

Transcript of the Kent Hovind Debate

Recorded July 21, 2:45 pm

By

Scott Burger and Andrew Smith-Moreland

Scott Burger and Andrew Smith-Moreland

Page 1

7/28/2006

**Andrew Smith-Moreland:** Hi, I'm Andrew Smith-Moreland.

**Scott Burger:** And I'm Scott Burger. And we are two eighteen year olds living up here on Orcas Island, Washington who happen to have a particular interest in science that some would say is unnecessarily complicated, but, we figure its fun, it's fascinating and basically we love it. My future plans for science include probably working for NASA, probably doing stuff for the European Space Agency, ESA. More or less my interest in science started with archeology, specifically pertaining to ancient Egyptian archeology. How they worshipped the stars, why they worshipped the stars and it kind of ballooned from there. I think only in the past three years or so I've actually been studying cosmology and astronomy fairly extensively. For my senior project in high school, I hand built a telescope that I used to take photos of the stars with my digital camera. Very fascinating, I love it, it's definitely my future profession. I've attended several Seattle Astronomical Society meetings and I also plan on being a future member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, or the AAAS. Andrew, maybe you can tell us a little bit about yourself?

**A:** My interest in science is purely for recreational purposes. Mainly, I'm a theoretical physics buff, what mainly interests me is how science, especially in relation to creation, with evolution and theoretical physics, relates to fields of theology, sociology and philosophy. While my future profession has nothing to do with my current field of study, this subject fascinates me, and I love to talk about it and debate it with others, especially showing others just how interesting and fascinating this subject can be.

**S:** Now, more importantly, you might be wondering just why we're doing this. Why are we going to go and talk a person on evolution and debate our side of it to begin with? In the science world, it's a very fundamental theory to biology, much like gravity is for cosmology in terms of theories. Andrew and I, one day, a while back had come across this very interesting fellow off the internet: a man by the name of Kent Hovind. The first time we saw one of his videos we initially just thought it was a joke. There was no possible way this guy was serious, it was all an elaborate scheme, but when we found out he was serious and that this guy is a very real, a very potential threat for the scientific community, maybe not just himself, but spreading delusions, spreading falsifications of the truth and just spreading flat out lies about evolution, we figured it was our duty and my duty especially as a potential future scientist, to not only correct these misinterpretations but also but also educate people, any person who is interested in the field whatsoever.

Scott Burger and Andrew Smith-Moreland

Page 2

7/28/2006

**A:** Now, you may be wondering who exactly is this Kent Hovind. First of all, he calls himself a doctor. He got his doctorate at an unaccredited college for Christian education. He has had numerous accounts of tax evasion even though he constantly talks about not wanting evolution taught in public schools and wasting our tax dollars. Just as an example of a few of his beliefs so that you can understand why we're so adamant about debating this man. He believes that the Earth and universe are six thousand years old, that fossil evidence isn't real evidence, the Flood actually happened and made all the geologic strata with which we use to date the age of the universe (he means the Earth).

**S** The biblical flood, yeah.

**A:** He also believes that dinosaurs lived with humans, specifically Adam and Eve, in the Garden of Eden, six thousand years ago.

**S:** Preposterous.

**A:** Exactly. So, today we're going to be debating this man, we're going to ask him questions about his particular belief, and then we're going to attempt to explain or at least elaborate on his answers so he knows where he's coming from because a lot of this stuff is information taken out of context that we need to address. We feel this is very, very, very important.

**S:** Correct. In terms of threat to biology and the sciences in general, Kent Hovind himself doesn't really present any credible intrinsic value that people should be worried about this guy. You really shouldn't be worried about him, at all.

**A:** You should be worried about the ideas he presents and the people he can possibly influence because the influence that he has and especially the way he presents his arguments is, unfortunately, brainwashing and very persuasive to those who don't know any better.

**S:** Precisely. Another kind of example of this is, although they're somewhat unrelated, because they have their quarrels within each other, but a very similar aspect to creation science, which in and of itself is just a joke, is a movement called Intelligent Design. And what it is is that it's trying to undermine evolution by saying there's a controversy, that scientists are confused, that whether or not evolution is real, which is a lie, that's not true at all. There were several state legislations throughout the south Midwest and the southeast United States and rural parts of the United States as well that were trying to pass legislation to get this across. Intelligent Design advocates are not necessarily saying that the Intelligent Designer that got life started on this planet was God, it could be an alien, but a majority of their funding comes from churches. Andrew and I have seen quite a few debates between these people, Intelligent Design advocates and then people advocating for evolution and naturalistic sciences. Intelligent Design is

Scott Burger and Andrew Smith-Moreland

distinctly trying to get religion into the science room. And it's not just religion in and of itself, its politics, and that's something that should really only be taught at a private school as opposed to a public school.

**A:** So, now that you know who we are and who Kent Hovind is, and why we're doing this, it's time to make the call and begin the debate. So we're going to cut off our initial introduction here and make the call.

**Robert:** Good afternoon, this is Robert with Dr. Dino Live, who's calling?

**A:** Hi, this is Andrew Smith-Moreland.

**S:** And Scott Burger.

**R:** Ok, we'll try and put you through again, Andrew.

**A:** Ok, thank you.

**R:** And you're from, did you say, Washington?

**A:** Yeah, and actually there's two of us here, just so you know.

**R:** Ok, that's fine. Thank you one second.

**Kent Hovind:** ...light speed is definitely not a constant...

Note: Due to the unpredicted microphone problem  
And the distance from the speakerphone, the recording from  
Hovind is significantly quiet. I have transcribed as much as possible  
From the recording and any summation if his that is too quiet to break  
The squelch is indicated by brackets [ ] to summarize his words.

**H:** [Hovind is talking about the speed of light not being constant, and specifically how that the square of the speed of light,  $C$ , in the equation  $E = mc^2$ , is just for suggestive use and that it is not definitively squared.] ...science [?] that  $E = mc^2$  is wrong and that  $c$  stands for constant and ... talking about the speed of light ... that scientists say that nothing can travel faster than the speed of light, what about if light was going one mile per hour and they tried to move an object faster than one mile per hour ... don't know about how big, I do cover in seminar seven, all these ... twenty five years ...

Scott Burger and Andrew Smith-Moreland

also, Einstein's formula,  $E = mc^2$ , energy equals mass times the speed of light, it doesn't stand for constant, it stands for the speed of light. So Einstein was saying that the speed of light squared, one and six thousand times ... I don't think that anyone knows that that exact number ... that's just an illustration to show how much energy can be ... could have been  $E = mc^3$  or quadrupled, I don't think anybody knows that ... disagrees or can prove this, actually ...

**A:** [whispering, to S] Don't address this immediately.

**H:** ... prove such a thing? How do you know it's not  $E = mc$  to the one half power? ... anyway, the point is that the speed of light is not a constant ... lot of research in the last twenty five years ... we cover that in seminar part seven. Ok, so Einstein's formula ... caller, Robert who's on the phone there?

**R:** Andrew from Washington.

**H:** Andrew from Washington, yes Andrew?

**A:** Hi, can you hear us?

**H:** Fine, yes sir.

**S:** Great.

**A:** First, we'd like to introduce who we are, there's actually two of us here, we know that you often say that you don't like people sneaking up on you, so we're not going to.

**H:** That's fine, go ahead.

**A:** My name is Andrew Smith-Moreland, I am eighteen years old and I live in Orcas Island, Washington and my main interest is, of course, science and theoretical physics and when coming across many of your videos, I decided that there were a few questions that I would like to ask you, because plenty of the ideas you presented were interesting.

**H:** Andrew, we have a two-minute break coming up here at the top of the hour, could you hold on a minute?

**A:** Yes we can

**S:** Absolutely.

Scott Burger and Andrew Smith-Moreland

Page 5

7/28/2006

**H:** We'll be back in two minutes, folks, thank you for calling. ... Good evening folks, welcome back to the Creation Science Hour and a Half, Kent Hovind and Robert Sagar live in Pensacola, Florida, July sometime

**R:** July 21<sup>st</sup>.

**H:** 2006, and we're the folks who believe the Bible is literally true and scientifically accurate and that evolution theory being taught in our schools is the dumbest and most dangerous religion in the history of planet earth, you can join us on the phone at (1) 877-479-DINO extension 136 ... Andrew, who's with you there, Andrew?

**A:** This is my friend, Scott Burger. Why don't you introduce yourself, Scott?

**S:** Well, like Andrew was saying, I, like him, am a fresh graduate out of Orcas Island High School here.

**H:** Ok.

**S:** We're both eighteen and we both share a common interest in science, much like you do, and specifically, my interest in science pertains to cosmology, astronomy, that sort of stuff, everything that floats over our heads. Andrew here seems to be more of a string theory kind of nut, where everything that comes out of his mouth doesn't really make sense to me. We just had some questions about who you were and what your stance on, like you said, evolution and what all that was about, so if you could give yourself an introduction to us, that'd be great.

**A:** It would help set things up.

**H:** [Hovind details his parent's profession, his sibling numbers and how he taught high school science and math, how he speaks in seminars, and probably debates some nine hundred times a year] ... and we've been having a long-standing offer of a quarter million dollars for anyone who has any real scientific evidence for evolution ... dumbest and most dangerous religion in the history of the world. ...so that's my totally unbiased and correct opinion.

**S:** Ok, we'll get to that in just a second, back to your education in science, I know you're a doctor, what exactly did you get your doctorate in, and I'm interested as to what your Ph.D. dissertation was.

**A:** Specifically the Ph. D thesis.

**H:** I'll try to answer these questions, however this sounds like an ad hominem argument instead of towards the facts-

Scott Burger and Andrew Smith-Moreland

**S:** No, no, just curious.

**H:** Ok, my Ph.D. is in education from a small, non-credited Christian university, it was in Colorado Springs, then moved out to Alamosa, Colorado, I believe, I don't know ... at the time, they had twenty five graduates a year, and three, typically, two to three were Ph.D.s ... don't like the education, don't like the degree then call me ... get back to the topic.

**A:** Well, we were just curious, it was a matter of a small dispute amongst ourselves.

**H:** There's a long article on the website dealing with that, has been for years,

**A:** Ok, well, we'll be sure to take a look at it, then. Now, I believe Scott has some comments to make on your,

**S:** First off, when you say, "evolution is a religion", we have some definitions off of unscientific websites, one of which you can just type into Google, they give you a definition that says, "a strong belief in a supernatural power, or powers, that controls human destiny". I'm sure you would agree to this as well.

**A:** That's the definition for religion.

**S:** Correct, however, when you type in evolution, into Google, again,

**A:** Or even Miriam-Webster's dictionary.

**S:** Precisely, Google says it's a "development: a process by which something passes by degrees to a different stage." An advanced or more mature stage.

**A:** Please note that that does not even pertain to even biological evolution. Evolution as the word and specifically how you seem to be using it in is actually just a change over time for anything, actually, not even species, it could be a change over time of my house. I could actually give you a very detailed description of the evolution of my house and would not be a religion.

**H:** Your house did not evolve without intelligent influence. It didn't happen from a pile of bricks getting caught in a hurricane.

**S:** Correct, but it's also non-biological. That's somewhat of an irrelevant argument. Moving onto astrophysics, we found off of your website, that you specifically have six definitions, six specific definitions which you seem to disagree with, well, five of which you disagree with, one of which you do agree with.

Scott Burger and Andrew Smith-Moreland

**A:** Could you state those real quick, just to know where we stand?

**H:** I can, but you need to understand, the meaning of words changes over time. I'm holding in my hands an 1828 dictionary. In 1828, the only meaning for evolution was, "unrolling, or unfolding" and is almost always used with mathematical expression. In geometry and algebra, they talk about how evolution is the extraction of roots from powers ... of involution.

**S:** Correct, but we're not talking about math here, this is more a physics/biological science argument.

**A:** And more importantly, the generally accepted definition, specifically from entirely credible dictionaries, such as Miriam-Webster's,

**S:** Encyclopedia Britannica, as well.

**A:** "Theory in Biology postulating that the various types of plants and animals and other living things on Earth have their origin in other preexisting types that the distinguishable differences are due to modifications in successive generations."

**H:** Would you agree that that definition could easily be construed to mean micro-evolution?

**S:** Define 'micro-evolution'.

**H:** Every plant and animal on the surface of this world had an ancestor that may have been slightly different than the current one is ... dad is different than my grandpa and different than my great-grandpa.

**S:** Correct, that's the premise of what evolution is. That slight variations in a particular generation are passed on genetically and keep going on along the lines until, say, several thousand years later, you have something that has hairier legs than initially had before.

**A:** And before we continue, this is a very important point that needs to be addressed, but we have some other ones we'd like to get to first.

**H:** I want to point out that what you did a minute ago, that if you go thousands of years, you just switched mid sentence from science to religion.

**S:** How is that, exactly? Elaborate on that.



**H:** It's true we see variations over time ... however, you are still human.

**A:** There's also changes between primates.

**H:** ... you have what's called mankind k-i-n-d ...

**S:** Is that first k capitalized or no?

**H:** I don't know, but there's certainly an obvious genetic barrier, mankind cannot cross breed with any other kind of animal.

**S:** Correct, that's exactly correct. Elaborating on your kinds argument, specifically having to do with what you just said, I have a quote here from Dr. Zachary Moore that says,

“This would presumably make “kinds” synonymous with the classification genus, but I've run across creationists that will even backpedal on that, and say that “Kind” is synonymous with “order” Which, of course, means that they'd have no problem with the idea of pigs and cows evolving from a common ancestor. Doesn't seem like that far of a stretch, right? Well, all primates belong to the same order also, so if Kinds is synonymous with order, then they're admitting that chimpanzees and humans evolved from a common ancestor also.”

**H:** I don't think you can take the word kinds and superimpose it over Carlos Linnaeus' classification system and say order at every instant or species in every instant. Kind is kind.

**A:** So what is your general definition—

**H:** ...Carlos Linnaeus' classification system and superimpose it over kinds, instead of vice-versa, which is what you're trying to do.

**S:** But there's no real set definition of what a species is. Because if you have a species, if you look at a species at a specific point in time its always in a constant state of flux there's no real point where you can easily say, it's not, it's not black and white, it's shades of gray. It's a gradient of change over how a specific organism goes from, say, a small little ball to something completely different. And, in fact I think Andrew, I believe you have something that goes along with this, as well.

**A:** And, before I begin, I would like to point out, I'm sorry that at times we are talking over you. If you remember yesterday when we tried calling, we had an issue with volume that we could barely hear you. Here, we can hear you a little bit better, its still

Scott Burger and Andrew Smith-Moreland

Page 9

7/28/2006

kind of quiet and Scott tends to talk a little bit loud, I was barely able to hear you, I'm not sure if he was hearing you.

**H:** There's two of you and there's one of me, and it's my program

**A:** Yeah, we're sorry.

**H:** and I want half the time, I want to talk about one topic at a time, don't make a statement then move onto another topic, I want to be able to answer your point.

**A:** Ok, ok, we understand that.

**S:** We're also going to try to keep our side of the thing going along as well, of course, we're the ones with the questions, we're seeking answers for the questions that we have and we figured you would be able to answer these questions quite thoroughly.

**H:** Let me ask you a question on that. Are you really seeking answers or are you looking to justify an acceptance of evolution because of some lifestyle reason because you don't like God telling you what to do?

**S:** No, no, we're specifically seeking what your answer to these particular questions are. We have one way of looking at something and sometimes some people can have a completely different way of looking at something, and we'd just like to know how, despite these observed, testable, predictable, producible results vary from your viewpoint. And that's all it is, is a viewpoint discussion. I don't want this to get into an argument; I want this to be a nice peaceful discussion between us.

**A:** And our goal here is not to convert you, or try to even get you to see our view, that would be entirely presumptuous and egotistical of us to even assume that we could try and do so.

**H:** No, please try to convert me, I'd love it.

**A:** While we're on this subject, I have a good example of how 'macro-evolution' can be sometimes mistaken for 'micro-evolution'.

**H:** Ok.

**A:** So, imagine here, a population of about one foot tall furballs. They're covered in fur. They have general variations between them, some have less fur, some have more fur, some are a little bit bigger, some are maybe not quite not so round, maybe some have a bigger brain case. That sort of thing. Somewhere on their planet, a volcano erupts and wipes out a forest or something, something causes the climate to change. An

Scott Burger and Andrew Smith-Moreland

environmental change. And the area that this population of furballs is living suddenly becomes incredibly hot and desert-like. Now the lightly furred furballs, now, are a little bit more likely to live. Because they have less fur, they're able to air condition themselves more, and the heavily furred furballs die of heat exhaustion. So now, the lightly furred furballs are able to live and procreate and make more even more lightly furred furballs because they're passing on their lightly furred gene. So, say, five hundred thousand years pass, now I know you disagree that the Earth isn't this old, but five hundred thousand years pass and now we have a population of completely hairless balls.

**H:** Right.

**A:** And maybe they've grown a little bit, increased their surface area and became cooler. Now, these lightly furred balls, a new animal species, comes into their domain. Before [the hairless balls] were living on plants, and now they have a new source of protein. Well, with this new source of protein, the furballs that had a larger brain case or larger brain are able to sustain themselves even better. Now, not that they were dying off before, or that others are dying off now, it's just that they're able to live better and more, they're able to seek and mate because they look fertile to all their other mates, because they're getting enough food and nutrition. So these balls with a larger braincase are increasing their braincase size. So, they're able to pass that gene along with the larger brain case now they have a little lump on their heads. Another five hundred thousand years pass, and now we have a population of sort of half-peanut things. The half-peanut things with their braincases continue to get larger are becoming top-heavy and falling over, since they have round bases. Well, as I mentioned before, small variations between the size of these peanut things, some of them have maybe a flatter base than others and these are able to not fall over as much, and [not] get eaten, not eating and not procreating, and so now, and these flat-bottom things are able to pass their gene along because they're able to procreate so another five hundred thousand years pass, and we have as of now, a population of six-foot tall flat-bottomed peanuts and these came from a population of one-foot tall furballs. You would not be able to distinguish the two of these as the same kind or the same species. Herein lies a very important concept: that each snapshot of the change of these species is what you would define as micro-evolution. The more furred going to lightly furred, the not so lumpy going to more lumpy.

**S:** Each bringing forth after their own kind.

**A:** And this is an important conceptual framework that needs to be grasped. In fact, evolution can be compared to the theory of general relativity. Which we know, though observed and tested fact, that it's true. Because astronauts have experienced a gain in time as well as other things. But that's not something we see in our everyday life. We don't move through life at speeds fast enough to see this happen. It's a purely conceptual concept, obviously. It's something you can only think about for the most part until you look at general equations or particle accelerators that show that relativity is true, since we

Scott Burger and Andrew Smith-Moreland

can accelerate things up to those speeds. Now, evolution is something similar along those lines. We don't have long enough lifespans, currently, to be able to observe evolution occurring, because we are a snapshot of evolution. Evolution takes place in extremely tiny changes over a very long period of time and each generation cannot see the general change between species. We can only see, in our extremely limited snapshot of life, the tiny changes that each kind brings forth.

**S:** I want to kind of lead in to your first definition of evolution, wherein

**A:** Let him address the point.

**S:** Ok.

**H:** We got a break here in about one minute. First off, what you gave me was a hypothetical situation. It's not been observed, ok? Secondly, it's going from hairballs to less-hairballs, that's losing information, not gaining.

**S:** But it's gaining an advantage on the environment.

**A:** It is a different type of information, and the changes were gaining of information.

**H:** You're missing it. It's not gaining genetic information. The gene code determines the individual. So where's it gaining this extra genetic information?

**A:** Well, when the braincases increased, that was a gain in information.

**H:** There, right there, you're off into religion. This is fairytale stuff.

**S:** How? Again, the definition of religion is based off faith, this is just a hypothetical situation where no faith is required.

**H:** You have faith that these furballs are increasing the size of their braincases.

**A:** But each of the steps the furballs took were completely logical steps. You would agree that each step this took, was something you would see happen, because some have bigger heads than others.

**H:** Let me give you a hypothetical one.

**A:** Ok.

**H:** You come from a family of Mexicans that work in the orange groves picking oranges. You work as fast as you can picking oranges with both hands. Over hundreds of

Scott Burger and Andrew Smith-Moreland

years, you develop a third hand because that allows you to pick oranges faster. And then over millions of years, you develop a fourth hand and a fifth hand and a sixth hand and slowly humans evolve into an octopus.

**A:** That is a different type of evolution which has been proven wrong. That is called Lamarckian Evolution. Lamarckian Evolution is based off need. The person who came up with that theory, actually it was a hypothesis, was named Lamarck, obviously...

**H:** Ok, we have break time, here.

**A:** Ok.

**S:** Ok, we'll get back to you.

**H:** We'll come back to your hypothetical story is an excellent example of how evolution is a religion. We'll be back folks, in two minutes. ... We have on the phone from Washington, Scott and Andrew. Still there, guys?

**S:** We are.

**A:** Yeah.

**H:** Ok, so your furball story that you told, like you said, is purely hypothetical. These creatures' response to their environment by losing information, not gaining ... opposite story. Instead of furballs, we're going to have, you know, skin balls. They have no fur at all. They don't even have the genes to make fur. They have no fur. So now it gets really cold. How are they going to develop fur?

**A:** Well, they don't. If the gene has been completely weeded out, then unfortunately, they're dead.

**S:** I think there's a statistic where somewhere around ninety eight or there was a very high percentage somewhere over ninety six percent of known species on the planet Earth that have gone permanently extinct.

**A:** And it could be by random causes, like the furballs.

**H:** Well, that's a real hypothetical concept, too. You're assuming, of course, that a lot of things are extinct, that we don't have this world thoroughly explored ... I cover it pretty well on my seminar part three that probably quite a few species of dinosaurs ... five or six ... [are still alive today].

**A:** Are Neanderthals still alive?

Scott Burger and Andrew Smith-Moreland

**S:** No.

**H:** We had a guy come in one time to our seminar program in Pennsylvania, I've got a snapshot of a side view of him, looks exactly like a Neanderthal, with his sloping forehead, even opened up his shirt and showed me his chest covered with hair, I mean this guy was definitely a Neanderthal.

**S:** Bigfoot walks among us, still.

**A:** Oh yeah.

**H:** But are Neanderthals still alive? I think there are certainly, you could line up skulls from different countries from around the world and find a wide range from high, flat, straight skulls, to sloping foreheads in every population. ... Neanderthals are perfectly normal humans you need to read Jack Cuozzo's book or go to [drjackcuozzo.com](http://drjackcuozzo.com) c-u-o-c-z-o. He's a dentist, spent thirty-two years studying growth of the human face and he studied all the Neanderthals, the originals, not the copies in America, he went to Europe with an x-ray machine. On several of them, they had taken the jaw and moved it out of the socket one inch. ... to make it look like it had a sloped face like a monkey, said 'guys, the jaw is an inch out of the socket, this thing's gonna stave to death' ... days, he put the jaw back in the socket and it looked exactly like a normal human. There's a lot of deceit about the Neanderthals, [drjackcuozzo.com](http://drjackcuozzo.com). Let me hear another furball story.

**A:** We're pretty much done with the furball stories.

**H:** I think you already illustrated the point that this is all hypothetical, this is something you believe in if you believe it might happen and you rely totally on the unseen factor of adding new gene code to create a new kind and the obvious unseen factor of millions of years. Plus you refer to five hundred thousand years later, something happened ... what makes it a religion you believe this, but you don't observe it.

**A:** Well, see that's the problem, when at least Einstein proposed his theory of general relativity, he was also unable to observe this

**S:** He was something like two years ahead of his time before predicting gravitational lensing using the Sun in a solar eclipse, for example.

**A:** A point though that I would like to make is that you continually say that genetic information was lost with the furballs. You're right. In the very beginning, when they lost their ability to have fur, that does seem like a loss of genetic information. However, Those hairless balls developed a bit of a lump, larger brains, that seems to be, if anything, a gaining of genetic of information, and also when they began to get larger, that sort of

Scott Burger and Andrew Smith-Moreland

thing. And something else I'd like to point out, there seems to be a misunderstanding here specifically how evolution is conducted, specifically going back to the Lamarckian view with giraffes. One of his theories, or hypothesis, actually, because it was never really confirmed, was that giraffes had long necks because they needed to reach the bigger trees.

**H:** Oh I'm very familiar with Lamarck and how he's been proven wrong and how the communists kept teaching that for decades afterwards.

**S:** Proven wrong by who, though, and by what means?

**A:** It is wrong, though.

**H:** Proven wrong in the mid eighteenth-hundreds by probably with the discovery of Mendelian genetics and that everything's controlled by genes. Lamarck is the one who said that rams have horns in their head because when they get angry, there's a special juice called horny material that makes the horns grow. Hence the term horny today.

**S:** Correct, but we also have throughout the course of time, when science is proven wrong, by other scientists, we have new theories like Mendel's genes in pertaining to specific alleles and how that applies to giraffes. Another hypothetical example, however this one deals with gaining information, not losing information...

**H:** Hang on a second, a giraffe has a long neck because it has long legs. What if a giraffe had long legs and a short neck? How's he going to get a drink? It has nothing to do with reaching the leaves it has to do with reaching the water.

**S:** There was also a very interesting thing I was hearing about the structure of a giraffes neck. It had something to do with blood flow, where a giraffe lifted its neck too high, it'll go faint, at least for people that's what happens, giraffes seem to get around this somehow. Seems kind of irrelevant, but it also has to do with the fact that giraffes had evolved this sort of need because of their longer appendages.

**H:** You have circular reasoning here.

**S:** How is that circular reasoning?

**H:** What they have is called a miracle network. It's a network of blood vessels that absorb the shock of the blood crashing down into their brain. When they lift their head up, to run from the lions, they would faint from lack of blood, but this miracle network, it [?] the blood and gives the blood three more pumps of blood to the brain before the heart catches up. So you could say that the giraffe evolved the need for that, but it's much more

logical to say that the creature was designed with this thing already here. I could say did the car evolve the need for a transmission or ... works?

**S:** Well that's dealing with non-biological mechanics, its dealing with something that isn't alive and didn't have DNA to begin with.

**A:** It doesn't self-assemble.

**H:** I get this argument all the time, I understand. I'm trying to get you to understand the folly of believing that the giraffe evolved these marvelous features. Did the giraffe get this miracle network before it had the long neck, if so, it wouldn't need that miracle network.

**A:** You're right, it wouldn't be here if it didn't evolve it.

**H:** There you go, circular reasoning. It's here, so it must've evolved.

**S:** So we have in the savanna, or wherever in Africa giraffes are found, I don't know specifically, giraffes feed on tall trees.

**H:** Giraffes feed on anything green, and there are lots of animals in the savanna that don't have a long neck that live right there with the giraffes, why didn't they all die off?

**S:** Well they have different sources of income of food. Lions, for example, very carnivorous meat-eaters prey on zebras or gazelles or anything else they can find within their reach.

**H:** Gazelles can't reach the tall trees, why don't they all have long necks?

**S:** Because they eat the grass that's beneath their feet.

**H:** Giraffes eat grass, too.

**S:** They do, but they also have an advantage, if there's a drought, and all the grass is dying out, there's a lot of taller trees up there with still some leaves that they can go up and eat.

**H:** I know, so why didn't the zebras die out?

**A:** This isn't going anywhere. This is a tangent we need to get off of otherwise this conversation will stay here for pretty much the entire time.

**H:** If you logic was right, there would only be giraffes in the savanna.

Scott Burger and Andrew Smith-Moreland



**A:** This is not something we need to address right now, because if we continue to talk about this, then we'll waste the entire show.

**S:** So getting back to our plan of action of questions we'd like to ask

**H:** Hold on just a second, we normally have a ten-minute limit on calls like this, we have a few more minutes, go ahead I want to hear what you have to say.

**S:** Specifically dealing with what I've come across is your Hovind Theory where, basically, to summarize, can be that: Noah and the animals got on the Ark, a large ice meteor came through the solar system, broke apart, that's where the craters on the moon, the rings of Uranus, Neptune, Jupiter, Saturn, came from, and through some sort of magical reasoning, happened to hit the north and south pole directly. What's the proof for this, and just how big of a meteor was it and what's the logic behind this at all?

**H:** Well first of all, I'd like to point out, I'm not asking the public schools to teach my Hovind Theory at the taxpayer's expense. I don't have to prove anything. They are asking for their religion of evolution to be taught at the taxpayer's expense. So the burden of proof lies purely on them, not me.

**S:** They're not asking, it's a scientific fact.

**H:** You believe it's a scientific fact.

**S:** Do you believe gravity is a religion? Gravity, on the basis of theory, has just as much as credible evidence as evolution does. What causes gravity? Have they found graviton yet? Have they found any carrier, have they found any boson to carry the information? No.

**H:** ... evolution has as much evidence as gravity, I mean, I can see gravity working right this minute, I'm sitting down in a chair.

**S:** That's because it works on such quick scales, though.

**A:** When you give birth, you're also contributing to evolution. You can see that happen, too.

**H:** You're contributing to less evolution?

**A:** You're contributing to evolution the same way you can see gravity. You're sitting in a chair or something; I don't know what you're doing right now. And you're like, oh, gravity's definitely affecting me right now, right?

Scott Burger and Andrew Smith-Moreland

**H:** It has all my life.

**A:** Do you know how gravity affects you? What is the carrier by which gravity works?

**H:** I don't know the how, but I do see the result.

**S:** So there's a fault right there. We can't prove that, so we should just automatically throw it out.

**A:** Gravity is a religion.

**H:** That's why it's called gravitational theory, there are theories about what's causing it, the attraction of masses. But there's so much evidence, everything in the universe is controlled by gravity.

**S:** What about inflation and dark matter, though?

**H:** Well, there's no evidence of a dog producing a non-dog.

**A:** You're right, a dog never, ever, ever produce a non-dog. In fact, we will never see it happen.

**H:** You believe that dogs came from non-dogs.

**S:** Explain that.

**H:** Were the dogs originally created, or did they come from something that was a non-dog?

**S:** I've heard you say yourself that modern dogs came from a somewhat of a wolf-like creature. You're not going to get a giraffe out of a wolf, that's just insane. I know that, we'll both agree to that. But you could also say that plants, an earlier version of, say, a fern will give rise to something like a fern. But what about primates? What about a chimp? What about a gorilla? Their earlier forms share the same form as our earlier form, like Neanderthals which are a different species.

**H:** You can believe that if you'd like, but that's your religion and not science.

**A:** So a monkey doesn't look like me? It's got two arms it's got two legs, a head and a face, two eyes, nose, mouth.

**H:** I got a chair with four legs and two arms

**S:** That's an inanimate object, though, that's not biologically active. Anymore, at least.

**H:** Ok, this is going nowhere, guys. I think you have an ulterior motive for wanting to believe in evolution.

**A:** Not necessarily

**H:** I don't know you at all, but I suspect there's a reason you would not want the Bible to be true because you would realize things like thou shalt not commit adultery, don't lust.

**S:** No, no, no, that's not what we're debating here. We're not debating...

**A:** Morals at all..

**S:** We're not debating the Bible here, we're debating science.

**H:** People choose to believe in evolution because of their lust, according to second peter, chapter three. Now, I don't know you at all, but I suspect there's an ulterior motive for wanting to believe we came from rocks. Last word guys, go ahead.

**A:** I could make the exact same argument because, like you said, I don't know you personally, and I probably never will, unfortunately, I'm sure you're a good person. But I suspect, for the same reasons you suspect, that you might also have an ulterior motive for not wanting evolution being taught in the schools and instead try to prove evolution is wrong because it goes against so many beliefs you have lived your life by. This could be an extremely earth shattering revelation for you if it ever came it around, and I suspect you do not want this to happen.

**S:** And me getting in a last word here so you can get on to more callers. Evolution, to sum up, is a fact. It has been proven and re-proven for two hundred years now, so it's a relatively new theory. But Gravity and general relativity have also only existed for a hundred years. Quantum mechanics and general relative can't be combined, so should we just throw them out because we don't know what can combine them? No. And specifically regarding back to gravity again. Gravity is

**A:** An unknown factor.

**S:** Yeah, I mean, there's so many things that science can't pin down one hundred percent. The Uncertainty Principle, for example. Should we throw that out because we

Scott Burger and Andrew Smith-Moreland

don't know the exact position and velocity of an electron at the same time? No. Should we toss out infrared spectroscopy, for example? No, that's proven. Should we throw out just about any scientific theory and just rip the carpet out from underneath the feet of science that's standing bold and strong right now, have it come tumbling down, and go back, faster than the speed of light, travel back in time back to the twelfth century and live in the dark ages?

**H:** Well, I think you're confusing evolution with science, I'm for science, I'm using a lot of technology

**S:** You are not for science at all! I'm sorry, but, I hate to interrupt you here and I hate to make it sound like I'm arguing against you, but

**A:** Don't get hostile now.

**S:** I'm trying not to. But you specifically said you do not want evolution in the classroom. But yet you also argue that the Big Bang could not produce hydrogen, You argue that planets could not form out of planetary nebulas around stars. you argue that big bang nucleosynthesis, stellar nucleosynthesis is bunk, abiogenesis is completely retarded, what about cytochrome-c?

**H:** But then you're getting into something that's already living. We got a break in thirty seconds here, we appreciate you guys calling, we've ended up giving you plenty of time. Come to a seminar sometime when I get to your area, or come to Pensacola, I'll take you to lunch and we'll discuss all this.

**S:** Absolutley.

**H:** Glad to try to get you converted. Have you watched the seminar series?

**A:** We have. [Andrew then asks about contacting off the air]

**H:** Thanks a lot.

**S:** Thanks.

**A:** ... for the talk, Hovind.

**H:** You can join us on the program 877-479-DINO, extension 136.

**A and S:** [celebratory scream]

Scott Burger and Andrew Smith-Moreland