

IS EVOLUTION A FACT?

INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

For a long time it has been obvious that the ACLU, supported by ignorant judges on federal benches, will not permit any explanation of the origin of mankind other than evolution to be taught in our educational institutions. Judges have ruled that any attempt to teach explanations other than evolution is merely a back-door way of getting God into classrooms. Congress has abdicated its responsibility under the first amendment to our U.S. Constitution, and has allowed these judicial rulings to stand.

Evolutionary proponents are now working to prohibit any discussion which would suggest that their theory might be flawed. I see this as an affront to both critical thinking and liberty. Although an oxymoron, this is probably best described as scientific tyranny.

Several years ago Dr. Carl Sagan made the assertion on the Johnny Carson show and in *Time* magazine that evolution was a fact. He offered to debate any credible opponent. Immediately, Dr. Thomas Warren (Ph.D. in philosophy from Vanderbilt University) took up the challenge. Dr. Sagan subsequently hid under his desk. Dr. Warren already had debated the famed atheist Dr. Antony Flew, and in my view Dr. Flew lost that debate (the debate book is available at Amazon.com). Apparently Dr. Flew must have thought so, too, since in his old age he finally has decided that there really **is** a God (see his book, *There Is No a God*).

Here in New Mexico we once had a State Board of Education (SBE) that added language to its charter that permitted alternative views of the origin of man to be taught in our public schools. Dr. Terry Yates, head of the biology department at the University of New Mexico, had a fit—writing all of the lawmakers, screaming at the newspapers, etc. I subsequently wrote a letter to Dr. Yates, and sent copies to each member of the SBE, all the newspapers, and the Governor. My letter was widely published in a variety of state newspapers. I challenged Dr. Yates to debate the issue strictly on the merits of the theory—with just one caveat: the results would be published, and would help form the basis of a course in the public schools so that students and teachers could decide for themselves. Dr. Yates preferred to stay in his protected, tenured tower so that he could dispense his doctrine with impunity. I did, however, receive a nice thank-you letter from the Governor.

During the 2008 Presidential Election process Dr. Ron Paul, a seven-term congressman from the 22nd district of Texas, offered himself as a candidate for President from the Republican Party. Though eminently qualified, he was marginalized by both his party and the press. No one wanted to upset the apple cart with the outdated idea of liberty. Nonetheless, Paul raised over \$35 million from the more-thoughtful citizens, and received more contributions from active members of the military than all of the other candidates combined. When he bowed out of the race, he was left with substantial funds, portions of which he used to organize The Campaign for Liberty website (C4L) that is designed to educate the public on the first principles of The Republic. I immediately joined, and began posting articles of my own.

One of the popular articles posted on the C4L site was ***Darwin = Junk Science*** by C4L member Robert Owens. My first thought was that this subject did not belong on C4L. But as I got into it I realized that it is a liberty issue after all. Owens' article received some criticism, especially from another C4L member who is an evolutionist. For privacy reasons I will simply refer to the evolutionist as Eguy. The comment that best explains the liberty aspect of this subject was advanced by C4L member and Illinois Interim State Coordinator Heather D., who said:

"It is always disappointing to see people within the movement who still cling to the "one thing"... You know the type.... They want freedom in every area except the ONE THING that is

important to them.... Some Greenies want states rights for everything but carbon emissions; some Evolutionists want freedom for everything except education.... And no matter how hard you try to reveal their inconsistency to them, they just don't get it.

I never expected that "EGuy" would change his opinion on Evolution, however I did hope that he would at some point realize he was advocating leaving the chains of bondage in place for everyone who did not believe as he does. Many times he has accused Creationists of destroying the Liberty Movement. Ironically, his insistence that the chains of bondage should remain in place for Creationists was truly the position that destroys liberty."

Eguy boasted that he was probably one of the only actual scientists at C4L, and implied that he was not to be questioned since he knew the evolution/creation debate inside and out. Seeing another opportunity to enter into a scholarly debate regarding this issue with an actual scientist, I offered to do so with Eguy. After some exchange he agreed to the debate. I arranged for a non-evolutionist disputant who proposed the terms for the debate. The terms (below in blue) were:

First, you will prepare a total of three affirmative arguments defending the theory of evolution (scientifically). As you submit each one, we will respond in the negative to refute your arguments. By the time you have concluded your affirmative arguments, we will have six documents in place (three from you affirming evolution, and three from us refuting evolution).

Then a reverse procedure will ensue, in which we will submit a total of three documents showing why evolution is an inadequate theory of origins (scientifically), and you, in turn, will respond to each of those. By the time we have concluded the affirmative arguments, we will have six more documents in place (three from us refuting evolution, and three from you affirming evolution).

Thus, by the end of the debate each of us will have produced six documents, making a total of twelve. Within reason, there will be no time constraint on replies. We each will work at our own pace.

Second, it is understood that there will not be any arguments to advocate things like God's existence, Intelligent Design, special creation, scientific creationism, etc. Rather, while we are in the negative, we simply will refute whatever arguments are set forth for evolution, and then while in the affirmative we will show why evolution is not an adequate theory of origins. Also, arguments regarding the age of the Earth will not be a part of this debate due to the limited space available to each disputant, and due to the tangential nature of the age of the Earth in regard to the legitimacy of evolution as a theory of origins.

Third, in order to eliminate personalities, no names will appear anywhere on the debate documents. We prefer the name BPC (Biblical Publishing Corporation) and would suggest Evolutionist for your name (with your approval).

Fourth, each argument should be no more than ten pages single spaced in an 11-point font with a 1-inch margin all around the page, and a 0.3-inch indent per paragraph. We would also suggest that page numbers be appended to each page at the top and center of the pages for uniformity.

Fifth, no *ad hominem* arguments will be made. This is in keeping with the finest traditions of scholarly debate. Each disputant needs to agree to stick solely to the facts and arguments at hand, and to refrain from making any types of personal attacks.

Sixth, no pejorative terminology, curse words, or other types of inappropriate speech patterns are to be used during the debate. Again, this is in keeping with the finest traditions of scholarly debate.

That said, here are the propositions suggested. Please look them over and see if you

agree.

RESOLVED: Macroevolution (as suggested by the General Theory of Evolution-as opposed to microevolution, as suggested by the Special Theory of Evolution) is a fact, and as such, represents a correct scientific explanation of the origin of the Universe and life on Earth. You affirm; we deny.

RESOLVED: Macroevolution (as suggested by the General Theory of Evolution-as opposed to microevolution, as suggested by the Special Theory of Evolution) is not a fact, and as such, does not represent a correct scientific explanation of the origin of the Universe and life on Earth. We affirm; you deny.

Eguy agreed to these terms, and said that he would work on his affirmatives ASAP. Almost a month went by without any word. Finally, Eguy replied (in blue) as follows:

Heres [sic] some affirmatives:

- 1- Bacterial antibiotic resistance**
- 2- DNA and heredity**
- 3- Fossil record**
- 4- Similarity of metabolic enzymes and pathways among organisms. Like redundant proteins and biochemical pathways.**
- 5- Similarity in DNA among organisms**
- 6- The reason new flu virus's [sic] show up every year**
- 7- The age of the earth and geological history and its effect on life in the past**
- 8- Vestigial organs or structures**
- 9- Endogenous retrovirus's [sic]**
- 10- The explanation of complexity via natural selection has never been contradicted.**

Is that enough for you?

**No offense but I am done with this movement [sic] and its conservative anti science propaganda
ps: fuck off.**

It appears that Eguy is the Henny Youngman of evolution. Since I was moderating the debate, and since I already had gone to the expense of arranging for the non-evolutionist disputant, I made the decision to proceed with the non-evolutionary rebuttal and affirmative documents.

Upon quitting the debate, Eguy violated the debate terms in his one-line declarations in both format and content (which included abusive language, also forbidden by the rules of the debate). Therefore, I relieved the non-evolutionist as well from having to comply with the format and content debate terms. Accordingly, the non-evolutionist's rebuttal and affirmative documents are somewhat expanded. Please read the following notice before beginning your review of the debate documents.

NOTICE

Some of the information used in these debate materials was derived from previously published articles of Apologetics Press <http://www.apologeticspress.org>

W. N. (Bill) Fangio
Moderator