

# THE FREEHOVIND WIKIPEDIA LINK:

*Copied verbatim from the Kent Hovind Wikipedia talk page located at:  
Comments should be posted to:*

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Kent\\_Hovind#FreeHovind.com](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Kent_Hovind#FreeHovind.com)  
<http://forum.freehovind.com/view-112>

18:29, 16 March 2007 (UTC)

I recommend we remove the FreeHovind.com link. That is basically a link to Hovind's websites and posts (which are linked on wiki). The website contains a biography that the author has admittedly taken from wikipedia [19], but purposefully has removed facts such as his education is not accredited and lacks information on his past criminal behavior. Hence, it is material taken from wikipedia, but twisted to misled readers. The website is ran by a sixteen year old homeschooled student who trying to organize a petition to overturn 58 federal convictions (signed by six people including petition's author). The website says "call the President" and contains the White House phone number. I see it has no value pertaining to WP:EL. Arbustoo 16:49, 8 March 2007 (UTC)

And its display of the Wikipedia content violates the GFDL to boot. It's moderately interesting in that it shows some level of ongoing interest from his supporters, but does not really add any new information about Hovind. ObiterDicta ( pleadings • errata • appeals ) 17:18, 8 March 2007 (UTC)

\* Re: FreeHovind.com

I disagree, and believe the FreeHovind link should be left on. I have re-added it because:

1) FreeHovind.com is much more than links to other sites: it includes a custom video gallery that is very intuitive and easy to use, a forum, a very handy downloads page, seminar transcriptions and articles (more coming soon), a custom petition, and lots of resources for Hovind supporters.

The videos and (coming soon section) don't offer anything that isn't on the page already. Arbustoo 01:38, 11 March 2007 (UTC)

2) Saying the biography has been taken from WikiPedia with no changes but purposefully removing Hovind's criminal history is deceptive. The 2 part biography [20] AND [21] contains portions of Hovind's WikiPedia article, but is significantly different. Hovind's biography on FreeHovind does mention most of the criminal charges on Hovind's WikiPedia article, but also contains explanations of the charges from the perspective Hovind often refers to them from. This is certainly not to mislead readers, but rather to give them the opportunity to see "the other side of the story". If FreeHovind was trying to mislead readers, why would it link to Hovind's WikiPedia article so often?

Much of what is taken from this article is twisted and purposely misleading. If FreeHovind wasn't trying to mislead readers why not include the true status of his "education"-- that it is worthless. He has no expertise or education in science. NONE. Arbustoo 01:38, 11 March 2007 (UTC)

3) The age of the person who "ran"s the FreeHovind website should have nothing to do with it's placement on WikiPedia, but if it did the homepage you mentioned contains links to quite a few other sites that should demonstrate that the 16 year old in question is fully capable of creating professional sites.

The age is just one part of it. If the author were, say, a person with a background in science, law or religion the website might have more validity. The point is, anyone can create a website and post what they want. However, it should always be linked on wikipedia. Arbustoo 01:38, 11 March 2007 (UTC)

4) The "16 year old" who runs the site is not "trying to organize a petition". He HAS organized a petition, which is being commented on in the forums right now, but is NOT open for signatures yet. The reason it has six signatures at the moment is because it was accidentally open for signatures for a short period of testing, and six people jumped at the opportunity to sign it.

The petition is currently 6 people (including someone who signed it "Shawn" and the author herself.). Forums again are meaningless. What does this have to do with adding anything to the article? No doubt petitions can be and are organized for all sorts of criminals with a devoted audience. Just because the criminal is notable that doesn't make the petition notable. Arbustoo 01:38, 11 March 2007 (UTC)

5) Even if you won't grant anything else, the website certainly has "link value" as the easiest and best source to watch and download Hovind's movies. Speaking of "link value", on the page you referenced it mentions "Avoid undue weight on particular points of view". Right now (without the FreeHovind link), the page has links to 3 non official pro-Hovind sites and 14 anti-Hovind sites.

Hovind's website is more valid as a place to download Hovind's videos. However, should we link every website that posts Hovind's videos or just yours? By the way, have you ever purchased Hovind's DVDs? If you have, I recommend you look at the back of the DVDs. He clearly states they ARE copyrighted. Arbustoo 01:38, 11 March 2007 (UTC)

For example, on the back of his presentation of volume 1 DVD: "ALL MATERIAL (UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED) IS COPYRIGHT© 2005 CSE MINISTRY." The DVDs clearly state that it is ILLEGAL to use his materials for public performance, to copy and distribute for free, or to sell copies. Arbustoo 01:54, 11 March 2007 (UTC)

5) Since the site is not copyrighted at all, I don't see how including portions of Hovind's Wikipedia article on the biography pages violates the GFDL. If the site does violate copyright laws, please say how and I am sure the site's author would be glad to fix it.

Roburmow 00:44, 11 March 2007 (UTC)

Its WP:SPAM. No reason to have it. The videos and other media are available via other links; the only possible reason for having this link is to promote the petition, which is a violation of Wikipedia is not a soapbox. One puppy's opinion. KillerChihuahua?!? 00:48, 11 March 2007 (UTC)

You can view the full text of the GFDL at WP:GFDL. The main provisions there would be that the text must still remain licensed under the GFDL, a copy of the GFDL must be provided, and some author attributions must be given. (This would be satisfied with a link back to this page or to the page history as author credit.) Also, please note that all websites are copyrighted unless the copyright holder explicitly states otherwise. Under US copyright law, all work is copyrighted the moment it is "fixed in a tangible form", which putting up a website counts as. (Of course, the copyright holder may certainly state that others are free to reuse the information, either with or without conditions, the GFDL is a reuse-with-conditions license.) As to including the link here, make that the opinion of two puppies, it doesn't seem to fit WP:EL, and we really don't need links to petitions. (Imagine what George W. Bush would look like if we started allowing petition links!) Seraphimblade Talk to me Please review me! 00:52, 11 March 2007 (UTC)

My favorite part of FreeHovind, besides the omission that Patriot University is a diploma mill and that referring to him as Dr is highly inappropriate (and insulting to people with real doctorates), is that the webmaster wants Hovind released from 58 felony convictions on the basis of his ignorant views of science. Yeah, let's just give all criminals a pass on the law who use fraudulent arguments to attack scientific FACT...

Also I'd like to know how this Hovind defender used his first ever wikipedia edit to reply on my talk page. Very advanced for a first ever edit. Arbustoo 01:23, 11 March 2007 (UTC)

\* "Answering the Critics":

Thanks everyone for the suggestions and comments! You can see my replies below:

KillerChihuahua: Your statement that "The videos and other media are available via other links" is completely wrong. The only other link on the page that has Hovind's videos is his official site, which only offers Hovind's seminars in WMV format. FreeHovind offers Hovind's seminars, college courses, answering critics, and a couple other movies in streaming embedded flash video on the watch page, and Google video, flash video, and bittorrent on the download page. FreeHovind is also the only pro-Hovind forum linked on WikiPedia, and contains a transcription of Hovind's 1st seminar. Many more resources are soon to come on the "Info" page, and the petition was actually requested by the site's visitors.

SeraphimBlade: Your information on copyright law is very helpful! A "this site is not copyrighted" notice has been added to the site, along with links to the GFDL on the biography pages. It looks like a couple other Pro-Hovind links were just removed from the article. Using your "George Bush" example, please imagine what the George W. Bush page would look like if it only had 1 non official (and somewhat affiliated) link to a pro-George W. Bush site and over ten times that many negative links!

Arbustoo: Since it bothers you so much, FreeHovind now does mention that Patriot University is unaccredited. Your statement that "the webmaster wants Hovind released from 58 felony convictions on the basis of his ignorant views of science." seems to indicate you forgot to read the petition. The fact Hovind teaches creation has nothing to do with Hovind supporters wanting him released from prison for ridiculous alleged "crimes"! No, I am not a "Sock Puppet" as you imply. It

was actually wasn't that advanced, as I didn't realize you were talking about the article's talk page and not your talk page :-)

Roburmow 02:37, 11 March 2007 (UTC)

The website still 1) doesn't add anything of relevance to the article, and 2) contains errors such as erroneously calling him "Dr. Hovind" and failing to mention serious questions about his false assertions on science. You have set up a petition for ideological reasons in support of pseudoscience and lies. That is, Hovind committed crimes, but you want those crimes ignored. You failed to answer my question about copyrights and purchasing videos. Lastly, I didn't call you a sock puppet, but I would like to know how you learned to sign your username with your first post. Have you had a previous account? Arbustoo 03:51, 11 March 2007 (UTC)

To address what you've stated-Hovind's "official" site is linked, but to be quite honest, the vast majority of material out there on Hovind is negative. He's mainly notable for questionable (and that's the nicest word I can think of) pseudoscientific theories, and being convicted of tax crimes. Most of what's out there that's positive contains information that's contradicted by reliable sources. (For my part, I couldn't care less if you have another account, you haven't done anything I can see that violates the rules for secondary accounts anyway.) Seraphimblade Talk to me Please review me! 04:07, 11 March 2007 (UTC)

I figured out how to sign my name after my first post... It's not hard. Cr4JC 04:11, 11 March 2007 (UTC)

There was someone who is banned from wikipedia from San Diego/Oceanside who was caught using sock puppets[22] on this very page. His goal was to give the impression that more people wanted the content change when that wasn't true. Arbustoo 04:39, 11 March 2007 (UTC)

Wow, that's a lot of user names... Cr4JC 02:48, 13 March 2007 (UTC)Cr4JC

That person behind that sock puppet has many more including Category:Suspected Wikipedia sockpuppets of Jason Gastrich and Category:Wikipedia sockpuppets of Jason Gastrich. This article was one of his favorites. Yes, 150+ is a lot for one person. Arbustoo 18:18, 14 March 2007 (UTC)

1) FreeHovind is the only site linked that contains Hovind's college courses, answering critics series, and a couple of Hovind's other videos. It is also the only Hovind site that offers Hovind's movies as streaming embedded flash videos. It is also the only Hovind site that offers Hovind's videos in Google video, flash video, and bitorrent. It also contains an "Info" page, which has information about Hovind from a different perspective than the WikiPedia article which many readers would be interested in. The info page also has a transcription of Hovind's 1st seminar, and more are coming soon. FreeHovind also contains a petition (which is the only pro-Hovind one on the net) and a forum (which is - believe it or not - actually a helpful resource for Hovind supporters).

2) Aside from the info section, which ADDRESSES most of the accusations against Hovind, FreeHovind provides Hovind's "Answering the Critics" series and College Courses, which answers pretty much all of the accusations against him.

3) The petition has nothing to do with "pseudoscience and lies" [23]

4) I didn't "Fail to answer your questions" - honestly the way this discussion works is totally confusing. I just figured out how to put colon symbols in front of each paragraph to make my replies readable, and now you are putting text inside my original post. Yikes! This WikiPedia formatting is hard to learn :-). Regarding copyrights, Hovind always says his materials aren't copyrighted. I don't know why it would say his DVD is copyrighted, but I will email the CSE staff about it.

5) I have not had a previous account, nor posted to WikiPedia previously. I design web applications all the time, so I guess my learning period is a bit shorter. On every single page it says "Sign your username with 4 tildes", so that part was easy to figure out. :-). Now the reply formatting - that is hard... The people who write WikiPedia should take some pointers from the threaded comment viewing system I wrote for PlexPedia.com (which powers the FreeHovind forums).

6) Right now, link space is biased VERY heavily to anti-hovind material, which as far as I understand is against WikiPedia policy. Other portions of this talk page are discussing bias in the article, and I believe it is being reflected in the links section. Claiming FreeHovind has nothing useful on it when (at the very least) it is the only linked site that allows people to watch Hovind's "Answering the Critics" series is quite a statement.

7) I am not quite sure what to make of your post "The age is just one part of it. If the author were, say, a person with a background in science, law or religion the website might have more validity. The point is, anyone can create a website and post what they want. However, it should always be linked on wikipedia." I think you meant "shouldn't always

be linked on Wikipedia". If that is what you meant, I would like to provide my opinion that using the website's author as credentials for linking to the website or not is discrimination.

8) It's kind of funny how you speak of the petition's author as a "she" when AubreyFalconer.com provides direct evidence to the contrary. :-) Just because someone signed the petition as "Shawn" doesn't mean it isn't valid. The petition collects much more information which isn't shown, such as phone number and address

9) What you say is "Twisted and misleading" is not twisted or misleading, it is just the other perspective. Again, by saying that FreeHovind doesn't deserve a link because it is twisted and misleading you are expressing the opinion that anyone who differs from your opinion should be silenced. When you said "If FreeHovind wasn't trying to mislead readers why not include the true status of his "education"", you ignored the fact that the "worthless" "Answering the Critics" series on the site discusses Hovind's education very clearly.

10) Yes, the majority of sites talking about Hovind are negative. But now people are working hard to keep all the non official pro-Hovind sites off the links section to make it look like the disparity is even greater. :-(

11) The San Diego sock puppet isn't me, so why even mention it? :-)

Have a Great Day, Roburmow 05:01, 11 March 2007 (UTC)

The critics have been silent for a couple days, so now what? (I am new to Wikipedia). Do I re-add the link again, are there moderators who make a decision, does the community "vote" - what happens? Roburmow 19:00, 13 March 2007 (UTC)

It has been three days since I posted my last response which I believed answered all the items brought up by critics, and I have still not got a response. I don't know the official Wikipedia policy regarding such matters, but three days seems like a fair amount of time to await a response - especially when responses were coming in nearly hourly prior to my last post. Therefore, I have re added the FreeHovind link to the "Pro Hovind" section, and tidied up the descriptions of all the links in the "Official and Pro-Hovind" section. Roburmow 16:59, 14 March 2007 (UTC)

Alright...here's the thing. The main guidelines for links are at WP:EL, but generally, we should only include a site if it at least potentially includes some reliably-sourced material that may be useful to the article. Also, for the decision-making process, please see WP:CONSENSUS. If you do something, and everyone who notices objects, it generally means you shouldn't do it again (at least until consensus has clearly changed), not to ask several times and wait until no one is noticing to say no again this time. I just don't see that FreeHovind adds anything of value to the article, contains any reliable information, or is usable as a source. If you disagree, you're welcome to file an article request for comment and get some more people's opinions. Seraphimblade Talk to me 17:24, 14 March 2007 (UTC)

Roburmow, you haven't added anything new. You've responded basically with "no it isn't." That doesn't address the concerns of the editors nor is it worthy of a reply (this will go back and forth). It's a fansite for Hovind. Imagine if we linked every fansite on the Britney Spears article. The link adds nothing new. By linking the webpage, it would serve to promote that website rather than add anything that isn't already in this article or available from Hovind's website. Also did you read the comments on copyright? Hovind DOES copyright his DVDs. Do not readd the link. Arbustoo 18:18, 14 March 2007 (UTC)

(I am not sure how reply formatting should work, but I have "reset" the indent level as the text was getting squished :-)

Seraphimblade: I disagree that the site has no value, please see items below. I have filed a request for comment in the "Biographies" section. Thanks for the "consensus" link - it has helped me to better understand how Wikipedia works! It was not trying to "ask several times and wait until no one is noticing to say no again this time", but rather felt that I had answered all questions and was being greeted by silence (I am not trying to Ask the other parent). Now that I understand Wikipedia better, I can see it would have been better for me to file a RFC instead had I known about them.

Arbustoo: Please see numbered items below.

A) Site Worth:

1) FreeHovind is the only site linked that contains Hovind's college courses, answering critics series, and quite a few other of Hovind's videos.

His "College" courses, "Answering Critics" are all videos (see below). Arbustoo 03:43, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

I would agree - the videos I mentioned are all videos (see below). Roburmow 05:50, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

2) FreeHovind also is the only site linked that contains Hovind's seminar notebooks, seminar workbooks, time graphs, and a seminar transcription.

1) Many, many, many sites have transcripts, videos, etc.[24][25][26] with various videos at google and so on[27]. All of these videos are on youtube as well. But again, there is YOU DO NOT HAVE THE COPYRIGHT OF THESE VIDEOS. THEY ARE NOT YOURS! Arbustoo 03:43, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

So why can't you link to the videos and let people hear Hovind's side of the story instead of just linking to all the aethiest "debunking" sites? Roburmow 05:50, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

Because they debunk Hovind's false claims they are atheistic? Arbustoo 18:47, 16 March 2007 (UTC)

3) FreeHovind also contains an "Info" section, which has information about Hovind from a different perspective than the Wikipedia article which many readers would be interested in.

A different perspective of MATERIAL FROM WIKIPEDIA. It offers nothing new other than a few omissions of fact and some misunderstanding of law. Nonetheless, it is material which is more accurate here and is taken from here. Arbustoo 03:43, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

What omissions of fact? I believe the misunderstandings of law you are referring to are commentaries on the charges against Hovind that people can actually understand, such as structuring is getting pulled over for deliberately not breaking the speed limit. I would not say this is a misunderstanding of law, but rather a logical simplification of the laws down to how ridiculous they actually are. I believe people should at least have the opportunity to hear the other side of the story Roburmow 05:50, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

4) FreeHovind is the easiest site on the net to view Hovind's materials. (FreeHovind offers online embedded Flash based video viewing, Google Video downloads, Flash Video downloads, BitTorrent video downloads, etc)

1) That is your opinion, and 2) people can go to google video or Hovind's website. BitTorrent's are hardly a reason to link to a page. Arbustoo 03:43, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

As I already said very clearly, FreeHovind is much easier to use and contains way more materials than Hovind's website. It is not only my opinion, but it is also easily demonstrable! If "people can go to google video" to find Hovind's Videos, then why don't they also have to go to google to find anti-hovind material? You are admitting that right now it is much easier to get to anti-Hovind material from this article than pro-Hovind material. Roburmow 05:50, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

5) FreeHovind is almost certainly the largest Hovind fan site on the net.

Maybe, but so what? Like I said we don't link to fansites just because they are designed nicely. Arbustoo 03:43, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

I agree. You link to fansites because they are relevant to the article and useful to visitors. Roburmow 05:50, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

6) FreeHovind also contains a petition (which is the only pro-Hovind one on the net) and a forum (which is actually a helpful resource for Hovind supporters).

Again, this no reason for inclusion. Should every wesbite that has a George W Bush petition get a link or just yours? Arbustoo 03:43, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

It appears you have already changed your position a bit, because at the start of this discussion you were saying it was reason for exclusion :-). Roburmow 05:50, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

B) Site Eligibility:

1) Right now, the article has 0 non official pro-Hovind sites and 14 completley anti-Hovind sites. From what I

understand, this is at odds with WikiPedia's Avoid undue weight on particular points of view policy which says: "On articles with multiple points of view, the number of links dedicated to one point of view should not overwhelm the number dedicated to other equal points of view, nor give undue weight to minority views."

If you have links that are in support of Hovind and if they meet the criteria then we will add them. The majority of the stuff about Hovind is negative because the scientific community and many creationists don't take his claims serious. This isn't a reason for YOUR website to be included. Arbustoo 03:43, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

Actually, I believe a complete lack of pro-Hovind sites in the links would be a great reason for adding FreeHovind! As far as I can tell, FreeHovind does support Hovind and does meet the criteria. Roburmow 05:50, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

2) The site contains no advertisements or solicitations, and does not even accept donations. I am not trying to promote the site for my benefit in any way, but rather to give people interested in Hovind a chance to see all his materials.

No ads yes, but interest in getting people to sign a petition. Arbustoo 03:43, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

The petition doesn't benefit me - It benefits Hovind - who is what this Article is about. Besides - the petition is not the main reason for the site Roburmow 05:50, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

3) (For Arbustoo) <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/WP:NOT#LINK> Says: "On articles about topics with many fansites, including a link to one major fansite may be appropriate, marking the link as such. See Wikipedia:External links and m:When should I link externally for some guidelines."

What makes your website "major"? Because you have more videos than others? Posting someone else's work hardly makes your website fit this criteria. You took other people's work (Hovind's and wikipedia's) and made it your own simply by putting it on your webpage. Arbustoo 03:43, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

What makes FreeHovind "major" is that it is the best site for people seeking Hovind's materials and information about Hovind from Hovind's perspective. Regarding simply "taking" other people's work, I and "Alaina" put a significant amount of work into the Hovind articles, and another Hovind supporter hand typed the outline for Hovind's entire 1st seminar. We are working on some more projects at the moment. Roburmow 05:50, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

4) One one guideline page, I remember reading that it is "bad form" to add your own site. For the record, I don't know who originally added FreeHovind. I noticed it one one day, and then noticed it disappear, then signed up and started the discussion :-)

You added it today.[28] And put it right near Hovind's webpages instead of adding it at the end. Arbustoo 03:43, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

I added it today because I had waited three days for a response and got none. Now that I know about RFCs, I will be sure to do that in the future. I added it down below the middle of the links, but if it bothers you I will add it at the end next time :) Really though, why add it under the one page article on there that just told a little about him? If there is some WikiPedia policy about new links on the bottom, I will be sure to follow it next time. Roburmow 05:50, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

C) Possible Site disqualifications:

1) Video Copyrights: The CSE team responded to my letter and said that they liked the site and said they would send me a letter written by Hovind that gives full permission for distribution provided the content is provided free and unaltered. I will be posting the letter on the site once I get it.

How about avoid breaking copyright law until getting a written statement on your webpage? Or waiting before adding your link? Arbustoo 03:43, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

I don't know when CSE copyrighted their materials, but I own Hovind's seminars on VHS and they do not say they are copyrighted. In nearly all his materials Hovind specifically says they are not copyrighted and encourages people to spread them, so I had no idea that CSE started copyrighting materials. Now that I do know, I would be fine with waiting to re-add the link until after I get the letter from CSE if it really bothers you. Roburmow 05:50, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

You don't know when? At the bottom of each page on his store it says "ALL MATERIAL (UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED) IS COPYRIGHT © 2005 CSE MINISTRY." So according to Hovind's website at least since 2005,

which would be two years ago. Arbustoo 18:47, 16 March 2007 (UTC)

2) It seems that everyone feels FreeHovind violates the External Links policy, so I will put the "Links normally to be avoided" section below with (comments) on why FreeHovind doesn't:

1. Any site that does not provide a unique resource beyond what the article would contain if it became a Featured article. (FreeHovind contains Hovind's videos and tons of other material)

Your website is not a unique source for Hovind's material. Arbustoo 03:43, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

It is the best source for it, and does contain unique material. Roburmow 05:50, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

2. Any site that misleads the reader by use of factually inaccurate material or unverifiable research. See Wikipedia:Attribution#Reliable sources. (If there is any inaccurate material on FreeHovind, let the critics come fourth!)

Wrong. Your website contains many errors. I'll point out one. You wrote, "Richard Dawkins, and the late Stephen Jay Gould, have in the past refused to debate Hovind." [29] This assertion is completely bogus. Please provide a WP:RS for this claim. Arbustoo 03:43, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

Note: You have several errors, wikipedia is not here, nor am I, to proof read a webpage. You wanted an example of an error there it is. Arbustoo 03:49, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

See Why I won't Debate Creationists, Wikipedia Richard Dawkins Article Section on "Creationism", and Wikipedia Creation V Evolution section on "debates". I thank you for your attempt at finding an error, but I don't see it to be one. I understand you have better things to do than proofread webpages, but if there are any other things you notice I would be glad to investigate them! Roburmow 05:50, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

3. Links mainly intended to promote a website. (The link is so people can view Hovind's material)

Your link promotes your petition. That is, "freehovind.com" has a petition to free hovind. This is not by itself bad however. Arbustoo 03:43, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

4. Links to sites that primarily exist to sell products or services. For example, instead of linking to a commercial bookstore site, use the "ISBN" linking format, giving readers an opportunity to search a wide variety of free and non-free book sources. (FreeHovind doesn't even accept donations)

Here you have a link [30] that says "Donate to CSE online". CSE is an unlicensed BUSINESS it is NOT a church nor a non-profit. Arbustoo 03:43, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

First of all, that text is buried on the bottom of the Action page, and second of all I have no affiliation with CSE whatsoever. Roburmow 05:50, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

5. Links to sites with objectionable amounts of advertising. (FreeHovind has no advertising)

6. Links to sites that require payment or registration to view the relevant content. (Nope)

7. Sites that are inaccessible to a substantial number of users, such as sites that only work with a specific browser. (FreeHovind is optimizer for all major browsers)

8. Direct links to documents that require external applications (such as Flash or Java) to view the relevant content, unless the article is about such rich media. If you do link to such material make a note of what application is required. (FreeHovind is very accessible)

9. Links to search engine and aggregated results pages. (Nope)

10. Links to social networking sites (such as MySpace), discussion forums or USENET. (Nope)

11. Links to blogs and personal web pages, except those written by a recognized authority. (Not a Blog)

12. Links to open wikis, except those with a substantial history of stability and a substantial number of editors. (Nope)

13. Sites that are only indirectly related to the article's subject: the link should be directly related to the subject of the article. A general site that has information about a variety of subjects should usually not be linked to from an article on a more specific subject. Similarly, a website on a specific subject should usually not be linked to an article about a general subject. If a section of a general website is devoted to the subject of the article, and meets the other criteria for linking, then that part of the site could be deep-linked. (FreeHovind is VERY applicable to an article about Kent Hovind)

I am looking forward to comments by other editors! Roburmow 02:07, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

Responded. 1) I would like to see a source for the one error I picked. 2) Do not add your own link. The fact you are arguing to put your own link in isn't a good sign. 3) Also re-read undue weight; The reason there is so much criticism about Hovind is because everything science does not agree with Hovind. Thus, criticism on a pseudoscientist is not "undue." It is reality. Arbustoo 03:43, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

Arbustoo: Thank you for your response! (1) Sources included under your request. (2) I agree - it is not a good sign that I have to defend the pro-Hovind link section on my own. It is a sign that there are very few if any other editors actively working of this topic who support Hovind. :-) (3) As Hovind would say, I have no problem with criticism. It's the tons of links to anti-Hovind sites and none to pro-Hovind ones that bothers me. Roburmow 05:50, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

You haven't addressed my issues. Again, you've basically replied, "No I disagree."

You have not shown any proof that Dawkins or Gould "refused to debate Hovind." Provide a source. Those links say they don't debate creationists. Do you understand the difference? Arbustoo 06:20, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

I would disagree that I failed to address your issues. If there is a specific issue you feel is left unanswered, please mention it! Those links say they not only don't debate creationists, but that they refuse to debate creationists "because they feel it will give them credibility". Since Hovind is a creationist (and one whom many aethiests often question), it is quite logical that Dawkins refuses to debate him along with the rest. It appears the people on Dawkin's forum agree: <http://richarddawkins.net/forum/viewtopic.php?p=128236&sid=7927f88a4960cd88d36e1b158b0f0534> Roburmow 17:05, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

Okay from now on I will refer to you as someone who purposely misleads people. You know he hasn't refused to debate Hovind anymore than he refuses to debate a dairy cow. Hovind and his moronic claims don't even appear on Dawkins' radar. You, however, feel the need to insert a famous scientist's name and give the impression he refuses to debate Hovind. You are a liar. You know he hasn't refused to debate Hovind. Another fine reason why we shouldn't add your webpage. Your crap is as bad as Hovind's lies. Arbustoo 14:59, 16 March 2007 (UTC)

Did Dawkins state that he refuses to debate dairy cows? no. Did Dawkins state that he refuses to debate creationists? yes, and the article you are speaking of clearly explains why he says he won't. I am certainly not trying to "purposely mislead people". You claim I "feel the need to insert a famous scientist's name and give the impression he refuses to debate Hovind", and yet you at this very moment are working hard to keep all Hovind supporting sites off the links section to make it look like Hovind has less support than he does. Roburmow 18:00, 16 March 2007 (UTC)

Dawkins doesn't debate dairy cows. I am not aware of any dairy cows he has debated. Thus, because he has never done it, and has never claimed to have any interest in it one can assume he's not interested in it. Shame on you for trying to tie a famous biologist to Hovind's garbage. Shame on you for passing on Hovind's bogus claims. Arbustoo 20:22, 16 March 2007 (UTC)

I want to focus on your above claim:

What omissions of fact? I believe the misunderstandings of law you are referring to are commentaries on the charges against Hovind that people can actually understand, such as structuring is getting pulled over for deliberately not breaking the speed limit. I would not say this is a misunderstanding of law, but rather a logical simplification of the laws down to how ridiculous they actually are. I believe people should at least have the opportunity to hear the other side of the story Roburmow 05:50, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

Hearing the otherside is fine. The wrong/misleading details is not. You wrote

Please note that Dr. Hovind did not break the law. He was charged with "structuring" his financial withdrawals in such a way as to "evade" the law requiring reporting of transactions of over \$10,000. Suppose you were pulled over for going 55 miles an hour in a 55 zone. The officer says, "I have clocked you everyday for a month going 55, so I am stopping you for speeding. I know you were purposely going 55 to avoid going over the speed limit. So since you were "structuring" your driving habits to deliberately "evade" the speeding regulations, I am going to give you a ticket." [31]

That statement makes no sense regarding what Hovind was convicted of. NONE. Also on that same page your comments that America: From Freedom to Fascism (which argues "Federal income taxes are unconstitutional or otherwise legally invalid.") is a good source for tax details shows you are promoting inaccurate details in defending Hovind. Arbustoo 06:37, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

I believe it makes perfect sense, and there are quite a few people who agree with me. I also believe that Freedom to Fascism is an excellent movie, and I even have it on the site to watch. The Wikipedia page on Freedom to

Fascism mentions nothing in the criticism but a couple simple quote issues. Since you appear to have some proof that America: Freedom to Fascism "promotes inaccurate details", I would be very interested to hear it. Until you actually say what it is that I or Freedom to Fascism is promoting that is inaccurate, all your talk is an unfounded personal opinion which is not particularly useful in this discussion. If there are a significant other number of editors who agree that any site which mentions America: Freedom to Fascism should be discriminated against, I would be perfectly happy to give up on trying to help straighten out this article and report on FreeHovind that it is censored by Wikipedia. Roburmow 17:05, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

Roburmow: it "makes no sense" because Hovind was NOT convicted of that. He was convicted for not paying his taxes, and this particular issue was merely evidence of his knowledge of his own wrongdoing. To use your earlier example: it's as if a driver was convicted for driving at an average of 80 mph, and tried to pretend that his speedometer was defective, but the cops have proof of him slowing down to the limit whenever he saw a police car (and then speeding up again when he thought he was unobserved). --Robert Stevens 15:14, 16 March 2007 (UTC)

Roburmow, logically it makes no sense. Withdrawing \$10,000 isn't illegal neither is withdrawing \$9,500. Hovind was avoiding the IRS, which can seize money in bank accounts. He knew this, as the jury attests, and tried to avoid the money laundry requirements. Withdrawing money in a systematic pattern to hide wrong doing is illegal. It's like going under 10 MPH under the 55 MPH limit when you don't have a license or insured car. Impeding the speed of traffic is illegal, and so is the other factors. Arbustoo 20:31, 16 March 2007 (UTC)

The article says "...forty-five counts of knowingly structuring transactions in Federally-insured financial institutions to evade the reporting requirements of 31 U.S.C. § 5313(a), in violation of 31 U.S.C. § 5324,...". As Arbustoo kindly pointed out in the "Freedom to Fascism" complaint section, I do mention the tax charges as well. Arbustoo 20:31, 16 March 2007 (UTC)

"Knowingly" refers to that knew what he was doing was wrong, and was avoiding attracting attention. Your analogy only embrasses yourself. As for "Freedom to Fascism" there is much fact in that movie as Dude, Where's My Car?. Those are Tax protestor arguments that were discredited long ago. If you do believe taht movie instead of legitimate lawyers you will wind up where Hovind is. Arbustoo 20:31, 16 March 2007 (UTC)

"11. Links to blogs and personal web pages, except those written by a recognized authority. (Not a Blog)". It is, however, a personal website not written by a recognized authority.

...And, scrolling up, I see "Right now, the article has 0 non official pro-Hovind sites and 14 completley anti-Hovind sites". Apples and oranges. It has several pro-Hovind sites, and the anti-Hovind sites are dominated by "official" ones (scientists, notable publications etc): recognized authorities. Furthermore, the "external links" section is for sites that provide relevant additional information: a site which merely provides Hovind's materials and recycled information from this article does not provide relevant additional information. --Robert Stevens 12:24, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

If you had looked carefully, you would see that there are actually 0 pro-Hovind sites in the links section and 4 official-Hovind sites, which brings the total number of pro-Hovind sites to 0. There is obviously a difference between "official" and "pro" sites, because it mentions both in the title of the link section as separate items. I fail to see how Hovind's all published materials are not relevant additional information. I also looked at some of the anti-Hovind links, and the Kent Hovind page really jumped out at me. The page is very poorly designed, contains hardly any content, and over 50% of it's links are off-site. If the anti-Hovind section had half as stringent of requirements as everyone is imposing on the pro-Hovind section, it would almost certainly be gone. Roburmow 17:05, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

That is not reason to include your BORROWED material. The page you refer to as poor may not be aesthetically appealing to you, but it is written by someone who has 1) a wikipedia article about his work (see that that work has been cited by various science groups), and 2) contains material written by credentialed scientists. Thus, it is to be included as containing important information about Hovind's bogus claims. Arbustoo 18:08, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

Roburmow, you're not classifying official Hovind sites as "pro-Hovind"? I'm inclined to agree, but perhaps not in the way you mean... --Robert Stevens 18:17, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

I am not saying that official sites are not "for Hovind", but rather that they fall into the "official" category and not the "pro-Hovind" category. The "official" category is for sites officially run by Hovind, and the "pro-Hovind" category is for sites that are run by non official people who support Hovind. Right now a reader of this article would be left with the impression that there are no sites supporting Hovind besides his own, which is completely wrong. I suggest we either add some pro-Hovind sites back, or change the title of the "Official and pro-Hovind" section to "Hovind's Official Sites" to avoid giving people a false impression that Hovind has no community support. Roburmow 18:00, 16 March 2007 (UTC)

Roburmow, just a reminder since you ignored it. You have not shown any proof that Dawkins or Gould "refused to debate Hovind." Provide a source. Those links say they don't debate creationists. Do you understand the difference? Arbustoo 20:57, 15 March 2007 (UTC)

I didn't "ignore" it, please see discussion on in the appropriate section - Regarding copyrights: the article itself RIGHT NOW says Hovind's material is not copyrighted, so why are you blaming me for not knowing? Roburmow 18:00, 16 March 2007 (UTC)

The problem is Hovind, as usual, contradicts himself. His website says his material is not copyrighted, but when you purchase his DVDs it clearly says otherwise. At the bottom of each page on his store it says "ALL MATERIAL (UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED) IS COPYRIGHT© 2005 CSE MINISTRY."The problem is that Hovind is a liar. He tells people what they want to hear, and at the same time wants to make money. That is why he is where he is.

Your response to the Dawkins claim is enigmatic. Hovind's website is not a reliable source for anything. Not his education claims, not his copyright claims, not his evolution claims. Nothing he says is believable. The problem is he tells people what they want to hear, and because they don't care about truth they go around following him. His DVDs are copyrighted, as stated on the back of the DVDs, that's a major source of income for him. Arbustoo 18:29, 16 March 2007 (UTC)

Fellow editors:

We have been continuing this discussion for quite a while, and I can not see that stretching it out further would be productive. If there are any new points brought up I would be glad to continue the discussion, but right now there are only a couple editors participating who are not likely to sway each other's views. Before leaving, I would like to list my standing concerns about this article:

1: Right now, readers are left with the impression that Hovind has no community support whatever. This is completely wrong, and is a good example that the article fails to be "unbiased". Saying "prior to his incarceration, spoke frequently in private schools, churches, university debates and on radio and television broadcasts arguing for young earth creationism" does not count.

So find a WP:RS and add it in. There is going to be no scientific support for pseudoscience. Arbustoo 18:29, 16 March 2007 (UTC)

2: Every time I check on this article it gets more negative - it seems that most the editors working on this article are more interested in making Hovind look bad than presenting his case objectively.

Specifically, what are you talking about? Give an example. It's not wikipedia's fault he makes crazy claims and is a convicted felon. Arbustoo 18:29, 16 March 2007 (UTC)

3: The links section is weighted orders of magnitude heavier to the anti-Hovind side, which I believe violates Wikipedia's "Avoid undue weight on particular points of view" policy which says: "On articles with multiple points of view, the number of links dedicated to one point of view should not overwhelm the number dedicated to other equal points of view, nor give undue weight to minority views."

Again this is not going to get YOUR website added. If there are WP:RS they will be added. This man is on fringes of society that is why there is no academic support for his claims. Now he is a community outcast for obstructing federal agents and breaking 58 FEDERAL LAWS. Arbustoo 18:29, 16 March 2007 (UTC)

4: Not only does the article defame Hovind as much as possible, but it also tries to silence all other views. Saying that the majority of sites online being against Hovind is reason for all the ones in the links section to be beside Hovind's official sites is convoluted logic.

Where does it defame him? What part is wrong/misleading? Its not wikipedia's fault that there are no reliable sources for information praising his false claims. It is unreasonable to believe a pseudoscientist with fake credentials who was sentenced to 10 years in prison will have many positive reliable sources about him. Arbustoo 18:29, 16 March 2007 (UTC)

Farewell, - Roburmow 18:00, 16 March 2007 (UTC)

It's unfortunate that you came to wikipedia merely to add your personal website. Wikipedia shares reliable information,

but does not exist to promote personal websites. Your bias is preventing you from understanding that academic and social communities don't consider this man in the mainstream. That is why a 16 year old is the one who created a webpage devoted solely to promoting videos, and is devoid of any relevant information(also I saw at freehovid.com a link to a woman's blog that has some very incorrect things about the trial). He is an outcast among creationists. Simply claiming otherwise won't get your link added. Arbustoo 18:29, 16 March 2007 (UTC)