

Debate merely "philosophical quibbling"

Dear Editor:

The most recent exchange in the ongoing evolution creation debate was so typical of what most of the so-called debate amounts to. It predominantly consists of little more than philosophical quibbling and nit-picking on comparatively minor pieces of evidence. There are much more serious and profound issues here than what these seemingly endless series of "debates" may reveal at a casual glance; and there is good reason to suspect that the questioning of these issues will not continue indefinitely in the present inconclusive and almost irrelevant manner.

The major bodies of evidence which have accumulated using evolution theory are mountainous and they are not seriously challenged. In biological science, evolution is an accepted fact based on these volumes of evidence, as much "proven" as the existence of ultra-violet radiation or electron orbits. Evolution theory attempts to explain the mechanisms involved in the process of change in life forms, while the "fact" of evolution means that a process of change has occurred during the origins of new forms. The fact of evolution means that life forms develop, form, originate, or evolve, from previously existing

forms.

The challenge to biology is not one of a credible alternate explanation to the origins of life forms, but on the phenomenon of life. Indeed, at stake is the authority of modern science in general as a source of knowledge on physical existence. The challengers come from many different lines of work and use many different and sometimes nefarious methods, but the authority almost solely remains the Bible or the Holy Scriptures. The evolution-creation question is a direct confrontation against science on the acceptance and teaching of evolution as fact, based on the authority of Scripture.

The anti-evolutionists do not read Genesis and conclude that teaching evolution as fact is unacceptable because here lies an equally viable explanation. The movement does not originate and emanate from Genesis are fundamental to the understanding of Christ, without original sin, separation and judgement, there is no meaning to the progression of awareness of sin, prophesy, and search for redemption which is recorded in Scripture to show the development of a savior. Without the concepts from Genesis there is no meaningful explanation to the concept of savior within the Scriptures. Redemption from sin through Christ would lose significance and

usefulness as knowledge, and the return of Christ would be meaningless. So, the authority of Scripture as a source of knowledge on Christ is now confronting science's relatively new authority on physical existence; and the bottom line of the confrontation is that evolution is a fact but so is Jesus.

The fundamental incompatibility of Scriptural and scientific accounts or origins is, at present, as much a problem of language as it is one of real meaning. Both evolution and creation refer to the same thing: the

origin of new forms. Evolution involves the creation of new forms, or, the creation of new forms occurs during evolution. Advances which will expand our awareness of the phenomenon of life are likely to produce a new understanding of direction and purpose in the origins of form, and therefore alter the way we interpret the meaning of evolution and creation. They may be interpreted in the future as meaning the very same thing.

Perhaps we will soon be aware that neither the language of Scripture nor

the language of science may be interpreted literally to achieve an accurate account of existence. We are becoming aware of the inseparable role of the conscious observer in creating the reality he is observing, and the limits to science's ability to meaningfully describe "unity". Perhaps "a new heaven and a new earth" will be created or appear when human animals reach a higher level of awareness about unity and the distinct, defineable separateness from it we see in our daily experiences as human existence.

Votes cannot be bought

Dear Sir:

I would like to take issue with Richard Hutchins on his idea of limiting campaign advertising (letters, Nov. 14). His contention seems to be that voter popularity can be bought. Perhaps this is true on a national level,

but on campus, elections are won more by a candidate's personal appearances, speaking engagements, and posters, not commercial advertising volume. The election of ten days ago showed that

money spent is not proportional to votes won.

An effective campus campaign, as history has shown, has been based on image before an election, poster saturation to familiarize the electorate with the name, and face to face encounters. Newspaper ads, to my knowledge, have not been seen here before, and while they should not be encouraged, should not be discouraged either. Fund raising is an important part of the election process, and advertising puts money

back in the student coffers via CHSR and the Brunswickan.

Finally, perhaps Mr. Hutchins should have a closer look at what he has written: "A truly Free election should have restrictions on campaign spending...". Promoting freedom by restricting rights is contradictory and not really necessary; the usual state of students' pocketbooks will see to that.

Sincerely,

Chris Chapman

Dance acts had class

Dear Pattie (Baby) and the Student Body in General (not that the two are in any way related):

On behalf of the Broadway act of the 37th Annual Red & Black Revue, a big thank you is in order for the most able and corvacious Pattie Lenihan, and to her Nina Hagen look-alike

assistant Miss Sherry Law. Without her choreography and training this act as well as the manhunt and kickline probably wouldn't have

been half as good. To put on all the class dance acts must have been quite a challenge (especially when the lousy directing is taken

into consideration). Happily everything seems to have worked out. Hope everyone enjoyed the show. I know I did.

Getting on his white gloves
Putting on his top hat
Straightening up his bow

Mike Pringle

Congrats to MacKenzie

Dear Editor:

We would like to commend MacKenzie House on the excellent reputation their house is getting this year. Last year at this time there was quite a commotion about the way they acted during Harrisons' Pumpkin Sacrifice. This year they not only didn't try and ruin the Sacrifice but actually helped it by having all the curtains drawn in the rooms which faced Harrisons' Path.

Not only this, but they also did something much

more important. On the Sunday before Hallowe'en the house financed the way for 40 young boys and girls from Headstart to a day at UNB. They hosted a dinner in the kids honor plus brought them around to the womens' residences trick-or-treating. The fantastic way the guys from MacKenzie treated these kids will not be forgotten by the kids or by us.

Keep it up MacKenzie!

Tibbits 2nd R.

Chairman needs replacing

We all know of the "slight discord" between Mr. Bosnitch and Mr. Letbridge (the chairman at last night's meeting). What went on last night was unreal. The situation almost looked like Mr. Lethbridge his temporary superiority as chairman, to avenge Mr. Bosnitch's victory at the

polls. Strangely enough, as we neared the end of the meeting a member of the council brought up the motion of having another chairman on the council. (The book of rules allows that we have two chairmen) Believe me, the motion was strongly seconded.

I thought Mr. Lethbridge

gave a poor show in handling the position of chairman, and I'm quite sure that most if not all the other members of the council, felt the same way. I hope that we can replace our present chairman for another in the near future so that these meetings can run more efficiently.