

You don't believe in Father Christmas?

Dean Taylor

You don't believe in Father Christmas?

No.

But what about the evidence?

What evidence?

Presents under the Christmas tree!

They don't prove that Father Christmas brought them.

How else do you explain the presents?

Perhaps some time ago your parents went shopping. They would have bought and wrapped the presents and that could explain how you came to find them arranged under the tree.

Shopping? Huh – I don't believe they went shopping.

Look - you believe in Father Christmas because you don't question it. You're a sheep. Almost all your friends believe in Father Christmas and you follow the crowd. You see movies on TV about him. Even your parents tell you he is true.

Didn't you used to believe in him?

Yes- but I grew up. I started to think for myself. The more I learned about the way the world works the more I understood the impossibility of Father Christmas. After all if he was real he would have to break quite a few fundamental scientific laws. I choose not to believe the impossible.

You can't prove he isn't true.

Perhaps not – but has anyone ever seen him?

Yes! My Mom took me to a big shop in town and there he was – red tunic, white beard and everything!

And you believe it was Father Christmas?

Why would my Mom lie to me?

It *must* have been Father Christmas.

There was a big sign saying 'FATHER CHRISTMAS' above his grotto and he had lots of elves to help him.

I'm sorry to disappoint you but the person you saw in that shop was just an ordinary man. The man was real but he should not be confused with Father Christmas.

The man you saw could not possibly be responsible for delivering millions of presents to millions of homes - no matter how many elves or magic reindeer he has to help him.

But how do you explain the disappearance of the mince pie I left out for him?

Ask your parents for an honest answer to that question.

Look - Father Christmas has NEVER been seen. Despite decades of photography not one single image has ever been captured of a fat bearded bloke hurtling across the sky in a sleigh.

Go on believing if you must – but please don't bury your head in the sand forever. I suggest it's time to grow up and start thinking for yourself.



You don't believe in Evolution?

No.

But what about the evidence?

What evidence?

Fossils in the ground!

They don't prove that Evolution happened.¹

How else do you explain the fossils?

Perhaps some time ago there was a global flood. It would have naturally sorted the fossils and that could explain how we come to find them arranged in the ground.

Flood? Huh – I don't believe there was a flood.

Look - you believe in Evolution because you don't question it. You're a sheep. Almost all your friends believe in Evolution and you follow the crowd. You see documentaries on TV about it. Even your teachers tell you it is true.

Didn't you used to believe in it?

Yes- but I grew up. I started to think for myself. The more I learned about the way the world works the more I understood the impossibility of Evolution. After all if it was real it would break quite a few fundamental scientific laws.² I choose not to believe the impossible.

You can't prove it isn't true.

Perhaps not – but has anyone ever observed it?

Yes! My teacher gave me a textbook and showed me pictures of Peppered moths, different dog breeds and everything!

And you believe this was Evolution?

Why would my teacher lie to me?

It *must* have been Evolution.

There was a big title 'EVOLUTION' at the top of the page and there was a discussion of mutations to help the argument.

I'm sorry to disappoint you but the process you saw in that book was just selection. Natural selection is a real process but it should not be confused with Evolution.³

You see natural selection could not possibly be responsible for adding millions of new genes to DNA - no matter how many mutations or time it has on its side.

But how do you explain bacteria developing antibiotic resistance?

Ask your teacher for an honest answer to that question.⁴

Look - Evolution has NEVER been observed. Despite decades of research not one single instance has ever been documented of a mutation adding information to the genome.⁵

Go on believing if you must – but please don't bury your head in the sand forever. I suggest it's time to grow up and start thinking for yourself.



You don't believe in Father Christmas?

Dean Taylor

1. What do you mean 'fossils don't prove evolution'?

Fossils are no more evidence of evolution than presents are evidence of Father Christmas. The fossil data is the same for everyone but the interpretation of that data depends upon your worldview. If you believe in evolution then you will likely argue that fossils are evidence of change over time whereas if you hold to a Biblical worldview you will likely argue that fossils are evidence of a global flood. As one assistant professor of Paleobiology put it,

'Contrary to what most scientists write, the fossil record does not support the Darwinian theory of evolution because it is this theory which we use to interpret the fossil record. By doing so we are guilty of circular reasoning if we then say the fossil record supports this theory'^a

Then there is the issue of time. Let's be clear - fossils are not found with little date tags attached. There is no direct method of dating fossils or the sedimentary rocks in which they are found. Instead the age of a rock is inferred from the fossils it contains! Another example of circular reasoning. How old is this fossil? That depends on which rock you found it in. How old is the rock? That depends on which fossils you found in it!

'And this poses something of a problem: if we date the rocks by their fossils, how can we then turn around and talk about patterns of evolutionary change through time in the fossil record?'^b

2. Scientists would surely have rejected evolution if it really broke scientific laws.

Increasing numbers are rejecting evolution for this very reason. For those who have understanding it is clear that evolution runs contrary to statistical laws, laws of information theory and laws of physics. For example, there is a physics law which explains why bananas turn to mush, why your car eventually rusts and why water flows downhill. It's called the 2nd law of thermodynamics. Isaac Asimov puts it this way,

'All we have to do is nothing, and everything deteriorates, collapses, breaks down, wears out, all by itself'

If Darwinian evolution were true it would have to work against this law. Taking the 'simplest' life and making it increasingly complex. Evolution cannot happen any more than mush can turn into a banana, or your car could have built itself, or water can flow uphill. The physicist Arthur Eddington said,

'If your theory is found to be against the second law of thermodynamics I can give you no hope; there is nothing for [your theory] but to collapse in the deepest humiliation'

The real question is why there are any scientists who believe in evolution at all. One simple reason is that many Biology specialists have had little training in Physics. They are simply unaware of any problem - like the innocent child who goes on believing in Father Christmas because they don't know any different. But this is a poor excuse for a scientist to use. Then there are those who do have some understanding of the problems but who choose to continue their belief in the impossible - like the child who realises that Father Christmas couldn't possibly visit all homes in one night but who is reluctant to give up on the magic. But there exists no magic in science which could come to the rescue of evolution. Evolution remains impossible.

3. Why did my book call it 'Evolution' if it isn't?

Good question. When most of us think of 'evolution' we think of fish crawling out of the sea, reptiles sprouting wings and ape-like hominids beginning to walk upright. This is the 'general theory of evolution' which requires the addition of new genetic information to code for the new features. But the word itself has a wide range of meanings - even within biology - and this has led to its less than honest use. If I wrote a chapter on 'water flow' I might start with examples of water flowing down a mountain side, plummeting over a waterfall or swirling eddies within a stream, I might tell you where to go to see these things for yourself and I'd probably include some photographs. But you would be alarmed if at the end of the chapter I were to conclude that water can flow uphill as well as downhill! Yet some biology textbooks are like this. They begin with examples of genetic information 'swirling' around - such as Darwin's Finches and Peppered moths where variations within a population are acted upon by natural selection. There may then be some discussion of mutations or selective breeding of dogs where information is ultimately lost. But it would be wrong for that book to go on to suggest that new genetic information can be added when all the examples cited have involved only the rearrangement and/or loss of information.

4. I'm afraid to ask my teacher.

Well - the development of antibiotic resistance in bacteria is often cited as an example of a beneficial mutation. And it is. However, it is often implied that such mutations may lead to evolution. Again in the broadest sense of the word this is true - the population has 'changed'. But this has nothing whatever to do with adding genetic information - the requirement of the general theory of evolution. Antibiotic resistance may be 'acquired' through gene transfer from bacteria which already have antibiotic resistance - in which case genetic information is simply moved around - but in every case where a mutation is involved genetic information is ultimately lost. So this is yet another example of water flowing downhill being used to support the erroneous idea that water can flow uphill.

5. What's this about information?

You have legs because there is information - a set of instructions for building legs - written into the genetic code in each of the cells in your body. And it would take masses of new information to code for a leg where there was no leg before. The simplest known cell has 120,000 bits of information in its DNA but we have 6 billion in ours. If evolution is true it would have to account for this increase in information. Yet biologists cannot explain the origin of new information - or indeed any genetic information. Richard Dawkins - famous proponent of Darwinian evolution - was completely stumped when asked during an interview to give an 'example of a genetic mutation or an evolutionary process which can be seen to increase the information in the genome'. He paused for 20 seconds before asking for the camera to be switched off. After composing himself the camera was turned back on and he continued to talk - but completely avoided answering the question! (find it on a famous internet video library). This man has written more popular books on the subject of Evolution than anyone else. He - of all people - should have an answer to this most fundamental question. But he doesn't! And with good reason - since no such process has ever been observed, nor will it be since information does not arise by chance. Whenever we see an example of information we know there is an intelligent agent behind the scenes. Behind every computer program there is a programmer, behind every book there is an author. So what lies behind the information stored in DNA? If evolution is not the answer then we need to look elsewhere - like the child who grows up and finally accepts that there is no Father Christmas.

^aRonald R. West, Ph.D. 'Paleoecology and Uniformitarianism'. *Compass*, vol.45, May 1968, p.216

^bNiles Eldredge (American Museum of Natural History, N.Y) in Time Frames: The Rethinking of Darwinian Evolution and the Theory of Punctuated Equilibria, *Simon and Schuster, 1985, p52*