**Never assume**

**3 assumptions evolutionists make**

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/get-answers/features/never-assume?utm_source=homepage&utm_medium=banner&utm_campaign=neverAssume>

Evolutionists like Dr. Richard Dawkins speak authoritatively as if their not-even-theory were as good as fact. But building a case for naturalistic evolution is like trying to build a house in midair. No matter how solid the construction, the house will collapse without a foundation. Thus, evolutionists must assume biblical grounds to support their worldview. These biblical grounds—such as logic, morality, and uniformity—stem from the nature and power of the Creator God as revealed in the Bible.[1](http://www.answersingenesis.org/get-answers/features/never-assume?utm_source=homepage&utm_medium=banner&utm_campaign=neverAssume" \l "fnList_1_1) Yet evolutionists deny the Creator while resting their faulty beliefs on His foundation. By challenging their faulty basic assumptions that the laws of logic, absolute morality, and the uniformity of nature exist apart from the Creator, the Christian can prove that reasoning, absolute moral standards, and science itself must be based on the biblical worldview.

**Evolutionist Assumption #1: Assuming God’s laws of logic to argue for a godless universe**

It is ironic that evolutionists argue passionately for a naturalistic universe. If we are just bundles of chemical reactions in a meaningless world, why would it matter what we believe? Evolutionists seek to defend and prove their worldview because they inherently know the Creator yet suppress the truth in order to rebel against His authority (Rom 1:18–20). Their very act of trying to persuade, which requires the laws of logic, confirms the existence of the biblical God.

All reasoning must be based on the laws of logic, which are the tools we use to reason correctly and identify fallacious arguments. For example, according to one of the laws of logic, the law of non-contradiction, two contradictory statements cannot both be true at the same time and in the same sense. Without laws of logic, a discussion would be useless nonsense. Any meaningful communication assumes these laws.

While an evolutionist might seek to explain the laws of logic apart from the biblical God, his explanations fall short. If the universe consists of only matter in motion, abstract laws of logic would not exist, and no one could prove anything.[2](http://www.answersingenesis.org/get-answers/features/never-assume?utm_source=homepage&utm_medium=banner&utm_campaign=neverAssume" \l "fnList_1_2) Of course, the evolutionist does use laws of logic as he tries to defend his worldview. As Dr. Jason Lisle said, “The fact that he is able to make an argument at all proves that he is wrong.”[3](http://www.answersingenesis.org/get-answers/features/never-assume?utm_source=homepage&utm_medium=banner&utm_campaign=neverAssume" \l "fnList_1_3)

The reason that laws of logic exist is because they stem from the nature of the biblical God.[4](http://www.answersingenesis.org/get-answers/features/never-assume?utm_source=homepage&utm_medium=banner&utm_campaign=neverAssume" \l "fnList_1_4) For example, the law of non-contradiction stems from God, who cannot deny Himself (2Tim 2:13). Universal, unchanging, and immaterial laws of logic reflect the God who is universal, unchanging, and immaterial.[5](http://www.answersingenesis.org/get-answers/features/never-assume?utm_source=homepage&utm_medium=banner&utm_campaign=neverAssume" \l "fnList_1_5)

To challenge the first basic assumption, ask your evolutionist friend, “On what basis do you assume the laws of logic?” Explain that having been created in God’s image, he is using the laws of logic that come from the Creator.

**Evolutionist Assumption #2: Assuming absolute moral standards within a world of chemical reactions**

It is ironic that evolutionists teach that man is a chance product of evolutionary struggle and death, yet they decry crimes like murder, rape, and theft. According to their worldview, why would those acts be crimes? After all, mankind is supposedly just an advanced animal, and we don’t imprison cheetahs for killing gazelles or bring raccoons to court for stealing chicken eggs. Why shouldn’t we act according to our chemical impulses to fulfill our evolutionary end of the survival of the fittest? In fact, if the evolutionary view were true, we *must* act according to those chemical impulses; therefore, no one should be held accountable for his actions.

An evolutionary worldview supports relative morality, the idea that no ultimate standards exist. An evolutionist may give lip service to the idea of relativism, but he expects absolute morality from others. If he doesn’t think so, tell him you’ll take his wallet. He inherently knows absolute standards of right and wrong because God has given him a conscience (Rom 1:32; 2:15).

To challenge the second basic assumption, ask your evolutionist friend, “On what basis do you assume absolute morality?” His inherent knowledge of absolute morality is God-given.

While some evolutionists try to offer alternatives, only the biblical worldview can uphold absolute morality. Because God created us for His glory, we are responsible to live according to His perfect standard. Instead, we all have rebelled against God and fall short of His glory (Rom 3:23). Man’s sin brought the curse of suffering and death into the world (Rom 6:23). Yet God sent His own Son to perfectly fulfill His standard and take the punishment for believing sinners by dying on the Cross and then rising victoriously from the grave (Col 1:21–22).

**Evolutionist Assumption #3: Assuming the order in the universe came from disorder**

It is ironic that evolutionists often poke fun of “dark age creation science” when they could not even practice science apart from the biblical God. Scientific study is based on the uniformity of nature: the laws of nature do not arbitrarily change with time and space.[6](http://www.answersingenesis.org/get-answers/features/never-assume?utm_source=homepage&utm_medium=banner&utm_campaign=neverAssume" \l "fnList_1_6) Otherwise, how could scientists experiment and make predictions if physical laws didn’t operate consistently? Uniformity makes no sense in a random chance world of evolution. How can the evolutionist assume that the future will reflect the past in a mindless world begun with a big bang?

While evolutionists have proposed other reasons, only the biblical worldview gives an adequate basis for the uniformity of nature. The Bible says God created the universe, instituting and promising the uniformity of nature (Gen 8:22). Christ Himself upholds the universe through the physical laws He ordained (Col 1:16–17; Heb 1:3).[7](http://www.answersingenesis.org/get-answers/features/never-assume?utm_source=homepage&utm_medium=banner&utm_campaign=neverAssume" \l "fnList_1_7)

To challenge the third basic assumption, ask your evolutionist friend, “On what basis do you assume the uniformity of nature?” Explain that his assumption of uniformity is actually based on the biblical worldview. Whether a scientist denies or believes in Him, God sustaining the universe through physical laws is the only reason science is possible.

In conclusion, the title of this article, “Never Assume,” is a bit of a misnomer because everyone has basic assumptions. The Christian assumes the truth of God’s revealed Word, whereas the non-Christian must assume the truth of man’s opinions. In fact, the non-Christian’s most basic assumptions actually rest on biblical truth. Standing on biblical ground and showing non-Christians that they, too, are standing there is the ultimate approach to defending the faith.

Evolutionists may never be persuaded by evidence alone, since they interpret the evidence according to their worldview. But by challenging their worldview, you can show that their assumptions—from logic to absolute morality to uniformity—are actually resting on biblical ground. Stand firm on the Word of God, respectfully challenge their assumptions, and ask the Lord to help them see His Word is true.
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**Evolution: The Anti-science**

### by Dr. Jason Lisle, AiG–U.S. February 13, 2008

Some evolutionists have argued that [science](http://www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/science.asp) isn’t possible without evolution. They teach that science and technology actually require the principles of molecules-to-man evolution in order to work. They claim that those who hold to a biblical creation worldview are in danger of not being able to understand science! [1](http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/aid/v3/n1/evolution-anti-science#fnList_1_1), [2](http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/aid/v3/n1/evolution-anti-science#fnList_1_2), [3](http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/aid/v3/n1/evolution-anti-science#fnList_1_3)

Critical thinkers will realize that these kinds of arguments are quite ironic because evolution is actually contrary to the principles of science. That is, if evolution were true, the concept of science would not make sense. Science actually requires a biblical creation framework in order to be possible. Here’s why:

**The Preconditions of Science**

Science presupposes that the universe is logical and orderly and that it obeys mathematical laws that are consistent over time and space. Even though conditions in different regions of space and eras of time are quite diverse, there is nonetheless an underlying uniformity.[4](http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/aid/v3/n1/evolution-anti-science#fnList_1_4)

Because there is such regularity in the universe, there are many instances where scientists are able to make successful predictions about the future. For example, astronomers can successfully compute the positions of the planets, moons, and asteroids far into the future. Without uniformity in nature, such predictions would be impossible, and science could not exist. The problem for evolutionism is that such regularity only makes sense in a biblical creation worldview.

**Science Requires a Biblical Worldview**

The biblical creationist expects there to be order in the universe because God made all things (Jn 1:3) and has imposed order on the universe. Since the Bible teaches that God upholds all things by His power (Heb 1:3), the creationist expects that the universe would function in a logical, orderly, law-like fashion.[5](http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/aid/v3/n1/evolution-anti-science#fnList_1_5) Furthermore, God is consistent[6](http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/aid/v3/n1/evolution-anti-science#fnList_1_6) and omnipresent.[7](http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/aid/v3/n1/evolution-anti-science#fnList_1_7) Thus, the creationist expects that all regions of the universe will obey the same laws, even in regions where the physical conditions are quite different. The entire field of [astronomy](http://www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/astronomy.asp) requires this important biblical principle.

Moreover, God is beyond time (2P 3:8) and has chosen to uphold the universe in a consistent fashion throughout time for our benefit. So, even though conditions in the past may be quite different than those in the present and future, the way God upholds the universe (what we would call the “laws of nature”) will not arbitrarily change.[8](http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/aid/v3/n1/evolution-anti-science%22%20%5Cl%20%22fnList_1_8) God has told us that there are certain things we can count on to be true in the future—the seasons, the diurnal cycle, and so on (Gen 8:22). Therefore, under a given set of conditions, the consistent Christian has the right to expect a given outcome because he or she relies upon the Lord to uphold the universe in a consistent way.

These Christian principles are absolutely essential to science. When we perform a controlled experiment using the same preset starting conditions, we expect to get the same result every time. The “future reflects the past” in this sense. Scientists are able to make predictions only because there is uniformity as a result of God’s sovereign and consistent power. Scientific experimentation would be pointless without uniformity; we would get a different result every time we performed an identical experiment, destroying the very possibility of scientific knowledge.

**Can an Evolutionist Do Science?**

Since science requires the biblical principle of uniformity (as well as a number of other biblical creation principles), it is rather amazing that one could be a scientist and also an evolutionist. And yet, there are scientists that profess to believe in evolution. How is this possible?

The answer is that evolutionists are able to do science only because they are inconsistent. They accept biblical principles such as uniformity, while simultaneously denying the Bible from which those principles are derived. Such inconsistency is common in secular thinking; secular scientists claim that the universe is not designed, but they do science as if the universe is designed and upheld by God in a uniform way. Evolutionists can do science only if they rely on biblical creation assumptions (such as uniformity) that are contrary to their professed belief in evolution.[9](http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/aid/v3/n1/evolution-anti-science%22%20%5Cl%20%22fnList_1_9)

**How Would an Evolutionist Respond?**

The consistent Christian can use past experience as a guide for what is likely to happen in the future because God has promised us that (in certain ways) the future will reflect the past (Gen 8:22). But how can those who reject Genesis explain why there should be uniformity of nature? How might an evolutionist respond if asked, “Why will the future reflect the past?”

One of the most common responses is: “Well, it always has. So, I expect it always will.” But this is circular reasoning. I’ll grant that in the past there has been uniformity.[10](http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/aid/v3/n1/evolution-anti-science%22%20%5Cl%20%22fnList_1_10) But how do I know that in the future there will be uniformity—unless I already assumed that the future reflects the past (i.e. uniformity)? Whenever we use past experience as a basis for what is likely to happen in the future, we are assuming uniformity. So, when an evolutionist says that he believes there will be uniformity in the future since there has been uniformity in the past, he’s trying to justify uniformity by simply assuming uniformity—a circular argument.

An evolutionist might argue that the nature of matter is such that it behaves in a regular fashion;[11](http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/aid/v3/n1/evolution-anti-science%22%20%5Cl%20%22fnList_1_11) in other words, uniformity is just a property of the universe. This answer also fails. First, it doesn’t really answer the question. Perhaps uniformity is one aspect of the universe, but the question is why? What would be the basis for such a property in an evolutionary worldview? Second, we might ask how an evolutionist could possibly know that uniformity is a property of the universe. At best, he or she can only say that the universe—in the past—seems to have had some uniformity.[12](http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/aid/v3/n1/evolution-anti-science%22%20%5Cl%20%22fnList_1_12) But how do we know that will continue into the future unless we already knew about uniformity some other way? Many things in this universe change; how do we know that the laws of nature will not?

Some evolutionists might try a more pragmatic response: “Well, I can’t really explain why. But uniformity seems to work, so we use it.” This answer also fails for two reasons. First, we can only argue that uniformity seems to have worked in the past; there’s no guarantee it will continue to work in the future unless you already have a reason to assume uniformity (which only the Christian does). Yet, evolutionists do assume that uniformity will be true in the future. Second, the answer admits that uniformity is without justification in the evolutionary worldview—which is exactly the point. No one is denying that there is uniformity in nature; the point is that only a biblical creation worldview can make sense of it. Evolutionists can only do science if they are inconsistent: that is, if they assume biblical creationist concepts while denying biblical creation.

**Theistic Evolution Won’t Save the Day**

Some evolutionists might argue that they can account for uniformity just as the Christian does—by appealing to a god who upholds the universe in a law-like fashion.[13](http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/aid/v3/n1/evolution-anti-science%22%20%5Cl%20%22fnList_1_13) But rather than believing in Genesis creation, they believe that this god created over millions of years of evolution. However, theistic evolution will not resolve the problem. A theistic evolutionist does not believe that Genesis is literally true. But if Genesis is not literally true, then there is no reason to believe that Gen 8:22 is literally true. This verse is where God promises that we can count on a certain degree of uniformity in the future. Without biblical creation, the rational basis for uniformity is lost.

It’s not just any god that is required in order to make sense of uniformity; it is the Christian God as revealed in the Bible. Only a God who is beyond time, consistent, faithful, all powerful, omnipresent, and who has revealed Himself to mankind can guarantee that there will be uniformity throughout space and time. Therefore, only biblical creationists can account for the uniformity in nature.

**Evolution Is Irrational**

In fact, if evolution were true, there wouldn’t be any rational reason to believe it! If life is the result of evolution, then it means that an evolutionist’s brain is simply the outworking of millions of years of random-chance processes. The brain would simply be a collection of chemical reactions that have been preserved because they had some sort of survival value in the past. If evolution were true, then all the evolutionist’s thoughts are merely the necessary result of chemistry acting over time. Therefore, an evolutionist must think and say that “evolution is true” not for rational reasons, but as a necessary consequence of blind chemistry.

Scholarly analysis presupposes that the human mind is [not just chemistry](http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs2004/0511basis.asp). Rationality presupposes that we have the freedom to consciously consider the various options and choose the best. Evolutionism undermines the preconditions necessary for rational thought, thereby destroying the very possibility of knowledge and science.

**Conclusions**

Evolution is anti-science and anti-knowledge. If evolution were true, science would not be possible because there would be no reason to accept the uniformity of nature upon which all science and technology depend. Nor would there be any reason to think that rational analysis would be possible since the thoughts of our mind would be nothing more than the inevitable result of mindless chemical reactions. Evolutionists are able to do science and gain knowledge only because they are inconsistent; professing to believe in evolution, while accepting the principles of biblical creation.

### Footnotes

1. Theodosius Dobzhansky wrote, “Nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evolution.” This was also the title of his 1973 essay first published in the *American Biology Teacher*, Vol. 35, p. 125–129.
2. The National Academy of Sciences issued a book called *Science, Evolution, and Creationism*which stated that evolution is a “critical foundation of the biomedical and life sciences . . .” and that evolutionary concepts “are fundamental to a high-quality science education.” (See [The Creation/Evolution Battle Resumes](http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/2008/01/04/creation-evolution-battle-resumes).)
3. The National Academy of Sciences also published a document called “Teaching About Evolution and the Nature of Science” (1998) with a similar theme. In the preface (p. viii) the authors indicate that biological evolution is “the most important concept in modern biology, a concept essential to understanding key aspects of living things.” They chose to publish the document in part “because of the importance of evolution as a central concept in understanding our planet.”
4. Uniformity should not be confused with “uniformitarianism.” Uniformity simply insists that the laws of nature are consistent and do not arbitrarily change with time or space, though specific conditions and processes may change. Uniformitarianism is the (unbiblical) belief that present processes are the same as past processes; it asserts a consistency of conditions and rates over time and is summed up in the phrase, “The present is the key to the past.”
5. The “ordinances of heaven and earth” are specifically mentioned in Jer 33:25.
6. 1Sam 15:29; Num 23:19
7. Ps 139:7–8
8. Granted, God can use unusual and extraordinary means on occasion to accomplish an extraordinary purpose—what we might call a “miracle.” But these are (by definition) exceptional; natural law could be defined as the ordinary way that God upholds the universe and accomplishes His will.
9. Why would someone who professes to believe in evolution also accept creation-based concepts? Although they may deny it, evolutionists are also made in the image of God (Gen 1:26–27). In their heart-of-hearts, they know the biblical God (Rom 1:19–20), but they have deceived themselves (Ja 1:22–24). They have forgotten that the principles of science come from the Christian worldview.
10. In granting this assumption, I’m actually being very generous to the evolutionist. I could have been very thorough and asked, “How do we really know that even in the past nature has been uniform?” One might argue that we remember that the past was uniform. But since the memory portions of our brain require that the laws of chemistry and physics are constant over time, you would have to assume that the past is uniform in order to argue that we correctly remember that the past is uniform! Any non-Christian response would be necessarily circular.
11. The atheist Dr. Gordon Stein used essentially this response in the famous 1985 debate with Christian philosopher Dr. Greg Bahnsen on the existence of God.
12. Again, I’m being generous here. Even this response is begging the question, since the evolutionist would have to assume uniformity in the past in order to argue that his memories of the past are accurate.
13. A “day-age” creationist might also try to use this argument. But it also fails for the same reason. Day-age creationists do not believe that Genesis really means what it says (that God literally created in six ordinary days). So, how could we trust that Gen 8:22 really means what it says? And if Gen 8:22 does not mean what it says, then there is no reason to believe in uniformity. Therefore, the day-age creationist has the same problem as the evolutionist. Neither can account for science and technology within his own worldview.

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/aid/v3/n1/evolution-anti-science>