

Assumptions of Evolutionists

Mark Bergemann

Assumptions Guide Science

Unproven assumptions guide the entire scientific process from start to finish. Assumptions determine what is to be observed and what is not to be observed, which methods, calculations, and models to use, and which to reject. Assumptions determine which conclusions are allowed and which are not allowed. Science is a biased process.

Professor Boehlke and several of his Wisconsin Lutheran College students wrote in the periodical, *Zygon: Journal Of Religion and Science*,

Presuppositions play into every aspect of science. ... Presuppositions can close minds subconsciously. ... Science is a process of investigation and a body of content accepted by a community of its practitioners. Experiment and observation are used to test and retest nature. However, data do not speak for themselves; they must be interpreted. We do not answer our questions simply by experience or by experiment. We sort the data, choose some, value some, and ignore others. Hence, science becomes a framework of thought and empiricism. Scientific presuppositions do play into the entire thought framework. Science cannot claim to be purely objective; it is a human activity.¹

Atheistic evolutionist and Nobel Laureate Francis Crick agrees that assumptions guide the scientific process. He calls these assumptions “pre-conceived ideas.” This is the world-famous Crick, who along with Watson discovered DNA. Crick writes, “You cannot pursue a difficult program of scientific research without some preconceived ideas to guide you.”²

¹ Boehlke, P. R., Knapp, L. M. and Kolander, R. L. (2006), PUTTING PRESUPPOSITIONS ON THE TABLE: WHY THE FOUNDATIONS MATTER. *Zygon*®, 41: 422-423. [doi:10.1111/j.1467-9744.2005.00746.x]

² Crick, Francis. 1994. *The Astonishing Hypothesis: The Scientific Search For The Soul*. New York: Touchstone, 257.

Pointing out the assumptions of evolutionists is a strong and solid argument, one which should remain strong for decades to come.

Assumptions Guide Evolution Theory

Evolutionists start with countless unproven presuppositions. These unproven starting assumptions require that creation be rejected. Creation is rejected NOT on the basis of scientific conclusions, but on the basis of unproven a priori assumptions.

Pointing out the Assumptions of Evolutionists

Pointing out the assumptions of evolutionists is a strong and solid argument, one which should remain strong for decades to come. If an assumption is wrong, then all conclusions based on that assumption are invalid. Pointing out these assumptions is relatively easy. On the other hand, pointing out scientific problems with evolution is often much more difficult and is much more easily countered by the evolutionist. Why not make the easy and solid argument of pointing out assumptions, instead of a more difficult and often weaker argument (one which may be incorrect a few years down the road)?

Simply pointing out the first and primary assumption of evolutionists, their “no creator” assumption, is a powerful and easy to make argument. The “no creator” assumption is imposed on every conclusion which evolutionists make. Pointing out other major assumptions such as the “no flood” and “deep time” assumptions is almost as powerful.

assumption: **No Creator**

The evolution story is written using science alone. The use of other sources of knowledge is forbidden when writing the evolution story. Science is an attempt to explain everything through natural causes. If there is a god, that god could do miracles. Miracles are not natural causes. There-

fore a scientist must reject the possibility of miracles when using science. This works very well in creating our modern technological world. We do not take miracles into account while designing airplanes and cell phones. But the assumption of natural causes is the worst assumption possible when considering origins. The assumption of natural causes means that if something is the result of a miracle, then science will never understand its origin. So if there is a creator god who made the universe, science alone will never be able to discover that fact. Evolutionists start with the assumption that there is no creator god. Evolution is the best story they can construct without a creator god. *If God really did create everything as he reveals in Scripture, then evolution is wrong, since evolution rejects that possibility regardless of the evidence.*³

Boehlke et al. also mention this most basic assumption of science, Presuppositions are always needed, but one can see that our vices often stem from our virtues. The reasonable move to a practical naturalism in the laboratory can, for some, shift to philosophical naturalism that entirely eliminates God. ... One is the presupposition that all natural events must have natural causes. ... Some believe that transcendent qualities do not exist because science has not uncovered them. But at the heart of this is that some assume that matter and energy are all that exist, and if God would appear to them they would question their sanity. ... Presuppositions need to be on the table. Scientists who boldly assert that reality consists exclusively of the interactions of matter and energy need to examine the roots of that claim and recognize it as a basic assumption that is useful only within narrow limits. Presuppositions are not proven, and such extreme use of naturalism without question cannot be justified and becomes scientism. Naturalism rules out the transcendent and the supernatural. This may be a practical and temporary

³ I have made this argument often. These particular words are taken from my video presentation: Mark Bergemann, "Did God Use Evolution To Create?" Presented to the Metro-Milwaukee Pastors' Conference meeting at Nain Lutheran Church in West Allis WI on October 10, 2016. www.LutheranScience.org/Did-GodUseEvolution (accessed Sep 16, 2017)

suspension of thought to make in the laboratory, but it ought to be recognized as such. Tension will remain if some push the application of naturalism to all forms of knowledge and experience.⁴

Evolutionists:

- assume* no global flood on earth,
- propose* global floods on other planets.

assumption: No Flood

Evolutionists *assume* no global flood on earth, yet propose global floods on other planets. This assumption leads evolutionists to so many wrong conclusions. The entire geologic column with its hundreds of millions of years is based on this assumption (and many other assumptions too). Evolution’s “Tree of Life” is based on this assumption (and many other assumptions too). If there really was a global flood on earth, then much of the evolution story would have to be scrapped and a new story written.

assumption: Deep Time

Evolutionists *assume* deep time (millions and billions of years). It is *assumed* that such long times would be needed for slow natural processes to accumulate large changes. Evolutionists *assume* that the very slow natural processes observed today were the means which produced the world we see today. They often reject catastrophes as alternative explanations, even though we have observed catastrophes like the eruption of Mt. St. Helens, which deposited layered sediment and then cut large canyons through that sediment in a few months. The assumption of slow processes over millions and billions of years (and rejection of known fast processes) often leads evolutionists to accept unreasonable explanations which sometimes are contrary to physics, chemistry, and biology as we know them. Evolutionists *assume* that eventually they will figure out how slow natural processes produced what we see today, without violating physics, chemistry, and biology.

⁴ Boehlke, P. R., et al., (2006), 420, 423, 424.

Greenland Ice Dating

Ice core dating is a good example of how the “no flood” and “deep time” assumptions drastically change scientific conclusions. Evolutionists *assume* that the middle and lower layers in the Greenland ice sheet have been compressed for long ages, with the lowest layers compressed nearly paper-thin. Evolutionists interpret the data to match their assumptions: They force their calculations so that the thickness of each “measured” annual layer does not significantly vary from the *assumed* thickness for that layer. If the ice actually accumulated over the few thousand years since Noah’s Flood, then those layers would NOT be compressed nearly that much and would have to be dated much younger. In addition, they *assume* that past annual snowfalls have been similar to today’s annual accumulations. If there was much heavier snowfall in the past, say for the century or so after the Flood, then the dates evolutionists calculate will be far too old due to that factor too. Meteorologist Michael Oard writes (italics in original),

The claimed 110,000 annual layers in the GISP2 ice core to near the bottom of the Greenland ice sheet is not a straightforward deduction. The annual layers, indeed, show up well near the top of the ice sheet. However, the situation becomes much more complicated deeper down in the ice sheet. Essentially, the uniformitarian scientists must make assumptions for the bottom and middle portion of the ice sheet in order to determine the annual layers. ...They *assume* that the Greenland and Antarctica ice sheets have existed for many millions of years. ...They think the amount of snow and ice added each year is approximately balanced by the ice that is lost by melting and calving of icebergs into the ocean. Because of their assumptions, uniformitarian scientists believe that the annual layers thin drastically as they are covered by more snow and ice. ...The upshot of their assumptions is that the amount of annual layer compression believed to have occurred depends upon *how old one believes the ice to be*. For an ice sheet in equilibrium for millions of years, the annual layers would, theoretically, thin rapidly and become almost paper-thin near the bottom

of the ice. On the other hand, if the ice built up rapidly, as in the creationist model during the Ice Age, the annual layers would be very thick at the bottom and thin upward to the present average annual layer thickness.⁵

Rock Layer and Canyon Dating

Assumptions of “no creator,” “no flood,” and “deep time” have led evolutionists to *assume* earth’s sedimentary and volcanic rock layers were deposited over hundreds of millions of years. The evolution story *assumes* canyons are cut through these rock layers over additional long ages. Yet the 1980 eruption of Mt. St. Helens showed thick rock layers can be deposited, and then canyons up to 600 feet deep cut through them, in months. LSI published an article on this in 2009.⁶ Up to date reports are on the Answers In Genesis website.⁷ Dr. Snelling reports that large canyons formed rapidly near Mt. St. Helens in the 1980s,

Side canyons also appeared, resembling the side canyons of the Grand Canyon (technically known as gully-headed and amphitheater-headed side canyons). The breach did not cut straight through the obstruction, but took a meandering path, similar to the meandering path of the Grand Canyon through the high plateaus of northern Arizona. Indeed, this “Little Grand Canyon of the Toutle River” is a one-fortieth scale model of the real Grand Canyon. This amazing feature was cut through soft debris, but another eruption two months later (on May 19, 1982) melted a snow pack that cut through hard basalt bedrock. The resulting Loowit Canyon was more than 100 feet (30 m) deep. Nearby, the

⁵ Michael Oard, “Do Ice Cores Show Many Tens of Thousands of Years?” Answers In Genesis, October 1, 2004. <https://answersingenesis.org/environmental-science/ice-age/do-ice-cores-show-many-tens-of-thousands-of-years/> (accessed Oct 16, 2017)

⁶ Warren Krug, “Age of the Earth, Part 1 Mount St. Helens and Surtsey,” *LSI Journal*, 2009 www.LutheranScience.org/2009AgeEarthPart1 (accessed Oct 6, 2017)

⁷ Andrew A. Snelling, Joe Francis, and Tom Hennigan, *Lasting Lessons from Mount St. Helens*, Answers In Genesis, April 1, 2015. <https://answersingenesis.org/geology/mount-st-helens/lasting-lessons-mount-st-helens/> (accessed Sep 16, 2017)

avalanche cut through lava and ash layers to form a third canyon, Step Canyon, up to 600 feet (180 m) deep. Small creeks now flow through these deep canyons. In other places, geologists assume creeks cut the surrounding canyons very slowly over a very long time period. Yet at Mount St. Helens they know that the canyons formed first and formed extremely rapidly!⁸

Oort Cloud

Assumptions of “no creator” and “deep time” have led evolutionists to invent the Oort Cloud. Evolutionists *assume* the Oort Cloud exists, even though they claim zero evidence for it. Evolutionists know that comets slowly melt as they orbit the sun, and many comets meet their end by crashing into a planet or moon. Since evolutionists *assume* the solar system is billions of years old, they need to find a source for new comets, otherwise there would be no long-period comets left. Evolutionists *assume* there are many icy objects (planetesimals) far past Pluto, and that occasionally they are sent toward the inner solar system. There is zero evidence for this Oort Cloud, which is too far away for us to verify its existence. Evolutionists need this imagined Oort Cloud to exist. The Oort Cloud may exist, but whether it does or doesn’t is in keeping with a young earth.

Similarities between animals are
ASSUMED to be from common de-
scend, not from common design.

assumption: Chemicals Self-Assembled Into Life

Evolutionists *assume* non-living chemical molecules self-assembled into life, yet they have no idea how that could happen. Life spontaneously developing from non-living chemicals goes against what we know about

⁸ Snelling.

physics, chemistry, and biology. World renowned evolutionist Paul Davies writes in *Scientific American* (September 2016),

We do not know the process that transformed a mishmash of chemicals into a living cell, with all its staggering complexity. ... We are almost as much in the dark today about the pathway from nonlife to life as Charles Darwin was when he wrote, “It is mere rubbish thinking at present of the origin of life; one might as well think of the origin of matter.”⁹

assumption: Common Descent

Evolutionists *assume* all animals and plants descended from a common ancestor, a single cell lifeform. Similarities between animals are *assumed* to be due to common descent, or due to that similar feature evolving twice independently. Evolutionists reject the possibility that similarities (in bone structures, DNA, etc.) are due to common design by a creator. This assumption is based on their belief in naturalism, that everything is a result of natural physical causes (the “no creator” assumption). Evolution’s Tree of Life connects the branch of one animal kind to the branch of another based on the assumption of common descent. The only evidence to connect those branches is a very small amount of fossil evidence. Evidence which equally supports creation. There is strong evidence against the assumption of common descent, including the reality that intelligence is needed to create new information in DNA, and that fossils show distinct kinds with at best a handful of debatable transitional forms. See *Evolution’s Tree of Life* (Winter 2016 LSI Journal, pages 28-29).

www.LutheranScience.org/2016winter

assumption: Mutations Lead to New Kinds

Evolutionists *assume* that genetic mutations are able to produce new information in DNA, and with many generations of accumulated new information in its DNA, a new kind of animal is produced. Yet new genetic information has never been observed. An LSI Journal article evaluates

⁹ Paul Davies, “Many Planets Not Much Life –We Still Have No Idea How Easy It Is for Life To Arise-and It May Be Incredibly Difficult,” in *Forum – Commentary on Science in the News From the Experts*, *Scientific American*, September 2016, 8.

claimed instances of new genetic information and explains why those cases would never lead to a new kind of animal. See *Natural Selection* (Fall 2016 LSI Journal, pages 25-31). www.LutheranScience.org/2016fall

assumption: DNA from Natural Causes

The evolution story *assumes* that natural causes can produce the information contained in DNA and the mechanisms needed to read and use that information, even though producing information requires intelligence. See *Code Systems Evidence a Creator and Declare the Glory of God* (Winter 2016 LSI Journal, pages 7-12). www.LutheranScience.org/2016winter

Instead of questioning the *science* of evolution, question the *unproven assumptions* which direct and constrain that science.

assumption: Everlasting Soft Tissue

Evolutionists are being forced to *assume* that biological tissue and cells from dead dinosaurs and other creatures can survive for hundreds of millions of years. Since 2005, evolutionists have repeatedly found tissue (such as collagen, pliable blood vessels, and the proteins actin and myosin) in fossils. The evolution story has dinosaurs going extinct more than 60 million years ago. Tissue has even been found “in bones of a supposed 247-million-year-old reptile,” and “flexible tissue in a supposed 550-million-year-old beard worm and evidence of trace amounts of protein fragments still retained in a 417-million-year-old arthropod.”¹⁰ Evolutionists have put forth suggestions of laboratory contamination and other explanations, but the growing number of impossibly old tissue discoveries by evolutionists is overwhelming such explanations. It seems evolutionists may have to accept the assumption that tissue can survive nearly indefinitely, even though that goes against what we know about biology and chemistry.

10 Anderson, K. (2016 October). Dinosaur Tissue -A Biochemical Challenge to the Evolutionary Timescale. Answers In Genesis. Retrieved from <https://answersingenesis.org/fossils/dinosaur-tissue/> (accessed July 18, 2017)

assumption: **Gas Molecules Self-Assembled Into Stars**

Evolutionists *assume* hydrogen gas molecules pulled together under their own gravity, forming the first stars, even though this would be contrary to the laws of physics. If gas is compacted, it heats up, and that would push the gas molecules apart due to the gas laws of physics. Evolutionists propose that a shock wave from a nearby supernova could have overcome the outward pressure produced by the gas laws. Now that claim would not work for the very first stars, since there would be no other stars to explode producing the needed shock wave. Evolutionists *hope* to one day figure out how the first stars could overcome the gas laws. Even if a means of overcoming the gas laws is found, it does not mean that the stars formed that way.

Your Creation Apologetic

Pointing out the assumptions of evolutionists is a powerful tool in your creation apologetics toolbox. Make good use of this tool. Start with the “no creator” assumption. If needed, also mention the “no flood,” “deep time,” and other assumptions. Instead of questioning the science of evolution, question the unproven assumptions which direct and constrain that science.

Mark Bergemann is a retired electrical engineer with a B.S. from UW-Milwaukee. He serves as president of the Lutheran Science Institute, and as a Martin Luther College adjunct instructor, teaching the online course Creation Apologetics 101. He is a member of Good Shepherd's Evangelical Lutheran Church in West Allis, Wisconsin.