

wrong in some areas (and it's *not*), this by itself doesn't disprove the argument.

A genetic fallacy can be committed in the other direction. That is, instead of addressing an evolutionist's argument, a creationist just points out the radical atheistic religion that *needs* evolution. The biblical principle of "equal weights and measures" ([Deuteronomy 25:13–16](#), [Proverbs 20:23](#)) holds both sides to the same standard.

However, many antirevolutionists can exhibit double standards. That is, they commit a genetic fallacy against a biblical creationist but not against an atheistic evolutionist.

Anti-Christian genetic fallacy

Anti-Christians often commit another genetic fallacy, "You only believe Christianity because your parents and culture indoctrinated you; if you came from a Hindu family in India, you would be a Hindu." Again, this is irrelevant to the question of whether Christianity is *true*. Jesus physically rose from the dead; founders of other religions rotted in their graves. Even if people *believe* in the Resurrection for the wrong reasons, it doesn't change the historical *fact*.

A related genetic fallacy is trying to disprove Christianity by pointing to alleged pagan parallels. For example, some anti-Christians compare Jesus' resurrection to alleged Egyptian myths about Osiris's resurrection. But once again, even if some Christians believed in Jesus' resurrection because of Osiris's, it would not change the fact of Jesus'. The evidence of the empty tomb and the physical appearance to 500 people at once would still stand ([1 Corinthians 15:4–6](#)). In any case, under investigation, alleged pagan parallels turn out to be nothing of the kind. E.g. Osiris never rose again, but was a 'dead' god who stayed in the underworld as Lord of the dead.

The genetic fallacy is an *informal fallacy* (see [previous article in this series](#)). That is, it is not a failing in formal logical reasoning as such, but instead fails to address the main issue.

Politicians' logic

On the astute British television political sitcom, *Yes, Prime Minister* (episode 'Power to the People', 1988), two head civil servants (Sir Arnold Robinson and Sir Humphrey Appleby) illustrated 'politicians' logic'. They were discussing one of the latest proposals by the Prime Minister, Jim Hacker. They boiled Hacker's argument down to:

1. Something must be done
2. This is something
3. Therefore, we must do this.

This argument is fallacious. How can we work this out? Often, a good way to spot a fallacy is to substitute terms while keeping the same *form* of argument. *Yes, Prime Minister* did this brilliantly. As

pointed out in the episode, this type of argument has the same form as this logically invalid one:

1. All cats have four legs
2. My dog has four legs
3. Therefore, my dog is a cat.

This example is a *formal fallacy*: the conclusion does not follow from the premises.¹

Both premises are true. But the problem is there is nothing in either premise that says that *only* cats have four legs. Therefore the conclusion, which is also false, doesn't follow.

Another form of politician's logic is:

1. To improve things, things must change
2. We are changing things
3. Therefore, we are improving things.

The term 'politicians' logic' is well deserved—far too many politicians use it. The major theme of the *Yes, Prime Minister* series (and its prequel, *Yes, Minister*) was satirizing real-life self-interested behaviours of politicians and bureaucrats. This is actually the subject of serious study, called *public choice theory*—however, *Yes, Minister* was much more entertaining.

Evolutionist example of politicians' logic

Politicians are not the only ones who fall for politicians' logic or closely related fallacies. Evolutionists do as well. Norman Macbeth, a lawyer and anti-Darwinian evolutionist, invented the term *best-in-field fallacy*. He objected to those who claimed that Darwinism must be true because all alternatives were worse.

For example, saltation (sudden uphill changes) and Lamarckism (inheritance of acquired characters) are clearly bad—and don't even *think* that creation is a possibility! Darwinism is clearly better; therefore it must be true. But as Macbeth said, being best-in-field means nothing if everything else is terrible.

Many evolutionists claim Darwinism must be true because all other evolutionary explanations are much worse. But being best-in-field means nothing if everything else is terrible.

In formal terms, the fallacy is the same form as politicians' logic:

1. Something must explain evolution [a fact, you know!]
2. Darwinism is something [because there is nothing else left]
3. Therefore Darwinism explains evolution.

The best-in-field fallacy occurs in other branches of evolution too. For example,

1. Something must explain our cosmos naturalistically [creation is *streng verboden*—*strictly forbidden*]
2. The big bang is something [because steady state theory and all other competitors are dead]
3. Therefore we must accept the big bang.

Conclusion

Jesus said, “you will know the truth, and the truth will set you free” ([John 8:32](#)). We are more likely to find truth if we think logically, like Jesus the Logos. This also means rejecting error, including fallacious arguments.

Posted on homepage: 13 January 2025

References and notes

1. Many logic textbooks call this type of argument the *fallacy of the undistributed middle*, or an AAA-2 syllogism. [Return to text](#).

▼ View All