

Discussion About Evolution With an Ex-Muslim¹ Confiscating the “Miracle” Required by Naturalists Leaves Them Empty-Handed and Unable to Respond

Abu ‘Iyaad
AboutAtheism.Net

For a more detailed treatment of evolution and the way materialists and naturalists play games with catchall definitions and cryptic language to hide or camouflage the reality of what they are saying, refer to <http://aboutatheism.net/?jqpdadp>.

Bismillāh wal-Ḥamdulillāh. Close to two years ago—in Rabī‘ al-Thānī 1438, January 2017—I received an email from someone regarding evolution. He was introduced to me by his brother and was seeking to discuss the subject. This is the text of his first email:

I have always been awed by nature and our existence and am bewildered why more people aren’t the same. I never could conceive the idea of a universe coming out of nothing. Which ultimately made me look for my creator.

¹ As I never heard from this person again, I do not know what his current state is in terms of Islām or absence of it. However, from what he stated about his beliefs at the time, there is no doubt that he exited from Islām.

Having been inspired by Ahmed Deedat and Maurice Bucaille I was convinced of Islam being the truth.² I understood knowledge was a gift and came with a responsibility of spreading this knowledge. I eventually crossed paths with evolution and sought to disprove it. However I found myself convinced by it. The only way I could reconcile evolution and islam was if evolution occurred in nature but excluded humans, after all Allaah explicitly created Adam and then Eve from Adam. Unfortunately there is no evidence for this. Scientists are in agreement we have descended from a common ancestor. No Christian, Jew, Muslim or other has been able to provide any real evidence to the contrary. I started seeing nature in a different light. I feel extremely humbled that I now understand the origins of our existence and how most of it can be explained without the need of a creator. I am now angry that most of this decades old knowledge is suppressed by older generations who want to keep the status quo. Surely we owe it to ourselves as intellectual

² Many of those who rode the “scientific miracle” bandwagon that was set into motion during the 80s onwards due to books like those of Maurice Bucaille were really building the foundations of their īmān upon shaky foundations. This is because this approach relies upon a) unsubstantiated claims, b) lying about Allāh by imputing meanings to His speech that it does not contain and c) trying to impress non-Muslims by blindly accepting their conjectures about life, the universe and nature as uncontested truths, and then twisting verses of the Qur’ān to agree with them. Refer to our paper: Big Bang Cosmology and the Qur’ān at <http://www.aqidah.com/creed/?nkqjq> which addresses this subject matter.

beings and our children to seek the truth, however uncomfortable. We need to progress as a humanity. Rejoice in the knowledge we have gained. We are all truly brothers and sisters regardless of our background. All inanimate and animate material has a single cosmic origin. This has more chance of us all achieving peace.

I responded to him on the same day:

I would like to learn and hear more about your position and how you arrived at it. It would be nice to speak to you over the phone inshaa'Allaah, or otherwise in person if convenient. I do believe you are mistaken in your assessment, however, and hope that through discussion you are able to shake off these conjectures, by Allaah's permission.

From here a discussion began. After he displayed a willingness to discuss, I started with the following, and this was two weeks after initial contact:

I think the best medium for discussion would be via email as it allows us to refer back to prior discussion.

There are multiple entry points for the discussion that follows from the remarks you made in your first email and I would liken this to a large house with multiple entrances all leading to a central hallway, the hub of the house. We

might open up different entrances, but eventually our direction should be to get to the centre, where the crux of the matter lies. As this is a complex subject, then we have to be aware of the nature and direction of our discussion, and that it can proceed with multiple strands, some might be dead ends, some might be productive, some will get to the crux of the matter etc...

So keeping that in mind and to remain in focus: Could you express for me, in a formal scientific way, **the primary, central tenet (axiom)** that underlies, justifies, proves, validates your new belief in “evolution” as a blind, undirected, purposeless yet creative force which in turn does away with a knowing, willing, creative force. That is to say, what has led you to change your belief that knowledge, will, wisdom and power are required for creating to the belief that blind, random, undirected, purposeless processes are sufficient for creating.

I would like to preempt you also in that the evidence for the existence of a creator is varied and diverse and does not rely upon any “gaps” arguments. That is to say, when you cannot explain something or have a gap in your explanation, does not mean that that gap has now become a primary argument for the existence of a creator, since the existence of a creator is not restricted to any one thing and is varied and diverse. So any retorts such as “that’s a god of the gaps argument” will be rejected.

The *asl* (foundation) in *fitrah* (innate disposition), reason (*aql*), the sum of all human experience in enterprise, industry and technology, is that knowledge, will and power and wisdom are attributes of an entity that creates. Since you have rejected that *asl* and have essentially claimed that knowledge, will, power and wisdom are not required for an entity that creates the burden is upon you to provide empirical evidence for this claim that clashes with *fitrah*, reason and the sum of human enterprise.

We can start on this if you provide us with the primary, central axiom that underlies this belief.

This is where the discussion must start with atheists in order to uncover the reality of their belief. Which is that acts of creation—known to have taken place by analysis of what is created, which is the artefact, product or item in question—must require an **entity** that possess the **attributes** that give rise to those acts. Those attributes are **knowledge, choice, intent, wisdom** and **power**, or they can be reduced and summarised as **choice with intent** or even further as **intentionality**. And essentially this is what the entire dispute is about. Is there evidence of “choice with intent” in creation and thereafter, what can this be

ascribed to on the basis of common sense, sound reason and the scientific method. That there is **intentionality** in creation is undeniable, it can be denied only on grounds of pure arrogance, and nothing else.

So this is always the first point to start. In attempting to flee from this necessity (of choice with intent, or intentionality in creation), conjectures are used by atheists, materialists and naturalists to ascribe intentionality to “nature”, but in a stealth, cryptic manner and then to dismiss intentionality as just **one big illusion** that nature plays upon our senses and intellects.

So here this becomes a circular argument in that they have already assumed the non-existence of a creator and their religion of philosophical naturalism to be the absolute truth which cannot be challenged. This then forces them to confer divine attributes to nature. They are nothing but **sophisticated nature worshippers** and hence, mushriks in the rubūbiyyah of Allāh the Exalted. Their belief enters into the various categories of shirk spoken of by Ibn al-Qayyim in al-Jawāb al-

Kāfī, from which is ta'ṭīl (تعطيل المصنوع عن الصانع), to strip the creation of having a creator.

So in his reply to the above, the person **did not respond in substance** to my question. In his email reply, he said he was grateful for my time and wanted a little more time to prepare his response. He then said he was researching materials that I may have written that are already published to get a broader picture of where I am coming from. He asked me to verify my authorship of articles and audios he had come across and asked me for my views on micro-evolution and macro-evolution. He then mentioned two points which he considered a direct reply to the points I raised—and I do not believe that they were really a direct reply, as I had asked him a very specific question which he had failed to address completely. These are his two points:

Direct reply to some of the points raised by your kind self:

—Whoever claims something as a fact then the burden of proof is on the claimer (me for evolution and you for God) so neither of us can take a back seat.

—Please understand, anyone who has taken it upon themselves to refute evolution shoulders a huge

responsibility for their community. I would imagine they must have studied evolution themselves to a certain degree. Then put that into context against all possible meanings of The Quran and Hadith in order to totally eliminate any possibility of evolution. For example, some Muslims to this day derive from their holy texts that the earth is flat while others hold the view that it is shaped like an ostrich egg. As a result, one of the two could be turning people away from Islam as only one view can be true. Would you equate the seriousness of this to the hadith of when someone sick was made to do wudu, unfortunately they died as a result, they were then declared to be murderers for ruling in that in which they had not done full research? I cannot imagine you would be of the view this equates simply to the idea of getting it right earns you double the award of not getting it right which earns a single reward. Views on evolution can turn people to God or away.

So note that this was not in fact a direct reply to my question. I asked him to first define and then provide empirical evidence for the primary, central axiom that underlies his new belief that knowledge, will, intent, power and wisdom are not needed for acts of creation. He did not answer this question.

In the above response, nevertheless, he made two points which are acceptable. The first is that whoever claims something as a fact in this issue of evolution—which is really a question about whether intentionality is involved and if there is evidence for it—must provide the proof. I answered this point in the email which followed (see below). His second point was that a lot hinges on this question and if not answered satisfactorily, it could be turning a lot of people away from Islām, which is a fair point.

I managed to respond to him a week later, when I found the time, with what follows below. I made sure to answer the questions he had raised so far directly and in substance and also to restate what I had presented to him in my earlier email but this time with a bit more elaboration:

I am short in time and offer you the following to get a clearer picture....:

1. First, we will continuously encounter problems with definitions and setting and moving of goal posts, this will affect the discussion. I am just making note of it here as this point may become relevant at some future point.

2. All biological organisms are have an in-built capacity to adapt and undergo change within limits. This is by design. The code base allows for such adaptation. Environment and the dna-gene-cell system can interact to provide such adaptability. This is what you refer to as “microevolution”. This is an observed fact.

3. I don't really like to use the word “species” as it can be subjective³, but physiologically similar organisms (if you want to say “species”) can interbreed and produce viable, fertile hybrids. This can introduce novelty. You may refer to this also as “evolution”. This is an observed fact.

4. The above indicates that biological life operates upon the same “operating system” so to speak, and code

³ The word “species” is also problematic. Species classification is a convention used to aid our ability to organize and classify nature. It is subjective and not objective. There are vague boundaries and the criteria of inclusion and separation are disputed. This problem is acknowledged and has not been satisfactorily resolved to date even amongst evolutionary biologists. Refer to, by way of example: Dobzhansky T. 1935. *A critique of the species concept in biology*. *Philos Sci* 2: 344–355; Hey J. 2006. *On the failure of modern species concepts*. *Trends Ecol Evol*, 21: 447–450; Hausdorf B. 2011. *Progress toward a general species concept*. *Evolution* 65: 923– 931; Ereshefsky M. 2010a. *Microbiology and the species problem*. *Biol Philos* 25: 553– 568. One should be aware of ways in which the ambiguity in species classification serves as a weapon for evolutionists in the construction of their arguments. Defining species works both for and against Darwinian evolution.

sections of software are portable and can be moved from one entity to another whilst retaining function.

5. Thus, there can be, within limits, degrees of interaction (between environment with organism and organism with organism) that lead to change, adaptation or novelty (within limits). At this point, you will note that our “raw data” or “evidence” for our views are actually the same. Belief in al-qadaa wal-qadar means that there is divine determination in all things and thus it obligates acceptance of the ways and means, causes and effects. So here, this would mean, for me, that all of these things are by design and determination.

6. “Macroevolution” (outside of what I have affirmed above) is an extrapolation from microevolution and is asserted upon prior metaphysical belief in materialism that necessitates—as the only other possible explanation—that chance (random events) and necessity (physical law), in blind, undirected processes can produce a net increase in prescriptive information within biological systems (after their existence has already been taken for granted) through mutation/selection. “Evolution” only occurs after we have a self-replicating cell. The graduated micro to macro claim is contested, subject to dispute and not agreed upon amongst evolutionary biologists. The reason for this is that the modern synthesis (neo-Darwinian view)

as an all-explanatory mechanism⁴ which provided a basis for the micro to macro claim has been undermined by other evolutionary biologists.⁵

⁴ The claim of evolution occurring through “natural selection” acting upon “random mutations” as **an all-explanatory mechanism for all variation and speciation in biological life** is now known to be false. Fanatical believers in this doctrine such as Richard Dawkins still exist and they are at odds with the growing number of evolutionary biologists who reject this view because its falseness has become apparent in the past couple of decades with advances in genetics. However, this split among evolutionary biologists is not being communicated through popular science media and educational institutions in an open, frank manner. There is now a search for the “**extended synthesis**” and the “**third way**” of evolution because the “modern synthesis”—natural selection acting on random mutations—has been proven to be false as an all-explanatory mechanism for all biological variation. However, that explanation was the most ingenious one and gave atheists, materialists and naturalists a good ride for the latter half of the 20th century. The challenge for evolutionary biologists has actually gotten much harder, and their conjectures will become more and more laughable, when they are stripped of their cryptic language and put in plain terms so that the common person can understand what they are really saying.

⁵ There is no evidence for the micro to macro evolution claim and it is nothing but a glorified, exaggerated extrapolation. Though there are many citations to demonstrate this, we will suffice with just one. Roger Lewin writes in the *Science* journal: “A wide spectrum of researchers—ranging from geologists and paleontologists, through ecologists and population geneticists, to embryologists and molecular biologists—gathered at Chicago’s Field Museum of Natural History under the simple conference title: Macroevolution. Their task was to consider the mechanisms that underlie the origin of species and the evolutionary relationship between species... The central question of the Chicago conference was whether the mechanisms underlying microevolution can be extrapolated to explain the phenomena of macroevolution. At the risk of doing violence to the positions

7. As for the burden and standard of proof, you have to realise that the demand for evidence has to be commensurate with the claim. The claim I have made is an axiomatic truth, empirically proven by the sum of all human enterprise in industry and technology. That knowledge, will, power, wisdom are attributes through which contrivance, design etc. comes about. Software code (a sign-symbol-token system, with decision nodes, logic gates, loops, instantiation, encryption-decryption, syntax, abstraction and so on) indicates knowledge, will, power and wisdom. That's as much proof as I need to bring in order to validate my claim. I know there is a creator through this reasoning which is proven by the sum of human experience and enterprise.⁶ The dna-gene-cell system is a self-replicating software-OS-hardware system with all the features I just listed and much more. Physico-chemistry and randomness cannot account for that. These are known, empirically proven facts.

of some of the people at the meeting, **the answer can be given as a clear, No.**" Roger Lewin. *Evolutionary theory under fire*. Science 210:883.

⁶ As for detailed knowledge of this Creator, then that only comes through revelation and this answers the doubt of the Atheists, when it is proven that some sort of agency must be behind creation, that how do you know it is the "God" you are asserting and describing, since you have no way of knowing who or what this force or power is. The answer to that is revelation and prophethood. The knowledge relating to God, the resurrection and the unseen cannot be reached by science.

On the other hand, the claim that random events, physical law and so on can produce self-replicating, software code running on an operating system on a hardware platform (this is the current understanding of the dna-gene-cell system)—then your evidence has to be commensurate with the claim. Invoking a miracle here is not allowed. Further, I am not obliged to detail the mechanism as to specifically how the creator developed such a code and created life, as that knowledge is not a condition for my basic argument to be correct. Just like a person who uses any Google service by way of example, can reason that there is intelligence behind it but the validity of this reasoning would not depend upon knowing how that service was crafted, engineered, and built from the ground up, and the nature of its programming (language, syntax etc).

This is not so with your argument, because of the nature of your claim.⁷ As this claim rejects **choice with intent**,

⁷ It is crucial to understand this point to see through the sophistry of atheists, materialists and naturalists. The nature of the burden of proof depends on the actual claim being made. Thus, if a person asserts that a bottle, a pen, a cart, or a phone or the creation of a language (for programming or for biological life) requires knowledge, will, power and wisdom—then the nature of this claim is that the evidence for it is already established and known. It is evidently true from the thousands of years of empirical evidence in the combined experience of humans in the fields of industry and technology. However, if a person argues that a language for programming (such as COBOL, C++, Javascript) or for biological life (DNA) can arise in the

then the standard of proof is that you must provide empirical evidence that there is sufficient creative power within nature (randomness and physical law) to produce a self-replicating machine in the absence of choice with intent. A miracle is not allowed in this claim. Like for like conditions must be replicated in order to demonstrate this, and it must meet the standards of science which you assert as the criterion for claims of fact. It should be observed, repeated and testable.

Now frankly, you and I know there is no evidence for this and never will be. So we can move to the next step: Let us allow the use of knowledge, will, power, wisdom in the form of the collective intelligence of the worlds software engineers, hardware specialists, data storage experts, biological surgeons and so on... let them come together and produce a simple, self-replicating life form, a single cell or a fly for example (a challenge in the Quran incidentally). Whether this is achieved or not, it will demonstrate the axiomatic truth I mentioned earlier.⁸

absence of knowledge, will, power and wisdom or the absence of choice with intent, then the burden of proof is on that person to prove that empirically, through experimentation **which must incorporate randomness as an independent variable**. Knowing that all people of sound mind will laugh, scorn and mock them, they have to deceive people about the nature of the burden of proof that is upon them.

⁸ In other words, if they are able to create a simple, self-replicating life form, then it is proof that there is knowledge, choice, intent, wisdom, purpose behind life and if they are unable to do so, then it is proof that there is a type

8. I refer you to two papers as background for the point I just made (you can find them easily online):

a) Abel, D. L., 2007, *Complexity, self-organization, and emergence at the edge of chaos in life-origin models*. Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences, 2007, 93: (4) 1-20

b) J.T. Trevors, D.L. Abel. *Chance and necessity do not explain the origin of life*. Cell Biology International 28 (2004) 729-739.

9. In summary, due to the nature of your claim, and also what I stated earlier that the nature of the evidence has to be commensurate with the claim, then your position cannot start with a miracle. As such, this discussion cannot move further until and unless you provide empirical proof for what I raised in my earlier email: “The *asl* (foundation) in *fitrah* (innate disposition), *reason* (*aql*), the sum of all human experience in enterprise, industry and technology, is that knowledge, will and power and wisdom are attributes of an entity that creates. Since you have rejected that *asl* and have essentially claimed that knowledge, will, power and wisdom are not required for an entity that creates the burden is upon you to provide empirical evidence for this claim that clashes with *fitrah*,

of knowledge, will, choice, intent, and wisdom behind life that is far outside the realm of human capacity.

reason and the sum of human enterprise.” Hence, to validate your new belief system, you would have to demonstrate that absence of knowledge, will, power, wisdom can lead to cybernetic systems (programmatically and algorithmically organized and controlled) by mere random, blind, undirected processes (“nature”), and you would have to demonstrate this empirically, as in physically, whether in a lab or outside of it. Until you can provide this, you remain a believer in miracles. On the other hand I can provide you ample empirical evidence that cybernetic systems only come about through choice with intent (or knowledge, will, ability and wisdom) etc. The evidence is abundant and all round.

I hope this provides some food for thought and that you are able to read and digest the two papers I have referenced so that if you provide any answer or response, it specifically addresses the issue I have raised in substance and is not just simply addressing other issues which you may have picked upon by reading other material (on this or other topics) I may have written or published elsewhere.

I did not receive a response to the above after a month had passed and hence I sent a follow up:

I wonder if you have anything further to contribute to our thread of discussion so far.

I am looking for empirical evidence that physicochemical dynamics absent choice with intent (or knowledge, will, wisdom and power) can create prescriptive code and a machine architecture within which to execute that code. As this is an as yet unproven assumption of the neo-Darwinian mutation/selection conjecture, it does not remove your current belief (which comprises rejection of a creator) from the realm of conjecture.

Alternatively, if you want to concede and say that you have taken this on blind faith and that your new belief rests and depends upon this unproven assumption, then we can move forward from this point.

As such, your position amounts to the following accurate and precise analogy:

The services of Google (based upon prescriptive code and the surrounding cybernetic system—inclusive of all abstract and physical data layers, hardware, software and so on) appeared through pure physicochemical dynamics in the absence of choice with intent, or absence of knowledge, will, power and wisdom. After believing in this assumption, you argue for the improvement (evolution) of these services with novel features through random mutation in Python/Javascript/C++ source code and natural selection by end user evaluation, whereby improved, adapted, useful services are retained and

preferentially reproduced/expanded and the not so fit (unuseful) services are retired and shut down by Google as a result of these environmental selection pressures. This is being very generous to your position. In case you find such an analogy hard to swallow I can furnish you with scientific research papers to show that this analogy, though broadly accurate, is still far too simplistic and generous to your position.

And my position amounts to the following accurate and precise analogy:

The services of Google (based upon prescriptive code and the surrounding cybernetic system—inclusive of all abstract and physical data layers, hardware, software and so on) arose through choice with intent, or through knowledge, will, power and wisdom. This is an empirical fact known through intuition, common sense basic reason and the sum of human experience in industry and technology and can be validated through the scientific method (testability, falsifiability, repeatability). Upon this, I can now argue for the evolution [within defined limits] of these services with novel features in response to environmental (end user) needs through injection of new source code, modification, or copying and pasting, the inclusion of modules from other source code, switching features on and off—with all of this being possible due to a pre-configured, pre-engineered architectural framework

[with in built automation] within which such dynamics can take place through agent interaction or choice contingency/intervention of the architect/designer.

The main idea here is to contrast between the belief that blind, undirected, purposeless forces create cybernetic systems with end goals and objectives with the same forces responsible for novelty within those systems through code mutation and cumulative selection and the belief that knowledge, will, power and wisdom create cybernetic systems with end goals and objectives. Fundamentally, this is the crux of the argument all along, from its beginning to its end at its highest conceptual level. Whatever is in the middle is just the intricate, technical detail with which either of these two views are being argued for. It just so happens that neo-Darwinism/modern synthesis is the current best (though discredited) justification for the doctrine that you hold which is simply: that acts of creation do not require knowledge, wisdom, will and power.

Look forward to hearing from you.

I never heard back from this person again. So a year and a half later—when I just happened to come across this discussion again—I sent the following:

Hope all is well. I know its been a while, but I was revisiting my emails and came across this loose end of a discussion with you from the beginning of last year. I was awaiting your answer and wonder if you have any comments on the points raised below.

I never received any response. I know the emails were delivered—they never bounced and no delivery failure, or inbox full messages came back from his email provider. There may be an explanation that I am not aware of. In any case, today (close to two years later) I sent him a final email:

As I have not heard back from you, I consider this discussion closed. Thank you for your time and kind regards.

Conclusion: In short, atheists, materialists, naturalists and their blind-followers think that they are upon something when in reality they are blind to the falsity of the assumptions they have built their beliefs upon. Because evolutionists have no other option but to claim life arose naturally, in the absence of choice with intent, their proof is the observed similarity between species (commonalities in structure, appearance,

function). Then they try and trace this to the source code (genetics) in order to demonstrate the “common origin” from both angles (i.e the whole organism level and the genetic code level). So keeping to the analogy given earlier with Google’s services, they would go to the source code and see similarities in lines of code of C++ or Python or Javascript used to build the various services. So they would say this is evidence of the “homology” or “common descent” of these services, after having noted the similarities in the services from a user point of view. They then claim that this therefore is a proof that “evolution” took place. And all of this is stated in such generalised terms, with catch-all, elastic definitions for “evolution” such that they are able to deceive the onlooker that they have brought the actual burden of proof due upon them, but which in reality they have not. There is nothing scientific in any of this, and it is nothing but pulling the wool over people’s eyes by diverting them away from the actual claim they are making. All they have done here is to tell a story. To illustrate, the observed similarity between many models of Apple smart devices leads them to say: “We see that there is commonality (homology), and now if we dig into the firmware, the code, we

predict there should be likeness, and lo and behold, we see a 99% likeness. This is now proof that these devices had a common ancestor, or common origin, hence evolution is true.” This is nothing but storytelling on the basis of data with not an ounce of the scientific method in it. What they are doing through this is to hide the actual claim they are making. Which is that the code base or the devices themselves arose in the complete absence of knowledge, will, power and wisdom, or choice with intent, or intentionality. And all people of sound mind know this to be pure falsehood, even children know this. So they mischaracterise the actual burden of proof that is upon them and instead tell stories to divert from the crux of the affair.

The actual burden of proof upon them is to prove that the evolution and diversification of Google’s services **did not come** about through knowledge, will, choice, intent, power and wisdom—or choice with intent, or simpler still, intentionality—and instead came about through the randomness of mutations in the programming code base and then to perform experiments that empirically validate this hypothesis as true. They have to validate this hypothesis through

experimentation **which must incorporates randomness**. And as we said, it would be pure foolishness for them to embark upon this, because its falsehood is known by all people, even children.

However, before they even get there, they also have a prior burden of proof upon them to demonstrate how nature can generate knowledge and language and upon that, create prescriptive code⁹ through nothing but pure random interactions (chance plus physical laws). As there is a tremendous amount of abstraction involved, and as nature does not have the ability to think, and pursue objectives through goal-steering mechanisms, then it is known by all people of sound mind that this is impossible and it can never, ever be reproduced, not even within experiments where conditions are very carefully controlled by experimenters (i.e. by “design”). However, they need this initial miracle (the first self-replicating cell) or the very first Google service (the search engine) as having come about through chance and necessity (physical law), before they can start telling the rest of their story of evolution and novelty. So they are not allowed to tell

⁹ Code which contains instructions, blueprints.

that story until they have first brought the burden of proof for what comes first. For more details on this refer to the article:

A Falsifiable Hypothesis to Prove Agency

<http://aboutatheism.net/dld.cfm?a=puvclx>

So the crux of the matter is that there are only two choices. Either you ascribe these attributes to a being external to nature and the universe, which is where the intentionality came from, or you ascribe them to matter.¹⁰ This is all that they are doing, but they are hiding it using very deceptive, cryptic, technical language. They are no different to primitive nature worshippers but just very good in hiding it through the use of deception, word games, elastic definitions and cryptic language. They need randomness, blindness, purposelessness and thus, they have to hide what is evident of intentionality, goal-steering mechanisms, knowledge, language—which they know from the sum

¹⁰ Or, if you are Richard Dawkins, you can admit a third possibility, that of some highly developed, advanced aliens. However, this only pushes the problem back one step and does not answer the question. In any case, it is an admission that you can never, ever escape having to admit that there is knowledge, will, wisdom and power behind life.

of all human enterprise in industry and technology—cannot arise except through an agent possessing knowledge, will, intent, power and wisdom. To put it another way, they are deceiving people about the nature of the burden of proof that is upon them.

From here, one can appreciate the statement of Allāh the Exalted: (أَفَمَنْ يَخْلُقُ كَمَنْ لَّا يَخْلُقُ) “**Is One who creates like one that does not create?**” (16:17) and (أَلَا يَعْلَمُ مَنْ (حَلَقَ) (67:14) “**Should He not know who created?**” Imām al-Sa’dī (رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ) stated: “Then He said—providing evidence through a rational proof for His [attribute of knowledge], ‘**Should He not know who created**’. So whoever created the creation and made it with precision and exactness, how can He not know it?”¹¹

It is evident that there is a language and code to biological life and it follows that there is a knower of that language and code who knows exactly what He has created—just as it is evident from the code upon which Google’s services are created, that there is a knower (or a group of them) of that language and code. All of this is sound reason which cannot be

¹¹ Refer to “Taysīr al-Karīm al-Raḥmān” in the commentary on (67:14).

challenged in any way except by sophistry. There is knowledge, will, choice, intent and wisdom behind life and the empirical evidence is biological life itself. It is not a condition for the correctness of this argument that one explain precisely the specific mechanism and the specific actions that were undertaken to create life. Atheists cannot argue with this, and hence must find ways to attribute intentionality to nature itself—whilst denying that this is what they are doing and treating it all as an “illusion”. That is all they are doing in their arguments, but it is highly camouflaged and often the blind-followers among them—which is the overwhelming majority of them—will not even realise what they are doing. In short, nothing but mushriks in the rubūbiyyah of Allāh using their shrewdness to avoid showing gratitude.

Abu Iyaad

10 Rabī al-Awwal 1440

18 November 2018

1.11

FURTHER READING

For more information refer to the following series of articles:¹²

[Important Preliminary Notes](#)

The following are some important preliminary notes that should be kept in mind as you read this book: 1. Discussions are bound and restricted by definitions of terms. Misunderstandings are perpetuated in the absence of defining terms clearly and making clear how they are being used and applied in any given context.

[Introduction](#)

The claim that best fits the available evidence-according to the standards of scientific inquiry-is that biological life is designed and created through knowledge (‘ilm), will (irādah), power (qudrah) and wisdom (ḥikmah).

[Key Tactics of the Naturalist Atheists](#)

There are a number of high-level operational tactics employed by atheist evolutionists. We will mention three main ones here: First: The deliberate, calculated separation between: a) the origin of life, termed abiogenesis. This refers to the process of biological life arising from non-living matter...

[Ibn al-Qayyim and a Naturalist’s Self-Dialogue](#)

In the preceding chapters we focused upon the saying of the evolutionists at the highest conceptual level. The naturalists

¹² Available here: <http://aboutatheism.net/?jqpdadp>

and atheist evolutionists cryptically conceal their attribution of "choice with intent" or "will, power and wisdom" to nature—implicitly or explicitly—through the clever use of language (choice of words) and creative definitions of terms...

Biological Life and Linguistic Information All known functionality in biological life is prescribed and controlled through information. Language(s) and grammar(s) are behind biological life. Hubert Yockey, the first person to apply information theory to biological systems and also a naturalist, wrote (emphasis added): "Information, transcription, translation, code, redundancy, synonymous, messenger, editing, and proofreading are all appropriate terms in biology. They take their meaning from information theory and are not synonyms, metaphors, or analogies."

DNA, the Genome and Information DNA is a digital communication and control system. The discoveries, formulas and communication theories which created our modern digital world and the basic ideas and principles of computer design and engineering of Von Neumann, Alan Turing and Norbert Weiner (inventor of cybernetics) were derived from the linear digital genetic programming in life.

A Falsifiable Hypothesis to Prove Agency Evolutionists detest conceptually, physically accurate, like for like analogies because they show convincingly—through common sense and basic reason—that the claims of evolutionists are not easily believed by laymen and learned alike, especially when the

smoke has been cleared, the mirrors smashed and their thinking exposed as being no different to the primitives of old.

Evolution History and Current Status There have been three broad stages in the doctrine of evolution. The first was popularised by Charles darwin in the mid 19th century when knowledge of biology was primitive and the fields of biochemistry and genetics were unknown. It is referred to as Darwinism. Simply put, the observable similarities in animals indicate that all living species arose through descent with modification from a common ancestor with the fittest?those having superior hereditary traits leading to better reproduction and survival rates?passing on their fitness traits to subsequent generations.

Elaboration with a Communications Analogy The following is a good analogy for understand the nature of cellular and genetic communications. Zayd has a thought and goes to his laptop. He opens up Microsoft Word, creates a new document and writes a message. He inserts an image into the document. After saving the document, he opens his email program. He composes a message in which there are instructions, attaches his document and presses the send button.