

الحمد لله رب العالمين والصلاة والسلام على أشرف
الأنبياء والمرسلين وعلى آله وصحبه أجمعين.

1. 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 (*hikmah*).

This is an **empirical conclusion** and can be formulated—from an information, communications and engineering perspective—as a **scientific hypothesis** which is not falsifiable except by abandoning common sense and reason. **Falsifiability tests** can be devised and constructed for this claim.²³ Design with intent in biological life is presented as a scientific hypothesis in this book along with falsifiability tests.

At the same time, the claim that the scientific method of inquiry is the only way to ascertain truths and facts cannot be proven by the scientific method itself and is therefore false. We shall explore this further in chapters relating to naturalism and the scientific method.

Thus, we can also claim—from the angle of innate disposition, common sense, basic reason and applied human intelligence in industry and technology—that biological life is designed and created through knowledge (*'ilm*), will (*irādah*), power (*qudrah*) and wisdom (*hikmah*) without requiring any application of the scientific method. The acquisition of sound, factual knowledge is not dependent solely

²³ In scientific inquiry, falsifiability tests increase the scientific status of a hypothesis. In the Qur'ān, tests of falsifiability are provided for non-believers: If there is doubt about the Qur'ān's divine origin, then produce a chapter like it to prove it is the work of a human (2:23). There is a challenge to create a simple form of biological life, a fly (22:73). Nimrod, the arrogant tyrant, is requested to bring the sun from the west (2:258) to prove his claim and to falsify Ibrāhīm's (عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام) that the sun's course has been designated for it by its creator.

on the scientific method. Limitations in the truth-reaching capacity of the scientific method are discussed later in this work. That is not to deny that it is an extremely useful and beneficial tool of inquiry to gain knowledge and understanding of phenomena .

A universal digital information, communication and engineering system drives biological life and manifests as a hardware-operating system platform within which a database of prescriptive information in the form of code is edited in real-time to generate software which can create, run and control more software which in turn creates and controls machinery allowing self-repair, self-regulation and self-replication.²⁴ Upon this architecture, biological life is designed with an in-built capacity for adaptation and change within defined limits in response to external stimuli. Organisms can share or acquire software code through which novelty can be introduced—not randomly as per the creed of the naturalists—but within a pre-configured design architecture that accommodates and accounts for all such variations. Physiologically similar organisms can reproduce and introduce variety if their coded instruction sets are similar and compatible enough to allow fertile offspring.²⁵

The ability to manipulate genetic code within a laboratory setting and introduce change and novelty with intent and by design is also empirical evidence that life is designed. This is no different to improving software through the use of pre-existing code templates, modules and plugins. “Evolution” within this conceptual framework—with understanding of computational and engineering

²⁴ This has been the emerging understanding of cellular, biological life and the relevant research in this regard is summarised later in this work.

²⁵ For example dogs and wolves are able to interbreed and produce viable, fertile offspring and it can be said that such physiologically similar variations have a “common ancestor”. However, this does not allow the generalisation that **all species** have a universal common ancestor within the framework of neo-Darwinian evolution, since the proposed mechanism for the emergence of variation, involving random mutations, has been empirically disproven, and further, this claim employs fallacious reasoning, through the use of hasty generalisation. This issue—and how evolutionists construct their arguments—is discussed in more detailed later in the book.

processes within the cell such as transposition and epigenetics—can accommodate all verifiable observations, whether in nature or within a laboratory setting. This is on the basis of belief in *al-qaḍā wal-qadar* (divine determination and precision in all affairs) and the fact that the creator has put inherent properties, strengths and qualities in things, and that the creation operates through a complex interconnected system of causes and effects (*al-asbāb wal-musabbabāt*) which are a manifestation of **immense, unrivalled creative power**.

The famous Muslim scholar Ibn al-Qayyim (d. 1350) said:

“The universe is tied together through causes (*al-asbāb*), forces (*al-quwā*) and efficient and purposeful causes (*al-‘ilal al-fā‘iliyyah wal-ghā‘iyyah*).”²⁶

He also said:

“If we were to follow up what affords the affirmation of causes (ways and means) from the Qu’ān and the Sunnah, it would be (found) in more than ten thousand places and we do not say that out of exaggeration, but in actual reality. But sufficient is the witness of sensory perception, reason and innate disposition (to establish it). For this reason it was said by one from the people of knowledge, ‘A people spoke about rejection of the causes (ways and means) and thus caused the possessors of intelligence to laugh at their intellects’.”²⁷

As such, there is no conflict between reason and revelation because revelation accommodates all empirically verified factual observations and cause-effect relationships.²⁸ As such, variation in

²⁶ *Madārij al-Sālikīn* (1/256).

²⁷ *Shifā’ al-‘Alīl* (p. 189).

²⁸ This opposes the view of the Ash‘arites who oppose both reason and revelation in denying that created entities have been endued with inherent qualities, strengths and powers through which efficient causality arises (cause-effect systems). For details of their views refer to, by way of example: Binyamin Abrahamov. *Al-Ghazālī’s Theory of Causality*. *Studia Islamica*. No. 67 (1988), pp. 75-98; Ilai Alon. *Al-Ghazālī on Causality*. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 100 (4):397 (1980); Griffel, Frank (2010), *Al-*

the creation—and **empirically verified cause-effect mechanisms** for that variation—do not pose any problems. There is no conflict.

Thus, “variation” is real and true. Denying it is denying sensory perception. It arises because it is pre-programmed and includes in-built adaptive mechanisms that anticipate environmental changes and challenges. **There are strict limits to variation that can never be crossed.** This is confirmed by empirical evidence through laboratory testing²⁹ and also in the practice of “artificial selection” in which plants and animals are interbred to enhance certain desirable traits above others. However, when pushed to extremes, the hybrid line tends to terminate because the enhancement of one quality usually comes at the expense of others. Thus, if a barrier is reached with artificial selection, guided with intent, knowledge and purpose, it is far-fetched to claim that blind, purposeless “natural selection” can transcend this barrier to introduce novel forms and features and turn the organism into a physiologically different species **through random mutations.** This is the **imaginary part** of [neo-Darwinian] evolution which is *deduced* from prior philosophical materialist convictions and is not empirically proven through the scientific method as will be demonstrated in this work inshā‘Allāh.

The imaginary part of “evolution” lies in the religious, metaphysical, philosophical non-empirical speculative claim that biological life with all its diversity arose through **blind, undirected processes** involving **chance** (random events) and **necessity** (physico-chemical laws) with random mutation being the driver of biological change and speciation. These ideas—though more sophisticated in nature—are not new. They have been stated before in cruder, less sophisticated terms, by the primitives. Naturalists of old claimed

Ghazali's Philosophical Theology, Oxford University Press. Al-Ghazali's view represents the standard Ash'arite position on this subject. Refutation of this view is apparent in the Qur'ān, the Prophetic traditions and the writings of well-known Salafī scholars such as Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim in their numerous works.

²⁹ Such as *Drosophila* fruit fly experiments which for 80 years have not produced any novel features or new species.

that everything regenerates in an eternal cyclical process and only the passing of time causes life and death.

The Muslim Qur'ānic exegete Ibn Kathīr (d. 1373) said: “[This] is said by the atheist philosophers [who believe in] continuous regeneration [of life] in rejection of a Maker and who believe that everything returns back to its original state after [every] 3,600 years. They claim this has recurred for eternity. Thus, they showed arrogation towards rationality and rejected revealed text, and it is why they said:

وَمَا يَهْدِيكُنَا إِلَّا الدَّهْرُ

‘Nothing destroys us but time.’ (45:24).

Allāh the Exalted said:

وَمَا لَهُمْ بِذَلِكَ مِنْ عِلْمٍ إِنْ هُمْ إِلَّا يَظُنُّونَ

‘They have no knowledge of that, they merely speculate.’ (45:24).

Meaning, that they presume and imagine.”³⁰

The theory of Charles Darwin regarding “*The origin of species by means of natural selection and the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life*”³¹—as it was later interpreted and presented—is a

³⁰ Tafsīr al-Qu’ān al-‘Azīm, explanation of al-Jāthiyah (45:24).

³¹ Both Charles Darwin (d. 1882) and Alfred Russel Wallace (d. 1913) came up with similar theories independently. Wallace revealed his idea to Darwin in a 1858 letter and also wrote an essay titled “*On the tendency of varieties to depart indefinitely from the original type*”. Seeing that he might be outdone in publishing, Darwin quickly got writing and released *On the Origin of Species By Means of Natural Selection* a year later in November 1859. Both of these men had read Thomas Malthus’s *Essay on the Principle of Population* and were influenced in the same way, leading them to develop similar ideas. Darwin’s theory was influenced by Malthus’s thesis: populations grow exponentially (geometrically) whereas the food supply grows linearly (arithmetically). As such, there will be a struggle for survival and favoured species and races will survive whilst others will be eliminated. Darwin extrapolated from this the notion that favourable variations that arise in species as a result of struggle would be preserved and could lead to the formation of new species. Thus, the mathematics of economic struggle and race differences (favoured traits) were combined to produce a concept that allowed for formation of new species. This claim was extrapolated from the small differences which

sophisticated rehash of the same idea. There is nothing original in this belief. However, in its particular formulation, it provided the basis for a more complicated, deceptive version of the religious belief of previous naturalists.

In this work, when spoken of critically, evolution is defined as:

*The theory that **all** biological species are descended from a universal common ancestor through **random mutations of DNA and natural selection**. Or—alternatively worded for accuracy—: *The theory that biological species which **are not** physiologically similar and **are unable** to interbreed to provide viable fertile offspring descended from common ancestry through **random mutations of DNA and natural selection**.**

This definition excludes all empirically verified mechanisms of variation such as transposition, horizontal gene transfer, epigenetic processes—which as this work will show—are pre-programmed and in-built as part of a vast and complex design architecture which gives powerful evidence that knowledge, will, intent, purpose, design and wisdom are behind biological life and its diversity.

are observed between parents and offspring or adaptive changes in animals in response new environments, and likewise from artificial breeding practices. However, Wallace later changed his mind and accepted intelligent design. In 1910, Wallace wrote the book, “*The World of Life: A Manifestation of Creative Power, Directive Mind and Ultimate Purpose*”. Darwin endowed ‘nature’ with the power of selection, the all-pervasive powerful force which can be invoked as an all-explanatory mechanism in every situation and scenario. It has the power to explain everything whilst proving nothing. Thus, miraculously, for example, the eye or other features are claimed to have been created by “natural selection” at least forty separate times in different geographical locations by “natural selection”. To remove the miraculous element in this wondrous feat of the blind, undirected random process, new terms are crafted to encrypt the meaning: *convergent evolution*. These cryptic terms conceal the underlying religious system which involves faith in unobserved miraculous phenomena. Eye-witness accounts of historical events and phenomena by tens, hundreds or thousands, passed on through successive oral transmission are greater in reliability than the conjectures and wild speculations about what has not been seen or experienced at all. Thus, there is greater justification for believing in the miracles of the Prophets, than believing in the miracles invoked by the naturalists and atheists.

This reframed naturalist religion has allowed materialists and atheists, in their own words, to become *intellectually fulfilled*. It is—as shall become clear inshā'Allāh—an unverifiable hypothesis and nothing more than a materialist doctrine. Let us elaborate on how they attained this intellectual fulfilment.

Speaking about the speculative theologians (*ahl al-kalām*) amongst the Muslims, and the philosophers and naturalists and their views on causes, effects and the inherent properties of things, the renowned Muslim Scholar Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 1328) said:

“For they (the philosophers and naturalists) observe some of the (natural causes) just as they observe the inherent properties and powers (forces) which Allāh created within essences (*ajsām*) and just as they observe the effects of the sun and moon upon this world, but alongside this, **they assign the events arising (thereby) to a cause amongst His causes, such as ascribing newly-emerging entities to ‘nature’**. But ‘nature’ is simply an attribute (that is) established with the entity.³² Thus, the one who made ‘nature’ to be that which brings about a human in the womb of his mother and whatever he possesses of the various limbs and the strengths and benefits endowed upon (these limbs), then his saying is more apparently corrupt than those sayings in which the newly-emerging entities are assigned to an eternal (static) will without affirmation of a cause or a wisdom (therein), or assigning newly-emerging entities to the power of a willing, powerful agent, irrespective of whether that power (has been exercised in) eternity or is exercised (through recurring will). For both of these sayings are better than assigning that to ‘nature’ which is simply an attribute in an entity amongst the entities, which has no wish or will.”³³

Naturalists, atheists and evolutionists ascribe “creative genius” to nature in **the absence of will, choice, intent**. And this is really the crux of the entire issue.

³² It is important to grasp this point. Refer to the citation from the Islāmic scholar Ibn al-Qayyim a little later regarding the naturalist who believes nature is the creator.

³³ Refer to *Kitāb al-Ṣafadiyyah*, Aḍwā' al-Salaf, 1423H, p. 169 onwards.

The actual point of contention, when we peel off all the layers of deception, cryptic terminology and doublespeak in their statements and writings is whether creation (contrivance, design, end-goal, objective-orientation) comes via **choice with intent**³⁴—or to put it another way, through the attributes of knowledge (*ilm*), will (*mashī'ah*), power (*qudrah*) and wisdom (*hikmah*)—or in their absence. Since **choice with intent** is rejected then, naturally, there only remains: chance (random events) and necessity (physical law) which work together blind and undirected and given enough time, can lead to scenarios in which creative processes can be unleashed.

Here is the secret of the naturalists and atheists: They have simply taken the attributes which belong to a creator—knowledge, will, power, wisdom—ascribed them to nature covertly, introduced the concept of randomness so as to conceal evident purposes, goals and wisdoms (*hikam*), and then masked everything through the use of imaginative, creative, cryptic, complicated terminology. In their scientific investigations, theory-formulations and writings, they are often inescapably forced to speak of nature as having *purpose, power, genius* and so on on the one hand, whilst consciously denying it on the other. Their contradiction is plain to see for all people of sound mind. When evaluated according to the strict standards of empirical science the theory of evolution [descent with modification arising through purely natural means without being engineered or caused by a creator represented by **choice with intent**, or the attributes of knowledge, will and power] is quickly exposed as a philosophical doctrine, and is disqualified as a scientific theory because of the vagueness and elasticity of definitions. It is protected ferociously by devoted, religious believers who have invested their emotions into it as relief from **cosmic authority syndrome**.³⁵

³⁴ The phrase “**choice with intent**” represents selection, the act of choosing which is *not* without intent. In other words that which involves agency. It contrasts with events that are said to be “chosen” through purely physico-chemical dynamics in nature where no intent is present.

³⁵ An emotional dislike and aversion of the notion that there should be an authority over the universe at all.

In his book *Origin of the Species*, Charles Darwin gives the example of **artificial selection** in which desired traits are accumulated within species through careful selection of breeding stock. Breeders could cultivate certain traits and found that offspring of the selected stock had those particular traits enhanced. This was “evolution”. Darwin extrapolated **natural selection** from this and spoke of nature as if it was **purposeful**, like artificial breeding. He spoke of natural selection it as if it was an **all-powerful force** that can account for everything. Basically, whatever man can do through knowledge, choice and intent, nature can also do. The difference was that though man is able to select with a rational mind with end-objectives in mind, nature, blind and purposeless, is superior.

Darwin therefore laid the ground for atheists to pursue their goal of *intellectual fulfillment*. Richard Dawkins stated, “Although atheism might have been logically tenable before Darwin, Darwin made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist.”³⁶ Dawkins follows Darwin in ascribing such qualities to nature.³⁷ He mentions “the **power** of natural selection”³⁸, of its mimicking “**conscious design**”, giving the illusion of “**design and planning**”, serving as a blind “**watchmaker**” which produces animals who get the illusion that they have been “**brilliantly designed for a purpose**”. He speaks of “**intricate architecture and precision-engineering**”.³⁹

What the naturalists and atheists have done is summarised by Ibn al-Qayyim succinctly:

تعطيل المصنوع عن صانعه وخالقه

“Stripping what is made [contrived, designed, originated, manufactured] from having a maker and creator.”⁴⁰

³⁶ *The Blind Watchmaker*. New York:Norton 1987. p. 6.

³⁷ *The Blind Watchmaker*, cover, p. 5 and *The Necessity of Darwinism*, New Scientist: 94, 4/15/82, p130.

³⁸ *The Blind Watchmaker*. New York:Norton 1987. pp. 94.

³⁹ *The Blind Watchmaker*. New York:Norton 1987. pp. 1-3.

⁴⁰ *Anwā' al-Shirk*. Maktabah Ṭabariyyah. 1992. p. 14.

They have stripped the creator of His attributes and conferred them upon nature. Then they use semantic devices to covertly ascribe the same attributes to nature: *natural selection, self-ordering, self-organization, emergence, complexity at the edge of chaos, dissipative structure formation* and so on. When discussing these concepts, it is extremely difficult for them to avoid the use of language which implies end-objectives, goal-orientation, purposefulness and qualities which can only be found with conscious, rational beings. Thus, the use of cryptic terminology and language.

Often, they make huge slips. In a 2014 lecture titled “The Origins of Life: From Geochemistry to Biochemistry”⁴¹ Nita Sahei, professor at the University of Akron and origin-of-life researcher spoke of the types of molecules that would have to be coordinated to form life in the lab, including, “four nucleotides, twenty amino-acids, there could be a few lipids that could involve... **several clays**”⁴² and other minerals.” Next, she speaks of the enormous difficulty: “So its a **combinatorial nightmare**” and then she slips up: “And we need to use **intelligent...**” Realising what she has just said, she quickly corrects herself, “Not **intelligent design**—we need to use our ... **our knowledge...**” Seeing she is stuck, a professor in the audience helps her out by saying, “**careful selection**”. Back to her senses, she now rephrases, “We need to **carefully select** which nucleotides to start with, which amino acids and minerals based on **our knowledge** of the structure and reactivity of these components.” After completing this sentence, she remains silent for a moment, a bewildered look on her face for a split second, as her mind contemplates the factual reality that has just pounded her intellect and her conscience. Then

⁴¹ Refer to: https://youtu.be/CeVk9yC0_vk at 48m:30s. The lecture was at the Institute for the Science of Origins at Case Western Reserve University. See also Tom Bethell, *Darwin's House of Cards*, 2017: p. 152 and *Researcher Almost Admits, then Quickly Retracts, that 'Intelligent Design' Is Needed to Explore Origin of Life* at <http://www.evolutionnews.org>.

⁴² Note the reference to clay. In the Qur’ān, Allāh describes the creation of man through extracts and types of clay, see (23:12), (55:14), (15:26), (32:7).

she says, “And we will also **screen**, we still have a large number of interactions to **screen**.”

What we see here is stark admission—through a slip of the tongue—of the reality alluded to by Ibn al-Qayyim earlier: stripping the creation of the wilful acts of creation that gave rise to it thereby negating the necessity of a creator’s existence. This researcher, and countless others, know that without *knowledge, intelligent design, careful selection, screening for specific interactions and choosing with an end-goal in mind*, they cannot produce anything which even remotely resembles biological life.

Very careful attention should be given to Nita Sahei’s use of the phrase “**careful selection**”—because it gives away the game from the outset. Whenever “selection” is used in any of their statements and writings, it has “*knowledge, will, intent, direction, purpose*” conceptually embedded within it.

This exposes the arrogation in intellect upon which atheists have built their intellectually fulfilling religion. It is a religion they have crafted to provide themselves with psychological and emotional relief from cosmic authority syndrome, especially when their claims blatantly clash with rationality and the scientific experiments performed front of their eyes and noses.

At the Royal Society November 2016 conference discussing “*New Trends In Evolutionary Biology: Biological, Philosophical And Social Science Perspectives*”, one of the professors, Samir Okasha, presented a lecture on *the metaphor of agency*. The following is the abstract, which should be read carefully in light of what has preceded (emphasis added):

Evolution and the metaphor of agency

Professor Samir Okasha, University of Bristol, UK

It is striking that evolutionary biology often uses **the language of intentional psychology** to describe the behaviour of evolved organisms, their genes, **and the process of natural selection that led to their evolution**. Thus a cuckoo chick ‘deceives’ its host; a worker ant ‘prefers’ to tend the queen’s eggs to those of other workers; a swallow ‘realises’ that winter is approaching and ‘wants’ to escape it; an imprinted gene ‘knows’ whether it was inherited paternally or

maternally; and natural selection 'chooses' some phenotypes over others.

This intentional idiom is **a symptom of a broader way of thinking about and modelling evolution**, which I call '**agential**'. This involves treating evolved entities, paradigmatically individual organisms, as if they were **agents trying to achieve a goal**, namely maximisation of reproductive fitness (or some proxy). The use of rational choice models, originally intended to apply to deliberate human action, in an evolutionary context, is one symptom of agential thinking.⁴³

I offer a cautious defence of agential thinking in evolutionary biology. I argue that this mode of thinking does genuine intellectual work, and is not 'idle metaphor'. **The key point is that attributions of agency presuppose a 'unity of purpose'**.

In his lecture given to the Society, Okasha discusses three things:

- a) the use of the "intentional" idiom in evolutionary biology,
- b) the "agential views" of evolution and
- c) the use of "concepts from the view of human rationality" in evolutionary biology.

Okasha notes: "It's a familiar point that the language of intentional psychology is widely used within evolutionary biology" and he explains "intentional psychology" in terms of when humans speak of "beliefs, desires, purposes and goals". Sometimes this is applied "to organisms, genes, groups, even to the evolutionary process itself." He states: "And we find assertions like '*natural selection chooses phenotypes*', '*tries to solve design problems*' and so on." Okasha speaks of ways used to "inject agency" into evolutionary biology. In type one, "the agent with the goal is Mother Nature, a personification of natural selection, the notion of Darwin, also defended at length by the philosopher Daniel Dennet".⁴⁴ In type two, "the agent with a goal is an actual evolved entity in the here and now. That might be a gene, more usually an organism...". Okasha describes type one as "dubious" and does not recommend that evolutionary biologists "talk that way"—for obvious reasons—and

⁴³ Refer to: <https://royalsociety.org/science-events-and-lectures/2016/11/evolutionary-biology/>.

⁴⁴ An American philosopher and neo-Darwinian fundamentalist.

states that type two “can be good.” About type one, which is “personification of natural selection and the use of psychological descriptors” he says, “we find this employed by Darwin, Darwin wrote that ‘natural selection is daily and hourly scrutinizing every variation, rejecting that which is bad, preserving all that is good, working insensibly for the improvement of each organic being’. Darwin was aware of this metaphorical usage and said its difficult to avoid personifying nature.” There is more in the lecture, but this amount suffices for our purpose.

The reader will now have been sufficiently primed about the precise nature of the naturalist scam to be unravelled in the rest of this book inshā'Allāh.

The above citation shows that it is impossible to speak of creation except with the language of design, purpose, intent and wisdom. This is because science itself is a design payoff, and the entire scientific enterprise finds its justification on the basis that there is order, regularity, design and purpose in what is being studied. This is neurally embedded in the subconscious mind and is *inevitably and unescapably* expressed in language. Okasha makes the interesting remark that “*attributions of agency presuppose a ‘unity of purpose’.*” Meaning, when agency is attributed to the evolutionary process, **a grand purpose** has been presupposed. What is going here is that elements of the *fiṭrah* (innate disposition) that have remained intact are coming through and being expressed in the form of truths, save that the utterer can often remain blind to the implied reality of what is being said, because of the corruption that has altered the *fiṭrah* on account of speculations, conjectures and whims.

Yes, there is **a grand unified purpose**, and it is not in vain:

أَفَحَسِبْتُمْ أَنَّمَا خَلَقْنَاكُمْ عَبَثًا وَأَنَّكُمْ إِلَيْنَا لَا تُرْجَعُونَ

“Did you think that We had created you in play (without any purpose), and that you would not be brought back to Us?” (23:115).

There is a maker who created life with knowledge, precision and wisdom. And Ibn al-Qayyim said of it: “He combines the objectives of His actions and the wisdom of His creation and command into a

single objective, the ultimate objective, which is to establish the true divinity, with all [alleged] divinities besides it being futile and impossible.”⁴⁵ Thus, the divinities that the Naturalists ascribe to “nature”— whether **the primitives** who went on to worship nature or the **arrogant, sophisticated moderns** of our time who cannot escape ascribing divine attributes to nature and resort to sophistry and cryptology as a means of concealing it—are all false divinities. Allāh the Exalted said:

قَالَ رَبُّنَا الَّذِي أَعْطَى كُلَّ شَيْءٍ خَلْقَهُ ثُمَّ هَدَىٰ

“He (Moses) said, ‘Our Lord is He who gave each thing its form and then guided [as to its pursuits and modes of activity].’” (20:50). The Qur’ānic exegetes explain that the guidance referred to here is with respect to the degree of awareness [of meaning] and reason required and suited for each form of biological life to pursue its beneficial interests.⁴⁶ Each creature is “guided to its form of mating, reproduction, food, drink and abode.”⁴⁷ Each is programmed with its own instinct and behaviour.

وَمَا مِنْ دَابَّةٍ فِي الْأَرْضِ وَلَا طَائِرٍ يَطِيرُ بِجَنَاحَيْهِ إِلَّا أُمَمٌ أَمْثَالِكُمْ

“And there is no creature on [or within] the earth or bird that flies with its wings except [that they are] communities like you.” (6:38).

وَاللَّهُ خَلَقَ كُلَّ دَابَّةٍ مِنْ مَّاءٍ فَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ يَمْشِي عَلَىٰ بَطْنِهِ وَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ يَمْشِي عَلَىٰ

رِجْلَيْنِ وَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ يَمْشِي عَلَىٰ أَرْبَعٍ يَخْلُقُ اللَّهُ مَا يَشَاءُ إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَىٰ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيرٌ

“Allāh has created every [living] creature from water. And of them are those that move on their bellies, and of them are those that walk on two legs, and of them are those that walk on four. Allāh creates what He wills. Indeed, Allāh is over all things competent.” (24:45).

وَفِي خَلْقِكُمْ وَمَا يَبُتُّ مِنْ دَابَّةٍ آيَاتٌ لِقَوْمٍ يُوقِنُونَ

⁴⁵ *Shifā’ al-‘Alīl*. Beirut: Dār Kuutb al-‘Ilmiyyah. 2nd edition. p. 385.

⁴⁶ Refer to the explanations of al-Ṭabarī, al-Sa’dī, al-Baghawī.

⁴⁷ As related by al-Ṭabarī in his tafsīr from Ibn ‘Abbās.

“And in your creation, and what He scattered (through the earth) of moving (living) creatures are signs for people who have Faith with certainty.” (45:4).

Humans have been placed above all creatures and given the best of form, language and reason. All creatures have communities. They have their own forms of communication. And they have degrees of “awareness” and “reason” suited to their form and function.

The naturalist scam is exposed in the simplest of ways in the Qur’ān with the power of stupefying reason:

أَفَمَنْ يَخْلُقُ كَمَنْ لَا يَخْلُقُ أَفَلَا تَذَكَّرُونَ

“Is one who creates like one who does not create? So will you not be reminded?” (16:17). Are these arrogant disbelievers and their worshipped deities, who are unable to create even a fly through knowledge, intelligent design, careful selection, screening and choosing with an obvious end-goal in mind—like the one who creates in reality and in truth?

And another truth:

أَلَا يَعْلَمُ مَنْ خَلَقَ وَهُوَ اللَّطِيفُ الْخَبِيرُ

“Should not He Who has created know? And He is the Subtle, the Acquainted.” (67:14). Knowledge and creation are binding as Nita Sahei and other origin-of-life researchers know full well. A challenge is thrown:

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ ضُرِبَ مَثَلٌ فَاستَمِعُوا لَهُ إِنَّ الَّذِينَ تَدْعُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ لَنْ يَخْلُقُوا
ذُبَابًا وَلَوْ اجْتَمَعُوا لَهُ

“O people, an example is presented, so listen to it. Indeed, those you invoke besides Allāh will never create [as much as] a fly, even if they gathered together for that purpose.” (22:73). With all the advances in genetics and biotechnology and millions of sharp minds, they are unable.

The arrogant, disputative nature of man is exposed:

أَوَلَمْ يَرَ الْإِنْسَانُ أَنَّا خَلَقْنَاهُ مِنْ نُطْقَةٍ فَإِذَا هُوَ خَصِيمٌ مُبِينٌ

“Does not man see that we have created him from semen-drops (*nutfah*). Yet behold! He (stands forth) as an open disputant.” (36:77)

Created from a mere sperm-drop, of lowly, humble origins, expelled from one private part, and pushed at birth from another, this man becomes an open disputant, is unjustifiably arrogant and ungrateful.

Returning back to the nature of the scam:

The naturalist atheist religious statement of creed, “*creation in the absence of choice with intent*” or “*nature as an able, knowing, willing, purposeful creator*” is buried, concealed and camouflaged with multiple layers of cryptic terminology and doublespeak within a *philosophically asserted* materialist paradigm of scientific enquiry.⁴⁸ Darwinism—and any subsequent rendition thereof including the modern synthesis, the extended synthesis, “the third way” and whatever else might come in the future—**has been deductively argued from prior philosophical and theoretical convictions in naturalism and materialism** and are not argued on the merits of genuine, unbiased, neutral scientific inquiry and the strict standards of its methods alone.

Since rejection of **choice with intent** necessitates explanation through blind, random, undirected processes, the only alternative is to assert **gradual accumulation** of systematic, sequential changes in primitive life forms leading to complex life forms. You have no other choice. This belief would have to appear at some point in history upon the tongue or by the pen of some character. It was just a matter of time before this was articulated. Darwin was that character. And naturalists and atheists finally found a means for intellectually fulfilling self-delusion.

To grasp its reality, this scenario will make it clear:

Some crash survivors are stranded on an island. They find an open beach and write “save our souls” in the sand by laying down

⁴⁸ Rarely, some atheists make frank admissions of the underlying psychology at work. From them is Richard Lewontin, an evolutionary biologist, who is cited later in this work.

branches, leaves and coconuts. An airplane goes past and notices the message. They try to figure out how it could have got there. They know that speculating that a sudden whirlwind led to the immediate chance and spontaneous creation of the message would be too far fetched and statistically impossible. So instead, they assert that the combined forces of the wind, sea and random events, led, **over time**, to the **gradual appearance** of the message. They then devise maths equations and statistical analyses to see if such an outcome is feasible. Their computer software—through the input of ocean waves, wind speed and direction, coconut shape and size, branch and leaf dynamics—affirms that their predetermined end goal—a meaningful message with a call to action—is feasible. The ability of “**natural selection**” to create information and give the illusion of design by acting upon variations in sand, coconuts, branches and leaves has now been confirmed and “evolution” is a fact. Explanation through intelligent design—some survivors must have intelligently placed the message through **choice with intent**—is scoffed at. New sciences emerge: *coconology*, *sandology*, *evolutionary windology*, “*coco-sando*”, *population coconetics*, *naturalized windo-teleonomy* and so on. These sciences are used to support the core belief—the **illusion of design**—by *logically unsound metaphysical interpretations* of observed and undisputed facts about sand, coconuts and ocean and wind dynamics. The fact of evolution is now a bygone conclusion.

Then messages appear on beaches in different parts of the island, far away from each other. “Help”, “SOS”, “Stranded” can be found. The researchers reason that the same natural forces that explained the first message can be used to explain these messages as well. They invent labels for this process, **parallel evolution**, or **convergence**. They argue that the same **selection pressures** were found in both environments, and led to similar outcomes.

Then on a long stretch of beach in another part of the island, they find a series of messages that are separated from each other by a distance but work together as a single message. “Shipwrecked and stranded”, “need food, SOS”, “have sick and wounded, help”, “come south east”, “help”. The investigators reason that these individual

messages were intended to work together and so they call it **complimentary coevolution**. Natural forces led to complimentary instructions, without purpose and design of course. By now, the empirical data is showing that the messages are all written in **the same language**, use the same token-symbol system (alphabet), and have similar sequences in different places such as “stranded”, “SOS” and “help”, thus, the messages have coconetic similarities. However, another observation is made. It appears that the messages are crafted in such a way so as to resemble various font types. Some are in sans and others are in serif.

Phylococonetic analysis [a study of the inferred evolutionary relationships between the messages through the field of *coconetics*—that is: how coconut sequences in the message affect physical form] demonstrates a connection between the existence of a certain word in the message and the morphological features [font type] of the message. A **branched tree** emerges from the data. All of this proves unequivocally that evolution took place through the forces of nature and random variations. Common ancestry and evolution is now **a fact**. The evidence is undeniable. Numerous other fields of knowledge are devised to study this natural phenomena in more detail to provide additional *intellectual fulfillment* to sagacious believers. The combined knowledge and evidence from all these fields validate the synthesis which is only denied by the “wicked”.

A very elaborate intellectual, academic, scientific ring-fence is put around this doctrine after it has been imposed and taught in schools, colleges, universities and institutions. Dissenters, apostates and heretical innovators are outcast, stripped of their jobs and livelihood. Large numbers just go with the flow to protect livelihood and liberty and cower under this new intellectual authority.

The activities of all naturalist, atheist evolutionists are to be seen as an ongoing attempt to convince people of completely naturalistic explanations—absent choice with intent—for the appearance of the messages, hoping that one day, **the mechanism will be cracked and empirically demonstrated** despite the fact that decades of laboratory tests with sand, coconuts, leaves, twigs and a wind-machine have

failed to generate such a message, or create a novel message from a pre-existing one. In the meanwhile, they continue to deceive others about the reality of their religious, naturalist beliefs through the use of broad, catch-all language such as:

“Evolution of messages is a fact.”

“Observed similarity of sequences is proof of common ancestry.”

“Phylococonetics has proven evolutionary relationships between the messages, hence evolution is a fact.”

“Message body-plans have clearly observed similarities.”

“Variation in coconut alleles over the generations of coconuts making up the messages is observed, hence evolution is a fact.”

“Its about time that all faiths accepted evolution, the evidence is just so overwhelming.”

The above master analogy presented here very quickly—though rattled and aggrieved evolutionists may come back and throw stones—is in fact a close enough and accurate portrayal of exactly what they are up to.

This book is a modest effort in trying to simplify the naturalist, atheistic religious doctrine so that its reality can be unmasked and understood by layman and learned alike, by Allāh’s permission.

Abu ‘Iyād Amjad Rafiq
10 Jumādā al-Awwal 1438 / 7 February 2017