

2. 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 which violates the law of **biogenesis**, [life only ever arises from life], which has never been proven false to date,⁴⁹ and

b) the process of evolution after biological life has appeared.

Atheists treat them as two different **non-related** fields pretending as if the scientific status of the first has no impact upon the scientific status of the second.

This is because evolutionary theory rests upon **the unproven assumption that encoded information, then biological life arose from inert inorganic molecules through purely physico-chemical processes.**

Put another way, they require **a miracle** upon which their naturalist storytelling can be embarked upon. Without this miracle—the appearance of encoded information followed by a self-replicating cell—the wagon does not move and remains stuck in the warm muddy pond. Hence, their response: “Abiogenesis isn’t part of the theory of evolution anyway.”

The two fields are inseparable and the scientific status of the first affects the scientific status of the second because the first is an unproven assumption of the second.

The first self-replicating cell must have as much digital, communications, engineering and data storage sophistication as cells today in order for all future alleged “mutation” and “selection”

⁴⁹ No **scientific refutation** of the law of biogenesis has been embarked upon to date. If there have been attempts of which we are unaware, they have failed. Many objections have been made by evolutionists and atheists about asserting that life only coming from life being a law, but they are of zero empirical value.

evolutionary processes to take place leading to the gradual increase of prescriptive information and biological complexity and diversity.

Using mutation and natural selection to account for the arrival of the first self-replicating cell is not possible because these processes cannot kick in unless there is something to “mutate” and “select” for which is the first self-replication cell. Hence, sagacious believers require a tremendous amount of faith in a miracle of astounding proportions which violates physico-chemistry and natural law.⁵⁰

The question would also arise as to whether life originated more than once. Since we are dealing with the micro-level scale, then relatively large areas (such as warm ponds, oceans and large rock surfaces) must have experienced the same circumstances and made multiple origins of biological life possible. This is a question that plagues evolutionists and atheists and it is amusing to see how they address this matter. We find articles in the New Scientist magazine: “*Life may have emerged not once, but many times on Earth*” with the subtitle: “Far from being a miracle that happened just once in 4 billion years, life’s beginnings could have been so commonplace that it began many times over”⁵¹ Years earlier, another article, “Why complex life probably evolved only once”.⁵² They also speculate that there may have been as much as ten different separate origins of life—each of which would have its own peculiar system—but only one survived. One can refer to the paper “*Multiple origins of life*”⁵³ by way of example wherein the authors present this conjecture on the basis of mathematical models—the same scam used in modern cosmology wherein the existence of imaginary forces, particles and

⁵⁰ Francis Crick, the atheist and molecular biologist who codiscovered the structure of DNA wrote in a 1981 book: “An honest man, armed with all the knowledge available to us now, could only state that in some sense, the origin of life appears at the moment to be almost **a miracle**, so many are the conditions which would have had to have been satisfied to get it going.” *Life Itself: Its Origin and Nature*. New York: Simon & Schuster. 1981. p. 88.

⁵¹ <https://www.newscientist.com>, 17 August, 2016.

⁵² *Ibid.* 21 October, 2010.

⁵³ Raup, D.M. & Valentine, J.W. *Multiple origins of life*. Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. Vol. 80; pp. 2981-2984, May 1983.

fields which just happen to patch and save their empirically and observationally falsified cosmological models is made possible through mathematical models and equations. They literally write imaginary entities into existence.

In accordance with the principle of **proof being commensurate with the claim**, in order to argue for their religion—upon the strict standards of the scientific method—then observable, repeatable and testable empirical evidence must be shown in which random events, physico-chemistry or the laws of nature—lacking **choice with intent**—are able to produce a self-replicating cell, complete with its information, communications and engineering architecture. The proof must be commensurate with the claim. Merely showing that amino-acids or small peptides can be produced within controlled laboratory conditions and then extrapolating from the results is not allowed because the proof is not commensurate with the claim and does not meet scientific standards. Conjectures about **metabolism-first, RNA-first, lipid-first** scenarios do not amount to empirical evidence, as they are mere conjectures and storytelling exercises.

Sagacious evolutionary clergymen are masters of extrapolation. *To extrapolate* means: To project beyond the range of known values on the basis of values already determined; to infer a possibility beyond the strict evidence of a series of facts, events, observations, and so on. Evidences for abiogenesis and neo-Darwinian evolution employ extrapolation and do not meet the standards of empirical science which include observation, testability and repeatability.

When pressed for satisfactory answers in this topic of the origin of life and knowing that humanity does not possess the knowledge, ingenuity and skill to general life, atheists like Richard Dawkins are forced to seek refuge in the possibility that **advanced intelligent aliens** seeded life on Earth, but then beg the question by claiming that these aliens must themselves have come about through some type of Darwinian evolution, thus only pushing the problem one step back and not answering the question in substance at all. At the end of the documentary “*Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*”, Dawkins is asked by Ben Stein to explain the origin of life. His hypothetical

answer (emphasis added): “...I **suppose it’s possible that you might find evidence for that if you look at the details of our chemistry, molecular biology, you might find a signature of some sort of designer**, and that designer could well **be a higher intelligence** from elsewhere in the universe. But that higher intelligence would itself have had to have come about by some explicable, or ultimately explicable, process. It couldn’t have just jumped into existence spontaneously. That’s the point.”⁵⁴

This reveals that atheists inwardly know that biological life is designed and that the inference to design is compelling, especially in light of ongoing advancements in the fields of molecular biology, systems biology, genetics, biosemiotics and the various in-built, pre-engineered adaptive mechanisms exhibited by organisms.⁵⁵

The significance of this point can not be overlooked because of the implication. Let us spell it out: All attempts to play with the basic ingredients of life (amino-acids, lipids, minerals and so on) in laboratory settings to generate the most rudimentary biological molecules through the use of “careful selection” and “intelligent design” have failed and show the impossibility of the task. This only leaves two possibilities:

⁵⁴ Stein, B. & Miller, K. *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*. (Premise Media). 2008.

⁵⁵ The evolutionist, theoretical physicist, and cosmologist and professor at Arizona State University, Paul Davies, writing in *New Scientist*, said, “One of the great outstanding scientific mysteries is the origin of life. How did it happen?...The truth is, nobody has a clue.” *New Scientist*, 192[2578]:35, November 18, 2006.

And Richard Dawkins stated in an interview regarding the origin of life, “Nobody knows how it got started. We know the kind of event that it must have been. We know the sort of event that must have happened for the origin of life. It was the origin of the first self-replicating molecule.” The interviewer, Ben Stein asked, “Right. And how did that happen?” Dawkins replied, “I’ve told you. We don’t know.” Stein then said, “So, you have no idea how it started?” Dawkins replied, “No. Nor has anybody.” Stein, B. & Miller, K. *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*. (Premise Media). 2008.

a) to have faith that the laws of nature can still generate biological life in the absence of choice with intent or knowledge, will, power and purpose—after having acknowledged that all human endeavours to do so with knowledge, intent, power and the use of all industrial and technical know-how have failed abysmally.

b) to have faith that agency involving attributes of knowledge, will, power, and wisdom must be behind biological life—with the empirical proof that human endeavours to do so with knowledge, intent, power, purpose and the use of all industrial and technical know-how have failed abysmally.

However, the two faiths are not the same. The first faith—that of the primitive naturalists and atheists opposes intuition, common-sense, reason, and even sound conclusions based upon the empirical findings of the scientific method of inquiry, as per their own failed experiments. The second faith—that of believers is in agreement with all that has been mentioned and is thus, warranted.

Further, just as the atheist and naturalist, in his or her faith that the laws of nature must have created life, does not have observable, testable, empirical knowledge of how it actually took place, then likewise, a believer does not have knowledge of how specifically a creating agent created biological life and the precise nature of the the agent's actions. Thus, there are equivalences between the two positions from one angle and from another, the position of the believer in a creator is superior, rational and justified.

As such any discussion with any atheist and evolutionist must not be embarked upon without full, explicit admission—on behalf of the atheist—of the point just made, that he or she is operating on faith that is unwarranted. Failure to acknowledge this with evasion or rejection is proof of arrogance and following whims and desires.

Second: And this is the central part of the scam which we have alluded to earlier and repeat again due to its importance within the whole discussion: To cryptically attribute knowledge, will, intent, purpose and wisdom to nature, to material matter, through ambiguity, loaded terminology and doublespeak whilst denying it

using clear, unambiguous language according to need and circumstance. When **choice with intent** is denied or that knowledge, will, power and wisdom are necessary attributes for manifestation of creative power is rejected, the only alternative is to confer these attributes upon nature. However—as people of sound mind will reject this and treat it no differently to the doctrine of the primitives of old among the naturalists—the moderns use the power of language, cryptology and technical scientific doublespeak to conceal this religious doctrine. The primitives were simple, they attributed divine attributes to the elements and worshipped them. The naturalists of today are sophists, they use sophistry to hide the reality of what they say and believe. This is apparent in their extremely clever use of technical language in order to confuse and deceive the people.

This can be observed—by way of a good example—through the computer simulation program of Richard Dawkins which aims to demonstrate that random mutations and natural selection can work together via a **non-random process**—pay attention to that—to generate order out of disorder.

This is how it is described (emphasis added):

“The weasel program... is a thought experiment and a variety of computer simulations illustrating it. Their aim is to demonstrate that the process that drives evolutionary systems—**random variation combined with non-random cumulative selection—is different from pure chance.**”⁵⁶

The key idea Dawkins tried to illustrate is that moving **in a single step** from a random, meaningless sequence of 28 characters to something meaningful and comprehensible is extremely unlikely. The statistical odds against it are extremely high at around 10^{40} to 1. But in **gradual steps**, along with “selection” it is not unlikely. To put it in practical terms, this is trying to say that to believe a hurricane taking component parts in a factory and assembling them into a finished Boeing 747 **within a single step** is impossible.

⁵⁶ From the Wikipedia entry for “Weasel Program”.

However, in **gradual steps**—with “non-random selection”—over very long time periods it can be shown to be plausible and likely, especially with the power of “non-random cumulative selection”.

Thus, if a certain number of the characters in the sequence are randomly substituted in a first step, they can be blindly and purposelessly selected (chosen), meaning preserved, if their position in the sequence matches the position in **a known, previously chosen, meaningful sentence**, in this case “Methinks it is like a weasel”, a line from Shakespeare’s Hamlet, which is the intended goal. The process is repeated wherein one, two or three letters are randomly substituted by other letters in each step and if there is a match with the known end-goal the substitution is “selected”, meaning kept and fixed to be passed on to the next generation. In this gradual, step by step fashion, arriving at the **intended goal** is not as statistically unlikely any more. Dawkins already knew the goal in advance and kept mutations only if they became closer to that goal.⁵⁷

Here is the relevant data from the simulation:

Generation 01: WDLTMNLT DTJBKWIRZREZLMQCO P
 Generation 02: WDLTMNLT DTJBSWIRZREZLMQCO P
 Generation 10: MDLDMNLS ITJISWHRZREZ MECS P
 Generation 20: MELDINLS IT ISWPRKE Z WECSEL
 Generation 30: METHINGS IT ISWLIKE B WECSEL
 Generation 40: METHINKS IT IS LIKE I WEASEL
 Generation 43: METHINKS IT IS LIKE A WEASEL

There are many technical critiques of this experiment and it is important not to get distracted by them and miss the most crucial point which is to understand the **religiously-motivated agenda** behind it and the **root psychology** in operation. Basically, Dawkins exhibited the same behavioural attributes that he wishes to project onto nature or natural selection. This is the virulent “**agential**

⁵⁷ Keep in mind that according to the evolutionists, nature does not have any goal, it is the blind watchmaker and does not have any purpose in mind. All of this is play with words and making fools of people.

thinking” we spoke of previously which plagues the minds of evolutionary biologists.

Knowing that physico-chemistry and randomness alone cannot account for the sudden or even gradual appearance of biological life, and knowing that **a known end-goal must exist**, Dawkins and his co-religionists conceal intelligence and goal-direction within cryptic terms such as **non-random cumulative selection**. In other words, they hide **choice with intent** through cryptology, because that is how they arrived at the sentence “Methinks it is like a weasel”—through nothing but **choice with intent**—with an end-goal in mind and the use of **intelligent selection**. They brought it in through the back door and camouflaged it with cryptic terms. Through this, they are trying to convince their audiences to accept **the least absurd of two absurd claims**. The first being spontaneous creation through a sudden gust of random, blind, undirected forces and the second being gradual creation over time in small incremental steps by the same forces acting blindly, without purpose, direction and end-goals. However, since an end-goal must exist for anything meaningful to be produced—and they cannot show that an end-goal exists otherwise their naturalist scam clothed in the garb of science is exposed—they used cryptic terms to conceal the hidden elements of **intelligent selection, steering, goal direction** and **teleology** which they have entered through the back door. Thus, they speak of “non-random cumulative selection”, an encryption of “intelligent or careful selection” exactly what the computer simulation was programmed to do.

It is worthy to remind here of the statement of **Nita Sahei**, professor and origins-of-life researcher, whom we quoted from earlier from her presentation at Case Western Reserve University. In showing her frustration with failed experiments when trying to coordinate the chemical ingredients that produce life, Nita let it slip that they “**need to use intelligent...**”, then she quickly corrected herself and said, “**... not intelligent design**”. Seeing she was stuck and hesitating, another professor in the audience helped her out and said, “**careful selection**”. Nita then rephrased her sentence and said

“we need to carefully select... based on our knowledge” which in substance is no different to saying we need to “intelligently design”. These are word games that are played and on occasions you will see them catching themselves out.

The same analogy applies to what they are doing with “**the evolutionary process**”. They know that for evolution to work through the mechanisms they are suggesting, there have to be end-goals, purposes and targets. In the language they use in their research, descriptions and analyses—as indicated in the lecture of Samir Okasha at London’s Royal Society cited earlier—they are unable to escape “agential thinking” by attributing powers, goals, purposes, designs to nature and natural selection. Sometimes this is blatant because it is inescapable, other times it is through cryptic language and at other times they make express denial.

The writings and statements of all neo-Darwinists inclusive of scientific reporting and publishing **should be scrutinized** for the use of this type of cryptic terminology in the discussion of mechanisms because it is an integral part of how they construct arguments and make their conjectural, speculative, belief(s) appear factual. The erudite Muslim scholar Ibn al-Qayyim exposed the scam over seven centuries ago and it merits some attention in the next chapter.

Third: Evolutionists make **tactical zone changes** when arguing for their religious beliefs. Memorize the following categorisation as it will prove useful later when we look at how sagacious believers construct arguments for their religious dogma.

a) **The empirical zone:** This is where we deal with facts and empirical observations.

b) **The twilight zone:** This is a conceptual area characterized by being undefined, intermediate, or mysterious. Basically, it is seeking refuge in ambiguity, the enemy of scientific inquiry which functions upon specificity and complete absence of ambiguity. In this zone, we find the use of ambiguous catch-all definitions and mischaracterising what the theory of evolution actually is.

c) The fallacy zone: This is where we are dealing with fallacious reasoning. This is routine in the construction of arguments using empirical data wherein the scientific method—[observable, testable, falsifiable]—and logical reasoning is violated.

In discussions and debates, the evolutionist freely moves between zones. At times he can be in two or all three zones at the same time. Herein lies the secret to deciphering the statements and writings of evolutionist sagacious believers and deconstructing their religiousu doctrines. Mark these words well.

In practical sessions later in this work, we will grab and restrain evolutionists who operate within one of the zones and then ground and pound them with empirical facts and sound reason, not letting them flee into any other zone, or bob in and out of zones, until we are done. Scenarios will be provided for training and comprehension purposes inshā'Allāh.