

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. This is a major problem in discussions of evolution. The definition for “evolution” is elastic and evolutionists frequently change goalposts when trying to justify their **religious belief in miracles**⁶ and the theology built upon it.

It is frequently defined in the broadest terms possible “change” “descent with modification”, “change over time”, “common descent”, “change in the properties of populations of organisms that transcend the lifetime of a single individual”⁷, “evolution is a process that results in heritable changes in a population spread over many generations”⁸, “evolution is change in the adaptation and in the diversity of populations of organisms”⁹ The apparent meanings conveyed through such very broad definitions are not in dispute, because they refer to what is observable. An inflated **extrapolation** is made from these deliberately broad definitions in order to support a metaphysical, religious belief that materialism or naturalism is true.

⁶ A self-replicating cell with a digital information, communication and engineering architecture whose appearance violates physico-chemical laws and cannot be explained through any empirically provable naturalistic means is a miracle for naturalists. They need this miracle. On the other hand, the hypothesis that knowledge, will and immense creative power *must be* behind the self-replicating cell can be proven empirically through the scientific method and falsifiability tests. The miracle of the naturalists, cannot.

⁷ Douglas J. Futuyma in *Evolutionary Biology*, Sinauer Associates 1986, via talkorigins.org.

⁸ From talkorigins.org.

⁹ Earnst Mayr in *Toward a New Philosophy of Biology*. Cambridge (MA): The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1988.

That extrapolation and the philosophical claims resulting from it do not have any scientific basis.

Evolutionists change goalposts in definitions in order to **covertly inject** their religiously asserted metaphysical beliefs of naturalism and materialism and to remove the burden of proof upon them to empirically validate their belief in miracles through the scientific method.

From the **miracles** touted by **sagacious believers** is that mutations—corruption in information—are the source of novel designs and features; that noise which competes with and drowns a radio signal, produces novelty in the perceived and rationally understood contents of the signal itself; that typographical errors in the copying of a dictionary lead to new word entries, producing an improved, up to date, well-adapted version of the dictionary suitable for its environment and so on. Miracles are events which violate known laws of nature. Evolutionists greatly fear their religious beliefs being reduced to simple conceptual examples like the ones given because laymen can easily understand and immediately recognise them as false, imaginary, fanciful beliefs of primitives.

Hence, they adhere to **very broad definitions** of evolution that agree with undisputed observations—that populations undergo change in their genes and in their forms and appearances (children, grandchildren and great grandchildren continue to acquire variation in genes and in form and appearance)—so that **the impossible mechanisms** they propose to validate their religious belief in naturalism are never given focused attention because empirical scientific inquiry consistently fails to demonstrate them and all they have are hopes and wishes.

This is the problem they are faced with:

Trying to prove a miracle [which violates physicochemical laws of nature] through the scientific method which can only give explanations by the physicochemical laws of nature is impossible. In other words: They have believed in a miracle [self-replicating cell] which breaks all known laws of nature and on top of that miracle they have added another miracle [that loss of information produces

increase of information, novelty and complexity]¹⁰. Then, amusingly, they assert that science must only deal with explanations through natural law.

This is their reality.

As a result, it is impossible for them to prove the mechanisms they propose, because laws of nature—which must do the explaining—are unable to reproduce these miracles in the laboratory. It is from this angle that we should understand the abject failure of **origins of life** research and the decades of failed laboratory tests with deliberately induced mutations in organisms such as *Drosophila*. This is the real secret behind the broad, ambiguous definitions they employ.

The **lack of consensus** amongst evolutionists about the precise definition of evolution is manipulated and formed into a powerful weapon to frequently accuse opponents of not having “understood” evolution. Anytime a naturalist claims that someone has not “understood” evolution and is “talking nonsense”—then this actually returns back to the fact that there is no precise definition for evolution to begin with. It is elastic and can be stretched or squeezed according to need and circumstance, and this is taken advantage of very effectively by sagacious believers in evolution.

On its website, the National Center for Science and Education (NCSE)¹¹ in the US, in an informative article on the definition of evolution—after presenting a range of definitions from leading evolutionary biologists—states: “These examples illustrate that there is a wide range of approaches to defining evolution and that ‘experts’ disagree over what to emphasize in their definitions.”¹² The **standard definition** for evolution in textbooks of evolution is given as: “any change in the frequency of alleles within a gene pool from one

¹⁰ As in, the neo-Darwinian “modern synthesis” mechanism.

¹¹ This organisation’s goal is to promote evolution and fights legally to keep creation accounts outside of schools and educational institutions.

¹² <https://ncse.com/library-resource/defining-evolution-0>.

generation to the next.”¹³ This is simply stating that evolution is the change in genetic make-up within a population. Thus, as a population reproduces over multiple generations, each paired set of genes that correlates with a physical characteristic—say eye or hair colour for example—received by offspring from a parent will change. Straightforward and obvious, nothing in dispute here. This is simply saying that evolution is proven true by having children since having children increases the frequency of alleles in the population. Evolutionists rarely point out that this standard definition for evolution is in fact **a definition for microevolution** over relatively short time periods, over a number of generations. It is then left for it to be **assumed** that macroevolution is the same process but on a larger time-scale. This is nothing but “convincing [or trying to deceive] through mere definition alone” and not through empirical evidence.

The fact that no specific, precise, agreed upon definition exists for the word “evolution” indicates the non-scientific status of the theory itself. Take note of this fact: When pressed to give **a precise, accurate definition** which can then be scrutinized to see whether it validates naturalist beliefs through the scientific method and the logical reasoning it employs, sagacious believers will only ever be defining microevolution, which is not under dispute. This is what they are talking about when they say “evolution is a fact”. Then, they inject—via stealth—their ideological, religious, belief in naturalism via extrapolation. In the appropriate chapter in this book we will cite the statement of **Michael Ruse**, an ardent evolutionist and philosopher who states explicitly that “evolution is a religion” and always was “from the very beginning”.

2. There is **widespread dissatisfaction** with the neo-Darwinian **modern synthesis** as the sole mechanism driving biological novelty

¹³ Helena Curtis and N. Sue Barnes, *Biology*, 5th ed. 1989 Worth Publishers, p.974, as cited by the NCSE. However, even this definition is disputed amongst evolutionist and is claimed to be insufficient and too narrow. Thus, one can see the problem with definitions from the outset.

and speciation in evolution.¹⁴ Efforts are under way by outspoken critics to throw it in the back seat, if not in the dustbin. A split has occurred between the **neo-Darwinian fundamentalists** and the “disbelieving apostate” **open-minded liberalists** amongst them. They do not have—and in fact have never had—a credible purely naturalist, materialist mechanism on the table. An “**extended evolutionary synthesis**” is being devised and a “**third-way of evolution**”¹⁵ is being proposed. Dissatisfaction with materialist philosophy is appearing amongst atheists and is finding its way to print through respected academic institutions.¹⁶ The materialist neo-Darwinian philosophy is under attack. The seams have been unstitched.

Current research being done in laboratories indicates an entirely different picture to the one that has dominated the scene since the mid-20th century. Empirically observed DNA-gene-cell mechanisms demonstrate the existence of what we can call *pre-programmed, in-built, dynamic, adaptive, algorithmic engineering processes* that can give rise to novelty which can be loosely called “evolution”. Sadly for the fundamentalists, this body of growing research demonstrates that blind, random, undirected forces of nature leading to the chance origin of life and subsequent biological diversity through “mutation” and “selection” is an entirely false picture. Instead, the cutting-edge research supports the view that a pre-designed architectural

¹⁴ **Random mutations** being acted upon by **natural selection**. This is referred to in this work as “RMNS”. Dissenters and critics state that Neo-Darwinists have elevated Natural Selection into a unique creative force that solves all the difficult evolutionary problems without a real empirical basis.

¹⁵ <http://www.thethirdwayofevolution.com/>. Within this group is the realisation that the neo-Darwinian modern synthesis is false and cannot stand on its own. They are trying to mould the latest findings in molecular biology and genetics—which give immense, renewed support for design—into a new evolutionary synthesis.

¹⁶ Refer to Thomas Nagel’s book, “*Mind and Cosmos: Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature is Almost Certainly False*”, Oxford University Press, 2012.

framework within which dynamic, creative processes following a *language of creation* and *grammatical rules* lead to biological novelty and diversity within defined limits.

This is posing difficulties for naturalists and evolutionists as a whole and they are in dispute with each other as to how tackle these new discoveries and somehow accommodate them as a means of protecting their naturalist, atheist beliefs. Hence, the differences and antagonisms between the neo-Darwinian fundamentalists, who take the path of dismissal, and the open-minded liberalists who want to accommodate them into a new synthesis or a third way within a naturalist belief system. In July 2009 a gathering of sixteen evolutionary biologists and philosophers took place in **Altenberg, Germany**. Opponents of the neo-Darwinian modern synthesis who represent a much wider group, they are trying to throw off the yoke of neo-Darwinism, which they consider “dead” and a hindrance to scientific research.¹⁷ In November 2016, a “paradigm-shift” conference to try and fix evolutionary theory took place at the prestigious **Royal Society** in London. Titled “*New trends in evolutionary biology: biological, philosophical and social science perspectives*”, the conference was attended by neo-Darwinian fundamentalists, “extensioners” and the liberal conciliationists. The aim was to refresh evolutionary theory—because as it stands—there is nothing on the table.

The evolutionists can be divided into the following groups:

a) **Neo-Darwinian religious fundamentalists** who are staunch believers in the modern synthesis.

b) **Disbelievers and apostates** who reject the modern synthesis and are working for a new synthesis.

Occasionally, there are **misguided innovating heretics** who are scolded and put back in line.¹⁸

¹⁷ Refer to Suzan Mazur (an evolutionist), *The Altenberg 16: An Expose of the Evolution Industry*. Berkely: North Atlantic Books. 2009.

¹⁸ Such as, the “heretical innovator” Stephen J. Gould who introduced the “punctuated equilibrium” doctrine in the early 1970s which challenged the “gradualism” of the modern synthesis.

c) **Liberalists** who are looking for a ways to reconcile between the two and work to accommodate conflicting views within an extended evolutionary synthesis.

As will be spelled out in the book—inshā'Allāh—the rug has been pulled from beneath the atheist materialist position. It has become exponentially more difficult for them to defend their conjectural naturalist beliefs in light of the emerging understanding of the intricacy in the programming and engineering of life. It's just a question of how effectively they can maintain the smoke, mirrors and bluster.

3. There is a glaring difference between what is documented in **peer-reviewed scientific research papers** about the current status of scientific understanding, molecular mechanisms and evolutionary theory in general and what is conveyed by standard textbooks on biology in academic institutions and promoted through popular science writings to the lay public via journalists and storytellers. Ignorance of this disparity is taken advantage of by naturalists and atheists in the construction of their arguments in order to present as factual what is speculative or controversial, if not discredited or rejected altogether within the scientific literature.

4. Terms have been coined historically on the basis of crude, limited knowledge. As knowledge evolved, these terms continued to be employed, affecting accuracy of understanding of phenomena and discussions regarding them. This is the case with the word *gene* [and thereafter *genetics*, *genome*, *genotype*, *phenotype* and so on]. This word was first used to simply denote a **unit of heredity** at the beginning of the 20th century. With advances in molecular biology and the discovery of DNA structure, it then referred to a distinct sequence of DNA within the chromosome whose order determines the synthesis of peptides and proteins. However, further advances in “genetics” are making this term obsolete. The popular meaning of the term “gene” no longer accords with biological reality and the more it is studied the less certainty there is about what a gene is. Within the past two decades, the understanding of what a gene has been refreshed though still lacking and incomplete. A gene is no longer a

linear sequence of DNA but is now more of a **computational process** in the context of which DNA sequences take on meanings.¹⁹ The “one gene to one trait” correlation is inaccurate and is opposed to biological reality. Current research shows that there can be fifteen different locations for a gene across eleven different chromosomes. Hence, the accepted notion of what a “gene” is has been turned on its head. The “gene” as a controlling, deterministic entity is false. Rather, there is a higher-level cell-based architecture in which computational processes construct “genes” dynamically according to need and circumstance.

The implications of the above are:

a) The materialists, naturalists and atheists do not have as full a grasp of reality as they claim to possess, and their bold assertions of certainty and authority are not founded.

To illustrate, when it was announced in 2000 that the “genetic code of human life has been cracked by scientists” in the New York Times, informed scientists remarked, “We’ve got another century of work to figure out how all these things relate to each other.”²⁰

b) They are restricted because of outdated conceptual baggage embedded in terms that now hinder understanding,

c) In discussing the subject we have no choice but to employ such terminology. Thus, our speech and use of terminology is within the framework of *the current best working—though conceptually deficient and limited—knowledge that is also undergoing a shift in direction*. In other words, how we speak of and characterise the DNA-gene-cell system, as it is currently being understood, is subject to revision. However, this would not affect the arguments made in this book. Rather, what

¹⁹ Refer to: Burian, R. M. (1985). “On Conceptual Change in Biology: The Case of the Gene”, in *Evolution at a Crossroads: The New Biology and the New Philosophy of Science*, Depew, D. J. and B. H. Weber (Eds.). Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 21-42; Griffiths, Paul E. and Eva M. Neumann-Held (1999). *The Many Faces of the Gene*, BioScience vol. 49, pp. 656-662; Gelbart, W. 1998. *Databases in Genomic Research*. Science 282: 659-661.

²⁰ Nicholas Wade. *Genetic Code of Human Life Is Cracked by Scientists*. New York Times. June 27, 2000.

is emerging from current research is that the system of biological life is much more complicated than expected. These findings only serve to strengthen the arguments in this book.

5. 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.²¹ 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.²² The word “species” is used in this work with this caution in mind. A less-problematic, more practical definition would be: organisms that are able to mate and produce fertile, viable offspring that can also mate and produce fertile, viable offspring are the same species. Or another way: all physiologically similar organisms that are able to produce viable, fertile offspring are the same species. Thus, wolves and dogs for example, are the same species.

6. The neo-Darwinian modern synthesis—random mutations and natural selection—as the sole driver of evolutionary change, novelty and speciation has been empirically falsified via advances in molecular biology and genetics over the past couple of decades. Before that, incompatibility with the fossil record led to a modification to the theory known as **punctuated equilibrium**,

²¹ 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.

²² Strictly speaking, since evolution requires lots of transitional forms between species then it should be extremely difficult to develop criteria to distinguish between species. Further, the amount of transitional forms required by Darwinian evolution do not exist in the fossil record. In any case, defining species remains an ongoing problem in general and leads to difficulties in arguments regarding evolution.

proposed by Stephen Jay Gould and Niles Eldredge in 1972. This was not taken well by fundamentalists, some considered them heretical innovators (*mubtadi'ah*).²³ As a consequence, evolutionists have been scrambling for some decades to create a **new synthesis**. The implications of all of this—when consideration is made of the various ideas they are trying to merge together and the nature of the empirical evidence they are trying to incorporate—is that the argument from design has become much more powerful than ever and next to impossible to refute.

For that reason, naturalists and atheists have many devices through which they ridicule empirical evidence, sound reason and evidences that undermine their beliefs. From them is the use of labels such as “creationists”. This term refers to Christians who believe in a literal six 24-hour day creation of the Heavens and Earth and a 6,000 year old Earth. This is not in agreement with authentic revelation and is not the view of Muslims.²⁴ The “creationist” label is extended to everyone who does not accept the neo-Darwinian religion.

7. The objections of David Hume (d. 1776) in the 18th century to the design argument were premature and made at a time when designed artefacts were highly mechanical, machine-like and relatively crude. Hume would have found it difficult to make such objections in the 21st century. Given current knowledge regarding

²³ There are three known problems in the fossil record that led to this proposal: The first is the **extreme rarity** of transitional forms (missing links). The second is **stasis** or **equilibrium** (meaning little or no change in a species throughout its time on Earth) as the most prominent feature of the fossil record. And the third is **sudden appearance** (extraordinary numbers of new species appear all at once and ‘fully formed’). One should be wary of all evolutionist propaganda that makes use of the fossil record.

²⁴ The Heavens and Earth were created within a measure of time other than our measurement of time [as calculated by the sun and moon]. There are years and days of measurement other than the years and days of this creation which precede it. Likewise, they were created with previously existing matter and not from “nothing”. Refer to *Bayān Talbīs al-Jahmiyyah* (2/459-461, 473) of Ibn Taymiyyah.

molecular biology and the semiotic, computational nature of the DNA-gene-cell system, Darwinism, neo-Darwinism and naturalist ideologies in general, would not even have been conceived of let alone see the light of day.

In order to divert attention away from the accumulating evidence of design from an information, prescriptive software code and communications and pre-engineering perspective, evolutionists use smear tactics by describing design arguments as “creationism” through the back door. This is mostly out of terrifying, debilitating fear than actually having any empirical evidence to counter the arguments. Staunch atheists like Richard Dawkins admit that the design argument is powerful and not easy to contend with. It can only be countered by **an alternative, competing explanation**, not by actual refutation. The alternative explanation is **deduced** from the religions of naturalism and materialism whose assumptions are taken as truth before any science has been done.

8. Returning back to terminology and how it can be used to play with people’s minds, subconsciouses and intellects. If one reflects upon dubious terms such as “natural selection” and clear terms such as “intelligent design” one can see that the first—in its obvious apparent meaning—is a loaded term and is conceptually invalid. Nature does not have any volition to select²⁵, which is **a conscious act**, but it is given this apparent ability with cryptic phraseology for philosophical reasons. It is also defined in the broadest manner possible so as to accommodate both empirically observed facts and non-empirical religious beliefs. Thus, the fact that some organisms within a population survive, reproduce and leave more offspring than others, is empirically observed. This process has been captured within the ambiguous term “natural selection” so as to provide a basis for embedding the metaphysical belief that nature is a creative power and force through extrapolation. Meaning, because we see

²⁵ The dictionary definition of select is: carefully choose as being the best or most suitable, to choose in preference to another or others; pick out; to make a choice; To take as a choice from among several.

some members of a population surviving and reproducing, thereby passing on their genes, we can extrapolate from this that if this process continues over very long periods of time, over hundreds and thousands of generations, that totally new species will emerge that are reproductively isolated. Meaning, they have become so different and isolated that they can no longer reproduce. Thus, the term “natural selection” is frontloaded with an empirical observation and backloaded with a metaphysical claim that is not testable.

As for “intelligent design”, then it agrees with reason and human experience and is a conceptually valid phrase. It is known to be true through the sum of human knowledge and experience in industry and technology. What shows all the hallmarks of design according to human standards and experience—and incorporates multiple levels of abstraction similar to what we see in systems analysis, database systems and coding of software—requires intelligence, the attributes of knowledge, will, power and wisdom. There is nothing ambiguous or deceptive about this term.

Thus, right at the very beginning, there are issues with the use of terminology. Deceptive terminology can be used to make people accept fallacious ideas and concepts unconsciously. The reliance upon this method by atheists, materialists and evolutionists is raised and tackled in various places in this work.

9. Evolutionists, naturalists and materialists are cited in this work in which they reveal data, findings and results which support views that go against their own materialist convictions and go against the grain of evolutionary dogma. By citing their statements, research papers and publications it is not implied that they support or are aligned with such views. Overwhelmingly, the same data is being used by atheists and those who believe in a creator and it is all within the domain of microevolution. No one has a monopoly over empirical facts and findings, nor exclusive rights to interpret them.