

Dr. Raida Adil Jarrar

Youtube: <https://tinyurl.com/y59h49tx>



Reviewed by:

Sheikh Esam Ishaq

Vice-Chairman, Discover Islam

Disclaimer

The views presented in this book belong to the author and do not necessarily

reflect the views of the Discover Islam Society

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background	2
A giant leap of faith	3
Who created God?	6
How can God allow bad things to happen?	8
No, it is not enough to be good	14
Is science enough?	20
Is science truly unbiased?	24
Academic bias	26
God by any other name	29
Intellectual terrorism	31
Stolen creationism concepts	35
Where is the evidence for God?	38
Signs in the Universe	39
Signs in Creation	46
How did life begin?	49
What about evolution?	53
Which religion should I follow?	66
Characteristics of a divine religion: from God, not Man.	68
Are we born believers?	76
Faith is for the ambitious	79
Worship: slavery or freedom?	81
Why does God judge us if He pre-ordains everything and knows our choices?	83
Do we really have the option of ignoring God?	85
What's at risk?	87
Conclusion	90

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

Background

As a volunteer at one of the largest Islamic centers in the Middle East, I have the pleasure of interacting and discussing faith with visitors from many different religious backgrounds and diverse cultures. It has become a challenge for me to find convincing answers to their many questions and concerns.

I had had some of the same questions and concerns in my younger years. However, by the Grace of God, I was guided to answers which deepened my faith and strengthened my relationship with my Creator.

This book presents a summary of the points of discussion with our guests in a Q&A format for clarity and ease of reference. The answers are sourced from my research, discussions with my colleagues and my personal thoughts on each subject. If what I present is correct, it is by the Grace of God. If there are mistakes, these are mine and I ask Him, then you, for forgiveness.

Often, what turns people away from religion is a wrong concept of God. The discussion in this book is based on the Islamic monotheistic concept of God: The One and Only God, Absolute, Non-human, Who begets not and is not begotten, Indivisible, Ever-living, Transcendent, the First and the Last, Omniscient, the One Who created, destined and guided each creation to its function, Who sustains everything in existence, to Whom we belong and to Whom we will return... the One God of Adam, Noah, David, Solomon, Abraham, Ezra, Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, etc. Over a hundred thousand prophets were sent across the ages to different people in different tongues with one main message: to worship the One Creator and worship Him directly without any intermediaries or detours.

A giant leap of faith

For many, faith in God is an instinctive feeling. They do not require empirical evidence or philosophical argument. Others are “sunshine” believers. When things are going well, God exists. But, when misfortune befalls, they question the wisdom of God or His existence. Others believe that advances in scientific discoveries and technology leave no room for God.

The Quran poses several logical questions:

Has there [not] come upon man a period of time when he was not a thing [even] mentioned? Quran 76:1

Were they created by nothing, or did they create themselves? Quran 52:35

Did they create Heavens and Earth? Quran 52:36

Or do they have a deity other than God? Quran 52:43

There are three possibilities for our existence:

1- First Possibility: We are created by nothing:

- Our innate knowledge tells us that every *previously non-existing* effect has a cause.¹ If I claimed that the Eiffel Tower came from nothing, would anyone believe me?

No, because it goes against necessary truths, logic, common sense, science and the collective human experience. The only logical explanation is that any previously non-existing structure such as the Eiffel Tower was created and designed by someone.

It takes a giant leap of faith to not believe in a Creator.²

¹ Some argue that, through Quantum Mechanics, something can come out of nothing. The “nothing” in Quantum mechanics is just terminology because it is actually something: a quantum vacuum in a field of time and space which contains small amounts of energy and produces only virtual particles, not real matter. Accordingly to theoretical physicist Matt Strassler: “A virtual particle is not a particle.” A “virtual particle”, generally, is a disturbance in a field that will never be found on its own, but instead is something that is caused by the presence of other particles, often of other fields.

<https://profmattstrassler.com/articles-and-posts/particle-physics-basics/virtual-particles-what-are-they/>

² Summarized from a quote by William Maillis, a 12-year-old genius, enrolled at Carnegie Mellon University. The full quote is: “Well because there’s these atheists that try to say that there is no God, when in reality it takes more faith to believe that there’s no God than it does to believe that there is a God... Because it makes more sense that something created the universe than that the universe

- Order cannot come from random events. Penrose³ calculated the probability for our specific Universe to come into being randomly from all possible outcomes of the Big Bang as 1 out of $10^{10^{123}}$. According to Penrose: “This number tells us how precise the Creator's aim must have been.”

If we sit on the beach and watch waves for 100 years, will any one of the millions and millions of waves we see ever create a sandcastle?

Never!

However, a small child with intelligence can create a sandcastle. So, *intelligence* is needed for order, even for a simple structure like a sandcastle. What about the amazing design and complex systems in our bodies? How about this universe which runs according to precise order, orbits, and fixed laws?

- 2- Second Possibility: We created ourselves and the Universe. Since we are created, we must have been non-existent before our creation. However, a creator must exist at the time of creation in order to create. For us to create ourselves we must have been in a state of non-existence and existence at the same time, which makes no sense, so we can reject this possibility.
- 3- Third Possibility: Someone created us. Then that Someone must be our Creator, God. Who else claims to have created the Universe, Earth, and Man?
No-one except the Creator.
Nobody disputes His claim.
No one else claims His title.

God's claim is unchallenged. So, why not believe Him?

created itself. It takes more faith to say the universe created itself than to say something other created the universe because that is more logical.”

³ Sir Roger Penrose is an English physicist, mathematician, and philosopher of science with contributions to the mathematical physics of general relativity and cosmology. He has received several prizes and awards, including the 1988 Wolf Prize for physics, which he shared with Stephen Hawking for the Penrose–Hawking singularity theorems.

Do you know anyone that can be named as Him? Quran 19:65

We have no other comprehensive explanation for our existence and the existence of the Universe. Therefore, it makes perfect sense to accept our Creator's claim.

If we have a roomful with a thousand men and one child, and only one man claims to be the father, nobody disputes his claim.

Should we follow unproven hypotheses by men like us or an unchallenged claim from our Creator?

Faith in a Creator is not the enemy of reason. Rather, faith is the basis of reason. In what follows we will review some of the stumbling blocks along the road to faith.

Who created God?

This question assumes that our Creator has to be created like us and that He has the same characteristics as His creation. This is a false assumption. Does Steve Jobs look like the iPhone? Does he operate in the same way? Of course not. A creator is different from his creation.

The correct assumption is that everything *with a beginning* has a cause and everything *created* has a creator. God is neither created nor does He have a beginning. He is the First.

He is the First and the Last, and the Manifest and the Hidden, and He has knowledge of everything. Quran 57:3

- According to Muslim philosophers, infinite regress⁴ in doers necessarily leads to no action. If every creator needs another creator to create him, there will be no creation. But there is creation: the Universe and its creatures, so the sequence must end at a First Originator, an Uncreated Eternal Creator.

This is a popular example to show the impossibility of infinite regress. If every soldier has to wait for the order of his commanding officer before firing, no shot will ever be fired.

This is in line with current science. Before the Big Bang which produced the universe, there was no space, no time and no matter. This points to a non-material First Cause.

- Hamza Tzortzis presents the argument as follows:

The Universe and all the things we perceive do not necessarily exist; they could have not existed. They also have limited physical qualities. Since they could not give rise to their own limitations, something external must have imposed these limitations. The

⁴ An infinite regress is a series of appropriately related elements with a first member but no last member, where each element leads to or generates the next in some sense. Usually, such arguments take the form of objections to a theory, meaning that infinite regression makes a theory objectionable. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/infinite-regress/>

Universe and all the things we perceive ... are dependent and dependent things do not exist independently.⁵

An independent source without limitations is the only possibility which avoids infinite regress.

- If this is a valid question, then, when some say the universe, natural processes or gravity created us, it is perfectly legitimate to ask them who created the Universe and/or natural processes, gravity, etc.
- The One who puts down the laws is exempt from his laws. As a simple example. If in your house, you set at bedtime of 7 pm for your kids, you are not bound by that bedtime because it is your house and your laws. God sets the laws and He is exempt from His laws including the law of causality.
- Created gods are called idols, not God.

⁵ *The Divine Reality*, Revised Edition, Hamza Andreas Tzortzis, FB Publishing, 2016.

How can God allow bad things to happen?

If God loves us, why does He allow us to experience pain, disappointment, sickness, loss, etc.?

Is this world the best of all worlds that a Just All-Powerful God can create?

To answer, we first need to clear up some misconceptions to put things in perspective:

- This worldly life is just a station. Death is not the end of our story. It is the beginning of our real life.

This worldly life is a **test, a learning academy**, a place where we can grow morally and intellectually, to determine where we truly stand on issues of belief, how we serve God and what we contribute to the well-being of humanity; to separate the righteous from the wrongdoers and the truthful from the hypocrites.

This life is not about fairness, uninterrupted happiness, or justice. These belong to the afterlife. If we expect these in this life, then we are confusing Earth with Paradise; the test with the result.

- Such questions go against the concept of belief which, in essence, is the **belief in a delayed outcome**. Faith is not about immediate or direct results. It is a conviction in a promise by a God we have never seen for delayed rewards we cannot imagine.
- These questions ignore the collective human experience. **Since when does great reward come without hardship?** Medical students apply themselves to years of study instead of immersing themselves in pleasurable activity, in order to receive the reward of a medical degree and a lifetime of monetary ease. Similarly, we are promised great rewards in the afterlife in return for the hardship and strife that we endure in this life.⁶

The Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, told us that people who did not suffer calamity in this life will wish, in the afterlife, that they had been given the worst trials when they see the reward of those who were afflicted.

⁶ Under atheism, suffering and evil come with no reward, meaning or recourse.

In al-Tirmidhi, Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, says: "On the Day of Resurrection people will wish that their skins had been cut with shears in this world, when they see the reward of those who were struck with calamity." Jami` at-Tirmidhi 2402.

- **Anything transient is bearable.** We are created for eternal life and not for this short worldly life. Therefore, whatever hardship we suffer in this life, and however long it lasts, it is inconsequential in the context of our eternal life. Would you say that a lifetime spent in the US was terrible just because of the jet lag you suffered during the first day?

The Quran tells us that in the afterlife, our life here on Earth will seem like part of a day:

God will say: "How long did you remain on Earth in number of years?"

They will say: "We remained a day or part of a day." Quran 23:112-113

- Our perception is very limited. Therefore, our judgment of what is "good" or "bad" is flawed. We cannot see the big picture or the final outcome. **We cannot judge a 1000-page book by reading only one paragraph.** If we can see the future, we would know that the outcome of hardship for a believer is the best one possible. This is a pledge from God.

Muhammad (peace and blessings of God be upon him), said: "How wonderful is the affair of the believer, for his affairs are all good, and this applies to no one but the believer. If something good happens, he is thankful for it and that is good. If something bad happens, he bears it with patience and that is good."(Narrated by Muslim, 2999).

- The ultimate test to know if anything was good or bad, is whether it brought you closer to God. If it did, then it was good. If it took you further away, it was bad. We know from experience that things are never good or bad in an absolute sense but are always related to a **purpose**. We often make decisions to choose temporary suffering for some higher good in the future. For example, we knowingly subject our children to the hardship of school in consideration of their future success and benefit, we subject ourselves to painful exercise to enjoy the benefits of a healthy body, etc. By keeping our eye on the ultimate goal, any hardship becomes bearable and acceptable.
- Every good thing has an apparently bad phase; fertile soil for crops comes from destructive volcanoes; sickness makes us appreciate

health and pain makes us compassionate. Goodness comes out of seemingly bad events.

- People with handicaps are compensated even in this life. They develop formidable strength and amazing talents. Their other senses are much enhanced as a result of dealing with hardship early on.
- God does not test anyone beyond their abilities. As an example, adults and children have different pain tolerances and feel things differently. Extracting a tooth from an adult is a painful process requiring anesthesia and an operation, whereas children (who have a lower tolerance for pain) change milk teeth painlessly.

The severity of trials depends on the capability of each person. A teacher who wants the student to learn and grow gives assignments just above the current caliber of the student, enough to challenge but not too much to frustrate. Thus, the most tried and the longest-suffering people were the Prophets who present the highest caliber of Mankind.⁷

God does not charge a soul except with that within its capacity. Quran 2:286

Dr. Jeffrey Lang, in his *Purpose of Life* video, suggests that the main purpose of this earthly life, from the perspective of Islam and the Quran, is our growth in order to prepare us for the Afterlife. The ultimate goal is to grow closer to God by developing the qualities that make us better individuals. These qualities are derived from God's attributes, e.g. Compassion, Graciousness, Peace, Love, Justice, Truth, Wisdom, Mercy, Patience, etc. God is the infinite source of all virtue.⁸

Dr. Lang points out that for a relationship to develop, the two parties must have some common ground. The greater the common ground, the stronger the resulting bond and relationship. The only possibility of common ground between humans and God lies in the moral dimension, i.e. the attributes of God: Mercy, Truth, Care, Compassion, Benevolence, Guidance, Peace, Love, etc. By cultivating these merciful attributes in our characters, we can bring ourselves closer to God.⁹

⁷ <https://goharmukhtar.wordpress.com/2010/03/01/dr-lang-and-purpose-of-life/>

⁸ Dr. Jeffrey Lang is an Associate Professor of Mathematics at the University of Kansas. He is a revert to Islam from atheism. The *Purpose of Life* video can be seen at: <https://youtu.be/GzWRmJ-dFr4>

⁹ *ibid*

So, we can think about it in this way. Our growth in the womb was to prepare us to exist physically on Earth. Our growth on Earth is to prepare us morally for Heaven. **We are not finished products yet, but rather work-in-progress.**¹⁰

But why does this growth need an environment of suffering?

Dr. Lang points out the three necessary ingredients to the recipe of morality and growth for humans: **Intellect, choice, and suffering.** Through choice, we decide whether to grow through the beautiful attributes from our Creator or to grow with the opposites of these qualities (which moves us further away from God). Intellect allows us to develop and suffering provides the environment and opportunity to acquire and exercise these attributes. For example, we can develop compassion as a result of experiencing pain, patience through ordeals, courage in an environment of fear, etc. Pure gold comes from the rough ores only when it is subjected to fire.

The Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, visited a sick person and said, "Be cheerful, ... When a Muslim is sick, God takes away his sins just as fire takes away impurities in gold and silver." Sunan Abī Dāwūd 3092

Such a perspective makes suffering an opportunity rather than a nuisance.

But, why does God allow evil?

Dr. Mustafa Mahmoud, a revert to Islam from atheism, discusses the other side of evil in this excerpt from his book, *Dialogue with an Atheist*. He says: "God was quite capable of making us all benevolent by compelling us to obey Him. This, however, would have entailed that He deprive us of the freedom to choose. But, in His plan and Law, freedom with suffering is more honorable than slavery with happiness. That is why He let us sin, suffer, and learn; this is the wisdom in His sufferance of evil to exist."¹¹

He also says: "Evil in the Universe is like the shaded spaces in a painting. If you come very near to the painting, you will see these parts as defects;

¹⁰ <https://goharmukhtar.wordpress.com/2010/03/01/dr-lang-and-purpose-of-life/>

¹¹ *Dialogue with an Atheist*, Dr. Mostafa Mahmoud

https://docs.google.com/viewer?url=https://www.muslim-library.com/dl/books/English_Dialogue_with_an_Atheist.pdf

but if you draw back to take a general view of the painting as a whole, you will discover that the shaded parts are necessary and indispensable, fulfilling an aesthetic function within the structure of the artwork.”¹²

So, the real question is not how we can avoid trials, but rather, how we handle the trials in this short life test in order to elevate our positions in our real eternal life?

¹² *ibid*

*I asked for strength and
God gave me difficulties to make me strong.*

*I asked for wisdom and
God gave me problems to solve.*

*I asked for prosperity and
God gave me brawn and brains to work.*

*I asked for courage and
God gave me dangers to overcome.*

*I asked for patience and
God placed me in situations where I was forced to wait.*

*I asked for love and
God gave me troubled people to help.*

*I asked for favors and
God gave me opportunities.*

*I received nothing I wanted and
I received everything I needed.*

My prayers have all been answered.¹³

¹³ <https://spirituallythinking.blogspot.com/search?q=I+asked+for+strength>.

No, it is not enough to be good

Some people say we do not need to believe in God; we just need to be good ethical people. Honestly, to a believer, this seems like such a waste. Why would anyone forgo the great rewards God promised for good deeds, and just do them for nothing? It's like choosing to go through years of medical studies without wanting the diploma at the end.

However, being “good”, ethical, and moral is not a purely selfless decision. If we think about it, everyone is motivated by something or another.

- Some people are motivated by punishment, i.e. they drive ethically to avoid a traffic ticket. They are honest (do not steal) because they do not want to end up in jail. This is the lowest form of motivation because it is acquired from the environment. In the absence of motive, in a different situation without high traffic penalties, they may drive like maniacs. Without rules for queuing they might push and shove as much as the next person.
- Some are motivated by reward, monetary or otherwise (such as recognition). For example, they give charity so that their community recognizes them as charitable kind citizens. This is a higher form of motivation, but it is still tied to the environment. In the absence of an audience, the charity might not be as forthcoming.
- Some are motivated by self-gratification. They are good because they expect nothing less of themselves. They hold themselves up to a high standard. This is a higher form of motivation because it is not tied to the environment, but is inherent in the individual. However, it is dependent on our fickle selves and our subjective moral compasses. What gratifies us today may not satisfy us tomorrow and what we consider good behavior may be regarded as harmful by others.
- The purest form of motivation is to be moral and ethical because you want to get closer to God, Who is the source of all morality, goodness, and virtue. This is a constant potent motivation that does not depend on the environment or mood. It is not subjective because it is sourced from our Creator who knows His creatures best and looks out for **everyone's** interests. Here, ethics are displayed in every circumstance and regardless of hardship because the believer believes God is watching at all times.

We have mounting scientific evidence that spirituality is directly proportional to morality. A 2011 study by Konrath, O'Brien, and Hsing

showed declining empathic concern and perspective-taking among US college students as a result of the emphasis on material sciences at the expense of humanities.

Dr. Tony Jack¹⁴ and his team conducted nine different experiments involving thousands of participants from diverse religious faiths (mainly people from monotheistic religions). They measured belief in God, analytical ability and caring tendencies. Their research proved that the “nicest and kindest” people believe in God. The believers were kinder, more tolerant and better listeners than the non-believers.¹⁵

In addition, their research showed a direct relationship between belief and empathy for other people and society at large. Contrary to what some atheists claim, religious people are not driven by loneliness and despair. Instead, religious people identify more with all of humanity. This empathy is even found among the most dogmatic religious believers. On the other hand, the more dogmatic the non-believers, the more psychological and social problems they faced.¹⁶

Other research shows that people distrust atheists because they do not adhere to a divine moral compass.¹⁷

Our life is a reflection of what we believe. If we do not have a clearly defined path, we lack focus. This generates confusion and unhappiness which is reflected in our lives and our relationships.

Even if we ignore the research and assume that we do not need God’s direction to be absolutely objective, ethical, empathetic and fully conscious of the rights of others, there are moral problems with ethics in the absence of faith:

- **Racism:** Evolution inherently, through its Survival of the Fittest philosophy, may be perceived as a racist ideology.¹⁸ Darwin paved

¹⁴ Dr. Anthony Jack leads the Brain, Mind, and Consciousness lab at Case Western Reserve University in the US. In 2014 Dr. Jack became the Research Director of the Inamori International Center for Ethics and Excellence.

¹⁵ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BihT0XrPVP8>

¹⁶ *ibid*

¹⁷ Cline, Austin, *Are Atheists Trusted Less Than Rapists?* Learn Religions, Apr. 17, 2019, learnreligions.com/atheists-trusted-less-than-rapists-248477

¹⁸ The writer of an 1888 book, justifying the killing of the native population in the State of Victoria, writes: “It is a question of temperament; to the sentimental it is undoubtedly an iniquity; to the practical it represents a distinct step in human progress, involving the sacrifice of a few thousands of an inferior race. ... But the fact is that Mankind, as a race, cannot choose to act solely as moral beings.

the way for racism and genocide when he said: “At some period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilized races of man will almost certainly exterminate, and replace, the savage races throughout the world.”¹⁹ He also said: “If it now had to be conceded that we were all related to the apes, it could nonetheless be insisted that blacks consanguinity was much closer – perhaps a straightforward identity.”

Galton, the Father of Eugenics, was Darwin’s first cousin and indebted to his theories. Major Leonard Darwin, Charles Darwin’s son, trumpeted the spread of eugenics. Major Darwin foresaw the day when “eugenics would become not only a grail, a substitute for religion, as Galton had hoped, but a paramount duty whose tenets would presumably become enforceable.” The Major repeated his father’s admonition that, though the crudest workings of Natural Selection must be mitigated by “the spirit of civilization”, society must encourage breeding among the best stock and prevent it among the worst without further delay.²⁰

Theories of Biological Determinism worried even evolutionists, such as Gould²¹ and Lewontin²². They noted that individuals with similar theories had used them to justify violations of civil rights, based on claims that some people in some populations had innate criminality or poor intellect, whereas people in other populations did not. An example was the eugenics movement at the beginning of the twentieth century when many people were sterilized against their will to prevent those who were seen as weak or feeble-minded from reproducing.

Many historians believe that the roots of Nazi ideology were found in Darwinism and other works disseminating scientific racism and

They are governed by animal laws which urge them blindly forward upon tracks they scarce can choose for themselves.”

¹⁹ *The Descent of Man*, Darwin, *Anthropological Review*, April 1867.

²⁰ <https://creation.com/darwin-and-eugenics>

²¹ Stephen Gould is an American paleontologist, evolutionary biologist and historian of science. He was also one of the most influential and widely read authors of popular science of his generation. Gould spent most of his career teaching at Harvard University and working at the American Museum of Natural History in New York.

²² Richard Lewontin is a famous American evolutionary biologist, mathematician, geneticist, and social commentator.

eugenics. In his book, *Hitler's Religion: The Twisted Beliefs that Drove the Third Reich*, Richard Weikart explains how the laws of nature became Hitler's only moral guide; how he became convinced he would serve God by annihilating supposedly *inferior* human beings and promoting the welfare and reproduction of the allegedly superior Aryans, in accordance with racist forms of Darwinism prevalent at the time.

The book, *Aborigines in White Australia: A Documentary History of the Attitudes Affecting Official Policy and the Australian Aborigine, 1697–1973*, consists almost entirely of excerpts from parliamentary transcripts, court records, letters to editors, anthropological reports, etc. These documents show a distinct change for the worse after the publication of Charles Darwin's book in 1859, with a marked increase in callousness, ill-treatment and brutality towards Aboriginal people evident in official attitudes. Readers took it that the European was the "fittest to survive" and the Aboriginal was doomed to die out according to natural law, like the dinosaur.

In a Congress speech in 1927, Stalin declared that "Our party is a living organism. As in every organism, a metabolism takes place; old, obsolete stuff dies off; new growing things flourish and develop." Historians believe he took this "dying off" quite ruthlessly and literally from Darwinism.²³

Compare that to the human equality demanded by religion. The Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, said:

O people, verily your Lord is One and your father is one. Verily there is no superiority of an Arab over a non-Arab, or a non-Arab over an Arab, or a red man over a black man, or a black man over a red man, except in terms of piety. Al-Albani in *as-Saheehah* (6/199).

- **Appreciation:** Part of being an ethical person involves the appreciation for gifts, for kindness, for knowledge imparted, etc. Don't we owe our Creator appreciation for our existence, our minds, this world and everything He gave us?
- **Fairness:** Is it fair to thank everyone but God? We thank the doctor for repairing our broken hand, so how is it fair not to thank the One who gave us a hand in the first place?

²³ https://evolutionnews.org/2012/12/darwinism_and_s2/

- **Respect:** Part of being ethical is being a conscientious, productive worker. If, at your company, you decide to have a great relationship with everyone except the boss and work in ignorance of his plans and in total oblivion of the mission statement of the company, how productive a worker can you be?

We have a choice...

We can either live in accordance with the morality and ethics derived from the attributes of our Perfect Creator or we can live in the fluid sphere of godlessness where there is no right or wrong:

- no evil, no good, nothing but blind pitiless indifference;²⁴
- incest may be ok;²⁵
- rape is a natural outgrowth of human nature and it may be ethical to kill people for certain beliefs;²⁶
- necrophilia²⁷ and bestiality²⁸ are not wrong;²⁹
- state programs for the underprivileged should be forbidden³⁰ and
- racism and warfare are the application of “Survival of the Fittest” (according to Social Darwinists).³¹

Given the above, it is amazing how people who deny any objective source for morality can claim a higher moral ground and resort to attacks on the morality of prophets and believers, to justify their denial of God.

²⁴ <https://tinyurl.com/ux4qvqy>

²⁵ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Zp7dRpWIdBo>

²⁶ <https://samharris.org/response-to-controversy/>

²⁷ sexual intercourse with or attraction towards corpses.

²⁸ sexual intercourse between a person and an animal.

²⁹ <https://theosophical.wordpress.com/2009/05/08/peter-singer-bestiality-and-infanticide/>

³⁰ This is according to Herbert Spencer, an English sociologist and philosopher, an early advocate of the theory of evolution.

³¹ Social Darwinism is a name given to various theories of society that originated in the United Kingdom, North America, and Western Europe in the 1870s, claiming to apply biological concepts of Natural Selection and Survival of the Fittest to sociology and politics. Social Darwinists argue that the strong should see their wealth and power increase while the weak should see their wealth and power decrease.

Thus far, Man's reliance on subjective morality has not led to much equity, morality or happiness in this world. Humanity seems to have lost its way: rising crime and corruption, widespread nationalism and racism, senseless mass killings, rising sexual harassment and rape statistics, family unit disintegration, excessive litigation, etc. The rejection of divine moral guidance has come at a high price!

So why don't we try God's way for a change? It can only be an improvement over the sad state of morality in the world today.

Is science enough?

The problem with putting our complete faith in science is that much of it is in a constant state of flux. Scientific “discoveries” are made every day which contradict previous discoveries. For example, look at the non-stop food/diet research. One day we hear something is very good for us. The next, they tell us it is bad for us. It has gotten to the point where we do not know what to eat anymore.

The Newtonian model for physics assumes time and space are independent and absolute. Einstein later said that they were relative; then came the Quantum Theory, String theory, etc. The steady-state eternal universe theory has been replaced by the Big Bang theory. A hundred or so years ago, we believed all cells were just protoplasm, now we know there is a complex programming system in our cells.

In Biology, Darwin’s theory for biological evolution underwent several modifications and name changes as new science invalidated many of its original assumptions. Soon, the only thing recognizable from Darwin’s original theory will be its name.

Even if we assume all science is proven, fixed and 100% accurate, it is still incomplete and limited. Science focuses on the physical world and can only address natural processes and phenomena, using observation at hand. New data, new methods of observation and/or other sources of information (e.g. trusted testimony,³²instinct and innate knowledge³³, logic, math, deductive argument) can negate established scientific discoveries.

Science gives all glory to the discoverer and none to the Creator. As an example: Adam walks into a room and finds a beautiful painting, very precisely executed, with unbelievable symmetry and a brilliant color scheme. When he walks out to tell people about his discovery, everybody is so impressed with Adam for discovering the painting that they forget to ask the most critical question: Who painted it?

³² Most of our knowledge comes from trusted testimony and is based on cumulative knowledge. We cannot repeat every experiment ourselves before accepting information. It is ironic that, while science accepts testimony when it builds upon previous research, as evidenced by citations and references, some reject the authenticated testimony in the most widely read books of all time, the Quran and Bible, as a credible source for any knowledge.

³³ Innate knowledge are the universal truths that need no prior experience or observation, e.g. every effect has a cause, something cannot exist and not exist at the same time, a part is smaller than a whole, etc.

We are so fascinated with science for discovering the universal laws, which govern this universe and our existence, that we forget to ask who created these laws. All science does is discover the laws. Scientists did not formulate these laws. Our Creator did.

Why does all the credit go to the discoverer instead of the Creator?

When Newton discovered his law of gravitation, he did not say: “Now I have gravity, I do not need God.” Instead, in his *Principia Mathematica*, arguably the most famous book in the history of science, he expresses the hope that it would “persuade the thinking man to believe in God.”

We marvel at Einstein’s brilliance for discovering that the speed of light is constant when we should tremble in awe and reverence of the One who created light! Einstein himself said: “Science without religion is lame, religion without science is blind.”

Science is promoted as a substitute for religion; a reason to abandon faith, while religion promotes science; elevates knowledge and praises people of knowledge. The first word of the Quran is “Read”. Many verses in the Quran exalt knowledge and encourage the pursuit of knowledge.

Read: In the name of thy Lord Who, created. Quran 96:1

God will exalt in degree those of you who believe, and those who have been granted knowledge. Quran 58:11

But those who have in-depth knowledge among them are believers in what is revealed unto you and what was revealed before you. Quran 4:162

Travel through Earth and observe how He began creation. Quran 29:20

How can those who know be equal to those who know not? It is only men of understanding who will remember. Quran 39:9

Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, said: “The seeking of knowledge is obligatory for every Muslim.” Sunan Al-Tirmidhi, Hadith 74. He also said: “Whoever follows a path seeking knowledge, God will make his path to paradise easy.” Sahih Muslim, Book 42, Hadith 7058.

However, religion doesn’t view science as a collection of dry abstract theories for academic debate and/or industrial application, but links it with the greater basic truths about existence and stresses the impact of the beauty and design in creation on the human heart and mind and on the relationship with the Creator.

Indeed, in the creation of the heavens and earth, and the alternation of the night and the day, and the [great] ships which sail through the sea with that which benefits people, and what God has sent down from the heavens of rain, giving life thereby to the earth after its lifelessness and dispersing therein every [kind of] moving creature, and [His] directing of the winds and the clouds controlled between the heaven and the earth are signs for a people who use reason. Quran 2:164

God of the Gaps?

Some believe that it is just a matter of time before science fills in the gaps in our knowledge, thus putting the final nail in the coffin for religion. They don't understand that to explain the existence of a limited dependent universe we need something completely independent and eternal. Science can only study things that can be sensed, which means dependent things with limited physical properties.³⁴ Thus, we can never explain the existence of the universe with science alone. Even the statement: "Science is the only way to truth" is not a scientific statement based on empirical observations and proof, therefore cannot be accepted as truth.

It is not because *we don't know* that we believe in God. But because we *know* that things don't just pop into existence without a cause, let alone a massive physical universe obeying non-physical laws of mathematics inhabited by creatures with non-physical consciousness.

It is ironic that, while atheists often accuse theists of adopting this "God of the Gaps" argument, some have no compunction in using their inability or unwillingness to see the signs for God - a gap in perception and logic - as proof that He does not exist. Isn't this "Atheism of the Gaps?"

According to John Lennox, some scientists such as Stephen Hawking have an inadequate view of God:

It would seem that he thinks of God as a "God of the Gaps" put forward as an explanation if we do not yet have a scientific one—hence his conclusion that physics has no room for God as it has removed the last place where He might be found—for the moment of creation. But this is certainly not what any of the great monotheistic religions believe. For them, God is not only to be found at creation; He is the author of the whole show. God both created the universe and constantly sustains it in existence. Without Him, there would be nothing there for physicists to

³⁴ *The Divine Reality*, Revised Edition, Hamza Andreas Tzortzis, FB Publishing, 2016.

study. In particular, therefore, God is the creator of both of the bits of the universe we don't understand and the bits we do. And it is, of course, the bits we do understand that give the most evidence of God's existence and activity. Indeed, just as I can admire the genius behind a work of engineering or art, the more I understand it, so my worship of the Creator increases, the more I understand what He has done.³⁵

Science is presented as an alternative to religion. It is like being asked to choose between a book and its author. They are not alternatives. Does the discovery of a book disprove the existence of its author?

Science explains how. Religion is needed to explain why the Universe exists and who created it. Finding out how the Universe works does not invalidate its Creator or the purpose behind its creation.

Science for all its advances still cannot answer life's basic questions:

Where did I come from?

Why am I here?

Where am I going to?

³⁵ <https://www.rzim.org/read/just-thinking-magazine/stephen-hawking-and-god>

Is science truly unbiased?

Real scientists should seek to eliminate all forms of bias from their research and follow the truth wherever it leads them. As an example, let's take Sir Anthony Flew. He set the agenda for modern atheism in the twentieth century with his *Theology and Falsification*, a paper presented in a debate with C.S. Lewis. This work became the most widely reprinted philosophical publication of the century.

Then, in a 2004 Summit at New York University, Professor Flew announced that discoveries in science led him to the conclusion that the Universe is indeed the creation of infinite intelligence. In his book, *There is A God*, Sir Anthony Flew followed the scientific evidence to truth. After a lifetime of calling to atheism, he announced that there is one God, non-materialistic, Who does not change, with absolute power and absolute knowledge, the source of all good.³⁶

Some of the scientific facts that led Flew and many other truth-seeking scientists to believe in a Creator are:

- 1- The Big Bang: The world has a beginning and every event has to have a cause.
- 2- The world runs according to steady interrelated laws and numbers.
- 3- The emergence of life from dead matter is still unexplained.
- 4- The ability of the human mind, which does not even understand itself, to think logically and in abstract terms and to be self-aware.
- 5- The Universe, with its components and anthropological conditions, presents the perfect environment for the life of Man.

For truth-seekers, each new scientific discovery inspires awe for God's design and reaffirms faith in the Creator. One of the quickest paths to the Creator is pondering His creation.

It is ironic that, while discoveries which confirm the order and intricate design in the Universe inspire awe of the Creator and lead many people to faith, they may have no impact on the discoverers themselves.

True science is a vector pointing straight to the Creator. But science itself does not speak. It is people who speak on its behalf. Scientists are human beings and, as such, they are fallible and subject to bias. Any

³⁶ *Khurafat Al Elhad*, Dr. Amr Sharif, Shuruq International Library, 2nd Edition, 2014.

science which starts with a bias or foregone conclusion: eliminating creationism from mere consideration, restricts the narrative and shapes the outcome before the research even starts. Therefore, the conclusions of such research do not deserve to be called science.

The following will show that not all scientific activity serves truth. Academic bias, self-deceit, intellectual terrorism and stolen concept fallacies are sometimes practiced, all in the name of science.

Academic bias

Many scientists do follow the evidence wherever it might lead, without subjectivity or bias. However, there are others who are more zealous in defense of atheism than religious fanatics are in defense of their beliefs. When faced with evidence which points to creation, they side-step the facts and cling to unsubstantiated hypothesis or dogma to bypass the proof, logic, and the collective human innate knowledge and experience.

As an example of the unscientific bias for randomness against design, Dr. Franklin Harold, in his book, *The Way of the Cell*, tells us that Intelligent Design should not even be considered: “We should reject, *as a matter of principle*, the substitution of Intelligent Design for the dialogue of chance and necessity; but we must concede that there are presently no detailed Darwinian accounts of the evolution of any biochemical or cellular system, only a variety of *wishful speculations*.” (P 205)³⁷

So, as a matter of principle, Dr. Harold puts “wishful speculations” over consideration of Intelligent Design.

How scientific!!

They follow only speculation and what [their] souls desire. Quran 53:23

Similarly, Lewontin, a famous evolutionary biologist, says:

It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, *no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying* to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, for *we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door*.³⁸

³⁷ *The Way of the Cell; Molecules, Organisms and the Order of Life*, Franklin M. Harold, emeritus professor of biochemistry and molecular biology at Colorado State University. The book describes in detail the incredible complexity of life at the cellular level.

³⁸ https://www.mercatornet.com/articles/view/a_divine_foot_in_the_door/11956

Proponents of Biological Determinism, which is the claim that many organism traits are determined primarily by their genetic makeup, argue that evolution and adaptation can explain complex human social behaviors such as altruism and aggression. They create evolutionary stories without collecting any evidence about how traits actually evolved. Even leading evolutionists, such as Gould³⁹ and Lewontin, describe this procedure as making up “just-so” stories.⁴⁰

To some, science fiction is more credible than Creation or Intelligent Design. In an interview with Ben Stein, Dawkins, a leading British atheist, fantasizes about alien seeding as a source of life: “Well, it could come about in the following way; it could be that at some earlier time, somewhere in the universe, a civilization evolved by probably some kind of Darwinian means to a very, very high level of technology, and designed a form of life that they seeded onto, perhaps, this planet. Now that is a possibility, and an intriguing possibility.”⁴¹

Some contradict themselves and each other in their attempt to deny the obvious. While Thomas Huxley, nicknamed “Darwin’s bulldog”, tells us that science is common sense at its best.⁴² Dawkins tells us to ignore common sense when considering the beginning of the Universe but states that the combined “common sense” of humanity, not religion, should serve as a good indicator of morally correct behavior.⁴³

Furthermore, we see ridicule for any other point of view. According to Dawkins: “It is absolutely safe to say that if you meet somebody who claims not to believe in evolution, that person is ignorant, stupid or insane (or wicked, but I’d rather not consider that).”⁴⁴

³⁹ Gould, Stephen, *The Panda’s Thumb*, 1980, p. 181-182. Stephen Gould is an American paleontologist, evolutionary biologist and historian of science. He was also one of the most influential and widely read authors of popular science of his generation. Gould spent most of his career teaching at Harvard University and working at the American Museum of Natural History in New York.

⁴⁰ <https://embryo.asu.edu/pages/spandrels-san-marco-and-panglossian-paradigm-critique-adaptationist-programme-1979-stephen-j>

⁴¹ Interview with Ben Stein, *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*, Documentary (2008-04-18).

⁴² https://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/thomas_huxley_118633

⁴³ Dawkins, Richard (2006), *The God Delusion*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

⁴⁴ https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Richard_Dawkins

We also see a fanatical resolve to keep some theories alive despite overwhelming discrediting science⁴⁵. Darwin's theory for biological evolution stood on the following assumptions: Random Change, Unguided Natural Selection, Gradual Evolution, Slowness and Innumerable Transitional Forms.

We will discuss these points in much more detail later, but the below demonstrates the bias and dogmatism of some evolutionists. As pillar after pillar of Darwin's theory collapses, they rush in to plug the holes to preserve it at all cost:

- The expected innumerable transitional forms were not found in the Earth's geological record. Instead, evolution scientists found species that appear suddenly and persist to our day.
- Once scientists observed the sudden appearance of new species, the Darwinian pillars of gradualism and slowness came tumbling down.
- Natural Selection: When it was discovered that different species living in different environments develop similar systems and that a species in different environments develops into almost identical varieties, many evolutionists abandoned "randomness or blindness" in Natural selection and started talking about "guided" selection.
- The last pillar left was Random Change. Many studies now show that cellular variation is not random, so terms like "non-random mutation" and "directed mutation" started appearing in evolution literature.

With the last pillar gone, will the evolutionists abandon the theory?

Never! Because it still retains its most important pillar: Godlessness.

⁴⁵ <https://tinyurl.com/r98c6cc>

God by any other name

Wherever they turn, scientists are faced with evidence for design, fine-tuning, encrypted language, intelligence, intent, complex systems, interrelated laws, etc.... things which cannot be explained randomly or materialistically. In such cases, even though they would never admit it, scientists refer to the Creator by other names (Mother Nature, the laws of the Universe, natural selection, etc.)

They are not but [mere] names you have named - you and your forefathers - for which God has sent down no authority. They follow not except speculation and what [their] souls desire, and there has already come to them from their Lord guidance. Quran 53:23

While calling God by any other name is convenient for non-believers as it removes the “stigma” of faith, it is very limiting to the concept of God. Any name other than God takes away some of His Absolute Qualities and opens up more questions. For example:

- Referring to the Creator as Mother Nature removes the Intelligent Designer attribute. In this case, to avoid mentioning God, we attribute the creation of interrelated universal laws and complex systems to random nature, and the creation of our vision and intelligence to a blind dumb origin. How is that possible?
- Referring to God as the “laws of the Universe” or saying that the Law of Gravity caused the Universe makes no sense. Laws simply describe repeated observations. Laws do not have actions nor can they create matter. If someone deposits 100 dollars into a bank account every month for a year, the bank cannot claim that the law of multiplication (12×100) created the account!

Even if we allow such an illogical claim, it leaves wide open the question of who put down the laws of the Universe and who created gravity.

- Some Darwinists speak of Natural Selection (a non-rational physical process) as a unique creative force that solves all the difficult evolutionary problems without any real empirical basis.
- Upon discovering the complexity of design in the structure and operation of bacterial cells, evolutionists started using phrases such as “intelligent” bacteria, “smart” bacteria, “microbial intelligence”, “decision-making” and “problem-solving” bacteria; thus making bacteria a new idol.

Regardless of the elaborate names, the fact remains that you cannot give what you do not have.

- How can mathematical equations create a physical universe?
- How can our rationality and consciousness come from non-rational unconscious physical processes?
- How can our intelligence come from dumb matter?
- How can our vision and hearing come from blind and deaf sources?

Why don't these self-sacrificing blind, dumb, non-rational, unconscious processes start with themselves before giving out these amazing miracles?

Only the word God - the One True God - gives the Creator His full attributes without limitation, and provides a comprehensive explanation for the scientific wonders which surround us.

At a loss to explain the emergence of life and intellect from dead matter, some scientists came up with the term “spontaneous emergence”.

Really!

Why not call it by its name: Creation?

And when God is mentioned alone, the hearts of those who do not believe in the Hereafter shrink with aversion, but when those other than Him are mentioned, immediately they rejoice. Quran 39:45

Intellectual terrorism

Many scientists who believe in Creationism or Intelligent Design experience discrimination from some in the atheist scientific community. Examples include:

- Richard Von Steinberg, a well-published Smithsonian researcher, was called an intellectual terrorist and pressured to leave his job because he authorized a peer-reviewed paper presenting evidence for Intelligent Design.⁴⁶
- David Coppedge, who worked at NASA as a team lead on the Cassini mission exploring Saturn, was demoted then terminated after he engaged his co-workers in conversations about Intelligent Design.⁴⁷
- Günter Bechly, a curator at Stuttgart’s State Museum of Natural History, with ground-breaking studies on the evolution of dragonfly wings, with several species named after him, found his Wikipedia page deleted when he came out against evolution and in favor of Intelligent Design.⁴⁸
- When the open-access scientific journal, PLOS ONE recently published a peer-reviewed paper which mentioned the Creator in reference to the complex biomechanical architecture of the hand, the public outcry immediate and swift. One editor posted: “Just found out @PLOSONE published a paper with “evidence” about some “creator”. If not retracted immediately, I will resign as editor.” Buckling under the pressure, the journal did exactly that shortly afterward; its rating was downgraded and the authors apologized for daring to refer to the Creator.⁴⁹ The Chronicle of Higher Education reported this incident as follows: “Paper Praising Creator Puts Fear of God in Open-Access Giant.”⁵⁰Wikipedia referred to this incident as “CreatorGate”.
- The 2008 documentary, *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*, discusses the conspiracy in academia to oppress and exclude people who believe in Intelligent Design. The film portrays several academics including Richard Sternberg, Guillermo Gonzalez, Caroline

⁴⁶ Interview with Ben Stein, *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*, Documentary (2008-04-18).

⁴⁷ *ibid*

⁴⁸ <https://uncommondescent.com/intelligent-design/erased-paleontologist-bechly-gets-support-from-science-and-health-council/>

⁴⁹ <http://chronicle.com/article/Paper-Praising-Creator-/235610>

⁵⁰ <https://creation.com/hand-design-peer-review>

Crocker and others as victims of persecution by major scientific organizations and academia for their promotion of Intelligent Design and for questioning Darwinism. The documentary also features numerous anonymous people who said that their jobs in the sciences would be jeopardized if their belief in Intelligent Design was made public.

Schools in many places in the Western world are mandated to teach evolution and prevented from teaching Intelligent Design. When the State of Louisiana tried to teach both, its decision was struck down by the US courts. The same happened in Pennsylvania, where a judge ruled that it was unconstitutional to teach Intelligent Design in biology in US schools. This is ironic, when the official motto of the US, printed on its currency and sung in its national anthem is: "In God, we trust." For this service to the evolution lobbyists, the judge was cited as one of Time Magazine's 100 most influential people.

Haeckel's embryo drawings are still taught as evidence for evolution in schools and are present in a large number of biology textbooks, years after they were exposed as fraudulent drawings.⁵¹

What happened to critical thinking, objectivity, and free thought in education?

In higher education and research forums, academics may be denied tenure and research funding, lose employment and be ostracized for questioning evolution. Dr. James Tour, one of the world's top ten chemists, named "Scientist of the Year" by R&D Magazine in 2013, with over 640 published papers and 120 patents, announced that he did not understand evolution and issued a lunch invitation to anyone who could explain it to him. He tells us that, in the backrooms of science, National Science Academy members and Nobel prize winners admit to him privately that they do not understand evolution either.⁵²

Even internet search engines show bias. According to Paul Price, Wikipedia is a dubious source but a powerful tool for suppressing dissent.⁵³ Its editors and contributors are mainly younger Westerners, indoctrinated in Darwinism, tending more and more towards the abandonment of religion. Wikipedia openly and blatantly classifies creationism as "pseudoscience".

⁵¹ https://evolutionnews.org/2015/04/haeckels_fraudu/

⁵² https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_aVNfx5fjh0&feature=youtu.be

⁵³ <https://creation.com/wikipedia>

I experienced this bias first-hand during the research for this book. Often, during a google search for specific papers on intelligent design, using the exact title, author and keywords, I would first get a list of articles debunking that research (mainly from Wikipedia) before I got the actual article I was searching for, on the second or third search page.

To combat the aggression of the pro-evolution lobbies and their efforts to monopolize science, a statement, *A Scientific Dissent from Darwinism*, was issued in 2001 as follows:

We are skeptical of claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the complexity of life. Careful examination of the evidence for Darwinian theory should be encouraged. There is scientific dissent from Darwinism. It deserves to be heard.⁵⁴

The statement was signed by leading pioneers in science including scientists from the US National Academy of Sciences, Russian, Hungarian and Czech National Science Academies, as well as from leading universities such as Yale, Princeton, Stanford, MIT, UC Berkeley, UCLA and others.

The Third Way is a grouping of scientists, including Denis Noble⁵⁵ and James Shapiro⁵⁶, who claim a third way to explain the origins of biological diversity (other than Creationism and neo Darwinism). According to them, Neo-Darwinists have elevated Natural Selection into a unique creative force that solves all the difficult evolutionary problems without a real empirical basis.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ <https://www.discovery.org/m/2019/02/A-Scientific-Dissent-from-Darwinism-List-020419.pdf>

⁵⁵ Dr. Denis Noble claims that the central assumptions of Neo-Darwinism have been disproven. Dr. Noble is a British Biologist, who held the Burdon Sanderson Chair of Cardiovascular Physiology at Oxford University from 1984 to 2004 and was appointed Professor Emeritus and co-Director of Computational Physiology. He was the first scientist to model cardiac cells (in two papers in *Nature* in 1960) and has published over 350 research papers. He is regarded as a leading researcher in the field of Systems Biology.

⁵⁶ James A. Shapiro, *Evolution: A view from the twenty-first century*, FT Press Science, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey 07458, ISBN 10: 0-13278093-3.

⁵⁷ <https://www.thethirdwayofevolution.com>

Alvin Plantinga⁵⁸ draws a parallel between the position of some modern-day atheists, who fight faith and stand against science if it paves the way to belief in God, and the position of the Church in the Middle Ages when it stood against science because it mistakenly believed that it paved the way to atheism.

So, when we are next assured that something is proven scientifically without any doubt, maybe it is valid to ask: “According to what: restricted policed science or true science?”

⁵⁸ Alvin Carl Plantinga is an American analytic philosopher. In 2017 he was awarded the Templeton Prize.

Stolen creationism concepts

If science removes the need for God, then why are most scientists, including most Nobel Prize winners, believers? Science did not turn them away from God. Instead, it solidified their faith. Again, Newton, upon discovering gravity, expressed the hope that this would persuade the thinking man to believe in God.

Sir Francis Bacon, known as one of the founders of empiricism and the scientific method,⁵⁹ said: “A little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion.”

Has science been hijacked by atheism?

Because of a few very vocal contemporary atheists, science has somehow become associated with atheism. This is a false association. In the Middle Ages, most sciences originated in the Muslim world and the world's leading scientists were Muslim. The language of science for seven centuries was Arabic. Muslims introduced the world to the experimental method on which scientific research is based today. According to UNESCO, Muslims established the oldest university still in operation and the first libraries. Given all these contributions, would it have been acceptable to associate science with the belief in God or the Muslim faith?

Stolen Concept Fallacy

According to Dr. Eyad Al-Qunaibi, atheist/materialistic scientists are guilty of a Stolen Concept Fallacy: They claim a materialistic point of view while relying on intelligent design assumptions to practice science.⁶⁰

When atheists perform scientific experimentation or research they must suspend their atheistic beliefs and don a believer's cap before any science can take place. According to Dr. Qunaibi, some of the most important resources for science are mind, innate truths, testimony (previous science) and observation.

⁵⁹ Around 250 years, before Roger Bacon, an Arab Muslim scientist named Ibn AL Haytham was the first to introduce the scientific method.

⁶⁰ https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCahYINszeMy_PHffYvgAOHg

- **Mind:** According to the materialistic philosophy, our mind is not built for truth, but for survival; it does not come from an intelligent source, but from inanimate matter. Such a mind cannot produce rational thought and there is no credibility for its reasoning or inference.

Therefore, to practice science, scientists must suspend their materialistic beliefs and assume their minds are built for truth and are therefore able to make rational judgments and reach conclusions.

- **Innate truths:** These are universal truths we are born with such as causality; every previously non-existence effect needs a cause to bring it into effect; a part is smaller than a whole; etc. Materialists tell us that things can come by without intent or cause and that innate truths are not absolute.

Yet, in performing scientific research to address “why” and “what is the mechanism” type questions, scientists must rely on innate truths such as causality, borrowed from Creationism, because science itself is built on causality, laws, and order.

- **Testimony/Previous Research/Citations/Cumulative Knowledge:** Again materialism assumes randomness and as such, the outcome of any experiment is not necessarily reproducible. Under such a philosophy, we cannot depend on previous research because the same set of conditions can produce different results. Therefore, citations are meaningless, as are test outcomes.

However, to practice science, scientists need to suspend their materialistic beliefs and assume that previous results are reproducible under the same conditions and that testimony is a reliable source of information (a concept borrowed from Creationism.)

- **Observation:** Materialism relies primarily on direct observation and empirical results. However, to identify things by studying their effects (e.g. gravity), one needs to believe that non-observable and non-physical things can exist through their effects.

Therefore, materialists need to suspend their materialistic view and their requirements for physical proof and accept that non-observable things can exist through their effects: a concept borrowed from belief. God is not directly observable, but His effects are.

In summary, to perform science, we need to trust that our minds are built for truth, that causality is necessary, that results are reproducible

and that non-observable and/or non-physical things can exist through their effects. In short, a definition of Creationism.

If scientists did not have faith that this world is understandable because it operates according to intelligence and order and that this order was made accessible to an intelligent rational human mind, they would not spend their lives researching the laws which control this order.

Can you think of any important invention which did not assume causality and design?

Can you think of any significant research based on randomness and chance?

Without God, His Universe, His laws and the minds He gave us, there would be nothing for scientists to study or for atheists to deny.

Where is the evidence for God?

Providing proof for God is difficult. Not because the evidence is not there, but because it is so obvious and so overwhelming. It is very difficult to point out the obvious to people who insist on denying it. It is like trying to prove you have a conscience. How do you present proof for something hard-wired into every human being, something every child knows instinctively? How do you introduce a God Who is known and worshipped by most people on the Earth across the ages; Whom even non-believers turn to in times of need?

How do you provide material or empirical proof for a non-materialistic Being? No tools exist, nothing encompasses Him. It is like being asked to measure the weight of the Earth using a ruler.

How do you draw attention to the everyday miracles that surround us? Our Universe and everything in it is profoundly unnatural, could not have existed or could have existed differently. But, familiarity breeds contempt and obliviousness. We are so used to order, harmony and stability that we think they are natural. We are so used to the miracles that surround us that we no longer think of them as miracles, but as entitlements.

God Himself is ultimately above and beyond direct observation, but His signs are evident in Creation and the Universe. The idea of God is not a blind belief, as some would have you believe, but a conviction supported by reason and proof.

We will show them Our signs in the horizons and within themselves until it becomes clear to them that it is the truth. Quran 41:53

Al-Ghazali, a famous Islamic scholar, describes those who do not see the signs of God in the Universe, as reductionists lacking a holistic view. He compares them to ants on a piece of paper that cannot lift their eyes from the ink and pen, thus failing to see who is writing.

The following are some of the signs for creation in the Universe and in ourselves and the confusing arguments which are presented to counter these clear signs.

Signs in the Universe

The laws that shape the Universe are much more complex than those that govern biological life.

The creation of the heavens and Earth is greater than the creation of Mankind, but most people do not know. Quran 40:57

Science cannot answer the basic questions regarding the Universe: Why is there something rather than nothing? Why is it that something the way it is? Who is sustaining that something to allow it to continue? Why is that something reproduced in an orderly non-random fashion consistently?

Indeed, God holds the heavens and the Earth, lest they cease. And if they should cease, no one could hold them [in place] after Him. Quran 35:41

In what follows are some of the signs for creation in the Universe:

- Science and logic tell us that every previously non-existent effect has a cause, but we are asked to exclude the most significant effect -the Big Bang- from this universal law.

Did not those who disbelieve realize that the heavens and the Earth were joined together as one united piece, then We tore them apart? And We have made from water every living thing. Will they not then believe?

Quran 21:30

The Day when We will fold the heaven like the folding of a scroll for the records. As We began the first creation, We will repeat it. Quran 21:104

Science also tells us that, before the Big Bang which produced the universe, there was no space, time or matter. So material causes could not have brought this universe into existence. Who caused the Big Bang?

- Even if we leave the big question of who caused the Big Bang aside, how can random unguided explosions form intricately balanced systems and complex life forms? On the contrary, our human experience with random unguided explosions is that they cause chaos and destruction.
- Randomness produces different outcomes, disharmony, inconsistencies and disparity. Everything in our Universe points to one Creator. All creation is made up of the same elements and repeatedly follows the same universal laws. Life anywhere requires

water. DNA in all living creatures uses the same four letters encrypted language.

One law system, same raw elements, repeated motion patterns across this vast Universe point to One Designer. Calvin, the Nobel Prize winner in organic chemistry, said, “The order of the Universe points to One God running it.”

- Science has widely accepted the Laws of Thermodynamics, but we are asked to ignore them when they point to a Creator:
 - The First Law of Thermodynamics states that energy can neither be created nor destroyed; it can only be changed in form or function. This means that neither the universe nor the laws of physics can explain the existence of energy. The most reasonable explanation is that Someone, outside of the laws of physics and apart from the Universe, provides this energy.
 - The Second Law of Thermodynamics involves entropy, which is more or less a measure of chaos. It states that the natural trend of all systems is to go into disorder. An outside force is needed for order. Who is providing this force?
 - Also, if the Universe were infinitely old, it would now be in a state of total chaos. Since it is not, the Universe must have a finite age, and therefore a beginning. This makes it reasonable to consider the Universe an effect, thus requiring a First Cause.
- Mathematics tells us to give more weight to the higher probability. Penrose calculated the probability of our specific Universe coming into being randomly from all possible outcomes of the Big Bang as 1 in $10^{10^{123}}$. Nevertheless, some scientists want us to consider this impossibility as the most likely probability. Alan Lightman considers this universe a lucky draw; an accidental universe.⁶¹

- **Fine-tuning:**

Sir Martin Rees tells us that there are six numbers that precisely control our Universe. Any change in these numbers could be catastrophic and end the Universe as we know it. Rees poses the question: “Suppose.... that you were the intended victim of a firing squad and every bullet missed you, wouldn't you be inclined to wonder if something special had been arranged on your behalf.”⁶²

⁶¹ <https://www.google.com/amp/s/bigthink.com/alan-lightman-the-universe-is-an-accident-2604482844.amp.html>

⁶² Martin Rees formulates the precise control in the Universe in terms of the following six dimensionless physical constants.

It is God Who sustains the heavens and the Earth lest they cease (to function). Quran 35:41

Just to give an idea of the precise settings of the cosmic constants:⁶³

If the strong nuclear force were slightly more powerful, then there would be no hydrogen, an essential element of life. If it was slightly weaker, then hydrogen would be the only element in existence. It is inconceivable that complex life can come from hydrogen alone.

If the weak nuclear force were slightly different, then either there would not be enough helium to generate heavy elements in stars, or stars would burn out too quickly and supernova explosions could not scatter heavy elements across the universe.

If the electromagnetic force were slightly stronger or weaker, atomic bonds, and thus complex molecules, could not form.

-
- N , the ratio of the strength of electromagnetism to the strength of gravity for a pair of protons, is approximately 10^{36} . According to Rees, if it were significantly smaller, only a small and short-lived universe could exist.
 - *Epsilon* (ϵ), a measure of the nuclear efficiency of fusion from hydrogen to helium, is 0.007: when four nucleons fuse into helium, 0.007 (0.7%) of their mass is converted to energy. The value of ϵ is in part determined by the strength of the strong nuclear force. If ϵ were 0.006, only hydrogen could exist, and complex chemistry would be impossible. According to Rees, if it were above 0.008, no hydrogen would exist, as all the hydrogen would have been fused shortly after the Big Bang.
 - *Omega* (Ω), commonly known as the density parameter, is the relative importance of gravity and expansion energy in the universe. It is the ratio of the mass density of the universe to the "critical density" and is approximately 1. If gravity were too strong compared with dark energy and the initial metric expansion, the universe would have collapsed before life could have evolved. On the other side, if gravity were too weak, no stars would have formed.
 - *Lambda* (Λ), commonly known as the cosmological constant, describes the ratio of the density of dark energy to the critical energy density of the universe, given certain reasonable assumptions such as positing that dark energy density is a constant. In terms of Planck units, and as a natural dimensionless value, the cosmological constant, Λ , is on the order of 10^{-120} . This is so small that it has no significant effect on cosmic structures that are smaller than a billion light-years across. If the cosmological constant were not extremely small, stars and other astronomical structures would not be able to form.
 - Q , the ratio of the gravitational energy required to pull a large galaxy apart to the energy equivalent of its mass, is around 10^{-5} . If it is too small, no stars can form. If it is too large, no stars can survive because the universe is too violent, according to Rees.
 - D , the number of spatial dimensions in spacetime, is 3. Rees claims that life could not exist if there were 2 or 4 dimensions of spacetime nor if any other than 1 time dimension existed in spacetime. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gravitational_coupling_constant
Rees, Martin (May 3, 2001). *Just Six Numbers: The Deep Forces That Shape The Universe* (1st American ed.). New York, NY: Basic Books. p. 4.

⁶³ <https://evolutionnews.org/2017/11/ids-top-six-the-fine-tuning-of-the-universe/>

If the value of the gravitational constant were slightly larger, one consequence would be that stars would become too hot and burn out too quickly. If it were smaller, stars would never burn at all and heavy elements would not be produced.

How finely-tuned must these constants be to yield a life-friendly universe?

- Gravitational constant: 1 part in 10^{34}
- Electromagnetic force versus force of gravity: 1 part in 10^{37}
- Cosmological constant: 1 part in 10^{120}
- Mass density of universe: 1 part in 10^{59}
- Expansion rate of universe: 1 part in 10^{55}
- Initial entropy: 1 part in $10^{10^{123}}$

Who can keep a number like the cosmological constant finely tuned to the accuracy of 1 part in 10^{120} parts, i.e. one part in a trillion trillion trillion trillion trillion trillion trillion trillion trillion parts? Is it reasonable to assume anything is fine-tuned to 120 decimal places by accident?

According to Hamza Tzortzis:

Electromagnetism has one-force strength, which enables multiples key processes to take place: it allows stars to burn steadily for billions of years; it enables carbon synthesis in stars; it ensures that leptons do not replace quarks; which would have made atoms impossible; it is responsible for protons not decaying too fast or repelling each other too strongly, which would have made chemistry impossible. How is it possible for the same one-force strength to satisfy so many different requirements, when it seems that different strengths would be required for each of these vastly different processes?⁶⁴

We will show them Our signs in the horizons and within themselves until it becomes clear to them that it is the truth. Quran 41:53

According to Sir Fred Hoyle:⁶⁵

⁶⁴ *The Divine Reality – God, Islam and the Mirage of Atheism*, Revised Edition, Hamza Andreas Tzortzis.

⁶⁵ Sir Fred Hoyle FRS, 1915-2001, was a famous English astronomer who formulated the theory of stellar nucleosynthesis.

A common-sense interpretation of the facts suggests that a superintendent has monkeyed with the physics, as well as chemistry and biology, and that there are no blind forces worth speaking about in nature. I do not believe that any physicist who examined the evidence could fail to draw the inference that the laws of nuclear physics have been deliberately designed with regard to the consequences they produce within stars.⁶⁶

Michael Turner, the widely quoted astrophysicist at the University of Chicago, describes the fine-tuning of the universe with a simile: “The precision is as if one could throw a dart across the entire universe and hit a bulls eye one millimeter in diameter on the other side.”⁶⁷

Who is holding these numbers exactly right; continuously; without randomness or variation, if not our Creator and Sustainer?

Verify, all things We created in proportion and measure. Quran 54:49

Fine-tuning for Life:

The fact that the Earth is precisely positioned to sustain life, the harmony between Earth, Sun, and Moon working together as one intricate system, the mass of Jupiter acting as a cosmic shield and the precise constants which govern multicellular life, all point to intention in the creation and sustenance of organic life on this privileged planet.

Professor Steven Weinberg, a Nobel laureate in high energy physics (a field of science that deals with the very early universe), in *Scientific American*, writes: “...how surprising it is that the laws of nature and the initial conditions of the universe should allow for the existence of beings who could observe it. Life as we know it would be impossible if any one of several physical quantities had slightly different values.”⁶⁸

According to Dr. Dennis Scania, the distinguished head of Cambridge University Observatories: “If you change a little bit the laws of nature, or you change a little bit the constants of nature - like

⁶⁶ <http://www.geraldschroeder.com/FineTuning.aspx>

⁶⁷ *ibid*

⁶⁸ *ibid*

the charge on the electron - then the way the universe develops is so changed, it is very likely that intelligent life would not have been able to develop.”⁶⁹

Nobel laureate in physics Charles Townes states:

Intelligent design, as one sees it from a scientific point of view, seems to be quite real. This is a very special universe; it’s remarkable that it came out just this way. If the laws of physics weren’t just the way they are, we couldn’t be here at all. The sun couldn’t be there, the laws of gravity, nuclear laws, magnetic theory, quantum mechanics, and so on have to be just the way they are for us to be here.⁷⁰

Some atheists propose multiple universes to explain the order in this Universe without a Designer. According to them, if there are trillions of universes, it is not far-fetched that one of them (ours) happens to have the perfect conditions for life.⁷¹ This is like saying that, since there are millions of empty canvasses, a particular masterpiece painting didn’t need a painter.

According to Richard Swinburne: “It is crazy to postulate a trillion (causally unconnected) universes to explain the features of one universe, when postulating one entity (God) will do the job.”⁷²

Incidentally, the multiverse is not a new idea. It was presented thousands of years ago in the first revelation. Believers can vouch for at least two other universes: Paradise and Hell!

- Modern science tells us that light can be outside of time, yet some ridicule the idea that God can be outside of time. And even though we now accept that particles with entanglement, even when separated over great distances, continue to interact

⁶⁹ *ibid*

⁷⁰ <https://evolutionnews.org/2017/11/ids-top-six-the-fine-tuning-of-the-universe/>

⁷¹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jwyFGFs7voI&feature=youtu.be>

⁷² <https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/9028275-it-is-crazy-to-postulate-a-trillion-causally-unconnected-universes>. Richard G. Swinburne is an Emeritus Professor of Philosophy at the University of Oxford.

instantaneously,⁷³ some atheists reject the idea that God can see and hear everyone simultaneously.

- The scientific community is passionate about the sanctity of patents and the rights of the inventor, yet some scientists have no compunction in giving full credit to the discoverers of the universal laws and none to their Creator.

In summary, this universe needed a cause to emerge, a Designer to create and fine-tune its laws and a Sustainer to stabilize and preserve it.

Yet, are asked to believe that this ordered universe happened randomly (a probability of 1 in $10^{10^{123}}$) and that this amazing design, interrelationship between laws and complexity of systems continues to occur with consistent results, without design, intention or maintenance. Would anybody believe that the jackpot-winning lottery ticket (the probability of winning the jackpot is 1 in 302,575,350) can show up in their home by itself, then keep showing up, *with the exact same winning number*, every single time the lottery is drawn, without fail?

Albert Einstein put it well. He said:

I am not an Atheist. I do not know if I can define myself as a Pantheist. The problem involved is too vast for our limited minds. May I not reply with a parable? The human mind, no matter how highly trained, cannot grasp the universe. We are in the position of a little child, entering a huge library whose walls are covered to the ceiling with books in many different tongues. The child knows that someone must have written those books. It does not know who or how. It does not understand the languages in which they are written...That, it seems to me, is the attitude of the human mind, even the greatest and most cultured, toward God. We see a universe marvelously arranged, obeying certain laws, but we understand the laws only dimly.

⁷³ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sn7YQOzNuSc&feature=youtu.be>

Signs in Creation

- **DNA**

This amazing four-letter encrypted language which contains the information for all life forms weighs less than a quarter kilograms in each human body. Yet, it is packed so tightly that, when unraveled, the DNA in one human body can go from the Earth to the sun and back hundreds of times. This massive amount of encrypted information, which would require millions of pages of text for each cell, is transformed by precise instructions to flesh, blood, organs, functions, hormones and enzymes.

Throughout the history of science, information only comes from an intelligent source. The extremely complex encrypted language in the cells of every living organism needs a supremely intelligent designer. Furthermore, random changes to any computer code will degrade the code, not produce new code. Similarly, random changes in the DNA cannot create new information or new kinds of organisms.

- **Senses**

Science tells us that our senses are limited; infrared light cannot be seen and ultrasound cannot be heard, etc. Our senses also see things that do not physically exist, such as rainbows and mirages. Nonetheless, some want to subject the proof for the existence of the Creator to our limited senses and observation.

- **Ethics and Morality**

Science can tell us how poison kills, but it cannot explain why poisoning a man for money is wrong.

C. S. Lewis tells us that we are moral creatures with a code of ethics that does not have a source in biology and materialistic science. Rather, its source is a supernatural Law-giver, who is the source of all goodness and virtue. From the other perspective, I invite you to read what some leading atheists say about ethics⁷⁴ or watch the episode of Grand Design, where Hawking attempts to explain how we acquired ethics. What a convoluted implausible explanation!

The German philosopher Immanuel Kant believed that some truths cannot be arrived at through evidence but through morality. This was evident to the founders of the USA who stated in their

⁷⁴ See “No, it is not enough to be good” Chapter in this book.

Declaration of Independence: “We find these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal...” This is not a truth that is justified by scientific evidence, yet it is a truth that nobody disputes, except possibly Darwin.⁷⁵

Evolution cannot explain why were we born with:

- Ethics and morals if we are a transient material phenomenon.
- A sense of justice if we cannot ever expect to see justice served.
- A sense of right or wrong if we will never see wrongs addressed or goodness rewarded.

• **Self-Awareness and Consciousness**

How can 1.3 kilograms of nerve cells conjure up a seamless and endless kaleidoscope of sensations, thoughts, memories and emotions? Electro-chemical brain signals can never describe fully the sensation of pain, the experience of color, our inner thoughts, etc. While we can measure *when* we are having a conscious brain activity, all attempts to explain consciousness and the subjective experience (what it feels like during the activity) materialistically have failed.

According to Dr. Robert Nelson, Professor of Public Policy at the University at Maryland:

Consciousness has no physical presence in the world...Yet, our nonphysical thoughts somehow mysteriously guide the actions of our physical human bodies. This is no more scientifically explicable than the mysterious ability of nonphysical mathematical constructions to determine the workings of a separate physical world.⁷⁶

• **Purpose in Life**

Kant believed that the goal of humanity is to achieve perfect happiness and complete virtue. To achieve this goal, an afterlife must exist, and God is needed to provide this afterlife.

⁷⁵ Darwin seemed to be paving the way for racism and genocide when he said: “At some period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilized races of man will almost certainly exterminate, and replace, the savage races throughout the world.”

⁷⁶ <https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/existence-of-god-rational-arguments-mathematics-human-consciousness-a7739841.html>

If there is no purpose to this life, what's the difference between the life of Hitler and Martin Luther King? Why does a human life have any more significance than that of a scarecrow?

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

Is it logical to assume that the Creator, who gave us the means to satisfy every need He created in us (food to satisfy hunger, water to satisfy thirst, clothes to address cold, sexual needs for reproduction purposes, etc.) would neglect to address our spiritual needs and our need to know our purpose in life? Is it logical that the Creator Who created a purpose for every part of our bodies: the eye for sight; the ear for hearing; etc....would not have a purpose in mind for us as a whole?

Of course not. Our Creator gave us a manual to explain our purpose and provide the directions for an optimal life on Earth and beyond. We do ourselves a grave disservice if we ignore our manual, squander this precious resource, and choose to wander around aimlessly through this life.

It is pure reductionism to consider the human being as a simple transient materialistic phenomenon; a biological robot with electro-chemical brain signals. Such a materialistic view ignores Man's spiritual aspect, his purpose, his intellect, his consciousness and strips away his central role in this Universe.

Describing a book as paper and ink completely misses its essence: its ideas, its significance, its morals, its message and the beauty of its meanings.

How did life begin?

The question of how life began on Earth has cannot be resolved materialistically. This is not a “God of the Gaps” excuse, but a valid inference from the observations at hand. It is logical to infer that a Creator is involved when we have:

- massive amounts of complex encrypted information in the cells of living creatures (equivalent to millions of pages of text for each cell.)
- this information transforms by precise instructions to flesh, blood, organs, functions, hormones and enzymes.
- The probability of building one functional protein with only 150 amino acids *randomly* is 1 in 10^{164} . To get a perspective on the magnitude of this number, it is larger than the number of particles in the Universe and larger than the age of the Universe. This is only for one protein, and life requires hundreds of proteins.⁷⁷

The Nobel Prize winning molecular biologist Francis Crick, who co-discovered the structure of the DNA molecule said: “The origin of life seems almost to be a miracle, so many are the conditions which would have had to have been satisfied to get it going.”

If we believe that life emerged accidentally in the primitive environment of Earth⁷⁸ and that encrypted genetic blueprints for life showed up without a programmer, we are attributing our gaps in knowledge to nature which knows less than we do; an unconscious nature with zero-intelligence, zero information, zero creative powers and non-existent abilities; yet credited with amazing abilities to think, plan, encrypt, program and execute.

Relying solely on observation leaves gaps in knowledge for both atheists and theists. Theists infer and deduce from observation and fill in the gaps from trusted testimony in revelation. Atheists wait for science to fill

⁷⁷ DNA has the code, or instructions, for making protein, which are the building blocks for our cells. Each protein is made of a chain of amino acids which join together into long chains that eventually fold into a protein. Scientists believe the simplest form of life has a minimum of 250 to 400 proteins, and each protein is made of (on average) 300 to 400 amino acids. There are 20 different amino acids that make up all of life. <https://www.str.org/blog/building-a-protein-by-chance#.XeUCbC2B28U>

⁷⁸ Jack Monod, a Nobel laureate, in his book, *Chance and Necessity*, says, “We have no idea what the structure of a primitive cell might have been. The simplest living system known to us, the bacterial cell ... its overall chemical plan is the same as that of all other living beings. It employs the same genetic code and the same mechanism of translation as do, for example, human cells. Thus, the simplest cells available to us for study have nothing 'primitive' about them...no vestiges of truly primitive structures are discernible.”

in the gaps while they play around with unproven hypotheses. This is like saying: “I’ll deny God in the hope that the future might provide proof for my denial.”

It looks like they will be waiting for a long time. On the Scientific American website, there is a 2011 article entitled: “Pssst! Don’t tell the creationists, but scientists don’t have a clue how life began.” In this article, Horgan states that the scientific community still does not have a clue about the origin of life as the different hypotheses have intractable issues.⁷⁹

Of course, they don’t have a clue if they ignore the only compelling option: that God created life!

Lifeless chemicals- no matter how complex they are - cannot create life. To hypothesize that cells can come by from aggregations of basic elements ignores the fact that cells have several components which cannot arise without each other. For example, genetic information can only be replicated and read out with the aid of enzyme proteins, which are themselves specified by these same genes. Energy is harnessed by means of enzymes whose production requires energy input. Neither proteins nor nucleic acids could have arisen without the other. According to Leslie Orgel: “one might have to conclude that life could never, in fact, have originated by chemical means.”⁸⁰ In the conclusion of his book, *The Way of the Cell*, Dr. Franklin Harold tells us: “It would be agreeable to conclude this book with a cheery fanfare about science closing in, slowly but surely, on the ultimate mystery; but the time for rosy rhetoric is not at hand. The origin of life appears to me as incomprehensible as ever, a matter of wonder but not for explication.” (Page 251)⁸¹

The many attempts, during the past decades, to create a simple life form from scratch have failed, despite using the best brainpower in the world, meticulously designed experiments, state of the art laboratory

⁷⁹<https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/cross-check/psst-dont-tell-the-creationists-but-scientists-dont-have-a-clue-how-life-began/>

⁸⁰ Leslie E. Orgel, *The Origin of Life on Earth*, Scientific American, vol. 271, October 1994, p. 78

⁸¹ *The Way of the Cell: Molecules, Organisms and the Order of Life*, Franklin M. Harold, emeritus professor of biochemistry and molecular biology at Colorado State University. The book describes in detail the incredible complexity of life at the cellular level.

equipment, exact parameters and an abundance of models to imitate (from God's creation).

In fact, the whole field of synthetic life research **starts with the objective already accomplished: a live cell.**

If some say that science did create life, they may be referring to the experiment of Craig Venter, a famous American millionaire. What Venter actually did was take a living mycoplasma cell with its cell membrane, enzymes and organelles and insert some processed bases inside the nucleus. So, he did a project inside a living cell and copied a pre-existing genome; nothing that approximates the creation of a new life form.⁸²

“To my mind, Craig has somewhat overplayed the importance of this,” said David Baltimore, a geneticist at Caltech...He has not created life, only mimicked it.”⁸³

“Of course that’s not right - its ancestor is a biological life form.” said Dr. Joyce of Scripps. “Dr. Venter copied the DNA from one species of bacteria and inserted it into another. The second bacteria made all the proteins and organelles in the so-called “synthetic cell”, by following the specifications implicit in the structure of the inserted DNA.”⁸⁴

“My worry is that some people are going to draw the conclusion that they have created a new life form,” said Jim Collins, a bioengineer at Boston University. “What they have created is an organism with a synthesized natural genome. But it doesn’t represent the creation of life from scratch or the creation of a new life form.”⁸⁵

The funny thing is that Venter himself said, "We didn't create life from scratch."⁸⁶

In summary, self-emerging life isn't a logical assumption – it is a mentally impossible deduction that has also proven to be experimentally

⁸² <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20488990>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5g4evIzesFs>

⁸³ <https://tinyurl.com/smypksq>

⁸⁴ *ibid*

⁸⁵ *ibid*

<https://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/21/science/21cell.html>

⁸⁶ <https://edition.cnn.com/2010/HEALTH/05/21/venter.qa/index.html>

impossible. **The self-emergence of a giant encrypted information pack with ultimate execution powers is a fantasy.**

So, how can we gamble away our life's end when we have no clue about its beginning?!

In August 2017, Arizona State University offered a 5 million USD prize for anyone who can provide an answer on the origin of life.⁸⁷ When no progress was made, scientists gathered again, towards the end of May 2019, at the Royal Society in London, to double the prize to 10 million USD and reduce the scope to the self-organization of chemicals into code.

Thus, God's challenge in the Quran has now been passed by evolution scientists to Mankind, but this time with a prize attached!

O people, a parable is set forth; pay heed to it. Those who call upon aught other than God shall never be able to create even a fly, even if all of them were to come together to do that. And if the fly were to snatch away anything from them, they would not be able to recover that from it. Powerless is the supplicant, and; powerless is he to whom he supplicates.

Quran 22:73

⁸⁷ <http://www.frontlinegenomics.com/blog/19919/5-million-tech-prize-seeks-answer-origin-life/>

What about evolution?

Does it make sense to say that your mobile phone evolved by itself, from some plastic and silicon which evolved into a smartphone? By that logic, if we walk around in the desert of Arabia, where there is sand (silica) and petroleum (which produces plastic), we should find a lot of evolved smartphones in the desert. We can pick one up and say: “Hi mom!”⁸⁸

We laugh at the idea of a smartphone, with its smart programming and user-friendly functions, evolving by itself, from its raw elements, without a designer. Yet we find it easy to believe that we did. Amazing, when we consider that **the most basic cell in our bodies is more complex than a mobile phone!**

From a religious point of view, there are two questions:

- Is there a God?
- How did He create?

The theory of evolution is not concerned with the first question but addresses the second.

The Quran details the creation of Man as an honored creation by God:

Have you disbelieved in He who created you from dust and then from a sperm-drop and then proportioned you [as] a man? Quran 18:37

However, on the methodology for creation and speciation in the animal and plant kingdoms, the Quran offers no details. In fact, some early Muslims hypothesized on the evolution of plants and animals years before Darwin.

Thus, from a *religious* point of view, guided adaptations and biological change over time may have occurred, in the plant and animal kingdom, following a plan by the Creator; but Man is a special creation.

Notwithstanding this theological viewpoint, thus far, there is no clear scientific evidence for the evolution of one kind of organism from another and certainly not for Man.

In the below, we will be discussing the mounting contrary evidence against the Darwinian theory of evolution and its many subsequent

⁸⁸This example is from the book, *The Man in the Red Underpants*, by A.R. Green.

modifications by scientists, including evolutionists, from a purely logical scientific point of view:⁸⁹

- Any process which has **never been observed to occur**, fully and unequivocally, in all human history, should not be treated as an established scientific fact and should not become the main premise for the speciation of creation.
- Any theory which **does not explain how life began** should not become a prevailing theory for the origin of life.⁹⁰ Darwin's theory does not address the biggest question: how dead matter suddenly came to life.
- Modern genetics and chromosomal studies indicate that **mutation does not create a new kind of organism** nor does it lead to a significant gain of new function in an existing kind.

The 2018 Nobel prize winners in Chemistry were able to induce a large number of successive mutations, which normally require millions of years, in a period of a few months, in a lab. Despite the introduction of this large number of *directed designed* mutations (picking the most beneficial traits), a new kind of organism never did emerge; nor were any proteins produced from scratch to rival the ones we see by the thousands in living cells. As Frances Arnold, one of the Nobel prize winners once said: "Efforts to date to generate novel catalysts have primarily demonstrated that we are getting good at making bad enzymes. Making good enzymes will require a whole new level of insight, or new methodologies altogether."⁹¹

The problem these efforts face in the lab is exactly the problem faced by Darwin's evolutionary mechanism in the wild: Nothing can be selected until it already exists.⁹²

Furthermore, Lenski, a microbiologist at Michigan State University, spent decades growing cultures of the common bacterium *E. coli* in his lab. In bacterial terms, this is upward of 50,000 generations and a cumulative population size of hundreds of trillions, roughly the number of generations and population size that it supposedly took for some primate ancestor to evolve into modern humans.

⁸⁹ https://www.icr.org/home/resources/resources_tracts_scientificcaseagainstevolution/

⁹⁰ Darwin titled his book: *The Origin of Species*, which gives the impression that he is discussing the origin, not the speciation.

⁹¹ <https://evolutionnews.org/2018/10/nobel-prize-in-chemistry-for-intelligent-design/>

⁹² *ibid*

However, despite the many mutations along the way, a new kind of organism did not evolve, nor was a new transport molecule or new enzyme produced. Instead, some silent, previously unexpressed genes were activated and the original organism was degraded in some aspects.

This is currently our best evidence of what mutation is capable of.

During one interview, Richard Dawkins, the famous evolutionary biologist, had great difficulty naming a single mutation that resulted in new information.⁹³

- Even if we assume that a new kind of organism came by way of random mutation, did both **male and female** evolve separately and synchronously with the same new characteristics so that the two lovebirds could mate and propagate the new kind?
- Nowadays, some are citing interbreeding as a method of speciation. Interbreeding is not evolution by any stretch, but it gives an indication of the limits of change within a species. Darwinian evolution assumes a great capacity for change, while **interbreeding highlights the robustness of species and resistance to change**. For example, when different species mate and reproduce, they usually produce barren offspring, i.e. the mating of a horse and donkey produces a mule that cannot reproduce.

Dog breeding is another example of how interbreeding can lead to defects rather than advantages. Great Danes, bred for large size, have bodies too large for their hearts and are prone to develop bone cancer.⁹⁴ Bulldogs, bred to have large heads, have breathing, skeletal, and skin problems, and, even worse, many can't naturally mate and need their puppies to be delivered by Cesarean section.⁹⁵

- Many scientists, including Nobel prize winners, tell us that the **simplest living creatures started whole**.⁹⁶ Also, the most

⁹³ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C.AzndMmnZJk&feature=youtu.be>

⁹⁴ <https://www.housemixblog.com/2017/12/19/is-there-proof-god-exists/>

⁹⁵ <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/news/2016/07/bulldogs-dogs-animals-science-breeding/>

⁹⁶ Jack Monod, a Nobel laureate, in his book , *Chance and Necessity*, says, “We have no idea what the structure of a primitive cell might have been. The simplest living system known to us, the bacterial cell ... its overall chemical plan is the same as that of all other living beings. It employs the same genetic code and the same mechanism of translation as do, for example, human cells. Thus, the simplest cells

basic organisms have the same complex cellular structure as complex ones.

- Darwinism does not present any empirical evidence to solve difficult evolutionary problems and variations in heredity. It ignores much contemporary molecular evidence such as symbiogenesis, horizontal DNA transfer, the action of mobile DNA and epigenetic modifications.⁹⁷
- **Survival of the Fittest** cannot explain:
 - Why a baby monkey who develops quickly would evolve into a human infant who needs 15 years to reach puberty?
 - Why Man would develop characteristics such as altruism and love of exploration which might hurt his chances of survival.
 - Why we spend a lot of time in superfluous activity which does not aid survival and reproduction such as art, spirituality, philosophy or producing contraceptive aids.⁹⁸
 - Why there are lifestyles such as homosexuality which go against reproduction and survival of species.
- **Unbiased Natural Selection:** When asked why marsupials and placentals were very similar in shape even though they were far off in the Darwinian classification, some evolutionists came up with the name *Convergent Evolution* and attributed the similarity in shape to similar environments. When we found bats and whales living in different environments sharing a common system: echo-location, and two cichlid fish in two different environments developing into almost identical varieties, nature magazine published a report calling for a rethink of evolution theory. New terms: *Parallel Evolution*,⁹⁹ *Guided along specific routes*,¹⁰⁰ *Evo-Devo and Constraints*,¹⁰¹ etc. started making their way in evolution literature. So Natural Selection became guided and constrained.

available to us for study have nothing 'primitive' about them...no vestiges of truly primitive structures are discernible.”

⁹⁷ <https://www.thethirdwayofevolution.com>

⁹⁸ *The Divine Reality – God, Islam and the Mirage of Atheism*, Revised Edition, Hamza Andreas Tzortzis.

⁹⁹ <https://www.britannica.com/science/evolution-scientific-theory/Convergent-and-parallel-evolution>

¹⁰⁰ <https://www.nature.com/news/does-evolutionary-theory-need-a-rethink-1.16080>

¹⁰¹ https://www.researchgate.net/publication/7067393_Brakefield_PM_Evo-devo_and_constraints_on_selection_Trends_Ecol_Evol_21_362-368

According to Stephen Gould: “Darwin made a mistake in proposing his natural-selection theory, and it is fairly easy to detect the mistake. We have seen that what the theory so grievously lacks is a criterion of survival that is independent of survival.”¹⁰²

This is what is called tautology or circular argument;¹⁰³ the fittest survive and those that survive are the fittest. A equals a equals a equals a equals a. The “how” is what natural selection theory is supposed to provide, but providing mutually inter-defined terms does not do so.¹⁰⁴

Numerous other scientists have criticized natural selection as a tautology or circular argument, rendering a fatal blow to the theory’s ability to explain the mechanism of biological change. These scientists include Butler (1882),¹⁰⁵ Morgan,¹⁰⁶ Waddington (1960),¹⁰⁷ MacBeth (1971),¹⁰⁸ Bethell (1976)¹⁰⁹ and Rosenberg and Bouchard (2008).¹¹⁰

Early in his career, the philosopher Karl Popper¹¹¹ called evolution via natural selection “almost a tautology” and “not a testable scientific theory but a metaphysical research program.” Attacked for these criticisms, Popper took them back. But in a later interview, in

¹⁰² Bethell T., *Darwin's mistake*, Harper's 1976; 252:1509 (Feb) p.70.

¹⁰³ Tautologies and circular statements are always true and are thus not useful as theories because they can't be falsified. A tautology is a statement that is true by necessity. Tautologies often take the form “a equals b,” but b reduces to a, so really “a equals a.” Similarly, circular statements include components that rely on each other mutually for their definition, taking the general form “a is true because b is true and b is true because a is true.” Tautologies and circular statements cannot be falsified, because they are always true, so they are not scientific under a Popperian view of science.

¹⁰⁴ <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4594354/>

¹⁰⁵ Butler S. *Evolution: Old and New*. London: Boque, 1882. Print.

¹⁰⁶ “For it may be little more than a truism to state that the individuals that are best adapted to survive have a better chance of surviving than those not so well adapted to survive.” Quoted in Bethell 1976, footnote 8.

¹⁰⁷ Waddington CH. *Evolution after Darwin; the University of Chicago Centennial*. Editor Sol Tax Chicago: University of Chicago, 1960. “Natural selection turns out on closer inspection to be a tautology, a statement of an inevitable although previously unrecognized relation. It states that the fittest individuals in a population will leave most offspring. Once the statement is made, its truth is apparent.”

¹⁰⁸ Macbeth N. *Darwin Retried: An Appeal to Reason*. Boston: Gambit, 1971. Print.

¹⁰⁹ Bethell T. *Darwin's mistake*. Harper's 1976; 252:1509 (Feb.) p.70.

¹¹⁰ Rosenberg A, Bouchard F. Fitness (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy). Stanford Encyclopedia Phil. 2008.

¹¹¹ Sir Karl Raimund Popper, 1902-1994, CH FBA FRS was an Austrian-born British philosopher and professor. Generally regarded as one of the 20th century's greatest philosophers of science.

1992, he blurted out that he still found Darwin's theory dissatisfying. "One ought to look for alternatives!"¹¹²

Jerry Fodor of Rutgers University and the cognitive scientist Massimo Piattelli-Palmarini of the University of Arizona in Tucson, in their book, *What Darwin Got Wrong*, also say that the theory of natural selection is fatally flawed. They cite, among other things, the large role contingency plays in evolution and the fact that clusters of genes persist unchanged for eons.¹¹³

- Darwin's evolution is based on **gradualism**. Darwin wrote: "Natural Selection acts only by taking advantage of slight successive variations; she can never take a great and sudden leap, but must advance by short and sure, though slow steps." "If numerous species, belonging to the same genera or families, have really started into life all at once, the fact would be fatal to the theory to descent with **slow modification through Natural Selection**."¹¹⁴

Nature Magazine published a paper by Chris Venditti, Andrew Meade and Mark Pagel which showed that *evolution is not driven by natural selection* or through the accumulative effects of random genetic drift¹¹⁵. Rather than incremental and gradual change, the study suggests that the vast bulk of speciation results from rare events. This means that Natural Selection may not be the cause of speciation, which, as the author Pagel says "really goes against the grain" for scientists who have a Darwinian view of evolution.¹¹⁶

In a 2018 study at Stanford's School of Earth, Energy and Environmental Sciences, it was discovered that different varieties of insects appeared suddenly. The researcher Sandra Schachat further adds:

The first two-winged insects in the fossil record are about as different from each other as you could possibly expect. This suggests that, once winged insects originated, they diversified very, very quickly. So quickly that their diversification appears,

¹¹² <https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/cross-check/dubitable-darwin-why-some-smart-nonreligious-people-doubt-the-theory-of-evolution/>

¹¹³ *What Darwin Got Wrong*¹¹³, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2010.

¹¹⁴ Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, 1902 edition, Part Two, pp. 83, 88.

¹¹⁵ Genetic Drift is term used to describe the change in the frequency of an existing gene variant in a population due to random sampling of organisms.

¹¹⁶ <https://www.nature.com/articles/nature08630>

from a geological perspective and the evidence available in the fossil record, to have been instantaneous.¹¹⁷

Stephen Gould¹¹⁸, arguably the world's top paleontologist, said: "Paleontologists have paid an exorbitant price for Darwin's argument. We fancy ourselves as the only true students of life's history, yet to preserve our favored account of evolution by Natural Selection we view our data as so bad that we never see the very process we profess to study."¹¹⁹

He also said:

The history of most fossil species includes two features particularly inconsistent with gradualism: (1) Stasis - most species exhibit no directional change during their tenure on Earth. They appear in the fossil record looking much the same as when they disappear; morphological change is usually limited and directionless; (2) Sudden appearance - in any local area, a species does not arise gradually by the steady transformation of its ancestors; it appears all at once and fully formed.¹²⁰

- Darwin, as well, was worried that the lack of **numerous transitional fossils** disproved the theory. He said: "Why, if species have descended from other species by insensibly fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? Why is not all nature in confusion instead of the species being, as we see them, well defined?" "Innumerable transitional forms must have existed but why do we not find them embedded in countless numbers in the crust of the Earth? ...Why is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links?"

It has been more than 150 years since, and the expected abundance of transitional forms has never materialized. Even in what was called

¹¹⁷ <https://news.stanford.edu/2018/01/23/insects-took-off-evolved-wings/>

¹¹⁸ Gould, Stephen, *The Panda's Thumb*, 1980, p. 181-182. Stephen Gould is an American paleontologist, evolutionary biologist, and historian of science. He was also one of the most influential and widely read authors of popular science of his generation. Gould spent most of his career teaching at Harvard University and working at the American Museum of Natural History in New York.

¹¹⁹ Stephen Jay Gould, *Evolution's Erratic Pace*, Natural History, May 1977.

¹²⁰ *ibid*, pp. 13, 14.

“The Cambrian Explosion”¹²¹ scientists did not discover the expected innumerable transitional forms.

Stephen Gould says: “I will regard the failure to find a clear vector of progress in life's history as the most puzzling fact of the fossil record.... *We have sought to impose a pattern that we hope to find on a world that does not really display it.*”¹²²

Note here that, for Darwin's theory of evolution to be true, **innumerable transitional forms** (as Darwin hoped for), should have been found, and should continue to be found, as the Earth's innumerable species continue to evolve. It is not enough to find a few transitional fossils to prove the theory. To further discredit the theory, even the few fossils labeled as transitional fossils were mostly exposed as fakes. Examples include the Piltdown Man, the Nebraska Man, the Archaeoraptor, the Fania Fly, Ida, Orce Man, Humanoid collarbone, the baboon bone found in Lucy, etc.

- Contrary to the theory's **Random Changes** assumption, studies now show that variation is not random. So, again, new terms, previously unheard of in evolution literature, started popping up, such as developmental bias and developmental constraints,¹²³ cells may have mechanisms for choosing which mutations will occur,¹²⁴ variation is not random,¹²⁵ non-random directed mutation confirmed,¹²⁶ etc.

Shapiro, a University of Chicago molecular biologist and evolutionist, says: “It is difficult (if not impossible) to find a genome change operator that is truly random in its action within the DNA of the cell where it works. All careful studies of mutagenesis find statistically significant non-random patterns of change.”¹²⁷

¹²¹ The "Cambrian Explosion" refers to the sudden appearance in the fossil record of complex animals with mineralized skeletal remains.

¹²² Gould, Stephen Jay. 1984. *The Ediacaran Experiment*, Natural History.

¹²³ <https://www.nature.com/articles/6800139>

¹²⁴ <https://www.nature.com/articles/335142a0>

¹²⁵ <https://www.nature.com/news/does-evolutionary-theory-need-a-rethink-1.16080>

¹²⁶ http://www.i-sis.org.uk/Nonrandom_directed_mutations_confirmed.php

¹²⁷ James A. Shapiro, *Evolution: A view from the twenty-first century*, FT Press Science, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey 07458, ISBN 10: 0-13278093-3.

- Among the evidence cited for evolution, found in virtually every biology textbook, are so-called **vestigial organs** present in both plant, animal, and man. These are organs which are believed to have once been useful during a previous stage of evolutionary development but in continuing evolution are now redundant and in disuse, shrunk away until only a vestige remains. The subsequent discovery of important functions for these vestigial organs (such as the appendix, the tailbone, thyroid gland, tonsils, hind legs of the whale, etc.) and for so-called “junk DNA” confirms intention in design.¹²⁸
- **Irreducible complexity:** Darwin said: “If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down.” A complex organ is composed of multiple parts, all of which are necessary for the system to function. If even one part is missing, the entire system will fail to function. Such a system, with “irreducible complexity”, could not have evolved slowly, piece by piece. Molecular biology, biochemistry and genetics research over the past fifty years has identified tens of thousands of irreducibly complex systems on the cellular level.

This is confirmed by the evolutionist, Dr. Franklin Harold:

Cell components as we know them are so thoroughly integrated that one can scarcely imagine how anyone function could have arisen in the absence of the others. Genetic information can only be replicated and read out with the aid of enzyme proteins, which are themselves specified by those same genes. Energy is harnessed by means of enzymes whose production requires energy input. Darwinian evolution is at the bottom of the struggle among individuals defined by cell membranes, yet how could membranes and transport catalysts arise without genes, proteins, and energy? (Page 245)¹²⁹

¹²⁸ <https://www.creationism.org/books/TaylorInMindsMen/TaylorIMMf10.htm>

¹²⁹ *The Way of the Cell: Molecules, Organisms and the Order of Life*, Franklin M. Harold, emeritus professor of biochemistry and molecular biology at Colorado State University. The book describes in detail the incredible complexity of life at the cellular level.

Similarly, neither proteins nor nucleic acids could have arisen without the other.

- **The Brain:** How can we consider our brain as the ultimate judge on truth, the tool for knowledge, if we believe it came randomly without design from irrational, dumb, physical processes? How can we trust anything that comes out of such a brain?

According to Darwin: “But then with me, the horrid doubt always arises whether the convictions of man's mind, which has been developed from the mind of the lower animals, are of any value or at all trustworthy. Would anyone trust in the convictions of a monkey's mind, if there are any convictions in such a mind?”

It is a mystery why he then decides to trust his mind's conclusions on evolution - a product of this untrustworthy brain?

Alfred Russel Wallace is widely seen as the co-discoverer of the Theory of Evolution. He and Darwin co-presented their theory to the Linnaean Society in 1858. Wallace was convinced that the human brain was of no use to ancestral humans and therefore could only be explained by Intelligent Design: “Natural Selection could only have endowed savage man with a brain a few degrees superior to that of an ape, whereas he actually possesses one very little inferior to that of a philosopher.”¹³⁰

John Gray, a famous British philosopher says: “Modern humanism is the faith that, through science, humankind can know the truth - and so be free. But if Darwin's theory of Natural Selection is true, this is impossible. The human mind serves evolutionary success, not truth.”¹³¹

Francis Crick, a Nobel prize winner and recognized evolutionist, says: “Our highly developed brains... were not evolved under the pressure of discovering scientific truths but only to enable us to be clever enough to survive and leave descendants.”¹³²

¹³⁰ Wallace A. R. (1870), *The limits of Natural Selection as applied to man, Contributions to the Theory of Natural Selection: A Series of Essays*, ed Wallace AR (MacMillan, New York).

¹³¹ https://evolutionnews.org/2015/03/why_evolutionar/

¹³² *ibid*

Steven Pinker, an evolutionist, in his book, *How our Mind Works*, says: “Our brains are shaped for fitness, not for truth. Sometimes the truth is adaptive, but sometimes it is not.”

Donald D. Hoffman, a professor of cognitive science at the University of California, Irvine, has spent the past three decades studying perception, artificial intelligence, evolutionary game theory and the brain. His conclusion is a dramatic one:

The world presented to us by our perceptions is nothing like reality. What’s more, we have evolution itself to thank for this magnificent illusion, as it maximizes evolutionary fitness by driving truth to extinction. Evolution has shaped us with perceptions that allow us to survive. But part of that involves hiding from us the stuff we don’t need to know. And that’s pretty much all of reality, whatever reality might be.¹³³

Can you imagine the implications of such an ideology, which devalues the human brain and casts doubt on its rationality and conclusions?!

So, next time an atheist asks for proof of God, of design, of the obvious...we have a right to ask: “What will you use to judge the truth of our answer?”¹³⁴

- If it's your brain, which you believe came from dumb processes, designed for survival, not truth, then why should we waste time to present proof? How can we expect such a brain to arrive at any truth or reach any intelligent conclusion?
 - If, on the other hand, your brain comes from a Supremely Wise All-Knowing source, then its credibility is established, and you have a right to demand respect for the conclusions of your brain.
- When faced with the intricate design in our bodies, Darwin expressed other doubts:

“To suppose that the eye, with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic

¹³³ <https://www.quantamagazine.org/the-evolutionary-argument-against-reality-20160421/>

¹³⁴ *The Divine Reality, God Islam and the Mirage of Atheism*, Revised Edition, Hamza Andreas Tzortzis.

aberration, could have been formed by Natural Selection, seems, I freely confess, **absurd in the highest possible degree....**"¹³⁵

How can we believe a blind random process gave us these intricately designed eyes?

How can we believe that He who gave us vision cannot see us and everything we do?

And it is He Who has created ears and eyes and hearts for you; very little is the right you acknowledge. Qur'an 23:78

He who planted the ear, shall He not hear? He who formed the eye, shall He not see? Bible Psalms 94: 9

- Darwin also referred to a Creator several times in his writings: "There is grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one; and that, whilst this planet has gone cycling on according to the fixed law of gravity, from so simple a beginning endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been, and are being, evolved."¹³⁶

¹³⁵ *The Origin of Species*, 1859, Masterpieces of Science Edition, 1958, p. 146. The full quote is: "To suppose that the eye with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by Natural Selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree. When it was first said that the sun stood still and the world turned around it, the common sense of Mankind declared the doctrine false; but the old saying of Vox populi, vox Dei, as every philosopher knows, cannot be trusted in science. Reason tells me, that if numerous gradations from a simple and imperfect eye to one complex and perfect can be shown to exist, each grade being useful to its possessor, as is certainly the case; if further, the eye ever varies and the variations be inherited, as is likewise certainly the case; and if such variations should be useful to any animal under changing conditions of life, then the difficulty of believing that a perfect and complex eye could be formed by Natural Selection, though insuperable by our imagination, should not be considered as subversive of the theory. How a nerve comes to be sensitive to light, hardly concerns us more than how life itself originated; but I may remark that, as some of the lowest organisms, in which nerves cannot be detected, are capable of perceiving light, it does not seem impossible that certain sensitive elements in their sarcodae should become aggregated and developed into nerves, endowed with this special sensibility."

Werner Gitt explains how the retina is a masterpiece of engineering design: "One single square millimeter of the retina contains approximately 400,000 optical sensors. To get some idea of such a large number, imagine a sphere, on the surface of which circles are drawn, the size of tennis balls. These circles are separated from each other by the same distance as their diameter. In order to accommodate 400,000 such circles, the sphere must have a diameter of 52 meters..." (1999, p. 15)..

¹³⁶ Charles Darwin closed the last paragraph of the first edition of his *On the Origin of Species* (publication date 24 November 1859) with this sentence. However, in March 1863, Darwin wrote about this inclusion of the three significant words "by the Creator" to his friend and scientific confidante Joseph Hooker: "I have long regretted that I truckled to public opinion & used

“Further, we must suppose that there is a power always intently watching each slight accidental alteration in the transparent layers; and carefully selecting each alteration.”¹³⁷

In his autobiography, Darwin says:

Reason tells me of the extreme difficulty or rather impossibility of conceiving this immense and wonderful universe, including Man with his capability of looking far into futurity, as the result of blind chance or necessity. When thus reflecting, I feel compelled to look to a First Cause having an intelligent mind in some degree analogous to that of man; and I deserve to be called a Theist.”

So, Darwin had doubts, but not so the Darwinians. To them, evolution is the new Godless religion and evolutionists are its new prophets.

Eminent scientific philosopher and ardent Darwinian Michael Ruse acknowledges that evolution is a religion: “Evolution is promoted by its practitioners as more than mere science. Evolution is promulgated as an ideology, a secular religion -- a full-fledged alternative to Christianity, with meaning and morality . . . Evolution is a religion. This was true of evolution in the beginning, and it is true of evolution still today.”¹³⁸

George Johnson, in his book, *Did Darwin get it right?* suggests that if a CD containing the information in the genetic code were discovered, everyone would conclude that it came from intelligent alien life. However, upon finding the same complex information inside our cells, ardent Darwinians conclude that it happened by chance and random trials.

Pentateuchal term of creation, by which I really meant “appeared” by some wholly unknown process. It is mere rubbish thinking, at present, of origin of life; one might as well think of origin of matter.”

¹³⁷ Darwin, *Origin of Species*: second British edition (1860), page 189.

¹³⁸ *Darwinism as a Religion*, Michael Ruse, Oxford University Press, 2017

Which religion should I follow?

The Quran says:

If you obey the majority of those upon this Earth, they will mislead you from the way of God. They follow only assumptions, and they are only falsifying. Quran 6:116

Religion cannot be judged by the actions of people born into it. We cannot judge Christianity as a barbaric religion because some Klu Klux clan members carry the cross while they are lynching black men. That would be a very superficial judgment. Christianity is innocent of such horrific actions.

Similarly, true Islam is there behind a veil of false media propaganda and a few bad people masquerading as Muslims. Remove that veil, and you will see beauty and perfection. In the Quran, we find an even bigger gap between what a believer can be and the present-day misapplication of religion.¹³⁹

Knowledge of God does not come from observing the actions of His creation. Nor does this knowledge come from trying to understand the wisdom behind His actions through our limited perspective. Instead, to know God and our purpose in life:

- We ponder His amazing creation.¹⁴⁰
- We read His words.

People's distortions to the pure monotheistic message, preached by all prophets of God, confuse any sane person and may turn him/her away from religion. People take idols as gods. They project God as a weak being Who allows His creatures to harm Him. They take people and religious figures as intermediaries to God and submit to their power and politics. Religious institutions abound with corruption and abuse. Some religious leaders act holier than thou and change God's laws to protect their power and influence. People commit terrorist acts in the name of religion. The list goes on...

¹³⁹ While there are clauses that discuss warfare in the Quran and Bible. In Leviticus: "You will pursue your enemies, and they will fall by the sword before you;" in the Quran: "Fight in the way of God those who fight you but do not transgress. Indeed, God does not like transgressors," these verses should not be taken out of context (ignoring the restrictions in the verses that precede or follow) nor in isolation of the values of justice, equality, forgiveness, and charity that monotheistic religions call to.

¹⁴⁰ Examples of the wonders in our body. If the veins in one human body were attached end to end, they would circle the diameter of the Earth 2.5 times.

Understandably this turns people off religion. In their view, religion poisons everything.

However, we need to differentiate between religion and people. John Lennox points out that if we fail to distinguish between the science of Einstein and the abuse of his discoveries by scientists who created weapons of mass destruction, we would then repudiate Einstein's science and say that science poisons everything. How does that make sense?

To keep things in perspective, World War I and World War II, with 14 million and 70 million killed, respectively, the 94 million killed to establish the atheist communist regimes,¹⁴¹ the dropping of atomic bombs on Japan and various other atrocities were not committed in the name of religion but by secular regimes. So, violence is a human trait; not attributed to religion as some would have us believe and we should not abandon religion because of the abuses of people.

So, we need to find a path to God. But which path? Each religion claims to be right. What is the logical way to find the correct path?

- Not by following our parents, society, etc.
- Not by following the religion of people who look like us or come from the same race
- Not by personal inclinations

¹⁴¹ *The Black Book of Communism*, by a group of European thought leaders and politicians, 1997.

Characteristics of a divine religion: from God, not Man

- It preserves the **Oneness** of God without partners, which is the universal monotheist message of all God's prophets, and respects the first commandment, the most important commandment in every major religion¹⁴² and the key to Paradise. The Oneness of God explains the harmony in this universe and provides the simplest and most comprehensive explanation for the uniformity of raw elements, consistency in universal laws, and repeated motion patterns. One All-powerful Independent Creator is all that is required. This avoids the problem of conflicting wills and contradicting laws.
- It provides a **direct** path between our Creator and us - frees man from subservience to anyone but God. There are **no intermediaries between us and God**.

One God has one way to worship him. All prophets of God came with the message to worship God alone and directly; without detours or intermediaries. All Prophets forbade people to worship them. This is echoed throughout the Quran and the Bible. The opening chapter in the Quran states:

You alone we worship and You alone we ask for help. Quran 1:5

The First Commandment in the Bible is to put God first. Furthermore, Jesus, peace be upon him, says:

¹⁴² *The Original Concept of God*, Faten Sabri, <https://www.muslim-library.com/english/the-true-concept-of-god/?lang=English>

- "So whoever would hope for the meeting with his Lord - let him do righteous work and not associate in the worship of his Lord anyone." Quran 18:110
- "Now this is eternal life: that they know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom you have sent." John 17:3, Bible
- "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." First Commandment, Bible.
- "They enter darkness, those who worship the natural elements...(Air, Water, Fire, etc.). They sink deeper in darkness, those who worship sambhuti (created things like idols, stones, etc)." Yajurveda 40:9 Hindu Vedas
- "He is One only without a second." Chandogya Upanishad 6:2:1, Hindu Vedas
- "There exists but one God, who is called 'The True. The Creator.'" Sikhism: Sri Guru Granth Sahib, vol:1, Japuji verse:1.
- "He is one; He is without an origin or end. He has no father or mother, wife or son." Zoroastrianism: Dasatir, Ahura Mazda. Refer to Yasna 31:7&11.
- "Confess and believe in God, who is the worthy object of obedience..." *Buddhism, India in Primitive Christianity*, P85.

They worship me in vain; their teachings are merely human rules. You have disregarded the commandment of God to keep the tradition of men. Mark 7.7, Bible, New International Version.

Their worship is a farce, for they teach man-made ideas as commands from God. Matthew 15.9, Bible, New Living Translation.

The Lord says: "These people come near to me with their mouth and honor me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me. Their worship of me is based on merely human rules they have been taught. Isaiah 29:13, New International Version.

It is people who created the different intermediaries in each religion. **Most similarities in religions are from God, the single source. Most differences are from people.**

When asked why they go through intermediaries, people often claim that the intermediaries bring them closer to God. To get close to God, we should obey Him.

Logically, an intermediary is needed if the intended target is difficult to reach or is unapproachable. For example, we go through our mother to get our father's approval as mothers are usually more approachable. But, none of this applies to our relationship with God. He is closer to us than anyone and more approachable than our mothers or spouses; infinitely more caring and more loving.

And We have already created man and know what his soul whispers to him, and We are closer to him than [his] jugular vein.
Quran 50:16

So why not go to Him directly? Why go through a helpless intermediary?

- It has a clear **unchanged scripture** as reference. This is where the Quran stands unique. Its single version is the only known preserved word of God.¹⁴³

¹⁴³ While the Torah, Bible, Psalms, etc. all came from God, they have been altered by Man. They are not available in original form and language. For example, we have multiple versions of the Bible some

Indeed, it is We who sent down the Qur'an and indeed, We will be its guardian. Quran 15:9

The Quran is the most memorized book on Earth. It has inimitable patterns and linguistic expressions. It foretold many future events and presented knowledge which was only discovered recently. It is timeless in that it describes natural phenomena in a way that is acceptable to people of all eras regardless of the science of the time. Furthermore, there are no inconsistencies in the Quran and nothing in it contradicts *proven* science. As described by Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, the Quran's miracles never end and you never tire of re-reading it. He also said:

"The superiority of the speech of God (the Quran) compared to all other speech is like the superiority of God over His creation."

Source: Tirmidhee no. 2926 - [Hasan]

- It acknowledges and honors all God's prophets and corroborates their teachings; no monopoly on faith and no denial of other messages from God.

Say, [O believers], "We have believed in God and what has been revealed to us and what has been revealed to Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac and Jacob and the Tribes and what was given to Moses and Jesus and what was given to the Prophets from their Lord. We make no distinction between any of them, and we are Muslims [in submission] to Him." Quran 2:136

contradicting each other. The oldest available copies of the New Testament are the Greek translations. The bible is not available in Aramaic, which was not the language of Christ and his disciples.

The only unaltered revelation, still preserved in its original language, is the Quran. According to the BBC, the Oxford University Radiocarbon Accelerator Unit shows that some of the oldest fragments of the Quran dated back to the time of Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, and comparison with the present-day version supports the claim that the Quran has been preserved throughout the past fourteen centuries since its revelation. <https://www.bbc.com/news/business-33436021>

The main message of the Bible and Torah is preserved through the Quran which reproduces their message without the man-added distortions and emphasizes their central theme of monotheism. Each prophet was given a miracle: Moses parted the Red Sea, Jesus, peace be upon him, brought the dead back to life and cured the sick. Muhammad's (peace be upon him) main miracle, as the last prophet, was the preserved Quran. It makes sense that the final revelation is preserved so that Mankind can have a lasting authentic manual from their Creator.

Islam is not a new faith, rather it is the faith of all prophets of God, from Adam until Muhammad, peace be upon them. **Muhammad, peace be upon him, is not the only prophet**, but the last link in a chain of prophets.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁴ *The Original Concept of God*, Faten Sabri, <https://www.muslim-library.com/english/the-true-concept-of-god/?lang=English>

Many prophets foretold of Muhammad, the last prophet, peace be upon them all:

Jesus, peace be upon him, said:

“I will pray the Father and He shall you another Comforter that he may abide with you forever: even the spirit of truth.” John 14:16.

“But when he, the spirit of truth is come he will guide you in all truth for he shall not speak of himself but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak...” John 16:33,14.

“I will raise up for them a prophet like you (like Moses) from among their brothers. And I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak to them all that I command him.” Deuteronomy 18:18.

“But I will also make a nation of the descendants of Hagar's son because he is your son, too.” Genesis 21:13.

In Hinduism (Bhavishya Purana, Parva: 3 Part 3, chapter 3; verse 5-8):

- “A “Milechar” (a foreigner) will appear as a teacher of a new religion, with the help of his friends. His name would be “Mahamat.” A king of this land will give great respect to his teaching, and; praise him. Cleansing himself with Ganges water and Panjagouyam, he would say: “I whole-heartedly follow you.””
“King of this land giving great respect to Mahamat's teachings” may refer to a South Indian King by the name of Heramaan, who had trade contacts with Arabs and later became a Muslim at the time of Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him.
- “He (Mahamat) would be devoid of all sins. Coming from dry land (desert), he would be very holy, he will fight against evil forces and he will gather warriors, for this purpose. He will give protection even to enemies.”
- Atharva Veda, (Kuntap Sukta) 20 Hymn 127 verses 1-2: “He is Narashansah or the praised one (Muhammad). He is Kaurama: the prince of peace or the emigrant, who is safe, even amongst a host of 60,090 enemies. He is a camel-riding Rishi, whose chariot touches the heaven. “The meaning of the Arabic word 'Muhammad' means “the praised one.”

In Zoroastrianism:

- In Zend Avesta Farvardin Yasht, chapter 28, verse 129 (Sacred Books of the East, Volume 23, Zend Avesta Part II pg. 220): “Whose name will be the Victorious, Soeshyant and whose name will be Astvat-ereta. He will be Soeshyant (The Beneficent one) because he will benefit the whole bodily world.” This Prophecy applies perfectly to Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him. He was not only victorious when he returned to Makah with an army of 10000, but he also forgave all his enemies by saying: “There shall be no reproof against you this day.”

Soeshyant means the 'praised one' which translated in Arabic means Muhammad.

Astvat-ereta is derived from the root word Astu which in Sanskrit as well as in Zend means “to praise.” The infinitive Sitaudan in present-day Persian means praising. It can also be derived from the Persian root word istadan which means “one who makes a thing rise up.” Therefore Astvat-ereta means the one who praised, which is the exact translation of the

If a Muslim does not believe in Moses or Jesus, peace be upon them, then his faith is flawed as he is denying large parts of the Quran. The only woman mentioned in the Quran by name is Mary, with an entire chapter named after her. The Quran states that Mary, mother of Jesus, peace be upon them both, is the best woman on Earth and attests to her purity.

- **It is open to all people**, not for a select group.

Say, [O Muhammad], "O Mankind, indeed I am the Messenger of God to you all." Quran 7:158

Arabic word 'Ahmad' which is another name for Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him. The Quran clearly mentions both names of the Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him.

- "Dasatir" in its 14th Verse: "When Persian morality declines to lowest, a man will appear from Arabia. Those following him will choke the Persian Crown, religion and everything. The authority and control of Persia will go to them. The idols in their permanent temple (Kaaba) built by their ancestors will be removed. But, people will give immense honor to the empty temple. Das and Bulk (two big cities of that time in Persia) will fall. The learned people and others of Persia will join those who follow him."

In Buddhism:

- In Chakkavatti Sihnada Suttanta D.III,76: "There will arise in the world a Buddha named Maitreya (the benevolent one), a holy one, a supreme one, an enlightened one, endowed with wisdom in conduct, auspicious, knowing the universe. What he realized through divine revelation (supernatural knowledge) he will convey to this universe. He will preach his religion, glorious in its origin, glorious at its climax, glorious at the end, in the spirit and the letter. He will proclaim a religion and a like life do proclaim. He will keep up the society of devotees numbering many thousands, even as now I keep up a society of devotees numbering many hundreds."

The word 'Maitreya' or 'Metta' in Pali language and all corresponding words used in Burmese, Chinese, Tibetan and Japanese, carries the same meaning; same as "Rahmat" in Arabic, which means "Mercy." Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, was proclaimed by God Himself in the Quran as Mercy for the whole world: "We have not sent you, [O Muhammad] except as a Mercy to the worlds." Quran 21:107.

- According to the Sacred Books of the East Volume 35 p. 225: "It is said that I am not an only Buddha upon whom the leadership and order are dependent. After me, another Buddha "Maitreya" of such and such virtues will come. I am now the leader of hundreds; he will be the leader of thousands."
- According to the Gospel of Buddha by Carus p 217, 218 (from Ceylon sources): "Ananda said to the Blessed One: "Who shall teach us when thou are gone? "And the Blessed one replied: "I am not the first Buddha who came upon the Earth nor shall I be the last. In due time another Buddha will arise in the world.""
- In the book "Arshagyanam", p 282, Buddha said: "All must believe in Maitreya, the Prophet to come."

- **It is simple** without any complexity, convoluted philosophy¹⁴⁵ or contradictions. Religion is for all and should be understood by all: the man in the street, the child, etc. It is not just for scholars or clerics.

Then do they not reflect upon the Qur'an? If it had been from [any] other than God, they would have found within it much contradiction. Quran 4:82

For God is not the author of confusion. Corinthians 14:33 (Bible KJV)

- It defines God as Unique, Self-sufficient, and **Separate** from His creation. Nothing with limited physical qualities or dependencies can be God. If we believe God is one with His creation, as some religions claim, then we must have created ourselves. As mentioned previously, this is impossible. We were non-existent before our creation while our Creator must have existed in order to create us. For us to be one with our Creator, we must have been in a state of non-existence and existence at the same time, which makes no sense.
- **It asks nothing** from people: no memberships; no money for religious institutions; etc. It only wants good for them.

Or do you, [O Muhammad], ask of them a payment. Quran 52:40

- Its **name** is not connected to any person or place but reflects the relationship with God. The name “Islam” is not derived from Prophet Muhammad’s (peace be upon him) name, but means submission to God, unlike the prophet-associated names created by men for other religions.
- **It respects freedom of choice - no original sin and no sacrifices of the innocent.** A true religion preaches absolute justice; no judgment for things one has no control over. God is absolutely Just and judges each person according to their own choices.

If we are born with Adam’s sin and somebody else dies for ours, then what are we doing here exactly? What is the value and

¹⁴⁵ The concept of God sending himself to sacrifice himself to himself to save us from himself is a convoluted philosophy added to Christianity after Jesus, peace be upon him, departed. The confusion it caused has led many people to question Christianity.

consequence of any choice we make? What is our incentive to do good and avoid evil?

How is it fair that a kind caring person ends up in the same place as the mass murderers of Rwanda because someone else was sacrificed for their sins? If you have two children and one of them does something wrong, then asks for forgiveness, would you forgive him/her? If you are like most parents, you would.

Do you think God is less forgiving than you are?

Even if we assume that God (whose name is the Most Forgiving) is the vengeful God some people portray, why would He (who is also the most Just) sacrifice one prophet for another's sin? You wouldn't sacrifice one of your children for the mistake of his sibling. If God had to sacrifice anyone, it should have been Adam. He was the one who sinned.

- **It respects the mind**; encourages the application of logic and reason to arrive at God; **no blind faith**. It elevates knowledge and science. The first word of the revealed Quran was "Read" (Iqraa). The Quran swears by the pen and stresses the importance of knowledge.¹⁴⁶
- It is not contradicted by established (proven) science but rather **confirms proven scientific facts**.¹⁴⁷
- It **applies to any place and time**; addressing **both materialistic and spiritual** aspects of man.

In many aspects, Islam was ahead of its time; it came with the first charter for women's rights and gave women financial independence. It introduced warfare rules which precede the

¹⁴⁶ "Read: In the name of thy Lord Who, created." Quran 96:1

"God will exalt in degree those of you who believe, and those who have been granted knowledge." Quran 58:11

"But those who have in-depth knowledge among them are believers in what is revealed unto you and what is revealed before you." Quran 4:162

"Travel through Earth and observe how He began creation." Quran 29:20

"How can those who know be equal to those who know not? It is only men of understanding who will remember." Quran 39:9

¹⁴⁷ https://www.academia.edu/36994097/The_Bible_The_Quran_and_Science_By_DR_Maurice_Bucaille.

Also, see "Does science confirm creation?" chapter in this Book.

Geneva Convention by centuries. It called for water conservation, environmental protection, animal rights, etc.

- It comes through a **trusted source**. This is an important aspect. If we think about it, science itself is built on cumulative knowledge and trust in the chain that passes that knowledge. We don't redo every experiment ourselves to verify the results. Muhammad, the Prophet of Islam, peace be upon him, was nicknamed "the honest one" for his integrity and honesty before and after he received the message. His ethics and comportment are studied and lauded by many great thinkers and historians.¹⁴⁸

We grow up in different environments and usually adopt the religion or belief of that environment. But, if we think about it, did we follow every path our parents and elders told us to take? No. We were willing to question many things from our society and investigate for ourselves. But when it comes to the most crucial questions of our lives: the purpose of our existence and what happens after death, we are willing to follow our environment's beliefs blindly. Does that make sense?

There is an old story about a woman who always cut off the heads of fish before cooking them. When her daughter asked her why she replied that she was following the recipe from her mother. They went to the grandmother and received the same answer. When they went to the great-grandmother, they found out the reason. The great-grandmother did not have a larger frying pan!

We owe it to ourselves to explore the most important questions of our life: the purpose of our lives and what comes after death.

The behavior of some people is ruining this life for us. If we let them turn us away from God, they will also ruin our afterlife.

¹⁴⁸ <http://www.cyberistan.org/islamic/quote1.html>

Are we born believers?

Everybody knows God in their minds and hearts, whether they admit it or not. We are innately programmed to know God, to love Him and to seek refuge in Him. Thus, the term for “non-believer” in Arabic is Kafir, which means “one who covers the truth.”

In the Quran, it is mentioned that, when we started as seed in our father Adam, God took an oath from all of us that we will know him as our Lord.

And (remember) when your Lord brought forth from the Children of Adam, from their loins, their seed (or from Adam's loins his offspring) and made them testify concerning themselves (saying): “Am I not your Lord?” They said: ‘Yes’, lest you should say on the Day of Resurrection: “Verily, we have been unaware of this” Quran 7:172

The fitrah (knowledge of God) upon which He has created people. No change in God's creation. Quran 30:30

The Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, said: “No child is born except on the Fitrah.” Bukhari, 2:440.

Before you rush to label this as sentimental mush, please consider the studies below.

- In a 2001 study by the Center for Brain and Spiritual Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, Dr. Andrew Newberg and Dr. Eugene D'Aquili found measurable changes in the limbic system and the object association area in the brains of monks and people in prayer. In the abstract of their paper, *The Neuropsychological Basis of Religions or Why God Won't Go Away*, they state:

In general, religion appears to serve two major functions - it is a system of self-maintenance and a system of self-transcendence. Since both of these functions bear directly on human survival and adaptability, the neuropsychological mechanisms that underlie religions appear to have become thoroughly ingrained in the human gene pool and ultimately human experience.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁹ <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/0591-2385.00140>

- In a 2013 Finnish study published in the *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*,¹⁵⁰ Marjaana Lindeman, Bethany Heywood, Tapani Riekkö and Tommi Makkonen examined whether atheists exhibit evidence of emotional arousal when they dare God to cause harm to themselves and their intimates. Skin conductance testing showed that asking God to do awful things was equally stressful for atheists and religious people. The results imply that atheists' attitudes toward God are ambivalent in that their explicit beliefs conflict with their effective response.

And they rejected, while their [inner] selves were convinced, out of injustice and haughtiness. Quran 27:14

- Olivera Petrovich¹⁵¹ uses supporting evidence from a series of studies of children and adults living in diverse cultures such as the UK and Japan to contend that religion or theology constitutes one of the core domains of human cognition, rather than being a by-product of other core domains and specific cultural inputs.
- Recent research by Jarnefelt, Canfield and Kelemen at Newman University concluded that there is a natural propensity to see nature as designed, even among atheists, and that non-belief was cognitively effortful.¹⁵²
- Professor Justin Barret, the Director of Thrive Center for Human Development in Pasadena, California, in his book, *Born Believers: The Science of Children's Belief*, concludes that children believe in a Divine Being that created the entire universe.

On the other hand, atheism is taught and is counter-intuitive.

Many atheists acknowledge this and try to address the void which results from denying their natural human inclinations by borrowing some concepts from religion. The writer Alain de Botton, during a TED talk, suggested that atheists should steal from religion to address this void.¹⁵³

¹⁵⁰Volume 24, 2014, Issue 2.

¹⁵¹ Olivera Petrovich is a Research Fellow at the University of Oxford in the Department of Experimental Psychology. Her book, *Natural Theological Understanding from Childhood to Adulthood*, 2018, and research deal with the origin and development of natural religious understanding across different cultures.

¹⁵² <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25880608/>

¹⁵³ <https://www.npr.org/transcripts/245957052?storyId=245957052>

The practice of religion is a basic need for people in every community. You may find many cities without a theatre, without a park, without a library, some even without a school. But you will rarely find one without a place of worship.

When a plane goes down, those on board (whether believers, atheists, or communists) start praying to Him. As the saying goes: “There are no atheists in foxholes.” Everybody at death knows God because at this point, all vanity and delusions disappear, and only the truth remains.

Say, Have you considered: if there came to you the punishment of God or there came to you the Hour - is it other than God you would invoke if you should be truthful? No, it is Him [alone] you would invoke. Quran 6:40-41

Thus, the real question is: do we want a relationship with God during this life, or do we want to know Him only upon death?

Faith is for the ambitious

Are you satisfied with this what this life has to offer, or do you yearn for more?

Every worldly desire loses its appeal after we acquire it. Either we lose excitement as it becomes familiar or we worry about losing it.

In a secular environment, Man searches for happiness in material things. He tells himself: "If I get money, I'll be happy." He becomes rich but finds he is still unsatisfied. When Bill Gates was asked how he felt about his 130 billion, he answered: "That number means nothing to me."

Or Man tells himself: "If I have power and fame, I'll be happy." Celebrities have both. Yet, in general, they are a notoriously unhappy segment of the population.

When we limit our goals to material things, we leave our other dimension - the spiritual dimension - unfulfilled. True happiness involves satisfying both aspects of our humanity. According to Ibn Al-Qayyim Al-Jawziyyah, a Muslim scholar: "Truly in the heart there is a void that cannot be filled except with the company of God, a sadness that cannot be lifted except with the bliss of knowing Him and a yearning that cannot be fulfilled except with His love and remembrance. Even, if a person were given all of this world and everything in it, it cannot fill this emptiness."

Furthermore, without faith in an afterlife, everything is incomplete because it comes to an end sooner or later. Ultimately, even if we have the best one hundred years or so on Earth, without an afterlife, there is only the grave to look forward to.

We are born with the desire to reach for the stars and touch eternity - and nothing in this transient and limited worldly life will ever satisfy that desire. Our dreams can only be met by our Creator, Who has everything.

Let's take a very ambitious dream list or bucket list on Earth:

- Fly on the space-mission to Mars
- Meet the Pope, the Queen, President of the US, Tom Cruise, etc.
- Own a Caribbean island
- Have the muscles of Muhammad Ali or the beauty of Cleopatra
- Live to be 150

Everything in this world is limited, even its dreams are limited. Let's compare this to a dream list without practical worldly constraints:

- Fly like a bird, anywhere one wishes
- Meet Muhammad, Jesus, and Moses, Noah, Gabriel (peace be upon them) and - dare I say it - meet our Glorious Creator?!!
- Own a galaxy or two
- Possess beauty that makes all the Miss Universes pale in comparison
- Regain our youth and live forever young

Sounds impossible?

Yet, in this Universe, we see the signs of the impossible in God's vast creation; numbers that are incomprehensible to our limited viewpoint. This gives us a perspective to imagine the unbelievable scale of an afterlife in comparison to this Earthly life.

So, contrary to what some may think, religious people are the most ambitious. However, unlike non-believers, they do not confine their ambitions to what this life has to offer. Paradise is their goal.

Paradise is the end of boredom, weariness, depression, fear, loss, pain and death; the disappearance of grey hair, undereye circles, wrinkles, etc. It is all the places we cannot hope to reach, the boundless love this world cannot offer, the people we yearn to meet, the realization of every hope and the fulfillment of our wildest dreams. It is the removal of all boundaries and the expansion into every possibility.

No soul knows what is kept hidden for them of delights of the eye as a reward for what they used to do. Quran 32:17

The Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, said: God tells us: "I have prepared for My righteous servants what no eye has seen, what no ear has heard, and what no heart has imagined." Sahih al-Bukhari 7498.

No eye has seen, no ear has heard, no heart has imagined, what God has prepared for those who love Him. Bible - Corinthians 2:9

Worship: slavery or freedom?

We are born to submit and follow (serve or worship) something or someone. If we do not submit to God then, whether we know it or not, we are submitting to or serving something else: a boss, a loved one, money, a celebrity, etc. If you look around you, most people are in a state of servitude to something or someone, but few worship the only One truly worthy of worship: God.

Which is more honorable: to worship those who take from us or He who gives us everything? To follow and obey those who cannot help themselves or He who has dominion over everything? To take direction from our Creator Who knows what's best for us or from people who are as lost as we are?

Worshipping God frees Man from submission to whims and weaknesses. Following every desire and submitting to every whim weakens Man's resolve and makes him a slave to his desires. Religion imposes some limitations and through the observance of these limitations we gain strength of character. To overcome addiction, addicts are advised to follow a ten or twelve-step program which often includes submitting to a higher power to restore their self-control.

Worshipping God gives Man the **freedom** to have a say in his afterlife. The path to everlasting happiness is clear for him. If he does good, he gets Paradise. If he is a non-repentant wrongdoer, he gets Hell. So, a believer has the choice and is allowed to affect his eternal life; while a non-believer believes he is created by and snapped away by unknown forces with no say whatsoever is his afterlife.

Furthermore, atheism wants to strip Man of free will - his distinguishing feature from the rest of creation - and treat him as a puppet. Sam Harris, a leading American atheist, says: "Free will is an illusion. Our wills are simply not of our own making.... We do not have the freedom we think we have."¹⁵⁴

In his million-copy international best-selling book, *The Selfish Gene*, renowned atheistic writer and speaker Richard Dawkins asserts that humans are "survival machines - robot vehicles blindly programmed to preserve selfish molecules known as genes."¹⁵⁵

¹⁵⁴ Sam Harris (2012), *Free Will*, New York: Free Press, p. 5.

¹⁵⁵ Dawkins, Richard, *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

In June of 2015, evolutionary biologist Jerry Coyne delivered a lecture at the “Imagine No Religion” convention in Vancouver, Canada. His speech was titled: “You Don’t Have Free Will.” Addressing his primarily atheistic audience, he said: “Now many of you don’t accept that. You don’t believe that you are robots made out of meat, which is what I’m going to try to convince you of today.”¹⁵⁶

If this is the case, then why then do atheists write books, give interviews and deliver lectures to convince people to deny God, if people have no free will to choose what to believe?

Coyne goes on to say: “I don’t consider myself morally responsible, because I don’t have a choice.” Similarly Cashmore¹⁵⁷ states: “From this simple analysis, surely it follows that individuals cannot logically be held responsible for their behavior.”¹⁵⁸

Consider the chain of implications of no free will. Consider the harm to society and what this means in terms of immorality, crime, punishment, the rights of others, etc. Would anyone wish to bring up a family in such a recklessly irresponsible environment?

¹⁵⁶ <http://apologeticspress.org/apPubPage.aspx?pub=1&issue=1228>

¹⁵⁷ Anthony Cashmore, a biologist at the University of Pennsylvania.

¹⁵⁸ <http://apologeticspress.org/apPubPage.aspx?pub=1&issue=1228>

Why does God judge us if He pre-ordains everything and knows our choices?

With God, Who is Absolutely Just, the sphere of accountability and judgment is limited to the areas of choice. Therefore:

- We are not judged if we are mentally impaired.
- We are not judged as children.
- We are not judged for our parents, our height, our nationality, our genes, etc., because we have no control over these things.
- We are not judged if we are coerced.
- We are not judged for our actions while asleep or unconscious.
- We will not be punished if we did not receive a prophet or hear about God.

The Messenger of God (peace be upon him) said: "The Pen is lifted from three (their deeds are not recorded): a child until he reaches puberty; an insane man until he comes to his senses; one who is asleep until he wakes up." Abu Dawud #4403 and Ibn Majah #2041.

So, we will only be judged for the actions and in the situations where we exercise complete and free choice.

While it is possible to force someone to say: "I love you," no amount of pressure will force them to love you with all their heart. God has safeguarded our hearts from all forms of compulsion and made them free. That is why we are judged by our intentions and what is in our hearts.

Dr. Mostafa Mahmoud tells us that human freedom is not a fixed sum but can increase through knowledge. By inventing machines for transportation, Man has increased his freedom to move. By opening ourselves to God's revelation, we gain knowledge and understand our honorable purpose in life, thereby freeing ourselves from all the fears which drag us down and from subservience to anyone but God.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁹ *Dialogue with an Atheist*, Dr. Mostafa Mahmoud

https://docs.google.com/viewer?url=https://www.muslim-library.com/dl/books/English_Dialogue_with_an_Atheist.pdf

Then you will know the truth, and the truth will set you free. Bible, New International Version John 8:32

But the Quran tells us that nothing we choose is outside God's will. Everything is subject to His will. Doesn't this contradict with our freedom to choose?

No. Because it is His will for us to have the choice to obey or disobey Him. He does not want us to disobey, but He gave us a choice to do so. Because with God, obedience by choice is more honorable and more deserving of reward than forced compliance.

Does God's pre-knowledge cancel our freedom of choice? No, it doesn't. Think of the following example: a teacher knows that a particular student will fail the course because he or she does not attend the lectures, fails to turn in the homework and skips the tests. When the end of the term comes, the student fails. Did the teacher, through his/her pre-knowledge, make the student fail? No. It was still the student's choice to fail, despite the teacher's pre-knowledge.

Do we really have the option of ignoring God?

If someone moved to your house, ate your food and used your furniture, then decided to ignore you and did not acknowledge your presence in your own home, how would you feel?

This is what we do with God.

We live on His Earth, breathe His air, eat His food, ...but many of us ignore Him.

If we can find anywhere to live other than God's Earth; sustain ourselves without the water and food He created; live without breathing His air; pump our own hearts and control the production of our own enzymes, then we have the option to ignore Him.

Even if we reject this need-driven argument, we have to admit that a Creator has rights over His creation. As an example, when we get a pet, we want its obedience for its own good and protection, so we train it and expect obedience. We expect submission from the pet even though we did not create it, we just bought it.

How about the rights of the One who created us and everything we have? Doesn't He have any rights over us? Do we owe Him nothing for our existence; our sight; our loved ones; this world; etc.? Isn't it the pinnacle of ingratitude and arrogance to deny Him?!

In most of life's aspects, we already submit to God: we do not choose our parents; our genes; do not control our breathing; do not pump our own hearts; etc. Our Creator wants us to willingly submit in the other aspects, where He gave us free choice, i.e. in mind and heart.

But, God does not demand a submission based solely on our dependency. His requirement for us to worship Him is not because He needs worship - He is totally independent and Has no needs - but is for our own good. As our Creator, He knows what's best for us.

Our happiness in this life and the next can only come from submission to the Creator and following His revelation. When I visit a new location and ask a trusted resident for directions to a nearby attraction, I have two choices: I can either follow the directions or try to find my way through trial and error. If I chose the former, I will not be lost. If I chose the latter, I'm opening myself to hardship and the possible failure to reach the destination. The most logical and efficient way to get to an unknown destination is to take directions from a trustworthy source.

In the example above, if I decide to take the local resident's directions, he might help me further by walking with me part of the way or even

taking me there. But if I say no, I'll find my own way, he'll probably leave me to face the results of my obstinacy, and I might get lost. Similarly, if we accept God's guidance, he will provide us with more help and direction. But if we turn our back on it, He might leave us to flounder in our ignorance.

Say: "Shall We tell you who the greatest losers are? They are those whose effort is lost in this worldly life while they think that they are doing well!" Quran 18:103-104

But God is most Merciful. Even when we try to forget Him, He puts us in situations where we are forced to remember Him. Wherever we go we cannot escape God.

Look at how much time and energy atheists and agnostics spend in discussing Someone Whom they deny? Our Creator, because He knows how much we are dependent on Him and that an optimal life for us in this world and the next requires that we know Him, keeps Himself in our thoughts and words, surrounds us with His signs, sends revelation and keep questions about Him continuously in our minds.

C.S. Lewis said: "...night after night, feeling whenever my mind lifted even for a second from my work, the steady, unrelenting approach of Him whom I so earnestly desired not to meet. I gave in, and admitted that God was God."

Atheists and agnostics have taken the first step of denying false Gods and man-made distortion. God wants them to take the next step of knowing Him truly and accurately in all His Absolute Power, Glory and Mercy.

To guide people along this path, He appeals to our logic, heart and instincts. He reminds us of His blessings and offers incentives. He also gives us plenty of guidance. He sent prophets and preserved His last revelation (a manual for an optimum existence.)

If you think about it, He even put this book in your path.

How many more signs do we need?

What's at risk?

There are two possibilities after death:

1. The first possibility is that there is no God: In this case, no loss, no gain. However, the believer would have lived a more purposeful life in anticipation of something much greater. Decades of research show that religious people live longer lives, enjoy better psychological health and have higher emotional intelligence.

According to a 2018 study from Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, participation in spiritual practices during childhood and adolescence may be a protective factor for a range of health and well-being outcomes in early adulthood. The researchers found that people who attended weekly religious services or practiced daily prayer or meditation in their youth reported greater life satisfaction and positivity in their twenties. They were less likely to have depressive symptoms subsequently, smoke, use illicit drugs or have a sexually transmitted disease than people raised with less regular spiritual habits.¹⁶⁰

At the John Hopkins School of Public Health, Ying Chen and Tyler VanderWeele studied the associations of religious upbringing on health and well-being from adolescence to young adulthood. The results showed that weekly attendance of religious services was associated with greater life satisfaction and positive effects, several character strengths, lower probabilities of marijuana use and early sexual initiation and fewer lifetime sexual partners.¹⁶¹

In a 2019 study, published in the *Journal of Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, Laura Edinger-Schons studied the impact of “oneness” belief on life satisfaction. She found that those who believed in oneness were more satisfied with life.¹⁶²

Muslims, on average, had the highest mean value of oneness beliefs¹⁶³, followed by Christians who did not identify as Protestant or Catholic. This was followed by Buddhists, Hindu,

¹⁶⁰ <https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/news/press-releases/religious-upbringing-adult-health/>

¹⁶¹ *American Journal of Epidemiology*, Volume 187, Issue 11, November 2018, Pages 2355–2364, <https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwy142>.

¹⁶² <https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/releases/rel-rel0000259.pdf>

¹⁶³ The central ideology of Islam is “Tawheed”, which means Oneness of God and uniqueness of His attributes.

Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, other non-Christians and finally atheists.

Another 2019 study by Pew Research Center, a non-partisan fact tank, compared the lives of religious people and non-religious people by analyzing survey data from more than two dozen countries. The study found that religiously active people are typically happier (by a statistically significant margin), make healthier life choices and are more “civically engaged”.¹⁶⁴

2. The second possibility is that there is a God (the only possibility for a believer): In this case, the believer is the winner; attaining unlimited rewards in eternal life, while the non-believer is a big loser; subjected to a miserable eternal life, without parole or second chances.

Have they ever reflected on the wonders of the heavens and the earth, and everything God has created, and that perhaps their end is near? In what after this then will they believe? Quran 7:185

Gardens of perpetual residence, which they will enter, beneath which rivers flow. They will have therein whatever they wish. Thus, does God reward the righteous. Quran 16.31

So enter the gates of Hell to abide eternally therein, and how wretched is the residence of the arrogant. Quran 16:29

Many non-believers, when asked about the second outcome, say that God will be forgiving. It is a paradox how they believe God is forgiving but do not even believe He exists!

And I do not think the Hour (Day of Judgement) will occur. And even if I should be brought back to my Lord, I will surely find better than this as a return. Quran 18:36

It is possible that they will be forgiven - God is the Most Merciful - and it is good that they think so well of God.

The Prophet Muhammad, peace and blessings be upon him, said: “God the Highest said, “I am as My servant thinks (expects) I am.” Narrated by Al-Buhkari (also by Muslim, at-Tirmidhi and Ibn-Majah).

¹⁶⁴ <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/01/31/are-religious-people-happier-healthier-our-new-global-study-explores-this-question/>

Nonetheless, it is a considerable risk to count on forgiveness while turning your back on the Forgive; sometimes even fighting Him and turning people away from His path. In this world, we see examples of God's punishment, so we know He is capable of it.

Also, God is just and fair. How is it fair for someone who ignored God all their life to get the same reward as someone who devoted his/her life to God, and lived in accordance with His rules?

Shall We then treat the people of Faith like the people of Sin? What is wrong with your judgment? Quran 68:35-36

Pascal, the famous French philosopher, mathematician and physicist, argues that a rational person should live as though God exists and seek to believe in God. If God does not actually exist, such a person will have only a finite loss (some pleasures, luxury, etc.); whereas, if God exists, he stands to receive infinite gains (as represented by eternity in Paradise) and avoid infinite losses (eternity in Hell).

Sir Thomas Scott, the former Chancellor of England, said these famous words on his deathbed: "Until this moment I thought there was neither a God nor a Hell. Now I know and feel that there are both, and I am doomed to perdition by the just judgment of the Almighty."¹⁶⁵

We ask God for a merciful ending.

¹⁶⁵ <https://www.christian-faith.com/quotes-of-dying-atheists-and-god-haters/>

Conclusion

In summary...Atheism presents many contradictions:

It demands belief that the Big Bang happened, without any agency whatsoever, for no purpose whatsoever, to create everything, rearranged itself, again for no purpose, in orderly orbits; following steady interrelated laws, then gave itself the ability to repeat and reproduce the same bits and patterns, again for no purpose, yet without randomness, interruption or variation. We are asked to believe that intelligence, abstract thought and consciousness can spring somehow from dumb irrational sources, again for no purpose; that the giant encrypted information pack with ultimate execution powers - the DNA - wrote itself without a programmer, for no reason, and that dead matter can suddenly come alive, again for no purpose and without any agency.

Atheism has a confusing relationship with universal laws. On one hand it claims that laws such as gravity caused the universe and relies heavily on causality to practice science; on the other hand, it ignores causality when explaining the emergence of the universe and the emergence of life.

It adopts infinitesimally small probabilities and assumes amazing luck to bypass extreme fine-tuning arguments.

It practices self-deceit (calling God by any other name) when it grants God-like unique creative powers to dumb physical processes (gravity, natural selection, etc.) to explain away all difficult cosmological and evolutionary problems, without any real empirical basis or proof.

It devalues the human mind and casts doubt on its ability to rationalize and reach truthful conclusions, then practices a stolen concept fallacy when it uses rationality to practice science and reach scientific conclusions.

It practices hypocrisy in fighting “religious indoctrination” while indoctrinating school children in Darwin’s tree of life and Haeckel’s diagrams, despite the discrediting science.

Atheism accepts nothing short of empirical proof for a non-materialistic God, yet it has no problem explaining away our ethics, morality, free choice, consciousness and ability to think in abstract terms through unproven hypotheses and “just so” unsupported suppositions.

It denies any truth in the Bible and Quran: the two most read books on the planet, yet treats unsubstantiated Wikipedia attacks on the prophets as gospel.

It practices extreme design and precision; employs the best scientists; exercises painstaking planning to imitate existing life models (God's creation), in continuously failing attempts to produce the simplest living creature, yet denies intelligence, intention and design in creation and attributes the huge variety of life forms created on Earth to randomness and chance.

A call to cancel the mind, ignore logic and common sense and cling to science-fiction, all in the name of science!

We are blessed with several sources to acquire knowledge, common to all:

- trusted testimony: revelation from our Creator,¹⁶⁶ which tells us our purpose in life and provides the manual for an optimal existence,
- instinct: through which we know our Creator and turn to Him in times of trouble,
- innate knowledge: which is the pre-requisite for rational thought and scientific activity: e.g. every previously non-existent effect has a cause; a part is smaller than the whole, something cannot exist and not exist at the same time, etc.,
- ethics and morality: through which we know right from wrong,
- observation and senses: through which we study God's wonders on this Earth and in the Universe,
- proven empirical science, and
- choice (free will) to decide between options.

Why not use them *all* to investigate the unknown? Why restrict ourselves to unproven hypotheses when the stakes involve the very purpose of our life and our ending?

It seems the main theme of atheism is randomness and lack of purpose. How is this scientific, when science itself is built on causality, laws, and order? How can our existence lack an overall purpose when every part of our body and everything in the Universe was built for a specific purpose?

We are told to believe only in material things that we can observe. By that yardstick, how do we know the Universe exists? Physicists say that

¹⁶⁶ While the Quran, Bible and Torah all originated from God, the Quran is the only scripture still available in original language and text, free from any human modification.

we can only observe 4% of the Universe. Yet, we know that a vast Universe exists because of its effects. We believe that non-material things such as energy, consciousness, etc. exist because of their effects and their explanatory power to explain the phenomena around us. Similarly, even though we cannot see God, His effects surround us, and His existence is the only valid comprehensive explanation for the existence of this fine-tuned Universe and the consciousness of its inhabitants.

God is beyond human perception, yet He is the only explanation.

The Quran tells us that nobody has seen creation start:

I did not make them witness to the creation of the heavens and the Earth or the creation of themselves, and I would not have taken the misguided as assistants. Quran 18:51

So, we should stop claiming a monopoly on the truth when it comes to the unknown.

And they have thereof no knowledge. They follow only conjecture, and indeed, conjecture is no substitute for the truth at all. Quran 53:28

Here you are - arguing about that of which you have [some] knowledge, but why do you argue about that of which you have no knowledge? And God knows while you know not. Quran 3:66

Everything happens by design. For some reason, God put the information in this book in your hands. What you do with it is Your choice.

You know the saying: “You get what you expect.”

We can believe we are insignificant chemical scum; living a purposeless life, or that we are God’s honored vice-Regents on Earth with the Universe subjected for *our benefit*.

Do you not see that God has subjected to your benefit all that is in the heavens and earth, and has lavished on you His evident and hidden favors? Quran 31:20

We can believe in an eternal Universe with a temporary fleeting human appearance, *or* we can believe this Universe has a beginning and an end, but that *we* will continue for eternity.¹⁶⁷

We can believe in a multiverse with trillions of failed universes to justify the extreme fine-tuning of this one, *or* we can believe in at least two other designed universes along with this one: Paradise and Hell.

We can believe we are here on Earth just to eat, sleep and die; that we come from nothing and go back to nothing; that's a choice *or* we can believe that after death a blissful eternal life awaits us; where all our dreams come true; where we will see justice served, good deeds and patience rewarded and evil punished.

In any case, we may get everything we expect and more.

We are free to believe what we wish. God tells us there is no coercion in religion.

There shall be no compulsion in [acceptance of] religion. Quran 2:256

From a purely cost-benefit analysis, atheism presents a losing value proposition.

Atheism gradually unravels the components of humanity. It removes God (the refuge, the mercy, the forgiveness), purpose (role and mission in life), guidance (the divine manual), common sense (basic truths), acceptance and contentment (trust in God's plan), objective source for ethics and morality, free will (responsibility for actions) and the afterlife (hope).

And what does it offer in return?

Nothing!

Atheism promises us we go back to nothing and provides no rewards or compensation for the loss of our humanity.

This quote from William B. Provine¹⁶⁸, describes the dismal state of a Godless existence:

Let me summarize my views on what modern evolutionary biology tells us loud and clear — and these are basically Darwin's

¹⁶⁷ Although we have a beginning, God promises us eternal life.

¹⁶⁸ A Charles A. Alexander Professor of Biological Sciences at Cornell University.

views. There are no gods, no purposes, and no goal-directed forces of any kind. There is no life after death. When I die, I am absolutely certain that I am going to be dead. That's the end of me. There is no ultimate foundation for ethics, no ultimate meaning in life, and no free will for humans, either. What an unintelligible idea.¹⁶⁹

What a bleak prospect!

Why would anyone give up a chance to attain Paradise for hell on Earth?!!

But whoever turns away from My Reminder will certainly have a miserable life, then We will raise them up blind on the Day of Judgment.

Quran 20:124

Thank you, God, for the blessing of faith!

¹⁶⁹ <https://creation.com/wm-provine-evolution=-atheism-no-purpose>

*God, please do not let me despair of Your mercy
or complain about Your providence
or doubt Your existence
or miss Your clear signs
or become weary of worshipping You
or lose heart in championing You
or question Your wisdom
or hold hope in anyone but You*

References

Books

Khurafat Al Elhad, Dr. Amr Sharif, Shuruq International Library, 2nd Edition, 2014

Dialogue with an Atheist, Dr. Mostafa Mahmoud

https://docs.google.com/viewer?url=https://www.muslim-library.com/dl/books/English_Dialogue_with_an_Atheist.pdf

The man in the Red Underpants, A.R. Green https://www.muslim-library.com/dl/books/english_The_Man_in_the_Red_Underpants.pdf

The Divine Reality, Revised Edition, Hamza Andreas Tzortzis, FB Publishing, 2016

Websites

https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLZJAdKOoYHnR_xVhx7MVwMnrHZWf4HPnz

<https://youtu.be/GzWRmJ-dFr4>

<https://goharmukhtar.wordpress.com/2010/03/01/dr-lang-and-purpose-of-life/>

<https://www.rzim.org/read/just-thinking-magazine/stephen-hawking-and-god>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BihT0XrPVP8>

<https://academic.oup.com/aje/article/187/11/2355/5094534>

<https://www.bbc.com/news/business-33436021>

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/0591-2385.00140>

<https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/releases/rel-rel0000259.pdf>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sn7YQOzNuSc&feature=youtu.be>

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC8akAH9YAui92aJ0cFiSNGw>

https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCahYINszeMy_PHffYvgAOHg

<https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLN2jADncOIAL6oxjm5MreX63b0k5yZpwl>

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCLj8UF0cdFrvlh24Lw7jrgA>

