

Title: A Silencing Reply to Atheism

First Edition: 2018

Published by: Madrasah Arabia Islamia, Azaadville

## Contents

Introduction.....	4
Belief of a Divine Being .....	4
Comments.....	7
Previous Titles to This Booklet.....	8
A Reasoned and Level-Headed Response to an Atheist .....	9
Additional Notes:.....	37
The Creed of the Atheists .....	37
What Led to the Success of the Evolutionists?.....	38
What Proof is there that Muslim Lands were Greatly Advanced? .....	39
Why do people still deny the existence of a Supreme Being? .....	40
Scientific Racism.....	43
Appendix 1 .....	44
What is Science?.....	44
Philosophy of Science Yields Uncertain Knowledge .....	53
Appendix 2 .....	59

Interesting Quotations from Scientists on Evolutionism .....	59
Brief Answers to A Few of the Common Arguments Used To Support Evolutionists .....	65
Introduction.....	65
Eohippus .....	66
Vestigial Organs .....	66
Peppered Moths.....	67
Archaeopteryx .....	67
"Ontogeny Recapitulates Phylogeny" .....	68
The Miller-Urey Experiments.....	68
The Fossil Record .....	69
Why are Scientists Evolutionists? .....	70
Appendix 3 .....	74
Moral Foundations.....	77



## Introduction

All praises are only due to Allaah  $\Phi$ , who created, sustains and nourishes all of creation. Salaat and Salaam (Blessings and Peace) be upon His  $\Phi$  chosen Messengers, who informed us of the origin of life, the object of life and the destination which we are headed to, particularly our Master, Muhammad H.

## Belief of a Divine Being

It is clear from history and from the religious literature of different groups that belief in the existence of a Supreme Being has always existed in the people. In every age, and in every people, it has been accepted that this world has a Creator, and that He has great power. Therefore, the call and teachings of the messengers who were sent to different people at different times, stressed the Oneness of that Deity. They did not feel the need to stress the actual existence of a Supreme Deity. The reason for this is that for almost the whole of mankind, His  $\Phi$  actual existence is an accepted fact, and the existence of a Creator of the universe is as natural and self-evident a fact as a person's own existence. Therefore, this error has never been very widespread

among mankind. However, in recent times, the atheistic movements have been very successful in promoting their ideologies. An immense change is occurring on university campuses. The popularisation of atheistic publications and propaganda through social media, combined with fervent activism, have increased an environment of intellectual challenge and peer pressure. Any Muslim who is not equipped with the adequate spiritual, intellectual and theological tools to address these challenges can be misguided onto the irrational path of denying the Divinity. Atheism is not merely a figment of imagination, which is not based on any proof whatsoever, but a sinister tool of Shaytaan to lure people away from the truth.

Allah ﷻ says in the Quran, “Allah ﷻ created the heavens and the earth as required, and so that each soul may be rewarded for its earnings, and they shall not be wronged. Look at the one who has made his own lust his deity. And Allah ﷻ, knowing him as such, led him astray and set a seal upon his ears and his heart, and cast darkness over his eyes. So now who will bring him onto the path beside Allah ﷻ? Do you not ponder? They say, “There is nothing but our life of this world. We die and we live, and nothing but time destroys us.” They have no knowledge thereof. They are merely guessing. When Our clear verses are recited to them, they have no proof except that they say, ‘Bring forth our forefathers if you are truthful.’” (Surah Jaathiyah)

It should not be necessary to make a case for the existence of a Divine Being, who created the heavens and the earth, and everything in it, including mankind. The evidence is so obvious, that one is amazed that anybody could think otherwise. Unfortunately, many people are still in denial, despite all the evidence being presented to them. The evidence is basic common sense, logic and is also backed by solid scientific material. That all this be rejected, should be something to be amazed at. From the inception of mankind, there has been a battle between truth and falsehood. This battle will continue. Many people get swayed by the arguments put forward by those who reject the existence of a Divine Being, and argue that mankind came into existence through a process of evolution. Many of these adherents are scientists (who ought to know better). They are so enthralled by scientific “progress!!!” that they refuse to acknowledge the Divine Hand behind the running of the universe.

A parable narrated by Maulana Rumi  $\zeta$  illustrates the position of the scientists accurately. It is being reproduced here, with slight modification:

“Once an ant saw an artist draw a beautiful sketch on paper with his pen and pencil. The ant said in admiration: ‘What beautiful figures!’ Another ant came and said: ‘It is the pen

that has to be praised. It is the pen that is making those beautiful figures.’ Another ant came and said: ‘That pen is held in the fingers, so the fingers are creating those wonderful figures. The pen is merely its instrument.’ A fourth ant remarked: ‘Don’t you see the arm? These control the fingers which merely carry out the actions through the power of the arm.’ The dispute was referred to the queen of ants and she said: ‘These figures do not proceed from the pen, the fingers or the arm. These proceed from the mind. The mind controls all of these.’”

## Comments

- The first ant is like those scientists who see only as far as their noses, and are not prepared to consider anything that exists beyond that.
- The other ants represent those individuals who can see a bit more, but are still deprived of Reality.
- The queen ant appears to be the most correct in her assessment.
- However, there is a higher level of understanding: to realise that the mind of the artist is also controlled. This Control is by the Hand of the Almighty. He is in Control of everything. He gave the understanding and intelligence to

the artist to be able to use his senses and talent to draw the figures.

Atheists, playing on the ignorance and impressionability of young people, try to exert their influence over them by pseudo-scientific arguments. These ideologies are ingrained in the school syllabus and propagated by mass media. In universities, these ideas are given further impetus. The youth, through lack of information and lacking in skills to answer those who believe in evolution, are often left confused. This booklet is meant to provide some answers to rebuff some of the baseless arguments put forward by the atheists with their belief in the theory of evolution. Hopefully, in-sha-Allah, it may help the reader to be better informed when he/she does come across material that promotes the baseless theory of evolution.”

## Previous Titles to This Booklet

Previous titles to this booklet were, “Why pseudo-scientists fail to explain God?”, “Who is the Monkey?” and “A reasoned and level-headed response to an atheist.” The original article did its rounds over the Internet some time back. Different versions of the article exist. It is difficult to assess who wrote the original article and when it was written. Additions and deletions were made resulting in this copy, which is now before your hands.



Note: Obviously, with all the changes made to the original article, the “students” depicted here are fictitious.

## A Reasoned and Level-Headed Response to an Atheist

(The following scenario takes place at an educational institute.)

"Let me explain the problem science has with God..." The atheist professor of philosophy pauses before his class, and then asks one of his new students to stand. "You're a Muslim, aren't you, son?"

"Yes, sir."

"So, you believe in God?"

"Absolutely!"

"Is God good?"

"Sure! God's good!"

"Is God all-powerful? Can God do anything?"

"Yes."

The professor grins knowingly and considers for a moment.

"Here's one for you: Let's say there's a sick person over here and you can cure him. You can do it. Would you help him? Would you try?"

"Yes, sir. I would."

"So, you're good...!"

"I wouldn't say that."

"Why not say that? You would help a sick and maimed person if you could... In fact, most of us would if we could... God doesn't."

[No answer.]

"He doesn't, does he? My brother was a Muslim who died of cancer, even though he prayed to God to heal him. How is this God good? Hmm? Can you answer that one?"

[No answer.]

The elderly man is sympathetic. "No, you can't, can you?"

He takes a sip of water from a glass on his desk to give the student time to relax. In philosophy, you have to go easy with the new ones.

"Let's start again, young fella. Is God good?"

"Er... Yes."

"Is Satan good?"

"No."

"Where does Satan come from?"

The student falters.

"From... God..."

"That's right. God made Satan, didn't He?"

The elderly man runs his fingers through his thinning hair and turns to the smirking student audience. "I think we're going to have a lot of fun this semester, ladies and gentlemen."

He turns back to the Muslim. "Tell me, son. Is there evil in this world?"

"Yes, sir."

"Evil's everywhere, isn't it? Did God make everything?"

"Yes."

"Who created evil?"

[No answer.]

"Is there sickness in this world? Immorality? Hatred? Ugliness? All the terrible things - do they exist in this world?"

The student squirms on his feet. "Yes."

"Who created them?"

[No answer.]

The professor suddenly shouts at the student. "WHO CREATED THEM? TELL ME. PLEASE!" The professor closes in for the kill and climbs into the Muslim's face. He speaks in a small, deadly voice, "God created all evil, didn't He, son?"<sup>1</sup>

[No answer.]

The student tries to hold the professor's steady, experienced gaze, but fails.

---

<sup>1</sup> Things are recognized by their opposites. If there was no disease, how would one recognize health? If ugliness had not been created, how would beauty be understood? If there was no injustice, how would one explain justice? Without death, one would have never understood the value of life. Evil has to be in existence so that good can be recognized and valued. (Refer to Moral Foundations on page 34 as well as the answer given by the student on page 12)

Suddenly the lecturer breaks away to pace the front of the classroom like an ageing, confident panther. The class is mesmerised. "Tell me..." he continues, "How is it that this God is good if He created all the evil throughout all time?" The professor swishes his arms around to encompass the wickedness of the world. "All the hatred, the brutality, the pain, all the torture, all the needless deaths and ugliness, and all the suffering created by this good God is all over the world - isn't it, young man?"

[No answer.]

"Don't you see it all over the place? Huh?" The professor pauses. "Don't you?" The professor leans into the student's face again and whispers, "Is God good?"

[No answer.]

"Do you believe in God, son?"

The student's voice betrays him, and in a cracked voice he mutters, "Yes, professor. I do."

The old man shakes his head sadly. "Science says you have five senses that you use to identify and observe the world around you. You have never seen God, have you?"

"No, sir. I've never seen Him."

"Then tell us if you have ever heard your God?"

"No, sir. I have not."

"Have you ever felt your God, tasted your God, or smelt your God? In fact, have you any sensory perception of your God whatsoever?"

[No answer.]

"Answer me, please."

"No, sir. I'm afraid I haven't."

"You're AFRAID... you haven't?"

"No, sir."

"Yet, you still believe in Him?"

"Yes..."

"That takes FAITH!" The professor smiles sagely at the underling. "According to the rules of empirical, testable, demonstrable protocol, science says that your God doesn't exist. What do you say to that, son?"

Where is your God now?"

[The student does not answer.]

"Sit down, please!"

[The Muslim sits, browbeaten into apparent defeat. However, ***'the Help of Allah Φ is at hand, and victory is imminent.'***]

Another Muslim, wearing a religious cap, having a beard and easily identified as a Muslim by his dress, lifts his hand up.

"Professor, may I address the class?"

The professor turns and smiles. "Ah! Another Muslim in the vanguard. A "Fundamentalist"<sup>1</sup>, I see. Come, come, young man! Speak some proper wisdom to the gathering!"

---

<sup>1</sup> Today this word has an evil connotation. Actually, this is a term of honour, because it refers to a person who adopts and abides by the fundamental and basic principles of his religion.

The Muslim ignores the sarcasm in the tone of the professor. He looks around the room, waits for the attention of the students, and turns to the professor. "Sir, you have made some interesting points. With your permission, sir, I would like to tackle each point individually. This subject has to be tackled logically and scientifically, and not emotionally. The first point is your basic doctrine that God does not exist. The universe, therefore, started with the doctrine of 'The Big Bang' and through a process of evolution, Man finally came into existence. Is that not your belief, professor?"

"My son, it goes without saying. There is enough scientific evidence for this. What are you getting at?"

"Let us not be hasty. Let us use logic and reason and proper scientific argument. As a preamble, I wish to point out that I use the word 'doctrine' knowingly, for the priests of pseudo-science are, in fact, merely promoting atheism as a religion."

"Coming to the question of the origin of the universe: Firstly: I have a question for you, professor. We have in this world millions upon millions of fireworks, ammunition and bombs. Have you heard of any going off spontaneously, or do you admit that, although the ingredients may be in existence in a container, there is required a detonating mechanism to set off the explosions? Two factors have to be present: firstly, the correct ingredients in correct amounts in a suitable environment; and, secondly, somebody to set off the explosion, whether it be by means of a match stick, or the hammer of a pistol, or some electrical spark. For example, if

somebody said that he had a bullet in his hand and it went off on its own and killed somebody sitting nearby, would any scientist accept such a ludicrous statement?"

"Of course not. What are you trying to say?"

"Surely, then, if you want us to believe in the 'Big Bang', that a massive explosion took place on its own without anybody there to 'pull the trigger' or 'light a match' or set off an 'electrical spark', then explain to us how smaller bangs are not taking place all over the world without any external agency? Any scientific claim has to be reproducible for it to be accepted.

Secondly, it is also common knowledge that when a bang takes place, things break, shatter or explode. It is amazing that a bang of such power and energy, instead of causing destruction and chaos, brought everything together with such precision and perfection that boggles the mind. Just one example: if the sun was slightly further away in its orbit, we would all freeze to death. If, on the other hand, the sun had to be closer to the earth in its orbit, we would all be burnt to cinders. That this has been so for countless years is in itself a miracle and proof of a Divine Being in Control of the Universe."

The professor's mouth opens, but no words come out.

"Thirdly, we know that it is scientifically impossible for matter to create itself. Take this wooden desk. It did not come into existence by itself. Some external agency had to make it. Even the wood did not come into existence by itself.

It came from a seed that was planted and nourished. The seed itself came from some source and could not come into existence by itself. Can you explain to us how the original matter came into existence - matter that the priests of pseudo-science state was ignited by the mysterious 'Big Bang' to produce the first matter? (See page 81 for more details)<sup>1</sup> Also, why are your priests not able to reproduce this phenomenon in the laboratory?<sup>1</sup> Professor, you must know that any scientific argument must be reproducible for it to have any scientific credence."

"Son, it is naive to think that we can do such a thing. The energy that was unleashed with the 'Big Bang' was such that we do not have access to, otherwise we would also have reproduced the same phenomenon."

"Professor, you have not told us who provided the basic ingredients, and you are unable to tell us who it was who

---

<sup>1</sup> People like Oparin, Haladine and Miller tried to prove the existence of life by itself in their laboratories. Miller tried to prove that amino acids could have come into existence "by chance" on the lifeless earth billions of years ago. In fact, by his experiment, Miller only proved that amino acids can only be produced in a controlled lab environment where all the conditions are specifically designed by conscious intervention.

Numerous experiments confirmed that Oparin-Haldane theory is invalid. See [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/300203242\\_Invalid\\_Oparin-Haldane's..](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/300203242_Invalid_Oparin-Haldane's..) for more details on the subject.



pushed the button or pulled the trigger or lit the matches for the 'Big Bang' to take place. Where did this tremendous energy that you are speaking about, originate? Come, come, professor! Let us be scientific about it. Yes, professor, it takes a lot of FAITH in the doctrinal teachings of the priests of pseudo-science to believe in their version of the creation of the universe. Do you expect us to discard proper scientific principles and believe in all this hocus-pocus on blind faith in the face of definitive scientific principles?"

[No answer.]

Fourthly, the claim that non-living materials can come together to form life is an unscientific one that has not been verified by any experiment or observation. Life is only generated from life. Each living cell is formed by replication of another cell. No one in the world has ever succeeded in forming a living cell by bringing inanimate materials together, not even in the most advanced laboratories. Nowadays, we know that the cell is the most complex system mankind has ever confronted. Never mind the cell, evolution cannot account for the building blocks of a cell. The formation of just one single protein out of the thousands of complex protein molecules making up the cell is impossible.

"Fifthly, according to the second law of thermodynamics, any system left on its own deteriorates. For example, if you leave a car outside in natural conditions, it will eventually rust and decay. This would also have happened if, over the

'billions' of years, the universe came into existence 'by chance'. Scientists have not seen this. Instead, they have seen a wonderful, highly complex and well-balanced universe remain in existence.

"So professor, modern scientific research is showing just the opposite of what the atheists are claiming. In other words, there has to be a Divine Being: One Who Created the whole universe and everything in it to such a degree of perfection that the human mind cannot comprehend! Can those who reject this provide us with an alternate explanation? "

[No answer.]

"If you don't mind, professor, I will now go on to the doctrine of evolution as promulgated by the priests of pseudo-science. You are aware that no fossils have been shown that would directly link the descent of Man from the ape-like ancestors and that there is a constant search for what is termed, the 'Missing Link'?"

"Yes, but there is so much other evidence..."

"Sorry to interrupt, professor. You admit there is no direct link. You must also admit that there are no fossils showing definite intermediary steps in the transition from ape-like ancestors to Man.<sup>1</sup> In fact, the fossil record clearly indicates

---

<sup>1</sup> Eldredge and Gould 1972 proposed the "punctuated equilibrium" theory. This theory seeks to explain why there is a lack of missing links/transitional fossils. Two basic hypotheses are accepted by accepting this: a.) macro-mutations bring advantages and produce new

that living things did not evolve from primitive to advanced forms, but instead emerged all of a sudden in a fully formed state. This provides evidence for saying that life did not come into existence through random natural processes, but through an act of intelligent creation. According to recent findings, all animal phyla known today emerged at the same time, in the middle of the geological period known as the Cambridge Age. The fossils found in Cambrian rocks belong to very different creatures, such as snails, trilobites, jellyfish, starfish, etc. most of the creatures in this layer have complex systems and advanced structures, such as eyes, gills, and circulatory systems, exactly the same as those in modern specimens. Till now, evolutionists have been unable to answer how the earth came to overflow with such a great number of animal species all of a sudden, and how these distinct types of species with no common ancestors could have emerged at a similar time.

And I'm sure you are also aware of the Piltdown Forgery as well as the Nebraska man, professor?"

"Piltdown...? Nebraska...?"

---

genetic information - However this conflicts with known facts of genetics. b.) Small animal populations have greater potential for genetic change - Scientific discoveries do not support this claim. This claim is actually less valid than the model of evolution proposed by mainstream Neo-Darwinists.

"Let me refresh your memory, professor. Some fossils were discovered in a place called Piltdown in England. These fossil-remains showed all the features that all the priests of pseudo-science and atheism were searching for as the 'Missing Link' in the chain of evolution. The whole world was led to believe in it, and even the sceptics were convinced - until it was found, some forty years later, that someone from the scientist-priest fraternity had 'doctored' the fossils to make them appear to be the missing link (it had the cranium of a human and the jaw of an orangatang attached). It was a big lie, a massive forgery that your priests had forged to try and convince the world that the religion of atheism was true and Man had descended from the apes! If you want more enlightenment on it you can read the works of Professor Tobias<sup>1</sup>, of South Africa, and others on the details of the forgery.

In 1922, a person by the name Osborn found a fossil molar tooth. This was named the Nebraska man. Some claimed it belonged to a species of an ape, whilst others claimed it appeared to be closer to human beings. Based on this tooth, reconstructions of Nebraska man's head and body were drawn. He was even pictured along with his wife and children. Eventually it was realized that the tooth belonged

---

<sup>1</sup> Although a Darwinist himself, Professor Tobias found the forgery to be too much to swallow.

to an extinct species of a wild American pig. All the drawings were quickly removed thereafter."

The professor's face goes an ashen white. Still no comment. "Speaking about forgeries - professor, do you know what plagiarism is? Can you explain to the class what plagiarism is?"

Rather hesitantly, the professor speaks, "Plagiarism is to take somebody else's work and pass it off as one's own."

"Correct. Thank you, professor. If you were to take the trouble of doing a bit of honest and truthful research you will find that the Western nations had plagiarised all the TRUE scientific works of the Muslims and then built on it and passed them off as their own 'discoveries', which led to modern scientific progress. Great Muslim personages made scientific discoveries while Europe was still in the Dark Ages. Their teachings were taken to Europe, and provided the stimulus for the Renaissance. The relevance of this is that, unlike in the West, there was no conflict between religion and science in the Muslim countries. Islam proved to be a boost for genuine scientific research, as borne out by the contributions of Muslims to science, astronomy, biology and other fields. Scientists who had a firm belief in a Divine Creator were inspired to make great advances in all branches of knowledge. "

By now the class is fully attentive to the Muslim student's words and they hastily jot down notes.

"Let us come back to the doctrine of evolution which the priests of pseudo-science have fostered on the world. The back-bone of all their doctrines is the concept of 'natural selection'.<sup>1</sup> This means that species adapted to the changes in the environment by a change in morphology and physiology, changes which they then passed on to succeeding generations, enabling them to survive; while those which did not adapt, became extinct, put forward as 'Survival of the fittest'. The classic example given is that of giraffes, who evolved from short necked antelopes who struggled to eat the leaves of high trees till their necks extended from generation to generation, or the example of bears evolving into whales over time by going into water to find food. Also, during the course of evolution, what was of no use anymore, disappeared, like tails and claws, being replaced with tail-less species with hands which could hold, the final result being Man. You do subscribe to this doctrine, don't you, professor?" (See page 86 for more details)<sup>ii</sup>

The poor professor is unsure whether to nod or not, as he is uncertain from which angle the next salvo is coming!

"Come, come, professor! This is the cornerstone of the doctrine of evolution which you priests have been brainwashing the unwary masses with. Let us challenge this

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: The laws of inheritance discovered by Mendel and verified by the science of genetics disproved this theory.

pseudo-science with true science. Professor, has any scientist ever produced any new species of life in his laboratory by controlling and changing the environment? Remember, science can only accept material doctrines if they are reproducible."

[No answer.]

Darwin said, "If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down." Today, science has shattered the basis of this theory. Key branches of science, such as palaeontology, biochemistry, population genetics, comparative anatomy, and biophysics, indicate one after another that natural laws and chance effects proposed by the theory cannot explain the origin of life. Life turns out to be infinitely more complex than Darwin imagined in his time, demonstrating that his theory has absolutely 'broken down.'

The Muslim student continues. Turning to the professor, he says, "There are so many holes in the doctrine of evolution that it leaks like a sieve. However, time is running out - I have to rush for prayers shortly - so we will not deal with all the myths now. Let us go on to the topic of morality that you raised.

But, before that, let us look at the point you made about your brother dying of cancer. If you are upset that he died, then you are absolutely foolish. That human beings, as well as all living matter, will certainly die is such an established fact, that it is believed in by all people, irrespective of whether they believe in God or not, and nobody can really object to the process of death.

"Secondly, you cannot be so naive as to object to the process of illness - whether it being cancer, or any other illness, or an accident, etc. - as a prelude to the process of death. Your objection stems from your misconception that 'goodness' is to relieve suffering, and to cause suffering is being 'cruel'. If this was so, then, professor, you have no choice but to agree that the cruelest people in the world are the medical research-scientists who use animals for all their horrible experiments. Surely you must be aware of the thousands upon thousands of animals that are tortured in different ways and made to suffer a million agonies, to prove, or disprove certain scientific and medical claims? Are these experimenters not cruel? You're still with me, professor?"

The professor looks quite ill. The Muslim student goes across and gives him some water to drink.

"Professor, I'm going to ask you another obvious question. You are aware of examinations - tests that are given to students in order for them to pass and be promoted to the next grade?"

The professor merely nods his head.



"A student has to make certain sacrifices, and even live away from home, to attend a university or college; he has to deprive himself of all home comforts; he is loaded with work; he has to give up his leisure time, and his sleep in order to get ready for the examinations; then he is faced with horribly difficult questions to answer in the examination, and he may also be grilled in his oral examination - and he still has to pay the institution for putting him through this torturing process! - You do not consider all this to be cruel? Is the professor a 'good' person for all the mental and physical suffering he is putting the student through?"

"I do not see your point. Of course, the institution and the professor are doing the student a favour by putting him through a training process in order for him to qualify in his particular field. Only a very short-sighted person would object to students having to write examinations, irrespective of the sacrifices they have to make."

The Muslim student sadly shakes his head. "Professor, it is amazing how you can understand the need for tests and examinations when you have to set them, but you can't see the same wisdom when God sets tests and examinations for His Creatures. Take your brother - if he withstood the test of his illness and he died with faith, what we term as Imaan - he will be rewarded abundantly in Paradise for the suffering that he underwent here. So much so, that he would wish that he had suffered a hundred times more, so that his

reward would be so much greater, a reward that no eye has seen and no mind has imagined! Unfortunately, 'only a very short-sighted person' - and an ignorant one - would object to the tests placed on His Creation by God, bearing in mind the everlasting rewards awaiting those who are successful."

"Paradise? Huh! Have you seen Paradise, touched it, smelt it, tasted it, heard it? According to the rules of empirical, testable, demonstrable protocol, science says that your Paradise doesn't exist."

"We will come to that point also, God willing. We say that God is all Mercy and Goodness. He has not enjoined evil, but allowed its existence for a wise purpose. God only enjoins justice, forbearance and benevolence. Why then does He permit the unjust, the murderers and the thieving to perpetrate their deeds? "

The Muslim student continues. "If there is evil in this world, professor - and we all agree that there is - then God must be accomplishing some work through the agency of evil. What is that work that God is accomplishing? Islam tells us it is to see if each one of us will choose good over evil."

The professor bristles. "As a philosophical scientist, I don't view this matter as having anything to do with any choice. As a realist, I absolutely do not recognise the concept of God or any other theological factor as being part of the world equation, because God is not observable."

"I would have thought that the absence of God's Moral Code is probably one the most observable phenomenon going,"

the Muslim student replies. "Newspapers make billions of dollars reporting on it every week. Professor, you have tried to put the blame of the evil in this world on the shoulders of God - in whom you don't believe - which is an obvious contradiction. However, let us analyse who is really responsible for the spread of evil - those who believe in God, or those who don't? A fundamental belief that a Muslim has is that of being resurrected on the Day of Judgement and answering for his actions in this world. For every good that he did, he will be rewarded; and for every evil that he committed, he will be held responsible. Every Muslim has to believe that he/ she is responsible for his/her actions and that nobody else will bear his/her burden on the Day of Judgement. The concept of Paradise being a reward for the believers, and that Hell will be the abode of the disbelievers, the infidels, is also a fundamental belief; as well as the belief that even Muslim wrongdoers will be punished for their misdeeds. Professor, these concepts have stopped countless millions of Muslims from committing wrong. We all know that punishment is a strong deterrent for committing crimes. Without this concept we would not be able to run our worldly affairs: fines, penalties, jail sentences are part and parcel of any civilised system.

On the other hand we have the priests of atheism who do not believe in these concepts, when they are mentioned in relation to moral issues. To them there is no Day of Judgement, no accountability, no reward, no punishment.

The message to the masses is quite clear, that 'if you can get away with it, then you are O.K. You have nothing to worry about'. Also, seeing that they state that there is no such thing as sin - sin, in our context, means going against the Laws of God - each individual is free to do anything he wishes, and no action can be labelled as 'wrong'. Let me put it this way: The atheist priests maintain that God does not exist. If He does not exist, then He can't have set down any rules of what is right and what is wrong - thus there can't be sin, sin means going against the wishes of God. So, man is free to make up his own rules, his own code of 'morality'. Thus men get 'married' to men; women get 'married' to women; to spread AIDS and other diseases is O.K.; there is nothing sinful with adultery and fornication, as long as those involved are 'consenting adults'; according to the logic of the atheists, even incest would not be sinful, if the parties are 'consenting adults', seeing incest is a sin based on a code of morality with its basis being religion, whereas the professor has categorically stated that he 'absolutely does not recognise the concept of God or any other theological factor as being part of the world factor'; to kill infants in their mothers' wombs is fine - it is exercising the 'rights' that the woman has; and so forth. The list of 'rules' passed by the atheist social pseudo-scientists priests is endless.

The height of intellectual dishonesty is to place the blame for the spread of this immorality and filth on God! Let us be scientific about the whole issue, professor. Take a group of

people who are God-conscious - who believe in Him, as he should be believed in - and take a group of people who are adherents to your atheistic creed. Assess, objectively, who is spreading evil. I don't wish to labour the point, but any objective observer will immediately see that the group of God-conscious people who use the Laws of the Almighty as their code of morality, are in fact, spreading goodness; whereas the those who make up their own rules of 'relative morality' are, in fact, the ones spreading evil throughout the world." (See page 89 for the reason behind the Creation of Heaven and Hell)<sup>iii</sup>

The Muslim student pauses for these important remarks to sink in. The eyes of the students in the class light up as they see these issues in a clearer light. Nobody had ever explained these important issues to them before, having being brought up on the diatribe spewed forth by the mass media.

"Professor, I am amazed, but not surprised, at your unscientific attitude to morality. I am amazed that, even though you believe that Man evolved from ape-like ancestors, he will not behave like an animal! I am amazed that, even though you do not believe in angels, you expect Man to behave like one on his own accord, without the assistance of a Divine Moral Code. The reason that I'm not surprised is that such muddled thinking is to be expected from those who are adherents of the false creed of atheism!" There is a burst of spontaneous applause from the class.

"We have already discussed evolution, professor. Have you ever observed speciation (formation of a new species) with your own eyes, sir?"

The professor makes a sucking sound with his teeth and gives the student a silent, stony stare.

"Professor, since no one has ever observed the process of speciation at work and cannot even prove that this process is an ongoing endeavour, are you not teaching a doctrine - a doctrine that leaks like a sieve and has less merit to it than any theological teachings? This is pseudo-science, not science, and its proponents are nothing but its ignorant priests!"

The professor goes blue in the face. "What impudence!" He huffs and puffs and strides up and down in front of the class, finally managing to regain some of his self-control. "In the light of our philosophical discussion, I'll overlook your impudence, son. Now, have you quite finished?" The words come out as a hiss.

"Sir, you don't accept God's moral code to do what is righteous?"

"I believe in what is - that's science."

"Sir, with due apologies, what you believe in is not science, but pseudo-science - and your pseudo-science is also flawed!"

"PSEUDO-SCIENCE.....? FLAWED...?" The professor looks as if he is going to have a fit. The class is in an uproar. The

Muslim student stands cool and calm, that wisp of a smile back on his face.

When the commotion subsides, he continues, "You see, professor, TRUE SCIENCE is to discover the laws and designs that the Creator of the universe has put into the system of the running of the universe, from the mega to the micro, from the measurable to the immeasurable. Pseudo-science is an atheistic religion that tries to oppose this concept by forgeries, manipulation of statistics, half-truths, etc. Pseudo-science postulates a mythical unnamed force - their own, man-made, false deity - caused a "Big Bang" and then started a process of evolution that is contrary to what actually happened. The priests of this atheistic religion are the ones that try to justify the gibberish that must accompany such falsehood, by means of forgeries, half-truths and manipulation of data. Truth must win - the truth of the logical conclusion anybody with any sense can deduce, that there is one God (Allah)  $\Phi$  who is the Creator of the whole universe. He created the whole system whereby the whole universe has been running smoothly from time immemorial. Let us go back to the point you had made earlier to the other student, and which I said I will deal with later. You postulated that 'the rule of empirical, testable, demonstrable protocol' is the principle you go on. This rule is flawed. Let us apply it: Is there anyone in the class who has seen oxygen? Is there anyone here who has heard it, felt it, or tasted it? Nobody has. Yet we know, based on the

evidence of reliable scientists, that oxygen exists and can be demonstrated indirectly by the effects of its presence or absence. Let us apply this rule to another situation. Is there anyone here who has ever heard the professor's brain, felt it, smelt it or tasted it? Because no one here has had any sensory perception of the professor's brains whatsoever, we cannot conclude that the professor has no brains. To the contrary, we can see the effects of the functioning of the brain, and this is sufficient to indicate that the professor has a brain. (See page 91 – Points to consider.)<sup>iv</sup>

The professor buckles into a chair. The class again applauds spontaneously.

The student goes and ministers some water to the professor, who recovers slowly. He glares at the student. "Your insults in no way proves the existence of God."

The Muslim student replies. "Professor, I'm really surprised. I would have thought that you would have conceded defeat. But, it seems that you want further arguments."

He pauses, looks very thoughtfully at the class, and then at the professor. With a heavy sigh and obvious reluctance, he addresses the professor again. "Sir, you have parents - you have a father and a mother?"

"Another of your stupid questions. It is obvious that we all have parents."

"Be patient, sir. Are you certain that your father is your father, and that your mother is your mother?"



The professor goes livid. "How preposterous! OF COURSE, MY FATHER IS MY FATHER, AND MY MOTHER IS MY MOTHER!" He is shouting. The Muslim student pauses. The pause becomes lengthy. There is an eerie atmosphere suddenly as the students sit on the edge of their chairs. With a quiet well controlled voice, the Muslim student says, "Prove it to me!"

The atmosphere is electric. The professor is unable to control himself. His face changes to a purple hue. "HOW DARE YOU!" He is shouting even louder, quite beside himself. "I'VE HAD ENOUGH OF YOUR INSULTS..! GET OUT OF MY CLASS..! I'LL REPORT YOU TO THE RECTOR...!"

The class sits petrified at the outburst. Is the professor heading for a fit or a stroke?

The Muslim student stands his ground, unruffled. Facing the class he lifts his hand up, reassuring them that there is nothing to worry about. He then turns his compassionate eyes on the professor. A force appears to emanate from his eyes, directed at the professor. The professor cannot maintain his stare. His gaze drops. His anger subsides. He flops back into his chair and holds his head in his hands.

After a few minutes, the Muslim student speaks, very gently. "Dear professor, I am not implying that your parents are not your parents. All I am trying to point out is that neither you, nor me, nor any of us in this class can prove that our parents are our parents or not."

Complete silence.

"The reason is that we did not witness the act of intercourse between our parents when we were conceived. We were not present to identify whose sperm it was that fertilised the ovum in our mother's womb. We take our parents word for it that they are our parents. We consider our parents to be honest and truthful in the matter. We do not question them their integrity. In the same way, your children will have to take your word that you are their father, and that their mother is really their mother. Is that not so, professor?"

The professor lifts up his head. He looks up at the Muslim student. One can see his face clearing up as some understanding dawns on him. The anger is gone. Very slowly he repeats, "We take the words of our parents... We take the words of our parents..."

"Yes, professor. We have to accept the word of our parents, as in many other things."

"But," the professor thinks he has found a flaw in the Muslim student's argument, "there are other sources of information besides the words of our parents, like DNA tests, to prove parenthood."

"You are wrong again in your reasoning, professor. Yes, there are laboratory tests to validate claims of parenthood. However, can anybody go to a laboratory and instruct the technician, 'Here, take some blood samples, and tell me who my parents are.' He will be told not to be foolish. The laboratory can only compare samples of DNA from the parents, as well as the offspring to verify whether the

parents are telling the truth or not. In other words, the tests do not tell you who your parents are, but they merely confirm or reject the claims of parents with regard to parenthood.

Even then, we have to take the word of the technician, as well as have enough FAITH in his technical skill to accept his findings. You see, professor, there are so many things that we have to take the word of others. The existence of air, of oxygen, of molecules, of atoms, and so forth.

So, when it comes to matters that are metaphysical, from our real scientific research we know that there have been no persons existing in the world more honest and reliable than those who are termed Messengers (Rasools). We Muslims are prepared to stake our lives on the fact that Muhammed H had an absolutely flawless character. He never lied to anybody. His integrity was such that even his avowed enemies called him 'Al-Ameen' (the Truthful). If he said that God (Allah  $\Phi$ ) exists - and we are prepared to accept the word of our parents that they are our parents- then, in all sincerity and honesty, we have to accept his word for it, as we have to accept many other things - the existence of Paradise and Hell; the existence of angels; the coming of the Day of Judgement; accounting to God for our deeds in this world; and many other concepts.

Besides this one point, there are many other pointers to the existence of God (Allah  $\Phi$ ). The Revelation called 'Al-Quran' is there for anybody to study. It has certain specific

challenges for anybody who has any doubts. These challenges have not been met in the fourteen hundred years of its existence. If one is not prepared to believe in such a Messenger - peace be on him - then it is pure hypocrisy to accept the word of scientists, whose doctrines keep on changing, and even to believe in the word of our parents. Judging from the number of law-suits that take place every year in our courts, where parents deny parentage of their offspring, and also taking into account that there are innumerable babies conceived from donor sperms of men who are strangers, and also the fact that innumerable infants are adopted in infancy by childless couples, and brought up as their own children, statistically there is room for a large degree of error in any person's claim that his/her parents are really his/her biological parents."

Turning to the class the Muslim student concludes. "It is every individual's duty to learn more about Islam. Al-Quran is there for everybody to study. Enough literature is also available on Islam. It is my duty only to inform you that the only Truth is Islam. *"There is no compulsion in religion. Clearly the right way has become distinct from error; And he who rejects false deities and believes in Allah  $\Phi$  (God), has grasped a firm handhold which will never break; And Allah  $\Phi$  is All-Hearing and All-Knowing."* Having informed you, it is also my duty to invite you to join the brotherhood of Muslims by embracing Islam. *"Allah  $\Phi$  is the Protecting Guardian of those who believe. He brings them out of darkness*

*into the light. As for those who disbelieve, their guardians are false deities. They bring them out of light into darkness..."*

These are verses from Al-Quran - Words of the Almighty - which I have quoted to you."

The Muslim student looks at his watch. "Professor and students, I thank you for having giving me the opportunity to explain these issues to you. If you would kindly excuse me, I have to go for my prayers. Peace on those who are rightly guided."

## Additional Notes:

### The Creed of the Atheists

Atheists have been in existence since time immemorial. Each time they lifted their heads up they were adequately defeated. However, in the late 1800's, Europe experienced an upsurge of those who did not believe in the existence of a Divine Being. Some of the factors which played a part in this are:

- The exploitation of the masses by the Church and state.
- The economic exploitation of workers, especially in the wake of the industrial revolution.
- The clash between the Church and men of science.

As a result the antipathy to religion became such that religion was referred to as “the opium of the masses”. It was in this fertile ground that Lamarck and then Darwin put forward the theory of evolution. They stated that the universe was not created by a Divine Being but came into existence by itself. Some matter combined to form life, and these rudimentary cells then went on to develop into more and more sophisticated forms of life. Marine life then evolved into terrestrial life and so forth, until evolution resulted in the vegetable, animal and human life coming into existence as we see now.

## What Led to the Success of the Evolutionists?

The factors mentioned above were crucial. However, the evolutionists’ success could also be attributed to the ignorance of the masses. Scientific knowledge in the West was very rudimentary, and the masses were kept in ignorance. The conclusions of “scientists” were looked upon as Gospel. Their theories found acceptance, especially when the masses were led to believe that their miserable conditions would improve if they turned to the god of materialism, especially by adopting communism.

It should be noted that this phenomenon took place largely in Christian Europe, and only later spread to China. The

point is that Muslims were by and large unaffected. There was no conflict between Islam and science. On the contrary, Islam proved to be the catalysts for scientists to soar high into the different sciences, causing Muslim lands to enjoy a very advanced society, when Europe was still experiencing the Dark Ages.

## What Proof is there that Muslim Lands were Greatly Advanced?

There are numerous proofs, recorded by Muslims and by non-Muslims. Details of the contributions of Muslims to science in general, and medicine in particular, may be found at: <http://www.1001inventions.com/>; [muslimheritage.com](http://muslimheritage.com) (and many other sites.)

While many attribute these achievements to be purely materialistic, they ignore the religious training and thinking that went before it. If it was simply a question of academic and material exercises, Europe would have also flourished by simply importing the institutions that existed in Muslim lands. The Europeans tried this, but failed dismally. It was only after they had studied Islam thoroughly, and tried to understand the underlying ethos, that they experienced what they call the Renaissance.

## Why do people still deny the existence of a Supreme Being?

One would have thought that with the great strides made in scientific fields and the obvious fact that stares us all in the face that there is a Supreme Designer and Creator, atheists would have ceased to exist. However, we do not see this.

Some of the reasons that come to mind are:

- People are in denial. For example: If a person does not want to accept that he/she has cancer, despite all the evidence, nothing will convince that person. Some atheists are the same.
- People who lack proper knowledge are easily led astray by die-hard atheists. These use forgery and lies to prop up a view that is just not sustainable. The famous Piltdown Hoax is the classic example. Not only ordinary people but even so-called “scientists” were fooled by the deceit. That one of the scientists was given the great honour of knighthood by the Queen must have removed any doubts that ordinary people may have had concerning the discovery of the “missing link”. Even more amazing is the fact that for 40 years nobody questioned the findings and many “scholars” even obtained post-graduate degrees on further studies of the forgery!
- That mutations cause progressive, improved development in species, is a blatant lie peddled by atheists. Mutations



usually cause disfigurements as can be seen by the great upsurge of abnormal births witnessed after exposure to radiation, as in Hiroshima and, more recently, in Iraq.

- If, for arguments' sake, mutations caused man to evolve from ape-like ancestors, for this to take place thousands of mutations must have taken place simultaneously and overnight for the infant of an ape to have been born with complete human features. A "gradual" evolution would imply somebody being in charge and directing the gradual progress. Gradual progressive evolution is impossible to occur "by chance".
- Another important aspect not brought to peoples' attention is: in addition to the miraculous and simultaneous mutations of thousands of genes that need to take place overnight, an exact similar set of mutations have to take place in a short span of time within a certain radius. Yes, there has to be one difference: if the first "human" was a male, this second must be a female; or vice versa. If both mutations resulted in the same sex of the infants, there would be no further descent. One also has to look at them finding one another, mating, the female not being infertile, etc. That all this took place at all by chance is statistically impossible.
- One obvious fact glossed over by evolutionists is, that they cannot account for failed models. If evolution took place "by chance" there would have been millions of fossils that had failed to survive, because they were not perfect. No such

fossils exist. All fossils found are “perfect specimens.” This is such an obvious argument against the theory of evolution, that one is surprised that so few people pay any attention to it.

- If left to “chance” the number of defective models that would need to arise before the perfect model, would be astronomical. Put simply, if the chance of a perfect model was one in ten, one would expect nine imperfect or failed models. If the chance was one in hundred, than there would be ninety-nine imperfect or failed models per one perfect model. But the chances of human genes being formed as such, are so remote that – in the words of Professor David L. Block – “no sane biochemist would argue that a single gene, let alone a human genome, was spontaneously formed.”

- A single protein has totally demolished evolution
- Darwinists HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO PRODUCE A SINGLE EXPLANATION OF HOW JUST ONE PROTEIN CAME INTO BEING
- DNA is essential for a single protein to form
- DNA cannot form without protein
- Protein cannot form without DNA
- Protein cannot form in the absence of protein
- Protein cannot form in the absence of any one of the proteins which serve in the manufacture of protein
- Protein cannot form without ribosome
- Protein cannot form without RNA

- Protein cannot form without ATP
- Protein cannot form without the mitochondria to manufacture ATP
- Protein cannot form without the cell nucleus
- Protein cannot form without the cytoplasm
- Protein cannot form in the absence of a single organelle in the cell
- And proteins are necessary for all the organelles in the cell to exist and function
- There can be no protein without these organelles.

## Scientific Racism

*“This is the use of scientific or pseudo-scientific techniques and hypotheses to support or justify the belief in racism, racial inferiority, or racial superiority, or alternatively the claim of classifying individuals of different phenotypes into discrete races or ethnicities.”*

Darwinists will quote Darwin’s “The Origin of Species”. However, they studiously avoid mentioning that he also wrote a book “The Descent of Man” in which he expresses his racist views. While proposing a sole human species, Darwin contrasted the “civilized races” (white) with the “savage races” (non-white).

## Appendix 1

### What is Science?

Science is a name applied to the endeavour to discover, and understand the world we live in, through a combination of observation, and reasoning based there-on; for instance, the attempt to discover the properties of water (when it boils, freezes, evaporates, etc.) by observing the changes that take place under specific circumstances, and then forming conclusions as to how this piece of information relates to other information we already know, is called science.

Science consists of two parts: a.) A METHODOLOGY b.) A PHILOSOPHY

Grasping the significance of both are crucial to understanding the limitations of science as a discipline. Hence we will provide a brief description of them both below.

1. METHODOLOGY OF SCIENCE: The Scientific Method is the process used in carrying out the *activity* of science. This includes stipulating the subject matter and questions, as well as the means of verifying those answers.

The above explanation can be simplified in the following way:

*The Scientific Method Focuses On The Material World:* Science only deals with the material world. “Material” refers to those things in the world which are generally perceived through the five senses, rather than through the mind. Heat, light, human behaviour, ecosystems, planetary movements, chemical substances, all fall under the direct umbrella of science due to the fact that they are perceivable, directly or indirectly. On the other hand, questions such as; “What is the meaning of life?”, “What constitutes morality”, “Does the soul exist?”, “Does God exist?” do not fall under the scope of science, either because they are not of a physical nature, and hence, are not perceivable nor falsifiable via our perception, or exists outside the limitations of time and space.

*It Seeks To Explain The Material World:* Science tries to specifically explain: how the natural world works, what it is made out of and how it came to be as we see and experience it today. Questions such as, “What is soil made up of?”; “How does the heart pump blood?”; “How did rocks from outer space get here?” are all part of the scientific process.

*Its Ideas Must Be Testable:* The questions and hypotheses that science deals with, must be testable. What is meant by testable is that the question or hypothesis must be able to produce;

- a) A specific set of results if it is *correct*
- b) A different set of results if it is *incorrect*

For example: if a hypothesis claims that the heart beats faster when a person is in love, the claim should be verifiable by conducting an experiment that can produce either one of two results. If an increase in heart rate is detected, the hypothesis will be *correct*. If an increase is *not* detected, the hypothesis will be *null and void*. The idea is thus scientifically valid, because of its ability to produce a specific set of results that can be used to either verify or falsify the claim.

It must be noted however that to rely on a single set of results is not the preferred option. The more times an experiment is repeated by different scientists, at different times, the more authentic the science, and the more reliable the results are considered to be.

*Science Relies On The Information Acquired Through Testing:*  
It is not enough to merely predict the results of a claim, but must be practically tested. The subsequent information obtained, must then be analysed in order for a conclusion to be reached.

This is where the scientific process stops, and the philosophy of science begins. After the necessary data is obtained, it has to be interpreted in a way that it makes sense. This understating is achieved by applying notions

from the philosophy of science. However before an elaboration of the philosophy of science is presented, the limitations of the methodology of science must be mentioned.

**Limitations of the Scientific Process:** The scientific method is limited. This places certain topics beyond the reach of scientific discussion. Therefore, the method cannot be used to form an accurate understanding of such issues. This does *not* mean that the truth and nature of such matters are unknown (this would be committing the fallacy of *scientism*, which will be discussed later). We must simply resort to other existing modes of acquiring knowledge other than the scientific method.

These limitations are due to a number of reasons. Some of them are as follows:

1.) *Sensory perception:* Science can only address issues which can generally be experienced. If a thing cannot be perceived, then it will be considered an issue outside the scope of scientific inquiry. So, matters such as the existence of God, are technically outside the purview of science, since a God, by definition, exists outside of the created universe, and thus is not subject to our sensory experience.

2.) *Morality:* As mentioned earlier, the study of science concerns itself with observable and physical phenomena. It cannot comment on abstract concepts. It cannot delve into

the nature of things which do not possess an observable form, such as one's personal experience, and notions of morality. In other words, we cannot conclude on how we should act as good moral beings, based on our observations of the physical world. A detailed understanding of the rain cycle, mating habits of pink salmon, cellular biology, solar flares and the like will not help us answer questions like "Is killing an innocent person bad?", "Is giving charity to the poor good?", "Is war ever justifiable?", "How do we settle a monetary dispute?", "Is homosexuality wrong?" etc. Science is compelled to remain silent on such matters.

3.) *Time*: Science cannot directly delve into the nature of past events. For example; questions such as "What was the first living organism?" "What was before the Big Bang?" etc. are technically outside the realm of science. This is because, - as mentioned earlier - science relies on conducting experiments to confirm its claims. Since experiments can only be possibly carried out in the present, past events remain untestable.

Science can, at best, **suggest** plausible explanations based on indirect reasoning, but can **never confirm** them as being true.

4.) *Metaphysics*: Metaphysics is the branch of philosophy that considers the ultimate nature of reality. If epistemology is concerned with what *is* knowledge, and how we can



obtain and justify it, then metaphysics is concerned with the question of *what* exactly it is that we can have knowledge of. Examples of such questions may be: Are there universal ideas that we can have access to? Laws that we can discover? How many substances does the universe consist of? Is there a self? If so, how does it maintain identity through change and time? What is time? What is the nature of space, and the objects that exists within it? Is there a purpose to existence? If so, what is the purpose?

Metaphysical questions are, therefore, of a deep and fundamental nature, and consequently, very difficult to answer. Science can attempt to address *some* metaphysical questions. For example: the issue of the beginning of the universe can be investigated through the field of cosmology, or take for instance Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity, which presented a picture of space-time wherein space and time were fused in a continuum, which challenged the traditional assumption that that the two are separate aspects of reality. However, these are the few metaphysical questions that may be empirically addressed. Arguably, most metaphysical assertions are not testable, but must either be taken as assumptions (e.g. the world only consists of physical things) or as a matter of logic (e.g. things with identical properties must, in fact, be the same thing). The reason that science cannot address these questions, is because they are not observable phenomenon.

5.) *Necessary Truths*: A necessary truth is a statement that cannot be wrong without leading to a contradiction in reality. It *has* to be true. For example; 1. All humans will die. 2. Person A is a human. Conclusion: Person A will die.

Or take for instance;  $3 + 3 = 6$  or  $6 - 3 = 3$

In all the above examples, the answer must be true in light of their two preceding statements. There cannot possibly be any other answer. This structure of reasoning is also known as a *deductive argument*.

Now, the point being made here is, that necessary truths are not considered to be true or valid based on scientific observations, but are deemed true in light of the inner logic present in our minds. No form of observation is needed to justify the logical necessity of the conclusion.

One does not come to the conclusion that two smart phones plus another two smart phones equals to four smart phones after obtaining the relevant number of phones and then conducting an experiment. Even a person who has never even seen a smart phone will easily formulate a conclusion, due to the *necessity* of such an answer.

A brief explanation of the scientific methodology has been provided. The sum total of this discussion is that the methodology of science, is subject to certain limitations. These limitations render science incapable of commenting on

a wide range of issues. Having said that, we will now turn our attention to the second part of science; the '*philosophy of science*'.

## 2 .THE PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE:

Philosophy of science is a branch of philosophy concerned with the foundations, methods, and implications of science. It deals with a wide range of questions and issues ranging from, "Can knowledge ever be wholly objective?" to "Can a gene be copyrighted?" Broadly speaking, some of its central questions are concerned with what exactly qualifies as science, the reliability and construction of scientific theories, and the ultimate purpose of science.

What is of particular concern to us, is that the philosophy of science provides a frame work of ideologies and assumptions, which are used to interpret and understand the data accumulated via the scientific method. There are two key points with regards to the nature of these ideologies which are largely ignored:

1. *These assumptions are pre-supposed:* Meaning that they are not adopted after extensive scientific endeavours, but are already accepted as true beforehand by the larger scientific community. The adoption of many of these assumptions are due to the contributions of a number of individuals' philosophical reactions to specific historical experiences.

2. *Different assumptions yield different interpretations:* Depending on which ideology a scientist chooses to adhere to, a different understanding will be obtained, even if the data in question remains the same. These ideologies can be likened to a pair of lenses through which observations are made. Yellow tinted lenses will yield a yellow tinted world. Likewise green tinted lenses will yield a green tinted world. The subtleties of these varying implications can be demonstrated by going back to our 'increase in heart rate experiment'. Once we have conducted the experiment and collected the data, our understanding of that data will depend on the assumptions that we apply to it.

For those who adhere to the doctrine of *materialism*: that all that exists in the universe consists solely of physical matter and nothing else, will explain that when a person falls in love, the body releases the chemicals adrenaline and norepinephrine into the blood stream, which increase the heart rate. Simply put, the phenomenon is explained entirely in terms of physical matter. Materialism as a presumption, is now firmly entrenched in modern scientific thought. However this was not always the case.

In the past there were those, such as Socrates, Aristotle, Plato, St. Thomas Aquinas, Descartes, who adhered to *dualism*, an ideology that asserts that the world consists of two substances: physical matter and mind stuff. Dualists may explain the increased heart rate to be caused by

nonphysical phenomena such as those pertaining to the soul or intellect.

These are two opposing ideas that affect the interpretation and understanding of the world, and specifically, the scientific data at hand.

## Philosophy of Science Yields Uncertain Knowledge

When we delve further into the Philosophy of Science, it comes to light that many of its assumptions suffer from inconsistencies, which render scientific claims, as a whole, uncertain in its pronouncements. What this means is that the philosophy of science cannot - for the most part - produce *certain* knowledge. Its claims are highly tentative at best.

The uncertainty of scientific claims are due to a number of problems with its philosophy:

*Validity of Induction:* Induction and inference is used to understand scientific data, whether it concerns fossil evidence, human behaviour, plant growth, etc. It is a form of reasoning, wherein conclusions are based on a limited sample of observations. A general statement is based on specific instances. For example: I have observed that ten

sheep are white. Therefore, based on this limited set of examples I conclude that *all* sheep must be white.

Although a useful thinking process, the problem with induction is that the process cannot *guarantee* the conclusion. My observation of ten white sheep does not rule out the possibility of the existence of black sheep. Arguments based on induction can range from a probability of 0% to 99%, but can never reach 100%. The number of *potential* observations, or examples, will always exceed the number of *available* examples. Therefore, the problem of induction is that it can never yield certainty.

*Empiricism:* Empiricism is a nuanced philosophical school of thought opposed to 'rationalism'. Its adherents disagree on numerous points, but they all share the belief that knowledge is ultimately derived from, and justified by sense experience. This means that we have no other source of knowledge on a subject, other than that which our five senses of touching, tasting, smelling, hearing and seeing provides us with. Our minds are like a blank sheet upon which the senses leave imprints of knowledge.

For an empiricist, if a statement or theory is consistent with reality, direct verification is the only means of ascertaining its truth. Otherwise, it is not rationally obligatory to accept its claim. For example: the existence of the sun is rationally tenable for an empiricist due to its sensory verifiability (its

heat, light etc.). On the other hand, the concept of God is not rationally tenable (according to an empiricist), due to a lack of sensory verifiability.

Empiricism suffers from a number logical problems and limitations. The main problem being that this sort of thinking only allows conclusions about observed realities to be made, and not conclusions about unobservable realities.

For example, a person looking at the full moon in the night sky observes it slowly being enshrouded by thick black clouds. Does the person now deny the existence of the moon since it is no longer subject to sensory verification? The empiricist will of course dismiss such a denial as absurd, but the point being made here is that the belief in the existence of the moon is no longer based on sensory experience, but on logical deduction, which is another root to knowledge distinct from the five senses. This brief example exposes one of the many inconsistencies of empiricist view point.

*Materialism:* This ideology has already been briefly discussed. It posits that all existing things in the universe solely consist of physical matter. This is a central belief of contemporary scientific thought that has endured, despite its many inconsistencies. Among its many problems is what is known as a '*recalcitrant fact*'. A recalcitrant fact is a fact that resists a specific theory or statement.

For example, Person A stands accused of murdering Person B. However Person A has proven that he was not present at the crime scene during the murder. Person A's absence serves as a recalcitrant fact to the accusation of murder.

One of the recalcitrant facts that resist materialism, is the existence of human consciousness. When I undergo a human experience, for instance, pain, a scientist may be able to track neuro-chemical activity in the brain associated with my experience. What these trackings merely show is that *something* is happening. It cannot explain what my personal experiences is actually like. It is possible for two people afflicted with the same injury to feel two different levels of pain, whilst their neuro-chemical reactions in the brain remain identical.

Experiences are an extension of our consciousness. If consciousness was solely comprised of physical matter, it would have been possible to track and explain the variations in the different personal experiences of pain. The absence of such a detection indicates that consciousness consists of non-physical matter (as suggested by a number of leading neurobiologists such as David Chalmers). Therefore, the sweeping assumption of materialism is exposed as inconsistent.

*Scientism:* Scientism is an assertion that claims that statements that cannot be scientifically proven, are not true.



This assertion is implicitly presumed in most scientific discussions rather than being explicitly stated. However, scientism is simply not true due to the wide range of issues in which science is descoped. The answers to metaphysical questions, moral truths and necessary truths, are all sought through other avenues.

Most importantly, the incoherence of scientism is best illustrated in the contradiction of its own assertion. The sentence that “all statements that are not scientifically verifiable are untrue” cannot be scientifically verified. It’s a self-defeating statement! Much like the statement “there are no sentences in the English language longer than three words”. Despite this obvious flaw in the logic of scientism, it continues to persist in modern scientific debates and discussions in the form of presumptions.

In light of the brief descriptions of certain key philosophical underpinnings of science listed above, it becomes evident that science cannot produce certain knowledge. Its claims are, for the most part conjectural and probabilistic, ranging from 0% to 99%.

*Conclusion:* After a brief analysis of the two basic components of science. It can be concluded that:

1. The scope of science is restricted, due to the limitations inherent in its methodology.

2. The claims of science are not certain, due to the inability of the philosophy of science to produce certainty.

What this means is that in the event of a scientific narrative coming into conflict with the claim of another discipline or tradition, the claim with higher epistemic value must be given precedence. It will be assumed that the relevant science to the issue at hand is either wrong in its claim, or in need of further scientific enquiry to arrive at a more coherent explanation.

We know that we have sufficient evidence (to be expounded in another article in-sha-Allah) to believe in the absolute validity of Quranic claims, that the knowledge conveyed to us through the medium of the Quran, yields certain knowledge.

When the claims of science (say evolution), a discipline with relatively lower epistemic value, comes into an irreconcilable conflict with the Quranic narrative (creation of Adam  $\Sigma$ ), precedence will be given to the claim with the higher epistemic value (in this case the Quran).

Science is a wonderful tool granted to us by Allah  $\Phi$ . But it is limited in its authority and scope. Understanding the nature of this discipline, and the historical context in which it arose, will help keep things in its correct perspective. (Article prepared by Ml. Shibli Rahmani with minor changes)

## Appendix 2

### Interesting Quotations from Scientists on Evolutionism

Here are some quotes by scientists speaking on the subject of evolutionism. Note that many of these scientists are evolutionists themselves, in spite of their comments. I suppose that they would maintain that to admit that "God did it" would not be "intellectually satisfying!" Such a confession, of course, flies in the face of their naturalistic pre-suppositionalism.

# "Nine-tenths of the talk of evolutionists is sheer nonsense, not founded on observation and wholly unsupported by facts. This museum is full of proofs of the utter falsity of their views. In all this great museum, there is not a particle of evidence of the transmutation of species." (*Dr. Etheridge, Palaeontologist of the British Museum*)

# "I reject evolution because I deem it obsolete; because the knowledge, hard won since 1830, of anatomy, histology, cytology, and embryology, cannot be made to accord with its basic idea. The foundationless, fantastic edifice of the evolution doctrine would long ago have met with its long-deserved fate were it not that the love of fairy tales is so deep-rooted in the hearts of man." (*Dr. Albert Fleischmann, University of Erlangen*)

# "By the late 1970s, debates on university campuses throughout the free world were being held on the subject of origins with increasing frequency. Hundreds of scientists, who once accepted the theory of evolution as fact, were abandoning ship and claiming that the scientific evidence was in total support of the theory of creation. Well-known evolutionists, such as Isaac Asimov and Stephen Jay Gould, were stating that, since the creationist scientists had won all of the more than one hundred debates, the evolutionists should not debate them." (*Luther Sunderland, "Darwin's Enigma", p.10*)

# "The more one studies palaeontology, the more certain one becomes that evolution is based on faith alone; exactly the same sort of faith which is necessary to have when one encounters the great mysteries of religion... The only alternative is the doctrine of special creation, which may be true, but is irrational." (*Dr. L.T. More*)

# "I have come to the conclusion that Darwinism is not a testable scientific theory, but a metaphysical research programme... (*Dr. Karl Popper, German-born philosopher of science, called by Nobel Prize-winner Peter Medawar, "incomparably the greatest philosopher of science who has ever lived."*)

# "The fact of evolution is the backbone of biology, and biology is thus in the peculiar position of being a science

founded on an unproved theory -- is it then a science or faith? Belief in the theory of evolution is thus exactly parallel to belief in special creation..." (*Dr. L. Harrison Matthews, in the introduction to the 1971 edition of Darwin's "Origin of Species"*)

# "What is so frustrating for our present purpose is that it seems almost impossible to give any numerical value to the probability of what seems a rather unlikely sequence of events... An honest man, armed with all the knowledge available to us now, could only state that in some sense, the origin of life appears at the moment to be almost a miracle... (*Dr. Francis Crick, Nobel Prize-winner, codiscoverer of DNA*)

# "Once we see, however, that the probability of life originating at random is so utterly minuscule as to make it absurd, it becomes sensible to think that the favourable properties of physics, on which life depends, are in every respect DELIBERATE... It is therefore, almost inevitable that our own measure of intelligence must reflect higher intelligences... even to the limit of God." (*Sir Fred Hoyle, British mathematician and astronomer, and Chandra Wickramasinghe, co-authors of "Evolution from Space," after acknowledging that they had been atheists all their lives*)

# "The chance that higher life forms might have emerged in this way is comparable with the chance that a tornado

sweeping through a junk-yard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials therein... I am at a loss to understand biologists' widespread compulsion to deny what seems to me to be obvious." (*Sir Fred Hoyle*)

# "I don't know how long it is going to be before astronomers generally recognize that the combinatorial arrangement of not even one among the many thousands of biopolymers on which life depends could have been arrived at by natural processes here on the earth. Astronomers will have a little difficulty in understanding this because they will be assured by biologists that it is not so, the biologists having been assured in their turn by others that it is not so. The 'others' are a group of persons who believe, quite openly, in mathematical miracles. They advocate the belief that tucked away in nature, outside of normal physics, there is a law which performs miracles (provided the miracles are in the aid of biology). This curious situation sits oddly on a profession that for long has been dedicated to coming up with logical explanations of biblical miracles... It is quite otherwise, however, with the modern miracle workers, who are always to be found living in the twilight fringes of thermodynamics." (*Sir Fred Hoyle*)

# "The fossil record with its abrupt transitions offers no support for gradual change..." (*Dr. Stephen Jay Gould, famous Harvard Professor of Palaeontology*)

# "I admit that an awful lot of that has gotten into the textbooks as though it were true. For instance, the most famous example still on exhibit downstairs (in the American Museum) is the exhibit on horse evolution prepared perhaps 50 years ago. That has been presented as literal truth in textbook after textbook. Now I think that that is lamentable, particularly because the people who propose these kinds of stories themselves may be aware of the speculative nature of some of the stuff. But by the time it filters down to the textbooks, we've got science as truth and we've got a problem." (*Dr. Niles Eldridge, Curator of Invertebrate Palaeontology at the American Museum*)

# "The fundamental reason why a lot of palaeontologists don't care much for gradualism is because the fossil record doesn't show gradual change and every palaeontologist has known that ever since Cuvier. If you want to get around that you have to invoke the imperfection of the fossil record. Every palaeontologist knows that most species, most species, don't change. That's bothersome if you are trained to believe that evolution ought to be gradual. In fact it virtually precludes your studying the very process you went into the school to study. Again, because you don't see it, that brings terrible distress." (*Dr. Stephen Jay Gould*)

# "To postulate that the development and survival of the fittest is entirely a consequence of chance mutations seems to me a hypothesis based on no evidence and irreconcilable

with the facts. These classical evolutionary theories are a gross over-simplification of an immensely complex and intricate mass of facts, and it amazes me that they are swallowed so uncritically and readily, and for such a long time, by so many scientists without murmur of protest." (*Sir Ernest Chain, Nobel Prize winner*)

# "Evolution is a theory universally accepted, not because it can be proved to be true, but because the only alternative, 'special creation,' is clearly impossible." (*D.M.S. Watson, Professor of Zoology, London University*)

# Henry Gee points out that all the evidence for human evolution 'between about 10 and 15 million years ago – several thousand generations of living creatures – can be fitted in a small box.' He concludes that conventional theories of the origin and development of human beings are "a completely human invention created after the fact, shaped to accord with human prejudices." He adds, "To take a line of fossils and claim they represent a lineage is not a scientific hypothesis that can be tested, but an assertion that carries the same validity as a bedtime story – amusing, perhaps even instructive, but not scientific. *"In Search of Deep Time"*(page 126-127)



## Brief Answers to A Few of the Common Arguments Used To Support Evolutionists

### Introduction

It is common for an introductory biology textbook to be written from the evolutionary perspective. Often "evidences" for the reasonableness of the theory of evolution are presented in such a manner that the whole thing appears to be conclusive and beyond reasonable doubt. Phrases such as "All scientists agree..." or "It is universally accepted..." (which are patently untrue--there are thousands of scientists who reject the theory of evolution) tend to intimidate many who have not closely studied the issue. The unsuspecting are led to believe that only "backwoods yahoos" and "illiterate bigots" would dare question the veracity of evolution.

Upon closer inspection, many of these evidences are found to come up short. In fact, many evolutionists disagree quite vehemently among themselves in regard to the significance of these evidences.

The following observations, presented only as brief notes, are offered merely in a small attempt to communicate that some of the evidences for evolution are not really as conclusive as many had thought them to be. If these brief comments "whet your appetite," there are many excellent articles and books which provide detailed studies.

## Eohippus

Two modern-day horses have been found in the same fossil stratum as Eohippus. (If they evolved from Eohippus, they should appear in strata that are "millions of years" younger.)

No evolutionary intermediates have been found between the "horses." Each appears abruptly in the fossil record.

There is no complete series to be found anywhere in the world. The series jumps from North America to Europe and back to North America.

There is no more evidence to conclude that these fossils indicate the evolutionary progression of the horse than that fossils of a chihuahua, a terrier, a german shepherd, and a great dane indicate the evolutionary progression of the dog.

## Vestigial Organs

Organs that were once thought to be vestigial have been discovered to serve useful (and even essential) purposes. (For example, the thyroid and pituitary were once considered to be vestigial.)

Lamarckism (the idea that organs develop or degenerate according to use or disuse) was discarded many years ago. Organs do not develop or degenerate according to need. The use

or disuse of an organ has no effect on subsequent generations. Only a genetic change can result in a different organ.

If vestigial organs existed, so should "nascent" organs (those "on the way in"). They do not.

## Peppered Moths

They have always existed in light and dark varieties. Before the industrial revolution, dark moths on white tree trunks were easily found and eaten by birds. Thus the white moths were predominant. After the industrial revolution, the trunks were blackened by pollution, and the white moths were more easily found and eaten by birds. Thus the black moths became predominant.

In any case, there is certainly no evolution of a simpler organism being transformed into a more complex one.

## Archaeopteryx

Archaeopteryx is famous for being a transitional fossil between reptiles and birds with features of both. Most modern palaeontologists classify it as a true bird.

Fossils of true birds have been found in the same rocks as the Archaeopteryx (implying that Archaeopteryx is not the ancestor of birds). Two bird species living today, the *touraco* and the *hoatzin*, have claws at the end of their wings, which allow them to hold onto branches. Other toothed-birds are also known to have lived in the

same period. Asymmetrical feathers also prove that it was capable of flying like modern birds

## "Ontogeny Recapitulates Phylogeny"

Evolutionists themselves have discarded this older argument (first proposed by Ernst Haeckel in 1866) and no longer advance it as evidence for evolution. Scientists now recognize that the stages of an embryo are specifically programmed by the DNA of the organism involved and have nothing to do with developmental stages of other organisms.

## The Miller-Urey Experiments

The complexity of amino acids does not even remotely compare to the degree of complexity necessary for self-replicating life forms.

There is no evidence that earth's early atmosphere was methane-ammonia (and considerable evidence that its atmosphere has always been an oxidizing one).

These experiments involved conditions carefully arranged by purposeful scientists.

The mild spark discharges were poor simulations of lightning. Real lightning would have destroyed any complex molecules that might have been present.

Complex molecules (even DNA and RNA) do not in and of themselves mean life anyway. Dead organisms have lots of DNA, etc. that cannot be made to reproduce itself.

(For more information in this area, see [The Second Law of Thermodynamics and Evolution](#))

## The Fossil Record

Often complex fossils are found alongside simple organisms. Layers thought to be "older" are found on top of "younger" layers.

After 130 years of digging up over 100 million fossils (of 250,000 species), the gaps between major groups of organisms are undeniably clear. One would think that by now fossils would have been found to begin to close up these gaps. They have not.

Dr. George Gaylord Simpson (noted evolutionist) has called the sudden appearance of many types of complex life forms in the Cambrian rocks the "major mystery of the history of life."

At one place or another in the world, rocks of every geologic period lay directly on basement rocks below which there are no fossils.

Interesting quote by Dr. Stephen Gould (world famous evolutionist and professor at Harvard University who has spent a lifetime studying the fossil record): "...the fossil record doesn't show gradual change and every palaeontologist has known that ever since Cuvier...Every palaeontologist knows that most species, most species don't change. That's bothersome if you are

trained to believe that evolution ought to be gradual. In fact it virtually precludes your studying the very process you went into the school to study. Again, because you don't see it, that brings terrible distress." (Question and answer session following a lecture at Hobart College on February 14, 1980)

Dr. Gould wrote in the June-July 1977 issue of Natural History magazine, "The fossil record with its abrupt transitions offers no support for gradual change..."

(Incidentally, fossilization is not found to occur today. After death, organisms go through the process of decay. This seems to indicate that fossilization is the result of catastrophic events.)

Steve Hall

## Why are Scientists Evolutionists?

There are additional mechanisms that force scientists to be evolutionist and materialist. In Western countries, a scientist has to observe some standards in order to be promoted, to receive academic recognition, or to have his articles published in scientific journals. A straightforward acceptance of evolution is the number-one criterion. This system drives these scientists so far as to spend their whole lives and scientific careers for the sake of a dogmatic belief. American molecular biologist Jonathan Wells refers to these pressure mechanisms in his book *Icons of Evolution* published in 2000: ...Dogmatic Darwinists begin by imposing

a narrow interpretation on the evidence and declaring it the only way to do science. Critics are then labelled unscientific; their articles are rejected by mainstream journals, whose editorial boards are dominated by the dogmatists; the critics are denied funding by government agencies, who send grant proposals to the dogmatists for "peer" review; and eventually the critics are hounded out of scientific community altogether. In the process, evidence against the Darwinian view simply disappears, like witnesses against the Mob. Or the evidence is buried in specialized publications, where only a dedicated researcher can find. Once critics have been silenced and counterevidence has been buried, the dogmatists announce that there is scientific debate about their theory, and no evidence against it. This is the reality that continues to lie behind the assertion "evolution is still accepted by the world of science". Evolution is kept alive not because it has a scientific worth but because it is an ideological obligation. Very few of the scientists who are aware of this fact can risk pointing out that the king isn't wearing any clothes.

This dogmatic materialistic point of view is the reason why many prominent names in the scientific community are atheists. Those who free themselves from the thrall of this spell and think with an open mind do not hesitate to accept the existence of a Creator. American biochemist Dr Michael J. Behe, one of those prominent names who support the

movement to defend the fact of creation that has lately become very accepted, describes the scientists who resist believing in the creation of living organisms thus: Over the past four decades, modern biochemistry has uncovered the secrets of the cell. It has required tens of thousands of people to dedicate the better parts of their lives to the tedious work of the laboratory... The result of these cumulative efforts to investigate the cell- to investigate life at the molecular level-is a loud, clear, piercing cry of "design!". The result is so unambiguous and so significant that it must be ranked as one of the greatest achievements in the history of science... Instead a curious, embarrassed silence surrounds the stark complexity of the cell. Why does the scientific community not greedily embrace its startling discovery? This is the predicament of the atheist or some people the theory of evolution or Darwinism has only scientific connotations, with seemingly no direct implication in their daily lives. This is, of course, a common misunderstanding. Far beyond just being an issue within the framework of the biological sciences, the theory of evolution constitutes the underpinning of a deceptive philosophy that has held sway over a large number of people: Materialism. Materialist philosophy, which accepts only the existence of matter and presupposes man to be 'a heap of matter', asserts that he is no more than an animal, with 'conflict' the sole rule of his existence. Although propagated as a modern philosophy based on science, materialism is in fact an



ancient dogma with no scientific basis. Conceived in Ancient Greece, the dogma was rediscovered by the atheistic philosophers of the 18th century. It was then implanted in the 19th century into several science disciplines by thinkers such as Karl Marx, Charles Darwin and Sigmund Freud. In other words science was distorted to make room for materialism. The past two centuries have been a bloody arena of materialism: Ideologies based on materialism (or competing ideologies arguing against materialism, yet sharing its basic tenets) have brought permanent violence, war and chaos to the world. Communism, responsible for the death of 120 million people, is the direct outcome of materialistic philosophy. Fascism, despite pretending to be an alternative to the materialistic world-view, accepted the fundamental materialist concept of progress through conflict and sparked off oppressive regimes, massacres, world wars and genocide. Besides these two bloody ideologies, individual and social ethics have also been corrupted by materialism. The deceptive message of materialism, reducing man to an animal whose existence is coincidental and with no responsibility to any being, demolished moral pillars such as love, mercy, self-sacrifice, modesty, honesty and justice. Having been misled by the materialists' motto "life is a struggle", people came to see their lives as nothing more than a clash of interests which, in turn, led to life according to the law of the jungle. Traces of this philosophy, which has a lot to answer as regards manmade disasters of

the last two centuries, can be found in every ideology that perceives differences among people as a 'reason for conflict'. That includes the terrorists of the present day who claim to uphold religion, yet commit one of the greatest sins by murdering innocent people. The theory of evolution, or Darwinism, comes in handy at this point by completing the jigsaw puzzle. It provides the myth that materialism is a scientific idea. That is why, Karl Marx, the founder of communism and dialectical materialism, wrote that Darwinism was "the basis in natural history" for his worldview. However, that basis is rotten. Modern scientific discoveries reveal over and over again that the popular belief associating Darwinism with science is false. Scientific evidence refutes Darwinism comprehensively and reveals that the origin of our existence is not evolution but creation. The Almighty has created the universe, all living things and man.

## Appendix 3

No system of life can work successfully, unless it is backed by sound knowledge. Man has been bestowed with certain sources of knowledge, each source possessing a specific jurisdiction. Beyond its jurisdiction, it becomes ineffective.

1.) The five senses – Each of these senses provide a person with knowledge, but are limited. For example, the eye can see, but cannot hear. The ear can hear, but cannot see. The nose can smell, but can neither see nor hear.

2.) The intellect – At a certain stage, the senses become ineffective and helpless. Where the senses terminate, man has been bestowed with intellect to continue acquiring knowledge. For example, there is a gun before me. I know its colour by seeing it with my eyes. I can know by touching it that it is made of steel. Yet none of these senses helps me to know how this gun came into existence, because the process of its manufacture did not take place before me. In such a situation, the intellect guides a person to understand that the gun was made by an expert engineer.

However, this source of knowledge is also limited. This source of knowledge cannot provide me with guidance as to how to utilize this gun.

3.) Revelation – The third source of knowledge, which functions where the intellect ends, is Divine Revelation. Divine Revelation teaches a person the object of his life, the abode from where he has come, and the abode to which we will finally return. These concepts can neither be understood by the intellect, nor discerned by one of the five senses.

Using the intellect in the presence of Divine knowledge, is like trying to see things with the ears. This does not mean that the intellect is useless. It is highly functional and

indispensable to man, but within its jurisdiction, and not beyond that. Ibn Khaldoun  $\zeta$  has written that the intellect is very useful and valuable, subject to the condition that it is used within its jurisdiction. It may be compared to a delicate scale which is used to weigh gold. If anyone uses it to weigh a large block of stone, it will break. Now if any person says that the scale is useless, as it could not weigh the block of stone, the person will be declared to be a fool. The truth is that the scale was used for something which did not fall within its jurisdiction, so it broke.

If a person does not accept this third source, and regards only the first two sources of knowledge as correct, then how will one judge right from wrong, etc. If left to the intellect, then people will fall into great evils. A few examples of these are:

1.) What is wrong if a person gets married to his sister or daughter as they know the person better than any other stranger? Incest is not wrong, but actually more in accordance with logic.

2.) What is wrong with eating dead human beings? Instead of burying them, it is more viable to consume them.

3.) Why can people not kill the aged, sick and disabled as they are of no use to society?

4.) What is wrong with eating excreta and drinking urine? This will save a person so much of money on food. If one argues that their taste is not right, then one could argue that he will add some seasonings to alter their taste.

(Extracted and abridged from Limits of reason by Mufti Taqi Uthmani. A few additions have been made.)

## Moral Foundations

A Divine Being can be the only rational anchor for morality, because Allah  $\Phi$  is the only Being that transcends human subjectivity. Without the concept of a Divine Reality, morality is reduced to something as relative as fashion. What's considered moral or immoral today may not hold true for tomorrow, and vice versa. Simply put, without Allah  $\Phi$  (a Divine Being), there can be no absolute definition for what constitutes good and bad. It becomes a matter of mere personal preference.

Normal justification for the atheist's moral views are one of the following:

1) Social consensus 2) Ethical humanism 3) Biology 4) Moral realism.

**1) Social consensus:** This is in essence the spirit of democracy. Whatever the majority of society deems to be good, *is* good. This cannot be an adequate determinant for morality because of its relative nature. An example to explain our point is Germany in 1935. There was a general agreement on the measures

adopted to rid the country of undesirables (Jews, Gypsies, the physically impaired etc.). Were their actions justified? The modern atheist will mostly likely reply in the negative, to which it can be asked “On what basis? Social consensus?” This effectively highlights the dilemma that an adherent of this moral view is faced with. Further, human beings are fickle in nature, and opinions are easily swayed by propaganda.

2) **Ethical Humanism:** The Oxford companion to Philosophy defines ethical humanism as follows: “...placing the end of moral action in the welfare of humanity, rather than in fulfilling the Will of God” (Pg.376 print 1995). In other words, only such actions that are of potential benefit to mankind, and do not result in harming others, are considered morally acceptable. God has nothing to do with the picture. This moral ideology rules out the promiscuity of homosexuality, fornication, alcohol consumption, and the like. Our contention is that the very claim of ethical humanism (i.e. to be altruistic, and to refrain from harming others as the *only* criterion for good) is in itself a moral claim. One may ask for the justification of this claim as well. On what logical grounds was this set as the only basis for good and evil?

(A note on ethical humanism: This viewpoint is antithetical to the Islamic concept of ‘‘Ikhl as (sincerity)’’, which means to perform all good actions solely for the Sake of Allah ﷻ.

Unfortunately quite a large number of Muslims have both consciously and subconsciously subscribed to this ideology.).

**3) Biology:** Some atheists (such as the late 19<sup>th</sup> century evolutionist and philosopher, Herbert Spencer, and famous science popularizer, Sam Harris) maintain that biology forms the foundation of morality. In response to this stance, Hamza Tzortzis quotes Charles Darwin, “If men were reared under precisely the same conditions as hive-bees, there can hardly be a doubt that our unmarried females would, like the worker bees, think it a sacred duty to kill their brothers, and mothers would strive to kill their fertile daughters, and no one would think of interfering”. To put it simply, if our moral instinct were truly a product of the biological changes that we, as a species supposedly underwent during the evolutionary process, then our morals would be subject to those changes. If for instance, we were reared according to the same conditions as an ocean salmon, the males among us would consider it okay to consume our own babies! This exposes the relative nature of this particular moral viewpoint. Furthermore, the most that this theory can provide us with are *rules* for morality, and not a *basis*. It can tell us what we *consider* to be moral, but not what *ought* to be moral.

4) **Moral Realism:** Another opinion that some atheist have adopted, is *Moral Realism*. That there are indeed such concepts as objective morals, but it's not subject to anything. It just *is*. Period. In truth, this viewpoint does not have a leg to stand on. On these very same grounds, any group can also make assertive claims on the validity of their moral stance, and get away with it.

It should be noted that there are a few atheistic thinkers, who admit that only a concept of a Divine Being can possibly serve as a basis for morality. The late atheist philosopher J.L. Mackie held that (since according to him there is no God) there is no such thing as an objective morality. If an atheist happens to hold this view, he automatically forfeits his right to dictate what's good and evil.

In summary, differences in moral views stem from the various paradigms upon which each group base their ethical concepts. Therefore, a thorough analyses of these foundations are necessary. Muslims believe that the only possible rational criterion for defining morality is the Divine Being, since only Allah  $\Phi$  can transcend human subjectivity. All other assertions, whether social consensus, biology, ethical humanism, or moral realism, are invalid, due to the lack of objectivity and constancy in their claims. (The above



article, 'Moral foundations', was prepared by Ml. Shibli Rahmani. It has been reproduced here with minor changes an

---

<sup>i</sup> This is referred to as spontaneous generation: By coincidence, the first single living cell came into existence 3.8 billion years ago. Inanimate matter produced it by chance. All living beings in the entire world around us are products of this cell. (Five years after? Darwin's book 'The origin of species', was written, Louis Pasteur disproved 'spontaneous generation', after numerous studies and experiments. In his lecture in Sorbonne in 1964, he said, "Never will the doctrine of spontaneous generation recover from the mortal blow struck by this simple experiment.").

This means that the first cell on earth was formed "all of a sudden" together with its incredibly complex structure, along with enzymes (specialized proteins) which it is dependent upon, and which depends upon the information encoded within the DNA. So, if a complex structure came into existence all of a sudden, what does this mean?

Let us ask this question with an example. Let us liken the cell to a high-tech car in terms of its complexity. (In fact, the cell is a much more complex and developed system than a car, with its engine and all its electronic equipment.) Now let us ask the following question: What would you think if you went out hiking in the depths of a thick forest, and ran across a brand-new car among the trees? Would you imagine that various elements in the forest had come together, by chance, over millions of years, and produced such a vehicle? All the parts in the car are made of products such as iron, copper, and rubber-the raw ingredients for which are all found on the earth - but would this fact lead

---

you to think that these materials had fused "by chance", and then, come together, and produced such a car? There is no doubt that anyone with a sound mind would realize that the car was the product of intelligent design - in other words, a factory - and wonder what it was doing there in the middle of the forest. The sudden emergence of a complex structure in a complete form, quite out of the blue, shows that this is the work of an intelligent being. A complex system like the cell is, no doubt, created by a Superior Will and Wisdom. In other words, it came into existence as a creation of Allaah ﷻ.

Believing that pure chance can produce perfect creations, goes well beyond the bounds of reason. A single plant, or animal, would require thousands and thousands of co-incidental events. Thus, miracles would become the rule: events with the most unlikely probability, could not fail to occur. Pierre-Paul Grasse (a French zoologist) summarizes what the concept of "coincidence" means for evolutionists: "...Chance becomes a sort of Providence, which, under the cover of atheism, is not named, but which is secretly worshipped."

Evolutionary theory claims that life is formed by chance: According to this claim, lifeless and unconscious atoms came together to form the cell, and then, they somehow formed other living things, including man. Let us think about that. When we bring together the elements that are the building-blocks of life such as carbon, phosphorus, nitrogen and potassium, only a heap is formed. No matter what treatments it undergoes, this atomic heap cannot form even a single living being. If you like, let us formulate an "experiment" on this subject, and let us

---

examine on behalf of the evolutionists what they really claim, without pronouncing loudly under the name "Darwinian formula":

Let evolutionists put plenty of materials present in the composition of living beings, such as phosphorus, nitrogen, carbon, oxygen, iron, and magnesium into big barrels. Moreover, let them add in these barrels, any material that does not exist under normal conditions, but as they consider necessary. Let them add in this mixture as many amino acids - which have no possibility of forming under natural conditions - and as many proteins - a single one of which has a formation probability of  $10^{950}$  - as they like. Let them expose these mixtures to as much heat and moisture as they like. Let them stir these with whatever technologically developed device they like. Let them put the foremost scientists beside these barrels. Let these experts wait in turn beside these barrels for billions, and even trillions of years. Let them be free to use all kinds of conditions which they believe to be necessary for a human's formation. No matter what they do, they cannot produce from these barrels a human, never mind a professor who can examine his cell structure under the electron microscope. They cannot produce giraffes, lions, bees, canaries, horses, dolphins, roses, orchids, lilies, bananas, oranges, apples, dates, tomatoes, melons, watermelons, figs, olives, grapes, peaches, pea-fowls, pheasants, multi coloured butterflies, or millions of other living beings such as these. Indeed, they could not obtain even a single cell of any one of them.

Briefly, unconscious atoms cannot form a cell by coming together. They cannot take a new decision, and divide this cell into two, then take other decisions and create the professors who first invented the electron microscope, and then examine their own cell structure under that

microscope. Matter is an unconscious, lifeless heap, and it comes to life with Allah's Superior Creation. Thinking even a little bit on the claims of evolutionists discloses this reality, just as in the above example.

The famous physicist, Sir Fred Hoyle, makes a very striking observation about the origin of life. In his book, 'The Intelligent Universe', he writes: "The chance that higher life forms might have emerged in this way (by coincidence) is comparable with the chance that a tornado sweeping through a junk-yard, might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials therein." Just as a hurricane cannot produce an airplane as a result of coincidences, neither is it possible for the universe to have come into being as a result of unanticipated happenings, and moreover, to harbour extremely complex structures therein. In truth, the universe is furnished with myriad systems of an infinitely greater complexity than those of an airplane.

A few incidents:

1.) An atheist once approached the Muslim ruler and said, "O leader of the Muslims, scholars of your age have reached consensus that the world has been created by a Divine Being. Please invite one of your leading scholars to debate this matter with me, as I do not believe that the world has been created by a Divine Being." The Muslim ruler immediately sent a message to a great scholar, "O Scholar of the Muslims, be informed that an atheist has arrived in my court. He denies that the world has been created by a Divine Being, and wants to debate the matter with you."

---

The scholar replied that he would arrive at a certain time. At the appointed time, the Caliph, his courtiers and the atheist waited, while the scholar arrived a few minutes late.

After greeting, the scholar was seated, and the atheist asked, "Why did you arrive late?" The scholar replied, "An amazing incident delayed me. My home is on the other side of the Tigris River. When I arrived at the bank of the river, I noticed an old boat, which had been broken in pieces. As my gaze fell on the scattered pieces of wood they began to move by themselves. Each piece attached itself to the others, and soon the boat was formed. All this happened without the aid of a builder. I boarded the boat, crossed the river and arrived here."

The atheist remarked, "Courtiers, have you ever heard such a lie as the one just told to us by your scholar and great leader? This is completely false."

The scholar then explained, "Do you think that I am speaking lies?" The atheist replied, "Definitely! Never was a boat ever constructed without the skills of a builder."

The scholar continued, "Now, listen! If a boat cannot be built without a builder, how is it possible that the universe came into existence without a Creator?"

2.) Someone once asked a high-ranking scholar for the proof of a Creator. He replied by indicating towards the face and said that the face of a man is small, and yet it consists of eyes, nose, tongue, cheeks, lips, etc. Notwithstanding this, no two person's faces are the same. The voice, mannerisms and habits of each person are unique. In short, the fact that every person's features and profiles are not alike, nor are their voices, tones, habits and characters alike, proves that this is definitely the work of a Supreme Creator, who has blessed each person with his own

---

uniqueness, which differs from others. This can never be the work of matter or molecules, nor can it be pure coincidence.

3.) An atheist asked an academic for the proof of a Creator. He replied that one must look at the leaves of a mulberry tree. The taste, colour and smell of all of them are alike, but when a silkworm eats therefrom, silk is produced; when a bee takes pollen therefrom, honey is; when a sheep eats therefrom, it ejects it as droppings; and when a deer eats therefrom, musk is produced. All these different things are made from one and the same source. It is obvious that all these different products are the result of an All-Knowing, Most Powerful Creator. These are certainly not the result of 'natural occurrences.' If it were, then the result would have all been the same.

<sup>ii</sup> According to this theory, the transformation of a species into another takes millions of years. Numerous intermediary species, or 'transitional forms' ought to have existed, for e.g. half-fish/half-reptile, half-reptile/half-bird. Had such creatures existed, there would be millions of them, the fossils of which should be easily found. Why then has many such fossils been found? A few like the archaeopteryx are claimed to have existed, but some scientists have declared them to be forgeries. Remember that those who want to prove something will do so, even with lies. Regarding the Piltdown forgery, the following has been noted, "The dualist arguments were there right throughout the sorry history of one of palaeontology's greatest and most notorious hoaxes, yet were ignored or waved away by several prominent workers who held influential positions. Piltdown's proponents (like Pycraft) used the weight of authority and special access to the material to dismiss or quash the dualist's arguments. This is despite the fact that those who

---

made the dualist arguments were actually more qualified, more experienced, and more 'relevant' (as goes their qualifications and areas of expertise) when compared to the proponents. Dualism is discussed at length in all the good books on Piltdown and also formed the focus of one of Stephen Gould's essays. I would say the same as Gould and other commentators: if leading workers in England, the USA and elsewhere had not been so invested, so committed, in the supposed authenticity of Piltdown man, if only they had listened to their detractors – to Miller, Hrdlička and others – they might well have accepted and understood the very reasonable, very well supported arguments of the dualists. Alarm bells were ringing right from the start.”

(<https://blogs.scientificamerican.com>)

Human evolution- According to evolutionists, man evolved from ape-like ancestors. This supposedly started 4-5 million years ago. The ape passed through four major stages (many more including Sahelanthropus, and Ardipithecus are part of evolutionary doctrine) to finally become a human:

1) Australopithecus (Southern African ape). (They were actually just from an ordinary ape species that became extinct and bore no resemblance to humans, however share bear great resemblance with the orangutan today.) 2) Homo Habilis ('homo' means man). 3) Homo Erectus. 4) Homo Sapiens (the human being)

(Apart from the fossil record, unbridgeable anatomical gaps between man and apes invalidate the fiction of human evolution. One has to do with the manner of walking. Evolutionist claim similarities related to bipedalism, (i.e. walking on two legs seen from similar hip, spine and foramen magnum position) Research has now shown that the evolution

---

of bipedalism never occurred, nor is it possible to have done so. Firstly, bipedalism is not an evolutionary advantage. Apes movement are much faster, easier and efficient than man's stride. According to the logic of evolution, humans should have evolved to become a quadruped (i.e. becoming bipedal would be de-evolving). Another problem is that bipedalism does not serve the 'gradual development' model of Darwinism, which requires that there be a compound stride between bipedalism and quadrupedalism. However computerized research in 1996 showed that a compound stride was impossible. (Ruth Henke "Aufretch aus den Baumen" Focus vol. 39, 1996, pg. 178) A half-bipedal being cannot exist. The immense gap between man and ape is not limited to this. Many other issues still remain unexplained, such as brain capacity, the ability to talk, and so on.)

Points to consider: 1) No fossils have been shown that would directly link the descent of Man from the apes, and that there is a constant search for what is termed, the 'Missing Link'?"

2) Actually, recent findings of paleoanthropologists have shown that 1, 2 and 3 all lived in different parts of the world at the same time. Stephen Jay Gould (a palaeontologist from Harvard) admits, "What has become of our ladder if there are three co-existing lineages of hominids (A. Africanus, the robust australopithecines and H. Habilis), none clearly derived from one another. Moreover, none of the three display any evolutionary trends during their tenure on earth." There is proof to show that 3 co-existed with 1 and 2, as well as with 4. Homo Erectus were just human beings. Note there is great diversity in the appearance of humans. Australian Aborigines have pronounced brow ridges associated with earlier Homo and Australopithecus species. The pigmies



---

of central Africa are very small in body size however, they are still Humans.

3) The biggest proof against this theory is that it cannot be reproduced or demonstrated, whereas they claim that they disbelieve in God because He is not testable, demonstrable, etc. The following is a logical question, "If one ancestor could become a human (while no other human existed), why cannot other ancestors turn into a human (whereas natural selection, i.e. development due to new circumstances and environment, ought to be more common in the presence of men already, as the present apes certainly need the new traits, which the first ones needed far more desperately, to survive)."

iii **The reason behind the creation of heaven and hell:** There are many people in this world who pass their lives in evil; robbing, terrorizing, usurping, oppressing, raping and hurting others. Nonetheless, they live a life of apparent happiness (although not spiritually) and luxury, and finally die in this condition. Similarly, there are those who pass their lives in piety and good works; being just, fair, honest, spending their time in the worship of Allah  $\Phi$  and working for the welfare of His  $\Phi$  creation. Despite this, they pass their lives in poverty and difficulty, afflicted with sickness, calamities and distress, and finally pass away in this condition.

We have proven above the existence of Allah  $\Phi$ , who, obviously, sees all man's actions - good and bad - yet does not reward and punish in this world. It logically follows that Allah  $\Phi$  will surely reward or punish man for his actions in some other life, since it is not possible to assume that Allah  $\Phi$  would be unfair as to not reward the good people for what they have carried out, and not take to task those who committed evil, or that

the good and bad all receive an equal treatment. Allah ﷻ states, “Should We treat the obedient ones in the same manner as the disobedient ones? (Certainly not!) What is the matter with you? How do you judge? (Surah Qalam v.35-36)

“Do those who perpetrate sins imagine that We will treat them like those who believe and perform good deeds, that they will be equal in life and death? (They are totally wrong.) Evil indeed is the judgement they make. (After death, their condition will be totally different, one group in Paradise and the other in Hell)” (Surah Jaathiyah v.21)

It is the very nature of humans to work towards rewards and to avoid punishments. We find that for little school children, there are punishments for misbehaviour; detention; etc. and awards are given to encourage them. In workplaces, bonuses are granted to those who excel, and those who are a liability are often demoted.

**Why is reward and punishment not given in this world?** Had it been given in this world, life would cease to be a test, as the recompense and repercussions would be clearly visible. People would then avoid evil just like they avoid jumping into a fire, and all would do good, just like they eat and drink. The test, for which Allah ﷻ has sent us into this world, would then be useless, as the results would be in front of us. There would therefore be no sincerity in deeds.

**What is the effect of this belief on human life?** Any person who has some knowledge of history, or some common sense, will never be able to deny that there is nothing in this world, no human system, government law, social progress, personal honour, or awareness campaigns which saves people from evil and misconduct to the extent

---

that the belief in the Hereafter can, and does. Experience proves that societies in which evil and moral corruption are widespread, are those which are devoid of the belief in the Hereafter. History has proven that the most pure, clean and civilized lives have been those of the servants of Allah ﷻ who were convinced of the Hereafter, and the reason for this, is that this conviction prevents a person from evil, even in those situations in which there is no one to see him and there is no danger of being held responsible in this world.

<sup>iv</sup> Points to consider: A person looks at a book which is beautifully penned i.e. the book is extremely beautiful and the language there-in very eloquent. Logically, he will realize that this is not the result of ink and its coincidental and accidental movements, but the work of an experienced and expert author and calligrapher.

A person looks at a beautiful palace, which has numerous spacious and impressive rooms, extremely beautiful carpets and lights, as well as equally attractive springs and fountains. Only a foolish person will claim that this is the result of the co-incidental mixing of sand and water. Any intelligent person will be forced to exclaim that this is the work of expert engineers and builders.

When looking at a watch, one observes all the intricate parts within it. He then notes the accurateness of its movements and its meticulous functioning. The obvious conclusion will be that the watch has been constructed by an expert watch-maker. If someone claims that a blind, deaf and dumb person, who has no knowledge or understanding of watch-making, is the one who constructed this watch, then no sane person will accept this conclusion. Alternatively, if some-one claims that it is a result of co-incidental and accidental movements of matter which

---

gave rise to the form of the watch, and then, after further movements of this matter, all the intricacies of this watch were formed, all these parts got together by themselves and started functioning, giving correct time, he will be regarded as insane.

The perfect movement, functioning and existence of the entire universe all point to the existence of a Most Powerful, All-Knowing, All-Seeing, All-Hearing, Most Wise Being.

Imagine a house whose rooms are well provisioned with luxurious furniture, standing on a high mountain surrounded by a thick forest; suppose that a man came across this house, but could not find anybody nearby. Suppose that he thought that the rocks from the mountain had been scattered around, and then automatically collected together to take the shape of this splendid palace with its bedrooms, chambers, corridors, and fittings, that the trees in the wood had split of their own accord into boards, and formed themselves into doors and beds, seats and tables, each taking its place in the palace; that the fibres from the plants and wool and hair of the animals of their own accord had changed into embroidered cloth, and then were cut into carpets, pillows, and cushions, and dispersed about the rooms and settled onto sofas and chairs; that lamps and chandeliers by themselves had fallen into this palace from all directions and fixed themselves into the ceilings, individually and in groups; would you not conclude that this must be a figment of imagination, or the reasoning of someone disturbed in his mind?

What, then, do you think of a palace whose ceiling is the sky, whose floor is the earth, whose pillars are the mountains, whose ornamentation is the plants, and whose lamps are the stars, moon, and sun? In the correct judgment of the intellect, can it be of lesser importance than this house?

Is it not more likely to direct the attention and mind to a Shaping Creator, Alive, Self-Subsistent, Who Created and Shaped, and Who Determined and Guided?

And do you think that if a man brought millions of letters and began to move them around day after day, week after week, year after year, that he would obtain from them, by chance, a composition which is a book of literature, philosophy, or mathematics?

As the Orientalist David Santillana said, even after moving them around for generations, after all his toil he would still be left with individual letters. If this is so, as Santillana continues, how can we imagine that this universe, with the perfection and harmony between its individual parts, and their amazing compatibility with each other, could ever have come about through random movement in a limitless void, as the materialists imagine? There is no doubt that rational people would agree with Aristotle that 'Every order bespeaks the intelligence behind it.'

The above manner of demonstration [that is, the cosmological proof] is the method which Kant, the philosopher of Germany, declared to be the clearest and strongest proof of the Existence of God.

## Fundamental Beliefs for Muslims

From the Quran, we learn that the most valuable treasure is imaan and the greatest calamity is kufr (disbelief). Everlasting success is the result of imaan while everlasting loss is the consequence of kufr (disbelief).

---

Righteous deeds are only acceptable to Allaah ﷻ if imaan is present. Without correct beliefs, righteous deeds are not accepted for reward in the hereafter. Allaah ﷻ states, "Whoever practises righteous deeds, be it male or female, while he (or she) is a believer, verily they will enter Jannah." (Surah Nisaa verse 124) The first question posed to a person in the grave will be regarding beliefs.

As far as those whose beliefs are not correct i.e. the disbelievers, their righteous deeds will not be acceptable in the court of Allaah ﷻ in the hereafter.

Beliefs are like roots and actions are like the branches. Just as how branches grow because of the roots, similarly beliefs are the source of actions. Thus the greatest and most imperative obligation on man is to correct his beliefs and to cleanse himself of wrong ideologies. He should adorn himself with good actions and try to earn Allaah's pleasure, which in fact is the prime object of coming into this world.

One has to understand what the beliefs of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamaa'ah are. Their beliefs are those which Nabi H taught to the sahaabah M, and all of them remained steadfast on these beliefs without any difference. Later on, people introduced new beliefs and divided into many factions and groups. Nevertheless, the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamaa'ah remained staunch on the beliefs of the sahaabah M and did not devise their own belief structure. These are the same beliefs found in the Quran and ahaadith.

---

These basic beliefs are:

1.) Belief in Allaah  $\Phi$ : This entails in believing in the existence of Allaah  $\Phi$  as well as He being unique in His Being, qualities and actions. He has no partner. He is the Creator, Sustainer and Nourisher of everything. Only He  $\Phi$  is worthy of worship. To worship anyone besides Him is severe rebellion which is referred to as *shirk* (polytheism). Nothing happens without the will of Allaah  $\Phi$ . Not a single leaf can move without His will. Allaah  $\Phi$  knows everything. No atom or speck in the universe is concealed from His knowledge. Allaah  $\Phi$  is free from the qualities of the creation. He  $\Phi$  possesses all qualities of perfection. He  $\Phi$  is pure and free from all faults and deficiencies.

2.) Belief in the angels: Allaah  $\Phi$  has created a certain creation from light. They are concealed from our gazes. They are known as angels. We have not been informed whether they are masculine or feminine. They neither eat nor drink. They are free from urinating and defecating. They have been entrusted with many duties. They never do any action contrary to the command of Allaah  $\Phi$ . They are constantly in the worship of Allaah  $\Phi$  in different forms and never weary of worship.

3.) Belief in the divine books: Allaah  $\Phi$  had sent many divine scriptures and booklets from the heavens via Jibreel  $\Sigma$ , to the messengers, so that they could convey to their people the divine commands. Four of these books are famous: The Tawrat was revealed to Moosa  $\Sigma$ . The Zabur was revealed to Dawood  $\Sigma$ . The Injeel was revealed to Isaa  $\Sigma$ . All these

---

scriptures were revealed for a specified time. The Quran was revealed to our messenger, Muhammad H. The Quran bears testimony that these books were the true revelations of Allaah ﷻ, and that they were changed by people. It is necessary to believe in the truthfulness of all the divine books in their original form (and not in the altered form they are presently in). The Quran is the final scripture. It has cancelled and abrogated the other divine books. No new scripture will be revealed. It is the best of all heavenly scriptures and a miracle of Nabi H. The rulings of the Quran will remain till Qiyamah. Allaah ﷻ has promised to preserve the Quran, which entails its words and meanings. No additions, subtractions or changes can appear in it.

4.) Belief in the Messengers of Allah: The messengers are the pure and chaste servants of Allaah ﷻ, who were sent by Allaah ﷻ to guide His servants, so that the creation be brought closer to Allaah ﷻ and onto the straight path, and they be saved from deviation. They were human beings and possessed all human propensities and qualities. They possessed the greatest knowledge in their times and amongst their people. They were sinless. The final and most honourable of all messengers was Muhammad H. He H is the messenger to all man and jinn till the Day of Judgement. His message is general and for the entire universe. After his coming, all other divinely revealed religions and missions of the past messengers are abrogated and cancelled. It is obligatory to act in accordance with the Shariah (code of



law) of Sayyiduna Muhammad. Salvation in the hereafter is based on accepting the messengership of Muhammad H.

5.) Belief in the Last Day: A time will come when the whole world will be destroyed. This is called Qiyamah.

6.) Belief in Taqdir (predestination): Belief in *Qadr* means to believe that whatever happened, happens or will happen (good or bad) is in the knowledge of Allaah ﷻ and happens by His command and will.

7.) Belief in the Hereafter: This means that one must believe in the life of the grave, reckoning on the Day of Judgement, and then entry into Jannah or Jahannum.

Besides these beliefs, one should possess love and entertain good thoughts regarding every one of the companions of Rasulullaah H. To think or talk evil of them is open transgression of the law of the Quran. There is fear of kufr regarding such a person.

Mocking any part of Islam, denying the dharuriyat of din (those aspects known generally by all Muslims), and having doubt in the basic beliefs of Islam renders a person out of the fold of Islam. It is of utmost importance that a person learns and corrects his beliefs. He should consult the ulama and study authentic literature on this subject. May Allah ﷻ let us live with imaan, die with imaan, and be resurrected with imaan.