

**A REASONED
AND
LEVEL HEADED
RESPONSE
TO
AN ATHEIST**

**Previous titles:
WHY PSEUDO-SCIENTISTS FAIL TO
EXPLAIN GOD
Or
WHO IS THE MONKEY**

INTRODUCTION

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 the whole of 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 should be rejected should not be something to be amazed at. From the very beginning of the coming into existence of Man 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 Mauláná Rumi illustrates the position of the scientists accurately. It is being reproduced here, slightly modified:

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. The youth, through lack of information and lacking in skills to answer these people 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.

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. Somebody said that the student mentioned in the original article was Albert Einstein. Obviously, with all the changes made to the original article, the “students” depicted here are fictitious.

With re-writing the article, I have also added and deleted from the original, to render it more comprehensive. Hopefully, inshá-Alláh, it may help the reader to be better informed when he/she does come across material that promotes the baseless theory of evolution.

Obviously, a booklet of this nature cannot tackle all the issues related to the topic under discussion. Nor is it meant to. Some end-notes have been added for the benefit of those who would like to delve further into the topic.

Dr. Ismail Mangera

In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful

A reasoned and level-headed response to an atheist

**Previous titles:
WHY PSEUDO-SCIENTISTS FAIL TO EXPLAIN GOD
or**

WHO IS THE MONKEY?

(A dialogue between a professor and a student.)
“Professing to be wise, they become fools.”

[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?”

[No answer.]

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

Suddenly the lecturer breaks away to pace the front of the classroom like an ageing, confident panther. The class is mesmerised. He continues: “Tell me, 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 student sits, browbeaten into apparent defeat. However, *‘the help of Allah 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*, I see. Come, come, young man! Speak some proper wisdom to the gathering!”

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, in your view, always existed 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, because those who reject the existence of a Divine Being are merely ‘priests’ promoting atheism as a religion.

“Coming to the question of the origin of the universe:

“Firstly: Years ago the famous astronomer, Edwin Hubble, showed that the universe was in a constant state of expansion. If it is expanding, then it follows, working backwards and calculating its contraction, it must have had a starting point. So, your theory that the universe always existed, has no scientific proof. On the other hand, scientific research conclusively proves that at some stage the universe came into existence from nothing.

“Secondly, matter cannot 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. Therefore the matter from which the universe arose must have been created. So, it follows that there is a Creator who created the initial matter from which the universe arose.

“Thirdly, there was no spontaneous explosion that took place. We are all aware that, despite there being tons of explosive material in factories and other places, explosives need to be set off by specific means. Also, the results of any explosion are destructive. However, we see that the universe is highly organised, very complex and very finely tuned. Just one example: if the sun was just slightly farther away in its orbit, we would all freeze to death. If, on the other hand, the sun had to be slightly 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.

“Fourthly, according to the second law of thermodynamics any system left on its own deteriorates. This would 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 come into 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.]

“Where did this tremendous energy that was required for the universe to come into existence, 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 a universe that always existed or one that was formed by a spontaneous explosion. 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.]

“If you don't mind, professor, I will now go on to the doctrine of evolution as promulgated by the 'priests' of atheism. You are aware that 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'?”

“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 transition from ape to man. And I'm sure you are also aware of the Piltdown Forgery, professor?”

“Piltdown...? Piltdown...?”

“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 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 scientific fraternity had 'doctored' the fossils to make them appear to be that of the missing link. It was a big lie, a massive forgery that Darwinists had forged to try to 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, of South Africa, and others, on the details of the forgery.”

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. But what is the relevance of this?”

“Thank you, professor. I shall explain in a minute. 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 personages like Avicenna, Averroes and others were Muslims who had made great 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 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 backbone of all their doctrines is the concept of ‘natural selection’. 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 species which did not adapt, became extinct. The classic example given is that of the dinosaurs which could not compete with smaller, more agile animals which had miraculously ‘evolved’, thus the bigger, more slower animals became extinct, whilst the smaller animals survived. 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 grasp, the final result being Man. You do subscribe to this doctrine, don’t you, professor?”

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 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.]

“Of course not, even though attempts have been made, sure enough! Let us go a step further: We know that the Jews circumcise their male offspring very soon after birth. We also know that circumcision has been practised by them in an unbroken chain since the time of Abraham (peace be on him). As a result, certain illness patterns have changed. Any male child with an inherited bleeding tendency would have died from bleeding and this disease would not have passed on to the next generation. You agree, professor?”

The professor nods eagerly, thinking that this is a point in his favour.

“So, tell us, professor, after thousands of years of circumcising all male infants, why are Jewish children not born without a foreskin? Even if the whole foreskin was not missing, according to the doctrine of natural selection of your priests, there should be some signs of the foreskin getting smaller! Don’t you agree, professor?”

The poor professor just stares blankly ahead, not knowing what hit him!

“Professor, do you have children?”

Somewhat relieved at the change of topic, the professor tries to muster some of his previous confidence. “Yes, I do. I have two boys and a girl.” The professor even manages to smile when he mentions his children.

“Professor, did you breast-feed them when they were infants?”

Somewhat taken aback by this obviously silly question, the professor blurts out. “What a stupid question! Of course, I did not! My wife did the breast-feeding.”

“Professor, have your priests ever discovered any males who breast-feed infants?”

“Again a stupid question. Only females breast-feed infants.”

“Professor, without being personal, I am certain that you have two nipples, just like all other males. Why have these not disappeared because of redundancy? According to the doctrine of natural selection, such useless items as nipples in males, should have disappeared in all males thousands if not millions of years ago!”

The Muslim student spoke gently, he did not shout and he did not push his face into that of the professor's. "Professor, I'm sure that, based on proper scientific argument and not on pseudo-science you will agree that the doctrine of evolution is just *a big load of rubbish?*"

The professor's face changes a number of colours and all he can do is splutter helplessly.

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 to the Mosque 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 naïve 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 cruellest 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 sacrifice his sleep 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 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' 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. Let us continue. Tell me, professor, is there such a thing as heat?"

The professor has recovered somewhat and he is feeling more confident. "Yes, there's heat."

"Is there such a thing as cold?"

"Yes, there's cold, too."

"No, sir. There isn't!"

The professor just stares blankly. The student explains: "You can have lots of heat, even more heat, super-heat, mega-heat, white heat, or at the opposite pole a little heat, or no heat, but we can't have anything called 'cold'. We can reach 458 degrees below zero, which is no heat, but we can't go further beyond that. There is no such thing as 'cold', otherwise we would be able to go colder than 458 degrees below zero. You see, sir, 'cold' is only a word we use to describe *the absence of heat*. We cannot measure cold. Heat we can measure in thermal units because heat is energy. *Cold is not the opposite of heat but merely the absence of heat.*"

Silence. A pin drops somewhere in the room.

The Muslim student continues: "Is there such a thing as darkness, professor?"

"That's another dumb question, son. What is night if it isn't darkness? What are you getting at...?"

"So, you say there is such a thing as darkness?"

"Yes."

"You're wrong again, sir! Darkness is not an entity it is the absence of an entity. It is the absence of light. One can have dim light, normal light, bright light, flashing light. If one has *no light* constantly then one has nothing, and this is called darkness, isn't it? That's the meaning we use to define the word. In reality, darkness isn't. If it were, one would be able to create darkness in a positive way and make darkness darker and obtain it in a container. Can you fill a jar with darker darkness for me, professor?"

"Would you mind telling us what your point is, young man?"

"Yes, professor. The point I'm making is that your philosophical premise is flawed, to start with, and so your conclusion must be in error. You are not scientific, but pseudo-scientific!"

The professor goes toxic. "Flawed...? How dare you...!"

The Muslim student is very cool and calm, and he speaks gently, as if to a little child. "Sir, may I explain what I mean?"

The students in the class eagerly nod their heads. They are all ears. The professor has no alternative but to consent. "Explain. Oh, explain." He waves his hand indifferently, in an admirable effort to regain control. Suddenly he is affability itself. The class is silent, expectant.

"You are working on the premise of duality," the Muslim student explains. "For example, there is life and then there's death, two different entities; a good God and a bad God. You are viewing the concept of God as a finite entity, an entity we can measure. Sir, science cannot even explain what a thought is. It uses electricity and magnetism, but has never seen them, much less understood them. To view death as the opposite of life is to be ignorant of the

fact that death cannot exist as a substantive entity. Death is not the opposite of life, but merely *the absence of life.*”

The young man holds up a newspaper he takes from one of the other student’s desks. “Here is one of the most disgusting tabloids this country hosts, professor. Is there such a thing as immorality?”

“Of course there is. Now look...”

“Wrong again, sir. You see, immorality is merely the *absence of morality.* Is there such a thing as injustice? No, sir. Injustice is *the absence of justice.* Is there such a thing as evil?” The Muslim student pauses. “Isn’t evil the *absence of good?*”

The professor’s face has turned an alarming colour. He is so angry that he is temporarily speechless.

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 phenomena going,” the Muslim student replies. “Newspapers make billions of dollars reporting 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. This is an obvious contradiction. However, let us analyse to see who is really responsible for the spread of evil those who believe in God, or those who don’t?

“Firstly, we all know that punishment is a strong deterrent for committing crimes. We are all agreed that without this concept we would not be able to run our worldly affairs: fines, penalties, jail sentences and other measures are part and parcel of any civilised system.

“Taken the case of Muslims: A fundamental belief is that of being resurrected on the Day of Judgement and answering for deeds performed in this world. For every good that there will be reward and for every evil committed there will be accountability. 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.

“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 and no punishment. The message to the masses is quite clear: ‘if you can get away with it then you are O.K. You have nothing to worry about’.

“Also, seeing that atheists 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. Seeing that they do not recognise any divine rules there can’t be a thing called sin.

“It follows, according to the atheists, that man is free to make up his own rules, his own code of ‘morality’. Thus men get ‘married’ to men and 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 mother has. The list 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 of ‘*laissez-aller* morality’. 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 its code of morality, is in fact spreading goodness; whereas the group which makes up its own rules of ‘relative morality’ is, in fact, spreading evil throughout the world.”

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 been 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 the apes, 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 evolution 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 evolution at work and cannot even prove that this process is an on-going 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 sits in shocked silence. The Muslim student stands cool and calm. After a pause

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 its 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 who 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) 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 ever 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 to another situation: Has anybody seen the professor’s brains? Touched it, smelt 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 functions of the brain and this is sufficient to indicate that the professor has a highly intelligent brain.”

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 prove 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. Sighing heavily and with 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: “*Sir, 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.”

There is complete silence as the students await an explanation.

“The reason is that we were not there as witnesses when conceived. We were non-existent when the chromosomes combined to give rise to us as foetuses in our mothers’ wombs. *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: “Yes, we take the words of our parents. Yes, 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 word 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 or she 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, these tests do not tell you who your parents are, but they merely confirm or reject the claims of parents with regard to parenthood.”

The Muslim student pauses again. He then continues: “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 and of oxygen, of molecules and of atoms, are just a few of the millions of instances where we have to accept the word of others.

“So, when it comes to matters that are metaphysical, from our *real* 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 Muhammad peace be on him 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) 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 (as we have to accept many other things) that Paradise and Hell exist; that angels exist; that there will come the Day of Judgement; that accountability to God for our deeds will happen; and many other concepts.

“Besides this one point, there are many other pointers to the existence of God (Allah). 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 unknown men 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. Yet, we are prepared take their word. So, why should we doubt the word of the Messengers whom friend and foe have attested to be absolutely honest?”

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 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 (God), has grasped a firm handhold which will never break; And Allah 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 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 to the mosque 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 developed into terrestrial life and so forth, until the 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 live a very advanced form of 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 (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 they 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 taken in 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 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 apes, 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' notice with regard to the above 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 is just a fairy tale.
- 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 are 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 for one perfect model to arise. But the chances of human genes being formed 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.”

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).