

## Excavating Evolution

The scientific dogma of the 20th century

Observe the sun rising in the morning, the stars hanging in the sky in their beautiful order, the incredible nature of man or of any other creature for that matter. See their intricate system interwoven, as splendid tapestry, systems upon systems, beauty upon beauty, complexity upon complexity.

If we were to come upon a beach where pebbles and stones had been arranged in an intricate pattern, we would feel no hesitation in jumping to the conclusion that they had been arranged in such a manner by someone. Although it is theoretically possible that the sea could have deposited the stones and pebbles in such a manner by chance. It would be considered most unlikely.

The standard argument put forward to counter the argument, that a Creator exists, is that the universe came into being purely by chance through the random forces of nature over millions of years. Thus the diversity and intricacy found in humans and animals is put down to chance. This argument holds that there is no purpose behind the universe and the complexity and intricacy of the world. Living experience shows us that without the Creator's 'design' the random evolutionary process could never have got started.

Finally, how does one explain the beauty and diversity in the world without reference to a purposeful Creator. The world exhibits order and regularity that testifies to the wisdom of Creator. This is in stark contradiction to the scientific view that things naturally tend towards disorder, which only proves that something is indeed ordering life to a particular plan.

Such an intricate relationship require an intelligent, purposeful power behind the world, and not the random unconscious and unintelligent process of chance. The occurrence of events requiring intelligence to explain them is positive proof for the designer of the world. Allah the Supreme being.

Like the Church in the Middle Ages that chained the minds of the people into thinking that there was no hope for salvation outside the Church, the Scientific Community has worked along the similar lines to enslave the people with the notion that the concepts of Evolution and Science are the key to understanding the nature of life and the universe.

Much too often we are forced to sit as passive observers in lecture halls as university professors dazzle the crowd with the idea that apes and baboons gave birth to humans. They have raised the Evolutionist Theory to the level of something holy.

In this age of science and technology, we have become accustomed to thinking that science is everything. Let us suppose for a moment that scientific knowledge became so complete that it encompassed everything in the universe. Would we then be any closer to answer, through science, questions like: "Why is there a universe?" and "What is the purpose of life?"

Science cannot answer such questions because scientific knowledge is derived through experiments. Science is concerned with observing things, i.e., the way things behave. Questions like "Why did the universe come into being?" cannot be answered just by observing things in an experiment.

A scientist can observe the movements of the watch and conclude that the watch keeps time because the quartz and the mechanics or electronics behaves in a particular manner; however, such observation will never answer the question "Why did the watch-maker make the watch?"

Indeed, scientific experiment alone will not tell us that there is a creator for the universe or a watch-maker for the watch. Now, if we substitute the watch for the universe, external observation alone will not answer the question "Why is there a universe?" Rather, these observations should be used to lead us to answer the big question.

Today there is such an ideology or way of life which answers all of the questions about our existence in a comprehensive manner. This ideology is Islam, and it is a complete way of life.

The education system of western nations is a means by which the thoughts, ideas, and culture of the secular ideology is preserved and protected. So vehement is the protection that any viewpoint in life that challenges the secular view and its systems is suppressed, distorted and eradicated. This distortion is nowhere more apparent than the area of science where any hint of objective scientific phenomena challenging the secular belief is distorted and presented as fact to conform to the belief. One of the best known examples of this manipulation is the subject of the origin of life and evolution.

In Islam, there is no disagreement between the objective scientific phenomena and the Islamic creed. On the contrary, the Islamic belief is built upon the objective reality, upon the foundation of fact rather than theory, assumption, or blindly accepted belief and therefore no manipulation of scientific phenomena needs to occur to conform to its belief.

We will endeavour to show the fallacy of modern scientific thinking regarding the evolution of mankind as a species, commonly referred to as Darwinism.

It is a fact that many of us take information for granted or just at face value, because it has a great deal of scientific backing.

For indeed it is science that has put digital watches on our wrists, television in our living rooms, and sent mankind into space. The credibility that science has attained over the last three hundred years has empowered it to start dictating the way people think. No longer do we question the theories and proposals, more likely we start taking them as fact, and very soon it becomes foolish to argue against them. So when we are faced with the question "are we descendant from apes?" we are more inclined to answer "yes", not because we are convinced of the theory, but more because of scientific thinking.

## THE QUESTION OF LIFE

The first stage of the theory states :

Life started as a result of an accident in the sea. This is commonly referred to as "spontaneous generation."

The result of this accident was a single celled organism which could 'replicate' itself to form similar organisms.

The spontaneous generation took place within what is known as the 'organic soup'.

When it comes to the creation of life on this planet, the principle of 'chance' is invoked. The belief posits that given a large enough number of planets, and the correct planetary conditions in the presence of the correct fundamental building blocks, life could have emerged spontaneously by chance on at least one of these planets (earth).

The earth at that time was very volatile with a great deal of seismic and volcanic activity. There was radiation from the sun owing to the partially formed atmosphere, and harsh weather conditions that existed. The distance from the sun was such that the temperature of the earth was able to sustain water in liquid form.

Within these oceans existed a mixture of elements compounds, and complex chemical chains. This is commonly referred to as 'organic soup'. Organic compounds are the building blocks that all living beings are comprised of (amino acids). It is not totally unlikely that organic compounds existed at this stage, since they can be formed by certain conditions arising. Up to this point the scenario that exists all seems very plausible according to the evidence we have in the fields of astronomy and chemistry. Indeed with only a partially formed atmosphere, and the beginning of a crust forming, the climate would have been very severe.

## THE FALLACY

The key statement amongst the facts illustrated above is that 'life started by accident through a process known as spontaneous generation'. To say that it started by accident means that it was an incidental byproduct of serious conditions. In fact, the objective was never to create life. .."it just happened".

It is impossible to objectively analyze this because science itself is proclaiming that it does not have the reason or the cause of life itself. So, the question begs "what is life?"

The inanimate or abiotic matter is simply the world we see around us, it comprises the elements that makes up the ground upon which we walk, the air we breathe, the buildings in which we live, or the cars that we drive. These are elements that do not have a mind or characteristics possessed by living or biotic organisms. The organic compounds are those that are necessary for the formation of life but like matter they are just unique configurations of inanimate objects. 'A collection of inanimate objects is itself inanimate'.

To say that life spontaneously arose from a collection of organic compounds i.e. a collection of inanimate objects is totally irrational and therefore totally absurd. The reason being that once life was formed it had needs and requirements, & it needed laws to regulate it, since it did not ability to create laws for itel. To state that an element is the source of laws to regulate itself is completely infounded & highyl ludicrous ! This same element has the ability to replicate itself, repair itself, & possessed survival characteristics.

All of these are implicit attributes of life, i.e. everything we see living around us needs sustenance, has the ability to renew or reproduce, and generates factors unique to its survival. We have to remember that we are dealing with a collection of organic compounds or a collection of inanimate objects. Somehow this collection of organic compounds gained an extra attribute that yields the

characteristics of life that cannot be totally understood. As of yet there is absolutely no understanding of the nature of the bridge between organic compounds and life.

In addition to this, scientists are still puzzled as to how the very first cell was able to survive let alone start replicating itself. Given the harsh temperatures and conditions that existed at that time, it seems a more probable event that such an organism would have been instantaneously eliminated.

Even if it did survive, what was existent in the cell to instruct it to create another just like it (the process of cell division and replication i.e. mitosis/meiosis? This can only mean that the first cell had some genetic structure thus begging some essential and fundamental questions.

How did the first D.N.A. (or equivalent) molecule come into being?

We know that genetic material only comes from a parent cell. Where was the parent cell?

What is instructing this molecule to replicate itself, and maintain the coding for hereditary cells?

Again this is an issue which is not satisfactorily tackled by science, since they use spontaneous generation example to hide what they do not know. They cannot answer how elements re-arranged themselves into unique configurations of genetic material, and this complex coded chain then became the key to defining the characteristics of the organism.

With the state of technology that exists at the moment it would be very easy to recreate (within a controlled environment) the harsh conditions that would have existed during the early period of the earth. So you think that scientists would be actively trying to recreate these conditions within experiments to see if life itself could be created spontaneously as they suggest.

However, in numerous experiments by scientists they have never been able to produce the minimum required quantity of amino acids from a random selection of elements under a myriad of conditions, let alone these building blocks to resemble anything that could be classified as life.

Professor Stanley Miller conducted an experiment to see if it was possible to create the basic building blocks for life. By accident he set up chemical solutions inside a flask and passed high voltage arcs through the flask. In many attempts altering the experimental parameters, he was never able to create more than four amino acids. The minimum requirement for each cell in the human body is twenty.

The fact that they have not generated life has been attributed to the failure to replicate the exact conditions that they presume to have existed, since according to them it is the natural consequence of a pre-set environment. On the other hand there were scientists like Louis Pasteur and Francisco Redy who contradicted modern belief by stating that life could only come from previous life. If this was the case, where did the first cell receive its life from?

From leading biologists in this field it becomes apparent that probabilities of life emerging by itself was virtually non-existent. In fact, the number quoted was so immensely small that it could not even be imagined. It was estimated that in order to create a D.N.A. molecule by accident required fourteen stages.

Within each stage there is a sequence of approximately ten steps which lead to the next stage. The probabilities are not known, so an example of a dice was used. If a dice was thrown at each step, the probability of success at each stage is one in six. For a successful of 140 stages (fourteen stages with ten sequences each) the probability would be one in  $6 \times 10^{140}$  a number which incidentally is more than the number of atoms in the entire universe! It is like having an explosion at a printing factory that results in a concise English dictionary by letters and words forming randomly. This is far from

the reality within which we exist

D.N.A. is simply the collection of inanimate matter. There is something beyond the material form of D.N.A. to account for life giving properties (i.e., what differentiates live matter from dead matter). Indeed, biologists recognize the fact that life could be independent of the elements, coding or structure of the D.N.A. molecule.

Twins could be born absolutely identical in make up and D.N.A.. However, one could be still born. From a chemical make up point of view they are exactly identical, their D.N.A. structure is exactly the same, however one has life the other has not.

Why does the characteristic of life exist in one and not the other?

After having explained the uniqueness and wonder of life that most biologists appreciate, it seems confusing that they leave the whole subject untackled. They say that life commenced through an unknown cause (an accident) & they leave the whole subject unfinished from a scientific viewpoint. The educational establishment, in upholding the secular view has tried to convince the populace that science has answered the question of life.

## EVOLUTION

Not content with icing over the question of life, one of the specialties of the educational establishment has been the constant reinforcement of the assumption of evolution.

So how did modern scientists and indeed Darwin himself postulate simple organisms started to give rise to more complex and advanced organisms?

Evolutionary theory continues to state that:

According to the theorists, this first living organism replicated itself in abundance from similar organisms. According to normal cell division, the rate of replication would have been geometric if the external factors remained constant. There is no idea of what structure the cell had at this stage, but it would have needed to be complex enough to undergo cell division as is understood by modern science.

The first cells found themselves living in a hostile environment such that the original cells were struggling to survive there in harsh surroundings.

The random element known as mutation resulted in variations occurring within the basic genetic structure. These primitive structures succumbed to the processes of Natural Selection.

There are a lot of terms here, all that need explanation before an in depth analysis can take place.

Geometric cell division is where each cell replicates at the same rate. So, in effect if we have one cell, and it divides then there are two. Then if the cells divide there are four. . . then eight, sixteen, thirty-two and so on. . .

Mutation is the process of random genetic change. All cells within an organism carry hereditary material in the form of genes, arranged linearly on the chromosomes contained in the nuclei of the cells. As the body grows, new cells are created with identical genetic material. Sometimes, genes make mistakes copying the genetic code. This is known as genetic mutation. Various factors can affect the rate of genetic mutation. These include external agents such as radiation, chemicals, smoke and certain edibles.

Natural Selection : The process of Evolution needs Natural Selection. Genetic Mutations are identified as the root cause of the change of characteristics of a certain number of members of a species. If the change enables that proportion to be better suited for survival, then as the environment changes, only those organisms within the species that are better suited for survival will live. This means that through time, only enhanced features will eventually dominate the species, and nature will gradually eliminate those species which lack this feature. In other words, weak & unsuitable forms that fail to adapt to their environment die out, while the strong & well adapted organisms survive "Survival of the Fittest."

In fact, this is the basis of Evolution. It is a very concise and clear theory to understand and appreciate (which probably relates to one of the reasons it has been so widely accepted.)

The theory itself doesn't sound so ridiculous. However, there is vast evidence that points to the fact that this could not possibly have been the case.

### Genetic Mutation

Firstly, Darwinian theory lays the basis of evolutionary change with genetic mutation. The problem here is that an overwhelming majority of mutations are fatal to the organism. Mutations are rarely beneficial, sometimes neutral, but mostly harmful, resulting in deformed, sick or weakened organisms.

In today's world where the effects of radiation/pollution are far less than primitive earth, you would expect less mutation. However, the effects of mutation are no less pronounced. According to some recent studies an incredible 99.99% of genetic mutations kill the cells in which they occur (be they harmful or even beneficial.)

Sometimes mutations may cause a cell to lose control of its machinery. For example, the affected cells undergo uncontrolled cell division, resulting in cancerous growth. Many human diseases can be traced to mutant genes.

Only in a very few cases will the organism be able to survive a mutation, but even then to be of any use to the organism's survival, it must produce a result in a feature which enhances the survival characteristics of the organism within that environment (e.g., a deer that has larger muscles on its hind legs allowing it to run faster from predators.)

### The Mechanics of Evolution

So, to be of any use, the mutation must result in an enhancement of physical characteristics as specified above. The mutations must take place within the sex cells in order to be passed on to progeny.

So, taking the example above, the mutation of muscle for the deer not only has to take place in the hind legs, but, it also had to take place within the sex cells of the deer (a mutation in a certain part of the body, without taking place in the sex cells, will never get passed to any of the breeding population).

The most evident problem here is that a large number of mutations would have to have taken place over a very large amount of time in order to produce a minimum quantity of viable organisms that were better suited to the changed environment (thousands of generations over millions of years). And then as the environment changed the ones that were less able to survive were selected out of existence. However, going by the nature of genetic mutation, if the rate of mutation were increased then the mortality rate of the organisms would have also drastically increased.

So in order for a species to develop from a lower one in a very short space of time would mean that the number of mutations would have to have been very high, which also implies that a large proportion of those organisms affected would have died.

A stark example will illustrate this principle:

Consider the evolution of terrestrial organisms to airborne organisms (i.e. since life started in the sea, at some stage in history according to Darwin, sea based organisms progressed onto land, some of these land based animals subsequently took to the air).

In order to create a viable airborne organism, a wing is required. So an arm of a creature had to evolve into a wing. Note, here that a stark mutation from an arm to a wing does not occur overnight. Many mutations will have to take place, over a considerable amount of time, before full transition is effective (typically millions of years). During the phase in which the arm is mutating into a wing it is neither a wing or an arm, and as such it is evidently detrimental to the organisms survival in the environment it was adapting. An organism with fully functional arms is better suited to survival than one which is undergoing mutations within the arm. In its current form, the mutated organism is in a form of disability because it is not able to use the originally intended arm for its main purpose. It is thus vulnerable, and by Darwin's own process of natural selection, it should be selected out of existence (because in its current form of transition it is not the fittest to survive).

Taking this example further, not only must the arms become wings but the entire physical structure must simultaneously evolve together in order for an effective transition to take place (i.e. in order

for flight to take place the strength to weight ratio is critical as is the skeletal structure, and muscle development, heart rate, lung capacity...etc.).

So, in other words, what we are trying to say is that an organism suited to living on the ground, undergoes physical mutation for flight, and somehow, according to the theory undergoes similar mutation that will enable it to eventually fly. It is not enough to have one feature, all these features must evolve together simultaneously. The design complexity required for such a change from a land bearing mammal to an airborne organism defies the idea that such selections could have happened by chance.

What the theory proposes is that those within the species undergoing transition from land to airborne flight, succeeded as far as natural selection is concerned. Why would they succeed...?

Of those that survived mutation, only a few mutated to the necessary further physical features that would enable flight. Of those, only a few had the equivalent mutation with their sex cells. At each stage, the mutation gets rarer and rarer, and the number of organisms gets less and less, and the time span stretches over thousands of millions of years. These facts only lend to the implausibility of the theory.

A second example that is widely used is the successful competition example:

According to Darwin, a modern giraffe's long neck is an evidence of successful competition. If indeed there was such a competition and this competition only favored its long-necked forms, how did the female giraffes and the baby giraffes (which are shorter than the males) survive during periods of scarcity of food (when the leaves were on the highest branches).

According to Darwin's standards, female & baby giraffes would have died first, and then the whole race would have died out in the absence of the females.

There are many other examples that lend themselves to the fact that such stark mutation from species to species could not have occurred in this manner.

#### The Continual Process

According to Darwin, life originated on earth from simple single-celled organisms giving rise to the multicellular organisms through process of gradual change, through random mutations over millions of years.

This is how the diversity of species is explained:

There is overwhelming evidence today that the intermediate forms required for the process of evolution are totally absent. Darwin was frustrated by this, and this frustration extends to evolutionists today.

If evolution was an ongoing process, we should be able to see evolving species, genera, classes. But, the fact is that there are sharply definable features within a species (classified easily). This puts evolutionists in a very embarrassing situation.

Darwin wrote, "Why, if species have descended from other species to fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? Why is not all of nature in confusion, instead of the species as we see them, well defined?"

To put it bluntly, if indeed mankind was descended from apes and evolution is a continuous ongoing process, then why do we not find today a half-man/half ape?

According to the theory, evolution resulted in the single cell organism forming more advanced better suited and more adaptable multi-celled organisms. If natural selection took over, then why weren't the single cells selected out of existence. Unicellular and multicellular organisms exist to



this day together in the same environment. Bacteria and yeast are the oldest surviving organisms and yet they show no signs of evolution. Why have they survived unchanged?

Some may argue that such organisms were too small to evolve, but if we look at starfish (440-500 million years), shark (350-400 million years), horseshoe crab (500-600 million years), these are neither too small or too simple or too recent in time, and yet still they too have escaped evolution.

It seems that certain forms existed and died out, and some other forms have existed in a set state for a considerable time. It does not seem that nature has made any species progress drastically into another species.

When we look at fossil remains there is no evidence of gradual development, (in fact, the opposite is true). Charles Darwin wondered about this, but reconciled that when plenty of fossils were unearthed, in the near future the gradual change could hopefully be seen. Indeed, he was postulating a theory which needed proof, and to him that is all it was-just a theory. Today, unfortunately it has been taken as fact.

Today, large amounts of fossil evidence exist. The evidence basically lead to the conclusion that species existed for a set time, only to be replaced by a markedly different species.

These facts are now generally accepted by biologists, despite the fact that they significantly oppose Darwinism.

J.F. Case & V.E. Steirs write:

"... Though the fossil record makes an enormously important contribution to evolutionary theory, this source of data poses some questions that have proved to be a source of embarrassment to evolutionary theorists."

#### Variations within a Species vs. Evolution of a Species

There exists a definite difference between: 1) Variation within a species, 2) Evolution of a species. The area of most confusion that exists when evolutionists cling so dearly to the theory, is when they try to reconcile the variation of species and the variation within those species. Although evolution sounds improbable, there is no other scientific explanation of the wide variety of animal species present on this planet.

##### 1. ) Variations within a Species

We see today many variations within a particular bird species: feathers, colour, weight, etc. This can occur, and is classified as variation within a species. There is no better proof of this than the human species. We can see the immense variation between individuals, and races living in different continents. The pygmies of Central Africa differ considerably in relation to the fair skinned people of Europe, but they are still the same species. Its just that the genetic make-up controlling the height is different.

Even with people of the same race; hair color, eye color, mental ability are all varying factors affected by the natural selection processes of human breeding.

The combining of the parent hereditary genes upon human conception, is a random factor influenced only by dominant genes governing certain characteristics. However, the fundamental genes governing human characteristics (i.e. two arms, two legs, bone structure, muscle configuration...) remain unchanged.

##### 2. ) Evolution of a Species

According to the theory, evolution of a species will only occur if the fundamental characteristics change within the progeny, and that mutated change is beneficial to that organism (i.e. increases its survival factor within a changing environment), and that organism manages to reproduce that

change to the rest of the species within that habitat, such that it becomes the dominant survival characteristic over its predecessor.

There is a distinct difference between the two.

Take for example, a selection of cockroaches that have immunity A & immunity B. If an insecticide is released which kills the immunity B cockroaches, then we cannot say that type A is an evolution within the cockroach species. It is still a cockroach and it has been living as a cockroach for the last few million years. It is simply a variation within that species that has succeeded as far as natural selection is concerned.

These two examples have simply illustrated the change in ratio of two different variants within a particular species (not evolution).

Indeed, changes have occurred but they have not been of such magnitude so as to change a lizard into a bird or a mouse into a man. There seems to be inherent rules, that while permitting certain amount of variation in certain directions, do not allow solid boundary of the permanent kind to be crossed over into another. Whatever change occurs, it occurs within secure boundaries of the same kind.

Even Pierre Crosee who held the chair of evolution for 30 years at the Sorbonne university writes "The repertory of mutations of a species has nothing to do with evolution. They merely represent the mutation spectrum".

## The Mind

The probability of life emerging by itself is astoundingly small (if at all we can say that the DNA molecule gives rise to life). But what has left scientists in the fields of anatomy, psychology, and even computer science completely baffled is the mind of human beings.

The mind is the sensing of the reality linked with the precedent information, allowing human beings to produce thoughts and enable them to verify that they exist.

We say that computers work in a similar fashion to the processing abilities of the brain, but they do not have a mind. They are not aware of their own existence, they cannot produce independent thought.

Of course, you know that you exist. But if you were to examine yourself from a material point of view, then all you consist of is a collection of complex chains of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, and some trace elements.

What gives this strange collection of atoms the ability to recognize that it exists?

Why does it attempt to protect itself against danger?

Why do we generate emotions, like love, hate and jealousy?

...given that all that is happening at the base level is, electrical impulses firing along neurons.

Indeed, if as Darwin proposes, that all life on earth emerged from just one single cell, and that the evolution of species was a random factor, then how does the theory account for the development of mental processes, and the mind. Nature seems to have played a cruel trick on Darwin. Since it seems that when we consider man in relation to other species, dominance has not occurred via physical survival characteristics. It has in fact come via progressive thought.

Many biologists have tried to attribute this to the brain to body ratio. But if we look at apes, the brain to body ratio is almost the same, and yet they have not advanced as far as man has. There is in fact, a more fundamental difference between humans and animals. Some may argue that you can teach an animal tricks and they have the ability to learn, but this is indeed not true. In animals it is based on reward, i.e. the instincts are pushing the animal to satisfy a certain requirement. This is in stark contrast to the human child who will ask the question, "WHY?," because it has a mind which allows it to learn and progress.

Again, as in the dilemma of life itself, the ability for a human mind to be able to monitor, react, and control a machine more complex and involved than any super computer on this earth (i.e. human body,) leaves evolutionists at a complete loss as to how this could occur through the haphazard random process they describe as Evolution. It actually seems as though evolving organisms knew their goal. Could it be the result of fortuitous simultaneous mutations or are there other factors involved which we are not considering or cannot understand...?

"We can still stand in awe of a universe in which galaxies and life and the human mind came into being. Evidence from cosmology does not provide a proof for the existence of God but it is consistent with belief in a cosmic design that is not pre-determined in all its details.

Humans might seem insignificant in the immensity of time and space, but the greatest complexity in the universe was not in the atomic structure or the galactic scale. It lies in the 100 million synapses in the human brain. The number of ways of connecting these, is greater than the number of atoms in the universe.

There is a higher level of organization and richness in a human being than in a thousand lifeless galaxies. It is human beings, after all, that reach out to understand that cosmic immensity." [Prof. Ian Barbour]

## The Dogma

How did evolution work with such serious difficulties...?

It is obvious that throughout the history of this planet, that species have come and gone, each being succeeded by other forms, as though it was following a well defined system.

Today, in schools, evolution is taught almost as fact, indoctrinating many millions with the idea that the current race of mankind in fact, all the species on earth derived their existence from a freak accident many millions of years ago. Something which may never have happened, something with no known cause, no reason, and no purpose.

It does not seem to be a reasonable conclusion. The immense complexity around us has lead many to concede that there may well be something beyond which we understand that instigated and controlled at the development of life on this planet.

J.F. Case & V.E. Stiers write

"...It is as though life-forms incubating in a single-celled form for a billion years or more, suddenly evolved overnight into the great variety of complex multicellular animals."

Prof. D'arcy Thompson quotes:

"...Eighty years of Darwinism evolution has not taught us how birds descend from reptiles, nor vertebrates from invertebrate stock..."

"...The breach between vertebrate & invertebrate, worm & coelenterate, and protozoan is so wide that we cannot set across the intervening gap at all...to seek for stepping stones across the gaps between is to seek in vain forever."

The Theory of Evolution has become a symbol of scientific logic & progressive thinking although its nothing of the kind. It has been taken as a dogma, proven or unproven it is always right. The absence of a coherent alternative to Darwinism has made biologists feel that a bad theory is better than no theory at all.

## Conclusion

Islam is a system of life which originated from the Creator (Allah in Arabic). Allah is the One who created man, life, and the universe and subjected man to the physical laws that He imposed on the universe. The Qur'an, as revealed to Muhammed (peace be upon him), directs man to study the physical world in order to understand the reality and to appreciate more the greatness of the One who created man, life and the universe.

Many verses in the Qur'an point to the physical world and explain natural phenomena to man, as a confirmation for mankind that this revelation is from the Creator, the Supreme. Some of these explanations could not be understood at the time of the revelation because man did not have the tools that we take for granted in modern times, such as the microscope, X-rays, etc. It is only in the last hundred years that some of these explanations became understood as a result of advances in science.

The examples in the Qur'an are many and range from the creation of the universe down to the fertilization of the egg by the sperm. It will suffice here just to quote few of these verses.

Ayat

"Do not the disbelievers see that the heavens and the earth were of one piece, then We parted them? We made every living thing from water. Will they not then believe?" [Translation of the meaning of the Qur'an, chapter 21; verse 30]

Ayat

"Do you not see that Allah has made subservient to you whatsoever is in the earth." [Translation of the meaning of the Qur'an chapter 22; verse 65]

Ayat

"Then We placed him as (a drop of) sperm in a place of rest, firmly fixed. Then we made the sperm into a thing which clings (to the womb), then of that thing We made a (fetus) lump, then We made out of that lump, bones and clothed the bones with flesh, then We developed out of it another creature. So blessed be Allah, the perfect Creator." [Translation of the meaning of the Qur'an, chapter 23; verses 13-14]

Ayat

"Verily, in cattle there is a lesson for you. We give you to drink of what is inside their bodies, coming from a conjunction between the contents of the intestines and blood, a milk pure and pleasant for those who drink it." [Translation of the meaning of the Qur'an, chapter 16; verse 66]

Although Islam points to the physical world to make man think, it did not come to explain the detailed physical laws, nor did it come to stop man from discovering them. Rather, it came to organize man's relationship with man himself, man's relationship with the society and man's relationship with his Creator. Islamic law therefore deals with the proper use of scientific facts and not their discovery in the state and society. For example, Islam does not prevent man from designing a gun, but it does lay down principles for its use.

Islam is an ideology which offers solution to all the problems faced by humanity.

Islam secures the mind by asking mankind to think about the existence of the creator and arrive to the rational conclusion that He does exist. **THAT'S RIGHT. GO AHEAD THINK & SCRUTINIZE ABOUT THE EXISTENCE OF THE CREATOR and THE NATURE OF HIS CREATION. DONT HAVE BLIND FAITH. DONT STOP THINKING.**