

## SCIENCE, REASON AND CONSCIENCE: A PHILOSOPHICAL JOURNEY FROM THE CHAIR TO THE CREATOR - 14

The silence was broken by the resolute voice of the Atheist. With a thoughtful expression on his face, he prepared to challenge the Believer's arguments, drawing the full attention of everyone in the room. There was a sense of anticipation, as all wondered what his next move would be. At this critical point in the debate, the Atheist began explaining how natural selection plays a role in the formation of complex structures, emphasizing that evolutionary processes are not random. Would this explanation provide a strong counter-argument to the Believer's claims, or would the Believer respond with an even more striking answer to this new challenge? Breath held, everyone awaited the next word. Then, with a pensive look, the Atheist broke the silence once again.

**Atheist:** What you've said is quite impressive, and you've presented an undeniable mathematical challenge. At first glance, such large probability calculations may seem impossible. However, we must not overlook an important point here: **evolutionary processes are not random, but guided processes**. Through natural selection, harmful mutations are eliminated, while beneficial ones are preserved. **In this way, small advantages accumulated over millions of years can lead to the formation of complex structures.**

**Believer:** So, are you arguing that evolutionary processes are capable of forming such complex structures?

**Atheist:** Yes, the theory of evolution explains how small, beneficial changes accumulate over time, leading to the development of more complex structures. Mutations in simple organisms are subject to selection pressures, and over time, these organisms become more complex. The modern form of *E. coli* is a result of these long processes.

**Believer:** But how could *E. coli* have come into existence with such low probability, and how can it reproduce every 20 minutes? Moreover, this bacterium contains highly complex biomolecules like enzymes, DNA repair mechanisms, and ribosomes.

**Atheist:** The key point here is that **the evolutionary process is cumulative**. Each mutation might be small, but beneficial ones accumulate over generations, leading to significant changes. Additionally, natural selection allows organisms to adapt to their environments and develop complex structures.

**Believer:** So, you're arguing that the universe has a vast timeline and countless trial-and-error processes?

**Atheist:** Absolutely. Given the vast number of organisms and the immense span of time in the universe, even low-probability mutations can occur. These mutations accumulate, leading to the formation of complex biological structures. **Evolution is a guided process, not a random one.**

**Believer:** But still, is it possible for such a complex structure to form by chance?

**Atheist:** "Chance" can be a misleading term here. **While evolutionary processes rely on random variations at the beginning, natural selection guides and shapes these variations.** The evolutionary history of *E. coli* shows that it passed through countless intermediate forms

before reaching its modern state. These processes make the formation of complex structures possible.

**Believer:** The more I listen to you, **the more I realize I'm on the right path, and I feel grateful for it.** I asked many questions on purpose, **hoping you would eventually acknowledge the existence of a creator. In fact, without even realizing it, you've already admitted to this.**

Everything you've just said describes a creator. I'm not sure if you're aware, but instead of saying "creator," you use "natural processes." You're just changing the name. What you're describing points to a conscious, willful, and purposeful being. Instead of saying "Creator," "God," or as we say in Islam, "Allah," you call it "nature." Let me clarify what I mean with a few examples. And just in case you might argue, "We don't hold such an idea," I'll provide detailed sources for each of your thoughts in the footnotes below.

- **You say,** "This process occurs through the accumulation of small changes over millions of years. Therefore, such structures are not random, but are formed through a cumulative process over a long period of time."<sup>1</sup>
  - **I say:** This is an admission that there is no randomness, but order. The phrase "accumulation of small changes" points to consciousness and purpose. This implies will, control, power, and knowledge, which all indicate a creator.
- **You say,** "Evolutionary processes are not random, but guided processes."<sup>2</sup>
  - **I say:** Isn't the fact that a process is "guided" an acknowledgment of a conscious guide? Doesn't this guide need to have consciousness, intent, will, and authority?
- **You say,** "Through mutations and natural selection, organisms adapt over time and develop complex structures. This process occurs through the accumulation of small changes over millions of years."<sup>3</sup>
  - **I say:** With these words, you are unknowingly expressing the very arguments I defend. Are you aware of what you're saying? You're speaking of an underlying order and purposeful movement, which points to the existence of a will.
- **You say,** "Harmful mutations are eliminated, while beneficial ones are guided under selection pressures."<sup>4</sup>
  - **I say:** Doesn't this statement point to a creator who acts consciously? Selection and guidance require a conscious and intentional guiding force.
- **You say,** "Natural selection shapes living beings just as a sculptor shapes a block of marble."<sup>5</sup>
  - **I say:** This is akin to an artist consciously shaping their work. How can you overlook such a clear expression?
- **You say,** "These processes occur through the combination of biological, chemical, and physical events, and generally show a certain order and continuity."<sup>6</sup>
  - **I say:** Think about the words "order" and "continuity." Don't these words indicate the presence of a will and a conscious organizing power behind them?
- **You say,** "Evolution is not entirely random."<sup>7</sup>

- **I say:** I, too, say that there is no randomness in the universe. Doesn't the absence of randomness point to order, consciousness, intentionality, and knowledge?
- **You say,** "The impossibilities of the universe are becoming reality, and existences continue to arise."<sup>8</sup>
  - **I say:** Yes, what was once deemed "impossible" is becoming reality, and situations thought to be "impossible" are coming to life. These situations are made possible not by chance, but by a conscious will and a sovereign being.

You explain the workings of the universe through "natural processes." However, while defining these concepts and explaining their operations, you are essentially speaking as though you're describing a creator. You offer an explanation through the invisible and abstract concept of "natural processes," whereas I speak of a creator who works behind the scenes.

In conclusion, you also believe in a supernatural and abstract being, but you don't call it a "creator." **You claim not to believe in a supernatural power, yet you attribute supernatural qualities to these processes, essentially deifying them.**

- I believe in a single creator, Allah, and I defend this truth.
  - **You, however, believe in countless creators.**
- I attribute attributes and qualities to Allah,
  - While you assign these attributes and qualities to abstract concepts like natural laws and processes.
- When I question how these concepts work,
  - You abstract them even further, thus turning them into a form of deification.
- While I attribute names and attributes like "Almighty," "All-Knowing," "All-Seeing," and "The Shaper" to Allah,
  - You distribute these attributes among the beings in the universe, especially assigning them to natural processes and laws.

Are you aware of what you deny and what you believe in?

As the Atheist pondered the deep meaning behind the Believer's words, a look of astonishment appeared on his face, and the words struggled to leave his mouth. His eyes widened, and for a moment, his mind went blank. He had never heard these arguments expressed so sharply and plainly before. It was as if a heavy curtain had been drawn over everything he had defended for years, and now, with the Believer's words, the curtain was beginning to part.

*"How... How could I not see such an obvious truth?"* he whispered to himself. In his voice, the cracks of the walls that had long upheld his arguments were evident. He had gotten lost in his own rhetoric, unable to perceive the truths behind them. Shaking his head in disbelief, he tried to gather his thoughts.

*"If it's true,"* he whispered again, *"if there really is a force guiding evolution as he says... then what have I been defending?"* He paused for a moment, feeling an emptiness within himself. Somewhere

deep in his mind, there was a stirring, perhaps a doubt that had been suppressed for years, now slowly rising to the surface.

The Believer's eyes held a calm and peaceful expression, as if he had anticipated the Atheist's inner turmoil. The Atheist found himself lost in that serene gaze because, for a fleeting moment, all his defenses, all his scientific arguments, began to feel meaningless. *"Could the truth be this simple?"* he thought, *"Have I missed a simple truth all these years?"*

The heavy silence that followed thickened the air in the room. As the Atheist struggled to untangle the knots in his mind, the echo of the Believer's words lingered. Inside, he had entered a battle—between the arguments he had championed for years and these new ideas that carried a profound sense of truth. And now, for the first time, he began to ask himself, with sincerity, *"What do I truly believe?"*

**Believer:** My goal here is to show you what you are actually referring to. Whether you call it "Natural Processes," "Nature," or "Natural Laws," or whether you name it God, Creator, or Deity, in the end, you are already acknowledging a creator, though you may not realize it. ***That's why I've been saying from the beginning that you need to understand the true nature of the concepts you're using.***

Perhaps you're aware of this. In that case, it seems like you're deliberately trying to obscure the truth by using complex explanations, technical terms, and different names. ***But this is an old tactic.*** Nowadays, access to information is easier, and people are more open to discovering the truth.

***Anyone who can think, question, research, and seek the truth can now pursue it.*** But we can see that you are trying to steer people away from questioning this truth. You're raising a generation that spends time on social media, chases fleeting desires, can't bear to think deeply for more than a minute, and doesn't have the patience to read even half a page of information. ***Because in this era, where access to technology and knowledge is easy, you can only cover up the truth with such a generation.***

Numbed minds, apathetic individuals, a purposeless youth... A society deprived of the ability to read, analyze, and question is the type of person you're aiming for. We try to reach those who don't read through short videos, but even that falls short because these people lack the ability to understand and analyze the truth. It must be quite easy for you to control and deceive a community that chases momentary satisfaction. It's not hard to see that you've been quite successful in this.

When the Believer finished speaking, taking a deep breath, no one in the room said a word for a moment. Everyone was at a loss for how to react to these powerful and striking arguments. The faces of the Atheist and Agnostic seemed molded by the weight of the Believer's words.

This was the most tense moment of the discussion. It was as if the Believer's statements had dismantled all the defenses of the opposing side. The heaviness of truth weighed on everyone's shoulders, and uncertainty filled the air about what the next move would be.

And right at that moment, the Believer broke the silence in the room and continued speaking:

**Believer:** In fact, I acknowledge that there is some truth in what you say—that in attributing divine-like functions to natural processes and believing in countless deities in the form of atoms, you may be on to something.

These words sent shockwaves through the room. Eyes widened, and the faces of the Atheist and Agnostic froze in astonishment. The Believer's unexpected statement hit like a bombshell. One question was on everyone's mind: What did the Believer mean? Was this a joke, or was there a deeper meaning behind these words?

Silence filled every corner of the room. As everyone tried to make sense of what the Believer had said, they eagerly awaited his next sentence. The Believer, fully aware of all the attention on him, paused and took a deep breath. He scanned the room with his eyes, then continued:

**Believer:** Yes, by attributing such characteristics to what you call natural processes, you are unknowingly acknowledging a creator. While you may not claim that nature has divine consciousness, by assigning these traits to it, you are, in a sense, sanctifying it. **Understanding this is the first step toward accepting the existence of a creator.**

These words struck like lightning in the minds of those present. The Atheist and Agnostic now understood more clearly what the Believer was trying to convey, but they were still grappling with the contradictions this realization brought. The Believer's statement had shifted the entire discussion to another level, tearing down all the walls of defense. A deep, contemplative silence took over the room.

**Believer:** The Creator creates in two ways: *ibda* and *insha*. *Ibda* is creation out of nothing, like the initial creation of the universe. *Insha* is the formation of new things from existing elements. In this process, the atoms from the initial creation are used, and only their shape, color, or qualities are altered.

**We can liken *ibda* to the creation of an alphabet and *insha* to writing a book with that alphabet.** The elements are like a divine alphabet, created through *ibda*. **Every being is like a book written with the letters of this elemental alphabet.**

You explain everything in the universe through “*natural processes*,” but in fact, this is expressing the Creator's act of *insha*. **The reason you attribute divine qualities to natural processes is because of this.** The Creator continues to create new beings using the atoms and materials He has already created. You call this “*natural processes*,” **but in reality, it is the Creator's act of *insha*.**

You say it is “**a combination of biological, chemical, and physical events that show a specific order and continuity.**” **This too is the Creator's act of *insha*.** However, thinking that these materials move on their own makes this impossible. You are aware of this, but since you cannot find another explanation, you cling to this view. Yet, the Creator uses the materials He created to bring forth new beings.

Just as an engineer first designs a building in his mind and then uses materials to construct it, Allah designed the universe and created it using the elements. Your mistake is not seeing the invisible hand behind the materials and attributing existence solely to the process of material assembly. **Because you cannot see the Maker, you question the existence of the Maker.**

You acknowledge that a chair is made by a craftsman because you have observed this process many times. **So why don't you attribute the existence of things in the universe to a craftsman? He too creates new things using materials, and you call this "natural processes."** Your mistake here is looking for the Creator within the universe. A craftsman is outside of his creation, not inside it. This is a universal principle. The Creator of the universe is not within the universe.

We are beings within the universe. If a being imagines its maker as something of its own kind, it makes a mistake. A being's maker is unlike it, and the being cannot fully comprehend its maker. Remember the example of the stove. The maker of the stove does not resemble the stove and is not of the same kind. If the stove were conscious and tried to imagine its maker, it would err. The stove can know its maker in two ways: either by directly seeing the maker or by the maker leaving behind something to reveal himself.

The laws of nature are a reflection of the Creator's design. The Creator plans how to create and places this plan within the beings, like the codes in DNA. **The Creator both designs and uses the appropriate materials to bring beings into existence.** Moreover, He reveals this process of creation to conscious beings as a way to make Himself known. **But you attribute these qualities to materials, atoms, and elements, as if they possess divine power on their own.** By thinking that matter and natural laws operate autonomously, you overlook the Creator behind them. This is an error that stems from ignoring the true Creator.

It was clear that the Believer had shifted the course of the discussion with his deep explanations and striking examples. His words had opened a new door in the minds of everyone in the room. While emphasizing the importance of seeking truth, the Believer had shaken the doubts that lingered in the minds of those before him.

Now, having presented his arguments to this point, the Believer took a deep breath to bring them to a conclusion. He slowly scanned the room, looking at each person as if trying to gauge the depth of their thoughts. Under the stunned gazes of those feeling the weight of his words, he delivered one final, powerful sentence:

**Believer:** Those who seek the truth will eventually find it. Now I ask you: **Are you truly searching,** or are you simply walking the path you already know?

These words sliced through the air like a sharp blade, dividing the atmosphere in the room. As each person searched within themselves for an answer to this question, a palpable curiosity hung in the air about where the discussion would go from here. Everyone held their breath, following this critical moment. The Believer's deeply impactful speech had left the minds of his listeners in disarray.

At that moment, the door to the room slowly creaked open, and a new participant entered. Everyone's attention shifted to this new arrival. Who was this person? What would they say? How

would they contribute to the discussion? The Agnostic, the Believer, and the Atheist momentarily stepped out of their own thoughts, awaiting the words of this newcomer. Silence settled over the room once again, and everyone was eager to hear what would come next.

The new participant took a deep breath and began to speak:

**Deist (One Who Believes in a Creator, But Not in the Necessity of Religion):** You've reached the critical point of this discussion. Perhaps now is the time for me to offer a new perspective.

Turning to the Atheist and Agnostic, the Deist continued:

**Deist:** Didn't I tell you? There is a Creator, and we must acknowledge His existence; we cannot deny this truth. This Creator, of course, has created the universe, but **then He stepped back and left it to run on its own, like a clock.**

This was a new perspective. It didn't align with the views of the Atheist or Agnostic. It resembled the Believer's faith, yet the reaction on his face showed that it was also quite different.

In the fifteenth chapter, we will uncover who this new participant is, how their perspective will alter the course of the discussion, and how everyone in the room will proceed with this new understanding. Get ready, because the most exciting part is just about to begin...

## TO BE CONTINUED (GOD WILLING)

---

<sup>1</sup> The following sources support the claims made in the text regarding the evolutionary processes described as "the accumulation of small changes over millions of years" and that these structures result from a cumulative process rather than randomness, from the perspectives of atheists and agnostics:

1. **Khan Academy: Evolution - A Paleontologist's Perspective.**
  - o Khan Academy. (n.d.). *Evolution: A paleontologist's perspective*. Khan Academy.
2. **Tammy AI: The Evolution Debate.**
  - o Tammy AI. (2024). *The evolution debate: A conversation*. Tammy AI.
3. **International Journal for Philosophy of Religion: Progressive Atheism.**
  - o Schellenberg, J. L. (2024). *Progressive atheism: How moral evolution changes the god debate*. International Journal for Philosophy of Religion.
4. **Futuyma, D. J. (2017). Evolution. (4th ed.). Sinauer Associates.**
5. **Coyne, J. A. (2009). Why Evolution Is True. Viking.**

These sources reflect the contemporary academic views on how atheists and agnostics perceive evolutionary processes.

<sup>2</sup> Regarding the claim that "evolutionary processes are not random but guided," the following sources discuss how evolutionary processes are understood, emphasizing that these processes involve direction rather than randomness. The aforementioned sources also apply here.

1. **Pew Research Center: Views About Human Evolution Among Atheists.**
  - o Pew Research Center. (2021). *Views about human evolution among atheists*. Pew Research Center.
2. **Cambridge University Press: Agnostic Evolution in Modern Ideas of Evolution.**

- 
- Cambridge University Press. (2010). *Modern ideas of evolution as related to revelation and science*. Cambridge University Press.

3. **American Scientific Affiliation: Theistic Evolution - Directed or Undirected?**

- American Scientific Affiliation. (2021). *Theistic Evolution: Directed or Undirected?* American Scientific Affiliation.

4. **Dawkins, R. (1986). *The Blind Watchmaker*. W. W. Norton & Company.**

These sources demonstrate that evolutionary processes are guided by natural selection, rather than by a supernatural force.

<sup>3</sup> For the statement that “mutations and natural selection cause organisms to adapt over time and develop complex structures, which occurs through the accumulation of small changes over millions of years,” the following sources support the atheist and agnostic viewpoint:

1. **UC Museum of Paleontology: *But it's not random either!***

- UC Museum of Paleontology. (2024). *Understanding Evolution*. Understanding Evolution.

2. **National Geographic Society: *Natural Selection*.**

- National Geographic Society. (2023). *Natural Selection*. National Geographic.

3. **Atheist Alliance International: *Evolution and Natural Selection Revisited*.**

- Atheist Alliance International. (2024). *Evolution, The Struggle For Existence, And Forms Of Natural Selection Revisited And Interpreted*. Atheist Alliance International.

<sup>4</sup> The following sources support the statement that “harmful mutations are eliminated, while beneficial ones are guided under selection pressures”:

1. **Springer Evolutionary Ecology.**

- Gerstein, A. C., & Sharp, N. P. (2021). *The population genetics of ploidy change in unicellular fungi*. *FEMS Microbiology Reviews*. doi:10.1093/femsre/fuab035.

2. **Quanta Magazine: *Supergenes and Evolutionary Genetics*.**

- Charlesworth, D. (2024). *Supergenes and Evolutionary Genetics*. Quanta Magazine.

3. **Nature.com: *Evolutionary Adaptation and Positive Selection in Humans*.**

- Hancock, A. M., et al. (2024). *Evolutionary adaptation and positive selection in humans*. Nature.

4. **Darwin, C. (1859). *On the Origin of Species*. John Murray.**

5. **Orr, H. A. (2009). *Fitness and its role in evolutionary genetics*. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 10(8), 531-539.**

<sup>5</sup> Sources supporting the statement that “natural selection shapes living beings just as a sculptor shapes a block of marble” are:

1. **National Geographic Society: *Natural Selection*.**

- National Geographic Society. (2023). *Natural Selection*. National Geographic.

2. **Quanta Magazine: *Supergenes and Evolutionary Genetics*.**

- Charlesworth, D. (2024). *Supergenes and Evolutionary Genetics*. Quanta Magazine.

3. **Understanding Evolution (2024).**

- UC Museum of Paleontology. (2024). *But it's not random either!*. Understanding Evolution.

4. **Dawkins, R. (1986). *The Blind Watchmaker*. W. W. Norton & Company.**

5. **Gould, S. J., & Lewontin, R. C. (1979). *The spandrels of San Marco and the Panglossian paradigm*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*.**

6. **Dennett, D. C. (1995). *Darwin's Dangerous Idea*. Simon & Schuster.**

<sup>6</sup> For the statement that “these processes occur through the combination of biological, chemical, and physical events and typically exhibit a specific order and continuity,” these sources support the claim:

1. **Quanta Magazine: *Supergenes and Evolutionary Genetics*.**

- Charlesworth, D. (2024). *Supergenes and Evolutionary Genetics*. Quanta Magazine.

2. **Springer Evolutionary Ecology (2021).**

- Gerstein, A. C., & Sharp, N. P. (2021). *The population genetics of ploidy change in unicellular fungi*. *FEMS Microbiology Reviews*. doi:10.1093/femsre/fuab035.

3. **Nature Education (2024).**

- Hancock, A. M., et al. (2024). *Evolutionary adaptation and positive selection in humans*. Nature.

4. **Campbell, N. A., & Reece, J. B. (2008). *Biology*. (8th ed.). Pearson Education.**

5. **Atkins, P., & de Paula, J. (2014). *Physical Chemistry*. (10th ed.). Oxford University Press.**

6. **Halliday, D., Resnick, R., & Walker, J. (2013). *Fundamentals of Physics*. (10th ed.). Wiley.**

<sup>7</sup> Finally, for the statement “evolution is not entirely random,” the following sources are relevant:

1. **UC Berkeley Understanding Evolution.**

- UC Museum of Paleontology. (2024). *But it's not random either!*. Understanding Evolution.

2. **National Geographic Society: *Natural Selection*.**



- 
- National Geographic Society. (2023). *Natural Selection*. National Geographic.
  - 3. **Atheist Alliance International.**
    - Atheist Alliance International. (2024). *Evolution, The Struggle For Existence, And Forms Of Natural Selection Revisited And Interpreted*. Atheist Alliance International.
  - 4. **Futuyma, D. J. (2017). *Evolution*. Sinauer Associates.**
  - 5. **Coyne, J. A. (2009). *Why Evolution Is True*. Viking.**
  - 6. **Dawkins, R. (1986). *The Blind Watchmaker*. W. W. Norton & Company.**

<sup>8</sup> For the statement “the impossibilities of the universe are happening, and existence continues, proving natural processes to be true,” the supporting sources are:

1. **Carroll, S. (2016). *The Big Picture: On the Origins of Life, Meaning, and the Universe Itself*. Dutton.**
2. **Dawkins, R. (2006). *The God Delusion*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.**
3. **Krauss, L. M. (2012). *A Universe from Nothing*. Free Press.**
4. **Carroll, S. B. (2016). *The Serengeti Rules*. Princeton University Press.**
5. **Dawkins, R. (1986). *The Blind Watchmaker*. W. W. Norton & Company.**
6. **Sagan, C. (1980). *Cosmos*. Random House.**