

# Chance, Probability and Atheists



Terms: **Probability, chance, impossible, possible, probable, feasible, unfeasible, operationally false, speculation, superstition.**

## Introduction:

The default position is that the universe and life are purposeful and meaningful and are the products of **knowledge, will, power and wisdom**. All observations in the horizons and within the bodies and souls provide evidence of this. The Muslim scholar **Ibn al-Qayyim** (d. 1350) said: “Whoever reflects upon the whole universe, its upper and lower [parts] and all of its domains will find it bearing witness to the affirmation of its maker, originator and owner.”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Madārij al-Sālikīn* (1/82). “Innate human faculties *unavoidably* generate beliefs of design, order and purpose which are rationally legitimate and warranted. Marks of design and purpose are recognized perceptually and implicitly (innately) and from here the inferential step to a designer is natural, minimal, rational and warranted. Such marks include contrivance, order, organization, intent, purpose, law-like behaviour, pursuit of goals or outcomes or goal-steering mechanisms, regularity, beauty and adaptation. This itself is the very source of the rational justification for

Staunch atheists readily admit that there is an overwhelming impression of design and that the design to designer inference is natural and expected. However, they then aim to overturn this necessity through **clever story-telling, employing deceptive technical and cryptic language**, and the **invocation of statistical probabilities** to make what is **theoretically possible** into an actual historical occurrence. And this is done without a single shred of scientific evidence that meets the standards of **empiricism, sound reason and logic** (in interpretation of data) and **repeatability or testability** which are all essential to the scientific method.

The default position of purposeful creation can only be overturned by establishing the truth of one of three other possible claims regarding the cause of the universe and life. And they are:

---

science and the scientific method, since the scientific method has underlying assumptions that cannot be verified by the scientific method itself, and must be assumed. It is therefore not possible to separate innate beliefs about the universe from scientific inquiry and the scientific enterprise as a whole. This is why up until the 19th century, and in the entire history of humanity—with very rare exceptions—all scientific research was conducted by believers in a Creator on the basis that they were studying the mechanisms in creation—*the ways and means, the causes and effects, the handiwork of the Creator*—in order to gain further enlightenment about the Creator. Likewise, to exploit their findings to facilitate human progress. The entire scientific enterprise rests upon the assumptions that the universe is **real, material, orderly, designed, consistent and rationally investigable**. This is why it is impossible to erase the innate disposition (fiṭrah)—*in which belief in a Creator is permanently embedded*—through any amount of materialist brainwashing within the lifecycle of education. It is why people will always be inclined towards belief in God and the desire to worship a Creator. Detailed knowledge of that creator, however, can only come through the medium of revelation, and not any other means.” From “This is Islam” (2018), p. 8.

- a) pure nothingness,
- b) an endless chain of causes or creators (an example of this is the claim or suggestion of aliens seeding life on earth) or
- c) self-origination of matter or self-organisation of nature.

The first two are false and atheists cannot revolve around them with any seriousness, though some of them—such as the three clowns, **Krauss, Dawkins, Atkins**—have tried to do so, but they have been mocked—even by other atheists—because of their use of sophistry in the process of proving the impossible and using word games to inject the meaning of “something” into “nothing”. This only leaves the third option. Within this option are the currently accepted claims regarding origins which are conjectural and speculative and do not meet the standards of empiricism, sound reason and testability.

Since purposes, end-goals, objectives, wisdoms, intent, will, choice and the likes cannot be invoked, and everything must be blind, purposeless and directionless in this scenario, then it means that we are effectively dealing with the **probabilities of physico-chemical dynamics**, that is the interactions between matter. Atheists cannot escape the use of language which includes end-goals, wisdoms, choice, intent, will and the likes when describing nature and hence they play with words in trying to camouflage all of this.

So faced with this scenario, Atheists play tricks and games by dismissing the innate default as only an “appearance” and “illusion”

and then making their own whims, fancies and fairy tales to be “inevitable” through technical, cryptic language, very clever story-telling and reliance on what is theoretically and statistically possible.

Here is what Dawkins wrote in one of his earlier books, and note the title, “Climbing Mount Improbable”: “Designed objects look designed, so much so that some people—probably, alas, most people—think that they are designed. These people are wrong... the true explanation— Darwinian natural selection<sup>2</sup>— is very different.” p 4-5. “Mount Improbable ... inch by million-year inch.” p. 77. “Nobody knows how it happened but, somehow, without violating the laws of physics and chemistry, a molecule arose that just happened to have the property of self-copying— a replicator.” p 282-3.

The next paragraph from Dawkins is perhaps the best example of the combination of clever story-telling, invoking statistical and theoretical possibilities, making actual design appear illusory and then

---

<sup>2</sup> Please note that “natural selection” on its own does not have any ability to innovate and introduce new function. This is because natural selection can only select FROM AMONG (a set of biological organisms), it cannot select FOR (functionality that does not yet exist in biological organisms). Hence, the novelty has to lie in something else, the random mutation part, and there is zero evidence that random mutations have the power to introduce new functionality with a net-increase of information. All examples given by atheists and evolutionists are simply **adaptations within a pre-programmed DNA-gene-cell framework** and are not examples of random mutations leading to new information, leading to new instructions, leading to new functionality.

conferring upon matter (nature) the design that actually belongs to an agent possessing knowledge, will, power and wisdom. He writes: “The more statistically improbable a thing is, the less can we believe that it just happened by blind chance... Darwin showed how it is possible for blind physical forces to mimic the effects of conscious design, and, by operating as a cumulative filter of chance variations, to lead eventually to organized and adaptive complexity, to mosquitoes and mammoths, to humans and therefore, indirectly, to books and computers.”<sup>3</sup> And similar to this clever story-telling is what is found on the back cover of his 1987 book, “The Blind Watchmaker”: “Natural selection is the blind watchmaker, blind because it does not see ahead, does not plan consequences, has no purpose in view. Yet the living results of natural selection overwhelmingly impress us with the appearance of design as if by a master watchmaker, impress us with the illusion of design and planning. The purpose of this book is to resolve the paradox to the satisfaction of the reader, and the purpose of this chapter is further to impress the reader with the power of the illusion of design.”

In discussions—when atheists are unable to contend in argument, and when simple, powerful evidences and analogies are given to them, they are forced to retreat to **statistical probabilities** in order to justify their religious belief that life is the product of blind, random, purposeless, physico-chemical dynamics, because this is the only option on the table for them and the only thing that they can work

---

<sup>3</sup> “The Necessity of Darwinism” in the New Scientist, no. 94, 18/4/1982, p. 130.

with, given that they have denied the involvement of knowledge, will, power and wisdom in the origins of the universe and life.

So here are some definitions and explanations of some terms that will aid the reader in better understanding what the atheist is really trying to achieve in the course of debate and discussion when he resorts to statistical probability.

1. **Probability** expresses the likelihood of an outcome with a range from 0 (impossible) to 1 (certain).
2. **“Chance”** is an expression of likelihood **and not causation**. It is not a “thing”, it is a word that describes mathematical possibilities. “Chance” cannot cause or create anything. Thus, it is not sound to say “created by chance”. In discussion, it is better to say “created in the absence of choice with intent”, or “created without knowledge, will, and intent” and so on. This is because the debate is about whether this creation is intended and purposeful, and thus it is a discussion about the attributes of knowledge, will, power and wisdom.
3. The probability of events in a sequence with each event being independent is the product of the probabilities of each event.  
Example: Rolling a six, five times in a row is  $(1 / 6)^5$  which is  $1 / 7776$  or 0.0001286.

Example: Tossing 10 heads in a row with a coin is  $0.5^{10}$  or 0.0009766.

4. The closer to a **probability of 1** a thing is, the more **possible** it is.
5. The closer to a **probability of 0** a thing is, the more **unlikely** it is.
6. A possible event becomes **probable** when its probability is **greater than 0.5**, but when it is less, it is more likely not to happen than to happen. As probability gets closer and closer to zero, an atheist starts believing (with “belief”, “faith” as they understand it) in more and more unlikely, absurd things.
7. Increasing the number of attempts for something that is impossible (probability of 0) will not increase its likelihood.
8. If the probability is not 0 but tends very closely towards 0, the event can “**theoretically**” happen. The beliefs of atheists about origins of the universe and life are “theoretical” in nature and do not have empirical grounds.
9. **Feasible** means able to be done, made or achieved, or viable, likely and reasonable. Not everything that can theoretically happen is feasible. For example, throwing 3

consecutive heads with a coin is feasible, but throwing 300 is not feasible. It is very unlikely

**10. Unfeasible** means not feasible. Not able to be done, made, or achieved, or not viable, likely or reasonable. In conducting our day to day lives, and in the practical application of science and in industry and technology, we do not operate on theoretical or statistical possibilities but on actual ground realities which are known as such through experience and empirical observations.

**11.** Further, **feasibility** itself must be verified through the scientific method for it to be invoked in any meaningful and credible manner for a given scenario.

**12.** The **statistical probability** of an outcome or scenario is not the same as the **logical possibility** of an outcome or scenario. Anything that is not logically possible, will never be statistically probable. It is impossible.

**13.** There is a **probability cut-off** point for everything beyond which **reality is no longer represented** and it becomes **operationally impossible and falsified**.

**14.** It is possible to calculate the cut-off point or limit beyond which any event can be **operationally falsified**. This is



based on the probabilistic resources of the earth, or universe, which are less than  $10^{70}$  and less than  $10^{108}$  respectively according to calculations. It is claimed or estimated that there are around  $10^{80}$  known atoms in the universe. In other words you can calculate the number of possible events allowed based on the number of atoms. Any scenario—such as origin of life—that does not meet these values for what takes place on earth ( $10^{70}$ ) or in the universe as a whole ( $10^{108}$ ), then it is rejected as **logically impossible** and **pure superstition**.

**15.** As elaboration of the above, this is how we calculate the number of all possible events given the amount of matter and a timeframe. The number of atoms in the universe is said to be  $10^{80}$ . We can give each atom  $10^{15}$  (a quadrillion) interactions taking place **every second**, and we then allow a very generous time frame of  $10^{20}$  seconds (3 trillion years). According to the law of powers, when we wish to multiply, we add the exponents, and hence we have  $80 + 15 + 20 = 115$ . Thus, the number of possible events in this very generous scenario is  $10^{115}$ .

**16.** Upon the above, if we have a 50 amino-acid protein, this would require a gene of 150 base-pairs in the DNA. A codon for an amino acid requires three base pairs. The probability of forming this is estimated at  $5 \times 10^{-91}$ . This is only for one simple, small protein, **And that is without consideration of**

**the whole architecture that must exist in the first place for such a scenario.** Thus, even this example is not realistic, because it is exponentially way too simplistic. Estimates have been made of forming the simplest life-compatible protein created by pure physicality at  $10^{-164}$  and of the simplest form of living organism at  $10^{-340,000,000}$ . Hence, these scenarios are **operationally falsified and logically impossible.**

**17.** According to Carl Sagan<sup>4</sup> the chance of life evolving on any given single planet, like the Earth, has a statistical probability of 1 in  $10^{2,000,000,000}$ . That's 1 in 10 with 2 billion zeros after it.

**18.** As you can now see, Atheists rely on pure superstition in their religious belief that life came about through physico-chemical dynamics alone and they believe what is **logically impossible.** They do this in order to flee the obvious conclusion dictated by innate disposition (fiṭrah), common sense, sensory perception (ḥiss) and sound reason ('aql ṣarīḥ) which have proven for thousands of years of human history that whatever has purposes, end-goals, goal-steering mechanisms, non-trivial function can only be a product of **knowledge, will, power and wisdom**, or in short, **choice with intent.** This is especially the case with biological life which is now treated as **an information science.**

---

<sup>4</sup> Sagan, Carl, ed. (1973), Communications with Extra-terrestrial Intelligence (Boston, MA: MIT Press), p. 46.

19. When it is said: “It is possible...”, and we are speaking beyond the probability cut-off point, then that is a false statement. Atheists make such false statements in the course of discussion.
20. As such, when Atheists resort to explanations using probability and chance, coupled with “natural law” (necessity), in order to flee from the default position that the universe and life are intended, purposeful and are the products of knowledge, will, power and wisdom, implying an agent, then they are fleeing from reason, science and empiricism to superstition, make believe and logical impossibility.
21. There is within humans an innate disposition which naturally rejects such outlandish claims, without requiring any detailed knowledge of science, philosophy, logic or rhetoric. Illiterate, barren old women in the villages of “third world” countries know this reality through basic intuition. This is why belief in a supreme creator cannot be erased from humanity, not even by sustained brainwashing with materialism through the lifecycle of education.

What has been presented above illustrates that the claims of atheists are **operationally false** and it reveals the desperations and lengths these people will go to in order to disguise their fairy-tale beliefs that

what is created does not require acts of creation exercised through the attributes of knowledge, will, wisdom and power.

After this, Atheists and Naturalists have numerous means through which they try to reduce the statistical odds to make the impossible appear possible, if not feasible, and one can already glean this from the statements of Dawkins cited earlier. Hence, their game-plan is as follows: How can we make the operationally impossible to appear possible, rather feasible, rather actual, rather as having happened as a matter of fact, and how can we make the actual and factual (as observed through sensory peception and processed through sound reason) to appear illusory. They do this without a shred of scientific evidence that meets the standards of scientific inquiry of empiricism (doing actual experiments to test the core, central hypothesis), sound reason and logic (in interpreting the data) and testability of the claim alongside repeatability.

Abu 'Iyaad

<http://aboutatheism.net>

5 Sha'bān 1440 / 10 April 2019 - v.1.2