

## Science, Evolution and the Qu'ran

Prof. Huseyin Atay

The religions brought by the prophets have deviated from their true paths and true goals; men of religion have interpreted religious teaching according to their own desires and thus made the original meaning invisible. Because the words of interpreters were put into practice, having being regarded as divine words, men grew tired and wearied. As a result, reasonable men did not consider those practices to be true religion and gave up their religions. I am saying here that those who use their minds reject these religions. At the same time, those who reason do not reject God. Hence, God and these religions must be separated from each other.

Regarding this point, I would like to express my gratitude to German Professor Otfried Höffe<sup>1</sup>. Upon reading my book İslam'ı Yeniden Anlama (A New Understanding of Islam), he understood that I was not dogmatic and emphasized this in his writing. Dogma means to uphold and accept the accuracy of any view without questioning and disputing it. In fact, I owe my practice of being non-dogmatic<sup>2</sup> to the Holy Qu'ran, since the Qu'ran attaches much importance to the thinking, discussing, and reasoning of man.

Two basic motivations or inclinations are predominant in the nature of man. One of these is to bring his ontological nature into safety and find a person to help him do so. This leads him to find God. All living creatures have this motivation. Just as plants need water and sun to maintain their lives, so animals and men show inclination toward shelter and practices that foster a sense of security and belonging. Living beings produce subsequent generations to succeed them with the goal that their descendents survive. As such, plants produce seeds and animals give birth. Since animals lack a sense of time, they are satisfied with maintaining their existence through their descendants. Men are not simply content with maintaining an existence through their descendants; they also think of the future of their own existence. They wonder about their future and find the answer in believing in a God who will take measures to ensure their existence.

The second basic motivation and inclination of man is his curiosity to learn. This desire begins during infancy and continues until his death. The distinctive feature separating man from animals is his having mind, power of mind. By using this power, man can rule over both living and non-living beings, and over men, his own species.

In order to express this fact more clearly, Aristotle pointed out in his definition of man that the mind is one of the elements of human nature. He said "Man is a living intelligent being".

This statement is constructed of two elements; the first is to be living and the second is to be intelligent. If one accepts this definition by Aristotle, the Qu'ran regards he who does not use his brain as the most evil of creatures.<sup>3</sup> According to

---

<sup>1</sup> Liberale Demokratie, Kulturen und Religionen, 13-14, Juni, 2005/Berlin 10.

<sup>2</sup> Dogma: To accept one's word without testing is called supposition in philosophy and faith in religion. Since neither supposition nor faith are tested, neither pertains to science.

<sup>3</sup> Anfal; 8/22. According to God, the worst creatures of living beings are the deaf and the dumb who do not use their mind.

Aristotle, man may pass judgment using either of two distinct means. Aristotle says, “Now mind is always right, but appetite and imagination may be either right or wrong.”<sup>4</sup> Men often attribute every judgment passed by human consciousness to the reasoning mind. However, as mentioned by Aristotle, apart from mind, man also has other powers and faculties that produce judgments.

That which is judged by mind can be illustrated with a very simple example, as follows: Let us imagine a tree, which has fallen down and blocks a road. A cow comes along and, realizing that the road is closed and it will not be able to cross, goes back. A man also comes along, realizes that the road is closed, and goes back. Up to this point, there is no difference between the two creatures. The fact that the tree is blocking the road is reflected in their minds as in a mirror, and both see the picture. They recognize the situation as one which requires turning back. After turning back, however, the following difference appears between the behavior of the cow and the behavior of the man: while turning back, the cow cannot say anything to warn another cow that is heading towards tree, but the man can tell another person who is coming that the road is closed. The difference between man and cow is the fact that the animal is not able to grasp that it is a tree which has blocked the road, while the man knows that what is blocking the road is called a tree.

Impressions such as pictures, smells and sensations are conveyed to the human mind through the human senses from external world. These sensations and sentiments reflected upon the tabula rasa of the mind are not science and knowing. They are perceptions and perceived objects. Just as animals perceive, so man perceives, and both can behave according to their perceptions. Despite this, such perceptions are not knowledge. But when the mind gives names to these impressions and sensations, they are transferred to the field of knowledge, and from that point onward, knowing and doing science begins. By giving names to sensations, the mind creates knowledge and science. A priori knowledge is contained neither in mind nor in memory. Just after the mind gives names to those sensations in the intellect, they are no longer in a concrete field but rather conveyed to the abstract field. Therefore, science itself is metaphysics, the metaphysical world and a field of abstractions. In other words, metaphysics is not outside physics; on the contrary, it resides within physics, one within the other. By this activity, the mind distinguishes man from animal. Undoubtedly, that which is abstract has near, distant, low and high layers; as there is no science without language, so it is that mind creates language.

In my study of the Qu’ran, I will begin by putting forth and explaining two basic principles. The first examines the question “What is science according to the Qu’ran?” i.e. epistemology according to the Qu’ran. The second concerns the observation that science in the Qu’ran comes before faith and thus constitutes the fundamental basis of faith.

According to the Qu’ran, epistemology has two sources. One of them is the five senses and the other is the mind that produces science. In the Qu’ran, the accumulation of knowledge in man is described as starting from scratch. Man knows nothing when he is born. By saying that He gave man hearing, sight and hearts,<sup>5</sup> God emphasizes that man gains knowledge through hearing, seeing and thinking. Hearing and seeing precede thinking, which is based upon them. The following verse makes it

---

<sup>4</sup> On the Soul, 432-a. 26-27.

<sup>5</sup> Nakh, 16/78.

clear that when man is born, having made no attempt at knowledge, it does not exist in his mind as a form.

“And follow not that of which you have not knowledge; surely the hearing and the sight and the heart, about all of these you shall be questioned.”<sup>6</sup>

Here, two principles are put forth. One emphasizes that science should be done objectively, without showing bias toward any side. The second emphasizes integrity, so that impartial science is in fact carried out. These attributes, objectivity and integrity, characterize true scientific activity.

Properly speaking, it is antithetical to the Qu’ran to say that science and religion are different fields that are not contrary to each other but rather harmonious, for science itself is religion. The truth that science reaches is a truth sought after, and religion regards the truth and practice reached by science as merit. It is by experimentation that man attains scientific knowledge, and to objectively put the value of science into effect among people is religion. This religious proposal must completely be true and straightforward

The Qu’ranic criterion by which the knowledge that a man acquires from others should be measured is to listen to every word carefully. This means that any word, regardless of its owner, should be evaluated. One must consider all words, no matter to whom they belong, whether God or prophet or scholar or philosopher, etc. All should be listened to, and then a decision should be made by comparing among them so that the best, the most beautiful, the most useful and the most correct words are chosen. Here the method and process is comparative and occurs in a man’s own mind. To conclude this point, the Qu’ran authorizes man’s thinking and deciding and holds him responsible for it.

God opens his existence to debate: "Is there a doubt about Allah, The Creator of the heavens and the earth?"<sup>7</sup>, and He himself answers this question. Concerning this matter, the duty of intelligent beings is to likewise think and consider.

“Give, then, this glad tiding to [those of] my servants who listen [closely] to all that is said, and follow the best of it. It is they whom God has graced with His guidance, and it is they who are [truly] endowed with insight!”<sup>8</sup>

The Qu’ran also states that those who have not received any verbal information (revelation) about God can find the truth with their minds.<sup>9</sup> Both in the past and today, many people have understood the truth correctly, although they did not receive divine revelation (*vahy*). According to God, those who behave in accordance with their minds are acceptable and admirable people.

The Qu’ran finds science reliable, not faith, since falsehood may occur in faith but not in science. It accuses those who claim to believe of being liars.<sup>10</sup> In another verse, it criticizes the faith of believers saying, “Miserable indeed is what your faith confers upon you, if you do have any faith.”<sup>11</sup> Since faith is subjective, the Qu’ran does not regard faith as reliable. It includes both falsehood and truth. So, whoever argues for his faith should be tested. Knowledge is objective; everyone comprehends its truthfulness or falsity. The Qu’ran says: “Do men think that they will be left alone in saying, “We believe,” without being put to the test? And certainly we tested those

---

<sup>6</sup> Isra, 17/36. This verse is repeated 14 times.

<sup>7</sup> Ibrahim, 14/10.

<sup>8</sup> Zumar, 39/18.

<sup>9</sup> Nisa, 4/83.

<sup>10</sup> Hujurat, 49/14; 2/8.

<sup>11</sup> Baqara, 2/93.

who came before them, so God will certainly know those who are true, and he will certainly know the liars.”<sup>12</sup>

Whoever says that he believes, by doing so, gives information about the existence of faith in his mind. Our first reaction towards him should be to keep quiet. We should neither accuse him of infidelity nor accept his faith. As his sharing of his faith is a statement, it can be either true or untrue as it is the case with any statement. The main purpose of the Qu’ran for man is to guide him in reliable knowledge and right conduct. I have phrased this as follows: Discipline in knowledge, discipline in thought and discipline in conduct are the qualities that the Qu’ran aims to see in man.

It is in line with the Qu’ran to treat man as a comprising two phases: Man as he is initially created and man as he is re-created. The Qu’ran does not refer to the first creation of other beings in as much detail as it refers to that of man. As such, maybe it assumes that the former can be understood by comparison to the creation of man.

“Man We did create from a quintessence (of clay). Then We placed him as (a drop of) sperm in a place of rest, firmly fixed; Then We made the sperm into a clot of congealed blood; then of that clot 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 best to create!”<sup>13</sup>

God speaks to man about man. What is man, who is he, what can he do, what must he do, and so God also speaks to man of Himself. Man is at the centre of the Qu’ran. Apart from spirit, God also gave man something else. It is soul (*nafs*).<sup>14</sup>

91:7 And the soul and Him who made it perfect,

91:8 Then He inspired it to understand what is right and wrong for it;

91:9 He will indeed be successful who purifies it.

91:10 And he will indeed fail who corrupts it.<sup>15</sup>

The Qu’ran is not an ordinary scientific book. It speaks of history, but it is not a book of history. It speaks of nature, but it is not a book of natural sciences. It speaks of physics, but it is not a book of physics. It speaks of all kinds of matters, aiming to draw man’s attention to those matters, that he may look upon and focus on them.

In a verse, the Qu’ran says as follows:

“Does He not know, He who created? He is the knower of subtleties, the Aware.”<sup>16</sup>

That is to say, does anyone not know what he has done? Since God created man, He knows him best, and so the Qu’ran employs different methods and expressions to describe how and why someone will act under certain conditions and in certain situations. In this sense, the Qu’ran includes universal principles, rules and judgments that lead and guide man’s life, although it is a small book. The Qu’ran always recommends thinking and seeking via one’s mind for help. The most direct expression of this fact is that the Qu’ran is subject to reason and that it must be understood in line with the mind and science; the mind is not subject to the Qu’ran.

Religion’s duty is to assess how knowledge can be used in man’s favor or to his detriment. No duality is found in science. The judgment of religion and the judgement of science can not be different. Science is religion. If one seeks out

---

<sup>12</sup> Ankabut, 29/2-3.

<sup>13</sup> 23/12

<sup>14</sup> In the Qu’ran, spirit (*rûh*) is used in the sense of soul (*nafs*).

<sup>15</sup> 91/ 7- 10

<sup>16</sup> Mulk 67/14.

knowledge with his mind, religion accepts it. Religion does not produce knowledge; it makes use of knowledge produced by the mind. The mind speaks of truth; any false information not based on experiment and observation is only an assumption or a prediction. It is the duty of the mind to make a distinction between right and wrong.

Knowledge is produced for knowledge's sake. If it is produced in the name of someone, it will be produced for him and is not absolute but rather relative. It is only true knowledge if it is produced merely to produce knowledge. When knowledge is real, then it is produced for God, since God is truth.

In my opinion, the controversy between evolutionists and creationists occurs at three points.

1. Identification of the theory of science and explanation of what science is and is not.
2. Suppression of science and scientists for thousands of years by men of religion who regarded holy narratives literally and employed these as expressions of power and authority over scientists.
3. Restriction and suppression of man's personality and freedom.

By speaking about the creation of man from mud, the Qu'ran indicates the importance of the first creation of other beings. Following this example, Muslim scholars from early times advocated learning about the first creation creatures because of their faith. I do not intend to argue that the foundations of the present day theory of evolution were laid down by Muslims. Philosophers before Islam also made attempts to identify the source of existence. I would like to say that such thought came to be studied and such work is not forbidden by religion. By doing such work, no one can be accused of doing something forbidden; on the contrary, religion supports such work.

As knowledge increases and advances, earlier pieces of knowledge get older and useless and need to be exchanged. This leads to conflict among people and among different powers and inclinations such as mind, intellect, imagination and desire. Among these people with various inclinations and understandings, some rarely or never make use of their minds. Those who found God by earlier knowledge oppose new knowledge for the fear that, if they exchange it for fresh knowledge, they will be obliged to leave God and thus be deprived of His guarantee.

Religionists bear the fault for the war that broke out between scientists and themselves. Because first they showed hostility to scientists, scientists began to react against this in the form of atheism.

It is just at this point that Howard Selsam's following statement seems to solve the matter completely. "Many philosophies have become the means to reconcile science and religion."<sup>17</sup> It is clear from this statement that those religionists and scientists, that is, those fanatics of religion and of science, are making use of this conflict on the part of their followers to guard their pecuniary or moral interests. Science is something static; science identifies the existence of any event or object. Science observes what is known; science is a process of producing knowledge; it is an expression of a fact that was observed and confirmed by the mind with words. As for faith, it confirms facts, i.e. the knowledge that was produced by the scientific process. Faith does not produce knowledge but rather approves or disapproves the produced knowledge. It is will or *irâda* that makes a decision to accept any object, or to reject

---

<sup>17</sup> Howard Selsam, Prof., *Din, Bilim ve Felsefe*, translated by Mehmet Türdeş, İstanbul, 2003, 23,

it. Here, philosophy makes use of this knowledge, works on it and produces from it different kinds of knowledge. This meta-knowledge is achieved by philosophy. Therefore, philosophy is the mother of science. Philosophy produces ideas and choices whose falsity and/or accuracy is discussed by theology, and Logic establishes the connection between knowledge and events. I have formulated this as P.T.L.: Philosophy-Theology-Logic. Philosophy is the art and science of knowing the unknown, seeing the unseen. This can be achieved only by mind. Mind knows what is known, knows the unknown from the known by making inferences. It is mind which has called science knowledge. It is mind that changes the picture of an object seen by eyes into knowledge.

Have evolutionists restricted themselves too much and encircled themselves within the narrow walls of substance?

A materialist argues that he is not obliged to prove the nonexistence of a God ruling over events and has no right to explain a scientific fact by a supernatural power. Laplace, a French mathematician and astronomer who developed theory of the solar system in a systematical way, provides a classical example of this state. To the comment that he had not mentioned God in his work, he said that he did not feel it necessary to postulate God<sup>18</sup> because he was not engaging in philosophy but rather identifying what he saw. Science does not make inference, it looks, and describes what it sees. Therefore, it is the mind's duty to infer.

There is no controversy between the definition of science by a Materialist and that of Laplace; in fact, there is a correspondence. I consider those who define science and practice it in this way to be objective in their research. They fit in well with the following view: they are working in a given order; the order is established for them. They look like an employee in a company. They needn't search for the founder of the company. So, they don't need God, because God is the founder of order. Whoever wants to set up an additional order leaves the order in which he finds himself and tries to establish a new order. Now, I have said that whoever wants to establish an order needs God, but whoever wants to live in an established order does not need God. According to the Qu'ran, fanatical and militant religionists have no right to attack those who remain in the given order and accuse them of being atheists.

Sixty years ago I read Charles Darwin's book *On the Origin of Species* in its Arabic translation. As I read, I was enjoying it and advancing in my quest to discover the origins of creatures, their first appearance. When I had finished reading the book, I had not found what I was looking for. It was not speaking about the beginning of creatures but rather about existent creatures. While composing this article, I read it once again by comparing a Turkish translation of the book with the original English one. Again, I could not find what I had not found before, but I learned much more.

Two kinds of thought have been dominant over human thought. Every fact and event has a cause and a goal. No one can be free from these two principles because cause and goal connote each other. All the rules of the world have been based upon these two, and without them life does not continue. In fact, without a goal, there is no cause, since the stimulant of a cause is its goal. Every man acts and observes another in accordance with these two principles. Just as creationists have an aim, so scientists, their opposites, have a purpose. They behave and work in line with these aims.

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid, 56.

Among the claims of Darwin's theory of evolution, it can be argued that there is no evidence regarding aim or purpose in the animal world.<sup>19</sup> We can not find any plan, aim or purpose anywhere in this natural world. Nor can we search for evidence for such things,<sup>20</sup> whereas, Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* is full of goals and causes.

Darwin's work has two distinctive features with respect to scientific morals. One is the manner in which he shares his views openly and honestly, and the other is his scientific modesty, that is, the fact that he openly admits his ignorance of a matter. In his work *On the Origin of Species*, he made use of the work of many scholars. Observations regarding instincts of plants and particularly of upper level animals, causal behavior, competition among animals, and sexual relations of plants and animals, among other topics, are collated with a degree of fastidiousness not seen in observations of human beings.

While evolutionists generally behave as if they had reached a consensus about the start of all living beings from a single mother cell, some of them argue that the preliminary cell of all species failed to survive and was different. With respect to those who hold that the living beings did originate from a single mother cell, it seems to me that figures showing the spread of creatures from a single cell are not presented in a clear order. A drawing of a tree does not mean anything. More reasonably, coherently and consistently, I imagine a circle. In the center of the circle is found the ancestor cell or mother cell, and the species of creatures disperse from the center to all quarters. Rank or steps in evolution are also shown.

In addition, it is said that saltation does not take place in nature, and this rule needs to be explained. Does evolution occur in a mechanical fashion? Are there any barriers between forms? Or is creation, along with such barriers, denied, since creation is a 'simple' event like jumping, leaping or explosion? If so, since a basic form passing from lower rank to higher one is interrupted between the two levels, long-range evolution is not possible.<sup>21</sup> So, while speaking of natural selection, natural transformation or natural evolution, the meaning of nature should be known. What is nature? Should it not be regarded as a dogma to call something nature and charge it with some duties without analyzing it? Does this not imply unquestioning imposition? This word 'nature' looks like something unknown, such as the "a priori" knowledge argued by some philosophers.

I focus on the confusion between words and terms, dogmatic phrases and controversies. Scientists have the right to describe evolution and to say whether it is a scientific fact, a theory or hypothesis. Rather than comment on the compatibility of evolution with the Qu'ran, I would like to emphasize that the Qu'ran itself recommends doing scientific study.

In the statements I quote here, evolution is clearly put forward to have neither target nor purpose. Is it not a contradiction then, that in evolutionary events a certain target and purpose are clearly observed? If survival among animals is pointless, and evolutionists have no purpose in their works and in their struggle to overcome their opponents, what is the benefit of all this trouble?

---

<sup>19</sup> Futuyama, Evrim, 14.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 12.

<sup>21</sup> Ö. Naci Soykan, *Türkiyeden Felsefe Manzaraları*, p.50, 1993, Bostancı, N. Hartmann, Almanya'da yeni ontoloji cereyanı, translated by Takıyuddin Mengüşoğlu, *Felsefe Sözlüğü*, Vol.1, pp. 2-3, İstanbul, 1966.

Additionally, it should be contemplated how the first cells were separated as female and male; did the cells charge themselves with this duty? Is evolution an event or a substance? I think this must be discussed.

In his work "The God Delusion", Richard Dawkins begins the first chapter with Albert Einstein's words "A Deeply Religious Non-Believer". From my point of view, the reason for the conflict between creationists and evolutionists is their misunderstanding of God. Curiously, the perception of God on both sides is the same. Evolutionists see God in the same way that Creationists do. Creationists use their perception of God as a means of suppression. It is a critical matter of debate that evolutionists are either unable or not eager to oppose the use of this perception of God as a means of suppression by putting forth how God should be accurately perceived.

In my opinion, Evolutionists' claim, which I regard as their minor or major evasion tactic, that the first mother or ancestor cell had neither cause nor purpose, echoes the fact that God is without cause and purpose. They call this nature. And this nature is equivalent to God. Besides, this nature creates: living beings, plants, animals and man. In these, causes, purposes and designs come into being, work and clash with each other. So, how do the features which nature never has in itself come into existence? These affairs are the very affairs made by God. In this case, since nature performs these with its own will and choice, nature would be God himself.<sup>22</sup> This is like the pantheists' God who is involved in all events. Evolutionists openly avoid calling nature God, lest it correspond to the religionists' understanding of God. Identifying this fact well, rationalist theologians among religionists may assert this against the Evolutionist: What you call nature is our God's word (*logos*). They solve the problem by including the evolutionists in their universal understanding of God and counting them among themselves. Evolutionists have restricted nature to living beings. However, the universe does not consist of only living beings. In fact, by not using the word 'God' but using instead the term 'nature', which carries out the same things, Evolutionists also revive a historical thought that gives them privilege. Man's privilege is found in his philosophy of creation and in his essence.

We are trying to solve the problem between religion and science. In fact, we must also know how to civilize man's conscience. Otherwise, we leave religious problems in the hands of religious persons with horse-conscience, as stated by Xenophanes; this is the cause of the existing conflicts so far.

In the Baghdad Faculty of Divinity (1951), I read to the teacher of Qu'ranic exegesis a verse from the Qu'ran that severely rejects the religion of ancestors. It asks, despite the fact that similar verses also indicate that to obey ancestors is to be cursed,<sup>23</sup> is not obeying ancestors a controversy among us? Does it not contradict the Qu'ran? We know these verses but we do not understand them. I also read the following verse in the Qu'ran, which criticizes Jewish rabbis and Christian priests:

"They take their priests and their rabbis to be their lords beside God, and Christ the son of Mary; yet they were commanded to worship but One God."<sup>24</sup> Rejecting the censure of the Prophet Muhammad, they said that they did not take their rabbis and priests to be their Lords. The Prophet Muhammad asked them "Don't you take what they took unlawful to be unlawful, and what they took lawful to be lawful?" When they said, "Surely," he replied, "This means to take them to be Lords."

---

<sup>22</sup> Ayala, *Darwins' Gift*, pp. 76-77.

<sup>23</sup> Qu'ran, 2/170, 5/104, 43/23-24.

<sup>24</sup> 9/31.

We know these verses, but we do not understand. What do we not realize? We do not realize that we do just as they did before; in other words, we have adopted men of religion as gods.

Neither because of their knowledge nor their religion have religionists opposed the similarity of man to monkey or monkey to man. Rather, prejudgment inherited from their traditions has played a key role in their opposition.

What I would like to focus on is what contributions the Qu'ran can make to Science and to Scientists. First of all, it should be emphasized that the name of Islam has been given by the Qu'ran itself. Islam, as a root, means to have the truth sincerely and preserve it. Neither is Islam the religion of Arabs, since it was revealed in Arabic, nor the religion of Muhammad since it was revealed to him. The Prophet Muhammad had no function in the composition of the Qu'ran. The Qu'ran is the book of God and Islam is the religion of God. Accordingly, since God is the creator of all humankind, Islam is the religion of the people all over the world. Every time and everywhere, all scientists have a right to understand the Qu'ran and explain what they understand objectively and in the light of mind and science. The owner of the Qu'ran has given this right, even as no one and no family has been specially authorized to understand the Qu'ran since the Prophet Muhammad passed away.

There are two sources for understanding the Qu'ran. One is mind, while other is empirical knowledge. The latter can be reduced to the former, i.e. mind, since the actuator of science is mind.

Whether creationist or evolutionist, both sides face the same problem: the matter of humanity. Both are humans. In a creationist's opinion, since God created everything, he also created evolutionists. Thus, to assert that evolutionists have any drawback or deformity means to charge their creator directly or indirectly. According to an evolutionist, man has come into being by way of evolution. Since creationists are men, they have also come into being through evolution. Therefore, to accuse them means to accuse evolution. If both sides are correct in their accusations, neither source lives up to what is expected from it. If both sides are wrong, neither side knows its source properly. Creationists have misunderstood God. Evolutionists have been awed by power and attributed it to evolution; in so doing, they have ascribed a divine provenance to evolution, just as creationists do. Thus, what is the problem and what is the solution?

In my opinion, in the universe, there are infallible, perfect, uninterrupted universal rules and designs. God does not interrupt the universal rule and cause an abnormal breakdown. If such unusual events have taken place, they happen in accordance with another rule. When people did not discover those rules in their time, they called those events miracles. Darwin answered the Question as to how the origins of change evolved with a wise word of impenetrability; he did not answer why or how change originated.

David Hume says, "Is God willing to prevent evil, but not able? Then he is impotent. Is he able, but not willing? Then he is malevolent. Is he both able and willing? Why then evil?"<sup>25</sup>

I think, the question directed by David Hume to enquire about God can, in a sense, be directed to the evolutionist.

-END-

---

<sup>25</sup> Fransisco J. Ayala, *Darwin's Gift*, s. 1, Washington, 2007.