

---

# DOES EVOLUTION REVEAL A WORLD WITHOUT INTELLIGENT DESIGN? A PHILOSOPHICAL REFLECTION ON THE ATHEISTIC READING OF DARWINISM

**Mahdi Ganjvar\* and Mohammad Bidhendi**

*University of Isfahan, Faculty of Theology and Ahl Al-Bait Studies, Department of Islamic  
Philosophy and Theology, Isfahan, 8174673441, Iran*

(Received 28 May 2021, revised 6 June 2021)

---

## **Abstract**

According to the atheistic reading of Darwinism, Evolution reveals a world without design and challenges the belief in the Divine Origin and supernatural causes. But it is only by relying on ‘Ontological Naturalism’ as a philosophical worldview that one can offer such an atheistic version of Evolution. In this paper, I show by a critical approach that the naturalists’ reading of Evolution has severe faults and shortcomings due to ontological, epistemological and methodological problems. Therefore, by relying on the atheistic reading of Darwinism, one cannot reject the Intelligent Design of the world and prove the needlessness of creatures from supernatural causes. Research findings show that ontologically, evolutionary naturalists, based on material reductionism, ignore a large part of world phenomena - supernatural identities. Epistemologically, the fact that they consider the theory of evolution to be in conflict with belief in God and supernatural causes is indicative of a ‘personal ideological decision’ rather than a ‘neutral scientific position’. But methodologically, the natural sciences and ‘scientific method’ cannot negatively or positively judge the existence or non-existence of God; because the issue of proving or denying the supernatural goes beyond the expertise of the experiential scientists and their scientific means and methods. Based on these basic deficiencies, ultimately, the naturalists’ reading of evolution cannot prove that the world is without intelligent design.

*Keywords:* evolution, theory, naturalism, atheism, materialism

---

## **1. Introduction**

The theory of evolution is the foundation of modern Biology, “nothing in Biology makes sense except in the light of Evolution” [1]. In a general sense, this theory emphasizes that the whole world or part of it is subject to constant and increasing changes. During this natural process, its number and diversity

---

\*E-mail: m.ganjvar@ltr.ui.ac.ir, tel.: +983137933105, fax: +983137933136

increase. Based on this definition, belief in the theory of evolution is contrasted with the assumption of the stability of the world and its components [2].

Historically, it is essential to note that pre-Darwinians, such as George Buffon and Lamarck, had been concerned with biological and organic evolution. They were an early proponent of the idea that ‘organic transformation’ and biological evolution occurred and proceeded under natural laws [3]. Nevertheless, we can find the origins of the evolution theory in Anaximander bio-philosophical thought in ancient Greece [4].

Finally, Darwin and his associates as natural scientists, not philosophers, analysed the origin of species by the mechanism of ‘natural selection’ without assuming a preconceived plan. They were so insistent on this idea that they asserted “if one could demonstrate that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down. But I can find out no such case.” [5] Despite his scientific views, he philosophically believed in divine origins and supernatural causes and considered God to be the ‘Primary Cause’: “Darwin at one point indicated that lawfulness does not exclude the concept of God as the primary cause; he even spoke of natural laws as the ‘secondary means’ by which God created” [6]. He later considered the most notable reason for the existence of God to be the fantastic greatness of creation [6, p. 89]. Maybe that’s why he admitted later in life that: “I am inclined to look at everything as resulting from ‘*designed laws*’, with the details, whether good or bad” [7]. Of course, Darwin’s theism is not the subject of this study and is not philosophically significant. In contrast, Naturalism - which we can consider as a consequence of evolution theory - is one of the most important philosophical issues, whose conflict with the purposefulness of creation (Intelligent Design) is the most important dimension of this theory’s conflict with Theosophy.

Naturalists such as Richard Dawkins - with their atheistic readings of evolution - believe that Darwin’s plan of natural selection completely shook the foundations of Nature’s purposefulness until the 19<sup>th</sup> century. They insist that the theory of evolution, with its causal-natural interpretation of organisms, makes us needless of the final or theological interpretation and provides the basis for an accidental and unpremeditated performance of the living world (the idea of chance). In the atheistic reading of Darwinism, the progressive mechanism of natural selection as the “driving force of Evolution” [8] is a blind, purposeless, undesignated and unguided mechanism. Hence, in this naturalistic view, the content of the evolution theory conflicts with the belief in the divine origin and supernatural causes.

In this article, I first explain the idea of Naturalism as a ‘philosophical presupposition’ for the atheistic understanding of evolution. Then, with a critical approach, I illustrate that the naturalists’ reading of evolution has severe shortcomings due to ontological, epistemological and methodological problems. Therefore, it cannot reject the Intelligent Design of the world and prove its needlessness from the divine origin and supernatural agents.

## **2. ‘Ontological Naturalism’ as a philosophical presupposition for the atheistic reading of Evolution**

The term ‘Naturalism’ has exact meaning in contemporary Philosophy. Its current usage derives from debates in America in the first half of the last century. Naturalist philosophers aimed to ally Philosophy more closely with Science. They insisted that reality is exhausted by Nature, containing nothing ‘supernatural’, and that we should use the scientific method to investigate all areas of reality, including the ‘human spirit’ [9, 10]. However, different modern philosophers interpret ‘Naturalism’ differently [11]. According to them, one can classify various contemporary forms of Naturalism into ontological and methodological components. The ontological component is concerned with the contents of reality, asserting that fact has no place for ‘supernatural’ or other ‘spooky’ kinds of entity. By contrast, the methodological component is concerned with methods of investigating reality and claims some kind of general authority for the scientific method [11]. Methodologically, to the extent that one does ‘scientific’ work, one should avoid referring to ‘supernatural forces’ like God.

‘Are there such supernatural identities and causes or not in the world?’ This question is not the subject of investigation in methodological naturalism. In contrast, ontological naturalism explicitly denies the existence of such identities and causes. Ruse states emphatically in this regard: “Whether there are such forces or beings [like God] is another matter entirely and simply not addressed by methodological Naturalism” [12, p. 356].

However, we know scientifically that one of the factors contributing to the development of Naturalism that strengthened the naturalist movement was Darwin’s theory of Evolution. Of course, I do not mean that Darwin is a naturalist or that his theory of Evolution requires Naturalism and the denial of supernatural identities. Rather, I mean that some naturalist thinkers, with their own perceptions, exploited the scientific-philosophical capacity of the theory of evolution in favour of Naturalism. Naturalists, such as Dawkins, utilizing the law of natural selection as the driving force of Evolution, have argued that Darwin’s theory contradicts the belief in Intelligent design, and as a result, the belief in supernatural causes: “There is nothing supernatural, no ‘life force’ to rival the fundamental forces of Physics” [13].

## **3. The evolutionary foundations of Naturalism**

Since a fair evaluation of a theory requires a proper understanding of its principles and foundations, it is necessary to analyse the roots of Naturalism concerning the theory of Evolution. But in analysing these foundations, I, as an impartial researcher, had encountered two basic problems. First, it is not clear exactly when Naturalism was introduced as a systematic attitude or scientific movement. Second, what kind of attitude does Naturalism actually refer to?

Despite these research limitations, I have tried to derive the ‘agreed-upon foundations’ of naturalists by analysing their works, which I will discuss below.

### **3.1. Materialism**

One of the common principles of naturalists concerning evolution is the philosophical idea of materialism. At its simplest definition, Materialism is a kind of philosophical monism that holds that matter is the essential substance in nature; and all things, including mental states and consciousness, is the result of material interactions. Materialism is closely related to physicalism, the view that all that exists is ultimately physical.

Interestingly, the theme of the idea of materialism or physicalism is also existent in the definition of Naturalism: “trying to understand the world as much as possible in terms compatible with materialist assumptions” is one of the topics tightly relevant and close to naturalistic dispositions that can to some extent help to explore naturalistic roots and their relation to evolution [14]. However, some scholars argue that: “Naturalism is identified sometimes with materialism, sometimes with empiricism, and sometimes with scientism... It certainly carries a commitment to the thesis that there is nothing but Nature or nothing supernatural.” [14, p. 21-22]

Thus, based on their material view, the naturalists do not attribute any role to supernatural forces and causes in understanding the world; Whether because he believes that these forces and causes - assuming they exist - do not play a ‘causal role’ in this world, Or because he believes that the explanations for such forces and causes are not efficient enough to explain the phenomena of this world.

This component also lies in Thomas Huxley’s definition of Naturalism [15]. He considers the avoidance of the supernatural as a necessary condition for achieving a valid knowledge of reality. He implies that a correct understanding of phenomena depends on adopting a method compatible with materialist assumptions that reject supernatural forces and causes.

Evolutionary naturalism not only considers man, life and mind as purely natural and material phenomena but also tries to explain the whole of Nature and the world - and even its life and survival - through exclusively natural and material mechanisms.

Therefore, from the perspective of naturalists, the ‘material evolutionary worldview’ is the role of a guiding and directing factor in philosophical research on man, life, mind and Nature. Besides, John Hutt offers a definition of Naturalism in which the basis of materialism with an evolutionary approach plays a central role. He introduces Naturalism as a philosophical approach, consisting of seven materialistic components: “1. Outside Nature, which includes humans and their cultural creations, there is nothing. 2. It follows from #1 that nature is self-originating. 3. Since there is nothing beyond Nature, there can be no overarching purpose/or transcendent goal that would give any lasting meaning to the Universe. 4. There is no such thing as the ‘soul’ and no

reasonable prospect of conscious human survival beyond death. 5. The emergence of life and mind in evolution was accidental and unintended. 6. Every natural event is itself the product of other natural events. Since there is no divine cause, all causes must be purely natural causes, in principle accessible to scientific comprehension. 7. All the various features of living beings, including humans, can be explained ultimately in evolutionary, specifically Darwinian, terms. I shall often refer to this belief as evolutionary Naturalism.” [16]

As we can see, these components clearly show the materialistic roots of Naturalism in relation to the atheistic reading of Evolution.

### **3.2. Scientism**

The second agreed-upon basis of naturalists in reconsidering and exploiting the theory of Evolution is the pervasive current of scientism. This term was initially defined to mean methods and attitudes typical of or attributed to the natural scientist. Some religious scholars applied it as a ‘pejorative’. It means excessive trust in the efficacy of the methods of Natural science applied to all areas of investigation or “an exaggerated respect for the physical and biological sciences and a corresponding disparagement of other ways of knowing” [17].

Therefore, the term scientism is often used critically, implying “an unwarranted application of Science in situations considered not amenable to the application of the scientific method or similar scientific standards” [18].

“Trying to conduct all of one’s philosophical theorizing in accord with the methods and results of the natural sciences” is another scientistic basis related to Naturalism that can significantly help us to understand this principle - scientism - in evolutionary Naturalism [14].

According to this basis, the naturalist does not accept Philosophy as a priori knowledge and avoids any attempt to understand reality in a framework prior to Science. He also refuses to recognize any a priori philosophical theory as the basis or arbiter of scientific methods.

The component of scientism is also clearly present in Huxley’s definition of Naturalism. Essentially he first used the term ‘scientific Naturalism’ in 1892 [19]. The concept ‘scientific’ in Huxley’s innovative term implies a very close relationship between Naturalism and the Natural sciences, as well as a naturalist dependence on Science and scientific method and results. He insists on this scientific approach that “the Natural sciences are the only valid basis for understanding the physical, social, and moral worlds” [19, p. 109].

Accordingly, the special attention and focus of naturalists on Science and the ‘scientific method’ are among their common principles and positions. The component of scientism as an “exaggerated disposition to employ scientific methods and results in all fields of research” [20] played an important role in shaping the atheistic reading of naturalists in the theory of Evolution. Because the adoption of this scientific method and its unlimited generalization to all areas of investigation leads to the rejection of theoretical methods of a priori

knowledge (philosophical and metaphysical theories) and the abandonment of religious ideas (Theology and revelatory teachings). They argue that such ‘a priori’ ideas are neither empirically testable nor play a role in solving scientific problems.

The issue of the origin of species, especially in the case of man, was one of the most controversial of questions to which the answer of metaphysical theories and religious sources (as a priori knowledge) did not convince naturalists in any way. I mean the idea of creationism or the Intelligent Design of the world. However, the origin of species - especially the process of human genesis - was a significant problem for naturalists who unrealistically hoped for a scientific explanation of all research areas through empirical laws of Nature. However, their purely scientific curiosity in this area was not very fruitful and convincing. Perhaps this is why “most serious British scientists in Darwin’s day studiously avoided the question of the origin of species....Certain questions were beyond the reach of Science” [21].

### 3.3. *Evolutionary worldview*

The last epistemological basis of Naturalism concerning Darwin’s hypothesis is the evolutionary worldview was inspired by Daniel Dennett. Of course, I may also use the term ‘world-view’ in this article “to designate a set of basic beliefs about the fundamental character of reality” [6, p. 261]. Dennett - as a naturalist - refers to Darwin’s idea as a ‘universal acid’ that “eats every traditional concept and leaves in its wake only one evolutionary worldview” [22]. I indicate the evolutionary worldview as an approach according to which most naturalists try to interpret and explain many natural phenomena - including the origin of species.

The advent of Darwin and the publication of *The Origin of Species* in 1859 gave a great impetus to the naturalistic movement. On the one hand, naturalists - in a scientific way - could provide a clearer explanation of the problem of species origin using Darwin’s theory. On the other hand, by disparaging Metaphysics and Theology, they offered an atheistic reading of evolution in which they depicted a world without Intelligent Design - that had no place for supernatural forces.

I can therefore argue that the goal of naturalists in focusing on components as mentioned earlier was to limit the supernatural realm by subjecting all phenomena under the domination of the natural laws. Interestingly, Darwin’s theory of evolution was in line with this spirit of naturalists and led them to their scientific goal [22].

Accordingly, in a well-known passage, Richard Dawkins points out that “although atheism might have been logically tenable before Darwin, Darwin made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist” [13, p. 6]. This component - the evolutionary worldview - motivated many philosophers to introduce Darwinism alongside scientism as one of the epistemological

foundations of Naturalism. Rosenberg, for example, considers Naturalism to consist of these essential components:

- 1) The repudiation of ‘first philosophy’ [as a priori knowledge]. Epistemology is not to be treated as a propaedeutic to the acquisition of further knowledge.
- 2) ‘Scientism’. The sciences - from Physics to Psychology and even occasionally Sociology, their methods and findings - are to be the guide to Epistemology and Metaphysics.
- 3) ‘Darwinism’. To a large extent, Darwinian theory is to be both the model of scientific theorizing and the guide to philosophical theory because it maximally combines relevance to human affairs and well-foundedness [23].

#### **4. A philosophical evaluation of the naturalists’ reading of Darwinism**

After analysing the idea of ontological Naturalism and its foundations as a philosophical presupposition for the atheistic reading of Evolution, it is time to evaluate this particular narrative of Darwin’s theory critically. My primary effort here will be to criticize the ontological, epistemological and methodological foundations of the naturalists’ view on denying supernatural causes and representing a world without design.

##### ***4.1. Ontological deficiencies***

Naturalists such as Sagan, Gould, Wilson and Dawkins offer the theory of Evolution based on a kind of material ontology. They believe that Darwin’s Evolution is inseparable from a ‘philosophical’ message, namely, materialism. Jay Gould explicitly acknowledges: “I believe that the stumbling block to [the acceptance of Darwin’s theory] does not lie in any scientific difficulty, but rather in the philosophical content of Darwin’s message. First, Darwin argues that evolution has no purpose. Second, Darwin maintained that evolution has no direction; it does not lead inevitably to higher things. Organisms become better adapted to their local environments, and that is all. Third, Darwin applied a consistent philosophy of materialism to his interpretation of Nature. The Matter is the ground of all existence; mind, spirit, and God as well, are just words that express the wondrous results of neuronal complexity.” [24]

For this reason, I believe that the most prominent ontological flaw in the naturalists’ atheistic reading of Evolution is this material vision of world phenomena. The main problem of materialism as the philosophical underpinning of evolutionists is ‘Reductionism’ and neglecting a considerable portion of world phenomena - the supernatural realm.

In this extremely superficial and limited worldview, meaning is reduced to matter, spirit to mind, mind to biological activity and biological activity to inanimate matter. Even belief in God is reduced to psychological complexes, consciousness to biological activity, and life to molecular motion. In his analysis of ‘Reductionism’ as one of the consequences of materialism and evolution

theory, Seyyed Hossein Nasr remarks: “The idea of reductionism which is innate to modern science and which was only fortified by the theory of evolution could be described as the reduction of the spirit to the psyche, the psyche to biological activity, life to lifeless matter and lifeless matter to purely quantitative particles or bundles of energy whose movements can be measured and quantified” [25].

Interestingly, this ontological basis - Materialism - is also involved in the scientific conceptualization of Naturalism. John Haught insists that: “The term ‘Naturalism’ today generally refers to a worldview that questions the existence of anything in principle inaccessible to experience or ordinary science” [16, p. 5]. “More often than not, the term ‘Naturalism’ entails the explicit rejection of the personal God of Abrahamic religions. It means the denial of any sacred principle of being that is distinct from nature or Matter itself.” [16]

Another serious problem of the material worldview is that it lacks rational justification and logical reasoning. Richard Lewontin, the prominent Harvard biologist, puts it this way: “It is not that the methods and institutions of Science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door.” [26]

Regardless of all the objections to materialism, the materialists themselves have not provided any convincing evidence for their claim [27]. Thus, the naturalists’ materialistic claim that ‘evolution reveals a world without design’ remains unproven. By appealing to this ontological presupposition - materialism - they have denied all supernatural identities and causes and offer no reasonable evidence to confirm their claims. Whereas, in Lewontin’s view, one cannot infer such a metaphysical consequence from the theory of Evolution merely through “a priori adherence to material reasons” [26]. As a result, no one can deny the role of supernatural causes and forces - like the Divine Creator - in the process of creation relying on the material worldview.

#### **4.2. Epistemological flaws**

The principal epistemological criticism of the atheistic reading of Evolution is that naturalists’ assertion is based on an ‘epistemic fallacy’. But my claim requires further clarification. Based on the theory of ‘critical realism’, the goal of Science is an unbiased understanding of Nature, not simply to control it or make predictions [6, p. 138]. Accordingly, Positivist biased explanations of natural phenomena are not always valid. This principle also applies to naturalists’ scientific views on Evolution and the origin of species.

In the field of Philosophy of Science, critical realism holds that we must distinguish between the knowledge that Science provides (*Transitive object of Science*) and the reality that Science is about (*Intransitive object of Science*), which exists independently of our knowledge and always has unexplored depths

for Science. When this distinction is not understood, we fall into the trap of an epistemological fallacy. Because in this case, we reduce what we say is 'real' or exists (ontological propositions) to what we can know or understand about the 'real' (epistemological propositions) [28].

The naturalists' claim to deny supernatural causes and to represent a world without design seems to contain this epistemological fallacy; because in their argument, they reduce what really exists (the whole reality, both Nature and the supernatural) to what they can know scientifically (physic or natural phenomena). Sheldrake emphasizes this epistemological shortcoming: what is problematic about the mechanistic view is that it is a limited or exclusive perspective. Such a scientific and one-dimensional description of the world is based on half the reality [29].

Another epistemological criticism of the naturalists' atheistic reading of Evolution focuses on the mechanism of biased inference of 'denying supernatural causes'. In fact, Belief in God and supernatural identities is a personal worldview, just as atheism - unbelief in supernatural forces - is an individual attitude. Moreover, scientific-empirical theories, including evolutionism, are all neutral to the existence and non-existence of supernatural identities.

Indeed, it is the scientists who, under the influence of their philosophical-ideological presuppositions, employ scientific theories to prove or disprove a particular belief. Naturalists are no exception to this rule of Philosophy of Science. They represent the Theory of Evolution in a way that conflicts with faith in God and supernatural causes. This is more a matter of personal worldview and ideological decision than a scientific theory resulting from the unbiased investigation. In this regard, Rosenberg argues that reconciling theism with Darwin's theory of natural selection is not difficult and that the view that this theory contradicts belief in God is more of a philosophical decision than part of a scientific theory: "Of course, it would be easy to reconcile theism with the appearance to us that the theory of natural selection was true, even though it is in fact false. It is a nice way of suggesting that though false, the theory is a good heuristic device for agents of our cognitive limitations. Notice that there is no difficulty in reconciling Darwinian natural selection with deism - the thesis that the Universe was created by a supreme being, who however did not intervene in its subsequent history." [30] Referring to Dawkins' fair acknowledgement, McGrath argues: "Nature can be interpreted in a theistic or in an atheistic way, but it demands neither of these. Both are genuine intellectual possibilities for science." [31]

Given these epistemological faults, we can claim that the naturalists' controversial narrative of Evolution - in denial of supernatural causes - is not a realistic interpretation of the world of life.

### **4.3. Methodological criticisms**

In addition to ontological and epistemological shortcomings, the naturalists' reading of Darwin's theory also suffers from methodological flaws. Its most essential criticism is that the 'scientific method' is positively or negatively incapable of judging the existence and non-existence of supernatural causes and forces; because that is not in the area of Natural sciences and experimental means and methods. Essentially the question of proving or disproving supernatural causes is beyond the area of the scientific method and any attempt to involve Science in the supernatural realm is to transcend the legal limits of Science. Indeed, scientific theories cannot be said to 'explain the world'; they only explain the phenomena observed within the world. Furthermore, scientific theories do not and are not intended to explain 'everything about the world', such as its purpose [31, p. 36-38].

To avoid misunderstanding, let's be quite clear that proposing that Science may have its limits is in no way a criticism or defamation of the scientific method. Relying on this methodological rule, McGrath holds that: "Dawkins presents Darwinism as an intellectual superhighway to atheism. In reality, the intellectual trajectory mapped out by Dawkins seems to get stuck in a rut at agnosticism. There is a substantial logical gap between Darwinism and atheism, which Dawkins seems to prefer to bridge by rhetoric, rather than evidence." [32]

I hold that naturalists in their atheistic conception of the theory of evolution have committed another methodological error, which is to transcend their own scientific speciality (i.e. the field of the experimental sciences) and to comment on issues that are specifically outside the realm of the Natural sciences and whose explanation is the essential duty of Philosophy or Theology. More explanation is that the naturalist faces three fundamental questions about the theory of evolution:

- 1) 'Who' or 'what' has designed the process of evolution/mechanism of natural selection?
- 2) 'How' has this process/mechanism been designed, and 'how' does it work?
- 3) 'Why' and 'for what purpose' has this process/ mechanism been designed?

Of these three basic questions, only the second is in the domain of the experimental sciences, especially Biology. Hence, the naturalist is expected to answer this question with scientific methods and experimental tools. But his answer to this question does not necessarily mean answering the other two questions. Because questions (1) and (2) are specifically beyond the scientific speciality of the naturalist and are related to the realm of Philosophy and Theology. In the face of questions (1) and (3), the naturalist can ultimately declare that he does not know or believe in the 'Primary Cause' and 'purpose' for this mechanism, not to claim with certainty that: 'there is no such a cause and purpose'.

I can therefore conclude that this claim of naturalists: ‘Evolution violates belief in supernatural forces’ and so ‘the evidence of Evolution reveals a world without design/purpose’ contains a methodological flaw. As some of them have explicitly asserted: “a Darwinian world has no purpose” [32, p. 46]. By adhering to the scientific method, therefore, the naturalist can consider only the second proposition as authentic and accurate between these two hypotheses:

- 1) The theory of Evolution reveals that there is no purpose, supernatural cause, or Intelligent Design in the process of life.
- 2) The theory of Evolution does not investigate the role of purpose, supernatural cause, or intelligent designer in the world. For, the central goal and function of this theory are to explain the natural causes and mechanisms involved in the process of evolutionary life.

It is now clear that in order to explain the ‘*final cause*’ and discover the ‘*efficient cause*’ of Intelligent Design, one must move beyond the level of Natural sciences and step into the realm of Philosophy and Theology. Ignoring this matter and confusing these two levels of explanation in the analysis of Evolution leads to the same methodological error that naturalists have committed in their atheistic interpretation of Darwin’s theory.

In addition to the criticisms mentioned above, various fundamental critiques of the naturalists’ interpretations of Evolution have been presented by thinkers and philosophers. For example, Plantinga has accurately criticized Richard Dawkins’ argument and fairly exposed its faults [33]. Because of brevity, I avoid quoting and citing more than enough in this paper.

## **5. Conclusions**

In the atheist reading of Darwin’s theory of Evolution, the mechanism of natural selection is essentially an aimless, blind, undesigned, unguided, and self-originating mechanism. The evolution, therefore, rejects belief in supernatural forces and divine causes. It means that evolution reveals a random world without Intelligent Design.

In this paper, I first showed that it is only by assuming ontological Naturalism, as a philosophical worldview, that such an atheistic conclusion can be drawn from evolution. To prove my point, I inevitably analysed ontological Naturalism and its epistemic foundations, including materialism, scientism and evolutionary worldview.

Finally, by criticizing the foundations of this view and expressing the ontological, epistemological, and methodological shortcomings of naturalists, I proved that their reading of the theory of Evolution is really inadequate, partial, and full of challenge. Based on its material reductionism, this idea ignores a large part of the reality - supernatural identities and causes.

In the epistemological critique of naturalists, I argued that macro-scientific theories, including Darwinian evolution, are neutral to the existence and non-existence of supernatural forces. The fact that certain naturalists see the

theory of evolution in conflict with belief in God and the supernatural stems more from an ideological decision than from ‘unbiased scientific research’.

Besides, their argument for denying supernatural causes contains an ‘epistemological fallacy’. Eventually, my most crucial methodological critique in this regard was that the ‘scientific method’ did not have the authority to judge in the realm of the supernatural; because the issue of proving or denying the supernatural is essentially outside the field of Natural sciences. Given these fundamental flaws, my main conclusion is that the naturalists’ atheistic version of Evolution cannot reveal that there are no supernatural causes and that the world is aimless or without Intelligent Design.

## References

- [1] T. Dobzhansky, *American Biology Teacher*, **35(3)** (1973) 125-129.
- [2] P. Wiener, *Dictionary of the history of ideas*, vol. 2, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, 1973, 174.
- [3] J.B. Lamarck, *Biography, Theory of Evolution & Facts*, in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998, 2-6.
- [4] F.C. Copleston, *A History of philosophy*, Vol. 5, Doubleday, New York, 1962, 101.
- [5] C. Darwin, J.A. Mortimer and R.M. Hutchins, *The origin of species by means of natural selection*, in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, University of Chicago, Chicago, 1952, 87.
- [6] I.G. Barbour, *Issues in science and religion*, Harper Torch Books, London, 1971, 90.
- [7] C. Darwin, *The Autobiography of Charles Darwin 1809-1882: With Original Omissions Restored*, N. Barlow (ed.), Harcourt, Brace, New York, 1959, 87.
- [8] J.A. Coyne, *Why Evolution Is True*, Viking, New York, 2009, 17.
- [9] J. Kim, *Mind in a Physical World*, MIT Press, Cambridge (MA), 1998, 13.
- [10] Y.H. Krikorian (ed.), *Naturalism and the Human Spirit*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1944.
- [11] D. Papineau, *Naturalism*, in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Summer edn., E.N. Zalta (ed.), Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2021, 1.
- [12] M. Ruse, *Methodological Naturalism under attack*, in *Intelligent Design Creationism and its Critics*, R.T. Pennock (ed.), MIT Press, Cambridge (MA), 2001, 339-361.
- [13] R. Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmakers: Why Evidence of Evolution Reveals a Universe without Design*, Norton, New York, 1986, 10.
- [14] M.C. Rea, *World without Design: The Ontological Consequences of Naturalism*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2002, 23.
- [15] R.L. Numbers, *Science without God: Natural Laws and Christian Beliefs*, in *The Nature of Nature*, L.G. Bruce & A.D. William (eds.), ISI Books, Wilmington, 2011, 62.
- [16] J.F. Haught, *Is Nature Enough? Meaning and Truth in the Age of Science*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006, 9.
- [17] P. Van Inwagen, *An Essay on Free Will*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1983, 215.
- [18] K. Nielsen, *Naturalism without Foundations*, Prometheus Books, Amherst (NY), 1996, 26.
- [19] T.H. Huxley, *Evolution and ethics: and other essays*, vol. 98, Macmillan, New York, 1894.

- [20] J.F. Haught, *Science and religion: From conflict to conversation*, Paulist Press, New York, 1995, 16.
- [21] D.L. Hull, *Charles Darwin and Nineteenth Century Philosophers of Science*, in *Foundations of Scientific Method: The Nineteenth Century*, R.N. Girer & R.S. Westfall (eds.), Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1973, 124.
- [22] D.C. Dennett and M. Ridley, *Darwin's Dangerous Idea: Evolution and Meaning of Life*, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1995, 3.
- [23] A. Rosenberg, *Brit. J. Philos. Sci.*, **47(1)** (1996) 1-29.
- [24] S.J. Gould, *Ever Since Darwin*, W.W. Norton & Company, New York, 1977, 12.
- [25] S.H. Nasr, *A young Muslim's guide to the modern world*, KAZI Publications, Chicago, 2003, 186-187.
- [26] R. Lewontin, *The New York Rev. Books*, **44(1)** (1997) 31.
- [27] M. Motahari, *An introduction to the Islamic worldview*, Sadra Publishing, Tehran, 1996, 170.
- [28] R. Bhaskar, A. Collier, T. Lawson and A. Norrie, *Critical realism*, Proc. of the Standing Conference on Realism and Human Sciences, Vol. 4, University of Bristol, Bristol, 1998, 720-721.
- [29] R.A. Varghese, *The intellectuals speak out about God*, Lewis and Stanley, Dallas, 1984, 57.
- [30] A. Rosenberg and D.W. McShea, *Philosophy of Biology: a Contemporary Introduction*, Routledge, New York, 2008, 87.
- [31] A. McGrath and J.C. McGrath, *The Dawkins Delusion? Atheist Fundamentalism and the Denial of the Divine*, InterVarsity Press, Westmont, 2007, 34.
- [32] A.E. McGrath, *Dawkins' God: genes, memes, and the meaning of life*, John Wiley & Sons, New Jersey, 2013, 67.
- [33] A. Plantinga, *Where the Conflict Really Lies: Science, Religion and Naturalism*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2011, 9-25.