

Moralities: A Contemporary Discourse between New Atheism and Islam

ATAUR REHMAN

ABSTRACT

Atheists deny the existence of God and strongly oppose all religious faiths especially Islam after 9/11. They use scientific, philosophical, historical and moral arguments mainly to prove the non-existence of God. They portray religion as illogical and irrational. Moreover, they argue that religions provide poor guidance on moralities. New atheists suggest that science should replace the religion in order to define what is moral or immoral. On contrary, Muslim scholars defend and argue that religion is main factor behind good moral values. The study focus on the moral dimension of new atheists' argumentation and the Muslim scholarly response. For this purpose, arguments of four founding fathers of new atheists and four renowned Muslim scholars are comparatively analyzed. New atheists attempt to develop science based moralities and eliminate the role of religion from all important areas of life. Muslim scholars illustrate that position of atheism is illogical and irrational. Moralities are impossible without God and these are outside of scientific domain. Objective moralities need a final authority to decide what is right and what is wrong, atheism lacks this authority.

Keywords: Moralities; Islam; new atheism; religion; Muslim scholars

INTRODUCTION

Atheism and theism are two opposite ideologies. Atheists deny the existence of God whereas theists strongly advocate it and spend their lives according to God's commandments. Historically, atheism remained in minor form and was not an issue of central debate as it has become in post-modern era. Traditional atheism was philosophical in nature, however new atheism explores its scientific dimensions. At present, atheism is rising in different parts of world rapidly. The reason behind this rise is the aggressive campaign of new atheists such as Sam Harris (b. April 9, 1967), Richard Dawkins (b. March 26, 1941), Daniel Dennett (b. March 28, 1942) and Christopher Hitchens (d. December 15, 2011). New atheism in form of an organized movement begins from the first decade of 21st century.

Sam Harris is considered as the initiator writer and public speaker of the campaign. He published the book '*The End of Faith: Religion, Terror and the Future of Reason*' in 2004. After the incident of 9/11, Harris criticized all the world's religions especially Islam. He portrayed Islam as the religion of terror and violence. The second most influential academic writer of this campaign is Richard Dawkins who published his bestselling book '*The God Delusion*' in 2006. Richard Dawkins is professor of Biology in Oxford University. He takes active part in the debates and discourses with religious scholars

and leads different campaigns against religious beliefs worldwide. Third influential writer is Daniel Dennett who is basically a philosopher. He wrote his bestselling book, '*Breaking the Spell: Religion as a Natural Phenomenon*' in 2007. Another most renowned new atheist writer is Christopher Hitchens. He wrote the book, '*God is not Great: How Religions Poisons everything*' in 2007. These four books are considered as the foundation of new atheism. These new atheist added scientific explanation of universe and struggled for establishing scientific moralities to remove religion from all walks of life.

In addition to these new atheists, some other atheists like Lawrence M. Krauss (b. May 27, 1954), Polly Toynbee (b. December 27, 1946), Philip Pullman (b. October 19, 1946), Martin Amis (b. August 25, 1949), Jerry Coyne (b. December 30, 1949), P.Z. Myers (b. March 9, 1957), Victor J. Stenger (d. August 25, 2014), Bill Maher (b. January 20, 1956), Robert L. Park (b. January 16, 1931), Stewen Weinberg (b. May 03, 1933), Ian McEvan (b. June 21, 1948), Peter Sloterdijk (b. June 26, 1947), Philip Moller, A. C. Grayling (b. April 03, 1949), Michael Schmidt-Saloman (b. September 14, 1967), Piergiorgio Osifreddi (b. July 13, 1950), Michael Onfray (b. January 01, 1959), ex-Muslim atheists Salman Rushdie (b. June 19, 1947), Ayyan Hisrsi Ali (b. November 13, 1969), Ibn e Warraq (b. 1947) have also become the part of new atheist campaign and considered the proponents and supporters of new atheism.

There is a long history of the refutation of atheism by different religions such as Judaism, Christianity and Hinduism. Similarly, Muslim scholars also have refuted atheism. In English literature, some studies have been carried out by Muslim scholars that claim the new atheists' major positions illogical and unscientific. Hamza Andreas Tzortis (2018) refuted major scientific, philosophical and moral arguments of new atheists. AbulFeda bin Masood (2016) responded Richard Dawkins' scientific argumentation. Theory of evolution is considered as the base of scientific atheism. Harun Yahya (2019) claimed evolution theory unscientific.

New atheists challenge the religious moralities and argue for replacing it with scientific moralities. They attack on all religions and argue in scientific, historical, philosophical and moral dimensions. Through this way, atheists try to exclude religion from all important areas of life. They replace religious moralities with science based moralities. Muslim scholars and scholars of other religions argue for the moralities given by God through the sacred scriptures. This paper focuses on moral arguments of new atheists and Muslim scholarly response followed by an analysis.

NEW ATHEISTS' MORAL ARGUMENTS

New atheists argue that moral values can be defined through scientific inquiry of human behavior and values. Moreover, they argue that role of religion should be eliminated in order to define moralities and social order (Dawkins 2006 & Harris 2011). They are in opinion that science should replace religion to make social norms, values and cultures.

SAM HARRIS (APRIL 9, 1967)

Sam Harris is an American atheist author, philosopher and neuroscientist (Wikipedia 2019). He is pioneer new atheist who discusses the possibility of scientific moralities in detail and urges other atheists and social scientists to work on similar pattern. In his best-selling works, *'The End of Faith'*, and *'The Moral Landscape'*, he rejects the idea of religious moralities and favors science in order to develop moral values and laws of the society. He argues that, "I am not suggesting that we are guaranteed to resolve every moral controversy through science. Difference of opinion will remain, but opinions will be increasingly constrained by facts" (Harris 2011: 03). He responds that the claim that science cannot

deal with moral values is not acceptable and within the discovery of outer world, science can sufficiently work for human ethics and norms. He asserts that "the underlying claim is that while science is the best authority on working of the physical universe, religion is the best authority on meaning, values, morality and the good life. I hope to persuade you that this is not only untrue; it could not possibly be true. Faith, if it is ever right about anything, is right by accident" (Harris 2011: 06). He favors science as the sole alternative of religion for telling the facts and principles of universe and defining moralities. He negates the services of religion for moral uplift of human societies.

He claims that science can define objective moralities. Kindness and happiness is more conducive to violence and cruelty for the majority of people. On this base in future, science can determine moral objectives. Science can make precise claims about good, neutral and which are worth abandoning (Harris 2011: 08). He adds that this work of making scientific moral objectives will be similar to other scientific theories. Science in principle can help us to know about the things which are necessary for our best living. As like there may be right and wrong answers to the questions of other sciences as physics and chemistry, there may be right and wrong answers to moral questions. Such answers may be refined in future as like the answers of other sciences (Harris 2011: 10).

Harris motivates different social scientists to come forward and contribute their scientific moralities to replace religious moralities. He elaborates his moral project for further consideration and refinement in future. Harris (2011: 145) proposes that:

1. It can be explained why different people incline to follow specific patterns of behavior and thought (mostly of them demonstrably silly harmful) in the name of moralities.
2. It can be thought more precisely about the nature and characteristics of moral truth and determine the patterns of behavior and thought which should follow in the name of moralities.
3. The people who are committed harmful and silly patterns of behavior and thought in the name of moral values to disown those commitments and to live better.
4. Since 19th century, it has been assumed widely that the progress of industrial society would spell the termination of religious faiths. Freud, Weber and Marx and other many anthropologists

effected via their works, expected religious faith to whither in the light of modernity. It has not come to pass. Religion still is one of the most important aspects of human life in the 21st century.

Harris (2011: 146) describes that religion is not urgency for humanity:

Mostly measures of societal health suggest that the religiously weak countries are better than religiously strong countries. Least religious countries like Norway, Denmark, Netherlands and Sweden that are most atheistic societies of the world, consistently showing rate better than religious countries on certain measures like expectancy of life, crime infant mortality, child welfare, literacy, economic equality, GDP, health care, investments in education, internet access, rates of university enrollment, lack of corruption, environmental protection, charity to poor nations and political stability etc.

Harris argues that with the better understanding of brain working, scientist could find the connections between human modes of conduct and states of consciousness and the ways of human attention. The questions like what causes a person happier than other? Why love is more suitable for happiness rather hate? Why do human prefer beauty than ugliness and law than disorder? Why does laugh and smile feel well and why do these mutual attachments usually make people closer to each other? Is the life after death is true? According to him, these all questions are relevant to the science of the mind. He argues rhetorically that “if we ever develop such a science, most of our religious texts will be no more useful to mystics than they now are to astronomers” (Harris 2004: 17). Sam Harris links morality with rest of human knowledge and motivates social scientists to develop moral principles on scientific patterns. He defines morality in terms of human and animal well being. He focuses on use of science to tell how we are and what we ought to be. He believes that intrusion of religion into the spheres of human values can be repelled. Daleiden (1998: 502) warns that science is probabilistic and not capable to make moral objectives.

Every person has different preferences in life; some feel pleasure with noble deeds and some with criminal activities. If a person’s moral preferences clashes with another person then science cannot tell us authoritative about the right and wrong. Determining moral values needs an authority which is just with everyone.

RICHARD DAWKINS (MARCH 26, 1941)

Richard Dawkins is an evolutionary biologist and atheist author. He also prefers science over religious guidance. He argues that “we do not need God in order to be good or evil” (Dawkins 2006: 226). In support of his argument, Dawkins quotes Einstein who said, “If people are good only because they fear punishment, and hope for reward, then we are a sorry lot indeed” (Dawkins 2006: 226).

Dawkins is in favor that human can set moral standards and values without the interference of God. Dawkins draws that some philosophers, notably Kant has strived to deduce absolute morals from sources other than religious. Kant proposes a model of morality that is to base a morality on duty for duty’s sake, rather than for God’s (Dawkins 2006: 231). According to Dawkins, it is tough to derive comprehensive moral values from the bible. In this way Dawkins attacks on Bible for their inconsistency to draw the moralities.

Much of the Bible is not systematically evil but just plain weird, as you would expect of a chaotically cobbled-together anthology of disjointed documents, composed, revised, translated, distorted and improved by hundreds of anonymous authors, editors, and copyists, unknown to us and mostly unknown to each other, spanning nine centuries. This may explain some of the sheer strangeness of the Bible (Dawkins 2006: 237).

Dawkins (2006: 264) presents some his own commandments:

1. Enjoy your own sex life (so long as it damages nobody else) and leave others to enjoy theirs in private whatever their inclinations, which are none of your business.
2. Do not discriminate or oppress on the basis of sex, race or (as far as possible) species.
3. Do not indoctrinate your children; Teach them how to think for themselves, how to evaluate evidence, and how to disagree with you. Christianity, just as much as Islam, teaches children that unquestioned faith is a virtue.
4. Value the future on a timescale longer than your own.

Dawkins explains that in the absence of divine instruction, human should take guidance from science. He argues that, “if the demise of God will leave a gap, different people will fill it in different ways. My way includes a good dose of science, the honest and systematic endeavor to find out the truth

about the real world” (Dawkins 2006: 361). Atheists are striving to fill every gap of knowledge with science without caring its limits and boundaries.

According to Dawkins an atheist can spend a happy, balanced, intellectual fulfilled and moral life (Dawkins 2006: 01). Religious people consider the life temporary and have the concept to answer all deeds in front of God. This fear of accountability stops them from wrong doing and killing. Moreover they have hope for reward and justice in last life. Dawkins is against the religious learning of children. In fact, children learn overwhelming part of morality from religion. Zuckerman (2010) argues that it is simply impossible for people to be moral without religion or God.

DANIEL DENNETT (MARCH 28, 1942)

Daniel Dennett, similar to Richard Dawkins and Sam Harris argues that it is not necessary for human to take moral guidance from the religion. He expresses that “even atheists and agnostics can have sacred values; values that are simply not up for re-evaluation at all” (Dennett 2006: 23).

According to Sam Harris our angels should be love, honesty and reason. On similar lines Dennett describes his sacred values to truth, love, justice, democracy and life (Dennett 2006: 23). Dennett argues that in the modern world religion is taking its last breaths and it is now just playing a ceremonial role instead of guiding humanity towards politics, science and ethics (Dennett 2006: 35). He adds that religion has negative outcomes like oppression, fanaticism, cruelty and ignorance (Dennett 2006: 56). He traces the historical developments of religions and argues that with the growth of human culture, the regional or ethnic religious customs converted into organized religions. The rational arguments of earlier intellectuals also became parts of these religions and through this approach religions became more domesticated and got acceptance in the different societies of the world (Dennett 2006: 56).

Dennett also understands the importance of religious faiths for the moral progress of humanity. He quotes Voltaire, who says that, “If God did not exist, it would be necessary for us to invent Him” (Dennett 2006: 242).

Dennett contends in case the religion is good for people but evidence to date is mixed. It seems beneficial for health but there may be other ways to deliver these benefits (Dennett 2006: 277). He argues that it is widely understood that religion is the bulwark of moral values. The idea of heaven is

considered to motivate people for the good and stops from evil are not true. He argues that, “the idea that religious authority grounds our moral judgments are useless in genuine ecumenical exploration; and the presumed relation between spirituality and moral goodness is an illusion” (Dennett 2006: 307). Dennett also denigrates the role of religion in order to identify moral values. He suggests scientific inquiry of every aspect of religion.

Islam promotes love, peace justice and truth which are also ideals for Dennett. It seems that Dennett has not studied the religions in depth. He just uses the arguments of other atheists to denigrate the role of religion from every sphere of life. To achieve any target, motivation plays a vital role, however Dennett, also discourages God’s motivation for people to get heaven. This is illogical and irrational position.

CHRISTOPHER HITCHENS (D. DECEMBER 15, 2011)

Christopher Hitchens also disagrees with the necessity of religious moral guidance for humanity. He argues that, “we believe with certainty that an ethical life can be lived without religion” (Hitchens 2007: 06). He rhetorically states, “Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of heartless world, just as the spirit of a spiritless situation. It is the opium of the people” (Hitchens 2007: 09). According to him, the abolition of religion is the only way for the real happiness of people (Hitchens 2007: 06). He does not agree with the religious teachings of Qur’ān and Bible and argues:

I simply laugh when I read the Koran, with its endless prohibitions on sex and its corrupt promise of infinite debauchery in the life to come: it is like seeing through the “let’s pretend” of a child, but without the indulgence that comes from watching the innocent at play. Christianity is too repressed to offer sex in paradise (Hitchens 2007: 06).

In Islamic perspective, Qur’ān prohibits homosexuality and adultery. These both sin have multiple negative effects in any society. It allows a male to even have four wives at time. Islam motivates for doing marriage and spending good life with spouse. It also offers a reward who obeys to God that is logical and rational. Hitchens proclaims that “the three great monotheism religions teach people to think abjectly of themselves, as miserable and guilty sinners prostrate before an angry and jealous god” (Hitchens 2007: 73). He states that people say that religion makes people humble and civilized. But in reality, “the worse the offender, the more devout he turns out to be” (Hitchens 2007: 192).

Hitchens argues that an atheist can live ethical life, but he does not talk about producing moral principles. He wants to leave religious moralities but does not offer its replacement. He just uses the arguments of other new atheists and argues to end religions from public life. If human replace religious moralities, there would be anarchy in societies, because everyone will have its own moral preferences. So, practically the arguments of Hitchens are not feasible.

New atheists highlight the few cases in which terrorists use the name of religion in order to fulfill their own purposes and ambitions. They ignore the billions of peaceful religious people who become humble and good for the society because of God and religion. As a whole, new atheists argue that objective and subjective moral values are possible with the help of science. Religions provides deficient moral values and religious moralities should be replaced with scientific moralities.

Mostly new atheists determine moral responsibility by referring to facts about natural moral intuitions or human biology, but without sufficiently defending this or tracing the possibilities on non-naturalistic secular moralities. Because of their naturalistic assumptions, new atheists' moral theories tend to be weak. Main promoters of new atheism seem to be unwilling to accept that moral philosophy can play a role in expanding secular moral precepts because philosophy fails to meet up with their tough standards of scientific validity. This stance is fallacious not only because it has led new atheists to defend weak moral theories but also because the methods of inquiry used in moral philosophy make it distinct from religion for many of the same reasons that the new atheists think that science is distinct from religion.

MUSLIM SCHOLARLY RESPONSE

Muslim scholars argue that objective moral values cannot be defined scientifically. They highlight the position of new atheists as irrational and illogical.

HARUN YAHYA (FEBRUARY 02, 1956)

Adnan Oktar is a Turkish Muslim religious scholar. He is known as Harun Yahya. Yahya proclaims that like other fields such as biology, astrophysics, psychology and medicine, atheistic belief also collapsed in social morality and politics by the development of science in twentieth century. Communism considered as the most important

outcome of nineteenth century atheism. Its founders like, Engels, Marx, Trotsky, Lenin and Mao all adopted atheist ideology as fundamental principle. The basic objective of all communist regimes was to get rid from religions and to run societies on atheistic patterns.

According to Yahya, atheistic ideology 'Social Darwinism' was main cause of first and second world wars. Professor James Joll describes in the book 'Europe Since 1870, Harvard history' that ideas of Social Darwinism caused the reasons of two world wars, the social Darwinist leaders believed that war was biological necessity (Joll 1990: 102-103).

Yahya argues that American writer, Patrick Glynn in the book, '*God: The Evidence*' traces the God fearing and atheistic elements in the West. He describes that the American Revolution was by believers and French revolution was because of atheists. The results of both revolutions were quite different. The American version was peaceful in which religion was respected whereas French revolution caused of blood and cruelty (Glynn 1999: 161). Glynn expresses that struggles in order to make USA an atheist country caused harm to whole American society. The sexual revolution in 70s resulted in massive social damage which is even recognized by secular historians (Glynn 1999: 163). The wave of atheism brought moral degeneration, imperialism, despotism and other many manifestation.

Yahya adds the example of the hippie movement and argues that the movement was an instance of social damage caused by atheism. The believer of this movement thought that they could get rid of spiritualism through sex and drugs which was being conveyed by humanist philosophers' at that time. The hippy leaders of 1960 either died because of drugs or killed themselves. The world without religion could not provide them a happy end. In the same line many other young hippies lost their lives with a similar fate while acting upon the words of John Lennon "with no countries and no religion too" (Haroon 2019).

Religious moral life style which is based on God's commandments causes peace and happiness in the world. When people find peace from wrong places and leave God, they cannot live happy and moral life. Yahya quotes Qur'ān: "those who have faith and whose hearts find peace in the remembrance of God". Feeling of despair, depression and unhappiness can be seen in people who deny the existence of God, the main factor behind this to ignore '*fitrah*' of human and to forget God. One major reason which causes

moral denigration is the Darwinist ideology which describes human not a God's servant. This ideology defines human a selfish animal which existed or originated by chance. This is an unscientific claim, and with this ideology the expectation of good moral life of human is irrational and illogical. Life requires struggle among human being and without objective moralities human cannot behave each other better than animals. Yahya quotes Professor Philip E. Johnson of university of California who writes in his book 'Defeating Darwinism' the negative effects of American materialist worldview: "It is correct to say that the 1960s witnessed the second American Declaration of Independence which was the declaration of some people's detachment from God. This declaration brought far reaching legal and moral adverse consequences" (Johnson 1997: 103-104). Similarly, biologist Michael Denton says in the book, '*Evolution: A theory in Crisis*' that:

The 20th century is incomprehensible in the absence of Darwinian revolution. The political and social movements that have swept our world in last eighty years would have been impossible without its intellectual sanction. The 19th century had increasingly secular perspective which at the start eased the way for acceptance of evolutionary theory. Today Darwinian ideology is responsible for skeptical and agnostic outlook of 20th century (Denton 2002: 358).

In the Godless society there will be war, conflict, injustice and ruthlessness. Yahya quotes Qur'ān which commands honesty, justice and goodness: "To the people of Midian We sent their brother, Shuayb. He said, 'My people, serve God: you have no god other than Him. A clear sign has come to you from your Lord. Give full measure and weight and do not undervalue people's goods; do not cause corruption in the land after it has been set in order: this is better for you, if you are believers'. In the next verse God says: "Do not sit in every pathway, threatening and barring those who believe in God from His way, trying to make it crooked. Remember how you used to be few and He made you multiply. Think about the fate of those who used to spread corruption".

Darwinism leads people to spend purposeless life. Yahya quotes evolutionist George Gaylord Simpson who summarizes Darwinism's perspective of humanity, based on deception, says: "Man is alone in our universe and he is a distinctive product of a long impersonal, unconscious and material procedure with distinctive potentialities and understandings. There he owes to no one but himself, and it is to himself that he is responsible" (Gaylord 1968). To suggest that there is no purpose

of life leads towards feelings of terrible depression and emptiness of life. Yahya argues that Richard Dawkins says that: "human beings are all mere 'gene machines' and that the only reason for existence is to pass their genes on to subsequent generations. There is no purpose behind the universe; man and the universe are both products of coincidence and chaos" (Dawkins 2000). Such kinds of belief will inflict unhappiness and despair. Similarly, good deeds, love and friendship give no joy to someone who does not have belief in God and life after death. Yahya Quotes Qur'ān: "Did you think We had created you in vain, and that you would not be brought back to Us".

Yahya provides the evidences against atheists from the renowned scholars of the philosophy of science. He also highlights the historical events in past and their outcomes in societies. He also adds Islamic beliefs to strengthen his arguments.

YASIR QADHI (B. 1975)

Yasir Qadhi is a Pakistani-American Muslim scholar. According to him, Islam talks about helping weaker sections of society which include mainly poor, handicapped, orphans and people in trouble and helping them give no benefit to helper except the reward in last life from God. Moreover it commands to respect elders and younger and the people living in whole society without noticing their beliefs. Scientists do not understand the core concept of morality. According to Western tradition one of the proofs for the God's existence is morality (Qadhi 2012). God created us upon the human nature that is called the '*Fitrah*' and a nature that is implanted into us. This is called divine nature. It is a subconscious knowledge that God has already put into every human being that differentiates between right and wrong for us. Everybody agrees that murder, rape and stealing are wrong (Qadhi 2012). Even though atheists also believe that these crimes are wrong. Human are not the descendants of animals because if we were the descendants of animals, the notions of the survival for fittest would apply on us and we do not take care for disable poor, orphan and needy people.

Every human being has a divine code by God that tells us consciousness. Every human irrespective of any belief feels guilty when he does some wrong like stealing, rape and murder and every human feels good when he does good with someone such as giving charity, helping poor and needy people. This is because God has created us on this '*Fitrah*'

that when we do good we feel good and when we do evil we feel evil in ourselves. God has given us some laws to protect these moral values. Muslims call these commandments as ‘*Shariah*’, Jews as ‘*Halakha*’ and Christians as ‘*Canon*’. According to Islamic perspective these laws are not only logical but they are completely expected and necessary requirement of a God.

God says did man assume that we created him and then cut him off. People who believe on deism have such notions who say that God has created us but he does not deal in his routine life. This concept is illogical in our tradition because the one who creates human, he should tell you how to live and what is life, because he knows best about the human. Qadhi argues that God says in Qur‘ān: “How could He who created not know His own creation, when He is the Most Subtle, the All Aware?”

It interprets as:

The meaning of the verse is that the one who created something must be aware of his creature, and this introduction is also prescribed by this text, it is also prescribed by mental indications, because creation is about creation and formation as a matter of intent, and the purpose of the thing must be He is aware of the truth of that thing, for he who is unaware of the thing is impossible to be intended for him, and just as it has proven that the creator must be aware of what creature is, he must be aware of its quantity, because it falls on that quantity without what is more than or less than it must be with the intention and choice of the subject, and the intention is preceded by science, then he must have known that quantity.

It is rational that the one who has created us to tell us how to live than who has created nothing. Our laws of mercy, spirituality comes from God who is higher authority (Qadhi 2012).

Religious law is completely rational and logical and it is only best law for humanity because it comes from God who is greater to all. God tells us what is permitted and what is not permitted and what is allowed and what is not allowed. The definition of Islam is to submit the will to laws of God (Qadhi 2012).

Qadhi argues that every human have a “spiritual DNA” and that it contributes to universal morality shared by many societies of the world (Qadhi 2018). When one’s morality clashes with other person’s morality, it is question of whose version is true and which morals become universal truths. This problem solves when we believe on the God’s objective moral standards. The knowledge of good and evil is embedded in every person prior at birth. It is not acquired and it housed in every human soul (Qadhi 2018).

Qadhi does not argue extensively using references from the scholars of philosophy of science. His focus is on theological arguments. He uses the evidence from Qur’an and Hadith to refute the atheists’ assumptions.

RIDI ALI ATAIE (N.D.)

Ridi Ali Ataie is an American Muslim scholar. He argues that classical atheists like Fried, Russell and Nietzsche understood that it is primarily religion that moralizes people. The purpose of religion is to make one better and more compassionate human being as Voltaire said “if God did not exist, we would have to invent Him” (Ataie 2014). Same as Dostoevsky said: “if God does not exist everything is permitted” (Ataie 2014). If there is no God then which is moral authority or moral anchor. Certainly survival of fittest cannot be our moral authority. In Ibrahimic tradition moral anchor was God is one, love God and love your neighbor which is mentioned in Torah. The Prophet Jesus A.S was asked about the greatest commandments of God, he repeated the same three God is one, love God and love your neighbor. Similarly Prophet Muhammad (SAAS) said: “be merciful to who is on earth, the God will mercy upon you”. It interprets as:

We should treat children with kindness because they are weak and to respect elders because of their old age. Prophet Muhammad (SAAS) said the young person who serves any old person; God will appoint a person who will serve him in his old age. The knowledge of relatives is necessary to children, so that they could respect their elders and younger. Good treatment with other people creates love among them. Love brings respect and harmony in society.

In another Hadith Prophet Muhammad (SAAS) says: “none of you will enter in paradise until you truly believe and none of you will truly believe until you love one and another, shall I tell you which increase your love, spread peace (*salam*) among yourselves”. It interprets as:

As for the meaning of the Hadith, Prophet Muhammad (SAAS) said: Do not believe until you love the meaning of it, unless you complete it. The other saying is: Do not enter Paradise until you believe it is on the face of its launch and do not enter Paradise except those who died a believer though not full of faith, it is apparent from the modern. Sheikh Abu Amr, may God have mercy on him, said. The meaning of the Hadith is that your faith will only be complemented by love. And you will not enter Paradise when its people enter, if you are not like that. And this is what he said is possible. God knows . As for his saying: (Spread peace among you), it is by cutting off the open hamza. And in it is the great urge to divulge peace and its efforts to all Muslims; whoever you know, and whoever you do not know,

as it was advanced in the last Hadith. Peace is the first cause of harmony, and the key to attracting affection.

Fakhr al-Din al-Razi was a Muslim theologian and philosopher. He defines Islam as “to worship the creator and show mercy towards his creation” (Ataie 2014). First, Muslims are called to worship their Creator and be thankful to Him. Second, we are in our Creator’s image which makes us responsible to love and care for whole humanity as well as the world we live in, animals, plants, rocks, water and air etc.

If we exclude religion from life morality becomes relative and human beings become little more than cattle, chunks of flesh and blood, soulless, easily slaughtered, atheists or material educationalists. In Islamic *Shariah* there are rules of war. Woman and children are not targeted. In the First World War two thousand pound bomb was dropped by secular world on innocent man, woman and children. In the absence of God there will be no objective or higher moral values. Right and wrong would be determined by a dominant group.

Ataie argues that all atheists are not immoral, there are many atheists that are moral, but science cannot give morality. There is nothing in science that compels anyone to be moral. One cannot extract charity, justice, selflessness and compassion from science. Atheism describes us just animals, and animals does not have morals, so why should we have? Most atheists concede that we have moral duties, for example if you see any kid drowning at beach, its moral obligation to save him. But why we should put us in harm, did we evolve to put ourselves in harm. Where does altruism come from, is there any gene which brings altruism? (Ataie 2014)

Atheism defines good as it is something that makes your life more pleasurable. Pleasure of someone can be danger for some one. If some kills children and feels pleasure in it, then it is not immoral for atheists. Religious people have objective moral values which come from religious scriptures. These values prohibit from murder, stealing, adultery and lying (Ataie 2014).

Ataie argues that why we give our seat in train to an old lady. Do we want to prolong our species, or to get a dollar or some advantage? We just do this altruism for the sake of God. We donate blood to others, does giving blood evolves our species or some sort of advantage on somebody? It is because religion moralize us in this way (Ataie 2014).

Ataie simply rejects the idea of scientific morality. He argues that to define moral principles is

the outside of scientific domain. He strengthens his arguments by the references of renowned scholars and Islamic theological arguments. He rejects the atheistic idea that sole aim of life is to get pleasure. To achieve this target if any atheist commits any evil thing, there will be no authority to stop him. Moreover, there will not be any authoritative distinction about what is right and what is wrong.

HAMZA ANDREAS TZORTIS (B. 1980)

Hamza Andreas Tzortis is a British Muslim scholar. In his article ‘Know God, Know Good: God & Objective Morality’, he argues that if you read a news on TV that a man beheads five year old boy. Almost all decent people who read the news will say that that man did wrong. People will say that it is wrong by objective moralities. A fundamental definition of term objective mentions to representing or considering facts without influencing by ones opinions or feelings (Tzortis 2018). According to this definition, objective represents that moral values are not based or dependant on personal feelings or one’s mind. In this position, it is external to one’s limited individual rational capabilities. Similarly scientific facts such as earth revolves around the sun and mathematical truths such as $1+1=2$ are true regardless what one feels about it. For this very reason, if these moral values are external to us, these have to be firmly grounded. These morals require a basic foundation.

On the other hand, defending or helping the innocent one is moral truth. This shows that creator provides sole rational basis for objective morals and no other than creator can provide such foundational basis. God gives their foundational basis since He is outside from our world. Andreas quotes Professor Ian Markham who says in his book ‘*Against Atheism: Why Dawkins, Hitchens and Harris are fundamentally Wrong*’: “Creator elaborates the mysterious ought to pressing down our lives; and God elaborates the nature of a moral claim. Because creator is external to the world, the creator can be both external and make universal commands” (Tzortis 2018).

According to Islam, God is a being of maximum perfection, powerful, knowledgeable and good. Perfection in goodness is creator’s necessary nature. His one name is Al-Barr which conveys the meaning that He is the origin of goodness. Moral command derivative of God’s will and God’s will do not oppose God’s nature. Because of this people believe the commandments of God are good because He is

good He says in Qur‘ān: “Yet when [these people] do something disgraceful, they say, ‘We found our forefathers doing this,’ and, ‘God has commanded us to do this.’ Say [Prophet] ‘God does not command disgraceful deeds. How can you say about God things that you do not know [to be true]?”.

Tzortis responds about main argument of atheism against religious moralities which is renowned as Euthyphro’s dilemma or Plato’s dilemma. Atheists argue that, is something morally good because God commands it, or does God command it because it is morally good? According to Tzortis, religious people argue that morality is not external to God’s commandments and it is defined by God. If God will not decide about good and evil then there will be no objective evil or objective good. If this is not the case, then for some people who seek pleasure while doing evil, there would be nothing wrong in killing innocent children. This is a rationally incorrect dilemma. The reason is because of a third possibility that God is good. Tzortis quotes professor of philosophy Shabir Akhtar who writes in the book, ‘*The Qur‘ān and the Secular Mind*’: “We have a third possible: a morally sound creator, which we find in religious texts, a higher authority who does not arbitrarily change his decision about goodness and evilness. God consistently commands about goodness because His nature and character are good” (Tzortis 2018).

Modern atheists say that there are substitute foundations for moral objectives. They describe these alternatives mainly to moral realism, biology and social pressure. Biology is unable to explain objective morality. Charles Darwin describes an example while saying that natural selection or biology forms the foundation of moral values. Darwin argues that in case human were the outcome of a divergent set of biological conditions, then our moral objectives could be entirely different. He says: “If men were reared under precisely the same conditions as hive-bees, there can hardly be a doubt that our un-married females would, like the worker-bees, think it a sacred duty to kill their brothers, and mothers would strive to kill their fertile daughters, and no one would think of interfering” (Tzortis 2018). This shows if morals are contingent on biological changes; they cannot become objective. As Darwin says “if we happened to be reared under the same conditions as the nurse shark, we would think it acceptable to rape our partner, as the nurse shark wrestles with its mate” (Tzortis 2018). Some atheists say that natural selection makes the

foundation of objective moral values. This is also incorrect position of atheism. Natural selection only can provide us the capability to make moral laws to assist us reproduce and survive conceptually. Tzortis quotes moral philosopher Philip Kitcher who writes in his book ‘*The Moral Argument*’: “Natural selection only may have done for human is to equip human with the capability for different social arrangements and the capability to make ethical rules” (Tzortis 2018: 163). To claim that biological science can provide foundational moral objective detach any meaning we connect with morality. In this way, morals standards become insignificant and meaningless, if they are only because of non-conscious and non-rational biological changes. Human have moral responsibilities and duties that are owed to creator, simply collection of molecules cannot provide us moral objectives (Tzortis 2018).

Atheists believe social pressure or consensus as another alternative of moralities. Social pressure cannot make the objective morals. In this case it becomes moral relative, which can be change due to inevitable social changes. Moreover, this creates moral irrationality, if we accept the agreement among people as a base of moral objective then how could we justify Nazis actions in 1940s in German territory? In this case we cannot argue that their cruelties were morally wrong (Tzortis 2018: 163).

Atheists also claim that moral realism also provides the basis of objective morals. It is also described as moral objectivism. This view explains that objective morals are independent and external to human emotions and intellectual faculties. In result, moral truths like justice, tolerance and compassion just exist objectively. According to Tzortis, this stance is meaningless and counterintuitive. Human simply do not know what justice is, existing on its own. If morals are objective (outside of one’s own opinion), then they need a rational and logical explanation. In other case they are not objective. Moreover, moralities are not limited to recognize the truth of justice or compassion. Morality brings a sense of obligation or duty; human are required to become just and compassionate. In perspective of moral realism these obligations and requirements are not possible.

Tzortis argues that it is fundamentally wrong to draw objective moralities from science. He expresses that the moral authority must be outside from the universe to be authoritative regardless people’s individual preferences. This condition is fulfilled when God decide about right and wrong.

His argument is logically sound that God is the authority to define objective moralities.

ANALYSIS

1. New atheists claim that science can define moralities. Muslim scholars responds that the domain of science is to describe nature and its explanation in terms of laws and deeper patterns. Science is unable to tell us how to live moral life. The questions about how should we live better or worse, fall outside the domain of objective empirical research. Science can tell us about things that cause pain but cannot tell us pain is bad. Atheists cannot prove that murder is wrong according to a scientific method. Science cannot prove love and emotions. Science does not know consciousness; it will say that consciousness is chemical mixing in your brain. Science cannot tell you about memory and imaginations. However, all atheists are not immoral, there are many atheists that are moral, but science cannot give morality. There is nothing in science that compels anyone to be moral. One cannot extract charity, justice, selflessness and compassion from science. Atheism defines good as it is something that makes your life more pleasurable. Pleasure of someone can be danger for someone else. If someone kills children and feels pleasure in it, then it is not immoral for atheists. Atheism describes us just animals, and animals does not have morals, so why should we have? Most atheists concede that we have moral duties, for example if you see any kid drowning at beach, its moral obligation to save him. But why we should put us in danger, did we come into being to put ourselves in danger. Where does altruism come from, is there any gene which brings altruism?
2. Atheists claim that universe is purposeless. One of the major factor behind good moralities of humans is the reward of God. This reward motivates people to be moral. Atheist's position lacks this motivation. Life requires struggle among human beings and without objective moralities humans cannot behave with each other better than animals.
3. Objective moralities require a final authority to decide what is right and what is wrong. In case there is not any moral authority/ God, people will prefer their own moralities. When one's morality clashes with other person's morality, it is question of whose version is true and which morals become universal truths. This problem solves when we believe on the God's objective moral standards. Atheism defines good as it is something that makes your life more pleasurable. Pleasure of someone can be danger for some one. If some kills children and feels pleasure in it, then it is not immoral for atheists. Religious people have objective moral values which come from religious scriptures. These values prohibit from murder, stealing, adultery and lying. *The reason why these morals are objective tells us that God exists. Similarly, in the absence of God human do not get objective moral truths. Creator provides sole rational basis for objective morals and no other than creator can provide such foundational basis. God gives their foundational basis since He is outside from our world.*
5. The people who deny God, deny the life after death, deny that concepts of heaven and hell become exceedingly aggressive, unreliable, selfish and prone to develop dangerous criminal behavior.
6. Every human being has a divine code by God that tells us consciousness. Every human irrespective of any belief feels guilty when he does some wrong like stealing, rape and murder and every human feels good when he does good with someone such as giving charity, helping poor and needy people. This is because God has created us on this 'Fitrah' that when we do good we feel good and when we do evil we feel evil in ourselves. God has given us some laws to protect these moral values.
7. The big four atheist rulers of the world; Chairman Mao, Joseph Stalin, Pol Pot, and Mussolini killed more than one hundred million peoples. Hitler was catholic he killed 6 million Jews. Those big four were seventeen times Hitler; they killed mass population than Hitler. The reason of killing of big four was no God, no Day of Judgment, survival of the fittest and natural selection.
8. According to Richard Dawkins: There is neither good nor evil, we are machines to propagate DNA. If one follow atheism one cannot be immoral because there is no right or wrong.
9. Atheists believe social pressure or consensus as another alternative of moralities. Social pressure cannot make the objective morals. In this case it becomes moral relative, which can

be change due to inevitable social changes. Moreover, this creates moral irrationality, if we accept the agreement among people as a base of moral objective then how could we justify Nazis actions in 1940s in German territory? In this case we cannot argue that their cruelties were morally wrong.

10. Some atheists say that natural selection makes the foundation of objective moral values. This is also incorrect position of atheism. Natural selection only can provide us the capability to make moral laws to assist us reproduce and survive conceptually. Human have moral responsibilities and duties that are owed to creator, simply collection of molecules cannot provide us moral objectives.

CONCLUSION

New atheists argue that science can determine human values and humans do not need God to set moral values. Moreover, they claim that religion guides about morality poorly. According to them, natural selection, social pressure and development of social sciences can replace religious moralities. This way, atheists tend to remove the role of religion for moral development of human beings.

New atheists use aggressive language against all religions especially Islam after 9/11. New atheists portray Islam as a religion of terror and violence. Muslim scholars highlight that the position of new atheists is irrational and illogical. They argue that science is incapable in order to define objective moralities.

Objective moralities require a final authority to decide what is right and what is wrong and that final authority is God. Social pressure and natural selection cannot define moral values. Atheists' regimes in history caused more bloodshed than religious regimes. Humans need to know more about God and religion to raise their moral standards instead of depending solely on science.

Mostly new atheists determine moral responsibility by referring to facts about natural moral intuitions or human biology, but without sufficiently defending this or tracing the possibilities on non-naturalistic secular moralities. Because of their naturalistic assumptions, new atheists' moral theories tend to be weak. Main promoters of new atheism seem to be unwilling to accept that moral philosophy can play a role in expanding secular moral precepts because philosophy fails to meet up with their tough standards of scientific validity.

This stance is fallacious not only because it has led new atheists to defend weak moral theories but also because the methods of inquiry used in moral philosophy make it distinct from religion for many of the same reasons that the new atheists think that science is distinct from religion.

Religion develops moralities while adding the God concept, hope for reward and punishment for sin in life. Purposeless life is deficient to develop moralities in individual and society. The Darwinist notion of survival for the fittest develops a selfish attitude in humans and hinders good moral values. There is necessity of God to make universal truths in cases when one's morality clashes with other's person morality. It is impossible to extract charity, justice, selflessness and compassion from science.

REFERENCES

- Abdel Haleem M. A. S. 2008. *The Qur'an*. UK: Oxford World's Classics.
- Masood, A. I. 2016. *Blasting the Foundations of Atheism*. [s.n.]
- Ataie, S. A. 2014. *Does God exists? A Muslim Response to Atheism with Sidi Ali Ataie*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7K8U1JvPhMQ> [15 June 2019].
- Daleiden, J. 1998. *The Science of Morality: The Individual, Community, and Future Generations*. UK: Prometheus Books.
- Dawkins, R. 2006. *The God Delusion*. USA: Mariner Publishers.
- Dawkins, R. 2000. *Unweaving the Rainbow: Science, Delusion and the Appetite for Wonder*. USA: Mariner Books.
- Dennett, D. 2006. *Breaking the Spell, Religion as a Natural Phenomenon*. USA: Penguin Books.
- Denton, M. 2002. *Evolution: a Theory in Crisis*. New York: Adler & Adler Publishers.
- Gaylord, G. S. 1968. *Life of the Past: an Introduction to Paleontology*. USA: Yale University Press.
- Glynn, P. 1999. *God: The Evidence, the Reconciliation of Faith and Reason in a Post Secular World*. California: Prima Publishing.
- Harris, S. 2004. *The End of Faith: Religion, Terror and the Future of Reason*. New York: W.W Norton & Company.
- Harris, S. 2011. *The Moral Landscape, How Science Can Determine Human Values*. USA: Free Press.
- Hitchens, C. 2007. *God is not Great: How Religion Poisons Everything*. USA: Twelve Publishers.
- Johnson, P. E. 1997. *Defeating Darwinism*. US: Intervarsity Press.
- Joll, J. 1990. *Europe since 1870: An International History*. Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Qadhi, S. Y. 2012. *Morality and Laws*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QzCMRBEjSg0> [26 April 2019].
- Qadhi, S. Y. 2018. *Muslim Scholar Discusses Ethics Morality in Secular World*. <https://badgerherald.com/news/2018/04/20/muslim-scholar-discusses-ethics-morality-in-secular-world/> [13 April 2019].

- Tzortis, H. A. 2018. *The Divine Reality: God Islam and the Mirage of Atheism*. San Clemente: FB Publishing.
- Wikipedia. 2019. "Sam Harris". Last modified April 15, 2019. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sam_Harris.
- Yahya, H. *Darwinism and Moral Collapse*. <https://m.harunyahya.com/tr/books/3984/The-Social-Weapon-Darwinism/chapter/5130/Darwinism-and-Moral-Collapse>. [03 February, 2019].
- Zuckerman, P. 2010. *Society without God: What the Least Religious Nations Can Tell Us About Contentment*. New York: NYU Press.

AUTHORS

Ataur Rehman
Assistant Professor
Department of Islamic Studies
Lahore Garrison University, Pakistan
ataurrehman@lgu.edu.pk