

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology
of Egypt / Egyptology

**SCIENCE AND GOD'S EXISTENCE: ISLAMIC PERSPECTIVE ON
IDEOLOGY OF NEW ATHEISM**

Ataur Rehman¹, Dr. Tahir Masood Qazi², Dr. Malik Kamran³, Dr. Shahzada Imran Ayub⁴

¹Assistant Professor, Lahore Garrison University, Lahore, Pakistan Email:
ataurrehman@lgu.edu.pk

²Associate Professor, Lahore Garrison University, Lahore, Pakistan Email:
drtmqazi@lgu.edu.pk

³Assistant Professor, The University of Lahore, Lahore, Pakistan Email:
malik.kamran@ais.uol.edu.pk

⁴Assistant Professor, The University of Lahore, Lahore, Pakistan Email:
imran.ayub@ais.uol.edu.pk

Ataur Rehman , Dr. Tahir Masood Qazi , Dr. Malik Kamran , Dr. Shahzada Imran
Ayub , Science And God's Existence: Islamic Perspective On Ideology Of New
Atheism , Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 18(10), 3320-3336.
ISSN 1567-214x.

Key Words: Islam, Muslim scholars, New Atheism, Religion, Science, God's existence,
Scientific atheism, Modern atheism.

Abstract

This article seeks to explore how Muslim scholars are responding to modern atheism that is known as 'New Atheism'. Sam Harris, Richard Dawkins, Daniel Dennett and Christopher Hitchens are considered as the founding fathers of scientific/ new atheism. In addition to traditional philosophical and moral arguments, the new atheists add substantial use of arguments from natural sciences to deny the God's existence and authenticity of religions. They draw on

science as alternative of religion in twenty-first century. Moreover, they suggest that empirical science is sufficient for genuine knowledge for humanity and there is no need to take guidance from religions. They conclude that religions are unscientific and irrational and it is satisfying to live without religion on the basis of scientific discoveries and secular moral values. The refutation of new atheism came from different religious scholars of Judaism, Christianity and scholars of other religious beliefs. Muslim scholars have also refuted atheism in its scientific dimension but this refutation is still unknown in academic community. This study will fulfill that gap by exploring the refutation of Muslim scholars by using scientific arguments. This write up is based on a qualitative research study. The data was collected through library research. Muslim scholars show that modern scientific discoveries have overthrown all important atheistic assumptions. They argue that new atheists misuse science in their favor.

Introduction

Modern atheism is depending heavily on science to disprove the existence of God and eradicate the role of religion in public and private life. In this pursuit, they make some scientific claims to construct their argument. First, existence of God is a scientific question. Second, Darwin's theory of evolution has replaced the religious explanation about the origin of universe and living species. Third, Moral values can be determine scientifically without the support of God or religion.

Scientific argument is concerned with all the assumptions, foundations, methods, implications of science, and with the use and merit of science. Sometimes it overlaps metaphysics, ontology and epistemology, viz., when it explores whether scientific results comprise a study of truth. In addition to these central problems of science as a whole, many philosophers of science consider problems that apply to particular sciences (e.g. philosophy of biology or philosophy of physics). Philosophers of science use contemporary results in science to reach conclusions about philosophy.

New atheists and Muslim scholars use contemporary results in science to make strengthen their specific argumentation. The foundational base of new atheists' scientific argumentation is the Charles Darwin's theory of evolution. They argue that the theory has converted the traditional philosophical atheism into scientific/ new atheism.

This study highlights major scientific arguments of new atheists about God and religion and contemporary Muslim response followed by an analysis.

New Atheism

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.

God's Existence and Science: New Atheists' Perspective

Scientific argument is concerned with all the assumptions, foundations, methods, implications of science, and with the use and merit of science. Sometimes it overlaps metaphysics, ontology and epistemology, viz., when it explores whether scientific results comprise a study of truth. In addition to these central problems of science as a whole, many philosophers of science consider problems that apply to particular sciences (e.g. philosophy of biology or philosophy of physics). Philosophers of science use contemporary results in science to reach conclusions about philosophy.

The foundational base of New Atheists' scientific argumentation is the Charles Darwin's theory of evolution. They argue that the theory has converted the traditional philosophical atheism into scientific/ new atheism.

Dawkins promotes the theory of evolution for the scientific explanation of the origin of universe and its working, instead depending upon religious explanation. According to him, evolutionary theory has provided scientific basis to atheism and explains the existing entities in the universe (Dawkins, 2006, P. 68). He expounds that evolution by natural selection provides thorough explanation of universe design and complexity (Dawkins, 2006, P.79). He expresses that natural selection elaborates the whole life and raises human consciousness and capability of science to describe the most complicated questions of our universe (Dawkins, 2006, P.116).

In another argument, Dawkins claims that existence of God is a scientific hypothesis:

I shall suggest that the existence of God is a scientific hypothesis like any other, even if hard to test in practice. God existence or non-existence is a scientific fact about the universe, discoverable in principle if not in practice. If he existed and chose to reveal it, God himself could clinch the argument, noisily and unequivocally, in his favour(Dawkins, 2006, P.50).

Dawkins further expresses: "I cannot know for certain but I think God is very improbable, and I live my life on the assumption that he is not there." (Dawkins, 2006). He argues that: "God's existence or non-existence is a scientific fact about the universe, discoverable in principle if not in practice" (Dawkins, 2006, P. 72-73). Dawkins rejects the existence of God through religious scientific invalidity of religious miracles.

Sam Harris argues that religious books teach barbarism and superstitions. He believes that natural selection theory by Charles Darwin is adequate to elaborate the beginning of universe and its functioning. He argues that, "Biologists say that DNA is the molecular basis for sexual reproduction. Each of us resembles our parents because we inherit a complement of their

DNA. Each of us has arms and legs because our DNA coded for the proteins that produced them during our early development” (Harris, 2004, P.82). New atheists believe that science can explain better about human origin and physical working. Harris also claims that miracles are unscientific: “Religious language is, without questions, unscientific in its claims for what is true. We have Christians believing in the Holy Ghost, the resurrection of Jesus and his possible return- these are claims about biology and physics which, from a scientific point of view in the 21st century, should be unsustainable” (Harris, 2011).

Like Harris and Dawkins, Daniel Dennett also has faith on evolution theory. He believes that the understanding of evolutionary theory can make our world a peaceful and better place (Dennett, 2007, P.268). Dennett narrates that scientific methods should continue to test the existence of God and truth of faiths (Dennett, 1995). He adds that the fundamental concepts of Darwinism, DNA based reproduction and evolution is now beyond any dispute among the scientists and getting strength every passing day. Dennett states: “If religion is put under the bright lights and the microscope, there is a serious risk of breaking a different and much more important spell: the life enriching enchantment of religion itself.” (Dennett, 2007, P.38)

Similar to Dawkins, Harris and Dennett, Hitchens also recounts Darwin's theories in order to explain the origins of humanity. He discusses that, “the real “miracle” is that we, who share genes with the original bacteria that began life on the planet, have evolved as much as we have. Other creatures did not develop eyes at all, or developed extremely weak ones. There is an intriguing paradox here: evolution does not have eyes but it can create them” (Hitchens, 2007, P.84). All the new atheists have firm belief on theory of evolution that is a way to explain the origin of universe and human scientifically. Dennett declares theory of evolution as atheistic miracle. He seems capable to nature itself for the origin and development of human and animals' body parts. Hitchens explains that fossil records highlights that around 98 percents of the species which have created on earth have been ended (Hitchens, 2007, P.88).

New atheists believe that universe is pre-eternal and self existent. Moreover, they argue that universe is purposeless; however, individual life can be spent purposefully. According to them, there is no life after death, no reward and no punishment.

Victor J. Stenger discusses the findings of astronomy, physics and quantum mechanics and shows that our universe appears exactly as it should if there is no creator. He concludes that there is no evidence for God's existence (Stenger, 2008).

New atheists believe that science should replace the religion in this age of the advancement of technology. They argue that science is based on reason whereas religion depends on superstitions and unscientific ideologies. Sam Harris argues that modern human should rely on scientific and historical evidences to believe on anything instead of religious claims.

Sam Harris narrates that science has replaced the authority of religion by secular progress generally. He adds that religion has still its ground about the morality, but morality, value and human happiness are scientific questions. He classifies the factors that contribute human happiness and sufferings are genes, ideas, intentions, economic systems and social structures. Scientific discourse is at its beginning to address these factors (Harris, 2016).

Richard Dawkins believes that “the calculations of physicists which results that if the constants and laws of physics had been minutely different then life would have been impossible at our planet” (Dawkins, 2006, P. 141). Dawkins opposes mainly beliefs about the existence of God, miracles, Prophets and other supernatural beliefs. In fact, he denies the origin of human culture and tradition but he considers the outcome of religious beliefs beneficial for the societies and don't want to give up them.

Denial Dennett invites scientific approach to study the validity of religious teachings and moralities. He believes that religion is manmade and has been developing as the passage of different generations. In this way, it should not be treated in more sacred way than other sciences. As other sciences are subject to experiment and verification, in the same way all principles and preaching of religions should be tested to know their validity and authenticity. He draws that religion should put under same scientific inquiry as scientists have done with tobacco, alcohol and music (Dennett, 2007, p.42). He narrates that, “I am not suggesting that science should try to do what religion does, but that it should study scientifically, what religion does” (Dennett, 2007, P.30-31).

Christopher Hitchens discusses that religious faiths have run out of justification. He emphasizes the importance of scientific discoveries like telescope and microscope in order to find the realities of universe more accurately (Hitchens, 2007, P.282). He narrates that modern man should detest everything which is contradictory to science. He argues that open-mindedness, free inquiry and pursuit of new ideas should be encouraged (Hitchens, 2007, P. 142).

The new atheists have almost similar kind of scientific argument. They promote Darwin's theory of evolution in order to understand the origin of universe and man. They refute miracles of Prophets on scientific grounds and through this they refute the existence of God. New atheists depends heavily on science for the developing scientific moralities, scientific spirituality and understating the nature of our universe. They borrow arguments from each other's writings. They add rhetoric and aggressive linguistic expression to make their arguments more compelling and appealing to wide audience.

God's Existence and Science: Muslim Perspective

Adnan Oktar (1956) is a Turkish Muslim scholar and creationist. He is known as HarunYahya. In 2007, he wrote the book 'The Atlas of Creation' about the Islamic perspective of creationism. According to HarunYahya, the modern scientific discoveries have nullified atheistic thought and theories. To justify his position he argues with the aid of modern scientific developments in diverse fields of science. He argues in his famous work, 'The Fall of Atheism' that American scholar of George Washington University, wrote in the book, 'The Reconciliation of Faith and Reason in a Post secular World' that:

The past two decades of research have overturned nearly all the important assumptions and predictions of an earlier generation of modern secular and atheist thinkers relating to the issue of God. Modern thinkers assumed that science would reveal the universe to be ever more random and mechanical; instead it has discovered unexpected new layers of intricate order that bespeak an almost unimaginably vast master design. Modern psychologists predicted that

religion would be exposed as a neurosis and outgrown; instead, religious commitment has been shown empirically to be a vital component of basic mental health. Few people seem to realize this, but by now it should be clear: Over the course of a century in the great debate between science and faith, the tables have completely turned. In the wake of Darwin, atheists and agnostics like Huxley and Russell could point to what appeared to be a solid body of testable theory purportedly showing life to be accidental and the universe radically contingent. Many scientists and intellectuals continue to cleave to this worldview. But they are increasingly pressed to almost absurd lengths to defend it. Today the concrete data point strongly in the direction of the God hypothesis (Glynn, 1997, P.19-20).

According to Yahya, the first blow to modern atheism came from cosmology. The atheistic idea that universe has no beginning was negated and discovered the fact that universes had a beginning point. He argues that scientific proof against this atheistic idea came as Big Bang theory which is the most significant theory of astronomy in 20th century. This theory was presented in scientific world after some important scientific discoveries. The renowned American astronomer, Edwin Hubble, noticed that universe is expanding by the observation of the movement of galaxies. He concluded that "if the flow of time in expanding universe were reversed, then it results that our universe must have emerged from a single point" (Sharov&Novikov, 2005). Anthony Flew an atheist professor confesses in his book, 'Atheistic Hamanism' that:

Notoriously, confession is good for the soul. I will therefore begin by confessing that the Stratonician atheist has to be embarrassed by the contemporary cosmological consensus. For it seems that the cosmologists are providing a scientific proof of what St. Thomas contended could not be proved philosophically; namely, that the universe had a beginning. So long as the universe can be comfortably thought of as being not only without end but also without beginning, it remains easy to urge that its brute existence, and whatever is found to be its most fundamental features, should be accepted as the explanatory ultimates. Although I believe that it remains still correct, it certainly is neither easy nor comfortable to maintain this position in the face of the Big Bang story (Margenau&Vergesse, 2002, P.41).

Moreover, he adds the point of view of an English Physicist H.P. Lipson who agrees about scientific concept of creation argues that "I think that we must admit that the only acceptable explanation is creation. (Lipson, 1980, P.138)

Yahya discusses that the modern discoveries in physics and astronomy have also invalidated the atheistic belief of random universe. The idea that matter, heavenly bodies and laws that regulate the relationship in universe are by chance that have no specific purpose. Since 1970, scientists believe that the present physical balance of our universe supports human life. Modern research discovers that biological, chemical and physical laws of the universe are exactly adjusted to support human life. Scientists call this deliberated design as 'anthropic

principle'¹ (Yahya, 2002). He elaborates this principle that mainly four physical forces in our universe are electromagnetic force, strong, nuclear force, weak nuclear force and gravitational force. These forces are at essential range to run a designed universe to support human existence. The slight variation in those forces, for instance one in 10²⁸ or one in 10³⁹ which are calculated as one in a billion, billion, billion and billion, our universe could either change in radiation, or compose of only hydrogen elements. There are some other important physical adjustments in the universe such as the sun's size, its distance from earth the chemical and physical characteristics of mineral water, size of sun rays, composition of gases on earth, and composition of earth's magnetic field, favor the human life. Yahya quotes the astronomer, Paul Davies who writes in the book, 'The Cosmic Blueprint' that: "The impression of design is overwhelming" (Davies, 1987, P.203). He quotes the astrophysicist W. Press who argues that "there is a grand design in the universe that favors the development of intelligent life" (Press, 1986).

Yahya argues about the evidences from quantum physics which are also support the existence of God. Quantum physics describes in detail about the tiniest matter's particles and discloses the sub-atomic realms. Electrons and nuclei are formed of little particles which are known as 'quarks'. Quarks are not considered only physical particles rather these are forms of energy. Matter in the universe is just a frozen energy which consists of quarks. Yahya quotes the physicist Freeman Dyson who states:

Atoms are weird stuff, behaving like active agents rather than inert substances. They make unpredictable choices between alternative possibilities according to the laws of quantum mechanics. It appears that mind, as manifested by the capacity to make choices, is to some extent inherent in every atom. (Schroeder, 2001, P.7)

While explaining the basis of matter, Yahya quotes the Gerald Schroeder who argues in his book, 'The Hidden Face of God' that there is an outside wisdom which is running our material universe while stating:

It took humanity millennia before an Einstein discovered that, as bizarre as it may seem, the basis of matter is energy, that matter is actually condensed energy. It may take a while longer for us to discover that there is some non-thing even more fundamental than energy that forms the basis of energy, which in turn forms the basis of matter (Schroeder, 2001, P.8).

Yahya illustrates while quoting different scientists and comes to conclusion that quantum physics is the shadow of a transcendent being. He quotes Schroeder who argues that:

The age-old theological view of the universe is that all existence is the manifestation of a transcendent wisdom, with a universal consciousness being its manifestation. If I substitute the word information for wisdom, theology begins to sound like quantum

¹ It is the cosmological principle which describes that theories of the universe are constrained by the necessity to allow human existence.

physics. We may be witnessing the scientific confluence of the physical with the spiritual (Schroeder, 2001, P.48).

While refuting the ideas of modern atheists, Yahya quotes extensively to different scientists. He also adds the relevant Qur'anic verses. While explaining the divine wisdom behind our universe he quotes Qur'an: "Your god is God alone, there is no god but Him. He encompasses all things in His knowledge" (Qur'an, 20:98).

Yahya argues that theory on intelligent design has triumphed over the Darwin's natural selection with scientific discoveries and progress in twentieth century. Evolutionary theory asserts that the initiation of all living species is from one prime ancestor and the divergence from one form to another form of different species over the centuries by little changes gradually. Darwin also supposed that his assumption would be demonstrated with discovery of fossil records. The research regarding fossils in twentieth century gives opposite results of Darwinian assumptions. The fossil of even any one undoubted intermediate which validate the idea in gradual evolution of living beings are not discovered. He argues that another Cambrian Explosion phenomenon about the structures of animal kingdom also disagrees with the atheistic notions. This phenomenon explains that different categories of species have totally different body structures and complex systems as well as organs, including arthropods, mollusks, vertebrates and echinoderms (Yahya, 2002).

Yahya argues that Darwin claims that all living beings made within a common ancestor, however he does not clarifies how this common ancestor produced. In this regard, Darwin says only that first living cell could have made due to random chemical reactions in some little warm small pond. The biochemical experiments and observations show that it is not possible for a cell to originate inside inanimate matter via random chemical reactions. He quotes Noble Prize holder Fred Hoyle who argues that this scheme "is comparable with the chance that a tornado sweeping through a junk-yard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials therein" ("Hoyle on Evolution", 1981, P.105). He discusses that the design of living things is more complex than that of any advanced technological equipment. The design of our eyes is more complicated than any advanced camera, wings of bird led the air plane technology, and organization of cells in living beings and information stored in DNA are remarkable. The evolutionary theory says simply that these all are just by chance which is illogical.

Yahya gives evidences from psychology against the atheistic views about religion. He argues that Sigmund Freud a renowned psychologist of nineteen century claimed religion as a mental illness (neurosis) and propagated the atheistic ideas which are known as Freudianism². The idea of Frued was also supported by the nineteenth century psychologists. According to a poll survey it was found that mere 1.1 percent USA's psychologists had religious belief (Wallace, 1990, P.1005). Freudianism spread with rapid pace in nineteenth century. In last quarter of twentieth century, the modern developments in the field of psychology proposed that religion is beneficial for mental health. He quotes the psychologist Patrick Glynn who argues that:

²Freudianism: Sigmund Freud considered the God as an illusion. He believed that religion was necessary in early human stages when human's nature was violent. However, in modern times religion should be replaced with science and reason.

Yet the last quarter of the twentieth century has not been kind to the psychoanalytic vision. Most significant has been the exposure of Freud's views of religion as entirely fallacious. Ironically enough, scientific research in psychology over the past twenty-five years has demonstrated that, far from being a neurosis or source of neuroses as Freud and his disciples claimed, religious belief is one of the most consistent correlates of overall mental health and happiness. Study after study has shown a powerful relationship between religious belief and practice, on the one hand, and healthy behaviors with regard to such problems as suicide, alcohol and drug abuse, divorce, depression, even, perhaps surprisingly, levels of sexual satisfaction in marriage, on the other. In short, the empirical data run exactly contrary to the supposedly "scientific" consensus of the psychotherapeutic profession (Glynn, 1997, P.60-61).

While strengthening the fact that modern discoveries in psychology support the religion, Yahya quotes renowned psychologist Glynn who writes: "modern psychology at the close of the twentieth century seems to be reacquainting itself with religion and a purely secular view of human mental life has been shown to fail not just at the theoretical, but also at the practical, level" (Glynn, 1997, P.69-78).

According to Yahya, there are medical evidences which support the claim that religion is beneficial for health. He argues that David B. Larson as well as his research fellows, the representatives of National Institute of Healthcare Research conducted a research to find out the relationships between the persons who attended the Church and who did not. The risk of a heart disease 'arteriosclerotic' in men who were regular in attending church was just 60 percent of that for men who were not frequent in attending church. In another research by same institute, it was found that smokers who took important to religion in their lives discovered to have normal diastolic pressure measurements than the smokers who had not considered religion important (Glynn, 1997, P.80-81).

Shaykh Yasir Qadhi is a Pakistani-American Muslim scholar. He has done his Ph. D. in Theology from university of Yale. He speaks about contemporary issues concerning Islam. He argues that how does God exist is a very deep question and goes back to centuries. From the Islamic perspective, there are numerous proofs of the existence of God. Allah created each and every human being with a soul, a spiritual DNA (a fitrah). When the 'fitrah' is pure, it examines everything beyond the sensory observations and observes the signs of the God. According to a Hadith of Prophet Muhammad (SAAS) every person is born on 'fitrah' then his parents change him into Christian or Jews or else. 'Fitrah' is human nature which is divine and tells every person regardless his belief about what is right and wrong; certainly this is evidence for the existence of God. This human nature tells every person that there is a creator (Qadhi, 2017).

Ridi Ali Ataie argues that mostly atheists like Sam Harris, Daniel Dennett, Richard Dawkins, Christopher Hitchens and Stephen Hawking claim that universe has come from nothing. According to atheists the universe is uncaused. Quentin Smith is professor at Michigan University. He argues that: "universe came from nothing, by nothing and for nothing" (Ataie, 2014). That is a metaphysical claim and not a naturalist claim. Ataie quotes Stephen Hawking who states: "universe can spontaneously create itself out of nothing" (Ataie, 2014). That is not

naturalism instead that is a religious statement. Stephen Hawking discusses that “at the sub atomic level, in the quantum vacuum, we have a proton that comes in and out of existence. This is something from nothing” (Ataie, 2014). In fact quantum vacuum is certainly not nothing. It is a fluctuating energy and highly volatile and very unstable.

Ataie differentiates between the concepts of an actual infinitude and theoretical infinitude. Actual infinite includes unending things or sets within a space which has an end and a beginning; it represents a series which is completed but composed of an infinite number of members. Aristotle described that actual infinities cannot exist because they are self-contradictory. On the other hand, the theoretical infinitude can be traversed within finite space. However an actual infinitude cannot get. So if we ask question who caused God; another God, who caused him; another God, who caused him; another God...this does not get us to pass infinite regression because we have a universe and an actual infinitude cannot be traversed. Infinite regression dies at the door of eternal. This is the only way one can deal with infinite regression. God is primal cause of universe and he created universe out of nothing. He is creator of time, space, matter, energy and everything in our universe (Ataie, 2014).

Ataie discusses that the distance between moon and sun, if the difference little bit closer or farther, there will be no life on our planet. If the day is little bit longer life would cease to exist on earth. If the axis of earth which is 23.5 degrees become slightly off, there would be no life on earth. If the atmosphere changes a little bit, we would burn. Jupiter is on perfect place with perfect mass which is solar cosmic vacuum cleaner. All of asteroids which come towards earth are pulling towards Jupiter and it saves us. The solar system itself is like a watch. Isaac Newton noticed that planet orbit around the sun in the same direction and with same plane; he said this is design (Ataie, 2014).

Hamza Andreas Tzortis is a British researcher on Islam and public speaker. In the book “The Divine Reality”, he provides a compelling case for the rational and spiritual foundations of Islam, whilst compassionately and intelligently deconstructing atheism. He addresses academic and popular objections while showing how contemporary atheism is based on false assumptions about reality, which leads to incoherent answers to life's more important questions. He argues about the usage and limitations of science in relation to God and religion:

Science focuses its attention on only what observations can solve. However, God, by definition, is a Being who is outside the physical universe. Therefore, any direct observation of Him is impossible. However, an atheist may argue that indirect observation may support or negate God's existence. This is not true. Any form of indirect observation could never negate God's existence, because it is like saying an observed phenomenon can negate an observed phenomenon (Tzortis, 2016, P. 191).

Hamza concludes that science is necessary for the progress of humanity but it cannot replace the religion because of its limitations. He argues:

Some atheists perceive that science is the only yardstick for truth and that science has the answers for all our questions. This motivates the atheists to conclude that God doesn't exist because science can only

address what can observe. Since God cannot be observed and science is the only yardstick for truth, then to claim God exists is false. This assumption also motivates the atheist to believe that God is no longer required as a reason for things we do not understand. This is false assumption because science has many limitations, and there are many things that it cannot answer. In addition, there are other sources of knowledge that science cannot justify, yet there are indispensable and fundamental sources of knowledge. This implies that science is not the only way to establish truths about the world and reality...questions such as, What is soul? What is meaning? Are questions outside the scientific process. Science is limited to observation, is morally neutral, cannot delve into the personal, cannot answer why things happen, cannot address some metaphysical questions, cannot prove necessary truths. (Tzortis, 2016, P.192)

AbulFeda Bin Masood has written the book, 'Blasting the foundations of atheism'. He responds the objections of Richard Dawkins against the existence of God. He argues that Qur'an says "Say bring your evidence if you were telling the truth" (Qur'an, 2:111). He discusses that the concept about existence of God always believed true through not a single source of human perception but all the sources of human perception. Similarly, not only a single particle of universe tells about the God's existence but the whole universe. He argues that it is impossible for a sensible man to look at universe without any creator. Such a balanced, composed, restricted and controlled system of universe necessitates a perfect composer (Masood, p.18, 2016). He adds that religious people do not believe on a blind faith but this is an argument that is self evident and axiomatic. It is just like an argument in terms of reason and language that "since I can think then I must have a mind" (Masood, P.18, 2016). He argues that in terms of mathematics:

Since system A is a set that is composed of elements {a,b,c,d,e,f} and since system A is decomposable by nature and its elements- in principle- can be made to compose system A once again, or any other system, therefore system A was composed. And since to be composed, necessitates that there be a willful composer that causes composition of elements to be initiated, and a system to be made up, then there must be a composer for A (Masood, P.19, 2016). He adds that:

There would be no order of our universe without a willful keeper and composer. Similarly no natural law can keep components and systems bound to a specific path without a composer. If the universe is running without a composer then it would be just like saying $(1+1+1=0)$ rather than $(1+1+1=3)$. This meaning was never proposed or theorized, it comes in natural manner from examination of things around us; the thing we can examine are made of elements which are put together, because of this there must be an commencing putter (Masood, P. 19-20, 2016).

Masood illustrates that infinity is not indicator of eternity of our universe itself, but the human being innate incapacity to discover the ending value. Mathematical infinity has its end and

beyond that point of infinity comes God (Masood, P.28, 2016). He adds that universe must have a creator or originator that is dissimilar to it in His features and properties (Masood, P.28, 2016).

According to Masood, science is unable to discover how the universe came into existence. He explains that science is a method of explanation and examination of already created or produced things by analogy. Science can tell us about what we see, hear, feel, experience and the elements of universe surrounding us. At this point to ask science to tell us that how universe came into existence is a rational mistake. The way a car is manufactured cannot be explained by any of method that works in car itself. To considering upon the analogy that how internal combustion engine works and how spark plug works cannot tell us about the manufacturing of car. Science is naturally limited by its input to already created things. He adds that the death of any planet or birth of any star and the fact that our universe is expanding can never tell us how precisely the universe came into existence. The reason is that rationally the prior something is must be different from what we see and feel here. Something which is not related to this universe is not bound by our scientific rules (Masood, P.47, 2016). He concludes that the process consisted of no universe to universe cannot be analogized³ to anything what we comprehend and see in this universe.

Masood describes that Darwin's theory only explains a procedure of change rather origination of our universe. Atheist scientists used the theory and considered the observations of the procedure how natural life changes because of adaptation and other scientific claims and reasons that how life has originated in this world. The mere evidence for this evolution and natural selection is that apes look like men and they both species have evolved from a common ancestor (Masood, P.50, 2016).

According to Masood, Big Bang theory is not more than a hypothesis in support in some circles of astronomy who try to elaborate an event that cannot be rationally explained with authentic evidence through any analogy what we observe. The proponents of Big Bang cannot explain how a big bang can happen by pure chance. He argues that:

To put the all celestial bodies and earth in such a perfect balanced position, in a style that is perfect tuned for the existence of life in our universe. How could such a perfect system originate and then get all chemical and physical variables maintained and preserved at those exact perfect values, not slight lower or higher, all by means of unplanned, unguided explosion. An explosion is not more than a phenomenon of destructive blast that caused from specific changes that occur in an unstable system inside this universe (Masood, P.51, 2016).

Atheists claim that miracles of Prophets are scientifically impossible. While answering this objection, Masood argues that the system of universe is entirely controlled by God, so regardless how unusual an event is made by God to be witnessed by few human minds; it is not outside to the system of our universe which is running by God. God must have made the universe

³Analogy: The author defines analogy as the process includes in mathematical expression and formulation and equations in mathematical physics which are attached with the expression of philosophical assumptions and theories.

in such order that it is bound to obey His will. In fact, miracles do not break causality. They occur external to the circle of statistically and physically possible, but not external to the circle of rationally feasibility. They occur via causes which are not in human ability to follow or understand. There is no way to know how Prophet Jesus brought back to life to a dead, how Mary gave birth to Jesus without Father. However we comprehend that there are effects and causes, similar to creation of earth, stars and visible universe are originated like these miracles occur in precisely the way we are described they occurred; this is not illogical and irrational; there is nothing which is not rationally possible. IbnTamiyya described that Qur'an and Hadith may tell us about events or things which are outside human's ability to elaborate but these never tell us about things that are rationally impossible (Masood, 2016, P.71-72). Miracles do not violate the natural laws, it is just the violation of what we could presently, or ever elaborate according to our current theoretical model of understanding. It is the violation of the way we according to our limited knowledge expect things to happen. Natural laws are just our limited understanding of the universe. By our limited definition of natural laws miracles breaks its laws; however the way the universes works in reality, the way it maintains its equilibrium perfectly with all those different events occurring within it, those we understand and know of some of their causes, those we understand nothing about, and even those we will never have the capability to know and understand; we cannot declare miracles to be exceptional to that law or to break it. This is just like arguing about a phenomenon on that we have no authority of knowledge to speak about. Masood says when atheists insist on explaining everything by means of our made natural laws, this shows their irrationality and narrow-mindedness. The scientific method even itself cannot be validated as a method of obtaining knowledge (Masood, 2016, P.169-173).

Masood describes that Jews, Muslim and Christians have not known about angels via the scientific method, and cannot authenticate their existence via tools of science; does not make it superstition. Human know the last causes and there are many earlier causes that humanity knows through scriptures because of our little understanding of universe. He quotes Qur'an: "But they are denying what they cannot comprehend— its prophecy has yet to be fulfilled for them. In the same way, those before them refused to believe, see what the end of those evildoers was" (Qur'an, 10:39). The validity of miracles is the authenticity of divine books. People have verified the Messengers of God as true. Atheists understand the miracles as unscientific; it is just a psychological issue that leaves atheists willing to refuse their own creator. Masood adds that he never saw angels, but he can approve that sacred texts in which those Angels are described are evidently the words of creator and are authentic (Masood, 2016, P. 180-185).

Masood Argues that Prophet of modern day atheism is Charles Darwin. About his theoretical concepts there are many objections and falsifications. However, as a Muslim my Prophet is Muhammad (SAAS) that has not any single objection about his true message which has not been answered completely, rationally and consistently (Masood, 2016, P.190-210).

While concluding his evidences in support of God' existence Masood argues that God's existence was never a theoretical assumption; instead this is a natural axiomatic reason, natural intuition and language, and the try to refute it is as incorrect linguistically as considering that Disorder = order (non-design=design), and as incorrect mathematically as the expression: $1=0$, or in Darwinian understanding if given ample time: $0+0+0+0+0+0=1$). In conclusion natural science has not any impact either negative or positive, on the question of either God exists or not (Masood, 2016, P.439). Muslim scholars refute atheistic argumentation by using cotemporary

results of science. They argue that science is in the support of God's existence. Moreover, science strengthens religion. They argue that atheist misuse science in their own favor.

Conclusion

Atheist argue that there are no scientific arguments in support of God and deny the evidences that support God. They promote the idea that science should replace the religion. They claim that Charles Darwin's theory is enough to explain about the origin of universe and there is no need to take guidance from religion in this regard. Moreover, they argue that miracles mentioned in religious scriptures are unscientific.

Muslim scholars argue that there are many scientific evidences that clearly indicate the existence of God. The complexity of our planet represents the existence of a deliberate designer who has created it and sustains it. Human organs like brain, eye and DNA code are so complex that many scientists are convinced that these cannot be created by chance. Intelligent design theory is widely accepted in scientific circles which support the existence of supernatural creator.

Science has discovered that most organisms are made up 50 to 90 % water. Qur'an says that God made every living thing from water. This verse revealed 1400 years ago, when the world was facing dark ages periods. This scientific fact shows the authenticity of Qur'an and indicates God.

Many scientists are convinced that our universe began with one enormous explosion of light and energy that is called Big Bang theory. This shows that our universe had a start and there must be an external force that caused it. This statement is backed by Qur'anic verse which describes that the heavens and the earth used to be joined together and God ripped them apart.

Our universe operates by uniform laws of nature that must be designed by someone because human have not designed them. Harun Yahya argues with scientific evidences that all the important assumptions of atheists have been collapsed by modern discoveries in different fields of science. Muslim scholars argue that God has revealed himself through Prophets, divine scriptures and his signs in nature and in human itself. It is biological fact that non living chemicals cannot produce living beings. To originate life there is need of supernatural. Mathematically, $0+0+0=0$, it shows that if there had not supernatural, our universe should not have existed.

Atheists deny the validity of miracles and claim that miracles are scientifically impossible. They argue that in this age of science, human should not accept anything unscientific. By definition, miracles are events produced by an infinite power. A great external power brings the event in natural world. Miracles cannot be tested through science because they cannot be replicated and lack predictive value. However, science cannot exclude the possibility that God does unprecedented things. God is designer of the system. He cannot be held its prisoner. God is the creator and sustainer of natural laws, in this connection; He has ability and freedom to suspend those laws according to His wish. The Arabic term 'Mo'jezeh' means: an act that all other humans are unable of doing similar to that. History shows that some people had falsely claimed that they were Prophets. A miracle becomes evidence and the sign of a true invitation of a Prophet. According to Muslim scholars their occurrence is not irrational. They cannot be contrary to the basic principles of a religion. In result, converting water to wine cannot be considered a miracle. Miracles never produce any discord, disorder or any element that is useless, wicked and ridiculous. For example, a Prophet never caused any harm in displaying a miracle or destroyed a forest miraculously. It is impossible that a huge majority of people of

different religions to give wrong witness. History shows that people have witnessed and verified those miracles and Prophets. The validity of miracles was not the issue of debate in the Prophets time. This issue is the creation of recent atheists. The main power behind these miracles is God not any Prophet, this make sense that nature is what He does. The sun, earth, planets all are miracles of God, no human has created them. Natural laws are not absolute but conditional. That means the relation between a natural cause and its effect is not limited and absolute and hence there are scientifically more possible methods to achieve the effect. Scientific development of the last century in medicine has cured some diseases that were considered mysterious for long time without appeal to divine powers. Thus if today's medicine is unable to cure a born blind, it is not rational to assume rationally impossible to cure a born blind in future. Natural laws for human are descriptive who have just discovered them but for God these are prescriptive. For example, the laws of a country for citizens are descriptive but for parliamentarian prescriptive. Thus God is more capable rationally to change the natural law.

Atheists misuse science in their own favor and portray religion as the enemy of science. However, religion supports science and science supports religion. Modern scientific developments have shown that position of atheism is illogical and irrational.

References

- Adams, P. (2010). The atheist delusion. Retrieved from www.abc.net.au.
- Ataie, S. A. (2014). Does God exists? a Muslim response to atheism with Sidi Ali Ataie. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com>.
- Christensen. B. (2001). In a review of Gerald Shroeder's book, The hidden face of God. Booklist March 15, 2001.
- Davies, P. (1987). The cosmic blueprint. London: Penguin Books.
- Dawkins, R. (2006). The God delusion. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Dennett, C. D. (1995). Darwin's dangerous idea: evolution and the meaning of life. USA: Paper Back Publishers.
- Dennett, C. D. (2007). Breaking the spell: religion as a natural phenomenon. USA: Penguin Group.
- Dennett, D. (2013). Diplomacy with foreign minds. Retrieved from <http://www.fogbanking.com>.
- Glynn, P. (1997). 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. (2005b). The politics of ignorance. Retrieved from <https://www.huffingtonpost.com>.
- Harris, S. (2009). Re-evolution. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com>.
- Harris, S. (2010). Science, not faith, should determine morality. Retrieved from <https://abcnews.go.com>.
- Harris, S. (2011). Letter to a Christian nation. USA: Transworld Digital Publishers.
- Hitchens, C. (2007a). God is not great: how religion poisons everything. Toronto: Emblem.
- Hitchens, C. (2010). Bitter Brit. Retrieved from <https://ordinary-times.com>.
- Hoyle on evolution.(1981). Nature, (294).
- Lipson, H.P. (1980). The physicist looks at evolution. Physics Bulletin, (138).
- Margenau, H. & Vargesse, R.A. (2002). Cosmos, bios, theos. Chicago: Open Court Publishing.
- Masood, A. (2016). Blasting the foundation of atheism. Kindle Edition.
- Press, W. (1986). A place for theology?. Nature, 320 (315).
- Qadhi, S. Y. (2017a). How do you know God exists? Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com>.
- Qur'an, Translated by Abdel Haleem.
- Ross, H. (1995). The creator and the cosmos: how the greatest scientific discoveries of the century reveal God. UK: Navpress.
- Schroeder, G. (2001). The hidden face of God. New York: Touchstone.
- Sharov, A.S. & Novikov, I.D. (2005). Edwin Hubble, the discoverer of the big bang universe. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Stenger, V. J. (2008). God: The failed hypotheses: how science shows that God does not exist. USA: Paperback.
- Tzortis, H. A. (2016). The divine reality. God, Islam & the mirage of atheism. USA: Paperback Publishers.
- Wallace, E. R. (1990). Psychiatry and religion: a dialogue. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Yahya, H. (2002). Darwinism and moral collapse. Retrieved from <http://www.harunyahya.com>.