

Journal of Religious and Social Studies

<http://ejrss.com/index.php/jrss>

ISSN (Print): 2789-0317
ISSN (online): 2789-0325
School of Religious and Social Studies,
Faisalabad (38000), Pakistan.

Existence of God and Morality: Scholastic Approaches of Christian and Muslim Scholarship

Salman Arif, and Usman Ahmad

To cite this article:

Salman Arif and Usman Ahmad. "Existence of God and Morality: Scholastic Approaches by Christian and Muslim Scholarship." *Journal of Religious and Social Studies* 2, no. 2 (2022): 47-66.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.53583/jrssv02i02.04.2022>



Published online: 30 December 2022



Submit your article to JRSS



View this issue



OPEN ACCESS

Full Terms & Conditions of access and licensing can be found at:
<http://ejrss.com/index.php/jrss/policies>



EXISTENCE OF GOD AND MORALITY: SCHOLASTIC APPROACHES OF CHRISTIAN AND MUSLIM SCHOLARSHIP


Salman Arif¹ and Usman Ahmed²

Abstract: Religion is the source of objective moral values and obligations that can also be declared as the fundamental beliefs of true religion. This article develops and unites the scholarly perspectives of Muslims and Christians on moral values to establish harmony, unity, and peace between Muslims and Christians globally and to provide a forum where both scholars can respond to common challenges. It argues that accurate moral values necessitate belief in God's existence, as if God does not exist, every evil and criminal activity would be permitted, and objective moral values would crumble. The article encompasses Professor John Hare's views on moral values while conducting interviews in the United States at Yale University, and a summary of the common responses of both religions on moral values will be discussed.

Keywords: *Moral values, Atheism, Naturalism, Nihilism, Relativism, Utilitarianism, Muslim- Christian Responses.*

INTRODUCTION:

Moral values and duties play a significant role in human affairs. They contribute to developing admirable traits such as love, kindness, respect, compassion, and humility. They may teach someone to discriminate between right and wrong or excellent and terrible. Atheism did not attain historical prominence and was not a point of contention. While previous atheism was philosophical in form, modern atheism is based on empirical evidence, and there is a big difference between old and new atheism. In the contemporary world, atheism is on the rise in several regions of the globe.

¹ Ph.D. Scholar, Institute of Islamic studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan. 

² Institute of Islamic studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.

Moral principles are crucial to social stability and play a significant influence in both individual and societal life. Therefore, the old atheist philosopher Voltaire claims, "If God did not exist, it would be necessary to invent him." He believed that the fear of God is essential for making the world morally and ethically sound. But new atheists claim that atheism and theism are mutually incompatible ideologies, and they reject the existence of God and all commandments given by God, particularly objective moral values and duties. In addition, atheists present religion as unreasonable and nonsensical and emphasize that scientific morality should replace religious morality. Sam Harris, an atheist, thinks that "Most indicators of social health show that nations with weak religious traditions are better than those with strong religious traditions."

Furthermore, he believes that only science can explain the rules and realities of the cosmos and determine morality. He dismisses the role of religion in the improvement of societal moral standards. He argued that science can define objective morality. Kindness and joy are more conducive to violence and cruelty toward most people. He has high expectations that science will seek moral values and principles. "In the future, science will be able to establish ethical objectives based on this." Harris contends that most social health indices demonstrate that societies with weak religious nations outperform those with solid religious nations.

According to Dawkins, an atheist may live a satisfying, moral, mentally, emotionally engaging, and pleasurable life. Religious people think life is fleeting and must answer to God for all their activities. They avoid misbehaviour and murder because they are afraid of being held responsible. They also believe in rewards and justice in the hereafter. Furthermore, Dawkin claims, "*If people are only good because they are afraid of punishment and hoping for reward, then we are a miserable lot indeed.*"¹

Christian scholar William Lane Craig says of moral values that if God exists and theism is true, then we have a sound foundation for objective moral values. In addition, he says that without God, we can't be decent. According to the theistic viewpoint, God is the source of objective moral values and duties. He thinks that "*there are no absolute*

¹ Muhammad Waqas and Yasir Farooq, "Biological Interpretation of Moral Argumentation for the Existence of God: A Critical Analysis of Richard Dawkin's Arguments," *Bannu University Research Journal in Islamic Studies* 7, no. 2 (2020): 83-96, <http://burjis.com/index.php/burjis/article/view/29>.

moral values that exist if atheism is right." Craig expresses his views on naturalistic moral theory, "If naturalism is accurate and effective, it is difficult to criticize tyranny, war, hatred, or crime as bad." He further takes a rational stance on naturalism, why should one give up one's self-interest for the sake of someone else? Self-sacrifice becomes utterly meaningless from a naturalistic viewpoint. According to the naturalistic worldview, there is no justification for such self-defeating conduct.

Generally, Muslim scholars believe that moral values and obligations cannot exist apart from God. Additionally, objective moral values indicate God's existence. Therefore, only God best explains the existence of objective moral truths and duties. People who deny the existence of God often experience hopelessness, depression, and unhappiness. The primary reason is that they disregard human pain, Fitrah, and God's existence. Darwinism, which argues that humans are not God's servants, is one of the leading causes of moral decline. A society's spiritual collapse is precipitated by a decline in or lack of belief in the presence of God. Individuals who deny God, the afterlife, and the concepts of heaven and hell demonstrate excessive anger, reliability concerns, selfishness, and a propensity for hazardous criminal behaviour. On the other hand, love and fear of God guarantee that individuals behave in ways that satisfy God by adhering to recognized morals. Such moralities enable communities to flourish and thrive.

Muslim scholar Hamza Tzortzis argues that if atheists reject the idea of objective morality, then they lack the right to condemn religion or even the oppressive regimes of ISIS, the KKK, and North Korea. Atheists form moral conclusions that support their viewpoint. Even the most intelligent people understand that crimes like stealing, murder, and abuse are immoral.¹

Why would atheists disagree and feel the need to introduce new moral values and duties if moral values and obligations already exist and are well-represented by religion? This research article aims to determine what kind of effects applying scientific and atheistic moral principles will have on the whole world. Second, how compatible are these atheistic theories of morality with logic, reason, and values given by religion?

¹ Tzortzis, Hamza A. "Know God, Know Good: God & Objective Morality." Hamza Andreas Tzortzis. Hamza Andreas Tzortzis, June 6, 2017. <https://doi.org/no>.

ATHEISTS' OBJECTIONS TO RELIGIOUS MORALITY

Some new atheists suggest that scientific, moral values should replace religious morality. They attack all religions and debate science, history, philosophy, and morality. Atheists aim to achieve this by eliminating religion from all essential aspects of life.

Sam Harris argues that science is the only discipline capable of explaining the rules and truths of the cosmos and establishing morality. He dismisses the role of religion in the improvement of societal moral values. Further, he claims that science can define objective morality. He states,

*"In the future, science will be able to establish ethical objectives based on this". "Science can make unbiased and worthwhile assertions about what is true and correct."*¹

He goes further to say that this initiative to establish moral criteria for research will be equivalent to other scientific concepts. Theoretically, science can help us understand the need for the highest quality of life. There may be accurate and erroneous solutions to moral dilemmas, just as there may be correct and incorrect responses to issues in other fields, such as physics and chemistry. Similar to other scientific solutions, these solutions might be enhanced. Religion, according to Harris, is not urgent for humanity, and he comes with the figure that a weakly religious European country's growth rate is better than strongly religious countries.

*"Most indicators of social health show that nations with weak religious traditions are better than those with strong religious traditions. The least religious nations in the world, such as Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, and Sweden, which have the highest percentages of atheists, consistently outperform religious nations in terms of things like life expectancy, infant mortality rates, child welfare, literacy rates, economic equality, GDP, health care, investment in education, internet access, university enrollment rates, lack of corruption, environmental protection, aid to underdeveloped nations, and political stability."*²

Harris claims that if scientists had a better understanding of how the brain works, they might find connections between a person's modes of action, states of consciousness, and modes of attentiveness. What makes one person happier than another, exactly? Why does love rather than by hatred enhance pleasure? He asserts argumentatively, *"If we*

¹ Sam Harris, *The Moral Landscape: How Science Can Determine Human Values* (Simon and Schuster, 2010).

² Harris.

ever develop such a science, most of our religious texts will be no more useful to mystics than they now are to astronomers."

Sam Harris draws a connection between morality and the understanding of other people and encourages social experts and scientists to create moral standards grounded on scientific paradigms. He addresses morality in terms of both human and animal welfare. He emphasizes the use of science to investigate who we are and how we need to be. He thinks stopping religion from trampling on human values might be possible.

Richard Dawkins values scientific understanding above religious authority. He asserts, "*We do not need God to be good or wicked.*" Dawkins pursues Einstein's quotation to bolster his argument:

*"If people are decent merely because they dread punishment, and hope for reward, then we are a wretched lot indeed."*¹

Dawkins supports humans in forming their moral values and principles without the intervention of God. Dawkins states, "*Some philosophers, especially Kant, have sought to derive absolute morality from non-religious sources. Kant proposes a moral model based on duty, 'morality for duty, not for God.'*"² And it is impossible to deduce universal moral values from the Holy Bible. Throughout this approach, Dawkins critiques the Bible for failing to reach moral judgments consistently. Dawkins offers a few of his moral standards.

- Take pleasure in your sexuality as long as it does not harm others, and let others do the same with their own, whatever they desire. It should not be your concern.
- Do not mistreat or discriminate against others based on their gender, colour, and (as much as possible) species.
- Teach your children to think critically, assess the evidence, and disagree with you instead of trying to indoctrinate them. Islam and Christianity teach children that blind trust is good and that performing trust is a virtue.
- Consider the future over a period that is longer than your own.

Dawkins contends that in the absence of spiritual guidance, humans should heed the guidance of science. He asserts, "*If the death of God would create a void, various individuals*

¹ Richard Dawkins and Lalla Ward, *The God Delusion* (Houghton Mifflin Company Boston, 2006).

² Waqas and Farooq, "Biological Interpretation of Moral Argumentation for the Existence of God: A Critical Analysis of Richard Dawkin's Arguments."

would fill it in different ways." My approach involves a suitable dosage of science and an honest and rigorous quest for the world's truth.¹

Atheists endeavour to fill any gaps in knowledge with science, regardless of its limits and boundaries. According to Dawkins, an atheist can live a happy, peaceful, moral, and intellectually satisfying life.² Religious people think life is fleeting, and they must answer to God for every one of their activities. They avoid misbehaviour and murder because they are afraid of being held responsible. They also believe in rewards and justice in the hereafter. Dawkins is hostile to religious education for children. In actuality, religion enhances the majority of moral values taught to children. Dennett argues that religion merely serves as a ceremonial force in contemporary culture instead of driving people towards science and technology, moral values, and world politics. He notes that religion leads to injustice, fanaticism, cruelty, and illiteracy.³ He traces the history of religion and argues that as human civilization progressed, local or ethnic religious rituals developed into institutionalized religions. Religions regulated themselves and achieved acceptance in various cultures worldwide by adopting previous academics' rational reasons.

Christopher Hitchens denies the notion that humanity needs both religious and moral leadership. He asserts that we think with clarity that an ethical life may be lived without religion. And adds sarcastically, "*Religion is the lament of the imprisoned creature, the heart of a heartless world, much as the spirit of a spiritless circumstance. It serves as the populace's opium.*" He considers terminating religion the only way to achieve people's ultimate happiness.⁴

CHRISTIAN RESPONSE ON MORAL VALUES

Christians have contended that Without God, human morals will collapse. They believed that our moral behaviour would have a solid, long-lasting basis if a good God

¹ Richard Dawkins and John Lexxos, "The God Delusion Debate," *Amazon*, 2007.

² Dawkins and Ward, *The God Delusion*.

³ Daniel Clement Dennett, *Breaking the Spell: Religion as a Natural Phenomenon*, vol. 14 (Penguin, 2006).

⁴ Christopher Hitchens, *God Is Not Great: How Religion Poisons Everything* (New York: Twelve Books, 2007).

existed. If there is no creator, then everything is permitted. This is also one of God's main duties: to set irrefutable moral standards, to offer a complete description of everything good and bad for all situations, to punish evil, and to reward virtue. Moral worth is central to religion and one of God's foremost fundamental commandments. A community founded on moral codes, responsibility, and accountability has the potential to survive a long period. Jesus Christ, the originator of Christianity, lived his entire life and exhibited his magnificent dying with strong moral qualities. Morality and God, or religion, or morality, cannot be distinguished in Christian thought. God determines what's good and wrong. Without God, moral values and obligations are meaningless. Furthermore, basic moral principles and obligations lead to the presence of God. We must look at biblical texts to see what they say about moral duties and obligations.;

*"But the cowardly, the unbelieving, the vile, the murderers, the sexually Immoral, those who practice magic arts, the idolaters, and all liars – their place will be in the fiery lake of burning sulfur."*¹

The Bible discusses truth and falsehood: *"We are from God, and whoever knows God listens to us, but whoever is not from God does not listen to us. This is how we recognize the Spirit of truth and the spirit of falsehood."*² According to Christian scholars and theologians, the underlying correlation can be understood to comprehend conceptual arguments and evidence for objective moral values, which necessitate God's existence;

1. If God exists, we have a sound moral basis.
2. We do not have a sound moral foundation if God does not exist.

William Craig asserts:

*"If God does exist, then moral ideals, moral responsibility, and moral responsibilities are assured as being objective. However, if God does not exist, morality is only a human invention, meaning it is completely subjective and non-binding."*³

William Craig refutes the atheistic moral philosophy and compares theism with atheism. *"There are no absolute moral values if atheism is correct. What basis do moral values*

¹ David M. Scholer, "The Holy Bible: New International Version: The New Testament," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93, no. 4 (1974), <https://doi.org/10.2307/3263835>.

² Scholer.

³ William L. Craig, "Can We Be Good Without God," *Reasonable Faith*, 2020.

have if God does not exist? What exactly is the basis of human worth? There is no reason to assume that humans are unique or that their morality is objectively true if God does not exist.

Moreover, why should we assume we have any moral obligation to achieve anything? Who or what imposes moral responsibilities on us?" William Craig argues that in the absence of God, we cannot establish a doctrine of morality without referring to God, and we cannot accept the reality of objective moral standards without God's rule. According to William Craig, human beings arrive at radically different moral theories, such as nihilism¹ and naturalism², which fundamentally contradict each other based on rational inquiry;

"If God exists, there is a strong basis for morality. As Nietzsche analysed it, nihilism is inevitable if God does not exist."³

The naturalistic worldview holds that humans are objectively meaningless, as shown by two of its outcomes: materialism and determinism. If there is no separate mind from the brain, then the information from the five senses of humans governs all of our thoughts and behaviours. William Craig has the following position on naturalism:

"If the concept of naturalism is correct and works, then it would be impossible to condemn oppression, war, hate or crime as evil. Nobody can praise brotherhood, equality, or love as good and follow the virtue."⁴

Moreover, if atheism is absolute, there is no moral responsibility for one's acts. Regardless of objective moral obligations and standards, naturalism renders them worthless since there is no moral obligation. It makes no difference if someone is Stalin or a saint if they die in a churchyard. Life is too brief to put it in danger by going against your best interests, and sacrificing for someone else is just plain stupid. Because naturalism doesn't have a sense of moral responsibility, a generous and selfless moral code is just a meaningless ideal. Moral philosopher Richard Mervyn Hare strives to demonstrate a link between morality and reason that implies belief in God, and he argues philosophically for his position;

¹ Nihilism is a philosophy that denies values and the societal valuing of people, possessions, and life, claiming that everything is meaningless.

² Naturalism is the concept that nothing exists outside of nature. Naturalism, as opposed to supernatural or spiritual explanations, emphasizes on explanations derived from natural laws.

³ Craig, "Can We Be Good Without God."

⁴ Craig.

“He says that if we can assure ourselves that happiness and morality are consistent, then morality becomes rationally stable so that we have to do what is morally good and not to do what is morally wrong to be happy. It concludes that we need to believe in God to give us this assurance.”¹

The moral philosopher Professor John Hare, the author of numerous well-known works on morality, proposes, *“While I interviewed with Professor John Hare at Yale University USA, he thinks that moral values and their evidence are the best way to prove the existence of God.”*

MUSLIM RESPONSE TO MORAL VALUES

According to the standpoint of Islam, moral values cannot exist apart from God. In addition, morality is evidence that God does indeed exist. The following structure may be used to comprehend theoretical justifications for God's existence based on moral principles:

3. There are objective moral facts
4. God provides the best explanation of the existence of objective moral facts.
5. Therefore, God exists.

Civilization descends into spiritual collapse when faith in God is weakened or lost. Extreme hostility, reliability problems, selfishness, and a penchant for dangerous criminal activity are characteristics of those who deny God, the afterlife, and the notions of heaven and hell. On the other hand, a person's love and fear of God ensure that they live up to the standards of morality and behave toward one another in a way that pleases God. Such moral principles enable communities to grow and flourish. Yahya cites the Qur'an, which calls for righteousness, fairness, and honesty:

“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.”² (Al-Quran 7:85).

¹ Philip L. Quinn, “Essays on Religion and Education. R. M. Hare ,” *Ethics* 104, no. 4 (1994), <https://doi.org/10.1086/293673>.

² Al-Quran.

Fakhr al-Din al-Razi was a philosopher and Muslim theologian. He characterizes Islam as worshipping the creator and showing mercy towards his creation, as he states:

*"If we eliminate religion from life, morality becomes relative, and humans become nothing more than livestock, bits of flesh and blood, soulless, easily murdered atheists or materialistic educationalists. When discussing the societal consequences of atheism, no one has more blood on their hands than atheists. Chairman Mao, Joseph Stalin, Pol Pot, and Mussolini were responsible for the deaths of almost one hundred million people. Hitler was catholic, and he murdered millions of Jews. These four were seventeen times more lethal than Hitler; they murdered more people than Hitler. The murdering of the great four was motivated by the absence of God, the Day of Judgment, the principle of natural selection, and the survival of the fittest."*¹

Sigmund Freud, Bertrand Russell, and Friedrich Nietzsche, among other mediaeval atheists, acknowledged that religion has a significant role in moralizing people. Ali Ataie quotes Voltaire's views: "Religion aims to improve and empathetically transform individuals. If God did not exist, we would have to invent Him. Comparable argument by Dostoevsky: "If God does not exist, everything is permitted." The Islamic Shariah law gives a comprehensive code of human life and military rules, and it is explicitly mentioned in the Prophet that women, children, religious minorities, and all other minorities who do not participate in warfare would not be attacked. During the First World War, the secular world blasted a 2,000-pound missile on innocent men, women, and children. Without the Creator, there will be no objective or fundamental moral values. A dominating group would decide right and wrong. Ali mentions the words of Richard Dawkins.: "There is neither good nor evil; we are machines to propagate DNA."

Atheists are incapable of immorality because they reject the existence of good and evil. Atheists think that science can determine morality. Using a scientific method, atheists cannot demonstrate why murder is wrong. Love and sentiments cannot be shown scientifically. The scientific community does not comprehend consciousness; it asserts that consciousness results from chemical interactions inside the brain. Imagination and memory are beyond the reach of science.

¹ *Does God Exist?: A Muslim 'S Response to Atheism | Dr. Ali Ataie, 2014,*
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NSnZIRYA5T0&ab_channel=MuslimCommunityCenter-MCCEastBay.

Ataie thinks that science cannot teach morality, even though not all atheists are wrong, and there are many good atheists. No evidence in science obligates moral behaviour. Kindness, charity, fairness, selflessness, and compassion cannot be produced by science. Atheism considers people to be mere animals, and because animals do not have morality, why should we? Most atheists acknowledge that humans have moral responsibilities; for example, if you observe a child dying on the beach, you have a moral obligation to rescue him. But why should we risk our lives, and have we evolved to do so? Is there a gene that generates altruism, and where does it originate?

According to atheists, the leap from ape to human requires a trillion intermediate stages and mutations. Darwin claimed that we would discover these billions of forms while excavating the earth, ranging from apes to humans. The fossil record indicates that we have only discovered six or seven different kinds instead of billions. Darwin expressed uncertainty by stating that:

*"If I believe that my brain came from a monkey, why should I even trust my brain in the first place, why should I trust my intellect."*¹

Ataie believes that we should share our train seats with a pregnant lady. Do we aim to maintain our species, gain money, or get some other benefit? We solely practice altruism for the sake of God. Would blood donation contribute to the evolution of our species or give any advantages to the recipient? Because religion imparts such morality to us. He fundamentally rejects the notion of scientific morality. He thinks that science is incapable of determining moral norms. Citations from renowned academics and Islamic religious concerns support his arguments. He rejects the atheistic belief that the only purpose of life is to experience pleasure. To achieve this goal, if an atheist does an evil deed, he will indeed be incapable of being prevented. Additionally, there won't be any definitive distinction between right and wrong.²

Muslim scholar Hamza Tzortis expresses his views on moral values in his research article "Know God, Know Good: God & Objective Morality",

"If you hear on the news that a guy beheads a five-year-old kid, you should not be surprised. Almost every ethical person who reads the news will agree that this individual committed wrongdoing. People will assert that it is immoral based on objective morality. A basic meaning

¹ *Does God Exist?: A Muslim'S Response to Atheism | Dr. Ali Ataie.*

² *Ibid.*

of the word objective is that it refers to presenting or examining facts without bias from one's ideas or emotions.”¹

This meaning of "objective" states that moral standards are independent of an individual's thoughts or feelings. It is beyond the person's limited capacity for thinking in this case. Therefore, scientific truths like the earth's orbit around the sun and mathematical truths like the equal sign are true regardless of one's perspective. If these moral standards are universal, they must be firmly established. These values need a solid foundation. If human limitations do not determine these immutable moral principles, the following issues must be answered: What is their nature, and where did they come from?

A reasonable basis for explaining the nature and genesis of these problems is necessary. Ontological morality is the field of philosophy that deals with these issues. Regardless of whether the vast majority of individuals were to believe it, murdering a kid is ethically reprehensible and will always be regarded as valid. People understand that certain moral principles, responsibilities, and duties are inherently objective. These are some actions that we should do or refrain from taking. These moral responsibilities and obligations seem to originate from outside. Hamza cites Professor Ian Markham asserts that:

“Human moral discourse targets something beyond and above ourselves implanted in the world ought is the sense of a moral fact transcending out life and world, a fundamental characteristic of moral language entails something external and universal.”²

The objective nature of these moral values shows the presence of God. Similarly, there would be no objective moral realities without God. Throughout the 21st century, atheists have praised these moral goals without thinking they originated from God. If God is excluded, all these moral values are only societal traditions. Thus, murdering innocent people for enjoyment is ethically reprehensible.

On the contrary, objective morality is the protection or assistance of the innocent. This proves that only God provides the sole rational basis for objective morality and that no other creature can provide such a basis because God exists outside our reality. According

¹ Hamza A. Tzortzis, “Know God, Know Good: God & Objective Morality,” 2017, <https://www.hamzatzortzis.com/know-god-know-good-god-objective-morality/>.

² Tzortzis.

to Islam, God is mighty, omnipotent, wise, and benevolent. Perfection in compassion is an essential component of the Creator's nature. His single name, Al-Barr, means He is the source of all goodness. God's will-derived moral necessity does not violate God's essence. As a result, many think God's commands are good because He is good. In the Qur'an, he says:

"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]?"¹

Modern atheists contend that there are several foundations for moral objectives. These alternatives are compared primarily with moral realism, biology, and normative influences. Biology is incapable of explaining objective morality. Charles Darwin offers an example to illustrate his claim that natural selection is the basis of moral standards. Darwin contends that if humans were the result of a different combination of biological circumstances, our moral goals would be radically different. He claims:

"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."²

This illustrates that morality cannot be objective if it depends on physical processes. According to Darwin, *"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."* Many atheists believe that objective moral norms result from natural selection. This is another fallacious atheist position. Also, natural selection would equip humans to develop moral standards that promote reproduction and survival.

Tzortzis cites moral philosopher Philip Kitcher, who wrote "The Moral Argument" in his work: "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". To claim that biomedical research might serve a fundamental moral goal is to isolate morality from its associated meaning. If moral standards are just the outcome of unconscious and illogical physical processes, they are made meaningless and irrelevant.

¹ Al-Quran 7:28

² Tzortzis, "Know God, Know Good: God & Objective Morality."

Humans have moral obligations and responsibilities to their creator; moral goals cannot be derived from a mere collection of chemicals. Atheists regard cultural interactions or consensus as morality's replacement. Absolute morality is impervious to societal influence. According to this perspective, morality is subjective and susceptible to inevitable social change. Furthermore, this causes moral inconsistency; if we consider consensus a foundation for moral objectives, how can we accept the Nazis' actions in Germany? We cannot dispute that their harshness was unethical in this situation.

Certain atheists argue that morality lacks an objective basis. In this case, atheists should refrain from making objective objections to religions, as *"If atheists deny objective moral claim then they have no authority to criticize religion or even at ISIS, KKK, and dictatorship of North Korea. Atheists make moral judgments that favour their perspective. The most intellectual persons do not deny theft, murder and abuse as objective moral truths."*¹

According to Islamic theological discussions, there are certain circumstances, such as protecting one's life or the lives of one's family, when killing is ethically acceptable. Consequently, certain atheists contend that nothing is inherently wicked. Regardless of the circumstances, fundamental moral principles necessitate that moral actions be wicked or great. For instance, a person who believes that murder is morally reprehensible would also consider that killing anybody, even in self-defence, is unethical. According to objective morality, certain moral truths are context-dependent. It is objectively wrong to kill someone without justification or explanation. The context-sensitive component of that moral claim has to be supported. The argument on objective morality contends that morality is subjective rather than objective and is tied to cultural ethics and norms. According to this viewpoint, ethical relativism is problematic since it depends on cultural customs to disregard the actual aim.

Several atheists believe that specific moral values are objective; thus, they must either agree that the creator is the sole logical basis for objective moral standards or acknowledge the existence of God. Atheists must provide a reasonable and persuasive alternative. If atheists cannot do so, they must reject their innate propensity to distinguish between evil and good and entirely reject objective moral values.

¹ Tzortzis.

Moral standards are the reason for the Muslim conception of God. It is considered that the creator is both intelligent and reasonable. Furthermore, His commands do not contradict God's perfection. Therefore, God's instructions are impeccable. Knowing something about God gives us objective moral foundations. Tzortis believes that knowing God is equivalent to understanding what is good. Shabir Ally contends that God alone is responsible for the inculcation of human morality, which he defines as the choice of the person to choose between good and evil.¹ Tzortis feels that deriving objective morality from science is illogical. He claims that:

“Moral authority has to be external to the cosmos to be authoritative, independent of the inclinations of individuals. This requirement is met when God decides what is good and wrong. His argument that God has the power to determine objective morality is logically sound.”²

COMMON ATHEIST’S OBJECTIONS TO RELIGIOUS MORALITIES

- Atheists deny religious, moral values and refer towards science in developing moral values. They claim that science has made life better in the physical world by introducing technologies and discoveries.
- Science can give a better and good meaning to life and human values.
- According to atheists, religiously weaker nations outperform religiously strong nations in terms of life expectancy, crime, infant mortality, child welfare, literacy, economic equality, GDP, health care, investments in education, internet access, the system of education rates, absence of corruption, protection of the environment, charity to poor nations, and political stability, among other things.
- Science can provide a greater understanding of how the brain functions, and scientists may identify the links between human patterns of behaviour, states of consciousness, and methods of human attention.
- Why do humans choose beauty over ugliness and order over disorder? Why is love more suited for pleasure than hatred? Why does it feel good to laugh and smile, and why do these mutual ties typically bring people closer together? Is it true that

¹ *Does God Really EXISTS? An Answer To ATHEISM In A Godless Society I Shabir Ally*, 2016, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rLafqqDvzfs&ab_channel=Nazam44.

² Tzortis, “Know God, Know Good: God & Objective Morality.”

there is life after death? All of these issues, according to atheists, are important to the study of the mind. With the advancement of science in future, we will be able to discover all these questions empirically proven, and then there will not be the need for religion.

- “We do not need God to be good or pious”.
- “If people are good only because they fear punishment, and hope for reward, then we are a sorry lot indeed”.
- Kant provides a morality model based on obligation for the sake of duty rather than duty for the sake of God.
- Dawkins believes an atheist can live a happy, balanced, intellectually fulfilling, and moral existence. Religious individuals believe life is fleeting and all actions must be justified before God. This dread of responsibility prevents them from wrongdoing and murder. Furthermore, they have hope for reward and justice in the hereafter.
- The belief that heaven motivates individuals to do good deeds and protects them from evil is false.

CHRISTIAN-MUSLIM COMMON ANSWERS TO ATHEISTS

- Atheists deny religious, moral values and refer towards science in developing moral values. They claim that science has made life better in the physical world by introducing technologies and discoveries. They created moral theories like naturism, humanism, and nihilism that fundamentally conflict with one another. Religious, moral principles provide objective standards generally acknowledged and on which the world's civilizations have long agreed.
- Science cannot give a better and good meaning to life and human values.
- In terms of life expectancy, 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, charitable giving to underdeveloped countries, and political stability, for example, atheists contend that religiously weaker countries perform better than religiously stronger ones instead of this progress, they suffer from high rates of depression,

anxiety, and stress and have been given the right to self-suicide also their governments legalized euthanasia before natural death.

- Science may better understand how the brain works, and scientists can discover links between human modes of behaviour, states of consciousness, and patterns of human awareness. However, they cannot prevent horrible things from occurring since they lack access to human emotions like love, hatred, and sacrifice.
- Why do people favour order and law over anarchy and beauty over ugliness? Why is love more conducive to pleasure than hatred? Why do smiles and laughs feel good, and why do these shared emotions often bring people closer together? Is there life after death? In the atheists' opinion, all these issues are pertinent to the study of the mind. With the advancement of science in future, we will be able to discover all these questions empirically proven, and then there will not be the need for religion. According to religious scholars, this atheist position is insufficient since it cannot be logically supported or scientifically proven. These essential concerns cannot be ignored or deferred till the future. This kind of inquiry is rationally outside the scope of empirical science.
- We do need God to be good.
- If there is no God, there would not be objective moral values exists.
- In the absence of God, everything would be permitted because if there were no accountability, fear or punishment, then who would care to live a moral life?
- Religion provides hope, reward and support, especially during a crisis.
- Religious people may have happy, balanced, intellectually fulfilling, and moral lives. Religious individuals believe life is fleeting and all actions must be justified before God. This dread of responsibility prevents them from wrongdoing and murder. Furthermore, they have hope for reward and justice in the hereafter.
- It is believed that the concept of paradise motivates individuals to do good deeds and prevents them from doing wrong.
- According to Richard Mervyn Hare, a connection between morality and reason makes faith in God necessary. Suppose we can convince ourselves that morality and happiness are compatible. In that case, morality becomes logically stable, and if we want to be happy, we must act morally righteously and refrain from acting immorally. Therefore, we must believe in God.

CONCLUSION:

Atheists think that science can determine human moral standards and that God is not required to create moral principles. Moreover, they assert that the moral training provided by religion is inadequate. They argue that societal pressure, evolution, and the growth of the social sciences may supplant religious morality. In this way, atheists tend to disregard religion's role in humanity's moral growth. New atheists use harsh language against all religions, especially Christianity and Islam. Islam and Christianity are seen as aggressive and violent religions by new atheists. Muslim and Christian intellectuals underline the absurdity and illogic of the new atheist stance. They claim that objective morality cannot be defined by science. Objective morality needs an ultimate authority to judge what is good and evil, and that authority is God.

Neither societal pressure nor natural selection can establish moral standards. Historically, atheist societies have resulted in more bloodshed than religious regimes. Rather than depending just on science, humans must first enhance their understanding of God and religion to strengthen their moral commitments. Several new atheists base their moral judgments on biological facts or natural moral intuitions. However, they do not sufficiently defend their viewpoint or examine the possibilities of non-naturalistic humanist moralities. Due to their naturalistic presumptions, the moral theories of new atheists are often erroneous. Since philosophy doesn't meet their strict standards for scientific validity, the prominent people who support the "new atheism" don't seem willing to admit that moral philosophy may help spread secular moral principles.

This argument is flawed, not merely because it encouraged atheists to support questionable moral theories but also because moral philosophy's approaches to investigation distinguish it from religion for many of the same reasons that atheists believe science and religion are separate. Religion promotes moral growth by including the concept of God, the possibility of reward, and the punishment for sin in life. A life without a purpose is inadequate for moral growth in people and civilizations alike. Survival of the fittest, according to Darwinism, creates selfishness in humans and destroys moral principles. If one's morality clashes with the morality of the other, God must give fundamental truths. Science cannot produce charity, justice, selflessness, or compassion.

This research article works at bringing Christians and Muslims together in a more harmonious relationship in the future. This significant combined effort of Christians and Muslims will create peace, prosperity, and good academic and social relationships. It is the finest-ever response to the atheist objection that religion and science are incompatible and there is no need to take any. It also shows that multiple faiths can coexist in one region and can or should work on a similar agenda, especially during a crisis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Craig, William L. "Can We Be Good Without God." Reasonable Faith, 2020.
- Dawkins, Richard, and John Lexxos. "The God Delusion Debate." Amazon, 2007.
- Dawkins, Richard, and Lalla Ward. *The God Delusion*. Houghton Mifflin Company Boston, 2006.
- Dennett, Daniel Clement. *Breaking the Spell: Religion as a Natural Phenomenon*. Vol. 14. Penguin, 2006.
- Does God Exist?: A Muslim'S Response to Atheism | Dr. Ali Ataie, 2014. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NSnZIRYA5T0&ab_channel=MuslimCommunityCenter-MCCEastBay.
- Does God Really EXISTS? An Answer To ATHEISM In A Godless Society I Shabir Ally, 2016. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rLafqqDvzfs&ab_channel=Nazam44
- Farooq, Yasir, and Ihsan-ur-rehman Ghauri. "Inequalities in Islamic State and Society (A Critical Review on the Thoughts of Bernard Lewis." *Journal of Islamic & Religious Studies* 2, no. 2 (2017): 33-44. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.36476/JIRS.2:2.12.2017.17>.
- Farooq, Yasir, and Inamullah Wattu. "The Socioeconomic Sphere of Muslim Women-A Critical Study on John L. Esposito's Views." *Journal of Religious Studies* 2, no. 1 (2018): 58-69. <https://jrs.uoch.edu.pk/index.php/journal3/article/view/97>.
- Harris, Sam. *The Moral Landscape: How Science Can Determine Human Values*. Simon and Schuster, 2010.
- Hitchens, Christopher. *God Is Not Great: How Religion Poisons Everything*. New York: Twelve Books, 2007.
- Quinn, Philip L. "Essays on Religion and Education. R. M. Hare ." *Ethics* 104, no. 4 (1994). <https://doi.org/10.1086/293673>.
- Scholer, David M. "The Holy Bible: New International Version: The New Testament." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93, no. 4 (1974). <https://doi.org/10.2307/3263835>.
- Tayyeb, Dr., and Yasir Farooq. "The Places of Worship of the Non-Muslims and Their Religious Independence in an Islamic State A Review in the Light of Seera'h." *Journal of Religious Studies* 2, no. 2 (2019): 31-48. [https://doi.org/10.33195uochjrs-v2i\(4\)1212019](https://doi.org/10.33195uochjrs-v2i(4)1212019).
- Tzortzis, Hamza A. "Know God, Know Good: God & Objective Morality," 2017. <https://www.hamzatzortzis.com/know-god-know-good-god-objective-morality/>.
- Waqas, Muhammad, and Yasir Farooq. "Biological Interpretation of Moral Argumentation for the Existence of God: A Critical Analysis of Richard Dawkin's Arguments." *Bannu University Research Journal in Islamic Studies* 7, no. 2 (2020): 83-96. <http://burjis.com/index.php/burjis/article/view/29>.

Journal of Religious and Social Studies

December-2022, Vol.: 2, Issue: 2, PP: 47-66

<https://doi.org/10.53583/jrsv02i02.04.2022>

- Wattoo, Inam Ullah, and Yasir Farooq. "Fundamental Human Rights and UNO Charter: A Critical Analysis with Islamic Perspectives." *Journal of Religious Studies (UOCHJRS)*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.33195/journal.v4i02.338>.
- Wattu, Yasir, and Yasir Farooq. "A Proportional Study of Contemporary Bio Safety Rules and Islamic Traditions Regarding Innate Privileges of Animals." *Journal of Religious Studies (UOCHJRS)*, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.33195/journal.v3i1.257>.