

# **Islamic Perspective on Atheistic Doctrines**

*By*

*Mohammed Alamawi*

*A Research Paper Submitted To M&M Learning  
Academy under supervision of Teacher Mr.  
Zouhair Tahar In Partial Fulfillment Of 12th  
Grade English Language Arts Course May 2022*

Atheism spreads today at a very rapid rate. To know what to say to an atheist if they indulge you in a conversation is important. As for the definition of atheism, It cannot be described plainly and is divided into segments and variants. This makes the definition very complicated and an explanation open to criticism. 1According to Britannica, atheism is “the critique and denial of metaphysical beliefs in God or spiritual beings. As such, it is usually distinguished from theism, which affirms the reality of the divine and often seeks to demonstrate its existence. Atheism is also distinguished from agnosticism, which leaves open the question whether there is a god or not, professing to find the questions unanswered or unanswerable.” (Nielsen). Many times, atheism is confused for agnosticism. This is a result of people not being generally educated on these things. As a result, we find so many people talking about agnostics as if they are atheists or vice versa. Aside from that, what does the word “God” refer to in the minds of people who follow varying ideologies? To Muslims, Jews, and Christians, God is the most powerful, creator of the universe, and has absolute sovereignty over his creation. Furthermore, God is needed in a theist’s life in order to make sense of life and existence. Additionally, God and his decree needs to be accepted by theists without question. Generally, atheists deny this definition of God. The definition of god presented by those religions which claim to worship more than one god is specific to those religions such as Hinduism, Buddhism...etc. If a religion is based upon the belief in spiritual beings, then religions in their totality are rejected by atheists. The problem with atheism is that, like so many fabricated religions based upon worshiping more than one god, it is complicated and thus cannot be fully understood by the average person. There are two major denominations of

atheists: narrow and wide atheists. “The narrow atheist does not believe in the existence of God. A wide atheist does not believe that any gods exist, including but not limited to the traditional omni-God. The wide positive atheist denies that God exists, and also denies that Zeus, Gefjun, Thor, Sobek, Bakunawa and others exist. The narrow atheist does not believe that God exists, but need not take a stronger view about the existence or non-existence of other supernatural beings. One could be a narrow atheist about God, but still believe in the existence of some other supernatural entities.” (“Atheism”). From this definition, we understand that atheism is a way of life which is loose and open to anybody’s interpretation. It is based on whims and desires with no guiding light to set a moral code. How is an atheist supposed to be firm in their belief if what they believe can be redefined by every other philosopher? According to Google, Epistemology is a philosophical term defined as “the theory of knowledge, especially with regard to its methods, validity, and scope. Epistemology is the investigation of what distinguishes justified belief from opinion.” A large problem which arises in atheist epistemology is that: “atheists have taken the view that whether or not a person is justified in having an attitude of belief towards the proposition, “God exists,” is a function of that person’s evidence.” (“Atheism”). By this definition, one can be the least educated person in the world and still deny the existence of god, since upon his less than rudimentary knowledge base, he has no evidence to prove that god exists. In this manner, atheists are guided by what little knowledge a human can attain. There is no way a person can know all the knowledge that there is to be, and as such no one is justified in making such an erroneous claim. Compare this with Islam. Prophet Mohammed received divine revelation with the instructions for a perfect way of life. It is important to note that though muslims on many

occasions refute atheists in their views, atheists have never used islamic or generally any of the monotheistic religions' own teachings to prove that there is no god. Atheism stands on a principle that those who know of a claim supported by evidence are irrational, referring to theists and their acceptance of god. Upon the same basis, atheists believe that the universe came from nothing and thus through a chain of accidental occurrences and came to be as we know it today. Considering that atheists depend on evidence for their entire belief system, they find themselves hopelessly defending science, the role of reason, and the necessity of basing beliefs on evidence. There are two types of atheists as described by William Rowe and Antony Flew. According to Rowe, the first type is friendly atheism. The friendly atheist can debate a theist and agree with them in that their belief in god is rational or justified. The point at which a friendly atheist will say that the theist is unjustified or irrational in their belief is when the conclusion that God exists comes into the discussion. For example, If one takes premise A and premise B to reach conclusion C, then they cannot remove either of those premises and still reach the same conclusion C. A friendly atheist will agree with a theist that premises A and B are rational and justifiably believed in, but will not do so for conclusion C. The atheist will tell you that conclusion C is incorrect. What causes the atheist to disagree with the theist on conclusion C is that they may not have the full set of information required to understand the matter, and they may be basing their opinions on false premises. The atheist could also be explicitly and implicitly employing inference rules that are not justifiable themselves. Although these inferences may not be truth preserving, the atheist believes them to be so and this can be based upon false background information. According to Flew, the negative atheist starts with a kind of clean slate or mind, like a

baby does their life. This negative atheist should be neutral on the idea of believing in God, meaning that they have not even a logical coherence of the idea of God. This presumption should then be revised and refined in light of evidence. Flew explains that: “The onus of proof lies on the man who affirms, not on the man who denies. . . on the proposition, not on the opposition,” (“Atheism”). The word onus has a meaning denoting duty and responsibility. My understanding of this statement is that this person who has started with a clear mind should not go and seek evidence from which they shall arrive at conclusions, but instead the believer or the atheist shall prove to them the correct understanding. History of Atheism has been found in the Islamic world as well as the Western one. In the muslim world, Atheists were treated with respect and tolerance. This is a result of what Allah says in the Quran: “There is no Compulsion in the Religion”(2:256 ) Allah also says in the Quran: “And had your Lord willed, those on Earth would have believed-all of them entirely. Then, would you compel the people in order that they become believers?” (10:99) The atheist group in the Islamic world was called the Dahriyya. These dahriyya were very similar to the atheists of today in that they believe that knowledge can only be obtained and fact checked by the empirical method. Another one of their claims was that everything existed and that it did not require a creator or maker. It must be noted that classical Muslim scholars have already dealt with much of atheist thought and that the phenomenon is not a new or foreign one. Atheism has also been and is still found in the western world. In its early stages, atheism wasn’t a popular belief. The ones who declared atheism were abnormal and barely influenced anyone. “The first use of the term atheism can be traced back to the Greek scholar Sir John Checke in a translation of Plutarch's *On Superstition*.” (Tzortzis 25) Although

atheism was not a famous belief during the 17th and 18th century, the seeds were being planted. The framers were the likes of Kazimiers Lyczynski, Mathias Knutzen, David Hume, and Voltaire, all aided by the advancements in science. By the 19th century, atheism was beginning to become a position no more looked down upon. In Britain at the time, one parliament member fought a long battle to make atheism acceptable. His works of literature to political engagement made atheism a perfectly respectable position. In one of his essays, he establishes that humanity has nothing to gain from religion, specifically christianity, and that disbelief only adds to humanity's happiness. Like the Dahriyya of the Islamic world and their proof by empirical measures only, the 1960s saw the emergence of logical positives. Among their arguments were that nothing transcends the physical world, anything that could not be perceived by the senses was nonsense, and that statements were either analytical or synthetic. This last point implies that something can only be proved by definition or experience, meaning that their own statements and arguments could not be proven. Eventually their movement would die, and theism would become a rapidly growing state of belief, especially after the 1980s. One of the reasons for this was that science became much more advanced and scientists were beginning to understand that the fine tuning of our universe to the perfection it is found in could have only been accomplished by God.

Although religion has been making a comeback, atheism has also been rising in popularity, especially among the new generations on college campuses. Unfortunately, uneducated Muslims go to college campuses and are lured in by the mirage that is atheism. Among other things, speakers like Richard Dawkins, Sam Harris, and many

others have been becoming more influential. They are internationally listened to and their statements are strong in claims and language. According to the CIA FactBook, people identifying as non-religious represent 9.66 percent of the U.S. Population. One fifth of those consider themselves atheist. In Britain and Wales, 25.1 percent of the population describe themselves as having no religion. In all of Europe, 46 percent of people don't believe in the traditional ideas of god. As for the country with the most atheists and the largest percentage of atheist inhabitants, there's China with over half of its population identifying as atheists. Although it may seem like atheism is sure to overtake the world, it is important to understand that although the largest atheist population is Chinese, China is not a melting pot for one to say that it's people's beliefs pose a great threat to theism, as opposed to Europe and North America, whose influence reaches their own melting pots and is sucked in by the rest of the world. In a study conducted by the Pew Research Center in 2015 on religious population growth, Islam is set to be as large a religion as christianity is today. Christianity itself will decrease from three fourths of the world's population to two thirds of it, and most importantly, non religious persons will make up a declining amount of the population.

There must be a reason for the amount of people leaving atheism to be doing so. Many times, they are convinced by a theist that God is real. Many atheists are guided by what they deem to be the most true path. What this means to them is that they will follow that which is supported by research, is intellectually conceivable, and also makes sense. For this reason, they can be convinced, through comprehensible arguments, that God does indeed exist. Generally, atheists struggle with many issues in life. An atheist struggles to

find an aim in their life, reward in their doing good, punishment in their doing bad, a basis for morality, and fulfillment. As a result, they become depressed. Suicide creeps into their minds, and all this is because one ultimate element is missing in their lives, and that is Islam. Through Islam, a person understands that their purpose in existence is to please Allah, Heaven is their reward, Hell is their punishment, morality is defined by the divine, and fulfillment is only achieved through the worship of Allah. If a person does not follow the divine way of life, then they will keep running to find happiness, and the happiness they do find will be temporary, and antidepressants are going to become equally important to breathing. It is safe and justifiable to say: Islam fills the Gaps atheism leaves in its wake.

To correctly explain atheist philosophy, the concept of a naturalist must be reiterated. A naturalist is one who only believes in empirically verifiable occurrences or things. To them, the entire universe is governed by natural laws. Since this is the case, atheists effectively deny their own base understandings. All humans believe in the human's ability to reason. Atheists also believe that everything we know comes from blind and non rational physical processes. Since all humans believe in the ability to reason, this means that we see the path to a conclusion in our mind. Our minds can drive premises to a conclusion. This ability can be described as insight. The key point here is that we have the ability to reason and rationality is of our traits. Back to the point of atheists refuting themselves. If all physical processes are blind and non rational, then how is it that we are capable of mentally seeing our way to a conclusion, reasoning between right or wrong, and rationally deciding upon a course of action. Is the human and his



brain not a result of blind and non rational physical processes. If these physical processes do not contain rationality or have the ability to rationalize, and cannot even give rise to it, then how is it that they are claimed to be responsible for the complicated human body, which scientists till today have not been able to fully comprehend, let alone the entire universe? Effectively, Atheism, being based upon philosophical naturalism, denies the very thing which it uses to deny god, and that is reason. In his book titled "*The Divine Reality. God, Islam, and the Mirage of Atheism*", Hamza Tzortzis gives a great example to demonstrate in a practical way the concept which was just explained. He starts with two taxi drivers. Both pick up their customers and each of them wants to reach their workplace. One taxi driver blindfolds himself and the other does not. Tzortzis uses the analogy of the blindfolded taxi driver to the blind physical processes which atheists claim rule our world. The same way that the blindfolded taxi driver will not be able to reach his destination while blindfolded, these blind and non rational physical processes cannot give rise to the complicated human biology, the universe with its harmonious workings, and the human mind. On the other hand, Islam does give a very adequate explanation to our existence in light of the previously mentioned argument. God is the All-knowing, the All-powerful, etc. Since He is such, then it does make sense that He created us, because He has the ability to create us, as opposed to coincidence after coincidence being the explanation of our existence, let alone the claim that everything comes from nothing. Allah has discussed this in the Quran. In verse 52:35-36, Allah says: "Or were they created by nothing, or were they the creators [of themselves]? Or did they create the heavens and the earth? Rather, they are not certain." The way Allah puts forth arguments in the Quran challenges a person to ponder upon what they read. It is this property which

partially plays a role in making the Quran captivating as it is. These verses imply four possibilities. The first is that the universe or humans were created by nothing, the second that they were self created, the third that they were created by something created, and the last that they were created by something uncreated. The first three possibilities' implications are self-explanatory, but the last possibility is derived from the last part of the verse where Allah says “Rather, they are not certain”. Here, Allah implies that He created humans (and the universe). To be able to examine what each of these possibilities entails, the concept of infinite regress must be understood. In his book *"The Divine Reality. God, Islam, and the mirage of Atheism"*, Hamza Tzortzis gives a good example. He says:

“Imagine you had a stack of cubes. Each cube is numbered. The first cube has a volume of  $10\text{cm}^3$ . The next cube on top of that has a volume of  $5\text{cm}^3$  and the next cube is half of the previous cube. This goes on ad infinitum (again and again in the same way forever). Now go to the top of the stack and remove the cube at the top. You cannot. There is no cube to be found. Why? Because if there was a cube to be found at the top it would mean that the cubes did not reach infinity. However, since there is no cube at the top, it also shows—even though the mathematical infinite exists (with assumptions and axioms)—that you cannot have an actualised infinite in the real world. Since there is no end to the stack it shows the infinite—that is made up of discrete physical things (in this case the cubes) — cannot be physically realised.” (Tzortzis, p.79)

This example of the infinity idea takes us into what Tzortzis identifies as the infinite made of discrete physical things. He calls this a differentiated type of infinite. This infinite can be made up of atoms, buses, or quantum fields as we'll come to later. This type of infinite cannot exist in the real world, as was demonstrated in the block stacking example. The type of infinite that can exist is the one not made up of discrete parts, and is coherent, as Tzortzis describes. Tzortzis does duly note that differentiated types of infinities can only exist in the mathematical world since it is based on axioms and assumptions. Through this explanation, he also notes that the universe is made up of discrete physical things, thus being incapable of infinite existence. As for the first assumption which Allah challenges humanity using, the word nothing needs to be defined. It is the absence of all things. This means the absence of all energy and matter. It also means, as Tzortzis states, "the absence of any causal condition. A causal condition is any type of cause that produces an effect. This cause can be material or non material." (Tzortzis, p.80). If there was no previous cause, then how could there be a result, or effect, in this case the universe. It must entail that if it were possible that something comes from nothing, then it should also be acceptable that things can just vanish with no surprise to anyone. As for the nothing that people describe to be a quantum vacuum, then it must be understood that the quantum vacuum is a state of fleeting energy which obeys the laws of physics. In his book, Tzortzis explores the atheist argument: If you cannot have something from nothing, then how did God create from nothing? Tzortzis's response regarding this argument is quite comprehensive:

“This contention is false, as it implies that God is nothing. God is a unique agent with the potential to create and bring things into existence through His will and power. Therefore, it is not the case of something coming from nothing. God’s will and power were the causal conditions to bring the universe into existence. Something coming from nothing is impossible, because nothing implies non-being, no potential and no causal conditions. It is irrational to assert that something can emerge from an absolute void without any potential or prior causal activity. God provides that causal activity via His will and power. Even though the Islamic intellectual tradition refers to the God creating from nothing, this act of creation means that there was no material stuff. However, it does not assume that there were no causal conditions or potential. God’s will and power form the causal conditions to bring the universe into existence.” (Tzortzis, p.85)

As for the second possibility, that of the humans (and the universe) creating themselves, the concept of creation requires an explanation. For something to have been created, then it entails that it only existed from a certain time period. This means that it is not infinite, or otherwise put: at one point, it didn't exist! It is understood that if one says the universe with all that is in it created itself, then this is a contradiction. This is since something that is created must have been created by something previous to it. If the universe created itself, then it itself must have existed before itself. Can it be that a frog creates, or otherwise births itself? This would be absurd. If someone were to resort to the duplication of cells as a confirmation to an organism’s ability to create itself, then it must be remembered that the first cell itself had to have been created. Additionally, scientists, till this very day, have not been able to determine the exact role of centriole organelles, the

region where spindles grow out of, in regards to cellular reproduction. The third possibility is that the universe is created by something else that was created. This possibility cannot even be used to explain the universe, for the question arises: what created the created thing which created the universe? If the answer is “another thing that was created by another created thing”, then this drops the argument into a loop of infinite regress, since every thing will have been created by another created thing. Under this possibility, no one will ever know what created the universe. The last and final possibility is the only one which can be supported by logically coherent arguments. On top of that, it is the only option left in explaining the universe’s existence. Since something created always, by definition, needs a creator, then it must be that something must have existed before the universe to have created the universe and all that’s in it. The universe and everything in it was created by something uncreated. This is since everything needs an uncaused cause, or a first cause. This first cause must be God and his will. Since God is uncreated, then this implies that God must have always existed. This makes him eternal. Since God created the universe known to us, then that means he transcends it. He does not become part of his creation the same way a glass blower doesn't become the nice vase he makes. Since God created the universe, this implies that he is the most knowledgeable, also implying that he did not instill all of his knowledge into his creation, but he did some of it, for he creates the laws which govern our universe. Lastly, He is omnipotent, meaning all powerful. Any power we have we only possess because the one who created us himself is all powerful and over everything powerful. If he is not all powerful, then how is it that God creates the universe? The Quran describes important attributes of God in one important verse: “He is the First (nothing is before Him) and the Last (nothing is

after Him), the Most High (nothing transcends him and he transcends all things) and the Most Near (nothing is nearer than Him). And He is Knowing of all things.” (*Qur'an* 57:3) He is the first meaning He, the uncreated, created the Universe, and as a condition, existed before it. He is the last since the universe has been proven to be finite since it is a physical actual infinite. He is the most high since He transcends everything. Although this hasn't been discussed, God is the most near spiritually. Since He created the universe with knowledge, then it entails that God is knowing of all things. As for God's attribute of omnipotence, then the following verse of the Quran shall suffice, but note that there are many more: “...and Allah is Powerful (over all things); and Allah is Forgiving, Merciful.”( Quran 60:7).

The Argument previously concluded was an argument from the Quran's refutation to the idea that the world could have been created from nothing. The next argument to be presented is purely logical and based upon the fact that our universe is dependent. In his book, Hamza Tzortzis gives a good analogy to present the idea of dependency:

“Imagine you walk out of your house and on your street you find a row of dominoes that stretch far beyond what your eyes can see. You start to hear a noise that gets slightly louder as time passes. This noise is familiar to you, as you used to play with dominoes as a child; it is the sound of them falling. Eventually, you see this amazing display of falling dominoes approaching you. You greatly admire how the basic laws of physics can produce such a remarkable spectacle; however, you are also saddened because the last domino has now fallen a few inches away from your feet. Still excited about what has

just happened, you decide to walk down the street to find the first domino, hoping to meet the person responsible for producing this wonderful experience. Keeping the above scenario in mind, I want to ask you a few questions. As you walk down your street, will you eventually reach where the chain of dominoes began? Or will you keep on walking forever? The obvious response is that you will eventually find the first domino. However, I want you to ask why. The reason you know that you will find the first domino is because you understand that if the domino chain went on forever, the last domino that fell by your feet would never have fallen. An infinite number of dominoes would have to fall before the last domino could fall. Yet an infinite amount of falling dominoes would take an infinite amount of time to fall. In other words, the last domino would never fall. Putting this in simple terms, you know that in order for the last domino to fall, the domino behind must fall prior to it, and for that domino to fall, the domino behind it must fall prior to it. If this went on forever, the last domino would never fall. Sticking with the analogy, I want to ask you another question. Let's say, walking down the street, you finally come across the first domino which led to the falling of the entire chain. What would your thoughts be about the first domino? Would you think this domino fell 'by itself'? In other words, do you think the falling of the first domino can somehow be explained without referring to anything external to it? Clearly not; that runs against the grain of our basic intuition about reality. Nothing really happens on its own. Everything requires an explanation of some sort. So the first domino's fall had to have been triggered by something else—a person, the wind or a thing hitting it, etc. Whatever this 'something else' is, it has to form a part of our explanation of falling dominoes. So to sum up our reflections thus far: neither could the chain of dominoes contain an infinite number of

items, nor could the first domino start falling for no reason whatsoever” (Tzortzis, p.95-96)

Consider that our universe is like the dominoes in the above mentioned example. This would mean that our universe requires something to have caused it to exist. The conclusion is that our universe is dependent. Since it is dependent and needs a previous external power to cause it, it cannot be said that another dependent thing caused our universe since this would mean that the other thing would have to have been caused by something dependent. In that case, we fall into infinite regress, which was discussed in the previous argument. For this to make sense, dependency needs to be defined properly and its conditions laid out. The first condition for something to be dependent is that it is not necessary. If something is necessary, then it means that it is absolutely impossible for it not to have existed. When thinking of any object, whether it be a ball, book, or table, it is a possibility that it could not have existed. For one, you could not have bought it, the manufacturer could have not produced it, and so on. Since a thing has the possibility of not having been there, it is not necessary. A ball cannot exist on its own without any external factors having assembled it. This means that the ball cannot explain itself, implying that an external factor is the only explanation. The second condition for something to be dependent is that the possibility of its building blocks being arranged differently exists. Take the previous example of the ball. If it is a soccer ball, then the inside is made of rubber and the outside of either synthetic or genuine leather. This very idea that the outer layer could have been made of synthetic or genuine leather exemplifies the second condition. As for the ball that you have in your hand, the rubber inside it could



have been a part of a car wheel, scattered into a million other balls, or even made into a balloon. This makes the ball a dependent object. The third condition for something to be dependent is that it relies on something outside of itself for existence. As for the soccer ball, it can be stated that it needs constant care if one were intending to keep it in the best condition. Even with the best care, the soccer ball will not last indefinitely. The seams will come apart, requiring you to sew the leather back into place. If this happens multiple times, then the holes which the threads go through may get torn. This will require either new seams or an entirely new leather cover. The examples can continue but this amount suffices. The fourth and last condition for the dependence of a thing is that it has limited physical qualities. These range from color to weight to temperature to size. The fact that they are limited to what they have been means that something external and prior to them had to have limited these physical qualities. The soccer ball obviously passes the requirement for this condition. As for eternity, then it can reasonably be argued that everything with limited physical qualities is finite, because arguing the opposite would be absurd. If someone claims that the soccer ball has existed and will exist indefinitely, then it would be very simple to just remind them that the ball needs maintenance as was discussed in explaining the previous requirement. Even with all the maintenance the ball needs, it will eventually reach a point of no return, and that is when the rubber gets torn or otherwise. Even if one argues that the rubber inside or the leather outside can be replaced, then the ball is not really composed of its original materials anymore, effectively making it into a new ball. Basically, replacing a single thread on the ball makes the original one dead and a new one now exists. Effectively, you've owned two balls. This point right here provides evidence to the fact that the world is created by

something preceding it. This is since everything with limited physical qualities requires that its limited physical qualities have a limiter. In the case of our universe, the limiter must be God, hence he is the creator. Otherwise, the universe would have to have some existence which is not limited, something that remains after the creation of the universe. Obviously though, this idea cannot even be considered since the universe in itself has limited physical qualities. Thus, it cannot contain something in it which is unlimited in its physical qualities. We cannot even begin to grasp the idea that something of unlimited physical qualities exists in our universe. This is one of the reasons why Muslims do not dwell upon the actuality and howness of God's attributes. Instead, Muslims accept that they cannot actually comprehend God's attributes since he exists by his own nature. Since it is true that the entire universe is dependent, limited and finite, then it is a fact that everything we comprehend in this universe is dependent. We know that dependent things need to depend on an independent existence. Similarly, finite things are finite because there was something eternal before them having created them. Lastly, things of limited physical qualities have to have been preceded by something unlimited. Since all these statements are true, then the only reasonable explanation for the existence of our universe is that it was created by God. From these comprehensible arguments, it is deduced that God is the being which everything depends on. He is Independent. He is The one that sustains everything. He is the Everlasting. He is Self-sufficient. Lastly, He is Necessarily existent. Since these just mentioned are facts, it makes a person truly ponder upon the miracle that is the Quran. It contains such mental conclusions about God that make a person truly understand why Islam is the true path. In the middle of the desert 1400 years ago, the Quran was revealed with these conclusions available to anybody. If the Quran in

itself is not the word of God, then what is? In chapter 3 verse 97 of the Quran, God says: "...God is independent of all that exists." Similarly, God says in chapter 35 verse 15 of the Quran: "O Mankind! It is you who stands in need of God, whereas He alone is self sufficient, the One whom all praise is due."

We live in a society which is increasingly changing its moral stances. In the time frame of 30 years, or one generation, moral understandings among one generation will become old to another. Commonly, we see as an older generation try to relate and join in on the fun of the next generation by abandoning the moral values they grew up upon. This western standard of moral inconsistency has unfortunately begun to seep into the Muslim world and societies. The Muslims are now adopting this standard and abandoning morals that they have been theirs for 1400 years. As for the christian society, which is dominant in the west, the same also applies. The result of such moral inconsistency is that one generation cannot effectively raise the next without having to face the difficulty and constant haunt of what they may consider as bombardments of immorality. That creates a constant tension between family members. As an example, the 25 year old son will not agree with and may abhor some things their younger 15 year old brother takes to be standards. Whether or not these moral standings are correct or otherwise, that is a subjective matter. Even greater discord in the familial structure can result when the parents and their children do not see eye to eye. A point of great contention can be when father and daughter don't agree on dress code. Unfortunately, the age at which a child is bombarded with these ideas considered by the parents to be immoral is not a mature one. Children as young as infants can and do access the internet and TV, and although the

programming geared towards them doesn't normally contain controversial content, it is actually beginning to. As a result, elementary school aged children will have understandings of the world and its moral workings that emanate from social media and TV. This in itself makes such aged children stand up to their parents thinking that their understanding of the world, its rights and wrongs, and their definition of morality is superior to their parents. That in itself, again, sows discord amongst family members. Parents are required to be beacons of hope and a guiding path for their children. If their children, through programming specialized for them and social media which reflects such programming, have been steered into a mentality a part of which is that parents will have to bend backwards and accept the moral alongside societal understandings which their children value, then the parents no longer represent beacons and guiding paths for the children. Effectively, TV and social media become the beacons and guiding paths rather than the parents. If the parents, who bore such children and tired for their wellbeing, and still do so during their children's dependency on them, cannot instill their morals, values, and ethics into these children, then the role of a parent has ultimately corrupted, diminished, and gone awry. An even worse scenario is when the parents are not the ones in agreement. This can have greatly detrimental effects on the children in the family. One parent may be open to accepting or tolerating new moral standards for their children and ultimately themselves. In this way, the parent has lost their identity as the person they are, for they are willing to debase their entire life's worth of moral understanding and experience for a child's whims, and if not a child's whims, then society's whims. The result is a parent who doesn't display strength, decisiveness, or discipline. The quality of personal and behavioral discipline in a parent is among the most important ones, for

without it the children will end up irresponsible, impossible to trust, and ultimately lacking in self discipline. Such things can lead them to manifest problems like atrocious money managing, procrastination, and many more. Before all this on its own takes effect, remember that the child grew up with parents who had completely different moral understandings and tendencies. How can a child grow mentally stable in such a polarized environment, especially considering that the household is supposed to be the home of a child, or otherwise their safe haven from all the stresses a child can face in their daily life. Considering that the family and the household are the basic unit of society, then it is pivotal that a household be stable, unwavering, and consistent in its understandings of morals, their ethical implementations, and the imperative vice-like grip on values. Since the household plays such a pivotal role in society, then it is crucial that the implications of the still spreading atheism be pointed out. Most importantly, atheist parents will lack determination, because they don't live for any purpose and everything they do is to please other people. Furthermore, any act is not devoted for the sake of anyone since there is no actual consequence to their actions. This is since atheists consider there to be no God, and thus have no one to account them for their actions. Whether they take care of their children with the utmost care or throw them on the streets is essentially the same to them since there is no actual compass for right and wrong. Everything they do is a result of the completely *random* and *accidental* arrangement of accidentally created matter. When it comes to an atheist's actual guiding light in this world, then some might claim that society plays such a role. Well, if this was the case, then why is the Uighur genocide in China being considered wrong and is condemned by the world? This in itself is a contradiction, since no one person can justify their society's standards over another's

without a firm basis and not just whims and inclinations. Another atheist might claim the stance of moral realism, a stance which explains that morals are objective, but they just exist. Such a contention cannot even be considered if the evidence provided in the body of this paper is to be applied upon it. Finally, I would like to conclude by quoting one of the statements of the Prophet Muhammad (Peace and Blessings be Upon Him), as it gives us food for thought and provides a point over which to ponder. It is authentically reported in Sahih Muslim, hadith number 2659a upon the authority of Abu Hurayra that the Prophet Muhammad (Peace and Blessings be Upon Him) said:

“The mother of every person gives him birth according to his true nature. It is subsequently his parents who make him a Jew or a Christian or a Magian. Had his parents been Muslim he would have also remained a Muslim. Every person to whom his mother gives birth (has two aspects of his life) ; when his mother gives birth Satan strikes him but it was not the case with Mary and her son (Jesus Christ).”

## Works Cited

“Atheism.” *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <https://iep.utm.edu/atheism/>. Accessed on 03/01/2022

Chalmers, David, and David Bourget. “Demographics of atheism.” *Wikipedia*, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Demographics\\_of\\_atheism](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Demographics_of_atheism). Accessed on 03/03/2022

“The Future of World Religions: Population Growth Projections, 2010-2050.” *Pew Research Center*, 2 April 2015, <https://www.pewforum.org/2015/04/02/religious-projections-2010-2050/>. Accessed on 03/02/2022

Lipka, Michael. “10 facts about atheists.” *Pew Research Center*, 6 December 2019, <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/12/06/10-facts-about-atheists/>. Accessed on 03/05/2022

“List of countries by irreligion.” *Wikipedia*, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_countries\\_by\\_irreligion](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_by_irreligion).

Nielsen, Kai E. “atheism | Definition, History, Beliefs, Types, Examples, & Facts.” *Encyclopedia Britannica*, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/atheism>. Accessed on 03/08/2022

*The Holy Qur'an.*

Tzortzis, Hamza Andreas. *The Divine Reality: God, Islam and the Mirage of Atheism.* FB  
Publishing, 2016.