

Scientism and Religion: Christian-Muslim Responses about Atheistic Ideology

Salman Arif¹

Dr. Usman Ahmad²

Abstract

The scientism belief that science is the finest and only objective method for determining societal norms and scientific principles. Scientism has been changing the measurements of thinking and has been taking place in scientific, non-scientific, and all other social platforms. Contemporary atheist scientists think that science is the sole dependable source of knowledge and only access to certainty. Many prominent atheist scientists have claimed religion as hurdles and conflict in the pathway of scientific progress. They promote scientism as the best explanation for everything, instead of religion. Science, its ramifications, and its boundaries all have been discussed, as well as how legendary scientists cannot validate science to reality. On contrary, Muslim and Christian scholars argue that religion based believe in God who provides the purpose and meaning of human existence and their objective moral values. This is critical to comprehend how swiftly the idea of scientism is infiltrating every aspect of human affair and how disastrously it is wreaking havoc on society.

The purpose of this article is to examine how atheists establish science's supremacy in all spheres of human life and reject other sources of knowledge, especially matters related to the divine guidance for humanity. The study focuses on new atheists' argumentation and the Muslim-Christian scholarly responses.

Keywords: *Scientism; Atheism; Legends Scientist's Views, Christian-Muslim Response*

Introduction

Atheist scientists reject the God existence and strongly oppose all religions of the world especially Islam and Christianity. Atheists use historical, philosophical and scientific and moral arguments mainly try to disprove the concept of God existence and reject the influence of religion on the basis of scientific assumptions. Based on scientific theories and secular moral principles, atheists conclude that religions are illogical and unscientific and that it is enough to live without religion. Moreover, they argue that science provide accurate guidance in all affair of life. Atheists recommend that science should take the role of religion in defining what is true and false and good and bad. Furthermore, they contend that no religion should be followed since scientific knowledge is adequate for a true comprehension of the

¹ Ph.D. Scholar, Institute of Islamic Studies, University of The Punjab

Salmanarif5900@gmail.com

² Assistant professor, Institute of Islamic studies, University of The Punjab

Usmanahmad.is@pu.edu.pk

world for everyone. Physician Stephen Weinberg, stated that the world should avoid religion, and scientists dissect the function of religion in society, and we need to do more. The world must awaken from its lengthy religious nightmare. We scientists should do everything possible to reduce religion's hold on society, which may be our greatest gift to civilization.

Since the beginning of the nineteenth century, science has had a vital impact and aggressive order in all spheres of life. Scientism has been changing the measurements of thinking, and taking place in all scientific, nonscientific and social platforms which is good and appreciated but at fundamental level, it has been spoiling other sources of knowledge which are compulsory as science itself.

On the other hand, legendary scientists explicitly claim that science is not a route of all knowledge and it does not concern with certainty rather there are various sources of knowledge. Science is dynamic and with the advancement of science its findings changes with time, most of the case science results change with the changing of internal chemical reactions. Most of the time science has been used for personal objectives and aims while practicing science Scientists' own ideas and work behind that objective and enthusiasm. According to scientists, Mathematics is not a science and therefore cannot straddle the line between natural and social sciences. Furthermore, Concept of love, beauty, ugly, hate, evil and moral duties and values have nothing to do with science and all these have been discussing by scientists in the perspectives of their knowledge and approaches.

Muslim and Christian scholarship have responded to scientism in a different ways, including academic, philosophical, and theological perspective and they often have arguments and positions that are almost identical to one another in this respect.

They think that the idea of scientism is self-refuted, and it is not a scientific claim but rather a philosophical position. Testimony is one of the primary sources of knowledge because without testimony, knowledge is unattainable. Human existence, history, religion, and all knowledge are dependent on testimony, and if it is contested or disregarded, we will continue to exist as animals but will be unable to live as human beings.

They believed that the majority of us had never seen a baby's birth, had never examined the blood vessels, and had never seen a representative sample of either the world's true geography or its legal systems. But we still believe in testimonial knowledge and human life depends on it rather than assessing everything scientifically, even if it falls beyond its realm.

Muslims and Christians provide compelling logical arguments in opposition to scientism, arguing that the universe's purpose, human existence, objective moral values, and obligations all

beyond the scope of science.

Muslim scholar Hamza comprehensively negate the position of scientism and comes with a sound logical and rational argument that Science is creating significant gains in comprehending the physical world, but we must not expect it to grasp everything in life. Science is not the only route to discovering the ultimate truth, and it cannot answer all of the questions. Science is limited to observation as well cannot examine the state of personal feelings, emotions and depression. Science 'Why?' Can't answer

Atheist's Perspective on Scientism

Scientism is based on scientific beliefs that cover all areas of human life, and atheists try to get rid of religion by replacing it with scientific theories. Many philosophers differently elaborated the definition of Scientism.

Sometimes the term scientism can be used decisively in debates and disputes between atheists and their opponents. The term scientism, in an analytical sense refers to a notion of science which can be defined by three basic components. Initially, scientism refers to science as the leading principle of thinking and action. In the viewpoint of contemporary atheist philosophers, Science has shown its superiority over philosophical, political, and traditional modes of reasoning. Second, from the standpoint of a scientist, science should be applied to all aspects of life and society, including the economics, politics, and social relationship. This led to the conviction in the power of human reason and the sense that the world is capable of being arranged and altered by men themselves. Third component, Scientism is constantly geared against the world's faiths, notably Islam and Christianity, which it seeks to supplant and eradicate. From this point of view, science and its theories that refer to science provide the means of inner worldly salvation. In addition, science is responsible for the experimentally observable parts of the world.

Father of the atheism of 21st century, Bertrand Russell shows his allegiance to both epistemic and rationalistic scientism when he says:

The core beliefs of the Christian religion—God and immortality—are not supported by science. People will remain to hold these views because they are happy to believe them, just as it is enjoyable to believe in your own goodness and the evil of your opponents. I, however, fail to find much support for either position. I don't claim to be able to disprove the existence of God. I can't just show that Satan doesn't exist. The Gods of Olympus, ancient Egypt, and Babylon may coexist with the God of Christianity. However, none of these hypotheses can be justified because they are more likely than the others since they are beyond the realm of what

is known to be feasible.¹

Alexander Rosenberg, a proponent of scientism, believes that scientism is the notion that scientific procedures are the only trustworthy means of acquiring knowledge about anything. Being a scientist only entails using science as our sole guide to reality and nature, both our own and that of everything else.²

Rosenberg used the phrases in his contention that trust, knowledge, reality, and nature should all be observed through the scientific lens. In practice, when we try to offer some meaning to certain phrases, we cannot rely on science; similarly, science cannot supply the meaning of this philosophical or theological explanation of the aforementioned notions. Nature has multi-dimensional of beauty and functions inside. Nature of beauty, truth of oppressor, philosophical inquiries and religious objective moralities cannot be addressed in the light of empirical science.

Ian Barbour talks about the effort to broaden the scope of science so that all real knowledge must be scientific or be able to be explained by scientific knowledge and method.

Ian Barbour has defined that the only reliable source of knowledge is the scientific method.³

Carnap expressed his view that there are many more dimensions beyond science in the whole range of life, within it Dimension, science does not meet any obstacle. When we claim that scientific knowledge is infinite, we imply that there is no question that science cannot answer.⁴

Methodological scientism is the attempt to apply the methods of natural science to academic fields in a way that leaves out or downplays methods that have been used in these fields for a long time and are seen as important to them.

Philip S. Gorski wishes to apply the natural scientific method to other academic fields.⁵

Another atheist scientist, Tom Sorell aims to propagate the concept of scientism instead of other academic disipline:

“It is very desirable for established sciences' ideas and methods to be propagated history or ethics, should be maintained in their pre-scientific state, catches the scientism in scientific empiricism.”⁶

¹ Russell Bertrand, *Why I am not a Christian* (London: Unwin Paperbacks, 1957), p. 44 (emphasis added).

² Rosenberg, Alexander, 2011, 6–8. *The Atheist's Guide to Reality: Enjoying Life without Illusions*, w.w. Norton & company New York, London.

³ Ian Barbour, *Religion in an Age of Science* (New York: Harper & Row, 1990), p. 4.

⁴ Rudolf Carnap, *The Logical Structure of the World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), p. 290.

⁵ Philip S. Gorski, 'Scientism, Interpretation, and Criticism' *Zygon*, Vol. 25, No. 3. (1990), p. 279

⁶ Sorell, Tom *Scientism, and Values* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982, p9.

According to Roger Trigg, scientism is the belief that "Science is our exclusive way of accessing reality."¹

The stance of ontological scientism is that the cosmos contains just atoms or material components. This is the view that the only beings and causes in the world are material objects. Carl Sagan presumably writes in the name of science using the phrase "scientific materialism."

"I am Carl Sagan, a composite made of calcium, water, and organic molecules. You are a group of almost similar molecules that have been given a distinct collective name. However, Is it them all? Are molecules the only thing present? Some folks seem to understand this. As intricate and nuanced as our own, molecular machinery have evolved throughout time. However, the core There aren't as many atoms and basic molecules in life as we would think. Whereby they are preserved together while demeaning personal dignity."²

Physician Stephen Weinberg, declared that religion should be avoided globally, and scientists dissect the function of religion in society, and we need to do more. The world must awaken from its lengthy religious nightmare. We scientists should do everything possible to reduce religion's hold on society, which may be our greatest gift to civilization.³

Biologist atheist Richard Dawkins discusses the need of turning to scientific knowledge for direction when heavenly guidance is unavailable and unreliable. "If the demise of God will leave a space, it will be filled by many individuals in various ways. My approach combines a healthy dose of science, the ethical and methodical quest to learn the reality of the world."⁴

Atheist Sam Harris rejects the concept of religious morality and advocates scientific development of societal moral standards and regulations. He argues, "I am not arguing that every moral question can be resolved by scientific inquiry. Opinion divergences will persist, but they will be more controlled by scientific realities."⁵

Atheists endeavor to fill any gap in knowledge with science, regardless of its bounds and constraints. Atheists may live a happy, healthy, intellectually fulfilling, and moral existence, according to Dawkins. In his response, He believes that it is untrue that science cannot address moral principles, within the context of the discovery of the outside world, science can adequately address moral values and duties. He states, the main premise is that

¹ Roger Trigg, *Rationality and Science* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993), p. 90.

² Sagan, Carl, *Cosmos* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1980), p. 105.

³ *New Scientist*, Issue 2578, 18 November 2006.

⁴ Dawkins, R. *The God Delusion*. USA: Mariner Publishers. 2006, p361.

⁵ Harris, S. *The Moral Landscape, How Science Can Determine Human Values*. USA: Free Press. 2011, p3.

although Religion is the most authoritative source of meaning, values, morality, and the ideal life, the physical world should be understood most accurately via the lens of scientific research. I want to convince you that this is not just false, but also implausible. If faith ever gets anything right, it does so by accident.”¹

Dennett argues that religion is taking its last breath in the modern world and is now playing a more formal role, rather than guiding humanity towards politics, science and ethics. Dawkins endorses the evolution theory as a scientific explanation of the creation of the universe and how it works, rather than relying on religious explanations. He describes that “Natural selection” determine the whole of existence and boosts the potential of human awareness and science to comprehend the universe's most intricate mysteries.²

Harris discusses that certainly religious language and its meanings are irrational and unscientific in its claim that what is truth and false. People of Christians believed in possible return of Jesus Christ and in Holy Ghost, these are claims about physics and biology which are scientifically unsustainable in 21st century.³

Richard Dawkins, emphasis on evolution theory is the best expiation of atheist’s worldview, “The more you learn about the importance of evolution, the more you are driven away from agnosticism and toward atheism.”⁴

Harris draws that every scientist has to admit what is said by religion true is unjustified scientifically.⁵ This time is to adopt a scientific methods and approaches for moral values and refusing the ideas of religious beliefs to determine good or bad. He adds “as soon as scientists start suggesting moralities, the divine moralities will go on the scrapheap”⁶ It is widely misconception that scientism and faiths like Christianity and Islam are inherently mismatched with science and religion.

John F. Haught argues, scientism is the adversary of religion nor science.⁷ There are various forms of scientism among academicians and they have different views about scientism. The only militant atheists and scientists especially those who have associated with the new atheism movement claim that scientism or even science could answer all the questions and science leads to atheism, ultimate truth, certainty, and science is the only

¹ Harris, S. *The Moral Landscape, How Science Can Determine Human Values*. USA: Free Press. 2011, p6.

² Dawkins, R. *The God delusion*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 2006, p116

³ Harris, S. Science, not faith, should determine morality. Retrieved from <https://abcnews.go.com>. 2010.

⁴ Dawkins, R. *The Blind Watchmaker: Why the Evidence of Evolution Reveals a Universe without Design*: Norton & Company. 1986, p50.

⁵ Harris, S. Science, not faith, should determine morality. Retrieved from <https://abcnews.go.com>. 2010.

⁷ Haught, John *Science and Religion* (New York: Paulist Press, 1995), p. 17

ultimate and reliable source of knowledge. Moreover, they think that the science is only and best explanation of everything in the universe. According to atheist scientists, the only scientific explanation for human being is that they are bioproduct composed of numerous chemicals, calcium, water, etc. Some hardcore atheists suggest that religion should replace with empirical sciences and that we do not need to take any guidance from any religion in the world.

Implication of Science: Scientists' Perspective

i) Science is not a route of all knowledge,

Richard P. Feynman stated that scientists are unable to find the reality of universe in a one way rather they need to discover things in particulars, basically,

Furthermore he says that if our little minds divide the glass of wine, i.e. the universe, into geology, physics, biology, psychology, astronomy, etc. for some convenience, then remember that nature never knows it. So let's put it all together, don't ignore what it's for. Let him give us one last joy. Drink it and forget it all.¹

ii) Science results change with change of inside chemical reactions,

Feynman explicitly declared that how cell system work well-organized and how it would rapidly to one form to another due to inside chemical reactions,

There are numerous chemical reactions in the cell living system, in which one compound changes to another and another. Our knowledge is summarized in just a small part of the innumerable series of reactions that take place in the cell system to this day, to give some impression of the immense efforts made in the study of biochemistry. One percent or more.²

iii) Science is impersonal but can be used for personal ambitions

Most of the time science has been used for personal objectives and aims while practicing science. There is a widespread misperception that science is an impersonal, neutral, and entirely unbiased. Science aims to be limited to the agreed principles of practice and rigorous testing, but most other human endeavors are manipulated by fashion, opacity, and personality. Of course, this manifesto is nonsense. Science, like all human endeavors, is a human-driven activity, and is absolutely subject to fashion and desire.³

¹ Feynman P. Richard, *Six Easy Pieces: Essentials of Physics Explained by Its Most Brilliant Teacher*, USA: Helix Books, 1995, p, 67.

² Richard P. Feynman, *Six Easy Pieces: Essentials of Physics Explained by Its Most Brilliant Teacher*, USA: Helix Books, 1995, p, 52.

³ *Ibid*, p. ix.

Concept of love, beauty, ugly, hate, evil and moral duties and values have nothing to do with science. If something is not a science, it does not necessarily indicate that it is bad for instance, since love is not a science, the fact that something is not a science does not necessarily imply that it is flawed. It just implies that it is not a scientific. According to Feynman's views on mathematical principle, mathematics is not a science in the sense that it is not a natural science.¹

Science and Atheism

The vast majority of scientific philosophers attest to the fact that science does not inevitably lead to atheism. Hugh Gauch, for instance, correctly deduces that arguing that atheism is supported by science is a good way to get high ratings for zeal but low marks for reasoning.²

Other Sources of Knowledge Instead Science

Lawrence M. Principe³ explicitly defines that how universally acceptable scientific methodology has changed when the claim is made that only science can provide answers to all of our questions. Of course, the methods of modern science have been extremely successful in answering many questions about the natural world. The real controversy arises when the claim of exception is made that "only science" as we recognize and follow it today is capable of providing accurate and acceptable answers to all questions, and That any questions that cannot be answered are either meaningless or not worth asking. . These are hegemonic, universal, and external claims that can be called strong science based on argument. These are the claims that make science a subject of debate and criticism.⁴

Lawrence M. Principe warns that adopting science as the only source of knowledge would lead to the destruction and neglect of other sources of knowledge. It claims science to be the only acceptable system for gaining knowledge, anything else is at best a poor second, or simply a delusion. If scientism were turned against the insights offered and expressed by poetry, art, music, or aesthetics, its advocates might simply be labeled as philistines and ignored.⁵ Lawrence M. Principe views on religion best interaction with human psychological

¹ Richard P. Feynman, *Six Easy Pieces: Essentials of Physics Explained by Its Most Brilliant Teacher*, USA: Helix Books, 1995, p, 47.

² Okasha, S. *Philosophy of Science, a Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2002 p. 77.

³ Lawrence M. Principe is the Drew Professor of the Humanities at Johns Hopkins University in the Department of History of Science and technology and the department of chemistry.

⁴ Principe M. Lawrence, *Scientism and the Religion of Science, scientism, the new orthodoxy*, press, New York and London. 2015 p, 42

⁵ *Ibid*, p. 43

condition and moral values. The conflict between religion and scientism arises when scientism replaces religion in the human condition.

It would be absurd to assert that scientific opinions and theological opinions do not at times conflict with one another, in the sense of putting forth discordant or apparently discordant or divergent claims. But this is the sort of conflict a diversity of opinions and claims that exists everywhere within science itself as well as within religion/theology, and without which little intellectual development of any sort could take place, and so such conflict need not be taken as a bad thing or a sign of trouble.¹

Susan Hacck² despite the fact that she does not believe in God or any religion, Susan Hacck makes credible statements on scientism. “Today scientism idea seems sound radical while making her strengthen narrative she comes with Albert Einstein statement about science that Science is just the refining of common thought of everyday life and furthermore John Dewey was very clear about how science could have grown out of everyday empirical inquiry, unforgotten remarks of Gustav Bergman that, science is a long arm of common sense.”³

As seen by scientists' claims, science has become a religion. Scientists naively think science is the ultimate and only source of knowledge, and everything will be studied under the science. Susan expresses herself clearly on the subject.

Christian Response to Scientism

Origin of Knowledge in the Holy Bible

Holy bible says:

“The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom: and the knowledge of the Holy One is understanding.”⁴

In the commentary of this verse:

“The spirit of respect and awe is the source of knowledge”.⁵

Numerous verses of the Holy Bible assert that God is the only source of knowledge and God directed mankind through his apostles with revelation from time to time. Only divine

¹ Principe M. Lawrence, *Scientism and the Religion of Science*, scientism, the new orthodoxy, press, New York and London. 2015 p, 43.

² Susan Haack is a British philosopher. She is Distinguished Professor in the Humanities, Cooper Senior Scholar in Arts and Sciences, Professor of Philosophy, and Professor of Law at the University of Miami. She has written on logic, the philosophy of language, epistemology, and metaphysics.

³ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5Be6vheIMAA&t=492s>

⁴ Bible, book of proverbs 9:10.

⁵ <https://biblehub.com/commentaries/barnes/proverbs/1.htm>

knowledge reveals the ultimate truth purpose of human life in this world as well as objective moral standards. In addition, only divine knowledge distinguishes between truths and false. Christian scholar Erkki remarks on scientism, the issue with scientism is not that we have an excessive appreciation for the natural sciences; I have no intention to argue against the value of science. Rather, we undervalue the significance of philosophy, religion, and everyday method of reasoning. In fact, performing the natural sciences necessitates a larger understanding of rationality, allowing some dependability for rational beliefs derived from observation, memory, rational intuitions, etc. To conduct experiments, one must be able to trust everyday experiences such as "I see such-and-such through the microscope." To operate within the scientific community, we must believe in the presence of other minds, our capacity for deliberate planning, the validity of collecting data, etc.¹

According to J.P Moreland that the idea of scientism is not based on scientific principle rather it's a philosophical idea, scientism is Philosophy not Science. Ironically, scientism is not a scientific assertion like 'cats are mammals' or 'water is H₂O'. But rather a philosophical assertion that expresses an epistemic attitude on science. Scientism is a philosophical position that contends the only scientific statements can be shown to be real and true knowledge, whereas philosophical claims cannot.²

Christen scholar John Lennox stated that it is widely accepted wrong that scientist cannot be a religious or science cannot allow you to believe in God or religious belief. If religion and science are incompatible, there wouldn't be any Christians awarded the Nobel Prize. Between From 1901 to 2000, around sixty percent of Nobel Prize recipients were Christians. According to Baruch Aba Shalev's 100 Years of Nobel Prizes (2005), a review of Nobel Prizes awarded between 1901 and 2000, 65.4% of Nobel Prize Laureates were identify as Christians of different denominations (423 prizes). Overall, Christians have won 78.3% of all Nobel Prizes in Peace, 72.5% of all Nobel Prizes in Chemistry, 65.3% of all Nobel Prizes in Physics, 62.5% of all Nobel Prizes in Medicine, 54.5% of all Nobel Prizes in Economics, and 49.5% of all Nobel Prizes in Literature.³

Human Knowledge and Role of Testimony

Professor Coady expresses his remarks on testimony and how it functions in everyday life.

¹ Kojonen Rope, Erkki virsa, the intelligent design debate and the temptation of scientism. Press, Routledge, Taylor & Francis group, London & New York. 2016, p, 5.

² Moreland. J.P. Scientism and secularism Learning to Respond to a Dangerous Ideology, published by Crossway ministry of Good News Publishers, united states of America. 2018, P, 59-60.

³ Lennox, John, Can science explain everything? Published by the Good Book Company in partnership with The Oxford Centre for Christian Apologetics the Zacharias Institute. 2019, p, 13.

We believe in so many things that we do not empirically or scientifically investigate them; instead, we rely on one another's testimonies and knowledge.

Many of us have never seen the birth of a child, and the majority of us have never examined the blood circulation. The observations that are concealed beneath our understanding that the lights of the sky are far away, the real geography of the Earth, or any accurate description of the rules of the earth, despite of all that we humans continue to believe in, many times we rely only on the testimony and knowledge of one another.¹

Scientific and other Source of Knowledge

There are a number of question kinds that do not belong within the field of science. According to Professor John Polkinghorne there are a number of answers to the question "Why is the water in the tea pot boiling? The empirical explanation for why the "water is boiling", might be a phase change from liquid to vapour at that temperature. Another acceptable non-scientific explanation is that the water is boiling because I placed the kettle on the burner. That the water is boiling the right answer might be, because my boyfriend is coming over for coffee. None of the responses are incorrect; rather, each offers a unique perspective on the subject. The scientific response cannot fully explain the situation. Science cannot respond to inquiries such as "Is the poetry well-written?" Or "Is my international friend reliable?" Understanding the physical world is advancing rapidly, but this should not lead us to believe that science can be used to explain everything in life.²

According to William Lane Craig³, scientism is not a science and it cannot be scientifically proven. It is irrational to believe in it. There are other sources of knowledge outside of science. Basically, science is limited to the physical world. There are huge variety of truth that we believe and know in, that are reasonable and believable but cannot be empirically verified, such as mathematics and logic, which are assumed by science but not verified by science or cannot be scientifically established: ethical truths such as what is good or bad, true or wrong. reality, facts and events of past cannot be scientifically proven, the existence of the extern world, these are metaphysical assumptions finally even science itself ironically permeated. According to philosophers this theory of knowledge is virtually and universally abandoned.⁴

¹ Coady, C. A. *Testimony: A Philosophical Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1992, p, 82.

² John Polkinghorne. "Is Science Enough?" *Sewanee Theological Review* 39, no. 1, 1995: 11-26.

³ William Lane Craig is an American analytic philosopher, Christian theologian, Christian apologist, and author. He is Professor of Philosophy at Houston Baptist University and Research Professor of Philosophy at Talbot School of Theology.

⁴ <https://www.reasonablefaith.org/media/other-videos/what-is-scientism-and-is-it-true>.

Robert Emmet Barron¹ credible remarks on scientism, scientism relegates religion just to the kind of ash heap of intellect history. Scientism is itself logically incoherent, when you empirically observe that all truth is simply scientific, so how can you draw this as an empirical conclusion. Basically, scientism is itself a meta-physical or philosophical position. In the human history we have great people like, Aristotle, Plato, Immanuel Kant, Homer they were engaged and associated the all sources of knowledge, science, philosophy, theology, religion, but none of them engaged with scientism.²

Muslim Response to Scientism

Humans seek information via observation and experimentation, which are main sources of knowledge and are referred to as sense perception. In Greek mythology, sophists, and the contemporary post-modernists philosophers and thinkers claim that sense perception is a definitive source of knowledge that leads to ultimate truth and certainty. Even its including meta-physical beliefs such as God's existence, moral values, duties, and regulations should be viewed through the lens of sense perception.

Scientific method is based on observation and experiment therefore science is dependent. We will analyze the validity of observation and experiment to knowledge and certainty in the first place.

Quranic Concept of Knowledge

Allah says in the Quran:

“ذَلِكَ الْكِتَابُ لَا رَيْبَ فِيهِ هُدًى لِّلْمُتَّقِينَ”³

“There is no (any sort of deviation) doubt in this book, a true mentor for those who believe in unseen/ faith-”

Dr. Usman Ahmad explains the notion of Islamic knowledge in light of Quranic verse,

1. Revelation is the ultimate source of knowledge and its stated facts cannot be invalid.
2. Only the revelation provides the ultimate realities and it has the only right to be called a true provider and instead of it there are false, approximations, and uncertainties.
3. Absolute reality cannot be obtained by sense perception, or the reasoning intellect; it can only be obtained through revelation.
4. Because observation and experimentation cannot verify every facts reality, therefore, faith in the unseen is a must.

¹ Robert Emmet Barron is an American prelate of the Catholic Church serving as auxiliary bishop of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

² <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KF8mgwgIKGE>.

³ Al-Baqarah: 2:2

5. Realities are not temporary or changeable.
6. Only the revelation would determine between false and true.¹

Allah says in the Quran:

“هُوَ الَّذِي بَعَثَ فِي الْأُمِّيِّينَ رَسُولًا مِّنْهُمْ يَتْلُوا عَلَيْهِمْ آيَاتِهِ وَيُزَكِّيهِمْ وَيُعَلِّمُهُمُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحِكْمَةَ وَإِن كَانُوا مِن قَبْلُ لَفِي ضَلَالٍ مُّبِينٍ”²

“He is the One Who sent the illiterate a messenger from among themselves, who recited His revelations to them, purified them, and taught them the Book and knowledge, since they had gone manifestly wrong before.”

The only words of God that disclose the ultimate truth and purpose of human existence in this life and the next. The one and only revelation emphasizes the significance and need of objective moral values for human stability. Since the beginning of human life on the planet, the revelation has been the trustworthy and ultimate source of knowledge, providing peace, justice, and guidance on the straight path for all of mankind.

Religion and revelation have had a significant and pivotal position in human history. There has never been a period in human history when religion and revelation were not present. History shows that if a nation's people refused to embrace the revelation as the ultimate source of knowledge, they perished.

Sense perception as a source of knowledge is weak fundamentally

According to Dr. Usman Ahmad, sense perception as a fundamental source of knowledge is unreliable because, for instance, humans are easily distracted by sensations because so many factors are involved, they sometimes do not listen attentively or skip words during communication, and they sometimes do not comprehend words in context; these variations are weak and lead to the uncertainty or invalidity of human sense as an absolute source of knowledge. This is the same happen with other human senses. Therefore, human senses cannot be accepted as an ultimate source of knowledge.³

Sense perception is contradictory

Human senses provide the contradictory information. Color of sky seen blue at afternoon, grey at evening and dark at night by the human sight. It provides contradictory information; thus, none of this information can be accurate. Therefore, sense perception is contradictory.⁴

¹ Ahmad, Usman, Mubahis Ulom ul Quran, AKS publications, Lahore, Pakistan 2018, p 171.

² Al-Quran: 62-2.

³ Ahmad, Usman, Mubahis Ulom ul Quran, AKS publications, Lahore, Pakistan 2018, p 89.

⁴ ibid, p 90.

Need and importance of revelation

Sense perception and rationality cannot lead to ultimate truth or certainty and cannot be accepted as a sources of knowledge in regard to find the meaning of life, purpose of human being, moral values and duties. Therefore, we need the best and unique source of knowledge that would lead to certainty, which is revelation from God.¹

Science is Limited to Observation

Religion deals with certainty, ultimate truth and provide the meaning of life and purpose of human existence as well provide the ultimate moral guidance. The other hand, science is limited to physical phenomena of world and cannot provide the realities of this and unseen world.

Hamza describes the limitation to observation in science, Scientists' observations are usually restricted. For instance, if a scientist sought to test the impact of coffee on newborn mice, he would be constrained by the quantity and kind of mice as well as all factors present throughout the experiment.²

Dr. Usman Ahmad describes the limitation and domain of science, if science were limited in its domain there will not be seen any contradiction or incompatibility between science and religion.

1. Science is only concerned with observation and experimentation. The object must have a tangible existence that would be considered in the domain of science. On the other hand, Metaphysical do not exist in physical form. Therefore, science is limited in its physical domain.
2. Because science is dynamic, scientific facts change. Newtonian truths were true at the time, however, Albert Einstein established new laws and facts that contradict the prior Newtonian facts.
3. It is not the domain of science to assign values to objects. Despite the fact that scientists do not employ moral language when conducting empirical tests.³

Science is Morally Neutral

Hamza expressly states, with a fantastic example, that science may be helpful in a moral matter but cannot cover all facet of the event, particularly its judgments and conclusion, Science can only demonstrate that all activities are involved when a knife pierces

¹ Ahmad, Usman, Mubahis Ulom ul Quran, AKS publications, Lahore, Pakistan 2018, p 178.

² Tzortzis, H. A. *The divine reality. God, Islam & the mirage of atheism*. USA: Paperback Publishers. 2016, p, 239.

³ Ahmad, Usman, Mubahis Ulom ul Quran, AKS publications, Lahore Pakistan. 2018, p 177.

someone's flesh, but it cannot tell us whether these actions are moral or immoral. Significant life-saving surgery or murder may both result in blood, suffering, and physical injury. The point is that comprehending the whole process of cutting and piercing the human body does not result in a moral conclusion.¹

Science never verify empirically the personal emotions, feelings and state of depression

Hamza describes that science cannot tell you about your personal feelings, relationships, and state of mind, Science, in particular, fails when it comes to examining relationships and emotions empirically, Science is proud of how it tests ideas. No science exists without testing. The probe should eventually give way to confidence, nevertheless. How, for instance, how can we determine someone's intentions? How can we determine a person's emotions? Scientists can use a lie detector to tell if someone is lying. They may also emphasize that a whole range of physical and behavioral cues are associated with certain emotions, but this is not as easy as they think.²

Human Emotions and Depression

Hamza brings another example of human emotion. How can we tell whether someone is experiencing depression? Do we have access to a Depression Detector? Although physical data gives some input, the interaction between the psychologist and the patient provides a substantial amount of vital information. It typically consists of questions, replies, and sometimes a whole questionnaire. All of this forces us to depend on the patient's responses. Consequently, I believe that observations alone are insufficient for various aspects of human existence, including mental health, conscious and true friendship. So, research only shouldn't be based on empirical tests; it should also be based on human observation and confidence.

Science cannot answer 'why?'

Hamza explicitly comes with a best narration to understand the limitation or implication of science over human actions and intentions, if your aunt knocks on your door and offers you a delicious homemade vanilla cake. You accept her cake. You open the box to get the piece after your aunt has left. Before you rejoice, consider this: Why did he create this cake? As a scientist, all you can do is figure out one piece of information you have: the cake. After doing a number of empirical tests, you came to the conclusion that the cake, which included cocoa powder, eggs, sugar, and milk powder, was probably baked at 350 degrees Fahrenheit.

¹ Tzortzis, H. A. *The divine reality. God, Islam & the mirage of atheism*. USA: Paperback Publishers.2016, p, 239.

² *ibid*, p. 243.

However, gathering all of this knowledge would not help you to respond to the question, "Why did she give you to you?" The only way to find out is to inquire.¹

Science can never answer meta-physical questions,

Science can only solve some meta-physical questions that related to its domain. However, these are questions that can be solved experimentally. For instance, through the study of cosmology, scientists has been able to investigate the origin of the universe. However, some of the fundamental sort of questions cannot be addressed empirically or scientifically. These comprise, why is it necessary to draw conclusions in inferential reasoning from the previous context? What is the afterlife? Are there souls? What is the experience of subjective awareness like for a conscious organism? Why is something present rather than nothing? The reason why science cannot answer these issues is because they pertain to phenomena outside the physical, observable universe.²

Necessary Truths

Science is incapable of proving fundamental facts such as mathematics and logic. Mathematical facts, such as $5 + 5 = 10$, are also fundamental truths and not only empirical generalisations.³

Conclusion

Science has been changing and improving the world into modernization in all fields of human life from telecommunications to medicine, transportation to nuclear technology. The quality of human lives significantly has been improved because of scientific advancements. Science is constantly improving our lives, and helping us to understand the universe and the world. However, the achievements of science have forced many atheists to adopt some philosophical hypothesis instead of pure scientific facts. These philosophical assumptions are summarized below in short.

Some atheists think that empirical sciences are the only criterion of truth and that science holds the solutions to all of our issues, even the non-scientific ones. This leads atheists to infer that God does not exist, since science can only study what can be seen. Since God's existence cannot be witnessed and science is the sole determinant of truth and reality, it is wrong to assert that God exists. This theory also leads atheists to reject God as the source of phenomena we do not comprehend. The second assumption is that scientific conclusions

¹ Tzortzis, H. A. *The divine reality. God, Islam & the mirage of atheism*. USA: Paperback Publishers. 2016, p, 244.

² *ibid*, p. 245.

³ Craig, W.L. Is Scientism Self-Refuting. Available at: <http://www.reasonablefaith.org/is-scientism-self-refuting> [Accessed 4th October 2016]. (2011).

must be valid and applicable to other fields of study since science is so successful and affluent.

If the scientific results are correct and accurate and science cannot counter the unseen assumptions like God, Heaven, Hell, Angels, then it follows that God never exists. The third assumption is that science leads to certainty or universal fundamental truth. If science cannot directly prove the existence of God, and this is the only way of belief and truth, then we cannot believe in the existence of God. This hypothesis also encourages atheists to argue that once something is labeled a well-proven scientific theory, we must reject or eliminate divine revelation if it is somehow opposed. This is not true. The purely scientific assumption is the lens through which many atheists view the world.

Muslims, Christians, and a large number of natural research scientists all agreed that Scientism is a self-defeating idea that can't explain moral truths, logical and mathematical truths, and reject other important sources of knowledge instead of empirical sciences. Science is a limited way to learn about the world, and it can't answer all of our questions.

Historically, scientism (philosophical position), never been claimed by any philosopher, theologian, scientist, across all developed civilizations of the world. In the contemporary world, philosophers, legends, and pioneers of science have all agreed that the flawed philosophical viewpoint of scientism should never be adopted. On the other hand, the militant atheists misuse and misrepresent science in order to make incompatibility between science and religion.

This research article works at bringing Christians and Muslims together in a more harmonious relationship in the future. This significant combined effort of both Christians and Muslims will create peace, prosperity, and good relationships academically and socially. It is the finest ever response to the atheist objection that religion and science incompatible with each other and there is no need to take any sort of guidance from religion. It also shows that multiple faiths can coexist in one region and they can or should work on similar agenda especially at the time of crisis.