

DISPROVING ATHEISM IN 10 MINUTES

"The first gulp from the glass of natural sciences will
turn you into an atheist, but at the bottom of the glass...
God is waiting for you."

ABU ZAYD
INSTITUTE

THEABUZAYDINSTITUTE@GMAIL.COM

Introduction

All praises are due to Allah TA'ALA, to whom alone, is worthy of all praises. The almighty, the merciful. The one who is MAALIK, the king and owner of the worlds. AL KHAALIQ, the creator of everything. The one to whom the word “existence” belongs exclusively to. As all else is merely creation.

A growing concern is the misleading and foolish narrative that “enlightenment” contains the proofs of science, and the negation of an almighty designer, ALLAH TA'ALA, behind it all.

May Allah Ta'ala reward brother Hamza Tzortzis, for his incredible work in his book titled “The Divine Reality”.

Unfortunately, society has lost its zeal in reading and learning. For this reason, we have simply summarized brother Hamza's proofs for God's existence into an argumentative step-by-step format, hopefully brief enough to have people acquainted with concise thoughts and proofs, which we deem fundamental in today's society.

DISCLAIMER: This booklet is meant to be brief, and has intentionally excluded references. There are many books detailing similar claims and proofs which we sincerely hope people will read. Phrases such as “studies have shown” are academically very weak. However, such references can be found in Brother Hamza's book.

Starting point

What is meant by atheism? Atheism put simply is a rejection of God, and belief that the earth and its existence can be understood through science. Essentially, everything is made up of matter, be it simple or complex matter. This includes us as human beings too. Hence, the world and its entire existence, according to atheism, is due to natural processes which occurred on its own with no intervening cause.

Basically, both you and your opponent agree that at one point there was no universe. And then thereafter, there was. The difference is, you are arguing that the change from non-existence to existence was due to the command of Allah TA'ALA "Be!" and it became. Whereas your opponent says that it merely just became.

Etiquettes in debate

Religion is a very emotionally invested, often heated discussion. Yet, if conducted correctly, has profound effects, not just on one person, but on an innumerable number of persons for a generation to follow.

Think of the famous incident of Taif, in which the Prophet Muhammad (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) was ridiculed and pelted with stones for preaching to a community. Instead of cursing them and adopting a hard approach, he (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) showed mercy stating that perhaps their progeny will accept Islam. Whilst the incident of Taif was not a debate, per say, it was however a discussion which could've been responded to aggressively, but which was dealt with gently by our prophet instead.

Interestingly enough, upon the expansion of Islam, and the deployment of delegations to various parts of the world, it was none other than a tribesman from Taif, Muhammad bin Qaasim, that headed the group of Muslims sent from Arabia to India to spread Islam. Hence, we sitting here typing this short booklet in favour of ALLAH TA'ALA can understand the effects of the mercy and diplomacy shown to the people of Taif and how it eventually led to our ancestors (from India) accepting Islam.

Etiquettes:

1. Desire Hidaayat for your opponent.
2. Do not be proud in debate.
3. Try and debate privately and not in public.
4. Sadly, people debate for likes and comments in their social media arguments. It makes one wonder if they wish the person truly reverts or whether it is for people to praise their intelligence.
5. If, however your opponent has broadcasted falsehood and has caused a Fitna of confusion, then a rebuttal publicly is necessary.
6. Do not assume that your argument is sufficient. Even a broken act done with sincerity can guide one whereas the most flowery discourse can produce resentment rather than love in your opponent's heart.
7. Be respectful in debate. Allow your opponent more talking time if it will foster goodness.
8. **The Shariah must be observed at all times. The rules of Pardah for example must be maintained.**
9. Make Duaa for the persons Hidaayat thereafter. Only Allah's mercy can lead one to the straight path.

“I never once argued with anyone hoping to win the debate; rather I always wished that the truth would come from his side” – IMAAM SHAAFI’

STEP ONE:

As a starting point, I think it is worth mentioning that should any reader encounter an atheist/agnostic looking to probe a discussion on the existence of God, **the onus rests on the atheist to prove non-existence**, as opposed to the believer needing to prove God's existence.

This is due to the fact that God is a **self-evident truth**. For example, if someone were to come up to you and tell you "Prove to me that every event which happened in your life actually happened. Prove to me your past". You would not need to. As your past is a self-evident truth.

Equated to God, for it to be deemed a self-evident truth, the following requirements would need to be met:

1. Universal

The belief in God is a universal belief. It is an undisputed fact that majority of the world are theists.

2. Untaught

The belief in God is untaught. Studies have shown that even if a child was stranded in a desert, the

child would think that there must be a creator behind everything.

3. Natural

There is psychological proof that children at age 7, when placed in a garden setting, had said that the plants were created by God and not by any human.

4. Intuitive

It is further human instinct to assume that any designed object has a designer.

STEP TWO:

You are now at a point where either the atheist is:

PART B: Attempting to disprove God

OR

PART A: You have caved in and opted to prove existence instead.

PART A: PROVING **EXISTENCE (BY YOU)**

Should the latter approach be adopted, the following proofs are enough to have your opponent squirming:

PROOF 1 – CONSCIOUSNESS AND RATIONALITY

The first proof of God’s existence is **our ability to think. Rationality and consciousness** are in fact crystal clear proofs of God.

Rationality entails our ability to draw conclusions in our minds. Example:

1. All people whose name begins with “R” are intelligent.
2. The boy’s name is Rafique.
3. RAFIQUE MUST BE INTELLIGENT.

Consciousness is a subjective experience. A computer can try and explain what a chocolate tastes like, but the feeling a person has when actually eating a chocolate and the explanation thereof cannot be done by a computer. This is because a computer lacks consciousness.

The problem with Atheism is that it posits that man is merely made up of matter. If this is indeed the case, and if it is held that my shoes and me both are just different compositions of matter, then how do I have consciousness and rationality?

Basically, you are saying that if we are indeed merely made of matter, then how are we

conscious and rational? Matter did not have such elements, so how do we have it then?

For instance, I cannot give you R500 if I don't have it. Physical processes don't have rationality so HOW DO THEY GIVE IT?

A notable defence to this rebuttal is the Darwinian Evolution claim.

Darwinian evolution?

The theory claims that our minds evolved to be rational and conscious as reason was necessary for survival.

HOWEVER!!!

1. **The ability to distinguish between truth and falsehood is not necessary for survival**
 - False beliefs can lead to survival. One who favours the view that the world is flat and not round continues to remain healthy and fit for survival.
2. **Achieving mental insights is not necessary for survival**
 - Why do we study math then? Not necessary!

3. Desire to **discover** is not necessary for survival
 - Why do humans climb Mount Everest then?
Not necessary!
4. Why do monks meditate if they need to reproduce?
 - Not necessary!

Naturalism actually denies reason, because rationality cannot come from non-rational physical processes. Mental insights cannot come from blind physical processes.

COMPUTER PROGRAMS

This defence sadly uses computer programs as an example and purports that it has rationality despite its composition of matter. However, computer programmes are merely an arrangement of symbols and not meanings.

PROOF TWO: SOMETHING FROM NOTHING?

Starting point:

The purpose of this booklet is the refutation of atheism. For this reason, the finite nature of the universe is already an accepted fact. By both you and your opponent.

Basically, at this proof, you and your opponent both agree that the universe did not exist at one point. You both agree there was once NOTHING. As in nothing at all. And then POOF! Something happened and matter was formed and from there everything else followed. However, your opponent alleges that nothing caused that to happen. It just happened on its own. Basically saying $0+0=1$. Whereas you are saying that, that 'POOF' which happened, was due to the command of ALLAH TA'ALA.

The world and its finite nature is a common ground between you and your opponent. Which means that the world's existence is due to either of the following:

1. THE UNIVERSE WAS CREATED FROM SOMETHING CREATED

The fallacy of this argument is self-evident. Even if, for example, the world is created by something else created, it then follows: who created that created entity which created the universe?

2. THE UNIVERSE WAS SELF CREATED

The fallacy of this argument, is too, self-evident. The universe to create itself would have needed to be in existence before it created itself. Who created it at that point?

3. UNIVERSE FROM NOTHING?

Your opponent favours this view. He believes that the universe somehow came from nothing. According to him, there was, at one point, nothing, and then boom, something. But with no cause. Just random.

It would be impossible to present an example, due to every example which I can possibly use, includes matter within itself. However, it's like having a blank white canvas lay in your room untouched and after 10 years you find it has now become a beautiful painting of a town. Basically, your

opponent's argument that something came from nothing is like saying $0 + 0 = 1$.

Also, this would imply that if NOTHING can somehow turn into something randomly, then something can also just turn into nothing without any further explanation. Hence, buildings could then randomly just disappear without any explanation.

4. CREATED BY SOMETHING UNCREATED

This is the best theory. This theory purports that the universe was brought into existence by a supreme cause. A cause which requires no further explanation. What is termed an INDEPENDENT & necessary existence.

A common red herring argument often ignorantly raised is "then who created God?". This suggests your opponent does not understand your argument.

Who created God does not answer the question, because who then created that being? And then ... Ad infinatum.

Rather, the best explanation is at some point to state that everything must have vested in an almighty being who was not begotten as this is the only logical explanation to the universe and its existence.

PROOF THREE: FINE TUNING

Your opponent is well aware that the universe exists due to a precise system regulating the universe. Should there be a disruption to the system, the entire universe will perish. Not just natural disasters such as tsunamis, tornados and so forth. But rather the entire universe will crumble.

Hence, you and your opponent both purport that the universe's existence is due to absolute precision. Except you claim that its precise regulation is due to ALLAH TA'ALA whereas your opponent claims it is per chance. Essentially your opponent's claim is like saying you have a box of alphabets, you throw the box in the air, and it lands in a precise sequence which now assembles Romeo and Juliet.

Below is an excerpt from Brother Hamza's book:

Imagine you are an astronaut working for NASA. The year is 2070, and you will be the first human being to visit an Earth-like planet in another galaxy. You finally land, and you can see human-like creatures walking around, eating, playing, working and living normal productive lives. You also notice plants, trees, and other vegetation. As you approach the structure, friendly ambassadors receive you and invite you in. During your initial meeting with these

friendly 'aliens', they tell you that the structure has the right levels of oxygen. It also has adequate amounts of water and chemical compounds to facilitate the production of food and life-supporting vegetation. Amazed by what you hear, you ask them how they managed to create a fully functioning ecological system that sustains life. One of the ambassadors responds, "It happened by chance".

Immediately your mind starts to comprehend the implications of such a ludicrous statement. The only possible explanation for the structure is that it was designed by an intelligent being, not some random physical process.

PRECISE SYSTEM OF THE UNIVERSE TO PERMIT LIFE

1. The law of gravity: Gravity is the force of attraction between two masses. Without gravity, there would be no force to aggregate things. Therefore, there would be no stars (and no planets). Without any stars there would not be any sustainable source of energy to facilitate life. The universe would be a dark, empty vacuum.
2. The electromagnetic force: This unique force affects everything within

the universe. The electromagnetic force is responsible for giving things strength, shape and hardness. Without it, atoms would not exist, because nothing would keep the electrons in orbit. If there were no atoms, there could not be any life. The electromagnetic force also causes chemical bonding by attracting charges. In absence of any chemical bonding, life could not exist.

3. *The position of our planet:* *One of the life-supporting features of our planet is its distance from the Sun. Earth is located in an area known as the habitable zone. This zone is defined as the “region where heating from the central star provides a planetary surface temperature at which a water ocean neither freezes over nor exceeds boiling point.” If our planet were slightly closer to the Sun, it would be too hot to host life. If it were farther away, it would be too cold to facilitate complex life, such as our own.*

4. *The strong nuclear force:* *Since the nucleus is made up of positively*

charged protons, it should just fly apart, because like charges repel each other. However, the nucleus remains intact because of the strong nuclear force. If this were changed, “the universe would most likely consist of a giant black hole.”

- 5. The weak nuclear force: The weak nuclear force is stronger than the force of gravity, but its strength is only effectual at extremely small distances. It is responsible for fuelling stars and the formation of elements. It is also responsible for radioactive decay. The sun would not be able to burn without this force, as it plays an important role in nuclear fusion. If this force were slightly stronger or weaker, stars would not form.*

Now despite the above selected few examples of the precise system of the universe, to posit that it is all “per chance” would be indeed nonsensical. The chance hypothesis is not only irrational, it is counter-discourse. What I mean by this is that if someone were to claim chance, it would be equivalent to making any type of irrational claim. For instance, I could tell an atheist that I believe

that my mother is not really the woman who I call my mother, but rather a large pink elephant that was born on Pluto and flew here on a giant feather. My atheist friend would call me crazy, but I would then, according to his belief system, reply, “There’s still a chance.”

An atheist who accepts the chance hypothesis as a valid explanation for the fine-tuning of the physical laws must be accused of intellectual double standards. Consider an atheist telling her son not to eat any cookies before he goes to bed, only to find him sleeping on the floor with crumbs all over his face and the cookie jar open right next to him. What do you think she will conclude? Do you think the chance hypothesis would even enter her mind? Do you think she will assume that the cookies fell off the shelf in a manner which led to some cookies landing in her son’s mouth? Of course not.

“How can even the lowest mind, if he reflects at all the marvels of this earth and sky, the brilliant fashioning of plants and animals, remain blind to the fact that this wonderful world with its settled order must have a maker to design, determine and direct it?” – IMAAM AL GHAZAALI

PART B: ATTEMPT TO DISPROVE GOD (BY YOUR OPPONENT)

Very often atheists use morality as a yardstick to prove God's existence i.e., If evil exists, God doesn't. Furthermore, aspects such as the prohibition of homosexuality and so forth, cause people to question a God which some consider as 'so-called' discrimination against such persons. The purpose of this booklet is not to discuss the rationale behind such prohibitions, but merely to place the caveat that an unjust God (*Nauthubillah – I seek refuge from God* [from making such heinous statements]) remains a God nevertheless. God being unfair does not mean he does not exist. Just that he is seemingly unfair (*Nauthubillah*).

WHY EVIL?

A very classical, yet misplaced contention is that if God exists, why does evil exist? This has indeed led to people's disbelief in God entirely. I have been informed of a girl who left Christianity because of a baby girl in her family being diagnosed with cancer. This led her to believe that if God existed, he would

not allow for something like this. Hence, he does not exist.

Unfortunately, we have judged God in accordance to our limited wisdom. Whereas we have failed to realize that **GOD HAS THE PICTURE. WE MERELY HAVE PIXELS.**

A young boy, 4 years old, drinks his father's bottle of whiskey. His father immediately grabs the bottle, and perhaps smacks him so that he understands the gravity of his act. Should the young lad be given eloquence of speech at that age, he will openly vent his anger at his father's approach. The young boy at that age does not understand the wisdom behind his father's approach. Hence, he feels aggrieved at the decision.

This is a perfect example in the context of God. We assume that plagues, illnesses, poverty etc are lamentable to the point that it must be an ungodly act. Whereas, the wisdom behind it we have failed to understand. God understands the wisdom behind all things.

However, we do not claim that the death of a family member is not worthy of sympathy. Just that it is not enough to disprove God's existence. If a kid falls and scrapes his knee, we do not claim that the child is not worthy of sympathy on account of God's will.

But that his knee being scraped does not disprove God's existence. Without poverty, man would not be able to appreciate wealth. The quality of thankfulness is thus established. At the same time, it becomes meritorious of the wealthy to feed the poor. All the while the poor should remain patient during the period of adversity. These are merely weak attempts at understanding Al-Hakeem (The wise).

GOD OF THE GAPS?

Your opponent, clutching at straws, now avers the classic "god of gaps" defence. What he means is that where there is a gap in science, this does not suggest that God fills this gap.

This defence is a non-starter to say the least. Reason being, this is not something which science will itself be able to answer.

How will science be able to prove how from nothing it can turn into something without an intervening cause?

How will science be able to prove that consciousness can be passed from matter to matter without itself having same? Unless buildings begin

to start speaking to each other this will not be remotely possible.

How will science be able to explain how everything perfectly fitted into place for the universe to exist in a manner in which it operates.

STEP 3: WORSHIP

Alhamdulillah, now that it has been proven that God, even logically and philosophically speaking HAS to exist. It now has to follow that we are his servants, and he must be worshiped. Our insignificance in the context of our existence is thus apparent.

It should then follow that us, insignificant, should worship Him, significant.

Now that we are at a point in which an all being has been proven. Then necessarily his attributes must thus be:

- Eternal = On the aspect of ‘Nothingness’ it follows that God must have existed always.
- Transcendent = God must be above understanding of all beings. His power and might cannot be equated to human terms.
- Knowing = He must indeed be all knowing to be capable of such creation. It would not be possible that a God, which created a being with the propensity to create devices which store terabytes of information, is unable himself to be the bearer of all knowledge.

- Powerful = Science itself acknowledges the fine precision in which the universe exists. With accurate measures of atoms and so forth. Now can such an artwork be produced by a being that is not all powerful?
- Will = The universe did not exist. Then it did. God, thus, willed for it to happen. Further, human beings are God's creation. A being made with a will. It must necessarily follow, that God, then, too, has a will.

Once such qualities are undoubtedly proven, then God, should then, be worthy of worship.

A father tells his son that should he wash his car for a week, he'll sponsor his holiday with his friends. The son will of course make sure the car is clean in order to get his reward. He understands the money is in his father's capacity, and that he is in need of same.

Similarly, is the case with God, we are in need of his might and mercy at all times. Hence, his worship is necessary.

CONCLUSION

Indeed, it is lamentable that we have viewed the issue of science vs God as a 'grey area'. By doing so, we have indirectly hinted that science proves that God does not exist and that we must shy away from such discussions.

I remember as a child I would ask my seniors "How is Allah everywhere? And who came before Allah?" I would immediately be reprimanded for asking such questions and be warned against asking such in the future. "Don't ask such questions!". However, spending time in the company of the learned provided the following response to my question:

"Your curiosity is due to your understanding that **matter** (humans for instance) can only occupy one **space** (example one area) at a certain **time**. However, these factors do not apply to ALLAH TA'ALA. He is not bound by the dictates of time, matter, and space. Hence, he can be everywhere at one time. Furthermore, your understanding of reality is such that in terms of time, everything must have a starting point and end point. This is the system of time. However, time too, is a construct of Allah TA'ALA. He is not bound by time. Hence, he needs no starting point."

The reason I have added this dialog is because it is my ardent prayer to advise the masses that due to the current age of internet and readily accessible information, **we cannot shy away from certain topics**. This shying away, has invariably led to apostasy, and major doubts of religion.

To conclude, ALLAH TA'ALA is Khaaliq (The creator), Bari (The originator), Aziz (The great) and many other names which humans cannot comprehend. The proofs can be found logically, scientifically, philosophically, ontologically and so forth. However, it is important to note that this is a very emotional discussion, which goes to the root of our being. Hidaayat (guidance) is not in the hands of man, but in ALLAH TA'ALA. Be patient, **pray for the atheist**, and remain respectful during the process.

Please equip yourself with these basic ideas. Should you encounter an atheist who probes certain proofs with scientific counter arguments, refer to Hamza Tzortsis book titled 'The Divine Reality' which is an extensive book, dealing with such weak atheist counter arguments as well.