



Islam and Science Relation: A Critical Analysis of Contemporary Scientific Atheism of Richard Dawkins

Fasya Tharra Annada¹, Muhammad Faqih Nidzom²

^{1,2}Universitas Darussalam Gontor, Ponorogo, Indonesia

fasya.thannada@gmail.com

Abstract

Richard Dawkins, the most prominent figure of New Atheism, maintains that God and religion can be examined scientifically, positioning the theory of evolution as the central foundation of his argument. For Dawkins, evolutionary theory provides the best explanation for the origin of the universe's complexity, thereby rendering the existence of God unnecessary and setting science in direct opposition to religion. This study critically analyzes Richard Dawkins' scientific atheism from the perspective of the Islamic worldview using a qualitative approach through content analysis of Dawkins' primary works and relevant secondary literature. The findings reveal that Dawkins' rejection of the supernatural and his claim that science is the sole path to truth are rooted in the worldview of scientific naturalism, which reduces reality to its material dimensions while denying any non-empirical aspects of existence. This stands in sharp contrast to the Islamic worldview, which affirms from the outset that the universe is God's creation and that science serves as a means to understand and study nature to strengthen faith in Him. Unlike scientific naturalism, which positions science and religion as mutually contradictory, Islam presents an integrated vision where scientific inquiry and religious faith are complementary rather than oppositional. Consequently, contemporary Muslim scholars have promoted the Islamization of science to protect the Muslim community from the philosophical implications of modern science that marginalize God and religion.

Keywords: Critique of Atheism; Richard Dawkins; Science; Worldview; Islam


Article Info

Article History:

Received: 2025-10-01 Accepted: 2025-12-16 Publish: 2025-12-31



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

 doi: 10.51590/waraqat.v10i2.1134

Introduction

Human beings, as creatures endowed with the capacity for reasoning, have long questioned the origins of the complex universe and the beginning of life.¹ While the responses to such questions are diverse, they frequently converge upon the recognition of God as the Creator and Sustainer of the cosmos. Nevertheless, the claim of the existence of God as Creator has remained a central point of contention within philosophical and theological discourse. Those who affirm this existence are commonly designated as theists, whereas those who reject it are identified as atheists.²

A survey conducted by the Pew Research Center reported that in 2010, out of a global population of 6.9 billion, approximately 1.1 billion people identified as atheists, agnostics, or unaffiliated with any religion. By 2050, this number is projected to reach 1.2 billion of the world's total population.³ The significant rise of atheism can be traced to Western secularization, which has increasingly marginalized religion from public life.⁴

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, atheism gained widespread public attention through the publications of four prominent authors—Richard Dawkins, Daniel Dennett, Sam Harris, and Christopher Hitchens—who called themselves "The Four Horsemen." This movement has been regarded as a new wave of atheism, often referred to as "New Atheism."⁵ Among these figures, the most prominent is Richard Dawkins, a British evolutionary biologist who rose to public prominence with his book *The God Delusion*. In this work, Dawkins argues that belief in God constitutes a delusion unsupported by evidence.⁶ He maintains that the complexity of the universe does not require God as its cause, since science can provide a more adequate explanation.⁷ From this perspective, it is evident that Dawkins sets religion and science in opposition, consistently privileging science as the victor.

Several studies have examined Richard Dawkins and his ideas from various perspectives. From a Christian theological standpoint, John F. Haught critically examines three prominent figures of New Atheism—Richard Dawkins, Sam Harris, and Christopher Hitchens—by highlighting the scientific claims they employ as the basis for atheism and their rejection of religion.⁸ In a similar way to Haught, Jason N. Blum also critiques the scientific claims of New Atheism, focusing specifically on Richard Dawkins, whom he argues has brought science into domains where it actually undermines the very scientific character of science itself.⁹ In addition, Alister McGrath, an Irish scientist and theologian, offers a comprehensive critique of Dawkins' ideas from a Christian theological perspective.¹⁰

Meanwhile, critical research from Muslim scholars has also emerged as an important contribution to the discourse on New Atheism. Achmad Fadel and Hasan Mujtaba focus on criticizing Dawkins'

¹ Syed Muhammad Naquib Al-Attas, *Prolegomena to the Metaphysics of Islam* (Kuala Lumpur: ISTAC, 2001).

² Usmanul Khakim et al., "God and Worldview According to Al-Attas and Wall," *Tsaqafah* 16, no. 2 (2020): 229, <https://doi.org/10.21111/tsaqafah.v16i2.4853>.

³ Pew Research Center, "The Future of World Religions: Population Growth Projections, 2010-2050," 2015, <https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/2015/04/02/religious-projections-2010-2050/>.

⁴ Heddy Shri Ahimsa-Putra, "The Rise of Atheism and Secularism in the West," *Kawistara* 9, no. 3 (2019): 240, <https://doi.org/10.22146/kawistara.50160>.

⁵ Steven Kettell, "What's Really New about New Atheism?," *Palgrave Communications* 2 (2016), <https://doi.org/10.1057/palcomms.2016.99>; Stephen LeDrew, "The Evolution of Atheism: Scientific and Humanistic Approaches," *History of the Human Sciences* 25, no. 3 (2012): 71, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0952695112441301>.

⁶ Richard Dawkins, *The God Delusion* (Houghton Mifflin, 2006).

⁷ Dawkins.

⁸ John F Haught, *God and the New Atheism: A Critical Response to Dawkins, Harris, and Hitchens* (Westminster John Knox Press, 2008).

⁹ Jason N Blum, "Dawkins in Wisdom's Garden," in *Science and the Self: Animals, Evolution, and Ethics: Essays in Honour of Mary Midgley*, ed. Ian James Kidd and Liz McKinnell (New York: Routledge, 2016), 200.

¹⁰ Alister McGrath, *Dawkins' God: Genes, Memes, and the Meaning of Life* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005).

improbability argument in *The God Delusion* through a logical-philosophical analysis.¹¹ Reza Alfarizi and Naupal Asnawi highlight the problems within Dawkins' improbability argument by employing a critical realism framework.¹² In addition, Kauthar Razali et al. analyzed Dawkins' criticisms of religion in terms of epistemology, ethics, and social implications.¹³

Previous studies have offered valuable insights into Richard Dawkins' views on religion and science from both Christian and Muslim perspectives. However, existing critiques—whether from Christian theological perspectives or Muslim philosophical analyses—primarily focus on responding to Dawkins' specific arguments (such as the improbability argument) or examining the ethical and social implications of his atheism. What remains underexplored is a systematic worldview analysis that examines the foundational philosophical assumptions underlying Dawkins' scientific atheism and contrasts these comprehensively with the Islamic intellectual tradition's approach to science and religion. Previous works either refute individual arguments logically or discuss ethical concerns, but do not conduct a comprehensive analysis of the deeper metaphysical, epistemological, and axiological frameworks that structure Dawkins' entire approach to reality, knowledge, and the role of science.

This study addresses this gap by conducting a systematic worldview analysis that goes beyond point-by-point refutation to examining how Dawkins' commitment to scientific naturalism shapes his entire understanding of reality. Unlike previous works that focus on isolated arguments, this research examines the coherent philosophical system—the worldview—that underlies and connects all of Dawkins' claims about God, religion, and science. Furthermore, this study offers a distinctively Islamic response not merely as an apologetic defense but as a constructive alternative worldview grounded in both classical Islamic intellectual heritage and contemporary Muslim scholarship. The theoretical contribution of this study lies in demonstrating that the debate between New Atheism and Islam is fundamentally a clash of worldviews rather than merely a disagreement over specific evidence or arguments. Practically, this analysis provides Muslim communities and educators with a comprehensive framework for engaging with scientific atheism at its foundational level, rather than merely addressing surface-level arguments.

This study employs worldview analysis as its central analytical framework. Following James Sire's widely adopted definition, a worldview is "a commitment, a fundamental orientation of the heart, that can be expressed as a story or in a set of presuppositions (assumptions which may be true, partially true, or entirely false) which we hold (consciously or subconsciously, consistently or inconsistently) about the basic constitution of reality, and that provides the foundation on which we live and move and have our being."¹⁴ Building upon Sire's framework and integrating Syed Muhammad Naquib al-Attas' Islamic conceptualization of worldview (*Ru'yat al-Islam li al-Wujud* or Islamic vision of reality),¹⁵ this study analyzes worldviews through five key components: (1) ontological assumptions about the nature of ultimate reality, (2) epistemological presuppositions regarding the valid sources and limits of knowledge, (3) anthropological conceptions concerning the nature and purpose of human beings, (4) axiological foundations of values and ethics, and (5) teleological understanding of ultimate purpose and meaning. This five-dimensional framework allows for systematic comparison between Dawkins' scientific naturalism and the Islamic

¹¹ Achmad Fadel and Hasan Mujtaba, *Pemikiran Ateisme Richard Dawkins: Studi Kritis Argument from Improbability God Delusion* (Ponorogo: UNIDA Gontor Press, 2020).

¹² Reza Alfarizi and Naupal Asnawi, "Problem Argumen Improbabilitas Dalam The God Delusion: Kritik Terhadap New Atheism Dawkins," *Al-A'raf: Jurnal Pemikiran Islam Dan Filsafat* 17, no. 2 (2020): 358, <https://doi.org/10.22515/ajpif.v17i2.2817>.

¹³ Kauthar Razali, "The Critique of Dawkins' The God Delusion from the Islamic Epistemological Perspective," *Al-Iryad: Journal of Islamic and Contemporary Issues* 5, no. 2 (2020): 64–77.

¹⁴ James W Sire, *The Universe Next Door: A Basic Worldview Catalog*, 5th ed. (Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic, 2009).

¹⁵ Syed Muhammad Naquib Al-Attas, *Tinjauan Ringkas Peri Ilmu Dan Pandangan Alam* (Kuala Lumpur: Ta'dib International, 2019).

worldview. For each component, the study identifies Dawkins' explicit and implicit assumptions, traces their philosophical roots in naturalistic thought, and contrasts them with corresponding Islamic positions grounded in both scriptural sources and intellectual tradition. The comparative analysis moves beyond mere descriptive contrast to examine the logical entailments and practical implications of these divergent fundamental assumptions.

The Islamic worldview presented in this study draws upon a rich intellectual tradition spanning both classical and contemporary scholarship. Classical Muslim scholars such as Abu Hamid al-Ghazali, whose *Tabafut al-Falasifah* (The Incoherence of the Philosophers) engaged critically with naturalistic philosophy while defending the compatibility of reason and revelation,¹⁶ Ibn Rushd (Averroes), who in *Tabafut al-Tabafut* (The Incoherence of the Incoherence) argued for the harmonious relationship between philosophy and religious law,¹⁷ And Ibn Sina (Avicenna), whose *Al-Shifa* integrated scientific inquiry with Islamic metaphysics,¹⁸ Demonstrated that rational inquiry and revealed knowledge are complementary rather than conflicting sources of truth. These classical foundations have been further developed by contemporary Muslim scholars, including Syed Muhammad Naquib al-Attas, whose *Prolegomena to the Metaphysics of Islam* articulates a comprehensive Islamic worldview that encompasses both the material and spiritual dimensions of reality.¹⁹ Mehdi Golshani, who has extensively written on Islamic philosophy of science and the proper orientation of science within an Islamic framework,²⁰ Muzaffar Iqbal, whose work on Islam and science emphasizes the Qur'anic foundation for scientific inquiry,²¹ And Ziauddin Sardar, who has contributed significantly to discussions on Islamic science and the Islamization of knowledge.²² This study draws upon these classical and contemporary articulations to present a comprehensive Islamic response to Dawkins' scientific naturalism, demonstrating that the Islamic intellectual tradition offers a robust alternative framework for understanding the relationship between science and religion.

Using a qualitative approach and content analysis method, this research systematically analyzes Richard Dawkins' major works to identify the underlying worldview assumptions that inform his scientific atheism. Primary data sources include Dawkins' seminal publications: *The God Delusion* (2006), which presents his comprehensive case for atheism;²³ *The Blind Watchmaker* (1986), which argues for evolution as an alternative to divine design;²⁴ *The Greatest Show on Earth* (2009), which defends evolutionary theory;²⁵ *The Selfish Gene* (1976), which introduced the gene-centered view of evolution;²⁶ and *Climbing Mount Improbable* (1996), which addresses the complexity argument.²⁷ These works were selected based on three criteria: (1) their centrality to Dawkins' articulation of his atheistic worldview, (2) their explicit treatment of the science-religion relationship, and (3) their wide influence and recognition in both academic and public discourse. Secondary sources include

¹⁶ Abu Hamid Al-Ghazali, *Tabafut Al-Falasifah (The Incoherence of the Philosophers)*, ed. Sabih Ahmad Kamali (Lahore: Pakistan Philosophical Congress, 1963).

¹⁷ Ibn Rushd (Averroes), *Tabafut Al-Tabafut (The Incoherence of the Incoherence)*, ed. Simon van den Bergh (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954); Ibn Rushd (Averroes), "Fasl Al-Maqal (The Decisive Treatise)," in *Averroes on the Harmony of Religion and Philosophy*, ed. George F Hourani (London: Luzac & Co., 1961).

¹⁸ Ibn Sina (Avicenna), *Al-Shifa (The Healing)*, ed. Ibrahim Madkour (Cairo: al-Hay'ah al-Misriyah al-'Ammah lil-Kitab, 1975).

¹⁹ Al-Attas, *Prolegomena to the Metaphysics of Islam*.

²⁰ Mehdi Golshani, "Islam Can Give A Proper Orientation to Science and Technology Development," in *Islamic Perspectives on Science and Technology*, ed. Mohammed Hashim Kamali and Osman Bakar (Singapore: Springer, 2016), 123–35.

²¹ Muzaffar Iqbal, *Perspectives on Islam and Science* (Dost Publication, 2010).

²² Ziauddin Sardar, *Explorations in Islamic Science* (London: Mansell Publishing, 1989); Ziauddin Sardar, *Islamic Futures: The Shape of Ideas to Come* (Kuala Lumpur: Pelanduk Publications, 1985).

²³ Dawkins, *The God Delusion*.

²⁴ Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker* (W.W. Norton & Company, 1986).

²⁵ Richard Dawkins, *The Greatest Show on Earth: The Evidence for Evolution* (New York: Free Press, 2009).

²⁶ Richard Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene* (Oxford University Press, 1976).

²⁷ Richard Dawkins, *Climbing Mount Improbable* (Norton, 1996).

critical works by both Western scholars (McGrath, Haught, Blum, Sire, Naugle) for comparative critical perspectives, and works by Muslim scholars (al-Attas, Golshani, Iqbal, Sardar, al-Faruqi, Zarkasyi) for articulating the Islamic worldview and philosophy of science. Classical Islamic sources provide historical grounding for the Islamic intellectual tradition's approach to science and knowledge.

Content analysis was conducted systematically by identifying key themes related to the five worldview components outlined above. Relevant passages from Dawkins' works were coded according to these thematic categories using both deductive and inductive coding approaches. Deductive codes were derived from the five-component worldview framework, while inductive codes emerged from careful reading of the texts to identify additional recurring themes and patterns. For instance, statements about natural selection as the "blind watchmaker" were coded under ontological naturalism; claims about science as the sole path to truth were categorized under epistemological scientism; discussions of human consciousness as a product of genetic evolution were coded under naturalistic anthropology; and assertions about the absence of cosmic purpose were coded under nihilistic teleology. For each worldview component, systematic comparison was conducted by: (1) reconstructing Dawkins' position from coded passages with supporting quotations, (2) tracing the philosophical roots and implications of his assumptions, (3) articulating the Islamic position drawing on classical and contemporary sources, and (4) conducting analytical comparison that identifies fundamental agreements, disagreements, and their theoretical and practical implications.

To ensure interpretive validity and scientific rigor, this study employs multiple validation strategies. First, source triangulation was employed by comparing Dawkins' arguments across his different works to identify consistent patterns versus potential inconsistencies or developments in his thought. Second, theoretical triangulation was achieved by analyzing Dawkins' worldview through both secular frameworks (Sire, Naugle) and Islamic frameworks (al-Attas) to avoid potential interpretive bias from a single perspective. Third, data triangulation involved consulting secondary literature on Dawkins—including both sympathetic and critical analyses—to ensure that interpretations are grounded in scholarly consensus where it exists and acknowledge points of contention where they arise. Fourth, extensive direct quotation is provided throughout the analysis to allow readers to verify the validity of analytical claims against the primary source material. Additionally, preliminary interpretations were discussed with experts in Islamic philosophy and philosophy of science to obtain feedback and refine the analysis.

The objective of this research is to critically examine Richard Dawkins' scientific atheism from the perspective of the Islamic worldview, particularly analyzing how his commitment to scientific naturalism influences his views on the opposition between religion and science. Furthermore, this study aims to demonstrate that the Islamic worldview offers a coherent alternative framework in which science and religion are not contradictory but instead form a harmonious relationship grounded in the recognition that both empirical investigation and divine revelation are complementary sources of knowledge about reality.

Result and Discussion

Richard Dawkins on God, Religion, and Science

Clinton Richard Dawkins is an evolutionary biologist, zoologist, ethologist, and science communicator from the United Kingdom. He was born in Kenya on March 26, 1941, to Clinton John and Jean Mary Vyvyan Dawkins. Dawkins spent his early childhood in Kenya before moving to England in 1949. He initially pursued his education at Chafyn Grove School and later transferred to Oundle School, where he studied from 1954 to 1959.²⁸ It was during this period that he adopted

²⁸ Graeme M Fraser, "Richard Dawkins and Zoomorphic Creationism: Articulating New Atheism as Religious Experience," *Sophia* 55, no. 3 (2016): 361, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11841-015-0499-9>.

an anti-religious stance and abandoned all his previous Christian beliefs. Influenced by his friends, he came to embrace the theory of evolution as the explanatory narrative for the origin of life, replacing the concept of divine creation.²⁹ Dawkins has admitted that he was always fascinated by profound questions about the nature of existence. However, he claimed that religion failed to provide adequate answers to these questions, whereas science succeeded in offering explanations that satisfied him. This conviction shaped Dawkins' decision to embrace atheism and pursue a career in biology.³⁰

In 1959, Dawkins enrolled at Balliol College, Oxford University, where he studied zoology and completed his undergraduate degree in 1962. He went on to pursue both his master's and doctoral degrees at Oxford University in the same field. As a science communicator, Dawkins writes about science—particularly the theory of evolution—with a touch of popular culture, making it accessible even to lay audiences. Consequently, he gained wide recognition and has even been described as a "celebrity scientist."³¹ Dawkins is also a prolific author who has published numerous books, including *The Selfish Gene* (1976), *The Blind Watchmaker* (1986), *The God Delusion* (2006), *The Greatest Show on Earth* (2009), and *Outgrowing God* (2019).

His book *The God Delusion* is the most controversial and has drawn extensive criticism from various circles.³² In this book, Dawkins presents arguments against the existence of God and criticizes religion, which he regards as irrational, while contrasting it with science, which he considers rational.³³ In his other works, Dawkins also discusses the theory of evolution, which he upholds as true,³⁴ thereby rejecting the narrative of divine creation.

Richard Dawkins defines God as a superhuman or supernatural intelligence that consciously designs and creates the universe and everything within it. This definition of God is rejected by Dawkins, who asserts that God is a delusion—an illusion founded on local traditions of private revelation rather than evidence. Dawkins categorizes himself as a *de facto* atheist who believes that the probability of God's existence is negligible. For Dawkins, the existence of God is a scientific hypothesis that could be discovered at least in principle. He is convinced that the question of God's existence does not lie beyond the scope of science.³⁵

Dawkins rejects the concept of NOMA (non-overlapping magisteria) proposed by Stephen Jay Gould, which asserts that science and religion occupy separate domains of authority.³⁶ Dawkins disagrees that there are matters outside the scope of science that can only be examined by religion. He even regards religion as an obstacle to scientific progress.³⁷ Consequently, Dawkins perceives science and religion as mutually contradictory.

Dawkins refutes several arguments for the existence of God in *The God Delusion*. Among these, Dawkins acknowledges that the *Argument by Design* is the strongest.³⁸ He then advances the *argument from improbability*,³⁹ grounded in the theory of evolution, to demonstrate the impossibility of God's existence as the designer of the universe. This argument focuses on the complexity of God.⁴⁰

²⁹ Richard Dawkins, *An Appetite for Wonder: The Making of a Scientist* (HarperCollins, 2013).

³⁰ Fraser, "Richard Dawkins and Zoomorphic Creationism: Articulating New Atheism as Religious Experience."

³¹ David R Johnson et al., "Responding to Richard: Celebrity and (Mis)Representation of Science," *Public Understanding of Science* 27, no. 5 (2018): 535, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662516673501>.

³² William W Emilsen, "The New Atheism and Islam," *The Expository Times* 123, no. 11 (2012): 521, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0014524612448737>.

³³ LeDrew, "The Evolution of Atheism: Scientific and Humanistic Approaches."

³⁴ Dawkins, *The Greatest Show on Earth: The Evidence for Evolution*.

³⁵ Dawkins, *The God Delusion*.

³⁶ Dawkins.

³⁷ Alfarizi and Asnawi, "Problem Argumen Improbabilitas Dalam The God Delusion: Kritik Terhadap New Atheism Dawkins."

³⁸ Fadel and Mujtaba, *Pemikiran Ateisme Richard Dawkins: Studi Kritis Argument from Improbability God Delusion*.

³⁹ Dawkins, *The God Delusion*.

⁴⁰ Mark F Sharlow, *Playing Fast and Loose with Complexity: A Critique of Dawkins' Atheistic Argument from Improbability*, 2009.

Dawkins employs the analogy of "The Ultimate Boeing 747" to illustrate the extreme improbability of a complex universe suddenly coming into being. However, according to Dawkins, the existence of a complex universe is not the result of divine intervention, but rather of evolution through gradual natural selection.⁴¹

For Dawkins, if God created the universe, then God must be an entity surpassing the complexity of the universe, which would raise an even greater question concerning God's origin—leading to infinite regress. Dawkins asserts that the more satisfactory explanation for the complexity of the universe is the theory of evolution, which demonstrates that science possesses the capacity to explain how organized complexity can arise from something simple without a conscious designer.⁴² Evolution provides a plausible answer because natural selection is a cumulative process through which complexity can gradually develop step by step.⁴³ Thus, Dawkins regards evolution not merely as a theory but as a fact,⁴⁴ Even acknowledging that Darwin's theory has enabled him to become a fulfilled atheist.⁴⁵

In examining Dawkins' thought, it becomes evident that his atheism is rooted in a particular worldview referred to as *scientific naturalism*.⁴⁶ Naturalism is a metaphysical position asserting that the natural world constitutes the entirety of existence, thereby denying the existence of anything supernatural, including God. Scientific naturalism is the belief that not only is reality composed solely of natural entities, but that science is also the single best—or even the only—means of understanding it.⁴⁷ Science aligns with naturalism insofar as its methodology rejects supernatural explanations and focuses exclusively on natural causes, forces, and laws. Darwinian evolution has played a pivotal role in establishing scientific naturalism as the dominant worldview within the scientific community.⁴⁸

Scientific naturalism reduces reality to its material aspects while neglecting non-material dimensions, restricting reality to what can be empirically verified.⁴⁹ Such reductionism creates philosophical problems, as it disregards dimensions of reality that form the foundation of human experience—the soul, values, and meaning. The worldview of scientific naturalism demands that all explanations of the universe's complexity remain within the bounds of science, which is why Dawkins advances evolution as the most valid answer.⁵⁰ Even though the theory cannot fully address metaphysical questions concerning purpose, value, and meaning.

Although various forms of evidence support evolutionary theory, this does not mean that the theory can be considered an epistemic fact. As it cannot be verified through controlled and repeatable experiments over evolutionary timescales, some researchers classify evolution as *historical science* rather than *experimental science*. Science, by its nature, is limited to the empirical objects that the senses can perceive. Yet, the fact that something cannot be observed does not necessarily mean it does not exist. It is reasonable to acknowledge the limits of human understanding and the

⁴¹ Dawkins, *The God Delusion*.

⁴² Dawkins.

⁴³ Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*.

⁴⁴ Dawkins, *The Greatest Show on Earth: The Evidence for Evolution*.

⁴⁵ Zainal Abidin Malik, *Islam Dan Evolusi* (Bandung: Mizan, 2019).

⁴⁶ Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*.

⁴⁷ John F Haught, *Is Nature Enough?: Meaning and Truth in the Age of Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

⁴⁸ Arthur W H Davis and Robin Collins, "Scientific Naturalism," in *The Blackwell Companion to Science and Christianity*, ed. J B Stump and Alan G Padgett (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 233.

⁴⁹ Hamid Fahmy Zarkasyi, Mohd Farid Mohd Shahrhan Musa, and Adian Husaini Abdul Rahman, "Al-Attas's Concept of Reality: Empirical and Non-Empirical," *Kalam* 13, no. 2 (2019): 122.

⁵⁰ Dawkins, *The Greatest Show on Earth: The Evidence for Evolution*.

constraints of science itself. Science possesses immense practical value, but this does not imply that everything can be answered by science.⁵¹

To assert that science is the sole source of truth amounts to a dogma that contradicts the principles of science itself.⁵² Dawkins conflates science with ideology, presenting what is no longer pure science but rather pseudoscience.⁵³ Dawkins does not provide a clear definition of God as a delusion but merely asserts that belief in God lacks empirical evidence. What Dawkins means by evidence refers exclusively to empirical evidence perceived through the senses.⁵⁴ In contrast, those who hold genuine faith possess logical evidence of God's existence—evidence that is a priori and epistemologically fundamental rather than derived from sensory perception.⁵⁵

The idea of God as Creator is profoundly rational when the data of human perception and reflection upon the cosmos are contemplated deeply. It seems inconceivable that the extraordinary complexity and precision of the universe could emerge from nothing without a cause and continue to exist in perfect harmony without a Creator.⁵⁶ Moreover, Dawkins' question "who created God?" is illogical because it places God in the same category as his creation, when in fact, the creator must not be identical in form and essence to what is created.⁵⁷ Furthermore, if we apply Dawkins' reasoning to science's goal of discovering the *Theory of Everything*, the same question arises: what explains the Theory of Everything? This question would also be endless.⁵⁸

If Dawkins' definition of God as a supernatural entity is reconsidered, it becomes evident that he implicitly acknowledges that God transcends the natural order and is not bound by the laws of nature. Due to this, discourse about God does not fall within the domain of science, and science cannot serve as the determinant of God's existence. Dawkins' position, which sets science and religion in opposition, further complicates their relationship and casts a negative image upon science itself.⁵⁹ In reality, not all scientists are atheists, and religion does not reject science. Within Islam in particular, science is neither separate from nor contradictory to religion but rather must be guided by it.⁶⁰

Comparative Worldview Analysis: Scientific Naturalism and Islamic Worldview

Having examined Dawkins' scientific atheism and the foundational assumptions of scientific naturalism, a systematic comparative analysis is necessary between the naturalistic worldview and the Islamic worldview. This analysis employs the five-dimensional framework: ontological assumptions, epistemological presuppositions, anthropological conceptions, axiological foundations, and teleological understanding. Rather than merely presenting descriptive contrasts, this section examines how these divergent foundational assumptions lead to fundamentally different conclusions about the relationship between science and religion.

Ontological Assumptions: The Nature of Ultimate Reality

Dawkins' scientific naturalism operates from the ontological assumption that only the natural or material realm exists. Reality is exhaustively constituted by matter, energy, and physical laws.

⁵¹ Alister McGrath and Joanna Collicutt McGrath, *The Dawkins Delusion?* (London: SPCK, 2007).

⁵² Jure Zovko and Mate Penava, "Scientism as a Fundamentalist Worldview," *Mostariensia* 26, no. 2 (2023): 8, <https://doi.org/10.47960/2831-0322.2022.2.26.7>.

⁵³ Fadel and Mujtaba, *Pemikiran Ateisme Richard Dawkins: Studi Kritis Argument from Improbability God Delusion*.

⁵⁴ Alexander Bird, "Scientific Evidence," in *The Routledge Handbook of the Philosophy of Evidence* (New York: Routledge, 2024), 528.

⁵⁵ Ben Martin and Ole Thomassen Hjortland, "Evidence in Logic," in *The Routledge Handbook of the Philosophy of Evidence* (New York: Routledge, 2024), 467.

⁵⁶ Abul Feda', *Blasting the Foundations of Atheism*, Second, vol. 1 (Waqfeya, 2009).

⁵⁷ Muhammad Al-Sanusi and Ahmad Al-Mallali, *Syarh Umm Al-Barabih Li Al-Imam Al-Sanusi* (Maktabah Syamilah, n.d.).

⁵⁸ Eric Reitan, *Is God A Delusion? A Reply to Religion's Cultured Despisers* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2009).

⁵⁹ Elaine Howard Ecklund and David R Johnson, *Varieties of Atheism in Science*, 1st ed. (Oxford University Press, 2021).

⁶⁰ Risal Qori Amarullah and Supriyatin, "Kritik Islam Terhadap Sains Barat," *Edusifa* 8, no. 2 (2023): 57, <https://doi.org/10.56146/edusifa.v7i1.33>.

Dawkins explicitly rejects any supernatural realm, arguing that belief in entities beyond nature lacks empirical evidence. This represents metaphysical naturalism: the view that there is no God or anything like God, and that nature is all there is.⁶¹ From this naturalistic ontology flows a crucial implication: all explanations must remain within natural causation. Dawkins's insistence on evolutionary theory as the exclusive explanation for biological complexity follows necessarily from his ontological commitment to naturalism.

In sharp contrast, the Islamic worldview begins with a radically different ontological premise: reality comprises both the visible realm (*'alam al-shahādah*) and the unseen realm (*'alam al-ghayb*). The Qur'an explicitly affirms this dual structure: "Knower of the unseen and the witnessed" (Q. 6:73). The visible realm encompasses all material phenomena accessible to human senses—the cosmos, natural laws, physical processes. The unseen realm includes non-material realities that transcend empirical observation: God's essence, angels, the soul (*ruh*), divine intervention, and eschatological realities.⁶²

Classical Muslim philosophers elaborated sophisticated ontological systems integrating both realms. Ibn Sina (Avicenna), in his *Al-Shifa*, distinguished between necessary existence (*wajib al-wujud*)—God, whose existence is self-caused and eternal—and contingent existence (*mumkin al-wujud*)—the created universe, which depends on God for its existence.⁶³ This ontological distinction grounds the Islamic understanding that while the universe operates according to observable laws, these laws are not self-explanatory but point beyond themselves to a transcendent Creator.

The fundamental disagreement is not primarily about empirical evidence but about the scope of reality itself. Dawkins restricts reality to what is empirically verifiable, while Islam affirms dimensions of reality that transcend empirical verification yet remain rationally demonstrable through philosophical argument and accessible through revelation.

Epistemological Presuppositions: Sources and Limits of Knowledge

Dawkins' epistemological position privileges empirical science as the sole reliable path to truth. He argues that the scientific method is the only valid means of acquiring genuine knowledge about reality. This epistemological scientism asserts that if science cannot verify a claim, it cannot be known to be true. Dawkins explicitly rejects revelation, religious authority, or metaphysical reasoning as forms of "blind faith." However, this contains internal tensions: the claim that "only empirically verifiable statements are meaningful" is itself not empirically verifiable—it is a philosophical assumption rather than a scientific finding.⁶⁴

The Islamic epistemological framework presents a more comprehensive account. Classical Muslim scholars, particularly al-Ghazali in his *Al-Munqidh min al-Dalal*, identified four primary sources of knowledge: (1) sense perception (*al-hiss*), (2) rational demonstration (*al-'aql*), (3) intuitive knowledge (*al-dhawq*), and (4) prophetic revelation (*al-wahy*).⁶⁵ These sources are understood not as competing alternatives but as complementary modes of accessing different dimensions of reality.

Islam fully affirms the validity and necessity of empirical investigation. The Qur'an repeatedly calls upon human beings to observe natural phenomena as signs pointing to divine wisdom: "Indeed, in the creation of the heavens and the earth and the alternation of the night and the day are signs for those of understanding" (Q. 3:190). Rational demonstration enables knowledge of logical truths and metaphysical realities that transcend empirical observation. Ibn Rushd (Averroes), in his *Fasl*

⁶¹ Alvin Plantinga, *Where the Conflict Really Lies: Science, Religion, and Naturalism* (Oxford University Press, 2011).

⁶² Zarkasyi, Musa, and Rahman, "Al-Attas's Concept of Reality: Empirical and Non-Empirical."

⁶³ Ibn Sina (Avicenna), *Al-Shifa: Al-Ilabiyat (The Metaphysics)*, ed. Ibrahim Madkour (Cairo: al-Hay'ah al-Misriyah al-'Ammah lil-Kitab, 1975).

⁶⁴ Alvin Plantinga, "Religion and Science," ed. Edward N Zalta, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2023, <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2023/entries/religion-science/>.

⁶⁵ al-Ghazali, *Al-Munqidh Min Al-Dalal*, ed. Richard Joseph McCarthy, *Deliverance from Error* (Twayne Publishers, 1980).

al-Maqal, argued that rational philosophical inquiry and religious truth are not only compatible but mutually supportive.⁶⁶ Finally, prophetic revelation provides knowledge of realities that lie beyond both sensory and rational access—God's attributes, divine will, the afterlife, and moral absolutes.⁶⁷

The analytical comparison reveals fundamentally different conceptions of knowledge itself. Dawkins restricts knowledge to what can be empirically verified, excluding entire domains of reality from rational consideration. The Islamic framework acknowledges the validity of empirical science while insisting that science alone cannot provide a complete account of reality. From an Islamic perspective, Dawkins' dismissal of revelation as "blind faith" represents a category error: revelation provides knowledge of realities outside the proper domain of empirical science, yet remains a genuine object of knowledge accessible through other valid epistemic modes.

Anthropological Conceptions: The Nature and Purpose of Human Beings

Dawkins' naturalistic anthropology views human beings as products of blind evolutionary processes. In *The Selfish Gene*, he argues that organisms are essentially "survival machines" constructed by genes to ensure their replication.⁶⁸ Human consciousness, morality, and sense of purpose are evolutionary adaptations. There is no special ontological status to humanity. This has profound implications: if humans are merely gene-replicating machines, then meaning, purpose, and value are ultimately illusory—useful fictions evolved to enhance survival but corresponding to nothing real. Dawkins acknowledges this, stating that the universe exhibits "precisely the properties we should expect if there is, at bottom, no design, no purpose, no evil and no good, nothing but blind, pitiless indifference."⁶⁹

The Islamic anthropological conception presents a radically different understanding. Human beings occupy a unique ontological status as *khalīfat Allāh* (vicegerent of God) on earth. The Qur'an describes the creation of the first human with divine intention: "When your Lord said to the angels, 'Indeed, I will make upon the earth a vicegerent'" (Q. 2:30). This vicegerency confers both dignity and responsibility: humans are created with capacity for knowledge, moral agency, and spiritual development that distinguish them from all other creatures.

Classical Islamic thought recognizes human beings as composite entities possessing both material (*jism*) and spiritual (*rūh*) dimensions. Ibn Sina's analysis of the soul in *Al-Shifa* argues that the rational soul (*al-nafs al-nāṭiqah*) is immaterial and therefore not subject to physical dissolution—providing philosophical grounding for the soul's immortality.⁷⁰ Moreover, Islamic anthropology affirms that humans are endowed with *fiṭrah*—an innate disposition toward recognizing and worshipping the One God. The Qur'an states: "So direct your face toward the religion, inclining to truth. [Adhere to] the *fiṭrah* of Allah upon which He has created [all] people" (Q. 30:30).

The comparison reveals incompatible understandings of human significance. Dawkins' naturalistic anthropology ultimately undermines the notions of human dignity, moral responsibility, and existential meaning that most people take for granted. The Islamic anthropology provides a metaphysical foundation for human dignity and moral accountability that naturalism cannot supply. If humans are merely sophisticated animals, the basis for universal human rights and ethical obligations becomes problematic; if humans are vicegerents of God, these concepts have secure metaphysical grounding.

⁶⁶ (Averroes), "Fasl Al-Maqal (The Decisive Treatise)."

⁶⁷ al-Ghazali, *Al-Munqidh Min Al-Dalāl*.

⁶⁸ Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene*.

⁶⁹ Richard Dawkins, *River Out of Eden: A Darwinian View of Life* (New York: Basic Books, 1995).

⁷⁰ Ibn Sina (Avicenna), *Al-Shifa: Al-Nafs (The Soul)*, ed. Ibrahim Madkour (Cairo: al-Hay'ah al-Misriyah al-'Ammah lil-Kitab, 1975).

Axiological Foundations and Teleological Understanding

Dawkins faces a well-recognized challenge in grounding ethics within his naturalistic framework. He attempts to ground morality in evolutionary processes, suggesting that ethical impulses evolved because cooperative behavior enhanced survival. However, this evolutionary account describes how moral beliefs arise, not why they should be binding. As philosopher J.L. Mackie acknowledged, if objective moral values exist, they would constitute robust evidence against naturalism, because naturalism provides no ontological foundation for objective prescriptive truths.⁷¹ Dawkins' position appears self-undermining: he makes strong moral claims while holding a worldview that provides no secure foundation for moral realism.

Similarly, Dawkins explicitly denies any cosmic purpose or ultimate meaning. The universe was not designed and does not exist for any purpose. Natural selection creates the appearance of design through cumulative selection of random variations, but this is "blind watchmaking" without foresight or intent. If there is no ultimate purpose to existence, then any meaning humans construct is subjective and ultimately arbitrary.

The Islamic worldview grounds ethics in divine revelation and God's nature. Al-Ghazali argued that genuine goodness consists in conformity with divine commandments, which reflect God's perfect wisdom.⁷² Ibn Rushd argued that reason can discern certain moral truths independently, yet revelation provides certainty and completeness that reason alone cannot achieve.⁷³ Islamic ethics is teleological: human flourishing (*falah*) is understood as conformity to one's created purpose. Just as a knife functions well when fulfilling its design, humans flourish when they fulfill their purpose as vicegerents of God—worshipping Him, acting justly, developing virtues, and using creation responsibly.

The Islamic worldview is fundamentally teleological. The Qur'an repeatedly asserts that creation has purpose: "And I did not create the jinn and mankind except to worship Me" (Q. 51:56). Classical Muslim philosophers developed sophisticated teleological frameworks. Ibn Sina's distinction between necessary and contingent existence entails that contingent entities exist for a purpose determined by the Necessary Being (God).⁷⁴ If human life has an ultimate purpose, then existential meaning is discovered rather than invented, and standards of human flourishing are objective rather than subjective.

Synthesis

This comparative analysis demonstrates that the disagreement between Dawkins' scientific naturalism and the Islamic worldview extends far beyond particular evidence to the foundational assumptions through which reality is interpreted. At every level—ontological, epistemological, anthropological, axiological, and teleological—the two worldviews operate from incompatible premises, generating incompatible conclusions.

The fundamental question is not "Do scientific evidences support or contradict religious belief?" but rather "Which worldview provides the most coherent, comprehensive, and rationally compelling account of reality in its totality?" The Islamic response maintains that naturalism—despite its explanatory power within limited domains—ultimately fails as a complete worldview because it cannot account for the preconditions of science itself (rationality, mathematical order, epistemic reliability), the foundations of morality, or the existential significance of human existence. The Islamic alternative offers a more adequate framework by recognizing both the autonomy of

⁷¹ J L Mackie, *Ethics: Inventing Right and Wrong* (London: Penguin Books, 1977).

⁷² Abu Hamid Al-Ghazali, *Ihya Ulum Al-Din (The Revival of the Religious Sciences)*, ed. Muhammad Abul Quasem, vol. 3 (Kuala Lumpur: Central Printing Sdn. Bhd., 1971).

⁷³ (Averroes), "Fasl Al-Maqal (The Decisive Treatise)."

⁷⁴ (Avicenna), *Al-Shifa: Al-Ilahiyat (The Metaphysics)*.

natural causation within its proper sphere and its ultimate grounding in transcendent divine purpose.

Science in the Perspective of the Worldview of Islam

The worldview of Islam constitutes a holistic perspective on reality, encompassing both the empirical and the non-empirical, as well as the domains of this world and the hereafter. Al-Attas refers to the Islamic worldview as *Ru'yat al-Islam li al-Wujud*, defined as a vision of reality and truth that reveals the essence of existence in its entirety, both physical and metaphysical.⁷⁵ It functions as the foundational framework for Muslim thought and guides all aspects of life, including scientific endeavors. From the perspective of Islam, the universe is regarded as the Creation of God. Consequently, the natural world must be understood, observed, and studied through the lens of the worldview of Islam.⁷⁶

The source of the Islamic worldview is divine revelation, which shapes the outlook of Muslims by grounding their perspective in the Qur'an and the Sunnah. Although the Qur'an does not provide a detailed account of when and how the universe was created, it commands human beings to reflect (*tafakkur*) and to investigate the processes of creation, thereby framing scientific inquiry as a form of religious duty.⁷⁷

The Qur'an affirms that reality comprises two interrelated dimensions: the unseen realm (*'alam al-ghayb*) and the visible realm (*'alam al-shahādah*). The unseen realm refers to non-material reality that cannot be perceived by human senses—the essence of God, divine intervention, the soul, and the hereafter. The visible realm refers to material reality that human senses and intellect can apprehend—the cosmos, the world, and human beings.⁷⁸ The Qur'an acknowledges the role of the senses and intellect in understanding the universe, yet maintains that they cannot yield comprehensive understanding without the complement of intuition and revelation.⁷⁹

All natural phenomena are viewed as signs of God's existence and omnipotence. For this reason, Islam does not recognize a separation between science and religion, since the concepts and theories of Muslims are always linked to God.⁸⁰ This distinguishes Islamic science from Western science, which leaves no room for God or religion, and when treated as absolute, positions itself in opposition to religion.

The most crucial issue in the discourse on religion and science concerns the question of origins. Modern science arose from the assumption that the universe began through a gradual evolutionary process in which simple entities evolved into complex ones, leading to the conclusion that the universe developed by itself without divine intervention. As al-Attas explains, modern science developed from a philosophy that proclaimed the becoming of all things from one another, conceiving the cosmos as eternal, self-subsisting, and evolving according to its own laws—a philosophy that implicitly denies the reality of the One God.⁸¹

Accordingly, modern science, grounded in the Western worldview, differs fundamentally from science based on the Islamic worldview. The epistemological basis of Islam includes not only the senses and reason but also revelation and intuition. Modern science focuses solely on reason and the senses, thus being limited to the physical dimension and excluding the metaphysical.

⁷⁵ Al-Attas, *Prolegomena to the Metaphysics of Islam*.

⁷⁶ Hamid Fahmy Zarkasyi, "Makna Sains Islam," *Islamia: Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Peradaban Islam* 3, no. 4 (2008): 15–32.

⁷⁷ Iqbal, *Perspectives on Islam and Science*; Mohammad Muslih, "Al-Qur'an Dan Lahirnya Sains Teistik," *Tsaqafah* 12, no. 2 (2016): 269, <https://doi.org/10.21111/tsaqafah.v12i2.756>.

⁷⁸ M Kamal Hassan, "The Necessity of Studying the Natural Sciences from the Qur'anic Worldview," in *Islamic Perspectives on Science and Technology* (Springer, 2016), 112–28.

⁷⁹ Golshani, "Islam Can Give A Proper Orientation to Science and Technology Development."

⁸⁰ Muhammad Thoyib, "Model Integrasi Sains Dan Agama," *Akademika* 18, no. 1 (2013): 13.

⁸¹ Al-Attas, *Tinjauan Ringkas Peri Ilmu Dan Pandangan Alam*.

Consequently, modern science tends to avoid explanations associated with God, which in its extreme form can lead to atheism, as exemplified by Richard Dawkins.

Many Muslims adopt modern science without critical filtering or adaptation. While embracing scientific developments is not wrong, Muslims need to ensure alignment with the Islamic worldview. Science is not value-free but is grounded in the paradigm of the scientists. Al-Attas offers the analogy that science is like a knife: its value is determined by the one who wields it. Islam is not merely a religion practiced through ritual worship but a knowledge-based faith that must be manifested in action as a comprehensive worldview. On this basis, contemporary Muslim scholars have contributed ideas and programs to reintegrate Islamic values into modern science, including Syed Muhammad Naquib al-Attas, Ismail al-Faruqi, Ziauddin Sardar, Mehdi Golshani, Muzaffar Iqbal, and others.

The objective of Islamization of science is to prevent Muslims from being exposed to corrupted knowledge that leads to error and to acquire authentic knowledge that enhances faith and piety. Islamization operates not solely at the level of worldview but extends to paradigm, methodology, and theory.⁸² Islamic science seeks to reformulate the "Islamization of Knowledge" as a long-term research program that is experimental, practical, and empirical, to embed Islamic values and adab within all scientific endeavors in the modern era.⁸³

Conclusion

This study has conducted a critical analysis of Richard Dawkins' scientific atheism from the perspective of the Islamic worldview, demonstrating that the debate between New Atheism and Islam extends far beyond disagreements over particular scientific evidence to a fundamental clash of worldviews. Through systematic examination of the foundational assumptions underlying Dawkins's thought and their comparison with Islamic intellectual tradition, several significant conclusions emerge.

First, Richard Dawkins' rejection of God's existence and his opposition between science and religion are deeply rooted in the worldview of scientific naturalism. This philosophical framework presupposes that reality consists solely of the natural or material realm, that science is the exclusive path to knowledge, and that all explanations of phenomena must remain within the bounds of natural causation. From these foundational assumptions, Dawkins' specific claims necessarily follow: his insistence on evolutionary theory as the only acceptable explanation for biological complexity, his treatment of God's existence as a scientific hypothesis subject to empirical falsification, and his dismissal of revelation as "blind faith." However, this worldview faces significant internal tensions. Scientific naturalism cannot account for the preconditions of science itself—such as the reliability of human rationality, the mathematical structure of nature, or the validity of logical inference—all of which transcend empirical verification. Moreover, it struggles to provide coherent foundations for objective moral values and existential meaning, ultimately undermining the very human dignity and ethical obligations that Dawkins himself affirms in practice.

Second, the Islamic worldview offers a radically different framework for understanding the relationship between science and religion. Grounded in both classical Islamic intellectual heritage and contemporary Muslim scholarship, Islam affirms from the outset that the universe is God's creation and that science serves as a means to understand and study nature in order to strengthen faith in Him. This worldview recognizes a dual structure of reality comprising both the visible realm (*'alam al-shahādah*), which is the proper domain of empirical science, and the unseen realm (*'alam*

⁸² M Faqih Nidzom, Hamid Fahmy Zarkasyi, and Setiawan bin Lahuri, *Merumuskan Rangka Kerja Islamisasi Ilmu Pengetahuan: Islamisasi Worldview, Paradigma, Teori* (UNIDA Gontor Press, 2023).

⁸³ Adi Setia, "Tiga Pengertian Sains Islam," in *Islamic Science (Paradigma, Fakta, Dan Agenda)* (Institute for the Study of Islamic Thought and Civilizations (INSISTS), 2025).

al-ghayb), which is accessible through revelation and rational demonstration. The Islamic epistemological framework acknowledges four complementary sources of knowledge—sense perception, rational demonstration, intuitive knowledge, and prophetic revelation—thereby affirming the validity of empirical science while insisting that science alone cannot provide a complete account of reality. Classical Muslim philosophers such as al-Ghazzali, Ibn Rushd, and Ibn Sina demonstrated through sophisticated philosophical arguments that rational inquiry and revealed knowledge are not contradictory but mutually supportive, and that the natural world, while operating according to observable laws, ultimately points beyond itself to a transcendent Creator.

Third, the comparative worldview analysis conducted in this study reveals that at every fundamental level—ontological, epistemological, anthropological, axiological, and teleological—scientific naturalism and Islamic worldview operate from incompatible premises that generate incompatible conclusions. Ontologically, Dawkins restricts reality to what is empirically verifiable, while Islam affirms dimensions of reality that transcend empirical verification yet remain rationally demonstrable. Epistemologically, Dawkins privileges empirical science as the sole source of knowledge, while Islam recognizes multiple complementary epistemic modes. Anthropologically, Dawkins views humans as gene-replicating machines produced by blind evolutionary processes with no special ontological status. At the same time, Islam affirms humans as *khalfat Allah*, endowed with unique dignity, moral responsibility, and spiritual purpose. Axiologically and teleologically, Dawkins' naturalism struggles to ground objective moral values and denies cosmic purpose. At the same time, Islam provides metaphysical foundations for ethics and meaning through divine revelation and the recognition that existence has an ultimate purpose in the worship and knowledge of God. These divergent foundational assumptions have profound practical implications for how science is understood, practiced, and integrated into a coherent vision of human life and civilizational purpose.

Fourth, contrary to Dawkins' claim that science and religion are inevitably in conflict, Islam does not separate science from religion but instead guides to ensure that scientific endeavors remain aligned with their proper purpose and ethical orientation. The Qur'an commands human beings to reflect upon and investigate the natural world, thereby framing scientific inquiry as a form of religious duty. All natural phenomena are viewed as signs (*āyāt*) of God's existence, wisdom, and power. However, modern science, which has been shaped by a naturalistic worldview, tends to avoid explanations of the universe that are associated with God. In its most extreme form, this can lead to atheism, as exemplified by Richard Dawkins. Therefore, Muslims need to engage with modern science critically, ensuring adaptation and alignment with the Islamic worldview. For this reason, contemporary Muslim scholars have advanced the project of Islamization of science—not to reject scientific findings but to protect the Muslim community from the negative intellectual and spiritual consequences that arise when science is detached from its metaphysical foundations and treated as an autonomous, value-neutral enterprise that recognizes no authority beyond empirical observation.

The fundamental question raised by this analysis is not simply whether particular scientific evidence supports or contradicts religious belief, but rather which worldview provides the most coherent, comprehensive, and rationally compelling account of reality in its totality. This study demonstrates that scientific naturalism, despite its explanatory power within limited domains, ultimately fails as a complete worldview because it cannot adequately account for the full range of human experience and knowledge. The Islamic alternative offers a more adequate framework by recognizing both the legitimate autonomy of natural causation within its proper sphere and its ultimate grounding in transcendent divine purpose, thereby integrating empirical investigation, rational inquiry, moral reasoning, and spiritual insight into a unified vision of reality.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study opens several avenues for further investigation. Future research may explore in greater depth how the Islamic worldview provides an alternative philosophical foundation for specific scientific disciplines. For instance, how do key Islamic metaphysical principles such as *tawhīd* (divine unity), divine causality (*al-‘illiyah al-ilahiyah*), and the purposefulness of creation shape distinctive approaches to cosmology, biology, environmental science, and physics? Additionally, empirical studies could investigate practical methodologies for integrating the Islamic worldview into modern scientific education at various levels, examining how curriculum design, pedagogical approaches, and institutional structures can be reformed to cultivate both scientific literacy and metaphysical awareness among Muslim students.

Moreover, comparative studies examining how other major religious traditions—particularly Christianity and Judaism—respond to scientific naturalism and New Atheism could enrich understanding of the broader religion-science discourse. While this study has focused specifically on the Islamic response, analyzing commonalities and differences among theistic responses to naturalism would illuminate both shared concerns and tradition-specific insights. Finally, further research is needed on the historical and contemporary development of Islamic science as a research program, examining case studies of Muslim scientists who have successfully integrated their faith commitments with rigorous scientific practice, thereby demonstrating the viability of theocentric approaches to science that avoid both religious fundamentalism and secular scientism.

Acknowledgement

All praise and gratitude belong to Allah Swt., the Bestower of knowledge and understanding, without Whose guidance and mercy this research would not have been possible. The authors express sincere appreciation to the lecturers of the Postgraduate Program at the University of Darussalam Gontor for their invaluable guidance, constructive feedback, and continuous support throughout the research process. Their expertise and dedication have significantly contributed to the intellectual rigor and scholarly quality of this work.

Special thanks are conveyed to all participants in the Focus Group Discussion whose insights, critical questions, and thoughtful contributions enriched the depth and comprehensiveness of this study. The collaborative exchange of ideas in these sessions proved instrumental in refining the analytical framework and sharpening the comparative analysis presented in this article.

The authors further acknowledge with deep gratitude the Ministry of Higher Education, Science, and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia (Kementerian Pendidikan Tinggi, Sains, dan Teknologi) for providing the research grant that made this work possible. This generous financial support enabled the extensive library research, access to critical academic resources, and dedicated time required to conduct a thorough investigation of this complex and significant topic.

Finally, the authors express appreciation to the editorial team and anonymous reviewers of *Waraqat: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Keislaman* for their constructive feedback and suggestions that have strengthened this article. Any remaining shortcomings are solely the responsibility of the authors.

Reference

- (Averroes), Ibn Rushd. “Fasl Al-Maqal (The Decisive Treatise).” In *Averroes on the Harmony of Religion and Philosophy*, edited by George F Hourani. London: Luzac & Co., 1961.
- . *Tabafut Al-Tabafut (The Incoherence of the Incoherence)*. Edited by Simon van den Bergh. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954.
- (Avicenna), Ibn Sina. *Al-Shifa: Al-Ilahiyat (The Metaphysics)*. Edited by Ibrahim Madkour. Cairo: al-Hay’ah al-Misriyah al-‘Ammah lil-Kitab, 1975.
- . *Al-Shifa: Al-Nafs (The Soul)*. Edited by Ibrahim Madkour. Cairo: al-Hay’ah al-Misriyah al-‘Ammah lil-Kitab, 1975.

- . *Al-Shifa (The Healing)*. Edited by Ibrahim Madkour. Cairo: al-Hay'ah al-Misriyah al-'Ammah lil-Kitab, 1975.
- Ahimsa-Putra, Heddy Shri. "The Rise of Atheism and Secularism in the West." *Kawistara* 9, no. 3 (2019): 240. <https://doi.org/10.22146/kawistara.50160>.
- Al-Attas, Syed Muhammad Naquib. *Prolegomena to the Metaphysics of Islam*. Kuala Lumpur: ISTAC, 2001.
- . *Tinjauan Ringkas Peri Ilmu Dan Pandangan Alam*. Kuala Lumpur: Ta'dib International, 2019.
- Al-Ghazali. *Al-Munqidh Min Al-Dalāl*. Edited by Richard Joseph McCarthy. *Deliverance from Error*. Twayne Publishers, 1980.
- Al-Ghazali, Abu Hamid. *Ihya Ulum Al-Din (The Revival of the Religious Sciences)*. Edited by Muhammad Abul Quasem. Vol. 3. Kuala Lumpur: Central Printing Sdn. Bhd., 1971.
- . *Tabafut Al-Falasifah (The Incoherence of the Philosophers)*. Edited by Sabih Ahmad Kamali. Lahore: Pakistan Philosophical Congress, 1963.
- Al-Sanusi, Muhammad, and Ahmad Al-Mallali. *Syarh Umm Al-Barahin Li Al-Imam Al-Sanusi*. Maktabah Syamilah, n.d.
- Alfarizi, Reza, and Naupal Asnawi. "Problem Argumen Improbabilitas Dalam The God Delusion: Kritik Terhadap New Atheism Dawkins." *Al-A'raf: Jurnal Pemikiran Islam Dan Filsafat* 17, no. 2 (2020): 358. <https://doi.org/10.22515/ajpif.v17i2.2817>.
- Amarullah, Risal Qori, and Supriyatin. "Kritik Islam Terhadap Sains Barat." *Edusifa* 8, no. 2 (2023): 57. <https://doi.org/10.56146/edusifa.v7i1.33>.
- Bird, Alexander. "Scientific Evidence." In *The Routledge Handbook of the Philosophy of Evidence*, 528. New York: Routledge, 2024.
- Blum, Jason N. "Dawkins in Wisdom's Garden." In *Science and the Self: Animals, Evolution, and Ethics: Essays in Honour of Mary Midgley*, edited by Ian James Kidd and Liz McKinnell, 200. New York: Routledge, 2016.
- Center, Pew Research. "The Future of World Religions: Population Growth Projections, 2010-2050," 2015. <https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/2015/04/02/religious-projections-2010-2050/>.
- Davis, Arthur W H, and Robin Collins. "Scientific Naturalism." In *The Blackwell Companion to Science and Christianity*, edited by J B Stump and Alan G Padgett, 233. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
- Dawkins, Richard. *An Appetite for Wonder: The Making of a Scientist*. HarperCollins, 2013.
- . *Climbing Mount Improbable*. Norton, 1996.
- . *River Out of Eden: A Darwinian View of Life*. New York: Basic Books, 1995.
- . *The Blind Watchmaker*. W.W. Norton & Company, 1986.
- . *The God Delusion*. Houghton Mifflin, 2006.
- . *The Greatest Show on Earth: The Evidence for Evolution*. New York: Free Press, 2009.
- . *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Ecklund, Elaine Howard, and David R Johnson. *Varieties of Atheism in Science*. 1st ed. Oxford University Press, 2021.
- Emilsen, William W. "The New Atheism and Islam." *The Expository Times* 123, no. 11 (2012): 521. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0014524612448737>.

- Fadel, Achmad, and Hasan Mujtaba. *Pemikiran Ateisme Richard Dawkins: Studi Kritis Argument from Improbability God Delusion*. Ponorogo: UNIDA Gontor Press, 2020.
- Feda', Abul. *Blasting the Foundations of Atheism*. Second. Vol. 1. Waqfeya, 2009.
- Fraser, Graeme M. "Richard Dawkins and Zoomorphic Creationism: Articulating New Atheism as Religious Experience." *Sophia* 55, no. 3 (2016): 361. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11841-015-0499-9>.
- Golshani, Mehdi. "Islam Can Give A Proper Orientation to Science and Technology Development." In *Islamic Perspectives on Science and Technology*, edited by Mohammed Hashim Kamali and Osman Bakar, 123–35. Singapore: Springer, 2016.
- Hassan, M Kamal. "The Necessity of Studying the Natural Sciences from the Qur'anic Worldview." In *Islamic Perspectives on Science and Technology*, 112–28. Springer, 2016.
- Haight, John F. *God and the New Atheism: A Critical Response to Dawkins, Harris, and Hitchens*. Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.
- . *Is Nature Enough?: Meaning and Truth in the Age of Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Iqbal, Muzaffar. *Perspectives on Islam and Science*. Dost Publication, 2010.
- Johnson, David R, Elaine Howard Ecklund, Di Di, and Kirstin R. W. Matthews. "Responding to Richard: Celebrity and (Mis)Representation of Science." *Public Understanding of Science* 27, no. 5 (2018): 535. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662516673501>.
- Kettell, Steven. "What's Really New about New Atheism?" *Palgrave Communications* 2 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1057/palcomms.2016.99>.
- Khakim, Usmanul, Teguh Kurniyanto, Mahendra Utama Cahya Ramadhan, Muhammad Habiburrahman, and Muhammad Iksan Rahmadian. "God and Worldview According to Al-Attas and Wall." *Tsaqafah* 16, no. 2 (2020): 229. <https://doi.org/10.21111/tsaqafah.v16i2.4853>.
- LeDrew, Stephen. "The Evolution of Atheism: Scientific and Humanistic Approaches." *History of the Human Sciences* 25, no. 3 (2012): 71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0952695112441301>.
- Mackie, J L. *Ethics: Inventing Right and Wrong*. London: Penguin Books, 1977.
- Malik, Zainal Abidin. *Islam Dan Evolusi*. Bandung: Mizan, 2019.
- Martin, Ben, and Ole Thomassen Hjortland. "Evidence in Logic." In *The Routledge Handbook of the Philosophy of Evidence*, 467. New York: Routledge, 2024.
- McGrath, Alister. *Dawkins' God: Genes, Memes, and the Meaning of Life*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.
- McGrath, Alister, and Joanna Collicutt McGrath. *The Dawkins Delusion?* London: SPCK, 2007.
- Muslih, Mohammad. "Al-Qur'an Dan Lahirnya Sains Teistik." *Tsaqafah* 12, no. 2 (2016): 269. <https://doi.org/10.21111/tsaqafah.v12i2.756>.
- Nidzom, M Faqih, Hamid Fahmy Zarkasyi, and Setiawan bin Lahuri. *Merumuskan Rangka Kerja Islamisasi Ilmu Pengetahuan: Islamisasi Worldview, Paradigma, Teori*. UNIDA Gontor Press, 2023.
- Plantinga, Alvin. "Religion and Science." Edited by Edward N Zalta. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2023. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2023/entries/religion-science/>.
- . *Where the Conflict Really Lies: Science, Religion, and Naturalism*. Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Razali, Kauthar. "The Critique of Dawkins' The God Delusion from the Islamic Epistemological

- Perspective.” *Al-Iryad: Journal of Islamic and Contemporary Issues* 5, no. 2 (2020): 64–77.
- Reitan, Eric. *Is God A Delusion? A Reply to Religion’s Cultured Despisers*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
- Sardar, Ziauddin. *Explorations in Islamic Science*. London: Mansell Publishing, 1989.
- . *Islamic Futures: The Shape of Ideas to Come*. Kuala Lumpur: Pelanduk Publications, 1985.
- Setia, Adi. “Tiga Pengertian Sains Islam.” In *Islamic Science (Paradigma, Fakta, Dan Agenda)*. Institute for the Study of Islamic Thought and Civilizations (INSISTS), 2025.
- Sharlow, Mark F. *Playing Fast and Loose with Complexity: A Critique of Dawkins’ Atheistic Argument from Improbability*, 2009.
- Sire, James W. *The Universe Next Door: A Basic Worldview Catalog*. 5th ed. Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic, 2009.
- Thoyib, Muhammad. “Model Integrasi Sains Dan Agama.” *Akademika* 18, no. 1 (2013): 13.
- Zarkasyi, Hamid Fahmy. “Makna Sains Islam.” *Islamia: Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Peradaban Islam* 3, no. 4 (2008): 15–32.
- Zarkasyi, Hamid Fahmy, Mohd Farid Mohd Shahrhan Musa, and Adian Husaini Abdul Rahman. “Al-Attas’s Concept of Reality: Empirical and Non-Empirical.” *Kalam* 13, no. 2 (2019): 122.
- Zovko, Jure, and Mate Penava. “Scientism as a Fundamentalist Worldview.” *Mostariensia* 26, no. 2 (2023): 8. <https://doi.org/10.47960/2831-0322.2022.2.26.7>.