

FREUD'S VIEW ON THE ORIGIN OF RELIGION AND ITS CRITICISM ACCORDING TO 'AQL AND NAQL

*Abdullah Hosseini Eskandian & Ali Babaei**

*Tabriz University, Islamic Republic of Iran

Email: hosseinieskandianabdullah@gmail.com

Abstract

The origin of religion remains a central and contested issue in the philosophy of religion and modern theology (kâlâm), frequently drawing skepticism from materialist and atheist perspectives. This foundational question shapes the identity of religion and determines whether it is viewed as divinely revealed or as a construct of human imagination and psychological needs. Theistic scholars assert that religion originates from a divine source, revealed through Prophets for the moral and spiritual guidance of humanity. In contrast, materialists and atheists, including prominent figures such as Sigmund Freud (1856–1939), argue that religion emerges from human psychological complexes, instincts, and social conditioning, denying any transcendent origin. Freud, in particular, attributes the genesis of religion to repressed desires and unresolved familial tensions, especially within the context of totemism and the Oedipus complex, thus rejecting any metaphysical or divine foundation. This article employs a descriptive-argumentative method and an analytical approach to examine and critically assess Freud's theory on the origin of religion. The study highlights several conceptual and methodological flaws in Freud's view, including the inadequacy of instinctual explanations for religious consciousness, the problematic generalization of Christian-specific myths, the irrationality of totemic belief systems, and the ethnocentric limitations of his framework. Furthermore, Freud's theory stands in direct contradiction to key Islamic theological principles rooted in reason ('aql) and inspired revelation (naql), particularly as conveyed through the Qur'an and Hadith. Ultimately, this critique

underscores the incompatibility of Freud's reductionist account with both Islamic epistemology and the innate disposition of human spirituality (fitrah).

Keywords: *fear of nature; freud; oedipus complex; religion; sexual instincts*

Received: May 27, 2023; Revised: September 01, 2023; Accepted: October 10, 2023

Introduction

Today, sociologists, psychologists, philosophers, historians, and even economic scientists have widely explored the origins of religion (Elmi 2003, 65; Malekian 2000, 24; Zamzami et al. 2023, 90). This question of the origin of religion seeks to discover why people pay attention to the concept of God and the reason for searching for Him. What factors and motivations had led mankind to the concepts of God, religion, and worship? In other words, what has made him think this way? Is it a logical, rational, psychological, or social factor? and if it is a psychological factor, is it caused by an innate and inherent desire, or is it some kind of reaction of the soul against some concepts? In other words, what needs have led mankind to religion, and what has caused them to remain? Are there any social, psychological, historical, mythological, or economic needs?

Everyone has answered these questions based on their technique, discipline, and knowledge and convinced themselves in a way. Freud is a famous Austrian psychologist and the founder of the school of psychology and is considered one of the most famous scientists of the new age. Despite his atheism, he paid special attention to the explanation of religion, and his analysis of religion and religious beliefs had a significant impact on the religious approaches of the 20th century. Freud believes that religion is nothing but the repressed childhood complexes that, because the family and society did not allow them to emerge, emerged in various forms of religion, art, prophethood, and so forth. Freud's theory provoked the reaction of many religious thinkers who considered religion beyond human desires and instincts and envisioned a divine origin for it.

Elmi (2003) in the article *An introduction to the religious theory of Shahid Motahhari* tried to examine and analyze the atheists' views on the origin of

religion, including Freud's view, but he has not criticized it. Narûwî (2008) in the research entitled *Investigation and Criticism of Freud's Approach to Religion*, has tried to investigate and criticize Freud's theory from a religious perspective. Taheri (2011) in an article entitled *Investigation and Criticism of the Theory of the Origin of Religion from Freud's Point of View* has tried to criticize Freud's view based on Islamic principles, arguing that Freud's theory, in addition to conflicting with religious propositions, is also inconsistent with rational principles, and his theory cannot be considered acceptable, but, his criticisms are not complete and he mostly deals with the Islamic criticism of Freud's theory. Some other research to study Freud's thinking about religion was conducted by Monteiro (2021), Malony (2021), Kistner (2021), and Goldhill (2021).

In all of the aforementioned research, the principles of Freud in explaining his theory and also the criticism of his theory from the aspect of the philosophy of religion, psychology, and sociology have not been discussed, and with a descriptive-argumentative method, this research tries to criticize Freud's theory and its principles from different aspects and investigate: What is the meaning and concept of the origin of religion? What does Freud consider about the origin of religion and what reasons does he give for it? What is the nature and function of religion from Freud's point of view? What is Freud's theory based on? How can the complexes and suppressed desires be the cause of the origin of religion? What criticisms does Freud's theory face from religious, philosophical, psychoanalytic, and sociological aspects?

Research Method

This article tries to analyze and criticize Freud's view on the origin of religion from the perspective of 'aql and naql with a descriptive-analytical method and a critical approach. This research employs Freud's works such as, among others, *A Life in Psychoanalysis*, *Totem, and Taboo*, *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, and the works of other theologians and psychologists like Shahid Motahhari, Abdullah Javadi Amoli, John Hick, Hans Eysenck, Antonio Moreno, Calvin Hall and more to analyze and criticize Freud's view on the origin of religion. The main references of this article are Freud's works, which have been used to explain and analyze his theory about the origin

of religion, and then by using other references used in the article, such as the works of the theologians and psychologists that we mentioned above.

Results and Discussion

The Origin of Religion

The discussion about the origin of religion is one of the issues of the philosophy of religion and new theology, which arose from human questions about religion and religious beliefs (Gharamaleki & Eskandian 2022, 154; Kühn 2020). At least the following three meanings can be considered for the term "origin of religion"; First, the reason for the origin of religion: In this sense, the question of the origin of religion is a question of explaining the phenomenon of religion, ignoring its acceptance or rejection by humans (Esfandiyari 2012, 34). The premise of this question is the real existence of religion and religious categories. Is the origin of religion God and heavenly revelation or is it derived from magic?

Second, the reason for accepting religion or the motive of religiosity: The second meaning refers to "religion in the position of realization". In this sense, the question of the origin of religion is a question of the causes and factors that have led people to religion (Pals 2003, 24). Therefore, the premise of this question is to accept religion as a psychological phenomenon or a social phenomenon, and it can lead to a psychological or sociological answer.

The third meaning refers to the rational aspect of religion or the moral aspect of religiosity. In this issue, the benefits and advantages of religiosity and the harms of non-religion are investigated to present an introduction that allows people to know religion and accept religion from them (Qâeminiyâ 2000, 47-48).

In the matter of explanation, a distinction should be made between the origin and birthplace of religion. Although these two issues are related, they are different (Reshad 2019, 34). The question of the origin of religiosity in human life is exactly a question of explanation, but the question of the birthplace of religion is a question of the relationship of religiosity with different aspects and areas of human existence.

In explaining the origin of religion, secularist theorists have relied on hypotheses that are based on denying the divine origin and heavenly identity of

religion, and have considered religion a human invention, but in the divine thought, the origin of religion depends on the will of God, as expressed in the Quran and Sunnah and through the prophets of Almighty God. Theistic thinkers believe that religion has a divine origin, while from the point of view of atheist thinkers, religion has something to do with a human origin and arises from imperfect thought and human lust.

Explanation of the theory

Freud's explanation of the origin of religion is based on his psychological views. From Freud's point of view, religion cannot be attributed to another origin beyond man and his instincts (Sajedi 2018, 86) Freud considered religious beliefs to be illusions, manifestations of the oldest, strongest, and most stable human desires. In his opinion, religion is a kind of mental defense against aspects (and phenomena) of nature such as earthquakes, floods, storms, illness, and inevitable death that create a kind of illusory hope in humans (Hick 1993, 77-78).

He believed that primitive humans, due to their intellectual immaturity, were looking for shelter to compensate for their lack of shelter. These humans, who were childish compared to modern humans, needed a strong father to support them, and they sought refuge in him like chickens that put their heads under their mother's blanket (Elmi 2007, 101). From here, they imagined a god in their minds and believed in his power and support. According to Freud, today's man relies on his father as a child. In adulthood, he chooses a bigger and stronger father, who is God, and relies on Him (Tâvakûli 1999, 92). This is the reason for Freud's return to the factor of fear of natural factors. According to Freud's point of view, one of the instincts that causes people to turn to religion and can be considered as the origin of religion is fear. This fear has flowed into the human race and is still an important factor in people's tendency toward religion; therefore, it can be considered one of the influential factors in the emergence of religion (Shojaei 2004, 89).

Freud has another expression for his psychological interpretation of religion, which considers religion and religious beliefs repressed sexual desires and instincts (Storr 1996, 130). When sexual desires are suppressed, they appear with another face; belief in God and religion is the other face of those regressed

desires. Suppressed desires manifest themselves in different states, one of which is religion and belief in God (Heydary 2009, 90).

In the book *Totem and Taboo*, Freud used the specific concept of the Oedipus complex to explain the great intensity and emotional strength of religious life and connected feelings such as guilt and the compulsion to obey God's commandments. He assumed a stage of human prehistory in which the main unit was the primitive group, including a father, a mother, and children (Freud 1983, 67).

The father, as the dominant male of the family, had all the exclusive rights of guardianship of the female persons, and he drove away or killed any of the male children who threatened his position. Realizing that they could not defeat the father on their own, the sons eventually banded together and killed him (and, being cannibals, ate him). This was the first crime or patricide that instilled fear and anxiety in mankind, and from its core, moral orders and morals of totemism and other religious phenomena evolved (Freud 1983, 70).

After killing their father, the sons, feeling regret and sorrow, found out that not everyone can replace him and had to constantly keep some restrictions. Therefore, the prohibition of patricide comes to the board of a new kind of moral respect as a taboo against adultery. This association of religion with the Oedipus complex that is repeated in every person (because Freud believed that the Oedipus complex was general and universal) explains the mysterious reverence of God in the human mind and the great guilt that makes people submit to such an illusion and fantasy. Therefore, religion is a kind of return of repressed instinct and it can appear in the form of religion and religious feelings (Storr 1996, 119-116; Hick 1993, 79; Freud 1983, 80).

Freud's explanations about the origin of religion are based on human instincts, and each of his explanations tries to reveal another manifestation of these instincts. From his point of view, a set of different instincts, such as fear and jealousy of the father are the cause of the origin of religion (Sajedi 2018, 64).

In other words, Freud believes that sexual instinct is the mother of instincts and our only instinct. The first requirement of the sexual instinct is to satisfy it whenever and wherever it is stimulated under any circumstances, but since childhood, parents and society regularly tell children that not only does

this absolute freedom not exist, but their penis should also be covered up. For this reason, people are usually not open and honest about their sexual affairs and do not comment easily on sexual issues, thereby perplexing people (Freud 1964, 60; Hall 1969, 77-82).

Freud called this return of the sexual instinct the head of the sexual instinct and believed that this process caused the sexual desire to go from the conscious to the unconscious mind, and after gathering there and not finding a way out, it turned into different forms; and poets, artists, and prophets emerged from this way. These are the modified forms of the sexual instinct. In other words, the repressed sexual instinct expresses itself in the form of poetry, art, and religious teachings so that it is no longer denied by society. If one day the social requirements are removed, there will be no more poets, artists, and prophets. To prove his theory, Freud resorted to the factor of fear, the Oedipus complex, and overpowering sexual instincts. He even interpreted God as "Your God", meaning the God of religious beliefs and traditions (Storr 1996, 128). Now, after explaining Freud's theory, we will discuss the basics and principles that he used in explaining his theory about the origin of religion.

In the division of the mind or the scope of human perception, Freud divided it into three parts; a). Conscious part: this part is related to the outward and external part of a person whose mind is always fully aware of its information and contents. b). Semi-conscious part: this part includes ideas and thoughts that we are not directly aware of, but if we are asked about them, we can refer to them and be reminded about them. c). Subconscious part: this part of the human mind is deep, vast, and strangely powerful, and the human being is completely unaware of its information and contents, he has no awareness of it, and signs of it are only sometimes revealed to us in dreams (Taheri 2011, 145).

According to Freud, the unconscious part of the human mind, although it is unknown, has great importance and value because this part of the human mind is the source of the most important physical desires, such as the desire for food and our sexual activities. Another thing is that this part contains an absolutely wonderful collection of ideas, emotions, and feelings that are related to things that a person has experienced or wished to do from the first day of his life until now. Freud says that this part of the human mind while being

completely hidden and unknown, has indirect effects on our behaviors, thoughts, and movements (Freud 2022, 80).

Freud's view about the origin of religion can be expressed in the following case: The first view is the "Oedipus complex". The Oedipus complex is considered a basic foundation in psychology, and any kind of relationship between father and daughter and mother and son somehow leads to this complex and the effective role of the father.

Freud defines the first diagrams of the child's feelings towards parents as follows: "The first manifestation of every person's lust instinct is triggered by his mother" (Freud 2023, 102). It can be said that the instinct of love first targets the mother, while the instinct of hatred targets the father; the child has a close relationship with the mother in the stage of "self-friendship" and "other-friendship". In the first stage, i.e., during the period of "self-love", he is raised in his mother's arms, and as soon as he notices her lips, he enjoys sucking his mother's breast.

In the second stage, when he turns away from himself, he chooses his mother among others. During the development of the child, parents stop him from some actions and prevent his fears. During these obstacles and conflicts, the child hates his father and harbors a grudge against him, but his mother's love continues in him because father's prohibition is associated with violence and domination, while mother's prohibition is associated with kindness. On the other hand, the child wants the mother for himself; while the father tries to take the mother away from him; because of this, the son feels jealous and resentful towards his father, and he is upset by the father's expression of love and kindness towards the mother. Of course, other factors are effective in intensifying the hatred of father and son, and the instinct of hatred is always flexible from the son to the father and the instinct of love to the mother.

According to the principle of "duality of emotions", this hatred towards the father is mixed with a sense of praise and affection, which originates from fear, and this same father with these attributes and feelings of the child is gradually worshiped as a god and provides the foundations and origin of religious beliefs" (Freud 1996, 250).

The second view: "Fear of nature and the factors in it". The theory of fear of nature has its roots in the era before Freud. Some theorists believe that the

fear of natural factors is the motive of human inclination toward religion and many writings about this issue can be seen. The Roman poet Titus Lucretius (55-99 BC) can be mentioned among the first thinkers who made a connection between religious teachings and the phenomenon of fear. He called fear “the first mother of gods” and called his main goal to free people from the fear of gods. After him, other thinkers expressed the role of fear of nature in the formation of God, such as; Epicurus (341-270 BC) or David Hume (1711-1776), who believed that belief in God did not come from wisdom and deep thinking, rather, it was rooted in the concern about life events and the fears and hopes that motivated a person’s thought to struggle; Bertrand Russell (1872-1970) said: “I think that the origin of religion is, first of all, fear and terror; man feels infinitely powerless and the main source of this terror is three things; first: it is a disaster that nature can bring upon him; for example, by means of thunder, lightning, or by burying him in the depths of the earth due to an earthquake. Second: it is the damage that his fellows can do to him; for example, kill him on the battlefield. Third: What depends on religion is the actions that the special lusts of man can make him perform when they are boiling and intense. Of course, a person knows very well that after regaining peace, he will regret having committed such acts. These were the main causes of fear and panic that most people have. Religion reduces the intensity of fear and discomfort caused by these factors and brings comfort to the human heart” (Yousefiyân 2011, 27).

Fear is the first mother of gods and among the types of fear, fear of death has the most important position. The life of primitive humans has been among thousands of dangers and it is very rare that people die a natural death or reach old age. Therefore, primitive man could not believe that death was a natural event, and they always assumed the cause behind nature for the events.

Freud considered religious beliefs illusions, manifestations of the oldest, strongest, and most stable human instincts, and held that religion was a kind of mental defense against natural aspects and phenomena, such as floods, storms, earthquakes, diseases, and ultimately inevitable death (Hick 1993, 78). According to Freud, as life is difficult and painful for society and humanity in general, it also entails many hardships for individuals.

A person finds himself exposed to a lot of difficulties and hardships in various ways, and he sees the first obstacle as a civilization that hinders his

complete freedom and emancipation and restricts a person in a framework by placing restrictions. The second obstacle is the people of the community who, by defying the rules of the community, harass the person and make him feel worried and disappointed, and the third and most important obstacle that makes a person feel insecure and confused is his restless and unruly nature, which always creates a feeling of despair and fear of loss in him and harasses him (Freud 1996, 252).

Now, a person who is faced with all these threats and insecurity should see how to protect himself against all these feelings of failure and be subdued against all these threats that have caused constant fear and worry in his existence. A person who faces these factors feels a kind of weakness and helplessness in himself that he cannot stand up to them and save himself from them, and now we have to see how he reacts to this insecurity and fear. The individual's reaction to these cases is "grudge, enmity, and hostility that is proportional to the suffering, limitation, and discomfort of the individual, which he has towards civilization and society" (Freud 2022, 34).

Freud states: "Individual and community are limited by three important forces and powers that cause discomfort and insecurity, and these three forces are; civilization and its facilities, the pressure and torture of people, nature, its fears, and apprehensions" (Freud 1996, 166-167).

Civilization helps mankind in this confusion and supports him. Just as civilization had created limits for the individual. Here too, it is looking for a solution for mankind to get rid of the cruel and violent force of nature, and it always provides common solutions in this case to save mankind (Moreno 2022, 98).

Mankind has become scared and helpless in front of the rebellion of nature and wants to arm himself against this obstacle by finding a way. The basic question is how can mankind be freed from constant fear and apprehension in these many problems? Here are three important points to consider; first of all, the sense of selfishness and self-esteem of human beings, or the so-called sense of self-infatuation, has been defeated and humiliated in this process and must be relieved. The forces of narcissism or the sense of selfishness against the threat of nature are passive and need consolation. The second point is that panic and fear as well as worry and fear should be removed from the page of life, and ways

and methods should be encouraged to ensure that these deadly and painful phenomena do not become external and exemplified. The third and most important point is that events must be explained, examined, and analyzed, and the grounds for those events and how they occur must be figured out (Freud 1996, 168).

Finding the cause of panic is one of the most important things in human relief and it frees him from the confusion and wanderings that arise in the face of natural events and create a sense of human curiosity. Freud considers the origin of religion to be the feeling of human helplessness, and it is similar to the feeling of fear of a child and the need for the support of a strong father, which has found a continuous state. Freud states: "From the first days of life, because of these fears, mankind has gone to the invention of an imaginary being called God, it seems that this God is his protector and preserver, and in times of calamity and danger, he takes refuge in Him and asks Him for peace" (Freud 1989, 26).

The third view is "suppression of the sexual instinct". In this hypothesis, Freud considered religion the result of the unconscious disillusioned with sexual instincts. According to Freud, repressed human instincts do not disappear; rather, they take place in the unconscious part of human existence, and at the right time, they appear misleadingly (Freud 2021, 16).

Freud believed that sexual instinct was the mother of all instincts and our only instinct. According to Freud, the requirement of the sexual instinct is that wherever and under any circumstances it is stimulated, it should be sought to be satisfied. However, since childhood, the conditions that prevail around the child, including parents and society, not only tell the child that this absolute sexual freedom does not exist, but he must also cover his genitals and observe these issues (Freud 2023, 67).

Therefore, people are usually not open and comfortable with their sexual issues, and it is always difficult for them to comment on sexual issues, for this reason, this issue is growing complex for the individual (Freud 1980, 139). According to Freud, human beings are sexually deprived in society, which causes the instinct to be pushed back. Freud considered this return of the sexual instinct to be the suppression of the sexual instinct and believed that this flow caused the sexual instinct to go from the conscious to the unconscious mind.

When it goes there, social restrictions prevent it from coming out, but in that case, these restrictions appear in other forms after they are given a kind of exaltation, and one of these forms is religion (Freud 1980, 22).

According to Freud, the manifestations of civilization, progress, and human perfection are the same force and instinctive desire of a man that has been suppressed and rejected. Therefore, Freud does not consider the existence of any kind of originality and honor in man to be real; because from his point of view, the nature and essence of these rejected demands do not change; rather, a kind of mask was put on their faces and they appeared in another form (Motahhari 1995, 436).

Review and Criticism

Freud's theory and point of view about the origin of religion have flaws and problems in many ways that sages and thinkers after him and even many of Freud's own students have made defects to his theory. Shahid Motahhari does not criticize Freud's theory because of its apparent stupidity and obsolescence; rather, he considers it a point of view that Freud himself regretted and his students also considered it invalid (Gharamaleki 2004, 156; Motahhari 2003, 57; Motahhari 2010, 90). Here, we will first criticize Freud's theory based on *naql* and *'aql*.

Review and Criticism according to *Naql*

First, we examine and criticize Freud's theory based on the verses of the Quran. The Quran considers religion a Divine Affair that humans are naturally inclined towards, and sexual instincts and childhood complexes do not play a role in it. It is not a secret to thinkers and experts that the Quran is not a purely scientific book that is responsible for reasoning in the form of general concepts based on conceptual arguments. In scientific books, different knowledge is divided based on topics, issues, and goals, and theoretical issues are separate from scientific and moral issues, and each category is raised in a specific place (Motahhari 2009, 89).

The Quran presents itself as a teacher of the book and wisdom, and in addition, a cultivator of souls. Therefore, it expresses scientific guidance and ethical and practical recommendations side by side, and introduces concrete examples in the text of scientific explanations; for example, when it talks about

goodness, it mentions a good person, while a book that only aims to propose a scientific theory in the field of ethics and the like, in the interpretation of goodness, mentions things such as faith, justice, and piety, but The Quran mentions good men in the definition of goodness (al-Baqarah [2]: 177).

The argument of nature (*fitra*) has been the focus of the Quran and has been referred to in various ways, and it can be considered as a sign of attention to God, due to its worthy educational effect and it can be partially provided through cultivation and personal intuition. According to the Quran, religion and belief in God are rooted in human nature, and in this context, we refer to some verses:

“Do you not see that ships sail through the sea by the favor of Allah that He may show you of His signs? Indeed in that are signs for everyone patient and grateful. And when waves come over them like canopies, they supplicate Allah, sincere to Him in religion [i.e., faith]. But when He delivers them to the land, there are [some] of them who are moderate [in faith]. And none rejects Our signs except everyone treacherous and ungrateful” (Luqmân [31]: 31-32).

Also, the Quran in al-‘Ankabût [29]: 65 says: “And when they board a ship, they supplicate Allah, sincere to Him in religion [i.e., faith and hope]. But when He delivers them to the land, at once they associate others with Him.”

In these verses, it is about one’s hope. That is, while he has no hope for any of the limited means and has given up hope of any limited power, such hope is an additional reality that cannot be any of the limited means. A person who has been attacked by a sea wave perceives this reality and the other side of it, and this reality becomes the source of a conceptual argument for him thereafter, and for others who hear the report of it, which proves God (Javadi 1995, 291).

Surah al-Rûm [30]: 30 says: “So direct your face [i.e., self] toward the religion, inclining to truth. [Adhere to] the *fitra* of Allah upon which He has created [all] people. No change should there be in the creation of Allah. That is the correct religion, but most of the people do not know.” This verse implies that man is naturally inclined towards religion, and man’s nature is a divine command that God has specified so that man should pay attention to Him in this way, and this is contrary to the theories that consider human origin as the cause of the origin of religion. (T{abâtabâi 1971, 231).

Review and Criticism according to 'Aql

In his book *Philosophy of Religion*, John Hick analyzed and criticized Freud's point of view and states that the "Primitive Group" hypothesis, which Freud adapted from Darwin (1809-1882) and Robertson Smith (1846-1894), is now opposed by anthropologists, and the Oedipus Complex, even according to many students and successors of Freud, can no longer be the key to solving all problems. In addition, philosophical critics have pointed out that Freud's psychological atomism and determinism do not have the dignity of reports based on observation but the dignity of philosophical theories (Raymond 1998, 80).

Although Freud's conception of religion is, on the whole, extremely theoretical, and probably the least durable aspect of his thought is his general view that faith is a kind of "psychic support", and it has the quality of imaginative thoughts, it has been approved by many sympathetic or non-sympathetic critics who think that this type of thought is applicable to everything that the majority call religion. Experimental religion represents a peculiar combination of elements, and without a doubt, the desire to make wishes is involved in it, and it is an important factor in the minds of many believers.

Perhaps the most interesting theological interpretation of Freud's theory is that in his research on the image of the father, he may have uncovered the same mechanism by which God created the idea of divinity in the human mind. If the paternal relationship of man with his children, according to the teachings of the Judeo-Christian tradition, is similar to God's relationship with mankind, it is not surprising that they consider God as their heavenly father and know God through the child's experience of absolute belonging and dependence and the child's growing experience of love, care and family upbringing. It is clear that some kinds of religious interpretation or naturalistic interpretation of psychological phenomena may be acceptable for minds that are not committed to some kind of naturalistic explanation. It seems that the provisions of the ruling are "not proven" here as well; Freud's theory about religion, similar to sociological theory, may be correct, but no evidence has been provided for its correctness (Hick 1993, 80-82).

Hamilton also states in his book *Sociology of Religion* that Freud's theories about religion and magic are very heretical and exciting, but at the same time very critical and full of multiple problems. According to Hamilton, Freud's method of psychoanalysis and a strong emphasis on sexual instinct has faced

many criticisms and has had notable opponents. According to all critics, the most outstanding problem of Freud's theory is that by examining a few of those who had abnormal behavior, he made a broad decision and gave it universal dimensions.

Hamilton also points out that there is no evidence for the claim that early humans lived in herds. According to some researchers, the origin of this idea of Darwin was the reports that have been proven false today. Also, "Freud's theory is based on the concept of racial and hereditary memory of initial events, events that continue to influence successive generations; however, modern biology has completely rejected this idea" (Hamilton 2008, 110-122).

Another criticism points to the point that although for those who have backgrounds in Christianity, Freud's explanation of religion can seem justified because, in the religion of Christ, you can find phrases like "God the Father" as well as "God the Son" or terms that give rise to this idea. God in Christianity has a paternal face which is also difficult and this model presented in the religion of Christ can in a way lead the human mind to the same relationship as father and son.

Therefore, if we assume that Freud's ideas about religion are compatible with Christianity, again, Freud's hypothesis and theory cannot be extended to all religions because there are different religions and cultures in the world and this type of transmission cannot be deemed right.

In these theories and his approach, Freud thought somewhat ethnocentrically. Freud was not aware of all the religious contexts and traditions existing in the world, and he presented the characteristics and traditions in which he was raised as part of the inherent and universal elements of mankind. While social contexts and many other factors affect the formation of emotional tensions, and different societies have different structures, and the tensions and emotions that usually occur in a society, to a large extent, reflect the special character of the social structure of that particular society, the assumption that there is emotional tension and a kind of duality in the nature of all human beings cannot be considered certain and seems to be a wrong view.

Another criticism is the criticism of totemism and Freud's ideas about the origin of religion in totemism. Freud's hypothesis in relation to totemism is mostly associated with guesses and conjectures in which No. solid and

convincing reasons can be obtained. There is even evidence that shows that many of the foundations on which Freud based his theory of totemism are false and misleading. Also, there is currently no evidence to show that totemism was the first human religion and that other religions arose from the evolution of the concept of totemism. Even in Freud's time, it was proven that totemism, as a distinctive form of religion, was nothing but a myth (Hamilton 2008, 110-122).

In criticizing Freud's third point of view, it should be said that Freud's method of psychoanalysis and emphasis on sexual instinct as well as presenting an unrealistic picture of the existence of sexual desire in childhood, and the fact that sexual instinct plays an essential role in the formation of a child's personality has faced many criticisms and has had notable opponents, including Daniel Pals who said: "Even after the contemporary sexual revolution, Freud's description of the Oedipus Complex still comes as something of a shock to many people. They consider it unimaginable that the innocence of a child can be infected with such powerful stimuli and hidden emotions" (Pals 2003, 108).

According to all critics, the most outstanding form of Freud's work is that by examining several people who had abnormal behavior, he made a wide generalization and gave it a universal dimension. One of these criticisms came from the famous psychologist, Eysenck in his book entitled *Decline and Fall of the Freudian Empire*, stating: "The fact that some people remember the sexual impulses of their childhood does not in any way prove that the said impulse is general. Apart from the fact that it was later discovered by Freud himself that in many or most of these cases "memory" is "illusory" and that their imaginings are a form of "regressive phantasy". The evidence obtained from the direct observation of normal children has shown that the existence of sexual motives directed at one of the parents is the most baseless of all (Eysenck 2000, 116).

Charles Wilfred Valentine, the famous English psychologist, has expressed his observations about his children and also the children of those around him in relation to Freud's theory of psychoanalysis. In the beginning, he was a supporter of Freud's assumptions, who later considered his observations against the views expressed by Freud in the field of relationships between infants of the same family, and the supposed competition between them. Valentine's decisive statements about his observations are more about the "Imaginary Oedipus Complex" that he pointed out: "Freud stated that after the age of approximately

two years, boys begin to give their hearts to their mothers in a sensual way and express jealousy and even hatred towards their father; therefore, they show “Oedipus Complex”.

On the other hand, girls trust their fathers and see their mothers as a rival. From observing my own children, I have seen no evidence of such an Oedipus Complex. It turns out that the evidence is just the opposite, especially the fact that girls show more affection for their mothers than boys after the age of two; that is, when, according to Freud, boys should be against the father and girls should be for him, children’s relationships with parents are exactly as expected on a general basis. First, the intense attachment that girls and boys show to their mothers as nurses and comforters; later, after the age of two, some attraction to the father can enter into their games, and in some cases, father can cause exciting joys, but this increasing attractiveness of the father after two or three years of age is much more for boys than for girls; even at this early age, girls’ tastes and interests are far more in harmony with their mothers than their fathers (Eysenck 2000, 115).

The fundamental and main criticism of Freud’s theory is that this theory, without paying attention to the evidence that has been established to prove the existence of God, says that the emergence of belief in religion and God is related to factors such as weakness and spiritual helplessness and childish fear of man. But if we comment on the statements of the thinkers who are present in the present age, we will see that in this age when human thought has reached a kind of maturity, most of these thinkers believe in God and provide strong arguments for their belief: however, the supporters of psychological hypotheses tend to ignore the mental ability of thinkers who believe in God by calling the mental-psychological disability of immature people and do not do any discussion and reflection about their thoughts, ideas and statements, and they also do not have a valid rational argument in this regard (TaHERi 2011, 144).

In terms of the last criticism that can be made of Freud’s theory, it is that in this theory there is confusion between motivation and excitement. Even if we assume that Freud’s analysis of the cause and motivation of human tendency to religion is correct, this fallacy has occurred in Freud’s analysis because by showing the clinical nature of the cause of religious tendency, he has concluded that the consequence of this tendency is negative. This means that assuming the

truth of the fact that a person has turned to religious beliefs to face the damage of civilization (motivation), it cannot be claimed that, as a result, religious ideas are invalid and illusory (excitement); because it is necessarily between the illusory motivation and the illusory excitement, there is no necessary relationship.

Conclusion

The issue of the origin of religion is among other issues that have always been questioned by atheists in denying the Divine religions and the sharia of the prophets. The discussion about the origin of religion is one of the issues of the philosophy of religion and new theology, which arose from human questions about religion and religious beliefs. The question of the origin of religiosity in human life is exactly a question of explanation, but the question of the birthplace of religion is a question of the relationship of religiosity with different aspects and areas of human existence. One of those who denied the Divine origin of religion is Sigmund Freud. Freud believes that the manifestations of civilization, progress, and human perfection are the same force and instinctive human desire that has been suppressed and rejected. Therefore, Freud does not consider the existence of any kind of originality and honor in man to be real; because from his point of view, the nature and essence of these repressed desires do not change, but a kind of mask has been put on their face and they have appeared in a different form. Freud believed that the suppression of sexual desire caused it to be moved from the conscious mind to the unconscious mind, and when it goes there, social constraints prevent it from appearing, and after that these suppressed desires, after a kind of exaltation was given to them, appear in other forms, one of which is religion, and religion has no root other than human sexuality.

Freud's theory can be criticized according to *naql* and '*aql*. In addition to contradicting the theory of *fitra*, which considers the basis of religion to be human nature, Freud's theory also contradicts the foundations of reason, psychology, and sociology. Confusion between motivation and excitement, conflicting with the arguments of the existence of God and inappropriate generalization of the theory conflicting with observations about children and their desires, and other cases have caused Freud's theory to be interpreted as a useless, irrational, simplistic, and childish theory.

One of the most important works that can be done in dealing with atheism is to criticize the views of those who deny the Divine origin of religion. Thinkers like, inter alia, Freud, Feuerbach, Emile Durkheim, and August Comte have principally denied the existence of the Divine origin of religions and considered human factors such as ignorance and instinct the origin of religions. By analyzing and criticizing such views, we can certainly defend the belief in God and help strengthen the revelation ideas.

References

- Elmi, G. 2003. An introduction to the Religious Theory of Shahid Motahhari. *The Journal of Essays and Investigations*, 10(3): 61-73.
- Elmi, G. 2007. Investigation the Origin of Religion and Religiosity from Allameh Tabatabai's Point of View. *The Journal of Ayeneh Ma'refat*, 5(10).
- Esfandiyari, M. 2012. Descriptive Bibliography of New Theology. *The Journal of Review and Comment*, 32(2).
- Eysenck, H. 2000. *Decline and Fall of the Freudian Empire*, trans by Yûsuf Karimi. Tehran: Sâmt Publications, First Edition.
- Freud, S. 1964. *A Life in Psychoanalysis*, trans by Mahmoud Nâvaei. Tehran: Negah Publications, First Edition.
- Freud, S. 1983. *Totem and Taboo*, trans by Iraj Pourbaqer. Tehran: Asia Publications, First Edition.
- Freud, S. 1989. *Die Frage der Laienanalyse*, trans by Farid Javaherkalam. Tehran: Mûrwarid Publications, Fourth Edition.
- Freud, S. 1996. *The Origin and Development of Psychoanalysis*, trans by Hâshem Razî. Tehran: Asia Publications, First Edition.
- Freud, S. 2021. *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, trans by Soheil Sami. Tehran: Pendâr Taban Publications, Seventh Edition.

- Freud, S. 2022. *Five Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, trans by Hasan Safavi. Tehran: Jami Publications, Third Edition.
- Freud, S. 2023. *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, trans by Ebrahim Malek Esmaili. Tehran: Negah Publications, Sixth Edition.
- Gharamaleki, A. 2004. *Shahid Motahhari and New Kalam*. Tehran: Research Institute of Islamic Culture and Thought, First Edition.
- Goldhill, S. 2021. Freud, Archaeology and Egypt: Religion, Materiality and the Cultural Critique of Origins. *Arion - Journal of Humanities and the Classics*, 28(3): 75-104.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/arion.28.3.0075>.
- Hall, C. 1969. *A Primer of Freudian Psychology*, trans by Iraj Nikaÿyin. Tehran: al-Ghazali Publications, First Edition.
- Hamilton, M. 2008. *The Sociology of Religion*, trans by Mohsen Thalâsi. Tehran: Thales Publications, Fourth Edition.
- Heydary, D. 2009. Criticism of the Functionalist Approach in Defining Religion. *The Journal of New Religious Thought*, 5(17).
- Hick, J. 1993. *Philosophy of Religion*, trans by Bahram Rad. Tehran: Hûda Publications, First Edition.
- Javadi Amoli, A. 1995. *Explanation of Arguments of proof of God*. Qom: Esra Publishing House, First Edition.
- Garamaleki gorbani, karimzadeh & Eskandian, Abdullah Hosseini. 2022.

- Review and Criticism of Emile Durkheim's View on the Origin of Religion from the Perspective of Shahid Motahhari and John Hick. *The Journal of Philosophy of Religion*, 11(1): 1-33.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22034/philor.2023.2002839.1430>.
- Kistner, U. 2021. Religion as 'universal obsessional neurosis of humanity'? Re-reading freud on religion. *HTS Teologiese Studies / Theological Studies*, 77(2).
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v77i2.6723>.
- Kühn, R. 2020. Freud's contribution to culture and its relation to philosophy and religion. *Tijdschrift voor Filosofie*, 82(2): 327-349.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2143/TVF.82.2.3287743>.
- Malekian, M. 2000. Religion and Religiosity in the Contemporary World. *The Journal of Seven Skies*, 1(2).
- Malony, H. N. 2021. The Future of an Illusion, The Illusion of the Future: An Historic Dialogue on the Value of Religion between Oskar Pfister and Sigmund Freud. *Contemporary Psychoanalytic Studies*, 29: 161-175.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004429222_013.
- Monteiro, G.d. P. 2021. Religion, life and society: Brief study from bergson and freud. *Trans/Form/Acao*, 44(3): 151-176.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/0101-3173.2021.V44N3.14.P151>.
- Moreno, A. 2022. *Jung, Gods and Modern Man*, trans by Daryûsh Mehrjûvi. Tehran: Markaz Publications, Twelfth Edition.
- Motahhari, M. 1995. *Collection of Works*. Tehran: Sadra Publications, First Edition.
- Motahhari, M. 2003. *Fitrâ*. Tehran: Sadra Publications, First Edition.

- Motahhari, M. 2009. *Reasons of Tendency towards Materialism*. Tehran: Sadra Publications, Sixth Edition.
- Motahhari, M. 2010. *Principles of Philosophy and the Method of Realism*. Tehran: Sadra Publications, Fourteenth Edition.
- Pals, D. 2003. *Seven Theories about Religion*, trans by Aziz Bakhtiyari. Qom: Imam Khomeini Educational Institute, First Edition.
- Qâeminiyâ, A. R. 2000. *An Introduction to the Origin of Religion*. Qom: Ma'arif Publications, First Edition.
- Raymond, A. 1998. *Main Currents in Sociological Thought*, trans by Bagher Parham. Tehran: Scientific and Cultural Publications, First Edition.
- Reshad, A. 2019. The Necessity of Establishing the Philosophy of Religion, the Logic of Exploring Religion and the Philosophy of Religious Wisdom and its Similarities and Differences with each other. *The Journal of Qâbâsat*, 38(3).
- Sajedi, A. 2018. The Philosophy of Origin of Religion. *The Journal of Qâbâsat*, 51(4).
- Shojaei-Zand, A. 2004. The Origin of Religion and the Root of Religiosity. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(3).
- Storr, A. 1996. *Freud*, trans by Hassan Marandi. Tehran: New Design, First Edition.
- Tabatabaei, M. H. 1971. *Principles of Philosophy and the Method of Realism*. Qom: Dar al-Ilm Publications, First Edition.
- Taheri, H. 2011. *Review and Criticism of the Theory of the Origin of Religion from Freud's Point of View*. *Journal of New Religious Thought*, 25(2).

- Tâvakûli, G. 1999. *A Critical Approach to the Origin of Religion from Freud's Point of View*. Tehran: Suhrawardi Research and Publication Office, First Edition.
- Yousefiyân, H. 2011. *New Kalam*. Tehran: Sâmt Publications, Fourth Edition.
- Zamzami, M., Karimzadeh Gharamaleki, G., HosseiniEskandian, A., Mahzumi, F. 2023. The Design Argument for God`s Existence: Ayatullâh Ja'far Subḥânî's Criticism of David Hume's Thoughts. *Ulul Albab: Jurnal Studi Islam*, 24(1): 89-109.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18860/ua.v24i1.20698>.