

Difference between believers and non believers religion essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

According to the Holy Quran, believers are “ They who turn (to Allah), who serve (Him), who praise (Him), who fast, who bow down, who prostrate themselves, who enjoin what is good and forbid what is evil, and who keep the limits of Allah; and give good news to the believers”(Surah At-Tawba: Ayah 112). The Holy Quran further shades light on this; “ Successful indeed are the believers, Who are humble in their prayers, And who keep aloof from what is vain, And who are givers of poor-rate, And who guard their private parts, Except before their mates or those whom their right hands possess, for they surely are not blamable, But whoever seeks to go beyond that, these are they that exceed the limits; And those who are keepers of their trusts and their covenant, And those who keep a guard on their prayers; These are they who are the heirs, Who shall inherit the Paradise; they shall abide therein.”(Surah Al-Muminun : Ayah 1-11).

In regards to the Bible, we might generally say that the biggest difference between a believer and a non-believer is the thought process of how a person looks at new information. Believers believe things are true until proven false and non-believers see things as false until proven true. However, we might say the opposite when other subjects are introduced such the Theory of Evolution. So Christians can be guilty of the same accusation. Christians need to present their case to non-believers using mechanisms that do not start with the assumption the Bible is true because it is the Bible. More objective methods that do not use circular reasoning are needed in these forums. We'll make far more progress this way.

The Bible teaches that in order to be saved you must repent toward God which means to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ who shed his innocent blood

<https://assignbuster.com/difference-between-believers-and-non-believers-religion-essay/>

for the forgiveness of all your sins. The Bible teaches that after you are saved you must stand in the true grace of God. (1) According to the Bible those who are saved are redeemed from the Law of Moses (Old Covenant) and are now under the New Covenant and a much higher law: The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus. The Bible says, " For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. (John 1: 17). If you are led by the Spirit you are not under the Law of Moses:" But if ye are led by the Spirit, ye are not under the law."(Gal. 5: 18). The law of Moses- as holy and righteous a standard as it is- does not give eternal life because no one is justified by keeping the law: But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith.(Gal. 3: 11).

Paul explained that the flesh lusts against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other (walking after the flesh is contrary to walking after the Spirit) so we " cannot do the things that we would": For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. (Gal. 5: 17). The goals of the flesh (man's selfish desires) are contrary to the goals of the Holy Spirit in a Christian's life. The goals of the flesh and the goals of the Holy Spirit are in opposition to each other. The Bible is clear that if the Christian follows the leading of the Holy Spirit he is not under the law, but if he walks after the flesh without repentance, God considers him to be under the law, not under grace.

A pressing issue that seems to have controversies worldwide is the issue of charitable giving. Apparently, it is an issue that is debated within religions, between religions, or between believers and non-believers: Are Religious
<https://assignbuster.com/difference-between-believers-and-non-believers-religion-essay/>

People More Charitable than Non-Believers? The differences in charity between secular and religious people are dramatic. Religious people are 25 percentage points more likely than secularists to donate money (91 percent to 66 percent) and 23 points more likely to volunteer time (67 percent to 44 percent). And, consistent with the findings of other writers, these data show that practicing a religion is more important than the actual religion itself in predicting charitable behavior. For example, among those who attend worship services regularly, 92 percent of Protestants give charitably, compared with 91 percent of Catholics, 91 percent of Jews, and 89 percent from other religions.

In the book, *Who Really Cares: America's Charity Divide* by Arthur C. Brooks (2006), Brooks cited several studies and surveys that appeared to demonstrate that secular Americans give less to charity than their religious counterparts. He proposed several reasons for these results, namely those secularists are just naturally less generous; that as a largely liberal group they had higher expectations of government welfare programs; and that they lacked a centralized institution such as a church that codified and encouraged giving. However, later critics have pointed out that it is not entirely clear whether the religious are more generous than the non-religious; other studies have shown that the real situation is far murkier.

These critics of Brooks' analysis were quick to point out that religious charities are usually clearly labeled as such, making it far easier to track the religious affiliations of the givers. Secular charities, by contrast, receive donations from religious and non-religious alike, with no particular distinction being made between the two. This might serve the purpose of "concealing"

<https://assignbuster.com/difference-between-believers-and-non-believers-religion-essay/>

charitable giving by secular Americans. Recent efforts to establish pointedly secular charities – like the Richard Dawkins-organized Non-Believers Giving Aid – have been very successful, but by definition secular charities act very much like secular individuals in being non-discriminating with both their donations and their disbursement.

There is some truth to Brooks' contention that seculars – who tend to lean liberal – for the largest part would desire that welfare programs be run more justifiably through government agencies to a certain extent than being left to the whims of private charitable trusts. And as extreme as it sets off, more European secular individuals give far less to charities than their American counterparts. Nevertheless, this is not the complete picture. When the sum Europeans disburse in taxes to finance social programs abroad and at home is taken into consideration, then their charitable philanthropic far outstrips that of Americans. In extremely atheistic Denmark, for instance, the tax coffer contributes to ninety percent to foreign aid, while in the U. S. the figure is merely fifteen percent.

Studies of spiritual generosity and belief that focused on non-cash giving established a further interesting result. With respect to donating blood, the religious belief or non-belief of the benefactor made extremely no distinction at all to the regularity or amount donated. equally, a study of American doctors who were prepared to forgo productive medical careers in order to work with the underprivileged in the overseas or the U. S. showed insignificant differences involving the secular and the religious, with 35% of the altruistic doctors self-identified unbeliever, as contrasted to 28% Catholics and 26% Protestants.

<https://assignbuster.com/difference-between-believers-and-non-believers-religion-essay/>

In additional studies of bigheartedness by means of more restricted methods, no disparity was established between non-religious and religious subjects. occurrences of the “ dictator game” - where a single subject is given funds and requested to split it or not with an unidentified other player who knows not anything of the specifics of the deal - established religious subjects were no more liberal than their non-religious counterparts; undeniably, a good number people who participated in the game offered the anonymous player half or almost half of the funds, despite of the religious belief or lack thereof.

As in the majority of research of this sort, there is a threat of relying too much on people’s self-reporting of their activities, in particular where something as accepted as generous giving is fretful. Some studies, together with one done in 1973, give the impression that the spiritual were more probable to want to be seen as bighearted and consequently more probable to pump up the amount they contributed to charity. Tom Flynn, in a free of charge Inquiry expose, illustrated the self-reporting impasse by referring to the oft-cited statistic that 40% of Americans account to having attended church services in the previous week, then illuminating that when researchers essentially went out to a big sampling of churches and counted attendants, the number was nearer to 20%. He supposes that the accurate inconsistency linking religious and non-religious giving, if any, can by no means be definitively known as long as self-reporting is the major means of data compilation.

In the discussion featured in “ The Great God Debate” showcasing atheist Christopher Hitchens and the Jewish Rabbi David Wolpe, similar to many of <https://assignbuster.com/difference-between-believers-and-non-believers-religion-essay/>

the encounters involving Hitchens and religious leaders, the argument was fascinating and spirited. This was one issue that came up-and perpetually does in these debates-was the subject of generous giving, and the reality that religious people confer substantially more of their money and time to charity than non believers. despite the fact that Hitchens endeavored to invalidate that allegation by claiming that spiritual charitable giving frequently comes with strings attached-that is as part of some sort of evangelical outreach to win further converts- the basic truth that spiritual people give more is inflexible to refute. Hitches also conversed about the Richard Dawkins Foundation's endeavor to raise funds for survivors of the Haitian tremor.

In addition, it ought to be understood that the dissimilarity is not only relevant to believers. Also, non believers are equally liberal with their money and time. So whatsoever the reason is, it's not a basis specific to one belief. Thus believers cannot justifiably claim that their openhandedness is because of some inherent moral virtue or righteousness of their faith. There ought to be factors at work that are universal to all major spiritual groups. Adding to this, the significance of benevolent giving isn't constrained to one political group or even within a specific religion.

Pious liberals are in addition much more probable to contribute money and time to charitable causes than their non-believing counterparts. it is factual that believers typically suppose that the government ought to have a superior role in helping the needy and poor in the world which, in turn, should decrease the need for clandestine donations, except that the belief definitely doesn't impede believers from donating their money and time at <https://assignbuster.com/difference-between-believers-and-non-believers-religion-essay/>

the higher rates distinctive of all religious believers, so the grounds why religious people contribute more is small to do with politics. Lastly, after an extended assessment of government wellbeing and how he believes is impairing charitable giving and religious faith, Brooks gets around to tackling the grounds of why devout believers tend to be more bighearted than non-believers. He further points out that it might be that belief simply has a strong didactic control over volunteering and giving. Various places of worship might educate their congregants the spiritual responsibility to give, and about both the spiritual and physical desires of the poor. Basically, people are more likely to study charity in a synagogue, mosque or church than outside.

It's unquestionable that places of worship are highly significant when it comes to bountiful giving. But it's to a large extent more than just educating people that they ought to give. First, congregants are not merely taught that it is their just duty to offer, they are frequently told in no doubtful terms that "they will be known by their fruits"-that if they are certainly authentic to their belief, they will portray it by bequeathing their money and time to laudable causes. This is an enticement beyond and above just telling people that it is the correct thing to do. Next, religious leaders are continuously repeating to their congregants of their spiritual duty to give bigheartedly, mostly in times of crisis (*What Laws are Believers Under*, 2001, ¶11-5).

For example, how many American pastors agreed up the prospect to sermonize a discourse about the moral conscientiousness of looking after those less fortunate than ourselves in the consequences of Hurricane Katrina? very few just as everyone would wager. And it's not just the <https://assignbuster.com/difference-between-believers-and-non-believers-religion-essay/>

influential who frequently remind believers about contributions, it is also as a result of peer pressure. Among the parishioners there will for all time be a number of people on the lookout for help with one laudable reason or another. If you are a vigorous affiliate of a religious community, it's hard to keep away from all these desires for your money and time.

In conclusion, religious institutions hearten charitable donations by putting up the infrastructure that makes philanthropic as painless and as easy as likely. Each Sunday in several churches around the globe, an offertory bowl is passed under every congregant's nose. In several of those churches, you can even set up a monthly express debit to send your cash from your account to the church's personal coffers with no lifting a finger. Furthermore as a plus, you get to set aside some money on the taxes as well. There are stands in the churches coffee rooms dealing with Traidcraft goods in assistance to Third World scarcity, as well as tables set up where people can give up their time to help out in the neighborhood. The listing of ways that spiritual institutions assist people contribute their time and money to generous causes is endless (Buzz, 2010, ¶4).

It's also worth remembering that while most organizations charge a membership fee in order to help fund its financial obligations, religious organizations typically do not, and thus all monies collected from members in support of their operations are classed as charity, thus greatly boosting the overall amount religious people donate. Compare all that with the experience of the non-believer. There is little question that the vast majority of non-religious people believe that charitable giving is a good and moral thing to do. Even without access to a vast religious infrastructure to help

<https://assignbuster.com/difference-between-believers-and-non-believers-religion-essay/>

them, two-thirds of all non-believers still donate money to charity on a regular basis. So why don't non-believers donate as much or as often? Simply put, they lack the same motivations and opportunities that religious people have.

Non-believers do not have their moral duty to give to charity preached at fifty-two Sundays a year. They do not have a collection plate waved in their face every week reminding them of their obligation to make a donation. They do not typically frequent places where large on-going efforts to raise money for charity are underway, and they usually only have their consciences stirred when some great tragedy hits the news headlines-like the Ethiopian famines, Hurricane Katrina, or the Haitian earthquake. So I don't think that it is at all surprising that non-religious people give less of their time and money to charity. But it's not because non-believers are intrinsically less moral in any way, it's simply because they lack the same obligations, encouragement, and outlets that religious people have.

Ashford (2010), points out an excellent proposition on this issue that if aid is indeed a cultured behavior, it may be that houses of devotion are only meant to teach it. Secularists concerned in increasing benevolent volunteering and giving among their ranks might expend some effort opinionating on alternative ways to foster these habits. If at all there exists hope, then it would be in efforts to give many more people a taste of what it's like to donate one's time to charitable works. Study after study have shown that engaging in regular volunteer work can be a great benefit to one's mental and physical health. It doesn't matter if the volunteerism is conducted through a religious institution or not, almost everyone who tries it, <https://assignbuster.com/difference-between-believers-and-non-believers-religion-essay/>

even for a short time, begins to experience those personal benefits first hand, making it more likely that they would want to persist doing it on a customary basis (¶5-8).

Basically, individuals must come together in the public and decide how communal wealth will be allocated as well as how actions will be governed. These opinionated questions bring both nonbelievers and believers together and force interaction among them. It is not good enough for believers and nonbelievers to twist their backs on one other when real-life sensible matters are at risk. Providentially, there is a lot of universal ground accessible between believers and nonbelievers to tackle practical problems. So there are various ways to hearten charitable giving as well as instill good habits beyond the auspices of spiritual groups, despite the fact that I do not underrate the scale of the duty of matching the altruistic work performed and encouraged through religious institutions. The most important aspect to keep in mind is that there is nothing supernatural or mystical regarding the generosity of religious people. It is purely an end product of indoctrination, facilitation, promotion as well as education facilitated by the various religious institutions they belong to.