July, 2015, I-III

Issues_title_English: 2015 Vol.44 Issue 2-3

EDITORIAL

ON THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

BY

Raouf Sallam

Stephen Hawking - today's Einstein - said that we cannot prove the existence of God by science alone. I considered this an insult to science; how can science fail to prove the existence of the most prominent and permanent fact in the universe? And hence was this article. It is as much about the scientific method as it is about God.

Let us first agree that a theory- any theory- is not to be proven or disproven but rather to be accepted or rejected.

In fact you can never prove any theory; as an example, that the sum of the angles of a triangle is always 180 degrees is a theory. To be proven we should measure the angles of all the triangles of different sizes, different shapes, on different surfaces, in different places and at different times. This is impossible, was not done and will not be done. Though not proven, the theory is accepted.

For a theory to be accepted it must fulfill three conditions:

- 1. There is enough evidence to support it.
- 2. It is amenable to testing.
- 3. There is not a single evidence to refute it.

In short a theory is accepted when it is: Evidenced....Testable....Unrefuted.

Now we turn to our subject, which is the existence of god, which I will tackle through the existence of the universe.

Iknow that some have suggested that the universe does not exist in reality but only exists in our imagination. Even if we entertain this idea we will find that we must exist to imagine and we are part of the universe. Besides there is no evidence to support this idea and plenty of evidence to the contrary; evidence to support the exictence of the universe which we can see, touch, hear, enjoy, suffer from, interact with and modify every day and everywhere. Evidence that has been tested and unrefuted.

Accepting that the universe exists and that we too exist as creatures with brains and minds; we must ask how did it begin? how did it develop? what maintains it?

There are many theories about the origin of the universe; they fall in two groups:

- A) Non creational theories.
- B) Creational theories.

The non creational theories are mainly two:

- 1. The universe was "Not Created" but it was here all thetime. For this Iwould say if the universe was here all the time, it must have been put here by some power. This theory is a matter of semantics with no evidence at all to support it; so we do not even need to refute it. It belongs to the pseudo science.
- 2. The universe "Developed Spontaneosly" from energy and matter; for this I would say that spontaneos development cannot be that diverse and that organised. It may then be argued that our universe is so diverse and organised only by the law of probability being one of millions of universes that developed spontaneosly and vanished or are there somewhere yet undiscovered by us. The counter argument would be that: * there not a single evidence to support this assumption. **the energy and matter must have been created before reacting to form the universe.

Now, after accepting the existence of the universe and rejecting all the suggestions and theories about the non creational existence let us discuss the creational theories; these are mainly two: the universe was created by one creator or more than one creator:

- 1. The theory of "More than One Creator" can be easily dismissed since there is no evidence to support it, besides the integrity of such a diverse universe testifies for the unity of creation which testifies for the unity of the creator.
- 2. The theory of a single creator is evidenced by the complementary nature of the universe, the coordination of its widely variable parts and its maintained regularity.

So much evidence for the exixtence of a single creator for the universe. Enough evidence to consider the theory for the other two conditionsforacceptability i.e testability and unrefutability

- 1. In fact for thousands of years now no body has been able to create anything even similar to a small part of the universe eg. a small comet, ananimal, a bird or a flowering seed.
- 2.No one has been able to create something anything out of nothing. What we consider our creation is in fact either a discovery or a clever assembly of the items of nature according to the laws of nature already created and in existence for thousands or millions of years.
- 3. Throughout history no one has ever claimed to have created any part of the universe, the earth, the stars the oceans or any member of the biology kingdom. The single creator stands unchallenged.

From all of the above it is clear that the theory of the existence of a single creator to all what we know and experience is:

- 1.Evidenced.
- 2. Tested.
- 3. unrefuted.

The "Theory is Accepted".

Science alone can lead us to accept the existence of a single creator even without any inherent, inherited, socially chosen or predetermined belief.

This single creator we call God.

Now, having established the exictence of god let us consider some of his characters as evidenced by the observed universe. The vast variability in the creation is a testominy of his capability, the afflunce is a testimony of his generosity, the dynamism of the universe is an evidence that he is alive and its maintenance an evidence that he is ever attending.

Having established the exictence and the characters of the god by inductive inference we can now use the deductive inference and the predictive ability of the theory to establish the truethfulness of the prophets and the holy books; but this may be the subject of a separate forthcoming article.

Editor-in-Chief Prof. Raouf Sallam F.R.C.S.