

SCIENCE, REASON AND CONSCIENCE: A PHILOSOPHICAL JOURNEY FROM THE CHAIR TO THE CREATOR - 3

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS CHAPTERS

In the first section, it is narrated that three people with different beliefs (a believer in a creator, an agnostic, and an atheist) gathered in a room and witnessed the formation of a chair. The atheist attributed the formation of the chair entirely to natural processes and the inherent properties of the materials. The believer in a creator, on the other hand, argued that this perfect order and creation could only be achieved by an unseen, conscious being with free will. The agnostic person rejected both sides, stating that it is not possible to make a definite judgment about how the event happened and that more scientific research and evidence are needed.

In the second section, the atheist continues to support his argument by explaining the formation of the chair with scientific explanations. The technical details explaining the movements and functions of the ruler, saw, hammer, glue, and sandpaper lead the reader **to deeper thoughts** on the complex relationship between science, belief, and philosophy. In response to the atheist's scientific explanations, the answer of the person who believes in a creator was eagerly awaited.

SECTION THREE: THE BRIDGE BETWEEN FAITH AND SCIENCE

The atheist's detailed explanations had caused a storm among the audience. Now it was the turn of the person who firmly believed in the existence of a creator to respond. This moment, which everyone was eagerly awaiting, would reveal the delicate balance between faith and science. Would the arguments put forward by the believer show which side of this bridge was stronger? The audience, eager to see how the bridge between faith and science was formed, **continued to listen carefully** to the arguments of both sides. In the third section, we will continue to seek answers to these complex and deep questions.

Believer: My friend, I am happy to exchange ideas with you on this important topic. We have different views on believing in the existence of a creator. However, we can discuss this topic in depth within the framework of mutual respect and understanding.

You explained in detail how a machine works. You really described a wonderful mechanism, and you did it so well that the listener felt as if they were watching a miracle. However, what you're describing only explains how this mechanism works, not "why" and "by whom" it was made.

Imagine a first-grade elementary school student, a 6-7 year old child who has just started school and is getting an education. One day at school, his teacher notices the child crying and asks why he is crying. The child says that he was upset when he saw his notebook randomly scribbled on when he entered the classroom after recess. The teacher sees a pencil next to the notebook and says to the child:

"My son, why are you blaming your friends? Look, there's a pencil next to the notebook. This pencil has the ability to write. It got up and scribbled on your notebook while you were away."

Your explanation is similar to this. Wouldn't the child be surprised by what the teacher said, despite his age, intelligence, and experience?

"Teacher, what are you saying? How is this possible?"

Wouldn't he say? The teacher's explanation doesn't even make sense to the child, does it? Yes, of course this could have been done with a pencil. But a perpetrator is needed, that is, someone who did this. **The pencil may have the ability to do such a thing, but it does not have the thought, will, and power to do these things.** *Even a child can comprehend this.*

Similarly, your explanation is like the teacher's answer to the child, but the real answer has not been received. The lines may have been drawn with a pencil, but the truth is that a friend took the pencil that had the ability to write and scribbled on the child's notebook. So it has the will and desire. It took the pencil and drew lines in the notebook, so it has the strength and power. It did not ask the pencil and did not get permission from the notebook, so it has the authority. This is the real truth.

If the perpetrator, that is, the doer, is not sought, there would be no science of law. When a person is seen killed, the person who did it is sought. Otherwise, the gun and bullets found next to the deceased are not considered guilty. Guns and bullets have the ability to kill a person, but they don't know and can't do that. Because **doing something requires qualities such as strength, power, dominance, knowledge, discretion, and desire.** Even a 6-7 year old elementary school child knows that these are not found in matter, and therefore looks at his teacher in amazement and says, *"Are you kidding?"*

Let me give you a simpler example:

You are watching TV in a room at two o'clock at night and you are alone at home. While you were focused on watching your movie on TV, the doorknob suddenly lowered and the door slowly opened. Why did your heart start pounding? Why were you excited?

"Because there is no one at home and the door opened"

you will say. But if we act with your logic, doesn't the doorknob have the ability to go down? Doesn't the door have the ability to open? The doorknob slowly tilted downwards in direct proportion to gravity. The door also moved horizontally forward with a certain and measured force on the ground. **The explanations for these movements are correct.** Because **the mechanism works like that.** *But this is not the real truth.* How did this door open out of nowhere? Let's say the wind pushed it open. But the doorknob going down? And the movements are done in a certain order? These require an intention and a will. These are neither in the door nor in the doorknob.

Your heart automatically started pounding and you excitedly said, "Who's there?" Why did you look for the "perpetrator", that is, the "doer", by saying "who"? Logic, reason, knowledge, conscience require this.

While a doer is sought for even two simple actions, how scientific, how logical, how wise would it be to seek all these wonderful, artistic, unique, miraculous works in the universe in a matter that is mindless, unwilling, without strength and power, does not know purpose, does not even know itself, is unaware of other substances and does not even know what it can do?

Bediuzzaman Said Nursi has wonderful determinations in the section titled "**The Air (Hüve Nüktesi)**" in the The Words (Sözler) book of Risale-i Nur Collection and says the following:ⁱ

"As if a handful of soil, in its pot, which serves as a pot for a hundred flowers in turn, if it is left to nature, to the causes, it is necessary that either there be a hundred, perhaps as many spiritual machines and factories as the number of flowers, on a small scale in that pot; or that every particle in that particle of soil should know how to make all those different flowers, with their various properties and life-giving apparatus, and have infinite knowledge and endless power like a god."

In the example given by Bediuzzaman Hazretleri, it is stated that a handful of soil cannot know and therefore cannot make hundreds of different flowers. If this situation were to be explained only by physical and chemical processes, we would have to attribute the knowledge and power to make all the flowers to each particle. However, you will agree that it is clear that these particles do not have such knowledge and power. Therefore, it is evident that there is a creative power behind this order.

We see that the materials that make the chair can also make armchairs, tables, coffee tables, and many other pieces of furniture. However, a substance does not have so much knowledge, ability to do, and power to dominate others. While even a being like a human, who is intelligent, has free will, has dominion and discretion, and has knowledge, does not have the ability to make thousands of different things like this, it is of course neither scientific, nor conscientious, nor rational, nor logical to expect god-like works from a mindless, unconscious, and unwilling substance.

If we attribute this order and productivity to the ability of the matter itself, we have to attribute infinite knowledge, will, and power to each particle. However, this situation is impossible and irrational. With the same logic, it is as illogical as expecting the pages of a book to come together with the wind and form a meaningful text.

As stated in "**The Air (Hüve Nüktesi)**", every particle in the universe moves in a certain order and purpose. Likewise, each step in the formation process of the chair takes place in a certain order and purpose. The one who provides this order and purpose is a creator with knowledge, will, and power.

The believer's profound and impressive explanations filled the room with a dense cloud of thought and curiosity. The same question was on everyone's mind: Did such a perfect order and functioning really point to a creator? While the audience pondered the examples and logical inferences presented by the believer, they eagerly awaited the atheist's response. This dialogue between science and faith opened the door to big questions that extended to the depths of the universe, beyond just understanding how a chair came to be.

Now it was the atheist's turn. What kind of defense would he make with scientific and rational explanations against the believer's arguments? Was it possible to explain the delicate order and magnificent structure of nature without the need for a creator? This eagerly awaited moment would reveal how the paths of faith and science intersected or diverged. The audience, listening carefully to the arguments of both sides, eagerly awaited the next stop on this philosophical journey.

Atheist (Who Does Not Believe in the Existence of a Creator): As I understand it, you think that a creator is needed to explain the existence and functionality of the chair. However, **nature and**

the complex processes within it are very different and more complex than the simple examples you give.

First of all, events such as the pencil drawing on the notebook, the doorknob lowering, and the door opening stem **from the fact that man-made objects and mechanisms are designed for a specific purpose.** These objects are specially produced to perform a certain function and may require human intervention when performing these functions.

For example, the formation of the universe and the movement of galaxies, stars, and planets within it are governed by basic laws of physics. **These laws explain how the universe works and how it changes.** The functioning of these laws can be explained without the need for a creator. It is neither correct nor scientific to try to explain natural events with such simple and man-made events.

In the face of these counter-explanations of the atheist, the answer and scientific data to be presented by the person who firmly believes that a creator must exist were eagerly awaited. Which arguments would come to the fore on this bridge between faith and science? In the fourth section, we will continue to seek answers to these complex and deep questions. How will the believer respond to the atheist's request for an answer **with scientific data**? Where will this dialogue between science and faith take us? We look forward to discovering the answers to these questions in the next section.

TO BE CONTINUED (GOD WILLING)

SCIENCE, REASON AND CONSCIENCE: A PHILOSOPHICAL JOURNEY FROM THE CHAIR TO THE CREATOR - 4

ⁱ From the Risale-i Nur Collection by Bediuzzaman Said Nursi the Words 160 : The Thirteenth Word / The Second Station (Maqam) of the Thirteenth Word / The Air (Hüve Nuktesi)