

SCIENCE, REASON AND CONSCIENCE: A PHILOSOPHICAL JOURNEY FROM THE CHAIR TO THE CREATOR – 11

The heated debate, which began with the example of a spacecraft on Mars, continues to experience extraordinary developments. The believer responds to both agnostic and atheist perspectives with solid arguments.

In this section, we see the believer deepen the discussion by providing a striking example against the claims of “**natural processes**” and “**science will explain everything.**”

The metaphor of reading the book of the universe, where each entity is likened to a word, each event to a sentence, and each system to a paragraph, is conveyed in an interesting manner.

The believer's examples continue to intrigue and provoke thought in the reader.

Believer: I've noticed that you frequently use expressions like “*natural processes,*” “*laws of nature,*” and “*science will eventually find an explanation.*” Before I clarify these expressions, you might object to my Mars example as follows: “***Nature and its complex processes are far more intricate and complex than the simple examples you've provided***” or “***Attempting to explain natural phenomena with simple human-made events is neither accurate nor scientific.***” Therefore, I have detailed the scientific foundations and academic research behind my Mars example in the footnotes below. I recommend reading these notes carefully.¹ To prevent any objections, I have chosen to reference English sources and Western authors.

Consider the amazement experienced by the three friends on Mars—Ahmet, Okan, and Teoman—when they encountered the spacecraft. **Doesn't their astonishment mirror our own world?** Particularly, the situations of Teoman and Okan resemble the atheist and agnostic perspectives. Okan tries to explain everything through natural processes, while Ahmet searches for a creator behind the order.

The three friends' examination of the spacecraft on Mars is, in fact, a metaphor for our discussion. Teoman and Okan, the Martians, observed the spacecraft's complex structure and operation. To them, the spacecraft might have formed naturally over time. However, this does not negate the presence of intelligence and design behind the spacecraft. We know **that the spacecraft was designed with a specific purpose and that there is an engineering intelligence behind it.**

Atheist: So, what questions should we ask to understand how something came to be?

Believer: Here are four fundamental principles that can guide us:

First Fundamental Principle: The Creator of a Work is Not Found Within the Work

- The creator of a work is not to be sought within the work itself. It is a mistake for someone examining the formation of an entity to conclude that the creator of that entity is derived from the characteristics of the materials involved. **To identify the creator, one should look for qualities such as will, knowledge, power, authority, and control.** For example, the person who constructed a building is not sought among the construction materials, such as cement or bricks. When investigating the architect or contractor of a building, we seek

someone external to the materials, with the will, knowledge, and control to carry out the task. No one goes to a building and asks, “**Who** made this?” by examining the construction materials. Even if the architect or contractor is not present, no one expects to find architectural or contracting qualities in the materials themselves. Certainly, the building was made with these materials, but these materials do not possess the capabilities of an architect or contractor.

- The universe, too, is made of atoms, molecules, and other substances. However, it is as erroneous to seek the creator within these materials as it is to seek the creator within the universe itself. Just as one would not search for the painter within a painting or within the brush and paint, the creator is not to be sought within the materials used in the universe.
- Teoman and Okan, the Martians, initially thought that the tools within the spacecraft might have created it. However, by the end of their investigation, they realized that these tools did not make the spacecraft. It is evident that the spacecraft was made by engineers at NASA. After examining the tools inside the spacecraft, particularly the computers and programs, they thought, “Maybe these created it.” But eventually, they understood that this too was incorrect. Initially, they objected to Ahmet, saying, “Let’s wait, research patiently, maybe we can find the answer here,” but ultimately, **they reached Ahmet’s truth. We also know that this is the real truth.**

Atheist: This argument is truly thought-provoking...

Agnostic: Yes, it's really a logical explanation. I need to think more about this...

Believer: Allow me to continue with the second fundamental principle that can guide us:

Second Fundamental Principle: The Creator of a Work is Not of the Same Kind as the Work

- The creator of a work is not of the same kind or material as the work itself. Let’s continue with the construction example: When searching for the person who built the construction, we do not look for a contractor or architect made of construction materials. In other words, we do not seek someone with the properties of cement, bricks, or wood.
- To make this clearer, let’s use the example of a stove. When searching for the person who made the stove, we do not look for someone with the characteristics of a stove. It would not be logical or correct to seek a maker who has fire inside, works with coal, has a chimney, or emits smoke. We cannot imagine the maker of the stove based on these characteristics, and without being told, we cannot fully know what the person is like, whether they are a woman, a man, tall, or dark-skinned, etc., but we can know their attributes.

The other listeners in the room listened to the Believer’s explanation with excitement, amazement, and curiosity. Feeling that they were thinking more clearly with this information, they felt relieved. They began to understand better that the astonishment of Ahmet, Okan, and Teoman on Mars in front of the spacecraft was, in fact, a reflection of the great truth in the universe. When examined deeply, natural processes and finely tuned structures reveal the intelligence and purpose behind them. They began to think more carefully: Did the universe and its contents really form by chance, as in the spacecraft example? Or is there engineering behind it? As they pursued these questions, their curiosity to discover the artistic and purposeful order of the universe increased.

Believer: The third fundamental principle that can guide us:

Nothing that is Artfully and Purposefully Made Can Arise by Chance or by Itself

- Especially something with a very precise and purposeful structure cannot arise by chance or by itself; particularly if it forms in the same way millions of times. Let's take the construction example again: Suppose we gather all the construction materials in a field and wait for billions of years; these materials would not even be able to stack a single brick on their own. Because they do not have the capability to do so, everyone knows this.
- You might say, *"But these are not alive, so they wouldn't do such a thing."* But in something you call alive, do you acknowledge the presence of intelligence, will, power, authority, and control? ***It is said, "They act intelligently," but it is not said, "They have intelligence." It is said, "They act as if they know," but it is not said, "They know."*** This shows that even in a living structure or being, the minimum required qualities are clear: intelligence, will, power, authority, and control.
- Okan's belief that the spacecraft on Mars formed through natural processes in the atmosphere and evolution is, therefore, not realistic. **NASA officials were also surprised by this idea.** The truth is that the spacecraft is a product of the design and effort of NASA engineers. **No matter how much Okan and Teoman research, this fact remains unchanged.**

The astonishment of the Atheist and Agnostic echoed in the minds of those in the room. Curiosity sparkled in their eyes. The truths expressed by the Believer led them into deep contemplation. They had never seen the intelligence and purpose behind natural processes and complex structures so clearly before. They began to grasp that the universe is a marvel of engineering.

As the question of whether the universe really formed by chance echoed in their minds, they paused to think. The reality that everything was created within an order and purpose amazed them. Their curiosity and desire to learn were further ignited by this new awareness.

Before moving on to the fourth fundamental principle, a silence fell in the room. This silence opened new doors in their minds, and their thoughts deepened. Then, in a calm voice, the Believer continued:

Believer: The fourth fundamental principle:

Researching How a Work is Made and Investigating Its Creator

- Investigating how a work is made requires a different perspective; investigating and trying to know its creator requires an entirely different approach. In other words, **investigating how a work is made and investigating its creator are different things, and each requires a different method.** All the methods and examples we provided above explain this principle. Therefore, the idea that **"being a believer hinders scientific research"** is incorrect. Faith does not hold us back; such a thought can only be explained by **"laziness"** and **"ignorance."**

- On the contrary, to know the creator, one must know the creations. Through them, we can understand the nature of the creator, that is, His attributes. To learn about His craftsmanship and what He can do, we need to investigate what is created. If He has not provided another way to introduce Himself, one must enter the laboratory of the universe to know Him and work there. Simply saying, “All of this was made by a being,” and **then sitting idly by is laziness, and the creator does not want or appreciate this. The creator cannot be known this way.**
- Imagine a painter. Four viewers are examining his painting. The first viewer claims that the painting formed by itself, with the help of materials. The second viewer says, “No, this painting was made by a painter,” and steps aside. **The third viewer describes the painter as having specific attributes, characteristics, and abilities.** Finally, the fourth viewer says he thinks they could all be right, feels confused, and wants to do more research.
- Now, which of them would the painter, watching from afar, appreciate, find correct, commend, and be disturbed by? I leave the answer to this question to you.

When the Atheist and Agnostic heard the fourth fundamental principle, they felt an enlightenment within them. They realized they had found the answers to the questions that had been troubling them. **They understood that the belief that “being a believer hinders scientific research” was actually an assumption, a supposition, or a reflection of some incorrect practices on their part.** They grasped how this mistaken belief had limited them and prevented them from seeing the truth. Realizing that this was one of the issues that had bothered them the most, they felt a sense of relief. When they understood that this false contradiction between science and faith was actually an illusion, they, like everyone else in the room, found great inner peace.

This moment of enlightenment had a profound impact not only on their minds but also on their hearts. The light shining in their eyes was a sign of new understanding and discovery. This moment was not only a turning point in the discussion but also in their own inner journeys.

The Believer noticed this change and supported them with a smile on his face.

Believer: This is the first step in searching for and finding the truth. **Never lose your questions, for they are your guides to the truth.**

These words became a **source of inspiration** for the Atheist and Agnostic. As they felt the excitement and hope of this new beginning within them, the Believer continued his speech.

TO BE CONTINUED (GOD WILLING)

I HAVE PARTICULARLY PREFERRED TO USE ENGLISH AND WESTERN AUTHORS' WORKS AS SOURCES BELOW. The reason for this preference is the unfortunately biased attachment of many people to **WESTERN AND ENGLISH SOURCES.** However, in Eastern sources and especially in our own works, there are works admired by

Western sources. The works of Bediüzzaman Said Nursi's Risale-i Nur Collection, Imam Ghazali, Muhyiddin Ibn Arabi, Ibn Rushd, Ibn Sina, Ibn Khaldun, and many other valuable names prove this.

¹ The following list comprehensively presents the scientific foundations and relevant academic research supporting the methods used in the text:

1. **Analogy:**

- **Explanation:** This method is used to facilitate the understanding of complex or abstract concepts. By relating new information to previously known ideas, it supports learning. The example of the spacecraft on Mars and NASA concretizes the idea that complex systems cannot arise by themselves, creating a clearer mental image for the reader and producing a convincing effect.
- **Scientific Basis and Research:**
 - Richland, L. E., & Begolli, K. N. (2016). *Analogy use in science learning*. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of the Learning Sciences* (2nd ed., pp. 334-352). Cambridge University Press.
 - Holyoak, K. J., & Thagard, P. (1997). *The analogical mind*. *American Psychologist*, 52(1), 35-44.

2. **Questioning:**

- **Explanation:** This method encourages active learning and develops critical thinking skills. By posing questions to the reader throughout the text, it promotes active participation and helps the reader better understand what they have learned.
- **Scientific Basis and Research:**
 - Chin, C., & Osborne, J. (2010). *Supporting argumentation through students' questions and teachers' questions: Case studies in science classrooms*. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 47(6), 608-636.
 - Graesser, A. C., & Person, N. K. (1994). *Question asking during tutoring*. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(1), 104-137.

3. **Appeal to Authority:**

- **Explanation:** Responses derived from artificial intelligence (e.g., ChatGPT 4.0 and Gemini Advanced) are presented as scientific authority, thereby enhancing the credibility of the text and fostering the reader's trust in it.
- **Scientific Basis and Research:**
 - Cialdini, R. B. (2009). *Influence: Science and Practice* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
 - Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). *The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion*. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 19, 123-205.

4. **Storytelling:**

- **Explanation:** This method makes information memorable and understandable. Stories process information both emotionally and logically, supporting learning. The story set on Mars at the beginning of the text captures the reader's attention and makes abstract concepts more concrete, making the narrative more engaging.
- **Scientific Basis and Research:**
 - Dahlstrom, M. F. (2014). *Using narratives and storytelling to communicate science with nonexpert audiences*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(Supplement 4), 13614-13620.
 - Zak, P. J. (2015). *Why inspiring stories make us react: The neuroscience of narrative*. *Cerebrum*, 2015, 1-10.

5. **Presenting Opposing Views:**

- **Explanation:** Presenting different perspectives encourages critical thinking and allows readers to evaluate the topic from multiple angles. The varying viewpoints of Ahmet, Okan, and Teoman in the text facilitate a multi-faceted discussion of the subject, encouraging the reader to think critically and consider diverse opinions.
- **Scientific Basis and Research:**
 - Hess, D. E. (2009). *Controversy in the classroom: The democratic power of discussion*. Routledge.
 - Parker, W. C. (2001). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life*. Teachers College Press.

6. **Arousing Curiosity:**

-
- **Explanation:** Curiosity is a significant motivator for learning. Arousing curiosity keeps readers engaged with the topic. The information provided at the end of the text about “beings in the hereafter” watching over humans triggers the reader's curiosity and directs them to the next section.
 - **Scientific Basis and Research:**
 - Kashdan, T. B., & Silvia, P. J. (2009). *Curiosity and interest: The benefits of thriving on novelty and challenge*. Oxford University Press.
 - Kang, M. J., Hsu, M., Krajbich, I. M., Loewenstein, G., McClure, S. M., Wang, J. T.-y., & Camerer, C. F. (2009). *The wick in the candle of learning: Epistemic curiosity activates reward circuitry and enhances memory*. *Psychological Science*, 20(8), 963-973.