

SAWAH BOOKS LTD

# Search for Truth

Maulana Wahiduddin Khan



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents.....	2
Introduction .....	3
Search for Truth.....	10
Philosophy.....	13
Science.....	17
Mysticism .....	20
Faith and Reason .....	27
Natural Argument.....	27
Philosophical Argument .....	29
Spiritual Argument.....	31
Scientific Argument.....	32



## INTRODUCTION

The theme of this book is evident from its title. Its purpose is to present Islam as it is, drawing on its original sources rather than judging it by the later day interpretations and commentaries or the practices of present day Muslims in different parts of the world. A distinction is made between Islam as presented by the Prophet Muhammad, may peace be upon him, and his Companions (information about which is available to us in the Qur'an and the *sunnah*) and Islam as represented by later Muslim generations—both in theory and practice. This is what we call the scientific approach.

We are living in the age of the media. Before the advent of the modern media there were large numbers of people in the world who knew nothing of Islam. With the invention of the printing press and now the electronic media it is difficult to find today a single person who is unaware of it.

But there is a clear-cut difference. In previous ages it happened that wherever Islam spread people



were so impressed with it that most of them accepted it as their religion. That is why today we find more than one billion Muslims throughout the world. Strangely enough the present day publicity given to Islam has produced only a negative effect. People are now generally allergic to Islam rather than being interested in it.

In previous centuries when Islam was introduced, people used to say: Yes, “Mr. Islam welcome to you!” Now when Islam is presented to them they say: “No thank you.” Why is there this difference? The answer is very simple. In previous centuries Islam was introduced to the people of the world through its scriptures, as it is—without the slightest change in its original message. Whereas in modern times, Islam is being introduced through the negative practices of certain Muslims as reported by the media.

There is a further and more severe problem that of selective reporting. According to their own criteria the media is interested only in ‘hot’ news, although so much ‘soft’ news is available about the Muslim people. Because of their ingrained professionalism,



they do not allow this 'soft' news to find its way into their columns of their broadcasts.

Islam is the religion of nature. If it were to be presented in its original form, people would turn to it quite naturally. For example, when a recently converted American by the name of Gary Miller was asked why he had converted to Islam, he replied: "I didn't convert to Islam I have rather reverted to my original religion."

Unfortunately, a section of Muslims is engaged in violent and aggressive activities, wrongfully indeed, in the name of Islam. It is such news as, through the media, has a great impact upon the general public and creates serious misunderstandings. People have come to take Islam as a militant religion. Since modern man is in search of peace, he finds no appeal in a religion which, as presented by the media, is one of hatred and violence.

This book attempts to introduce Islam as it is. It calls for a distinction to be made between Islam and the practices of Muslims. Taking a scientific attitude, you have to see Islam in the light of the



Islamic scriptures and not judge it by Muslim conduct.

For surely, if you want to know what democracy is, you will examine the ideology of democracy as established by its champions. You will not form an opinion about the democratic system merely on the basis of observing some self-styled democratic nation. Everyone who wants to know what Islam is should follow this scientific method while trying to form his opinion on Islam.

We are living in an age of information. This is the age of the knowledge explosion. Today, everyone wants to know more and more about everything, including religion. The result is that, on the subject of religion, people are far better informed than ever before. But there is a difference. About other religions, people generally know what is enshrined in their religious books. Whereas the case of Islam is the opposite. Their information about Islam is derived from unauthentic sources. The reason for this lies with the Muslims and not with anyone else. The Muslims of modern times are engaged in violence everywhere in the name of Islam. Violence,



however, is not limited only to Muslims. It is found in every community and in every group. But there is a basic difference between the two. When the adherents of other religions engage in violence, they do not do so in the name of their religion. But the violence engaged in by the Muslims is being done in the name of Islam.

These violent activities of the Muslims reach the people through the media. As modern media is a “hot news”-based industry, these violent events are flashed in the media. For this reason, people come to regard Islam as a religion of violence. It is only among Muslims that all violent activities are carried out in the name of religion.

In practice, only a tiny minority of Muslims is engaged in such violent activities. However, since other Muslims neither condemn these activities, nor disown them outright, it is but natural for people to attribute their violent propensities to their religion. But the scientific way of study is to distinguish Islam from the deeds of Muslims, just as the ideology of democracy is studied by distinguishing it from the acts of democratic countries.



The aim of this book is to present Islam as it is enshrined in its sacred scriptures, so that it may be brought before the people in its true form. The authentic source of information about Islam is the Qur'an. The Qur'an, according to Muslim belief, was revealed by God to the Arabian Prophet Muhammad, may peace be upon him. The second source of knowledge about Islam is the *sunnah*, i.e., the words, deeds and sanctions of the Prophet Muhammad, may peace be upon him. The lives of the companions of the Prophet provide another later source. Then, there is a full stop in this matter. No other person or historical record enjoys the status of source of Islam.

However, this book does not claim to be a comprehensive introduction to Islam. That is something which can be had only by studying Islam directly through its basic scriptures, that is, the Qur'an and Sunnah. This book thus presents a fundamental introduction for those who want to understand Islam as it is. Its aim is to provide a proper background in the light of which the original sources of Islam may be studied.



I hope that this book will be useful for those who want to know about the original Islam, as opposed to the “religion” represented by certain self-styled Muslim leaders introduced to us by the media.

## SEARCH FOR TRUTH

Man is a born seeker—a veritable truth-seeking animal. Every human being regards himself as incomplete until he has found that supreme principle by which he can explain his existence in this world and discover the purpose and meaning of his life.

Everyone is a seeker. True. But few are finders. Why? Because, where seeking is instinctive, finding is the outcome of one's own conscious effort.

In the pre-Islamic period, there were certain individuals in Arabia, called *hunaafa*. They were all truth seekers. Confining themselves to solitary places, they would remember God and say: "O God if we had known how to worship You, we would have worshipped you accordingly."

This was due to their urge to come to grips with reality—an urge such as is found in every human being, the difference between one individual and another being only one of degree: in some, the urge is weak, in others it is strong.



Then, there are some deviations. Some people take certain material objects to be their goal in life and do their utmost to obtain them. But there is an internal evidence that they do so mistakenly. Before obtaining these material objects, they are highly enthusiastic about them. But as soon as they have them in their possession their enthusiasm turns to frustration for, with experience, they invariably find that what they have struggled for so hard, has failed to give them the desired sense of fulfillment. All these material things in this world are meant to fulfill only our physical needs. They have nothing to do with the purpose of our lives. This purpose can be only spiritual in nature, and not something material.

To achieve this purpose is the greatest quest in life. Everyone is motivated, consciously or unconsciously, by this demand of human nature, everyone at one time or another suffers from a sense of frustration, with or without sad experiences. To make one's life meaningful, therefore one has to discover its purpose. One should be extremely sincere and honest in this respect. Sincerity and honesty are an assurance of engaging oneself



unremittingly in this pursuit, and never giving-up, until one has discovered the real purpose of human existence.

When a man succeeds in discovering this ideal, he becomes a person who is fit to be called a complete man, one who has succeeded in making his life purposeful, in the real sense of the word. Such a person has been called in the Qur'an: *al-nafs al-Mutmainna* (89:27). This means a soul at rest, in peace or in a state of complete satisfaction. That is, a man who wholeheartedly follows the divine way of life and is always fully satisfied, whether or not it is in consonance with his own desires. By showing such total willingness to surrender his will to the will of God, he attains that state of humanity which is at one with the creation plan of God. Such people will be rewarded with eternal paradise in the world Hereafter.

This will to search for the truth is implanted in everyone. But it depends upon every individual himself, whether or not he pursues this natural urge. Only through sincere pursuit will he discover the truth and thus make his life meaningful. For any



kind of negligence or apathy in this regard, there is no excuse, whatever the circumstances.

## **PHILOSOPHY**

Philosophy is the only discipline which, by its own definition, embodies the quest for knowledge and understanding of the nature and meaning of the universe as well as of human life.

But after a long search of more than 5000 years, to which the greatest minds of human history have been bent, it has failed to provide any definite answer to such questions.

Bertrand Russell was a great thinker of the present world, whose life spanned almost a century. He spent almost his entire life in reading and writing on philosophical subjects. But he failed to evolve any credible ideology. Because of this failure, one of his commentators remarks that “he was a philosopher of no philosophy.” This is true not only of Bertrand Russell, but also of all other philosophers. Individually or jointly, they have failed to produce any philosophical system which



might have provided a sound answer to the human dilemma.

The main concern of philosophy was to make a unified picture of the world, including human life. But the long history of philosophy shows that this still remains an unfulfilled dream. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in its 27-page article on philosophy and its history admits that there seems to be no possibility of philosophical unification. The article concludes with this remark:

In the contemporary philosophical universe, multiplicity and division still reign. (*EB*, Vol. 14:274 [1984])

Why this failure? This failure is not of a chance or intermittent nature, but seems to be a permanent feature of the philosophical approach to reality. The Qur'an has drawn our attention to this fact, saying:

They put questions to you about the Spirit. Say: "The Spirit is at the command of my Lord and of knowledge you have been given only a little." (17:85)



This means that the problem stems from man's own shortcomings. The philosophical explanation of the world requires unbounded knowledge, whereas man has had only limited knowledge bestowed upon him. Due to these intellectual constraints man cannot uncover the secrets of the world on his own. So it is not the lack of research, but the blinkered state of the human mind, that stands as a permanent obstacle in the philosopher's path to reality. It is this human inadequacy which explains the unexplainable.

For example, suppose, in order to unveil reality and the law of life, the enquirer starts from a study of human settlements. After a detailed survey, he comes to the conclusion that since society is composed of human beings, he had better focus on the individual, and so he studies human psychology. But there he finds that, despite extensive research in this field it has resulted in nothing but intellectual chaos.

He ultimately finds that no unified system emerges from psychology. In despair of finding any solution to the problem, he turns to biology. His in-depth



study of biology leads him to the conclusion that the whole human system is based on certain chemical actions and reactions, so, for a proper understanding of the human body he begins to study physics and chemistry. This study leads him to the discovery that, in the last analysis, man like other things, is composed of atoms. So, he takes to the study of nuclear science, only to arrive at the conclusion that the atom is composed of nothing but incomprehensible waves of electrons.

At this point man, as well as the universe, is seen as nothing but, in the words of a scientist, a mad dance of electrons. A philosopher ostensibly begins his study from a basis of knowledge, but ultimately comes to a point where there is nothing but the universal darkness of bewilderment. Thus a 5000-year journey of philosophy has brought the sorry conclusion that, due to its limitations, it is simply not in a position to unfold the secrets of the universe.

It is evident from the several thousand year-long history of philosophical inquiry that philosophy has failed to give any satisfactory answer to questions





concerning reality. Moreover, there is a growing body of evidence that philosophy is inherently incompetent for the task undertaken by it. The need, therefore, is to find some alternative discipline that may help us reach our desired intellectual goal.

## **SCIENCE**

What is science? According to its definition “Science is a branch of knowledge concerned with the material world conducted on objective principles involving the systematised observation of, and experiment with physical phenomenon.”

Science has divided the world of knowledge into two parts—knowledge of things and knowledge of truths. According to this division, science has confined its study only to a part of the world and not to the entire world. A scientist has rightly remarked that “science gives us but a partial knowledge of reality.”

This means that science being confined in its scope to the physical aspect of the world, has kept itself aloof from higher spiritual matters. No scientist has



ever claimed that science attempts to find out the absolute truth. All scientists humbly submit that the “search for truth” is not their target. They are simply trying to understand how the objective world functions and not why it functions. For instance, the chemistry of a flower may be chemically analyzed, but not its odour.

Chemistry can describe how water may be turned into steam power, but not why a miraculous life-giving element such as water came to exist in our world. Similarly, while science is concerned with the biological aspect of man, it is not the aim of science to try to discover the secret of the strange phenomena commonly known as the mind and spirit.

Science has never claimed that its objective is to discover the total truth or absolute reality. The concerns of science are basically descriptive, and not teleological. Although science has failed to give a satisfactory answer to the quest for truth, it is not to be disparaged, for this has never been its motivation.



Many people had pinned their hopes on science providing them with the superior life they had sought for so long. But after more than two hundred years, it has dawned upon recent generations that science has fallen very far short of fulfilling man's hopes and aspirations, even in the material sense. Now it has been generally acknowledged that, although science has many plus points for human betterment, it has many minus points as well.

Science gave us machines, but along with them it also gave us a new kind of social problem: unemployment. Science gave us comfortable motor cars but at the same time it polluted the air, making it difficult for human beings to inhale fresh air, just as with the rise of modern industry, there came the pollution of life giving water. Production may have been speeded up, but at the cost of adversely affecting our whole social structure.

If the object of science was to provide man with the answer to his search for truth it had obviously failed. If the search for truth was not within the province of science, there was no reason for it to



figure in such discussions at all. In other words, science cannot be legitimately blamed for not helping man to grasp the ultimate reality, for this was not something expected of it. Indeed the reality lies far beyond the boundaries of science.

## **MYSTICISM**

What is mysticism? According to the Encyclopaedia Britannica, mysticism is a “quest for a hidden truth or wisdom.” The Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought, defines it thus: “Mysticism is the direct experience of the divine as real and near, blotting out all sense of time and producing intense joy.”

Some people mistakenly think that mysticism is the answer to the search for truth. In fact, mysticism, to be more exact, is a sort of escapism. It seeks a refuge rather than the truth.

According to the mystics, the final state produced by mystical exercises is inner joy or spiritual bliss. The subject of the present volume is the search for truth. So far as this subject is concerned, mysticism is quite irrelevant to it.



1. The search for truth, by its very nature, is entirely an intellectual exercise. Its findings too are intellectual in nature. It is successful when the seeker finds rational answers to the questions he poses about the universe and his own existence. The search for truth is not a vague matter. It begins from the conscious mind and also culminates there.

The case of mysticism is quite different. Mysticism, essentially based on intuition, is not really a conscious intellectual process. As such, the mystical experience is more an act of spiritual intoxication than an effort to apprehend the truth in intellectual terms. A drug user undergoes an experience of inner pleasure which is too vaguely and unconsciously felt to be explained in comprehensible language. Similarly, what a mystic experiences is a type of unconscious ecstasy, which does not amount to a consciously sought after or properly assessable discovery. On the contrary, the search for truth is an intellectual exercise from beginning to end.



2. Mysticism, as popularly conceived, makes the basic assumption that the physical, material, and social needs of man act as obstacles to his spiritual progress. Therefore, mysticism teaches him to reduce his physical needs to the barest minimum; to renounce worldly and social relations; and if possible to retire to the mountains or jungles. In this way, he will supposedly be able to purify his soul. Thus, by giving up the world and by certain exercises in self-abnegation, a mystic expects to awaken his spirituality.

The educated community, however, does not find this concept of mysticism acceptable. A seeker aims at a rational explanation of the world and endeavours to discover a definite principle by which he may successfully plan his present life. Mysticism, on the contrary, teaches man to abandon the world itself; to depart from the world without uncovering its mystery. Obviously such a scheme amounts only to an aggravation of the problem rather than a solution to it.



3. The mystics can broadly be divided into two groups. Those who believe in God and those who do not. Non-believers in God assert that there is a hidden treasure in the centres of our souls. The task of the mystic is to discover this hidden treasure. But this is only a supposition. None of them has ever been able to define this hidden treasure or to explain it in understandable terms. Tagore has thus expressed this claim made by the mystics:

“Man has a feeling that he is truly represented in something which exceeds himself.”

But this is only a subjective statement unsupported by logical proofs. That is why, in spite of its great popularity, no school of this mystical thought has so far produced any objective criterion by which one may rationally ascertain that the existence of such a hidden treasure within the human soul is a reality, and not an illusion. On the other hand, no well-defined law, or step-by-step practical programme, has been introduced by any

individual or group that might help the common man reach his spiritual destination consciously and independently.

Moreover, mysticism makes the claim that the natural quest of man is its own fulfillment. It does not require any external effort to arrive at the perceived goal. In other words, it is like assuming that the feeling of thirst or hunger in man contains its own satisfaction. A thirsty or hungry person is not to trouble himself to search for water or food in the outer world.

4. Those (of this school of thought) who believe in God interpret this hidden treasure in terms of God. To them the inner contemplation of a mystic is directed towards God.

This concept too is rationally inexplicable, for, if such mystic exercises are a means to discover God, then, there should be genuine proof that God Himself has shown this way to find Him. But there is no evidence that this path has been prescribed by God. On the other hand, there is a clear indication that this course separates the seeker from God's creation and leads him to a





life of isolation. This makes it plain that God cannot enjoin such a path to realization as would mean nullifying the very purpose of creation.

5. The mystics hold that although the mystical experience may be a great discovery for them, it is, however, a mysterious, and unexplainable realization which can be felt at the sensory level, but which cannot be fully articulated. According to a mystic: "It is knowledge of the most adequate kind, only it cannot be expressed in words." (*EB/12:786*)

This aspect of the mystical experience proves it to be a totally subjective discipline. And something as subjective as this can, in no degree, be a scientific answer to the human search for truth. Those who have attempted to describe the mystic experience have chosen different ways of doing so. One is the narrative method, that is, describing their point of view in terms only of claims, without any supporting arguments. Another method is to make use of metaphors. That is, attempt to describe something by means of supposed analogies. From the point of view of



scientific reasoning, both the methods are inadequate, being quite lacking in any credibility in rational terms, and are therefore invalid.



## FAITH AND REASON


It is through reason that man justifies his faith. Rational justification strengthens his convictions. Rational argument is thus an intellectual need of every believer. Without this he would not be able to stand firmly by his faith. It is reason which transforms blind faith into a matter of intellectual choice.

History shows that man has employed four kinds of argument to find rational grounds for his faith. Each of these reflects different stages in his intellectual development.

### NATURAL ARGUMENT

The first kind of argument is one based on nature. That is, on simple facts or common experiences. This has been the most commonly used since ancient times. Some examples of this kind are found in the Qur'an, one of which relates to the Prophet Abraham. It is stated as follows in the Qur'an:

Have you not considered him (Namrud) who disputed with Abraham about his Lord,



because God had given him the kingdom? When Abraham said: 'My Lord is He who gives life and causes to die,' he said: 'I too give life and cause death.' Abraham said: 'So surely God causes the sun to rise from the east, then you make it rise from the west.' Thus he who disbelieved was confounded; and God does not give guidance to unjust people. (2:258)

We find another example of the argument based on natural reasoning in the Qur'an:

Thus did We show Abraham the kingdom of the heavens and the earth, so that he might become a firm believer. When night overshadowed him, he saw a star. He said: 'This is my Lord'. But when it set, he said: 'I love not those that set.' Then when he saw the moon rising, he said: 'This is my Lord.' But when it set, he said: 'Unless my Lord guide me, I shall surely be among those who go astray'. Then when he saw the sun rising, he said: 'This is my Lord. This is the greatest.' But when it set, he said: 'O my people! Surely,

I am done with what you associate with God.’  
(6:75-78)

Argument of this kind may appear to be simple, but they are invested with deeper meaning. For this reason, they have been engaged in as much in the past as today.

## PHILOSOPHICAL ARGUMENT

The second kind of argument is that first propounded by Greek philosophers. Based on pure logic, it was so popular in the medieval ages that Jews and Christians and Muslims all incorporated it into their theological system. Commonly known as First Cause, it may be summed up as follows:

The world man observes with his senses must have been brought into being by God as the First Cause. Philosophers have argued that the observable order of causation is not self-explanatory. It can only be accounted for by the existence of a First Cause. This First Cause, however, must not be considered simply as the first in a series of successive causes, but rather as the First Cause in the

sense of being the cause for the whole series of observable causes.

The Prime Mover or First Cause theory. Although obviously very sound, it has constantly been under attack from secular circles, and critics have raised a variety of objections. To begin with, they say that it is only guesswork, and not an undeniable fact. Some critics also object that the actions or free will of subatomic particles are uncaused; so, why not also the world as a whole? Moreover, even if all things in the world are caused, this may not be true of the world itself, because no one knows whether the whole is sufficiently like its parts to warrant such a generalization.

This is why some people think that the faith of Islam is not based on rational grounds. They say that Islamic belief can be proved only through inferential argument and not through direct argument. They assert that in Islam there is only secondary rationalism and not primary rationalism. But modern science has demolished this notion, as will be shown in the last part of this chapter.





## SPIRITUAL ARGUMENT

Yet another argument is that which is based on spiritual experience. Some people, who engage in spiritual exercises and have spiritual experiences, say that when they reach the deeper levels of the human consciousness, they find an unlimited world which cannot be described in limited language. They insist that this limitless, unexplainable phenomenon is nothing but God Almighty Himself.

The critics say that even if this spiritual state is as real as is claimed by those who enter it, it is still a subjective experience; that it conveys nothing to those who have not experienced the same spiritual state.

All the above arguments are in one way or another inferential in nature and not of the direct kind. In view of this fact, the critics hold that all faiths, including Islam, have no scientific basis. They contend that Islamic theology is not based on primary rationalism, but on secondary rationalism.

However, these contentions appeared to be valid only by the end of the nineteenth century. The



twentieth century has closed the chapter on all such debates. Now, according to modern developments in science, one can safely say that religious tenets can be proved on the same logical plane as the concepts of science. Now there is no difference between the two in terms of scientific reasoning. Let us then see what modern scientific reasoning is all about.

### **SCIENTIFIC ARGUMENT**

Religion, or faith, relates to issues such as the existence of God, something intangible and unobservable, unlike non-religious things like the sun, which has a tangible and observable existence. Therefore, it came to be held that only non-religious matters might be established by direct argument, while it is only direct or inferential argument which can be used to prove religious propositions.

It was believed, therefore, that rational argument was possible only in non-religious matters, and so far as religious matters were concerned, rational argument was not applicable at all. That is to say, that it was only in non-religious areas that primary





rationalism was possible, while in religion only secondary rationalism was applicable.

In the past, arguments based on Aristotlean logic used to be applied to faith. By its very nature it was an indirect argument. Modern critics, therefore, ignored such arguments as unworthy of consideration. That is why religion was not thought worthy of being paid any attention by rational people. This state of affairs presented a challenge not only to other religions but to Islam as well.

About five hundred years ago, with the emergence of science, this state of affairs did not change. All the scientists in the wake of the Renaissance believed that matter, in fact, the entire material world was something solid which could be observed. Newton had even formed a theory that light consisted of tiny corpuscles. As such, it was possible to apply direct argument as an explanation of material things. Similarly, even after the emergence of modern science, this state of affairs prevailed. It continued to be believed that the kind of argument which is applied to apparently tangible things could not be applied in the case of religion.



But by the early twentieth century, specifically after the First World War, this mental climate changed completely. The ancient Greek philosophers believed that matter, in the last analysis, was composed of atoms. And the atom, though very tiny, was a piece of solid matter. But with the breaking of the atom in the twentieth century, all the popular scientific concepts underwent a sea change. The theories about faith and reason seemed relevant only while science was confined to the macrocosmic level. Later, when science advanced to the microcosmic level, it underwent a revolution, and along with it, the method of argument also changed.

So far, science had been based on the proposition that all the things it believed in, like the atom, could be directly explained. But when the atom, the smallest part of an element, was smashed, it was revealed that it was not a material entity, but just another name for unobservable waves of electrons.

This discovery demonstrated how a scientist could see only the effect of a thing and not the thing itself. For instance, the atom, after being split, produces



energy which can be converted into electricity. This runs along a wire in the form of a current, yet this event is not observable even by a scientist. But when such an event produces an effect, for instance, it lights up a bulb or sets a motor in motion this effect comes under a scientist's observation. Similarly, the waves from an X-ray machine, are not observable by a scientist, but when they produce the image of a human body on a plate, then it becomes observable.

Now the question arose as to what stand a scientist must take? Should he believe only in a tangible effect or the intangible thing as well, which produced that effect? Since the scientist was bound to believe in the tangible effect, he had no choice but to believe in its intangible cause.

Here the scientist felt that direct argument could be applied to the tangible effect, but that it was not at all possible to apply direct argument to the intangible cause. The most important of all the changes brought about by this new development in the world of science was that, it was admitted in scientific circles that inferential argument was as



valid as direct argument. That is, if a cause consistently gives rise to an effect, the existence of the intangible cause will be accepted as a proven fact, just as the existence of the tangible effect is accepted because it is observable. In modern times all the concepts of science held to be established have been proven by this very logic.

After reaching this stage of rational argument the difference between religious argument and scientific argument ceases to exist. The problem faced earlier was that religious realities, such as the existence of God, could be proved only by inference or indirect argument. For instance, the existence of God, as a designer (cause) was presumed to exist because His design (effect) could be seen to exist. But now the same method of indirect argument has been generally held to be valid in the world of science.

There are numerous meaningful things in the universe which are brought to the knowledge of human beings, for which no explanation is possible. It has simply to be accepted that there is a meaningful Cause, that is God. The truth is that,



without belief in God, the universe remains as unexplainable as the entire mechanism of light and motion is without belief in electric waves.

Thus, the option one has to take is not between the universe without God and the universe with God. Rather, the option actually is between the universe with God, or no universe at all. Since we cannot, for obvious reasons, opt for the latter proposition, we are, in fact, left with no other option except the former, that is, the universe with God.

In view of the recent advancement in scientific reasoning, a true faith has proved to be as rational as any other scientific theory. Reason and faith are now standing on the same ground. In fact, no one can legitimately reject faith as something irrational, unless one is ready to reject the rationality of scientific theories as well. For, all the modern scientific theories are accepted as proven on the basis of the same rational criterion by which a matter of faith would be equally proved true. After the river of knowledge has reached this advanced stage, there has remained no logical difference between the two.