

Theologians and materialists agree that this universe has a self-sustaining First Cause. Materialists call it matter, while the religious philosophers call it Allah or God.

It is essential to acknowledge the existence of the First Cause, for a sequence of causes and effects cannot go on indefinitely and we must reach a point where we should come to a cause which is not the effect of any other cause, i.e. the ultimate cause or the Unmoved Mover, which is self-existing and which has always been and shall always be.

It is this Self-Sustaining First Cause which not only makes our intellectual life possible but also quite meaningful. Suppose for a moment that there is no such First Cause. To where does this all would lead us? Surely this cause and effect pursuit lands us in what is known in Philosophy as a continuum ad infinitum.

This brings our investigation to a blind alley. It marks the beginning of intellectual wilderness, a wild goose chase. You go on piling cause upon cause and effect upon effect only to find still another cause and effect staring you in the face.

Of what earthly use is it to put zero after zero when the result is zero or to place nil after nil when the result is nil? A similar problem is Chicken or the Egg Dilemma which is discussed in another article on this site. Such is the deception of a certain mental activity and such is its misguidance.

The only way to get out of this mire is the acknowledgment of the Self- Sustaining First Cause. Belief in the existence of an Eternal and First Cause is the common ground between the believers in God and the materialists. The only controversial point is whether the First Cause has knowledge and intellect or not. That is the real point of difference.

The materialists deny that the First Cause has any intellect. They hold that the first cause is matter, which lacks any intellect or knowledge. The believers in God maintain that the First Source of the universe has limitless knowledge, wisdom and rationality.

Let us various naturally occurring phenomena to find out which of these two theories are more logical grounds. We only want to see whether or not the physical systems in the universe indicate that the First Cause has intellect.

### **Human, Animal and Plant Physiology**

Let us start with our own body. Does not the construction of the human eye and the way the lenses, retina and various layers of it have been constructed, testify that its maker is fully conversant with the physical laws concerning the reflection of light and the working of lenses and mirrors ?

Does not the composition of human blood of plasma and various types of corpuscles with such a fixed proportion that the slightest change in it disturbs the whole biological system, clearly show that the maker of the blood knew the chemical composition and properties of all the ingredients of blood fully well?

Does not the construction of the living human, animal and plant cells in such a complex and mysterious and at the same time elegant and accurate way manifest that the job has been performed by a Being who had full knowledge of all the laws connected with the human, animal and plant physiology?

### **Solar System**

Does not the special construction of the solar system and the particular proportion between the size, distance and speed of each planet of this system prove that the maker of this machine is fully aware of all the details of the law of gravitation and the effects of the rotatory motion in

producing centrifugal forces?

In short, the special construction of all that exists in the universe from the smallest particles or sub atoms to the biggest galaxies and the accurate and wonderfully arranged systems of their working bear witness to the fact that the First source has full knowledge of all the physical laws and systems.

In principle all human sciences are nothing more than a partial knowledge of a minute part of the secrets and laws of the universe.

How can it ever be that we, with such a partial knowledge, should become scholars and scientists but the First Source who brought the whole universe into existence should have no knowledge and intellect?

Transplantation of a human heart by Dr. Bernard required millions of scientists for thousands of years to put in their efforts for the development of medicine and surgery. Is it conceivable that the very maker of the heart should have no knowledge?

In short, considering perfectly designed physical systems as chance events and product of

purposeless causes is as illogical as to say that the transplantation of heart performed by Dr. Bernard and his team was without knowledge and study. It is equivalent in saying that the transplant took place by chance.

Such an interpretation is totally unacceptable from a rational viewpoint. Aside from the heart transplant, the idea that the entire universe has come into existence just by chance is far more illogical. Hence the materialistic interpretation of the genesis of the universe and all that exists in it is totally unscientific.

Thus, every book of our natural sciences like physics, chemistry, physiology, anatomy, medicine, surgery etc. may be used as book of natural theology, for all these books discuss the secrets and laws of the marvelous systems of creation, whose logical and correct interpretation is not possible without acknowledging the existence of God.

This very line of argument has been mostly followed by the Holy Quran while adducing arguments for the unity of Allah.

As Kepler, the famous scientist and founder of modern Astronomy, has said, "The more we know about the creation and grandeur of heavenly bodies, the deeper should be our faith."

Thus, there exists a close relationship between the progress of sciences and the firmness of faith in God. More the scientific knowledge expands, the firmer will the faith grow in the One Source of knowledge and power.

Mr. McCombs, a biologist, who has been the head of the Academy of Sciences, Florida, says that every new discovery in the world of science increases the firmness of our faith hundreds of times, dispels the hidden doubts which more or less lurk inside our hearts, and replaces them with the nobler ideas of the acknowledgement of God and His unity.

---

### References

The following sources are used to prepare the above article.

1. Group of Scholars, Rationality of Islam (1978), under the auspices of Ayatullah Sayyid Abu'l Qasim al-Khu'i, Publisher: Islamic Seminary Publications, Pakistan