

Introductions to the Evidences for the Existence of Allah (swt)

(Translated)

<https://www.al-waie.org/archives/article/20248>

Yousef Al-Sarisiy – Palestine

Al Waie Magazine Issue No. 477

Fortieth Year, Shawwal 1447 AH corresponding to April 2026 CE

America Works to Spread Atheism in the Muslim World: Some years ago, in July 2022, the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) expressed deep concern regarding an American program aimed at promoting atheism in the Muslim World. Under the title of “DRL FY20 IRF Promoting and Defending Religious Freedom Inclusive of Atheist, Humanist, Non-Practicing and Non-Affiliated Individuals” the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (DRL), affiliated with the US Department of State, made an announcement on 21 April 2022, that funded program activities for “Creating or strengthening networks of advocates for the diverse communities of atheist, humanist, non-practicing and non-affiliated individuals of all religious communities in target countries.” The US State Department identified the locations for these activities as the Middle East and North Africa, in addition to South and Central Asia.

Consequently, it became imperative for Muslims, and specifically for Dawah carriers, to confront the war waged by America and its followers against the Deen of Allah (swt), using the projectiles of truth to strike down their falsehood. Hence, this article was conceived.

Introduction:

When engaging in an intellectual debate with our opponents, it is necessary to establish a common ground. Debating a believing Muslim differs from debating an atheist who denies the Creator, and debating a Christian differs from debating a Marxist, and so forth. The common ground we refer to here consists of those matters upon which the disputants agree, regarding them as acknowledged postulates that serve as a reference and foundation for the debate. These postulates are then utilized as criteria for the issues upon which the discussion will be built in order to arrive at common denominators or ideas founded upon this ground.

A Muslim from a differing school of thought accepts the Quran and the Sunnah as the ultimate reference for any disputed issue though he may differ with you regarding the Foundations of Shariah Jurisprudence (Uṣūl al-Fiqh أصول الفقه). Conversely, an atheist denies all of this and fundamentally rejects the existence of God. A Christian, meanwhile, acknowledges the existence of God, Prophethood, and Messengers, but does not believe in the Noble Quran or the Messenger of Islam (saw). Therefore, debating any individual must proceed from specific postulates acknowledged by both disputing parties, ensuring the debate is fruitful and productive in reaching truth and correctness.

The Necessary Postulates for Debating Atheists:

Whoever wishes to debate the question of God’s existence rationally with atheists or skeptics must present foundations and principles that are observed and established prior to engaging in the debate. This ensures that the evidences presented to prove the existence of God are robust, devoid of gaps, and possess a binding force upon the opponents.

In this article, we will address the necessary postulates required when we intend to debate atheists, deniers, or skeptics regarding the existence of God and establish the evidence against them. It is imperative that we begin with shared postulates between us and them. These postulates are not the textual evidences (الأدلة النقلية) Al-Adillah An-Naqliyah) from the Noble Quran and Prophetic Sunnah, nor are they the body of knowledge of Usul al-Fiqh. Instead, they are something else shared between us: namely, the intellect, its fundamental

criteria, the conditions of thinking, and the methodology of constructing rational evidence (الدليل العقلي Ad-Daleel Al-Aqlee).

When we examine the proofs (evidence) we use in the Foundations of Deen or Aqeedah (creed) to rationally establish the existence of Allah and His Attributes — such as the Evidence of Limitation (دليل المحدودية Dalil al-Mahdudiyah), the Evidence of Need (دليل الاحتياج Dalil al-Ihtiyaj), and the Evidence of Providence (دليل العناية Dalil al-'Inayah)—we find that these proofs rely on rational criteria and implicit premises embedded within them. However, these premises are often concealed or left unstated, and we must reveal and elucidate them. As postulates, whether they are Principles (بديهيات Badahiyaat) or Essentials (أصليات Al-Asliyat)—no two rational beings differ over them. That is, the common ground for the disputants is solely the rational proofs (evidence) (الأدلة العقلية Al-Adillah An-'Aqliyah) and their premises.

Premises of the Evidences:

Given that the reality of the intellect, logical proofs, and the method of evidencing (طريقة الاستدلال Tareeqatul Istidlaal) are unclear and unformulated for most people—especially for ideological deviants, atheists, and skeptics—it was necessary, before initiating a debate with an atheist or skeptic regarding the existence of God, to agree upon a set of rational premises, prior to delving into the proofs for the existence of Allah (swt). The opponent may disagree with us during the debate on certain propositions whose certainty we take as a postulate, while he considers them inconclusive or may not concede them. For instance, when we state that the Creator must necessarily be uncreated and that the contrary is rationally absurd, we rely here on a rational premise: the Invalidity of Contradiction (بطلان التناقض Butlan At-Tanaaqud) and the Association of Attributes (تلازم الصفات Talazum al-Şifat). The opponent might object to this, seeking to evade the binding force by creating a loophole through which to escape. Therefore, it is preferable that these premises be made binding before the debate.

Thus, it has become necessary to pave the way for the required rational evidence by agreeing upon specific postulates: namely, the nature of the evidence and the premises of the proofs. Regarding the nature of the evidence, we mean: what is the required evidence for substantiation, such that this evidence is categorically free of doubt? The requirement is not the ocular vision of the Creator for the sake of belief, as the Children of Israeel demanded of Musa (as), **“The People of the Scripture ask you to bring down to them a book from the heaven. But they had asked of Musa (as) even greater than that and said, ‘Show us Allah outright’”** [TMQ Surah An-Nisa: 153]. The required deduction must proceed from a known matter to arrive at knowledge of an unknown matter, because the meaning of evidence is that which guides to something else. The evidence must proceed from a known matter—which is the sensory perception of tangible objects—to arrive at an absent or unknown matter, by which we mean here the knowledge of Allah (swt) and belief in the Unseen. This means the starting point is reliance on sensory perception, not on logical premises or philosophical skepticism. Instead, the rational evidence and the conditions of thought are what are relied upon.

As for the second matter, the premises we utilize are postulates universally agreed upon with the opponent. They are fourfold and include: Al-Badahiyaat, Al-Asliyat, Causality (Al-Sababiyah), and Talazum al-Şifat. We will proceed to briefly explain these premises so that their reality becomes clear and their importance is grasped.

First: Principles (بديهيات Badahiyaat):

Al-Badahiyaat—also termed primary principles (al-Awwaliyat)—are the criteria for the validity of the rational evidences employed. What renders them systematic is that they rely directly on the laws of thought. There is a law in thinking which is concordance (المطابقة al-Mutabaqah), from which the principle of the (بطلان التناقض) “invalidity of contradiction” emanates. Thus, it follows necessarily that proofs must not be contradictory. Likewise, proofs must not be an infinite chain without end, which is the (بطلان التسلسل اللانهائي) “invalidity of infinite regress,” nor should they be circular, which is the (بطلان الدور) “invalidity of circular reasoning.”

Furthermore, there is the principle of the invalidity of preponderance without a preponderant, and that every event must have an agent—which is the principle of Causality. Additionally, there is the principle of stability, which is the inverse of Causality. This set of principles is what we rely upon during the construction of rational evidence, and by which the evidence must be disciplined and not contravene; otherwise, the evidence is deemed irrational or incompatible with the intellect.

Al-Badahiyaat are propositions that do not require evidence. Instead, the intellect assents to them immediately upon conceptualizing their meanings. In this sense, they are postulates. What is required is merely to clarify and explain them through examples so that an agreement is reached on their specific terminology, not to evidence them. For example, striking some examples of the principle of the invalidity of contradiction: such as the impossibility of the coexistence of existence and non-existence in the same matter, or that an entity could be simultaneously alive and dead, or that a body could be luminous and dark at the same time. These contradictory matters, which cannot coexist, belong to the absurdities that the intellect does not accept. Otherwise, truth and falsehood would be equivalent, and right and wrong would be identical, whereas they are opposites that absolutely cannot converge. Another example is that a thing cannot exist in two different places simultaneously; if you are present before me now in Al-Quds, it is impossible for you to be present now in Damascus. Similarly, stating that a matter is both limited and unlimited, or that it is both incapable and capable at the same time, and so forth.

Among the applications of the invalidity of contradiction in the realm of ideas and creeds is the Christians' claim that Christ is the Son of God, while simultaneously being eternal with God. This is considered a contradiction rejected by the intellect, because the reality of a son is that he is born—meaning he exists after the existence of his father, meaning the father is the cause of his existence. Thus, at a certain time, he was non-existent and then came into existence. This contradicts the concept of eternity, because the eternal is that which has no beginning to its existence and was not brought into existence by anyone prior to it. The intellect rejects this contradictory evidence; consequently, belief in this concept is deemed unacceptable and irrational.

As for the principle of the invalidity of infinite regress, a famous example is that of a soldier firing a bullet from his rifle at a person in front of him. However, the soldier must receive the order from an officer responsible for him, and this first officer receives the order from an officer higher in rank, and the higher officer receives the order from someone higher still, and the matter regresses infinitely. This infinite regress is rejected by the intellect. Since the bullet has already been fired by the soldier and struck the person, the order must necessarily have originated from one of the individuals in this chain. The claim that it is an infinite chain is categorically false and rejected by the intellect, because it implies that the regress is still awaiting infinity for the soldier to fire the bullet, meaning the event has not yet occurred, or that this chain is non-existent and fundamentally non-binding. Since the bullet has been fired, the order must have originated from one of the individuals in the chain, or the killer soldier acted on his own accord, non-bindingly. Therefore, the infinite regress is false.

Among the applications of the principle of the invalidity of infinite regress in the realm of ideas is the assertion that the one who created the universe is a first creator, and this first creator is created by a second creator, and the second creator is created by a third creator, and so the chain proceeds infinitely. This is rationally impossible and false. Either this chain is non-existent from the outset, or it is fundamentally non-binding. Since the universe exists, it necessarily requires an originating creator, and the chain must definitively end. From a second angle, based on the principle of the invalidity of contradiction, it is impossible for a thing to be both a creator and created simultaneously; it must be either a creator or created. By combining the two principles, we arrive at the conclusion that this chain of creators is non-existent and categorically non-binding, and that the existent is a single Creator, who must necessarily be uncreated.

Second: Essentials (الأصليات Al-Asliyat):

Al-Asliyat are propositions inherent in the essence of things or in their initial states. They are matters fixed in the nature of things and their conditions, and are not necessarily in the intellect initially. The rule of the Presumption of Continuity (استصحاب الأصل Istishab al-Asl) is a well-known rule in the science of Usul al-Fiqh.

Al-Asliyat do not require proofs to evidence them; what requires confirmation evidence, and demonstration is the contrary state—that is, their departure from the original state to another. When researching and deducing the existence of things, their attributes, and their states, our reference point is these Asliyat. The attribution of matters to their original state is fixed and indisputable, because the factual conceptualization—in the intellect—of the state contrary to this original is categorically rejected without doubt. Consequently, to evidence Al-Asliyat, it suffices to provide examples to conceptualize the categorically rejected contrary state.

Among the rules of *Al-Asliyat* are the following:

1. The original state is the non-existence of tangible material objects, and their existence requires categorical evidence.

2. The original state in objects is that they are stable and unchanging, and they naturally resist change; this is the (مبدأ الاستقرار) principle of stability.

3. The departure of objects from a state of stability and inertia occurs through their acquisition of an effective causal energy that works to change their states.

4. The original state in the movement of objects is chaos and randomness; they do not order or organize except by a force compelling them. The organizing force is that which creates causal systems by establishing links and relationships among the parts comprising the system, expending causal energy in connecting them, to create an arrangement in a specific pattern, or organizing the parts in a specific manner to perform a purposed function.

5. The original state in objects is the inanimate state, which is, the absence of life. Living things require a cause to create life and sustain it within them. Life is an emergent and temporary state present in living beings, and the origination or return to the original state—namely, non-life or death—is inevitable in them.

6. The original state in the human mind is the state of ignorance, and knowledge is an emergent thing upon it, requiring acquisition and reception from another.

7. The original state in the animal brain is the absence of discerning intellect, thought, absence of intelligence, and aware linkage; its behavior results from instinctual discrimination devoid of concepts.

8. The original state in a human being is the presumption of innocence, and the accusation of committing a specific act, negative or positive, requires evidence.

Al-Asliyat resemble rational principles, except they exist in the nature of objects and their states, not in the intellect like principles. The importance of Al-Asliyat lies in the fact that they are binding in closing the loopholes in certain arguments, through which some attempt to invalidate proofs. For example, the idea of the multiverse is a loophole through which some atheist astronomers attempt to invalidate the need of the precisely organized universe for a regulating Creator. This loophole is sealed through the rule that the original state in objects is non-existence, unless their existence is categorically proven. Therefore, whoever claims the existence of universes other than the universe, we perceive that he must confirm their existence with categorical evidence, because this contradicts the original state. If he does not provide evidence, his claim is false, and the alleged other universes have no evidence for their existence.

Similarly, the false assertion that the original state in the intellect is knowledge and not ignorance. If this claim were true, every human would be born a scholar and would not need to learn. This is a conception the intellect utterly rejects, and it categorically contradicts reality, and so forth.

Using Al-Asliyat, the Darwinian theory of evolution is refuted through the rule that the original state in the movement of objects is chaos and randomness. They do not order or organize except by a force compelling them. This is corroborated by the law of Entropy or the Second Law of Thermodynamics, which stipulates that systems always tend toward greater randomness, and that the process of organization is categorically irreversible. Therefore, the Darwinian theory of evolution, and other alleged theories of evolution such as Marx's theory of the evolution of history, categorically contradict Al-Asliyat and the law of Entropy. Consequently, the original state is the lack of self-organization of objects; meaning, the alleged evolution is inverted and reversed. If the original state in objects were that they organize spontaneously, we would not find any random matter in the universe. Thus, the existence of random events, that are not purposed, in some objects around us, such as the effect of natural factors, dismantles their argument and evidences the original state of randomness in movement.

Among Al-Asliyat is the rule "The burden of evidence is upon the claimant." An example of this is if a person claims paternity of a certain man's children but brings no evidence to evidence that. In the case of a lack of evidence, we revert to the ruling of the original state, which is non-existence—meaning the original state is the non-existence of children and wives for any man initially. The mere conceptualization of the contrary state, which is that all men have women and children initially, contradicts reality and the intellect. Evidence, therefore, is demanded of the claimant, and without sufficient evidence or proof, the claim falls. However, this is the opposite of the case of fatherhood, for the existence of the child is categorical evidence of the existence of two parents for him, because the child exists and his existence necessarily requires a cause.

Third: Causality (Al-Sababiyah):

Causality is considered a part of the aforementioned rational principles, but there is a causality of a second category, which is realistic or natural causality. This natural causality is perfectly congruent with rational causality. Allah (swt) created the universe upon the system of causality and created the intellect, placing within it the causal connection. Thus, there is congruence between them.

However, natural causality possesses details and parameters that must be elucidated so that the causal connection between cause and effect is correct and disciplined. There is Simple Causality (Sababiyah Basitah), Causal System (Nizam Sababi), and Human Causality (Sababiyah Insaniyah). Their details are as follows:

A. Simple Causality:

Objects resist any process of change that occurs to the state of stability they are in. The altering factor that can change the condition and state of these objects is the cause. This occurs when it acquires an effective energy at a specific moment, by which it can transition objects that possess the susceptibility to be affected—that is, they have suitable properties—from one state to another. For the cause to be effective, it requires cooperation with other factors that assist it in exerting influence, which are the conditions. The process of causal influence is inevitably followed by the occurrence of the result, the effect. The foundation of causal influence is the existence of causal energy, and with its depletion, the effect of the cause ceases, whereas this is not necessary for the condition.

B. Causal System:

A system consists of a set of parts and links that bring the parts together in a specific, ordered manner, according to a programming that achieves a goal or performs a specific function. Objects tend to break free from order and restriction, leaning toward chaos and randomness. Consequently, they do not cooperate among themselves to organize and form links. Therefore, the existence of a system initially requires a cause that gathers its parts and programs them to perform the function intended by its designer. A constructed building is a system, a table is a system, a water channel is a system, and so forth.

As for the Causal System, it is distinguished from a normal stable system, by carrying an effective causal energy, performing a specific action, and causing a change in something else. Examples of this include mechanical systems like a car and a refrigerator, as well as biological systems like the human body.

I asked a question to a skeptic leaning towards atheism: Why can you not believe that nature could produce or evolve a table or a car? He could not answer, but he agreed with me that it is rationally impossible, yet he did not know the answer. I answered him that the causes or natural factors that exert their action in nature—such as wind, rain, sunlight, Earth's gravity, ocean waves, volcanoes, earthquakes, pressure, heat, and so on—cannot produce a system. Instead, they possess a random effect, and they fundamentally destroy existing systems. Furthermore, within the laws of thermodynamics, there is the law of Entropy which dictates that all systems tend toward randomness and not the reverse. Thus, a group of stones cannot agree to form an ordered and interconnected system together for a specific purpose. Instead, the exact opposite is true, which is that systems tend to break free and liberate themselves from constraints and links. Therefore, evidencing that there are perfected systems in the universe, humanity, and life—especially causal systems—is one of the most important pillars for proving the existence of the Designer (الصانع As-Saani'a) and the existence of Purposefulness (الغائية) Al-Ghaa'iyyah in the universe.

C. Human Causality:

There is a difference between natural causality and the causality related to the actions and behavior of human beings due to the existence of will or freedom of choice in humans. The human being possesses two aspects: the physical aspect and the intellectual aspect. The physical aspect is a material aspect shared with other living organisms. It is a causal system consisting of a set of organs and a set of biological systems such as the digestive system, the nervous system, amongst others. As for the abstract intellectual aspect, the human possesses the property of thought: the ability to link the external perceived reality via the senses with previous information, and then pass judgment upon the matters—that is, interpret it and give it meaning.

Human actions are effective causes, generated as a result of the blending of vital energy with intellectual energy which are concepts. The human cause, in order to be executed, requires emotional, vital energy and intellectual energy, the intellect, which contains the concepts that steer this vital energy. Thus, the human cause is an action undertaken by a human to affect a specific matter and change it from one state to another. This action is determined by the intellect through choice and will, based on the concepts it holds regarding its interest in performing this action or refraining from it.

Fourth: Concomitance of Attributes (تلازم الصفات Talazum al-Şifat):

There are many concomitant relationships between objects, and what concerns us here is the Concomitance of Attributes for objects. This concomitance is among the matters that must be established before presenting the evidences, and thus it is necessary for deduction. This is because arriving at certain attributes that the intellect affirms for the Creator are attributes deduced from other perceived attributes of things, and these attributes of things are derived from other tangible attributes of things. We wish to evidence that the origin of the rational attributes of the Creator traces back to the opposites of the attributes of created beings.

What is meant by the Concomitance of Attributes for objects is that things possess multiple attributes, some of which are directly tangible and others are hidden or unknown. The meaning of the Concomitance of Attributes is that we can deduce an unknown attribute of a specific object, from another attribute or two known attributes about it, provided they are interconnected or concomitant. Concomitance is evidences through conjunction or the definitive realistic correlation between them. This definitive concomitant relationship is established between two matters by means of complete induction or conjunction. It is also

established by means of causal or conditional concomitance, or by means of sharing a specific descriptive trait that unites them, or through succession and sequence, and others.

Induction (استقراء *istiqraa'a*) evidences a permanent concomitance between two matters, and from this permanent conjunction, an indicative link is formed between them. By using the method of *istiqraa'a*, specific attributes of objects are evidenced. However, this inductive method contains a problematic aspect because it relies on incomplete induction rather than complete induction. Complete induction necessitates observing and perceiving all the matters upon which we wish to generalize the judgment individually, one by one, with the aim of evidencing the concomitance of a specific attribute within them. This induction—in this form—is practically impossible. However, incomplete induction is deemed sufficient to generalize judgments by relying on the essential states of objects—that is, on a fixed attribute or characteristic inherent to the essence of objects. Thus, one judges by generalizing this attribute, and the incomplete induction is compelled to become complete.

For example, to evidence the combustibility of wood, it is not necessary to burn all the wood in the world to evidence it. Instead, it suffices to conduct an experiment by burning some pieces of wood and then generalizing by stating that all wood burns. This is because combustibility is a property present in its essence, and if it does not burn, it ceases to be wood. This attribute is among the essential attributes or latent properties inherent to wood that never separate from it absolutely. Therefore, incomplete induction is compelled by both empirical experimentation and sensory observation, relying on a concomitant relationship between the observed phenomenon and an attribute inherent to it in the properties of things.

However, this type of induction does not evidence emergent, non-permanent attributes. For example, if a person grew up on an island and saw that all the ducks there had white feathers, he would generalize his limited induction that all ducks have white feathers. If he traveled outside the island and found a duck with black feathers, he would realize that his previous judgment was incorrect because it was based on incomplete induction, and that he built his judgment on the attribute of the ducks' feather color, which is an emergent attribute and not essential or fixed, and is subject to change in things. Consequently, it is more accurate for him to say that, according to his observation in the places he investigated, he found the color of ducks to be white, provided he does not generalize this judgment to deny the existence of ducks of other colors, because there is nothing preventing the existence of other colors.

As for causal concomitance between two matters—between the effect and the effector—it exists by means of the causal relationship that links the cause with the result. Similar to it is the conditional concomitance between the condition and the cause to produce the result. If you hear a voice speaking in the dark, this categorically indicates the existence of a living human from whom the voice emanated, because the effect categorically indicated the existence of the effector object. There is a causal concomitance between smoke and fire because fire is the cause of the existence of smoke and it is a product of it, and a concomitance between footprints on the ground and the living entity that walked upon it. As for conditional concomitance, its example is the correlation between fire and oxygen to cause burning. If oxygen is absent, the action of the cause is suspended, burning does not occur, and smoke is not produced, because oxygen is a necessary condition or factor for combustion.

As for the succession between two matters, its example is the succession of night after day, and the existence of children after the parent. Among the sequential concomitance is the sequence, such as the number three following two, and the number five coming in the sequence after four, and so forth.

• **Concomitance of Attributes Related to Independent Existence or Dependent Existence:**

Attention must be drawn, when researching the Concomitance of Attributes, to the existence of specific attributes for some objects, and to the existence of general, shared

attributes encompassing all objects. When we wish to arrive at a generalization via induction, we must use the general attributes of objects, not the specific ones. This is because the objective is to investigate the universe and objects to arrive at an answer to a central question regarding the independent existence of tangible things or whether their existence is dependent upon something else. The fundamental inquiry is about the origin of existents, and the origin must be that its existence is independent, not dependent upon another. This is what must be investigated to distinguish independent existents from dependent ones.

However, this attribute—namely, self-independence and dependency in objects—cannot be perceived directly via the senses. Therefore, it must be arrived at through other tangible attributes that are concomitant with it. Its independence in existence necessitates the existence of attributes concomitant with this independence. It must exist in objects. We search for it, and if we find it, we judge the existence of the attribute concomitant with independent existence. If we find the attributes contrary to independence—i.e., dependency—we judge by affirming the attributes of dependency.

The Concomitance of Attributes that we are investigating here involves searching for a set of attributes concomitant with independence, and another set of attributes related to the contrary attributes, concomitant with dependency. When searching for general attributes of objects, we find that they share the existence of attributes that correlate with one another and combine to form attributes of an existence dependent upon another, such as deficiency and incapacity. Among these are ignorance, weakness, shortcoming, need, and limitation. These are all shared attributes concomitant with dependent existents, the created beings. Conversely, the opposites of these attributes are attributes of the self-independent existence, and they are concomitant with self-independence, such as the existence of the attributes of perfection, eternity, absolute power, self-sufficiency, all-encompassing knowledge, absolute will, Lordship, and others.

It is important to note that there are some shared attributes between independent (المستقل Al-Mustaqil) and dependently existent (تابع taabi'a) beings, or between perfect and imperfect beings, such as the attributes of existence, will, life, and knowledge. However, there is a difference between the perfect and the imperfect in terms of the essence of the attribute. The perfect Essence (ذات Dhaat) of Allah (swt) is not perceptible to the senses, so we cannot judge the nature of His Unseen Attributes through reason. Instead, we perceive the existence of the attribute and its general meaning either through reason, if it is conceivable, or through the Revelation of Allah (swt) to us about His Essence and Attributes with conclusive evidence. We must accept the divine revelation about His Attributes as it has been revealed, but without comparing the Creator to humans, even if these attributes share the same name. Humans can only perceive the meaning of these attributes in the tangible creations they perceive. For example, humans have the ability to learn and are described as knowledgeable, and Allah (swt) is Knowledgeable, but the true nature and essence of His knowledge are unknown to humans. Therefore, there is no comparison between them.

• The Importance of Evidencing the Concomitance of the Attributes of Independence (الاستقلالية Istiqlaliyyah) and Dependency (التابعة At-Taab'iyah) in Deducting the Existence of the Creator:

When investigating tangible perceived objects, we search for general shared attributes within them, such that these attributes correlate with each other and do not separate in order to deduce the concomitance and to judge their existence as either independent or dependent. For example, when we look at the universe, we find it composed of a collection of celestial bodies, and every celestial body among them is composed of several elements and several parts interconnected with each other. This indicates the existence of the attribute of composition, composed of parts, and this indicates the existence of a designed system. This is because the original state in objects is randomness, and they do not organize themselves except by the action of another. If we look at a composed thing made of a set of interconnected, ordered parts that then performs an action or a specific function, we categorically judge that it is a designed system.

Likewise, upon examining the universe, we also find that every celestial body among the bodies of this universe is limited. The existence of the attribute of limitation in the universe is concomitant and correlates with another attribute, which is incapacity. The incapacitated cannot bring anything into existence from nothingness and is incapable of bringing itself into existence with greater reason; thus, it is in need of One to bring it into existence, making it a created being. Incapacity, therefore, is an attribute that correlates with the attribute of being created, leading us to the conclusion that among the attributes of the universe is that it is created. This indicates the lack of independence of the universe in its self-existence; meaning, the existence of the attribute of dependency in the universe upon another for its existence is evidenced.

Here, we have researched and examined objects, and we found that they possess shared attributes concomitant with their existence, such as the attribute of need and the attribute of limitation. Then, we deduced from the existence of these attributes, other attributes concomitant with them, such as incapacity and existence after non-existence, being created. Furthermore, it follows necessarily from the existence of these attributes in things that they are not independent in their existence—meaning they are not self-existent. That is, the original state in them is non-existence—according to the aforementioned Essentials, which is the rule that the original state in objects is non-existence unless their existence is evidenced. Since their existence is evidenced by sense and observation, it is evidenced that their existence is an existence dependent upon another and is not independent. Consequently—and by using the principle of Causality—we arrive at the conclusion that their existence necessarily requires an Agent Who is the Cause of bringing them into existence; meaning they are created after non-existence, and they are in need of someone to bring them into existence, to create them.

This Agent is their Creator from non-existence. This Creator must have an existence that is self-independent, and not dependent in His existence upon another; otherwise, He would be created, and this is an absurd contradiction that is invalid. This attribute—namely, the attribute of being the Creator—is an attribute of perfection that the Creator must be described with, and the contrary attributes with which deficient created beings are described are negated from Him. Thus, we arrive at the conclusion that this self-independent existent as the Obligatorily Existent (واجب الوجود Wajib al-Wujud) must necessarily be an eternal Creator, capable, willing, knowing, self-sufficient, perfect, sovereign, a single Lord. He must be transcendent above all attributes of deficiency found in created beings. Therefore, it follows necessarily that He is uncreated, not incapacitated, not in need, and not limited, because the convergence of two contradictions in the same essence is invalid according to the aforementioned principles of the intellect.

These attributes of the Creator, even if they are not tangible in themselves—because the Essence of Allah (swt) and His attributes are not directly tangible—the intellect has nevertheless perceived and evidenced them for the Creator (الخالق Al-Khaaliq) through the senses, through tangible rational evidence. This is from its perception of the attributes of deficiency concomitant with tangible created beings, and its perception of the necessity of the existence of the attributes of perfection concomitant with the existence of the Creator. Therefore, these necessary attributes for the existence of the Creator are attributes perceived by the intellect and evidenced by the intellect, even if the essence of the Creator is not directly tangible to the intellect.

It is fitting for us to reflect upon an example used by the Noble Quran to evidence that our master Esa (Jesus), peace be upon him, is neither a god nor the son of a god. Allah (swt) said in Surah Al-Ma'idah, **يَمَا الْمَسِيحُ ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ إِلَّا رَسُولٌ قَدْ خَلَتْ مِنْ قَبْلِهِ الرُّسُلُ وَأُمُّهُ صِدِّيقَةٌ كَانَا يَأْكُلَانِ الطَّعَامَ انظُرْ** **يَمَا الْمَسِيحُ ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ إِلَّا رَسُولٌ قَدْ خَلَتْ مِنْ قَبْلِهِ الرُّسُلُ وَأُمُّهُ صِدِّيقَةٌ كَانَا يَأْكُلَانِ الطَّعَامَ انظُرْ** **كَيْفَ نُبَيِّنُ لَهُمُ الْآيَاتِ نَمْ انظُرْ أَنَّى يُؤْفَكُونَ** **“The Messiah, son of Mary, Esa (as), was not but a messenger; other messengers have passed on before him. And his mother was a supporter of truth. They both used to eat food. Look how We make clear to them the signs; then look how they are deluded.”** The fact that our master Esa (as) and his mother Maryem ate food indicates the existence of the attribute of need, and need indicates incapacity, and the incapacitated cannot be eternal, and it is impossible for him to be a Lord.

Thus, Allah (swt) showed to the Christians the signs—i.e., the evidence—of the created nature of Esa (as), yet they are deluded—meaning they turn away from the evidence and fall into deviation and straying from the truth. Had they reasoned properly according to the postulates of the intellects in their heads, they would have known that our master Esa (as) is a human being, and consequently, all their characteristics and attributes apply to him: he eats, drinks, sleeps, is born, and dies. All of these are attributes of living organisms that need others in their actions and the management of their affairs. This need indicates the existence of another attribute, which is incapacity, and the attribute of incapacity correlates with the attribute of being created. Concomitant with it are the attributes of created beings, such as deficiency, incapacity, need, death, life, and the like. This means that Esa (as) is a created servant, and not a Creator or a Lord. It is rationally impermissible to combine the attributes of eternity and Lordship with the attributes of deficiency and incapacity in a single essence, because this is impossible as it is a contradiction, and contradiction is invalid.

Fifth: Application of the Premises of the Evidence to the Evidence of Designing (مصنوعية Masnoo'iyah) and the Evidence of Limitation (محدودية Mahdoodiyah):

Let us take a tangible example that guides us to the necessity of the existence of the Creator using the Evidence of Limitation. Upon observing a wooden table, it is an object that evidence the existence of a designer for it. We deduce that he must necessarily be an expert carpenter, knowledgeable in his craft, perfecting it, possessing will and capability, having a purpose, possessing sight, having hands with which to design, and owning tools and raw materials, and the like, from the attributes and necessary corollaries. However, it cannot be claimed from observing the table the existence of other attributes for the designer, such as his skin color being white, or his eyes being blue, or his name being Ahmad, or that he wears a red shirt, or that he lives in Jerusalem, etc. These claims are not rational; they are conjectures and guessing at the unseen. The table, as a designed object, does not evidence these matters at all, neither from near nor from afar, unless the carpenter who made it is known to us personally. In that case, these specific attributes can be mentioned based on prior information about him, or if we find a specific stamp or identification card indicating the designer, so he is asked about, and then the carpenter informs about himself.

Reflecting upon the wooden table guides us to the fact that it is manufactured, because it consists of parts interconnected with each other and performs a function; thus, it is a stable teleological system. This indicates the necessity of the existence of a maker for it. We deduce from its tangible attributes—such as perfection, arrangement, precision in craftsmanship, beauty, and the performance of the function effectively—that its maker must possess necessary attributes derived from observing his design, which are expertise, knowledge, perfection, capability, ownership, will, and others. These are a set of necessary attributes for the maker so that he is able to produce the designed object, which is the wooden table.

When applying this example of the table to the universe, we observe the existence of order and laws that govern its behavior in everything. This organization present in the universe must emanate from a Designer for it, and its Designer must be described with attributes such as knowledge, perfection, wisdom, capability, ownership, will, and other attributes.

As for the Evidence of Limitation, we observe specific attributes in the universe, such as limitation. The meaning of limitation is that when we look at things, we find they have a beginning and an end; meaning they are spatially limited. Whatever has a beginning in space inevitably has a beginning in time, because time is subordinate to and existentially linked with space. There is no existence of time independently of the existence of space, and there is no existence of time without space. Consequently, every limited object has a beginning to its spatial and temporal existence, which means it was created at a specific time after having been non-existent. From another angle, the limited is considered incapable of transcending its limits; it is unable to exit its boundaries except by means of another. Therefore, it is deficient and incapacitated. Thus, there is a concomitance between the attribute of limitation

and the attribute of incapacity or deficiency. The attribute of limitation, therefore, is concomitant with the attribute of incapacity. The limited must necessarily be incapacitated, and the incapacitated cannot transcend its limits, and its incapacity is most evidently manifested in its inability to bring itself into existence with greater reason. Therefore, it is an existent dependent in its existence upon another; meaning it is created by another, and it is in need of a Creator to create it. Thus, there is a concomitance between the attributes of limitation and incapacity, and a concomitance of incapacity with the attribute of being created in objects.

From another perspective, the Creator must be described with the attributes of perfection concomitant with the attribute of being the Creator, and all attributes of deficiency and incapacity must be negated from Him. This is because the convergence of these attributes in the same essence is an invalid contradiction rejected by the intellect according to its principles. Among the attributes concomitant with the attribute of being the Creator is the attribute of capability, such that He is not incapacitated; and among the attributes is also eternity, such that He is not limited; as well as absolute knowledge, absolute will, and other attributes of perfection, the establishment of which in the Creator is evidenced by the existence of designed objects, created beings, and their perceived tangible attributes.

Thus, we have arrived, through the Evidence of Design (Dalil al-Masnu'iyah) for the table, and from the existence of specific attributes in this designer object, at the necessity of the existence of attributes conjoined with them in the designer. This is because the effect of the designer's attributes appeared in the manufactured object, which is a causal link, that is, a causal relationship between an effect and an effector.

However, in the Evidence of Limitation, we arrived through the Concomitance of Attributes to the conclusion that the existence of the universe is an existence not independent in itself. Instead, it is an existence dependent upon another, meaning it is created. The created being must necessarily have a Creator Who is the Cause of its creation. We thus arrived at the obligatory existence of a Creator for the universe. As the most important attribute concomitant with the Creator is independent existence in Himself, it follows necessarily that this attribute for the Creator is concomitant with other attributes, which are the opposites of the attributes of the limited, incapacitated, needy, created beings. The Creator must be described with non-limitation, Al-Azaliyyah (الأزلية Eternal), Al-Qudrah Al-Mutlaqah (القدرة المطلقة Absolute Power), and As-Samadiyyah (Self-Sufficiency الصمدية). We also arrive at the necessity of the existence of other attributes conjoined with the attribute of Eternity, such as the attributes of perfection, lack of deficiency, absolute knowledge, absolute will, oneness, Lordship, and other attributes. These are the necessary attributes that the intellect mandates for the Lord (رب) of the Worlds.

Thereafter, these are the most important premises recommended to be agreed upon as postulates for debate with disbelievers regarding the existence of the Creator, so that they may be bound by the rational evidence and proofs we use to evidence the existence of Allah (swt).

May Allah (swt) make this of benefit to the Islamic Ummah, which Allah (swt) has made a witness over mankind with truth, for truth, and for guidance. And may He (swt) make us guiding leaders by whose hands Allah guides the astray nations of the earth, so that they may enter the Deen of Allah (swt) with conviction of minds and tranquility of souls. Ameen, O Allah.