The Questioner says: “Is linking scientific events with Religion a correct thing to do? Is the purpose of religion worship or science or both? Some have started to explain every new scientific discovery with the Religion.

Before I answer this question, I need to make a general remark. I want to say that first of all we need to have a correct definition of what science is. When we say science, or the relationship between science and religion, what is meant by science? And how does a thing become scientific?

This is scientific philosophy and I’m not specialized in it, but it intertwines with the Howza research from the side of Logic studies.

Such that Howza sciences researches the Logic of Inference and the Logic of Proofs, therefore, it also looks at the recent sciences and their status.

One must pay attention that there are two methodologies to the Human reasoning, Induction and Deduction. Deduction is that through specific premises you reach a conclusion which is in included within these premises. For example, when I want to deduce that, let’s use this example, the World is a variable, and every variable is created, thus the World is created. The “World is created” statement can be found in the previous two

premises. And this is called deduction, where I deduce a conclusion from specific premises. It is also called Qiyas (Analogy) in Aristotle's Logic.

This is the methodology of deduction. And on the other hand, we have Induction. Almost all of the Science of Mathematics is through deduction. And we have induction. As for induction, you move from the premises which are individual cases to reach a general conclusion. The Conclusion is more general than the premises. For example, I have a metal that expands with heat, I keep trying several other metals and then I reach to the general conclusion that "metal expands with heat".

When we take a look at the inductive reasoning, we find several issues have been raised against it:

What is the justification for reaching a general conclusion when the premises are individual case? We tried a few metals from all the available metals. The cases that you tried on are much less than the cases the general conclusion applies to. This is a problem

Another problem is that did we put in mind all the variables of the experiment? For example, when we tried heating the metal, we tried it on the Surface of Earth. Couldn't it be that on the surface of Moon this doesn't apply? But the conclusion we get is that All metals expand with heat regardless of such variables. Not all variables are put into account.

From here we can see that there is an issue in the inductive reasoning. This issue is an indecipherable (difficult) issue in the recent sciences and there are attempts at dealing with it and presenting solutions.

When we talk about recent sciences – what we mean when we say recent sciences- is the science that builds its theories through experiments, as in Induction. This is the recent science, it needs experimental proof, and theoretical deduction isn't enough.

This science if we wanted to look at the issues in it, as in if we wanted to look at the issues in the inductive reasoning, we will see that, of course the Scholars (Ulama) have taken different stances towards Induction. One old approach is to refer the inductive conclusion to a deductive one such that it becomes definitive, which is known to be used by Muslim Logicians. Others have said that we can reach to conclusions that are close to being definitive, but that we don't reach the level of scientific definitive. One of the recent positions on Inductive is by Karl Popper where he says that inductive reasoning is no good and does not help you reach any conclusion.

What is science? Any issue/rule we impose that aligns with the evidence we currently have and which can be disproved in the future, this is considered a scientific issue. And while it still hasn't been disproved then it remains correct. This methodology is present and is strongly valid. Such that we agree that the issues raised on Induction cannot be solved, and

that recent sciences (Experimental) are built upon hypothesis that aligns with the evidence we currently have, and as long as it can be disproved, then it is a scientific issue. Where you can say that since it hasn't been disproved yet, then its correct. This is the meaning of "correct". When it is said that something has been scientifically proven, it means up to the present time the current evidence aligns with the hypothesis.

What do we want to get out of all this? We want to say that recent science is built upon Induction Methodology, this Methodology faces certain Logical issues, and the stances taken on these issues are multiple. When we want to talk about science and relate it with Religion or give it value, we need to have a correct visualization regarding the scientific issue, and a correct visualization regarding the methodology of assessing the sciences.

For example, it is said that it has been proven in medicine that Tea strengthens a specific something, no not proven in medicine rather let's say scientific studies have proven.

Scientific studies have proven that Corona can spread through surfaces, then through air, then through speech, I don't know if they said through speech but I read something similar, and that it stays in the air for 14 minutes. You find such studies, what is the level of evidence in this study? How many subjects are studied? What is the level of randomness, what system did they follow in collecting it? All of this we must look at, then after we know what happened in the process, we must then present it to

the methodology we use in assessing the scientific issues. After we do all this, we can then say this is what it means that science has proven. That sciences says so.

Some would say science has proven the evolution theory, what does it mean? What does that sentence represent? Does it mean that it hasn't been disproved yet, that there isn't any evidence to disprove it yet, or does it mean that there is plenty of evidence that aligns with the evolution theory, while there is plenty of evidence that doesn't align with the evolution theory but we haven't yet reached a conclusion in these. Or does it mean that all the evidence we have aligns with the evolution theory?

You need to state what do you mean by "scientifically proven" and then I accordingly to my logical reasoning methodology, will assess it. Depending on who I follow, Karl popper, or Sayyid Al Shahid and his probability theory, or the Muslim Philosophers like Ibn Sina and others who refer the Induction back to Deduction, to the realistic reason. Depending on my methodology I will assess. Then after all of that we can say that the Quran has proved or negated or any of the sort, or that we link it with the Quran or we don't.

That's why the Metaphysical narrations (Akhbar Ghaybiya) we have in the Quran and Sunnah cannot be disproved by the recent scientific evidence, unless if the narration was linked to something perceptible, and the scientific evidence is linked to

something perceptible directly. It is not enough to say that the age of the universe was proven to be 13 billion years, that it was created 13 billion years ago. I need to see your complete inference, then assess it according to my methodology, and then I can deal with the scientific issue, that is it compatible with the Quran and Sunnah or not, and if I find something that is against what is in the Quran and Sunnah then I will take the Quran and Sunnah with all due respect, with all due respect. Why? Because your Induction methodology isn't enough to reach a definitive conclusion so why should I leave my definitive methodology and take yours.

One might say are you serious? Look at where science has reached and all that. It is true, but all of this is not definitive and didn't include all the details. All you can prove scientifically is that if we heat metal, it will expand. What if there is an Angel doing it, how do you know? Science can't prove or negate it. For real, it cannot. Or the Jinn and where they come from, science can't prove or negate these details. It could be that the Jinn affects a certain thing in the brain. It's possible that certain reasons can lead to a Jinn affecting the brain in a certain way and it's called Mas[1] (مس), and science has proven that Mas is an issue in the brain due to a certain substance, all of this could be due to a Jinni, how do you know if its not?

What we're trying to say is that we can't create a definite relationship between science, and the Quran and Sunnah,

[1] used the original word used by the Sayyid because I didn't know what exactly he was referring to. But in general, you can replace it with any mental condition.

whether to prove or negate, except if 1) We have a clear view on what has been definitively proven from this scientific issue, and 2) that we have a clear methodology on how to assess the logical reasoning used to present these scientific conclusions. Without those two that it'll be just newspaper talk, twitter talk give and take[2]

We must establish those two conditions above. Of course, we don't have an issue to reject a narration, even if Sahih, if it was opposing a definitive scientific conclusion. Because the Sahih Narration is definitive. But in the end, we say that it is not possible for science to oppose something definitive in the Quran and Sunnah, and what appears to be so, must be looked into further.

That's why we warn that you shouldn't link a religious text (Quran or Sunnah) to a scientific proof, yes, it is fine to say that is goes along with, that this religious text goes along with this certain scientific study. Both in the case of proving and negating there must be caution in dealing with it, and observing the scientific methodology.

At the end I'd like to preset a point quickly, there is an important matter in the scientific methodologies. In a lot of the cases the Induction is based on the assumption that there is no godly metaphysical intervention. For example, the age of the universe. They say if we take the speed of the expansion of the universe, the universe is expanding according to a certain

[2] This refers to it being unacademic and non-scientific talk, just simply everyone stating his opinion.

mathematical formula (2,4,8,16, etc.). So, if we reverse the direction, we can know the age of the universe. Now you have obtained the age of the universe, how do you know that the Universe started from point zero? What if the universe started with the planets and stars already existing, and then it started to expand as per the mathematical formula? And how do you know if the expansion rate followed the same rate of change a billion year ago? All of these are assumptions that you cannot prove. A lot of the scientific issues are based on that there is no godly metaphysical interference. So, if there is an intervention, then there is no proof. We don't want to tell them that you shouldn't speak in science, but that you state based on no intervention, then the age of the universe is 13 million years. But you can't say it definitively, because you assumed no intervention and you cannot prove it. I'm speaking logically and not as someone wearing a Turban[3], I'm speaking from a logical point of view. We must discuss these scientific issues with accuracy then we can talk about the conclusions. Scientifically proven and so on.

Sometimes they say that the percentage of atheists is 10%, but what are the parameters of the study? Of course, they do put this information, don't understand from my words that they do not. But when these studies are presented, they do not show this to the people, it is kept hidden. If we dissect these points then we may disagree with the conclusions of the study depending on our logical methodology.

[3] This is referring to that he is speaking from a logical point of view and not religiously

The conclusion is that the recent sciences are based on Induction methodology, this methodology faces a number of logical issues. There are multiple theories on how to deal with these issues, and since this is the case, then we cannot prove or negate between the Islamic sciences and recent sciences except 1) if we know the exact amount of what has been definitely proven, and 2)if we have a correct visualization/understanding of the scientific methodology. Without the previous two points, we shouldn't speak in this topic and it should be left until these two points mentioned above are obtained.