

OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF AMERICA

Temur Z. Kalanov.
Yozuvchilar (Pisatelskaya) 6a,
100128 Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
tzk_uz@yahoo.com,
t.z.kalanov@mail.ru,
t.z.kalanov@rambler.ru.
May 11, 2021

The President Joe Biden.
The White House,
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW,
Washington, DC 20500.

Dear Mr. President Joe Biden,

I would like to draw your attention to my research work:

THE THEORETICAL MODEL OF GOD: PROOF OF THE EXISTENCE AND OF THE UNIQUENESS OF GOD

Temur Z. Kalanov
Home of Physical Problems, Yozuvchilar (Pisatelskaya) 6a,
100128 Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
tzk_uz@yahoo.com, t.z.kalanov@mail.ru, t.z.kalanov@rambler.ru

Abstract. The work is devoted to the 21st century's most urgent problem: the problem of existence of God. The theoretical proof of the existence and of the uniqueness of God, based on the correct method of knowledge – unity of formal logic and of rational dialectics, – is proposed. This proof represents a theoretical model of God: a system of axioms from which the principle of existence and of uniqueness of God is deduced. The principle runs as follows: God exists as the Absolute, the Creator, the Governor of the essence (information) and of the phenomenon (material manifestation of information). The theoretical model of man and the formulation of the principle of development of Mankind – as consequences of the model of God – are proposed as well. The main conclusion is as follows: the principle of the existence and of the uniqueness of God represents absolute scientific truth and, consequently, should be a starting-point and a basis of the 21st century's correct sciences.

Key words: general science, philosophy of religion, metaphysics.

Introduction

1. Lately, the global problem – the problem of stable and safe development – arises before Mankind. The analysis of this problem shows that it is inseparably connected with the principle of development and with the global problem of sense and of purpose of existence of Mankind. These problems cannot be solved within the framework of 20th century sciences – inductive sciences. As is known, the 20th century's science paradigm – i.e. the initial conceptual scheme of science, the approach to formulation and solution of problems – is formulated as follows: (a) God does not exist; (b) the unity of the world consists in its materiality; (c) the knowledge of the phenomenon (i.e. form, external aspect) determines the knowledge of essence (i.e. content,

internal aspect); (d) any object can be mentally divided into elements; the knowledge of the elements of a system results in knowledge of the system of elements. This paradigm stipulates an inductive way of knowledge of the world, formed by ascending movement of knowledge: by the transition of knowledge from one states into higher states, i.e. by transition from a formulation of separate concepts to the formulation of a system of concepts. An ascending movement of knowledge in the way of an “unlimited” sequence of “dialectic negations” reflects the development of Mankind as ascension from a simple state to a complex state. The inductive science ascertains the fact of development, researches previous and present states but does not predict the future (next) states because it does not contain a deductive key to an explanation for the principle of development. In other words, inductive science (unlike a deductive science) does not answer the main question: “Why is there development in the world?” Therefore, the 20th century’s science paradigm does not allow to draw a complete (true) scientific picture of the world and, consequently, to solve correctly the following global problems: the problem of predestination, predetermination (inevitability) of knowledge of the world; the problem of the purpose of knowledge of the world; the problem of the limit of knowledge of the world; the problem of truth of knowledge of the world; the problem of existence of the absolute truth; the problem of the sense and of purpose of the existence of Mankind; the problem of source and of motive force in the development of Mankind; the problem of the way and of the limit of development of Mankind; the problem of destination of Mankind; the problem of the essence of the world. Thus, the correct research for the problem of development of Mankind is impossible without formulation of a new paradigm.

2. The formulation of a new paradigm means, first of all, a dialectic negation of 20th century philosophy (epistemology). As is known, the 20th century philosophy is characterized by perfect scientific methods but it cannot answer the “eternal” questions: “What is man?”, “What is life?”, “What is death?”, “What is the sense and the purpose of a human life?”, “Does God (the Creator, the Governor) exist?”, “What is God (the Creator, the Governor)?”. Weakness of 20th century philosophy (epistemology) is explained not by a lack of necessary scientific data but by the narrowness of modern scientists’ consciousness: (a) narrow consciousness (which is not contain concept of God) determines interpretation of scientific data, and interpretation of scientific data characterizes narrow consciousness (which is not contain concept of God); (b) the modern scientists’ thinking has not moved far from well-known interpretation of the key concepts: the categories “reality”, “matter”, “consciousness”, “thinking”, “thought”, “knowledge”, “morals”, “truth”, and “criterion of truth”. Thus, dialectic negation of 20th century philosophy (gnosiology) and formulation of a new paradigm are impossible without a broadening of scientists’ consciousness, without the critical analysis and correct definition of philosophy’s (epistemology’s) key concepts: the categories “reality”, “matter”, “consciousness”, “thinking”, “thought”, “knowledge”, “morals”, “truth”, and “criterion of truth”.

3. Broadening of scientists’ consciousness and the correct definition of scientific concepts (in particular, the categories “reality”, “matter”, “consciousness”, “thinking”, “thought”, “knowledge”, “morals”, “truth”, and “criterion of truth”) are possible only in that case if two different, mutually connected, mutually complementary methods of scientific knowledge of the world are used: the formal-logical method (the method of formal logic) and the rational-dialectical method (the method of rational dialectics). The unity of these methods is not only the correct way of building and of substantiating a system of philosophical knowledge, but also a correct methodological basis for the critical analysis of any system of concepts. Since these methods of scientific knowledge represent the formal-logical and rational-dialectical ways of thinking, scientific knowledge (i.e. system of scientific concepts) is a consequence of these correct ways of thinking. In other words, the way of thinking determines human knowledge, and the human knowledge characterizes a way of thinking. There is no knowledge in general – knowledge separated and independent of the subject of knowledge, – and there is only human and non-human knowledge. Hence, the existence and definition of concepts (in particular, the

categories “reality”, “matter”, “consciousness”, “thinking”, “thought”, “knowledge”, “morals”, “truth”, and “criterion of truth”) is the consequence of a way of thinking.

4. Modern scientific thinking is analytical thinking. The purpose of scientific thinking and of scientific knowledge of the world is to comprehend scientific truth. Scientific truth represents the content of objective scientific knowledge, i.e. represents a property of a system of scientific concepts, not depending on the scientists’ outlook, not containing references to the means and methods of knowledge (in particular, to devices, procedure of measurement or calculation). The objective scientific knowledge at a certain moment of history is one of states of knowledge in the process of inductive knowledge. If the process of inductive knowledge has no upper limit (i.e. an upper boundary), then knowledge – the system of scientific concepts – is always incomplete. Since the properties of a complete system, generally speaking, qualitatively differ from properties of an incomplete system (i.e. since properties of complete system are not consequence of properties of incomplete system), the content of incomplete knowledge represents relative truth. Social practice is an aspect of the criterion of relative truth. In this connection, the problem of the validity of scientific knowledge – one of the central problems in gnosiology – cannot be solved without determination of an upper limit of process of inductive knowledge, without comprehension of absolute truth. In other words, a complete (correct) definition of scientific concepts (in particular, the categories “reality”, “matter”, “consciousness”, “thinking”, “thought”, “knowledge”, “morals”, “truth”, and “criterion of truth”) is impossible if absolute truth does not exist: the absolute truth is the criterion of correctness, of validity of scientific knowledge. Thus, the problem of the existence of a upper limit of inductive knowledge – i.e. the problem of the existence of absolute truth – arises.

5. The statement and solution of the problems of the existence of a upper limit of inductive knowledge and of the existence of absolute truth are out of framework of an inductive science because, according to the definition of the concept “induction”, an inductive way of knowledge has no the upper limit. Each stage of an inductive way of knowledge is: statement and solution of a new problem; a new scientific knowledge; a result of scientific creativity. As George Polya – the well-known mathematician and pedagogue – has pointed out, the methods of scientific creativity are as follows: a scientist should guess the theorem before he will prove it; a scientist should guess the idea of the proof before he will carry out the proof in details. In this sense, the theorem of the existence of a upper limit of inductive knowledge (the theorem of existence of absolute truth) is my guess, my scientific hypothesis. One can guess this theorem and idea of the proof of this theorem only if one take into consideration the concept “God” explained in the main religious sources – the Bible and the Koran. Hence, the problem of development of Mankind represents a logical consequence of the global problem of the existence of a upper limit of inductive knowledge and of the problem of the existence of God. Thus, the scientific solution of the problem of the existence of God (i.e. the correct solution of the problem of the relation between science and religion) is a key to the correct solution of the actual problem of development of Mankind.

6. As is known, one of the main purposes of science and of religion is to explain the world. However, scientific and religious pictures of the world – as results of such explanation – essentially differ from each other. This distinction is not sufficient reason, a logical substantiation, a proof of existence of the contradiction between science and religion. Really, from the formal-logical point of view, science and religion cannot be compared because there are no logical relations (i.e. relations of identity, subordination, collateral subordination, partial coincidence, and discrepancy) between scientific and religious concepts. This is explained by the fact that structures, principles of knowledge, categories (concepts), methods of science and of religion are different. For example, science uses an inductive (analytical) method of knowledge. This method is based on the analysis, i.e. mental division of the object of knowledge into aspects. And religion uses a deductive (non-analytical, meditative) method of knowledge which is not based on the analysis. This distinction leads to the fact that the main religious concepts – “God”, “creation”, “result of creation” – and scientific concepts have no general (common) basis

and, hence, there is no reason for comparison between them. It means that the problem of the relation between science and religion is a problem of logical-philosophical relations between scientific and religious concepts. It is obvious that this problem cannot be solved within the framework of special sciences (for example, cosmology, astrophysics, physics, biology, genetics) because it is a general scientific problem. For comparison of these concepts to make, it is necessary to build scientific model of God. Thus, the problem of relation between science and religion is reduced to the problem of building of theoretical model of God. Only on the base of this model, one can establish unambiguous (one-to-one) correspondence between the main, key scientific and religious concepts.

The above results in the following statement of the problem of stable and of safe development of Mankind:

(a) the solution of the problem of stable and of safe development of Mankind is impossible without a knowledge of the principle of development;

(b) the principle of development should be researched within the framework of the new paradigm [1-9] which runs as follows: the world is a unity of essence and phenomenon; the knowledge of essence (i.e. content, internal aspect) of the world determines knowledge of the phenomenon (i.e. forms, external aspect, manifestation of essence); not any object of knowledge can be mentally divided into aspects (elements); the knowledge of elements of a system does not result in knowledge of a system of elements since the properties of a system are not a consequence of the properties of its elements;

(c) the principle of development cannot be correctly formulated without research and solution of the problem of existence of God because the principle of development is a logical consequence of the principle of existence and of uniqueness of God;

(d) the principle of existence and of uniqueness of God – a starting-point and a basis of 21st century's correct (deductive) science – should be the logical consequence of a correct scientific knowledge of interaction between a subject of knowledge and an object of knowledge; this principle should not depend on outlook of any scientist;

(e) it is necessary: to build the theoretical model (identifier) of God on the basis of a correct scientific knowledge of the interaction between a subject of knowledge and an object of knowledge (i.e. to build the system of axioms (premises)); to deduce logically the principle of existence and of uniqueness of God;

(f) it is necessary to identify God, i.e. to establish an unambiguous (one-to-one) correspondence between the main scientific and religious concepts;

(g) it is necessary to interpret the moral principles, stated in the Bible and the Koran, as criteria of the truth of human life, of human science and of practice, as the criteria of correct development of Mankind.

In accordance with this statement of the problem, the purpose of the present work is: to propose a scientific approach to a solution of the problem of correct development of Mankind; to propose a starting-point and a basis for a correct science in 21st century – the theoretical model of God and the principle of existence and of uniqueness of God (expressing the content of the theoretical model of God); to propose the theoretical model of man and the principle of the development of Mankind (as the consequences of the model of God). The constructed model of God represents the theoretical proof of existence and of uniqueness of God within the framework of correct methodological basis – the unity of formal logic and of rational dialectics. Therefore, this proof is absolute scientific truth.

My work has been published in the following peer-reviewed journals:

[1] T.Z. Kalanov, "On the hypothesis of Universe's "system block"". Bulletin of the Amer. Phys. Soc. (April Meeting), Vol. 51, No. 2 (2006), p. 61.

- [2] T.Z. Kalanov, "On a new theory of the black hole". Bulletin of the Amer. Phys. Soc. (April Meeting), Vol. 51, No. 2 (2006), p. 62.
- [3] T.Z. Kalanov, "Theoretical model of God: The key to correct exploration of the Universe". Bulletin of the Amer. Phys. Soc. (April Meeting), Vol. 52, No. 2 (2007), p. 121.
- [4] T.Z. Kalanov, "On the hypothesis of control of the Universe". Bulletin of the Amer. Phys. Soc. (April Meeting), Vol. 52, No. 2 (2007), p. 121.
- [5] T.Z. Kalanov, "Theoretical model of God: proof of existence". Indian Journal of Science and Technology, Vol. 2, No. 3 (2009), pp. 80-88.
- [6] T.Z. Kalanov, "The theoretical model of God: Proof of the existence and the uniqueness of God". Scientific GOD Journal, Vol. 1, No. 2 (2010), pp. 85-97.
- [7] T.Z. Kalanov, "The Doctrine of Reality: A New Paradigm of Science". Scientific Review, Vol. 5, No. 1 (2019), pp. 24-32.
- [8] T.Z. Kalanov, "Hubble Law, Doppler Effect and the Model of "Hot" Universe: Errors in Cosmology". Open Access Journal of Physics (USA), Vol. 3, No. 2 (2019), pp. 1-16.

My work is the only one in the world and represents an outstanding achievement in science, because my work is the only rigorous (correct) theoretical work. In my work, I am the first in the world, who scientifically proved the existence and uniqueness of God. Science is a struggle for truth!

Based on the above, let me ask you to help in promotion of my work to the Nobel committee and the Nobel Prize.

Most respectfully,
Dr. Temur Z. Kalanov.
www.facebook.com.