



Kaya Argument: A New Logical and Philosophical Expansion to the Premise ‘God Exists’

HACI KAYA

Necmettin Erbakan University

Discussion

Submitted: 25.10.2017 Accepted: 18.11.2017

Abstract: If ontological, cosmological, religious experience and moral argument on the existence of God are valid proofs, or at least to the point of convincing us, then, the premise “God exists” is correct. If there is no valid argument, that is, if they do not prove the existence of God, or if we believe that they are not convincing arguments for us, we are still within the boundaries of the reason when we said “God exists” and we believed in it. Consequently, in both cases, the premise “God exists” is within the limits of the reason. While in the first case the proposition is rational and affirmed, in the second case it is denied and not irrational.

Keywords: Kaya argument, ontological argument, cosmological argument, existence of God, logic.

HACI KAYA ✉

N. Erbakan University, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Department of Philosophy
Köyceğiz Kampüsü, Meram, Konya, 42210, Turkey [kayahaci5@gmail.com]

Introduction

The arguments for the existence of God are methodologically either inductive or deductive, and the first is cosmological and the second is ontological.

It is clear that Saint Anselm, Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz came to mind in the West, while Eastern thinkers had their efforts in the works of al-Farabi and Ibn Sina. Thomas Aquinas and Immanuel Kant have essential criticisms against this belief.

Cosmological argument has been spoken by Plato, Aristotle, al-Razi, al-Ghazali, Ibn Sina and Thomas Aquinas; we know that criticism against this argument is expressed by thinkers such as Ibn Rushd, Kant, Mill and Hume. In addition to this, it is also necessary to mention the argument of *nizam* and *ghaya* or teleological argument, possession and religious experience. We can finally go on to defend our thesis by giving brief information about these arguments.

“God exists” is within the boundaries of the reason.

We must not explain that anyone who says ‘God exists’ will still be in the mental frame, even if all these proofs are invalid or not persuasive. Let’s ask the following question about the suggestion that God exists”: Is this proposition proven or irrational? We are arguing that if we believe that the argument we have developed is ‘God exists’, it is not proven or proven that it is included in the bounds of the mind.

The Terms of Kaya Argument

A : Affirmed

E : Exists

G : God

N : Nonexistent

Note: In this demonstration, even if the existence of God has not been proven, when we say “God exists” or put forward the premise “God exists”, we are still trying to demonstrate that we are within the limits of reason.

The Form of Argument in Classical Logic

Argumentation 1

- I All A is E,
G is A,
Then, G is E.
- II Some G is not E,
G is A,
Then, some A is not E.

The premise "Some A is not E" is contradictory with "All A is E". Then, the premise "G is E" should be correct.

Argumentation 2

- I All A is E,
No E is not N,
Then, no A is not N (All A is E).
- II Some A is not E,
No E is not N,
Then, some A is not not N (Some A is not E).

The premise "Some A is not E" is contradictory with "All A is E". Then "No A is not N (Every A is E)" is correct.

Argumentation 3

True conversion of the premise "All A is E" is "Some E is A".

If "Some E is A", then, "Some E is not A". Because,

- All E is not A,
Some E is A,
Then, some E is not A.

Argumentation 4

There is no logical contradiction between premises "If G is A, then, G is E" and "If G is not A, then, G is E". Because,

- Some E is A,
Some E is not A.

Argumentation 5

If there is no logical contradiction between premises “If G is A, then, G is E” and “If G is not A, then, G is E”, then, this premises are not irrational.

We proved in *Argumentation 4* that there was no logical contradiction between premises “If G is A, then, G is E” and “If G is not A, then, G is E”. Then, these premises are not irrational.

Conclusion

If ontological, cosmological, religious experience and moral argument on the existence of God are valid proofs, or at least to the point of convincing us, then, the premise “God exists” is correct. If there is no valid argument, that is, if they do not prove the existence of God, or if we believe that they are not convincing arguments for us, we are still within the boundaries of the reason when we said “God exists” and we believed in it. Consequently, in both cases, the premise “God exists” is within the limits of the reason. While in the first case the proposition is rational and affirmed, in the second case it is denied and not irrational.