

Essay

The Necessity of God & the Uncreated Whole

Himangsu S. Pal *

ABSTRACT

In this essay, I argue that, if there is a phenomenon in this universe which forever defies natural description or a plausible account of it based on material processes alone, there, and there only, God can show up by proving to be necessary. I further argue that the “Whole” for which no change can ever occur, is unborn, without a beginning and without an end. Neither the “Whole” is composite, and everything about this “Whole” is self-explanatory.

Key Words: necessity, God, uncreated, Whole, composite, not composite, self-explanatory.

The Necessity of God

Scientist Victor J. Stenger in his book “God: The Failed Hypothesis” [1] has written: “However, the God of the gaps argument by itself fails, at least as a scientific argument, unless the phenomenon in question is not only currently scientifically inexplicable but can be shown to forever defy natural description. God can only show up by proving to be necessary, with science equally proven to be incapable of providing a plausible account of the phenomenon based on natural or material processes alone” (pp 13-14).

We are really very grateful to Mr. Stenger for expressing his thoughts with such clarity, because it is extremely rare. This shows that not only he is a scientist, but also he is an able philosopher. Yes, if there is a phenomenon in this universe which forever defies natural description, or if science is also proven to be incapable of providing a plausible account of it based on material processes alone, in that case only God can show up by proving to be necessary.

Now whatever may be the cause due to which space and time become non-existent for light, at least one thing seems to be certain here. This cause can be at the very most either an unnatural or a supernatural one, but it can never be a natural one. Natural cause will be for that entity for which space and time exist. As light is not such an entity, so in this case we find a phenomenon that, according to Victor J Stenger, will “forever defy natural description”.

But it is our urgent wish to show that there is at least one phenomenon in this universe where God will ultimately show up by proving to be necessary. Therefore we must have to find out as to whether there can really be any such material description of the phenomenon in question here. If we find that no such description is scientifically possible, then that will only show that in this case science is proven to be incapable of providing a plausible account of the phenomenon based on material processes alone, thus leaving only God to show up by proving to be necessary.

* Correspondence: Himangsu S. Pal. E-Mail: sekharpal1946@rediffmail.com

So, can there really be a material description of this mind-boggling case of light, where we find that even an infinite distance as well as a time-interval of an eternity becomes zero for it? How do scientists propose to explain these facts by material processes alone? Or, shall we have to go for God here?

The Uncreated Whole

The Whole (TW) as per definition is that entity outside of which there cannot be anything: no space, no time, no matter, simply nothing. Whatever will be there at all will be within The Whole. If there is anything outside TW, then it will no longer be TW. Rather the entity that will contain both the so-called TW and the thing lying outside of that so-called TW will be the new TW. So by definition there can never be anything outside The Whole.

TW being placed neither in space nor in time cannot change at all. Change can occur either in space or in time. So TW cannot change, because it is placed neither in space nor in time. Being not in space we cannot say about this TW that it was 'there' before, and that it is 'here' now. Being not in time we cannot say about this TW that it was 'this' before, and that it has become 'that' after, in both these cases it remaining at the same point of space. So there can never be any question of change for TW.

Now it can be shown that an entity which cannot change at all will also be unborn and uncreated. An entity that is created comes into existence from non-existence, and so, for it once there was a change, and thus it is not changeless. So an entity, for which no change can ever occur, can never be created. It will be uncreated.

Similarly it can be shown that an entity, for which no change can ever occur, was never born, because being born means coming into being from non-being. This is also a change. So an entity, for which no change can ever occur, will also be unborn.

It can also be shown that an entity for which no change can ever occur is without any beginning and without any end. It is everlasting. Having a beginning means change, and coming to an end also means change. So for an entity for which no change can ever occur there will be no beginning, no end; for it there will be neither any coming into existence nor any going into non-existence.

Thus it can be shown that simply by default TW will always be spaceless, timeless, changeless, immortal, all-pervading, one, unborn, uncreated and everlasting, without a beginning and without an end.

Can The Whole be Composite?

Can The Whole (TW) be composite? I know that I am composite, but can TW be composite? If one of my hands is cut off from my elbow, then will I die for that reason? No, I will not die,

although I will no doubt become a little bit handicapped by this mutilation. If I am right-handed and if my left elbow is cut off, then I will be not too much handicapped. But if I am right-handed and if my right elbow is cut off from my body, then I will really, really be too much handicapped. If I lose one of my legs due to an accident, then again I will become handicapped, but will that loss cause me my death? The answer is: No. If most of the hairs of my head fall, and if I become bald as a result of this hair-fall, will I not still remain me? If most of the teeth in my mouth are broken due to old age, will I not still remain me? If I become blind in one of my eyes, will that man not be me?

The above examples show that even if I have to lose some of the parts of my body due to accidents or due to some other reasons, still I will remain the same person as before assuming that these losses will not cause me my death, and also assuming that these losses will only make me a little bit handicapped in one way or other. This is the sign of a composite being.

Now, if we find that by mutilating some parts of TW, TW can still remain TW, then that will prove that TW is composite. But if we find that after cutting off some parts of it, TW can no longer remain TW, then we will have to conclude that TW cannot be composite, that it is one unbroken whole.

We say that there is nothing outside of TW; no space, no time, no matter, simply nothing. But that does not mean that TW itself has no extension. It may and will have extension, and this extension may even be infinite. We do not know. Only that this TW having infinite extension will not be placed in any space, because outside it there will be no space at all. If some parts of TW are now mutilated, will the remaining part still remain TW? No, because as per definition there cannot be anything outside TW, and so there cannot be any space outside it. But as soon as some parts of TW are cut off, its size as a whole will be reduced and space will be created where TW has been mutilated. So the mutilated TW will be in space now, and thus it will no longer remain TW. This shows that TW cannot be composite, it is one unbroken whole.

But the main reason as to why TW cannot be composite is that there is no space where the mutilated portions of TW can be thrown away or dumped, because TW is not in any space. So TW cannot be mutilated at all, and not even an infinitesimal part of this TW can be separated from the main body of TW. This is because after separating that infinitesimal part of TW from its main body we will find that we will have to keep that separated portion at the very same place from where it has been separated, because there can never be any extra space available at all to dump even this infinitesimal part of TW, and thus all our attempts to mutilate this TW in every possible way is always bound to become a failure.

The Whole is self-explanatory

The Whole is self-explanatory in the sense that the conclusions that have been arrived at about TW have simply followed from its definition. The Whole being The Whole is neither in space nor in time, because being The Whole there cannot be anything outside it. From this it then necessarily follows that TW is spaceless, timeless, changeless, immortal, all-pervading, one,

unborn, uncreated, everlasting, without a beginning and without an end, and not composite. Thus nothing about TW requires any further explanation from outside, and we can say that TW is self-defined.

But this cannot be said about any entity placed within space and time. There nothing is self-explanatory, and everything requires an explanation from outside. I think only one example will suffice here. We know that there are four forces in this universe: strong nuclear force, weak nuclear force, electromagnetic force and gravitational force. Out of these four forces strong nuclear force is the strongest and gravitational force is the weakest. But all these four forces are not of equal range; the gravitational force is of an infinite range whereas the strong nuclear force is of very small range. Actually it works only within the nucleus of the atom, but not beyond that region. But how was it determined that one force would have to be of very short range, whereas another force of very long range? What were the physical processes by means of which the discrimination was first of all made among the four forces and then their range of action chosen separately for each force? The answers of all these questions are not so self-obvious, and they will have to come from outside.

References

1. Stenger, V.J. (2007), *God: The Failed Hypothesis* (Prometheus Books).
2. Pal, H. S. (2010), God, scientists and the void. *Scientific GOD Journal*, 1(6): pp. 428-432.
3. Pal, H. S. (2010), Timeless & climax. *Scientific GOD Journal*, 1(7): pp. 492-496.
4. Pal, H. S. (2010), Some reflections on God and Science. *Scientific GOD Journal*, 1(7): pp. 484-491.
5. Pal, H. S. (2010), If God created Universe, who created God? *Scientific GOD Journal*, 1(8): pp. 582-584.
6. Pal, H. S. (2011), Something versus nothing & some thoughts on proof of no God. *Scientific GOD Journal*, 2(2): pp. 188-193.
7. Pal, H. S. (2011), How to prove that there is a God, God is real & the Universe needs a God. *Scientific GOD Journal*, 2(4): pp. 327-333.
8. Pal, H. S. (2011), God of the gaps. *Scientific GOD Journal*, 2(6): pp. 635-637.
9. Pal, H. S. (2011), Stephen Hawking's hotchpotch. *Scientific GOD Journal*, 2(6): pp. 629-634.

10. Pal, H. S. (2012), Various thoughts on God & Science. Scientific GOD Journal, 3(1): pp. 132-137.
11. Pal, H. S. (2012), One more proof that there is a God. Scientific GOD Journal, 3(2): pp. 217-219.
12. Pal, H. S. (2012), Evidence of God in modern physics. Scientific GOD Journal, 3(4): pp. 415-422.
13. Pal, H. S. (2012), More Thoughts on Light, Matter, Space & Time. Scientific GOD Journal, 3(8): pp. 721-726.
14. Pal, H. S. (2012), On Atheists' Complaint of No Evidence for God. Scientific GOD Journal, 3(8): pp. 815-819.