

Essay

## On Infinite Regress

Himangsu S. Pal\*

### Abstract

In this essay, I show that the scientific explanation for the origin of the universe still suffers from infinite regress, whereas the theistic explanation has overcome this problem. In that sense, it can be said that the theistic explanation is much better than the scientific explanation. So, it may be said that there is no need to feel frustrated over the issue that the infinite regress problem can never be solved, because we have successfully shown that it can be solved.

**Keywords:** Infinite regress, origin, universe, nothing, theism, atheism.

In the essay “Existence of anything ultimately points to God” [1], I have shown that, if anything exists at all, then ultimately there will have to be something that will be neither in space nor in time, as otherwise there will be an infinite regress.

When I have posted this essay in one YouTube comment thread, one commentator has asked the following question: ‘Why must we “stop an infinite regress”?’

He has also remarked that, as far as he can tell, all discussions of origins, purpose and meaning, eventually would lead to infinite regress, if one cannot simply accept reality as it appears to be.

He is the same person who in another occasion has written that, in Krauss’ book “A universe from nothing: Why there is something rather than nothing”, it is required that reality must have an underlying nature that would include the laws of quantum mechanics, but that Krauss cannot explain why such laws should exist when there would be nothing. He has also written that, like theists, Krauss also runs into the problem that all explanations of origin would ultimately lead to infinite regress. He has written that no matter how the scientists explain the origin of the universe, it would have to be in terms of some pre-existing condition or entity, which leads to the question of why that is the way it is, and whatever explains that would then need to be explained [Also see 2].

So the reason he has asked the above question is quite apparent. It is due to the sad realization that even the scientific explanation for the origin of the universe has failed to keep itself free from the infinite regress problem that is a real bug in the theistic explanation, because in the latter case nobody knows why God would have to be always there or where did God come from. In the scientific explanation also one has to assume that quantum laws were already there but

---

\*Correspondence: Himangsu S. Pal. E-Mail: [sekharpal1946@rediffmail.com](mailto:sekharpal1946@rediffmail.com)

nobody can explain why that would have to be so. So the scientific explanation is no better than the theistic explanation in this respect, because in both the cases there would be an infinite regress. So, if we cannot stop this infinite regress in one occasion, then what is the use of trying to stop it in another occasion?

But this person is definitely wrong here, because the question ‘who created God?’ has already been answered and thus there would be no infinite regress in the theistic explanation. We have been able to show that God is a bunch of several zeroes and everybody knows that zero does not have to come from anything. For this one can read the article ‘Who created God?’ here [3].

So it can be said that the scientific explanation for the origin of the universe still suffers from infinite regress problem, whereas the theistic explanation has overcome this problem. In that sense, it can be said that the theistic explanation is much better than the scientific explanation.

We would also say that there is no need to feel frustrated over the issue that the infinite regress problem can never be solved, because we have successfully shown that it can be solved.

## References

1. <http://www.scigod.com/index.php/sgj/article/view/498/536>
2. <http://www.scigod.com/index.php/sgj/article/view/556/601>
3. <http://www.scigod.com/index.php/sgj/article/view/76/85>