

# Palgrave Frontiers in Philosophy of Religion

## **Series Editors**

Yujin Nagasawa  
School of Philosophy  
University of Birmingham  
Birmingham  
United Kingdom

Erik Wielenberg  
DePauw University  
Greencastle  
Indiana, USA

### **Editorial Board Members**

Michael Almeida, University of Texas at San Antonio

Lynne Rudder Baker, University of Massachusetts Amherst

Jonathan Kvanvig, Baylor University

Robin Le Poidevin, University of Leeds

Brian Leftow, University of Oxford

Graham Oppy, Monash University

Michael C. Rea, University of Notre Dame

Edward Wierenga, University of Rochester

Palgrave Frontiers in Philosophy of Religion is a long overdue series which will provide a unique platform for the advancement of research in this area. Each book in the series aims to progress a debate in the philosophy of religion by (i) offering a novel argument to establish a strikingly original thesis, or (ii) approaching an ongoing dispute from a radically new point of view. Each title in the series contributes to this aim by utilising recent developments in empirical sciences or cutting-edge research in foundational areas of philosophy (such as metaphysics, epistemology and ethics).

More information about this series at

<http://www.springer.com/series/14700>

Andrew Ter Ern Loke

# God and Ultimate Origins

A Novel Cosmological Argument

palgrave  
macmillan

Andrew Ter Ern Loke  
Faith and Global Engagement  
University of Hong Kong  
Hong Kong

Palgrave Frontiers in Philosophy of Religion  
ISBN 978-3-319-57546-9      ISBN 978-3-319-57547-6 (eBook)  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57547-6>

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017939317

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2017, corrected publication 2018

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover image credit: © David Attenborough/Alamy Stock Photo

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature  
The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG  
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

*The original version of the book was revised.*

*To the Divine First Cause of the Cosmos  
The God who made the world and all things in it  
The Lord of heaven and earth  
Who does not dwell in temples made with hands  
Nor is He served by human hands, as though He needed anything  
Since He Himself gives to all people life and breath and all things  
—Acts 17:24–25*

# Preface

Issues concerning the ultimate origins of the Universe and God have generated huge public interest recently with the publication of books promoting and responding to the so-called New Atheism. There has also been a resurgence of interest in theistic arguments in academia in recent decades, one of the most discussed being the Kalam Cosmological Argument (KCA) (Copan and Craig 2017). The KCA, as formulated by its noteworthy recent proponent, William Lane Craig (Craig and Sinclair 2009), is as follows:

1. Everything that begins to exist has a cause.
2. The Universe began to exist.
3. Therefore, the Universe has a cause.

Craig argues that further analyses of the Cause of the Universe show that this Cause possesses various theistic properties, such as being uncaused, beginningless, timeless, enormously powerful and possessing free will. Critics have raised various objections, such as arguing that Craig has not shown that everything that begins to exist has a cause, and that Craig's defence of the argument for a beginning of the

Universe based on the impossibility of concrete actual infinities begs the question against the existence of an actual infinite.

This book develops a novel argument which combines the Kalam with the Thomistic Cosmological Argument. It approaches an ongoing dispute concerning whether there is a First Cause of time from a radically new point of view, namely by demonstrating that there is such a First Cause without requiring the controversial arguments against concrete infinities and against traversing an actual infinite (although these arguments remain defensible, see Chap. 2). Readers would discover the synthesis of a familiar Thomist story about infinite sequences of train cars with the KCA; this synthesis constitutes one of the novel features of this book. This point of originality is combined with other novelties, such as a new ‘infinite additions of zero’ argument and the replacement of the traditional Leibnizian/Thomistic focus on the necessity/pure actuality of the First Cause with a focus on the beginninglessness of the First Cause. This book also offers a robust defence of the traditional form of Kalam by presenting original arguments in response to various objections to the Kalam. These include new defences for the argument for the impossibility of traversing an actual infinite, and a reply to Puryear’s latest responses to myself and Dumsday in Puryear (2016). I defend the coherence of the view that time might be continuous yet naturally divide into smallest parts of finite durations, and show that Puryear’s conceptualist view of time is implausible and that it does not block the finitist’s argument in any case.

A key premise of both arguments is the Causal Principle: ‘everything that begins to exist has a cause’. This book develops a novel philosophical argument for the principle which is stronger and more rigorous than other arguments which have been proposed thus far, and which comprehensively addresses objections based on metaphysical theorising by naturalists such as Oppy (2010, 2015). I also demonstrate that, contrary to Craig and Sinclair (2009, 183–184), the Causal Principle can be shown to be true without presupposing the dynamic theory of time. Very roughly, the argument shows that if something (e.g., the Universe) begins to exist uncaused, then many other kinds of things/events which can begin to exist would also begin to exist uncaused, because: (i) there would not be any causally antecedent condition which would make it

the case that only universes (rather than other kinds of things) begin to exist; and (ii) the properties of universes and of other kinds of things/events which differentiate between them would be had by them only when they had already begun to exist.

In addition, this book offers a more detailed discussion on whether a First Cause of time can be avoided by a causal loop than other publications on the KCA. It makes original contributions to the debate by engaging with recent work on casual loops by Meyer (2012) and Romero and Pérez (2012), and show that, contrary to these authors, the required causal loop is viciously circular and metaphysically impossible. This book also draws certain parallels between the conclusions of my novel argument with the Hartle–Hawking (1983) model, shows that the deeper conceptual problem with the Hartle–Hawking model is that it cannot satisfactorily address issues concerning the origination of change, and demonstrates that the required property is characteristic of libertarian agency rather than quantum system.

Finally, this book addresses epistemological issues related to the KCA which have been relatively neglected by recent publications on the KCA, and demonstrates (contra Hawking et al.) the continual relevance and significance of philosophy for answering ultimate questions. In particular, I present various arguments against scientistic and radical post-modernist views relevant to the Cosmological Argument, demonstrate that philosophical arguments are capable of yielding knowledge about reality that are more epistemically certain than scientific discoveries, develop such a philosophical argument for a personal First Cause, and explain why the progress of science would never replace the need for such a First Cause.

For very helpful exchanges I would like to thank Professors Graham Oppy, Garry DeWeese, J.P. Moreland, Jason Colwell, Alister McGrath, Phil Chan, Tung Shi Ping, Edwin Lee, Chan Kai-yan, Chan Man Ho, Kwan Kai Man, Bruce Reichenbach, Jacobus Erasmus, Don Page, Karen Zwier, members of the philosophy faculty at the University of Hong Kong, Mike Brownutt from the Faith and Science Collaborative Research Forum Hong Kong which is supported by the Templeton World Charity Foundation, as well as Charles Blackledge, Lai Hon Wai, Alan Wong, Peter Lyth, Rolf Zentek, Harold Leong, Julian Perlmutter

and Brian Wong. I hope this monograph will prove worthy of their efforts, though any mistake remains my responsibility. I am thankful for my wonderful colleagues and friends in Hong Kong—in particular, Professor Daniel Chua, Grace Lee Baughan, Carmen Bat and K.Y. Wong—for their support and encouragement for this project. I am grateful for ‘Seed Fund for Basic Research, University of Hong Kong’ (project code: 201611159076) for funding the writing of this monograph. I would like to thank my parents, parents-in-law, daughters Joy, Serene, Evangel and my beloved wife Mary for their support for my research. Finally, I would like to thank Prof. William Lane Craig, whose writings, lectures and debates answered so many of my questions concerning ultimate origins.

Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Andrew Ter Ern Loke

## References

- Copan, Paul and William Lane Craig (ed.) 2017. *The Kalām Cosmological Argument. 2 Vols.* New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Craig, William Lane, and James Sinclair. 2009. The Kalam Cosmological Argument. In *The Blackwell Companion to Natural Theology*, ed. W.L. Craig and J.P. Moreland. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hartle, James, and Stephen Hawking. 1983. Wave Function of the Universe. *Physical Review D* 28: 2960–2975.
- Meyer, Ulrich. 2012. Explaining Causal Loops. *Analysis* 72: 259–264.
- Oppy, Graham. 2010. Uncaused Beginnings. *Faith and Philosophy* 27: 61–71.
- Oppy, Graham. 2015. Uncaused Beginnings Revisited. *Faith and Philosophy* DOI: [10.5840/faithphil20154932](https://doi.org/10.5840/faithphil20154932).
- Puryear, Stephen. 2016. Finitism, Divisibility, and the Beginning of the Universe: Replies to Loke and Dumsday. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 94: 808–813, DOI: [10.1080/00048402.2016.1194443](https://doi.org/10.1080/00048402.2016.1194443).
- Romero, Gustavo, and Daniela Pérez. 2012. New Remarks on the Cosmological Argument. *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 72: 103–113.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>The Question of Ultimate Origins</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Is the Number of Prior Causes and Durations Infinite? An Assessment of the Current Literature</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Formulating a New Cosmological Argument</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Is There a Causal Loop Which Avoids a First Cause?</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Did the Initial State of Reality Begin to Exist Uncaused?</b>	<b>125</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>What is the Nature of the First Cause?</b>	<b>159</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>The Conclusion of Our Quest</b>	<b>183</b>

<b>Erratum to: Is the Number of Prior Causes and Durations Infinite? An Assessment of the Current Literature</b>	E1
<b>Author Index</b>	193
<b>Subject Index</b>	197

# List of Figures

Fig. 2.1	Joining the points between 0 and 1 and the points between 0 and 2 in one-to-one correspondence	49
Fig. 2.2	Persons grabbing presents this way	57
Fig. 2.3	Persons grabbing presents this way	58