None is void of relations. Not even those that don’t seem to be at all. The existing and the non-existing—all have superfluous relations, if not many at least one. This absolute one relation is their definition. One cannot deny the fact that when one attempts at defining a thing, he almost impudently takes as aid all the other constituents that mark their existence in the realm extraordinaire.

A careful reflection reveals that for a thing to be, it owes its existence to every other thing. Hence it is a lineage of dependencies that follow—all because of the quest to define something completely. Any such definition would require infinite iterations, and still not provide a strong build. Instead it would frustrate us as we would again end up where we started. Take for example the sun. How does one define it? A star perhaps. But what is a star? A ball of mass formed from clouds of dust, you might say. Now, tell me then, what is mass and what are clouds and dust? First let’s deal with mass and then get on the latter two. Mass is amount of substance contained in an object, physicists say. In this statement, there is a huge gap in clarity. I question them, how to define an object and what exactly is this substance that it contains. For object, you might consider saying something that exists. But the mundane beauty in the falsity is that, what do you mean by the phrase that exists? What exists when you cannot, eruditely, describe it well enough? When there is an answer to this question, we will continue the argument.

Since every existing thing in the Universe relies on each other for their cause, one might consider that the one who created all that we see and presume must be supposedly independent, because he had nothing before him to rely upon for his definition. And that leads us to the conclusion.
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that this God is indeed indefinable. And that ultimately to the result that he shouldn’t exist. This is because of the fact earlier established that when one cannot define, he cannot argue over the topic of existence and vice-versa. When we make idols, stories, epics and so on, how can you be so sure that this indefinable something is merely like your imagination when you can even not define this cause substantially? Or, to engulf him into trivial existence, you could go on the side that indeed, he is dependent. Then he would surely exist but then what would he be dependent on? Anything he is dependent on would be surely trivial to him, because we had defined him to be the most Supreme Being who created this world. Depending on any trivial thing would surely degrade his omnipotent character, making him more and more ordinary because this trivial thing on which he is dependent upon would be dependent on every other thing that shows its existence as discussed earlier. This would make the Supreme just a partaker, place holder in this infinite loop, chain of man-made definitions, not giving him any special status whatsoever. Now that this is the result, what is your take? God exists or not?

“DEPENDENCY IS THE TRIUMPH AND CAUSE OF EXISTENCE”