On the Equivalence between God and Being

Igor Furgel, 2nd November 2020[1], Version 1.2 (en)

In this essay, we want to substantiate the equivalence between God and Being. To approach this topic, we begin by trying to understand what "Being" is and what is meant by this term and state.

Content

1 Observability, Being and Existential Triad

Observability and *non-observability* are obviously related to *symmetry* and *asymmetry:* Absolutely symmetrical - i.e. absolutely homogeneous - objects cannot react to any action, otherwise they would not be absolutely symmetrical. Therefore, the existence (the being, Dasein) of material objects is observable only in the case of at least one of their asymmetry - i.e. their inhomogeneity with respect to at least one of their characteristics - i.e. only if they react to at least some kind of action. To be able to react to any action, i.e. for an interaction can change a material object, this object must be inhomogeneous (asymmetrical) with respect to this action. If an object is absolutely homogeneous (symmetrical), no interaction can change the object; therefore, no interaction with such an object is possible. This relation is discussed in more detail in [2], section 2.4[2].

The absolute symmetry, homogeneity represents the complete indeterminacy. Asymmetry - as a deviation from symmetry - represents the change in the degree of indeterminacy. The change of the degree of indeterminacy is information (by definition, [2], section 2.2.1).

What role does the interaction between matter and information play for *being* and *not being*?

[1] the first released version 1.0 (de) was from 26.08.2015

[2] This essay contains all the information needed to follow its explanation; use of the references can be useful for readers interested in a *more detailed justification* of one or other thesis.

The process of interaction between the material and ideal objects has a direct affinity to inhomogeneity (asymmetry):

- The presence of asymmetry (inhomogeneity) **is** *information*, i.e. asymmetry and *information* are equivalent to each other;

- The existence of material objects (their Dasein) is observable only in the case of at least one of their asymmetry, i.e. thanks to the presence of *information*. Thus, the existence of information is observable only thanks to the existence of material objects.

Thus, *information*[3] gives matter *the form* of its existence and matter gives information *the content* of its existence, i.e. *the being* of material objects and *the being* of information are mutually conditional.

Absolutely symmetrical, homogeneous objects are generally not observable. The fundamental non-observability is equivalent to the *non-being state.* This connection is discussed in detail in[1], chapter 2.

The concepts of *being* and *not-being* can also be considered on a less abstract level than through their relation to symmetry and asymmetry, based on the ideas presented in [2]. Here we will only briefly reproduce the relevant results.

At any given time, nature is in a "state"[4]. These microstates can be indeterministic (probabilistic) and deterministic (for a detailed description see section 2.1.3 in [2]).

Only probabilistic microstates are fundamentally *observable* and *differ from each other* ([2], Section 2.1.3). Ensembles of such "microstates" of nature form their "macrostates" (see section 1.4 in [2]) and can thus form observable objects ([1], chapter 2). This means that only observable microstates of nature - assembled into macrostates - can be distinguished as *being* from *non-being.*

On the other hand, as we have explained above, the *being* of material objects and the *being* of information are mutually conditional. This means that, in one view, information together with matter produces *being*, and, in another view, *observable* (probabilistic) states of nature produce *being*.

This means that the pair {information, matter} on one side and observable states of nature on the other side are equivalent to each other.

[3] lat.: informatio <- informare: to give a form, to shape (one of the meanings)

[4] denoted in [2] as the "microstate of nature".

We now consider a pair of complementary terms: {state, process}. As described above, the entity "observable state" can be expressed by another pair of complementary terms {information, matter}. Thus, the triad of complementary terms {state, process} ≡ {{information, matter}, process of interaction between them} produces an observable *system*, i.e. a *system* in the state of "being" ([1], para. 1.2).

In these considerations we have not made any restrictions concerning the kind of observable states produced by the triad {{information, matter}, process of interaction between them}. Therefore, an observable *system* can include any observable entities (as an ensemble of observable states); an observable *system* can be, among others, the whole nature.

Thus, the set {information, matter, process of interaction between them} is equivalent to the observability of states ([2], para. 2.4), and the observability of states is in turn equivalent to *being* ([1], para. 2).

From this follows ([1], chapter 3):

The set {information, matter, process of interaction between them} **is** Being.

Now we consider the question of the necessity and sufficiency of the three entities - information, matter and the process of interaction between them - for the state of "being".

As discussed above, these three entities are necessary for the creation of observable microstates of nature - and thus for the creation of objects in the state of "being".

These three elements taken together are also sufficient for the creation of the observable microstates of nature and, thus, for the creation of objects in the state 'being', but only if the process of interaction between information and matter

- has fundamentally *stochastic*[5] character ([2], section 2.1.3 and[1], section 4.2, C)) and
- *statistically* obeys a certain law, namely the Principle of Least Resources Consumption (PLR)[6] ([2], Section 2.1.5).

The evolution of nature follows this character of the interaction process between information and matter, which represents the *'interaction-control-information', or, synonymously, the 'relation-control-information'*, which we have called *enmorphya* ([1], chap. 3).

We call the set {information, matter, process of interaction between them} "existential triad", because this triad is necessary and sufficient for the creation of the *state of being* ([1], ch. 3) [7].

[5] *probabilistic, indeterministic*

[6] the principle of most entropy, the principle of least action represent particular cases of the PLR

[7] in Hegel's terminology this would be a tetrad: Three mutually complementary theses + synthesis

The one element of the existential triad shall provide multiplicity of opportunities. Therefore, it represents a medium (*substrate*, matter). Theoretically, medium can be even in the absolutely homogeneous, absolutely symmetric state with unlimited multiplicity of opportunities: it is unobservable then.

The other element of the existential triad shall be a disturbance (information; возмущение, perturbation). This disturbance has, per definitionem, an asymmetry with respect to at least one of possible characteristics, i.e. this disturbance represents a *property*. A *property* may include both qualitative and quantitative characteristics of the substrate, as well as a possible type of interaction of these characteristics.

The third element of the existential triad shall be the process of an interaction between the substrate and the disturbance, i.e. shall represent a *relation*. As the result of this interaction, the substrate loses its homogeneity, its symmetry, namely exactly according to the disturbance (*property*).

In other words, amongst all existing potential opportunities, which can be provided by a given substrate, exact the opportunity becomes the reality that corresponds to the disturbance, which interacts with this substrate. In this way, a system arisen on the base of this *existential triad* becomes observable and, hence, is in the state of 'being'.

I.e. the existential triad {substrate, property, relation}[8] is necessary for creating the *state of being* of the system based on this existential triad. The same triad always creates a system with a corresponding system-constituting concept, see definitions in chapter 3.

If 'relation' in an existential triad has fundamentally *stochastic*[9] character ([2], para. 2.1.3 and[1], para. 4.2, C)) **and** *statistically* obeys a certain law (namely, the principle of least resources consumption), then this triad is not only necessary, but also sufficient for the achievement of observability and, thus, for creating the state of 'being' of the system based on this existential triad. The evolution of this system will follow the character of the 'relation' in the existential triad.

It is important to emphasize that the entities of the existential triad - information, matter and the process of interaction between them - are complementary to each other. This means that (i) they can only exist together, i.e. the existence of one entity necessarily implies the existence of the other entity, and (ii) they cannot be defined over each other (discussed in detail in [1]).

[8] The dyad {property, relation} has different names: Avenir Uemov [5] calls it 'structural factor', Niklas Luhmann – 'form'.

[9] *probabilistic, indeterministic*

2 Theological Interpretation

Now we can move on to the main subject of this essay. We substitute the entities of the existential triad with the corresponding theological concepts:

Information	≡	Word (God the Father)
Matter	≡	Flesh (God the Son)
the process of interaction between information and matter	≡	Holy Spirit

Then, taking into account the relationship established above:

The set {information, matter, process of interaction between them} **is** Being,

we obtain the following assertion by substituting the terms:

Triad {Word, Flesh, Holy Spirit} **is** Being.

On the other hand, since the Triad {Word, Flesh, Holy Spirit} in theological consideration is God (cf. [3], 1:1-4[10], 1:14[11]), it can be asserted:

God **is**[12] Being;

If one denotes the whole nature (the whole creation) as *being*, then it is valid:

God **is**[12] the whole Nature[13] / the whole Creation.

[10] "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was with God in the beginning. Through him all things were made; without him nothing was made that has been made. In him was life (Igor Furgel: "the life" = "being", "existence", "existence"), and the life was the light of mankind."

[11] "The Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of the one and only Son, who came from the Father, full of grace and truth."

[12] in the sense of "equivalent"

[13] cf. [4], part 1, chapter 3, Ip 15: "Whatever is, is in God, and without God nothing can be, or be conceived".

We now reuse the substitution of the three entities - information, matter and the process of interaction between them - by the corresponding theological terms already carried out, and then conclude that

the divine Trinity God the Father, God the Son and the Holy Spirit is necessary and sufficient for the creation of the *state of being* (i.e. for the establishing of Creation / Nature)

Hereby the Holy Spirit himself is to be understood as the complementarity of contingency and necessity (of indeterminacy and determinacy), cf. [3], 3:8[14].

Summary:

Thus, our consideration has shown that

- God and Being (Nature / Creation) are equivalent to each other and
- The divine Trinity is necessary and sufficient for the creation of Nature / Creation (for the creation of the *state of being*).

[14] "The wind blows where it wants to, and you hear its sound (Igor Furgel: = "determinacy"); but you do not know where it comes from or where it is going (Igor Furgel: = fundamental "indeterminacy"). That's how it is with everyone who has been born from the Spirit."

3 Glossary

This chapter defines the main concepts of systems theory [5] that are necessary for reading this paper.

Term	Definition
system	any given entity, on which a *relation*, possessing an arbitrarily taken certain *property*, is implemented. Or equivalently: any given entity, on which some *properties*, being in an arbitrarily taken certain *relation*, are implemented.
system-constituting concept[15]	apriori given system-constituting *property* or *relation*; dependent on this, system-constituting concept is *attributive* or *relational* one, resp.
structural factor[16]	A set of properties and relations that suffices the given system-constituting concept. Structural factor can be relational one (in the case of the attributive concept) and attributive one (in the case of the relational concept).
system substrate[17]	a carrier of relational or attributive structure.
enmorphya[18] *of sth.*	a particular term for the notion 'control-information-*of-sth.*', e.g. 'enmorphya of relation'.

[15] The original term by Uemov: 'системообразующий концепт'

[16] The original term by Uemov: 'структурный фактор'.

[17] The original term by Uemov: 'субстрат системы'.

[18] The term ‚enmorphya (enmorfia, enmorphy)' is constructed on the basis of Greek: ἐνμορφήα (ἐν-μορφή-α => (bringing) in-form, (приведение) в-форму)

Term	Definition
	The distinguishing mark between the notions ‘information’ and ‘enmorphya’ consists in the following: ‘information’ interacts with material substrate, whereas ‘enmorphya’ interacts with the relation, process between this ‘information’ and this material substrate.

4 References

[1] Being and Systemacy, v.4.02, I. Furgel, DNB, 2020 (https://d-nb.info/121247628X/, urn:nbn:de:101:1-20200623153526207565 74)

[2] Complementarity of deterministic past and probabilistic future as the source of natural evolution, I. Furgel, DNB, 2009 (http://d-nb.info/995850909)

[3] The Gospel of John

[4] Ethics, Baruch (Benedict) de Spinoza, 1677 published posthumously

[5] Uemov A.I. Systemic aspects of philosophical knowledge, Odessa, 2000[19]

[19] A. Uemov, Systemic Aspects of Philosophical Knowledge, Odessa, 2000