

DE REVOLUTIONIBUS VERITATIS: THE KEY

De [[Revolutionibus Veritatis]] (“On the Revolutions of Truth”) honors Copernicus and names a re-centering of truth analogous to the re-centering of the cosmos.

The Fulfillment — [[Christianity Tested]] Against the Twenty Axioms of [[Mathematical Truth]]

David Lowe | Theophysics | 2025

Abstract

This is the final paper in the Proof Tetralogy. The preceding three papers defined a **lock**: twenty axioms derived from information theory and thermodynamics, eight boundary conditions on the ground of mathematical truth, and a proof that the person who denies these conditions cannot exist. This paper tests which key fits that lock. We evaluate Christianity—specifically, the person and claims of Jesus Christ—against every axiom and every boundary condition, without having designed the lock to fit any particular key. We then test five alternative worldviews against the same conditions. We conclude with a probability analysis: given N independent constraints, what are the odds of any worldview satisfying all of them by coincidence? The result is not isomorphism—two structures with the same shape. It is **specification and fulfillment**—a lock designed blind, and a key that fits.

*[!tip] Series Navigation This is **Paper 4 of 4** in De [[Revolutionibus Veritatis]].*

- **[[02_DE REVOLUTIONIBUS VERITATIS THE LOCK|De [[Revolutionibus Veritatis]]: The Lock]]**: *The formal derivation — the lock.*
 - **[[01_DE REVOLUTIONIBUS VERITATIS THE ARCHITECTURE|De [[Revolutionibus Veritatis]]: The Architecture]]**: *The architecture explained simply.*
 - **[[03_DE REVOLUTIONIBUS VERITATIS THE COST OF DENIAL|De [[Revolutionibus Veritatis]]: The Cost of Denial]]**: *The existential negation — what denial costs.*
 - **Paper 4** (this document): *Christianity tested against all 20 axioms — the key.*
-

I. Methodological Note: Specification and Fulfillment

This paper's method must be understood precisely, because the entire force of the argument depends on it.

Papers 1 through 3 derive requirements from information theory, thermodynamics, [[Gödel]], Chaitin, [[Shannon]], and Kolmogorov. At no point in those derivations does any theological premise appear. The axioms are not designed to point at Christianity. They are designed to characterize mathematical truth. The constraints that emerge—necessary existence, eternality, universality, immateriality, coherence, rationality, moral goodness, active coherence maintenance—are consequences of the mathematics, not inputs.

This is what distinguishes the present argument from apologetics. Apologetics typically starts with a conclusion and constructs arguments toward it. This tetralogy starts with information theory and follows the math wherever it goes. The math goes somewhere very specific.

The distinction matters because it eliminates the accusation of curve-fitting. We did not design the axioms to produce Christianity. We derived constraints from mathematics—and *then* checked which worldview satisfies all of them. That is prediction and confirmation, not retrofit.

The metaphor is a lock and a key. Papers 1–3 machine the lock. Paper 4 tries keys. The lock does not know which key fits. The key does not know what lock it was made for. If

one key fits perfectly, that is not coincidence. It is evidence.

II. The Eight Boundary Conditions

Before testing axiom by axiom, we restate the eight boundary conditions that any candidate for the ground of mathematical truth must satisfy. These are the minimal requirements derived in [[Paper 1 - [[Principia Mathematica]] Moralia]]:

#	Boundary Condition	Source Axiom(s)
BC1	Necessary Existence	A1, A3, A8
BC2	Eternality	A2, A5, A13
BC3	Universality	A4, A12
BC4	Immateriality	A6, A14
BC5	Coherence	A7, A15
BC6	Rationality	A7, A19
BC7	Moral Goodness	A11, A16, A17, A18
BC8	[[Active Coherence]] Maintenance	[[Second Law]] + [[Paper 3 - The Person [[Who Does]] [[Not Exist]]][[[Active Coherence]] Proof]]

A worldview either satisfies a boundary condition or it does not. There is no partial credit. We test Christianity first, then five alternatives.

III. [[Christianity Tested]]: Axiom by Axiom

Level 1: Existence (A1–A3)

A1 – Non-Contingent Existence.

The Christian claim: God's existence is not contingent on anything outside Himself. "I AM WHO I AM" (Exodus 3:14). This is not a name; it is a statement of ontological self-sufficiency. God does not *have* existence—He *is* existence. The ground of being is being itself.

The Johannine prologue makes this explicit: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" ([John 1:1]). The Logos is not a creature. It is the uncreated ground from which all contingent things derive their existence.

Verdict: SATISFIED. Christianity's central ontological claim is that God exists necessarily and non-contingently. This is not a peripheral doctrine—it is the foundation of the entire theological system.

A2 — Temporal Independence.

The Christian claim: God exists outside time and is not subject to temporal change. "Before Abraham was, I AM" (John 8:58)—present tense, not past tense. Christ claims existence outside temporal sequence. "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever" (Hebrews 13:8). "Before the foundation of the world" (Ephesians 1:4).

Classical Christian theology, from Augustine through Aquinas, has consistently affirmed divine timelessness. God does not experience a sequence of moments. He is the ground of time itself—which is precisely what A2 requires of the ground of mathematical truth: $I(T_m; t) = 0$.

Verdict: SATISFIED.

A3 — Necessity.

The Christian claim: God's existence is not merely actual but *necessary*. He could not fail to exist. This is the doctrine of divine aseity—God depends on nothing for His existence. Every other being is contingent; God alone is necessary.

Anselm's ontological argument, whatever its philosophical status, reflects a deep theological intuition: God is the being whose non-existence is impossible. Christianity does not merely assert that God *happens* to exist. It asserts that God *must* exist—that His nature is such that non-existence is excluded.

This matches the formal requirement: $\square(\text{God exists}) \wedge \neg\diamondsuit(\text{God does not exist})$.

Verdict: SATISFIED.

Level 2: Properties (A4–A7)

A4 — Universality.

The Christian claim: God is omnipresent—not located in a single place but present everywhere simultaneously. "Where shall I go from your Spirit? Where shall I flee from your presence? If I ascend to heaven, you are there! If I make my bed in Sheol, you are there!" (Psalm 139:7–8).

The Great Commission sends the gospel to "all nations" (Matthew 28:19) precisely because the God behind it is universal, not tribal. Christianity's expansion from a small Jewish sect to a global faith enacts this universality in history.

The formal requirement: $I(T_m; \text{position}) = 0$. Truth does not vary by location. The Christian God does not vary by location.

Verdict: SATISFIED.

A5 — Eternality.

The Christian claim: God does not change. "For I the LORD do not change" (Malachi 3:6). "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of lights, with whom there is no variation or shadow due to change" (James 1:17).

The formal requirement: $\frac{d}{dt} K(T_m) = 0$. The Kolmogorov complexity of mathematical truth is time-invariant. The Christian God is time-invariant. Not merely long-lived—eternally unchanging.

Verdict: SATISFIED.

A6 — Immateriality.

The Christian claim: "God is spirit, and those who worship him must worship in spirit and truth" (John 4:24). God has no body, no spatial location, no mass. He is not a physical being. He is not part of the universe. He is the ground of the universe.

The Incarnation—God taking on flesh in Christ—does not contradict this. The Incarnation is the union of the immaterial divine nature with a material human nature.

The divine nature remains immaterial. The union is the miracle, not the erasure of immateriality.

Verdict: SATISFIED.

A7 — Coherence.

The Christian claim: God does not contradict Himself. "God is not a God of confusion" (1 Corinthians 14:33). "It is impossible for God to lie" (Hebrews 6:18). The internal consistency of God's nature is a non-negotiable attribute in classical theology.

This is not merely an assertion. The entire enterprise of systematic theology—the effort to show that Christian doctrines form a coherent whole—presupposes and continually tests A7 applied to the divine nature.

Verdict: SATISFIED.

[!important] Checkpoint: The Emergent Profile Redux At this point we have tested A1–A7 and Christianity satisfies all seven. The profile—existent, necessary, eternal, universal, immaterial, coherent—matches perfectly. But this is not yet remarkable. Most classical monotheisms would pass this checkpoint. The test becomes decisive at Level 3.

Level 3: Origin (A8–A11)

A8 — The Ground of [[Mathematical Truth]] Is External to Mathematics.

The Christian claim: "Through him all things were made; without him nothing was made that has been made" (John 1:3). "For by him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible... all things were created through him and for him. And he is before all things, and in him all things hold together" (Colossians 1:16–17).

Christianity does not merely claim that God created the physical universe. It claims that God is the ground of *all things*—including the rational structure of reality. The Logos is the ordering principle. Mathematics, as an expression of rational order, is grounded in the Logos. This is not a modern reinterpretation. It is the plain reading of [[John 1:1]]–3: the Word (Logos) was with God, was God, and through the Word all things came into being.

Chaitin and [[Gödel]] prove that mathematics cannot ground itself. Christianity provides the specific entity that serves as the external ground. Not merely "something out there" but a named, characterized, historically engaged ground.

Verdict: SATISFIED.

A9 — Not From Nothing.

The Christian claim: creation is *ex nihilo* by God, not *from* nothing as a source. The distinction is critical. Nothing did not produce the universe. God produced the universe from nothing—meaning God is the sole and sufficient cause. The information content of creation comes entirely from God, not from a pre-existing void.

$K(\emptyset) = 0$, but $K(\text{God}) = \infty$ —God is the infinite information source. Nothing contributes zero information. God contributes all of it.

Verdict: SATISFIED. Christianity does not claim the universe emerged from nothing. It claims God created the universe. God is not nothing.

A10 — Not From Chaos.

The Christian claim: God brings order from disorder. This is the creation narrative of Genesis 1: "The earth was without form and void" (tohu wa-bohu)—and God imposed structure. Light from darkness. Land from sea. Life from matter. The pattern is always the same: chaos receives order through the word of God.

Thermodynamically: the [[Second Law]] says entropy increases in closed systems. God, as an external source of negentropy (G), is the reason structure exists at all. The Christian narrative of creation is structurally identical to the thermodynamic requirement: coherence requires an external source working against entropy.

This maps directly to the χ variable G (Grace/Negentropy) in the [[Paper 1 - Principia Mathematica]] Moralia|Master Equation]: grace is the anti-entropic force that creates and sustains structure.

Verdict: SATISFIED.

A11 — Not From Deception.

This is the keystone axiom—the one where morality enters the proof.

The Christian claim: "I am the way, the truth, and the life" (John 14:6). Christ does not merely *tell* the truth. He claims to *be* truth. This is a unique claim in the history of religion—not "I teach truth" but "I am truth." If true, it means the ground of mathematical truth literally walked the earth and named itself.

Further: "The Spirit of truth... will guide you into all truth" (John 16:13). "You will know the truth, and the truth will set you free" (John 8:32). "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all" (1 John 1:5).

And the inverse: "The devil... is a liar and the father of lies" (John 8:44). Christianity does not merely affirm that the ground of truth is non-deceptive. It explicitly identifies deception with the *adversary* of the ground—and identifies truth with the ground itself. The moral taxonomy is built into the theology: truth = God = coherence = good. Deception = Satan = entropy = evil.

The [[Coherence Asymmetry]] Theorem (from [[Paper 3 - The Person [[Who Does]] Not Exist]]) proves that a coherent source cannot produce deceptive output. Christianity claims the same thing in theological language: God cannot lie (Hebrews 6:18), and the source of lies is the adversary (John 8:44).

Verdict: SATISFIED. And not merely satisfied—Christianity is the only worldview that makes A11 a *central, named, explicit* doctrine rather than an implicit assumption.

Level 4: Source Properties (A12–A15)

A12 — Universal Source. "For God so loved the *world*" (John 3:16). Not a tribe, not a nation—the world. The scope is universal by explicit declaration.

A13 — Eternal Source. "Before the foundation of the world" (Ephesians 1:4). "The Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end" (Revelation 21:6).

A14 — Immaterial Source. "God is spirit" (John 4:24). The Incarnation is the *exceptional* event—the one time immateriality took on materiality—which only reinforces that the default divine nature is immaterial.

A15 — Coherent Source. "It is impossible for God to lie" (Hebrews 6:18). "God is not a God of confusion" (1 Corinthians 14:33). Internal coherence is not a peripheral attribute but a core one.

Verdict: ALL FOUR SATISFIED.

Level 5: The Moral Dimension (A16–A18)

A16 — Truth Is Inherently Valuable.

Christianity does not merely treat truth as valuable. It identifies truth with the divine nature itself (John 14:6). To value truth is to value the ground of being. To disvalue truth is to reject reality. Christianity goes further than A16 requires—it makes truth *sacred*.

Verdict: SATISFIED.

A17 — Deception Is Morally Wrong.

The Decalogue: "You shall not bear false witness" (Exodus 20:16). The identification of Satan as "the father of lies" (John 8:44). The repeated New Testament exhortations to speak truth to one another (Ephesians 4:25, Colossians 3:9).

Christianity does not merely condemn deception. It identifies deception as the *primary weapon* of the adversary of God. Deception is not one sin among many—it is the original sin's mechanism. The serpent deceived. The fall was a corruption of signal. Sin entered through noise.

Verdict: SATISFIED. Again, not merely satisfied—structurally central to the theology.

A18 — Mathematical and Moral Truth Share a Common Ground.

This axiom requires that the ground of mathematical truth and the ground of moral truth are identical—not two separate entities but one.

Christianity's central theological claim is that the Logos—the rational ordering principle of the universe—is identical to the moral lawgiver. They are not two gods. They are not two aspects of two different things. They are one God, and the unity is expressed in the doctrine of the Logos.

[[John 1:1]] does not say "In the beginning was the Law" (moral) *and* "In the beginning was the Ratio" (mathematical). It says "In the beginning was the Logos"—a single Greek word that encompasses both rational order and meaningful speech. The unity of mathematical and moral truth is not a theological afterthought. It is the *opening line* of the Gospel of John.

No other worldview makes this unity explicit at its definitional level. Islam separates Allah's will from rational necessity. Buddhism denies the existence of a ground.

Hinduism fragments the ground across multiple deities. Only Christianity identifies the rational order and the moral order as expressions of a single Logos.

Verdict: SATISFIED. This is where Christianity begins to separate from the field.

Level 6: Identification (A19–A20)

A19 — The Ground Is the Logos.

The axiom names the ground as the Logos—a unified rational-moral source. The Johannine identification is direct and explicit:

"In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God."
([[John 1:1]])

This is not an inference. It is a claim. The Christian scriptures directly identify the ground of rational-moral truth as the Logos, and identify the Logos as God. The philosophical term chosen by the author of John's Gospel is precisely the term we have derived from information theory.

Verdict: SATISFIED.

A20 — The Logos Is Functionally Identical to God.

Christianity goes further than functional identity. It claims *ontological* identity. The Logos is not "like" God. The Logos *is* God. And then it makes the most extraordinary claim in the history of ideas:

"And the Logos became flesh and dwelt among us." (John 1:14)

The ground of mathematical truth, the source of moral order, the external ground that [[Gödel]] and Chaitin proved must exist—Christianity claims this ground entered history. Took on a human nature. Lived, taught, died, and rose again. Not as a symbol or a myth but as an event in spacetime.

This is either the most important fact in the history of the universe or the most audacious lie ever told. There is no middle ground. A Logos that becomes flesh is either the fulfillment of everything the first three papers derive, or it is a category error of unimaginable proportions.

Verdict: SATISFIED. Christianity does not merely satisfy A20. It *exceeds* it. The proof requires functional identity. Christianity claims ontological identity plus historical incarnation.

IV. The Scorecard

Axiom	Requirement	Christianity
A1	Non-contingent existence	✓ "I AM WHO I AM"
A2	Temporal independence	✓ "Before Abraham was, I AM"
A3	Necessity	✓ Divine aseity
A4	Universality	✓ Omnipresence
A5	Eternality	✓ "Same yesterday, today, forever"
A6	Immateriality	✓ "God is spirit"
A7	Coherence	✓ "Impossible for God to lie"
A8	External ground	✓ "Through him all things were made"
A9	Not from nothing	✓ God as sole cause, not void
A10	Not from chaos	✓ Creation narrative: order from disorder
A11	Not from deception	✓ "I am the truth" / Satan as "father of lies"
A12	Universal source	✓ "God so loved the world"
A13	Eternal source	✓ "Before the foundation of the world"
A14	Immaterial source	✓ "God is spirit"
A15	Coherent source	✓ "Not a God of confusion"
A16	Truth is valuable	✓ Truth identified with God
A17	Deception is wrong	✓ "You shall not bear false witness"

Axiom	Requirement	Christianity
A18	Math-moral unity	✓ The Logos unifies both
A19	The ground is the Logos	✓ [[John 1:1]]
A20	Logos = God	✓ [[John 1:1]], 14

Score: 20 / 20. Every axiom satisfied. Every boundary condition met.

V. The Boundary Condition Summary

Boundary Condition	Status	Primary Evidence
BC1: Necessary Existence	✓	Exodus 3:14, Aseity doctrine
BC2: Eternality	✓	Hebrews 13:8, John 8:58
BC3: Universality	✓	Psalms 139, Matthew 28:19
BC4: Immateriality	✓	John 4:24
BC5: Coherence	✓	Hebrews 6:18, 1 Cor 14:33
BC6: Rationality	✓	[[John 1:1]] (Logos = rational order)
BC7: Moral Goodness	✓	John 14:6, 1 John 1:5
BC8: [[Active Coherence]]	✓	Colossians 1:17 ("in him all things hold together") — active, continuous, present-tense maintenance

Score: 8 / 8.

[!danger] On BC8: [[Active Coherence]] Maintenance This boundary condition is the most discriminating. [[Paper 3 - The Person [[Who Does]] Not Exist]] proved that passive honesty is thermodynamically impossible—the ground must actively

maintain coherence against entropy. Christianity provides a specific mechanism for this: grace. "In him all things hold together" (Colossians 1:17) is not a metaphor. It is a claim about active, continuous, present-tense coherence maintenance by the Logos. The universe does not persist by inertia. It persists because the ground actively sustains it—moment by moment, against the [[Second Law]].

Grace, in the Theophysics framework, maps directly to negentropy (\$G\$). Grace is the anti-entropic force. The [[Soteriological Limit]] (proved in [[Paper 3 - The Person [[Who Does]] [[Not Exist]]\Paper 3]]) shows that self-restoration is thermodynamically impossible—you need an infinite external dissipator. Christianity provides exactly that: an infinite God who freely gives grace to finite systems that cannot save themselves.

VI. Comparative Worldview Analysis

The lock has been tested against the Christian key. Now we test five alternative keys against the same lock.

Islam

Islam affirms many of the boundary conditions—necessary existence, eternity, universality, immateriality, coherence. Where it diverges:

A18 (Mathematical-Moral Unity): Islam emphasizes divine voluntarism—Allah's will is the ultimate source of moral law, and that will is not necessarily constrained by rational structure. The Ash'ari tradition explicitly holds that God could have commanded the opposite moral law if He wished. This separates rational order from moral order in a way that violates A18. If moral truth depends on arbitrary will rather than rational necessity, then mathematical truth and moral truth have *different* grounds—which A18 forbids.

A20 (Logos = God): Islam explicitly rejects the Logos theology. The Qur'an denies that the Word of God is God—it is a creature. This means the rational ordering principle is *created*, not *uncreated*. But a created ground would be contingent (violating A3) and temporal (violating A2).

Score: Fails at A18 and A20. 18/20.

Judaism

Judaism shares the same scriptural foundation through the Torah and affirms most boundary conditions robustly.

A19–A20 (Logos Identification): Judaism does not identify the Logos with God in the way [[John 1:1]] does. The *memra* (Word) tradition in Targums comes close but does not make the ontological identification. More significantly, Judaism rejects the Incarnation—the claim that the Logos became flesh. Without the Incarnation, the Logos remains an abstract attribute of God rather than a person who entered history. This is philosophically coherent but does not satisfy A20 as fully as Christianity does.

BC8 ([[Active Coherence]] Maintenance): Judaism affirms ongoing creation (the *tsimtsum* and *hithadshut* traditions) but does not provide the explicit mechanism of incarnational grace—the infinite entering the finite to restore coherence from within.

Score: 19/20. Passes most tests. The divergence is at the point of maximum specificity.

Buddhism

A1 (Non-Contingent Existence): Buddhism denies the existence of a permanent, non-contingent ground. The doctrine of *śūnyatā* (emptiness) holds that all phenomena are dependently originated—nothing exists non-contingently. This directly contradicts A1.

A3 (Necessity): If nothing exists necessarily, then mathematical truths are not necessary—they are dependently originated like everything else. But $2+2=4$ is not dependently originated. It is true regardless of causes and conditions.

A8–A11 (Origin): Without a non-contingent ground, the question of mathematical truth's origin is either dissolved (fictionalism, which fails per Paper 1's objection analysis) or deferred infinitely (which violates A8).

Score: Fails at A1, A3, A8–A11. $\leq 14/20$.

Hinduism

A7 (Coherence): The vast diversity of Hindu theological traditions contains internal contradictions. Advaita Vedanta (non-dualism) contradicts Dvaita Vedanta (dualism) at a fundamental level. If the ground of truth must be coherent, and the theological system

describing that ground is incoherent, then the system fails A7 as applied to the ground's description.

A18 (Mathematical-Moral Unity): Hinduism's multiple deities fragment the ground. If Brahma creates, Vishnu preserves, and Shiva destroys—and these are genuinely distinct—then the ground of mathematical truth and the ground of moral order might be different entities. A18 requires a single, unified ground.

A11 (Not From Deception): Hindu mythology includes divine deception (*māyā* as cosmic illusion). If reality is fundamentally illusory—if the ground generates appearances that differ from reality—this conflicts with A11. *Māyā* introduces a gap between appearance and reality at the foundational level.

Score: Fails at A7, A11, A18. ≤17/20.

Atheism / Naturalism

A8 ([Sufficient Reason]): Naturalism either treats mathematical truths as brute facts (violating A8) or grounds them in physical structures (violating A6 and A2, since physical structures are material and temporal).

A9 (Not From Nothing): If there is no ground, mathematical truth comes from nothing. $K(\emptyset) = 0$. Nothing has zero information content. Mathematical truth has non-zero information content. The math does not work.

A10 (Not From Chaos): If the ground is random physical processes, then $K(T_m) \ll |T_m|$ cannot be explained. Structure from randomness violates the Kolmogorov bound.

A11 (Not From Deception): Without a ground, the question of deception vs. non-deception is dissolved. But the dissolution itself is the problem: if there is no ground, there is no explanation for why mathematical truth is reliable. Reliability without a ground is a brute fact—and A8 forbids brute facts.

A16–A20: Without a ground, truth has no inherent value (A16 fails), deception has no inherent wrongness (A17 fails), mathematical and moral truth have no common ground (A18 fails), the Logos does not exist (A19 fails), and there is no God to identify (A20 fails).

Score: Fails at A8–A11, A16–A20. ≤11/20.

VII. Comparative Summary

Worldview	Score	First Failure
Christianity	20/20	—
Judaism	19/20	A20 (Logos identification)
Islam	18/20	A18 (Math-moral unity)
Hinduism	≤17/20	A7, A11, A18
Buddhism	≤14/20	A1, A3
Atheism	≤11/20	A8

[[Semantic Map]]: oo_DE REVOLUTIONIBUS VERITATIS.md

Summary

Axiom: 4 Claim: 10 EvidenceBundle: 8 Theorem: 2 Relationship: 8

Tags (32 total)

- [Axiom] Existence of a morally good ground of mathematical truth (3de3422c)
- [Axiom] Logos as coherent ground of truth (1022c722)
- [Claim] Christianity satisfies all 20 axioms (009056ae)
- [Claim] Five alternative worldviews tested against constraints (ae4729fo)
- [Claim] Physical and spiritual laws share identical mathematical structure (b1a2c3d4)

- [Claim] Institutional entropy cycle is thermodynamically inevitable (c2b3d4e5)
- [Claim] Mathematics is man-made position formally closed by [[Soteriological Limit]] (a1b2c3d4)
- [EvidenceBundle] Probability of worldviews satisfying constraints (5929e128)
- [EvidenceBundle] Papers 1-3 derive requirements from foundational theories (4c263db5)
- [EvidenceBundle] PEAR-LAB 6.35 σ , GCP 6 σ , PROP-COSMOS 5.7 σ (d3c4e5f6)
- [EvidenceBundle] Developmental cognition: ANS, helper/hinderer, moral universals (f1e2d3c4)
- [Theorem] Incoherence of [[Materialist Consensus]] (9506ed85)
- [Theorem] Incoherence of the [[Eternal Loop]] (b8940d1b)
- [Relationship] Axioms derive from information theory (001c765c)
- [Relationship] Christianity as fulfillment of axioms (f5192a5a)
- [Relationship] [[Master Equation]] variables and their roles (123bdaca)
- [Relationship] [[Ten Laws]] physical-spiritual isomorphism (e4d5f6a7)
- [Axiom] Existence of a morally good ground of mathematical truth (aab278ba)
- [Axiom] Logos as coherent ground of truth (b5c9822c)
- [Claim] Christianity satisfies all 20 axioms (072e1e24)
- [Claim] Five alternative worldviews tested against constraints (2e6817c8)
- [Claim] Physical and spiritual laws share identical mathematical structure (4cda8265)
- [Claim] Institutional entropy cycle is thermodynamically inevitable (1f4f6f42)
- [Claim] Mathematics is man-made position formally closed by [[Soteriological Limit]] (0e35edc8)
- [EvidenceBundle] Probability of worldviews satisfying constraints (1dcf3ef5)
- [EvidenceBundle] Papers 1-3 derive requirements from foundational theories (c4f54d03)
- [EvidenceBundle] PEAR-LAB 6.35 σ , GCP 6 σ , PROP-COSMOS 5.7 σ (ef9393f9)
- [EvidenceBundle] Developmental cognition: ANS, helper/hinderer, moral universals (c3915952)
- [Relationship] Axioms derive from information theory (8861ccbd)
- [Relationship] Christianity as fulfillment of axioms (7cb8971e)
- [Relationship] [[Master Equation]] variables and their roles (7ad22db9)
- [Relationship] [[Ten Laws]] physical-spiritual isomorphism (2b8f8d4a)

[[Mermaid Diagram]]

```
graph TD
  n0(["Axiom: Existence of a morally good ground of mathematical"])
  n1(["Axiom: Logos as coherent ground of truth"])
  n2["Claim: Christianity satisfies all 20 axioms"]
  n3["Claim: Five alternative worldviews tested against constraints"]
  n4["Claim: Physical and spiritual laws share identical mathematical"]
  n5["Claim: Institutional entropy cycle is thermodynamically irreversible"]
  n6["Claim: Mathematics is man-made position formally closed by"]
  n7(["EvidenceBundle: Probability of worldviews satisfying constraints"])
  n8(["EvidenceBundle: Papers 1-3 derive requirements from foundations"])
  n9(["EvidenceBundle: PEAR-LAB 6.35σ, GCP 6σ, PROP-COSMOS 5.7σ"])
  n10(["EvidenceBundle: Developmental cognition: ANS, helper/helper"])
  n11["Theorem: Incoherence of [[Materialist Consensus]]"]
  n12["Theorem: Incoherence of the [[Eternal Loop]]"]
  n13>"Relationship: Axioms derive from information theory"
  n14>"Relationship: Christianity as fulfillment of axioms"
  n15>"Relationship: [[Master Equation]] variables and their roles"
  n16>"Relationship: [[Ten Laws]] physical-spiritual isomorphism"
  n17(["Axiom: Existence of a morally good ground of mathematical"])
  n18(["Axiom: Logos as coherent ground of truth"])
  n19["Claim: Christianity satisfies all 20 axioms"]
  n20["Claim: Five alternative worldviews tested against constraints"]
  n21["Claim: Physical and spiritual laws share identical mathematical"]
  n22["Claim: Institutional entropy cycle is thermodynamically irreversible"]
  n23["Claim: Mathematics is man-made position formally closed by"]
  n24(["EvidenceBundle: Probability of worldviews satisfying constraints"])
  n25(["EvidenceBundle: Papers 1-3 derive requirements from foundations"])
  n26(["EvidenceBundle: PEAR-LAB 6.35σ, GCP 6σ, PROP-COSMOS 5.7σ"])
  n27(["EvidenceBundle: Developmental cognition: ANS, helper/helper"])
  n28>"Relationship: Axioms derive from information theory"
  n29>"Relationship: Christianity as fulfillment of axioms"
  n30>"Relationship: [[Master Equation]] variables and their roles"
  n31>"Relationship: [[Ten Laws]] physical-spiritual isomorphism"
  n0 --> n1
```

```
n17 --> n18
n0 -.-> n2
n0 -.-> n3
n0 -.-> n4
n0 -.-> n5
n0 -.-> n6
n0 -.-> n19
n0 -.-> n20
n0 -.-> n21
n0 -.-> n22
n0 -.-> n23
n2 -.-> n7
n2 -.-> n8
n2 -.-> n9
n2 -.-> n10
n2 -.-> n24
n2 -.-> n25
n2 -.-> n26
n2 -.-> n27
```

```
%% Styling
```

```
classDef axiom fill:#e1f5fe,stroke:#01579b
classDef claim fill:#fff3e0,stroke:#e65100
classDef evidence fill:#e8f5e9,stroke:#1b5e20
classDef relationship fill:#f3e5f5,stroke:#4a148c
classDef process fill:#fce4ec,stroke:#880e4f
classDef link fill:#e0f7fa,stroke:#006064
classDef name fill:#fff8e1,stroke:#ff6f00
classDef ontology fill:#efebee9,stroke:#3e2723
class n0 axiom
class n1 axiom
class n2 claim
class n3 claim
class n4 claim
class n5 claim
class n6 claim
class n7 evidence
```

```
class n8 evidence
class n9 evidence
class n10 evidence
class n13 relationship
class n14 relationship
class n15 relationship
class n16 relationship
class n17 axiom
class n18 axiom
class n19 claim
class n20 claim
class n21 claim
class n22 claim
class n23 claim
class n24 evidence
class n25 evidence
class n26 evidence
class n27 evidence
class n28 relationship
class n29 relationship
class n30 relationship
class n31 relationship
```

VIII. The Probability Calculation

How likely is it that any given worldview satisfies all constraints by coincidence?

We have 8 independent boundary conditions. Call the probability of any arbitrary worldview satisfying a single boundary condition p . If we assign a generous $p = 0.5$ (coin flip—any worldview is equally likely to satisfy or fail any given constraint), the probability of satisfying all 8 independently is:

$$P(\text{all } 8) = p^8 = 0.5^8 = 0.0039 = 0.39\%$$

But $p = 0.5$ is absurdly generous. Most worldviews do not affirm necessary existence (most are agnostic on ontology). Most do not affirm mathematical-moral unity (most separate rational structure from moral order). A more realistic prior might be $p = 0.2$:

$$P(\text{all } 8) = 0.2^8 = 2.56 \times 10^{-6} = 0.000256\%$$

And if we use all 20 axioms rather than the 8 boundary conditions:

$$P(\text{all } 20) = 0.5^{20} = 9.54 \times 10^{-7} \approx 1 \text{ in a million}$$

$$P(\text{all } 20) = 0.2^{20} = 1.05 \times 10^{-14} \approx 1 \text{ in 100 trillion}$$

These are lower bounds. The actual probabilities are likely much smaller, because the constraints are not truly independent—satisfying some constrains which others can be satisfied, making the joint probability even smaller than the product suggests.

[!important] What This Means The probability that any worldview satisfies all 20 axioms derived independently from information theory is vanishingly small. Christianity does not merely scrape by—it satisfies every axiom with explicit, central, named doctrines. Not peripheral teachings. Core claims.

This is not curve-fitting. The lock was machined from mathematics. The key was forged two thousand years ago. They fit.

IX. What Science Could Not Answer

The proof in [[Paper 1 - [[Principia Mathematica]] Moralia]] derives that the ground of mathematical truth must be morally good, eternally coherent, and actively maintaining order against entropy. But it leaves open questions that pure mathematics cannot resolve:

Why does the ground act? The proof shows that active coherence maintenance is thermodynamically necessary. It does not explain *motivation*. Christianity answers: "For God so loved the world" (John 3:16). The ground acts because it loves. Love is the motive force of negentropy.

Can the ground be known? The proof shows that humans access the Logos through the mathematical faculty ($f : \text{Human} \rightarrow \text{Logos}$). But access is not the same as relationship. Christianity claims the Logos became flesh (John 1:14)—the ground made itself knowable not merely through abstract reason but through personal encounter.

Can the damaged be restored? The [[Soteriological Limit]] ([[Paper 3 - The Person [[Who Does]] Not Exist]]) proves that finite systems cannot self-restore coherence. The

math requires an infinite external dissipator. Christianity provides one: grace, freely given by an infinite God to finite creatures who cannot save themselves. "For by grace you have been saved through faith. And this is not your own doing; it is the gift of God" (Ephesians 2:8).

Why does entropy exist at all? The proof takes the [[Second Law]] as given. Christianity provides a narrative: entropy entered through the Fall. Disorder is not original to creation; it is a corruption of the original order. The [[Second Law]] is not a design feature—it is a consequence of rebellion against the Logos.

What happens at the limit? The proof shows that coherence and entropy are in tension. Christianity claims the tension resolves: "Behold, I am making all things new" (Revelation 21:5). The ultimate destiny is not heat death but restoration—the infinite dissipator fully restoring coherence to the finite system. New creation. Zero entropy. Perfect signal.

Each of these answers exceeds what the mathematics requires. The proof says: *the ground must be morally good*. Christianity says: *the ground is love*. The proof says: *the ground must actively maintain coherence*. Christianity says: *the ground entered history to maintain it from within*. The proof says: *self-salvation is impossible*. Christianity says: *grace*.

The mathematics opens doors. Christianity walks through every one of them.

X. Conclusion

The first three papers in this tetralogy derive, from information theory and thermodynamics, a set of constraints on the ground of mathematical truth. These constraints are derived without reference to any theological tradition. They define a lock.

This paper has tested Christianity against every constraint—every axiom, every boundary condition. The result is 20 for 20. Eight boundary conditions, all satisfied. Not with peripheral doctrines but with *central, defining claims* that are as old as the faith itself.

No other worldview tested achieves a perfect score. The closest competitor fails at the point of maximum specificity—the Logos identification and incarnational theology that distinguish Christianity from all other monotheisms.

The probability of this coincidence is vanishingly small—somewhere between one in a million and one in a hundred trillion, depending on priors.

This is not isomorphism. Two structures with the same shape could be coincidence. This is **specification and fulfillment**. A lock machined by mathematics. A key forged by history. They fit.

The mathematics does not prove Christianity true. Mathematics cannot prove historical claims. What the mathematics does is narrow the field to a single candidate, generate specific requirements that candidate must meet, and then observe that the candidate meets every one of them—with room to spare.

The remaining step is not mathematical. It is personal. The proof can show you the lock and the key. It cannot make you turn the key.

That is between you and the Logos.

$\chi = \iint (G \cdot M \cdot E \cdot S \cdot T \cdot K \cdot R \cdot Q \cdot F \cdot C), dx, dy, dt$

"In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things were made through him, and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life, and the life was the light of men." — [[John 1:1]]-4

David Lowe | *Theophysics* | 2025 χ

SEMANTIC TAGS

---%tag::Axiom::d8da5138-b342-460c-b6e6-ebb893ac6543::"Non-Contingent Existence"::null% %tag::Claim::9dee7884-217c-4217-b6f8-de77693d139f::"God's existence is not contingent"::d8da5138-b342-460c-b6e6-ebb893ac6543% %tag::Axiom::63227450-f674-43cd-be47-64ac901eea71::"Temporal Independence"::null% %tag::Claim::b861816e-fodo-4e22-906b-8efb7b429ad3::"God exists outside time"::63227450-f674-43cd-be47-64ac901eea71% %tag::Axiom::95529fd3-bf2f-4ca8-acc7-19f6937aa5f4::"Necessity"::null% %tag::Claim::fea11444-e888-4882-bd7a-3cda61b50183::"God's existence is necessary"::95529fd3-bf2f-4ca8-acc7-19f6937aa5f4% %tag::Axiom::f31c739c-144c-42bo-ba86-4ed7b5e662e8::"Universality"::null% %tag::Claim::dd5f54cc-de9a-4237-8fb5-3d45cc3a4156::"God is omnipresent"::f31c739c-144c-42bo-ba86-4ed7b5e662e8% %tag::Axiom::f06033df-79f9-4a5d-a152-be7ae0b23e37::"Eternality"::null%

%%tag::Claim::087b6d08-070d-44a9-ac25-c1257a791758::"God does not change":f06033df-79f9-4a5d-a152-be7ae0b23e37%% %%tag::Axiom::7369dd5a-f93a-4767-9853-c53f11d59ab6::"Immateriality":null%% %%tag::Claim::99f9b9b7-68ce-4f60-9030-4e875e654dd5::"God is spirit":7369dd5a-f93a-4767-9853-c53f11d59ab6%% %%tag::Axiom::b2b9bc01-892b-4555-afec-f835967a25b6::"Coherence":null%% %%tag::Claim::b4b82f58-ec5b-40d8-b4a9-0b092edfd5c2::"God does not contradict Himself":b2b9bc01-892b-4555-afec-f835967a25b6%% %%tag::Axiom::cdc706cf-dd3a-47a4-83da-bodd8325010c::"External Ground":null%% %%tag::Claim::3aacb252-4dob-41d5-a8dd-73d591249882::"God is the ground of all things":cdc706cf-dd3a-47a4-83da-bodd8325010c%% %%tag::Axiom::3d6371ef-4cad-4a1a-ba62-3575bbaad87c::"Not From Nothing":null%% %%tag::Claim::73d9e15b-9ec9-4031-af98-0090e7491190::"God created the universe from nothing":3d6371ef-4cad-4a1a-ba62-3575bbaad87c%% %%tag::Axiom::71247320-e9b4-45d5-b9da-6753e3e7f707::"Not From Chaos":null%% %%tag::Claim::c23cb2a2-f59f-487c-8b05-6f4bc195a1f9::"God brings order from disorder":71247320-e9b4-45d5-b9da-6753e3e7f707%% %%tag::Axiom::6f7f3f48-01f7-4f42-bedf-493aea8cc17d::"Not From Deception":null%% %%tag::Claim::9250f4db-90b4-4ab9-a4dc-65636845b12b::"God is truth":6f7f3f48-01f7-4f42-bedf-493aea8cc17d%% %%tag::Axiom::2035f647-be3e-4a1a-8747-60a7f2d253b1::"Universal Source":null%% %%tag::Claim::95abo291-dda5-4305-9cec-3d2e27ad2f07::"God loves the world":2035f647-be3e-4a1a-8747-60a7f2d253b1%% %%tag::Axiom::f8f9f81a-c462-40e1-be56-551e18373208::"Eternal Source":null%% %%tag::Claim::44052213-4c61-4116-bd2d-559c8a9185a5::"God is eternal":f8f9f81a-c462-40e1-be56-551e18373208%% %%tag::Axiom::70c52b31-5eae-413a-885f-6857f2643f14::"Immaterial Source":null%% %%tag::Claim::99f9b9b7-68ce-4f60-9030-4e875e654dd5::"God is spirit":70c52b31-5eae-413a-885f-6857f2643f14%% %%tag::Axiom::b8de0200-d8a8-4aad-a4f4-10006c8e7a88::"Coherent Source":null%% %%tag::Claim::d862b832-9648-4195-b29c-1f3e5f565412::"God is not a God of confusion":b8de0200-d8a8-4aad-a4f4-10006c8e7a88%% %%tag::Axiom::02c24bf2-94d8-48b6-acdf-6751104f604c::"Truth Is Inherently Valuable":null%% %%tag::Claim::ba917095-65e2-4166-abad-3ca82898995c::"Truth is sacred":02c24bf2-94d8-48b6-acdf-6751104f604c%% %%tag::Axiom::2897149e-1223-4a2c-bf25-2f39fa22b41a::"Deception Is Morally Wrong":null%% %%tag::Claim::40861ced-36cd-454d-96ba-ac2ab9ba0e08::"Deception is the primary weapon of the adversary":2897149e-1223-4a2c-bf25-2f39fa22b41a%% %%tag::Axiom::046c175d-4810-455f-941a-f5a10da81712::"Mathematical and Moral Truth Share a Common Ground":null%% %%tag::Claim::e524975d-189d-45cd-9347-fa2e2cf11347::"The Logos unifies both mathematical and moral truth":046c175d-4810-455f-941a-f5a10da81712%% %%tag::Axiom::281773ec-58fc-4417-bcf8-4cf94f38a034::"The Ground Is the Logos":null%% %%tag::Claim::437db307-f0f3-4aff-

a945-a72ef25ce55f::"The ground of truth is identified as the Logos"::281773ec-58fc-4417-bcf8-4cf94f38a034%% %%tag::Axiom::8ac9doca-1f6d-4f55-960d-86d6a06e67ab::"The Logos Is Functionally Identical to God"::null%% %%tag::Claim::c8369798-82d2-4c9f-9623-e3701a2845e2::"The Logos is God"::8ac9doca-1f6d-4f55-960d-86d6a06e67ab%% %%tag::primary::322ce611-c8a6-45fe-ad0d-2dac0b7dc7ef::"Biblical References"::null%% %%tag::primary::dbf6ea61-8ca2-455f-9c8a-96ab97a4b643::"Mathematical Proofs"::null%% %%tag::Relationship::2647c3ed-2664-4573-8f58-70e20a034787::"Axioms and Claims Dependency"::null%% %%tag::Relationship::1db989co-e47d-4foe-bf86-1e44da15f447::"Logos and Truth Connection"::null%% %%--- END SEMANTIC TAGS --- %%