

# If a being knows everything, then it includes the existence of the Omniscient

Author: Dmitri Martila

[amidalitram@mail.ru](mailto:amidalitram@mail.ru)

Date: 24.04.2020

**The title indicates the proven existence of an Omniscient Being, resembling a achievable level of knowledge of perfectly 100 %. Another words: it is impossible to know everything without knowing that the Omniscient exists. Therefore, the agnostic-like problems, e.g. undecidability, come from incomplete knowledge. The moment we gain enough amount of knowledge of reality, the reality becomes more and more real and solid. A perfect saint has ability to know all. Because God is his friend.**

Your sceptical mood is not caused by my proof [I know, that you have already 'debunked' the proof or are making no sense of it]. The problem is your reception of the Existing God. It makes no sense for an atheist to except Existing God. His imaginable god does not exist, for there are two poles of soul attraction: Existing God and Non-existing god. That is the reason behind infinite variety of religions between perfectly true Theism and total atheism.

***The moment we gain enough amount of knowledge of reality, the reality becomes more and more real and solid. The knowledge comes with information, so let us discuss the basics of information.***

We got to know about the conservation of information from first hand by a physical problem. The problem was found by Dr. Steven Hawking and is called the "Information loss paradox in Black Holes". According to my own calculations, the Black Hole is indeed a hole in spacetime: the event horizon is the edge of our reality, and falling matter [including the related information] simply vanishes into the Absolute Nothing.

In Quantum Mechanics, the Law of Conservation of Information is known. The amount of information that is recorded in the [wave function of] nature does not change over time.

This means that all of Shakespeare's poems could have been read before the poet's birth, if we would have been there with the necessary devices called "readers of information".

However, if we would have read his poems before Shakespeare's birth, we would have destroyed the poet in this act of reading. Therefore, there would never have been such a Shakespeare with his poems. But then we would not be able to read this information about Shakespeare. The way out of this contradiction is: we cannot read the information about the poems before the birth of the poet. So, the poet is the source of poems.

Conclusion: there must be a free-will of people, as people are truly free. Through this channel new information is coming in. However, looking from the spacetime perspective, the actions of people with free-will have already happened. As an example, in the next year I will be dead or alive, and the right option is already written into the spacetime map. Therefore, even having proven the existence of free-will, we have not disproven the Omniscient Being. This is because of the way we look at the spacetime continuum: there is no scientific reason why we see on the calendar the year 2020 and not 2022. Why? Because there is problem with the definition of "today":

1. "Today" is 2020, but the last year's "Today" was 2019, so it is undecidable.
2. "Today" is what you see on the calendar today. But this is tautology.

Conclusion: Today's biggest problem is "Today" itself.

### ***With Omniscience comes Omnipresence as tool of it.***

The Omnipresent Being can hardly be called local, as if he is being killed in one place, he will be killed everywhere. Can there be a non-local physical theory? Yes, it is the Abiogenesis.

Given the perfect conditions on some planet "Avalon" for life [liquid water, air, etc.], there will never be perfect 100 % probability to produce life forms, from start of Universe until today. Why? Because hardly is anything absolutely perfect in this world, so there is no perfect 100 % for any limited amount of time. Moreover, because of the failure to produce self-replicating life forms the Miller's experiment, this probability is less than, let us say  $1 / 10^{200}$ . If it is so grim, then the Abiogenesis never happens on a selected planet. However, if you consider  $10^{200}$  planets with perfect conditions for life, then there could be several planets with happened Abiogenesis:  $(10^{200}) * (1/10^{200}) = 100\%$ . Thus, the Abiogenesis is not a local theory, e.g. it needs the multiverse hypothesis to deal with fine tuning of the fundamental constants.

The problem with a non-local theory is what it is out of the scope of local-like definition of physical system: "physics in the small free-falling laboratory is invariant throughout spacetime".