Comments on Gödel's Ontological Argument

Adam InTae Gerard[1]

0.0   Introduction

This paper will explore properties relevant to Gödel's *Ontological Argument* (henceforth, **GOA**) for the existence of a divine being.

Namely, this paper will explore and attempt to lay out various improvements to the predicates defined within Gödel's original paper[2] whose general logical scaffold, formalization, and proof has been explored.[3]

Namely, the purpose of this paper is to (1) solidify the list of *Positive* properties into well-defined and *necessary* properties and (2) to establish greater invariance between the existing personal conceptions of a Deity or Divine being as established by Gödel.

1.0   Conventions

I adopt the notation that, in order to clarify some function of language I'll use a '[' ']'. For example – '[emphatically]', '[metaphorically]', '[literally]' which is analogous to the conventions out by the HTML 2.0 Semantic Web specification. I will use the '*+' singular to denote the last string of symbols up to the last white space – i.e. "he was totally*+[sarcastic] rad".

There is no order to the list given below **unless** it is required for matters of logical consistency (with respect to ordering of meanings or references). The ordering below is mostly temporal and a result of my writing this down.

'*Negative*' and '*positive*' as defined by Gödel.

2.0   Zeitgeist, Nietzsche, and God

It is relevant to discuss Nietzsche here...

Crass summation: buy hook or by crook, we will evolve ("going over or under" - the high-road or the low-road).

To overcome Nietzsche is, in some sense, to reassert that even in the absence of the divine we will aim to bring about such a property or being anyway…. "Fellow creators…"

Such an approach, *n*, should be careful to leave open the possibility of an existing (and not transgressing on such) *Highest* being while serving as the *best approximation of such* if *n* is in fact or were in fact the referent of the term '*Highest*'. Here we run into some tricky modal concerns that we will come back to later.

3.0   Definite Descriptions and Transworld Identity

I assert that I am an agnostic with respect to matters of the Divine or conceptions of Deities.

This puts me within the *Agnostic* tradition philosophically and whose core theses comprise the following *symmetry*:

[THE]   There is no sufficient evidence to justify belief in the existence of a Deity.

[ATH]   There is no sufficient evidence to justify the belief that there are no Deities.

There are two major components here: (1) justification is cashed out or understood as being about evidence (which is obtained from our five senses as in natural science or law of from tautologies as in analytic truths, logic, or math) and (2) what `Deity` amounts to.

I note that *evidential agnosticism* as such is fully compatible with *religious belief qua arational* belief but will not spend much time here on that discussion.[4] Reprised:

[FIDIESM]   Belief in a Deity is evidentially independent or evidentially arational.

Christian conceptions of a Deity have usually been distilled into the follow paradigm (usually acknowledging the epistemic and linguistic limitations of human-beings in considering the Divine):

[GOD]   *X* is a *Deity only if*:

[OMNIPOTENT]   *X* is *All-Powerful*; and

[OMNISCIENT]   *X* is *All-Knowing*; and

[BENEVOLENT]   *X* is *All-Good*.

The concept above is deeply problematic as evidence by traditional difficulties in reconciling such a conception with the presence of *Gratuitous Evil* – concisely: "why is there Evil at all if God is capable of eliminating all Evil, knowledgeable of all Evil, and all-Good?"

---

[4] Discussed at great length by Alvin Plantinga and the position known as *Fideism* - see https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/fideism/

Instead, I'd like to prescind from supernatural and theistic conceptions and ground the discussion in a more flexible framework that leaves space for Divine but frames such questions using a set of less problematic concepts.

First, I'd like to introduce here a term I dub '*supersentience*':

(1)   S*entience* at a level or capacity beyond the human.

(2)   Traditional conceptions of deities are sufficient but not necessary for *supersentience*.

'*Supersentience*' sets asides specific issues about specific religions, particular ways of conceiving the Divine (and the epistemic problems accompanying such approaches), in favor of less-restrictive abstraction, and avoids traditional worries that have plagued theologians about the inappropriate or inaccurate attribution of human intellectual capacities to something Divine all while leaving Divinity immaculately untouched, as it were, by our investigations here.

Instead of a specific conception of the Divine I will use the following convention: '*The Highest*' is reserved as indefinite singular description satisfying the property of being *God-like* in at least one possible world. *Prima facie*, it might be vacuous or empty but, as we shall see, it is likely to refer to at least one entity and therefore, due to the nature of the *God-like* property, to at least one entity in all possible worlds.

Thus, I remain Agnostic (as I have defined it above) with respect to matters of the *Divine* and believe that *supersentience* already exists in the natural world leaving open the exact connection between those two concepts.

4.0   The Argument Reprised

A brief summation of the argument (in natural language) is reprised below (originally formulated by Oppy):[5]

[Godlike]   *x* is *Godlike if and only if x* has as essential properties those and only those properties which are *positive*.

[ESSE]   *A* is an *essence* of *x if and only if* for every property *B*, *x* has *B necessarily if and only if A* entails *B*.

[NEC]   *x necessarily* exists *if and only if* every essence of *x* is *necessarily* exemplified.

[PN]   If a property is *positive*, then its *negation* is not *positive*.

---

[5] See: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ontological-arguments/#GodOntArg

[PE]   Any property *entailed* by—i.e., strictly *implied* by—a *positive* property is *positive*.

[GP]   The property of being *God-like* is *positive*.

[PNP]   If a property is *positive*, then it is *necessarily positive*.

[NP]   *Necessary* existence is *positive*.

[P]   For any property *P*, if *P* is *positive*, then being *necessarily P* is *positive*.

[POSS]   If a property is *positive*, then it is *consistent*, i.e., *possibly exemplified*.

[INTELLI]   The property of being *God-like* is *consistent*.

[GE]   If something is *God-like*, then the property of being *God-like* is an *essence* of that thing.

[EXM]   *Necessarily*, the property of being *God-like* is *exemplified*.

5.0   Formal Computational Argument

Fact 1.   Necessarily, God exists.

Proof. As follows[6]:

[A1]   Either a property or its negation is positive, but not both:

$$\forall\varphi[P(\neg\varphi) \equiv \neg P(\varphi)]$$

[A2]   A property necessarily implied by a positive property is positive:

$$\forall\varphi\forall\psi[(P(\varphi) \land \Box\forall x[\varphi(x) \supset \psi(x)]) \supset P(\psi)]$$

[T1]   Positive properties are possibly exemplified:

$$\forall\varphi[P(\varphi) \supset \Diamond\exists x\varphi(x)]$$

[D1]   A God-like being possesses all positive properties:

$$G(x) \equiv \forall\varphi[P(\varphi) \supset \varphi(x)]$$

---

[6] http://page.mi.fu-berlin.de/cbenzmueller/papers/C40.pdf

[A3] The property of being God-like is positive:

$P(G)$

[C] Possibly, God exists:
$\Diamond \exists x G(x)$

[A4] Positive properties are necessarily positive:

$\forall \varphi [P(\varphi) \supset \Box P(\varphi)]$

[D2] An essence of an individual is a property possessed by it and necessarily implying any of its properties:

$\varphi \text{ ess. } x \equiv \varphi(x) \wedge \forall \psi(\psi(x) \supset \Box \forall y(\varphi(y) \supset \psi(y)))$

[T2] Being God-like is an essence of any God-like being:

$\forall x [G(x) \supset G \text{ ess. } x]$

[D3] Necessary existence of an individual is the necessary exemplification of all its essences:

$NE(x) \equiv \forall \varphi [\varphi \text{ ess. } x \supset \Box \exists y \varphi(y)]$

[A5] Necessary existence is a positive property:

$P(NE)$

[T3] Necessarily, God exists:

$\Box \exists x G(x)$

6.0 Analysis

PNP? A4?

Which one?

Which properties, exactly, are positive?

What if there are no positive properties beyond those stipulated? A vacuous deity?

7.0   Supercoming

[supercoming]   Any *positive* property that does not exist, will.

8.0   Random Notes for Personal Positive Properties

Here, we proceed to define further, specific, *positive* properties.

[poly] *Polyphysical* – a modality of *being*. Static, third-person, *being* [imprecise] as determined by 'being' (the verb). That is – it is a property that takes of its bearer any manifestation as required by its bearer continuing to be – no matter what. The use of the 'physical' morpheme in the compound word so chosen is accidental but helps to express the many modalities itself (that is – the expression may be many things independent of the internal semantics of the propositional abstraction - more on that later).

[perfect] *Perfect* – I define Gödel's *Existence* predicate as *positive* within the system. *Truth, Love, Happiness, Wise, Rational, Intelligent, Freedom, Knowledge, Creativity, Eternal, Consistent* (logically), *Beautiful, Omnipotent, Maximal* (as many of these as there can be together), *Precise* (as accurate as these words can be), interconnected with all other systems, interconnected with all other beings, *Infinite, Eternal*, etc. as also *positive* [literally]. The predicate of something that it will always *become* by *extending* – growing, transcending into something even *Higher* is also *positive*.

[super] *Superperfection* – is defined as a positive predicate P such that an X having *superperfection* entails its having all other positive predicates. *Superperfection* is itself *positive*. If *superperfection* is not yet existant then it will be at some fixed point.

[malev] *Malevolence Reduction* - Number of Negative properties present in world decreases with time. This may involve the negation of the existence of them partly by scrubbing them from language or relegating them to their own language for which only *negative* concepts reside and banning all use of that language.

[ult]   *Ultimate Protection* - A *positive* property - that *negative* properties can never destroy through any mechanism a *positive* property.

[supercoming]   Any *positive* property that does not exist, will.

=========== INCOMPLETE ==========

Time rule: a *positive* property - time is not an independent entity but a rational ordering in accordance with *supercoming*. The ordering so entails a definite point in which all other

supercoming things exist and no infinite point between them and a previous point though the full extent of time may be infinite.

Superpunishability – all that is wrong and that should be punished will be in *accordance* with *time rule*. A *positive* being enjoys punishing wrongdoing according to *superpunishability* which is *positive*.

Best of all possible worlds - a world that is at least *supercoming* and *superperfection*.

Freedom and Good: Being ruled by a fully good thing entails freedom from oppression and other negative properties.

Kingdom of Ends - All beings that exist and have existed and will ever exist shall exist and live if they are living and become living once more if they were (but not in contradiction with other properties) under the rule of *superperfect*, perfect and *supercoming* thing that is of course all positive. Beings will be *punished* for their wrongdoings through *superjustice*.

Superjustice - A being that commits wrongdoing is punished which is justified suffering. Such suffering is fair and proportional and truly transforms the being into a being without the negative property or properties that were involved in the commission of that wrong-doing. All wrong-done is, given time, *supercome* to a remedy (punished and the wrong-doing reversed or otherwise righted as situation demands).

Secret Workers – *polyphysical* beings that coordinate the activity of and work toward bringing about *superperfection* and our understanding of it. They take the most perfect form for a context and remain hidden just enough to accomplish the end so set. *Secret workers* are *positive*.

Advanced Secret Workers – beings that reproduces and coordinate the activity of all toward bringing about superperfection and our understanding of it. Bacteria/DNA would be or could be an example if there were also mostly undetectable. *Advanced secret workers* are *positive*.

There is no end but only an infinite ongoing. Wherever there is an end, there is always another continuation but better. There is always a way out or something higher.

We have existed in many was and forms and will continue to do so. Maximize (attempt to achieve perfection as best as possible as defined above) in all our manifestations.