Of Omniscience and Probability

Aman Chawla

December 25, 2023

Abstract

In this note the author comments on the relation between chance and knowledge. The observation is that probabilistic knowledge is about the best one can do when faced with our human ignorance of event-ual outcomes.

By definition, limited knowledge leads to probabilistic reasoning. So it is not contradictory or confusing that in the omniscient perspective[1], nothing is random[2].

A deeper question is, do these two perspectives - single observer and multiple observers - exist? Or is there only the absolute Brahman [2], and no "observer" [3]? In the latter case, "nothing is random" becomes an absolute governing law. Then, any-"one" that needs probabilistic reasoning, is operating from limited knowledge. So, limited knowledge is in a way synonymous with the existence of observers. Limited knowledge also connotes locality and mind. Further, it stems from a deep-seated notion which various knowledgeable masters of religion have sought to dispel over the ages [4, page 60-61].

We leave unadressed the question of why much of science is built on the position of limited knowledge. Related to it is the expansive goal which seeks to make science and scientific theories non-local.

References

[1] T. Luoma. *Incarnation and Physics: Natural Science in the Theology of Thomas F. Torrance*. AAR Academy Series. Oxford University Press, 2002.

[2] Walter Eugene Clark. *The Aryabhatiya of Aryabhata: An Ancient Indian Work on Mathematics and Astronomy*. University of Chicago Press, 1930.

[3] Sri Harsa. Khandanakhandakhadya. *Achyut Granthmala, Benares*, 1969.

[4] *Ashtavakra Gita*. Swami Anubhavananda.

[1] Newton's *sensorium Dei* [1].

[2] This is also related to the conception of Time as a container of the field of existence: if Time (referring to all time) is once known, the container is had, having which the contents are all exposed and randomness ceases to have any role.