16 Conclusion.

In this thesis I have proposed a theory of creation as a
means of explaining the mathematical nature of reality. Why
is mathematics so successful in our understanding of
reality both conceptually and physically? The reason I give
is that reality is created by God both physically and
conceptually. The physical is not reducible to the
conceptual and the conceptual is not reducible to the
physical.

This is the first of three ideas I use about the creation,
which is, that the creation is spoken by God. That is, the
creation itself is inherently linguistic and conceivable.
The conceivability of the creation means that it can be
understood and manipulated by language, in particular
mathematical language. The mathematics is in the creation
objectively, independent of the human mind. However,
because of the human capacity for language, we can work at
the mathematics and discover and use its intricacies.

The second statement that I make about the creation is that
it is ex nihilo. This implies that the creation is not
driven by theory nor is it conforming to pre-arranged
conceptual systems. The act of creation was an arbitrary
and free act by God. However, because the creation is
conceivable and expressed by thought, thought is a means of
reflecting on the creation but not a means of generating
the creation. Familiarity with the conceptual system of the
creation may lead us to say that something can or even
should exist, but thought (the a priori) cannot tell us if

it does exist. Mathematics is a key science is helping us determine what may exist.

The third statement about the creation is that the creation is finished. Traditionally, God has finished all God's works. I claim that this implies that there are only a countably finite number of created physical objects. This may be a huge number but it is only finite. However, concepts are countably infinite. The conceptual creation is complete and closed. This means that concepts and the relations between them cannot create something that is not a concept. Also the conceptual possibilities are already there because all possible relations between concepts are part of the conceptual creation.

I claim that mathematics can point us to God, if we want to look. Just as a constructivist can refuse to leave the sequence to tolerate the completed infinity, even so the reductionist can refuse to accept that God is indicated by the mathematical ways of thinking.

For instance, mathematical definitions of sequences and their properties can structure thought sequences such as Anselm's Definition. Mathematics can provide an ordinal sequence with an infinite ordinal limit ω, which can be interpreted as a limit thought indicating an object beyond thought. Cantor's work has enabled us to conceive a completed infinity rather than always remain, constructively, in a sequence. Limitative results in computability can show the limits to algorithmic systems and the lack of definition in highly defined systems. Mathematical attempts to define algorithms are analogous to

formal ways to define God. Diagonalization shows how in a recursive (fully defined) list there is the possibility of constructing a diagonal entry that is not part of the list. Gödel's Incompleteness results show how, in a consistent system, there is a true but unprovable statement. This undecidable formula cannot be proved nor disproved, without the addition of more axioms. A study of paradox brings out the difficulties of attempting to describe the indescribable. Mathematical ideas of complexity indicate that a system cannot create its own information. A system cannot increase its own complexity.

None of these results use the idea of God. So the reductionist or constructivist can remain skeptical. I cannot prove that God is the idea indicated by the limit point. Nor can they prove that it is not. I claim that the limit thought and the undecidable formula are consistent with (and point to) the idea of God. The existence of God, as suggested by the above results, is indicated but not proved. That the proposition 'God exists' is undecidable can be seen as an interpretation consistent with our mathematical insights. Ontological argument can be seen to be an attempt to break this impasse and force thought to yield up a necessary existent. But by the very nature of the creation, I believe that thought alone cannot determine what exists. Existence is not theory driven but is always the choice of a creator God.

So the Creator, who (I argue) has created the creation so that God can be understood, remains forever conceptually beyond the reach of what was created to be a conceptual

means to God. Indeed, God (possibly by design) remains
conceivable but beyond the range of our conceptions.