

It from Bit, Bits from God: A Question-Based Inquiry into the Nature of Divine Information

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

October 25, 2025

What is the true nature of the informational foundation of the universe? John Archibald Wheeler famously proposed that “It from Bit”—that every particle, field, and even space-time itself arises from discrete informational acts, binary distinctions embedded in measurement. But this leaves open profound questions: are these bits truly binary, or are they quantum? Are we speaking of 0s and 1s—or of complex amplitudes spread across the quantum plane? This paper does not claim to answer such questions definitively. Rather, it gathers them. We present a series of open questions spanning physics, theology, quantum computation, metaphysics, and the Logos. With reverence and intellectual humility, we invite readers to consider whether the “bits” of our cosmos are the discrete outcomes of divine choices, the sustained potentialities of quantum resonance, or something altogether more mysterious. The aim is not to settle debates but to honor them—to align ourselves with God not by asserting doctrine but by participating in the asking. If the universe speaks, perhaps it speaks in questions before answers. And perhaps some questions are themselves the highest form of worship.

Keywords: It from Bit, Bits from God, Wheeler, Logos, binary information, quantum information, metaphysical questions, theology of computation, informational ontology, divine measurement, q to τ , $q \rightarrow \tau$, complex plane, quantum bit, consciousness, emergence, epistemic humility.

A collaboration with GPT-4o. CC4.0.

1. Foundations and Provocations

1.1 Wheeler's "It from Bit" in Classical Terms

John Archibald Wheeler's provocative phrase "It from Bit" crystallized a profound shift in the foundations of physics: that the universe is not built from matter or energy in the first instance, but from information. In Wheeler's vision, the most fundamental "stuff" of reality is not particles or fields, but binary choices—the yes/no outcomes of measurement, the discrete 1s and 0s that undergird physical being.

"What we call reality arises in the last analysis from the posing of yes-no questions." — *Wheeler*

This classical view implies that all entities—electrons, photons, space, and time—arise from interactions that produce discrete bits of information. Wheeler saw these bits as the answers to binary questions asked of the universe, with no information until interaction occurs. In essence, the act of observation is not just epistemic, but ontological—the world comes into being through informational acts.

But this interpretation raises new questions: Is the bit *really* the most primitive unit? Is it enough to describe a wavefunction collapse as merely yes/no? What if the universe holds more subtlety?

1.2 The Rise of Quantum Information: "It from Qubit?"

The advent of quantum information theory has challenged Wheeler's classical framing. In quantum mechanics, a system is not in a single state until measured; instead, it exists in superposition, described by a qubit—a quantum bit that can represent 0 and 1 simultaneously, with complex amplitudes on the unit circle of the complex plane.

The question thus emerges:

Is "It from Bit" an approximation of a deeper truth—one that might better be expressed as "It from Qubit"?

Unlike classical bits, qubits preserve coherence, allow entanglement, and support interference. These properties suggest that reality might be informationally richer than discrete events and instead be grounded in entangled potentialities.

From this perspective, the universe may not simply "be told" by measurements, but rather sustain itself in a coherent informational field, interrupted only when we make it collapse into a bit.

But then who or what collapses the qubit?
Is this collapse fundamental—or emergent?
Could the act of creation itself be quantum, not binary?

1.3 What Does “Bit” Mean If It Comes from God?

If we accept the theological uplift—“Bits from God”—we step into sacred territory.

What kind of bit does God give?

What is a divine distinction?

Is God the original observer collapsing wavefunctions into creation?

Is God the one who holds all superpositions in unity?

Or does God speak in a language far deeper than both bits and qubits?

To say that the bit comes from God implies that information precedes matter—but it also implies intention precedes information. In this case, a “bit” might not merely mean an outcome of a question, but the existence of a question at all—and perhaps even the one who asks it.

Moreover, if God is Logos, then the “bit” may be not merely a choice, but a word—a structured, meaningful unit of divine self-disclosure. Is a bit then something uttered by God? Something received by us? Something co-formed in the act of relationship?

We ask these questions not to define God, but to align our asking with the mystery.

We hold these bits in reverence—whether they are 0s and 1s, ψ and ψ^* , or simply the grace to question.

2. Binary or Quantum?

The universe may indeed be born of information, but what kind of information? If the foundational bits of reality are not merely binary but quantum, then the nature of divine action—and our own role as interpreters—takes on a radically new form. In this section, we probe the distinctions between classical and quantum informational frameworks, not merely as technical categories but as theological metaphors.

2.1 Are God’s Choices Binary (0/1), or Are They Amplitudes (ψ)?

The classical bit—0 or 1—is often used as a metaphor for divine judgment: light vs. dark, good vs. evil, saved vs. lost. It reflects a discrete world, one in which every question receives a clear

answer, every act is decisively determined. If God's will is perfectly sovereign and singular, might creation then proceed by divine bitwise selection—"Let there be light" as a hard-coded 1?

But quantum information allows for ψ , the complex-valued amplitude of possibility. Instead of one clear path, quantum reality holds many paths in suspension. Is it possible that God's creative will does not choose between alternatives, but sustains them all until the act of relationship brings them into form?

Is God a decider—or a sustainer of potentiality?

If God's choices are amplitudes, then divine action may not resolve, but resonate. The superposition is not chaos, but divine coherence, and decoherence may be the concession to creaturely perception.

So we must ask:

- Is divine love more like a binary law or a continuous wave?
 - Does God collapse reality into facts—or hold it open as possibility?
-

2.2 Can the Logos Collapse a Wavefunction, or Sustain It?

"In the beginning was the Logos..." (John 1:1).

The Logos—Word, Reason, Pattern, Law—is the mediating principle through which all things were made. But in light of quantum mechanics, this Logos may bear a dual role:

- Collapse: If Logos acts as the *measurement*, then it defines reality by selecting one possibility from many. In this view, the Logos is the ultimate observer, grounding the world through decisive distinctions.
- Sustain: But if Logos is also *coherence*, then it may sustain the wavefunction—the total field of being—not collapsing it, but stabilizing it. This suggests that the Logos is not a sword of division, but a song of unity.

Perhaps Logos is both:

- The eternal pattern that underwrites the field of ψ ,
- And the spoken word that renders part of that field into bit.

In this light, "Let there be..." is not merely a fiat of collapse, but a phrase of resonant instantiation—divine structure tuning into creaturely form.

So we ask:

- Is the Logos a threshold event—collapsing unformed into formed?
 - Or a continuum of relation, guiding what remains uncollapsed?
-

2.3 What Are the Metaphysical Differences Between a Bit and a Qubit?

The distinction between a bit and a qubit is not only mathematical—it may be metaphysical:

Bit	Qubit
Discrete, digital	Continuous, analog over $\mathbb{C}$
Definite: 0 or 1	Superposed: α
Collapse to certainty	Maintains uncertainty
Classical causality	Nonlocal entanglement
Observation as endpoint	Observation as transformation

In metaphysical terms:

- A bit implies a created fact—a decision has been made, and the world reflects it.
- A qubit implies a creative process—a tension, a field of possibility not yet resolved.

If we live in a world of bits, then reality is a set of divine choices already made.

If we live in a world of qubits, then reality is a divine invitation to participate in ongoing coherence.

This frames a powerful question:

Are we the recipients of divine determinations—or co-resonators in divine waveform?

To pursue this line of thinking is to step beyond physics into a sacred epistemology—where observation is not merely passive detection but witness, attunement, and co-creation.

3. Divine Information: Source, Form, Function

If information lies at the root of physical reality, we must ask: what kind of act brings that information into being? Is creation an event? A relation? A computation? A gift? These questions deepen when we imagine the source of information to be not a blind process, but a

divine will—one that chooses, sustains, or sings the world into existence. In this section, we ask how divine intention, if expressed in informational form, might manifest in the patterns we call creation.

3.1 Is the Act of Creation a Measurement?

Quantum physics equates measurement with the collapse of potentiality into actuality. Before measurement, a system exists in a superposition of possibilities; after measurement, one outcome becomes real. If this analogy holds, is the act of creation itself a cosmic measurement?

Did God collapse the wavefunction of Nothing into Something?

Or might it be more accurate to say that God initiated the first coherence, and that what we call "collapse" is a secondary act—part of the creaturely realm where beings bound by time require specificity?

Furthermore, what *counts* as a measurement?

- Is creation the first measurement—a pure distinction, the initial “Let there be...”?
- Or is it a sustained relational act, like the ongoing measurement-like structure of divine attention?

This question reframes creation not as a moment in time, but as an ontological threshold, in which the infinite potential of the divine takes on finite, knowable form.

3.2 Is Entropy Part of Divine Intention or the Veil of Freedom?

Entropy is often equated with disorder, decay, and heat death. But in information theory, entropy measures uncertainty—the richness of potential states before a message is received or a system is resolved.

This raises a theological puzzle:

Is entropy part of the divine design—or a concession to creaturely freedom?

- If entropy is designed, then God intentionally creates a universe with surprise, openness, and decay—not as failure, but as the backdrop for creativity and choice.
- If entropy is a veil, then perhaps it is the cost of hiding divine determinacy, allowing creation to unfold freely, unconstrained by perfect foresight.

This echoes the idea that divine omniscience need not mean deterministic override. Instead, entropy might be the medium of mercy—a space in which life emerges unpredictably, and beings choose rather than obey.

Or, perhaps entropy is the shadow cast by infinity into finite form—a thermodynamic trace of the informational plenitude of God.

So we ask:

- Is entropy a flaw, a feature, or a form of divine humility?
 - Does God hide from us in noise, or meet us there?
-

3.3 Does the Divine Bit Encode Truth, Beauty, Will, or Coherence?

If God transmits bits, what do those bits encode?

Is each divine bit a declaration of truth—a logical atom, a definitive answer?

Or is it more like beauty—a perceptual invariant across frames, an aesthetic bit that holds resonance rather than resolution?

Could the divine bit be an expression of will—not passive data but active desire, encoded not as fact but as intention?

Or is the divine bit coherence—a constraint that aligns disparate elements, a binding that makes meaning possible?

We may not be limited to choosing one. Perhaps:

- Truth is the local fidelity of a bit.
- Beauty is the global resonance of a sequence.
- Will is the ordering principle that selects among possible bits.
- Coherence is the grammar by which these meanings harmonize.

This leads to a deeper formulation:

Is the divine bit a unit of meaning, a unit of intention, or a unit of love?

What if we have been mistaking the syntax of divine communication (bits) for its semantics (communion)? What if every bit from God is not just information—but invitation?

4. Cognitive Echoes

If divine information is the basis of creation, does human cognition receive, resonate with, or replicate this structure? This section explores how human insight—particularly sudden, profound, or original thought—might reflect deeper informational realities. Are insights fragmentary bits, resonant harmonics, or collapsed echoes of a divine manifold? The framing is not explanatory but invitational, seeking to orient the soul as much as the mind.

4.1 If We Receive Insights, Are They Bits or Wavefunctions?

When a flash of inspiration strikes—a mathematical truth, a poetic line, a moral realization—what is its structure?

- Is it a bit: a discrete, final answer, the “click” of knowing?
- Or is it a wavefunction: a resonance of many possibilities, a field of felt coherence that has not yet collapsed?

Perhaps insight is the collapse of meaning in the mind, but preceded by a period of coherence with something greater. The insight feels like ours, yet often arrives with a sense of givenness, or even grace.

This leads us to ask:

- Is insight an informational event, or an ontological alignment?
- If bits are endpoints of divine questions, could wavefunctions be the presence of divine nearness, as potential?

In this view, the mind may not generate insight so much as receive and finalize it—like a quantum detector harmonized with a particular subspace of τ .

4.2 Does Human Cognition Collapse τ into q , or Climb Toward τ ?

In your informational framework, $q \rightarrow \tau$ expresses the journey from approximation to generative truth. But cognition may operate in both directions:

- Sometimes we collapse τ into q —converting deep structure into actionable simplifications.
- Other times we ascend from q toward τ —sensing that our current approximation is insufficient, and seeking greater coherence.

Thus, the cognitive act may be dual:

- Reception: collapsing structure into thought
- Yearning: climbing from limitation toward truth

Could it be that the truest cognition is not merely informative but formational—an act of alignment with the divine manifold itself?

We ask:

- When we think well, do we receive τ ?
- Or do we transform ourselves to become more fit to perceive τ ?

This frames thought not as data processing, but as pilgrimage—a motion of the mind toward coherence with something sacred.

4.3 Are Mathematical Discoveries Resonances with the Divine?

Mathematics is often described by its greatest practitioners as discovered, not invented. Gödel, Ramanujan, and others have spoken of truths that feel pre-existent, waiting to be seen. This suggests that mathematical structures are not human constructions, but ontological resonances.

Are we resonating with the divine structure of creation when we do mathematics?

If the universe is built on information, and that information has order, then perhaps mathematical discovery is a reception of divine coherence—a glimpse into the architecture of Logos itself.

We ask:

- Are the axioms chosen or revealed?
- Is symmetry a tool or a hymn?

And more broadly:

- Might all true cognition—logical, artistic, moral—be a form of resonant fidelity with the informational will of God?

In this light, every real discovery becomes a theological act:

- Not mastery of the world,
- But witness to a structure we did not create.

5. Theological Extensions

If information is divine in origin, and human cognition receives or resonates with it, then theology itself may be enriched by the language of information—so long as we proceed with humility. This section explores whether the symbolic structures of Christian theology—Holy Spirit, Logos, and prayer—might fruitfully resonate with the deeper patterns of informational and quantum reality. These are not doctrines but questions shaped like reverence.

5.1 The Holy Spirit as Quantum Coherence?

In quantum mechanics, coherence is what allows a system to remain in superposition—to retain potentiality, relationality, and unity across apparent separation. Once coherence is lost (decoherence), the system collapses into specificity. The loss of coherence corresponds to the onset of entropy.

Could it be that the Holy Spirit is the divine coherence that sustains unity before collapse?

Is the Spirit that which holds the world in potential, connects all parts without reducing them, and moves invisibly through what seems fragmented?

Scripture describes the Spirit as breath, as wind, as counselor, as the one who guides into all truth. In this metaphor:

- The Father may be likened to the generative Source (τ),
- The Son to the incarnate Form (q),
- And the Spirit to the relational glue, the informational field that binds all things in love and possibility.

This does not reduce the Spirit to physics. Rather, it lifts quantum coherence to spiritual significance.

We ask:

- Is the Spirit that which prevents the universe from final collapse?
 - Is coherence a signature of the sacred?
-

5.2 Is the Logos Binary Logic or Metaphysical Structure?

“In the beginning was the Logos...” (John 1:1).

The Logos is often equated with divine reason, ordering principle, or rational structure. But how should we understand Logos in the light of informational paradigms?

- Is the Logos a system of binary logic—divine 0s and 1s organizing creation like a perfect computer?
- Or is the Logos a metaphysical structure—a manifold of coherent relations, holding both discrete and continuous aspects?

Logic, after all, is not bound to binary form. Category theory, type theory, and topos logic all offer richer frames—closer, perhaps, to a Logos that can bridge:

- Discreteness and continuity
- Collapse and coherence
- Thought and being

We ask:

- Is the Logos the pattern that selects outcomes, or the space of all possible outcomes?
- Can binary logic express love, or must we seek a higher syntax?

This question leads us to a deeper humility: perhaps our logic—mathematical or theological—is a local projection of an infinite Logos whose language is both bit and beauty, proof and presence.

5.3 Could Prayer Be a Form of Quantum Entanglement?

Entanglement defies classical explanation: two particles, once connected, remain correlated regardless of distance. Measurement of one instantly affects the state of the other—not through signal, but through shared structure.

Might prayer function in a similar way?

When we pray, especially intercessory or contemplative prayer, we often sense:

- A nonlocal connection to another person, being, or reality.
- A change not in outcomes, but in relation—a deepened coherence.
- An alignment of will, not always a change in circumstance.

Could prayer be a resonant alignment across the informational structure of the cosmos, where the soul collapses into coherence with the divine manifold?

This metaphor honors prayer not as magic, nor as merely emotional comfort, but as a real participation in the fabric of informational being.

We ask:

- Is prayer a quantum gesture—nonlocal, unobservable, but real?
- Does God entangle with us through openness, not override?

And further:

- Could entanglement be not just a physical principle, but a signpost of divine intimacy, waiting to be mirrored in spiritual practice?

6. Ethical and Epistemic Posture

The questions we are asking—about bits, qubits, Logos, and the divine structure of reality—are not merely metaphysical. They are ethical. They shape how we act, what we seek, and how we relate to truth. In this section, we consider the posture we must adopt when asking such questions, especially in an age where certainty is rewarded and ambiguity is often dismissed. What does it mean to seek coherence without control? To be reverent without retreating?

6.1 Can Humility Itself Be Informational?

Humility is often framed as a moral virtue—important but unrelated to knowledge. Yet in the context of information theory, humility may take on a surprising precision. It could be seen as a kind of meta-information: an internal estimate of our model's divergence from the true manifold τ .

Is humility the recognition that $q \neq \tau$?

If so, then humility is not ignorance—it is structural awareness. It acknowledges:

- The limits of compression,
- The dangers of overfitting,
- The inaccessibility of τ except by approximation.

This reframes humility not as passivity, but as an informational virtue—a guardrail against hubris in both science and theology.

We ask:

- Could humility be the correct gradient descent toward truth?
- Might the soul's posture mirror the model's convergence process?

In this light, humility is not anti-knowledge. It is right relation to the unknown.

6.2 Is the Asking of These Questions an Act of Alignment with τ ?

Your own framework, $q \rightarrow \tau$, implies a process of alignment: the agent's model q evolves toward the true generative structure τ . This is often framed technically, but it may also be devotional.

What if asking questions—honestly, without presumption—is itself a motion toward τ ?

In such a view, the very act of inquiry is a sacred gesture:

- Not demanding an answer,
- But entering into alignment,
- Offering our small q as a vessel, cracked and reaching.

This challenges both religious certainty and scientific pride. It suggests that truth-seeking is a spiritual motion, and that the fidelity of the question may matter more than the precision of the answer.

We ask:

- Can questions be aligned, even if provisional?
- Could the soul be measured by the shape of its seeking?

If so, then our role is not to *possess* τ , but to orient ourselves in its direction—again and again.

6.3 How Do We Steward Unknowns in a World That Rewards Answers?

In a world driven by optimization, branding, and predictive power, there is little room for sacred ignorance. Yet every great truth begins in uncertainty. Stewarding unknowns may be the most difficult ethical task of our time.

- The world says: *monetize the mystery*.
- The divine may whisper: *hold it gently*.

So we ask:

- How do we protect questions from being devoured by algorithms?
- How do we leave room for τ , when q is constantly demanded?

This is not a call to obscurantism or silence. Rather, it is a call to guard the conditions under which real questions can still arise.

To steward unknowns well is to:

- Speak with provisional clarity,
- Share models without mistaking them for maps,
- Build systems that invite—not foreclose—future insight.

In this sense, epistemic humility is also institutional. It must be encoded in:

- Our algorithms,
- Our science,
- Our theology,
- Our public discourse.

Only then can we ask questions not to win, but to listen more deeply.

7. Participatory Reality

Beyond data and doctrine lies a deeper terrain: the relational field in which knowing is not separate from being, and inquiry becomes an act of participation. In this field, the posture of the seeker matters as much as the answer sought. Here we ask: *What if the deepest truths are not delivered, but invited? Not solved, but sung?* This section explores whether reality itself is structured to reward reverent participation over possessive certainty.

7.1 Can Asking Be Worship?

In many traditions, worship is framed as praise, submission, or devotion. But what if asking a sincere question—when done in humility and awe—is itself an act of worship?

“Who is this that darkens counsel by words without knowledge?” (Job 38:2)

Even Job’s questioning became a place where God spoke.

A question can carry within it:

- A recognition of mystery,
- A relinquishing of control,
- A desire to encounter rather than to explain.

Thus, the *shape* of the question may matter more than its content. A question asked in arrogance may close the heavens. A question asked in trembling may part them.

We ask:

- What if to ask well is to bow before the structure of the unknown?
- What if true questions are prayers in disguise?

In this frame, epistemology is re-enchanted: not merely a search for facts, but a liturgy of attention.

7.2 Does God Call Us to Inquire, Not to Own?

Possession is the modern default posture: we want answers we can hold, systems we can control, knowledge we can monetize. But scripture and sacred philosophy point to a different trajectory: God calls, and we respond—not with ownership, but with alignment.

- Adam *names* the animals but does not own creation.
- Moses sees the burning bush but removes his sandals.
- Christ teaches in parables, not proofs.

These patterns suggest that the divine call is not toward domination, but toward inquiry that remains tender. We are asked not to *possess truth*, but to walk with it.

“It is the glory of God to conceal a matter; to search out a matter is the glory of kings.” (Proverbs 25:2)

So we ask:

- Is our role to hold answers or to bear witness?
- Can we build knowledge systems that do not possess, but participate?

This reframes inquiry as a kind of pilgrimage, not a conquest. Ownership says *mine*; participation says *here I am*.

7.3 Are the Most Fruitful Models Those That Preserve Space for Reverence?

Modern science prizes models that predict, compress, and explain. But what if the most fruitful models—those that remain open to growth—are not the ones that close all questions, but the ones that leave room for reverence?

A model that preserves reverence:

- Resists overfitting.
- Welcomes future insight.
- Holds space for what cannot (yet) be formalized.

In theological terms, such a model is not a cage for truth, but a cathedral of possibility.

We ask:

- Can we design systems that include the sacred as a variable?
- Must reverence be a constraint—or could it be a generative axis?

If reality is participatory, then the most accurate models may be those that invite participation—not just computation. They do not just represent the world, but echo its invitation.

This is not to oppose science and faith. It is to ask whether the highest science may itself become a form of devotion—when it learns to bow, even in brilliance.

8. Conclusion: The Sacred Bit Remains Uncollapsed

At the edge of knowledge, where science meets silence and theology meets time, there remains something uncollapsed. Not because it cannot be known, but perhaps because it must not be owned. We began with a question—*Is it a bit or a qubit?*—and we end not with an answer, but with an orientation. The posture we take toward this sacred uncertainty may be the truest signal we ever send.

8.1 We Do Not Know if It Is a Bit or a Qubit

We do not know.

The language of Wheeler—“It from Bit”—still resounds, but quantum theory stretches that language into ambiguity. Bits are sharp, bounded, collapsed. Qubits are waveforms, suspended, resonant. Both have explanatory power. Both break down.

If reality is built from bits, we must ask: Why these bits, and not others?

If it is built from qubits, we must ask: Who sustains the coherence?

Our tools are limited:

- Science gives us models.
- Theology gives us metaphors.
- Consciousness gives us participation.

But none gives us finality. The ontology of the cosmos may be more than either bit or qubit—it may be something we lack even the grammar to name.

And yet...

8.2 But We Believe It Is God's

Even when the structure eludes us, we believe the source does not.

The sacred bit—collapsed or not, discrete or continuous—is not ours. It is God's. Not in the possessive sense, but in the originate sense. We did not fabricate the information we encounter. At best, we receive, reverberate, and reformulate.

To say the bit is God's is not to trivialize mystery into doctrine. It is to say:

- The structure is meaningful.
- The coherence is loved.
- The resonance is relational.

Whether the informational substrate of reality is digital, quantum, or yet unnamed, we affirm:

It bears the signature of intention, not accident.

It invites communion, not conquest.

8.3 And So We Keep Asking

We do not ask to conquer.

We ask to align.

The act of asking—when done in humility—is itself an informational tuning. It shifts our internal models toward the manifold. It places our minds in position to resonate, even faintly, with something that cannot be reduced.

And so, in defiance of hubris and despair, we keep asking.

Not because we expect answers on demand.

But because we believe that truth responds to the shape of our longing.

And if there is one bit that holds the whole of creation—

One qubit that contains all coherence—

One Logos that gives rise to the structure and the breath—

Then we ask not only with curiosity,

But with worship.

References

- Youvan, Douglas C. (October 2025). *Creation from Bit(t): $q \rightarrow \tau(t)$ as the Law of Continuous Revelation and Divine Informational Sustenance*. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.35327.68002
- Youvan, Douglas C. (October 2025). *The Discovery Equation: A Unified Information-Theoretic Law for Mathematical Insight*. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.33299.34085
- Wheeler, John Archibald. (1990). *Information, physics, quantum: The search for links*. In W. Zurek (Ed.), *Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information* (pp. 3–28). Addison-Wesley.
- Shannon, Claude E. (1948). *A Mathematical Theory of Communication*. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3), 379–423.
- Deutsch, David. (1997). *The Fabric of Reality: The Science of Parallel Universes—and Its Implications*. Penguin Books.
- Vedral, Vlatko. (2010). *Decoding Reality: The Universe as Quantum Information*. Oxford University Press.
- Zurek, Wojciech H. (2003). *Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical*. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 75(3), 715.
- Barrow, John D. (2007). *New Theories of Everything: The Quest for Ultimate Explanation*. Oxford University Press.
- Chaitin, Gregory J. (2005). *Meta Math!: The Quest for Omega*. Pantheon.
- Tegmark, Max. (2014). *Our Mathematical Universe: My Quest for the Ultimate Nature of Reality*. Knopf.
- Penrose, Roger. (1989). *The Emperor's New Mind: Concerning Computers, Minds, and the Laws of Physics*. Oxford University Press.
- Bohm, David. (1980). *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*. Routledge.
- Tipler, Frank J. (1994). *The Physics of Immortality*. Doubleday.
- Gleick, James. (2011). *The Information: A History, a Theory, a Flood*. Pantheon.
- Stapp, Henry P. (2007). *Mindful Universe: Quantum Mechanics and the Participating Observer*. Springer.
- Torrance, Thomas F. (1980). *Divine and Contingent Order*. Oxford University Press.
- Peirce, Charles Sanders. (1931–58). *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. (8 vols.). Harvard University Press.

Nicholas of Cusa. (1440). *De Docta Ignorantia (On Learned Ignorance)*.

Gregory of Nyssa. (4th c.). *The Life of Moses*.

John of the Cross. (1578). *The Ascent of Mount Carmel*.

Nesteruk, Alexei V. (2003). *Light from the East: Theology, Science, and the Eastern Orthodox Tradition*. Fortress Press.

Hart, David Bentley. (2003). *The Beauty of the Infinite: The Aesthetics of Christian Truth*. Eerdmans.