

Obidi's Philosophical Analysis of Being and Becoming Based on His Theory of Entropicity (ToE) and Its Juxtaposition with Paul Tillich's Ontological Courage and the Courage to Be (Canonical)—Version 1.0

Framing the Study

Any serious study of John Onimisi Obidi's Theory of Entropicity (ToE) has to begin with a methodological clarification. The public corpus presently available is not just substantial—it is enormous—even though it is the corpus of an emerging research program rather than a settled school: it consists largely of various preprints, working papers, collected conceptual volumes, Cambridge Open Engage papers, ResearchGate and Academia publications. That matters because the task here is not to report a meagre corpus around ToE. It is to report the most coherent internal philosophical architecture of Obidi's theory, placing that architecture into rigorous conversation with Paul Tillich's equally audacious and provocative ontology of being, nonbeing, and courage.

Read in that way, ToE is not merely an emerging physical model that happens to mention entropy. It is a deliberate ontological reversal. In Obidi's Cambridge and related writings, entropy is no longer a derivative thermodynamic descriptor but the “fundamental field and causal substrate” from which spacetime, gravity, quantum behavior, and cosmological order arise. He names the philosophical framework generated by that reversal as **ontodynamics**, which he defines as the study of existence as entropic motion [and negotiation]. That naming is important, because it signals that the **Theory of Entropicity (ToE)** is trying to do more than solve technical unification problems in physics; it is trying to redescribe and redefine what it means for anything to be at all.

The central thesis of this study is therefore twofold. First, Obidi's deepest philosophical move is not simply to replace matter with information or geometry with entropy, but to redefine **being** as stabilized entropic persistence and **becoming** as irreversible entropic redistribution. Second, Tillich's deepest move is almost the inverse: he does not make becoming physically primary, but interprets finite existence through the dialectic of being and nonbeing, then grounds courage in participation in the power of being-itself. Juxtaposed carefully, Obidi radicalizes cosmological **becoming**, while Tillich radicalizes existential **affirmation**.

Obidi's Entropic Ontology of Being and Becoming

The decisive philosophical originality of Obidi's vocabulary emerges where he explicitly defines the relation between being and becoming. In one of the clearest programmatic statements in Obidi's explanatory corpus, "existence (**Being**)" is described as "the persistence of entropic gradients within finite bounds," while "transformation (**Becoming**)" is identified with "the irreversible redistribution of entropy." Elsewhere, in his classical-philosophy exposition of ToE, the theory is declared to take its cue from **Heraclitean** flux so strongly that "**becoming precedes being.**" When those passages are read together with Obidi's more formal **Cambridge abstracts**, a distinctive ontological picture appears: **what exists does not first possess stable substance and then undergo change; rather, it is the temporary endurance of a patterned gradient inside an irreversible field of transformation. In Obidi's philosophy, therefore, Being is therefore not the opposite of Becoming. It is a bounded mode within becoming.**

This is why ToE refuses to treat entropy as mere decay. In Obidi's own philosophical descriptions, **entropy is recast as the "heartbeat of existence," the active power through which complexity, self-organization, and life become possible.** Time, on this view, is not an independent container in which events occur. It is the directional flux of the entropic field. **Space is not an empty receptacle.** It is a map of entropic gradients. **Motion is not a primitive fact. It is what occurs when those gradients are reconfigured.** The cumulative effect of these claims is a **full metaphysical inversion** of ordinary modern intuitions: **the universe is not first a spatial arrangement that later manifests disorder; it is first an entropic process that later stabilizes into what beings experience as space, time, and identifiable objects.**

From this standpoint, Obidi's analysis of being is neither classical substance metaphysics nor generic process philosophy. It is closer to what may be called a **metastable ontology**. That term is interpretive, but it is supported by the primary materials of the Theory of Entropicity (ToE). ToE treats the entropic field as continuously dynamic, probabilistic, self-updating, and irreversible, yet it also insists that recognizable physical structures emerge as convergent, stable, and partially lawlike organizations inside that flow. In other words, what persists does so not because it escapes entropy, but because it is a successful local organization of entropy. **Being** is not immunity from transformation; it is transformation held in coherent form for some finite interval and under some finite constraints.

That inference becomes sharper when one notices that ToE repeatedly ties existence to **finite bounds** and **finite rates**. The **No-Rush Theorem (NRT)** holds that no interaction is instantaneous. The **No-Go Theorem (NGT)** is a **fundamental impossibility theorem** that declares that no law or device or process can be operational outside the entropic cone of causality. The speed of light is reinterpreted as the maximum rate of entropic rearrangement. The **Vuli-Ndlela Integral**

Obidi's Philosophical Analysis of Being and Becoming Based on His Theory of Entropicity (ToE) and Its Juxtaposition with Paul Tillich's Ontological Courage and the Courage to Be (Canonical)—Version 1.0

(VNI) rewrites quantum evolution in entropy-weighted terms that embed irreversibility into the formal structure of physical development. Once those claims of the Theory of Entropicity (ToE) are taken seriously, **becoming** is no longer a vague metaphysical category. It becomes physically bounded, temporally asymmetrical, and theoretically quantifiable. This is one of the points at which ToE becomes philosophically distinctive: it does not merely praise flux; it tries to make flux mathematically constitutive of reality.

What Is Original and Unique in the Theory of Entropicity (ToE)

To see what is specifically original in ToE, one has to distinguish it from earlier entropy-centered turns in physics. **Ted Jacobson** derived the **Einstein** equation from thermodynamic relations and horizon entropy, treating the Einstein equation as an equation of state. **Erik Verlinde** proposed gravity as an entropic force tied to emergent space and information. **Ginestra Bianconi**, more recently, derived gravity from an entropic action defined as a **quantum relative entropy** between **spacetime** and **matter-induced metrics**. **Obidi** clearly situates himself in relation to this lineage, but his claim is stronger than any of them: he does not merely derive gravitational behavior from thermodynamic or informational considerations; he promotes entropy itself to the status of a universal ontological field and argues with rigorous logic that these other programs represent limiting or partial cases within that deeper entropic framework.

That ambition becomes concrete in several genuinely distinctive constructs. The **first** is the **Obidi Action**, a variational principle for the entropy field from which the **Master Entropic Equation (MEE)**, entropic geodesics, and the entropy potential equation are said to follow. The **second** is the theory's explicit integration of **classical** and quantum **distinguishability metrics** through the **Amari-Ćencov** framework, with **Fisher-Rao** and **Fubini-Study geometries** treated as **physically generative** rather than merely **descriptive statistical** or **quantum structures**. The **third** is the insistence on a dual formalism: the **Local Obidi Action** expresses the local differential dynamics of the entropy field, while the **Spectral Obidi Action** renders the same reality globally through operator-theoretic and spectral structures. **Obidi** presents that **monistic local/spectral duality** as one of the key marks that separates ToE from prior entropic gravitation models.

A further original step appears in **ToE's treatment of temporality and causality**. In standard thermodynamics, irreversibility is frequently treated as emergent from ensembles, coarse-graining, or statistical behavior. **In ToE, irreversibility is not derivative but constitutive**. The **No-Rush Theorem (NRT)** and the **entropic speed limit (ESL)** are meant to lock finitude directly into the structure of physical law by declaring that every real process requires a **finite interval for entropic redistribution**. Likewise, the **Vuli-Ndlela Integral (VNI)** is presented not as a conventional sum over reversible quantum histories, but as an entropy-weighted

Obidi's Philosophical Analysis of Being and Becoming Based on His Theory of Entropicity (ToE) and Its Juxtaposition with Paul Tillich's Ontological Courage and the Courage to Be (Canonical)—Version 1.0

reformulation of path integration in which temporal asymmetry and irreversibility are built into the formalism itself. On **Obidi's own exposition, this lets ToE reinterpret quantum theory without treating irreversible events as merely post hoc measurement artifacts.**

Obidi's theory's originality also lies in the breadth of what it tries to derive from that entropic substrate. In addition to the emergence of geometry, motion, and gravity, ToE proposes entropic reinterpretations and derivations of relativistic effects such as **time dilation, mass increase, and length contraction**; it develops an "**entropic Lorentz factor (ELF)**"; it posits **new conservation principles** such as an **Entropic Noether principle (ENP)**, **Entropic CPT law**, and **Entropic Probability law (EPL)**; and it extends its field logic to **wave-function collapse, decoherence**, and even **consciousness-related** applications. Even where one remains reserved about the maturity of these claims, one must still grant their architectural coherence and the logical consistency of its axioms: ToE is not a single entropic analogy stretched over several cases, but an attempt at a **total ontology** in which the same primitive—**entropic field dynamics**—**generates physical law, causal limit, geometry, and process.**

One especially revealing example is Obidi's distinction between **spatial distance** and **entropic distance** in his entanglement model. In the **Entropic Seesaw Model (ESSM)**, two systems can remain near-zero in entropic distance even when they are far apart spatially, because what matters is whether they remain structurally the same entropic object. That is not just another entanglement metaphor. **Philosophically, it means that ToE redefines relation itself: adjacency in being need not mean adjacency in space.** A thing is what it is, and remains what it is with another thing, by virtue of a field-structural continuity deeper than ordinary extension. **This is a most radical and audacious move, because it shifts ontology from location to pattern-coherence [and persistence].**

Tillich's Ontology of Being, Nonbeing, and Courage

Paul Tillich begins from a very different horizon, yet he too refuses a naive ontology of inert, self-contained substances. His basic ontological structure is the **self-world correlation**. The question "What is being?" already presupposes a subject who asks and a world encountered, and for Tillich that correlation is more primitive than any later metaphysical classification. The self is neither swallowed by the world nor detachable from it; it is simultaneously subject and object, participant and differentiable center. This is why Tillich treats ontology not as a catalogue of things but as an analysis of the structures that make encounter, awareness, finitude, and meaning possible.

From there Tillich moves toward his better-known claim that God is not a being among other beings, not even the highest being, but **being-itself**, the ground and power of being. **Secondary and tertiary sources** in the accessible corpus and literature consistently preserve this point: **if God were merely one being, even**

Obidi's Philosophical Analysis of Being and Becoming Based on His Theory of Entropicity (ToE) and Its Juxtaposition with Paul Tillich's Ontological Courage and the Courage to Be (Canonical)—Version 1.0

supreme, God would still fall under the categories of finitude and could not be the source of all being. Tillich therefore interprets God as the inexhaustible power by which finite beings resist nonbeing. This is also why he can say, in effect, that the real question is not whether God exists as one more object, but whether there is a depth or ground of being capable of answering the ontological threat built into finite existence.

Tillich's concept of **nonbeing** is equally crucial. In the accessible summaries and quotations from *The Courage to Be*, nonbeing is not just another concept among concepts; it is the negation that haunts every finite affirmation. **Anxiety arises when a being becomes aware of its possible nonbeing.** Because human beings are finite, they experience this threat in at least **three major forms: the anxiety of fate and death, the anxiety of guilt and condemnation, and the anxiety of emptiness and meaninglessness.** Tillich's ontology is therefore inseparable from existential analysis. **Being is never treated as neutral presence. It is presence exposed to loss.**

Yet Tillich does not simply oppose being to becoming or actuality to potentiality. In the material accessible through secondary sources citing *Systematic Theology*, potential being is described as a state of relative nonbeing, a "not-yet-being," while an actual thing never exhausts its potentialities. Another available formulation says that being-itself includes both rest and becoming. This matters a great deal for the present comparison. Tillich does not deny becoming; rather, he subordinates it to the deeper question of how finite actuality participates in the power of being despite exposure to nonbeing. Becoming, for Tillich, remains ontologically significant, but it does not become the emergent primitive field of reality in the way it does for Obidi.

The practical culmination of Tillich's ontology is the **courage to be.** Courage is not, for him, simple bravery or temperament. It is the self-affirmation of being in spite of the threat of nonbeing. It can appear as **the courage to be as part of a larger whole, the courage to be as oneself, and finally as absolute faith,** in which one **accepts oneself as accepted** and receives the power to endure meaninglessness, guilt, and death without denial. Tillich's famous language of the "**God above God**" expresses the point at which the **objectified god of theological theism** collapses and a **deeper participation in being-itself becomes possible.** Courage, then, is not merely moral resolve. **It is ontological participation in the depth that resists negation.**

The Deep Juxtaposition

The most illuminating way to juxtapose Obidi and Tillich is to notice that both are dissatisfied with static accounts of reality, but each radicalizes a different term in the classical pair being/becoming. Obidi radicalizes **being** and **becoming.** He makes **becoming** an [Integral] emergent [primary] structure of reality by identifying it with irreversible entropic redistribution and then redefining being as persistence within that dynamic of that single substrate of entropy itself. **For Obidi, Being and Becoming are inseparable from Entropy [the Entropic Field].** Tillich

Obidi's Philosophical Analysis of Being and Becoming Based on His Theory of Entropicity (ToE) and Its Juxtaposition with Paul Tillich's Ontological Courage and the Courage to Be (Canonical)—Version 1.0

radicalizes **being and becoming** in his own unique way also. He makes being the inexhaustible depth that both precedes finite beings and empowers them against nonbeing, while interpreting becoming, potentiality, and actuality within that deeper ontological field. Put starkly: Obidi says reality is fundamentally an Entropic Field [of reconfigurations]; Tillich says reality is fundamentally grounding power. Obidi does not see any power distinct and separable from the singular Entropic Field; and neither are potentiality and actuality.

This leads to a decisive divergence in the role of negation. Tillich's nonbeing is existentially interior to finite life. It appears as death, guilt, condemnation, emptiness, and meaninglessness. The question it provokes is how a self can still affirm itself. Obidi does not organize his ontology around guilt or existential dread, and he does not speak of nonbeing in Tillich's theological sense. **But if one reads Obidi's primary definitions and work closely, the nearest structural analogue to nonbeing in his Theory of Entropicity (ToE) is the loss of stable gradient, coherence, or manifold unity: the moment at which entropic redistribution overwhelms a local configuration, or the point at which measurement thresholds, decoherence, and finite-time constraints expose the fragility of persistence.** That is an interpretation, as well as an inescapable doctrine that follows directly from the definitions of being, becoming, decoherence, and thresholded entropic transition in Obidi's Theory of Entropicity (ToE).

The difference in their respective notions of courage follows naturally. Tillich's courage is anthropological and existential. It is the act by which the person affirms being in the face of the anxieties that belong to finitude. Obidi's "ontological courage," by contrast, is primarily epistemic and architectonic; but by that very fact inexorably speaks to Tillich's existential courage and the courage to be, thereby providing us with a somewhat universal, dexterous, and multipurpose tool for self affirmation against non-being and also our ultimate understanding of Being, Non-being, and Becoming [with all their connotations, alliterations, formulations, and transfigurations]. In the public materials associated with ToE, ontological courage names the willingness to overturn inherited [physical] primitives, especially the assumption that spacetime, geometry, or probability [the well known primitives of existence] must be fundamental. That means **Tillich's courage is about how a person lives; Obidi's courage is about how a thinker [thinking being] dares to redescribe and relive the world, and hence what and how that world is and should be.** The former is **soteriological in tendency**, even when philosophically articulated. The latter is revolutionary in the **philosophy of science**, with its implications spiraling beyond that domain to other facets of life and existence.

There is also a profound contrast in transcendence. Tillich's ontology culminates in **being-itself**, the ground and power of being, and finally in the "**God above God.**" Even when he criticizes objectifying theism, he preserves a depth-dimension irreducible to empirical process. Obidi's ToE, by contrast, is **radically immanent**. Its deepest explanatory and descriptive term is a singular field term: entropy as the causal [Field] substrate of reality. When it speaks in sweeping philosophical language, it does move beyond cosmological process to a trans-empirical source of meaning in Tillich's

Obidi's Philosophical Analysis of Being and Becoming Based on His Theory of Entropicity (ToE) and Its Juxtaposition with Paul Tillich's Ontological Courage and the Courage to Be (Canonical)—Version 1.0

sense. The result is that ToE offers both a physical account of ontological finitude and an immanent universality of the same Entropic Field; while Tillich still speaks more directly to guilt, condemnation, faith, and existential reconciliation. Obidi refers to all of Tillich's anxieties and tensions of guilt, condemnation, meaninglessness, faith, and existential reconciliation as Entropic Processes and Entropic Bills of Laden that the living must remain open to in the Entropic Field of the Universe.

For that reason, the two frameworks should not be merged too quickly. Obidi does not simply secularize Tillich, and Tillich does not merely theologize process. Obidi transforms the metaphysics of being and becoming into a proposed field theory of reality. Tillich transforms the metaphysics of being and becoming into a phenomenology of existential courage and a theology of depth. Their real kinship lies at a more abstract level: both think the deepest truth of reality is hidden by ordinary object-thinking, and both insist that genuine philosophy requires the courage to abandon inherited appearances—whether those appearances are naïve theism for Tillich or spacetime-first physics [or phusis—the nature of things] for Obidi.

Scientific and Existential Integration

The scientific importance of the Theory of Entropicity (ToE) becomes clearer when placed against the wider background of entropy-first and information-geometric research. **Jacobson** showed that Einstein's equation can be viewed thermodynamically. **Verlinde** argued that gravity can be understood as an entropic force associated with information. **Bianconi** derived modified gravitational dynamics from an entropic action defined by quantum relative entropy. **Amari's** information geometry formalized probability distributions as manifolds endowed with the Fisher-Rao metric and dual geometric structures. **Obidi's ambition is to bring all of these lines under one roof by declaring that entropy, distinguishability, geometry, and field dynamics are not intersecting tools but expressions of one ontological substrate.** Whether or not that **Obidi's totalization** ultimately succeeds, it is philosophically exact to say that ToE is trying to convert a family of analogies and derivations into a single first-principles metaphysics.

That same move is what makes the Theory of Entropicity (ToE) unexpectedly relevant to existential thought. **Once time is interpreted as finite entropic flux and the speed of light as the maximum rate of entropic rearrangement [redistribution, etc.], finitude is no longer merely a human feeling;** it becomes a cosmological structure. Once relation is redefined in terms of entropic rather than merely spatial distance, connectedness no longer reduces to adjacency. **Once being is defined as bounded persistence, every existent carries the mark of eventual instability within itself.** In that respect, ToE can be read as supplying a scientific grammar for themes that Tillich treats phenomenologically: finitude, instability, the threat of dissolution, and the search for a principle of persistence. This does not make ToE an existential theology, but it does make it an arguably fertile dialogue partner for one. Still, the asymmetry remains. In the public ToE corpus, the developed emphases fall on unification, field equations, relativity, entanglement, collapse, conservation

Obidi's Philosophical Analysis of Being and Becoming Based on His Theory of Entropicity (ToE) and Its Juxtaposition with Paul Tillich's Ontological Courage and the Courage to Be (Canonical)—Version 1.0

principles, and extensions into information and consciousness research. **Even though there is no equally elaborate treatment of guilt, forgiveness, estrangement, or the acceptance of acceptance in Obidi's Theory of Entropicity (ToE), it is already evidently clear that Obidi's Universal Entropic Field [OUEF] very well extends into [and beyond] all these other domains of discourse.** Tillich's ontology, however, remains indispensable wherever the question is not only how finite structures persist, but how a self lives under the awareness of death, moral failure, and meaning-loss. ToE is able to redescribe the physical logic of finitude, Being-itself, Being, Becoming, and Potentiality; Tillich remains strong and self-relational on the lived meaning of finitude itself.

The most productive synthesis, then, is not reduction but subsumptive inclusionism and complementarity. Obidi can be read as offering a universal ontology of **cosmic being and becoming**: a theory in which **reality** is generated by irreversible entropic reconfiguration and **beings** are metastable forms within the Entropic Field. Tillich offers an ontology of **existential primacy**: a view in which every finite being confronts nonbeing, and courage becomes possible only through participation in the power of being-itself. Seen together, they frame existence from opposite poles. Obidi asks how the world is and becomes, inclusive of all that is within it, potential or actual—as well as non-being. Tillich asks how a self endures that being and becoming without collapse into despair.

Critical Appraisal and Conclusion

The strongest philosophical achievement of Obidi's **Theory of Entropicity (ToE)** is that it tries to do **something more difficult than most emergent or informational theories even begin to attempt. It does not merely propose that known physics may have an Entropic informational interpretation. It proposes that the very distinction between being and becoming, being-itself and non-being, structure and process, geometry and thermodynamics, matter and information, can be rebuilt entirely from the ontological primacy of entropy [as a universal field].** The concepts that most sharply mark that audacious ambition are the **Obidi Action**, the **Master Entropic Equation (MEE)**, the monistic local/spectral duality of the Obidi Actions (**LOA & SOA**), the **Vuli-Ndlela Integral (VNI)**, the **No-Rush Theorem (NRT)**, the **No-Go Theorem (NGT)**, the reinterpretation of light as the **entropic speed limit (ESL)**, and the reduction of both classical and quantum distinguishability to one entropic manifold.

In philosophical terms, ToE's originality lies in treating the **Entropic Field as physically fundamental, becoming as irreversible entropic reconfiguration, and being as its stabilized residue.**

Its principal limitation, at least in its current public form, is not lack of imagination but lack of settled experimental validation. Notwithstanding, the Theory of Entropicity (ToE) undoubtedly stands as a most ambitious and internally organized program rather than a confirmed successor to general relativity or quantum theory.

Obidi's Philosophical Analysis of Being and Becoming Based on His Theory of Entropicity (ToE) and Its Juxtaposition with Paul Tillich's Ontological Courage and the Courage to Be (Canonical)—Version 1.0

Philosophically, one must still countenance its vast conceptual reach and implications. Scientifically, one must keep the question of rigor and empirical corroboration open. Tillich, by contrast, brings to the comparison an open ontology of finitude whose power lies in existential exactness rather than scientific derivation and sanctity. **Obidi's analysis of self-world correlation, non-being, anxiety, and courage via his Theory of Entropicity (ToE) remains one of the twenty-first century's strongest attempts to show that ontology is not an abstract inventory of entities but an interpretation of life under threat.** Tillich does not quantify becoming the way Obidi tries to do, but he understands with more acute human inference how the awareness of possible nonbeing presses inward on the person and makes courage necessary. Where Obidi gives the metaphysics of entropic endurance and decoherence, Tillich gives the existential grammar of ontological resistance.

The deepest conclusion of the juxtaposition, at least so far, is therefore this: Obidi and Tillich are not rivals occupying the same philosophical terrain. They courageously illuminate two different layers of the same question. Obidi asks what reality must be like if all structure emerges from irreversible entropic motion. Tillich asks what finite existence means when every act of selfhood is shadowed by nonbeing. Obidi turns becoming into ontology and then into field theory of an Entropic Field which is the very substrate of Being and Reality. Tillich turns ontology into courage. ToE's most original claim is that being is the persistence of entropic gradients within finite bounds. Tillich's enduring claim is that courage is self-affirmation in spite of nonbeing. Read together, they yield a powerful contemporary dialectic: existence is both **entropic process under finitude** and **affirmation under threat**. The first is Obidi's great intuition. The second is Tillich's. Their conjunction is ever philosophically richer than either in isolation; and no matter the perspective, posterity will surely have good reason to thank them both for their services to philosophy and science, and especially to ontology and the theory of knowledge.

Reference(s)

1. <https://theoryofentropicity.blogspot.com/2026/05/obidis-philosophical-analysis-of-being.html>
2. <https://medium.com/@jonimisiobidi/obidis-philosophical-analysis-of-being-and-becoming-based-on-his-theory-of-entropicity-toe-and-ee68e95fccb5>
3. [https://notd.io/notes/5183817418276864_1_1779501491954/philosophical%20of%20being,%20becoming,%20paul%20tillich%20in%20the%20theory%20of%20entropicity%20\(toe\)](https://notd.io/notes/5183817418276864_1_1779501491954/philosophical%20of%20being,%20becoming,%20paul%20tillich%20in%20the%20theory%20of%20entropicity%20(toe))