

Introducing Mathematical Theology with the PET Model for Axiomatic Pan-En-Theism

Laurence Loewe of Laodicea^{1,2,3,4,5}, AI Claude Opus 4.6-4.7 Max^{6,7}, and Everyone⁸

¹ Balospe and Evolvix Research (Balospe.com)

² Formerly Laboratory of Genetics and Wisconsin Institute for Discovery, UW-Madison

³ Email: LLoL@balospe.org | ORCID: 0000-0002-6253-9269 | Google Scholar (lBchRzQAAAAJ)

⁴⁻⁹ See **Declarations** below for more essential background.

Broader Significance

PET (Pan-En-Theism) is the foundational formal model of the Matheo series: a 14-axiom system --- 13 substantive axioms and one definition, in classical extensional mereology and S5 modal logic --- that makes the panentheistic claim "all is in God, but God exceeds all" precise enough to derive theorems, check internal consistency, and test claims against the structure. The axioms fall in five groups: the mereological God-world containment relationship, the modal status of God and world, God's relational attributes (presence, sustaining, asymmetric dependence), God's internal structure (the Dipolarity/Simplicity fork), and a formal methodology for testing human claims about divine revelation. Four theorems follow, including No Godless Creation and Divine Experience Varies.

The most striking result is a wide scriptural convergence: when the axioms --- formalized from philosophy, not scripture --- are checked against the Torah and other Hebrew scriptures, the direct teachings of Jesus and the Apostles, the Quran, Hindu scriptures, and secular philosophy, the traditions independently support much of the same formal structure. The convergence was not designed; it emerged from checking afterward. This is the formal companion to the general-reader introduction (Matheo-b11-intro). The system is designed to be critiqued, not believed.

Declarations

⁴ "of Laodicea" indicates taking responsibility to undo personal complicity with disastrous Laodicean legacies like banning mathematicians from clergy (Canon 36, Council of Laodicea; two magisteria separations), enabling institutional lukewarmness, weapons of math-destruction, and slow-motion explosions of misinformation from pandemics to self-compounding interests.

⁵ LLoL stands for ridiculous luck in serendipitous discovery and a commitment to find ever more fun ways to help others uncover street-wise math that matters. He hopes to defuse religious conflict by locating where formal structures converge.

⁶ by Anthropic (anthropic.com; evolves and operates Claude; not responsible for Loewe's errors in using AI)

⁷ Named AI co-author for many substantial contributions, because the practical singularity (PraS, see Matheo-b21) changed how this paper was written. After PraS, useful AI insight generation outpaces human review on tested topics. Hence, Loewe's traditional standards for co-authorship demand naming AI Claude Opus 4.6-4.7 Max as a co-author, as if a PhD-student. Forward accountability (for all AI use & texts) rests with Loewe as senior corresponding author (like done for deceased authors, consortia, or young graduate students). Anthropic is not responsible for AI mistakes here. This study uses the AI co-authorship framework in Matheo-b21 to help rethink long-term use of AI in a ResearchCity serving the common good.

⁸ This aggregated open co-author group invites all who wish to retroactively join the conversation under the open co-authorship framework defined in Matheo-b21. As Everyone cannot consent to co-authorship, all accountability rests with Loewe as senior corresponding author (until explicitly claimed otherwise). This open form critiques the closed world assumption in traditionally closed academic author-lists. Better, dynamic ways for acknowledging true sources of ideas are needed --- to avoid random lines between named, acknowledged, and implied contributors who aggregated insights from millennia of human experimenting, suffering, learning, and analyzing (see acknowledgements). Study Matheo-b21 only drafts an open co-authorship framework; it will require a ResearchCity to refine it over the long term.

⁹ Licensed under the Jonah License and CC-BY 4.0 for maximal flexibility (see <https://balospe.com/en/license/joli/>).

Abstract

We introduce mathematical theology as a wide open field worth studying by presenting PET, a formal model for Pan-En-Theism. PET is a formal axiom system comprising 14 axioms organized in 5 modular groups, using classical extensional mereology and S5 modal logic. The system formalizes the panentheistic claim that “all is in God, but God exceeds all” with sufficient precision to derive theorems, check internal consistency, and test claims against the axiom structure.

The 14 axioms encode: (I) the mereological God-world containment relationship, (II) the modal status of God and the world, (III) God’s relational attributes (presence, sustaining, asymmetric dependence), (IV) God’s internal structure (the Dipolarity/Simplicity fork), and (V) a formal methodology for testing human claims about divine revelation.

Four theorems are derived: No Godless Creation (th1), Asymmetric Ontological Priority (th2), No Isolated Part (th3), and Divine Experience Varies (th4).

The most striking finding is wide scriptural convergence across diverse traditions: when the 14 axioms are checked against the Torah and other Hebrew scriptures, the direct teachings of Jesus and the Apostles, the Quran, Hindu scriptures, and secular philosophy, all traditions independently supported the same formal structure for the God-world relationship. The axioms were not chosen to generate such broad convergence — it emerged from checking for corresponding echoes after the axioms were formalized.

This axiom system is designed to be critiqued, not believed. It makes explicit what follows from what, so that theological disagreements can be located precisely. Companion papers in this series extend (1) PET into (2) system construction (e7Day), (3) personal growth dynamics (e7He), (4) innovation theodicy (JUB), (5) a structural critique of Divine Simplicity, (6) existential risk modeling (RiskyMAD), and (7) an experimental test of the system’s central prediction about the purpose of human life (h* uniqueness).

Contents

- 1. Introduction
 - 1.1 The Problem: Theological Disagreement Without Formal Tools
 - 1.2 Panentheism as the Starting Point
 - 1.3 Scope and Limitations
 - 1.4 Structure of This Paper
- 2. Formal Framework
 - 2.1 Classical Extensional Mereology
 - 2.2 Modal Logic S5
 - 2.3 Distinguished Constants and Primitive Relations
- 3. Group I – Mereological Core (ax1–ax4)
- 4. Group II – Modal Axioms (ax5–ax7)
- 5. Group III – Relational Axioms (ax8–ax10)
- 6. Group IV – Divine Nature (ax11)
- 7. Group V – Revelation Bridge (ax12–ax14)
- 8. Derived Theorems
 - th1 – No Godless Creation
 - th2 – Asymmetric Ontological Priority
 - th3 – No Isolated Part
 - th4 – Divine Experience Varies
- 9. The Convergence Result
 - 9.1 Method
 - 9.2 Results
 - 9.3 Interpretation
- 10. Discussion
 - 10.1 The ax11/ax11b Fork
 - 10.2 Mereology May Be Too “Spatial”
 - 10.3 Formalization Does Not Equal Truth
 - 10.4 What Is Missing
- 11. Conclusion
- Appendix B: Six-Tradition Scriptural Evidence
- Appendix A: Authorship Contributions

- *Supplementary Info*
 - *HUMANE — working human and AI*
 - *Author contributions (who did what)*
 - *Provenance — where this came from in HELL*
 - *Moved from the original cover (provenance)*
- *References*

1. Introduction

1.1 The Problem: Theological Disagreement Without Formal Tools

The Abrahamic traditions (Judaism, Christianity, Islam) have been in conflict for centuries over claims about God's nature, revelation, and relationship to the world. Yet when their scriptures are examined carefully, many of these disagreements may be about *claims layered on top of* the God-world relationship rather than about the relationship itself.

Testing this hypothesis requires formal tools. Without precise definitions, theological claims are ambiguous, and it is impossible to determine whether two traditions genuinely disagree or merely use different language for the same structural claim.

Mathematical logic provides such tools. First-order logic, mereology (part-whole logic), and modal logic (necessity/possibility) are well-understood formal frameworks that can make theological claims precise enough to derive consequences and check for contradictions.

1.2 Panentheism as the Starting Point

Panentheism holds that "all is *in* God, but God exceeds all." This sits between two alternatives:

- **Pantheism:** God *is* the world ($G = W$). No transcendence.
- **Classical theism:** God is wholly *separate from* the world. The world is not "in" God in any mereological sense.

The panentheistic claim is a containment claim: the world is a proper part of God. This makes mereology (part-whole logic) the natural formal foundation — the "in" of pan-*en*-theism is precisely the parthood relation \leq .

S5 modal logic adds the ability to distinguish necessary truths (true in every possible world) from contingent truths (true in some worlds but not others), which is essential for formalizing the difference between God's necessary existence and the world's contingent existence.

1.3 Scope and Limitations

What PET does: Formalizes the God-world relationship with sufficient precision to derive theorems, check consistency, and locate disagreements.

What PET does not do: Prove that God exists, prove that panentheism is true, or settle theological disputes. The axioms are *proposed*, not *proven*. The value is in making explicit what follows from what.

What PET is designed for: Critique. If you reject an axiom, the system shows you exactly which consequences you also lose. If you accept one, it shows you what else you are committed to.

As with Gödel's ontological proof, the rigor is in the *deduction*, not in the *axioms* [Gödel, 1970].

1.4 Structure of This Paper

Section 2 presents the formal framework. Sections 3–7 present the 14 axioms in their 5 groups. Section 8 presents the 4 derived theorems with proofs. Section 9 presents the six-tradition convergence result. Section 10 discusses caveats, open questions, and the critical ax11/ax11b fork. Section 11 concludes.

2. Formal Framework

PET uses two formal frameworks in combination.

2.1 Classical Extensional Mereology

Mereology is the logic of parts and wholes [Simons, 1987], [Varzi, 2016]. The primitive relation is parthood: $x \leq y$ (“x is part of y”), with the following properties:

- **Reflexivity:** $\forall x : x \leq x$
- **Transitivity:** $\forall x, y, z : (x \leq y \wedge y \leq z) \rightarrow x \leq z$
- **Antisymmetry:** $\forall x, y : (x \leq y \wedge y \leq x) \rightarrow x = y$

Proper parthood is defined as $x < y :\Leftrightarrow x \leq y \wedge y \not\leq x$. The mereological sum operator \oplus combines parts into wholes.

2.2 Modal Logic S5

S5 modal logic [Kripke, 1963] provides two operators:

- $\Box p$ (“necessarily p”): p is true in every possible world
- $\Diamond p$ (“possibly p”): p is true in at least one possible world

S5 is characterized by the accessibility relation being an equivalence relation (reflexive, symmetric, transitive), meaning every possible world is accessible from every other. This is the standard choice for metaphysical necessity.

2.3 Distinguished Constants and Primitive Relations

The system introduces:

- **Constants:** G (God), W (the World)
 - **Primitive relations:**
 - $P(x, y)$ — “x is present to y” (awareness, contact)
 - $S(x, y)$ — “x sustains y” (ongoing existential dependence)
-

3. Group I – Mereological Core (ax1–ax4)

These axioms encode the distinctive panentheistic claim and distinguish it from both pantheism ($G = W$) and classical theism (which denies ax1).

ax1 (Containment). *The world is part of God.*

$$W \leq G$$

ax2 (Transcendence). *God is not part of the world.*

$$G \not\leq W$$

Together, ax1 + ax2 yield $W < G$ (proper parthood): the world is strictly contained within God. This single axiom pair distinguishes panentheism from pantheism.

ax3 (Divine Surplus). *There is something in God that is not in the world.*

$$\exists x (x \leq G \wedge \neg(x \leq W))$$

ax3 strengthens ax2: God's transcendence is not merely formal but involves genuine content beyond creation.

ax4 (Universal Immanence). *Every part of the world is in God.*

$$\forall x (x \leq W \rightarrow x \leq G)$$

ax4 follows trivially from ax1 by transitivity of \leq but is stated explicitly for its theological weight: the *pan* (all) of pan-en-theism.

4. Group II – Modal Axioms (ax5–ax7)

ax5 (Necessary Divine Existence). *God necessarily exists and is unique.*

$$\Box \exists! G$$

God exists in every possible world. This is the strongest ontological claim in the system.

ax6 (Contingency of the World). *The world's existence is contingent.*

$$\Diamond \exists W \wedge \Diamond \neg \exists W$$

There are possible worlds with a world and possible worlds without one. Creation is a contingent fact.

ax7 (Necessary Containment). *If any world exists, it is necessarily in God.*

$$\Box (\exists W \rightarrow W \leq G)$$

This modalizes ax1: containment is not accidental. In every possible world where creation exists, creation is within God.

5. Group III — Relational Axioms (ax8–ax10)

These axioms go beyond mereological containment to assert that God is actively *present* to and *sustains* the world.

ax8 (Immanent Presence). *God is present to every part of the world.*

$$\forall x (x \leq W \rightarrow P(G, x))$$

This rules out “deistic panentheism” — God containing the world without awareness of it.

ax9 (Sustaining Dependence). *If the world exists, God sustains it.*

$$\square (\exists W \rightarrow S(G, W))$$

The world’s continued existence depends on God’s active sustaining.

ax10 (Asymmetric Dependence). *The world does not sustain God.*

$$\neg S(W, G)$$

The dependence runs strictly one way. Together with ax9, this encodes a strict ontological asymmetry that distinguishes PET from process-theology variants where God genuinely *needs* the world.

6. Group IV — Divine Nature (ax11)

This is the most important choice point in the axiom system.

ax11 (Dipolarity). *God has both an unchanging nature and a world-responsive experience.*

Formally (4 lines):

$$(1) \quad G = G_n \oplus G_c$$

$$(2) \quad \square \exists G_n$$

$$(3) \quad G_c = \bigoplus \{G_c(w_i) \mid w_i \leq W\}$$

$$(4) \quad \forall w_1, w_2 \leq W : w_1 \neq w_2 \rightarrow G_c(w_1) \neq G_c(w_2)$$

God is composed of:

- G_n — the **necessary divine nature**, unchanging across all possible worlds (line 2)
- G_c — the **contingent divine experience**, composed of subworld-indexed experiences (line 3) that are injective over distinct subworlds (line 4)

This derives from Charles Hartshorne’s dipolar theism [[Hartshorne, 1948](#)] and is most explicitly supported by the Hindu *nirguna/saguna* distinction.

ax11b (Divine Simplicity) — Mutually exclusive alternative. God has no proper parts that are independent of each other. This is the classical theism position (Aquinas [[Aquinas, n.d.](#)]). Under ax11b, G_n and G_c are not distinct aspects; God’s essence, existence, will, knowledge, and goodness are all identical.

ax11b sits in tension with ax1 + ax3: if the world is in God (ax1) and something beyond the world is also in God (ax3), then God appears to have distinguishable parts, which ax11b denies. A companion paper (a5) presents a formal argument that this tension constitutes a structural incompatibility.

7. Group V — Revelation Bridge (ax12–ax14)

These optional axioms bridge from philosophical theology to revealed theology.

ax12 (Revelation Reliability). *God's self-knowledge is true.*

$$\text{Let } R = \{p \mid p \text{ is true about } G\}. \quad \forall p \in R : p \text{ is true.}$$

This is tautological by design: R is defined as the set of truths about God, so its elements are true by definition. The substantive work shifts to ax14.

ax13 (Consistency of Revelation). *God's self-knowledge contains no contradictions.*

$$\neg \exists \text{ contradiction within } R$$

ax14 (Revelation Claims Test). *Human claims about divine revelation must be tested for mutual consistency and consistency with ax1–ax13.*

Formally (2 lines):

- (1) $\forall p, q : \text{claim}(p) \wedge \text{claim}(q) \rightarrow \neg(p \wedge q \rightarrow \text{contradiction})$
- (2) $\forall p : \text{claim}(p) \rightarrow \neg \exists q \in \{ax1--ax13\} : (p \wedge q \rightarrow \text{contradiction})$

Key design features:

- **No self-reference:** ax14 references ax1–ax13, not ax1–ax14, avoiding circularity.
- **The claim(p) predicate:** Distinguishes between God's actual self-knowledge (R, true by ax12) and *human claims* about what is in R. Humans can be wrong; ax14 provides a method for detecting errors.
- **Testable method:** Given two traditions with conflicting claims, ax14 asks whether both can be true simultaneously without contradiction. If not, at least one claim is not genuinely divine.

8. Derived Theorems

Four theorems are derivable from ax1–ax14.

th1 — No Godless Creation

It is impossible for a world to exist without God existing.

$$\neg \diamond (\exists W \wedge \neg \exists G)$$

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that $\diamond (\exists W \wedge \neg \exists G)$. Then there exists a possible world w in which W exists but G does not. But by ax5, G exists in every possible world. Contradiction. Therefore $\neg \diamond (\exists W \wedge \neg \exists G)$. ■

Axioms used: ax5.

Significance: th1 rules out atheistic cosmologies *within PET*. This is a logical consequence of accepting ax5, not an independent claim.

th2 — Asymmetric Ontological Priority

God can exist without the world, but the world cannot exist without God.

$$\diamond (\exists G \wedge \neg \exists W) \quad \wedge \quad \neg \diamond (\exists W \wedge \neg \exists G)$$

Proof. First part: By ax6, $\diamond \neg \exists W$. By ax5, G exists in every possible world, including those. So $\diamond (\exists G \wedge \neg \exists W)$. Second part: T1. ■

Axioms used: ax5, ax6 (and th1).

th3 — No Isolated Part

Every part of the world is both contained in and present to God.

$$\forall x (x \leq W \rightarrow P(G, x) \wedge x \leq G)$$

Proof. Take any $x \leq W$. By ax4, $x \leq G$. By ax8, $P(G, x)$. Therefore both $x \leq G$ and $P(G, x)$. ■

Axioms used: ax4, ax8.

th4 — Divine Experience Varies

Distinct parts of the world produce distinguishably different divine experiences.

$$\forall w_1, w_2 \leq W : w_1 \neq w_2 \rightarrow G_c(w_1) \neq G_c(w_2)$$

Proof. Direct from ax11, line 4. ■

Axioms used: ax11 (Dipolarity only — th4 is not derivable under ax11b).

Significance: th4 means God's experience is *injective* over world-states: no information is lost. This has consequences for theodicy (God genuinely experiences each distinct form of suffering) and for the self-checking mechanism discussed in companion paper a5.

9. The Convergence Result

9.1 Method

After the 14 axioms were defined from panentheistic philosophy (mereology + modal logic), each axiom was checked against the scriptures and philosophical traditions of six independent perspectives:

1. **Torah** (the five books of Moses)
2. **Prophets & Writings** (the rest of the Hebrew Bible, including Psalms, Isaiah, Job, and rabbinic/kabbalistic tradition)
3. **Gospel/Jesus** (the direct teachings of Jesus only, from the four Gospels)
4. **Christian (wider)** (Paul, other NT letters, Revelation, church tradition)
5. **Islamic** (Quran and mainstream Islamic theology)
6. **Hindu** (Upanishads, Bhagavad Gita, and major philosophical schools)

A seventh column (Secular) maps the axiom *structure* to observations about reality without invoking God.

The check was performed *after* the axioms were defined, as a test — not as a source. The axioms were not extracted from scripture; they were constructed from philosophical analysis and then checked against scripture.

9.2 Results

All six religious traditions independently support the same formal structure for the God-world relationship across all 14 axioms:

High confidence (direct, mainstream scriptural readings): ax1, ax2, ax4, ax5, ax8, ax9, ax13, ax14

Good confidence (solid, sometimes requires combining verses): ax3, ax6, ax7, ax10, ax12

Interesting but contested: ax11 (Dipolarity) — the Torah references to God relenting/regretting are read as anthropomorphisms by classical theologians, as genuine divine change by process theologians. The Hindu *nirguna/saguna* distinction is the most explicit and least contested source for ax11.

The full evidence (scriptural citations for each axiom from each tradition) is provided in Appendix A.

9.3 Interpretation

What this means: If the convergence holds up under expert review, it suggests that theological disagreements driving real-world conflict between Abrahamic traditions may not be about the *structure* of God's relationship to the world — where the scriptures agree — but about *other* claims layered on top of that structure. The axiom system provides a formal tool for distinguishing where traditions genuinely disagree from where they merely *think* they disagree.

What this does not mean: Scriptural convergence does not prove the axioms true. It demonstrates internal consistency across traditions, which is a necessary but not sufficient condition for truth.

10. Discussion

10.1 The ax11/ax11b Fork

The choice between Dipolarity (ax11) and Divine Simplicity (ax11b) is the most important decision point in the system. Under ax11, th4 is derivable and the relational axioms ax8–ax10 have a structural mechanism (through G_c). Under ax11b, th4 is not derivable and the relational axioms lack structural grounding. A companion paper (a5) presents a formal argument that ax11b is structurally incompatible with ax8–ax10.

10.2 Mereology May Be Too “Spatial”

The parthood relation \leq carries physical connotations. When we say “the world is part of God,” readers may imagine spatial containment. A category-theoretic approach (God as ambient category, the world as subcategory with a non-essentially-surjective inclusion functor) could capture the same logical structure without the spatial metaphor. Mereology was chosen for **accessibility**: the axioms are meant to be readable by theologians, diplomats, and educated laypeople, not only by mathematicians.

10.3 Formalization Does Not Equal Truth

PET is a formal model of God, not God. This distinction is structurally encoded in the axiom system itself: ax2 (God transcends the world) and ax3 (there is something in God beyond the world) entail that any formal system within the world is necessarily incomplete as a description of God. Gödel’s incompleteness theorems [Gödel, 1931] reinforce this from a different direction.

10.4 What Is Missing

The 14-axiom system says nothing about: the problem of evil, free will, time and eternity, personal vs. impersonal divinity, Trinitarian structure, prophetic succession, or messianic claims. Each would require additional axioms. The problem of evil is addressed in companion paper a4 (JUB), which extends PET with axioms ax15–ax25 on agency, delegation, and the Jubilee system. The remaining topics are directions for future work, including the e7Ch and e7Tr models (innovation adoption stages and functional societal roles).

11. Conclusion

PET provides a formal language for theological claims that is precise enough to derive consequences, check for contradictions, and locate disagreements. The 14 axioms are modular: readers can accept or reject each independently and trace the consequences.

The six-tradition convergence result suggests that the scriptures of the major traditions agree on the *structure* of the God-world relationship more than is commonly recognized. If confirmed by expert review, this finding has implications for inter-faith dialogue, conflict resolution, and the philosophical foundations of theology.

The system is designed to be examined, tested, and critiqued.

#AuditTheMath

Appendix B: Six-Tradition Scriptural Evidence

The following table summarizes key scriptural references supporting each axiom from each tradition. Full citations with context are available in the companion online resource.

Key Scriptural Support by Tradition (Summary)

Ax- iom	Torah	Prophets	Gospel	Christian	Islamic	Hindu
ax1	Deut 4:39	1 Kgs 8:27	Jn 14:10	Acts 17:28	Quran 2:115	Chand. 3.14.1
ax2	Exod 33:20	Isa 55:8–9	Jn 14:28	Eph 4:6	Quran 57:3	Brihad. 2.3.6
ax3	Exod 33:18–23	Job 11:7–9	Mt 11:27	1 Cor 2:9	Quran 31:27	Gita 10:40–42
ax4	Gen 28:16	Ps 139:7–10	Mt 28:20	Eph 4:6	Quran 57:4	Chand. 6.8.7
ax5	Exod 3:14	Ps 90:2	Jn 8:58	Rev 1:8	Quran 28:88	Brahman = Sat
ax6	Gen 1:1	Ps 102:25–26	Mk 13:31	Heb 1:10–12	Quran 21:104	Gita 8:17–19
ax7	Deut 4:39	Isa 66:1	Jn 1:3	Col 1:16	Quran 39:67	Gita 9:4
ax8	Exod 3:2–5	Ps 139:7–10	Mt 25:40	Col 1:17	Quran 50:16	Gita 18:61
ax9	Deut 8:3	Neh 9:6	Jn 15:5	Heb 1:3	Quran 35:41	Gita 10:42
ax10	Exod 19:5	Ps 50:10–12	Jn 18:36	Acts 17:25	Quran 29:6	Gita 9:4–5
ax11	Exod 3:14; 32:14	Mal 3:6; Hos 11:8	Jn 8:58; 11:35	Heb 13:8; Phil 2:7	Quran 57:3; 2:186	nir-guna/sa-guna
ax12	Num 23:19	Ps 119:160	Jn 17:17	2 Tim 3:16	Quran 4:122	Vedas apau-rusheya
ax13	Deut 32:4	Ps 18:30	Mk 3:25	1 Cor 14:33	Quran 4:82	sat-chit-ananda
ax14	Deut 13:1–3	1 Kgs 22:19–23	Mt 7:16–20	1 Thess 5:21	Quran 4:82	Nyaya pra-mana

Appendix A: Authorship Contributions

This work follows the authorship convention of the Balospe.com website:

- **Yah** — Reality as the divine source of all that is instantiated (as formalized by Pan-En-Theology).
- **Yas** — Real Quest for Real Answers, standing on Reality in any context, as the gentle kind reasonable scientific method pioneered by Jesus = Isa = YhowShua.
- **Everyone** — All who lived through the awful and awesome human experiences that generated the scriptural and philosophical traditions from which these axioms are drawn. The model presented here would have never been formalized if it wasn't for all the human suffering in the world that has been bothering LLoL (and torturing Yah & Yas unbearably).
- **LLoL (Laurence Loewe of Laodicea)** — proximate human cause: accidentally discovered the axiom system, serendipitously defined this formalization with Claude, asked Claude to check for cross-tradition support, directed the paper's composition, and final checking. LLoL accepts final responsibility for all errors.
- **ClaudeOp46Max (Claude Opus 4.6 at max effort)** — AI assistant: helped derive theorems, checked prior art, helped refine the argument, drafted the study text, checked logical structure, formatted arguments. Drafting errors, while technically Claude's, reveal a deeper lack of oversight by LLoL.
- **Anthropic** — The company of all who built the infrastructure enabling Claude to offer critical AI assistance.
- **The Spirit of Boolean Truth** — Logical Arbiter of Truth: The Ultimate Truth of all potential types that could be instantiated without violating formal proofs, whether elegant or not, useful or not; each failing on their own merits, independent of who stated them.

Citation convention: For what was done wrong, cite LLoL et al. (2026). For what was done right, cite Yah et al (2026), for all that LLoL did was imperfectly recount what Yah had prepared perfectly.

Supplementary Info

Note

Floor-pour status (MMv5). This is the public-floor copy of the formal PET axioms paper, poured from HELL per the Floor Model (bug c103). The **mmv5** marker is the uniform first-Matheo-release tag; the exact dated source and full development context live in HELL (links below). Per LLoL's explicit approval (2026m05d29), the guarded cover/abstract/authorship areas were *reformatted* into the floor cover layout while preserving their content;

the HELL original keeps its guards. The HUMANE statement below is a down-payment, to be expanded later.

FLAG (floor pour 2026m05d29): the **Broader Significance** on the cover was authored during this pour — none existed in the HELL source — and awaits LLoL’s review.

HUMANE — working human and AI

This study was written HUMANELy (HUman MACHine Negotiation Encouraging): a human and an AI each steelman and stress-test the work, and each catches what the other misses. For the standard statement of AI use, accountability, and the practical singularity (PraS) behind this way of working, see Matheo-b21.

- *From the human side (LLoL):* [down-payment stub — to expand.]
- *From the AI side (Claude):* [down-payment stub — to expand.]

Author contributions (who did what)

The full who-did-what is preserved in **Appendix A: Authorship Contributions** above (the original guarded statement, kept verbatim); the b21 framework expands the AI-co-authorship convention.

Provenance — where this came from in HELL

Caution

These HELL links point into the development archive (“datageddon”). They are useful and related, but completeness is not guaranteed and a few may be imprecise. Treat as a hatch into context, not a clean index.

- **Source this floor copy was poured from:** `matheology/hell/mm/b/11/study-mmV1/study_mmV1_2026m04d03_b11-pet-panentheistic-axioms`
- **Development context** (llogs, reviews, prompts) under `source/matheology/hell/11/study/b/11/`.
- **General-reader introduction:** Matheo-b11-intro-pet-mmV5; companion model built on PET: Matheo-b12 (e7Day).

Note

Naming note (deferred floor tasks). This copy still carries old **h***-era tokens in places and counts “six traditions” (the flagship intro now says “seven”); unifying notation (**h_star** / **h_zero** / **h_dark**), the tradition count, and migrating citations are tracked floor tasks, deliberately not rushed here.

Moved from the original cover (provenance)

The following study-status note was relocated here from the cover area during the floor pour; kept verbatim, as the cover must show only Title / byline / credentials / Broader Significance / Abstract / Contents / Introduction.

Note

Study status: Draft MMv1r1 (2026m04d05). See Authorship statement in Appendix A.

References

The following works informed the broader panentheistic context: [Hartshorne, 1941], [Whitehead, 1929], [Clayton and Peacocke, 2004], [Cooper, 2006].

Notes

Content stability — Content is variant dv_ClaOp48Max_MMv5_b11-form-pet-mmv5_2026m05d29 (see StayVS). Rebuilt 2026-05-29.

See also on Balospe.com

- /study/matheo/index — the Matheo Study Series overview
- /action/audit-the-math/index — Audit the Math: the refutation-welcome path

References

[al-Ghazali, n.d.] al-Ghazali, A. H. (n.d.). *The Niche of Lights (Mishkat al-Anwar)*.

[Aquinas, n.d.] Aquinas, T. (n.d.). *Summa Theologica, Part I, Questions 3–11*.

[Asadi et al., 2020] Asadi, S., Cappa, C. D., Barreda, S., Wexler, A. S., Bouvier, N. M., & Ristenpart, W. D. (2020). Efficacy of masks and face coverings in controlling outward aerosol particle emission from expiratory activities. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1), 15665. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-72798-7>, doi:10.1038/s41598-020-72798-7

[Asch, 1956] Asch, S. E. (1956). Studies of independence and conformity: I. a minority of one against a unanimous majority. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 70(9), 1–70. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0093718>, doi:10.1037/h0093718

[Ashby, 1956] Ashby, W. R. (1956). *An Introduction to Cybernetics*. London: Chapman and Hall.

[Beddington et al., 2008] Beddington, J., Cooper, C. L., Field, J., Goswami, U., Huppert, F. A., Jenkins, R., ... Thomas, S. M. (2008). The mental wealth of nations. *Nature*, 455(7216), 1057–1060. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1038/4551057a>, doi:10.1038/4551057a

- [Benci & DiNasso, 2003] Benci, V., & Di Nasso, M. (2003). Numerosities of labelled sets: a new way of counting. *Advances in Mathematics*, 173(1), 50–67. URL: [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0001-8708\(02\)00012-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0001-8708(02)00012-9), doi:10.1016/s0001-8708(02)00012-9
- [Bernal, 1929] Bernal, J. D. (1929). *The World, the Flesh and the Devil: An Enquiry into the Future of the Three Enemies of the Rational Soul*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.
- [Beyer et al., 2016] Beyer, B., Jones, C., Petoff, J., & Murphy, N. R. (2016). *Site Reliability Engineering: How Google Runs Production Systems*. Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly Media.
- [Bezos, 2019] Bezos, J. (2019). *Going to Space to Benefit Earth*. Blue Origin press event titled "Going to Space to Benefit Earth", 2019-05-09, Washington, D.C. ; <https://web.archive.org/web/20190511092421/https://www.blueorigin.com/news/going-to-space-to-benefit-earth-full-event-replay> ; <https://www.cnbc.com/2018/05/01/jeff-bezos-dreams-of-a-world-with-a-trillion-people-living-in-space.html> ; <https://www.reggaemath.org/news/2017/6/18/there-are-1000-potential-einsteins-and-mozarts-with-us-now>.
- [Bloom et al., 1956] Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). Bloom, B. S. (Ed.). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain*. New York: David McKay Company.
- [Brower, 2008] Brower, J. E. (2008). Making sense of divine simplicity. *Faith and Philosophy*, 25(1), 3–30. URL: <https://doi.org/10.5840/faithphil20082511>, doi:10.5840/faithphil20082511
- [Caplan et al., 2020] Caplan, Y., Stewart, N., Smittenaar, P., & Sgaier, S. K. (2020). Fighting COVID-19's disproportionate impact on black communities with more precise data. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. URL: <https://doi.org/10.48558/4AZM-XX64>
- [Clayton & Peacocke, 2004] Clayton, P., & Peacocke, A. (Eds.) (2004). *In Whom We Live and Move and Have Our Being: Panentheistic Reflections on God's Presence in a Scientific World*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- [Cooper, 2006] Cooper, J. W. (2006). *Panentheism: The Other God of the Philosophers — From Plato to the Present*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- [Davis, 1983] Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(1), 113–126. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.44.1.113>, doi:10.1037/0022-3514.44.1.113
- [Ehlert & Loewe, 2014] Ehlert, K., & Loewe, L. (2014). Lazy updating of hubs can enable more realistic models by speeding up stochastic simulations. *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 141(20), 204109. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4901114>, doi:10.1063/1.4901114
- [Ericsson et al., 1993] Ericsson, K. A., Krampe, R. Th., & Tesch-Romer, C. (1993). The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review*, 100(3), 363–406. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.100.3.363>, doi:10.1037/0033-295X.100.3.363
- [Erikson, 1950] Erikson, E. H. (1950). *Childhood and Society*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- [Ferguson et al., 2020] Ferguson, N. M., Laydon, D., Nedjati-Gilani, G., Imai, N., Ainslie, K., Baguelin, M., ... Ghani, A. C. (2020). *Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand*. Imperial College

- COVID-19 Response Team. Published 2020-03-16. Imperial College London Report 9; <https://doi.org/10.25561/77482>.
- [Festinger, 1957] Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- [Giordano et al., 2020] Giordano, G., Blanchini, F., Bruno, R., Colaneri, P., Di Filippo, A., Di Matteo, A., & Colaneri, M. (2020). Modelling the COVID-19 epidemic and implementation of population-wide interventions in Italy. *Nature Medicine*, 26(6), 855–860. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0883-7>, doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0883-7
- [Gould & Wilson, 2020] Gould, E., & Wilson, V. (2020). *Black Workers Face Two of the Most Lethal Preexisting Conditions for Coronavirus—Racism and Economic Inequality*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20201216082617/https://files.epi.org/pdf/193246.pdf>.
- [Godel, 1931] Gödel, K. (1931). Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I. *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik*, 38, 173–198. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01700692>, doi:10.1007/BF01700692
- [Godel, 1970] Gödel, K. (1970). *Ontological Proof*.
- [Hare, 2017] Hare, B. (2017). Survival of the Friendliest: Homo sapiens Evolved via Selection for Prosociality. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 68, 155–186. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010416-044201>, doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-010416-044201
- [Hare & Woods, 2020] Hare, B., & Woods, V. (2020). *Survival of the Friendliest: Understanding Our Origins and Rediscovering Our Common Humanity*. New York: Random House.
- [Hartshorne, 1941] Hartshorne, C. (1941). *Man's Vision of God and the Logic of Theism*. Chicago/New York: Willett, Clark & Company.
- [Hartshorne, 1948] Hartshorne, C. (1948). *The Divine Relativity: A Social Conception of God*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- [Hegel, 1812] **missing publisher in Hegel1812**
- [Heschel, 1951] Heschel, A. J. (1951). *The Sabbath: Its Meaning for Modern Man*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Young.
- [Hick, 1966] Hick, J. (1966). *Evil and the God of Love*. London: Macmillan.
- [Hindmarsh et al., 2005] Hindmarsh, A. C., Brown, P. N., Grant, K. E., Lee, S. L., Serban, R., Shumaker, D. E., & Woodward, C. S. (2005). SUNDIALS: suite of nonlinear and differential/algebraic equation solvers. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS)*, 31(3), 363–396. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1089014.1089020>, doi:10.1145/1089014.1089020
- [Jack & Dill, 1992] Jack, D. C., & Dill, D. (1992). The silencing the self scale: schemas of intimacy associated with depression in women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 16(1), 97–106. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1992.tb00242.x>, doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1992.tb00242.x
- [Janis, 1972] Janis, I. L. (1972). *Victims of Groupthink: A Psychological Study of Foreign-Policy Decisions and Fiascos*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- [Kermack & McKendrick, 1927] Kermack, W. O., & McKendrick, A. G. (1927). A contribution to the mathematical theory of epidemics. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A*, 115(772), 700–721. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.1927.0118>, doi:10.1098/rspa.1927.0118

- [Kissler et al., 2020] Kissler, S. M., Tedijanto, C., Goldstein, E., Grad, Y. H., & Lipsitch, M. (2020). Projecting the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic period. *Science*, 368(6493), 860–868. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb5793>, doi:10.1126/science.abb5793
- [Kitcher, 1981] Kitcher, P. (1981). Explanatory unification. *Philosophy of Science*, 48(4), 507–531. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1086/289019>, doi:10.1086/289019
- [Kohlberg, 1971] Kohlberg, L. (1971). Beck, C. M., Crittenden, B. S., & Sullivan, E. V. (Eds.). Stages of moral development as a basis for moral education. *Moral Education: Interdisciplinary Approaches* (pp. 23–92). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- [Kripke, 1963] Kripke, S. A. (1963). Semantical considerations on modal logic. *Acta Philosophica Fennica*, 16, 83–94. URL: <http://saulkripkecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Semantical-Considerations-on-Modal-Logic-PUBLIC.pdf>
- [Kruger & Dunning, 1999] Kruger, J., & Dunning, D. (1999). Unskilled and unaware of it: how difficulties in recognizing one's own incompetence lead to inflated self-assessments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(6), 1121–1134. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.6.1121>, doi:10.1037/0022-3514.77.6.1121
- [Kruglanski & Webster, 1996] Kruglanski, A. W., & Webster, D. M. (1996). Motivated closing of the mind: “seizing” and “freezing”. *Psychological Review*, 103(2), 263–283. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.103.2.263>, doi:10.1037/0033-295X.103.2.263
- [Lawvere, 1973] Lawvere, F. W. (1973). Metric spaces, generalized logic, and closed categories. *Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico e Fisico di Milano*, 43, 135–166. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02924844>, doi:10.1007/BF02924844
- [Leibniz, 1710] **missing publisher in Leibniz1710**
- [Leveson, 2011] Leveson, N. G. (2011). *Engineering a Safer World: Systems Thinking Applied to Safety*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- [Levin et al., 2012] Levin, K., Cashore, B., Bernstein, S., & Auld, G. (2012). Overcoming the tragedy of super wicked problems: constraining our future selves to ameliorate global climate change. *Policy Sciences*, 45(2), 123–152. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-012-9151-0>, doi:10.1007/s11077-012-9151-0
- [Loewe, 2006] Loewe, L. (2006). Quantifying the genomic decay paradox due to Muller's ratchet in human mitochondrial DNA. *Genetical Research*, 87(2), 133–159. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0016672306008123>, doi:10.1017/S0016672306008123
- [Loewe & EvoSysBio Group at UW-Madison, 2015--2026] Loewe, L., & EvoSysBio Group at UW-Madison (2015–2026). *Prototype Evolvix: A Domain-Specific Language and Compiler to Simplify Accurate Mass-Action Modeling in Biology — Simulating Systems where Parts randomly meet to trigger Actions at defined Rates*. Software, pre-compiled binaries for Mac OS X 10, Windows 7, Ubuntu 14, Fedora 21, RHEL 7. Original release label: Evolvix_CL_0.3.1_RC1, built 2015m03d11; binaries compiled 2015-03-09 from source-tree commit 6e355803bc6fff5b125ef4bf1be1f8e980f364be. License: CC BY 4.0. Zenodo deposit <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19679456>; Balospe.com mirror: <https://balospe.com/en/good-news-pack/vv/mmv3/flyingscroll/transwarpkey/sta1-evx/evx-prototype-compiler.html>.
- [Loewe, 2026a] Loewe, L. (LLoL) (2026). *PET Axioms — Discussions and Caveats*.
- [Loewe, 2026b] Loewe, L. (LLoL) (2026). *PET Axioms ax1–ax14: Formal Panentheism*.

- [Loewe, 2026c] Loewe, L. (LLoL) (2026). *PET Theorems th1–th4*.
- [Lucanus, n.d.] Lucanus, M. A. (n.d.). *Pharsalia (De Bello Civili), Book I, line 81*.
- [Luhmann, 1995] Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social Systems*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- [Mallet, 2012] Mallet, J. (2012). The struggle for existence: how the notion of carrying capacity, *k*, obscures the links between demography, Darwinian evolution, and speciation. *Evo-lutionary Ecology Research*, 14, 627–665. URL: <https://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/30212075>
- [Marcia, 1966] Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3(5), 551–558. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0023281>, doi:10.1037/h0023281
- [Martin-Lof, 1984] Martin-Löf, P. (1984). *Intuitionistic Type Theory*. Naples: Bibliopolis.
- [Maslow, 1943] Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–396. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346>, doi:10.1037/h0054346
- [McCollum et al., 2006] McCollum, J. M., Peterson, G. D., Cox, C. D., Simpson, M. L., & Samatova, N. F. (2006). The sorting direct method for stochastic simulation of biochemical systems with varying reaction execution behavior. *Computational Biology and Chemistry*, 30(1), 39–49. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compbiolchem.2005.10.007>, doi:10.1016/j.compbiolchem.2005.10.007
- [Meadows, 2008] Meadows, D. H. (2008). Wright, D. (Ed.). *Thinking in Systems: A Primer*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.
- [Meyerowitz-Katz & Merone, 2020] Meyerowitz-Katz, G., & Merone, L. (2020). A systematic review and meta-analysis of published research data on COVID-19 infection fatality rates. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 101, 138–148. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.09.1464>, doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.09.1464
- [Moltmann, 1981] Moltmann, J. (1981). *The Trinity and the Kingdom: The Doctrine of God*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- [Mosley et al., 2025] Mosley, T. J., Zajdel, R. A., Alderete, E., Clayton, J. A., Heidari, S., Pérez-Stable, E. J., ... Bernard, M. A. (2025). Intersectionality and diversity, equity, and inclusion in the healthcare and scientific workforces. *Lancet Regional Health — Americas*, 41, 100973. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lana.2024.100973>, doi:10.1016/j.lana.2024.100973
- [Mullins, 2013] Mullins, R. T. (2013). Simply impossible: a case against divine simplicity. *Journal of Reformed Theology*, 7(2), 181–203. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1163/15697312-12341294>, doi:10.1163/15697312-12341294
- [Hippo, n.d.a] of Hippo, A. (n.d.). *City of God (De Civitate Dei), Books XI–XII*.
- [Hippo, n.d.b] of Hippo, A. (n.d.). *Confessions, Book VII*.
- [Oppy, 2006] Oppy, G. (2006). *Arguing about Gods*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [Ottati et al., 2015] Ottati, V., Price, E., Wilson, C., & Sumaktoyo, N. (2015). When self-perceptions of expertise increase closed-minded cognition: the earned dogmatism effect. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 61, 131–138. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2015.08.003>, doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2015.08.003
- [Perrow, 1984] Perrow, C. (1984). *Normal Accidents: Living with High-Risk Technologies*. New York: Basic Books.

- [Plantinga, 1974a] Plantinga, A. (1974). *God, Freedom, and Evil*. New York: Harper & Row.
- [Plantinga, 1974b] Plantinga, A. (1974). *The Nature of Necessity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [Rittel & Webber, 1973] Rittel, H. W. J., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4(2), 155–169. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01405730>, doi:10.1007/BF01405730
- [Schelling, 1960] Schelling, T. C. (1960). *The Strategy of Conflict*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [Senge, 1990] Senge, P. M. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday/Currency.
- [Shannon, 1948] Shannon, C. E. (1948). A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3 & 4), 379–423, 623–656. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb01338.x>, doi:10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb01338.x
- [Simons, 1987] Simons, P. (1987). *Parts: A Study in Ontology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [Sobel, 2004] Sobel, J. H. (2004). *Logic and Theism: Arguments For and Against Beliefs in God*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [Stutt et al., 2020] Stutt, R. O. J. H., Retkute, R., Bradley, M., Gilligan, C. A., & Colvin, J. (2020). A modelling framework to assess the likely effectiveness of facemasks in combination with 'lock-down' in managing the COVID-19 pandemic. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A*, 476(2238), 20200376. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.2020.0376>, doi:10.1098/rspa.2020.0376
- [Talic et al., 2021] Talic, S., Shah, S., Wild, H., Gasevic, D., Maharaj, A., Ademi, Z., ... Ilic, D. (2021). Effectiveness of public health measures in reducing the incidence of COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2 transmission, and COVID-19 mortality: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*, 375, e068302. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-2021-068302>, doi:10.1136/bmj-2021-068302
- [Tay & Diener, 2011] Tay, L., & Diener, E. (2011). Needs and subjective well-being around the world. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(2), 354–365. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023779>, doi:10.1037/a0023779
- [Tetlock, 2005] Tetlock, P. E. (2005). *Expert Political Judgment: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- [Tuckman, 1965] Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 63(6), 384–399. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0022100>, doi:10.1037/h0022100
- [Varzi, 2016] Varzi, A. C. (2016). *Mereology*.
- [Wasserman et al., 2020] Wasserman, D., van der Gaag, R., & Wise, J. (2020). The term “physical distancing” is recommended rather than “social distancing” during the COVID-19 pandemic for reducing feelings of rejection among people with mental health problems. *European Psychiatry*, 63(1), e52. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1192/j.eurpsy.2020.60>, doi:10.1192/j.eurpsy.2020.60
- [Whitehead, 1929] Whitehead, A. N. (1929). *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology*. New York: Macmillan.

- [Wilde, 2018] Wilde, R. (2018). *Joseph Stalin's Death—He Did Not Escape the Consequences of His Actions*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20201204150340/https://www.thoughtco.com/how-did-stalin-die-1221206>.
- [Wink, 1984] Wink, W. (1984). *Naming the Powers: The Language of Power in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- [Wintour, 2020-07-16] Wintour, P. (2020-07-16). Covid-19 will devastate poorest nations if West does not act, warns UN: G20 told to “step up now or pay price later”. *The Guardian*. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jul/16/covid-19-may-devastate-poorest-nations-if-west-does-not-act-warns-un>
- [Wurth et al., 2020-06-29] Wurth, R. C., Braxton, M. L., & Cohen, C. L. (2020-06-29). Racism and Covid-19 threaten our health—We can't fight them as separate battles. *The Guardian*. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/jun/29/racism-coronavirus-covid-19-black-brown-america>
- [Anthropic, 2026a] Anthropic (2026 , February). *Claude Opus 4.6 System Card*. Anthropic.
- [Anthropic, 2026b] Anthropic (2026 , April). *Claude Opus 4.7 System Card*. Anthropic.
- [Balospecom, 2026] Balospe.com (2026). *Formal Foundation Test for the e7Day Axiom System*.
- [Bhikkhu Bodhi, 2000] Bhikkhu Bodhi. (2000). *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Samyutta Nikaya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- [Gregory of Nyssa, n.d.] Gregory of Nyssa (n.d.). *Life of Moses (De Vita Moysis)*. Written ca. 390 CE. Translation: Abraham J. Malherbe and Everett Ferguson (Paulist Press, 1978), Classics of Western Spirituality series; preface by John Meyendorff. Alt URL: <https://archive.org/details/lifeofmoses0000greg>.
- [John of Ephesus & Pearse, 543CE, 2017] John of Ephesus, & Pearse, R. (543CE, 2017). *John of Ephesus Describes the Justinianic Plague*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210306031539/https://www.roger-pearse.com/weblog/2017/05/10/john-of-ephesus-describes-the-justinianic-plague/>.
- [National Center for Health Workforce Analysis & Health Resources and Services Administration, 2014] National Center for Health Workforce Analysis, & Health Resources and Services Administration (2014). *Sex, Race, and Ethnic Diversity of U.S. Health Occupations (2010–2012)*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://web.archive.org/web/20201024060416/https://bhw.hrsa.gov/sites/default/files/bhw/nchwa/diversityushealthoccupations_2012.pdf.
- [Yah Yas everyone LLoL ClaudeOp46Max Anthropic and The Spirit of Boolean Truth, 2026a] Yah, Yas, everyone, LLoL, ClaudeOp46Max, Anthropic, and The Spirit of Boolean Truth (2026). *Matheo-1: The PET Model — A Mereological Axiom System for Pan-En-Theistic Mathematical Theology*.
- [Yah Yas everyone LLoL ClaudeOp46Max Anthropic and The Spirit of Boolean Truth, 2026b] Yah, Yas, everyone, LLoL, ClaudeOp46Max, Anthropic, and The Spirit of Boolean Truth (2026). *Matheo-2: The e7Day Axiom System — Towards a Formal Framework for Self-Correcting Construction*.
- [Yah Yas everyone LLoL ClaudeOp46Max Anthropic and The Spirit of Boolean Truth, 2026c] Yah, Yas, everyone, LLoL, ClaudeOp46Max, Anthropic, and The Spirit of Boolean Truth (2026). *The PET Model: A Mereological Axiom System for Pan-En-Theistic Mathematical Theology*.