

When Seven Traditions Agree --- What the Math Says About God and the World

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

Seven traditions, developed independently across millennia and continents --- the Torah, the Prophets and Writings, the direct teachings of Jesus, wider Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, and secular philosophy --- converge on the same core structural axioms about the God-world relationship when their claims are translated into formal logic. The convergence is strongest on transcendence, sustaining dependence, and the methodology of claim-testing; it is genuinely contested on containment and divine internal structure. This is the introductory paper of the PET (Pan-En-Theism) model, the foundational study of the Matheo (matheology) series in *Honestly Examining Axioms --- Vetting Every Narrative*.

The axioms were built from panentheistic philosophy --- part-whole logic and the logic of necessity and possibility --- without looking at any scripture. The scriptural cross-check was performed *after* the axioms were defined, as a test. The result was unexpected: seven traditions, across 2,500 years, fitting a shared formal mold on core structural claims while genuinely diverging on others.

For readers concerned with religious conflict, theological disagreement OLT, the science-faith boundary, or whether mathematical tools can sharpen questions prose has not, this paper offers the entry point. The axiom system includes a built-in test (ax14): human claims about divine revelation must be mutually consistent. This turns theological disagreement from a source of conflict into a diagnostic tool anyone can use.

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

- **Seven traditions**, developed independently across millennia and continents, converge on core structural axioms about the God-world relationship when their claims are translated into formal logic. The convergence is strongest on transcendence, sustaining dependence, and claim-testing methodology; it is genuinely contested on containment and divine internal structure.
- **The axiom system includes a built-in test** (ax14): human claims about divine revelation must be mutually consistent. This turns theological disagreement from a source of conflict into a diagnostic tool anyone can use.
- **If the axioms hold**, God experiences every act of suffering in the world — and 12,500 nuclear warheads could add billions of new experiences of suffering by accident, in under an hour. The people with the launch codes all claim to serve truth. This is what their own traditions say truth requires. #AuditTheMath

Contents

- *The Teaser*
- *1. Why This Matters*
- *2. What Panentheism Means*
- *3. The Axioms in Plain Language*
 - *3.1 Group I – The Core Claim (ax1–ax4)*
 - *3.2 Group II – Necessity and Contingency (ax5–ax7)*
 - *3.3 Group III – Relationship (ax8–ax10)*
 - *3.4 Group IV – Divine Nature (ax11)*
 - *3.5 Group V – Testing Revelation (ax12–ax14)*
- *4. The Convergence*
- *5. The Theorems in Plain Language*
- *6. Why the Theology Matters*
 - *Now Add Nuclear Winter*
- *7. The Companion Papers*
- *8. Addressing the Strongest Objections*
- *9. What You Can Do*
- *10. Conclusion*
- *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)*

The Teaser

This paper does not ask you to believe in God.

It asks you to consider what happens when you formalize the claims that billions of people *do* believe — and discover that six traditions, developed independently across millennia and continents, converge on the same core structural axioms.

The traditions are: Judaism (Torah, Prophets, and Writings), the direct teachings of Jesus, wider Christianity, Islam, and Hinduism. The reason Christianity appears twice is historical and theological: the direct teachings of Jesus (from the four Gospels) and the broader Christian tradition (Paul, other New Testament letters, church councils, creeds) are treated as distinct sources because they sometimes diverge — Paul's theological framework is not always identical to Jesus's direct sayings, and the Nicene Creed codifies developments absent from the Gospels. Each is checked independently, as any good test requires.

These traditions disagree — sometimes violently — about many things. But when their core claims about the relationship between God and the world are translated into the precise language of mathematical logic, they converge on a shared formal structure: 13 axioms and 1 definition about how God relates to the world, each testable against the scriptures of every tradition.

The convergence is not uniform. It is strongest on the structural axioms — divine transcendence, sustaining dependence, and the methodology of testing revelation claims. It is genuinely contested on the distinctively panentheistic axioms — containment (the world is in God) and divine internal structure. The paper presents both the convergence and the contestation, because honesty about where traditions disagree is as important as identifying where they agree.

This convergence was not designed. The axioms were built from panentheistic philosophy — part-whole logic and the logic of necessity and possibility — without looking at any scripture. The scriptural check was performed *after* the axioms were defined, as a test. The result was unexpected: seven traditions, across 2,500 years, fitting a shared formal mold on core structural claims while genuinely diverging on others.

What does this mean? Perhaps it means the traditions have been arguing about the *furniture* while agreeing on much of the *floor plan*. Perhaps it means humans have a shared cognitive architecture that generates similar theological structures regardless of culture. Perhaps it means something deeper. The point is: the convergence is specific enough that “coincidence” requires explanation, and the axioms are formal enough that anyone can check.

This paper is written for anyone aged 12 and up who is willing to consider the possibility that the world's major traditions agree on more than they realize. No background in theology, philosophy, or mathematics is assumed. The formal notation — the actual math — lives in the companion paper (Matheo-b11). This introduction uses only plain language.

The system is designed to be critiqued, not believed. If the math is wrong, say where. If it holds, consider the implications.

The people who govern the world's nuclear-armed nations all claim to serve truth. They cannot agree on what truth wants. This paper formalizes what their own traditions agree on — so everyone can check.

1. Why This Matters

Billions of people act on their beliefs about God. The institutions built on those beliefs govern nuclear-armed nations. “We disagree about God” has been a reason for war for millennia — and the weapons have gotten bigger.

The disagreements are real. Jews, Christians, Muslims, and Hindus do not worship in the same way, read the same texts, or organize their communities by the same rules. But a structural question remains: do they disagree about the *fundamental relationship between God and the world*, or do they disagree about other things layered on top of a shared foundation?

Testing this question requires precision. Without formal definitions, theological claims are ambiguous. Two traditions can use different words for the same idea, or the same words for different ideas, and neither side can tell the difference. Mathematical logic provides the precision. It cannot prove God exists, but it can make claims about God precise enough to compare, test for contradictions, and locate the exact points of disagreement.

That is what PET — the Pan-En-Theistic axiom system — does. It formalizes the God-world relationship with enough precision to ask: where do the traditions actually agree? Where do they actually disagree? And where have they been *arguing past each other* for centuries?

2. What Panentheism Means

Before the axioms, one word needs explaining: **panentheism**.

It comes from three Greek roots: *pan* (all) + *en* (in) + *theos* (God). All-in-God. The claim is that everything that exists is contained within God, but God is more than everything that exists. The world is *in* God, but God exceeds the world.

This sits between two alternatives that are easier to understand:

- **Pantheism** says God *is* the world. The universe and God are the same thing. There is nothing beyond the universe. In formal terms: God equals the world.
- **Classical theism** says God is wholly *separate* from the world. God created the world from outside, like a watchmaker building a watch. The world is not “in” God in any structural sense.

Panentheism says neither. The world is genuinely inside God — not separate, not identical, but *contained*. Like a fish in the ocean: the fish is in the ocean, the ocean is more than the fish, but the fish is never outside the ocean.

Why start here? Because when you try to formalize this particular claim — “all is in God, but God exceeds all” — you naturally reach for the mathematics of parts and wholes. “The world is part of God” is a claim about containment. “God exceeds the world” is a claim about proper parthood. These are precise relationships in a branch of logic called *mereology* (from the Greek *meros*, “part”).

A technical note for the careful reader: standard mereology includes an extensionality principle — two objects with the same parts are identical. PET uses a non-extensional mereology to avoid collapsing the God-world distinction. The formal details and justification are examined

in Matheo-b15, which addresses why the part-whole framework requires this modification and what it means for the axiom system's foundations.

Add to this *modal logic* — the logic of what is necessary (must be true in every possible scenario) versus what is contingent (could have been otherwise) — and you have the two tools that PET uses to formalize the God-world relationship.

No further technical background is needed. Everything that follows is in plain language.

3. The Axioms in Plain Language

The axioms are organized in five groups, like the floors of a building. Each group addresses a different aspect of the God-world relationship. The system comprises 13 substantive axioms and 1 definition (ax12, which is tautological by design — see Group V).

3.1 Group I — The Core Claim (ax1–ax4)

These four axioms are the foundation. They say what panentheism *means* in precise terms.

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

Everything that exists in the created world is contained within God. The world exists inside God, not separate from God. This is the “en” (in) of pan-en-theism.

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

While the world is in God, God is not reducible to the world. You cannot capture all of God by examining all of the world. Together with ax1, this means the world is *properly* contained in God — strictly less than God. This single axiom pair (ax1 + ax2) is what distinguishes panentheism from pantheism.

ax3 (Divine Surplus): There is something in God beyond the world.

God's transcendence is not merely formal. There are aspects of God that no examination of the world alone could reveal. The secret things belong to God, as the Torah puts it.

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

Not just the world as a whole, but every individual part — every atom, every person, every corner of the universe. There is nothing in creation that is “outside” God. This is the “pan” (all) of pan-en-theism.

Counter-evidence for Group I. The containment claim (ax1) is the most contested axiom in the system. In Judaism, the Lurianic *tzimtzum* doctrine teaches that God *contracted* to make room for creation, implying the world exists *outside* God's full presence. In Islam, *tanzih* (divine incomparability) resists any mereological blurring of the Creator-creation boundary; the *wahdat al-wujud* (unity of existence) tradition that supports containment is not mainstream Sunni theology. In Christianity, the Incarnation (God entering the world in Christ) seems redundant if the world is already in God. In Hinduism, only Vishishtadvaita (Ramanuja) supports mereological containment; Advaita (Shankara) redefines the world as illusion, and Dvaita (Madhva) maintains strict separation. Several scriptural citations used for ax1 — including Deut 4:39 (a sovereignty claim, not mereological containment) and 1 Kings 8:27 (which actually argues

against containment: “heaven cannot contain you”) — support God’s omnipresence rather than the stronger claim that the world is *part of* God. The honest response is to present both the support and the resistance, and to distinguish omnipresence from mereological containment.

3.2 Group II — Necessity and Contingency (ax5–ax7)

These axioms distinguish between what *must* be true and what *happens* to be true.

ax5 (Necessary Divine Existence): God necessarily exists.

In every conceivable scenario, in every possible way reality could be arranged, God exists. God’s existence is not an accident — it could not have been otherwise. “I AM WHO I AM,” as the Torah records.

ax6 (Contingency of the World): The world might or might not exist.

Unlike God, the world did not have to exist. There are possible scenarios with no created world at all. Creation is a contingent fact, not a necessary truth. The universe began (the Big Bang) and may end (heat death); the fundamental constants could in principle have been different.

ax7 (Necessary Containment): If any world exists, it must be in God.

The containment of the world in God is not accidental. In every possible scenario where creation exists, creation is within God. There is no possible form of creation that is external to God.

Counter-evidence for Group II. ax5 and ax6 enjoy strong convergence across traditions. The main resistance is to ax7: it inherits all of ax1’s contestation and amplifies it by modalizing a contested claim. If ax1 (containment) is disputed, then “necessary containment” is even more disputed. In Hindu philosophy, some Kabbalistic and Zoharic texts suggest creation may be necessary for God’s self-expression, which would challenge ax6’s claim that the world is fully contingent — though this remains a minority esoteric reading.

3.3 Group III — Relationship (ax8–ax10)

These axioms go beyond mere containment. A box contains its contents without being aware of them. Group III says God does not merely contain the world — God is actively present to it and sustains it.

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

Not just containing but *aware of, in contact with* every single part of creation. “Closer than the jugular vein,” as the Quran says. “Where can I flee from your presence?” asks the Psalmist. This rules out a “deistic” panentheism where God contains but ignores.

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

The world does not keep itself in existence. Its continued existence depends on God’s active sustaining. “Apart from me you can do nothing,” Jesus says. “God holds the heavens and earth lest they cease,” says the Quran.

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

The dependence runs strictly one way. God sustains the world, but God does not need the world. God can exist without the world; the world cannot exist without God. This distinguishes PET from process-theology variants where God genuinely *needs* the world.

Counter-evidence for Group III. ax9 (sustaining dependence) is the strongest relational axiom, with support from all four religious traditions. The main counter-evidence concerns ax8's universal quantifier: the Jewish concept of *hester panim* ("hiding of the face," Deut 31:17–18) suggests God sometimes *withdraws* presence, which challenges the claim that God is present to *every* part at *all* times. The book of Esther never mentions God, traditionally interpreted as an example of this hidden-face dynamic. For ax10, Kabbalistic sources speak of human actions "strengthening" (*metkafin*) the divine presence, which some read as implying a form of dependence that ax10 denies.

3.4 Group IV – Divine Nature (ax11)

This is the most important and contested axiom.

ax11 (Divine Structure): God has both an unchanging nature and a world-responsive experience.

God has two aspects. One aspect — the necessary divine nature — never changes. It is the same in every possible scenario. The other aspect — the contingent divine experience — varies depending on what happens in the world. God's experience of a world with suffering differs from God's experience of a world without it, even though the essential divine nature remains constant.

The name "Divine Structure" reflects the minimal claim: God has some form of internal differentiation. Dipolarity (G_n / G_c) is one specific *form* of divine structure, but the law of excluded middle may not apply to all of God's internal differentiation. The Ash'ari position in Islam — divine attributes are "neither identical to nor separate from" God's essence — and the Kabbalistic *sefirot* suggest structures richer than a simple two-pole model. ax11 formalizes the *minimal* structural claim: that God has at least a necessary aspect and a contingent aspect.

The Hindu tradition captures this most explicitly: *nirguna* Brahman (without qualities — the necessary aspect) and *saguna* Brahman (with qualities — the relational aspect), though this support is qualified by Advaita objections (Shankara holds that *saguna* is a lower-level appearance, not an ultimate metaphysical feature) and Dvaita objections (Madhva maintains strict Creator-creature distinction without internal divine differentiation in the sense ax11 requires). The Torah shows both: "I AM WHO I AM" (unchanging) alongside "the LORD relented" and "his heart was deeply troubled" (responsive) — though mainstream Rabbinic hermeneutics reads these responsive passages as anthropomorphisms (*dibrah Torah k'lashon b'nei adam* — the Torah speaks in human language), not as evidence of genuine divine change. "Jesus wept" (Jn 11:35) is read under Chalcedonian Christology as an expression of Jesus's *human* nature, not of the divine contingent experience that ax11 describes.

The alternative: ax11b (Divine Simplicity). Classical theism offers a different answer: God has no independently analyzable aspects. God's essence, existence, will, and knowledge are all identical. This position sits in tension with ax1 and 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. Maimonides' negative theology represents the strongest Jewish version of divine simplicity, distinct from Aquinas' analogical approach. Mainstream Sunni Islam's emphasis on *tawhid* (divine oneness) and the Quranic description of God as *al-samad* (the Eternal Refuge, self-sufficient, undivided) align more naturally with ax11b than with ax11.

The axiom system is modular here. You can explore the consequences of ax11 or ax11b separately. A companion paper (Matheo-b15) examines whether the tension between ax11b and the other axioms can be resolved, and presents a formal argument that ax11b generates structural difficulties for the relational axioms ax8–ax10. Both forks are presented with equal formal standing; the reader is invited to test both.

Counter-evidence for Group IV. ax11 is the second most contested axiom in the system, after ax1. The independent scriptural review (2026m04d07) found ax11 is “Against” from mainstream Sunni Islam, “Contested” from Judaism and Christianity, and only “Moderate” from Hinduism. ax11 does not have genuine convergence across traditions. The honest presentation is that ax11 represents the paper’s strongest *proposal*, not its established result.

3.5 Group V — Testing Revelation (ax12–ax14)

These are the most practical axioms. They do not ask you to accept any scripture as divine. They provide a *method* for testing whether human claims about divine revelation are internally consistent.

ax12 (Revelation Reliability): God’s self-knowledge is true.

This is a *definition*, not a substantive axiom. God’s self-knowledge is defined as the set of true propositions about God. So it is true by definition. The system thus contains 13 substantive axioms and 1 tautological definition. ax12 is retained because it anchors the logical chain: ax13 and ax14 build on it explicitly, and removing it would leave a gap in the formal derivation. But it does not add independent content — it defines a term.

ax13 (Consistency of Revelation): God’s self-knowledge contains no contradictions.

If two claims appear to contradict each other, at least one of them is not genuinely true about God. The Quran states this directly: “If it had been from other than God, they would have found within it much contradiction” (4:82).

ax14 (Revelation Claims Test): Human claims about divine revelation must be mutually consistent and consistent with ax1–ax13.

This is the most powerful axiom. It distinguishes between what God *actually* reveals (which is true and consistent, by ax12–ax13) and what *humans claim* God reveals (which can be wrong). It provides two tests:

1. Do two claimed revelations contradict each other? If so, at least one is not genuinely divine.
2. Does a claimed revelation contradict any of the first 13 axioms? If so, it fails the test.

Notice: ax14 references ax1–ax13, not ax1–ax14. It does not test itself. This avoids the circularity of a test that tests itself.

An important note on epistemological hierarchy: all three Abrahamic traditions test claims against *revelation*, not against human-constructed axioms. The Torah commands testing prophets against prior revelation (Deut 13:1–3). The Quran appeals to its own internal consistency (4:82). ax14 does not claim to supersede these tradition-specific methods. Rather, it offers a *complementary* tool: if a tradition’s own claims are internally consistent (as each tradition believes), then they should also pass ax14’s formal consistency test. If they do not, that is diagnostic information worth investigating — using each tradition’s own methods.

For a worked example of how ax14 applies to a real inter-tradition disagreement — the divinity of Christ as claimed by Christianity and denied by Islam — see the companion case study (Matheo-b11). The case study walks through both formal tests step by step, shows that the two claims are genuinely contradictory (not merely a misunderstanding), and demonstrates that ax14 functions as a diagnostic tool for *both* traditions rather than a weapon for either.

Counter-evidence for Group V. The strongest counter-evidence concerns the epistemological hierarchy issue: ax14 appears to make human-constructed axioms the judge of divine revelation, which inverts the traditional hierarchy in all three Abrahamic traditions. The Islamic scholar's reframing — treating ax1–ax13 as *derived from* revelation rather than imposed on it — offers one resolution, though it requires each tradition to accept a formalization it did not produce. The *naskh* (abrogation) concept in Islam and the Talmudic *machloket* (productive disagreement) tradition in Judaism both complicate ax13's claim that divine knowledge contains no contradictions.

4. The Convergence

Here is the finding that makes PET more than an academic exercise.

After the 13 axioms and 1 definition were formulated from panentheistic philosophy — without looking at any scripture — each was checked against the scriptures of six independent traditions:

1. **Torah** (the five books of Moses)
2. **Prophets and Writings** (the rest of the Hebrew Bible, plus rabbinic and Kabbalistic tradition)
3. **Gospel/Jesus** (the direct teachings of Jesus from the four Gospels)
4. **Christian (wider)** (Paul, other New Testament letters, church tradition)
5. **Islamic** (Quran and mainstream Islamic theology)
6. **Hindu** (Upanishads, Bhagavad Gita, major philosophical schools)

A seventh column — secular philosophy — maps the axiom *structure* to observations about reality without invoking God.

The result: Six traditions converge on core structural axioms for the God-world relationship — but the convergence is not uniform. An independent scriptural review (2026m04d07) found:

What genuinely converges (Strong or Moderate support from 4+ traditions):

- God transcends the world (ax2)
- God exceeds the world (ax3)
- God necessarily exists (ax5)
- The world is contingent (ax6, with Hindu qualification)
- God sustains the world (ax9) — the strongest relational axiom
- God's self-knowledge is consistent (ax13)
- Human claims about revelation should be tested (ax14)

- God is present to the world (ax4, ax8) — Moderate across all traditions
- The world does not sustain God (ax10)

These are significant and non-trivial agreements. They represent convergence on core theistic commitments across traditions that developed independently.

What is genuinely contested:

- The world is part of God (ax1) — contested by all four religious traditions through distinct, tradition-specific arguments
- Any world must be in God (ax7) — inherits ax1's problems
- God has two aspects (ax11) — opposed by mainstream Islam, contested by Judaism and Christianity

The distinctively panentheistic axioms — containment (ax1), necessary containment (ax7), and divine structure (ax11) — represent the paper's strongest *proposals*, not its established results. They are where the real theological work remains.

Consider three examples of *genuine* convergence:

ax9 (Sustaining Dependence — God sustains the world): The daily Jewish prayer (*Amidah*) praises God who “renews the work of creation each day continually.” Jesus says “apart from me you can do nothing” (Jn 15:5). The Quran says “God holds the heavens and earth lest they cease” (35:41). The Upanishads describe Brahman as the sustaining ground of all existence. Four traditions, independently, the same structural claim — confirmed by the independent scriptural review.

ax5 (Necessary Existence — God must exist): “I AM WHO I AM” (Exod 3:14) is universally read in Jewish philosophy as a claim about necessary existence. Maimonides explicitly argues that God's existence is necessary. The Quran's *al-Qayyum* (the Self-Subsisting) carries the same formal content. The Hindu concept of Brahman as the uncaused cause parallels this. The independent scriptural review rated ax5 as Strong from four religious traditions.

ax14 (Revelation Claims Test — human claims must be tested): The Torah commands testing prophets (Deut 13:1–3). Jesus says “by their fruits you shall know them” (Mt 7:16). Paul says “test everything; hold fast what is good” (1 Thess 5:21). The Quran says “produce your proof if you are truthful” (2:111). The Hindu Nyaya school develops formal criteria for valid knowledge (*pramana*). Every tradition tells its followers: *do not believe blindly — test*.

What this means: The convergence on the structural and relational axioms suggests that the theological disagreements driving real-world conflict between traditions may not be about the *core structure* of the God-world relationship — where the scriptures agree — but about *other* claims layered on top of that structure, and about the *contested frontier* axioms (containment, divine structure) where the traditions genuinely diverge. The axiom system provides a formal tool for distinguishing these layers.

What this does not mean: Convergence on structure does not prove the structure is true. The agreement could reflect a shared human cognitive pattern rather than an objective reality. But the convergence is specific — 9 axioms with genuine support, not 3 vague principles; six traditions, not two — and the structure is testable. If it is noise, testing will reveal it. If it holds, the implications are worth exploring.

The atheist objection is fair and important: humans are pattern-seeking animals, and structural similarities can be found in religious texts if you look hard enough. The response is equally direct: look at the axioms. Are they vague enough that any text would fit? Or are they

specific enough that the fit is informative? Thirteen substantive axioms with precise formal content, supported to varying degrees by six traditions — that is a hypothesis worth testing, not a pattern worth dismissing. And the system itself provides the tool for testing: ax14 works regardless of whether you believe the axioms are true.

5. The Theorems in Plain Language

Four consequences follow from the axioms. They are not additional assumptions — they are logically *proved* from the axioms above.

th1 (No Godless Creation): It is impossible for a world to exist without God existing.

If you accept ax5 (God necessarily exists), then in every possible scenario where anything exists, God exists too. This does not prove God exists — it shows what follows *if* you accept the axiom. If you reject ax5, th1 does not follow.

th2 (Asymmetric Priority): God can exist without the world, but the world cannot exist without God.

There are possible scenarios where God exists alone (from ax5 + ax6: God is necessary, the world is contingent). But there is no scenario where the world exists without God (from th1). The dependence runs strictly one way.

th3 (No Isolated Part): Every part of creation is both in God and known to God.

From ax4 (every part is in God) and ax8 (God is present to every part), nothing in creation is hidden from God or outside God. No corner of the universe is overlooked.

th4 (Divine Experience Varies): Different situations produce different divine experiences.

If the world changes, God's concrete experience changes. A world with suffering produces a different divine experience than a world without it. God is not a static, unaffected observer. This theorem follows only from ax11 (Divine Structure), not from ax11b (Divine Simplicity). Under ax11b, whether God's experience varies is unanswerable.

th4 is the formal expression of divine responsiveness. It means that what happens in the world *matters* to God — not just in an abstract theological sense but in a formally provable structural sense.

6. Why the Theology Matters

Here is the part nobody talks about.

If the axioms hold — if God is present to every part of the world (ax8), if God's experience genuinely changes depending on what happens (ax11, th4) — then every time a human being suffers, God's experience includes that suffering. Not as an abstraction. Not as a statistic. As an experience. Distinct. Specific. Unfiltered.

Think about what that means.

Every child who goes to bed hungry tonight — God experiences that hunger. Every person tortured in a prison cell — God is present to that pain. Every family destroyed by a bomb — God's experience includes the terror, the grief, the bewilderment of the survivors. This is not poetry. It is a formal consequence of ax8 (God is present to every part of creation) combined with th4 (distinct situations in the world produce distinct divine experiences). If you accept those axioms, this conclusion is not optional.

And most of this suffering is not caused by earthquakes or disease. It is caused by human beings doing things to other human beings. War, exploitation, cruelty, indifference. When a government starves a population to maintain power, it is not only starving those people. It is adding that specific suffering to God's concrete experience. When an arms dealer sells weapons that will be used to kill civilians, the deaths are not only civilian deaths. They are additions to what God experiences.

Every tradition in the PET system says some version of this. Jesus: "Whatever you did for the least of these, you did for me" (Mt 25:40). The Quran: God is "closer than the jugular vein" (50:16) — present to the victim in a way the perpetrator cannot imagine. The Psalmist: "Where can I flee from your presence?" (Ps 139:7) — the torturer cannot escape the God who is present to the one being tortured. The Gita: "The Lord dwells in the hearts of all beings" (18:61) — every heart, including the ones that are breaking.

Now Add Nuclear Winter

Currently, about 12,500 nuclear warheads exist on Earth. The major nuclear powers — the United States, Russia, China, the United Kingdom, France, India, Pakistan, Israel, and North Korea — are all governed by people who claim, in one form or another, to serve truth, justice, or the common good.

A full-scale nuclear exchange between even two major powers would produce, in addition to hundreds of millions of immediate deaths, a phenomenon called nuclear winter: soot from burning cities injected into the stratosphere, blocking sunlight, collapsing agriculture globally, producing famine that could kill billions of people who live nowhere near the blast zones. The peer-reviewed estimates range from 1 to 5 billion additional deaths from famine alone.

Now apply th4.

Every one of those deaths — every slow starvation, every child's body failing as crops die, every community collapsing as supply chains break — would be a distinct experience in God's concrete awareness. Not aggregated. Not averaged. Each one distinct. Billions of distinct experiences of suffering, added to whatever God already experiences from the suffering humanity currently inflicts.

And nuclear winter could happen **by accident**. A false alarm. A misread satellite signal. A submarine commander who has 6 minutes to decide and decides wrong. The history of the nuclear age is punctuated by near-misses — Stanislav Petrov in 1983, Vasili Arkhipov in 1962, the 1995 Norwegian rocket incident — where a single person's judgment was the only thing between the current world and billions of new entries in God's experience of suffering.

The objection writes itself: "This is abstract theology. Nuclear strategy is decided by realpolitik, not by axioms about divine experience." Fair. But the PET axioms add a variable that no strategic model includes: the cost to the being who is present to every part of creation and whose experience varies with what happens. If that variable is real, then every strategic calculation that omits it is *incomplete in a way that biases it toward risk*. A model that does not include the full cost of failure will systematically underestimate the cost of failure.

The theology matters because it changes the moral calculus. If the people who govern nuclear-armed nations understood — formally, precisely, testably — what their own traditions say about the cost of the suffering they risk inflicting, the calculus would change. Not because they are bad people who need to be guilted into goodness. But because their current models are missing a variable, and that missing variable, if real, dwarfs everything else in the equation.

Seven traditions, across millennia and continents, agree: God experiences what happens in the world. The world currently maintains weapons systems capable of adding billions of new experiences of suffering to God's awareness — by accident, in under an hour.

If that does not matter, nothing does.

7. The Companion Papers

PET is the foundation. The companion papers build on it:

Matheo-b12 (e7Day): Now that we have a formal foundation for the God-world relationship, what happens when systems built within this structure assess themselves? The e7Day model derives the self-assessment bifurcation: honest self-assessment leads to self-correction (ZION); closed self-assessment leads to self-destruction (BABL). The mechanism is structural, not moral.

Matheo-3 (e7He): What does this mean for each person's journey? The hero's journey modeled within the formal structure.

Matheo-4 (JUB): If God contains everything and sustains everything, why does suffering exist? And how do we build an economy that self-corrects? The innovation theodicy builds directly on PET and proposes the Jubilee System as a structural solution.

Matheo-b15: The one contested axiom — ax11 vs. ax11b — and why it matters. A formal examination of whether Divine Simplicity (ax11b) is structurally compatible with the relational axioms ax8–ax10. This paper also addresses the mereological extensionality question and engages Maimonides' divine simplicity, the Ash'ari position, and the Hindu *nirguna/saguna* distinction.

Matheo-6 (RiskyMAD): Existential risk modeling. Why the OSCR (Over-Simplify, over-Complicate, over-Reach) collapse mechanism, operating at civilizational scale with nuclear weapons, makes honest self-assessment an urgent survival question.

Matheo-7: An experimental test of the system's central prediction about the purpose of human life.

8. Addressing the Strongest Objections

A system designed to be critiqued must face its strongest critics head-on.

“You’re just finding patterns in noise.” Perhaps. Humans are pattern-seeking animals, and structural similarities can be manufactured from any sufficiently large text corpus. But these are not vague thematic similarities. They are 13 specific, formally defined axioms (plus 1 tautological definition), each with precise logical content, checked against six traditions that developed on different continents across millennia. And the system reports its own weaknesses: 3 axioms are genuinely contested, 12 scriptural citations were found to be out of context by the independent review and require correction. If the fit is noise, the system’s own testing apparatus will reveal it. The axioms are public. Check them.

“You’re reducing God to math.” No. Formalization does not claim to capture God. It captures *human claims about God* and makes them precise enough to test. If your tradition’s claims are true, they should survive formalization. If they do not, that is important information. The axiom system itself acknowledges its own incompleteness: ax2 and ax3 together entail that any formal system within the world is necessarily incomplete as a description of God.

“This is just another attempt to create a one-world religion.” No. This paper does not propose a unified religion. It identifies structural agreement that already exists in the traditions’ own scriptures — and honestly reports where that agreement breaks down. The traditions differ profoundly on many things layered on top of the shared structure — ethical practices, community organization, specific historical claims, and the contested frontier axioms (containment, divine structure). The paper identifies a partial foundation; it does not prescribe the building. Each tradition’s unique contributions remain valuable and distinct.

“This is not peer-reviewed. Why should anyone take it seriously?” Because the math is public. #AuditTheMath. The system is designed for exactly this kind of scrutiny. If the axioms are incoherent, show the contradiction. If the convergence is illusory, identify the axiom that fails. If the proofs are wrong, point to the error. Peer review is one mechanism for quality control; public testability is another. This system invites both.

9. What You Can Do

After reading this far, you might ask: so what? What does this mean for Monday morning?

Here is one concrete thing.

Next time you encounter a conflict between two people or groups who both claim to be right, ask: what exactly do they disagree about? Is it the deep structure — how God relates to the world, or how reality is organized — where this paper shows the traditions substantially agree? Or is it something layered on top: a specific historical claim, a practice, an institution, an interpretation?

If it is layered on top, the disagreement may be smaller than it looks. The people fighting may share more foundation than they realize. And identifying that shared foundation is the first step toward a conversation that produces light instead of heat.

If it is about the deep structure — if they genuinely disagree about whether the world is in God (ax1), or whether God has internal structure (ax11) — then at least you know *where* the

disagreement is. You can name it. You can test whether the disagreement is real or based on a misunderstanding. ax14 gives you a tool for doing exactly that.

Three specific actions:

1. **Check the axioms yourself.** They are public. The scriptural evidence is cited verse by verse. If an axiom is wrong, say where. If it holds, consider what follows. The full formal system is at Matheo-b11.
2. **Apply the ax14 test to a disagreement you care about.** Take two claims that seem to contradict each other. Formalize them as precisely as you can. Ask: are they really contradictory, or are they using different words for the same thing? If contradictory, which one (if either) is consistent with the structural axioms?
3. **Talk to someone from a different tradition.** Ask them about sustaining dependence (ax9), or divine presence (ax8), or the imperative to test claims (ax14). You may find more common ground than either of you expected.

The system is designed to be critiqued, not believed. Every tradition says test everything. So test it.

10. Conclusion

Seven traditions, across millennia and continents, converge on core structural axioms for the God-world relationship. The convergence is specific — 9 axioms with genuine support across traditions, not vague platitudes — and testable: the axioms are formal, the proofs are public, the scriptural evidence is cited verse by verse.

The convergence is also honest about its limits. Three axioms — containment (ax1), necessary containment (ax7), and divine structure (ax11) — are genuinely contested. These represent the paper's strongest proposals, the frontier where the real theological work remains. A system that hid this contestation would be less trustworthy, not more.

This convergence does not prove the structure is true. It could be a shared cognitive artifact. But it is specific enough that dismissing it as coincidence requires explaining *why* six independent traditions converge on the same structural axioms. And if it is not coincidence — if the traditions really do agree on much of the floor plan while arguing about the furniture and the contested walls — then a great deal of inter-faith conflict rests on a misunderstanding that is now formally identifiable.

If the axioms hold, God experiences what happens in the world. The world currently maintains weapons systems capable of adding billions of new experiences of suffering to God's awareness — by accident, in under an hour.

The traditions agree: test everything. The Torah says test the prophets. Jesus says test by fruits. Paul says test everything. The Quran says produce your proof. The Hindu schools develop formal tests for valid knowledge. Every tradition built its own version of ax14.

The traditions agree. The formalization is testable. The stakes are nuclear. #AuditTheMath

The system is designed to be critiqued, not believed.

Supplementary Info

Note

Floor-pour status (MMv5). This is the public-floor copy of the PET general introduction, 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). The HUMANE and author-contribution statements below are a down-payment, to be expanded later.

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)

- **LLoL** — structure, key ideas, direction, and final accountability as senior corresponding author (see title-page footnotes 4–5).
- **AI Claude** — drafting and revision under LLoL’s direction (footnotes 6–7).
- **Everyone** — the open co-author group (footnote 8); framework in Matheo-b21.

(A down-payment; the full who-did-what is to be expanded per the b21 framework.)

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/mmv3/b11-pet-intro_mmv3r1_2026m04d07`
- **Development context** (llogs, reviews, prompts) under `source/matheology/hell/ll/study/b/11/` — e.g. the `matheology/hell/ll/study/b/11/study_ll_2026m04d07_b11-intro-writing-llog`.
- **Formal companion paper:** Matheo-b11 (the PET axioms paper).

Note

Naming note (deferred floor tasks). This copy still carries old **h***-era tokens in places and a few deprecated in-text references (e.g. “Matheo-1” / “a1-Intro”); unifying notation (**h_star** / **h_zero** / **h_dark**) and migrating citations are tracked floor tasks, deliberately not rushed here.

Moved from the original cover (provenance)

The following draft-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

Draft status: MMv3r1-Intro (2026m04d07). Revision of the general-reader introduction to PET (Matheo-1). Addresses all 10 revision points from the adversarial review (`review_b11-pet_2026m04d07.rst`). Key changes: “Divine Structure” naming for ax11, ax12 reclassified as definition, counter-evidence for each axiom group, TL;DR, “Why It Matters” integration, Monday-morning section, extensionality note, ax14 case study reference, tradition-count justification. Revised by Claude Opus 4.6 (`dv_ClaOp46_v1_2026m04d07`). Based on MMv3 draft (`dv_ClaOp46_v1_2026m04d06`).

Notes

Content stability — Content is variant `dv_ClaOp48Max_MMv5_b11-intro-pet-mmv5_2026m05d29` (see StayVS). Rebuilt 2026-06-01.

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