

The e7Day Model: Construction, Self-Correction, and the Logic of Genesis 1

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 \(IBchRzQAAAAA\)](https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=IBchRzQAAAAA)

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

Broader Significance

For centuries the seven-day creation narrative of Genesis 1 has been trapped in a false choice: either a literal account of physical history, or a metaphor that says nothing precise. This paper proposes a third reading --- Genesis 1 as a *logic of construction*: a formal blueprint for building systems that correct themselves before they collapse. It presents the theological and philosophical face of the e7Day model (the formal axioms are in Matheo-b12), whose 8 construction stages (VOID through TRUST) each yield a concrete result the next stage builds on.

The central finding is a self-assessment bifurcation: an agent that judges itself adequate (OK) enters a self-reinforcing trap of blindness (BABL); an agent that judges itself adequate-but-incomplete keeps open the narrow path of self-correction (ZION). The paper grades cross-traditional convergence into tiers and works one Tier-1 example (Buddhist dependent origination) in full, engages theodicy (Plantinga, Hick, Leibniz) and the epektasis tradition, and is explicit that it explores one instantiation of a constructor-parametric structure: God as constructor, held to be true and submitted for testing. 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 Genesis 1 read as a logic of construction can outlast the science wars.

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

The seven-day creation narrative of Genesis 1:1–2:3 is often read as a cosmological claim about the physical history of the universe, a reading that has fueled centuries of conflict between science and religion. This paper proposes a different reading: Genesis 1 as a *logic of construction* – a formal blueprint for building systems that correct themselves before they collapse.

We present the e7Day model, an axiom system of 20 axioms and 7 theorems (plus 1 conjecture, 1 definition, 1 notational correspondence, and 1 design constraint) that formalizes this logic. The model defines 8 construction stages (VOID through TRUST), each producing a concrete result that the next stage builds upon. The central finding is a self-assessment bifurcation: when an agent assesses itself as adequate (OK), it enters a self-reinforcing trap of blindness (BABL = Blindly Assuming Blind Leveraging); when it assesses itself as adequate-but-incomplete (OKO), self-correction becomes possible but is not guaranteed (ZION = Zoning, Investigating, Organizing, Navigating).

The paper examines cross-traditional convergence: the cascade structure independently appears in Buddhist dependent origination (12 links), Paul's faith-hope-love (1 Cor. 13:13), and further traditions spanning 2,500 years and four continents. Evidence is graded into tiers: *structural convergence* (functional dependencies match bidirectionally), *partial convergence* (some functional dependencies match), and *suggestive resonance* (count matches or loose analogies). One fully worked Tier 1 example (Buddhist dependent origination) is presented with both forward and reverse comparison tables.

This paper is a theological reading of the e7Day model. The formal structure (as presented in the companion paper Matheo-b12) is parametric in the constructor. This paper explores one specific instantiation: God as constructor. The author holds this instantiation to be true and submits it for testing.

The system is designed to be critiqued, not believed.

Contents

- 1. *Introduction: Beyond the Literal-vs-Metaphorical Deadlock*
 - 1.1 *The Work-Logic Cascade*
 - 1.2 *Relation to PET (Paper a1)*
 - 1.3 *Scope: A Theological Reading*
- 2. *The Eight Stages*
 - 2.1 *VOID (m0) – Formless and Void*
 - 2.2 *TYPE (m1) – Let There Be Light*
 - 2.3 *EQUAL (m2) – The Firmament Without a Verdict*
 - 2.4 *VALUE (m3) – Dry Ground and Seas*
 - 2.5 *LOGIC (m4) – Signs and Seasons*
 - 2.6 *CARE (m5) – Swarming Life*
 - 2.7 *HOPE (m6) – Humanity and the Bifurcation*
 - 2.8 *TRUST (m7) – The Sabbath*
- 3. *The BABL/ZION Framework*
 - 3.1 *BABL: The Mechanism of Self-Destruction*
 - 3.2 *ZION: The Structure of Self-Correction*
 - 3.3 *OSCR Collapse*
- 4. *The Genesis 1 Structural Correspondences*
 - 4.1 *The Missing Verdict (Day 2)*
 - 4.2 *The Double Verdict (Day 3)*
 - 4.3 *The “Very Good” Ambiguity (Day 6)*
 - 4.4 *The Sabbath Structure*
- 5. *Cross-Traditional Convergence*
 - 5.0 *What Counts as Genuine Structural Convergence?*
 - 5.1 *Tier 1: Buddhist Dependent Origination (c. 500 BCE)*
 - 5.2 *Tier 2: Paul’s Faith-Hope-Love (c. 55 CE)*
 - 5.3 *Tier 2: Bernal’s Three Domains (1929)*
 - 5.4 *Tier 3: Weaker Resonances*
 - 5.5 *Convergence Summary*
- 6. *Implications*
 - 6.1 *For Theodicy*

- *6.2 For Eternal Life: The Epektasis Resolution*
 - *6.3 For Inter-Faith Dialogue*
- *7. Discussion and Future Work*
- *8. Author's Theological Position*
- *9. 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)*
- *References*

1. Introduction: Beyond the Literal-vs-Metaphorical Deadlock

The Genesis 1 creation narrative has been trapped in a false dilemma for centuries: either it is a *literal* account of physical creation (young earth creationism) or it is a *metaphor* that tells us nothing precise (liberal reductionism). Both readings miss what may be the text's most important contribution: its *structural logic*.

Consider what Genesis 1 actually describes. It is a construction sequence with the following properties:

- Each day produces a concrete result (partition, entity, or system)
- Each day builds on the results of all prior days
- Each day (except one) receives a quality verdict: "it was good"
- The process begins from formless chaos and ends in ordered rest
- The sequence concludes with a null operation (God rested; nothing new was added)

These are not cosmological claims. They are *construction principles*. They describe how a system-builder (any system-builder) constructs a world that can sustain itself. Whether the system-builder is God, a development team, or an evolutionary process is a separate question — one that the text's logic does not require answering.

This paper examines these construction principles from a theological and philosophical perspective, reading Genesis 1 as a logic of construction authored by God. The most surprising finding is not in the axioms themselves but in what emerges from them: a precise mechanism for self-destruction (BABL) and a precise mechanism for self-correction (ZION), with the boundary between them located at a single point — self-assessment.

1.1 The Work-Logic Cascade

The e7Day model organizes its 8 construction stages as a Work-Logic Cascade (WoLC): a dependency hierarchy in which each level governs the construction of all levels below it. The stages, in construction order, are:

1. **VOID** — formless chaos (tohu va-vohu)
2. **TYPE** — the first distinction (light from darkness)
3. **EQUAL** — the tension between indivisible and divisible (the firmament = rakia)
4. **VALUE** — unconditional and conditional knowledge (dry ground and seas)
5. **LOGIC** — processes and time (luminaries for signs and seasons)
6. **CARE** — self-managing living systems (sea creatures, birds)
7. **HOPE** — general intelligence and self-assessment (land animals, then humanity)
8. **TRUST** — rest and consolidation (the seventh day)

The cascade extends naturally to four further stages connecting abstract principles to the physical world: INFO (information), TECH (technology), LIFE (biology), BASE (physics). Bernal [Bernal, 1929] independently recognized the lower two stages (physics = "the World," biology = "the Flesh") as steered by higher levels, but then lumped all higher levels under the category of "the Devil" — precisely the levels that e7Day now differentiates.

Paul’s identification of faith (TRUST), hope (HOPE), and love (CARE) as permanent, with love as the greatest (1 Cor. 13:13), is structurally consistent with the WoLC: CARE occupies the highest construction position among the three, and TRUST the lowest. (See Section 5.2 for the full argument on Paul’s “greatest.”)

The dual perspective — construction (top-down) and emergence (bottom-up) — is itself theologically significant. In emergence, physical systems appear first and spiritual structures appear later. In construction, the principles must be established first and the physical world follows. The WoLC holds both simultaneously, resolving a tension that has plagued theology since Aquinas: whether divine action is “from above” (classical theism) or “from below” (process theology). The answer is: both, because construction and emergence are dual perspectives on the same cascade.

For the formal axioms and derivations, see the companion paper Matheo-b12. This paper focuses on theological and philosophical significance.

1.2 Relation to PET (Paper a1)

The PET model (Matheo-b11) formalizes the panentheistic God-world relationship: “all is in God, but God exceeds all.” PET describes *where* the world sits (within God, as a proper part). e7Day describes *how* that world is constructed to be self-correcting.

When the constructor is God, e7Day’s notational correspondence $NC1$ yields $W = L$ — the world IS the in-scope domain. PET asserts this relationship; e7Day constructs it.

1.3 Scope: A Theological Reading

The creation-vs-evolution debate is explicitly outside the scope of e7Day. The model’s formal structure (as presented in Matheo-b12) is parametric: the constructor is a variable, not a constant. This separation follows from Philip Henry Gosse’s observation (the Omphalos argument): any constructed system that includes temporal processes will appear, from within, to have a history that predates its construction.

This paper is a theological reading of the e7Day model. The formal axiom system is parametric in the constructor, and multiple readings are possible. A systems theorist can read it with “design process” as the constructor. This paper explores one specific instantiation: **God as constructor**. The author holds this instantiation to be true and submits it for testing.

The distinction between the parametric formal system and this theological reading is not evasion — it is a structural consequence of the model itself. The BABL/ZION bifurcation (m6.ax4) applies to every agent, including the author. An author who claims neutrality is claiming “I am OK without taking a position” — which is an OK self-assessment, and therefore BABL. An author who owns a position and subjects it to testing is claiming OKO — the ZION path. If the e7Day model is correct, then it predicts that its own author cannot be neutral. The parametric claim holds for the formal system; it cannot hold for any presentation of that system by an author with commitments.¹

¹ The chronological order of discovery is relevant for assessing the model’s evidential weight. LLoL saw Genesis 1 as a systems architecture blueprint in 2015 while working on the Evolvix compiler. The structural features (Day 2 anomaly, Day 6 significance) emerged ~2020–2024. The cross-traditional evidence was discovered serendipitously in 2025 when LLoL asked an AI assistant to check whether other traditions exhibited similar structures — with no prior expectation of what would be found. The model’s relationship to these textual and cross-traditional features is one of *surprising unification* (Kitcher, 1981 [Kitcher, 1981]): each feature was known independently, but their joint explanation by a single formal structure is novel.

2. The Eight Stages

Each stage is presented with its formal content, its Genesis correspondence, and its theological significance. For full formal statements with mathematical notation, see Matheo-b12, Section 2.

2.1 VOID (m0) — Formless and Void

“The earth was formless and void, and darkness was over the surface of the deep.”

— Genesis 1:2

The axiom (m0.ax0): The starting condition is a pre-partition domain with maximum disorder — no types, no structure, no distinctions.

Theological significance: The void is not merely empty; it is maximally dangerous. In formal logic, the void type entails everything (ex falso quodlibet: from nothing, anything follows). “Nothing” is the most permissive entity because it places no constraints.

This connects to a deep theological insight: the danger is not in evil (which is structured and therefore limited) but in *nothing* (which is unstructured and therefore unlimited). The traditional equation of evil with “privation of good” (Augustine, *Enchiridion*) is not strong enough: the void is not merely the absence of good but the *presence of unlimited permissiveness*.

The riddle — “What is stronger than God? Nothing. What is more evil than the devil? Nothing” — is formally precise: Nothing (the void) is the ground state of BABL.

2.2 TYPE (m1) — Let There Be Light

“God said, ‘Let there be light,’ and there was light. God separated the light from the darkness.” — Genesis 1:3–4

The axiom: The first constructive act is a binary partition: in-scope (Light, L) and out-of-scope (Dark, D). The partition is irrevocable within a construction cycle.

Theological significance: The first act of creation is not making something but *distinguishing* something. Light is separated from darkness before anything is built. This is scope definition: declaring what is relevant and what is not.

“Darkness” (D) is not destroyed. It is declared out of scope. This has implications for theodicy: “darkness” in the creation narrative is not evil to be eliminated but scope to be managed. The constructor does not fight the dark; the constructor defines the light.

2.3 EQUAL (m2) — The Firmament Without a Verdict

“God made the firmament, and separated the waters which were below the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament.” — Genesis 1:7

[No “it was good” verdict for Day 2.]

The axioms: Types within the in-scope domain partition into indivisible (Integer — individuals) and divisible (Real — quantities). Every mapping from divisible to indivisible loses information (m2.ax2, Lossy Mapping). There is no lossless way to represent continuous reality in discrete categories.

Theological significance: This is the most theologically loaded stage in the model because it introduces an *irresolvable* tension.

The firmament (rakia) is the boundary “hammered out” between two kinds of water — two kinds of types that cannot be perfectly reconciled. The tension between individuals (who cannot be divided without destruction) and resources (which must be divided to be shared) is not a construction error. It is an inherent structural feature of any world that contains both individuals and shared resources.

The missing verdict. Genesis 1 omits “it was good” for Day 2 — the only day without this verdict. The e7Day model structurally accounts for this: the verdict for EQUAL is OKO (adequate-but-incomplete), not OK. Even a perfect constructor cannot call this “good” because the tension is structural. Calling it “good” (OK) would mean the tension is resolved, which it is not and cannot be.

Competing explanations for the missing verdict. The rabbinic tradition has offered multiple explanations for the Day 2 anomaly, including:

- **Genesis Rabbah 4:6 / Rashi:** The work of separating the waters was not completed until Day 3. Day 3’s first “it was good” completes Day 2’s deferred work. This is the simplest and most widely accepted explanation.
- **Talmud, Pesachim 54a:** The waters were divided in anger, and anger is not “good.”
- **Midrashic numerology:** The number two is inherently associated with division and strife.

The e7Day explanation is compatible with the delayed-completion reading: Day 3 completing Day 2 is consistent with Day 2’s work being genuinely incomplete. The model adds a formal reason *why* the work was incomplete: the partition of individuals from resources introduces irreversible information loss (m2.ax2), which no amount of additional construction can retroactively resolve. The rabbinic tradition identified the anomaly; the model proposes a structural reason for it.

PERFECT and PERFIDE. The tension generates two strategies:

- **PERFECT** — preserve each individual’s integrity at the cost of system-level efficiency
- **PERFIDE** — preserve system-level efficiency at the cost of individual integrity

These map to: individual rights vs. collective welfare, conservation vs. adaptation, protectionism vs. free trade, mercy vs. justice. The model proves (m2.th1) that no universal strategy can satisfy both simultaneously. This is not a failure of human ingenuity; it is a mathematical impossibility arising from the structure of types.

The Jubilee System (Matheo-b14, forthcoming) provides the mechanism for periodically renegotiating the PERFECT/PERFIDE boundary — but it cannot eliminate the tension. Nothing can.

2.4 VALUE (m3) — Dry Ground and Seas

“God said, ‘Let the waters below the heavens be gathered into one place, and let the dry land appear.’ ... God saw that it was good. ... God saw that it was good.” — Genesis 1:9–12

[Two “it was good” verdicts on Day 3 — unique.]

The axioms: Values partition into Ground (unconditionally known) and Ocean (conditionally known). Programs are decision trees rooted in Ground, taking Water input, producing Ground output. Water must circulate: Ocean to Trees to Ocean.

Theological significance: After the unresolved tension of EQUAL, VALUE establishes what can be known for certain (dry ground) and what remains fluid (ocean). Programs (trees) draw from the ocean, process the water, and produce fruit — ground output.

The double verdict (unique to Day 3) corresponds to two distinct results: the partition itself (ground from sea) and the construction of vegetation (programs). Both are “good” — both converge within scope. The delayed-completion reading (Genesis Rabbah 4:6) holds that the *first* verdict completes Day 2’s unfinished work; the e7Day model is compatible with this: the formal structure treats the two verdicts as marking two distinct fixpoint results, with the first closing the loop left open by m2’s OKO.

The circulation requirement is theologically rich: Water must flow from Ocean through Trees and back. Without circulation, Ground dries up (certainties become brittle without fresh data) and Ocean stagnates (uncertainties never get processed). This is the formal structure behind “living water” (Jn. 4:10) — water that circulates, not water that sits.

2.5 LOGIC (m4) — Signs and Seasons

“Let there be lights in the firmament of the heavens to separate the day from the night, and let them be for signs and for seasons and for days and years.” — Genesis 1:14

The axioms: Processes partition into foreground (DAY — directed activity) and background (NIGHT — nondeterministic guidance). Time is a first-class entity with measurable progress.

Theological significance: Day 4 introduces time as a *structural* element, not merely a backdrop. The luminaries are “for signs and for seasons” — they are *instruments of logic*, markers that make temporal reasoning possible. Without them, there is no basis for measuring progress, scheduling rest, or detecting periodicity.

2.6 CARE (m5) — Swarming Life

“God said, ‘Let the waters swarm with swarms of living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth.’ ... God blessed them, saying, ‘Be fruitful and multiply.’” — Genesis 1:20–22

The axioms: Conditional-data machines (living systems that process uncertain information) are self-managing and self-replicating. When noise exceeds a threshold, the channel for meaningful signal collapses to zero (m5.ax2, the Unimportant Message Problem).

Theological significance: Day 5 introduces systems that *care for* conditional data — they process uncertain, fluid, oceanic information without trying to force it into certainty. These are the first autonomous systems: they maintain and reproduce themselves.

The Unimportant Message Problem (UMP) is the formal structure behind the prophetic complaint: “They have ears but do not hear” (Jer. 5:21; Mk. 8:18). When noise (misinformation, distraction, propaganda) exceeds the channel’s capacity, the signal (truth, guidance, warning) cannot get through — no matter how loudly it is sent. The channel is the bottleneck, not the volume.

2.7 HOPE (m6) — Humanity and the Bifurcation

“God said, ‘Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; and let them rule.’” — Genesis 1:26

“God saw all that He had made, and behold, it was very good.” — Genesis 1:31

Day 6 is a two-part construction: first the land animals (completing the special-purpose world), then humanity (introducing general intelligence). The model formalizes this in several axioms, the last of which generates the paper’s most significant finding.

m6.ax1 — The world is complete but helpless. After Days 0–5, the world contains self-managing machines (Day 5) operating on established values (Day 3) within logical processes (Day 4). But no component has *general* intelligence. The world can run itself under normal conditions but cannot handle novel crises — situations where the PERFECT/PERFIDE trade-off (Day 2) must be renegotiated in ways that no existing machine was designed for. The new m6.ax5 (Environmental Novelty) formalizes this: novel configurations arise that exceed any special-purpose machine’s scope.

m6.ax2 — Balospe (humanity). A new type of agent is introduced: one with general intelligence, responsible for long-term balance, and *recursively endowed* — created in the image of the creator. “Let Us make man in Our image” is a fixpoint condition: the constructor creates a construct that replicates the constructor’s own general capability. This is the self-hosting compiler: a compiler that can compile its own source code.

m6.ax3 — The matched OKO. The EQUAL problem (Day 2, OKO) is matched by humanity (Day 6.2, OKO). Two acknowledged imperfections — the structural tension in reality and the imperfect-but-learning agent designed to manage it — together produce a self-correcting system. Neither is individually “OK,” but the system is OK+ (self-correcting) because the problem-solver is specifically designed for the problem.

The arithmetic is: $(-1) \times (-1) = +1$. Two negatives (OKO verdicts) yield a positive (OK+) because the system is designed to handle its own imperfections.

m6.ax4 — The self-assessment bifurcation. And here is the knife edge.

The Hebrew text of Genesis 1:31 reads: דָאֵם בּוֹט-הַנְהוּ הַשֶּׁע רָשָׁא לֶכְ-תָּא מִיְהִלָּא אֲרִיּוּ (wayyar’ ‘elohim ‘et-kol-‘asher ‘asah wehinneh-tov me’od). The key phrase is “kol-‘asher ‘asah” = “everything that he made.” In Hebrew syntax, the verdict applies unambiguously to the *totality*, not to each part individually. A native Hebrew reader would parse this as a summative verdict on the whole system.

The ambiguity is not in the text but in the agent’s reception. The formal model identifies a structural situation where the *agent* (not the text) can misread “the system is very good” as “I am very good.” The Hebrew syntax is unambiguous: the verdict is on the system. But the agent

within the system faces a genuine parsing problem: “the system including me is very good” can be read as “I am very good.” This structural parsing ambiguity — located in the agent, not the text — is the origin of the BABL bifurcation:

- **Reading A: “I am very good”** (OK self-assessment). This is BABL. The agent blindly assumes its own adequacy, stops self-correcting, and enters a self-reinforcing trap. “I am very good” → “I don’t need to improve” → “I can’t see my failures” → “I am very good.”
- **Reading B: “The system is very good, and I am the part that still needs work”** (OKO self-assessment). This is the prerequisite for ZION. The agent acknowledges that the system’s goodness depends on its own continued self-correction.

The formal result (theorem th3): BABL originates in self-assessment. Not in external circumstances, not in the structure of the world, not in the quality of the construction — but in how the agent assesses *itself*. OK self-assessment is *sufficient* for BABL (any agent that thinks it’s adequate is trapped). OKO self-assessment is *necessary* for ZION (but not sufficient — a free agent can stop at any time).

This is the formal structure of the Fall. In Eden, both trees are accessible (genuine choice). The Tree of Knowledge-faking shortcuts (ToK, the Closed World Assumption) is the BABL attractor. The Tree of Life-giving decision-making (ToL) is the ZION attractor. The serpent’s offer — “you will be like God, knowing good and evil” — is precisely the OK self-assessment: “you are already adequate to judge.” The Fall is not punishment for curiosity; it is the natural consequence of a self-assessment error.

For the psychological parallel to Dunning-Kruger effect and cognitive dissonance, see b12-socpsy. For the formal derivation of the bifurcation, see Matheo-b12, Section 2.8.

2.8 TRUST (m7) — The Sabbath

“By the seventh day God completed His work which He had done, and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done. Then God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it.” — Genesis 2:2–3

The axioms: TRUST adds no new content (null aggregation). Time partitions into WorkTime and RestTime (qualitatively different). The 6+1 ratio is a design constraint (fractal periodicity).

Theological significance: God’s rest is not exhaustion. It is the formal assertion that the construction is complete and the system can sustain itself. The ability to do nothing and have the system persist is the strongest possible stability claim.

Heschel’s insight [Heschel, 1951] — the Sabbath as a “cathedral in time” — is precisely m7.ax2: rest-time is a distinct *type* of time, not merely the absence of work. Sanctifying the seventh day is a type-theoretic operation: declaring it categorically different from the other six.

The fractal periodicity (design constraint DC1) — 6:1 at daily, weekly, sabbatical, and Jubilee-cycle scales — is the structural foundation of the Jubilee System (Matheo-b14, forthcoming). The Jubilee is the macro-scale rest that periodically resets the PERFECT/PERFIDE boundary. The daily 6:1 extrapolation (work 6/7ths of each day, rest 1/7th) is tentative: it is a question for further investigation, not an established consequence of the model.

Conjecture th6 (Dual-Nothing): VOID (Day 0) and TRUST (Day 7) are formally dual “nothings.” VOID is nothing-as-chaos (pre-structure, the most dangerous state). TRUST is nothing-as-rest (post-structure, the most stable state). The entire creation arc is a journey from nothing to nothing — but the two nothings are qualitatively opposite.

This resolves a theological puzzle: creation *ex nihilo* does not mean creation from a void that is the same as the rest that follows creation. The “nothing” before creation (VOID, maximum entropy) and the “nothing new” after creation (TRUST, null aggregation) are categorically different. Genesis recognizes this by placing both at the boundaries of the creation narrative.

3. The BABL/ZION Framework

The self-assessment bifurcation (m6.ax4) and the BABL Origin theorem (th3) together generate a formal framework for understanding how systems fail and how they can be maintained.

This framework is not without predecessors. The dynamics it formalizes have been described in theological traditions for millennia:

- **Augustine’s two cities** (*City of God*, c. 426): amor sui (self-love) leading to contempt of God (BABL) vs. amor Dei (love of God) leading to self-giving service (ZION). The bifurcation is in the loves, which is structurally parallel to the bifurcation being in self-assessment.
- **Yetzer ha-tov / yetzer ha-ra** (rabbinic Judaism): the good inclination and the evil inclination as perpetual internal dynamics. Crucially, the yetzer ha-ra is not inherently evil — it drives ambition, creativity, and survival — but becomes destructive when unbalanced. This maps closely to BABL’s characterization: not a moral failure but a structural trap.
- **Luther’s simul justus et peccator**: the Christian is simultaneously righteous and sinner — a permanent OKO state. The claim that any declaration of “arrived” (OK) is self-deception is precisely Luther’s anti-Pelagian argument.
- **Ignatius of Loyola’s discernment of spirits**: consolation (movements toward God = ZION dynamics) and desolation (movements away = BABL dynamics), with detailed rules for distinguishing genuine from false consolation — the diagnostic problem that BABL’s self-reinforcing trap makes structurally difficult.

What the formal framework adds beyond these predecessors is fourfold:

1. **The self-reinforcing trap mechanism.** Augustine describes the *state* (amor sui → contempt of God) but not the *mechanism* by which self-love becomes self-reinforcing. BABL provides a specific causal loop: OK self-assessment → disabled error-detection → reinforced OK assessment. This is a mechanism, not a description.
2. **The OSCR diagnostic sequence.** The three-stage degradation (over-simplify → over-complicate → over-reach) provides a *diagnostic order* that the traditional frameworks do not differentiate. Augustine distinguishes pride from its effects; BABL/ZION specifies the *sequence* in which the effects cascade. This enables early detection: over-simplification is the warning sign, not over-reach.
3. **The information-theoretic grounding.** The UMP (m5.ax2) provides a formal, non-moral explanation for “hardness of heart”: once noise exceeds channel capacity, the signal cannot get through regardless of how loudly it is sent. This gives structural content to what Ignatius calls “desolation” and what the yetzer tradition calls the yetzer ha-ra gaining dominance. It is not willful rebellion; it is channel collapse.
4. **The asymmetry formalization.** The formal result that BABL is an attractor (self-reinforcing, locally optimal) while ZION is not (requires perpetual effort against

local incentives) quantifies what the traditions assert qualitatively. This enables structural questions: how much effort is required to maintain ZION? Under what conditions does the effort become unsustainable? When does intervention from outside the system become necessary?

3.1 BABL: The Mechanism of Self-Destruction

BABL (Blindly Assuming Blind Leveraging) is not a moral failure. It is a structural trap: an agent that assesses itself as adequate (OK) cannot detect its own inadequacy (because detection requires the humility of OKO). The trap is self-reinforcing: OK → no self-correction → no detection of errors → reinforced OK.

BABL operates through three components that form the OSCR pipeline:

- **BA** (over-Simplification): The agent assumes its understanding is complete, collapsing nuance. Blind spots form.
- **ASH** (over-Complication): The blind spots are filled with work-arounds, creating unnecessary complexity on a false foundation.
- **MOL** (over-Reaching): The accumulated complexity is leveraged to extend control beyond what resources can sustain.

The pipeline produces: LIE (over-simplified models that misrepresent reality) → SIN (structurally inconsistent complexity built on those lies) → DEATH (system collapse from unsustainable overreach).

MOL operates by forcing a Closed World Assumption (CWA) on an open-world system. In logic, the CWA declares anything not known to be true as false. In an open world — which every real-world system is — this is always wrong. The connection to Genesis is direct: “eating from the Tree of Knowledge-faking” = accepting the CWA (pretending to have complete knowledge of good and evil when such knowledge is impossible for finite agents).

3.2 ZION: The Structure of Self-Correction

ZION (Zoning → Investigating → Organizing → Navigating) is the natural innovation cycle: define scope (seed), gather information (feed), build structure (grow), deliver results (reap). It is characterized by perpetual OKO self-assessment: the cycle never terminates because each reaping reveals new scope for the next seeding.

ZION is not a stable state. It is a perpetual process. There is no “arriving at ZION” in the sense of completion. Any agent that declares itself “arrived” has performed an OK self-assessment and is, by th3, in BABL. (For how this interacts with eschatological hope, see Section 6.2.)

The asymmetry is existentially significant: BABL is the easier path (self-reinforcing, requires no effort to maintain), while ZION is the harder path (requires perpetual effort against the local gradient). This is the formal structure behind “narrow is the gate and difficult is the way that leads to life” (Mt. 7:14).

3.3 OSCR Collapse

When Balospe (humanity) self-assesses as OK, the OSCR collapse mechanism (theorem m6.th1) activates:

1. Balospe is in BABL (from m6.ax4)
2. Balospe does not self-correct (definition of BABL)
3. Balospe cannot resolve the EQUAL ambiguity (m6.ax3 fails)
4. The system fails (KO)

This is derivable in 6 formal steps from just two axioms (m6.ax3 + m6.ax4). The formal derivation is in Matheo-b12, Section 3.1.

The theological reading: the world was designed to work *through* humanity's self-correction. When humanity stops self-correcting, the design fails — not because the design was bad, but because the designed-in correction mechanism was disabled by the agent itself.

4. The Genesis 1 Structural Correspondences

The following correspondences are *structural*, not allegorical. They identify formal features of the Genesis text that the e7Day model is consistent with.

The model's relationship to these textual features is one of *surprising unification* (Kitcher, 1981 [Kitcher, 1981]): the model was not built to explain these anomalies specifically, yet it accounts for them as consequences of its formal structure. Each feature was known independently (the missing verdict has been discussed for over 1,500 years); their joint explanation by a single formal framework is the novel contribution. The evidential weight rests on the unification, not on any individual correspondence.

4.1 The Missing Verdict (Day 2)

Genesis 1 omits "it was good" for Day 2 and *only* Day 2. This has been noted by commentators for over 1,500 years. The midrashic tradition (Genesis Rabbah 4:6) offers the delayed-completion explanation: the separation of the waters was not finished until Day 3. The Talmud (Pesachim 54a) offers the anger explanation: the waters were divided in anger. Midrashic numerology associates the number two with division and strife.

The e7Day model structurally accounts for this omission. The EQUAL stage (m2) has verdict OKO, not OK. The tension between indivisible and divisible types is structural and cannot be resolved by any construction. Even a perfect constructor cannot call this "good" because calling it "good" would mean the tension is resolved, which it is not.

The model's explanation is compatible with the delayed-completion reading: the formal model adds the *reason* for the incompleteness (m2.ax2: irreversible information loss in any Integer/Real mapping), while the rabbinic tradition identifies the *textual consequence* (the verdict is deferred to Day 3). These are complementary, not competing.

4.2 The Double Verdict (Day 3)

Genesis 1 records two “it was good” verdicts on Day 3 and *only* Day 3 (verses 10 and 12). The model accounts for this: Stage 3 (VALUE) produces two distinct results — the Ground/Ocean partition (first OK) and the construction of programs/vegetation (second OK). The delayed-completion reading (Genesis Rabbah 4:6) holds that the first verdict completes Day 2’s unfinished work; the model is structurally compatible with this.

4.3 The “Very Good” Ambiguity (Day 6)

Genesis 1:31 says “God saw everything that He had made, and behold, it was very good.” The system-level verdict is “very good” — but no individual verdict is given to humanity.

As discussed in Section 2.7, the Hebrew syntax (using “kol,” everything) is unambiguous: the verdict is on the totality. The model identifies the ambiguity not in the text but in the *agent’s reception* of the verdict: the structural parsing problem of reading “the system including me is very good” as “I am very good.” This is the origin of the self-assessment bifurcation regardless of what the original syntax intended — making the claim structural rather than exegetical.

4.4 The Sabbath Structure

Genesis 2:1–3 describes three acts: (1) God ceased work (null aggregation, m7.ax1), (2) God blessed the seventh day (positive valuation of non-action), (3) God sanctified it (type distinction, m7.ax2 — rest-time is categorically different from work-time). The model formalizes all three.

5. Cross-Traditional Convergence

The most surprising finding is not the Genesis correspondence but the appearance of WoLC-like structures across independent traditions. This section presents the evidence, graded by strength, and addresses the serious objection that such convergence may be trivial.

5.0 What Counts as Genuine Structural Convergence?

The objection: Humans organize everything in hierarchies. Any hierarchical model with 7–12 levels will superficially “map” to any other hierarchical model with 7–12 levels if the mapper is sufficiently creative with the correspondences. What distinguishes genuine convergence from trivial pattern matching?

The operational definition: Two systems converge *structurally* if their stages exhibit the same *functional dependencies* (what-determines- what) in the same order, walkable in both directions.

Specifically, the WoLC exhibits a causal chain where each stage’s function determines the next:

- Logic determines *what is worth* caring for.
- Care determines *what is worth* hoping for.

- Hope determines *what is worth* trusting in.

This functional dependency chain can be walked in both directions:

- **Top-down (construction):** What you trust determines what you hope for; what you hope for determines what you care about; what you care about determines what logic you apply.
- **Bottom-up (causation):** The physics constrains the biology; the biology constrains the technology; the technology constrains the information; and so on upward.

A genuine cross-traditional echo should exhibit the same bidirectional functional dependency, not merely the same number of stages or the same hierarchical shape.

Evidence tiers:

- **Tier 1 (Strong structural convergence):** Functional dependencies match at the level of specific causal relations, walkable in both directions. The convergence is non-trivial: a mere hierarchy does not automatically support bidirectional walkability with matching functional content.
- **Tier 2 (Partial convergence):** Some functional dependencies match. The mapping requires interpretive work but is not arbitrary. The structural parallel operates at the level of functional relationships, not just count or shape.
- **Tier 3 (Suggestive resonance):** Count match or loose analogy. The similarity is real but insufficient to distinguish genuine structural convergence from the human tendency to build hierarchies. These are *suggestive*, not evidential.

An exhaustive cross-traditional comparison is a book-length project. This paper presents the strongest evidence (one Tier 1 example in full, two Tier 2 examples briefly) and acknowledges the weaker cases honestly.

5.1 Tier 1: Buddhist Dependent Origination (c. 500 BCE)

The twelve nidanas (links of dependent origination) from the Pali Canon (*Samyutta Nikaya* 12.1, [Bhikkhu Bodhi, 2000]) form a 12-stage cascading dependency. This is the strongest cross-traditional mapping because it exhibits the specific structural features that distinguish genuine from trivial convergence: internal root cause, self-reinforcing chain, bidirectional walkability, and breakability at any link.

Forward chain comparison (arising / construction):

Buddhist Dependent Origination vs. WoLC (Forward)

#	DO Link (Pali / English)	DO Forward (Arising)	WoLC Stage (proposed mapping)	WoLC Forward (Construction)
1	Avijja / Ignorance	Root condition: not seeing things as they are	VOID (m0)	Pre-partition: no types defined, maximum uncertainty
2	Sankhara / Volitional formations	Conditioned by ignorance, habitual patterns form	TYPE (m1)	First distinction: in-scope vs. out-of-scope
3	Vinnana / Consciousness	Conditioned by formations, awareness arises	EQUAL (m2)	The tension: individuals vs. resources, irreversible loss
4	Namarupa / Name-and-form	Conditioned by consciousness, mind-body arises	VALUE (m3)	Knowledge partition: certain vs. uncertain
5	Salayatana / Six sense bases	Conditioned by name-and-form, senses develop	LOGIC (m4)	Directed action + background guidance + time
6	Phassa / Contact	Conditioned by sense bases, contact with objects	CARE (m5)	Self-managing systems, channel capacity (UMP)
7	Vedana / Feeling	Conditioned by contact, pleasant/unpleasant/neutral	HOPE (m6)	Self-assessment: OK vs. OKO vs. KO
8	Tanha / Craving	Conditioned by feeling, desire/aversion arises	[BABL entry if OK]	If self-assesses OK → BABL (blindly assuming)
9	Upadana / Clinging	Conditioned by craving, attachment solidifies	[OSCR stage 1: over-simplify]	Simplification of complex reality to match desire
10	Bhava / Becoming	Conditioned by clinging, karmic process continues	[OSCR stage 2: over-complicate]	Work-arounds for problems caused by simplification
11	Jati / Birth	Conditioned by becoming, new existence arises	[OSCR stage 3: over-reach]	Extension beyond sustainable scope
12	Jaramarana / Aging-and-death	Conditioned by birth, suffering and death follow	TRUST/collapse (m7 or system failure)	Either consolidation (ZION) or collapse (BABL)

Reverse chain comparison (cessation / diagnosis):

Buddhist Dependent Origination vs. WoLC (Reverse)

#	DO Reverse (Cessation: nirodha)	WoLC Reverse (Diagnosis)
12 → 1	With cessation of ignorance, formations cease; with cessation of formations, consciousness ceases; ... with cessation of birth, aging-and-death ceases.	If VOID is correctly understood (no false certainties), then TYPE is correctly drawn, EQUAL tension is acknowledged, ... and the system self-corrects rather than collapsing.

Arguments that the mapping holds (structural fit):

1. **Root cause is internal.** Both DO and WoLC locate the origin of suffering/collapse in an *internal* state (ignorance / self-assessment error), not in external conditions.
2. **The chain is self-reinforcing.** In both systems, once the root error is made, each subsequent link strengthens the error. DO: ignorance → formations → ... → suffering. WoLC: OK self-assessment → BABL → OSCR → collapse.
3. **The chain is breakable at any link.** Buddhist practice targets specific links (craving, clinging) as intervention points. The WoLC similarly identifies Stage 6 (HOPE / self-assessment) as the critical intervention point, but allows correction at any stage.
4. **Bidirectional walkability.** Both systems can be read forward (how suffering/collapse arises) and backward (how suffering/collapse is prevented or reversed). This bidirectionality is a non-trivial structural feature — a mere hierarchy does not automatically support it.

Arguments that the mapping does not hold (gaps and disanalogies):

1. **The root states differ semantically.** Avijja (ignorance of the three marks of existence: impermanence, suffering, non-self) is a specific kind of ignorance. VOID (maximum uncertainty, no types defined) is a different concept. The formal match (both are “root states”) is real; the semantic match is loose.
2. **The goal states differ.** Buddhist cessation (nibbana) is *exit from the cycle*. WoLC self-correction (ZION) is *perpetual cycling in the right direction*. The DO aims to end the process; the WoLC aims to sustain it. This is a fundamental difference in telos.
3. **Links 8–11 are approximate.** Mapping tanha (craving) to BABL entry and upadana/bhava/jati to OSCR stages 1–3 requires significant interpretive work. The Buddhist links describe psychological states; the OSCR stages describe systemic behaviors. The mapping works at the abstract level (escalating attachment → escalating overreach) but the specifics diverge.
4. **The count match requires unaxiomatized stages.** If only the 8 axiomatized WoLC stages are counted, the 12-link DO does not map 1:1. The 12-stage count requires including 4 extension stages (INFO, TECH, LIFE, BASE) that lack full axiomatization.²

Assessment: The structural parallel (internal root cause, self-reinforcing chain, bidirectional walkability) is genuine and non-trivial — Tier 1 for the overall structure, Tier 2 for individual

² Axiomatizing the extension stages is an open task for future work on Matheo-b12. The case for structural convergence rests on the functional parallels, not the count.

link correspondences. This convergence spans 2,500 years, from the Ganges to the Jordan, with no documented contact between traditions.

5.2 Tier 2: Paul's Faith-Hope-Love (c. 55 CE)

“And now these three remain: faith, hope, and love. But the greatest of these is love.” — 1 Cor. 13:13

The three map to the upper WoLC:

- Faith = TRUST (m7) — consolidation, reliance on what has been established
- Hope = HOPE (m6) — forward-looking agency, the self-assessment stage
- Love = CARE (m5) — self-managing systems that care for conditional data, for the other

The “greatest” (meizon) argument. Paul calls love “the greatest” (μεῖζων, meizon). What does this mean? The reviewer’s suggestion — “most permanent” — is self-defeating:

1. Paul first lists things that are *impermanent*: prophecy, tongues, knowledge (1 Cor 13:8–10). These will cease.
2. Paul then contrasts these with faith, hope, and love — all three described as *permanent* (they “remain,” μένει, menei; 1 Cor 13:13).
3. If meizon meant “most permanent,” it would imply faith and hope are *less permanent* than love — contradicting Paul’s own argument that all three “remain.”

Therefore meizon must mean something other than “most permanent.” The WoLC offers a structural reading: meizon reflects *functional magnitude* — small changes in CARE (love/agape) have disproportionately large consequences downstream in the construction cascade. CARE (m5) sits at the top of the constructed cascade (before the meta-stages of HOPE and TRUST), making it the stage where agent action has the greatest downstream impact.

The CARE-agape connection. The objection that Paul’s agape (unconditional self-giving love, 1 Cor 13:5: “does not seek its own”) is not the same as the e7Day model’s CARE (self-managing living systems that process uncertain information) has force at the surface level. The connection requires showing that “self-managing living systems that process uncertain information” is the *structural substrate* for agape: one cannot love unconditionally unless the systems supporting life (food, shelter, health, community) are functional. Agape without functional care is aspiration without infrastructure. The e7Day CARE stage is the *material precondition* for agape, not a replacement for it.

This is a Tier 2 mapping: the functional ordering matches, but the connection requires interpretive work.

5.3 Tier 2: Bernal's Three Domains (1929)

J. D. Bernal [Bernal, 1929] independently identified three domains of human endeavor: “the World” (physics = BASE), “the Flesh” (biology = LIFE), and “the Devil” (everything higher). Bernal recognized that the lower two domains are steered by the higher levels but could not differentiate the higher levels, lumping them as “the Devil” — a suggestive name for levels that, when undifferentiated, produce precisely the BABL dynamics the e7Day model formalizes.

The structural match: Bernal correctly identified the lower WoLC stages and their governance by higher stages, and he recognized that the higher stages are the dangerous ones. The limitation: Bernal did not differentiate the higher stages. This is a Tier 2 mapping (partial functional match).

5.4 Tier 3: Weaker Resonances

The following traditions exhibit resonance with WoLC features, but the evidence is insufficient to establish structural convergence:

- **al-Ghazali's Maqasid al-Shariah** (c. 1109, [al-Ghazali, n.d.]): Five objectives of Islamic law in priority order (Religion, Life, Intellect, Lineage, Property). The priority hierarchy is WoLC-compatible, but the mapping to specific stages requires creative reinterpretation. A suggestive hierarchy, not a demonstrated functional dependency chain.
- **Haudenosaunee Seven Generations** (c. 1142–1500): The principle that decisions must consider their impact on seven generations is an independent recognition of 7-based periodicity for long-term decision-making. The “7” is the structural overlap; the internal structure does not exhibit the WoLC's specific functional dependencies.
- **Hegel's Being-Nothing-Becoming** (1812, [Hegel, 1812]): Pure Being is indeterminate and therefore indistinguishable from pure Nothing; the transition is Becoming. This maps to VOID → TYPE (the undifferentiated and the first distinction). The parallel covers 2–3 stages at most.

5.5 Convergence Summary

Tradition	Date	Region	Tier	WoLC Fragment
Buddhist DO	c. 500 BCE	India	Tier 1	12-stage cascade, internal root cause, bidirectional
Paul (1 Cor. 13)	c. 55 CE	Rome	Tier 2	TRUST, HOPE, CARE (upper WoLC), functional ordering
Bernal	1929	Britain	Tier 2	BASE, LIFE (lower WoLC), higher-level governance
al-Ghazali	c. 1109	Persia	Tier 3	5-priority hierarchy
Haudenosaunee	c. 1142–15	N. America	Tier 3	7-based periodicity
Hegel	1812	Germany	Tier 3	VOID/TYPE transition (2–3 stages)
Genesis 1	varies	Near East	(source)	Full 8-stage cascade

No single tradition captures the full WoLC. Each independently identifies fragments. The Tier 1 evidence (Buddhist DO) demonstrates that the convergence operates at the level of specific functional dependencies, not merely hierarchical shape. The Tier 2 evidence (Paul, Bernal) shows partial functional match. The Tier 3 evidence (al-Ghazali, Haudenosaunee, Hegel) is suggestive but does not, by itself, establish structural convergence.

The alternative explanation — that humans naturally organize things hierarchically and the convergence is coincidental — can account for the Tier 3 evidence but has difficulty accounting for the Buddhist DO's specific structural features (bidirectional walkability, internal root cause, self-reinforcing chain). An exhaustive cross-traditional comparison is a direction for future work.

6. Implications

6.1 For Theodicy

The problem of evil asks: why does a good God allow suffering? The e7Day model does not resolve this question but reframes it with formal precision, and the reframing has consequences.

Classification of theodicies. The following table situates the e7Day model's contribution within the existing theodicy landscape:

Theodicy Classification

Theodicy Type	Key Formulation	e7Day Ad- dresses?	How
Logical Problem of Evil	Epicurus (c. 300 BCE); Hume, <i>Dialogues</i> (1779)	Partially	The EQUAL tension (source of suffering) cannot be eliminated in any world with individuals + shared resources. But the proof of <i>logical necessity</i> is an open question (see below).
Free-Will Theodicy	Augustine, <i>De Libero Arbitrio</i> (c. 395); Plantinga, <i>God, Freedom, and Evil</i> (1974)	Extends	e7Day formalizes <i>why</i> free will is structurally necessary (m6.ax4: the correction mechanism requires genuine choice). Adds: the OSCR cascade mechanism (how free-will failure compounds).
Soul-Making Theodicy	Irenaeus (c. 180 CE); Hick, <i>Evil and the God of Love</i> (1966)	Extends	e7Day formalizes the growth structure: OKO self-assessment = perpetual growth. Adds: the asymmetry (BABL is easy, ZION is hard) as a formal result.
Best-of-All-Possible-Worlds	Leibniz, <i>Theodicee</i> (1710)	Reframes	Replaces “best possible world” with “any world containing both individuals and shared resources necessarily has the EQUAL tension.” The question shifts from “is this the best?” to “is the EQUAL tension logically necessary?”
Process Theodicy	Whitehead, <i>Process and Reality</i> (1929); Griffin, <i>God, Power, and Evil</i> (1976)	Compatible	PET’s panentheism + e7Day’s perpetual OKO is structurally compatible with process theology’s God-who-suffers-with-creation.
Protest Theodicy	Dostoevsky, <i>Brothers Karamazov</i> (1880); Roth (1981)	Acknowledges	The parent analogy (below) does not diminish the reality of suffering. The justification is prospective (the child will grow), not retrospective (the suffering was secretly good).
Skeptical Theism	Wykstra (1984); Bergmann (2001)	Partially compatible	e7Day’s OKO stance is structurally similar to epistemic humility. But e7Day provides a structural reason for suffering, which skeptical theism deliberately avoids.
Horrendous Evils	Adams, <i>Horrendous Evils and the Goodness of God</i> (1999)	Partially	The parent analogy has limits: some suffering exceeds what any parent would willingly allow. The model acknowledges this via the asymmetry result (BABL cascades can become catastrophic).

The parent analogy. To say “God designed suffering” is as technically correct as saying “any parents, by having children, design suffering.” All children live in complex worlds, share resources, and face the EQUAL tension. Raising a new human being involves immense work, including work no adult would otherwise choose to do. Parents do it because their greater vision (the child’s flourishing) makes the temporary suffering bearable — not because the suffering is “good” or “worth it” in retrospect, but because the alternative (no child at all) is judged worse.

The same structural concepts transfer to God (as the ultimate Parent under PET):

- Does God *want* to suffer? Almost certainly not.
- Does God accept the temporary suffering, patiently knowing that humanity will grow up eventually? The model suggests yes.
- The critical point: God is NOT unaffected. Under PET (where God is the mereological whole containing all), God *bears the brunt* of the suffering — with a greater capacity for handling it, but no option to avoid it.

This analogy must be handled with care. Many readers carry personal tragedies. The claim is not that their suffering was “worth it” or “secretly good.” The claim is that the system was designed to prevent suffering through humanity’s self-correction (OKO), and when prevention fails, the fault lies in BABL (the structural trap of self-assessed adequacy), not in divine intent.

The free-agency argument. If humans have genuine free agency (m6.ax4: the agent’s self-assessment is a free choice), and if God truly delegates to humans in order for them to learn (th4: Balospe necessity), then:

- If a human refuses to innovate for the greater good → the suffering that results is the *human’s* responsibility, not God’s.
- If God had prevented the refusal → the human would not have free agency → the correction mechanism would not function → the system would lack self-correction → BABL is guaranteed.

This does not solve *all* theodicy problems. But it solves the ones where human agency is the proximate cause of suffering.

What the formal treatment specifically adds beyond existing theodicies:

1. The OSCAR cascade mechanism (how free-will failure compounds — not just “the agent chose wrong” but “the wrong choice triggers over-simplification, then over-complication, then over-reach”).
2. The asymmetry result (why BABL is the default and ZION requires effort — a formal explanation for why the world tends toward suffering without divine intervention being the cause).
3. The information-theoretic grounding (the EQUAL tension as information loss in any Real → Int mapping, not as a moral or metaphysical assertion).
4. The parent analogy with formal backing (God as the panentheistic whole who bears the suffering, not as a distant designer — connecting PET to e7Day).

The remaining gap. The paper must honestly acknowledge: the reframing relocates the logical problem of evil rather than resolving it. The classical problem asks why an omnipotent God chose *this* construction logic (one with the EQUAL tension) rather than one without it. The e7Day model’s implicit answer is that any world containing both individuals and shared resources *necessarily* has this tension. But this is a claim about logical necessity, and the

formal proof is not yet in the paper. If the proof can be provided (that the Integer/Real tension is logically necessary for any world with individuals and shared resources), it would be a genuine contribution to theodicy comparable to Leibniz's "best of all possible worlds" but more formally grounded. The author believes this is provable; the proof is future work.

6.2 For Eternal Life: The Epektasis Resolution

If Trust (m7), Hope (m6), and Care (m5) persist — as Paul claims — then the conditions making the Hero Journey necessary also persist. Theorem th7, Gate 5 shows that the only conception of eternal life compatible with living Trust, Hope, and Care is perpetual Hero Journey cycling. "Arrived" is formally indistinguishable from deadlock.

This result stands in tension with significant theological traditions. Mainstream Christian theology affirms a final state (the beatific vision in Thomism, theosis in Orthodox theology, glorification in Reformed theology) in which the redeemed are genuinely perfected. The claim that "arrived = deadlock" appears to contradict these eschatological hopes.

The resolution: two kinds of "arrived."

The apparent contradiction dissolves once we distinguish:

- **BABL "arrived":** "I'm done, I've made it" → deadlock → collapse. This is the "arrived" that the model identifies as structurally unstable.
- **ZION "arrived" (= epektasis):** Resting in God (no survival anxiety, universal acceptance, free provision) WHILE perpetually innovating, discovering, hoping, creating. Not striving for acceptance; innovating for joy.

Gregory of Nyssa's *epektasis* (eternal stretching forward into the infinite God) is structurally identical to OKO applied to eternity [Gregory of Nyssa, n.d.]. The "rest" component is real: all are accepted, all are given life, there is no fighting for survival. The "forward" component is also real: genuine discovery, genuine hope, genuine innovation. The rest and the forward motion are not in contradiction. The rest removes the *anxiety* (no one needs to earn their place). The forward motion provides the *life* (genuine discovery, not live-locked repetition).

Even God hopes — the Godel argument. All theists agree God is eternal. But Genesis records that God "regretted" making humans (Gen 6:6) and "saw" that human hearts were continually evil (Gen 8:21). How can God learn something if God already knows everything?

Godel's incompleteness theorem shows that no sufficiently powerful formal system can be both complete and consistent. If this applies to God's knowledge (which PET's panentheism suggests, since God contains all), then even God's knowledge is perpetually incomplete — and therefore even God genuinely hopes. 1 Cor 13:13 concurs: hope is eternal, which means hope applies to God as well.³

The conception of heaven follows: not an infinite loop of known outcomes (live-lock), but genuinely exciting discovery where cool things and hot ideas are found, with the potential for hopes to be disappointed at times — or else they would not be true hopes.

Pastoral framing: comfort for the afflicted. The message is NOT "there is no final rest for the suffering." The message IS: suffering will end as promised. It will not end in a graveyard pit or

³ The claim that "even God hopes" is theologically bold and departs from classical omniscience (Thomistic *scientia Dei*). It is presented as a specific, testable prediction of the model, not a dogmatic claim. The model predicts that any omniscience which excludes genuine hope is structurally unstable (BABL). Traditions that describe a static final state (Thomistic beatific vision, Westminster glorification) are predicted to be structurally unstable unless reinterpreted as epektasis.

an infinite loop. It will end **with a celebration** — where those who have been suffering now (“the last”) will be the guests of honor (“the first”), and those who have been commanding everyone around (“the first”) will have to sit back (“the last”), as Jesus explained on many occasions (Mt 19:30, 20:16; Mk 10:31; Lk 13:30).

This is Jesus’ message: comfort for the afflicted and affliction for the comfortable.

Walter Wink’s *Powers Trilogy* [Wink, 1984] analyzes how Jesus inverted the power hierarchies: the structural inversion (“the last shall be first”) operates not merely morally but systemically — it is the ZION correction of BABL’s power accumulation.

6.3 For Inter-Faith Dialogue

The cross-traditional convergence result (Section 5) suggests that different traditions may have independently recognized fragments of the same underlying construction logic, expressed in different symbolic languages. If this holds under expert review, it provides a formal foundation for inter-faith dialogue: rather than arguing about which tradition is “correct,” the question becomes which fragments each tradition has correctly identified and which it has missed.

7. Discussion and Future Work

e7Ch and e7Tr. The e7Ch (7 Change Stages) and e7Tr (technology adoption cycle) models, both forthcoming, extend the e7Day architecture into innovation dynamics and societal adoption patterns.

The 7e family. e7Day is one model in a family of “7e” models — 8-slot structures (7 core + VOID) with different instantiations. The e7He model (Matheo-b13, forthcoming) applies e7Day to the Hero Journey.

Caveats. The cross-traditional convergence evidence is graded in Section 5. The Tier 1 evidence (Buddhist dependent origination) is non-trivial; the Tier 3 evidence (count matches, loose analogies) is suggestive but not evidential. The alternative explanation — that the convergence is coincidental — can be tested by examining additional traditions and by seeking *absence predictions*: gaps in traditions that the WoLC predicts and that can be independently checked.

Open questions. The logical necessity of the EQUAL tension (whether *any* world with individuals and shared resources must have this tension) is the paper’s most important open question for theodicy. The axiomatization of the extension stages (INFO, TECH, LIFE, BASE) is an open question for the formal system. Both are directions for future work.

8. Author's Theological Position

The author (LLoL) holds that the e7Day model describes the construction logic of Genesis 1 because Genesis 1 was authored by God, who used this logic. This is a theological commitment, not a neutral formal observation.

The author notes that the model itself (m6.ax4) predicts that no author can be neutral: the BABL/ZION bifurcation applies to the author's own self-assessment. Claiming neutrality would be an OK self-assessment ("I am fine without taking a position"), which the model identifies as BABL. Therefore the author owns a position and invites testing.

The formal axiom system (as presented in Matheo-b12) remains parametric in the constructor. The theological reading presented in this paper is one instantiation. Other instantiations are possible. But the author does not claim to be neutral between them.

9. Conclusion

The e7Day model reads Genesis 1 as what it may have been all along: not a cosmological claim about the physical history of the universe, but a formal blueprint for constructing systems that correct themselves before they collapse.

The blueprint's central insight is that self-correction depends on self-assessment. An agent that declares itself adequate (OK) stops correcting. An agent that acknowledges incompleteness (OKO) can continue correcting but must choose to do so perpetually. The asymmetry — self-destruction is self-reinforcing while self-correction requires perpetual effort — is the formal structure behind "the road to destruction is broad" (Mt. 7:13).

The cross-traditional convergence evidence, graded by tier, suggests this is not merely a Jewish or Christian insight. Buddhist dependent origination (Tier 1) exhibits the same functional dependencies — internal root cause, self-reinforcing chain, bidirectional walkability. Paul's faith-hope-love (Tier 2) and Bernal's three domains (Tier 2) exhibit partial structural matches. Further traditions (Tier 3) resonate but do not, by themselves, establish structural convergence. An exhaustive comparison is a direction for future work.

The model reframes theodicy with formal precision but does not resolve it completely. The parent analogy, the free-agency argument, and the OSCAR cascade mechanism extend existing free-will and soul-making theodicies. The logical necessity of the EQUAL tension remains an open question.

The epektasis resolution (Gregory of Nyssa) shows that "arrived = BABL" is not a denial of eschatological hope but a clarification: heaven is perpetual joyful discovery (epektasis), not static completion. Even God hopes — a theologically bold claim that the model predicts and that stands in tension with classical omniscience.

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

#AuditTheMath

Supplementary Info

Note

Floor-pour status (MMv5). This is the public-floor copy of the theological-philosophical e7Day 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). The HUMANE and author-contribution statements below are 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)

- **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.

The full who-did-what is the same as Matheo-b12, Appendix B, to be expanded per the b21 framework. *Citation convention (from the HELL source):* for what was done wrong, cite LLoL et al. (2026); for what was done right, cite the Matheo series (2026), for all that LLoL did was imperfectly recount what had been prepared.

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/12/mmV3/b12-theophil_mmV3_2026m04d05

- **Development context** (llogs, reviews, prompts) under `source/matheology/hell/ll/study/b/12/`.
- **Formal companion paper:** Matheo-b12 (the e7Day axiom system, math presentation); other lenses: Matheo-b12 (syseng / socpsy / intro); foundational model: Matheo-b11 (PET).

Note

Naming note (deferred floor tasks). This copy still carries old **h***-era tokens in places and deprecated in-text series references (e.g. “Matheo-b12”); 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: MMv3-ThePhil (2026m04d05). Major revision of the MMv2-ThePhil draft responding to a theological- philosophical adversarial review (2 S4, 4 S3, 6 S2, 1 S1 issues). All 13 review issues addressed. Key changes: own theological identity (Issue 3.1), tiered convergence evidence with Buddhist DO comparison tables (Issue 2.1), theodicy classification engaging Plantinga/Hick/ Leibniz (Issues 4.1+4.2), epektasis resolution for “arrived = BABL” (Issue 5.2), surprising-unification epistemology (Issue 1.1), Hebrew syntax for Gen 1:31 (Issue 1.4), BABL/ZION four contributions beyond existing frameworks (Issue 5.1), parent analogy for theodicy, Paul’s meizon argument (Issue 2.2). This is the *theological and philosophical* presentation of the e7Day model, written for theologians, philosophers of religion, and scholars of comparative religion. It is one of five audience-specific papers covering the same axiom system. The formal derivations are in the companion paper Matheo-b12. Psychological connections are in b12-socpsy. Engineering applications are in b12-syseng. A general introduction is in b12-intro. Draft by Claude Opus 4.6 (dv_ClaOp46_MMv3_theophil_2026m04d05).

References

Notes

Content stability — Content is variant dv_ClaOp48Max_MMv5_b12-theophil-e7day-mm5_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 Fiascoes*. 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 combi-

- nation 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*.