Atlas KINS Institute — ABC Theology

Daily Theological Research Note — August 24, 2026

ABC Theology as a Living, Ordered, and Evidence-Responsive Open System

1. Purpose

Today's later discussion clarified an important characteristic of ABC Theology: ABC Theology is an open theological system.

This openness follows directly from the methodological discipline established earlier today: We do not search for evidence merely to support ABC; we allow evidence to correct ABC.

If ABC genuinely permits Scripture, exegesis, historical evidence, cultural encounter, scientific evidence, and practical testing to question its constructive formulations, ABC cannot be a closed theological system whose conclusions are protected in advance from correction.

Yet openness does not mean disorder. The emerging formulation is therefore:

ABC Theology is a living, ordered, evidence-responsive open theological system.

2. Open Does Not Mean Arbitrary

ABC receives new questions and evidence, but it does not receive them indiscriminately as revelation.

The working sequence remains:

Scripture → Exegesis → Faithful Understanding → New Questions → Constrained Continuation → Testing.

Exegesis serves ABC.
History tests ABC.
Culture questions ABC.
Science constrains and illuminates ABC.
Scripture norms ABC.

Therefore:

Openness ≠ relativism.

ABC remains open precisely because it is willing to be corrected; it remains ordered because not every input possesses the same normative authority.

3. Evidence Enters ABC as a Question Before It Becomes an Answer

Today D039, D098, and Matthew 27:45 helped expose an important methodological distinction.

An unresolved phenomenon must not immediately be converted into evidence for an existing ABC construction. Likewise, a biblical event whose physical mechanism is not specified must not automatically be assigned an ABC explanation.

The correct movement is:

Datum → Examination → Constraint → Interpretation → Possible Continuation.

Not:

ABC hypothesis → search for confirming phenomena.

Thus:

Evidence first; ABC afterward.

The unexplained must be permitted to remain unexplained.

Unexplained does not mean unreal; but unexplained does not authorize unrestricted explanation.

4. Matthew 27:45 as an Example of Disciplined Openness

Matthew 27:45 states that darkness occurred from the sixth hour until the ninth hour during the crucifixion of Jesus.

For ABC, the first responsibility is not to manufacture a physical explanation but to receive the biblical datum and examine it through exegesis, Synoptic comparison, canonical context, historical inquiry, and only subsequently appropriate scientific questions.

Therefore:

Biblical Datum → Exegesis → Canonical Comparison → Historical Inquiry → Scientific Question → ABC Continuation.

This exemplifies an open system: ABC does not close the question simply because its present conceptual vocabulary cannot explain the event.

Neither does it fill the explanatory gap merely because the gap exists.

5. ABC Is Ordered Without Being Static

A second important insight emerged today.

The stability of ABC Theology does not require theological stasis.

ABC may remain ordered while undergoing continuing:

Questioning → Testing → Correction → Integration → New Questioning.

Therefore:

ABC's stability does not require theological stasis.

Its order is maintained not by preventing new information from entering, but by disciplined processing of new information under its normative theological commitments.

A provisional formulation is:

ABC is open without being arbitrary, ordered without being static, and correctable without losing its normative center.

6. “Living” Must Be Used Carefully

Today’s earlier work established:

THE LIVING GOD ALONE IS ANTECEDENT.

Calling ABC a “living” theological system must therefore never blur the Creator–creation distinction.

God is Living in the proper theological sense.

ABC is “living” only analogically: it is a human theological research system capable of continuing inquiry, receiving evidence, undergoing correction, and developing ordered understanding.

Thus:

Living God ≠ “living” theological system.

ABC is not self-grounded.

7. A Threefold Vocabulary of “Emptiness” for Future ABC Research

Today’s discussion also recorded a developing threefold terminology in preparation for future comparison with Nāgārjuna:

True Emptiness | Static Emptiness | Form-Emptiness

The present working expressions supplied in today’s discussion are:

True Emptiness — 真空
0 the Absolute:
$0 \leftrightarrow 1/\Omega$

Static Emptiness — 静空
Intrinsic Unit the Omnipresent:
$0 \leftrightarrow 1/\Omega$

Form-Emptiness — 色空
Presently used as an ABC comparative designation for Nāgārjuna’s emptiness.

These formulations remain working ABC terminology and should not yet be frozen as final definitions.

In particular, True Emptiness and Static Emptiness presently carry the same symbolic expression $0 \leftrightarrow 1/\Omega$. Their intended distinction therefore requires further clarification before the threefold taxonomy is formally stabilized.

8. The Future Nāgārjuna Encounter Must Follow the Same Evidence Discipline

ABC should approach Nāgārjuna exactly as it has learned to approach Zhu Xi.

Therefore:

We must not weaken Nāgārjuna in order to strengthen ABC.

“Form-Emptiness” should consequently remain an ABC comparative label until Nāgārjuna’s own texts have been examined carefully.

Future work should distinguish at least śūnyatā, pratītyasamutpāda, and svabhāva according to their textual and philosophical contexts before ABC attempts a Christian theological comparison.

The methodological principle is identical to the Zhu Xi citation audit:

We do not search Nāgārjuna for evidence supporting ABC; we allow Nāgārjuna's texts to correct ABC's understanding of Nāgārjuna.

Only then is genuine comparison possible.

9. "Far from Static Emptiness" as a Developing Analogy

Today's proposal that ABC is a highly ordered open system "far from equilibrium (Static Emptiness)" is promising, but it should presently remain an exploratory analogy, not a frozen theological definition.

There are potentially three conceptual fields involved:

ABC theological openness;
non-equilibrium / open-system language; and
ABC's developing concept of Static Emptiness.

Their relationship must be demonstrated rather than assumed.

Nevertheless, the analogy already points toward an important ABC intuition:

High Order + Openness + Continuous Responsiveness ≠ Static Equilibrium.

ABC's vitality would therefore lie not in instability but in ordered responsiveness.

10. Relationship to Divine Antecedence

ABC itself cannot become its own ultimate ground.

The ontological boundary established earlier today remains prior:

THE LIVING GOD ALONE IS ANTECEDENT.

ABC is therefore open, but not self-grounding; developing, but not self-authorizing; ordered, but not ultimate; correctable, because it is human; and normed by Scripture, because it is Christian theological continuation.

This gives a deeper formulation:

ABC is ordered without being static,
open without being arbitrary,
living without being self-grounded.

11. A Provisional Open-System Definition of ABC Theology

Today's discussion permits the following provisional extension of the methodological definition:

ABC Theology is a living, ordered, and evidence-responsive open theological system. Its openness permits new exegetical, historical, cultural, scientific, and experiential evidence to question and correct its constructive formulations; its order is maintained through disciplined interpretation and testing under the normative authority of Holy Scripture.

Its vitality does not consist in doctrinal instability.

Rather:

Its vitality lies in sustained, ordered self-correction rather than theological stasis.

This should remain provisional until its relation to the already frozen August 24 methodological definition has been examined carefully.

12. Today's Research Discipline

Today's discussion strengthens rather than replaces the principle established earlier:

We do not search for evidence merely to support ABC; we allow evidence to correct ABC.

An open ABC Theology therefore does not say:

"Everything can be incorporated into ABC."

It says:

"Nothing relevant should be excluded merely because it threatens an existing ABC construction; but nothing should be incorporated merely because it appears to support one."

That distinction may prove foundational.

13. Next Research Horizon

Three major questions now remain open.

First:

How can Divine Antecedence + Created Dependence coexist with Freedom + Love?

Second:

What precisely distinguishes True Emptiness from Static Emptiness?

Third:

What does Nāgārjuna himself mean by emptiness before ABC compares it with Christian theology?

These questions should not be answered prematurely.

The next stage should preserve today's discipline:

Primary evidence → careful interpretation → comparison → ABC construction.

14. Conclusion

Today ABC Theology became more clearly open without becoming unbounded.

Its openness arises from its willingness to receive questions and correction. Its order arises from disciplined interpretation. Its Christian norm remains Holy Scripture. Its ontological boundary remains:

THE LIVING GOD ALONE IS ANTECEDENT.

And its research attitude may now be summarized:

Open, but not arbitrary.
Ordered, but not static.
Correctable, but not normless.
Living, but not self-grounded.

Faithful continuation requires disciplined openness.

Soli Deo Gloria.
Glory be to the one Living God.
Amen and Amen.