ABC THEOLOGY — DAILY RESEARCH NOTE

Divine Antecedence, GPO_REST, Relational Descent, Controlled 0_ABS, and the Road to GCO

September 15, 2026 | Atlas KINS Institute

Refined after the evening discussion. Research status: ABC constructive theology under biblical, scientific, mathematical, cultural, and practice-accountability testing.

1. Purpose and Method

This refined note preserves the day's earlier work but incorporates the decisive corrections and developments reached later in the discussion. The governing ABC sequence remains: Scripture → Contemporary Science Established → Core → Culture → PA (Practice-Accountability). The Self-Similarity Principle is a research heuristic, not an identity claim. Created patterns may disclose structurally useful questions, but they do not prove the ontology of the Living God.

$$\text{Representation} \neq \text{Reality represented} \quad | \quad \text{Accessibility} \neq \text{Exhaustibility}$$

The purpose of the ABC Divine Trinity Project is therefore not to mathematically contain God, but to test whether a disciplined accessibility representation can preserve undivided Divine fullness, real personal distinction, communion, authority, self-giving, and the biblical movement from humiliation to resurrection and exaltation.

2. The Corrected Definition of GPO_REST

The earlier version of this note weakened the working definition of GPO_REST by speaking only of possible indistinguishability in accessible respects. That wording is withdrawn. Within the present AZF/ABC construction, the definition being tested is stronger:

$$\text{GPO_REST} = \{(0,1)_IU, 1\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \dim_AZF(\text{GPO_REST}) = 0$$

Definition (current working formulation): In the GPO_REST state, any two points have no difference in any respect; all activity of Antecedent The Divine is screened within IU.

Accordingly, REST is not ordinary emptiness, disorder, Divine inactivity, or nonexistence. The claim is that differentiation is screened in the REST state. The theological representation must still remain distinct from God Himself.

$$\text{GPO_REST} \neq \text{God}$$

3. Infinite Layering: Not Merely Three Positions

The structure must not be reduced to three layers. The discussion explicitly requires indefinitely many unit-maintained layers. The adjacent terms Ω−1, Ω, and Ω+1 are a local window within an unbounded sequence, not the totality of the structure.

$$\ldots, \Omega-2, \Omega-1, \Omega, \Omega+1, \Omega+2, \ldots$$

$$\Omega+1 = 314161 = (1+1+1+\cdots), \quad \Omega = 314160 = (1+1+1+\cdots), \quad \Omega-1 = 314159 = (1+1+1+\cdots)$$

$$\text{Infinitely many } \{(0,1),1\} = 1_\{x\infty\} \quad \text{(working AZF notation)}$$

This infinite setting matters because any later statement about "the whole team" cannot be reduced to an average or to a finite sample. It raises a universal, no-exception condition.

4. REST Termination as an SOP-Governed Operation

The present ABC working hypothesis treats termination of GPO_REST in Divine Antecedence as a routine operation governed by an SOP. On this proposal, breaking REST is not difficult in itself: the screening is released according to the governing authorization. The substantive question is what follows the release of screening and whether the work satisfies the Father / the whole represented by 1_{Ω+1}.

$$\text{GPO_REST} \ \text{—[SOP / release of screening]}\rightarrow \ \text{accessible relational differentiation} \ \rightarrow ? \ \text{GCO}$$

This SOP is not presented as explicit biblical teaching or as an AZF theorem. It is an ABC construction that must remain open to correction by Scripture and by mathematical consistency.

5. Satisfaction of the Whole: No 1_x Left Behind

Matthew 25:45 supplied a powerful ethical-theological constraint: failure toward "one of the least" is treated as failure toward the King. The passage does not teach GPO_REST, but its transferable ABC Core suggests that satisfaction of the whole cannot be secured by neglecting an individual member.

$$\mathrm{Sat}(1_{\Omega+1}) \Leftarrow ? \Rightarrow \forall x, \mathrm{Sat}(1_x)$$

For an infinite structure, density or average success is not logically equivalent to universal satisfaction. A limiting density of 1 can still leave exceptions. The candidate structural principle is therefore:

$$\text{Global satisfaction requires local sufficiency.} \quad | \quad \text{No } 1_x \text{ is left behind.}$$

This is one of the day's most important "jade" results: the criterion is universal rather than merely statistical.

6. From "Best Performer" to the Faithful Servant

The earlier phrase "best performer" is no longer adequate. The Christological pattern encountered in Scripture is not fundamentally competitive optimization. It is faithful obedience, love, service, and self-giving. The Father's pleasure should therefore not be modeled as death for death's sake.

$$\text{Love} \rightarrow \text{Service} \rightarrow \text{Obedience} \rightarrow \text{Self-giving}$$

The refined Core is: the Father is pleased not by death itself, but by complete love and faithful self-giving—faithfulness that withholds nothing when obedience and service require costly sacrifice. The parenthetical qualification remains essential: death itself is not the goal.

7. Christological Descent: Lowered, Not Lesser in Essence

Psalm 8:5 must be handled carefully: the Hebrew phrase מְעַט מֵאֱלֹהִים is not itself a mathematical statement, and Hebrews 2 receives Psalm 8 through a Christological reading. Philippians 2:6–11 supplies the complementary movement of self-emptying, servant-form, humbling, obedience, death, and exaltation.

$$\text{self-emptying} \rightarrow \text{servant-form} \rightarrow \text{self-humbling} \rightarrow \text{obedience} \rightarrow \text{death} \rightarrow \text{exaltation}$$

Within the ABC/AZF construction, a new candidate interpretation emerged. The Father and the other sons are represented at Ω+1 in the antecedent arrangement; the Son's movement to Ω−1 is therefore not an original ontological inferiority but a voluntary relational descent for service.

$$F : \Omega{+}1 \qquad \text{sons} : \Omega{+}1 \qquad S : \Omega{+}1 \rightarrow \Omega{-}1 \quad \text{(candidate relational descent)}$$

$$\text{Relational lowering} \neq \text{Essential diminution} \quad | \quad \text{“降维” ≠ “降格”}$$

This remains an ABC representation, not an exegesis that equates biblical "lowering" with the arithmetic expression Ω−1.

8. The Relational-Dimensional Window and Entry Toward GCO

The local adjacent structure now becomes especially important:

$$(\Omega{-}1, \Omega \mid \Omega{+}1)$$

On the present proposal, Father is represented at Ω+1 and Son at Ω−1. The structure is not an ordering of degrees of divinity. Rather, it is being tested as a relational-dimensional accessibility window that may permit transition into GCO once REST screening is released.

$$S_{\Omega-1} \quad — \quad \Omega \quad | \quad F_{\Omega+1}$$

This gives a sharper candidate answer to the earlier relation/dimension problem: relation need not be generated by dimension; instead, an irreducible relation becomes dimensionally accessible when screening is released.

$$\text{Antecedent relation} \rightarrow \text{accessible relational difference} \rightarrow \text{relational dimension}$$

Candidate principle: Relation is antecedent; Dimension is its accessible realization. This is not yet an AZF theorem and must be tested against the formal AZF definition of dimension.

9. Do Not Fill Ω Merely to Complete a Trinity Diagram

The middle position Ω remains an open research question. It must not be assigned to the Holy Spirit merely because a triadic diagram is desired. The proper ABC question is whether biblical constraints independently give Ω a Spirit-related relational meaning within the Son's descent from Ω+1 to Ω−1.

$$S \rightsquigarrow \Omega{-}1 \qquad ? \rightsquigarrow \Omega \qquad F \rightsquigarrow \Omega{+}1$$

If the middle position is eventually earned by Scripture, Core, and mathematics together, it would be significant. If it is merely inserted, the model would be imposing Trinity on the mathematics rather than discovering a faithful representation.

10. Trust, Death, Resurrection, and Exaltation

The descent cannot be the whole Christological trajectory. Christian faith confesses the Father's justice and faithfulness: Christ gives himself, dies, is raised, and is exalted at the Father's right hand. Philippians 2:8–9 makes the downward movement inseparable from the "therefore" of exaltation. The resurrection also prevents the model from treating death as terminal self-annihilation.

$$\text{Trust} \rightarrow \text{Obedience} \rightarrow \text{Self-giving} \rightarrow \text{Death} \rightarrow \text{Father raises Him} \rightarrow \text{Exaltation}$$

A useful Core is: Kenosis requires trust. Self-giving in trust is not self-destruction. Any ABC representation that maps only the downward movement and stops at reduction is therefore Christologically incomplete.

11. 0_ABS: First Fundamental Natural Law, Not Death

A major correction was made in the evening discussion. 0_ABS is not to be defined as death. Within the current AZF terminology it is the First Fundamental Natural Law and a completely controlled accessibility-reduction condition. Death may be investigated as one realization or application in a life system, but it must not be identified with 0_ABS itself.

$$0_ABS = \text{First Fundamental Natural Law} \qquad \text{and} \qquad 0_ABS \neq \text{Death}$$

The earlier attempt to use Hebrews 2:14 as the primary text for "control of death" is therefore withdrawn from this line of argument; that passage addresses another theological theme. The present issue is authority, permission, scope, and boundary in the operation of a fundamental law.

12. Permission, Use, Control, and Sovereignty

The discussion introduced an essential hierarchy of concepts. Other sons may be permitted to use 0_ABS, but permitted use does not imply control or sovereignty. Nothing is done independently of the Father's authorization in the present ABC construction.

$$\text{Permission to operate} \neq \text{Authority to control} \neq \text{Ultimate sovereignty}$$

Job 2:6 supplies a strong biblical pattern of permission plus boundary: destructive agency is permitted, yet a limit is imposed. Matthew 10:28 likewise distinguishes the capacity to kill the body from ultimate authority concerning body and ψυχή. These texts do not define 0_ABS; they constrain the ABC Core by showing that creaturely capacity and ultimate authority are not the same.

$$\text{Operation within a law does not imply sovereignty over the law.}$$

13. Genesis 3:14, Apoptosis, and Local Reduction Without Global Annihilation

A further Self-Similarity proposal connected Genesis 3:14 with apoptosis. The biblical text says that the serpent will go upon its belly; it does not specify a cellular mechanism, nor does it explicitly state that limbs were removed by apoptosis. The apoptosis connection must therefore remain an ABC biological analogy rather than biblical exegesis.

The structural insight behind the analogy is nevertheless important. In established biology, apoptosis is regulated cell death that can contribute to development and tissue organization. A local component may be eliminated while the organism as a whole persists. The transferable structural Core is:

$$\text{Local reduction} \neq \text{Global annihilation}$$

$$A \subset X, \quad A \rightarrow 0_ABS \text{ (candidate local realization)}, \quad \text{while} \quad X \not\rightarrow 0_ABS$$

This gives "controlled" a sharper research direction: reduction occurs under authority with a specified scope and boundary. It does not mean that 0_ABS is an autonomous annihilator.

14. The Revised ABC/AZF Architecture

The evening discussion allows the day's working architecture to be summarized without collapsing the distinct levels of evidence:

$$\text{GPO_REST (0D, differences screened)}$$

$$\downarrow \text{ SOP / authorized release of screening}$$

Infinite 1_x structure; Father and sons represented at Ω+1

↓ faithful self-giving / candidate Kenotic Relational Descent

(S_{Ω−1}, ?_{Ω} | F_{Ω+1}) →? GCO

↓ death as a possible life-system realization under 0_ABS, not 0_ABS itself

Resurrection and exaltation: the Christological trajectory cannot terminate in reduction

This architecture is a research map, not a proof. Its value is that each arrow now names a separate question that can be tested rather than hidden inside a single metaphor.

15. Evidence Status and Firewalls

Level	Claim / discipline
Scripture	Father–Son antecedent glory and love; Christ's self-emptying, obedience, death, resurrection/exaltation; permission and boundary motifs. Scripture does not teach Ω notation, GPO_REST, GCO, or 0_ABS.
Established science	Apoptosis is regulated cell death and can participate in developmental tissue sculpting. It does not establish a mechanism for Genesis 3:14.
ABC Core	Global satisfaction may require local sufficiency; self-giving is not self-annihilation; permitted operation is not sovereignty; local reduction need not annihilate the whole.
AZF/ABC hypothesis	SOP termination of REST; Father/sons at Ω+1; Son's relational descent to Ω−1; (Ω−1,Ω|Ω+1) as a route toward GCO; local 0_ABS realizations.
Open question	What, if anything, does Ω represent? What uniquely distinguishes the Son's relation to 0_ABS? Can the proposed relational dimension be mathematically derived rather than assigned?

Governing firewalls: Relational position ≠ ontological rank. Accessibility reduction ≠ intrinsic erasure. Use ≠ control. Representation ≠ Reality represented. If the mathematics fails, discard the representation, not the Trinity.

16. Research Status and Next Snail-Walk

The strongest advance of September 15 is no longer merely the distinction between relation and dimension. The refined work now joins four testable structural questions: (1) whether screened REST can yield relational dimension through authorized unscreening; (2) whether the Son's Ω+1 → Ω−1 movement can be represented as kenotic relational descent without ontological diminution; (3) whether universal "no 1_x left behind" sufficiency can be formalized for the infinite structure; and (4) whether "controlled" 0_ABS can be formalized through authority, scope, boundary, and non-global annihilation.

The next snail-walk should therefore resist adding another analogy. First formalize the mathematical meanings of permission, scope, boundary, and relational descent. Then test the middle Ω position from Scripture rather than assigning it in advance. Finally, require any Christological mapping to include resurrection and exaltation rather than ending at death or reduction.

Preserve the revelation; earn the continuation.

Preserve the insight; earn the mathematics.

Seek faithfully. Test honestly. Speak truthfully.

Closing Prayer

LORD our God, grant us wisdom to seek what is true, courage to correct what is mistaken, and humility to stop where Your Word and the evidence do not permit us to go. Teach us to trust Your justice and faithfulness, to distinguish what You have revealed from what we construct, and to let Scripture, truth, reason, and honest testing correct our models. If there is something true in this work, help us preserve it without exaggeration; if there is error, help us release it without fear. May our study serve truth and deepen faithful understanding. In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

Soli Deo Gloria.