Matter, Consciousness, and the Creator

A Dialogue between Marxist Philosophy and Biblical Revelation

October 8, 2026 | Research note, not a submission-ready manuscript

Abstract

Marxist philosophical traditions commonly affirm the priority of matter and understand consciousness in relation to objective reality and human social practice. Scripture, by contrast, witnesses to the Creator as the source of creation, to the possibility of knowing God through created things, and to the limits of human comprehension. This note identifies both a fundamental ontological disagreement and a space for serious dialogue. It distinguishes biblical affirmations, historical-philosophical claims, and provisional ABC theological constructions.

1. Marxist Approaches to Matter and Consciousness

In familiar Marxist philosophical formulations, matter is primary and consciousness secondary; consciousness is related to the material world, embodied human life, and historically situated social practice. The claim that consciousness is a function of the human brain is especially prominent in later Marxist philosophical teaching. These formulations should not all be attributed verbatim to Karl Marx himself.

Marx's critique of religion attends to the human and social formation of religious ideas. Yet explaining how a concept of God arises in human consciousness does not, by itself, settle whether God exists. The genesis of a belief and the ontological status of its referent are distinct questions.

2. Biblical Witness: Creator, Creation, and Revelation

Deuteronomy 6:4 proclaims the oneness of the LORD. Genesis 1:26–27 speaks of humanity made in the image and likeness of God. Romans 1:20 states that God's invisible attributes may be apprehended through what has been made. John 1:18 presents the unique revealer of the unseen Father, with a well-known textual variation between "only/unique Son" and "only/unique God."

Together these passages support a central theological distinction: the Creator is not identical with creation, yet created reality and divine self-disclosure make genuine knowledge of God possible. They do not themselves constitute a formal mathematical theory of representation.

3. The Priority of Matter and Divine Antecedence

The materialist thesis of the priority of matter stands in significant tension with classical Christian teaching that God is eternal, uncreated, and the source of all created things. Our discussion distinguished Divine Antecedence, also called God's Proto-Order (GPO), from the subsequent Order of Creation.

Carbon-based life, hypothetical silicon-based life, and any possible nonhuman intelligence belong to questions about the created order. Their discovery would not, without further argument, establish or refute the existence of God. Whether a material-priority thesis could be extended to GPO is an open speculative question, not a conclusion demonstrated by Scripture.

4. The Mathematical One and Accessibility

A central ABC theological proposal in today's discussion was that the mathematical unit 1 can serve as a mathematical accessibility representation of the oneness of the LORD proclaimed in Deuteronomy 6:4. This is a proposed representational convention, not an ontological equation identifying God with the number 1.

Two methodological safeguards remain decisive: "Representation ≠ Reality" and "Accessibility ≠ Exhaustibility." A symbol may faithfully represent an aspect of its referent without being identical to that referent; genuine knowledge does not imply exhaustive knowledge. Formal development would require explicit definitions of the domain, representation map, and preserved relations.

5. Biblical Resemblance and Mathematical Self-Similarity

Genesis 1:26 uses the language of image and likeness; Hebrews 8:5 describes earthly sanctuary service in relation to a heavenly copy, shadow, or pattern. These passages motivate the ABC theological use of the Self-Similarity Principle. They do not, however, directly establish the precise scale maps or invariants required by mathematical fractal self-similarity.

Similarity is not identity. A future formal account of a proposed relationship between GPO and the Order of Creation must specify exactly what corresponds, what transformation is involved, and what is preserved.

6. Human Wisdom, Material Conditions, and Hope

Isaiah 55:8–9 contrasts divine thoughts and ways with human thoughts and ways. First Corinthians 1:19 challenges the pretensions of human wisdom in the context of Paul's proclamation of the cross. Neither text requires rejection of science, mathematics, or philosophy; both caution against elevating finite understanding into final authority.

Habakkuk 3:17–18 speaks of rejoicing in the LORD even when crops, flocks, and herds fail. This witnesses to hope that cannot be measured solely by material prosperity. It does not by itself provide a scientific demonstration that consciousness exists independently of every material condition.

7. Implications for "I Argue for Karl Marx in Heaven"

The proposed article seeks a thoughtful bridge to readers in mainland China. Its intellectual and ethical credibility depends on distinguishing Marx as a historical person, Marxist theories, later political movements, and actions taken by governments. Neither the spread of an ideology nor worldly political success establishes ultimate truth.

Matthew 4:8–10, with its temptation involving the kingdoms and glory of the world, may serve as a theological analogy about power and worship; it must not be presented as a historical event

in Marx's life. Critically examining Marx's ideas, or defending genuine insights in them, does not authorize a verdict on his eternal destiny.

8. Publication and the Responsibility Not to Cause Stumbling

Luke 17:1–4 joins warning against causing others to stumble with admonition, repentance, and forgiveness. The possibility of disagreement is not itself evidence that a paper causes spiritual harm. But careless scriptural claims, unsupported assertions, contempt for persons, or unqualified judgments about salvation demand correction.

For mathematics, distinguish definitions, theorems, computations, and conjectures. For ABC theology, distinguish direct scriptural affirmations (Level I), provisional theological constructions (Level II), and responsible practice (Level III). Recognition by journals may be welcomed, but must never displace truthfulness or love.

Conclusion

Today's discussion did not resolve the ontological disagreement between materialist philosophy and biblical creation theology, nor did it prove the structure of GPO or the ultimate origin of consciousness. It clarified a constructive task: take seriously material and social accounts of human consciousness while preserving the biblical witness to the Creator and the limits of human understanding. Mathematics may discipline our representations, but it does not replace divine self-revelation. Let the research be patient, testable, corrigible, and accountable to love.

Soli Deo Gloria. Amen and Amen.