AKI Daily ABC Theological Research Note

October 3, 2026

Divine Omnipresence, Human Inaccessibility, and the Passage from Matter to the Human Person

Status: Research note — not a manuscript-ready conclusion

1. Purpose of Today's Note

Today's discussion clarified a possible bridge between ABC Theology's doctrine of divine omnipresence, the AZF/AZSF language of accessibility realization, the reality of human non-recognition of God, and the developing research sequence matter → consciousness → human person. The purpose of this note is to preserve the questions and distinctions that emerged without converting them prematurely into settled theological claims.

The governing research discipline remains: Evidence first; construction afterward.

2. Established Working Relations to Preserve

The discussion reaffirmed an existing ABC/AZF-AZSF working relation in which 0_ABS is not an independent rival to God. Rather, 0_ABS arises from and remains completely under G-Tzimtzum. The First Fundamental Natural Law — the Holy Created Order (GCR) — exists within this ordered relation and is subordinate to it.

$$\text{God} \rightarrow \text{G-Tzimtzum} \rightarrow \text{0_ABS} \quad \text{[with GCR within and subject to this created-order relation]}$$

At the same time, the AZF/AZSF expression 0_ABS || God is to be retained in its established sense as 0_ABS + God, a trial result associated with TC_Ω_7. The plus sign must not be casually reinterpreted as two independent ultimate beings. It belongs to the existing AZF/AZSF structural vocabulary and should be studied according to that vocabulary rather than redefined here.

$$\text{0_ABS} \,||\, \text{God} \equiv \text{0_ABS} + \text{God} \quad \text{(trial result from TC_Ω_7)}$$

3. Two Accessibility Representations of Divine Omnipresence

A major clarification today was that the omnipresence of LORD God is represented, within the present ABC/AZF-AZSF research framework, through at least two accessibility realizations:

$$1)\ \text{GPO_REST}$$

$$2)\ \text{0_ABS} \leftrightarrow \text{INS}, \quad \text{where INS} = 1/(\Omega + 1)$$

These expressions are representations of accessibility; they are not exhaustive identities with the divine reality itself. The distinction is essential: representation does not exhaust the Reality represented, and accessibility does not amount to ontological containment.

The bidirectional relation 0_ABS ↔ INS must also be preserved as written. It should not be silently replaced by an equality unless a separate AZF/AZSF argument establishes such an identity.

4. Calamity, Contrast, and Accessibility

The discussion further clarified the importance of what may be called the accessibility realization of calamity or radical privation. Such a state is not needed in order for God to be good, perfect, omnipotent, or omniscient. Divine perfection does not arise from contrast. Rather, for finite creatures, contrast may function as an accessibility condition through which the goodness, perfection, power, and knowledge of God become more sharply recognizable.

Contrast may enable accessibility; contrast does not constitute God.

This distinction protects two claims simultaneously: God's perfection is not dependent upon evil, privation, or calamity; yet creaturely recognition may occur through contrasts that expose the limits of finite existence and finite understanding.

5. The Biblical Challenge: Human Wisdom and the Knowledge of God

The discussion then turned to 1 Corinthians 1, especially Paul's citation of Isaiah 29:14: "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and the discernment of the discerning I will thwart" (cf. 1 Cor. 1:19). The theological significance for the present project is not that intelligence itself is evil, nor that Christian theology should become anti-intellectual. The sharper question concerns the self-sufficiency of human wisdom.

Intellectual accessibility ≠ human intellectual mastery.

A finite intellect may genuinely know, reason, discover, and construct powerful explanatory systems without thereby becoming the sufficient ground or final measure of reality. This gives the ABC project an important question for testing any comprehensive human system of thought:

How far can human wisdom reach when it makes itself the sufficient ground for explaining reality?

This question should not be used as a shortcut for dismissing a thinker. On the contrary, the stronger the intellectual system, the more seriously ABC Theology should allow it to speak before testing its scope, presuppositions, explanatory power, and limits.

6. Atheism as a Real Accessibility Problem

The existence of atheism must therefore be treated as a real phenomenon rather than explained away. If God is omnipresent, yet human persons can sincerely experience, reason toward, or affirm a world in which God appears absent, ABC Theology faces a genuine accessibility question.

Divine omnipresence does not imply automatic human recognition of God.

This suggests a threefold distinction that deserves further study:

Ontological Presence ≠ Epistemic Accessibility ≠ Human Recognition

The distinction is presently a research tool, not a completed doctrine. It allows ABC Theology to ask how genuine non-recognition of God can occur without prematurely attributing a single motive to all atheists. Intellectual argument, suffering, cultural formation, moral resistance, scientific interpretation, and other possible pathways must be examined rather than assumed.

7. Matter, Consciousness, and the Human Person

The discussion of Lenin's definition of matter opened a useful route into Paper II. Lenin's famous formulation attempts to secure the mind-independent reality of matter by defining it in relation to sensation and consciousness. For the ABC project, however, acknowledging that physical reality exists independently of

human consciousness does not by itself settle the deeper question of the antecedence or ultimate ground of that reality.

This yields a research sequence rather than a conclusion:

matter → consciousness → human person

The sequence should not yet be treated as a complete causal theory. It names the order of questions now before us: What is matter? What is consciousness? What distinguishes a human person from either matter considered abstractly or consciousness considered in isolation?

A further question emerged from the accessibility framework:

Is matter itself an accessibility realization within Created Reality?

This question is especially important because it prevents ABC Theology from merely opposing materialism with an assertion. Instead, it asks what materialism successfully describes, what ontological commitments it makes, and whether its account of objective reality is sufficient to explain consciousness and the human person.

8. Implication for Paper II: Let the Strongest Human System Speak

For Paper II, the methodological consequence is decisive: Karl Marx and the intellectual tradition surrounding him should not be introduced merely as examples to be refuted. A powerful human explanatory system should first be reconstructed fairly and allowed to speak in its strongest historically supportable form. Only then should ABC Theology ask where its explanatory reach ends and what remains unaccounted for.

This remains consistent with the previously established discipline of Paper II: Marx must be distinguished from Marxism, later Marxist movements, and political regimes; historical facts must not be converted automatically into theological conclusions; and the final judgment of Karl Marx belongs to God.

The present research therefore does not begin by asking whether Marx was a "fool." It asks a more demanding question: how far can a human intellectual system proceed when human reason, material reality, practice, labor, history, and social relations are asked to carry the explanatory weight of reality?

9. Provisional Research Questions

- What is matter, beyond the criterion that it exists independently of human consciousness?
- What is consciousness, and can it be reduced exhaustively to material description?
- What constitutes a human person?
- How should ABC Theology distinguish ontological presence, epistemic accessibility, and human recognition?
- How can genuine atheistic non-recognition coexist with the confession of divine omnipresence?
- What exactly is represented by GPO_REST and by 0_ABS ↔ INS = 1/(Ω + 1), and what must remain beyond those representations?
- What does the accessibility realization of calamity disclose to finite creatures without making calamity constitutive of God?
- How far can human wisdom reach when it makes itself the sufficient ground for explaining reality?
- What survives careful examination in materialist accounts of matter, consciousness, practice, labor, and human social existence?

10. Research Boundary

No claim in today's discussion should yet be treated as a completed biblical doctrine, a scientific result, or a demonstrated mathematical theorem merely because it can be expressed in ABC/AZF-AZSF notation. The theological, philosophical, scientific, and mathematical levels must remain distinguishable. The value of the present framework lies in the questions it makes visible and in the disciplined comparisons it permits.

In particular, the AZF/AZSF representations discussed here should not be identified with God Himself. They function within the project's language of accessibility. Likewise, 1 Corinthians 1 should not be used to suppress intellectual inquiry; it places human wisdom under theological examination rather than abolishing the work of reason.

11. Working Conclusion

Today's discussion brought the research path from divine omnipresence to the human person into sharper focus. The central tension is not simply "faith versus atheism" or "God versus matter." It is the deeper relation among Reality, accessibility, recognition, and the limits of human explanatory systems.

God is not exhausted by accessibility; accessibility is not guaranteed to become recognition.

Accordingly, the next stage of Paper II should permit the strongest available account of matter and human reality to speak before asking what it can and cannot explain. The biblical challenge of 1 Corinthians 1 then becomes methodologically significant: human wisdom should be taken seriously enough to be tested at its strongest point, while never being assumed in advance to be the sufficient ground of all reality. **Evidence first. Construction afterward.**