AKI Second ABC Theological Research Note

October 3, 2026

Behind 0_ABS Is God: Divine Omnipresence Beyond the Limit of Accessibility

Status: Research note — a continuation of today's first note, not a manuscript-ready conclusion

1. Biblical Anchor: Isaiah 55:8–9

"For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways," declares the LORD. "As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts." (Isaiah 55:8–9)

For ABC Theology, this passage establishes a decisive theological boundary. Human thought may genuinely know something of God, but human thought cannot become the measure that contains or exhausts God. Divine transcendence therefore does not abolish accessibility; it prevents accessibility from being mistaken for mastery.

Accessibility ≠ Exhaustion

Human Recognition ≠ Measure of Divine Reality

2. The New Clarification: Behind 0_ABS Is God

Today's later discussion sharpened an important point that should be preserved separately from the first research note. Within the present ABC/AZF-AZSF construction, 0_ABS is not a region in which God ceases to be present. It arises through and remains under G-Tzimtzum. Accordingly, when creaturely accessibility reaches 0_ABS, it has reached an extreme accessibility boundary; it has not reached the end of Divine Presence.

0_ABS ≠ God

0_ABS is an accessibility boundary, not a boundary of God's presence.

This permits a concise theological formulation:

Behind 0_ABS is God.

The word "behind" is used here relationally and representationally, not spatially. God is not located behind a mathematical point or object. Rather, the expression means that what appears, from within a finite accessibility realization, as an ultimate boundary or radical nothingness does not possess ontological ultimacy over God.

3. G-Tzimtzum, 0_ABS, and GCR

The existing working relation is therefore retained:

God → G-Tzimtzum → 0_ABS

The First Fundamental Natural Law — the Holy Created Order (GCR) — exists within this ordered relation and is subject to it. The construction must not be reversed so that 0_ABS becomes an independent principle conditioning God.

0_ABS is under G-Tzimtzum; G-Tzimtzum is not under 0_ABS.

This preserves the ABC theological priority that the living LORD God alone is antecedent. The mathematical or structural language is an accessibility representation and must not be promoted into an independent divine ontology.

4. The TC_Ω_7 Trial and 0_ABS || God

The AZF/AZSF trial result associated with TC_Ω_7 is retained in its established notation:

$$0_ABS \,||\, God \;\equiv\; 0_ABS + God$$

This expression should not be read as a simple arithmetic addition of two coequal ultimate entities. Nor should it be read as the identity 0_ABS = God. Its significance lies in the accessibility structure disclosed by the TC_Ω_7 trial.

The later clarification suggests a more careful interpretation: what appears at one accessibility level as 0_ABS may, under a further accessibility realization, disclose that Divine Presence was never absent. Thus the trial should be studied as a possible accessibility transformation rather than as an ontological transformation of 0_ABS into God.

What changes is accessibility; God does not become God.

5. Divine Omnipresence: Two Established Accessibility Representations

Today's discussion preserves two representations of the omnipresence of LORD God:

$$1)\;\; GPO_REST$$

$$2)\;\; 0_ABS \leftrightarrow INS, \quad INS = 1/(\Omega + 1)$$

These representations must remain distinct from Divine Omnipresence itself. Their theological importance is that the second representation reaches precisely toward the extreme accessibility condition. If even the 0_ABS ↔ INS relation remains within the representation of omnipresence, then radical creaturely inaccessibility cannot simply be equated with Divine Absence.

The limit of accessibility is not the limit of Divine Presence.

6. Calamity as Accessibility Realization

The discussion of calamity ("劫") now becomes more precise. Calamity, privation, darkness, destruction, or the apparent approach to nothingness does not constitute God's goodness, perfection, omnipotence, omniscience, or omnipresence. God does not require an opposite in order to be God.

Nevertheless, for finite creatures, an extreme contrast may become an accessibility realization. It can expose the radical difference between creaturely limitation and Divine fullness. In this limited sense, calamity may make creaturely dependence and the non-self-sufficiency of created reality more accessible.

Contrast may disclose Divine perfection; contrast does not create Divine perfection.

7. Isaiah 55 and the Destruction of Self-Sufficient Wisdom

Isaiah 55:8–9 now deepens the earlier discussion of 1 Corinthians 1:19 and Isaiah 29:14. The biblical challenge is not a rejection of intelligence. It is a rejection of the assumption that finite human intelligence can become the sufficient measure of Reality.

The phrase “my thoughts are not your thoughts” therefore places an upper boundary on every human explanatory system — theological, philosophical, scientific, or mathematical. The stronger the system, the more important it is to let that system speak accurately and fully; but no system gains divine status merely by explanatory power.

Human wisdom may be powerful without being ontologically sufficient.

This strengthens the methodological question established earlier today:

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

8. Atheism Reconsidered: Absence of Recognition Is Not Absence of God

The reality of atheism becomes particularly important under this framework. A human person may sincerely experience or intellectually describe a world in which God appears absent. ABC Theology should not deny the reality of that human experience or prematurely reduce every atheist to a single psychological or moral explanation.

Yet the present construction also prevents a direct inference from non-recognition to ontological absence:

$$\text{“I do not find God”} \not\Rightarrow \text{“God is absent.”}$$

This is not offered as a proof of God’s existence. It is a distinction between epistemic experience and ontological conclusion. For ABC Theology, atheistic non-recognition therefore becomes a major test case for accessibility: how can the omnipresent God remain genuinely unrecognized by a finite human knower?

9. Return to Matter → Consciousness → Human Person

This clarification changes the depth of the developing Paper II question. If human consciousness is not the final measure of Reality, then defining matter solely by its independence from human consciousness cannot by itself establish matter as ontologically ultimate.

$$\text{matter} \rightarrow \text{consciousness} \rightarrow \text{human person}$$

The sequence remains a research sequence, not a completed causal theory. We must still ask what matter is, what consciousness is, and what constitutes the human person. But Isaiah 55:8–9 now supplies a biblical warning against allowing any one humanly accessible category — including matter, consciousness, reason, or mathematical representation — to become the exhaustive measure of Reality.

10. A Stronger ABC Principle Emerging from Today’s Work

The following proposition appears worthy of preservation as a provisional ABC theological research principle:

The limit of creaturely accessibility is not the limit of Divine Presence.

A complementary proposition follows:

What appears as nothing to an accessibility realization need not be ontological nothing before God.

These propositions require further biblical, theological, philosophical, and AZF/AZSF examination. They should not yet be elevated to manuscript-ready doctrine. Their present value is that they preserve the asymmetry between God and creaturely access to God.

11. Research Boundaries

Several non-identities must remain explicit:

0_ABS ≠ God

AZF/AZSF representation ≠ Divine Reality

Human non-recognition ≠ demonstrated Divine absence

Accessibility ≠ Exhaustion

Likewise, Isaiah 55:8–9 must remain Scripture rather than being converted into a mathematical theorem. AZF/AZSF may offer analogical or structural representations that help ABC Theology formulate questions, but those representations remain accountable to Scripture and must never be treated as additional revelation.

12. Working Conclusion

Today's second stage of discussion moved beyond the question of whether God can be represented at an accessibility boundary. The deeper insight is that no accessibility boundary can be allowed to function as a boundary imposed upon God.

Behind 0_ABS is God.

This does not identify God with 0_ABS. It confesses, within the ABC construction, that Divine Presence is not exhausted by what the creature can access, represent, perceive, or deny. Isaiah 55:8–9 provides the biblical horizon: God's thoughts and ways exceed ours as the heavens are higher than the earth.

Accordingly, the next movement toward Paper II should continue to let the strongest human accounts of matter, consciousness, and the human person speak in their strongest form, while testing the assumption that any human explanatory system can become the sufficient ground of Reality.

Evidence first. Construction afterward. Scripture remains normative.