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INTRODUCTION

And it came about when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother and killed him.
Genesis 4:8

Murder for the glory of God; how could it be? Religious studies academics habitually cast the story of Cain killing Abel in pejorative terms. E.g., q.v., (Lowry 1998; Inbinder 2004). Have we had it wrong before now? What is it about the Cain and Abel story we haven’t understood?

It’s actually straightforward. In the social welfare economist’s lexicon, scripture is a book on economics; social choice theory to be exact. Social choice theory is all about individual-to-societal well-being transitivity. The story of Cain and Abel is part of describing how the scripture writers’ social choice theory model operates; specifically, the fundamental ethical battle over subjective and objective perspectives.

The Cain and Abel story is set in the only social choice theory model space where the “Subjective Paradigm” meets the “Objective Paradigm.” The reason is threshold hierarchically structured and interrelated conflict resolution, simply described as ordered conflict resolution, commences in this basest of all spaces; the only space where the Subjective Paradigm exists.

Initial Objective Paradigm exclusionary prejudice evisceration and inclusionary prejudice impoundment occurs with an eye toward ever-increasing exogenous utility maximization foci. Cain is an Objective Paradigm metaphor. The Subjective Paradigm's initial exclusionary prejudice evisceration and inclusionary prejudice impoundment occurs with an eye toward endogenous utility maximization focus retention. Abel is a Subjective Paradigm metaphor.
Essentially, the Lord uses Abel to teach Cain the distinction between the Objective and Subjective Paradigms. As a result, the Lord regarded Abel’s offering, Genesis 4:4; not for its significance to Abel, but its significance for what it teaches Cain. Initially, Cain doesn’t get it right. He does not properly effect ridding himself of all Subjective Paradigm trappings while concomitantly adopting all Objective Paradigm characteristics. This is reflected in the Lord’s initial displeasure with Cain’s offering. Genesis 4:5. But, then Cain does get it right. The moment is captured by the report of Cain killing Abel. Genesis 4:8.

Cain’s accomplishment is captured in the famous question, “Am I my brother’s keeper?” Genesis 4:9. Cain is rhetorically investigating whether there is a scintilla of the Subjective Paradigm tainting his characterization of the Objective Paradigm. The Deities agree Cain successfully effected Subjective Paradigm evisceration and Objective Paradigm impoundment. Genesis 4:9-10. By turning this economic corner, transforming societal-to-individual well-being descension into individual-to-societal well-being ascension, Cain is heading back toward God’s domain. That is, Cain is now on the path to glorify God.

The paper’s organization simply consists of interpreting specific Book of Genesis passages centered on one objective: explaining why Cain had to kill Abel to glorify God. Section II provides a broad scripture writer social choice theory model overview and briefly explains how the scripture writers organized the Book of Genesis. This is beneficial inasmuch as Genesis 2:4-25 and Chapters 3 and 4 materially parallel macro-to-microeconomic descension and micro-to-macroeconomic ascension. Section III provides a broad overview of the Genesis Creation Sequence and God’s domain as it sets the stage for the Lord God’s initial Genesis 2:4 appearance and responsibilities.
Section IV begins specific passage interpretation as the Lord God introduces the Utility Maximizing Economic Prosecutor, or UMEP, to the Human Condition’s [(Given Combination Macroeconomic, Any Permutation Microeconomic), (Lower Order)] space. These events are Genesis 2:4-25 captured. The woman, as described in this space, is virginal and does not have children.

Section V continues specific passage interpretation as the fall from grace is reconciled in Human Condition (Any Permutation, Lower Order) into (Given Permutation, Higher Order) transition events. These events are Genesis Chapter 3 captured. It explains why the ex ante “bite-of-the-apple” woman is substantively different than the ex post bite-of-the-apple woman. The ex post bite-of-the-apple woman is scripture’s child-bearing woman.

Section VI likewise continues specific passage interpretation as the story of Cain killing Abel represents (Macroeconomic Combination Space into Microeconomic Permutation Space)-descension into (Microeconomic Permutation Space into Macroeconomic Combination Space)-ascension transition. These events are Genesis Chapter 4 captured; where the Lord’s presence is introduced. Section VII concludes heading back toward Macroeconomic Combination Space metaphorically glorifies God. That is why Cain killing Abel is a necessary condition; otherwise Cain would have been stuck in the Subjective Paradigm.

II
PBW MODEL OVERVIEW

Social choice theory involves individual well-being, societal well-being and such well-being transitivity. (Arrow, 1951 and 1963; Jenkins, 2006A and 2006B; Sen, 1999). It involves the interrelationship between social state definition (SSD) and social welfare function formulation (SWFF). Id.
In the scripture writers' social choice theory model, *The Perfect and Beautiful Woman* (PBW Model), SSD is a static notion; an ideal to be achieved. (Jenkins, 2006A and 2006B). SWFF is a dynamic notion, the process undertaken to achieve SSD. *Id.* Once incremental SSD\(_n\) is achieved by reconciling the economic organization to the state of the economy by and through the SSD\(_n\) qualities, SSD\(_n\) becomes SWFF impounded and no longer exists. *Id.* Thereupon, the next incremental SSD\(_n\) articulates the state of economy qualities that ought to become SWFF impounded. *Id.*

Insightfully, the religious studies academic literature has captured SSD and SWFF interrelationships. While Miles credits Becker with the “spiritual capital” notion (Miles 2005, p. 1; *citing*, Becker 1991), she intuitively recognizes the (SSD, SWFF) interrelationship, to wit:

> By noting that an individual's utility can be enhanced through increased attention to the utility of family, friends, and co-religionists, economic analysis can help us understand the collective (or "super") rationality of many forms of so-called "altruism." But by adding a concept of "spiritual capital," we can better understand how moral, religious, or spiritual beliefs motivate individuals to "do good" even to those whom they have no personal interest in benefiting. Spiritual or religious capital shifts the constraints imposed by material scarcity and invites believers to consider a different system of production.

(Miles 2005, p. 2).

Miles’ notion that an individual’s utility can be enhanced through “increased . . . collective” rationality captures the individual and societal well-being transitivity that is SWFF symptomatic. Adding the notion of spiritual capital as a constraint is analogous to the economist’s notion of incremental SSD cast as the social ideal. Ergo, there is a common basis between the religious studies and economics literature for grasping the significance of the scripture writers’ contribution to social choice theory impossibility resolution.
A. The Nature of a Model, the Book of Genesis and the Sacred Feminine

Both the contemporary economists and the scripture writers employ social choice theory models to examine their respective theories. The contemporary economists' social choice theory models include the tastes-based social welfare function models (Sen, 1999) and values-based social welfare function models (Arrow, 1951 and 1963). Understanding the scripture writers' social choice theory model, *The Perfect and Beautiful Woman*, begins with understanding their perspective of how a model operates. Once understood, it becomes readily transparent the Book of Genesis is organized along such model definition lines. Finally, answering the rhetorical question "What happened to the Sacred Feminine in the shift from polytheism to monotheism?" shows the scripture writers placed the Sacred Feminine atop the Book of Genesis. She is the glue that holds model operation together.

1. The Nature of a Model

The scripture writers define a model as the devolution of functions into progressions into positions. Quantitatively, a model is defined as the function $Z$, where $Z = f(X, Y)$; S.T. $Z_k$, $X_k$. The subscript "$k$" denotes the "any" condition; while a subscript "$i$" denotes the "given" condition. The problem with the foregoing statement is that the function $Z$ involves ordered infinite statements.

An ordered statement is defined as $(\text{Statement}_n, \text{Statement}_{n+1})$ such that the statements are hierarchically interrelated. Since the constraint is articulated in terms of two "any" condition statements, $Z_k$ and $X_k$, the function $Z$ is characterized as an ordered infinite statement and confounded. The "any" condition enables the infinite characterization. The scripture writers defined infinite statements as confounded. In order to deconfuse the statement, the constraint must be "given condition" transformed.
The first step in transforming the any-condition function $Z$ into a given-condition statement is to transform the function into a progression. This is accomplished by transforming the any-condition $Z$ into the given-condition $Z$. Thus, while the function $Z$ is defined as $Z = f(X, Y); S.T. Z_k, X_k$, the progression $Z$ is defined as $Z = f(X, Y); S.T. Z_i, X_i$. Now the statement involves only an unordered infinite statement, $X_k$. However, that means even the progression $Z$ is confounded. To deconfuse this statement, the progression $Z$ must be transformed into the position $Z$. This is accomplished by transforming the any-condition $X_k$ into the given-condition $X_i$. However, it is this transformation which raises the threshold social choice theory model ethical question.

An example will illustrate the ethos at hand. If it is assumed the position $Z$ statement is characterized as $Z = (X + Y)$, then for a given value $Z$, there is an infinite set satisfying the statement. In order to resolve the infinite nature of the statement either $X$ or $Y$ must declare an initial value. Then the other's value can be computed by comparing the declared value to $Z$. The ethical conflict involves the reference question, "Who gets to declare the initial value, $X$ or $Y"?"$.

The ethical conflict hosts two answers: the subjective versus objective reference. The different answers incur differing economic consequences. In a nutshell, this is the story of Cain and Abel.

The subjective reference is position $Z = f(X \text{ or } Y); S.T. Z_i, X_i$ defined as either the X-perspective adduced from the X-position or the Y-perspective adduced from the Y-position. The objective reference is position $Z = f(X \text{ or } Y); S.T. Z_i, X_i$ defined as either the Y-perspective adduced from the X-position or the X-perspective adduced from the Y-position.

Subjective reference declaration leaves the position $Z = f(X \text{ or } Y); S.T. Z_i, X_i$ conflict unresolved such that it matters who declares the reference first, $X$ or $Y$, because the declaration is
effected through the endogenous perspective. On the other hand, objective reference declaration makes it indifferent who declares the reference first, X or Y, because the declaration is effected through the exogenous perspective.

The ethical question involves whether incremental primary and antithetical conflict is either subjective reference or objective reference resolved. *Id.* The scripture writers demonstrate ordered subjective references (*i.e.*, an unordered conflict resolution tactic) result in significant economically inefficient consequences where (i) the perspective is (Microeconomic: Microeconomic) alignment characterized, and (ii) the (Macroeconomic: Microeconomic)-Perspective is inaccessible because its alignment is illusionary. *Id.* They also demonstrate ordered objective references (*i.e.*, an ordered conflict resolution tactic) result in significant economically efficient consequences where (i) the perspective is (Microeconomic: Macroeconomic) alignment characterized, and (ii) the (Macroeconomic: Microeconomic)-Perspective is accessible because its alignment is actual. *Id.* The scripture writers' ordered conflict resolution methodology distills to ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition. *Id.* Moreover, as a result of effecting ordered (subjective: objective) reference declaration, the scripture writers' social choice theory model is feasibly impossibility resolved. *Id.*

The foregoing social choice theory model lesson distills generalized conclusions: (i) subjective references lead to illusionary consequences defined as significant economically inefficient, and (ii) objective references lead to actual consequences defined as significant economically efficient.

2. The Organization of the Book of Genesis

As the preceding section demonstrates, the scripture writers' notion of a model involves processes referred to as functions, progressions and positions. The scripture writers' social
choice theory lessons distill to the idea that if all model positions involve ordered objective references, then the model can be completely described from the vantage of model positions. The lessons also distill to the idea that if all model progressions are equilibratorily aligned between functions and positions, then the model can be completely described from the vantage of model progressions. And, finally, models can always be described from the vantage of model functions, albeit depending on how the description is processed, it may appear confounded.

The scripture writers carefully structured the Book of Genesis in the context of function, progression and position model processes. That is, each element of the triune tells the same story; only from a differing perspectives -- functions, progressions and positions. Specifically, the scripture writers' explain their social choice theory model operation from the vantage of model function processes in the Genesis Creation Sequence, Genesis 1:1-31 and 2:1-3. They explain the same thing from the vantage of model progression processes in Genesis 2:4 through the end of Chapter 10. And, finally, the scripture writers complete the model trilogy by explaining how their social choice theory model operates from the vantage of model position processes in Genesis Chapters 11-50. That means, the scripture interpretation in this paper, taken from Genesis 2:4-25 and Chapters 3 and 4, are told from the vantage of model progression processes.

3. What Happened to the Sacred Feminine?

An interesting corollary involves answering the rhetorical question, "What happened to the Sacred Feminine in the transition from polytheism to monotheism?" The current thesis posits the transformation represents a fundamentally significant shift in the philosophical argument as to whether deities are (product, will, perception) endowed (the polytheistic definition) or are only defined by their wills (the monotheistic definition). That is, in polytheism, the Deity and Human
Conditions are like defined; while in monotheism, they are distinguished. While the Sacred Feminine actively participated in polytheism's deity (product, will, perception) metaphor scheme, her presence was transformed in the (polytheism: monotheism) transition. In the monotheistic setting, the Sacred Feminine was not exiled from deity significance; but, rather, she was redefined as the implicit nexus among the model's spaces, venues, entities, processes, states and stages and their operating parameters. She hosts a model's theorems, principles, properties and assumptions. This is why, today, we tend to refer to things like trains, boats, planes and automobiles using feminine labels. In the context of the scripture writers' social choice theory model, the Sacred Feminine is reposed atop the Book of Genesis, melding together the interrelationship of the model's function, progression and position processes. Because the scripture writers' social choice theory model is comparatively impossibilityresolved, the Sacred Feminine takes on special importance and is referred to herein as The Perfect and Beautiful Woman Model (PBW Model).

B. SSD and SWFF General Impossibility

The scripture writers’ social choice theory model is impossibility resolved whereas the contemporary economists’ social choice theory models are impossibility plagued. (Jenkins, 2006A and 2006B). The difference is that the scripture writers employ ordered conflict resolution tactics (i.e., ordered objective references) in an ordered conflict environment while the contemporary economists employ unordered conflict resolution tactics (i.e., ordered subjective references) in an ordered conflict environment. Id.

Specifically, contemporary economists employ a two-individual, three-social state model where the conflict involves individual comparative social state preference rankings. Id. Since the social states are inherently interrelated they are hierarchically structured. Id. That is, the
resulting preference ranking conflict involves ordered conflict. *Id.* Arrow’s famous possibility theorem claims the only impossibility resolved social choice theory model involves relaxing the condition of nondictatorship. *Id.* Arrow then employs the condition of the independence of irrelevant alternatives to settle all preference ranking conflicts in favor of the dictator. *Id.* This blunt conflict settlement conflict is (dictator-position, dictator-perspective) characterized; that is, it is a subjective reference. *Id.* Ergo, the contemporary economists employ ordered subjective references in an ordered conflict environment. *Id.* This, the scripture writers would claim, is the root cause of the contemporary economists’ social choice theory model general impossibility; not the reasons set forth by Arrow. Ordered conflict resolution is the fundamental ingenious aspect of the PBW Model. *Id.*

**C. The Economy, Economic Organizations and the Individual**

The PBW Model is organized such as to define the interrelationships among the economy, economic organizations and the individual. Simply stated, collections of individuals comprise an economic organization and collections of economic organizations comprise an economy. The economy can be described in terms of either a given state of the economy or any state of the economy.

In the PBW Model, the transition from the individual to the economic organization and the transition from the economic organization to the economy are endowed with certain commonalities. While the transition from the economic organization to the economy will be addressed in later academic papers, individual and economic organization model operation transitivity remains the centerpiece of this paper and explicitly coalesces with interpreting Genesis 2:4-25, Chapters 3 and 4 and the story of Cain killing Abel.
One of the important things to recognize is that the terms, "individual," "economic organization," and "economy" are relative. More than one individual is required to comprise an economic organization and more than one economic organization is required to comprise an economy. The term "individual" may include a person or an entity representing a collection of individuals. In such cases, either more than one person is required to comprise an economic organization of such persons or more than one entity is required to comprise an economic organization. Whether individuals or collections of individuals called entities comprise the economic organization, more than one economic organization is required to comprise an economy. In the PBW Model, the scripture writers define such transitions by their lowest common denominator, pairwise progression.

Scripture's transition from the economic organization to the individual in Genesis 2:4-25 first focuses on intra-economic organization transition. Generally speaking, when an economic organization's management policies are desensitized for individual idiosyncrasies, the policy position is management practice characterized. Until such desensitization is confirmed, the policy position is specific manager characterized. When scripture's metaphors describe a migration from a manager to a management practice, the migration indicates a progression from the economic organization to the economy is at hand. When scripture's metaphors described a migration from a management practice to a specific manager, the migration indicates a progression from the economic organization to the individual is at hand.

Both the management practice and the manager exist in and shape the economic organization as it comprises one of the equilateral triangles of the Star of David. (Jenkins 2006B). While the Star of David's conjoined equilateral triangles represent objective equilibratorily aligned economic space in the transition from microeconomic to macroeconomic
space, each of its equilateral triangles respectively represents subjective equilibratorily aligned microeconomic space. That is, two objective equilibratorily aligned microeconomic events define a macroeconomic event. *Id.*

Management practice and manager transitivity occurs within each of the Star of David equilateral triangles' subjective equilibratorily aligned economic space. Each Star of David equilateral triangle is defined by seven levels, while the entire Star of David is defined by nine levels. *Id.* These seven levels define order model processes in the operation of the PBW Model. *Id.* The ordered model notion is represented by the Noah's Ark metaphor, "You shall take with you of every clean animal by sevens, a male and its female;" (Genesis 7:2). That is, scripture's report of clean animals implicates ordered model processes and its seven levels.

On the other hand, the balance of that verse implicates the unordered model's primary and antithetical conflict when it reads, "... and of the animals that are not clean two, a male and his female." *Id.* The unordered model process involves unresolved management policy conflict referred to as ordered conflict. (Jenkins 2006A and 2006B). Conflict involves primary and antithetical opposing forces. *Id.* The numerosity of such opposing forces accounts for the "two" metaphor.

Learning hierarchy analysis academics have employed similar hierarchical structures as those used by the scripture writers in defining ordered and unordered model processes. Reporting on Professor Gagné's learning hierarchy analysis, Jonassen, *et al.*, illustrate a structure that can be described in ordered and unordered model process terms, to wit:
The Ordered Model

Figure 2.1
Professor Gagné's Learning Hierarchy

When a change in management policy is engendered, it must first undergo the process of resolving inherent revenue maximization and cost minimization conflicts. (Jenkins 2006B). Thereafter, its further equilibratory alignment is a matter of Pareto optimal exchanges where costs are minimized while revenue maximization is held constant; or revenues are maximized while cost minimization is held constant. Id. Once conflict is addressed in unordered model space and the conflict-resolved policy issue returns to ordered model space it is first confirmed as a feasible specific manager Pareto optimal policy and then it is confirmed as a feasible management practice Pareto optimal policy.

The transition from given manager to any manager (i.e., the management practice) management policy characterization is captured by the scripture writers as the transition from a given permutation to any permutation PBW Model theatre prosecution. The PBW Model theatre's most common socioeconomic entity is the camp. There are sixteen camps in each theatre. Given-permutation characterization involves given-manager commencement from one of the sixteen camps. Any-permutation characterization involves any-manager commencement from any of the sixteen camps. Thus, the given-permutation and any-permutation characterization distinguishes a specific manager from the management practice.

The specific scripture interpretation undertaken in this paper unveils the scripture writers' summary of certain PBW Model aspects including,

1. The transition from the economy to a specific economic organization represented by the transition from the Star of David to one of its equilateral triangles and the transition from objective to subjective equilibratorily aligned economic space (this involves the transition from God's domain in the Genesis Creation Sequence, Genesis Chapter 1 and 2:1-3, to the commencement of the description of the Lord God's domain in Genesis 2:4);
2. The transition from the specific economic organization's management practice to one of its specific managers (this involves the transition from the generalized "man" into the man named Adam);

3. The transition from Pareto optimal ordered model space to the unordered model space's ordered conflict environment and the transition of the manager to an individual (the bite of the forbidden fruit and the woman's transformation),

4. The rejection of individual ordered subjective reference declaration in favor of individual ordered objective reference declaration (this is where Cain kills Abel),

5. The return to ordered model space from unordered model space and the transition of the individual to a specific manager (Cain's genealogy), and

6. The transition from the specific manager to the economic organization's management practice and complete definition of a microeconomic event (Lamech's genealogy).

The transition from subjective to objective equilibratory aligned economic space is represented by the Genesis Chapter 5 metaphors, including its numerical reference litany. That will be the subject of a future PBW Model academic paper. The story of Noah's Ark, Genesis Chapters 6-10, involves the characterization of the economy and how economic progression is measured therein. That, too, will be the subject of a forthcoming academic paper.
III
THE GENESIS CREATION SEQUENCE
Genesis 1:1-31 and 2:1-3

The Genesis Creation Sequence is characterized as the Deities' PBW Model Functions Learning Theatre. The Scripture Writers employ a quaternary order Deity structure in which "I Am" is Primary Deity defined. The Primary Deity is the PBW Model Function "Continuum Deity." As the continuum Deity, I Am is the

The God, Lord God and Lord Deities are scripture-defined hierarchical Deities. The God Deity is the Secondary Deity and the PBW Model Function (Any, Any) Deity. The Lord God Deity is the Tertiary Deity and PBW Model Function (Given, Any) Deity. The Lord Deity is the Quaternary Deity and PBW Model Function (Given, Given) Deity. The Genesis Creation Sequence involves the Continuum Primary I Am Deity teaching the Secondary God, Tertiary Lord God and Quaternary Lord Deities several PBW Model functions. The functions define PBW Model operating parameters. The Genesis Creation Sequence theatre, *inter alia*, is defined as Mutual Reconciliation's (Any Combination Space, Any Permutation Space), Macroeconomic Combination Space and God domain.

A. The Deity Function Distinctions

The Deity Functions are broadly distinguished in the PBW Model as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deity</th>
<th>Objective Paradigm Deity Distinctions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Am</td>
<td>{([DGO_{ik}]<em>k), (ER</em>{ik}, RR_{ik}, MR_{ik})_k}, {(Ordered, Ordered) Interpersonal (Tastes, Values) Comparison Conflict Resolution}} Objective Paradigm.¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The $k$ subscript is an "any" reference. Since 1008 Divine Given Opportunities (DGOs) are in a given DGO set the $k$ subscript represents "any infinite" 1008 DGO Set continuum and any 1008 DGOs. Equilibratory alignment space is inherently defined as being a Macroeconomic Event space; non-equilibratory alignment space is inherently defined as being a Microeconomic Event space. DGOs are a function of the "Mountains of Ararat DGO and DGO Social State Accounting System." (The *Mountains of Ararat* DGO and DGO Social State Accounting System.)
God

The \{[(DGO)\text{i}], [(ER)\text{ii}, RR_{\text{ik}}, MR_{\text{kk}})], [(Ordered, Ordered) Interpersonal (Tastes, Values) Comparison Conflict Resolution}\} Objective Paradigm.

Lord God

The \{[(DGO)\text{i}], [(ER)\text{ii}], [(Ordered, Ordered) Interpersonal (Tastes, Values) Comparison Conflict Resolution]\} Objective Paradigm.

Lord

The \{[(DGO)\text{i}], [(ER)\text{ii}], [(Unordered, Ordered) Interpersonal (Tastes, Values) Comparison Conflict Resolution]\} Objective Paradigm. ²

B. Deity Objective Transition

The Deity Condition Objective transition is defined as [((\rightarrow), (EMP, Lock), (RETEMP, Unlock))]. Comparatively, the Human Condition Objective transition is defined as [((\rightarrow), (EMP, Lock), (RETEMP, Unlock))]. Both (Lock, Unlock) conditions may be concomitantly imposed or satisfied. Generally, a progression "Lock" means that incremental progression is prevented until an appropriate RETEMP is effected. A progression "Unlock" means that incremental progression is enabled, given the appropriate RETEMP. The progression Lock is an (EMP, APPGIT-Serial) function and the progression Unlock is a (RETEMP, APPGIT) function. APPGIT is the voice in which the Deity language is delivered. APPGIT-Serial language is superficially equivalent to ordinary serialization in the Subjective Paradigm.

C. The God Deity Genesis Creation Sequence Domain: Where the Deities Learn PBW Model Functions

The Genesis Creation Sequence includes Scripture's most compact yet complete PBW Model recitation. This is where I Am teaches God, Lord God and Lord the several and relevant

Accounting System will be interpreted from Scripture in a future academic paper.) Multivariate subscript designations are always (Complex, Simplex)-ordered variables. Since (i) ER (Exclusive Reconciliation), RR (Reflexive Reconciliation) or MR (Mutual Reconciliation) are (Combination, Permutation) references and (ii) combinations are comparatively more complex than permutations, the ER, RR and MR multivariate subscripts are read as \{[(Combination, Permutation), [(Any, k), (Given, i)]\}.

² APPGIT occurs in the Lord's \{[(DGO)\text{i}], [(ER)\text{ii}], [(Unordered, Ordered) Interpersonal (Tastes, Values) Comparison Conflict Resolution]\} Objective Paradigm space.
PBW Model functions. The next teaching theatre includes Genesis 2:4-25 and Chapters 3-10. This theatre somewhat explodes the Genesis Creation Sequence PBW Model learnt functions as the teaching audience expands. The PBW Model begins to operate in Genesis Chapter 11.

II
THE LORD GOD DEITY GIVEN COMBINATION FUNCTION (GENESIS 2:4-24): UMEPₙ LEARNS THE PBW MODEL FUNCTIONS

In this passage, the Lord God Deity teaches to the (Utility Maximizing Economic Prosecutor)ₙ (UMEPₙ) the PBW Model functions that the Lord God Deity learnt in the Genesis Creation Sequence. The Lord God Deity's domain is Reflexive Reconciliation's (Given Combination, Any Permutation) and is defined as being in Equilibratory Alignment Space.

A. The Scripture Writers' Social Welfare Function Definition: Distilling Equilibratory Alignment

Genesis 2:4-7 generally explains the (God: Lord God) Deity domain transition. This passage also incurs the Equilibratory Alignment Space perspective of the Objective Paradigm's threshold social welfare function formulation and social state definition.

B. The (Macroeconomic Combination Space, Equilibratory Alignment, Microeconomic Permutation Space) Function

Genesis 2:9 refers to the "Tree of Life" and the "Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil." This verse defines the (Macroeconomic Combination Space, Equilibratory Alignment Space, Microeconomic Permutation Space) function in which the Tree of Life provides the Equilibratory Alignment Space's perspective of Macroeconomic Combination Space. And, the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil provides the Equilibratory Alignment Space's perspective of Microeconomic Permutation Space. The verse structure also imposes a Deity (EMP, Lock), foreclosing UMEPₙ PBW Model progression until (RETEMP, Unlock) is effected.
C. DGO-Invested Equilibratory Alignment

Genesis 2:10-14 recounts the "Four Rivers," which is the enciphered Equilibratory Alignment Space perspective of the Mountains of Ararat DGO and DGO Social State Accounting System. The Scripture Writers use the Mountains of Ararat DGO and DGO Social State Accounting System as a social welfare progression measurement system in lieu of countenancing unrestrained quaternary order combination space. The point made is that PBW Model progression is DGO invested.

D. Commencement of the Utility-Maximizing Economic Prosecutor's Function

In Genesis 2:15-20, the Lord God Deity teaches UMEP the necessary conditions for Equilibratory Alignment Space functioning. The teaching includes the Lord God's correcting UMEP when UMEP initially comes up short of the Equilibratory Alignment Space necessary conditions.

E. Eve's Separate Creation-Entity Assumption

Genesis 2:18, inter alia, defines "Eve's Separate Creation-Entity Assumption" on which the Scripture Writers' social welfare function formulation and social state definition are based. This assumption enables transforming subjective assessment into objective discernment. Objective discernment is a utility maximization focus (UMF) shift necessary condition. An UMF-shift, in turn, is an APPGIT-voice-change necessary condition. And, APPGIT-voice-change is a necessary condition for APPGIT-compliant progression.

F. (SIIT = PC) Definition, (Subjectivity, Objectivity) and Objective Paradigm Characterization
UMEP, Spiritual Infrastructure is defined by the Scripture Writers in the PBW Model as
{[(Macroeconomic Combination Space), (PC₄)], [(Equilibratory Alignment Space), (SI[Π₃, PC₄]),
[(Microeconomic Permutation Space), (SI[Π₃, PC₄, PCP₂])]. Allegorical references are inherently enciphered in scripture as {[(Combination Space, PC₄, Man), [(Equilibratory Alignment Space), (SI[Π₃, PC₄), (Woman, Man)], [(Permutation Space), (SI[Π₃, PC₄, PCP₂), (Child, Man, Woman)]}.³ The definition is inherently an APPGIT-Serial (EMP, Lock) function inasmuch as it is a progressive APPGIT-Serial [(4): (4, 3): (4, 3, 2)] ascription. The UMEPₙ (EMP, Lock) is a (Mountains of Ararat DGO and DGO Social State Accounting System)ₙ progression lock.

IV
THE LORD GOD DEITY ANY PERMUTATION FUNCTION (GENESIS CHAPTER 3): THE (UMEPₙ+<₁>:ₙ, APPGIT VCₙ:ₙ+₁) PBW MODEL FUNCTION

The principal thesis of Genesis Chapter 3 is a description of the Lord God's Any Permutation domain characteristics and the (UMEPₙ+<₁>:ₙ, APPGIT-VCₙ:ₙ+₁) PBW Model Function.⁴ The Lord God's Reflexive Reconciliation (Given Combination, Any Permutation) domain is defined by UMEPₙ commencing progression on an "Any Camp" permutation basis. For example, a quaternary order PBW Model Structure is defined by 16 camps.⁵ A "Given Permutation" is defined by referring to a given camp out of the 16 camps for progression commencement purposes. That is, in a Given Permutation context, it makes a difference as to the camp from which UMEP commences progression. "Any Permutation" is defined by

³ SI[Π] is defined as Spiritual Infrastructure Product and is a (PC, PCP) function. PC or PCORSC is defined as a philosophical code of right-standing conduct. PCP is defined as PC perception. The (4, 3, 2) subscripts are APPGIT-Serial Lock ascriptions while the (3, 4, 2) subscripts are APPGIT unlock ascriptions.

⁴ APPGIT-VC is defined as an APPGIT Voice Change.

⁵ The quaternary order PBW Model structure is not limited as to its quaternary nature until Cain's Genesis 4:13 lament and the Lord's Genesis 4:14 sevenfold vengeance relent.
referring to commencing progression from any of the 16 camps. That is, in an Any Permutation context, it does not make a difference as to the camp from which UMEP commences progression. Since each PBW Model camp is uniquely quaternary order Antithetical-Primary Population voice characterized, UMEP's Antithetical-Primary Population voice must change as Any Permutation satisfaction requires camp-to-camp prosecution commencement APPGIT-Voice-Change: (UMEP\(_{n+<1>}: n\), APPGIT-VC\(_{n; n+1}\)).
A. The "Bite of the Apple": The Woman's (SI[Π]: PCP) and (PCP: SI[Π]) Transformation

The woman's (SI[Π]: PCP) transformation is a necessary condition for APPGIT-VC\(_{n+1}\) inasmuch as APPGIT-VC\(_{n+1}\) requires an UMEP\(_{n+<I>:\:n}\) transition. Equilibratory Alignment Space offers no child metaphorical reference, only (PC\(_4\), Man) and (SI[Π], Woman) metaphorical references. The equilibratorily aligned woman is defined on a lower order basis.\(^6\) As the Equilibratory Alignment Space Spiritual Infrastructure Product, the woman represents a given APPGIT-voice in an Any Permutation environment. UMEP\(_{n+<I>:\:n}\) transition is effected from \{[LO (Given Combination, Any Permutation)]: [HO (Given Combination, Any Permutation)]\}. The LO distinction is chiefly woman-centered because, in the (Given Combination, Any Permutation) context where progression commencement changes require a different commencement Antithetical-Primary Population voice, the (LO, Woman, SI[Π]) becomes (HO, Woman, PCP) transformed. The (HO, Woman, PCP) must necessarily embrace her role as derived from the (Given Combination, Given Permutation) space. That is, the (Given Combination, Given Permutation) space nature is not Equilibratory Alignment Space defined; but, rather, it is Microeconomic Permutation Space defined. This so called (Equilibratory Alignment Space: Microeconomic Permutation Space) "fall from grace" is all about the Any Permutation UMEP\(_n\) progression commencement APPGIT-voice-change that necessitates a \{(LO, Woman, SI[Π]): (HO, Woman, PCP)\} transformation. That's why the "bite of the apple" story is all about "Eve."

\(^6\) A lower order (LO) devolves while a higher order (HO) evolves. Devolution proceeds from the reconciled to the unreconciled while evolution proceeds from the unreconciled to the reconciled.
B. The Woman's Lament

The Genesis 3:13 woman laments to the Lord God, "The serpent deceived me, and I ate." This is the LO Any Permutation Woman speaking. The serpent did not deceive her. Rather she countenanced only the LO notion, not the HO notion. The LO Any Permutation Woman is SI defined and her perspective is \(((\text{Macroeconomic Combination Space}): (\text{Equilibratory Alignment Space}): (\text{Microeconomic Permutation Space}))\) oriented. From this perspective she never loses sight of the Objective Paradigm because the first LO rung achievement is characterized as ordered interpersonal tastes and values comparison conflict resolution space. This characterization is symptomatic of only the Objective Paradigm. That is, it does not apply to any other paradigm, such as the Subjective Paradigm. The Any Permutation \(((\text{UMEP}_{n+1} < \text{UMEP}_n), (\text{APPGIT VC}_n, \text{APPGIT VC}_{n+1}))\) transition is (i) a LO: HO necessary condition, (ii) a \(((\{\text{LO}\}, (\text{Macroeconomic Combination Space}): (\text{Equilibratory Alignment Space}): (\text{Microeconomic Permutation Space})): (\{\text{HO}\}: (\text{Microeconomic Permutation Space}): (\text{Equilibratory Alignment Space}): (\text{Macroeconomic Combination Space})))\) perspective transition, and (iii) a function of an HO \(((\{\text{Subjective Paradigm}, (\{\text{Unordered, Unordered} \text{ Interpersonal (Tastes or Values) Comparison Conflict Resolution}\}), (\{\text{Objective Paradigm}, (\{\text{Unordered, Ordered} \text{ Interpersonal (Tastes and Values) Comparison Conflict Resolution}\})))\) choice function. The HO Any Permutation Woman is PCP-defined and her perspective is \(((\text{Microeconomic Permutation Space}): (\text{Equilibratory Alignment Space}): (\text{Macroeconomic Combination Space}))\). The deceit is an \(((\{\text{Objective, Paradigm}, [\text{APPGIT-Serial (EMP, Lock)}], [432]), (\{\text{Subjective Paradigm}, [\text{Ordinary Number Serialization}], [432]))\) difference function. The LO Woman only knows 432 as the APPGIT-Serial (EMP, Lock); she does not comprehend that it also implicates the HO
Woman's Subjective Paradigm ordinary number serialization perspective. Ergo, she deems that the serpent deceived her when, in fact, the serpent was educating her.

C. The Any Permutation EMP Double Lock.

The Lord God's \((\text{UMEP}_{n+\langle t: n, \text{APPGIT VC}_{n: n+1}})\) response constitutes the Any Permutation EMP Double Lock. The Lord God metes out consequences in a (Serpent, Woman, Adam) order. The Serpent, here, represents camp-to-camp APPGIT-voice-change SI\(\prod\) differences and, therefore, is APPGIT-SI\(\prod\)_3 ascribed. The Woman is now \((\text{LO, Given Combination, SI}\prod_3): (\text{HO, Any Permutation, PCP}_2)\) transformed and is, therefore APPGIT-PCP2 ascribed. Adam or the "Man" remains APPGIT-PC4 ascribed. Ergo, the (Serpent, Woman, Adam) order is APPGIT (SI\(\prod\)_3, PCP2, PC4) or (324) ascribed. The 324 (EMP, Lock) constitutes a \((\text{UMEP}_{n+\langle t: n, \text{Lord God}}, (\leftrightarrow, 342\odot))\) double lock. The step-by-step double lock process follows:

1. The First Lock

First, recognize that \((\leftrightarrow, 342\odot) = \odot243\) represents the vertical or Deity perspective. The Lord God's Genesis 2:4-25 and Chapter 3 domain is defined as Lord God\(\uparrow\otimes\) or \((\text{Lord God), (Given Combination, Any Permutation})\). A completed (Given Combination, Any Permutation) is defined: \((\leftrightarrow, 3421) = 1243\). The \((\leftrightarrow, 3421) = 1243\) statement is a horizontal or Pythagorean 4-Space statement. The Genesis 2:4-25 and Chapter 3 lesson is a \((\{(\text{Lord God}\_\uparrow\otimes\), (\text{Lord God}\_\uparrow\otimes)\}, \{(\text{Given Combination, Any Permutation})_{\text{vertical}}: [(\text{Given Combination})_{\text{vertical}}, (\text{Any Permutation})_{\text{vertical}}]\})\) function. The horizontal \((\leftrightarrow, 3421) = 1243\) statement is vertical \([(\leftrightarrow, 342\odot) = \odot243]\) transformed where \([(\leftrightarrow, 342\odot) = \odot243]\) is a Pythagorean 3_Space statement. Deities are always vertical space operators and always
articulated in the APPGIT voice. The Genesis 2:4-25 vertical \[\text{(Deity: UMEP}_n, \text{EMP, Lock)}\] is a Deity (APPGIT: APPGIT-Serial) function: \[\text{APPGIT (243)} \Rightarrow \text{APPGIT-Serial (234)}\] = \[\text{APPGIT (243)} \Rightarrow \text{APPGIT-Serial (234)}\]. Ergo, 234 represents the Genesis 2:4-25 vertical \[\text{(Deity: UMEP}_n, \text{EMP, Lock)}\], which is the first (EMP, Lock) in play here.


2. The Second Lock

*Ex ante* Second Lock, the APPGIT ascription is 234. The second lock is a Genesis Chapter 3 (UMEP\textsuperscript{n+<I>} : UMEP\textsuperscript{n}) function. Since the second lock is solely a UMEP or horizontal space function, the second lock is a (→, horizontal) function. The second lock is [(APPGIT, →, 342): (APPGIT-Serial, →, 432)] akin to: [(2\textsubscript{3}3\textsubscript{4}2\textsubscript{4}2): (3\textsubscript{4}, 2\textsubscript{3}, 4\textsubscript{2})]. Ergo, the number 324 represents a (Given Combination, Any Permutation) double lock.

3. [(UMEP\textsubscript{n}): (UMEP\textsubscript{n+<I}, UMEP\textsubscript{n})]

With respect to the Genesis Chapter 3 Any Permutation (UMEP\textsubscript{n+<I}: UMEP\textsubscript{n}) APPGIT-voice-change, the Genesis 2:4-25 UMEP\textsubscript{n} becomes the Genesis Chapter 3 (UMEP\textsubscript{n+<I}, APPGIT VC\textsubscript{n}). The Genesis Chapter 3 (UMEP\textsubscript{n}, APPGIT VC\textsubscript{n+1}) is the second APPGIT-voiced UMEP whose APPGIT-voice differs from the first APPGIT-voiced UMEP. Ergo, UMEP\textsubscript{n}'s (Genesis 2:4-25, Chapter 3) relationship is defined as \{[Genesis 2:4-25, UMEP\textsubscript{n}], [(Genesis 2:4-25, Genesis Chapter 3), (UMEP\textsubscript{n+<I>, UMEP\textsubscript{n}})]\}. The [(UMEP\textsubscript{n+<I>, UMEP\textsubscript{n}}, (n+<I>, n)] relationship is validated by Ezra 2:17 (Bezai, 323) and Nehemiah 7:23 (Bezai, 324). The Nehemiah Bezai is like the Genesis Chapter 3 double-locked UMEP\textsubscript{n} because the census is reported to have been 324. The Ezra Bezai is like the Genesis Chapter 3 single-locked UMEP\textsubscript{n+<I>}, because the census is reported as having been 324 + <1> = 323.

D. Bruising the Serpent: (Equilibratory Alignment: Nonalignment) and the Undoing of the Star of David

The Genesis 3:14-15 events are, respectively, [(Permutation Space, Given Permutation), (Equilibratory Alignment Space, Any Permutation)]-related. Ergo, the events are (↔, Deity Perspective)-related although what is being described is an {[(Equilibratory Alignment Space),}
(Given Combination, Any Permutation)}: [(Permutation Space), (Given Combination, Given Permutation)] transition.

Two distinct serpentine differences are in play here, as well. The Genesis 3:15 Lord God reports that the serpent will be bruised on the head and, in turn, will bruise on the heel, is an encrypted reference for undoing the equilibratorily aligned ($\star$, Star of David) into non-equilibratorily aligned [(EMP, $\Delta$), (RETEMP, $\nabla$)], to wit: $\{[\star, \text{Star of David}]: [(\text{EMP}, \Delta), (\text{RETEMP}, \nabla)]\}$. This serpent represents LO [(UMEP$\_n^{<1>:}$ UMEP$_n$), (Any Permutation)$_k$] differences. The verse 15 "woman" is a LO [(Equilibratory Alignment Space), (Woman, SI[I])] reference.

The Genesis 3:14 serpent represents HO [(UMEP$_n$), (Any Permutation)$_i$] differences where (Any Permutation)$_i$ is substantively equivalent to (Given Permutation). The verse 14 "woman" refers to "HO [(Equilibratory Alignment Space), (Woman, PCP)]."

The verse 15 woman is graphically depicted as substantively equivalent to the equilibratorily aligned Genesis 2:22 woman:

![The Genesis 3:15 Woman](image)

The verse 14 woman, on the other hand, is graphically depicted as the impregnable wife, implicating {Equilibratory Alignment Space [(Exponential, Logarithmic), Objective, (SI[?])]}:
The Genesis Space \{(Exponential, Bifurcating Linear Progression, Logarithmic), Objective, (PCP)\}, to wit:

**The Genesis 3:14 Woman**

The Genesis 3:22-24 Garden of Eden eviction is all about the [(Given Combination, Any Permutation): (Given Combination, Given Permutation)] transition.

V

**THE LORD DEITY (GIVEN COMBINATION, GIVEN PERMUTATION) FUNCTION: THE UMEP SET TEACHES THE DEVOTEE POPULATION THE PBW MODEL LEARNT FUNCTIONS**

Genesis Chapter 4 is the Lord Deity's domain, which is defined as Exclusive Reconciliation's (Given Combination, Given Permutation) Permutation Space. This is where the Lord supervises UMEP,\(n\)'s teaching to the Devotee Population the PBW Model functions, the learning of which progressively devolved from the Genesis Creation Sequence, Genesis 1:1-31 and 2:1-3. Generally, a Devotee Population implicates the Objective Paradigm because the essential notion of a UMF-shift is characterized as being symptomatic of devotion. In Genesis Chapter 4, the Lord Deity is teaching Cain, who is now UMEP,\(n\) for the Devotee Population, the distinction between the Subjective and Objective Paradigms. Allegorically, Cain represents the Objective Paradigm, while Abel represents the Subjective Paradigm.
A. Cain Killing Abel: The Lord Teaches Cain the Subjective, Objective Paradigm Distinction

The Lord Deity teaches Cain that the {Subjective Paradigm, Objective Paradigm} distinction lies in the differences between the following:

(i) {Subjective Paradigm, (Unordered, Unordered) Interpersonal (Tastes or Values) Comparison Conflict Resolution}, and

(ii) {Objective Paradigm, (Unordered, Ordered) Interpersonal (Tastes and Values) Comparison Conflict Resolution}).

First, Genesis 4:4 reports the Lord as having regard for Abel's offering. The regard is not for Abel's paradigm, per se, because Abel represents the Subjective Paradigm and Deities do not countenance the Subjective Paradigm. Rather, the Lord's regard is for what Abel's offering teaches Cain. Essentially, the teaching represents the idea that both the Subjective Paradigm's and the Objective Paradigm's threshold "Interpersonal (Tastes, Values) Comparison Conflict Resolution" is unordered. The paradigmatical difference has to do with whether there is an eye toward ordered conflict resolution. The APPGIT Theorem holds that it is generally impossible for the Subjective Paradigm to be characterized as having an eye toward ordered conflict resolution because the Subjective Paradigm does not countenance the essential UMF-shift that defines APPGIT-voice-changes, which in turn, characterize APPGIT-compliant progression. Ergo, ordered exclusionary prejudices make it generally impossible to discern actual Tastes Utility Functions in the Subjective Paradigm, which in turn, makes it generally impossible to formulate a meaningful social welfare function that culminates in a meaningful social state definition. On the other hand, having an eye toward ordered conflict resolution, although such a perception may be situated at the threshold of unordered conflict resolution, characterizes the
Objective Paradigm and distinguishes it from the Subjective Paradigm. The APPGIT-compliant Objective Paradigm progression leads to a meaningful social welfare function formulation that culminates in a meaningful social state definition.

B. Cain's Sevenfold Vengeance: Defining the Quaternary Order PBW Model Structure

The Lord Deity's teaching of Cain begins with the Lord's lack of regard for Cain's offering. The lack of regard occurs because Cain didn't get it right. The threshold of unordered conflict resolution is characterized as the Subjective Paradigm until characteristics of the Objective Paradigm and UMF shift-predicated APPGIT-voice-change are achieved. The UMF-shift must be an [Objective, (GOXE, EXOG, ENDOG)] function; else, the effort falls short and remains characterized as the Subjective Paradigm. Cain's killing Abel represents the idea that Cain finally got it right. He successfully distinguished the Objective Paradigm from the Subjective Paradigm on the threshold of "Unordered Interpersonal (Tastes, Values) Comparison Conflict Resolution" because he achieved a (GOXE, EXOG, ENDOG) eye toward "Ordered Interpersonal (Tastes, Values) Comparison Conflict Resolution."

Cain's killing of Abel represents the turning point of descension and ascension. Genesis Chapter 2 and 3 are about descension defined as (Macroeconomic Combination Space): (Equilibratory Alignment Space): (Microeconomic Permutation Space). Cain's killing Abel commences ascension defined as (Microeconomic Permutation Space): (Equilibratory Alignment Space): (Macroeconomic Combination Space). Ergo, Cain's killing Abel represents the descension: ascension turning point. Moreover, Cain's killing Abel is unequivocally an

---

7 "ENDOG" is defined as the [Endogenous, Endogenous] progression state of the world. "EXOG" is defined as the [(Endogenous, Exogenous), (Exogenous, Endogenous)] progression state of the world. "GOXE" is defined as the [Exogenous, Exogenous] progression state of the world.
ascension necessary condition. Since God's domain is Macroeconomic Combination Space and Cain's goal is to return to such space, it can be said Cain had to kill Abel for the glory of God.

When Cain realizes how enormous unchecked APPGIT-compliant progression is in scope, he laments to the Lord in Genesis 4:13, "My punishment is too great to bear!" The Lord then concedes as much and confines the (VOWₙ: VOWₙ₊₁) PBW Model Structure to eight (8) QEXPs by confining the QEXP transitions to seven transitions, in toto, for each PBW Model structure.⁸ That is, this is the first place in scripture where the PBW Model structure is defined as a quaternary order. The seven QEXP transitions are defined in "spiritual infrastructure" terms and comprise Cain's sevenfold vengeance.

C. Cain's Genealogy: The PBW Model Structure as a (QLO, QHO) Environment

By going out of the presence of the Lord as reported in Genesis 4:16, Cain is addressing the definition of HO [(Exclusionary Prejudice Evisceration): (Inclusionary Prejudice Impoundment)]. While Cain's sevenfold vengeance defines the quaternary-order PBW Model Structure, his (Enoch, Irad, Mehujael, Methushael, Lamech) genealogy (five generations) defines the quaternary-order PBW Model Structure as a (QLO, QHO) prosecution theatre, to wit:

---

⁸ QEXP refers to the Quaternary Exogenous Prejudice. In any given PBW Model Structure there are 8 QEXPs that are primary and antithetical exogenous prejudice comprised. This accounts for the total of 16 PBW Model Structure Camps.
**Cain's (QLO, QHO) Genealogy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descendant</th>
<th>QLO</th>
<th>QHO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lamech</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methushael</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Quaternary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehujael</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irad</td>
<td>Quaternary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enoch</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Lamech's Seventy-sevenfold Vengeance: [(EMP, ▲), (RETEMP, ▼)] Definition**

Genesis 4:19-24 reports Lamech's further embellished genealogy. Lamech's genealogy is graphically depicted as:

![Lamech's Genealogy Diagram]

The foregoing Lamech genealogy schematic shapes the [(EMP, ▲), (RETEMP, ▼)] PBW Model Structure composition as [(1-GOXE, 7), (2-EXOG, 3), (4-ENDOG, 1)], to wit:
That is, the solitary GOXE progression state of the world is seven PBW Model Structures comprised; each of the two EXOG progression states of the world are three PBW Model Structures comprised; and, each of the four ENDOG progression states of the world are one PBW Model Structure comprised.

Finally, while Cain's sevenfold vengeance defines the quaternary-order PBW Model Structure, Lamech's seventy-sevenfold vengeance defines the respective non-equilibratorily aligned seven-level [(EMP), (GOXE, EXOG, ENDOG)] and seven-level [(RETEMP), (GOXE, EXOG, ENDOG)] microeconomic events. Lamech's 77-fold vengeance represents two sevens side by side. The side-by-side presentation references the non-equilibratorily aligned [(EMP, ▲), (RETEMP, ▼)] characterization.

The reader may find it helpful to note that, although not immediately within the scope of this treatise, Genesis Chapter 5 addresses the transition of non-equilibratorily aligned [(EMP, ▲), (RETEMP, ▼)] space into equilibratorily aligned (Star of David, ♠) space. This is addressed in The Christ Model treatise.⁹ Genesis Chapters 6-10 address the transition of the pre-flood unrestrained quaternary order combination space into the post-flood definition of the Mountains of Ararat DGO and DGO Social State Accounting System. Ergo, Genesis 2:4-25 and

---

Chapters 3-10 expound upon the teaching of the Genesis Creation Sequence PBW Model functions by expanding on the teaching of PBW Model (descension: ascension) progression in terms of 
\[(\text{Macroeconomic Combination Space}): (\text{Equilibratory Alignment Space}): (\text{Microeconomic Permutation Space})]: [(\text{Microeconomic Permutation Space}): (\text{Equilibratory Alignment Space}): (\text{Macroeconomic Combination Space})].\] Genesis Chapter 11 commences PBW Model operation.

VI
Conclusion

The Contemporary Economists' failure to deal with ordered interpersonal tastes and values comparison conflict under the Subjective Paradigm condemns their social welfare function formulation and social state definition as generally impossible. However, the impossibility is not for the reasons articulated by Arrow's impossibility theorem, but for the reason that Arrow and the Contemporary Economists employ an unordered conflict resolution tactic in an ordered conflict environment. The Scripture Writers ferret the difference between the two paradigms, \{[\text{Subjective Paradigm}] \text{ versus } [\text{Objective Paradigm}]\}, and demonstrate impossibility-resolved social welfare function formulation that culminates in meaningful social state definition. The Scripture Writers' Objective Paradigm's achievement is defined as ordered interpersonal tastes and values comparison conflict resolution, which in turn, is enabled by APPGIT-Compliant Progression. Ergo, Scripture's Antithetical-Primary Population General Impossibility Theorem is the \{(\text{Tastes, Values}) \text{ Social Welfare Function's Ordered Conflict Resolution Constraint}\}. 

34