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Abstract

Ever since polytheism gave way to the demands of monotheism women have searched for their place in every religion or theology’s deity structure. The prevailing thought that scripture held counsel only for the male deity role permeated every fabric of society, affecting women and women’s rights along the way. First, this paper educates what engendered the (polytheism: monotheism) shift. Second, this paper reveals the role of the monotheistic female deity has been scripture impounded since it was written inasmuch as scripture’s God is a woman.
Introduction

I attended the American Academy of Religion’s Western Region meeting in March 2005. It was held on the Arizona State University campus. The conference was humming with the female religious studies professors’ renewed academic interest in the Sacred Feminine; a buzz surely inspired by the then forthcoming May release of the *DaVinci Code* movie and its focus on Mary Magdalene.

It was the first academic meeting I attended following my October 2004 release from prison. I found the female religious studies professors’ focus on the Sacred Feminine quite interesting although, in the past, I had been an accounting and tax professor; a field quite distant from traditional religious studies research. My scripture research interest is defined by social choice theory; a field in economics involving (individual: societal) well-being transitivity.

Commencing January 1999 I spent a good deal of my incarceration time studying scripture; motivated by a set of “Instructions” I had been given on March 13, 1997. As my research progressed, I deciphered what I believe is scripture’s most important secret. I refer to it as “Ordered Conflict Resolution.” A paper by the same title was eventually published in early 2010. (Jenkins 2010).

I received the Instructions because I had been “introduced” to a blonde guard while incarcerated. In hindsight, I concluded she had come to the prison facility to meet me in person and propound a romantic interest that reached its prosperous conclusion on March 14, 1997.

A week later, I was moved to another prison yard. It wasn’t long after I realized informal information signals regarding my new love interest filled the airwaves through the transparent cooperation of local radio stations. I remember the breakthrough song: Doris Troy’s *Just One Look*. It was played on the Phoenix radio station, *KOOL* 94.5.
At my new facility I was again assigned to work in the prison kitchen. I recall a particular morning in late 1997 or early 1998 when I kept returning to the kitchen storeroom to listen to the sequence of songs played on the oldies radio station. In hindsight, I realized I was playing a hide and seek game with Chief Justice Rehnquist. Later propounded informal information signals represented the blonde guard was related either to the Chief Justice or Madam Justice Sandra Day O’Connor.

The game distilled a query as to where in scripture I might place my perception of loving the female guard in the presence of God. An uncontrollable grin spread across my face, as if to say, “You’ll never figure it out.” Many years would pass before I would come to consciously realize where, indeed, I hid the perception.

In fact, the realization didn’t come until Thanksgiving 2005; just a few months after the AAR Western Region meeting and the religious studies professors’ Sacred Feminine focus. I found my perception of loving her in the presence of God atop the Book of Genesis.

The Book of Genesis is organized into three processes I initially labeled “The Function Process” (*The Genesis Creation Sequence*; Genesis 1:1 – 2:3), “The Progression Process” (Genesis 2:4 through Chapter 10), and “The Position Process” (Genesis Chapters 11 through 50). The three processes encryptically describe how scripture’s impossibility-resolved social choice theory model operates in unordered context space: [Unordered Context: Unordered (Context: Content): Unordered Content]. I have named the model “The Perfect and Beautiful Woman.” It is a name referencing the beauty of the Sacred Feminine inasmuch as it is Her axioms that enable impossibility-resolved (individual: societal) well-being transitivity.

I concluded the Sacred Feminine is the “axiomatic glue” holding the three processes together; and, as a result, she had to reside atop the Book of Genesis. “That was it,” I concluded
to no one but myself, ”that’s where I hid Diane.” I had hid my perception of her atop the Book of Genesis, where the Sacred Feminine lies in repose.

Commencing *circa* 2001 and as the years passed I developed a practice where every year on Diane’s purported August birthday I would provide a gift of scripture research; always wanting to one-up myself year after year. In August 2007, I deciphered the Book of Matthew’s *Lord of the Harvest*. It was so cool I said to myself, “What am I going to do next year?” As August 2008 approached, I wanted to return to the Genesis Creation Sequence; surely, I would find a worthy birthday gift if I studied it harder than I did when I deciphered Ordered Conflict Resolution.

Although the conclusion now headlining this paper came a couple of months after her birthday, the gift surpassed all prior birthday gifts combined (and probably all future birthday gifts as well). My study concluded in a finding that God in the Genesis Creation Sequence is a woman! That’s right, a woman!³

**II**

*Polytheism, Monotheism, and Female Deities*

The female religious studies professors at the March 2005 regional conference were passionately vehement about the reemergence of the Sacred Feminine. One even reported she planned to be ordained a priest; despite the Church’s prohibition concerning women in the priesthood.⁴ Their presentations lamented the monotheistic demise of the Sacred Feminine. However, their lament is misplaced.

The (polytheism: monotheism) transition was never about gender, *per se*. Indeed, it was all about the impossibility-(plagued: resolved) social choice theory transition. Polytheism’s deity structure involved both male and female deities and was inherently domain based.⁵ In Greek
mythology, gods and goddesses were allocated domains like love, sun, daylight, night, darkness, wind, and the heavens. The allocation of these domains is symptomatic of the want of a (physical universe, human condition) philosophical nexus. That is, Greek mythology’s domain based deity structure is symptomatic of impossibility-plagued social choice theory inasmuch as the perfect balance of the physical universe is not translated into (individual: societal) well-being (i.e., preference aggregation) transitivity.

The great thinkers of Greek philosophy, particularly Pythagoras, figured it out. Specifically, Pythagoras proved the physical universe is endowed with the same ethics that enable impossibility-resolved social choice theory or (individual: societal) well-being transitivity. (Jenkins 2007C). Moreover, the great thinkers of Greek philosophy proved the ethics endowed physical universe corrects the corruption of the philosophy of the human condition. This latter proof humbled them before the Creator. Id.

Pythagoras is renowned for his disdain for irrational numbers; historically blamed on the discovery of irrational numbers in solving the Pythagorean Theorem where the two sides of a right triangle are equal to one. (Wilczek 2002). That is, the hypotenuse expressed as the square root of two is blamed for the discovery of irrational numbers. Id. Pythagoras proved (Any Finite)\(_k\) space, a space inherently defined in terms of whole integer real numbers, was just as infinite as any notion of infinity endowed with both rational and irrational numbers. (Jenkins 2006B). As a result, Pythagoras concluded the physical universe is (Any Finite)\(_k\) space defined. This conclusion enables the proof the physical universe is ethics endowed. Id. Moreover, the discernment scripture is written in terms of (Any Finite)\(_k\) space implicates Pythagorean authorship. Id.
The ethics that endows the physical universe is the same ethics that enables impossibility-resolved social choice theory: reference ethics. Reference ethics is the heart of ordered conflict resolution. (Jenkins 2010). Ordered conflict resolution is characterized, first, by an impossibility theorem and, second, by axioms that enable impossibility resolution. Id. These impossibility resolving axioms taken together with other axioms that enable (individual: societal) well-being transitivity transcend an impossibility resolved (physical universe, human condition) philosophical nexus. (2007C).

“Ordered Relations Theory” is my term for the space in which the Ordered Conflict Resolution impossibility theorem and impossibility-resolving axioms coexist. Ordered Relations Theory’s exogenous pressures engender Social Choice Theory’s endogenous response. While Ordered Relations Theory space is inherently (Any Finite)$_k$ space defined (and, therefore “infinite”), Social Choice Theory space is inherently hierarchically structured to enable (individual: societal) well-being transitivity; and, as a result, is inherently and incrementally given finite space defined. Specifically, Social Choice Theory’s unordered contextual space is progressively $[\text{(Given Finite)}_i: \text{(Any Finite)}_i]$, which is coextensive with (individual: societal) well-being transitivity. The (Social Choice Theory: Ordered Relations Theory) transition is a progressive $[(\text{Any Finite})_i: (\text{Any Finite})_{i+1}: (\text{Any Finite})_k] \ f(x)$.

This (exogenous, endogenous) contextual interrelationship, which subsumes competent Social Choice Theory under the impossibility-resolving umbrella of Ordered Relations Theory, ordained the monotheistic deity structure. First, Ordered Relations Theory is scripture exogenous. That’s why I discovered the Sacred Feminine in repose above the Book of Genesis. Moreover, Her mate, the Great I Am, likewise resides above the Book of Genesis. As a result, I Am and the Sacred Feminine are, generally, scripture invisible. Inherently, I Am implicates the
foregoing impossibility theory while the Sacred Feminine implicates its impossibility resolving axioms. This gender association ensues throughout scripture.

The lesser deities (God, Lord God, and Lord) exist in Social Choice Theory axiomatic space. God is the only named deity in the Genesis Creation Sequence, Genesis 1:1 - 2:3. The Lord God first appears in Genesis 2:4 and the Lord first appears in Genesis Chapter 4.

The (I Am: God: Lord God: Lord) regression implicates the [Ordered Context: Unordered Context: Unordered (Context: Content): Unordered Content] regression. Importantly, Ordered Relations Theory represents “ordered context” space while Social Choice Theory represents “unordered context” space. That’s why God first appears in Genesis 1:1, the Lord God first appears in 2:4, and the Lord first appears in 4:1: It mirrors that regression. It is also why the Sacred Feminine and the Great I Am are invisible (they are quintessentially Genesis 1:1 ex ante); yet their exogenous pressures shape the Genesis Creation Sequence and the entirety of scripture.

Since Ordered Relations Theory space begets Social Choice Theory space, it can be said the Great I Am and the Sacred Feminine beget Social Choice Theory’s God, Lord God, and Lord. As a result, the inclusion of the feminine among scripture’s God, Lord God, and Lord Deities is derivative. That is, the Sacred Feminine did not disappear in the (polytheism: monotheism) transformation; rather, She merely became invisible – laying in repose atop the Book of Genesis. Importantly, this paper demonstrates how the axiomatic Sacred Feminine influences the definition of the Social Choice Theory space God, Lord God, and Lord Deities; leading to the conclusion the God deity in the Genesis Creation Sequence is a woman.
The first two verses of the Book of Genesis set the stage for God determining His or Her gender. The verses read:

1. In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.
2. The earth was formless and void, and darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was moving over the surface of the waters.

God is the Social Choice Theory unordered context Deity. By creating the heavens and the earth, the verse translates God will define the totality of Social Choice Theory space in terms of the hierarchical structure [Unordered Context: Unordered (Context: Content): Unordered Content] regression. That is, unordered context is “heaven” relative to unordered (context: content)’s “earth,” and unordered (context: content) is “heaven” relative to unordered content’s “earth.”

In the first clause of the second verse, God is investigating his sex or gender. Is He female; and therefore in charge of defining axioms or empowering correction showings in Social Choice Theory space? Or, is He male; and therefore in charge of defining theory in Social Choice Theory space? The verse 2 term “earth” implicates the idea that God is investigating the bottom of the extant (and first Social Choice Theory space) regression. Table 3.1 shows the Book of Genesis’s threshold Ordered: Unordered Context Deity regression, to wit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Deity$_n$</th>
<th>Regression$_n$</th>
<th>Deity$_{n+1}$</th>
<th>Regression$_{n+1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I Am/SF$_n$</td>
<td>Ordered Context$_n$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>God$_n$</td>
<td>Unordered Context$_n$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lord God$_n$</td>
<td>Unordered (Context: Content)$_n$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lord$_n$</td>
<td>Unordered Content$_n$</td>
<td>I Am/SF$_{n+1}$</td>
<td>Ordered Context$_{n+1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>God$_{n+1}$</td>
<td>Unordered Context$_{n+1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lord God$_{n+1}$</td>
<td>Unordered (Context: Content)$_{n+1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lord$_{n+1}$</td>
<td>Unordered Content$_{n+1}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.1  
Ordered: Unordered Context Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Deity(_n)</th>
<th>Regression(_n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I Am/SF(_n)</td>
<td>Ordered Context(_n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>God(_n)</td>
<td>Unordered Context(_n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lord God(_n)</td>
<td>Unordered (Context: Content)(_n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lord(_n)</td>
<td>Unordered Content(_n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>God(_{n+1})</td>
<td>Unordered Context(_{n+1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lord God(_{n+1})</td>
<td>Unordered (Context: Content)(_{n+1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lord(_{n+1})</td>
<td>Unordered Content(_{n+1})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2  
Collapsed Ordered: Unordered Context Regression

Since Lord\(_n\) is on the same line as I Am/SF\(_{n+1}\) scripture invisibility of the Great I Am and the Sacred Feminine is demonstrated. The same table collapsed to account for this invisibility appears as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Deity(_n)</th>
<th>Regression(_n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I Am/SF(_n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>God(_n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lord God(_n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lord(_n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>God(_{n+1})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lord God(_{n+1})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lord(_{n+1})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is why when the Deity name “Lord” appears in scripture care must be exercised to ferret whether the reference implicates the Great I Am, the Ordered Context Deity, or whether the reference implicates the quaternary Deity, the Unordered Content Lord.\(^8\)

The verse 2 characterization of the earth as “formless and void” answers God’s investigative query. The second descriptor, “void,” is the key. Theory can either be framed in terms of an impossibility theorem or a possibility theorem. For example, Professor Arrow first demonstrates his impossibility theorem and then resolves the impossibility in his possibility
theorem by relaxing his nondictatorship condition and imposing his independence of irrelevant alternatives condition in his 1951 effort to resolve impossibility-plagued (individual: societal) well-being transitivity. (Arrow 1951, 1963).

Generally, theories stated as impossibility theorems require the articulation of impossibility resolving axioms. In such cases, God will be female because extant space axiom articulation is an impossibility resolution necessary condition. On the other hand, if the theory is articulated as a possibility theorem it embodies conditions, where conditions represent axioms that have become theory impounded. As a result, axiom articulation is unnecessary and God will be male because it is the theorem itself that is paramount. As I articulated in my paper, Ordered Conflict Resolution, the Ordered Relations Theory theorem (the “Antithetical-Primary Population General Impossibility Theorem” or “APPGIT”) is an impossibility theorem that requires two impossibility resolving axioms. (Jenkins 2010).

The verse 2 term, “void,” defines the theorem God discerned on the “earth” [Table 3.1, Line 4; (Lord, I Am/SF_{n+1})]. By using the term “void,” God is reporting the Social Choice Theory space theorem (the Aggregation Theorem) is articulated as an impossibility theorem and not as a possibility theorem. In the same verse 2 first clause, God also reports the earth as “formless.” The term “formless” connotes the want of incremental Aggregation Theory impossibility-resolving axiom articulation. That is, God is recognizing that Her charge is to supplant the body of Ordered Relations Theory impossibility-resolving axioms due to the unique aspects of the hierarchically structured Social Choice Theory space to enable (individual: societal) well-being transitivity. Conclusively, God now knows He is a She and Social Choice Theory space (individual: societal) well-being transitivity requires further axiom articulation;
incremental to the two axioms already articulated by the Sacred Feminine in Ordered Relations Theory space.\(^9\)

The verse 2, clause 2 report, “darkness was over the surface of the deep,” holds a few interpretive implications. First, the term “darkness” implicates the ordered nature of \((\text{Any Finite})_k\) Ordered Relations Theory space relative to God’s comparatively unordered domain of \((\text{Any Finite})_i\): \((\text{Given Finite})_i\) Social Choice Theory space. Generally, the term darkness in scripture implicates ordered progression above the extant position because ordered “Illusionary Consequence Variables” make the impossibility-resolution path so “dark” it is generally impossible to see the single path defining (individual: societal) well-being transitivity in a hierarchical structure of ordered conflict.\(^{10}\) The impossibility-resolving APPGIT Constraint axiom enables one hierarchical progression at a time to achieve actual consequences; otherwise the consequences are illusionary. Here, from the Social Choice Theory space perspective, Ordered Relations Theory space is “dark.” Even among Deities, the prowess of APPGIT is compelling.

The entire verse 2, clause 2 reports “darkness was over the surface of the deep.” Metaphorically, the notion of “water” used in scripture connotes the idea of “corrected” space or a correction showing necessary to effect impossibility resolution. As a result, by using the phrase “darkness over the surface of the deep” God is reporting the axioms She articulates in Social Choice Theory space must be progressively correct as an endogenous response to the Sacred Feminine’s Ordered Relations Theory space impossibility-resolving axioms.

The female God’s appropriate APPGIT regressive perspective is reported in verse 2, clause 3: “the Spirit of God was moving over the surface of the waters.” The first three days of creation are metaphors for the three axioms the female God will articulate relevant to the unique
aspects of Social Choice Theory space impossibility-resolved (individual: societal) well-being
transitivity: The Indifference Principle, The Correction Principle, and The Connectivity
Principle. These principles are coextensive with three Social Choice Theory space states of the
world regressively described as \{[(Exogenous, Exogenous), (GOXE)], [(Exogenous,
Endogenous), (EXOG)], [(Endogenous, Endogenous), (ENDOG)]\}. Vertical movement is
always an EXOG function for the reason EXOG is the only state of the world connected to the
other two states of the world. The term, “the Spirit of God,” implicates the amalgamation of
\((\text{God}_n, \text{God}_{n+1}, \text{God}_{n+3}, \ldots, \text{God}_{n+i})\) inasmuch as scripture’s notion of “spirit” implicates an
ordered function defining actual consequences (the “Actual Consequence Variable” or “ACV”).
Therefore, God is reporting whatever axioms She ordains in Social Choice Theory space must
not only be reconciled in Ordered Relations Theory space, but must be operative at all levels of
the Social Choice Theory space’s impossibility-resolved (individual: societal) well-being
transitive hierarchical structure. Now, the female Deity, God, is ready to articulate the Social
Choice Theory space axioms.
Then God said, "Let there be light"; and there was light.

God saw that the light was good; and God separated the light from the darkness.

God called the light day, and the darkness He called night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day.

The first three principles identified in the Genesis Creation Sequence following God’s determination He is an axiomatic She include *The Indifference Principle*, *The Correction Principle*, and *The Connectivity Principle*. In regressive order, these three principles account for the first three creation days. The commonality of these three principles is that they are products of APPGIT generalization and are Social Choice Theory space inventions that marry the philosophy of the human condition space to Ordered Relations Theory space, the space of the ethics endowed physical universe. This inextricable bond is a necessary condition to extend the impossibility resolving qualities of Ordered Conflict Resolution into Social Choice Theory space.

The Indifference Principle derives from APPGIT’s (Exogenous Position, Exogenous Perspective) reference ethics declaration. Inherently, this declaration represents starting point or first declaration indifference. That is, no matter the quaternary order starting point, \((VOW_n: VOW_{n+1})\) transition occurs.11

From the Ordered Relations Theory space perspective, Ordered Context\(i\) is the empowerment regression set \([\text{Unordered Context: Unordered (Context: Content): Unordered Content}]_i, \text{Unordered Context: Unordered (Context: Content): Unordered Content}]_{i+1}\). The Indifference Principle represents the notion that it is indifferent whether \([\text{Unordered Context: Unordered (Context: Content): Unordered Content}]) or \([\text{Unordered Context: Unordered Content}]_i\) or \([\text{Unordered Context: Unordered Content}]_{i+1}\). The
Unordered Context\(i_{i+1}\) return of empowerment is first discerned, Ordered Context\(i\) is the same.

In Social Choice Theory space, the Indifference Principle reconciles indifference as to whether the formation of sets of Stars of David (the highest order of Social Choice Theory space transitivity) commences with Star-of-David-Set\(i\) or Star-of-David-Set\(i_{i+1}\). It is the regressively broadest of the three principles because it subsumes the Correction and Connectivity Principles.

There are two clauses in verse 3: 1. “Then God said, ‘Let there be light;’” and, 2. “and there was light.” It is the first time in scripture where empowerment (the effect of clause 1) and return of empowerment discernment or confirmation (the effect of clause 2) are distinguished. By declaring, “Let there be light;” God is declaring the Indifference Principle is a competent APPGIT generalization in Social Choice Theory space. The second clause’s report, “and there was light” is the invisible Sacred Feminine’s return of empowerment confirmation that God has properly articulated the Indifference Principle APPGIT generalization in Social Choice Theory space. At this point in the Genesis Creation Sequence, only Ordered Context and Unordered Context are recognized.

Verse 4 involves God’s Social Choice Theory space regressive empowerment. It comprises two clauses: 1. “God saw that the light was good;” and 2. “God separated the light from the darkness.” The totality of the two clauses represents God’s empowerment. The first clause represents the notion that regressive empowerment is an EXOG \(f(x)\). The Indifference Principle is light to the position of the Correction Principle (the EXOG position), but darkness to the position of the Connectivity Principle (the ENDOG position). Again, the empowerment is an EXOG \(f(x)\) because it is the only position directly connected to the other two positions. By
acknowledging the “light was good,” God is acknowledging discernment that the empowerment vested.

The second clause represents the notion the empowerment’s scope is an $[\text{Unordered Context, Unordered (Context: Content), Unordered Content}] f(x)$. The act of separation implies the empowerment is accordingly trifurcated. Relative to the Indifference Principle (the GOXE position juxtaposed to God’s extant position), the position of the Correction Principle represents light (the unordered position) while the position of the Connectivity Principle represents darkness (the ordered position). As a result, the totality of the empowerment is an $[\text{Unordered Context: Unordered (Context: Content): Unordered Content}] f(x)$.

Verse 5 defines $[(\text{Any Finite})_i: (\text{Any Finite})_{i+1}: (\text{Any Finite})_k]$ transitivity. Briefly, $(\text{Any Finite})_i$ comprises the female God Deity’s domain where She empowers Ordered Relations Theory axiomatic translation in Social Choice Theory space; and, subsequently empowers Social Choice Theory space unique axioms that are axiomatic Ordered Relations Theory consonant. While the Ordered Relations Theory space theorem is always characterized in impossibility terms, the Social Choice Theory space Aggregation Theory involves (impossibility: impossibility) theorem transition where such transition is distinguished by (axiom: condition) transition. That is, Aggregation Theory’s axioms incrementally become impounded in the theory as theoretical conditions. To the extent of such impoundment, the theorem is articulated in possibility terms, while yet to be impounded Aggregation Theory axioms mandate the Social Choice Theory space theorem be articulated in impossibility terms.

$(\text{Any Finite})_k$ is infinite defined as a continuum of $(\text{Ordered Context, Unordered Context})$ linearity. Social Choice Theory space translates Unordered Context into the $[\text{Unordered Context, Unordered (Context: Content), Unordered Content}]$ regressive hierarchical structure.
Ordered Relations Theory space empowerment and return of empowerment discernment is always an Ordered Context Deity function because the space’s theorem is always stated in impossibility terms. However, since the Social Choice Theory space Aggregation Theorem can be stated in either impossibility or possibility terms, the space’s empowerment function is \((\text{Any Finite})_i\) defined and its return of empowerment function is \((\text{Any Finite})_{i+1}\) defined. In the empowerment setting, the incremental hierarchical structure Aggregation Theory \((\text{Any Finite})_i\) regression is (axiom, impossibility theorem) defined. That is, empowerment is axiomatic. In the return of empowerment setting, the incremental hierarchical structure Aggregation Theory \((\text{Any Finite})_{i+1}\) regression is (condition, possibility theorem) defined. This explains what God did in verse 1:2. She went down the [Unordered Context, Unordered (Context: Content), Unordered Content] regression and peeked across to note whether the theorem was impossibility or possibility articulated. Once She realized it was impossibility (the earth was . . . void) articulated, She realized her axiomatic femininity.

In the verse 5 first clause, God, in Her feminine voice, “called the light day.” This means She is declaring Her \((\text{Any Finite})_i\) empowerment ought to enable the transitioning \((\text{Any Finite})_{i+1}\) male God return of empowerment discernment. Note that \([((\text{Any Finite})_i): (\text{Any Finite})_{i+1}]\) transition is unordered. Therefore, the \((\text{Any Finite})_{i+1}\) return of empowerment discernment male God function can be characterized as “light” relative to the female God’s \((\text{Any Finite})_i\) empowerment function. The term “day” refers to the totality of the \((\text{Any Finite})_{i+1}\) male God function.

In the verse 5 second clause, it is reported “the darkness He called night.” This clause implicates the Ordered Context return of empowerment confirming God’s \((\text{Any Finite})_i\)
empowerment will, indeed, enable the \( \text{(Any Finite)}_{i+1} \) transition, leading to further \( \text{(Ordered Context: Unordered Context)} \) empowerment.

The last sentence of verse 5 is used throughout the Genesis Creation Sequence. It reports, “And there was evening then there was morning, one day.” The female God \( \text{(Any Finite)}_i \) Deity is declaring Her Indifference Principle empowerment is \[ \text{Unordered Context, Unordered (Context: Content), Unordered Content} \] regression sufficient inasmuch as, from the \( \text{(Unordered Content, Connectivity Principle)} \) perspective [from that position the \( \text{(Unordered Context, Indifference Principle)} \) position is darkness because it is relatively ordered] , it is competent. At the same time, the female God \( \text{(Any Finite)}_i \) Deity is declaring Her Indifference Principle empowerment is likewise \( \text{(Any Finite)}_{i+1} \) male God Deity competent. The \( \text{(Any Finite)}_{i+1} \) male God Deity’s position relative to the female God \( \text{(Any Finite)}_i \) Deity is light because the relative positions are unordered. Since evening is the beginning of the night; morning is the beginning of the day, the statement implicates the notion that for all the female God \( \text{(Any Finite)}_i \) Deity’s domain, the Indifference Principle empowerment is competent.
V
The Second Day of Creation: The Correction Principle

6Then God said, “Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it separate the waters from the waters.”
7God made the expanse, and separated the waters which were below the expanse from the waters which were above the expanse; and it was so.
8God called the expanse heaven. And there was evening and there was morning, a second day.

The Indifference Principle recognizes the (Ordered Context, Unordered Context) relationship to the extent Ordered Context represents both theory and impossibility-resolving axioms without distinction. Importantly, the Ordered Context theorem and impossibility resolving axioms always remain unchanged. However, Unordered Context was recognized by and through the female God (Any Finite)_i Deity and (Any Finite)_{i+1} male God Deity distinction: Axioms v. Conditions. As a result, the (Any Finite)_i: (Any Finite)_{i+1} transition is ordered.

Here, the (Ordered Context, Unordered Context) relationship involves the female God (Any Finite)_i Deity’s unilateral relationship with the Sacred Feminine, the Ordered Context axiomatic lessor. The reason is straightforward. In Social Choice Theory space, the transformation of an impossibility theorem into a possibility theorem occurs by and through the (axiom: condition) transition; concomitantly distinguishing the female Deity’s empowerment and the male Deity’s return of empowerment. However, the Correction Principle does not implicate the (Any Finite)_{i+1} male God Deity for the reason His function is not invoked until correction occurs. The Correction Principle involves showings of axiomatic compliance; either ordered relations theory or aggregation theory compliance. Therefore, the Correction Principle implicates the Sacred Feminine’s unordered relationship to the female God (Any Finite)_i Deity.

The unordered aspect of the verse 6 God’s relationship with the Sacred Feminine is what enables Her to declare an expanse in the midst of the waters. Water is scripture’s metaphor for
an axiomatic correction showing. Such a power would be wanting in an ordered relationship; barred by APPGIT’s general impossibility. As a result, the placing of the expanse to separate the waters from the waters recognizes the ordered relations theory axiomatic correction showing versus aggregation theory axiomatic correction showing distinction.

The verse 7 declaration that God made the expanse recognizes Ordered Conflict Resolution is a necessary condition for impossibility-resolved Social Choice Theory and (individual: societal) well-being transitivity. God is situated in Social Choice Theory space. Because She is reported as having made the expanse, God is recognizing the direction of the necessary condition relationship is one way. That is, Social Choice Theory needs Ordered Relations Theory; the latter does not need the former, per se.

Verse 7 also reports God as separating the waters below the expanse from the waters above the expanse. This clause implicates another important reason for the expanse. The Ordered Relations Theory axiomatic correction showings are unchanging because the Ordered Relations Theory theorem is always characterized in general impossibility terms. So, the Sacred Feminine’s axiomatic correction showings are unchanging. However, owing to hierarchical structure progression, Aggregation Theory axiomatic correction showings are always changing. Once return of empowerment evidences (impossibility: possibility) theorem transformation, what was once an axiom is now a theoretical condition and the previous correction showing gives way to the next and incremental Aggregation Theory axiomatic correction showing. As a result, the expanse also separates unchanging axiomatic correction showings from consistently changing axiomatic correction showings.

Verse 8 evidences God’s juxtaposition to the expanse. Since God called the expanse heaven, She is declaring the Sacred Feminine’s axiomatic correction showings devolve from
Ordered Relations Theory space; a space atop God’s Social Choice Theory space. The verse’s second sentence is interpreted as it was in the first creation day: the Correction Principle relevancy scope is the entirety of Social Choice Theory space.

VI
The Third Day of Creation: The Connectivity Principle

9 Then God said, "Let the waters below the heavens be gathered into one place, and let the dry land appear"; and it was so.
10 God called the dry land earth, and the gathering of the waters He called seas; and God saw that it was good.
11 Then God said, "Let the earth sprout vegetation, plants yielding seed, and fruit trees on the earth bearing fruit after their kind with seed in them"; and it was so.
12 The earth brought forth vegetation, plants yielding seed after their kind, and trees bearing fruit with seed in them, after their kind; and God saw that it was good.
13 There was evening and there was morning, a third day.

The first thing to notice about the third creation day is the structure of the passage. For the first time, the verses include two statements reporting, “God saw that it was good.” This structure implicates \([\text{Ordered Context: Unordered Context: Unordered (Context: Content): Unordered Content}_{n+1}]\) transition. The transition is described in Table 3.1’s Line 4, to wit:

| 4 | Lord\(_n\) | Unordered Content\(_n\) | I Am/SF\(_{n+1}\) | Ordered Context\(_{n+1}\) |

That is, the third creation day’s verses 9 and 10 implicate the \((\text{Lord}_{n}, \text{Unordered Content}_{n})\) portion of Table 3.1’s Line 4, while verses 11 and 12 implicate the \((\text{I Am/SF}_{n+1}, \text{Ordered Context}_{n+1})\) portion. Contextually, then, there is an implicit transition from verses 9 and 10 to verses 11 and 12.

Ordered Relations Theory’s Connectivity Principle, another APPGIT generalization, is implicated by the verse 9 and 10 interpretation. Verses 11 and 12 summarize Social Choice Theory’s three principles, a relative ordered context statement; thereby implicating the (I
Am/SF$_{n+1}$, Ordered Context$_{n+1}$) portion of Table 3.1’s Line 4 continuum. The [(Lord$_n$, Unordered Content$_n$): (I Am/SF$_{n+1}$, Ordered Context$_{n+1}$)] transition is articulated in the name of the verse 11 “God.” But the question is whether the verse 11 God is the female God$_n$ Deity, a male God Deity, or a combined female/male God Deity in the vein of the continuum Deity.

The answer is provided in verse 11. The verse articulates three metaphors: 1) vegetation, 2) plants yielding seed, and 3) fruit trees on the earth bearing fruit after their kind with seed in them. As a result, it is reasonable to conclude further empowerment is implicated; translating further axiom articulation. The axiom venue is Social Choice Theory space where the axioms are Aggregation Theory related. Aggregation Theory is that aspect of Social Choice Theory enabling (individual: societal) progressive preference aggregation. When the aggregation is transitive, then it is Social Choice Theory competent. Then and only then does Aggregation Theory [(impossibility: possibility), (axiom: condition)] transition occur.

Arrow first demonstrated ordered conflict rendered aggregation generally impossible. (Arrow 1951, 1963). However, by relaxing his nondictatorship condition and by invoking his irrelevance of independent alternative condition (this condition rendered the dictator’s preferences the only relevant preferences), Arrow was able to sustain his possibility theorem as “competent.” That is, Arrow transformed his impossibility theorem into a possibility theorem. Id.

While Arrow did not couch (axiom: condition) transition as enabling (possibility: impossibility) theorem transition, his result resonates the scripture writers notion of the transition. This transformation is Social Choice Theory’s competency key. The scripture writers recognized the [(axioms, impossibility theorem), (conditions, possibility theorem)] corollary and that the (impossibility: possibility) theorem transition is an (axiom: condition) transition $f(x)$. In
the scripture writers’ lexicon, an axiom is a condition yet to be impounded in the possibility theorem. Once impounded, the impossibility theorem then becomes a possibility theorem to that extent.

In Ordered Relation Theory space, APPGIT, an impossibility theorem, never becomes a possibility theorem. As a result, the Sacred Feminine’s axioms never become impounded in the theorem. The reason for this is transparent. Correction derives from an impossibility theorem and not from a possibility theorem. An axiom can only be impounded as a possibility theorem condition transcending when correction is no longer a progression necessary condition. Ordered Relations Theory correction in Social Choice Theory space is a continuous requirement because the Ordered Relations Theory APPGIT axioms (APPGIT Constraint and APPGIT Compliant Progression) and Social Choice Theory hierarchical structure APPGIT generalized axioms (Transitivity, Correction, and Connectivity) invoke Aggregation Theory correction.

Metaphor numerosity establishes the contextual pressures for the individual metaphors. The contextual pressures

Therefore, it can be expected forthcoming creation days will expound in more detail on the three Aggregation Theory axioms. As a result, there must be a transition from Ordered Relations Theory’s Connectivity Principle to Aggregation Theory’s incremental set of axioms expressed as an (individual: societal) well-being transitivity necessary condition.
In the second creation day, the Social Choice Theory space female God Deity is interpreted as interfacing with the Sacred Feminine. In verses 9 and 10, the Social Choice Theory space female God Deity is interfacing with the Great I Am. While Ordered Relations Theory’s Correction Principle and correction showings are a Sacred Feminine $f(x)$, actual correction is legislated by the Great I Am. Thus, while the Ordered Relations Theory’s Sacred Feminine empowers Social Choice Theory’s female God Deity’s articulation of Aggregation Theory axioms vis-á-vis the APPGIT generalized Indifference, Correction, and Connectivity Principles, the Great I Am discerns the return of empowerment as Ordered Relations Theory competent.

$\text{God}_n$ becomes the progression$_{n+1}$ I Am/SF$_{n+1}$. That is the Unordered Context$_n$ God Deity becomes the Ordered Context$_{n+1}$ compounded male/female Ordered Context Deity.
VII

The Fourth Day of Creation: APPGIT as Applied in Social Choice Theory Space

14 Then God said, "Let there be lights in the expanse of the heavens to separate the day from the night, and let them be for signs and for seasons and for days and years; and let them be for lights in the expanse of the heavens to give light on the earth"; and it was so.
15 God made the two great lights, the greater light to govern the day, and the lesser light to govern the night; He made the stars also.
16 God placed them in the expanse of the heavens to give light on the earth,
17 and to govern the day and the night, and to separate the light from the darkness; and God saw that it was good.
18 There was evening and there was morning, a fourth day.

Here, the organization of the four symbols ("signs," "seasons," "days," and "years") reveals the hierarchical structure necessary to effect APPGIT's illusionary-resolving axioms. The illusionary-resolving axioms are a necessary condition for social choice theory impossibility resolution. Indeed, the four symbols collectively provide a metaphorical reference to one of the triangles of the Star of David. Stars of David are implicated by the fourth creation day's casual description, "He made the stars also."

The four symbols verse structures the relationship of signs and seasons as somewhat pair-wise and days and years as somewhat pair-wise. Since signs and seasons are independently introduced by the "for" preposition it appears the scripture writers intended to implicate the signs and season pair to be horizontally juxtaposed inasmuch as the independent use of the preposition invokes an appearance of unordered symbols. Unordered variables in hierarchical structures define the higher order progression. That is, the horizontal juxtaposition metaphorically represents hierarchical structure's higher order, to wit:
On the other hand, since days and years are collectively introduced by the same preposition, it appears the scripture writers intended days and years to be vertically juxtaposed. In hierarchical structures vertical juxtaposition implicates the lower order regression of ordered variables. That is, the metaphorical reference to days and years implicates the quaternary lower order regression [(Primary, Years), (Secondary, Months), (Tertiary, Weeks), (Quaternary, Days)]. Hierarchical structure's lower order regression and higher order progression are concomitantly represented in schematic form as follows:

**The Quaternary Lower and Higher Order Hierarchical Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QLO</th>
<th>QHO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Quaternary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaternary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Signs, Seas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Completing the quaternary order (Primary, Antithetical) relationship defines a triangular shape. It is this shape that represents each triangle of the Star of David. It is also the field in which the greater and lesser light APPGIT impossibility-resolving axioms are applied.\(^1\)

This expanse is the transition between ordered relations theory space and social choice theory space. It can also be described as the transition between functions and progressions.

The two lights are metaphorical references to the two axioms that enable actual economic consequences in the face of APPGIT's formidable illusionary holding. These axioms include the APPGIT Constraint and APPGIT-Compliant Progression. (Jenkins 2006A). The axioms derive directly from ordered relations theory space. That is why they are characterized as lights. The lesser light is most likely a metaphorical reference to the APPGIT-Constraint inasmuch as the APPGIT-Constraint only enables unordered progression. On the other hand, the greater light is most likely a metaphorical reference to APPGIT-Compliant Progression because it enables ordered progression.

The stars are the Stars of David in the progression of Stars of David that lead to ordered relations theory space, the space of DGO accounting.

This expanse is the transition between social choice theory space and welfare theory space as represented in the (ordered relations theory: social choice theory: welfare theory) regression. The hallmark of welfare theory is participation. Participation involves the simple notion that by and through increasing the opportunity for others to participate in our creations without the limitation of exclusionary prejudice the more certain becomes the creation's contribution to societal well-being.

\(^1\) See the interpretation for verse 16, infra.
Alternatively, is the expanse the transition between unordered model space and non-model space?

18. Verse 18. Verse 18 reads:

\[18\] and to govern the day and the night, and to separate the light from the darkness; and God saw that it was good.

19. Verse 19. Verse 19 reads:

\[19\] There was evening and there was morning, a fourth day.
VIII
The Fifth Day of Creation: The Star of David Triangle Principle

20 Then God said, "Let the waters teem with swarms of living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth in the open expanse of the heavens."
21 God created the great sea monsters and every living creature that moves, with which the waters swarmed after their kind, and every winged bird after its kind; and God saw that it was good.
22 God blessed them, saying, "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let birds multiply on the earth."
23 There was evening and there was morning, a fifth day.

IX
The Sixth Day of Creation: The Unordered Star of David Principle

24 Then God said, "Let the earth bring forth living creatures after their kind: cattle and creeping things and beasts of the earth after their kind"; and it was so.
25 God made the beasts of the earth after their kind, and the cattle after their kind, and everything that creeps on the ground after its kind; and God saw that it was good.
26 Then God said, "Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; and let them rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over the cattle and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth."
27 God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.
28 God blessed them; and God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it; and rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over every living thing that moves on the earth."
29 Then God said, "Behold, I have given you every plant yielding seed that is on the surface of all the earth, and every tree which has fruit yielding seed; it shall be food for you;
30 and to every beast of the earth and to every bird of the sky and to every thing that moves on the earth which has life, I have given every green plant for food"; and it was so.
31 God saw all that He had made, and behold, it was very good. And there was evening and there was morning, the sixth day.

X
The Seventh Day of Creation: The Ordered Star of David Principle

1 Thus the heavens and the earth were completed, and all their hosts.
2 By the seventh day God completed His work which He had done, and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done.
3 Then God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because in it He rested from all His work which God had created and made.
XI
Conclusion
VI
Conclusion

The paper's interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis and the first three verses of the book's second chapter evidence the (ordered relations theory: social choice theory: welfare theory) regression, emphasizing social choice theory impossibility-resolution. The interpretation also embraces the related hierarchical structure progression involving the principles attending aggregation mechanics that enables return to the empowering ordered relations theory space. It is scripture's most compact explanation of the most important empowerment and return of empowerment function attending the philosophy of the human condition.
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Endnotes

1 My incarceration began September 21, 1994. By October 1995, I had concluded my conviction had been procured by a fraud on the court. I believed I would be going home soon thereafter. I was wrong. By 2000, I then concluded I was sequestered by the Supreme Court of the United States pursuant to the exercise of its supervisory powers in its historic conflict with the Informal Capital Market Cartel. (Jenkins 2009).

2 I will explain later in this paper how the female guard contributed to my Ordered Conflict Resolution paper.

3 Prior to this finding, women were openly part and parcel of polytheistic deity structures. Part of the March 2005 AAR Western Region meeting was devoted to the female professors’ lament over the demise of the Sacred Feminine in the transition to monotheism. Once I found the Sacred Feminine atop the Book of Genesis, I suspected their lament misplaced. As a result of this paper, I am convinced their lament is misplaced. The (polytheism: monotheism) transition occurred because Greek philosophers resolved ordered conflict and impossibility-plagued social choice theory. It had nothing to do with the propriety of women in the Deity structure.

4 I suspect the Church is in sole possession of scripture’s decipherment key. Accordingly, it knows, inter alia, God in the Genesis Creation Sequence is female. It’s male priest requirement is its misdirection to avoid public discernment of the monotheistic female deity presence; which implicates ordered conflict resolution.


6 I suspect their relationship defines the Sacred Marriage and the notion of the Messiah. The product of this relationship is inherently regressive, devolving from Ordered Relations Theory space into Social Choice Theory space. On the other hand, the relationship between the New Testament’s Mary and Joseph defines the Blessed Marriage, a Social Choice Theory progressive necessary condition enabling the Christ function (the transition between sets of Stars of David).

7 The male Deities are Lord God Almighty, God Almighty, and Lord. The male Deities correct creations not formulated in (individual: societal) well-being transitivity. The transition between the female axiomatic Deities and the male correcting Deities is the Lord. The female Deities not only bear axiomatic impossibility-resolution, but also manifest correction showings.

8 One clue I have observed is whsether the verse or passage references the Lord once or twice. Since the Great I Am is ordered relative to the quaternary Unordered Content Lord, the use of two or more Lord references in the same sentence implicates the Great I Am.

9 In my Ordered Conflict Resolution paper I refer to the two impossibility resolving axioms as the APPGIT Constraint and APPGIT Compliant Progression axioms. (Jenkins 2010).

10 For example, Professor Arrow’s impossibility theorem proof involves Individuals A and B and the conflict of their preference rankings for Social States 1, 2, and 3 (Arrow 1951, 1963). Ordered conflict emerges when Individuals C, D, . . . , n preference ranking conflicts are added to the analysis.

11 “VOW” is defined as “View of the World”.
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