HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies
ISSN: (Online) 2072-8050, (Print) 0259-9422

Quantum Molinism: God's fuzzy logic and the freedom to love

Check for updates

Author:
Thomas F. McAllister[1]

Affiliation:
[1]Hans Hut School of Business, Truett McConnell University, Cleveland, United States of America

Corresponding author:
Thomas McAllister,
tfmac@aol.com

Dates:
Received: 07 Nov. 2025
Accepted: 11 Feb. 2026
Published: 26 Mar. 2026

How to cite this article:
McAllister, T.F., 2026, 'Quantum Molinism: God's fuzzy logic and the freedom to love', *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 82(1), a11112. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v82i1.11112

Copyright:
© 2026. The Authors. Licensee: AOSIS.
This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Quantum Molinism is a contemporary theological model that builds upon classical Molinism to address the enduring tension between divine sovereignty and human freedom. Situated within the tradition of middle knowledge theories, it advances a probabilistic reinterpretation of divine omniscience informed by quantum uncertainty, chaos theory, and complex systems science. This model proposes that God, while fully sovereign and omniscient, has created a dynamic universe in which human choices are genuinely free yet bounded within a structured probability matrix. Crucially, this openness is not merely epistemic but ontological: a divinely embedded 'quantum sliver' of contingency woven into the fabric of creation itself. Such a framework preserves real contingency, safeguards the meaningfulness of prayer, secures the authenticity of love, and maintains the moral responsibility of creatures. By reframing Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz's claim that this is the 'best of all possible worlds', Quantum Molinism suggests that 'best' is not measured by the absence of pain, but by the possibility of agapē freely chosen.

Contribution: The article culminates with the Agape Triangle, illustrating how truth, love, and freedom converge within the moral ecology of the universe to orient human life toward Christlikeness.

Keywords: quantum Molinism; divine providence; agapē; theology and science; moral formation; stochastic kernel: middle knowledge.

Read online:
Scan this QR code with your smart phone or mobile device to read online.

Introduction

The divine dilemma – Omniscience, freedom, and the suffering world

The question of how an omniscient, omnipotent, and all-loving God could create a world filled with suffering and rebellion is not new – as Augustine observes, 'God judged it better to bring good out of evil than not to permit any evil to exist' (Augustine 1887:ch. 103). A version of this tension can be traced even further back, as the Stoic Epictetus frames it: 'It's not what happens to you, but how you react to it that matters' (Epictetus 1925:1.1.17). Yet, this question remains as urgent today as when it was first posed.

At the intersection of divine sovereignty and human responsibility lies a tension that has animated centuries of philosophical, theological, and existential inquiry. How can human choices be truly free if God knows the future exhaustively? And more pressingly: why would a loving God create a system in which so few seem to choose Him[1], and so many suffer?

This dilemma extends beyond abstract metaphysics into the emotional terrain of the human heart. It raises unavoidable questions: If God knew in advance that billions would reject Him, why allow their creation? If prayer cannot affect outcomes, is it meaningful? If love is commanded but cannot be freely given, is it love at all?

Historically, systems of theology have sought to resolve this puzzle in different ways – through determinism, divine passivity, or open-ended theism. But each resolution brings its own friction points. Some secure divine control at the expense of human authenticity; others protect human freedom but at the cost of God's omniscience or sovereignty.

This article proposes an alternative – a refinement of Molinism that preserves both divine omniscience and genuine freedom. At its centre is the claim that creation contains a divinely embedded element of contingency and unpredictability – a *stochastic kernel* the size of a quantum sliver – not as a by-product of randomness, but as an intentional design feature. This structure allows for authentic choice within

1.The author prefers capitalisation of divine pronouns per theological convention.

a probabilistic framework, thereby preserving the meaningfulness of love, obedience, and prayer.

The hinge of destiny – The gravity of real choices

Poet Edwin Markham observes, 'Choices are the hinges of destiny. First, we make our decisions, then our decisions make us' (Rodenhizer 2018). These sayings are more than platitudes; they reflect spiritual and practical insight. It is a vivid metaphor: lives, legacies – even the rise and fall of nations – swing on the fulcrum of human choice. We are what we do, and we do what we decide – from what job to take, where to live, whom to marry, or how to respond in a crisis; we are shaped by what we choose (Brightlight 2013:20). A central theme of Andy Stanley's text, *The Principle of the Path*, notes that it is not your desires, but your decisions that determine your destination (Stanley 2008).

The destiny of humankind, both individually and collectively, pivots upon these inflexion points of choice. Scripture instructs that whatever we do, we are to do it all for the glory of God (1 Cor 10:31 BSB), and to do it in love (1 Cor 16:14 BSB).[2] Love (agapē) is not merely emotional affection; it is the core character of God (Jn 1 4:8 BSB) and the driving metric of the moral universe.

But love, by its very nature, demands relationship and choice. One cannot simply 'love' in the abstract – love requires an object, even if that object is oneself. Nor can love be coerced; it must be freely chosen. Love is inherently volitional – a decision of the will aimed at the good of the other. In this sense, the cosmos is not merely functional but relational, designed as a moral ecosystem in which glory arises not from forced compliance but from freely chosen goodness.

But are our choices real?

Consider this thought experiment: there exists a person *P* at a moment in time *t* in an environment *E*, who has four choices of A, B, C, or D. *E* is defined as the set of all forces – physical and metaphysical – that exert a non-zero influence on *P*. This influence spans a range from the gravitational pull of an electron at the edge of the universe to the wistful prayer of a sceptic (Polkinghorne 2000:84–85). If God knows with certainty that *P* at *t* in *E* will choose B, then the probability of B is one, or 100%. Therefore, the probabilities of A, C, and D are zero. If something has a probability of zero, does it exist? If so, is it still considered a viable option? (Brightlight 2010:112–114).

Here lies the paradox: God is omniscient, yet love compels choice. And choice, by definition, requires genuine alternatives – not illusions, but real possibilities. A world in which our decisions are foreknown with absolute precision begins to look more like a script than a symphony. If the path is already fixed, can we still call it love when we walk it?

Molinism, developed by 16th-century Jesuit theologian Luis de Molina, offers one of the most elegant frameworks to resolve this tension. Through the concept of *scientia media*, or middle knowledge, God is said to know not only all that is and will be, but also all that could be – how any free creature would act in any given circumstance (De Molina 1988:121–126). This concept preserves divine omniscience while maintaining libertarian freedom.

Yet even classical Molinism encounters difficulty when filtered through a strictly deterministic lens. It is recognised that God's foreknowledge does not cause future outcomes nor render them necessary – knowing is not causality (Craig 2000:57–85). However, this clarification addresses a semantic concern regarding truth conditions, rather than an ontological one regarding the reality of alternatives. If only one outcome exists, then the event is not a choice – it is a conclusion. Counterfactuals whose probabilities are strictly zero do not represent real alternatives, even if they are subjectively perceived as such by the agent. It is no different than, say, combining chemical A with chemical B and their turning blue. No decision was made; it is simply a result.

This conundrum is where theology may benefit from physics.

Quantum mechanics – perhaps the most experimentally validated scientific model in history – reveals that uncertainty is not simply a lack of information but a fundamental feature of the universe. The Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle states that we cannot simultaneously know both the position and the momentum of a particle (essentially where it is and where it is going) with perfect precision (Heisenberg 1949). This lacuna is not a result of measurement limitations but a structural property of nature itself.

It is proposed that a similar principle may apply to divine-human interaction. *Quantum Molinism* (Calude et al. 2022:167)[3] integrates the core strengths of classical Molinism with the probabilistic architecture of quantum theory and the scalable flexibility of chaos science. It presents a cosmos that is neither rigidly deterministic nor randomly chaotic, but dynamically ordered, relationally open, and spiritually alive.

In such a world, love becomes not just possible but also essential. For love to be real, it must be chosen. And for choice to be real, there must exist legitimate alternatives.

2.Unless otherwise indicated, all Scripture quotations are from the *Berean Standard Bible* (BSB).

3.Calude et al. introduced the term *Quantum Molinism* to explore whether quantum uncertainty might serve as a mechanism for divine foreknowledge apart from counterfactuals of freedom, i.e. can quantum theory explain divine knowing? By contrast, this study advances a constructive theological model and argues that quantum indeterminacy is not merely epistemic but also ontological – a designed feature of creation in which a 'quantum sliver' embedded by God secures genuine contingency within the cosmos, providing authentic freedom and the possibility of love.

The greatest story ever told is not a locked script but a living drama – written by an Author who remains on stage, within earshot, inviting each of us to improvise in harmony with the score.

Classical frameworks: The strain of reconciliation

From the earliest creeds to modern theological forums, Christian thinkers have wrestled with the tension between divine sovereignty and human freedom. What kind of world must exist for love to be both commanded and possible? At stake is more than a metaphysical puzzle – this dispute is about the very architecture of justice, prayer, purpose, and salvation.

Although God's ways are higher than our ways and His thoughts are higher than our thoughts (Is 55:9), the human struggle to grasp these higher ways and thoughts seem beyond comprehensible reach. We believe God is good – Perfect good. Yet, when God pressed the cosmic start button, why did things turn out seemingly not so very good? Even after the reboot of humanity through a flood, at best, humanity struggles. It is very challenging to reconcile.

Philosophical theology developed to address and attempt to resolve this difficult dilemma during the past two millennia has segregated itself into four primary approaches:

Calvinism

God's sovereignty is absolute; nothing occurs outside His decretive will. Human decisions are secondary causes, but every action – including evil – ultimately fulfils God's ordained plan. In its deterministic forms, Calvinism affirms *compatibilist* freedom, in which human beings act according to their strongest desires, although those desires are determined (Calvin 1960:I.16.2–3). The strength of this view is its security of divine control, but the trade-off is that human choice risks becoming illusory.

Arminianism

Reacting against determinism, Arminianism maintains *libertarian* freedom. God knows the future exhaustively, including the free actions of creatures, but this foreknowledge is based on passive foresight, not decree. God's election of individuals is conditional upon foreseen faith (Arminius 1986:1:248–250). This preserves responsibility but can seem to place the decisive element in salvation on human initiative.

Open theism

A more radical position, Open Theism argues that God cannot know future free choices – not as a result of any deficiency in God, but because such choices are not ontologically real until made (Boyd 2000:15–20). This secures human spontaneity but limits God's foreknowledge and can challenge classical views of prophecy and providence.

Molinism

Molinism introduces the concept of *middle knowledge*, whereby God knows not only all actualities and necessities but also all counterfactuals – what any free creature would do in any possible set of circumstances (De Molina 1988:121–126). In addition to His natural knowledge (all necessary truths) and His free knowledge (all truths about what will actually occur), God also possesses this scientia media, or middle knowledge, which allows Him to sovereignly actualise a world in which His purposes are fulfilled without overriding creaturely freedom (Craig 2000:57–85). Its elegance lies in preserving both divine omniscience and libertarian freedom, enabling God to govern providentially while respecting human agency. Yet critics observe that if only one future is actualised, the sense of 'real alternatives' can appear compromised. Even though God's knowing does not *cause* human choices, the fact that only one outcome ever becomes real can leave the notion of genuine possibility vulnerable to charges of determinism.

Each model strains to reconcile omniscience with moral agency. The more certain the outcome, the less real the choice appears; the more open the future, the more uncertain God's control becomes. Underlying all of them is the core conviction: love requires choice, and choice must include options and incur consequences.

This gap is where Quantum Molinism introduces a new paradigm – not to negate these traditions, but to illuminate a deeper structure beneath them. It posits that contingency is not a bug in the system – it is a feature. It allows for real love, real obedience, real rebellion – and therefore, real redemption.

Quantum Molinism: A structured choice

Physicist-priest John Polkinghorne (2005:60) famously observes that the world operates 'more like a cloud than a clock'. Classical physics imagined a universe governed by linearity and determinism, but quantum theory revealed a cosmos built on probability, contingency, and nonlinearity. Beneath the surface of physical reality lies not a rigid script, but a dynamic field of potentials (Schroeder 1997:154–166) – wave functions that collapse into actuality. The collapse of a wave function occurs when a system of possibilities is reduced to a single outcome through interaction or measurement – a decisive shift from 'could be' to 'is'. In this sense, the universe is no less rational than Newton imagined – but far more relational (Polkinghorne 2002:23–27).

This insight carries profound theological implications. Just as quantum systems resist full prediction until observed, so too human moral systems resist mechanical determinism. The freedom to choose includes potential outcomes of suffering, rejection, or rebellion. This is the moral cost of love. To command love, God had to permit its refusal. To make it meaningful, He had to make it consequential.

To move from metaphor to model, we must define what Quantum Molinism claims:

- Quantum Molinism emerges not as a rejection of classical theology, but as a reframing of its metaphysical scaffolding. It preserves the essential commitments of divine omniscience and sovereignty while integrating discoveries from quantum physics and the operating structure of complex systems.
- The model introduces what this article calls a quantum sliver – a divinely embedded margin of non-zero possibility described as the stochastic kernel. Structurally analogous to quantum uncertainty, this sliver ensures that choice is not illusory but genuinely agentive. It is not an artefact of chaos or ignorance, but an intentional design feature that allows for genuine contingency.
- God's *middle knowledge* functions within this probabilistic structure – foreknowing the range and probability distributions of what might occur while allowing for what does occur to be actualised through the real decisions of creatures. Within this framework, legitimate counterfactuals exist only where probabilities are non-zero – even when those probabilities are vanishingly small and exert no appreciable effect at the macro level. This option preserves genuine alternative possibility without collapsing into determinism or exploding into randomness.
- The crucial claim of Quantum Molinism is that this uncertainty is ontological, rather than epistemic. Unlike Open Theism, which limits divine foreknowledge to what currently exists (Boyd 2000; Pinnock et al. 1994), Quantum Molinism affirms that God exhaustively comprehends the complete probability distribution of all possible futures**.** Contingency is embedded into the very fabric of creation itself and exhaustively known by God. The openness of the future is real, completely structured by divine design, and therefore, freedom is not an illusion but an agency within a genuine field of possibility.

This approach affirms that choice is not a workaround in God's plan – it is part of the architecture. Creation itself bears the imprint of this design, as later sections will argue, through fractals, chaotic dynamics, and biological complexity. The result is a world that is truly alive – not merely computed. And in that world, prayer, love, and moral obedience are not predestined performances but co-authored actions. They matter. They move the story forward.

The five pillars of Quantum Molinism

For any theological model to be robust, it must uphold the core tensions of Christian doctrine without collapsing under the weight of contradiction. Quantum Molinism seeks to do this by standing on five interdependent pillars. Together, they form the structural integrity of a worldview that affirms both God's sovereignty and human freedom, while accounting for the lived reality of prayer, love, and moral responsibility.

Before exploring these pillars, we affirm a foundational truth: God is immutable, eternal, and transcendent – yet intimately active within His creation. Although He stands outside of space and time, He works within it through His Son and by the power of the Holy Spirit (Torrance 1996:227–231). The classical Trinitarian formulation holds that 'The Father works through the Son by the power of the Holy Spirit', reflecting both divine unity and dynamic engagement (Athanasius 2011).

Sovereignty without micromanagement

God is LORD of all (Ps 103:19). His authority is absolute. In the Quantum Molinist model, divine governance is exercised not through micromanagement but through sovereign orchestration of the probabilistic cloud.

The world is neither random nor rigid. This brilliant insight of Polkinghorne (2005:60) notes that the universe operates 'more like a cloud than a clock'. The illustration captures the theological nuance as this 'cloud of possibilities' forms the boundary space within which human choices operate. In this design, God remains fully in control, not by scripting every outcome, but by sovereignly working through the entire cloud of contingent possibilities. This model allows room for genuine creaturely participation while preserving divine providence.

Real freedom and real responsibility

Human freedom in this model is neither absolute nor illusory. It is a constrained agency within a divinely structured field of possibility, or that 'intrinsic unpredictability is to be treated as the signal of an underlying ontological openness' (Polkinghorne 2000:147). Our choices are shaped by environment, biology, conscience, and experience – but not overridden by them. This view aligns with libertarian freedom, the view that one could have chosen otherwise under the same conditions.

Because our decisions occur in a moral ecosystem shaped by divine wisdom – but not predetermined in outcome – the burden of responsibility is real (Craig 2000:143–146). As Plantinga (1974:29–50) argues, free will is a necessary condition for genuine moral action and authentic love. In this space, each choice carries real weight, not merely as a logical endpoint, but as a meaningful inflexion point in one's moral trajectory.

The real power of prayer

In a deterministic framework, prayer is often reduced to self-alignment rather than causative power (Calvin 1960:I.16.2–3). Open theism, in contrast, allows prayer to change outcomes but at the cost of divine omniscience (Pinnock et al. 1994:136–150). Quantum Molinism offers a third way: prayer shifts the probability cloud. It nudges the environment so that E becomes E′, altering the range of outcomes. As in chaos theory, small changes in initial

conditions can produce dramatically different results (Lorenz 1993),[4] so too sincere prayer, both individual and corporate in private or public settings, can alter the future without breaking causality (Van Ness 1983).[5]

Paul exhorts, 'Pray unceasingly' (Th 1 5:17 Berean Literal Bible [BLB]), and James (5:16 NIV) affirms, 'The prayer of a righteous person is powerful and effective'. This power is not metaphorical but metaphysical: the butterfly effect becomes theological. Prayer alters history not by violating nature but through the lawful structure of divine design.

Love requires the risk of freedom

Agapē love, the highest biblical ideal, demands freedom. It cannot be programmed or coerced. 'God is love' (Jn 1 4:8) – not merely in attribute, but in essence. And for love to be authentic, it must be chosen as well as resistible.

Quantum Molinism affirms that God does not avoid the risk of refusal – He designs for it. The Cross is not a Plan B; it is the price of a world in which love is possible (Moltmann 1993:204–213). Kierkegaard (1995:21–30) famously argues that compelled love is no love at all. Likewise, C. S. Lewis observes that a world of automata may be easier to manage, but it would be 'a world without love' (Lewis 2001:47). The possibility of rejection is not a flaw in the system – it is the cost of a meaningful relationship.

Image-bearing as a partnership

Genesis affirms that humans are made in the image of God (Gn 1:26–28) – not merely as decorative statues, but as dynamic partners in stewardship. This concept, which theologians like Walton (2009:91–103) have framed as vocational, takes on expanded significance in Quantum Molinism. We are co-labourers in the moral unfolding of creation. 'We are God's fellow workers' (1 Cor 3:9). We do not merely endure the world; we shape it. Our prayers, our moral actions, even our sufferings become ingredients in the divine drama. As Wright (2008:207–209) observes, Christian life is not about escape but transformation – living as agents of new creation.

This role affirms our dynamic agency. We are not spectators of providence, but participants. The image of God in us is not merely static dignity – it is vocational responsibility. As Tozer (1955:12) remarks, 'As the excellence of steel is strength, and the excellence of art is beauty, so the excellence of mankind is moral character'. In this sense, image-bearing is less about static representation and more about active, co-creative partnership – a theme that will reappear as we explore the practical implications of Quantum Molinism.

4.Lorenz introduced the 'butterfly effect' in 1972, illustrating initial condition sensitivity: minute changes in a system's starting state can produce drastically different long-term outcomes.

5.In thermodynamics, a phase transition (i.e. water turning to steam) requires an input of enthalpy without any immediate change in temperature until a critical threshold is reached. Similarly, persistent prayer may not produce immediate visible results, but accumulates spiritual momentum until a breakthrough occurs.

Scientific parallels – Fractals, chaos, and complexity

Theology is not science, yet they are 'intellectual cousins' (Polkinghorne 1994:22) as they both seek truth. When they harmonise with reality, their melodies resonate. Quantum Molinism finds conceptual reinforcement in chaos theory, fractal geometry, and quantum biology – fields that reveal a world structured yet unpredictable, patterned yet open, where small fluctuations can yield vastly diverse effects. Together, they affirm a cosmos of designed flexibility – a universe not scripted but sculpted for moral dynamism.

Fractals and mythofractals: Patterns in creation and history

Fractals – self-similar patterns recurring across scales – appear in snowflakes, blood vessels, coastlines, tree leaves, lightning, and galaxies (Mandelbrot 1983:5–20). They exemplify order within apparent chaos, echoing structure without monotony, and their nonlinearity affects decision strategies (Snowden 2020). Under Quantum Molinism, human decision-making unfolds in spiritual fractality – bounded by God's sovereign structure yet open to meaningful variety. These outcomes do not repeat precisely; as Mark Twain observed, 'History doesn't repeat itself, but it does rhyme' (O'Toole 2014). Within the mythos of humanity, historical archetypes, from Tytler (1854) and his cycle of republics to Cahn (2012) and his detailed, apocalyptic parallels between the conduct of ancient Israel and modern America, illustrate what this author describes as *mythofractals* or recognisable, repeating patterns of human behaviour.

Scripture often retells this fractal cycle that begins with faith → spiritual growth → apathy → disobedience → judgment → repentance → restoration, and it scales from an individual to the behaviour of nations. Similar recursions appear in family systems, trauma studies, and addiction science (Bowen 1978:343–362), as well as epigenetics – in which behaviour influences heritable gene expression (Yehuda 2008:121–135). This finding highlights the biblical caution of 'iniquity passed to the third and fourth generation' (Ex 20:5) – not as a vindictive Divine curse, but as a loving moral admonition – a manufacturing warning label from the Creator regarding human genetics and nature. Although embedded patterns persist, these strongholds can be taken down (2 Cor 10:4), and they can be rewritten through repentance and renewal (Rm 12:2), much as neuroplasticity rewires the brain.

From the butterfly effect to quantum navigation

Chaos theory demonstrates that even deterministic systems can generate unpredictable outcomes as a result of sensitivity to initial conditions. Famously illustrated by the 'butterfly effect' shows how small inputs – such as the flap of a butterfly's wings in Brazil – can propagate to influence a tornado in Texas (Lorenz 1993:14–25). Theologically, this theory affirms that small acts of faith – words spoken, prayers

offered, mercies extended – can ripple across lives, generations, and eternity.

Quantum biology deepens this effect. Migratory birds may use quantum entanglement to navigate (Bandyopadhyay, Tomasz & Dagomir 2012), tuning into Earth's magnetic field probabilistically. Photosynthesis likewise uses quantum tunnelling to transfer energy with near-perfect efficiency, particles exploring paths before collapsing to the optimal one (Engel et al. 2007:782–786).

Theologically, this phenomenon mirrors grace: improbable yet real paths exist, and God's design permits them. Creation is not a closed loop of inevitability but a structured arena of improvisation. Prayer, repentance, and obedience shift the field – not by breaking God's law, but by acting within the responsive system he built.

From quantum indeterminacy to spiritual dynamism

Spiritual development often follows feedback loops: love begets love. Sin deepens bondage. Complexity theory notes these cycles accelerate until hitting limits – plateau, breakthrough, or collapse (Simon Fraser University 2025).

Here lies the stochastic kernel – God's embedded quantum sliver or margin of possibility.

Analogous to how physicists predicted the Higgs boson to account for what gives particles mass (CERN 2025), Quantum Molinism posits a theological necessity: the existence of a 'quantum sliver' that preserves moral freedom. Its size or precision is not the point – its *existence* is. Even a vanishingly small window of true contingency is enough to make love meaningful, prayer powerful, and repentance possible. As an example, Jesus did not say, '*Peter, it's well beyond six standard deviations above the mean that you will deny Me three times*'. From the probabilistic cloud, Jesus discerned what would almost certainly unfold – not as scripted necessity, but as the convergence of Peter's character, circumstance, and decision-making capability under extreme pressure.

Ironically, naturalists have wagered their worldview (and eternal destiny) on odds far slimmer. Astrophysicist Fred Hoyle estimates the probability of life arising spontaneously from inanimate matter at 1 in $10^{40\,000}$ – a number so absurdly small that even across a googol of universes, it rounds to zero (Hoyle & Wickramasinghe 1981). Stunningly, Hoyle subsequently concluded that life must have come from space – suggesting that alien intervention was more plausible than divine intention.

By contrast, the stochastic kernel we propose requires no winning lottery ticket – only its presence. Ontologically, it opens the gate to moral breakthroughs: Forgiveness, courage, and self-sacrifice. In quantum terms, it is the collapse of a wave function – a new reality emerging from options, not force. 'No temptation has overtaken you … ' (1 Cor 10:13 NIV) presumes authentic escape routes. Determinism renders this symbolic; Quantum Molinism renders it structurally credible. Like quantum tunnelling, improbable yet lawful paths exist. Spiritually, no soul is fully trapped. Redemption may be narrow and unlikely – but never zero. Every moral choice collapses possibility into history, revealing a God both sovereign and participatory.

The fall re-examined: Real freedom or rigged collapse?

Genesis 1:31 (NIV) records one of the most provocative declarations in Scripture:

> God saw all that He had made, and it was very good.

But this raises a profound question: how could God call creation 'very good' if He knew – with certainty – that it would soon collapse into rebellion, suffering, and death?

If deterministic foreknowledge were true, this declaration would be incoherent. Classical deterministic models imply that the Fall was not only foreseen but also foreordained. If Adam and Eve had no real possibility of resisting disobedience, then God's declaration of goodness becomes unintelligible – or worse, morally problematic. It would mean God knowingly authored a system designed to fail, creating beings in His image while guaranteeing their destruction (Brightlight 2010:99–101). The inadequacy lies not in God's evaluation, but in any theological framework that makes genuine alternatives impossible.

This view collapses the moral coherence of creation. Scripture repeatedly affirms God's goodness, holiness, and justice (Ps 119:68; Dt 32:4). But if human freedom was a façade, the entire narrative of judgment, redemption, and covenant becomes theatre. The moral weight of Genesis 3 – indeed, of the whole biblical drama – dissolves into divine puppetry. Furthermore, deterministic models make God's desire for universal repentance logically impossible. Scripture declares that God 'is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance' (Pt 2 3:9 New American Standard Bible [NASB]) and that He 'desires all people to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth' (1 Tm 2:4 NASB). Yet in a world where outcomes are fixed, these divine desires are not just eternally unmet – they never had a chance, raising difficult questions about either God's power or His sincerity.

If love requires real choice – and choice demands real alternatives – then the first act of human rebellion must have been avoidable. Not merely in theory, but in actual, meaningful possibility.

Quantum Molinism offers a corrective. It affirms divine foreknowledge while rejecting deterministic fatalism. If creation includes a stochastic kernel – a quantum-level margin of genuine indeterminacy – then the Fall was not an engineered inevitability, but a risk taken for the sake of love. Paul declares, 'No temptation has seized you except what is

common to man … But with the temptation, [*God*] will also provide the way of escape' (1 Cor 10:13).

If this promise holds for us, it must have applied in Eden. To declare creation 'very good', God must have embedded a non-zero probability of obedience into the moral field. Adam and Eve had a way of escape – a real one. They fell not because the system required it but because the possibility of disobedience was intrinsic to the gift of freedom.

Here, Quantum Molinism recovers the moral seriousness of the Genesis account. Obedience was not hypothetical – it was live and viable. God did not embellish when He evaluated creation. He judged it *very good* because it held the possibility of real love and real loyalty (Augustine 1887:II.18–19).

This also exposes a critical weakness in deterministic theologies: if the Fall was guaranteed, then it was not a moral failure but a scripted act. And if all sin follows the same logic, moral responsibility becomes incoherent. If failure was the only real option from the beginning, redemption is not grace – it is cosmic clean-up (Craig 2000:57–85).

Instead, Quantum Molinism argues for a contingent cosmos in which moral agents genuinely participate in the unfolding of history. The Fall was likely, perhaps even probable – but *not* certain. God's omniscience allowed Him to weigh this risk. And still, He declared it worth it (Plantinga 1974:29–50).

Why? Because the possibility of love freely chosen is greater than the comfort or efficiency of automation. God's declaration of 'very good' was not naïve – it was grounded in a moral architecture in which faithfulness was truly possible (Lewis 2001:46–52).

This argument also reframes a deeply emotional objection: *Why would God create a world where so many are lost?* The answer lies not in determinism, but in design. Because the system was not rigged. Because every soul has, or has had, a chance. Even the narrow road, however unlikely, was not illusory but real. The opportunity to choose this day, to draw near to God, to abide in Christ, to humble oneself in prayer, or to trust with faith as small as a mustard seed – all remain true, non-zero options.[6]

Thus, Quantum Molinism reclaims the credibility of the Fall, the urgency of choice, and the sacredness of every moral decision. God did not launch a broken world. He launched a world of profound potential – where obedience was achievable, failure avoidable, and every act of love eternally significant.

Reframing Leibniz: The most loving potential of all possible worlds

The philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz famously claims that God, being all-powerful, all-knowing, and perfectly good, must have created 'the best of all possible worlds' (Leibniz 1985:128–135). By this claim, he did not mean the most comfortable or painless world, but one in which divine purposes, moral growth, and human freedom could be realised. Although critics from Voltaire (2005:ch. 5–6) onward mocked the idea as naïve in the face of suffering, the caricature misses the point. For Leibniz, 'best' referred not to ease but to a moral architecture in which love and virtue could flourish.

Quantum Molinism reframes this as the most loving potential of all possible worlds. If God is love (Jn 1 4:8), and if love requires freedom (Gl 3:19), then the best possible world is not the one with the fewest wounds but the one with the greatest opportunity for love freely chosen. Not all will choose it – but all can. The universe God created maximises moral potential, not just favourable outcomes. A deterministic paradise without sin may seem utopian, but it would be incapable of authentic relationships. As Lewis (2001) observes,

> God created things which had free will … this, though it makes evil possible, is also the only thing which makes possible any love or goodness or joy worth having. (pp. 52–53)

Love that cannot be resisted is not love – it is programming. And programming cannot fulfil the purpose for which humans were made: to bear God's image (Gn 1:26–27) in relational, sacrificial, and redemptive ways (Eph 5:1–2). Seen this way, suffering is not a refutation of God's goodness – it is the inevitable cost of a cosmos that permits genuine love and transformation. And where love is possible, so too is redemption. This moral ecology is not passive: God works all things together for the good of those who love Him (Rm 8:28), shaping even adversity into the raw material of courage, endurance, and a deepened faith (Ja 1:2–4). In this world, perseverance is a choice, not a scripted survival reflex.

Indeed, Scripture portrays God not as an aloof engineer but as a relational Being who pleads, warns, weeps, and intercedes. Jesus' lament over Jerusalem is emblematic:

> O Jerusalem, Jerusalem … how often I wanted to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her chicks under her wings – but you were not willing. (Mt 23:37 NIV)

This is not the voice of a deterministic playwright – it is the voice of a relational father in a real drama, who stands at the door and knocks for the opportunity to grow and deepen intimacy.

Quantum Molinism makes sense of both divine sovereignty and emotional transparency. God remains omniscient – not because He determines every outcome, but because He sees all paths, knows their probabilities, and works redemptively through them. As the Perfect Architect, He designed a universe with a stochastic kernel – a flawlessly calibrated quantum sliver that ensures cosmic stability yet allows the maximum potential for agapē love.

6.Joshua 24:15; James 4:8; John 15:4; Second Chronicles 7:14; Matthew 17:20 (New Living Translation [NLT]).

In a universe that continuously collapses the wave function from possibility into actuality, every act of love collapses potential into eternity. Every prayer, every act of faith, every whisper of repentance is not wasted – it is real. This view makes Leibniz's optimism not naïve but profound. It recognises that a world where love can emerge and a unified body in a spiritual ecosystem can blossom (Lowe & Lowe 2018:101–105) is greater than one in which it is unnecessary; a world where grace can be received is more glorious than one where it is irrelevant.

Thus, the quantum architecture of creation allows God to write a story that is open to love, redemption, and real victory – not because He forces it, but because He fosters it.

The Agape triangle: Navigating the moral field with love and truth

Within the architecture of Quantum Molinism – structured yet open, sovereign yet free – there must exist a compass by which moral agents can navigate the vast field of possibility. If the universe is probabilistic rather than deterministic, then the significance of each human decision increases, not decreases. The question is not merely 'what is possible?' but 'what is good?' And here, we find that Scripture offers not only theological guidance but geometric clarity.

When Jesus was asked to identify the greatest commandment, He answered with a citation from Deuteronomy 6:5 and Leviticus 19:18: to love God with all one's heart, soul, and mind, and to love one's neighbour as oneself. He then concludes, 'All the Law and the Prophets hang on these two commandments' (Mt 22:40). It is an extraordinary claim: Every principle, every divine directive, and every 'thy shall' and 'thy shall not' is encapsulated by a single verb: Love. Love is the motivational principle for every human action.

But this love is not abstract sentimentality. It is directional, relational, and actionable. Conceptually, these three dimensions – love of God, love of others, and love of self – form what we call the Agape Triangle (McAllister 2022:43–44). This model serves not only as a theological ethic but as a practical tool for navigating the moral landscape defined by Quantum Molinism.

Geometrically, imagine an isosceles triangle: God is at the apex, while 'others' and 'self' form the two base corners. As one moves upward toward love for God – through obedience, worship, and surrender – the base angles draw closer together. Love for God deepens and animates the ability to love others and self in rightly ordered ways. In this way, the triangle is not only a metaphor but a spiritual feedback loop: love directed upward transforms love expressed outward and inward into an ecological system of human flourishing (Lowe 2019).

This aligns with Christ's call to discipleship: 'Whoever wants to be My disciple must deny themselves and pick up their cross daily and follow Me' (Lk 9:23 NIV). The cross we are called to carry is not a burden but a spiritual realignment with the operating system of the universe. It is formed from the vertical love for God (God above us) and the horizontal love (peer-to-peer) for others. Together, these two beams of love form a cross. As living sacrifices (Rm 12:1), it is a cross of love that we carry. It's hard to love a terrorist. It's challenging to love someone who has betrayed you. Love keeps no account of wrongs (1 Cor 13:5). Love gets nailed to a cross and responds with, 'Forgive them, for they know not what they do' (Lk 23:34 English Standard Version [ESV]).

Moreover, this model is not limited to spiritual abstraction. Neurological and psychological research demonstrates that acts of love – compassion, service, and forgiveness – generate measurable well-being in both the giver and the recipient (Moll et al. 2005:799–809). Altruism activates reward centres in the brain, releasing serotonin, dopamine, and oxytocin. In counselling psychology, interventions that foster empathy and generosity are shown to mitigate depression, anxiety, and trauma (Post 2005:66–77). This finding suggests that the Agape Triangle reflects not only theological truth but also psychosomatic integration – a design that promotes flourishing on every level.

In this sense, agapē is not a private virtue – it is a public force. It blesses the recipient, sanctifies the giver, and glorifies God. As Paul writes, 'Do everything in love' (1 Cor 16:14). That wholehearted command takes shape in *alētheuontes en agapē* – literally, 'truthing in love' (Eph 4:15). This instruction is not merely moral – it is structural. In a universe governed by freedom and consequence, truth-abiding love is the vector that aligns will with wisdom and agency with glory.

What makes the Agape Triangle central to Quantum Molinism is freedom to choose love; it cannot be automated. This is not deterministic altruism – it is relational faithfulness enacted within a probabilistic moral field. The model functions within the dynamic architecture of creation: love is not mandated but invited. It is not coerced but catalysed.

It is also sustained – not by human willpower alone – but by divine enablement. Jesus says, 'Remain in Me, as I also remain in you … apart from Me you can do nothing' (Jn 15:4–5 NIV). The Agape Triangle is not self-salvation – it is Spirit-empowered orientation. Practically, this tri-fold love yields a decision framework that crystallises discipleship:

> Does my choice honour God?
>
> Does it help others?
>
> Does it develop me toward Christlikeness? (McAllister 2022:165)

If any answer is no, then the decision must be reconsidered. This simple but profound decision matrix ensures that love is enacted in truth and that truth is embodied in love. Here, the Agape Triangle converges with the wisdom of Christ. For truth, love, and wisdom are not abstract theoretical constructs. They are a Person. One finds wisdom at the intersection of

truth and love, as there, one finds Christ – the wisdom of God (McAllister 2022:89).

Finally, Christ sharpens this ethic with a new command: 'Love one another, as I have loved you' (Jn 13:34; 15:12). This command closes the moral triangle with cruciform clarity: love that forgives, sacrifices, and redeems. Love that walks the extra mile – a love willing to lay down one's life. The apex of the triangle is not theoretical – it is Christ himself.

In this way, the Agape Triangle is not an addendum to Quantum Molinism – it is its culmination. If the probabilistic universe is the stage, and love is the script, then the Agape Triangle is the choreography. It orients us amid uncertainty – not toward comfort, but toward Christlikeness. If every human being on the planet put this love into daily practice, it would be the best of all possible worlds. Yes, there would still be famines and cancer and hurricanes and all the unfortunate accoutrements of a fallen world, but the fulfilling relational experience within humanity and with their Creator would be optimised. Quantum Molinism describes a world where every choice matters, and the best choices are those focused on truth and rooted in love, for it is a transparent reflection of the imago Dei.

Conclusion

Love, freedom, and the architecture of hope

Quantum Molinism offers more than a resolution to a theological paradox. It presents a coherent, theologically grounded, and scientifically aware framework for understanding divine providence, human freedom, and the centrality of love in a contingent universe.

This model affirms that the world is neither a deterministic machine nor a chaotic accident. It is a *structured possibility space*, designed by a sovereign and loving God who embedded freedom, responsibility, and consequence into the fabric of creation. The probabilistic 'quantum sliver' is not a gap in God's sovereignty – it is a grace-shaped feature, a designed margin of agency that makes real obedience, transformation, and love possible.

God remains fully omniscient – not because He scripts every outcome, but because He comprehends the entire moral cloud: every actualised path, every counterfactual trajectory, every branching possibility within the divine economy of freedom. In this architecture, God governs without coercion, foreknows without programming, and invites without forcing. The stochastic kernel He wove into space-time provides the most loving potential of all possible worlds – fertile ground for a mustard seed of faith to grow.

If the future unfolds like a branching tree and the present collapses to a single trunk of actuality, then each person's life emerges from these leaves of real possibilities. The leaves – the choices of individuals – can, in every case, be chosen rightly, and an omniscient God experiences the actuality of our choices. Infinity does not preclude discovery. Although God foreknows all possibilities, the experience of actualisation of our choices is novel. Just as in Abraham's test, where God declared, 'Now I know that you fear God' (Gn 22:12), divine foreknowledge transitioned into a relational encounter. This Divine declaration is not epistemic in nature, as though God acquired new propositional knowledge, but relational – recognising the transition from exhaustive foreknowledge of possibilities to the experiential actualisation of one freely enacted path. Omniscience comprehends the field of all outcomes, but omnipotent love delights in the lived reality of obedience freely given. In this way, eternity embraces time – not merely as prediction, but as participation.

Therefore, God's commands are not rhetorical – they are structurally viable. Scripture speaks in vivid conditionals throughout its pages. Each 'if' reflects a live option within a divinely ordered moral landscape: 'If you will seek Me with all your heart … ' (Jr 29:13), 'If today you hear his voice … ' (Heb 3:15), 'If you confess with your mouth … ' (Rm 10:9), and 'If you love Me, keep My commandments' (Jn 14:15). These are not poetic flourishes but divine invitations, evidence that freedom is real and obedience possible. Decisions shape destinies, prayer shifts outcomes, and love is neither compulsory nor irrelevant, but directionally fulfilling.

In such a world, discipleship regains its full moral weight. Every decision to forgive, serve, believe, or persevere matters – not symbolically, but tangibly. The biblical calls to trust, repent, forgive, and endure are not tests in a closed system, but pathways through an open architecture of grace.

At the centre of this architecture stands *agapē* – the divine vector of truth and love, the wisdom of God revealed in Christ (Jn 14:6, 1 Cor 1:24). As expressed in the Agape Triangle, love of God, others, and self all converge into the singular command that defines the telos of human life – not survival, not material gain, but love enacted in truth.

It is modelled by a God who loved us first: 'While we were still sinners, Christ died for us' (Rm 5:8) and 'Greater love has no one than this, that he lay down his life for his friends' (Jn 15:13). It frames the hinge of eternity in a single question from Jesus: 'Who do you say that I am?' (Mt 16:15).

The response to that question remains the ultimate hinge of destiny – and everyone gets their say.

Quantum Molinism is not merely a theory of providence; it is a theology of hope. It declares that the universe is alive with possibility, that freedom is sacred, and that God reigns – not despite our freedom, but through it. In this world, every soul matters. And in this divine architecture of love and liberty, you can still choose well – and hear at the journey's end: 'Well done, good and faithful servant' (Mt 25:23).

Acknowledgements

During the preparation of this work, the author used ChatGPT, version 4.0, for sourcing references, analytical

discussion, and grammar editing. The content was reviewed and edited by the author, who takes full responsibility for its accuracy.

Competing interests

The author declares that no financial or personal relationships inappropriately influenced the writing of this article.

CRediT authorship contribution

Thomas F. McAllister: Conceptualisation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. The author confirms that this work is entirely their own, has reviewed the article, approved the final version for submission and publication, and takes full responsibility for the integrity of its findings.

Ethical considerations

This article followed all ethical standards for research without direct contact with human or animal subjects.

Funding information

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Data availability

The author declares that all data that support this research article and findings are available in the article and its references.

Disclaimer

The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the author and are the product of professional research. They do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of any affiliated institution, funder, agency, or that of the publisher. The author is responsible for this article's results, findings, and content.

References

Arminius, J., 1986, *The works of James Arminius*, vol. 1, transl. J. Nichols, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, MI.

Athanasius of Alexandria, 2011, *Letters to Serapion on the Holy Spirit*, transl. S. Williams, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, Crestwood, NY.

Augustine, 1887, 'Enchiridion on faith, hope, and love', in P. Schaff (ed.), transl. J.F. Shaw, *Nicene and post-Nicene fathers*, First Series, vol. 3, pp. 229–276, Christian Literature Publishing, Buffalo, NY.

Bandyopadhyay, J.N., Tomasz, P. & Dagomir, K., 2012, 'Quantum coherence and sensitivity of Avian Magnetoreception', *Physical Review Letters* 109(11), 110502. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.110502

Bowen, M., 1978, *Family therapy in clinical practice*, Jason Aronson, New York, NY.

Boyd, G.A., 2000, *God of the possible: A Biblical introduction to the open view of God*, Baker Books, Grand Rapids, MI.

Brightlight, B.A., 2010, *Blue collar faith*, CreateSpace, Scotts Valley, CA.

Brightlight, B.A., 2013, *Short strolls in faith*, WestBow Press, Bloomington, IN.

Cahn, J., 2012, *The harbinger*, Frontline, Lake Mary, FL.

Calude, C.S., Harvey, T., Kroon, F. & Svozil, K., 2022, 'Quantum Molinism', *European Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 14(3), 167–194. https://doi.org/10.24204/ejpr.2022.3680

Calvin, J., 1960, *Institutes of the Christian religion*, J.T. McNeill (ed.), transl. F.L. Battles, 2 vols, Westminster John Knox, Louisville, KY.

CERN, 2025, 'The Higgs Boson', *CERN*, viewed 28 August 2025, from https://home.cern/science/physics/higgsboson.

Craig, W.L., 2000, *The only wise God: The compatibility of divine foreknowledge and human freedom*, Wipf and Stock, Eugene, OR.

De Molina, L., 1988, *On divine foreknowledge: Part IV of the concordia*, transl. A.J. Freddoso, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.

Engel, G.S., Calhoun, T.R., Read, E.L., Ahn, T.K., Mančal, T., Cheng, Y.C. et al., 2007, 'Evidence for wavelike energy transfer through quantum coherence in photosynthetic systems', *Nature* 446(7137), 782–786. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05678

Epictetus, 1925, *Discourses*, transl. W. A. Oldfather, Loeb classical library, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Heisenberg, W., 1949, *The physical principles of the quantum theory*, Dover Publications, New York, NY.

Hoyle, F. & Wickramasinghe, N.C., 1981, *Evolution from space*, J.M. Dent & Sons, London.

Kierkegaard, S., 1995, *Works of love*, transl. H.V. Hong & E.H. Hong, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Leibniz, G.W., 1985, *Theodicy: Essays on the goodness of God, the freedom of man and the origin of evil*, transl. E.M. Huggard, Open Court, La Salle, IL.

Lewis, C.S., 2001, *The problem of pain*, HarperOne, New York, NY.

Lorenz, E.N., 1993, *The essence of Chaos*, University of Washington Press, Seattle, WA.

Lowe, S.D. & Lowe, M.E., 2018, *Ecologies of faith in a digital age: Spiritual growth through online education*, IVP Academic, Downers Grove, IL.

Lowe, S., 2019, 'With all your heart, soul, Wi-Fi, and websites', *Christianity Today*, 22 April, 2019, viewed 23 January 2026, from https://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2019/may/stephen-mary-lowe-ecologies-faith-digital-age.html.

Mandelbrot, B.B., 1983, *The fractal geometry of nature*, rev. ed., W. H. Freeman, New York, NY.

McAllister, T., 2022, 'All excellence is God's excellence: Examining the fractal nature of Biblical wisdom for decision-making in complex environments', EdD diss., Liberty University.

Moll, J., Zahn, R., De Oliveira-Souza, R., Krueger, F. & Grafman, J., 2005, 'The neural basis of human moral cognition', *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 6(10), 799–809. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn1768

Moltmann, J., 1993, *The crucified God*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, MN.

O'Toole, G., 2014, 'History doesn't repeat itself, but it often rhymes', *Quote Investigator* 18, January, 2014, viewed from https://quoteinvestigator.com/2014/01/12/history-rhymes/.

Pinnock, C.H., Richard, R., John, S., William, H. & David, B., 1994, *The openness of God: A Biblical challenge to the traditional understanding of God* , InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, IL.

Plantinga, A., 1974, *God, freedom, and evil*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Polkinghorne, J., 1994, *Quarks, chaos, and Christianity*, Crossroad, New York, NY.

Polkinghorne, J., 2000, *Faith, science and understanding*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.

Polkinghorne, J., 2002, *The quantum world*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Polkinghorne, J., 2005, *Science and providence: God's interaction with the world*, Templeton Foundation Press, Philadelphia, PA.

Post, S.G., 2005, 'Altruism, happiness, and health: It's good to be good', *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine* 12(2), 66–77. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327558ijbm1202_4

Rodenhizer, S., 2018, 'Choices are the hinges of destiny', *Quotation Celebration*, 08 June, 2018, viewed from https://quotationcelebration.wordpress.com/2018/06/08/choices-are-the-hinges-of-destiny-edwin-markham/.

Schroeder, G.L., 1997, *The science of God*, The Free Press, New York, NY.

Simon Fraser University, *Feedback loops*, Complex Systems Frameworks, viewed 16 August 2025, from https://www.sfu.ca/complex-systems-frameworks/frameworks/strategies/feedback-loops.html.

Snowden, D., 2020, *Cynefin: Weaving sense-making into the fabric of our world*, Cognitive Edge Pte Ltd, Singapore.

Stanley, A., 2008, *The principle of the path: How to get from where you are to where you want to be*, Thomas Nelson, Nashville, TN.

Torrance, T.F., 1996, *The Christian doctrine of God: One being three persons*, T&T Clark, Edinburgh.

Tozer, A.W., 1955, *The knowledge of the holy*, Harper & Row, New York, NY.

Tytler, A.F., 1854, *Universal history, from the creation of the world to the beginning of the eighteenth century*, Fetridge and Company, Boston, MA.

Van Ness, H.C., 1883, *Understanding thermodynamics*, Dover Publications, New York, NY.

Voltaire, 2005, *Candide*, transl. T. Cuffe, Penguin Classics, New York, NY.

Walton, J.H., 2009, *The lost world of genesis one*, IVP Academic, Downers Grove, IL.

Wright, N.T., 2008, *Surprised by hope: Rethinking heaven, the resurrection, and the mission of the church*, HarperOne, New York, NY.

Yehuda, R. & Bierer, L.M., 2008, 'Transgenerational transmission of cortisol and PTSD risk', *Progress in Brain Research* 167, 121–135. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-6123(07)67009-5