SUBMISSION 4

Secular Explanation of Submission 3's Theological Framework

Royal Commission into Antisemitism and Social Cohesion

Submitted by: Robert Vose
Melbourne, Victoria

Date: March 2026

Contact: [Provided separately to Royal Commission]

Purpose

This submission provides a secular explanation of Submission 3's theological content for policy makers, commissioners, and readers who need to understand its strategic purpose without engaging directly with biblical theology.

Summary

Submission 3 contains approximately 21,000 words of theological argument written in biblical register, targeting American Christian Zionist theology as an upstream driver of Middle East conflict and global extremism.

This submission (Submission 4) translates that theological framework into secular language and explains:

- What Submission 3 claims
- Why it was submitted to this Royal Commission
- What behavioural change it aims to achieve
- How theological intervention relates to Australian antisemitism prevention

Word Count

Approximately 3,000 words

This is Submission 4 of 4 submissions to the Royal Commission

---

Table of Contents

SUBMISSION 4....1
Secular Explanation of Submission 3's Theological Framework....1
Purpose....1
Summary....1
Word Count....1
Submission 4: Secular Explanation of Submission 3's Theological Framework....3
Royal Commission into Antisemitism and Social Cohesion....3
Purpose of This Submission....3
Why Two Separate Submissions?....3
Why Submission 3 Exists....4
Important Disclosure: These Are Novel, Unverified Ideas....4
Cultural Specificity: Abrahamic Creation Myths, Not Universal Claims....4
The Core Theological Innovation: Abundance, Scarcity, and Return....5
What Submission 3 Actually Claims....5
The World Past Judgement: What Becomes Possible....7
Why Submission 3 Uses Biblical Register....8
The Australian Context: Why Submit Submission 3 to This Royal Commission?....8
What Submission 3 Is Not....9
The Risk and the Record....9
For Commissioners Reading This....10
Summary: What Commissioners Need to Know....11

Submission 4: Secular Explanation of Submission 3's Theological Framework

Royal Commission into Antisemitism and Social Cohesion

Submitted by: Robert Vose
Date: March 2026
Purpose: To clarify the strategic purpose and content of Submission 3 for secular audiences

---

Purpose of This Submission

Submission 3 contains approximately 21,000 words of theological argument written in biblical register. For most Australians—including the Royal Commissioners reading this—the language, premises, and entire framework will feel utterly foreign, perhaps even repugnant. Australian political culture operates on secular, rational principles. Biblical prophecy, creation accounts, and resurrection theology have little currency in Australian public policy discourse.

This submission (Submission 4) exists to translate Submission 3 into secular language and explain its strategic purpose. It addresses three questions:

1. **What does Submission 3 actually claim?** (Summary in non-theological terms)
2. **Why was it submitted to an Australian Royal Commission?** (Strategic rationale)
3. **What outcome is it designed to achieve?** (Theory of change)

This submission is written for commissioners, policy advisers, and secular readers who need to understand Submission 3's purpose without engaging directly with biblical theology.

Why Two Separate Submissions?

Submission 3 is written for American evangelical Christians in their own theological language. It needs to speak authentically within that tradition to be credible and persuasive to that audience.

Submission 4 is written for Australian policy makers to explain why such a document was submitted to this Royal Commission and what strategic purpose it serves.

The two documents have different audiences, different registers, and different functions—but they work together: Submission 3 is the intervention; Submission 4 is the explanation of the intervention.

Why Submission 3 Exists

Submission 3 contains approximately 21,000 words of theological argument written in biblical register. For most Australians—including the Royal Commissioners reading this—the language, premises, and entire framework will feel utterly foreign, perhaps even repugnant. Australian political culture operates on secular, rational principles. Biblical prophecy, creation accounts, and resurrection theology have little currency in Australian public policy discourse.

So why submit this to an Australian Royal Commission into Antisemitism and Social Cohesion?

Because the theological framework in Submission 3 is not designed to persuade Australians. It's designed to reach approximately 70 million American Christian Zionists whose theological convictions directly shape US Middle East policy, which in turn drives extremism and antisemitic violence globally—including in Australia.

Submission 3 addresses the theological root causes of conflict as an upstream prevention strategy. If American Christian theological perspectives can be shifted, US foreign policy changes, Middle East conflict reduces, global extremism diminishes, and antisemitic violence in Australia decreases. The chain is long, but it's real.

Important Disclosure: These Are Novel, Unverified Ideas

Before describing the framework, an essential clarification: **The three theological steps presented in this submission are novel and have not been published before in theological literature.** They have not been peer-reviewed by theologians, validated by biblical scholars, or accepted by any mainstream Christian denomination. They are new ideas, offered for evaluation.

This is speculative theology, not established doctrine. The author is an ordinary person without theological credentials, using democratised tools (astronomical software, historical research, biblical cross-referencing) to propose new interpretations. These ideas may be wrong. They may be rejected by every theologian who reads them. But they're offered in good faith as a potential reframing that could have practical consequences if adopted.

Cultural Specificity: Abrahamic Creation Myths, Not Universal Claims

Every religion has creation myths. Every culture has origin stories. This framework specifically develops the **Jewish/Christian/Muslim creation accounts**—the Abrahamic traditions that share Genesis as foundational text. It does not claim to be universal theology applicable to all faiths.

This is a "Western" theological approach in the sense that it works within the biblical tradition dominant in Europe and the Americas. **It makes no claims about Hindu cosmology, Buddhist sutras, Indigenous Australian Dreamtime stories, or any other cultural tradition's understanding of creation and human purpose.**

However, the architectural outcome this framework envisions—**modern liberal democratic states built on equality principles**—is designed to be **robust enough for people of all faiths (or no faith) to live and experience their beliefs as they wish.** The theology is culturally specific; the political architecture it supports is intended to accommodate pluralism.

This matters for the submission's strategic purpose: the framework addresses American Christian Zionist theology specifically because that's a key driver of current conflict. But the peace architecture it proposes (regional integration, democratic governance, Marshall Plan reconstruction) doesn't require theological conversion—it creates conditions where multiple traditions can coexist.

The Core Theological Innovation: Abundance, Scarcity, and Return

The central insight linking all three reinterpretations is this:

The Garden of Eden represents original abundance (not just moral innocence)
The Fall represents entry into scarcity (not just sin, but structural condition of lack)
Technology—AI and space-based renewable energy—represents return to abundance
Democracy represents sound judgement needed to navigate abundance safely

Traditional Christian theology focuses on the Fall as moral failure requiring individual redemption. This framework adds a structural dimension: humanity was expelled from abundance into scarcity, and scarcity drives conflict, hierarchy, and violence. The return to abundance through technology creates the material conditions for peace—but only if guided by democratic judgement rather than hierarchical control.

This reframing has immediate contemporary relevance: **If AI and abundant energy are controlled exclusively by billionaires and technologists within hierarchical systems, their accelerated, unmoderated power will be inherently unstable.** Democracy—the operationalisation of equality—becomes essential for judgement to guide these powerful systems. This point wasn't emphasised in the main submission but grounds the theological framework in present-day technology governance concerns.

What Submission 3 Actually Claims

The theological section in Submission 3 presents three major reinterpretations of Christian tradition:

1. Christmas (The Star of Bethlehem as Acrux)
Submission 3 proposes that the Star of Bethlehem was Acrux (Alpha Crucis), the brightest star in the Southern Cross, which was visible from Jerusalem 2,000 years ago due to axial precession but is no longer visible from northern latitudes.

Traditional meaning: The star guided wise men to Jesus, fulfilling prophecy.

New meaning: The star is an observable astronomical phenomenon that anyone with software like Stellarium can verify. This demonstrates that biblical reinterpretation through observable reality is legitimate—sacred narratives can be understood differently without losing their power or meaning.

Strategic purpose: Establishes precedent. If Christmas can be reinterpreted through observation, so can other theological concepts. This opens the door to reframing Revelation.

2. Easter (The Three Days Pattern)
Submission 3 identifies a structural pattern in Genesis and Jesus's death/resurrection:

The Genesis descent (1→2→3):

- Day 1: Genesis 1:27, "Male and female He created them" (equality)

- Day 2: Genesis 1, Day 7 (Sabbath rest, transition)
- Day 3: Genesis 2 (woman created from man's rib, hierarchy established)

This represents humanity's descent from original equality into hierarchy and scarcity.

Jesus's reversal (3→2→1):

- Day 3: Crucifixion (hierarchy and death at their worst)
- Day 2: Tomb/Sabbath (transition)
- Day 1: Resurrection (return to life and equality)

Traditional meaning: Jesus died for our sins, rose from the dead, conquered death, offers eternal life.

New meaning (preserved but reframed): Jesus enacted a reversal of the descent pattern, showing the path back from hierarchy/scarcity to equality/abundance. His teaching "destroy this temple, and in three days I will rebuild it" wasn't just about his body—it was about reorienting from the wrong foundation (hierarchy) to the rejected cornerstone (equality). The resurrection validated this teaching.

Crucially: This claim—that he could destroy and rebuild the temple in three days—was the public basis of blasphemy that led to Jesus's execution. It was the most serious charge the religious authorities brought against him. This wasn't abstract theology; it was considered so threatening to hierarchical power that it warranted death. The religious authorities recognized this teaching as a fundamental challenge to their authority—which reveals exactly how radical the equality/reversal pattern was (and is).

The structural insight: Hierarchy creates scarcity thinking—there must be winners and losers, those who rule and those who serve, insiders and outsiders. This scarcity mindset drives exile, demonisation, and conflict. Equality enables abundance thinking—collaboration, shared prosperity, innovation, peace. The Fall wasn't just moral failure; it was entry into a scarce world where hierarchy became the organising principle. Jesus's reversal pattern shows the way back to abundance through equality.

Strategic purpose: Shows that the fundamental architecture of civilisation is built on the wrong foundation. Hierarchy drives scarcity, exile, and demonisation. Equality enables abundance and peace. Jesus's death and resurrection demonstrated the reversal pattern—but the pattern is accessible to all, not dependent on supernatural resurrection alone. This becomes critical when we have powerful technologies (AI, abundant energy) that can either amplify hierarchical control or enable democratic flourishing.

3. Day of Judgement / Book of Revelation (Conditional Warning, Not Predetermined Script)
This is the most strategically critical reframing.

Current Christian Zionist view:

- Revelation describes predetermined end-times events
- Tribulation, Armageddon, and mass death must occur before Christ returns
- Human action cannot prevent prophesied events
- Supporting Middle East peace = delaying God's timeline

- Palestinian suffering is acceptable or even necessary as part of prophecy fulfillment
- **Faith requires welcoming disaster**

This theology creates perverse incentives: conflict becomes desirable because it brings us closer to the Second Coming.

New meaning (using the Jonah pattern):
The Book of Jonah demonstrates that biblical prophecy functions as conditional warning meant to provoke repentance and avert disaster, not as predetermined script that must occur. Jonah prophesied Nineveh's destruction in 40 days. Nineveh repented. God showed mercy. The prophecy did not come to pass. Jonah was angry because he wanted the destruction to happen—and God rebuked him.

Applied to Revelation: The visions are warnings about where humanity is headed if we don't repent, not a script we're required to enact. Revelation 1:1 says these things "must soon take place"—that was 2,000 years ago. If it was literal prediction, it failed. But if it's conditional warning (like Jonah), it's working: we've had 2,000 years of grace to change course.

2 Peter 3:9 explicitly states: "The Lord is not slow in keeping his promise, as some understand slowness. Instead he is patient with you, not wanting anyone to perish, but everyone to come to repentance."

The "delay" is mercy. God desires repentance, not destruction.

Traditional meaning: Revelation describes final judgement, Christ's return, new heaven and new earth.

New meaning (preserved but reframed): Revelation warns about consequences of continuing on the current path. Working to prevent tribulation through peace, justice, and reconstruction is the faithful response—not opposing God's plan. The goal is reaching new heaven and new earth through collective repentance and transformation, not through mass death and destruction.

Strategic purpose: **This removes the theological barrier preventing Christian Zionists from supporting Middle East peace.** If Revelation is conditional warning (not predetermined script), then supporting peace is faithful. Palestinian suffering is not prophetically necessary. Reconstruction rather than punishment becomes theologically legitimate. The Marshall Plan model (proven to work post-WWII) becomes a faithful path rather than a delay tactic.

The World Past Judgement: What Becomes Possible

Submission 3's final section presents a vision of what building on the equality foundation (the rejected cornerstone) enables:

- **Marshall Plan-scale reconstruction** for Palestine, Lebanon, Syria ($100-200 billion over 10-15 years)
- **Levantine Economic Community** (modelled on European Coal and Steel Community)
- **Regional integration** making war economically irrational
- **Energy abundance** through space-based solar power and AI optimisation
- **Knowledge abundance** democratising access to education and technology

- **Space colonisation** as literal fulfilment of Abrahamic covenant promises ("your descendants will be as numerous as the stars")
- **Democratic governance** as essential judgement mechanism for AI and abundant energy systems

This isn't just "avoiding war." It's showing what peace enables—a future so compelling that it makes peace desirable rather than merely necessary.

The governance dimension is critical: If AI and abundant energy remain controlled by hierarchical elites (billionaires, technologists, authoritarian states), their accelerated power will be unstable and dangerous. Democracy—operationalised equality—provides the distributed judgement needed to guide these systems safely. The "rejected cornerstone" (equality) becomes the only stable foundation when we have tools this powerful. This connects ancient theological patterns to contemporary technology governance debates.

Why Submission 3 Uses Biblical Register

Submission 3 is written in biblical register because that's the language American Christian Zionists speak. Secular policy arguments don't reach them. Academic theology doesn't reach them. But reframing their own scriptures—showing that the Jonah pattern, 2 Peter 3:9, and Revelation's calls for repentance all support peace rather than conflict—that can reach them.

It's written to be circulated in American evangelical churches, Bible study groups, and theological seminars. It provides pastors and lay theologians with an alternative framework that preserves faith while removing the perverse incentive to welcome Middle East conflict.

The Australian Context: Why Submit Submission 3 to This Royal Commission?

Australian policy makers cannot directly influence American evangelical theology. But Submission 3 serves several purposes:

1. **Creates a permanent public record** of the theological drivers of Middle East conflict for long-term circulation
2. **Documents the connection** between American Christian Zionist theology and downstream antisemitic violence in Australia
3. **Provides the Royal Commission with evidence** that addressing antisemitism requires engaging with upstream theological causes, not just downstream manifestations
4. **Offers a framework** that could be shared with relevant stakeholders (faith communities, policy advisers, international partners)

Submission 3 doesn't ask Australians to adopt this theology. It asks them to understand that this theological shift in a key American demographic could have greater impact on global extremism and antisemitism than any number of domestic hate speech laws.

What Submission 3 Is Not

Submission 3 is not:

- A claim to revelation or divine authority
- An attempt to convert anyone to Christianity
- A denial of Jewish, Muslim, or other faith traditions
- A prediction that this will be adopted by mainstream evangelicals
- A guarantee that theological reframing will change US policy
- **Established theology validated by peer review or scholarly consensus**
- **A claim that these novel interpretations are correct—they may be entirely wrong**
- **Universal theology applicable to all religions—this specifically addresses Abrahamic (Jewish/Christian/Muslim) creation myths**
- **A claim that other cultural traditions' creation stories are less valid—every culture has origin myths; this works within one specific tradition**

Submission 3 is:

- **Speculative theology offered for evaluation, not established doctrine**
- **A "Western" theological framework addressing biblical traditions, not claiming universality across all faiths**
- **An attempt to create conditions where peace becomes rational and desirable for a population that currently has theological reasons to oppose it**
- **A framework developed over twenty years, not a reactive response to current events**
- **A proposal that systems architecture (building abundance) can marginalise extremism more effectively than punishment (like how Marshall Plan prosperity marginalised Nazi remnants post-WWII)**
- **Recognition that scarcity drives conflict and abundance enables peace—a structural principle, not a moral judgement**
- **An argument that democracy becomes essential for safe governance of AI and abundant energy, connecting ancient theological patterns to contemporary technology debates**
- **An architectural vision (liberal democratic states) robust enough for people of all faiths—or no faith—to live and experience their beliefs as they wish, even though the theological reasoning is culturally specific**

The Risk and the Record

The author knows that submitting all four papers together (Submission 1: Robodebt/Schedule 2 analysis; Submission 2: Naturalised Crown constitutional reform; Submission 3: theological framework; Submission 4: this secular explanation) creates risk of pattern-recognition dismissal: "outsider with grand unified theory, ignore." But the priority is creating a durable, searchable record for long-term circulation and influence—not necessarily immediate institutional adoption.

Even if every Royal Commissioner rejects Submission 3's framework, even if no evangelical pastor ever reads it, even if it changes nothing in the short term—it exists. It's in the public record.

Someone searching for "conditional prophecy Revelation peace Middle East" might find it. A seminary student might cite it. A policy adviser might reference it.

Long-term ideas require long-term patience.

For Commissioners Reading This

You don't need to believe any of this theology. You don't need to accept its cultural assumptions or biblical interpretations. You just need to understand:

1. **Approximately 70 million Americans believe a version of the theology this framework challenges**
2. **Their votes and advocacy directly influence US Middle East policy**
3. **Current Christian Zionist theology creates perverse incentives that make peace harder to achieve**
4. **Alternative theological framing that preserves faith while removing those perverse incentives could shift behaviour at scale**
5. **That behavioural shift would reduce Middle East conflict, global extremism, and antisemitic violence in Australia**
6. **The framework is culturally specific to Abrahamic traditions, but the architectural outcome (liberal democratic states) is designed to accommodate all faiths and cultures**

This is a systems intervention at the theological-political interface. It's unconventional, yes. But so is recognising that American evangelical theology is a legitimate factor in Australian antisemitism policy.

The framework works within one specific cultural-religious tradition (biblical Christianity) because that's the tradition creating the problem. But the solution it proposes—equality-based governance, abundance through technology, regional integration—doesn't require theological conversion. It creates conditions where multiple traditions can coexist peacefully.

The theological sections that follow **in Submission 3** use language and logic that will feel alien to secular Australian readers. That's intentional. They're written for a different audience—but an audience whose actions profoundly affect Australia's security and social cohesion.

This submission (Submission 4) serves as a translation layer between Submission 3's biblical register and the secular policy context of the Royal Commission. Commissioners need not read the full theological argument to understand its purpose and potential impact.

Summary: What Commissioners Need to Know

Submission 3 contains: ~21,000 words of biblical theology reframing Christmas, Easter, and Day of Judgement to remove theological barriers to Middle East peace among American Christian Zionists.

This submission (Submission 4) explains: Why that theology was submitted here, what it claims, who it targets, and what behavioural change it aims to achieve.

The ask: Recognise that upstream theological interventions targeting American evangelical populations may be a legitimate component of Australia's long-term strategy to reduce global extremism and domestic antisemitic violence—even if the theology itself feels foreign to Australian political culture.

The theological framework in Submission 3 is unconventional. So is recognising that American evangelical theology is a structural driver of Australian security threats. Both may be necessary.