Co-existence Theory

James Sirois

11/10/2020

Non-Academic

Athens, Greece

Abstract

This thesis attempts to present a new *singular* type of paradox called a "Monoletheia", which itself creates a logical bridge to reconcile two subsequent paradoxes we call "Antinomies" and "Dialetheia". The consequence follows therefrom, to state that the concept of infinity transcends its own regress of an existential construct to include a non-existent variable (representing void). This is done by applying the theoretical idea of *co-existence* between constructs and their own negation.

The working hypothesis can be summed up in the following proposition: *"Existence co-exists with non-existence"*, and is expressed mathematically for convenience as "*Ex + co-ex w/ X*". For the same purpose, the expression denoting an antinomy is *"A*"* and "*Dt"* is used for dialetheia.

Background

Antinomy: from <u>Greek</u> ἀντί, *antí*, "against, in opposition to", and νόμος, *nómos*, "law"

Diale̗theia: from <u>Greek</u> δι- *di-* 'twice' and ἀλήθεια *ale̗theia* 'truth'

The subtle difference between the two is that an antinomical paradox negates itself and a dialetheia holds a proposition and it's own negation as *true*, in the same sense.

Differential Examples:

"There is no such thing as absolute truth"

The statement is an antinomy because it happens linearly, meaning there is logical consistency right through to the last word, which itself simultaneously refutes the entirety of the statement.

John stands in a doorway: *"John is both here and not here."*

The statement is a dialetheia because it asserts that both propositions being made are true; John being here is true, and John's absence is also true.

Seemingly, the subtle difference between an Antinomy and a Dialetheia is that the former is a self-negation which exists purely linguistically, whereas the latter is a possible linguistic proposition describing a physical state which we hold to be self-negating and *im*possible.

The Core Hypothesis

The statement: *"Existence co-exists with non-existence"*– is an antinomy describing a physical dialetheia.

The Antinomy Explained:

The word "non-existence" refutes the entirety of the sentence because its meaning holds that it has no basis upon which it can co-exist with anything; Whereas the proposition: Existence "A" co-exists with Existence "B" is logically consistent- the proposition Existence "A" co-exists with void is *not* consistent, but the sentence is not altogether false; what makes it an antinomy rests upon an impossible need for the logical understanding of void. Therefore the proposition is better constructed as so:

Existence co-exists with "X", or alternatively, that "existence co-exists", thereby referring to a self-referential construct: *existence co-exists with itself*, or that it

is divisible in nature, separated by what can only be void, and so collapsing back to the equation: Existence *A* co-exists with Existence *B*, which is itself collapsed by virtue of void unable to exist in order to separate Existence A and B- giving us once again: **Ex + Co-Ex with X.**

Therefore we can be reasonably certain that the only equivocation possible is:

Existence co-exists with non-existence = Existence co-exists with X

It then follows that with *Ex + Co-Ex w/ X*, we can see the antinomy because existence can not logically co-exist with anything, therefore "X" refutes the sentence, however it gives a valid basis for *co-existence* to be a logically consistent element which follows the element of existence.

Resumed, "X" makes it possible for Existence to Co-exist, *and also* refute the sentence it is part of, making the equation a tangible antinomy (keeping in mind that this means the linguistic paradox is validated).

The Dialetheia Explained:

The co-existence element is what also makes the proposition a Dt because it asserts that existence is true while also asserting that non-existence or X is true simultaneously.

If an antinomy (A*) is linguistic, meaning it represents a contradiction between abstractions, and a dialetheia (Dt) represents a physical impossibility *in* the existential construct, then what is an *A* which describes a Dt?*

Logically, it means that a single A* exists as a sufficient descriptor of non-existence because it linguistically goes *outside* the existential construct to emerge; out of such an emergence arises the Dt (Co-Ex), bridging the gap between both elements (Ex & X) which were previously unable to be reconciled.

An antinomy is a possibility arising only next to its impossibility which, if it describes the dialetheia of metaphysical reality, actually makes non-existence *possible*.

Resumed, Dt is nested within A*, making two seemingly contradictory truths (Ex & X) an event which emerges out of a single self-refuting truth (at least in our minds*), which is **the infinite**.

For all intents and purposes, we could call this great paradox of infinity the *monoletheia*. Such a concept is the only possible result arising out of, and is necessarily shared by, both existence *and* non-existence coming together.

> *Infinity is self-refuting to us because "beginnings" and "endings" exist, and they seem to be a part of the continuum of an infinity which itself has no Alpha or Omega; how can infinity be composed of finitude? We can not make sense of how but we know this paradox to be true through our direct experience of the law of causality.

Final Commentary

Within any given system it may not be possible for dialetheia to exist however for the continuity of an existential construct to be logically consistent, there *must* be a dialetheic counter-part (Non-existence). Existence, in so far as humans understand it, only supports itself this way. Essentially, the false dichotomy presenting either an infinity of existence or that void came before existence is remedied by a third option: *they co-exist.*

It must be treated that linguistically speaking, *non-existence does not exist in order to co-exist with existence to begin with*, but this is not a reflection of the strange physics at play as much as it reflects our inability to conceive of non-existence, and so consequently our language is set up to logically negate the initial proposition with this sentence; yet still, we have a word to describe such an inconceivable idea: **void**– and so as a matter of actuality, we still have an ability to intuitively go beyond our logical constraints to accept an idea such as "co-existence theory"- if not by pure intuition

alone, then at least by Gödel's mathematical incompleteness theorem. *We can see the truth of it without having the logical consistency.*

Subsequently, co-existence theory is then derived to describe how relativity and the dualistic functioning of our reality come to be, not only in the physics of our reality but also in our reflective human behaviour; these concepts (relativity and duality) are also treated as paradoxes in their own rite, whom come together to unify a logical picture of reality as human cognition experiences it. These essays are still currently in progress.