

The Greatest Philosophical Question Answered:

$$\infty = [A+Dt \parallel X] = Mt$$

“Why is there something, rather than nothing?” is the greatest possible question one can ask objectively. This demands an answer which includes having to see the relationship between consciousness (that which is aware of and asks the question), existence (that which gives us the ability to be aware and ask questions), and non-existence (That which we are aware of but cannot physically prove). This is ultimately a matter of understanding the relationship consciousness has with its own reality (whether this reality is internal, external, or both).

The following is a mathematical answer to the question, but a more verbal one will follow.

The relationship consciousness has with reality is:

$$\infty = [A+Dt \parallel X] = Mt$$

Translated: Infinity, as an antinomical paradox equals another antinomical paradox formed by existence plus the dialethic paradox of co-existence in parallel with a non-existent variable (nothingness) which equals the “Monoalethia”, Greek for “single truth” or absolute truth. Shorthand: $\infty = Mt$ (Infinity equals absolute Truth.)

Understanding the monoalethia is an act of “metatheos”, which means “going beyond God”. Make no mistake about it- this is not to say God does not exist, as one goes beyond nothing in that case: nothing to go beyond to begin with and no act of going beyond; This negates your own existence, and dissolves it into nothingness.

However, because you know you exist with the cogito (I think therefore I am), you possess the fundamental capability to prove your own existence (science) and how you emerged (metaphysics). The act of metatheos then, a metaphysical activity, serves to help you understand your own consciousness and its limitation, while simultaneously understanding God and its limitlessness. God hereby, should begin to be conceivably understood as something well beyond our abilities to perceive, while also proving the definition that it is everything, including nothingness. This eliminates the anthropomorphism of fundamentalist religions and the infinite regress of the material reductionists, as it makes them both valid and compatible.

LEGEND:

$$\infty = [\mathbf{A+Dt} \parallel \mathbf{X}] = \mathbf{Mt}$$

∞ = Infinity

A = Existence (Ex)

Dt = Co-existence, a special type of paradox called a 'Dialethia', Greek for "2 truths"

\parallel = 'With' or 'in parallel with'

X = An unknown variable or 'non-existence'

Mt = Monoalethia, Greek for "single truth" or absolute truth. (Also holds the double-meaning of a 'Mountain', upon which the act of 'metatheos' is achieved; Metatheos, Greek for 'Beyond God')

[] = A container, meaning that the grouped elements within form an 'antinomical' paradox (From the Greek: *anti* = 'against' & *nomos* = 'law') Essentially, it means something which emerges next to its direct negation, or a thesis existing only through its antithesis.

Additional Derivations for Perspective:

Ex+Co-ex \parallel X = ∞ (Existence plus co-existence with non-existent variable equals infinity)

Ex+Co-ex \parallel X = ∞ = X \parallel Co-ex + Ex (The same only seen with the symmetry of identity)

A+Dt \parallel X = ∞ (Existence plus the Dialethic paradox with non-existence equals infinity)

$\infty = [\mathbf{A+Dt} \parallel \mathbf{X}] = \mathbf{Mt}$ (Infinity equals Existence plus Dialethia with a non-existent variable equals absolute truth or "Monoalethia". The brackets [] hold the paradox of antinomy)

Essentially, we have a paradox within a paradox within a paradox.

Why is there something rather than nothing? Because nothing is something.

For those who need more context and explanation, I detail them here below in a less condensed way, easier to understand.

The Main Theory

There are three possible perspectives to be had when explaining existence.

1: Existence is infinite

2: There was an infinity of nothingness and post-event “X” is now infinite existence

3: Nothingness and existence co-exist

Fact 1 – No matter which perspective is taken, the one, immovable constant is that infinity exists, regardless of a spatio-temporal construct or lack thereof. Therefore, infinity transcends both existence and void, serving as baseline for absolute truth.

Hypothesis 1 – We are capable of the concept of “void”, and we seek a satisfactory answer as to what its relationship to existence is. Therefore, we must consider that they co-exist if we are to gain a new understanding. Why? Because understanding void on its own is impossible, as it does not exist in order to be understood to begin with. Therefore, examining its relationship to existence is ultimately an examination of our consciousness.

Proposition 1 – This examination is as follows:

1.1: When we think about void, we fall into infinite regress (creating a mental image of white or black, which is existential)

1.2: When we think of infinity, we experience a paradox: inevitably chained to the experience of causality, we think of a continuum of beginnings and endings which itself has no beginning or ending.

1.3: Therefore, the experience of a paradox when we think about the nature of existence seems to say something important: First, that this is where human perception ends (we are unable to meaningfully perceive much more than perhaps 1 million objects). Second, that this is where human conception begins. We can create a meaningful, mental representation of something too big to perceive, such as a circle to denote an object with an infinite amount of sides for example. We are satisfied with this, which is why scientists default to an infinity of existence, leaving the question of nothingness unanswered.

1.4: What is the experience that consciousness has when it thinks about the paradox that “existence co-exists with non-existence”? This requires an examination of paradoxes themselves.

First, the concept of “infinity” is an “antinomical” paradox, which is to say: something emerging next to its negation, or a thesis which is contingent upon its antithesis. Second, the notion of “co-existence” is the type of paradox we call a “dialethia”, which is to say: a physical state which breaks the law of non-contradiction. For example, when “John” stands perfectly halfway in a doorframe, saying that *John is both here and not here at the same time*, is a physical impossibility yet a linguistic paradox which is possible.

So we now see what remains: with the statement that “existence co-exists with non-existence”, we have an antinomy describing a dialethia, and by symmetry of identity, the inverse as well. This means that the human mind is capable of encapsulating nothingness, or rendering it compatible with existence. Regardless of void being demonstrably “true”, the statement posed as a question turns into its own infinite regress which logically proves it:

DOES existence co-exist with non-existence? The answer is both *yes and no*, because if we answer only “no”, we remain with the truth that existence is infinite, and if we answer only “yes”, we again remain with the truth that both existence and non-existence are infinite, therefore infinity as a concept transcends existence and void, and we *must* say that they co-exist in order to achieve the proof and truth that the infinite exists. In this manner, infinity proves existence & void while existence & void prove infinity- they prove each other, as long as we apply the concept that existence and void co-exist.

Conclusion – Unity is the operating concept here: the unification of that which is seemingly supposed to mutually cancel each other out leads to absolute truth, free from differentiation. I am afraid that this truth, although understood, can still be refused: it can not be accepted by anyone but the individual who chooses to.

Final Thoughts

The examination I have laid out is one that describes the relationship between consciousness and its experience of “reality”, whatever this reality may be (physical or otherwise). It seems emphatically important and imperative that we integrate this understanding of metaphysics and consciousness, if we are to approach a new kind of physics capable of explaining the quantum and our ultimate goal of reconciling it with classical physics- I strongly sense that we will only be able to do so paradoxically.

In addition, this metaphysical theory emerged from a geometric combination that I made and studied, and it included its own epistemology, ethics, and aesthetics, all intrinsically tied to the physics of our spacetime construct. I will write about these in the future; It is by some astounding yet necessary fact that such a theory includes its own epistemology required to understand the metaphysics, while also giving us our ethical frameworks and aesthetics- a

complete philosophy emerges from the paradoxism of *nothingness*. I mean to say that it includes an understanding of absolute purpose and meaning as well!

For those who want a deeper proof of what I call “co-existence theory” (the core idea of my equation $\infty = [A+Dt \parallel X] = Mt$), you can [read my paper](#) on philpapers.org. This theory employs the use of the concept of co-existence in order 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. Essentially, it is the use of paradoxes to reconcile physics and metaphysics;

James Sirois

Tuesday August 23rd, 2022

Den Haag, South Holland.