

Primordial Cycle

1. The logical imperatives of paradox

A key concept of the Impressionist Theory of Everything (IToE) is that a natural and self-determining process of development through cycle generates all structures and relationships found in the universe. Shape and relationship become more complex as cycle is successively superposed on itself. This cycle has a fundamental presence at all locations in the universe and determines the structure of the universe itself. The sequence for the development of this cycle begins at a location defined as *primordial*.

Under IToE, the logical imperative that is the basis of the process of development of primordial cycle is provided by paradox. Paradox is responsible for the force that applies, and it determines the shape that develops. The primordial structure and its complex representation is called *R* after the Russell paradox, the statement in language of the first logical imperative of IToE. Each theoretic construction and empirical phenomenon in which the primordial cycle of *R* is expressed takes on a unique form for the development of *R*; however, a common principle is found. Examining the details of philosophical and mathematical arguments, as well as physical phenomena, can identify this common structure.

In the most fundamental terms, anything that is observable has location in the geometric sense and an identity or name. Of note, each such observable then conforms to the principle that it is composed as a fundamental dualism. The properties of geometric location and an identity are complementary but also nontransformable for their characteristics. Furthermore, the fact that each such observable is *R* means that this observable is imbalanced for containment of all the properties that apply to define the state completely. The observables that form such a domain exist in a more fundamental perspective than is rationally conceivable. These objects exist in an imbalance for the closure, containment, and definition of the given structure in rational terms.

The nature of this structure is most clearly delineated when that which is observed exists at some appropriate absolute and fundamental limit to the observer. Paradox, as described above, is then openly displayed in the full composition of the domain. An *absolute limit* has the special characteristic that, in the necessarily classical space of the observer, the boundary of the domain defined as absolute does not internally contain properties that are also directly observable as a collection of objects having classical identities and relationships. In other words, that which is absolutely fundamental is indivisible in the observer's universe. The problem with the representation of any such object is that under the mechanism of paradox some part of its fundamental structure is necessarily not present in the local site that is observed.

Under IToE, there are two formats for constructing the entire space of this nonobservable and nonrational structure. The first is that a hidden dualism is contained within R , and this dualism is a more fundamental collection of objects. It is these objects that are fundamental, not the object that is observed. The second format is that R is part of a dimensionally larger structure. That which is observed is again not absolutely fundamental and must change in space and time to accommodate inclusion of the second portion of that which is absolutely fundamental (as a dualism). The first format has static characteristics because the description fully accounts for the containment of its Dualistic properties. This space is quantum mechanical. The second format has dynamic characteristics because the dualism of the structure is not encompassed by the singular construction that is observed.

Regardless of the formalism that applies and the structure that is observed, conclusions that are drawn through either mathematics or language represent an imbalance by the mechanism of R . Rational conclusion represents an *undue dominance* in regard to the final representation of absolute fundamentality. This undue dominance must be annulled or normalized if accurate statement is to be formed. The necessary factor of correction, to properly annul this undue dominance, is none other than fundamental paradox.

In the geometric structure of IToE, primordial cycle results in the development of the boundary of circumference on the two-dimensional plane. This development is a cross-dimensional process that applies equally to all individual locations in the universe as well as the universe itself. The same structure is found for whatever is observed, but takes on a unique appearance in each example. The strength of IToE is being able to show the common structure of R in each instance of phenomenon or theoretic argument.

The key factor to understanding how this primordial cycle evolves is to understand the nature of superposition. The structure of a superposed state is absolutely closed to observation and conclusion. In this superposition, primordial cycle accumulates by inflation of cycle across successive dimensional boundaries. Primordial cycle becomes superposed on itself. If this complexity is to be observed internally for conclusion, it must be transformed to a nonsuperposed format. That which is inherently closed as rotational (equally nondistributive for any linear relationship of parts) is opened to observation.

When a state displays distributive *linearity*, in the most general terms, the observer has entered the state and observes an appropriate rational relationship between the parts of the state, and the parts necessarily take on relationship to the observer. The more complex the state of superposition, the more complex will be the parts to this linear format. The two-dimensional geometric model presented in IToE is necessarily incomplete for the depth to which it can represent development of superposition for cycle. Nevertheless, in those two subclassical dimensions, a complete structure of symmetries is found that represents phenomena directly observed in Nature. The key components of far more complex spaces are equally represented.

2. Containment and noncontainment

For the description of a space of any phenomenon under the Impressionist Theory of Everything (IToE), *containment* and *noncontainment* bear relativistic perspectives to each other. As a minimum two frames of reference apply, and consequently the terms must be used

consistently.

Thus under IToE, the fundamental property of an observationally contained domain is that it is inherently singular in structure under observation. The fundamental property of a noncontained domain, in its simplest format, is that it is dualistic, and this dualism is not singularly observable. Within IToE, these separate singular and dualistic perspectives for the nature of domain are conceptually combined in one space to form a comprehensive description of space. This space is necessarily rationally paradoxical for its construction.

The inherent property of the nonrational dichotomy between singularism and dualism carries forward as cycle accumulates. If this accumulation is unrestrained for the physical structure of the classical universe, the first and simplest representation of singularism and dualism is distance and time. Specifically for the process of superposition of the state of R in an unrestrained physical setting, distance accumulates as a contained singularism that appears as gravitational acceleration; time accumulates as the passage of time, a noncontained dualism. Time is the more mysterious of these two concepts. We have difficulty conceptualizing the relationship of the past, present, and future in the flow of time. It is the concept of noncontainment of domain that requires time to accumulate in this manner. Because time accumulates as noncontained, we never have the sense that this process causes the growth of a single state as growth by containment does for properties such as distance.

Thus the two processes of accumulation, containment and noncontainment, are absolutely complementary. They fulfill the requirement of R that perspectives of singularism and dualism must both be accounted for if the statement is to be complete.

3. Sequence in the development of primordial cycle

Description of the sequence for the development of complexity is described in Chapter 1.5, The Cross-Dimensional Development of Angularity. The space of R develops from an entirely

closed null location. A curvilinear shape takes form that consists of two dimensionally distinct subclassical structures. A dimensional boundary separates them, and each shape is an infinity. In other words, each is infinitely symmetrical although not in the classical sense. The two structures are a half-orbit and a half-spin. The structures have different appearance because each is a hidden space to the other. Specifically, the first shape of half-orbit collapses to a half-spin when it is viewed from the second stage of the development that is itself a half-orbit. Thus, the difference in structure between the first two subclassical levels of dimension means that their additive combination does not result in the shape known classically as the unit circle, but in two dissimilar shapes that complete a primordial cycle.

4. Conclusion

There are no fixed structures in the geometric model of the Impressionist Theory of Everything (IToE). Rather, space must develop its complex shapes out of a primordial cycle. For this reason, the relationship of parts across the geometric and mathematical model of IToE is not singularly rational. No single structure of orthogonality applies that can form the basis of calculative reasoning in mathematics or literal statement in language. However, IToE does give insight into the mechanism behind the relationship of fixed planes of logical structure that apply in the descriptions of the complex universe.

Without the Impressionist perspective it is not possible to integrate the parts of the universe that are held absolutely and naturally apart by the mechanism of paradox. The strength of the Impressionist Theory of Everything (IToE) comes from showing how primordial cycle develops and corresponds to what is observed in Nature.

November 30, 2002