

How did everything start from ... absolutely nothing?

By Thor Fabian Pettersen (2018)

Step 1: Existence

First, we need to find the state of absolute position in order to know what it is. We start by shrinking the space-time in our mind's eye so that we can truly home in on our position. We arrive at some point. The question is, how do we accomplish this point in reality? Well, we already know the answer to this question because photons experience this "zero-dimensional" reality every day, as it were. The answer is: We discover the absolute position or timelessness with speed; viz., the speed of light in a vacuum.

Ok. Let us remove the photons in order to create nonexistence. If we remove the photons, we remove the absolute position. We remove that which is absolute. What do we get? We get that light is stationary. To me, this looks like a paradox of Zeno, which means it is an impossibility. You cannot do it. You cannot create nonexistence because nonexistence is impossible to create.

Why do we get the stationary phenomenon when we remove the absolute position? Why can't we just remove the absolute position and accomplish nonexistence? In your mind's eye, you can simply extinguish a flame with your thought. In actuality, you need, say, water. Similarly, when we reduce all the velocities in existence to a complete stop, we do not get nonexistence but a state that is completely frozen, which must look like the points in Zeno's paradoxes. The paradoxes make motion impossible, so if you want to create nonexistence,

then the best you can do is to create the paradoxical pictures you will find in Zeno's paradoxes.

Alternatively, you would not create Zeno's paradoxes as such, but you would simply have a frozen landscape; which means, if nonexistence always was, then you would have this frozen landscape, but then you are back at the problem of origins, "How can the frozen landscape have always been there?" If we have this thing called existence and, the thing comes in the form of motion, then we solve the paradox, because now you can create a velocity that is so fierce that you curl the frozen landscape up into a "zero-dimensional" knot. That is, nothingness is the speed of light in a vacuum.

Timelessness is not the opposite of time; timelessness is a high speed, the ultimate expression of time.

Step 2: Origins

Existence always was, which means we have things like atoms. But, did the atom start "over here" or, "over there." This is the infinite regress paradox. We solve it by fusing "over here" and "over there." Now, we have one place, one point of origin for all atoms. This point is known as the Big Bang.

Step 3: Prime Mover

What caused the Big Bang? Existence always was, but what, exactly, is it? We start with our absolute state, which is the only logical place to start. This state was the speed of light in a vacuum. We then need to find a geometry that is built for speed. A man called Buckminster Fuller found it: the cuboctahedron.

We build the cuboctahedron, fold it, and see what happens.

We get clockwise and anticlockwise spin.

If existence always was and, if existence is the cuboctahedron, then we have always had spin. The question arises then, when did the cuboctahedron first start to spin? What set it going? This is the First Mover problem.

Our solution to the problem was that, the cuboctahedron has always spun. However, this is puzzling because, then the spin itself does not have an origin, and we are back at the infinite regress problem.

The resolution here is that, we only see the problem from our point of view. From the light's point of view (in a vacuum), the spin is timeless or absolute.

Imagine that you had godly speakers and godly ears; then you could keep turning up the volume. What would happen if you just continued to turn up the volume? I believe the volume would be so high you would get silence. That is, motionlessness is an extreme form of motion. That is, our everlasting spin is motionless in actuality, which means we solve the infinite regress problem.

Step 4: Creation

Ok. Now we have the cuboctahedron. The cuboctahedron spins. The spin is frozen. Then, how do we get space-time out of this frozen spin? How does motionlessness or nothingness birth space-time?

This is the ingenious part: When we fold the cuboctahedron, we get, among other things, the tetrahedron. The nature of the tetrahedron answers how we get something out of nothing. Note that "nothing" is not nonexistence. Nothingness is the state that came before the space-time.

What created the cuboctahedron? A: Step 1. Meaning, the cuboctahedron had always been.

So, how can nothingness birth something(ness)? The answer is: We find a creature that is both. We find a creature that is both nothingness and something(ness).

So, how did the nothingness become something? As I said, I believe that the nature of the tetrahedron answers it. The tetrahedron is both unbound and bound. It is like asking, "How did life go from water (nothingness) to land (something(ness))?" Well, obviously, there was a creature that could (both) breathe underwater and breathe on land. That is, the boundary of a boundary is zero. Meaning, the unbound dwells in that which is bound and vice versa.

Ok. But what does this mean? How does it work?

It works because existence is a dual creature. Existence is absolute and relative. The absolute is the speed of light in a vacuum. And the relative is, e.g., two planets relative to each other. Note that duality does not mean "separate." We are only dealing with one reality here. The absolute and the relative embody the same coin, so to speak.

The tetrahedron is both absolute (unbound) and relative (bound), I muse. The absolute is the wave and the relative is the particle. The tetrahedron is both a particle and a wave because of its bound/unbound nature.

So, back to our frozen spin. The thing is, our frozen spin is only frozen in the absolute state. In the relative state, the frozen spin is not frozen but spins with a fury. This is because, in the absolute state, you are all alone, which means you cannot tell if you are big or small or what. However, on the relative side, we can find out what you are; and, we find what the cuboctahedron is by folding it. Which means the infinite regress paradox only applies to the relative side of things. From the absolute side, there is no paradox. Which means: All is fine.

Seen from our point of view, then, things simply pop from the nothingness. And the Know-How is the frozen/spinning cuboctahedron.

However, if the cuboctahedron has always spun, then does it spin to the left or right? Is it spinning clockwise or anticlockwise? The answer is both. Why? Because the cuboctahedron lives in the absolute state. Just stand in front of a mirror and left becomes right. The cuboctahedron folds both ways because there is no such thing as left and right. Right is left.

About nothingness:

When you fold the cuboctahedron, you get the tetrahedron whose boundary of a boundary is 0. The cuboctahedron produces nothingness by its 12 converging lines that make perfect equilibrium/balance. The cuboctahedron is built for speed and, if we look at the universe from the light's point of view, we see only nothingness. It all fits.

So, how did everything start from ... absolutely nothing?

I think the answer is so simple it has eluded philosophers for thousands of years. Basically, the philosophers equate nothingness with nonexistence. Nothing is nothing and therefore it cannot exist, nor create anything. If you believe that, then you must be stupid. But what if the simple answer is a simple question: What if real nothingness exists? (meaning it has properties, whereas nonexistence would have zero properties). How?

I think the key to the mystery of creation lies in the fact that true nothingness can only be accomplished with a high speed as seen with the light's own eyes. From the light's point of view in a vacuum, there is only nothingness. Well, the light's point of view, is not merely a "view," but the true state of things. That is, the high speed of nothingness is motionlessness or timelessness. That is, timelessness is not the opposite of time; timelessness is a high speed, the ultimate expression of time. What does that mean? It means that timelessness does not need a cause or a beginning therefore it never moved, that is, it has no trajectory or history that needs to be explained. The universe has a history, you need to explain that, but you do not need to explain the trajectory of the nothingness because there is none. However, you do need to explain why there is nothingness rather than nonexistence. And I believe the answer is hidden in the question: If it was possible to form nothingness without motion, then true nonexistence would rule and we would not be here. However, it is impossible to create real nothingness without motion (well, just try), thus, nonexistence is impossible. Existence and motion always were, but this is not a real paradox because motion in its primal state is motionlessness or nothingness.

Ok. Then the trillion-dollar question arises: "How DID our universe come from the true state of things?"

The cool thing here is, we know that nothingness is accomplished with speed. We then need to find a geometry that is built for ultimate speed. That geometry is the cuboctahedron. When we fold the cuboctahedron, we get the tetrahedron. And the tetrahedron is the key to the wonder of creation.

The tetrahedron is special: it can exist in the relative world of stars and in the absolute world of light simultaneously, which means it is in motion and in

motionlessness simultaneously. The way to explain this is that the tetrahedron's boundaries amount to zero. A zero energy universe, so to speak. A way to visualize this is with a spinning gyroscope where motion is the actual spin of the thing and motionlessness is the fact that the gyroscope does not tilt over but is stable. Therefore, motion and motionlessness go hand in hand. Two sides of the same coin. I believe this dual nature of nature is the wave/particle phenomenon. Nature CAN be both a wave and a particle, and that explains the mystery of creation.

However, the cosmic gyroscope, so to speak, cannot tilt over because there is no gravity, nor do we have an environment that can affect it. But this may be the point, if you could "tilt it over," then existence would come crashing down and paradox, nonexistence and clowns would rule supreme.

No. Motion must always be.

In other words: The only true view of the universe is that of the light because the light is absolute for any observer. The light's point of view is pure nothingness. Mull on it. We came from this nothingness. To find the solution to the riddle of nothingness, we employ the geometry that is best suited for the task of generating speed: the cuboctahedron. The cuboctahedron is a system much like your lungs, which means it breathes in and out generating a torus. Maybe this is so because our lungs are based on the primal forms in the universe. That we are a mirror of the universe is not so puzzling because we came from the universe. The twelve vectors in the cuboctahedron form a state of absolute stillness or equilibrium. This is what the nothingness is. This stillness can be seen as the speed of light in a vacuum. Then how is the nothingness moved to create space and time? When we fold the cuboctahedron, we get spin. This spin is responsible for generating the stillness, thus spacetime is a by-product of nothingness-generation. This fact can be seen in the tetrahedron (you get the tetrahedron when you fold the cuboctahedron) whose boundary of a boundary is zero. What does that mean? It means that reality is a dual creature that lives and can live in both worlds simultaneously. This is perhaps why we have the wave/particle nature of the universe. In other words, what mechanism folded the primal cuboctahedron in order to create the spin that generates the nothingness? There was no such mechanism; meaning, the cuboctahedron has always spun. This is not a riddle from the light's own perspective because here the spin is totally frozen. Motion is motionless in the absolute world of light. In our relative universe, the cuboctahedron spins with a fury generating spacetime, which is a cosmic dual torus. However, how do we switch from the absolute world to the relative world in order to explain the something from nothing? Again, we look at

the tetrahedron whose boundary of a boundary is zero: if you start with a dot, then make a line, and then you got something from nothing. No. In order to get something from nothing, you need to start at the dot, and then draw a circle that ends with the dot you started out with. This way, you will always carry the dot, and the dot will be the center no matter what. Creation out of nothing. It takes some time to see it, I guess. The dot represents the nothingness. In the world of speed, then the speed of light would be the nothingness, and creation would be a lesser speed. God taps on the brakes and the universe becomes visible. In reality, nothingness is very unstable. Just try to breathe in, you reach a point where you want to breathe out. The system we call nothingness is exactly like that. Liken the nothingness to a cosmic gyroscope that is only stable (breathes in and out) when spinning. The stable part is the nothingness and the spinning is the spacetime that whirls around the cosmic whirlpool. At the center of this whirlpool, space and time do not exist, or, they exist as motionlessness/timelessness/nothingness/absolute spacetime. We thus solve the infinite regress problem: What caused motion? What set motion going? The answer is, motion has always existed and always been motionless (due to spinning so fast) as seen in the center of creation, the lowest levels of our reality. Then, further out the cosmic whirlpool, the arms do not spin as fast; this major traffic jam is responsible for the creation of the universe. "When" becomes "where" the arms of the whirlpool do not spin as fast. When did time begin? There is no such thing because absolute time has always been. Where did relative time start? At the slower parts of the cosmic whirlpool. By "whirlpool" I mean dual torus.

In summa: The infinite regress paradox or the First Mover problem is solved by understanding the dual nature of reality. That is, that reality can be both motionless and in motion at the same time. This is not a paradox, only a clever gyroscope.

Say that nothingness is your lungs that breathe in and out forever. Then spacetime (or matter) is the air that fills and escapes those lungs.

More: A soap bubble can explain what is meant by boundary. The soap bubble is isolated from the environment it sits in, because, if it was not, then the bubble would join the environment and become one with it, that is, the bubble would burst. The tetrahedron is such a clever creature that it can be both a soap bubble and a burst one at the same time. It is therefore both nothingness and something(ness). This explains how you can get from nothing to something because you can create this boundary within the no-boundary reality by setting up a boundary that is = to having no boundary. Like that of the doorless door:

You mark the outside from the inside by setting up a frame of a door. The air moves from the outside, through the frame, and then inside. From the air's point of view, there is no outside/inside, thus your frame does not violate it and can therefore be made. But this means that the universe can only exist as a clever illusion. And it must, or else you would have a real creation out of nothing, which is impossible.