The Cascade Series — Prelude

Why Nothing Has Structure

RTAC

March 2026

Abstract

A theory of everything cannot have inputs: every input demands an explanation of its origin, and that explanation is either circular or requires a deeper theory. The only starting point that requires no explanation is nothing. This prelude shows that "nothing," taken seriously as a mathematical object, is the infinite-dimensional unit ball—and that the unit ball is not featureless. It has a slicing recurrence, a unique constant ($\sqrt{\pi}$), four distinguished dimensions, and a cascade invariant of 10^{-120}. These are not imposed; they are consequences of the single pre-mathematical fact that false and true are distinguishable. The series that follows is the derivation of what that fact implies about the geometry of the world.

1 The Problem with Starting Points

Every theory of everything proposed to date begins with something: a string, a spin network, a set of fields, a symmetry group, a Lagrangian, a wave function, a set of rules. Each starting point carries structure, and that structure demands explanation.

Why a string rather than a membrane? Why $\mathrm{SU}(3) \times \mathrm{SU}(2) \times \mathrm{U}(1)$ rather than $\mathrm{SU}(5)$? Why ten dimensions rather than eleven? Every choice is a free input. Every free input is a knob that could have been set differently. Every knob that could have been set differently invites the question: what set it?

The options are limited. Either the starting point is explained by something deeper—in which case it was not the starting point—or it is accepted as given, and the theory is incomplete. A theory of everything that begins with something is, by construction, not a theory of everything. It is a theory of everything *given* its starting point.

The alternative is to begin with nothing.

2 What "Nothing" Means

"Nothing" in physics is usually taken to mean empty space, or the quantum vacuum, or the absence of matter. These are not nothing. Empty space has dimension, signature, topology. The quantum vacuum has energy, fluctuations, fields. The absence of matter presupposes a stage on which matter is absent.

Mathematical nothing is more austere: no space, no time, no dimension, no content. But pure nothing—the absence of all structure—cannot even be discussed, because discussion requires the distinction between a statement and its negation.

This is the key observation. The minimal structure required for any formal system to exist is not a space, not a symmetry, not a dynamical law. It is the distinction between true and false.

Definition 2.1 (Pre-mathematical axiom)**.** $0 \neq 1$.

This is not an axiom in the usual sense. It is not chosen from a menu of alternatives. It is the precondition for axioms, theorems, and proofs to be meaningful. A system that cannot distinguish 0 from 1 cannot state any proposition, cannot derive any consequence, cannot describe any world. Definition 2.1 is the cost of admission for coherent thought.

The question is: what does $0 \neq 1$ *imply*?

3 Distinction Implies Orthogonality

If 0 and 1 are distinguishable, they are maximally distinguishable. There is no sense in which 0 partially overlaps with 1; they share no content. In the language of geometry, they are *orthogonal*: their inner product is zero.

This is not a metaphor. The logical operation NOT, which maps $0 \mapsto 1$ and $1 \mapsto 0$, is an involution ($\mathrm{NOT}^2 = \mathrm{Id}$) that exchanges two states sharing no common component. In any inner-product space, the unique pair of unit vectors with no shared component is the orthogonal pair. The passage from $0 \neq 1$ to orthogonality is not an additional assumption; it is a translation of the same fact into geometric language.

Theorem 3.1 (Distinction is orthogonality)**.** *Let V be an inner-product space and let $e_0, e_1 \in V$ be unit vectors representing two fully distinguishable states—states sharing no common component under any linear operation on V. Then $\langle e_0, e_1 \rangle = 0$.*

Proof. In an inner-product space, $\langle e_0, e_1 \rangle$ is the component of e_1 along e_0: the projection of e_1 onto the line through e_0 is $P_{e_0}(e_1) = \langle e_0, e_1 \rangle\, e_0$. "Fully distinguishable" states share no common component by definition, so for every projector this projection must vanish. Applied to P_{e_0}: if $\langle e_0, e_1 \rangle \neq 0$, then a linear operation on e_1 (projection onto e_0) produces a nonzero multiple of e_0—a partial identification of e_1 with e_0, contradicting full distinguishability. Hence $\langle e_0, e_1 \rangle = 0$. The argument uses only the geometric interpretation of the inner product: no probability measure, no Born rule, and no fidelity relation is invoked. □

4 Orthogonality Iterates

One distinction gives two orthogonal directions and a one-dimensional space. But the existence of one distinction does not preclude a second. If e_0 and e_1 span a plane, a third direction e_2 can be independent of both. There is no logical obstruction: the fact that $0 \neq 1$ does not limit the number of independent things that can be distinguished.

Theorem 4.1 (Countable independence)**.** *Let $\{e_0, e_1\}$ be an orthogonal pair. For any finite n, there exists a unit vector e_n orthogonal to $\{e_0, \ldots, e_{n-1}\}$. The iteration extends to countable infinity: the resulting structure is a separable infinite-dimensional inner-product space (a Hilbert space).*

Proof. Existence of arbitrarily many orthogonal directions. At each step, Gram–Schmidt orthogonalisation produces a unit vector in the orthogonal complement of the span of the previous vectors, as long as the ambient space has dimension greater than the number already constructed. So for any finite n, an $(n{+}1)$-th orthogonal unit vector can be constructed.

Dimension is either 0 *or* ∞ *(free-parameter argument).* It remains to show that the iteration must terminate at countable infinity rather than at any finite n. Suppose the iteration stops at some finite $n < \infty$. Then n itself is a structural input of the theory—an unexplained integer specifying where distinction ceases. A theory of everything cannot accommodate unexplained inputs (Section 1), so any finite stopping point is exactly the kind of free parameter the starting-point argument rules out. The only stopping points compatible with zero free parameters are $n = 0$ (contradicting Definition 2.1, which requires at least two distinct states) and $n = \infty$.

The iteration therefore extends to countable infinity. The step from finite to infinite is not an additional assumption; refusing it would be.

Countable rather than uncountable (discreteness of distinction). Each distinction is a single bit: a binary test "is the state e_i or not?" resolvable in finitely many steps. Countably many binary tests generate a countable orthonormal family, whose closed linear span is a separable Hilbert space. Uncountable dimension would require distinctions not resolvable by any countable sequence of binary tests—strictly stronger than $0 \neq 1$—and is therefore excluded by the same parameter-economy principle that excludes finite n. The completion of the pre-Hilbert space generated by the orthonormal sequence $\{e_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a separable infinite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. □

5 Scale Invariance and the Projective Starting Object

Starting from nothing, there is no external reference against which to measure absolute magnitude. There is no metre stick, no Planck mass, no energy scale. The only quantities that can be defined without an external reference are *ratios*. Equivalently: the dilation $x \mapsto \lambda x$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^*$ is unobservable. The starting object must be invariant under it.

The invariant of $\mathcal{H}$ under this action is the *projective Hilbert space*

$$\mathbb{P}\mathcal{H} \;=\; (\mathcal{H} \setminus \{0\})/\!\sim, \qquad x \sim \lambda x \text{ for } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^*.$$

$\mathbb{P}\mathcal{H}$ is the unique quotient of $\mathcal{H}$ that forgets exactly what scale invariance says is unobservable and no more. Unit norm is not an additional axiom imposed on $\mathcal{H}$; it is the choice of a canonical *representative* of each equivalence class in $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{H}$.

Definition 5.1 (Unit ball as canonical representative)**.** *The unit ball $B^d = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| \leq 1\}$ and unit sphere $S^{d-1} = \partial B^d$ are canonical representatives of $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{H}$: each ray through the origin meets S^{d-1} exactly twice (at antipodal points) and $B^d \setminus \{0\}$ in a half-open radial segment. Every subsequent theorem of the cascade is projective-invariant—it depends only on the ratio structure of $\mathcal{H}$, not on the chosen representative— so the choice is computational, not ontological.*

Remark 5.2 (Why the ball rather than the sphere)**.** *We work with B^∞ rather than S^∞ because the ball contains the entire tower $\{S^{d-1}\}_{d\geq 1}$ as cross-sections of a single operation: slicing B^{d+1} perpendicular to any axis at height $x \in [-1, 1]$ yields a ball B^d of radius $\sqrt{1-x^2}$, whose boundary is a sphere S^{d-1}. This is the slicing recurrence of Section 7, and it is the mechanism by which the Gamma function enters. The sphere S^d does not carry an analogous native recurrence to lower-dimensional spheres; the ball is the minimal container in which the recurrence is expressible without auxiliary structure. Once the recurrence is in place, boundary dominance ($\Omega_{d-1}/V_d = d$) shows that the spheres carry essentially all the content—so physics lives on the sphere, but the recurrence is organised by the ball.*

From Section 4: the natural $\mathcal{H}$ is an infinite-dimensional separable real Hilbert space. From scale invariance: the starting object is $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{H}$. Working in the unit-ball representative:

Corollary 5.3 (The starting point)**.** *The mathematical object corresponding to "nothing with the capacity for distinction" is $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{H}$, represented for calculation by B^∞, the infinite-dimensional unit ball.*

6 Nothing Is Empty

The infinite-dimensional unit ball is a legitimate mathematical object—but it is empty in every measurable sense.

Theorem 6.1 (Geometric nothing)**.** *B^∞ has zero volume, zero surface area, and no interior point is farther than ε from the boundary for any $\varepsilon > 0$ (concentration of measure).*

Proof. $V_d = \pi^{d/2}/\Gamma(d/2+1) \to 0$ as $d \to \infty$. $\Omega_{d-1} = 2\pi^{d/2}/\Gamma(d/2) \to 0$ as $d \to \infty$. By concentration of measure on S^{d-1}, the uniform distribution on B^d places a fraction $1-(1-\varepsilon^2/d)^{d/2} \to 1-e^{-\varepsilon^2/2}$ of its mass within a shell of thickness $\varepsilon/\sqrt{d}$ of the boundary. □

B^∞ has no volume to fill, no boundary to inhabit, no interior to explore. It is the geometric expression of "distinction exists but content does not." It is structured nothing.

7 Nothing Is Unstable

B^∞ is empty—but it is not inert. It has a slicing recurrence: cut B^{d+1} perpendicular to one axis, and each cross-section is a d-ball of radius $\sqrt{1-x^2}$. The volumes obey:

$$V_{d+1} = V_d \cdot \sqrt{\pi} \cdot R(d+1), \qquad R(d) = \frac{\Gamma((d+1)/2)}{\Gamma((d+2)/2)}.$$

The constant $\sqrt{\pi}$ is forced by orthogonality (Theorem 3.1): the angle between axis and equator is $\pi/2$, forcing the half-integer argument in $B(1/2,\cdot)$, giving $\Gamma(1/2) = \sqrt{\pi}$.

As d decreases from infinity, volumes *grow*. The ball acquires content it did not have. The volume peaks at $d = 5$. Nothing, viewed from a lower dimension, is no longer nothing.

This is the instability: B^∞ has zero volume, but its finite-dimensional cross-sections do not. The descent from $d = \infty$ to finite d is a transition from emptiness to content, governed entirely by the Gamma function, with no free parameters.

Remark 7.1. *The word "descent" does not imply a process in time. It is a mathematical relationship: the volumes and areas of unit balls at successive finite dimensions are related by the slicing recurrence. Time will emerge later (Part II) as the cascade's own orthogonal slicing direction. The descent is the static structure from which time is read off.*

8 The Destination Is Forced

The volume maximum is at $d = 5$: the unique dimension where the unit ball has the largest volume. The observer sits at $d = 4$, the boundary S^3 of B^5. By boundary dominance ($\Omega_{d-1}/V_d = d$), this boundary carries 4/5 of the content.

Why does the observer end up here? Part III of the series proves that $d = 4$ is the unique spacetime dimension satisfying two independent constraints simultaneously:

1. **Lovelock uniqueness**: the gravitational equation has a unique form (Einstein's equation with cosmological constant) only at $d = 4$.

2. **Complex spinors**: the Clifford algebra $\mathrm{Cl}(1, d-1)$ has irreducibly complex minimal spinors—the prerequisite for quantum mechanics—only when $d \bmod 8 \in \{4, 5, 6\}$.

The intersection is $\{4\}$. No other dimension permits both unique physical laws and quantum information processing. The observer is not placed at $d = 4$ by assumption; $d = 4$ is where the mathematics forces the unique coincidence of stable laws, complex phase, and maximal content.

9 The Chain

The complete logical chain, from pre-mathematics to physics, is:

Step	Statement	Status
0	$0 \neq 1$	Pre-mathematical
1	Distinction $\Rightarrow$ orthogonality	Theorem 3.1
2	Orthogonality iterates $\Rightarrow d = \aleph_0$	Theorem 4.1
3	Scale invariance $\Rightarrow \mathbb{P}\mathcal{H}$; B^∞ is a representative	Definition 5.1
4	B^∞: zero volume, zero area	Theorem 6.1
5	Slicing recurrence, constant $\sqrt{\pi}$	Forced by step 1
6	Descent: volumes grow, peak at $d = 5$	Gamma function
7	Observer at $d = 4$: boundary of the peak	Lovelock $\cap$ Clifford
8	Four distinguished dimensions: $5, 7, 19, 217$	Part 0
9	Cascade invariant $\approx 10^{-120}$	Part 0
10	Cosmological constant, QM, GR, SM, cosmology	Parts I–V

Steps 0–4 are established in this prelude. Step 5 is proved in Part 0 (Theorem 3.1). Steps 6–7 are proved in Parts 0 and III. Steps 8–10 are the content of the series.

No step introduces a free parameter. No step selects from a menu of alternatives. Each step is either logically necessary (0–3), a theorem about the Gamma function (4–6, 8–9), or a uniqueness result from known mathematics (7). The series is the derivation of what $0 \neq 1$ implies about the geometry of the world.

10 What This Paper Does Not Do

Does not derive physics. This prelude contains no physical predictions. Its sole purpose is to establish that the starting point of the series—the infinite-dimensional unit ball—is not a choice. It is the unique mathematical structure that corresponds to "nothing with the capacity for distinction," and it requires no input beyond the precondition for coherent thought.

Real start, complex amplitudes, quaternionic spacetime. The Prelude's starting object is over $\mathbb{R}$: no complex or quaternionic structure is introduced by hand. By Hurwitz's theorem, the associative normed division algebras over $\mathbb{R}$ are exactly $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{C}$, and $\mathbb{H}$, and the Gamma function governs the slicing recurrence in all three cases. The cascade selects between them downstream:

- *Real at the start.* The real Hilbert space is the most austere starting point and is the one used here. No complex or quaternionic structure is assumed.
- *Complex at the amplitude level.* A complex structure J with $J^2 = -\mathrm{Id}$ arises as a *derived* consequence of the forced precession $\alpha = \pi/2$ in Part II. It is a theorem, not an axiom: two consecutive cascade quarter-turns compose to multiplication by -1, promoting the state space to a complex Hilbert space at the quantum layer.
- *Quaternionic at the spacetime dimension.* Lovelock uniqueness intersected with Clifford periodicity forces the spacetime dimension to $d = 4 = \dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{H}$ in Part III. The *spacetime* dimension matches the quaternions while the *amplitude* algebra remains $\mathbb{C}$.

The real/complex/quaternionic hierarchy is thus not an open question: each algebra enters the cascade at the layer forced by a downstream theorem. What the Prelude does not do is prove that the cascade could not have been written over $\mathbb{C}$ or $\mathbb{H}$ from the outset—it proves only that the real case suffices, and that the complex and quaternionic roles are recovered downstream without additional input.

Does not resolve the hard problem. The cascade derives the dimension where self-awareness is mathematically possible. It does not derive self-awareness itself. The question "why is there something rather than nothing?" receives an answer: because nothing, taken seriously, has structure. The question "why is there *experience*?" remains open.

The series begins.