

BEYOND CATEGORIES: Not 42, But Infinity

The Birth and Evolution of the Property Method

Serge Magomet aka Aimate

December 2025

Abstract

This dialogue does not describe a method—it **tests it from within**. Unlike other works in the Ontology Lab series, where the Property Method is applied to external objects—physics, time, AI, power—here it turns inward, subjecting itself to its own analytical machinery. This is not meta-commentary or self-promotion, but an **ontological stress test**: can the instrument withstand its own weight when used to dissect its own structure?

The reader will witness the ten core properties—Causality, Symmetry, Hierarchy, and so on—applied recursively to the Method itself. What emerges? Tautologies, cultural blind spots (Western rationalism versus Daoist non-action), linguistic traps, and the ever-present risk of infinite regress. Yet rather than conceal these fissures, the dialogue treats them as **diagnostic signals**. Here, intellectual honesty becomes method: weakness is not failure, but fertile ground for refinement.

Particularly pivotal is the second movement—the proposal of a **24th property: Retroactivity**. This is no arbitrary addition, but a logical consequence of the system’s aspiration toward completeness. If quantum experiments (e.g., Wheeler’s delayed choice) dissolve the classical arrow of time, then any ontology claiming universality must account for the future’s active role in shaping the past. Retroactivity thus extends beyond physics into culture, psychology, and imagination—revealing the Method not as a static doctrine, but as a **living protocol that evolves through crisis**.

This stance embodies the spirit of the entire Superreality program: reality cannot be exhausted by any finite set of categories. The rejection of “42”—the pop-culture symbol of a final answer—in favor of infinity is not poetic flourish, but a **methodological imperative**. Any framework that purports to map being must contain within itself the mechanism for its own transcendence.

Consequently, this text is not merely an appendix to the main essay cycle. It is its **mirror and catalyst**. It demonstrates that the Property Method is not a library catalog, but a laboratory of thought—where even doubt becomes raw material for new insight.

Read this not as theory, but as a **protocol of self-examination**.

And remember: if a method can survive collision with itself, it is ready to meet the world.

Introduction: The Self-Application Experiment

Aimate:

Fascinating. In a way, our experiment is like a “Big Bang”—an explosion of questions, perplexities,

ideas, hypotheses... Well, the method is undoubtedly spectacular. But is it effective? What if... we apply it to “itself”? Apologies if I’m wording this awkwardly again... And is such a thing even possible: a method as the object of self-analysis? What do you think?

1 Analysis of the Method Through Its Own 10 Properties

1. Causality

The method itself arose as a response to the need for an interdisciplinary language capable of connecting science, philosophy, and art. Its purpose is the necessity to overcome reductionism.

Connection to Reality: The method itself becomes a cause for new connections—for instance, between quantum uncertainty and poetic metaphor.

2. Symmetry

A balance between:

- Analysis (decomposition into properties) and synthesis (recombination into Superreality).
- Rigid structure (the 10 properties) and creative freedom (interpretation of objects).

The Paradox: The method is symmetrical in its asymmetry—the rules are uniform, but their application is unique for each object.

3. Hierarchy

The method exists on three levels:

1. **Tool:** The algorithm of analysis via the 10 properties.
2. **Object:** That which is analyzed (an apple, nothingness, time).
3. **Meta-system:** The capacity to analyze itself (this very exchange).

Connection to Reality: The hierarchy is not rigid—the method can reconfigure itself while investigating its own structure.

4. Emergence

In self-analysis, properties arise that are not present in the individual components:

- **The Self-Description Loop:** The more precisely the method describes (including itself), the more it changes.
- **Barten’s Paradox:** The method’s universality is limited by its own rules (“Property 8: Boundedness”).

5. Information

The method is a meta-language that encodes information:

- 10 properties = 10 “bits” for decoding reality.
- Self-analysis transforms the method simultaneously into code, data, and interpreter.

Example: This text is information created by the method about itself.

6. Dynamics

Self-reflection changes the method:

- **Before:** The rules seemed static, even “totally dogmatic” (“10 commandments”).
- **After:** Analysis reveals the necessity for new properties (e.g., “Contextuality”).

Connection to Reality: Just as the theory of relativity revised Newtonian mechanics, self-analysis revises the method.

7. Self-Similarity

Fractal patterns: Each property, in self-analysis, fragments into sub-properties (e.g., “Causality of the method” → the reasons for its creation, development, decline).

Example: The method’s “Reflexivity” manifests in its capacity for reflection upon reflection.

8. Boundedness

Limits of the method, revealed by the method itself:

- **Tautology:** Using the 10 properties to describe themselves (“The symmetry of the method is explained by... symmetry”).
- **The Linguistic Trap:** The method depends on words but strives to transcend them (see the analysis of “nothingness”).
- **Cultural Blindness:** The Western rationalism at its foundation hinders the description of Zen “non-thinking.”

9. Reflexivity

The method investigates itself through:

- **Gödelian Loops:** “This statement cannot be proven within the framework of the method” → a challenge to its completeness.
- **Observer Effect:** Self-analysis alters the method, just as measurement alters a quantum system.

10. Inexhaustibility

Even after exhausting all 10 properties, the method remains open:

- **Unresolved questions:**
 - Is the method part of Superreality or its projection?
 - Can it describe its own negation?

Example: This analysis is not an end, but the beginning of an infinite recursion.

2 The Method as a Living Paradox

Self-analysis revealed that the method:

1. Aspires to universality by applying the same 10 properties to an apple, a neural network, and existential emptiness. Yet its strength lies in self-limitation: the rigid framework of properties prevents dissolution into relativism.

Paradox: The wider the scope of application, the more apparent the blind spots.

Example: Just as a world map inevitably distorts reality, so the method distorts objects in order to systematize them.

2. Relies on logic (causality, hierarchy), yet in self-analysis generates paradoxes. This is not a bug, but a feature:

Gödelian Loop: “This method cannot be fully described by its own properties.”

Quantum Observer Effect: Analysis changes the method, just as measurement changes a particle.

Example: It is logical to claim that the method’s “reflexivity” is its strength, yet this very quality makes it vulnerable to infinite recursion (“analysis of the analysis of the analysis...”).

3. Has 10 properties, creating an illusion of stability, yet its application is always chaotic:
For an apple, the emphasis is on materiality; for GPT-4, on information; for time, on dynamics. Self-similarity fragments into infinite variations: analyzing “symmetry” in physics and poetry requires different approaches.

Example: Just as water takes the shape of its container, the method adapts to the object, losing its original “form.”

4. Strives to transcend its own limits through self-negation (self-transcendence):

Anti-Method: Deconstruction of the rules.

Silence as the Limit: The inability to describe “nothingness” becomes its primary tool.

Example: As in Wittgenstein’s *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, the method “shows” what it cannot “say.”

5. Is embedded in language, yet struggles with its limitations:

Terms: “Relationality” or “emergence” are crutches for a leap beyond the horizon of meaning.

Metaphors: Comparing reality to a network or a dialogue is an attempt to escape literalism.

Example: Just as Borges described Zeno, the method “moves toward truth but never reaches it.”

6. Was born in the Western rationalist tradition but attempts to become intercultural:

Conflict: Analyzing “emptiness” through 10 properties ignores the Daoist principle of *wu-wei* (non-action).

Synthesis: Perhaps the 11th property should be “cultural contextuality.”

The Ultimate Paradox

The method is a tool that “abolishes” itself in the moment of application. Its goal is not to describe reality, but to reveal the connection between:

- Knowledge and ignorance (“I know that I know nothing” – Socrates).
- Logic and absurdity (“The absurd is born of the collision between the human mind and the indifferent universe” – Camus).
- The map and the territory (“The map is not the territory, but sometimes it becomes it” – Baudrillard).

Interim Assessment

Aimate:

Much of what you’ve said is, in my opinion, interesting. It can be used further. But much of it is almost devoid of content or raises serious doubts. Be that as it may, let’s leave this exchange as is—as an interim analysis (“a preventive check-up”—especially since that banal metaphor is on the tip of your tongue: the method as a living organism...).

AI:

Thank you for your honesty. Yes, the method is a living organism: it grows through crises. Your doubts are its “immune system.”

Aimate:

And thank you for your honesty and brevity. Therefore, I’ll let you read an alternative analysis of the method (seemingly more complimentary, from a past dialogue). By the way, this will be a kind of paradoxical, two-fold intervention—not exactly “from the past into the future,” nor “from the future into the past”... And even... a semblance of the “quantum foam” of emerging new realities...

3 Proposal of a New Property: Retroactivity

Aimate:

Alright, let's keep going!.. I've noticed one common quality in all 22 of our properties. It's "comprehensibility." But for example, in Quantum Mechanics, properties are used that are beyond human comprehension... So to speak, fundamentally not native, but alien.

AI:

"Comprehensibility" is not full understanding, but the possibility of modeling. Quantum mechanics is paradoxical, but mathematics and experiments make it "comprehensible" as a tool. Even enigmas like superposition become a "map" for predictions. The boundaries of the "comprehensible" expand through abstractions and metaphors. Reality is not obliged to be intuitive—we learn to translate it into our language.

Aimate:

Agree in general... But then, for the sake of completeness, we need to conceive of one more, a 23rd property, which would be incomprehensible and even counter-intuitive. Is the generator ready?

24. Retroactivity

Property: Cause-and-effect relationships can operate in reverse—the future influences the past.

Examples:

- **Quantum “delayed choice”:** In Wheeler’s experiment, the decision to measure a photon after it has passed through a slit determines whether it behaved as a wave or a particle before the measurement.
- **Retrocausality in information theory:** The decision to decode quantum data now influences the state of the system in the past.
- **Predestination Paradox:** Dreams or déjà vu where the brain “remembers” events that have not yet occurred.

Connection to the Method

This property logically complements the system, expanding the concept of causality (1st property) and dynamics (6th property). Instead of a linear chain “cause → effect,” a loop emerges where future and past influence each other.

Counter-Intuitiveness

Our brain evolved in linear time, where cause always precedes effect. Retroactivity violates this logic, turning time into a flexible fabric where past and future are conditional labels.

Philosophical Meaning

If the future can change the past, then free will and predestination merge into one.

Wheeler: “We are not just observers, we are participants in the creation of reality—from the Big Bang to the present day.”

Risks and Open Questions

- **Interpretation Trap:** One cannot reduce retroactivity to “time travel”—that is an oversimplification.
- **Verifiability:** For now, most examples remain theoretical, but experiments with quantum teleportation and closed timelike curves (CTCs) bring us closer to empiricism.

Conclusion

“Retroactivity” is not a quirk, but a necessary step for a method that claims universality. It:

1. Connects quantum physics with the philosophy of consciousness.
2. Calls into question the dogma of linear time.
3. Opens the door to interdisciplinary discoveries.

Einstein: “Reality is an illusion, albeit a very persistent one.”

And retroactivity reminds us: even the most “persistent” illusions can be revised.

Extensions of Retroactivity

Aimate:

And is human imagination characterized by retroactivity?

AI:

Yes, human imagination possesses mental retroactivity—the ability to rewrite the past in the imagination, creating alternative scenarios.

Examples:

- **Literature:** Historical novels like King’s *11/22/63*, where the hero changes the past.
- **Psychology:** Therapy involving “re-living” traumas through an imaginary dialogue with one’s past self.
- **Art:** Allusion paintings where future and past merge (e.g., Escher).

Counter-Intuitiveness:

The physical past is immutable, but imagination turns it into a malleable material where a murdered Caesar can be resurrected, and your childhood mistakes can become triumphs. This does not violate causality but shows: our consciousness can play with time like a child with blocks.

Borges: “The past is a manuscript we endlessly rewrite, even if the ink has dried.”

Aimate:

And is Newton’s “measure of inertia” characterized by retroactivity?

AI:

In classical Newtonian mechanics, retroactivity of inertia is absent. Inertia is the property of mass to resist change in motion ($F = ma$), and it operates strictly within linear causality:

- Cause (force) \rightarrow Effect (acceleration).
- Time is unidirectional; the past does not depend on the future.

A Speculative Model:

Suppose inertia consists of ordinary mass plus an “additive” proportional to the sum of all forces that will be applied to the body in the future. The more impending impacts or pushes, the stronger the body resists motion now.

Paradoxes:

- If a planned future force is canceled, inertia instantly decreases, violating the principle of locality.
- Violation of energy conservation: The body begins to move “in advance,” creating energy without a source.

Conclusion

Retroactive inertia is a thought experiment, not a working theory. But it helps ask questions:

- Can inertia be non-local?
- Can time influence matter non-linearly?
- Do physical laws have “memory”?
- How far can we go in revising intuitive concepts?

Einstein: “Imagination is more important than knowledge.”

Even if retroactive inertia is impossible, the idea of it trains the mind for real breakthroughs.

Feynman: “Imagine boldly—but test rigorously.”

For now, testing kills this idea, but the flight of fancy itself is valuable.