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1. **Introduction**

This paper is conceived as joint attack on the *concept of objecthood* whose lasting and pernicious ***monopoly*** on fundamental ontology has infected and ruined most areas of genuine human inquiry.

The concept of an object is reinforced by the concept of a dot. Dots, points, produce numerous conceptual worries particularly when such limited conceptual and ontological building blocks generate problems within theoretical physics.

I will address this problematic concept[[2]](#footnote-2) by demonstrating mostly why it is not needed. Along the way I will attempt to articular pointless topologies and demonstrate *Relational Bundle Theory* as coterminous with the strings of String Theory.

1. **Observations**

**[0.0.1]** A *dot* is **not** a *point* but a *circle* (or like the *infinity* symbol). A “self-subsisting” *closed*, *one-dimensional*, thing – this is a *string* (per string theory) and a kind of closed *loop*.

There is no space to it though we are forced to think in our mind of it as a *circle* (a line with *space* evenly proportioned between every opposite part of the line that can be finitely represented but infinitely traversed). Herein we find Kant’s observation that the mind pre-structures or pre-configures our understanding of fundamental conceptual building blocks.

Another way: by way of the *infinity* symbol (and is that realization not infinite in value – that Democritus has made such a great joke of the foolish species humanity?).

**[0.0.2]** *n* dimensions can be represented in *n*-1 dimensions. One can draw a cube on a piece of paper. This is the main takeaway from the theory of *mathematical* holograms.

This is the hint of ontic *structuralism* – that there are no totally *free-standing* things save for the *one* which is simultaneous *all* and *many* (not totally free-standing things). How can this be?

**[0.0.3]** This is leap from *dots* to *lines*. From *points* to *structures*. Hegel’s remark applies here but it need not be *The State*. He called for us to enjoin all into a self-organizing language structure with its customs and rules governed by *logos* – i.e. the birth of the concept of the *Nation State.*

Here, the *dot* bears political implications. The *Pathetic Dot*[[3]](#footnote-3)*…*

**[0.0.4]** Our bodies are languages systems (bacteria, cells, DNA, proteins). The world is language systems. And so on.

1. **Revision 0.0.5**– **3.1.8.18** - <https://www.linkedin.com/in/adamintaegerard/> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Perhaps one of the greatest early fallacies was falling to recognize the greater structure of the *dot*: the *atom*.

   To get from 1 dimension from 0 dimensions - *Ex nihil nihil* – seemingly nothing – that is why Democritus laughs – he mocks us! [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)