Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Mukundan's Supreme Position: A Meta Axiomatic Examination of Absolute Totality

Mukundan M *

Posted Date: 18 December 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202512.1618.v1

Keywords: supreme position; absolute totality; philosophy; philosophy of logic; metaphysics; epistemology; logical systems; ontology; impossibility

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.1618.v1

Article

Mukundan's Supreme Position †: A Meta Axiomatic Examination of Absolute Totality

Mukundan M

Independent Researcher; mukundanmuthukumar@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper introduces a meta-axiomatic framework centered on the concept of the **Supreme Position** ($S^{\dagger}$) – an absolute totality encompassing every conceivable or inconceivable position, including all forms of existence, non-existence, logical systems, and meta-logical frameworks. Built upon three core axioms–the Meta-Axiom of Supreme Position, the Axiom of Position's Plenitude, and the Axiom of Anekāntavāda–the framework provides a hierarchical ontology of positions from individual premises to meta-logical systems. It resolves persistent philosophical and scientific problems by showing that impossibility, contradiction, and paradox are relative to specific logical systems ($Ł_n$), not absolute properties of positions. Through practical examples in physics (classical, quantum, relativistic systems) and conceptual analyses (black holes, square circles, causal explanations), we demonstrate how the framework explains why mysteries exist in one system but not another, why unification efforts encounter boundaries, and how absolute totality can contain seemingly incompatible positions. The framework offers a principled approach to epistemology that honors both the drive for unification and the inherent plurality of intelligible structures, suggesting that comprehensive understanding emerges from mapping positions to their natural logical homes rather than forcing universal containment.

Keywords: supreme position; absolute totality; philosophy; philosophy of logic; metaphysics; epistemology; logical systems; ontology; impossibility

---

1. Introduction

The quest for absolute understanding has driven human inquiry across philosophy, science, and mathematics, leading to the construction of logical systems designed to model reality, resolve paradoxes, and unify disparate phenomena. Yet persistent mysteries, apparent contradictions, and the elusive nature of a complete "Theory of Everything" reveal fundamental limitations in our current epistemological frameworks. Why does a proposition appear contradictory in one logical system while being perfectly coherent in another? Why does the pursuit of unification–whether in physics, mathematics, or philosophy–consistently encounter seemingly insurmountable boundaries? What does it mean for something to be "impossible," and how should we understand paradoxes that resist resolution within any single logical framework?

This paper introduces a meta-axiomatic framework centered on the concept of the **Supreme Position** ($S^{\dagger}$)–an absolute totality that transcends all conventional distinctions between possible and impossible, logical and illogical, existent and non-existent. At the foundation of this framework lies a fundamental ontological unit: the **position**.

> **Definition (Position):** A *position* is the meta-fundamental ontological unit of the Supreme Position, denoting *any possible or impossible* state, condition, entity, configuration, or relation. This includes all forms of existence, non-existence, logical and illogical structures, conceivable and inconceivable scenarios, mathematical objects, physical phenomena, abstract concepts, and beyond. A position transcends the conventional notion of a "thing" or "proposition"–it is the most basic element of the absolute totality, without presupposing any particular metaphysical or logical status.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.1618.v1

The framework proposes to resolve persistent epistemological questions by fundamentally re-contextualizing the nature of logic, reality, and understanding. Built upon three foundational axioms–the Meta-Axiom of Supreme Position, the Axiom of Position's Plenitude, and the Axiom of Anekāntavāda–it demonstrates that logical systems are not universal containers of truth but specific *collections of positions* within the Supreme Position. What appears as a contradiction in system $Ł_1$ is simply a position that does not belong to that system's structure–it belongs naturally to another system $Ł_2$ within the same meta-logical framework.

This perspectival approach dissolves the notion of absolute impossibility, recasting paradox as an indicator of deeper structural relationships rather than as flaws in reasoning. Our struggle with unification emerges from attempting to contain positions within systems where they do not naturally belong, while the limitations of our logical systems reflect inherent boundaries rather than failures of human intellect.

The paper develops this framework through formal characterization, practical applications in physical theories, and conceptual analyses of paradoxical scenarios. It shows how the Supreme Position provides both a theoretical foundation for understanding absolute totality and a practical methodology for navigating between specialized logical systems without forcing artificial unification. Ultimately, this approach offers a comprehensive perspective on reality, logic, and knowledge that respects both the human drive for coherence and the inherent plurality of intelligible structures.

2. The Meta Axiōma's

2.1. Meta-Axiom of Supreme Position†

2.1.1. Axiomatic Statement

The **Supreme Position**† is the meta-abstract totality of all positions. It is absolute and complete. No position exists outside it. Every conceivable or inconceivable state, condition, or entity—including all forms of existence, non-existence, logical, and illogical configurations—is a position within it. The term **position** is the meta-fundamental ontological unit of this totality, transcending the notion of a "thing" and denoting any possible or impossible.

2.1.2. Formal Characterization

1. **Absolute Totality:** The Supreme Position contains all positions. There is no position outside it.
2. **Reality as a Sub-position:** What we term "reality" constitutes only few positions, or one collection of positions, within the Supreme Position.
3. **Dissolution of Distinctions:** Within the Supreme Position, conventional distinctions between possible and impossible, logical and illogical, consistent and contradictory, are not absolute but are relative to specific logical systems.

Meta-Logical Grounding: This axiom is itself formulated using meta-logic—the fundamental reasoning faculty that precedes and enables any specific logical system.For humans, this constitutes a specific meta-logical system; other species or forms of intelligence might employ different kinds of meta-logic. This implies the existence of multiple meta-logical systems. The act of asserting the axiom does not step outside the Supreme Position; rather, it is a meta-logical acknowledgment of the absolute totality that encompasses even the act of acknowledgment. This is our most fundamental abstract tool, the meta-logic. The totality includes any kind of meta-logic.

2.1.3. Immediate Consequences:

- **Impossibility is Relative:** A state deemed impossible within a specific logical system $Ł_n$ is a valid position within the Supreme Position.
- **Paradox Indicates Depth:** A paradoxical situation in a given logical system signals the existence of a deeper structural layer within the Supreme Position.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.1618.v1

- **Contradiction is Contained:** Seemingly mutually exclusive truths can coexist within higher-order systems that are part of the Supreme Position.
- **Logic is a Sub-position:** Any logical system, including the one used to formulate this axiom, is a Sub-position of the Supreme Position.
- **Multi Meta-Logic:** There exists a plurality of meta-logical systems. For humans, we employ a specific meta-logical system; other forms of intelligence or consciousness might employ different kinds of meta-logic. All such meta-logical systems are positions within the Supreme Position.
- **Validity of All Positions:** In the Supreme Position, every position (or any position) is valid. Here, "valid" does not denote truth or falsehood in any specific logical sense; rather, it signifies that the Supreme Position contains all positions without classifying, judging, or assigning them truth values. Distinctions such as existence vs. non-existence, logical vs. illogical, and conceivable vs. inconceivable are relative only to specific logics and meta-logics, not to the Supreme Position itself. The Supreme Position simply contains all positions—it does not evaluate them.

2.2. Meta-Axiom of Position's Plenitude

2.2.1. Axiomatic Statement

The Supreme Position contains an unimaginable plenitude of positions that fundamentally exceeds all quantitative conceptions. This plenitude is not merely infinite but transcends any notion of absolute infinity, for absolute infinity itself constitutes merely few positions within the Supreme Position. Indeed, if we were to state that absolute infinity is the cardinality of the Supreme Position, that would itself be a limitation, failing to capture the true vastness of actuality. Furthermore, the collection of positions that constitute what we term "reality" is a proper Sub-position of this plenitude; reality is few positions among the unimaginable totality of the Supreme Position.

2.2.2. Formal Characterization

1. **Transcendent Cardinality:** The collection of positions within the Supreme Position possesses a cardinality that is incomprehensibly beyond any mathematical or conceptual notion of infinity, including absolute or proper class-sized infinities.
2. **Absolute Infinity as Position:** Any concept of absolute infinity—whether mathematical, meta-physical, or theological—is itself merely few positions among the plenitude of the Supreme Position.
3. **Reality as Sub-position:** What we conventionally designate as "reality" corresponds to only a few specific configurations of positions within the Supreme Position. Other configurations, which we might term "unreal" or "impossible," are equally valid positions within the totality.

Meta-Logical Grounding: This axiom is established through meta-logical necessity.The very attempt to conceive of a boundary or limit to the plenitude of positions is itself a meta-logical operation that presupposes a more comprehensive totality. The axiom acknowledges that while specific logical systems (denoted $\{\dots\}_{\mathbb{L}_n}$) may have limited capacity to describe this plenitude, meta-logic enables us to assert its necessary existence as a foundational principle of absolute totality.

2.2.3. Immediate Consequences

- No quantitative measure, however vast, can adequately characterize the Supreme Position.
- Any attempt to assert a "largest" or "ultimate" infinity is immediately relativized within the Supreme Position.
- The distinction between "real" and "unreal" becomes context-dependent within specific logical frameworks, while the Supreme Position contains all such distinctions as positions.

2.3. Meta-Axiom Anekāntavāda

Sanskrit: Anekāntavāda $\rightarrow$ Unique Relativistic Perspective

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.1618.v1

Note: *Premise* represented as Subscript '$\mathcal{P}$'

2.3.1. Axiomatic Statement

For any specific logical system $Ł_n$ and any 3^{rd}order **position** $(\mathfrak{P}^3)$ $X_\mathcal{P}$, if $X_\mathcal{P} \notin Ł_n$ (i.e., $X_\mathcal{P}$ appears as a mystery, contradiction, paradox, or is illogical within $Ł_n$), then there exists at least one logical system, denoted $Ł_m$, such that $X_\mathcal{P} \in Ł_m$. Conversely, for any specific logical system $Ł_a$ and any 3^{rd}order **position** $(\mathfrak{P}^3)$ $Y_\mathcal{P}$, if $Y_\mathcal{P} \in Ł_a$, then there exists at least one logical system, denoted $Ł_b$, such that $Y_\mathcal{P} \notin Ł_b$(i.e., Y appears as a mystery, contradiction, paradox, or is illogical within $Ł_b$). In other words, what is excluded or unintelligible from one perspective is necessarily included and intelligible from another, and what is included or intelligible from one perspective is necessarily excluded and unintelligible from another.

2.3.2. Formal Characterization

1. **Perspectival Completeness:** Every 3^{rd}order **position** $(\mathfrak{P}^3)$ $X_\mathcal{P}$, is a member of at least one logical system. There is no 3^{rd}order **position** $(\mathfrak{P}^3)$ that is universally excluded from all logical systems.
2. **Perspectival Exclusivity:** For any 3^{rd}order **position** $(\mathfrak{P}^3)$ $Y_\mathcal{P}$, and any logical system $Ł_a$ that includes $Y_\mathcal{P}$ (i.e., $Y_\mathcal{P} \in Ł_a$), there exists at least one logical system $Ł_b$ such that $Y_\mathcal{P} \notin Ł_b$. Equivalently, no 3^{rd}order **position** $(\mathfrak{P}^3)$ is universally included in all logical systems.
3. **Relativity of Mystery:** The properties of being a mystery, contradiction, paradox, or illogical are not intrinsic to a 3^{rd}order **position** $(\mathfrak{P}^3)$ but are relative to the logical system from which it is viewed.
4. **Non-Universality of Inclusion and Exclusion:** For every 3^{rd}order **position** $(\mathfrak{P}^3)$ $Z_\mathcal{P}$, there exists at least one logical system that includes $Z_\mathcal{P}$ and at least one logical system that excludes $Z_\mathcal{P}$. Hence, no 3^{rd}order **position** $(\mathfrak{P}^3)$ is universally included in or universally excluded from all logical systems.

Meta-Logical Grounding: This axiom is a direct consequence of the Absolute Meta-Axiom and the Axiom of Position's Plenitude. Since the Supreme Position contains all positions and all logical systems, for any $X_\mathcal{P}$ that is not in a given $Ł_n$, the plenitude of systems ensures the existence of an alternative system that includes $X_\mathcal{P}$. Similarly, for any $Y_\mathcal{P}$ that is in a given $Ł_a$, the plenitude of systems ensures the existence of an alternative system that excludes $Y_\mathcal{P}$.

2.3.3. Immediate Consequences

- **No Absolute Impossibility:** There is no 3^{rd}order **position** $(\mathfrak{P}^3)$ that is absolutely impossible; impossibility is always relative to a framework.
- **No Absolute Necessity:** There is no 3^{rd}order **position** $(\mathfrak{P}^3)$ that is absolutely necessary or universally true across all logical systems.
- **Plurality of Perspectives:** The axiom underscores the existence of multiple, equally valid perspectives (logical systems) within the Supreme Position.
- **Resolution of Paradox:** Any paradox that arises in one system can be resolved by shifting to a different system that contains the relevant 3^{rd}order **position** $(\mathfrak{P}^3)$ without contradiction.
- **Epistemic Humility:** Recognizing that our own logical system is just one among many encourages epistemic humility and openness to alternative ways of reasoning.

This axiom emphasizes the perspectival nature of truth and understanding: what is true, false, possible, or impossible depends on the logical system one adopts. The Supreme Position, by containing all systems, transcends all such perspectives and provides the absolute background in which every perspective is a valid 3^{rd}order **position** $(\mathfrak{P}^3)$.

2.4. Symbolic Representation

Note: *Premise* represented as Subscript '$\mathcal{P}$'

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.1618.v1

The following symbolic representation is a direct formal consequence derived from the three axioms of the Supreme Position: the Absolute Meta-Axiom, the Axiom of Position's Plenitude, and the Axiom *Anekāntavāda*. These axioms establish that:

1. The Supreme Position contains all positions in absolute totality (Absolute Meta-Axiom)
2. This totality possesses an unimaginable plenitude that transcends all quantitative measures (Axiom of Position's Plenitude)
3. For any 3^{rd}order **position** $(\mathfrak{P}^3)$ $X_{\mathcal{P}}$ and any specific logic Ł_n: (i) if $X_{\mathcal{P}} \notin \text{Ł}_n$, there exists at least one logic Ł_m such that $X_{\mathcal{P}} \in \text{Ł}_m$; and (ii) if $Y_{\mathcal{P}} \in \text{Ł}_a$, there exists at least one logic Ł_b such that $Y_{\mathcal{P}} \notin \text{Ł}_b$ (Axiom *Anekāntavāda*).

From these principles, we can construct a hierarchical representation of positions that captures their structural relationships within the Supreme Position.

The Supreme Position $S^{\dagger}$, it is 'All-Position'.

$$\left[\!\!\left[\left\{ \left\{\!\!\left\{ \{\dots\}_{\text{Ł}_1}, \{\dots\}_{\text{Ł}_2}, \{\dots\}_{\text{Ł}_3}, \dots \right\}\!\!\right\}_{\mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}}, \left\{\!\!\left\{ \dots \right\}\!\!\right\}_{\mathfrak{M}_2}, \left\{\!\!\left\{ \dots \right\}\!\!\right\}_{\mathfrak{M}_3}, \dots \right\}^{\mu}, \mathfrak{X}_1, \mathfrak{X}_2, \mathfrak{X}_3, \dots \right]\!\!\right]^{\dagger}$$

- $[\!\![\dots]\!\!]^{\dagger}$ is **supreme position** $S^{\dagger}$
- $\{\dots\}^{\mu}, \mathfrak{X}_1, \mathfrak{X}_2, \mathfrak{X}_3, \dots$ are 0^{th} **position**, denoted as $\mathfrak{P}^0$
- $\{\!\!\{\dots\}\!\!\}_{\mathfrak{M}_z}$ is Matelogic and it is 1^{st}order **position**, denoted as $\mathfrak{P}^1$
- $\{\dots\}_{\text{Ł}_n}$ is specific logic and it is 2^{nd}order **position**, denoted as $\mathfrak{P}^2$
- Those positions inside the $\{\dots\}_{\text{Ł}_n}$(i.e., $X_{\mathcal{P}}$) is 3^{rd}order **position**, denoted as $\mathfrak{P}^3$(premises)
- $\{\dots\}^{\mu}$ is a Metalogical Holder, denoted as μ (i.e., $\mu = \{\dots\}^{\mu}$)
- Sub-position is denoted by $\subset$
- Super-position is denoted by $\supset$
- $X_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathfrak{P}^3) \subset \text{Ł}_n(\mathfrak{P}^2) \subset \mathfrak{M}_{Homo}(\mathfrak{P}^1) \subset \mu(\mathfrak{P}^0)$
- If $X_{\mathcal{P}}$(3^{rd}order **position** $\mathfrak{P}^3$) is *'belongs to'* Ł_n(2^{nd}order **position** $\mathfrak{P}^3$), then we represent "$X_{\mathcal{P}} \in \text{Ł}_n$"
- If $X_{\mathcal{P}}$ is logical to Ł_n, then $X_{\mathcal{P}} \in \text{Ł}_n$. Furthermore, if $Y_{\mathcal{P}}$ is illogical, paradox, contradiction or mystery to Ł_n, then $Y_{\mathcal{P}} \notin \text{Ł}_n$
- Any $\mathfrak{P}^n$(n $\in$ {0,1,2,3}) are always valid in **supreme position**(i.e., $\mathfrak{P}^n \in_{\alpha} S^{\dagger}$, $\in_{\alpha}$ is 'always belongs to')
- **Axiom Anekāntavāda in Hierarchy:** For any 3^{rd}order **position** $(\mathfrak{P}^3)$ $X_{\mathcal{P}}$ or $Y_{\mathcal{P}}$:
  - If $X_{\mathcal{P}} \notin \text{Ł}_n$ for some specific logic Ł_n, then there exists at least one specific logic Ł_m such that $X_{\mathcal{P}} \in \text{Ł}_m$.
  - If $Y_{\mathcal{P}} \in \text{Ł}_a$ for some specific logic Ł_a, then there exists at least one specific logic Ł_b such that $Y_{\mathcal{P}} \notin \text{Ł}_b$.
- **Universal Inclusion:** The Supreme Position, by virtue of its plenitude, guarantees that every 3^{rd}order **position** $(\mathfrak{P}^3)$ is included in at least one specific logic, and thus no position is absolutely mysterious or contradictory.
- **Universal Exclusion:** Conversely, the plenitude also guarantees that every 3^{rd}order **position** $(\mathfrak{P}^3)$ is excluded from at least one specific logic, and thus no 3^{rd}order **position** $(\mathfrak{P}^3)$ is universally necessary or absolutely true across all systems.

This representation follows necessarily from the axioms: the Absolute Meta-Axiom guarantees that every entity (including metalogic, specific logics, and their contents) is a position within the Supreme Position; the Axiom of Position's Plenitude ensures that the hierarchy of positions extends beyond any conceivable limit; and the Axiom *Anekāntavāda* ensures both that every 3^{rd}order **position** $(\mathfrak{P}^3)$ is included in some logic and excluded from some other logic, thus making mystery, contradiction, and paradox—as well as truth and necessity—relative to a given system. The existence of multiple meta-logical systems, such as the one used by humans (denoted by $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$) and potentially different ones used by other forms of intelligence, is a direct consequence of these axioms. The notation $\{\dots\}$

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.1618.v1

represents the plenitude of positions within each level, with the subscript indicating the type of logical framework governing that collection. In particular, the metalogic systems $\mathfrak{M}_{Homo}, \mathfrak{M}_2, \ldots, \mathfrak{M}_z$ denote the plurality of meta-logical systems contained in the Supreme Position.

3. The Meta-Logic Distinction

"The assertion that a specific logical system is limited is made using a more fundamental meta-logic."

3.1. Definition

The *Meta-Logic Distinction* recognizes the fundamental difference between human-constructed logical systems and the underlying reasoning capacity that enables their formation and critique. Specific, formalized logical systems (denoted as $Ł_n$)—such as classical logic, intuitionistic logic, or mathematical logical frameworks—are products of human abstraction and definition. The *meta-logic* is the innate, more fundamental cognitive faculty that allows us to reason, construct arguments, and recognize patterns, including the capacity to identify the limitations of our specific logical systems.

3.2. The Two Levels

- **Specific Logical Systems $Ł_n$:** Formal, invented frameworks with explicit rules, axioms, and boundaries. These systems are objects of study and can be analyzed for their properties, limitations, and scope.
- **Meta-Logic:** The foundational, pre-formal reasoning ability that precedes and enables the construction, application, and critique of any specific logical system. It is not itself a formal system but the cognitive ground from which all formal systems emerge.

3.3. Implications

- The ability to critique any logical system demonstrates that meta-logic operates at a more fundamental level than the systems it evaluates.
- While specific logical systems have identifiable boundaries, meta-logic is the medium through which we recognize these boundaries. Any attempt to declare meta-logic as "limited" would itself be an exercise of that very meta-logic.
- This distinction resolves the apparent paradox: we are not trapped within a specific logical system when critiquing logic; rather, we are employing our fundamental meta-logic to evaluate our constructed systems.
- The **Absolute Meta-Axiom** and the **Axiom of Position's Plenitude** together imply that the Supreme Position encompasses both specific logical systems and the meta-logic we employ to analyze them, with meta-logic constituting a more fundamental position within the totality.
- The existence of multiple meta-logical systems—for humans, other species, or other forms of intelligence—is a direct consequence of these axioms. All such meta-logical systems are positions within the Supreme Position.

4. The Reach of Meta-Logic

Meta-logic, as the fundamental cognitive faculty underlying all formal reasoning, reaches where specific logical systems cannot. It is not constrained by the particular rules of any single logical system, but rather enables us to formulate, analyze, and transition between different logical frameworks. In contrast, any specific logical system, denoted $Ł_n$, is defined by a fixed set of axioms and rules that establish its boundaries and internal consistency.

For example, consider two distinct systems:

- In $Ł_1$, the law of identity may hold: $A = A$.
- In $Ł_2$, a contradictory rule might apply: $A = \neg A$.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.1618.v1

Each system $Ł_n$ is self-contained and cannot transcend its own foundational rules. The principle of *Specific Logic Unreachable* applies to each individually: $Ł_1$ cannot apprehend truths that require violating its law of identity, justj as $Ł_2$ cannot operate under the constraints of $Ł_1$.

Meta-logic, however, is the reasoning faculty that enables us to conceive of both $Ł_1$ and $Ł_2$, to compare them, and to recognize their respective limitations. It is not itself a formal system with fixed axioms, but the precondition for constructing and critiquing any such system. Consequently, meta-logic "reaches" in a way that no specific $Ł_n$ can: it allows us to navigate the plurality of logical frameworks and to acknowledge positions that lie beyond any one of them, all within the Supreme Position.

5. The Problem for Theory of Everything

5.1. The Traditional Unification Paradigm and Its Assumptions

The pursuit of a *Theory of Everything* (ToE) represents one of science's most ambitious goals: to unify all fundamental forces and phenomena within a single, comprehensive logical framework. This paradigm rests on the assumption that nature must ultimately be describable by a single, internally consistent logical system. However, when examined through our human metalogic $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$, this assumption reveals inherent tensions between the structure of logical systems and the nature of reality.

5.2. Concrete Problem: Three Logical Systems and a Singular Position

Consider three physical theories as specific logical systems within our metalogic $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$:

- $\{\dots\}_{Ł_1}$: Relativity Theory (macroscopic gravity and spacetime)
- $\{\dots\}_{Ł_2}$: Quantum Mechanics (microscopic phenomena)
- $\{\dots\}_{Ł_3}$: Singularity Theory (mathematical and physical singularities)

Define $S_{\mathcal{P}}$ as a 3^{rd}order position ($\mathfrak{P}^3$) representing: *"complete description of physical singularities."* Current evidence establishes:

- $S_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_1$: Relativity cannot describe singularities without mathematical breakdown.
- $S_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_2$: Quantum mechanics lacks a complete framework for singularities.
- $S_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_3$: Singularity theory explicitly contains singularities.

5.3. The Impasse: Forced Unification

Traditional ToE attempts force $S_{\mathcal{P}}$ into $Ł_1$ and $Ł_2$ simultaneously:

$$S_{\mathcal{P}} \in (Ł_1 \cap Ł_2)$$

This encounters structural incompatibility between continuous ($Ł_1$) and discrete ($Ł_2$) frameworks when applied to $S_{\mathcal{P}}$.

5.4. Applying the Third Axiom: Anekāntavāda

The third axiom, **Anekāntavāda**, directly addresses this situation. It states that for any position $X_{\mathcal{P}}$ and any logical system $Ł_n$:

$$(X_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_n) \Rightarrow \exists Ł_m (X_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_m)$$

and conversely,

$$(Y_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_a) \Rightarrow \exists Ł_b (Y_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_b)$$

Applied to our problem:

$$(S_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_1) \text{ and } (S_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_2) \Rightarrow \exists Ł_3 (S_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_3)$$

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.1618.v1

This axiom formalizes the observation that what appears as a limitation or impossibility in one system is simply a natural belonging in another system within $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$.

5.5. Two-Stage Epistemological Approach

The pursuit of understanding nature involves two sequential stages:

1. **Maximize Unification:** We should first attempt to unify phenomena within existing logical systems. The quest for $S_{\mathcal{P}} \in (Ł_1 \cap Ł_2)$ represents a valid scientific endeavor to achieve coherent understanding through unification.
2. **Adapt to Nature:** When unification persistently fails—when positions like $S_{\mathcal{P}}$ cannot be coherently contained within existing systems—we must adapt our approach. Nature does not conform to our logical systems; we must instead seek the logical system that naturally contains the phenomenon.

This two-stage approach honors both the scientific drive for unification and the epistemological humility required by persistent failure. It acknowledges that unification should be pursued until evidence indicates it's unattainable, at which point adaptation becomes necessary.

5.6. Implications of Anekāntavāda for Unification

The axiom provides a principled framework for addressing unification problems:

1. **Natural Belonging:** Positions have natural logical homes. Rather than forcing $S_{\mathcal{P}}$ into incompatible systems, we recognize $S_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_3$ as its natural location.
2. **Relativity of Impossibility:** The impossibility of describing singularities in $Ł_1$ or $Ł_2$ is relative to those systems, not absolute.
3. **Perspectival Completeness:** Complete understanding emerges from knowing which positions belong to which systems and how these systems interrelate.

5.7. Adaptive Epistemology: Following Natural Belongings

Within $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$, the third axiom suggests an adaptive epistemology: our logical systems should follow the natural belongings of positions rather than forcing positions into predetermined systems.

When $S_{\mathcal{P}}$ resists inclusion in $Ł_1$ and $Ł_2$, the approach dictated by Anekāntavāda involves:

1. **Acknowledging Natural Membership:** Accept $S_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_3$ as established by the axiom.
2. **Exploring System Relations:** Investigate how $Ł_1$, $Ł_2$, and $Ł_3$ relate within $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$.

This transforms the unification problem from modifying systems to contain $S_{\mathcal{P}}$ to understanding $S_{\mathcal{P}}$'s natural logical home and inter-system relations.

5.8. Hierarchical Structure Guided by Anekāntavāda

The axiom clarifies the hierarchical relationships within our metalogic:

$$S_{\mathcal{P}} \subset Ł_3 \subset \mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$$

while

$$\{Ł_1, Ł_2, Ł_3\} \subset \mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}} \quad \text{and} \quad S_{\mathcal{P}} \not\subset Ł_1, S_{\mathcal{P}} \not\subset Ł_2$$

This structure emerges from the axiom's guarantee that every position has at least one system that contains it, and no position is contained in all systems.

5.9. Progressive Understanding through Anekāntavāda

The axiom suggests a pathway to comprehensive understanding:

1. **Position-System Mapping:** Identify natural system memberships for each position.
2. **Boundary Analysis:** Study the boundaries where positions transition between systems.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.1618.v1

3. **Meta-Relational Framework:** Develop understanding of system interrelations without forcing unification.

5.10. Scientific Methodology Guided by the Third Axiom

Within $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$, Anekāntavāda suggests:

- **Contextual Validation:** Each theory's validity is context-dependent on its natural domain.
- **System Exploration:** When phenomena resist existing systems, explore alternative systems rather than forcing modification.
- **Relational Understanding:** Focus on understanding relations between specialized systems.

5.11. Redefining Comprehensive Understanding

The Theory of Everything problem, viewed through Anekāntavāda, suggests reality may not be containable within a single logical system. Instead, comprehensive understanding within $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$ requires:

- Mapping positions to their natural system memberships.
- Understanding system interrelations and boundaries.
- Recognizing that $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$ accommodates multiple specialized systems.

The third axiom thus provides a framework for comprehensive understanding:

$$\text{Understanding} = \text{Mapping}(X_{\mathcal{P}} \to Ł_n) + \text{Relating}(\{Ł_n\} \subset \mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}})$$

where $X_{\mathcal{P}} \to Ł_n$ represents the natural belonging of each position to at least one system, as guaranteed by Anekāntavāda.

where $X_{\mathcal{P}} \to Ł_n$ represents the natural belonging of each position to at least one system, as guaranteed by Anekāntavāda.

6. Practical Interpretation

6.1. Physical Systems

To illustrate the practical application of the Supreme Position framework, we examine three major physical theories as specific logical systems within human metalogic $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$:

- $Ł_1$: Classical Physics (Newtonian mechanics, electromagnetism, thermodynamics)
- $Ł_2$: Quantum Physics (Quantum mechanics, quantum field theory)
- $Ł_3$: Relativity (Special and general relativity)

Consider the following premises (3^{rd}order positions $\mathfrak{P}^3$) about physical reality:

- $A_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Nature is deterministic"
- $B_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Fundamental nature is random"
- $C_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Gravity is a force"
- $D_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Gravity is spacetime curvature"
- $E_{\mathcal{P}}$: "The universe speed limit is the speed of light"
- $F_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Entangled particles collapse instantaneously even at arbitrary distance"
- $G_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Particles exist in a single position"
- $H_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Particles exist in multiple positions simultaneously"
- $I_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Energy is continuous"
- $J_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Energy is quantized"
- $K_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Physical entities exist either as waves or particles"
- $L_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Physical entities exhibit wave-particle duality"

Notation Interpretation: According to the framework's formal structure:

- If $X_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_n$, then $X_{\mathcal{P}}$ appears *logical*, coherent, and well-defined within $Ł_n$.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.1618.v1

- If $X_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_n$, then $X_{\mathcal{P}}$ appears *illogical*, contradicted, paradoxical, or mysterious within $Ł_n$.

These appearances are relative to the specific logical system $Ł_n$ and do not reflect any absolute truth about $X_{\mathcal{P}}$ itself, since every $X_{\mathcal{P}}$ belongs to at least one logical system within $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$, as guaranteed by the Axiom of Anekāntavāda.

Applying the framework, we map each premise to its natural logical homes:
For $A_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Nature is deterministic"

$$A_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_1, \quad A_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_2, \quad A_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_3, \quad \text{and} \quad A_{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$$

For $B_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Fundamental nature is random"

$$B_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_1, \quad B_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_2, \quad B_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_3, \quad \text{and} \quad B_{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$$

For $C_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Gravity is a force"

$$C_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_1, \quad C_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_2, \quad C_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_3, \quad \text{and} \quad C_{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$$

For $D_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Gravity is spacetime curvature"

$$D_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_1, \quad D_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_2, \quad D_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_3, \quad \text{and} \quad D_{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$$

For $E_{\mathcal{P}}$: "The universe speed limit is the speed of light"

$$E_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_1, \quad E_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_2, \quad E_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_3, \quad \text{and} \quad E_{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$$

For $F_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Entangled particles collapse instantaneously even at arbitrary distance"

$$F_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_1, \quad F_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_2, \quad F_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_3, \quad \text{and} \quad F_{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$$

For $G_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Particles exist in a single position"

$$G_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_1, \quad G_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_2, \quad G_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_3, \quad \text{and} \quad G_{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$$

For $H_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Particles exist in multiple positions simultaneously"

$$H_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_1, \quad H_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_2, \quad H_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_3, \quad \text{and} \quad H_{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$$

For $I_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Energy is continuous"

$$I_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_1, \quad I_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_2, \quad I_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_3, \quad \text{and} \quad I_{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$$

For $J_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Energy is quantized"

$$J_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_1, \quad J_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_2, \quad J_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_3, \quad \text{and} \quad J_{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$$

For $K_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Physical entities exist either as waves or particles"

$$K_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_1, \quad K_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_2, \quad K_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_3, \quad \text{and} \quad K_{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$$

For $L_{\mathcal{P}}$: "Physical entities exhibit wave-particle duality"

$$L_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_1, \quad L_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_2, \quad L_{\mathcal{P}} \notin Ł_3, \quad \text{and} \quad L_{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$$

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.1618.v1

This mapping reveals several important patterns:

1. **Non-Uniform Distribution:** Premises are not uniformly distributed across logical systems. Some positions naturally belong to one system but not others.
2. **Complementary Pairs:** Contradictory premises like $A_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $B_{\mathcal{P}}$ (determinism vs. randomness) or $G_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $H_{\mathcal{P}}$ (single vs. multiple positions) find natural homes in different systems, illustrating how apparent contradictions are resolved by recognizing different logical contexts.
3. **Metalogical Containment:** All premises belong to $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$, demonstrating how human metalogic contains and can reason about positions that are incompatible within specific logical systems.
4. **System Specialization:** Each logical system has a domain of natural belonging—positions that are coherent and well-defined within that system's rules and axioms.
5. **Boundary Recognition:** The framework helps identify where one system's applicability ends and another's begins, providing a principled approach to understanding why certain phenomena resist description in particular frameworks.

This practical application demonstrates how the Supreme Position framework resolves the apparent paradoxes in physics: contradictions between positions like determinism and randomness, or between gravity as force and gravity as curvature, are not problems to be solved by forcing unification but rather indications of natural boundaries between logical systems. The framework suggests that comprehensive understanding of physical reality requires recognizing which positions belong to which systems and understanding how these systems relate within $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}}$, rather than attempting to contain all positions within a single logical framework.

7. Concepts Viewed Through the Supreme Position

The Supreme Position framework provides a meta-logical perspective from which to examine concepts that appear paradoxical, impossible, or mysterious within specific logical systems. By recognizing that every position—regardless of its status within any particular $Ł_n$—is a valid member of the Supreme Position, we can resolve apparent contradictions and understand the limitations of our current logical frameworks. Below we examine several such concepts.

7.1. Life in a Black Hole

According to specific logic $Ł_1$ (current physics): Within $Ł_1$, a black hole's interior—especially near the singularity—is characterized by extreme curvature, unbounded gravitational forces, and the breakdown of known physical laws. These conditions are considered incompatible with biological life or complex structure. The event horizon marks a causal boundary, making the interior fundamentally inaccessible and inhospitable within the framework of $Ł_1$.

$$\text{“Life in a black hole”} \notin Ł_1$$

Viewed through the Supreme Position: The impossibility of life in a black hole is relative to $Ł_1$. The position $X_{\mathcal{P}} =$ “Life exists within a black hole” is a valid $\mathfrak{P}^3$ within the Supreme Position. According to the Axiom of Anekāntavāda, there exists at least one logical system $Ł_m$ (a system beyond current physics) such that:

$$X_{\mathcal{P}} \in Ł_m \quad \text{and} \quad X_{\mathcal{P}} \subset \mathfrak{M}_{\text{Homo}} \subset S^{\dagger}$$

The principle of *Specific Logic Unreachable* indicates that $Ł_1$ reaches its descriptive boundary at the event horizon and singularity. What lies beyond this boundary is unreachable by $Ł_1$, but is nevertheless a valid position within the Supreme Position.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.1618.v1

7.2. A Square Circle

According to specific logic $Ł_1$ (Euclidean geometry/classical logic): In $Ł_1$, a "square circle" is a contradiction because the defining properties of squares and circles are mutually exclusive; no object can satisfy both simultaneously. Hence:

$$\text{"Square circle"} \notin Ł_1$$

Viewed through the Supreme Position: Within $S^\dagger$, the position $Y_\mathcal{P} =$ "A square circle" is a valid $\mathfrak{P}^3$. Its impossibility is an artifact of the constraints of $Ł_1$. By Anekāntavāda, there exists at least one logical system $Ł_k$ (perhaps a non-Euclidean, non-classical, or trans-logical framework) such that:

$$Y_\mathcal{P} \in Ł_k \quad \text{and} \quad Y_\mathcal{P} \subset S^\dagger$$

In such a system, mutually exclusive properties may coexist or be redefined. The position exists beyond the descriptive capacity of $Ł_1$, in a domain where $Ł_1$'s boundaries do not apply.

7.3. An Uncaused Cause of Itself

According to specific logic $Ł_1$ (causal reasoning/classical metaphysics): The causal reasoning of $Ł_1$ holds that every entity must have a cause. The notion of an *uncaused cause of itself* (*causa sui*) is paradoxical within $Ł_1$ because it requires the entity to both exist and not exist at the same time to be its own cause. This violates the principles of non-contradiction and sufficient reason:

$$\text{"Uncaused cause of itself"} \notin Ł_1$$

Viewed through the Supreme Position: The position $Z_\mathcal{P} =$ "Uncaused cause of itself" is a valid $\mathfrak{P}^3$ in $S^\dagger$. Its contradictory status arises from the linear, cause-and-effect logic of $Ł_1$. By Anekāntavāda, there exists at least one logical system $Ł_p$ (perhaps a framework where causality is non-linear, acausal, or differently structured) such that:

$$Z_\mathcal{P} \in Ł_p \quad \text{and} \quad Z_\mathcal{P} \subset S^\dagger$$

The principle of *Specific Logic Unreachable* asserts that $Ł_1$ reaches a boundary at this concept. This position exists at or beyond this boundary—unreachable and indescribable by $Ł_1$, but a valid position within the Supreme Position.

7.4. Change in Laws of Physics

According to specific logic $Ł_1$ (modern physics): Modern physics, operating within $Ł_1$, assumes that fundamental laws are constant, universal, and invariant across time and space. The idea that these laws could change in unimaginable ways is considered speculative and empirically unsupported:

$$\text{"Laws of physics change fundamentally"} \notin Ł_1$$

Viewed through the Supreme Position: The Supreme Position contains configurations where physical laws are non-uniform, variable, or entirely different from those in $Ł_1$. Consider the position $W_\mathcal{P} =$ "The laws of physics evolve or differ across eras". By Anekāntavāda, there exists at least one logical system $Ł_q$ (perhaps a meta-physical or trans-physical framework) such that:

$$W_\mathcal{P} \in Ł_q \quad \text{and} \quad W_\mathcal{P} \subset S^\dagger$$

For example, in a framework $Ł_q$, the Big Bang might be a concept that only arises within $Ł_1$, not an absolute truth. The assumption of universal constancy is a constraint of $Ł_1$, not an absolute truth. The true nature of physical law may extend beyond what is accessible to $Ł_1$, permitting positions and

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.1618.v1

evolutions that are unreachable from within that framework, yet fully contained within the Supreme Position.

7.5. Why Does Something Exist Rather Than Nothing?

According to specific logic $Ł_1$ (traditional metaphysics): This question, often posed in metaphysics within $Ł_1$, seeks an explanation for why there is any existence at all. Traditional approaches invoke causal principles, necessary beings, quantum fluctuations, or the multiverse hypothesis—all frameworks that operate within $Ł_1$ and distinguish between existence and non-existence.

Viewed through the Supreme Position: The distinction between "something" and "nothing" is itself a product of $Ł_1$. Within $S^\dagger$, both "thing" and "no-thing" are valid $\mathfrak{P}^3$ positions. Let:

$$V_{\mathcal{P}} = \text{“Existence of something”}, \quad U_{\mathcal{P}} = \text{“Existence of nothing”}$$

Both are positions within the Supreme Position:

$$V_{\mathcal{P}} \in_\alpha S^\dagger, \quad U_{\mathcal{P}} \in_\alpha S^\dagger$$

The question "why something rather than nothing?" presupposes a binary choice imposed by $Ł_1$. The Supreme Position contains all positions without requiring a reason for one over the other. Our universe's existence is simply one manifestation of the unimaginable plenitude of $S^\dagger$. In this context, the question loses its absolute force because $S^\dagger$ contains all positions—existent, non-existent, and beyond—without necessitating a causal or explanatory hierarchy.

7.6. Summary: The Supreme Position as Absolute Totality

These examples demonstrate how the Supreme Position framework resolves paradoxes and mysteries by relativizing impossibility—showing that what is impossible in $Ł_1$ is possible in some $Ł_m$—and dissolving contradictions through the coexistence of contradictory positions in different logical systems, all contained within $S^\dagger$. By acknowledging the plenitude of positions and logical systems, it expands epistemic boundaries beyond the limits of any single $Ł_n$, while validating every position as a member of the Supreme Position regardless of its status within a particular logical system. Thus, the framework provides a comprehensive meta-logical foundation for understanding reality, logic, and existence beyond the constraints of any specific logical system.

Conclusions

The Supreme Position framework offers a transformative approach to understanding logic, reality, and knowledge by introducing an absolute totality ($S^\dagger$) that contains all positions–from the concrete to the inconceivable. Through its three foundational axioms, the framework establishes a hierarchical ontology where positions exist in nested relationships: individual premises ($\mathfrak{P}^3$) within specific logical systems ($\mathfrak{P}^2$), within meta-logical systems ($\mathfrak{P}^1$), all contained within the Supreme Position itself ($\mathfrak{P}^0$).

The framework resolves long-standing philosophical and scientific puzzles by demonstrating that impossibility, contradiction, and paradox are not absolute but relative to specific logical systems ($Ł_n$). What appears impossible in $Ł_1$ may be perfectly coherent in $Ł_m$, with both positions valid within $S^\dagger$. This perspective explains why mysteries persist in one domain of inquiry while being resolved in another, why the Theory of Everything remains elusive, and why certain phenomena resist description within established frameworks.

Practical applications to physical theories (classical, quantum, relativistic systems) show how the framework explains the distribution of positions across different domains of physics without requiring forced unification. Conceptual analyses of scenarios like life in black holes, square circles, and uncaused causes demonstrate how the framework accommodates positions that appear paradoxical within specific logical systems.

The Axiom of Anekāntavāda, in particular, provides a principled approach to epistemology: rather than attempting to contain all phenomena within a single logical system, comprehensive

 doi:10.20944/preprints202512.1618.v1

understanding emerges from mapping positions to their natural logical homes and understanding the relationships between specialized systems. This approach honors both scientific methodology and metaphysical inquiry while acknowledging the inherent limitations of any single perspective.

The Supreme Position framework thus provides a comprehensive meta-logical foundation that reconciles the apparent tension between the drive for unified understanding and the manifest plurality of reality. By situating all logical systems and their contents within an absolute totality, it offers both humility about the limits of any particular framework and confidence in our ability to navigate between perspectives to achieve deeper understanding. This approach suggests a new paradigm for philosophical and scientific inquiry–one that embraces the plenitude of positions while providing structured methods for understanding their interrelationships within the absolute totality of the Supreme Position.

Data Availability Statement: No new data was created.

Acknowledgments: This work originated entirely from the author's conceptual development from **curiosity**. AI-supported tools (DeepSeek) were used solely to assist with organization, refinement, and academic formatting. All other insights and frameworks are original contributions by the **author**.

Conflicts of Interest: None declared.

References

1. Priest, G. (2006). *In Contradiction: A Study of the Transconsistent* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
2. Beall, J. C., & Restall, G. (2006). *Logical Pluralism*. Oxford University Press.
3. Cantor, G. (1883). *Grundlagen einer allgemeinen Mannigfaltigkeitslehre*. Teubner.
4. Woodin, W. H. (2017). The continuum hypothesis, the generic-multiverse of sets, and the conjecture. In *Set Theory, Arithmetic, and Foundations of Mathematics* (pp. 13–42). Cambridge University Press.
5. Dundas, P. (2002). *The Jains* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
6. Weinberg, S. (1992). *Dreams of a Final Theory*. Pantheon Books.