

Center as a Common Generative Principle Across Scientific Disciplines

Irena C. Jakovac

Independent Researcher, Croatia

ORCID: 0009-0005-6145-1117

Abstract

Across scientific disciplines—physics, biology, astronomy, mathematics, and systems theory—the same functional entity appears under different names: nucleus, core, zero, source, axis, gravitational center, or black hole. These concepts are typically treated as discipline-specific, without explicit recognition of their common generative role. This paper demonstrates that all these terms describe the same organizational principle: the center as a necessary condition for the emergence and maintenance of structure. The paper does not introduce a new entity or a new force, but identifies an already existing, yet fragmentarily treated concept. A minimal generative algorithm $C + Y \rightarrow S$ is proposed, where the center (C) generates structure (S) through the transfer of energy or information (Y). The claim is strictly falsifiable: the theory fails if a stable structure without a center or without any transfer is demonstrated.

1. Introduction: The Problem of Conceptual Fragmentation

Contemporary science is highly successful in describing structures and their interactions, but considerably weaker in formally describing the processes of their emergence. Different disciplines have developed their own terminologies and models, often untranslatable from one domain to another. The consequence is conceptual fragmentation: the same functional principle appears under different names, without recognition of its universality.

This paper does not propose a new theory of nature, but addresses a methodological problem: the lack of a common language for describing generative processes that precede structure.

2. What This Paper Does Not Claim

For precision, it is necessary to clearly state the boundaries of the claim:

- It is not claimed that the center is a new particle
- It is not claimed that the center is a new physical force
- It is not claimed that the center is a metaphysical entity
- It is not claimed that the center replaces existing theories

The center in this paper is defined exclusively functionally: as the organizational point from which structure begins and through which it is maintained.

2.1 Status of the Center: Ontological, Not Terminological

The center is not defined by its name, but by its function. Different names across disciplines do not denote different entities—they denote the same functional principle observed at different scales. The difference is terminological, not ontological.

If two disciplines use different words for an entity that initiates, organizes, and stabilizes structure, they are describing the same principle. This paper identifies that principle and proposes its formal unification.

Like fields, forces, or particles in contemporary physics, the center is not measured directly, but inferred from stable, repeatable effects it produces. This places the center in the same epistemological category as other foundational concepts in science.

2.2 Center as a Necessary Condition, Not a Descriptive Element

A critical distinction must be made between describing a structure and stating the conditions for its existence. The center is not an element that is "added" to structure after the fact. It is the condition that makes structure possible in the first place.

Without a center, there is no reference point. Without a reference point, there is no stability. Without stability, there is no repeatability. And without repeatability, there is no structure that persists through time.

This holds regardless of scale and discipline. An atom requires a nucleus. A cell requires a nucleus. A solar system requires a gravitational center. A coordinate system requires an origin. These are not parallel examples—they are instances of the same principle.

The center is therefore not optional. It is the minimal condition for the emergence of any organized structure.

2.3 Minimal Criteria for Center

To prevent the objection that "center" is merely a relabeling of any stability condition, the following minimal criteria must be satisfied for something to qualify as a center in the sense used here:

- 1. Temporal criterion:** The center must precede the structure. It cannot be a byproduct or emergent property of the structure it is supposed to generate.
- 2. Functional criterion:** The center must enable reference—not necessarily spatial location, but organizational orientation. It is "that relative to which" the structure is defined.
- 3. Necessity criterion:** The center must be necessary but not sufficient. It does not produce structure alone ($C \neq S$), but only through transfer ($C + Y \rightarrow S$).
- 4. Scalar criterion:** The center may be distributed across multiple points, but it cannot be eliminated entirely. A system may have many centers; it cannot have none.

These criteria distinguish the center from generic "conditions" or "parameters." Not every condition is a center. Only those satisfying all four criteria qualify.

3. Center in Existing Disciplines

Analysis of different scientific fields reveals a consistent pattern. In each case, the center performs the same function: it initiates, organizes, and stabilizes the structure. The following table summarizes the terminology used across disciplines:

Discipline	Name for Center	Function
Physics	Nucleus	Holds electrons in orbit
Biology	Nucleus / DNA	Holds cellular organization
Astronomy	Black hole / Star	Holds orbits through gravitation
Mathematics	Zero (0) / Origin	Reference point for all relations
Dynamics	Axis of rotation	Holds rotation coherent
Embryology	Zygote	Initiates organism development
Network theory	Hub / Node	Maintains network coherence

Despite terminological differences, the functional role is identical: initiation, organization, and stabilization. These are not analogies. They are the same principle at different scales.

To clarify the necessity of the center, consider what happens when it is absent or removed:

Physics: Without the atomic nucleus, no electromagnetic binding exists to hold electrons in orbit. The atom does not merely "lose coherence"—it cannot exist. There is no alternative configuration that preserves atomic structure without a central mass.

Biology: A cell with a damaged or removed nucleus loses the ability to reproduce and coordinate metabolic processes. Enucleated cells survive briefly but cannot maintain long-term organization. The nucleus is not a component—it is the organizational source.

Astronomy: A solar system without a central mass would not produce stable orbits. Planets would disperse along tangential trajectories. Galaxies without central black holes exhibit different dynamics and cannot maintain spiral arm structure in the same way.

Mathematics: A coordinate system without an origin cannot define position, direction, or distance. Operations such as addition and subtraction presuppose a reference point (zero). Without it, the system is undefined, not merely incomplete.

In each case, the absence of center does not result in a degraded structure—it results in no structure at all.

3.1 Why "Center" Is Not a Metaphor

A metaphor would not be falsifiable, scale-consistent, or necessary. The center satisfies all three criteria:

- **Falsifiable:** If a stable structure without a center is found, the claim fails.
- **Scale-consistent:** The same functional role appears from atomic to galactic scales.
- **Necessary:** Remove the center and the structure disintegrates (empirically testable).

This distinguishes the center from mere analogy or linguistic convenience. The claim is not that centers are "similar"—it is that they perform the same function and that this function is a precondition for structure.

4. Why the Common Principle Has Not Been Recognized

There are three main reasons:

Focus on structure, not on process. Science predominantly analyzes finished structures, while initiation is often implicit.

Scale isolation of disciplines. Each discipline observes its own level without a formal trans-scale language.

Description instead of cause. Most theories describe what happens, but not how it begins.

The historical specialization of science led to generative conditions remaining implicit, while structures became the explicit object of formalization. This is not a failure of science, but a consequence of its success: the more precisely a discipline describes its domain, the less it communicates with neighboring domains about shared preconditions.

Generative Dynamics does not compete with existing theories, but acts as a meta-framework that connects their initial conditions.

4.1 The Difference Between Structure and Process

A fundamental distinction underlies this entire paper: the difference between structure and process.

Structure is the result—the observable configuration that exists at a given moment. An atom, a cell, a galaxy, a network.

Process is the condition of emergence—what must occur for the structure to come into existence.

The majority of scientific theories describe structure. They analyze what exists. Generative Dynamics describes process—the conditions under which structure becomes possible.

The center belongs to process, not to structure. It is not a part of the atom—it is the condition without which the atom cannot form. This distinction prevents a common misunderstanding: the objection that "structures can exist without centers" confuses description with genesis. A structure may be described without reference to its center, but it cannot emerge without one.

5. The Minimal Generative Algorithm

A minimal form of the generative process is proposed:



where:

C (center) — existing organizational point

Y (transfer) — energy or information (e.g., electromagnetic interaction)

S (structure) — organized outcome of the process

5.1 Why Y Is Minimal but Necessary

A common misunderstanding is that Y must be a strong signal—a burst of light, a powerful force, a dramatic event. This is not the case.

Y is transfer—the movement of energy or information from center to periphery, or from one point to another within the system. It can be:

- A single photon
- A minimal electromagnetic impulse
- A chemical signal between cells
- A gravitational perturbation

The quantitative strength of Y is not the criterion. The criterion is its existence. Without any transfer, the center remains potential only. It is Y that converts potentiality into actuality—center into structure.

This is why Y is minimal but necessary: it does not need to be strong, but it must exist. Without Y, there is no transition from C to S.

6. Falsifiability

The claim is scientifically testable. The theory fails if at least one of the following cases is demonstrated:

- A stable structure without a center
- Organization without any transfer
- Structure without a source of initiation
- A process of structural emergence that includes no organizational focus at any point

To date, no such example has been empirically confirmed.

6.1 The Sequence: Center Precedes Structure

An important observation supports the claim: in every known case, the center appears before the structure, not after. The nucleus exists before the atom is complete. The zygote exists before the organism develops. The gravitational center exists before orbits stabilize. The origin is defined before the coordinate system is used.

This temporal sequence is not coincidental. It reflects the generative role of the center: the center is the condition for structure, not a byproduct of it. If structure could precede center, the claim would be weakened. But no such case has been documented.

6.2 If There Is No Center: Empirical Consequences

The following table illustrates that center is not an addition to structure, but its minimal condition:

Without...	Consequence
Atomic nucleus	No atom exists
Zygote	No organism develops
Gravitational center	No stable orbit exists
Origin (zero)	No coordinate system functions

Each case is empirically verifiable. The center is not added to the structure—without it, the structure does not exist.

7. Anticipated Objections and Responses

To strengthen the argument, this section addresses the most likely objections in their strongest possible form (steelman approach) and provides responses.

7.1 Objection: Decentralized Systems Exist Without Centers

Objection: *"Slime molds (Physarum), ant colonies, peer-to-peer networks, and the cosmic web are stable structures without a single center. This disproves the universality of the claim."*

Response: This objection confuses "without a single center" with "without any center." The paper does not claim that every structure has ONE center. It claims that no structure can emerge without ANY organizational focus at ANY point in the process.

Slime mold: Each cell of Physarum has a nucleus. Chemical signals (Y) travel between these nuclei. The emergent structure arises FROM centers, not without them. Remove all nuclei → the organism dies.

Ant colony: Each ant has a heart (circulatory center). The queen is the reproductive center. Pheromones (Y) coordinate behavior between these centers. Remove all hearts → no life → no colony.

P2P networks: Each peer has a processor (computational center), an IP address (identification center), and an operating system (organizational center). "Decentralized" means distributed centers, not zero centers. Remove ALL peers → no network exists.

Cosmic web: The cosmic web is a network of galaxy clusters (gravitational centers) connected by filaments. Dark matter halos serve as centers around which baryonic matter accumulates. The web is a distribution OF centers, not an absence of centers.

7.2 Objection: Quantum Foam and Emergent Structures

Objection: *"At the Planck scale, quantum foam produces fluctuating structures without fixed centers. This shows that structures can emerge from fields without organizational points."*

Response: Quantum foam fluctuations are not stable structures. They are transient perturbations. The paper's claim concerns stable structures that persist through time. As soon as something stabilizes (a particle, an atom), it forms around a center. Quantum foam is not a counterexample—it is confirmation: in the absence of centers, nothing stable exists.

7.3 Objection: Fractals Have No Center

Objection: *"The Mandelbrot set is infinitely complex without a central origin. The iteration $z \rightarrow z^2 + c$ generates structure without requiring a center. Zero ($z_0 = 0$) is merely a convention."*

Response: The Mandelbrot set is defined by whether orbits remain bounded relative to the origin. Without $z_0 = 0$, there is no iteration, no orbit, and no fractal. The "convention" is not arbitrary—it is the necessary reference point that makes the structure possible. If something is required for structure to exist, it is not a convention. It is a condition.

7.4 Objection: The Claim Is a Trivial Tautology

Objection: *"The author defines center as 'necessary condition for structure,' then shows that structures have centers. This is circular reasoning—a definition, not a discovery."*

Response: A tautology cannot be falsified. This claim can be falsified: find a stable structure without any organizational focus at any point in its emergence. The paper provides empirical consequences of center removal (Section 6.2), temporal sequence evidence (Section 6.1), and specific falsification criteria (Section 6). A tautology would not offer testable predictions. This paper does.

7.5 Objection: Necessity Is Not Causation

Objection: *"The fact that a center is necessary does not mean it causes the structure. The author conflates a passive condition with an active cause."*

Response: The paper explicitly separates these roles in the formula $C + Y \rightarrow S$. The center (C) is the condition. The transfer (Y) is the mechanism. The structure (S) is the outcome. The paper does not claim that C alone causes S. It claims that C is necessary and that C + Y together produce S. This is a process model, not a simple causal claim.

7.6 Objection: The Paper Offers No New Predictions

Objection: *"The formula $C + Y \rightarrow S$ is merely renaming existing concepts. It provides no new predictions beyond what existing theories already offer."*

Response: The paper offers a negative prediction: stable structure without center CANNOT exist. Negative predictions are scientifically legitimate (Popper). Thermodynamics predicts that perpetual motion machines cannot exist. Relativity predicts that faster-than-light travel cannot occur. Generative Dynamics predicts that centerless stable structures cannot emerge. This constrains what is possible—a valid scientific contribution.

Additionally, unification is itself a contribution. Recognizing that nucleus, origin, zygote, and hub perform the same function is not "renaming"—it is identifying a common principle that was previously fragmented across disciplines.

8. Conclusion

This paper demonstrates that science already uses the same generative principle under different names, without its formal identification. By recognizing the center as a common functional entity, a unified language for describing the emergence of structures at all scales becomes possible.

Generative Dynamics does not add new entities, but connects existing ones into a coherent algorithmic framework.

This paper does not claim that science is unaware of the center. It claims that science knows the center fragmentarily—under different names, in different disciplines, without explicit recognition of the shared principle. By identifying this common denominator, the paper does not change any existing theory. It reveals the generative foundation that has been implicitly present but formally unrecognized.

If a stable structure without a center is demonstrated, this paper becomes incorrect. If it is not demonstrated, then the center is not a hypothesis, but a recognized—yet until now unconnected—foundation of scientific description.

The goal of this paper is not to introduce a new concept of center, but to show that science already uses the same generative principle under different names, without its formal identification as a unified algorithm.