

Background Development of the Minimal Statement of Existence

1. Initial Postulates

When I first began developing my theoretical framework, my starting point was a minimal and elegant set of assumptions. I postulated that the most basic entity of existence could be represented as a 'void'—a propagating absence that travels at the speed of light. Each void, by moving forward, produces a distortion of space around it: space is split at its head and re-closed at its tail. In this picture, energy itself is nothing more than the continual propagation of such voids through spacetime.

I further assumed that if such voids encounter gradients in the curvature or density of spacetime, they could loop back upon themselves in stable or semi-stable circular paths. These configurations obscure regions of space from external observation, and thus give rise to the property we call 'mass.' In this sense, mass is not a primitive quantity but an emergent one: it is energy (a propagating void) that has been trapped within spacetime gradients.

2. The Roadblock

At this point, however, I ran into a major conceptual barrier. If voids always travel at the speed of light in perfectly straight lines, then in the very early universe—before any mass had formed—they could never encounter any spacetime gradients. If the universe were born in a perfectly uniform Big Bang, there would be no variations in density, no irregularities in curvature, and therefore no mechanism for energy to loop back into stable configurations of matter. Energy would stream endlessly outward, never interacting, never condensing, and never forming the structured universe we observe today.

This realization trapped me in a logical dead end for nearly a year. I had a consistent picture of propagating voids and their potential to create mass, but under the assumption of a perfectly uniform beginning, the theory could not explain how the first mass ever formed. In effect, the simplicity of my postulates created a universe that could not evolve beyond energy.

3. Influence of Late 1980s and Early 1990s Physics

My breakthrough came when I encountered Stephen Hawking's writings—particularly *A Brief History of Time** (1988)—and the broader discussions in cosmology during the late 1980s and early 1990s. Physicists began openly acknowledging that the Big Bang could not have been perfectly uniform. The simple fact that the present-day universe is non-uniform—with galaxies, clusters, and large-scale structures—means that the initial conditions must themselves have contained some non-uniformities. This was not just speculation; it became a necessary conclusion.

For me, this was the turning point. Where I had been stuck, assuming uniformity and seeing no way forward, Hawking and others confirmed that a uniform singularity was insufficient.

They admitted that the universe must have begun with irregularities—whether quantum fluctuations, inflationary perturbations, or some deeper pre-Big Bang phenomenon. That admission cleared my roadblock, because it validated my instinct: a purely uniform beginning was impossible.

4. Divergence from Quantum Mechanics

However, while many physicists explained these irregularities through the lens of quantum mechanics—positing random fluctuations amplified during cosmic inflation—I did not accept quantum mechanics as the ultimate origin of non-uniformity. Instead, I began to postulate the existence of a preceding, massless Big Bang. This primordial event would not have produced matter, but it would have left residual gradients in spacetime—ripples, disturbances, or curvature variations—that the later energy of 'our' Big Bang could encounter.

This was my critical deviation. While I acknowledged the necessity of non-uniformity, I did not attribute it to inherent randomness. Rather, I attributed it to structured irregularities left by a preceding event. In my framework, these residual gradients served as the seeds upon which voids propagating from the Big Bang could loop back and form matter.

Thus, what mainstream physics treated as 'random quantum fluctuations,' I reinterpreted as deterministic geometric remnants of a deeper pre-Big Bang process. This move preserved the internal logic of my void-based theory while resolving the dead end that a uniform singularity would have created.

5. Moving Forward

In hindsight, the significance of this influence cannot be overstated. Had physicists in the 1980s insisted on a perfectly uniform Big Bang, my theory might have remained blocked indefinitely. But once leading voices like Hawking acknowledged that uniformity was impossible, I was freed to move forward. The acknowledgment of non-uniformity not only aligned with my instincts but provided the crucial logical gap that allowed me to bridge my minimal postulates with the observable universe.

This sequence of development—starting from the void as a propagating representation of energy, encountering the roadblock of perfect uniformity, and then resolving it by embracing non-uniform initial conditions informed by contemporary physics—marks one of the defining moments in the formation of my minimal statement of existence.

Prologue: Minimum Statement of Existence

Many times, I get the same question, what is a Void? What is inside a Void? In building my minimal statement of existence, I made a deliberate choice: not to populate reality with unnecessary assumptions, but to work only with what we already accept about empty space. One of those accepted features is the existence of a boundary between being and non-being — the void at the origin of time itself. Standard cosmology already concedes that there was a singular boundary, a moment where existence began and space and time first

emerged. Beyond that boundary lies not a hidden domain, but true nonexistence — no coordinates, no fields, no geometry. The only meaningful physics is on the boundary surface where existence begins.

If we accept such a boundary once — at the start of time — then again as the edge or limit of the universe - then it is consistent to admit that such boundaries can exist within existence itself. Why should they be restricted only to the exterior of cosmos as a whole? If the fabric of existence can emerge from a boundary with nonexistence, then such boundaries could be elemental building blocks of reality, not unique anomalies. This is the essence of the void postulate: that the same kind of boundary we already tolerate cosmologically can exist locally, and once it exists, it or at least its boundaries must carry geometric and dynamical properties of its own.

Seen in this light, I have not invented new machinery out of thin air. Instead, I have taken the most minimal and conservative step possible: extend what we already accept about space at the largest scale down into the local fabric of reality. A void is simply a hole in space, an absence, with its boundary carrying surface action. From this one move — already implicit in our cosmological models — follows the entire framework of derivations. Thus the void postulate is not an exotic speculation, but the most natural generalization of what we already concede about existence itself. So, what is in a Void? In my mind, the same thing that is just beyond our the boundaries of our universe.