Original Conception to Model Elements

When I first came up with the concept, I was trying to tie energy to mass geometrically. That's where the term "missing space" came from. I envisioned the void wrapping around a piece of space and obscuring it. Then I imagined that collapsing to a point particle and hiding that space, and I wondered if that would exactly align with Einstein's formulas for the curvature of space.

At the same time, I envisioned something spinning around in a circle at the speed of light, and that progression being equivalent to the force of gravity. But that's as far as it got for eight or ten years. I really wanted to do the missing space math first, but I couldn't find the time or figure out how to get started. Then I saw some symposium from some Scandinavian physicists who had proposed what I remember being a massless particle theory — where two massless particles are bound together, rotating at the speed of light.

Now, it was only obliquely related to my theory. It just kind of re-derived Newton and Einstein's equations for acceleration from gravity. It said nothing about how the curvatures or gravity was formed, although it made a novel claim for an elemental description of matter or mass. Still, seeing the math on paper gave me hope, and that's when I started to actually write this theory down.

When I came back to it recently, I realized there was no avoiding mathematically describing a photon. That math wasn't too bad, because when you get down to it, describing an area of finite but very small thickness approaching the speed of light — and the "display area" — you can find that in some high school physics books. But to find the equations to track its path required me to start working in three dimensions, and that seemed to make everything for mass and the force of gravity work.

Then, when I tied electromagnetism in logically, everything pointed in the right direction mathematically, although I hadn't done all the derivations. So I'm sitting at a stable loop that obscures a certain amount of missing space, and that produced the curvatures that Einstein's equations showed. And motion within that, from another harmonically closed loop, also showed Newton's and Einstein's mathematical interpretations of the force of gravity. Directionally, I was pointed right direction with regards to electromagnetisms.

I had skipped over thinking about the Standard Model, but I had shown that particles could exist in both worlds — using the model of a smooth area that obscured the space behind it and moved at the speed of light. The way the rotating void emitted null waves that orthographically would affect other voids differently than gravity, and would be completely dependent on the other void's rotational direction, showed me there was a consistent way to capture electromagnetic behavior.

The next breakthrough I got was just doing research and thinking about the actual real-world path of a photon or any solid thru REAL space. Looking at the different types of gravitational waves that could interact and seeing how caustics have been predicted and studied for over 100 years — and how they've been empirically seen through experimentations for decades. When I started to try to map a straight line, I realized there was you could not at this scale and speed avoid them and they gave you optionality, and that's when my research led to a more statistical model of the space.

That allowed me to move through all the different branches with my model of a propagating photon for energy and a closed harmonic loop for mass. And the spinning nature and pinned direction of mass allowed me to derive electromagnetic forces. But it wasn't until I came back and tried to understand the transitional states that I had to confront catastrophic caustics — and the math wouldn't line up. There was no way to produce a closed loop.

It was only when I considered what the Standard Model and current experimentations have revealed about matter and antimatter that I understood: for a closed loop to form, it needed the added mathematical benefit of display area expansion from splitting a photon in half.

At this point, all the elements of the model were in place and mathematically logical.

Beyond Genesis: Calibration, Composite Particles, and Transitional States

After I locked down that the basic model worked, I started moving into deeper territory. Calibration became unavoidable. Ratios alone could point in the right direction, but to really anchor the math to physical constants, I had to introduce checkpoints. That's where the calibration decision matrix came in — not just a convenience, but a way to keep the derivations honest and consistent across different domains.

As I explored composite particles, like the proton, it became clear that you can't just think of charge as a single spin. With charges moving in opposite directions, the geometry forces the particle to pry open. That insight gave me a way to picture why protons are stable but tensioned, and why they have a finite size rather than collapsing into a point like the electron.

Then came a deeper look at transitional states. If loops can't always close smoothly, you have to understand what happens in between. That's where catastrophic caustics blend into something else — sometimes they can be stabilized, sometimes not. From that came the first hints of tunneling: the idea that instead of a loop snapping or breaking, it might slip

through a forbidden region statistically. That opened the door toward quantum behavior emerging from the geometry itself.

Entropy and thermodynamics followed naturally. Once you start looking at ensembles of loops, you can't help but see temperature as a distribution of loop frequencies, and entropy as the degeneracy of their configurations. Heat flow stopped being an abstract law and instead became curvature redistribution. That statistical lens tied the whole picture together, showing why transitions, tunneling, and apparent randomness had to exist.

Now, there is there a very long way to go. Classic physics has had a hundred or more years to carry all these models out into different aspects of the physical world. It helps this work, but is daunting. The scale of work is pretty big, even though some of the paths are laid out. And while conformation along their (classic models) direct paths is straight forward, measurements to conform what ELSE we can see from my model are few and far between. Anecdotes mostly, "we see this over and over but can't explain why" or "this must be a consistent setup error in the experiments" that kind of stuff. But it looks to be a fun ride.