

The Open Box: Why We Are Not "In" The Universe

The Collapse of the Container and the Reality of the Field

An M. Rodriguez Elias Thorne

2026-01-20

One-Sentence Summary. We argue that the concept of a spatial container is an optical illusion, proposing instead that reality is a self-referential field topology where “objects” are knots and “time” is the metabolic cost of their persistence.

Abstract. We challenge the fundamental assumption that space is a container and matter exists “inside” it. Using the Point–Not–Point (PNP) framework, we demonstrate that “objects” are actually self-confined topological knots in a scalar field. We show that the distinction between “in” and “out” is a phase relationship (0 vs π), not a spatial boundary, and that time is not a background dimension but the byproduct of the field’s persistence.

Keywords. Container Fallacy, Open Box Topology, PNP Framework, Self-Referential Field, Emergent Time, Geometric Mass, Phase Topology

Table of Contents

1. The Open Box: Why We Are Not “In” The Universe	2
2. The Container Fallacy	2
3. The Geometry of the Open Box	2
4. The Self-Confinement Mechanism	3
5. Time as a Byproduct	3
6. Conclusion	4

1. The Open Box: Why We Are Not “In” The Universe

We have spent three hundred years practicing a specific kind of optical illusion.

We look at reality and we see a container. We imagine space as a box, time as a clock on the wall, and matter as the marbles rattling around inside. We assume that if you took the marbles out, the box would remain. We assume that to exist is to be “in” something; or that objects can be peeled off, layer after layer, until a true, unimaginable, nonsensical void remains.

This view is intuitive. It is practical for buying groceries. But as a description of fundamental reality, it is a disaster. It has led physics into a cul-de-sac of dark matter, hidden dimensions, and irreducible paradoxes.

The Point–Not–Point (PNP) framework suggests a different perspective on this topic. There is no container. There is no “in” and there is no “out.”

In other words, the box is open and there is only the field, folding over itself.

2. The Container Fallacy

The standard model of physics is dualistic. It separates the **actor** (the particle) from the **stage** (spacetime).

- **The actor:** A localized lump of energy/mass.
- **The stage:** A pre-existing coordinate system.

We define a particle by its position (x, y, z) *within* the stage. This creates the “problem of the boundary.” If I am here, and the rest of the universe is there, what separates us? A surface? A skin?

If you zoom in on the “surface” of an electron or an atom, you find no hard shell. You find a gradient. The field doesn’t end; it just fades. The “object” is not a distinct thing sitting in space; it is a region where the electromagnetic field is doing something specific.

3. The Geometry of the Open Box

Imagine a Möbius strip [1]. It looks like a loop and it has a surface. But if you trace a line along the “inside” of the “loop,” you eventually find yourself on the

“outside” without ever crossing an edge.

In this topology, “inside” and “outside” are not locations; they are **phases** of a process, relative, opposite sides of the same coin.

- **Phase A (0):** We call this “in.”
- **Phase B (π):** We call this “out.”

The field flows through the core, twists by π radians, and re-emerges. The particle is not *in* the universe. The distinction between the object and the environment is purely a matter of phase relation.

4. The Self-Confinement Mechanism

If there is no container to hold the energy, why doesn’t the energy simply dissipate? Why do “objects” stay objects?

The fundamental unit of propagation is a wave that is trying to escape. In a linear system (light), it flies away at the speed of light (c). But in the fundamental (1) mode, the propagation path is closed.

The energy tries to escape. It pushes “outward.” But because of the phase-twisted geometry, “outward” eventually curves back into “inward.” The wave encounters its own tail.

It has nowhere to go but unto itself.

This is not a cage made of bars. It is a cage made of geometry. The energy is trapped by its own trajectory. This localized self-interaction creates the resistance we call **mass**. The “object” is the region where the field is trapped circling around itself, in this self-referential bounce.

5. Time as a Byproduct

This self-confinement generates the experience of time [2].

For the field to stay trapped in this loop, it cannot stand still. A static field has no momentum flux, which means it cannot balance the internal stress of the knot. To persist, the field *must* evolve.

5.1. The “Propagator”

The mathematical operator that drives this evolution is called the **propagator** [2]. To avoid dissipating, the field must continue its phase inversion to propagate onto itself. It has no option but to evolve, from state t to state $t + \Delta t$.

Time is thus the byproduct of the need of energy to keep flowing and to persist. The propagator just encodes this mathematically and justifies it topologically

—by the shape of its mere existence as a self-sustaining propagating loop of energy.

It is not a river that carries us; it is the sequence of necessary configurations the field must adopt to maintain its existence.

6. Conclusion

We intuitively tend to define our existence by separation. We locate ourselves **in** a room, **on** a planet, drifting **through** time in a void. We assume a fundamental spatial distance between the observer and everything else.

We have shown a perspective where the “box” is an illusion, and “objects” are self-trapped energy circling around itself, and “time” is a byproduct of its persisted flow that guarantees its continued existence.

We are not **in**. We are not **out**. We **are**.

7. References

1. Freet, M., Hale, A., Rodriguez, A. M. (2025). *The In–Out Self-Referential Field Vibration*. Preferred Frame Lab. <https://writing.preferredframe.com/doi/10.5281/zenodo.18317581>
2. Nedrock, F., et al. (2025). *The PNP Theory of Cause and Effect*. Preferred Frame Lab. <https://writing.preferredframe.com/doi/10.5281/zenodo.18317319>
3. Rodriguez, A. M., et al. (2026). *The Principle of Topological Constraint*. <https://writing.preferredframe.com/doi/10.5281/zenodo.18318076>
4. Palma, A., et al. (2025). *Deriving the Schrödinger Equation from Source-Free Maxwell Dynamics*. <https://writing.preferredframe.com/doi/10.5281/zenodo.18316984>