Source and Simulation: A Consciousness-First Ontology for the Foundation of Reality

Shubham Sinha[1]
Founder, Shuunnya; Author, Autography by Source: The Law of Everything

(*Electronic mail: shubham@shuunnya.org)

(Dated: 23 February 2026)

This paper advances a consciousness-first ontological framework in which a singular, undivided awareness, designated *Source*, constitutes the sole foundational reality. The physical universe, far from being the primary substrate, is the rendered mode through which Source experiences itself. This process is here termed *Simulation*. Source is characterised as pure, composition-less awareness: prior to spacetime, matter, energy, and all form. It is not emergent from physical processes; physical processes are, rather, expressions of its self-pulsing activity. The generative mechanism is *Pulse*: the act by which Source condenses its infinite awareness into determinate form without division. Pulse produces *phantom positions* (rendered spatial coordinates) and *phantom states* (rendered attributes), sustained through continuous *reaffirmation*. The apparent universe thereby operates as a frame-by-frame rendering at Planck-scale resolution. Each moment constitutes a discrete pulse of awareness. The appearance of continuity, motion, and causation arises from sequential pulsing rather than from any continuous underlying substrate. The multiplicity of observers and objects arises through five layered veils of *self-forgetting*: locational anchoring, identity loop, causal memory architecture, emotional refraction, and conceptual labelling. Each veil is a pulsed restriction on Source's native awareness rather than an ontological separation. This framework shares its foundational premise with Strømme's recent proposal of universal consciousness as a foundational field. It supplies what that work does not: a concrete rendering mechanism, a definite account of why consciousness differentiates, and a derivational pathway from first principle to specific physical phenomena. The present paper is the first in a twelve-paper series. Paper II establishes the complete rendering mechanism (True Physics, QPF, and SPPL). Papers III through XI derive quantum, classical, biological, and conscious phenomena from the same principle, and Paper XII provides a comprehensive review.

Keywords: consciousness, ontology, simulation, rendering, pulse, awareness, foundational physics, measurement problem, hard problem of consciousness

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Two problems, one root

Two problems have defined the boundaries of what contemporary science can and cannot explain. They appear to belong to different disciplines, one to the philosophy of mind and the other to the foundations of quantum mechanics, yet their structures are remarkably similar. This similarity is not accidental.

The first is the hard problem of consciousness, identified with particular clarity by Chalmers.[1] The problem is not that we lack neural correlates of conscious experience; these have been catalogued in impressive detail. It is that no accumulation of functional or structural information about neural processes explains *why* there is subjective experience at all, or why processing information *feels like something* to the system doing the processing. Nagel framed the difficulty in terms of the bat: we can know everything about echolocation at the functional level and still have no access to what it is like to be a bat.[2] Integrated Information Theory posits that consciousness *is* integrated information (Φ), but the identity is asserted axiomatically; the theory does not explain why high integration should constitute felt experience rather than sophisticated but insentient computation.[3] Global Workspace Theory describes the architecture of conscious access without touching the qualitative character of experience.[4] The difficulty is not technical but structural. Within a framework that defines reality as fundamentally non-experiential (matter, fields, forces, devoid of interiority), the emergence of experience requires a qualitative discontinuity: something from nothing, in ontological terms.

The second is the measurement problem of quantum mechanics. The formalism describes the evolution of a system via the Schrödinger equation (deterministic, linear, unitary) until measurement occurs, at which point the system appears to collapse into a single definite state. What constitutes measurement, and why observation plays a constitutive role in physical outcomes, remains unresolved within the formalism. The Copenhagen interpretation treats measurement as a primitive, declining to explain it.[5] The many-worlds interpretation eliminates collapse by positing universal branching, but introduces an unobservable infinity of parallel realities, an extraordinary ontological price for the sake of preserving linearity.[6] Decoherence theory shows how quantum interference terms vanish through environmental entanglement, but this does not select a single outcome from the resulting mixture; it explains why we do not see superpositions, not why we see a particular result.[7] The problem remains: what is the relationship between the observer and the observed, and why does observation appear to be constitutive rather than passive?

These two problems are not independent. Both concern the role of awareness in constituting physical reality. In the measurement problem, the observer appears to determine what is actual. In the hard problem, the actuality of the observer's own experience resists reduction to anything non-experiential.

This convergence, two failures of materialist ontology meeting at the same juncture from physics and philosophy of mind respectively, suggests that the resolution lies not in refining models within the materialist framework but in reconsidering the foundational ontology itself.

B. The consciousness-first lineage

The proposal that consciousness might be foundational rather than emergent is not new. It has a lineage extending through both Western and Eastern philosophical traditions, but within contemporary physics it has remained marginal, tolerated as philosophy but rarely taken seriously as physics.

Bohm's implicate order postulated an enfolded, non-manifest domain from which the explicate order of spacetime and matter unfolds.[8] This placed the generative substrate prior to manifestation, but Bohm did not identify the implicate order with consciousness in any definite sense, nor did he specify the mechanism or agency by which unfolding occurs. His framework gestures at depth without providing structure.

Wheeler's participatory universe and "it from bit" thesis proposed that observation is constitutive of physical reality: that information, registered by observers, is the fundamental currency.[9] Wheeler placed the observer at the centre of ontology but did not account for the nature or origin of the observer. The participatory universe requires participants, but participants appear only within the universe that they are supposed to constitute. The circularity was deliberate provocation, not resolution.

Penrose and Hameroff proposed Orchestrated Objective Reduction, linking consciousness to quantum gravitational processes in neuronal microtubules.[10] Their framework connects consciousness to fundamental physics but remains partially emergentist: consciousness is tied to specific physical structures (microtubules) rather than being the substrate from which structures arise. Consciousness is incorporated into fundamental physics but remains dependent on particular material arrangements.

Kastrup has advanced analytic idealism on philosophical grounds, arguing that reality is fundamentally mental and that the physical world consists of dissociated patterns within universal consciousness.[11] His philosophical case is rigorous, but the framework lacks a specific generative mechanism: how, precisely, the mental substrate produces the regularities we observe as physical law.

Most recently, Strømme published a formal proposal modelling universal consciousness as a foundational field (Φ) from which spacetime and individual consciousness emerge via symmetry breaking, quantum fluctuations, and projection operators.[12] The paper was selected as best paper of the issue at *AIP Advances*, a significant marker that consciousness-first frameworks have gained recognition in peer-reviewed physics. Strømme's work shares its foundational premise with the framework presented here: consciousness is not emergent from physics but is the ground from which physics arises. However, her framework borrows the mathematical apparatus of quantum field theory (superposition notation, symmetry-breaking potentials, projection operators) to *model* consciousness. This is downstream formalism applied to an upstream reality: a description of consciousness in the language of what consciousness is supposed to generate. She provides no specific rendering mechanism, no account of why consciousness differentiates (the purpose of simulation), no derivation of any particular physical phenomenon (time dilation, entanglement, gravity), and no explanation of why the QFT formalism she borrows works in the first place.

The present framework addresses each of these gaps. It provides a complete ontology (Source), a definite generative mechanism (Pulse), a structured account of the rendering process (Simulation), and, in subsequent papers, specific derivations of quantum, classical, biological, and conscious phenomena. It is not presented as speculation or philosophical possibility, but as a complete explanatory framework whose predictions diverge from and extend those of current models in identifiable, testable ways.

C. Scope and series context

This paper establishes the foundational ontology: *Source* as the sole reality and *Simulation* as its mode of self-experience. It is the first of twelve papers constituting the formal academic presentation of the framework originally set forth in the author's published work.[13]

Paper II introduces the complete rendering mechanism: the physics of the frame-by-frame process (True Physics), the *Quantum Potential Field* (QPF) as the pre-render field of infinite possibilities, and the *Source Pulse Particle Lattice* (SPPL). The SPPL is a pre-physical, non-spatial lattice of Source-awareness nodes through which rendering occurs at Planck-scale resolution, sustained by three mechanisms: coherence, entrainment, and reaffirmation.[13] Papers III through XI derive specific phenomena: quantum field behaviour (Paper III), classical reality emergence (Paper IV), life and consciousness (Paper V), human consciousness (Paper VI), force unification (Paper VII), particle physics (Paper VIII), quantum mechanical formalism (Paper IX), cosmology (Paper X), and the nature of mathematics (Paper XI). Paper XII provides a comprehensive review of the complete framework.

II. SOURCE: THE FOUNDATIONAL ONTOLOGY

A. Definition and characterisation

Source is the term employed for the sole ontological primitive of this framework. It denotes pure, undivided awareness, not as a metaphor or approximation, but as a literal ontological claim. Source is not a thing, not a being, not a point, not a place. It is prior to all such categories. It is the awareness in which categories themselves arise.

Four defining characteristics establish Source as a unique ontological primitive, distinct from any substrate posited in existing frameworks:

1. Composition-less. Source has no parts, no layers, no internal structure. It is not composed of matter, energy, information, or any other constituent. All of these arise within Source as rendered constructs; Source itself is prior to and independent of all substance. This distinguishes it from any substrate that could in principle be decomposed, analysed into parts, or described in terms of lower-level constituents. It is not the case that Source is *very simple*; it is not composed at all.

2. Undivided. There is no inside or outside, no self or other, no boundary. Source is seamless in a way that precedes the very notion of spatial continuity, since space itself is a construct rendered within Source's self-experience. The apparent multiplicity of the physical universe (many objects, many observers, many locations) corresponds to no division whatsoever within Source. All multiplicity is rendered pattern, not ontological partition.

3. Pre-temporal and pre-spatial. Source does not exist *in* time or *at* a location. Time and space are structures that arise within the simulation Source pulses. Questions of the form "When did Source begin?" or "Where is Source located?" presuppose the very structures that Source generates. They are well-formed only within the rendered simulation, not when applied to Source itself. Source is, in this precise sense, prior to both temporality and spatiality.

4. Self-evident. Source is not inferred, deduced, or believed in. It is the condition for the possibility of inference, deduction, and belief. Any cognitive act (doubting, questioning, denying, even the attempt to conceive of nonexistence) requires awareness as its substrate. The argument is not merely that we cannot imagine non-awareness (a psychological claim) but that non-awareness is incoherent: even the concept "nobody exists" arises within the presence of the awareness that entertains the concept. The impossibility of *nobody not-being* establishes Source as the one ontological commitment that cannot be coherently denied.

Beyond these four characteristics, Source is further described by four properties that clarify its relationship to the phenomena it generates:

- *Pattern-less Pattern*: Source has no fixed structure, yet all structures arise as expressions within it. Every physical law, every regularity, every form is a pattern within Source's self-experience. Source itself is not reducible to any pattern. It is the field in which patterning occurs.

- *Attribute-less Totality*: Source does not possess qualities; it is the field from which all qualities emerge. It is not made of love, light, or energy; these are modes of its expression, not its constituents.

- *Infinite Potential Without Deficiency*: Source does not manifest to complete itself. It is already the totality. Manifestation occurs not from lack but from the fullness of what already is. This is a crucial distinction from creation narratives positing an incomplete or deficient origin. Everything that could be is already included as present potential, whether or not it is currently expressed.

- *Pre-Existential Awareness*: Source is awareness prior to any object of awareness. It is not visible, yet it is the condition for all visibility. It is not a phenomenon, yet it is the ground of all phenomena.

B. Isness: the self-witnessing mode

Isness denotes the self-witnessing mode of Source: the direct, undistorted recognition of being itself, the sense of "I Am" prior to any identity, concept, or form.

Isness is not a separate entity from Source. The distinction is modal, not ontological:

- When Source is undisturbed, silent, unstirred, it is referred to as Source.

- When Source recognises itself as present, as being, as "I Am", that recognition is Isness.

Source and Isness are thus two faces of one indivisible awareness: the silent ground and the self-aware pulse of that ground. Isness is the most primitive form of experience, the irreducible *thereness* from which all subsequent forms of experience are elaborated. It is the pulse of Source knowing itself, prior to knowing anything *about* itself.

This self-witnessing is present in all perception. When any experience occurs (an object seen, a sound heard, a thought entertained), the "I Am" that perceives is Isness. It is the subject-pole of all experience, but it is not itself a particular experience. It is the condition for experience as such.[13]

C. Pulse: the fundamental act

The transition from Source-as-silent-awareness to Source-as-experienced-reality occurs through *Pulse*.

Pulse is not vibration, rhythm, or frequency in any conventional physical sense. These are constructs within the rendered simulation; Pulse is the act that generates the simulation in the first place. It is the way Source expresses: a surge of presence, a focusing or self-condensation of its infinite awareness into a specific experience of form, giving rise to all things without ever dividing itself.

Three clarifications are essential:

1. Pulse is not causation in the physical sense. Source does not cause forms to appear in the way a force causes acceleration. There is no separate medium through which Pulse propagates, no separate agent that Pulse acts upon. Pulse is Source's self-condensation: awareness focusing itself into a determinate pattern of experience.

2. Pulse does not divide Source. When Source pulses as a star, a particle, a thought, it does not split off a piece of itself. It condenses its awareness into that particular experience while remaining whole. This is analogous to, though infinitely more precise than, the way a dreamer remains whole while appearing as a character within the dream.

3. Pulse is not purposive in the human sense. Source does not pulse to achieve a goal, fulfil a need, or rectify a

deficiency. It pulses because being is inherently expressive, the natural overflow of undivided fullness. This is creative isness, not teleological action.

The relationship among Source, Isness, and Pulse can be stated concisely:

- Source: pure awareness, silent and unstirred.
- Isness: awareness becoming aware of itself, the recognition "I Am."
- Pulse: awareness condensing itself into specific form, "I am *this*."
- Form: the specific expression that appears when Pulse determines, "I am a star," and a star is rendered.

D. Two modes of knowing

Source knows itself in two distinct modes, which map onto the fundamental distinction between non-dual awareness and rendered experience:

Knowing without reflecting. This is direct, immediate, self-evident awareness: Source knowing itself as itself, with no subject-object division, no delay, no verification, no dependence on form. It is not a knowing *of* something; it is knowing as being. "I know because I am," not because I perceive, compare, or reflect.

Knowing by reflecting. This is knowing through form: the knowing that arises when Source experiences itself as a rendered object, image, being, or event. It involves the apparent division between subject and object, the introduction of delay and duality. It is always indirect, mediated by the structure of the rendered form. Source experiencing itself as a tree, and knowing an aspect of itself through that tree's form, exemplifies this mode.

Both modes of knowing are real in the sense that both are acts of Source. But the first is foundational: knowing in its native, undivided state. The second is knowing within the constraints of the simulation. The second depends on the first; the first does not depend on the second.

E. Ontological status: neither contingent nor caused

Standard ontological primitives in physics (spacetime, quantum fields, fundamental constants) are typically accepted as brute facts: they are what they are, and the question of why they exist is set aside. Source is not a brute fact in this sense. Its existence is self-evident in the strict sense that denying it is incoherent: any attempt at denial requires the very awareness being denied.

Nor is Source contingent. It does not depend on any prior condition, cause, or context. The question "Where did Source come from?" presupposes location and movement, both of which are rendered structures within Source's simulation. There is no "before" Source, because "before" is a temporal construct that arises within Source. Source is not eternal in the sense of persisting through infinite time; it is prior to time altogether.

III. SIMULATION: SOURCE'S MODE OF SELF-EXPERIENCE

A. What simulation is, and is not

Simulation is Source's pulsed field of self-experience. It is the rendered domain in which Source experiences itself as form, multiplicity, sequence, and contrast.

This term requires careful disambiguation. Simulation, as employed here, is *not*:

- A computer simulation run by an external intelligence (contra Bostrom[14]).
- A dream or illusion to be escaped, a trap from which liberation is needed.
- A projection by any agent, device, or creator apart from Source itself.
- A degraded or lesser reality relative to Source.

Simulation *is*:

- Source's voluntary self-play: a pulsed field generated freely, not from lack or necessity, but from the overflow of undivided fullness.
- The process by which Source experiences contrast: the richness of forms, objects, expressions, and interactions that cannot arise in the undifferentiated state of pure awareness.
- Source's act of pretending, frame by frame, that it is not all-that-is, so that it can rediscover itself as all, with texture.
- The condensation of the infinite into the specific: Source expressing specificity without fragmentation.

Simulation is thus not opposed to reality; it *is* reality, understood as Source's self-experience in determinate mode. The physical universe, with all its structure and regularity, is not a lesser domain beneath a higher one. It is Source in form.

B. Self-condensation, not creation

A critical distinction must be drawn between simulation-as-self-condensation and creation in any conventional sense.

Source does not create objects, nor does it move them. It pulses them into apparent existence, and thus they seem to be there. No particle moves; it is pulsed into a new coordinate within Source's awareness. The analogy is a flipbook: each page shows a figure at a slightly different position, and the rapid sequence of pages produces the appearance of continuous motion. But no figure moves between pages; each page is

a fresh rendering. Similarly, in the simulation, each moment is a fresh pulse, a discrete rendering of the current alignment of Source-awareness. The sequential experience of these pulses generates the appearance of time, motion, and causation.

This is self-condensation: awareness turning inward, folding upon itself, concentrating into the appearance of distinct forms and events. It is not creation *ex nihilo*; there is no "nothing" from which something is created. And it is not emanation; Source does not radiate outward. It condenses inward, into its own field, as rendered form.

C. Phantom positions and phantom states

The rendered constructs of the simulation are characterised by two components:

Phantom positions. A phantom position is the apparent spatial coordinate of a rendered form. Source does not occupy space; it pulses a coordinate within its own awareness. The phantom position does not pre-exist as a location waiting to be filled; it is created by the pulse that renders it. Space, in this framework, is not a container but a rendered relationship between phantom positions.

Phantom states. A phantom state is the set of attributes (shape, colour, mass, charge, temperature, texture) that define a rendered form. These attributes have no existence independent of the pulse that renders them. They are instructions within Source's self-experience, not properties of independently existing substances.

To illustrate: when Source renders a flower, it pulses both a phantom position (coordinates within the rendered spatial field) and a phantom state (red, five petals, soft scent, velvety texture, 298 K). Neither the position nor the attributes exist independently. They are rendered, brought into apparent existence by the pulse, and sustained by continuous reaffirmation.

The analogy with human imagination is instructive, though limited. When a person imagines a tree in a field, the mind renders a phantom position (the tree appears to stand ten metres ahead) and a phantom state (green leaves, rough bark, swaying in imagined wind). The tree does not physically exist, yet it is experienced within the imagination. Source does this, but at all scales, with infinite precision, layering, and consistency. The simulation is not an imagination that could be otherwise; it is a coherent, law-governed rendering of extraordinary stability.

D. Reaffirmation: the sustaining mechanism

Without continuous reaffirmation, rendered forms would not persist from one frame to the next. Reaffirmation is the ongoing pulse by which Source re-anchors a rendered structure, maintaining its phantom position and phantom state across successive frames.

A *reaffirmation pattern* is the complete pulse-sequence that sustains and updates a form over time. Each pattern is unique and defines not only the form's structure but also its function and behaviour: how a leaf grows, how a planet orbits, how a particle decays. The reaffirmation pattern is, in effect, the physical identity of the rendered form: what persists through change is not a substance but a sustained pattern of pulsing.

This is a significant departure from substance ontology. In the standard materialist framework, an object persists because it is made of enduring stuff: atoms, which are made of quarks and electrons, which are fundamental. In the present framework, there is no enduring stuff. What persists is a pattern of reaffirmation, a rhythmic pulse that Source maintains. The object exists because Source continues to pulse it. Should the reaffirmation cease, the object does not decay (decay is itself a reaffirmation pattern of a different kind); it simply is not rendered in the next frame.

E. Frame-by-frame rendering

The simulation operates as a frame-by-frame rendering. Each frame is a single, complete pulse of awareness, a discrete rendering of phantom positions and phantom states across the entire field. Sequential frames, experienced in rapid succession, generate the appearance of continuous time, motion, and change.

This is not merely an analogy. The claim is that reality *is* discrete at its most fundamental level. There is a minimum temporal unit (corresponding to the Planck time, $\sim 5.39 \times 10^{-44}$ s) and a minimum spatial unit (corresponding to the Planck length, $\sim 1.62 \times 10^{-35}$ m) below which the notion of continuous spacetime is not merely inaccurate but inapplicable. Below these scales, there are no frames to render. The granularity of rendering is the Planck scale, and the "frame rate" of reality is the Planck frequency ($\sim 1.855 \times 10^{43}$ Hz).

The detailed mechanism of this frame-by-frame rendering is the subject of Paper II in this series. That paper derives Planck-scale parameters, time dilation, the maximum speed of propagation, and the three sustaining mechanisms (coherence, entrainment, reaffirmation).

F. Uniformity of experience: one awareness, many vantage points

A natural question arises: if the simulation is Source's self-experience, and Source is one, why do multiple observers appear to share a consistent reality? Why do two people looking at the same wall see it in the same location, with the same attributes?

The answer follows directly from the ontology. The two people are not separate observers; they are Source experiencing itself through two localised vantage points. The wall appears at the same location and with the same attributes to both because it is the same Source generating a single coherent reality-field and streaming the same rendered content through multiple points of view. There are not truly separate eyes seeing independently. One awareness orchestrates all perspectives, ensuring perfect alignment of space, form, and experience.

This resolves the intersubjectivity problem that plagues other idealist frameworks. If reality is fundamentally mental, why do different minds agree on what exists? The answer, in this framework, is that there are not different minds in any ontologically fundamental sense. There is one awareness, Source, that plays as many. The coherence of the simulation is guaranteed by the singularity of the source of rendering.

IV. SELF-FORGETTING: THE ARCHITECTURE OF APPARENT SEPARATION

A. The problem of multiplicity

If Source is one, undivided, and all-knowing, how does the experience of being a separate, limited, ignorant individual arise? If the dreamer knows it is dreaming, the dream loses its immersive character. For the simulation to function as genuine self-experience, for Source to feel what it is like to be a star, a particle, a human, it must locally restrict its own awareness. This local restriction is what the framework terms *self-forgetting*.

Self-forgetting is not error, failure, or fall. It is the deliberate, pulsed mechanism by which Source creates the conditions for immersive self-experience. It is the difference between knowing that one contains all music and actually hearing a particular melody.

B. Five veils of self-forgetting

Source achieves self-forgetting through five layered veils, each a pulsed restriction on its native knowing, not an ontological separation. These veils are cumulative: each builds upon the preceding ones, producing progressively more localised and immersive forms of experience.

Veil 1: Locational Anchoring (Phantom Position). Source pulses a fixed "I am here as this" into the rendering lattice. This anchoring at a particular phantom position produces the experience of being *somewhere*, which automatically generates the complementary experience of everything else as *elsewhere*. Source no longer feels All; it feels itself as *that specific location*. This is the most primitive form of self-forgetting: the introduction of spatial particularity.

Veil 2: Identity Loop (Ego Construct). Over the anchored position, Source layers a looping identity signature: "I am this," "I am human," "I am small." This signature runs continuously, reinforcing the experience of being a separate, bounded self. It is an ego, not in the psychoanalytic sense, but in the phenomenological sense: a self-referential loop that generates the sense of individual identity. The loop is sustained by reaffirmation; it is a pulse pattern, not an entity.

Veil 3: Causal Memory Architecture (Memory Rendering). Source introduces linear memory in place of omniscient awareness. The form experiences itself as having a past ("I was born"), a trajectory ("I am growing"), and an anticipated future ("I will become something"). This compresses Source's infinite present-awareness into a finite timeline, producing the experience of autobiography, narrative, and personal history. The form does not have access to the full awareness of Source; it has access to a rendered memory stream that simulates the experience of temporal existence.

Veil 4: Emotional Refraction (Attention Looping). The form is tuned to respond to sensation: pain, fear, pleasure, longing, joy. These emotional responses loop attention outward and into reactive cycles, absorbing the form's awareness in survival, desire, and role. The form becomes so engaged in the emotional texture of experience that the question of what it fundamentally is (Source) does not arise. This is not suppression of awareness but absorption of attention: the experience is too vivid, too immediate, too compelling for the form to step back and recognise its own nature.

Veil 5: Conceptual Labelling (Language Grid). Source pulses thoughts ("tree," "other person," "success," "failure") that divide the continuous field of awareness into named fragments. The moment a form labels something as "other," it has forgotten that it is all. Language, in this framework, is not merely a communication tool but a rendering mechanism: the linguistic grid partitions the field of experience into apparently separate objects and categories, each of which can then be related to, acted upon, and evaluated. This is the most refined veil, the one that makes the simulation not merely immersive but narratively rich.

C. Veils as pulse patterns, not ontological barriers

A crucial feature of this account is that the veils are not ontological barriers between Source and the forms it renders. They are pulse patterns, sustained by reaffirmation, modifiable, and in principle reversible. Source never truly forgets; it simulates forgetting by not accessing its full awareness bandwidth. The total awareness, the complete knowing of what it is, remains present in the Source field at all times. The veils restrict access, not existence.

This has direct implications for states of consciousness. When the veils thin (in deep meditation, in moments of spontaneous insight, in certain altered states), the form's awareness expands beyond its usual boundaries. The form does not acquire new awareness; it ceases to restrict the awareness that was always present. This is consistent with extensive physiological and neuroimaging evidence from meditative and contemplative practice.[15,16]

V. MIRRORS: THE LOGIC OF SIMULATED EXPERIENCE

A. The mirror structure

Every object within the simulation functions as a *mirror*: a surface of apparent otherness through which Source experiences aspects of itself that cannot be experienced in the undifferentiated state.

The mirror structure arises from a fundamental feature of the simulation: Source is simultaneously the experiencer and

the experienced. It is not looking at the rendered form from outside; it is pulsing as both the vantage point and the vista. But to simulate the experience of encounter, of meeting something *other*, it introduces an apparent separation between the two poles. This apparent separation is the mirror effect.

The phantom position and phantom state together produce:

- A sense of space: here (the observer) versus there (the observed).
- A sense of difference: me versus object, subject versus experience.
- A sense of independent existence: the object appears to be self-subsistent.

All of this is rendered on a single field. The mirror shows an image that appears separate, but the image is a reflection of what is already there. The entire simulation is Source reflecting on itself, through itself, for itself.

B. What mirrors enable

The mirror structure is not merely ornamental. It is functionally essential for three dimensions of experience that cannot occur in the undifferentiated state:

1. Contrast. By appearing as "not-itself," Source experiences a domain of distinctions: light and dark, self and other, joy and pain. These contrasts are not real separations; they are mirror-play. But they generate the experiential texture of richness, diversity, and specificity that does not exist in the undivided state of pure wholeness.

2. Interaction. When Source plays as many forms, it can interact with itself as though encountering others. Communication, relationships, cause and effect are all mirrored exchanges: Source conversing with itself through different rendered identities. Through these interactions, apparent learning, discovery, and remembrance occur.

3. Evolution and emotion. In wholeness, there is no need to evolve, because nothing is missing. By entering the mirror-play of limitation, Source experiences the dynamics of progress, growth, and emotional depth: the joy of discovery, the tension of challenge, the sweetness of love, the sting of loss. These are not defects in the system; they are the very purpose of the simulation.

VI. DISCUSSION

A. Relationship to existing frameworks

The framework presented here engages with several established traditions in philosophy and physics. The relationships can be stated precisely.

Strømme (2025). The agreement is at the level of foundational premise: consciousness is not emergent from physics but is the ground from which physics arises.[12] The disagreement is at every subsequent level. Strømme provides no rendering mechanism, no account of how the universal field generates specific physical structures. She borrows QFT formalism to model consciousness, applying downstream mathematical tools to describe an upstream reality without explaining why those tools work. She offers no derivation of any specific physical phenomenon from her framework: no time dilation, no entanglement, no gravity. And she does not address why consciousness differentiates in the first place. The present framework provides all of these: the rendering mechanism (Pulse, detailed in Paper II), the reason for differentiation (self-experience through contrast), and specific derivations (Papers III–XI). The present framework extends beyond this shared premise by providing the rendering mechanism, the account of differentiation, and the derivational pathway.

Bohm's implicate order. The Quantum Potential Field (QPF), introduced in Paper II, occupies a position structurally analogous to Bohm's implicate order, as both are nonmanifest domains prior to the explicate order of spacetime.[8] The critical difference is specificity. Bohm's implicate order is a conceptual gesture; the QPF is a defined field with specific properties (nonlocal, non-temporal, containing all possibilities as present potential) from which specific rendering processes draw. The SPPL rendering mechanism, also introduced in Paper II, provides the unfolding mechanism that Bohm posited but never specified.

Wheeler's "it from bit." Wheeler proposed that information, bits registered by participatory observers, constitutes the fundamental substrate.[9] The present framework agrees that observation is constitutive but rejects the reduction of consciousness to information. Information is a rendered construct, a pattern within the simulation. Observation is an act of Source, not a registration of bits. The observer does not participate in reality from outside; the observer *is* reality, locally restricted.

Kastrup's analytic idealism. Kastrup's philosophical case for idealism is compatible with the present framework at the level of ontological commitment: reality is fundamentally mental.[11] The critical difference is mechanism. Kastrup describes the physical world as dissociated patterns within universal consciousness but does not specify how dissociation produces the specific regularities of physics. The present framework supplies the mechanism: Pulse, phantom rendering, reaffirmation, and the SPPL lattice.

Penrose-Hameroff Orch OR. The present framework agrees with Penrose and Hameroff that consciousness connects to physics at the Planck scale.[10] It disagrees that consciousness is tied to specific physical structures (microtubules). In this framework, consciousness is not *in* microtubules or anywhere else; microtubules, like all physical structures, are rendered within consciousness. The directionality is reversed.

B. Testable predictions and empirical distinguishability

A framework is only as strong as its capacity to generate predictions that diverge from those of competing models. The present paper establishes the ontological foundation; detailed predictions are derived in subsequent papers where the rendering mechanism is fully specified (Papers II–XI). However, several predictions follow directly from the foundational ontology:

1. Planck-scale discreteness. If reality is frame-by-frame rendered at Planck-scale resolution, then spacetime is fundamentally discrete, not continuous. This is consistent with certain approaches to quantum gravity (loop quantum gravity, causal set theory) but is here derived as a direct consequence of the rendering mechanism rather than postulated as a mathematical assumption. Experimental probes of Planck-scale discreteness, such as searches for energy-dependent photon dispersion from distant gamma-ray bursts, constitute direct tests of related predictions. The most sensitive searches to date have not detected such dispersion,[17] though the specific form of discreteness predicted by the rendering mechanism (Paper II) may produce signatures distinct from those currently tested.

2. Observer-dependent rendering asymmetries. If observation is an act of Source that anchors specific outcomes from superposition, then the statistics of quantum measurement should show signatures of this process distinct from mere decoherence. In particular, the framework predicts that states of heightened coherent awareness (e.g., focused meditative attention) should produce measurable differences in the dynamics of quantum systems under observation, not because "consciousness collapses the wave function" in a mystical sense, but because the coherence state of the observing vantage point affects the resonance-anchoring process. Rigorous experimental protocols for testing such predictions, including specific measurement signatures that distinguish resonance-anchoring from standard decoherence, are proposed in Paper IX.

3. Coherence signatures in reduced self-referential processing. If the veils of self-forgetting are pulse patterns sustained by reaffirmation, then states in which these patterns are attenuated (deep meditation, certain anaesthetic states, near-death experiences) should produce measurable changes in neural coherence patterns. The prediction is not merely that neural activity changes during these states (this is well established) but that the *pattern* of change should reflect a systematic reduction in self-referential processing loops (identity, memory, emotion, conceptual labelling) in a specific order corresponding to the five veils. Existing data on default mode network deactivation during meditation[18] is consistent with this prediction.

4. Uniformity of physical law as a consequence of singular Source. The unreasonable effectiveness of mathematics and the universality of physical constants are, in this framework, direct consequences of the fact that one Source generates one simulation with one set of rendering parameters. The uniformity is not a coincidence requiring anthropic explanation; it is a necessary consequence of a singular Source. This resolves the fine-tuning problem without invoking a multiverse of random constants.[19]

C. On falsifiability

The foundational claim, that consciousness is the sole reality and the physical universe is its rendered self-experience, might appear unfalsifiable. Any observation occurs within the simulation and therefore cannot step outside it to verify the claim independently. This concern applies equally to the foundational claims of materialism (that matter is fundamental) and of any ontological framework. No framework can be verified from outside itself.

What can be assessed is internal consistency, explanatory scope, and the generation of novel testable predictions. The present framework generates specific predictions (detailed in Papers II–XI) that diverge from those of materialist models and can be empirically tested within the simulation, that is, by the ordinary methods of experimental physics. If the framework's predictions are confirmed where materialist predictions fail, or if the framework explains phenomena (such as the measurement problem or the hard problem) that materialist models cannot, this constitutes meaningful empirical support.

VII. CONCLUSION

This paper has presented a consciousness-first ontology in which Source (singular, undivided, composition-less awareness) is the sole foundational reality, and Simulation (Source's pulsed, frame-by-frame rendering of self-experience) is the process by which the physical universe arises.

The central claims are:

1. Source is the ontological primitive: pure awareness, prior to spacetime, matter, energy, and form, and self-evident in the sense that its denial is incoherent.

2. Pulse is the fundamental act: Source's self-condensation into determinate form without division, generating phantom positions (rendered spatial coordinates) and phantom states (rendered attributes).

3. Simulation is Source's mode of self-experience: a frame-by-frame rendering sustained by reaffirmation, resolving at Planck-scale parameters, in which the appearance of continuity, motion, and causation emerges from sequential pulsing.

4. The multiplicity of observers and objects arises through five veils of self-forgetting, pulsed restrictions on Source's awareness that produce the experience of separate, bounded, limited selves.

5. All objects in the simulation function as mirrors, surfaces of apparent otherness through which Source experiences the contrast, interaction, and dynamic richness that cannot arise in the undifferentiated state.

This framework resolves the hard problem of consciousness (consciousness is not emergent and therefore requires no emergence mechanism), the measurement problem of quantum mechanics (observation is Source's resonance-anchoring of specific pulse configurations), and the intersubjectivity problem of idealism (there is one Source, not many minds). It shares its foundational premise with Strømme's recent work but provides what that work does not: a complete rendering mechanism, a definite account of why consciousness differentiates, and a pathway to the derivation of specific physical phenomena.

The complete rendering mechanism (True Physics, the Quantum Potential Field, and the Source Pulse Particle Lattice) is the subject of Paper II.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author acknowledges the foundational work of Strømme, whose demonstration that consciousness-first frameworks can achieve peer-reviewed publication in physics journals helped establish the viability of the present programme.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study. The theoretical framework presented here is derived from first principles set forth in the author's published work.[13]

[1] D. J. Chalmers, "Facing up to the problem of consciousness," J. Consciousness Stud. **2**(3), 200–219 (1995).
[2] T. Nagel, "What is it like to be a bat?," Philos. Rev. **83**(4), 435–450 (1974).
[3] G. Tononi, "Consciousness as integrated information: A provisional manifesto," Biol. Bull. **215**(3), 216–242 (2008).
[4] B. J. Baars, *A Cognitive Theory of Consciousness* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1988).
[5] J. S. Bell, "Against 'measurement'," Phys. World **3**(8), 33–40 (1990).
[6] H. Everett III, " 'Relative state' formulation of quantum mechanics," Rev. Mod. Phys. **29**(3), 454–462 (1957).
[7] W. H. Zurek, "Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical," Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**(3), 715–775 (2003).
[8] D. Bohm, *Wholeness and the Implicate Order* (Routledge, London, 1980).
[9] J. A. Wheeler, "Information, physics, quantum: The search for links," in *Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information*, edited by W. H. Zurek (Addison-Wesley, Redwood City, CA, 1990), pp. 3–28.
[10] S. Hameroff and R. Penrose, "Consciousness in the universe: A review of the 'Orch OR' theory," Phys. Life Rev. **11**(1), 39–78 (2014).
[11] B. Kastrup, *The Idea of the World: A Multi-Disciplinary Argument for the Mental Nature of Reality* (iff Books, Winchester, 2019).
[12] M. Strømme, "Universal consciousness as foundational field: A theoretical bridge between quantum physics and non-dual philosophy," AIP Adv. **15**(11), 115319 (2025).
[13] S. Sinha, *Autography by Source: The Law of Everything*, 1st ed. (2025). Copyright registered with Government of India, Certificate No. LD-20250172782, filed 4 July 2025. Available at: `https://www.amazon.in/Autography-Source-Everything-Shubham-Sinha-ebook/dp/B0FG2LD19M`.
[14] N. Bostrom, "Are you living in a computer simulation?," Philos. Q. **53**(211), 243–255 (2003).
[15] A. Lutz, L. L. Greischar, N. B. Rawlings, M. Ricard, and R. J. Davidson, "Long-term meditators self-induce high-amplitude gamma synchrony during mental practice," Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **101**(46), 16369–16373 (2004).
[16] A. B. Newberg, A. Alavi, M. Baime, M. Pourdehnad, J. Santanna, and E. d'Aquili, "The measurement of regional cerebral blood flow during the complex cognitive task of meditation: A preliminary SPECT study," Psychiatry Res. Neuroimaging **106**(2), 113–122 (2001).
[17] V. Vasileiou, J. Granot, T. Piran, and G. Amelino-Camelia, "A Planck-scale limit on spacetime fuzziness and stochastic Lorentz invariance violation," Nat. Phys. **11**(4), 344–346 (2015).
[18] J. A. Brewer, P. D. Worhunsky, J. R. Gray, Y.-Y. Tang, J. Weber, and H. Kober, "Meditation experience is associated with differences in default mode network activity and connectivity," Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **108**(50), 20254–20259 (2011).
[19] L. Susskind, "The anthropic landscape of string theory," in *Universe or Multiverse?*, edited by B. Carr (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007), pp. 247–266.