# Universe as a Cancellation System: Non-Cancelling Principle and Sanity Checks

Dritëro Mehmetaj

December 10, 2025

**Abstract**

This paper examines the idea of treating the universe as a *cancellation system*: a configuration in which many large contributions interact so that some global quantity nearly vanishes. Motivated by puzzles such as vacuum energy and the apparent smallness of certain cosmological parameters, we ask whether a structural rule that forbids *exact* cancellation can provide a useful organising principle.

Building on the Origin Axiom—which excludes configurations whose global complex amplitude $A(C)$ lies in a small neighbourhood of a reference value $A_*$—we survey where cancellations appear in known physics, what kinds of cancellations are benign, and which ones look finely tuned. We then discuss a series of sanity checks and toy models, including a minimal scalar toy universe, that probe whether a non–cancelling principle can be formulated without contradicting standard behaviour.

We find that: (i) many cancellations in realistic theories are symmetry–driven and therefore structurally robust, not accidental; (ii) a non–cancelling rule must be formulated in terms of a carefully chosen global amplitude if it is to avoid trivial conflict with charge neutrality and other well established phenomena; and (iii) in simple lattice models, a global constraint $|A| \geq \epsilon$ can be imposed without destabilising the dynamics, but does not by itself solve any fine–tuning problems. The value of the principle lies in the way it restricts configuration space, not yet in a quantitative prediction.

## 1 Introduction

It is tempting to view the universe as a vast *cancellation machine*. Positive and negative charges arrange themselves so that macroscopic objects are neutral; wave fields interfere to yield regions of almost perfect destructive interference; contributions to vacuum energy from different modes and sectors are often imagined to cancel to near zero. In many theoretical contexts, we rely on this picture implicitly: large contributions are allowed as long as they almost exactly balance in the end.

This raises a structural question:

*Can the universe be understood as a configuration that is "just enough off from nothing" to be real, held away from exact cancellation by a simple principle?*

The Origin Axiom is one attempt to answer this. It does not claim that every observed small quantity arises from a single mechanism. Instead, it proposes that there exists at least one global amplitude $A(C)$ over configuration space such that configurations with $A(C)$ extremely close to a special value $A_*$ (in particular $A_* = 0$) are structurally forbidden. In companion work, this is implemented as a rule $|A(C)| \geq \epsilon$ with a small non–cancellation scale $\epsilon$, and tested in simple scalar toy universes.

The purpose of the present paper is to step back and evaluate this idea as a whole:

- What does it mean to model the universe as a cancellation system?

- Where do cancellations already play a clear, structural role in standard physics?
- What kinds of cancellations look suspect or fine–tuned?
- How can a non–cancelling principle be formulated so that it is neither trivial nor obviously ruled out?

We do not claim to answer these questions definitively. Instead, we aim to separate promising directions from conceptual dead ends and to provide a set of sanity checks that any future elaboration of the Origin Axiom must pass.

## 2 Cancellation systems: basic picture

At a minimal level, a *cancellation system* is a collection of degrees of freedom $\{q_i\}$ together with a global quantity $Q$ of the form

$$Q = \sum_i q_i, \tag{1}$$

for which the observed value of $Q$ is small compared to the typical size of the individual $q_i$. In such systems, the smallness of $Q$ is explained not by the smallness of its constituents, but by the way they arrange so that positive and negative contributions almost neutralise.

There are many examples:

- **Charge neutrality.** In a macroscopic piece of matter, the total electric charge is often extremely close to zero. The microscopic charges $\pm e$ are large compared to the net charge $Q_{\text{tot}}$.
- **Wave interference.** For a superposition of waves, the local field amplitude at some point can be almost zero while individual components are sizable.
- **Vacuum contributions.** In naive treatments of quantum field theory, vacuum energy receives contributions from many modes and sectors, which are sometimes hoped to cancel.

In each case, one can ask whether the smallness of $Q$ is:

1. a robust consequence of symmetry or structure;
2. a dynamical attractor driven by evolution; or
3. a contingent fine–tuning with no structural explanation.

The Origin Axiom is not meant to replace existing symmetry arguments. Rather, it aims to constrain the third class: situations where exact cancellation seems to be taken for granted without a clear structural justification.

## 3 Cancellations in known physics

We briefly review some representative ways in which cancellations appear in standard theories, with an eye toward what a non–cancelling rule could or could not touch.

### 3.1 Benign cancellations

Some cancellations are clearly benign and well understood:

- **Charge neutrality in atoms.** The number of electrons equals the nuclear charge by construction in a neutral atom. This is enforced by the way we *define* the system, not by an accident.
- **No–force balances.** In certain classical configurations, forces can cancel so that the net acceleration is zero while internal stresses are nonzero. These are understood as equilibrium conditions.
- **Interference patterns.** Destructive interference is a direct consequence of linearity and phase relations in wave equations.

Any viable non–cancelling principle must leave these phenomena intact. That is one reason to formulate it in terms of a specifically chosen global amplitude $A(C)$ that does not coincide with ordinary conserved charges or forces.

### 3.2 More problematic cancellations

Other cancellations look more problematic:

- **Vacuum energy.** Many heuristic estimates of vacuum energy contributions from quantum fields are vastly larger than the observed effective cosmological constant. It is tempting to imagine hidden cancellations, but without a structural principle such cancellations appear finely tuned.
- **Sector–by–sector tuning.** In some models, different sectors of a theory contribute with opposite signs to a global quantity, and one hopes that the net result is small. Unless a symmetry enforces this, it is difficult to see why the cancellations should be exact.

It is in these contexts that a non–cancelling rule might, in principle, be relevant. But as our toy models show, simply imposing $|A| \geq \epsilon$ on a single scalar field is far from enough to solve such issues; at best it is a structural constraint that could feed into more elaborate constructions.

## 4 Non–cancelling principle: abstract formulation

We adopt the abstract viewpoint developed in the principle paper. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a space of configurations and $A : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ a chosen global amplitude. The Origin Axiom asserts that physically realised configurations avoid a forbidden neighbourhood $\mathcal{D}_\epsilon(A_*)$ of a special value $A_*$:

$$\mathcal{D}_\epsilon(A_*) = \{A \in \mathbb{C} \mid |A - A_*| < \epsilon\}, \tag{2}$$

and

$$\forall C \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{phys}} : \quad A(C) \notin \mathcal{D}_\epsilon(A_*). \tag{3}$$

In the simplest case, $A_* = 0$ and we forbid configurations with $|A(C)| < \epsilon$. This excludes exact cancellation of $A$ and forces the universe to retain a minimal "offset" away from the origin in amplitude space.

The choice of $A$ is crucial. If $A$ were, say, total electric charge, the axiom would be ruled out by the existence of neutral systems. The intent is instead to choose a functional that probes some deeper global property, such as a complexified vacuum amplitude, a weighted field sum, or an object built from multiple sectors.

## 5 Sanity checks from toy models

The scalar toy universe studied in the companion paper provides a concrete arena for sanity checks. There the amplitude is the lattice sum of a complex scalar field on a discrete three–torus, and the axiom is implemented as a projection that enforces $|A| \geq \epsilon$ at each time step.

The simulations reveal several important points:

- **Implementation is possible.** The constraint can be imposed in a numerically stable way in both linear and nonlinear regimes. The global amplitude is driven away from zero and held near $|A| \approx \epsilon$ without obvious pathologies.
- **Energy is largely unchanged.** The total energy of the system, as defined by a standard discrete functional, is nearly insensitive to the constraint. This suggests that the non–cancelling rule can act as a structural selection on configuration space rather than a crude new interaction term.
- **Null results in one dimension.** In one–dimensional twisted scalar models, the total vacuum energy is numerically independent of a global twist parameter. This shows that in highly symmetric quadratic systems, a global phase–like parameter can be spectrally trivial.

These results form a first layer of sanity checks: they demonstrate that a non–cancelling rule can be embedded in concrete dynamics without immediate contradiction, but they also underscore that such a rule does not automatically explain any observed small numbers.

## 6 Conceptual gaps and limitations

Several gaps remain between the abstract non–cancelling principle and any realistic application:

- **Ambiguity in $A$.** We have not uniquely identified what physical quantity $A$ should be in realistic theories. Different choices may lead to very different consequences.
- **Quantum formulation.** The toy models are classical or semiclassical. A full quantum version of the axiom would require specifying how the forbidden region in amplitude space is implemented at the level of states and path integrals.
- **Relation to observed fine–tunings.** It is not yet clear whether a constraint $|A| \geq \epsilon$ can be connected in any precise way to the observed smallness of quantities such as the cosmological constant. The toy models suggest qualitative analogies but no quantitative bridge.
- **Measure and typicality.** Even if we restrict configuration space by forbidding $|A|$ near zero, we must still specify a measure over the remaining configurations. It is not obvious that typical configurations under such a measure will resemble our universe.

These limitations do not invalidate the Origin Axiom as a conceptual proposal, but they signal clearly that much work remains before it can be considered a candidate explanation for any specific observational puzzle.

## 7 Outlook

Viewing the universe as a cancellation system is a suggestive but potentially dangerous metaphor. On the one hand, it captures the way many large contributions combine to yield small net effects.

On the other, it can hide fine–tuning behind a language of “balancing” and “neutrality” that has no structural justification.

The non–cancelling principle embodied in the Origin Axiom is an attempt to discipline this metaphor. By insisting that at least one global amplitude never cancels exactly, it imposes a modest but nontrivial restriction on configuration space. The scalar toy models show that this restriction can be realised concretely and that it behaves in a controlled way; the analytic checks in one dimension clarify where naive hopes for phase–based effects fail.

From here, progress will require:

- sharpening the definition of physically meaningful global amplitudes;
- exploring richer models where $|A| \geq \epsilon$ has nontrivial consequences;
- developing a quantum formulation of the axiom; and
- searching for potential observational signatures or no–go theorems.

The present paper should therefore be read as a map of constraints and sanity checks rather than a final claim. It sets the stage on which more ambitious attempts—such as connecting the non–cancelling principle to vacuum energy or to other global features of the universe—can be judged.