# The Laws of Nature Are Not the Beginning

*An Essay on Fractal Context Dynamics*

J. Konstapel · Leiden · July 25 2026

## A question physics rarely asks

For more than three centuries, physics has been a search for universal laws. Newton, Maxwell, Einstein, and the founders of quantum mechanics were read as successive approximations to a single rulebook, valid everywhere and always. The search has been extraordinarily successful, and its success has made one question almost unaskable: are the laws of nature truly fundamental, or are they stable patterns that arise within a particular context?

This essay takes the second possibility seriously. The claim is not that the established theories are wrong — they are among the best-tested constructions in human history — but that they may be the end product of physics rather than its foundation. On this view, what needs explaining is not why the laws hold, but where they come from. And the context from which they come, I will argue, is the vacuum itself. The vacuum is not the empty stage on which physics is performed. The vacuum is the physics.

## The vacuum stopped being empty long ago

This is less heretical than it sounds, because twentieth-century physics quietly prepared the ground. In 1967 Andrei Sakharov showed that gravitation can arise from the quantum fluctuations of the vacuum, as a kind of elasticity of empty space rather than a force in its own right. Grigory Volovik demonstrated, using superfluid helium as a laboratory analogue, that a quantum liquid generates its own effective "particles", its own effective metric, and even its own low-energy version of relativity — all of which dissolve when one looks at the liquid closely enough. And in 1995 Ted Jacobson derived Einstein's field equations, the crown jewels of fundamental physics, from thermodynamics: spacetime behaves like an equation of state, the way pressure and temperature describe a gas without being properties of any single molecule.

Each of these results points in the same direction. What we call fundamental law behaves, on inspection, like the collective behaviour of something underneath. The question is what that something is.

## Process before substance

A candidate answer comes from an unexpected quarter. In 1969 the mathematician George Spencer-Brown built an entire calculus from a single primitive act: the drawing of a distinction. Before there are things, there is the act of distinguishing this from that. Louis Kauffman later showed that a distinction which is applied to itself — a process that re-distinguishes its own results — does not dissolve into noise but settles into stable, self-reproducing forms, which he called eigenforms. Kauffman also showed that this logic of self-reference maps naturally onto the mathematics of knots and braids.

Combining the two lines yields the central proposal of Fractal Context Dynamics. The fundamental object is not a particle, not a field, and not spacetime. It is a network of strands — knots, braids, and loops — that continually rewrites itself according to purely local rules. At this level there is no space and no time; there is only topological change. The structure is fractal: every winding is built of smaller windings, repeating the same recursive organization at every scale. Space appears as the correlation structure of the network, the way a fabric appears from stitches. Time appears as the ordering generated by the network's statistical state, in line with the thermal-time hypothesis of Connes and Rovelli. Gravity appears thermodynamically, along Jacobson's route. And matter appears as frozen topology: a particle is a knot that the rewriting cannot undo, its mass, spin, and charge fixed by topological invariants — a picture given concrete form by Williamson and van der Mark's model of the electron as a photon confined in a toroidal loop.

The familiar laws of physics, in this picture, are renormalization fixed points: the stable statistical regularities that survive when one zooms out far enough. Newton, Maxwell, Einstein, and quantum mechanics are not the axioms of the universe. They are its climate.

## Where this framework parts company with the others

Emergent-spacetime programmes already exist — Jacobson's thermodynamic derivation, Causal Dynamical Triangulations, loop quantum gravity, the rewrite-based cosmologies of Wolfram and Gorard. All of them, however, keep the constants of nature universal. Fractal Context Dynamics makes one further move, and this is its distinctive claim: if the laws are state properties of the vacuum, then so are the constants. The speed of light, the permittivity of empty space, the fine-structure constant — these are elastic moduli of the medium, and a medium can be in different states in different places. Constants are local.

A claim of this kind is only worth making if it forbids something, so consider one worked consequence. Treat the local tension of the vacuum as a dimensionless quantity set by the gravitational potential, and let the electric permittivity of space depend on it, following the "polarizable vacuum" representation of gravity developed by Dicke and Puthoff. To first order this reproduces the classical tests of general relativity — the bending of light, gravitational redshift, radar delay — without curved spacetime: curvature becomes a refractive-index profile of the medium. Dicke arranged the accompanying variations so that the fine-structure constant α stays exactly fixed. The present framework says that this arrangement is exact only at the fixed point; the fractal structure of the vacuum leaves a small residue, a drift of α proportional to the difference in vacuum tension.

That residue can be hunted. The photosphere of the hot white dwarf G191-B2B sits in a gravitational potential tens of thousands of times deeper than Earth's, and precision spectroscopy of its iron lines currently constrains any shift of α there to below about one part in ten million. Taking as a benchmark the natural one-loop vacuum-polarization factor — an educated guess, it must be said plainly, not a derivation — the framework predicts a shift of roughly three parts in a hundred million: just below today's bound, and decidable at the next improvement in measurement. A neutron star, with a potential a thousand times deeper still, would show an unmistakable signal. Two outcomes, meanwhile, are forbidden outright. If gravity is thermodynamic, there is no graviton to detect. And the controversial "Australian dipole" in α reported from quasar spectra cannot be gravitational in origin — the potential differences are far too small — so if it is real, it must reflect a slow cosmic relaxation of the vacuum itself.

## What a computer experiment revealed

A framework of this kind ultimately stands or falls with its dynamics: one must write down the rewriting rules explicitly and see what they do. A first prototype has now been built — a network of a few thousand nodes, initialized as an orderly two-dimensional lattice, subjected to exactly the kind of local, random reconnection the framework prescribes. The probe is deliberately observer-free: release a random walker on the network and record how often it returns to its starting point. On a line it returns constantly, on a lattice less often, in a tangled mess almost never; the return statistics encode an effective dimension. The method was validated first: on the untouched lattice it correctly measures dimension two.

The experiment produced two negative results, and they are the most instructive part of this essay. First: free local rewriting destroys geometry. After thirty thousand local moves the lattice is not a richer space but a featureless tangle, whose apparent dimension explodes rather than settling anywhere near the three-plus-one of experience. Pull out the stitches of a knitted sweater one by one and reattach them at random, and you do not get a different sweater; you get a clump of wool. Second, the obvious remedies fail too: rewarding small closed cycles either finds no grip on a sparse network or, worse, rewards exactly the shortcuts that densify the tangle.

The lesson is sharp. A bare network of points and links carries too little structure to hold a geometry: nothing is conserved when its connections are rewritten, so disorder is the only destination. Causal Dynamical Triangulations escapes this by imposing causal structure from outside. The escape native to the present framework is different, and it is the point at which the strand picture stops being decoration and becomes load-bearing: strands, unlike bare links, have orientation and crossing signs, and therefore conserved quantities — winding numbers — that survive local rewriting. Conservation is what resists the flow to disorder. The experiment does not prove the strand hypothesis; it shows that something with exactly the strand structure's properties is required.

## Who is measuring, and with what

There is, however, a deeper objection to the experiment, and it deserves to be stated at full strength: the success criterion — "the dimension should come out as four" — is a human artefact. Poincaré argued more than a century ago that the three-dimensionality of space is a property of our sensorimotor apparatus, of the repertoire of bodily movements by which we compensate and correct our perceptions; Kant had already placed space among the forms of intuition rather than the furniture of the world; and modern cognitive science, in the work of Lakoff and Johnson, has shown in detail how abstract categories are built on bodily schemata — up and down from the vestibular sense of gravity, left and right from the body's symmetry, depth from two eyes and a reaching arm. The return statistics of a random walk are a fact about the network. Calling their exponent "dimension", and demanding the value four, is a fact about us.

This does not make the criterion arbitrary, and here the architect Christopher Alexander becomes unexpectedly relevant. Alexander spent his career on the question of why some built structures feel right — why they possess what he called the quality without a name — and reached two conclusions that matter here. Empirically, judgements of harmony are not idiosyncratic: in his comparison experiments, people agree to a striking degree about which of two forms has more life. Structurally, the configurations that elicit this judgement share identifiable, countable properties: levels of scale, strong centers, boundaries, alternating repetition, local symmetries, echoes. Nikos Salingaros has since given several of these a mathematical form. Harmony, in other words, is a human detector for something structurally real.

Read against the framework, Alexander's properties translate almost term for term. Levels of scale is the fractality of the vacuum — windings made of windings. Strong centers, which Alexander defines as centers that strengthen other centers, are Kauffman's eigenforms: knots that stabilize knots. Echoes are self-similarity. The tangle produced by the failed experiment scores zero on every one of these properties; a living structure scores high. This suggests replacing the anthropocentric target "dimension four" with a criterion that is anchored in the human capacity for harmony yet cashed out in observer-free network measures: does the rewriting dynamics produce structural wholeness? The statement "space has three dimensions plus time" then becomes a statement about the interface between the vacuum and embodied observers — about how bodies read wholeness — rather than a property the vacuum must deliver on its own.

## What remains to be done

It is important to be precise about the status of all this. Fractal Context Dynamics is a research programme, not a finished theory. Its reinterpretation of existing physics adds no new mathematics of its own; its one quantitative prediction rests on a borrowed ansatz and a benchmark parameter chosen for plausibility, not derived; its computational prototype is a first implementation whose negative results, however instructive, were obtained on one family of networks at modest size. The list of open tasks is correspondingly concrete: build the conserved strand structure into the dynamics, since the experiment shows bare networks cannot hold geometry; define vacuum tension quantitatively and derive, rather than assume, how the constants depend on it; find the recurrence that links one winding level to the next, for which the Bronze Mean sequence is the working candidate; operationalize two or three of Alexander's wholeness properties as network measures and install them as the fixed-point test; and derive quantum amplitudes, for which Rowlands' nilpotent rewrite system offers the most developed route. Behind all of these stands the oldest question in the subject, which this framework inherits rather than resolves: who draws the first distinction.

What the programme offers, meanwhile, is a coherent inversion with consequences that can die. If the constants of nature drift with the state of the vacuum, spectroscopy of compact stars will find it or forbid it. If gravity is thermodynamic, no graviton will ever be caught. And if the laws of nature are the stable shadow of a self-organizing fractal vacuum, then physics has spent three centuries mapping the climate of a world whose weather it has not yet begun to study.

## Annotated References

Spencer-Brown, G. (1969). Laws of Form. London: Allen & Unwin.

*The primitive of the entire framework: the act of distinction as the origin of form, prior to space, time, and matter.*

Kauffman, L. H. (1987). "Self-reference and recursive forms." Journal of Social and Biological Structures 10(1), 53–72; and Kauffman's knot-logic papers.

*Shows that self-applied distinction stabilizes into eigenforms and maps self-reference onto knot and braid topology. Eigenforms reappear in this essay as Alexander's strong centers: knots stabilizing knots.*

Sakharov, A. D. (1967). "Vacuum quantum fluctuations in curved space and the theory of gravitation." Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR 177, 70–71.

*Induced gravity: gravitation as an elasticity of the vacuum rather than a fundamental force. The organizing idea behind vacuum tension.*

Volovik, G. E. (2003). The Universe in a Helium Droplet. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

*Demonstrates in condensed-matter analogues that Lorentz invariance, "particles", and effective metrics emerge in the low-energy limit of a quantum liquid — the strongest existing precedent for context-dependent laws.*

Jacobson, T. (1995). “Thermodynamics of spacetime: the Einstein equation of state.” Physical Review Letters 75, 1260–1263.

*Derives the Einstein field equations from heat and entropy on local horizons. The essay adopts this route for the emergence of gravity and draws from it the forbidden outcome: no graviton.*

Connes, A., & Rovelli, C. (1994). “Von Neumann algebra automorphisms and time-thermodynamics relation in generally covariant quantum theories.” Classical and Quantum Gravity 11, 2899–2917.

*The thermal-time hypothesis: physical time is generated by the statistical state itself — the basis for treating time as ordering rather than substance.*

Ambjørn, J., Jurkiewicz, J., & Loll, R. (2005). “Spectral dimension of the universe.” Physical Review Letters 95, 171301.

*Causal Dynamical Triangulations: the spectral dimension runs from about four at large scales to about two near the Planck scale. Also the model case of a restoring principle imposed from outside, against which the strand-internal alternative is set.*

Dicke, R. H. (1957). “Gravitation without a principle of equivalence.” Reviews of Modern Physics 29, 363–376; Puthoff, H. E. (2002). “Polarizable-vacuum (PV) approach to general relativity.” Foundations of Physics 32, 927–943.

*Gravity as a refractive-index profile of the vacuum, with permittivity and permeability as functions of gravitational potential. The direct template for the worked example — and the tuning of constants that the framework deliberately breaks.*

Robinson, V. N. E. Sub-quantum gravity model (Qeios / QuiCycle publications).

*Proposes gravity as arising from rotating-photon nucleons altering the electric permittivity of space. Non-mainstream; included as a third reference point alongside Sakharov and Volovik, not as established physics.*

Williamson, J. G., & van der Mark, M. B. (1997). “Is the electron a photon with toroidal topology?” Annales de la Fondation Louis de Broglie 22(2), 133–160.

*The electron as a self-confined photon in a toroidal loop — the concrete model behind “matter as frozen topology”.*

Rowlands, P. (2007). Zero to Infinity: The Foundations of Physics. Singapore: World Scientific.

*The nilpotent Universal Rewrite System: the most developed route toward deriving quantum amplitudes within a rewrite-based physics.*

Poincaré, H. (1902). La Science et l’Hypothèse. Paris: Flammarion.

*Argues that the three-dimensionality of space derives from the group of bodily movements and compensations — the classical source for the claim that dimension is an embodied category.*

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). Philosophy in the Flesh. New York: Basic Books.

*Embodied cognition: abstract categories, dimension included, are grounded in sensorimotor schemata. Grounds the reinterpretation of “three-plus-one” as a statement about the observer–vacuum interface.*

Alexander, C. (1977). A Pattern Language. New York: Oxford University Press; Alexander, C. (2002–2005). The Nature of Order, Books 1–4. Berkeley: Center for Environmental Structure.

*Structural wholeness and its identifiable properties, with comparison experiments showing that judgements of harmony are inter-subjectively stable. Supplies the observer-anchored but non-arbitrary success criterion proposed here; Book 4 extends the theory into cosmology.*

Salingaros, N. A., & Mehaffy, M. W. (2011). Principles of Urban Structure. Amsterdam: Techne Press.

*Gives several of Alexander’s wholeness properties a mathematical form via complexity and network theory — the starting point for operationalizing wholeness as network measures.*

Webb, J. K., et al. (2011). “Indications of a spatial variation of the fine structure constant.” Physical Review Letters 107, 191101.

*The reported dipole in the fine-structure constant from quasar absorption spectra. The framework predicts this dipole cannot be gravitational in origin.*

Berengut, J. C., et al. (2013). “Limits on the dependence of the fine-structure constant on gravitational potential from white-dwarf spectra.” Physical Review Letters 111, 010801.

*Establishes hot white dwarfs as probes of the fine-structure constant in strong gravitational potentials — the experimental arena for the essay’s central prediction.*

Hu, J., et al. (2019–2021). White-dwarf α-variation analyses for G191-B2B and continuum-placement systematics studies (MNRAS).

*The sharpest current spectroscopic bound, about one part in ten million, together with the systematics warnings any future test must respect. Bibliographic details to be verified against the primary publications.*

Uniyal, A., Kalita, S., Mizuno, Y., Chakrabarti, S., & Lu, Y. (2025). “Refining fundamental constants with white dwarfs.” Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 542, 3395–3401.

*Gaia-DR3 mass–radius constraints at the level where the essay’s benchmark prediction becomes decidable.*

## Acknowledgement

The axiomatic ordering, the quantitative benchmark, and the computational prototype discussed in this essay were developed in dialogue with Claude (Anthropic); responsibility for the framework and its claims rests with the author.