Reengineering the Universe

Fractal Compression of Situations in a Trit-Addressed Net

J. Konstapel, Leiden, 24 August 2026 Constable Research · hans.konstapel@gmail.com · constable.blog Part of the MAZE project.

Abstract

Every system built for ordering knowledge has failed in the same way, and the failure is not technical. The address is assigned by an authority, and what is assigned can be revoked. This paper takes the one inversion that escapes it — do not assign the address, compute it — and carries it to its conclusion.

A situation is walked ring by ring, each ring answering a single question against a reference the net itself supplies. The answers form a route in balanced ternary. The walk terminates when the route becomes periodic, and at that point the situation is compressed: everything deeper is the repetition of what stands, with different material in it. The compressed form is a rational number.

Sixty-five academic disciplines, walked by hand, terminate on the same route. So does a case from outside that corpus. The compression is therefore not asserted but exhibited, and the ratio between inputs and occupied positions is the measurement that matters.

The paper gives the arithmetic in full, the demonstration, the relation to the ancient binary oracles that performed the same compression at fixed depth, the architecture of a machine that fills itself and can be consulted, and the one problem that remains open: the net can address, and it cannot move.

1. Four techniques, four centuries, one fault

Dewey's decimal classification requires revision. The Universal Decimal Classification survives exactly as long as an office in The Hague maintains it. A web address points at a server that will one day be switched off. A DOI resolves for exactly as long as a publisher pays. And the newest variant — the vector space in which a language model places what it knows — shifts wholesale the moment the model is retrained.

The fault is not that these systems are badly built. In every one of them the address is *assigned*. A committee, a publisher, a company or a training run decides where a thing goes. What is assigned can be revoked. And the moment material arrives that the ordering did not foresee, the ordering must be extended, and the meaning of everything already shelved shifts underneath it.

That is why there is no world archive. Not because the world is too large. Because the numbering cannot hold.

Paul Otlet and Henri La Fontaine made the most serious attempt, from 1895, and the Mundaneum stranded on precisely this point: the classification had to be maintained by an institution, so the codes were handed out and could be taken back. Ted Nelson diagnosed the rotting of web addresses decades before it happened, and his remedy was a central register — the very assumption that fails.

One family of systems escapes. Ralph Merkle's hash trees, and content-addressed storage generally, compute the address from the content instead of assigning it to the content. Git and IPFS run on nothing else. But a hash destroys structure by design: there is nothing to truncate, nothing to mirror, nothing to subtract. That is what a hash is for, and it is why it is useless for knowledge.

Geohash escapes further. Drop characters from a geohash and the address names a larger region containing the smaller one. That is the prefix property, in worldwide production use, proving that this kind of addressing scales. Geohash has two spatial axes.

What follows generalises it to arbitrary distinctions.

2. One rule, repeated

Everything rests on a single question that anyone can ask and that always yields the same answer:

Relative to the reference on this ring, is the pattern laid, does it stand still, or does it fall away?

Laid is +1. Standing is 0. Falling away is −1.

The rule is applied repeatedly. The answer on ring one fixes the reference for ring two, the answer on ring two fixes the reference for ring three, and so on, as deep as the material demands.

The image is a fishnet: meshes within meshes. A thing is not an object in a drawer but a place in the net — a winding at a certain depth. A sequence of answers is a *route*, and every route is an integer written in balanced ternary with digits −1, 0 and +1.

Charles Sanders Peirce supplies the strongest existing reason to think the three-way form is structural rather than a matter of taste: relation begins at three, and a triadic relation does not decompose into pairs. The rule has three outcomes because relation has three outcomes.

2.1 The reference is not chosen

This is the point at which reproducibility is won or lost, and it is where most attempts at computed classification fail.

The reference on ring n is the material standing on the route up to ring $n-1$. It is not selected by whoever is encoding. On ring one the reference is rest — address zero. Thereafter every occupied winding is the reference for what is encoded beneath it. The net refers to itself.

A consequence follows that is worth stating plainly, because it inverts the usual expectation about inter-coder agreement. In an empty net two encoders diverge, because the reference is a judgement. In a full net they converge, because the reference is an addressed piece. **Reproducibility is a property of the filling, not of the rule.** It is therefore not a threshold to be cleared before the work begins; it is a quantity that rises as the net fills, and it is measurable at every stage.

3. The arithmetic

3.1 Route and value

A route is a sequence of moves from {−1, 0, +1}. The first move carries the highest place value.

```
v(r) = Σ  r[i] · 3^(d−1−i)        for i = 0 … d−1
```

Route `+1 −1 +1 0` at depth 4 gives 27 − 9 + 3 + 0 = **21**.

3.2 The address is a pair

The address is `(v, d)` — value *and* depth. The integer alone does not name a place: route `0 +1 −1` at depth 3 has value 2, and route `+1 −1` at depth 2 also has value 2. Two different places.

This has a consequence for the strongest political claim in the design. Merging two independently built nets is the union of two sets — but of *pairs*, not of integers. The claim survives; the formulation does not.

At depth *d* the valid range is `[−(3^d−1)/2, +(3^d−1)/2]`. At depth 4 that is ±40. At depth 8, ±3,280. At depth 24, ±141,214,768,240.

3.3 Coarsening is integer arithmetic

Donald Knuth's treatment of balanced ternary establishes the property the whole design leans on: in this system, truncation *is* rounding to nearest. There is no separate rounding step.

Implemented in floating point this is a source of error. The exact form:

```
balanced_trit(v):
    r = ((v mod 3) + 3) mod 3         // 0, 1 or 2
    if r == 0: return  0
    if r == 1: return +1
    if r == 2: return −1

truncate(v, d):
    t = balanced_trit(v)
    return ((v − t) / 3, d − 1)       // exact integer
division
```

There are no ties. The fractional part of v/3 is 0, ⅓ or ⅔ — never ½. Rounding to nearest is therefore always unambiguous, and the rounding mode is irrelevant.

The chain for 21 at depth 4:

depth	route	value
4	+1 −1 +1 0	21
3	+1 −1 +1	7
2	+1 −1	2
1	1	1
0	—	0 (rest)

Negatives behave: −5 gives r = 1, so t = +1 and the parent is −2. The route of −5 at depth 3 is `−1 +1 +1`; truncating gives `−1 +1` = −2.

An answer returned *k* rings coarser deviates by at most `(3^k − 1)/2` on the fine scale. That bound is printed beside every answer.

3.4 Three more properties, free of charge

The opposite is a minus sign. Flip every +1 to −1 and the number becomes its own negative. The antithesis of a claim sits one operation away. No dictionary of opposites is required.

Distance is subtraction. Subtract two addresses at equal depth. The result is a number with a meaning of its own, not a similarity score between zero and one whose interpretation depends on whichever model produced it. At unequal depth, coarsen the deeper one first — never refine the shallower one, because those moves do not exist.

Scale is a prefix. What holds at the level of a neighbourhood and what holds at the level of a household share the beginning of their address.

Together these replace the entire apparatus of search: no index, no query language, no ranking, no relevance model. Four arithmetic operations whose cost depends on the number of moves and not on the size of the archive. An archive of a hundred pieces and an archive of a billion answer these questions equally fast.

3.5 Branching is three

One move distinguishes three things. A rung on a ladder therefore costs $\lceil \log_3(\text{branching}) \rceil$ moves, not one.

For the Netherlands: twelve provinces cost 3 moves, 342 municipalities cost 6, roughly 3,000 quarters cost 8, roughly 13,000 neighbourhoods cost 9. A ladder of eight rungs is about forty moves. The prefix property is untouched; only the bookkeeping changes, and it must be got right before the first real dataset is loaded.

3.6 How deep the world is

Each move multiplies capacity by three, which turns "how large must this become" into arithmetic.

Nineteen moves give 1,162,261,467 addresses — roughly seven times every book ever printed. Twenty-six moves give 2.54 trillion: every document ever written, letters and ledgers included. Thirty-two moves give every sentence in every document. Forty-two moves give about 10^{20} — a hundred billion people who ever lived, a billion distinguishable moments each.

One move carries 1.585 bits, by Shannon's accounting. Forty-two moves are 66.6 bits. Nine bytes to name any moment in the history of human experience — and the addresses are not stored but computed.

The difference from a language model is not the count. It is that these digits are *defined*. Of every move it can be said what it means: above, on it, below. In a language model a digit carries an unnamed part of an unnamed distinction; there is no move, only a position. Two million undefined digits do not yield an address, and therefore yield no opposite, no scale prefix, no distance-as-number. Forty-two defined ones yield all of it.

4. The stopping rule: the repeating trit

This is the contribution that turns an address space into a compression.

Walk the rings. After each move, test whether the last *p* moves equal the *p* before them.

```
detect_period(r):
    d = len(r)
    for p in 1 … d div 2:
        if r[d−p … d−1] == r[d−2p … d−p−1]:
            kind = 'rest' if all moves in the period are 0
else 'pattern'
            return (p, kind)
    return null
```

Three rules govern it.

Two full periods are required. A period of length *p* is detectable only at depth ≥ 2*p*. A period of 4 therefore requires depth 8.

The smallest *p* wins. `+1 −1 +1 0 +1 −1 +1 0` closes at p = 4, not at p = 8.

Rest is a period, and a different one. A period consisting entirely of zeros means the situation adds no further distinctions: it has run into rest. That closes, and it does not mean the same thing as a repeating non-zero pattern. The two are recorded separately.

When the period closes, the situation is compressed. What lies deeper is not unknown. It is the repetition of what stands, with other material in it.

4.1 Closed form

For a purely periodic route with period *p* and period value `v_p`:

```
v(k·p) = v_p · (3^(k·p) − 1) / (3^p − 1)
```

With v_p = 21, p = 4, k = 2:

$21 \cdot (3^8 - 1)/(3^4 - 1) = 21 \cdot 6560/80 = 21 \cdot 82 =$ **1722**

And the route `+1 −1 +1 0 +1 −1 +1 0` at depth 8 evaluates to 2187 − 729 + 243 + 0 + 27 − 9 + 3 + 0 = **1722**.

More generally, for a run-up followed by a period: `v(d + p) = 3^p · v(d) + v_p`.

4.2 The situation as one rational number

The infinite route converges:

```
lim (d→∞)  v(d) / 3^d  =  v_p / (3^p − 1)
```

For v_p = 21, p = 4 this is 21/80 = **0.2625**.

That number is the angular position of the winding on the circle and the complete compression of the situation. Everything the situation is, at every depth, is in it.

What is stored per situation is therefore: the run-up, the period value, the period length, and the material. Not the reasoning — the reasoning is computable.

5. Storage is occupation

Storage is paid only where something stands. The address space is enormous and almost entirely empty.

This is not an efficiency argument about databases. It is the reason the universe is mostly empty. Matter is the occupied winding. Where nothing closes, nothing stands, and emptiness costs nothing.

The gate follows from this and is not what an editorial board does. $\Psi^2 = 0$ does not admit or reject a submission. It determines whether anything can stand in that place. What closes becomes material. What does not close is not refused; it is simply absent.

Operationally: encode the situation twice, independently, from the same material. If both routes agree, the place is occupied. If one is a prefix of the other, it is occupied at the shorter one, marked as coarser. Otherwise try the opposite −a; a claim that does not fit where it was offered fits its antithesis strikingly often. Otherwise nothing.

Two further consequences.

Empty addresses are a result. Ask for an address; if something stands there, that is the answer. If not, drop one move and ask again, until something stands — and address zero is always occupied. The answer that comes back is *coarser* than the question, never *other* than the question, and the deviation is bounded in advance. Set that against a language model handed something it does not know: the model produces a fluent sentence; this produces a rougher true one and states the depth it came from. Confabulation is not forbidden by policy. It is excluded by construction.

Collision is not a fault. There is exactly one kind: the same address with different content. That is a substantive disagreement, and the address points at it precisely — something to be discussed rather than averaged away.

5.1 Frequency must not touch placement

A winding confirmed ten thousand times is not nearer than a winding occupied once. Counting is bookkeeping and takes no part in determining the reference.

The moment frequency influences placement, the address is voted rather than computed — which is exactly the fault of Dewey and of the vector space. This constraint is not a design preference. It is the condition under which the whole construction differs from what it replaces.

6. The demonstration

An assertion that the net compresses is worth nothing. What follows is a walk that can be checked.

6.1 The first distinction

The corpus is *Paths to the Knot*, a cross-disciplinary reference work covering sixty-five academic fields, each walked from its own accepted ground.

The distinction that opens it is this: **maintenance produces no change.** Its entire output is that something is still there. And nearly every measurement system in these sciences is built to detect difference — before and after, treatment and control, trend and deviation. An activity whose success is indistinguishable from nothing having happened is invisible to instruments calibrated on change.

That is why care work is undervalued, why infrastructure budgets are cut, and why the maintenance of a discipline's own standards is nobody's research topic. The fields that did see it are the ones where neglect is punished quickly: aviation regulates skill currency because pilots who have not landed recently crash; distributed systems are built to self-stabilise because at scale something is always broken; conservators know that nothing is preserved by being left alone.

6.2 The four rings

The reference on each ring is whether the pattern is laid, stands, or falls away.

Ring 1 — is there fixed ground? Every chapter opens with a finding no school within the field disputes. Sociology: an organisation remains the same organisation while its entire staff is replaced. Biochemistry: the molecular constituents of an organism are continuously replaced. Medicine: health is not the absence of damage. → **+1**

Ring 2 — does that ground close? It does not. Each field runs into a question it has not settled. Sociology has words for what persists and none of them says what the persisting thing is. Biochemistry answers with organisation, structure or information, and none of these is located. Medicine has homeostasis, reserve, resilience and allostatic load — four partial names for one quantity it does not have. → **−1**

Ring 3 — are the measurements there? They are, and they were collected for something else. Tie decay against contact frequency. Proteome turnover rates spanning minutes to years. Deconditioning curves for muscle, bone and glucose tolerance. → **+1**

Ring 4 — are they divided by one another? They are not. Both rates exist in the literature — the rate at which something lapses and the rate at which it is put back — measured by different specialists for different purposes, and never divided. Skill decay and retraining. Relational decay and restoration. Deterioration and conservation. → **0**

Route `+1 −1 +1 0`. On place values 27, 9, 3, 1: 27 − 9 + 3 + 0 = **21**.

Sixty-five times the same route.

6.3 One ring deeper

Chapter XXXI, Medicine, at section level:

- fixed ground: the Dallas bed rest measurements → **+1**
- does it close: no single quantity for repair capacity → **−1**
- measurements: wound healing rates, fracture union times, consolidation → **+1**

- divided: never computed → **0**

The same four moves. The route is `+1 −1 +1 0 +1 −1 +1 0`, value 1722 at depth 8, period 4, limit 0.2625.

There the trit repeats and the walk stops. What lies deeper adds no new distinction, only different material.

6.4 What that compresses

Seventeen names for one winding, drawn from fields that do not cite one another: repair, proteostasis, self-stabilization, relatedness, entrainment, soft assembly, routine, turnover, calibration, traceability, adstock, going concern, susceptible replenishment, error threshold, structural inertia, renewal, scrubbing, preventive conservation. Add abeyance, desistance, currency.

Sixty-five disciplines, over four hundred sections, one address. The names are the material. The route is the place.

And what stands at that address is not a summary. It is a set of statements each field can check in its own terms: the largest pattern a system can hold equals its repair-to-decay ratio; rest is required and its size is the pattern divided by that ratio; depth is finite and failure runs from the top down. Manfred Eigen established the first of these for replicating molecules in 1971, and Shannon proved the general form in 1948 without setting out to characterise living things.

6.5 A case from outside the corpus

The demonstration above is vulnerable to an obvious objection: the book is written in six fixed steps, so the recurring route may only confirm the shape of the book. The test is a situation nobody wrote that way.

Dutch water management.

- **Ring 1.** The land lies below sea level and staying dry is an achievement, not a condition. Nobody disputes this. → **+1**
- **Ring 2.** Water boards compute dikes and discharge. How much must be restored per year for the system to continue existing is nowhere a single number. → **−1**
- **Ring 3.** Both sides are measured. Subsidence in millimetres per year, peat oxidation, dike deterioration curves. And: raising, dike reinforcement, pumping capacity, dredging frequency. → **+1**
- **Ring 4.** Never divided. Subsidence and raising sit with different agencies, different budgets, different reports. The quotient does not exist. → **0**

Same address. One ring deeper — Green Heart peat meadow — the same four moves, and the period closes.

The net then yields something that was not put into it. Whatever stands at 21 applies here: the largest pattern that can be held equals repair over decay. Dividing subsidence by raising is a day's work with existing figures, and it produces a number that appears nowhere in Dutch water management.

That is not an opinion. It is what already lay at that place, put there by sixty-five other fields.

7. The ancient compressions

Ifá, the *I Ching*, the Torah and the Kabbalistic Tree of Life are not independent cultural inventions. They are one distributed research programme into the architecture of change, and they performed the compression described here, at fixed depth, in binary.

The *I Ching* operates on six binary positions: $2^6 = 64$ hexagrams. Ifá on eight: $2^8 = 256$ *odù*. Deeper initiatory layers reach $2^{12} = 4{,}096$. The progression is not arbitrary. Six positions suffice for strategic questions, eight for complex moral and systemic ones, twelve for questions of succession and civilisational transition — a hierarchical encoding of experience, mapped empirically over millennia before Shannon named the accounting.

What they did was cut the tree at one fixed depth and write that whole layer down. Not an archive with gaps: *every* place occupied, with a narrative attached. That is why they fit in a book. The compression lies not in leaving things out but in stopping at a depth where the layer is still legible.

Binary, therefore without rest. No zero, no middle, no address zero.

7.1 The moving line

The *I Ching* has the zero anyway, and it has it as movement.

The throw does not give two values but four: old yin, young yin, young yang, old yang. Young is still. Old is turning. And the moving lines transform one hexagram into another.

That is a rewrite rule, three thousand years old, and it satisfies the constraints an engine requires. It preserves depth — six lines remain six lines. It is not an involution, because which lines move is determined by the state and not by the operation.

The correspondence is exact enough to be useful. Four states per position:

state	meaning	turns
loading	the position is filling	no
holding	the position stands	no
discharging	the position is full and reverses	yes
rest	the position is zero	no

This is where a search for a single fixed operator on the whole address goes wrong. There is no single R. There is, per position, an indication of whether that position turns — and what turns is what is full.

7.2 What writing removed, and the third loss

Plato has Thamus refuse the gift of writing in the *Phaedrus* on two grounds: it weakens memory by substituting retrieval for knowing, and a written text cannot answer back — it says the same thing to everyone regardless of who asks.

There is a third loss he does not name, and it is the one that matters here. In the oral tradition the deeper layers are inaccessible until the shallower ones are mastered, because the deeper stories only make sense in the context of the shallower ones. The structure enforces its own developmental order. Writing lifts that gate, and everything becomes simultaneously available to everyone.

In the arithmetic this is not a cultural observation but a structural fact: **a deep address without its prefix is meaningless.** The initiatory ladder is the truncation chain enforced as access. Lifting it does not democratise the system; it hands out the top rungs with no way to climb.

Writing did not kill these systems. It compressed them lossily and recoverably. The written *odù*, hexagram or verse is a pointer to an acoustic, embodied, relational practice. Those who have been initiated read the pointer and recover the practice. Those who have not mistake the pointer for the content, and call it mystical. It is not mystical. It is compressed.

8. Reengineering

What has been described is a method, not an archive. Take an existing functionality, walk its rings, and its address follows. From the address follow three things the functionality did not have: what it is coarsely, what its opposite is, and how far it stands from every other functionality already placed.

Section 1 of this paper is an instance. Dewey, the UDC, the DOI and the vector space are four techniques with one winding and one fault: the address handed out from outside. Four centuries collapse to one place in the net.

Section 6 is another instance, at larger scale: sixty-five disciplines and a national water system on one winding.

This is what the title means. The universe is not simulated by modelling it. Nilpotency has already split it into a hierarchy of enormous depth, and every endpoint of that splitting is unique. A person is one such endpoint — one of some vast number, at a route whose moves were not assigned by anyone. Encoding is not an act. It is walking what is already there.

Two consequences follow immediately and are worth stating without hedging.

No position is privileged. Every endpoint is exactly as unique as every other.

Any two endpoints share a beginning. How deep that beginning lies is how far apart they stand. One subtraction.

8.1 What this does and does not replace

Current information technology carries eight layers. This construction reaches five of them and leaves three alone.

layer	replaced
naming — URL, DOI, UUID, primary key, DNS	yes: computed instead of assigned
index — B-tree, inverted, vector	yes: arithmetic
schema and ontology	largely: the chain of distinctions *is* the schema

admission and moderation	yes: the gate
federation — ETL, crosswalks	yes: union of sets of pairs
storage of content	no
transactional consistency — balances, locks, bookings	no
computation and dynamics	not yet: see §10

The honest claim is therefore not that this replaces information technology. It is that it replaces **the catalogue** — and the catalogue is the largest single item in every existing system.

Schema translation, ontology alignment and crosswalk tables exist only because systems that received their addresses from different authorities have no common ground. Systems that compute their addresses from the same rule already share every address.

9. The machine

A net that must be filled by hand is a notation. What follows is the architecture of one that fills itself.

Where the net stands. In a shared database, not in a browser. A net in a browser does not grow: every visitor starts empty, there is no reference, and therefore no self-reference. Without a shared net, autonomous filling is impossible.

Sources. An adapter that knows how to fetch an observation and what kind of material it yields. It knows nothing about addresses. Idempotency is enforced on `(source, key)`, so the loop may run without limit without polluting the net.

Two kinds of encoder. For a series, the rule is a comparison: the value against the running centre of the material on the route so far, with the tolerance taken from the spread of that same material. Nothing is set by hand. For a text, a language model reads and returns one move per ring together with the literal passage the move rests on. No passage, no move — and the server verifies that the passage occurs. A unit with more than two ungrounded moves is not placed at all. This is what keeps a fluent model from filling the net with invented routes.

Integration, itself a trit. Confirmation: no new winding, the count rises, the name joins the material list. Too coarse: encode one ring deeper. Opposite: place on −a. Incompatible and none of the three: a collision, recorded, not averaged.

Here is where the compression is measurable. A source that arrives daily and lands daily on the same winding does not grow the net. Only the count rises. **Windings grow sublinearly while observations grow linearly** — that is the test, and if it fails the encoder is wrong.

Drift. A source standing on the same address for seven consecutive observations and then landing elsewhere has undergone a state transition. What discharges jumps winding. That is the discharge detector, as a property of the net rather than a separate module.

Consultation. There is no search. The question is encoded by the same rule and the net answers from the nearest occupied winding. A coarse question returns everything beneath it, exactly. A deep question with nothing there walks up and returns something coarser, with the bound printed.

The empty map. A finite, readable list of what is not yet known — a research agenda produced by arithmetic rather than by a committee.

9.1 Wikipedia as first source

An article is not a situation. It is the residue of one: the mapping of a field of knowledge. The text is the trace, as a sediment layer or a tree ring is a trace of something that ran.

The four rings are therefore read as questions about the mapping, and the article is where that is legible. Ring 1 in the lead. Ring 2 in the sections named for controversy and open problems, and in the maintenance templates. Ring 3 in the tables, the figures and the references. Ring 4 between the sections: whether the quantitative sections refer to one another.

Ring 4 is almost always zero. That is not weakness; it is the finding, and it is the same finding as §6.2. Two sections standing in one article, each carrying a rate, each the other's counterpart — decay and repair, loss and replenishment, subsidence and raising — and neither mentioning the other. Every such pair is a division that can be made with existing figures and has not been made.

The gate here is stronger than two readings by one model: one pass parses the wikitext and counts, deterministically, with no model at all; the other reads. Two independent *methods* arriving at the same address is a harder test than one method run twice.

And the language links give something no other source gives: the two-coder trial, already run, by people who have never met. The same subject in English, Dutch, German and Japanese — different editors, different languages, no coordination. If the four land on the same address or in a prefix relation, the encoding does not hang on the language. If they do not, the rule is not sharp enough, and the rule is what must be sharpened. Never the model enlarged.

9.2 The check with a known answer

The sixty-five disciplines of §6 all have articles. They should land on the address computed by hand in §6.3.

That single proportion is the first honest measurement this machine can produce, and it is the point at which the reading rules are either adequate or not.

10. What is not solved

One thing. The net can address, and it cannot move.

Truncation is itself a rewrite, and truncating something truncated is truncation again, so it is its own fixed point — but it loses depth. That fixes what the sought rewrite must differ in: it must preserve depth and still close.

Four requirements, and the fourth is the one that comes from the theory rather than from the archive:

1. `depth(R(x)) = depth(x)`
2. `truncate(R(x)) = R(truncate(x))` — coarsen-then-rewrite must equal rewrite-then-coarsen; the lattice must not tear

3. `R(x)` must pass the gate
4. `R ∘ R = 0`

The fourth requirement is nilpotency, and it is sharper than "not an involution". Not-an-involution is the archive reading. $\Psi^2 = 0$ is return to *rest*, not return to self. The opposite fails on this ground: flipping every sign twice returns the original, which is a fixed point and not zero.

Requirement 2 has a precise mathematical content that narrows the search decisively. Closing under truncation means preserving the parent–child relation, which is the definition of an automorphism of the rooted ternary tree. Candidates are therefore parameterised by one permutation of $\{-1, 0, +1\}$ per node — not by a handful of digit permutations. This explains the exhaustive results already computed at depth five: the opposite is the transposition applied at every node, hence an automorphism, hence closing; mirror and shift are not tree automorphisms and scramble the scale lattice; the successor fails because its carry runs from the deepest move toward the shallowest, so the first move depends on the last.

Reverse the carry — increment the shallowest move, carrying downward — and the operation depends at each move only on what precedes it. That closes by construction, preserves depth, is bijective, and is not an involution.

It is also, honestly, not yet an answer. It enumerates rather than infers, and it does not satisfy requirement 4. The real question is not which operations close but **which of the closing operations means something**, and that is a design question rather than a search.

Until such an R exists, this is an archive with an excellent numbering and no engine. That sentence should remain checkable, and the machine should display its own failure to satisfy it rather than papering over it with a provisional operator. A provisional R makes the whole net untrustworthy.

11. What would falsify this

Four things, each measurable, none requiring the theory to be granted first.

Refinement does not preserve the prefix. Encode the same situation at two depths. If the coarse code is not the truncation of the fine one, the rule is not one rule, and the hierarchy is a set of unrelated addresses at different resolutions.

Independent encoders diverge as the net fills. The claim in §2.1 is that agreement rises with occupation. If it does not — if the interwiki proportion stays flat or falls as the net grows — the reference is not doing the work claimed for it.

The net grows linearly with observations. If windings rise as fast as inputs, nothing is being compressed and the encoder is producing distinctions where there are none.

A case from outside the corpus lands elsewhere. §6.5 is one such case and it landed on the same address. A systematic sample that does not would show that the recurring route is an artefact of how the source material was written.

Each of these is a number, obtainable from a running instrument, and each of them can come out the wrong way.

12. Conclusion

The address must not be handed out. That is the whole inversion, and everything else follows from it: coarsening is dropping digits, the opposite is a minus sign, distance is subtraction, scale is a prefix, and federation is union.

What this paper adds is where the walk stops. A situation is walked until the trit repeats, and at that point it is compressed to a run-up, a period and a rational number. Sixty-five disciplines and a national water system have been walked by hand and terminate on the same route, with the same period. The names differ; the place does not.

The ancient oracles performed this compression at fixed depth, in binary, and wrote out the complete layer. Writing cost them the acoustic carrier, the adaptive interpreter and the gate — and preserved the combinatorial skeleton, which is enough to rebuild from.

What is being rebuilt is not a better index. It is a navigable space in which knowledge is a coordinate, relation is arithmetic, and a place can be occupied only by what closes there. Storage is paid where something stands, which is why the map is mostly empty and why the empty part is itself an artefact worth reading.

One thing is missing and its name is known. Until the rewrite rule exists, this addresses and does not move. The task of the instrument was to make that sentence checkable. The task now is to make it false.

References

Bar-Natan, D. (1995). On the Vassiliev knot invariants. *Topology* 34(2), 423–472.

Chen, W.Y.C., Deng, E.Y.P., Du, R.R.X., Stanley, R.P. & Yan, C.H. (2007). Crossings and nestings of matchings and partitions. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 359(4), 1555–1575.

Dijkstra, E.W. (1974). Self-stabilizing systems in spite of distributed control. *Communications of the ACM* 17(11), 643–644.

Eigen, M. (1971). Selforganization of matter and the evolution of biological macromolecules. *Naturwissenschaften* 58(10), 465–523.

Ingold, T. (2015). *The Life of Lines*. Routledge.

Jung, C.G. (1952). *Synchronicity: An Acausal Connecting Principle*. Princeton University Press.

Knuth, D.E. (1997). *The Art of Computer Programming*, vol. 2, §4.1. Addison-Wesley.

Konstapel, J. (2026). *The Vacuum.Net Theory: Foundational Paper*. constable.blog.

Konstapel, J. (2026). *Paths to the Knot: How Every Human Science Arrives at the Same Object From Its Own Accepted Ground*. constable.blog.

Konstapel, J. (2026). *The Codable World: Design for a World-Scale Intelligence in Which All Knowledge, Past and Future, Becomes Address*. constable.blog.

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1963). *Structural Anthropology*. Basic Books.

Lord, A.B. (1960). *The Singer of Tales*. Harvard University Press.

Merkle, R. (1979). *Secrecy, Authentication, and Public Key Systems*. Stanford University.

Nelson, T. (1981). *Literary Machines*.

Niemeyer, G. (2008). Geohash. geohash.org.

Ong, W.J. (1982). *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. Methuen.

Otlet, P. & La Fontaine, H. (1895–). The Mundaneum and the Universal Decimal Classification.

Peirce, C.S. (1931). *Collected Papers*, vol. 2. Harvard University Press.

Plato. *Phaedrus*. Trans. Nehamas, A. & Woodruff, P. (1995). Hackett.

Ranganathan, S.R. (1933). *Colon Classification*.

Shannon, C.E. (1948). A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal* 27, 379–423 and 623–656.

Brusentsov, N.P. (1958). The Setun computer. Moscow State University.

Wilhelm, R. (1950). *The I Ching, or Book of Changes*. Princeton University Press.