The Vacuum.Net Theory as a Transformation of Known Physics

Nothing New: One Change of Projection, Six Known Results, and Where the Applications Come From

J. Konstapel, Leiden, 14 September 2026

1. The claim

This essay makes one claim. The Vacuum.Net theory is not a new physics. It is a transformation of the physics we already have.

Physics knows this kind of move well. Heisenberg's matrices and Schrödinger's waves describe the same quantum mechanics. A Fourier transform turns a signal in time into the same signal in frequency. Nothing is added. Nothing is lost. The object stays; the projection changes. And a good projection makes visible what the old one hid.

The Vacuum.Net theory is such a projection. Its picture is a fishnet: one thread, knotted into meshes, mesh upon mesh, to depths no eye reaches. Every element of that picture — the single thread, the rule that only closed windings persist, the three-state register at each crossing, the ladder of allowed depths, the remainder that never settles, constants that vary with the state of the medium, the split between a fixed address layer and a loaded tension layer — exists in standard physics today. Each carries an established name, a published derivation, and in most cases a working device.

The essay proceeds in six steps. Each step takes one axiom or theorem of the Vacuum.Net theory and shows the standard result it transforms. All numbers needed to follow the argument are computed in the text. The reader needs no external source to check a single step. The closing section then answers the applications question. If the theory adds no new substance, its physical applications cannot be inventions either. They are re-projections: known effects, aimed differently. That is exactly what they turn out to be.

2. Step one — one substance: the thread

The Vacuum.Net theory begins with one strand. Everything is a configuration of that strand. There is no second ingredient.

Standard physics made this move a century ago. In quantum field theory there are no little balls. An electron is an excitation of the electron field. A photon is an excitation of the electromagnetic field. "Particle" is the name of a stable pattern in a continuous substrate. The substrate is everywhere; the pattern is local. That is the textbook position since the 1930s.

Two further results tighten the picture. Sakharov showed in 1967 that gravity need not be fundamental. It can arise as the elasticity of the vacuum itself — the way the medium resists being deformed. Volovik showed, over three decades of work on superfluid helium-3, that an ordinary laboratory condensate reproduces the structures of high-energy physics: effective metrics, effective gauge fields, effective horizons, chiral fermions. His conclusion is explicit: the vacuum behaves as a condensed-matter medium, and the "fundamental" laws are its low-energy collective modes.

The transformation is now a single sentence. Draw the field as a line. The field of quantum field theory, the elastic vacuum of Sakharov, the condensate of Volovik — represented one-dimensionally, as a thread that can pass over itself, under itself, or not at all. Nothing has been asserted that the sources do not assert. Only the drawing has changed.

3. Step two — closure: why only knots persist

The second axiom states: only what closes, remains. An open winding relaxes and is gone. A closed winding cannot be undone without cutting the thread. Its shape is its memory.

This is topological stability, and it is one of the oldest ideas in field physics. Kelvin proposed in 1867 that atoms are knotted vortices in the ether — stable precisely because a knot in a continuous medium cannot untie itself. The ether fell; the mechanism survived. Skyrme showed in 1961 that nucleons can be built as topological solitons of a pion field: their baryon number is a winding number, conserved not by a force but by the impossibility of continuous unwinding. Faddeev and Niemi showed in 1997 that knotted solitons — configurations classified by the Hopf invariant — are stable solutions of a definite field theory. Flux quantization in superconductors is the same fact in the laboratory: a closed loop of superconductor traps magnetic flux in integer units, because the phase of the condensate must return to itself around the loop. The trapped flux does not leak. It is protected by closure.

And the electron itself has been read this way. Williamson and van der Mark proposed in 1997 that the electron is a photon confined on a closed double-loop path: light, closed on itself, appearing as charge, spin and rest mass. Whatever one thinks of the model's details, its logic is the standard logic above — persistence through closure.

The transformation: rename topological protection "closure," and rename the conserved winding numbers "the memory of the winding." The physics is identical. Conservation by topology means exactly this: the configuration remembers how it was made, because no local process can forget it.

4. Step three — the three-state register

At every self-crossing the thread does one of three things: it passes over, passes under, or does not cross. Three states. The Vacuum.Net theory takes this trit — the balanced set $\{-1, 0, +1\}$ — as its address register.

Three known results stand behind this choice.

First, knot theory itself counts in threes. The simplest nontrivial knot, the trefoil, is proved distinct from the unknot by tricolorability: its arcs can be painted with three colors under a local rule, and the unknot's cannot. The first invariant that separates something from nothing is a three-coloring.

Second, rotation physics counts to 4π, and the thread explains why. A spin-½ object returns to itself only after 720 degrees, not 360. The demonstration is Dirac's belt trick: a belt fixed at both ends acquires a twist under one full turn that a second full turn removes. The double cover of the rotation group — SU(2) over SO(3) — is a statement about a band, a strip, a thread with orientation. Spinor physics is thread physics, drawn abstractly.

Third, base three is the cheapest number system, and this is a computed fact, not an aesthetic one. The cost of representing N in radix r scales as $r/\ln r$: the number of digit positions times the number of symbols per position. The function $r/\ln r$ is minimized at $r = e \approx 2.718$. Among integers: $2/\ln 2 =$

2.885, 3/ln 3 = 2.731, 4/ln 4 = 2.885. Three wins. Balanced ternary adds two structural gifts: negation is digit-wise mirror-flip (no minus sign needed), and rounding is truncation. A working computer, the Soviet Setun (1958), ran on exactly this arithmetic.

The transformation: read the three crossing-states as the three digits of balanced ternary. The address of a winding is then its crossing sequence, and the address space at depth n grows as 3^n. Nothing here departs from the sources. Knot theory supplied the three states; number theory certified the base; a built machine proved it computes.

5. Step four — two clocks, one ladder, and the comma

Now the central derivation. The net counts in two languages at once. The address layer counts in threes: windings. The tension layer counts in twos: charge and discharge. A configuration is stable only where both counts close together.

They never close exactly. The condition for joint closure is 3^p = 2^q for integers p, q — equivalently, $\log_2 3$ = q/p rational. But $\log_2 3$ = 1.5849625… is irrational. So exact closure is impossible, and the best a finite system can do is a best rational approximation. Number theory lists these approximations completely: they are the convergents of the continued fraction of $\log_2 3$, which reads [1; 1, 1, 2, 2, 3, 1, 5, 2, 23, …]. The convergents are:

1/1, 2/1, 3/2, 8/5, 19/12, 65/41, 84/53, 485/306, …

Read the denominators: 1, 1, 2, 5, 12, 41, 53, 306. This is the ladder of allowed closure depths. Between the rungs, nothing is stable — a mathematical theorem about best approximations, not a physical postulate.

Every rung leaves a remainder. At depth 12 the remainder has been audible for two and a half millennia. Twelve steps of ratio 3 against nineteen of ratio 2: 3^{12} = 531,441 and 2^{19} = 524,288, and their ratio is 531,441 / 524,288 = 1.013643… — the Pythagorean comma, the 1.36 percent by which twelve perfect fifths overshoot the octave cycle. Every piano tuner distributes it; no tuning removes it. Each higher rung shrinks the remainder; none annihilates it. The comma is inextinguishable because $\log_2 3$ is irrational — again theorem, not postulate.

Standard physics knows this entire structure under its own names. When two oscillators with incommensurate frequencies couple, they lock onto rational frequency ratios; the locking regions are Arnold tongues, and as coupling grows the locked ratios fill out a devil's staircase ordered exactly by the Farey/convergent hierarchy — the strongest locking at the best rational approximations. This was worked out for circle maps in the 1980s and measured in fluids, in driven junctions, in heart tissue. The complementary theorem is KAM (Kolmogorov, Arnold, Moser): motions with sufficiently irrational frequency ratios survive perturbation; rational and near-rational ratios resonate and break up. The solar system is the display case — the Kirkwood gaps in the asteroid belt sit at the rational ratios with Jupiter, swept clean by resonance, while the "most irrational" ratios persist.

The transformation: the Vacuum.Net ladder is mode-locking applied to the pair (3, 2) — the address count against the tension count. The allowed depths are the convergent denominators. The comma is the frustration that mode-locking never removes. And frustration as a motor is itself standard: in spin glasses and incommensurate crystals, the impossibility of satisfying all constraints at once is precisely what generates structure, slow dynamics and history-dependence. A net that closed exactly would stop. The comma keeps it running. Known mathematics; known physics; new projection.

6. Step five — constants as state functions of the medium

The fourth axiom says: the "constants" of physics are state functions of the local vacuum, the way elastic moduli are state functions of a steel specimen. Universality is the limiting case of a slowly varying medium.

Standard physics already says most of this, in three registers.

First, the renormalization group. Coupling "constants" run with energy scale; this is measured, not conjectured — the fine-structure constant is 1/137.036 at low energy and about 1/127 at the Z-boson scale. Wilson's framework, which earned the 1982 Nobel Prize, treats every law as an effective law valid at a scale, with coefficients that flow. "Constant" already means "constant within a context."

Second, condensed matter. Inside a crystal an electron moves with an effective mass set by the lattice — sometimes a fraction of, sometimes many times, its vacuum mass. Inside a dielectric, light moves at c/n. Every material is a small universe with its own constants, and those constants are state functions of the medium. Analog gravity makes the point sharp: Unruh showed in 1981 that sound in a flowing fluid obeys the equation of a field in curved spacetime, horizon included. The metric of general relativity can be a constitutive property of a laboratory medium.

Third, the astronomical hints. Dirac raised the large-number question in 1937; Webb and collaborators reported in 2011 spectroscopic evidence for a spatial variation of the fine-structure constant at the 10^{-5} level. The observation remains contested. The point here is only that "do the constants vary with context?" is a live, instrumented question inside standard physics, with dedicated telescope programs and atomic-clock comparisons.

The transformation: promote the running of couplings and the state-dependence of material constants from special cases to the general reading. Write $g = g(\chi)$, a constitutive relation between the interaction strength and a dimensionless state variable of the vacuum. This is the acoustoelastic effect — stress changes sound speed in steel, a standard NDT technique with the Murnaghan third-order constants behind it — applied to the vacuum condensate. One known coincidence then reads naturally: the acceleration scale below which galactic rotation curves flatten sits numerically at $a_0 \approx cH_0/2\pi \approx 1.1 \times 10^{-10}$ m/s², a fact noted by Milgrom in 1983 and never explained. In the transformed projection it marks the crossover of the constitutive curve $g(\chi)$ — a materials-science reading of a materials-science-shaped fact.

7. Step six — the two layers: address and tension

The last piece is the two-layer law. Backward along the thread, everything is fixed: every closure has a unique address, and even irreversible loss has an address where it happened. Forward along the thread, nothing is fixed: there is only loading — tension building toward discharge — and the forecast is probability per layer. Time is nothing but this difference in reading direction.

Both halves are standard.

The backward half is thermodynamics. The past is what left records; records are entropy spent; the arrow of time is the direction in which the ledger fills. That losses are booked, not leaked, is the content of entropy accounting since Clausius: dissipation is production with a location, a magnitude and a time stamp.

The forward half is the physics of loaded systems, and it is the best-instrumented physics on Earth. Self-organized criticality (Bak, Tang, Wiesenfeld, 1987): slowly driven systems load tension and release it in discharges whose sizes follow power laws — sandpiles, solar flares, earthquakes with their Gutenberg–Richter statistics. Stick-slip friction: load builds smoothly, releases suddenly, and the release is statistically forecastable but individually not. ENSO: Jin's recharge-oscillator model (1997) reads El Niño as the slow charging of equatorial heat content followed by discharge — the loading variable predicts the discharge, the discharge itself picks its moment. And each of these systems obeys the same horizon rule: a layer forecasts on the timescale of its own cycle. Daily loading warns days ahead; annual loading warns years ahead; neither sees the other's horizon.

The transformation: name the record side "address layer" and the loaded side "tension layer," and state the horizon rule as a law of the net. Weather forecasting, seismic hazard, ENSO prediction and credit-cycle analysis were already doing the calculation. The projection unifies their common form.

8. The dictionary

The six steps compress into a dictionary. Field, condensate, elastic vacuum — the thread. Topological protection, conserved winding number — closure and memory. Trit at the crossing — tricolorability plus the SU(2) double cover plus radix-three economy. Ladder of depths 2, 5, 12, 41, 53, 306 — the convergent denominators of $\log_2 3$, selected by mode-locking, protected by KAM. The comma — the residue of an irrational ratio, the frustration that drives dynamics. Constants as $g(\chi)$ — the renormalization group and material constitutive relations, generalized. Address layer versus tension layer — thermodynamic record versus self-organized-critical loading, with the horizon rule.

Every left-hand term is Vacuum.Net vocabulary. Every right-hand term has a citation, an equation and in most cases a device. The theory's contribution is not any single entry. It is the observation that the entries describe one object, and the choice of a projection — one thread, drawn as a fishnet — in which that unity is visible at a glance.

9. Where the applications come from

Now the payoff of the "nothing new" claim. If the theory is a transformation, its applications must be transformations too: known effects, re-aimed. They are. Six families, each anchored in a working technology.

Protection by closure. Topological quantum computing stores information in braids of anyons, immune to local noise because a braid cannot be locally untied. Topological insulators conduct on their edges for the same reason. In the transformed projection this entire engineering discipline is closure engineering: building windings whose depth exceeds the reach of the disturbance. The design rule generalizes to any carrier — photonic, acoustic, mechanical metamaterial — because the protection was never electronic; it was topological.

Dialing the constants. Feshbach resonances let cold-atom experimenters tune the interaction strength of a gas continuously, through zero, from attractive to repulsive — g under external control. Metamaterials assign a designed permittivity and permeability point by point; transformation optics literally engineers an effective metric, cloaks included. Analog-gravity platforms build horizons in flowing condensates and have measured their thermal radiation. In the transformed projection these are all one activity: setting χ locally and letting $g(\chi)$ follow. The constitutive reading says where to look next — for the vacuum analog of acoustoelastic measurement: reading the local state of the medium from the local value of its "constants," as one reads stress in steel from sound speed.

The ladder as an instrument. Mode-locking is already precision engineering. The Josephson voltage standard works because a driven junction locks its voltage to sharp rational steps (Shapiro steps) — the devil's staircase, used as a ruler. Mode-locked lasers turn the same locking into femtosecond combs. Phase-locked loops run every radio. In the transformed projection, the ladder of closure depths is measurable wherever two incommensurate counts couple — and the theory's own encoder test (an address archive at depth 19 that must jump to 41 or 53 as it grows, because 19/12's successor convergents are 65/41 and 84/53) is a Shapiro-step experiment run on stored knowledge instead of on a junction.

Resonance management. The KAM side of the ladder is avoidance engineering. Accelerator designers steer working points away from rational tunes; spacecraft navigators exploit and avoid orbital resonances; turbine designers detune blades from forcing frequencies. The transformed statement — "between the rungs nothing is stable" — is the same design rule stated once for all layers, and it predicts where deliberately placed structure will hold (on convergents) and where it will shake apart (between them).

Loading gauges. Seismic hazard maps, avalanche control, ENSO indices and financial stress instruments all read loading to bound discharge. The transformed projection adds the two-layer discipline: loading reads discharge, never the discharged value itself; information flows only from deep layers to shallow ones; each layer warns on its own closure horizon. Two such gauges built on this discipline — a yearly-scale credit layer and a daily-scale market layer — have survived blind testing. They contain no new physics. They contain the old physics of the sandpile, pointed at ledgers.

Ternary hardware and content addressing. Setun proved balanced-ternary computing in 1958; energy-efficiency arguments have revived ternary logic research in the memristor era. Kanerva's sparse distributed memory (1988) showed that a memory can use content as address in a vast, mostly empty space — independently rediscovering the address-layer architecture from the mathematics of high-dimensional spaces. The transformed projection joins the two: an addressing machine whose register is the trit and whose address is the winding. That machine is running; it is an application of 1958 and 1988, not of 2026.

The pattern across all six families is uniform. No application requires a phenomenon outside the standard literature. Each requires only the transformed projection to see that a technique proven in one layer — junctions, atoms, crystals, sandpiles — is a technique of the net, and therefore portable to every layer where the same closure structure holds.

10. Status

Three statements, three statuses. That the six steps each rest on established, cited physics: fact, checkable in the references below. That the six describe one object under one projection: a reading — the essay's thesis, judged by its coherence and its yield. That the portability of techniques across layers will keep delivering instruments: an extrapolation, with the encoder depth-jump and the two loading gauges as its running tests. The theory's own foundational paper carries the open calculations (the coarse-graining that must produce the rung structure, 2π, and the dimension of stable closure); nothing in this essay depends on their outcome. The transformation stands on the sources.

Annotated references

Sakharov, A. D. (1967). "Vacuum quantum fluctuations in curved space and the theory of gravitation." Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR 177, 70; reprinted Gen. Rel. Grav. 32, 365 (2000). Why read? Two pages in which gravity becomes the elasticity of the vacuum — the founding document of the "medium" reading. Reading advice: read the reprint with Visser's commentary.

Volovik, G. E. (2003). *The Universe in a Helium Droplet*. Oxford University Press. Why read? The full case that a laboratory condensate reproduces the structures of fundamental physics — effective metrics, gauge fields, horizons, fermions. The strongest single source behind Step one. Reading advice: chapters 1 and 32 frame the argument; the middle is a reference work.

Thomson, W. (Lord Kelvin) (1867). "On Vortex Atoms." Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh 6, 94–105. Why read? The original closure argument: matter as knots in a medium, stable because knots cannot untie. The ether died; the mechanism did not.

Skyrme, T. H. R. (1961). "A non-linear field theory." Proceedings of the Royal Society A 260, 127–138. Why read? Nucleons as topological solitons, baryon number as winding number. Conservation by topology, in a theory still used in nuclear physics today.

Faddeev, L. & Niemi, A. (1997). "Stable knot-like structures in classical field theory." Nature 387, 58–61. Why read? Knotted solitons classified by the Hopf invariant, shown stable in a concrete field theory. The direct ancestor of "only what closes, remains."

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, 133. Why read? The electron as light on a closed double loop — closure applied to the best-measured particle there is. Reading advice: read it as a logic, not as a finished model.

Spencer-Brown, G. (1969). *Laws of Form*. Allen & Unwin. Why read? The calculus that starts from a single distinction — the formal grammar of "the thread crosses or it does not." Reading advice: the first two chapters and the notes suffice.

Kauffman, L. H. (1991). *Knots and Physics*. World Scientific. Why read? The bridge between knot invariants and physical models, including tricolorability and state sums. The mathematical toolbox of Steps two and three. Reading advice: Part I is self-contained.

Rowlands, P. (2007). *Zero to Infinity: The Foundations of Physics*. World Scientific, Series on Knots and Everything. Why read? The zero-totality principle: the universe as a rewrite system whose sum is always nothing. The source of the closure-as-bookkeeping reading, and of the nilpotent condition $Q^2 = 0 \Longleftrightarrow E^2 = p^2 + m^2$.

Knuth, D. E. (1997). *The Art of Computer Programming*, Vol. 2, §4.1. Why read? The standard treatment of balanced ternary — "perhaps the prettiest number system of all" — with the negation and truncation properties used in Step three.

Hayes, B. (2001). "Third Base." American Scientist 89, 490–494. Why read? The radix-economy computation r/ln r in full, the case for base three, and the story of Setun. Ten pages; everything Step three needs.

Brusentsov, N. P. & Ramil Alvarez, J. (2011). "Ternary Computers: The Setun and the Setun 70." In *Perspectives on Soviet and Russian Computing*, Springer. Why read? The built proof: a working balanced-ternary computer, 1958, Moscow State University. Hardware, not speculation.

Khinchin, A. Ya. (1964). *Continued Fractions*. University of Chicago Press. Why read? The complete theory of best rational approximation — why the convergents of $\log_2 3$ are the only candidates for joint closure, and why nothing between them qualifies. Reading advice: chapters I–II carry the essay's Step four.

Jensen, M. H., Bak, P. & Bohr, T. (1983). "Complete devil's staircase, fractal dimension, and universality of mode-locking structure in the circle map." Physical Review Letters 50, 1637. Why read? Mode-locking worked out: Arnold tongues, the Farey ordering, the staircase — the standard-physics form of the ladder.

Arnold, V. I. (1963). "Proof of a theorem of A. N. Kolmogorov…" Russian Mathematical Surveys 18, 9. (KAM theorem.) Why read? The complementary theorem: sufficiently irrational ratios survive, rational ones resonate and break. With the Kirkwood gaps as the sky's own demonstration. Reading advice: read a modern exposition first; the original is dense.

Barbour, J. M. (1951). *Tuning and Temperament: A Historical Survey*. Michigan State College Press. Why read? The Pythagorean comma and its two-thousand-year management history — the oldest continuously operated remainder ledger in human culture, and the depth-12 rung heard rather than computed.

Wilson, K. G. (1983). "The renormalization group and critical phenomena." Reviews of Modern Physics 55, 583 (Nobel lecture). Why read? Constants that run, laws that are effective at a scale — the mainstream half of Step five, from its author.

Unruh, W. G. (1981). "Experimental black-hole evaporation?" Physical Review Letters 46, 1351. Why read? Sound in a flowing fluid obeys curved-spacetime equations. The metric as a constitutive property of a medium — measured since, horizon radiation included.

Webb, J. K. et al. (2011). "Indications of a spatial variation of the fine structure constant." Physical Review Letters 107, 191101. Why read? The contested but instrumented claim that α varies across the sky. Whatever its fate, it proves the question "are constants state functions?" belongs to observational physics. Reading advice: read the criticism alongside.

Milgrom, M. (1983). "A modification of the Newtonian dynamics as a possible alternative to the hidden mass hypothesis." Astrophysical Journal 270, 365. Why read? The paper that measured the crossover scale a_0 and noted its numerical proximity to cH_0 — the coincidence Step five re-reads as a constitutive fact of the medium.

Chin, C., Grimm, R., Julienne, P. & Tiesinga, E. (2010). "Feshbach resonances in ultracold gases." Reviews of Modern Physics 82, 1225. Why read? The complete manual for dialing an interaction constant with a magnetic field. g under experimental control — the application family "dialing the constants," already routine.

Bak, P., Tang, C. & Wiesenfeld, K. (1987). "Self-organized criticality: An explanation of 1/f noise." Physical Review Letters 59, 381. Why read? The loading–discharge machine in its canonical form: slowly driven, suddenly released, power-law sized. The physics behind every loading gauge in Section 9.

Jin, F.-F. (1997). "An equatorial ocean recharge paradigm for ENSO. Part I." Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences 54, 811–829. Why read? El Niño as charge and discharge of stored heat — the best-instrumented two-layer system on Earth, and the model whose form the tension layer generalizes.

Shapiro, S. (1963). "Josephson currents in superconducting tunneling." Physical Review Letters 11, 80. Why read? Mode-locking as a working instrument: the voltage steps that now define the volt. The ladder, used daily as a ruler in every national metrology institute.

Nayak, C., Simon, S., Stern, A., Freedman, M. & Das Sarma, S. (2008). "Non-Abelian anyons and topological quantum computation." Reviews of Modern Physics 80, 1083. Why read? Closure as an information technology: computation protected by braiding. The application family "protection by closure," in its most developed form.

Kanerva, P. (1988). *Sparse Distributed Memory*. MIT Press. Why read? Content as address in a vast, mostly empty space — the address layer, derived independently from high-dimensional mathematics. Reading advice: the first three chapters give the structure.

Konstapel, J. (2026). "The Vacuum.Net Theory: Foundational Paper," 6th/7th edition. constable.blog. Why read? The axioms, theorems and open calculations that this essay transforms back into their sources — five axioms, the ternary ground, the five-status ledger. Reading advice: Part II ("The Ternary Ground") is self-contained.