Why The Universe Has a Lot of Time

The Infinite Ladder, the Indelible Residue, and the Address of the Universe

J. Konstapel, Leiden, 3 September 2026

Third paper in the closure series, after "The Comma in the Net" (constable.blog, 2 September 2026) and "The Comma in the Sky".

Abstract

Two earlier papers established a candidate law and paid its first debt. *The Comma in the Net* proposed that closure depth in the Vacuum.Net theory is quantized: a structure built on a doubling ladder and a tripling ladder can close only at the depths where the two ladders return to record-near coincidence — the continued-fraction convergents of $\log_2 3$, giving the pairs (2,3), (5,8), (12,19), (41,65), (53,84), (306,485), … — and that every closure carries an indelible residue, of which the Pythagorean comma is the first famous case. *The Comma in the Sky* took the law to the top rung and found the cosmological end already published inside accepted physics. The present essay answers the two questions the ladder itself now forces. **Is the sequence finite or infinite** — does it end because the residue eventually becomes too small to matter? And **what does a universe do with a residue** — where does the part that never closes go? The answers are sharper than expected, and each carries its status openly. The sequence is infinite as mathematics (theorem). It never ends physically through unreadability, because of an asymmetric race that number theory itself referees: the residue is protected against disappearance — it can shrink only polynomially in depth (Baker's theorem on linear forms in logarithms) — while the discriminating power of a closure grows exponentially (one assumption, stated and flagged), so the net perceives its own deficit ever more sharply as it deepens, never more faintly. A proven jewel marks the ladder's start: by Mihăilescu's theorem, the closure that misses perfection by exactly one unit occurs exactly once in the infinite sequence — at the very first rung, $3^2 - 2^3 = 1$ — and never again. The residue is therefore not waste but the motor: the closed part is address, the open part is tension, and tension is the only layer in which anything happens. The sequence does end *in use*, through capacity: the information content of the observable universe, of order 10^{120}, would naively require closure depth $n \approx 252$ — which lies in the forbidden band — so the universe sits at the record rung (306, 485), with twenty-six orders of magnitude of excess capacity, the predicted fingerprint of quantization now given as a number. And the next rung, $n = 665$, will not be needed for roughly 10^{13} times the present age of the universe. That is the title's answer: the universe's address is fixed, its residue is eternal, and we have a lot of time.

0. The ground this essay stands on — read first

Nothing in this essay floats free of physics, and the reader deserves to see the anchoring before the argument. The Vacuum.Net theory is a **rederivation of existing physics** from a single ground — one strand, no outside, one closure rule — in the same sense in which Rowlands rederived established physics from zero-totality and the nilpotent condition and recovered the Dirac formalism from it. A rederivation proves itself by landing on the accepted equations, and where this one departs from the received picture, it departs at exactly one identified point: the interpretive step taken after the Michelson–Morley null result of 1887. From that null result two conclusions were drawn — that the light-carrying medium does not exist, and, deeper, that what holds locally on Earth holds universally. Both are logic, not measurement. An instrument built of the medium cannot detect its own motion through the medium — every rod and clock contracts along with what it measures — so the null result is precisely what a medium theory *predicts*, not evidence against one. And the promotion of one local null measurement to a universal principle is an extrapolation the data never contained. The measured counter-fact now exists: the CMB dipole defines an observationally preferred rest frame through which the Earth moves at ~370 km/s — the drift the 1887 instrument could not see, measured a century later — a frame modern cosmology uses daily while the received framework denies its significance in principle. Condensed-matter physics has meanwhile demonstrated the mechanism in the laboratory (Volovik): excitations inside a medium obey an emergent, exact Lorentz symmetry with the medium's signal speed as limit, while the medium itself has a rest frame the excitations cannot internally detect. Correct that single interpretive step — the medium exists; Lorentz symmetry is local and emergent, not universal — and the Balanced Three and the Balanced Tree are **consequences of current physics under a different reading of one experiment, not additions to it**. Every load-bearing mathematical statement in what follows is a published theorem (Khinchin, Baker, Mihăilescu, Hurwitz — each cited); every physical anchor is a measurement (the MAZE depth 19; the galactic scale 1.2×10^{-10} m s^{-2}; the dimensional ceiling 8); every hypothesis is labelled as one and carries a named death route. The reader who wants to dismiss this essay must therefore dismiss a specific theorem, a specific measurement, or a specific labelled hypothesis — and the essay says, at every step, which of the three is on the table.

1. Two questions the ladder forces

The essay is self-contained, so everything needed is stated from scratch; readers of the earlier papers may skim §2–3.

Once one accepts, even provisionally, that closure depths are quantized on the convergent ladder, two questions become unavoidable, and they are the questions of this paper.

First: **is the ladder finite or infinite?** The residues shrink along the sequence — 11.1%, 5.35%, 1.35%, 1.15%, 0.21%, 0.10%, … Is there a depth at which the residue becomes so small that the net itself can no longer register it, so that closure becomes, for all physical purposes, perfect — and the ladder ends not by prohibition but by unreadability?

Second: **what does the universe do with a residue?** If no closure ever closes completely, then every stored structure — a memory, a human being, the universe itself — permanently carries an unreconciled remainder. Is that remainder waste, noise to be minimized? Or does it do something?

Both questions turn out to be answerable by careful estimation, using proven number theory for one side of each balance and one clearly flagged physical assumption for the other. The result is a reasoned estimate — not a proof, and the essay will not pretend otherwise — but an estimate whose load-bearing parts are theorems.

2. The two ladders and the one rule (restated)

The Vacuum.Net theory runs on two ladders. The dimensional ladder doubles — 1, 2, 4, 8 — the same doubling that generates the four normed division algebras and stops, by Hurwitz's theorem, at eight. The address ladder triples: the elementary symbol of the net is the balanced trit $\{-1, 0, +1\}$, and each addressing layer multiplies the number of distinguishable addresses by three. And the theory has a single existence rule: nothing is stored, nothing exists as a thing, unless it returns to itself. A winding that returns is a knot; a period that closes is an address. Closure is the criterion, and the net contains no second kind of closure at any scale.

Two ladders with steps ×2 and ×3 never meet exactly, because $\log_2 3$ is irrational. They meet almost, at depths fixed by the continued-fraction convergents of $\log_2 3$:

3/2, 8/5, 19/12, 65/41, 84/53, 485/306, 1054/665, …

giving the closure pairs (n, m) — n triplings against m doublings — with computed residues:

n	m	residue 2^m/ 3^n	mismatc h
2	3	0.8889	11.1 %
5	8	1.0535	5.35 %
12	19	0.9865	1.35 %
41	65	1.0115	1.15 %
53	84	0.9979	0.21 %
306	485	1.0010	0.10 %

The record property is a standard theorem (Khinchin): no depth between consecutive convergents approximates better with a smaller denominator. The (12,19) residue is the Pythagorean comma — twelve pure fifths overshooting seven octaves by 1.35%, the debt every tuned piano carries. The physical hypothesis of the series is that the net realises these record near-closures as its only stable closure depths; its falsifiable prediction is the depth jump of the MAZE encoder, 19 → 65 or 41, with the band 20–64 (bar 41) forbidden.

One structural detail, usually overlooked, matters below: the residue **alternates in sign**. At (12,19) the doubling side falls short (0.9865); at (41,65) it overshoots (1.0115); at (53,84) it falls short again. The two ladders overtake each other in turn — the structure under-rotates and over-rotates alternately, which is the behaviour of a winding, not of an error term.

3. The mathematical answer: the sequence is infinite (theorem)

As mathematics, the first question is closed immediately. Because $\log_2 3$ is irrational, its continued fraction never terminates; there are infinitely many convergents, hence infinitely many record closures, and the residue — while shrinking — never reaches zero at any finite depth. Perfect closure does not exist on any rung. This much is theorem, three centuries old in its tools.

But the physical question is different, and sharper: not whether the residue reaches zero, but whether it ever drops below what the net itself can register. A remainder smaller than the net's own finest distinction would be physically indistinguishable from zero; closure would be perfect *for the net*, and the ladder would end in practice while continuing on paper. That is the possibility the next section tests.

4. The race: why the ladder never ends through unreadability

The test is a race between two rates, and the two runners are of provably different kinds.

How fast does the comma shrink? (theorem.) Naive inspection of the table suggests rapid decay, but the truth is stronger and stranger. The residue in logarithmic form is $\varepsilon(n,m) = |n\cdot\ln3 - m\cdot\ln2|$, a linear form in the logarithms of algebraic numbers, and for such forms Baker's theorem provides an *effective lower bound*: there exist computable constants C, ϰ such that

$$\varepsilon(n, m) > C / n^{\varkappa}$$

for all pairs. The comma can shrink only **polynomially** in depth. It is not merely true that it never reaches zero; it is mathematically *protected* against fast disappearance. Between the record rungs of our table, the mismatch drops from 1.35% at n = 12 to 0.10% at n = 306 — twenty-five times the depth buys barely a factor of thirteen in closure. The residue is one of the most durable objects in the entire construction.

How fast does the net's resolution grow? (assumption, flagged.) A closure at depth n distinguishes 3^n addresses; the natural measure of its finest relative distinction is therefore 3^{-n} — one part in its own address space. This is a theory-internal assumption, not a theorem: it is one of the quantities the programme's named missing calculation (the coarse-graining of the knot network) must eventually deliver or correct. It is flagged as the load-bearing non-proven step of this section, and everything below inherits that flag.

The verdict. Polynomial against exponential is not a race. Already at (5,8) the comma is 5.35% against a resolution of 1/243 ≈ 0.4%; at (12,19) it is 1.35% against 0.0002%; and the gap **widens** with every rung, forever. The conclusion inverts the intuition that motivated the question: the net does not gradually lose sight of its own deficit — it sees the deficit ever more sharply as it deepens. A deeper memory does not approach perfection; it approaches ever finer awareness of its imperfection. **The ladder never ends through unreadability.** If it ends at all, it ends for a different reason (§6).

The jewel at the first rung (theorem). One exact statement decorates the head of the ladder. At (2,3) the absolute deficit is exactly one unit: $3^2 - 2^3 = 9 - 8 = 1$. Mihăilescu's theorem — the proven Catalan conjecture (2002) — states that 8 and 9 are the *only* consecutive perfect powers that exist. The closure that misses perfection by a single quantum therefore occurs exactly once in the infinite sequence, at the very first rung, and never again: beyond it the absolute deficit always exceeds one and grows without bound, even as the relative mismatch shrinks. The ladder opens with the closest call it will ever have.

5. What the universe does with a residue

Now the second question, and here the theory's own two-layer law does the work. The law states: the closed part of any closure is **address** — topology, frozen at the moment of closure, never changing; the open part is **tension** — dynamic, treatable, the only layer in which anything happens. Read the residue through that law and its role reverses: the comma is not the waste product of closure. **It is the motor.**

Consider what a perfect closure would be. Nothing left to equalise; no gradient; no throughflow; an address with no life on it. Frozen topology and nothing else — in every meaningful sense, dead. The comma is the reason anything happens *after* a closure: every memory, every human being, every star carries its unreconcilable remainder, and carrying it is what the structure's ongoing existence consists of. Section 4's verdict now acquires its meaning: the universe is not a system unfortunately unable to reach equilibrium — it is a system mathematically guaranteed a permanent, ever-more-finely-felt disequilibrium. Baker's theorem, read physically, is a guarantee that the tension never runs out.

Three things a universe can concretely do with its residue, in ascending order of speculation:

Carry it (two-layer law, theory-internal). The residue persists as permanent tension inside the closure — a comma's worth of stress built into every stored structure. This is the first paper's claim, unchanged.

Reduce it by deepening (derived direction). Each jump to the next record rung is a residue reduction: 1.35 → 1.15 → 0.21 → 0.10. Growth of the net is how it processes its own remainder — which gives the ladder an intrinsic direction, an arrow, without importing any separate law of time. The net deepens *because* it does not close, and each deepening closes better without ever closing.

Pay it out as expansion (hypothesis, stated fully so it cannot be smuggled in later as a result). The second paper of this series recorded a geometric reading in which the two closures of the theory — the vertical (n,m) ladder and the circular 2π of one completed winding — are components of a single spiral, with the comma as the phase-radial mismatch a spiral necessarily carries. On that reading, the radial progress of the universe is literally what happens to the non-closing part: **the universe expands because it does not close.** The Hubble flow is then not a background against which the comma exists; the Hubble flow *is* the comma, paid out. This is consistent with the cosmological end of the series — Rowlands' relation $a = H_0^2 r$, in which acceleration and recession are one process — but nothing in this paragraph is derived. It is the shape of the missing derivation, on record.

One earlier speculation must now be retracted, because §4 kills it. A previous discussion in this programme entertained a "closure death by perfection": an end state in which the universe's comma drops below its own tension quantum and nothing remains to equalise — extinction not by heat death but by perfect closure. The estimate of §4 rules this out under its stated assumption: the comma's polynomial protection against the resolution's exponential growth means the deficit becomes *more* legible with depth, not less. There is no perfection to die into. What replaces the retracted picture is starker and, arguably, more interesting: a universe that carries its comma forever and feels it ever more sharply.

6. Where the ladder does end: capacity, and the universe's address

The sequence is infinite in principle and indelible in residue — but it is finite *in use*, and the bound is computable.

The information content of the observable universe is bounded, by the holographic bound and by Lloyd's direct estimate of the universe's computational capacity, at roughly **10^{120} bits/operations**. A closure carrying that content needs $3^n \geq 10^{120}$, hence

$$n \geq 120 / \log_{10} 3 \approx \mathbf{252.}$$

And 252 lies deep in forbidden territory: the nearest admissible n-rungs are 53 (hopelessly small, $3^{53} \approx 10^{25}$) and **306**. Under the quantization law the universe cannot sit at its naive depth; it sits at the record above it:

the universe's address is the rung (306, 485),

with capacity $3^{306} \approx 10^{146}$ — an overshoot of $3^{54} \approx \mathbf{10^{26}}$, twenty-six orders of magnitude of excess capacity. The earlier papers predicted that quantization always overshoots and called the overshoot its fingerprint; here the fingerprint becomes a number. If the law holds, the universe is running at one part in 10^{26} of its address space — a memory bought absurdly large because the smaller sizes were forbidden. (The residue at this rung, for completeness: 0.10%, the smallest comma any structure in the observable universe carries — and by §4, the most sharply felt.)

Two flags, honestly placed. The 10^{120} is an external import — holographic/Lloyd accounting within standard physics — and must eventually be re-derived inside the net's own dynamics; and the identification of "content" with occupied address space is the same resolution-type assumption as §4's. The estimate is a reasoned one, not a theorem.

7. Why we have a lot of time

The final step answers the title. When does the universe need its next address?

The next admissible n-rung after 306 is **665** (convergent 1054/665), with capacity $3^{665} \approx 10^{317}$. The universe outgrows its current rung when its content approaches 10^{146} — twenty-six orders of magnitude beyond today. If content grows with the horizon area, as holographic accounting has it — proportionally to t^2 — then a factor 10^{26} in content is a factor 10^{13} in time:

the universe will not need the jump 306 → 665 for roughly ten trillion times its present age.

The number should be read for its structure, not its digits — the growth law is an import, and a different one shifts the exponent. But the structural conclusion is robust against any polynomial growth law: because the rungs are exponentially spaced in capacity while content grows polynomially in time, the residence time on each successive rung is not constant but *enormously increasing*. The universe changed addresses relatively often when it was small; it will occupy (306, 485) for a period that dwarfs its entire history; and each future rung will hold it longer still. The ladder is infinite, the climbing slows forever, and no rung is ever the last.

That is the answer the two questions of §1 were converging on, and it earns the title honestly. The residue never becomes invisible — it is theorem-protected, felt more sharply at every depth, and it is the tension that everything alive in the net runs on. The ladder never ends — but its use slows so profoundly that the current address is, for every practical and impractical purpose, home. Nothing is about to close. Nothing is about to run out. **We have a lot of time.**

8. Status ledger

What is proven: the infinitude of the convergent ladder and its record property (Khinchin); the polynomial protection of the residue (Baker); the uniqueness of the one-quantum near-miss at the first rung (Mihăilescu); the residue table and its sign alternation (computation); Hurwitz's ceiling on the doubling ladder.

What is assumed, and flagged where used: that a depth-n closure's finest relative distinction is 3^{-n} (§4, §6) — awaiting the programme's named coarse-graining calculation, which must deliver the rung structure, the coupling 2π, and the dimension of stable closure in one derivation; that the universe's content is 10^{120} and grows as t^2 (§6–7) — standard holographic accounting, to be re-derived internally.

What is hypothesis, stated in full and not used as premise anywhere: the quantization law itself (stable closure only at convergent depths — the MAZE jump 19 → 65/41 is its test); the spiral reading in which expansion is the paid-out comma.

What is retracted: closure death by perfection — killed by the race of §4.

9. Conclusion

A question that began as a technical worry — does the ladder end because the leftover becomes too small? — turns out to have an answer with the shape of a worldview. The leftover cannot become too small: number theory forbids it, and the deepening net feels it ever more finely. The leftover is not a flaw in closure but the life of it: address is what a closure *is*, tension is what it *does*, and the comma is the guarantee that there is always something left to do. The universe, on this accounting, holds the address (306, 485) — bought 10^{2^6} sizes too large because the right size was forbidden — carries the smallest and sharpest comma in existence, and will not need to move for ten trillion of its own lifetimes. The first paper found the comma in every piano; the second found it in the sky; this one finds that it can never be lost, and that its permanence is not a sentence but an endowment. The books never balance. That is why there is time — and why there is anything at all.

Annotated references

Konstapel, J. (2026). The Comma in the Net — Why Closure Depth Is Quantized. constable.blog, 2 September 2026. The first paper of the series: the two ladders, the convergent pairs, the quantization hypothesis, the forbidden band, the 19 → 65/41 prediction, the residue as permanent tension. *Why read:* the law whose consequences this essay estimates.

Konstapel, J. (2026). The Comma in the Sky — The Universe as Closure. The second paper: Rowlands' critical value as the cosmological end of the closure law; the two closures (vertical (n,m), circular 2π); $a_0 \approx cH_0/2\pi$; the spiral hypothesis; the specification of the missing coarse-graining calculation. *Why read:* the top rung this essay assigns an address and a residence time.

Konstapel, J. (2026). The Vacuum.Net Theory: Foundational Paper. constable.blog. One strand, no outside, one closure rule; the trit; the two-layer law of address and tension. *Why read:* the framework in which the residue can be a motor rather than an error.

Khinchin, A. Ya. (1964). Continued Fractions. University of Chicago Press. The record-holder theorem: convergents are the best rational approximations, and nothing between them approximates better with a smaller denominator. *Why read:* the theorem that makes the ladder's rungs provably complete — the infinitude half of §3.

Baker, A. (1975). Transcendental Number Theory. Cambridge University Press. Effective lower bounds for linear forms in logarithms of algebraic numbers: $|n \cdot \ln 3 - m \cdot \ln 2| > C/n^\varkappa$. *Why read:* the theorem carrying §4 — the comma's polynomial protection against disappearance, the single strongest ingredient of this essay's argument.

Mihăilescu, P. (2004). Primary cyclotomic units and a proof of Catalan's conjecture. J. reine angew. Math. 572, 167–195. The proof that 8 and 9 are the only consecutive perfect powers. *Why read:* the jewel of §4 — the one-quantum near-closure occurs exactly once, at the first rung, and the theorem saying so is unconditional.

Hurwitz, A. (1898). Über die Composition der quadratischen Formen. Nachr. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen, 309–316. Why the doubling ladder of dimensions stops at eight. *Why read:* the closed top of the ×2 ladder, making (5,8) the last record the dimensional ladder itself can host.

Lloyd, S. (2002). Computational capacity of the universe. Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 237901. The estimate that the observable universe has performed $\sim 10^{120}$ operations on $\sim 10^{90}$ bits, with the holographic bound raising registerable bits to $\sim 10^{120}$. *Why read:* the external number behind §6's capacity bound — the input that fixes the universe's naive depth at ≈252.

't Hooft, G. (1993). Dimensional reduction in quantum gravity. arXiv:gr-qc/9310026; Susskind, L. (1995). The world as a hologram. J. Math. Phys. 36, 6377; Bekenstein, J. D. (1981). Universal upper bound on the entropy-to-energy ratio for bounded systems. Phys. Rev. D 23, 287. The holographic and entropy bounds behind area-scaling of content. *Why read:* the provenance of §7's growth law t^2 — and the place where an internal re-derivation must eventually take over.

Rowlands, P. (2013). A Critical Value for Dark Energy. arXiv:1306.4620. $\Omega_\Lambda = 2/3$, $\Lambda = 2H_0^2$, $a = H_0^2 r$, integrating exactly to the Hubble law — with the magnitude in print since 1979. *Why read:* the accepted-physics form of the top rung's dynamics, against which the spiral hypothesis of §5 must eventually be checked.

Salinas, F. (1577). De musica libri septem. Salamanca; Barbour, J. M. (1951). Tuning and Temperament. Michigan State College Press. The 19-tone division and the full history of practical life inside the closure table. *Why read:* three millennia of empirical work on the ladder's early rungs, done without knowing it was one — the humanities' share of the priority.

Lagarias, J. C. (1985). The 3x+1 problem and its generalizations. Amer. Math. Monthly 92, 3–23. The Collatz problem as the number-theoretic face of the same two ladders. *Why read:* a century of adjacency — multiply by three, divide by two — minus the concept of closure that organises it here.

Ma, S. et al. (2024). The Era of 1-bit LLMs: All Large Language Models are in 1.58 Bits. arXiv:2402.17764. Ternary-weight models named after $\log_2 3 = 1.58$. *Why read:* the nearest neighbour in machine learning — the exchange rate between two and three in daily industrial use, the closure depths still unasked.

Volovik, G. E. (2003). The Universe in a Helium Droplet. Oxford University Press. Emergent Lorentz symmetry for excitations inside a laboratory medium that itself possesses an undetectable-from-within rest frame. *Why read:* the mechanism of §0 demonstrated experimentally — the 1887 situation reproduced in a droplet, with the "wrong" conclusion visibly wrong.

Smoot, G. F., Gorenstein, M. V. & Muller, R. A. (1977). Detection of anisotropy in the cosmic blackbody radiation. Phys. Rev. Lett. 39, 898; Planck Collaboration I (2020). A&A 641, A1. The CMB dipole: the Earth's motion at ~370 km/s through an observationally preferred cosmic rest frame. *Why read:* the measured counter-fact of §0 — the drift the 1887 instrument could not see, on record for half a century.