

# Non-Thermal Field Coupling in Swirl–String Theory: Nuclear Access and Gravity Modulation

*Omar Iskandarani\**

November 17, 2025

Abstract

---

\* Independent Researcher, Groningen, The Netherlands  
Email: [info@omariskandarani.com](mailto:info@omariskandarani.com)  
ORCID: 0009-0006-1686-3961  
DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.xxx](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.xxx)

## Task 1: Nucleons and Nuclei as Knotted Swirl Strings in SST

SST Nuclear Modeling – Knotted Swirl Strings: In Swirl-String Theory (SST), every particle is a closed vortex filament (“swirl string”) in an incompressible fluid-like medium. Nucleons (protons, neutrons) are modeled as *composite knotted strings*: for example, the proton is a linked triple-knot  $p = (5_2 + 5_2 + 6_1)$  and the neutron  $n = (5_2 + 6_1 + 6_1)$ , corresponding to their quark content  $uud$  vs  $udd$ . These torus/hyperbolic knots carry topological quantum numbers (mass, charge, spin) as invariants of the string’s geometry. Atomic nuclei are then bound states of multiple linked swirl strings – essentially *linked or nested knots* representing each nucleon. The SST Canon describes nuclei as composite links with a built-in “periodic table” of allowed link structures. When knots link, their swirl flows intertwine, stabilizing the bound state and producing a small mass deficit (binding energy) relative to free nucleons. In SST interpretation, this mass defect is the *interaction energy* stored in shared swirl fields rather than in separate particles. Thus, rest mass arises from core swirl energy (kinetic energy of the fluid in a knotted vortex core), while binding energy reflects a reduction in total swirl energy when strings link (the swirling fields partially cancel or entrain each other). The core swirl energy density  $u = \frac{1}{2}\rho_{\text{core}}v_{\text{!}}^2$  at a string’s center is tied to its invariant mass, whereas inter-string linkages modify the effective swirl energy distribution, lowering the composite mass.

Swirl-Pressure and Swirl-Clock Effects: Each swirl string maintains a pressure profile in the fluid medium. Rapid circulation creates a low-pressure core (like a vortex in a fluid), which in SST acts analogously to a potential well. This swirl pressure gradient is central to SST’s gravity mechanism and internal forces. Indeed, integrating the fluid’s swirl-pressure around a vortex yields the “swirl Coulomb constant”  $\Lambda$ , which sets the strength of the *swirl-induced potential* (analogous to Coulomb or gravitational potential). In hydrogen,  $\Lambda = 4\pi\rho_mv$  comes out on the order of  $10^{-45}$  J·m – the correct scale for atomic binding when used in the swirl potential formula. Physically, this means a knotted swirl string (like a proton–electron system) produces a  $1/r$  pressure well in the medium that can bind other strings. Swirl pressure coupling refers to direct interaction via these pressure fields – e.g. an external disturbance that alters the pressure around a nucleus could perturb the swirl flow. In canonical SST, swirl pressure fields give rise to forces equivalent to gravity, but using them for controlled coupling (without high energies) is speculative, as discussed below.

Parallel to pressure effects, SST introduces swirl clocks as a chronometric facet of swirl dynamics. A clock comoving with swirling fluid runs slow by the factor  $S_t = \sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$ , where  $v$  is the local swirl speed. This is formally analogous to special relativistic time dilation, but here it is *fluid velocity* through the universal medium that sets the ticking rate. In a vortex core where  $v_{\text{!}}$  is high, proper time is slowed – these are “slow-clock” zones in SST. The core clock-rate reflects how mass and interaction processes are paced: a tightly knotted, fast-spinning nucleon has a slightly slower internal time than a weakly swirling system. Swirl-clock modulation means altering the local  $v_{\text{!}}$  (and thus  $S_t$ ) to affect reaction rates or decay timing. Canonically, swirl time dilation is a built-in effect (it ensures consistency with relativistic mass-energy), but *actively changing* a nucleus’s clock-rate via external fields would require changing the vortex speed  $v$  – something not normally possible without extreme conditions. We will identify this as a speculative coupling mechanism.

Canonical vs. Speculative Couplings: SST provides a “swirl-EM bridge” linking fluid motion to electromagnetic fields, and a “swirl-gravity mechanism” for attractive forces. Canonical couplings in SST are those grounded in known physics via these bridges. For example, *electromagnetic coupling via electrons* is a standard pathway: external E/M fields interact with the atomic electron swirl (which is a 3 torus-knot for an electron) and can indirectly transfer energy to the nucleus through well-known processes (exciting electron orbitals, hyperfine splitting, etc.). This corresponds to indirect electronic mediation in SST, and it aligns with ordinary quantum mechanics – no new physics is needed to, say, use laser light to perturb an atom and slightly

influence nuclear state populations. Similarly, swirl-EM inductive coupling is part of SST’s foundation: changes in a swirl string’s density induce electromagnetic fields with a coupling constant  $G \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ . *Reciprocally*, time-varying electromagnetic fields can induce swirl currents in the medium. This means a properly configured external EM field (e.g. a resonant coil field) *could* drive a swirl flow. In SST’s formalism, this is not exotic – it’s required for recovering Maxwell’s equations from fluid dynamics – and we’ll see an example with a 3-phase coil in Task 3. Thus, electromagnetic pathways (via electrons or directly via induced swirl currents) are considered *canonical coupling mechanisms*.

In contrast, direct manipulation of swirl pressure or clock rates goes beyond standard interactions. Using a classical field to push directly on the *nuclear vortex core* – for instance, creating a low-pressure region externally to “pull” on the nucleus’s swirl – would amount to an acoustic/gravitational coupling. SST indeed posits that macroscopic forces of gravity and lift arise from swirl-pressure gradients. For example, a specially wound coil can induce a circulating flow (vortex) in the medium, creating a pressure dip and lifting mass like an aerodynamic fan. This is speculative but semi-canonical – SST’s equations predict it, yet it hasn’t been empirically demonstrated. Applying this idea at the nuclear scale (without disrupting the nucleus) is even more speculative. Likewise, swirl-clock modulation by external means would require altering  $v_l$  significantly – essentially creating a *gravitational time-dilation* or high-velocity vortex at the nucleus. This is *theoretically possible* (SST’s pseudo-metric allows in principle for external swirl flows to influence local clock rates), but practically nonviable with any known technology. We therefore classify direct swirl-pressure coupling and clock-rate manipulation as *hypothetical/speculative couplings* – intriguing within SST’s framework, but not realized by any established experiment. By contrast, indirect EM coupling (via electrons or photon fields) is firmly within the canonical SST (and SM) toolkit, though even there the challenge is coupling efficiently to the deeply bound nuclear knots.

In summary, SST models nucleons/nuclei as knotted vortices whose mass = swirl kinetic energy and binding = shared swirl fields, and it provides conceptual hooks for external coupling via pressure fields (gravity/pressure analogues), time dilation (clock rate), or electromagnetism (standard fields). Among these, only the electromagnetic route (including electron-mediated effects) is part of SST’s canonical structure and known physics. The ideas of directly tweaking swirl pressure or clock rates in a nucleus extend SST into the speculative regime, guiding us to explore how one might *theoretically* achieve non-destructive field control of nuclear structure.

## Task 2: Nuclear Excitation Modes in SST and Resonance Overlap Analysis

Conventional Nuclear Excitations: Atomic nuclei support a variety of quantized excitation modes, which in standard nuclear physics include: (i) Single-particle excitations (individual nucleons jumping to higher shells, often a few keV–MeV), (ii) Collective vibrational modes (coherent oscillations of the nuclear shape, typically a few MeV for low-lying quadrupole or octupole vibrations), (iii) Collective rotations (for deformed nuclei, rotational bands with spacings of tens to hundreds of keV), and (iv) Giant resonances, which are high-frequency collective modes (e.g. the Giant Dipole Resonance, where all protons oscillate against all neutrons) typically in the  $E \sim 7\text{--}40$  MeV range [en.wikipedia.org](http://en.wikipedia.org). For example, medium-heavy nuclei exhibit a giant dipole peak around  $\sim 15$  MeV (oscillation frequency on the order of  $10^{21}$  s<sup>−1</sup>), and giant quadrupole or monopole resonances in the 10–30 MeV range [en.wikipedia.org](http://en.wikipedia.org). These resonances involve coherent motion of many nucleons and can lead to nuclear decay or fission if strongly excited [en.wikipedia.org](http://en.wikipedia.org). In contrast, the lowest energy excitations (rotations/vibrations) involve much smaller frequencies – e.g. a heavy deformed nucleus might have a 50 keV ( $\sim 10^{16}$  Hz) rotational transition. Thus, nuclear excitation spectrum spans a broad frequency range (  $10^1\text{--}10^{22}$  Hz).

Translation to SST Language: How do we describe these modes in Swirl-String Theory terms? In SST, a nucleus is a linked network of swirl strings (knotted nucleons). Collective modes can be seen as coherent perturbations of the knotted swirl configuration. For instance: a giant dipole resonance becomes an oscillation where the swirl currents of proton-knots and neutron-knots flow against each other in a coherent pattern (creating an oscillating dipolar swirl-pressure field). A quadrupole vibration (a nuclear “breathing” or elliptic distortion) would correspond to a periodic deformation of the linked knot bundle – perhaps alternating the swirl linkage tightness along different axes. Rotational states correspond to the entire linked-knot assembly spinning as a whole (the swirl fluid around the nucleus acquiring a bulk rotation). In SST, one can imagine the nucleus’s composite swirl flow has normal modes, just as a fluid vortex lattice might: small perturbations could propagate as swirl waves or shape oscillations of the knotted structure.

Crucially, SST provides natural characteristic scales for these motions. Each swirl string has a core radius  $r_c$  and a characteristic swirl speed  $v_l$ . Using the canonical values  $r_c \approx 1.4 \times 10^{-15}$  m and  $v_l \approx 1.1 \times 10^6$  m/s (calibrated to reproduce atomic spectra), we get a core rotation frequency on the order of:

$$\Omega_0 \sim \frac{v}{r_c} \approx \frac{1.1 \times 10^6 \text{ m/s}}{1.4 \times 10^{-15} \text{ m}} \sim 0.8 \times 10^{21} \text{ s}^{-1}$$

In angular frequency units this is  $\Omega_0 \sim 8 \times 10^{20} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , which corresponds (via  $E = \hbar\Omega$ ) to an energy of order  $\hbar\Omega_0 \sim 0.5$  MeV. This “swirl core frequency” is essentially the baseline rotation rate of a nucleon’s vortex core in its ground state. We can compare this to typical nuclear resonance frequencies:  $\Omega_0$  is about two orders of magnitude below the giant dipole frequency (which corresponds to  $\sim 15$  MeV  $\sim 2.3 \times 10^{21} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ), but it is well above the frequencies of rotational or low vibrational modes (which are  $10^{16}$ – $10^{19} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ). In other words, a single nucleon’s fundamental swirl circulation (if  $v_l$  is as calibrated) lies in the sub-MeV range, whereas the nucleus’s *collective* high-energy modes require multi-MeV frequencies.

However, SST knots can have higher harmonic excitations. A nucleon’s swirl string might support faster torsional oscillations (SST associates photons with torsional waves on swirl strings), and a nucleus with many linked loops might have normal modes exceeding the base  $\Omega_0$ . SST’s “universal resonance” concept ties together quantum spectra with fluid resonance, hinting that higher swirl mode frequencies could reach the nuclear giant resonance range. Indeed, an SST analysis note suggests using the “swirl resonance scale”  $\Omega_0 = v_l/r_c$  as a seed for designing external excitation sources. The idea is that if an external field is tuned near  $\Omega_0$  or a multiple thereof, it could resonantly couple to the nucleus’s internal swirl motions. Practically, this means frequencies on the order of  $10^{20}$ – $10^{21} \text{ s}^{-1}$  (i.e. soft gamma-ray to hard X-ray range) might be needed to directly drive nuclear dynamics. In fact, a general SST overlap model treats a tunable source spectrum coupling to *Lorentzian target resonances*, and suggests that optimal excitation occurs when the source frequency matches a target resonance within its bandwidth. In an SST context, one would target an external field at frequencies overlapping the nucleus’s swirl normal modes.

Resonance Overlap Plausibility: Given the above scales, is there a plausible overlap between externally achievable fields and nuclear swirl modes without destroying the nucleus? Standard giant resonances require gamma photons (MeV energies) – one could in principle use a high-energy photon beam or electron beam to excite them (indeed, giant dipole resonances are classically excited by 7–40 MeV gamma rays [en.wikipedia.org](http://en.wikipedia.org)). That is a *thermal* or high-energy approach, usually causing violent decay (photofission, particle emission [en.wikipedia.org](http://en.wikipedia.org)). The question here, though, is about non-thermal, non-destructive coupling – e.g. gently modulating a nucleus at a special frequency to alter reaction rates without dumping excessive energy. SST offers a speculative angle: if the nucleus has a sharply defined swirl mode that can be driven *coherently*, one might not need to deliver huge energy quanta (as a single gamma does)

but instead accumulate energy in the mode over many cycles. The spectral overlap functional introduced in the user’s files formalizes this: a narrow-band source overlapping a narrow nuclear resonance can, in theory, transfer energy efficiently into that mode. The key is that the power delivered is the overlap of source and target spectra, so a highly monochromatic drive at just the right frequency could *pump* the nucleus continuously but gently. In formula terms, if a nuclear mode has frequency  $\omega_n$  and width  $\Gamma_n$ , and the source has frequency  $\omega_0 \approx \omega_n$  with bandwidth  $\sigma \lesssim \Gamma_n$ , the overlap integral accumulates energy into that mode. This is analogous to pushing a child on a swing with small but well-timed pushes, rather than one violent shove.

Using SST constants, we estimated  $\Omega_0$  for a nucleon-scale mode (0.5 MeV). Many nuclei have excited states or resonances in that vicinity (0.1–1 MeV range), especially collective ones in heavy nuclei. For instance, some deformed heavy nuclei have *K*-isomer or vibrational states at a few hundred keV. If those correspond to a coherent swirl pattern (like a small oscillation in knot linkage), an external drive at that frequency might modulate the nucleus. On the other hand, truly altering barrier heights (fusion/fission barriers 5–10 MeV) suggests needing a few MeV of energy input – perhaps via an overtone of the swirl motion. It is not obvious that a nucleus has a narrow resonance exactly at the barrier frequency; more likely, one would excite a collective mode that indirectly affects the barrier (e.g. vibrationally *softening* the nucleus). We identify a few conceptual pathways for external fields to achieve such coupling:

- (i) Direct Resonant Excitation of Collective Modes: Tune an external photon or phonic field (laser, X-ray, microwave, etc.) to a known nuclear mode frequency (e.g. a low-lying vibrational or rotational transition). By resonant amplification, the nucleus can absorb energy into that mode over time. In SST terms, this means driving a small oscillation in the linked-knots – for example, a  $\approx 100$  keV E2 vibration could be driven by a far-infrared or UV laser if up-converted via the electron shell (direct 100 keV photon sources are X-rays). Although single photons of that energy are ionizing, a carefully phased lower-frequency field could excite the mode through multi-photon processes or via the electron (see (ii) below). The effect of exciting a collective vibration is to temporarily deform the nuclear shape, which *in effect lowers the effective barrier* for reactions along that mode. For instance, a driven vibration could momentarily stretch or compress the nucleus, modulating the Coulomb barrier for fusion or the fission barrier. If timed correctly, this might enhance tunneling probabilities without violently ejecting nucleons. SST would describe this as pumping energy into a particular swirl-pattern of the nucleus.
- **\*\***(ii) Electron-Mediated Energy Transfer (Indirect): Leverage the atomic electrons as intermediaries to bridge from accessible field frequencies to nuclear excitations. One mechanism is the “electron bridge” or NEET (Nuclear Excitation by Electronic Transition), where an excited electron transfers its energy to the nucleus. For example, a laser could excite an inner-shell electron to a high orbital; if the electron’s de-excitation energy matches a nuclear level, it can non-radiatively excite the nucleus. SST doesn’t alter this basic physics – rather, it reinterprets electrons and nucleons as linked swirls, so an electron transition shifts the electromagnetic field around the nucleus (the swirl-EM field), which can modulate the swirl pressure at the nucleus and kick the nucleus into an excited knot state. This path is essentially canonical (it’s been studied in standard physics), but SST might provide specific selection rules in terms of swirl topology (e.g. requiring certain knot chirality alignments for efficient coupling). Using electrons, one could target lower-frequency nuclear modes even with much lower-frequency lasers, by exploiting multi-step processes. This is non-thermal in that the energy is delivered quantum-coherently to the nucleus rather than as random heat.
- **\*\***(iii) Dynamic Field-Induced Barrier Modulation: Here the idea is not to resonantly excite a discrete mode, but to use an oscillating external field configuration to alter the nucleus’s effective potential landscape. For instance, a strong oscillating electric quadrupole

field (achievable with RF or microwave in a resonator) could interact with the nucleus’s quadrupole moment, causing a small periodic deformation. In SST, an oscillating external field corresponds to an oscillating *swirl flow in the medium* (via the swirl-EM bridge). A specially structured field (for example, a set of phase-shifted coil currents producing a time-varying non-uniform magnetic field) could induce a synchronous swirl in the nucleus’s vicinity. While the frequency might be far below the nucleus’s natural frequencies, if the field is strong enough and properly phased, it could *statically* bias the nucleus: e.g. stretching it slightly 50 times per second – too slow to resonantly excite, but possibly adiabatically lowering certain barrier directions. This is similar to how a strong static electric field can lower a Coulomb barrier (Schwinger effect in extreme cases), though for nuclei the fields required are enormous. Still, SST invites us to consider if *swirl pressure fields* can be manipulated similarly: a *standing swirl wave* imposed on the nucleus might transiently reduce the pressure holding it together, aiding a reaction. We should note this is highly speculative, as it blurs into the territory of dynamic nuclear Stark or Zeeman effects, which are known to be exceedingly small unless the fields are huge.

- **\*\*(iv) Swirl-Phase Modulation (RT Phase):** SST posits each swirl string has two phases: an extended wave-like R-phase and a localized particle T-phase. A nucleus in its ground state is largely T-phase (knotted and localized). A possible path to “easy” fusion/fission is to induce more wave-like behavior in the nucleons, so that they overlap and re-knot without high barriers. In theory, an external perturbation could push nucleons towards the R-phase (delocalize them) just enough to merge through quantum tunneling. This might be done by injecting noise or oscillations that stimulate the R-phase transition (essentially a controlled partial “measurement” that loosens the knot). SST formalizes measurement as a R→T phase transition via a resonance condition. One could envision tuning a field to the “knot unbinding” frequency – essentially hitting the frequency that corresponds to unwrapping a knot turn. While purely hypothetical, SST provides a framework (the “kernel law” of measurement) to calculate the rate  $\Gamma_{R \rightarrow T}$  given a spectral density  $\chi(r, \omega)$  of perturbations. A sharp external spectral line at the right  $\omega_0$  might dramatically increase the probability of a nucleon de-localizing (R-phase) then re-localizing in a new configuration (fusing with a neighbor or re-knotting to a different nucleus). Essentially, this is *field-assisted tunneling* recast as *swirl-phase perturbation*. It remains very much a theoretical construct – one would need to identify that “un-knotting” frequency (likely tied to the core swirl frequency or harmonic thereof).

Each of these pathways aims to alter nuclear barrier heights or decay rates by using external fields to either put the nucleus in an excited shape (lowering the barrier) or change the effective interaction time (via time dilation or phase) or route energy into or out of the nucleus in unusual ways. Resonance overlap is key: the external drive must overlap with a natural frequency of the nucleus (or of its swirl-subsystem) to transfer energy efficiently. SST encourages us to quantify this overlap with its spectral functional approach – essentially treating the nucleus as having Lorentzian response peaks. If no overlap exists (drive too low-frequency or wrong symmetry), the coupling will be negligible – which is consistent with why static or slow fields don’t normally affect nuclear decay. The above concepts are, as of now, largely speculative; in mainstream terms, they correspond to ideas like gamma triggering of isomers, laser-driven nuclear transitions, or acoustic compression of barriers – none of which have demonstrated large, controllable effects in the lab. SST’s novel contribution is to provide a unified set of variables (e.g.  $\Omega_0$ , swirl density fractions, etc.) to *estimate* these effects and possibly find sweet spots where external fields “see” the nucleus more strongly than expected.

In summary, to couple fields to nuclear structure without blowing it apart, one must operate in a precision resonance regime. SST translations suggest looking at the nucleus as a *resonant swirl system* and targeting frequencies around the core swirl rate or collective mode frequencies

(from  $\sim 10^{19}$  Hz up to  $10^{21}$  Hz). Doing so via gentle coupling (small quanta over time) could in principle alter reaction kinetics – for example, pumping energy into a fission mode to encourage decay, or into a bonding mode to assist fusion at lower temperatures. The feasibility of achieving this experimentally remains uncertain – it demands extremely monochromatic, high-frequency sources or clever indirect schemes – but these are the theoretical avenues SST offers for “non-thermal, non-destructive” nuclear coupling.

### Task 3: Topologically Structured Field Sources – The 30° Double Saw 3-Phase Coil

**Coil Geometry and Swirl Coupling:** The “30° double saw-shape 3-phase coil” is understood here as a specially engineered electromagnetic coil system with a non-trivial geometric winding (a sawtooth-like pattern, possibly two interlaced sets offset by 30°) energized by three-phase currents. In effect, this device produces a time-varying, spatially structured magnetic (and electric) field pattern with a particular topology. From an SST perspective, such a coil can be seen as a *driver of swirl flows* in the underlying medium. Conventional coils (e.g. a simple solenoid or a dipole loop) produce relatively uniform or smoothly varying fields – these can induce eddy currents or magnetization in materials, but they do not inherently impart *circulation* to the surrounding swirl medium. A simple loop’s magnetic field is symmetric and does not “grab” the fluid into a whirl; it’s akin to pushing uniformly on all sides of a wheel – no rotation ensues. In contrast, a multi-phase, spatially modulated coil can create a rotating field pattern – analogous to the stator of a motor – which *does* impart angular momentum to the medium. A 3-phase coil with a sawtooth winding will generate a traveling wave of magnetic field around the coil’s circumference. This is precisely the setup needed to “stir” the swirl medium. As SST states, applying a 3-phase sequence (0, 120, 240) to a set of coils can induce a non-zero circulation  $\kappa$  in the medium, breaking time-reversal symmetry and creating *nonreciprocal effects*. Essentially, the coil’s fields drag the medium around in a loop.

In SST, Maxwell’s equations emerge from fluid dynamics of the swirl medium. Therefore, a rotating magnetic field is literally a rotating velocity field in the medium (for the swirl component tied to electromagnetism). The “double saw” shape likely introduces a high spatial harmonic content – meaning it can create fine-grained swirl eddies rather than just a large single vortex. The 30° offset between two saw patterns could ensure that the field has a chiral twist or a particular helicity. We know from the SST Canon that certain coil configurations can induce helicity and circulation in the medium: e.g. the Gamma coil (S=40, +11/−9) cited in the Canon has a specific winding that yields a net linking number  $\chi = 42$  and creates a Rankine vortex core in the medium when driven. The result is a region of circulating flow (swirl) with lower pressure at the core, capable of exerting lift. This is presented as a “helicity–lift bridge” – a canonical demonstration that coil geometry can engender swirl pressure effects. By analogy, the double-saw 3-phase coil is a *family of topologically structured sources* designed to maximize coupling to swirl modes.

**Modulating Swirl Energy Density and Clock Rates:** When such a coil is energized, it produces an electromagnetic field configuration with time-varying curl. In the swirl medium, that corresponds to vorticity injection – essentially, it can create or amplify a vortex in the otherwise quiescent medium. If placed near a mass (like a nucleus or any matter), this induced swirl field superposes with the object’s own swirl fields. One can think of it as *spinning the local æther*. The immediate effect in SST terms is to increase the local swirl velocity  $v$  of the medium around the target. That raises the local swirl energy density  $U_{\text{swirl}} = \frac{1}{2}\rho_f v^2$  and the dimensionless swirl fraction  $\chi_{\text{swirl}} = U_{\text{swirl}}/U_{\text{max}}$ . A higher swirl energy density in a region means the medium exerts extra pressure or tension on swirl strings there (since the strings are moving in a “stiffer wind”). It also means, by the swirl-clock law, that clocks in that region run a bit slower ( $S_t = \sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$  decreases). Thus, yes – a structured coil can modulate local swirl energy and

clock rate, in principle. Symbolically, if the coil produces a magnetic field  $\mathbf{B}(r, t)$  with angular pattern  $m$  (like  $e^{im\theta}$  spatial dependence) and frequency  $\omega$ , the induced swirl velocity field  $\mathbf{v}_l(r, t)$  might take a form like  $\Re \mathbf{A}(r) e^{i(m\theta - \omega t)}$ , where  $\nabla \times \mathbf{v}_l \neq 0$ . The energy density  $\rho_f |\mathbf{v}_l|^2 / 2$  could be concentrated near the coil's geometry (say near sharp sawtooth features, which act like vanes pushing the fluid). If the coil is tuned near a resonance (as in Task 2),  $\mathbf{v}_l$  can build up over time (as a standing wave or strong vortex). SST's equations even allow one to calculate the circulation quantum induced:  $\kappa_{\text{ind}} = \oint \mathbf{v}_l \cdot d\ell$ , which can be related to coil linkage numbers.

**Contrasting Conventional Multipoles:** A conventional multipole magnet (like a quadrupole or sextupole) produces a static spatial pattern of fields (e.g. four poles around circle). These are very useful for focusing beams, but *static* multipoles do not generate circulation – they have no time-varying phase to drag the fluid. A rotating dipole field (single phase AC) would simply alternate push-pull and typically induce oscillatory flows that cancel out net rotation. It's the combination of spatial pattern + phase progression (like a wave traveling around the circumference) that yields a net swirl. The 3-phase coil achieves exactly that: each phase drives a sector of the coil, and the phase difference means the peak field rotates around. This is analogous to a synchronous motor for the swirl medium – it “grips” the medium and spins it. The sawtooth shape likely ensures the field isn't just rotating uniformly but has a sawtooth variation along the radius or length, which could be intended to couple to smaller-scale swirl eddies (perhaps matching the size of a target, e.g. a nucleus or a cluster of atoms). In symbolic terms, a simple circular loop has one Fourier mode ( $m=0$  for uniform field inside); a sawtooth winding contains higher  $m$  modes in its field expansion. Those higher modes might couple to swirl structures of corresponding size – possibly allowing a more localized effect on a small target rather than a large-scale vortex.

**Topological vs Traditional Field Control:** A noteworthy difference is topological invariants. The Gamma coil example from the Canon assigned a linking number  $\chi = 42$  to the coil geometry, indicating a topologically nontrivial winding. That coil, when driven, induced quantized circulation (i.e. the medium's response jumped in units of  $\kappa$ ) and produced lift. This suggests that by designing the coil's winding topology, one can control the helicity and linking number of the induced swirl field. A double-saw coil might be designed to have a certain braid-like pattern that maximizes the *coupling of coil topology to fluid topology*. Conventional coils lack this consideration – a solenoid's winding number matters only for the magnitude of  $\mathbf{B}$ , not for a new qualitative effect. But in SST, if you wind the coil in a complex way (e.g. crossing wires, making knots in the coil itself), the field can carry that imprint and potentially induce corresponding knot-like flows (one might call them “field knots” or Hopf fibration patterns in the  $\mathbf{B}$ -field). The contrast is that a regular coil can be described by low-order multipoles (monopole-none, dipole, quadrupole, etc.), whereas a topologically rich coil has a broad spectrum of modes and can drive multiple Fourier components of the swirl medium simultaneously. This may be crucial for coupling to a complex target like a nucleus, which isn't a simple dipole but a many-body system with internal nodes.

In summary, the 30° double saw 3-phase coil exemplifies a *strategy of field shaping* to engage the swirl medium on its own terms. By generating a rotating, knot-informed field, it injects swirl (circulation and vorticity) into the environment. The local swirl energy density can thereby be increased (the coil pumps kinetic energy into the medium), and local time dilation would concomitantly increase (clocks slow as  $v_l$  rises). We must caution that in practice the achieved  $v_l$  may be tiny fractions of  $c$ , so the clock effect is minuscule – but conceptually, if one could push  $v_l$  toward relativistic speeds in a region, the coil would be effectively creating a “pocket” of slower time (a gravity-like potential well) there. SST's formalism even predicts how much lift or weight change a given induced  $v_l$  should produce. The take-home point is that unlike a normal coil (which just produces fields), a topologically structured multi-phase coil produces *fields that do work on the medium*, creating a tailored swirl field. This capability is what one needs to attempt coupling to nuclear swirl structure: the coil's swirl field can overlap with

the nucleus’s swirl field modes (much like two gears meshing). This is an advanced and still speculative concept, but SST provides the language (helicity, circulation quanta, etc.) to discuss it rigorously, whereas classical physics would simply see a complicated magnetic field with no obvious nuclear relevance.

## Task 4: Heavy Nuclei as Probes – Complex Knots and Swirl-Gravity Considerations

SST Representation of Heavy Nuclei: Heavy nuclei (such as the actinides or beyond) in SST are viewed as larger, more complex linked-knot structures. Each proton and neutron is a knotted swirl string, and in a nucleus like uranium ( $Z = 92, N = 146$  for U-238), we have on the order of 238 knotted loops linked together. The topology of such a nucleus is daunting – it’s not simply a chain of 238 links, but rather a three-dimensional network where each nucleon’s swirl may link with multiple neighbors. SST suggests that nuclei arrange into *nested or interlinked clusters* (perhaps shells of linked knots). For instance, alpha particles (Helium-4 knots) might form sub-links within heavy nuclei (echoing the cluster models of nuclei). The linking number  $b$  in SST’s mass formula increases with each additional component, and a higher  $b$  generally means a higher total mass (unless offset by binding). Indeed, Table V of the Canon shows that heavier atoms have a missing mass corresponding to nuclear binding (0.7% for mid-range nuclei like O-16). This indicates the more complex the link (higher  $b$ ), the more energy can be stored in the swirl linkage (and thus subtracted from mass as binding). A heavy nucleus, being a high- $b$ , high- $L_{\text{tot}}$  knot, likely has many *internal* swirl modes – it’s a rich object vibrationally. Some of those modes correspond to relatively low frequencies (like the collective rotations or surface vibrations) because with so many parts moving together, the system has large moments of inertia and many degrees of freedom.

From a field coupling perspective, heavy nuclei are interesting: they have *more potential resonance matches* (more modes to hit), but they also have *broader damping* (lots of internal coupling means modes might be less sharp). Does a more complex knot aid or hinder external access? There are two lines of thought:

- **Aid (more accessible modes):** A complex, loosely bound system has collective modes at lower energies – e.g. heavy nuclei often have soft vibrations (beta and gamma vibrations in deformed nuclei) at 0.1–0.5 MeV. These are far closer to feasible electromagnetic sources than, say, the 7 MeV giant dipole in Oxygen. In SST terms, a heavy nucleus’s swirl network might support a slow “breathing” where many loops oscillate in phase – effectively a shallow modulation of the entire knotted bundle. An external field of the right symmetry might couple to that mode more easily because it involves coherent motion of charge (for E/M coupling) or coherent deformation of the swirl pressure field (for gravitational coupling). Additionally, heavy nuclei have larger cross-sections for photons (more protons, more chances to absorb) – which could improve coupling strength if resonance is found. Also, some heavy isotopes have isomeric states that can be triggered with relatively low energy (keV range) if you find the right trigger (e.g.  $^{229}\text{Th}$ ’s famous 8 eV nuclear transition, though that’s an outlier in the UV range). SST would describe those isomers as metastable knot configurations that might be particularly amenable to perturbation.
- **Hinder (stability and damping):** On the other hand, heavy nuclei are often less stable – many are on the edge of fission or other decay. This instability means that perturbing them could just cause random decay (destruction) rather than a controlled modulation. In SST, a very large knot might have multiple nearly degenerate T-phase configurations, making it facile for it to spontaneously slip from one to another (fission could be seen as the knot splitting into two sub-knots). So a small push might simply break the knot (induced

fission), which is *destructive* rather than gentle modulation. Moreover, with many internal degrees of freedom, energy put in might dissipate among them (internal damping): the swirl energy might spread through the network instead of focusing into one coherent mode. That would manifest as broad resonances (large  $\Gamma_n$ ), meaning any drive is less efficient (the spectral overlap is spread out). Thus, coupling might be *weaker per mode* even if more modes exist.

Now, regarding swirl-gravity coupling: heavy nuclei have more mass (and more swirl circulation) concentrated in a small region. Does that produce a stronger gravitational effect in SST? According to the Hydrogen-Gravity theorem, gravity in SST arises from net *chiral circulation* extending between masses. A single nucleus, even a heavy one, would have extremely short-range swirl fields (mostly confined within the atom) and likely alternating orientations of loops that mostly cancel at long range (especially in a symmetric nucleus). So a lone heavy nucleus would not create any appreciable far-field gravity beyond what its tiny mass already implies. If one envisions a macroscopic object made of heavy nuclei, its gravity is just the sum of masses – unless some *coherent alignment of swirl fields* occurs. Could heavy nuclei be better at producing or responding to swirl gravity fields if externally induced? Perhaps if one could line up many heavy nuclei so that their swirl axes align, the cumulative pressure deficit could be slightly more than for light nuclei. But practically, in a solid, nuclei orientations are random; there’s no known way to phase-align their swirl.

However, heavy elements might serve as testbeds for exotic gravity-like claims. For instance, Einsteinium (Z=99) and Element 115 (Moscovium, Z=115) have been mentioned in fringe contexts as having unusual gravity effects. From an SST standpoint, these nuclei are just larger composites of the same knotted swirl components, without any new fundamental forces. Einsteinium isotopes are highly radioactive (short-lived), so any attempt to use them is impractical – they decay and emit heat and radiation (definitely *not* “non-destructive”!). Element 115, similarly, has no stable isotopes (the longest-lived known is around 0.7 s). We flag these elements as impractical: they cannot be accumulated in significant quantity or used under safe conditions. The lore around element 115 having special gravity properties finds no support in SST; if anything, SST would predict that a super-heavy nucleus, if somehow stabilized, would have *even more* internal swirl cancellation (because large numbers of nucleons likely pair up swirl flows to minimize energy, leaving little net external field). Moreover, heavy nuclei above a certain size are so unstable that their “knots” spontaneously unravel (fission) – indicating that using them for controlled phenomena is untenable. In short, heavy nuclei don’t unlock new physics in SST; they merely offer more complex instances of the same swirl-string dynamics.

So, treating heavy nuclei as probes: they give us a larger, “softer” target to try field coupling (good for finding resonance overlaps), but they are also prone to break or be unavailable. If one imagines a thought-experiment: perhaps a sphere of metastable element 115 in a device – SST would not assign it magical properties; it would calculate its swirl link structure and likely find it highly constrained by stability requirements. Unless a novel stable island exists (and some theories do suggest longer-lived super-heavies in an island around Z 114–126, but still not abundant), using heavy nuclei will be mostly conceptual. They serve as theoretical extremes: lots of components (to test SST’s topology-based mass formula), and high charge (to test the swirl-EM coupling in extreme Coulomb fields). If swirl-gravity coupling were significant anywhere, one might guess it in the interplay of strong EM fields in heavy atoms – but conventional physics finds gravity completely negligible at atomic scales (the gravitational attraction between two nucleons is  $10^{36}$  times weaker than their electric repulsion). SST does not invent a new strong gravity; it just explains gravity via swirl. So unless those swirl fields are coherently enhanced, heavy nuclei will not noticeably gravitate or levitate differently due to an external coil, etc.

In summary, actinides and beyond are complex knotted systems: they highlight how SST handles many-body knots (with significant binding energy from shared swirl). Their structure could be slightly easier to perturb in certain low-frequency modes, but controlling those per-

turbations without inducing outright decay is challenging. We treat mentions of exotic heavy elements (Einsteinium, element 115) as purely conceptual illustrations – there is no credible evidence that they enable effective gravity control or safe fusion in reality. SST would require any *extraordinary* gravity modulation by such matter to come from extraordinary swirl arrangements – something not automatically provided by just adding protons. Thus, heavy nuclei mostly reinforce the need for *coherent alignment and resonance* for any gravity-like effect, rather than providing a magic shortcut.

## Task 5: “Safe Fusion”/“Safe Fission” in SST – Definitions and Gravity-Effect Feasibility

Defining “Safe Fusion” and “Safe Fission” (SST Formalism): In conventional terms, *safe fusion* means producing fusion energy in a controlled, non-explosive manner (no runaway reaction, no high-level radioactive fallout), and *safe fission* means harnessing fission without risk of meltdown or uncontrollable chain reactions. SST reframes these in its own language of knots and swirl energy.

– Safe Fusion in SST: This would correspond to inducing knot transitions where two or more swirl strings merge into a single knotted structure *without releasing a dangerous burst of swirl energy*. In a typical fusion (say  $D + D \rightarrow {}^4\text{He}$ ), a lot of energy is released as kinetic energy of particles (fast neutrons, etc.). “Safe” fusion would imply that instead of violent particle emission, the excess swirl energy finds a benign outlet. SST hints at possible “subcritical knot transitions” – imagine two vortex rings gently linking into a single, larger vortex loop, with the excess energy radiating away as soft swirl waves (analogous to low-frequency radiation) rather than a bang. Technically, if one could maintain the reacting strings partially in R-phase (wave-like, delocalized) during the merge, the process might avoid forming a strong shock in the medium. *Passively quenched swirl energy* means any energy released immediately converts into distributed fluid motions or electromagnetic fields that are not lethal. For example, instead of a 14 MeV neutron flying out, you’d have a swirl oscillation or gravity wave emitted. SST’s conservation laws would still require the energy to go somewhere – but perhaps as a gently expanding swirl pattern that thermalizes over a large volume (thus no high local temperature rise). Summarily, safe fusion = controlled re-knotting of swirl strings at sub-explosive energies, ideally with energy output in a “soft” form (like gentle electromagnetic or phononic waves in the medium, which could be directly converted to electricity). It might be achieved if external fields (like those in Task 2 and 3) nudge nuclei together through barrier lowering, so they fuse at lower relative velocity and the products remain in a bound, non-destructive state (maybe immediately in an excited but bound knot that emits photons rather than shattering). SST would define criteria such as: the fusion should occur in T-phase transition that adiabatically connects to an R-phase network, preventing a shock. While this is speculative, it’s a way of thinking of fusion as a *topological rearrangement* rather than a high-energy collision.

– Safe Fission in SST: Similarly, this implies splitting a heavy knotted string into two (or more) smaller knots in a controlled way. A “safe” fission would be one that is subcritical – meaning it does not trigger a chain reaction avalanche of neighboring nuclei. In SST terms, one would want to ensure that when one composite knot splits, it doesn’t spit out high-energy fragments (neutrons) that slam into other knots. A safe fission might occur if an external field slowly stretches a heavy nucleus’s knot until it separates into pieces *at the threshold*, with the excess swirl energy “quenched” – perhaps converted into a gradual swirl flow in the medium rather than all kinetic energy of fragments. One could imagine a process where a heavy nucleus is held by a field in a metastable configuration and then encouraged to split, but as it does, a damping field absorbs the kinetic energy. In SST, maybe a specially tuned swirl field around the nucleus could siphon off the released swirl energy (like an inductive pickup capturing the energy as electrical current – effectively using the nucleus as a tiny electrical generator rather

than a bomb). Safe fission thus is controlled knot un-linking with energy extraction through fields instead of destructive particle emission. It would also involve keeping the system below the critical density of free neutrons – in reactor terms, a subcritical assembly where each fission does not guarantee another. SST might add that if we can manipulate swirl clocks, we could even *slow down* the fission process – stretching the time it takes, so that power output is low and steady rather than a spike. (Time-dilation of the process from the lab frame could in theory disperse the energy output over a longer interval – this is extremely speculative and likely tiny effect, but conceptually interesting: slowing the internal clock means a decay appears prolonged externally.)

Gravity Modulation from Swirl Modulation: The second part of Task 5 asks if modest changes in swirl energy or decay structure could produce detectable gravitational effects, and calls for predictions for nuclear spectra, gravimetry, etc. In SST, gravitational effects come from swirl energy distributions. The local gravitational potential analog  $\Phi_{\text{SST}}$  is proportional to the negative of the swirl energy density:  $\Phi_{\text{SST}} \approx -\frac{U_{\text{swirl}}}{2\rho_{\text{core}}}$ . For a single swirl string like a proton,  $U_{\text{swirl}}$  is tiny compared to  $U_{\text{max}}$  (core energy density), giving a dimensionless  $\chi_{\text{swirl}} \sim 10^{-30}$  – hence a negligible gravitational potential. If we *modulate*  $U_{\text{swirl}}$  by some factor – say we manage to double the swirl kinetic energy in a region –  $\chi_{\text{swirl}}$  might go from  $1 \times 10^{-30}$  to  $2 \times 10^{-30}$ . This is still far too small to measure with current gravimetric technology; gravity experiments typically detect fractional changes no smaller than  $10^{-12}$  or so in local  $g$  in the lab, and here we’re talking  $10^{-30}$ . So static or modest changes in one or a few nuclei’s swirl energy will *not* produce measurable weight differences. Even if we gather  $10^{23}$  atoms (a mole) and somehow align or modulate all their swirl energies in phase, the change in net gravitational attraction is on the order of  $10^{-30} \times$  the object’s weight – utterly imperceptible. Thus any hope of “effective gravity modulation” rests on either extreme coherence or transient amplification.

SST does allow for the possibility of coherent swirl flows on a macroscopic scale – essentially creating a small gravitational field by fluid dynamics (like the coil-induced lift in Task 3). But to get a noticeable gravity-like force (say able to offset a fraction of an object’s weight), one needs a significant pressure deficit in the medium over a macroscopic region. The coil example S40 (+11/-9) aimed to create a small lift force measurable in milligrams or less (they mention an asymmetry of 25 mK in a thermal test, which corresponds to a tiny energy difference). So, if an external apparatus produced a substantial swirl field (vortex) that encompassed many atoms, it could in theory reduce the apparent weight of those atoms (by making a lower pressure zone beneath them). This is *not* so much modulating the nuclear swirl as it is adding an external swirl. It doesn’t require changing the nucleus’s internal structure – just creating a fluid flow around it (hence affecting it like any mass).

But perhaps the question is hinting at more subtle signals: *falsifiable predictions for nuclear spectra, precision gravimetry, condensed-matter transport*. We can list a few:

- Nuclear Spectra: If external swirl fields or slight clock-rate shifts occur, one could look for tiny frequency shifts or splitting in nuclear transition lines. For example, a highly precise Mössbauer spectroscopy experiment could see if placing the source in a strong induced swirl field changes the gamma line frequency. In GR terms, this would be like a gravitational redshift or time-dilation effect. Given  $\Delta\Phi/\Phi \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-30})$  for achievable swirl, the expected shift is absurdly small. However, SST might introduce unique dependence: e.g. if we somehow excited a nucleus’s internal swirl mode, could that shift its ground-state energy slightly (through mixing of states)? Possibly one could see line broadening or an extra line if a resonance overlap condition is met (the nucleus + field system might have combined eigenstates). A concrete prediction might be: *If a nucleus is subjected to a resonant EM drive at frequency  $\omega_0 = \Omega_0$ , one might observe an enhanced decay rate of a particular gamma transition (as the nucleus spends time in an excited-state admixture)*. This could be tested by measuring lifetimes with and without an applied RF or microwave

field (some experiments have done this for isomers, generally seeing no effect beyond a tiny level – thus providing bounds that in SST terms rule out large  $\Gamma_{R \rightarrow T}$  enhancements).

- **Precision Gravimetry:** SST suggests that if you really manage to create a macroscopic coherent swirl gradient (like the coil-induced pressure drop), you could measure a force or weight change. A falsifiable prediction here is the outcome of the coil experiment: *by driving a multi-phase, topologically nontrivial coil at resonance, one should observe a slight weight decrease of an object above it (on the order of parts in  $10^9$  of its weight, for example)*. The Canon actually outlines how to calculate the needed swirl to lift a weight. So one can attempt this experiment (indeed similar experiments have been claimed sporadically in literature – “impulse gravity generator” or Podkletnov’s spinning superconductor). SST provides a structured theory to either predict a positive result or be proven wrong. If precision gravimetry (e.g. superconducting gravimeters or atom interferometers) detect no effect where SST says there should be one (given a certain  $\kappa$  induced), that falsifies that aspect of SST. Current empirical data: no confirmed gravitative anomaly from EM devices exists, which constrains how strong the swirl coupling  $G$  can be. So far, these constraints imply either the effect is too small or the theory needs revision.
- **Condensed-Matter Transport:** This might refer to phenomena like superconductors, superfluids, or other systems where macroscopic quantum behavior and possibly swirl medium effects could appear. A prediction SST might make is: *In a superconducting state, where electrons form a coherent macro-swirl (Meissner circulation currents, etc.), there may be anomalous coupling to gravity (e.g. slight weight changes or coupling to Earth’s rotation)*. This aligns with some fringe experiments (e.g. claims that spinning superconductors alter weight by ppm). SST doesn’t require exotic new particles to allow this – just a coherent swirl current. It could be tested by precision weight measurements of superconductors under rotation, or of superfluids in moving containers, etc. Another aspect is transport experiments: if swirl fields can influence nuclear decays, perhaps conducting an electric current (which is a swirl of electrons) through a radioactive material could slightly change its decay rate. One could look for tiny changes in half-life when a sample is under high current or in a high-field superconducting magnet. Generally, past experiments have found no half-life changes beyond  $10^{-4}$  even in extreme fields or pressures (except for processes like electron-capture which depend on electron density). Those null results *rule out* large SST effects in those regimes, providing important empirical bounds.

In sum, likely ruled-out ideas by existing data include: *large modifications of radioactive decay by modest fields* (since extensive tests during solar flares, seasonal variations, intense laser illumination, etc., have shown at most extremely small effects, if any). Also, *any significant anti-gravity or weight-loss effect from electromagnetic devices* has not been reliably observed – if SST predicted a huge effect, it’s wrong; if it predicts a tiny effect, it’s not yet falsified but also not useful. The most plausible SST-consistent pathways to nuclear access or gravity modulation remain those that piggyback on known physics (e.g. resonant absorption, isomer triggering, etc.), albeit recast in a new light. Many wilder ideas (e.g. using purely magnetic fields to destabilize the nucleus, or expecting spinning atoms to lose weight) are largely constrained to be extremely small if they exist at all.

To be explicit and falsifiable: SST might predict *e.g.* a  $10^{-6}$  relative frequency shift in a nuclear transition if an external swirl field of a certain strength is applied. One could then do that spectroscopy experiment; seeing no shift would rule out that magnitude of effect. Another prediction: a specific coil geometry with given current will produce a lift force of  $X$  newtons (perhaps given by  $F \approx \frac{\rho_f v^2 A}{2}$  over area  $A$  in the ideal case) – one can measure that. If nothing is measured at the predicted order, that aspect is falsified or  $G$  (swirl-EM coupling) is much smaller than 1.

Finally, we should articulate these points in a brief summary.

## Summary and Conclusions

- Plausible SST Pathways to Nuclear Access/Gravity Modulation:
  - *Resonant electromagnetic coupling via nuclear swirl modes:* By tuning external fields (laser, RF, X-ray) to match characteristic swirl frequencies of nucleons or nuclei (e.g.  $\Omega_0 = v_l/r_c$  and its harmonics), one can in theory induce coherent nuclear excitation. SST predicts that a monochromatic drive overlapping a nuclear resonance can pump energy into the nucleus efficiently, potentially altering reaction rates (e.g. stimulating decay or lowering fusion barriers). This includes indirect methods like using atomic electrons (NEET/NEEC processes) to bridge frequency gaps. These approaches are grounded in known physics (gamma-triggering, laser-induced transitions) but SST provides a unified quantitative framework (spectral overlap function, swirl constants) to guide them.
  - *Topologically structured field drivers:* Complex coil systems (like the described 3-phase double-saw coil) can generate circulating swirl fields in the medium. SST suggests such fields can impart angular momentum and helicity to the vacuum, creating low-pressure vortices and “slow-clock” regions. In principle, placing nuclei or materials in these engineered swirl fields could *modulate their internal swirl energy*. This might manifest as slight shifts in decay rates or even a small weight reduction (lift) if the induced vortex is strong. It’s a speculative but SST-consistent pathway to affect gravity: effectively creating a local gravity-well via electromagnetic means, which can be tested by precision force measurements.
  - *Manipulating swirl-phase and binding energy release:* SST’s two-phase (R/T) model allows for the idea of non-destructive fusion/fission through controlled phase transitions. “Safe fusion” would mean guiding two knotted strings to merge while dumping excess energy into gentle swirl waves rather than lethal particles. “Safe fission” would mean splitting a heavy knot slowly, with swirl energy siphoned off by fields (like an inductive pickup). These are theoretical constructs – SST can outline conditions (e.g. maintaining coherence, subcritical link counts) under which a reaction’s energy release is adiabatically absorbed by the medium instead of forming a blast. This could yield predictions like: if a nucleus fissions under a strong swirl field, the fragment kinetic energies will be lower and more energy will go into EM radiation. Such predictions, while futurist, are falsifiable in that one could look for anomalously low fragment energies or excess radiation in field-assisted reactions.
- Likely Ruled-Out by Existing Data:
  - *Large decay-rate changes by static or low-frequency fields:* Extensive experiments have searched for changes in radioactive decay due to environment (EM fields, chemical state, pressure) and found at most minute effects (apart from well-understood cases in electron-capture). This implies that direct swirl-pressure or clock-rate modulation by feasible field strengths is extremely small – if SST predicted, say, a 5% half-life change by a modest magnetic field, that would be inconsistent with experiments (no such change seen). Therefore, any SST pathway relying on static field effects or minor swirl tweaks is likely negligible in practice.
  - *Strong “antigravity” or weight anomalies from EM devices:* Various groups have tested rotating superconductors, magnetic coil rigs, etc., for weight differences, with null or inconsistent results. If SST’s coil-induced lift were significant (e.g. enough to noticeably levitate objects), it likely would have been observed. The fact that we have no robust evidence for that constrains the swirl-EM coupling constant  $G$  and the efficacy of induced swirl flows. It suggests that either much more intense conditions are needed or the effect doesn’t scale as hoped. Thus ideas of easily modulating gravity with a bench-top coil are probably ruled out at the present scales of  $v_l$  achievable (the induced  $\chi_{\text{swirl}}$  is too small).

– *Use of exotic heavy elements for special gravity/fusion effects:* Any notion that elements like 115 or Einsteinium grant magical capabilities is discredited both by basic physics and SST’s analysis. These nuclei follow the same rules and are in fact extremely unstable or hard to produce. Their swirl structures don’t permit stable, exploitable phenomena beyond conventional nuclear reactions (which are highly radioactive and dangerous, not “safe”). So, relying on super-heavy elements is not a viable shortcut; experiments with them have not shown any new forces (and are hard to perform at all).

- Open Theoretical Gaps and Needed Derivations:

– *Quantitative knot dynamics:* SST provides a qualitative framework, but to design an implementation we need detailed dynamics of how external fields couple to specific knot modes. This means deriving the coupling matrix elements between a given coil field harmonic and a nuclear excitation (e.g. using the SST Lagrangian to compute perturbation amplitudes). These calculations are largely undone – bridging from the canonical SST equations to concrete reaction rates or cross-sections remains an open task.

– *Loss mechanisms and decoherence:* The theory must account for how energy put into a swirl mode might dissipate (internal frictionless it may be, but it can radiate or spread to other modes). A full stability and damping analysis of swirl excitations is needed. For instance, if one drives a nucleus at  $\Omega_0$ , will it absorb indefinitely (narrow resonance) or quickly reradiate (broad resonance)? SST can in principle predict quality factors of knot resonances, but this hasn’t been fleshed out. Such derivations are critical to know if external coupling can ever overcome damping.

– *Scaling of induced swirl fields:* While the Canon lays out how a coil can induce a certain circulation, further work is needed to scale that to microscopic targets. How does one focus a swirl field on a single nucleus or a small region? The theory should be extended to near-field swirl effects – analogues of near-field optics but for vorticity. Without this, practical designs remain guesswork.

– *Experimental traceability:* SST’s bold claims (e.g. predicting  $G_{\text{swirl}} \approx G_N$  for gravity or specific lift in coil experiments) need translation into concrete experimental setups with units. A checklist of what to measure: gamma line shifts, half-life changes under RF, weight changes in rotating magnetic fields, etc., should be developed with SST’s expected magnitude for each. Many of these predictions will be extremely small, but providing even upper-bound estimates makes the theory testable. Currently, some of those numbers exist scattered in the Canon (e.g.  $\chi_{\text{swirl}} \sim 10^{-30}$ ,  $\Lambda \sim 10^{-45}$  J·m) – translating them into, say, “a 10 Tesla field might change a 100 keV transition by  $10^{-14}$  eV” would be a useful derivation to encourage experimental checks.

In conclusion, Swirl-String Theory allows one to *theoretically* discuss gentle nuclear manipulations and gravitic effects in a single framework, but merging that theory with reality requires much additional work. We identified how nucleons as knotted vortices could, in principle, be tickled by external fields through resonances, and how specifically crafted field topologies (coils with multi-phase currents) might engage the swirl medium to mimic gravity or buffer nuclear energy. We also recognized that most of these ideas lie on the edge of current evidence – either not yet seen (hence possibly extremely subtle) or already constrained by null results. Going forward, SST would need to deliver concrete calculations – e.g. precise scaling laws for induced swirl vs coil current, or energy transfer rates for a given spectral overlap – to be taken seriously and to design experiments that could finally confirm or refute these intriguing possibilities. For now, the pathways remain *plausible in theory*, but it falls to further theoretical development and experimentation to determine if any can be realized in practice without violating the empirical safety and stability that nature so far insists upon.

## References

- [1] A. Einstein, *Ist die Trägheit eines Körpers von seinem Energieinhalt abhängig?*, newblock Ann. Phys. **18**, 639–641 (1905).