From Empirical Knots to a Canonical Field Theory: An Analytical History of the VAM/SST Framework

Section 1: Foundations in Numerical Knot Topology: The Empirical Seed

The intellectual lineage of what would become the Swirl-String Theory (SST) does not begin with established physical principles or *a priori* theoretical postulates. Instead, its origins are rooted in an extensive and systematic empirical exploration of the mathematical properties of knots. An analysis of the early computational files reveals a data-driven methodology, where a vast parameter space of knot configurations was generated and mined for correlations between geometric invariants and numerically assigned physical quantities. This foundational stage was not a test of a pre-existing theory, but rather the search for a pattern in need of a theory.

Analysis of the fseries Dataset

The primary evidence for this empirical-first approach is a large dataset cataloged in the file fseries_batch_results.csv.[1] This file contains calculated properties for a wide variety of knots, identified using the standard Rolfsen notation (e.g.,

3_1 for the trefoil knot, 6_2, 7_4, etc.).[1] The

.fseries file extension suggests that the knots were generated and represented as finite Fourier series, a standard technique for creating smooth, parametrically defined curves in three-dimensional space. The dataset is comprehensive, including not only standard topological invariants such as writhe and an estimated crossing number (crossing_est), but also a suite of non-standard, author-defined metrics. These include Hvortex_X(b0=3), mass_fluid_kg, and mass_energy_kg.

The presence of these custom "mass" columns is particularly revealing. At this early stage, these values do not appear to be derived from a coherent physical model. Rather, they represent a numerical attempt to associate a scalar quantity, analogous to mass-energy, with the geometric and topological properties of each knot. The methodology appears to have been one of computational experiment: generate a knot, calculate its mathematical properties, apply a proprietary algorithm to derive a "mass," and catalog the results to search for meaningful patterns. The existence of multiple file types for the same knot, such as .fseries and .short, which yield different calculated values for the same topological object, further indicates a process of algorithmic experimentation, likely involving different relaxation methods or geometric representations to find stable or minimal-energy configurations.[1]

The Central Role of Hvortex_X

Within this exploratory framework, the Hvortex_X(b0=3) metric emerges as a pivotal quantity. This value, which is not a standard invariant in mathematical knot theory, appears to be a custom-calculated proxy for a physical property, likely related to fluid helicity or a similar measure of topological knottedness and twist. Its strong correlation with other properties in the dataset, such as sigma (a measure of chirality or handedness), and its apparent use as an input for the mass_energy_kg calculation, suggests it was the central invariant of interest. The (b0=3) notation implies it is the output of a specific, parameterized algorithm. The development of such a custom metric is a hallmark of an empirical search for a predictive variable—a search for a mathematical handle that correlates strongly with a desired physical outcome.

The entire theoretical edifice of the Vortex Æther Model (VAM) and its successor, SST, appears to be an *a posteriori* justification for the numerical patterns discovered during this initial data-mining phase. The physics was not used to predict the numbers; the numbers were used to invent the physics. The progression of the research materials, from the raw data in fseries_batch_results.csv [1] to the highly abstract Lagrangian of the final SST papers [1], shows a clear trajectory of reverse engineering. The early VAM papers assert connections between knot topology and physical laws with minimal formal derivation, while the later SST papers construct a sophisticated mathematical apparatus, including a complex numerical classifier [1], to retroactively justify these asserted connections. The non-standard

Hvortex_X metric can be seen as the "smoking gun" of this empirical-first methodology—a proprietary tool used to find the initial correlations that the subsequent decades of theoretical work were designed to explain.

Table 1 provides a sample of the key metrics for the knots that would later become central to the VAM/SST particle taxonomy. These specific numerical values, discovered through the initial computational exploration, likely served as the primary inspiration for the development of the physical theory.

knot_id	writhe	crossing_est	sigma	Hvortex_X(b0=3)
3_1	3.4165	3	1.0	0.0
5_1	6.6885	5	1.0	2.0
6_2	72.7464	58	1.0	55.0
7_4	−0.1205	57	−1.0	−54.0

Table 1: Key metrics from the initial empirical knot analysis for knots that later became foundational to the VAM/SST particle taxonomy. Data extracted from.[1]

Section 2: The Vortex Æther Model (VAM): An Ontological Framework

Following the initial phase of numerical exploration, the Vortex Æther Model (VAM) was developed as the first comprehensive physical and ontological framework to account for the observed correlations. VAM represents a profound philosophical commitment: it elevates the mathematical analogies of analogue gravity—wherein fluid dynamics can mimic relativistic phenomena—to a literal theory of physical reality. This move required the construction of a detailed, albeit heterodox, ontology for space, time, matter, and force.

The Æther as a Physical Substrate

The foundational postulate of VAM is the existence of a physical medium, the "æther," which constitutes the substrate of reality.[1] This æther is conceived as a compressible, inviscid superfluid filling a static, three-dimensional Euclidean space. This postulate marks a deliberate break with modern physics by reintroducing a preferred reference frame—the frame in which the æther is at rest.[1] Within this framework, elementary particles are not point-like entities but are modeled as topologically stable, knotted vortices within the æther fluid. This idea is a direct revival and modernization of Lord Kelvin's 19th-century "vortex atom" hypothesis.

Furthermore, fundamental forces are not mediated by exchange particles in the standard sense but are emergent properties of the æther's fluid dynamics. Gravity, in particular, is described not as the curvature of spacetime but as an effective force arising from pressure gradients induced by "swirl"—the structured vorticity of the æther.[1] Regions of high swirl correspond to low pressure via the Bernoulli principle, creating an attractive potential that mimics Newtonian gravity.[1]

Layered Time and Emergent Relativity

The most significant theoretical challenge for any preferred-frame theory is to reconcile its existence with the overwhelming experimental evidence supporting special and general relativity, most notably the null result of the Michelson-Morley experiment.[2] VAM addresses this challenge by proposing a complex, multi-layered temporal ontology, a structure designed to recover Lorentz invariance as an emergent symmetry of the underlying fluid dynamics.[1]

This layered model of time is a crucial, and highly speculative, component of the VAM framework. It is not derived from a deeper physical principle but is instead postulated as a necessary mechanism to make the theory consistent with observation. It is, in effect, a theoretical device required to solve the problems created by the model's own foundational assumption of a preferred frame.

Temporal Mode	Symbol	Description in VAM	Role in the Theory
Æther-Time	N	The absolute, universal background clock of the æther manifold.	Provides a global parameter for causal evolution and a preferred foliation of spacetime.
Chronos-Time	τ	The local,	Subject to dilation;

		measurable proper time experienced by a vortex.	its rate is slowed in regions of high swirl, analogous to gravitational time dilation.
Swirl Clock Phase	S(t)	The internal, cyclical phase angle of a rotating vortex.	Acts as a local "clock hand" or phase memory; its dynamics are tied to helicity and are central to the VAM reinterpretation of quantum phase.
Vortex Proper Time	Tv	The period for one full circulation of a disturbance around a vortex loop.	Defines an intrinsic, topological timescale for a particle, related to its internal oscillation modes.
Kairos Moment	K	A discrete, instantaneous moment of topological change.	Represents quantum jumps, particle decay, or measurement events as irreversible vortex reconnection events.

Table 2: The layered temporal ontology of the Vortex Æther Model, which distinguishes between absolute background time and various emergent, local time-like parameters. Data synthesized from.[1]

Within this structure, the time dilation predicted by special relativity is derived as a direct fluid-dynamic effect. The formula $dNd\tau=1-c2|v\theta|2$, where $v\theta$ is the local tangential swirl velocity of the æther, reproduces the mathematical form of the Lorentz factor.[1] This demonstrates how VAM recovers relativistic kinematics: time dilation emerges as a consequence of high swirl speeds within the æther medium, a phenomenon analogous to compressible flow effects in classical fluids.[1]

Quantum Mechanics from Fluid Dynamics

VAM extends its fluid-dynamic ontology to provide a mechanical basis for quantum phenomena. The Schrödinger equation, the cornerstone of quantum mechanics, is derived from the æther's phase dynamics via a Madelung transformation.[1] In this picture, the quantum wavefunction,

ψ, is not a fundamental object but a composite variable that compactly encodes the æther's density (ρ) and velocity potential (θ): $\psi=\rho/\rho\infty ei\theta$.[1] The probabilistic Born rule is thus reinterpreted as a literal statement about fluid density: the probability of finding a particle is proportional to the amount of æther-fluid mass at that location.

Quantum discreteness is also given a physical origin. Quantization of properties like angular momentum or charge arises from the topological constraint that the circulation integral, $\oint v\cdot dl$, around a vortex core must be an integer multiple of a fundamental quantum, $\kappa\infty$.[1] Furthermore, intrinsic spin, a purely quantum property with no classical analog, is explained as an emergent feature of knot topology. For example, a trefoil knot (the VAM electron) must be rotated by

4π (720 degrees) to return to its original configuration, geometrically mimicking the behavior of a spin-½ fermion.[1]

Section 3: The Genesis of Mass: Evolution of the Master Formula

The central predictive claim of the VAM/SST framework is its ability to calculate the masses of elementary particles and atomic nuclei from the topological properties of knots. The evolution of the "Master Mass Formula" provides a clear window into the theory's development, revealing a trajectory of increasing mathematical sophistication aimed at retroactively fitting known experimental data. This process highlights both the model's impressive descriptive power for nuclear masses and its fundamental limitations, most notably its complete failure to account for molecular binding energies.

From Heuristics to a Tunable Formula

The earliest attempts to formulate a mass-energy relationship were heuristic and, as documented in the project's own files, dimensionally flawed. An early equation, $Me\propto \rho rc3Ce-1(p2+q2+A)$, was later identified as "dimensionally inconsistent".[1] This was succeeded by what is termed the "emperical version," which introduced terms like "swirl length" (

$p2+q2$) and an "inter-linking/twisting" energy (γpq) governed by an empirically fitted constant, $\gamma\approx 5.9\times 10-3$.[1] This formula, while more structured, still relied on vaguely defined physical concepts and fitted parameters.

This exploratory phase culminated in the "Corrected Master Mass Formula," the mature version from the VAM era.[1] This formula introduced a set of integer parameters—

n (number of coherent knots), m (internal thread multiplicity), s (a golden tension index), and k (a "golden rapidity layer")—that functioned as adjustable knobs to tune the output. The formula is given as:

$M(n,m,s,k;\{Vi\})=\alpha 4(m1)3/2n-1/\phi\phi-(s+2k)(i\Sigma Vi)c221\rho Ce2$

In practice, specific integer values for these parameters were assigned to different particles to achieve a close match with their known masses. For example, in the calculation for the proton (a composite of three quark-knots), the parameters are set to $n=3$, $m=1$, and $s=3$.[1] This process is one of parameter fitting, not

ab initio prediction. The evolution from a dimensionally incorrect guess to a multi-parameter fitting function is a classic sign of a model being reverse-engineered to conform to existing data.

Formula Version	Mathematical Expression	Key Features & Parameters
Early Empirical	$M(p,q)\propto \rho rc3Ce(p2+q2+\gamma pq)$	Dimensionally inconsistent. Uses heuristic "swirl length" and a fitted constant γ.
Corrected VAM Master	$M\propto \alpha 4m-3/2n-1/\phi\phi-(s+2k)(\Sigma Vi)c2\rho Ce2$	Dimensionally correct. Introduces tunable integer parameters n,m,s,k

		assigned to particles.
Canonical SST Invariant	$M \propto \alpha 4b(T)-3/2n(T)-1/\phi\phi-g(T)(\Sigma Vi)$	Replaces integer parameters with formal topological invariants: braid index (b(T)), component number (n(T)), and Seifert genus (g(T)).

Table 3: The evolution of the VAM/SST mass formula, tracking its development from an empirical, dimensionally flawed model to a sophisticated function based on formal topological invariants. Data synthesized from.[1]

Predictive Accuracy and a Fundamental Flaw

The predictive performance of the VAM mass formula for atomic nuclei is, on its face, remarkable. The provided calculation sheets show that for elements across the periodic table, from Hydrogen to Uranium, the predicted mass is typically within 1-3% of the experimental value.[1] This apparent success, however, masks a profound conceptual limitation that is exposed when the model is applied to molecules.

The mass formula in all its iterations contains a term (ΣiVi), indicating that the total mass of a composite object is calculated by simply summing the effective volumes of its constituent knots.[1] This "bag model" approach works as a reasonable approximation for atomic nuclei, where the nuclear binding energy, while significant, constitutes a relatively small and smoothly varying fraction of the total mass. For molecules, however, the situation is entirely different. The forces and energies involved in chemical bonds are of a completely different nature and scale than those governing nuclear structure.

The VAM/SST framework has no mechanism to account for chemical binding energy. As a result, its predictions for molecular masses fail catastrophically. As shown in the SST_Atom_Toy_Masses.csv file, the error for simple molecules is already large, and it grows dramatically with complexity. The predicted mass for Methane (CH_4) is overestimated by 27%, for Octane (C_8H_{18}) by 74%, and for an average DNA strand by an astounding 213%.[1] This failure is not a matter of poor calibration; it is a fundamental flaw stemming from the model's inability to describe the physics of chemical bonds. It treats a molecule as a simple bag of non-interacting atomic knots, an assumption that is physically incorrect.

Section 4: The Great Reformulation: From Vortex Æther to Swirl-String Theory

In the later stages of the project, a deliberate and systematic rebranding of the entire theoretical framework was undertaken. The Vortex Æther Model (VAM), with its explicit and heterodox ontology, was reformulated as Swirl-String Theory (SST). This transition was not driven by new physical discoveries but by a strategic decision to align the theory's language and formalism with those of mainstream theoretical physics, particularly effective field theory and string theory. This reformulation was designed to increase the theory's palatability to a broader scientific audience while preserving its core physical content.

The "Rosetta Stone" and the Rebranding Mandate

The most explicit evidence of this strategic shift is the document VAM_SST_Rosetta.pdf, which functions as an internal "nomenclature concordance" or style guide for the transition.[1] It provides direct, one-to-one translations between the "legacy VAM presentation" and the new "SST house style".[1] The document's purpose is unambiguous: to systematically replace the old terminology with new, more conventional terms.

VAM (Legacy Term)	SST (House Style)
"æther time"	absolute time parametrization
"vortex line(s)"	swirl string(s)
ρx(fluid)	ρf
Ce (tangential velocity)	vs (characteristic swirl speed)
"æther"	condensate / foliation

Table 4: A selection of terminological mappings from the VAM/SST "Rosetta Stone," illustrating the systematic replacement of the original VAM ontology with the more abstract language of

Swirl-String Theory. Data extracted from.[1]

The document goes beyond simple translation, issuing a clear "Rebrand Policy" that mandates the new vocabulary: "Legacy words like 'æther' and 'vortex' are strictly reserved for quoting historical titles or citations; narrative prose adopts the neutral SST vocabulary (e.g., foliation, swirl string) without altering the mathematics".[1] This directive confirms that the change was a matter of presentation and rhetoric, not of underlying physics.

Obscuring the Origin in Formal Language

The culmination of this rebranding effort is found in the later research papers, such as VAM-20.2.2_String_Theory.pdf.[1] The abstract of this paper openly declares the intent of the reformulation: to "re-express all original VAM parameters in new symbols...thereby obscuring the model's origin while retaining its content".[1] This document meticulously replaces the fluid-dynamic concepts of VAM with the formal machinery of modern string theory. The physical æther is replaced by a "condensate field." Vortex filaments become "one-dimensional topological defects" or "string-like objects." Their dynamics, previously described by fluid equations, are now governed by a Nambu-Goto action, and their interactions are mediated by Kalb-Ramond couplings to a two-form gauge field,

$B\mu\nu$.[1]

This VAM-to-SST transition serves as a fascinating case study in the sociology and rhetoric of theoretical physics. Recognizing that the explicit æther-based ontology of VAM was a significant barrier to mainstream acceptance, the author undertook a comprehensive translation of the theory's concepts into the more fashionable and formally accepted language of effective field theory. The underlying physical assumptions, constants, and predictive equations remain identical; only the descriptive language has changed. This is not a scientific evolution driven by new data or deeper understanding, but a formalistic transformation designed to make a heterodox theory appear more conventional and thus more likely to be accepted by the scientific community.

Section 5: The Canonical Formalism of Swirl-String Theory

The final stage of the framework's development is its codification into the canonical formalism of Swirl-String Theory (SST). This mature version represents the successful abstraction of the initial fluid-dynamic ideas into a sophisticated, QFT-like structure. The language is formal, the constants are fixed, and the core equations are presented as definitive. This canonical presentation effectively launders the unorthodox concepts of VAM through the language of mainstream theoretical physics, creating a polished, albeit still speculative, final product.

The SST Canon

The CANON documents serve as the "single source of truth" for the theory, establishing its axiomatic foundation.[1] The core postulates are rephrased in more abstract terms: the physical "æther" becomes an "incompressible, inviscid swirl condensate," and gravity is said to emerge from "coherent swirl fields and swirl-pressure gradients".[1] These documents also list the definitive numerical values for the theory's fundamental constants, such as the characteristic swirl speed (

vs=1.09385×106 m/s) and the core density (ρm=3.89344×1018 kg/m^3), which are carried over directly from the VAM calculations.[1]

The Invariant-Driven Mass Formula

The evolution of the mass formula reaches its final stage in the SST Canon. The heuristic, tunable integer parameters of the VAM-era formula are replaced with formal, *a priori* defined topological invariants of knots.[1] The mass of a particle, represented by a torus knot or link

T(p,q), is now given by a function of its fundamental mathematical properties:

M(T(p,q))=(α4)b(T)−3/2ϕ−g(T)n(T)−1/ϕ(21ρfvs2)c2πrs3Ltot(T)
Here, the parameters are no longer arbitrary integers but are derived directly from the knot's topology: n(T) is the number of components, b(T) is the braid index, and g(T) is the Seifert genus. The volume term is now explicitly tied to the knot's ropelength, Ltot(T), another geometric invariant. This final formulation completes the journey from a purely empirical fitting exercise to a seemingly deductive theoretical statement grounded in deep mathematics.

The SST Lagrangian

The theory's ultimate expression is a complete effective field theory Lagrangian, designed to mirror the structure of the Standard Model.[1] This highly abstract formalism describes the dynamics of the "swirl condensate" and its knotted excitations. Its key components include:

- A **clock field T(x)** that defines a preferred foliation of spacetime, preserving the core concept of an absolute time from VAM.[1]
- A **two-form gauge field Bμν**, whose field strength H=dB represents the vorticity of the condensate.[1]
- An **emergent non-Abelian swirl connection Wμ** that governs the interactions between knots, giving rise to sectors that mimic QCD and the electroweak force.[1]
- **Dirac spinor fields ΨK** to represent the knotted fermions, labeled by their knot class K.[1]

This final Lagrangian is a formal restatement of the original VAM ideas. The physical æther is now a condensate field; absolute time is a preferred foliation; vortex knots are spinor fields. The fundamental physical content—a preferred frame and a fluid-dynamic origin for particles and forces—remains unchanged, but it is now dressed in the sophisticated and conventional language of modern field theory.

Particle	Assigned Knot	Topological Class	Key Invariants
Photon	Unknot (01)	Torus T(1,1)	g=0,b=1,n=1
Neutrino	Trefoil (31)	Torus T(2,3)	g=1,b=2,n=1
Electron	Solomon Link	Torus T(4,2)	g=1,b=2,n=2
Up Quark	62 Knot	Hyperbolic	(Chiral)
Down Quark	74 Knot	Hyperbolic	(Chiral)

Table 5: The canonical particle-knot taxonomy in the final SST framework, which forms the basis for the invariant-driven mass formula. Data synthesized from.[1]

Section 6: Synthesis and Conclusion: Closing the Loop

The developmental trajectory of the VAM/SST framework, traced from its empirical origins to its canonical formulation, provides a compelling narrative of modern theoretical physics in practice. It showcases a research program that is ambitious, mathematically sophisticated, and internally consistent, yet one whose foundations and evolution reveal a methodology of post-hoc justification and strategic repositioning.

The journey began with a data-mining exercise. The numerical patterns observed in the fseries dataset, particularly the correlations involving the custom metric Hvortex_X, formed the empirical bedrock upon which the entire theory was constructed. The initial VAM ontology, with its physical æther and layered time, was a creative and elaborate attempt to provide a physical explanation for these pre-existing numerical results. The subsequent evolution of the mass formula—from a dimensionally flawed heuristic to a multi-parameter fitting function and finally to an elegant expression based on topological invariants like the Seifert genus, g(T)—was a process of refining the mathematical description to better fit the known masses of particles. The core idea, that a knot's mass is a function of its complexity, remained constant; what evolved was the mathematical sophistication of that function.

The transition from VAM to SST marks a pivotal moment in the theory's history, one driven by rhetoric as much as by science. Faced with the challenge of presenting a heterodox theory to a mainstream audience, the framework was systematically "translated" into the accepted language of effective field theory. The physical æther was sublimated into an abstract "condensate," and fluid dynamics were replaced by a formal Lagrangian. This rebranding was successful in making the theory appear more conventional, but it did not alter its fundamental, and problematic, reliance on a preferred reference frame, now disguised as a "preferred foliation."

In conclusion, the VAM/SST framework stands as a highly developed example of a "bottom-up" theoretical construction. It is a testament to how deep numerical experimentation with mathematical structures can inspire the creation of a rich physical model. However, its historical analysis also serves as a cautionary tale. The consistent pattern of post-hoc justification, the strategic rebranding to obscure its unorthodox origins, and the persistence of fundamental flaws—such as the inability to account for chemical binding energy and the reliance on a preferred frame—raise significant questions about its ultimate viability as a predictive theory of nature. While the framework successfully reproduces a wide range of known physical phenomena, from the Lorentz factor to the masses of atomic nuclei, the evidence suggests that this is a result of careful construction and fitting rather than genuine *a priori* predictive power. The theory is a masterful description, but whether it is a true explanation remains an open question.

Geciteerd werk

1. VAM-2-Swirl_Clocks_and_Vorticity-Induced_Gravity.pdf

2. Modern searches for Lorentz violation - Wikipedia, geopend op augustus 25, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Modern_searches_for_Lorentz_violation
3. The Michelson-Morley Experiment: A Modern Perspective - Number Analytics, geopend op augustus 25, 2025, https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/michelson-morley-experiment-modern-perspective