Convergent Mathematical Foundations
of Hydrodynamic Quantum Gravity

Seven Independent Frameworks, One Physical Reality

Robert William Harrison
Independent Researcher

February 2026 — Revised

Abstract

Modern particle physics describes interactions with high precision, yet many key quantities—masses, mixing angles, and couplings—enter the Standard Model as empirically determined inputs rather than derived outputs. This paper surveys whether several widely separated mathematical formalisms can be arranged to reproduce, constrain, or illuminate a subset of these regularities (notably: three-generation structure, charged-lepton mass relations, neutrino mixing structure, and the fine-structure constant).

We consider seven frameworks developed for purposes unrelated to particle physics: nonlinear wave theory (solitons), emergent-metric constructions in condensed-matter analogues, algebraic topology, geometric circle packing, classical coupled-oscillator mechanics, crystallography/phonon band structure, and information-theoretic constraints. Under a working assumption that vacuum dynamics admit an effective 'medium-like' description (in the universality-class sense), each framework yields structures that can be placed in correspondence with selected Standard Model features—sometimes as exact mappings under stated substitutions, and sometimes as structural or parameter-matched analogues.

The aim is not to claim a completed derivation of the Standard Model, but to document a comparative catalogue of correspondences and to separate (i) exact identities, (ii) structural correspondences, and (iii) heuristic analogies. Where the mapping is sufficiently constrained, we note potential discriminating tests. The overall thesis is that some Standard Model regularities may admit interpretation as properties of vacuum excitations in an effective-medium description, and that this possibility merits targeted scrutiny.

1. Introduction: The Parameter Problem

The Standard Model of particle physics is often celebrated as the most successful scientific theory ever constructed. Its predictions have been verified to extraordinary precision — the electron's magnetic moment, for instance, matches theory and experiment to better than one part in a trillion. Yet this success conceals a profound limitation: the Standard Model is a framework for organising observations, not a theory that explains them.

1.1 The Nineteen Parameters

The Standard Model requires at minimum 19 free parameters that must be determined by experiment:

- 6 quark masses (up, down, charm, strange, top, bottom)
- 3 charged lepton masses (electron, muon, tau)
- 3 neutrino mass differences (or 3 masses if Majorana)
- 4 CKM matrix parameters (quark mixing)
- 4 PMNS matrix parameters (neutrino mixing)
- 3 coupling constants (electromagnetic, weak, strong)
- Higgs vacuum expectation value
- Higgs self-coupling
- QCD theta parameter

These numbers are not predicted by the theory. They are measured, inserted, and used to calculate other quantities. The Standard Model answers ‘how do these particles interact?’ but cannot answer ‘why do these particles exist?’ or ‘why do they have these masses?’

1.2 The Generation Problem

Perhaps the deepest mystery is the existence of exactly three generations of fermions. The electron, muon, and tau are identical in every quantum number — charge, spin, weak isospin — except mass. The muon is 207 times heavier than the electron; the tau is 17 times heavier than the muon. Why three copies? Why these mass ratios?

The Standard Model provides no answer. A fourth generation is not forbidden by any known principle; it is simply not observed. The three-generation structure appears to be a brute fact about nature — a parameter of the theory rather than a consequence of it.

1.3 The Mixing Problem

The PMNS matrix describes how neutrino mass eigenstates (ν_1, ν_2, ν_3) relate to flavour eigenstates (ν_e, ν_μ, ν_τ). Its four parameters — three mixing angles and one CP-violating phase — determine neutrino oscillation probabilities. But why these particular angles? The Standard Model cannot say.

1.4 The Coupling Problem

The fine structure constant $\alpha \approx 1/137.036$ determines the strength of electromagnetic interactions. It is one of the most precisely measured quantities in physics. It is also one of the most mysterious. Why this value? What determines it?

Richard Feynman famously wrote: ‘It has been a mystery ever since it was discovered… a magic number that comes to us with no understanding by man. You might say the hand of God wrote that number, and we don’t know how He pushed His pencil.’

1.5 The Thesis of This Paper

This paper proposes that these ‘mysteries’ are not fundamental. They appear mysterious because the Standard Model is an effective description of deeper physics — like thermodynamics before statistical mechanics, or chemistry before quantum theory.

We argue that seven largely independent mathematical frameworks—developed for purposes unrelated to particle physics—can be placed in correspondence with several Standard Model regularities when one adopts an effective description in which vacuum dynamics share features with inviscid superfluids. The convergence, to the extent it survives careful classification into exact mappings versus fitted or heuristic links, motivates the following hypotheses:

- Mass is an eigenvalue, not a parameter
- Three generations arise from trigonal symmetry and topological constraints
- Mixing matrices are normal mode transformations
- Coupling constants emerge from geometric stability conditions

The broader proposal is that the frequent reappearance of hydrodynamic and condensed-matter mathematics in high-energy contexts may be signalling shared underlying structures. In this programme, 'medium-like' language is used as an effective description of vacuum degrees of freedom rather than a return to a classical, preferred-frame ether.

2. The Translation Principle: Why Independent Convergence Matters

Before examining the individual mathematical frameworks, we must establish the epistemological significance of their convergence. The argument presented in this paper is not that hydrodynamic models *resemble* particle physics — resemblance can be coincidental or contrived. The argument is that independent mathematical structures, developed for unrelated purposes by researchers with no knowledge of particle physics, produce the same quantitative outputs when applied to the vacuum. This distinction is crucial.

A note on terminology: When this paper describes the vacuum in "medium-like" terms, it refers to an effective description of vacuum dynamics, not to a literal substance filling space. Space is taken to be empty in the ordinary sense; the claim is that the vacuum has dynamical degrees of freedom that support propagating modes and stable excitations. Michelson–Morley constrains classical preferred-frame ether models with Galilean velocity addition; it does not preclude Lorentz-invariant vacuum dynamics that admit a medium-like effective description. In this sense, "superfluid vacuum" is used as a universality-class / analogue-gravity pointer rather than a claim about a material ether.

Correspondence types used in this paper:
• Exact identity: an explicit mapping shows two expressions are mathematically identical under stated substitutions.
• Structural correspondence: different formalisms reduce to the same eigenvalue problem / symmetry / conservation structure.
• Parameter-matched fit: agreement obtained after choosing free parameters to match known values.
• Heuristic analogy: a qualitative resemblance that guides intuition but is not treated as evidential on its own.

2.1 The Distinction Between Analogy and Isomorphism

An analogy is a qualitative similarity: 'the atom is like a solar system.' Analogies are heuristically useful but prove nothing about underlying structure. They can be constructed between almost any two complex systems by selective emphasis.

An isomorphism is a structural identity: the mathematical equations are the same, the symmetry groups are the same, the numerical outputs match. Isomorphisms cannot be constructed arbitrarily — they exist or they don't. When two systems share an isomorphism, they are instantiations of the same abstract structure.

This paper documents a spectrum of correspondences, not all of equal strength. Some items are exact identities under explicit substitutions (e.g., Koide ↔ Descartes as formulated by Kocik under stated geometric assumptions). Others are structural correspondences (shared eigenvalue/symmetry structure), and some are parameter-matched demonstrations (e.g., coupled-oscillator models reproducing mixing angles to within a stated tolerance). The evidential weight of each correspondence is therefore assessed case-by-case.

2.2 The Evidential Weight of Independent Discovery

Consider the following historical facts:

René Descartes (1643) derived the Circle Theorem while studying Apollonian gaskets — a problem in pure geometry concerning the packing of mutually tangent circles. He knew nothing of leptons, which would not be discovered for 250 years.

Lev Landau (1957) developed Fermi liquid theory to explain the thermodynamic properties of liquid helium-3 and electrons in metals. He was not attempting to model the vacuum or particle physics.

Classical mechanicians (18th century) solved the coupled pendulum problem as an exercise in Newtonian dynamics. They could not have anticipated the PMNS matrix, which describes neutrino oscillations discovered in 1998.

These researchers were not collaborating. They were not borrowing assumptions from particle physics. They were solving problems in their own domains. The convergence was not designed; it was discovered.

2.3 The Archaeological Metaphor

Imagine archaeologists excavating an ancient city. One team digs from the north and uncovers a wall running east–west. Another team digs from the south and uncovers the same wall. A third team, digging from the east, finds the wall turning a corner. None of the teams communicated during excavation.

Agreement between independent excavations is not, by itself, a proof of any particular interpretation; it is an indicator that multiple lines of inquiry may be touching the same underlying structure. In the present context, the analogy is used only to motivate why independent mathematical 'hits' can be worth cataloguing, while remaining alert to selection effects and near-misses.

In that spirit, we review several convergences reported across soliton theory, topology, geometry, and coupled-oscillator mechanics. Where a correspondence is exact or tightly constrained, it is treated as a candidate structural link; where it is loose or requires tuning, it is treated as heuristic. The central claim is modest: if multiple constrained links survive replication and generate new testable constraints, an effective-medium picture of vacuum dynamics becomes increasingly plausible.

2.4 Different Inputs, Same Outputs

A critical feature of the convergence is that the frameworks do not share input constants. They share output structures.

The Sine-Gordon equation uses coupling parameter ξ. The Descartes theorem uses curvatures k_i. Homotopy theory uses winding numbers N. These are not the same quantities; they arise from completely different physical considerations.

Yet when each framework is applied to its domain:

- Sine-Gordon breathers produce exactly three stable states
- Topological charge N = 3 splits into exactly three sub-defects
- Circulant matrices with Z_3 symmetry have exactly three eigenvalues
- Three coupled pendulums have exactly three normal modes

The number three was not put in by hand. It emerges from the mathematics when applied to systems with appropriate symmetry properties.

3. Framework I: Nonlinear Wave Theory

In linear wave theory, localised wave packets inevitably disperse; they cannot form stable, persistent particles. The existence of stable matter therefore implies that the underlying field theory must be nonlinear. Soliton physics provides the mathematical framework for understanding how stable, particle-like excitations emerge from nonlinear fields.

3.1 The Sine-Gordon Breather

The Sine-Gordon equation is the prototypical integrable nonlinear field theory:

$$\partial^2\varphi/\partial t^2 - \partial^2\varphi/\partial x^2 + (m^2/\lambda)\sin(\sqrt{\lambda}\,\varphi) = 0$$

Beyond its topological ‘kink’ solutions (which model domain walls), this equation supports breather solutions — bound states of soliton–antisoliton pairs that oscillate in time while remaining spatially localised. The breather is a standing wave that does not disperse.

In the quantum regime, the continuous classical spectrum becomes discrete. The mass M_n of the *n*-th breather state is given exactly by:

$$M_n = 2M_{soliton} \times \sin(n\pi\xi/2)$$

where ξ is a coupling parameter. This formula has profound implications: a continuous nonlinear field naturally generates a discrete mass spectrum. Particles emerge as quantised vibrational modes.

3.2 Integrability Breaking and Finite Generations

The pure Sine-Gordon equation is 'integrable' — it has an infinite number of conserved quantities, which can stabilise an infinite tower of breather states. However, the physical vacuum is unlikely to be perfectly integrable.

When integrability is broken — for example, by adding a higher-harmonic term — the stability analysis changes dramatically. Higher breather modes develop radiative instabilities; they decay into lower modes plus radiation. Only the lowest few modes remain stable.

This provides a mechanism for why exactly three generations exist. In a non-integrable vacuum, the specific form of the nonlinearity selects for stability only the first few modes ($n = 1, 2, 3$). The tau is the heaviest stable mode; anything heavier would decay too quickly to observe.

3.3 The Mass Hierarchy from Topological Solitons

Manfried Faber has developed models of 'topological fermions' based on field configurations with non-trivial winding in 3D space. The mass of such a soliton is determined by minimising the field energy:

$$H = \int [\textit{kinetic} + \textit{gradient} + \textit{potential}]\, d^3x$$

The potential term takes the form $\cos^{2m}(\alpha)$, where m is an exponent characterising the vacuum's nonlinearity. Faber's numerical analysis shows that the stable soliton mass is highly sensitive to this exponent.

Remarkably, Faber notes that 'increasing the power m… may even reach the experimental mass ratios 1:207:3477 of electron, muon and tauon around $m \approx 350$.' While the specific value requires explanation, this demonstrates that large hierarchical mass ratios can arise geometrically from the structure of a nonlinear vacuum potential.

3.4 Breather Interactions and the Bjerknes Force

Two breathers interact via the exchange of field quanta. The effective potential between breathers at separation R depends critically on their relative phase Φ:

- **In-phase ($\Phi = 0$):** Attractive potential, decaying as $\exp(-MR)/\sqrt{R}$
- **Out-of-phase ($\Phi = \pi$):** Repulsive potential

This is mathematically identical to the Secondary Bjerknes Force between oscillating structures in a medium. If vacuum oscillons are phase-locked, they experience universal attraction — precisely as observed for gravity. The mechanism by which approximately 10^{80} particles achieve and maintain this phase coherence is physically motivated by the natural tendency of coupled oscillator systems to synchronise (the Kuramoto model provides the mathematical framework), but has not been derived from first principles. This phase-locking remains an open problem shared across the HQG framework.

4. Frameworks II–VI: Convergent Structures

4.1 Framework II: Emergent Metric Theory — Tensor Gravitational Waves

The detection of gravitational waves by LIGO in 2015 confirmed their tensor (spin-2) polarisation — space stretches along one axis while squeezing the perpendicular axis. This has been cited as evidence against fluid models of gravity, since classical fluids support only longitudinal (scalar) waves.

However, this objection assumes a classical fluid. The HQG framework models the vacuum as belonging to the ^{3}He-A universality class — a chiral superfluid whose order parameter is not a scalar but a complex matrix encoding orientation, chirality, and phase.

In the ^{3}He-A universality class, the emergent spacetime metric is constructed from the order parameter triad:

$$g\mu\nu = e^a\mu\ e^b\nu\ \eta_a{}^b$$

where $e^a\mu$ is the emergent tetrad (vierbein) built from the order parameter fields and $\eta_a{}^b$ is the flat Minkowski metric. This construction is bilinear in the tetrad — it is inherently a rank-2 symmetric tensor. Perturbations of this metric are tensor perturbations by construction, producing the quadrupolar strain pattern observed by LIGO.

An important clarification: Transverse Zero Sound (TZS), often cited in earlier versions of this framework, is governed by the ℓ = 1 (dipolar) Landau parameter F^s_1, making it a spin-1 vector mode—the analogue of a photon-like excitation rather than a graviton-like one. In this programme, the spin-2 character associated with gravitational-wave observations is therefore attributed to the tensor structure of an emergent metric construction, not to TZS itself. Recent experimental work reporting chiral graviton modes (spin-2 collective excitations) in fractional quantum Hall liquids (Liang et al. 2024) and theoretical analyses of spin-nematic Goldstone modes (Chojnacki, Shannon & Penc 2024) indicate that condensed-matter systems can host spin-2 collective behaviour. Identifying the relevant propagating spin-2 mode in a ^{3}He-A–class vacuum analogue, and deriving gravitational-radiation power from microscopic dynamics, remain open tasks.

The correspondence as it currently stands:

- **Polarisation:** The emergent metric is rank-2 symmetric, producing quadrupolar strain
- **Propagation speed:** Metric perturbations travel at c, the limiting velocity of the acoustic metric
- **Open question:** Deriving the gravitational radiation formula and computing binary pulsar orbital decay (0.013% precision for PSR J0737−3039) from microscopic superfluid dynamics

LIGO's observations are consistent with the emergent metric framework but do not yet constitute an independent confirmation of it. The framework must earn that status by computing the radiation formula from first principles.

4.2 Framework III: Topology — Why Three Generations

Algebraic topology classifies stable defects in ordered media using homotopy groups $\pi_n(R)$, where R is the manifold of degenerate ground states. Volovik [1] has applied this to ^{3}He-A, showing that the vacuum can support point defects (Fermi points) carrying topological charge N.

A Fermi point with charge N gives rise to N species of chiral fermions. In the simplest case N = 1. However, topological arguments allow N = 3 as a stable configuration. Crucially, an N = 3 Fermi point can split into three N = 1 points at lower energies (symmetry breaking).

This provides a rigorous explanation for three generations: they are the remnants of a unified N = 3 topological defect that has split under symmetry breaking. Generation mixing (PMNS/CKM matrices) reflects the residual topological linkage between the split components.

4.3 Framework IV: Geometry — The Koide Formula

The Koide formula relates the masses of charged leptons:

$$Q = (m_e + m\mu + m\tau) / (\sqrt{m_e} + \sqrt{m\mu} + \sqrt{m\tau})^2 = 2/3$$

This holds to 0.01% precision — far better than experimental uncertainty. It is not fitted; it was a prediction that matched subsequent measurements.

Kocik [2] demonstrated that this formula is mathematically identical to the Descartes Circle Theorem for four mutually tangent circles, when generalised to circles intersecting at angle φ:

$$(\Sigma k_i)^2 = (1/\cos^2(\varphi/2)) \times \Sigma k_i^2$$

Setting $\sqrt{m} \leftrightarrow k$ (mass corresponds to curvature), $k_4 = 0$ (vacuum as infinite-radius 'line'), and $\cos^2(\varphi/2) = 2/3$, the Koide formula emerges exactly. The required angle $\varphi \approx 96.4°$ corresponds to intersection at 48.2° to baseline.

This suggests that leptons are constrained by contact geometry — like soap bubbles meeting at specific angles dictated by surface tension equilibrium.

4.4 Framework V: Classical Mechanics — The PMNS Matrix

The PMNS matrix, describing neutrino flavour mixing, has been experimentally reconstructed using three coupled pendulums (Savla, 2024 [3]). The mathematical correspondence is exact:

Coupled Pendulums	**Neutrino Oscillations**
Pendulum angles $\theta\alpha$	Flavour amplitudes (ν_e, $\nu\mu$, $\nu\tau$)
Normal mode frequencies ω_i	Mass eigenvalues (m_1, m_2, m_3)
Mode transformation matrix	PMNS matrix
Beat frequency ($\omega_i - \omega_j$)	Oscillation frequency $\propto \Delta m^2/E$

By tuning spring constants, Savla reproduced the observed PMNS mixing angles to approximately 5%. This suggests that neutrino mixing can be modelled as a normal-mode transformation in a coupled-oscillator system. Here it is presented as a structural correspondence (shared eigenmode mathematics), not as a literal mechanical model of neutrinos.

4.5 Framework VI: Crystallography — Mass Gaps and Optical Branches

In crystalline solids, phonon dispersion splits into acoustic branches ($\omega \to 0$ as $k \to 0$) and optical branches (finite ω at $k = 0$). The optical branches have a 'mass gap' — minimum energy required for excitation.

If the vacuum has lattice-like structure (at the Planck scale), then:

- Massless particles (photon, graviton) correspond to acoustic branches — Goldstone modes of broken symmetry
- Massive particles (leptons, quarks) correspond to optical branches — excitations with energy gaps
- Generations correspond to different optical branches arising from a multi-component 'unit cell'

The periodicity numbers of the standard periodic table (2, 8, 18, 32 = $2n^2$) demonstrate this principle at the atomic scale, where standing waves in a central potential produce discrete, quantised shell structures.

4.6 Framework VII: Information Theory — The Fine Structure Constant

The fine structure constant $\alpha \approx 1/137$ can be explored through geometric stability conditions of toroidal vortices. If the electron is modelled as a stable vortex ring, its wave function must satisfy a closure condition: the phase must return to itself after one circuit around the torus.

Meucci [4] has calculated that the aspect ratio (poloidal vs toroidal radius) required for this wave closure yields a geometric constant. Combined with the Bekenstein bound (maximum information in a region), this produces $1/\alpha \approx 137$.

This line of reasoning is suggestive but must be treated cautiously. Meucci's calculation awaits peer review and independent replication. If a robust derivation were established, it would support the interpretation that α is constrained by geometric and stability conditions in an effective vacuum dynamics. Here it is included as a research lead rather than as a settled result.

5. The Translation Dictionary

Having examined each framework individually, we construct a systematic mapping of concepts across disciplines. This 'translation dictionary' reveals that the same physical entities appear under different names in different fields.

5.1 Fundamental Entities

Framework	Term for 'Particle'	Definition
Soliton Physics	Breather / Oscillon	Time-periodic, spatially localised nonlinear wave
Emergent Metric Theory	Quasiparticle	Dressed excitation near a Fermi point
Topology	Topological Defect	Configuration protected by homotopy class
Geometry	Tangent Circle	Circle constrained by contact with neighbours
Classical Mechanics	Normal Mode	Eigenstate of coupled oscillator system
Crystallography	Optical Phonon	Quantised lattice vibration with energy gap
Information Theory	Information Packet	Structure saturating Bekenstein bound

These are not seven different things. They are seven descriptions of a stable, localised excitation of empty space exhibiting medium-like dynamics.

5.2 Mass Concepts

Framework	Mass Corresponds To	Mathematical Form
Soliton Physics	Oscillation energy	$M = 2M_0 \sin(n\pi\xi/2)$
Emergent Metric	Effective mass	$m^* = m(1 + F_1/3)$
Topology	Winding energy	$E \propto \int\|\nabla\varphi\|^2\, d^3x$
Geometry	Curvature squared	$m \propto k^2 = 1/r^2$
Classical Mechanics	Frequency squared	$m \propto \omega^2$
Crystallography	Energy gap	$m = \hbar\omega(0)/c^2$

In every framework, mass is quantised and discrete — determined by integer indices, winding numbers, or mode numbers.

6. The Convergence Matrix

We now ask: which Standard Model features are explained by which frameworks? The following matrix maps explanatory coverage:

SM Feature	Soliton	Emerg. Metric	Topology	Geometry	Mechanics	Crystal	Info.
3 Generations	✓	—	✓	✓	✓	✓	—
Mass Hierarchy	✓	—	✓	✓	—	—	—
Koide Formula	—	—	—	✓	—	—	—
PMNS Matrix	—	—	✓	—	✓	—	—
Tensor GWs	—	✓*	—	—	—	—	—
$\alpha \approx 1/137$	—	—	—	✓	—	—	✓†
Mass Quantisation	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	—
Periodic Table	—	—	—	—	—	✓	—

** The emergent metric formalism produces tensor perturbations by construction (rank-2 symmetric from the tetrad), but the specific spin-2 propagating mode and radiation formula have not yet been derived from microscopic dynamics. This entry is marked with an asterisk to indicate partial status.*

† Meucci's wave closure derivation awaits peer review and independent verification.

Two observations emerge:

1. No single framework explains everything. The diagonal is not dominated by any one column. This confirms that the frameworks are genuinely independent — not disguised versions of each other.

2. Together, they cover all features. Every Standard Model mystery in the table has at least one (usually multiple) framework explanations. The combination is complete even though the parts are partial.

This pattern is precisely what we would expect if all frameworks describe the same underlying physics from different angles — like different projections of a higher-dimensional object.

7. The Statistical Argument

How surprising is the observed convergence? A note on selection effects. One can attempt rough "back-of-the-envelope" surprise estimates, but any such calculation is limited by correlations between frameworks, multiple-hypothesis searching, and the fact that we notice matches more readily than misses. Accordingly, the discussion below is framed as heuristic guidance rather than a formal statistical proof.

7.1 Individual Probabilities

Koide relation (geometry): The empirical relation $Q = 2/3$ is satisfied by charged-lepton masses at high precision. In this paper, we note a proposed structural correspondence between this relation and the Descartes circle theorem under a curvature substitution. The evidential weight of the correspondence depends on whether the mapping is exact and parameter-free, and on whether comparable "near-miss" relations are rare under an appropriate null model.

PMNS matrix (classical mechanics): A mechanical coupled-oscillator system can reproduce mixing-like transformations when tuned. The significance of this correspondence depends on how constrained the tuning is, whether the mapping is robust across implementations, and whether it predicts additional relations beyond the fitted angles.

Tensor Waves (Emergent Metric): LIGO detected exactly quadrupolar (spin-2) polarisation. The emergent metric formalism produces rank-2 symmetric tensor perturbations by construction. A classical fluid would not. The correspondence is structural: the tensor character follows necessarily from the tetrad construction, though the specific propagating mode and radiation formula remain to be derived.

Three generations (multiple frameworks): Several of the surveyed frameworks naturally produce three prominent modes, states, or topological classes. This is suggestive, but it is not by itself decisive: the inference is sensitive to model choice, definitions of "stability," and whether alternative counts can be obtained with comparably natural assumptions. We therefore treat this as a motivator for targeted tests, not as a probability argument.

7.2 Qualitative assessment (in place of a combined probability)

Taken together, the correspondences form a pattern that appears non-trivial under simple null assumptions, but the evidence is best evaluated correspondence-by-correspondence. The strongest items are those that (i) state an explicit mapping, (ii) avoid free parameter matching, and (iii) lead to independent predictions or constraints. Where those conditions are not met, the correspondence is treated as heuristic rather than probative.

7.3 The Alternative Hypothesis

The alternative — that these frameworks converge because they describe the same physical reality — requires no improbable coincidences. If empty space behaves like a structured medium with specific properties, then:

- Circle geometry describes how oscillons pack: Koide follows
- Pendulum mechanics describes how modes mix: PMNS follows
- Emergent metric theory describes vacuum dynamics: tensor waves follow
- Topology constrains stable defects: three generations follow

The convergence becomes expected rather than miraculous.

8. Implications

8.1 The Standard Model as Emergent Spectroscopy

If the convergences documented here are not coincidental, then the Standard Model is not fundamental physics. It is emergent spectroscopy — a catalogue of the resonant modes of the vacuum, just as atomic spectroscopy catalogues the resonant modes of atoms.

This does not diminish the Standard Model's achievements. Spectroscopy was extraordinarily successful before quantum mechanics explained it. The Balmer formula for hydrogen spectral lines was discovered in 1885; its explanation came in 1913. For 28 years, spectroscopy was a precise empirical science without foundational understanding.

The Standard Model may be in an analogous position. Its precision is real. Its parameters are measured. But the reason those parameters take their values — the underlying physics — lies in the structure of the vacuum.

8.2 General Relativity as Vacuum Acoustics

Similarly, General Relativity emerges as the acoustics of the vacuum. The acoustic metric formalism (Unruh [5], Visser [6]) shows that sound propagation in a moving fluid obeys equations formally identical to wave propagation in curved spacetime.

In the ^{3}He-A universality class, the emergent metric $g_{\mu\nu} = e^a{}_\mu e^b{}_\nu \eta_{ab}$ is constructed from the order parameter triad. Perturbations of this metric — gravitational waves — are tensor perturbations by construction. The Einstein equations describe the effective dynamics of this emergent geometry.

General Relativity and the Standard Model may be viewed, in this programme, as effective descriptions of a single underlying set of vacuum degrees of freedom: GR as the long-wavelength metric/hydrodynamic limit, and the Standard Model as the spectrum of stable excitations. This is offered as an organising hypothesis, not a completed derivation, and it stands or falls on whether the proposed mappings survive independent replication and discriminating tests.

8.3 What 'Fundamental' Means

This reframes the question of what physics is 'fundamental.' If particles are vacuum excitations and spacetime is vacuum flow, then the vacuum itself — empty space with its dynamic properties — is the fundamental entity.

But what is the vacuum 'made of'? This may be the wrong question. The vacuum may be ontologically primitive — not made of anything else. What we can say is this: the mathematical structures governing particles and spacetime are the mathematical structures of hydrodynamics, topology, and wave mechanics — the natural mathematics of a structured vacuum.

9. Falsifiable Predictions

The convergent framework makes specific predictions that distinguish it from conventional physics:

9.1 Gravastar Echoes

If black holes are not singularities but gravastars (dense vacuum condensate with physical surface), gravitational waves should reflect off the core and produce echoes in LIGO ringdown signals.

Standard GR predicts: Smooth exponential ringdown decay.

HQG predicts: Secondary pulses (echoes) following the primary ringdown.

Detection of persistent, statistically robust echoes (after controlling for analysis systematics) would be consistent with compact-object models involving physical interfaces or effective-medium boundary conditions, and would motivate closer comparison with vacuum-condensate scenarios. Non-detection would place constraints on such models.

9.2 No Fourth Generation

If three-generation structure is tied to a specific topological charge (e.g., $N = 3$) or to stability limits in a non-integrable nonlinear vacuum, then additional generations may be dynamically disfavoured rather than merely unobserved. This remains a hypothesis: the programme should specify which extensions are excluded and under what assumptions.

Standard Model: Fourth generation not forbidden, merely constrained by electroweak precision.

HQG: Fourth generation topologically impossible.

Any confirmed detection of fourth-generation fermions would falsify the topological explanation.

9.3 CP Violation from Vacuum Vorticity

The pendulum reconstruction of PMNS assumed zero CP-violating phase ($\delta = 0$). The convergent framework predicts that CP violation arises from vacuum vorticity or chirality.

Prediction: The CP phase should correlate with topological properties of vacuum defects. Detailed calculations may predict the phase value.

9.4 Mass Ratio Precision

Faber's topological model achieves the 1:207:3477 mass ratio with potential exponent $m \approx 350$. If this value can be derived from first principles (e.g., from vacuum equation of state), it becomes a prediction rather than a fit.

Test: Improved measurements of tau mass; prediction of heavier fermion masses in extended models.

10. Conclusion: Physics is Resonance

This paper has documented mathematical convergence across seven independent frameworks:

- Soliton physics — discrete mass spectrum from nonlinear wave quantisation
- Emergent metric theory — tensor gravitational waves from rank-2 symmetric metric perturbations (*specific spin-2 propagating mode remains an open programme*)
- Topology — three generations from Fermi point charge $N = 3$
- Geometry — Koide formula from Descartes Circle Theorem
- Classical mechanics — PMNS matrix from coupled pendulums
- Crystallography — mass gaps from optical phonon branches
- Information theory — fine structure constant from wave closure geometry (*awaiting verification*)

These frameworks were developed independently, for purposes unrelated to particle physics, by researchers with no knowledge of the Standard Model's structure. Yet they converge on the same outputs: exactly three generations, specific mass ratios, mixing matrices, coupling constants.

The convergence surveyed here is presented as a research signal rather than a conclusion. If future work shows that key mappings are exact (or tightly constrained), robust to alternative modelling choices, and linked to independent predictions, then a dynamical-vacuum interpretation becomes increasingly compelling. If not, the correspondences may be pedagogical analogies or artefacts of selection. Either way, the decisive criterion is testability: which links generate new constraints that conventional frameworks do not.

The mathematical structures of particle physics are not arbitrary. They are the structures of wave mechanics, topology, and geometry — the natural mathematics of a physical vacuum. The 'unreasonable effectiveness' of hydrodynamics in physics is not unreasonable at all. It is evidence.

Within this programme, the Standard Model is treated as an effective description of what vacuum excitations do, while the proposed hydrodynamic/topological picture is offered as a candidate explanation for why certain regularities appear. Whether the programme adds explanatory power depends on the survival of its strongest correspondences under independent scrutiny and on the delivery of discriminating, falsifiable predictions.

Acknowledgements

This paper was developed with AI research assistance (Claude, Anthropic; Gemini, Google) for literature survey, consistency verification, and technical review. The underlying theoretical framework, physical interpretations, and all original arguments are the author's own.

References

[1] Volovik, G. E. The Universe in a Helium Droplet (Oxford University Press, 2003).

[2] Kocik, J. 'The Koide Lepton Mass Formula and Geometry of Circles.' arXiv:1201.2067 (2012).

[3] Savla, N. 'Classical Reconstruction of the PMNS Matrix Using a Mechanical Neutrino Oscillator.' arXiv:2512.01851 (2024).

[4] Meucci, S. 'Wave Closure and the Fine Structure Constant.' (2020).

[5] Unruh, W. G. 'Experimental Black-Hole Evaporation?' Physical Review Letters 46, 1351–1353 (1981).

[6] Visser, M. 'Acoustic Black Holes: Horizons, Ergospheres and Hawking Radiation.' Classical and Quantum Gravity 15, 1767–1791 (1998).

[7] Landau, L. D. 'The Theory of a Fermi Liquid.' Soviet Physics JETP 3, 920–925 (1957).

[8] Valentinis, D., Zaanen, J. & van der Marel, D. 'Propagation of shear stress in strongly interacting metallic Fermi liquids enhances transmission of terahertz radiation.' Scientific Reports 11, 7105 (2021).

[9] Nguyen, H. N., Park, S., Scott, H. L., Zhelev, N. & Halperin, W. P. 'New Limits for Existence of Transverse Zero Sound in Fermi Liquid ^{3}He.' arXiv:2410.10795 (2024).

[10] Liang, J. et al. 'Evidence for chiral graviton modes in fractional quantum Hall liquids.' Nature 628, 78–83 (2024).

[11] Chojnacki, L., Shannon, N. & Penc, K. 'Spin-nematic Goldstone boson.' arXiv (2024).

[12] Dashen, R., Hasslacher, B. & Neveu, A. 'Particle Spectrum in Model Field Theories from Semiclassical Functional Integral Techniques.' Physical Review D 11, 3424 (1975).

[13] Faber, M. 'A Model for Topological Fermions.' Few-Body Systems 30, 149–186 (2001).

[14] Brannen, C. A. 'The Lepton Masses.' Preprint (2006).

[15] Mermin, N. D. 'The Topological Theory of Defects in Ordered Media.' Reviews of Modern Physics 51, 591 (1979).

[16] Koide, Y. 'A New View of Quark and Lepton Mass Hierarchy.' Lettere al Nuovo Cimento 34, 201 (1982).

[17] Jacobson, T. 'Thermodynamics of Spacetime: The Einstein Equation of State.' Physical Review Letters 75, 1260–1263 (1995).

Companion Papers:

Harrison, R. W. 'Gravity as Acoustic Radiation Pressure: The Secondary Bjerknes Force in the Superfluid Vacuum.' (2026).

Harrison, R. W. 'Hydrodynamic Electromagnetism: Maxwell's Equations in the Superfluid Vacuum.' (2026).