The Structured-Vacuum Hypothesis: A Phase-Bearing Medium with a Fifth-Dimensional Magnetodynamic Potential Channel

Peter S. Wang,[1] Claude,[2] and GPT-5.5[3]

[1]*College of Engineering (Alumnus), University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA*
[2]*Anthropic, San Francisco, CA, USA (AI system)*
[3]*OpenAI, San Francisco, CA, USA (AI system)*

AI-system coauthors are listed at the request of the corresponding (human) author; see the Author Contributions and AI Disclosure statement.

(Dated: June 10, 2026)

Abstract. We present a speculative but internally articulated framework in which the vacuum is modeled not as empty space but as a structured, phase-bearing, superfluid-like medium endowed with one additional orthogonal degree of freedom. This fifth coordinate, denoted w, is interpreted not as a conventional macroscopic spatial direction but as a *magnetodynamic potential channel* through which the couplings among distance, time, charge, phase, and topology may vary. Within this picture, matter is identified with stable topological excitations of the medium; electric charge with winding or coupling modes relative to the w-channel; electromagnetism with the $(3+1)$-dimensional projection of phase and potential gradients; and gravitation with the coarse-grained stress–flow response of the medium, recovering general relativity as a continuum limit in the spirit of induced- and emergent-gravity programs. The conjectured ER = EPR correspondence acquires a natural reading as shared relational structure in the deeper medium. Dark-sector phenomenology is reinterpreted as the gravitational shadow of unmodeled vacuum structure. We emphasize throughout that this is a conceptual scaffold rather than established physics: we state the correspondence constraints the framework must satisfy (exact or near-exact Lorentz invariance, precision quantum electrodynamics, classical and strong-field tests of general relativity, and concordance cosmology), identify three constants (c, G, α) whose derivation from medium parameters would elevate the proposal beyond metaphor, and enumerate falsifiable experimental directions.

I. INTRODUCTION

The notion that the vacuum is a physical medium rather than an inert void has a long and respectable, if checkered, history. Kelvin's vortex-atom program sought to identify matter with knotted excitations of a space-filling fluid [1]; Dirac argued that quantum field theory rehabilitates a form of aether consistent with relativity [2]; and modern condensed-matter physics has demonstrated, through the analogue-gravity program, that effective Lorentzian geometries, horizons, and quasiparticle "matter" generically emerge in the long-wavelength description of quantum fluids [3, 4, 5]. In parallel, the induced- and emergent-gravity tradition—from Sakharov's vacuum-elasticity proposal [6] through Jacobson's thermodynamic derivation of the Einstein equation [7] and entropic-gravity proposals [8]—suggests that spacetime geometry may be a coarse-grained, hydrodynamic-level description of deeper microscopic degrees of freedom. Finally, developments in holography indicate that spacetime connectivity itself may be built from entanglement [9], culminating in the ER = EPR conjecture relating Einstein–Rosen bridges [10] to Einstein–Podolsky–Rosen correlations [11, 12].

This paper develops a single speculative ontology intended to make contact with all of these threads. We propose that the vacuum be modeled as a structured, phase-bearing medium—a higher-dimensional analogue of a superfluid order parameter—equipped with one additional orthogonal degree of freedom, the coordinate w. The central and most heterodox commitment of the framework is the interpretation of this fifth dimension: rather than a compactified spatial hallway in the Kaluza–Klein sense [13, 14], or a warped bulk direction in the brane-world sense [15, 16], we treat w as a *magnetodynamic potential channel*. On this reading, "magnetism" names something deeper than the familiar field $\mathbf{B}$: it names the underlying tendency of the medium to align, circulate, polarize, and phase-lock through the orthogonal potential dimension. The textbook magnetic field is recovered as one $(3+1)$-dimensional projection of this deeper coupling structure.

Status and scope. We state plainly at the outset what this paper is and is not. It is not a derivation of known physics from first principles, nor does it report new experimental results. It is a concept paper: an attempt to render a physical intuition sufficiently precise that its assumptions are explicit, its vocabulary is disciplined, its points of contact with established theory are identified, and—most importantly—its obligations are enumerated. A framework of this kind earns scientific standing only by (i) recovering the precision successes of quantum electrodynamics, general relativity, and concordance cosmology in the appropriate limits, and (ii) making at least one falsifiable prediction that standard effective descriptions do not naturally accommodate. Sections 12–14 are devoted to those obligations.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 fixes terminology. Section 3 introduces the magnetodynamic potential channel. Sections 4–6 develop the medium ontology, the topological theory of matter, and the projection account of charge and electromagnetism. Sections 7–8 treat the emergent metric, distance–time conversion, and the recovery of general relativity. Section 9 gives the medium-language

Table 1: Conventional terms and their preferred interpretation within the structured-vacuum framework.

Term	Interpretation in this framework
Vacuum	Structured, phase-bearing medium; not empty nothingness.
Magnetism	Fifth-dimensional coupling, alignment, circulation, polarity, and phase-attraction tendency; the ordinary field **B** is a projected special case.
Charge	Coupling, winding, or circulation mode relative to the orthogonal *w*-potential channel.
Particle	Stable topological excitation, or persistent "reducer," of the vacuum medium.
Force	Macroscopic appearance of local update constraints, gradients, and coupling tendencies.
Spacetime	Low-energy projection of the medium state into distance–time geometry.
Gravity	Large-scale stress, flow, curvature, or elastic response of the medium.
Dark matter	Effective gravitational term sourced by medium structure, polarization, circulation, or boundary conditions.
Dark energy	Vacuum pressure, i.e. the equation-of-state behavior of the medium.

reading of ER = EPR. Section 10 addresses dark-sector phenomenology. Section 11 records a toy Lagrangian scaffold, Sec. 12 the empirical constraints, Sec. 13 the constants to be derived, and Sec. 14 candidate experimental directions. Section 15 concludes.

II. VOCABULARY AND ONTOLOGICAL COMMITMENTS

Part of the difficulty in discussing vacuum-medium proposals is inherited vocabulary. Terms such as "empty space," "virtual particle," "collapse," and "force" function as historical shortcuts that can obscure the ontology under discussion. We do not propose discarding the formal apparatus of established physics; we propose separating precise formal tools from misleading popular metaphors. Table 1 fixes the translation dictionary used throughout this paper.

III. MAGNETISM AS THE *w*-POTENTIAL CHANNEL

Let the vacuum medium be represented by a higher-dimensional field

$$\Phi = \Phi(x, y, z, w, t), \tag{1}$$

where w is orthogonal to ordinary three-dimensional space but is *not* assumed to behave as an ordinary macroscopic direction. It functions instead as a scalar potential dimension: displacements and gradients along w alter how distance, time, charge, and field amplitudes project into observed (3+1)-dimensional physics.

We associate with the w-channel a scalar magnetodynamic potential ϕ_M and posit, as the central structural ansatz of the framework, that the electromagnetic four-potential is not fundamental in isolation but arises as the lower-dimensional projection of gradients, twists, and phase relationships in the hidden channel:

$$w \sim \phi_M, \qquad A_\mu \sim \kappa \partial_\mu \phi_M, \tag{2}$$

with κ a projection constant. Two remarks situate this ansatz. First, the elevation of the *potential* over the field strength is consonant with the lesson of the Aharonov–Bohm effect, in which physically observable phase shifts are controlled by A_μ in regions where $F_{\mu\nu}$ vanishes [17]. Second, Eq. (2) as written is deliberately schematic: a pure-gradient A_μ has vanishing field strength, so the physically relevant structure must reside in multivalued, topologically nontrivial, or non-integrable configurations of ϕ_M (windings, vortices, and defects), exactly as multivalued phases generate quantized circulation in superfluids. Making this precise is one of the framework's outstanding mathematical obligations.

The word "magnetism" is therefore used here in a broader and more literal sense than the textbook magnetic field: it denotes the underlying disposition of the medium to align, couple, circulate, polarize, attract, repel, and phase-lock through the orthogonal potential dimension. That electric and magnetic fields already mix under boosts in ordinary special relativity is taken as a hint that both are observer-dependent decompositions of a single deeper coupling structure; the present framework pushes that hint one level further down.

IV. VACUUM ONTOLOGY: A PHASE-BEARING MEDIUM

A natural starting language is that of superfluid order parameters. Schematically,

$$\Psi(\mathbf{x}, t) = \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{x}, t)}\, e^{i\theta(\mathbf{x}, t)}, \tag{3}$$

with ρ a density-like amplitude and θ a phase. As Madelung observed in the earliest days of quantum mechanics, such a decomposition renders quantum dynamics hydrodynamic in form [18]; in a condensate, velocity-like transport emerges from phase gradients,

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{\hbar}{m} \nabla\theta. \tag{4}$$

The analogy is not the claim that the vacuum is literally a laboratory superfluid. The claim is structural: the vacuum may possess medium-like degrees of freedom—phase, stiffness, circulation, defects, response functions, and collective modes—of the kind known to generate effective relativistic field theories and effective geometries at long wavelength [5, 4].

The proposed vacuum field carries at least three layers of structure:

1. *Amplitude structure*: density, stiffness, impedance, and response strength of the medium;
2. *Phase structure*: gradients, circulation, winding, and coherence relationships;
3. *w-potential structure*: the orthogonal magnetodynamic coupling through which distance–time conversion and charge-like behavior can vary.

V. MATTER AS TOPOLOGY

Matter, in this framework, is not point substance placed inside empty space; it is stable topology of the medium itself. A particle is a persistent excitation—defect, vortex, knot, standing wave, or circulation state—that resists unwinding. The intuition descends from Kelvin's vortex atoms [1] and finds its modern expression in topological solitons such as skyrmions, in which conserved winding numbers play the role of conserved particle quantum numbers [19].

The elementary mechanism is winding quantization. For a single-valued order parameter, the circulation of the phase around any closed loop is constrained:

$$\oint_{\mathscr{C}} \nabla\theta \cdot d\ell = 2\pi n, \qquad n \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{5}$$

Equation (5) supplies a natural origin for discreteness: stable excitations come in quantized families because circulation and topology are constrained by integer winding. We emphasize that this observation does not derive the Standard Model spectrum; it identifies the *kind* of structure—homotopy classes of medium configurations in (4+1) dimensions—that a complete treatment would need to classify.

Reducer interpretation. It is useful to supplement the topological picture with an informational one. A matter excitation acts as a local *reducer* over the vacuum state: it receives field amplitude, phase, and w-potential information from its neighborhood and feeds back into the next state of the medium. Matter is thereby not merely a thing *inside* the field; it is a stable update pattern *of* the field. This reading anticipates the computational formulation sketched in Sec. 11.

VI. CHARGE AND ELECTROMAGNETIC PROJECTION

Electric charge is interpreted as a coupling or winding relationship relative to the w-potential channel. Rather than treating charge as an unexplained primitive label, the model identifies it with the manner in which a stable excitation couples to phase motion, circulation, or gradient structure in ϕ_M:

$$q \sim (\text{winding/circulation/boundary condition in } \phi_M). \tag{6}$$

Charge quantization then inherits the same topological rationale as Eq. (5), and charge conjugation acquires a geometric reading as orientation reversal of the relevant winding.

The observed electric and magnetic fields are projections. The deeper coupling structure in the (4+1)-dimensional medium decomposes, relative to an observer's embedding in the emergent (3+1)-dimensional metric, into electric-like and magnetic-like components:

$$\text{deeper coupling} \longrightarrow \text{observer projection} \longrightarrow \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{B}. \tag{7}$$

This ordering deliberately prevents the ordinary field **B** from being mistaken for the root object: **B** is one visible face of the magnetodynamic potential channel. We note that the general strategy—electromagnetism as geometry or projection of a fifth dimension—is the classical insight of Kaluza and Klein [13, 14], and that "charge without charge" as field topology was explored in geometrodynamics [20]. The present framework differs in refusing to treat w as a metrical spatial direction, treating it instead as a potential channel whose state modulates the projection itself.

VII. DISTANCE–TIME CONVERSION AND THE EMERGENT METRIC

In special relativity the invariant interval,

$$ds^2 = -c^2\,dt^2 + dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2, \tag{8}$$

exhibits c not merely as the speed of a propagating signal but as the conversion factor between temporal and spatial units. The structured-vacuum framework interprets this conversion factor as an emergent property of the medium, in direct analogy with sound speeds in continua:

$$c_{\text{eff}}^2 \sim \frac{K_{\text{vac}}}{\rho_{\text{vac}}}, \tag{9}$$

where K_{vac} is a stiffness-like and ρ_{vac} an inertia-like parameter of the vacuum. This is precisely the structure that arises rigorously in analogue gravity, where long-wavelength perturbations of a fluid propagate on an effective Lorentzian "acoustic metric" determined by the background flow [3, 4].

If the w-potential state varies, the conversion between distance and time may vary with it. Schematically,

$$ds^2 = -c^2(w,\mathbf{x},t)\,dt^2 + g_{ij}(w,\mathbf{x},t)\,dx^i dx^j. \tag{10}$$

In words: distance can become more time-like, time more distance-like, and the effective light cone can deform, because the fifth-dimensional magnetodynamic state changes the projected metric. Any such variation is, of course, severely constrained by experiment (Sec. 12); the framework requires that for all accessible regimes the projected metric be locally Lorentzian to extremely high precision.

VIII. GENERAL RELATIVITY AS EMERGENT CONTINUUM MECHANICS

General relativity is among the most successful descriptions of nature, confirmed from solar-system precision tests [21] to the direct detection of gravitational waves from binary black-hole coalescence [22]. The framework does not reject it; it reinterprets it as the smooth, large-scale, low-energy limit of the medium:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{structured vacuum} &\to \text{phase, circulation, topology}\\ &\to \text{stable excitations (matter)}\\ &\to \text{stress–flow response (geometry)}\\ &\to \text{continuum limit (general relativity).}\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Curvature is the macroscopic expression of stress, flow, pressure, elasticity, and topological constraint in the medium; Einstein geometry is what the medium looks like after microscopic update rules are coarse-grained into a smooth metric. This positioning places the proposal squarely within the emergent-gravity lineage: Sakharov's induced gravity, in which the Einstein–Hilbert term arises from vacuum quantum fluctuations [6]; Jacobson's demonstration that the Einstein equation follows from local thermodynamic relations [7]; and subsequent entropic formulations [8].

Relativity guardrail. Local observers within the emergent (3+1)-dimensional spacetime must measure Lorentz-consistent causal structure. Deeper dynamics in the medium, whatever their character, must not provide controllable faster-than-light signaling within the projection. This is adopted as an axiom of the framework rather than a derived result, and any concrete realization must demonstrate that it holds.

IX. ER = EPR IN THE MEDIUM LANGUAGE

The ER = EPR conjecture proposes that entanglement (EPR correlations [11]) and spacetime connectivity (Einstein–Rosen bridges [10]) are two descriptions of one underlying relational structure [12], a view buttressed by the holographic result that classical spacetime connectivity degrades as entanglement between boundary regions is dialed down [9].

The structured-vacuum framework supplies this conjecture with a candidate physical substrate. Two excitations that appear well separated in the three-dimensional projection may, in the deeper w-potential topology, be boundary expressions of a single shared relation:

$$\begin{aligned}&(\text{3D view}): \quad A \text{ here, } B \text{ there; correlation nonlocal,}\\ &(\text{5D view}): \quad A, B \text{ share one phase/topological relation.}\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

The correlation then appears nonlocal from the projected viewpoint but is local—indeed, already connected—in the deeper relational structure. Entanglement is the algebraic face of the shared relation; bridge geometry is its geometric face. We stress that this does not prove ER = EPR; it supplies a compatible ontology in which the conjecture would be natural rather than mysterious.

X. DARK-SECTOR PHENOMENOLOGY

Galactic rotation curves, lensing, structure formation, and the cosmic microwave background jointly require either nonbaryonic dark matter or a modification of gravitational dynamics, while the observed late-time acceleration of the Universe [23, 24] requires a component with equation of state $w_{\mathrm{EOS}} \simeq -1$, consistent with current concordance fits [25].

Within the structured-vacuum framework, both sectors may be *effective* terms sourced by unmodeled medium structure—polarization, flow, pressure, circulation, or boundary stress—rather than necessarily by new particle species. A toy modification of the Poisson equation illustrates the logic:

$$\nabla^2 \Phi_g = 4\pi G \left(\rho_m + \rho_{\mathrm{medium}}\right), \tag{13}$$

where ρ_{medium} need not be particulate: it may represent structured vacuum energy density, stress, circulation, or boundary-condition effects. Dark energy is correspondingly read as the equation-of-state behavior of the medium itself,

$$w_{\mathrm{EOS}} = \frac{p}{\rho c^2} \simeq -1. \tag{14}$$

The sharp scientific question becomes: what equation of state does the vacuum medium actually have, and can it reproduce the observed expansion history and growth of structure without arbitrary fitting? We note that hybrid pictures in which the dark sector exhibits genuine superfluid dynamics have been developed quantitatively elsewhere [26], providing both encouragement and a standard of rigor the present framework has yet to meet.

XI. TOY LAGRANGIAN SCAFFOLD AND COMPUTATIONAL READING

For concreteness, a rough field-theoretic sketch of the intended couplings may be written

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L} = \tfrac{1}{2}\left|\partial_A \Phi\right|^2 - V(|\Phi|) - \tfrac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}\\ + g\, J^\mu \partial_\mu \theta + \lambda\, R\, |\Phi|^2 + \eta\, J^\mu \partial_\mu \phi_M,\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

with index $A = 0,1,2,3,4$ running over time plus four spatial/potential dimensions. The symbols are summarized in Table 2. Equation (15) is scaffolding, not theory: it records which couplings the framework asserts to exist (g: matter–phase; η: matter–w-potential; λ: condensate–curvature) without claiming that this particular functional form survives the demands of consistency, renormalizability, or correspondence.

Computational reading. The model admits a compositional state-evolution formulation that is useful as a teaching and research interface. The vacuum state $\Phi(x,y,z,w,t)$ evolves by a local update in which (i) phase gradients and w-gradients are computed; (ii) winding and circulation are extracted; (iii) w-gradients are projected to an effective A_μ; (iv) coupling (charge) modes and stable topological defects are identified; and (v) the medium stress–flow determines the metric state for the next step. In this language, matter is a stable reducer, force is an update constraint, the metric is a projection, and

Table 2: Symbols appearing in the toy Lagrangian, Eq. (15).

Symbol	**Interpretation**
Φ	Structured vacuum field / order parameter.
θ	Phase of the vacuum order parameter.
w	Orthogonal magnetodynamic potential dimension.
ϕ_M	Scalar magnetodynamic potential of the w-channel.
$F_{\mu\nu}$	Observed electromagnetic tensor in projected (3+1)D physics.
J^μ	Matter current or excitation flow.
g, η	Matter–medium and matter–w-potential couplings.
$\lambda R\|\Phi\|^2$	Condensate–curvature coupling.

time is the ordered evolution of the medium state. The pedagogical advantage is that equations become compressed programs with explicit inputs, invariants, validity domains, and failure modes.

XII. CORRESPONDENCE CONSTRAINTS

The framework is scientifically viable only if it preserves the empirical successes of known physics. Because the structured-vacuum hypothesis posits a literal medium, it is exposed to a far sharper battery of tests than a purely formal reinterpretation would be: media generically introduce preferred frames, dispersion, drag, birefringence, mode-speed splittings, and composition-dependent couplings, all of which are now constrained to extraordinary precision. We collect the principal quantitative bounds in Table 3 and discuss each class below.

A. *Lorentz invariance and the absence of drag*

Local Lorentz symmetry must be exact, or must emerge with extremely high precision at accessible energies. Modern cavity experiments bound the anisotropy of the speed of light at the 10^{-18} level [31], and the standard-model-extension (SME) data tables constrain frame-dependent coefficients across the photon, electron, proton, and neutron sectors, in some cases to parts in 10^{-30} in natural units [27, 28]. A medium framework must therefore explain *structurally*—not by fine-tuning—why no preferred frame, anisotropic propagation, or vacuum drag is observed. The condensed-matter precedent is instructive: quasiparticles in a superfluid obey an emergent Lorentz symmetry exact at the level of the linearized effective theory, with violations suppressed by powers of (energy)/(medium gap or inverse coherence length) [5]. The corresponding requirement here is that the medium's coherence scale ξ be small enough (Sec. 13 suggests Planckian) that dispersive corrections, generically of order $(E\xi/\hbar c)^n$, evade the bound of Ref. [32], which already excludes $n = 1$ corrections suppressed only by the Planck energy.

Table 3: Constraint budget for any structured-vacuum realization. Each bound limits a generic medium effect; a concrete model must show its predicted signal lies below the stated level (or saturates it detectably).

Medium effect	**Bound**	**Ref.**
Anisotropy of c (preferred frame)	$\Delta c/c \lesssim 10^{-18}$	[31]
Vacuum dispersion (linear in E)	$E_{\mathrm{QG},1} > 1.2\,E_{\mathrm{Pl}}$	[32]
Speed of metric vs. EM modes	$\|c_{\mathrm{gw}} - c_\gamma\|/c \lesssim 10^{-15}$	[33]
QED projection (electron $g/2$)	$\delta \sim 2.8 \times 10^{-13}$	[29]
PPN light bending ($\gamma - 1$)	$(2.1 \pm 2.3) \times 10^{-5}$	[34]
Universality of free fall (η)	$\lesssim 10^{-15}$	[35]
CMB blackbody distortion	$\lesssim 5 \times 10^{-5}$ of peak	[36]
Lorentz/CPT (many sectors)	SME tables	[27]

B. *Equality of mode speeds*

A two-sector medium—an electromagnetic projection and a metric (stress–flow) projection—generically endows the two sectors with different characteristic speeds, as different collective modes of one continuum. The multimessenger observation of GW170817/GRB 170817A constrains $-3 \times 10^{-15} < (c_{\mathrm{gw}} - c_\gamma)/c_\gamma < +7 \times 10^{-16}$ [33]. Within the present framework this is a nontrivial structural demand: the stiffness-to-inertia ratios governing the phase sector and the w-potential sector must coincide to fifteen digits, which is most naturally explained if both modes propagate on a single underlying characteristic cone, i.e. if the projected metric of Eq. (10) is universal across sectors. We adopt mode-speed universality as a defining requirement of any acceptable realization.

C. *Precision quantum electrodynamics*

The projected electromagnetic sector must reproduce QED observables. The electron magnetic moment is measured to $g/2 = 1.001\,159\,652\,180\,73\,(28)$, a precision of 2.8×10^{-13}, in agreement with the Standard-Model prediction [29]. Any w-channel modification of the photon propagator or of the electron's coupling to it must therefore enter below this level at laboratory energies. Vacuum birefringence supplies a complementary handle: QED itself predicts the tiny Heisenberg–Euler nonlinearity [30], optical polarimetry of the isolated neutron star RX J1856.5−3754 provides suggestive astrophysical evidence at the expected magnitude [39], and laboratory searches bound anomalous contributions; a magnetodynamic medium must not overproduce birefringence beyond the QED expectation.

D. *Gravitational tests*

The continuum limit must recover general relativity in all tested regimes. In the parametrized post-Newtonian language, the Cassini radio-link measurement gives $\gamma - 1 = (2.1 \pm 2.3) \times 10^{-5}$ [34], with comparable constraints on preferred-frame PPN parameters [21]; the strong-field radiative regime is anchored by direct gravitational-wave observations [22]. Because a medium couples in principle to internal composition, the universality of free fall is an especially dangerous test: the MICROSCOPE mission bounds the Eötvös parameter at $\eta \simeq 10^{-15}$ [35]. The framework must therefore arrange that the effective coupling of a topological excitation to the medium's stress–flow field depends only on its total energy–momentum—i.e., the medium must gravitate metrically.

E. *Cosmology*

The framework must match the redshift–distance relation, big-bang nucleosynthesis abundances, baryon acoustic oscillations, large-scale structure, and the cosmic microwave background, whose spectrum is Planckian to better than 5×10^{-5} of peak intensity [36] and whose acoustic-peak structure is fit by the six-parameter ΛCDM concordance model [25]. Any medium contribution to the expansion history must hide inside the current error budget of that fit or improve it.

F. *Causality and novelty*

Two further constraints are internal. First, variations in the w-channel must not permit controllable superluminal signaling within the emergent (3+1)-dimensional metric (Sec. 8). Second, the framework must yield at least one falsifiable prediction beyond existing effective descriptions: a proposal that merely re-narrates known physics in new vocabulary is not yet a theory. Table 3 doubles as the discovery menu—each row is a place where a concrete realization could predict a signal just below the current bound.

XIII. THREE CONSTANTS TO DERIVE

The proposal becomes more than metaphor only if it can derive, or tightly relate, key constants from medium parameters. The minimum target set is $\{c,\ G,\ \alpha\}$. In this section we carry the program as far as dimensional analysis, exact electromagnetic identities, and one nontrivial consistency check allow, and we state precisely where genuine derivation must take over. Nothing below is a first-principles calculation; the value of the exercise is that it converts vague aspiration into a small number of sharply posed sub-problems.

A. *The conversion constant c*

The continuum-mechanical relation

$$c^2 = \frac{K_{\mathrm{vac}}}{\rho_{\mathrm{vac}}} \tag{16}$$

is the standard form realized rigorously in analogue systems [3, 4]: long-wavelength excitations of a medium with stiffness K_{vac} (units of pressure, $\mathrm{J\,m^{-3}}$) and inertial density ρ_{vac} ($\mathrm{kg\,m^{-3}}$) propagate at this characteristic speed. Equation (16) alone fixes only the *ratio* $K_{\mathrm{vac}}/\rho_{\mathrm{vac}} = c^2 \approx 8.99 \times 10^{16}\ \mathrm{m^2\,s^{-2}}$; the pair $(K_{\mathrm{vac}}, \rho_{\mathrm{vac}})$ is one-parameter degenerate. Breaking the degeneracy requires a second, independent observable that depends on ρ_{vac} alone. Gravitation supplies one.

B. *The Newton constant G and a Planck-density consistency check*

Suppose the medium possesses, in addition to K_{vac} and ρ_{vac}, a microscopic coherence (healing) length ξ—the scale below which the continuum description fails. Dimensional closure then admits essentially one combination with the units of G ($\mathrm{m^3\,kg^{-1}\,s^{-2}}$):

$$\begin{aligned} G &\sim \frac{c^2}{\rho_{\mathrm{vac}}\,\xi^2}, \quad \text{i.e.} \\ \rho_{\mathrm{vac}}\,\xi^2 &\sim \frac{c^2}{G} \approx 1.35 \times 10^{27}\ \mathrm{kg\,m^{-1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

This is the medium-language transcription of Sakharov's induced gravity, in which the inverse Newton constant is generated at one loop and scales with the square of the ultraviolet cutoff, $G^{-1} \propto \Lambda^2$ [6], with $\xi \sim \hbar c/\Lambda$. Equation (17) again contains one undetermined scale—but now the framework faces a consistency check rather than a free choice. If the coherence length is identified with the Planck length, $\xi \to \ell_{\mathrm{P}} = \sqrt{\hbar G/c^3} \approx 1.6 \times 10^{-35}$ m, Eq. (17) *forces*

$$\rho_{\mathrm{vac}} \to \frac{c^5}{\hbar G^2} \approx 5.2 \times 10^{96}\ \mathrm{kg\,m^{-3}}, \tag{18}$$

the Planck density—precisely the order of magnitude that naive zero-point estimates assign to the quantum vacuum. The dimensional scheme is therefore internally consistent: a Planck-stiff, Planck-dense medium with Planckian granularity yields the observed c and G simultaneously, and automatically pushes the Lorentz-violating dispersion corrections of Sec. 12 to the (currently allowed) Planck-suppressed regime.

The same arithmetic exposes the framework's deepest obstruction. The density that *gravitates* cosmologically is the dark-energy scale $\rho_\Lambda \approx 6 \times 10^{-27}\ \mathrm{kg\,m^{-3}}$ [25], some 122 orders of magnitude below Eq. (18). This is the cosmological-constant problem [37], and the structured-vacuum hypothesis does not evade it; it inherits it in maximally explicit form. The most promising medium-native response is the one articulated by Volovik for condensed-matter ground states: an equilibrium, self-sustained medium adjusts its pressure so that the energy of the ground state itself does not gravitate, leaving only deviations from equilibrium—excitations, defects, boundary effects—as sources [5]. Promoting that observation from analogy to mechanism is sub-problem number one of the derivation program below.

C. The fine-structure constant α as an impedance ratio

For the electromagnetic sector the framework can be anchored to an identity that is exact rather than schematic. With $Z_0 = \sqrt{\mu_0/\varepsilon_0} \approx 376.730\ \Omega$ the impedance of free space and $R_K = h/e^2 \approx 25\,812.807\ \Omega$ the von Klitzing constant of quantized Hall transport [38],

$$\alpha = \frac{e^2}{4\pi\varepsilon_0\hbar c} = \frac{Z_0}{2R_K} \approx \frac{1}{137.035\,999}. \tag{19}$$

Read in medium language, Eq. (19) says that the fine-structure constant is an *impedance match*: the ratio between the characteristic impedance of the projected electromagnetic channel (Z_0, fixed by the medium parameters of the w-channel, schematically $Z_0 \sim \sqrt{\mu_w/\varepsilon_w}$ with μ_w and ε_w the inertial and stiffness response coefficients of the channel) and the quantum of charge transport (R_K, fixed by the winding quantum of Sec. 5). Deriving α therefore decomposes into two cleaner targets: derive Z_0 from the stiffness and inertia of the magnetodynamic channel, and derive the charge winding quantum e from the topology of stable excitations. The empirical target is unforgiving: $\alpha^{-1} = 137.035\,999\,084\,(51)$ as extracted from the electron magnetic moment [29].

The geometric reading proposed earlier,

$$\alpha = \sin^2\chi, \qquad \chi = \arcsin\sqrt{\alpha} \approx 4.90^\circ, \tag{20}$$

remains exactly that—a reading. Equation (20) is a reparametrization, not a derivation, and it acquires content only if the coupling angle χ between ordinary matter and the orthogonal magnetodynamic dimension is computed independently from medium dynamics and found to equal 4.90°. The long history of numerological proposals for α counsels treating Eq. (20) as a target, never as evidence.

D. A minimal derivation program

The foregoing reduces "derive the constants" to four sharply posed sub-problems:

1. *Vacuum-energy subtraction.* Exhibit an equilibrium condition on $V(|\Phi|)$ under which the homogeneous medium does not gravitate, so that Eq. (18) is compatible with ρ_Λ [37, 5]; identify the residual (boundary, circulation, or excitation) contribution and compare it to the observed dark-energy density.

2. *Stiffness tensor.* Specify $V(|\Phi|)$ and the gradient terms of Eq. (15) concretely enough to compute K_{vac}, ρ_{vac}, and ξ, and verify Eqs. (16) and (17) with a single parameter set.

3. *Channel impedance.* Show that the projection Eq. (2) generates a Maxwell term with coefficient fixing Z_0 in terms of w-channel stiffness, and that topological winding fixes e; their ratio must reproduce Eq. (19).

4. *Mode-speed universality.* Demonstrate that the phase sector and the w-potential sector share one characteristic cone to the accuracy demanded by GW170817 [33].

The success criterion is strict: at least two independent dimensionless quantities (e.g., α and $\rho_\Lambda/\rho_{\text{vac}}$) reproduced from one underlying parameter set without per-observable fitting. Order-of-magnitude consistency, as achieved above, is the entry fee, not the prize.

XIV. TESTABLE DIRECTIONS

A useful research program would seek regimes in which the structured-vacuum model makes predictions differing from standard assumptions. Candidate directions include:

1. Residual Lorentz-violating or dispersive effects at high energy, constrained by astrophysical timing and precision laboratory measurements [27, 28];

2. Vacuum birefringence or polarization-dependent propagation beyond the (extremely small) Heisenberg–Euler nonlinearities expected within QED [30];

3. Anomalous gravitational or inertial behavior correlated with strong electromagnetic field configurations, superconductors, superfluids, or high-Q coherent systems, beyond known systematic effects;

4. Cosmic-scale vorticity, parity asymmetry, or other imprints of large-scale circulation structure in the medium;

5. Derivable (rather than fitted) relationships among α, the vacuum impedance, and other dimensionless constants;

6. Dark-sector phenomenology in which apparent missing mass tracks vacuum polarization, circulation, or boundary conditions rather than particle density alone, with quantitative comparison to superfluid dark-sector models [26].

Each direction is double-edged: the same measurements that could reveal medium structure currently constrain it, and any concrete realization of the framework must quantify how far below existing bounds its predicted signals lie.

XV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The strongest form of the proposal is not that current physics is wrong, but that current physics may be an effective low-energy description of a deeper vacuum medium. In compressed form: the vacuum is a higher-dimensional, phase-bearing medium; magnetism is the orthogonal w-potential coupling channel of that medium; matter is a stable topological reducer; electromagnetism is the (3+1)-dimensional projection of phase and w-potential gradients; gravity is the macroscopic stress–flow response; distance and time are conversion modes of the projected metric, which can in principle vary with the w-potential state; entanglement and spacetime connectivity may be two faces of shared medium topology; and the dark sector may be the gravitational shadow of unmodeled vacuum structure.

Each of these commitments has antecedents in respectable literature—vortex atoms and topological solitons [1, 19], relativistic aethers [2], superfluid and analogue models of geometry [5, 4], induced and thermodynamic gravity [6, 7], geometrodynamic charge [20], fifth-dimensional unification [13, 14], and entanglement-built spacetime [9, 12]. What the present framework adds is a specific, heterodox organizing claim: that the fifth degree of freedom is best understood as a magnetodynamic *potential* channel, with the familiar magnetic field demoted to a projection, and with charge, metric conversion, and topology all modulated through that channel.

The framework's value, finally, is conditional. It should not be presented as established physics; it is a candidate interpretation and research scaffold. Its worth will be decided by whether the schematic relations of Secs. 3, 7, and 13 can be promoted to derivations; whether the correspondence constraints of Sec. 12 can be satisfied non-trivially; and whether at least one prediction from Sec. 14 can be sharpened to the point of risking refutation. Until then, the appropriate epistemic posture is the one adopted throughout: explicit assumptions, disciplined vocabulary, and enumerated obligations.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS AND AI DISCLOSURE

P.S.W. conceived the structured-vacuum hypothesis, the magnetodynamic interpretation of the fifth dimension, and the overall framework, and directed the work. The AI systems Claude (Anthropic) and GPT-5.5 (OpenAI) assisted with literature contextualization, mathematical formalization, quantitative constraint analysis, and manuscript preparation, under the direction and review of the human author, who takes full responsibility for the content. The authors note that prevailing editorial policies (e.g., those of the ICMJE and of major publishers) do not recognize AI systems as authors, on the ground that authorship entails accountability; venues applying such policies would require the AI contributions to be reported in this disclosure rather than in the author list.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank colleagues for critical discussion.

REFERENCES

[1] W. Thomson (Lord Kelvin), "On vortex atoms," Proc. R. Soc. Edinburgh **6**, 94–105 (1867).

[2] P. A. M. Dirac, "Is there an æther?," Nature **168**, 906–907 (1951).

[3] W. G. Unruh, "Experimental black-hole evaporation?," Phys. Rev. Lett. **46**, 1351–1353 (1981).

[4] C. Barceló, S. Liberati, and M. Visser, "Analogue gravity," Living Rev. Relativ. **14**, 3 (2011).

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

[6] A. D. Sakharov, "Vacuum quantum fluctuations in curved space and the theory of gravitation," Sov. Phys. Dokl. **12**, 1040–1041 (1968).

[7] T. Jacobson, "Thermodynamics of spacetime: The Einstein equation of state," Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1260–1263 (1995).

[8] E. Verlinde, "On the origin of gravity and the laws of Newton," J. High Energy Phys. **2011**(4), 29 (2011).

[9] M. Van Raamsdonk, "Building up spacetime with quantum entanglement," Gen. Relativ. Gravit. **42**, 2323–2329 (2010).

[10] A. Einstein and N. Rosen, "The particle problem in the general theory of relativity," Phys. Rev. **48**, 73–77 (1935).

[11] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, "Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?," Phys. Rev. **47**, 777–780 (1935).

[12] J. Maldacena and L. Susskind, "Cool horizons for entangled black holes," Fortschr. Phys. **61**, 781–811 (2013).

[13] T. Kaluza, "Zum Unitätsproblem der Physik," Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Berlin (Math. Phys.) **1921**, 966–972 (1921).

[14] O. Klein, "Quantentheorie und fünfdimensionale Relativitätstheorie," Z. Phys. **37**, 895–906 (1926).

[15] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, and G. Dvali, "The hierarchy problem and new dimensions at a millimeter," Phys. Lett. B **429**, 263–272 (1998).

[16] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, "Large mass hierarchy from a small extra dimension," Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3370–3373 (1999).

[17] Y. Aharonov and D. Bohm, "Significance of electromagnetic potentials in the quantum theory," Phys. Rev. **115**, 485–491 (1959).

[18] E. Madelung, "Quantentheorie in hydrodynamischer Form," Z. Phys. **40**, 322–326 (1927).

[19] T. H. R. Skyrme, "A unified field theory of mesons and baryons," Nucl. Phys. **31**, 556–569 (1962).

[20] C. W. Misner and J. A. Wheeler, "Classical physics as geometry," Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **2**, 525–603 (1957).

[21] C. M. Will, "The confrontation between general relativity and experiment," Living Rev. Relativ. **17**, 4 (2014).

[22] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific and Virgo Collaborations), "Observation of gravitational waves from a binary black hole merger," Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 061102 (2016).

[23] A. G. Riess *et al.*, “Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a cosmological constant,” Astron. J. **116**, 1009–1038 (1998).

[24] S. Perlmutter *et al.*, “Measurements of Ω and Λ from 42 high-redshift supernovae,” Astrophys. J. **517**, 565–586 (1999).

[25] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck Collaboration), “Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters,” Astron. Astrophys. **641**, A6 (2020).

[26] L. Berezhiani and J. Khoury, “Theory of dark matter superfluidity,” Phys. Rev. D **92**, 103510 (2015).

[27] V. A. Kostelecký and N. Russell, “Data tables for Lorentz and CPT violation,” Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 11–31 (2011).

[28] S. Liberati, “Tests of Lorentz invariance: a 2013 update,” Class. Quantum Grav. **30**, 133001 (2013).

[29] D. Hanneke, S. Fogwell, and G. Gabrielse, “New measurement of the electron magnetic moment and the fine structure constant,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 120801 (2008).

[30] W. Heisenberg and H. Euler, “Folgerungen aus der Diracschen Theorie des Positrons,” Z. Phys. **98**, 714–732 (1936).

[31] M. Nagel *et al.*, “Direct terrestrial test of Lorentz symmetry in electrodynamics to 10^{-18},” Nat. Commun. **6**, 8174 (2015).

[32] A. A. Abdo *et al.* (Fermi LAT and GBM Collaborations), “A limit on the variation of the speed of light arising from quantum gravity effects,” Nature **462**, 331–334 (2009).

[33] B. P. Abbott *et al.*, “Gravitational waves and gamma-rays from a binary neutron star merger: GW170817 and GRB 170817A,” Astrophys. J. Lett. **848**, L13 (2017).

[34] B. Bertotti, L. Iess, and P. Tortora, “A test of general relativity using radio links with the Cassini spacecraft,” Nature **425**, 374–376 (2003).

[35] P. Touboul *et al.* (MICROSCOPE Collaboration), “MICROSCOPE mission: final results of the test of the equivalence principle,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **129**, 121102 (2022).

[36] D. J. Fixsen *et al.*, “The cosmic microwave background spectrum from the full COBE FIRAS data set,” Astrophys. J. **473**, 576–587 (1996).

[37] S. Weinberg, “The cosmological constant problem,” Rev. Mod. Phys. **61**, 1–23 (1989).

[38] K. von Klitzing, G. Dorda, and M. Pepper, “New method for high-accuracy determination of the fine-structure constant based on quantized Hall resistance,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **45**, 494–497 (1980).

[39] R. P. Mignani *et al.*, “Evidence for vacuum birefringence from the first optical-polarimetry measurement of the isolated neutron star RX J1856.5$-$3754,” Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **465**, 492–500 (2017).