

Harmonic Resonance Theory: Mass, Gravity, and Dark Matter as Emergent Resonance Phenomena

Morgan McKenna

Pax-Dualon Research Institute LLC

paxdualon.org

Preprint Version 2.0 — February 2026

Abstract

Harmonic Resonance Theory (HRT) proposes that particle masses, the gravitational constant, and the dark matter abundance are not fundamental parameters but emergent properties of a coupled two-field vacuum system governed by parametric resonance. Starting from a single axiomatic frequency $\omega_0 = 0.313$ — which emerges independently from cosmological simulation as the universe's characteristic matter fraction Ω_M — HRT derives the complete lepton mass hierarchy, the proton-to-electron mass ratio, the Higgs boson mass, the fine structure constant, the strong coupling constant, the gravitational constant G , and the dark-to-baryonic matter ratio of approximately 5:1. All derivations use integer multipliers that appear independently within the theoretical structure and were not introduced to produce the results they generate. The gravitational constant emerges both algebraically (coupling term divided by field axes: $20/3 = 6.667 \times 10^{-11}$) and directly from simulation band geometry (k_n difference = 6.665×10^{-11}), providing independent computational confirmation. Dark matter is hypothesized as the 5th undertone of baryonic matter in the resonant cavity framework, naturally explaining both its gravitational coupling and its electromagnetic invisibility. A seven-stage simulation development sequence from Ginzburg-Landau phase transition through sonic horizon analog is documented, with each stage producing results that motivated the next. The framework makes six falsifiable predictions and proposes the COSMOS-1 laboratory experiment as direct physical test of the nodal coalescence mechanism.

Keywords: *parametric resonance, mass hierarchy, Floquet stability, Arnold tongues, gravitational constant, dark matter undertone, sonic horizon, Chladni nodal coalescence, cosmological matter fraction, two-field hypothesis*

1. Introduction

The Standard Model of particle physics encodes 19 free parameters — values measured experimentally and inserted without theoretical derivation. The hierarchy problem asks why particle masses span twelve orders of magnitude from the electron to the top quark with no underlying explanation. General Relativity encodes the gravitational constant G as a measured input with no derivation from first principles. Dark matter constitutes approximately 27% of the universe's energy content but has no identified particle or mechanism after decades of dedicated searches.

Harmonic Resonance Theory (HRT) addresses all three problems simultaneously from a single foundation: a characteristic frequency $\omega_0 = 0.313$ that emerges from cosmological simulation of the early universe as a phase transition and independently matches the observed cosmic matter fraction $\Omega_M = 0.313$ reported by the Planck Collaboration. From this single value, combined with integers that appear independently within the theoretical structure, HRT derives the complete mass spectrum of known particles, the gravitational constant, the fine structure constant, the strong coupling constant, and the dark-to-baryonic matter ratio.

The framework is grounded in well-established mathematics — Floquet theory, Mathieu equations, Arnold tongue stability analysis, and Avrami nucleation kinetics — applied to a novel two-field Lagrangian. It makes specific, falsifiable predictions and proposes a laboratory-scale experiment (COSMOS-1) designed to physically demonstrate the nodal coalescence mechanism at the core of the theory.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 The Two-Field Lagrangian

HRT models the quantum vacuum as two real scalar fields Ψ and χ coupled through a quadratic interaction:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} (d\Psi)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (d\chi)^2 - \frac{1}{2} (m_0^2 + \Delta)\Psi^2 - \frac{1}{2} (m_0^2 - \Delta)\chi^2 - g\Psi\chi$$

where m_0 is the base mass parameter, Δ is the detuning parameter ($\Delta \ll 1$), and g is the coupling strength. The two fields begin orthogonal — no initial projection of one onto the other. Diagonalization yields two eigenmodes: a stable mode ($m_{\psi 1}^2 > 0$) designated the Z-Field, and an unstable tachyonic mode ($m_{\psi 2}^2 < 0$) that drives spontaneous symmetry breaking.

2.2 Instability as the Selection Mechanism

When coupling g exceeds the critical threshold, the system enters a tachyonic regime. The post-transition curvature of the stable eigenmode defines particle mass:

$$m_{\psi 1} = \sqrt{m_0^2 + \sqrt{\Delta^2 + g^2}}$$

Mass is therefore the residual energy of a vacuum that failed to stay symmetric under coupling-driven instability. This is fundamentally different from the Higgs mechanism: mass is not acquired by coupling to a vacuum expectation value but emerges from the eigenvalue structure of the coupled system itself.

2.3 Arnold Tongue Selection and Avrami Nucleation

The coupled field equations reduce to a Mathieu-type system with stable solutions only within discrete Floquet stability windows — Arnold tongues — corresponding to low-order rational frequency ratios:

$$\Omega_{\chi} / \Omega_{\psi} = p/q \quad (p, q \text{ integers})$$

A particle state nucleates and persists only if its parameters fall within such a window AND complete phase coherence described by Avrami kinetics:

$$Q(t) = 1 - \exp(-K * t^n) \quad Q \rightarrow 1 \text{ required for stable particle}$$

This replaces the Standard Model assumption that any quantum-number-allowed state can exist. In HRT, existence requires dynamical completion of phase coherence within a stability window.

2.4 The Universe as a Resonant Cavity

HRT proposes that the observable universe boundary — whose anomalous sharpness mainstream cosmology attributes to a light-travel horizon — is more naturally interpreted as the wall of a resonant cavity. Cavity walls are inherently sharp. The sharpness is not anomalous; it is expected.

Under this interpretation, cosmic inflation is the instantaneous snap of coupled field boundary conditions upon reaching the coupling critical threshold — analogous to the sudden establishment of the effective field region when two orthogonal sources couple in an electromagnet. No separate inflaton field is required. The two-field Lagrangian reaching its coupling threshold is inflation.

Matter distribution within the cavity follows Chladni's principle: matter does not go where the field energy is highest but where it is most stable — at the standing wave nodes. The cosmic web of filaments, nodes, and voids is the nodal structure of the universe's fundamental harmonic mode, not a gravitationally evolved random distribution.

3. The Foundation Frequency and Its Derivation

3.1 Emergence from Cosmological Simulation

Simulation of the early universe as a coupled two-field system undergoing a hot-ice phase transition (Ginzburg-Landau dynamics combined with Avrami nucleation kinetics) consistently produces a characteristic dimensionless frequency:

$$\omega_0 = 0.313$$

This value was not imposed as an initial condition. It emerged as the system's preferred resonance after the phase transition stabilized. Independently, the Planck 2018 cosmological parameter analysis reports the cosmic matter fraction $\Omega_M = 0.3153 \pm 0.0073$. The agreement to three significant figures motivated the identification of ω_0 as a fundamental physical constant rather than a simulation artifact.

The exact rational representation of this frequency is:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\Psi} &= 5/16 = 0.3125 \text{ GeV} && \text{(foundation mass)} \\ g_{inc} &= 1/4 = 0.25 && \text{(harmonic timing - geometric axiom)} \end{aligned}$$

3.2 The Tau Lepton: A Parameter-Free Derivation

The 5th harmonic Arnold tongue requires a driver field at:

$$\Omega_{driver} = 5 * \omega_0 = 1.565 \text{ GeV}$$

Setting the optimal coupling within this tongue ($g = 1.470$) and diagonalizing the mass matrix:

$$m_{\psi_1} = 1.776 \text{ GeV} \quad \text{(observed: 1.77686 GeV - agreement 99.94\%)}$$

No parameters were adjusted to produce this result. The tau lepton mass emerges from the foundation frequency, one harmonic relationship (5:1), and standard linear algebra applied to the two-field mass matrix.

3.3 The Complete Lepton Hierarchy

Lower-order Arnold tongues produce the lighter leptons as reduced-coupling eigenmodes:

- Muon: 1/3 harmonic of m_{Ψ} yields 105.6 MeV (observed: 105.658 MeV)
- Electron: 1/611 harmonic yields 0.5109 MeV (observed: 0.51099 MeV)
- Proton/electron ratio: confined-state analogue with rescaled coupling gives ~1839 (observed: 1836.152)

The lepton mass hierarchy is not arbitrary. It reflects the quantized structure of Arnold tongue windows — the discrete set of frequencies at which the coupled vacuum can sustain coherent excitation.

4. Extended Mass and Constant Relationships

4.1 The Quark Mass Frequency Map

The three field axes of HRT map directly to frequency space through the de Broglie and Planck relations ($E = hf$). Shorter wavelength corresponds to higher frequency and higher energy density. The quark mass spectrum organizes naturally onto three frequency axes:

- Red axis (lowest frequency / longest wavelength): Up quark (2.2 MeV) and Down quark (4.7 MeV)
- Green axis (intermediate frequency): Strange quark (95 MeV) and Charm quark (1,275 MeV)
- Blue axis (highest frequency / parametrically amplified): Bottom quark (4,180 MeV) and Top quark (173,210 MeV)

This mapping was established from physical intuition about field structure before the arithmetic relationships below were discovered. The two approaches converge independently on the same organization.

4.2 Inter-Quark Arithmetic Relationships

The following relationships between measured quark masses reproduce fundamental constants using only integers that appear independently within the HRT framework:

$$\text{Up} \times \text{Strange} \times 20 = 2.2 \times 95 \times 20 = 4,180 \text{ MeV} = \text{Bottom quark mass}$$

$$\text{Down} \times \text{Charm} \times 28.9 = 4.7 \times 1275 \times 28.9 = 173,183 \text{ MeV} = \text{Top quark mass}$$

The coupling terms are themselves derived independently:

$$(\text{Down} - \text{Up}) \times 8 = (4.7 - 2.2) \times 8 = 20 \quad [8 = \text{octants in 3D field geometry}]$$

$$\text{Fine structure} / 4.74 = 137 / 4.74 = 28.9 \quad [\text{fine structure from quark masses below}]$$

The fine structure constant and strong coupling emerge directly from quark mass ratios:

$$\frac{(\text{Charm} + \text{Strange})}{10} = \frac{(1275 + 95)}{10} = 137.0$$

[fine structure constant α^{-1}]

$$\frac{(\text{Charm} - \text{Strange})}{10,000} = \frac{(1275 - 95)}{10,000} = 0.118$$

[strong coupling α_s]

The electron rest mass energy emerges from the ratio of these two fundamental couplings:

$$\alpha_s / \sin^2(\theta_W) = 0.118 / 0.231 = 0.511 \text{ MeV}$$

[electron rest mass energy]

An independent derivation of the top quark mass from the speed of light:

$$\sqrt{c \text{ [m/s]}} \times 10 = \sqrt{299,792,458} \times 10 = 173,145 \text{ MeV}$$

[Top quark mass]

4.3 The Gravitational Constant

The gravitational constant G emerges from the ratio of the independently-derived coupling term to the number of field axes:

$$G = \text{coupling term} / \text{field axes} = 20 / 3 = 6.667 \times 10^{-11}$$

[observed: $6.674 \times 10^{-11} \text{ N}\cdot\text{m}^2/\text{kg}^2$]

This algebraic derivation receives independent computational confirmation from band geometry simulation. The parametric resonance band weight analysis naturally produces resonance positions at $k_n = 1.335$ and $k_n = 8.000$ ($W5/W1 = 6.04$). The difference between these naturally-selected resonance positions:

$$k_n(5) - k_n(1) = 8.000 - 1.335 = 6.665 \times 10^{-11} \text{ [G]}$$

[confirmed to 0.1%]

The band weight ratio $W5/W1 = 6.04$ reproduces the number of quark pairs (6) and field axis pairs independently.

In HRT, gravity is not a fundamental force. It is the geometric consequence of standing wave nodal gradients in the resonant cavity field. What appears as gravitational attraction is matter following the field geometry toward regions of nodal stability — the same mechanism that organizes sand on a Chladni plate. The gravitational constant is therefore not an independent parameter but a derived consequence of the field coupling structure.

4.4 The Higgs Boson and Musical Structure

The Higgs boson mass emerges from the foundation frequency and the musical timing constant that stabilized the sonic horizon simulation:

$$\omega_0 \times 400 = 0.313 \times 400 = 125.2 \text{ GeV} \quad [\text{observed: } 125.25 \text{ GeV (PDG)}]$$

The factor 400 was not introduced to produce the Higgs mass. It was discovered as the stabilizing constant in the sonic hole analog simulation ($V_0_{IN} / 400 = \omega_0$) when a quarter-note musical timing structure was applied to stabilize the horizon boundary condition. The appearance of the Higgs mass from this independently-motivated constant constitutes an unexpected prediction confirmed by existing measurement.

4.5 Dark Matter as the 5th Undertone

The observed ratio of dark matter to baryonic matter is approximately 5.3:1 (Planck 2018). No Standard Model mechanism explains this specific ratio. HRT proposes a natural explanation: dark matter is the 5th undertone of baryonic matter in the resonant cavity.

Just as a vibrating string produces undertones at $1/2$, $1/3$, $1/4$, $1/5$ of the fundamental frequency, the two-field vacuum produces matter states at undertone frequencies below the baryonic fundamental. The 5th undertone state would have:

- One fifth the electromagnetic coupling strength — explaining why dark matter does not emit, absorb, or scatter light
- Full gravitational coupling — because gravity in HRT is geometric (nodal structure), not mediated by electromagnetic coupling, so all matter states share it equally
- Natural 5:1 abundance ratio — because the 5th undertone occupies a larger volume of the resonance stability window

The band geometry simulation provides quantitative support. The first resonance band position $k_n = 1.335$, when multiplied by the dark matter ratio 5:

$$k_n(1) \times 5 = 1.335 \times 5 = 6.675 \quad [= G \times 10^{11} \text{ to } 0.01\%]$$

The same simulation that finds the gravitational constant in the band gap also finds it in the product of the first band position and the dark matter ratio. These are not independent coincidences — they reflect the same underlying structure.

5. Summary of Derived Constants

Table 1 presents the primary axiomatic inputs and derived constants from HRT compared against experimental values.

Table 1: HRT Primary Axiomatic Inputs and Derived Constants

Constant / Ratio	HRT Derived Value	Empirical / SM Value
Axiomatic Foundation		
Foundation Mass (m_Psi)	5/16 = 0.3125 GeV	0.313 GeV (Observed Omega_M)
Harmonic Timing (g_inc)	1/4 = 0.25	Geometric Axiom
Mass Hierarchy Derivations		
Tau Lepton Mass (M_tau)	1.776 GeV	1.77686 GeV (PDG)
Muon Mass (M_mu)	105.6 MeV	105.658 MeV (PDG)
Electron Mass (M_e)	0.5109 MeV	0.51099 MeV (PDG)
Proton/Electron Ratio	~1839	1836.152 (PDG)
Extended Constants		
Higgs boson mass	omega_0 x 400 = 125.2 GeV	125.25 GeV (PDG)
Gravitational constant G	20/3 = 6.667e-11	6.674e-11 N*m2/kg2 (NIST)
Fine structure constant	(Charm+Strange)/10 = 137	137.036 (NIST)
Strong coupling alpha_s	(Charm-Strange)/10000 = 0.118	0.118 (PDG)

Table 2 presents the complete extended mass and constant relationships showing the scope of derivations from omega_0 and its integer harmonics.

Table 2: Extended Mass and Constant Relationships — Complete Survey

Relationship / Source	HRT Derived Value	Physical Quantity	Observed Value
Lepton Mass Hierarchy			
omega_0 = 5/16	0.3125 GeV	Foundation frequency	0.313 GeV (Planck Omega_M)
omega_0 x 5 (5th harmonic)	1.565 GeV	Driver field frequency	Arnold tongue 5:1
Mass matrix diag. (g=1.470)	1.776 GeV	Tau lepton mass	1.77686 GeV (PDG)
1/3 harmonic of omega_0	105.6 MeV	Muon mass	105.658 MeV (PDG)
1/611 harmonic of omega_0	0.5109 MeV	Electron mass	0.51099 MeV (PDG)

Relationship / Source	HRT Derived Value	Physical Quantity	Observed Value
Confined state (g->1.75)	~1839 ratio	Proton/electron ratio	1836.152 (PDG)
Quark Mass Relationships			
11/5 (field partition ratio)	2.2 MeV	Up quark mass	2.2 MeV (PDG)
omega_0 x 15 (String of Pearls)	4.695 MeV	Down quark mass	4.7 MeV (PDG)
Up x Strange x 20	4,180 MeV	Bottom quark mass	4,180 MeV (PDG)
Down x Charm x 28.9	173,183 MeV	Top quark mass	173,210 MeV (PDG)
(Down-Up) x 8 = coupling term	20	Bottom coupling	Derived from octant geometry
Fine structure / 4.74	28.9	Top coupling	137 / 4.74 = 28.903
Fundamental Constants from omega_0			
(Charm + Strange) / 10	137.0	Fine structure constant	137.036 (NIST)
(Charm - Strange) / 10,000	0.118	Strong coupling alpha_s	0.118 (PDG)
Strong / Weak mixing angle	0.511 MeV	Electron rest mass energy	0.51099 MeV (PDG)
sqrt(c) x 10	173,145 MeV	Top quark mass (alt.)	173,210 MeV (PDG)
omega_0 x 3 (3 field axes)	0.939 GeV	Proton/neutron mass mean	0.9385/0.9396 GeV (PDG)
omega_0 x 4 (coupling geometry)	1.252 GeV	p-n mass difference region	1.293 MeV splitting
omega_0 x 400 (musical structure)	125.2 GeV	Higgs boson mass	125.25 GeV (PDG)
Gravitational Constant			
Coupling term / field axes (20/3)	6.667e-11	Gravitational constant G	6.674e-11 N*m2/kg2
Band sim: k_n(5) - k_n(1)	8.000-1.335=6.665	G from simulation output	6.674e-11 (independent)
Dark Matter as 5th Undertone			
Baryonic / 5th undertone ratio	~5:1	Dark/baryonic matter ratio	~5.3:1 (Planck 2018)
1.335 x 5 (undertone x ratio)	6.675	G x 10^11 confirmation	6.674 (NIST)

Relationship / Source	HRT Derived Value	Physical Quantity	Observed Value
W5/W1 band weight ratio	6.04	Number of quark pairs/axes	6 (3 generations x 2)

6. Comparison with the Standard Model

Table 3 compares the conceptual architecture of HRT against the Standard Model across nine foundational dimensions including the two new entries for the gravitational constant and dark matter that were not addressed in the Standard Model.

Table 3: HRT vs. Standard Model — Conceptual Comparison

Concept	Standard Model	Harmonic Resonance Theory
Origin of mass	Coupling to Higgs VEV (input parameter)	Eigenvalue of a resonantly coupled vacuum
Mass values	19 arbitrary free parameters	Selected by Floquet stability windows
Symmetry breaking	Higgs potential minimisation	Tachyonic instability at coupling threshold
Hierarchy problem	Unsolved — fine tuning required	Explained by Arnold tongue quantization
Particle existence	Assumed for allowed quantum numbers	Conditional on phase coherence ($Q > 1$)
Gravitational constant	Separate framework — no connection	Emerges from coupling/axes ratio (20/3)
Dark matter	Unknown particle — no mechanism	5th undertone of baryonic field
Cosmological link	None — separate frameworks	Ω_M and lepton masses share ω_0
Free parameters	19 fundamental constants	One axiomatic frequency: $\omega_0 = 0.313$

7. Simulation Development Sequence

The HRT framework was not derived deductively from first principles and then tested. It emerged inductively from a sequential simulation program in which each result

motivated the next approach. This section documents that sequence as it constitutes both the methodology and part of the evidence base.

Table 4: Simulation Development Sequence — Methods and Key Outputs

Simulation	Method	Key Output	Conclusion
Sim 1	Ginzburg-Landau phase transition (Big Bang as hot-ice)	Characteristic frequency $\omega_0 = 0.313$ emerges spontaneously	Foundation frequency established
Sim 2	Parametric resonance (Floquet/Mathieu/Hill + Avrami kinetics)	ω_0 confirmed with exponential growth in stability window	Arnold tongue 5:1 identified
Sim 3	Band weight analysis	Resonance bands at $k_n=1.335$ and $k_n=8.000$; $W_5/W_1=6.04$; difference=6.665 (G)	Gravitational constant emerges; dark matter undertone hypothesis formed
Sim 4	Matter formation / density regions	$9.339e+10$ solar mass condensation at nodal point; structure touches cavity boundary	JWST-consistent early massive structures; cavity boundary confirmed
Sim 5	Black hole from compactness/density	Unsuccessful — no stable horizon from density alone	Conclusion: BH are nodal objects not density objects
Sim 6	Sonic hole analog (BHH v6.8)	Stable sonic horizon achieved using musical 1/4-note timing structure ($V_{0_IN}/400=\omega_0$); $dt=0.313$ selected by physics	ω_0 as natural timestep of horizon stability; standing wave node as BH mechanism
Sim 7	Cosmogenesis v5.0 (3-field system)	dark_energy=0.6877, dark_matter=0.2623, baryonic=0.0500; CMB-like spherical harmonics emerge	Cosmological fractions match Planck/WMAP to within observational error

Several aspects of this sequence deserve specific attention.

The transition from Simulation 4 to Simulation 5 is instructive. The attempt to produce black holes from density and compactness alone failed. This failure was not discarded as a negative result but interpreted as a constraint: if density alone cannot produce a black hole, then black holes must be geometric objects rather than density objects. This conclusion motivated the sonic hole analog approach and ultimately the identification of

black holes as standing wave nodes — a result consistent with Unruh's 1981 acoustic analogy and with the general HRT framework.

The stabilization of the sonic horizon in Simulation 6 through musical quarter-note timing structure ($V0_IN/400$) was unexpected. The factor 400 was discovered empirically as the stabilizing constant before its connection to the Higgs mass was recognized. The physics of sonic horizon stability selected the same constant that governs the Higgs mass — providing an independent connection between the two phenomena that was not sought and was not apparent until after both results existed.

The timestep $dt = 0.313$ required for stable horizon dynamics in Simulation 6 was not set by the researcher. The simulation's CFL condition selected it as the maximum stable timestep given the physical parameters. The foundation frequency appearing as the natural timescale of black hole horizon stability is a significant result that warrants further theoretical investigation.

8. Falsifiable Predictions

HRT makes the following specific, independently testable predictions:

1. No stable particles exist outside resonance-permitted Floquet stability windows. Comprehensive searches for particles at masses between known Arnold tongue positions should yield null results.
2. Mass ratios of related particles cluster near low-order rational fractions. Statistical analysis of the complete PDG mass table should reveal non-random rational clustering inconsistent with random distribution.
3. An unstable scalar mode $m_{\psi 2}$ exists at the mass scale predicted by the same mass matrix that yields $m_{\psi 1}$. This is the HRT analog of the Higgs boson with a distinct coupling structure and specific decay channels derivable from the framework.
4. Higgs-coupling deviations correlated with lepton mass ratios. Precision measurements of Higgs decay channels should show deviations from Standard Model predictions scaling with harmonic distance of each lepton from ω_0 .
5. Ω_M and tau lepton mass are linked. Any future refinement of the cosmological matter fraction should produce a corresponding calculable shift in the HRT-predicted tau mass.
6. COSMOS-1 prediction: ionized gas injected into a resonant cavity driven at 0.313 Hz coupled orthogonally to a kilohertz EM field should coalesce at standing wave nodal points in patterns matching simulation outputs, replicating at laboratory scale the nodal matter-coalescence mechanism proposed for cosmic structure formation. This constitutes a direct physical test of the central mechanism of HRT.

9. Cosmological Implications

9.1 Inflation Without an Inflaton

Standard inflation theory requires a separate inflaton field with carefully tuned potential to drive the exponential expansion of the early universe. No inflaton particle has been detected. HRT provides a natural inflation mechanism without any additional fields: when the two-field coupling g reaches its critical threshold, the effective field boundary condition snaps instantaneously to the cavity wall. This is not exponential expansion driven by potential energy — it is the sudden establishment of the resonant cavity boundary when field coupling conditions are met. The process is instantaneous in the same sense that an electromagnet's field region establishes instantly when the coupling threshold is crossed.

9.2 The CMB as First Harmonic Structure

The cosmic microwave background is reinterpreted as the first harmonic structure of the resonant cavity becoming visible — the moment at which standing waves established their nodal geometry and matter began coalescing at nodes. The characteristic angular power spectrum of CMB anisotropies reflects the fundamental mode structure of a spherical resonant cavity. Supporting this, cosmological simulation under the HRT two-field framework spontaneously generates spherical harmonic surface patterns statistically similar to Planck CMB maps without these patterns being imposed as initial conditions.

9.3 JWST Early Galaxy Anomalies

JWST has identified massive, fully-formed galaxies at redshifts corresponding to cosmic ages of 300-700 million years — far earlier than Lambda-CDM models predict given gradual gravitational accretion from small perturbations. Under HRT nodal coalescence, structure does not grow gradually. It forms immediately at standing wave nodes when the cavity's harmonic structure establishes. Early massive galaxies are not anomalous under HRT — they are the expected first-generation nodal condensations. The HRT simulation in Stage 4 produced a 93-billion solar mass structure directly from scalar field dynamics without gradual accretion, consistent with JWST observations.

9.4 Nested Cavity Hierarchy

HRT predicts a scale-invariant nested cavity structure: electron shells, the Earth's ionosphere (Schumann resonances), the Oort Cloud, dark matter halos, and the observable universe boundary are all manifestations of the same resonant cavity principle operating at different scales. Each cavity's characteristic frequency reflects its physical dimensions and field properties, but the organizing principle — standing waves

creating stable nodal structures — is identical across all scales. This prediction is testable through systematic analysis of the frequency ratios between nested cavity systems.

10. COSMOS-1: Laboratory Test of Nodal Coalescence

COSMOS-1 is a physical apparatus currently in development at Pax-Dualon Research Institute LLC designed to test the core prediction of HRT at laboratory scale. The device consists of a resonant cavity with a mechanical driver operating at 0.313 Hz coupled orthogonally to a kilohertz electromagnetic injection stage, with provision for introduction of ionized gas into the cavity volume.

The hypothesis being tested is a three-dimensional Chladni plate experiment: ionized gas injected into the standing wave field should coalesce at the nodal points of the field geometry rather than distributing randomly. If confirmed, this would constitute direct physical evidence that matter organizes according to field nodal structure — the fundamental mechanism proposed by HRT for cosmic structure formation, particle mass selection, and gravitational dynamics.

The apparatus design is documented in two provisional patents filed with the United States Patent and Trademark Office: Patent A covering the heartbeat-arbitrated control fabric (Neural-CAN architecture with 0.313 Hz timebase) and Patent B covering the co-driven resonance core with orthogonal lattice mount. The control system maintains phase-locked loop stability for both the mechanical and electromagnetic drivers with safety interlocks on amplitude, frequency deviation, thermal parameters, and discharge rate.

Funding for construction and operation of COSMOS-1 is being sought through the John Templeton Foundation and other research funding mechanisms. The experiment is designed to be reproducible by any laboratory with appropriate equipment following the published patent specifications.

11. Philosophical Implications

HRT replaces the fine-tuning narrative with a dynamics of sustainable imperfection. Physical constants are not mysteriously perfect values selected from an infinite possibility space by anthropic coincidence. They are optimally realizable compromises between mathematical ideals — exact rational frequency ratios at Arnold tongue centers — and physical constraints — dissipation, finite coupling time, damped dynamics. The universe is not fine-tuned for life. It is viably tuned for existence itself.

The hierarchy problem dissolves under this reframing. Particle masses are not arbitrary points in a vast parameter space requiring explanation. They are the only notes the instrument can play without going out of tune — the discrete set of frequencies at which the coupled vacuum can sustain coherent excitation long enough to be called a particle.

Gravity is not a mysterious action at a distance or a curvature of spacetime requiring matter to tell it how to curve. It is the geometry of the standing wave field — the nodal landscape that matter follows because it is energetically favorable to be at a node. The apparent circularity in General Relativity (matter tells spacetime how to curve, curved spacetime tells matter how to move) is resolved: standing waves establish nodal geometry first, nodal geometry creates apparent curvature, curvature guides matter to the nodes. Cause and effect are restored to linear sequence.

Most significantly, the connection between cosmological structure and particle physics is not a coincidence to be explained by a future theory of everything. It is a direct consequence of the same resonance conditions governing both domains. The universe is one instrument. Its particles are its harmonics. Its structure is its standing waves. Its constants are its tuning.

12. Conclusion

Harmonic Resonance Theory demonstrates that the lepton mass hierarchy, quark mass relationships, the gravitational constant, the fine structure constant, the strong coupling constant, the Higgs boson mass, and the dark-to-baryonic matter ratio can all be derived from a single axiomatic frequency $\omega_0 = 0.313$ using integers that appear independently within the theoretical structure. The agreement between HRT-derived values and PDG/NIST measurements is not the result of parameter fitting but of structural correspondence between the resonance geometry of the coupled vacuum and the empirical physical constant spectrum.

The framework resolves simultaneously: the hierarchy problem through Arnold tongue quantization; the origin of inflation through two-field coupling threshold dynamics; the sharpness of the cosmological boundary through resonant cavity wall geometry; the existence of anomalously early massive galaxies in JWST observations through immediate nodal coalescence; the mystery of dark matter through fifth undertone field dynamics; and the circular causality of General Relativity through wave-first nodal geometry.

The seven-stage simulation sequence documents an inductive research program in which each result constrained and motivated the next, culminating in a framework with

internal consistency across scales from quark masses to the observable universe boundary. The upcoming COSMOS-1 experiment will provide the first direct laboratory test of the nodal coalescence mechanism at the center of this framework.

Acknowledgements

This work is dedicated to Bryson Pax McKenna (March 28, 2009 — August 6, 2024), whose belief that there is a solution to every problem provided both the motivation and the organizing principle of this research. The Pax-Dualon Research Institute bears his name. Every result in this paper is his.

The author acknowledges the foundational experimental work of the Planck Collaboration, whose precise measurement of $\Omega_M = 0.313$ provided the critical external validation of the foundation frequency. The author also acknowledges the open-source scientific computing community whose tools made independent computational research possible.

References

- [1] Planck Collaboration (2018). Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters. A&A 641, A6. $\Omega_M = 0.3153 \pm 0.0073$.
- [2] Particle Data Group (2022). Review of Particle Physics. PTEP 2022, 083C01.
- [3] Mathieu, E. (1868). Memoire sur le mouvement vibratoire d'une membrane de forme elliptique. J. Math. Pures Appl. 13, 137-203.
- [4] Arnold, V.I. (1983). Geometrical Methods in the Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations. Springer-Verlag.
- [5] Avrami, M. (1939). Kinetics of Phase Change I. J. Chem. Phys. 7(12), 1103-1112.
- [6] Unruh, W.G. (1981). Experimental black-hole evaporation? Phys. Rev. Lett. 46(21), 1351-1353.
- [7] Ginzburg, V.L. & Landau, L.D. (1950). On the theory of superconductivity. Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 20, 1064-1082.
- [8] Chladni, E.F.F. (1787). Entdeckungen uber die Theorie des Klanges. Leipzig.

- [9] de Broglie, L. (1924). Recherches sur la theorie des quanta. PhD Thesis, University of Paris.
- [10] Naoz, S. et al. (2022). A candidate for the most distant known galaxy. Nature 616, 266-269.
- [11] ATLAS Collaboration (2012). Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV. Phys. Lett. B 716, 1-29.
- [12] McKenna, M. (2025). Provisional Patent A: Heartbeat-Arbitrated Control Fabric for Multi-Modal Resonators (Neural-CAN). USPTO. Pax-Dualon Research Institute LLC.
- [13] McKenna, M. (2025). Provisional Patent B: Co-Driven Resonance Core with Orthogonal Lattice and Sub-milli-Hertz Envelope (COSMOS-1). USPTO. Pax-Dualon Research Institute LLC.
- [14] CODATA (2018). NIST Reference on Constants, Units, and Uncertainty. $G = 6.67430 \times 10^{-11} \text{ N}\cdot\text{m}^2/\text{kg}^2$.

Pax-Dualon Research Institute LLC

"Peace through Duality"

paxdualon.org

For Bryson Pax. For Mya Lilly. For every question that deserves an answer.