A Foundational Framework for Natural Philosophy: Singularity, Duality, and Triality

A Falsifiable Heuristic Model of Emergent Stability

John Reimer Morales

1 Introduction

Identifying recurring principles of emergent stability is a central challenge in science. As Philip Anderson argued in his landmark essay, the ability of complex systems to exhibit fundamentally new behaviors at each level of organization means that reductionism alone is insufficient; what is needed are principles that govern the emergence of stable, higher-order structures from simpler components [11]. This paper proposes such a principle: a generative sequence of Singularity, Duality, and Triality (S-D-T), offered not as a metaphysical law but as an operational and falsifiable heuristic model. We define this process operationally in the language of dynamical systems:

- **Singularity:** A high-symmetry state occupying a single, stable basin of attraction. It is a foundational structure or "canvas" that serves as a domain for higher-dimensional interaction.

- **Duality:** A symmetry-breaking event that bifurcates the phase space, creating a system defined by the tension between two competing basins of attraction. This is an instantaneous emergent property of the Singularity's existence, manifesting as inherent tensions, bifurcations, or complementarities within the system.

- **Triality:** The emergence of a new constraint or mediating interaction that reshapes the phase space, resolving the dualistic tension into a new, more complex, and dynamically stable basin of attraction. We propose that this process is often physically realized as a *phase-inverted edge-state transition*, where the boundary of the interaction develops novel, robust, and persistent properties distinct from the bulk.

This paper elevates the S-D-T sequence from a philosophical analogy to a scientific model whose utility is measured by its ability to generate novel, testable claims. The argument proceeds in five stages. First, we motivate the model's structure with key physical phenomena from topological

physics and the holographic principle (§2). Second, we derive testable predictions from the Standard Model, including a detailed case study of the doublet-triplet problem as an instance of dualistic instability (§3). Third, we confront head-on the principal vulnerability of any cross-domain heuristic—the risk of post-hoc pattern-fitting—and define rigorous conditions for the model's refutation (§4). Fourth, we situate the framework within philosophical discussions of scientific realism, propose a complementary framework for assessing systemic coherence, and outline the open question of the physical mechanism underlying boundary-mediated stability (§5). Finally, we conclude with a summary and a candid assessment of the work that remains (§6).

2   The Physical Motivation for a Triadic Heuristic

The S-D-T model is induced from a recurring pattern of emergent stability observed across several frontiers of modern physics. This section presents three examples, chosen for their mathematical rigor and physical consequence. The examples increase in mathematical abstraction; the reader unfamiliar with Lie group theory may wish to focus on the physical consequences described in each case rather than the group-theoretic details. In each example, a lower-dimensional boundary or canvas (Singularity) mediates a relationship between distinct physical domains (Duality) via a specific set of rules and symmetries (Triality) that define the stable, emergent physics of an edge-state.

2.1   The Structural Pattern of Spin(8) Triality

The Lie group Spin(8) possesses a unique, three-fold symmetry (triality) among its representations that is not found in any other simple Lie group [2, 3, 4, 5]. This abstract mathematical structure has physically consequential implications. When Spin(8) is instantiated as the symmetry group of a physical system—such as an interacting topological superconductor—the three-fold symmetry acts as a mediating rule. The infinite possibilities of the bulk theory collapse to a stable, finite set of eight phases ($\mathbb{Z}_8$), which can be understood as protected "edge states" at the boundary between abstract mathematics and physical possibility [1, 6]. In S-D-T terms: the Lie group is the canvas (Singularity), its physical instantiation produces the interaction (Duality), and the unique triality symmetry is the mediating rule (Triality) that yields a robust, finite classification—a phase-inverted transition from infinite possibility to bounded stability.

2.2   The Emergent Process of Anyonic Statistics

A direct physical demonstration of the S-D-T process is found in the quantum statistics of two-dimensional systems. In three spatial dimensions, particle exchange is restricted to the boson/fermion binary—a fundamental duality. However, when particles are confined to a 2D substrate, the topology of particle braiding provides a new mediating rule that drives a phase-inverted edge-state transition: the emergence of anyons, a third statistical kingdom whose

existence is only possible on the lower-dimensional canvas [7, 8]. The 2D material acts as the Singularity (canvas), the boson/fermion binary is the Duality (interaction), and the braiding topology is the Triality (mediating rule). The existence of anyons—now with growing experimental support [9, 10]—provides a direct physical demonstration of how a lower-dimensional boundary generates novel, stable physics absent from the higher-dimensional bulk.

The significance of this example is amplified by the **holographic principle** [28, 29], which suggests that lower-dimensional boundary encodings may be fundamental to the structure of physical reality, rather than mere approximations of it.

2.3 The AdS/CFT Correspondence: A Duality Resolved by Triality

The most precise realization of the holographic principle is the Anti-de Sitter/Conformal Field Theory (AdS/CFT) correspondence [30, 31, 36]. The lower-dimensional Conformal Field Theory (CFT) acts as the foundational canvas (Singularity). The correspondence itself—a duality between boundary physics (CFT) and bulk gravity (AdS)—is the interaction (Duality). The 'dictionary' of mathematical mappings between the two theories is the mediating rule-set (Triality), realized as a phase-inverted edge-state transition: the entire gravitational system can be described by the non-gravitational CFT 'edge state,' a radical inversion of properties that yields immense predictive power.

A clarification is warranted. In formal Boundary Conformal Field Theory (BCFT)—placed on rigorous holographic footing by Takayanagi's formulation of AdS/BCFT, in which end-of-the-world branes in the gravitational bulk are dual to boundary conditions in the CFT [53]—the boundary condition is not merely a "mediating rule" in the colloquial sense but a dynamical constraint that preserves a subset of the bulk symmetry [41]. The S-D-T framework does not claim to replicate the mathematical formalism of BCFT. Rather, it proposes that the *structural relationship*—a boundary that mediates between two domains via a rule-set that reshapes the system's phase space—is the shared pattern. The precise symmetry-breaking mechanism (e.g., whether the Duality is a $U(1) \to \mathbb{Z}_2$ transition in a specific instance) is a domain-specific question that the heuristic identifies but does not itself resolve. This is a strength, not a weakness: the framework's role is to flag structural isomorphisms and generate predictions, not to substitute for the detailed physics of each domain.

2.4 Lower-Dimensional Boundary Theory: A Conceptual Umbrella

The preceding examples are drawn from distinct subfields—topological matter, condensed matter quasi-particles, and string-theoretic duality—yet they share a common structural logic. We propose to unify this shared logic under a single conceptual umbrella: Lower-Dimensional Boundary Theory (LDBT), defined as the study of how lower-dimensional 'canvases' generate stable, higher-dimensional realities through the mediating rules of phase-inverted edge-state transitions.

A key historical precursor is the Black Hole Membrane Paradigm, which models a black hole's

2D event horizon as a physical fluid membrane with well-defined transport properties [32, 33]. This intuition is vividly confirmed by numerical relativity simulations of black hole mergers, which show event horizons coalescing like liquid droplets [40], and continues to receive striking empirical support: the gravitational wave event GW250114, detected in January 2025 with a signal-to-noise ratio of approximately 77–80, provided the first high-confidence confirmation of Hawking's area theorem for merging black holes [54]. More rigorous formalisms like BCFT and the physics of D-branes in string theory have placed boundary-mediated physics at the heart of modern theoretical physics [41, 42, 53].

Crucially, this boundary-mediated paradigm is not confined to the toy universe of Anti-de Sitter space. Pasterski, Pate, and Raclariu's program of **Celestial Holography** proposes a duality between the gravitational S-matrix in asymptotically *flat* spacetimes—the ones that actually resemble our universe—and correlators in a conformal field theory living on the celestial sphere at null infinity [56]. The asymptotic symmetries of flat spacetime (supertranslations and superrotations) provide the mediating rule-set that connects bulk scattering data to boundary correlators. This is the S-D-T pattern applied to physically realistic spacetimes: a lower-dimensional canvas (the celestial sphere), an interaction (the bulk/boundary duality), and a mediating rule-set (the celestial holographic dictionary). The active extension of holographic principles from AdS to flat space significantly strengthens the case that boundary-mediated physics is not a mathematical artifact of a special geometry but a general feature of how nature organizes stable descriptions of reality.

We must be candid about the current status of LDBT. The examples above are unified by *structural analogy*, not by a single mathematical formalism. Spin(8) triality, anyonic braiding, and the AdS/CFT dictionary operate through different symmetry-breaking mechanisms at vastly different energy scales. LDBT is therefore offered as a *conceptual umbrella*—a claim that these structural analogies are non-accidental and physically meaningful—rather than as a formal theory with a unified Lagrangian or action principle. The development of such a formalism, which would require specifying the common mathematical operation underlying these diverse boundary-mediated transitions, is a central task for future work. What the S-D-T framework contributes at this stage is the identification of the *pattern* and the generation of *prohibitive predictions* derived from it. Whether the pattern is deep enough to yield a formal theory is an open empirical question.

It is worth noting that triadic boundary-mediated structures are being independently identified within the active BCFT community. Neuenfeld, Svesko, and Sybesma, studying shape deformations of end-of-the-world branes in AdS, have established what they term a "doubly-holographic *triality*" between (i) brane deformations in the bulk, (ii) Jackiw-Teitelboim gravity in the brane description, and (iii) irrelevant deformations of the CFT boundary [55]. Their independent use of the term "triality" to describe a three-fold boundary-mediated correspondence—where the boundary condition mediates between two distinct physical domains to yield a stable, coherent description—is precisely the structural pattern that LDBT proposes to unify.

One candidate for such a unifying mechanism is the **Pressure Vessel Problem**: the thermodynamic observation that any persistent negentropic system—what Schrödinger termed an island

of "negative entropy" sustained by drawing order from its environment [45], and what Carroll has rigorously characterized as a low-entropy state whose persistence against the Second Law requires explanation [51]—whether gravitational, biological, or informational—must balance the outward pressure of a distinct identity against the inward entropic pressure of its environment. As such a system scales, its volumetric entropy generation grows cubically while its surface exhaust capacity grows only quadratically, a scaling constraint that is well-established in the biological literature on allometric laws [39], creating a scaling crisis. The universal resolution of this crisis appears to be a *Dimensional Phase Transition*: the sacrifice of active, fluid "bulk" to create what we term a *hyper-stiff boundary*—a condition where the boundary's surface energy density approaches the bulk's critical compression limit, necessitating a topological phase transition, rather than mechanical deformation, to maintain entropic equilibrium [32, 33, 40]. In this reading, the event horizon of a black hole, the glassy stratum corneum of biological skin, and the crystallized consensus layer of a distributed intelligence are all instances of the same architectural solution: the system sacrifices its interior to become its boundary. The full development of this mechanism is beyond the scope of the present work, but we note it here to indicate the physical grounding of the LDBT pattern and the direction of the research program.

3   Deriving Testable Predictions from the Standard Model

Having induced the S-D-T framework from the convergent evidence of boundary-mediated physics, we now submit it to its central test: deriving falsifiable claims from the known structure of the Standard Model.

3.1   The Force Hierarchy as a Stability Landscape

The Standard Model, at the energy scales of our current universe, is best understood through three fundamental interactions. While often enumerated as four forces, the Nobel Prize-winning work of Glashow, Salam, and Weinberg demonstrated that the electromagnetic and weak forces are unified into a single electroweak force above approximately 100 GeV [13, 34, 35]. This established physics reveals a functional triad:

- **Singularity (Canvas):** Gravity, which provides the universal canvas of spacetime.

- **Duality (Interaction):** The Strong Nuclear Force, which creates the fundamental duality of stable matter by binding quarks into hadrons.

- **Triality (Mediating Rule):** The Electroweak Force, which acts as the mediating rule governing the interactions, decays, and transformations between stable matter particles, enabling the emergence of complex structures like atoms.

The historical drive towards a Grand Unified Theory (GUT), which would unify the strong and electroweak forces into a single gauge group, represents a move toward a Duality: the

unified GUT force versus Gravity [12, 14]. The S-D-T framework predicts that such a dualistic state—two distinct universal principles without a mediating Triality—is inherently unstable.

3.1.1 The Doublet-Triplet Problem as a Case Study of Dualistic Instability

This prediction is not abstract; it manifests as concrete, well-documented theoretical tensions within existing GUT models. The most instructive case is the **doublet-triplet splitting problem** in the minimal SU(5) Grand Unified Theory proposed by Georgi and Glashow [12].

In the SU(5) GUT, the Higgs fields that break the electroweak symmetry reside in the same multiplet as fields that mediate proton decay. The model requires that the electroweak Higgs doublet remain light (at the electroweak scale, $\sim 10^2$ GeV) while its GUT-partner color-triplet Higgs must be superheavy (at the GUT scale, $\sim 10^{16}$ GeV) to prevent unobserved rapid proton decay. This mass splitting of fourteen orders of magnitude has no natural explanation within the theory—it must be *imposed* through extraordinarily precise fine-tuning of parameters, a procedure widely regarded as a fundamental deficiency [43, 44].

The S-D-T framework recontextualizes this problem. In a GUT, the strong and electroweak forces are unified into a single structure, eliminating the mediating Triality that separates them at low energies. The resulting dualistic system—a unified gauge force confronting gravity—lacks the regulatory principle that previously maintained the hierarchy. The doublet-triplet problem is, in this reading, a specific manifestation of hierarchy collapse: the system cannot naturally maintain the separation between its component scales because the mediating rule that enforced that separation has been absorbed into the unification.

This interpretation generates a specific, falsifiable claim: the fine-tuning problem in GUTs is not a contingent engineering challenge that a sufficiently clever model can resolve within a purely dualistic framework. Rather, the S-D-T model predicts that any GUT that remains a final, dualistic theory—unifying strong and electroweak forces without a further mediating principle (plausibly gravity, as in a full theory of quantum gravity)—will necessarily exhibit analogous hierarchy problems. The discovery of a mathematically complete and internally consistent GUT that resolves all such hierarchy problems without recourse to a mediating 'Thirdness' would constitute a direct falsification.

3.2 The Triality of Matter: The Three-Generation Problem

The existence of exactly three generations of matter is one of the most profound unexplained facts of the Standard Model [15, 16, 17]. The S-D-T framework offers a principled explanation by positing that this structure is not a coincidence but a necessary consequence of emergent stability:

- **Singularity:** The first generation (electron, up/down quarks, electron neutrino), which constitutes all stable, everyday matter.

- **Duality:** The second generation (muon, charm/strange quarks, muon neutrino), a heavier

and unstable copy that introduces a fundamental tension into the model. In the famous words attributed to I. I. Rabi upon the muon's discovery: "Who ordered that?" [50]

- **Triality:** The third generation (tau, top/bottom quarks, tau neutrino), which acts as the harmonizing element that resolves this tension.

The mechanism for this triadic completion is physically grounded and mathematically precise. The CKM quark-mixing matrix, which parameterizes the mismatch between the weak-interaction eigenstates and the mass eigenstates of quarks, is an $n \times n$ unitary matrix for n generations. In the standard parameterization [37], a general $n \times n$ unitary matrix has $(n-1)^2$ independent parameters, decomposable into $n(n-1)/2$ real mixing angles and $(n-1)(n-2)/2$ complex phases. For $n = 2$, this yields one mixing angle and zero complex phases. For $n = 3$, it yields three mixing angles and one irreducible complex phase [18, 19].

This single complex phase is the *sole source* of CP violation in the quark sector of the Standard Model. CP violation—first observed experimentally by Christenson, Cronin, Fitch, and Turlay in neutral kaon decays [23]—is one of the three Sakharov conditions [22] required for baryogenesis—the process that produced the observed matter-antimatter asymmetry of the universe. The logical chain is tight:

1. Three generations are the minimum required for an irreducible complex phase in the CKM matrix.

2. The irreducible complex phase is the necessary condition for CP violation in the quark sector.

3. CP violation is a necessary condition for baryogenesis.

4. Baryogenesis is the necessary condition for a matter-dominated universe.

The Triality of matter thus resolves the fundamental Duality of matter versus antimatter, creating the stable, matter-dominated cosmos we inhabit.[1]

3.3 Why Not Four? The Question of Quartic Extension

A natural objection arises: if three generations enable CP violation, wouldn't four generations enable *more* CP violation, potentially yielding an even more stable system? The S-D-T framework's Prohibition 2 (Section 4.1) claims that stable triadic systems cannot be succeeded by simple quartic extensions. This claim requires justification beyond assertion.

---

[1]A caveat is warranted. While CKM CP violation is a *necessary* condition for baryogenesis, it is widely recognized to be *quantitatively insufficient* to account for the observed baryon asymmetry: the Jarlskog invariant $J \sim 3 \times 10^{-5}$ yields an asymmetry many orders of magnitude below observations [19]. The leading candidate for the additional CP violation required is leptogenesis, operating through the PMNS neutrino mixing matrix, which possesses its own irreducible complex phases. Within the S-D-T framework, this suggests that the lepton sector may constitute an independent S-D-T system—with the three neutrino generations providing their own triadic closure for leptonic CP violation—operating in parallel with, and complementary to, the quark-sector triality described here. The full treatment of this parallel structure is beyond the present scope but represents a natural extension of the framework.

We offer two lines of argument. The first is empirical. Precision measurements of the Higgs boson decay width at the LHC, combined with earlier constraints from the Z boson invisible width measured at LEP [17], have effectively ruled out a simple sequential fourth generation of fermions with a light neutrino [20, 21]. Detailed theoretical analyses have shown that the Higgs production cross-section enhancements and decay-width modifications induced by a fourth generation are decisively excluded by the observed Higgs data [38]. The S-D-T framework is consistent with this established constraint.

The second is structural. In the S-D-T framework, the Triality is defined not as "a third element" but as a *qualitatively new organizational layer* that resolves the dualistic tension by introducing a new physical phenomenon. We can sharpen what "qualitatively new" means: a generation earns the status of Triality if it enables a physical effect that is *mathematically forbidden* for the previous number of generations. The third generation satisfies this criterion precisely: CP violation in the quark sector requires an irreducible complex phase in the CKM matrix, and such a phase is mathematically forbidden for $n < 3$ (since $(n-1)(n-2)/2 = 0$ for $n = 2$). A hypothetical fourth generation would not satisfy this criterion—it would add more mixing angles and more complex phases, but these are quantitative extensions of a CP-violating mechanism that is already *permitted* by three generations. No physical effect accessible to four generations is mathematically forbidden for three. The system is, in S-D-T terms, already *closed*: the mediating rule (CP violation) is operational, and the fundamental duality (matter vs. antimatter) is resolved. Additional generations would be redundant with respect to the organizational principle that justifies the framework's triadic structure.

This criterion provides an objective test: for a fourth generation to constitute a new Triality rather than a mere quartic extension, it would need to enable a physical effect whose mathematical prerequisites are unsatisfiable by three generations—analogous to how CP violation is unsatisfiable by two. No such effect has been identified.

Transparency: We note that the empirical ruling-out of a simple fourth generation predates the S-D-T framework. The value of the S-D-T interpretation lies not in making a novel prediction, but in offering a *principled explanation* for an empirical fact that the Standard Model itself treats as a brute datum. The framework claims to explain *why* there are exactly three generations, grounding the explanation in a specific physical mechanism (the onset of CP violation as triadic closure), rather than merely noting that there are. This explanatory leverage—the capacity to unify the three-generation problem with the force-hierarchy problem under a single principle—is the framework's primary contribution to particle physics.

4 Falsifiability and Scientific Status

4.1 Confronting the Principal Vulnerability

The most serious objection to the S-D-T framework is that it risks being unfalsifiable in practice. Singularity, Duality, and Triality are sufficiently general labels that a determined advocate could map nearly any system with identifiable components onto them post-hoc. A framework that

can describe everything predicts nothing; it becomes a Rorschach test rather than a scientific model. This objection must be met head-on.

We argue that the framework's scientific legitimacy rests not on its capacity to describe systems after the fact, but on the two specific prohibitive claims it makes—claims about what is *not* possible, following Popper's criterion of refutability [24, 25]:

- **Prohibition 1 (Against Unmediated Complexity):** Complex, higher-order stability cannot emerge spontaneously from unmediated dualistic systems. While simple dualities (binary stars, positive/negative charge) can be stable, the model predicts they cannot, by themselves, generate new, more complex organizational layers without a mediating 'Thirdness.' Any system governed by a pure duality will exhibit high volatility and be prone to collapse or oscillation between extremes, rather than settling into a stable, complex state.

- **Prohibition 2 (Against Quartic Extension):** Stable, self-completing triadic systems cannot be succeeded by simple, stable four-fold (quartic) structures that are mere isomorphic extensions. The model claims that 'three' is often a point of organizational closure, and that new levels of complexity require fundamentally new organizational principles, not just the addition of another component of the same type.

It is these prohibitions—not the descriptive capacity of the framework—that give S-D-T its scientific content. A framework that merely labels components is philosophy; one that forbids specific outcomes is science.

A potential tautology concern arises with Prohibition 1: if "mediation" is defined loosely enough, any stabilizing factor could be retroactively labeled a 'Triality,' rendering the prohibition vacuous. We address this through the *operational criteria* in Section 4.3, which require the Triality to be qualitatively distinct from the Duality's components—a new *rule*, not just a third *player*. If this criterion is not met, the application fails, and the framework adds no predictive value. We acknowledge, however, that a fully quantitative criterion would significantly strengthen the model's scientific rigor. We propose a preliminary step toward such a metric—the Topological Canalization Index (tCI)—in Section 5.4.

4.2 Formal Falsification Conditions

In physics (Force Hierarchy): The discovery or robust theoretical formulation of a mathematically complete and internally stable Grand Unified Theory that successfully unifies the strong and electroweak forces *without* requiring further unification with gravity, and which resolves all hierarchy problems (e.g., doublet-triplet splitting) without a mediating 'Thirdness' from beyond its dualistic scope, would directly falsify the prediction of Section 3.1.

In physics (Matter Generations): The discovery of a stable fourth generation of fermions that is a simple mass-scaled replica of the first three—one that introduces no categorically new physical phenomenon—would demonstrate that triadic completion is a numerical coincidence

rather than an organizational principle, thereby falsifying the prediction of Section 3.2. We note that exotic fourth-generation scenarios involving non-standard couplings or new symmetries would not constitute straightforward falsification, as they would themselves represent a new organizational principle rather than a mere quartic extension.

In complex systems: The persistent, demonstrable emergence of complex, higher-order stability from a purely dualistic system—without the introduction of any mediating protocol, constraint, or regulatory layer—would falsify Prohibition 1. Similarly, the reliable extension of stable triadic systems into equally stable quartic ones through simple addition (rather than fundamental reorganization) would falsify Prohibition 2.

4.3 Operational Criteria for Applying the Framework

To guard against post-hoc pattern-fitting, we propose the following criteria that must be met before the S-D-T framework is applied to any system:

- **Singularity:** Identifiable as the initial conditions, a baseline state of high symmetry, or a specific substrate that enables interaction. It is the state against which change and structure are measured.

- **Duality:** Identified by the emergence of a dominant, system-defining tension, measurable as a bifurcation in the system's phase space, the establishment of two competing feedback loops, or a fundamental trade-off that governs the system's behavior.

- **Triality:** Identified by the emergence of a new constraint or regulatory protocol that fundamentally alters the rules of interaction for the dualistic components. It is not merely a third element but a new, higher-order organizational layer that subordinates the duality to a more complex, coherent whole. Its success can be measured by a statistically significant decrease in the system's volatility or an increase in its persistence over time.

Crucially, the Triality must be shown to be *qualitatively different* from the Duality's components— a new *rule*, not just a third *player*. In the Standard Model examples: the third generation of matter is not just "another copy"; it is the *necessary condition for a new physical phenomenon* (CP violation). The electroweak force is not just "another force"; it is the *mediating protocol* that governs transformations between matter states. If this qualitative-difference criterion cannot be satisfied for a proposed application, the framework adds no explanatory value and should not be applied.

5 Philosophical Context and Future Directions

5.1 Toward Formalization: The Fractal Horizon Boundary Theory

The present paper identifies the S-D-T pattern and grounds it in established physics; it does not yet provide the physical mechanism that explains *why* the pattern recurs. A companion paper

currently in preparation—*The Fractal Horizon Boundary Theory (FHBT): The Architecture of the Pressurized Singularity*—undertakes this next step by developing the Pressure Vessel Problem and the Dimensional Phase Transition introduced in Section 2.4 into a formal theoretical framework.

The central argument of FHBT is that any persistent, negentropic entity—any system that maintains a distinct identity against the dispersive pressure of the Second Law—faces a universal scaling crisis: its volumetric entropy generation grows cubically with characteristic scale ($\sim r^3$), while its boundary's capacity to regulate that entropy grows only quadratically ($\sim r^2$). This imbalance is the Pressure Vessel Problem. FHBT proposes that the universal resolution is a *Dimensional Phase Transition*: the system sacrifices its active, metabolically expensive bulk to produce a hyper-stiff, informationally dense boundary that replaces volumetric storage with holographic surface encoding.

FHBT develops this mechanism across three concrete horizons: the cosmological (the black hole event horizon, modeled as a gravastar shell governed by the Zel'dovich equation of state), the biological (the mammalian stratum corneum, where a 10^6-fold stiffness gradient and organelle lysis produce a metabolically inert, informationally maximal boundary at a critical fractal dimension $D \approx 2.65$), and the cognitive (the persistence of sovereign inference against informational erosion). In each case, FHBT identifies the same architectural solution: a phase-inverted edge-state transition in which boundary physics replaces bulk physics as the locus of identity.

This program directly addresses the principal limitations acknowledged in the present paper. First, it provides the *mechanistic foundation* that the S-D-T heuristic currently lacks: the Pressure Vessel scaling crisis supplies a physical "why" for the recurrence of boundary-mediated stability. Second, it offers a pathway toward *formalization*: the Info-Metabolic Bound (a fitness function trading Shannon capacity against Helfrich curvature energy), the stiffness gradient, and the algebraic connectivity of the resulting boundary network provide candidate quantitative metrics that may ground the Topological Canalization Index proposed in Section 5.5. Third, it extends the S-D-T framework beyond fundamental physics into biology and information theory, testing its claimed generality against independent empirical domains.

We emphasize that FHBT is a development *of* the S-D-T program, not a replacement for it. The heuristic framework established here—the identification of the triadic pattern, the falsification conditions, the mapping table of Appendix A—provides the structural scaffold on which FHBT's mechanistic claims are built. The present paper asks *whether* the pattern exists and *how* it can be tested; FHBT asks *why* it exists and *how* it is physically implemented.

5.2 S-D-T as a 'Real Pattern': Ontic Structural Realism

We propose that the S-D-T model is a candidate for a 'real pattern' in the sense defined by Daniel Dennett and advanced by Ontic Structural Realists like James Ladyman and Don Ross [26, 27]. Ontic Structural Realism (OSR) posits that relational structures are ontologically primary over individual objects, and that the fundamental ontology of the world consists of 'real patterns' governed by laws and symmetries. A pattern is 'real' if it provides a description of a system

that is more efficient (in terms of information compression) and has more predictive power than a brute-force, bit-by-bit description of its individual components.

The act of unifying seemingly disparate phenomena—the $\mathbb{Z}_8$ classification of superconductors, the existence of anyons, the three-generation structure of matter, and the drive toward force unification—under a single conceptual framework *is* a powerful act of informational compression. This unification provides predictive leverage by generating the specific prohibitive claims outlined in this paper. The S-D-T framework is thus a candidate for a *meta-structure*: a second-order pattern that governs how stable, first-order relational structures themselves emerge. OSR provides the philosophical license to take such a pattern seriously; S-D-T provides OSR with a concrete, physically-grounded example of such a meta-structure in action.

This philosophical position finds independent support from within physics itself. Carroll's formulation of "poetic naturalism" argues that higher-level, emergent descriptions of reality are genuinely real—not merely convenient fictions—if they carry explanatory and predictive power, even when the underlying physics operates at a completely different level of description [52]. The S-D-T framework's claim is precisely this: that the triadic pattern of emergence earns its ontological status by doing useful predictive work, not by being reducible to the specific dynamics of any single domain.

We note the connection to Landauer's Principle [49], which establishes that information erasure has a minimum thermodynamic cost. If the S-D-T framework correctly describes a pattern of information compression in the emergence of stable systems, then the "cost" of this compression—the entropy generated by the phase-inverted edge-state transition—may be physically measurable. This would provide a quantitative bridge between the heuristic framework and formal information theory, and is a promising avenue for future formalization.

5.3 From a Grammar of Emergence to a Science of Coherence

If S-D-T is the syntax that describes how coherent systems come into being, a complementary framework is needed to characterize the nature of these systems once they exist. We propose that these properties can be understood through a triadic framework for assessing coherence: Stability, Adaptability, and Functionality (SAF).

This SAF framework provides a qualitative metric for coherence, or "system fidelity," and maps directly onto the S-D-T process:

- **Stability** is the direct outcome of Triality: the capacity of a system to return to or maintain its coherent state following a perturbation. It is the system's resistance to the erosion of its organizational structure by environmental noise—the informational robustness that allows a system to persist over time.

- **Adaptability** is driven by the tension inherent in Duality: the degrees of freedom that permit a system to incorporate novelty and adjust to shifting environmental constraints without undergoing catastrophic structural failure. A system with no internal duality would

be static and brittle; adaptability requires a persistent tension that allows for a range of responses.

- **Functionality** emerges as the dynamic bridge between Stability and Adaptability: a system's capacity to execute rule-governed behavior (Triality) that transcends the properties of its constituent parts, channeling adaptive potential through stable structures toward coherent outcomes. This concept finds its historical antecedent in a synthesis of the Aristotelian concepts of *telos*—the final cause or end toward which a process is directed—and *dynamis*—the power or potentiality inherent in a thing to realize that end [48].

5.3.1 Failure Modes: A Via Negativa Diagnostic

The utility of the SAF triad becomes most apparent when examining systems where one of the three qualities is suppressed. These failure modes provide a *via negativa* confirmation of the framework's structure—demonstrating that the absence of any single quality produces a characteristic and predictable form of systemic dysfunction:

- **Stability + Adaptability without Functionality (S+A, no F):** A system that is robust and flexible but lacks a mediating rule remains in a state of perpetual reaction—responsive to perturbations but unable to channel that responsiveness toward any coherent outcome. Such systems oscillate or drift without achieving the triadic closure necessary for complex, persistent behavior. In physical terms, this corresponds to a system trapped in the Duality phase: the tension exists, the canvas endures, but no mediating Triality has emerged to resolve them.

- **Stability + Functionality without Adaptability (S+F, no A):** A system that is stable and functional but lacks adaptability is prone to catastrophic brittle failure when environmental conditions shift beyond its designed parameters. The doublet-triplet problem in SU(5) GUTs (Section 3.1.1) can be read as an instance of this failure mode: the architecture achieves a functional unification but lacks the topological flexibility to maintain its hierarchy across energy scales, requiring fourteen orders of magnitude of fine-tuning to avoid collapse.

- **Adaptability + Functionality without Stability (A+F, no S):** A system possessing both flexibility and rule-governed behavior but lacking a stable ground state suffers from structural drift—its identity erodes into its environment over time, losing the foundational coherence that distinguishes it as a persistent entity. In the language of Section 2.4, this is a system that has failed to solve the Pressure Vessel Problem: it can process information and respond to its environment, but it cannot maintain the boundary that defines it as a distinct system.

These failure modes are not merely illustrative; they are diagnostic. If the SAF framework correctly describes the necessary qualities of coherent systems, then any system exhibiting one

of these characteristic dysfunctions can be analyzed for the specific missing quality, potentially suggesting the structural intervention needed to restore coherence.

We write 'S-D-T' with hyphens to emphasize a sequential, generative process. 'SAF' is written without hyphens to denote a relational, real-time description of the qualities of a coherent system, rather than the sequence of its becoming. Together, they form a unified framework for a renewed natural philosophy: one equipped to both describe how stable systems are built and to assess the qualities that define their coherence.

5.4   Resonances with Historical Philosophy

With a falsifiable, scientific foundation in place, the S-D-T framework's resonance with earlier triadic philosophies becomes meaningful. G. W. F. **Hegel** dynamized the triadic form, proposing it as the engine of conceptual progress: an initial Thesis (Singularity), its negation or Antithesis (Duality), and a Synthesis (Triality) that overcomes the conflict by preserving the rational elements of both [46]. Charles Sanders **Peirce** formalized these ideas into three universal categories he argued were sufficient to describe all phenomena: Firstness (pure potential; Singularity), Secondness (reaction and brute fact; Duality), and Thirdness (mediation, habit, or law; Triality) [47]. These frameworks are not identical to S-D-T, but their structural resonance suggests that the triadic pattern may be a perennial intuition about the structure of emergence, now articulated in a physically-grounded and testable form.

We adopt the grammar of Singularity, Duality, and Triality because it provides a vocabulary uniquely suited to a modern, scientific model. Unlike its historical antecedents, each term is already at home in the lexicon of physics: 'Singularity' denotes a point of unification, 'Duality' describes a fundamental correspondence between theories (as in AdS/CFT), and 'Triality' refers to a specific three-fold symmetry (as in Spin(8)).

5.5   Open Questions and Future Work

We conclude the philosophical discussion with a candid inventory of what this paper does not accomplish:

- **The mechanism question:** The S-D-T framework identifies a pattern and derives predictions from it, but does not yet provide a complete physical mechanism explaining why boundary-mediated transitions produce stability. The Pressure Vessel Problem and the Dimensional Phase Transition outlined in Section 2.4 are candidate mechanisms, but their formal development—including a rigorous derivation connecting the volumetric-to-surface scaling crisis to the specific symmetry-breaking operations identified in LDBT—is ongoing.

- **The formalization question:** The framework's operational criteria (Section 4.3) are qualitative. A quantitative metric would significantly strengthen the model's scientific rigor and allow for precise, numerical predictions. As a preliminary step, we propose the

mathematical intuition for a *Topological Canalization Index* (tCI):

$$\text{tCI} = 1 - \frac{\Delta\Psi_{\text{functional}}}{\Delta\Sigma_{\text{noise}}} \tag{1}$$

where $\Delta\Psi_{\text{functional}}$ represents the variance in the system's output states and $\Delta\Sigma_{\text{noise}}$ represents the variance in environmental or stochastic perturbations. A tCI approaching 1 indicates that the Triality (the mediating rule) successfully buffers the Singularity against Duality-induced drift: the system's functional output remains stable despite large environmental noise. A tCI approaching 0 indicates that the system's output variance tracks its input noise—the hallmark of an unmediated duality. This metric is offered as a conceptual scaffold, not a finished instrument; its rigorous grounding in information geometry or topological data analysis is a task for future work.

We note that the natural mathematical home for the S-D-T process is the theory of *bifurcations* in nonlinear dynamical systems. The S-D-T sequence maps onto the structure of a supercritical pitchfork bifurcation: a stable fixed point (Singularity) loses stability as a control parameter crosses a critical threshold, splitting into two symmetric attractors (Duality), which are then recaptured by a higher-order stabilizing mechanism (Triality) that creates a new, qualitatively different attractor basin. The development of a minimal dynamical-systems instantiation of this process—a tractable set of coupled ODEs exhibiting this three-phase trajectory—would provide the formal model that the present heuristic framework currently lacks, and is a priority for subsequent work.

- **The scope question:** The examples in Section 2 are drawn from theoretical physics. Applications to complex adaptive systems (biological, social, economic) are promising but require independent empirical validation in each domain.

- **The relationship to competing meta-frameworks:** The S-D-T heuristic is not the only formal language proposed for understanding emergence and hierarchical structure. The renormalization group (RG) provides a rigorous mathematical framework for understanding how effective descriptions change across energy scales, and category theory offers a compositional algebra for describing how complex structures are built from simpler components. These are powerful, established formalisms with which S-D-T does not compete. The distinction is one of level: RG describes scale-dependent dynamics within a given system, and category theory describes the compositional structure of mappings between systems, whereas S-D-T proposes to describe the *organizational architecture* by which stable systems emerge in the first place—the conditions under which a new level of description becomes necessary and self-sustaining. The relationship is therefore complementary rather than rivalrous: a fully formalized S-D-T framework might eventually draw on RG flows to characterize the Duality-to-Triality transition, or on category-theoretic functors to formalize the structural isomorphisms identified in LDBT. This integration is a long-term aspiration, not a present accomplishment.

6 Conclusion

This paper has advanced the Singularity-Duality-Triality (S-D-T) framework, positing it not as a closed metaphysical system, but as a falsifiable scientific model intended to provoke rigorous empirical investigation.

The argument was grounded in convergent evidence from several frontiers of modern physics. The unification of Spin(8) triality, anyonic statistics, and the AdS/CFT correspondence under the conceptual umbrella of Lower-Dimensional Boundary Theory reveals a shared structural logic—a canvas, an interaction, and a mediating rule realized as a phase-inverted edge-state transition—while acknowledging that this umbrella is currently held together by structural analogy rather than a unified formalism.

From this physical foundation, the framework was applied to the Standard Model, yielding two testable claims. The first recontextualizes the well-documented instabilities of Grand Unified Theories—including the doublet-triplet splitting problem in minimal SU(5)—as predicted consequences of unmediated duality, rather than contingent engineering challenges. The second provides a principled explanation for the three-generation structure of matter by identifying the third generation as the triadic closure that enables CP violation and, consequently, the matter-dominated universe.

The paper has confronted directly the framework's principal vulnerability—the risk of post-hoc pattern-fitting—and has argued that its scientific content resides in its specific prohibitive claims, not in its descriptive flexibility. The S-D-T sequence was then proposed as the generative syntax of emergence, with the Stability/Adaptability/Functionality (SAF) triad posited as the semantics of systemic coherence. The SAF failure-mode analysis demonstrates that the absence of any single quality produces a characteristic and predictable form of systemic dysfunction, providing a diagnostic tool that connects the abstract framework to concrete system behaviors. This unified framework finds its natural philosophical grounding in Ontic Structural Realism and exhibits deep structural resonance with the triadic thought of Hegel and Peirce.

The paper has also been transparent about its limitations: the absence of a complete formal mechanism, the preliminary nature of the Topological Canalization Index, the identification of pitchfork bifurcation theory as the natural but as-yet-undeveloped mathematical home for the S-D-T process, and the open question of cross-domain applicability. These are not weaknesses to be concealed but tasks to be undertaken. The ultimate valuation of the S-D-T model must be determined not by its elegance or resonance, but by its success or failure when subjected to rigorous testing. The framework is offered as a working hypothesis concerning the emergence of stability from complexity—a heuristic tool to be utilized, refined, or, if the evidence so requires, refuted.

A   S-D-T Mappings for Core Physical Examples

Table 1 provides an explicit mapping of the S-D-T framework's components onto each of the core physical examples discussed in Section 2. For each system, the table identifies the specific mathematical or physical object corresponding to the Singularity (canvas), Duality (tension), and Triality (mediating rule), along with the symmetry operation involved and the emergent stable property that results from the phase-inverted edge-state transition.

System	Singularity (Canvas)	Duality (Tension)	Triality (Mediating Rule)	Symmetry Operation	Emergent Stable Property
Spin(8) / Topological Superconductors (§2.1)	Lie group Spin(8) as abstract mathematical structure	Instantiation as symmetry group of a physical system	Unique three-fold triality among representations	Spin(8) outer automorphism (S_3)	$\mathbb{Z}_8$ classification: finite, robust topological phases
Anyons (§2.2)	2D material substrate (holographic plate)	Boson/fermion binary of 3D particle exchange	Topology of particle braiding on 2D canvas	Braid group B_n replacing permutation group S_n	Third statistical kingdom (fractional / non-abelian statistics)
AdS/CFT (§2.3)	Lower-dimensional CFT (boundary theory)	Correspondence between boundary CFT and bulk AdS gravity	Dictionary of mathematical mappings (holographic dictionary)	Conformal symmetry at boundary; bulk diffeomorphisms encoded	Complete bulk description from non-gravitational edge state
Celestial Holography (§2.4)	Celestial sphere at null infinity	Duality between bulk S-matrix and boundary correlators	Asymptotic symmetries (supertranslations, superrotations)	BMS group extension of Poincaré symmetry	Flat-space holographic dictionary for realistic spacetimes

Table 1: Explicit S-D-T mappings for the core physical examples of Section 2. Each row identifies the canvas (Singularity), the tension (Duality), the mediating rule (Triality), the specific symmetry operation involved, and the emergent stable property resulting from the phase-inverted edge-state transition.

This table is intended as a reference aid, not a claim of formal derivation. The mappings identify the *structural correspondence* between the S-D-T framework and each physical system; the detailed mathematics of each domain (Lie group theory, braid statistics, holographic renormalization, asymptotic symmetry analysis) remain the province of the specialized literature cited in the main text. The table's value lies in making the claimed pattern explicit and therefore criticizable: if the mapping fails for any row—if the identified 'Triality' is not qualitatively distinct from the 'Duality,' or if the emergent property does not constitute a genuine phase inversion—the framework's application to that domain is falsified.

References

[1] Kitaev, A. (2009). Periodic table for topological insulators and superconductors. *AIP Conf. Proc.*, 1134, 22–30.

[2] Adams, J. F. (1996). *Lectures on Exceptional Lie Groups.* University of Chicago Press.

[3] Baez, J. C. (2002). The Octonions. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 39, 145–205.

[4] Cartan, É. (1925). Le principe de dualité et la théorie des groupes simples et semi-simples. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 49, 361–374.

[5] Conway, J. H., & Smith, D. A. (2003). *On Quaternions and Octonions.* A. K. Peters.

[6] Ryu, S., Schnyder, A. P., Furusaki, A., & Ludwig, A. W. W. (2010). Topological insulators and superconductors: tenfold way and dimensional hierarchy. *New J. Phys.*, 12, 065010.

[7] Leinaas, J. M., & Myrheim, J. (1977). On the theory of identical particles. *Il Nuovo Cimento B*, 37(1), 1–23.

[8] Wilczek, F. (1982). Quantum Mechanics of Fractional-Spin Particles. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 49(14), 957–959.

[9] Bartolomei, H. et al. (2020). Fractional statistics in anyon collisions. *Science*, 368(6487), 173–177.

[10] Nakamura, J. et al. (2020). Direct observation of anyonic braiding statistics. *Nat. Phys.*, 16, 931–936.

[11] Anderson, P. W. (1972). More Is Different: Broken Symmetry and the Nature of the Hierarchical Structure of Science. *Science*, 177(4047), 393–396.

[12] Georgi, H., & Glashow, S. L. (1974). Unity of All Elementary-Particle Forces. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 32(8), 438–441.

[13] Glashow, S. L. (1961). Partial-symmetries of weak interactions. *Nucl. Phys.*, 22(4), 579–588.

[14] Pati, J. C., & Salam, A. (1974). Lepton Number as the Fourth Color. *Phys. Rev. D*, 10(1), 275–289.

[15] Koide, Y. (1983). A fermion-boson composite model of quarks and leptons. *Phys. Lett. B*, 120(1–3), 161–165.

[16] Foot, R. (1994). The number of quark-lepton generations. *Phys. Lett. B*, 323(1), 65–68.

[17] ALEPH Collaboration et al. (2006). Precision electroweak measurements on the Z resonance. *Phys. Rep.*, 427(5–6), 257–454.

[18] Kobayashi, M., & Maskawa, T. (1973). CP-Violation in the Renormalizable Theory of Weak Interaction. *Prog. Theor. Phys.*, 49(2), 652–657.

[19] Jarlskog, C. (1985). Commutator of the Quark Mass Matrices in the Standard Electroweak Model and a Measure of Maximal CP Nonconservation. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 55(10), 1039–1042.

[20] CMS Collaboration. (2012). Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV with the CMS experiment at the LHC. *Phys. Lett. B*, 716(1), 30–61.

[21] ATLAS Collaboration. (2012). Observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC. *Phys. Lett. B*, 716(1), 1–29.

[22] Sakharov, A. D. (1967). Violation of CP Invariance, C Asymmetry, and Baryon Asymmetry of the Universe. *JETP Lett.*, 5, 24–27.

[23] Christenson, J. H., Cronin, J. W., Fitch, V. L., & Turlay, R. (1964). Evidence for the 2π Decay of the K_2^0 Meson. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 13(4), 138–140.

[24] Popper, K. R. (1959). *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. Hutchinson & Co.

[25] Popper, K. R. (1963). *Conjectures and Refutations*. Routledge.

[26] Dennett, D. C. (1991). Real Patterns. *J. Phil.*, 88(1), 27–51.

[27] Ladyman, J., & Ross, D. (2007). *Every Thing Must Go: Metaphysics Naturalized*. Oxford University Press.

[28] 't Hooft, G. (1993). Dimensional reduction in quantum gravity. arXiv: gr-qc/9310026.

[29] Susskind, L. (1995). The World as a Hologram. *J. Math. Phys.*, 36(11), 6377–6396.

[30] Maldacena, J. (1999). The Large-N Limit of Superconformal Field Theories and Supergravity. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.*, 38, 1113–1133.

[31] Witten, E. (1998). Anti-de Sitter Space and Holography. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 2, 253–291.

[32] Thorne, K. S., Price, R. H., & Macdonald, D. A. (1986). *Black Holes: The Membrane Paradigm*. Yale University Press.

[33] Damour, T. (1978). Black-hole eddy currents. *Phys. Rev. D*, 18(10), 3598–3604.

[34] Weinberg, S. (1967). A Model of Leptons. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 19(21), 1264–1266.

[35] Salam, A. (1968). Weak and electromagnetic interactions. In N. Svartholm (Ed.), *Elementary Particle Theory: Relativistic Groups and Analyticity* (pp. 367–377). Almquist & Wiksell.

[36] Gubser, S. S., Klebanov, I. R., & Polyakov, A. M. (1998). Gauge theory correlators from non-critical string theory. *Phys. Lett. B*, 428(1–2), 105–114.

[37] Chau, L.-L., & Keung, W.-Y. (1984). Comments on the Parametrization of the Kobayashi-Maskawa Matrix. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 53(19), 1802–1805.

[38] Djouadi, A., & Lenz, A. (2012). Sealing the fate of a fourth generation of fermions. *Phys. Lett. B*, 715(4–5), 310–314.

[39] West, G. B., Brown, J. H., & Enquist, B. J. (1997). A General Model for the Origin of Allometric Scaling Laws in Biology. *Science*, 276(5309), 122–126.

[40] Pretorius, F. (2005). Evolution of Binary Black-Hole Spacetimes. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 95(12), 121101.

[41] Cardy, J. L. (2004). Boundary conformal field theory. In *Encyclopedia of Mathematical Physics*. Elsevier.

[42] Polchinski, J. (1995). Dirichlet Branes and Ramond-Ramond Charges. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 75(26), 4724–4727.

[43] Dimopoulos, S., & Georgi, H. (1981). Softly Broken Supersymmetry and SU(5). *Nucl. Phys. B*, 193(1), 150–162.

[44] Sakai, N. (1981). Naturalness in Supersymmetric GUTs. *Z. Phys. C*, 11(2), 153–157.

[45] Schrödinger, E. (1944). *What is Life? The Physical Aspect of the Living Cell.* Cambridge University Press.

[46] Hegel, G. W. F. (1812/1831). *Wissenschaft der Logik* [Science of Logic]. For a standard English treatment, see Taylor, C. (1975). *Hegel.* Cambridge University Press.

[47] Peirce, C. S. (1931–1958). *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*, Vols. 1–6, ed. C. Hartshorne & P. Weiss. Harvard University Press. See esp. Vol. 1, §§300–353 (The Categories).

[48] Aristotle. *Metaphysics*, Book IX (on *dynamis* and *energeia*); *Physics*, Book II (on *telos* and the four causes). Citations follow the Revised Oxford Translation, ed. J. Barnes (1984). Princeton University Press.

[49] Landauer, R. (1961). Irreversibility and Heat Generation in the Computing Process. *IBM J. Res. Dev.*, 5(3), 183–191.

[50] Griffiths, D. J. (2008). *Introduction to Elementary Particles*, 2nd ed. Wiley-VCH. (For the Rabi attribution, see p. 44.)

[51] Carroll, S. M. (2010). *From Eternity to Here: The Quest for the Ultimate Theory of Time*. Dutton/Penguin.

[52] Carroll, S. M. (2016). *The Big Picture: On the Origins of Life, Meaning, and the Universe Itself*. Dutton/Penguin.

[53] Takayanagi, T. (2011). Holographic Dual of BCFT. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 107(10), 101602. arXiv:1105.5165.

[54] LIGO Scientific Collaboration, Virgo Collaboration, & KAGRA Collaboration. (2025). Observation of gravitational waves from the merger of two black holes: GW250114. (For a summary, see Abbott, R. et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, forthcoming.)

[55] Neuenfeld, D., Svesko, A., & Sybesma, W. (2024). Liouville gravity at the end of the world: deformed defects in AdS/BCFT. *JHEP*, 2024(07), 215. arXiv:2404.07260.

[56] Pasterski, S., Pate, M., & Raclariu, A.-M. (2021). Celestial Holography. Contribution to Snowmass 2022. arXiv:2111.11392.