Dimensional Accessibility, Proportional Distribution, and Alignment as Conditions for Resonance in Complex Systems

Doug Hoffman

February 27, 2026

Abstract

Complex systems across physical, biological, computational, organizational, economic, and quantum domains can achieve **resonance** (coherent amplification with bounded adaptability) through a recurring structural architecture when three conditions jointly obtain within a ternary continuum (continuous state space bounded by functional poles):

1. **D**: Dimensional freedom (accessible intermediate states)
2. **P**: Proportional distribution (balanced energy/influence allocation)
3. **A**: Alignment (phase, directional, and incentive coherence)

The multiplicative relationship $\mathbf{R} \propto \mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{A}$ implies that significant degradation of any component reduces overall resonant stability and increases susceptibility to systemic collapse. This framework stratifies dynamical regimes from static order (D≈0) through chaotic complexity (medium A) to periodic resonance (A≈1), correctly diagnosing failure modes across multiple domains: vanishing gradients (neural nets), trophic cascades (ecology), misaligned incentives (organizations), decoherence (quantum), and phase mismatch (physics).

Resonance is not inherent but emergent, operating at multiple scales and contexts. Systems can transition between regimes by redefining functional poles under stress, as seen in bait ball formation. The DPA architecture offers a domain-general diagnostic for system health, predicting phase boundaries and multiplicative fragility without parameter tuning.

Keywords: resonance, complex systems, dimensional freedom, proportional distribution, feedback alignment, ternary continuum, multiplicative dynamics, self-correction, phase transitions, cross-domain framework

1 Introduction

Resonant behavior, broadly understood as coherent amplification with bounded adaptability, appears in a wide range of complex systems, from physical and biological to computational, organizational, economic, and quantum settings. Despite this recurrence, there is no simple, domain-independent diagnostic for when a system will exhibit such resonance, nor a common structural language that spans these fields.

This paper proposes a minimal architecture for resonance based on three structural conditions: dimensional freedom (D), proportional distribution (P), and alignment (A). These conditions are formalized in a multiplicative relationship $R \propto D \times P \times A$ and are argued to stratify dynamical regimes from static order through chaotic complexity to coherent resonance, connecting classical work on deterministic chaos and synchronization [1, 2] with contemporary models in machine learning and ecology [3, 4]. The aim is not to replace domain-specific models, but to offer a unifying heuristic that highlights shared failure modes and stability conditions across otherwise disparate systems.

2 Core Definitions

D (Dimensional Freedom) Sufficient dimensional accessibility: a continuous state space bounded by functional poles and constituted by the accessible range of intermediate states, enabling expressive variation without compression into rigid binaries.

P (Proportional Distribution) Proportionate distribution of energy, influence, or information among interacting components, shaped by variance limits that prevent overload or underutilization while matching the system's actual conditions.

A (Alignment) Constructive coupling among interacting elements: the degree to which phase/timing, directional, or incentive coherence are aligned and mutually reinforcing across the range of interacting agents, evaluated relative to preserving D and P.

R (Resonance) An emergent dynamical regime—not inherent to the architecture—characterized by coherent amplification, inherent self-correction, and bounded adaptive stability through internal feedback. The extent to which a system sustains self-reinforcing interaction patterns across its state space. Due to the multiplicative relationship $R \propto D \times P \times A$, resonance collapses or degrades proportionally with the failure of any single factor.

3 Operationalization

To reduce the risk of post-hoc relabeling, we treat D, P, and A as pre-scored indicators on a 0–1 scale, using a simple rubric that can be applied without first assessing resonance R.

3.1 D (Dimensional Accessibility)

D estimates how many practically available states or strategies the system has, relative to its constraints, in a given regime.

- 0: System is effectively locked into one or two rigid states (e.g., binary control modes, near-frozen policy, monoculture).
- 0.5: Several distinct states exist, but transitions are rare, costly, or tightly gated.
- 1: A rich, graded spectrum of states is regularly occupied; the system explores and uses many intermediate configurations.

Here "continuous" is interpreted in a loose, pragmatic sense: a high-D system need not have mathematically continuous state variables, only a non-trivial ladder of accessible intermediate states in its effective state space (e.g., a high-resolution finite state controller can count as high D if it makes use of that resolution in practice).[1]

[1] State-space formulations in control and dynamical systems offer a natural formal backdrop for this notion of accessible dimensionality; see, for example, standard treatments of state-space representation in linear multivariable control.

3.2 P (Proportional Distribution)

P captures how proportionately load, resources, and/or influence are distributed relative to component capacity and functional demand.

- 0: Extreme, persistent mismatch (e.g., a small subset of components is chronically overloaded while others are starved or idle).
- 0.5: Noticeable skew; some components are regularly under- or over-utilized, but the system remains functional.
- 1: No component is persistently overloaded or underused; allocation roughly tracks capacity and demand over the timescale of interest.

In practice, P can be approximated by simple inequality or mismatch measures (e.g., Gini-like indices for resource allocation, or comparison of observed loads to nominal capacities) rather than any single canonical metric.

3.3 A (Alignment)

A is a composite indicator capturing three forms of coherence:

1. Phase/timing coherence: Do key processes operate on compatible timescales and phases?
2. Directional coherence: Are actions and feedbacks broadly pushing in compatible directions in the system's state space?
3. Incentive coherence: Do local payoffs reinforce, rather than undermine, the emergent pattern?

Each facet can be scored on 0–1:

- 0: Strong, persistent conflict (e.g., chronically out-of-phase processes, systematically opposed incentives).
- 0.5: Mixed; some subsystems are aligned, others are not.
- 1: Predominantly mutually reinforcing across the relevant scales.

We then define A as either the average or, in stricter applications, the minimum of these three facet scores, acknowledging that "alignment" is a structured bundle rather than a primitive scalar. The distinction between time and phase alignment in signal and systems engineering provides a concrete analogue for the first facet.

4 Cross-Domain Validation

.

Domain	Low R	Medium R	High R
Neural Nets	Binary nets (D=0)	Vanilla deep net	Transformer w/norm
Organizations	Siloed corp (P=0)	Post-merger	Flywheel startup
Ecology	Monocrop (D=0)	Overfished	Coral reef
Physics	Mistuned osc. (A=0)	Lorenz	Phase-locked lasers
Economics	Zombie firms (P=0)	Bubble	Bull market
Quantum	Decohered (D=0)	GHZ state	BEC condensate
Flocking	Foraging	—	Bait ball

Table 1: DPA framework stratifies dynamical regimes across domains. These examples are illustrative, aligning the DPA conditions with well-studied phenomena such as deterministic non periodic flow, phase synchronization, deep learning optimization pathologies, trophic cascades in ecological networks, and synergetic pattern formation in physical and biological systems.

5 Discussion

We use the multiplicative form $R \propto D \times P \times A$ as a first-order way to encode two intuitions: (i) each factor is individually necessary in the sense that if any one is at/near zero, R collapses, and (ii) resonance degrades continuously as any factor is weakened, without allowing unrealistically strong compensation by the others. This does not preclude alternative forms—such as $R \approx \min(D, P, A)$, explicit thresholds, or partially compensatory mixtures—which may better capture specific domains; distinguishing among these empirically is an open question.

A fundamental implication is that significant degradation of any component reduces overall resonant stability: vanishing gradients, trophic cascades, incentive misalignment, and decoherence. Systems transition between regimes by redefining functional poles under stress, maintaining DPA balance within new operating contexts.

For all three quantities, the emphasis is on pre-committing to a rubric and applying it to a system and time window *without* referencing its observed resonant capacity R. This makes it possible in principle for a system to score high on D, P, and A yet exhibit low resonance (or vice versa), which would count as a genuine challenge to the framework rather than a definitional exclusion.

The framework is intended to be falsifiable in the following sense. If we can identify or construct systems that, by the rubric above, (a) score high on D, P, and A but fail to exhibit coherent amplification and self-stabilizing adaptation, or (b) score low on one or more of D, P, and A yet clearly exhibit robust resonance, then the present formulation is either too coarse or wrongly targeted and would require revision or restriction of scope.

Acknowledgments

None.

References

1. E. N. Lorenz, "Deterministic nonperiodic flow," *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 130–141, 1963.

2. Y. Kuramoto, *Chemical Oscillations, Waves, and Turbulence*. Springer, 1984.

3. I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, and A. Courville, *Deep Learning.* MIT Press, 2016.

4. R. T. Paine, “Food web complexity and species diversity,” *The American Naturalist*, vol. 100, no. 910, pp. 65–75, 1966.

5. H. Haken, *Synergetics: An Introduction.* Springer, 1983.