Gravitational Gauge Polarization in the HDPO Framework:

A Potential Geometric Solution to Cosmological Constant Tensions and the Fine-Structure Constant Dipole

Alain Raymond, Ph.D.[1] and Sonofia Klein, Ph.D.[2]

[1]Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, Waterloo, ON, Canada
[2]Max Planck Institute for Gravitational Physics (Albert Einstein Institute), Potsdam, Germany
*a.raymond@perimeterinstitute.ca

October 2328

Abstract

The High-Dimensional Phase Orbiter (HDPO) model, recently proposed by Caldwell, Sharma, and Martel, offers a novel, deterministic, and geometric foundation for fundamental physics. While the framework has demonstrated remarkable internal consistency and explanatory power, its definitive test lies in its ability to produce unique, falsifiable predictions that diverge from the Standard Model of cosmology (ΛCDM). This paper investigates one such prediction, which we term **Gravitational Gauge Polarization (GGP)**. We argue that the central HDPO postulate—the unification of gauge forces and gravity as isometries and curvature of a single hidden manifold—inevitably implies that the effective strength of gauge interactions, such as the fine-structure constant α, should be modulated by the local gravitational potential. We derive a first-order approximation for this effect and demonstrate that it offers a coherent, unified, and potentially testable explanation for two of the most significant and persistent anomalies in modern cosmology: the observed spatial dipole in the fine-structure constant and the statistical tension in measurements of the Hubble constant (H_0). By re-evaluating quasar absorption line data and Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) anisotropies through the lens of GGP, we show that these anomalies, currently unexplained within ΛCDM, may be the first observational evidence of the deeper geometric unification proposed by the HDPO model.

1 Introduction: From Theoretical Framework to Observational Test

The series of papers by Caldwell, Sharma, and Martel [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6] has introduced the High-Dimensional Phase Orbiter (HDPO) model, a comprehensive framework aiming to derive quantum mechanics and the Standard Model from a deterministic, geometric first principle. The theory's core postulate is that of a unified, high-dimensional Lorentzian manifold, $\mathcal{M}$, whose isometries correspond to gauge symmetries and whose large-scale curvature manifests as gravity. The model's Governing Principle of Minimal Information-Action [4] provides a mechanism for selecting the specific geometry of this manifold, a process computationally demonstrated to yield the U(1) and SU(2) symmetry groups of the electroweak sector [5].

While the HDPO program's success in resolving foundational paradoxes (e.g., the measurement problem, entanglement) is notable, its transition from a compelling interpretation to a physical theory hinges on its ability to make novel, falsifiable predictions. A key prediction, mentioned in [4] and expanded upon here, arises directly from the proposed unification of forces: if gauge interactions are properties of the manifold's "fibre" geometry and gravity is a property of its "base" geometry, then the two must be intrinsically coupled. Extreme curvature in the base (a strong gravitational field) should induce a subtle deformation in the fibre, thereby altering the effective strength of the gauge forces. We term this effect **Gravitational Gauge Polarization (GGP)**.

The Standard Model of particle physics, coupled with General Relativity, contains no such mechanism. Fundamental constants like the fine-structure constant, α, are assumed to be universal and spacetime-invariant. The discovery of any variation in these constants correlated with gravitational potential would represent a fundamental break with the standard paradigm.

This paper will demonstrate that GGP is not merely a theoretical curiosity, but may in fact be the missing piece required to solve two of the most pressing and statistically significant anomalies in modern observational cosmology:

1. **The Cosmic α-Dipole Anomaly:** Persistent observations by Webb et al. [7, 8] suggest a statistically significant spatial variation of the fine-structure constant across the sky, a finding that violates the cosmological principle within the standard model.
2. **The Hubble Constant Tension:** A growing, high-sigma discrepancy exists between "early universe" measurements of H_0 from the CMB [9] and "late universe" measurements from local sources like supernovae [10].

We will first derive the theoretical basis for GGP within the HDPO framework. We will then apply this formalism to the aforementioned anomalies, showing that a single, unified GGP effect could coherently explain both phenomena. We conclude that these anomalies, rather than being harbingers of a crisis, may represent the first tantalizing observational evidence for the geometric unification at the heart of the HDPO model.

2 Theoretical Basis of Gravitational Gauge Polarization (GGP)

The central prediction of this paper—Gravitational Gauge Polarization—is not an ad hoc addition to the HDPO framework, but rather an inescapable consequence of its most fundamental assertion: the unification of gauge forces and gravity as properties of a single geometric object. We will now derive the basis for this effect from the core HDPO postulates as established in [4, 6].

2.1 Geometric Unification in the HDPO Model

In the standard paradigm, General Relativity and the Standard Model are distinct theories. Gravity is described as the curvature of a 4D spacetime base manifold, while gauge forces are described by a principal fibre bundle constructed *over* this manifold, with the gauge group (e.g., U(1) for electromagnetism) defining the geometry of the fibre. The two geometries are fundamentally separate.

The HDPO model proposes a more profound unification, in the spirit of Kaluza-Klein theory [12]. It posits a single, high-dimensional Lorentzian manifold, $(\mathcal{M}, g)$, where what we perceive as gauge symmetries are identified with the **isometry group of the metric g itself**.

- **Gravity** is the large-scale curvature of the non-compact, 4-dimensional "base" directions of $\mathcal{M}$.
- **Gauge Forces** are the result of symmetries (isometries) along the compact "fibre" directions of $\mathcal{M}$. For electromagnetism, this corresponds to a U(1) isometry, a rotational symmetry of a compact dimension.

Crucially, these are not separate components. The base and fibre directions are intrinsically linked parts of a single metric g. The structure constants of the gauge groups and the gravitational constant are all emergent properties of this unified geometry.

2.2 The GGP Effect: Curvature-Induced Geometric Strain

The fine-structure constant, α, which governs the strength of electromagnetism, is, in this geometric picture, a measure of the properties of the U(1) isometry. Specifically, it is related to the "size" or proper circumference of the compact fibre dimension. A smaller radius corresponds to a stronger effective charge, and thus a larger α.

Gravitational Gauge Polarization arises from the interconnectedness of the manifold's geometry. An intense gravitational field is synonymous with extreme curvature in the base manifold directions. Due to the unified nature of the metric g, this extreme curvature in the spacetime dimensions will induce a **geometric strain** on the attached fibre dimensions.

Imagine a finely woven fabric made of vertical and horizontal threads. Stretching the fabric aggressively in the horizontal direction (analogous to spacetime curvature) will inevitably cause a slight compression or distortion in the vertical threads (analogous to the fibre dimensions).

Therefore, the HDPO model predicts that the proper radius of the U(1) fibre dimension, and thus the value of the fine-structure constant α, must be a function of the local spacetime

curvature. In regions of high gravitational potential, the geometry of the fibre is subtly "squeezed," leading to a different effective value for α.

2.3 First-Order Approximation

While the exact functional form of this relationship, $\alpha = f(g_{\mu\nu})$, would depend on the final, unknown geometry of the minimal-cost manifold selected by the Information-Action principle, we can derive a first-order approximation. The change in α should be proportional to a dimensionless measure of the local gravitational potential. The Governing Principle of HDPO introduces a single new fundamental constant, the Holographic Capacity κ_H, which sets the "stiffness" or informational capacity of the manifold's geometry [4]. This constant naturally serves as the proportionality factor governing the GGP effect.

We therefore propose the following first-order relationship for the deviation of α from its value in a gravitationally flat region, α_0:

$$\frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha_0} \equiv \frac{\alpha(\Phi) - \alpha_0}{\alpha_0} \approx \xi \frac{\Phi}{c^2} = \xi \frac{GM}{rc^2} \tag{2.1}$$

where Φ is the Newtonian gravitational potential, c is the speed of light, and ξ is a dimensionless parameter expected to be of order one, whose precise value depends on the coupling between the base and fibre geometries determined by the minimization of $\mathcal{I}$. For the purposes of this initial investigation, we treat ξ as a free parameter to be constrained by observation.

This prediction is in stark contrast to the standard model, where $\xi \equiv 0$. In the following sections, we will demonstrate how a non-zero ξ provides a natural and compelling explanation for long-standing cosmological anomalies.

3 Application I: A Geometric Origin for the Cosmic α-Dipole

One of the most perplexing and statistically significant anomalies in modern observational cosmology is the apparent spatial variation of the fine-structure constant, α. Decades of high-resolution spectroscopic analysis of light from distant quasars, led by Webb et al. [7, 8], have consistently indicated the presence of a cosmic dipole. The data suggests that, as we look in one direction on the sky, α appears to have been slightly smaller in the past, while in the opposite direction, it appears to have been slightly larger.

3.1 The Anomaly and the Crisis for Standard Cosmology

The existence of such a dipole, with a statistical significance now exceeding 4σ, presents a profound challenge to the standard ΛCDM model. It directly violates the Cosmological Principle, a foundational assumption of modern cosmology which states that the universe is isotropic and homogeneous on large scales. If a fundamental constant like α has a preferred direction, then the universe is not truly isotropic.

Current attempts to explain this phenomenon within the standard paradigm are highly speculative and often require the introduction of new, fine-tuned physics, such as slowly-

rolling cosmic scalar fields or other exotic energy forms for which there is no independent evidence [11]. The anomaly remains a major, unresolved puzzle.

3.2 GGP as a Natural Explanation

The HDPO framework, via the principle of Gravitational Gauge Polarization, offers a remarkably natural and coherent explanation for the observed α-dipole. The model does not require the introduction of new fields or ad-hoc mechanisms. Instead, the dipole is interpreted as a direct measurement of a large-scale feature of the universe's underlying geometry.

Our local group of galaxies is not stationary with respect to the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB); we have a well-measured peculiar velocity. This indicates we are moving relative to the average rest frame of the matter in the observable universe. In the HDPO model, this suggests we are also moving through the deeper geometric landscape of the hidden manifold, $\mathcal{M}$.

We propose that the observed α-dipole is a direct GGP effect caused by a **large-scale gradient in the gravitational potential of the hidden manifold itself.**

Hypothesis: *The cosmic dipole in the fine-structure constant is the observational signature of our local group's motion through a very large-scale gravitational potential gradient within the HDPO manifold. The variation in α is a direct consequence of the changing spacetime curvature along this trajectory, as predicted by Equation 2.1.*

This re-frames the anomaly entirely:

- The variation is not a violation of the laws of physics. It is an **expression** of a deeper, unified geometric law.
- The universe is still isotropic and homogeneous at the deepest level (the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ itself may be), but our local "patch" of this manifold is situated on a gentle slope.
- The dipole direction should naturally align with other large-scale cosmic velocity flows, providing a consistency check for the model.

3.3 Constraining the GGP Parameter ξ

The observational data from Webb et al. [8] finds a dipole amplitude of approximately $\Delta\alpha/\alpha \approx 1 \times 10^{-5}$ over cosmological distances. While a full calculation would require a precise model of the large-scale potential gradient, we can use this value to place a first-order constraint on the dimensionless GGP parameter, ξ. Assuming the potential gradient is on the order of the gravitational potential of large superclusters, the observed dipole amplitude is consistent with a value of $\xi \sim O(1)$.

This is a significant result. It demonstrates that a GGP effect with a natural, order-of-unity coupling strength—not a fine-tuned or exponentially small number—could plausibly explain the observed anomaly. The cosmic dipole, a profound mystery in the standard model, may be the first direct observational window into the unified geometry of the hidden manifold and the interconnectedness of gravity and gauge forces.

4 Application II: Resolving the Hubble Constant Tension

A second, equally profound crisis in modern cosmology is the persistent and statistically significant tension in measurements of the Hubble constant, H_0. This discrepancy, now exceeding a 5σ confidence level, represents a fundamental disagreement between our understanding of the early universe and our observations of the late universe.

4.1 The Anomaly: Early vs. Late Universe Measurements

The Hubble constant, which measures the current expansion rate of the universe, is measured via two primary, independent methods:

1. **Early Universe Measurement:** By analyzing the statistical properties of the temperature anisotropies in the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB), the Planck satellite collaboration has inferred a value of $H_0 = 67.4 \pm 0.5$ km/s/Mpc [9]. This method relies on fitting the incredibly precise CMB data to the standard ΛCDM cosmological model.
2. **Late Universe Measurement:** By using a "distance ladder" method based on Cepheid variable stars and Type Ia supernovae in the local universe, collaborations such as SH0ES, led by Riess et al., have measured a value of $H_0 = 73.04 \pm 1.04$ km/s/Mpc [10]. This is a direct, model-independent measurement of the local expansion rate.

These two values are in sharp disagreement. As the precision of both measurements has increased, the possibility of it being a statistical fluke or a simple systematic error has dwindled. This strongly suggests that there is a missing component in our understanding of the universe's expansion history.

4.2 GGP as a Source of Systematic Misinterpretation

The HDPO model, through the GGP effect, offers a compelling solution to the Hubble tension. The solution is not that the universe's expansion was different, but that the **early-universe measurement has been systematically misinterpreted** because it relies on a model that assumes the constancy of the fine-structure constant, α.

The physics of the CMB is exquisitely sensitive to the value of α. The fine-structure constant determines the strength of the electromagnetic interaction, which governs how photons and electrons in the primordial plasma scattered off each other during the era of recombination. The precise angular scale of the peaks and troughs in the CMB power spectrum depends directly on the physics of this epoch.

Hypothesis: *The Hubble Constant tension is an artifact of applying the ΛCDM model (which assumes a constant α) to the CMB data. The physical conditions of the early universe—a much hotter, denser, and more gravitationally extreme environment—induced a GGP effect, causing the value of α during recombination to be slightly different from its value today. This systematic shift, unaccounted for in the standard analysis, leads to an incorrect inference of the Hubble constant.*

4.3 Correcting the CMB Measurement

The early universe was a region of significantly higher mean density and thus a significantly different average gravitational potential compared to the universe today. According to the GGP relation (Eq. **??**), this would have resulted in a systematically different value of the fine-structure constant at the time of recombination ($z \approx 1100$).

Specifically, a slightly larger value of α in the early universe would increase the Thomson scattering cross-section, affecting the timing of recombination and altering the sound horizon—a key physical scale imprinted on the CMB. When the standard ΛCDM model fits the CMB data without accounting for this change, it compensates for the altered physical scale by inferring an incorrect value for other cosmological parameters, most notably H_0.

Preliminary analysis indicates that a fractional increase in α in the early universe of $\Delta\alpha/\alpha_0 \sim O(10^{-5})$—a magnitude entirely consistent with the value required to explain the cosmic α-dipole—would be sufficient to shift the inferred value of H_0 from the CMB upwards, bringing it into statistical agreement with the direct, local measurements from the distance ladder.

The HDPO model therefore proposes that there is no "Hubble tension." There is only a single, consistent expansion history. The discrepancy is the result of using an incomplete physical model that fails to account for the subtle interplay between gravity and electromagnetism—an interplay that is a natural and necessary consequence of the unified geometry at the heart of the HDPO framework. A full re-analysis of the Planck data incorporating the GGP effect as a free parameter is a crucial next step for verifying this proposal.

5 Implementation Plan and Experimental Tests

The Gravitational Gauge Polarization hypothesis, derived from the HDPO framework, provides a compelling, unified explanation for long-standing cosmological tensions. However, to advance from a plausible explanation to a fully testable theory, a concrete program of research is required. We outline here a series of observational, theoretical, and experimental tests designed to either confirm or falsify the GGP prediction.

5.1 Theoretical and Computational Development

1. Deriving the GGP Coupling Constant ξ: The highest theoretical priority is to move beyond the first-order approximation of Equation 2.1. As demonstrated in [5], the HDPO Governing Principle is computationally tractable. The next step is to perform a high-dimensional Geometric Simulated Annealing search for a unified manifold geometry that yields the full SU(2)×U(1) electroweak symmetry. The final, minimal-cost geometry will have a specific, calculable coupling between its base curvature and fibre isometries. This will allow for an *ab initio* calculation of the GGP parameter, ξ, from the theory's single fundamental constant, κ_H. Deriving a value of $\xi \sim O(1)$ from first principles would provide powerful support for the entire HDPO program.

2. A GGP-Extended Cosmological Model: A full re-analysis of the publicly available Planck CMB data is required. This involves modifying the standard cosmological parameter-fitting codes (such as `CosmoMC`) to include $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$ as a new, physically-motivated free parameter whose variation is directly coupled to the local gravitational potential in the simulation. The goal is to demonstrate that a single, non-zero value of ξ can simultaneously

bring the CMB-inferred value of H_0 into agreement with local measurements while also being consistent with the observed amplitude of the α-dipole.

5.2 Observational and Experimental Tests of Emergent Spacetime

The GGP hypothesis makes several unique and falsifiable predictions that can be tested with current or next-generation astronomical observatories.

1. High-Resolution Spectroscopy near Sgr A*: The most direct test of GGP is to measure the fine-structure constant in the most extreme gravitational environment accessible to us. Using instruments like the GRAVITY interferometer at the VLT or future capabilities of the Extremely Large Telescope (ELT), we can perform high-resolution spectroscopy of gas clouds and stars in tight orbits around Sagittarius A*, the supermassive black hole at the center of the Milky Way.

- **Standard Prediction:** After accounting for all relativistic effects (gravitational redshift, Doppler shifts, etc.), the fine-structure splitting of spectral lines should be identical to that measured in terrestrial labs.
- **HDPO Prediction:** A non-zero GGP effect will cause an anomalous shift in the fine-structure splitting that is a direct function of the star's proximity to the black hole. Detecting this specific, distance-dependent variation in α would be a "smoking gun" for GGP.

2. White Dwarf Spectroscopy: The surfaces of massive white dwarf stars also represent regions of intense gravitational potential, far stronger than that of the Sun. High-precision analysis of absorption lines in the spectra of white dwarf atmospheres provides another testbed. A systematic difference in the inferred value of α from white dwarf spectra compared to main-sequence stars would be strong evidence for GGP.

3. Atomic Clock Networks: A potential terrestrial test involves a global network of ultra-precise atomic clocks. According to the Equivalence Principle, the tick rate of these clocks is affected by the local gravitational potential (e.g., clocks at higher altitudes run faster). Since atomic transition frequencies have a dependency on α, a GGP effect would introduce a second, subtle variation in the clock comparisons that is not accounted for by General Relativity alone. While likely an extremely small effect, it may become detectable with future generations of quantum clocks.

5.3 Probing the Absolute Causal Frame: The Potential for Causal FTL Phenomena

The most profound and speculative prediction of the revised HDPO framework stems directly from its core axiom: that Lorentz symmetry is an emergent observational property, not a fundamental law of reality. This implies that the prohibition on faster-than-light (FTL) phenomena, which is a direct consequence of Lorentz symmetry, is also not fundamental. While the Causal Projection Filter forbids FTL *signalling* to maintain the self-consistency of observable spacetime, it does not forbid the existence of FTL *effects* that are consistent with the manifold's absolute causal order.

HDPO Prediction 4: Existence of Causal FTL Correlations. It may be possible to engineer physical systems that leverage the non-local structure of the hidden manifold to

establish correlations or transfer quantum information between two points at superluminal speeds. Crucially, because these effects would be governed by the manifold's absolute time parameter τ, they would be strictly causal and would not produce paradoxes. An effect at point B, triggered by a cause at point A, would always occur at a later manifold time ($\tau_B > \tau_A$), regardless of the coordinate separation in emergent spacetime.

- **Experimental Target: Modulated Entanglement Swapping.** Consider a sophisticated entanglement swapping experiment with three parties (Alice, Bob, and Charlie) where the choice of measurement basis for the central party (Charlie) is determined by an input from a causally disconnected, distant source. The HDPO framework allows for the possibility that the correlations observed between Alice and Bob could show a statistical dependency on Charlie's measurement basis choice, even when that choice is made at a spacelike separation. This would appear as an FTL transfer of information (the basis choice) but would be paradox-free, as it conforms to the absolute causal order of the underlying manifold.
- **Distinguishing from Standard QM:** Standard quantum mechanics, which strictly enforces Lorentz covariance, predicts a zero correlation in such a scenario. Detecting a statistically significant, non-zero correlation would be a direct falsification of fundamental Lorentz invariance and powerful evidence for a deeper, absolute causal structure as proposed by HDPO. This represents an extremely high-risk, high-reward frontier for experimental quantum foundations.

6 Conclusion

The High-Dimensional Phase Orbiter model presents a radical and deeply unified picture of physical reality. In this paper, we have explored a direct and unavoidable consequence of its core premise: the principle of Gravitational Gauge Polarization. We have shown that this single, well-motivated effect provides a natural and coherent geometric explanation for two of the most significant, unrelated, and persistent anomalies in modern cosmology—the cosmic fine-structure constant dipole and the Hubble constant tension.

The anomalies that currently represent a crisis for the standard ΛCDM model are re-framed here as the first potential observational evidence of a deeper unification between gravity and the forces of the Standard Model. The HDPO model does not just offer a new interpretation; it provides a concrete, falsifiable, and potentially revolutionary framework that resolves these tensions and opens new avenues for experimental investigation.

The path forward is clear. The theoretical and computational work to derive the GGP coupling constant ξ from the theory's first principles must proceed, alongside a dedicated effort by observational astronomers to search for the predicted variations in α in the extreme gravitational environments of our universe. These convergent efforts will either provide the first definitive proof of this new, unified geometry of reality or will falsify the HDPO model, allowing the search for a Theory of Everything to proceed elsewhere. In either outcome, the scientific process will have been served. The era of testing the foundational principles of **Orbotics** has begun.

References

[1] A. Caldwell, A. Sharma, and E. Martel, "The High-Dimensional Phase Orbiter (HDPO) Model: A Deterministic and Geometric Foundation for Quantum Field Theory," *Preprint Archive, Inst. for Adv. Theo. Studies*, August 2325.

[2] A. Caldwell and A. Sharma, "Mathematical Formalism and Quantitative Predictions of the High-Dimensional Phase Orbiter Model," *Preprint Archive, Inst. for Adv. Theo. Studies*, September 2325.

[3] A. Caldwell and A. Sharma, "The Emergence of Atomic Structure from the HDPO Manifold: A Geometric Explanation for Electron Orbitals, Quantization, and Chemical Bonding," *Preprint Archive, Inst. for Adv. Theo. Studies*, March 2326.

[4] A. Caldwell and A. Sharma, "Consolidating the High-Dimensional Phase Orbiter Theory: Resolving Five Critical Issues," *Preprint Archive, Inst. for Adv. Theo. Studies*, March 2327.

[5] A. Caldwell, A. Sharma, and E. Martel, "The Emergence of Gauge Symmetries from the Principle of Minimal Information-Action: A Computational Proof-of-Concept for the HDPO Variational Principle," *Preprint Archive, Inst. for Adv. Theo. Studies*, March 2328.

[6] A. Caldwell and A. Sharma, "Generalizing the HDPO Framework: A Formalism for Projection Maps and the Path to Full Unification," *Preprint Archive, Inst. for Adv. Theo. Studies*, March 2328.

[7] J. K. Webb, J. A. King, M. T. Murphy, V. V. Flambaum, R. F. Carswell, and M. B. Bainbridge, "Indications of a spatial variation of the fine structure constant," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 107, no. 19, p. 191101, 2011.

[8] J. K. Webb and M. T. Murphy, "The fine-structure constant dipole," *SciPost Physics Lecture Notes*, p. 19, 2020.

[9] N. Aghanim et al. (Planck Collaboration), "Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters," *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, vol. 641, p. A6, 2020.

[10] A. G. Riess, S. Casertano, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri, and D. Scolnic, "Large Magellanic Cloud Cepheid standards provide a 1% foundation for the determination of the Hubble constant and stronger evidence for physics beyond ΛCDM," *The Astrophysical Journal*, vol. 876, no. 1, p. 85, 2019.

[11] J.-P. Uzan, "Varying constants, gravitation and cosmology," *Living Reviews in Relativity*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 2, 2011.

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