PAST KNOWLEDGE PEOPLE

ISSN: 3065-9779

Review Article

Annals of Civil Engineering and Management

A Unified Energy Framework for Structural Material Strength: An AT Mathematics Interpretation of Electromagnetic Bonding in Steel, Concrete, Wood, and Masonry

Paul T E Cusack*

BScE (Civil), Canada

***Corresponding Author**
Paul T E Cusack, BScE (Civil), Canada.

Submitted: 2026, Jul 13 **Accepted:** 2026, Sep 14; **Published:** 2026, Sep 23

Citation: Cusack, P. T. E. (2026). A Unified Energy Framework for Structural Material Strength: An AT Mathematics Interpretation of Electromagnetic Bonding in Steel, Concrete, Wood, and Masonry. *Ann Civ Eng Manag, 3*(3), 01-10.

Abstract

Modern structural engineering relies on experimentally calibrated design equations to predict the strength of concrete, steel, wood, and masonry structures. Limit States Design (LSD) methodologies have achieved remarkable success; however, the fundamental origin of the measured material strengths used in these equations remains primarily empirical. Parameters such as steel yield strength, concrete compressive strength, wood bending strength, and masonry compressive strength are determined through testing rather than derived from a universal physical principle. This paper proposes a theoretical interpretation in which the strength of structural materials is considered a macroscopic expression of electromagnetic interactions occurring at the atomic and molecular level. Since chemical bonding is fundamentally electromagnetic in origin, the mechanical resistance of engineering materials can be viewed as arising from stored electromagnetic energy within their atomic structures.

An AT Mathematics framework is introduced through the fundamental relationships
[
t^2-t-1=E,
]
[
E=\frac{1}{t},
]
[
M=\ln t,
]
and
[
\frac{dM}{dt}=\frac{1}{t}=E.
]

These relationships are proposed as a universal energy relationship connecting mass, energy, and structural resistance. A generalized strength expression is developed in which the measured strength of a material is interpreted as a material-dependent transformation of a universal energy parameter. The objective is not to replace established structural design standards but to propose a possible theoretical foundation linking materials engineering, electromagnetic physics, and AT Mathematics.

Keywords: Structural Engineering, Limit States Design, Electromagnetic Bonding, Material Strength, Steel, Concrete, Wood, Masonry, AT Mathematics, Energy Density

1. Introduction

The design of modern infrastructure depends upon a detailed understanding of material behavior. Bridges, buildings, tunnels, dams, and transportation systems are designed using experimentally verified relationships that describe the resistance of structural members under load. The principal materials used in construction steel, concrete, wood, and masonry appear very different at the engineering scale. Steel is ductile and capable of large deformation before failure. Concrete is strong in compression but weak in tension. Wood has highly directional strength due to its cellular structure. Masonry combines manufactured units and mortar into a composite material. Despite their differences, all structural materials share a common origin: their atoms and molecules are held together by electromagnetic forces.

The fundamental question addressed in this paper is:

Can the strength parameters used in structural engineering be interpreted as manifestations of a deeper electromagnetic energy principle?

Current engineering practice begins with measured properties:

$$
f_y,\quad f'_c,\quad F_b,\quad f'_m
$$

and incorporates them into design equations. This approach is highly effective but does not directly explain why these strengths exist or why different materials possess different levels of resistance.

A theoretical framework based on energy provides a possible connection between atomic physics and structural mechanics.

2. Electromagnetic Foundation of Material Strength

2.1. Fundamental Interactions

All physical materials are governed by the fundamental forces of nature:

1. Gravitational force
2. Electromagnetic force
3. Strong nuclear force
4. Weak nuclear force

At the scale of engineering materials, the electromagnetic interaction dominates. Chemical bonding occurs because electrons and atomic nuclei interact through electromagnetic attraction and quantum mechanical principles. The resulting bonds determine the stiffness, strength, and deformation characteristics of matter.

2.2. Bonding Mechanisms in Engineering Materials

- **Steel:** Steel derives its strength from metallic bonding. In a metal lattice, positively charged atomic nuclei are surrounded by delocalized electrons. This electron structure allows atoms to rearrange through dislocation movement, giving steel its characteristic combination of strength and ductility.
- **Concrete:** Concrete strength originates primarily from ionic and covalent bonding within cement hydration products. Calcium-silicate-hydrate phases provide the microscopic structure responsible for compressive resistance.
- **Wood:** Wood consists mainly of cellulose, lignin, and water. Covalent bonds within polymer chains provide molecular strength, while hydrogen bonding and cellular structure influence macroscopic behavior.
- **Masonry:** Brick, stone, and mortar involve ionic and covalent bonds within ceramic and mineral structures. Their strength depends on both atomic bonding and the mechanical interaction between units and mortar.

Although these materials behave differently, their ultimate resistance to deformation arises from electromagnetic interactions.

2.3. From Atomic Bonding to Engineering Strength

A structural member resists applied loads by developing internal stresses.

Stress is defined as

$$
\sigma=\frac{F}{A}
$$

where:

- (F) is applied force,
- is resisting area.

Elastic deformation follows Hooke's law:

$$
\sigma=E_s\varepsilon
$$

where:

- (E_s) is elastic modulus,
- (ε) is strain.

The energy stored during elastic deformation is

$$
u=\frac12\sigma\varepsilon.
$$

This energy density represents the work required to deform the material.

At the atomic level, this energy is associated with changes in electromagnetic bonding configurations. As deformation increases, atoms are displaced from equilibrium positions and internal electromagnetic forces resist this displacement. Failure occurs when the available bonding energy can no longer maintain equilibrium. Therefore, the macroscopic failure stress can be interpreted as the point at which a critical internal energy condition is reached.

2.4. The Need for a Unified Strength Theory

Current structural engineering formulas are extremely successful but remain largely empirical.

For example, steel design uses:

$$
M_r=\phi Zf_y
$$

where (f_y) is determined by material testing.

Concrete design uses:

$$
M_r=\phi A_sf_y(d-a/2)
$$
where concrete strength enters through experimentally determined parameters.
Wood design uses:
$$
M_r=\phi F_bS.
$$
Masonry design uses:
$$
P_r=\phi f'_mA.
$$

The common feature is that each equation requires a measured strength parameter. The question is whether these different strength parameters can be related through a common physical quantity. This paper proposes that AT Mathematics provides a possible framework for such a relationship.

3. Part II: AT Mathematics Foundation and Energy-based Strength Formulation

3.1. Foundations of AT Mathematics

The proposed AT Mathematics framework begins with a fundamental relationship between a universal parameter (t), energy (E), and mass (M).
The primary equation is defined as:
$$
t^2-t-1=E
$$
The same energy quantity is expressed as:
$$
E=\frac{1}{t}
$$
Therefore,
$$
\boxed{t^2-t-1=\frac{1}{t}}
$$

which establishes a relationship between the mathematical structure of (t) and the energy parameter (E).

The parameter (t) represents the underlying variable from which energy and mass relationships are developed.
Multiplying through by (t),
$$
t^3-t^2-t-1=0
$$
This defines a characteristic value of (t) for which the two energy expressions are equal.

3.2. Mass-Energy Relationship in AT Mathematics

Mass is defined in the AT Mathematics framework as:
$$
M=\ln t.
$$
Differentiating with respect to (t),
$$
\frac{d(\ln t)}{dt}
$$
gives
$$
\boxed{
\frac{dM}{dt}=\frac1t
}
$$
Since
$$
E=\frac1t,
$$
then
$$
\boxed{
\frac{dM}{dt}=E
}
$$
This provides a central relationship:
$$
\boxed{
\text{Energy}=\frac{\text{change in mass}}{\text{change in }t}
}
$$

Within this interpretation, energy is not treated as an isolated quantity but as a rate of transformation associated with the fundamental variable (t).

3.3. Energy Density as the Basis of Structural Resistance

Structural materials resist deformation by storing energy.
For an elastic material:
$$
u_e=\frac12\sigma\varepsilon
$$
where:
$$
u_e=\text{elastic energy density}
$$
$$
\sigma=\text{stress}
$$
$$
\varepsilon=\text{strain}.
$$
The units are:
$$
\frac{J}{m^3}.
$$

Therefore, the mechanical resistance of a material can be described as an energy density.

At the atomic scale, this stored energy corresponds to the displacement of atoms from their equilibrium positions within electromagnetic bonding fields.

3.4. Electromagnetic Origin of Bond Energy

The strength of a material depends upon the energy required to alter its atomic structure.
For a simple atomic bond, the restoring force arises from electromagnetic interaction between charged particles.
When an external force is applied:

- Atoms are displaced.
- Electromagnetic forces resist displacement.
- Energy is stored in the material.
- Continued deformation eventually causes irreversible changes.

In metals, this occurs through dislocation motion.
In ceramics and concrete, failure occurs through crack propagation.
In wood, failure involves rupture of polymer chains and cellular structures.

In all cases, electromagnetic interactions provide the fundamental resistance mechanism.

3.5. Proposed AT Energy Criterion

The central hypothesis of this paper is that material failure occurs when the available structural energy reaches a critical value.
The critical energy density is proposed as:
[
U_c=E
]
where:
[
E=\frac1t.
]
Therefore:
\frac1t
}
]
or
\frac{2}{t}
}
]

This provides a theoretical relationship between mechanical deformation and the AT energy parameter.

3.6. Material-Specific Strength Constants

Engineering materials do not all possess identical strength because their structures convert atomic bonding energy into macroscopic resistance differently.
Therefore, introduce a material coefficient:
[
C_m
]
where:

- (C_s) = steel coefficient,
- (C_c) = concrete coefficient,
- (C_w) = wood coefficient,
- (C_m) = masonry coefficient.

The generalized strength equation becomes:
[
\boxed{
f=C\frac1t
}
]
where:
[
f=\text{measured material strength}.
]
Therefore:

Steel
[
f_y=C_s\frac1t
]
Concrete
[
f'_c=C_c\frac1t
]

Wood
[
F_b=C_w\frac1t
]

Masonry
[
f'_m=C_m\frac1t
]
The empirical strengths used in engineering design are therefore interpreted as material-dependent expressions of a universal energy parameter.

3.7. Connection to Limit States Design

Limit States Design introduces resistance factors:
[
\phi
]
to account for uncertainty, variability, and reliability.
A general resistance equation is:
[
R=\phifA
]
where:

- (R) is resistance,
- (f) is material strength,
- is the resisting quantity.

Substituting the AT strength relationship:
[
f=C\frac1t
]
gives:
[
\boxed{
R=\phi C\frac{A}{t}

}
]

This provides a theoretical interpretation of the existing LSD formulation.

The resistance factor (\phi) remains an engineering reliability parameter, while the strength term is interpreted as a manifestation of the underlying energy relationship.

3.8. Example: Steel Yield Strength

For structural steel:
[
f_y=250,MPa
]
is obtained experimentally.

The AT formulation proposes:
[
f_y=C_s\frac1t.
]

The coefficient (C_s) represents the efficiency of metallic bonding, crystal structure, alloy composition, and microstructure in converting fundamental energy into engineering resistance.
Thus:
[
C_s=f_yt.
]

The same approach can be applied to concrete, wood, and masonry.

3.9. Significance of the Framework

The proposed framework does not eliminate experimental testing. Material testing remains essential because real materials contain:

- Defects
- Voids
- Impurities
- Grain Boundaries
- Moisture Effects
- Construction Variability

However, it provides a possible theoretical explanation for why empirical strength parameters exist. The hypothesis is that engineering strength is not an arbitrary measured property, but a macroscopic expression of deeper energy relationships.

4. Part III - Unified Structural Equations and Application to Engineering Materials

4.1. Development of a Unified Structural Strength Equation

Structural engineering separates materials into independent categories because each material exhibits unique mechanical behavior. Steel, concrete, wood, and masonry have different failure mechanisms, and therefore separate design equations have been developed.

However, each material ultimately develops resistance through stored energy associated with atomic and molecular interactions.

The proposed AT Mathematics interpretation begins with:
[
E=\frac1t
]
and proposes that a material strength parameter can be expressed as:
[
\boxed{
f=C\frac1t
}
]
where:

- (f) is the measured engineering strength,
- (C) is a material structure coefficient,
- (1/t) represents the universal energy parameter.

The coefficient (C) contains the effects of:

- Atomic Bonding
- Crystal Structure
- Molecular Arrangement
- Defects
- Porosity
- Manufacturing Processes
- Environmental Effects

Thus, different materials possess different strengths because they transform the universal energy parameter differently.

4.2. Steel: Metallic Bonding and Yield Strength

- Conventional Steel Design

In structural steel design, the plastic moment resistance is:
[
M_r=\phi Zf_y
]
where:

- (M_r) = moment resistance,
- (\phi) = resistance factor,
- (Z) = plastic section modulus,
- (f_y) = yield strength.

The yield strength is measured experimentally.

- **AT Mathematics Interpretation**

Using:
[
f_y=C_s\frac1t
]
the resistance becomes:
[
\boxed{
M_r=\phi ZC_s\frac1t
}
]

The steel coefficient (C_s) represents the ability of metallic bonding and crystal structure to resist plastic deformation.

Steel is highly effective because metallic bonding permits:

- High Atomic Packing Density
- Dislocation Strengthening
- Alloy Strengthening
- Controlled Plastic Deformation

The AT interpretation views these mechanisms as different ways of converting microscopic electromagnetic bonding energy into macroscopic strength.

4.3. Concrete: Ionic-Covalent Bonding and Compression Resistance

- **Conventional Concrete Design**

Concrete flexural resistance is commonly expressed as:
Concrete strength is determined through cylinder testing.

$$M_r=\phi A_sf_y(d-a/2)$$

where:

$$a=\frac{A_sf_y}{0.85f'_cb}$$

and:

- (f'_c) = concrete compressive strength,
- (A_s) = reinforcing steel area,
- (d) = effective depth.

Concrete strength is determined through cylinder testing.

4.4. AT Formulation

The concrete strength becomes:

$$f'_c=C_c\frac1t$$

Therefore:

$$a=\frac{A_sf_y}{0.85C_c/t; b}$$

or:

$$\boxed{a=\frac{A_sf_yt}{0.85C_cb}}$$

The flexural resistance becomes dependent on the AT energy parameter.
The concrete coefficient (C_c) reflects:

- Cement Chemistry
- Hydration Products
- Aggregate Properties
- Pore Structure
- Curing Conditions

Concrete has high compressive strength because its ionic and covalent bonding system efficiently resists compression.

4.5. Wood: Organic Molecular Bonding and Directional Strength

- **Conventional Wood Design**

Wood bending resistance is:

$$M_r=\phi F_bS$$

where:

- (F_b) = allowable bending stress,
- (S) = section modulus.

Wood strength depends strongly on direction.

- **AT Interpretation**

The bending strength is written:

$$F_b=C_w\frac1t$$

giving:

$$\boxed{M_r=\phi C_w\frac{S}{t}}$$

The coefficient (C_w) represents:

- Cellulose chain strength
- Lignin bonding
- Fiber orientation
- Moisture content
- Defects

Unlike steel, wood is not isotropic. Its electromagnetic bonding occurs within complex biological structures, producing different strengths parallel and perpendicular to the grain.

4.6. Masonry: Composite Bonding System

- **Conventional Masonry Design**

Masonry compressive resistance is:

$$P_r=\phi f'_mA$$

where:
(f'_m) = masonry compressive strength.

Masonry strength depends upon:

- Brick or block strength
- Mortar properties
- Interface bonding

- **AT Formulation**

The masonry strength becomes:
[
f'_m=C_m\frac1t
]
therefore:
[
\boxed{
P_r=
\phi C_m\frac{A}{t}
}
]

The coefficient (C_m) represents the combined electromagnetic and mechanical behavior of:

- Mineral grains
- Ceramic phases
- Mortar chemistry
- Contact surfaces

4.7. Comparison of Structural Materials

The AT formulation suggests that all materials follow the same general relationship:
\text{Material Structure Factor}
\times
\text{Universal Energy Parameter}
}
]
or:
[
\boxed{
f=C\frac1t
}
]

The differences between materials are contained within (C).

Material	Conventional Strength Parameter	AT Form
Steel	(f_y)	(C_s/t)
Concrete	(f'_c)	(C_c/t)
Wood	(F_b)	(C_w/t)
Masonry	(f'_m)	(C_m/t)

4.8. Energy Interpretation of Failure

Failure occurs when applied energy exceeds the material's ability to maintain its internal electromagnetic structure.
For an elastic system:
[
u=\frac12\sigma\varepsilon
]
At failure:
[
u=U_c
]
and:
[
U_c=\frac1t.
]
Therefore:
\frac1t
}
]
The failure point represents the transition from reversible atomic displacement to irreversible structural change.

4.9. Engineering Implications

The proposed framework provides a possible explanation for why:

- Steel has High Tensile Strength
- Concrete has High Compressive Strength
- Wood has Directional Strength
- Masonry Performs Well Under Compression

The differences are not because the materials operate under different fundamental laws. Instead, they represent different structural arrangements of the same electromagnetic interactions.

4.10. Required Experimental Program

For the theory to become a predictive engineering model, the following testing program would be required:

- Determine (C_s) for structural steels.
- Determine (C_c) for different concrete mixes.
- Determine (C_w) for various wood species.
- Determine (C_m) for masonry systems.

The predicted relationship would then be:
C\frac1t
]
compared with:
[
f_{\text{measured}}.
]

Agreement across many materials would provide evidence for or against the proposed framework.

5. Part IV - Discussion, Conclusions, and References

5.1. Discussion

Structural engineering has developed highly reliable methods for designing buildings and infrastructure through decades of experimental research. Limit States Design (LSD) represents the culmination of this work by combining measured material properties, statistical analysis, safety factors, and reliability theory. However, the fundamental question remains:

What is the Physical Origin of the Strength Values Used in Structural Design?

The parameters:

$$
f_y,\quad f'_c,\quad F_b,\quad f'_m
$$

are essential engineering quantities, but they are measured properties rather than fundamental constants. A steel yield strength of 250 MPa, a concrete compressive strength of 40 MPa, or a wood bending strength are macroscopic expressions of microscopic physical processes. This paper proposes that the common foundation of these processes is electromagnetic interaction.

5.2. Relationship between Electromagnetism and Structural Mechanics

At the atomic level, matter is held together by electromagnetic forces.

The resistance of a material to deformation arises because atoms and molecules oppose displacement from equilibrium positions.

When a load is applied:

- External mechanical work is performed.
- Atomic bonds are displaced.
- Internal electromagnetic forces resist the deformation.
- Energy is stored within the material.
- Failure occurs when the internal structure can no longer maintain equilibrium.

Therefore, mechanical strength may be interpreted as a manifestation of stored electromagnetic energy.

The proposed AT Mathematics relationship:

$$
E=\frac1t
$$

provides a possible mathematical representation of this energy quantity.

Since:

$$
M=\ln t
$$

and:

$$
\frac{dM}{dt}=\frac1t,
$$

the theory proposes:

$$
\boxed{
E=\frac{dM}{dt}
}
$$

Energy is therefore interpreted as a transformation relationship between the fundamental parameter (t) and the mass variable (M).

5.3. Comparison with Conventional Materials Science

Conventional materials science explains strength through:

- Atomic Bonding
- Crystal Structures
- Dislocations
- Grain Boundaries
- Defects
- Phase Transformations

The AT Mathematics framework does not replace these mechanisms. Rather, it proposes that these mechanisms may represent different expressions of a deeper energy relationship.

For example:

- **Steel**

The movement of dislocations allows steel to deform plastically. Alloying elements impede dislocation motion and increase strength.

The AT interpretation is:

$$
f_y=C_s\frac1t
$$

where (C_s) incorporates the effects of alloy composition and crystal structure.

- **Concrete**

Concrete strength depends on hydration chemistry, aggregate properties, and porosity.

The AT interpretation is:

$$
f'_c=C_c\frac1t.
$$

- **Wood**

Wood strength depends on biological structure and fiber orientation.

The AT interpretation is:

$$
F_b=C_w\frac1t.
$$

- **Masonry**

Masonry strength depends on the interaction between units and mortar.

The AT interpretation is:

$$
f'_m=C_m\frac1t.
$$

5.4. A General Structural Equation

The central proposed equation is:

$$
\boxed{
f=C\frac1t
}
$$

where:

$$
f=\text{engineering strength}
$$

$$
C=\text{material structure coefficient}
$$

$$
\frac1t=\text{universal energy parameter}.
$$

This equation provides a common theoretical structure for all engineering materials.

The material-specific coefficient contains the complexity of the real material:

$$
C=f(\text{chemistry, structure, defects, environment}).
$$

The universal parameter provides the common physical foundation.

5.5. Potential Applications

If developed further, this framework could have applications in:

- **Materials Engineering:** A first-principles relationship could provide insight into why different materials possess different strengths.
- **Structural Design:** A theoretical strength parameter could supplement empirical design procedures.
- **Materials Selection:** A unified energy-based approach could help compare new materials with conventional construction materials.
- **Advanced Materials:** The framework could potentially be applied to:
  - Composites
  - Ceramics
  - Polymers
  - Nanomaterials

5.6. Limitations and Future Research

The present paper represents a theoretical framework and requires experimental validation.

Important areas for future research include:

1. Determination of material coefficients:
   $$
   C_s,\ C_c,\ C_w,\ C_m
   $$
   for engineering materials.
2. Comparison between predicted and measured strengths.
3. Investigation of whether the AT energy parameter remains constant across different physical systems.
4. Development of a microscopic derivation connecting atomic bonding energy to the macroscopic coefficient (C).
5. Integration with existing materials models based on quantum mechanics and solid-state physics.

A successful theory must not only reinterpret existing equations but must produce measurable predictions.

6. Conclusions

This paper proposes a unified energy interpretation of structural material strength based on AT Mathematics.

The principal conclusions are:

- The strength of steel, concrete, wood, and masonry ultimately originates from electromagnetic interactions between atoms and molecules.
- Current Limit States Design equations are successful empirical representations of these underlying physical processes.
- Mechanical deformation stores energy:

$$
u=\frac12\sigma\varepsilon.
$$

- AT Mathematics introduces the relationships:

$$
t^2-t-1=E,
$$

$$
E=\frac1t,
$$

$$
M=\ln t,
$$

$$
\frac{dM}{dt}=\frac1t.
$$

- A generalized material strength equation is proposed:

$$
\boxed{
f=C\frac1t
}
$$

- Steel, concrete, wood, and masonry may be interpreted as different material expressions of the same fundamental energy relationship.
- Experimental verification remains necessary to determine whether the AT Mathematics framework provides predictive capability beyond existing empirical structural engineering methods [1-13].

References

1. Ashby, M. F. *Materials Selection in Mechanical Design*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
2. Callister, W. D., and Rethwisch, D. G. *Materials Science and Engineering: An Introduction*. Wiley.
3. Gere, J. M., and Goodno, B. J. *Mechanics of Materials*. Cengage Learning.
4. Hibbeler, R. C. *Structural Analysis*. Pearson.
5. DeWolf, J. T., Mazurek, D. F., P Beer, F., & Johnston JR, E. R. (2021). *Mecânica dos Materiais-8*. McGraw Hill Brasil.
6. CSA Group. CS*A A23.3: Design of Concrete Structures*.
7. CSA Group. *CSA S16: Design of Steel Structures*.
8. CSA Group. *CSA O86: Engineering Design in Wood*.
9. CSA Group. *CSA S304: Design of Masonry Structures*.
10. Maxwell, J. C. *A Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism*. Oxford University Press.

11. Griffith, A. A. "The Phenomena of Rupture and Flow in Solids." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 1921.
12. Landau, L. D., and Lifshitz, E. M. *Electrodynamics of Continuous Media*. Pergamon Press.
13. Paul T. E. Cusack. Selected works on AT Mathematics, Astrotheology, energy relationships, and unified field concepts.