

Re: UNITIVITY

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2009-05/msg00433.html>

- *From:* Eric Gisse <jowr.pi@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 8 May 2009 20:18:53 -0700 (PDT)
-

On May 8, 5:30 pm, "Ken S. Tucker" <dynam...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

To Jay, Peter et al.

On May 8, 4:12 pm, "Jay R. Yablon" <jyab...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

"Peter" <end...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

news:4a332b85-098a-4c04-aeb0-af34ef6a0bf3@xx

On 8 Mai, 19:36, "Jay R. Yablon" <jyab...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

Hello to all.

I would normally keep revisions of a work in progress in a single thread, but I have today been able to connect the principle of general

Re: UNITIVITY

coordinate
invariance
from
gravitation
theory, not
only to
electrodynamic
gauge
theory, but
also to
Planck's
quantization
of
energy.

This is at
the link
below:

[http://jayryablon.files.wordpress.com/2009/05/covariance-and-gauge](http://jayryablon.files.wordpress.com/2009/05/covariance-and-gauge-theory-quantization-11-11-09.pdf)

In twelve
pages, we
show how
both
electrodynamics,
and the very
root
of
quantum
theory --
energy
quantization
-- both
derive from
gravitational
theory.

I plan to
spruce this
up in the
next day or
two, and

Re: UNITIVITY

unless
someone
points out
some
fundamental
flaw, to
submit this
for
publication.

(2.8) looks strange:

$\text{lhs} = 0$ for my \neq sigma

while, in general,

$\text{lhs} \neq 0$ for my \neq sigma

please explain

Peter,

I assume "my" should be "mu"?

yes – sorry!

That is a good question. (2.8) is what the
math gives. That formula
is
not easily understood until the end in (4.16),

Re: UNITIVITY

there is no (4.16)

oops, (4.15).

where the diagonal components do make sense as Planck's formula for energy quantization.. And even there, the interpretation of the off-diagonal components is a challenge, not because it is wrong, but because it is saying something deep about energy quantization that needs to be deciphered.

For the off-diagonal components, (2.8) looks plain wrong to me, I'm afraid to have to say – but this does not yet devalue your basic idea :-)

No, it is absolutely correct, and it the the source of quantum reality!
;-) To reconcile the off- with the on-diagonal components, the vectors MUST be non-commuting operators. What will make sense in (2.8)? Canonical quantum operators!

What is now the bottom line to all of this is as follows: because spacetime coordinates x^u do not transform as a vector under general coordinate transformations, one cannot arrive at a complete description of nature if one assumes that the coordinates are simple numbers. In order to describe nature in a generally covariant manner, one MUST — no choice about it — promote the coordinates to infinite dimensional operators in the manner of Heisenberg matrix mechanics.

Succinctly: One CANNOT describe nature in a generally coordinate-covariant fashion, without quantum mechanics!

Re: UNITIVITY

Re: UNITIVITY

I very much agree with you Jay.

The evolution of that unified field theory provides QT with a GR/GC foundation, however, by doing so, one invalidates the classical Maxwell Equations, since partial diffs become quantized, at the microscopic (quantum) level.

So I/we wrote up the paper (1996), and in the abstract, wrote that Maxwell's Equation's are not valid in QFT, because there is *no such thing* as a derivative of a photon, which in plain terms means one cannot divide a photon into two parts and have each physically detectable. The paper was rejected, for invalidating ME's.

It was rejected because it was stupid.

Seriously, Ken? "*no such thing*" as a derivative of a photon"

Are you seriously surprised such a stupid fucking idea was dismissed out of hand?

A very brief synopsis of the paper is simplified here, http://physics.trak4.com/GR_Charge_Couple.pdf

Oh, THIS was the paper that was rejected? Small fucking wonder.

- a) You don't actually solve the Einstein field equations.
- b) You don't actually solve Maxwell's equations.
- c) You don't even write down all the components.

Therein the operational equation is (4), which in more detail

$S^2 = X^2 + 4k(ab)$, Eq.(4d) detailed

($k = G/c^4$, (length to energy conversion))

to create a metric compatible with finite lengths.

Eq.(4d) renders gravitation, Coulomb force and QT.

In vectors, the root of Eq.(4) can be written,

$S > = X > + 4k(a \text{ or } b) > .$

With appropriate units, $h = ab$, yielding,

Re: UNITIVITY

Re: UNITIVITY

$$S^2 = X^2 + h,$$

to quantize the field in accord with GR.

That program we termed "Unitivity". It goes on to predict g-radiation does NOT exist, also an unpopular result. Further study revealed "frame-dragging" as an artifact, and that too is unpopular.

Ken you have been lying about frame dragging for years now. Give it a rest.

You can predict it doesn't exist until the day you die but it doesn't change the fact IT HAS BEEN OBSERVED.

Jay, it takes guts to make hard predictions, what say you about LIGO and GP-b results?

Regards

Ken S. Tucker

Re: UNITIVITY