Re: SU(4)×SU(2)×SU(2)

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2006−05/msg00338.html

- *From*: Stolen_Humanity@xxxxxxxxx

- *Date*: 3 May 2006 18:43:26 −0700

Ken S. Tucker wrote:

> Ilja Schmelzer wrote:
>
> > On Sun, 30 Apr 2006 18:12:55 −0700, Stolen_Humanity wrote:
> >
> > > T Wake wrote:
> > >
> > > > <Stolen_Humanity@xxxxxxxxx> wrote
> > > >
> > > > > It seems very few people are
> > > > > willing to argue the merits
> > > > > of respective
> > > > > GUTs, and spend more
> > > > > effort arguing with cranks,
> > > > > which requires very
> > > > > little thinking, than actually
> > > > > analyzing the merits of
> > > > > contemporary
> > > > > physics.
> > > > >
> > > > > ...
> > > > >
> > > > > That's why I introduced the topic of SU(4)×SU(2)×SU(2)
> > > > > into this
> > > > > newgroups. The cranks don't even know what the hell it is.
> > > > > Meanwhile
> > > > > you've got more intelligent people who might have logical
> > > > > disagreements
> > > > > on it. However, from my perspective, SU(4)×SU(2)×SU(2) is
> > > > > more
> > > > > symmetric than SU(5). Think about it.
> > > >
> > > > I propose to look at symmetry from the other end. Global symmety
> > > > is more traditional than gauge symmetry, but it is more symmetric,
> > > > preferable from point of view of simplicity (and, that's why, has
> > > > been recognized much earlier).

> > From this point of view, GUTs are less symmetric than the SM itself.
> >
> > If we ignore mass terms, we have a nice global E(3) symmetry:
> > Rotations between generations, additive shifts to the components
> > of right−handed neutrinos. It explains much of the asymmetries
> > of the SM: It forbids to extend SU(3)_c to SU(4) with leptons
> > as forth color, forbids right−handed SU(2)_R partners of SU(2)_L,
> > forbids I_3 alone, outside the combination I_3−1/2.
>
> What scares me is Ilja might be right!
> Ken

Howso?

−Matthew Paul Finnigan−

.