

**ON THE FIELD EQUATIONS GOVERNING THE ORIGIN AND EVOLUTION
OF
THE SPACE AND TIME AND PARTICLES OF THIS UNIVERSE**

© May 4, 2003, HyperSpace Solutions
Robert E. Var, President
130 Sheffield Rd, Waltham, MA 02451-2323

RvarSpace@alum.mit.edu

On the field equations governing the origin and evolution of
compactified hyper-dimensional-energy universes

© May 4, 2003, HyperSpace Solutions
Robert E. Var, President
130 Sheffield Rd, Waltham, MA 02451-2323
RvarSpace@alum.mit.edu

Twentieth century science produced a clear need for a *universe theory* (UT) with an inherent capacity to explain how compactified hyper-dimensional universes are explosively created and sustained. *Space-energy theory*, in (R. Var, Foundations of Physics **5**, 3, (Sept. 75, pp. 407-431)), offered a embryonic $(1 + 4)$ -dimensional candidate for such a theory. Here I derive a definitive $(1 + p \geq 4)$ -dimensional UT called *hyper-energy theory*—as the third of three increasingly comprehensive gauge-field theories (GFT1–3) which are derived from the physical implications of a gravity theorem that Maxwell published, along with his electromagnetic field theory, in 1864; stating that: *Gravity is a mass-induced reduction of an enormous intrinsic energy density, ${}^0\epsilon_m$, that characterizes the space-medium*. GFT1, called **w**-gauge theory, yields five ways that particles couple to ${}^0\epsilon_m \leq {}^0\epsilon_m$ via a single coupling-strength function; $\ell = 1/[1 - \mathbf{w}^2]^{1/2}$, of their propagation velocity, **w**, in order conserve their energy and momentum. GFT1 is shown to cover special relativity theory while introducing the following two revolutionary discoveries: a) The flow velocity **u** of ϵ_m is a locally unobservable 3-vector-potential of the two previously disparate kinds of gravity referred to as matter-gravity and ‘elevator-gravity’. b) The potential of Maxwellian-gravity, $\Phi_m = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{u}^2$, provides fluid- ϵ_m explanations for the potential $(-\Phi_n/c^2)$ of Newtonian gravity and for the black holes and gravitational red-shifts deduced from general relativity theory. GFT2 is a $(1 + 3)$ tensor generalization of **w**-gauge theory precipitated from Einstein’s *overly general* relativity theory by employing ℓ to give the 4-scalar differential, ds , a specific practical form, dx^0/ℓ , which causes the resulting theory—called Einstein-Maxwell (EM) gravity theory—to be harmonious with **w**-gauge theory and thus Maxwell’s gravity theorem. The interactions of EM gravity and particles are then evaluated in sufficient depth to show that EM gravity is a readily quantizable solution of the long standing quantum-gravity problem. Hyper-energy theory (GFT3) is then logically deduced as being—to a first approximation—nothing more than, and nothing less than, a $(p-3)$ -dimensional extension of the $(1 + 3)$ -dimensional laws governing the dynamics of an abstractly continuous (non particulate) medium of compressible and inviscid mass-energy. I then demonstrate the $e^{(p-3)}$ proportional efficacy of hyper-energy theory with multi big-bang driven, p -invariant, qualitative solutions of the hyper energy field equations that can be seen to account for: a) Compactification and ${}^0\epsilon_m$ structure—with $(p - 3)$ locally orthogonal (flat) time-flow-sourced hyper-dimensions. b) The Inflationary and Hubble expansion phases. c) The unifying role of a soliton Higgs-field in determining: 1) Cosmological particle-generation; 2) Maxwell’s gravity theorem; 3) The quasi- $(1 + 3)$ -dimensional propagation of particles and their de Broglie waves; 4) The elementary particle spectrum; And 5) The physical nature of both time and superstrings. Hence, a single, multi-component, super gauge-field representing *the flow of time*—which controls particle structures and interactions via its many and various types of physically comprehensible symmetry breakings—is accurately identified by hyper-energy theory as the $(1 + p)$ -dimensional flux of hyper-energy through the propagationally expanding and solitonally compactified ‘3-space’ of this universe.

PACS numbers: 04.50.+h, 98.80.Cq, 11.15.-q, 11.25.-w, 98.80.Bp, 11.10Kk, 11.25.Mj,
12.10.-g, 98.80.Hw.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. The Gravity Theorem of James Clerk Maxwell.

In his classic 1864 paper “A Dynamical Theory of the Electromagnetic Field” Maxwell also described his attempt to derive a $1/r^2$ theory of gravity that would be consistent with his newly formulated field equations of electrodynamics. That attempt led Maxwell to the following three conclusions:

- a) The medium of 3-space is characterized by an enormous intrinsic energy.
- b) Gravity is a mass-proportional reduction of that relatively enormous 3-space-energy.
- c) “As I am unable to understand in what way a medium can possess such properties I cannot go further in this direction in searching for the cause of gravitation.”¹

I here raise Maxwell’s conclusions (a) and (b) to the level of a theorem, called *Maxwell’s gravity theorem*, and I assert that Maxwell’s conclusion (c) posed a well defined challenge for the scientific community that is referred herein to as the *3-space-energy problem*.

I then assert that, in defining the *3-space-energy problem*, James Clerk Maxwell passed-on the challenge of explaining and exploiting the enormous classical energy of the 3-space medium to early 21st century theorists who now possess all of the mathematical tools, knowledge, and, experimental data, needed to do just that—*by simply employing Maxwell’s gravity theorem as a driving physical principle*.

The truth of this assertion is then demonstrated in this paper by employing Maxwell’s gravity theorem and contemporary scientific knowledge to derive the three increasingly comprehensive gauge-field theories (GFT1–3) summarized in the abstract.

The remaining sections of this paper are organized as follows:

Section II. Founding Principles, Equations, Terminologies, and Working Notations.

- A. New terminologies consistent with Maxwell’s gravity theorem.
- B. Four interrelated working implications of Maxwell’s gravity theorem.
- C. The founding theoretical concept and equation of hyper-energy theory.
- D. The pragmatically essential but strictly complementary nature of GFT1.
- E. Analytic constructs and variables for deriving GFT1, 2 and 3.

Section III. GFT1: A \mathbf{W} -Gauge Theory of ϵ_m -Field-Particle Coupling—Covering special relativity and introducing Maxwellian gravity.

Section IV. GFT2: Einstein-Maxwell (EM) Gravity—Directly from the founding equation of hyper-energy theory derived in II.C.

Section V. Applications Demonstrating That EM Gravity Solves The Quantum-Gravity Problem.

Section VI. GFT3: The General Principles and Field Equations of Hyper-Energy Theory.

Section VII. On The Hyper-Energy Origin, Dynamics, and Structure of the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -Continuum.

Section VIII. On The Hyper-Energy Origins of Massive and Massless $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ Particles.

Section IX. On The Hyper-Energy Physics of Electric Charge and $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ Energy, Inertia, and Gravity.

Section X. On Tapping the Flow of Time for Low Pollution Hyper-Energy Power and Propulsion.

Section XI. Some General Remarks concerning a Hyper-Energy Theory Completion Program.

II. Founding Principles, Equations, Terminologies, and Working Notations.

A. New terminologies consistent with Maxwell's gravity theorem.

The MKS system of units is employed throughout, and terms like *3-space-energy* or the *3-space-energy continuum* are used to supplant traditional terms like *space* or *3-space*, *empty-space*, *physical space* or *physical 3-space*, the *void* or *vacuum* of the foregoing, the *medium of space*, and the *luminiferous ether* or *aether*—terms which failed to suggest anything even remotely resembling the enormously rich *energy-medium* deduced, originally it seems, by Maxwell.

The symbol ${}^0\mathcal{E}_m$ (m for Maxwell) denotes the *3-space-energy* contained in a given 3-volume (V) of the undisturbed *3-space-energy continuum*, and ${}^0\epsilon_m = {}^0\mathcal{E}_m/V$ then denotes the corresponding 3-volume density of ${}^0\mathcal{E}_m$.

Terms like *3-space-energy* and the *3-space-energy continuum* will always refer to the *undisturbed* regions characterized by ${}^0\epsilon_m$. Since *3-space-energy* is implied by the symbols ${}^0\mathcal{E}_m$ and ${}^0\epsilon_m$, the *3-space-energy continuum* will also be referred to as the ${}^0\mathcal{E}_m$ -continuum or the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum.

Logically, any explanation for the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum which is consistent with the big bang scenario and which maintains the hallowed principle of energy conservation can only come from the physics of a more fundamental, $(1 + p \geq 4)$ -dimensional-energy continuum.^a And since this conclusion is rigorously vindicated herein by GFT1–3, it is useful to note the logical distinction that must be made and hereafter born in mind; between *this* [ephemeral ${}^0\mathcal{E}_m$] *universe* and *the* [permanent hyper-energy] *universe*.

Namely:

The universe is a permanent $(1 + p)$ -dimensional *hyper-energy-universe*, U_{4+m} , ($m = (p - 3)$), in which *this* (quasi- U_4) *universe* is sustained as an explosively created, 100% dynamically compactified and coupled, *internal soliton energy state* of U_{4+m} .

Since the readily quantizable EM gravity theory (derived in Section IV) furnishes a useful mathematical link between all of our present quasi- $(1 + 3)$ knowledge and the new $(1 + p)$ energy physics of *the universe*, it may be helpful to keep this revolutionary view of *the universe* in mind while studying the derivations of the gauge-field theories (GFT1–3) which substantiate this new paradigm.

B. Four interrelated working implications of Maxwell's gravity theorem.

The gauge-field theories (GFT1–3) are derived in a straight forward manner from the following four physically interrelated and mathematically qualifiable *working implications* of Maxwell's gravity theorem (i-iv), referred to herein as ${}^0\mathcal{E}_m$ -Implications (i-iv):

- (i) Given that ${}^0\mathcal{E}_m$ is defined as being 3-dimensionally *continuous* and possessing an *enormous intrinsic energy*—relative to matter—it follows that, 3-volume for 3-volume, the rest-energy of any particle represents a miniscule disturbance or perturbation of ${}^0\mathcal{E}_m$. The symbol $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ will then be used to denote any such miniscule perturbation of ${}^0\mathcal{E}_m$.

The symbol $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ will also be used as an adjective to occasionally emphasize this new *perturbational* perception of *matter particles and fields* by referring to them as $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ field-particles and $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ fields. This $\delta\mathcal{E}$ aspect of the new physics is emphasized more strongly by saying that *all $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ matter particles and fields have a 100% coupling to the ${}^0\mathcal{E}_m$ -continuum*.

^a The $(1 + p)$ ordering of *hyper energy* coordinates was chosen over the traditional $(p + 1)$ ordering of *spacetime* coordinates for reasons of notational convenience which become important in Sections VI – XI.

- (ii) Given (i), Newton's laws of motion, and Maxwell's equations, it follows that the physical structure of ${}^0\mathcal{E}_m$ provides all $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ field-particles with a common *propagational* mechanism for their transport through the 3-space-energy continuum—which is basically *frictionless*. The symbol $\mathbf{w} = w^\alpha \mathbf{e}_\alpha$ will then be used to denote the lightspeed normalized propagation velocity of an arbitrary $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ particle or field point.
- (iii) Given (ii), the electromagnetic basis for light and its constant propagation velocity (c) within ${}^0\mathcal{E}_m$ (as disclosed by Maxwell in his classic 1864 paper), plus some theoretical insights drawn from compressible hydrodynamics, I assume that c^2 is a proportionate measure of ${}^0\epsilon_m$. The physical properties of Maxwell's ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum can thus be said to be characterized by c^2 , or equivalently, by either $\mathbf{w}^2 = 1$ or the null 3-scalar, s^0 , where

$$(s^0)^2 \equiv (1 - \mathbf{w}^2) = 0. \quad (2.1)$$

- (iv) Since $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ *propagation* in ϵ_m and a *relative flow field* of ϵ_m with lightspeed normalized flow velocity, $\mathbf{u} = u^\alpha \mathbf{e}_\alpha = -\mathbf{w}$, are *complementary physical properties of continuum physics*, I assume that a more general flow field of $\epsilon_m \leq {}^0\epsilon_m$ exists relative to a massive $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ particle—associated with the 3-dimensionally extended field-structure of the particle. Maxwell's gravity theorem therefore precipitates the existence of a new 3-vector field in physical theory,

$$\mathbf{p}_m(x^i) = \epsilon_m(x^i) \mathbf{u}(x^i), \quad (2.2)$$

which, to a first approximation, describes a momentum density or flux of the enormous energy characterizing the medium of our compactified 3-space.

The field $\mathbf{p}_m(x^i)$ (m for Maxwell) is herein shown to function as a *3-vector potential of Maxwellian gravity*. Following the derivation of GFT1 and proof that GFT1 covers special relativity theory, we show that variations of $\mathbf{p}_m(x^i)$ described by $\partial\mathbf{p}_m/\partial x^0$ and $(\nabla \times \mathbf{p}_m)$ have been routinely measured and exploited over the last half century for the practical purpose of inertial (${}^0\epsilon_m$) navigation. Thereby revealing that the $\mathbf{p}_m(x^i)$ field already has the same degree of empirical vindication as the electromagnetic vector potential—if one merely takes gainful advantage of the liberty, allowed by GFT1—of describing the responses of *inertial sensors* in the same proper *in situ* manner as one typically describes the responses of various electromagnetic field sensors via their responses to temporal and spatial changes of the electromagnetic gauge fields, ϕ_e and \mathbf{cA} .

C. The founding theoretical concepts and equation of hyper-energy theory.²

1. The founding theoretical concepts of hyper-energy theory.

The founding theoretical concepts (FTCs) of hyper-energy theory are just the two physical revelations of ${}^0\mathcal{E}_m$ -implications (i–iv); suggesting that the 3-transport of *any* particle or field-point (p) is generally due to two distinct physical mechanisms: a) The *frictionless propagation* of p with lightspeed normalized 3-velocity \mathbf{w} *relative to* its underlying ϵ_m -continuum. And b) The *frictionless flow* of ϵ_m with lightspeed normalized 3-velocity \mathbf{u} *relative to* the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum.

2. The founding equation of hyper-energy theory.

The founding equation of hyper-energy theory answers this simple question: If an arbitrary particle, p , is propagating with velocity \mathbf{w} at a point where the ϵ_m -continuum is flowing with velocity \mathbf{u} , what is p 's velocity relative to the superficially undisturbed ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum?

The answer:

$$d\mathbf{r}/dx^0 \equiv \beta(p) = \mathbf{u}(\epsilon_m) + \mathbf{w}(p), \quad (2.3a)$$

therefore describes how the FTCs of hyper-energy theory serve to explain the *rectilinear velocity of p* referenced to the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum (and/or any given inertial observer, as we shall be demonstrating). Equation (2.3a) then quantifies a new parameter in physical theory referred to herein as the *generalized rectilinear-velocity* (GRV) of an arbitrary (massive or massless) $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ particle or field point (p). The GRV and its magnitude β —defining the generalized rectilinear speed (GRS) of p—are mathematically clarified in Section II.D.7, and an angular complement of the GRV is described in Section II.D.8 with the help of the intervening analytic constructs.

a. Historical note.

In his valedictory Scientific American article of 1963, P. A. M. Dirac asserted that if a new field like $\mathbf{p}_m(x^i)$ could be successfully introduced into physical theory, it would lead to a *classical physics of the future* capable of modeling *particle structure*—unencumbered by the mathematical complications of the uncertainty relations which pertain only to *particle-interactions*.³ As Dirac pointed out, to be successfully introduced it would have to be shown that $\mathbf{p}_m(x^i)$ preserves the *4-dimensional symmetry required by Einstein's relativity principle*. And as shown herein, this is precisely what \mathbf{w} -gauge theory does.

D. Analytic constructs and variables for deriving GFT1–3.

1. Point-like particles, compound particles, rigid bodies, and spacecraft laboratories.

A general $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ field-point or point-like particle is represented by p. A *massless* p particle is represented by p^0 . And a *massive* and *electrically uncharged* p particle is represented by p^π . p^π particles carrying positive and negative electric charges are then denoted respectively by $+p^\pi$ and $-p^\pi$. A *compound, massive, electrically neutral* $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ particle—consisting of two or more p^π particles bound together by their attractive field-energies is denoted by c^π . A ‘*rigid*’, electrically neutral, macroscopic body of crystalline-bound c^π particles is then denoted by C^π . Unless stated otherwise, remarks in this paper concerning the *rotational propagation physics* of c^π particles will apply equally well to C^π bodies, and visa versa.

A very general kind of C^π body used throughout is a spacecraft, denoted by Σ , which houses a general scientific laboratory; including measurement standards for defining a Cartesian 3-distance (\underline{x}^α) and time ($\underline{x}^0 = ct$) relative to its origin (\underline{O}), plus, an inertial navigation system for controlling the orientation and propagation path of Σ to throughout the effective ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum that remains after the calculated effects of matter gravity have been subtracted out by Σ 's inertial navigation computer. Immediately following the derivation of GFT1, it will be shown—as a practical introduction to GFT2—that *all* inertial sensors (which necessarily includes *all* matter-gravity sensors)—provide unambiguous *proper* (in situ) measures of various *Maxwellian gravity fields* stemming from nothing other than temporal and spatial variations of the relative $\mathbf{p}_m(\underline{x}^i)$ field.

2. The fundamental ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -reference frame, $\Sigma(x^i)$.

In Fig. 1, $\Sigma(x^i)$ symbolizes the Cartesian measurement system of a copy of $\underline{\Sigma}$ which employs $(1 + 3)$ coordinates $x^i = \{(x^0 = ct), x^\alpha\}$ relative to its origin O , but which is defined—for purely heuristic purposes—to be rotationally and rectilinearly at rest in the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum characterized by constant local values of $\epsilon_m(x^i) = {}^0\epsilon_m$ and $c(x^i) = c$.

a. The local Σ^ℓ and distant Σ^d domains of Σ .

In order to preserve the *fundamental status* and *symmetry* of Σ , while allowing its x^i to parameterize the interactions of $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ particles with long range $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ fields like gravity, electricity, and magnetism—that would break Σ 's symmetry—it is necessary to divide the geometric domain of Σ into a *local-laboratory* domain, Σ^ℓ , where all measurements are carried out, and an abstract *distant-field* domain, Σ^d , in accordance with the following prescription:

The Σ^ℓ domain of Σ remains free of any long range fields from distance sources, and contains the instruments and means for analyzing *local* $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ particle interactions, and, any massive or massless *radiations* which might be emitted from *distant* $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ particle interactions taking place within (or relative to) a given long-range field in the *distant-field* domain of Σ , Σ^d . As illustrated in Fig. 1, any reference to a long range field, such as $\mathbf{u}(x^i)$, presumes that $\mathbf{u}(x^i)$ is restricted to Σ^d and that $\mathbf{u}(x^i) = \mathbf{0}$ within Σ^ℓ .

It will be demonstrated herein, more definitively than previously⁴, that Σ^ℓ is the reference frame in which *virtually* all of our present classical and quantum laws hold good—with the greatest possible physical significance.

3. The rectilinear and angular forms of $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ propagation.

Let $\mathbf{w}(p) = w^\alpha \mathbf{e}_\alpha$ be the lightspeed-normalized, *rectilinear* propagation velocity of a given $p(x^i)$ relative to Σ .^a And let $\varpi(c^\pi) = \varpi^\alpha \mathbf{e}_\alpha$ be the lightspeed normalized, *angular* propagation velocity of a given c^π particle. Unless stated otherwise, $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}(p^\pi \text{ or } C^\pi)$, and $\mathbf{w}^0 \equiv \mathbf{w}(p^0)$.

The ${}^0\mathcal{E}_m$ *rest status* of Σ is then quantified by the statement, $\mathbf{w}(\Sigma) = \varpi(\Sigma) = \mathbf{0}$. And the essence of ${}^0\mathcal{E}$ -Implication (iii) is then quantified by stating that the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum is characterized by a *lightspeed three scalar*, $s^0 \equiv [1 - (\mathbf{w}^0)^2] = 0$. Hence, $s^0 = 0$ is a *dynamical characterization* of the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum which holds good even if $c(x^i) < c$ where $\epsilon_m(x^i) < {}^0\epsilon_m$, provided that the *lightspeed normalization* of \mathbf{w} is done with $c(x^i)$.

4. An arbitrary ϵ_m -reference frame, $\underline{\Sigma}(\underline{x}^i)$.

In Fig. 1, $\underline{\Sigma}(\underline{x}^i)$ denotes the more general $(1 + 3)$ reference system of a spacecraft whose Cartesian space axes are co-aligned with those of Σ . The propagational state of $\underline{\Sigma}(\underline{x}^i)$ and the physical environment of $\underline{\Sigma}(\underline{x}^i)$ are thus completely arbitrary, and a double underscore will be used to label all variables associated with the origin \underline{O} of $\underline{\Sigma}$. Some examples of which are $\underline{x}^i = (\underline{\mathbf{r}}, \underline{x}^0)$ and $\underline{\beta} = d\underline{\mathbf{r}}/d\underline{x}^0 = \underline{\mathbf{w}} + \underline{\mathbf{u}}$, with $\underline{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{0}$ defining $\underline{x}^0 - \underline{x}^0 = 0$, and $\underline{\varpi}(\underline{\Sigma})$ defining $\varpi(\underline{\Sigma})$ about the point \underline{O} at \underline{x}^i . The generality of $\underline{\Sigma}$ is then stated more precisely by saying that $\underline{\mathbf{w}}(\underline{\Sigma})$ and $\underline{\varpi}(\underline{\Sigma})$ are both generally unrestricted, and, $\underline{\Sigma} = \underline{\Sigma}^d = \underline{\Sigma}^\ell$ can be embedded in an arbitrary $\mathbf{p}_m(x^i)$ field of distant matter.

^a All rectilinear and angular velocities are normalized to lightspeed, unless stated otherwise.

The generality of $\underline{\Sigma}$ will not be exploited until after until GFT1 is derived, however—prior to which $\underline{\Sigma}$ will be restricted to an *inertial* $\underline{\Sigma}$ defined by $\underline{\omega}(\underline{\Sigma}) = \mathbf{0}$, and $\underline{\beta} = \underline{\mathbf{w}}(\underline{\Sigma}) = \text{constant}$ in the $\underline{\beta}$ -coupling domain of the 3-space-energy continuum defined above.

a. On the expected \mathbf{w} -deformations of $\underline{\Sigma}$'s structure and properties.

Given that $\underline{\Sigma}$'s structure is sustained by the relatively tenuous electromagnetic interactions of its relatively insubstantial $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ particles, one can reasonably expect to find that the structure and properties of $\underline{\Sigma}$ are altered by it $\underline{\mathbf{w}}$ in well defined ways which become increasingly discernable with respect to Σ as $\underline{\mathbf{w}}^2 \rightarrow 1$. And \mathbf{w} -gauge theory nicely precipitates the precise forms of five such \mathbf{w} -deformations (the five $\underline{\mathbf{w}}d^i$ of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory) having a useful *two-fold degeneracy* which stems from, what can be considered to be, the limiting $\underline{\beta}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ causes of $\underline{\mathbf{w}} = (\underline{\beta} - \underline{\mathbf{u}})$. An invaluable tool for the derivation and understanding of the $\underline{\mathbf{w}}d^i$ —the abstraction of a propagationally un-deformable reference frame—is therefore described next.

5. The working abstraction of a propagationally un-deformable reference frame, $\Sigma(\mathbf{x}^i)$.

I define $\Sigma = \Sigma(\mathbf{x}^i)$ as a generic working abstraction of Σ which acquires the label $\Sigma = \Sigma(\mathbf{x}^i)$ when it is abstractly overlaid on $\underline{\Sigma}$; so as to be both co-aligned with and co-moving with $\underline{\Sigma}$. The abstractly un-deformable measurement standards and measures of Σ are therefore immune to any deformations that the instruments and measures of $\underline{\Sigma}$ might suffer in response to the presence of a constant \mathbf{p}_m -field in Σ , $\mathbf{p}_m(\mathbf{x}^i)$. The (1 + 3) coordinates of Σ and Σ are thus usefully related by an ordinary Galilean transformation; $\mathbf{r} = (\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r}) = (\underline{\beta}x^0 + \mathbf{r})$, and $x^0 = \mathbf{x}^0$.

We will also be overlaying the origin \mathbf{O} of Σ on $\epsilon_m(\mathbf{x}^i)$ to obtain $\Sigma_\epsilon = \Sigma_\epsilon(\mathbf{x}_\epsilon^i)$ as a working abstraction of an un-deformable Σ reference frame that co-moves with the energy density $\epsilon_m(\mathbf{x}^i)$ —in a *null propagation state* quantified, with respect to Σ , by $\mathbf{w}(\Sigma_\epsilon) = \mathbf{w}(\Sigma_\epsilon) = \mathbf{0}$. Relative to Σ then, Σ_ϵ has a rectilinear velocity $\beta_\epsilon = \mathbf{u}$, and (as explained in II.D.8) a spin-rate $\omega(\Sigma_\epsilon) = \mathbf{s}(\Sigma_\epsilon) = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla \times \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}^i))$.

Via these two applications, $\Sigma = \Sigma(\mathbf{x}^i)$ will be seen to provide an invaluable tool for the derivation and understanding of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory.

a. Useful formulas consistent with the Galilean transformation linking Σ and Σ .

Given:

$$d\mathbf{r} = (d\mathbf{r} + d\mathbf{r}) = (\underline{\beta}dx^0 + d\mathbf{r}), \text{ and } dx^0 = d\mathbf{x}^0, \quad (2.4a)$$

it follows that:

$$\beta = \underline{\beta} + \mathbf{r}, \quad (2.4b)$$

and

$$dx^0 = \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{\beta} = \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{\mathbf{r}} = d\mathbf{x}^0. \quad (2.4c)$$

This shows that the form of the equation defining a $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ particle's GRV is invariant under a Galilean transformation of the (1 + 3) coordinates linking Σ and Σ , which naturally conserves the respective, GRS-defined, transport-time intervals. These *Galilean coordinate relations*, as they will be hereafter referred to, will be liberally employed throughout Section III to transform the intuitively derived Σ - Σ expressions of the $\underline{\mathbf{w}}d^i$ formulas into their experimentally verifiable Σ - Σ expressions, thereby establishing Σ 's utility as a very practical analytic perspective of $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ - ϵ_m coupling.

6. Four principal analysis points and parameters.

For the derivations which follow, x^i , \underline{x}^i , and $\text{'}\underline{x}^i$ will generally parameterize the same arbitrary point-property of a $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ field-particle field-point, $p(x^i)$, $\underline{p}(\underline{x}^i)$, and $\text{'}\underline{p}(\text{'}\underline{x}^i)$, from the complementary perspectives of Σ , $\underline{\Sigma}$, and $\text{'}\underline{\Sigma}$. Whereas (\underline{x}^i) will point exclusively to the origin \underline{O} of $\underline{\Sigma}$ and thus to the origin $\text{'}\underline{O}$ of $\text{'}\underline{\Sigma}$. As detailed below, a defined function of a given variable will then be similarly underscored to denote which of these reference systems its variable belongs to.

a. The form invariance of operator, vector, scalar, and tensor functions.

Let \mathfrak{R} , \mathbf{w} , f , and T_{ik} , denote a given operator, vector, scalar, and tensor, associated with $p(x^i)$ of Σ^d . Then, $\underline{\mathfrak{R}}$, $\underline{\mathbf{w}}$, \underline{f} , and \underline{T}_{ik} will denote the same mathematical quantities associated with $\underline{p}(\underline{x}^i)$ of $\underline{\Sigma}$. And, $\text{'}\mathfrak{R}$, $\text{'}\underline{\mathbf{w}}$, $\text{'}\underline{f}$, and $\text{'}\underline{T}_{ik}$ will denote the same mathematical quantities associated with $\text{'}\underline{p}(\text{'}\underline{x}^i)$ of $\text{'}\underline{\Sigma}$. And, $\underline{\mathfrak{R}}$, $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{w}}}$, $\underline{\underline{f}}$, and $\underline{\underline{T}}_{ik}$ denote the same mathematical quantities associated with \underline{O} of $\underline{\Sigma}$ and $\text{'}\underline{O}$ of $\text{'}\underline{\Sigma}$.

Thus if the propagation velocity of a given p^π particle is \mathbf{w} , $\underline{\mathbf{w}}$, and $\text{'}\underline{\mathbf{w}}$ referenced to Σ , $\underline{\Sigma}$, and $\text{'}\underline{\Sigma}$, and the particle's coupling strength referenced to Σ is defined by $\ell = \ell(\mathbf{w}) = 1/[1 - \mathbf{w}^2]^{1/2}$, we can subsequently introduce $\underline{\ell}$ and $\text{'}\underline{\ell}$ with the understanding that $\underline{\ell}$ and $\text{'}\underline{\ell}$ are the same functions of $\underline{\mathbf{w}}$ and $\text{'}\underline{\mathbf{w}}$ that ℓ is of \mathbf{w} , and that they describe the p^π particle's propagational coupling strength referenced, respectively, to $\underline{\Sigma}$ and $\text{'}\underline{\Sigma}$.

7. A $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{P}/\mathbf{R})$ notation for clarifying *generalized* (\mathbf{p}_m -field + $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ -field-particle) equations.

The GRV equation, $\beta = (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{w})$, is a primary example of what is referred to herein as a *generalized*(\mathbf{p}_m -field + $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ field-particle) equation, more concisely referred to as a *generalize field-particle* (GFP) equation, since it is an equation that combines *one type* of \mathbf{p}_m -field and *one type* of $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ -particle property—in this example the normalized \mathbf{p}_m -field; $\mathbf{p}_m/\epsilon_m = \mathbf{u}$, and the $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ propagation velocity \mathbf{w} . Two other GFP's; the *generalized angular velocity* (GAV) equation, $\omega = \mathbf{s} + \varpi$, and the *generalized rectilinear acceleration* (GRA) equation, $\beta_0 = \mathbf{u}_0 + \mathbf{w}_0$, are derived in II.D.8,10.

The physics and the symmetries involved in each GFP can be conceptually and mathematically clarified by employing a $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{P}/\mathbf{R})$ qualification for each 3-vector, \mathbf{D} , in a GFP equation, with the understanding that $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{P}/\mathbf{R})$ means the dynamic state \mathbf{D} (of a specified $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ particle \mathbf{P} /relative to the frame of reference \mathbf{R} that has been uniquely associated with \mathbf{D}).

Having already described each of the parameters in the GRV, we may then strive to clarify its meaning by expressing the GRV in its $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{P}/\mathbf{R})$ form

$$\beta(p(x^i)/\Sigma^d) = \mathbf{u}(\epsilon_m(x^i)/\Sigma^d) + \mathbf{w}(p(x^i)/\Sigma^d). \quad (2.3b)$$

However, since all terms in a GFP must pertain to the same x^i , we can always use the neater $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{P}/\mathbf{R})$ form

$$\beta(p/\Sigma^d) = \mathbf{u}(\epsilon_m/\Sigma^d) + \mathbf{w}(p/\Sigma^d). \quad (2.3c)$$

This betrays, most clearly, what might at first glance seem to be a troublesome fact: Namely, that different terms in a GFP equation pertain to different reference systems. However, (2.3c) is a logical and practical equation of continuum mechanics which has naturally surfaced here as the founding equation of hyper-energy theory, and which (as mentioned in II.C.2) is employed in the self consistent form

$$\mathbf{w}(p/\Sigma_\epsilon) = \beta(p/\Sigma^d) - \mathbf{u}(\epsilon_m/\Sigma^d), \quad (2.3d)$$

to formally source the tensor form and substance of Einstein-Maxwell gravity (as mentioned in II.C.2.a).

Hence, with the exception of $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{w}$ (which is always referenced to Σ_ϵ), the reference frame that $\mathbf{D}(P)$ is both referred to and defined in is uniquely betrayed by the specific labeling assigned to \mathbf{D} . And with the exception of \mathbf{w} , it is understood that 3-vectors which are respectively labeled as $(\mathbf{D}$ or $\underline{\mathbf{D}})$, $\mathbf{\dot{D}}$, and $\underline{\mathbf{D}}$, are always respectively referenced to (Σ^d) , Σ , and $\underline{\Sigma}$. This offers some justification for working with the original GRV form

$$\beta(p) = \mathbf{u}(\epsilon_m) + \mathbf{w}(p). \quad (2.3a)$$

Furthermore, simply acknowledging that all terms—other than the *field* term—are *particle* parameters, offers some justification for working with the simplest form of all,

$$\beta = \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{w}. \quad (2.3d)$$

8. A first order Angular Complement to the GRV equation.

a. The generalized angular velocity(GAV).

Just as $\beta = (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{w})$ is the generalized *rectilinear* velocity, referenced to Σ^d , of a $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ particle (p) which has a *rectilinear* propagation velocity, \mathbf{w} , at x^i of Σ^d where the ϵ_m -continuum is *flowing rectilinearly* with velocity \mathbf{u} ,

$$\omega(c^\pi) = \mathbf{s}(\epsilon_m) + \varpi(c^\pi), \quad (2.5a)$$

is the generalized *angular* velocity (GAV), referenced to Σ^d , of a c^π particle which has an *angular* propagation velocity, ϖ , at x^i of Σ^d where the ϵ_m -continuum is *circulating* with a vorticity $\boldsymbol{\zeta}(x^i) = \nabla \times \mathbf{u} \equiv 2\mathbf{s}$ which is presumed to be constant over the 3-volume of the c^π particle. The parameter, \mathbf{s} , is the *c^π -spin equivalence* of ϵ_m -vorticity, $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$, since it accounts fully for $\omega(c^\pi)$ when $\varpi(c^\pi) = 0$.

In $\mathbf{D}(P/R)$ form

$$\omega(c^\pi/\Sigma^d) = \mathbf{s}(\epsilon_m/\Sigma^d) + \varpi(c^\pi/\Sigma_\epsilon). \quad (2.5b)$$

b. Derivation of the GAV equation for $\underline{\Sigma}$.

We now employ $\underline{\Sigma}$, the abstraction $\mathbf{\dot{\Sigma}}$, and the crucial fact that $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{\dot{\Sigma}}/\Sigma^d) = \mathbf{D}(\underline{\Sigma}/\Sigma^d)$, to derive (2.5)—in a way that neatly circumvents the issues associated with; 1) the un-observability in $\underline{\Sigma}$ of $\mathbf{\dot{u}}$ (derived in Section III), and 2) the complications of both \mathbf{w} -deformations and ϖ -deformations in $\underline{\Sigma}$.

Relative to Σ^d ; $\mathbf{r} = \underline{\mathbf{r}}(\underline{\mathbf{O}}) + \mathbf{\dot{r}}(\underline{\Sigma})$, the dynamic *coordinate state* of $\underline{\Sigma}$ is parameterized by $\underline{\beta}(\underline{\mathbf{O}})$ and $\underline{\omega}(\underline{\Sigma})$, and the dynamic *propagational state* of $\underline{\Sigma}$ is parameterized by $\underline{\mathbf{w}}$ and $\underline{\varpi}$. Referenced to $\mathbf{\dot{\Sigma}}$ then, $\epsilon_m(\mathbf{\dot{r}})$ is flowing with velocity $\mathbf{\dot{u}}$ relative to $\mathbf{\dot{r}}$. And because of $\mathbf{\dot{\Sigma}}$'s $\underline{\beta}$ and $\underline{\omega}$ relative to Σ^d , $\epsilon_m(\mathbf{\dot{r}}) = \epsilon_m(\mathbf{r})$ must then be flowing relative to \mathbf{r} of Σ^d with velocity

$$\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{\dot{u}}(\mathbf{\dot{r}}) + \underline{\beta}(\mathbf{\dot{\Sigma}}) + \underline{\omega}(\mathbf{\dot{\Sigma}}) \times \mathbf{\dot{r}}. \quad (2.6)$$

And since $\underline{\beta}$ and $\underline{\omega}$ are coordinate point-functions (unaffected by the $\mathbf{\dot{\nabla}}$ operator), taking the curl of (2.6) generates the following fundamental relationship between $\mathbf{\dot{\zeta}}$, $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$, and $\underline{\omega}$:

$$\boldsymbol{\zeta}(x^i) \equiv \nabla \times \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{\dot{\zeta}} + \underline{\omega}(\mathbf{\dot{\nabla}} \cdot \mathbf{\dot{r}}) - (\underline{\omega} \cdot \mathbf{\dot{\nabla}}) \mathbf{\dot{r}}, \quad (2.7a)$$

$$= \mathbf{\dot{\zeta}} + 2\underline{\omega}.^5 \quad (2.7b)$$

In $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{P}/\mathbf{R})$ form

$$\zeta(\in_m/\Sigma^d) = \zeta(\in_m/\Sigma) + 2\omega(\Sigma/\Sigma^d). \quad (2.7c)$$

We then recall the independent fluid-dynamic formula

$$\frac{1}{2}\zeta(\in_m/\Sigma) = -\omega(\Sigma/\Sigma_\epsilon), \quad (2.8)$$

which explains, in this case, that one half of the \in_m -vorticity relative to Σ (at the point \mathbf{Q}) is, necessarily, always opposite and equal to the angular propagation rate of Σ relative to Σ_ϵ . This is derived here for the special case that $\omega = \omega^z \mathbf{e}_z$. This allows us to employ cylindrical coordinates (r, θ, z) to state that, since $\omega^z(\Sigma/\Sigma_\epsilon)$ is relative to Σ_ϵ , then, regardless of how \in_m may or may not be circulating relative to Σ^d , we are assured that, relative to Σ

$$\mathbf{u}_\theta = -(\omega^z)r. \quad (2.9)$$

By employing Stokes' theorem and $d\mathbf{r} = r d\theta$, we then obtain

$$\oint \mathbf{u} \cdot d\mathbf{r} = -2\pi r^2 \omega^z = -2\mathbf{A} \cdot \omega^z, \quad (2.10)$$

$$= \oint \zeta \cdot d\mathbf{A} = +\mathbf{A} \cdot \zeta^z. \quad (2.11)$$

Thus proving that

$$\frac{1}{2}\zeta^z = -\omega^z, \quad (2.8)$$

is a direct consequence of the 100% coupling of Σ and the \in_m -continuum. Finally, recalling that $\mathbf{D}(\Sigma/\Sigma^d) = \mathbf{D}(\Sigma/\Sigma^d)$, we let $\mathbf{s} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\zeta$ define the c^π -spin equivalence of ζ , and insert (2.8) into (2.7b) to obtain the GAV of Σ in the two equivalent forms:

$$\omega(\Sigma/\Sigma^d) = \mathbf{s}(\in_m/\Sigma^d) + \omega(\Sigma/\Sigma_\epsilon), \quad (2.12)$$

and

$$\omega(c^\pi/\Sigma^d) = \mathbf{s}(c^\pi/\Sigma^d) + \omega(c^\pi/\Sigma_\epsilon), \quad (2.5b)$$

where \mathbf{s} is now presumed to be constant over the 3-volumes of Σ and the c^π particle.

The GRV formula introduced a previously unknown *dual physical basis* for the observable rectilinear velocity of a p particle in a general (*non inertial*) region of the 3-space-energy continuum characterized by $\mathbf{u}(x^i) \neq \mathbf{0}$, and $\in_m \leq {}^0\in_m$. Namely: *Frictionless rectilinear propagation* of a p particle relative to its underlying \in_m -continuum, and, the *local rectilinear convection* of \in_m relative to the superficially undisturbed ${}^0\in_m$ -continuum.

Now, the complementary GAV has introduced a previously unknown *dual physical basis* for the observable angular velocity of a c^π particle in a general (*non inertial*) region of the 3-space-energy continuum characterized by $\mathbf{s}(x^i) \neq \mathbf{0}$, and $\in_m \leq {}^0\in_m$. Namely: The *frictionless angular propagation* of a c^π particle relative to its underlying \in_m -continuum, and, the *local vorticity* of \in_m relative to the superficially undisturbed ${}^0\in_m$ -continuum.

9. On the intrinsic unification of *polar* and *axial* $\mathbf{p}_m(x^i)$ -field and particle properties in the $(1 + 3)$ sector of hyper-energy theory.

The GRV equation puts two distinct field-theoretic concepts on the same mathematical footing: The distinct *rectilinear* field-particle-property, $\mathbf{w}(p)$, and the distinct *polar* field-property, $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{p}_m(x^i)/\in_m$.

Whereas the GAV equation puts two other distinct theoretical concepts on the same mathematical footing: The distinct *angular* field-particle-property, $\omega(c^p)$, and the distinct *axial* field-property, $\zeta(\epsilon_m)$, together with its $\frac{1}{2}$ spin equivalency for c^π particles and, possibly, certain ‘point-like’ particles as well.

10. A second order Rectilinear-Acceleration complement to the GRV equation.

a. *The generalized rectilinear acceleration (GRA).*

Applying the $(\partial/\partial x^0)$ operator to the GRV equation, and defining:

$$\beta_0 = \partial\beta/\partial x^0 = \beta_0(p/\Sigma^d), \quad (2.13a)$$

$$\mathbf{u}_0 = \partial\mathbf{u}/\partial x^0 = \mathbf{u}_0(\epsilon_m/\Sigma^d), \quad (2.13b)$$

$$\mathbf{w}_0 = \partial\mathbf{w}/\partial x^0 = \mathbf{w}_0(p/\Sigma_\epsilon), \quad (2.13c)$$

yields the *generalized rectilinear acceleration* (GRA) equation,

$$\beta_0 = \mathbf{u}_0 + \mathbf{w}_0 \quad (2.14a)$$

of an arbitrary p particle at x^i of Σ^d , stating that

$$\beta_0(p/\Sigma^d) = \mathbf{u}_0(\epsilon_m/\Sigma^d) + \mathbf{w}_0(p/\Sigma_\epsilon). \quad (2.14b)$$

11. Can the *relative manifestation* \mathbf{F} of the *absolute* ϵ_m -field \mathbf{F} in a GFP equation be entirely independent of \mathbf{F} , and due entirely to the *particular propagational state* of Σ defined by the GFP equation?

The answer, yes, which is gainfully employed in Section III, is explained for the \mathbf{u} , \mathbf{s} , and \mathbf{u}_0 fields of the GRV, GAV, and GRA equations by creating *relative forms* of the GFP’s as follows:

a. *The \mathbf{u} field of the relative GRV equation.*

Recalling that $\mathbf{D}(\Sigma/\Sigma^d) = \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{r}/\Sigma^d) = \mathbf{D}(\Sigma/\Sigma^d)$, and rearranging the founding GRV equation to define its *relative form*

$$\mathbf{u}(\epsilon_m(\mathbf{r})/\Sigma) \equiv [\mathbf{u}(\epsilon_m(\mathbf{r})/\Sigma^d) - \beta(\Sigma/\Sigma^d)] = -\mathbf{w}(\Sigma/\Sigma_\epsilon), \quad (2.15)$$

reveals the following four things about the relative ϵ_m velocity field (\mathbf{u}) that can exist in Σ :

- Via the equality of \mathbf{u} and the bracketed middle term of (2.15), \mathbf{u} is mathematically explained, from the perspective of Σ^d , as the flow velocity of ϵ_m *relative to* Σ —which is naturally biased by Σ ’s GRV relative to Σ^d .
- Via the equality of \mathbf{u} and third term of (2.15), \mathbf{u} is mathematically explained as the negative of Σ ’s propagation velocity relative to Σ_ϵ .
- The \mathbf{u} field of the relative GRV equation is, therefore, *totally independent* of the flow velocity of the ϵ_m -continuum, being *entirely dependent*, instead, on the velocity of Σ ’s rectilinear propagation relative to Σ_ϵ .
- If $\beta(\Sigma/\Sigma^d) = 0$, then $\mathbf{u}(\epsilon_m(\mathbf{r})/\Sigma)$ is identical with $\mathbf{u}(\epsilon_m(\mathbf{r})/\Sigma^d)$, as one would expect.

b. *The \mathbf{s} field of the relative GAV equation.*

Rewriting the GAV equation to define

$$\mathbf{s}(\epsilon_m(\mathbf{Q})/\Sigma) \equiv [\mathbf{s}(\epsilon_m(\mathbf{Q})/\Sigma^d) - \omega(\Sigma/\Sigma^d)] = -\mathbf{q}(\Sigma/\Sigma_\epsilon), \quad (2.16)$$

reveals the following three similar things about the $\frac{1}{2}$ -vorticity field ($\underline{\mathbf{s}}$) that can exist in $\underline{\Sigma}$:

- Via the equality of $\underline{\mathbf{s}}$ and the second term (middle) of (2.16), $\underline{\mathbf{s}}$ is mathematically explained, from the perspective of Σ^d , as the $\frac{1}{2}$ -vorticity of ϵ_m *relative to* $\underline{\Sigma}$ —which is naturally biased by $\underline{\Sigma}$'s GAV relative to Σ^d .
- Via the equality of $\underline{\mathbf{s}}$ and third term of (2.16), $\underline{\mathbf{s}}$ is mathematically explained as the negative of $\underline{\Sigma}$'s angular propagation velocity relative to Σ_ϵ .
- The $\underline{\mathbf{s}}$ field of the relative GAV equation is, therefore, *totally independent* of the vorticity of the ϵ_m -continuum, being *entirely dependent*, instead, on the velocity of $\underline{\Sigma}$'s angular propagation relative to Σ_ϵ .
- If $\underline{\omega}(\underline{\Sigma}/\Sigma^d) = \mathbf{0}$, then $\underline{\mathbf{s}}(\epsilon_m(\underline{\mathbf{O}})/\underline{\Sigma})$ is identical with $\mathbf{s}(\epsilon_m(\underline{\mathbf{O}})/\Sigma^d)$, as one would expect.

c. The $\underline{\mathbf{u}}_0$ field of the relative GRA equation.

Likewise, rearranging the GRA equation to define the relative GRA equation

$$\underline{\mathbf{u}}_0(\epsilon_m(\underline{\mathbf{r}})/\underline{\Sigma}) = [\mathbf{u}_0(\epsilon_m(\underline{\mathbf{r}})/\Sigma^d) - \underline{\beta}_0(\underline{\Sigma}/\Sigma^d)] = -\underline{\mathbf{w}}_0(\underline{\Sigma}/\Sigma_\epsilon), \quad (2.17)$$

reveals the following three things about the ϵ_m acceleration field ($\underline{\mathbf{u}}_0$) that can exist in $\underline{\Sigma}$:

- Via the equality of $\underline{\mathbf{u}}_0$ and the second (middle) term of (2.17), $\underline{\mathbf{u}}_0$ is mathematically explained, from the perspective of Σ^d , as the explicit acceleration of ϵ_m *relative to* $\underline{\Sigma}$ —which is naturally biased by $\underline{\Sigma}$'s GRA relative to Σ^d .
- Via the equality of $\underline{\mathbf{u}}_0$ and third term of (2.17), $\underline{\mathbf{u}}_0$ is mathematically explained as the negative of $\underline{\Sigma}$'s propagational acceleration relative to Σ_ϵ .
- The $\underline{\mathbf{u}}_0$ field of the relative GAV equation is, therefore, *totally independent* of the explicit acceleration of the ϵ_m -continuum, being *entirely dependent*, instead, on the explicit acceleration of $\underline{\Sigma}$'s rectilinear propagation relative to Σ_ϵ .
- If $\underline{\beta}_0(\underline{\Sigma}/\Sigma^d) = \mathbf{0}$, then $\underline{\mathbf{u}}_0(\epsilon_m(\underline{\mathbf{r}})/\underline{\Sigma})$ is identical with $\mathbf{u}_0(\epsilon_m(\underline{\mathbf{r}})/\Sigma^d)$, as one would expect.

d. On the intrinsic *un*-observability of a constant $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ field, and the intrinsic *observability* of the $\underline{\mathbf{s}}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{u}}_0$ fields, and thus, the field $\underline{\mathbf{g}} = \nabla(\frac{1}{2}\underline{\mathbf{u}}^2)$ covering Newtonian gravity.

In Section III.B, we begin the derivation of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory by deducing that a $\underline{\mathbf{p}}_m(\underline{\mathbf{x}}^i)$ field must be un-observable, and by raising this conclusion to the level of an axiom, called the Null- $\underline{\mathbf{p}}$ Axiom, which states that the non-zero physical state described by $\underline{\mathbf{p}}_m(\underline{\mathbf{x}}^i) \neq \mathbf{0}$ in $\underline{\Sigma}$ must be consistent with the null physical state described by $\underline{\mathbf{p}}_m(\underline{\mathbf{x}}^i) = \mathbf{0}$ in $\underline{\Sigma}$. The Null- $\underline{\mathbf{p}}$ Axiom and GRV formula are then consistently employed to derive the full $\underline{\mathbf{w}}^d$ structure of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory, which is shown to cover special relativity theory in the special ($\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$) limit of the γ -coupling domain.

Then in Section III.N, as useful practical prelude to EM gravity, we delineate a 3-vector theory of Maxwellian gravity which allows us to derive experimentally confirmed scale factors for the *proper* (in situ) measurements of the ϵ_m -fields $\underline{\mathbf{s}}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{u}}_0$, which (measurements) are routinely made today with the so-called *inertial sensors* of the many and various inertial navigation systems that are in use today. This conveniently provides the opportunity to deduce two things via \mathbf{w} -gauge theory that are readily confirmed by EM gravity. Namely: Maxwellian matter-gravity—covering Newtonian matter-gravity—is the $\underline{\mathbf{p}}_m$ field, $\underline{\mathbf{g}} = \nabla(\frac{1}{2}\underline{\mathbf{u}}^2)$. And the singularity in general relativity theory corresponding to a gravitational black hole is the thermodynamic Mach-one condition in hyper-energy theory wherein the flow velocity of ϵ_m equals the local velocity of light.

III. GFT1: A \mathbf{w} -Gauge Theory of ϵ_m -Field-Particle Coupling.

A. Three distinct environments of ϵ_m -field-particle coupling which remove an intrinsic three-fold degeneracy of propagation velocity.

Given that \mathbf{w} is a natural parameter for quantifying propagational deformations of $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ particles and structures, and that the founding GRV formula give $\mathbf{w} = (\beta - \mathbf{u})$ with a three fold degeneracy; it is useful to precede the derivation of the ($\ell = 1/[1 - \mathbf{w}^2]^{1/2}$ proportional) $\underline{\mathbf{w}}d^1$ of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory with brief descriptions of three distinct ϵ_m -particle coupling environments which remove the triple degeneracy of $\ell(\mathbf{w}^2)$ and which warrant unique notations for the propagational coupling strengths in each of those specific environments. The specific ϵ_m -particle coupling environments which remove the triple degeneracy of $\mathbf{w} = (\beta - \mathbf{u})$ are

Respectively characterized by:	With:	Defining a domain of:	With degenerate coupling strength:
$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$. Whence $\mathbf{w} = \beta$.	$\epsilon_m = {}^0\epsilon_m$.	${}^0\epsilon_m$ γ -coupling	$\ell[(\mathbf{w} = \beta)^2] \equiv \gamma(\beta^2)$
$\beta = \mathbf{0}$. Whence $\mathbf{w} = -\mathbf{u}$.	$\epsilon_m \leq {}^0\epsilon_m$.	ϵ_m Γ -coupling	$\ell[(\mathbf{w} = -\mathbf{u})^2] \equiv \Gamma(\mathbf{u}^2)$
$\beta = \mathbf{u}$. Whence $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{0}$.	$\epsilon_m \leq {}^0\epsilon_m$.	ϵ_m null-coupling	$\ell(0) = 1 \equiv \text{Free Fall}$

These special environments of ϵ_m -particle coupling are conveniently referred to hereafter as the degenerate (γ , Γ , and null)-coupling environments of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory, with ℓ -coupling representing the most general expression of the coupling. Some specific attributes and notations unique to each of these ϵ_m -particle coupling environments are describe as follows.

1. Analytic attributes and notations unique to the γ -coupling environment of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory.

With the additional qualification that $s^0 = 0$, the γ -coupling environment of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory covers what 20th century science referred to as *inertial space*, and it provides the most convenient coupling environment for deriving the $\underline{\mathbf{w}}d^1$ of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory because it allows the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -particle coupling to be described and thus viewed from the two complementary perspectives of

Σ : Where $\mathbf{w}(p) = \beta(p)$, and $\underline{\mathbf{w}}(\underline{\Sigma}) = \underline{\beta}$, parameterize, respectively, the coupling strengths $\ell = \gamma$ and $\underline{\ell} = \underline{\gamma}$ of an arbitrary p^π particle and of $\underline{\Sigma}$ (or any $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ structure that is either stationary in or co-propagating with $\underline{\Sigma}$).

$\underline{\Sigma}$: Where the same p^π particle is propagating in a constant $\underline{\mathbf{p}}_m$ field, $\underline{\mathbf{u}} = -\underline{\mathbf{w}}$, with rectilinear velocity, $\underline{\beta} = \underline{\mathbf{w}} + \underline{\mathbf{u}}$, and a coupling strength $\underline{\ell}$ that has only two degenerate values. Namely, $\underline{\ell} \rightarrow \underline{\Gamma}$ for $\underline{\beta} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$, and $\underline{\ell} \rightarrow 1$ for $\underline{\mathbf{w}} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$.

a. The special Galilean invariance of $w(p)$ and $\ell(p)$.

In the γ -coupling environment we have $\beta = \mathbf{w} = [\underline{\beta} + \underline{\beta}] = [\underline{\mathbf{w}} + (\underline{\mathbf{w}} + \underline{\mathbf{u}})] = \underline{\mathbf{w}}$, and $\underline{\ell} = \ell$. Hence, in a ($u = 0$)-environment both the *propagation velocity* and the *coupling strength* of a particle are invariant under a Galilean transformation of *un-deformed* (1 + 3) coordinates linking $\underline{\Sigma}$ to Σ . Also, since $\underline{\mathbf{u}} = -\underline{\beta} = -\underline{\mathbf{w}}$, it follows that $\underline{\Gamma}(\underline{\mathbf{u}}^2) = \underline{\ell}(\underline{\mathbf{w}}^2) = \underline{\gamma}(\beta^2)$ are three equivalent expressions of the propagation coupling strength of $\underline{\Sigma}$ and any co-moving $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ particles or structures. These special ($u = 0$) invariants and equalities constitute useful supplements the Galilean coordinate relations of (2.4).

2. Attributes and notations unique to the Γ -coupling environment of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory.

Let a p^π particle be at rest at x^α of Σ^d and embedded in a $\mathbf{p}_m(x^i)$ field which is broken out of ${}^0\epsilon_m(x^i)$ by the mass of a distant $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ particle-structure, with $\mathbf{w}(x^i) = -\mathbf{u}(x^i)$ accounting for the *rest status* of the p^π particle in Σ . From the perspective of Σ then, the p^π particle couples to the potential of Maxwellian gravity with a strength $\ell(\mathbf{w}^2) \equiv \Gamma(\mathbf{u}^2)$, where $\mathbf{u}(x^i) = \mathbf{p}_m(x^i)/\epsilon_m(x^i)$.

3. Attributes and notations unique to the null-coupling environment of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory.

A p^π particle which is embedded in the velocity field $\mathbf{u}(x^i)$ of $\epsilon_m \leq {}^0\epsilon_m$ at x^α of Σ^d can be moving entirely with the flow of ϵ_m . A state which is characterized by $\beta = \mathbf{u}$ and thus by $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{0}$. From the perspective of Σ then, the propagational coupling strength of a p^π particle moving with the flow is unity because it is not propagating. It is simply being carried along with the flow of ϵ_m —in a state of propagational free fall.

B. On the un-observability of a constant \mathbf{p}_m field via $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ particle interactions in $\underline{\Sigma}$, and its gauge-field and symmetry implications.

From the perspective of Σ and Newtonian mechanics, $\underline{\Sigma}$'s total energy, \mathbf{E} , is just the sum of its internal energy \mathbf{E}_{in} and its kinetic energy \mathbf{KE} . The propagational state of $\underline{\Sigma}$ is then further quantified by the statement that $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}_{in} + \mathbf{KE} = \text{constant}$. In addition, the measurement of a physical quantity (Q) requires that a certain amount of *Q-proportional measurement energy* be transferred to the Q-meter. Consequently, if a physical operation or process in $\underline{\Sigma}$ could produce a measure of \mathbf{p}_m , the \mathbf{p}_m -proportional increase of \mathbf{E}_{in} would have to be at the expense of a corresponding decrease of $\underline{\Sigma}$'s \mathbf{KE} , in accordance with the formula:

$$d(\mathbf{E}_{in}) = -d(\mathbf{KE}) = -d(\mathbf{P}^2)/2\mathbf{M} = -\mathbf{V} \cdot d\mathbf{P}. \quad (3.1)$$

1. The Null- \mathbf{p}_m Axiom.

From the preceding considerations of first principles, it follows that the possibility of employing $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ particle interactions in $\underline{\Sigma}$ to measure a constant \mathbf{p}_m field must be excluded on the grounds that such a measurement would violate the well established conservation laws of $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ energy and momentum. But Maxwell's gravity theorem guarantees that virtually every inertial system of reference is embedded in a constant \mathbf{p}_m field. Thus, in order for Maxwell's gravity theorem to be preserved along with the conservation laws of $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ energy and momentum, we are led to conclude that:

The physical state described by a constant $\mathbf{p}_m(\mathbf{x}^i) \neq \mathbf{0}$ in $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ must be fully consistent with the null physical state in $\underline{\Sigma}$ described by $\mathbf{p}_m(\mathbf{x}^i) = \mathbf{0}$.

I raise this conclusion to the level of an axiom, called the *Null- \mathbf{p}_m Axiom* (NPA), and note that the NPA has the following two corollaries:

NPA-Corollary One (NPA-C1)

A \mathbf{p}_m field is a fundamental gauge field whose various influences on the properties and physics of $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ particle in $\underline{\Sigma}$ constitute new laws of $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ particle physics which are valid in every inertial reference frame.

NPA-Corollary Two (NPA-C2)

Insofar as the laws $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ particles and fields are concerned, the physical space of every $\underline{\Sigma}$ is indistinguishable from the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum of Σ .

2. The inherent equivalence of the Null- \mathbf{p}_m Axiom and the two postulates of SRT.

The first postulate of SRT⁶ can be interpreted as stating that:

The physical laws describing the interactions of (particles and fields) with (particles and fields) are the same in all inertial systems of reference.

And the second postulate of SRT⁷ can be interpreted as stating that:

With respect to any inertial reference system, electromagnetic radiation propagates with the same speed c irrespective of both the relative direction of the propagation and the relative velocity of the source of the radiation.

Since NPA–C2 holds that the laws of $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ particle physics can not distinguish the physical space of $\underline{\Sigma}^\ell$ from the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum of Σ^ℓ , and $\underline{\Sigma}^\ell$ is an arbitrary inertial system of reference, it follows that the Null- \mathbf{p}_m Axiom covers the two postulates of SRT.

3. A useful consequence of NPA–C2.

NPA–C2 gives rise to the following working prediction of hyper-energy theory:

Starting with the \underline{w}^d of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory, the *dynamical content* of every classical and quantum law of $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ particle physics can be looked upon anew; as being referenced to the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum, in order to ascertain the new and collectively unifying physical significances that the laws of $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ particle physics have for the formal structure of hyper-energy theory.

4. GFT1 as a pragmatic prerequisite to, but innate complement of, GFT2.

The derivation of GFT1 is driven by the explicit gauge-field character of the Null- \mathbf{p}_m Axiom stated by NPA–Corollary One. In Section IV, however, Einstein-Maxwell gravity is derived independently of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory *per se* by employing

- a) Eqs. (2.1–3),
- b) The lightspeed 3-scalar, s_3 , and,
- c) The invariance of Maxwell’s equations implied by NPA–C2,

to give the (1 + 3)-dimensional tensor calculus^a a far greater reach and descriptive power—fully commensurate with Maxwell’s gravity theorem. EM gravity will thus be seen to have an extraordinary efficacy due to the synergism of two factors:

- The revolutionary physical content of Eqs. (2.1–3).
- The much wider range of dynamics and symmetries which the expanded (1 + 3)-dimensional scalar source of EM gravity, $ds = dx^0/\ell$, makes available—covering $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ particles and fields, and, the flow dynamics of the ϵ_m -continuum, and defining a fundamental tensor, $g_{ik}(u^\alpha)$, which represents a (1 + 3)-dimensional gauge-field prototype of Kaluza’s (1 + 4)-dimensional gravitational-electromagnetic tensor.

It will thus become clear that EM gravity contains GFT1—but only implicitly. Hence the problem with by-passing GFT1 and proceeding directly to Section IV is that one would then be immediately

^a That was precipitated from the static $(0 + p)$ -dimensional tensor calculus by special relativity theory.

faced with no less than ten different physical ways that the coupling strength $\ell = 1/[1 - \mathbf{w}^2]^{1/2}$ is readily precipitated by the tensor mathematics (five for $\mathbf{w} \rightarrow \beta$ and five for $\mathbf{w} \rightarrow -\mathbf{u}$)—with no *a priori* understanding of the physical reasons for these different manifestations of ℓ or their relative ascendancy. The effort which would then have to be expended to unravel all of this, by effectively extracting \mathbf{w} -gauge theory from EM gravity, would severely impede the mathematical exploitation and appreciation of EM gravity.

For these reasons \mathbf{w} -gauge theory can be regarded as a very pragmatic prerequisite to, but innate complement of, EM gravity—that reveals that the actions of the \mathbf{p}_m field which insure that $\mathbf{p}_m(\underline{x}) = \mathbf{0}$, locally, are the actions of a vector potential of gravity that represents a broken symmetry of time—having scalar and vector components that are mathematically similar to the scalar and vector potentials of Maxwell’s electrodynamics.

a. The general Lorentz transformation that will be precipitated by both \mathbf{w} -gauge theory and EM gravity.

It will be shown in Sections III.(E–I) that the first three \mathbf{w} -deformations of GFT1 provide a full and complete \mathbf{p}_m gauge-field rationale for a general Lorentz transformation linking dx^i and dx^i . And in full support of the comments in Section III.B.2, the general Lorentz transformation will also be precipitated by EM gravity.

Consequently, it is important to know in advance that the general Lorentz transformation derived herein—initially from $\underline{w}d^{1-3}$ —is the general Lorentz transformation that is both indigenous to hyper-energy theory and in full accord with the purpose for which it was originally derived and applied via Poincaré and Lorentz.⁸ A purpose which we now know was undermined simply and solely by the failure on the part of all 19th century theorists to perceive that the temporal component of the Lorentz transformations could be explained in the same causal (γ -proportional) way as the spatial component.⁹ The fact that this failure is fully rectified by the \mathbf{w} -gauge theory component of hyper-energy theory is, therefore, a large part of the reason why GFT1 is such a pragmatic prerequisite to, but innate complement of EM gravity.

b. Historical note.

The above noted failure on the part of all 19th theorists; to even venture the suspicion that propagating clocks might run slow by the γ factor, accounts for the fact that no successful Lorentz invariant theory of the 3-space medium had been proposed prior to 1905. But some early relativity texts got this wrong; stating that such a theory had been proposed prior to 1905—implying, *unsatisfactorily so*. As Rindler apologetically noted: “I must hasten to include myself among the contributors to this myth,^{10,11} and regret to have to include in the same category my revered friend Professor Peter Bergmann whose 1942 book¹² has educated many relativists.”

Historical accidents of this kind have helped to establish a false belief that all possible alternatives to special relativity theory have been exhausted, and that special relativity theory is therefore wholly unique and unassailable.

C. The four generators of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory.

The Null- \mathbf{p}_m Axiom and the GRV equation must be preserved by the laws of $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ particle physics. In this sense the Null- \mathbf{p}_m Axiom and the GRV equation constitute two generators; (G1) and (G2), of a

gauge-field structure of $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ particle physics that will be consistent with Maxwell's gravity theorem. The need to also preserve Maxwell's *electrodynamic* field laws (G3) and Newton's *momentum conservation* laws (G4) defines two additional generators of the gauge-field structure of $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ particle physics which are to be delineated by **w**-gauge theory.

Hence, G1–4 will now be employed—in the γ -coupling environment—to derive a set of five \mathbf{p}_m -particle coupling deformations ($\underline{\underline{wd}}^i$) which are slaved to a single coupling strength ($\underline{\ell}$) and which therefore act *conjointly* to preserve G1–4 and to define **w**-gauge theory.

D. Outline of $\underline{\underline{wd}}^i$ derivations.

1. $\underline{\underline{wd}}^1$: The fundamental **w**-compression of 'rigid' $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ 3-volumes.

The inhomogeneous wave equation of G3 is solved to obtain the soliton-like electromagnetic potentials ($\phi, \mathbf{A}^* = c\mathbf{A}$) which physically envelop and co-propagate with a given electric charge situated at the origin of $\underline{\Sigma}$ and $\underline{\Sigma}$. Such fields are shown to contain an asymmetry in the direction of $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ which would violate the Null- \mathbf{p}_m Axiom if it could be observed in $\underline{\Sigma}$. It is then shown that the $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ -asymmetry will be rendered un-measurable in $\underline{\Sigma}$ if the otherwise 'rigid' 3-volume ($\underline{\mathbf{V}}$) of any $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ structure is propagationally compressed along the direction of $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$, by the factor $\underline{\Gamma}^{-1}$. This $\underline{\underline{wd}}^1$ component of **w**-gauge theory is subsequently identified as the spatial component of a general Lorentz transformation—but it is pictorially defined for this outline by $\underline{\underline{wd}}^1 = V^0/V_{\parallel} = \ell$, where V^0 is rest 3-volume of a give $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ structure, and V_{\parallel} denotes that only the dimensions parallel to **w** suffer this compressional deformation.^a

a. On the independent status of $\underline{\underline{wd}}^1$.

By virtue of the way that it is derived, $\underline{\underline{wd}}^1$ must be regarded as being both a *fundamental* and a totally *independent* component of the ϵ_m -field-particle coupling physics that is covered by **w**-gauge theory. This fundamental nature of $\underline{\underline{wd}}^1$ is qualitatively explained in Section IX where $\underline{\underline{wd}}^1$ is shown to be mathematically analogous to the 'solid-mass-energy'–'fluid-mass-energy' coupling physics which initially prohibited *faster than sound* air travel in the mid 20th century—until it was theoretically understood that the linear physics of *soundspeed* and the nonlinear physics of *shockwaves* are inextricably tied to a *fundamental intensive property* of the medium, called *compressibility*.

2. $\underline{\underline{wd}}^2$: The dependent **w**-reduction of $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ oscillation frequencies.

It is first shown that the GRV of electromagnetic radiation in $\underline{\Sigma}$ causes the frequency ($\underline{\mathbf{f}}$) of an *optical-oscillator* ($\underline{\mathbf{S}}$) to be reduced by an orientation dependent factor ranging from $f^0/\underline{\ell}$ to $f^0/\underline{\ell}^2$ as the orientation of $\underline{\mathbf{S}}$ (relative to the $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ field in $\underline{\Sigma}$) changes from perpendicular to parallel. And it then shown that the application of $\underline{\underline{wd}}^1$ removes this orientation sensitivity, completely—causing $\underline{\mathbf{S}}$ to have a frequency, $\underline{\mathbf{f}} = f^0/\underline{\ell}$, which is independent of its orientation relative to $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$.

It is then asserted that the frequency of every $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ oscillator must be reduced by the same $1/\underline{\ell}$ factor in order to preserve the Null- \mathbf{p}_m Axiom. The $\underline{\underline{wd}}^2$ component of **w**-gauge theory is then defined by the requirement that $\underline{\underline{wd}}^2 \equiv f^0/f = \underline{\ell} = \ell$ applies to any $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ oscillator. This **w**-deformation is also defined by the equivalent requirement that $\underline{\underline{wd}}^2 = T/T^0 = \ell$ where T is time period defined by any $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ process.

^a Note that the $\underline{\underline{wd}}^i$'s are generally derived within $\underline{\Sigma}$ and then transformed into Σ parameters via the Galilean relations of (2.4).

a. On the dependent nature of \underline{wd}^2 .

From the way in which it is derived, it will be clear that \underline{wd}^2 must be regarded as being a totally *dependent* component of the ϵ_m -field-particle coupling physics covered by \mathbf{w} -gauge theory. Hence, different components of the \underline{wd}^i sub-group; $\underline{wd}^{1,3-5}$, can then be invoked, as logic dictates, to explain the \underline{wd}^2 deformations associated with different $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ processes involving different $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ particle interaction laws. Two other examples of the dependent nature of \underline{wd}^2 are given via two independent ways that the mass deformation, \underline{wd}^4 , is derived in Sections III.J,K.

3. \underline{wd}^3 : The asimultaneity indigenous to a \mathbf{p}_m field.

By examining the influence in $\underline{\Sigma}$ of \mathbf{u} on the measurement of a $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ particle's GRV via the *time of flight* (TOF) method, we deduce that such measurements would allow the Null- \mathbf{p}_m Axiom to be violated unless the TOF includes, from the perspective of \mathbf{u} ; not just the usual GRS-defined transport time, $d\mathbf{x}^0 = d\mathbf{r}/\beta$, but also an *asimultaneity time*, $\delta\mathbf{x}^0 = \mathbf{u}^2(\mathbf{u} \cdot d\mathbf{r}) = \underline{wd}^3$, which is indigenous to the \mathbf{p}_m field and which gets physically transferred to, or mapped to, a pair of TOF clocks by means of, what appears in $\underline{\Sigma}$ to be, a *geodynamically symmetric synchronization* (GSS) of the clocks.

We then show that the measure of $\{(d\mathbf{x}^0 + \delta\mathbf{x}^0) \equiv D(\mathbf{x}^0)\}$ via the slow running TOF clocks in $\underline{\Sigma}$ —as $\{d\mathbf{x}^0 = D(\mathbf{x}^0)/\Gamma\}$ —represents a generalization of \underline{wd}^2 (from two events at the same point, to two events at different points) which both constitutes and explains *the temporal component of a general Lorentz transformation*. We thus show that taken together, \underline{wd}^{1-3} can be truthfully said to cause the $d\mathbf{x}^i$ of $\underline{\Sigma}$ to be related to the $d\mathbf{x}^i$ of Σ by a general Lorentz transformation. And we then use this result to develop transformations for the γ 's and β 's between Σ , $\underline{\Sigma}$, and \mathbf{u} , which are then gainfully employed to derive \underline{wd}^{4-5} .

4. \underline{wd}^4 : The propagational increase of p^π mass.

Given \underline{wd}^{1-3} and the Null- \mathbf{p}_m Axiom we derive the need for a propagational increase in the mass of a p^π particle in two ways: A rather trivial idealistic way—employing a freely spinning disc. And a more sophisticated practical way—employing a hypothetical experiment designed to generate zero-momentum pairs of p^π particles. Both ways yield \underline{wd}^4 in the form $\underline{wd}^4 = m/m^0 = \ell$. And in support of III.D.2.a, it is noted that \underline{wd}^4 and the conservation law of angular momentum are entirely sufficient to explain the \underline{wd}^2 deformation of the time period defined by one rotation of a freely spinning disc.

5. \underline{wd}^5 : The \mathbf{w} -variation of p^π energy.

Given \underline{wd}^4 , we then derive $\underline{wd}^5 = E/E^0 = mc^2/m^0c^2 = \underline{wd}^4 = \underline{\ell} = \ell$ —and thus $E = mc^2$ —directly from the Newtonian law, $dE = \mathbf{F} \cdot d\mathbf{r}$, for the change in p^π energy (E), where $\mathbf{F} = d\mathbf{p}/dt$ and $\mathbf{p} = mc\beta = m^0c\gamma\beta$.

6. Summary of $\underline{\underline{w}}d^i$'s

In the ways just outlined we will then obtain four \mathbf{w} -deformations of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory:

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{\underline{w}}d^1 &= \underline{\underline{w}}d^2 = \underline{\underline{w}}d^4 = \underline{\underline{w}}d^5 \\ V^0/V_{\parallel} &= f^0/f = mc^2/m^0c^2 = E/E^0 = \ell \equiv 1/[1 - \mathbf{w}^2]^{1/2},\end{aligned}\quad (3.54)$$

arbitrarily referenced to Σ , plus the fundamental *asimultaneity* component

$$\underline{\underline{w}}d^3 \equiv \delta \cdot \underline{\underline{x}}^0 \equiv \cdot \Gamma^2(\cdot \underline{\underline{u}} \cdot \underline{\underline{d}} \cdot \underline{\underline{r}}) \text{ light-seconds}, \quad (3.32d)$$

with $\underline{\underline{w}}d^{1-3}$ causing the $d\underline{\underline{x}}^i$ of $\underline{\underline{\Sigma}}$ to be related to the dx^i of Σ by a general Lorentz transformation.

From Eqs. (3.54) it follows that $E = mc^2$ is a fundamental characteristic of the $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ particle coupling to the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum which leaves the $\cdot \underline{\underline{p}}_m(\cdot \underline{\underline{x}}^i)$ gauge-field in $\cdot \underline{\underline{\Sigma}}$ locally unobservable in $\underline{\underline{\Sigma}}$, and thus, the ϵ_m environment in $\underline{\underline{\Sigma}}$ *empirically isotropic*. Hence, by expanding the laws governing $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ interactions to include the GRV formula and $\underline{\underline{w}}d^{1-5}$, it is easy to understand how they are consistent with Maxwell's gravity theorem, and thus, how every $\underline{\underline{\Sigma}}$ can be empirically equivalent to Σ .

It will thus become clear that \mathbf{w} -gauge theory covers the relativity theory that Einstein derived—nearly 100 years earlier—from his exceedingly advanced *symmetry and simultaneity rooted arguments*. The correctness of which promoted revolutionary advances in theoretical physics—leading, eventually, to the conceptually sophisticated *gauge theory* which allowed the fundamental *symmetry and simultaneity* issues addressed by Einstein (and held to be consistent with ${}^0\epsilon_m = 0$) to be covered by a *fundamental gauge-field theory* consistent with Maxwell's gravity theorem (and hence with ${}^0\epsilon_m \gg 0$) and thus the very kind of classical field theory and cosmology that Einstein had hoped to uncover with his personal *Maxwellian Program* (see Section IV).

E. The \mathbf{w} -deformation of $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ 3-volume $\equiv \underline{\underline{w}}d^1$.

1. The solitonal electromagnetic fields in Σ and $\cdot \underline{\underline{\Sigma}}$ sourced by a charge Q at $\underline{\underline{Q}}$ of $\underline{\underline{\Sigma}}$.

a. On the newly recognized fundamentality of ϕ_e and \mathbf{A}^* , and completeness of $G3$.

By the middle of the 20th century, it had become apparent that Maxwell's theory of electrodynamics was not altered in any fundamental way by relativity theory. Consequently it became clear that the descriptions of classical radiation theory—most of which were derived before 1905—possessed a much more general validity than could have been originally supposed. Revealing that:

“All the detailed calculations of fields from moving charges made on the assumption that there is one frame in which the wave equation is correct are equivalent to those resulting from a covariant formulation of electrodynamics if we thus re-interpret the velocity.”^{13,a}

And by 1964 it had also become apparent that the pair of intrinsically unobservable electromagnetic fields, ϕ_e and $\mathbf{A}^* = c\mathbf{A} = \beta\phi_e$, associated with the existence and the propagation velocity of electric charge, are more fundamental than the measurable \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{B} fields representing various time and 3-space

^a Via \mathbf{w} -gauge theory it will be seen that the same thing is true of *all* the $(1 + 3)$ laws of fields and particles: They are all valid with respect to Σ , if we simply reinterpret a particle's velocity as its generalized rectilinear velocity $\beta = (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{w})$, and include in the those laws the empirically confirmable gauge-deformations of \mathbf{w} being here derived.

derivatives of φ_e and \mathbf{A}^* .¹⁴ The fields φ_e and \mathbf{A}^* are conveniently packaged here in $(1 + 3)$ notation as $\varphi_e^i(x^i) = (\varphi_e, \mathbf{A}^*) = \varphi_e(x^i)(1, \underline{\beta}) \equiv \varphi_e \underline{\beta}^i$.^a

b. The wave equation governing the 3-dimensional distributions of φ_e and \mathbf{A}^ in ${}^0\mathcal{E}_m$.*

We begin the derivations of the $\underline{\omega}^i$ by deriving, from the perspectives of both Σ and ${}'\Sigma$, the 3-dimensional distributions of the fundamental soliton-like ψ^i fields that envelop a small volume of electric charge $Q = \int \rho dV$ at the origin \underline{O} of $\underline{\Sigma}$. The ψ^i fields are then sourced by the presence of Q and by the $\underline{\omega} = \underline{\beta}$ of Q in accordance with the following inhomogeneous wave equation of G3:

$$\square \psi^i \equiv [\partial^2/\partial x^2 + \partial^2/\partial y^2 + \partial^2/\partial z^2 - \partial^2/(\partial x^0)^2] \psi^i = -\rho \underline{\beta}^i(x, y, z)/\epsilon_0, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\underline{\beta}^i = (1, \underline{\beta})$, and the x^α have been expanded into the set of Cartesian coordinates x, y , and z , for descriptive convenience.

c. Simplified formulas which exploit the constancy of $\underline{\beta}^i$.

In view of the constancy of $\underline{\beta}^i$, $\square \psi^i = \square(\varphi_e \underline{\beta}^i) = \underline{\beta}^i \square \varphi_e$. Hence Eq. (3.2) is completely equivalent to the simple scalar wave equation

$$\square \varphi_e = -\rho(x, y, z)/\epsilon_0 \quad (3.3)$$

for φ_e only. The solution of which, $\varphi_e(x^i)$, then yields the solution $\mathbf{A}^*(x^i) = \varphi_e(x^i)\underline{\beta}(x^i)$ as well.

d. The inherent axial symmetry of ψ^i and ${}'\psi^i$.

With no loss of generality, $\underline{\beta}$ is defined to be along the co-aligned positive z -axes of Σ , $\underline{\Sigma}$ and ${}'\Sigma$. And since $\underline{\beta} = \underline{\beta} \mathbf{e}_z$ is constant with time, we can predict that φ_e , when explicitly referenced to ${}'\Sigma$, as ${}'\varphi_e$, will be a temporally-constant, axially-symmetric, soliton-like structure that envelops and co-propagates with Q . It follows that any $\partial \varphi_e / \partial x^0$ relative to a fixed point in Σ must be due entirely the constant $\underline{\omega}$ of Q and/or of ${}'\varphi_e$. The formula describing this $\underline{\omega}$ -induced time rate of change is derived as follows:

e. The explicit time-rate-of-change of $\varphi_e(x^i)$ due entirely to $\underline{\omega}(Q)$.

Equations (3.2) subsume the continuity equation $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A}^* + \partial \varphi_e / \partial x^0 = 0$. And $\mathbf{A}^* = \underline{\beta} \varphi_e$. Therefore, by inserting the latter equality into the former equality, and using $\underline{\beta}(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A}^*) = (\underline{\beta} \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{A}^*$, we obtain

$$(\underline{\beta} \cdot \nabla + \partial / \partial x^0) \varphi_e = 0, \quad (3.4)$$

as a special form of the continuity equation consistent with a constant $\underline{\beta}$ and $\mathbf{A}^* = \underline{\beta} \varphi_e$. The explicit time rate of change of φ_e referenced to Σ is then given by

$$\partial \varphi_e / \partial x^0 = -(\underline{\beta} \cdot \nabla) \varphi_e(x^\alpha) = -\underline{\beta} \partial \varphi_e / \partial z. \quad (3.5)$$

f. The resulting wave equation for φ_e in Σ .

Using Eq. (3.5) to eliminate $\partial \varphi_e / \partial x^0$ in Eq. (3.3) then yields

$$[\partial^2/\partial x^2 + \partial^2/\partial y^2 + (1 - \underline{\beta}^2) \partial^2/\partial z^2] \varphi_e = -\rho(x, y, z)/\epsilon_0, \quad (3.6)$$

referenced to Σ .

^a A $(1 + 3)$ notation is used throughout (instead of the traditional $(3 + 1)$ notation) because it facilitates a smoother transition to the $(1 + p)$ -dimensional notation appropriate for hyper-energy theory.

g. The complementary $\varphi_e(x^i)$ and $\varphi_e(\underline{x}^i)$ solutions of (3.6a).

The solution of (3.6a) will yield the scalar electromagnetic potential $\varphi_e(x^0, \mathbf{r})$ that arrives at a given fixed point (\mathbf{r}) in Σ at the instant (x^0) that the charge Q , propagating with velocity $\underline{\beta}$, arrives at the point $\underline{\mathbf{r}} = \underline{\beta}x^0$ in Σ . These two events in Σ will therefore be simultaneous in Σ with a spatial separation, $\underline{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{r} - \underline{\beta}x^0$, that changes with time in accordance with the formula $\underline{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{r} - \underline{\beta}x^0$.

With respect to Σ then, the solution of (3.6a) will have a non steady, time-varying, axially symmetric form, $\varphi_e = \varphi_e(Q, r, \theta, x^0, \underline{\beta})$ that gives rise to a similarly structured and varying vector potential, $\mathbf{A}^* = c\mathbf{A} = \underline{\beta}\varphi_e$, and, their corresponding effects; as observable $\mathbf{E}(x^0)$ and $\mathbf{B}(x^0)$ fields at \mathbf{r} .

But the solution of (3.6a) can also be conveniently expressed with respect to the abstractly co-moving and co-aligned reference system $\underline{\Sigma}$ to provide a steady, non time-varying, axially symmetric description of the potential; as $\varphi_e = \varphi_e(Q, \underline{\mathbf{r}} = \underline{\mathbf{u}}\underline{\mathbf{r}}, \underline{\theta}, \underline{\mathbf{u}})$. Thus, φ_e can be regarded as the solution to the equivalent wave equation

$$[\partial^2/\partial \underline{x}^2 + \partial^2/\partial \underline{y}^2 + (1 - \underline{\mathbf{u}}^2)\partial^2/\partial \underline{z}^2] \varphi_e = -\varrho(\underline{x}, \underline{y}, \underline{z})/\epsilon_0, \quad (3.7)$$

referenced to $\underline{\Sigma}$. Thereby providing an intuitive *in situ* view of how a local \mathbf{p}_m -field couples to and alters the $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ field of electric charge. A view which can be easily transformed into $\varphi_e = \varphi_e(Q, r, \theta, x^0, \underline{\beta})$ by simply setting $\underline{\mathbf{r}} = |\mathbf{r} - \underline{\beta}x^0|$ and $\sin \underline{\theta} = (r \sin \theta)/\underline{\mathbf{r}}$.

Because the $\underline{\Sigma}$ view of $Q^0_{\infty m}$ coupling happens to be entirely consistent with the restricted (constant $\underline{\beta}$) form of the well known Liénard-Wiechert potentials, we will describe the solution of (3.7) first. With due allowance for obvious differences in notation, it has been argued¹⁵ that the solution of (3.7) is the restricted (constant $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$) Liénard-Wiechert potential

$$\varphi_e = \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \int \frac{\varrho(\underline{\mathbf{x}}^\alpha) d\underline{\mathbf{y}}}{\underline{\lambda}} \cong \frac{Q}{4\pi\epsilon_0 \underline{\mathfrak{L}}}, \quad (3.8)$$

where

$$\underline{\lambda} = \{[(\underline{x} - \underline{\mathbf{x}})^2 + (\underline{y} - \underline{\mathbf{y}})^2](1 - \underline{\mathbf{u}}^2) + (\underline{z} - \underline{\mathbf{z}})^2\}^{1/2}, \quad (3.9a)$$

and

$$\underline{\mathfrak{L}} = \{[\underline{x}^2 + \underline{y}^2](1 - \underline{\mathbf{u}}^2) + \underline{z}^2\}^{1/2} \text{ for a point charge approximation,} \quad (3.9b)$$

$$= \underline{\mathbf{r}} [1 - (\underline{\mathbf{u}} \times \underline{\mathbf{u}})^2]^{1/2}, \quad (3.9c)$$

$$= \underline{\mathbf{r}} [1 - \underline{\mathbf{u}}^2 \sin^2 \underline{\theta}]^{1/2}. \quad (3.9d)$$

Equations (3.7) clearly display the *axial symmetry* and the *rectilinear asymmetry* of φ_e and of $\mathbf{A}^* = -\underline{\mathbf{u}}\varphi_e = \mathbf{A}^*$ in relation to the relative \mathbf{p}_m -field, $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$. And because of the constancy of $\underline{\beta}$, this $\underline{\Sigma}$ perception of the solitonal structure of φ_e is wholly un-encumbered by the relations; which otherwise need to be taken into account, between the *present* and *retarded* position and GRV of Q . And transforming to the perspective of Σ in the manner described above gives

$$\varphi_e(Q, r, \theta, x^0, \underline{\beta}) = \frac{Q}{4\pi\epsilon_0 [r^2(1 - \underline{\beta}^2 \sin^2 \theta) + (\underline{\beta}x^0)^2 - 2\mathbf{r} \cdot \underline{\beta}x^0]^{1/2}}. \quad (3.10)$$

The solitonal electric and magnetic fields of φ_e and φ_e are described next.

h. The solitonal electric and magnetic fields of φ_e and $\underline{\varphi}_e$.

For the point charge approximation, and with due allowance for obvious differences in notation, the solitonal electric and magnetic fields of φ_e are given by formulas

$$\mathbf{E}(Q, \mathbf{r}, \theta, x^0, \underline{\beta}) = -\nabla(\varphi_e) - \partial \mathbf{A}^* / \partial x^0 = -(\nabla - \underline{\beta} \cdot \nabla) \varphi_e, \quad (3.11a)$$

$$= \frac{Q(1 - \underline{\beta}^2)}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \frac{(\mathbf{r} - \underline{\beta}x^0)}{[r^2(1 - \underline{\beta}^2 \sin^2 \theta) + (\underline{\beta}x^0)^2 - 2\mathbf{r} \cdot \underline{\beta}x^0]^{3/2}}, \quad (3.11b)$$

$$\mathbf{Bc}(Q, \mathbf{r}, \theta, x^0, \underline{\beta}) = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}^* = -\nabla \times (\varphi_e \mathbf{u}) = Q \mathbf{u} \times \nabla(\varphi_e), \quad (3.11c)$$

$$= \frac{Q(1 - \underline{\beta}^2)}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \frac{\underline{\beta} \times \mathbf{r}}{[r^2(1 - \underline{\beta}^2 \sin^2 \theta) + (\underline{\beta}x^0)^2 - 2\mathbf{r} \cdot \underline{\beta}x^0]^{3/2}} = \underline{\beta} \times \mathbf{E}, \quad (3.11d)$$

while the solitonal electric and magnetic fields of $\underline{\varphi}_e$ are given by better known formulas^{16,17,18}

$$\underline{\mathbf{E}}(Q, \underline{\mathbf{r}}, \underline{\theta}, \underline{\mathbf{u}}) = -\underline{\nabla}(\underline{\varphi}_e) - \partial \underline{\mathbf{A}}^* / \partial \underline{x}^0 = -(\underline{\nabla} + \underline{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \underline{\nabla}) \underline{\varphi}_e, \quad (3.12a)$$

$$= \frac{Q(1 - \underline{\mathbf{u}}^2)}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \frac{\underline{\mathbf{r}}}{\underline{r}^3 [1 - \underline{\mathbf{u}}^2 \sin^2 \underline{\theta}]^{3/2}}, \quad (3.12b)$$

$$\underline{\mathbf{Bc}}(Q, \underline{\mathbf{r}}, \underline{\theta}, \underline{\mathbf{u}}) = \underline{\nabla} \times \underline{\mathbf{A}}^* = -\underline{\nabla} \times (\underline{\varphi}_e \underline{\mathbf{u}}) = Q \underline{\mathbf{u}} \times \underline{\nabla}(\underline{\varphi}_e), \quad (3.12c)$$

$$= \frac{Q(1 - \underline{\mathbf{u}}^2)}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \frac{\underline{\mathbf{r}} \times \underline{\mathbf{u}}}{\underline{r}^3 [1 - \underline{\mathbf{u}}^2 \sin^2 \underline{\theta}]^{3/2}} = \underline{\mathbf{E}} \times \underline{\mathbf{u}}. \quad (3.12d)$$

Because these effects of $Q-\epsilon_m$ coupling have long been empirically confirmed by the successful application of the theory of electromagnetic radiation, there can be no question as to the reality of these solitonal electromagnetic fields, and thus, no question regarding the revelation that the solitonal $\underline{\mathbf{E}}$, and $\underline{\mathbf{B}}$ fields in $\underline{\Sigma}$ may be regarded as being induced and sustained by the interaction of the steady \mathbf{p}_m -field $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ with the steady field of Q .

But these solitonal fields contain first and second order effects of $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ which could, in principle, allow $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ to be measured in $\underline{\Sigma}$, and thus, the Null- \mathbf{p}_m Axiom to be violated via an electro-mechanical $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ -sensor of the Trouton-Noble type. Hence, there is no question about the necessity for a \mathbf{w} -deformation that will cause the *true* solitonal electromagnetic fields of Q —in both Σ and $\underline{\Sigma}$ —to be consistent with an *empirical* Coulomb potential and electric field of Q in $\underline{\Sigma}$ satisfying $\underline{\psi}^i = (\underline{\varphi}_e, \mathbf{0})$, where $\underline{\varphi}_e = Q/(4\pi\epsilon_0 \underline{r})$.

It follows that in order to preserve Maxwell's gravity theorem and the reality of the solitonal $\underline{\psi}^i$, $\underline{\mathbf{E}}$, and $\underline{\mathbf{B}}$ fields which envelop Q as co-propagating disturbances in the ϵ_m -continuum, we need only derive a \mathbf{w} -gauge deformation that would cause $\underline{\varphi}_e = Q/(4\pi\epsilon_0 \underline{r})$ to be empirically consistent with $\underline{\varphi}_e = Q/(4\pi\epsilon_0 \underline{s})$, so that for this experimental situation, in particular, $\underline{\mathbf{u}} \neq \mathbf{0}$ will be consistent with $\underline{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{0}$. The needed \mathbf{w} -deformation, labeled as $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{w}}}$ ¹, is derived as follows.

2. The structure of $\underline{\underline{w}}d^1$.

With due allowances for mere differences in notation, it has been pointed out¹⁹ that the simple change of variables:

$$\underline{x} = \underline{\underline{x}}, \quad (3.13a)$$

$$\underline{y} = \underline{\underline{y}}, \quad (3.13b)$$

$$\underline{z} = \underline{\underline{\Gamma}} \underline{\underline{z}} = \underline{\underline{\Gamma}} (z - \underline{\underline{\beta}}x^0), \quad (3.13c)$$

serves to transform (3.7) into a simple electrostatic Poisson equation,

$$(\partial^2/\partial \underline{x}^2 + \partial^2/\partial \underline{y}^2 + \partial^2/\partial \underline{z}^2) \Phi_e = - \underline{\underline{\Gamma}} \rho(\underline{x}, \underline{y}, \underline{z}/\underline{\underline{\Gamma}})/\epsilon_0, \quad (3.14)$$

of which the solution is the ordinary Coulomb potential

$$\Phi_e(\underline{\underline{r}}) = \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \int \frac{\rho(\underline{\underline{x}}/\underline{\underline{\Gamma}}, \underline{\underline{y}}, \underline{\underline{z}}) d\underline{\underline{V}}(\underline{\underline{x}}/\underline{\underline{\Gamma}}, \underline{\underline{y}}, \underline{\underline{z}})}{|\underline{\underline{r}} - \underline{\underline{r}}'|}, \quad (3.15a)$$

where

$$|\underline{\underline{r}} - \underline{\underline{r}}'| = [(\underline{x} - \underline{\underline{x}})^2 + (\underline{y} - \underline{\underline{y}})^2 + (\underline{z} - \underline{\underline{z}})^2]^{1/2}, \quad (3.15b)$$

which reduces to

$$\Phi_e(\underline{\underline{r}}) = \frac{Q}{4\pi\epsilon_0 \underline{\underline{\Gamma}}} \quad (3.16)$$

for a point-charge approximation, where $\underline{\underline{r}} = [\underline{x}^2 + \underline{y}^2 + \underline{z}^2]^{1/2}$.

From this we conclude that, in order for the Null- $\underline{\underline{p}}_m$ Axiom to be preserved despite the rectilinear asymmetry of the solitonal structure of the electromagnetic field that envelops a uniformly propagating point electric charge, the 3-volume (V) of any $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ structure must suffer a compression solely along the direction of its propagation by the factor $\underline{\underline{V}}_{||}/V^0 = 1/\underline{\underline{\Gamma}} \equiv 1/\underline{\underline{w}}d^1$, thereby causing the 3-dimensional distance coordinates of $\underline{\underline{\Sigma}}$ and $\underline{\underline{\Sigma}}$ to be related by Eqs. (3.13), and the lengths of the corresponding radius vectors in $\underline{\underline{\Sigma}}$ and $\underline{\underline{\Sigma}}$ (and their changes) to be related by the formulas

$$\underline{\underline{r}} = \underline{\underline{\Gamma}} [\underline{\underline{r}}^2 - (\underline{\underline{r}} \times \underline{\underline{u}})^2]^{1/2} \equiv \underline{\underline{\Gamma}} \underline{\underline{r}}. \quad (3.17a)$$

$$d\underline{\underline{r}} = d\underline{\underline{r}}_{||} + d\underline{\underline{r}}_{\perp} = (\underline{\underline{\Gamma}}) d\underline{\underline{r}}_{||} + d\underline{\underline{r}}_{\perp} \equiv (\underline{\underline{\Gamma}}) d\underline{\underline{r}}. \quad (3.17b)$$

$$d\underline{\underline{r}} = \underline{\underline{\Gamma}} [1 - (\underline{\underline{u}} \times \underline{\underline{u}})^2]^{1/2} d\underline{\underline{r}} \equiv \underline{\underline{\Gamma}} d\underline{\underline{r}}, \quad (3.17c)$$

$$= [(\underline{\underline{\Gamma}} d\underline{\underline{r}}_{||})^2 + (d\underline{\underline{r}}_{\perp})^2]^{1/2}. \quad (3.17d)$$

Using the Galilean coordinate relation, $d\underline{\underline{r}} = (d\underline{\underline{r}} - d\underline{\underline{r}})$, in (3.17d) gives

$$d\underline{\underline{r}} = \{[\underline{\underline{\gamma}}(d\underline{\underline{r}}_{||} - d\underline{\underline{r}})]^2 + (d\underline{\underline{r}}_{\perp})^2\}^{1/2}, \quad (3.17e)$$

and hence,

$$d\underline{\underline{r}} = d\underline{\underline{r}}_{||} + d\underline{\underline{r}}_{\perp} = \underline{\underline{\gamma}}(d\underline{\underline{r}}_{||} - d\underline{\underline{r}}) + d\underline{\underline{r}}_{\perp}. \quad (3.17f)$$

Thereby showing that $\underline{\underline{w}}d^1$ can be formally regarded as describing the spatial component of a general Lorentz transformation.

The $\underline{\underline{w}}d^1$ deformation of $\underline{\underline{w}}$ -gauge theory, arbitrarily referenced to Σ for an arbitrary $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ structure, is then conveniently defined as

$$\underline{\underline{w}}d^1 = V^0/V_{||} = \underline{\underline{\ell}} = \ell. \quad (3.18)$$

a. *The implied structure of $\underline{\underline{w}}d^5$.*

Using (3.17a) to eliminate \underline{r} in (3.16), and comparing the result to Eqs. (3.8) reveals that

$$\underline{\underline{w}}_e = \underline{\Gamma} \underline{w}_e, \quad (3.19a)$$

and, equivalently, that

$$\phi_e = \underline{\gamma} \underline{w}_e, \quad (3.19b)$$

$$= \underline{\ell} \underline{w}_e, \text{ most generally.} \quad (3.19c)$$

Since ϕ_e moderates the energy of interacting charges, this result suggests that the interaction energy of charged particles increases nonlinearly with propagation velocity. But this could lead to a violation of the Null- \underline{p}_m Axiom if it did not apply to every conceivable type of particle-interaction energy. Hence, what we have here is a hint of the fifth \mathbf{w} -deformation of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory to be derived in the more general form $\underline{\underline{w}}d^5 = E/E^0 = \underline{\ell}$.

b. *The independent nature of $\underline{\underline{w}}d^1$.*

The way in which $\underline{\underline{w}}d^1$ was derived makes it clear that $\underline{\underline{w}}d^1$ is an isolated effect of the 100% coupling of $^0\epsilon_m$ and its $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ structures, completely independent of the three other \mathbf{w} -deformations.

F. The general asymmetry of particle transport in $\underline{\Sigma}(\underline{x}^i)$.

1. The generalized rectilinear speed (GRS) of an arbitrary $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ particle in $\underline{\Sigma}(\underline{x}^i)$.

Squaring $\underline{\underline{w}} = (\underline{\beta} - \underline{\underline{u}})$, solving for $\underline{\beta} = \underline{\underline{n}} \cdot \underline{\beta}$, and using the fact that $\underline{\underline{w}} = \mathbf{w} = \beta$ (derived in III.A.1.a), yields the following three equivalent expressions;

$$\underline{\beta} = [\underline{\underline{w}}^2 - (\underline{\underline{n}} \times \underline{\underline{u}})^2]^{1/2} + \underline{\underline{n}} \cdot \underline{\underline{u}}, \quad (3.20a)$$

$$= [\beta^2 - (\underline{\underline{n}} \times \underline{\underline{\beta}})^2]^{1/2} - \underline{\underline{n}} \cdot \underline{\underline{\beta}}, \quad (3.20b)$$

$$= \underline{\underline{n}} \cdot \underline{\beta} - \underline{\underline{n}} \cdot \underline{\underline{\beta}}, \quad (3.20c)$$

for the *generalized coordinate speed* (GRS) of an arbitrary particle (p) with propagation velocity $\underline{\underline{w}}$ in $\underline{\Sigma}$, as a function of p's *transport direction* $\underline{\underline{n}}(p)$ and the \underline{p}_m field, $\underline{\underline{u}} = \underline{p}_m / ^0\epsilon_m = -\underline{\underline{w}} = -\underline{\underline{\beta}}$.

a. *Galilean invariant ϵ_m -particle coupling strengths.*

With respect to:

Σ and $\underline{\Sigma}$:

$$\text{The coupling strengths due to } \mathbf{w} \text{ and } \underline{\underline{w}} \text{ are: } \ell(\mathbf{w}^2) = \gamma(\beta^2) = \underline{\ell}(\underline{\underline{w}}^2), \quad (3.21a)$$

$$\underline{\ell}(\underline{\underline{w}}^2) = \underline{\gamma}(\underline{\underline{\beta}}^2) = \underline{\Gamma}(\underline{\underline{u}}^2). \quad (3.21b)$$

Hence, from Eq. (3.21a) it is seen that the coupling strength of a p^π particle is invariant under a Galilean transformation of references systems. The fact that $\underline{\Gamma}$ is conveniently employed for gauge-field derivations should not detract from the fact that the coupling strength of a p^π particle is always expressed, most meaningfully and most generally, by $\ell(\mathbf{w}^2)$ where $\mathbf{w} = (\beta - \underline{\underline{u}})$ has a triple degeneracy which, as is elaborated more fully in Section III.A, causes it to reduce to $\mathbf{w} = \beta$ in the *inertial* 3-space-

energy continuum, to $\mathbf{w} = -\mathbf{u}$ at a fixed x^α of Σ^d where matter-gravity is present, and to $\mathbf{0}$ in absolute ($\beta = \mathbf{u}$) gravitational free fall.

2. The GRS of electromagnetic radiation in $\underline{\Sigma}(\underline{x}^i)$.

The special case in which $\underline{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbf{p})$ refers to the propagation of electromagnetic radiation or p^0 particles in $\underline{\Sigma}(\underline{x}^i)$ is then described by putting $\underline{\mathbf{w}}^2 = (\mathbf{w}^0)^2 = 1$ in Eq. (3.20a), and by adding a zero superscript to the $\underline{\beta}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{n}}$ parameters, to give $\underline{\beta}^0 = \underline{\mathbf{u}} + \underline{\mathbf{w}}^0$, and thus,

$$\underline{\beta}^0 = \underline{\beta}^0(\underline{\mathbf{n}}^0, \underline{\mathbf{u}}) = \underline{\mathbf{n}}^0 \cdot \underline{\mathbf{u}} + [1 - (\underline{\mathbf{n}}^0 \times \underline{\mathbf{u}})^2]^{1/2}. \quad (3.22a)$$

Solving for the particular values of $\underline{\beta}^0$ when $\underline{\beta}^0$ is parallel and perpendicular to $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ gives:

$$(\underline{\beta}^0)_\parallel = 1 + \underline{\mathbf{n}}^0 \cdot \underline{\mathbf{u}}, \quad (3.22b)$$

$$(\underline{\beta}^0)_\perp = (1 - \underline{\mathbf{u}}^2)^{1/2} \equiv 1/\underline{\Gamma}, \quad (3.22c)$$

G. Derivation of $\underline{\mathbf{w}}d^2$ from the \mathbf{w} -sensitivity of an optical oscillator's frequency.

Consider an optical oscillator, \underline{S} , in $\underline{\Sigma}$ whose optical length, frequency, and period referenced to $\underline{\Sigma}$ is $\underline{L} = \underline{\mathbf{n}} \cdot \underline{\mathbf{L}}$, \underline{f} , and $\underline{T} = 1/\underline{f}$. The \underline{T} of \underline{S} is fixed by the sum of the to-and-fro ($\underline{\mathbf{n}}^0$ and $-\underline{\mathbf{n}}^0$) transport times of electromagnetic radiation over \underline{L} . Employing (3.22a), with $\underline{\mathbf{n}}^0(p^0)$ restricted to $\pm \underline{\mathbf{n}}$, yields

$$\underline{T} = [\underline{T}(\underline{\mathbf{n}}, \underline{\mathbf{u}}) + \underline{T}(-\underline{\mathbf{n}}, \underline{\mathbf{u}})] = (2\underline{L}/c) \underline{\Gamma}^2 [1 - (\underline{\mathbf{n}} \times \underline{\mathbf{u}})^2]^{1/2}, \quad (3.23)$$

where $\underline{T}(\underline{\mathbf{n}}, \underline{\mathbf{u}}) = \underline{L}/[c \underline{\beta}^0(\underline{\mathbf{n}}, \underline{\mathbf{u}})]$, and $\underline{\beta}^0(\underline{\mathbf{n}}, \underline{\mathbf{u}})$ is given by Eq. (3.22a).

This shows that, if \underline{L} was a constant unaffected by $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$, the ${}^0_{\in m}p^0$ coupling would cause the frequency of \underline{S} to be reduced in an orientation ($\underline{\mathbf{n}}$) sensitive manner—by a factor ranging from $1/\underline{\Gamma}$ for $\underline{\mathbf{L}}$ perpendicular to $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ (defining \underline{L}_\perp), to $1/\underline{\Gamma}^2$ for $\underline{\mathbf{L}}$ parallel to $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ (defining \underline{L}_\parallel)—which could, in principle, allow $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ to be measured and the Null- $\underline{\mathbf{p}}_m$ Axiom to be violated.

If one didn't know about $\underline{\mathbf{w}}d^1$, this would lead one to conclude that the ${}^0_{\in m}\underline{S}$ coupling must gauge deform the physical geometry of \underline{S} and $\underline{\Sigma}$ in a way that eliminates the orientation sensitivity of \underline{T} described by (3.23). Hence, we now prove that $\underline{\mathbf{w}}d^1$ fulfills this requirement of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory.

From the scalar representation of $\underline{\mathbf{w}}d^1$:

$$\underline{\mathbf{r}} = \underline{\Gamma}[\underline{\mathbf{r}}^2 - (\underline{\mathbf{r}} \times \underline{\mathbf{u}})^2]^{1/2} \equiv \underline{\Gamma} \underline{\mathfrak{f}}, \quad (3.17a)$$

$$= \underline{\Gamma} \underline{\mathbf{r}} [1 - (\underline{\mathbf{n}} \times \underline{\mathbf{u}})^2]^{1/2},$$

it follows that

$$\underline{L} = \underline{L} / \{ \underline{\Gamma} [1 - (\underline{\mathbf{n}} \times \underline{\mathbf{u}})^2]^{1/2} \}, \quad (3.24a)$$

$$= \underline{L}^0 / \{ \underline{\Gamma} [1 - (\underline{\mathbf{n}} \times \underline{\mathbf{u}})^2]^{1/2} \}. \quad (3.24b)$$

And substitution of (3.24b) in (3.23) then yields

$$\underline{T} = \underline{\Gamma} (2\underline{L}^0/c) = \underline{\Gamma} \underline{T} = \underline{\Gamma} T^0, \quad (3.25)$$

or

$$\underline{f} = 1/\underline{T} = \underline{f}/\underline{\Gamma} = f^0/\underline{\Gamma}. \quad (3.26)$$

This shows that ${}^0\epsilon_m\text{-}\underline{S}$ coupling, embracing the \underline{wd}^1 component of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory, causes the frequency of \underline{S} to be reduced in a directionally invariant manner by the factor $1/\underline{\Gamma}$; a fact which, in principle, could still be used to violate the Null- $\underline{\mathbf{p}}_m$ Axiom, and thus, the conservation law of rectilinear $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ -momentum, unless, the frequency and time measures defined by every type of $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ -oscillator suffer the same \mathbf{w} -deformation as \underline{S} .

H. The definition of \underline{wd}^2 .

Generalizing the results described by Eqs. (3.25-6) to an arbitrary $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ oscillator with proper extensive (integer cycle) parameters f^0 and T^0 , we then define \underline{wd}^2 with respect to Σ as

$$\underline{wd}^2 = T/T^0 = f^0/f = \underline{\ell} = \ell. \quad (3.27)$$

1. The dependent nature of \underline{wd}^2 .

From the way in which \underline{wd}^2 was derived, it is clear that this \mathbf{w} -deformation is *a totally dependent consequence of ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -particle coupling*. It follows that the $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ *time-dilation* associated with any given $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ process can always be explained in terms of other—more fundamental— \mathbf{w} -gauge deformations affecting the given $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ process. In Section III.J.1, for instance, the necessity of \underline{wd}^2 is derived simply from the need to conserve angular $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ momentum in the presence of the more fundamental \mathbf{w} -deformation of $\delta\mathcal{E}_m$ mass, \underline{wd}^4 , where $\underline{wd}^4 = m/m_0 = \ell$.

a. On the physical nature of time.

Given \underline{wd}^2 , it follows that the fundamental nature and physics of time is to be found in the physics accounting for the existence of the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum, as the physical solution of Maxwell's 3-space-energy problem. And the next \mathbf{w} -deformation will shed some light on this by allowing us to conclude that the $\mathbf{p}_m(x^i)$ field, in addition functioning as a 3-vector potential of matter gravity, is also—and perhaps more fundamentally—a broken symmetry of a $(1+p)$ -dimensional *time field*, $\mathbf{p}(x^a)$ which characterizes the compactified ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum by the vanishing of its 3-space components therein—something which is graphically illustrated in Figs. II–IV of Sections VII and VIII.

I. \underline{wd}^3 : The asimultaneity indigenous to a $\underline{\mathbf{p}}_m$ field.

1. A geodynamically symmetric synchronization (GSS).

In Σ , a geometrodynamically symmetric synchronization (GSS) results when two synchronization signals—sent out simultaneously from the midpoint of two clocks at time x^0 , with equal and opposite transport velocities, β_s —cause the times displayed by their respective target clocks to be reset (upon their respective impacts) to the same time—typically $[x^0 + dr/(2\beta_s)]$ light seconds, for a clock separation of dr .

A GSS (or its equivalent) fulfills the important practical need of replacing the generally unknown phase difference between two otherwise identical clocks with a phase difference that is known to be zero (or some other number which can be mathematically eliminated from the measured difference in time). And this must be equally true in the effectively isotropic environment of $\underline{\Sigma}$ as well.

However, on the basis of the \underline{wd}^{1-2} derivations and the perspective of $\underline{\Sigma}$, it is reasonable to expect that a GSS in $\underline{\Sigma}$ will cause the clock times in $\underline{\Sigma}$ to actually differ by a specific, $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ and $d\underline{\mathbf{r}}$ dependent amount, $(\delta\underline{x}^0, \text{ say})$ which can be said to quantify, from the perspective of $\underline{\Sigma}$, a differential amount of

asimultaneity between the two clock readings. But in accordance with the Null- \mathbf{p}_m Axiom, $\delta \underline{x}^0$ must be rendered unobservable in $\underline{\Sigma}$ by the laws of $\delta \mathcal{L}_m$ particle physics.

The purpose of this section is then twofold: Formulate $\delta \underline{x}^0$ mathematically, and then show how $\delta \underline{x}^0$, as \underline{wd}^3 , causes the laws of $\delta \mathcal{L}_m$ particle physics to be further modified consistent with \underline{wd}^{1-2} .

2. Derivation of \underline{wd}^3

From the perspective of $\underline{\Sigma}$, let a stationary *downstream clock*, C_d , and a stationary *upstream clock*, C_u , be separated by a vector-distance, $d \underline{r}$, that arbitrarily points from C_u to C_d in the \underline{p}_m field, \underline{u} , making $\underline{u} \cdot d \underline{r} > 0$. And let electromagnetic radiation furnish the synchronization signals which travel in the opposite directions \underline{n}_d^0 and $\underline{n}_u^0 = -\underline{n}_d^0$. Since C_d will be reset first, the time of C_d will be advanced relative to that of C_u by an amount, $\delta \underline{x}^0$, which is calculated via (3.22a) as

$$\delta \underline{x}^0 \equiv [\underline{x}^0(C_d) - \underline{x}^0(C_u)] = \frac{1}{2} [d \underline{r} \wedge \underline{\beta}_u^0 - d \underline{r} \wedge \underline{\beta}_d^0], \quad (3.28a)$$

$$= \underline{\Gamma}^2 (\underline{u} \cdot \underline{n}_d^0) d \underline{r} = \underline{\Gamma}^2 (\underline{u} \cdot d \underline{r}) \equiv \underline{wd}^3. \quad (3.28b)$$

From the perspective of $\underline{\Sigma}$ then, \underline{wd}^3 is a difference in time (or *asimultaneity*) that gets mapped to two neighboring clocks—independently of \underline{wd}^{1-2} —via a GSS in $\underline{\Sigma}$ employing electromagnetic radiation as the sync signal. But the Null- \mathbf{p}_m Axiom could be violated, in principle, if a different value or function for $\delta \underline{x}^0$ were to result from the use of any other kind of $\delta \mathcal{L}_m$ particle or field as the sync signal in a GSS. Hence it follows that (3.28b) must be independent of which $\delta \mathcal{L}_m$ particles or fields are employed as the synchronization signals in a GSS.

Conversely, one can gain a lot of information about the way that a given type of $\delta \mathcal{L}$ -mass-energy flows—in the presence of a \underline{p}_m field—by insisting that it flows in a way that would yield \underline{wd}^3 if it were employed as the sync signal in a GSS. As the consequences of \underline{wd}^3 (addressed next) will demonstrate, this is equivalent to simply insisting that all types of $\delta \mathcal{L}_m$ -mass-energy flow in a Lorentz covariant manner.

3. Consequences of \underline{wd}^3

From the perspective of $\underline{\Sigma}$, it follows that the GRS defined transport time, $d \underline{x}^0 = d \underline{r} \wedge \underline{\beta}$, of a given $\delta \mathcal{L}_m$ particle in $\underline{\Sigma}$ must be augmented by the corresponding *asimultaneity*, $\delta \underline{x}^0$, in order to express the *total transport time*

$$D(\underline{x}^0) \equiv (d \underline{x}^0 + \delta \underline{x}^0), \quad (3.29)$$

that two stationary, synchronized, clocks in $\underline{\Sigma}$ would measure, in compliance with \underline{wd}^2 , as the smaller time interval,

$$d \underline{x}^0 = D(\underline{x}^0) / \underline{\Gamma}, \quad (3.30)$$

for the GRS defined transport time, $d \underline{x}^0 = d \underline{r} / \underline{\beta}$, of that $\delta \mathcal{L}_m$ particle in $\underline{\Sigma}$.

The interpretation of $\delta \underline{x}^0$; as a differential amount of *asimultaneity* that has been physically transferred to, or mapped to the clocks in $\underline{\Sigma}$, would be secured if it could be proved that (3.30) is correct. And because the laws of $\delta \mathcal{L}_m$ particle physics are known to be Lorentz covariant, we can do just that by proving that (3.30) is nothing less than the temporal component of a general Lorentz transformation—so that, taken together, \underline{wd}^{1-3} may be truthfully said to cause the $d \underline{x}^i$ of $\underline{\Sigma}$ to be related to the dx^i of Σ by a general Lorentz transformation.

a. Proof that (3.30) is the temporal component of a general Lorentz transformation.

Employing the Galilean relations of (2.4) and the previously defined equalities; $\underline{\beta} = -\underline{u}$, and $\gamma = \Gamma$, allows us to express $\delta \underline{x}^0$ in the following equivalent ways:

$$\delta \underline{x}^0 = \Gamma^2 (\underline{u} \cdot d \underline{r}) = \Gamma^2 (\underline{u} \cdot \underline{\beta}) d \underline{x}^0, \quad (3.31a)$$

$$= \Gamma^2 (1 + \underline{u} \cdot \underline{\beta}) d \underline{x}^0 - d \underline{x}^0, \quad (3.31b)$$

$$= \gamma^2 (dx^0 - \underline{\beta} \cdot d \underline{r}) - d \underline{x}^0, \quad (3.31c)$$

$$= D(\underline{x}^0) - d \underline{x}^0. \quad (3.31d)$$

And this permits $D(\underline{x}^0)$ and $d \underline{x}^0$ to be expressed in terms of Σ parameters, as

$$D(\underline{x}^0) = \gamma^2 (dx^0 - \underline{\beta} \cdot d \underline{r}), \quad (3.32)$$

$$d \underline{x}^0 = \gamma (dx^0 - \underline{\beta} \cdot d \underline{r}). \quad (3.33)$$

Thereby revealing that (3.30) is in fact the temporal component of a general Lorentz transformation,²⁰ and that the interpretation of $\delta \underline{x}^0$; as a real asimultaneity that is generally manifested in two clock time measurements, is correct.

Since it has already been noted that the representation

$$d \underline{r} = d \underline{r}_{\parallel} + d \underline{r}_{\perp} = \gamma (d \underline{r}_{\parallel} - d \underline{r}_{\perp}) + d \underline{r}_{\perp}, \quad (3.17f)$$

of $\underline{w} d^1$ is the spatial component of a general Lorentz transformation, the above result also reveals that, taken together, $\underline{w} d^{1-3}$ serve to predict that the $d \underline{x}^i$ of $\underline{\Sigma}$ are related to the dx^i of Σ by a general Lorentz transformation. This result, the catalytic utility of the $\underline{\Sigma}$ perspective, and the Galilean relations of (2.4), are now exploited to derive relationships between the 3-scalar and 3-vector quantities; γ , $\underline{\beta}$, γ , $\underline{\beta}$, γ , and $\underline{\beta}$, which are gainfully employed to derive the remaining $\underline{w} d^{4-5}$ components of \underline{w} -gauge theory.

4. Useful expressions of γ and $\underline{\beta}$ in terms of $\underline{\Sigma}$ and Σ parameters.

Dividing (3.17f) by (3.33) allows $\underline{\beta}$ to be expressed in terms of Σ parameters as

$$\underline{\beta} = d \underline{r} / d \underline{x}^0 = [\underline{\beta}_{\parallel} + \underline{\beta}_{\perp}] = [(\underline{\beta}_{\parallel} - \underline{\beta}) + \underline{\beta}_{\perp} / \gamma] / (1 - \underline{\beta} \cdot \underline{\beta}), \quad (3.34a)$$

and in terms of $\underline{\Sigma}$ parameters as

$$\underline{\beta} = \gamma^2 [\underline{\beta}_{\parallel} + \underline{\beta}_{\perp} / \gamma] / (1 - \gamma^2 \underline{\beta} \cdot \underline{\beta}), \quad (3.34b)$$

$$= \gamma^2 [\underline{\beta}_{\parallel} + \underline{\beta}_{\perp} / \gamma] / (1 + \delta \underline{x}^0 / dx^0). \quad (3.34c)$$

The parallel component of $\underline{\beta}$ covers what is popularly referred to as the *relativistic velocity addition* formula, with the new insight that $\delta \underline{x}^0$ is directly responsible for $\underline{\beta} \cdot \underline{\beta}$ coupling term in the denominator of the formula, which is crucial for transforming $\underline{\beta}$ into $\underline{\beta}^0$ when $\underline{\beta} \rightarrow \underline{\beta}^0$ for electromagnetic radiation.^a

^aFrom the perspective of Σ , if $\underline{\beta}$ and $\underline{\beta}$ are two known constants, then from the perspective of Σ the GRV of a $\delta \mathcal{L}_m$ particle *relative to* $\underline{\Sigma}$ is correctly *predicted* in Σ by $\underline{\beta} = \underline{\beta} - \underline{\beta}$, for all possible values of $\underline{\beta}$ and $\underline{\beta}$. This *velocity addition law* is immutable, which is why it and the other Galilean relations of (2.4) are so gainfully employed in descriptions referenced to $\underline{\Sigma}$.

From (3.34a) one can readily obtain

$$\gamma = \gamma(1 - \underline{\beta} \cdot \underline{\beta}) \quad (3.34d)$$

as the third member of the $\underline{\beta}(\underline{\beta}, \underline{\beta}, \underline{\beta})$ GRV transformation group, with the $\underline{\beta} \cdot \underline{\beta}$ coupling term being tied directly to the asimultaneity described by $\delta \underline{x}^0$.

a. The inverse $\underline{\beta}(\underline{\beta}, \underline{\beta})$ GRV transformation group.

The parallel component of (3.34b) can be mathematically inverted to obtain $\underline{\beta}_{||}(\underline{\beta}_{||}, \underline{\beta})$ and thus $\underline{\beta}_{||}(\underline{\beta}_{||}, \underline{\beta})$ by making use of the formulas $\underline{\beta}_{||} \times \underline{\beta}_{||} = \mathbf{0}$, and $\underline{\beta} \cdot \underline{Z} \equiv \underline{\beta} \cdot \underline{Z}_{||}$. And the perpendicular component can then be mathematically inverted by making use of $\underline{\beta}_{||}(\underline{\beta}_{||}, \underline{\beta})$ and $\underline{\beta}_{\perp} = \underline{\beta}_{\perp}$. The resulting equations are

$$\underline{\beta} = \underline{\beta} - \underline{\beta} = \frac{[\underline{\beta}_{||}/\gamma + \underline{\beta}_{\perp}]}{\gamma(1 + \underline{\beta} \cdot \underline{\beta})}, \quad (3.35a)$$

and

$$\underline{\beta} = [(\underline{\beta}_{||} + \underline{\beta}) + \underline{\beta}_{\perp}/\gamma]/(1 + \underline{\beta} \cdot \underline{\beta}), \quad (3.35b)$$

plus

$$\gamma = \gamma(1 + \underline{\beta} \cdot \underline{\beta}), \quad (3.35c)$$

as the third member of the $\underline{\beta}(\underline{\beta}, \underline{\beta})$ GRV transformation group. Notice the symmetry of form that exists between $\underline{\beta}(\underline{\beta}, +\underline{\beta})$ and $\underline{\beta}(\underline{\beta}, -\underline{\beta})$, and between $\gamma(\underline{\beta}, +\underline{\beta})$ and $\gamma(\underline{\beta}, -\underline{\beta})$.

b. Related formulas

From (3.34d) and (3.35c) we obtain the related formulas,

$$\gamma^2(1 + \underline{\beta} \cdot \underline{\beta})(1 - \underline{\beta} \cdot \underline{\beta}) = 1, \quad (3.36a)$$

$$(1 + \underline{\beta} \cdot \underline{\beta})(1 - \gamma^2 \underline{\beta} \cdot \underline{\beta}) = 1, \quad (3.36b)$$

$$\gamma^2(1 - \underline{\beta} \cdot \underline{\beta}) = (1 - \gamma^2 \underline{\beta} \cdot \underline{\beta}). \quad (3.36c)$$

All of the reference frame transformations for the scalar and vector velocity parameters are thus seen to contain a second order coupling term between $\underline{\beta}$ and the $\delta \mathcal{L}_m$ particle velocity which is tied directly to the temporal asimultaneity described by $\delta \underline{x}^0$. These equations (3.34a–3.36c) are generally useful for investigating particle interactions that will preserve the Null- \underline{p}_m Axiom from the perspective of $\underline{\Sigma}$, and this is illustrated herein by employing some of these equations to derive $\underline{w}d^{4-5}$.

5. On the fundamental character of $\delta \underline{x}^0$.

From the method of its derivation, one might be tempted to conclude that the temporal asimultaneity described by $\delta \underline{x}^0$ only enters into the equations of $\delta \mathcal{L}_m$ particle physics whenever two clocks are employed to determine the time between two spatially separated events. But that would be an incorrect conclusion to draw, and being incorrect it would tend to blind one to the more fundamental character of the asimultaneity. We therefore summarize the results of two hypothetical experimental situations which suggest that the asimultaneity described by $\delta \underline{x}^0$ has a more fundamental character than its “creation” via a GSS might lead one to believe. Thereby making room for the more general notion that the asimultaneity described by $\delta \underline{x}^0$ is indigenous to the \underline{p}_m field, and a GSS merely causes $\delta \underline{x}^0$ to be accurately (Lorentz covariantly) mapped to the pair of clocks involved.

a. The single-clock measure of β_{\parallel} via radar principles.

In its simplest application, radar technology employs a single clock to measure the relative velocity of a target along a given *line of sight* (LOS), and since $\delta \underline{x}^0$ is proportional to $d \underline{r}_{\parallel}$ there is no loss of substance if the outcome of such a measurement is modeled for the case that the direction of \underline{r} is fixed and the GRS's β , β_{\parallel} , and β_{\perp} of the target (C^{π}) are parallel to \underline{r} and thus β_{\parallel} . With respect to Σ , $\beta = \beta_{\parallel}$, is then determined via the dimensionless formula

$$\beta/(\beta_A^0 \beta_R^0) = \beta/(1 - \beta) = \frac{1}{2} \Delta^2(\underline{x}^0)/\Delta x_p^0 = k. \quad (3.37a)$$

Here, β_A^0 is the speed with which electromagnetic radiation *approaches* C^{π} , β_R^0 is the speed with which electromagnetic radiation *returns* from C^{π} , Δx_p^0 is the time between successive outgoing radar pulses, and $\Delta^2(\underline{x}^0)$ is the difference between two successive (round trip) echo times. Observers in Σ would naturally derive the same formula

$$\beta/(\beta_A^0 \beta_R^0) = \beta/(1 - \beta) = \frac{1}{2} \Delta^2(\underline{x}^0)/\Delta x_p^0 = \underline{k}, \quad (3.37b)$$

with $\beta = \beta_{\parallel}$. But from the theoretical perspective of Σ , employing (3.22a) to calculate the echo times, one obtains the slightly different formula

$$\beta/(\beta_A^0 \beta_R^0) = \beta/[(1 - \beta)(1 + \beta)] = \frac{1}{2} \Delta^2(\underline{x}^0)/\Delta(\underline{x}_p^0) = \underline{k} = \underline{k}, \quad (3.37c)$$

where $\beta = \beta_{\parallel}$, $\beta = \beta_{\parallel}$, and the equality of \underline{k} and \underline{k} follows from the $\underline{w}d^2$ relations; $\Delta^2(\underline{x}^0) = \underline{\Gamma} \Delta^2(\underline{x}^0)$, and $\Delta \underline{x}_p^0 = \underline{\Gamma} \Delta x_p^0$.

The empirical isotropy of Σ (necessitated by the Null- \underline{p}_m Axiom) will then be preserved regardless of the \underline{u} bias of electromagnetic radiation provided that the laws of $\delta \mathcal{L}_m$ particle physics (including $\underline{w}d^2$) uphold the equality

$$\beta/(1 - \beta) = \beta/[(1 - \beta)(1 + \beta)], \quad (3.38a)$$

$$= \beta/(1 - \beta - \beta\beta). \quad (3.38b)$$

Which is to say, provided that

$$\beta = (\beta - \beta)/(1 - \beta\beta). \quad (3.39)$$

Here it is made clear that the $\beta\beta$ coupling term comes into play from $\beta_R^0 = (1 + \beta) = (1 + \underline{u})$.

b. Derivation of $\underline{w}d^3$ from $\underline{w}d^1$ and the reference frame invariance of $\underline{w}d^2$.

Given $\underline{w}d^{1-2}$, Eqs. (2.4), and the equalities $\ell = \underline{\ell} = \gamma$ noted in (III.A.1.a), the propagationally reduced time increment registered by a clock must have, in Σ , Σ , and Σ , the same value

$$dS = dx^0/\gamma = d\underline{x}^0/\gamma = d\underline{x}^0/\underline{\gamma}, \quad (3.39b)$$

$$= dr/\gamma\beta = d\underline{r}/\gamma(\underline{\beta}) = d\underline{r}/\underline{\gamma}\underline{\beta} = d\underline{r}[1 - (\underline{n} \times \underline{u})^2]/\underline{\gamma}\underline{\beta}. \quad (3.39b)$$

Using $(\gamma\beta)^2 = (\gamma^2 - 1)$, equations (3.39a-b) can be solved for $\underline{\gamma}$, giving

$$\underline{\gamma} = \gamma[1 + \underline{\Gamma}^2(\underline{u} \cdot \underline{\beta})]/\underline{\Gamma} = \underline{\Gamma}\gamma(1 + \underline{u} \cdot \underline{\beta}) = \underline{\gamma}\gamma(1 - \underline{\beta} \cdot \underline{\beta}). \quad (3.39c)$$

And by then using (3.39c) in (3.39a) to eliminate $\underline{\gamma}$, one obtains

$$d\underline{x}^0 = [d\underline{x}^0 + \underline{\Gamma}^2(\underline{u} \cdot d\underline{r})]/\underline{\Gamma} \equiv (d\underline{x}^0 + \delta \underline{x}^0)/\underline{\Gamma} \equiv D(\underline{x}^0)/\underline{\Gamma}. \quad (3.39d)$$

Q.E.D.

J. A simple derivation of the \mathbf{w} -deformation of p^π particle-mass $\equiv \underline{\underline{w}}d^4$.

1. The propagational dynamics of a freely spinning mass.

Let the state of $\underline{\Sigma}$ corresponding to $\underline{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{0}$ be denoted by $\underline{\Sigma}^0$. We then define, in $\underline{\Sigma}^0$ and in $\underline{\Sigma}^0$, the angular momentum $\mathbf{H}^0 = \mathbf{I}^0 \underline{\underline{\omega}}^0$ of an *idealistic frictionless gyroscope* (IFG) of mass m^0 and moment of inertia $\mathbf{I}^0 = k m^0$ for a given constant k . The IFG is also a simplistic mechanical clock, with one countable rotation defining a time period of $T^0 = 2\pi/\underline{\underline{\omega}}^0$ seconds.

We then consider, from the perspective of $\underline{\Sigma}$, the state of the IFG after the appearance of a constant $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ field and conclude that the angular rotation rate of the IFG must decrease from $\underline{\underline{\omega}} = \underline{\underline{\omega}}^0$ to the $\underline{\underline{\omega}} = \underline{\underline{\omega}}^0/\underline{\Gamma}$ in order to comply with $\underline{\underline{w}}d^2$.

But it is also necessary that the angular momentum of the IFG be conserved. Hence, from the perspective of $\underline{\Sigma}$ it must be true that $\underline{\mathbf{H}} = \mathbf{H}^0 = \underline{\mathbf{I}} \underline{\underline{\omega}} = (k \underline{\underline{m}}) \underline{\underline{\omega}}^0/\underline{\Gamma}$. Which is possible only if the mass of the IFG increases in accordance with the law $\underline{\underline{m}} = \underline{\Gamma} m^0$. Hence $\underline{\underline{w}}d^2$, \mathbf{H} -conservation, and $\underline{\underline{m}} = \underline{\Gamma} m^0$ are interdependent, and since we have already shown $\underline{\underline{w}}d^2$ to be a dependent \mathbf{w} -deformation it follows that, in this particular case, $\underline{\underline{w}}d^2$ is explained by \mathbf{H} conservation and a propagationally induced increase of mass. The $\underline{\underline{w}}d^4$ component of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory, arbitrarily referenced to $\underline{\Sigma}$, is then formally described more generally by

$$\underline{\underline{w}}d^4 = m/m^0 = \ell = 1/[1 - \mathbf{w}^2]^{1/2}. \quad (3.40)$$

2. On the wholly dependent nature of $\delta \mathcal{L}_m$ time-dilation.

The preceding finding therefore strengthens the two conclusions drawn in III.H.1: That $\underline{\underline{w}}d^2$ is a totally dependent member of the group of $\underline{\underline{w}}d^4$ deformations. And, accordingly, logical place to seek a physical explanation of time is in the physics accounting for the structure of the ${}^0_{\in m}$ -continuum.

K. Derivation of $\underline{\underline{w}}d^4$ from an analysis of pairs of particles having zero net-momentum in $\underline{\Sigma}$.

We now derive $\underline{\underline{w}}d^4$ by employing $\underline{\Sigma}$ to:

- a) Analyze the results of an experiment in $\underline{\Sigma}$ designed to generate a pair of identical $\delta \mathcal{L}_m$ particles having equal and opposite coordinate velocities and momenta relative to $\underline{\mathbf{Q}}$.
- b) Deduce that $\underline{\underline{w}}d^4$ is necessary to prevent the Null- $\underline{\mathbf{p}}_m$ Axiom from being violated by the observations of both unequal GRV's and unequal momenta.

The notations employed to describe the experiment—referred to as the $\leftarrow(2)[(\underline{\mathbf{Q}})](1)\rightarrow$ experiment—are described next.

1. Notations for a $\leftarrow(2)[(\underline{\mathbf{Q}})](1)\rightarrow$ experiment in $\underline{\Sigma}$

We denote two identical $\delta \mathcal{L}_m$ particles as $\delta \mathcal{L}_m$ particles (1) and (2). And we define a $\leftarrow(2)[(\underline{\mathbf{Q}})](1)\rightarrow$ Energy Conversion in $\underline{\Sigma}$ as one that is designed to impart equal and opposite GRV's and momenta to these particles—on the presumption that physical space of $\underline{\Sigma}$ is equivalent to the ${}^0_{\in m}$ -continuum.

From the derivation of $\underline{\underline{w}}d^3$ we know that the influence of $\underline{\underline{w}}d^3$ vanishes for $\underline{\beta}$ perpendicular to $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$. Hence we will analyze the $\leftarrow(2)[(\underline{\mathbf{Q}})](1)\rightarrow$ experiment, without loss of substance, by taking the GRV of each $\delta \mathcal{L}_m$ particle be parallel or anti-parallel to $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$, which allows us to work with the GRS of each $\delta \mathcal{L}_m$ particle instead.

Hence we expect to find that $\underline{\beta}_1 = \underline{\beta}_2 \equiv \underline{\beta}$, and that $\underline{p}_1 = \underline{p}_2 \equiv \underline{p}$. But we will employ $\underline{w}d^{1-3}$ and the GRV formula, to calculate $\underline{\beta}_x$ as a function of $\underline{\beta}_x$ ($x = 1$ or 2), and thereby show that this symmetry can not exist unless $\underline{w}d^4$ intervenes to cause $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ energy and momentum to be conserved in compliance with the Null- \underline{p}_m Axiom.

2. The true asymmetry of $\underline{\beta}_1$ and $\underline{\beta}_2$ in $\underline{\Sigma}$ and its consequences.

In order for the Null- \underline{p}_m Axiom to be preserved, it is clear that observers in $\underline{\Sigma}$ must find that $\underline{\beta}_1 = \underline{\beta}_2$ for any orientation (\underline{n}) of the $\leftarrow(2)[(\underline{Q})](1)\rightarrow$ apparatus. Considering the left side of (3.35a), however, it is equally clear that $\underline{\beta}_1$ and $\underline{\beta}_2$ will then differ in some \underline{u} -dependent and $\underline{\beta}$ -dependent way. Hence, in order to preserve the Null- \underline{p}_m Axiom we are obligated to complete the following two tasks:

- a) Derive the values of $\underline{\beta}_1$ and $\underline{\beta}_2$ corresponding to $\underline{R} \equiv \underline{\beta}_1/\underline{\beta}_2 = 1$.
- b) Derive a \underline{w} -deformation which will explain why the values of $\underline{\beta}_1$ and $\underline{\beta}_2$ so determined are physically necessary.

a. Task-a): The values of $\underline{\beta}_x$ corresponding to $\underline{\beta}_1 = \underline{\beta}_2$.

Solving (3.40a) for $\underline{\beta}$ gives

$$\underline{\beta} = \frac{[\underline{\beta}^2 - (\underline{\beta} \cdot \underline{u})^2]^{1/2}}{\underline{\Gamma}(1 - \underline{\beta} \cdot \underline{u})}. \quad (3.43)$$

And since $(\underline{\beta}_1)^2 = (\underline{\beta}_2)^2$, it follows that

$$\underline{R} \equiv \frac{\underline{\beta}_1}{\underline{\beta}_2} = \frac{(1 - \underline{\beta}_2 \cdot \underline{u})}{(1 - \underline{\beta}_1 \cdot \underline{u})}. \quad (3.44)$$

b. Task-2): The necessary \underline{w} -deformation, $\underline{w}d^4$.

In accordance with Newtonian mechanics, the asymmetry of $\underline{\beta}_1$ and $\underline{\beta}_2$ described by (3.44) could only exist if a momentum impulse of magnitude $\Delta \underline{J} = |\underline{m}_2 \underline{\beta}_2 - \underline{m}_1 \underline{\beta}_1|$ was imparted to the $\leftarrow(2)[(\underline{Q})](1)\rightarrow$ apparatus—which could be easily instrumented to sense it. Hence, the equality of $\underline{\beta}_1$ and $\underline{\beta}_2$, although *necessary*, is *insufficient* to preserve the conservation law of linear momentum for particle pairs generated by a symmetric $\leftarrow(2)[(\underline{Q})](1)\rightarrow$ energy conversion.

It follows that if the conservation law for the linear momentum of p^π particles is to be preserved with momentum expressed in the Newtonian form, $\underline{p} = \underline{m} \underline{\beta}$, it is then necessary to conclude that the mass of a p^π particle varies with its propagation velocity in such a way that $\underline{m}_1/\underline{m}_2 = m_1/m_2 = 1/\underline{R}$. Using this restriction, (3.35c), and the equivalences described in III.A and III.F, we obtain

$$\frac{\underline{m}_2}{\underline{m}_1} = \frac{m_2}{m_1} = \frac{\underline{\beta}_1}{\underline{\beta}_2} = \frac{(1 - \underline{\beta}_2 \cdot \underline{u})}{(1 - \underline{\beta}_1 \cdot \underline{u})} = \frac{\ell_2}{\ell_1} = \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} = \frac{(1 - \underline{\beta}_2^2)^{1/2}}{(1 - \underline{\beta}_1^2)^{1/2}} = \frac{(1 - \underline{w}_2^2)^{1/2}}{(1 - \underline{w}_1^2)^{1/2}}, \quad (3.45)$$

and thus, the result

$$\underline{w}d^4 = m/m^0 = \ell = 1/[1 - \underline{w}^2]^{1/2}, \quad (3.40)$$

previously derived in III.J for the \underline{w} -deformation of p^π particle mass referenced arbitrarily to $\underline{\Sigma}$.

c. The mass and velocity asymmetries of zero-momentum particle pairs.

The asymmetries of the particle masses and velocities implied by (3.45) is more fully described and clarified by noting that the value of $\beta \cdot \underline{u}$ will be *positive* for the particle that is moving in a generally *downstream direction*. That particle is here defined as p_2 but re-indexed as p_d for added clarity. Hence $(1 - \beta_d \cdot \underline{u}) \rightarrow (1 - |\beta_d \cdot \underline{u}|)$. Conversely, for the *upstream particle* ($p_1 \rightarrow p_u$) we have $(1 - \beta_u \cdot \underline{u}) \rightarrow (1 + |\beta_u \cdot \underline{u}|)$. From these definitions and (3.45) we then obtain

$$\gamma_R = \frac{\underline{m}_d}{\underline{m}_u} = \frac{\beta_u}{\beta_d} = \frac{(1 - |\beta_d \cdot \underline{u}|)}{(1 + |\beta_u \cdot \underline{u}|)} = \frac{\ell_d}{\ell_u} = \frac{(1 - \underline{w}_u^2)^{1/2}}{(1 - \underline{w}_d^2)^{1/2}} \leq 1. \quad (3.46a)$$

Hence, relative to Σ ,

$$\beta_u < \beta_d, \quad (3.46b)$$

$$\underline{m}_u = m_u > \underline{m}_d = m_d, \text{ because } \underline{w}_u = w_u > \underline{w}_d = w_d. \quad (3.46c)$$

That is, compared to p_d ,

p_u has a *larger* propagation speed ($\underline{w}_u = w_u = \beta_u$)—accounting for a *larger* upstream mass ($\underline{m}_u = m_u$) which is transported *upstream* with a *smaller* GRV speed (β_u) so that $m_u \beta_u = m_d \beta_d$.

And conversely, compared to p_u ,

p_d has a *smaller* propagation speed ($\underline{w}_d = w_d = \beta_d$) accounting for a *smaller* downstream mass ($\underline{m}_d = m_d$) which is transported *downstream* with a *larger* GRV speed (β_d) so that $m_d \beta_d = m_u \beta_u$.

d. Additional consequences of $\underline{p}_1 + \underline{p}_2 = \mathbf{0}$

Given \underline{w}^{1-4} , setting $\underline{p}_1 + \underline{p}_2 = \mathbf{0}$, and using $\beta_x = (\beta_x - \beta)$ and $\ell_x = \ell_x \ell (1 + \beta_x \cdot \beta)$, we obtain the equations

$$\underline{p}_1 + \underline{p}_2 = m_1 \beta_1 + m_2 \beta_2 = (m_1 + m_2) \underline{\beta} \equiv M \underline{\beta} = \underline{M} \underline{\beta}, \quad (3.47a)$$

since

$$M = m_0(\ell_1 + \ell_2) = 2m_0 \underline{\ell} = 2\underline{m}_0 \underline{\ell} = 2\underline{m} = \underline{M}, \quad (3.47b)$$

and,

$$\Delta M = M - 2m_0 \underline{\ell} = \Delta \underline{M} = \underline{M}_0 (\underline{\ell} - 1), \quad (3.48a)$$

$$\cong \underline{M}_0 (\underline{w}^2/2) = \Delta \underline{KE}/c^2 \text{ for } \underline{w}^2 \ll 1. \quad (3.48b)$$

If $\Delta \Phi$ is the potential energy used up by the symmetric $\leftarrow (2)[(\underline{O})](1) \rightarrow$ energy conversion in Σ , these equations show that $\Delta \Phi$ has the following three characteristics:

- 1) $\Delta \Phi$ creates an increase in the propagating masses of p_1 and p_2 , $\Delta M = \Delta \underline{M}$, which is invariant under the \underline{w} -deformations \underline{w}^{1-4} linking Σ to Σ , and which leaves the total propagating mass ($M = \underline{M}$) reference-frame invariant as well.
- 2) From the perspective of Σ , $\Delta \Phi$ produces a non-zero change of momentum in Σ , $\Delta \underline{p} = \Delta m \underline{\beta}$, which is consistent with $\Delta \underline{J} = \Delta \underline{p} = \mathbf{0}$ in Σ .
- 3) For β and $\underline{\beta} \ll 1$, the ΔM and $\Delta \underline{M}$ supplied by $\Delta \Phi$ are both equal to $1/c^2$ times the changes in the corresponding Newtonian kinetic energies of the particles, ΔKE and $\Delta \underline{KE}$.

These characteristics of $\Delta\Phi$ suggest that, in order for the conservation of mass and energy to be maintained, $\Delta\Phi$ must possess $\Delta\Phi/c^2$ kilograms of mass or $\Delta\Phi$ Joules of mass-energy—at least in the domain of $\beta \ll 1$. There are several ways to demonstrate that the Null- \underline{p}_m Axiom would be violated, however, if this c^2 link between energy and mass failed to hold good for $\beta \rightarrow 1$, and the following is one example

L. \underline{wd}^5 : The physical equivalence of a $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ particle's mass and energy.

In the derivation of \underline{wd}^4 we employed the Newtonian expression for p^π particle momentum ($\mathbf{p} = m\mathbf{c}\beta$) to show that, in order for mass and momentum to be \mathbf{w} -gauge invariant, mass must be expressed in the form $m = m_0\gamma$. If we further assume that Newton's equation for a differential change of a p^π particle's kinetic energy ($d(\text{KE}) = \mathbf{F} \cdot d\mathbf{r}$) also remains \mathbf{w} -gauge invariant, with $\mathbf{F} = c d\mathbf{p}/dx^0$ being Newton's formula for the force acting on the particle, we then get the following differential equation

$$d(\text{KE}) = \mathbf{F} \cdot d\mathbf{r} = c\beta \cdot d\mathbf{p} = \frac{1}{2m} d(\mathbf{p}^2) = \frac{m_0 c^2}{2\gamma} d(\gamma\beta)^2 = d(mc^2) \quad (3.49)$$

with the indefinite solution

$$\text{KE} = mc^2 + C. \quad (3.50)$$

Using the constraint $[\text{KE}(\beta = 0) = 0]$ to solve for the constant C yields an equation

$$\text{KE} = mc^2 - m_0 c^2 = \Delta mc^2 = m_0 c^2 (\ell - 1) = E^0 (\ell - 1) = E - E^0, \quad (3.51a)$$

$$\cong \frac{1}{2} m_0 v^2 \text{ for } \mathbf{w}^2 = \beta^2 \ll 1, \quad (3.51b)$$

for the propagational energy of a p^π particle, where $E^0 = m_0 c^2$ is an energy associated with the particle's structure when it is at rest in the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ continuum, and $E = mc^2$ is clearly the particle's total (propagational plus non propagational) energy. In this way we have proved the prior suspicion; that the c^2 link between particle mass and energy holds good for $w \rightarrow 1$, and via (3.51b) we see that the Newtonian expression for a p^π particle's kinetic energy naturally obtains when the particle's propagation speed is small compared to lightspeed.

1. The resulting physical equivalence of p^π particle mass and energy, and thus, of \underline{wd}^4 and \underline{wd}^5 .

Solving Eq. (3.51a) for mc^2 puts the foregoing results in a clearer perspective by showing that a p^π particle evidently carries a total energy

$$E(\ell) \equiv m(\ell)c^2 = [\text{KE}(\ell) + E^0] = E^0 \ell \quad (3.52a)$$

which is defined in three equivalent ways by:

$$E(\ell) = [\text{KE}(\ell) + E^0], \quad (3.52b)$$

$$E(\ell) = E^0 \ell, \quad (3.52c)$$

$$E(\ell) = m(\ell)c^2. \quad (3.52d)$$

The \underline{wd}^5 component of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory is then obtained explicitly from Eq. (3.52a) as

$$\underline{wd}^5 \equiv E/E^0 = m/m_0 = \ell. \quad (3.53)$$

This shows that \underline{wd}^4 and \underline{wd}^5 are physically equivalent because the energy and inertia of a p^π particle are physically equivalent. Which strongly suggests that a p^π particle's *inertia* and *energy* are just

different aspects of ${}^0\epsilon_m\text{-p}^\pi$ coupling physics—and this is indeed qualitatively explained by the compactification model described in Sections VII – IX.

M. The complete $\underline{\underline{w}}\underline{\underline{d}}^i$ group.

The complete $\underline{\underline{w}}\underline{\underline{d}}^i$ group of \mathbf{w} -deformations is then

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{\underline{w}}\underline{\underline{d}}^1 &= \underline{\underline{w}}\underline{\underline{d}}^2 = \underline{\underline{w}}\underline{\underline{d}}^4 = \underline{\underline{w}}\underline{\underline{d}}^5 = \ell \\ \frac{V^0}{V_{\parallel}} &= \frac{dt}{dt^0} = \frac{m}{m^0} = \frac{E}{E^0} = \ell \equiv 1/[1 - \mathbf{w}^2]^{1/2},\end{aligned}\quad (3.54)$$

plus the differential asimultaneity component,

$$\underline{\underline{w}}\underline{\underline{d}}^3 = \delta \cdot \underline{\underline{x}}^0 = \cdot \Gamma^2(\cdot \underline{\underline{u}} \cdot \underline{\underline{d}} \cdot \underline{\underline{r}}) = - \cdot \underline{\underline{\ell}}^2(\underline{\underline{w}} \cdot \underline{\underline{d}} \cdot \underline{\underline{r}}) = - \cdot \underline{\underline{\gamma}}^2(\underline{\underline{\beta}} \cdot \underline{\underline{d}} \cdot \underline{\underline{r}}) \text{ light-seconds}, \quad (3.32d)$$

and the implicit equivalence of $\delta \mathcal{E}_m$ mass and energy

$$E(\ell) = m(\ell)c^2. \quad (3.52d)$$

All of which are:

- Conjointly necessary to preserve the Null- $\underline{\underline{p}}_m$ Axiom.
- Implicitly contained in the (1 + 3) tensor structure of EM gravity, which covers special relativity theory for the restriction $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}^i) = \mathbf{0}$ (to the γ -coupling domain).
- Vital for an intuitive hyper-energy understanding of the tensor mathematics of EM gravity which readily precipitates all of the $\underline{\underline{w}}\underline{\underline{d}}^i$ —but with no hint of their relative priorities.
- Necessary, therefore, to prevent their traditional (null ${}^0\epsilon_m$) interpretations from weakening the reader's comprehension of EM gravity.

1. Can the $\underline{\underline{w}}\underline{\underline{d}}^i$, the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum, the roots of EM gravity, and the necessity of a (1 + p)-dimensional energy reality and universe theory, all be derived from $E = mc^2$?

Because it was just shown that the equality of $\underline{\underline{w}}\underline{\underline{d}}^4$ and $\underline{\underline{w}}\underline{\underline{d}}^5$ is intrinsically linked to equality of particle energy and mass described by $E = mc^2$, one can readily guess that the answer to the title question is yes. The details of just such a derivation are in fact provided in my earlier work³.

N. Experimental confirmation of Maxwell's gravity theorem and Maxwellian gravity.

1. Introduction.

Via \mathbf{w} -gauge theory we have just shown that the Maxwellian gauge field, $\mathbf{p}_m(\mathbf{x}^i) = \epsilon_m(\mathbf{x}^i)\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}^i)$, preserves the (1 + 3) symmetry required by special relativity theory, but for the revolutionary physical condition, ${}^0\epsilon_m \gg 0$, instead of the physical condition ${}^0\epsilon_m = 0$ that was thought to be uniquely dictated by relativity theory. But if $\mathbf{p}_m(\mathbf{x}^i)$ is that fundamental, any temporal or spatial variation of \mathbf{p}_m should create a corresponding ϵ_m -field that can be readily observed. So before introducing the tensor formalism of Einstein-Maxwell gravity, it is important to show that—within the limits of the 3-vector calculus—which characterizes Maxwellian gravity—three such ϵ_m -fields can now be seen to explain and to unify:

- The non conservative spatial field of 'merry-go-round' gravity, as; $\mathbf{g}_r \equiv \underline{\underline{\zeta}} = (\nabla \times \underline{\underline{u}}) \cong \cdot \underline{\underline{\zeta}}$.
- The non conservative temporal field of 'elevator' gravity, as; $\mathbf{g}_0 \equiv \underline{\underline{u}}_0 = \partial \underline{\underline{u}} / \partial \underline{\underline{x}}^0 \cong \cdot \underline{\underline{u}}_0$.
- The conservative spatial field of Newtonian gravity, as; $\mathbf{g}_s \equiv \nabla(\frac{1}{2} \underline{\underline{u}}^2) \equiv \nabla(\varphi_m) \cong \cdot \underline{\underline{g}}_s$.
- The workings, therefore, of the various *gravity* and *inertial acceleration* sensors which are ubiquitously employed today by *inertial navigation systems* to control the orientations (θ_i) and propaga-

tion paths (S_i) of spacecraft throughout the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum of so-called *inertial space* that subsists after the distortions of Newtonian gravity along each S_i have been mathematically removed.

With all of this substantiated, the reader can be confident that Maxwellian gravity offers a fundamental, albeit mathematically limited, 3-vector resolution of the quantum gravity problem. The reader can then proceed to EM gravity and the GFT3 with a much greater confidence in, and understanding of, the new hyper-energy physics which is further evolved therein. Additionally, it will be made clear that inertial navigation theorists can immediately begin to model *inertial sensor response functions*—more conveniently and consistently than before—from a proper (in situ) field theoretic perspective of the specific ϵ_m -fields that are actually being sensed.

a. Outline of experimental evidence for the $\underline{\zeta}$ -field.

We will first employ the GRV equation of electromagnetic radiation to calculate the proper electromagnetic frequency response $\Delta \underline{f}(\underline{\zeta})$ of a ring laser to a local $\underline{\zeta}$ -field. And we will then employ the relative GAV equation to point out the special conditions under which $\Delta \underline{f}(\underline{\zeta})$ can be accurately correlated to the ring-laser's $\underline{\omega}$, and thus, the special conditions—which are not presently acknowledged and appreciated—under which a ring laser can be also regarded as a *rotation sensor*.

b. Outline of experimental evidence for the Maxwellian gravity field $\underline{g}_m = \underline{g}_0 + \underline{g}_s$.

We next employ the relative GRA equation to show that \underline{g}_0 provides a fundamental explanation for the field of ‘elevator’ gravity—as measured by a *restrained mass* (RM) instrument, functioning as \underline{g}_0 -field sensor—and we then point out the special conditions under which \underline{g}_0 can be accurately correlated to the RM's $\underline{\beta}_0$, and thus, the special conditions—which are not presently acknowledged and appreciated—under which an RM instrument can also be pragmatically regarded as an *inertial acceleration sensor* or *accelerometer*.

Then, recalling the fact that ‘elevator’ gravity and Newtonian gravity are known to be just different aspects of the same, *unknown*, physical thing, we note that \underline{g}_s is both mathematically identical to the field of Newtonian gravity, and physically equivalent to \underline{g}_0 —since \underline{g}_0 and \underline{g}_s are just the different *temporal* and *conservative-spatial* aspects of the 3-vector, $d\mathbf{u}/dx^0$, describing the *total acceleration* of ϵ_m .

In this way it is shown that the Maxwellian gravity field, $\underline{g}_m = \underline{g}_0 + \underline{g}_s$ provides a unified explanation of ‘elevator’ gravity and Newtonian gravity, and that, consequently, the potential, $\Phi_m \equiv \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{u}^2$, of *ideal Maxwellian gravity* provides an explanation of the absolute potential, $-\Phi_n/c^2$, of *ideal Newtonian gravity*, commensurate with limitations of the 3-vector subsection of the (1 + 3) sector of hyper-energy theory.

c. Outline of evidence that Einstein gravity implicitly contains Maxwellian Gravity.

The revelation, $\Phi_m = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{u}^2 = -\Phi_n/c^2$, of Maxwellian gravity, implies that ideal Newtonian gravity is the first *matter field* to be fundamentally addressed, even if incompletely, within the 3-vector subsection of the (1 + 3) sector of hyper-energy theory. The consequences of EM gravity will transform this implication to a certainty, but in keeping with the intent of this subsection; to describe the experimental evidence for Maxwellian gravity—as a insightful prelude to EM gravity—this subsection is concluded by first noting that: a) the Φ_m explanation of $-\Phi_n/c^2$ can be expressed in the form $[1 + 2\Phi_n/c^2] = [1 - \mathbf{u}^2] = 1/\Gamma^2$, and b) this can then be used to transform the spherically symmetric, general relativistic, metric interval for ideal Newtonian gravity into an equivalent hyper-energy expression, $ds^2 = \{ (dx^0/\Gamma)^2 - (\Gamma dr)^2 - r^2[d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2] \}$, as one example of how the ϵ_m -particle coupling of \mathbf{w} -gauge theory will naturally surface within EM gravity.

It is then argued that the gravitational red-shift, resulting as it does from the gravitational reduction of any oscillator's frequency, can be intuitively understood now in terms of the ϵ_m -particle coupling that obtains in the Γ -coupling domain of the general ϵ_m -particle coupling. Also, since $ds = 0$ characterizes electromagnetic radiation, this predicts that, in the field of ideal Newtonian gravity, electromagnetic radiation propagates radially with a speed $dr/dx^0 = (1 - \mathbf{u}^2)$. And we then explain how this invites an interpretation of a black hole as a stationary ϵ_m -shockwave.

Finally, we note that the interpretation of a black hole as an ϵ_m -shockwave correctly suggests a general principle of hyper-energy theory which is richly exploited in GFT3, and is in harmony with the ongoing efforts to extract *hints of the new physics* from thermodynamic analyses of *black-hole physics*. Namely; that ϵ_m -compressibility is the root cause of the *non-linearity* which gives the hyper-energy field equations their enormous *structure-forming potential*—permitting *apparent* singularities associated with the compactified 3-space-energy continuum, the structures of electrically charged and neutral $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ field-particles, and the *apparent* lightspeed limitation to $\delta\mathcal{L}_m$ propagation, to be seen as just that, *apparent* singularities and limitations.

2. The fields, \mathbf{g}_r , \mathbf{g}_0 , and \mathbf{g}_s , of Maxwellian gravity.

Relative to the $\underline{\Sigma}$ of a spacecraft (named $\underline{\Sigma}$), first order temporal and spatial variations of $\mathbf{p}_m(\underline{x})$ generate three observable flow fields of $\epsilon_m \leq {}^0\epsilon_m$ denoted (with italics) by \mathbf{g}_r , \mathbf{g}_0 , and \mathbf{g}_s . Letting $k = c/\epsilon_m$, these three ϵ_m -fields describe:

- The ϵ_m -circulation field of ϵ_m -vorticity, $\mathbf{g}_r \equiv \underline{\zeta} = k (\nabla \times \mathbf{p}_m) \equiv 2 \underline{s}$, (3.55a)

- The ϵ_m -acceleration field of *temporal gravity*, $\mathbf{g}_0 \equiv ck \partial \mathbf{p}_m / \partial \underline{x}^0$, (3.56a)

- The ϵ_m -acceleration field of *spatial gravity*, $\mathbf{g}_s \equiv k^2 \nabla (\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{p}_m^2) \equiv \nabla (\varphi_m)$, (3.57a)

a. Some convenient working approximations and notations.

The \mathbf{g}_0 , \mathbf{g}_s , and \mathbf{g}_r fields of Maxwellian gravity defined via Eqs. (3.55a–3.57a) are conveniently referred to as the $\underline{\mathbf{G}}_m$ fields of Maxwellian gravity, with $\underline{\mathbf{G}}_1 \equiv \mathbf{g}_0$, $\underline{\mathbf{G}}_2 \equiv \mathbf{g}_s$, and $\underline{\mathbf{G}}_3 \equiv \mathbf{g}_r$. Measurements of the $\underline{\mathbf{G}}_m$ fields will now be described, without loss of substance, by employing: a) The *weak field and coupling approximations*; $\epsilon_m \cong {}^0\epsilon_m$, $\underline{\ell} \cong 1$, and $(\mathbf{w}^0)^2 \cong 1$. And b) The (non italicized) *light-speed normalizations*; $\mathbf{g}_r \equiv \underline{\zeta} = \mathbf{g}_r/c$, $\mathbf{g}_0 \equiv \mathbf{g}_0/c^2$, and $\mathbf{g}_s \equiv \mathbf{g}_s/c^2$. This allows the $\underline{\mathbf{G}}_m$ fields to be expressed as the mathematically simpler set, $\underline{\mathbf{G}}_m (\mathbf{g}_0, \mathbf{g}_s, \underline{\zeta})$, of Maxwellian gravity fields:

$$\mathbf{g}_r \equiv \underline{\zeta} = (\nabla \times \mathbf{u}) \equiv 2 \underline{s}. \quad (3.55b)$$

$$\mathbf{g}_0 \equiv \partial \mathbf{u} / \partial \underline{x}^0 = \mathbf{u}_0, \quad (3.56b)$$

$$\mathbf{g}_s \equiv \nabla (\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}^2) \equiv \nabla (\Phi_m), \quad (3.57b)$$

b. On the qualified use of 3-vector descriptions of $\underline{\mathbf{G}}_m$ sensors.

In order to simplify mathematical notations, the workings of $\underline{\mathbf{G}}_m$ -sensors will be described via the ordinary 3-vector calculus, *as if the $\underline{\mathbf{G}}_m$ sensors were inherently 3-dimensional*, which is generally not the case. With only a few exceptions, $\underline{\mathbf{G}}_m$ -sensors are designed to measure just one component of each $\underline{\mathbf{G}}_m$ field, and a typical inertial navigation system then employs three mutually orthogonal *one-dimensional* $(\underline{\mathbf{G}}_m)^\alpha$ -sensors to measure the mutually orthogonal components of $\underline{\mathbf{G}}_m$ in $\underline{\Sigma}$, which the navigation computer then sums to construct the instantaneous $\underline{\mathbf{G}}_m$ field in $\underline{\Sigma}$. No loss of substance will be entailed if we thus acknowledge that an actual $\underline{\mathbf{G}}_m$ sensor generally senses only one component of the $\underline{\mathbf{G}}_m$ field and the associated $\underline{\mathbf{G}}_m$ forces that are here described with 3-vectors.

3. On the proper measurement of the $\underline{\zeta}$ field via ring-lasers.

a. The Ring-Laser $\underline{\zeta}$ -field sensor, overview.

A proper measurement of a $\underline{\zeta}$ field in $\underline{\Sigma}$ can be accomplished by means of a *Ring-Laser* (RL) which is stationary in $\underline{\Sigma}$ and which employs three mirrors to confine two counter propagating laser beams to a common propagational path of physical length \underline{L} enclosing an oriented area, $\underline{A} = \underline{\alpha} \underline{A}$. The vector $\underline{\alpha}$ then serves to define, via the right-hand curl-rule; the *ccw direction* for both 1) *the propagation* of electromagnetic radiation in the *ccw beam*, and 2) *the circular flow* of ϵ_m corresponding to a positive value of $\underline{\zeta} \cdot \underline{\alpha}$.

The cw and ccw radiation leaking through the RL's output mirror is combined to form a fringe pattern, and a pair of photo-detector 'eyes' are then employed to electronically determine the + (or -) direction of fringe pattern motion—corresponding to $\underline{\zeta}^\alpha = \underline{\zeta} \cdot \underline{\alpha} > 0$ (or < 0). Each phase-shift of 2π radians is then registered as a *directionally-signed electromagnetic pulse*.

Hence, in accordance with the theory of operation described next, the proper signal of a ring laser; is a *signed electromagnetic beat frequency*, $\Delta \underline{f}^\alpha$, that provides a direct and sensitive proper measure of $\underline{\zeta}^\alpha$ via the proper response function $\underline{\zeta}^\alpha = \Delta \underline{f}^\alpha / K$.

b. The proper RL response function, $\Delta \underline{f}^\alpha = K \underline{\zeta} \cdot \underline{\alpha}$.

The wavelength of the ccw laser beam is fixed by the resonance condition

$$N \underline{\lambda}_{ccw} = \underline{L}_{ccw} = \oint [\underline{\kappa}(\underline{r})]_{ccw} d\underline{r}_{ccw}, \quad (3.59)$$

where $[\underline{\kappa}(\underline{r})]_{ccw}$ is the ccw index of refraction for electromagnetic radiation and \underline{L}_{ccw} is the corresponding ccw *optical length* of the invariant geometric length

$$\underline{L} = \oint d\underline{r}_{cw} = \oint d\underline{r}_{ccw}. \quad (3.60)$$

Here N is an integer N that places $\underline{\lambda} = \underline{L}/N$ near the peak of the $\underline{\lambda}$ -gain-curve for the RL's gain-medium, and the reciprocal of $[\underline{\kappa}(\underline{r})]_{ccw}$ is the generalized rectilinear speed (GRS) of electromagnetic radiation along the ccw direction of \underline{L} , expressed as a function of both \underline{u} and the index of refraction of the RL's gaseous gain-medium, $\chi \cong 1$. Thus,

$$1/[\underline{\kappa}(\underline{r})]_{ccw} = \underline{\beta}_{ccw}^0(\underline{n}_{ccw}^0, \underline{u}, \chi). \quad (3.61)$$

Similar properties and relations are obtained for the cw beam by simply interchanging ccw and cw.

Without loss of substance we will ignore the small and constant contribution effect of χ , and employ Eq. (3.22a)—referenced to $\underline{\Sigma}$ instead of $\underline{\Sigma}$ —to describe $[\underline{\kappa}(\underline{r})]_{ccw}$ and $[\underline{\kappa}(\underline{r})]_{cw}$. Hence, with $\underline{n}_{cw}^0 = -\underline{n}_{ccw}^0$, and $N_{ccw} = N_{cw} = N$, the signed electromagnetic frequency ($\Delta \underline{f}^\alpha$) created by a flux of $\underline{\zeta}$ through \underline{A} is calculated via the following additional definitions and relations:

$$\underline{L}_{ccw} = \oint \underline{\kappa}_{ccw} d\underline{r} = \oint [\underline{\beta}_{ccw}^0(\underline{n}_{ccw}^0, \underline{u})]^{-1} d\underline{r} = \oint \{ + (\underline{n}_{ccw}^0 \cdot \underline{u}) + [1 - (\underline{n}_{ccw}^0 \times \underline{u})^2]^{1/2} \}^{-1} d\underline{r}. \quad (3.62a)$$

$$\underline{L}_{cw} = \oint \underline{\kappa}_{cw} d\underline{r} = \oint [\underline{\beta}_{cw}^0(\underline{n}_{cw}^0, \underline{u})]^{-1} d\underline{r} = \oint \{ - (\underline{n}_{cw}^0 \cdot \underline{u}) + [1 - (\underline{n}_{cw}^0 \times \underline{u})^2]^{1/2} \}^{-1} d\underline{r}. \quad (3.62b)$$

$$\Delta \underline{f}^\alpha \equiv \underline{f}_{ccw} - \underline{f}_{cw} = \frac{c}{\underline{\lambda}_{ccw}} - \frac{c}{\underline{\lambda}_{cw}} = cN \left(\frac{1}{\underline{L}_{ccw}} - \frac{1}{\underline{L}_{cw}} \right) = \frac{cN}{\underline{L}_{cw} \underline{L}_{ccw}} (\underline{L}_{cw} - \underline{L}_{ccw}). \quad (3.63)$$

$$\cong \frac{cN}{\underline{L}^2} (\underline{L}_{cw} - \underline{L}_{ccw}) = \frac{c}{\lambda \underline{L}} (\underline{L}_{cw} - \underline{L}_{ccw}), \quad (3.64)$$

where $\underline{\lambda}$ is the degenerate lasing wavelength that obtains when $\underline{\mathbf{u}}(\underline{\mathbf{r}}) = 0$. Using (3.62) and Stokes' theorem we then obtain $\Delta \underline{\mathbf{f}}^\alpha$ in the form

$$\Delta \underline{\mathbf{f}}^\alpha \cong \frac{2c}{\lambda \underline{L}} \oint \underline{\Gamma}^2 (\underline{\mathbf{n}}^0_{ccw} \cdot \underline{\mathbf{u}}) d\underline{\mathbf{r}} = \frac{2c}{\lambda \underline{L}} \oint \underline{\Gamma}^2 (\underline{\zeta} \cdot \underline{\alpha}) d(\underline{\mathbf{A}}), \quad (3.65a)$$

$$\cong \frac{2c \underline{\Gamma}^2}{\lambda \underline{L}} \langle (\underline{\zeta} \cdot \underline{\alpha}) \rangle_{\underline{\mathbf{A}}} \cong \frac{2c \underline{\mathbf{A}}}{\lambda \underline{L}} \underline{\zeta}^\alpha = K \underline{\zeta}^\alpha, \quad (3.65b)$$

where $K = 2c \underline{\mathbf{A}} / (\lambda \underline{L})$. This proper $\Delta \underline{\mathbf{f}}^\alpha$ response of a ring laser to $\underline{\zeta}^\alpha$ therefore permits $\underline{\zeta}^\alpha$ to be quantified via the formula

$$\underline{\zeta} = 2 \underline{\mathbf{s}} = \Delta \underline{\mathbf{f}} / K. \quad (3.66)$$

4. On the unwitting experimental confirmation of Eq. (3.66)

Recalling the relative GAV equation,

$$\underline{\mathbf{s}}(\in_m / \underline{\Sigma}) \equiv \underline{\mathbf{s}}(\in_m / \underline{\Sigma}^d) - \underline{\omega}(\underline{\Sigma} / \underline{\Sigma}^d) = - \underline{\omega}(\underline{\Sigma} / \underline{\Sigma}_\epsilon), \quad (2.13)$$

and the fact that in deriving (3.66) we set Γ to unity, consistent with the restrictions set forth in III.N.2.a, we can safely set,

$$\underline{\mathbf{s}}(\in_m / \underline{\Sigma}) \cong \underline{\mathbf{s}}(\in_m / \underline{\Sigma}), \quad (3.67)$$

and, using (3.66), obtain

$$\Delta \underline{\mathbf{f}}(\underline{\mathbf{RL}} / \underline{\Sigma}) \cong 2K [\underline{\mathbf{s}}(\in_m / \underline{\Sigma}^d) - \underline{\omega}(\underline{\Sigma} / \underline{\Sigma}^d)]. \quad (3.68)$$

Hence, if the absolute vorticity of $\in_m(\mathbf{x}^i)$ due to distant matter can be safely assumed to be negligible, $\Delta \underline{\mathbf{f}}(\underline{\mathbf{RL}} / \underline{\Sigma})$ can be assumed to give the rotation rate of the ring laser and the spacecraft, relative to the ${}^0\in_m$ -continuum, in accordance with the formula

$$\Delta \underline{\mathbf{f}}(\underline{\mathbf{RL}} / \underline{\Sigma}) = 2K \underline{\mathbf{s}}(\in_m / \underline{\Sigma}) \cong - 2K \underline{\omega}(\underline{\Sigma} / \underline{\Sigma}^d) = - \frac{4 \underline{\mathbf{Ac}}}{\lambda \underline{L}} \underline{\omega}(\underline{\Sigma} / \underline{\Sigma}^d). \quad (3.69)$$

Equation (3.68) therefore covers the formula

$$\Delta \underline{\mathbf{f}}(\underline{\mathbf{RL}} / \underline{\Sigma}) = - \frac{4 \underline{\mathbf{Ac}}}{\lambda \underline{L}} \underline{\omega}(\underline{\Sigma} / S^0), \quad (3.70)$$

of contemporary ring-laser theory; wherein S^0 denotes the traditional concept of *empty inertial space* (${}^0\in_m = 0$), and *rotational motion*, relative in S^0 , is allowed to break the 3-dimensional isotropy of lightspeed required by special relativity theory. The historically felt need to interpret all observations consistent with ${}^0\in_m = 0$ therefore prohibited theorists from devising a proper (in situ) field theoretic explanation of the proper observation, $\Delta \underline{\mathbf{f}}(\underline{\mathbf{RL}} / \underline{\Sigma})$.

Because there are numerous *external ways* to confirm a change in the orientation of a spacecraft, it can be safely stated that the accuracy of Eq. (3.70) has been extensively confirmed over the last 30 years by the *strapped-down* (quasi solid state) technology of inertial navigation which came into being in the early 1970's due to the invention of the ring-laser around 1962.

It then follows that Eq. (3.66), which embodies all of the working ${}^0\mathcal{C}_m$ -Implications (i-iv) of Maxwell's gravity theorem, has been experimentally confirmed, albeit unwittingly, for the last three decades

by the successful employment of ring lasers as ‘rotation sensors’ within quasi solid state inertial navigation systems.

a. *The $\Delta f^\alpha(\underline{\omega})$ scale factor for a typical navigation grade RL.*

Given the response function of (3.69), a typical navigation grade ring-laser (characterized by $\lambda = 0.63$ microns, $\underline{L} = 30$ cm, $\underline{A} = 43$ cm²) generates 3,176 electromagnetic pulses (per second) for each degree (per second) of Σ ’s angular propagation in the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum.²¹ This $\underline{\omega}$ -proportional *frequency* sensitivity is a factor of $c/\underline{L} = 10^9$ times the $\underline{\omega}$ -proportional *fringe-shift* sensitivity of a physically equivalent Sagnac interferometer.

5. On the ϵ_m -field unification of ‘elevator’ gravity and Newtonian gravity.

a. *A restrained-mass (RM) instrument.*

A restrained-mass (RM) instrument is an instrument which develops whatever restraining force, $\underline{F}_R = -E^0 \underline{g}$, is required to prevent an otherwise free c^π particle, of rest energy $E^0 = m^0 c^2$, from moving in response to a proper Maxwellian gravitational field, \underline{g}_m , which, like \underline{g}_0 and \underline{g}_s , has the units of acceleration per unit c^2 .

b. *On the proper measurement of \underline{g}_0 .*

Recalling the relative GRA equation

$$\underline{u}_0(\epsilon_m(\underline{r})/\underline{\Sigma}) = [\underline{u}_0(\epsilon_m(\underline{r})/\Sigma^d) - \underline{\beta}_0(\underline{\Sigma}/\Sigma^d)] = -\underline{w}_0(\underline{\Sigma}/\underline{\Sigma}_e), \quad (2.17)$$

and the restrictions set forth in III.N.2, we can safely set,

$$\underline{g}_0(\epsilon_m(\underline{r})/\underline{\Sigma}) = \underline{u}_0 \cong \underline{u}_0(\epsilon_m(\underline{r})/\underline{\Sigma}),$$

and thereby obtain

$$\underline{g}_0(\epsilon_m(\underline{r})/\underline{\Sigma}) = [\underline{u}_0(\epsilon_m(\underline{r})/\Sigma^d) - \underline{\beta}_0(\underline{\Sigma}/\Sigma^d)] = -\underline{w}_0(\underline{\Sigma}/\underline{\Sigma}_e). \quad (3.71)$$

Hence, when it can be further safely assumed that $\underline{u}_0(\epsilon_m/\Sigma^d) = \underline{0}$ —which is true for the kinds of spacecraft mission environments typically encountered to date (no black-hole or cosmic-string missions, as yet)—then \underline{F}_R can be safely assumed to be a proportionate measure of the rectilinear acceleration of $\underline{\Sigma}$ relative to the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum; in accordance with the equation

$$\underline{F}_R(\underline{x}^0)/E^0 = -\underline{g}_0(\epsilon_m(\underline{r})/\underline{\Sigma}) = \underline{\beta}_0(\underline{\Sigma}/\Sigma^d) = \partial^2 \underline{r}/(\partial x^0)^2. \quad (3.72)$$

Equation (3.72) therefore covers the formula

$$\underline{F}_R(\underline{x}^0)/E^0 = \underline{\beta}_0(\underline{\Sigma}/S^0) = \partial^2 \underline{r}/(\partial x^0)^2. \quad (3.73)$$

of contemporary inertial sensor theory; wherein S^0 denotes the traditional concept of *empty inertial space* (${}^0\epsilon_m = 0$), and \underline{F}_R is the Newtonian force required in $\underline{\Sigma}$ —on account of the unexplained inertia of E^0 —to give the c^π particle in $\underline{\Sigma}$ the same acceleration relative to S^0 as the RM instrument in $\underline{\Sigma}$. The historically felt need to interpret all observations consistent with ${}^0\epsilon_m = 0$ therefore prohibited inertial sensor theorists from devising a natural proper (in situ) field theoretic explanation of the proper observation, $\underline{F}_R(\underline{RM}/\underline{\Sigma})$.

A navigation computer upon receiving \underline{F}_R/E^0 , as a digital electronic signal, integrates it twice with respect to time to obtain the corresponding changes in $\underline{\Sigma}$ ’s $\underline{\beta}$ and \underline{r} relative to their initially prescribed values. And since there are numerous *external ways* to confirm these changes, it can be safely stated that the accuracy of Eq. (3.73) has been extensively confirmed over the last 40 years by the technology of

inertial navigation which came into being in the early 1950's—about ten years before the invention of the ring laser, employing mechanical gyroscopes to determine the changes in $\underline{\Sigma}$'s attitude.

It follows that Eq. (3.72) has been experimentally confirmed, albeit unwittingly, for the last four decades.
c. The delimiting attributes of ideal Newtonian gravity.

Ideal Newtonian gravity is here defined with respect to $\underline{\Sigma}$ as being sourced by a spherically symmetric distribution of electrically neutral mass-energy, E_n^0 , which is centered on \underline{O} , occupies a 3-volume of radius \underline{R} , and is subject to the null-propagation constraints $\mathbf{w}(E_n^0) = \omega(E_n^0) = \mathbf{0}$.

The field point $\underline{r} > \underline{R}$ is seen from the perspective of Σ^d as the field point $\mathbf{r} = \underline{\mathbf{r}} + \underline{\mathbf{r}}$, where $\underline{\mathbf{r}}$ is the fixed vector distance from O to \underline{O} . Because of the *null-propagation* status of $\underline{\Sigma}$, the *relative generalized* ϵ_m -fields, $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$, $\underline{\mathbf{s}}$, and $\underline{\mathbf{u}}_0$, are identical to the corresponding *absolute* ϵ_m -fields \mathbf{u} , $\mathbf{s} = \frac{1}{2}\underline{\boldsymbol{\zeta}} = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla \times \mathbf{u})$, and $\mathbf{u}_0 = \partial \mathbf{u} / \partial x^0$. These conditions cause the ϵ_m -particle coupling at $\underline{\mathbf{r}}$ of $\underline{\Sigma}$ and \mathbf{r} of Σ^d to be restricted to the purely Γ -coupling described in III.A.2. Hence we can here dispense with the pre-prime notation for the ϵ_m -fields *per se*, and describe, unambiguously, the absolute ϵ_m -fields at $\underline{\mathbf{x}}$ of $\underline{\Sigma}$ —thereby retaining the pre-prime notation only for the un-deformable reference system $\underline{\Sigma}$.

The absolute force, $\underline{\mathbf{F}}_n(\underline{\mathbf{r}})$, of ideal Newtonian gravity on a stationary test particle, E^0 , at $\underline{\mathbf{r}} > \underline{\mathbf{R}}$, can then be unambiguously described by:

$$\underline{\mathbf{F}}_n(\underline{\mathbf{r}}) = E^0 \underline{\mathbf{g}}_n(\underline{\mathbf{r}}) = -GE_n^0 \underline{\mathbf{r}} / \underline{r}^3, \quad (3.74a)$$

$$\equiv - (E^0) \underline{\nabla}(\Phi_n / c^2), \quad (3.74b)$$

where,

$$\Phi_n / c^2 \equiv - GE_n^0 / \underline{r} = - GE_n^0 / \underline{rc}^4, \quad (3.75)$$

G is the gravitational constant ($6.67 \times 10^{-11} \text{ m}^3 / (\text{Kg} \cdot \text{sec}^2)$), and the quantity $(-E^0 \Phi_n / c^2)$ is both the Newtonian gravitational potential energy of E^0 (relative to $\underline{\Sigma}$), and, the *mass-energy defect* or *binding energy* of the stationary $(E^0 E_n^0)$ particle system.^a

The *acceleration field* of ideal Newtonian gravity, $\underline{\mathbf{g}}_n(\underline{\mathbf{r}})$, is then quantified via Eqs. (3.74) as

$$\underline{\mathbf{g}}_n \equiv - \underline{\nabla}[\Phi_n(\underline{\mathbf{r}}) / c^2] = \underline{\mathbf{F}}_n(\underline{\mathbf{r}}) / E^0, \quad (3.76a)$$

and for the weak field-coupling approximation this is the acceleration field

$$\underline{\mathbf{g}}_n \cong \underline{\mathbf{g}}_n = - \mathbf{F}_R / E^0 \quad (3.76b)$$

that would be quantified by a stationary RM instrument ($\underline{\Sigma}$) at $\underline{\mathbf{r}}$, functioning as a *gravimeter* instead of an 'elevator' gravity sensor or $\underline{\Sigma}$ *accelerometer*.

d. The ϵ_m -field explanation of ideal Newtonian gravity.

Because an RM instrument can not distinguish between the $\underline{\mathbf{g}}_n$ field of ideal Newtonian gravity and the $\underline{\mathbf{g}}_0$ ϵ_m -field 'elevator' gravity, we must conclude that $\underline{\mathbf{g}}_n$ and $\underline{\mathbf{g}}_0$ are just different aspects of the same physical thing—a principle, commonly referred to as the *acceleration equivalence principle*, that has long been recognized and pragmatically exploited, but never theoretically explained. From the perspective of Maxwellian gravity then, we are justified in predicting that an RM instrument in $\underline{\Sigma}$ responds to a more general relative ϵ_m -acceleration field

$$\underline{\mathbf{g}}_m = \underline{\mathbf{g}}_0 + \underline{\mathbf{g}}_s, \quad (3.77)$$

^a The mass defect explanation of $-E^0 \Phi_n / c^2$ suggests that; in describing the orbits of attractively bound particles, allowance must be made for the decreases in the rest energy (and thus inertia) of each of the particles.

where \mathbf{g}_s is the ϵ_m -field explanation of \mathbf{g}_n . And since \mathbf{g}_0 represents the *explicit* time-rate-of-change of $\mathbf{u}(x^i)$, we are encouraged to seek a common explanation for both \mathbf{g}_0 and \mathbf{g}_n in the *more general acceleration field* of ϵ_m described by the *total* time-rate-of-change of $\mathbf{u}(x^i)$. We therefore apply a well known fluid dynamic equation to obtain the Maxwellian expression

$$\mathbf{g}_m \equiv d\mathbf{u}/d\mathbf{x}^0 = \partial\mathbf{u}/\partial\mathbf{x}^0 + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}, \quad (3.78a)$$

$$= \mathbf{g}_0 + \nabla(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{u}^2) - \mathbf{u} \times (\nabla \times \mathbf{u}), \quad (3.78b)$$

$$\equiv \mathbf{g}_0 + \mathbf{g}_s - \mathbf{u} \times \boldsymbol{\zeta}, \quad (3.78c)$$

for the total (temporal and spatial) acceleration of ϵ_m . Which leads us to conclude that; to the degree of approximation consistent with both the conservative ($\boldsymbol{\zeta} = \mathbf{0}$) and weak-field characteristics of ideal Newtonian gravity, the \mathbf{g}_m -field of Maxwellian gravity—embracing ‘elevator gravity and ideal Newtonian gravity—is both described and explained by equation

$$\mathbf{g}_m = \mathbf{g}_0 + \mathbf{g}_s = \partial\mathbf{u}/\partial\mathbf{x}^0 + \nabla(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{u}^2) \equiv \partial\mathbf{u}/\partial\mathbf{x}^0 + \nabla(\Phi_m). \quad (3.79)$$

Thus, in addition to providing an intuitive physical explanation for ‘elevator’ gravity, Maxwellian gravity offers a fundamental explanation for the scalar potential of ideal Newtonian gravity, via the equalities

$$\Phi_n/c^2(\mathbf{r}) = -\Phi_m = -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{u}^2(\mathbf{r}) = -GM_n/r_c^2, \quad (3.80a)$$

and,

$$[1 + 2\Phi_n/c^2(\mathbf{r})] = [1 - 2\Phi_m] = [1 - \mathbf{u}^2(\mathbf{r})] = 1/\Gamma^2. \quad (3.80b)$$

The potentials (Φ_m and \mathbf{u}) of Maxwellian gravity exhibit an interesting *pseudo 4-potential* analogy to the 4-potential of Maxwell’s theory of electrodynamics. This analogy is summarized next.

e. The pseudo 4-potential of Maxwellian gravity.

In accordance with (3.79) and (3.80a), the expression (3.74b) for the force of Newtonian gravity, can be usefully replaced by the more general expression

$$\mathbf{F}_m(x^i) = E^0 \mathbf{g}_m(x^i) = E^0 (\nabla \Phi_m + \partial\mathbf{u}/\partial\mathbf{x}^0), \quad (3.81)$$

for the force of Maxwellian gravity which is exerted on a p^π particle that is instantaneously at rest at x^i of Σ^d , due to both the presence and the propagation dynamics of the energy of a distant c^π particle. This Maxwellian *gravity force* happens to be functionally identical to the *gravity-free* ($\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$) Maxwellian *electromagnetic force* which is exerted on an a negative charge (q_-) that is instantaneously at rest at x^i of Σ^d , due to both the presence and the propagation dynamics of the electric charge (Q) carried by a distant p^π particle. Namely, the force

$$\mathbf{f}_{q_-}(x^i) = -q_- \mathbf{E}(x^i) = q_- [\nabla \varphi_e + \partial \mathbf{A}^*/\partial \mathbf{x}^0], \quad (3.82)$$

where, as discussed in Section III.E.1.a, $\varphi_e(x^i)$ and $\mathbf{A}^*(x^i) = \mathbf{c}\mathbf{A}(x^i)$ are the components of the electrodynamic 4-potential $\varphi_e^i(x^i) = (\varphi_e, \mathbf{A}^*) = \varphi_e(x^i)(1, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \equiv \varphi_e \boldsymbol{\beta}^i$.

Hence, to the degree of approximation with which we are presently working, we assert that

$$\Phi_m^i(x^i) = (\Phi_m, \mathbf{u}), \quad (3.83)$$

is a pedagogically useful, *pseudo 4-potential* of Maxwellian gravity, that is to E^0 what $\varphi_e^i(x^i) = (\varphi_e, \mathbf{A}^*)$ is to negative charge—knowing full well that this assertion will be both confirmed and clarified by the consequences of EM gravity in Section V—although no effort has been expended as yet to show that,

either like (or unlike) \mathbf{A}^* , a co-propagating $(1/r)$ \mathbf{u} -field is (or is not) induced in the ${}^0\epsilon_m$ -continuum by the GRV of E^0 . If it is, its mathematical expression could be modeled in strict analogy with the \mathbf{A}^* field of propagating electric charge, and possibly confirmed via ring-laser ‘ ζ ’-field sensors.

f. The fundamentality of field-potentials—expanded.

The fact that the pseudo 4-potentials, $\Phi_m^i(x^i) = (\Phi_m, \mathbf{u})$, of Maxwellian gravity are clearly more fundamental than the readily observable gravity fields resulting from their temporal and spatial variations, harmonizes with the late 20th century revelation of quantum mechanics (pointed out in Section III.E.1.a); that the 4-potentials $\phi_e^i(x^i) = (\phi_e, \mathbf{A}^*)$ are in fact more fundamental than the readily observable electromagnetic fields resulting from their temporal and spatial variations—thereby extending the range of validity of the quantum mechanical revelation. Only now it is clear that all field potentials are *not equally fundamental*, and that the 3-vector potential

$$\mathbf{p}_m(x^i) = \epsilon_m(x^i) \mathbf{u}(x^i), \quad (2.2)$$

of Maxwellian gravity—being a generator of three, interrelated, gauge-field theories (GFT1-3), which lead unerringly to the hyper-energy field equations governing the creation and the evolution of compactified hyper-dimensional universes and their particles—is, in fact, the *most fundamental field-potential*. This claim is in perfect accord with Robert Mills’ assertion that:

“There seems to be little doubt now that the ultimate theory, if it is ever accurately identified, will turn out to be gauge theory. My own feeling is that there will have to be at least one more major conceptual revolution before that final goal is achieved.”²²

This revelation; that gravity is more fundamental than other matter fields—despite its “relative weakness”—helps to explain its long recognized overriding importance as *the energy underlying material evolution*. It thus follows that ideal Newtonian gravity and ‘elevator’ gravity are simply the first two classical but readily quantizable matter fields to fall under the purview the new ϵ_m -physics, and for these reasons it will come as a very great and very welcome surprise to learn that, contrary to present fears,²³ gravity will be, in fact, *the simplest* rather than *the most complicated* field to absorb into a unified *classical-quantum* theory of particle structure, consistent with all known particle interactions and transmutations.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

- ¹ J. C. Maxwell, "A Dynamical Theory of the Electromagnetic Field," *Phil. Trans.*, **155**, (1865), 459—512. I learned of Maxwell's gravity theorem via C. Domb, "James Clerk Maxwell—100 years later," *Nature*, **282**, 15 November, 1979.
- ² Hyper-energy theory is the $(1 + p)$ -dimensional-energy theory that results from the theoretical implications of Maxwell's gravity theorem, and is suitable for addressing Maxwell's *3-space-energy problem*.
- ³ P.A.M. Dirac, "The Evolution of the Physicists Picture of Nature," *Sci. Am.*, **208** (5), pp. 45–53, 1963.
- ⁴ R. Var, *Foundations of Physics* **5**, 3, (Sept. 75, pp. 407-431)
- ⁵ L. M. Milne-Thomson, *Theoretical Hydrodynamics*, p. 87 (The Macmillan Co., 1968).
- ⁶ A. Einstein, "On The Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies," in *The Principle of Relativity*, pp. 37-65 (Dover, 1952).
- ⁷ A. Einstein, *op cit*, p. 38.
- ⁸ G. Holton, *Thematic Origins of Scientific Thought—Kepler to Einstein*, pp. 202–205 (Harvard University Press, 1988).
- ⁹ W. Rindler, *Am. J. Phys.*, **38**, (9), September, 1970, p. 1111.
- ¹⁰ W. Rindler, *Special Relativity*, pp. 1, 4, 21 (Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1960).
- ¹¹ W. Rindler, *Essential Relativity*, p. 8 (Springer-Verlag, 1977).
- ¹² P. G. Bergmann, *Introduction to the Theory of Relativity* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1942), p. 45.
- ¹³ W. Panofsky and M. Phillips, *Classical Electricity and Magnetism*, pp. 341-44 (Addison-Wesley, second edition, 1962).
- ¹⁴ R. P. Feynman, R. Leighton, M. Sands, *The Feynman Lectures on Physics*, Vol. II., p. 15-14 (Addison-Wesley 1964). It is therefore encouraging to find, in Sections IV and V, that, even with its $(1 + 3)$ -dimensional limitations, the $\mathbf{p}_m(\underline{x}^1)$ field of EM gravity is to *mass-energy* what the electromagnetic potentials are to *charge*.
- ¹⁵ W. Panofsky, *op cit*, pp. 347-8.
- ¹⁶ W. Panofsky, *op cit*, pp. 344-6.
- ¹⁷ R. Feynman, *op cit*, pp. 26-(1-4).
- ¹⁸ John D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics*, pp. 464–468 (John Wiley & Sons, May, 1967).
- ¹⁹ W. Panofsky, *op cit*, pp. 347-8.
- ²⁰ C. Møller, *The Theory of Relativity*, p. 43 (Oxford University Press, 1966).
- ²¹ A. Lawrence, *Modern Inertial Technology*, p. 212 (Springer-Verlag, 1993).
- ²² R. Mills, "Gauge fields," *Am. J. Phys.*, **57** (6), p. 507, 1989.
- ²³ R. Mills, *op. cit.*, p. 506.