A Clifford Algebra Based Grand Unification Program of Gravity and the Standard Model : A Review Study

Carlos Castro
Center for Theoretical Studies of Physical Systems
Clark Atlanta, GA. 30314

October 2013

Abstract

A Clifford $Cl(5, C)$ Unified Gauge Field Theory formulation of Conformal Gravity and $U(4) \times U(4) \times U(4)$ Yang-Mills in $4D$, is reviewed, along with its implications for the Pati-Salam group $SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$, and *Trinification* GUT models of 3 fermion generations based on the group $SU(3)_C \times SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R$. We proceed with a brief review of a unification program of $4D$ Gravity and $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ Yang-Mills emerging from $8D$ pure Quaternionic Gravity. A realization of E_8 in terms of the $Cl(16) = Cl(8) \otimes Cl(8)$ generators follows, as a preamble to Tony Smith's E_8 and $Cl(16) = Cl(8) \otimes Cl(8)$ unification model in $8D$. The study of Chiral Fermions and Instanton Backgrounds in $\mathbf{CP}^2, \mathbf{CP}^3$ related to the problem of obtaining 3 fermion generations is thoroughly studied. We continue with the evaluation of the coupling constants and particle masses based on the geometry of bounded complex homogeneous domains and geometric probability theory. An analysis of neutrino masses, Cabbibo-Kobayashi-Maskawa quark-mixing matrix parameters and neutrino-mixing matrix parameters follows. We finalize with some concluding remarks about other proposals for the unification of Gravity and the Standard Model, like string, M, F theory and Noncommutative and Nonassociative Geometry.

Keywords: Clifford Algebras, Exceptional Algebras, Gravity, Yang-Mills, Grand Unification, Strings, M-Theory, Noncommutative, Nonassociative Geometry.

1 Introduction

Clifford, Division, Exceptional and Jordan algebras are deeply related and essential tools in many aspects in Physics [7], [8], [9] . Grand-Unification models in $4D$ based on the exceptional E_8 Lie algebra have been known for sometime [1], [4]. The supersymmetric E_8 model has more recently been studied as a fermion family and grand unification model [2]. The low-energy phenomenology of superstring-inspired E_6 models has been reviewed by [6]. Lisi [63] proposed a E_8 unification model with gravity but it was plagued by many problems and criticisms. Another controversial and problematic model was the $E_8 \times E_8$ model of [64].

Supersymmetric non-linear σ models of Kahler coset spaces $\frac{E_8}{SO(10)\times SU(3)\times U(1)}$; $\frac{E_7}{SU(5)}$; $\frac{E_6}{SO(10)\times U(1)}$ are known to contain three generations of quarks and leptons as (quasi) Nambu-Goldstone $superfields$ [3] (and references therein). The coset model based on $G = E_8$ gives rise to 3 left-handed generations assigned to the $\mathbf{16}$ multiplet of $SO(10)$, and 1 right-handed generation assigned to the $\mathbf{16}^*$ multiplet of $SO(10)$. The coset model based on $G = E_7$ gives rise to 3 generations of quarks and leptons assigned to the $\mathbf{5}^* + \mathbf{10}$ multiplets of $SU(5)$, and a Higgsino (the fermionic partner of the scalar Higgs) in the $\mathbf{5}$ representation of $SU(5)$.

A Chern-Simons E_8 Gauge theory of Gravity, based on the octic E_8 invariant construction by [38], was proposed [36] as a unified field theory (at the Planck scale) of a Lanczos-Lovelock Gravitational theory with a E_8 Generalized Yang-Mills field theory which is defined in the $15D$ boundary of a $16D$ bulk space. The role of the Clifford algebra $Cl(16)$ associated with a $16D$ bulk was essential [36]. In particular, it was discussed how an E_8 Yang-Mills in 8D, after a sequence of symmetry breaking processes based on the $non-compact$ forms of exceptional groups as follows $E_{8(-24)} \to E_{7(-5)} \times SU(2) \to E_{6(-14)} \times SU(3) \to SO(8,2) \times U(1)$, leads to a Conformal gravitational theory in $8D$ based on gauging the non-compact conformal group $SO(8,2)$ in $8D$. Upon performing a Kaluza-Klein-Batakis [39] compactification on CP^2, involving a nontrivial $torsion$ which bypasses the no-go theorems that one cannot obtain $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ from a Kaluza-Klein mechanism in $8D$, leads to a Conformal Gravity-Yang-Mills unified theory based on the Standard Model group $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ in 4D.

An interesting comparison between the number of physical (helicity) states of the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM), the Clifford algebra $Cl(8)$ and the unique and exceptional self dual 24-cell polytope in four-dimensions, the octa-cube, was analyzed by Boya [10]. He found that the total number of bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom was 256 which is the dimension of the $Cl(8)$ algebra. Another interesting numerical coincidence is that if one assumes that the neutrino is massive, each massive fermion generation in $4D$ is comprised of 16 fermions. A Dirac spinor in $4D$ has 4 complex components = 8 real components, hence the total number of real components is then $16 \times 8 = 128$. The *mirror* fermions yield another 128 real components, so the total number of degrees of freedom for one generation plus one anti-generation (mirror fermions) is 256 which coincides also with the dimension of the $Cl(8)$ algebra. We also may notice that a $Cl(16)$ spinor with $2^{16/2} = 256$ components in $16D$ can be decomposed into spinors of positive and negative chirality with

128 components, respectively.

A candidate action for an Exceptional E_8 gauge theory of gravity in $8D$ was constructed [37]. It was obtained by recasting the E_8 group as the semi-direct product of $GL(8,R)$ with a deformed Weyl-Heisenberg group associated with canonical-conjugate pairs of vectorial and antisymmetric tensorial generators of rank two and three. Other actions were proposed, like the quartic E_8 group-invariant action in 8D associated with the Chern-Simons E_8 gauge theory defined on the 7-dim boundary of a $8D$ bulk. The E_8 gauge theory of gravity can be embedded into a more general extended gravitational theory in Clifford spaces associated with the Clifford $Cl(16)$ algebra due to the fact that $E_8 \subset Cl(8) \otimes Cl(8) = Cl(16)$.

The aim of this work is to review a Clifford algebra based Grand Unification program of Gravity and the Standard Model. The outline of this work goes as follows. Section **2** is devoted to a thorough study of Clifford Algebras, Conformal Gravity and $U(4) \times U(4) \times U(4)$ Yang-Mills Unification [33]. It includes : (1) a Clifford algebra realization of the Conformal Group $SO(4,2)$, $U(4)$ and how the pseudo-unitary algebras $U(p,q)$ can be obtained from the unitary ones $U(p+q)$ via the Weyl unitary trick. (2) A study of Gravity, Trinification and Pati-Salam Models from $Cl(5,C)$ Gauge Field Theories. (3) An embedding of $U(4)$ into $SO(8) \subset Cl(8)$ via the use of Fermionic Oscillator Algebras will allow us to end the group-chain with $SO(10)$ which is a Grand-Unification (GUT) group candidate since it admits complex representations to describe chiral fermions in $4D$.

In section **3** we briefly review how $4D$ Gravity and $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ Yang-Mills emerges from $8D$ Quaternionic Gravity [34]. A realization of E_8 in terms of $Cl(16) = Cl(8) \otimes Cl(8)$ generators follows in section **4**. In section **5** a detailed analysis of the incorporation of Fermions is presented.

Section **6** is devoted to Smith's $E_8 \subset Cl(8) \otimes Cl(8)$ algebra-based Unification Model in $8D$. The Coleman-Mandula Theorem and Gauge Bosons as Fermion Condensates are discussed along with an Octonionic Realization of $GL(8,R)$ [56] and the $SU(3)$ Color Algebra of Quarks [58]. We proceed with the Lagrangian construction in Smith's Physics Model and an extensive analysis of chiral fermions, number of generations and instanton backgrounds in CP^n based on the work by [61].

In section **7** a detailed study of Complex Geometric Domains, couplings, masses and parameters of the Standard Model is presented. The evaluation of the fine structure constant by Wyler [68], and the weak, strong couplings by Smith [29], [30] are performed via the Geometric Probability Theory formalism analysis as described explicitly by [35]. The Particle masses, Electroweak bosons, Higgs mass, the Leptons and Quarks masses, the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa parameters, the neutrino masses and neutrino-mixing (PMNS) matrix parameters are obtained following the construction of [29], [30]. We also include a discussion of the lepton masses procedure by [75]. Section **7** ends with a discussion on the other approaches to obtain the Physical Constants, like the one by Beck [77].

To conclude in section **8**, we add some important remarks related to String

(M, F) theory and Noncommutative and Nonassociative Geometry.

2 Clifford Algebras and Conformal Gravity, $U(4) \times U(4) \times U(4)$ Yang-Mills Unification

2.1 A Clifford algebra realization of the Conformal Group $SO(4,2)$

Te aim of this section is to explain the relationship between Clifford-algebra-valued Gauge Field Theories and Conformal Gravity [33]. By fixing some of the gauge symmetries and imposing some constraints one recovers ordinary gravity. We shall begin by showing how the conformal algebra in four dimensions admits a Clifford algebra realization; i.e. the generators of the conformal algebra can be expressed in terms of the Clifford algebra basis generators. The conformal algebra in four dimensions $so(4,2)$ is isomorphic to $su(2,2)$.

Let $\eta_{ab} = (-,+,+,+)$ be the Minkowski spacetime (flat) metric in $D = 3+1$-dimenisons. The epsilon tensors are defined as $\epsilon_{0123} = -\epsilon^{0123} = 1$, The real Clifford $Cl(3,1,R)$ algebra associated with the tangent space of a $4D$ spacetime $\mathcal{M}$ is defined by the anticommutators

$$\{ \Gamma_a, \Gamma_b \} \equiv \Gamma_a \Gamma_b + \Gamma_b \Gamma_a = \ = 2 \eta_{ab} \tag{2.1a}$$

such that

$$[\Gamma_a, \Gamma_b] = 2\Gamma_{ab}, \quad \Gamma_5 = -i \Gamma_0 \Gamma_1 \Gamma_2 \Gamma_3, \quad (\Gamma_5)^2 = 1; \quad \{\Gamma_5, \Gamma_a\} = 0; \tag{2.1b}$$

$$\Gamma_{abcd} = \epsilon_{abcd} \Gamma_5; \quad \Gamma_{ab} = \frac{1}{2} (\Gamma_a \Gamma_b - \Gamma_b \Gamma_a). \tag{2.2a}$$

$$\Gamma_{abc} = \epsilon_{abcd} \Gamma_5 \Gamma^d; \quad \Gamma_{abcd} = \epsilon_{abcd} \Gamma_5. \tag{2.2b}$$

$$\Gamma_a \Gamma_b = \Gamma_{ab} + \eta_{ab}, \quad \Gamma_{ab} \Gamma_5 = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{abcd} \Gamma^{cd}, \tag{2.2c}$$

$$\Gamma_{ab} \Gamma_c = \eta_{bc} \Gamma_a - \eta_{ac} \Gamma_b + \epsilon_{abcd} \Gamma_5 \Gamma^d \tag{2.2d}$$

$$\Gamma_c \Gamma_{ab} = \eta_{ac} \Gamma_b - \eta_{bc} \Gamma_a + \epsilon_{abcd} \Gamma_5 \Gamma^d \tag{2.2e}$$

$$\Gamma_a \Gamma_b \Gamma_c = \eta_{ab} \Gamma_c + \eta_{bc} \Gamma_a - \eta_{ac} \Gamma_b + \epsilon_{abcd} \Gamma_5 \Gamma^d \tag{2.2f}$$

$$\Gamma^{ab} \Gamma_{cd} = \epsilon^{ab}{}_{cd} \Gamma_5 - 4\delta^{[a}_{[c} \Gamma^{b]}{}_{d]} - 2\delta^{ab}_{cd}. \tag{2.2g}$$

$$\delta^{ab}_{cd} = \frac{1}{2} (\delta^a_c \delta^b_d - \delta^a_d \delta^b_c). \tag{2.2.h}$$

the generators $\Gamma_{ab}, \Gamma_{abc}, \Gamma_{abcd}$ are defined as usual by a signed-permutation sum of the anti-symmetrizated products of the gammas. A representation of the $Cl(3,1)$ algebra exists where the generators

$$\mathbf{1}; \ \Gamma_1, \ \Gamma_2, \ \Gamma_3, \ \Gamma_4 = -i\Gamma_0; \ and \ \Gamma_5 \tag{2.3}$$

are Hermitian; while the generators $\Gamma_a\Gamma_5$ and Γ_{ab} for $a, b = 1, 2, 3, 4$ are anti-Hermitian. Using eqs-(2.1-2.3) allows to write the $Cl(3,1)$ algebra-valued one-form as

$$\mathbf{A} = \left(a_\mu \mathbf{1} + b_\mu \Gamma_5 + e^a_\mu \Gamma_a + f^a_\mu \Gamma_a \Gamma_5 + \frac{1}{4}\omega^{ab}_\mu \Gamma_{ab} \right) dx^\mu. \quad (2.4)$$

The physical significance of the field components $a_\mu, b_\mu, e^a_\mu, f^a_\mu, \omega^{ab}_\mu$ in eq-(2.4) will be explained below.

The Clifford-valued gauge field A_μ transforms according to $A'_\mu = U^{-1} A_\mu U + U^{-1}\partial_\mu U$ under Clifford-valued gauge transformations. The Clifford-valued field strength is $F = dA + [A, A]$ so that F transforms covariantly $F' = U^{-1} F U$. Decomposing the field strength in terms of the Clifford algebra generators gives

$$F_{\mu\nu} = F^1_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{1} + F^5_{\mu\nu} \Gamma_5 + F^a_{\mu\nu} \Gamma_a + F^{a5}_{\mu\nu} \Gamma_a \Gamma_5 + \frac{1}{4} F^{ab}_{\mu\nu} \Gamma_{ab}. \quad (2.5)$$

the Clifford-algebra-valued 2-form field strength is $F = \frac{1}{2} F_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu$ and $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu + [A_\mu, A_\nu]$ where $\partial_\mu A_\nu = \frac{\partial A_\nu}{\partial x^\mu}$. The field-strength components are given by

$$F^1_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu a_\nu - \partial_\nu a_\mu \quad (2.6a)$$

$$F^5_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu b_\nu - \partial_\nu b_\mu + 2e^a_\mu f_{\nu a} - 2e^a_\nu f_{\mu a} \quad (2.6b)$$

$$F^a_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu e^a_\nu - \partial_\nu e^a_\mu + \omega^{ab}_\mu e_{\nu b} - \omega^{ab}_\nu e_{\mu b} + 2f^a_\mu b_\nu - 2f^a_\nu b_\mu \quad (2.6c)$$

$$F^{a5}_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu f^a_\nu - \partial_\nu f^a_\mu + \omega^{ab}_\mu f_{\nu b} - \omega^{ab}_\nu f_{\mu b} + 2e^a_\mu b_\nu - 2e^a_\nu b_\mu \quad (2.6d)$$

$$F^{ab}_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \omega^{ab}_\nu + \omega^{ac}_\mu \omega_{\nu c}{}^b + 4\left(e^a_\mu e^b_\nu - f^a_\mu f^b_\nu\right) - \mu \longleftrightarrow \nu. \quad (2.6e)$$

At this stage we may provide the relation among the $Cl(3,1)$ algebra generators and the the conformal algebra $so(4,2) \sim su(2,2)$ in $4D$. The operators of the Conformal algebra can be written in terms of the Clifford algebra generators as [25]

$$P_a = \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_a (1 - \Gamma_5); \quad K_a = \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_a (1 + \Gamma_5); \quad D = -\frac{1}{2} \Gamma_5, \quad L_{ab} = \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_{ab}. \quad (2.7)$$

P_a ($a = 1, 2, 3, 4$) are the translation generators; K_a are the conformal boosts; D is the dilation generator and L_{ab} are the Lorentz generators. The total number of generators is respectively $4+4+1+6 = 15$. From the above realization of the conformal algebra generators (2.7), the explicit evaluation of the commutators yields

$$[P_a, D] = P_a; \quad [K_a, D] = -K_a; \quad [P_a, K_b] = -2g_{ab} D + 2 L_{ab}$$

$$[P_a, P_b] = 0; \quad [K_a, K_b] = 0; .... \quad (2.8)$$

which is consistent with the $su(2,2) \sim so(4,2)$ commutation relations. We should notice that the K_a, P_a generators in (2.7) are both comprised of Hermitian Γ_a *and* anti-Hermitian $\pm\Gamma_a\Gamma_5$ generators, respectively. The dilation D operator is Hermitian, while the Lorentz generator L_{ab} is anti-Hermitian. The fact that Hermitian and anti-Hermitian generators are required is consistent with the fact that $U(2,2)$ is a pseudo-unitary group as we shall see bellow.

Having established this one can infer that the real-valued tetrad V_μ^a field (associated with translations) and its real-valued partner $\tilde{V}_\mu^a$ (associated with conformal boosts) can be defined in terms of the real-valued gauge fields e_μ^a, f_μ^a as follows

$$e_\mu^a \, \Gamma_a \; + \; f_\mu^a \, \Gamma_a\Gamma_5 \; = \; V_\mu^a \, P_a \; + \; \tilde{V}_\mu^a \, K_a \tag{2.9}$$

From eq-(2.7) one learns that eq-(2.9) leads to

$$e_\mu^a \; - \; f_\mu^a \; = \; V_\mu^a; \quad e_\mu^a \; + \; f_\mu^a \; = \; \tilde{V}_\mu^a \; \Rightarrow$$

$$e_\mu^a \; = \; \frac{1}{2}\,(V_\mu^a + \tilde{V}_\mu^a), \quad f_\mu^a \; = \; \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{V}_\mu^a - V_\mu^a). \tag{2.10}$$

The components of the torsion and conformal-boost curvature of conformal gravity are given respectively by the linear combinations of eqs-(2.6c, 2.6d)

$$F_{\mu\nu}^a \; - \; F_{\mu\nu}^{a5} \; = \; \widetilde{F}_{\mu\nu}^a[P]; \quad F_{\mu\nu}^a \; + \; F_{\mu\nu}^{a5} \; = \; \widetilde{F}_{\mu\nu}^a[K] \; \Rightarrow$$

$$F_{\mu\nu}^a \, \Gamma_a \; + \; F_{\mu\nu}^{a5} \, \Gamma_a \, \Gamma_5 \; = \; \widetilde{F}_{\mu\nu}^a[P] \, P_a \; + \; \widetilde{F}_{\mu\nu}^a[K] \, K_a. \tag{2.11a}$$

Inserting the expressions for e_μ^a, f_μ^a in terms of the vielbein V_μ^a and $\tilde{V}_\mu^a$ given by (2.10), yields the standard expressions for the Torsion and conformal-boost curvature, respectively

$$\widetilde{F}_{\mu\nu}^a[P] \; = \; \partial_{[\mu} \, V_{\nu]}^a \; + \; \omega_{[\mu}^{ab} \, V_{\nu]b} \; - \; V_{[\mu}^a \, b_{\nu]}, \tag{2.11b}$$

$$\widetilde{F}_{\mu\nu}^a[K] \; = \; \partial_{[\mu} \, \tilde{V}_{\nu]}^a \; + \; \omega_{[\mu}^{ab} \, \tilde{V}_{\nu]b} \; + 2 \, \tilde{V}_{[\mu}^a \, b_{\nu]}, \tag{2.11b}$$

The Lorentz curvature in eq-(2.6e) can be recast in the standard form as

$$F_{\mu\nu}^{ab} = R_{\mu\nu}^{ab} \; = \; \partial_{[\mu} \, \omega_{\nu]}^{ab} \; + \; \omega_{[\mu}^{ac} \, \omega_{\nu]c}^{b} \; + \; 2(\, V_{[\mu}^a \, \tilde{V}_{\nu]}^b \; + \; \tilde{V}_{[\mu}^a \, V_{\nu]}^b \,). \tag{2.11c}$$

The components of the curvature corresponding to the Weyl dilation generator given by $F_{\mu\nu}^5$ in eq-(2.6b) can be rewritten as

$$F_{\mu\nu}^5 \; = \; \partial_{[\mu} \, b_{\nu]} \; + \; \frac{1}{2} \, (\, V_{[\mu}^a \, \tilde{V}_{\nu]a} \; - \; \tilde{V}_{[\mu}^a \, V_{\nu]a} \,). \tag{2.11d}$$

and the Maxwell curvature is given by $F_{\mu\nu}^1$ in eq-(2.6a). A re-scaling of the vielbein V_μ^a/l and $\tilde{V}_\mu^a/l$ by a length scale parameter l is necessary in order to endow the curvatures and torsion in eqs-(2.11) with the proper dimensions of $length^{-2}, length^{-1}$, respectively.

To sum up, the real-valued tetrad gauge field V_μ^a (that gauges the translations P_a) and the real-valued conformal boosts gauge field $\widetilde{V}_\mu^a$ (that gauges the conformal boosts K_a) of conformal gravity are given, respectively, by the linear combination of the gauge fields $e^a_\mu \mp f^a_\mu$ associated with the $\Gamma_a,\ \Gamma_a\ \Gamma_5$ generators of the Clifford algebra $Cl(3,1)$ of the tangent space of spacetime $\mathcal{M}^4$ after performing a Wick rotation $-i\ \Gamma_0 = \Gamma_4$.

Gauge invariant actions involving Yang-Mills terms of the form $\int Tr(F \wedge^* F)$ and theta terms of the form $\int Tr(F \wedge F)$ are straightforwardly constructed. For example, a $SO(4,2)$ gauge-invariant action for conformal gravity is [42]

$$S\ =\ \int d^4x\ \epsilon_{abcd}\ \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\ R^{ab}_{\mu\nu}\ R^{cd}_{\rho\sigma} \qquad (2.12)$$

where the components of the Lorentz curvature 2-form $R^{ab}_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu$ are given by eq-(2.11c) after re-scaling the vielbein V^a_μ/l and $\tilde V^a_\mu/l$ by a length scale parameter l in order to endow the curvature with the proper dimensions of $length^{-2}$.

The conformal boost symmetry can be fixed by choosing the gauge $b_\mu = 0$ because under infinitesimal conformal boosts transformations the field b_μ transforms as $\delta b_\mu = -2\ \xi^a\ e_{a\mu} = -2\ \xi_\mu$; i.e the parameter ξ_μ has the same number of degrees of feedom as b_μ. After further fixing the dilational gauge symmetry, setting the torsion to zero (which constrains the spin connection $\omega^{ab}_\mu(V^a_\mu)$ to be of the Levi-Civita form given by a function of the vielbein V^a_μ), and eliminating the $\tilde V^a_\mu$ field algebraically via its (non-propagating) equations of motion [5], the expression in eq-(2.12) leads to the de Sitter group $SO(4,1)$ invariant Macdowell-Mansouri-Chamseddine-West action [40], [53] (suppressing spacetime indices for convenience)

$$S\ =\ \int d^4x\ (\ R^{ab}(\omega)\ +\frac{1}{l^2}\ V^a \wedge V^b\ )\ \wedge\ (\ R^{cd}(\omega)\ +\frac{1}{l^2}\ V^c \wedge V^d\ )\ \epsilon_{abcd}. \quad (2.13)$$

The action (2.13) is comprised of 3 terms. One term is the topological invariant Gauss-Bonnet term $R^{ab}(\omega) \wedge R^{cd}(\omega)\epsilon_{abcd}$. The standard Einstein-Hilbert gravitational action term is given by $\frac{1}{l^2} R^{ab}(\omega) \wedge V^c \wedge V^d \epsilon_{abcd}$, and the cosmological constant term $\frac{1}{l^4} V^a \wedge V^b \wedge V^c \wedge V^d \epsilon_{abcd}$. l is the de Sitter space's throat size; i.e. l^2 is proportional to the square of the Planck scale (the Newtonian coupling constant).

The familiar Einstein-Hilbert gravitational action can also be obtained from a coupling of gravity to a scalar field like it occurs in a Brans-Dicke-Jordan theory of gravity

$$S\ =\ \frac{1}{2}\int\ d^4x\ \sqrt{g}\ \phi\ \left(\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}}\partial_\nu(\sqrt{g}\ g^{\mu\nu}\ D^c_\mu\phi)\ +\ b^\mu\ (D^c_\mu\phi)\ +\ \frac{1}{6}\ R\ \phi\ \right). \qquad (2.14a)$$

where the conformally covariant derivative acting on a scalar field ϕ of Weyl weight one is

$$D^c_\mu\phi\ =\ \partial_\mu\ -\ b_\mu\ \phi \qquad (2.14b)$$

Fixing the conformal boosts symmetry by setting $b_\mu = 0$ and the dilational symmetry by setting $\phi = constant$ leads to the Einstein-Hilbert action for ordinary gravity.

To finalize this section we should remind that gravity involves invariance under *diffeomorphisms* (coordinate transformations) and that gravitons ($g_{\mu\nu} = e^a_\mu e^b_\nu \eta_{ab}$) have spin 2, not 1. What occurs is that the torsion constraint $R^a_{\mu\nu} = 0$ allows to convert a combination of translations, Lorentz and dilation transformations of the vielbein e^a_μ into general coordinate transformations of the vielbein, see [11] for further details. Nevertheless we must emphasize that gravity is *not* an ordinary gauge theory. If it were we would have been able to quantize it long ago.

2.2 A Clifford algebra realization of $U(4)$

In order to obtain the generators of the compact $U(4) = SU(4) \times U(1)$ unitary group, in terms of the $Cl(3,1)$ generators, a *different* basis involving a full set of Hermitian generators must be chosen of the form [33]

$$M_a = \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_a (1 - i\,\Gamma_5); \quad N_a = \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_a (1 + i\,\Gamma_5); \quad \mathcal{D} = \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_5, \quad \mathcal{L}_{ab} = -\frac{i}{2}\Gamma_{ab}. \tag{2.15}$$

One may choose, instead, a full set of anti-Hermitian generators by multiplying every generator $M_a, N_a, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{L}_{ab}$ by $\mathbf{i}$ in (2.15), if one wishes. The choice (2.15) leads to a *different* algebra $so(6) \sim su(4)$ and whose commutators *differ* from those in (2.8)

$$[M_a,\ \mathcal{D}] = i\ N_a; \quad [N_a,\ \mathcal{D}] = -i\ M_a; \quad [M_a,\ N_b] = -2i\ g_{ab}\ \mathcal{D}$$

$$[M_a,\ M_b] = [N_a,\ N_b] = \frac{1}{2}\ \Gamma_{ab} = i\ \mathcal{L}_{ab};\ .... \tag{2.16}$$

The Hermitian generators $M_a, N_a, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{L}_{ab}$ associated to the $so(6) \sim su(4)$ algebra are given by the one-to-one correspondence

$$M_a = \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_a (1 - i\ \Gamma_5) \longleftrightarrow -\Sigma_{a5}; \quad N_a = \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_a (1 + i\ \Gamma_5) \longleftrightarrow \Sigma_{a6}$$

$$\mathcal{D} = \frac{1}{2}\ \Gamma_5 \longleftrightarrow \Sigma_{56}; \quad \mathcal{L}_{ab} = -\frac{i}{2}\ \Gamma_{ab} \longleftrightarrow \Sigma_{ab} \tag{2.17}$$

The $so(6)$ Lie algebra in $6D$ associated to the Hermitian generators Σ_{AB} $(A, B = 1, 2, ..., 6)$ is defined by the commutators

$$[\Sigma_{AB},\ \Sigma_{CD}] = i\ (g_{BC}\ \Sigma_{AD} - g_{AC}\ \Sigma_{BD} - g_{BD}\ \Sigma_{AC} + g_{AD}\ \Sigma_{BC}\ ) \tag{2.18}$$

where g_{AB} is a diagonal $6D$ metric with signature $(-,-,-,-,-,-)$. One can verify that the realization (2.15) and correspondence (2.17) is consistent with the $so(6) \sim su(4)$ commutation relations (2.18). The extra $U(1)$ Abelian generator in $U(4) = U(1) \times SU(4)$ is associated with the unit $\mathbf{1}$ generator.

Since $su(4) \sim so(6)$ (isomorphic algebras) and the unitary algebra $u(4) = u(1) \oplus su(4) \sim u(1) \oplus so(6)$, the Hermitian $u(1) \oplus so(6)$ valued field $\mathbf{A}_\mu$ may be expanded in a $Cl(3,1,R)$ basis of Hermitian generators as

$$\mathbf{A}_\mu \ = \ a_\mu \ \mathbf{1} + \ b_\mu \ \Gamma_5 \ + \ e^a_\mu \ \Gamma_a \ + \mathbf{i} \ f^a_\mu \ \Gamma_a \ \Gamma_5 \ + \mathbf{i} \ \frac{1}{4} \omega^{ab}_\mu \ \Gamma_{ab} \ =$$

$$a_\mu \ \mathbf{1} + \ A^{56}_\mu \ \Sigma_{56} \ + \ A^{a5}_\mu \ \Sigma_{a5} \ + \ A^{a6}_\mu \ \Sigma_{a6} \ + \ \frac{1}{4} A^{ab}_\mu \ \Sigma_{ab} \qquad (2.19)$$

One should notice the key presence of $\mathbf{i}$ factors in the last two (Hermitian) terms of the first line of eq-(2.19), compared to the last two terms of (2.4) devoid of $\mathbf{i}$ factors. All the terms in eq-(2.4) are devoid of $\mathbf{i}$ factors such that the last two terms of (2.4) are comprised of anti-Hermitian generators while the first three terms involve Hermitian generators. The dictionary between the real-valued fields in the first and second lines of (2.19) is given by

$$a_\mu = a_\mu, \ b_\mu = A^{56}_\mu, \ A^{a5}_\mu \ = \ e^a_\mu - f^a_\nu, \ A^{a6}_\mu \ = \ e^a_\mu + f^a_\nu, \ A^{ab}_\mu = \omega^{ab}_\mu \qquad (2.20)$$

the dictionary (2.20) is inferred from the relation

$$e^a_\mu \ \Gamma_a \ + \mathbf{i} \ f^a_\mu \ \Gamma_a \ \Gamma_5 \ = \ A^{a5}_\mu \ \Sigma_{a5} \ + \ A^{a6}_\mu \ \Sigma_{a6} \qquad (2.21)$$

and from eq-(2.15) (all terms in (2.21) are comprised of Hermitian generators as they should). The evaluation of the $u(1) \oplus so(6)$ valued field strengths $F_{\mu\nu}, F^{MN}_{\mu\nu}$, $M, N = 1,2,3,....,6$ proceeds in a similar fashion as in the conformal Gravity-Maxwell case based on the pseudo-unitary algebra $u(2,2) = u(1) \oplus su(2,2) \sim u(1) \oplus so(4,2)$.

2.3 $U(p,q)$ from $U(p+q)$ via the Weyl unitary trick

In general, the unitary *compact* group $U(p+q;C)$ is related to the *noncompact* unitary group $U(p,q;C)$ by the Weyl unitary trick [41] mapping the anti-Hermitian generators of the compact group $U(p+q;C)$ to the anti-Hermitian *and* Hermitian generators of the noncompact group $U(p,q;C)$ as follows : The $(p+q) \times (p+q)$ $U(p+q;C)$ complex matrix generator is comprised of the diagonal blocks of $p \times p$ and $q \times q$ complex anti-Hermitian matrices $M^\dagger_{11} = -M_{11}$; $M^\dagger_{22} = -M_{22}$, respectively. The off-diagonal blocks are comprised of the $q \times p$ complex matrix M_{12} and the $p \times q$ complex matrix $-M^\dagger_{12}$, i.e. the off-diagonal blocks are the anti-Hermitian complex conjugates of each other. In this fashion the

$(p+q) \times (p+q)$ $U(p+q;C)$ complex matrix generator $\mathbf{M}$ is anti-Hemitian $\mathbf{M}^\dagger = -\mathbf{M}$ such that upon an exponentiation $U(t) = e^{t\mathbf{M}}$ it generates a unitary group element obeying the condition $U^\dagger(t) = U^{-1}(t)$ for $t = real$. This is what occurs in the $U(4)$ case.

In order to retrieve the noncompact group $U(2,2;C)$ case, the Weyl unitary trick requires leaving M_{11}, M_{22} intact but performing a Wick rotation of the off-diagonal block matrices $i\ M_{12}$ and $-i\ M_{12}^\dagger$. In this fashion, M_{11}, M_{22} still retain their anti-Hermitian character, while the off-diagonal blocks are now *Hermitian* complex conjugates of each-other. This is precisely what occurs in the realization of the Conformal group generators in terms of the $Cl(3,1,R)$ algebra generators. For example, P_a, K_a both contain Hermitian Γ_a and anti-Hermitian $\Gamma_a\Gamma_5$ generators. Despite the name "unitary" group $U(2,2;C)$, the exponentiation of the P_a and K_a generators does not furnish a truly unitary matrix obeying $U^\dagger = U^{-1}$. For this reason the groups $U(p,q;C)$ are more properly called *pseudo*-unitary. The complex extension of $U(p+q,C)$ is $GL(p+q;C)$. Since the algebras $u(p+q;C), u(p,q;C)$ differ only by the Weyl unitary trick, they both have identical complex extensions $gl(p+q;C)$ [41]. $gl(N,C)$ has $2N^2$ generators whereas $u(N,C)$ has N^2.

The covering of the general linear group $GL(N,R)$ admits $infinite$-dimensional spinorial representations but *not* finite-dimensional ones. For a thorough discussion of the physics of infinite-component fields and the perturbative renormalization property of metric affine theories of gravity based on (the covering of) $GL(4,R)$ we refer to [49]. The group $U(2,2)$ consists of the 4×4 complex matrices which preserve the *sesquilinear* symmetric metric $g_{\alpha\beta}$ associated to the following quadratic form in C^4

$$< u, u > \ = \ \bar{u}^\alpha\ g_{\alpha\beta}\ u^\beta \ = \ \bar{u}^1 u^1 \ + \ \bar{u}^2 u^2 \ - \ \bar{u}^3 u^3 \ - \ \bar{u}^4 u^4. \qquad (2.22)$$

obeying the *sesquilinear* conditions

$$< \lambda\ v, u > \ = \ \bar{\lambda} < v, u >; \quad < v, \lambda\ u > \ = \ \lambda < v, u > . \qquad (2.23)$$

where λ is a complex parameter and the bar operation denotes complex conjugation. The metric $g_{\alpha\beta}$ can be chosen to be given precisely by the chirality $(\Gamma_5)_{\alpha\beta}$ 4×4 matrix representation whose entries are $\mathbf{1}_{2\times 2}, \ -\ \mathbf{1}_{2\times 2}$ along the main diagonal blocks, respectively, and 0 along the off-diagonal blocks. The Lie algebra $su(2,2) \sim so(4,2)$ corresponds to the conformal group in $4D$. The special unitary group $SU(p+q;C)$ in addition to being sesquilinear metric-preserving is also volume-preserving.

The group $U(4)$ consists of the 4×4 complex matrices which preserve the *sesquilinear* symmetric metric $g_{\alpha\beta}$ associated to the following quadratic form in C^4

$$< u, u > \ = \ \bar{u}^\alpha\ g_{\alpha\beta}\ u^\beta \ = \ \bar{u}^1 u^1 \ + \ \bar{u}^2 u^2 \ + \ \bar{u}^3 u^3 \ + \ \bar{u}^4 u^4. \qquad (2.24)$$

The metric $g_{\alpha\beta}$ is now chosen to be given by the unit $\mathbf{1}_{\alpha\beta}$ diagonal 4×4 matrix. The $U(4) = U(1) \times SU(4)$ metric-preserving group transformations are generated by the 15 Hermitian generators Σ_{AB} and the unit $\mathbf{1}$ generator.

In the most general case one has the following isomorphisms of Lie algebras [41]

$$so(5,1) \sim su^*(4) \sim sl(2,H); \quad so^*(6) \sim su(3,1); \quad so(3,2) \sim sp(4,R)$$

$$so(4,2) \sim su(2,2); \quad so(3,3) \sim sl(4,R); \quad so(6) \sim su(4), \ etc..... \qquad (2.25)$$

where the asterisks like $su^*(4), so^*(6)$ denote the algebras associated with the *noncompact* versions of the compact groups $SU(4), SO(6)$. $sl(2,H)$ is the special linear Mobius algebra over the field of quaternions H. The $SU(4)$ group is a two-fold covering of $SO(6)$ but their algebras are isomorphic.

2.4 Complex Conformal Gravity and $U(4) \times U(4)$ Yang-Mills from $Cl(5,C)$

To complete this section it is necessary to recall the following isomorphisms among real and complex Clifford algebras [33]

$$Cl(2m+1,C) = Cl(2m,C) \oplus Cl(2m,C) \sim M(2^m,C) \oplus M(2^m,C) \ \Rightarrow$$

$$Cl(5,C) \ = \ Cl(4,C) \oplus Cl(4,C) \qquad (2.26a)$$

and

$$Cl(4,C) \sim M(4,C) \sim Cl(4,1,R) \sim Cl(2,3,R) \sim Cl(0,5,R) \qquad (2.26b)$$

$$Cl(4,C) \sim M(4,C) \sim Cl(3,1,R) \oplus \mathbf{i}\, Cl(3,1,R) \sim M(4,R) \oplus \mathbf{i}\, M(4,R) \quad (2.26c)$$

$$Cl(4,C) \sim M(4,C) \sim Cl(2,2,R) \oplus \mathbf{i}\, Cl(2,2,R) \sim M(4,R) \oplus \mathbf{i}\, M(4,R) \quad (2.26d)$$

$M(4,R), M(4,C)$ is the 4×4 matrix algebra over the reals and complex numbers, respectively. From each one of the $Cl(3,1,R)$ algebra factors in the above decomposition (2.26c) of the complex $Cl(4,C)$ algebra, one can generate a $u(2,2)$ algebra by writing the $u(2,2)$ generators explicitly in terms of the $Cl(3,1,R)$ gamma matrices as displayed above in eqs-(2.7) ; i.e. one may convert a $Cl(3,1,R)$ gauge theory into a

Conformal Gravity-Maxwell theory based on $U(2,2) = SU(2,2) \times U(1)$. Therefore, a $Cl(4,C)$ gauge theory is algebraically equivalent to a *bi*-Conformal Gravity-Maxwell theory based on the complex group $U(2,2) \otimes \mathbf{C} = GL(4,C)$; i.e. the $Cl(4,C)$ gauge theory is algebraically equivalent to a *complexified* Conformal Gravity-Maxwell theory in four real dimensions based on the complex algebra $u(2,2) \oplus \mathbf{i}\ u(2,2) = gl(4,C)$. The algebra $gl(N,C)$ is the complex extension of $u(p,q)$ for all p,q such that $p+q=N$.

Furthermore, from each $Cl(3,1,R)$ commuting sub-algebra inside the $Cl(4,C)$ algebra one can also generate a $u(4) = u(1) \oplus su(4) \sim u(1) \oplus so(6)$ algebra by writing the latter generators in terms of the $Cl(3,1,R)$ gamma matrices as displayed explicitly in eqs-(2.15). Therefore, the $Cl(4,C)$ gauge theory is also algebraically equivalent to a Yang-Mills gauge theory based on the algebra $u(4) \oplus \mathbf{i}\ u(4) = gl(4, C)$ and associated with the *two* $Cl(3, 1, R)$ commuting sub-algebras inside $Cl(4, C)$. The complex group is $U(4) \otimes \mathbf{C} = GL(4, C)$ also.

From eq-(2.26d) : $Cl(4, C) \sim Cl(4, 1, R)$ one learns that the complex Clifford $Cl(4, C)$ algebra is also isomorphic to a *real* Clifford algebra $Cl(4, 1, R)$ (and also to $Cl(2, 3, R), Cl(0, 5, R)$). A Wick rotation (Weyl unitary trick) transforms $Cl(4, 1, R) \rightarrow Cl(3, 2, R) = Cl(3, 1, R) \oplus Cl(3, 1, R) \sim M(4, R) \oplus M(4, R)$ such that there are two commuting sub-algebras of $Cl(3, 2, R)$ which are isomorphic to $Cl(3, 1, R)$.

From each one of the latter $Cl(3, 1, R)$ algebras one can build an $u(4)$ (and $u(2, 2)$) algebra as described earlier. A typical example of this feature in ordinary Lie algebras is the case of $so(3) \sim su(2)$ such that there are two commuting sub-algebras of $so(4)$ and isomorphic to $so(3)$ furnishing the decomposition $so(4) = su(2) \oplus su(2) \sim so(3) \oplus so(3)$. Concluding, one can generate a $U(4) \times U(4)$ Yang-Mills gauge theory from a $Cl(4, C)$ gauge theory via a $Cl(4, 1, R)$ gauge theory (based on a *real* Clifford algebra) after the Wick rotation (Weyl unitary trick) procedure to the $Cl(3, 2, R)$ algebra is performed.

The physical reason why one needs a $U(4) \times U(4)$ Yang-Mills theory is because the group $U(4)$ by itself is *not* large enough to accommodate the Standard Model Group $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ as its maximally compact subgroup [26]. The GUT groups $SU(5), SU(2) \times SU(2) \times SU(4)$ are large enough to achieve this goal. In general, the group $SU(m+n)$ has $SU(m) \times SU(n) \times U(1)$ for compact subgroups. Therefore, $SU(4) \rightarrow SU(3) \times U(1)$ or $SU(4) \rightarrow SU(2) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ is allowed but one cannot have $SU(4) \rightarrow SU(3) \times SU(2)$. For this reason one cannot rely only on a $Cl(4, C) = Cl(3, 1, R) \oplus \mathbf{i}\ Cl(3, 1)$ gauge theory to build a unifying model; i.e. because one cannot have the branching $SU(4) \rightarrow SU(3) \times SU(2)$, one would not able to generate the full Standard Model group despite that the other group inside $Cl(4, C)$ given by $U(2, 2) = SU(2, 2) \times U(1)$ furnishes Conformal Gravity *and* Maxwell's Electro-Magnetism based on $U(1)$.

A breaking [19], [5] of $U(4) \times U(4) \longrightarrow SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times SU(4)$ leads to the Pati-Salam [18] GUT group which contains the Standard Model Group, which in turn, breaks down to the ordinary Maxwell Electro-Magnetic (EM) $U(1)_{EM}$ and color (QCD) group $SU(3)_c$ after the following chain of symmetry breaking patterns

$$SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times SU(4) \ \rightarrow \ SU(2)_L \times U(1)_R \times U(1)_{B-L} \times SU(3)_c \ \rightarrow$$

$$SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times SU(3)_c \ \rightarrow \ U(1)_{EM} \times SU(3)_c. \tag{2.27}$$

where $B-L$ denotes the Baryon minus Lepton number charge; $Y =$ hypercharge and the Maxwell EM charge is $Q = I_3 + (Y/2)$ where I_3 is the third component of the $SU(2)_L$ isospin. It is noteworthy to remark that since we had already identified the $U(1)_{EM}$ symmetry stemming from the ($U(2, 2)$ group-based) Conformal Gravity-Maxwell sector, it is not necessary to follow the symmetry breaking pattern of the second line in (2.27) in order to retrieve the desired $U(1)_{EM}$ symmetry.

The upshot of the $Cl(5,C) = Cl(4,C) \oplus Cl(4,C)$ algebraic decomposition is that the group structure given by the *direct* products $[U(2,2) \times U(2,2)]_{spacetime} \times [U(4) \times U(4)]_{Yang-Mills}$ is ultimately tied down to four-dimensions. Decomposing $U(2.2) = SU(2,2) \times U(1)$ and focusing on the conformal group $SU(2,2)$, we see that it does *not* violate the Coleman-Mandula theorem because the spacetime symmetries (conformal group $SU(2,2)$ in the absence of a mass gap, Poincare group when there is mass gap) do *not* mix with the internal symmetries. Similar considerations apply to the supersymmetric case when the symmetry group structure is given by the *direct* product of the superconformal group (in the absence of a mass gap) with an internal symmetry group so that the Haag-Lopuszanski-Sohnius theorem is not violated. There is an extra $U(1)$ symmetry that needs further clarification. It is likely that it can be related to a global symmetry that survives at lower energies, see below.

2.5 Gravity, Trinification and Pati-Salam Models from $Cl(5,C)$ Gauge Field Theories

In [33] we briefly mentioned that under the Weyl unitary "trick" one of the $U(2,2)$ group factors becomes $U(2,2) \to U(4)$ so that $Cl(5,C) \simeq U(2,2) \times [U(4) \times U(4) \times U(4)]$ resulting in a $four$ generation Trinification model. The first factor group $U(2,2) = SU(2,2) \times U(1)$ contains the conformal group $SU(2,2)$, it acts on the $4D$ spacetime and does not mix with the trinification group $[U(4)]^3 = U(4) \times U(4) \times U(4$. Meaning that the commutators of the $U(2,2)$ generators with the $[U(4)]^3$ ones are all vanishing.

Recently in [12] a conformal completion of the Standard Model with a fourth generation was advanced with predictions of new gauge bosons, bi-fundamental fermions and scalars accessible by the LHC can be found. Related to four fermion generations, the authors [13] argued the possibility that fermion masses, in particular quarks, might originate through the condensation of a fourth family which interacts with all of the quarks via a contact four-fermion term coming from the existence of torsion on the spacetime. A fourth generation model and a kinematic Higgs mechanism to construct chiral fermion masses in the Standard Model based on Dirac-Kahler fermions was presented by [14]. The mass spectrum was computed and the electron neutrino and the 4th neutrino masses are related via a see-saw-like mechanism. The relevance of Dirac-Kahler fermions is that their description fits naturally into the polyvector decomposition of the Clifford algebra generators into scalars, vectors, bivectors, trivectors, ...

A breaking of $U(4) \times U(4) \times U(4) \to SU(3)_C \times SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R$ leads to the trinification gauge group proposed long ago by Glashow [15] involving 3 generations of fermions. The group is combined with a discrete symmetry group Z_3 exchanging left, right and color symmetries. A breaking of $SU(3)_C \times SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R \to SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_W \times U(1)_Y$ furnishes the Standard Model gauge group.

Within the context of string and M-theory, a $U(3)_C \times U(3)_L \times U(3)_R$ gauge symmetry from intersecting D-branes was found by [16] . This is equivalent to the trinification model extended by three $U(1)$ factors which survive as global symmetries in the low energy effective model. The Standard Model fermions are accommodated in the three possible bifundamental multiplets represented by strings with endpoints attached on different brane-stacks of this particular setup.

A Dp-brane is an extended object in p-dimensions whose world volume is $p+1$-dim. In D-branes model building one exploits the fact that a stack of N parallel, almost coincident D-branes gives rise to a $U(N)$ gauge group. Chirality arises when intersecting branes are wrapped on a torus with the chiral fermions sitting in the various *intersections* of the D-branes configuration. Here, the six-dimensional compact space is taken to be a $6D$ factorizable torus $T_6 = (T_2)^3$.

To construct the D-brane analogue of the trinification model, Leontaris [16] considered three stacks of $D6$-branes, each stack containing 3 parallel almost coincident branes giving rise to the gauge symmetry. 4 stacks of 4 parallel almost coincident D-branes will furnish the group $U(4)\times U(4)\times U(4)\times U(4) \simeq Cl(5,C)$ The Standard Model fermions are represented by open strings attached to two different brane-stacks and belong to $(\mathbf{3},\bar{\mathbf{3}},\mathbf{1})+(\bar{\mathbf{3}},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{3})+(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{3},\bar{\mathbf{3}})$ representations as is the case of the $SU(3)^3$ Trinification model. For further details we refer to [16]. More recently the physical Higgs mass (pole mass) was found to be 125 ± 1.4 GeV in agreement with the experimental results and based on a study of the Trinification subgroup of E_6 by [17].

The fermionic matter and Higgs sector of the Standard Model within the context of Clifford gauge field theories has been analyzed in [33]. The 16 fermions of each generation can be assembled into the entries of a 4×4 matrix representation of the $Cl(4)$ algebra whose 16 generators are Γ^A, $A = 1,2,3,....,16$. The latter generators can be represented in terms of 4×4 matrices $(\Gamma^A)_{ij}$ whose indices are $i,j = 1,2,3,4$. A fermion field Ψ^A_α carries double indices, A represents an internal $Cl(4)$-valued gauge index, while α represents a $Cl(3,1)$ spinor index associated with the four-dim spacetime. The left handed sector can be written as

$$\sum_A \Psi^A_{\alpha,L}\ (\Gamma_A)_{ij} \ \equiv \ \begin{pmatrix} \nu_e & u_r & u_b & u_g \\ e & d_r & d_b & d_g \\ e^+ & \bar{d}^{\bar{r}} & \bar{d}^{\bar{b}} & \bar{d}^{\bar{g}} \\ \bar{\nu}_e & \bar{u}^{\bar{r}} & \bar{u}^{\bar{b}} & \bar{u}^{\bar{g}} \end{pmatrix}_L \tag{2.28a}$$

the right handed sector is

$$\sum_A \Psi^A_{\alpha,R}\ (\Gamma_A)_{ij} \ \equiv \ \begin{pmatrix} \nu_e & u_r & u_b & u_g \\ e & d_r & d_b & d_g \\ e^+ & \bar{d}^{\bar{r}} & \bar{d}^{\bar{b}} & \bar{d}^{\bar{g}} \\ \bar{\nu}_e & \bar{u}^{\bar{r}} & \bar{u}^{\bar{b}} & \bar{u}^{\bar{g}} \end{pmatrix}_R \tag{2.28b}$$

We have arranged the entries of the above 4×4 matrix in order to accommodate the chiral fermions into representations of the Pati-Salam (PS) $SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ group such that the above 4×4 matrix entries admit the following $SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ decomposition. The left-handed fermions are displayed in the following representation of the Pati-Salam group

$$(\mathbf{4}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1}) \;=\; \begin{pmatrix} \nu_e & u_r & u_b & u_g \\ e & d_r & d_b & d_g \end{pmatrix}_L \qquad (2.29a)$$

Since the right-handed antiparticles feel the left-handed weak $SU(2)_L$ force [26] one has

$$(\bar{\mathbf{4}}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1}) \;=\; \begin{pmatrix} e^+ & \bar{d}^{\bar{r}} & \bar{d}^{\bar{b}} & \bar{d}^{\bar{g}} \\ \bar{\nu}_e & \bar{u}^{\bar{r}} & \bar{u}^{\bar{b}} & \bar{u}^{\bar{g}} \end{pmatrix}_R \qquad (2.29b)$$

Since the left-handed antiparticles feel the right-handed weak $SU(2)_R$ force [26] one has

$$(\bar{\mathbf{4}}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}) \;=\; \begin{pmatrix} e^+ & \bar{d}^{\bar{r}} & \bar{d}^{\bar{b}} & \bar{d}^{\bar{g}} \\ \bar{\nu}_e & \bar{u}^{\bar{r}} & \bar{u}^{\bar{b}} & \bar{u}^{\bar{g}} \end{pmatrix}_L \qquad (2.29c)$$

and, finally, the right-handed fermions are displayed in the representation

$$(\mathbf{4}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}) \;=\; \begin{pmatrix} \nu_e & u_r & u_b & u_g \\ e & d_r & d_b & d_g \end{pmatrix}_R \qquad (2.29d)$$

where we have omitted the spacetime spinorial indices $\alpha = 1, 2, 3, 4$ in each one of the entries of the above matrices. In particular, e, ν_e denote the electron and its neutrino. The subscripts r, b, g denote the red, blue, green color of the up and down quarks, u, d. The subscripts $\bar{r}, \bar{b}, \bar{g}$ denote the anti-red, anti-blue, anti-green color of the up and down antiquarks, $\bar{u}, \bar{d}$. The anti-particles are denoted by $\bar{e}, \bar{\nu}_e, \bar{u}, \bar{d}$. The remaining chiral fermions (Weyl spinors) of the second and third generation have identical decomposition as the one displayed in eqs-(2.28, 2.29). One simply replaces e for the muon and tau μ, τ particles; the neutrino ν_e for the neutrinos ν_μ, ν_τ, and the u, d quarks for the charm, strange c, s and top, bottom t, b quarks, respectively.

The algebra of Grand Unified theories, related to the $SO(10), SU(5)$ and Pati-Salam group was analyzed from a different perspective than the Clifford algebraic one presented here by [26]. The uphsot of having the $Cl(4)$-algebraic description of the 16 left/right handed fermions (Weyl spinors) in eqs-(2.28) is that it is consistent with the $SU(4)$ color symmetry (force) of the Pati-Salam model. The leptons are seen as the carriers of the white "fourth" color. Furthermore, one is confined to the observed four-spacetime dimensions.

In general, the fermionic matter kinetic terms for n_f generations is

$$\mathcal{L}_m \;=\; \sum_{i=1}^{n_f} \bar{\Psi}^A_{\alpha i}\; \Gamma^\mu_{\alpha\beta}\; (\; \delta_{AC}\; \partial_\mu \;+\; f_{ABC}\; \mathcal{A}^B_\mu\;)\; \Psi^C_{\beta i}. \qquad (2.30)$$

where the indices $i = 1, 2, 3, ...n_f$ extend over the number of generations (flavors) and $A, B, C = 1, 2, 3, ..., 16$. f_{ABC} denote the structure constants of the $Cl(4)$ gauge algebra.

Because the Pati-Salam (PS) $SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ group arises from the symmetry breaking of *one* of the $SU(4)$ factors in $SU(4) \times SU(4) \times SU(4)$, and given by $SU(4) \to SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_Z$, this requires taking the following vacuum expectation value (VEV) of the Higgs scalar

$$< \ \Phi \ > \ \equiv \ v_1 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.31}$$

Taking the VEV of the other Higgs scalar

$$< \ \tilde{\Phi} \ > \ \equiv \ v_2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -3 \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.32}$$

leads to a breaking of $SU(4) \to SU(3)_c \times U(1)_{B-L}$. Therefore, an overall breaking of $SU(4) \times SU(4)$ contains the Patti-Salam (PS) model in the intermediate stage as follows

$$SU(4) \times SU(4) \ \to \ [SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R]_{PS} \times U(1)_Z \to$$

$$SU(3)_c \times U(1)_{B-L} \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_Z. \tag{2.33}$$

The Higgs Potential $V(\Phi, \tilde{\Phi})$ involving quadratic and quartic powers of the fields is of the form

$$V \ = \ -m_1^2 \, Tr(\Phi^2) + \lambda_1 \, [Tr(\Phi^2)]^2 + \lambda_2 \, Tr(\Phi^4) \, -m_2^2 \, Tr(\tilde{\Phi}^2) + \lambda_3 \, [Tr(\tilde{\Phi}^2)]^2 +$$

$$\lambda_4 \ Tr(\tilde{\Phi}^4) \ + \ \lambda_5 \ Tr(\Phi^2 \tilde{\Phi}^2) \ + \ \lambda_6 \ Tr(\Phi \tilde{\Phi} \Phi \tilde{\Phi}) \ . \tag{2.34}$$

A further symmetry breaking

$$U(1)_{B-L} \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_Z \ \to \ U(1)_Y. \tag{2.35}$$

requires additional Higgs fields leading to the Standard Model

$$SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \ \to \ SU(3)_c \times U(1)_{EM}. \tag{2.36}$$

For further details of the Yukawa coupling terms furnishing masses for the quarks and leptons we refer to [33]. In Clifford space (C-space) the couplings are of the form $f_{ABC} \bar{\Psi}^A \mathcal{A}_0^B \Psi^C, f_{ABC} \bar{\Psi}^A \mathcal{A}_5^B \Psi^C$ (after taking the VEV of the Higgs scalars) associated to the C-space (Clifford space) fermionic kinetic terms $\bar{\Psi}_A \Gamma^M (D_M)^{AB} \Psi_B$ [33] due to the fact that the Higgs scalar fields in C-space are identified with the scalar and pseudo-scalar components of the C-space $Cl(4)$-valued gauge field $\Phi^A = \mathcal{A}_0^A$ and $\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\tau} \tilde{\Phi}^A = \mathcal{A}_{\mu\nu\rho\tau}^A$ as shown in [33]. The kinetic terms for the Higgs field $(D_\mu \Phi)^\dagger (D^\mu \Phi)$ are contained in the field strength components $F_{0M}F^{0M}$ associated to the $F_{MN}F^{MN}$ terms. M, N are polyvector-valued indices corresponding to the coordinates of the 16-dim ($2^4 = 16$) Clifford space associated with four spacetime dimensions. The 0 index corresponds to the unit (scalar) element of the spacetime Clifford algebra $Cl(3,1)$. The 5 index corresponds to the $\gamma_1 \wedge \gamma_2 \wedge \gamma_3 \wedge \gamma_4$ (pseudo-scalar) element of the spacetime Clifford algebra $Cl(3,1)$.

Whereas, the kinetic terms for the other Higgs field $(D_\mu\tilde{\Phi})^\dagger(D^\mu\tilde{\Phi})$ are contained in the components $F_{5M}F^{5M}$ associated to the $F_{MN}F^{MN}$ terms. Inserting the VEV of the Higgs scalars into their kinetic terms, after redefining the fields such that the new fields have zero VEV, yields the mass terms from the gauge fields associated to the broken gauge symmetries.

There is another symmetry-breaking branch that leads to the Standard Model and which does not contain the PS model. This requires breaking one of the $SU(4)$ factors as

$$SU(4) \times SU(4) \;\rightarrow\; SU(3)_c \times SU(4) \times U(1)_{B-L}. \tag{2.37}$$

leading to a partial unification model based on $SU(4) \times U(1)_{B-L}$. which can be broken down to the minimal left-right model via the Higgs mechanism [19]. More work remains to be done to verify whether or not this approach to unification is feasible. In particular, a thorough analysis of the parameters involved in the potential $V(\Phi, \tilde{\Phi})$, the gauge couplings g, the expectation values parameters $v_1, v_2, ...$ is warranted.

A unified model of strong, weak and electromagnetic interactions based on the flavor-color group $SU(4)_f \times SU(4)_c$ of Pati-Salam has been described by Rajpoot and Singer [18]. Fermions were placed in left-right multiplets which transform as the representation $(\bar{4}, 4)$ of $SU(4)_f \times SU(4)_c$. Further investigation is warranted to explore the group $SU(4)_f \times SU(4)_c$ of Pati-Salam within the context of the $U(4) \times U(4)$ group symmetry associated with the $Cl(4, C)$ algebra presented here.

2.6 Embedding $U(4)$ into $SO(8) \subset Cl(8)$, Fermionic Oscillator Algebras and $SO(10)$ GUT

The $u(4)$ algebra can also be realized in terms of $so(8)$ generators, and in general, $u(N)$ algebras admit realizations in terms of $so(2N)$ generators [5]. Given the Weyl-Heisenberg "superalgebra" involving the N fermionic creation and annihilation (oscillators) operators

$$\{a_i, a_j^\dagger\} \;=\; \delta_{ij}, \quad \{a_i, a_j\} \;=\; 0, \; \{a_i^\dagger, a_j^\dagger\} \;=\; 0; \quad i, j \;=\; 1, 2, 3, ...\; N. \tag{2.38}$$

one can find a realization of the $u(N)$ algebra bilinear in the oscillators as $E_i^{\ j} \;=\; a_i^\dagger \; a_j$ and such that the commutators

$$[E_i^{\ j},\; E_k^{\ l}] \;=\; a_i^\dagger \; a_j \; a_k^\dagger \; a_l \;-\; a_k^\dagger \; a_l \; a_i^\dagger \; a_j \;=$$

$$a_i^\dagger\ (\delta_{jk} - a_k^\dagger\ a_j)\ a_l\ -\ a_k^\dagger\ (\delta_{li} - a_i^\dagger\ a_l)\ a_j\ =\ a_i^\dagger\ (\delta_{jk})\ a_l\ -\ a_k^\dagger\ (\delta_{li})\ a_j\ =$$
$$\delta_k^j\ E_i{}^l - \ \delta_i^l\ E_k{}^j. \tag{2.39}$$

reproduce the commutators of the Lie algebra $u(N)$ since

$$-a_i^\dagger\ a_k^\dagger\ a_j\ a_l\ +\ a_k^\dagger\ a_i^\dagger\ a_l\ a_j\ =\ -\ a_k^\dagger\ a_i^\dagger\ a_l\ a_j\ +\ a_k^\dagger\ a_i^\dagger\ a_l\ a_j\ =\ 0. \tag{2.40}$$

due to the anti-commutation relations (2.38) yielding a double negative sign $(-)(-) = +$ in (2.40). Furthermore, one also has an explicit realization of the Clifford algebra $Cl(2N)$ Hermitian generators by defining the even-number and odd-number generators as

$$\Gamma_{2j}\ =\ \frac{1}{2}\ (a_j\ +\ a_j^\dagger);\quad \Gamma_{2j-1}\ =\ \frac{1}{2i}\ (a_j\ -\ a_j^\dagger). \tag{2.41}$$

The Hermitian generators of the $so(2N)$ algebra are defined as usual $\Sigma_{mn} = \frac{i}{4}[\Gamma_m, \Gamma_n]$ where $m, n = 1, 2, ...2N$. Therefore, the $u(4), so(8), Cl(8)$ algebras admit an explicit realization in terms of the fermionic Weyl-Heisenberg oscillators $a_i, a_j^\dagger$ for $i, j = 1, 2, 3, 4$. $u(4)$ is a subalgebra of $so(8)$ which in turn is a subalgebra of the $Cl(8)$ algebra. The Conformal algebra in $8D$ is $so(8, 2)$ and also admits an explicit realization in terms of the $Cl(8)$ generators, similar to the realization of the algebra $so(4, 2) \sim su(2, 2)$ in terms of the $Cl(3, 1, R)$ generators as displayed in eq- (2.7). The compact version of the group $SO(8, 2)$ is $SO(10)$ which is a GUT group candidate. In particular, the algebras $u(5),\ so(10),\ Cl(10)$ admit a realization in terms of the fermionic Weyl-Heisenberg oscillators $a_i, a_j^\dagger$ for $i, j = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$.

3 $4D$ Gravity, $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ Yang-Mills from $8D$ Quaternionic Gravity

In this section we review how Gravity and $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ Yang-Mills in four-dim can be obtained from $8D$ Quaternionic Gravity after a Kaluza-Klein compactification along the internal four-dimensional space [34].

It has been argued by [39] that a Kaluza-Klein compactification of $8D$ gravity on CP^2 involving a nontrivial *torsion* may bypass the no-go theorems by Witten that one cannot obtain the group $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ from a Kaluza-Klein mechanism in $8D$. It was *assumed* by [39] that if the torsion components $T^a_{\mu\nu}$ were proportional to $F^I_{\mu\nu} e^a_I$, where e^a_I is a vielbein employed to change the $SU(2) \times U(1)$ group index $I = 1, 2, 3, 4$ to the internal four-dim space CP^2 index $a = 1, 2, 3, 4$, the $8D$ Lagrangian corresponding to the curvature scalar and associated with a connection with contorsion K : $\mathbf{R}(\Gamma + K) = R(\Gamma) + (K)^2 + \nabla K$ yields a gravitational and $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ Yang-Mills theory upon compactification on $CP^2 = SU(3)/SU(2) \times U(1)$. The *problem* was that *no* proof was presented in [39] which shows why $T^a_{\mu\nu}$ is proportional to $F^I_{\mu\nu} e^a_I$.

For these reasons in this section we shall build an unification model of $4D$ gravity and $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ Yang-Mills theory (in the absence of matter) obtained from a Kaluza-Klein compactification of $8D$ quaternionic gravity on CP^2, rather than introducing by hand the torsion squared terms [39]. In this way we avoid the problems encountered by [20], [21], and also construct unified theories that contain the electro-weak force and gravity in $4D$. Our results differ also from the construction in [43] to unify the electro-weak force with gravity in $4D$ after complexifying the de Sitter group.

A geometrical treatment of a non-Riemannian geometry including an internal complex, quaternionic and octonionic space has been investigated by several authors [20], [21], [22], [23]. A quaternionic-valued metric is defined as

$$\mathbf{g}_{\mu\nu} \ = \ g_{\mu\nu} \ e_o \ + \ \mathbf{g}^i_{[\mu\nu]} \ e_i, \quad e_i e_j = -\delta_{ij} e_o + \epsilon_{ijk} e_k, \quad i,j,k = 1,2,3 \tag{3.1}$$

obeying the symmetry condition $\mathbf{g}^\dagger_{\mu\nu} = \mathbf{g}_{\nu\mu}$ where the Hermitian conjugation is taken in the internal quaternionic space. Namely, one can represent the generators of the quaternionic algebra in terms of the Hermitian Pauli spin 2×2 matrices σ_i and the unit 2×2 matrix as $e_o = \mathbf{1}_{2\times 2}; e_i = -i\sigma_i$. Hence the Hermitian conjugation is carried on the 2×2 matrices. The physical distance is

$$ds^2 \ = \ \frac{1}{2} \ Trace \ (\mathbf{g}_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu \ ) \ = \ g_{(\mu\nu)} \ dx^\mu \ dx^\nu \tag{3.2}$$

due to the traceless condition of the Pauli spin matrices and commuting nature of the coordinates. One may choose $g_{\mu\nu} = g_{(\mu\nu)} + i g_{[\mu\nu]}$ and maintain the Hermiticity condition $\mathbf{g}^\dagger_{\mu\nu} = \mathbf{g}_{\nu\mu}$ if $(i g_{[\mu\nu]} e_o)^\dagger = -i g_{[\mu\nu]} e_o$; i.e. if one includes a complex conjugation on i as well and which is compatible with the fact that $(e_i)^\dagger = (-i\sigma_i)^\dagger = +i\sigma_i = -e_i$ since the Pauli spin 2×2 matrices σ_i are taken to be Hermitian.

The quaternionic-valued connection is

$$\Upsilon^\sigma_{\mu\rho} \ = \ (\ \Gamma^\sigma_{(\mu\rho)} \ + i \ \Gamma^\sigma_{[\mu\rho]} \ ) e_o \ + \ (\Theta^\sigma_{[\mu\rho]})^i e_i \tag{3.3}$$

we explicitly write $(\mu\rho), [\mu\rho]$ to denote the symmetry and antisymmetry properties of the connection components. We will show how a Kaluza-Klein compactification in the internal space CP^2, from $8D$ to $4D$, yields a gravitational, $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ Yang-Mills theory in $4D$.

The gravitational and $U(1)$ Maxwell's EM sector are encoded, respectively, in the symmetric piece $\Gamma^\sigma_{(\mu\rho)} e_o$ and antisymmetric piece $i\Gamma^\sigma_{[\mu\rho]} e_o$ corresponding to the unit element e_o of the quaternionic-algebra-valued connection. The $SU(2)$ sector is encoded in the internal part $(\Theta^\sigma_{[\mu\rho]})^i e_i$. The $SU(3)$ Yang-Mills sector arises upon the Kaluza-Klein compactification resulting from the isometry group of the CP^2 internal space. Therefore, from a pure quaternionic gravity in $8D$ one can obtain a grand unified field theory of gravity and the standard model group $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ in $4D$.

This result can be attained by restricting $\Gamma^\sigma_{[\mu\rho]} = \delta^\sigma_\rho A_\mu - \delta^\sigma_\mu A_\rho$ to be the Einstein-Schrodinger connection, where A_μ is the EM field. Due to the antisymmetry, $\Gamma^\sigma_{[\mu\rho]}$ transforms as a tensor. This is not the case with $\Gamma^\sigma_{(\mu\rho)}$. The internal part of the connection $\Theta^\sigma_{[\mu\rho]}$ is restricted to be of the form $(\delta^\sigma_\rho\ \Theta^i_\mu - \delta^\sigma_\mu \Theta^i_\rho)\ e_i, i = 1,2,3$, such that the commutator becomes $[\Theta_\mu, \Theta_\nu] = 2\ \Theta^i_\mu\ \Theta^j_\nu\ \epsilon_{ijk}\ e_k$. The quaternionic-valued curvature

$$\mathbf{R}^\sigma_{\mu\nu\rho} \ = \ \partial_\mu\ \Upsilon^\sigma_{\nu\rho} \ - \ \partial_\nu\ \Upsilon^\sigma_{\mu\rho} \ + \ \Upsilon^\sigma_{\mu\tau}\ \Upsilon^\tau_{\nu\rho} \ - \ \Upsilon^\sigma_{\nu\tau}\ \Upsilon^\tau_{\mu\rho} \ =$$

$$(\ R^\sigma_{\mu\nu\rho} \ + i\ F^\sigma_{\mu\nu\rho}\ )e_o \ + \ (\ \mathbf{P}^\sigma_{\mu\nu\rho}\ )^k\ e_k \ + \ extra\ terms \tag{3.4}$$

has for components the following terms : the standard Riemannian curvature tensor written in terms of the Christoffel symbols as

$$R^\sigma_{\mu\nu\rho} \ = \ \partial_\mu\ \Gamma^\sigma_{(\nu\rho)} \ - \ \partial_\nu\ \Gamma^\sigma_{(\mu\rho)} \ + \ \Gamma^\sigma_{(\mu\tau)}\ \Gamma^\tau_{(\nu\rho)} \ - \ \Gamma^\sigma_{(\nu\tau)}\ \Gamma^\tau_{(\mu\rho)} \tag{3.5}$$

The tensor containing the Maxwell field strength is

$$F^\sigma_{\mu\nu\rho} \ = \ \delta^\sigma_\rho\ (\partial_\mu A_\nu \ - \ \partial_\nu A_\mu) \ + \ \delta^\sigma_\mu\ \partial_\nu A_\rho \ - \ \delta^\sigma_\nu\ \partial_\mu A_\rho \tag{3.6}$$

such that the contraction $F^\sigma_{\mu\nu\sigma} = (D-1) F_{\mu\nu}$ in D-dim is proportional to the $U(1)$ EM field strength $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$. And, finally, the $SU(2)$ field strength is encoded in the internal part of the curvature tensor which can be written as

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mu\nu} \ = \ \partial_\mu\ \Theta_\nu \ - \ \partial_\nu\ \Theta_\mu \ + \ [\ \Theta_\mu,\ \Theta_\nu\ ] \ =$$

$$(\ \partial_\mu\ \Theta^k_\nu \ - \ \partial_\nu\ \Theta^k_\mu\ )\ e_k \ + \ 2\ \Theta^i_\mu\ \Theta^j_\nu\ \epsilon_{ijk}\ e_k. \tag{3.7}$$

leading to

$$\mathbf{P}^\sigma_{\mu\nu\rho} \ = \ (\ \mathbf{P}^\sigma_{\mu\nu\rho}\ )^k\ e_k \ = \ \delta^\sigma_\rho\ (\mathbf{P}_{\mu\nu})^k\ e_k \ =$$

$$\delta^\sigma_\rho\ (\ \partial_\mu\ \Theta_\nu \ - \ \partial_\nu\ \Theta_\mu \ + \ [\ \Theta_\mu,\ \Theta_\nu\ ]\ )^k\ e_k \tag{3.8}$$

There are *extra* terms in eq-(2.4) involving products of the form

$$\Gamma^\sigma_{(\mu\tau)}\ \Gamma^\tau_{[\nu\rho]}, \ \ \Gamma^\sigma_{(\mu\tau)}\ (\Theta^\tau_{[\nu\rho]})^k, \ \ \Gamma^\sigma_{[\mu\tau]}\ \Gamma^\tau_{[\nu\rho]}, \ \ \Gamma^\sigma_{[\mu\tau]}\ (\Theta^\tau_{[\nu\rho]})^k \tag{3.9}$$

and for simplicity are not written down. The first two terms in (3.9) can be reabsorbed inside the ordinary derivatives to yield "covariantized" $SU(2)\times U(1)$ field strengths involving the *analog* of covariant-like derivatives ∇_μ acting on the gauge fields; and the last two terms are *analogous* (but *not* identical) to torsion-squared terms and products of torsion terms. If one has quaternionic gravity in $8D$, the indices are $M, N, L = 1,2,3,.....,8$ and, if one wishes, one may build a Lagrangian out of the following tensorial quantities found *within* the quaternionic-valued curvature above : namely the $8D$ Riemannian scalar curvature $\mathcal{R} = g^{(MN)} R_{MN}$, the $U(1)$ and $SU(2)$ field strengths F_{MN}, F^i_{MN}. In particular, let us start with a standard Lagrangian for gravity plus $SU(2)\times U(1)$ Yang-Mills in $8D$ given by

$$\mathcal{L} \ = \ \mathcal{R} \ - \frac{1}{4}\ (F_{MN})^2 \ - \frac{1}{4}\ (F^i_{MN})^2, \quad M, N = 1,2,3,......,8 \tag{3.10}$$

where we set the numerical couplings to unity. The components of the Ricci tensors after a Kaluza-Klein compactification are given by [24]

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu} \ = \ R_{\mu\nu} \ - \frac{1}{2} \ K^a_I \ K_{aJ} \ F^I_{\mu\rho} \ F^{J\rho}_\nu, \quad \mathcal{R}_{\mu a} \ = \ \frac{1}{2} \ K^I_a \ D_\nu F^{I\nu}_\mu \qquad (3.11a)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{ab} \ = \ R_{ab} \ + \ \frac{1}{4} \ K^I_a \ K^J_b \ F^I_{\mu\nu} \ F^{J\mu\nu} \qquad (3.11b)$$

where K^{aI} are the Killing vectors associated with the $SU(3)$ isometry group (metric preserving symmetry) of the internal space $CP^2 = SU(3)/SU(2) \times U(1)$. The range of the indices is $\mu, \nu = 1,2,3,4$; $a, b = 1,2,3,4$ and $I, J = 1,2,3, ..., 8$. Eqs-(2.11a, 2.11b) lead to the following decomposition of the $8D$ scalar curvature

$$\mathcal{R} \ = \ R[g_{\mu\nu}] \ - \frac{1}{4} \ F^I_{\mu\nu} \ F^{\mu\nu}_I \ + \ g^{ab} \ R_{ab} \ + \ .... \qquad (3.11c)$$

so that the Lagrangian (3.10) furnishes a four-dim theory of gravity and $SU(3)$ Yang-Mills interacting with a non-linear sigma model scalar field stemming from the metric degrees of freedom in the internal space. The indices $I = 1,2,3, ..., 8$ span the 8 generators of the $SU(3)$ algebra and $R = g^{(\mu\nu)} R_{\mu\nu}$ is the four-dim scalar curvature.

Concluding, from a quaternionic-valued gravitational theory in $8D$, one has the necessary field ingredients to build the Lagrangian in eq-(3.10) and generate a gravitational and $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ Yang-Mills theory in $4D$ after a Kaluza-Klein compactification on CP^2. For this reason, this kind of grand unification program warrants further investigation.

4 A realization of E_8 in terms of $Cl(16) = Cl(8) \otimes Cl(8)$ generators

Note : For convenience, in what follows we are going to use $SO(N), SU(N), E_8, \cdots$ for both the algebras and groups. Mathematicians use $so(N), su(N), e_8, \cdots$ and direct sums $\oplus$ for Lie algebras; while capital letters and direct products $\times$ are used for groups. We hope this will not cause confusion. The Lie algebra E_8 is a complex one which admits many different real forms that are described by the difference in the number of non-compact and compact generators. The realization of the E_8 algebra in this section is the one associated to $E_{8(8)}$ with 128 non-compact generators, and 120 compact ones.

The commutation relations of E_8 can be expressed in terms of the 120 $SO(16)$ bivector generators $X^{[IJ]}$ and the 128 $SO(16)$ chiral spinorial generators Y^α as [44] (and references therein)

$$[X^{IJ}, X^{KL}] \ = \ 4 \ (\ \delta^{IK} \ X^{LJ} - \delta^{IL} \ X^{KJ} + \delta^{JK} \ X^{IL} - \delta^{JL} \ X^{IK} \ ).$$

$$[X^{IJ}, Y_\alpha] \;=\; -\frac{1}{2}\,\Gamma^{[IJ]}_{\alpha\beta}\;Y^\beta; \qquad [Y_\alpha, Y_\beta] \;=\; \frac{1}{4}\,\Gamma^{[IJ]}_{\alpha\beta}\;X_{IJ}. \qquad (4.1a)$$

where $X^{IJ} = -X^{JI}$. It is required to choose a representation of the gamma matrices such that $\Gamma^{[IJ]}_{\alpha\beta} = -\Gamma^{[IJ]}_{\beta\alpha}$ since $[Y_\alpha, Y_\beta]$ is antisymmetric under $\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta$. The Jacobi identities among the triplet $[Y_\alpha, [Y_\beta, Y_\gamma]]$ + cyclic permutation are

$$\Gamma^{IJ}_{\alpha\beta}\;\Gamma^{IJ}_{\gamma\delta}\;Y^\delta \;+\; \textit{cyclic permutation among } (\alpha,\beta,\gamma) \;=\; 0. \qquad (4.2a)$$

the above Jacobi identity can be shown to be satisfied by contracting two of the spinorial indices (α,β) in (4.2a) after multiplying (2.2a) by $\Gamma^{\alpha\beta}_{KL}$ and $\Gamma^{\alpha\beta}_{K_1K_2....K_6}$, respectively, giving

$$\Gamma^{IJ}_{\alpha\beta}\;\Gamma^{\alpha\beta}_{KL}\;\Gamma^{IJ}_{\gamma\delta} \;+\; \Gamma^{IJ}_{\beta\gamma}\;\Gamma^{\alpha\beta}_{KL}\;\Gamma^{IJ}_{\alpha\delta} \;+\; \Gamma^{IJ}_{\gamma\alpha}\;\Gamma^{\alpha\beta}_{KL}\;\Gamma^{IJ}_{\beta\delta} \;=\; 0. \qquad (4.2b)$$

and

$$\Gamma^{IJ}_{\alpha\beta}\;\Gamma^{\alpha\beta}_{K_1K_2....K_6}\;\Gamma^{IJ}_{\gamma\delta} + \Gamma^{IJ}_{\beta\gamma}\;\Gamma^{\alpha\beta}_{K_1K_2....K_6}\;\Gamma^{IJ}_{\alpha\delta} + \Gamma^{IJ}_{\gamma\alpha}\;\Gamma^{\alpha\beta}_{K_1K_2....K_6}\;\Gamma^{IJ}_{\beta\delta} = \;0. \quad (4.2c)$$

Eqs-(4.2b, 4.2c) are zero (which implies that eq-(4.2a) is also zero) due to the very special properties of the *chiral* representation of the Clifford gamma matrices in $16D$ and after decomposing the $\frac{1}{2}(128\times127) = 8128$ dimensional space of antisymmetric $\Sigma_{[\alpha\beta]}$ matrices into a space involving 120 *antisymmetric* $\Gamma^{IJ}_{\gamma\delta}$ and 8008 $\Gamma^{I_1I_2....I_6}_{\gamma\delta}$ matrices in their chiral spinorial indices $\gamma\delta$.

The E_8 algebra as a sub-algebra of $Cl(16) = Cl(8)\otimes Cl(8)$ is consistent with the $SL(8,R)$ 7-grading decomposition of $E_{8(8)}$ (with 128 noncompact and 120 compact generators) as shown by [44]. Such $SL(8,R)$ 7-grading is based on the diagonal part $[SO(8)\times SO(8)]_{diag} \subset SO(16)$ described in full detail by [44].

Baez, in a rigorous detail of the algebra of octonions, described how the 248 generators of E_8 have a $28 + 28 + 3\times(8\times8) = 248$ decomposition consistent with the dimensions of

$$SO(V_8^{(1)}) \oplus SO(V_8^{(2)}) \;\oplus\; (V_8^{(1)}\otimes V_8^{(2)}) \;\oplus\; (S_8^+\otimes S_8^+) \;\oplus\; (S_8^-\otimes S_8^-) \quad (4.3a)$$

where $SO(V_8^{(1)})$ and $SO(V_8^{(2)})$ are two 28-dim orthogonal rotation algebras associated with two 8-dim vector spaces $V_8^{(1)}$ and $V_8^{(2)}$, respectively. The 16-dim $(2^{8/2} = 16)$ spinor space of $Cl(8)$ is represented by S_8 and it decomposes into two invariant subspaces S_8^+ and S_8^- forming respectively, the left handed and right-handed spinor representations of $SO(8)$ [28] and which exhibits triality, as we shall see next. Meaning that there is a Z_3 automorphism symmetry which exchanges the 8-dim vectorial representation V_8 with the S_8^+ and S_8^- left/right 8-dim spinorial representations.

Pavsic [28] has given a nice interpretation of the two 8-dim vector spaces $V_8^{(1)}$ and $V_8^{(2)}$ in eq- (4.3a) based on the $(8,8)$ split signature nature of the 16-dim Clifford space associated with the 16-dim (2^4) $Cl(1,3)$ algebra in $4D$ Minkowski spacetime, and which is comprised of polyvectors of grade $0,1,2,3,4$. The dimension of $SO(16)$ can be decomposed [26] as

$$SO(V_8^{(1)}) \oplus SO(V_8^{(2)}) \oplus V_8^{(1)}\otimes V_8^{(2)} \qquad (4.3b)$$

spanning the 120 generators X^{IJ}. The tensor products of the spinorial representations $(S_8^+ \otimes S_8^+) \oplus (S_8^- \otimes S_8^-)$ furnish the left-handed 128_+ spinorial representation of $SO(16)$. The other combination $(S_8^+ \otimes S_8^-) \oplus (S_8^- \otimes S_8^+)$ furnishes the right-handed 128_- spinorial representation of $SO(16)$.

A very important remark is in order. Extreme caution must be taken *not* to confuse the 7-grading decomposition of E_8 provided by Larsson, and the actual construction of the 248 generators of E_8 which is provided below. Taking the combination of the following tensor products

$$[\gamma^a_{(1)} \oplus \gamma^{a_1 a_2}_{(1)} \oplus \gamma^{a_1 a_2 a_3}_{(1)}] \otimes \mathbf{1}_{(2)} + \mathbf{1}_{(1)} \otimes [\gamma^b_{(2)} \oplus \gamma^{b_1 b_2}_{(2)} \oplus \gamma^{b_1 b_2 b_3}_{(2)}] + \gamma^a_{(1)} \otimes \gamma^b_{(2)}. \tag{4.4a}$$

from some of the generators of the two factor $Cl(8)$ algebras, described by the subscripts $(1), (2)$, furnishes Larsson's 7 grading of E_8

$$8 + 28 + 56 + 64 + 56 + 28 + 8 = 248. \tag{4.4b}$$

8 corresponds to the $8D$ vectors $\gamma^a, ...$; 28 is the $8D$ bivectors $\gamma^{a_1 a_2}, ...$; 56 is the $8D$ tri-vector $\gamma^{a_1 a_2 a_3}, ...$, and $64 = 8 \times 8$ corresponds to the tensor product $\gamma^a_{(1)} \otimes \gamma^b_{(2)}$. However, this *does not* mean that the 248 generators in eq-(4.4a) are the actual 248 generators of E_8 !. The E_8 generators and its commutators are explicitly constructed next. The set of generators provided by eq-(4.4a) does *not* generate an algebra. Their commutators do *not* even close. For example, taking the commutators

$$[\gamma_{a_1 a_2 a_3}, \ \gamma^{a_4 a_5 a_6}] = 2\gamma_{a_1 a_2 a_3}{}^{a_4 a_5 a_6} - 36 \ \delta^{[a_4 a_5}_{[a_1 a_2} \ \gamma^{a_6]}_{a_3]} \tag{4.4c}$$

yields the *sixth*-grade polyvector generator $\gamma_{a_1 a_2 a_3}{}^{a_4 a_5 a_6}$ in the commutators (4.4c) and which was *not* initially part of the generators in eq-(4.4a). Hence, one can deduce immediately that the latter generators in (4.4a) do not constitute a sub-algebra. They all are part of the larger algebra $Cl(16) = Cl(8) \otimes Cl(8)$ comprised of polyvectors of grades $0, 1, 2, \cdots, 16$.

We will show below how one can rewrite the E_8 algebra in terms of $8 + 8$ vectors Z^a, Z_a ($a = 1, 2, ...8$); $28 + 28$ bivectors $Z^{[ab]}, Z_{[ab]}$; $56 + 56$ tri-vectors $E^{[abc]}, E_{[abc]}$, and the $SL(8, R)$ generators E^b_a which are expressed in terms of a $8 \times 8 = 64$-component tensor Y^{ab} that can be decomposed into a symmetric part $Y^{(ab)}$ with 36 independent components, and an anti-symmetric part $Y^{[ab]}$ with 28 independent components. Its trace $Y^{cc} = N$ yields an element N of the Cartan subalgebra such that the degrees $-3, -2, -1, 0, 3, 2, 1$ of the 7-grading of $E_{8(8)}$ can be read from [44]. We should note that the description of the E_8 generators, below, differs from the one used by Smith [29], [30].

We begin by following very closely [44] and write the full $E_{8(8)}$ commutators in the $SL(8, R)$ basis of [45], after decomposing the $SO(16)$ representations into representations of the subgroup $SO(8) \equiv \big(SO(8) \times SO(8)\big)_{\text{diag}} \subset SO(16)$. The indices corresponding to the $\mathbf{8}_v, \mathbf{8}_s$ and $\mathbf{8}_c$ representations of $SO(8)$, respectively, will be denoted by a, α and $\dot{\alpha}$. After a triality rotation the $SO(8)$ vector and spinor representations decompose as [44]

$$\mathbf{16} \to \mathbf{8_s} \oplus \mathbf{8_c}. \tag{4.5}$$

$$\mathbf{128_s} \to (\mathbf{8_s} \otimes \mathbf{8_c}) \oplus (\mathbf{8_v} \otimes \mathbf{8_v}) = \mathbf{8_v} \oplus \mathbf{56_v} \oplus \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{28} \oplus \mathbf{35_v}. \tag{4.6a}$$

$$\mathbf{128_c} \to (\mathbf{8_v} \otimes \mathbf{8_s}) \oplus (\mathbf{8_c} \otimes \mathbf{8_v}) = \mathbf{8_s} \oplus \mathbf{56_s} \oplus \mathbf{8_c} \oplus \mathbf{56_c}. \tag{4.6b}$$

respectively. We thus have $I = (\alpha, \dot\alpha)$ and $A = (\alpha\dot\beta, ab)$, and the E_8 generators decompose as

$$X^{[IJ]} \to (X^{[\alpha\beta]},\ X^{[\dot\alpha\dot\beta]},\ X^{\alpha\dot\beta}); \quad Y^A \to (Y^{\alpha\dot\alpha}, Y^{ab}). \tag{4.7}$$

Next we regroup these generators as follows. The 63 generators

$$E_a^b \ = \ \frac{1}{8}(\ \Gamma^{ab}_{\alpha\beta} \ X^{[\alpha\beta]} \ + \ \Gamma^{ab}_{\dot\alpha\dot\beta} \ X^{[\dot\alpha\dot\beta]}) \ + \ Y^{(ab)} \ - \ \frac{1}{8}\delta^{ab} Y^{cc}. \tag{4.8}$$

for $1 \leq a, b \leq 8$ span an $SL(8,R)$ subalgebra of E_8. The generator given by the trace $N = Y^{cc}$ extends this subalgebra to $GL(8,R)$. $\Gamma^{ab}, \Gamma^{abc}, ..$ are signed sums of antisymmetrized products of gammas. The remainder of the E_8 Lie algebra then decomposes into the following representations of $SL(8,R)$:

$$Z^a \ = \ \frac{1}{4}\Gamma^a_{\alpha\dot\alpha} \ (\ X^{\alpha\dot\alpha} \ + \ Y^{\alpha\dot\alpha}). \tag{4.9a}$$

$$Z_{[ab]} \ = \ Z_{ab} \ = \ \frac{1}{8} \left(\ \Gamma^{ab}_{\alpha\beta} \ X^{[\alpha\beta]} \ - \ \Gamma^{ab}_{\dot\alpha\dot\beta} \ X^{[\dot\alpha\dot\beta]} \ \right) \ + \ Y^{[ab]}. \tag{4.9b}$$

$$E^{[abc]} \ = \ E^{abc} \ = \ -\frac{1}{4}\Gamma^{abc}_{\alpha\dot\alpha} \ (\ X^{\alpha\dot\alpha} \ - \ Y^{\alpha\dot\alpha}). \tag{4.9c}$$

and

$$Z_a \ = \ -\frac{1}{4}\Gamma^a_{\alpha\dot\alpha} \ (X^{\alpha\dot\alpha} \ - \ Y^{\alpha\dot\alpha} \ ). \tag{4.10a}$$

$$Z^{[ab]} \ = \ Z^{ab} \ = \ -\frac{1}{8} \left(\ \Gamma^{ab}_{\alpha\beta} \ X^{[\alpha\beta]} \ - \ \Gamma^{ab}_{\dot\alpha\dot\beta} \ X^{[\dot\alpha\dot\beta]} \ \right) \ + \ Y^{[ab]}. \tag{4.10b}$$

$$E_{[abc]} \ = \ E_{abc} \ = \ -\frac{1}{4}\Gamma^{abc}_{\alpha\dot\alpha} \ (\ X^{\alpha\dot\alpha} \ + \ Y^{\alpha\dot\alpha}). \tag{4.10c}$$

It is important to emphasize that $Z_a \neq \eta_{ab} Z^b$, $Z_{ab} \neq \eta_{ac}\eta_{db} Z^{cd}$, ... and for these reasons one could use the more convenient notation for the generators

$$\mathcal{Z}^a_\pm \equiv (Z^a, Z_a); \quad \mathcal{Z}^{ab}_\pm \equiv (Z^{ab}, Z_{ab}); \quad \mathcal{Z}^{abc}_\pm \equiv (E^{abc}, E_{abc}). \tag{4.11}$$

which permits to view these *doublets* of generators (4.11) as pairs of "canonically conjugate variables", and which in turn, allows us to view their commutation relations as a defining a generalized deformed Weyl-Heisenberg algebra with noncommuting coordinates and momenta as shown next. One may define the pairs of complex generators if one wishes to be given as

$$V^a \ = \ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \ (\mathcal{Z}^a_+ \ - i \ \mathcal{Z}^a_-), \quad \bar{V}^a \ = \ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \ (\mathcal{Z}^a_+ \ + i \ \mathcal{Z}^a_-). \tag{4.12a}$$

$$V^{ab} \ = \ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \ (\mathcal{Z}^{ab}_+ \ - i \ \mathcal{Z}^{ab}_-), \quad \bar{V}^{ab} \ = \ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \ (\mathcal{Z}^{ab}_+ \ + i \ \mathcal{Z}^{ab}_-). \tag{4.12b}$$

$$V^{abc} \ = \ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \ (\mathcal{Z}^{ab}_+ \ - i \ \mathcal{Z}^{ab}_-), \quad \bar{V}^{abc} \ = \ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \ (\mathcal{Z}^{abc}_+ \ + i \ \mathcal{Z}^{abc}_-). \tag{4.12c}$$

The remaining $GL(8,R) = Sl(8,R) \times U(1)$ generators are

$$\mathcal{E}^{ab} \ = \ \mathcal{E}^{(ab)} + \mathcal{E}^{[ab]}. \tag{4.13}$$

The Cartan subalgebra is spanned by the diagonal elements $E^1_1, ..., E^7_7$ and N, or, equivalently, by $Y^{11}, ..., Y^{88}$. The elements E^b_a for $a < b$ (or $a > b$) together with the elements for $a < b < c$ generate the Borel subalgebra of E_8 associated with the positive (negative) roots of E_8. Furthermore, these generators are graded w.r.t. the number of times the root α_8 (corresponding to the element N in the Cartan subalgebra) appears, such that for any basis generator X we have $[N, X] = deg\ (X) \cdot X$.

The degree can be read off from

$$[N, \ Z^a] \ = \ 3Z^a, \ \ [N, \ Z_a] \ = \ -3\, Z_a, \ \ [N, \ Z_{ab}] \ = \ 2Z_{ab}; \ \ [N, \ Z^{ab}] \ = \ -2Z^{ab}$$

$$[N, \ E^{abc}] \ = \ E^{abc}, \quad [N, \ E_{abc}] \ = \ - E_{abc}; \quad [N, \ E^b_a] \ = \ 0. \tag{4.14}$$

The remaining commutation relations defining the generalized deformed Weyl-Heisenberg algebra involving pairs of canonical conjugate generators are

$$[Z^a, Z^b] = 0; \quad [Z_a, Z_b] = 0; \quad [Z_a, Z^b] = E^b_a - \frac{3}{8}\delta^b_a N. \tag{4.15}$$

This last commutator between the pairs of conjugate Z_a, Z^b generators (like phase space coordinates) yields the deformed Weyl-Heisenberg algebra. The latter algebra is $deformed$ due to the presence of the E^b_a generator in the r.h.s of (2.15) and also because the $\mathcal{N}$ trace generator does *not* commute with Z_a, Z^a as seen in (2.14). Similarly, one has the deformed Weyl-Heisenberg algebra among the pairs of conjugate Z_{ab}, Z^{ab} antisymmetric rank-two tensorial generators (like tensorial phase space coordinates in Quantum Mechanics)

$$[Z_{ab}, Z_{cd}] = 0; \quad [Z^{ab}, Z^{cd}] = 0; \quad [Z_{ab}, Z^{cd}] = 4\delta^{[c}_{[a}\ E^{d]}_{b]} \ + \ \frac{1}{2}\delta^{cd}_{ab}N; \tag{4.16}$$

The commutators among the pairs of conjugate and *noncommuting* E_{abc}, E^{abc} antisymmetric rank-three generators (like noncommuting tensorial phase space coordinates) are

$$[E^{abc}, E^{def}] \;=\; -\frac{1}{32}\epsilon^{abcdefgh} Z_{gh} \;\neq\; 0 \quad [E_{abc}, E_{def}] \;=\; \frac{1}{32}\epsilon_{abcdefgh} Z^{gh} \;\neq\; 0 \tag{4.17}$$

$$[E^{abc}, E_{def}] \;=\; -\frac{1}{8}\;\delta^{[ab}_{[de} E_{f]}{}^{c]} \;-\frac{3}{4}\;\delta^{abc}_{def}\;N. \tag{4.18}$$

The other commutators among the generalized antisymmetric tensorial generators are

$$[Z_{ab}, Z^{c}] = 0;\;\; [Z_{ab}, Z_{c}] = -E_{abc};\;\; [Z^{ab}, Z^{c}] = -E^{abc};\;\; [Z^{ab}, Z_{c}] = 0. \tag{4.19}$$

$$[E^{abc}, Z^{d}] = 0;\;\;\; [E_{abc}, Z^{d}] = 3\delta^{d}_{[a}\; Z_{bc]};\;\;\; [E^{abc}, Z_{de}] = -6\delta^{[ab}_{de}\, Z^{c]};\;\;\; [E_{abc}, Z_{de}] = 0. \tag{4.20}$$

$$[E^{abc}, Z_{d}] = 3\delta^{[a}_{d}\; Z^{bc]};\;\;\; [E_{abc}, Z_{d}] = 0;\;\;\; [E^{abc}, Z^{de}] = 0;\;\;\; [E_{abc}, Z^{de}] \;=\; 6\delta^{de}_{[ab} Z_{c]}. \tag{4.21}$$

The homogeneous commutators among the $GL(8,R)$ generators and those belonging to the deformed Weyl-Heisenberg algebra are

$$[E^{b}_{a},\; Z^{c}] \;=\; -\,\delta^{c}_{a}\; Z^{b} \;+\; \frac{1}{8}\;\delta^{b}_{a}\; Z^{c};\quad [E^{b}_{a},\; Z_{c}] \;=\; \delta^{b}_{c}\; Z_{a} \;-\; \frac{1}{8}\;\delta^{b}_{a}\; Z_{c}. \tag{4.22}$$

$$[E^{b}_{a},\; Z_{cd}] \;=\; -\,2\delta^{b}_{[c}\; Z_{d]a} \;-\; \frac{1}{4}\;\delta^{b}_{a}\; Z_{cd};\quad [E^{b}_{a},\; Z^{cd}] \;=\; 2\delta^{[c}_{a}\; Z^{d]b} \;+\; \frac{1}{4}\;\delta^{b}_{a}\; Z^{cd}.$$

$$[E^{b}_{a},\; E^{cde}] \;=\; -3\delta^{[c}_{a}\; E^{de]b} \;+\; \frac{3}{8}\;\delta^{b}_{a}\; E^{cde};\quad [E_{a}{}^{b}, E_{cde}] \;=\; 3\delta^{b}_{[c}\; E_{de]a} \;-\frac{3}{8}\;\delta^{b}_{a}\; E_{cde}. \tag{4.23}$$

Finally, the commutators among the $GL(8,R)$ generators are

$$[E^{b}_{a},\; E^{d}_{c}] \;=\; \delta^{b}_{c}\; E^{d}_{a} \;-\; \delta^{d}_{a}\; E^{b}_{c}. \tag{4.24}$$

The elements $\{Z^{a}, Z_{ab}\}$ (or equivalently $\{Z_{a}, Z^{ab}\}$) span the maximal 36-dimensional abelian nilpotent subalgebra of E_8 [44], [45]. Finally, the generators are normalized according to the values of the traces given by

$$Tr\;(NN) \;=\; 60\cdot 8;\quad Tr\;(Z^{a} Z_{b}) \;=\; 60\;\delta^{a}_{b},\quad Tr\;(Z^{ab} Z_{cd}) \;=\; 60\cdot 2!\;\;\delta^{ab}_{cd}$$

$$Tr\;(E_{abc} E^{def}) \;=\; 60\cdot 3!\;\delta^{def}_{abc},\quad Tr\;(E^{b}_{a} E^{d}_{c}) \;=\; 60\;\delta^{d}_{a}\delta^{b}_{c} \;-\; \frac{15}{2}\;\delta^{b}_{a}\;\delta^{d}_{c}. \tag{4.25}$$

with all other traces vanishing.

Using the redefinitions of the generators in eqs-(4.11, 4.12) allows to write the E_8 Hermitian gauge connection associated with the E_8 generators as

$$\mathcal{A}_\mu = E^a_\mu V_a + \bar{E}^a \bar{V}_a + E^{ab}_\mu V_{ab} + \bar{E}^{ab}_\mu \bar{V}_{ab} +$$

$$E^{abc}_\mu V_{abc} + \bar{E}^{abc}_\mu \bar{V}_{abc} + i \Omega^{(ab)}_\mu \mathcal{E}_{(ab)} + \Omega^{[ab]}_\mu \mathcal{E}_{[ab]} \quad (4.26)$$

where one may set the length scale $L = 1$, scale that is attached to the vielbeins to match the $(length)^{-1}$ dimensions of the connection in (4.26). The $GL(8, R)$ components of the E_8 (Hermitian) gauge connection are the (real-valued symmetric) $\Omega^{(ab)}_\mu$ shear and (real-valued antisymmetric) $\Omega^{[ab]}_\mu$ rotational parts of the $GL(8, R)$ anti-Hermitian gauge connection $i\ (\Omega^{(ab)}_\mu - i\Omega^{[ab]}_\mu)$ such that the $GL(8, R)$ Lie-algebra-valued connection $i\ \Omega^{ab}_\mu\ \mathcal{E}_{ab}$ is Hermitian because the $GL(8, R)$ generators $\mathcal{E}_{(ab)}, \mathcal{E}_{[ab]}$, and the remaining ones appearing in the E_8 commutators of eqs-(4.14-4.24), are all chosen to be anti-Hermitian (there are no i factors in the r.h.s of the latter commutators). The (generalized) vielbeins fields are $E^a_\mu, E^{ab}_\mu, E^{abc}_\mu$ plus their complex conjugates. These (generalized) vielbeins fields involving antisymmetric tensorial tangent space indices also appear in generalized gravity in Clifford spaces (C-spaces) where one has polyvector-valued coordinates in the base space and in the tangent space such that the generalized vielbeins are represented by square *and* rectangular matrices [25]. The trace part $\mathcal{N}$ is included in the symmetric shear-like generator $\mathcal{E}_{(ab)}$ of $Gl(8, R)$. The rotational part corresponds to $\mathcal{E}_{[ab]}$.

The E_8 (Hermitian) field strength (in natural units $\hbar = c = 1$) is

$$\mathbf{F}_{\mu\nu} = i\ [\ D_\mu,\ D_\nu\ ] = (\ \partial_\mu\ \mathcal{A}^A_\nu - \partial_\nu\ \mathcal{A}^A_\mu + i\ f^A_{BC}\ \mathcal{A}^B_\mu\ \mathcal{A}^C_\nu\ )\ L_A. \quad (4.27a)$$

where the indices $A = 1, 2, 3, ...248$ are spanned by the 248 generators L_A of E_8

$$V_a,\ \bar{V}_a,\ V_{ab},\ \bar{V}_{ab},\ V_{abc},\ \bar{V}_{abc},\ \mathcal{E}_{(ab)},\ \mathcal{E}_{[ab]}. \quad (4.27b)$$

respectively, giving a total of $8+8+28+28+56+56+36+28 = 248$ generators.

5 Fermions, E_8 and $Cl(8) \otimes Cl(8)$

In the introduction [36] it was mentioned how an E_8 Yang-Mills in $8D$, after a sequence of symmetry breaking processes based on the $non-compact$ forms of exceptional groups as follows $E_{8(-24)} \to E_{7(-5)} \times SU(2) \to E_{6(-14)} \times SU(3) \to SO(8, 2) \times U(1)$, leads to a Conformal gravitational theory in $8D$ based on gauging the non-compact conformal group $SO(8, 2)$ in $8D$. Upon performing a Kaluza-Klein-Batakis [39] compactification on CP^2, involving a nontrivial *torsion* which bypasses the no-go theorems that one cannot obtain

$SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ from a Kaluza-Klein mechanism in $8D$, leads to a Conformal Gravity-Yang-Mills unified theory based on the Standard Model group $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ in 4D. In section **3** it was reviewed how Gravity and $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ Yang-Mills in four-dim can be obtained from $8D$ Quaternionic Gravity after a Kaluza-Klein compactification along the internal CP^2 four-dimensional space [34].

Section **4** was devoted entirely to the algebraic structure of the E_8 algebra and whose 248 Lie algebra generators can be expressed in terms of the generators of the $Cl(16) = Cl(8) \otimes Cl(8)$ Clifford algebra. For this reason, it is not necessary to repeat all the technical details about the $Cl(8)$ algebra.

Let us begin with the first factor $Cl(8)$ in the product $Cl(8) \otimes Cl(8) = Cl(16)$. The $16 \times 16 = 256$-dim $Cl(0,8)$ algebra happens to be isomorphic to the $Cl(1,7)$ algebra, which in turn, is isomorphic to the 16×16 Real Matrix Algebra $M(16,R)$. This is relevant in so far that the $non-compact$ $8D$ Lorentz group $SO(1,7)$ is a subgroup of $Cl(1,7)$ and whose $\frac{8\times 7}{2} = 28$ generators L_{mn} are given by the following Clifford bivectors $\frac{1}{2}\ \gamma_m \wedge \gamma_n \Rightarrow L_{mn} = \frac{1}{4}\ [\gamma_m, \gamma_n], m, n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, 7$. The signature corresponding to $Cl(p,q)$ is chosen to be

$$ds^2 = (dx^1)^2 + (dx^2)^2 + \cdots + (dx^p)^2 - (dx^{p+1})^2 - (dx^{p+2})^2 - \cdots - (dx^{p+q})^2 \tag{5.1}$$

therefore for an $8D$ spacetime one has one temporal coordinate $p = 1$, and 7 spatial ones $q = 7$. This fixes the signature to be $(+, -, -, \cdots, -)$. We must remark that the Clifford algebra $Cl(7,1)$ is isomorphic to the 8×8 quaternionic matrix algebra $M(8, \mathbf{H})$ but is *not* isomorphic to the $Cl(1,7) \sim M(16,R)$ algebras. The algebras $Cl(0,8) \sim Cl(8,0) \sim M(16,R)$ are isomorphic. Clifford $Cl(p,q)$ algebras are very sensitive to the signature $p - q$ and dimensions $p + q$ of the space in question. For this reason the existence of Majorana, Weyl, Majorana-Weyl, Symplectic-Weyl spinors, depends on the number of dimensions $p + q$ and the signature $p - q$.

The 28 bivector (anti-Hermitian) generators $L_{mn} = \frac{1}{2}\gamma_m \wedge \gamma_n$, of the *second* factor $Cl(8)$ in the product $Cl(8) \otimes Cl(8) = Cl(16)$ obey the $SO(8)$ commutation relations

$$[L_{mn},\ L_{pq}] = g_{np}\ L_{mq} - g_{mp}\ L_{nq} - g_{nq}\ L_{mp} + g_{mq}\ L_{np} \tag{5.2}$$

In section **2.6** we described how to embed $U(4)$ into $SO(8)$, and such that $U(4) \times U(4) \subset SO(8) \times SO(8)$. The product group $U(4) \times U(4) = SU(4) \times SU(4) \times U(1) \times U(1)$ is large enough to accomodate the Standard Model group $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$. As mentioned in section **2**, $SU(4)$ is *not* large enough to accomodate the Standard Model group. $SU(4)$ branches as $SU(2) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ or $SU(3) \times U(1)$ but not into the Standard Model group. Despite that the number of 15 generators of $SU(4)$ is larger than the number of 12 generators ($8 + 3 + 1$) of the Standard Model group, the rank of $SU(4)$ is 3 and which is *less* than the rank 4 of the Standard Model group. $SU(5)$ (rank 4) is large enough to accommodate the Standard Model group. For this reason one needs *two* copies $U(4) \times U(4)$ as explained earlier in section **2** such that one can embed the Standard Model group into $U(4) \times U(4) \subset SO(8) \times SO(8)$.

Another approach to accommodate the Standard Model inside the $Cl(8)$ algebra was already discusssed in section **2.6** . The Standard Model group can be embedded into $SU(5) \subset SO(10)$, and in turn $SO(10)$ can be embedded into *one* copy of the $Cl(8)$ group. The $non-compact$ $8D$ Lorentz group $SO(1,7)$ is a subgroup of $SO(2,8)$, which in turn, can be embedded into the $Cl(1,7) \simeq Cl(0,8)$ group. Therefore the $8D$ Lorentz group and conformal group $SO(2,8)$ can both be embedded into the *second* copy of $Cl(0,8) \sim Cl(8,0) \sim M(16,R)$. Consequently, the Standard Model group and the Conformal group live inside the *direct* product (not to be confused with the tensor product) $Cl(8) \times Cl(8)$ in such a way that one does not violate the Coleman-Mandula theorem stating roughly that one cannot *mix* spacetime symmetries with internal ones. The direct product $Cl(8) \times Cl(8)$ has for dimension $2^8 + 2^8 = 2^9$. Whereas the tensor product $Cl(8) \otimes Cl(8)$ has for dimensions $2^8 \times 2^8 = 2^{16}$ which equals the dimension of $Cl(16)$.

Let us assume that one has 3 generations of 16 *massless* (chiral) fermions Ψ_α, with each Weyl spinor (half-spinor) having 4 real components in $4D$, the total number of degrees of freedom is then $3 \times 16 \times 4 = 3 \times 8 \times 8 = 192$, which incidentally matches precisely the number $3 \times |\mathbf{O}| \times |\mathbf{O}| = 3 \times 8 \times 8$ where $|\mathbf{O}| = 8$ denotes the real dimension of the Octonion algebra. The factor of 3 is actually due to the $Triality$ property of $SO(8)$ more than the fact that we have observed 3 generations. Lisi [63] speculated that because the adjoint and fundamental representation of E_8 are both 248-dimensonal, the massless fermions might correspond to a particular subset of the E_8 gauge fields, and which after a symmetry breaking, they acquire masses via the Higgs mechanism. The remaining 56 massless gauge fields will fit into two copies $SO(8) + SO(8)$.

The attempts to recur to this possibility were based in invoking the work of Quillen's superconnection [47]. We shall follow next the arguments of Distler [48] concerning the Quillen superconnection. A typical example of a Quillen superconnection is given by the Lie superalgebra-valued object comprised of a zero-form and one-form

$$D \; = \; d \; + \; dx^\mu \; A^a_\mu(x) \; T_a \; + \; \Phi^\alpha(x) \; \tau_\alpha, \;\; d = dx^\mu \frac{\partial}{dx^\mu} \tag{5.3}$$

where T_a, τ_α are the even and odd generators of a Lie $superalgebra$ and whose (anti) commutators are given by

$$[T_a, \; T_b] \; = \; f_{ab}{}^c \; T_c, \;\; [T_a, \; \tau_\alpha] \; = \; c_{a\alpha}{}^\beta \; \tau_\beta, \;\; \{\tau_\alpha, \; \tau_\beta\} \; = \; d_{\alpha\beta}{}^a \; T_a \tag{5.4}$$

$d_{\alpha\beta}{}^a$ is $symmetric$ under the exchange of α, β indices. $A^a_\mu(x)$ and the zero-forms Φ^α (scalar fields) are both bosonic fields. The curvature of D is defined as $F = [D, D]$ and has an even grade since the grade of the Quillen's superconnection D by definition is odd (the grade is 1).

Schreiber [48] proposed instead to replace the Lie superalgebra by a Z_2-graded Lie algebra where *all* the generators are *bosonic* and obey the commutators

$$[T_a, \; T_b] \; = \; f_{ab}{}^c \; T_c, \;\; [T_a, \; L_\alpha] \; = \; c_{a\alpha}{}^\beta \; L_\beta, \;\; [L_\alpha, \; L_\beta] \; = \; g_{\alpha\beta}{}^a \; T_a \tag{5.5}$$

where $g_{\alpha\beta}^{\ a}$ is now *antisymmetric* under the exchange of α, β indices. The reason Schreiber wanted to do this is that E_8 is a Lie algebra, and *not* a Lie *superalgebra*, and it admits various Z_2 gradings. The Schreiber superconnection [48] is based on a Z_2-graded Lie algebra given by

$$D \ = \ d \ + \ dx^\mu \ A^a_\mu(x) \ T_a \ + \ \psi^\alpha(x) \ L_\alpha, \quad d = dx^\mu \frac{\partial}{dx^\mu} \tag{5.6}$$

where now ψ^α is a fermionic (anti-commuting) Grassmannian-odd field $\psi^\alpha\psi^\beta = -\psi^\beta\psi^\alpha$. Its curvature $F = [D, D]$ differs from the prior case and makes sense because due to the *antisymmetry* property of $g_{\alpha\beta}^{\ a}$ under the exchange of α, β, the curvature contains the product $g_{\alpha\beta}^{\ a}\psi^\alpha\psi^\beta \neq 0$ which is not zero.

Schreiber remarked [48] that Lisi [63] was not interested in just any old Z_2-grading of the algebra E_8, but a very particular one. Namely, let us choose some embedding of $SL(2, C)$ into E_8. This defines an action of $SL(2, C)$ on the Lie algebra E_8. One wants the Z_2-grading that comes from the action of the (Z_2) center of $SL(2, C)$ on E_8. Then it is automatic that the Z_2-odd generators transform as spinors of $SL(2, C)$.

Despite this proposal by Schreiber, Distler added that, when all the dust settles, the Schreiber superconnection is equally useless for Lisi's purposes as a Quillen superconnection, though for different reasons as described in full detail by [62] and which we shall discuss below. Also one should notice that one cannot claim that the spacetime chiral fermions Ψ^α can be made to coincide with the anti-commuting (Grassmanian-odd) $SL(2, C)$ spinors ψ^α of the Schreiber superconnection (5.6) because the spacetime chiral fermion components Ψ^α are commuting $\Psi^\alpha\Psi^\beta = \Psi^\beta\Psi^\alpha$, whereas $\psi^\alpha\psi^\beta = -\psi^\beta\psi^\alpha$ are *anticommuting* and behave differently than the Ψ^α components.

The Quillen superconnection has been used in the construction of internal supersymmetries by [49] to give rise to unified structures that include quarks and leptons. The Quillen superconnection provides a natural setting for the dynamics of an internally supersymmetric theory with the Higgs field occuring as the "zero-th" order part of the superconnection. The Higgs mechanism enters quadratically into the curvature and hence quarticaly into the Lagrangian. Furthermore, the supercovariant derivatives provide naturally the Yukawa-couplings of the Higgs field to the fermions, without having to put them by hand as in the Standard model [49].

However, the problem here is that there are *no* known Lie superalgebras that are defined similarly to the Lie algebras E_6, E_7, E_8 (e.g. via octonions as in the classical case). The supersymmetric extensions turn out to be $infinite$-dimensional. They belong to the class of affine and hyperbolic Kac-Moody superalgebras like E_9, E_{10}, E_{11} [51]. The infinite dimensional hyperbolic Kac-Moody superalgebras E_{11} have been conjectured by [53] to encode the hidden symmetries of M-theory in 11-dimensions.

The reason Lie superalgebras could be very appealing to accomodate and incorporate fermions, *geometrically*, is that recently a gauge theory for a (de Sitter/Anti de Sitter) superalgebra that could describe the low energy particle phenomenology was constructed by [52]. The system includes an internal gauge connection one-form $dx^\mu A_\mu$, a spin-1/2 Dirac fermion ψ in the fundamental representation of the internal symmetry group, and a Lorentz connection ω^{ab}. There were many important distinctive features between this theory and standard supersymmetries, in particular that although the supersymmetry is local and gravity is included, there is *no* gravitino and the fermions get their mass from their coupling to the background or from a higher order self-coupling, while bosons remain massless. In four dimensions, following the Townsend-MacDowell-Mansouri construction out of a $osp(4|2), usp(2,2|1)$ superconnection it produces a Lagrangian invariant under the subalgebra $u(1) \oplus so(3,1)$ and where the only non-standard additional piece is the Nambu-Jona Lasinio (NJL) quartic fermionic terms. In this case, the Lagrangian depends on a single dimensionful parameter that sets the values of Newton's constant, the cosmological constant and the NJL coupling.

Zanelli et al [52] used the following super-Lie-algebra-vaued connection

$$\mathbf{A}_\mu = \; A_\mu^A T_A \; + \; \bar{\psi}_\mu^\alpha \; Q_\alpha \; + \; \bar{Q}_\alpha \psi_\mu^\alpha \tag{5.7}$$

where Q_α are the fermionic charge generators and the bosonic ones T_A are the $U(1)$ generator, the six Lorentz generators J_{ab} and four additional generators J_a comprising the (Anti) de Sitter algebra in four-dimensions. By projecting out the gravitino spin-$\frac{3}{2}$ component in $\psi_\mu^\alpha \rightarrow \psi^\alpha \Gamma_\mu$ it leaves only a spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ fermion ψ^α in (5.7). In this fashion Zanelli at al [52] recovered a gravitional Lagrangian with a cosmological constant, the Dirac Lagrangian with mass terms plus the couplings of fermions to the background torsion and the Nambu-Jona Lasinio (NJL) quartic fermionic terms. We should add also, that there are $(D\bar{\psi})(D\psi)$ terms as well.

The construction of Zanelli et al [52] could be generalized to supersymmetric extensions of exceptional Lie algebras like E_6, E_7, E_8 but that would involve the use of $infinite$-dimensional affine and hyperbolic Kac-Moody superalgebras like E_9, E_{10}, E_{11}. We leave this project for future work. A unified description of the orthogonal and symplectic Clifford algebras was used recently [50] to construct theories of Super-Clifford Gravity, Super-Clifford Spaces, Higher Spins, ... which might be relevant in Generalized Supergeometry.

6 Smith's $E_8 \subset Cl(8) \otimes Cl(8)$ algebra-based Unification Model in $8D$

6.1 The Coleman-Mandula Theorem and Gauge Bosons as Fermion Condensates

We remarked earlier that the Standard Model group and the Conformal group in $8D$ live inside the *direct* product $Cl(8)_{(1)} \times Cl(8)_{(2)}$ in such a way that one does not violate the Coleman-Mandula theorem stating roughly that one cannot mix spacetime symmetries with internal ones. Namely that the commutators $[Cl(8)_{(1)}, Cl(8)_{(2)}] = 0$. However when uses tensor products $Cl(8)_{(1)} \otimes Cl(8)_{(2)}$ in the construction of E_8, one has to check that the commutators of the tensor products of the matrix representations of the $SO(8)$ ($SO(1,7)$) bivector generators and the unit element represented by matrix $\mathbf{1}$ also vanish. Such commutators can be written symbolically as $[\ SO(1,7) \otimes \mathbf{1},\ \mathbf{1} \otimes SO(8)\ ]$ and we must check that they vanish.

After some straightforward algebra one can verify that the fundamental identities

$$[\ A \otimes B,\ C \otimes D\ ] \ = \ \frac{1}{2}\ [A,\ C] \otimes \{B,\ D\} + \frac{1}{2}\ \{A,\ C\} \otimes [B,\ D] \quad (6.1a)$$

and

$$\{\ A \otimes B,\ C \otimes D\ \} \ = \ \frac{1}{2}\ \{A,\ C\} \otimes \{B,\ D\} + \frac{1}{2}\ [A,\ C] \otimes [B,\ D] \quad (6.1b)$$

are a direct *consequence* of the definition

$$(A \otimes B)\ (C \otimes D) \ = \ AC \otimes BD \quad (6.1c)$$

Therefore from eq-(6.1a) one has

$$[\ SO(1,7) \otimes \mathbf{1},\ \mathbf{1} \otimes SO(8)\ ] \ = \ \frac{1}{2}\ [\ SO(1,7),\ \mathbf{1}] \otimes \{\ \mathbf{1},\ SO(8)\ \} \ +$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\ \{\ SO(1,7),\ \mathbf{1}\ \} \otimes [\ \mathbf{1},\ SO(8)\ ] \ = \ 0 \quad (6.2)$$

and there will be *no* mixing among the spacetime symmetries with the internal ones due to the vanishing contribution of all the terms in the right hand side of (6.2). Thus one does not violate the Coleman-Mandula theorem.

However if one looks at the explicit E_8 commutation relations of section **4** among the bivector generators $[Z_{ab}, Z^{cd}] \neq 0$ we can see these are *not* vanishing. The E_8 lives inside the *tensor* product $Cl(8)_{(1)} \otimes Cl(8)_{(2)}$. However when all of the E_8 generators $E^a_b, Z_a, Z^a, Z_{ab}, Z^{ab}, Z_{abc}, Z^{abc}$ are given by very specific linear combinations of the 120 bosonic $X^{[IJ]}$, and 128 bosonic Y^A $SO(16)$ generators as displayed in section **4**, there will be entanglement among Z_{ab} and Z^{ab} and there will be mixing of spacetime (external) symmetry generators and internal symmetry ones. A close inspection of eqs-(4.9b, 4.10b, 4.16) reveals this is the case because the two sets of $SO(8)$ bivector generators *do not commute* $[Z_{ab}, Z^{cd}] \neq 0$ so that there is *mixing* among external and internal symmetries.

The question is now how does one resolve the discrepancy with the results in eq-(6.2) ? The source of the discrepancy has to do with the choice of basis for the E_8 algebra. A tensor product of $Cl(8)_{(1)} \otimes Cl(8)_{(2)} = Cl(16)$ produces

2^{16} generators. Out of these very large number of generators one must extract a linearly independent basis of 248 E_8 generators that is compatible with the basis description outlined in section **4** and based on the 120 bosonic $X^{[IJ]}$ and 128 bosonic Y^A $SO(16)$ generators.

As we emphasized earlier, the set of 248 generators used in eq-(4.4a) to describe the 7-grading of the E_8 algebra by Larsson did *not* constitute an algebra (subalgebra of $Cl(16)$) because their commutators do *not* close as shown in (4.4c). This means, in particular, that the bivector $SO(1,7) \otimes \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{1} \otimes SO(8)$ generators, and the other generators of (4.4a), *are not* given by suitable linear combinations of the bivector generators Z_{ab}, Z^{ab} and the other E_8 generators in eqs-(4.8-4.10). The reason being that the latter E_8 generators constitue an algebra, while the former generators in (4.4a) do *not*. This is the underlying reason why $[SO(1,7) \otimes \mathbf{1},\ \mathbf{1} \otimes SO(8)] = 0$ and $[Z_{ab}, Z^{cd}] \neq 0$.

A change of basis for the E_8 generators is in principle possible such that in the new basis the commutators are $[Z'_{ab}, Z'^{cd}] = 0$ and there would not be an entanglement. For this reason we believe that it would simpler from the beginning to focus on the *direct* product $Cl(8)_{(1)} \times Cl(8)_{(2)}$ in such a way that one does not violate the Coleman-Mandula theorem, like we did in section **2** when dealing with the direct product of $Cl(4,C) \times Cl(4,C) = Cl(5,C)$ (at the algebra level one has $cl(5,C) = cl(4,C) \oplus cl(4,C)$).

Because $SO(1,4) \times SO(3) \subset SO(1,7)$, the $SO(1,7)$ bivector generators contains : (1) the de Sitter group $SO(1,4)$ in a $4D$ spacetime, which is the one associated with the Macdowell-Mansouri-Chamsedine-West formulation of gravity as shown in eqs-(2.12, 2.13). (2) it also contains the $SO(3) \sim SU(2)$. Because $SO(6) \times SO(2) \subset SO(8)$, the $SO(8)$ bivector generators contain : (1) $SO(6) \sim SU(4)$ and (2) it also contains $SO(2) \sim U(1)$. Hence, the combination of the $SO(1,7)$ and $SO(8)$ bivector generators contain the de Sitter group $SO(1,4)$ in $4D$ spacetime, $SU(2)$ and $SU(4) \times U(1)$ (the total combination is large enough to contain the Standard Model via the branching $SU(4) \to SU(3) \times U(1)$).

Another important remarks are in order. Let us look at the $120 + 128$ generators of the $SO(16)$ algebra in eq-(4.7) which led to the construction of all the E_8 generators $E^a_b, Z_a, Z^a, Z_{ab}, Z^{ab}, Z_{abc}, Z^{abc}$. The first $120 = 28 + 28 + 64$ generators are respectively

$$X^{[IJ]} \to (X^{[\alpha\beta]},\ X^{[\dot\alpha\dot\beta]},\ X^{\alpha\dot\beta}),\quad \alpha,\beta = 1,2,\cdots,8;\quad \dot\alpha,\dot\beta = 1,2,\cdots,8 \tag{6.3}$$

the remaining $128 = 64 + 64$ bosonic generators obeying commutation relations despite that the index A is a $Spin_+(16)$ chiral spinorial one, are

$$Y^A \to Y^{\alpha\dot\alpha},\quad Y^{ab},\quad a,b = 1,2,\cdots,8 \tag{6.4}$$

The $28 + 28$ bivectors associated to two copies of $SO(8)$ are respectively given by $X^{[\alpha\beta]}$ and $X^{[\dot\alpha\dot\beta]}$.

Focusing now on the triplet set of 64 generators each, and given by

$$X^{\alpha\dot\beta},\quad Y^{\alpha\dot\alpha},\quad Y^{ab} \tag{6.5}$$

one could try to reinterpret two sets of $8 \times 8 = 64$ massless spin-1 bosonic gauge fields (associated with the above first two sets of 64 generators) as if they were *massless* "fermion-composites" of two spin-1/2 massless fermions; i.e. comprised of massless fermion/anti-fermion pairs such as $A_\mu \sim \bar{\Psi}\gamma_\mu\Psi$, omitting internal E_8 indices and spacetime spinorial ones.

The massless antifermions have opposite chiralities as the fermions so the $\mathbf{8}_c$ spinorial representation associated with an antifermion corresponds actually to the $\mathbf{8}_s$ spinorial representation of the fermion counterpart , and vice versa. Hence, two of the sets of 64 generators associated with the *massless* fermion/anti-fermion "condensates" correspond to the tensor products of the $SO(8)$ spinorial representations $\mathbf{8}_c \otimes \mathbf{8}_c$ and $\mathbf{8}_s \otimes \mathbf{8}_s$ as in Lisi's model [63].

The fermions in Smith's model are assembled into octet-multiplets associated with the 8 octonion basis elements $e_0, e_1, e_2, \cdots, e_7$ and which correspond in the first generation, respectively, to the electron neutrino ν_e; the red, blue, green up quarks u^r, u^b, u^g; the electron e, and the red, blue and green down quark d^r, d^b, d^g. Their respective anti-particles fall into another octonion-multiplet. The problem is that these fermions are *not* massless. Hence one cannot use them as candidates for the fermion-condensates, unless one assumes them to be massless and later gain their mass via the Higgs mechanism. There are other problems as well, even if they are massless as it occurred with the neutrino theory of light [54].

There is the third set Y^{ab} of $64 = 8\times 8$ generators corresponding to the tensor product of two $SO(8)$ vector representations $\mathbf{8}_v \otimes \mathbf{8}_v$. Smith interprets the 64 spin-1 bosonic gauge fields (associated with the above set Y^{ab} of 64 generators) as if they were bilinears $X^\mu P^\nu$ involving the $8D$ spacetime X^μ coordinates plus their momentum P^ν conjugates. Because the classical phase-space coordinates are not operators, since X, P commute, one needs another interpretation. More rigorously one could say that a realization of the 64-dim $U(8)$ algebra bilinear in the fermionic oscillators as described in **2.6** ${E_i}^j = a_i^\dagger a_j, i, j = 1, 2, 3, \cdots 8$, and obeying the commutators $[{E_i}^j,\ {E_k}^l] = \delta_k^j {E_i}^l - \delta_i^l {E_k}^j$ seems closer to our goals .

However, to be physically rigorous, one must emphasize that the triplet set of 64 spin-1 gauge fields (bosons) associated with the generators $X^{\alpha\dot{\beta}}, Y^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}, Y^{ab}$ are *not* massless fermion-composites, *nor* phase-space coordinates composites, but just mere spin-1 bosons (gauge fields). All of the E_8 gauge fields must be $fundamental$.

Furthermore, let us suppose for the sake of the argument that one generation of massless fermions allowed us to generate 128 gauge bosons as fermion-anti-fermion condensates. We still have 2 more generations of fermions and whose fermion-anti-fermion condensates would make up two sets of additional 128 bosons. This is very problematic because there is *no* room for 256 extra gauge fields inside E_8.

The Neutrino theory of light was proposed in 1932 by Louis de Broglie who suggested that the photon might be the combination of a neutrino and an antineutrino. Pryce showed that one cannot obtain both Bose-Einstein statistics and transversely-polarized photons from neutrino-antineutrino pairs [54]. There is convincing evidence that neutrinos have mass. In experiments at the Super Kamiokande researchers [54] have discovered neutrino oscillations in which one flavor of neutrino changed into another. This means that neutrinos have non-zero mass. Since massless neutrinos are needed to form a massless photon, a composite photon is not possible.

6.2 Octonionic Realization of $GL(8,R)$ and $SU(3)$ Color Algebra of Quarks

The Octonionic algebra being nonassociative is difficult to manipulate. The authors [56] introduced left-right octonionic barred operators, by acting on the left and right on octonionic-valued functions (comprised of 8 entries), and which enabled them to find a realization of the associative $GL(8,R)$ group in terms 8×8 matrices. Octonionic realizations of the 4-dimensional Clifford algebra and $GL(4,C)$ were also constructed. Dixon [27] has explicitly displayed the octonionic realizations of $SU(3)$ and G_2 in terms of linear combinations of suitable bilinear products of left-acting operators.

The left-barred operators act on octonionic valued functions Ψ as $[\mathbf{a})\mathbf{b}]\Psi = (\mathbf{a}\Psi)\mathbf{b}$. The right-barred operators act on octonionic valued functions Ψ as $[\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{b}]\Psi = \mathbf{a}(\Psi\mathbf{b})$. One has $\Psi = \Psi_o e_o + \Psi^i e_i$ and $\mathbf{a} = a_o e_o + a^i e_i, \mathbf{b} = b_o e_o + b^i e_i$. The octonion basis elements $e_0, e_i, i = 1,2,3,\cdots,7$ obey the relations $e_i e_j = -\delta_{ij} e_o + c_{ijk} e_k$ where the structure constants c_{ijk} are fully antisymmetric in their indices. e_o is the unit element and e_i are the seven octonion imaginary units. For the octonionic imaginary units one has that the associator $\{e_i, e_j, e_k\} = (e_i e_j)e_k - e_i(e_j e_k) = 2 d_{ijkl} e_l$ does *not* vanish due to the nonassociative nature of the octonion algebra.

Defining the left-action (corresponding to the 7 imaginary elements e_m) by $L_m, m = 1,2,\cdots,7$, and the right-action (corresponding to the 7 imaginary elements e_n) by $R_n, n = 1,2,\cdots,7$ one can find a realization of L_m, R_n in terms of 8×8 matrices and extract two different bases for $GL(8,R)$. One basis is comprised of $\mathbf{1}, L_m, R_n, R_n L_m$ giving a total of $1+7+7+49 = 64$ (8×8) matrices representing $GL(8,R)$. Another basis is $\mathbf{1}, L_m, R_n, L_m R_n$ giving a total of $1+7+7+49 = 64$ (8×8) matrices. This provides a one-to-one correspondence between the left-right barred octonion operators and $GL(8,R)$. The authors [56] also showed that

$$L_m\, L_n \;=\; -\delta_{mn} + c_{mnp}\, L_p + [R_n, L_m], \;\; R_n\, R_m \;=\; -\delta_{mn} + c_{mnp}\, R_p + [L_m, R_n] \tag{6.6}$$

By introducing a new matrix multiplication defined in terms of ordinary matrix multiplication as

$$L_m * L_n \;=\; L_m\, L_n \;-\; [R_n, L_m] \;\Rightarrow\; L_m * L_n \;=\; -\,\delta_{mn} \;+ c_{mnp}\, L_p \tag{6.7}$$

one reproduces the nonassociative and noncommutative octonionic algebra.

An octonionic representation for the Dirac Hamiltonian was given by [56]. The complexified octonionic solutions found by using the complex inner products defined in [56] contain two orthogonal spinorial solutions, Ψ_1, Ψ_2, and each solution with its 4 complex degrees of freedom represent a Dirac particle. This suggests a natural simple *one*-dimensional octonionic formulation of the Standard Model, where two orthogonal spinorial solutions are needed to represent the leptonic and quark doublets [57].

The split-octonion algebra is based on the choice of basis

$$u_0 \ = \ \frac{1}{2}\,(e_0+ie_7), \ \ u_0^* \ = \ \frac{1}{2}\,(e_0-ie_7), \ \ u_i \ = \ \frac{1}{2}\,(e_i+ie_{i+3}), \ \ u_i^* \ = \ \frac{1}{2}\,(e_i-ie_{i+3}) \tag{6.8}$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$. One learns that u_i, u_i^*, for $i = 1, 2, 3$, behave like fermionic creation and annihilation oscillators corresponding to an exceptional nonassociative Grassmannian algebra

$$\{u_i, \ u_j\} \ = \ \{u_i^*, \ u_j^*\} \ = \ 0, \ \ \{u_i, \ u_j^*\} \ = \ -\,\delta_{ij}, \ \ i, j = 1, 2, 3 \qquad ()$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\,[u_i, \ u_j] \ = \ \epsilon_{ijk}\ u_k^*, \ \ \frac{1}{2}\,[u_i^*, \ u_j^*] \ = \ \epsilon_{ijk}\ u_k, \ \ (u_0)^2 = u_0, \ \ (u_0^*)^2 = u_0^* \tag{6.9}$$

Unlike the octonion algebra, the split-octonion algebra is *not* a division algebra since it contains *zero* divisors.

The automorphism group of the octonion algebra is the 14-dim G_2. It admits $SU(3)$ as the subgroup leaving invariant the e_7 imaginary element and the idempotents u_0, u_0^*. Gursey and Gunaydin [58] identified this $SU(3)$ as the color group acting on the quark and antiquark triplets $\Psi_\alpha = u_i \Psi^i_\alpha; \bar{\Psi}_\alpha = -u_i^* \bar{\Psi}^i_\alpha, i = 1, 2, 3$. From the split-octonion multiplication table one learns that triplet $\times$ triplet = anti-triplet; anti-triplet $\times$ anti-triplet = triplet, and triplet $\times$ anti-triplet = singlet, providing a very natural algebraic interpretation of quark confinement. Mesons are comprised of a quark/anti-quark pair, while (anti) baryons are comprised of three quarks and three anti-quarks, respectively. This preamble is necessary to understand the use of octonions in what follows next.

6.3 The Lagrangian in Smith's Physics Model

Smith's physical model is based on a $4D$ Lagrangian which has its origins in a parent $8D$ theory based on a gauge theory associated with the Clifford group $Cl(8) \otimes Cl(8) = Cl(16)$ (the isomorphism is due to the 8-fold periodicity of real Clifford algebras). The $4D$ Lagrangian is obtained after a spontaneous compactification process from 8 to 4 dimensions is performed. One must not confuse a Kaluza-Klein spontaneous compactification mechanism with a dimensional reduction. A higher-dimensional universe with compactified extra dimensions admits a four-dimensional description consisting of an *infinite* Kaluza-Klein tower of fields [55]. At lower energies one does not see that infinite tower of fields.

The group $U(4) \subset SO(8)$ is used to get the color group $SU(3)$, while the $U(2) = SU(2) \times U(1)$ emerges from the isotropy group in $SU(3)/U(2)$ defining the coset internal space CP^2 and which is based on the Kaluza-Klein-Batakis mechanism (requiring torsion) obtained from an spontaneous compactification of $M_8 \rightarrow M_4 \times CP^2$. The other pseudo-unitary group $U(2,2) \subset SO(1,7)$ living in the second copy of $SO(1,7) \subset Cl(1,7) \simeq Cl(0,8)$ is needed to obtain a $SU(2,2)$ Conformal gauge theory of gravity in four-dimensions.

The selected terms in the $4D$ Lagrangian (there are *many* other terms in the E_8 parent gauge field theory in $8D$) is comprised of the following four pieces :

(1). In $4D$, when there is self-duality $F =^* F$, one has that the Yang-Mills Lagrangian $Tr(F \wedge^* F)$ becomes $Tr(F \wedge F)$ which is the basis to build the MacDowell-Mansouri-Chamseddine-West (MMCW) Lagrangian associated with the $U(2,2) = SU(2,2) \times U(1)$ algebra as described in eqs-(2.12, 2.13). The MMCW action is the one used by Smith [29], [30] to account for gravity.

We should notice that in $8D$ the natural object upon which one builds an action is the 8-form $< F \wedge F \wedge F \wedge F >$ where the $<>$ symbol denotes extracting the group invariant element among the wedge product and requires an invariant group-tensor to contract group indices. In $D = 16$, the natural object will be the 16-form made out of 8 factors $< F \wedge F \wedge \cdots F \wedge F >$. This is how a Chern-Simons E_8 Gauge theory of Gravity, based on the octic E_8 invariant construction by [38], was used by [36] to build a unified field theory (at the Planck scale) of a Lanczos-Lovelock Gravitational theory with a E_8 Generalized Yang-Mills field theory and which is defined in the $15D$ boundary of a $16D$ bulk space.

(2) A Yang-Mills Lagrangian associated with the $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ group.

$$-\frac{1}{4} \left(Tr_{SU(3)}[F_{\mu\nu} \ F^{\mu\nu}] \ + \ Tr_{SU(2)}[F_{\mu\nu} \ F^{\mu\nu}] \ + \ [F_{\mu\nu} \ F^{\mu\nu}]_{U(1)} \right) \tag{6.10}$$

(3) A Ginzburg-Landau-Higgs term

$$- \ (D_\mu \Phi^\dagger)(D^\mu \Phi)] \ - \frac{1}{4} \ \lambda \ (\Phi^\dagger \Phi)^2 \ + \frac{1}{2} \ m^2 \ \Phi^\dagger \Phi \tag{6.11}$$

The complex scalar field Φ is an $SU(2)_L$ doublet. $\Phi^\dagger$ is the Hermitian adjoint. The complex scalar field terms originate from the dimensional reduction to $4D$ of the $8D$ Yang-Mills action.

$$-\frac{1}{4} \int_{M^8} Tr \ [\mathbf{F} \wedge^* \mathbf{F}] \tag{6.12}$$

via the Mayer-Trautman mechanism [31]. The Ni-Lou-Lu-Yang method [32] is used to calculate the Higgs mass.

(4) In the Standard Model, the Dirac mass terms for the fermions are generated after Yukawa couplings among the leptons and quarks with the Higgs field are introduced, and the mechanism of spontaneous symmetry breaking has been used. In Smith's model, the $8D$ Lagrangian integral is such that the mass m emerges from the internal space kinetic terms $\bar{\Psi}\gamma^a D_a \Psi = \bar{\Psi}\gamma^a \partial_a \Psi + \bar{\Psi}\gamma^a A_a \Psi; a = 1, 2, 3, 4$ and which represent the internal four-dim space contribution to the $8D$ Dirac kinetic terms $\bar{\Psi}\gamma^M D_M \Psi, M = 1, 2, \cdots, 8$. The 4 internal components $A_a = A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4$ of the gauge fields behave like 4 scalars from the $4D$ spacetime point of view. Those 4 real scalars can be assembled into 2 complex scalars that represent the complex Higgs $SU(2)$ doublet Φ. Thus from $\bar{\Psi}\gamma^a A_a \Psi \sim \bar{\Psi}\Phi\Psi$ one will generate Yukawa-type couplings leading to mass terms for the fermions when Φ acquires a vacuum expectation value (vev).

In section **5** we discussed the work of [52] which generates Dirac mass terms geometrically in $4D$ and directly from the coupling of the fermions to the background geometry. The Standard Model fermionic kinetic terms $\sum_f \bar{\Psi}_f \gamma^\mu D_\mu \Psi_f$ and mass terms $\sum_f m_f \bar{\Psi}_f \Psi_f = \sum_f m_f (\bar{\Psi}_{f,L}\Psi_{f,R} + \bar{\Psi}_{f,R}\Psi_{f,L})$ involve a summation over the 3 generations of chiral fermions, Weyl spinors. (Mathematicians use the terminology of half-spinors, here we shall use the physicist terminology). Each family (generation) is comprised of 16 fermions as described in eqs-(2.28) once a *massive* neutrino is introduced comprised both of a left and right handed component $\Psi_{R,L} = \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \gamma_5)\Psi$.

The fermion assignment by Smith differs from the one described in eqs-(2.28, 2.29). It is connected to the octonion-multiplet associated with the 8 octonion basis elements and which correspond, respectively, to the electron neutrino ν_e; the red, blue, green up quarks u^r, u^b, u^g; the electron e, and the red, blue and green down quark d^r, d^b, d^g. The anti-particles fall into another octonion-multiplet. At low energies (where we do experiments) a Quaternionic structure freezes out, splitting the 8-dim spacetime into a 4-dim physical spacetime M_4 and a 4-dim internal symmetry space CP^2.

The first generation of fermion particles are represented by octonions. The first generation of fermion antiparticles are represented by octonions in a similiar way. The second generation of fermion particles and antiparticles are represented by pairs of octonions. The third generation of fermion particles and antiparticles are represented by triples of octonions. Since the octonions are nonassociative one must not confuse a triplet of octonions (X_1, X_2, X_3) with the triple products $X_1(X_2X_3) \neq (X_1X_2)X_3$. These representation of the fermion families is the basis of the combinatorics used in the fermion mass calculations [29], [30] to be discussed in section **7**. In the next section we shall focus on the existence of chiral fermions after compactifications to lower dimensions.

6.4 Chiral Fermions and Instanton Backgrounds in CP^n

The complex projective space $CP^2 = SU(3)/U(2)$ was actively investigated in the 1980s as an interesting candidate for an Euclidean gravitational instanton.

The Euler characteristic of CP^2 is 3 ($n+1$ for CP^n) and the Hirzebruch signature is 1. It is *not* a spin manifold, there is a global obstruction to putting spinors on this space, since the second Stiefel-Whitney class is not zero. CP^n admits globally defined spinors for *odd* n, but *not* for *even* n. However, one can still put spinors on it provided fundamental gauge fields are added; namely if an appropriate topologically non-trivial background gauge field is introduced. This fact was used in [59] to construct a generalised spin structure $Spin^c$, where spinors with an Abelian charge move in the field of the Kahler 2-form on CP^2, which is somewhat analogous to a monopole field on $CP^1 = S^2$. To sum up, we have the interpretation of $Spin^c$ structures as being (locally) a spinor with an attendant $U(1)$ gauge connection. One may also construct $Spin^c$ structures associated with nonabelian fields as well, by including topologically non-trivial Yang-Mills gauge fields on CP^n.

It was shown by [61] that the quarks and leptons of the standard model, including a right-handed neutrino, can be obtained by gauging the holonomy groups of complex projective spaces of complex dimensions two and three. The spectrum emerges as chiral zero modes of the Dirac operator coupled to gauge fields and the demonstration involves an index theorem analysis on a general complex projective space in the presence of topologically non-trivial $SU(n) \times U(1)$ gauge fields.

The electroweak sector of the Standard Model emerges naturally in this construction from $CP^2 = SU(3)/U(2)$ when the gauge group is taken now [61] to be the holonomy group $U(2)$, instead of the $SU(3)$ isometry group, and the usual $Spin^c$ structure gives rise to a neutral singlet which is identified with the right-handed neutrino, while tensoring the standard $Spin^c$ bundle with the inverse of the canonical line bundle gives another $SU(2)$ singlet with the quantum numbers of the right-handed electron. The electron- neutrino doublet arises by coupling spinors to a natural rank 2 bundle which is dual to the generating line bundle. The curvature associated with this bundle represents a $U(2)$ instanton on CP^2.

A very rigorous application of the Atiyah-Singer index theorem for fermions coupled to gauge fields in CP^n backgrounds was used by [61] to determine the number of chiral zero (massless) modes of the (generalized) Dirac operator; i.e. the number of positive chirality zero modes minus the number of negative chirality zero modes equals the index which determines the number of fermion generations.

For a $SU(n)$ singlet with $U(1)$ charge $Y = q$, where q is an *integer*, the index in CP^n is [61]

$$\nu_q \ = \ \frac{1}{n!} \ (q+1) \ (q+2) \ ...... \ (q+n) \tag{6.13}$$

A Fermion in the fundamental **n**-dim representation of $SU(n)$, with a $U(1)$ charge $Y = q + \frac{1}{n}$, has for index given by

$$\nu_{q,n} \ = \ \frac{(q+n+1) \ (q+1) \ (q+2) \ ... \ (q+(n-1))}{(n-1)!} \tag{6.14}$$

On CP^2 Dolan and Nash [61] had : (1) An $SU(2)$ singlet with $q = 0$ giving zero charge $Y = 0$ and index $\nu_0 = +1$. (2) A second $SU(2)$ singlet with $q = -3$ giving charge $Y = -3$ and index $\nu_{-3} = +1$. (3) An $SU(2)$ doublet with $q = -2$ giving charge $Y = -2 + \frac{1}{2} = -3/2$ and index $\nu_{q=-2,\mathbf{n=2}} = -1$.

On CP^3 Dolan and Nash [61] had : (1) An $SU(3)$ singlet with $q = 0$ giving a charge $Y = 0$ and index $\nu_0 = 1$. (2) An SU(3) triplet with $q = -3$ giving a charge $Y = -3 + \frac{1}{3} = -\frac{8}{3}$ and index $\nu_{q=-3,\mathbf{n=3}} = 1$.

Interpreting positive (negative) index as giving right (left)-handed spinors, and rescaling the Y charge by $2/3$ (Dolan and Nash scaled it by $\frac{1}{3}$), this results for CP^2 in a single generation of particles of the electroweak sector of the standard model, including a right-handed neutrino. There are two $SU(2)$ singlets and one $SU(2)$ doublet given, for example, by a right-handed electron neutrino, a right-handed electron, and a left-handed doublet comprised of an electron neutrino and an electron as follows

$$\mathbf{1}_0 \;=\; \nu_{e,R}, \;\; \mathbf{1}_{-2} \;=\; e_R, \;\; \mathbf{2}_{-1} \;=\; (\nu_{e,L}, \; e_L) \tag{6.15}$$

The subscripts denote their weak charges Y and the normalization is such that the electric charge agrees now with the conventional form $Q = I_3 + \frac{Y}{2}$. For example, for the doublet, we have the third component of isospin $I_3(\nu_{e,L}) = \frac{1}{2} \Rightarrow Q = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} = 0$. $I_3(e_L) = -\frac{1}{2} \Rightarrow Q = -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} = -1$. Under CPT conjugation one gets their antiparticles : a left-handed electron anti-neutrino $\bar{\nu}_{e,L}$, a left-handed positron $\bar{e}_L$ and a right-handed doublet comprised of an electron anti-neutrino and a positron $(\bar{\nu}_{e,R}, \; \bar{e}_R)$.

The results for CP^3 allowed [61] (after scaling the Y charges by suitable factors) to obtain one complete generation of the quark sector of the standard model. For example, the right-handed up quark u_R; the right-handed down quark d_R, and a left-handed doublet (u_L, d_L). Under CPT conjugation one gets their antiparticles : the left-handed up antiquark $\bar{u}_L$; the left-handed down antiquark $\bar{d}_L$, and a right-handed doublet of antiquarks $(\bar{u}_R, \bar{d}_R)$.

To sum up, a single complete generation of the Standard Model was obtained successfully by Dolan and Nash [61]. The generalized $Spin^c$ structures were described in terms of tensor products of the exterior bundle of anti-holomorphic k forms in CP^2, CP^3 with powers of $U(1)$ line bundles and higher rank n vector bundles. See [61] for full details.

However, a number of questions and problems are still present. Firstly there is *no* obvious sign of *three* generations. Inserting different positive and negative integer values of q into the index formulas eqs-(6.13, 6.14) would yield different values for the number of generations but the fermions do not longer carry the correct quantum numbers of the Standard Model. Dolan and Nash argued that one could obtain more generations by taking copies of CP^2, but there seems no compelling reason to take three such copies and not some other number. Secondly since the internal manifold $CP^2 \times CP^3$ is 10-dimensional, and spacetime is four-dim, the total spacetime has 14-dimensions which is riddled with quantum anomalies.

They also remarked that this issue may be related to the question of what possible role the isometry group may play. In particular, they added that the smallest non-trivial matrix approximation to CP^2 is the algebra of 3×3 matrices, acting on a three dimensional complex vector space which carries the fundamental representation of the isometry group $SU(3)$. And it may be that this could be interpreted as a horizontal symmetry giving rise to three generations [61].

Note that the philosophy here is rather different to the usual Kaluza-Klein approach where the isometry group is identified with the gauge group. In the work of [61] the isometry group is being identified with a horizontal symmetry group and the holonomy group is the gauge group. On CP^2 one has $SU(3)$ and, using this as a horizontal generation group, the fundamental representation would give three generations. But then it is not clear what the role of the $SU(4)$ from $CP^3 = SU(4)/U(3)$ would be.

Distler and Garibaldi published a critical paper [62] arguing that Lisi's E_8 "theory of everything" [63] in four-dimensions, and a large class of related models, cannot work. They offered a direct proof that it is impossible to embed all three generations of fermions in E_8, or to obtain even the one-generation Standard Model without the presence of an antigeneration comprised of *mirror* fermions (fermions carrying opposite chirality to ordinary fermions). Other problems were cited by Motl [65] objecting to the addition of bosons and fermions in Lisi's superconnection, and to the violation of the Coleman-Mandula theorem. Lisi, Smolin and Simone Speziale [66] later on proposed an action and symmetry breaking mechanism, and used an alternative treatment of fermions.

Chakraborty and Parthasarathy [60], following the work of Hawking and Pope [59], have shown how an $U(1)$ instanton field configuration on CP^2 triggered a compactification from 8 to 4 dimensions, $M_8 \to M_4 \times CP^2$, and it led to an integer-valued index but to half-integer values for the electric charges of the chiral fermions. Their action was based on a $U(1)$ Maxwell gauge field, plus gravity and a cosmological constant. Despite that half-integer charges appeared in the results of [60] for the $U(1)$ instanton, integer-valued charges may occur for non-Abelian gauge fields coupled to the fermions due to a nontrivial topological twist generating an extra $1/2$ contribution to the electric charge.

It is required to repeat the Chakraborty and Parthasarathy's [60] construction and index calculation for the $SU(4) \subset SO(8)$ gauge field and verify (via a rigorous mathematical calculation of the Atiyah-Singer index) whether or not it leads to 3 generations with the right $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ quantum numbers for all the leptons and quarks. In particular to check that the electric charge is integer-valued. The reason being that according to Smith [30] it is $SO(8)$ which acts on the CP^2 internal part of $M_4 \times CP^2$ through its $SU(4)$ subalgebra that contains the color $SU(3)$. While the Electroweak $U(2) = SU(2) \times U(1)$ originates from the isotropy $U(2)$ group in $CP^2 = SU(3)/U(2)$ via the Batakis mechanism [39].

To conclude : without the actual calculation of the Atiyah-Singer index as it was rigorously performed by Dolan and Nash [61] on CP^2 , for example, one cannot claim with absolute certainty that Smith's E_8 theory in $8D$ furnishes 3 generations of chiral fermions in $4D$. Hawking and Pope [59] raised the interesting possibility that there may be a connexion between the topology of space-time and the spectrum of elementary particles.

Another interesting project would be also to repeat the above calculations for other gauge fields, $E_7, E_6, SO(10), SU(8), ...$, and compact internal spaces like CP^n, $\mathbf{G/H}$ coset spaces to find out if instanton configurations trigger an spontaneous compactification to lower dimensions. Secondly, if this lead to an integer-valued index such that it can accomodate the right number of chiral fermions (3 or more generations) in four dimensions. A pure Kaluza-Klein approach was largely abandoned in the 1980's due in part to the realisation by Witten [67] that it was difficult, if not impossible, to obtain chiral Fermions from a Kaluza-Klein compactification (of 11-dim supergravity, in particular) in this way. Dolan and Nash [61] took a different approach to the internal coset spaces $\mathbf{G/H}$, focusing on the holonomy group H rather than G. And, thirdly, one has to verify that all the chiral fermions have precisely the right quantum numbers consistent with the Standard Model and its extensions.

7 On Complex Geometric Domains, Couplings, Masses and Parameters of the Standard Model

7.1 Evaluation of the Coupling Constants

By recurring to Geometric Probability methods it was shown [35] that the coupling constants, $\alpha_{EM}, \alpha_W, \alpha_C$, associated with the Electromagnetic, Weak and Strong (color) force are given by the *ratios* of measures of the sphere S^2 and the Shilov boundaries $Q_3 = S^2 \times RP^1$, *squashed* S^5, respectively, with respect to the Wyler measure $\Omega_{Wyler}[Q_4]$ of the Shilov boundary $Q_4 = S^3 \times RP^1$ of the poly-disc D_4 (8 real dimensions). The latter measure $\Omega_{Wyler}[Q_4]$ is linked to the geometric coupling strength α_G associated to the gravitational force.

The topology of the boundaries (at conformal infinity) of the past and future light-cones are spheres S^2 (the celestial sphere). This explains why the (Shilov) boundaries are essential mathematical features to understand the geometric derivation of all the coupling constants. In order to describe the physics at infinity we will recur to Penrose's ideas [81] of conformal compactifications of Minkowski spacetime by attaching the light-cones at conformal infinity. Not unlike the one-point compactification of the complex plane by adding the points at infinity leading to the Gauss-Riemann sphere. The conformal group leaves the light-cone fixed and it does not alter the causal properties of spacetime despite the rescalings of the metric. The topology of the conformal compactification of real Minkowski spacetime $\bar{M}_4 = S^3 \times S^1/Z_2 = S^3 \times RP^1$ is precisely the same as the topology of the Shilov boundary Q_4 of the 4 complex-dimensional poly-disc D_4. The action of the discrete group Z_2 amounts to an antipodal identification of the future null infinity $\mathcal{I}^+$ with the past null infinity $\mathcal{I}^-$; and the antipodal identification of the past timelike infinity i^- with the future timelike infinity , i^+, where the electron emits, and absorbs the photon, respectively.

Shilov boundaries of homogeneous (symmetric spaces) complex domains, G/K [78], [79] ,[80] are not the same as the ordinary topological boundaries (except in some special cases). The reason being that the action of the isotropy group K of the origin is not necesarily *transitive* on the ordinary topological boundary. Shilov boundaries are the minimal subspaces of the ordinary topological boundaries which implement the Maldacena-'t Hooft-Susskind $Holographic$ principle [72] in the sense that the holomorphic data in the interior (bulk) of the domain is fully determined by the holomorphic data on the Shilov boundary. The latter has the property that the maximum modulus of any holomorphic function defined on a domain is attained at the Shilov boundary.

For example, the poly-disc D_4 of 4 complex dimensions is an 8 real-dim Hyperboloid of constant negative scalar curvature that can be identified with the conformal relativistic *curved* phase space associated with the electron (a particle) moving in a $4D$ Anti de Sitter space AdS_4. The poly-disc is a Hermitian symmetric homogeneous coset space associated with the $4D$ conformal group $SO(4,2)$ since $D_4 = SO(4,2)/SO(4) \times SO(2)$. Its Shilov boundary *Shilov* $(D_4) = Q_4$ has precisely the *same* topology as the $4D$ conformally compactified real Minkowski spacetime $Q_4 = \bar{M}_4 = S^3 \times S^1/Z_2 = S^3 \times RP^1$. For more details about Shilov boundaries, the conformal group, future tubes and holography we refer to the article by Gibbons [83] and [78], [8] .

A typical objection to the possibility of being able to derive the values of the coupling constants, from pure thought alone, is that there are an uncountable infinite number of possible analytical expressions that accurately reproduce the values of the couplings, at any given energy scale, and within the experimental error bounds. However, this is not our case because once the gauge groups $U(1), SU(2), SU(3)$ are known there are *unique* analytical expressions stemming from Geometric Probability which furnish the values of the couplings.

Another objection is that it is a meaningless task to try to derive these couplings because these are *not* constants per se but vary with respect to the energy scale. The running of the coupling constants is an $artifact$ of the perturbative Renormalization Group program. We will see that the values of the couplings derived from Geometric Probability are precisely those values that correspond to the natural physical scales associated with the EM, Weak and Strong forces. The difficulty still remains in explaining *why* this occurs. Namely, why there is a precise correlation among the values of the couplings hereby obtained with the typical energy scales associated with the EM, Weak and Strong forces.

Another objection is that physical measurements of irrational numbers are impossible because there are always experimental and physical limitations which rule out the possibility of actually measuring the $infinite$ number of digits of an irrational number. Measurements with finite-resolution apparatus are more compatible with *rational* values for the physical constants, rather than irrational nunbers. The rational values of physical constants is more amenable to the role of p-adic numbers in Physics [74]

This experimental constraint does not exclude the possibility of deriving exact expressions based on π as we shall see. We should not worry also about obtaining numerical values within the error bars in the table of the coupling constants since these numbers are based on the values of *other* physical constants; i.e. they are based on the particular *consensus* chosen for all of the other physical constants.

In our conventions, $\alpha_{EM} = e^2/4\pi = 1/137.036...$ in the natural units of $\hbar = c = 1$, and the quantities $\alpha_{weak}, \alpha_{color}$ are the Geometric Probabilities $\tilde{g}_w^2, \tilde{g}_c^2$, after *absorbing* the factors of 4π of the conventional $\alpha_w = (g_w^2/4\pi), \alpha_c = (g_c^2/4\pi)$ definitions used in the Renormalization Group (RG) program.

7.2 Evaluation of the Fine Structure Constant

We review the work [35] on the derivation of the fine structure constant, the weak and strong coupling, based on Feynman's physical interpretation of the electron's charge as the probability amplitude that an electron emits (or absorbs) a photon. The clue to evaluate this probability within the context of Geometric Probability theory is provided by the electron self-energy diagram. Using Feynman's rules, the self-energy $\Sigma(p)$ as a function of the electron's incoming (outgoing) energy-momentum p_μ is given by the integral involving the photon and electron propagator along the internal lines

$$-i\Sigma(p) = (-ie)^2 \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4}\ \gamma^\mu\ \frac{i}{\gamma^\rho(p_\rho - k_\rho) - m}\ \frac{-ig_{\mu\nu}}{k^2}\ \gamma^\nu. \tag{7.1}$$

The integral is taken with respect to the values of the photon's energy-momentum k^μ . By inspection one can see that the electron self-energy is proportional to the fine structure constant $\alpha_{EM} \sim e^2$, the square of the probability amplitude (in natural units of $\hbar = c = 1$) and physically represents the electron's emission of a virtual photon (off-shell, $k^2 \neq 0$) of energy-momentum k_ρ at a given moment, followed by an absorption of this virtual photon at a later moment.

Based on this physical picture of the electron self-energy graph, we will evaluate the Geometric Probability that an electron emits a photon at $t = -\infty$ (infinite past) and re-absorbs it at a much later time $t = +\infty$ (infinite future). The off-shell (virtual) photon associated with the electron self-energy diagram *asymptotically* behaves on-shell at the very moment of emission ($t = -\infty$) and absorption ($t = +\infty$). However, the photon can remain off-shell in the intermediate region between the moments of emission and absorption by the electron. The fact that Geometric Probability is a classical theory does not mean that one cannot derive the fine structure constant (which involves the Planck constant) because the electron self-energy diagram is itself a quantum (one-loop) Feynman process; i.e. one can recur to Geometric Probability to assign proper geometrical measures to Feynman diagrams, not unlike the Twistor-diagrammatic version of the Feynman rules of QFT.

In order to define the Geometric Probability associated with this process of the electron's emission of a photon at i^- ($t = -\infty$), followed by an absorption at i^+ $(t = +\infty)$, we must take into account the important fact that the photon is on-shell $k^2 = 0$ *asymptotically* (at $t = \pm\infty$), but it can move off-shell $k^2 \neq 0$ in the intermediate region which is represented by the *interior* of the $4D$ conformally compactified real Minkowski spacetime which agrees with the Shilov boundary of D_4 (the four-complex-dimensional poly-disc) $Q_4 = \bar{M}_4 = S^3 \times S^1/Z_2 = S^3 \times RP^1$. Q_4 has four-real-dimensions which is half the real-dimensions of D_4 $(2 \times 4 = 8)$.

The measure associated with the celestial spheres S^2 (associated with the future/past light-cones) at timelike infinity i^+, i^-, respectively, is $V(S^2) = 4\pi r^2 = 4\pi$ $(r = 1)$. Thus, the *net* measure corresponding to the two celestial spheres S^2 at timelike infinity $i^\pm$ requires an overall factor of 2 giving $2V(S^2) = 8\pi$ ($r = 1$). The factor of $8\pi = 2 \times 4\pi$ can also be interpreted in terms of the two-helicity degrees of freedom, corresponding to a spin 1 massless photon, assigned to the area of the celestial sphere. The Geometric Probability is defined by the ratio of the (dimensionless volumes) measures associated with the celestial spheres S^2 at i^+, i^- timelike infinity, where the photon moves on-shell, relative to the Wyler measure $\Omega_{Wyler}[Q_4]$ associated with the full *interior* region of the conformally compactified $4D$ Minkwoski space $Q_4 = \bar{M}_4 = S^3 \times S^1/Z_2 = S^3 \times RP^1$, where the massive electron is confined to move, as it propagates from i^- to i^+, (and $off-shell$ photons can also live in) :

$$\alpha_{EM} = \frac{2V(S^2)}{\Omega_{Wyler}[Q_4]} = \frac{8\pi}{\Omega_{Wyler}[Q_4]} = \frac{1}{137.03608...}. \qquad (7.2a)$$

after inserting the Wyler measure

$$\Omega_{Wyler}[Q_4] = \frac{V(S^4)\ V(Q_5)}{[\ V(D_5)\ ]^{\frac{1}{4}}} = (\frac{8\pi^2}{3})(\frac{8\pi^3}{3})(\frac{\pi^5}{2^4 \times 5!})^{-1/4}. \qquad (7.2b)$$

The Wyler measure $\Omega_{Wyler}[Q_4]$ [70] is *not* the standard measure (dimensionless volume) $V(Q_4) = 2\pi^3$ calculated by Hua [79] but requires some elaborate procedure.

It was realized by Smith [29] that the presence of the Wyler measure in the expression for α_{EM} given by eq-(2-1) was consistent with Wheeler ideas that the observed values of the coupling constants of the Electromagnetic, Weak and Strong Force can be obtained if the geometric force strengths (measures related to volumes of complex homogenous domains associated with the $U(1), SU(2), SU(3)$ groups, respectively) are all *divided* by the geometric force strength of Gravity α_G (related to the $SO(3,2)$ MMCW Gauge Theory of Gravity) and which is not the same as the $4D$ Newton's gravitational constant $G_N \sim m^{-2}_{Planck}$. Hence, upon dividing these geometric force strengths by the geometric force strength of gravity α_G one is dividing by the Wyler measure factor because (as we shall see below) $\alpha_G \equiv \Omega_{Wyler}[Q_4]$.

Furthermore, the expression for $\Omega_{Wyler}[Q_4]$ is also consistent with the Kaluza-Klein compactification procedure of obtaining Maxwell's EM in $4D$ from *pure* Gravity in $5D$ since Wyler's expression involves a $5D$ domain D_5 from the very start; i.e. in order to evaluate the Wyler measure $\Omega_{Wyler}[Q_4]$ one requires to embed D_4 into D_5 because the Shilov boundary space $Q_4 = S^3 \times RP^1$ is *not* adequate enough to implement the action of the $SO(5)$ group, the compact version of the Anti de Sitter Group $SO(3,2)$ that is required in the MacDowell-Mansouri-Chamseddine-West (MMCW) $SO(3,2)$ Gauge formulation of Gravity. However, the Shilov boundary of D_5 given by $Q_5 = S^4 \times RP^1$ is adequate enough to implement the action of $SO(5)$ via isometries (rotations) on the internal symmetry space $S^4 = SO(5)/SO(4)$. This justifies the embedding procedure of $D_4 \to D_5$

The 5 complex-dimensional poly-disc $D_5 = SO(5,2)/SO(5)\times SO(2)$ is the 10 real-dim Hyperboloid $\mathcal{H}^{10}$ corresponding to the relativistic curved phase space of a particle moving in $5D$ Anti de Sitter Space AdS_5 . The Shilov boundary Q_5 of D_5 has 5 real dimensions (half of the 10-real-dim of D_5). One cannot fail to notice that the hyperboloid $\mathcal{H}^{10}$ can be embedded in the 11-dim pseudo-Euclidean $R^{9,2}$ space, with two-time like directions. This is where 11-dim lurks into our construction.

Having displayed Wyler's expression of the fine structure constant α_{EM} in terms of the ratio of dimensionless measures , we shall present a Fiber Bundle (a sphere bundle fibration over a complex homogeneous domain) derivation of the Wyler expression based on the bundle $S^4 \to E \to D_5$, and explain below why the propagation (via the determinant of the Feynman propagator) of the electron through the *interior* of the domain D_5 is what accounts for the "obscure" factor $V(D_5)^{1/4}$ in Wyler's formula for α_{EM}.

We begin by explaining why Wyler's measure $\Omega_{Wyler}[Q_4]$ in eq-(7.2) corresponds to the measure of a S^4 bundle fibered over the base curved-space $D_5 = SO(5,2)/SO(5) \times SO(2)$ and *weighted* by a factor of $V(D_5)^{-1/4}$. This $S^4 \to E \to D_5$ bundlle is linked to the MMCW $SO(3,2)$ Gauge theory formulation of gravity and explains the essential role of the gravitational interaction of the electron in Wyler's formula corroborating Wheeler's ideas that one must normalize the geometric force strengths with respect to gravity in order to obtain the coupling constants.

The subgroup $H = SO(5)$ of the isotropy group (at the origin) $K = SO(5) \times SO(2)$ acts naturally on the Fibers $F = S^4 = SO(5)/SO(4)$, the internal symmetric space, via isometries (rotations). Locally, and only locally, the Fiber bundle E is the product $D_5 \times S^4$. The restriction of the Fiber bundle E to the Shilov boundary Q_5 is written as $E|_{Q_5}$ and *locally* is the product of $Q_5 \times S^4$, but this is *not* true globally unless the fiber bundle admits a global section (the bundle is trivial). For this reason the volume $V(E|_{Q_5})$ does not necessary always factorize as $V(Q_5) \times V(S^4)$.

Setting aside this subtlety, we shall pursue a more physical route, already suggested by Wyler in unpublished work [71] [1], to explain the origin of the "obscure normalization" factor $V(D_5)^{1/4}$ in Wyler's measure $\Omega_{Wyler}[Q_4] = (V(S^4) \times V(Q_5)/V(D_5)^{1/4})$, which suggests that the volumes may not factorize.

The relevant physical feature of this measure factor $V(D_5)^{1/4})$ is that it encodes the *spinorial* degrees of freedom of the electron, like the factor of 8π

[1] We thank Frank (Tony) Smith for this information

encodes the two-helicity states of the massless photon. The Feynman propagator of a massive scalar particle (inverse of the Klein-Gordon operator) $(D_\mu D^\mu - m^2)^{-1}$ corresponds to the *kernel* in the Feynman path integral that in turn is associated with the Bergman kernel $K_n(z, z')$ of the complex homogenous domain D_n which is proportional to the Bergman constant $k_n \equiv 1/V(D_n)$.

$$(D_\mu D^\mu - m^2)^{-1}(x^\mu) = \frac{1}{(2\pi\mu)^D} \int d^D p \, \frac{e^{-ip_\mu x^\mu}}{p^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon} \leftrightarrow K_n(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}') = \frac{1}{V(D_n)} \, (1 - \mathbf{z}\bar{\mathbf{z}}' \,)^{-\mathbf{2n}}. \tag{7.3}$$

where we have introduced a momentum scale μ to match units in the Feynman propagator expression, and the Bergman Kernel $K_n(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}')$ of D_n whose dimensionless entries are $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, z_2, ..., z_n)$, $\mathbf{z}' = (z'_1, z'_2, ..., z'_n)$ is given as

$$K_n(\mathbf{z}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}') = \frac{1}{V(D_n)} \, (\, 1 - \mathbf{z}\bar{\mathbf{z}}' \,)^{-\mathbf{2n}} \tag{7.4a}$$

$V(D_n)$ is the dimensionless Euclidean volume found by Hua $V(D_n) = (\pi^n / 2^{n-1} n!)$ and satisfies the reproducing and normalization properties

$$f(z) = \int_{D_n} f(\xi) \; K_n(z, \xi) \; d^n\xi \; d^n\bar{\xi}. \quad \int_{D_n} K_n(z, \bar{z}) \; d^n z \; d^n \bar{z} = 1. \tag{7.4b}$$

The *key* result that can be inferred from the Feynman propagator (kernel) $\leftrightarrow$ Bergman kernel K_n correspondence, when $\mu = 1$, is the $(2\pi)^{-D} \leftrightarrow (V(D_n))^{-1}$ correspondence; i.e. the fundamental hyper-cell in momentum space $(2\pi)^D$ (when $\mu = 1$) corresponds to the dimensionless volume $V(D_n)$ of the domain, where $D = 2n$ real dimensions. The regularized vacuum-to-vacuum amplitude of a free *real* scalar field is given in terms of the zeta function $\zeta(s) = \sum_i \lambda_i^{-s}$ associated with the eigenvalues of the Klein-Gordon operator by

$$Z = \; < \; 0 \mid 0 \; > \; = \sqrt{det \; (D_\mu D^\mu - m^2)^{-1}} \sim exp \; [\; \frac{1}{2} \frac{d\zeta}{ds}(s = 0)]. \tag{7.5}$$

In case of a *complex* scalar field we have to *double* the number of degrees of freedom, the amplitude then factorizes into a product and becomes $Z = det \; (D_\mu D^\mu - m^2)^{-1}$.

Since the Dirac operator $\mathcal{D} = \gamma^\mu D_\mu + m$ is the "square-root" of the Klein-Gordon operator $\mathcal{D}^\dagger \mathcal{D} = D_\mu D^\mu - m^2 + \mathcal{R}$ ($\mathcal{R}$ is the scalar curvature of spacetime that is zero in Minkowski space) we have the numerical correspondence

$$\sqrt{det \; (\mathcal{D})^{-1}} = \sqrt{det \; (D_\mu D^\mu - m^2)^{-1/2}} = \sqrt{\sqrt{det \; (D_\mu D^\mu - m^2)^{-1}}} \leftrightarrow k_n^{1/4} = (\frac{1}{V(D_n)})^{1/4}. \tag{7.6}$$

because $det \; \mathcal{D}^\dagger = det \; \mathcal{D}$, and

$$det \, \mathcal{D} = e^{\; trace \; ln \; \mathcal{D}} = e^{\; trace \; ln \; (D_\mu D^\mu - m^2)^{1/2}} = e^{\; \frac{1}{2} \; tr \; ln \; (D_\mu D^\mu - m^2)} = \sqrt{det \; (D_\mu D^\mu - m^2)}. \tag{7.7}$$

The vacuum-to-vacuum amplitude of a *complex* Dirac field Ψ (a fermion, the electron) is $Z = det\ (\gamma^\mu D_\mu + m) = det\ \mathcal{D} \sim exp\ [\ -(d\zeta/ds)(s=0)\ ]$. Notice the $det\ (\mathcal{D})$ behavior of the fermion versus the $det\ (D_\mu D^\mu - m^2)^{-1}$ behavior of a complex scalar field due to the Grassmanian nature of the Gaussian path integral of the fermions. The vacuum-to-vacuum amplitude of a Majorana (real) spinor (half of the number of degrees of freedom of a complex Dirac spinor) is $Z = \sqrt{det\ (\gamma^\mu D_\mu + m)}$. Because the complex Dirac spinor encodes both the dynamics of the electron and its anti-particle, the positron (the negative energy solutions), the vacuum-to-vacuum amplitude corresponding to the electron (positive energy solutions, propagating forward in time) must be then $Z = \sqrt{det\ (\gamma^\mu D_\mu + m)}$.

Therefore, to sum up, the origin of the "obscure" factor $V(D_5)^{1/4}$ in Wyler's formula is the *normalization* condition of $V(S^4)\times V(Q_5)$ by a factor of $V(D_5)^{1/4}$ stemming from the correspondence $V(D_5)^{1/4} \leftrightarrow Z = \sqrt{det\ (\gamma^\mu D_\mu + m)}$ and which originates from the vacuum-to-vacuum amplitude of the fermion (electron) as it propagates forward in time in the domain D_5. These last relations emerge from the correspondence between the Feynman fermion (electron) propagator in Minkowski spacetime and the Bergman Kernel of the complex homogenous domain after performing the Wyler map between an unbounded domain (the interior of the future lightcone of spacetime) to a bounded one. In general, the Bergman Kernel gives rise to a Kahler potential $F(z,\bar{z}) = log\ K(z,\bar{z})$ in terms of which the Bergman metric on D_n is given by

$$g_{i\bar{j}} = \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial z^i \partial \bar{z}^i}. \tag{7.8}$$

We must emphasize that this Geometric probability explanation $is\ very\ different$ from the interpretations provided in [70], [76] and properly accounts for all the numerical factors. Concluding, the Geometric Probability that an electron emits a photon at $t = -\infty$ and absorbs it at $t = +\infty$, is given by the *ratio* of the dimensionless measures (volumes) :

$$\alpha_{EM} = \frac{2V(S^2)}{\Omega_{Wyler}[Q_4]} = (8\pi)\ \frac{1}{V(S^4)}\frac{1}{V(Q_5)}\ [\ V(D_5)\ ]^{\frac{1}{4}} =$$

$$\frac{9}{8\pi^4}(\frac{\pi^5}{2^4 \times 5!})^{1/4} = \frac{1}{137.03608....}. \tag{7.9}$$

in very good agreement with the experimental value. This is easily verified after one inserts the values of the Euclideanized *regularized* volumes found by Hua [79]

$$V(D_5) = \frac{\pi^5}{2^4 \times 5!}. \quad V(Q_5) = \frac{8\pi^3}{3}. \quad V(S^4) = \frac{8\pi^2}{3}. \tag{7.10}$$

In general

$$V(D_n) = \frac{\pi^n}{2^{n-1} n!}. \quad V(S^{n-1}) = \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)}. \tag{7.11}$$

$$V(Q_n) = V(S^{n-1} \times RP^1) = V(S^{n-1}) \times V(RP^1) = \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \times \pi = \frac{2\pi^{(n+2)/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)}. \tag{7.12}$$

Objections were raised to Wyler's original expression by Robertson [73]. One of them was that the hyperboloids (discs) are *not* compact and whose volumes diverge because the Lobachevsky metric diverges on the boundaries of the poly-discs. Gilmore explained [73] why one requires to use the Euclideanized regularized volumes because Wyler had shown that it is possible to map an unbounded physical domain (the interior of the future light cone) onto the interior of a homogenous bounded domain without losing the causal structure and on which there exist also a complex structure. A study of Shilov boundaries, holography and the future tube can be found in [83].

Furthermore, in order to resolve the scaling problems of Wyler's expression raised by Robertson, Gilmore showed why it is essential to use *dimensionless* volumes by setting the throat sizes of the Anti de Sitter hyperboloids to $r = 1$, because this is the only choice for r where all elements in the bounded domains are also coset representatives, and therefore, amount to honest group operations. Hence the so-called scaling objections against Wyler raised by Robertson were satisfactory solved by Gilmore [73]. Thus, all the volumes in this section and in the next sections, are based on setting the scaling factor $r = 1$.

The question as to *why* the value of α_{EM} obtained in Wyler's formula is precisely the value of α_{EM} observed at the *scale* of the Bohr radius a_B, has not been solved, to our knowledge. The Bohr radius is associated with the ground (most stable) state of the Hydrogen atom . The spectrum generating group of the Hydrogen atom is well known to be the conformal group $SO(4,2)$ due to the fact that there are two conserved vectors, the angular momentum and the Runge-Lentz vector. After quantization, one has two commuting $SU(2)$ copies $SO(4) = SU(2) \times SU(2)$. Thus, it makes physical sense why the Bohr-scale should appear in this construction.

Bars has studied the many physical applications and relationships of many seemingly distinct models of particles, strings, branes and twistors, based on the (super) conformal groups in diverse dimensions. In particular, the relevance of two-time physics in the formulation of M, F, S theory has been advanced by Bars for some time. The Bohr radius corresponds to an energy of $137.036 \times 2 \times 13.6\ eV \sim 3.72 \times 10^3\ eV$. It is well known that the Rydberg scale, the Bohr radius, the Compton wavelength of electron, and the classical electron radius are all related to each other by a successive scaling in products of α_{EM}.

To finalize this section and based on the MMCW $SO(3,2)$ Gauge Theory formulation of Gravity, with a Gauss-Bonnet topological term plus a cosmological constant, the (dimensionless) Wyler measure was $defined$ as the geometric coupling strength of Gravity [29]

$$\Omega_{Wyler}[Q_4] = \frac{V(S^4)\ V(Q_5)}{[\ V(D_5)\ ]^{\frac{1}{4}}} \equiv \alpha_G\ . \tag{7.13}$$

The relationship between α_G and the Newtonian gravitational G constant is based on the value of the coupling $(1/16\pi G)$ appearing in the Einstein-Hilbert Lagrangian $(R/16\pi G)$, and goes as follows :

$$(16\pi G)(m^2_{Planck}) = \alpha_{EM}\ \alpha_G = 8\pi\ \Rightarrow G = \frac{1}{16\pi}\frac{8\pi}{m^2_{Planck}} = \frac{1}{2m^2_{Planck}}\ \Rightarrow$$

$$Gm^2_{proton} = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{m_{proton}}{m_{Planck}})^2 \sim 5.9 \times 10^{-39}. \tag{7.14}$$

and in natural units $\hbar = c = 1$ yields the physical force strength of Gravity at the Planck Energy scale $1.22 \times 10^{19} GeV$. The Planck mass is obtained by equating the Schwarzschild radius $2Gm_{Planck}$ to the Compton wavelength $1/m_{Planck}$ associated with the mass; where $m_{Planck}\sqrt{2} = 1.22 \times 10^{19}\ GeV$ and the proton mass is $0.938\ GeV$. Some authors define the Planck mass by absorbing the factor of $\sqrt{2}$ inside the definition of $m_{Planck} = 1.22 \times 10^{19}\ GeV$.

7.3 Evaluation of the Weak and Strong Couplings

We turn now to the derivation of the other coupling constants. The Fiber Bundle picture of the previous section is essential in our construction. The Weak and the Strong geometric coupling constant strength, defined as the probability for a particle to emit and later absorb a $SU(2), SU(3)$ gauge boson, respectively, can both be obtained by using the main formula derived from Geometric Probability (as ratios of dimensionless measures/volumes) after one identifies the suitable homogeneous domains and their Shilov boundaries to work with.

Since massless gauge bosons live on the lightcone, a null boundary in Minkowski spacetime, upon performing the Wyler map, the gauge bosons are confined to live on the Shilov boundary. Because the $SU(2)$ bosons $W^\pm, Z^0$ and the eight $SU(3)$ gluons have *internal* degrees of freedom (they carry weak and color charges) one must also include the measure associated with the their respective internal spaces; namely, the measures relevant to Geometric Probability calculations are the measures corresponding to the appropriate sphere bundles fibrations defined over the complex bounded homogenous domains $S^m \to E \to \mathcal{D}_n$.

Furthermore, the Geometric Probability interpretation for $\alpha_{Weak}, \alpha_{Strong}$ agrees with Wheeler's ideas [29] that one must normalize these geometric force strengths with respect to the geometric force strength of gravity $\alpha_G = \Omega_{Wyler}[Q_4]$ found in the last section. Hence, after these explanations, we will show below why the weak and strong couplings are given, respectively, by the *ratio* of the measures (dimensionless volumes) :

$$\alpha_{Weak} = \frac{\Omega[Q_3]}{\Omega_{Wyler}[Q_4]} = \frac{\Omega[Q_3]}{\alpha_G} = \frac{\Omega[Q_3]}{(8\pi/\alpha_{EM})}. \tag{7.15}$$

$$\alpha_{Color} = \frac{\Omega[squashed\ S^5]}{\Omega_{Wyler}[Q_4]} = \frac{\Omega[squashed\ S^5]}{\alpha_G} = \frac{\Omega[squashed\ S^5]}{(8\pi/\alpha_{EM})}. \tag{7.16}$$

As always, one must insert the values of the regularized (Euclideanized) dimensionless volumes provided by Hua [79] (set the scale $r = 1$). We must also clarify and emphasize that we define the quantities $\alpha_{weak}, \alpha_{color}$ as the probabilities $\tilde{g}_w^2, \tilde{g}_c^2$, by absorbing the factors of 4π in the conventional $\alpha_w = (g_w^2/4\pi), \alpha_c = (g_c^2/4\pi)$ definitions (based on the Renormalization Group (RG) program) into our definitions of probability $\tilde{g}_w^2, \tilde{g}_c^2$.

Let us evaluate the α_{Weak}. The internal symmetry space is $CP^1 = SU(2)/U(1)$ (a sphere $S^2 \sim CP^1$) where the isospin group $SU(2)$ acts via isometries on CP^1. The Shilov boundary of D_2 is $Q_2 = S^1 \times RP^1$ but is not adequate enough to accommodate the action of the isospin group $SU(2)$. One requires to have the Shilov boundary of D_3 given by $Q_3 = S^2 \times S^1/Z_2 = S^2 \times RP^1$ that can accommodate the action of the $SU(2)$ group on S^2. A Fiber Bundle over $D_3 = SO(3,2)/SO(3) \times SO(2)$ whose $H = SO(3) \sim SU(2)$ subgroup of the isotropy group (at the origin) $K = SO(3) \times SO(2)$ acts on S^2 by simple rotations. Thus, the relevant measure is related to the fiber bundle E restricted to Q_3 and is written as $V(E|_{Q_3})$.

One must notice that due to the fact that the $SU(2)$ group is a double-cover of $SO(3)$, as one goes from the $SO(3)$ action on S^2 to the $SU(2)$ action on S^2 , one must take into account an extra factor of 2 giving then

$$V(CP^1) = V(SU(2)/U(1) = 2\ V(SO(3)/U(1)) = 2\ V(S^2) = 8\pi. \tag{7.17}$$

In order to obtain the weak coupling constant due to the exchange of $W^\pm Z^0$ bosons in the four-point tree-level processes involving four leptons, like the electron, muon, tau, and their corresponding neutrinos (leptons are fundamental particles that are lighter than mesons and baryons) which are confined to move in the interior of the domain D_3, and can emit (absorb) $SU(2)$ gauge bosons, $W^\pm Z^0$, in the respective s, t, u channels, one must take into account a factor of the square root of the determinant of the fermionic propagator, $\sqrt{det\ \mathcal{D}^{-1}} = \sqrt{det\ (\gamma^\mu D_\mu + m)^{-1}}$, for each *pair* of leptons, as we did in the previous section when an electron emitted and absorbed a photon. Since there are *two* pairs of leptons in these four-point tree-level processes involving $four$ leptons, one requires *two* factors of $\sqrt{det\ (\gamma^\mu D_\mu + m)^{-1}}$, giving a net factor of $det\ (\gamma^\mu D_\mu + m)^{-1}$ and which corresponds now to a net normalization factor of $k_n^{1/2} = (1/V(D_3))^{1/2}$, after implementing the Feynman kernel $\leftrightarrow$ Bergman kenel correspondence. Therefore, after taking into account the result of eq-(7.17), the measure of the $S^2 \to E \to D_3$ bundle, restricted to the Shilov boundary Q_3, and weighted by the net normalization factor $(1/V(D_3))^{1/2}$, is

$$\Omega(Q^3) = 2V(S^2)\ \frac{V(Q_3)}{V(D_3)^{1/2}}. \tag{7.18}$$

Therefore, the Geometric probability expression is given by the ratio of measures (dimensionless volumes) :

$$\alpha_{Weak} = \frac{\Omega[Q^3]}{\Omega_{Wyler}[Q_4]} = \frac{\Omega[Q^3]}{\alpha_G} = \frac{2V(S^2)\ V(Q_3)}{V(D_3)^{1/2}}\ \frac{\alpha_{EM}}{8\pi} =$$

$$(8\pi)\ (4\pi^2)\ (\frac{\pi^3}{24})^{-1/2}\ \frac{\alpha_{EM}}{8\pi} = 0.2536.... \tag{7.19}$$

that corresponds to the weak coupling constant ($g^2/4\pi$ based on the RG convention) at an energy of the order of

$$E = M = 146\ GeV \sim \sqrt{M^2_{W_+} + M^2_{W_-} + M^2_Z}. \tag{7.20}$$

after we have inserted the expressions (setting the scale $r = 1$)

$$V(S^2) = 4\pi. \quad V(Q_3) = 4\pi^2. \quad V(D_3) = \frac{\pi^3}{24}. \tag{7.21}$$

into the formula (7.19) . The relationship to the Fermi coupling G_{Fermi} goes as follows (after setting the energy scale $E = M = 146\ GeV$) :

$$G_F \equiv \frac{\alpha_W}{M^2} \Rightarrow G_F\ m^2_{proton} = (\frac{\alpha_W}{M^2})\ m^2_{proton} = 0.2536\times(\frac{m_{proton}}{146\ GeV})^2 \sim 1.04\times10^{-5}. \tag{7.22}$$

in very good agreement with experimental observations. Once more, it is unknown why the value of α_{Weak} obtained from Geometric Probability corresponds to the energy scale related to the W_+, W_-, Z_0 boson mass, after spontaneous symmetry breaking.

Finally, we shall derive the value of α_{Color} from eq-(7.16) after one defines what is the suitable fiber bundle. The calculation is based on the book by L. K. Hua [79] (pages 40, 93). The symmetric space with the $SU(3)$ color force as a local group is $SU(4)/SU(3) \times U(1)$ which corresponds to a bounded symmmetric domain of type $I(1,3)$ and has a Shilov boundary that Hua calls the "characteristic manifold" $CI(1,3)$. The volume $V(CI(m,n))$ is:

$$V(CI) = \frac{(2\pi)^{mn-m(m-1)/2}}{(n-m)!(n-m+1)!...(n-1)!}. \tag{7.23}$$

so that for $m = 1$ and $n = 3$ the relevant volume is then $V(CI) = (2\pi)^3/2! = 4\pi^3$. We must remark at this point that $CI(1,3)$ is *not* the standard round S^5 but is the *squashed* five-dimensional $\tilde{S}^5$ [2] .

The domain of which $CI(1,3)$ is the Shilov boundary is denoted by Hua as $RI(1,3)$ and whose volume is

$$V(RI) = \frac{1!2!...(m-1)!1!2!...(n-1)!\ \pi^{mn}}{1!2!...(m+n-1)!}. \tag{7.24}$$

[2]Frank (Tony) Smith, private communication

so that for $m = 1$ and $n = 3$ it gives $V(RI) = 1!2!\pi^3/1!2!3! = \pi^3/6$ and it also agrees with the volume of the standard six-ball.

The internal symmetry space (fibers) is $CP^2 = SU(3)/U(2)$ whose isometry group is the color $SU(3)$ group. The base space is the $6D$ domain $B_6 = SU(4)/U(3) = SU(4)/SU(3) \times U(1)$ whose subgroup $SU(3)$ of the isotropy group (at the origin) $K = SU(3) \times U(1)$ acts on the internal symmetry space CP^2 via isometries. In this special case, the Shilov and ordinary topological boundary of B_6 both coincide with the *squashed* S^5 [29].

Since Gilmore, in response to Robertson's objections to Wyler's formula [70] , has shown that one must set the scale $r = 1$ of the hyperboloids $\mathcal{H}^n$ (and S^n) and use *dimensionles* volumes (if we were to equate the volumes $V(CP^2) = V(S^4, r = 1)$ [29]) this would be tantamount of choosing another scale [88] R (the unit of geodesic distance in CP^2) that is $different$ from the unit of geodesic distance in S^4 when the radius $r = 1$, as required by Gilmore. Hence, a bundle map $E \rightarrow E'$ from the bundle $CP^2 \rightarrow E \rightarrow B_6$ to the bundle $S^4 \rightarrow E' \rightarrow B_6$, would be required that would allow us to replace the $V(CP^2)$ for $V(S^4, r = 1)$. Unless one decides to *calibrate* the unit of geodesic distance in CP^2 by choosing $V(CP^2) = V(S^4)$.

Using again the same results described after eq-(6.2), since a quark can emit and absorb later on a $SU(3)$ gluon (in a one-loop process), and is confined to move in the interior of the domain B_6, there is *one* factor only of the square root of the determinant of the Dirac propagator $\sqrt{det\ \mathcal{D}^{-1}} = \sqrt{\sqrt{det\ (D_\mu D^\mu - m^2)^{-1}}}$ and which is associated with a normalization factor of $k_n^{1/4} = (1/V(B_6))^{1/4}$. Therefore, the measure of the bundle $S^4 \rightarrow E' \rightarrow B_6$ restricted to the *squashed* S^5 (Shilov boundary of B^6), and weighted by the normalization factor $(1/V(B_6))^{1/4}$, is then

$$\Omega[squashed\ S^5] = \frac{V(S^4)\ V(squashed\ S^5)}{V(B_6)^{1/4}}. \tag{7.25}$$

and the ratio of measures

$$\alpha_s = \frac{\Omega[squashed\ S^5]}{\Omega_{Wyler}[Q_4]} = \frac{\Omega[squashed\ S^5]}{\alpha_G} = \frac{V(S^4)\ V(squashed\ S^5)}{V(B_6)^{1/4}}\ \frac{\alpha_{EM}}{8\pi} =$$

$$(\frac{8\pi^2}{3})\ (4\pi^3)\ (\frac{\pi^3}{6})^{-1/4}\ \frac{\alpha_{EM}}{8\pi} = 0.6286..... \tag{7.26}$$

matches, remarkably, the strong coupling value $\alpha_s = g^2/4\pi$ at an energy E related precisely to the pion masses [29]

$$E = 241\ MeV = 0.241\ GeV \sim \sqrt{m^2_{\pi^+} + m^2_{\pi^-} + m^2_{\pi^0}}. \tag{7.27}$$

The one-loop Renormalization Group flow of the coupling is given by

$$\alpha_s(E^2) = \alpha_s(E_0^2)\ [\ 1 + \ \frac{(11 - \frac{2}{3}N_f(E^2))}{4\pi}\ \alpha_s(E_0^2)\ ln\ (\frac{E^2}{E_0^2})\ ]^{-1} \tag{7.28}$$

where $N_f(E^2)$ is the number of quark flavors whose mass $M^2 < E^2$. For the specific numerical details of the evaluation (in energy-intervals given by the diverse quark masses) of the Renormalization Group flow equation (7.28) that yields $\alpha_s(E = 241\ MeV) \sim 0.6286$ we refer to [29]. Once more, it is unknown why the value of α_{Color} obtained from Geometric Probability corresponds to the energy scale $E = 241\ MeV$ related to the masses of the pions. The pions are the known lightest quark-antiquark pairs that feel the strong interaction.

Rigorously speaking, one should include higher-loop corrections to eq-(7.28) as shown by Weinberg [92] to determine the values of the strong coupling at energy scales $E = 241\ MeV$. This issue and the subtleties behind the calibration of scales (volumes) by imposing the condition $V(CP^2) = V(S^4)$ need to be investigated. For example, one could calibrate lengths in terms of the units of geodesic distance in CP^2 (based on Gilmore's choice of $r = 1$) giving $V(CP^2) = V(S^5; r = 1)/V(S^1; r = 1) = \pi^2/2!$ [88], and it leads now to the value of $\alpha_s = 0.1178625$ which is very close to the value of α_s at the energy scale of the Z-boson mass (91.2 GeV) and given by $\alpha_s = 0.118$.

7.4 Evaluation of Particle Masses

In this subsection we will review closely the derivation of the particle masses by Smith [29], [30] and add a few results based on the work by Gonzalez-Martin [75].

• **The Electroweak Bosons**.

The triplet (W^+, W^-, Z) couples directly with the Higgs scalar, which carries the Higgs mechanism by which the W_0 becomes the physical Z, so that the total mass of the triplet (W^+, W^-, Z) is equal to the vacuum expectation value v of the Higgs scalar field $v = 252.514$ GeV.

What are individual masses of members of the triplet (W^+, W^-, Z) ? First, look at the triplet (W^+, W^-, Z) which can be represented by the 3- sphere S^3. The Hopf fibration of S^3 as $S^1 \to S^3 \to S^2$ gives a decomposition of the W bosons into the neutral W_0 corresponding to S^1 and the charged pair W^+ and W^- corresponding to S^2. The mass ratio of the sum of the masses of W^+ and W^- to the mass of W_0 should be the volume ratio of the S^2 in S^3 to the S^1 in S^3.

The unit sphere S^3 in R^4 is normalized by $1/2$. The unit sphere S^2 in R^3 is normalized by $1/\sqrt{3}$. The unit sphere S^1 in R^2 is normalized by $1/\sqrt{2}$. The ratio of the sum of the W^+ and W^- masses to the $W_0(Z)$ mass should then be $(2/\sqrt{3})V(S^2)/(2/\sqrt{2})V(S^1) = 1.632993$.

Since the total mass of the triplet (W^+, W^-, Z) is 259.031 GeV, and the charged weak bosons have equal mass, we can infer from the prior mass-ratio $1.632993 = 2M_{W^\pm}/M(Z)$, that $M_{W^+} = M_{W^-} = 80.327$ GeV; $M_Z = 98.38$ GeV. Radiative corrections are not taken into account here, and may change these tree-level values somewhat.

- **The Higgs Mass**. Φ_0, Φ^+.

As with forces strengths, the calculations produce ratios of masses, so that only one mass needs be chosen to set the mass scale. In the unitary gauge of the Standard Model [92], after a $SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauge transformation, the charged component of the complex scalar Higgs doublet $\Phi^{(+)}$ is gauged to zero, and the neutral one $\Phi^{(0)}$ is Hermitian with a positive vacuum expectation value (vev) $< \Phi^{(0)} >= v$. In Smith's model, the value of the fundamental mass scale vacuum expectation value v of the Higgs scalar field was set to be equal to the sum of the physical masses of the weak bosons, W_+, W_-, Z. The electron mass is the only input parameter by hand and set to be 0.5110 MeV.

The relationship between the Higgs mass and v is given by the Ginzburg-Landau term from the Mayer-Trautman mechanism [31]. The authors [32] found that the invariant meaning of the self-coupling λ of the quartic Higgs terms is nothing but the ratio of two mass scales: $\lambda = 3(M_H / < \Phi^{(0)} >)^2$. The idea of the top quark condensate [89] explains naturally the large top mass of the order of the electroweak symmetry breaking (EWSB) scale. In the explicit formulation of this idea often called the "top mode standard model" (TMSM), the scalar bound state of $\bar{t}t$ plays the role of the Higgs boson in the Standard Model (SM).

In Smith's $8D$ model the Higgs has also the structure of a Top quark condensate $\bar{t}t$ in which a Higgs located at a point in the $4D$ spacetime is connected to a $\bar{t}t$ condensate in the internal four-dim space CP^2 in such a way that the 3 vertices of the Higgs-$\bar{t}t$ system are connected by 3 lines forming an equilateral triangle. Due to the equilateral triangle configuration of these lines, Smith argues that the self-coupling λ constant of the Higgs quartic coupling $\lambda\Phi^4$ should contain a trigonometric reduction factor associated with a $\pi/6$ angle projection onto the $4D$ spacetime so that now the value $\lambda = 1$ should be $\lambda = (cos(\pi/6))^2 = (0.866)^2$. The square is due to the combination $\Phi^4 = (Higgs.\bar{t}t)^2$. Such value, according to Smith, is consistent with the Higgs/Top quark condensate model of Hashimoto et al [90] where the standard model gauge bosons and the third generation of quarks and leptons are put in higher D $(= 6, 8, 10, \cdots)$ dimensions. They find that the top quark condensate can be the MAC (Maximal Attractive Channel) for $D = 8$.

Therefore, by including this extra reduction factor, according to Smith, the Higgs mass becomes

$$m_H \;=\; v\;\frac{cos(\pi/6)}{\sqrt{3}} \;=\; 126.257\;GeV \tag{7.29}$$

which agrees with the effective Higgs mass observed by LHC.

- **The Leptons and Quarks Masses**

Gonzalez-Martin [75] in a geometric approach to the lepton and meson masses, which was based on the volumes of complex homogeneous domains, recurred to the cosets

$$K \;=\; \frac{SL(4,R)}{SL(2,C)\times SO(2)} \;\simeq\; \frac{SO(3,3)}{SL(2,C)\times SO(2)}, \quad C = \frac{Sp(4,R)}{Sp(2,C)} \;\simeq\; \frac{SO(3,2)}{SO(3,1)} \tag{7.30}$$

and the Lorentz Boost Integrals

$$I_K(\beta) \;=\; \int_0^\beta sinh^3\beta \; d\beta, \quad I_C(\beta) \;=\; \int_0^\beta sinh^2\beta \; d\beta \tag{7.31}$$

in order to extract the *finite* parts of the infinite-volumes of the non-compact coset spaces K, C after dividing their infinite values by the Lorentz boost integrals as follows

$$V(K)_{finite} \;=\; \frac{V(K)}{I_K(\beta)} \;=\; \frac{2^5\pi^6 I_K(\beta)}{I_K(\beta)} \;=\; 2^5\;\pi^6 \tag{7.32}$$

$$V(C)_{finite} \;=\; \frac{V(C)}{I_C(\beta)} \;=\; \frac{(16\pi/3)I_C(\beta)}{I_C(\beta)} \;=\; \frac{16\pi}{3} \tag{7.33}$$

The ratio of the finite parts of the volumes yields the proton to electron mass ratio

$$\frac{V(K)_{finite}}{V(C)_{finite}} \;=\; 6\pi^5 \;=\; 1836.1181 \;\sim\; \frac{m_{proton}}{m_{electron}} \tag{7.34}$$

After taking families of topological excitations corresponding to mappings of n-spheres S^n to the group space, Gonzalez-Martin [75] found that the mass of certain leptons is proportional to integer powers of the volume $V(C_n)$ which depends on the wrapping number n as

$$V(C_n) \;=\; V[U(1)]\,(V(C)_{finite})^{n+1} \;=\; 4\pi\,(\frac{16\pi}{3})^{n+1}, \quad n \neq 0, \quad V(C)_{finite} \;=\; \frac{16\pi}{3} \tag{7.35}$$

The bare mass of the trivial excitation $n = 0$ is taken to be related to the electron mass and is proportional to the volume $V(C)_{finite} = \frac{16\pi}{3}$ so that the masses for other values of n are

$$m_n \;=\; m_e\; 4\pi\;(\frac{16\pi}{3})^n, \quad 0 \;<\; n \;\leq\; 2 \tag{7.36}$$

When $n = 1$ and $m_e = 0.511$ Mev, the theoretical results gives 107.5916 Mev for the muon mass. For $n = 2$ it gives 1770.3 Mev for the tau mass. Using the additional geometric interaction energy in a muon-neutrino system, the main leptonic mass contribution to the pion and kaon mass is calculated to be, respectively, 140.88 Mev and 494.76 Mev.

In the approach [29], [30] by Smith he takes the spinor fermion volume to be the Shilov boundary corresponding to the same symmetric space on which Spin(8) acts as a local gauge group that is used to construct 8-dimensional vector spacetime : the symmetric space $Spin(10)/Spin(8)\times U(1)$ corresponds to a bounded Hua domain of type $IV8$ whose Shilov boundary is $RP^1 \times S^7$. Smith normalizes the volume V(electron) to 1. In order to obtain the proton mass, comprised of two up quarks and a down quark, Smith inserted the volume of the domain $IV8$ to be $\pi^5/3$; included a quark-gravity enhanced extra contribution by a factor of 6 (three colors and three anti colors), and an extra factor of 3 (based in setting the constituent masses of the up and down quark to be equal so that $m_u = m_d = m_{proton}/3$) so that Smith [30] gets the proton to electron mass ratio to be $6 \times (\pi^5/3) \times 3 = 6\pi^5$, which is the same ratio-value obtained by Gonzalez-Martin [75] above. This proton to electron mass ratio, according to [75], was known to Wyler, Lenz and Good [91].

Therefore, the proton mass obtained by both authors is $6\pi^5 m_e = 6\pi^5 \times 0.5110$ MeV $= 938.25$ MeV which is close to the experimental value of 938.27 MeV. The proton mass is calculated as the sum of the constituent masses of its constituent quarks $m_{proton} = m_u + m_u + m_d = 938.25$ MeV. The constituent masses of the up and down quark are then $m_u = m_d = 2\pi^5 m_e = 312.75$ Mev.

Because quarks are confined, unobserved, the constituent masses must not be confused with the current masses listed in the Particle Data Booklet and defined in a mass-independent subtraction scheme at a scale of the order of 2 Gev. A constituent quark is a current quark with a covering [93]. In the low energy limit of QCD, a description by means of perturbation theory is not possible. According to the Feynman diagrams, constituent quarks seem to be 'dressed' current quarks, i.e. current quarks surrounded by a cloud of virtual quarks and gluons. This cloud in the end explains the large constituent-quark masses.

Fermion masses are calculated in [30] as a product of four factors: $V(Qfermion) \times N(Gravity) \times N(octonion) \times N(Symmetry)$. $V(Q_{fermion})$ is the volume of the part of the Weyl (half-spinor) fermion particle manifold $S^7 \times RP^1$ that is related to the fermion particle by photon, weak boson, and gluon interactions. $N(Gravity)$ is a gravity enhacement factor. N(octonion) is an octonion number factor relating the up-type quark to the down-type quark in each generation beyond the first one. The $N(octonion)$ number is set to unity for the first generation. $N(Symmetry)$ is an internal symmetry factor relating the second and third generation massive leptons to the first generation fermions.

Here is a summary of the results of calculations of tree-level fermion masses (quark masses are constituent masses) obtained by Smith [30]. One may compare these values with the ones listed in [93].

The neutrino masses are set to zero at the tree level. Taking the electron mass to be $m_e = 0.5110$ MeV, the other values for the masses are obtained in relation to the electron mass giving : $m_{muon} = 104.8$ MeV. $m_{tau} = 1.88$ GeV. The constituent masses of the quarks are $m_d = m_u = 312.8$ MeV. $m_s = 625$ MeV. $m_c = 2.09$ Gev. $m_b = 5.63$ GeV and the top quark $m_t = 130$ GeV. The controversy with the establishment result value for the top (truth) quark mass of 174.2 ± 3.3 Gev is due to the fact that Smith [29], [30] believes that the Fermilab figure is incorrect because is based on an analysis of semi-leptonic events and it does not handle background correctly and ignore signals that are in rough agreement with his tree level constituent mass value close to 130 Gev.

The combinatorics and more details about the fermion mass calculations can be found in [30].

7.5 Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa parameters and Neutrinos

In the Standard Model of particle physics, the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix (CKM matrix, quark mixing matrix, sometimes also called KM matrix) is a unitary matrix [94] which contains information on the strength of flavour-changing weak decays. Technically, it specifies the mismatch of quantum states of quarks when they propagate freely and when they take part in the weak interactions. It is important in the understanding of CP violation.

Smith [30] used the following formulas based on the above masses to calculate the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa parameters

$$sin(\theta_{12}) \;=\; s_{12} \;=\; \frac{me + 3md + 3mu}{\sqrt{[m_e^2 + 3m_d^2 + 3m_u^2] + [m_\mu^2 + 3m_s^2 + 3m_c^2]}} \;=\; 0.222198 \tag{7.37a}$$

$$sin(\theta_{13}) = s_{13} \;=\; \frac{m_e + 3m_d + 3m_u}{\sqrt{[m_e^2 + 3m_d^2 + 3m_u^2] + [m_\tau^2 + 3m_b^2 + 3m_t^2]}} = 0.004608 \tag{7.37b}$$

$$sin(\tilde{\theta}_{23}) \;=\; \frac{m_\mu + 3m_s + 3m_c}{\sqrt{[m_\tau^2 + 3m_b^2 + 3m_t^2] + [m_\mu^2 + 3m_s^2 + 3m_c^2]}} \tag{7.37c}$$

$$sin(\theta_{23}) \;=\; s_{23} \;=\; sin(\tilde{\theta}_{23}) \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{f,2}}{\sum_{f,1}}} \;=\; 0.04234886 \tag{7.37d}$$

where $\sum_{f,2}$ and $\sum_{f,1}$ are the sum over the second and first generation masses, respectively. The CP violating phase angle used by Smith is $\delta_{13} = 70.529$ degrees. We may compare these values in eq-(7.37) with the currently best known values for the standard parameters [94] :

$\theta_{12} = 13.04$ degrees $\Rightarrow$ $sin(\theta_{12}) = 0.225631$. $\theta_{13} = 0.201$ degress $\Rightarrow$ $sin(\theta_{13}) = 0.003508$. $\theta_{23} = 2.38$ degrees $\Rightarrow$ $sin(\theta_{23}) = 0.041526$ and one finds close agreement with the numbers in eq-(7.37). The CP violating phase is $\delta_{13} = 1.20$ radians = 68.7549 degrees is also close to the CP violating phase angle $\delta_{13} = 70.529$ degrees in [29], [30].

The neutrino masses were zero at tree level in Smith's model. They receive loop corrections. The heaviest neutrino mass state ν_3 corresponds to a neutrino whose propagation begins and ends in the CP^2 internal symmetry space, lying entirely therein. The results by [30] are

$$M_{\nu_3} \;=\; \sqrt{2}\, m_e\, G_{Weak}\, m_{proton}^2\, \alpha_E \;=\; = 1.4{\times}5{\times}10^5{\times}1.05{\times}10^{-5}{\times}(1/137)\; eV =$$

$$5.4 \times 10^{-2}\; eV \tag{7.38}$$

The intermediate mass state ν_2 corresponds to a neutrino whose propagation begins in CP^2 and ends in the physical Minkowski space, or vice versa. The first-order corrected mass of ν_2 is $M_{\nu_2} = M_{\nu_3}/Vol(CP^2) = 5.4 \times 10^{-2}/6 = 9 \times 10^{-3}$ eV.

The low mass state ν_1 corresponds to a neutrino whose propagation begins and ends in physical Minkowski spacetime. The first-order corrected mass of ν_1 is $M_{\nu_1} = M_{\nu_2}/Vol(CP^2) = 9 \times 10^{-3}/6 = 1.5 \times 10^{-3}$ eV.

The neutrino mixing matrix calculation was based in using the Stella Octangula configuration of two dual tetrahedra. This is because the neutrino mixing matrix has a 3-generation structure so it has the same phase structure as the Cabibo-Kobayashi-Mawakaw quark mixing matrix. The Unitarity Triangle angles found by Smith are : $\beta = arccos(2\sqrt{2}/3) = 19.471220$ degrees ; $\alpha = 90$ degrees, and $\gamma = arcsin(2\sqrt{2}/3) = 70.528779$ degrees.

In particle physics, the Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata matrix (PMNS matrix) [95], lepton mixing matrix, or neutrino mixing matrix, is a unitary matrix which contains information on the mismatch of quantum states of leptons when they propagate freely and when they take part in the weak interactions. It is important in the understanding of neutrino oscillations.

Experimentally, the mixing angles were established to be approximately $\Theta_{12} = 34$ degrees. $\Theta_{23} = 45$ degrees, and $\Theta_{13} = 9.1$ degrees (as of April 3, 2013) [95]. Smith' s convention for the angles differs by an extra factor of 2 so $2\Theta_{12} = 64$ degrees is close to the values of γ. $2\Theta_{23} = 90$ degrees agrees with the value of α; and $2\Theta_{13} = 18.2$ degrees is close to his value of β. We refer to [30] for explicit details.

7.6 Other Approaches to obtain the Physical Constants

Beck [77] has obtained all of the Standard Model parameters by studying the numerical minima (and zeros) of certain potentials associated with the Kaneko coupled two-dim lattices (two-dim non-linear sigma-like models which resemble Feynman's chess-board lattice models) based on Stochastic Quantization methods. The results by Smith [29] (also based on Feynman's chess board models and hyper-diamond lattices) are analytical rather than being numerical [77] and it is not clear if there is any relationship between these latter two approaches. Noyes has proposed an iterated numerical hierarchy based on Mersenne primes $M_p = 2^p - 1$ for *certain* values of $p = primes$ [84], and obtained a quite large number of satisfactory values for the physical parameters. An interesting coincidence is related to the iterated Mersenne prime sequence

$$M_2 = 2^2 - 1 = 3, \quad M_3 = 2^3 - 1 = 7, \quad M_7 = 2^7 - 1 = 127, \quad 3 + 7 + 127 = 137$$

$$M_{127} = 2^{127} - 1 \ \sim 1.69 \times 10^{38} \ \sim (\frac{M_{Planck}}{m_{proton}})^2. \tag{7.39}$$

Pitkanen has also developed methods to calculate physical masses recurring to a p-adic hierarchy of scales based on Mersenne primes [85].

An important connection between anomaly cancellation in string theory and perfect even numbers was found in [87]. These are numbers which can be written in terms of sums of its divisors, including unity, like $6 = 1 + 2 + 3$, and are of the form $P(p) = \frac{1}{2}2^p(2^p - 1)$ if, and only if, $2^p - 1$ is a Mersenne prime. Not all values of $p = prime$ yields primes. The number $2^{11} - 1$ is not a Mersenne prime, for example. The number of generators of the anomaly free groups $SO(32)$, $E_8 \times E_8$ of the 10-dim superstring is 496 which is an even perfect number. Another important group related to the unique tadpole-free bosonic string theory is the $SO(2^{13}) = SO(8192)$ group related to the bosonic string compactified on the $E_8 \times SO(16)$ lattice. The number of generators of $SO(8192)$ is an even perfect number since $2^{13} - 1$ is a Mersenne prime. For an introduction to p-adic numbers in Physics and String theory see [86].

A lot more work needs to be done to be able to answer the question: is all this just a mere numerical coincidence or is it design ? However, the results of the previous sections indicate that it is very *unlikely* that these results were just a mere numerical coincidence (senseless numerology) and that indeed the values of the physical constants could be actually calculated from pure thought, rather than invoking the anthropic principle; i.e. namely, based on the interplay of harmonic analysis, geometry, topology, higher dimensions and, ultimately, number theory. The fact that the coupling constants involved the ratio of measures (volumes) may cast some light on the role of the world-sheet areas of strings, and world volumes of p-branes, as they propagate in target spacetime backgrounds of diverse dimensions.

8 Conclusions

To conclude we should add some important remarks related to String (M, F) theory and Noncommutative and Nonassociative Geometry. Concerning string theory, we explicitly quote below some of the most salient excerpts which appeared in the most recent report about the status of Particle Physics by Dine et al [96] :

"There are many challenges in connecting string theory to the real world, but consideration of string models has profoundly influenced ideas for particle physics models. In Astroparticle physics and cosmology there is much still to explain, including the reason the cosmological constant has the value it does, the origin of cosmological density perturbations, and the nature of dark matter. String theory has had an important indirect impact on particle physics by inspiring new computational approaches to ordinary perturbation theory. String theory and supersymmetry have also had a broad impact in pure mathematics in areas ranging from algebraic geometry to number theory.

One of the most important recent developments in string theory is the AdS/CFT correspondence, or gauge/string duality. This is the startling observation that a quantum gravity theory in Anti-deSitter space is equivalent to a conformal field theory at the boundary of the space. This idea has provided a fundamental new tool for the study of strongly interacting field theories. As such it has provided a new method of studying non-perturbative QCD, has motivated new computations in lattice gauge theory, has found important applications to heavy ion physics, where it was used to predict the viscosity to entropy ratio of the quark-gluon plasma, and is now being widely applied to problems in condensed matter physics.

There has also been increasing interaction between particle theory and areas of pure mathematics, an area of research sometimes referred to as "physical mathematics". For example, there are burgeoning connections between number theory, geometry and the mathematical structure of scattering amplitudes. There has also been a resurgence of interest in the formal structure of supersymmetric gauge theories and their application to areas of mathematics, including knot theory and the structure of low-dimensional manifolds. Dualities in string theory have found a direct connection to elements of the Langlands correspondence, one of the main drivers of research in mathematics".

On the negative front, String Theory gives us a *vast* number of possible vacua 10^{500}, this is a huge "landscape" of possibilities, that can be realized in a multiverse and populated by eternal inflation. Schellekens reviewed the developments in this area, focusing especially on the last decade [97]. Despite the huge number of vacua the search for realistic models can be *narrowed* down *considerably*. Thanks to very powerful algorithms in computational algebraic geometry heterotic model building on 16 specific Calabi-Yau manifolds have been constructed by [98]. These 16 special manifolds are the only ones among more than half a billion manifolds in the Kreuzer-Skarke list with a non-trivial first fundamental group. The authors [98] classified the line bundle models on these manifolds, both for $SU(5)$ and $SO(10)$ GUTs, which lead to consistent supersymmetric string vacua and have three chiral families. A total of about 29000 models is found, most of them corresponding to $SO(10)$ GUTs. These models constitute a starting point for detailed heterotic model building on Calabi-Yau manifolds in the Kreuzer-Skarke list. Therefore we should not dismiss string theory yet.

Connes Noncommutative geometry [99] generalizes the concepts of ordinary geometry. As recently summarized by the authors [102] :

"The geometrical setting is that of an usual manifold (spacetime) described by the algebra of complex valued functions defined on it, and tensor multiplied by a finite dimensional matrix algebra. The Standard Model is described as a particular almost commutative geometry, and the corresponding Lagrangian is built from the spectrum of a generalized Dirac operator. This noncommutative geometry description of the standard model has a phenomenological predictive power and is approaching the level of maturity which enables it to confront with experiments

The spectral action principle [100] puts gauge theories, such as the standard model, on the same geometrical footing as general relativity deriving a Lagrangian from a noncommutative spacetime, making it possible unification with gravity. The principle is purely spectral, based on the regularization of the eigenvalues of the Dirac operator, and of its fluctuations, and the action could be derived from its fermionic counterpart via the renormalization flow in the presence of anomalies" [102].

This noncommutative model was enhanced to include massive neutrinos and the seesaw mechanism. The most remarkable result is the possibility to predict the 126 Gev mass of the Higgs particle [100]. In the context of the spectral action and the noncommutative geometry approach to the standard model, more recently the authors [102] built a model based on a larger symmetry. The latter satisfies all the requirements to have a noncommutative manifold, and mixes gauge and spin degrees of freedom without introducing extra fermions. With this grand symmetry it is natural to have the scalar field necessary to obtain the Higgs mass in the vicinity of 126 GeV. Requiring the noncommutative space to be an almost commutative geometry (i.e. the product of manifold by a finite dimensional internal space) gives conditions for the breaking of this grand symmetry to the Standard Model.

Model building based on Nonassociative Geometry have also been proposed by some authors, in particular by [101]. The theme in common with the spectral action principle in Noncommutative geometry and this work is the key role played by Clifford algebras (Dirac operator). We hope to pursue further connections among them in the near future. In particular, Smith [29], [30] has suggested that within the context of Algebraic Quantum Field Theory (AQFT) and Noncommutative Geometry to get a more global theory, the local Lagrangians must be patched together. Using the 8-fold periodicity of real Clifford algebras, taking N tensor products of factors of $Cl(8)$ as $Cl(8) \otimes \cdots \otimes Cl(8) = Cl(8N)$ allows the construction of arbitrarily large real Clifford algebras as composites of lots of local $Cl(8)$ factors. By taking the completion of the union of all such $Cl(8)$-based tensor products, one gets a generalized Real Hyperfinite II1 von Neumann Algebra factor that describes physics in terms of Algebraic Quantum Field Theory.

The appearance of von Neumann Algebras in Noncommutative Geometry is also connected to the problem of constructing a universal gauge group which underlies the dynamical symmetries of the quantum string spacetime [103]. By studying toroidal compactifications of the bosonic 26-dim string the authors [103] found how certain generalized Kac-Moody symmetries, such as the Monster group, arise as gauge symmetries of the resulting stringy spacetime. The automorphism group of the infinite-dimensional Vertex Operator Algebras in string theory is known to be the Monster group. It is warranted to study these connections deeper.

Acknowledgments

We thank M. Bowers for her assistance. Special thanks to Tony Smith for numerous discussions

References

[1] I. Bars and M. Gunaydin, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **45** (1980) 859; N. Baaklini, *Phys. Lett* **91 B** (1980) 376; S. Konshtein and E. Fradkin, *Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz* **42** (1980) 575; M. Koca, *Phys. Lett* **107 B** (1981) 73; R. Slansky, *Phys. Reports* **79** (1981) 1.

[2] S. Adler, "Further thoughts on Supersymmetric E_8 as family and grand unification theory", hep-ph/0401212.

[3] K. Itoh, T. Kugo and H. Kunimoto, Progress of Theoretical Physics **75**, no. 2 (1986) 386.

[4] S. Barr, *Physical Review* **D 37** (1988) 204.

[5] R. Mohapatra, *Unification and Supersymmetry : The frontiers of Quark-Lepton Physics* (Springer Verlag, Third Edition, 1986).

[6] J. Hewett and T. Rizzo, *Phys. Reports* **183** (1989) 193.

[7] I. R. Porteous, *Clifford algebras and Classical Groups* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995).

[8] C. H Tze and F. Gursey, *On the role of Divison, Jordan and Related Algebras in Particle Physics* (World Scientific, Singapore 1996); S. Okubo, *Introduction to Octonion and other Nonassociative Algebras in Physics* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2005); R. Schafer, *An introduction to Nonassociative Algebras* (Academic Press, New York 1966); G. Dixon, *Division Algebras, Octonions, Quaternions, Complex Numbers, and the Algebraic Design of Physics* (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1994); G. Dixon, *J. Math. Phys* **45** no 10 (2004) 3678; P. Ramond, Exceptional Groups and Physics, hep-th/0301050; J. Baez, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc* **39** no. 2 (2002) 145.

[9] P. Jordan, J von Neumann and E. Wigner, *Ann. Math* **35** (1934) 2964; K. MacCrimmon, *A Taste of Jordan Algebras* (Springer Verlag, New York 2003); H. Freudenthal, *Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser* **57 A** (1954) 218; J. Tits, *Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser* **65 A** (1962) 530; T. Springer, *Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser* **65 A** (1962) 259.

[10] L. Boya, "Supersymmetry and Polytopes" arXiv : 0808.3667.

[11] D. Freedman, P. van Nieuwenhuizen and S. Ferrara, Phys. Rev. **D 13** (1976) 3214.

D. Deser and B. Zumino, Phys. Lett. **62 B** (1976) 335.

S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields III : Supersymmetry* (Cambridge University Press 2000).

F. Hehl, J. McCrea, E. Mielke and Y. Ne'eman, Phys. Reports **258** (1995) 1.

[12] Chiu Man Ho, Pham Q. Hung and T. W. Kephart, "Conformal Completion of the Standard Model with a Fourth Generation" arxiv : 1102.3997

[13] O. Castillo-Feliosola, C. Corral, C. Villavicencio and A. Zerwekh, "Fermion masses through condensation in spacetimes with Torsion" arXiv : 1310.4124.

[14] A. Jourjine, "The Spectrum of the 4-Generation Dirac-Kaehler Extension of the SM" Phys. Lett. **B 695** (2011) 482; arXiv : 1011.0382.

"Mass Mixing, the Fourth Generation, and the Kinematic Higgs Mechanism" arXiv : 1005.3593.

[15] S. L. Glashow, "Trinification Of All Elementary Particle Forces", Print-84-0577 (BOSTON). A. Rizov, Bulg. J. Phys. **8** (1981) 461.

[16] G.K. Leontaris, " A $U(3)_C \times U(3)_L \times U(3)_R$ gauge symmetry from intersecting D-branes", arxiv : 0802.4301.

[17] B. Stech, "The mass of the Higgs boson in the trinification subgroup of E_6, arXiv : 1206.4233.

[18] J. Pati and A. Salam, Phys. Rev. Lett **31** (1973) 661; Phys. Rev. **D 8** (1973) 1240; Phys. Rev. **D 10** (1974) 275.

S. Rajpoot and M. Singer, J. Phys. **G** : Nuc. Phys. **5**, no. 7 (1979) 871. S. Rajpoot, Phys. Rev. **D 22**, no. 9 (1980) 2244.

[19] L. Fong Li, Phys. Rev. **D 9**, no. 6 (1974) 1723. P. Jetzer, J. Gerard and D. Wyler, Nuc. Phys. **B 241** (1984) 204.

[20] A. Einstein, Ann. Math. **46** (1945) 578. A. Einstein and E. Strauss, Ann. Math. **47** (1946) 731.

[21] K. Borchsenius, Phys. Rev **D 13** (1976) 2707.

[22] S. Marques and C. Oliveira, J. Math. Phys **26** (1985) 3131. Phys. Rev **D 36** (1987) 1716.

[23] C. Castro, International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics, **9**, no.3, May, 2012.

[24] C. Pope, "Lectures in Kaluza-Klein Theory"
http://faculty.physics.tamu.edu/pope/ihplec.pd (2002).

[25] C. Castro and M. Pavsic, Progress in Physics **vol 1** (April 2005), 31.

[26] J. Baez and J. Huerta, " The Algebra of Grand Unified Theories" arXiv : 0904.1556.

[27] G. Dixon, *Division Algebras : Octonions, Quaternions, Complex Numbers, and the Algebriac Design of Pjhysics* (Kluwer, 1994).

[28] M. Pavsic, "A Novel View on the Physical Origin of E_8'', arXiv : 0806.4365. J. Phys. **A 41** (2008) 332001.

[29] Frank (Tony) Smith, *The Physics of* E_8 *and* $Cl(16) = Cl(8) \otimes Cl(8)$ www.tony5m17h.net/E8physicsbook.pdf (Carterville, Georgia, June 2008, 367 pages).

Frank (Tony) Smith *Int. J. Theor. Phys* **24** , 155 (1985); *Int. J. Theor. Phys* **25**, 355 (1985).

Frank (Tony) Smith, " From Sets to Quarks, hep-ph/9708379; The $D_4 - D_5 - E_6 - E_7 - E_8$ Model, [CERN CDS EXT-2003-087] .

[30] Frank (Tony) Smith, " E_8 Physics 2013" vixra.org/1310. 0182.

Frank (Tony) Smith, "Physics of E_8 and $Cl(16) = Cl(8) \otimes Cl(8)$" vixra.org/0907.0006.

Frank (Tony) Smith's entire website can be found in vixra.org/abs/1311.0094

[31] M.Mayer, Hadronic Journal **4** (1981) 108.

[32] G. Ni, S. Lou, W. Lu, and J. Yang, Sci.China **A41** (1998) 1206, arXiv : hep-ph/9801264.

[33] C. Castro, Advances in Applied Clifford Algebras **22**, no. 1 (2012), 1.

[34] C. Castro, Int. J. Theor. Phys, **Vol 51**, Issue 10 (2012) 3318.

[35] C.Castro, Progress in Physics **vol 2** (April 2006) 46.

[36] C. Castro, IJGMMP **4**, No. 8 (2007) 1239; IJGMMP **6**, No. 3 (2009) 1-33.

[37] C. Castro, IJGMMP **6**, No. 6 (2009) 911.

[38] M. Cederwall and J. Palmkvist, "The octic E_8 invariant", hep-th/0702024.

[39] N. Batakis, Class and Quantum Gravity **3** (1986) L 99.

[40] S. W. MacDowell and F. Mansouri: Phys. Rev. Lett **38** (1977) 739;
F. Mansouri: Phys. Rev **D 16** (1977) 2456.
A. Chamseddine and P. West, Nuc. Phys. **B 129** (1977) 39.

[41] R. Gilmore, *Lie Groups, Lie Algebras and some of their Applications* (John Wiley and Sons Inc, New York, 1974).

[42] E. Fradkin and A. Tseytlin, Phys. Reports **119**, nos. 4-5 (1985) 233-362.

[43] N. Batakis, "The gravitational and electroweak interactions unified as a gauge theory of the de Sitter group" hep-th/9605217.

[44] K. Koepsell, H. Nicolai and H. Samtleben, " An Exceptional Geometry of $d = 11$ Supergravity" hep-th/0006034.

[45] E. Cremmer, B. Julia, H. Lu, and C. N. Pope, Nucl. Phys. **B523** (1998) 73.

[46] A. Malcev. Izv. Akad. Nauk SSR, Ser. Mat. **9** (1945) 291.

[47] D. Quillen, Topology **24** (1985) 89.

[48] J. Distler, "Superconection for Dummies"

http://golem.ph.utexas.edu/∼distler/blog/archives/001680.html

[49] Y. Ne'eman and S. Sternberg, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **87** (1990) 7875. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **77** (1980) 3127.

[50] C. Castro, "Super-Clifford Gravity, Higher Spins, Generalized Supergeometry and much more' to appear in Adv. in Applied Clifford Algebras.

[51] D. Persson, "Arithmetic and Hyperbolic Structures in String Theory" arXiv : 1001.3154.

[52] P. D. Alvarez, P. Pais, and J. Zanelli "Local supersymmetry without SUSY partners" arXiv : 1306.1247.

[53] P. West, "Generalized geometry, eleven dimensions and E_{11}" arXiv : 1111.1642.

[54] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neutrino_theory_of_light

[55] K. Hinterbichler, J. Levin and C. Zukowski, "Kaluza-Klein Towers on General Manifolds" arxiv : 1310.6353.

[56] S. De Leo and K. Abdel-Khalek, J. Math. Phys. **38** (1997) 582; arXiv : hep-th/9607140.

S. De Leo and G. Ducati, "The octonionic eigenvalue problem" arXiv : 1208.4999.

[57] L. S. Brown, *Quantum field theory* (1992, Cambridge University Press, Bristol).

[58] M. Gunaydin and F. Gursey, J. Math. Phys **14** (1973) 1651.

M. Gunaydin, J. Math. Phys **17** (1976) 1875.

[59] S.W. Hawking and C. Pope, Phys. Lett. 73B, 42, (1978)

[60] B. Chakrborty and P. Parthasarathy, “On instanton induced spontaneous compactification in $M^4 \times CP^2$ and chriral fermions” Class. Quan. Grav. **7** (1990) 1217.

B. Chakrborty and P. Parthasarathy“On generalized spin structures on the CP^2 manifold” Class. Quan. Grav. **8** (1991) 843.

[61] B. P. Dolan and C. Nash, “The Standard Model Fermion Spectrum From Complex Projective spaces” JHEP 0210 (2002) 041 [hep-th/0207078].

B. P. Dolan and C. Nash, “Chiral Fermions and Spinc structures on Matrix approximations to manifolds” JHEP 0207 (2002) 057 [hep-th/0207007] .

[62] J. Distler and S. Garibaldi, Commun. Math. Phys. **298** (2010) 419.

[63] A. G.Lisi, ”An Exceptionally Simple Theory of Everything”, arXiv : 0711.0770

[64] G. Traintaphyllou, ” Towards $E_8 \times E_8'$ Unification” arXiv : 1109.4761.

[65] L. Motl, The Reference Frame, http://motls.blogspot.com/2007/11/exceptionally-simple-theory-of.html

[66] A. G. Lisi, Lee Smolin and S. Speziale ”Unification of gravity, gauge fields, and Higgs bosons”, arXiv:1004.4866

[67] E. Witten, in Proceedings of the 1983 Shelter Island Conference on Quantum Field Theory and the Fundamental Problems of Physics, Ed. R. Jackiw, N.N. Khuri, S. Weinberg and E. Witten, MIT Press, (1985).

[68] A. Wyler, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris **A 269** (1969) 743.

A. Wyler, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris **A 272** (1971) 186.

[69] R.V Ambartzumian, ”Stochastic and Integral Geometry”, Dordrecht, Netherlands: Reidel, 1987.

M.G Kendall and P.A.P Moran, ”Geometric Probability”, New York: Hafner, 1963.

W.S Kendall, O. Barndorff-Nielson and M.C van Lieshout, ”Current Trends in Stochastic Geometry: Likelihood and Computation”, Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 1998.

D.A Klein and G.C Rota, ”Introduction to Geometric Probability”, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

L.A Santalo, ”Integral Geometry and Geometric Probability” , Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1976 .

H. Solomon,”Geometric Probability”, Philadelphia, PA: SIAM, 1978.

D. Stoyan, W.S Kendall and J. Mecke, ”Stochastic Geometry and Its Applications” New York: Wiley, 1987.

http://mathworld.wolfram.com/GeometricProbability.html

[70] A. Wyler, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **A 269***, 743 (1969). C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **A 272***,186 (1971)* .

[71] A.Wyler's unpublished Princeton papers on the Complex Light Cone, Symplectic Spinors and Symmetric spaces can be found at : http://www.valdostamuseum.org/hamsmith/WylerIAS.pdf

[72] J. Maldacena, "The large N limit of Superconformal Theories and Supergravity" [arXiv: hep-th/9711200].

[73] R. Gilmore, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **28***, 462 (1972). B. Robertson, Phys. Rev. Lett* **27***, 1845 (1972).*

[74] Vladimorov, I. Volovich and Zelenov *p-Adic Analysis and Mathematical Physics* (World Scientific, 1994).

[75] G. Gonzalez-Martin, "Physical Geometry", University of Simon Bolivar, publishers, Caracas, June 2000, 265 pages, ISBN : 9800767495. G. Gonzalez-Martin, " The proton/electron Geometric Mass Ratio" [arXiv : physics/0009052] . "The fine structure constant from Relativistic Groups " [arXiv : physics/0009051]

[76] W. Smilga, "Higher order terms in the contraction of $S0(3,2)$" [arXiv : hep-th/0304137].

[77] C.Beck, "Spatio-Temporal Vacuum Fluctuations of Quantized Fields", World Scientific, Singapore 2002.

[78] R. Coquereaux, A. Jadcyk, *Reviews in Mathematical Physics* **2***, 1 (1990).*

[79] L.K. Hua, "Harmonic Analysis of Functions of Several Complex variables in the Classical Domains", Birkhauser, Boston-Basel-Berlin 2000.

[80] J. Faraut, S. Kaneyuki, A. Koranyi, Qi-keng Lu and G. Roos, "Analysis and Geometry on Complex Homogeneous Domains", *Progress in Mathematics vol. 185* , Birkhauser, Boston-Basel-Berlin.

[81] R. Penrose, W. Rindler, "Spinors and Space-Time", Cambridge University Press 1986.

[82] S.A Hugget , K. P Todd, "An Introduction to Twistor Theory" *London Mathematical Society Students Texts* **4** , Cambridge University Press 1985.

[83] G. Gibbons, " Holography and the Future Tube" [arXiv : hep-th/9911027].

[84] P. Noyes, "Bit-Strings Physics : A Discrete and Finite Approach to Natural Philosophy", *Series in Knots in Physics, vol. 27* , Singapore, World Scientific, 2001.

[85] M. Pitkanen, "Topological Geometrodynamics I, II", *Chaos, Solitons and Fractals* **13** *no. 6, 1205 (2002).*

[86] L. Brekke, P. Freund, *Physics Reports* **1**, *231 (1993)* .

[87] P. Frampton, T. Kephart, *Phys. Rev.* **D 60**, *08790 (1999).*

[88] L. Boya, E.C.G Sudarshan and T. Tilma, " Volumes of Compact Manifolds" [arXiv : math-ph/0210033].

[89] V. A. Miransky, M. Tanabashi, and K. Yamawaki, Phys. Lett. **B 221** (1989) 177 ; Mod. Phys. Lett. **A 4**, (1989) 1043.

Y. Nambu, Enrico Fermi Institute Report No. 89-08, 1989; in Proceedings of the 1989 Workshop on Dynamical Symmetry Breaking, edited by T. Muta and K. Yamawaki (Nagoya University, Nagoya, Japan, 1990).

W. J. Marciano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62** (1989) 2793; Phys. Rev. **D41** (1990) 219.

[90] M. Hashimoto, M. Tanabashi and K. Yamawaki, "Topped MAC with extra dimensions?", hep-ph/0311165.

[91] F. Lenz, Phys. Rev. **82** (1951) 554.

A. Wyler, Acad. Sci. Paris, Comtes Rendus **217 A** (1971) 180.

I. Good, Phys. Lett **33 A** (1970) 383.

[92] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields II : Modern Aplications* (Cambridge University Press, 1996)

[93] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Constituent_quark

[94] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cabibbo_Kobayashi_Maskawa_matrix

[95] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pontecorvo_Maki_Nakagawa_Sakata_matrix

[96] M. Dine, K. Babu, C. Csaki, S. Dawson, L. Dixon, S. Gottlieb, J. Harvey and D. Whiteson, "The Future of U.S. Particle Theory: Report of the DPF Theory Panel" arXiv : 1310.6111

[97] A.N. Schellekens, "Life at the Interface of Particle Physics and String Theory" arXiv : 1306.5083

[98] Y.H He, S. J Lee, A. Lukas and C. Sun, "Heterotic Model Building: 16 Special Manifolds" arXiv : 1309.0223

[99] A. Connes, *Noncommutative Geometry*, (Academic Press, 1984).

A. H. Chamseddine and A. Connes, "Noncommutative Geometry as a Framework for Unification of all Fundamental Interactions including Gravity. Part I," Fortsch. Phys. **58** (2010) 553 [arXiv:1004.0464 [hep-th]].

[100] A. H. Chamseddine and A. Connes, "The spectral action principle", Commun. Math. Phys. **186**, 731 (1997) [arXiv:hep-th/9606001].

A. H. Chamseddine and A. Connes, "Resilience of the Spectral Standard Model", arXiv:1208.1030 [hep-ph].

[101] R. Wulkenhaar, "The Standard model within nonassociative geometry". Phys. Lett. B **390** (1997) 119 [hep-th/9607096].

S. Farnsworth and L. Boyle, "Non-Associative Geometry and the Spectral Action Principle", arXiv:1303.1782 [hep-th].

[102] A. Devastato, F. Lizzi and P. Martinetti, "Grand Symmetry, Spectral Action and the Higgs Mass" arXiv : 1304.0415.

[103] F.Lizzi and R. Szabo, Chaos, Solitons and Fractals **vol 10**, nos. 2-3 (1999) 445. (Special edition on Superstring, M, F, S ... Theory; C.Castro and M. El Naschie, editors).