Fragments of Energy?

Clark M. Thomas

Abstract

Astrophysical mathematicians keep trying to make sense of the motley models they have inherited from the 20th century. They never will succeed in their quest of a Theory of Everything by continuing along gerbil paths. A new correlating math theory has emerged that seeks to integrate all within the hybrid model of flowing "fragments of energy." Whereas this clever model is fatally flawed (but the math is pretty), there is a valuable fragment of truth within this odd paradigm.

Larry Silverberg and Jeffrey Eischen, of NC State University, have tackled the apparently incompatible models of particles and waves which replaced the ancient hierarchy of earth, air, fire, water, and aether. Particles rose to prominence with Newton's idea of points at intersecting lines; and waves rose to prominence with Maxwell's electromagnetic waves.[1]

Einstein's fertile mind created General Relativity with geometric gravity branes. His descriptive GR math correlates well on some macro scales with simple models. However, it breaks down at scales where quantum theory dominates. It was Einstein who created confusion when he explained the dual particle and wave nature of the double-slit experiment. Instead of defining points and waves, Einstein eliminated them with geometric spacetime, at least on non-quantum scales.

[1] https://theconversation.com/fragments-of-energy-not-waves-or-particles-may-be-the-fundamental-building-blocks-of-the-universe-150730

Any worthwhile Theory of Everything (TOE) needs to embrace *all* dimensions of physical reality, not just some dimensions that we access through our telescopic and microscopic instruments, or describe in clever mathematics. Emerging TOE physics must go beyond what is experimental, yet still remain connected with most hypotheses underlying experimental models. Theory within logarithmic size dimensions beyond experimental evidence should generally correlate with hypotheses inspired by experiments.

Efforts have been made to minimize 4D science, most notably with various string-theory maths generating an obscenely large number of logarithmic dimensions. Platonic idealists who adhere to pure ideals over actuals prefer holographic universes with one and two dimensionality. Experimentalists prefer 3D strings within a recognizable fourth dimension of time and place.

The Silverberg and Eischen theory of flowing energy fragments attempts to link their model to the precession of Mercury's orbit, and to the bending of light along lines of flowing energy (their idea of branes). However, their idea of flowing energy units follows lines that don't intersect, which is clearly opposed to the idea of competing brane gravity funnels. Not clearly defined is what are those individual lines in origin, operation, and direction, other than correlating math models.

Einstein's GR math correlated with Mercury's orbit better than Newton's, which impressed many people early last century. However, the real truth has been revealed by an iconoclastic fan of Einstein who showed how Einstein twisted his correlative math to fit the observed precession of Mercury's orbit.[2]

There are more perspectives on correlative "proofs of GR" beyond what Silverberg and Eischen propose. The paradigm that stands out above others, and which opens the door to a viable

[2] http://milesmathis.com/merc2.html

causative TOE along all dimensions, can be found within these links (and more) below: [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10].

It is not my intention to re-invent the wheel with each essay, so I invite you to explore several of the essays footnoted herein for a richer perspective on the emerging physics of the 21st century.

As for what is truly interesting in the hybrid "fragments of energy" thesis – it is the idea that electromagnetic (EM) energy can travel along vector lines as discrete fragmented units:

Because of the law of the conservation of energy and matter, these energy units (misnamed as fragments) carry momentum.

Because these EM units have many different frequencies, depending on the length of each tumbling "beaded" 3D string, they also can interact kinetically with measurable matter along the push/shadow gravity paradigm, as properly expressed.

Such energy/matter units can express either as baryonic matter, or as dark matter, depending on the lengths of individual spinning strings and their cohesion into ever larger units. Short strings can spin at high frequencies (beyond our abilities to measure), with corresponding high unit energies. Thus, it is with irony that we note how so-called "dark" matter is anything but dark. We call it dark because we are experimentally in the dark.

---

[3] https://astronomy-links.net/Universal.Anisotropy.Explained.pdf

[4] https://astronomy-links.net/Faster.Dark.Energy.pdf

[5] https://astronomy-links.net/Quanta.and.General.Relativity.pdf

[6] https://astronomy-links.net/Solar.Corona.pdf

[7] https://astronomy-links.net/String.Types.pdf

[8] https://astronomy-links.net/LightSpeed.pdf

[9] https://astronomy-links.net/DipoleRepellerExplained.pdf

[10] https://astronomy-links.net/correlation.and.causation.pdf