

Universal Theory of Relativity and the “Unification” of Fundamental Physical Interactions

Sanjay M Wagh

Central India Research Institute, Post Box 606,

*Laxminagar, Nagpur 440 022, India **

(Dated: February 7, 2006)

Abstract

The “unification” of fundamental physical forces (interactions) imagines a “single” conceptual entity using which *all* the observable or physical phenomena, *ie*, changes to physical bodies, would be suitably describable. The physical, conceptual and mathematical, framework which achieves this is that of the recently proposed Universal Theory of Relativity [3]. Here, we argue that the mathematical framework required to achieve the “unification” should be that of the general Category Theory. There are certain unanswered mathematical questions arising out of this context. In the sequel, we also point out these issues for the wider attention.

*Electronic address: cirinag'ngp@sancharnet.in

Physics is our attempt to conceptually grasp the happenings of the observable world. Various physical concepts are also succinctly expressible in the language of mathematics. Laws of Physics are therefore mathematical statements about mathematical structures representing “observable” or “physical” bodies. Unless the theory (concepts and their mathematical representations, both) is appropriate, it will fail to explain, at least, “some” observations. Needs of “appropriate” physical concepts and mathematical structures to represent them are, both, then evident [12].

Experiments “verify” theoretical explanations of phenomena and, in turn, indicate the appropriateness of our choice of, both, the physical conceptions and the mathematical structures representing them. There also are purely logical methods to decide, at least partly, this appropriateness. These methods determine the *mutual compatibility* of our concepts, *ie*, the *internal consistency* of the theoretical framework.

Using any of these above methods, we then judiciously accept or reject any conceptual framework as an admissible theory of the observable world. When an internally consistent theory fails to explain some observations, we need to *expand* the conceptual basis of that theory and, hence, mathematical structures representing those concepts. As an acceptable explanation of the observable world, the conceptual framework of the “expanded” theory must also be internally consistent in the sense of Logic.

Currently, physical explanations rely on four basic forces (of newtonian conceptual origin as “means” to cause “changes” to physical bodies), *viz*, gravity, electromagnetism, weak nuclear, and strong nuclear interactions. The present goal of theoretical physics is of “unifying” these four independent forces. Clearly, this aim requires appropriate physical concepts and their mathematical representations, both.

Einstein [1, 2], from (only an apparently) different perspective than that of the above, arrived at the Principle of General Relativity that the Laws of Physics be applicable with respect to all the systems of reference, in relative acceleration or not, *without unnatural forces* (whose origin is not in physical or observable bodies) *entering into them*. Then, the Laws of Physics should be based on the same mathematical structures, and be also the same mathematical statements, for all the reference systems.

Changes in physical bodies are the *physical phenomena*. Physical reference systems are physical bodies used as reference. This situation provides [3, 4, 5, 6] us a *guiding principle*: mathematical structure(s) representing physical bodies be such that phenomena become ‘changes’ to (mathematical structure of) reference systems themselves.

Here, the unification of basic forces is closely related to Einstein’s principle of general relativity and the aforementioned guiding principle, the former principle helping us with the formulations of various physical laws and the latter principle helping us select the unifying mathematical structure. This is the theoretical framework which I had called as the *Universal Theory of Relativity* [3].

Now, the “unification” of fundamental physical interactions must postulate “some” *single* mathematical entity that “represents” not only *all* the characteristics of physical bodies but also their “changes” (mathematical transformations).

Then, we note that a mathematical transformation essentially “knows” about the mathematical structure it “transforms”. This single concept, that of the transformation of a mathematical structure representing *all* the characteristics of physical bodies, appears to possess therefore the ingredients necessary to be the single conceptual entity capable of “unifying” the four fundamental forces.

This is the *same* as in the case of a category. A *category*, \mathcal{C} , is usually defined in terms of *two* collections - the first, \mathcal{C}_o , of *objects* and the second, \mathcal{C}_A , of *arrows or transformations* and *four suitable operations* on collections \mathcal{C}_o and \mathcal{C}_A satisfying conditions naturally arising for them to be mutually compatible operations.

However, a category is also definable [7, 8, 9, 10] in terms of only \mathcal{C}_A , in an object-free manner. Objects serve only to index (identity) arrows as far as the functions [13] from a subset of $\mathcal{C}_A \times \mathcal{C}_A$ to \mathcal{C}_A are concerned. Thus, a category can be defined using only \mathcal{C}_A and the binary operation of *composition* of arrows, an operation which is not always defined and is subject to naturally arising compatibility conditions.

Categorical foundations of the aim of “unification” are then manifest. We focus either on a suitable mathematical structure possessing *all* the characteristics of physical bodies and consider appropriate means (equations) arising out of its possible transformations to arrive at physically verifiable conclusions or, completely equivalently, on *general* transformations (as arrows of an abstract category) and ‘extract’ *all* the characteristics of physical bodies from these transformations alone.

We now turn to some reasons as to why only the most general mathematical framework of the Category Theory, and nothing short of it, is suitable for concepts behind universal relativity or the unification of basic interactions.

The representation (originating with Euclidean and Cartesian conceptions) of physical bodies by points is inadequate vis-a’-vis the principle of general relativity and the aforementioned guiding principle, both: with it, reference systems do not “change” with the occurrence of observable phenomena. We thus require a mathematical notion other than a point to represent physical bodies.

We may then choose to represent a physical body by a collection of “points”. Now, any physical body can be considered to possess a “boundary”. (But, see discussion later.) Then, the “interior” of such a set with boundary is an “open” subset of suitable topological space X constructible out of many such points. Thus, we could represent physical bodies by open subsets of the corresponding topological space X .

However, if we consider a physical body as a (collection of) open subset(s) of an underlying topological space X , then it will, mathematically equivalently, be also represented [4, 5, 6] as a *spatial Frame* [11].

Technically speaking, a *Frame* is a complete lattice [14], denoted by L , in which binary meet distributes over arbitrary joins, *ie*, $x \wedge \bigvee S = \bigvee \{x \wedge y | y \in S\}$ for all $x \in L$ and $S \subseteq L$. In considering a *Frame*, we thus focus essentially on the concept of an “order” definable on a set, for example, order by “inclusion” of one open subset in another open subset. (This is in contrast to the notion of a neighborhood of a point on which topological considerations focus by generalizing relevant properties of the (Euclidean) real line.) In this last case, we regain the topology on a set from the order by inclusion on the class of its (open) subsets, and such *Frames* are called the *spatial Frames*.

For a space X , the lattice of its open subsets, $\mathcal{O}X$, forms, trivially, a *spatial Frame*. Now, the topology of a space X is always obtainable from suitable *spatial Frame*, but the *Frame*, in general, need not [15] correspond to topology on any space X .

In categorical notions, the category $\mathbb{S}p\mathbb{F}rm$ of spatial *Frames* is a full sub-category of the category $\mathbb{F}rm$ of *Frames*. Also, the category opposite [16] to $\mathbb{F}rm$ is called the category $\mathbb{L}oc$ of *locales*, the notion of a “Locale” being reminiscent of that of the neighborhood of a point of a set. This is the framework of the Point-free Topology [11].

Now, the concept of the boundary of a physical body is not any fundamental physical notion of the collection of points making up that body. We could, in its place, then focus on “orders” imposable on the set of points constituting a physical body, that is to say, we could choose to represent a physical body by a *Frame*.

Then, representation of some properties of material bodies will involve *mathematical structures* (measures or generalizations thereof) *defined over Frames or over the arrows of \mathbb{Frm}* . Corresponding notions have not been developed as yet.

A map $h : L \rightarrow M$ between *Frames* L and M preserving finite meets (including $\mathbf{1}$) and arbitrary joins (including 0) is called a *Frame homomorphism*. Such maps could then represent observable phenomena affecting physical reference systems.

So far, the collection of points constituting a physical body is treated as a set from the intuitive set theory (to avoid paradoxes like Russell’s paradox). This too is not mandatory. The set-theoretic restrictions can then be relaxed [8, 9] in the setting of a *Quasi-Category* which uses a collection of objects (classes) as a conglomerate [17].

We could then represent a physical body as an object (class) of the Quasi-Category. Presently however, a general mathematical structure (measures or generalizations thereof) to represent *all* the physical characteristics of observable bodies does not seem to have been developed within this framework or within its object-free form.

Nonetheless, Category Theory [7, 8, 9, 10] does appear to provide [4, 5, 6] a mathematical basis to conceptions behind the unification of all the basic physical interactions.

Notably, very general physical and mathematical conceptions are identical then. Much work is of course needed before the physical concepts of universal relativity or of unification of forces can be mathematically represented in a satisfactory way.

In the end, we emphasize that the approach adopted here is also *logically compelling* if Mathematics is indeed the tool to represent our physical conceptions.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Partha Ghosh, Gareth Amery, Sunil Maharaj and many others for helpful discussions. I am also indebted to Hemant Wagh, MD (Psychiatry) and Dimi Chakalov (Psychologist) for raising certain conceptual issues and for related discussions. This work is dedicated to the memory of Prof A K Raychaudhury.

-
- [1] Einstein A (1970) in *Albert Einstein: Philosopher Scientist* (Ed. P A Schlipp, Open Court Publishing Company - The Library of Living Philosophers, Vol VII, La Salle)
See also, Pais A (1982) *Subtle is the Lord ... The science and the life of Albert Einstein* (Clarendon Press, Oxford)
- [2] See, Einstein A (1968) *Relativity: The Special and the General Theory* (Methuen & Co. Ltd, London) (Appendix V: Relativity and the Problem of Space.)
- [3] Wagh S M (2005) *Foundations of a Universal Theory of Relativity* and references therein
<http://arxiv.org/physics/0505063>
- [4] Wagh S M (2005) *Progress with a Universal Theory of Relativity*, Talk delivered at the SARS Einstein Centennial Meeting, Durban, September 25-26, 2005.
<http://arxiv.org/physics/0602032>
- [5] Wagh S M (2005) *Universal Relativity and Its Mathematical Requirements*, Talk delivered at the SAMS 48th Annual Meeting, Grahamstown, October 31 - November 2, 2005.
<http://arxiv.org/physics/0602038>
- [6] Wagh S M and Ghosh P P (2006) *Universal Relativity & Category Theory*, to be submitted.
Will be made available at **<http://arxiv.org/physics>**
- [7] Lawvere F W (1966) *The category of categories as a foundation for mathematics*, (La Jolla Conference on Categorical Algebra, Springer-Verlag) pp. 1 - 20 and references therein

- [8] MacLane S (1971) *Categories for the Working Mathematicians*, (Springer-Verlag, New York) and references therein
- [9] Adámek J, Herrlich H and Strecker G E (2004) *Abstract and Concrete Categories - Joy of Cats*, Online edition: <http://katmat.math.uni-bremen.de/acc>
- [10] MacLane S and Moerdijk I (1992) *Sheaves in Geometry and Logic - A First Introduction to Topos Theory*, (Springer-Verlag, New York) and references therein
- [11] Banaschewski B (1997) *The Real Numbers in Pointfree Topology*, (Textos de Matemática, Série B, Departamento de Matemática, da Universidade de Coimbra) and references therein
- [12] As examples, we recall the formulation of the concept of motion using velocity and its mathematical representation initially as a scalar and later as a vector quantity.
- [13] A function f with domain X and codomain Y is treated here as a triple (X, f, Y) , where $f \subseteq X \times Y$ is a relation such that for each $x \in X$, there exists a unique $y \in Y$ with $(x, y) \in f$. We also write $y = f(x)$ or $x \mapsto f(x)$.
- [14] A *lattice*, L , is a partially ordered set (poset) such that for all $x, y \in L$ there exists a lowest upper bound (lub or sup or join), denoted as $x \vee y$, and a greatest lower bound (glb or inf or meet), denoted as $x \wedge y$. A poset P is *complete* iff every subset of P has a lowest upper bound and a greatest lower bound. If there exist elements $0, \mathbf{1} \in L$ such that $0 \leq x \leq \mathbf{1}$ for all $x \in L$, we call L a *complete lattice* and it is a complete poset. [For sets, \wedge corresponds to set-intersection and \vee corresponds to set-union.]
- [15] Not every “order” definable on a set is ‘equivalent’ to the order by inclusion on any topology-forming collection of its (open) subsets. That is why every *Frame* is *not spatial*.
- [16] Category Opposite or Dual to a category \mathcal{C} has the same objects as \mathcal{C} but directions of all the arrows as well as the orders of all the compositions of arrows in \mathcal{C} are *reversed*.
- [17] A *class* is a collection of sets: for any property P , we can form a class of all sets with property P . But, there is no surjection from a set to a class that itself is not a set. Every set is a class. A *conglomerate* is a collection of classes: for any property P , we can form a conglomerate of classes with property P . Moreover, we assume an Axiom of Choice for Conglomerates: for each surjection $f : X \rightarrow Y$ of conglomerates, there exists an injection $g : Y \rightarrow X$ with $f \circ g = id_Y$, the identity of Y . Every class is also a conglomerate. Usual set-theoretic constructions are permissible for classes and conglomerates.