

An Exceptionally Simple Theory of Everything

by A Garrett Lisi

Here is a link for the theory itself in pdf.

http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/arxiv/pdf/0711/0711.0770v1.pdf

IS IT RIGHT?

WHAT IS IT TELLING US?

November 19, 2007

IS IT RIGHT?

I'm not even going to comment on that! Others will give you plenty of comments on that.

I'm going to proceed on the assumption that **IT IS RIGHT**.

And from there I'm going to look at the facts and say:

IF IT IS RIGHT THEN

WHAT IS IT TELLING US about this universe that we find ourselves living in?

We still have the same basic problem today that Huygens complained about to Newton,

Yes, you have all the math working correctly but where is your mechanical model that tells us why the math is working?

Even mathematician Stephen Wolfram, who made millions selling his higher mathematics software says math can only explain simple things. The major premise in Stephen Wolfram's \$59.95 Best Selling book, that you can read FREE by clicking this link: [Wolfram's 1,000 page "A New Kind of Science"](#) is that we absolutely need a simple model of how this is all working.

Has A. Garrett Lisi just given us this?

I'll answer that and the answer is no!

But what he has given us, if he is right, is a three dimensional space plus one dimension of time picture of the **linkages** of how this all **links** together in our spacetime realm, reference frame.

He's given us a 4D representation of how these things are **linked** together as seen by us here.

Lisi may well have given us a veritable mathematical blueprint by which we *can* work out the real model.

OK, I'll simplify and explain the above with a picture of what's happening.

Einstein predicted our sun would bend the light from a distant star and he was proven correct when this was measured during an eclipse. Einstein gave us his general relativity tensor math that showed us exactly how much this light should bend.

But why does it do this? Einstein showed us that it's the curvature of space. But why then is space curved?

Now, this is exactly what A. Garrett Lisi's model is beginning to tell us, if it is right.

What we see, in Lisi's model, is something extremely important: this is the fact that electrons are, in some way, linked to quarks. How exactly this is being done, the model does not tell us. But we can infer things about how it is being done. Lisi's math is telling us these are harmonics we are dealing with in this blueprint.

We know quarks are far more massive and therefore have more energy than electrons. In the quantum world energy and frequency are virtually interchangeable. A higher energy means a higher frequency and a higher frequency means a higher energy. From this we know the quark frequency is far higher than the electron frequency.

What Lisi's mathematical blueprint seems to be telling us is that that not only are the electron and quark spinors important but that for these linkages to occur, the quark's spin frequency must be at a higher harmonic from the electron's spin frequency.

Now I'm going to stop where the road forks in two directions:

I'm going to start up one fork of the road and ask, what if the quark spin frequency is an exact square of the electron's spin frequency?

And I'll make an abrupt turn and continue down the other fork of the road and we'll look at what Dr. Milo Wolff has discovered: [*Milo Wolff's website*](#)

Fulbright Scholar Dr. Milo Wolff mathematically proved the electron, itself, is a scalar, standing wave resonance. Then later he proved the spin frequency of the electron was also a scalar, standing wave resonance.

Now, if Dr. Wolff and Lisi are both right and the tensor math of general relativity is being used correctly, we have to come to another startling conclusion, and it is startling indeed.

There are no tensors for force in Einstein's tensor math so general relativity mathematicians equate **more** space, **than average**, with **repulsive** force and less space, **than average** with attractive force.

Isn't all of this showing us that these electrons that have all this attractive and repulsive power are also creating space itself? Are these electrons actually creating all this space we see? General relativity concepts certainly seem to be telling us this, as we look at Lisi's model.

Now that Lisi's model is showing us quarks are in some way linked to electrons, we have to ask can quarks also create space? Now we'll go back to that other fork in the road where we asked what if the quark spin frequency was the exact square of the electron's spin frequency?

We know it's the electron's spin that produces magnetism. Is it the quark's spin that produces the strong force?

We know that light quanta comes to our eyes from stars and it takes more than one individual quantum of energy before our eyes can see the slightest bit of light. It takes about 7 quanta. We know another fact

about these quanta in that there is no energy lost in a quantum of energy as it comes to our eye from a distant star. No energy whatsoever is lost in that transfer. It is only the **number** of these quanta involved that drop off with the **square of the distance**.

Lisi's model is pointing to the importance of these spinors -- the electron and quark spins -- as to the reason we have not only all these invisible forces but space itself.

Lisi's model also certainly looks like it is hinting to us why acceleration is linked with gravity: this is the *Principle of Equivalence*, if you wish to look it up on Google.

If the quark spin frequency is the square of the electron frequency then we will see this quark produced space as acceleration. This would also be why c^2 shows up in our math. And if there is some strong force binding leakage then quarks binding with quarks in nearby objects will be the cause of gravity and quarks binding with quarks in the fixed stars will be inertia. This quark to quark binding energy should also not decrease with distance similarly to the electron quanta.

And this may only be the tip of the iceberg of what A. Garrett Lisi's new model is telling us.

Only time will tell.

Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.

[Daniel P. Fitzpatrick Jr.](#)