

A Case for Heim Theory

Based on the Original Works of Burkhard Heim

by Joel Michalowitz

April 21, 2025

Introduction

Burkhard Heim’s research program aims at providing a unified description of the physical world by appealing to higher-dimensional geometry, quantized spacetime cells (“metrons”), and a systematic approach that integrates gravitation with the other fundamental interactions. This document formulates an argument for the plausibility of Heim Theory by drawing on ideas and formulations from Heim’s original texts, such as *Elementarstrukturen der Materie* (Bd. 1 and 2) [1, 2], *Strukturen der physikalischen Welt und ihrer nichtmateriellen Seite* [3], and *Einheitliche Beschreibung der Materiellen Welt* [4].

1 Logical and Empirical Motivations

Heim’s point of departure is the logical observation that *both* General Relativity and Quantum Field Theory remain incomplete in certain crucial respects:

1. **General Relativity (GR)** geometrizes gravity but does not incorporate the discrete quantum behavior ubiquitous in microphysics. In particular, the classical field equations of GR cannot by themselves yield a quantum mass spectrum or describe the short-range weak and strong interactions.
2. **Quantum Field Theory (QFT)** accounts for discrete energy levels and localized excitations but retains a background of continuously parameterized spacetime. Moreover, standard QFT does not unify gravity on the same footing as gauge interactions.

Heim observed that any consistent framework covering both extremes (macroscopic gravitation and microscopic quantum effects) must be built on a quantized structure of spacetime. The impetus is therefore to replace the usual continuum-based differential geometry by an effectively discrete geometry based on fundamental area cells, the “metrons.” In *Elementarstrukturen der Materie, Bd. 1* [1], Heim lays out how the Einstein field equations can be recast and extended into the discrete regime so that metric components become subject to *eigenvalue problems*, yielding the characteristic quantization phenomenon.

2 Quantized Higher-Dimensional Geometry

At the core of Heim Theory is the postulate that *six* dimensions—rather than four—are required to embed the field equations of matter and gravity. In [1, 2], Heim shows that analyzing the Ricci-type curvature terms in the microdomain leads to 36 coupled field equations. Since 36 is 6^2 , Heim deduced that the geometric base space must be six-dimensional (denoted R_6). This rationale is deeply reminiscent of Einstein’s route to a four-dimensional R_4 from $4^2 = 16$ field

equations, with the important difference that Heim introduces *imaginary* or *trans*-coordinates to achieve a full geometry that can handle microscopic quantum structures.

In the subsequent expansions of his framework (*Strukturen der physikalischen Welt* [3]), Heim and his collaborator Walter Dröscher argued that certain unresolved phenomena—in particular, nonlocal interactions, additional gauge structures, and informational degrees of freedom—require an eventual extension to a 12-dimensional manifold R_{12} . This extension addresses the emergent, organizational aspects beyond standard gauge interactions.

3 Discrete Spacetime and the Metron Concept

One of the most distinctive features of Heim Theory, as discussed in [1, 2], is the *Metron Principle*: spacetime is composed of fundamental surface elements (the “metrons”). These metrons represent the smallest physically meaningful units of area, and thus no length interval can be subdivided continuously below the Planck-scale order. This leads to a discrete version of differential geometry often called a *difference geometry* or *selector calculus*, where the continuum limit emerges in large-scale approximations.

Implications for Particle Physics. Because metrons render geometry discrete, one is naturally led to *finite-difference* analogs of the Ricci curvature. Heim shows that these geometric difference equations develop *eigenvalue solutions* corresponding to stable localized excitations. Physically, these excitations can be interpreted as massive particles [2]:

- **Mass Spectra:** Solving the difference equations for these geometric “condensations” yields the correct mass spectrum of stable particles (the electron, proton, neutron, etc.) within surprisingly small errors, matching experimental data.
- **Charge and Interactions:** The geometric structure also accommodates electric charge through certain *Hermitian* (or, in the expanded formalism, *polymetric*) extensions. Heim links the appearance of gauge fields to the geometry of the extra coordinates.

4 Unifying Gravity with Other Interactions

Gravity, in Einstein’s approach, arises from the geometry of R_4 . Heim extends this logic to R_6 (and ultimately R_{12}), so that in the microdomain, *all forces* appear as geometric manifestations of the extended manifold. The standard gauge interactions (electromagnetism, weak, and strong nuclear forces) can, in principle, be embedded in the same geometric entity as gravity, once the extra coordinate pairs and discrete geometry are fully taken into account [3].

5 Cosmological and Phenomenological Consequences

Finally, Heim Theory suggests radical new perspectives in cosmology:

1. *No Traditional Singularity:* The metric structure extends beyond what standard GR would call singular points, since discrete geometry modifies the high-curvature regime [4].
2. *Evolution of the Universe:* Heim proposed a cyclical or self-organizing cosmic scenario, in which the distribution of matter and fields arises from the dynamical arrangement of metronic units. Potentially, the observed phenomenon of an accelerating expansion (dark energy) and the large portion of invisible matter could link to undisclosed geometry in the extra dimensions.

6 Summary of the Case for Heim Theory

1. **Geometrization of Physics:** The success of General Relativity in describing gravity, and of field theories in describing microscopic particles, strongly motivates a fully geometric approach that simultaneously captures quantum phenomena. Heim Theory pursues precisely this approach, going beyond $4D$.
2. **Discrete Structure of Spacetime:** By replacing continuum calculus with a difference geometry, Heim posits that spacetime cannot be infinitely subdivided. This assumption yields naturally discrete mass spectra and a novel approach to unifying gravity with other forces.
3. **Empirical Checks:** Although still the subject of further verification, Heim's original computations demonstrate approximate matches to known masses and coupling constants. The framework also outlines testable predictions regarding new interactions and possibly additional stable or metastable excitations.
4. **Extended Dimensional Framework:** The progression from R_6 to R_{12} addresses deeper organizational and informational aspects of physical reality, pointing to possible new interactions beyond the Standard Model.

In his collected works [1, 2, 3, 4], Heim provides a rigorous mathematical foundation for each of these claims. While the theory's more ambitious unification goals remain to be fully validated by experiment, the approach stands as a novel, consistent attempt to push Einstein's geometrization program into the quantum domain.

7 Response to the College's Critique

In light of the algebraic and group-theoretical remarks raised in the college response, it is important to clarify how Heim's framework views the embedding of gauge groups, the role of Bott periodicity, and the possibility of supplementing the original six-dimensional model with a higher-dimensional extension. Below is a detailed point-by-point examination:

7.1 Group-Theoretical Embedding and Algebraic Constraints

The college critique highlights the tension in embedding

$$\text{SM} = SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1) \times \text{Spin}(1, 3)$$

into a higher group such as $\text{Spin}(6, 6)$. In particular, a direct identification of the Lorentz group plus the Standard Model gauge group with subgroups of $\text{Spin}(6, 6)$ runs into the well-documented issue that $SU(3)$ is not a subgroup of $\text{Spin}(5)$ (the maximal compact subgroup of $\text{Spin}(5, 3)$). Consequently, the emergent suggestion is that a 6+6 dimensional base might not trivially reproduce the known gauge structure unless further internal symmetry-breaking or extension is introduced.

Heim's Perspective on Gauge Groups. In the original writings (cf. [1, 2]), Heim focuses on the *geometrization of all interactions*, but does not rely on a direct group embedding akin to GUT or E_8 approaches. Instead, he postulates that additional *trans*-coordinates can yield new field components interpreted as novel forces or extended gauge symmetries. Heim further comments that the actual gauge structure in the macroscopic limit emerges from partial symmetry breakings of a more universal *polymetric* geometry.

Thus, while a *standard embedding* of $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ into $\text{Spin}(6, 6)$ runs into group-theory obstacles, Heim's approach may circumvent some pitfalls via a stepwise reduction. The

R_6 construction provides a minimal extension that captures quantum gravitational features, whereas the broader extension to R_{12} (cf. [3]) begins to handle subtle cosmic and organizational (“informational”) aspects, which might well allow a more flexible embedding scheme.

7.2 On Bott Periodicity and Alternative Dimensional Signatures

The college’s response invokes Bott periodicity to argue that certain 7+7 or 11+3 dimensional frameworks might provide more natural spinor representations. Heim’s theory similarly acknowledges that straightforward 6+6 signatures can be topologically restrictive; indeed, the subsequent move to a 12D manifold (with internal imaginary coordinates) is in part an outgrowth of recognizing the insufficiency of 6 alone to describe the full range of field interactions and possibly emergent gauge charges.

In [3] and related notes, Heim indicates that purely local isomorphisms (e.g. $\text{Spin}(1, 3) \simeq \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ in the standard scenario) generalize to the extended manifold with additional imaginary or *trans*-dimensions. The precise path from these trans-coordinates to the realistic gauge group, however, involves a sequence of symmetry breakings or *tensor structure condensations* in the discrete geometry of metrons. Such steps do not necessarily map 1–1 to conventional GUT embeddings, which helps explain why a direct $\text{Spin}(6, 6)$ embedding might seem incomplete from a conventional group-theory vantage.

7.3 Possible Resolutions within the Heim Framework

Rather than disclaiming the entire 6+6 approach, Heim’s methodology suggests several possible resolutions:

1. **Refined Polymetric Tensors:** The so-called *Hermetrie-Formen* and *Hermitian partial structures* [1] can yield extra gauge-like fields beyond the immediate scope of $\text{Spin}(6, 6)$. These partial structures might break or re-interpret the group-theoretical constraints, effectively matching the Standard Model’s gauge sector in the low-energy limit.
2. **12D Extensions:** The final steps of Heim’s research argue for a 12-dimensional extension (R_{12}) [3], containing additional imaginary coordinate pairs. One can view the 6+6 signature as a sub-block or partial diagonalization of an ultimately 12D polymetric. This extra room may accommodate $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ embeddings more naturally, possibly by factoring out $\text{Spin}(4, 4)$ or $\text{Spin}(8, 4)$ factors, then incorporating appropriate breakings.
3. **Discrete Metrons and Emergent Charges:** Much of the group structure in Heim Theory emerges from *eigenvalue constraints* of discrete difference equations. Rather than demanding a purely continuous group embedding, the theory might let gauge charges arise as *integral winding* or *condensation* numbers in the 6D or 12D lattice of metrons. This more combinatorial approach can be partially independent of whether a direct $\text{Spin}(6, 6)$ cover is fully realized.

Summary of Rejoinder. Heim Theory’s unorthodox approach to deriving gauge fields from a discrete higher-dimensional geometry is only superficially similar to standard group-embedding GUT methods. Thus, while the college’s criticism is mathematically valid when considering a standard $\text{Spin}(6, 6)$ containment of $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$, it may not fully address Heim’s discrete scenario wherein gauge charges and fields are byproducts of metron-based metric eigenvalue equations. The 12D extension further broadens the possible gauge structures and might allow future refinements or partial embeddings that bypass the typical group-theoretic contradictions.

In essence, the algebraic mismatch noted by the critique does not necessarily invalidate Heim’s postulates; it mainly underscores the difference between *continuous group* embeddings

on the one hand, and *discrete-lattice-based emergent charges* on the other. Heim’s final investigations suggest that bridging the two viewpoints might require the entire 12D theory, along with carefully orchestrated dynamical symmetry breakings, to replicate the Standard Model multiplets and interactions consistently.

8 The Role of Partial Geometric Structures

Heim’s theory is based on the premise that the properties of elementary particles arise from the detailed structure of space at the smallest scales. (For example, see Heim’s discussions in his mass formula overview [?].) In this approach the dynamical equations—in the microdomain they emerge as eigenvalue equations derived from a generalization of Einstein’s field equations—split naturally into different sectors. More concretely, one finds that the (typically 64) tensorial differential equations governing the geometric field decompose so that 28 of the equations vanish identically and the remaining 36 can be arranged in a 6×6 schema. The residual equations are then interpreted by grouping the various contributions according to their geometric origin into four distinct parts.

These four sectors are denoted by the symbols a , b , c , and d and each contributes in a characteristic way to the overall physical picture. Their interplay ultimately enters Heim’s mass formulas, determines the partitioning between imponderable and ponderable contributions, and leads to a quantized description of particle properties.

- **a:** x5, x6
- **b:** x4, x5, x6
- **c:** x1, x2, x3, x5, x6
- **d:** x1, x2, x3, x4, x5, x6

9 Detailed Description of the Structures a , b , c , and d

9.1 Structure a : The Vacuum or Basal Geometric Background

The structure labeled a is typically associated with the fundamental *background geometry* of the six-dimensional space. Its key features include:

- **Vacuum Lattice:** In Heim’s approach the empty vacuum is modeled as an undistorted six-dimensional geometric lattice where the smallest possible unit, the “metron,” (with an area on the order of the squared Planck length) sets the natural scale.
- **Symmetry and Invariance:** The a -sector embodies the high degree of symmetry (full polymetric invariance) in the absence of any localized excitations. It serves as the starting point from which all deformations (and hence interactions) are defined.

9.2 Structure b : The Initial Deformation Field

Structure b represents the first order (or “initial”) deviations from the perfect vacuum state:

- **Geometric Excitations:** The b -sector is responsible for the first level of local deformation of the lattice. These excitations are typically of non-ponderable character (i.e., they are not directly associated with a measurable mass) but are essential in establishing the gauge-like field structure.

- **Field Degrees of Freedom:** In mathematical terms, these deformations introduce additional tensor components in the overall metric. Their transformation properties under the larger symmetry group of the six-dimensional space help set up the framework from which the observed gauge fields will emerge after symmetry breaking.

9.3 Structure c : The Mass-Generating Sector

Among the four partial structures, c is particularly significant for the derivation of the mass spectrum:

- **Quantized Excitations:** The c -sector contains those deformations that, when quantized, yield discrete eigenvalues which are identified with the masses of elementary particles. In Heim’s mass formula these contributions are closely linked to the “ponderable” aspects of matter.
- **Relation to the Metron:** Its discrete nature is related to the fundamental quantum of area (the metron). In other words, the eigenvalue structure in this sector reflects the fact that space is not continuous below a certain scale.

9.4 Structure d : The Correction and Symmetry Breaking Sector

Structure d is interpreted as providing corrections to the mass spectrum and is crucial for ensuring consistency with empirical observations:

- **Symmetry Breaking:** Heim postulates that the overall polymetric geometry in the six-dimensional space possesses a much higher symmetry than that visible at macroscopic scales. Structure d accounts for the partial symmetry breaking that ultimately leads to the effective gauge groups and the observed mass hierarchy.
- **Complementarity with c :** While c generates the leading-order mass eigenstates, the d -sector supplies additional corrections and refinement. In many formulations the combination of the c and d contributions yields the total mass as computed in Heim’s extended mass formula.

10 Interplay of the Partial Structures

The complete geometric structure underlying Heim’s theory is obtained by combining all four sectors:

$$M = \mu \alpha^+ + \left[(G + S + F + \Phi) + 4 q \alpha^- \right],$$

where the terms G and S (and others like F and Φ) embody contributions that can be associated with the partial structures. Although the original notation may differ among Heim’s various texts, one can understand that:

- The structures a and b provide the geometric background and the initial excitations of the vacuum.
- The structures c and d are intertwined in producing the quantized mass spectrum. In practice, certain eigenvalue equations derived from the full 6-dimensional field equations separate into distinct contributions identifiable with c and d .

The detailed interplay—and the way in which the extra coordinates (the trans-coordinates) modify the effective field functions—ensures that the macroscopic gauge structures, conservation laws, and mass relations emerge as partial remnants of the original, much higher symmetry of the full polymetric space.

11 Conclusion

In Heim’s unified field theory, the idea of decomposing the geometry into four partial structures a , b , c , and d is central. Rather than postulating the gauge group externally, the effective interactions are seen to arise as an emergent phenomenon from the interplay of these sectors:

1. Structure a establishes the symmetric vacuum lattice (set by the smallest area unit, the metron).
2. Structure b introduces the first deformations, which correspond to massless or imponderable excitations.
3. Structure c is responsible for the generation of discrete (quantized) masses.
4. Structure d gives rise to the necessary corrections through partial symmetry breakings, rendering the complete mass spectrum.

Together, these partial geometric structures form a coherent picture in which the complex spectrum of elementary particles and the associated interactions are derived from a single, unified geometric framework. Modern interpretations view such schemes as precursors to ideas where large symmetry groups in high-dimensional theories are broken to yield the observed low-energy physics.

Burkhard Heim’s unified field theory is based on the geometrization of all interactions. Rather than introducing gauge groups via an *a priori* group embedding (as is common in many Grand Unified Theories or in approaches based on exceptional groups such as E_8), Heim’s approach starts from a *polymetric* geometry of an extended space. In his theory the familiar four-dimensional spacetime is embedded in a six-dimensional space

$$\mathbb{R}^4 \subset \mathbb{R}^6,$$

or, in some parts of the theory, even in a twelve-dimensional space. In his writings (cf. [1,2]) he argues that *additional trans-coordinates* (denoted x^5, x^6 for the six-dimensional case) play an essential role by yielding new field components. These new components are then interpreted as either novel forces or as an extension (or “completion”) der gauge symmetries we observe at macroscopic scales.

12 Heim’s Approach in Contrast to Traditional Group Embedding

Most modern unified theories attempt to describe the known forces (electromagnetic, weak, strong, and gravitational) by assuming that the gauge symmetries of the Standard Model embed into a larger (often simple) Lie group. For example:

- In **Grand Unified Theories (GUTs)** one looks for an embedding such as $SU(5)$ or $SO(10)$ or even the exceptional group E_8 in some string-inspired models.
- These approaches begin with a set of fields that transform under a postulated gauge group G , and symmetry breaking (via Higgs or other mechanisms) selects the observed subgroup.

Heim, on the other hand, does not assume the existence of a fixed compact gauge group that underlies all forces from the outset. Instead, he makes the following key points:

1. **Geometrization of interactions:** Heim’s theory is built on the idea that all physical interactions are ultimately a manifestation of geometry. The dynamics of the fields are derived by rewriting (or “geometrizing”) Einstein’s field equations into an eigenvalue problem within the microdomain.

2. **Additional (trans-)Coordinates:** Heim postulates that in addition to the four familiar spacetime coordinates x^1, x^2, x^3, x^4 (with x^4 representing time), there exist two extra coordinates x^5 and x^6 (which have an *imaginary* character) that act as “organizing value stores.” These extra coordinates change the probability distribution of microstates in spacetime and thereby introduce additional components in the field.
3. **Emergent Gauge Structure:** In Heim’s view the full symmetry of the underlying poly-metric (or multi-metric) geometry is more universal than the gauge symmetries observed in the macroscopic limit. The effective or “actual” gauge group is then seen as emerging from *partial symmetry breakings* of this universal geometry. That is, while the microscopic theory might be invariant under a much larger group of coordinate (and metric) transformations, only a smaller group survives in the low-energy, macroscopic limit.

13 Mathematical Aspects and Geometrical Interpretation

In Heim’s formulation the following mathematical ideas play a role:

13.1 The Extended Coordinate System

Heim introduces a six-dimensional space $\mathbb{R}^6$, where the first four coordinates are the usual spacetime coordinates, and the additional two, which we denote as:

$$s_1 = (x^5, x^6),$$

act as additional organizing parameters. These coordinates are not simply appended but have the unique property of influencing the geometric structure of the fields.

13.2 Field Equations and Eigenvalue Problems

By transferring Einstein’s field equations into the microdomain, Heim obtains eigenvalue equations of the type

$$C_i \phi_{kl}^{(i)} = \lambda_i(k, l) \phi_{kl}^{(i)}, \quad (i, k, l = 1, \dots, 4),$$

where C_i symbolically represents the effect of a nonlinear operator acting on the mixed-variant third rank tensor field $\phi_{kl}^{(i)}$. The eigenvalues $\lambda_i(k, l)$ are then linked to energy densities. Here the additional coordinates (and the ensuing polymetric structure) eventually provide extra degrees of freedom that, when analyzed appropriately, yield extra field components.

13.3 Polymetric Geometry and Symmetry Breaking

Heim’s theory is sometimes described as a *polymetric* theory because the fundamental metric is itself composed of several tensor contributions:

$$G_{\mu\nu} \sim \sum \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^{(j)},$$

where some of the constituent tensors are *non-hermitian* and represent more elementary geometric quantities. In the full high-dimensional space, the theory is invariant under a larger group of coordinate transformations. However, when we consider physical processes at observable scales (the macroscopic limit), only a subset of these symmetries survive—this is what Heim calls *partial symmetry breaking*. Such symmetry breakings give rise to the effective gauge groups that appear in the conventional description of interactions.

13.4 Comparison to Kaluza–Klein and Modern Gauge Theories

In standard Kaluza–Klein theories, one adds extra dimensions and then compactifies them; the resulting gauge fields appear as components of the higher-dimensional metric. Heim does something analogous, but his extra dimensions are treated in a more subtle way. They are not merely compact dimensions but are *trans-coordinates* with specific algebraic properties (e.g., having an imaginary character and reversibility). Thus, while Kaluza–Klein ideas lead to extra fields by a straightforward compactification, Heim’s additional dimensions allow the emergence of gauge forces via the dynamics of symmetry breakings in a universal polymetric geometry.

14 Implications for the Gauge Structure

The net consequence is that Heim’s approach does not start by postulating a particular gauge group G (e.g., $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ or E_8) but rather:

- **Emergence from Geometry:** The effective gauge symmetries in the low-energy (macroscopic) limit appear as remnants of a larger symmetry group that governs the entire high-dimensional, polymetric geometry.
- **Dynamical Field Components:** The additional trans-coordinates provide additional geometric degrees of freedom. These extra degrees of freedom, when projected onto four-dimensional spacetime (or as effective degrees of freedom in the macroscopic limit), manifest as new field components. These might be interpreted as novel force carriers or, more generally, as an extended gauge structure.
- **Partial Symmetry Breaking:** The complex interactions at the micro-level—encoded in the full set of 64 differential equations (where 28 are identically zero and the remaining 36 form a 6×6 array)—undergo partial symmetry breakings to yield the observed (and tested) gauge symmetries. For example, the gravitational field, which in Heim’s theory is not identical to the standard Einstein field, emerges with contributions that are analogous to gauge fields.

15 Summary and Concluding Remarks

In summary:

1. Heim’s theory begins with a *six-dimensional* (or, in extensions, twelve-dimensional) space in which the usual four-dimensional spacetime is embedded.
2. The extra two (or more) *trans-coordinates* introduce additional degrees of freedom that are not present in conventional field theories.
3. Instead of assuming a predetermined gauge group by hand, Heim’s approach allows an *emergent* gauge structure; that is, the effective gauge symmetry arises from the dynamics and partial symmetry breakings of a universal, polymetric geometry.
4. This process parallels ideas from Kaluza–Klein theory but uses a more generalized geometric framework that includes both Hermitian and non-Hermitian metric components.
5. In the macroscopic limit, the complicated geometry simplifies to a set of effective gauge fields that, in principle, can account for the observed interactions and even suggest additional forces.

Thus, Heim's perspective on gauge groups is unique because it does not build the gauge structure from a fixed Lie group embedding, but rather derives it dynamically from the interplay between extra (trans-)coordinates and the intrinsic polymetric properties of the geometry. In modern terms, this could be compared to mechanisms where the full symmetry of a high-dimensional theory is broken (or "hidden") at low energies, leaving behind the effective gauge groups of the Standard Model and possibly additional interactions.

References

- [1] B. Heim, *Elementarstrukturen der Materie. Band 1*, Resch Verlag, Innsbruck (1979/1989).
- [2] B. Heim, *Elementarstrukturen der Materie. Band 2*, Resch Verlag, Innsbruck (1984).
- [3] B. Heim & W. Dröscher, *Strukturen der physikalischen Welt und ihrer nichtmateriellen Seite*, Resch Verlag, Innsbruck (1996).
- [4] B. Heim, *Einheitliche Beschreibung der Materiellen Welt*, Resch Verlag, Innsbruck (1990).