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## 1. M.W. Evans' claims in his ECE theory

In their paper [1], The Bianchi Identity of differential geometry , the authors M.W. Evans and H. Eckardt assert:

A second Bianchi identity of Cartan geometry is given in ref $\{13\}(=[3])$

$$
\begin{equation*}
D \wedge R_{b}^{a}=0 \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

but this is a special case $\{13\}$, when the torsion is zero (the Einstein-Hilbert case). . . .
and in M.W. Evans' paper [2]: The fundamental origin of curvature and torsion the author writes about the equation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
D \wedge R_{b}^{a}=0 \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the presence of the torsion form (i.e. $T^{u} \neq 0$ ) however the rigorously correct Bianchi identity is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
D \wedge T^{u}=R^{a}{ }_{b} \wedge q^{b} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and there is only one Bianchi identity (see paper 88). The second one can be derived from Eq.(11).

From the Abstract of the same paper we learn that
the conventional second Bianchi identity is true if and only if torsion is zero.
And on p. 8 of paper 88 the authors Evans and Eckardt introduce a "true second Bianchi identity" by:

[^0]The true second Bianchi identity is obtained by taking the $D \wedge$ derivative of both sides of the true first Bianchi identity ([1], 1).

All these statements mean that M.W. Evans doubts the validity of the second Bianchi identity for the general case of a connection (covariant derivative ${ }^{1}$ ) with non-vanishing torsion. He is believing that the conventional $2^{\text {nd }}$ Bianchi identity must be replaced with his "true second Bianchi identity", which is a trivial consequence of the $1^{\text {st }}$ Bianchi identity. As we shall show below, the "conventional" $2{ }^{\text {nd }}$ Bianchi identity is a more far reaching statement.

The $2^{\text {nd }}$ Bianchi identity

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{D} \wedge \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{a}}:=\mathrm{d} \wedge \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{a}}+\omega_{\mathrm{c}}^{\mathrm{a}} \wedge \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{c}}-\omega_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{c}} \wedge \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{c}}^{\mathrm{a}}=0 \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

is well-known in literature [3, p. 93 (3.141)], [4, p. 489 (J.32)], [5, p. 208 (C.1.69)], [6, p. 123 $(4,127 \mathrm{~b})$ ] . It is a classical result, in exterior calculus going back to Élie Cartan (see e.g. [12], p.225, p.236) in the twenties of the last century.

## 2. Evans" "true second Bianchi identity"

Before we present the simple (textbook) algebra proof of Eq.(1.1), which is valid for any general connection, we shall show that Eq.(1.1) does not follow from Eq. (paper 99, 11) as claimed by Evans (not even in the case of a connection with null torsion).

Indeed, taking the exterior covariant derivative of both sides of Eq. (paper 99, 11) we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{D} \wedge\left(\mathrm{D} \wedge \mathrm{~T}^{\mathrm{a}}\right)=\mathrm{D} \wedge\left(\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{a}} \wedge \mathrm{q}^{\mathrm{b}}\right) . \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now recall some well-known rules of exterior calculus: For any r-form F and any s-form G, we have that

$$
\begin{align*}
& d \wedge d \wedge F=0  \tag{2.2}\\
& F \wedge G=(-1)^{r s} G \wedge F, d \wedge(F \wedge G)=d \wedge F \wedge G+(-1)^{r} F \wedge d \wedge G \tag{2.3}
\end{align*}
$$

Using these rules we get for the left hand side of Eq.(2.1)

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{D} \wedge(\mathrm{D} & \left.\wedge T^{a}\right)=d \wedge\left(D \wedge T^{a}\right)+\omega^{a}{ }_{b} \wedge\left(D \wedge T^{b}\right) \\
& =d \wedge\left(d \wedge T^{a}+\omega_{b}^{a}{ }_{b} \wedge T^{b}\right)+\omega_{b}^{a} \wedge\left(d \wedge T^{b}+\omega^{b}{ }_{c} \wedge T^{c}\right) \\
& =d \wedge \omega^{a}{ }_{b} \wedge T^{b}-\omega^{a}{ }_{b} \wedge d \wedge T^{b}+\omega_{b}^{a} \wedge d \wedge T^{b}+\omega^{a}{ }_{b} \wedge \omega^{b}{ }_{c} \wedge T^{c}  \tag{2.4}\\
& =\left(d \wedge \omega^{a}{ }_{b}+\omega^{a}{ }_{c} \wedge \omega_{b}^{c}\right) \wedge T^{c} \\
& =R^{a}{ }_{b} \wedge T^{b}
\end{align*}
$$

On the other hand, by using the rules (2.3-4) we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& D \wedge\left(R_{b}^{a} \wedge q^{b}\right)=d \wedge\left(R_{b}^{a} \wedge q^{b}\right)+\omega_{c}^{a} \wedge\left(R_{b}^{c} \wedge q^{b}\right) \\
& =\left(d \wedge R_{b}^{a}+\omega^{a}{ }_{c} \wedge R^{c}{ }_{b}\right) \wedge q^{b}+R_{b}^{a}{ }_{b} \wedge\left(d \wedge q^{b}\right)  \tag{2.5}\\
& =\left(D \wedge R_{b}^{a}\right) \wedge q^{b}+R^{a}{ }_{b} \wedge T^{b} .
\end{align*}
$$

Hence, inserting the results (2.4) and (2.5) into Eq. (2.1) yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{a}} \wedge \mathrm{~T}^{\mathrm{b}}=\left(\mathrm{D} \wedge \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{a}}\right) \wedge \mathrm{q}^{\mathrm{b}}+\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{a}} \wedge \mathrm{~T}^{\mathrm{b}}, \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\mathrm{D} \wedge \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{a}}\right) \wedge \mathrm{q}^{\mathrm{b}}=0 . \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

However, this result, a reformulation of Evans' "true 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Bianchi identity", does not yet imply the more far reaching Eq. (2.1), the $2^{\text {nd }}$ Bianchi identity, itself.

## 3. The $2^{\text {nd }}$ Bianchi identity

We repeat next the simple (textbook) algebra proof of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ Bianchi identity Eq.(1.1), which is valid for any general connection:

## Proof

The curvature 2-forms are by definition ${ }^{2}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{a}}=\mathrm{d} \wedge \omega_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{a}}+\omega_{\mathrm{c}}^{\mathrm{a}} \wedge \omega_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{c}} . \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now due to the rules (2.3-4) we can write

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{d} \wedge \mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}}=\mathrm{d} \wedge\left(\mathrm{~d} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}}+\omega^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{c}} \wedge \omega_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{c}}\right)=0+\mathrm{d} \wedge\left(\omega_{\mathrm{c}}^{\mathrm{a}} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{c}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}}\right)=\omega_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{c}} \wedge \mathrm{~d} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{c}}-\omega_{\mathrm{c}}^{\mathrm{a}} \wedge \mathrm{~d} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{c}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}} . \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, by using the provided rules we can evaluate

$$
\begin{align*}
& \omega^{a}{ }_{c} \wedge R^{c}{ }_{b}=\omega^{a}{ }_{c} \wedge\left(\mathrm{~d} \wedge \omega^{c}{ }_{b}+\omega^{c}{ }_{d} \wedge \omega^{d}{ }_{b}\right)=\omega^{a}{ }_{c} \wedge d \wedge \omega^{c}{ }_{b}+\omega^{a}{ }_{c} \wedge \omega^{c}{ }_{d} \wedge \omega^{d}{ }_{b}  \tag{3.3}\\
& \omega^{\mathrm{c}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}} \wedge \mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{c}}=\omega^{\mathrm{c}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}} \wedge\left(\mathrm{~d} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{c}}+\omega^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{d}} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{d}}{ }_{\mathrm{c}}\right)=\omega^{\mathrm{c}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}} \wedge \mathrm{~d} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{c}}+\omega^{\mathrm{c}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{d}} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{d}}{ }_{\mathrm{c}}
\end{align*}
$$

and due to $\omega^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{c}} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{c}}{ }_{\mathrm{d}} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{d}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}}=\omega^{\mathrm{c}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{d}} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{d}}{ }_{\mathrm{c}}$ we get

[^1]\[

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{d} \wedge \mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}} \quad+\quad \omega^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{c}} \wedge \mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{c}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}}-\omega^{\mathrm{c}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}} \wedge \mathrm{R}^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{c}} \\
& =\mathrm{d} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{c}} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{c}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}}-\omega^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{c}} \wedge \mathrm{~d} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{c}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}}+\omega^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{c}} \wedge \mathrm{~d} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{c}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}}-\omega^{\mathrm{c}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}} \wedge \mathrm{~d} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{c}}  \tag{3.4}\\
& =\mathrm{d} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{c}} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{c}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}} \quad+\quad 0 \quad-\omega^{\mathrm{c}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}} \wedge \mathrm{~d} \wedge \omega^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{c}}=0,
\end{align*}
$$
\]

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{D} \wedge \mathbf{R}^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}}=\mathbf{d} \wedge \mathbf{R}^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}}+\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\mathrm{a}}{ }_{\mathrm{c}} \wedge \mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{c}}-\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\mathrm{c}}{ }_{\mathrm{b}} \wedge \mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{c}}^{\mathrm{a}}=\mathbf{0} . \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remark: More comments on the other serious confusions and errors that M.W. Evans made in his use of differential geometry (in particular, Cartan calculus of differential forms) will be presented in this series of short and pedagogical notes. See also [7].
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Please, do not confuse (as M.W. Evans does) the general covariant derivative operator $\nabla$ (which acts on general tensor fields) with the exterior covariant derivative operator D (which acts on indexed form fields). See, e.g., [6] for details.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Note that the connection 1 -forms $\omega_{b}^{a}{ }_{b}$ do not behave as tensors under changes of the tetrad frame. Hence a presumed exterior covariant derivative of $\omega_{b}{ }^{a}$. built in analogy to Eq. (3.5) fails to transform correctly, i.e. "covariantly". Nevertheless, the combination $d \wedge \omega_{b}^{a}+\omega^{a}{ }_{c} \wedge \omega_{b}^{c}$ behaves as a tensor: It is identical with $R^{a}{ }_{b}$.

