Conservation laws can be derived from field equations?
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Charge conservation law ($\partial_l J^l = 0$) usually is considered as a corollary of Maxwell's equations. A circular reasoning, however, is found in the derivation. A similar fallacy exists in the matter source's conservation law ($\nabla^\mu T_{\mu\nu} = 0$) and Einstein's field equations. Therefore, the source's conservation laws are NOT consequence of field equations.

There are two viewpoints about relation between (electromagnetic, gravitational and Yang-Mills's) fields and corresponding sources with sources' conservation laws. The paper's main purpose is to illuminate that there is a circular logic fallacy in the following view [b].

The relationship between fields and sources is stated as following in Ref.[1]:

View [a]: Sources are primary. Conservations of sources come first; fields have to adjust themselves accordingly. Fields affect sources by dynamical laws.

View [b]: Fields are primary. Fields take the responsibility of seeing to it that sources obey the conservation laws. Sources can be built from fields. Conservation laws can be derived from fields' equations.

For electromagnetic fields, Maxwell's equations are

$$\partial^\alpha F_{\alpha\beta} = J_{\beta}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

$$\partial_\alpha F_{\beta\gamma} + \partial_\beta F_{\gamma\alpha} + \partial_\gamma F_{\alpha\beta} = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

As we all know, Faraday tensor $F_{\alpha\beta}$ is antisymmetric. Therefore, from Eq.(1), we can get $0 \equiv \partial^\alpha \partial^\beta F_{\alpha\beta} = \partial^\beta J_{\beta} \Rightarrow \partial^\beta J_{\beta} = 0$. The charge conservation law $(\partial^\beta J_{\beta} = 0)$ is derived from Maxwell's equations.

For gravitational fields, the same process is repeated. Einstein's equation is

$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi T_{\mu\nu}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

Because of Bianchi identities, $\nabla^\mu G_{\mu\nu} \equiv 0$ are identities. That $0 \equiv \nabla^\mu G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi \nabla^\mu T_{\mu\nu} \Rightarrow \nabla^\mu T_{\mu\nu} = 0$ can be obtained from Eq.(3). Matter sources' conservation laws ($\nabla^\mu T_{\mu\nu} = 0$) are derived from Eq.(3).

The same thing also happens in Yang-Mills fields and corresponding sources.

That is the total contents of view [b].

However, a circular reasoning exists in view [b].

In the following, we first talk the single div-curl equations. The conclusion can directly be transferred to view [b].

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{S}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = \rho$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where, $\mathbf{u}$ is the unknown; $\rho, \mathbf{S}$ are known sources. If $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{S} \neq 0$ (e.g. $\mathbf{S} \propto x$), solutions of Eq.(4) do not exist. Therefore, the equation ($\nabla \cdot \mathbf{S} = 0$) is one of preconditions about the existence of solutions for div-curl equations, while not the corollary of Eq.(4). If $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{S} = 0$ is thought as a corollary of Eq.(4) ($0 \equiv \nabla \cdot \nabla \times \mathbf{u} = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{S} \Rightarrow \nabla \cdot \mathbf{S} = 0$), a circular logical fallacy must be involved in it, because it is also one of preconditions about the existence of solutions for Eq.(4).

That existing differential identities are the same thing between the single div-curl system and Maxwell's, Einstein's and Yang-Mills's equations.

For the sake of understanding, we suppose $T_{kl}$ is an antisymmetric $n$-dimensional ($n > 2$) tensor. We consider the following equation

$$\partial^l T_{kl} = J_l, \hspace{1cm} n = 3, 4, 5, \ldots$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

$J_l$ is a known source. Similarly, if $\partial^l J_l \neq 0$ (e.g. $J_l \propto x_l$), Eq.(6) has no solutions. Hence, $\partial^l J_l = 0$ is one of preconditions of existence about solutions of Eq.(6). If $\partial^l J_l = 0$ is thought as a corollary of Eq.(6) ($0 \equiv \partial^l T_{kl} = \partial^l J_l \Rightarrow \partial^l J_l = 0$), and at the same time it is one of preconditions of existence about Eq.(6)'s solutions. It must involve circular reasoning. Hence, $\partial^l J_l = 0$ is not a corollary of Eq.(6) for any $n$. Now, we let $n = 4$ and metric signature is $+2$, and then Eq.(6) becomes Eq.(1). And $\partial^l J_l = 0$ is charge continuum equation; therefore, $\partial^l J_l = 0$ is not a corollary of Eq.(1).

For an $n$-dimensional ($n > 2$) manifold, $R_{kl}$ is Ricci tensor, and $G_{kl} \equiv R_{kl} - \frac{1}{2} g_{kl} R^n$ Because of Bianchi identities, $\nabla^k G_{kl} \equiv 0$ are identities for any $n$. We consider the following equation

$$G_{kl} = 8\pi T_{kl}, \hspace{1cm} n = 3, 4, 5, \ldots$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

$T_{kl}$ is a known source. If $\nabla^k T_{kl} \neq 0$, solutions of Eqs.(7) do not exist. Therefore, $\nabla^k T_{kl} = 0$ is one of preconditions of existence about Eqs.(7)'s solutions. If we think that $\nabla^k T_{kl} = 0$ can be derived from Eqs.(7) ($0 \equiv \nabla^k G_{kl} = 8\pi \nabla^k T_{kl} \Rightarrow \nabla^k T_{kl} = 0$), circular reasoning must be involved. Hence, $\nabla^k T_{kl} = 0$ is not a corollary of Eq.(7) for any $n$. Now, we let $n = 4$ and metric signature is $+2$, and then Eq.(7) becomes Eq.(3). And $\nabla^k T_{kl} = 0$ is stress-energy tensor conservation; therefore, $\nabla^k T_{kl} = 0$ is not a corollary of Eq.(3).

The same analysis can be made in Yang-Mills's fields and sources.

Obviously, a circular reasoning exists in view [b] and conservation laws of sources are not corollaries of fields'...
equations. Therefore, view $b$ is wrong, and view $a$ is correct.

Now, we talk the relation between Maxwell’s curl equations and divergence ones. Maxwell’s equations without sources are:

\[
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} = 0, \quad (8)
\]
\[
\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \mu_0 \varepsilon_0 \frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial t}, \quad \nabla \times \mathbf{E} = -\frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t}. \quad (9)
\]

Taking the divergence of Eqs.(9) gives

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E}) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B}) = 0. \quad (10)
\]

Following the above analysis, that compatibility conditions Eqs.(10) hold is one of preconditions of existence about solutions of Eqs.(9). And that Eqs.(8) hold can ensure Eqs.(10) hold. Therefore, the viewpoint in Ref.[2] that Eqs.(8) are thought as initial conditions of Eqs.(9) is not correct. If the view of Stratton[2] is right, a similar circular reasoning exists in the derivation.

Now, we talk the last thing. Maxwell’s equations (Eqs.(1),(2)/(8),(9)), Einstein’s equations (with four harmonic coordinates) and Yang-Mills’s equations (with gauge conditions) are overdetermined systems. A generalized definition can be employed to describe the overdetermination. There are first-order linear partial differential equations as following

\[
\begin{cases}
\sum_{ij} a^{(1)}_{ij} \frac{\partial y_j}{\partial x_i} + f_1 = 0 \\
\vdots \\
\sum_{ij} a^{(n)}_{ij} \frac{\partial y_j}{\partial x_i} + f_n = 0
\end{cases} \quad (11)
\]

where $x_i$ are independent variables; $y_j$ are dependent unknowns; $a^{(k)}_{ij}$ are linear coefficients; and $f_k$ are non-homogeneous items. Let $Z_k \equiv \sum_{ij} a^{(k)}_{ij} \frac{\partial y_j}{\partial x_i} + f_k$.

Two linear dependence definitions are as following.

**Definition I:** In algebra, given a number field $P$, when there are coefficients ($c_k \in P$), not all zero, such that $\sum_k c_k Z_k = 0$; the Eqs.(11) are linear dependent.

This definition can be referred in any algebraic textbook. Maxwell’s equations are over-determined in the definition I.

**Definition II (differential linear dependence):** Given a number field $P$, when there are coefficients ($c_k, d_{kl} \in P$), not all zero, such that $\sum_k c_k Z_k + \sum_{kl} d_{kl} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_l} Z_k = 0$, the Eqs.(11) are thought as differential linear dependent. If $d_{kl} \equiv 0$, this definition degenerates into the definition I.

Maxwell’s equations (Eqs.(1),(2)/(8),(9)), Einstein’s equations (with four harmonic coordinates) and Yang-Mills’s equations (with gauge conditions) are well-determined in definition II.

There are some unproved propositions about the definition II.

1. If Eqs.(11), whose solutions exist and are unique, are over-determined in the definition I, then they must be well-determined in the definition II.

2. If Eqs.(11), whose solutions exist, are under-determined in the definition II and are well-determined in the definition I, then the solutions must be non-unique.

3. If Eqs.(11) are over-determined in the definition II, then the solutions do not exist.

The unproved propositions seem obvious, but the proof is not easy. If all the propositions are correct, the definition I should be changed to the definition II.
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