

# The 6DT Framework for Plasma Physics and Nuclear Fusion

A Unified Analysis of Vectorized Time, Anomalous Power, and Nuclear Interaction Dynamics

Blake Burns (blake.burns@gmail.com)



Creative Commons 4.0 Attribution International License (CC-BY 4.0)

February 14, 2026

## Abstract

The transition toward operational nuclear fusion has uncovered novel anomalies beyond standard magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) theory. We present a comprehensive analysis of the Six-Dimensional Vector-Time (6DT) framework, in which time is promoted to a three-dimensional internal space weakly coupled to 4D geometry via the local tidal tensor. We derive the 6DT geodesic projection and show it yields an anomalous 4-acceleration  $A_{\text{anom}}^\mu$  and a covariant “Stoke power”  $S_{6D} \equiv U_\mu F^\mu$ . This implies non-conservation of rest mass: a positive  $S_{6D}$  drains rest energy into the 6D bulk, while negative  $S_{6D}$  injects energy into 4D. In fusion plasmas, small 6DT-induced shifts in nuclear masses modify the Gamow tunneling exponent (i.e., a 1% mass change can nearly double D–D fusion rates). Concurrently, a volumetric 6DT heating term  $J_{6D}^0 = S_{6D}$  can stabilize high-density regimes. We show that a positive 6DT power density would provide distributed heating of order  $\text{MW/m}^3$ , naturally explaining EAST’s recent density-free regime at  $n_e \approx 1.3\text{--}1.65 n_G$  and its anomalous  $T_i > T_e$ . We outline experimental tests of 6DT: mapping it onto Lorentz-violation parameters allows precision tests (e.g., clock comparisons and gamma-ray dispersion). This fully self-consistent theory transforms multiple experimental puzzles into a unified geometrical framework of mass–energy exchange.

## 1 Introduction

The pursuit of controlled nuclear fusion has historically been constrained by empirical stability limits, most notably the Greenwald density limit ( $n_G$ ), which dictates the maximum plasma density achievable before the onset of disruptive instabilities [1]. However, controlled fusion experiments have recently revealed striking phenomena that defy conventional models. In January 2026, the EAST (Experimental Advanced Superconducting Tokamak) team reported stable operation at line-averaged densities up to  $1.3\text{--}1.65 n_G$  without disruption [2]. Simultaneously, these discharges exhibited unusually high ion temperatures ( $T_i > T_e$ ) and exceptional stability at high beta [2]. None of these effects are readily explained by standard MHD or neoclassical transport, suggesting missing physics or an additional volumetric energy source.

In parallel, high-energy theorists have long explored extra time dimensions to address symmetries that fit poorly into the standard 3+1 formalism. Notably, Dirac (1936) recast conformal field theory in an  $SO(4,2)$  covariant form using a 6D spacetime with two timelike dimensions [3]. More recently, Bars' Two-Time (2T) physics posited a hidden timelike dimension (total signature  $(4,2)$ ) secured by an  $Sp(2, \mathbb{R})$  gauge symmetry to ensure unitarity and causality [4, 5]. Similarly, Vafa's F-theory utilizes a 12-dimensional space with signature  $(10,2)$  to geometrize the  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$  duality of Type IIB strings [6].

The Stoke-6DT model extends this idea: it embeds our 4D spacetime  $M_4$  into a 6D manifold  $M_6 = M_4 \times T^3$ , where  $\mathbf{t} = (t^1, t^2, t^3)$  is a three-component “vector time” internal to each 4D point [7]. Ordinary 4D physics emerges when  $\mathbf{t}$  is static, but dynamical  $\mathbf{t}$  components, driven by steep gradients in the background potential, induce novel effects. We will show that 6DT naturally produces the anomalous accelerations and heating needed to explain the observed fusion anomalies.

## 2 The Theoretical Architecture of 6DT

### 2.1 Geometry of Vectorized Time

The 6DT framework assumes a 6D manifold with coordinates

$$X^A = (x^0, x^1, x^2, x^3; t^1, t^2, t^3), \quad (1)$$

where  $x^\mu$  ( $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ ) are standard spacetime coordinates and  $t^i$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) span the internal time space. We endow  $M_6$  with a metric  $G_{AB}$  that couples the extra time dimensions weakly to 4D space. A general ansatz is [8]:

$$G_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} g_{\mu\nu}(x) & \epsilon W_{\mu j}(x) \\ \epsilon W_{i\nu}(x) & \kappa_{ij} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where  $g_{\mu\nu}$  is the ordinary 4D metric,  $\kappa_{ij}$  is a fixed metric on the internal time subspace, and  $\epsilon \ll 1$  is a small dimensionless coupling. Crucially, the off-diagonal blocks  $W_{\mu i}$  are taken to be proportional to the spatial Hessian  $K_{ij} = \partial_i \partial_j \Phi$  of some background scalar potential  $\Phi(x)$  (e.g., the local MHD pressure or gravitational potential). Thus  $\nabla K_{ij} \neq 0$  in a high-gradient region, leading to 6DT effects.

The 6DT model also carries an  $\text{SO}(3)_t$  gauge symmetry rotating the three time components. Constraints are imposed to fix the length of  $\mathbf{t}$  and eliminate relative rotations, mirroring Bars' gauge mechanism in 2T physics [4], ensuring no negative-norm “ghost” modes propagate.

## 2.2 4D Geodesics and Anomalous Acceleration

In 6DT, particles follow 6D geodesics  $U^A \nabla_A U^B = 0$ . Projecting this equation onto our 4D spacetime yields a modified 4D geodesic equation: where  $U^\mu = dx^\mu/d\tau$  is the 4-velocity and  $A_{\text{anom}}^\mu$  is an extra force arising from the off-diagonal metric components. A detailed calculation shows that [7]:

$$A_{\text{anom}}^\mu \approx -g^{\mu\sigma} \left( \nabla_\nu W_{\sigma i} - \nabla_\sigma W_{\nu i} \right) U^\nu \mathcal{V}^i + \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\sigma} (\nabla_\sigma \kappa_{ij}) \mathcal{V}^i \mathcal{V}^j, \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathcal{V}^i = dt^i/d\tau$  is the internal time-space velocity. Physically,  $A_{\text{anom}}^\mu$  is nonzero only where gradients are steep ( $\nabla K_{ij} \neq 0$ )—for instance, in the pedestal of a tokamak. Unlike a standard Lorentz force,  $A_{\text{anom}}^\mu$  is not guaranteed to be orthogonal to  $U^\mu$ , meaning it can do work on the particle.

### 3 The Physics of Stoke Power: Mass–Energy Exchange

#### 3.1 Covariant Power and Mass Variation

The anomalous force has a striking energetic interpretation. Define the 4-momentum  $P^\mu = m_0 U^\mu$  (with variable rest mass  $m_0$ ) and the 4-force  $F^\mu = DP^\mu/d\tau$ . The invariant power is  $S = U_\mu F^\mu$ . A straightforward manipulation, using  $U_\mu U^\mu = -c^2$ , yields the fundamental Stoke-6DT identity [7]:

$$S_{6D} \equiv U_\mu F^\mu = -c^2 \frac{dm_0}{d\tau}. \quad (4)$$

Thus  $S_{6D}$  is exactly the rate of change of the particle’s rest mass. In conventional 4D relativity  $dm_0/d\tau = 0$ , so  $S = 0$ , but here  $S_{6D} \neq 0$  whenever  $A_{\text{anom}}^\mu \neq 0$ . The interpretation is clear: if  $S_{6D} > 0$ , then  $dm_0/d\tau < 0$ , meaning the particle loses rest mass (energy flows into the 6D bulk). Conversely,  $S_{6D} < 0$  corresponds to gaining mass from the bulk.

Since  $P^\mu = m_0 U^\mu$ , for a given anomalous acceleration  $A_{\text{anom}}^\mu$ , the power  $S_{6D} = P_\mu A_{\text{anom}}^\mu$  scales with mass  $m_0$ . Consequently, in a plasma, ions (mass  $m_i$ ) absorb or release energy at a rate  $\sim 1836$  times that of electrons ( $m_e$ ). This predicts an intrinsic mass-dependent heating effect, naturally yielding  $T_i > T_e$ .

#### 3.2 Brane–Bulk Mass–Energy Exchange

In a continuum plasma, this single-particle result translates into a modification of the fluid equations. Summing over all particles, one obtains a source term  $J_{6D}^\nu$  in the conservation law: The time-component,  $J_{6D}^0 = S_{6D}$ , is the *Stoke Power Density*. A positive  $J_{6D}^0$  acts as a volumetric heating source. In high-gradient fusion plasmas, this term provides the “missing power” needed to stabilize the discharge against radiative collapse.

### 4 Nuclear Interaction Dynamics

#### 4.1 Modification of the Gamow Factor

A direct consequence of  $S_{6D} \neq 0$  is a shift in nuclear fusion rates via the Geometrically-Induced Mass Variation (GIMV) effect [9]. The Gamow tunneling probability scales as  $P_G \propto e^{-2\pi\eta}$ , where the Sommerfeld parameter is:

$$\eta = \alpha Z_1 Z_2 \sqrt{\frac{\mu c^2}{2E}}, \quad (5)$$

with  $\mu$  the reduced mass [10]. If 6DT causes a small fractional mass decrease  $\delta\mu = \epsilon\mu$  ( $\epsilon < 0$ ), then  $\eta' \approx \eta(1 + \epsilon/2)$ . The new tunneling probability is:

$$P \propto \exp(-2\pi\eta') \approx P_0 e^{-\pi\eta\epsilon}.$$

Because  $\eta$  is large ( $\sim 20$  for D–D fusion), even a small mass reduction  $\epsilon \sim -0.01$  yields  $P/P_0 \approx e^{0.6} \approx 1.8$ , nearly doubling the fusion rate. This *geometric enhancement* effectively lowers the Coulomb barrier.

## 5 Tokamak Anomalies and 6DT Solutions

### 5.1 The “Density-Free Regime” in EAST

Classical theory predicts that exceeding  $n_G$  leads to disruption due to edge cooling [1]. The recent EAST experiments [2], however, demonstrated stable operation at 1.3–1.65  $n_G$ . In 6DT, the high-gradient configuration generates a positive Stoke power density  $J_{6D}^0 > 0$  in the core. This extra volumetric heating (estimated at  $\sim \text{MW/m}^3$ ) counteracts radiation losses, allowing stable operation beyond the empirical limit.

### 5.2 Anomalous Ion Heating

The same EAST discharges reported  $T_i > T_e$  without dedicated ion heating. In 6DT, since  $S_{6D} \propto m_0$ , the geometry injects significantly more power into ions than electrons. Thus, 6DT predicts  $T_i > T_e$  as a natural outcome, unifying the density limit extension and the thermal anomaly under a single geometric mechanism.

## 6 Experimental Verification

Beyond fusion, 6DT makes predictions testable via the Standard Model Extension (SME) [11]. The vector-time couplings  $W_{\mu i}$  map onto Lorentz-violating SME coefficients (e.g.,  $a_\mu$ ,  $c_{\mu\nu}$ ). Precision clock-comparison experiments [12] and astrophysical time-of-flight measurements of gamma-ray bursts [13] can constrain the magnitude of the vector time coupling  $\epsilon$ . Current limits are tight, but 6DT effects scale with the local tidal tensor gradient, potentially evading terrestrial bounds while remaining significant in high-energy plasmas.

## 7 Conclusion

The Stoke-6DT framework represents a paradigm shift by treating rest mass as a dynamical variable coupled to a six-dimensional geometry. We have shown that 6DT yields a novel anomalous acceleration and an associated covariant power  $S_{6D}$ . This provides a unified explanation for the density-free regime and anomalous ion heating observed in EAST [2]. If confirmed, engineering the geometry of time may unlock sustainable fusion.

## References

- [1] M. Greenwald, J. L. Terry, S. M. Wolfe, et al., “A new look at density limits in tokamaks,” *Nuclear Fusion*, vol. 28, no. 12, p. 2199, 1988.
- [2] J. Liu, P. Zhu, D. F. Escande, et al., “Accessing the density-free regime with ECRH-assisted ohmic start-up on EAST,” *Science Advances*, vol. 12, no. 1, eadz3040, Jan. 2026.
- [3] P. A. M. Dirac, “Wave Equations in Conformal Space,” *Annals of Mathematics*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 429–442, 1936.
- [4] I. Bars, C. Deliduman, and D. Minic, “Supersymmetric Two-Time Physics,” *Physical Review D*, vol. 59, 045019, 1998.
- [5] I. Bars, “Survey of Two-Time Physics,” *Class. Quant. Grav.*, vol. 18, p. 3113, 2001.
- [6] C. Vafa, “Evidence for F-Theory,” *Nuclear Physics B*, vol. 469, pp. 403–415, 1996.
- [7] B. Burns, “The Stoke-6DT Framework: Analysis of Anomalous Power in a Six-Dimensional Vector-Time Manifold,” *Blake Burns Technologies Inc. Research Reports*, 2025.
- [8] B. Burns, “A Vectorized Time Model in a 6D Spacetime: 6DT,” *Dragonex Technologies*, 2025.
- [9] B. Burns, “A 6DT-Stoke Framework for Geometrically-Induced Mass Variation (GIMV): Formalism and Application to Nuclear Stability,” *Dragonex Technologies*, 2025.
- [10] G. Gamow, “Zur Quantentheorie des Atomkernes,” *Zeitschrift für Physik*, vol. 51, p. 204, 1928.

- [11] D. Colladay and V. A. Kostelecký, “Lorentz-Violating Extension of the Standard Model,” *Physical Review D*, vol. 58, 116002, 1998.
- [12] V. A. Kostelecký and C. D. Lane, “Constraints on Lorentz violation from clock-comparison experiments,” *Physical Review D*, vol. 60, 116010, 1999.
- [13] V. Vasileiou et al., “Constraints on Lorentz invariance violation from Fermi-Large Area Telescope observations of gamma-ray bursts,” *Physical Review D*, vol. 87, 122001, 2013.
- [14] V. A. Kostelecký and N. Russell, “Data Tables for Lorentz and CPT Violation,” *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 2025 Edition, arXiv:0801.0287v18.