

The Gauge Principle — Not Conflating Weyl's Two "Gauges" (Scale and Phase) — [Paper 96]

Yuuki YAMAGISHI (山岸 勇輝)
Yamagishi Complexity Torus Lab, Japan
August 2026

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

Abstract

At the deepest level of modern physics lies a principle: **local symmetry FORCES an interaction** — the gauge principle. Its source is the "gauge" (German *Eichung* = the calibration of a ruler) that Hermann Weyl introduced in 1918 in an attempt to **unify gravity and electromagnetism**. Weyl's original idea was that **the length scale could be chosen freely at each point (a local scale symmetry)**, with the electromagnetic potential arising as the connection that corrects the "mismatch." But **this original theory failed as a theory of nature** — Einstein's objection (the so-called second-clock problem: if scale depends on the path, atomic spectral lines would depend on history). Yet the idea was **reborn**: after quantum mechanics (1929), Weyl himself reinterpreted "gauge" not as length scale but as the **phase of the wavefunction $e^{i\theta(x)}$** . A **local phase symmetry plus the demand of covariance** forces the electromagnetic potential A as a connection — this is the modern gauge principle, the backbone of Yang–Mills theory and the Standard Model. The point of this paper is the **separation of distinct roots (Papers 58/48)**: the single word "gauge" names **two different things** — (1) Weyl's original **scale gauge** (real dilation $\mathbb{R}^+$, non-compact; failed as a theory of nature) and (2) the modern **phase gauge** (the circle $U(1)$, compact; the foundation of the Standard Model). Same word, distinct roots; one must **not conflate "Weyl 1918" with the Standard Model** (it is the ancestor of the idea, not the same theory). **Scope**: a Layer-2 structural interpretation of established gauge theory; no new mathematics and no new prediction. The Universe OS is a Layer-3 non-science lens.

Positioning of this paper (discipline): This paper is a **structural interpretation** of established physics (Weyl's gauge theory, the phase gauge of quantum mechanics, Yang–Mills / the Standard Model). It contains no new mathematics and no new prediction. The point is to **separate the two distinct roots the word "gauge" names** (the original scale gauge / the modern phase gauge) and not identify Weyl 1918 with the modern Standard Model. The principle "local symmetry forces an interaction" resonates with the corpus's "weak assumptions force structure" (Paper 90), but this is an observation of structural analogy, not an assertion. "Universe OS" is a Layer-3 non-science lens, not a claim of mechanism.

1. Introduction: The Principle of Local Symmetry

At the deepest level of modern physics lies a strikingly simple and powerful principle: **demand a local symmetry (independent at each point), and to preserve it an interaction (a force field) is automatically forced into existence.** Electromagnetism, the weak force, and the strong force all issue from this one principle; the Standard Model is built upon it. At its source stands one of the corpus's geometric-lineage figures, Hermann Weyl (1885–1955).

But this principle carries an often-overlooked **duality**. The word "gauge" names **different things** in the sense Weyl first introduced (length scale) and in the sense modern physics uses (the phase of the wavefunction). This paper separates the two and, with the corpus's discipline of distinct roots (Papers 58/48), places the gauge principle correctly. It builds no new theorem.

2. Weyl 1918: The Gauge of Length (the Dream of Unification)

Standard fact (Weyl's original gauge theory, 1918)

In general relativity, parallel-transporting a vector around a closed loop can change its **direction** (curvature). Weyl went further: the **length (scale)** too, he thought, should be freely choosable at each point — a **local scale symmetry** that re-calibrates the ruler (German *Eichung*, English gauge) independently at every point. Introducing a connection (a 1-form) A_μ to correct this "mismatch" of scale yields its curvature $F = dA$. Weyl saw in this A_μ the **electromagnetic potential** and dreamed of a **geometric unification** of gravity and electromagnetism.

The idea was beautiful. Just as curvature measures the "mismatch of direction," a new connection would measure the "mismatch of scale," and that would be the electromagnetic field — two forces spoken by one geometry. Weyl carved this grand step into the corpus's geometric lineage (Riemann → Clifford → Einstein → **Weyl** → Cartan → Hopf).

3. The Failure: Einstein's "Second-Clock Problem"

But Einstein returned a fatal objection at once. If the length scale depends on position (and path), then **when two clocks (or atoms) are carried along different paths and reunited, their rates (or the wavelengths of their spectral lines) would depend on the history of the path.** This is the **second-clock problem**. In reality, the spectral lines of a hydrogen atom are the same everywhere — an atom does not "remember" its history. Hence the **original theory, that nature possesses a local scale symmetry of length, failed against experience.**

This must be stated honestly. Weyl 1918 **failed as a theory describing nature**. Yet the idea of scale (conformal) invariance itself is not dead — it survives in other contexts today (conformal field theory, Weyl gravity). What failed was the goal of

that time, "unifying gravity and electromagnetism," not the whole mathematical object "scale symmetry" (this too is a matter of distinct roots).

4. Rebirth: From Scale to Phase (the Modern Gauge Principle)

Standard fact (the phase gauge principle, Weyl 1929 / London)

After quantum mechanics arrived, Weyl himself **reinterpreted** the idea. What is localized is not the length scale (real dilation $e^{\lambda(x)}$) but the **phase** of the wavefunction (a rotation of the circle $e^{i\theta(x)}$). Demanding the **local phase symmetry** $\psi \rightarrow e^{i\theta(x)}\psi$, the ordinary derivative ∂_μ cannot remain covariant. To restore covariance one introduces a connection A_μ , so that $\partial_\mu \rightarrow \partial_\mu - ieA_\mu$ (the covariant derivative), and A_μ behaves exactly as the **electromagnetic potential**, with its curvature $F = dA$ the electromagnetic field.

Thus Weyl's dream came true — **in the right place**. An interaction appears as "the connection forced by preserving a local symmetry." Extending this principle to the non-abelian groups $SU(2) \times U(1)$ and $SU(3)$ is Yang–Mills theory, the backbone of the **Standard Model** binding the weak, strong, and electromagnetic forces. Local symmetry gives rise to force — Weyl's idea, its vessel changed from scale to phase, took the central seat of modern physics.

5. The Two "Gauges" Are Distinct Roots (Scale vs Phase)

Observation 5.1 (one word "gauge," two distinct roots)

The word "gauge" names **two different symmetries** that the corpus's discipline of distinct roots (Papers 58/48) must separate.

- **(1) The original scale gauge** (Weyl 1918): a local **dilation of length**. The group is the multiplicative reals $\mathbb{R}^+$ (**non-compact**). **Failed** as a theory of nature (the second-clock problem).
- **(2) The modern phase gauge** (Weyl 1929 onward): a local **rotation of phase**. The group is the circle $U(1)$ (**compact**), non-abelianized to $SU(N)$. The **foundation of the Standard Model**.

For the same "gauge," **scale ($\mathbb{R}^+$, non-compact) and phase ($U(1)$, compact) are different groups, different objects = distinct roots**. Therefore one must not say "Weyl 1918 = Standard Model." 1918 is the **ancestor of the idea** (local symmetry $\rightarrow$ connection), not the **same thing** as the successful theory from 1929 on.

This separation is the point. In telling the "triumph" of the gauge principle, it is an error to compress the story as though Weyl's first theory had been correct. Correctly: **the idea (local symmetry forces a connection) survived, its first vessel**

(length scale) was rejected, and it flowered in the right vessel (the circle of phase). The corpus's discipline — do not mix distinct roots that merely share a word — holds here too.

6. Connection to the Corpus

The gauge principle crosses several threads of the corpus. **(a) Weak assumptions force structure:** "imposing a local symmetry forces an interaction" is **structurally similar** to "weak assumptions force a continuous symmetry (a Lie group)" (Paper 90 = Yamabe / Hilbert's fifth) — but it is a different theorem and a different mechanism, not to be identified (an observation, not an assertion). **(b) The lineage of symmetry:** gauge symmetry connects via Noether's theorem (Papers 80/85) to a conserved charge (electric charge), but **global symmetry** → **conservation** (Noether) and **local symmetry** → **interaction** (gauge) play different roles = distinct roots (the sorting of the roots of necessity, Paper 86). **(c) The shared alphabet:** the gauge connection A is a 1-form and the field strength is $F = dA$ (Papers 92/93/87) — the gauge field is written in the corpus's shared letters. **(d) The census of curvatures:** $F = dA$ is the **curvature** of a connection, standing beside the corpus's other curvatures (spacetime / velocity-space / sphere = Papers 91/60/67) as **distinct instances of one intrinsic concept**. **(e) The circle fiber:** the circle of $U(1)$ connects to the same "circle-fiber" geometry as the Hopf fibration (Papers 67/68). Weyl is a member of the corpus's geometric mainstream (Riemann → ... → Weyl → Cartan → Hopf).

The Author's Personal Note (Layer 3, non-science label / not a claim of mechanism)

In the corpus's lens (metaphor), the gauge principle looks like this: when the Universe OS grants a **local freedom (that the phase calibration may be chosen freely at each point)**, a **force field (a connection)** automatically wells up to reconcile that freedom — an interaction born as the price of freedom. But **this carries the non-science label**. "The price of freedom" is a metaphor that carries intuition, not a mechanism or a prediction. **What is certain here is only the royal-road fact that demanding a local symmetry mathematically forces a connection (a potential)**. And Weyl's story teaches the very humility of the corpus's three layers: **a beautiful idea (1918) failed against experience, yet the core of the idea revived in the right vessel (1929)**. Intuition is a seed; it becomes science through royal-road mathematics and the test of experience. To the corpus's hero Weyl, quiet respect is recorded.

7. Scope (What Is Shown, and What Is Not)

What is shown (descriptive, structural):

- Weyl's 1918 original gauge (local scale symmetry) and its failure (Einstein's second-clock problem) (§§2–3).
- The reinterpretation from scale to phase (1929) = the modern gauge principle (local phase symmetry → connection A , $F = dA$) and the Standard Model (§4).

- The separation of "gauge" into two distinct roots (scale $\mathbb{R}^+$ / phase $U(1)$); Weyl 1918 $\neq$ Standard Model (§5).

What is not shown (restraint):

- **Do not conflate Weyl 1918 with the successful theory.** The original scale gauge failed as a theory of nature; what survived is the idea (local symmetry $\rightarrow$ connection).
- **Do not identify local symmetry $\rightarrow$ interaction with global symmetry $\rightarrow$ conservation (Noether) or weak assumptions $\rightarrow$ Lie group (90).** They resonate but are different theorems, distinct roots.
- **No new mathematics or prediction.** Gauge theory and the Standard Model are standard. Hence Layer 2 (structural interpretation). The OS is Layer-3 non-science.

8. Conclusion

"Local symmetry forces an interaction" — the gauge principle, the backbone of modern physics, is the story of Weyl's two ideas. In 1918 he localized the **length scale** to unify gravity and electromagnetism, and failed against Einstein's second-clock problem. But in 1929, when he changed the vessel of the idea to the **phase of the wavefunction**, local symmetry correctly forced the electromagnetic potential, flowering into Yang–Mills and the Standard Model.

The point is the corpus's discipline: do not conflate the two distinct roots the single word "gauge" names — scale ($\mathbb{R}^+$, failed) and phase ($U(1)$, successful). Weyl 1918 is the ancestor of the idea, not the same thing as the Standard Model. What this paper did is not a new claim but to sort the gauge principle correctly by the corpus's discipline of distinct roots and to graft it precisely onto the corpus's threads — $F = dA$ (92), curvature (91), the circle fiber (67/68), and weak assumptions $\rightarrow$ structure (90). A beautiful failure, and a rebirth in the right vessel — to the corpus's geometric hero Weyl, we return one address.

References

1. Weyl, H. (1918). *Gravitation und Elektrizität*. Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. (the original scale gauge)
2. Weyl, H. (1929). *Elektron und Gravitation*. Z. Phys. 56, 330. (the phase gauge principle)
3. Yang, C. N. & Mills, R. L. (1954). *Conservation of Isotopic Spin and Isotopic Gauge Invariance*. Phys. Rev. 96, 191.
4. O'Raifeartaigh, L. (1997). *The Dawning of Gauge Theory*. Princeton University Press.
5. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Distinct Roots (Census of Necessity)* [Papers 58/86]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21597747; 10.5281/zenodo.21744839
6. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Shared Alphabet* [Paper 92]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21758486
7. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Continuous Symmetry Emerges from Weak Assumptions* [Paper 90]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21758361

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

Yuuki YAMAGISHI (山岸 勇輝)

© 2026 Yamagishi Complexity Torus Lab, Japan · Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)