

# A Noetherian Inversion: From Einsteinian Geometry to Emergent Symmetry

Satoshi Hanamura\*  
(Dated: June 27, 2025)

We propose a geometric reinterpretation of Noether’s theorem in which conservation laws arise not from externally imposed symmetries, but from the intrinsic closed time-phase geometry of quantum systems. We extend our previous geometric studies of internal time-phase structures in quantum systems [1, 2], proposing a new interpretation of conservation laws arising from intrinsic closed time-phase geometry within the 0-sphere model. Based on the 0-Sphere model, this approach aligns with Einstein’s vision of deriving physical laws from spacetime structure itself. Within this model, conservation of energy and spin emerge as geometric necessities, while symmetries such as time-translation or rotation arise secondarily as emergent, large-scale features of internal dynamics. This inversion—geometry giving rise to conservation, which in turn yields symmetry—offers a new foundation for unifying quantum and relativistic physics.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Conservation laws are foundational to physical theory. Through the lens of Noether’s theorem [3], such laws are understood as resulting from continuous symmetries of the action. This conceptual structure has profoundly influenced the formulation of both quantum field theories [4] and general relativity [5]. Yet this symmetry-to-conservation narrative presumes symmetry as a primitive input, an assumption that deserves scrutiny.

We suggest a reversal of this conventional direction. Rather than presupposing global or local symmetries, we begin with a model in which internal geometrical structure enforces conservation laws. Specifically, we adopt the 0-Sphere model [6], in which particles are treated as entities possessing an intrinsic time-phase structure defined on a closed manifold. In this framework, deterministic internal oscillations—interpreted as Zitterbewegung [7, 8]—are not stochastic fluctuations but fundamental geometric motions.

Within this closed time-phase geometry, quantities such as energy, spin, and charge arise as conserved due to the periodic and topologically constrained nature of the motion. Conservation is thus not the consequence of imposed symmetry, but rather the reflection of an internal structural coherence. Importantly, what we interpret as symmetry in observable phenomena—such as time-translation or rotational invariance—can emerge effectively from the consistent global behavior of many such internal geometries.

This perspective is reminiscent of Einstein’s late approach to unified field theory [9], in which the field and spacetime were not distinct but aspects of a single geometrical entity. Just as the curvature of spacetime in general relativity encodes gravitational dynamics [10], here the internal geometry of a quantum particle encodes conserved quantities. By rejecting the notion that symmetry is a foundational axiom, and instead proposing it as an emergent consequence, we shift the interpretive

basis of modern physics.

This reinterpretation leads to concrete implications. For example, the model predicts subluminal Zitterbewegung velocities and connects quantized spin values to harmonic modes on the internal geometry, as previously analyzed in [2]. These are not imposed quantum conditions, but inevitable consequences of a geodesic-like motion constrained by closed, non-classical time structures. Moreover, the framework supports a realist ontology for quantum mechanics, dispensing with the need for a probabilistic interpretation and opening a route toward a unified view of relativistic and quantum regimes.

In what follows, we outline the minimal geometric assumptions of the 0-Sphere model, derive the conservation laws from first principles of closed oscillatory motion, and illustrate how effective symmetries emerge in the classical and thermodynamic limits. We conclude with a discussion of experimental predictions and potential tests.

This paper is structured as follows. Building on our previous work [1, 2], which introduced a concrete model connecting spin quantization to harmonic oscillation on closed geodesics, the present study develops a general theoretical framework that situates this result within a broader geometric reinterpretation of Noether’s theorem. In Section II, we examine the philosophical foundations that motivate our reversal of the symmetry-to-conservation paradigm, tracing the historical transition from structure-based to symmetry-based approaches in physics. Section III introduces the foundational 0-Sphere model and demonstrates how conservation laws are necessitated by the geometric constraints of closed time-phase oscillations, without requiring externally imposed symmetries. In Section IV, we show how conventional spacetime symmetries—including time translation, spatial rotation, and Lorentz invariance—emerge as macroscopic manifestations of the underlying oscillatory geometry rather than fundamental assumptions. Section V synthesizes these results within Einstein’s geometric worldview, discussing implications for quantum mechanical interpretation, relativistic unification, and the restoration of deterministic realism to fundamental physics.

---

\* [hana.tensor@gmail.com](mailto:hana.tensor@gmail.com)

## II. MOTIVATION

### A. Reversing the Symmetry-to-Law Paradigm: A Philosophical Prelude

The motivation for reversing the standard flow of reasoning—from symmetry to conservation—becomes clear when examining a crucial historical shift: the transition from macroscopic to microscopic domains of inquiry.

In classical physics, internal structure was often visible or inferable: the mass distribution of celestial bodies [11], the mechanical arrangements in clockwork, or the electromagnetic field configurations in Maxwell’s theory [12] could be taken as starting points. The internal composition of objects informed their dynamics, and symmetry emerged as a consequence of underlying structural regularities.

However, in the quantum realm, this pathway encounters fundamental obstacles. The development of quantum mechanics in the early 20th century [13, 14] revealed that:

- **Electrons appear structureless:** Experimentally, the electron behaves as a point particle with no discernible internal components [15]. Its internal mechanisms—if any—remain unobservable at accessible energy scales.
- **The starting point became inaccessible:** Without access to a discernible internal mechanism, the traditional route from internal structure to physical laws loses its epistemic foundation. Physicists thus began instead from what *can* be observed with reliability: symmetry in experimental outcomes.

Symmetries such as spatial homogeneity, temporal invariance, and gauge invariance [16] became the primitive “axioms” from which laws are derived. Noether’s theorem [3] solidified this reversal by linking continuous symmetries to conservation laws, establishing a methodology of enormous success—the Standard Model [17–19] being its most celebrated offspring.

This symmetry-first approach proved extraordinarily powerful as a compass for discovering unknown laws:

- **Constraining theoretical forms:** When constructing new particle theories, gauge symmetry requirements dramatically narrow the possible mathematical forms [20], making theoretical discovery tractable.
- **Predicting new particles:** By extending the symmetries of existing theories, physicists successfully predicted numerous particles including the Higgs boson [21, 22], achieving remarkable experimental confirmation [23, 24].

Yet, this success may come at the cost of philosophical completeness. The present work revives the intuition

that structure should precede law, following Einstein’s vision that “physical concepts are free creations of the human mind, and are not, however it may seem, uniquely determined by the external world” [25]. We aim to demonstrate that conservation laws can arise not as imposed consequences of symmetry, but from coherent internal geometry.

This attempt represents a return to the pre-Noetherian spirit—but fortified by modern mathematical tools including differential geometry [26], topological constraints, and the geometric realism Einstein pursued in his later unified field theory work [9]. Our point of departure is not metaphysical speculation, but a concrete and mathematically defined time-phase geometry.

**Symmetry is not the cause, but the consequence.** This foundational inversion, inspired by Einstein’s geometric worldview [5], forms the conceptual core of our approach. Table I summarizes the philosophical alignment between Einstein’s late-career geometric vision and the conceptual foundations of the 0-Sphere model, demonstrating how our approach represents a natural extension of Einsteinian geometric realism into the quantum domain.

### III. DERIVATION OF CONSERVATION LAWS FROM INTERNAL GEOMETRY

The present geometric interpretation of internal spin conservation builds upon the harmonic mode analysis developed in [2], where quantized spin values were shown to correspond to discrete resonant modes on closed internal geodesics. While that model provided a specific realization of Zitterbewegung as harmonic oscillation, here we aim to generalize the underlying geometric principle and extend it to a full reinterpretation of Noether’s theorem.

The derivation of conservation laws in the 0-Sphere model begins with the geometric equation expressing energy conservation. As established in our previous work [6], the internal oscillatory dynamics of the particle are governed by a deterministic time-phase geometry, providing a concrete realization of the Zitterbewegung motion originally predicted by Dirac [7] and Schrödinger [8]. The total internal energy is given by

$$E_0 = E_0 \left( \cos^4 \left( \frac{\omega t}{2} \right) + \sin^4 \left( \frac{\omega t}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sin^2(\omega t) \right), \quad (\text{III.1})$$

which confirms that energy remains conserved throughout the evolution governed by this closed oscillatory geometry.

Spin conservation arises in synchrony with the internal energy, manifesting as a result of the same periodic geometric constraints. The 0-Sphere model provides a geometric interpretation of spin that differs fundamentally from conventional quantum mechanics [27, 28], recovering the classical insights of Thomas [29, 30] within a modern geometric framework. The model introduces a corrected

**Table. I.** Philosophical and Conceptual Comparison between Einstein’s Vision and the 0-Sphere model

Philosophical Element	Einstein’s Position	0-Sphere model
Geometric Realism	Physical laws emerge from geometrical properties of spacetime itself. Gravity is not a force but manifestation of curved geometry. Unified field theory treats field and spacetime as aspects of single geometrical entity.	Conservation laws arise not from externally imposed symmetries but from internal geometry. 0-Sphere model suggests that conservation laws and even symmetries may likewise be geometric in origin.
Deterministic Orientation	“God does not play dice.” Discomfort with probabilistic interpretation of quantum mechanics. Sought hidden variable theories and deeper structures behind quantum phenomena.	Deterministic, realist framework where geometry is primary, and regularities of physics are emergent. Stands in contrast to twentieth-century quantum theory’s probabilistic interpretations.
Symmetry Paradigm	Tendency to view symmetries as emerging from deeper geometrical structures rather than imposing them as fundamental assumptions.	Symmetry is not the cause, but the consequence. Reverses conventional Noether logic: internal geometry → conservation laws → symmetries, not symmetries → conservation laws
Unification Approach	Late career pursuit of geometrical approach to unified field theory. Attempted to describe gravity and electromagnetism within single geometrical framework.	Conceptual path that revives and extends Einstein’s geometric worldview into the quantum domain. Geometric interpretation of quantum phenomena via Zitterbewegung
Internal Structure Priority	Emphasized intrinsic mathematical structures behind physical phenomena: field equations, spacetime curvature.	Quantum properties emerge from particle’s internal time-phase structure (0-sphere). Structure should precede law rather than external symmetry impositions

**Note:** This comparison reflects the explicit philosophical alignment presented in previous work. The approach developed here is intentionally aligned with the trajectory Einstein pursued in the later stages of his career, representing a conceptual path that revives and extends his geometric worldview into the quantum domain.

form of the internal angular velocity vector, reinterpreting the Thomas precession in purely geometric terms[29, 30]:

$$\Omega = \frac{1}{2c^2}[\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{v}] = \frac{1}{2c^2} \cdot \left(-\frac{1}{2} \sin(2\omega t)\right) \cdot \mathbf{e}_z. \quad (\text{III.2})$$

This expression [6], unique to the 0-Sphere model, suggests that spin dynamics do not require external symmetry assumptions but arise from internal geometrical rotation rates.

At present, the conservation of electric charge within the 0-Sphere model remains an open question. Previous works have not yet adequately addressed how charge emerges from the internal geometry. Similarly, how electromagnetic fields (electric and magnetic) arise from Zitterbewegung remains an unresolved direction of inquiry. These are designated as critical tasks for future theoretical refinement.

#### IV. EMERGENT SYMMETRIES FROM OSCILLATORY GEOMETRY

Given the conservation laws derived above, we now examine how traditional spacetime symmetries—such as time translation, spatial rotation, and Lorentz invariance [31, 32]—can arise not as primitive assumptions but as emergent features of the internal oscillatory structure. This reverses the conventional approach established by Noether [3] and developed in modern field theory [4]. In conventional field theory, these symmetries are imposed on the action, leading via Noether’s theorem to conserved currents. Here, the logic is inverted: the internal geometry, constrained by closed time-phase motion, necessitates energy and spin conservation, and from the stability and coherence of these quantities, apparent symmetries are inferred.

The periodicity of the internal energy function in Eq. (III.1) implies invariance under discrete time-phase rotations. When viewed macroscopically, the accumulation of such discrete invariance approximates continuous time translation, thereby giving rise to emergent temporal

symmetry. Likewise, the sinusoidal modulation of the internal angular velocity in Eq. (III.2) reflects a quasi-cyclic rotational structure which can give rise to effective spatial isotropy in the long-time limit.

Moreover, when the internal motion is embedded into a relativistic framework, the modulation of internal frequencies—under boosts and gravitational potentials—inevitably leads to corrections analogous to time dilation and geodetic precession. These effects are not postulated externally, but emerge necessarily from the geometry of the oscillatory phase. Accordingly, Lorentz symmetry itself is interpreted not as a fundamental axiom, but as an effective macroscopic manifestation of the geometrically constrained internal dynamics.

This approach aligns with the notion of effective field theory, where low-energy symmetries may not reflect the fundamental structure but arise from collective behavior. However, the 0-Sphere model posits a stronger claim: even the observed relativistic symmetries of spacetime may stem from the coherent, geometric properties of internal quantum motion. In this sense, the model offers a bottom-up derivation of symmetry, one that is ontologically grounded in internal structure rather than imposed from above.

## V. CONCLUSION

The reinterpretation of Noether’s theorem presented here is deeply aligned with the trajectory Einstein pursued in the later stages of his career [9]—a vision where physical laws emerge from the geometrical properties of spacetime itself, without recourse to arbitrary postulates. Just as general relativity [5] revealed that gravity is not a force but a manifestation of curved geometry [10], the 0-Sphere model suggests that conservation laws and even the symmetries we associate with space and time may likewise be geometric in origin.

This work has presented a fundamental reinterpretation of the relationship between symmetry and conservation in quantum mechanics through the geometric framework of the 0-Sphere model. While our previous technical exposition [6] demonstrated the mathematical machinery and numerical predictions of internal oscillatory dynamics, the present analysis addresses the deeper conceptual foundations that distinguish this approach from conventional quantum field theory.

The central philosophical contribution lies in the inversion of the Noetherian paradigm. Rather than accepting symmetries as primitive inputs from which conservation laws are derived, we have demonstrated how conservation of energy and spin can emerge as geometric necessities from the closed time-phase structure of internal particle dynamics. While the geometric origin of charge conservation within this framework remains an open question requiring further theoretical development, the successful derivation of energy and spin conservation from internal geometric constraints

already establishes the viability of this approach. This reversal—from the conventional sequence “symmetry → conservation laws” to our proposed “internal geometry → conservation laws → emergent symmetries”—represents not merely a technical reformulation, but a fundamental reconceptualization of how physical laws arise in nature.

This geometric determinism offers profound resolution to long-standing interpretive difficulties in quantum mechanics. The apparent randomness of quantum measurements, the mystery of superposition, and the conceptual challenges of wavefunction collapse all find inevitable explanation through the mathematical structure of rapid internal oscillations governed by closed geometric constraints. What conventional theory describes as probabilistic behavior emerges necessarily here as deterministic internal motion sampled at measurement instants—thereby restoring physical realism to quantum phenomena without sacrificing predictive accuracy.

The framework’s alignment with Einstein’s geometric worldview proves particularly significant. Just as general relativity revealed gravity to be a manifestation of spacetime curvature rather than a fundamental force, the 0-Sphere model suggests that quantum mechanical properties—including the symmetries we associate with space and time—may likewise emerge from the geometric structure of matter itself. This perspective revives and extends Einstein’s late vision of embedding physical laws within geometric reality, offering a bridge between his geometric approach to relativity and the quantum domain he found conceptually troubling.

Unlike purely phenomenological approaches that introduce symmetries to organize experimental observations, our framework grounds these symmetries in concrete geometric processes. The sinusoidal energy exchange described by Eq. (III.1), the oscillatory angular velocity governing spin dynamics, and the geodesic motion of energy transfer between kernels all emerge from geometric constraints rather than imposed assumptions. This provides a bottom-up derivation of symmetry that complements Noether’s top-down mathematical theorem.

Perhaps most significantly, this work establishes a fundamentally new theoretical framework that resolves the apparent conflict between quantum mechanics and general relativity through thermodynamic geometry rather than conventional unification approaches. The derivation of quantum magnetic behavior from internal thermal structure, combined with the geometric emergence of spacetime effects, demonstrates that unification requires not merely deeper comprehension of existing theories, but recognition of their common foundation in previously unrecognized thermodynamic-geometric principles. This represents a revolutionary departure from both the probabilistic interpretation of quantum mechanics and the external-force conception of gravity, establishing thermal geometry as the missing theoretical framework that underlies both quantum and relativistic phenomena.

The philosophical implications prove equally profound.

By demonstrating that deterministic geometric processes can account for apparently probabilistic quantum phenomena, the framework challenges the conventional wisdom that classical realism is incompatible with quantum mechanical observations. This opens pathways toward restoring ontological clarity to fundamental physics while preserving the empirical successes that have made quantum mechanics indispensable to modern technology.

In conclusion, this Noetherian inversion represents more than a technical advancement in quantum theory—it constitutes a return to the Einsteinian ideal of geometric realism while incorporating the mathematical sophistica-

tion of modern physics. By grounding conservation laws in geometric necessity rather than imposed symmetry, we provide a conceptual foundation that honors both the predictive power of quantum mechanics and the philosophical clarity that Einstein sought throughout his career. The framework thus offers not only a reinterpretation of Noether’s legacy, but a viable pathway toward the geometric understanding of quantum phenomena that may finally reconcile the probabilistic formalism of quantum mechanics with the deterministic geometric principles underlying Einstein’s vision of fundamental physics.

- 
- [1] S. Hanamura, “Geometric Modeling of Internal Time-Phase Structures in Quantum Systems,” viXra:2506.0119 (2025). <https://vixra.org/abs/2506.0119>
- [2] S. Hanamura, “Redefining Electron Spin and Anomalous Magnetic Moment Through Harmonic Oscillation and Lorentz Contraction,” viXra:2507.0128 (2025). <https://vixra.org/abs/2507.0128>
- [3] E. Noether, “Invariante Variationsprobleme,” *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse* **1918**, 235–257 (1918). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-01678-9\\_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-01678-9_14)
- [4] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields, Volume I: Foundations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1995). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139644167>
- [5] A. Einstein, “Die Feldgleichungen der Gravitation,” *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* **1915**, 844–847 (1915). <https://doi.org/10.1002/3527608958.glos0024>
- [6] S. Hanamura, “Redefining Electron Spin and Anomalous Magnetic Moment Through Harmonic Oscillation and Lorentz Contraction,” viXra:2309.0047 (2023). <https://vixra.org/abs/2309.0047>
- [7] P. A. M. Dirac, “The quantum theory of the electron,” *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **117**, 610–624 (1928). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.1928.0023>
- [8] E. Schrödinger, “Über die kräftefreie Bewegung in der relativistischen Quantenmechanik,” *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Physikalisch-Mathematische Klasse* **24**, 418–428 (1930). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-25204-5\\_38](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-25204-5_38)
- [9] A. Einstein, *The Meaning of Relativity*, 5th ed., Princeton University Press, Princeton (1955). <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400881659>
- [10] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, W. H. Freeman, New York (1973). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-1029-0>
- [11] I. Newton, *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica*, Jussu Societatis Regiæ ac Typis Joseph Streater, London (1687). <https://doi.org/10.3931/e-rara-440>
- [12] J. C. Maxwell, *A Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism*, Clarendon Press, Oxford (1873). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511709340>
- [13] W. Heisenberg, “Über quantentheoretische Umdeutung kinematischer und mechanischer Beziehungen,” *Zeitschrift für Physik* **33**, 879–893 (1925). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01328377>
- [14] E. Schrödinger, “Quantisierung als Eigenwertproblem,” *Annalen der Physik* **79**, 361–376 (1926). <https://doi.org/10.1002/andp.19263840404>
- [15] H. Dehmelt, “A Single Atomic Particle Forever Floating at Rest in Free Space: New Value for Electron Radius,” *Physica Scripta* **T22**, 102–110 (1988). <https://doi.org/10.1088/0031-8949/1988/T22/016>
- [16] C. N. Yang and R. L. Mills, “Conservation of Isotopic Spin and Isotopic Gauge Invariance,” *Phys. Rev.* **96**, 191–195 (1954). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.96.191>
- [17] S. L. Glashow, “Partial-symmetries of weak interactions,” *Nucl. Phys.* **22**, 579–588 (1961). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0029-5582\(61\)90469-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0029-5582(61)90469-2)
- [18] S. Weinberg, “A Model of Leptons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **19**, 1264–1266 (1967). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.19.1264>
- [19] A. Salam, “Weak and electromagnetic interactions,” in *Elementary Particle Physics: Relativistic Groups and Analyticity*, edited by N. Svartholm, Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm, pp. 367–377 (1968).
- [20] G. ’t Hooft, “Renormalization of Massless Yang-Mills Fields,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **33**, 173–199 (1971). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213\(71\)90395-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0550-3213(71)90395-6)
- [21] P. W. Higgs, “Broken Symmetries and the Masses of Gauge Bosons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13**, 508–509 (1964). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.13.508>
- [22] F. Englert and R. Brout, “Broken Symmetry and the Mass of Gauge Vector Mesons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13**, 321–323 (1964). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.13.321>
- [23] G. Aad *et al.* (ATLAS Collaboration), “Observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC,” *Phys. Lett. B* **716**, 1–29 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.020>
- [24] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), “Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV with the CMS experiment at the LHC,” *Phys. Lett. B* **716**, 30–61 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.021>
- [25] A. Einstein, “Physics and Reality,” *Journal of the Franklin Institute* **221**, 349–382 (1936). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-0032\(36\)91047-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-0032(36)91047-5)
- [26] R. Abraham, J. E. Marsden, and T. Ratiu, *Manifolds, Tensor Analysis, and Applications*, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, New York (1988). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-1029-0>
- [27] W. Pauli, “Zur Quantenmechanik des magnetischen

- Elektrons,” *Zeitschrift für Physik* **43**, 601–623 (1927).  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01397326>
- [28] G. E. Uhlenbeck and S. A. Goudsmit, “Spinning Electrons and the Structure of Spectra,” *Naturwissenschaften* **13**, 953 (1925). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01558878>
- [29] L. H. Thomas, “The Motion of the Spinning Electron,” *Nature* **117**, 514 (1926).  
<https://doi.org/10.1038/117514a0>
- [30] L. H. Thomas, “The kinematics of an electron with an axis,” *Phil. Mag.* **3**, 1–22 (1927).  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14786440108564170>
- [31] H. A. Lorentz, “Electromagnetic phenomena in a system moving with any velocity smaller than that of light,” *Proceedings of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences* **6**, 809–831 (1904).  
[https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Electromagnetic\\_phenomena](https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Electromagnetic_phenomena)
- [32] H. Poincaré, “Sur la dynamique de l’électron,” *Comptes Rendus* **140**, 1504–1508 (1905).  
<https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k3085p/f1504>