The Lost Geometric Language of the Wavefunction

Peter Cameron*

Michigan/MIT/Brookhaven (retired)

(Dated: July 18, 2026)

Abstract

Twentieth-century physics achieved extraordinary technical power through general relativity, quantum mechanics, quantum field theory, and the Standard Model. Their predictive success is beyond question. Less frequently recognized is the possibility that the mathematical language of theoretical physics changed in ways that altered the direction in which we seek explanation. Nineteenth-century geometry, culminating in Clifford's geometric algebra, sought the mathematical structure from which physical law emerges. Twentieth-century physics increasingly adopted the opposite approach, beginning with observed symmetries, constructing invariant Lagrangians, and deriving wavefunctions as solutions of the resulting equations. This essay examines the historical development of these two complementary traditions, and asks whether recovering the geometric representation of the vacuum wavefunction offers a useful perspective on the evolution of modern theoretical physics.

"What we observe is not nature itself, but nature exposed to our method of questioning."

Werner Heisenberg

Written for the 2026 American Physical Society History of Physics Essay Competition

Introduction

Every physical theory must decide where explanation begins.

Twentieth-century physics transformed our understanding of Nature more profoundly than any previous period in history. General relativity redefined gravitation, quantum mechanics transformed our understanding of matter, and quantum field theory culminated in the Standard Model, one of the most successful scientific theories ever developed. Their predictive success is unquestioned.

Their historical development, however, raises another question.

Did twentieth-century physics gradually change not only its mathematical language, but also the direction in which it sought explanation?

The history of physics is usually presented as a succession of increasingly successful theories. As Thomas Kuhn observed, scientific revolutions not only alter accepted answers, but also alter the questions regarded as meaningful[1]. This essay suggests that the transition from geometric algebra to twentieth-century field theory may represent one such change in the questions physicists naturally learned to ask.

The history may also be understood as that of changing mathematical languages. Grassmann and Clifford developed a unified geometric algebra before the birth of modern physics[2,3]. During the twentieth century that unified language gradually fragmented into vectors, tensors, matrices, spinors, differential forms, and gauge fields, each becoming indispensable within its own domain.

At the same time, another transition quietly occurred. Nineteenth-century geometry sought mathematical objects from which physical law might emerge. Twentieth-century physics increasingly began with symmetries, constructed invariant Lagrangians, derived equations of motion, and regarded the wavefunction as the solution of those equations.

This essay explores these two historical developments. It suggests that twentieth-century physics became overwhelmingly a *top-down* enterprise, beginning with physical law, while a complementary *bottom-up* tradition beginning with the geometric structure of the vacuum wavefunction remained comparatively unexplored. The present purpose is not to diminish the extraordinary achievements of modern physics, but to ask whether recovering a unified geometric language may illuminate one of the unfinished historical questions of theoretical physics - where should a fundamental physical theory begin?

Geometry preceded Physics

Every scientific revolution begins with a new language.

In 1844 Hermann Grassmann published *Die Ausdehnungslehre*, introducing an algebra intended to describe geometry itself rather than merely calculate geometric quantities[2]. His work was unconventional, difficult, and largely ignored by his contemporaries, yet it established an extraordinary possibility: geometry itself might possess an algebraic structure, an algebra of geometric objects.

William Kingdon Clifford recognized the significance of Grassmann's work, and extended it by combining Grassmann's exterior algebra with Hamilton's quaternions[3]. The resulting geometric algebra unified scalars, vectors, oriented areas, and oriented volumes within a single mathematical framework. Rather than treating these objects as fundamentally different mathematical entities, Clifford regarded them as different grades of one algebra.

For three-dimensional space the algebra naturally decomposes into

$$1 \oplus 3 \oplus 3 \oplus 1, \tag{1}$$

representing one scalar, three vectors, three bivectors, and one trivector.

Today this structure is immediately recognizable through Pauli and Dirac algebras, spin, and modern Geometric Algebra[4]. Yet when Clifford introduced it there was no quantum mechanics, no spinors, and no gauge theory. There was simply the remarkable possibility that one mathematical language might describe all geometric objects.

Geometry preceded physics.

The algebra was not invented to solve existing physical problems. Rather, it suggested that physical theory itself might emerge from a deeper geometric structure.

The Great Simplification

This possibility did not become the dominant tradition.

Instead, the closing decades of the nineteenth century witnessed the most consequential mathematical simplification in the history of physics.

Oliver Heaviside and Josiah Willard Gibbs developed vector analysis, emphasizing practical computation while discarding much of Clifford's richer algebraic structure. For engineering and Maxwell's electromagnetism this proved enormously successful. Vector analysis was easier to teach, easier to calculate, and became the standard language of applied physics[5,6].

From the perspective of practical science this transition represented a triumph. From the perspective of mathematical unity, however, something had changed. Geometry fragmented. Vectors survived. Oriented areas and volumes ceased to exist as independent geometric objects. Higher-grade structures largely disappeared from everyday physics.

The fragmentation continued throughout the twentieth century. Tensors became the language of gravitation. Matrices described spin. Differential forms described topology. Gauge fields described particle interactions. Each formalism proved extraordinarily successful within its own domain, yet no single language encompassed them all.

Whether this fragmentation represented inevitable specialization or the loss of a deeper unity remains an open historical question.

Einstein's Choice

Einstein inherited precisely this mathematical landscape. Seeking a language for gravitation, he naturally chose tensor calculus. His achievement transformed science. Yet it also illustrates a larger historical point. Einstein did not choose between curved spacetime and the flat Minkowski spacetime of geometric algebra[7,8]. Geometric algebra was no longer part of mainstream theoretical physics.

Recent historical scholarship suggests that Einstein himself did not simply identify gravity with geometry in the way later textbooks often imply[9,10]. Rather, the metric represented the gravitational field. The historical significance of this observation extends beyond general relativity. It reminds us that mathematical language shapes physical imagination. One cannot formulate theories using mathematical tools one no longer possesses.

The Wavefunction's Meaning Changes

Quantum mechanics quietly completed the historical transition. The wavefunction became the central object of physics. Yet it no longer occupied the logical position it might once have held. It became the solution of equations. Not their origin. Schrödinger searched for the correct equation. Dirac searched for the relativistic formulation. Gauge theory sought invariant Lagrangians.

The wavefunction entered only afterward. History had reversed the direction of explanation. Nineteenth-century mathematics had asked "What geometric object gives rise to physics?" Twentieth-century physics increasingly asked "What equations does the wavefunction satisfy?" The difference appears slight. Its philosophical consequences may be profound.

Recovering the Bottom-Up Program

The revival of geometric algebra during the second half of the twentieth century reopened a path that had disappeared from mainstream theoretical physics. Hestenes and the Cambridge group demonstrated that quantum mechanics could again be written geometrically[4,11–13]. Gauge Theory Gravity later showed that Einstein's observable predictions could be formulated in flat Minkowski spacetime without abandoning geometric principles[7,8].

These developments suggest that the empirical success of twentieth-century physics does not uniquely determine its ontology. Contemporary research extends this idea further[14–17]. Rather than beginning with an invariant action, one begins with the vacuum wavefunction itself[18]. Geometry becomes primary. Wavefunction interactions emerge from geometry, are modeled by the geometric Clifford product.

The importance of Clifford's algebra lies not simply in the geometric objects it contains, but also in the single operation, the Clifford product, that relates them. Unlike conventional vector analysis, which separates the dot and cross products into distinct operations, the Clifford product unifies them within one algebraic rule. The familiar dot product expresses the shared component of two geometric objects, while Grassmann's exterior (wedge) product expresses the oriented geometric structure they jointly define. Together these complementary operations permit transitions between different geometric grades (dimensions) within a single mathematical language. Interactions need no longer be introduced as independent mathematical prescriptions; they are inherent in the algebra itself.

Clifford's achievement was therefore twofold: he unified not only the representation of geometric objects, but also the algebra governing their relationships. Symmetry follows from interactions under the Clifford product. Equations of motion become consequences rather than assumptions.

Rather than assuming particles, fields, or invariant actions as fundamental, one begins with the geometric structure of the vacuum wavefunction expressed in Clifford algebra. The wavefunction is not interpreted merely as a probability amplitude awaiting measurement, but as the geometric representation of the vacuum from which the mathematical description of physical interactions is developed.

The electromagnetic coupling constant $\alpha = e^2/4\pi\epsilon_0\hbar c$ provides the first physical bridge between the abstract geometric structure and measurable physics. The model does not explain why this bridge exists; it accepts its existence as a primitive fact, just as every foundational physical theory accepts certain empirical primitives. Various combinations of the four fundamental constants that define α permit assigning appropriate electric and magnetic flux quanta to the geometric and topological components of the vacuum wavefunction[15]. With this, both geometry and fields are quantized.

There is no Lagrangian in such a model. Equations of motion directly calculate the quantum impedance networks that govern amplitude and phase of the flow of energy between eigenstates. Stable impedance matching at network nodes produces resonant structures identified with elementary particles[16]. Both flux quantization and impedance matching constrain these resonances, explaining mass quantization. The lightest charged particle electron mass, the mass gap of QED, sets the scale of space with the electron Compton wavelength.

In this view, the familiar hierarchy of modern field theory is reversed. Instead of deriving wavefunctions from field equations, the field equations themselves emerge as effective descriptions of an underlying geometric network, governing the flow of energy. Geometry precedes interaction; interaction precedes symmetry; symmetry precedes the equations of motion.

Within this viewpoint, the vacuum wavefunction is not an alternative interpretation of quantum mechanics, but rather provides a geometric representation of the quantum-mechanical state[17].

Why This Matters

The distinction between these two approaches is not merely philosophical. It bears directly on some of the most persistent conceptual problems in theoretical physics.

Twentieth-century field theories begin with continuous fields extending over spacetime. Finite particles are subsequently extracted from these continuous descriptions. This strategy has been remarkably successful but has also required renormalization, introduced numerous free parameters, and left gravity resistant to conventional quantization.

Bottom-up approaches beginning with finite geometric relationships ask a different question. If the elementary structures are themselves finite resonances rather than point particles embedded in continuous fields, then finiteness need not be imposed through regularization. It becomes an intrinsic property of both the underlying geometry and the infinite impedance mismatch to the singularity.

Whether this bottom-up approach proves correct is a scientific question rather than a historical one. Historically, however, it illustrates how mathematical language influences the kinds of explanations physicists consider natural[19]. Beginning with continuous fields encourages one class of theories. Beginning with finite geometric objects encourages another.

An Unfinished History

The purpose of history is not to identify wrong turns. History asks different questions. Could alternative paths have been taken? Did available mathematics influence available ideas? What possibilities disappeared before they could be explored?

The purpose of a foundational theory is not to eliminate every primitive assumption, but to identify the smallest set from which the largest range of physical phenomena may be consistently derived.

The extraordinary success of twentieth-century physics demonstrates the power of beginning with symmetry and physical law. The nineteenth century offers a complementary vision. Begin instead with geometry. Allow physical law to emerge.

Whether future physics ultimately combines these two traditions remains unknown. History suggests only this - the language in which physicists think influences the theories they imagine. Recovering the geometric representation of the vacuum wavefunction represents more than the revival of an old mathematical formalism. It represents the recovery of a forgotten way of asking questions.

Conclusion

Like every physical theory, the impedance model begins from primitive assumptions. The vacuum wavefunction provides the mathematical structure. The electromagnetic coupling constant provides the empirical bridge through which that structure acquires physical significance. Quantum impedance networks provide dynamic constraints. Why mathematics is physically realized is not explained by the model; it is accepted as a primitive fact of Nature.

Historians often ask why one scientific idea replaced another. Equally important is the question of which ideas ceased to be pursued, not because they were disproved, but because the mathematical language in which they were naturally expressed gradually disappeared from common use.

The history traced here suggests that twentieth-century physics did not merely replace one theory with another. It also shifted the direction of explanation—from beginning with geometry and seeking physical law, to beginning with physical law and deriving geometry. Both traditions have produced profound insights. The remarkable success of the latter should not prevent us from reconsidering the former.

Whether the vacuum wavefunction ultimately proves to be the correct foundation for future physics remains unknown. Yet the historical question remains compelling. If mathematical language shapes scientific imagination, then recovering the unified geometric language of Grassmann and Clifford may represent not a return to the past, but the continuation of a line of inquiry interrupted before modern physics began.

The history of theoretical physics has often been presented as the replacement of one successful theory by another. The history presented here suggests a complementary interpretation. Mathematical language not only records scientific ideas; it also shapes the questions scientists learn to ask. Recovering the geometric representation of the vacuum wavefunction therefore represents more than the revival of an historical formalism. It invites reconsideration of one of the oldest questions in physics: Should explanation begin with physical law, or with the geometric structure from which physical law emerges[20]?

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Michaele Suisse for earlier contributions that focused sustained attention on the philosophy of quantum interpretations[21] and the fundamental role of the wavefunction in first principles[22]. This essay was written in collaboration with GPT 5.

---

* pcameron@HimalayanInstitute.org

[1] T. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, University of Chicago Press (1962)

[2] H. Grassmann, "Die lineale Ausdehnungslehre, ein neuer Zweig der Mathematik" (1844)

[3] W. Clifford, "Applications of Grassmann's extensive algebra", Am. J. Math., **1** 350 (1878)

[4] D. Hestenes, *Space-Time Algebra*, Gordon and Breach, New York (1966)

[5] M. Crowe, *A History of Vector Analysis*, Dover (1965)

[6] J. Chappell et.al., "The Vector Algebra War: A Historical Perspective" https://www.reddit.com/r/math/comments/6hyzyd/the_vector_algebra_war_a_historical_perspective/

[7] A. Lasenby et.al, "Gravity, gauge theories and geometric algebra," Phil. Trans. R. Lond. A **356** 487–582 (1998) http://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0405033

[8] D. Hestenes, "Gauge Theory Gravity with Geometric Calculus", Found. Phys. **35** (6) 903-970 (2005) http://geocalc.clas.asu.edu/pdf/GTG.w.GC.FP.pdf

[9] A. Einstein: Letter to Robert A. Thornton, 7 December 1944. EA 61-574, In: The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ (1986) https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.10602

[10] D. Lehmkuhl, "Why Einstein did not believe general relativity geometrizes gravity", Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics **46** 316–326 (2014) https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1355219813000695

[11] D. Hestenes, "Oersted Medal Lecture 2002: Reforming the mathematical language of physics", Am. J. Phys. **71**, 104 (2003) http://geocalc.clas.asu.edu/pdf/OerstedMedalLecture.pdf

[12] D. Hestenes, "The Genesis of Geometric Algebra: A Personal Retrospective", Adv. Appl. Clifford Algebras **27** (2017) https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00006-016-0664-z

[13] C. Doran and A. Lasenby, *Geometric Algebra for Physicists*, Cambridge University Press (2003)

[14] P. Cameron, "The Two Body Problem and Mach's Principle", submitted to AJP. (1975) Original is appended to "Electron Impedances"[15].

[15] P. Cameron, "Electron Impedances", Apeiron **18** 2 p.222-253 (2011) https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254995406_Electron_Impedances

[16] P. Cameron, "Generalized Quantum Impedances: A Background Independent Model for the Unstable Particle Spectrum" (2012) http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.25702.84800

[17] P. Cameron, "Two Core Organizing Principles Lost in the History of Physics: How it happened and why it matters", APS History of Physics essay competition (2025) https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.33054.65604f

[18] P. Cameron and M. Suisse, "Advances of the New Century: It's All About the Wavefunction", Physics Today essay competition (2018) https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.19885.18402

[19] P. Cameron and M. Suisse, "Naturalness begets Naturalness: An Emergent Definition", (2019) https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.13602.20165

[20] P. Cameron, "Emergence of Time from the Vacuum Wavefunction" (2025) https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.35941.36320

[21] M. Suisse and P. Cameron, "Quantum Interpretation of the Impedance Model as Informed by Geometric Clifford Algebra" (2014) https://vixra.org/abs/1608.0129

[22] M. Suisse and P. Cameron, "Space and Time, Geometry and Fields: An Historical Essay on the Fundamental and its Physical Manifestation", FQXI essay competition (2018) https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.18742.19527

---

* pcameron@HimalayanInstitute.org