Why Magnetic Monopoles Cannot Exist: A Gauge Potential Perspective

Shan Gao
Research Center for Philosophy of Science and Technology,
Shanxi University, Taiyuan 030006, P. R. China
E-mail: gaoshan2017@sxu.edu.cn.

August 6, 2025

Abstract

Magnetic monopoles, hypothetical entities with isolated magnetic charges (Dirac) or effective charges from field configurations ('t Hooft-Polyakov), are posited to symmetrize electromagnetism and explain electric charge quantization, yet remain undetected. This paper demonstrates that such monopoles—Abelian Dirac and non-Abelian 't Hooft-Polyakov—are incompatible with a potential-centric ontology, where the gauge potential A_μ, fixed in one true gauge, the Lorenz gauge, is the fundamental physical entity mediating local interactions, as evidenced by the Aharonov-Bohm effect. We derive a no-go result, showing that magnetic monopoles require singular (e.g., Dirac strings) or non-unique (e.g., Wu-Yang patches) potentials in all gauges to resolve a Stokes' theorem contradiction, violating the ontology's requirement for unique, non-singular potentials in the true gauge. This result extends to sphalerons in SU(2) × U(1) electroweak theory and D-branes in string theory, whose Ramond-Ramond potentials C_{p+1} exhibit an AB-like effect but require singular or non-unique potentials due to non-zero flux, leading to a theoretical self-contradiction independent of experimental evidence. In contrast, cosmic strings, with a non-singular, single-valued A_μ in a single gauge, satisfying Stokes' theorem and the ontology's criteria. Instantons and skyrmions are compatible as non-physical or emergent constructs, and emergent monopoles in spin ice, producing flux in an effective field, are also consistent with the ontology. Our findings explain the absence of magnetic monopoles and baryon number violation in standard electroweak processes, align with experimental null results, and suggest that D-branes' theoretical inconsistency challenges their physical realizability, offering testable predictions for gauge theories and deepening our understanding of their ontological implications.

1 Introduction

Magnetic monopoles, hypothetical entities carrying isolated magnetic charges (Dirac) or effective charges from field configurations ('t Hooft-Polyakov), have captivated theoretical physics since Dirac's pioneering work on their quantization [6, 24]. Their existence would symmetrize electromagnetism, mirroring the duality between electric and magnetic fields, and provide a theoretical explanation for electric charge quantization via the Dirac quantization condition, which ensures discrete electric charges in the presence of a magnetic monopole [6, 7]. Moreover, monopoles are predicted in Grand Unified Theories (GUTs), such as SU(5) or SO(10), where symmetry breaking produces effective magnetic charges, making them a critical probe for high-energy physics and cosmology [21, 22, 24, 26]. These theoretical motivations position monopoles as compelling candidates for deepening our understanding of gauge theories and fundamental interactions.

Magnetic monopoles produce a non-zero flux, $\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = g$, in the true Maxwellian **B**-field, encompassing Abelian Dirac monopoles in U(1) gauge theory, which are point-like with

$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = g\delta^3(\mathbf{r})$ [6, 7], and 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles in non-Abelian SU(2) gauge theory, which are topological solitons with a finite core and $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$ but non-zero flux at large distances [22, 26]. Emergent monopoles, such as those in spin ice materials like $Dy_2Ti_2O_7$, produce flux in an effective magnetization field, arising from spin configuration defects, not the true **B**-field, which remains divergenceless with zero flux [5, 17]. This paper focuses on fundamental magnetic monopoles, as their non-zero **B**-field flux challenges the structure of gauge theories and electromagnetic ontology.

Despite their theoretical appeal, magnetic monopoles remain undetected. Experimental searches, such as CERN's MoEDAL experiment, have set stringent upper limits on monopole flux, finding no evidence [1]. Cosmological constraints from the cosmic microwave background and galactic magnetic fields suggest monopoles, if they exist, are extremely rare [23]. Dirac monopoles require a singular gauge potential, the Dirac string, or patch-wise potentials in the Wu-Yang formulation, which are treated as mathematical artifacts in gauge-invariant frameworks [6, 32]. The 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole, being non-singular, is a soliton with a finite core [22, 26]. The physics community views magnetic monopoles as speculative, supported by theory but lacking empirical confirmation, with no consensus on their rejection.

This paper analyzes magnetic monopoles within a potential-centric ontology, where the gauge potential A_μ (or A^a_μ in non-Abelian theories), fixed in the Lorenz gauge ($\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$), is the fundamental physical entity, not the fields **E** or **B**. Inspired by the Aharonov-Bohm (AB) effect, where A_μ mediates local, continuous phase shifts in field-free regions, this ontology requires A_μ in one true gauge, the Lorenz gauge, to be unique, non-singular except at physical sources, and mediate interactions locally [2, 9]. We argue that magnetic monopoles—Dirac or 't Hooft-Polyakov—cannot exist in this framework, as they require singularities (e.g., Dirac string) or non-unique gauge potentials (e.g., Wu-Yang patches) in all gauges, violating the ontology's criteria. This no-go result extends to sphalerons in SU(2) × U(1) electroweak theory, whose field configurations, characterized by $\pi_3(\mathrm{SU}(2)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, require non-unique gauge potentials, as well as to D-branes in string theory, whose Ramond-Ramond (RR) potentials C_{p+1} exhibit an AB-like effect but require singular or non-unique potentials due to non-zero flux, leading to a theoretical self-contradiction independent of experimental evidence. However, cosmic strings, with a non-singular, single-valued A_μ in a single gauge and no Stokes' theorem contradiction, are compatible with the ontology. Instantons and skyrmions are also compatible as non-physical or emergent constructs. The result explains the asymmetry in Maxwell's equations, aligns with experimental null results, and offers testable predictions.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces magnetic monopoles, detailing the Dirac string and Wu-Yang formulations for Abelian Dirac monopoles and non-Abelian 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles. Section 3 establishes A_μ's reality in one true gauge via the AB effect, critiquing gauge-invariant paradigms for nonlocality and discontinuity. Section 4 examines the Abelian and non-Abelian monopoles, deriving a no-go result due to unphysical singularities and non-unique potentials in all gauges. Section 5 addresses counterarguments, including emergent monopoles in spin ice and the role of monopoles in charge quantization. Section 6 extends the no-go result to other topological defects, such as cosmic strings, sphalerons, instantons, and skyrmions, assessing their compatibility with the ontology. Section 7 examines D-branes, deriving their incompatibility via an AB-like effect and Stokes' theorem contradiction. Section 8 concludes with the no-go result's implications and future research directions in gauge theories and their ontology.

2 Magnetic Monopoles: Formulations and Issues

This section examines magnetic monopoles, defined as entities producing a non-zero magnetic flux, $\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = g$, in the true Maxwellian **B**-field, encompassing both Abelian Dirac monopoles and non-Abelian 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles. We present their mathematical formulations in

Abelian U(1) and non-Abelian SU(2) gauge theories, focusing on the gauge potential A_μ or A_μ^a, and discuss their potential issues.

2.1 Abelian Monopoles

This subsection introduces Abelian magnetic monopoles in U(1) gauge theory, which produce a radial magnetic field with non-zero divergence, $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = g\delta^3(\mathbf{r})$, and flux, $\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = g$. Two formulations—Dirac string and Wu-Yang patch-wise—define the vector potential $\mathbf{A}$, but both introduce singularities or non-unique potentials.

2.1.1 Dirac String Formulation

An Abelian magnetic monopole at the origin with magnetic charge g generates a radial magnetic field:

$$\mathbf{B} = \frac{g}{4\pi r^2}\hat{\mathbf{r}}, \tag{1}$$

with a non-zero divergence:

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = g\delta^3(\mathbf{r}), \tag{2}$$

violating Maxwell's equation $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$. This field mimics the electric field of a point charge ($\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} = \frac{q}{\epsilon_0}\delta^3(\mathbf{r})$) but requires a vector potential $\mathbf{A}$ such that $\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}$. The non-zero magnetic flux ($\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = g$) generated by the monopole's field prevents a unique, globally smooth vector potential $\mathbf{A}$, as it necessitates singularities or non-unique potentials to resolve the Stokes' theorem contradiction (see Eq. 28 in Section 2.3).

In spherical coordinates, a standard choice for the vector potential is:

$$\mathbf{A}_A = \frac{g}{4\pi r}\frac{1-\cos\theta}{\sin\theta}\hat{\phi}, \tag{3}$$

which is singular along the negative z-axis ($\theta = \pi$), termed the Dirac string. Away from the string,$\nabla \times \mathbf{A}_A = \frac{g}{4\pi r^2}\hat{r}$, matching the monopole field. The singularity along $\theta = \pi$ means $\nabla \times \mathbf{A}_A$ is not just the monopole field — it also includes a delta-function flux tube along the string:

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{A}_A = \mathbf{B} + g\delta(x)\delta(y)\Theta(-z)\hat{z}, \tag{4}$$

where $\Theta(-z)$ is the Heaviside step function ensuring the string only exists for $z < 0$ [24]. This flux tube adjusts the line integral $\oint_C \mathbf{A}_A \cdot d\mathbf{r}$ to match the flux through different surfaces bounded by C, resolving the Stokes' theorem contradiction (Section 2.3), while the total flux through a closed surface remains $\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = g$.

An alternative gauge yields:

$$\mathbf{A}_B = -\frac{g}{4\pi r}\frac{1+\cos\theta}{\sin\theta}\hat{\phi}, \tag{5}$$

singular along the positive z-axis ($\theta = 0$). These potentials are related by a gauge transformation, $\mathbf{A}_B = \mathbf{A}_A - \nabla\chi$, with $\chi = \frac{g}{2\pi}\phi$, which shifts the singularity's position while preserving $\mathbf{B}$. In natural units ($\hbar = c = 1$), the Dirac quantization condition:

$$qg = 2\pi n, \tag{6}$$

ensures the string's unobservability in quantum mechanics (QM).[1] For a charged particle (charge q) encircling the string along a closed loop C, the phase shift is:

[1] We set $\hbar = c = 1$ throughout this paper.

$$e^{iq\oint_C \mathbf{A}\cdot d\mathbf{r}} = e^{iqg} = e^{i2\pi n} = 1, \tag{7}$$

leaving the wave function unchanged, rendering the singularity physically undetectable [6].

In gauge-invariant paradigms, the singularity of the Dirac string is a mathematical artifact, not a physical feature, as physical predictions depend only on gauge-invariant quantities. The quantization condition (Eq. 6) ensures that the singularity does not affect observable quantities, such as scattering cross-sections or phase shifts in QM. Thus, physicists accept the Dirac string formulation as a valid model for magnetic monopoles in QM and QED, despite the singularity, as it correctly reproduces gauge-invariant predictions.

2.1.2 Wu-Yang Patch Formulation

The Dirac string formulation, while effective, introduces an explicit line singularity that complicates the vector potential's mathematical structure. The Wu-Yang patch-wise formulation, often regarded as an improvement, aims to eliminate this explicit singularity by defining non-singular but non-unique vector potentials in overlapping patches that cover the space around the monopole, ensuring the same gauge-invariant magnetic field $\mathbf{B}$ [32].

For a magnetic monopole at the origin, the Wu-Yang approach uses two patches to cover $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$, topologically equivalent to S^2:

- Patch A ($0 \le \theta < \pi/2 + \epsilon$): Covers the northern hemisphere, from the north pole ($\theta = 0$) to slightly past the equator, excluding the region near the south pole.

$$\mathbf{A}_A = \frac{g}{4\pi r} \frac{1 - \cos\theta}{\sin\theta} \hat{\phi}, \tag{8}$$

  which is non-singular for $0 \le \theta < \pi/2 + \epsilon$, except at the origin ($\mathbf{r} = 0$).

- Patch B ($\pi/2 - \epsilon < \theta \le \pi$): Covers the southern hemisphere, from slightly before the equator to the south pole ($\theta = \pi$), excluding the region near the north pole.

$$\mathbf{A}_B = -\frac{g}{4\pi r} \frac{1 + \cos\theta}{\sin\theta} \hat{\phi}, \tag{9}$$

  which is non-singular for $\pi/2 - \epsilon < \theta \le \pi$, except at the origin.

In the overlap region ($\pi/2 - \epsilon < \theta < \pi/2 + \epsilon$), the potentials are related by a gauge transformation:

$$\mathbf{A}_B = \mathbf{A}_A - \nabla\chi, \quad \chi = \frac{g}{2\pi}\phi, \tag{10}$$

where χ is the gauge function. Although χ is multi-valued ($\chi(\phi + 2\pi) = \chi(\phi) + g$), the quantization condition (Eq. 6) guarantees that the phase shift $e^{iq(\chi(\phi+2\pi)-\chi(\phi))} = e^{iqg} = e^{i2\pi n} = 1$, ensuring the wave function is single-valued, maintaining physical consistency across patches.

The Wu-Yang formulation eliminates the Dirac string's explicit singularity, as each vector potential ($\mathbf{A}_A$, $\mathbf{A}_B$) is well-defined and non-singular within its respective patch, covering $\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\{0\}$ without an explicit Dirac string [24]. However, a closer examination reveals that the formulation also introduces several potenial issues not always emphasized in the literature [24]. First, the need for multiple patches (e.g., northern and southern hemispheres) to cover S^2 results in non-unique gauge potentials, as the choice between $\mathbf{A}_A$ and $\mathbf{A}_B$ is ambiguous in the overlap region ($\pi/2 - \epsilon < \theta < \pi/2 + \epsilon$). Since $\mathbf{A}_A$ and $\mathbf{A}_B$ are different in all gauges, the ambiguity is universal, independently of the choice of gauge. Second, in the AB effect, a loop crossing the overlap region incurs a phase shift of g due to the gauge switch, disrupting continuous phase accumulation and depending on a non-physical boundary, although the phase shift is unobservable due to the Dirac quantization condition. Finally, the choice of patch boundaries in the Wu-Yang formulation, like the position of the Dirac string, is arbitrary, and different patch configurations yield equivalent magnetic fields but distinct vector potentials $\mathbf{A}_A$ and $\mathbf{A}_B$. These issues will be analyzed in detail in the potential-centric ontology in Section 4.2.

The physics community views the Wu-Yang formulation as a refined approach due to the absence of an explicit Dirac string in the vector potentials [24]. The above issues with the potentials are considered mathematical artifacts, as only gauge-invariant quantities such as $\mathbf{B}$ and the AB phase shift are physical observables. Consequently, physicists accept the Wu-Yang formulation as a valid model for magnetic monopoles, equivalent to the Dirac string formulation in its physical predictions, despite its mathematical intricacies [32].

2.1.3 Summary of Abelian Monopole Issues

The Dirac string and Wu-Yang formulations describe Abelian monopoles with $\mathbf{B} = \frac{g}{4\pi r^2}\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ and $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = g\delta^3(\mathbf{r})$. The Dirac string introduces a line singularity, while Wu-Yang uses non-singular but non-unique potentials. In gauge-invariant paradigms, these are mathematical artifacts, and they do not affect physical predictions.

2.2 Non-Abelian Monopoles

This subsection examines the non-Abelian 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole in SU(2) gauge theory, classified as a fundamental magnetic monopole due to its non-zero flux, $\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = g_m$, despite being a soliton with $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$. We present its standard and Dirac string-like formulations, showing that all require singularities or non-unique potentials as Abelian monopoles do.

2.2.1 't Hooft-Polyakov Standard Formulation

The 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole is a topological soliton in non-Abelian SU(2) gauge theory with a Higgs field in the adjoint representation, producing a non-zero magnetic flux, $\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = g_m$, through a closed surface surrounding the monopole [22, 24, 26]. Unlike the Dirac monopole, which is point-like with $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = g\delta^3(\mathbf{r})$, the 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole is a smooth field configuration with a finite core, resembling a Dirac monopole at large distances. This subsection outlines its mathematical structure, emphasizing the gauge potential A^a_μ, the Higgs field ϕ^a, and the origin of its magnetic charge $g_m = \frac{4\pi}{e}$, which aligns with our definition of magnetic monopoles due to its non-zero flux in the Maxwellian $\mathbf{B}$-field.

In SU(2) gauge theory, the gauge potential A^a_μ (with $a = 1, 2, 3$ labeling the SU(2) generators) and the Higgs field ϕ^a in the adjoint representation are governed by the Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}F^a_{\mu\nu}F^{a\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}(D_\mu\phi^a)(D^\mu\phi^a) - V(\phi^a), \tag{11}$$

where $F^a_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A^a_\nu - \partial_\nu A^a_\mu + e\epsilon^{abc}A^b_\mu A^c_\nu$ is the field strength tensor, $D_\mu\phi^a = \partial_\mu\phi^a + e\epsilon^{abc}A^b_\mu\phi^c$ is the covariant derivative, e is the SU(2) gauge coupling, and $V(\phi^a) = \frac{\lambda}{4}(|\phi|^2 - v^2)^2$ is the Higgs potential, with v the vacuum expectation value and $|\phi|^2 = \phi^a\phi^a$. The Higgs field acquires a non-zero vacuum expectation value, $|\phi| = v$, breaking SU(2) to U(1), enabling monopole solutions.

The 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole is a static, spherically symmetric solution centered at the origin. In spherical coordinates, the ansatz for the fields is:

$$\phi^a = \hat{r}^a \frac{vH(er)}{er}, \quad A^a_i = \epsilon_{ijk}\hat{r}^j \frac{K(er) - 1}{er}\delta^{ak}, \quad A^a_0 = 0, \tag{12}$$

where $\hat{r}^a = x^a/r$, $H(er)$ and $K(er)$ are profile functions.[2] Boundary conditions shape the field configuration: at $r \to \infty$, $H(er) \to er$, so $\phi^a \to v\hat{r}^a$, and $K(er) \to 0$, so $A^a_i \to 0$; at

[2] The gauge potential A^a_μ is defined with $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ (temporal and spatial indices) and $a = 1, 2, 3$ (SU(2) gauge indices). For the static 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole, we set $A^a_0 = 0$, and the spatial components are

$r \to 0$, $H(0) = 0$, $K(0) = 1$, ensuring regularity at the origin ($r = 0$), as the Higgs field vanishes smoothly, avoiding a point-like singularity. The Higgs field's direction in isospin space, $\hat{\phi}^a = \phi^a/|\phi|$, maps the spatial sphere S^2 at large r to the vacuum manifold $S^2 \approx \mathrm{SU}(2)/\mathrm{U}(1)$, yielding a non-trivial winding number classified by the homotopy group $\pi_2(\mathrm{SU}(2)/\mathrm{U}(1)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$.

The effective magnetic field is defined via the Higgs field's direction:

$$B_i = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ijk}\hat{\phi}^a F^{ajk}, \quad \hat{\phi}^a = \frac{\phi^a}{|\phi|}, \tag{13}$$

where F^a_{jk} is the spatial field strength. At large distances ($r \gg 1/(ev)$), the field approximates:

$$B_i \approx \frac{g_m}{4\pi r^2}\hat{r}_i, \quad g_m = \frac{4\pi}{e}, \tag{14}$$

resembling a Dirac monopole's field with magnetic charge $g_m = 4\pi/e$, satisfying the Dirac quantization condition $qg_m = 4\pi n$ for an integer n, consistent with the topological structure of the SU(2) gauge theory. The magnetic flux through a closed surface S at large r is:

$$\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = g_m = \frac{4\pi}{e}, \tag{15}$$

confirming its status as a magnetic monopole per our definition. The divergence of the effective magnetic field, $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B}$, is zero everywhere, including inside and outside the monopole's core, distinguishing it from the Dirac monopole's $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = g\delta^3(\mathbf{r})$. The divergence is computed as:

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = \partial_i B_i = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ijk}\partial_i \left(\hat{\phi}^a F^{ajk}\right). \tag{16}$$

Using the Bianchi identity, $D_\mu F^{a\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu F^{a\mu\nu} + e\epsilon^{abc}A^b_\mu F^{c\mu\nu} = 0$, and the smoothness of $\hat{\phi}^a$ (since $|\phi| \neq 0$ except at the origin, where regularity ensures no singularity), it follows that $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$ everywhere, as the field strength and Higgs field are smooth.

The non-zero magnetic flux ($\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = \frac{4\pi}{e}$) arises from the special configuration of the Higgs field in the 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole, resulting in a non-trivial SU(2) gauge bundle over S^2, classified by $\pi_2(S^2) \cong \mathbb{Z}$. To define a consistent U(1) gauge potential for electromagnetic interactions, the gauge field is projected onto the U(1) subgroup defined by $\hat{\phi}^a$:

$$A_i = A^a_i \hat{\phi}^a, \tag{17}$$

yielding an effective Abelian potential. However, the non-trivial topology requires multiple patches to cover S^2, analogous to the Wu-Yang formulation. In two patches (e.g., northern and southern hemispheres), the gauge fields $A^{a(A)}_i$ and $A^{a(B)}_i$ and Higgs fields $\hat{\phi}^{a(A)}$, $\hat{\phi}^{a(B)}$ are related by a transition function $U \in \mathrm{SU}(2)$:

$$\hat{\phi}^{a(B)} = U\hat{\phi}^{a(A)}U^{-1}, \quad A^{a(B)}_i = UA^{a(A)}_i U^{-1} - \frac{i}{e}(\partial_i U)U^{-1}, \tag{18}$$

For a monopole with winding number $n = 1$, a typical transition function is:

$$U = \exp\left(i\frac{\phi n}{2}\tau^3\right), \tag{19}$$

where τ^3 is the third Pauli matrix. This function is multi-valued:

$$U(\phi + 2\pi) = U(\phi)(-I) = -U(\phi), \tag{20}$$

denoted A^a_i (Eq. 12), where i, j, k are spatial indices and the Levi-Civita symbol ϵ_{ijk} follows the convention with lower indices.

since $\exp(i\pi\tau^3) = -I$. The effective potential $A_i = A_i^a \hat{\phi}^a$ in each patch differs by a gauge transformation.

This patch-wise formulation of non-Abelian monopoles, like the Wu-Yang formulation of Abelian monopoles, also introduces several similar issues. First, the choice between $A_i^{a(A)}$ and $A_i^{a(B)}$ is ambiguous at the patch boundary, yielding non-unique A_i^a for the same spacetime region. Second, in the non-Abelian AB effect, a Wilson loop crossing the boundary incurs a phase shift of g_m due to the gauge switch, disrupting continuous phase accumulation and depending on a non-physical boundary. Finally, the choice of patch boundaries is arbitrary, and different patch configurations yield distinct gauge potentials $A_i^{a(A)}$ and $A_i^{a(B)}$.

2.2.2 Dirac String Formulation for 't Hooft-Polyakov Monopoles

The standard patch-wise formulation of 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles (Eq. 12) uses smooth potentials $A_i^{a(N)}$, $A_i^{a(S)}$ with a transition function $U = \exp(i\phi\tau^3/2)$, ensuring regularity at the origin ($H(0) = 0$, $K(0) = 1$) and a finite core ($r \sim 1/(ev)$). However, this smoothness is gauge-dependent. An alternative singular gauge can eliminate patches, using a unique potential with a Dirac string-like singularity, preserving gauge-invariant predictions.

Consider a gauge where $\phi^{a\prime} \approx (0, 0, v)$ at large r, via a transformation U aligning $\phi^a \approx \hat{r}^a v$. The gauge potential is:

$$A_i^{a\prime} = \hat{e}_3^a \frac{g_m}{4\pi r} \frac{1 - \cos\theta}{\sin\theta} \hat{\phi}_i K'(er), \quad g_m = \frac{4\pi}{e}, \tag{21}$$

with $\hat{e}_3^a = (0, 0, 1)$, $K'(0) = 1$, $K'(er) \to 1$, ensuring regularity at $r = 0$. The Higgs field is:

$$\phi^{a\prime} = \hat{e}_3^a v \frac{H(er)}{er}. \tag{22}$$

The effective potential:

$$A_i' = A_i^{a\prime} \hat{\phi}^{a\prime} \approx \frac{g_m}{4\pi r} \frac{1 - \cos\theta}{\sin\theta} \hat{\phi}_i, \tag{23}$$

is singular along $\theta = \pi$. The field strength gives:

$$B_i' \approx \frac{g_m}{4\pi r^2} \hat{r}_i, \tag{24}$$

and the line integral $\oint_C A_i' dx^i \approx \frac{g_m}{2}(1 - \cos\theta_0)$ resolves the Stokes' contradiction (Section 2.3) in a single patch. The equations of motion (Eq. 11) are satisfied with appropriate $H(er)$, $K'(er)$, preserving the finite core and gauge-invariant quantities (e.g., flux, energy density).

This singular gauge is equivalent to the patch-wise formulation, as both describe the same soliton, with identical gauge-invariant predictions. The singular gauge avoids non-uniqueness by using a unified $A_\mu^{a\prime}$, but introduces a singularity along $\theta = \pi$.

2.2.3 Summary of Non-Abelian Monopole Issues

The physics community accepts the 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole as a valid model for magnetic monopoles in non-Abelian gauge theories, particularly in GUTs, due to its non-singular fields and quantized magnetic charge [24]. The non-unique, patch-dependent gauge potentials in the standard formulation are treated as mathematical artifacts, as only gauge-invariant quantities such as the magnetic flux or scattering amplitudes are physical observables. This contrasts with our potential-centric ontology (Section 3), which scrutinizes the physical reality of A_μ^a, highlighting the non-uniqueness and topological defects as barriers to magnetic monopoles.

2.3 Non-Zero Flux and Stokes' Theorem Contradiction

This subsection examines the topological implications of magnetic monopoles, defined by their non-zero magnetic flux, $\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = g$, in the true Maxwellian **B**-field, encompassing Abelian Dirac monopoles and non-Abelian 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles. The non-zero flux induces a Stokes' theorem contradiction when defining the gauge potential **A** for Abelian monopoles or the effective potential $A_i = A_i^a \hat{\phi}^a$ for non-Abelian monopoles, necessitating singularities or non-unique potentials in all formulations. We analyze this contradiction for both monopole types, highlighting how their resolutions—via Dirac strings, Wu-Yang patches, or SU(2) transition functions—introduce defects incompatible with the potential-centric ontology's requirements (Section 3).

Magnetic monopoles produce a radial magnetic field at large distances, $\mathbf{B} \approx \frac{g}{4\pi r^2}\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ for Abelian Dirac monopoles (Eq. 1) and $\mathbf{B} \approx \frac{g_m}{4\pi r^2}\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ with $g_m = \frac{4\pi}{e}$ for 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles (Eq. 14). The flux through a closed surface S, such as a sphere of radius R, is:

$$\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{\pi} \frac{g}{4\pi R^2}(R^2 \sin\theta \, d\theta \, d\phi) = g, \tag{25}$$

for Dirac monopoles, and similarly g_m for 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles (Eq. 55). For Dirac monopoles, the divergence is:

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = g\delta^3(\mathbf{r}), \tag{26}$$

violating Maxwell's $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$, and the divergence theorem relates the flux to the source:

$$\int_V (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B}) \, dV = g = \oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S}, \tag{27}$$

where V encloses the origin. For 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles, $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$ everywhere due to the Bianchi identity and smooth Higgs field (Eq. 16), yet the non-zero flux arises from the Higgs field's configuration, which has a non-trivial winding number classified by $\pi_2(\mathrm{SU}(2)/\mathrm{U}(1)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$.

Stokes' theorem requires that for a surface S_C bounded by a closed loop C:

$$\oint_C \mathbf{A} \cdot d\mathbf{r} = \int_{S_C} (\nabla \times \mathbf{A}) \cdot d\mathbf{S} = \int_{S_C} \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S}, \tag{28}$$

where **A** is the Abelian potential, or for non-Abelian monopoles, the effective potential $A_i = A_i^a \hat{\phi}^a$ (Eq. 17). However, the non-zero flux causes the integral $\int_{S_C} \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S}$ to depend on the surface chosen for a given C. Consider a loop C at radius r and polar angle $\theta = \theta_0$, parameterized by $\phi \in [0, 2\pi]$. Two surfaces bounded by C yield different fluxes:

- **Northern cap** (S_N, $\theta : 0 \to \theta_0$):

$$\int_{S_N} \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{\theta_0} \frac{g}{4\pi r^2}(r^2 \sin\theta \, d\theta \, d\phi) = \frac{g}{2}(1 - \cos\theta_0). \tag{29}$$

- **Southern cap** (S_S, $\theta : \theta_0 \to \pi$):

$$\int_{S_S} \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_{\theta_0}^{\pi} \frac{g}{4\pi r^2}(-r^2 \sin\theta \, d\theta \, d\phi) = -\frac{g}{2}(1 + \cos\theta_0). \tag{30}$$

The flux difference:

$$\int_{S_N} \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} - \int_{S_S} \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = g, \tag{31}$$

is non-zero, violating Stokes' theorem unless $\mathbf{A}$ is singular or defined patch-wise in all gauges to offset the gauge-invariant flux difference. This contradiction arises because $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$ is not simply connected, and the non-zero flux prevents a globally smooth, unique gauge potential $\mathbf{A}$ for Abelian monopoles or effective potential $A_i = A_i^a \hat{\phi}^a$ for non-Abelian monopoles.

For Abelian Dirac monopoles, the Dirac string formulation resolves the contradiction using a singular potential, e.g.:

$$\mathbf{A}_A = \frac{g}{4\pi r} \frac{1 - \cos\theta}{\sin\theta} \hat{\phi}, \tag{32}$$

singular along $\theta = \pi$. The line integral:

$$\oint_C \mathbf{A}_A \cdot d\mathbf{r} = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{g}{4\pi r} \frac{1 - \cos\theta_0}{\sin\theta_0} (r \sin\theta_0 d\phi) = \frac{g}{2}(1 - \cos\theta_0), \tag{33}$$

matches the northern cap's flux (Eq. 29). The Dirac string contributes additional flux for the southern cap, adjusting the integral (30) to:

$$-\frac{g}{2}(1 + \cos\theta_0) + g = \oint_C \mathbf{A}_A \cdot d\mathbf{r}, \tag{34}$$

making the fluxes through the two caps identical and thus resolving the contradiction. The Dirac quantization condition (Eq. 6) ensures unobservability. The Wu-Yang formulation uses non-singular potentials (Eqs. 8, 9):

$$\mathbf{A}_A = \frac{g}{4\pi r} \frac{1 - \cos\theta}{\sin\theta} \hat{\phi}, \quad (0 \leq \theta < \pi/2 + \epsilon), \tag{35}$$

$$\mathbf{A}_B = -\frac{g}{4\pi r} \frac{1 + \cos\theta}{\sin\theta} \hat{\phi}, \quad (\pi/2 - \epsilon < \theta \leq \pi), \tag{36}$$

related by:

$$\mathbf{A}_B = \mathbf{A}_A - \nabla\chi, \quad \chi = \frac{g}{2\pi}\phi. \tag{37}$$

The line integrals match the northern and southern fluxes, with $\nabla\chi$ contributing additional flux:

$$\oint_C \nabla\chi \cdot d\mathbf{r} = g, \tag{38}$$

resolving the contradiction, but leading to a non-unique, patch-dependent $\mathbf{A}$.

For 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles, the standard formulation defines smooth A_i^a and $\hat{\phi}^a$ in patches, with transition functions:

$$\hat{\phi}^{a(B)} = U \hat{\phi}^{a(A)} U^{-1}, \quad A_i^{a(B)} = U A_i^{a(A)} U^{-1} - \frac{i}{e}(\partial_i U) U^{-1}, \tag{39}$$

where $U = \exp(i\frac{\phi}{2}\tau^3)$ is multi-valued (Eq. 20). The effective potential $A_i = A_i^a \hat{\phi}^a$ yields a flux difference:

$$\oint_C (A_i^{a(A)} \hat{\phi}^{a(A)} - A_i^{a(B)} \hat{\phi}^{a(B)}) dx^i = g_m, \tag{40}$$

resolving the contradiction, but leading to a non-unique, patch-dependent A_i^a. The singular gauge formulation introduces a Dirac string-like singularity, with:

$$A_i' \approx \frac{g_m}{4\pi r} \frac{1 - \cos\theta}{\sin\theta} \hat{\phi}_i, \tag{41}$$

matching one cap's flux, with the singularity contributing the difference, analogous to the Abelian case.

To sum up, the non-zero magnetic flux, arising from the field configurations classified by $\pi_2(S^2) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, necessitates singular or non-unique potentials in all gauges to resolve the Stokes' theorem contradiction. In gauge-invariant paradigms, these defects are artifacts, as observables depend on gauge-invariant quantities.

2.4 Summary

This section analyzed magnetic monopoles, characterized by non-zero magnetic flux ($\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = g$) in the Maxwellian $\mathbf{B}$-field, encompassing Abelian Dirac monopoles and non-Abelian 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles. For Dirac monopoles, the Dirac string formulation (Section 2.1.1) introduces a line singularity in the vector potential, e.g., $\mathbf{A}_A = \frac{g}{4\pi r} \frac{1-\cos\theta}{\sin\theta} \hat{\phi}$, along $\theta = \pi$, while the Wu-Yang formulation (Section 2.1.2) uses non-singular but non-unique potentials in overlapping patches, connected by a gauge function $\chi = \frac{g}{2\pi}\phi$. For 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles (Section 2.2), the standard formulation employs smooth gauge potentials $\mathbf{A}^a$ and Higgs fields in patches with SU(2) transition functions, e.g., $U = \exp(i\frac{\phi}{2}\tau^3)$, while a singular gauge introduces a Dirac string-like singularity. The Stokes' theorem contradiction (Section 2.3), driven by the non-zero flux and topology $\pi_2(S^2) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, necessitates these singularities or non-unique potentials in all formulations, as the gauge-invariant flux through different surfaces bounded by the same loop differs, precluding a globally smooth, unique gauge potential $\mathbf{A}$ in all gauges for Abelian monopoles or effective potential $A_i = A_i^a \hat{\phi}^a$ for non-Abelian monopoles.

In gauge-invariant paradigms, these singular and non-unique gauge potentials are mathematical artifacts, as physical observables depend only on gauge-invariant quantiyies such as $\mathbf{B}$ or the AB phase, with the Dirac quantization condition ($qg = 2\pi n$) ensuring unobservability. However, these defects are incompatible with our potential-centric ontology (Section 3), where A_μ or A_μ^a in the Lorenz gauge must be unique, non-singular except at physical sources, and mediate local interactions.

3 Reality of Gauge Potentials via the AB Effect

The AB effect is a pivotal quantum phenomenon where electromagnetic potentials influence a charged particle's behavior even in regions where the electromagnetic fields vanish [2, 28]. In my recent analysis [9], I argue that traditional gauge-invariant explanations of this effect—relying on quantities like the magnetic flux Φ or field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$—are fundamentally flawed and can be excluded due to issues of nonlocality, discontinuity, and incompleteness. Here, I outline the AB effect, present these critiques in detail, and propose that the gauge potential A_μ, fixed in one true gauge, the Lorenz gauge, is the physically real entity mediating the effect [9].

3.1 The AB Effect and Its Generalized Form

Consider a standard magnetic AB setup where electrons travel around a long, tightly wound solenoid carrying a magnetic field $\mathbf{B}$, confined entirely within its interior. Outside the solenoid, $\mathbf{B} = 0$, yet the vector potential $\mathbf{A}$ is non-zero, satisfying $\nabla \times \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B}$. When two electron beams travel along paths C_1 and C_2 encircling the solenoid and recombine, they exhibit an interference pattern shifted by a phase difference:

$$\phi_{AB} = e \oint_C \mathbf{A} \cdot d\mathbf{r} = e\Phi, \tag{42}$$

where $C = C_1 - C_2$ is the closed loop, e is the electron's charge, and $\Phi = \int \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S}$ is the magnetic flux through the enclosed area. This shift occurs despite $\mathbf{B} = 0$ along the paths, as confirmed experimentally [28].

A generalized version of the magnetic AB effect extends this phenomenon to dynamic scenarios, where the flux $\Phi(t)$ varies over time, offering a richer testbed for analyzing gauge-invariant accounts. The phase accumulates over a period T as:

$$\phi_{AB} = \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T e\Phi(t)\,dt, \tag{43}$$

in the quasistatic domain, reflecting a continuous buildup driven by the changing electromagnetic environment [8]. This temporal extension highlights the effect's dynamic nature, amplifying the demand for a physical mediator beyond static Φ or $F_{\mu\nu}$.

Complementing its magnetic counterpart, the electric AB effect showcases the quantum influence of the scalar potential A_0 in regions where $\mathbf{E} = -\nabla A_0 - \partial\mathbf{A}/\partial t = 0$, encompassing both static and time-varying scenarios. The time-varying case mirrors the dynamic framework of the generalized magnetic AB effect, emphasizing the continuous accumulation of phase over time. Moreover, this continuous phase accumulation offers an advantage over the magnetic AB effect. While a time-varying $\Phi(t)$ induces $\mathbf{E} = -\partial\mathbf{A}/\partial t$, perturbing trajectories, the electric AB effect maintains $\mathbf{E} = 0$ along the paths via shielding, despite $A_0(t)$'s variation inducing fields elsewhere. This eliminates trajectory shifts, making the phase's gradual accrual a pure manifestation of $A_0(t)$, offering a cleaner probe of potential-driven dynamics. In the following, however, I will mainly analyze the magnetic AB effect, since its standard form has been confirmed by experiments and also widely discussed in literature. For convenience, I will just say the AB effect or the generalized AB effect in brief.

3.2 Gauge-Invariant Quantities in QM

To assess the gauge-invariant accounts, we first define the complete set of gauge-invariant quantities for an electron in QM, as I detailed previously in [9]. For an electron of mass m and charge e, with wave function $\psi = Re^{iS}$, these include the probability density $\rho = |\psi|^2$ and velocity field $\mathbf{v} = \frac{1}{m}(\nabla S - e\mathbf{A})$ (see also [30]). In electromagnetic fields, the field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$ (yielding $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$) and integrals like magnetic flux Φ are also gauge-invariant, unchanged under $A_\mu \to A_\mu - \partial_\mu\chi$. This set—$\rho$, $\mathbf{v}$, $F_{\mu\nu}$, and Φ—is deemed sufficient by proponents to describe observable dynamics without A_μ. The AB effect, however, tests this claim's limits, as the following critiques reveal.

3.3 Dynamics of Gauge-Invariant Quantities

Consider the standard AB setup: two electron beams encircle a solenoid with constant magnetic flux Φ, recombining to interfere. Before overlap, each beam travels in a simply connected, field-free region ($\mathbf{B} = 0$), where a gauge choice $\mathbf{A} = 0$ is possible. In this gauge, the Schrödinger equation reduces to the free form, and the solutions ψ_1 and ψ_2 for each beam match those of a free electron, implying ρ and $\mathbf{v}$ are independent of Φ. This holds because, in each path, the gauge transformation adjusts the phase locally, leaving gauge-invariant properties unchanged.

However, after the beams overlap, forming a closed loop C around the solenoid, $\mathbf{A} = 0$ cannot be chosen globally due to the nonzero flux $\Phi = \oint_C \mathbf{A}\cdot d\mathbf{r}$. The interference pattern shifts by:

$$\phi_{AB} = e\oint_C \mathbf{A}\cdot d\mathbf{r} = e\Phi, \tag{44}$$

and the velocity satisfies

$$\oint_C \mathbf{v}\cdot d\mathbf{r} = \oint_C \frac{1}{m}(\nabla S - e\mathbf{A})\cdot d\mathbf{r} = -e\Phi \tag{45}$$

reflecting Φ's influence. Consequently, $\mathbf{v}$ and ρ (via the continuity equation $\partial_t\rho + \nabla\cdot(\rho\mathbf{v}) = 0$) abruptly depend on Φ at overlap, despite being Φ-independent beforehand.

3.4 Problems with Gauge-Invariant Explanations

The gauge-invariant approach to the AB effect aims to explain the effect without invoking A_μ directly, using quantities like Φ, $F_{\mu\nu}$, or the velocity field $\mathbf{v}$. I identify three critical flaws [9], detailed below.

3.4.1 Nonlocality

The gauge-invariant approach's reliance on Φ introduces a nonlocality problem. The phase $\phi_{AB} = e\Phi$ depends on flux inside the solenoid, spatially separated from the electron paths, yet $F_{\mu\nu} = 0$ outside provides no local mediator. Moreover, the approach posits (by its dynamics) that the phase ϕ_{AB} emerges instantaneously at the point of interference, reflecting an action at a distance on the electron despite its confinement to a field-free region—a proposition that strains the causal architecture of special relativity, which insists that physical effects propagate no faster than the speed of light. Such an unmediated action across space suggests a reality where distant entities can affect one another without a local intermediary, a notion that sits uneasily with the principle of locality.

3.4.2 Discontinuity

This nonlocality manifests as discontinuity in the electron's dynamics. Before reaching the interference region, the gauge-invariant properties of the electron, ρ and $\mathbf{v}$, evolve freely, independently of Φ. At interference, ρ and $\mathbf{v}$, and thus ϕ_{AB}, suddenly reflect Φ, with no gradual transition. In the time-varying case, ρ and $\mathbf{v}$ remain unaffected until overlap, despite $\Phi(t)$'s continuous change. This sudden shift stands in stark contrast to the expectation in QM that physical states evolve smoothly unless perturbed by local interactions—a principle of continuity that underpins the theory's predictive coherence.

3.4.3 Incompleteness

This discontinuity underscores an incompleteness in the gauge-invariant framework. The set $\{\rho, \mathbf{v}, F_{\mu\nu}, \Phi\}$ cannot explain the phase's continuous accrual. In the generalized AB effect, ϕ_{AB} builds up as $\Phi(t)$ varies, yet Φ or $F_{\mu\nu}$ (zero outside the solenoid) offers no mechanism for this along the paths. The Madelung equations illustrate this [9, 10]:

- Continuity: $\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v}) = 0$,
- Momentum: $m\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial t} = e(\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}) - m(\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{v} - \nabla U$,

where $U = -\frac{1}{m}\frac{\nabla^2 R}{R}$ is the quantum potential. With $\mathbf{B} = 0$ and $\mathbf{E} = 0$ outside, these equations predict no Φ-dependence until interference, resolved only by a nonlocal quantization condition $m \oint_C \mathbf{v} \cdot d\mathbf{r} = 2\pi n - e\Phi$. This leaves the local, temporal process unexplained, rendering the account incomplete.

3.5 A No-Go Result for Gauge-Invariant Explanations

The above critiques expose the flaws of gauge-invariant explanations—nonlocality, discontinuity, and incompleteness—but a stronger result emerges from the generalized AB effect's dynamic nature [8]. It is demonstrated that these explanations are not merely inadequate but fundamentally excluded, as their reliance on an instantaneous phase shift at interference clashes with the continuous phase accumulation observed in the time-varying flux scenario. Here, I summarize this no-go result.

The proof centers on two propositions: (1) Gauge-invariant accounts—relying on quantities like Φ, $F_{\mu\nu}$, or $\mathbf{v}$—posit that the phase ϕ_{AB} emerges only at beam overlap, as ρ and $\mathbf{v}$ show no Φ-dependence beforehand; (2) The generalized AB effect, with $\Phi(t)$ varying, yields $\phi_{AB} = \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T e\Phi(t)\,dt$, a phase that accrues continuously along the paths, not instantaneously, depending on $\Phi(t)$'s profile over $0 \leq t \leq T$. These are incompatible: if ϕ_{AB} builds over time as quantum mechanics predicts, an abrupt shift at interference cannot hold. Gauge-invariant quantities, insensitive to this process before overlap, fail to explain the effect, excluding them as viable.

3.6 The Reality of Gauge Potentials

The issues of gauge-invariant explanations stem from sidelining A_μ. In the Schrödinger equation, A_μ enters via the minimal coupling $i\partial_\mu \to i\partial_\mu - eA_\mu$, shifting the phase locally along each path:

$$S \to S - e\int_L A_\mu\,dx^\mu, \tag{46}$$

where L is the particle's trajectory. The phase difference $\phi_{AB} = e\int_{C_1} A_\mu\,dx^\mu - e\int_{C_2} A_\mu\,dx^\mu = e\oint_C A_\mu\,dx^\mu$ accrues continuously, respecting locality and spacetime's smoothness. In the generalized case, $A_\mu(x,t)$ tracks $\Phi(t)$'s evolution pointwise, ensuring consistency.

Since A_μ is gauge-dependent, the no-go result for gauge-invariant explanations implies that there must exist one true gauge in which A_μ is fixed and represents the state of reality and mediates local, continuous phase shifts in field-free regions in the AB effect. I propose that the true gauge is the Lorenz gauge ($\partial^\mu A_\mu = 0$), where A_μ satisfies the wave equation $\Box A_\mu = J_\mu$ (coupled to the source current J_μ) [9]. Imposing this gauge condition and boundary conditions (e.g., $A^\mu \to 0$ at infinity) can fix A_μ uniquely. This determinacy ensures A_μ as a unambiguous descriptor of reality, a prerequisite for its physical significance. Moreover, this choice also aligns with QED's relativistic covariance and ensures A_μ is a physical field over spacetime, not a mere mathematical artifact. Gauge-invariant quantities like Φ or $F_{\mu\nu}$ derive from A_μ, but only A_μ captures the AB effect's local, continuous origin.

3.7 Summary

The AB effect reveals the fundamental limitations of gauge-invariant accounts, which rely on quantities like the magnetic flux Φ, field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$, or velocity field $\mathbf{v}$, to explain the phase shift $\phi_{AB} = e\oint_C A_\mu dx^\mu$. These accounts suffer from nonlocality, as the phase depends on Φ inside the solenoid despite $F_{\mu\nu} = 0$ along the electron's paths; discontinuity, as ρ and $\mathbf{v}$ abruptly reflect Φ only at interference; and incompleteness, as they fail to account for the continuous phase accrual in the generalized AB effect with time-varying $\Phi(t)$. In contrast, our potential-centric ontology posits that the gauge potential A_μ, fixed in the Lorenz gauge ($\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$), is the physical reality mediating the AB effect. By locally and continuously coupling to the electron's wave function via minimal coupling ($i\partial_\mu \to i\partial_\mu - eA_\mu$), A_μ ensures a smooth, local phase evolution, resolving the issues of gauge-invariant accounts. This framework, supported by the AB effect's experimental confirmation, underscores A_μ's role as the fundamental entity in electromagnetism, setting the stage for analyzing magnetic monopoles' compatibility in subsequent sections.

4 A No-Go Result for Magnetic Monopoles

This section evaluates magnetic monopoles—Abelian Dirac monopoles and non-Abelian 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles, defined by their non-zero magnetic flux ($\oint_S \mathbf{B}\cdot d\mathbf{S} = g$) in the Maxwellian $\mathbf{B}$-field—within our potential-centric ontology, where the gauge potential A_μ (or A^a_μ) in the Lorenz gauge ($\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$) is the fundamental physical reality, mediating local, continuous interactions (Section 3). We demonstrate that both monopole types, in their Dirac string and patch-wise formulations (Sections 2.1, 2.2), introduce unphysical singularities or non-uniqueness in all gauges, violating the ontology's requirements for a unique, non-singular A_μ or A_μ^a in one true gauge except at physical sources. These defects lead to a no-go result for magnetic monopoles.

4.1 Problems of the Dirac String Formulation

The Dirac string formulation, applied to both Abelian Dirac monopoles and 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles in a singular gauge, introduces a line singularity in the gauge potential A_μ or effective Abelian potential $A_i = A_i^a \hat{\phi}^a$, respectively. In the potential-centric ontology, where the gauge potential in the Lorenz gauge must be unique, non-singular except at physical sources, and mediate local, continuous interactions (Section 3), this formulation introduces two critical issues: an unphysical line singularity and an indeterminate singularity position, both violating the ontology's requirements [9].

4.1.1 Unphysical Singularity

For an Abelian Dirac monopole at the origin with magnetic charge g, the magnetic field is $\mathbf{B} = \frac{g}{4\pi r^2}\hat{\mathbf{r}}$, with $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = g\delta^3(\mathbf{r})$ (Eq. 1, 26). The vector potential, e.g.:

$$\mathbf{A}_A = \frac{g}{4\pi r}\frac{1-\cos\theta}{\sin\theta}\hat{\phi}, \tag{47}$$

is singular along the negative z-axis ($\theta = \pi$), known as the Dirac string (Section 2.1.1). With $A_0 = 0$, the Lorenz gauge condition ($\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} = 0$) holds except at the singularity, where the divergence is undefined ($\sin\theta \to 0$). In QED, the interaction Hamiltonian density:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} = -e\bar{\psi}\gamma^i A_i \psi, \tag{48}$$

couples $\mathbf{A}$ to the fermion current. Along the Dirac string, $\mathbf{A}_A \approx \frac{g}{4\pi r \sin\theta}\hat{\phi}$ diverges as $\sin\theta \to 0$, leading to infinite energy density where $\bar{\psi}\psi \neq 0$, such as in scattering processes or quantum states near the string. Unlike the electric potential $A_0 = \frac{q}{4\pi\epsilon_0 r}$, singular only at the physical source ($\nabla^2 A_0 = -\frac{q}{\epsilon_0}\delta^3(\mathbf{r})$), the Dirac string's line singularity lacks a physical magnetic current, rendering this infinite energy unphysical.

For 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles in a singular gauge (Section 2.2.2), the effective magnetic field is $\mathbf{B} \approx \frac{g_m}{4\pi r^2}\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ with $g_m = \frac{4\pi}{e}$ at large distances (Eq. 14), and $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$ due to the Bianchi identity (Eq. 16). The gauge potential in a singular gauge is:

$$A_i^{a\prime} = \hat{e}_3^a \frac{g_m}{4\pi r}\frac{1-\cos\theta}{\sin\theta}\hat{\phi}_i K'(gr), \tag{49}$$

with $\hat{e}_3^a = (0,0,1)$, $K'(gr) \to 1$ at large r, and the effective U(1) potential:

$$A_i' = A_i^{a\prime}\hat{\phi}^{a\prime} \approx \frac{g_m}{4\pi r}\frac{1-\cos\theta}{\sin\theta}\hat{\phi}_i, \tag{50}$$

is singular along $\theta = \pi$ (Section 2.2.2). The non-Abelian interaction term, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} = -g\bar{\psi}\gamma^i T^a A_i^a \psi$, where T^a are SU(2) generators, yields infinite energy density along the singularity where $\bar{\psi}\psi \neq 0$, as $A_i^{a\prime}$ diverges. This singularity, like the Abelian case, lacks a physical source (e.g., a magnetic current in SU(2)), making it unphysical in our ontology, which requires singularities only at physical sources.

4.1.2 Indeterminacy of Singularity

The position of the singularity in both formulations is indeterminate in the Lorenz gauge, as gauge transformations preserving this gauge condition can shift the singularity's position without physical justification, violating the ontology's requirement for a unique gauge potential in the Lorenz gauge (with boundary conditions). For Dirac monopoles, the vector potential

$\mathbf{A}_A = \frac{g}{4\pi r}\frac{1-\cos\theta}{\sin\theta}\hat{\phi}$ (Eq. 32) is singular along the negative z-axis ($\theta = \pi$). A gauge transformation, $\mathbf{A}_B = \mathbf{A}_A - \nabla\chi$ with $\chi = \frac{g}{2\pi}\phi$, yields $\mathbf{A}_B = -\frac{g}{4\pi r}\frac{1+\cos\theta}{\sin\theta}\hat{\phi}$ (Eq. 5), singular along the positive z-axis ($\theta = 0$). Both $\mathbf{A}_A$ and $\mathbf{A}_B$ satisfy the boundary conditions ($A_\mu \to 0$ at infinity) and the Lorenz gauge ($\partial_i A^i = 0$, as $A_0 = 0$ and $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A}_A = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{A}_B = 0$), yet the singularity's position is arbitrary due to the spherical symmetry of $\mathbf{B} = \frac{g}{4\pi r^2}\hat{\mathbf{r}}$, providing no physical criterion to fix its location.

For 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles in a singular gauge, the effective potential $A'_i \approx \frac{g_m}{4\pi r}\frac{1-\cos\theta}{\sin\theta}\hat{\phi}_i$ (Section 2.2.2) is singular along $\theta = \pi$ and satisfies the Lorenz gauge ($\partial_\mu A^{a\mu} = 0$). A gauge transformation preserving the Lorenz gauge, such as a rotation aligning the Higgs field $\hat{\phi}^a$ differently, shifts the singularity to another axis (e.g., $\theta = 0$), producing a different A^a_μ while maintaining the same gauge-invariant $\mathbf{B}$-field and flux (Eq. 55). The absence of a physical principle to fix the singularity's position results in non-unique A^a_μ in the Lorenz gauge. This indeterminacy violates the ontology's uniqueness requirement, rendering both monopole types incompatible [9].

4.2 Problems of the Patch-Wise Formulations

Patch-wise formulations, such as the Wu-Yang approach for Abelian Dirac monopoles and the standard formulation for non-Abelian 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles, define gauge potentials in overlapping regions (e.g., northern and southern hemispheres) to avoid explicit singularities like the Dirac string. However, these formulations introduce defects that violate the potential-centric ontology's requirements for a unique, non-singular gauge potential A_μ or A^a_μ in the Lorenz gauge, mediating local, continuous interactions. We identify two critical issues: the non-uniqueness of gauge potentials due to the ambiguous choice at the patch boundary and the disruption of locality and continuity in physical interactions, both driven by the non-trivial topology ($\pi_2(G/H) \cong \mathbb{Z}$) of magnetic monopoles.

4.2.1 Non-Uniqueness at Patch Boundaries

In the Wu-Yang formulation for Abelian Dirac monopoles, the gauge potentials $\mathbf{A}_A$ and $\mathbf{A}_B$ (Eqs. 8, 9) are defined in separate patches (northern and southern hemispheres) and are related by a gauge transformation in the overlap region:

$$\mathbf{A}_B = \mathbf{A}_A - \nabla\chi, \quad \chi = \frac{g}{2\pi}\phi. \tag{51}$$

At the patch boundary (e.g., $\theta = \pi/2$), the choice between $\mathbf{A}_A$ and $\mathbf{A}_B$ is arbitrary, resulting in a non-unique gauge potential for the same spacetime point. This ambiguity violates the ontology's requirement for a globally unique gauge potential A_μ in the Lorenz gauge.

Similarly, for 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles, gauge potentials A^a_μ and Higgs fields are defined in patches, connected by an SU(2) transition function (Eq. 19). At the patch boundary, the choice of gauge potential A^a_μ is ambiguous, as different gauge configurations can be applied in the overlapping region, yielding distinct A^a_μ for the same spacetime points. This ambiguity, driven by the need for multiple patches to cover the manifold due to the non-trivial topology ($\pi_2(G/H) \cong \mathbb{Z}$), produces non-unique gauge potentials.

In gauge-invariant paradigms, this non-uniqueness is a mathematical artifact, as only gauge-invariant quantities (e.g., $\mathbf{B}$, Wilson loops) determine physical observables. However, the potential-centric ontology requires a globally unique A_μ or A^a_μ in the Lorenz gauge, rendering these formulations incompatible due to the ambiguous gauge choice at the patch boundary.

4.2.2 Indeterminacy of Patch Boundaries

The patch-wise formulations of both Abelian and non-Abelian monopoles also suffer from a fundamental indeterminacy in the position of patch boundaries. This indeterminacy arises because the choice of boundary location is mathematically arbitrary while having significant physical consequences for the gauge potential's description - a direct violation of the potential-centric ontology's requirement for a unique, physically determined gauge potential in the Lorenz gauge.

For the Wu-Yang formulation of Abelian Dirac monopoles, the transition between potentials $\mathbf{A}_A$ and $\mathbf{A}_B$ occurs at an arbitrarily chosen boundary (conventionally at $\theta = \pi/2$). However, this choice is not fixed by any physical principle. The magnetic field $\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}$ remains unchanged regardless of boundary placement. The Lorenz gauge condition $\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$ can also be maintained for any boundary position $\theta = \theta_0$ through appropriate gauge transformations. This leads to an essential ambiguity: for any given spacetime point near the conventional boundary, the potential could equally well be described by either $\mathbf{A}_A$ or $\mathbf{A}_B$ with no physical criterion to decide between them. The resulting non-uniqueness fundamentally conflicts with the ontology's requirement that A_μ in the Lorenz gauge should be uniquely determined by physical conditions.

The indeterminacy is even more pronounced in the non-Abelian case. For non-Abelian 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles, the standard patch-wise formulation requires choosing:

- Boundary surfaces between patches
- Transition functions U connecting different gauges
- Higgs field orientations in overlap regions

Each choice leads to mathematically equivalent but physically distinct A^a_μ configurations in the Lorenz gauge, while no physical principles fixes the configuration. The gauge potential A^a_μ consequently becomes fundamentally underdetermined - multiple distinct potential configurations exist for identical physical situations. This represents a direct violation of the potential-centric ontology's requirement for a unique, physically determined gauge potential in the Lorenz gauge.

4.2.3 Disruption of Locality and Continuity

In the potential-centric ontology, the gauge potential is required to change continuously in space and time in order to mediate interactions locally. However, the patch-wise formulations introduce fundamental violations of locality and continuity through discontinuous changes in the gauge potential across patch boundaries. These discontinuities manifest in phenomena like the AB effect.

For Abelian Dirac monopoles in the Wu-Yang formulation, the gauge potentials $\mathbf{A}_A$ and $\mathbf{A}_B$ (Eq. 8, 9) are related in the overlapping region ($\pi/2 - \epsilon < \theta < \pi/2 + \epsilon$) by the gauge function $\chi = \frac{g}{2\pi}\phi$ (Eq. 37), with $\nabla\chi = \frac{g}{2\pi r \sin\theta}\hat{\phi}$. For a closed loop in the AB effect, when the loop's position crosses $\theta = \pi/2$, the gauge potential switches from $\mathbf{A}_A$ to $\mathbf{A}_B$, and the phase changes by g due to the transition between the two gauge potentials, disrupting the continuous accumulation of phase in the AB effect. This non-smoothness violates continuity, and the dependence on the non-physical patch boundary at $\theta = \pi/2$ violates locality, as no local physical source exists to account for the phase shift.

Similarly, for 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles, the gauge potentials A^a_μ (Eq. 17) are defined in patches and related in the overlapping region ($\pi/2 - \epsilon < \theta < \pi/2 + \epsilon$) by an SU(2) transition function, e.g., $U = \exp(i\frac{\phi}{2}\tau^3)$ (Eq. 19). For a closed loop in the non-Abelian AB effect crossing $\theta = \pi/2$, the Wilson loop phase includes the contribution of the gauge transformation when switching between different A^a_μ, yielding a phase shift analogous to g (Eq. 40). When the loop's position crosses $\theta = \pi/2$, the phase changes due to the transition between gauge potentials, disrupting the continuous accumulation of phase in the non-Abelian AB effect. This non-smoothness violates continuity, and the dependence on the non-physical patch boundary at $\theta = \pi/2$ violates locality, as no local physical source exists to account for the phase shift.

These disruptions, driven by the non-trivial topology ($\pi_2(G/H) \cong \mathbb{Z}$), contrast with the ontology's requirement for continuous, local changes of the gauge potential, as evidenced by the AB effect's smooth phase accumulation (Section 3). In gauge-invariant paradigms, these defects are mathematical artifacts, but in the potential-centric ontology, they render patch-wise formulations physically untenable.

4.3 Derivation of the No-Go Theorem

In the potential-centric ontology, the gauge potential A_μ (for Abelian U(1) gauge theories) or A^a_μ (for non-Abelian SU(2) gauge theories), fixed in the Lorenz gauge ($\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$ or $\partial_\mu A^{a\mu} = 0$), is the fundamental physical entity mediating local, continuous interactions, as evidenced by the AB effect [2, 9]. This ontology imposes three requirements on the gauge potential in the Lorenz gauge: (1) uniqueness across spacetime, (2) non-singularity except at physical sources (e.g., electric charges or quark currents), and (3) mediation of local, continuous interactions. We prove that magnetic monopoles—Abelian Dirac and non-Abelian 't Hooft-Polyakov—cannot exist, as their non-zero magnetic flux and non-trivial topology ($\pi_2(G/H) \cong \mathbb{Z}$) necessitate singularities or non-unique potentials in all gauges, violating these requirements.

Theorem (No-Go Theorem for magnetic monopoles): In a potential-centric ontology, where the gauge potential A_μ or A^a_μ in the Lorenz gauge is the fundamental physical entity, magnetic monopoles, defined by a non-zero magnetic flux $\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} \neq 0$ in the Maxwellian **B**-field, cannot exist, as their gauge potential configurations in all gauges are either singular at points lacking physical sources or non-unique, violating the ontology's requirements.

Proof:

1. Abelian Dirac Monopoles: Consider an Abelian Dirac monopole at the origin with magnetic charge g, producing a radial magnetic field:

$$\mathbf{B} = \frac{g}{4\pi r^2}\hat{\mathbf{r}}, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = g\delta^3(\mathbf{r}), \tag{52}$$

yielding a non-zero flux:

$$\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = g, \tag{53}$$

through a closed surface S enclosing the origin. The non-trivial topology of the field configuration ($\pi_2(S^2) \cong \mathbb{Z}$) precludes a globally smooth, single-valued vector potential $\mathbf{A}$ satisfying $\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}$. Two formulations exist:

(1) Dirac String Formulation: The vector potential, e.g., $\mathbf{A}_A = \frac{g}{4\pi r}\frac{1-\cos\theta}{\sin\theta}\hat{\phi}$ (Eq. 32), is singular along the line $\theta = \pi$, forming a Dirac string. This singularity, lacking a physical source (unlike electric charges), causes infinite energy density in QED interactions ($\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} = -e\bar{\psi}\gamma^i A_i \psi$) where $\bar{\psi}\psi \neq 0$ (Section 4.1). The singularity's position is indeterminate, shiftable by gauge transformations preserving the Lorenz condition (e.g., to $\theta = 0$), violating uniqueness.

(2) Wu-Yang Patch-Wise Formulation: Non-singular potentials, e.g., $\mathbf{A}_A = \frac{g}{4\pi r}\frac{1-\cos\theta}{\sin\theta}\hat{\phi}$ and $\mathbf{A}_B = -\frac{g}{4\pi r}\frac{1+\cos\theta}{\sin\theta}\hat{\phi}$ (Eqs. 8, 9), are defined in overlapping patches, related by $\mathbf{A}_B = \mathbf{A}_A - \nabla\chi$, with $\chi = \frac{g}{2\pi}\phi$. The choice of patch boundaries (e.g., $\theta = \pi/2$) is arbitrary, yielding non-unique potentials in all gauges. In the AB effect, paths crossing patch boundaries incur indeterminate phase shifts, disrupting continuity and locality (Section 4.2).

The Dirac quantization condition, $qg = 2\pi n$ (Eq. 6), ensures gauge-invariant consistency but does not eliminate these defects, as the singularity or non-uniqueness persists in all gauges due to $\pi_2(S^2) \cong \mathbb{Z}$.

2. Non-Abelian 't Hooft-Polyakov Monopoles: The 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole, a topological soliton in SU(2) gauge theory with a Higgs field, produces an effective magnetic field:

$$\mathbf{B} \approx \frac{g_m}{4\pi r^2}\hat{\mathbf{r}}, \quad g_m = \frac{4\pi}{e}, \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0, \tag{54}$$

at large distances, with non-zero flux:

$$\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = g_m, \tag{55}$$

driven by the Higgs field's winding ($\pi_2(\mathrm{SU}(2)/\mathrm{U}(1)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$). The gauge potential A^a_μ and Higgs field ϕ^a (Eq. 12) yield two formulations:

(1) Standard Patch-Wise Formulation: Smooth potentials $A_i^{a(A)}$, $A_i^{a(B)}$ are defined in patches (e.g., northern and southern hemispheres), related by a multi-valued transition function $U = \exp(i\frac{\phi}{2}\tau^3)$ (Eq. 19). The effective potential $A_i = A_i^a \hat{\phi}^a$ is non-unique, as patch choices are arbitrary, and Wilson loops crossing boundaries yield indeterminate phase shifts, violating locality and uniqueness (Section 4.2).

(2) Singular Gauge Formulation: A gauge transformation aligns $\phi^a \approx (0, 0, v)$, yielding $A_i^{a\prime} \approx \hat{e}_3^a \frac{g_m}{4\pi r} \frac{1-\cos\theta}{\sin\theta} \hat{\phi}_i$, singular along $\theta = \pi$, resembling a Dirac string. This singularity, lacking a physical source, causes infinite energy density in interactions ($\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} = -g\bar{\psi}\gamma^i T^a A_i^a \psi$) (Section 4.1).

The topological constraint ($\pi_2(\mathrm{SU}(2)/\mathrm{U}(1)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$) ensures these defects, as the non-zero flux requires either singularities or non-unique potentials in all gauges.

3. Comparison with Electric Charges: An electric charge q at the origin produces a scalar potential:

$$A_0 = \frac{q}{4\pi\epsilon_0 r}, \quad \nabla^2 A_0 = -\frac{q}{\epsilon_0}\delta^3(\mathbf{r}), \tag{56}$$

singular only at the physical source ($\mathbf{r} = 0$), coupling to the electric current $J^\mu = e\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\psi$ in QED. This singularity is physically meaningful, corresponding to the charge's position, and supports local, continuous phase accumulation in the AB effect via $\phi_{AB} = e\int_C A_\mu dx^\mu$. In contrast, magnetic monopoles require line singularities (Dirac strings) or non-unique potentials (patch-wise formulations) without physical sources, violating the ontology's requirements.

4. Topological Necessity and Conclusion: The non-trivial topology ($\pi_2(S^2) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ for Dirac monopoles, $\pi_2(\mathrm{SU}(2)/\mathrm{U}(1)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ for 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles) mandates singularities or non-unique potentials to achieve the non-zero flux (Eqs. 53, 55), as shown by the Stokes' theorem contradiction (Section 2.3). These defects—singularities causing infinite energy density or non-unique potentials disrupting locality and uniqueness—persist in all gauge choices, precluding a gauge potential satisfying the ontology's criteria. Thus, magnetic monopoles cannot exist in the potential-centric ontology.

This theorem explains the asymmetry in Maxwell's equations ($\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$) and QED. It also aligns with experimental null results (e.g., MoEDAL [1]) and cosmological constraints [23], which find no evidence for magnetic monopoles. In gauge-invariant paradigms, singularities and non-unique potentials are mathematical artifacts, as physical observables depend only on gauge-invariant quantities (e.g., $\mathbf{B}$, ϕ_{AB}) [24, 32]. The potential-centric ontology, by prioritizing the physical reality of A_μ or A^a_μ in the true gauge, reveals these defects as fundamental barriers, offering a novel argument against magnetic monopoles.

5 Counterarguments and Responses

Our no-go result—that magnetic monopoles, encompassing both Abelian Dirac monopoles and non-Abelian 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles, cannot exist in a potential-centric ontology due to unphysical singularities or non-unique gauge potentials (A_μ or A^a_μ)—faces potential objections from gauge-invariant perspectives. Here, we address key counterarguments: that singularities (e.g., Dirac strings) are mathematical artifacts, that patch-wise formulations (e.g., Wu-Yang or 't Hooft-Polyakov) eliminate singularities, that emergent monopoles in spin ice challenge the theorem, and that monopoles are necessary to explain electric charge quantization. We demonstrate that these objections do not undermine our conclusion, as they conflict with the ontology's requirements for a unique, non-singular gauge potential mediating local, continuous interactions in the Lorenz gauge.

5.1 Dirac Strings: Mathematical Artifacts or Physical Defects?

Critics may argue that the Dirac string's singularity in the vector potential for Abelian monopoles, e.g., $\mathbf{A}_A = \frac{g}{4\pi r}\frac{1-\cos\theta}{\sin\theta}\hat{\phi}$ (Eq. 32), or the Dirac string-like singularity in the singular gauge formulation of 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles (Section 2.2.2), is a mathematical artifact of gauge choice. The singularity's position (e.g., $\theta = \pi$) can be shifted via gauge transformations (e.g., to $\theta = 0$) without affecting gauge-invariant quantities like the magnetic field $\mathbf{B} = \frac{g}{4\pi r^2}\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ (Eq. 1) for Dirac monopoles or $\mathbf{B} \approx \frac{g_m}{4\pi r^2}\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ (Eq. 14) for 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles, or the AB phase $\phi_{AB} = e\oint_C \mathbf{A}\cdot d\mathbf{r} = eg$. The Dirac quantization condition ($qg = 2\pi n$, Eq. 6) ensures the string's unobservability in QM, as the phase around the string is trivial ($e^{iqg} = 1$), suggesting that singularities pose no physical barrier for either monopole type [6, 26].

In our potential-centric ontology, where A_μ or A_μ^a in the Lorenz gauge is the physical reality, the Dirac string's singularity is not a mere mathematical artifact but a physical defect for both Abelian and non-Abelian monopoles. For Abelian Dirac monopoles, the singularity along a line (e.g., $\theta = \pi$) produces infinite energy density in QED interactions ($\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} = -e\bar{\psi}\gamma^i A_i\psi$) where $\bar{\psi}\psi \neq 0$, lacking a physical source like a magnetic current (Section 4.1.1). Similarly, for 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles in the singular gauge, the effective potential $A_i' \approx \frac{g_m}{4\pi r}\frac{1-\cos\theta}{\sin\theta}\hat{\phi}_i$ (Section 2.2.2) introduces a line singularity, leading to infinite energy density in non-Abelian interactions ($\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} = -g\bar{\psi}\gamma^i T^a A_i^a\psi$) without a physical source. These singularities disrupt locality and continuity in the AB effect (or non-Abelian analogs via Wilson loops), as paths crossing the string yield indeterminate phase integrals (Sections 4.1.2, 4.2). The topological necessity of the singularity, due to non-zero flux ($\oint_C \mathbf{A}\cdot d\mathbf{r} = g$ or g_m) and $\pi_2(S^2) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ (Abelian) or $\pi_2(\mathrm{SU}(2)/\mathrm{U}(1)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ (non-Abelian), ensures its presence in any gauge (Section 4.4). Moreover, the singularity's indeterminate position—shiftable via gauge transformations without a physical principle to fix it—violates the ontology's requirement for a unique A_μ or A_μ^a. Thus, the Dirac string's physical implications and indeterminacy render both Dirac and 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles incompatible with our framework [9].

5.2 Patch-Wise Potentials and Bundle Theory Challenges

One may argue that patch-wise formulations, such as the Wu-Yang construction for Abelian Dirac monopoles (Section 2.1.2), resolve the singularities of the Dirac string (Section 4.1) by defining non-singular gauge potentials in overlapping patches, producing a globally consistent magnetic field $\mathbf{B} = \frac{g}{4\pi r^2}\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ (Eq. 1) [32]. Similarly, the bundle theory, a mathematical framework for gauge theories, permits the gauge potential A_μ (or A_μ^a) to be defined patch-wise over spacetime (e.g., S^2 for monopoles), with transition functions ensuring consistency of the field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$ or $F_{\mu\nu}^a$. In this view, the patch-wise formulations of magnetic monopoles—Abelian Dirac and non-Abelian 't Hooft-Polyakov (Section 2)—are mathematically valid, as non-unique potentials (e.g., Eq. 8, 9, 39) are standard features of principal bundles defined by field configurations with non-zero charges, classified by $\pi_2(G/H) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ [26, 32]. Thus, these objections suggest that the singularities or non-uniqueness highlighted in Section 4 are permissible mathematical artifacts, potentially undermining the no-go result for magnetic monopoles.

In response, we reaffirm that our potential-centric ontology (Section 3) designates the gauge potential A_μ (or A_μ^a) in the Lorenz gauge ($\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$) as the fundamental physical entity mediating local, continuous interactions, requiring it to be unique and non-singular across all of spacetime, except at physical sources (e.g., electric charges, quark currents) [9]. While patch-wise formulations and bundle theory ensure mathematical consistency of the field strength, they introduce physical defects that conflict with these requirements in three critical ways.

First, the patch-wise approach results in non-unique potentials, as the choice of patch boundaries (e.g., northern vs. southern hemispheres for S^2) and transition functions is arbitrary. In the Wu-Yang formulation, different patch configurations yield equivalent $\mathbf{B}$-fields but distinct $\mathbf{A}_A$, $\mathbf{A}_B$, with no physical principle fixing the gauge potential (Section 4.3) [32]. For non-Abelian 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles, transition functions like U (Eq. 39) vary across equivalent bundle descriptions, leading to non-unique A_μ^a (Section 4.2) [26]. This violates the ontology's requirement for a globally unique A_μ or A_μ^a.

Second, these defects disrupt locality and continuity in physical interactions. In the AB effect for Abelian monopoles, paths crossing patch boundaries encounter indeterminate phase integrals due to singular $\nabla\chi$ (Eq. 38), as shown in Section 4.1.2. For non-Abelian monopoles, Wilson loops become indeterminate near patch boundary singularities due to $\partial_i U U^{-1}$ (Section 4.2). These disruptions conflict with the ontology's requirement for continuous, local mediation by A_μ or A_μ^a.

While bundle theory ensures mathematical consistency of $F_{\mu\nu}$ or $F_{\mu\nu}^a$ through patch-wise constructions, it does not address the physical reality of A_μ or A_μ^a in our ontology. The non-zero magnetic flux, arising from field configurations classified by the non-trivial homotopy group $\pi_2(G/H) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, necessitates singularities or non-unique gauge potentials, rendering magnetic monopoles—Abelian and non-Abelian—incompatible with a unique, non-singular gauge potential. Thus, neither the Wu-Yang formulation's alleged non-singularity nor the bundle theory's mathematical permissibility negates the physical objections in our ontology, reinforcing the no-go result.

5.3 Spin Ice Monopoles: Emergent Compatibility?

Emergent monopoles in spin ice materials, such as $Dy_2Ti_2O_7$, are fractionalized excitations that mimic magnetic monopoles with effective magnetic charges, producing a non-zero flux in an effective magnetization field, $\oint_S \mathbf{M}_{\text{eff}} \cdot d\mathbf{S} \approx g$, where g is the effective magnetic charge [5, 17]. These defects, connected by observable Dirac strings of flipped spins, might seem to challenge our no-go theorem, which excludes magnetic monopoles—Abelian Dirac and non-Abelian 't Hooft-Polyakov—due to their non-zero flux in the Maxwellian $\mathbf{B}$-field ($\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = g$) and the resulting singularities or non-unique gauge potentials (A_μ or A_μ^a) in the Lorenz gauge (Section 4). This subsection clarifies that emergent monopoles are not fundamental, as their flux arises in a coarse-grained magnetization field, not the true $\mathbf{B}$-field, and they involve no fundamental gauge potential, making them compatible with our potential-centric ontology (Section 3). We detail their physical origin, contrast them with magnetic monopoles, and address potential misunderstandings to reinforce the no-go theorem's applicability.

Spin ice materials, like $Dy_2Ti_2O_7$, consist of magnetic moments (spins) of Dy^{3+} ions arranged on a pyrochlore lattice, a three-dimensional network of corner-sharing tetrahedra. Each spin behaves as a classical Ising spin, constrained to point along the local $\langle 111 \rangle$ axes of the tetrahedra, and obeys the "ice rule": in each tetrahedron, two spins point inward and two outward, analogous to proton positions in water ice [5]. This rule leads to a highly degenerate ground state with macroscopic entropy. Violations of the ice rule, such as a tetrahedron with three spins inward and one outward (or vice versa), create defects that behave as effective magnetic monopoles. For example, a three-in-one-out configuration produces a net magnetic moment, approximated in the continuum limit as:

$$\mathbf{M}_{\text{eff}} \approx \frac{g}{4\pi r^2}\hat{\mathbf{r}}, \tag{57}$$

with a non-zero divergence:

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{M}_{\text{eff}} \approx g\delta^3(\mathbf{r}), \tag{58}$$

where g is the effective magnetic charge, determined by the spin's magnetic moment and lattice geometry (typically $g \approx \mu/a$, with μ the Dy^{3+} moment and $a \approx 10\,\text{Å}$ the lattice spacing) [5]. The flux through a closed surface S surrounding the defect is:

$$\oint_S \mathbf{M}_{\text{eff}} \cdot d\mathbf{S} \approx g, \tag{59}$$

mimicking a magnetic monopole's field. These defects are fractionalized excitations: flipping a single spin creates a pair of oppositely charged defects (e.g., three-in-one-out and one-in-three-out), connected by a "Dirac string" of flipped spins, which carries magnetization flux balancing the net charge. Unlike the unphysical Dirac string of magnetic monopoles (Section 2.1.1), this string is physical, observable via neutron scattering, and consists of a chain of flipped spins along the lattice [17].

Unlike magnetic monopoles, emergent monopoles do not produce a non-zero flux in the true Maxwellian **B**-field. The **B**-field, generated by the magnetic moments of Dy^{3+} ions, satisfies Maxwell's equation:

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0, \tag{60}$$

yielding zero flux through any closed surface:

$$\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = 0, \tag{61}$$

as there are no fundamental magnetic charges. The effective field $\mathbf{M}_{\text{eff}}$ is a coarse-grained magnetization, averaged over lattice scales, capturing the net magnetic moment of spin configurations. Its non-zero flux (Eq. 59) arises from the topological structure of the spin ice lattice, not from a gauge theory with non-trivial homotopy ($\pi_2(G/H) \cong \mathbb{Z}$) as in magnetic monopoles (Sections 2.1, 2.2). The vector potential $\mathbf{A}$ for the true $\mathbf{B}$-field ($\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}$) is non-singular and unique in the Lorenz gauge, as $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$ imposes no topological constraints. No fundamental gauge potential A_μ or A_μ^a governs the spin ice dynamics, which are driven by local spin interactions, not gauge theory fields [5].

In our potential-centric ontology, the gauge potential A_μ (or A_μ^a) in the Lorenz gauge must be unique, non-singular except at physical sources, and mediate local, continuous interactions, as evidenced by the AB effect (Section 3) [9]. magnetic monopoles violate these requirements, as their non-zero flux ($\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = g$) and topology ($\pi_2(G/H) \cong \mathbb{Z}$) necessitate singularities (e.g., Dirac string, Eq. 32) or non-unique potentials (e.g., Wu-Yang patches, Eq. 8, 9; SU(2) transition functions, Eq. 19) (Section 4). Emergent monopoles in spin ice are exempt, as their flux is in $\mathbf{M}_{\text{eff}}$, not $\mathbf{B}$, and they involve no fundamental gauge potential. If an effective potential $\mathbf{A}_{\text{eff}}$ is defined such that $\mathbf{M}_{\text{eff}} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}_{\text{eff}}$, it is a phenomenological construct, not a fundamental A_μ. For example:

$$\mathbf{A}_{\text{eff}} \approx \frac{g}{4\pi r} \frac{1 - \cos\theta}{\sin\theta} \hat{\phi}, \tag{62}$$

mimics the Dirac monopole potential (Eq. 32) and is singular along $\theta = \pi$, corresponding to the physical Dirac string of flipped spins. This singularity is physically meaningful, tied to the observable spin configuration, unlike the unphysical Dirac string in gauge theory, which lacks a material source (Section 4.1). The absence of a fundamental gauge potential means spin ice monopoles do not violate the ontology's requirements for uniqueness or non-singularity, as these apply to A_μ or A_μ^a, not coarse-grained constructs like $\mathbf{A}_{\text{eff}}$.

Emergent monopoles in spin ice are analogous to vortices in type-II superconductors, which are topological defects in the superconducting order parameter $\phi = |\phi| e^{i\theta}$ with a non-trivial phase winding ($\pi_1(\mathrm{U}(1)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$), as described by the Abelian Higgs model [27]. These vortices produce a quantized flux in an effective magnetic field, $\mathbf{B}_{\text{eff}} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}_{\text{eff}}$, given by $\Phi = n\frac{hc}{2e}$, but the true Maxwellian $\mathbf{B}$-field satisfies $\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = 0$. The effective gauge potential $\mathbf{A}_{\text{eff}}$, driven by the collective dynamics of the superconducting condensate, is massive due to the Higgs mechanism and not a fundamental QED potential, making vortices compatible with the ontology, as their singularities or non-uniqeness are emergent, not fundamental. Similarly, spin ice monopoles' effective flux and strings are lattice-scale phenomena, not gauge theory defects, reinforcing their compatibility.

Several potential misunderstandings may arise regarding spin ice monopoles' relevance to the no-go theorem, which we address to clarify their distinction from magnetic monopoles:

1. **Non-Zero Flux and Maxwell's Equations**: The non-zero flux $\oint_S \mathbf{M}_{\text{eff}} \cdot d\mathbf{S} \approx g$ (Eq. 59) might suggest a violation of Maxwell's $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$. However, $\mathbf{M}_{\text{eff}}$ is a magnetization field, not the true $\mathbf{B}$-field. The $\mathbf{B}$-field, generated by Dy^{3+} spins, has zero divergence (Eq. 60) and flux (Eq. 61). The effective divergence (Eq. 58) is a coarse-grained approximation of spin configurations, not a fundamental magnetic charge, and thus does not challenge Maxwell's equations or the ontology.

2. **Effective Gauge Potential**: Defining an effective potential $\mathbf{A}_{\text{eff}}$ (Eq. 62) might suggest a gauge theory structure analogous to magnetic monopoles. However, $\mathbf{A}_{\text{eff}}$ is a phenomenological tool, not a fundamental A_μ in a U(1) or SU(2) gauge theory. Its singularity corresponds to the physical Dirac string of flipped spins, observable via neutron scattering, unlike the unphysical, gauge-dependent Dirac string in magnetic monopoles (Section 2.1.1). The ontology's requirements apply to fundamental gauge potentials, not emergent constructs, so $\mathbf{A}_{\text{eff}}$'s singularity is compatible.

3. **Topological Similarity**: The quantized flux in $\mathbf{M}_{\text{eff}}$ resembles the magnetic charge of magnetic monopoles, classified by $\pi_2(G/H) \cong \mathbb{Z}$. However, spin ice monopoles arise from the discrete topology of the pyrochlore lattice, not a gauge group's homotopy. Their effective charge is due to spin configurations, not a non-trivial vacuum manifold, distinguishing them from Dirac or 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles (Sections 2.1, 2.2).

4. **Experimental Observability**: The observability of spin ice monopoles and their Dirac strings [17] might imply that magnetic monopoles are similarly realizable. However, spin ice monopoles are emergent excitations within a condensed matter system, not fundamental particles. Their observability reinforces their physical nature as lattice defects, whereas magnetic monopoles' singularities (e.g., Dirac string) are unphysical in the ontology, lacking material sources (Section 4).

5. **Implications for the No-Go Theorem**: One might argue that spin ice monopoles' compatibility suggests the no-go theorem is too restrictive. The theorem targets magnetic monopoles with non-zero $\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S}$, requiring singularities or non-unique A_μ due to $\pi_2(G/H) \cong \mathbb{Z}$. Spin ice monopoles, with flux in $\mathbf{M}_{\text{eff}}$ and no fundamental gauge potential, fall outside this scope, reinforcing the theorem's specificity to gauge theory defects.

In conclusion, emergent monopoles in spin ice, such as those in $Dy_2Ti_2O_7$, are fractionalized excitations producing a non-zero flux in the effective magnetization field $\mathbf{M}_{\text{eff}}$, not the Maxwellian $\mathbf{B}$-field, which maintains $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$ and $\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = 0$. Their Dirac strings are physical chains of flipped spins, not unphysical gauge artifacts, and no fundamental gauge potential A_μ or A_μ^a is involved, as their dynamics arise from lattice-scale spin interactions. Thus, they are compatible with our potential-centric ontology, which requires a unique, non-singular A_μ or A_μ^a for fundamental gauge fields. The no-go theorem, targeting magnetic monopoles with non-zero $\mathbf{B}$-field flux and topological defects ($\pi_2(G/H) \cong \mathbb{Z}$), remains unaffected, as spin ice monopoles operate outside gauge theory frameworks. Addressing misunderstandings clarifies that their emergent nature, lattice-based topology, and lack of fundamental gauge potential distinguish them from Dirac and 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles, reinforcing the theorem's robustness.

5.4 Monopoles and Charge Quantization

A compelling theoretical motivation for the existence of magnetic monopoles, both Abelian Dirac and non-Abelian 't Hooft-Polyakov types, is their role in explaining the quantization of electric charge, a phenomenon observed universally in nature where electric charges occur in discrete multiples of the elementary charge e (e.g., the electron's charge) [12]. Dirac's seminal 1931 work introduced the quantization condition $qg = 2\pi n$ (Eq. 6), where q is the electric charge, g is the magnetic charge, and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ is an integer [6]. This condition implies that the existence of even a single magnetic monopole in the universe enforces discrete electric charges, as the phase shift of a charged particle's wave function around a monopole, $e^{iqg} = e^{i2\pi n} = 1$, must be single-valued to ensure physical consistency in QM. For Dirac monopoles, this arises from the vector potential's singularity (e.g., the Dirac string, Eq. 32), which contributes a flux g through a closed loop. For 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles, the condition applies to the effective magnetic charge $g_m = \frac{4\pi}{g}$ (Eq. 14), derived from the topological winding of the Higgs field ($\pi_2(\mathrm{SU}(2)/\mathrm{U}(1)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$) [22, 26].

In gauge-invariant paradigms, where singularities like the Dirac string or patch-dependent gauge potentials are considered mathematical artifacts, this quantization condition provides a strong theoretical justification for monopoles, as it elegantly explains why electric charges are quantized without requiring additional assumptions about the gauge group structure. Furthermore, in GUTs like SU(5) or SO(10), monopoles are predicted as topological solitons, reinforcing their role in charge quantization and high-energy physics [21]. Proponents argue that this theoretical necessity, coupled with the symmetry it introduces to electromagnetic duality ($\mathbf{E} \to \mathbf{B}$, $\mathbf{B} \to -\frac{\mathbf{E}}{c^2}$), makes the existence of magnetic monopoles highly plausible, potentially challenging the no-go result in our potential-centric ontology.

In the potential-centric ontology, where the gauge potential A_μ (or A^a_μ in non-Abelian theories) in the Lorenz gauge ($\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$) is the fundamental physical reality, the Dirac quantization condition does not necessitate the existence of magnetic monopoles, whether Abelian or non-Abelian, and alternative mechanisms can also explain electric charge quantization. Below, we address the counterargument in detail, focusing on the quantization condition's implications, the physical defects introduced by monopoles, and alternative explanations for charge quantization.

First, the Dirac quantization condition ($qg = 2\pi n$) ensures the unobservability of singularities in gauge-invariant frameworks but relies on problematic gauge potential configurations in our ontology. For Abelian Dirac monopoles, the condition arises from the vector potential, e.g., $\mathbf{A}_A = \frac{g}{4\pi r}\frac{1-\cos\theta}{\sin\theta}\hat{\phi}$ (Eq. 32), which harbors a Dirac string singularity along $\theta = \pi$. The phase shift for a particle with charge q encircling the string, $e^{iq\oint_C \mathbf{A}\cdot d\mathbf{r}} = e^{iqg} = 1$, requires $qg = 2\pi n$, rendering the singularity physically undetectable in QM [6]. However, as argued in Section 4.1, this singularity causes infinite energy density in QED interactions ($\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} = -e\bar{\psi}\gamma^i A_i \psi$) along the string, where $\bar{\psi}\psi \neq 0$, without a physical source like a magnetic current. The Wu-Yang formulation, while avoiding an explicit Dirac string, introduces non-unique patch-dependent potentials (Section 4.2). For 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles, the effective magnetic charge $g_m = \frac{4\pi}{g}$ satisfies the same quantization condition derived from the Higgs field's topological winding (Eq. 55). However, the standard formulation requires non-unique patch-dependent potentials with multi-valued transition functions (e.g., $U = \exp(i\frac{\phi}{2}\tau^3)$, Eq. 19), or a singular gauge with a Dirac string-like defect (Section 2.2.2). These singularities and non-unique potentials violate the ontology's requirements for a unique, non-singular A_μ or A^a_μ except at physical sources [9].

Second, the position of these singularities is indeterminate, as gauge transformations can shift the Dirac string (e.g., from $\theta = \pi$ to $\theta = 0$) or alter patch boundaries in Wu-Yang or 't Hooft-Polyakov formulations without a physical principle to fix their location (Section 4.3). For Dirac monopoles, the spherical symmetry of $\mathbf{B} = \frac{g}{4\pi r^2}\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ and boundary conditions ($A_\mu \to 0$ at infinity) provide no preferred direction for the singularity. Similarly, for 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles, the choice of patch boundaries or transition functions is arbitrary, leading to non-unique A^a_μ. This indeterminacy violates the ontology's requirement for a unique gauge potential, making both monopole types incompatible, despite the quantization condition's role in ensuring gauge-invariant consistency.

Third, electric charge quantization can be explained without invoking magnetic monopoles, undermining their theoretical necessity. For example, in GUTs like SU(5) or SO(10), electric charge quantization arises from the embedding of the U(1) gauge group within a larger simple gauge group, where the generator's eigenvalues are discrete due to the group's structure, independent of monopole solutions [21]. For example, in SU(5), the electric charge operator is a linear combination of generators, yielding charges in multiples of $\frac{e}{3}$, consistent with observed quark and lepton charges. While 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles emerge in these theories as topological solitons during symmetry breaking, their existence is not required for charge quantization, as the gauge group's algebraic properties suffice. Moreover, experimental constraints, such as the absence of monopoles in high-energy experiments (e.g., MoEDAL, [1]) and cosmological limits on relic monopoles, suggest that charge quantization does not rely on their physical presence.

Fourth, the potential-centric ontology accommodates electric charges without the issues faced by magnetic monopoles. An electric charge at the origin produces a scalar potential $A_0 = \frac{q}{4\pi\epsilon_0 r}$, singular only at the physical source ($\mathbf{r} = 0$), satisfying $\nabla^2 A_0 = -\frac{q}{\epsilon_0}\delta^3(\mathbf{r})$ and coupling to the electric current $J^\mu = e\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\psi$ in QED. This singularity is physically meaningful, corresponding to the charge's position, and supports local, continuous interactions in the AB effect, where the phase $\phi_{AB} = e\int_C A_\mu dx^\mu$ accumulates smoothly [9]. In contrast, magnetic monopoles require line singularities or patch-dependent gauge potentials, lacking a physical source, and their non-unique potentials violate the ontology's criteria. This distinction explains why electric charges are compatible with the ontology, while magnetic monopoles—Abelian or non-Abelian—are not.

Finally, the appeal of magnetic monopoles in gauge-invariant paradigms stems from their role in electromagnetic duality and theoretical elegance, symmetrizing Maxwell's equations by introducing magnetic charges ($\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = g\delta^3(\mathbf{r})$ for Dirac monopoles or non-zero flux for 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles). However, this symmetry is not observed in nature, as Maxwell's equations and QED maintain $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$, supported by experimental null results [1]. Introducing a dual potential or magnetic current to restore duality would require non-standard modifications to QED, conflicting with the ontology's minimal, local structure. The potential-centric ontology prioritizes the physical reality of A_μ, revealing the unphysical nature of monopole singularities, whereas gauge-invariant paradigms dismiss these as artifacts, highlighting the novelty of our no-go result.

In conclusion, while the Dirac quantization condition provides a theoretical motivation for magnetic monopoles in gauge-invariant frameworks, it is neither necessary nor sufficient in our potential-centric ontology. The singularities and non-unique potentials required by both Dirac and 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles (Sections 4.1, 4.2) conflict with the ontology's requirements, and alternative mechanisms in GUTs explain charge quantization without invoking monopoles. The absence of empirical evidence for monopoles further supports the ontology's conclusion that magnetic monopoles cannot exist.

5.5 Summary: Refuting Counterarguments

These counterarguments—Dirac strings as mathematical artifacts, patch-wise formulations eliminating singularities, emergent monopoles in spin ice, and monopoles explaining charge quantization—fail to overturn the no-go result. For both Abelian Dirac and non-Abelian 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles, singularities (in Dirac strings or transition functions) cause infinite energy density and disrupt locality, while patch-wise formulations introduce non-unique potentials. Emergent monopoles are irrelevant, as they involve effective magnetization, not the Maxwellian **B**. Charge quantization has alternative explanations in GUTs. The topological necessity

($\pi_2(G/H) \cong \mathbb{Z}$) ensures these defects, rendering magnetic monopoles incompatible with our ontology's requirements for a unique, non-singular A_μ or A_μ^a, distinguishing our argument from gauge-invariant paradigms.

6 Extension to Other Topological Defects

The no-go result for magnetic monopoles (Section 4) arises from their non-zero magnetic flux, produced by field configurations classified by $\pi_2(G/H) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, which necessitate singularities or non-unique gauge potentials (A_μ or A_μ^a) in the Lorenz gauge ($\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$), violating our potential-centric ontology's requirements for a unique, non-singular potential mediating local, continuous interactions (Section 3). This section extends the analysis to other topological defects in gauge theories, including cosmic strings, sphalerons, instantons, and skyrmions, assessing their compatibility with the ontology. We demonstrate that some fundamental topological defects in Lorentzian spacetime ($\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$), characterized by non-trivial homotopy groups (e.g., π_1, π_2, π_3), introduce unphysical singularities or non-unique potentials, rendering them incompatible, while emergent or non-physical configurations may be exempt. This universalizes the no-go result, suggesting that fundamental topological defects are physically unrealizable in gauge theories under our framework, with implications for cosmology, electroweak processes, and quantum chromodynamics (QCD).

6.1 Topological Defects in Gauge Theories

Topological defects in gauge theories, such as magnetic monopoles, cosmic strings, and sphalerons, arise from specific field configurations that define non-trivial mappings of spacetime or spatial manifolds to the gauge group's vacuum manifold, characterized by quantities like magnetic flux or Chern-Simons number. In our potential-centric ontology, the gauge potential A_μ or A_μ^a in the Lorenz gauge must be unique, non-singular except at physical sources (e.g., electric charges, quark currents), and mediate local, continuous interactions, as evidenced by the AB effect (Section 3) [9]. We analyze cosmic strings ($\pi_1(\mathrm{U}(1)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$), sphalerons ($\pi_3(\mathrm{SU}(2)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$), instantons ($\pi_3(\mathrm{SU}(2)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$), and skyrmions ($\pi_3(\mathrm{SU}(2)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$), evaluating their gauge potential configurations and ontological compatibility.

Cosmic strings are fundamental topological defects that arise during symmetry-breaking phase transitions in cosmology, primarily in Abelian U(1) gauge theories, such as the Nielsen-Olesen vortex in the Abelian Higgs model, but also in certain non-Abelian gauge theories, such as SU(2) or other gauge groups with appropriate symmetry breaking [18, 29]. They are characterized by a magnetic flux:

$$\Phi = \oint_C A_\mu dx^\mu = \frac{2\pi n}{e}, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}, \tag{63}$$

associated with $\pi_1(G/H) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, where C is a loop encircling the string, and G/H is the vacuum manifold after symmetry breaking (e.g., $G = \mathrm{U}(1)$, $H = \{1\}$ for Abelian strings, or $G = \mathrm{SU}(2)$, $H = \mathrm{U}(1)$ for certain non-Abelian strings). In the Abelian case, the gauge potential A_μ is non-singular, regularized by the Higgs field, and single-valued, with:

$$A_\theta \approx \frac{n}{er} \text{ at } r \to \infty, \tag{64}$$

due to the phase winding of the scalar field $\phi = vf(r)e^{in\theta}$. In non-Abelian gauge theories, cosmic strings may involve gauge potentials A_μ^a with non-trivial gauge group structure, but stable strings typically reduce to an effective U(1)-like flux at large distances due to symmetry breaking to a U(1) subgroup, maintaining a non-singular, single-valued potential in a single gauge [29]. This non-zero flux, reflected in the gauge-invariant Wilson loop $\exp(ie \oint A_\mu dx^\mu) = \exp(i2\pi n)$, is analogous to the AB effect, producing measurable phase shifts. The field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$ (or $F^a_{\mu\nu}$ for non-Abelian strings) is localized near the string's core due to the Higgs mechanism. For a loop C encircling the string, Stokes' theorem holds, as $\int_S F_{\mu\nu} dS^{\mu\nu} = \frac{2\pi n}{e}$ for a surface S piercing the core, and the flux through a closed surface (e.g., a large sphere enclosing a finite string loop) is zero due to $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$. Unlike magnetic monopoles, which require singular (e.g., Dirac string) or non-unique (e.g., Wu-Yang patches) gauge potentials to resolve a Stokes' theorem contradiction due to non-zero flux through closed surfaces (Section 2.1), cosmic strings have a non-singular, single-valued A_μ (or effective A_μ) in a single gauge, satisfying the ontology's requirement for a unique, non-singular gauge potential mediating local, continuous interactions, as in the AB effect. Thus, as fundamental defects in Lorentzian spacetime, both Abelian and non-Abelian cosmic strings are compatible with the potential-centric ontology, distinguishing them from the no-go result for magnetic monopoles (Section 4) [9].

Sphalerons in SU(2) × U(1) electroweak theory are saddle-point configurations mediating transitions between vacuum states differing in Chern-Simons number:

$$N_{CS} = \frac{g^2}{32\pi^2} \int d^3x \, \epsilon^{ijk} \left(F^a_{ij} A^a_k - \frac{2}{3} g \epsilon^{abc} A^a_i A^b_j A^c_k \right), \tag{65}$$

tied to $\pi_3(\mathrm{SU}(2)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, where $F^a_{ij} = \partial_i A^a_j - \partial_j A^a_i + g\epsilon^{abc} A^b_i A^c_j$ is the SU(2) field strength and g is the gauge coupling [15]. These transitions, occurring at high temperatures or energies, violate baryon and lepton number ($\Delta B = \Delta L = n_f$, with $n_f = 3$ fermion families in the Standard Model) due to the chiral anomaly. Sphaleron configurations are non-singular, with gauge fields $A^a_i \sim \epsilon_{iak} \hat{r}_k f(r)/(gr)$ and Higgs fields regularizing the energy to a finite value ($\sim 4\pi v/g$). However, interpolating between vacua with $\Delta N_{CS} = 1$ requires patch-wise gauge potentials with multi-valued transition functions, e.g., $U = \exp(i\alpha^a \tau^a/2)$, leading to non-unique A^a_i across patches. This non-uniqueness violates the ontology's requirement for a unique, non-singular gauge potential A^a_μ in the Lorenz gauge ($\partial_\mu A^{a\mu} = 0$). Thus, sphalerons are incompatible with the potential-centric ontology, which demands a globally single-valued A^a_μ, aligning with the no-go result for magnetic monopoles (Section 4) [9, 15].

Instantons are non-perturbative solutions in SU(2) Yang-Mills theories in Euclidean spacetime ($\mathbb{R}^4$), with topological charge:

$$q = \frac{g^2}{32\pi^2} \int d^4x \, F^a_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{a\mu\nu} \in \mathbb{Z}, \tag{66}$$

reflecting $\pi_3(\mathrm{SU}(2)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ [4]. As Euclidean constructs, instantons are not physical fields in $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$, but their quantum effects (e.g., chiral symmetry breaking, θ-vacuum structure) influence physical observables in Lorentzian spacetime via path integral continuation. These effects are gauge-invariant and computed via:

$$Z[\theta] = \sum_n e^{in\theta} \int_{\{A|q=n\}} \mathcal{D}A_\mu \mathcal{D}\psi \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} e^{-S[A,\psi,\bar{\psi}]}, \tag{67}$$

without requiring a physical A^a_μ in $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$. Thus, instantons' effects are compatible with the potential-centric ontology, as they avoid singular or non-unique gauge potentials in Lorentzian spacetime.

Skyrmions are topological solitons in the Skyrme model, a non-linear sigma model of pions, with baryon number:

$$B = \frac{1}{24\pi^2} \int d^3x \, \epsilon^{ijk} \mathrm{Tr} \left(U^{-1} \partial_i U U^{-1} \partial_j U U^{-1} \partial_k U \right) \in \mathbb{Z}, \tag{68}$$

tied to $\pi_3(\mathrm{SU}(2)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ [16, 25]. In the non-gauged Skyrme model, no fundamental gauge potential A^a_μ exists, only the pion field $U \in \mathrm{SU}(2)$, which is single-valued and non-singular, satisfying the ontology's requirements. In gauged versions coupled to electromagnetism, the induced A_μ responds to baryon currents (e.g., $J^\mu \propto \bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\psi$) and is single-valued in the Lorenz gauge, as it lacks topological constraints like those in magnetic monopoles. As an emergent field, it is exempt from the ontology's constraints, similar to superconductor vortices. Thus, skyrmions are compatible, either as non-gauged solitons or emergent configurations.

6.2 A Universal No-Go Result

Fundamental topological defects in gauge theories—magnetic monopoles and sphalerons—require non-unique or singular gauge potentials due to field configurations classified by non-trivial homotopy groups (π_2, π_3). Singular gauges yield infinite energy density in interactions (e.g., $\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} \propto A^a_\mu J^{a\mu}$) at unphysical points, while patch-wise formulations introduce non-unique potentials, disrupting locality (e.g., AB effect, Wilson loops) and violating uniqueness, as they lead to a Stokes' theorem contradiction for closed surfaces. Cosmic strings, however, are compatible with the potential-centric ontology, as their non-singular, single-valued gauge potential A_μ in a single gauge satisfies Stokes' theorem, with the flux $\oint_C A_\mu dx^\mu = \frac{2\pi n}{e}$ accounted for by the localized field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$. Instantons, being Euclidean, and skyrmions, being non-gauged or emergent, are also compatible, as they avoid fundamental gauge potential defects.

Unlike electric charges or quark currents, which produce singularities at physical sources (e.g., $\nabla^2 A_0 = -\frac{q}{\epsilon_0}\delta^3(\mathbf{r})$), topological defects like monopoles and sphalerons lack such sources, rendering their singularities unphysical. Their field configurations, classified by non-trivial homotopy groups (π_2, π_3), produce these defects, as their non-zero winding numbers correspond to non-zero fluxes or Chern-Simons numbers. Cosmic strings, with $\pi_1(\mathrm{U}(1)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, avoid this issue, as their flux is consistent with a non-singular A_μ and $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$. Thus, fundamental topological defects like monopoles and sphalerons are incompatible with our ontology, which prioritizes a unique, non-singular gauge potential mediating local, continuous interactions, while cosmic strings, instantons, and skyrmions are compatible.

This no-go result, applying to monopoles and sphalerons, offers a novel argument against their existence. While gauge-invariant paradigms treat singularities as mathematical artifacts, our ontology views them as physical defects. Cosmic strings' compatibility suggests they may exist as physical defects in cosmology, consistent with their non-detection but theoretical plausibility. The result explains the absence of magnetic monopoles and baryon number violation in standard electroweak processes, while aligning with the composite nature of skyrmions in QCD and instantons' quantum effects. By rejecting certain fundamental topological defects, our ontology provides a unified perspective on gauge theories, emphasizing the physical reality of the gauge potential over problematic topological constructs.

7 Extension to D-Branes in String Theory

D-branes, fundamental objects in string theory, are extended hypersurfaces where open strings terminate, playing a pivotal role in non-perturbative phenomena, dualities, and the AdS/CFT correspondence [13, 19, 20, 33]. Unlike traditional topological defects like magnetic monopoles or cosmic strings, D-branes are dynamical objects sourcing Ramond-Ramond (RR) fields, which are differential forms in 10-dimensional spacetime. This section extends our potential-centric ontology, where the gauge potential (here, the RR potential C_{p+1}) is the fundamental entity mediating local, continuous interactions (Section 3), to assess D-branes' compatibility. We demonstrate that D-branes exhibit an AB-like effect for their RR potentials, but their non-zero RR flux leads to a Stokes' theorem contradiction, requiring singular or non-unique potentials, rendering them incompatible with the ontology, akin to magnetic monopoles (Section 4).

7.1 Introduction to D-Branes

A Dp-brane is a p-dimensional spatial hypersurface in 10-dimensional spacetime, where open strings end with Dirichlet boundary conditions [19]. D-branes carry RR charges, coupling to RR potentials C_{p+1}, a $(p+1)$-form, via the Chern-Simons term in their worldvolume action:

$$S_{\text{CS}} \propto \mu_p \int_{\text{Dp}} C_{p+1} \wedge e^{2\pi\alpha' F}, \tag{69}$$

where μ_p is the D-brane charge, α' is the string scale, and $F = dA$ is the field strength of the U(1) gauge field A_μ on the D-brane's $(p+1)$-dimensional worldvolume. The RR field strength is $G_{p+2} = dC_{p+1}$ (in the absence of background fluxes), and the D-brane acts as a source:

$$dG_{p+2} = \mu_p \delta^{9-p}(\Sigma_{\text{Dp}}), \tag{70}$$

where δ^{9-p} is a delta function supported on the D-brane's worldvolume Σ_{Dp}. The RR charge is measured by the flux:

$$Q_p = \oint_{S^{p+2}} G_{p+2}, \tag{71}$$

over a $(p+2)$-dimensional surface S^{p+2} (e.g., a sphere) linking the D-brane in the transverse directions [20]. For example, a D0-brane (point-like) sources C_1, with flux over an S^2, while a D1-brane (string-like) sources C_2, with flux over an S^3. This non-zero flux, classified by K-theory or cohomology, is analogous to the magnetic flux of a monopole ($\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = g$, Eq. 1).

7.2 AB-Like Effect for RR Potentials

The potential-centric ontology relies on the AB effect, where the gauge potential A_μ mediates observable phase shifts in field-free regions ($F_{\mu\nu} = 0$), establishing its physical reality (Section 3) [2]. For D-branes, an analogous AB-like effect exists for the RR potential C_{p+1}. A probe Dq-brane ($q \geq p$) or fundamental string moving in the field of a Dp-brane couples to C_{p+1} via the Chern-Simons term (Eq. 69). Consider a probe Dq-brane encircling the Dp-brane along a closed $(p+1)$-dimensional cycle C^{p+1} on its worldvolume, in a region where $G_{p+2} = 0$. The worldvolume action contributes a phase:

$$\exp\left(i\mu_q \oint_{C^{p+1}} C_{p+1} \right), \tag{72}$$

where μ_q is the probe's charge. This phase is gauge-invariant and observable, analogous to the AB phase $\exp(ie \oint_C A_\mu dx^\mu)$. For example:

- A D0-brane sources C_1, and a probe D2-brane encircling it along a 1-cycle C^1 (a loop) acquires a phase $\oint_{C^1} C_1$.
- A D1-brane sources C_2, and a probe D3-brane encircling it over a 2-cycle C^2 (e.g., a 2-sphere) acquires a phase $\oint_{C^2} C_2$.

This AB-like effect establishes the physical reality of C_{p+1}, as it directly influences observables (phase shifts) in regions where the field strength $G_{p+2} = 0$, mirroring the role of A_μ in the AB effect (Section 3). The non-trivial topology of the spacetime manifold minus the D-brane ($\pi_{p+1}(S^{9-p})$) ensures a non-zero phase, similar to the monopole's $\pi_2(S^2) \cong \mathbb{Z}$.

7.3 Stokes' Theorem Contradiction

The non-zero RR flux (Eq. 71) leads to a Stokes' theorem contradiction, akin to magnetic monopoles (Section 2.1). For a closed $(p+2)$-dimensional surface S^{p+2} linking the Dp-brane, the flux is:

$$\oint_{S^{p+2}} G_{p+2} = Q_p \neq 0. \tag{73}$$

In the absence of D-branes, $G_{p+2} = dC_{p+1}$, and Stokes' theorem for a closed surface ($\partial S^{p+2} = \emptyset$) implies:

$$\oint_{S^{p+2}} G_{p+2} = \oint_{\partial S^{p+2}} C_{p+1} = 0. \tag{74}$$

The non-zero flux contradicts this unless C_{p+1} is not globally defined. To reconcile the flux, C_{p+1} requires either:

- **Singularities**: A higher-dimensional analogue of the Dirac string, where C_{p+1} has a singularity along a $(9-p)$-dimensional submanifold, carrying the flux (similar to Eq. 32).
- **Non-unique potentials**: Patch-wise definitions, analogous to Wu-Yang patches (Eqs. 8, 9), where C_{p+1} differs across overlapping regions, related by gauge transformations with multi-valued transition functions.

This is due to the non-trivial topology of the spacetime minus the D-brane, classified by $\pi_{p+1}(S^{9-p})$. For example, a D0-brane in 10D spacetime has a flux over S^2, with $\pi_1(S^8)$, while a D1-brane has a flux over S^3, with $\pi_2(S^7)$. These topological obstructions prevent a globally defined, non-singular C_{p+1}, violating the ontology's requirement for a unique, non-singular potential mediating local interactions.

In contrast, the worldvolume gauge field A_μ on the Dp-brane, with field strength $F = dA$, typically satisfies $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0$ (no magnetic monopoles on the worldvolume). For a closed surface S on the worldvolume, $\oint_S F = 0$, and Stokes' theorem holds:

$$\oint_C A_\mu dx^\mu = \int_S F, \tag{75}$$

where $C = \partial S$. If the worldvolume hosts vortex-like defects, the flux $\oint_C A_\mu dx^\mu = \frac{2\pi n}{e}$ is accounted for by localized F, as in cosmic strings (Section 6.1), ensuring compatibility with the ontology.

7.4 A No-Go Result for D-Branes

The AB-like effect for C_{p+1} (Eq. 72) confirms its physical reality, as it mediates observable phase shifts in field-free regions, analogous to A_μ in the AB effect (Section 3). However, the Stokes' theorem contradiction requires singular or non-unique C_{p+1}, violating the ontology's criteria: uniqueness, non-singularity except at physical sources, and locality of interactions. This parallels the no-go result for magnetic monopoles, where the non-zero flux $\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = g$ necessitates singularities or non-unique potentials (Section 4). Since the RR potential C_{p+1} is integral to the D-brane's definition as an RR source (Eq. 69), D-branes are fundamentally incompatible with the ontology.

Unlike magnetic monopoles, whose incompatibility is reinforced by the experimentally confirmed AB effect for A_μ in quantum mechanics, ruling out their existence due to the Stokes' theorem contradiction (Section 4), D-branes are hypothetical entities in string theory, lacking experimental confirmation of their AB-like effect for C_{p+1}. The no-go result for D-branes arises from a theoretical self-contradiction: the AB-like effect establishes C_{p+1}'s physical reality

(Eq. 72), but its singularity or non-uniqueness, required to resolve the Stokes' theorem contradiction (Section 7.3), violates the ontology's requirements. Thus, while monopoles are refuted by both theory and experiment, D-branes' incompatibility stems from an internal inconsistency within string theory's framework, independent of empirical evidence, highlighting a fundamental challenge to their physical realizability in the potential-centric ontology.

Note that the non-gauge-invariance of G_{p+2} in the presence of the Neveu-Schwarz (NS) 3-form field strength $H_3 \neq 0$ does not undermine the no-go result but strengthens it. The patch-wise definition of C_{p+1}, necessitated by the modified field strength $G_{p+2} = dC_{p+1} + H_3 \wedge C_{p-1}$, mirrors the Wu-Yang approach for monopoles (Section 2.1.2), where non-unique potentials resolve the non-zero flux. Singularities, interpreted as D-branes (e.g., D(p-2)-branes), are analogous to the Dirac string (Section 2.1.1), further violating the ontology's requirement for non-singularity. The Hanany-Witten transition, where D-brane creation alters the flux topology [11], underscores the need for such configurations, reinforcing the Stokes' theorem contradiction and D-branes' incompatibility with the ontology, as the physical reality of C_{p+1}, established by the AB-like effect (Eq. 72), demands a unique, non-singular potential.

This no-go result is significant, as D-branes are central to string theory, underpinning dualities, black hole entropy, and gauge/gravity correspondences [3, 14, 19, 31]. String theory's gauge-invariant formalism often dismisses singularities and non-uniqeness as mathematical artifacts. Nevertheless, the AB-like effect and Stokes' theorem contradiction provide a robust argument against D-branes' existence, challenging string theory's framework. Future work could explore whether alternative ontologies accommodate higher-form potentials or whether string theory's reliance on D-branes necessitates a modified gauge potential framework.

8 Conclusions and Future Directions

This study establishes a robust no-go theorem for magnetic monopoles—both Abelian Dirac and non-Abelian 't Hooft-Polyakov types—within a potential-centric ontology, where the gauge potential A_μ (or A^a_μ in non-Abelian theories), fixed in the Lorenz gauge ($\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$), is the fundamental physical entity mediating local, continuous interactions. We demonstrate that these monopoles, characterized by non-zero magnetic flux ($\oint_S \mathbf{B} \cdot d\mathbf{S} = g$) produced by field configurations classified by $\pi_2(G/H) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, necessitate unphysical singularities or non-unique gauge potentials in all formulations to resolve a Stokes' theorem contradiction (Section 4). For Dirac monopoles, the Dirac string introduces a line singularity, while the Wu-Yang patch-wise approach introduces non-unique gauge potentials. Similarly, 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles require either a singular gauge with a Dirac string-like defect or patch-wise potentials with multi-valued transition functions (Eq. 19), both violating the ontology's requirements for uniqueness, non-singularity except at physical sources, and locality, as evidenced by infinite energy density in interactions ($\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} \propto A_\mu J^\mu$) and indeterminate phase integrals in the AB effect (Sections 4.1, 4.2).

This no-go result extends to sphalerons ($\pi_3(\text{SU}(2)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$), whose non-unique gauge potentials disrupt locality and uniqueness (Section 6.1), and to D-branes in string theory, whose RR potentials C_{p+1} exhibit an AB-like effect but require singular or non-unique potentials due to non-zero flux ($\oint_{S^{p+2}} G_{p+2} = Q_p$), leading to a theoretical self-contradiction independent of experimental evidence (Section 7). In contrast, cosmic strings ($\pi_1(\text{U}(1)) \cong \mathbb{Z}$) are compatible with the ontology, as their non-singular, single-valued gauge potential A_μ in a single gauge satisfies Stokes' theorem, with the flux $\oint_C A_\mu dx^\mu = \frac{2\pi n}{e}$ accounted for by the localized field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$ (Section 6.1). Instantons, being Euclidean constructs, and skyrmions, as non-gauged or emergent solitons, are also compatible, as they avoid fundamental gauge potential defects (Section 6.1). This distinguishes monopoles and sphalerons as physically unrealizable in our ontology, while cosmic strings may exist as physical defects, consistent with their theoretical plausibility in cosmology.

The ontology's prioritization of A_μ's physical reality, grounded in the AB effect's local, continuous phase accumulation (Section 3), distinguishes this result from gauge-invariant paradigms, where singularities are dismissed as mathematical artifacts (Section 5). Responses to counter-arguments—Dirac strings as artifacts, patch-wise formulations, emergent monopoles in spin ice, and monopoles' role in electric charge quantization—reinforce the theorem's robustness. Notably, charge quantization is explained without monopoles via the algebraic structure of GUTs like SU(5) or SO(10), consistent with experimental null results and the ontology's compatibility with electric charges, which produce physically meaningful singularities at their sources. For D-branes, their centrality in string theory (dualities, AdS/CFT) underscores the significance of their theoretical inconsistency, challenging their physical realizability.

The theorem is empirically testable: detecting a magnetic monopole or sphaleron would falsify the ontology, while cosmic strings' compatibility suggests they could be observed in cosmological probes. Current null results from high-energy experiments and cosmological constraints support our conclusions for monopoles and sphalerons [1]. Future research should pursue enhanced experimental searches, such as MoEDAL's ongoing efforts or cosmological probes of relic defects like cosmic strings, and explore theoretical extensions to non-Abelian gauge theories via Wilson loops and to string theory's higher-form potentials. Additionally, applying this framework to gravitational theories, where the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ may serve as a potential-like entity, could unify gauge and spacetime interactions, offering novel insights into their ontology. These directions promise to advance our understanding of gauge theories, electromagnetic asymmetry, and the fundamental structure of physical reality.

References

[1] Acharya, B. et al. (MoEDAL Collaboration). (2017). Search for Magnetic Monopoles with the MoEDAL Forward Trapping Detector in 13 TeV Proton-Proton Collisions at the LHC. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 118, 061801.

[2] Aharonov, Y., and Bohm, D. (1959). Significance of Electromagnetic Potentials in the Quantum Theory. *Physical Review*, 115(3), 485–491.

[3] Ammon, M. and Erdmenger, J. (2015). *Gauge/Gravity Duality: Foundations and Applications.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

[4] Belavin, A. A., Polyakov, A. M., Schwartz, A. S., and Tyupkin, Yu. S. (1975). Pseudoparticle solutions of the Yang-Mills equations. *Phys. Lett. B*, 59: 85–87.

[5] Castelnovo, C., Moessner, R. and Sondhi, S. L. (2008). Magnetic Monopoles in Spin Ice. *Nature*, 451, 42-45.

[6] Dirac, P. A. M. (1931). Quantised Singularities in the Electromagnetic Field. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A*, 133(821), 60–72.

[7] Dirac, P. A. M. (1948). The Theory of Magnetic Poles. *Phys. Rev.*, 74: 817-830.

[8] Gao, S. (2025a). Generalized Aharonov-Bohm Effect: Its Derivation, Theoretical Implications and Experimental Tests. https://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/24726/.

[9] Gao, S. (2025b). The Aharonov-Bohm Effect Explained: Reality of Gauge Potentials and Its Implications. https://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/24913/.

[10] Gao, S. (2025c) Can Unitary Gauge Provide a Local and Gauge-Invariant Explanation of the Aharonov-Bohm Effect? https://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/24678/.

[11] Hanany, A. and Witten, E. (1997). Type IIB Superstrings, BPS Monopoles, and Three-Dimensional Gauge Dynamics, *Nucl. Phys. B* 492, 152.

[12] Heras, R. (2018). Dirac quantisation condition: a comprehensive review. *Contemp. Phys.*, 59, 331–349.

[13] Johnson, C. V. (2003). *D-Branes.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

[14] Maldacena, J. (1998). The Large N Limit of Superconformal Field Theories and Supergravity. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* 2, 231.

[15] Manton, N. S. (1983). Topology in the Weinberg-Salam model. *Phys. Rev. D*, 28: 2019–2026.

[16] Manton, N. S. (2022). *Skyrmions – A Theory of Nuclei.* Singapore: World Scientific Publishing Co.

[17] Morris, D. J. P. et al. (2009). Dirac Strings and Magnetic Monopoles in Spin Ice $Dy_2Ti_2O_7$. *Science*, 326, 411–414.

[18] Nielsen, H. B., and Olesen, P. (1973). Vortex-line models for dual strings. *Nuclear Physics B*, 61, 45–61.

[19] Polchinski, J. (1995). Dirichlet Branes and Ramond-Ramond Charges. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 75, 4724.

[20] Polchinski, J. (1998). *String Theory.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

[21] Polchinski, J. (2004). Monopoles, Duality, and String Theory. *International Journal of Modern Physics A*, 19(Supplement 1), 145–156.

[22] Polyakov, A. M. (1974). Particle Spectrum in Quantum Field Theory. *JETP Letters*, 20(6), 194–195.

[23] Preskill, J. P. (1979). Cosmological production of superheavy magnetic monopoles. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 43: 1365–1368.

[24] Shnir, Y. M. (2005). *Magnetic Monopoles.* Berlin, Germany: Springer.

[25] Skyrme, T. H. R. (1962). A unified field theory of mesons and baryons. *Nucl. Phys.*, 31: 556–569.

[26] 't Hooft, G. (1974). Magnetic Monopoles in Unified Gauge Theories. *Nuclear Physics B*, 79(2), 276–284.

[27] Tinkham, M. (2004). *Introduction to Superconductivity.* 2nd ed., Dover Publications.

[28] Tonomura, A., Osakabe, N., Matsuda, T., Kawasaki, T., Endo, J., Yano, S., and Yamada, H. (1986). Evidence for Aharonov-Bohm effect with magnetic field completely shielded from electron wave. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 56, 792–795.

[29] Vilenkin, A., and Shellard, E. P. S. (2000). *Cosmic Strings and Other Topological Defects.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

[30] Wallace, D. (2014). Deflating the Aharonov-Bohm effect. Forthcoming; available online at https://arxiv.org/abs/1407.5073.

[31] Witten, E. (1995). String Theory Dynamics in Various Dimensions, *Nucl. Phys. B* 443, 85.

[32] Wu, T. T., and Yang, C. N. (1975). Concept of Nonintegrable Phase Factors and Global Formulation of Gauge Fields. *Physical Review D*, 12(12), 3845–3857.

[33] Zwiebach, B. (2004). *A First Course in String Theory.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.