

# Quantum discreteness is an illusion

H. Dieter Zeh ([www.zeh-hd.de](http://www.zeh-hd.de)) - arxiv:0809.2904v3

**Abstract:** I review arguments demonstrating how the concept of “particle numbers” arises as a consequence of the equidistant energy spectra of coupled harmonic oscillators representing free fields. Their quantum numbers (numbers of nodes of the wave function) can be interpreted as occupation numbers for objects with a formal mass (defined by the field equation) and spatial wave number (“momentum”) of the classical field mode. The superposition of quantum states with  $n$  different modes having one node, all others none, then defines a non-degenerate “ $n$ -particle wave function”. Other discrete properties and phenomena (such as events and discrete mass points) can be understood by means of the fast but smooth process of decoherence: the irreversible delocalization of superpositions. Any wave-particle dualism thus becomes obsolete. The observation of *individual* outcomes of this process, which by itself leads to apparent ensembles of different outcomes, requires either a subsequent collapse of the wave function or a “branching observer” in accordance with the Schrödinger equation – both possibilities applying clearly after the decoherence process. Any probability interpretation of the wave function in terms of local elements of reality would open a Pandora’s box of paradoxes.

## 1. Introduction

The discreteness of Nature was the *leitmotiv* for the physics of the first third of the twentieth century. Atoms and molecules were finally confirmed to exist, while electromagnetic radiation was shown to consist of quanta that could also have particle-like effects (photons). The atoms themselves were found to consist of nuclei and electrons as the carriers of discrete units of charge, and to exist only in discrete energy states formed by these constituents – with transitions between them occurring as discrete “quantum jumps”. Therefore, the new theory, which is governed by Max Planck’s *quantum of action*, got the name “quantum theory” (a theory of discrete quantities). For given frequencies, this fundamental constant defines the energy quanta which Planck had postulated in order to explain the spectral distribution of thermal radiation.

On the other hand, the basic principle of the later formulated quantum theory, the superposition principle, always requires a continuum (in what is called Hilbert space). Its most familiar application, the superposition of classical configurations, gives rise to the concept of wave functions. Unfortunately, most textbooks start teaching quantum theory by following the early Schrödinger in extensively studying independent-particle problems, thus giving the impression that the wave function is something like a spatial field (see the remark concerning the “second quantization” in Sect. 2). So it may not be surprising that many scientists still believe that each electron in an atom possesses its own wave function (except for their antisymmetrization). Entanglement, which is a generic consequence of the super-

position principle, and which has for a long time been known to be important in atomic physics, has often not been taken seriously as a generic property of real quantum states.

If the relevant classical configuration space consists of the amplitudes of certain *fields*, the wave function becomes an entangled “wave functional” for all of them. However, there are also quantum systems which can *not* be obtained by quantizing a classical system – for example certain “intrinsic” properties of elementary particles.

In this formulation of quantum theory by means of wave functions, Planck’s constant is not used to describe discrete quantities (“quanta”), but merely as a scaling parameter, required to replace canonical momenta and energies by wave lengths and frequencies, respectively, just as time is replaced by length by means of the velocity of light in the theory of relativity. I will therefore simply drop it in the following by an appropriate choice of units. The corresponding “uncertainty relations” can be readily understood by the Fourier theorem (see also Sect. 5), and discrete energies by the number of nodes of the wave function, required for fulfilling certain boundary conditions (while the general state may be any superposition of these discrete states – thus recovering the continuum).

Any remaining discreteness can then enter the theory only through an added “interpretation” of the wave function – in particular in terms of probabilities for assumed particles or the occurrence of “events”. Stochastic decay of an unstable state may be the most prominent example of a quantum event. However, the measurement process (including the measurement of decay events) has in recent years been dynamically analyzed by means of the process of environmental decoherence, which is a smooth process that acts very fast but according to the Schrödinger equation, and thus mimics quantum jumps in a sense that will be discussed. Decoherence also leads to (apparent) ensembles of narrow wave packets, which may mimic classical points in configuration space (Sect. 3).

How much of the apparent discreteness of Nature can in a similar way be understood in terms of a universal Schrödinger equation? Many objections have been raised against such a program: the deterministic Schrödinger equation cannot *really* describe probabilistic events; one has to *presume* a particle concept in order to quantize it, and a concept of particle *numbers* to define an n-particle problem; the wave function seems to be defined on a space of possible configurations and thus to represent mere “potentialities”; etc.

I will now argue that all these objections can be overcome, and that the apparent discreteness can be deduced from a smoothly evolving wave function that may be assumed to describe reality. Nothing in the following is new. The purpose of this article is merely pedagogical, so I had already posted some of the text in the form of various “web essays” on my

website. The major motivation for writing it up was the observation that tradition seems to be incredibly strong even in the absence of any arguments supporting it. In particular, the Heisenberg picture of quantum mechanics has led to an almost religious belief in the existence of particles because of the central role of “observables” which replace particle variables. Therefore, quantum theory is in general taught in a way that is based on historical prejudice, by using empirically unjustified and/or inconsistent concepts (circumstribed as a dualism or complementarity) that were introduced at a time when the theory was insufficiently understood.

The only as yet unexplained discrete quantities may be the electric charge and its generalizations. Although there have been attempts to understand them as topological numbers (winding numvers) – hence as a consequence of certain *classical* fields – no such explanation has as yet been confirmed.

## 2. Quantum numbers and “particle” numbers

On a one-dimensional configuration space, the solutions of the eigenvalue equation  $H\psi = E\psi$  are characterized by their numbers of nodes,  $n$ . This Schrödinger equation is usually called “stationary”, but this terminology is lent from a statistical interpretation in terms of particles, and therefore already misleading. According to the wave function formalism it should be called a “static” equation, since it does not refer to time in any way. During the early days of quantum theory, most physicists believed that the dynamics of quantum states consisted solely of quantum jumps between energy eigenstates, while the time-dependent Schrödinger equation would allow them just to calculate the corresponding probabilities.<sup>1</sup>

Since the d’Alembertian forming the kinetic energy operator in the Schrödinger equation measures the curvature of the wave function, and since curvature must increase with the number of nodes, the energy eigenvalues can usually be sorted according to these “quantum numbers”. This operator should therefore better be called a curvature operator, as it has nothing to do with motion in the quantum formalism. In the multidimensional case, the nodes are replaced by a grid of hypersurfaces, which factorizes in an analytical way only for the familiar textbook applications that exploit symmetries.

The time-dependent Schrödinger equation explains energies as frequencies. However, since its generic solution is a *superposition* of different energy eigenstates, the preferred occurrence of the latter in microscopic systems has still to be understood (see Sect. 3).

Solutions of both Schrödinger equations are in general difficult to find, since all variables are generically entangled in a complicated way. Only approximate or effective

solutions, often using phenomenological variables, are then available. Coupled harmonic oscillators provide a very fortunate exception – even when they are themselves based on approximations. A system of coupled oscillators can be diagonalized *before* quantization (defining classical “eigenmodes”  $k$ , say), and then treated as a set of independent quantum oscillators, which give rise to a product wave function – each factor with its own number of nodes  $n_k$ . This procedure applies in particular to free fields. Note, however, that these nodes of the wave functions have to be distinguished from the nodes which may characterize the classical field modes,  $k$ . The latter represent *spatial* (not canonical) wave numbers or momenta.

This situation has two important consequences: (1) energy eigenvalues of different modes add,  $E = \sum E^{(k)}$ , and (2) the energy eigenvalues of the individual harmonic oscillators  $k$  depend linearly on  $n_k$ . For a field with a “mass” parameter  $m$  (defined by the field equation), the energy eigenvalues for the modes are given by  $E^{(k)}_{n_k} = \sqrt{m^2 + k^2} \left( n_k + \frac{1}{2} \right)$ . Except for the zero point energy, the quantum numbers  $n_k$  can therefore be regarded as “occupation numbers” for objects with mass  $m$  and momentum  $k$ . However, in this field quantization,  $n_k$  is nothing but the number of nodes of the factor wave function characterizing the quantum state of mode  $k$ . It is then not surprising that there are also superpositions of different “particle numbers”. This interpretation of Planck’s quanta has recently been confirmed in an elegant way by experimentally determining the Wigner function (which is defined as a partial Fourier transform of the density matrix that in this case is the dyadic product of the wave function) for  $n$ -photon states in a single cavity mode.<sup>2</sup> The nodes then form circles in the thus defined phase space of this one-dimensional oscillator.

In the nonrelativistic case of massive particles, states with different *total* number of nodes,  $n = \sum n_k$ , are energetically more different from one another than those which differ only by their individual  $n_k$ ’s. So the latter may more easily be superposed in practice than those with different total occupation number. (There may also be other properties which restrict possible superpositions, such as electric charge – see Sect. 3.) For  $n=1$ , this leads to a superposition of different *modes*  $k$ , that defines the Fourier transform of a “single-particle” wave function in space. In the general case, one obtains entangled  $n$ -“particle” wave functions (for example, products of  $n$  wave packets in space). Evidently, these multiple energy quanta cannot be distinguished from one another in an absolute sense (just their number is meaningful), while the empirical fact that the wave functions come with different exchange symmetries for bosons and fermions, thus restricting the fermion node numbers to 0 and 1, appears to have not yet been satisfactorily explained from first principles.

This approximation, which gives rise to the conventional  $n$ -particle quantum *mechanics*, is valid only in the nonrelativistic case. Many other useful but non-fundamental quantization procedures are known, such as for the rigid rotator or for vibrational modes (leading to rotational spectra and phonons, respectively). In the relativistic case, the phenomenological quantization of particles fails; one has to use field quantization from the beginning, whereby the fields to be quantized need not appear as classical fields. Their possible amplitudes form the basis for the corresponding Hilbert space, such that general states are given by their superpositions (wave functionals for fields). The very concept of quantization can simply be understood as the conceptual reversal of the physical process of decoherence (Sect. 3), while the thus recovered quantum states have to obey a generalized Schrödinger equation. It is therefore not even clear whether fields really form the ultimate fundamental Hilbert space basis – as assumed for unified field theories.

Non-classical fields, such as spinor fields, are often confused with (and were originally discovered as) single particle wave functions. This has led to the misnomer of a “second quantization”,<sup>3</sup> although there are no particles to be quantized any more in quantum field theory. It is thus particularly paradoxical that high-energy physics is often referred to as “particle physics”. Many formulations of quantum field theory start by introducing “particle creation and annihilation” operators, which are no more than formal transition operators between wave functions with different numbers of nodes.

I will now argue that particles are not even required for a probability interpretation of the wave function as suggested by Born and Pauli.

### **3. Superselection rules, localization and stochastic events**

When Ernst Mach was confronted with the concept of atoms, he used to ask: “Have you seen one?” He did accept their existence only when Loschmidt’s number had been confirmed beyond doubt. At his time he could hardly imagine that this number represented the number of nodes of some not-yet-known and extremely complex wave function.

However, can we today not observe individual atoms and other particles in many ways, such as by clicks of a counter, spots on a screen, or tracks in a bubble chamber? When experimentalists store single “particles” in a cavity, these may again be understood in terms of wave functionals with one single node – but why do they often *appear* as pointlike (discrete) objects in space?

What we actually observe in such cases are the “pointer positions” of appropriate measurement devices, that is, positions of macroscopic quantities, such as spots or droplets, or

short sounds. So one naturally expects local causes for these phenomena. While particles are indeed essential for Heisenberg's quantization procedure, Niels Bohr was more careful – at least during his later years. He presumed classical properties to apply consistently only to macroscopic objects. In a recent paper,<sup>4</sup> Ulfbeck and Aage Bohr (Niels Bohr's son) concluded that in an observed quantum decay “No event takes place in the source itself as a precursor of the click in the counter ...”. They refer to this interpretation as “the new quantum theory”, although they do not specify whether they thereby mean Niels Bohr's later interpretation or their own generalization of it. So far I agree with them, but they claim furthermore that “the wave function loses its meaning” when the macroscopic click occurs.

With this latter assumption, Ulfbeck and Bohr are missing a better and more consistent description of the quantum measurement and its classical outcome. If the apparatus *and* the environment are both included in the description by a Schrödinger wave function, interaction leads to a dislocalization of the original superposition, known as decoherence.<sup>5</sup> This process may well *explain* Niels Bohr's deep pragmatic insights,<sup>6</sup> but without postulating classical “pointer positions” or “events” to spontaneously occur in measurements – in *contrast* to the smooth Schrödinger dynamics.<sup>7</sup> Although Ulfbeck and Bohr's claim may then even be justified in the sense that the complete wave function just becomes *inaccessible* to a local observer, this consequence is derived by *assuming the existence* of a global wave function.

Since misinterpretations of decoherence (such as in terms of perturbations by, rather than entanglement with, the environment) are still quite popular, let me here explicitly recall its mechanism and meaning. For this purpose, assume that some macroscopic variable  $y$  had been brought into a superposition  $\psi(y)$ . Its uncontrollable environment  $\chi(z)$ , where  $z$  may represent very many variables, would then unavoidably and extremely fast be transformed into a state  $\chi_y(z)$  that depends strongly on  $y$ , while a reaction (recoil) of the macroscopic system,  $\psi \rightarrow \psi'$ , can often be neglected. The initial superposition described by  $\psi(y)$ , which would represent a “Schrödinger cat”, is thus (in practice irreversibly) dislocalized, although it remains open what the resulting entangled global state  $\psi(y)\chi_y(z)$  means.

So one might expect never to find any macroscopic variable in a superposition  $\psi(y)$  by itself (an essential step to explain classical behavior in terms of wave functions). However, a macroscopic superposition entangled with a microscopic system may be produced in a measurement. If the microscopic superposition  $\phi(x)=\sum c_n\phi_n$  is measured by a pointer variable  $y$ , one has according to von Neumann's unitary measurement interaction,

$$\sum c_n\phi_n\psi_0(y) \rightarrow \sum c_n\phi_n\psi_n(y),$$

where  $\psi_n(y)$  are narrow and mutually orthogonal wave packets centered at pointer positions  $y_n$ . If  $y$  were a microscopic variable that could be isolated from its environment, this process would represent a reversible measurement (or a “virtual” decoherence of the original superposition  $\phi$ ), but according to what has been said above, the superposition of macroscopically different pointer states  $\psi_n$  would immediately be *irreversibly* decohered by its environment. The superposition can then never be relocalized (“recohered”) any more. Although we do not yet know what this nonlocal superposition *means*, this fast but smooth process of decoherence must be responsible for the appearance of a stochastic quantum jump into one of the pointer states  $\psi_n$  (see below).

Exceptions to the superposition principle, such as those effectively applying to macroscopic variables, are called “superselection rules”. Others, such as charge superselection rules, can similarly be explained by entanglement with the environment, in this case between a local charge and the quantum state of its Coulomb field.<sup>8</sup> The Coulomb constraint, which requires this specific entanglement, can either be understood as part of the kinematics, or again as being “caused” in the form of the retarded Coulomb field of the conserved charge. Charge conservation by itself is insufficient to establish the absence of superpositions.

The arrow of time required for the irreversibility of decoherence derives from assumptions analogous to those used in irreversible statistical physics: all correlations (including entanglement) must form “forks of causality”, based on a common local cause in their past.<sup>9</sup> It then follows from statistical arguments, by taking into account the complexity of macroscopic systems, that these correlations usually remain irrelevant for all relevant future – so they have no local effects. In particular, if all existing interactions are local (see Sect. 4), the approximately factorizing *components* of dislocalized superpositions remain dynamically autonomous in practice. In them, all macroscopic variables are in narrow wave packets which mimic classical states (points in what we classically regard as a configuration space). Note that I have not used any concept of a reduced density matrix or “mixed state” in this argument. We have then two options to understand this situation in accordance with the observed world: either we assume that decoherence triggers a collapse of the wave function, in which all but one of the autonomous components disappear by means of an unknown violation of unitary dynamics, or, according to Everett, that all unitarily arising components exist simultaneously, forming a “multiverse” that consists of many different quasi-classical worlds containing many different successors of the same observers.

Superpositions of macroscopic variables are thus permanently decohered, for example by the scattering of light. While thermal radiation would suffice to cause decoherence,

ordered light carries away redundant *information* about the classical trajectory. In this sense, a macroscopic trajectory is “overdetermined by the future” in each branch. This is the physical reason why the macroscopic past appears “fixed”.

An *almost* classical trajectory can be observed for an  $\alpha$ -particle in a Wilson chamber by means of repeated measurements of its position by the undercooled gas. Although its wave function may flow out of a decaying atomic nucleus as a spherical wave, according to Mott’s analysis<sup>10</sup> the interaction with the electrons of the gas molecules gives rise to the superposition of a continuum of narrow angular wave packets that are correlated with ionized molecules lying along almost straight tracks. These ions then lead to the formation of macroscopic droplets, which are in turn irreversibly decohered and documented by scattered light (a consequence not explicitly taken into account by Mott). Decoherence separates even branches with slightly different droplet positions along the same track. This situation differs only quantitatively from that of trajectories of macroscopic bodies by (1) its not quite negligible recoil (leading to slight deviations from straight tracks – related to quantum Brownian motion), and (2) somewhat weaker interaction of the  $\alpha$ -“particles” with their environment (leading to noticeable gaps between successive “particle positions”).

If recoil is strong, such as for the scattering between “particles” of similar mass in a gas, the thereby decohered variables (positions) are again localized, but do not follow quasi-deterministic trajectories. Boltzmann’s stochastic collision equation is then a more realistic quasi-classical approximation than the deterministic particle mechanics from which it is usually derived. The particle concept is thus nothing but a prejudice from classical physics.<sup>11</sup>

Decoherence does not only explain apparent points in configurations space, such as those representing particle positions or classical fields in terms of narrow wave packets, but also apparent events in terms of fast but smooth processes. If a decaying system were described by a Schrödinger equation, its decay would be smooth and coherent – forming a superposition of different decay times. This is known to lead to very small deviations from an exponential time dependence for large times. Similar but larger effects are observable for decay within reflecting cavities, thus demonstrating that decay of *isolated* systems is incompatible with stochastic events or quantum jumps. However, when the outgoing wave front interacts with an environment, it is decohered from the later partial wave that has not yet interacted. In this way, the wave is decohered into many partial waves which correspond to different decay times, whereby the time resolution depends on the strength of the interaction. So decoherence leads to *apparent* events, and to their consequence of an exactly exponential decay. In the case of coherent decay into clearly separated energy eigenstates, as they exist for



microscopic systems, the outgoing radiation would decohere their otherwise resulting superpositions (wave packets), which may describe macroscopic systems.

After decoherence has occurred, the superposition can for all practical purposes be replaced by an effective ensemble. The decay or transition is then regarded as “real” rather than “virtual”, even when we have not yet observed it. This explains the pragmatic interpretation of the wave function as representing “quantum information”. I do not know of any discrete quantum property in space or time that cannot be described by means of decoherence.

#### **4. No spooky action at a distance**

The apparent events discussed towards the end of the last section were assumed to occur in local systems. As mentioned before, they are often described by a collapse of the wave function – either into a genuine ensemble of unknown outcomes, or, in the case of a controlled measurement, into a definite outcome. If the measured system had been entangled with another, distant system, however, the latter would be instantaneously affected by the collapse, too,<sup>12</sup> although an observer at the distant place will not be able to recognize this influence before he is informed about the other outcome in each individual measurement. Nonetheless, this consequence of entanglement can *not* simply be understood as a statistical correlation between local variables<sup>13</sup> (hence the measurement not as a mere increase of information).

Entanglement means that quantum *states* are generically nonlocal. On the other hand, quantum field theory is assumed to be compatible with the relativistic spacetime structure. How can such a dynamical locality (“Einstein locality”) even be formulated for a kinematically nonlocal theory? If a nonlocal state changes, this change can in general not be located. Since I am here trying to argue that quantum states, represented by wave functions, describe reality, their nonlocality must then also be regarded as real (a fundamental property of *physical* states).

Let me therefore first recall how the concept of dynamical locality enters quantum field theory. In conventional terms, locality would mean that there is no action at a distance: states “here” cannot instantaneously influence states “there”. Relativistically, this has the consequence that dynamical effects can only arise within the forward light cones of their causes. Since generic (entangled) quantum states are “neither here nor there”, and not even just composed of “states here *and* states there” (quantum mechanically represented by a direct product), quantum dynamics must in general describe the dynamics of *global* states. It might thus appear to be necessarily nonlocal, too.

The concept of dynamical locality in quantum theory requires more than a formal Hilbert space structure (relativistically as well as non-relativistically). It has to presume a local Hilbert space *basis* (for example defined by spatial fields), which spans all nonlocal states in the form of their superpositions. Dynamical locality then means that the Hamiltonian is a sum over local operators, that is, an integral over a local *Hamiltonian density* in space, while all dynamical propagators must relativistically obey the light cone structure.

This framework is most successfully represented by canonical quantum field theory, characterized by the following program:

- (1) Define an underlying set of local “classical” fields (including a metric field) on a three-dimensional (or more general) manifold.
- (2) Define quantum states as wave functionals of these fields (that is, nonlocal superpositions of different spatial fields).
- (3) Assume that the Hamiltonian operator  $H$  (acting on wave functionals) is defined in a given Lorentz frame as an integral over a Hamiltonian density, written in terms of these fields at each space point.
- (4) Using this Hamiltonian, postulate a time-dependent Schrödinger equation for the wave functionals, or, in order to allow the inclusion of quantum gravity, a Wheeler-DeWitt equation,  $H\Psi = 0$ .

This dynamics is local (in the classical sense) for all states of the basis. For their superpositions this construction then *defines* the quantum version of Einstein locality.

In effective (phenomenological) quantum field theories, dynamical locality is often formulated by means of a condition of “microcausality”. It requires that commutators between field operators at spatially separated spacetime points vanish. This condition is partially kinematical (as it presumes a local basis for the quantum states), and partially dynamical (as it uses the Heisenberg picture for field operators). The dynamical consistency of this microcausality condition is nontrivial, since the commutators between operators at different times should be derivable from those at equal times (on an arbitrary simultaneity) by *using* the dynamics.

We are now ready to discuss the spacetime dynamics of a collapse of the wave function,

$$\sum c_n \psi_n \longrightarrow \psi_n \text{ with probability given by } |c_n|^2 ,$$

representing a measurement, for example. Its instantaneous character forms a major obstacle to dynamical collapse theories, which propose to modify the Schrödinger equation in order to describe von Neumann’s “process 1”. No *direct* evidence has ever been found for such a non-

unitary modification, although a collapse is always *used* in practice – regardless of its interpretation. Let me therefore add that the usual “textbook excuse”, according to which the wave function is merely a tool to calculate probabilities, is inconsistent with many consequences drawn from the wave function: superpositions are well known to describe individually observable (“real”) properties, such as total angular momentum, which depend on the complex phases of their relative coefficients – hence on the complete wave function.

The problem of an instantaneous action at a distance does *not* seem to arise in the Everett interpretation, since it is based on the assumption that the (relativistic) Schrödinger equation is universally valid and exact. This universality is also assumed when deriving decoherence as an unavoidable process of dislocalization of superpositions, propagating subluminally. In this way, decoherence explains the formation of autonomous “branches” of the wave function, but it does *not explain a collapse*, since all components would stay to exist. One has instead to *postulate* that the observer, understood as the carrier of conscious awareness, also “splits” according to his physically different branch versions. So he becomes aware of *definite* measurement results in each branch, for example. This new form of a psycho-physical parallelism is the essential novel (though in hindsight plausible) element of the Everett interpretation. Branching of the wave function into a *definite* (though unpredictable) component is nonetheless always *taken into account* in order to describe the dynamics of that wave function which represents “our” quasi-classical quantum universe. It is particularly important for the preparation of initial states. Would this branching, when explicitly formulated, then not necessarily lead into the same conflict with relativity as a collapse?

To understand what is going on, consider the complete process of decoherence and observation in spacetime. If the general state is represented by a wave functional over some fundamental spatial fields  $F(\mathbf{r})$ ,  $\Psi[F(\mathbf{r}),t]$ , on arbitrarily chosen simultaneities characterized by a time coordinate  $t$ , these states form a tensor product of local states. We can, for example, write any global state in the form

$$\Psi = \sum_{njk} c_{nj} \Psi_n^{\text{system}} \Psi_j^{\text{apparatus}} \Psi_k^{\text{environment}}$$

for *any* choice of subsystems which are spatially disjunct, and which cover all of space. To which kind of superpositions, in which representation, and when, does the effective collapse apply? Only if we had started with an initial product state, and thereafter assumed only ideal measurement interactions, would we have ended up with a *single* sum in the corresponding measurement basis instead of the triple sum.

In order to analyze the resulting decoherence as a spacetime process, we may now further subdivide the environment into arbitrary spatial subregions. For example, if “near”

describes a sphere with radius defined by the distance light could have traveled since the measurement began, and “far” the environment further away, we obtain for the mentioned case of ideal measurements

$$\Psi = \left( \sum_n c_n \Psi_n^{\text{system}} \Psi_n^{\text{apparatus}} \Psi_n^{\text{near}} \right) \Psi^{\text{far}} ,$$

where the far-region is not yet entangled with the “system”. (In general, there will be additional, here irrelevant entanglement in other variables, too.) The radius of the near-region would thereby steadily but subluminally grow, while very complex processes may be going on within it. If the branching of the wave function is *defined* by this decoherence process, it does not act instantaneously, but rather like a relativistic, three-dimensional zipper. While a collapse seems to act superluminally, the correlation between simultaneously obtained measurement results is in the Everett interpretation a consequence of *kinematical* quantum non-locality. Decoherence transforms this entanglement into an apparent statistical correlation. Therefore, at this point it represents only an *apparent* solution of the measurement problem. An important assumption regarding the physical nature of the observer has still to be added.

There has been much dispute about *when* the (real or apparent) collapse into a definite component occurs – that is, when the measurement has really been completed. We *may assume* that this is the case as soon as the dislocalization of a superposition has somewhere become irreversible (in practice – there is no *fundamental* irreversibility in this unitary description). However, we do not *have to* take into account a collapse before we have observed the outcome, or before we have been informed about it. This statement refers, strictly speaking, only to the subjective observer – not even to his “friend” who may act as a mediator to tell him the result, since we could *in principle* perform interference experiments even with our friends. This description is also compatible with the *delayed choice experiment*, where the second observer decides later in some reference system *what* experiment he will perform, thus giving the impression of an *advanced* action at a distance.

So what would this subjective observation (at the end of the measurement chain) mean in quantum dynamical description? Clearly, the “near-region” must now include this observer. It would not suffice, though, if some of those uncontrollable (thermal) variables, which are mostly relevant for decoherence, had propagated beyond his position. It is necessary that some controllable variables, such as light, which are able to carry information, have been registered by his senses, and the message has been transferred to his consciousness – so that the latter has controllably become entangled with the variable  $n$ . Only then has the subjective observer split into the various branches distinguished by the measurement variable  $n$ . From an objective point of view (the “bird’s perspective”), no branch is ever selected.

However, such a “subjective collapse” is definitely *not* usually assumed to define the collapsed wave function that seems to represent “our world” as a function of an appropriate time coordinate. The conventional picture relates a *global* collapse already to the *local* completion of the irreversible decoherence process. Thereafter, one pretends that the global wave function has collapsed into one of its branches, while one may not yet know into which one. The initial superposition over  $n$  is thus replaced by an effective ensemble that describes the lacking knowledge about the observers’ subjective future defined by their later participation in the branching. Since this replacement of a global superposition by an ensemble is merely a heuristic picture (not a physical process), it may well be assumed to propagate superluminally. A causal decoherence process starts at the location of *each* individual measurement – even if the measured systems happened to be entangled. The results are usually locally and irreversibly “documented”, and therefore appear as part of a fixed, objective history to all later observers in each resulting branch. The latter’s *passive* participation in the branching when getting entangled with the measurement results appears to them as a “mere increase of knowledge”, thus justifying the conventional textbook description, which is part of the Copenhagen interpretation. If the measurement results did enter existence in entirely local events, however, they would thereafter have to influence each other in order to explain the Bell correlations.

The prejudice that reality must consist of local events is particularly persistent. The usual (Copenhagen) pragmatism may therefore be characterized by the position: “Better no reality at all than a nonlocal one.” However, denying the reality of the wave function, and nonetheless regarding it as a carrier of “quantum information” comes pretty close to esoterics.

## **5. Other related misconceptions and misnomers in quantum theory**

This description of a branching wave function, caused by a smooth, local spacetime process, demonstrates that the infamous “spooky action at a distance” is a misconception. The correlations between pairs of measurement results are a consequence of entanglement – hence of the nonlocal kinematics. They can be observed only when physical information from both measurements has reached the same local observer. In the case of a Bell state of two spinors, for example, and parallel analyzers in both spin measurements, there are then only two rather than four final branches in spite of two branchings caused at different places.

There are many other experiments demonstrating the “weirdness” of quantum theory. They appear as paradoxes only if one believes in the common folklore that the wave function is merely a tool to calculate probabilities for local *events* (which occur spontaneously and “outside the laws of Nature” in Pauli’s words), or for local (classical) objects, such as part-

icles. They have indeed all been predicted by *consistently using* the wave function. So the only (but indeed very deep) weirdness is the latter's nonlocality as a property of reality. This general nonlocality remains mostly hidden, since entanglement becomes uncontrollable (that is, unusable) because of decoherence. Therefore, the macroscopic world *appears* local.

Let me discuss a few other examples of quantum weirdness, which have become popular. In particular, *quantum teleportation* has been celebrated as one of the most sensational recent discoveries in quantum theory.<sup>14</sup> The teleportation protocol for the usually considered spinor state consists of three steps:

1. the preparation of an appropriate Bell state by Alice and Bob, who then travel to different places – each of them keeping one of the two entangled spinors,
2. the later measurement of another (local) Bell state, involving her and a third spinor, by Alice, who then sends a message about the outcome to Bob, and
3. a unitary transformation performed locally by Bob on the spinor he kept with him.

It is evidently the crucial last step that reproduces the (possibly unknown) state of the third spinor, which was destroyed by the measurement at Alice's place, at Bob's place. The first two steps are only required to inform Bob about what to do precisely among a small set of formal possibilities without knowing the state that is to be reproduced. This may be more dramatically illustrated by means of a *complex* physical state to be “teleported”, such as Captain Kirk (CK), instead of a spinor.

According to the protocol, Bob would need a device that allows him to physically transform any superposition of (a specific quantum state of) CK and some state in which he is absent,  $a|CK\rangle + b|NoCK\rangle$  (as a new version of Schrödinger's cat), into any other such superposition – including a transformation of “no CK” ( $a = 0$ ) into the state representing Captain Kirk! This macroscopically unrealistic, though in quantum theory formally conceivable device would evidently have to contain all the information about CK's physical state. Bob would thus have to be able to locally *reconstruct* Captain Kirk when physically realizing the unitary transformation, while the first two steps of the protocol only serve to circumvent the no-cloning theorem in the case of an unknown initial Schrödinger cat superposition at Alice's place if it is this that is to be teleported.

Even for this first part of the protocol, no teleportation is actually involved. Before traveling to their final positions by ordinary means, Alice and Bob have to prepare an appropriate Bell state (for spinors or Captain Kirk occupation number states 0 and 1), and then take their now entangled subsystems with them, thereby carefully shielding them against the environment in order to avoid decoherence (impossible in practice for a macroscopic system). If

such a nonlocal Bell state represents reality, it contains already a component in which Bob's subsystem is in the state that he is supposed later to unitarily transform into the required one. So this quantum state (and the whole information it represents) is physically at Bob's place before the “teleportation” proper begins. Decoherence between the four different possible outcomes of Alice's subsequent Bell state measurement, required by the protocol, leads to four Everett branches. They are correlated with Bob's subsystem through the entanglement of the initial Bell state. Bob himself becomes entangled with Alice's measurement result when he receives her message. Therefore, he can perform different unitary transformations in the four different branches, which would all lead to the same intended final state of his spinor or CK state<sup>15</sup> – and this is called quantum teleportation.

Any interpretation of this experiment in local kinematical terms must in fact assume some spooky action at a distance or telekinesis that would have to *create* a certain local state to be used by Bob in order to apply his specific unitary transformation. For an interpretation in terms of nonlocal states one has instead to conclude that the quantum teleportation protocol allows one *neither* to teleport physical objects, *nor the information* needed to reconstruct them (even by technically unrestricted means).

Another recently invented drastic misnomer in quantum physics is the *quantum eraser*,<sup>16</sup> since this name seems to imply that the essential element of this procedure to recover coherence between different results of an intervening (for example “which way?”) measurement was a mere destruction of the information about its outcome. However, the physical destruction of information (for example, by its deterministic transformation into heat – as in the “reset” of a memory device<sup>17</sup>) would *strengthen* irreversible decoherence rather than cause recoherence. Decoherence is precisely defined by such a transformation of controllable “information” into uncontrollable entanglement with the environment (that is, by the irreversible dislocalization of the corresponding superposition). The typical decoherence-producing environment can thus *not* be regarded as an informed “witness” any more. In a causal world, *genuine* information does usually exist redundantly about macroscopic quantities (mainly in the form of scattered light). In this way it gives rise to a documented macroscopic “history”.<sup>9</sup> Only in the case of a *virtual* (reversible) measurement of a microscopic system by another one, where decoherence can be avoided, can the *conjugate* variable still be measured after exactly reversing the virtual measurement and *all* its consequences (rather than merely erasing its result).

This concept of virtual measurements (including the idea of a delayed choice for the subsequent real measurement) was first discussed in a quantum-optical setting by Edward

Jaynes.<sup>18</sup> Later versions of the experiment added other, more practicable reversible elements as virtual detectors.<sup>19</sup> While in the Copenhagen interpretation a Heisenberg cut for applying the probability interpretation has always to be chosen *ad hoc* (namely, far enough to keep all controllable entanglement on its quantum side), and while collapse theories attempt to derive such a cut from a speculative nonlinear modification of the Schrödinger equation, this boundary between quantum and classical description can readily be understood within quantum theory in terms of decoherence (cf. Sect. 4).

Other quantum misnomers based on an inappropriate application of classical concepts have become established tradition. Examples are the *uncertainty relations* or so-called *quantum fluctuations*. If a quantum state is completely defined (pure), it is “certain”. The “uncertainty relations” can be understood for each certain state by the familiar relation between Fourier variables – just as for completely defined classical radio waves. Nonetheless, uncertain initial conditions for presumed classical variables have often been claimed to be responsible for the observed dynamical quantum indeterminism, although this would require a stochastic modification of the deterministic Schrödinger equation (a dynamical indeterminism of *quantum* states).

Various kinds of “quantum fluctuations” (in particular *vacuum fluctuations*, depicted in terms of “virtual particles”) are used to circumscribe genuine quantum aspects, such as the entanglement that exists in the ground state of interacting quantum fields (their physical vacuum). Finite subvolumina may then have to be represented by “mixed” reduced density matrices, while virtual particles are considered to become “real” as soon as some of their consequences are irreversibly decohered.<sup>20</sup> States of quantum fields that are exactly localized on finite volume elements are incompatible with definite particle numbers if “particles” are defined in terms of the plane wave modes of a Klein-Gordon or Dirac field equation. A particularly interesting example is a free field in the presence of an accelerated mirror, since in an inertial system it appears as a temperature bath of particles and antiparticles – related to Hawking radiation.<sup>21</sup> This demonstrates that the pragmatic particle concept is not only restricted to free fields, but would furthermore depend on the choice of the reference frame. (In curved spacetime, there is not even a uniquely defined *inertial* vacuum any more.)

A general thermal equilibrium is quantum mechanically described by a density matrix that can be represented by a canonical ensemble of energy eigenstates (that is, without assuming any thermal motion), while in classical theory it corresponds to an ensemble that is justified by *time-averaging* over some chaotic motion (using ergodic theory). This ensemble of microscopic states is often called a “thermodynamical state” – a terminology that seems to



be responsible in part for the misconception of quantum states representing statistical ensembles. In this way, the classical picture has given rise to the misnomer of “quantum fluctuations” for characterizing static entangled quantum states.

So it seems that paradoxes arise only if one insists on classical or other local visualizations of reality. The resulting “weird” phenomena had all been predicted by instead using the wave function or state vector. This includes Bell’s (purely theoretical) theorem about the incompatibility of the quantum formalism with the assumption of some local reality. Therefore, all these weird phenomena could have been discussed on the basis of mere *gedanken* experiments by *assuming* the universality of quantum theory. This can even be done for experiments that can never be performed in practice (for example, interference experiments with conscious observers). In view of the sophisticated experiments that have already been done, though, the traditional lame excuses “The wave function describes only information” or “Quantum theory does not apply to macroscopic objects” are neither helpful nor convincing any more. In the quantum formalism, there always exists an observable (namely, the projector onto the actual state) that would give the value one with certainty, so that the unitary evolution of the state vector could *in principle* always be traced and confirmed.

## References

---

<sup>1</sup> H.D. Zeh, Time in Quantum Theory, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0705.4638> .

<sup>2</sup> S. Deléglise, I. Dotsenko, C. Sayrin, J. Bernu, M. Brune, J.-M. Raimond, and S. Haroche, Reconstruction of non-classical cavity fields with snapshots of their decoherence, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0809.1064v1> . The instability of photon number eigenstates (in contrast to their coherent states), and hence of all n-photon wave functions, under decoherence was first predicted in O. Kübler and H.D. Zeh, Dynamics of quantum correlations, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **76**, 405 (1973).

<sup>3</sup> H.D. Zeh, There is no “first” quantization, Phys. Lett. **A309**, 329 (2003) – <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0210098> .

<sup>4</sup> O. Ulfbeck and A. Bohr, Where did that click come from?, Found. Phys. **31**, 757 (2001).

<sup>5</sup> H.D. Zeh, On the interpretation of measurement in quantum theory, Found. Phys. **1**, 69 (1970); W.H. Zurek, Pointer basis of quantum apparatus: Into which mixture does the wave packet collapse?, Phys. Rev. **D24**, 1516 (1981); E. Joos and H.D. Zeh, The emergence of classical properties through interaction with the environment, Z. Phys. **B59**, 223 (1985); M. Schlosshauer, *Decoherence and the quantum-to-classical transition* (Springer, Berlin, 2007).

- 
- <sup>6</sup> M. Schlosshauer and C. Camilleri, The quantum-to-classical transition: Bohr's doctrine of classical concepts, emergent classicality, and decoherence, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0804.1609> .
- <sup>7</sup> H.D. Zeh, There are no quantum jumps, nor are there particles, Phys. Lett. **A172**,189 (1993).
- <sup>8</sup> D. Giulini, C. Kiefer, and H.D. Zeh, Symmetries, superselection rules, and decoherence, Phys. Lett. **A199**, 291 (1995).
- <sup>9</sup> H.D. Zeh, The physical basis of the direction of time, 5<sup>th</sup> edn. (Springer, Berlin, 2007) – see [www.time-direction.de](http://www.time-direction.de) .
- <sup>10</sup> N.F. Mott, The wave mechanics of  $\alpha$ -particle tracks, Proc. R. Soc. London, **A126**, 79 (1929).
- <sup>11</sup> See also C. Blood, No evidence for particles, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.3930>v1. I agree with the statement in this title (based on the Everett interpretation), even though the author has misunderstood the concept of decoherence, and therefore missed its essential role as an objective irreversible process that leads to the *emergence* of quasi-classical properties.
- <sup>12</sup> R. Garisto, What is the speed of quantum information? <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0212078> ; D. Salart, A. Baas, C. Branciard, N. Gisin, and H. Zbinden, Testing spooky action at a distance, Nature **454**, 861 (2008) – <http://arxiv.org/abs/0808.3316> .
- <sup>13</sup> J.S. Bell, On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox, Physics **1**, 195 (1964).
- <sup>14</sup> C.H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W.K. Wootters, Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993)
- <sup>15</sup> see E. Joos on p. 172 of: E. Joos, H.D. Zeh, C. Kiefer, D. Giulini, J. Kupsch, and I.-O. Stamatescu, *Decoherence and the Appearance of a Classical World* (Springer, Berlin, 2003).
- <sup>16</sup> M.O. Scully and K. Drühl, Quantum eraser: A proposed photon correlation experiment concerning observation and “delayed choice”, Phys. Rev. **A25**, 2208 (1982).
- <sup>17</sup> C.H. Bennett, Demons, Engines, and the Second Law, Sci. Amer. **257**(5), 88 (1987).
- <sup>18</sup> Jaynes in: *Foundation of Radiation Theory and Quantum Electronics*, A. Barut, ed., Plenum 1980; see also F. Herbut, On EPR-type entanglement in the experiments of Scully *et al.* I. The micromaser case and delayed choice quantum erasure, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0808.3176>v1.
- <sup>19</sup> See Sect. 20.3 of M.O. Scully and M.S. Zubairy, *Quantum Optics* (Cambridge UP 1997).
- <sup>20</sup> C. Kiefer, *Quantum Gravity*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. (Oxford Science Publications 2007), p.310 ff.; C. Kiefer, I. Lohmar, D. Polarski, and A.A. Starobinski, Pointer states for the primordial fluctuations in inflationary cosmology, Class. Quantum Grav. **24**, 1699 (2007).
- <sup>21</sup> N.D. Birrel and P.C.W. Davies, *Quantum fields in curved space* (Cambridge UP 1982).