

The strange (hi)story of particles and waves*

H. Dieter Zeh – www.zeh-hd.de – arxiv:1304.1003v8

Abstract: Attempt of a non-technical but conceptually consistent presentation of modern quantum theory in historical context. While the first part is written for a general readership, Sect. 5 may appear provocative. I argue that the single-particle wave functions of quantum mechanics have to be correctly interpreted as *field modes* that are “occupied once” (first excited states of the corresponding quantum oscillators in the case of a boson field). Multiple excitations lead to apparent many-particle wave functions, while the quantum state proper would be defined by a wave function(al) on the configuration space of fundamental fields.

1. Early History

The conceptual distinction between a discrete or a continuous structure of matter (and perhaps other „substances“) goes back at least to the pre-Socratic philosophers. However, their concepts and early ideas were qualitative and speculative. They remained restricted to some general properties, such as symmetries, while the quantitative understanding of continuous matter and motion had to await the conceptual development of calculus on the one hand, and the availability of practicable clocks on the other. Quantitative laws of nature and the concept of mass points were invented as part of classical mechanics.

Modern mechanics was first applied to extended “clumps of matter”, such as the heavenly bodies or falling rocks and apples. It was in fact a great surprise for Newton and his contemporaries (about 1680) that such very different objects – or rather their centers of mass – obeyed the same laws of motion.¹ The objects themselves seemed to consist of continuous matter. However, the new concept of mass points was quite early also applied to the structure of matter, that is, in the sense of an atomism. Already in 1738, Daniel Bernoulli explained the pressure of a gas by the mean kinetic energy of small particles, but without recognizing its relation to the phenomenon of heat. If one regarded these particles themselves as small elastic spheres, though, the question for their internal structure might in principle arise anew.

* Free and extended translation of my unpublished German text “Die sonderbare Geschichte von Teilchen und Wellen” – available on my website since October 2011.

At about the same time, Newton's theory was also generalized by means of the concept of infinitesimal massive volume elements that can move and change their size and shape according to their local interaction with their direct neighbors. This route to continuum mechanics formed a mathematical program that did not require any fundamentally novel *physical* concepts beyond Newton. The assumption of an unlimited divisibility of matter thus led to a consistent theory. In particular, it allowed for wave-like propagating density oscillations, which explained the phenomenon of sound. So it seemed that the fundamental question for the conceptual structure of matter had been answered.

As a byproduct of this "substantial" (or "Laplacian") picture of continuum mechanics, based on the assumption of individually moving infinitesimal elements of matter, also a formally elegant "local" (or "Eulerian") picture could be formulated. In the latter one neglects any information about trajectories of individual pieces of matter in order to consider only its spatial density distribution together with a corresponding current density as the kinematical objects of interest. In modern language they would be called a scalar and a vector *field*. In spite of this new form, continuum mechanics remains based on the concept of a locally conserved material substance with its consequence of a continuity equation.

The picture of individually moving elements of a substance would prove insufficient, however, if the true elements of matter could move irregularly, as suspected for a gas by Daniel Bernoulli. Since his gas pressure is given by the density of molecular kinetic energy, that is, by the product of the number density of gas particles and their mean kinetic energy, this picture could nonetheless be understood as representing a "chaotic continuum" by means of the appropriately defined simultaneous limit of infinite number density and vanishing size and mass of the particles. This remained a possibility even when chemists began to successfully apply Dalton's and Avogadro's hypotheses about molecular structures from the beginning of the nineteenth century in order to understand the chemical properties of the various substances. Similar to August Bravais's concept of crystal lattices (about 1849), these structures were often regarded as no more than a heuristic tool to describe the internal structure of a multi-component continuum. This view was upheld by many even after Maxwell's and Boltzmann's explanation of thermodynamic concepts in terms of molecular kinetics, and in spite of repeated but until then unsuccessful attempts to determine a finite value for Avogadro's or Loschmidt's numbers. The "energeticists", such as Wilhelm Ostwald, Ernst Mach and initially also Max Planck remained convinced until about 1900 that atoms are an illusion, while internal energy, heat and entropy are fundamental continua. Indeed, even after the determina-

tion of Loschmidt's number could they have used an argument that formed a severe problem for atomists: Gibbs' paradox of the missing entropy of self-mixing of a gas. Today it is usually countered by means of the indistinguishability of molecules of the same kind, although it requires more, namely the *identity* of states resulting from particle permutations. Such an identity is in conflict with the concept of particles (with their individual trajectories), while a field with two bumps at points x and y would be the *same* as with bumps at y and x . Although we are using quite novel theories today, these conceptual differences do remain relevant (see Sect. 5).

Another object affected by the early dispute about particles and waves is light. According to its potential of being absorbed and emitted, light was traditionally regarded as a "medium" rather than a substance. Nonetheless, and in spite of Huygens' early ideas of light as a wave phenomenon in analogy to sound, Newton tried to explain it by means of "particles of light", which were supposed to move along trajectories according to the local refractive index of matter. This proposal was later refuted by various interference experiments, in particular those by Thomas Young in 1802. It remained open, though, what substance (called the ether) did oscillate – even after light had been demonstrated by Heinrich Hertz in 1886 to represent an electromagnetic phenomenon in accordance with Maxwell's equations. The possibility of these fields to propagate and carry energy gave them a certain material character that seemed to support the world of continua as envisioned by the energeticists. For a long time, Ernst Mach used to ask "Have you seen one?" whenever somebody mentioned atoms to him. Later in this article I will argue that his doubts may still be justified today – even though we *seem* to observe individual atoms as particles.

At the end of the nineteenth century, the continuum hypothesis suffered a number of decisive blows. In 1897, J. J. Thomson discovered the elementary electric charge; in 1900, Max Planck postulated his radiation quanta with great success; and in 1905, Albert Einstein estimated the value of Loschmidt's number N_L by means of his theory of Brownian motion. Thereafter, even the last energeticists resigned. Einstein even revived the concept of particles of light (later called photons) – although he regarded it merely as a "heuristic point of view" that he was never ready to fully accept himself. Niels Bohr, in 1913, replaced the concept of continuous motion by stochastic "jumps" between his discrete electron orbits in the hydrogen atom – in accordance with Planck's and Einstein's probabilistic ideas about the radiation process. These early ideas led later to the insufficient interpretation of quantum mechanics as merely a stochastic dynamics for otherwise classical particles.

However, the development soon began to proceed in the opposite direction again.² In 1923, Louis de Broglie inverted Einstein's speculative step from light waves to photons by postulating a wave length $\lambda = c/\nu = h/p$ for the electron, where p is its momentum, in analogy to Planck's relation $E = pc = h\nu$. For him this could only mean that all microscopic objects must consist of both, a particle and a wave, whereby the wave has to serve as a "guiding field" for the particle. This field would have to be more powerful than a conventional force field, since it must determine the velocity rather than merely the acceleration; the initial velocity can according to this proposal not be freely chosen any more. This theory was later brought into a consistent form by David Bohm. In particular, it turned out thereby that the assumed guiding wave cannot be local (defined in space), as it must be identified with the global entangled wave function to be described in Sect. 4.

2. Wave Mechanics

Inspired by de Broglie's ideas, Schrödinger based his novel wave mechanics of 1926 on the assumption that electrons are *solely* and uniquely described by wave functions (spatial fields, as he first thought). This allowed him to explain the hydrogen spectrum by replacing Bohr's specific electron orbits in the atom by standing waves (energy eigenstates). For a special case, the harmonic oscillator, he was furthermore able to construct "wave packets" that would move like extended particles (see the Figure below for the case of *free* motion). Shortly thereafter, interference phenomena in agreement with de Broglie's wave length were observed by Davisson and Germer for electrons scattered from crystal lattices. A wave function can furthermore penetrate a potential barrier and thus explain "quantum tunneling", required for the possibility of α -decay. Does this not very convincingly demonstrate that electrons and other "particles" are in reality just wave packets of some fields that are described by Schrödinger's equation?




Figure: A wave packet (real part of an initial Gaussian modulated by a plane wave $e^{2\pi ix/\lambda}$) moving freely according to the time-dependent Schrödinger equation, depicted at three different times (blue: $t=0$, red: $t=0.04$, yellow: $t=1$ in arbitrary units). When comparing blue and red one recognizes that the packet as a whole moves faster than its waves, while the yellow curve demonstrates a slight dispersion of the packet (in contrast to a wave packet of the mentioned harmonic oscillator, which preserves its shape). The center of the packet moves according to the group velocity $v = p/m = h/m\lambda$, where the mass m is now just a parameter of the wave equation. For this reason, momentum is in wave mechanics *defined* by h/λ . It can indirectly be measured even for plane waves, which would not define a group velocity, by means of a conservation law for the sum of wave numbers (a resonance condition) that holds in scattering events (“momentum transfer”) with objects which do exist in localized wave packets, such as observable Brownian particles. Already for atomic masses and thermal velocities, the de Broglie wave length is clearly smaller than the radius of a hydrogen atom. So one may construct quite narrow wave packets for their center of mass (cms) wave functions. Although the dispersion of the wave packet is reduced with increasing mass m , it becomes always non-negligible with growing time. In order to compensate for it, one would need a new mechanism that dynamically reduces the “coherence length” characterizing a packet in order to retain the appearance of a particle (see Sect. 4).

A few months before Schrödinger invented his wave mechanics, Heisenberg had already proposed his matrix mechanics. In contrast to Schrödinger, he did not abandon the concept of particles, but in a romantic attempt to revive Platonic idealism and overcome a mechanistic world view, combined with an ingenious guess, he introduced an abstract formalism that was to eliminate the concept of deterministic trajectories. Together with Born and Jordan, Heisenberg then constructed an elegant algebraic framework that could be used to “quantize” all mechanical systems. This mathematical abstraction perfectly matched Heisenberg’s idealistic philosophy. Later, matrix mechanics was indeed shown to lead to the same observable predictions for measurements as wave mechanics when applied to closed systems. A year after his first paper, Heisenberg supplemented this formalism by his uncertainty relations between position and momentum of an electron or other “conjugate” pairs of variables. This uncertainty is in conflict with any genuine concept of particles, while in wave mechanics it would simply be a consequence of the Fourier theorem – without any uncertainty of the wave function or the assumption of a “distortion” of the electron during a measurement (as originally suggested by Heisenberg as an explanation). Another signal for a choice of inappropriate concepts is the introduction of a “new logic”. So it is not surprising that Schrödinger’s intuitive wave mechanics was preferred by most atomic physicists – for a short time even by Heisenberg’s mentor Max Born. For example, Arnold Sommerfeld wrote only a “Wellenmechanischer Ergänzungsband” to his influential book on “Atombau und Spektrallinien”.

However, some important facts and phenomena remained unexplained. For example, while Schrödinger’s general equation $-i\hbar\partial\psi/\partial t = H\psi$ would allow various time-dependent

solutions, such as the moving wave packets of the figure, bound electrons are mostly found in standing waves or “energy eigenstates”. They are solutions of the stationary Schrödinger equation $H\psi = E\psi$ that gives rise to discrete eigenvalues E . Although this equation can be derived from the general one under the assumption of a special time dependence of the form $\psi \propto e^{iEt/\hbar}$, no reason for this special form was given. Instead, these eigenstates seemed to be dynamically connected by stochastic “quantum jumps”, responsible for the emission of photons, which thus explained the hydrogen spectrum by means of the conservation of energy. These jumps are clearly incompatible with the otherwise so successful Schrödinger equation. Similarly, wave functions seemed to “jump” into particle-like wave packets during position measurements. In a Wilson chamber, one could observe tracks of droplets that can be regarded as successions of such position measurements along particle trajectories.

As a consequence, Schrödinger seemed to resign when Max Born, influenced by Wolfgang Pauli, re-interpreted his new probability postulate, which was originally meant to postulate jumps between different wave functions, in terms of probabilities for the spontaneous occurrence of particle properties (such as positions). This interpretation turned out to be very successful (and earned Born a Nobel prize) even though it was never quite honest, since the wave function does *not only* describe probabilities. It also defines observable individual properties of microscopic objects, such as energy or angular momentum – realized by their corresponding “eigenstates”. Similarly, a spinor (a generalized wave function for the electron spin) describes probabilities for the “occurrence” of other *individual* spinor states rather than for any classical properties in a measurement.

The problem was so painful that Heisenberg spoke of the wave function as no more than “a new form of human knowledge as an intermediary level of reality”, while Bohr introduced his anti-realistic principle of complementarity that required the application of mutually exclusive classical concepts, such as particles and waves, to the same objects. No doubt – this was an ingenious pragmatic strategy, but from there on the quest for a consistent description of Nature herself was not allowed any more in microscopic physics. Bohr insisted that “there is no microscopic reality” – a conclusion that was often regarded as philosophically very deep. Only few dared to object that “this emperor is naked”, and the new terminology no more than empty words, used to verbally circumvent an inconsistency. The large number of philosophical or formal arguments for its justification is even the more impressive. In particular, it has always remained open when and where precisely the probability interpretation (representing the “Heisenberg cut”) has to be applied. The Hungarian Eugene Wigner called this

situation a “Balkanization of physics” – a traditional (Hapsburgian) name for a region without law and order.

In spite of these shortcomings, three-dimensional wave mechanics still dominates large parts of most textbooks because of its success in correctly and simply describing many important individual-particle aspects, such as atomic energy spectra and scattering probabilities. This limited approach (see the next section for a more general one) is often supported by presenting the two-slit experiment as *the* key to understanding quantum mechanics.

3. Wave Functions in Configuration Space

So one should take a more complete look at Schrödinger’s wave mechanics. When he first formulated it, he used Hamilton’s partial differential equations as a guiding principle. These equations, the result of a reformulation of classical mechanics, are solved by a function that would describe a whole continuum of independent classical trajectories that differ by their initial conditions – sort of a wave function without interference. Hamilton had mainly been interested in the elegant mathematical form of this theory rather than in applications. This turned out to be an advantage for Schrödinger. He assumed that Hamilton’s equations were no more than a short wave lengths approximation (corresponding to the limit $h \rightarrow 0$) of a fundamental wave theory – similar to the approximation of geometric optics that could be applied to Maxwell’s theory in order to obtain trajectories for Newton’s hypothetical particles of light. With respect to Heisenberg’s particle concept, he later remarked ironically that even Newton’s assumption of particles of light could have been maintained in spite of the observed interference phenomena if one had claimed some “uncertainty relations” for them. However, the short wave length approximation means only that local parts of an extended wave propagate approximately independently of one another along trajectories – not that they represent particles. Similarly, Feynman’s path integral, which is equivalent to a propagating wave, does neither require nor justify the existence of individual paths. Partial waves or Feynman paths can always interfere with one another (act coherently) if focused in some way.

However, while light waves propagate in three-dimensional space, Hamilton’s waves must according to their construction exist in the configuration space of all possible states of the system under consideration. Therefore, Schrödinger, too, obtained wave functions on (what appears to us classically as) configuration spaces of various dimensions. Later this turned out to be the only correct version of his wave mechanics. It can also be understood as a

consequence of Dirac's general superposition principle, since the superposition of all classical configurations defines precisely a wave function on configuration space. This concept of a wave function can easily be generalized to include variables that never become classical. Dirac himself understood his superpositions in Born's sense as probability amplitudes for properties that are formally represented by Heisenberg's "observables", that is, not only for *points* in configuration space (classical states). If these observables are themselves represented in terms of dyadic products of their eigenfunctions, this becomes equivalent to probabilities for jumps or collapse events of the wave function (projections in Hilbert space as part of the dynamics).

Schrödinger was convinced of a reality *in space and time*, and so he hoped to describe the electron as a spatial field. Therefore, he initially restricted himself with great success to single-particle problems (quantized mass points, whose configuration space is isomorphic to space). Consequently, he spoke originally of a "ψ-field". Such a three-dimensional wave function can also be used to describe scattering problems – either for the center-of-mass wave function of an object scattered from a potential, or for the relative coordinates of a two-body problem. In scattering events, Born's probability interpretation is particularly suggestive because of the usual subsequent position measurement in a detector. This insufficient three-dimensional wave function is in general meant when one speaks of the *wave-particle dualism*.

The generalization (or rather the return) to wave functions in configuration space happened almost unnoticed at those times of great confusion – for some physicists even until today. Although most physicists are now well aware of "quantum non-locality", they remain used to arguing in terms of spatial waves for many purposes. In contrast to fields, however, even single-particle wave functions do not describe additive (extensive) charge or energy distributions, since each partial wave of a plane wave representing a quantum "particle", for example, describes essentially its full charge and kinetic energy.

Schrödinger took initially great pains to disregard or to re-interpret his general wave equation in configuration space, even though it is precisely its application to oscillating field amplitudes rather than positions of mass points that explains Planck's quanta $h\nu$. (Another early example of quantization in configuration space is the rigid rotator – although it can only represent an approximation.) The spectrum $E = nh\nu$ which one obtains for the stationary states of field quantum oscillators with frequency ν is proportional to the natural numbers n , and only therefore suggests the concept of additive energy quanta $h\nu$ (later related to pho-

tons). In Schrödinger's wave mechanics, these quantum numbers n are explained by the numbers of nodes of the wave functions, which have to obey certain boundary conditions. But where can one find these wave functions if not in space? In contrast to the figure, they are here defined as functions on the configuration space of field amplitudes. (Historically, radiation quanta had instead often been attributed to an emission mechanism by hypothetical charged oscillators.) Different eigenmodes of a classical field (that is, of coupled harmonic oscillators) can fortunately separately be quantized; their wave functions factorize. Although their oscillator spectrum can alternatively be derived from Heisenberg's algebra of observables (matrix mechanics) without explicitly using wave functions, the latter's nodes, which must be clearly distinguished from the spatial nodes of the considered classical field mode (to be identified with a "photon wave function"), have recently been made visible for the first time for various photon number eigenstates in an elegant experiment,³ and thus been confirmed to be *real*. The importance of this fundamental experiment for the wave-particle debate has in my opinion not yet been sufficiently appreciated by the physics community (see also Sect. 5).

The difference between Schrödinger's theory and a classical field theory becomes particularly obvious from the fact that the amplitudes of a classical field now appear as *arguments* in Schrödinger's wave function. Positions occur only as an "index" that distinguishes different local field variables (the coupled oscillators). Their confusion with particle position variables has led, for example, to the unjustified concept of a "time operator" (although there is no dynamical time variable in quantum mechanics). While a general time-dependent "one-photon wave function" can be understood as a superposition of various classical field modes that are in their first excited quantum state ("occupied once" – with all others in their ground state in each component), a quasi-classical *field* state has to be described as a coherent superposition of many different excitations (different photon number eigenstates) of the corresponding field mode. In contrast to the free wave packet shown in the figure, these "coherent oscillator states" (Gaussians as functions of the field amplitude) preserve their shape and width exactly, while their centers follow classical trajectories. In this way, they imitate oscillating classical fields far better than wave packets in space may imitate free particles (as in the figure). Field quantum states may thus describe both "particle" numbers and spatial fields – mutually restricted by a Fourier theorem – in one and the same formalism and without any mysterious concept of complementarity.

4. Entanglement and Quantum Measurements

Before trying to study *interacting* quantum fields (see Sect. 5), early quantum physicists investigated the quantum mechanics of many-particle systems, such as multi-electron atoms and molecules. These systems could approximately be described by means of different single-particle wave functions for each electron, while the atomic nuclei seemed to possess fixed or slowly moving positions similar to classical objects. For example, this picture explained the periodic system of the chemical elements. On closer inspection it turned out – at least for atoms and small molecules – that *all* particles, including the nuclei, have to be described by one common wave function in their $3N$ -dimensional configuration space. This cannot normally be a product or determinant of single-particle wave functions – a consequence that extends to all composite systems (including the whole quantum universe), and is known as “entanglement”. David Bohm later referred to this property of the wave function as “quantum wholeness” or an “intricate order” of Nature when he began to study its consequences for his theory.

Every physics student is using the entanglement between an electron and a proton in the hydrogen atom when writing the wave function as a product of functions of cms and relative coordinates. The simplest nontrivial case, the Helium atom, was first successfully studied in great numerical detail by Hylleraas in a series of papers starting in 1929 and by using variational methods. Already Arnold Sommerfeld remarked in his *Wellenmechanischer Ergänzungsband* that “Heisenberg’s method”, which used only the anti-symmetrization of product wave functions by means of “exchange terms”, is insufficient for this purpose. (Anti-)symmetrization is often confused with entanglement, since it formally corresponds to an entanglement between physical properties and meaningless particle numbers. This disappears in the formalism of quantum field theory (see Sect. 5). In other many-body systems, one has to take into account “configuration mixing” as a correction to the independent-particle (Hartree-Fock) approximation or for describing collective motions. An important consequence of entanglement is that subsystem Hamiltonians can in general not be well defined – thus in principle ruling out a local Heisenberg or interaction picture. Today, all closed non-relativistic multi-particle systems are accepted to be correctly described by one entangled wave function in their high-dimensional configuration space.

However, how can the space of all possible classical configurations, which would even possess different numbers of dimension for different systems, replace three-dimensional space as a new arena for the dynamics of a wave function that might be hoped to successfully describe physical reality? If our Universe consisted of N particles (and nothing else), its configu-

ration space would possess $3N$ dimensions. For early quantum physicists – including Schrödinger, of course – such a wave function was inconceivable. On the other hand, the concept of a space of possible configurations fits excellently with Born’s probability interpretation in terms of classical properties. Entanglement could then conveniently be understood as describing statistical correlations between measured variables. But only for *measured* variables! Since macroscopic variables are “permanently measured” by their environment (see below for decoherence), their local entanglement does indeed always appear as a statistical correlation. This explains why we interpret the space on which the wave function is defined as a “configuration” space. In the mentioned case of the Helium atom, on the other hand, entanglement is responsible for the precise energy spectrum and other observable properties – regardless of any statistical interpretation and in contrast to classical ensembles of *possible* states. This irritating fact is often simply “overlooked” in order to stick to an epistemic interpretation of the wave function (representing information only). But even in scattering processes one often needs entangled scattering amplitudes for all fragments. Only after Einstein, Podolski and Rosen had shown in 1935 that entanglement can have directly observable consequences did Schrödinger regard this property as the greatest challenge to his theory, although he kept calling it “statistical correlations”. These three authors had in fact incorrectly concluded from their analysis that the wave function can only be a statistical (not a complete or ontic) description, so that unknown (“hidden”) variables would have to be expected to exist.

Although many physicists assumed that these hypothetical hidden variables could perhaps never be observed in an experiment (even though they might exist), it came as a surprise to them when John Bell showed in 1964 that *every* local theory (regardless of whether it consists of particles, fields or anything else) cannot be compatible with certain observable consequences of entangled wave functions. In order to demonstrate this incompatibility, Bell used arbitrary local hidden variables (just names for something not yet known) for an indirect proof. However, most physicists had by then become so much accustomed to Bohr’s denial of a microscopic reality that they immediately accused Bell for having used a “long refuted assumption”. As the crucial consequences of entangled wave functions have always been confirmed since, physicists now disagree deeply about whether these experimental results exclude locality (in three-dimensional space) or rather microscopic reality. For neither those who accept a non-local wave function as representing reality nor those who are ready to live without any microscopic reality feel particularly disturbed by Bell’s theorem. These two camps usually prefer the Schrödinger or the Heisenberg picture, respectively, and this fact seems to be the origin of many misunderstandings between them.

If, for consistency, one assumes Schrödinger's theory to apply universally, one is forced to consider one entangled wave function for the whole universe. Heisenberg and Bohr assumed instead that the wave function is no more than a tool, which "loses its meaning" after the final measurement that concludes an experiment – another way of avoiding unwanted consequences. This "end of the experiment" remains vaguely defined and *ad hoc*, as it is equivalent to the Heisenberg cut. A universal wave function that always evolves according to the Schrödinger equation, on the other hand, leads to an entirely novel world view that appears unacceptable to most physicists because of its unconventional consequences. For example, if one measures a microscopic object that is initially in a wave function extending over two or more different values of the measured variable, this will give rise to an entangled state for the microscopic system and the apparatus – the latter including Schrödinger's infamous cat if appropriately prepared. In order to avoid this consequence, one assumes in von Neumann's orthodox interpretation that Schrödinger's dynamics must be complemented by a stochastic "collapse of the wave function" into a product of narrow wave packets for all macroscopic variables (such as pointer positions). This collapse mechanism may then also re-localize the spreading free wave packet shown in the Figure. In the Copenhagen interpretation, one would instead pragmatically jump from a description in terms of wave functions to one in classical terms and back to a new wave function in order to describe a subsequent experiment. This unsatisfactory situation is also known as the quantum measurement problem.

If one does nonetheless insist on a universal Schrödinger equation, one has to understand what an entangled wave function for the measured microscopic system and the apparatus can possibly mean. Toward that end one has to include the observer into this quantum mechanical description.⁴ If he reads off the measurement result, he must himself become part of the entanglement. According to the theory, he would then simultaneously exist in different states of awareness – similar to the fate of Schrödinger's cat. Hugh Everett first noticed in 1957 that this consequence is not in conflict with our subjective observation of *one* individual outcome, since each "component state" of the observer would be aware of only one individual component of the quantum world (its "relative state", representing one definite outcome). As there must be many such component states in one global superposition according to the Schrödinger equation, the question which one contains the "true" successor of the experimenter who prepared the experiment has no unique answer: they all are. After the measurement, these different versions of the observer are dynamically autonomous in spite of their common origin (see the subsequent remarks about decoherence). In contrast to identical twins, who also have one causal origin, they cannot even communicate any more, and thus

can conclude each others existence only by using the dynamical laws known to them. This is certainly an unusual but at least a consistent picture, which does not require any new physical laws (only a novel kind of identification of physical states of subjective observers who are part of a nonlocal global wave function). Attempts to avoid this conclusion are usually motivated by a traditional world view, but they would require that Schrödinger's theory cannot hold universally.

Until very recently one did in fact generally believe that some conceptual or dynamical border lines between micro- and macrophysics do exist – even though they had never been directly confirmed by an experiment. Otherwise it should be possible (so it seemed) to observe individual properties of the entangled combination of a microscopic system and its measurement apparatus – similar to the energy or other properties of Hylleraas's Helium atom as a whole. However, the bipartite entanglement between system and apparatus is not yet realistic. Every macroscopic system must inevitably, very fast, and in practice irreversibly interact with its natural “environment”, whereby the entanglement that resulted from the measurement proper would uncontrollably spread into the “rest of the universe”. This happens even before an observer possibly enters the scene. Because of the large number of effective degrees of freedom of a realistic environment, this situation cannot be formulated in complete detail, but one may at least understand how a wave function extending over different macroscopic pointer positions, for example, would inevitably be transformed locally into an *apparent* ensemble of narrow wave packets that mimic classical states. As we subjectively observe only one of them, this amounts essentially to what Pauli had called the “creation of a measurement result outside the laws of Nature” – but it is now described in terms of the global unitary dynamics. Pauli (as all physicists at his time) had simply neglected the environment and not properly taken into account the role of a genuine observer in a quantum world: a local quantum observer is unable to observe the global entangled state. This entanglement with the environment, whose unavoidability defines the true border line between micro- and macrophysics, is called decoherence,⁵ since predominantly phase relations defining quantum mechanical superpositions are locally lost (that is, they become uncontrollably “dislocalized”).[†]

Decoherence led to the first (indirect) confirmation of entanglement beyond microscopic systems. Although it must remain uncontrollable in order to be irreversible (“real”

[†] A mere phase randomization does neither represent a generic quantum interaction nor is it sufficient for this purpose, as each individual member of the thereby assumed ensemble of initial states would remain in a local superposition (possibly with unknown, but not with undetermined phase relation).

rather than “virtual”), it has many consequences. It explains why one seems to observe individual atoms as apparent particles in a Paul trap, or tracks in a Wilson chamber as apparent particle trajectories (both are described in terms of wave packets), and why one finds bound microscopic systems preferentially in their energy eigenstates.^{5,6} While virtual decoherence has for a long time been known as a consequence of *local* entanglement, the unavoidable and irreversible effect of the environment on macroscopic systems was generally overlooked.

The observation of radioactive decay represents another measurement of a continuous variable (namely, the decay time). Its resolution cannot be smaller than the remaining coherence time (which is usually very much smaller than the half life, and thus gives rise to apparent quantum jumps). This coherence time depends on the efficiency of the interaction of the decay fragments with their environment, and it would be further reduced by their genuine measurement. In the case of decay by emission of weakly interacting photons, one may even observe interference between different decay times, thus excluding the assumption of instantaneous quantum jumps (fundamental “events”) in this case.

Many leading physicists who are not happy any more with the Copenhagen interpretation nonetheless prefer to speculate about some novel kind of dynamics (such as a collapse of the wave function) that would avoid the consequence of Many Worlds. As yet, this is no more than wishful thinking, but it could in principle also solve the measurement problem in terms of a universal wave function representing reality. However, one should keep in mind that *all* observed apparent deviations from the Schrödinger equation, such as quantum jumps or measurements, can readily be described dynamically (and have in several cases been confirmed experimentally) as smooth decoherence processes in accordance with a global Schrödinger equation. If a genuine collapse mechanism did exist, it would thus probably have to be *triggered* by decoherence, but it could then hardly have any observable consequences by its own.

For example, when one of two spatially separated but entangled microscopic systems are measured, their total state would according to a unitary description become entangled with the apparatus, and thus also with the latter’s environment. Nothing else as yet. An observer at the position of the second system, say, becomes part of this entanglement only when he receives a signal about the result. He would thereafter exist in various versions in the different world components that have already been dynamically separated from one another by the decoherence process following the measurement. In contrast, a genuine *collapse* caused by the measurement would have to affect distant objects instantaneously (whatever that means

relativistically) in order to avoid other weird consequences. If the distant observer also measured the second microsystem, which is at his own location, (before or after receiving the signal about the first measurement – thus including delayed choice experiments) the state of his memory would have to depend on the results of both measurements. That is, it must have split twice unless there had been an exact correlation between the outcomes. The order of these measurements does not matter, in general. However, only if one *postulates* probability weights to the different versions of the observer according to the squared norms of the branches, will he according to the thus defined “weighted ensemble of subjectivities” very probably confirm those frequencies of results for series of measurements that are predicted by Born’s rule (and thus violate Bell’s inequality). These weights are in fact the only ones that are dynamically conserved under the Schrödinger equation, and thus factorize into products of relative weights for successive branchings (as required for a concept of “consistent histories”, for example). Everett regarded this as a *proof* of Born’s rule.⁷ The branches themselves (regardless of their weights) are now understood as being defined by their dynamical autonomy: a measurement cannot be undone any more as soon as the global superposition cannot be re-localized in practice.

In this way, *all* those much discussed “absurdities” of quantum theory can be consistently explained. It is precisely the way how they were all predicted – except that the chain of unitary interactions forming an experiment is usually cut off at the last “relevant” measurement that is accompanied by decoherence (where it defines a consistent choice for the Heisenberg cut). So-called quantum teleportation is another example, where one can easily show, using a consistent unitary description, that nothing is “teleported” that was not prepared in advance at its final position in one or more components of the entangled wave function.⁶ This demonstrates again that non-local wave functions cannot just describe “information” about mere possibilities – even though one *may assume* that a global collapse into an undetermined outcome did already occur (or that this outcome had come into existence in some other way) as an effect of the first irreversible decoherence process in a measurement. It is precisely this fact that justifies the usual pragmatic approach to quantum mechanics (including the whole Copenhagen interpretation). Since such a restriction of “quantum reality” to one tiny component of the universal wave function (“our quantum world”) merely represents a convention rather than a physical process, it may even be assumed to apply instantaneously (superluminally). Since an entangled wave function (or superposition) is already non-local, quantum teleportation does not require any spooky action at a distance. It is also obvious that this “collapse by convention” cannot be used for sending superluminal signals.

If the global wave function does indeed evolve deterministically, the observed quantum indeterminism cannot represent any objective dynamics. In Everett's interpretation, it is in principle a "subjective" phenomenon, based on the branching histories of all observers into many different versions that gives rise to "many minds". This subjective indeterminism nonetheless allows them to prepare pure states as initial conditions for microscopic systems in their "relative states" (their "worlds") by selecting the required results in an appropriately designed measurement. These relative states are objectivized between those versions of *different* observers (including Wigner's friend or Schrödinger's cat) who live in one and the same Everett branch or quasi-classical world and can thus communicate. In contrast to the conceptual dualism of the Copenhagen interpretation, different classical concepts can thus be approximately *derived* in terms of specific wave packets that are the consequence of decoherence.

5. Quantum Field Theory

We have seen that the interpretation of quantum theory in terms of a universal wave function admits a consistent (even though quite unusual) description of Nature, but this does not bring the strange story of particles and waves to an end. Instead of spatial waves (fields) we were led to wave functions on a high-dimensional "configuration space" (a name that is justified only because of its classical appearance as a space of possibilities). For a universe consisting of N particles, this configuration space would possess $3N$ dimensions, but we have already seen that for QED (quantum electrodynamics) it must be complemented by the infinite-dimensional configuration space of the Maxwell fields. A factorizing wave functional for the amplitudes of their free field modes was sufficient to explain Planck's quanta by the number of nodes of the corresponding factor wave functions. The spontaneous occurrence of photons as apparent particles is then merely a consequence of the fast decoherence of the absorber or detector.

However, it is known from the quantum theory of relativistic electrons that they, too, have to be described by a quantized *field* (that is, by a field functional) – a consequence that must then also apply to the non-relativistic limit. The relativistic generalization of a one-electron wave function is called the *Dirac field* (again the result of a confusion of space and configuration space) and thus regarded as a function on spacetime. It can in fact *not* be generalized to an N -electron field on a $4N$ -dimensional "configuration spacetime", although this has occasionally been proposed. In the Schrödinger picture of QED, the Dirac field is used to

define, by its configuration space and that of the Maxwell field, the space on which the corresponding time-dependent wave functionals live. According to the rules of canonical quantization, these wave functionals have to obey a generalized Schrödinger equation.^{8,9} This consequence avoids a fundamental N -dependence of the relevant configuration spaces for varying numbers N of “particles”, and it allows for a concept of “particle creation”. Since Schrödinger had originally discovered his one-electron wave functions by the same formal quantization procedure (applied to a single mass point), the quantization of the Dirac field is for this purely historical reason called a “second quantization”. As explained above, however, the particle concept, and with it the first quantization, are no more than historical artifacts.

The Hamiltonian form of the Dirac equation is unusual as a consequence of its linearization insofar as canonical momenta are not defined by time derivatives of the variables any more. Nonetheless, the two occupation numbers 0 and 1 resulting from the *assumption* of anti-commuting field operators[‡] are again interpreted as “particle” numbers because of their consequences in the quasi-classical world (such as “clicks in the counter”) resulting from decoherence. Field modes “occupied” once and their superpositions define “single-particle wave functions”. In contrast to the case of photons, however, one does not observe any superpositions (wave functionals) of *different* electron numbers. This has traditionally been regarded as a fundamental restriction of the superposition principle (a “superselection rule”),

[‡] Let me emphasize, though, that the Pauli principle, valid for fermions, seems not to be sufficiently understood yet. While the individual components of the Dirac equation also obey the Klein-Gordon equation, the latter’s quantization as a field of coupled oscillators would again lead to *all* bosonic quantum numbers $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Anti-commuting field operators, which lead to anti-symmetric multi-particle wave functions, were postulated quite *ad hoc* by Jordan and Wigner, and initially appeared artificial even to Dirac. Interpreted consistently, their underlying configuration space (now only a Hilbert space basis) would represent a spatial continuum of coupled bits (“empty” or “occupied”) rather than a continuum of coupled oscillators. The n -th excited state of this bit continuum (that is, n occupied positions) would then represent n identical point-like “objects”. Because of the dynamical coupling between bit-neighbors, these objects can move, but only *after* their quantization (application of the superposition principle) does this give rise to propagating waves. In contrast, coupled oscillators defining a free field propagate as spatial waves already classically, and thus obey a *classical* superposition principle (in space rather than in configuration space) in addition to the quantum superposition principle that is in both cases realized by the field functionals. However, these pre-quantization concepts do not seem to have any physical meaning by themselves. – An additional source of confusion is given by the fact that relativistic invariance can and need not be manifest in the canonical formalism of the Schrödinger picture. For example, the canonical quantization of the Maxwell field leads consistently to a wave functional $\Psi\{A(x); t\}$, with a vector field A defined at all space-points x on an arbitrary simultaneity t .

but it may again be understood as a consequence of decoherence: for charged particles, the Coulomb field assumes the role of an unavoidable environment.¹⁰

The traditional formulation that one particle is in the quantum state described by the spatial wave function ψ_1 and a second one in ψ_2 has to be replaced by the statement that the two *field modes* ψ_1 and ψ_2 are both in their first excited field quantum state. Consequently, a permutation of the two modes does not physically change this state, so there is only one total state to be counted in any statistics. This eliminates Gibbs' paradox in a natural way.

It would also be wrong to claim that *wave functions* can be directly observed in Bose-Einstein condensates (as is often done). What one does observe in this case are again the (now multiply "occupied") three-dimensional boson *field modes* – even though bosons are in general regarded as particles because of their normal appearance in detectors. Instead of the free field modes used for photons for this purpose, for interacting bosons one can more appropriately use self-consistent field modes in analogy to the self-consistent Hartree-Fock single-fermion wave functions. Both cases lead to an effective non-linear "single-particle wave equation" – for bosons called the Gross-Pitaevskii equation.[§] In spite of this effective nonlinearity, the quantum states proper are, of course, correctly described by the linear Schrödinger equation – relativistically always understood in the sense of Tomonaga.[§] As mentioned already in Sect. 3, eigenfunctions $\Psi_n(q)$ for various "photon" numbers n – to be distinguished from their three-dimensional field modes or "single-photon wave functions" (which can be fixed modes in a cavity) – have recently been made visible by means of their Wigner functions for various values of n .³ For pure states, the Wigner functions are defined as partial Fourier transforms of the dyadic products $\Psi_n(q)\Psi_n^*(q')$, and hence equivalent to the $\Psi_n(q)$ themselves. The variable q is here the amplitude of the field mode rather than a particle position. The two-dimensional Wigner functions on their apparent phase space q,p are made visible in this experiment, and allow one to clearly recognize the nodes of the wave functions. Their numbers n , which determine the oscillator energies $E = nh\nu$, are interpreted as "photon numbers". Photons *appear* nonetheless in measurements as clicks in the detector or spots on the screen because of the corresponding decoherence.

[§] At normal temperatures, most "many-particle" systems behave approximately like a gas of classical particles undergoing stochastic collisions because of the permanent mutual decoherence of their wave functions into narrow wave packets. This consequence perfectly justifies Boltzmann's *Stosszahlansatz*, but no quasi-deterministic particle trajectories, which apply to macroscopic objects that suffer only "pure" decoherence (with negligible recoil).

For relativistic reasons, *all* known elementary physical objects (still called “elementary particles” because of their phenomenology in measurements) have to be described as quantum fields. The contrast between the first order in time of the Schrödinger equation and the second order of the classical field equations with their negative frequencies opens the door to the concept of “anti-bosons”. (For fermions this relation assumes a different form – depending on the starting point before quantization.) Because of the universality of the concept of quantum fields, one also expects a “theory of everything” to exist in the form of a unified quantum field theory. At present, though, the assumption that the fundamental arena for the universal wave function is given by the configuration space of some fundamental field(s) is no more than the most plausible attempt. On the other hand, the general framework of Schrödinger’s wave function(al) or Dirac’s superposition as a universal concept of quantum states that obey unitary dynamics has always been confirmed so far, while no convincing proposal for deriving this framework from some deeper concepts has ever been offered.

Unfortunately, interacting fields would in general require such an enormous number of entangled fundamental degrees of freedom that they can normally not even approximately be treated beyond a (questionable) perturbation theory that is based on free fields. Instead of insisting on the successful concepts of quantum mechanics (entangled wave functions) to the new variables (such as field amplitudes), one can in general only apply semi-phenomenological methods for specific purposes – mostly for calculating scattering amplitudes between hardly understood objects. (Only for fixed field modes in cavity QED may one explicitly study their entanglement with individual atoms, for example.) The construction and interpretation of these new methods is again based on particle concepts (such as in Feynman diagrams, or in terms of clicks and bubbles caused in detectors and interpreted as being caused by particles). Therefore, the “effective” fields used in QFT must not be expected to represent fundamental variables that have merely to be “renormalized”. This opens up quite novel possibilities, perhaps even to understand all fermions as quantum consequences of certain topological effects (such as superpositions of different locations of topological singularities – see the footnote about fermions above).

Freeman Dyson’s “equivalence”¹¹ between relativistic field functionals (Tomonaga) and field operators (Feynman) is again essentially based on that between the Schrödinger and the Heisenberg picture, respectively. However, the latter is hardly able even in principle to describe the strong and steadily growing entanglement of a global wave function, while a propagating wave functional can alternatively be formulated as a path integral. As relativistic

physics is characterized by the absence of absolute simultaneity, the relativistic generalization of the Schrödinger equation can indeed only be given by the Tomonaga equation with its “many-fingered” concept of time – but clearly *not* by the Dirac equation. The time parameter of a relativistic single-particle equation could strictly represent only proper times along trajectories, which do not exist any more in quantum mechanics, however. Apparent particle lines in Feynman diagrams, on the other hand, are just shorthand for certain field modes (such as plane waves, with “particle momenta” representing wave numbers). They appear mostly under an integral for calculating scattering amplitudes. Closed lines (“virtual particles”) then represent entanglement between the corresponding quantum fields rather than “vacuum fluctuations”.

Similar semi-phenomenological methods as in QFT are also used in solid state physics, even when solid bodies are non-relativistically regarded as given N -particles systems. For example, they may give rise to effective phonon fields or other “quasi-particles”. In this approach, the particles wave functions are regarded as fundamental, while the phonon field functional is derived. Symmetry-breaking ground states and their “Fock states” can be understood as specific “relative states” that have become autonomous by their decoherence. Some of them are characterized by a certain number of particles (such as electrons in a metal) that contribute to a specific *stable entanglement*. Most familiar are pair correlations in the BCS model of superconductivity, whose generalization to QFT later led to the prediction of the Higgs “particle”. The BCS model is also useful for understanding the phenomenon of Hawking radiation and the concept of “Rindler particles”, that is, plane waves in a uniformly accelerated reference frame. A Rindler vacuum, which would be created by a uniformly accelerated perfect universal mirror, consists of entangled *inertial* “particle-antiparticle” pairs that are again conventionally interpreted as vacuum fluctuations.¹² However, only in situations described by an effective Hamiltonian that gives rise to an energy gap (defining an effective mass) can the lowest energy eigenstates avoid further decoherence within the Fock space, and thus exhibit the usual phenomena of “quantum particles”.

In *microscopic* many-particle systems such as atomic nuclei or small molecules, whose internal states can in good approximation be regarded as isolated, the creation of collective degrees of freedom by spontaneous intrinsic symmetry breaking may even lead to exact energy eigenstates (vibrational and rotational spectra, for example).¹³ Such eigenstates are observable to an external observer, although they are formally analogous to the bird’s perspective of an isolated quantum world (which *contains* its observer).

The successful phenomenology of apparently fundamental fields (“elementary particles”), such as described by the Standard Model, must certainly form the major touchstone for any fundamental theory of the future. At present, this model does not seem to offer convincing hints for the structure of such a future theory (except perhaps that the variables defining a fundamental basis in Hilbert space would have to be local in three- or some higher dimensional space in order to allow a definition of dynamical locality). New theories that are solely based on mathematical arguments have to remain speculative, and even to remain incomplete as long as there is no general consensus about the correct interpretation of their quantization. Many quantum field theorists and mathematical physicists seem to regard their phenomenological models, combined with certain recipes for calculations and applied to classical field or particle concepts, as the quantum field theory proper. Indeed, why should one expect a consistent theory if there is no microscopic reality to be described (as assumed in the still quite popular Copenhagen interpretation and its variants)? Therefore, textbooks of QFT usually do not even *attempt* to present a conceptually closed theory.

Our conclusion that the particle aspect is merely a consequence of a fast decoherence process in the detector may understandably not be of particular interest for practicing high-energy experimentalists, but it seems to be unknown even to many theoreticians in this field. So they sometimes call the enigmatic objects of their research “wavicles”, as they cannot make up their mind between particles and waves. This indifferent language represents just another example for Wigner’s “Balkanization of physics” (or “many words instead of many worlds” according to Tegmark). Waves are in the context of the wave-particle “dualism” usually understood in the sense of *spatial* waves – not as high-dimensional wave function(al)s. As we have seen, this is quite insufficient for a complete and consistent quantum theory.

6. Quantum Gravity and Cosmology

I cannot finish this brief review of quantum theory without having mentioned quantum gravity.¹⁴ Although one cannot hope to observe quanta of gravity in the foreseeable future, the formal quantization of gravity can hardly be avoided for consistency in view of the quantization of all other fields. Its dynamical variables must then also appear among the arguments of a universal wave function, and thus be entangled with all other fields – in a very important way, as it turns out.

The Hamiltonian formulation of Einstein's theory was brought into a very plausible final form in 1962 by Arnowitt, Deser and Misner (ADM). They demonstrated that the configuration space of gravity can be understood as consisting of the spatial geometries of all possible three-dimensional space-like hypersurfaces of spacetime. These hypersurfaces define arbitrary simultaneities that may form a foliation of spacetime, parametrized by a time coordinate t . This Hamiltonian form of the theory is therefore also called "geometrodynamics". Its canonical quantization leads to a Schrödinger equation in the sense of Tomonaga for the wave functional on all these geometries – known as the *Wheeler-DeWitt equation*.

This equation is remarkable insofar as according to the required constraint $H\Psi = 0$ it is time-independent. The physical reason for this property is that the spatial metric that occurs as the argument of the wave function determines proper times ("physical times") along all time-like curves connecting it with any other spatial geometry, while the value of the time coordinate t has no physical meaning. So in spite of its formal timelessness, the Wheeler-DeWitt equation *does* depend on time by means of the entanglement between matter and geometry. In general, this *physical* time is many-fingered (that is, it depends on the progression of the space-like hypersurfaces of spacetime individually at every space point), but in the case of an exactly homogenous and isotropic Friedmann cosmology, time may be represented by *one* single "finger": the expansion parameter a . If regarded as a probability amplitude, however, the wave function defines probabilities *for* time – not as a function *of* given time.

It is further remarkable that, for Friedmann type universes, the static Wheeler-DeWitt equation $H\Psi = 0$ (the Hamiltonian quantum constraint) assumes a hyperbolic form in its infinite-dimensional configuration space – again with a or its logarithm defining a time-like variable. This consequence is physically very important, since it defines a global initial value problem for the wave functional with respect to this variable – for example at $a = 0$.¹⁵ Its empirically required asymmetry (a general arrow of time) might even be derivable from a symmetrically formulated boundary condition because of the asymmetry of the Hamiltonian under reversal of a or $\ln a$. Claus Kiefer could furthermore show that one may derive the usual time-dependent Schrödinger (Tomonaga) equation for matter from the Wheeler-DeWitt equation under a short wave length approximation for the geometric degrees of freedom – in analogy to a Born Oppenheimer approximation (see his Ch. 4 in Joos et al. of Ref. 5 and Sect. 5.4 of Ref. 14.). This result demonstrates once more that the Wheeler-DeWitt equation, now representing the global Schrödinger equation, can only describe a whole Everett multiverse, since each trajectory through the configuration space of spatial geometries would define a classical

spacetime. Wave packets following such trajectories according to the WKB approximation are decohered from one another by the matter variables – in analogy to large molecules, whose nuclei, decohered by scattered molecules, appear to move on quasi-classical orbits according to the frog’s perspective of an observer.

If one also allowed for a multiverse of “landscapes” (Tegmark’s level 2 of multiverses), which is suggested by many speculative field theories that lead to a drastically inhomogeneous universe on the very large scale, the “subjective selection” (by chance – not by free will) of an observer with his epistemologically important frog’s perspective of the world (cf. Sect. 4) could be roughly characterized by a hierarchy of five not necessarily independent steps: (1) the selection of a definite landscape from their quantum superposition that must be part of a general wave function (in the sense of Tegmark’s level 3 of multiverses, that is, Everett), (2) the selection of a particular region in the resulting three- or higher dimensional landscape (a locally defined “world” that may be characterized by specific values of certain “constants of nature” – Tegmark’s level 2), (3) the selection of a quasi-classical spacetime (as described above – level 3 again), (4) the selection of one specific complex organism from all those that may exist in this world, including some “moment of awareness” for it (giving rise to an approximate localization of this subjective observer in space and time: a “here-and-now”), and (5) the selection of one of his/her/its “quantum versions” that must have been created by further Everett branching by means of decoherence. Each step (except for the fourth one) creates its own kind of unpredictable initial conditions characterizing the further evolution of the resulting individual branches or “worlds”. Properties characterizing our specific branch of the universe can thus not be derived from any theory – they have to be empirically determined as part of an answers to the question “Where are we in the widely hypothetical physical world?” Only step 4 can *not* be objectivized in the usual sense of this word, namely with respect to different observers in the same quasi-classical “world”, but at least for this step “our” selection as humans seems to require an application of the weak anthropic principle. Entropy may *decrease* in most of these steps (depending on its precise definition).^{4,16,17}

7. Conclusions

These brief remarks about quantum gravity and quantum cosmology may bring the strange story of particles and waves in principle to a (preliminary?) end. While the particle concept has been recognized as a mere illusion, waves can exist only as part of a global wave function

in a very high-dimensional (if not infinite-dimensional) space. Matrix mechanics with its formal concept of “observables” thus turns out to be essentially no more than an effective probabilistic description in terms of not consistently applicable particle and other classical concepts. (Many physicists are busy constructing absurdities, “paradoxes”, or no-go theorems in terms of such concepts in order to demonstrate the “weirdness” of quantum theory.) “Quantum Bayesianism”, recently proposed by some information theorists as a framework to describe quantum phenomena, does not even do that; it replaces the whole physical world by a black box, representing an abstract concept of “information” that is assumed to be available to some classical “agents” rather than to observers who may be consistent parts of the physical world. Obviously, such a “non-theory” cannot even be falsified (it is “not even wrong”).

Although concepts like particles and classical fields remain important for our everyday life, including that in physical laboratories, their limited validity must deeply affect a consistent world model (cosmology, in particular). If the Schrödinger equation holds universally, our *observed* quantum world, that is, the “relative state” of the world with respect to the quantum states representing our subjective states as observers, can be no more than a very small (but dynamically autonomous in its future) *partial* wave of the global wave function. We have to accept, however, that the precise structure of a fundamental Hilbert space basis, which is often assumed to be given by the configuration space of some fundamental fields, remains essentially unknown. Because of the unavoidable entanglement of all fields, one cannot expect the *effective* quantum fields, which seem to describe the apparently observed “elementary particles”, to be related to these fundamental variables in a simple way. This conclusion seems to put in doubt much of the traditional approach to QFT, which is based on a concept of renormalization and “dressing” of the effective fields when assumed to be fundamental. There are in fact excellent arguments why even effective or quasi-classical fields may be mathematically simple and elegant – thus giving rise to the impression of their fundamental nature. New mathematical concepts *may* turn out to be helpful, but their applicability to physics has to be demonstrated empirically, and can thus never be *exactly* confirmed.

References:

- ¹ E. Segrè, *From Falling Bodies to Radio Waves – Classical Physicists and their Discoveries* (Freeman, NY 1984)
- ² M. Jammer, *The Conceptual Development of Quantum Mechanics* (McGraw-Hill 1966)
- ³ S. Deléglise et al., Reconstruction of non-classical cavity field states with snapshots of their decoherence, *Nature* **455**, 510 (2008) – cf. also Fig. 3.14 in E. Joos et al. from Ref. 5
- ⁴ H. D. Zeh, The role of the observer in the Everett interpretation, *NeuroQuantology* **11**, 97 (2013) – arxiv:1211.0196
- ⁵ H. D. Zeh, On the interpretation of measurement in quantum theory, *Found. Phys.* **1**, 69 (1970); E. Joos and H. D. Zeh, The emergence of classical properties through interaction with the environment, *Z. Phys.* **B59**, 223 (1985); W. H. Zurek, Decoherence and the transition from quantum to classical, *Physics Today* **44** (Oct), 36 (1991); W. H. Zurek, Preferred states, predictability, classicality, and the environment-induced decoherence, *Progr. Theor. Phys.* **89**, 281 (1993); L. Diósi and C. Kiefer, Robustness and Diffusion of Pointer States, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 3552 (2000); E. Joos et al., *Decoherence and the Appearance of a Classical World in Quantum Theory* (Springer 2003), Chs. 1-4; M. Schlosshauer, *Decoherence and the quantum-to-classical transition* (Springer 2007)
- ⁶ H. D. Zeh, Quantum discreteness is an illusion, *Found. Phys.* **40**, 1476 (2010)
- ⁷ P. Byrne, *The Many Worlds of Hugh Everett III* (Oxford UP, 2010), Ch. 27
- ⁸ S. Tomonaga, On a Relativistically Invariant Formulation of the Quantum Theory of Wave Fields, *Progr. Theor. Phys.* **1**, 27 (1946); E. C. G. Stückelberg, Die Wechselwirkungskräfte in der Elektrodynamik und in der Feldtheorie der Kernkräfte, *Helv. Phys. Acta* **11**, 225 (1938)
- ⁹ H. D. Zeh, There is no ‘first’ quantization, *Phys. Lett.* **A309**, 329 (2003)
- ¹⁰ D. Giulini, C. Kiefer, and H. D. Zeh, Symmetries, superselection rules, and decoherence, *Phys. Lett.* **A199**, 291 (1995)
- ¹¹ F. J. Dyson, The Radiation Theories of Tomonaga, Schwinger and Feynman, *Phys. Rev.* **75**, 486 (1949)
- ¹² N. D. Birrel and P. C. W. Davies, *Quantum Fields in Curved Space* (Cambridge UP, 1983)
- ¹³ H. D. Zeh, Symmetry violating trial wave functions, *Z. Phys.* **188**, 361 (1965); Symmetrieverletzende Modellzustände und kollektive Bewegungen, *Nucl. Phys.* **202**, 38 (1967)
- ¹⁴ C. Kiefer, *Quantum Gravity*, 2nd edn. (Oxford UP, 2007)
- ¹⁵ H. D. Zeh, Emergence of classical time from a universal wave function, *Phys. Lett.* **A116**, 9 (1986); The nature and origin of time-asymmetric spacetime structures, arxiv:1012.4708
- ¹⁶ H. D. Zeh, *The Physical Basis of the Direction of Time*, 5th edn. (Springer, 2007)
- ¹⁷ M. Tegmark, How unitary cosmology generalizes thermodynamics and solves the inflationary entropy problem, *Phys. Rev.* **D 85**, 123517 (2012)