

# THERE IS NEITHER CLASSICAL BUG WITH A SUPERLUMINAL SHADOW NOR QUANTUM ABSOLUTE COLLAPSE NOR (SUBQUANTUM) SUPERLUMINAL HIDDEN VARIABLE

Vladan Panković<sup>\*,\*</sup>, Milan Predojević <sup>\*,\*</sup>, Miodrag Krmar<sup>\*</sup> Milan Radovanović <sup>\*</sup>

<sup>\*</sup>Department of Physics,

Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics,

21000 Novi Sad, Trg Dositeja Obradovića 4., Serbia and Montenegro,

vladanp@gimnazija-indjija.edu.yu

<sup>\*</sup> Gimnazija, 22320 Indjija, Trg Slobode 1a, Serbia and Montenegro

PACS number: 03.65.Ta , 03.65.Ud , 03.30.+p

## Abstract

In this work we analyse critically Griffiths's example of the classical superluminal motion of a bug shadow. Griffiths considers that this example is conceptually very close to quantum nonlocality or superluminality, i.e. quantum breaking of the famous Bell inequality. Or, generally, he suggests implicitly an absolute asymmetric duality (subluminality vs. superluminality) principle in any fundamental physical theory. It, he hopes, can be used for a natural interpretation of the quantum mechanics too. But we explain that such Griffiths's interpretation retires implicitly but significantly from usual, Copenhagen interpretation of the standard quantum mechanical formalism. Within Copenhagen interpretation basic complementarity principle represents, in fact, a dynamical symmetry principle (including its spontaneous breaking, i.e. effective hiding by measurement). Similarly, in other fundamental physical theories instead of Griffiths's absolute asymmetric duality principle there is a dynamical symmetry (including its spontaneous breaking, i.e. effective hiding in some of these theories) principle. Finally, we show that Griffiths's example of the bug shadow superluminal motion is definitely incorrect (it sharply contradicts the remarkable Roemer's determination of the speed of light by coming late of Jupiter's first moon shadow).

In this work we shall analyze critically presentations, discussions and implicitly suggested original solutions of some significant conceptual problems of the quantum mechanics foundation given in the significant book of David Griffiths *Introduction to Quantum Mechanics* [1]. Precisely, we shall analyze Griffiths's suggestion on the conceptual analogy between quantum mechanics (quantum nonlocality or superluminality, i.e. quantum breaking of the famous Bell inequality) and classical mechanics (classical (nonquantum) superluminal motion of a bug shadow along a sufficiently distant screen). This analogy, Griffiths hopes, implies the existence of a *absolute asymmetric duality* (causal subluminality, i.e. locality vs. acausal superluminality, i.e. nonlocality) principle not only in the quantum mechanics but in practically all fundamental physical theories (classical mechanics, theory of relativity, quantum mechanics and quantum field theory). Further we shall compare such Griffiths's absolute asymmetric duality principle with "relativistic and symmetrical" suppositions and statements of the usual, Copenhagen (Bohr-Heisenberg's) interpretation of the standard quantum mechanical formalism. It will be demonstrated that Griffiths's and Copenhagen conceptual view points are principally different. Moreover, it will be demonstrated that conceptual basis of practically all fundamental physical theories (classical mechanics, theory of relativity, quantum mechanics and quantum field theory) represents instead of the Griffiths's absolute asymmetric duality principle a "relativistic" dynamical symmetry (including its spontaneous breaking, i.e. effective hiding in some of these theories) principle. Finally, we shall prove that Griffiths's example of the classical superluminal bug shadow motion is definitely inconsistent. It is not hard to see that given example contradicts sharply the remarkable Roemer's determination of the speed of light by coming late of Jupiter's first moon shadow. Subtle distinctions between absolute asymmetric (Griffiths's and other) and "relativistic and symmetric" (Copenhagen) interpretations of the quantum mechanics, which are presented here, can be very interesting for the students for a better understanding of the basic concepts in the modern physics.

In the afterward of his above-mentioned book David Griffiths presents simply and clearly famous Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox, EPR [2] (that states that quantum mechanics is *consistent* but *incomplete* so that it must be completed with some (subquantum) hidden variables), Bell inequality [3] (that states that *if* quantum mechanics is *incomplete* then it is *necessarily inconsistent*) and takes notice on Bell inequality breaking by real experiments [4]. These works, Griffiths concludes, imply the so-called *quantum nonlocality, superluminality* or (by Einstein's words [2]) "spooky action-at-a-distance". Or, generally, it implies, in Griffiths's opinion, a principal absolute asymmetric duality (causal subluminal dynamics vs. acausal superluminal influences) not only in quantum mechanics but in all other fundamental physical theories too.

However this conclusion is not quite accurate even if the term "quantum nonlocality" is in a general use. Quite correctly speaking, according to its standard formalism [5] including its usual, Copenhagen (Bohr-Heisenberg's) interpretation [6],[7], that are in an excellent agreement with real experiments [4], quantum mechanics is both, *complete and subluminal*. It forbids not only superluminal energy or information transfer but *any* superluminal action, i.e. influence. Namely, according to standard quantum mechanical formalism and Copenhagen interpretation seeming superluminal actions represent nothing more than a consequence of an *incorrect use* of this formalism. Especially, collapse of the wave function by measurement, as one of the most fundamental standard quantum mechanical concepts, represents, as it has often been suggested by Bohr (even if Bohr does not use the word collapse but only measurement, or more generally, complementarity of the principally different measurements) [6], [7], only a *relative* but *not an absolute* phenomenon. Moreover, Bohr compares the relative character of the collapse within standard quantum mechanical formalism with the relative character of the space-time in Einstein's

general theory of relativity. In this sense at the end of his remarkable comment of EPR paradox [6] Bohr observes the following :

”Especially, the singular position of measuring instruments in the account of quantum phenomena, just discussed, appears closely analogous to the well-known necessity in relativity theory of upholding an ordinary description of all measuring processes, including a sharp distinction between space and time coordinates, although the very essence of this theory is the establishment of new physical laws, in the comprehension of which we must renounce the customary separation of space and time ideas. The dependence of the reference system, in relativity theory, of all readings of scales and clocks may even be compared with essentially uncontrollable exchange of momentum and energy between the objects of measurements and all instruments defining the space-time system of reference, which in quantum theory confront us with the situation characterized by the notion of complementarity. In fact this new feature of natural philosophy means a radical revision of our attitude as regards physical reality, which may be paralleled with the fundamental modification of all ideas regarding the absolute character of physical phenomena, brought about by the general theory of relativity.” (p.701.)

In other words in the general theory of relativity all space-time referential frames at any space-time point are equivalent or symmetric and none of these frames can be exactly treated as unique, i.e. absolute (formal existence of the absolute referential frame corresponds, in fact, to absolute breaking of the general relativistic dynamical symmetry), on the one hand. It means that symmetric general relativistic dynamics, that is, of course, subluminal, can completely describe all exact general relativistic phenomena. On the other hand, at any point of the Riemannian space-time there is unique local Euclidian referential frame that can be locally approximately, i.e. effectively treated as the ”absolute” (in this way general relativistic symmetry becomes locally approximately, i.e. effectively broken, precisely hidden). Also, by a sufficiently small gravitational field and sufficiently small speeds (ten or many times smaller than the speed of light), a transition from local Euclidian referential frame in some close to Euclidian frame can be effectively approximated by appearance of the Newtonian inertial forces in given local Euclidian frame. It denotes the approximate transition from Einstein’s general theory of relativity to Newton’s classical mechanics. But for a sufficiently large gravitational field or sufficiently large speeds (comparable with the speed of light) Newton’s classical mechanics becomes an incorrect approximation of the Einstein’s general theory of relativity.

Similarly, on the one hand, Bohr suggests that in the standard quantum mechanical formalism, all bases, representing referential frames in Hilbert space of the states of quantum system are equivalent or symmetric and none of these frames can be exactly treated as unique, i.e. absolute (formal existence of absolute referential frame corresponds, in fact, to absolute breaking of the quantum dynamical unitary symmetry, i.e. superposition or to absolute collapse). It means that quantum dynamical state completely (deterministically and objectively) describes the quantum system in Hilbert space. Also, it means that subluminal unitary symmetric quantum dynamics (that conserves superposition) can completely describe all exact quantum mechanical phenomena, including exact subluminal dynamical interaction between measured quantum object and measurement device. On the other hand, it is possible to apply an approximate, hybrid description of this interaction between quantum object and measurement device. By such hybrid description measurement device is described *approximately, i.e. effectively classically* and limit of a correct use of this approximation is determined by Heisenberg’s indeterminacy relations. Only in respect to so-described measurement device, i.e. *relatively* quantum object becomes described *effectively quantum mechanically* by *(relatively) collapsed* state from the eigen basis of the measured

observable preferred by given measurement device. In this way quantum dynamical symmetry, i.e. superposition, becomes *effectively and relatively broken, i.e. effectively hidden* by measurement.

More precisely, in Copenhagen interpretation there is a sufficiently explicit suggestion that a superposition of the weakly interfering wave packets of the measurement device is exactly quantum dynamically stable so that it stands exactly conserved during time. But given superposition is effectively classical dynamically globally unstable. For this reason only *relatively*, i.e. in respect to effective approximate classical level of the analysis accuracy this superposition turns spontaneously (nondynamically and probabilistically) in one locally classical dynamically stable wave packet with well-known (Born's) probability. It represents the so-called *self-collapse* on the classically effectively described measurement device. Simultaneously, on the measured quantum object, quantum dynamically exactly correlated with measurement device, *relatively*, i.e. in respect to selfcollapsed measurement device, corresponding exact eigen state of the measured observable appears. It represents *relative collapse as effective quantum* (but not effective classical) phenomenon on the measured quantum object. In this way, without any necessity for an absolute collapse on the classical level of the analysis or in the macroscopic domains, Copenhagen interpretation can correctly to reproduce all existing experimental facts.

It can be added that Bohr himself observed [7] that many of his or Copenhagen early terms are not quite accurate but that they can be formalized in a satisfactory way. For example, in early Bohr's terminology exact conservation of the quantum dynamical unitary symmetry, or unit norm of the state, is phenomenologically and simply called "indivisibility of the quant of action" [6],[7]. Also, Bohr's remarkable term "complementarity" that represents a conceptual generalization of the quantum particle-wave duality principle does not consider any absolute asymmetric duality of the particle and wave characteristics that exist in de Broglie's, Bohm's etc. hidden variables theories [8]. Especially, Heisenberg [9] cites his discussions with Bohr which many times expressed the opinion that (particle-wave) duality, even complementarity represents only a phenomenological expression. It does not belong to quantum mechanics itself, but it refers to the different possibilities of the (phase) transitions (that cannot be realized simultaneously, i.e. in the same conditions) from exact quantum in the approximate, i.e. effective classical mechanics. These complementary transitions occur by different measurements defined only within the corresponding approximation limits (Heisenberg's indeterminacy relations). A consequent formalization of Bohr's relative collapse concept is given, for example, in [10]. It is shown that relative collapse can be modeled by a typical Landau's continuous phase transition (whose critical values of the order parameters are determined by Heisenberg's indeterminacy relations) from exact quantum to the effective, i.e. approximate classical mechanics.

Really, it is not hard to see that the situation in the quantum mechanics is conceptually entirely analogous to the situation in the quantum field theory, especially in the quantum theory of the electro-weak interactions [11],[12]. Namely, as it is well-known, the necessity that within a quantum field theory relativistic locality, i.e. subluminality of the (inter)action is consistently connected with quantum indeterminacy principle, introduces a strict condition of the renormalizability of the given quantum field theory. So, roughly speaking, if the quantum mechanics with indeterminacy principle would admit a nonrelativistic, i.e. nonlocal or superluminal completion by hidden variables, then the corresponding complete quantum field theories cannot be renormalizable, or quantum field theories in the existing form cannot be possible at all. Renormalizability in the standard model of the electro-weak interaction is strictly caused by local gauge symmetry (including its spontaneous (probabilistic) breaking, i.e. effective hiding) of the quantum electro-weak field dynamics. More precisely, as it is well-known, the exact local gauge symmetry of the

electro-weak field dynamics does not admit nonzero boson rest mass. Meanwhile, exactly dynamically stable locally gauge symmetric electro-weak field is relatively, i.e. in respect to small perturbation approximation for low energies, dynamically nonstable (perturbation series diverges). But, in respect to given approximation, an electro-weak field can spontaneously (nondynamically and probabilistically) turn into one of its equivalently probable local minimums which generates effectively nonzero boson mass. However, after this spontaneous local gauge symmetry breaking (effective hiding), except the three massive bosons and one massless photon, there is, according to the remarkable Goldstone's theorem (that would correspond conceptually to Bell's theorem) an additional, fifth, massless Goldstone's boson, i.e. "ghost" (spooky or "ethereal") boson. It cannot be eliminated in any absolute way. Any attempt of the absolute elimination of such "ghost" boson, that considers explicitly or implicitly the absolute existence of such boson before elimination, leads explicitly or implicitly to the forbidden absolute (dynamical) breaking of the local gauge symmetry. Nevertheless it does not mean that in the quantum theory of the electro-weak interaction there is an absolute asymmetric duality (material bosons vs. "ghost" boson). Namely, "ghost" bosons can be correctly treated as a superfluous degree of the freedom only, i.e. as a possibility for the choice of a Higgs's "rotating" referential frame. After the choice of given referential frame, i.e. after application of so-called Higgs's mechanism, the "ghost" boson becomes effectively and relatively eliminated without any exact breaking of the local gauge symmetry of the electro-weak quantum field dynamics.

Obviously, standard quantum mechanical formalism including its usual Copenhagen interpretation is deeply conceptually analogous to practically all modern fundamental physical theories (special and general theory of relativity and quantum field theory) where symmetry (including its spontaneous breaking, i.e. effective hiding by corresponding approximations) represents one of the most general and significant concepts.

Thus, since collapse is relative, i.e. principally dependent on the limits of the approximate classical mechanical description of the concrete measurement device, within Copenhagen interpretation of the standard quantum mechanical formalism there is no sense in discussing the collapse or any corresponding (hidden) variables before concrete measurement. It represents the main reason why the premises of EPR or Bell inequality cannot be applied at all within Copenhagen interpretation of the standard quantum mechanical formalism or why there are *no* superluminal influences here.

In comparison with other interpretations of the quantum mechanics it can be concluded that Copenhagen interpretation is much more than a simple, so-called approximationistic interpretation. In such approximationistic interpretation, eg. [13], roughly speaking, a measurement device is a quantum mechanically described by a superposition of the weakly interfering wave packets correlated with eigen states of the measured observable on the measured quantum object. But since here an approximate classical level of the analysis, discretely (for reason of the Heisenberg's indeterminacy relations) different from the exact quantum level of the analysis, is not introduced, there is no consistent way of modeling of the collapse by an individual measurement. Simply speaking approximationistic interpretations is incomplete, as it has been pointed out in [14], since it cannot explain the empirical fact on the "exact" but not approximate difference between quantum superposition and quantum mixture on the measured quantum object after measurement.

Also Copenhagen interpretation is principally different than such interpretations that can be called super-quantum or macroscopic hidden variables interpretations. These interpretations or theories explain collapse as an absolute phenomenon that appears by an asymmetrically, i.e. nonunitary extended dynamics by nonlinear terms [15], environment influences [16] etc., in the

macroscopic domains. Nevertheless, since Bell inequality refers to practically all types of the local hidden variables, Bell inequality breaking in the real experiments implies that such macroscopic hidden variables theories must be necessary superluminal. Moreover, such superluminal macroscopic hidden variables theories predict not only an incompleteness of the quantum mechanics but, also, an incompleteness of the classical mechanics and (special and general) relativistic mechanics in the macroscopic, nonquantum domains.

It can be added that Copenhagen relative collapse interpretation is principally different from the famous Everett's relative state (subsystemic branching), i.e. many world interpretation of the quantum mechanics [17]. Namely, soon after the appearance of EPR and significantly before Bell inequality appearance, Furry [18] observed quite correctly that in contrast to EPR statement quantum mechanics cannot be both, consistent and incomplete. EPR authors stated that quantum mechanics cannot differ pure (with superposition) and mixed (without superposition but with quantum mixture) state on a quantum supersystem that holds distant subsystems. But, Furry showed that within the standard quantum mechanical formalism there is always a clear difference between pure and mixed state. It refers not only to a simple quantum system (without subsystems) but also to a quantum supersystem with near or distant subsystems. For this reason incompleteness of the quantum mechanics, i.e. existence of a (subsystemic) quantum mixtures instead of a (supersystemic) quantum superposition, induces inconsistency of the quantum mechanics too, and vice versa. Furry's and similar argumentation applied to Everett's interpretation yields following. Within standard quantum mechanical formalism supersystemic superposition is inconsistent with subsystemic branching. Or Everett's interpretation is inconsistent with standard quantum mechanical formalism and existing experimental results [4]. This interpretation can be consistent only with a hidden variables theory but then it must be necessarily completed by hidden variables that are not given explicitly in Everett's original work. Meanwhile, in this case Everett's subsystemic branching and relative states lose fundamental character and become an auxiliary (even superfluous) construction.

Finally Copenhagen relative collapse interpretation is different from von Neumann's, called orthodox, interpretation of the quantum mechanics with absolute collapse [5]. It can be observed and pointed out that there is a very oft opinion, accepted implicitly by Griffiths too, that orthodox interpretation represents a new, more accurate version of the old, less accurate Copenhagen interpretation. But, in fact, such opinion is incorrect and Copenhagen and orthodox interpretation are principally different. According to Copenhagen interpretation, as it has been explained, only unitary symmetric quantum dynamics is completely exact and universal. Collapse by measurement represents only a hybrid, effectively classical on the measurement device and effective and relative quantum on the quantum object, phenomenon. Simply speaking, Copenhagen interpretation that proposes quantum mechanics as a theory with spontaneous symmetry breaking (i.e. effective hiding) is not old but very modern since it is comparable with contemporary quantum field theories with spontaneous symmetry breaking. On the contrary, in the orthodox interpretation the classical approximation is completely eliminated from the quantum dynamics. It, seemingly, causes a more pure, or completely exact theory than this predicted by Copenhagen interpretation. But in such "more pure" (or "sterile" for the aspect of Copenhagen interpretation) theory there is none way that the collapse be described by quantum dynamics. For this reason asymmetric (since it breaks unitary symmetry) collapse, absolutely independent of the unitary symmetric quantum dynamics, i.e. absolute collapse, must be *ad hoc postulated* without any clear explanation of its origin. This von Neumann's projection postulate represents *an extension* of the standard quantum mechanical formalism. On the one hand, i.e. *quantitatively or numerically*, von Neuman's

projection postulate corresponds unambiguously to Born's probabilistic postulate by the getting of the measurements results on the quantum object. On the other hand, i.e. *qualitatively*, von Neumann's projection postulate states that collapse appears quite exactly and entirely on the supersystem (measured quantum object + measurement device), but not only by Copenhagen hybrid description of the same supersystem. In this way within orthodox interpretation there is an absolute asymmetrical duality, i.e. the difference between unitary symmetric quantum dynamics and absolute asymmetric collapse any of which must be treated as the exact but incomplete. In this sense quantum mechanics is absolutely exact but necessarily absolutely incomplete too. Von Neumann suggested implicitly that absolute asymmetric duality of the quantum mechanics in the orthodox interpretation represents the result of a Cartesian like absolute separation of the material world (described by quantum dynamics) and immaterial, spiritual world of an Abstract Ego of the human observer (that generate absolute asymmetric collapse).

EPR authors, that accepted standard quantum mechanical formalism and absolute collapse postulate, concluded, i.e. suggested that quantum mechanics must be incomplete. But in contrast to von Neumann's orthodox interpretation EPR authors suggest implicitly that incompleteness of the quantum mechanics can be removed by some more general dynamical theory called (sub-quantum) theory of hidden variables. Word "subquantum" refers to an implicit supposition that the level of the hidden variables, in some sense analogous to the quantum field theory level, lies "down" quantum mechanical level. Implicitly, EPR authors would admit any, including the above mentioned macroscopic, or superquantum, hidden variables theory whose level, in some sense analogous to the classical mechanical level, lies "up" quantum mechanical level. Nevertheless, any, subquantum or superquantum, but local hidden variables theory must satisfy Bell inequality. Meanwhile, since Bell inequality is broken by exact experiments, it means that none, neither subquantum nor superquantum, local hidden variables theory can exist. On the other hand acceptance of a nonlocal hidden variables theory that can to satisfy the existing experimental results, needs, as it has been discussed, not only a radical revision of the standard quantum mechanical formalism. It needs, also, a radical revision (even rejection) of the classical mechanics, theory of relativity and quantum field theory. It represents a very implausible demand (an "impossible mission").

Bell [19] suggested a solution of the hidden variables theory problem by supposition of such hidden variables, called beables, that, roughly speaking, except their existence, have no other physical characteristics. Meanwhile, it is not hard to see that then there is no real physical criterion for differentiation of locality, i.e. subluminality and nonlocality, i.e. superluminality of such "material" beables, or, for differentiation of such "material" beables and "imaterial" Abstract Ego of the human observer. It means only that beable interpretation is equivalently incomplete as well as orthodox interpretation. In other words, absolute asymmetric duality and incompleteness problems that appear by extension of the standard quantum mechanical formalism by absolute asymmetric collapse are equivalent to the same problems that appear by extension of the standard quantum mechanical formalism by hidden variables.

Also, there are opinions [20] that absolute asymmetric duality and incompleteness of the quantum mechanics does not represent differentiation between ontological, material vs. immaterial, concepts, but that it represents a differentiation between ontological and epistemological concepts. In such, so-called positivistic interpretations of the quantum mechanics ontological material concepts can be described by unitary symmetric quantum dynamics, but epistemological concepts (connected with measurement) stand completely unclear, i.e. quantum dynamically undescrivable, i.e. unexplainable. The difference between positivistic and orthodox interpretation

is based on a supposition within positivistic interpretation that quantum mechanics (or any other physical theory) cannot describe an individual quantum object or individual measurement but only a statistical quantum ensemble of the quantum objects and measurement results. However it is obvious that it represents only a change of the one by the other ad hoc postulate that is not inherent but that is added to standard quantum mechanical formalism. This change does not cause any diminishing of the principal absolute asymmetric duality, i.e. incompleteness of the extended quantum mechanics.

All this points clearly that *only* usual Copenhagen interpretation of the quantum mechanics represents an interpretation with the relative collapse modeled, in full agreement with general formalism of the spontaneous symmetry breaking. It, on the one side, *without any* "ethereal", i.e. metaphysical construction, especially *without any* superluminal influences, satisfies *all* existing experimental results. On the other hand, it corresponds deeply conceptually (with "relativistic" dynamical symmetry and its spontaneous breaking as the basic concepts) to practically all other fundamental physical theories, classical mechanics, theory of relativity and quantum field theory. On the contrary, *all the other* above-mentioned interpretations of the quantum mechanics are either inconsistent with existing experimental results or hold explicitly or implicitly *absolutely unremovable* "ethereal", i.e. metaphysical constructions, i.e. an *absolute asymmetric duality*. As an especial form (consequence) of this general absolute asymmetric duality, the duality, i.e. difference between the subluminal, i.e. dynamical or causal and superluminal, i.e. nondynamical or acausal influences appear.

Now we shall analyze a more or less implicit original Griffiths's attempt to solve the problems of the foundation of the quantum mechanics. He starts from the view point of the interpretations with absolute asymmetric duality. But he attempts to prove that absolute asymmetric duality, especially subluminal, i.e. dynamical or causal vs. superluminal, i.e. nondynamical or acausal absolute duality does not characterize only quantum mechanics but that it characterizes practically all other fundamental physical theories. If it were true, then quantum mechanics with its absolute asymmetric duality would not represent any exception but only an especial example of the general principle of the absolute asymmetric duality in the nature.

Griffiths states the following :

"Ironically, the experimental confirmation of quantum mechanics came as something of a shock to the scientific community. But not because it spelled the demise of "realism" - most physicists had long since adjusted to this (and for those who could not, there remained the possibility of *nonlocal* hidden variables theories, to which Bell's theorem does not apply). The real shock was the proof that *nature itself is fundamentally nonlocal*. Nonlocality, in the form of the instantaneous collapse of the wave function (and for matter also in the symmetrization requirement for identical particles) had always been a feature of the orthodox interpretation, but before Aspect's experiment it was possible to hope that quantum nonlocality was somehow a nonphysical artifact of the formalism, with no detectable consequences. That hope no longer be sustained, and we are obliged to reexamine our objection to instantaneous action at a distance." (p.379.)

It can be shortly observed and pointed out that Griffiths, obviously, neglects principal aspects of Copenhagen interpretation discussed above. Within Copenhagen interpretation *nature itself is fundamentally local* while seeming impression on the fundamental nonlocality of the nature is the consequence of an incorrect postulate on the absoluteness of the collapse. In this way Griffiths's conclusions can refer, or *must be limited*, only to such an interpretation of the quantum mechanics that *ad hoc postulates* absolute asymmetric duality in one or in other form.

Further, Griffiths states the following :



”Why *are* physicists so alarmed at the idea of superluminal influences? After all, there are many things that travel faster than light. If a bug flies across the beam of a movie projector, the speed of its shadow is proportional to the distance to the screen; in principle, that distance can be as large as you like, and hence the *shadow* can move at arbitrarily high velocity (Figure A.4.). However, the shadow does not carry any *energy*; nor can transmit any *message* from one point to another on the screen. A person at point  $X$  cannot *cause anything to happen* at point  $Y$  by manipulating the passing shadows.” (p. 380.)

At first sight it represents only a formal analogy between a classical, strictly nonquantum, superluminality (by motion of the bug shadow) and quantum (strictly nonclassical) nonlocality (by Bell inequality breaking). But by a deeper analysis of the cited (and further) Griffiths’s words it can be concluded that Griffiths points to a principal analogy. Namely Griffiths says :

”Well,let’s consider Bell’s experiment. Does the measurement of the electron *influence* on the outcome of the positron measurement? Assuredly it *does* - otherwise we cannot account for correlation of the data. But does the measurement of the electron *cause* a particular outcome for the positron? Not in any ordinary sense of the word. There is no way the person monitoring the electron detector could use his measurement to send a signal to the person at the positron detector, since he does not control outcome of his own instrument (he cannot *make* a given electron come out spin up, any more than the person at  $X$  can effect the passing shadow of the bug). It is true that he can decide *whether to make a measurement at all*, but the positron monitor, having immediate access only to data as his end of the line, cannot tell whether the electron was measured or not. For the lists of the data compiled at the two ends, considered separately, are completely random. It is only when we compare the two lists later that we discover the remarkable correlations.” (p.381.)

Obviously,Griffiths compares *very seriously* the observers of the electron and positron in EPR paradox and the observers of the bug shadow at  $X$  and  $Y$  point of the screen. By such comparison the limitation of the separate, or more accurately subsystemic, measurements on the electron and positron, that cannot carry energy or information, are *seriously analogous* to the observation of the observers at  $X$  and at  $Y$ . Let us say that, for example, the bug moves up-down quite accidentally with the speed that has absolute value  $v$  but whose direction can be changed practically ”instantaneously”. Let us say that,in further admirable simplification, this bug can appear accidentally, during a small time period, either in a point  $x$  corresponding to  $X$  or  $y$  corresponding to  $Y$ . Then if during given small time interval, the observer at  $X$  observes bug shadow he will know that the observer at  $Y$  observes light point, i.e. shadow absence,and vice versa.

However we can ask again if all Griffiths’s statements, that are consistent with orthodox interpretation or nonlocal hidden variables interpretation,are consistent with Copenhagen interpretation. The answer is again - no, which can be proved by Bohr’s comment of EPR [6], [7]. Simply speaking according to standard quantum mechanical formalism initial local unitary symmetric quantum dynamical interaction correlates electron and positron as the quantum subsystems in the quantum supersystem, [electron+positron]. Or, given supersystem according to initial *local* quantum dynamics becomes described by pure correlated quantum state from Hilbert’s space of the states of supersystem. This state of the supersystem that, according to unitary symmetry, stands correlated even later when immediate dynamical interaction between distant subsystems disappear. According to standard quantum mechanical formalism given supersystemic pure correlated state must be exactly different from supersystemic mixture of the noncorrelated states. Simultaneously, it means that given supersystem *cannot be exactly split* into its subsystems even if they are distant in sense of the usual space of classical mechanics (Bohr’s *indivisibility* of the quant of action!). Namely, fundamental space of the standard quantum mechanical formalism is

Hilbert's space but not the usual classical mechanical space of the coordinates. Any explicitly or implicitly opposite statement leads without standard quantum mechanical formalism. Further when the electron interacts later exactly quantum dynamically with corresponding measurement device no absolute collapse on the supersystem appears and for this reason there is *no* absolute superluminal influence of the electron on the positron. Given exact quantum dynamical interaction correlates electron+positron supersystem and electron measurement device in a new broader supersystem, called supersupersystem, [electron+positron+electron measurement device]. Given supersupersystem according to *local* quantum dynamical interaction between electron and its measurement device becomes described by a new correlated quantum state from Hilbert's space of the states of supersupersystem. According to standard quantum mechanical formalism given supersupersystemic pure correlated state must be exactly different from supersupersystemic mixture of the noncorrelated states which means that given supersupersystem *cannot be exactly split* into its subsystems, electron, positron and electron measurement device even if some of these subsystems are distant in sense of the usual classical mechanical space. In this way exact quantum dynamics by initial interaction between electron and positron or later interaction between electron, more precisely [electron+positron] and electron measurement device, yields *none* superluminal influences. Analogously, exact quantum dynamics by initial interaction between electron and positron or later interaction between positron, more precisely [electron+positron] and positron measurement device, yields *no* superluminal influences.

Further, by a hybrid description of given supersupersystem in which on the effectively classically described electron measurement device a selfcollapse appears on the supersystem relative collapse appears as an effective quantum phenomena. Relatively collapsed supersystem becomes effectively exactly described by a mixture of the noncorrelated quantum states, which admits an effective separation of the supersystem in the electron and positron. Obviously, here is nothing superluminal in given selfcollapse and relative collapse, i.e. by corresponding measurement realized by electron measurement device. Analogously, there is nothing superluminal by measurement by positron measurement device and corresponding selfcollapse and relative collapse. Also, the comparison of the results of the measurement of the electron measurement device and positron measurement device points out that any of given separate, i.e. subsystemic measurements represents only an incomplete description of corresponding exact description of the quantum dynamical interactions. In other words, within Copenhagen interpretation comparison of the separate measurements does not yield any conclusion on a superluminal influences between electron and positron. Given comparison, within Copenhagen interpretation, points out that any of given separate measurement, i.e. collapse, must be only a relative but not an absolute phenomenon.

Griffiths ,finally, concludes :

"We are lead, then to distinguish two types of influences: the "causal" variety, which produce actual changes in some physical property or receiver, detectable by measurements on that subsystem alone, and an "ethereal" kind which do not transmit energy or information, and for which the only evidence is a correlation in the data taken on the two separate subsystems - a correlation which by its nature cannot be detected by examing either list alone. Causal influences *cannot* propagate faster than light, but there is no compelling reason why ethereal ones should not. These influences associated with collapse of the wave function are of the latter type, and fact that they "travel" faster than light may be surprising, but it is not, after all, catastrophic."(p.381.)

In other words Griffiths states that even if absolute asymmetric quantum duality, dynamical subluminality vs. superluminality by absolute collapse, seems surprising, it is not catastrophic at all since quite similar, moreover identical "catastrophy" exists in the classical, strictly nonquantum,

motion of the bug shadow. By a simple extension and corresponding examples it seems that it can be stated that given absolute asymmetric duality exists in practically any fundamental physical theory.

But from Copenhagen's view point there is a serious compelling reason for the rejection of Griffiths's concept of the absolute asymmetric duality. First of all, from Copenhagen's view point, the relative character of the collapse within standard quantum mechanical formalism represents such serious compelling reason. Moreover, as it has been discussed, necessity that by the acceptance of the absolute asymmetric duality practically all physical theories (classical mechanics, special and general theory of relativity, quantum mechanics and quantum field theory) must be radically revised, even completely broken and rejected, represents a more serious compelling reason.

All this causes a serious suspicion about the correctness of Griffiths's example of the classical duality and superluminality of the bug shadow motion. Really, it is not hard to see that given superluminality of the bug shadow contradicts sharply to the remarkable Roemer's determination of the speed of light by real astronomical facts on the coming late of the first Jupiter moon shadow. In further text we shall simply prove that this suspicion is justified, i.e. that Griffiths's example of the classical bug shadow superluminal motion is definitely incorrect.

We can imagine that in this second we realize a superluminal influence at the Sun even if, as it is well-known, light must to propagate from the Earth to the Sun during, approximately, 8 minutes and 20 seconds. But if we do not suggest any causal mechanism for demonstration and explanation of this influence this influence represents only an unphysical imagination, but not any physical "thing that travels faster than light". Meanwhile Griffiths's example is not based on an imagination since it proposes a causal mechanism, i.e. one-to-one correspondence between initial and final state of the bug shadow. This causal mechanism is based on the well-known principles of the classical mechanics and optics, even if, formally, the shadow itself does not represent a classical mechanical body. It would mean that if Griffiths's example is correct classical mechanics is not only incomplete, but that it must be definitely incorrect. In some way, Griffiths's example in the classical mechanics corresponds to EPR in the quantum mechanics. All this needs a more accurate analysis, i.e. formalization which will be given in further work .

So, suppose that a projector is a permanent source of the mutually decoherent continuous light beams that is placed in the coordinate beginning  $(0, 0)$  in  $xOy$  plane. In any continuous light beam, i.e. in any direction on the right hand-side of the coordinate beginning continuously filled by light (photons), the speed of light equals  $c = 3108m/s$ .

Suppose that the screen is placed parallel to  $y - axis$  at the distance  $L$  from the coordinate beginning along  $x - axis$  direction.

Suppose that at the initial time moment a small bug is placed at the point  $(l, 0)$  at  $xOy$  plane for  $0 < l < L$ .

Finally, suppose that this bug moves with the constant subluminal speed  $v$ , parallel to  $y - axis$  direction till  $(l, s)$  point in  $xOy$  plane where it will be stopped. It means that the bug will appear at  $(l, s)$  in the time moment

$$t = \frac{s}{v} \quad (1)$$

According to the introduced suppositions (especially suppositions of the continuity of the light beams and finite value of the speed of light), the shadow of the bug will appear at  $(L, 0)$  point of the screen only after  $[0, t_1]$  time interval of the initial coming late, where

$$t_1 = \frac{L}{c} \quad (2)$$

As it is not hard to see, according to the same suppositions and (1),(2), the complete time of the motion of the bug shadow from  $(L, 0)$  till  $(L, S)$ , for

$$\frac{S}{s} = \frac{L}{l} \quad (3)$$

will be

$$T = t + t_2 = \frac{s}{v} + \frac{((L - l)^2 + (S - s)^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{c} \quad (4)$$

Here

$$t_2 = \frac{((L - l)^2 + (S - s)^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{c} \quad (5)$$

represents length of the time interval of the coming late of the bug shadow stopping at  $(l, s)$  in respect to time moment of the bug stopping at  $(L, S)$ . It is caused by finite value of the speed of light.

Now it is obvious that the average speed of the bug shadow equals

$$v' = \frac{S}{T} = c \frac{S}{c \frac{s}{v} + ((L - l)^2 + (S - s)^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \quad (6)$$

It can be simply proved that following is satisfied

$$\frac{S}{c \frac{s}{v} + ((L - l)^2 + (S - s)^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq 1 \quad (7)$$

Namely, (6) can be simply transformed in

$$(S - c \frac{s}{v})^2 \leq (L - l)^2 + (S - s)^2 \quad (8)$$

Since  $v$  is subluminal, i.e since

$$\frac{c}{v} \geq 1 \quad (9)$$

it follows finally

$$(S - c \frac{s}{v})^2 \leq (S - s)^2 \leq (L - l)^2 + (S - s)^2 \quad (10)$$

so that (7), (8) are satisfied.

Thus, according to (6), (7) it follows generally

$$v' \leq c \quad (11)$$

which means that the bug shadow moves really with a *subluminal* speed.

But for a relatively small  $L$  and  $S$  for which

$$t \gg t_1 \quad (12)$$

$$t \gg t_2 \quad (13)$$

$T$  (4) turns approximately in  $t$  and  $v'$  (6) turns approximately in

$$v' \simeq \frac{S}{t} \quad (14)$$

which, according to (1),(3) , yields

$$v' \simeq \frac{L}{l}v \quad (15)$$

Obtained expression points out that since  $L$  is greater than  $l$  the bug shadow speed is greater than the bug speed. Seemingly, according to (15), for a sufficiently large  $L$ , i.e. for

$$L > l\frac{c}{v} \quad (16)$$

$v'$  can be superluminal, which represents the original Griffiths's argumentation. However, for such a large  $L$  expression (15) becomes an incorrect approximation of (6) while (6) itself, according to (11), represents even in this case a subluminal speed.

Suppose now, quite formally, that that expression (15) is always correct. We shall prove that in this case there is a causal, but superluminal information transfer by a person, sender of the information, at  $X = (L, 0)$  point and a person, recipient of the information, at  $Y = (L, S)$  point. Namely, suppose that there is a third person, mediator  $Z$  close to the bug that governs bug motion in the following way. It, during the time interval smaller or equal to  $[0, t]$ , can either have no influence on the bug motion or stop the given bug before, even significantly before it arrives in the final point of its trajectory  $(l, s)$ . In the first case, during time interval smaller or equal to  $[0, t]$ , recipient will observe the appearance of the bug shadow at  $Y$ , while in the second case during the same time interval he will not observe given shadow. Simply speaking, there is a possibility of the information transfer from  $Z$  toward  $Y$ .

The distance between  $X$  and  $Y$  equals  $S$ , while the distance between  $X$  and  $Z$ , as it is not hard to see, is smaller than or equal to  $((L - l)^2 + s^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Suppose that  $X$  during the noted time interval can inform  $Z$ , by an additional way (telephone, radio waves, etc.) with subluminal speed of the information transfer  $v''$ , either that bug be not disturbed or that bug be stopped before it arrives in  $(l, s)$ . This supposition can be expressed by the following condition

$$\frac{((L - l)^2 + s^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{t} \leq v'' \leq c \quad (17)$$

On the other hand (15), formally treated as an exact expression, under the condition (16) on  $v'$  superluminality, can be presented in the following way

$$v' = \frac{L}{l}v = \frac{L}{l} \frac{s}{t} = \frac{Ls}{lt} > c \quad (18)$$

Expressions (16), (17) yield

$$\frac{((L - l)^2 + s^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{t} < \frac{Ls}{lt} \quad (19)$$

or, after simple transformations,

$$l((L - l)^2 + s^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} < Ls \quad (20)$$

or, finally,

$$l^2((L - l)^2 + s^2) < L^2s^2 \quad (21)$$

Since condition (16) does not forbid following conditions

$$L \gg l \quad (22)$$

$$L \gg s \tag{23}$$

it follows that (21) can, for (22),(23), approximated by

$$l^2 < s^2 \tag{24}$$

which yields

$$l < s \tag{25}$$

Obviously, for an appropriately chosen  $l$  and  $s$ , condition (25) can be satisfied without any principal problem. However, according to the introduced suppositions, it means that between  $X$  and  $Y$  a superluminal information transfer is possible. (It is not hard to see that analogous conclusion on the possibility of the superluminal communication between  $X$  and  $Y$  can be satisfied even without (22), (23) by the appropriate choice of  $l$ ,  $s$  and  $L$ , which will not be discussed in detail.) For this reason, as well as for the supposed serious analogy between Griffiths's example and EPR, inequality (25), or generally, (21), can be considered as the serious analogy of, metaphorically speaking, an anti-Bell inequality.

In this way it is proved that Griffiths's example of the classical superluminal motion of a bug shadow is definitely incorrect. Moreover, it is proved that under a fictitious supposition that Griffiths's example is correct between the observer at  $X$  and the observer at  $Y$ , superluminal and causal information transfer is possible.

In conclusion we can shortly repeat and point out the following. Except for a hope of some physicists, there is no compelling reason to suppose that the absolute asymmetric duality (in the form of an absolute collapse, superluminal hidden variables, etc.) exists in the standard quantum mechanical formalism or any other fundamental physical theory (classical mechanics, theory of relativity or quantum field theory). On the contrary, there is a real compelling reason for consideration that standard quantum mechanical formalism and its usual, Copenhagen interpretation yield a complete description of the quantum phenomena. It is in full conceptual agreement with the foundation of all other modern physical theories. In these theories dynamical symmetry principle (including its spontaneous breaking, i.e. effective hiding in some of these theories), that "modificates" relativistically" all ideas regarding the absolute character of physical phenomena", represents one of the most significant basic concept.

The authors gratefully appreciate the helpful discussions and comments provided by Professor Tristan Hübsch. Authors are very grateful to Sanja Panković for corrections of the form of this work.

## References

- [1 ] D.J.Griffiths,*Introduction to Quantum Mechanics*(Prentice Hall Inc.,Englewood Cliffs,New Jersey,1995.)
- [2 ] A.Einstein,B.Podolsky,N.Rosen,Phys.Rev.,**47**,(1935.),777.
- [3 ] J.S.Bell,Physics,**1**,(1964.),195.
- [4 ] A.Aspect,P.Grangier,G.Roger,Phys.Rev.Lett.,**47**,(1981.),460.
- [5 ] J.von Neumann,*Mathematische Grundlagen der Quanten Mechanik* (Springer Verlag,Berlin,1932.)
- [6 ] N.Bohr,Phys.Rev.,**48**,(1935.),696.
- [7 ] N.Bohr,*Atomic Physics and Human Knowledge* (John Wiley,New York,1958.)
- [8 ] F.J.Belinfante,*A Survey of Hidden Variables Theories* (Pergamon Press,Oxford,1960.)
- [9 ] W.Heisenberg,*Der Teil und das Ganze* (Ro.Piper Co.,Mnchen,1969.)
- [10 ] V.Panković, T.Hübsch,M.Predojević,M.Krmar, *From Quantum to Classical Dynamics: a Landau Continuous Phase Transition with Spontaneous Superposition Breaking* , quant-ph/0409010 v1 1 Sep 2004
- [11 ] F.Halzen,A.Martin,*Quarks and Leptons: An Introductory Course in Modern Particle Physics* (John Wiley and Sons,New York,1984.)
- [12 ] L.H.Ryder,*Quantum Field Theory* (Cambridge University Press,Cambridge,1987.)
- [13 ] A.Daneri,A.Loinger,G.M.Prosperi,Nucl.Phys.,**33**,(1962.),297.
- [14 ] J.S.Bell,Physics World,**3**,(1990.),53.
- [15 ] G.C.Ghirardi,A.Rimini,T.Weber,Phys.Rev.D,**34**,(1986.),470.
- [16 ] W.H.Zurek,Phys.Rev.D,**26**,(1982.),1862.
- [17 ] H.Everett III,Rev.Mod.Phys.,**29**,(1957.),454.
- [18 ] W.H.Furry,Phys.Rev.,**49**,(1936.),393.
- [19 ] J.S.Bell,*Speakable and Unsayable in Quantum Mechanics* (Cambridge University Press,Cambridge,1987.)
- [20 ] A.Peres,Am.J.Phys.,**52**,(1984.),644.