

Why Bohm's Quantum Theory?

H. D. Zeh

Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Heidelberg,
Philosophenweg 19, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany.
e-mail: zeh@urz.uni-heidelberg.de

Abstract

This is a brief reply to Goldstein's article on "Quantum Theory Without Observers" in *Physics Today*. It is pointed out that Bohm's pilot wave theory is successful only because it keeps Schrödinger's (exact) wave mechanics unchanged, while the rest of it is observationally meaningless and solely based on classical prejudice.

Key words: quantum theory, pilot wave theory, quantum trajectories, decoherence.

To be published in *Foundations of Physics Letters*

In his recent article on “Quantum Theory Without Observers” [1], Sheldon Goldstein raised a number of important questions about quantum theory. Even though I cannot quite understand what a universal physical theory without any concept of observers could *mean*, I agree with many of his critical remarks. Bell, who once objected “against measurement”, also pointed out that Bohm’s quantum theory depends on the *assumption* that only its hypothetical classical variables can directly affect the consciousness of an observer [2]. However, Goldstein’s characterization of the consequences that have to be drawn from his criticism appears one-sided, since he neglects many essential aspects.

In particular, he does not mention at all that Bohm’s classical trajectories can neither be experimentally confirmed nor refuted if the theory is exactly valid. It is *always* possible to postulate otherwise unobservable (hence arbitrary) causes for stochastic events. Bohm’s presumed ensemble of classical configurations is merely *dynamically* consistent because of their presumed unobservable dynamics. The resulting trajectories are thus entirely based on classical prejudice. Goldstein quotes Bell that “it should be clear from the smallness of the scintillation on the screen that we have to do with a particle.” Should it then not be as clear that the photon (or any other boson) is a particle, too, rather than the consequence of a *field* on three-dimensional space, as is assumed in Bohm’s theory? What is observed as a local object is in *all* cases the position of a macroscopic “pointer” (such as a flash on the screen or a track in the bubble chamber).

Appropriately localized *wave packets* representing pointer positions could be explained as emerging in a fundamental irreversible “spontaneous localization” process by means of a modified Schrödinger equation, such as it has been proposed by Pearle or Ghirardi, Rimini and Weber (GRW) [3] and also mentioned by Goldstein. Why then re-introduce classical variables? There is no need (or any good reason) even for a Heisenberg picture in terms of *particles*, nor for a wave-particle “dualism”. And why always represent these classical variables by a (crucial) ensemble, while the wave function (the other element of *reality* in Bohm’s theory) is normally regarded as given, but tacitly excluded from being directly experienced by an observer?

The nonlinear terms in spontaneous localization models are chosen to become relevant in measurements or similar situations in order to describe von Neumann’s collapse of the wave function. However, equivalent effects in the density matrix of any relevant *system* arise without any modification of the Schrödinger equation if only the unavoidable environment of this system is realistically taken into account by what Goldstein calls “Zurek’s decoher-

ence” [4, 5]. Therefore, these two quite different dynamical mechanisms (the disappearance and the dislocalization of phase relations) can both explain the emergence of apparent “particles” and other quasi-classical (local) properties (such as Bell’s “small scintillations”). They cannot practically be distinguished from one another in these cases, provided only the usual probability rules apply *somewhere* and *for something* along the chain of interactions between pointer and observer(s) in order to justify the concept of a density matrix. Goldstein’s claim that “the environment acts as an observer” is quite wrong: decoherence is an objective physical process that is essential (and unavoidable) also in Bohm’s theory for correctly guiding the postulated classical pointer positions or other macroscopic variables.

The application of a probabilistic collapse just where environmental decoherence occurs anyway is thus as much a prejudice as the existence of classical particles and fields. “Appearances are misleading.” Here I fully agree with Goldstein (although appearance requires an observer). In contrast to Bohm, Pearle and GRW proposed modifications of quantum theory that can be experimentally refuted (and very probably have been unless modified again [6]). While the search for deviations from the Schrödinger equation is a reasonable endeavour, one must warn young scientists against spending their time on calculating Bohm trajectories or “unraveling” entangled (open) systems — as suggestive as these pictures may appear to the traditionalistic mind. They would be investigating mere phantoms. Such calculations would be meaningful if they led to new observable consequences. However, precisely this is excluded by construction of Bohm’s theory, while a quantum system that is entangled with its environment clearly does not possess any wave function by its own. The idea of “quantum trajectories” for all systems of interest, now quite popular in quantum optics, is (1) inconsistent (as it would depend on the precise choice of the systems), (2) incompatible with a Schrödinger equation (even if that were complemented by a phenomenological collapse), and (3) in conflict with relevant experiments.

Most experiments are local and *not* relevant for this purpose (thus permitting the concept of a local density matrix, or an *apparent* ensemble of wave functions representing it). However, all basic quantum experiments performed during recent decades have confirmed consequences of a *nonlocal wave function(al)*, defined on a high-dimensional space that we are used to interpret as a *classical configuration space*. These consequences appear as “paradoxes” when described in terms of particles or spatial waves (fields). The Schrödinger equation, which unavoidably leads to drastic (eventually

universal) entanglement between all macroscopic systems (and thereby *locally* to decoherence) [7], would not have to be modified at all by means of the apparently required probabilistic terms if one dropped the further prejudice that there is only one state of each observer in this “nonlocal reality”. A universally exact Schrödinger equation would require that there is an ever increasing number of different “versions” of the quasi-classical world with all its observers, which are individually described by robust wave packets in appropriate factor spaces of this high-dimensional space. According to wave mechanics, observers can only exist in dynamically branching, thereafter essentially autonomous *components* of the global wave function. These observer versions would practically lack any possibility of communicating with one another, and therefore need not be assumed to disappear from reality with precisely one exception (as postulated by the collapse). Because of their dynamical autonomy, these global branch wave functions describe “consistent histories” to their observers. In order to be subjectively and individually experienced, a component of the global wave function seems to have to possess the product form $\psi_{obs}\Psi_{rest}$, with a sufficiently complex and robust observer state ψ_{obs} , and regardless of the existence of any *classical* observer variables. The observer is the only “system” that has to be conceptually defined in principle.

All we have then still to assume in order to explain Born’s probabilities in the form of observable frequencies of measurement results is that *we*, described by certain correlated ψ_{obs} ’s, happen to live in a branch that does not possess a very small norm. This robust component would represent an “apparent reality” to us (in the *operational* sense), that also forms the basis of Zurek’s “existential interpretation” [8].

It is usually overlooked that Bohm’s theory contains the *same* “many worlds” of dynamically separate branches as the Everett interpretation (now regarded as “empty” wave components), since it is based on precisely the same (“*absolutely* real”) global wave function [2]. Its robust components *branch* by means of decoherence (rather than combining by means of re-coherence) because of a fundamental initial condition to the global wave function that is also responsible for the Second Law [9] — not because of “increasing knowledge” about a classical state (the reduction of Bohm’s ensemble). Only the “occupied” wave packet itself is thus meaningful, while the assumed classical trajectory would merely point at it: “This is where *we* are in the quantum world.” However, this can be done without using a trajectory. Any pointing finer than compatible with the width of the robust wave packet is empirically unjustified. John Bell (who rejected Everett’s

interpretation for being “extravagant”) seems to have realized this equivalence before he began to favor spontaneous localization (such as GRW) over Bohm’s theory [10]. This is another (historical) fact simply neglected by Goldstein when he heavily relies on Bell’s words in his arguments.

References

- [1] S. Goldstein, *Phys. Today* **51**, (March) 42, (April) 38 (1998).
- [2] J.S. Bell, in: *Quantum Gravity 2*, C. Isham, R. Penrose, and D. Sciama, eds. (Clarendon, Oxford, 1981).
- [3] Ph. Pearle, *Phys. Rev.* **D13**, 857 (1976); G.C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini, and T. Weber, *Phys. Rev.* **D34**, 470 (1986).
- [4] E. Joos, *Phys. Rev.* **D36**, 3285 (1987); M. Tegmark, *Found. Phys. Letters* **6**, 571 (1993).
- [5] D. Giulini, E. Joos, C. Kiefer, J. Kupsch, I.-O. Stamatescu, and H.D. Zeh, *Decoherence and the Appearance of a Classical World in Quantum Theory* (Springer, Berlin, 1996).
- [6] Ph. Pearle and E. Squires, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 1 (1994).
- [7] H.D. Zeh, *Found. Phys.* **1**, 69 (1970).
- [8] W.H. Zurek, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond.* **A356**, 1793 (1998).
- [9] H.D. Zeh, *The Physical Basis of the Direction of Time*, 3rd edition (Springer, Berlin, 1999).
- [10] J.S. Bell, private correspondence (1981).