What went wrong with the “interpretation” of Quantum Theory?

Robert H. McEachern

This slideshow is a preliminary account of how the misinterpretation of quantum theory originated.
What’s the Matter - with Physics?

With the Theory (the computational model)?
With the **Interpretation** of the theory (the physical model)?
With the **Scientific Method**?

Why the confusion concerning the things (matter) that exist?
Are they particles? Or waves? Or wave-particle dualities?

Is the Double Slit Experiment - “the only mystery?”
Is Bell’s Inequality Theorem & experiments - a new mystery?

What’s the ultimate source of all the uncertainty?
The Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle, or its (mis)interpretation?

The underlying Math: Fourier Analysis & Information Theory
“Could you really persuade, if we don’t listen?”
Plato, “The Republic”, book 1 327c

“The trouble with people is not that they don’t know but that they know so much that ain’t so.”
Josh Billings (Henry Wheeler Shaw)

“A new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it.”
Max Planck

“Claude (Shannon) told me this story. He may have been kidding, but it illustrates both his sense of humor and his delightfully self deprecating nature, and it certainly could be true. The story is that Claude was in the middle of giving a lecture to mathematicians in Princeton, when the door in the back of the room opens, and in walks Albert Einstein. Einstein stands listening for a few minutes, whispers something in the ear of someone in the back of the room, and leaves. At the end of the lecture, Claude hurries to the back of the room to find the person that Einstein had whispered too, to find out what the great man had to say about his work. The answer: Einstein had asked directions to the men’s room.”
Arthur Lewbel

That is about as must interest as any physicist had in Shannon’s Information Theory, for the first forty years it existed.
A good *Computational* model may not necessarily be a good *Physical* model

Epistemology versus Ontology

“Shut-up and Calculate!”
“Fools rush in, where angels fear to tread”
How the Hippies Saved Physics

Source: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Orrery
There is a distinction between the properties of a mathematically constructed map describing a territory, and those of the territory itself.

Greenland is not really three times larger than Australia.

Source: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mercator_projection
Physicists have failed to distinguish between the properties of the "reality" they are attempting to describe, and the properties of their mathematical "descriptions of that reality"; properties of descriptions of observations vs. properties of the things observed. But they are two very different things.

For example, all such descriptions, written in the English language, contain only 26 letters, a-z. Should one assume from this property of the description, that this must correspond to some fundamental property of the entities being described? Perhaps the universe is actually constructed from just 26 fundamental “letters” in a manner similar to that in which genetic material is constructed from the 4 “letters” of the DNA code. This assumption may seem absurd, but it is no more absurd than the one physicists have made.

Properties like the Uncertainty Principle, Superposition and Entanglement, are all properties of the mathematical language (Fourier Analysis) being used to describe observations of the world; they are not necessarily properties of the world itself.

Consequently, it is inevitable that these properties will appear in all such descriptions of reality, regardless of whether or not they are properties of the entities being described, just as it is inevitable that the 26 letters appear in all such descriptions written in English.
Expanding circular waves interfere with each other, creating a diffraction pattern.
Huygen’s Principle

Expanding circular waves interfere with each other, creating a diffraction pattern.

Source: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Huygens–Fresnel_principle

Slapped-on Interpretation:
It’s a Wave!

but: as if ≠ is

Source: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fraunhofer_diffraction
What miracle causes these circular waves to appear?
Wave Interference?  
or  
Particle Scattering?  

Huge steel plate 100,000 km long  

The trajectory of an Asteroid passing through a giant slit is effected by the missing mass of a second slit: the Field at the first slit is altered by the mere existence of the second slit:  

Analogous to how your mere existence near an old TV rabbit-ear antenna changes the Field at the antenna, and consequently, the TV picture.
Wave Interference? or Particle Scattering?

The trajectory of an Asteroid passing through a giant slit is affected by the missing mass of a second slit: the Field at the first slit is altered by the mere existence of the second slit:

This \textit{interference} within the gravitational Field causes \textit{interference} in the scattering pattern.
Wave Interference? or Particle Scatter?

Is the scattering Field smooth or rippled? A 10 km asteroid would not “feel” a 1 meter ripple on a steel plate within each slit, as it scatters off a plate. A 1 cm bullet would. Reduce the size of the entire system: A tiny electron or photon, would “feel” any tiny ripple in the electromagnetic force Field within each slit. A bullet would not.

The trajectory of an Asteroid passing through a giant slit is effected by the missing mass of a second slit: the Field at the first slit is altered by the mere existence of the second slit:

This interference within the gravitational Field causes interference in the scattering pattern.
Motion Tracking: Enabled by attaching easy to follow lights, to the points being tracked

Problem:
How can the trajectory of a quantum “particle” be tracked mathematically, as it “flows” through a differential equation - an equation of motion?

Solution:
de Broglie did the mathematical equivalent, of attaching easy to follow, sinusoidal “waves”, to each particle and then used Fourier “Superposition” to localize each particle’s position.

But what happens if you turn off all the other lights, and ignore, as de Broglie did, everything except the “light” from the waves, attached to the trackers?
Motion Tracking: Enabled by attaching easy to follow lights, to the points being tracked

What is this?
a Wave?
a Particle?
a Wave-Particle Duality?

Origin of Wave vs. Particle Confusion:
This technique is great for tracking the positions and velocities of things!
But it is useless for determining the type of things the trackers are attached to!

Source: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Motion-capture_acting
De Broglie associated a Wave with every Particle. Each Wave Packet, which yields the probability of finding the particle at a given position, is mathematically constructed as a superposition of (real & imaginary) sinusoids: a Fourier Transform. These sinusoids function like Motion Trackers, enabling the Packet’s position and velocity to be tracked, as it passes through the equation of motion.

The Born Rule:

Phase is determined by the relative amplitudes of the real & imaginary components of the wave function. The probability of finding the particle is given by the square of the wave function's amplitude at that point.
The Trackers (waves) are *not* the same as the Thing (particle) being tracked

Mathematical Identities are *not* Physical Identities:

\[ a(b+c) = ab + ac \]

But one side of the equation has twice as many multipliers as the other: Which side is the “correct” *physical* interpretation?

The *fundamental* problem with the Scientific Method: Mathematically identical equations, that all yield the exact, same, theoretical result, to be compared to observations, may thus have *wildly* different Physical Interpretations

The standard interpretations are like Huygen’s miraculously appearing waves. But an alternative, is that the math describes an array (filter bank) of “telescopic” detectors, counting the arrivals of equal-energy particles

The math *only* describes how things behave, the observed effects (theory); it does *not* describe the underlying causes (interpretation), responsible for producing those effects
Any curve, such as a triangular wave, can be approximated (red) as a sum of sinusoids (green). Usually both real and imaginary sinusoids are required, but in this special case, all the imaginary ones have an amplitude of zero.

The more terms in the sum, the better the approximation.

\[
y = \sum_{n=1}^{3} \left( \frac{4}{\pi} \right) \frac{\cos((2n-1)x)}{(2n-1)^2}
\]

Aside: These particular curves play a role in the famous EPR-B Paradox, Bell's Inequality Theorem and "Quantum Correlations" vs. Classical Correlations.
Freely moving particle trackers (no force acting on them) all moving together as a single object, with no change in shape.

How can this be described mathematically?
Whence the Wave Equation?

The Fourier Transform merely describes freely-moving (no forces) tracking-wave-packets, attached to each particle, in one dimension:
it’s just Math, not Physics - no “Laws of Nature” are involved

It is necessary that the Group Velocity of a particle’s wave packet, be equal to a classical particle’s velocity: this implies that the angular frequency \( \omega = \frac{\hbar k^2}{2m} \)

1. The defining equation for any Fourier Transform:

\[
\Psi(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(k) \exp\left[ i (kx-\omega t) \right] dk
\]

2. Or, as a function of time:

\[
\Psi(x, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(k) \exp\left[ i (kx-\omega t) \right] dk
\]

3. First derivative of (2) with respect to time:

\[
\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi(x, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(k) \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} \exp\left[ i \left( kx-\frac{\hbar k^2}{2m} t \right) \right] dk
\]

4. Second derivative of (2) with respect to x:

\[
- \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \Psi(x, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(k) \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} \exp\left[ i \left( kx-\frac{\hbar k^2}{2m} t \right) \right] dk
\]

The last two equations are equal, so we have the Schrödinger Wave Equation for describing the motion of the tracking-wave-packets, attached to each particle

\[
i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi(x, t) = - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \Psi(x, t)
\]

problem if \( m=0 \): photon
How can a force be introduced into this description of motion?

By demanding that the derivatives of the average momentum and the average position of the wave-packet agree with Newton’s laws of motion (Bohm 9.26):

\[
i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi(x, t) = \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + V(x) \right] \Psi(x, t)
\]

or

\[
i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi(x, t) = \left[ \frac{p^2}{2m} + V(x) \right] \Psi(x, t)
\]

This should have been called the Schrödinger Heat Equation! Not the Schrödinger Wave Equation!

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} T(x, t) = \left[ k \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + S(x, t) \right] T(x, t)
\]

Classical Heat Equation for the temperature, T, in a rod, with a heat source, S, proportional to the local temperature. (Berg and McGregor 3.2.5)
Waves, Heat or Heat-Wave dualities?

Light spreads out when a narrow beam flows through a small slit. But so does heat.

So why assume only waves behave like this?

Classically, heat is thought of as being caused by particle motion.
Why are Observations Quantized?

Claude Shannon, the father of Information Theory, provided an answer, that has been ignored by the physics community, for 70 years:

Quantized Observations result from observations having:

- a small *Information* content
- *not*
- a small physical size
  of the object being observed!
What are these theories actually describing?

An unobserved emitter? (think of a black hole)

An observed emission?

Both?

Physics often confuses the two (entropy vs. information). Information Theory resolves the confusion.

The Map vs. the Territory
What is the connection between a continuous function, such as those described by the differential equations of theoretical physics, and the discrete (quantized) measurements and observations produced by experimental physics?
Two Points *Determine* a Line Segment

*Determine* = being able to accurately compute the coordinates of *all* the points, on the curve, *between* the specified points

How many points are required to determine an arbitrary curve?
Two Points *Determine* a Line Segment

**Determine** = being able to accurately compute the coordinates of *all* the points, on the curve, *between* the specified points.

How many points are required to determine an arbitrary curve?

Claude Shannon found the answers to these questions in the late 1940s, thereby inventing Information Theory.

How many significant bits are required to specify the coordinates of each of those points, if the curve is *noisy*?
In what sense is one curve approximately equal to another? - *curve fitting*

**Collocation**: points at which one curve intersects the other.

**Osculation**: points at which both the curves and their derivative(s) are equal.

**Least Squares**: The sum of the squares of all the errors are minimized - have the least possible sum.

**Fourier Analysis and Information Theory**

Fourier Analysis will fit a curve in both the least squares and the collocation sense. But the curve it fits will be the signal *plus* the noise! Hence, a wave-function *only* fits (models) the noisy observations. It is *not* a clean, noise-free, physical model of the underlying *being*. 
Information Theory uses an entirely different conception, of what it means, for discrete measurements to approximate a continuous function: Perfect Reconstruction of Symbols

Perfect Reconstruction of only those aspects of the curve that you, the observer, actually care about: the Signal (symbols), not the Noise

In a sent Message, an emitter does not ever need to send (emit) anything the receiver (observer) already knows, in order to achieve perfect reconstruction: and that includes everything that the receiver can predict!

Everything that is predictable is non Information!!!
This is totally **contrary** to the Physics Perspective: what is important and interesting about much of the world, is precisely what *cannot* be predicted rather than what *can* be predicted - like free will.

Physics is entirely concerned with those few natural phenomenon, that are almost *devoid* of any information (low information density/capacity) and thus - predictable.

And that includes all the equations being used to describe the “laws” of physics!

Almost all of the *information*, in every physical situation, and in every mathematical description of those situations, exists in the form of the auxiliary conditions, such as initial values and boundary values. It does not exist within the “laws” of physics or the equations describing those laws!

The devil (Maxwell’s Demon) is in the details.
In other words, Shannon discovered the maximum number of bits of information, required to perfectly reconstruct an arbitrary curve - like a wave-function!

\[
\# \text{ bits} = (\# \text{ samples})(\# \text{ bits/sample}) (\Delta T \Delta B) \log_2(1+S/N)
\]

or, to put it another way, Shannon discovered the maximum number of bits of information that can be recovered from any set of measurements of such a continuous function.

The famous Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle, is simply equivalent to saying: \# bits \geq 1

But S/N = 1, means that there is intrinsic noise in the very definition of a bit of information
This goes to the heart of the very concept of what it means for Particles to behave as if they are *Identical*

Noise, intrinsic to the very definition of a bit, means that particles *must* behave identically, without actually *being* identical

This, in turn, goes to the heart of what it means for something to be an *elementary* particle. How can the most elemental particle, possibly contain more information (have an infinite number of significant bits encoded into its measurable attributes), than anything else in the cosmos? An *elementary* particle ought to have the *minimum* number of recoverable bits of information, not the *maximum* - and it *does* in Shannon’s Theory!

**The Map versus the territory**

**Epistemology versus Ontology**
These are all measurably different. Yet under many circumstances, you make a decision to treat them as if they are all identical: a quarter of a dollar.

This decision making, process, which designates some things as “signal” and others as “noise”, is what is being mistaken for a “collapse of the wave-function”
Conservation Laws are the ultimate example of this lack of information:
It is trivial to predict the future value of every constant!

No one has to bother with ever sending you a message, to “update” the value of a constant.

This is why physics has a hard time, dealing with time. If your predictions are perfect, then the predictive model never needs to be updated with a message containing any new information, about the world. Thus, such a static model has become, in a peculiar sense, independent of both time and the world it purports to model - disconnected from a reality, in which all new (emergent) behaviors, are driven by the arrival of new information.
Conservation Laws are the ultimate example of this lack of information:

It is trivial to predict the future value of every constant!

No one has to bother with ever sending you a message, to “update” the value of a constant.

This is why physics has a hard time, dealing with time. If your predictions are perfect, then the predictive model never needs to be updated with a message containing any new information, about the world. Thus, such a static model has become, in a peculiar sense, independent of both time and the world it purports to model - disconnected from a reality, in which all new (emergent) behaviors, are driven by the arrival of new information.

Slapped-on Interpretation: It’s “BlockTime!”

The map of the world’s physics is timeless, even though the world is not
Signal (symbols) Vs. Noise

Are these all examples of the same symbol in a known/familiar alphabet?

Or are they each a different letter in an unknown (to you) alphabet?

If you know the alphabet being used, then you know exactly how to ignore the noise - the misshaping of symbols - like bad handwriting.
Information Recovery and Perfect Reconstruction are based upon the exploitation of a priori knowledge like what is the alphabet being used.

To completely eliminate every distorted symbol within every received message and/or sequence of measurements - by substituting the receiver’s “best estimated allowable symbol” for each actual, received symbol.

If the estimate is correct, the noise and distortion is GONE! This is why an HDTV picture is so much cleaner than an old analog TV’s picture. But if the guess is wrong - you get a catastrophic failure in the reconstruction.
Actually, this is not all that bad. If it was really bad, most HDTVs would blank the screen, to prevent you from even seeing it!
Quadrature Amplitude Modulation

*Information* is all about making *decisions* (manifested in an action, like absorbing a quanta of energy, or not - Maxwell’s Demon): Decisions about what to ignore and what not to ignore - Based on a prior knowledge about what is significant to the recipient and what is not

This is what *causes* non-continuous behaviors and why the equations of continuous, classical models, cannot be extended into the quantum realm

The continuous equations only work, for physical systems in which the information content *actually* being mathematically modeled, is negligible in comparison to the information content available, and that *could be* modeled: it is not necessary to model every atom in a planet in order to predict the planet’s orbital motions.
This decision making, is ultimately (in the high information content case) equivalent to treating sequences of observations, not as *measurements*, with most and least significant bits, but as one long *serial-number*. Thus, such a system behaves, towards its input, symbolically rather than physically - a car stopping, because its driver detected (recovered information from) a red traffic-control-light, rather than because it hit a concrete wall.

A particle’s *response* to a detected serial-number, is part of its built-in, a priori, behavioral repertoire. Such responses cannot be derived from observations of the encounter; they lack sufficient information content. Analogous to biological “receptors” detecting the specific type of molecule that they have been empowered to detect.

The devil (Maxwell’s Demon) is in the details.

The coins can be thought of as spatially localized fields asteroids passing through slits off-center, like NASA gravitational slingshot trajectory

Elementary particles ought to have minimal, rather than maximal, information content

Inverse square law (Gravity, EM, Holographic principle) is a consequence to how information carrying signals disperse - passing through a sphere enclosing the emitter - information density with constant noise level

Fraunhofer versus Fresnel diffraction and Gibbs phenomenon - the ripple in the scattering field

observables like position, momentum and spin, are inherently “relative” to the detector
Comments on particle scattering:
21.19: “Born Approximation “...approximation is equivalent to the assumption that the incident wave is not seriously distorted by the scattering potential.”

21.20: “the cross section is determined by the Fourier components of the potential.”
“This is because the particle is described by a wave packet, rather than by a trajectory.”

21.22: “A very important property of the deflections is that a given momentum change, $\Delta p = p - p_0$ can be produced only if the potential has such a shape that this Fourier component is present. A very large deflection can be produced in this way by a very small force, provided that the force varies rapidly enough in space.”

“This is in contrast to classical theory…”

“... in the Born approximation the deflection process is described as a single indivisible transition from one momentum state to another.”

“If there are enough successive deflections, the scattering process will begin to seem continuous, and it will approach a classical behavior. Thus, we see in another way why a strong force tends to produce a classical behavior; also we see how the apparently continuous classical deflection arises, despite the indivisible nature of the elementary processes of deflection.”

21.23: “The oscillatory nature of $\sigma$ arises from the sharp “edge” in the square potential.”

21.27: “It can be treated rigorously only by a complete solution of the wave equation, which takes into account the change of wave amplitude in the slit resulting from electric currents that are induced in the slit by the total waves, including the part produced by the currents themselves. For a slit that is wide in comparison to a wavelength, the wave amplitude inside the slit is not very different from the incident amplitude, so that the Born approximation can be used in computing the diffraction pattern. For a narrow slit, however, the modification of the wave by the slit is so great that one needs a much better solution of the wave equation.”

21.34: “…the breakdown of the Born approximation means… the system may make many successive transitions… This, however, is exactly what will lead to the possibility of describing the scattering process classically.”
Additional References:
(2) Misinterpreting Reality - Confusing Mathematics for Physics: http://fqxi.org/community/forum/topic/1372
(3) Demystifying the Connection Between Physics and Mathematics: http://fqxi.org/community/forum/topic/2315