An exceptionally simple argument against the many-worlds interpretation

Shan Gao*

February 28, 2012

Abstract

It is shown that the components of the wave function of a measuring device, each of which represents a definite measurement result, do not correspond to many worlds as assumed by the many-worlds interpretation, because all components of the superposed wave function can be observed in our world by protective measurement, and they all exist in one world.

According to the many-worlds interpretation, each component of the wave function of a measuring device that represents a definite measurement result corresponds to each world among the many worlds (Barrett 2011). This means that in one world there is only one component of the superposed wave function and the other components do not exist, and thus these components that correspond to the other worlds cannot be observed in this world. As a result, in every world the whole superposed wave function of the measuring device cannot be measured.

It is unsurprising that the existence of such many worlds may be consistent with the results of conventional impulse measurements[1], as the many-worlds interpretation is just invented to explain the emergence of these results, e.g. the definite measurement result in each world always denotes the result of a conventional impulse measurement. However, this does not guarantee consistency for all types of measurements. It has been known that there exists another type of measurement, the protective measurement (Aharonov and Vaidman 1993; Aharonov, Anandan and Vaidman 1993; Aharonov, Anandan and Vaidman 1996; Vaidman 2009). Like the conventional impulse measurement, protective measurement also uses the standard measuring procedure, but with a weak, adiabatic coupling and an appropriate protection. Its general method is to let the measured system be in a nondegenerate eigenstate of the whole Hamiltonian using a suitable protective interaction, and then make the measurement adiabatically. This permits protective measurement to be able to measure the expectation values of observables on a single quantum system. In particular, the

*Unit for HPS and Centre for Time, University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia. E-mail: sgao7319@uni.sydney.edu.au.

[1]It should be noted that the consistency is still debated, mainly due to the controversial interpretation of probability. For more discussions see Saunders et al (2010) and references therein.

wave function of the system can also be measured by protective measurement as expectation values of certain observables[2].

It can be seen that the existence of the many worlds defined above is inconsistent with the results of protective measurements. The reason is that the whole superposed wave function of a quantum system including a measuring device can be measured by a protective measurement[3]. The result of the protective measurement as predicted by quantum mechanics implies that all components of the superposed wave function of the measuring device exist in the same world where the protective measurement is made. Therefore, according to protective measurement, the components of the superposed wave function of a measuring device, each of which represents a definite measurement result, do not correspond to many worlds, in each of which there is only one such component and a copy of the measuring device that obtains a definite result; rather, the whole superposed wave function of the measuring device, if it exists, only exists in one world, namely our world, and in this world there is only one measuring device that obtains no definite result. In this way, protective measurement provides a strong argument against the many-worlds interpretation[4].

Four points are worth stressing. First of all, the above argument does not depend on how the many worlds are precisely defined in the many-worlds interpretation. For example, it is irrelavant to whether the many worlds are fundamental or emergent, and in particular, it also applies to the recent formulation of the many-worlds interpretation based on a structuralist view on macro-ontology (Wallace 2003). The key point is that all components of the superposed wave function of a measuring device can be detected by protective measurement in one world, namely our world, and thus they all exist in this world. Therefore, it is impossible that the superposed wave function of a measuring device corresponds to many worlds, only one of which is our world[5].

Next, the above argument is not influenced by environment-induced decoherence. On the one hand, even if the superposition state of a measuring device is entangled with the states of other systems, the entangled state of the whole system can also be measured by protective measurement in principle (Anandan 1993). The method is by adding appropriate protection procedure to the whole system so that its entangled state is a nondegenerate eigenstate of the total Hamiltonian of the system together with the added potential. Then the

[2]Note that the earlier objections to the validity and meaning of protective measurements have been answered (Aharonov, Anandan and Vaidman 1996; Dass and Qureshi 1999). A unique exception is Uffink's (1999) objection. Although Vaidman (2009) regarded this objection as a misunderstanding, he gave no concrete rebuttal. Recently we have argued in detail that Uffink's objection is invalid due to several errors in his arguments (Gao 2011a).

[3]Note that protective measurement in general requires that the measured wave function is known beforehand so that an appropriate protective interaction can be added. But this requirement does not influence our argument, as the superposed wave function of a measuring device can be prepared in a known form before the protective measurement.

[4]This objection does not apply to the de Broglie-Bohm theory, according to which the wave function of a measuring device does not collapse, but it exists only in our world. Besides, the objection does not apply to the many-minds interpretation. For a critical analysis of these two theories see Gao (2011b).

[5]Note that this objection is more serious than the problem of approximate decoherence for the many-worlds interpretation (cf. Janssen 2008). The interference between the nonorthogonal components of a quantum state can not be detected for individual states, but only be detected for an ensemble of identical states. Moreover, the presence of tiny interference terms in a (local) quantum state does not imply that all components of the state wholly exist in one world.

entangled state can be protectively measured. On the other hand, environment-induced decoherence is not an essential element of the many-worlds interpretation. Even for a measuring device isolated from environment, the interpretation also requires that each component of the wave function of the measuring device that represents a definite measurement result corresponds to each world among the many worlds; otherwise the many-worlds interpretation will not give the same predictions of measurement results as standard quantum mechanics (so long as the latter gives unambiguous predictions).

Thirdly, the above argument does not require protective measurement to be able to distinguish a superposed wave function of a measuring device from one of its components, or whether the superposed wave function collapses or not during a conventional impulse measurement. Since the determination demands the distinguishability of two non-orthogonal states, which is prohibited by quantum mechanics, no measurements consistent with the theory including protective measurement can do this. What protective measurement tells us is that such a superposed wave function, which existence is assumed by the many-worlds interpretation, does not correspond to many worlds as assumed by the many-worlds interpretation. In other words, protective measurement reveals inconsistency of the many-worlds interpretation.

Lastly, we stress that the principle of protective measurement is irrelevant to the controversial process of wavefunction collapse and only depends on the linear Schrödinger evolution and the Born rule. As a result, protective measurement can (at least) be used to examine the internal consistency of the no-collapse solutions to the measurement problem, e.g. the many-worlds interpretation, before experiments give the last verdict[6].

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Postgraduate Scholarship in Quantum Foundations provided by the Unit for HPS and Centre for Time of the University of Sydney.

References

[1] Aharonov, Y., Anandan, J. and Vaidman, L. (1993). Meaning of the wave function, Phys. Rev. A 47, 4616.

[2] Aharonov, Y., Anandan, J. and Vaidman, L. (1996). The meaning of protective measurements, Found. Phys. 26, 117.

[3] Aharonov, Y. and Vaidman, L. (1993). Measurement of the Schrödinger wave of a single particle, Phys. Lett. A 178, 38.

[4] Anandan, J. (1993). Protective Measurement and Quantum Reality. Found. Phys. Lett., 6, 503-532.

[5] Barrett, J. (2011). Everett's Relative-State Formulation of Quantum Mechanics, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2011 Edition),

[6] For a more detailed analysis of the implications of protective measurement see Gao (2011b, 2011c).

Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2011 /entries/qm-everett/.

[6] Dass, N. D. H. and Qureshi, T. (1999). Critique of protective measurements. Phys. Rev. A 59, 2590.

[7] Gao, S. (2011a). Comment on "How to protect the interpretation of the wave function against protective measurements" by Jos Uffink. http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/8942.

[8] Gao, S. (2011b). Interpreting Quantum Mechanics in Terms of Random Discontinuous Motion of Particles. http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/8987.

[9] Gao, S. (2011c). Derivation of the Meaning of the Wave Function. http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/8919.

[10] Janssen, H. (2008). Reconstructing Reality: Environment-Induced Decoherence, the Measurement Problem, and the Emergence of Definiteness in Quantum Mechanics. http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/4224.

[11] Saunders, S., Barrett, J., Kent, A. and Wallace, D. (eds.) (2010). Many Worlds? Everett, Quantum Theory, and Reality. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[12] Uffink, J. (1999). How to protect the interpretation of the wave function against protective measurements. Phys. Rev. A 60, 3474-3481. arXiv: quant-ph/9903007.

[13] Vaidman, L. (2009). Protective Measurements, in Greenberger, D., Hentschel, K., and Weinert, F. (eds.), Compendium of Quantum Physics: Concepts, Experiments, History and Philosophy. Springer-Verlag, Berlin. pp.505-507.

[14] Wallace, D. (2003). Everett and structure. Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics, 34, 87-105.