

Conservation laws in the many-worlds interpretation of quantum mechanics

Lev Vaidman^{a, b}

^aRaymond and Beverly Sackler School of Physics and Astronomy, Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv 69978, Israel

^bH. H. Wills Physics Laboratory, University of Bristol, Tyndall Avenue, Bristol BS8 1TL, UK

May 31, 2024

Abstract

Although the basic approach of the many-worlds interpretation is that the ontology of our universe is a unitarily evolving highly entangled wavefunction, we live in a world in which we only perceive a tiny part of the global wavefunction, and the quantum state corresponding to our world does not evolve unitarily, making our world an effectively open system. Recently, the common approach that within a world conservation laws hold only for an ensemble of measurements was questioned. The paper analyzes how this can affect viewing worlds as open systems and proposes a possible resolution of the unitarity puzzle.

1 Introduction

We are witnessing rapid progress in technology that allows more and more precise measurements, but until today we have not seen a deviation from the predictions of quantum theory. These predictions are made in the standard framework based on analyses of closed systems. Performing experiments on isolated systems provides the expected results. Considering larger and larger systems we extrapolate our understanding of smaller systems and, in the framework of closed systems approach, we may suggest that the whole universe is a unitarily evolving closed system. This approach leads to the many-worlds interpretation (MWI) which, in my view, is the best available interpretation of quantum mechanics, as it avoids action at a distance and randomness at the level of physics which describes all worlds together, Vaidman (2021).

Although I strongly believe in the existence of a wavefunction of the universe, we do not have direct access to it. Thus, the program of obtaining our observed classical world as emerging from the universal wavefunction, Wallace (2012) seems to be off the target, apart from the question of the feasibility of its success. We have access to our world and some information about recently created parallel worlds, but all these worlds contain only a tiny part of the information encoded in the wavefunction of the universe. Although physical laws describe all worlds together, what is relevant for us is the wavefunction of our world. It includes records of our world in the past, and analysis of these records is

our scientific task. By observing these records, including description of preparations of quantum states, we can reconstruct the time-dependent wavefunction of our world in the past. (In my understanding, we cannot discuss a single world in which we will be in the future: our world now is related to *all* future worlds.) The wavefunction of my world in the past does not evolve in a unitary way. At every quantum measurement (which does not have a single possible outcome) an uncontrollable jump (effective collapse) takes place. This seems very much like a description of a world in the framework of open systems in which we get uncontrollable disturbances from the environment.

One of the important differences between open and closed system approaches is that we get uncontrollable kicks from the environment leading to failures of some conservation laws which hold for closed systems. In the standard approach to quantum measurement, when the symmetry of the Hamiltonian of physical interactions leads to a conserved quantity, the quantum state is usually a superposition or mixture of different values of this quantity. Without measurements, this distribution is constant over time. If a system is in a superposition of different values of the conserved quantity, its measurement ends up with a single value. The measurement interaction, in general, does not change the eigenvalues, but we end up with a singular distribution. So, according to the standard analysis, the distribution changes. Only when we consider the whole ensemble is the distribution the same as represented by the quantum state, and this is the counterpart of the conservation law for situations with measurements. Since in every individual measurement event the expectation value of the conserved quantity is changed, it mimics the open-system situation, Cuffaro & Hartmann (2023).

More close analysis shows some differences: an external system kicks and thus shifts the distribution, or if the interaction with external systems has an uncertainty, it widens the distribution. The measurement-induced change in the distribution of conserved quantities behaves differently. This is what I want to discuss here.

2 Evolution of the distribution of a conserved quantity within a world of the MWI

In this section, I shall prove a general feature of the evolution of a conserved quantity in the world. Although I am pretty sure that the result is technically correct, its relevance for our world is far from being clear, as it will be discussed in the sections which will follow.

Let us define our setup. We consider a universe which has symmetry leading to a conserved quantity. For simplicity we assume that it is a translation symmetry in flat space (no gravity, cosmology, etc. are considered). The whole universe which includes all worlds is described by a highly entangled wavefunction $|\Psi\rangle$ that evolves in a unitary way. Let us assume that the universe at the beginning has a particular distribution of momentum $f_{\text{uni}}(\vec{P})$. The density function f is non-negative and normalized $\int f_{\text{uni}}(\vec{P})d\vec{P} = 1$. The translation symmetry ensures that this distribution is constant in time.

Let us now consider a quantum measurement of some observable O having eigenvalues $\{o_i\}$. The measurement is specified by a set of possible outcomes with a macroscopic pointer that shows the results $\{o_i\}$ in different worlds. In such a situation, the pointer's states are orthogonal, or more generally, the pointer's readings correspond to spaces of quantum states which do not overlap. For a world with an outcome o_i , the momentum distribution is $f_i(\vec{P})$. Let us signify the probability of an outcome o_i by p_i . (In my take

on MWI, Vaidman (2021) there is only an illusion of probability, the world splits into multiple worlds with “measures of existence” p_i .) Probabilities (measures of existence) are defined by the wavefunction $|\Psi\rangle$. Due to the orthogonality of the spaces corresponding to different outcomes, we have the following relation:

$$\sum_i p_i f_i(\vec{P}) = f_{\text{uni}}(\vec{P}). \quad (1)$$

This equation places constraints on what might be the distribution of momentum in a world. The support of $f_i(\vec{P})$ must not be larger than the support of $f(\vec{P})$. Since interference of worlds is not feasible (without super-technology of Wigner who can perform measurements on his friend), more measurements cannot increase the support of the momentum distribution in a world, so, when more and more measurements are performed, one might expect that the support becomes smaller and smaller, unless there are some special reasons (the possibilities for which will be discussed in sections below) that prevent this change.

By definition, we live in one world. It is hard to estimate how many measurements have been performed in our world. Today, there are many actually working quantum devices, and apparently some natural phenomena also play the role of quantum measurement. (The frequency of such natural cases seems to be a difficult physical question.) Clearly, Stern-Gerlach experiments are quantum measurements, Geiger counters and bubble chambers observe quantum events. Thus, apparently, we should expect a non-conservation of conserved quantities similar to what is happening in open systems.

The earliest experiment exhibiting quantum randomness that I am aware of is a spintharoscope built by William Crookes in 1903 for the observation of single radiation events, see Kolar & den Hollander (2004). Not that I claim that no quantum detection events that split the world have happened before; supernova explosions apparently are also quantum events with macroscopic records.

Even if we do not have clear knowledge about splitting in the past, multiple usage of radiation counters, single-particle detectors, and quantum random generators tell us that there are now many, many worlds. If support of distributions of conserved quantities indeed decreases in newly created worlds, we should expect very narrow distributions of conserved quantities in our world. However, when the support becomes very small, it will not change anymore, so there will be a tendency for the future worlds to be closed systems, at least from the point of view of conservation laws.

3 Collins-Popescu conjecture

What can invalidate the conclusions of the previous section? One might think that the measurement device will “give” momentum to the system so that the total momentum of the system and the measurement device will not be changed. However, we do not see it from the interaction Hamiltonian of the canonical von Neumann measurement, say of the z component of the momentum of the system, $H_{\text{int}} = g(t)p_z P_{MD}$. I also do not see any reason why the momentum of the measuring device, P_{MD} , should be of the order of the momentum of the system to balance the change in momentum.

Another interesting proposal to avoid the effect of measurements on conservation laws is the Collins-Popescu conjecture. Collins & Popescu (2024) argued that the conservation laws are satisfied for every outcome of quantum measurements (without relying on the dynamics of the measuring devices) and not just as average for an ensemble of

measurements. At first glance, it seems that the conjecture cannot be true. Almost all variables are not in their eigenstates, including variables of the systems, like the momentum for which we have the conservation law of total momentum. When we measure the momentum of a system which has an uncertainty, clearly its distribution changes and then the distribution of the total momentum changes. (We accept that the measuring device does not compensate for the change.) What might save the conservation law is that initially the system was entangled with other systems such that the distribution of the total momentum is the same for any momentum state of the system. This entanglement tells us that initially the system does not have a pure state, but a mixed state. We, however, frequently observe quantum systems to behave as if they have pure states.

Collins and Popescu realized that for a wide enough distribution of momentum of the external system, the required entanglement can be vanishingly small, so we will not be able to see the difference between a slightly mixed state and the pure state. In fact, this situation does not look so special when we analyze the interaction of systems in standard quantum experiments as I will demonstrate in the following example. In quantum optics experiments photons coming to a beam splitter end up in a superposition of two orthogonal states: passed and reflected. The photon passing through does not change the state of the beam splitter. The reflected photon, on the other hand, transfers a finite amount of its momentum to the beamsplitter. This transfer, however, leads only to a tiny entanglement, because the uncertainty in the momentum of the beamsplitter in a properly working interferometer has to be much larger than the absolute value of the momentum of the photons in the beam. This is due to the uncertainty principle and the requirement that the beam splitter has to be localized with precision much better than the wave length of the photons. When the photon bounces mirrors in the interferometer, it also transfers the momentum, but again, the mirrors must be well localized, so the momentum uncertainty of mirrors is much larger than the momentum transfer, so we get tiny entanglement which only negligibly spoils the interference. When finally the photon is detected in one of the output ports, the world splits, but the total momentum distribution before splitting is the same as in every one of the obtained worlds: the world with detection and the world with negative result of the experiment in which the photon leaves the interferometer in other port(s). Thus, looking at the history of a particular world, we do not see any change in the distribution of the total momentum.

Another interesting case is the superoscillations, Aharonov, Popescu, & Rohrlich (1991), Popescu (1991), Berry (1994). In a rare case, when a particle is found in a low-amplitude region, its momentum is apparently outside of the initial distribution, Aharonov, Popescu, & Rohrlich (2021, 2023). The apparent paradox of nonconservation can be explained by claiming that initial super-oscillation state is not pure, but entangled with some external system with wide distribution. It might be true, but it does not naturally follow from the analysis of the experiment that can prepare the superoscillation example. To prepare the required state we can perform a “spoiled” weak measurement procedure with a pre and postselection of a particle with a large spin such that in a weak regime we get an anomalously large value, Berry & Shukla (2011). Consider a Stern-Gerlach experiment similar to the one in which the value 100 is obtained for z component of the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ particle, Aharonov, Albert, & Vaidman (1988). But now, the value $100N$ is obtained for the spin- $\frac{N}{2}$ particle. This corresponds to an anomalously large kick of the particle in the z direction. “Spoiling” means that our original spatial wavefunction of the particle had a wide spread (instead of the narrow spread required for weak measurements) in the z

direction. The interaction Hamiltonian

$$H = g(t)S_z z, \tag{2}$$

provides a weak coupling if we select a small region around $z = 0$, only then the appropriate postselection of the spin state leads to an anomalous kick. With a wide initial z distribution, the spatial wavefunction after the spin postselection has a familiar superoscillation form with a tiny amplitude in the center, where the spin state was not significantly changed, so it was almost orthogonal to the spin postselection measurement. The exponential increase in amplitude is explained by rotation of the initial spin by the interaction Hamiltonian (2), making the scalar product of local spin at a large distance from $z = 0$ much bigger.

A paradox with a similar flavor was presented by Dicke (1981). A photon beam passes through part of the location of a particle in a ground state without scattering, thus without changing its energy, while the particle increases the energy since it is no longer in the ground state. In a follow-up paper, Dicke (1986), claimed that we can observe energy conservation only on an ensemble. See also recent related discussion, Sen (2023).

4 The issue of the reference frame

The interaction Hamiltonian of the Stern-Gerlach device (2) changes the momentum of the pointer (z component of the momentum of the particle), so the conservation of the total momentum should not be expected. In reality, we do expect symmetry under translation, so we do expect conservation of total momentum. What really appears in the measurement interaction Hamiltonian is

$$H = g(t)S_z(z - z_{MD}). \tag{3}$$

We never measure absolute variables, always relative variables: the system relative to the measuring device. The conservation law of momentum and the Third Law of Newton are closely related, so measurement interaction does not change the total momentum. The total momentum commutes with $z - z_{MD}$. This suggests that measurements and conservation laws are not connected. This also questions the significance of the Araki-Yanasy theorem, Araki & Yanase (1960) as well as its recent generalization to continuous variables, Kuramochi & Tajima (2023).

The separability of the global variables and relative variables is true, however, only if there is no entanglement between relative variables and absolute variables. This assumption is closely connected to the Collins-Popescu conjecture. An even stronger assumption is that the Universe is in an eigenstate of the total momentum. Apparently, it is consistent with us, observing only relative positions, seeing the usual world. Motivation for such a constraint might appear in the cosmological analysis of the beginning of the universe which, as far as I know, has no established results. Anyway, the construction of the relative variables seems to be simpler than the Page-Wootters scheme Page & Wootters (1983) required for a universe in the eigenstate of energy, for which a variable which replaces time has to be invented.

In summary, measurements are performed using interactions depending on relative variables, while conservation laws are usually related to global variables describing all systems together. Thus, one might not expect a direct connection between measurements and conservation laws.

In Section 2 I presented (as far as I know, new) simple strong result which is relevant if for some (cosmological?) reason we do have initial entanglement between global and relative variables. Then, measurements tend to decrease the uncertainty of the global conserved quantities. This regime has some similarity with the non-conservation of conserved quantities of open systems. In the long run, however, there will be saturation to very small uncertainties and non-conservation will become negligible.

Recent Collins-Popescu conjecture also describes initial entanglement, but of a different nature. This special type of entanglement avoids the connection between measurements and conservation laws by exploiting tiny entanglement and large uncertainties of external systems. This special type of entanglement is obtained naturally in some typical experimental situations. More general analysis is needed to shed light on the actual scenario that corresponds to the initial state of the universe.

Living in a particular world of many worlds (which can be properly analyzed only in the past) we witness a non-unitary evolution (an illusion of collapse) which is not described by standard closed system approach. The question of conservation laws in the history of the MWI world is not given a definitive answer. For example, the total momentum of the Universe might correspond to a particular value (relative to some quantum frame of reference), it can be a distribution constant in time, or its uncertainty can decrease with more and measurements to be performed. In all cases the conservation laws differ from the standard case of the open system approach in which we do not expect exact conservation laws to hold.

Even if the conservation laws hold in the splitting process of the MWI, the evolution of the quantum state of a world is not unitary, so a world cannot be considered as a closed system. It is important to understand this. It might be that some paradoxes follow from not appreciating this fact. In discussing the “unitarity puzzle” appearing in the evaporation process of a black hole predicted by Hawking (1976), we can put an arbitrary amount of information into a black hole, but when it evaporates, we get just thermal radiation, so the information is lost, and unitarity fails, see Giddings (2006). A simple resolution might be as follows. It is usually assumed that we end up with one world with thermal radiation. However, evaporation of a black hole is a quantum process, so it happens at different times. Thus, we get a superposition of thermal radiations created at different times. Relative phases between these terms are capable of containing the information that was fed into the black hole.

This work has been supported in part by the Israel Science Foundation Grant No. 2064/19.

References

- Aharonov, Y., Albert, D. Z., & Vaidman, L. (1988). How the result of a measurement of a component of the spin of a spin-1/2 particle can turn out to be 100. *Physical Review Letters*, 60(14), 1351.
- Aharonov, Y., Popescu, S., & Rohrlich, D. (1991). *Preprint TAUP 847-90*. Tel Aviv University.
- Aharonov, Y., Popescu, S., & Rohrlich, D. (2021). On conservation laws in quantum mechanics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(1), e1921529118.

- Aharonov, Y., Popescu, S., & Rohrlich, D. (2023). Conservation laws and the foundations of quantum mechanics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *120*(41), e2220810120.
- Araki, H., & Yanase, M. (1960). Measurement of quantum mechanical operators. *Physical Review*, *120*(2), 622.
- Berry, M. (1994). Faster than Fourier. *Quantum Coherence and Reality*, (pp. 55–65).
- Berry, M., & Shukla, P. (2011). Pointer supershifts and superoscillations in weak measurements. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, *45*(1), 015301.
- Collins, D., & Popescu, S. (2024). Conservation laws for every quantum measurement outcome. *arXiv:2404.18621*.
- Cuffaro, M. E., & Hartmann, S. (2023). The open systems view and the Everett interpretation. *Quantum Reports*, *5*(2), 418–425.
- Dicke, R. (1981). Interaction-free quantum measurements: A paradox. *Am. J. Phys.*, *49*(10), 925–930.
- Dicke, R. (1986). On observing the absence of an atom. *Foundations of Physics*, *16*(2), 107–113.
- Giddings, S. B. (2006). Black hole information, unitarity, and nonlocality. *Phys. Rev. D*, *74*, 106005.
URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.74.106005>
- Hawking, S. W. (1976). Breakdown of predictability in gravitational collapse. *Physical Review D*, *14*(10), 2460.
- Kolar, Z., & den Hollander, W. (2004). 2003: A centennial of spinthariscopes and scintillation counting. *Applied Radiation and Isotopes*, *61*(2), 261–266.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0969804304001162>
- Kuramochi, Y., & Tajima, H. (2023). Wigner-Araki-Yanase theorem for continuous and unbounded conserved observables. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, *131*, 210201.
URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.131.210201>
- Page, D. N., & Wootters, W. K. (1983). Evolution without evolution: Dynamics described by stationary observables. *Physical Review D*, *27*(12), 2885.
- Popescu, S. (1991). *Ph.D thesis*. Tel Aviv University.
- Sen, R. (2023). The collapse problem as a consistency problem. is the quantum measurement hypothesis consistent with conservation laws? *Annals of Physics*, *458*, 169462.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0003491623002646>
- Vaidman, L. (2021). Many-Worlds interpretation of Quantum mechanics. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.) *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.
- Wallace, D. (2012). *The Emergent Multiverse: Quantum theory according to the Everett interpretation*. Oxford University Press, USA.