Fundamental Irreversibility: Planckian or Schrödinger-Newton?
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The inception of a universal gravity-related irreversibility took place originally in quantum cosmology. The ultimate reason of universal irreversibility is thought to come from black holes close to the Planck scale. Completely different instances of irreversibilities are quantum state reductions unrelated to gravity or relativity but related to measurement devices. However, an intricate relationship between Newton gravity and quantized matter might result in fundamental and spontaneous quantum state reduction — in the non-relativistic Schrödinger-Newton context. The above two concepts of fundamental irreversibility emerged and evolved with few or even no interactions. The purpose here is to draw a parallel between the two approaches first, and to ask rather than answer the question: can both the Planckian and the Schrödinger-Newton indeterminacies/irreversibilities be two faces of the same universe. A related personal note of the author’s 1986 meeting with Aharonov and Bohm is appended.

I. INTRODUCTION

Standard micro-dynamical equations, whether classical or quantum, are deterministic and reversible. They can, nonetheless, encode various options of irreversibility even at the fundamental level. Here I am going to discuss two separate concepts of fundamental irreversibility, which are quite certain to overlap on the long run. The first option concerns space-time (gravity), it is relativistic, hallmarkled by mainstream cosmologists and field theorists (including immortal ones). The second option roots in the explicit irreversibility of von Neumann measurement in non-relativistic quantum mechanics, its story is perhaps more diffuse than the first one’s. The standard and linear story of Planck scale irreversibility is recapitulated in Sec. [I] I choose a personal account for the parallel story of the conjectured Newton-gravity-related non-relativistic irreversibility of macroscopic quantum mechanics in Sec. [II] I stop both stories with the 1980’s when the same structure of heuristic master equations became proposed for the two options of fundamental irreversible dynamics — with different interpretations and regimes of significance, of course. Towards their reconciliation, Sec. [IV] offers some thoughts with the open end.

II. IRREVERSIBILITY AT PLANCK SCALE

At the dawn of quantum-gravity research, Bronstein [1,2] discovered by heuristic calculations that the precise structure of space-time, contrary to the precise structure of electromagnetism, is unattainable if we rely on quantized motion of test bodies. The coming decades brought up stronger and famous arguments for space-time unsharpness, unpredictability, its role in universal loss of information, of quantum coherence, and of microscopic reversibility in general. Wheeler [3] found that smooth space-time changes into a foamy structure of topological fluctuations at the Planck scale. Bekenstein [4] gave the first exact quantitative proposal toward fundamental irreversibility, claiming black holes have entropy:

\[ S = \frac{k_B}{\ell_{Pl}^2} \times \text{(black hole surface area)}, \]

where \( k_B \) is Boltzmann’s constant, \( \ell_{Pl} \) is the Planck length. This was confirmed by Hawking [6] who showed that black holes emit the corresponding thermal radiation indeed. Only a little later, he summarized the situation by stating the unpredictability of quantum-gravity at the Planck scale, leading him to propose that quantum field theory is fundamentally irreversible. Accordingly, the unitary scattering operator \( \hat{S} \) should be replaced by the more general superscattering operator \( \mathcal{S} \) acting on the initial density operator \( \hat{\rho}_{in} \) instead of the initial state vector:

\[ \hat{\rho}_{out} = \mathcal{S} \hat{\rho}_{in} \mathcal{S}^\dagger. \]

To resolve the detailed irreversible (non-unitary) dynamics beyond Hawking’s superscattering, Ellis et al. [7] proposed a simple quantum-kinetic (master) equation, which Banks, Susskind and Peskin [8] generalized as follows:

\[ \frac{d\hat{\rho}}{dt} = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}] - \frac{1}{2\hbar^2} \int \int [\hat{Q}(x), [\hat{Q}(y), \hat{\rho}]] \hbar(x-y) d^3xd^3y, \]

where \( \hat{H} \) is the Hamiltonian, \( \hat{Q}(x) \) is a certain quantum field, and \( \hbar(x-y) \) is a positive symmetric kernel. The transparent structure allowed the authors to point out a substantial difficulty: non-conservation of energy-momentum.

III. IRREVERSIBILITY IN THE SCHröDINGER-NEWTON CONTEXT

In the early 1970’s, being a student fascinated already by the quantum theory, I missed a dynamical formalism of state vector collapse from it. Weren’t I be a student, were I aware of the related literature, I would have read the phenomenological model by Bohm and Bub [10].
But I was not aware of it, started to think on my own. Open the textbook, you read the expansion of the time-dependent state vector \( |t\rangle \) in terms of the energy eigenstates \( |n\rangle \) of eigenvalues \( E_n \), resp. But I wrote it with a little modification:

\[
|t\rangle = \sum_n c_n \exp \left( \frac{-i}{\hbar} E_n (1 + \delta t) \right) |n\rangle,
\]

(4)

because I observed that allowing a small randomness \( \delta \) of the time flow, the average density matrix becomes gradually diagonal in the energy basis:

\[
\langle t | t \rangle = \sum_n |c_n|^2 |n\rangle \langle n|,
\]

(5)

exactly as if someone measured the energy. I got a prototype dynamical model of non-selective von Neumann measurements. A question remained to answer: where does randomness of time come from? The hint should have come from the sadly forgotten Bronstein [11] basically, but it came occasionally from Károlyházy after he gave department seminars in 1973 on his earlier work [11] where he used a Planck scale uncertainty of classical space-time and a very vague model of massive body’s state vector collapse based upon it. Just I had to do experimental particle physics for a decade.

When back to theory, I showed [12] that the Newtonian limit of standard reversible semiclassical gravity, the so-called Schrödinger-Newton equation [13], obtains sensible solitonic wave functions for the massive (e.g.: nano-) objects’ center-of-mass. It determined my way, as to put non-relativistic flesh on the toy dynamics (4-5) of state vector reduction. The uncertainty \( \delta \) of time flow should come from of metric tensor element \( g_{00} \), which is the Newton potential \( \phi \) in fact. The unpredictability \( \delta \phi \) of the Newton potential should depend on \( G \) and \( \hbar \), but not on \( c \). The choice was the following spatially correlated white-noise:

\[
\delta \phi(x,t) \delta \phi(y,s) = \frac{\hbar G}{|x - y|} \delta(t - s).
\]

(6)

The random part of the Newton potential couples to the mass density operator \( \hat{\bar{f}}(x) \) via the interaction \( \int \phi(x,t) \hat{\bar{f}}(x) d^3x \), yielding the following master equation for the density operator:

\[
\frac{d \hat{\bar{f}}}{dt} = -\frac{i}{\hbar} \left[ \hat{H}, \hat{\bar{f}} \right] - \frac{G}{2\hbar} \int \int \left[ \hat{f}(x), \hat{\bar{f}}(y), \hat{\bar{f}} \right] \frac{1}{|x - y|} d^3x d^3y.
\]

(7)

This dynamics is mimicking the (non-selective) von Neumann measurement of massive object’s positions, it predicts the spontaneous reduction (decay) of Schrödinger cat states (see same result in [13] by Penrose).

Before journal publication [14], I showed this result to Yakir Aharonov (read Sec. [A]). He warned me of the energy-momentum non-conservation. I took it with surprise because I did not read [9].

IV. PLANCK SCALE OR SCHRODINGER-NEWTON CONTEXT?

Irreversibility at the Planck scale seems plausible within standard physics because of evaporation black holes (Sec. [1]). The non-relativistic Schrödinger-Newton irreversibility (Sec. [II]) is a conjecture although its derivation is not seriously more heuristic than the Planckian’s. For both options, the same structure of master equations were proposed to encode the irreversible dynamics of the density operator. Planck scale irreversibilities from eq. (3) become significant for certain fundamental elementary particles. Contrary to that, eq. (7) predicts irreversibility for massive non-relativistic objects in the Schrödinger-Newton context. Whether the two underlying concepts are compatible at all, it is not known. Whether or not the Newtonian unpredictabilities/fluctuations are the non-relativistic limit of the Planckian’s? That is hard to answer.

Let me mention, nonetheless, two examples where relativistic phenomenologies, different from the line of Sec. [II] turned out to reduce to the Schrödinger-Newton uncertainty (6) non-relativistically. Unruh [15] proposed a possible uncertainty relation between the metric and Einstein tensors, resp. In the Newtonian limit, speed of light \( c \) cancels and we are left just with the white-noise uncertainties (6), as pointed out in [14]. Penrose discussed the fundamental conflict between general relativity and quantization. To resolve it heuristically at least, he also found the necessity of space-time’s fundamental unsharpness, guessed it non-relativistically and concluded to what was equivalent with expression (6) up to a factor 2 (which discrepancy has recently been resolved by [16]).

Against questioning a possible transmutation of Planck scale uncertainties into the non-relativistic Schrödinger-Newton regime, I have an elementary argument. Consider the Schrödinger-equation for the center-of-mass of a big body like \( M = 1 kg \), with velocity \( 1 km/s \) which is fairly non-relativistic. Calculate the de Broglie wave length: \( \lambda = (2\pi \hbar /mv) = 4.16 \times 10^{-36} m \). This is smaller than the Planck length \( \ell_P = 1.62 \times 10^{-35} m \) by about one order of magnitude. Since standard physics breaks down anyway at the Planck scale, we can no longer trust in the Schrödinger equation for the motion of our massive non-relativistic body. Planck scale space-time uncertainties have thus flown down into uncertainties in the Schrödinger dynamics of non-relativistic massive bodies. So far so good. But shall \( c \) cancel so that we get the effective Schrödinger-Newton uncertainty (6-7) and the corresponding spontaneous reduction for massive objects [13 14]?

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Two independent theories of relativistic and non-relativistic fundamental irreversibility, resp., both related
to the conflict between gravity and quantization, are in the scope of this work. One was conceived and would be relevant in cosmology. The other one was born from the quantum measurement problem and would modify the quantum mechanics of massive bodies even in the lab. Their conceptions have been outlined in Secs. II and III, respectively, including their basics without the details and later developments. Such restricted presentation sufficed to expose the issue put in the center of this work in Sec. IV: what is the relationship between the Planckian and the Schrödinger-Newton unpredictability of our space-time? The answer remains missing, but our purpose has been to urge it. In particular, we pointed out that Planckian unpredictability survives non-relativistically — for massive macroscopic quantized degrees of freedom.

Appendix A

![Image of a page from March 18, 1986]

FIG. 1: Author’s diary, page from March 18, 1986.

It was the courtesy of Asher Peres who asked Yakir to receive the unknown theorist from Hungary. Below is the translation of my notes (Fig. A1).

11 Aharonov: His office and desk are almost empty, no personal library, no paper piles. Maximum 50 or so, sits behind the desk, smokes long fat cigar and just phones, but makes me seated.

Awaiting for David Bohm as well, shall introduce me to him as well. Until that, I can unfold my quantum-gravity idée fix. Meanwhile David Bohm arrives, he is at least in his 60’s, but can be 70. I’m listening, Aharonov is explaining the superstring to Bohm who is repeatedly asking. Finally I also communicate my layman’s views, Bohm’s criticism is also akin. Aharonov returns the word to me, but first tells Bohm hellish intensively what he could not have heard. Aharonov dislikes the gravitational noise, he’d prefer dynamics, but at the end my master equation and the pure state representation may have caught him a bit. He understood everything very well, his talking is really firm and organized, also steady.

He got two offprints (localization + orthog.) Shall send Peres money for me.

13 We say good bye.

Left margin: Bohm looked at the master equation strongly! Immediately he knew also that decoherence ≠ reduction.
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