

GRAVITATION AND THE PROBLEM OF QUANTUM MEASUREMENT

Chris Allen Broka

2002 Granemore St. Las Vegas, NV 89135

(chris.broka@gmail.com)

Abstract

We consider the possibility that the goal of quantizing General Relativity should be abandoned in favor of Semiclassical Gravity. A formalism is provided for doing so. The quantum measurement problem is investigated in this context. The 'particle' concept is examined and clarified.

Keywords: Semiclassical Gravity, Quantization of Gravity, Quantum Measurement, von Neumann-Wigner Interpretation.

Introduction.

Despite much effort the quantization of General Relativity has remained an elusive goal. The non-linearity of the theory poses serious problems. And if we would try to picture gravity as mediated by spin-2 gravitons we encounter another problem—the resulting theory cannot be renormalized in any conventional sense (1, 2). String Theory gives rise to massless spin-2 particles that could be identified with gravitons. But the mathematics is difficult and the project remains a work in progress. Loop Quantum Gravity is a completely different suggestion (3).

Semiclassical Gravity is the theory that results when we treat spacetime in a classical sense but require the quantized fields to obey its geometry. It is generally required that $G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi \langle \Psi | T_{\mu\nu} | \Psi \rangle$ where $T_{\mu\nu}$ is the operator representing the stress-energy tensor for the quantum field theory of interest and $|\Psi\rangle$ the state of its matter fields. Many interesting results have followed from this approach. These include the observation of a thermal bath of particles in frames accelerated relative to an unaccelerated one observing a vacuum (4, 5), Hawking radiation (6), and the creation of particles in an expanding universe (7). Nevertheless, it has largely been regarded a sort-of poor halfway house between classical physics and a proper theory of quantum gravity.

Could Semiclassical Gravity Be All There Is?

Perhaps our wish to quantize gravity should be resisted. Such ideas have been discussed in the past (8, 9). This requires us to assume the existence of a classical spacetime manifold whose geometry is given. It also requires us to specify upon this a quantum field theory (QFT) we are interested in. From this we get equations of motion for the quantum fields. We solve these equations and get expressions for our quantum fields that are to be written in terms of the creation and annihilation operators appropriate to the Fock space that defines our quantum field theory. For now we work in the Heisenberg Picture. Write the action as:

$$1) \int (-R / 16\pi + \mathcal{L}_{\text{field}}) \sqrt{-|g|} d^4x \text{ from which follows:}$$

$$2) T_{\mu\nu} = 2 \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}_{\text{field}}}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} - g_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{L}_{\text{field}}.$$

Equation 2) ensures that the divergence of $T_{\mu\nu}$ vanishes (10). We assume $\mathcal{L}_{\text{field}}$ has no explicit spacetime

dependence.

Our Fock space must contain and be constructed around a vacuum state $|0\rangle$. In even the simplest theories $\int <0|T_{00}(\mathbf{x}, t)|0\rangle d^3V$ diverges. (Here d^3V designates the volume element for the spacelike hypersurface of interest.) And, in some cases (11), this divergence worsens if the spacetime geometry becomes more complicated. We will address this in a very simple and straightforward way:

3) $G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi (<\Psi|T_{\mu\nu}|\Psi\rangle - <0_M|T_{\mu\nu}|0_M\rangle) = 8\pi \{\Psi|T_{\mu\nu}|\Psi\}$ where $\{\Psi|\mathcal{O}|\Psi\}$ is defined as $<\Psi|\mathcal{O}|\Psi\rangle - <0_M|\mathcal{O}|0_M\rangle$ for any operator \mathcal{O} and $|0_M\rangle$ represents the lowest energy state for which $G_{\mu\nu} = 0$.

This becomes our new Einstein's equation. If $|\Psi\rangle = |0_M\rangle$ we assume spacetime to be Minkowskian. Since this spacetime is static so is $|0_M\rangle$ (4). We might better have written the action as:

$$1') \int (-R / 16\pi + \{\Psi| \mathcal{L}_{\text{field}} |\Psi\}) \sqrt{-|g|} d^4x.$$

Simple Cases.

Consider a very elementary example. Spacetime is a Minkowski manifold; $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu}$. Suppose we are interested in a real scalar field $\varphi(\mathbf{x}, t)$. Suppose $\mathcal{L}_{\text{field}} = \frac{1}{2}(\eta^{\mu\nu}(\varphi_{,\mu})(\varphi_{,\nu}) - m^2 \varphi^2)$. From this we get a Klein-Gordon equation whose solution is familiar. We may write:

4) $\varphi(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} \sum_k \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega_k}} (e^{-ik\cdot x} a_k + e^{ik\cdot x} a_k^\dagger)$ where $\omega_k = \sqrt{k^2 + m^2}$ and we imagine the system contained in an enormous periodic box of volume V .

This allows us to construct a simple Fock space whose basis vectors consist of $|0_M\rangle$, 1-particle states $|\mathbf{k}\rangle$, two-particle states $|\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'\rangle$, and so on. We find that $\{\Psi|\int T_{00}(\mathbf{x}, t) d^3V|\Psi\} = <\Psi|\sum_k \omega_k a_k^\dagger a_k|\Psi\rangle$ which is finite for a state like $|\mathbf{k}\rangle$. It occurs to us that we have already found a solution to our above-discussed problem. And we did not have to look very far for it. $\{\mathbf{k}|T_{\mu\nu}|\mathbf{k}\} = 0$ since Minkowski space is infinite ($V \rightarrow \infty$). Therefore $G_{\mu\nu} = 0$. This is a completely adequate situation according to our criteria as long as there are only finitely many particles represented in $|\Psi\rangle$.

Although $|\Psi\rangle$ is not in any way a function of spacetime it can contain information relevant to it. Consider a Klein-Gordon state— $|\Psi_{\text{KG}}\rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_k \frac{e^{-ik\cdot x_0}}{\sqrt{2\omega_k}} |\mathbf{k}\rangle$ (where N is for normalization). $\{\Psi_{\text{KG}}|T_{00}(\mathbf{x}, t)|\Psi_{\text{KG}}\}$ describes a world in which we have a massive particle localized at \mathbf{x}_0 . This particle will curve the spacetime around it so the manifold cannot be Minkowskian. We have produced an inadequate and inconsistent situation. We would have to try other manifolds in the hope of finding one that gave us a consistent solution. Since this problem seems rather simple we think it could be solved (given a little cleverness and patience). But it is not obvious how to solve such problems, in general, other than by trial and error.

Let us consider another simple case—the Einstein-de Sitter cosmology. Here our manifold is spatially flat and has $g_{00} = 1$, $g_{ii} = -t^{4/3}$, with the rest 0. From this we derive a curved spacetime version of the Klein-Gordon

equation whose solution we can write as:

$$5) \quad \varphi(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_0}} \sum_k \frac{1}{t} (u_k a_k + u_k^* a_k^\dagger).$$

Unfortunately, we are unable to find simple solutions for u_k except when $k = 0$. Fortunately, these are the only solutions we will end up requiring. Let us write:

$$5') \quad \varphi(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_0 t^2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2m}} (e^{-im t} a_0 + e^{im t} a_0^\dagger) + \text{other terms.}$$

$V_0 t^2$ represents the comoving volume element for this cosmology.

From equations 2) and 5') we can deduce $T_{\mu\nu}$. We must now find a $|\Psi\rangle$ that affords the desired expectation values for these operators. Since the matter in this universe is distributed evenly and is at rest in our coordinate system let us guess that $|\Psi\rangle = a_0^\dagger |0_M\rangle$; essentially we have put a single, $k = 0$, massive particle *everywhere* in this universe. We posit $a_0 |0_M\rangle = 0$. We find:

$$6) \quad \{\Psi|T_{00}|\Psi\} = \rho = \frac{m}{V_0 t^2} + \frac{1}{V_0 m t^4} \text{ (which contains a } 1/t^4 \text{ term). All other } \{\Psi|T_{\mu\nu}|\Psi\} = 0.$$

We know from Einstein's equation that $\rho = 1/(6 \pi t^2)$. So we must set $m = V_0/6 \pi$. And we recognize that V_0 is infinite. The unwanted $1/t^4$ term vanishes and we are left with the result we desire. We are able to find a perfectly acceptable solution to this problem. But it does require us to adopt a rather strange QFT—one in which infinite mass particles exist.

In these examples we have worked in the Heisenberg picture. This has been practical because we have only dealt with simple Lagrangians that give rise to quantum fields that satisfy linear equations whose solutions can be interpreted easily in terms of creation and annihilation operators the physical meaning of which we can pretty well understand. But physically interesting Lagrangians contain complicated, nonlinear, interaction terms. We would have a hard time calculating useful results were we forced to work in anything besides the Interaction Picture. Let us write $H(t) = \int T_{00}(\mathbf{x}, t) d^3 \mathbf{V} = \int (\mathcal{H}_0(\mathbf{x}, t) + \mathcal{H}'(\mathbf{x}, t)) d^3 \mathbf{V} = H_0(t) + H'(t)$ where the former designates the underlying (linear) part of the QFT and the latter the interaction terms. It is from the former that we derive creation and annihilation operators that make intuitive sense to us. It is these operators for which we assume $a_k |0_M\rangle = 0$. Creation operators are associated with positive frequency solutions and annihilation operators with their negative frequency counterparts. $|\Psi\rangle$ must now be written $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ where $i \partial_t |\Psi(t)\rangle = H'(t) |\Psi(t)\rangle$. The existence of interactions will, in many cases, require us to regularize and renormalize our QFT. All operators here (e.g. $T_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}, t)$) must, themselves, be represented in the Interaction Picture.

We can write the field operators corresponding to $H_0(t)$ as linear combinations of spacetime functions (wave function-like things) multiplying creation and annihilation operators. To the extent that these functions comprise complete, orthonormal, sets we can generally say that $[\varphi_i(\mathbf{x}, t), \pi_j(\mathbf{x}', t)] = i \delta^3(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')$ for the various fields in our QFT—implying $[a_k, a_{k'}^\dagger] = \delta_{kk'}$ and all other commutators = 0 for the various fields. (We would use anticommutators if we were dealing with half-spin fields.). It is only in these cases that we can speak of 'particles' in any meaningful way. Here a number operator, $N_k = a_k^\dagger a_k$, can be usefully defined. And here we

can write $\{\Psi|T_{\mu\nu}|\Psi\} = \langle\Psi|:T_{\mu\nu}:|\Psi\rangle$. 'Particles' are natural creatures of Minkowski spacetime and do not, as a concept, help us very much in more complicated situations.

Discussion.

What is suggested can be cast in the form of a simple protocol:

- A) Specify a globally hyperbolic spacetime manifold \mathcal{M}^4 . It can be whatever one likes. Impose upon it a coordinate system (t, x, y, z) which can be anything one likes provided t allows us to define a set of spacelike Cauchy hypersurfaces.
- B) Define upon it a QFT as desired (i.e. define $\mathcal{L}_{\text{field}}$) and solve its field equations given \mathcal{M}^4 thus providing expressions for $T_{\mu\nu}$. $T_{\mu\nu}$ is given by equation 2).
- C) Find a $|\Psi\rangle$ in the Fock space corresponding to the QFT such that $G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi \{\Psi|T_{\mu\nu}|\Psi\}$.

One could supplement this protocol with additional requirements (e.g. the weak energy condition) if one wished.

We have already examined some simple cases where it is possible to accomplish this goal. We, of course, hope that the actual \mathcal{M}^4 we live in has a QFT and $|\Psi\rangle$ that make all of this consistent. We have already seen that Minkowski space, a real scalar field, and a finite number of momentum-eigenstate particles, constitutes one such self-consistent system. (Were it not for the fact that $|0_M\rangle$ corresponds to Minkowski spacetime \mathcal{M}^4 could also be, for example, a Taub-NUT or Ozv th-Sch cking space (12)—these are exact solutions of the vacuum Einstein's equation and any QFT should allow for a vacuum state (13). There is an element of prior geometry at work here.)

Accelerating observers can experience a thermal bath of particles in a Minkowski space vacuum for which $\{0_M|T_{\mu\nu}|0_M\} = 0$ (14). Rindler (15) shows that a family of uniformly accelerating observers divides (2-dimensional) Minkowski space into causally disconnected wedges. In both of the 'Rindler wedges' they can define a coordinate system in which the massless Klein-Gordon equation takes the same form as its Minkowskian counterpart and may be solved to give 4) where the creation and annihilation operators (they might call them b_k^\dagger and b_k) pertain to the "particles" seen by the accelerating observers. Bogolubov coefficients relate their field to that corresponding to non-accelerated observers. If the latter see a vacuum the former will "see" a thermal bath of particles even though $\{0_M|T_{\mu\nu}|0_M\} = 0$ for everyone. It is an open question what "seeing" means in connection with these phantom particles. The Rindler observers can define number operators $N_k = b_k^\dagger b_k$ which they may assume count their particles. But $b_k |0_M\rangle \neq 0$. And, unlike their Minkowskian counterparts, they cannot say $\int T_{00}(\mathbf{x}, t) \sqrt{-g_{11}} d\mathbf{x} = \sum_k \omega_k N_k$ since $\sqrt{-g_{11}} \neq 1$ for them. It is unclear what their N_k s are actually *counting*. Unruh (4) has tried to address this question somewhat by imagining a monopole 'particle detector' that moves along with a particular Rindler observer.

Quantum Measurement and the Page-Geilker Experiment.

Things would be much easier if von Neumann measurements did not occur leading to what is familiarly (if a little carelessly) known as wave function collapse. They do, in fact, occur and this matter must be addressed. In earlier work (16) this author has attempted to frame the problem in term of the Interaction Picture and the evolution of the Fock space state of our world $|\Psi(t)\rangle$. Normally it evolves by unitary evolution— $i \partial_t |\Psi(t)\rangle = H'(t) |\Psi(t)\rangle$. But not all $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ are admissible in this interpretation. I give the example of an electron going through a Stern-Gerlach apparatus. In one scenario it comes in spin-up and strikes a detector that makes a light turn red. A different scenario has a spin-down electron triggering a green light. Had the electron started out $(|+\rangle + |-\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ unitary evolution would lead to a superposed state having us seeing both a green and a red light. This is considered an inadmissible state (since we cannot be conscious of the green light and the red one simultaneously) and $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ is projected into either the 'red' or 'green' state in accordance with the Born rule. It will be noted that $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ contains all the information relevant to the electron, the measuring device and the observer. It will also be noted that I invoke consciousness in distinguishing between admissible and inadmissible state vectors. So I am dealing with a variant of the von Neumann-Wigner Interpretation related somewhat to Chalmers' theory of M-Properties (17). Some readers may regard the involvement of consciousness in physics as anathematic. They can consider consciousness as a placeholder here that could signify other criteria they might prefer (e.g. complexity, the simple size of the measuring device, gravity itself (18)). In any case, there just seem to be states of reality that are not allowed. What happens when a wave function "collapses?"

In earlier work (16) we proposed that our Fock space consisted of a collection of admissible states, $\{C_i\}$, with the rest being inadmissible (such as those in which observers simultaneously witness both a green and red light). We worked in the Interaction Picture and paid no attention to General Relativity. We introduced a "projection operator," \mathfrak{S} , which, if $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ were to evolve into an inadmissible state, would convert it into one of the C_i at random with a *relative* probability given by the absolute square of $\langle C_i | \Psi(t) \rangle$. Since the time coordinate here is specific to a particular Lorentz frame we might worry that Special Relativity could suffer violation. We tried to argue that this would not be the case. But the matter was left somewhat up in the air. We can sharpen this argument by supposing that \mathfrak{S} can only project $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ into such C_i s that:

7) $\{\Psi(t) \mathfrak{S}^\dagger | T_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}, t) | \mathfrak{S} \Psi(t)\} = \{\Psi(t) | T_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}, t) | \Psi(t)\}$ whenever (\mathbf{x}, t) lies outside the future light cone of the measurement event.

A situation arises here that did not in the earlier work where we regarded \mathcal{M}^4 as static. As the geometry of \mathcal{M}^4 changes depending on t so will the operators represented therein. So a state vector that might be admissible in the context of one spacelike hypersurface (defined by t) might be inadmissible at another t — $\{C_i\}$ is not necessarily time-independent. If the world evolves such that its present state vector becomes inadmissible \mathfrak{S} will project it into an acceptable state as described above. We will find it convenient in what follows to dispense with the Interaction Picture and return to the Heisenberg Picture. $|\Psi\rangle$ will now remain static until some measurement operator evolves such that the state becomes inadmissible; only then will it be projected.

This may explain the red and green lights. But what is the case with gravity? An experiment of Page and Geilker (19) looked for an answer. They, essentially, did as above with the lights replaced by a gravity detector and a heavy lead sphere that could be moved to either point A or B depending on the outcome of a quantum measurement. A $|+\rangle$ electron would move it to A and a $|-\rangle$ one would result in its going to B. (This is a sort-of

simplification of the actual experiment.) Would a $(|+\rangle + |-\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ electron result in a situation where gravity would be coming from A and B simultaneously? No. They find that this is not the case. Just as with the lights, only one of the two "classical" possibilities is observed. But, according to what has been argued above, this ought not be so—the M^4 corresponding to the superposed state does not seem any more pathological than either of the "classical" ones. We conclude that the superposed state is inadmissible, *but not for reasons having anything to do with gravity*. (Perhaps the experimenters looked at the sphere. Perhaps they could not consciously perceive a ghostly half-sphere in two different locations.) Page and Geilkar were motivated to perform this experiment by the fact that, if the state vector does project (or as others might put it, the wave function collapses), $\{\Psi | T_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}, t) | \Psi\}$ will not evolve continuously and its divergence will, at that event, not necessarily equal 0. Einstein's equation therefore breaks down. That it does so comes as no great surprise since von Neumann measurements are not, in general, energy-conserving.

It become more complicated if we deal with multiple measurements performed on entangled states. Consider an EPR experiment in which two particles are prepared with their spins anticorrelated. One is sent out to the left where its spin is measured at event X. The other goes to the right and is observed at Y. X and Y are spacelike-separated. Depending on our choice of coordinate systems X could precede Y or the other way around. Assume X happens first. Suppose, prior to this, we can write $|\Psi\rangle$ as $(|+\rangle_L |-\rangle_R + |-\rangle_L |+\rangle_R)/\sqrt{2} = (|I\rangle + |II\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. (This is a notational convenience. We know the state vector embodies the behavior of all the particles in the universe, not just these two.) At X $|\Psi\rangle$ will be projected into one of the now-admissible states $|I\rangle$ or $|II\rangle$. Say it is $|I\rangle$. The observer at Y will then surely see his particle's spin as down. This process will only be consistent with equation 7) if $\{\Psi | T_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}, t) | \Psi\} = \{I | T_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}, t) | I\}$ outside the future light cone of X. This seems quite reasonable here. The spins presumably correspond to some spin-measuring operator S. It would appear that influences on S caused by the measurement at X have propagated superluminally (which, in a sense, they have). This is alright since equation 7) applies only to $T_{\mu\nu}$. It ensures that *energy changes* cannot propagate faster than light. It has nothing to say about spin changes as long as these do not affect $G_{\mu\nu}$. We conclude, also, that EPR-like correlations cannot be detected by making purely gravitational observations.

Conclusion.

A variant of semiclassical gravity is proposed. No graviton exists and all quantum mechanical phenomena are associated with the matter fields. We consider these to define a Fock space. The quantized operators that act upon it obey the classical equations of motion that follow from the metric of the background spacetime. Our Fock space's vacuum state is such that $\{0_M | T_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}, t) | 0_M\} = 0$ always. The 'particle' concept has no strict meaning in this formulation of things. It makes sense if and only if we can write $\{\Psi | H | \Psi\} = \langle \Psi | \sum_k \omega_k N_k | \Psi \rangle$ where $N_k = a_k^\dagger a_k$ and $a_k | 0 \rangle = 0$. In this case we can denominate the energy of the world in *discrete packets* bearing energies ω_k .

But the particle concept *is* resilient in a sense. Suppose there are physicists in a small laboratory. It is freely falling and non-rotating. In it they employ normal coordinates so that they have a small region where their (t, x, y, z) define something very much like a Minkowski spacetime. They do not know what $\varphi(\mathbf{x}, t)$ really is. They could be falling through the event horizon of a very large black hole and they would not know that either. They do know that $\varphi(\mathbf{x}, t)$ must pretty much satisfy their Minkowskian equations. They do not know what $|\Psi\rangle$ really

is. But they know that $\{\Psi | T_{\mu\nu} | \Psi\}$ pretty much equals zero within their laboratory. If their laboratory is well-insulated from outside influences they can perform experiments and get results almost identical to what their counterparts in a completely Minkowskian spacetime would obtain.

Acknowledgement.

The author is grateful to Professor W. G. Unruh (UBC) for interesting and helpful comments regarding this work.

References.

- 1) Feynman, R. P.; Morinigo, F. B.; Wagner, W. G. (1995). *Feynman Lectures on Gravitation* (Reading, Mass. Addison-Wesley. ISBN 978-0201627343). See also Hollands, S., Wald, R. M. (2015). *Physics Reports*, **574**, 1.
- 2) Birrell, N. D., Davies, P. C. W. (1982). *Quantum Fields in Curved Space* (Cambridge), Chapter 1.
- 3) Penrose, R. (2007). *The Road to Reality: A Complete Guide to the Laws of the Universe* (Vintage), Chapter 32.
- 4) Ref. 2, Chapter 4. See also: Unruh, W. G. (1984). *Phys. Rev. D*, **29**, 1047.
- 5) Fulling, S. A. (1973). *Phys. Rev. D*, **7** (10), 2850. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.7.2850.
- 6) Hawking, S. W. (1975). *Commun. Math. Phys*, **43**, 199 .
- 7) Bernard, C., Duncan, A. (1977). *Ann. Phys. (NY)*, **107**, 201.
- 8) Møller, C. (1962). *Les Theories Relativistes de la Gravitation* (CNRS Paris).
- 9) Rosenfeld, L. (1963). *Nucl. Phys.*, **40**, 353.
- 10) Misner, C., Thorne, K. S., Wheeler, J. A. (1970). *Gravitation* (W. H. Freeman), Chapter 21.
- 11) Ref. 2, Chapter 6.
- 12) Ozváth, I., Schücking, E. (1962). *Recent Developments in General Relativity* (Pergamon), 339.
- !3) But see: Haag, R. (1955). *Mathematisk-fysiske Meddelelser*, **29**, 12. (See also Hall, D: Wightman, A. S. (1957). *Mathematisk-fysiske Meddelelser*, **31**, 1 .)
- 14) Ref. 2, Chapter 4.
- 15) Rindler, W. (1960). *Phys. Rev.*, **119**(6), 2082.

- 16) Broka, C. A. (2019). arXiv:1911.01823.
- 17) Chalmers, D. J., *Consciousness and its Place in Nature*, Sec. 9, in *Philosophy of Mind: Classical and Contemporary Readings* (Oxford, 2002). See also <https://www.tubule.com/watch?v=DIBT6E2GtjA>.
- 18) Ref. 3, Chapter 30.
- 19) Page, D. N., Geilker, C. D. (1981). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **47**, 979.