The certainty principle II Proof of the uncertainty principle

D.A.Arbatsky

March, 2006

A bstract

A more detailed derivation of the Heisenberg uncertainty principle from the certainty principle is given.

Introductory rem arks. After publication of the paper [1] I received many letters, including those with references. In this connection, I think it is necessary to specify the following:

- 1. The metric introduced by me (\quantum angle") is known to mathematicians from 1904 as Fubini-Study metric.
- 2. The correct \uncertainty relation" (in fact, certainty relation) for the quantities energy time was rst suggested by M and elshtam and Tamm [2].
- 3. M and elsh tam and Tamm studied a quantum system in the Schrodinger representation and did not use group theory methods. For this reason they could not understand that their result has more general character.
- 4. In contrast, I used group theory formulations. And implied that the system can be studied, in particular, in the representation of relativistic canonical quantization [4]. This allowed me to formulate the certainty principle and to suggest more general inequalities.

Some of my critics refused to believe that the Heisenberg uncertainty principle is really a consequence of the certainty principle. They claimed that \this can not be so, because this can never be so".

N evertheless, this is so. And here I give a more detailed explanation.

Derivation of the uncertainty principle. Suppose that for a given quantum system we succeeded to not some observable X, that can be considered in some sense a \coordinate operator".

Suppose that X is a self-adjoint operator w ith continuous spectrum, X = X. Let us denote $_{(a;b)}$ its spectral projector for an arbitrary real interval (a;b).

Suppose also that we have a self-adjoint operator P, P = P, such that for any a, b and x we have equality:

$$e^{+ i \times P} = (a + x; b + x) e^{- i \times P} = (a; b)$$
;

i.e. P is a \generator of spectral shifts" for X . As we know, such an operator is usually an operator of m om entum .

Suppose now that the system is in state i, hji = 1.

The quantity h $_{(a;b)}$ i, obviously, de nes the probability to nd the system inside the interval (a;b). Let us de ne such 1 and r, that

$$h_{(1;1)} i = h_{(r;+1)} i = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} p_{1 - \infty s^{2} 1}$$
 0;07926:::

http://daarb.narod.ru/, http://wave.front.ru/

¹R oughly speaking, spectral projector is an operator nullifying wave function in X—representation outside of the given interval.

It is easy to see, that 1 and r exist². So, the quantity $_{i}X = r$ 1 can be naturally called \uncertainty" of the coordinate X.

Theorem. The following inequality takes place (the uncertainty principle):

$$_{i}X \quad _{i}P > \sim \tag{1}$$

In order to prove this theorem let us rst estimate the scalar product of the vector i and the shifted vector $e^{i_{i}X}$ $P=\sim i$:

Here, coming from the fih to the sixth line, we estimated both terms by the Cauchy-Bunyakovsky-Schwarz inequality.

So, for the quantum angle between the initial and the shifted vectors we have estimation:

\
$$i;e^{i_iXP=\sim}i > 1:$$

But it means that under the action of $e^{i_{i}X}$ P= the vector i changes substantially [1].

Applying the certainty principle [1], we directly get (1).

D iscussion. Historically, it stacked up so [5] that now in all textbooks the Heisenberg uncertainty principle is illustrated with the help of the Kennard inequality,

$$_{i}X$$
 $_{i}P > \frac{\sim}{2}$;

which is not identical with (1). Its undoubted virtue is that its proof is easier to understand for a person, who just starts to study quantum mechanics. Nevertheless, I believe that (1) is more fundamental.

A cknow ledgem ents. In closing I want to thank T.A.Bolokhov, A.V.Ossipov, E.V.Aksyonova, A.Yu.Toschevikova, A.K.Leyn, M.Gatti, A.K.Pati, and P.Enders for helpful discussions, references and help in procuring literature.

R eferences

[1] D.A.Arbatsky \The certainty principle" (2005),
http://daarb.narod.ru/tcp-eng.html, http://wave.front.ru/tcp-eng.html, arX iv quant-ph/0506165.
Rus.: D.A.Arbatsky "Printsip opredelyonnosti\" (2005),
http://daarb.narod.ru/tcp-rus.html, http://wave.front.ru/tcp-rus.html, arX iv quant-ph/0506165.]

 $^{^2}$ But, generally speaking, they are not unique. In order to elim inate this non-uniqueness, it is convenient to choose 1 m aximum of the possible, and r | m inimum. Then the distance r 1 will be m inimum.

- [2] L.I.M andelshtam, I.E. Tam m, The uncertainty relation between energy and time in nonrelativistic quantum mechanics", J.Phys. (USSR) 9,249-254 (1945).

 [Rus.: L.I.M andelshtam, I.E. Tam m "Sootnoshenie neopredelyonnosti energiya-vrem ya v nerelyativistskoy kvantovoy mekhanike, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR (ser. z.) 9,122-128 (1945), in [3], p.306-315.]
- [3] L.I.M andelshtam, Polnoe sobranie trudov, v.2, M.-L. (1947).
- [4] D.A.Arbatsky \W hat is \relativistic canonical quantization"?" (2005),

 http://daarb.narod.ru/wircq-eng.html, http://wave.front.ru/wircq-eng.html, arX iv m ath-ph/0503029.

 Rus.: D.A.Arbatsky "Chto takoe "relyativistskoe kanonicheskoe kvantovanie\?\ (2005),

 http://daarb.narod.ru/wircq-rus.html, http://wave.front.ru/wircq-rus.html, arX iv m ath-ph/0503029.]
- [5] J.H ilgevoord, J.U nk \The uncertainty principle", in The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy, ed.E.N.Zalta (2001), http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/w in 2001/entries/qt-uncertainty/.