

Interaction, Evolution, Space and Time in Classical Mechanics and in Quantum Mechanics

Quantizing Time, PI, 18. Jun 2021

Erik Curiel

Munich Center For Mathematical Philosophy
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität

Black Hole Initiative
Harvard University

email: erik@strangebeautiful.com

Gefördert durch die Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) – Projektnummer 312032894, CU 338/1-2. (Funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) – project number 312032894, CU 338/1-2.)

I've never worked on the measurement problem before. It always struck me as too hard. None of the extant "interpretations" of quantum mechanics suffices, to my mind, to deal with it.

Indeed, I've tried my hardest to avoid anything to do with quantum mechanics my entire career. In my gut, I feel that there's something about the idea of "interaction" (superset of "measurement") we're getting fundamentally wrong, as with "simultaneity" before Einstein.

I will draw out and make precise some differences in the mathematical representations of “interaction” and “evolution” in classical mechanics and quantum mechanics, and begin to draw some conceptual lessons from that analysis.

I will not propose a “solution” to the measurement problem, rather a different way of looking at it, trying to approach it—an attempt to reconceptualize what a good answer to it might look like.

in sum, classical (Newtonian and Lagrangian) mechanics:

1. characterizes “interaction” and “evolution” as naturally distinguished mathematically, physically and conceptually by the dynamics alone (and so intrinsic to it)
2. $\Rightarrow$ natural distinction between configuration and momentum
3. $\Rightarrow$ natural characterization of free evolution
4. $\Rightarrow$ construction of (*a priori* relation to) spacetime geometry
5. clean separation of system's degrees of freedom from environment's

in sum, in quantum mechanics:

1. NO natural distinction between interaction and evolution intrinsic to dynamics
2. $\Rightarrow$ NO natural distinction between configuration and momentum
3. $\Rightarrow$ NO natural characterization of free evolution
4. $\Rightarrow$ NO construction of (*a priori* relation to) spacetime geometry
5. NO clean separation of system's degrees of freedom from environment's

Interaction and Evolution in Classical Mechanics

Interaction and Evolution in Quantum Mechanics

Where Does This Leave Us?

classical system

1. space of states $\mathcal{S}$ is even-dimensional manifold
2. evolution governed by Newton's Second Law (family of dynamical vector fields $\mathfrak{D}$)
3. "interaction": applying an "external force" to the system ("intervention")
4. has distinguished "free" evolution ("isolation" = no external force)

Newton's Second Law

free particle

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\mathbf{x}} &= \mathbf{v} \\ \dot{\mathbf{v}} &= \mathbf{0}\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

dynamical vector field has components: $(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{0})$

with interaction turned on (“hit it with a stick”)

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\mathbf{x}} &= \mathbf{v} \\ \dot{\mathbf{v}} &= \mathbf{F}_{\text{stick}}\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

dynamical vector field: $(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{F}_{\text{stick}})$

interaction vector field: $(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{F}_{\text{stick}})$

Definition

A classical system is fully characterized by:

1. *space of states is even-dimensional manifold;*
2. *the family of interaction vector fields $\mathfrak{I}$ has the structure of a vector space;*
3. *the family of dynamical vector fields $\mathfrak{D}$ has the structure of an affine space modeled on $\mathfrak{I}$.*

conceptually, the family of possible interactions allows one to distinguish “configuration” from “velocity” quantities in a principled way:

- interactions directly modify the system’s evolutions only in “velocital directions”, *i.e.*, as generalized “accelerations”
- correlatively, the physical meaning of “configuration” is that those quantities encode the possible interactions the system can have with its environment
- “velocity” quantities are always dynamical derivatives of “configuration” ones (in sense of affine structure on family of dynamical vector fields)
- then: free dynamical vector field distinguished by fact that only configurative quantities change

(one can make this all precise and rigorous, for finite-dimensional systems AND fields with infinite-dimensional spaces of state)

this is what I mean by “classical system”:

1. mathematical and conceptual distinction between “configuration” and “velocity” encoded in the dynamics
2. mathematical and conceptual distinction between “evolution” and “interaction” encoded in the difference between configuration and velocity
3. and so a naturally distinguished “free” evolution

always a clean separation between a system’s degrees of freedom and those of its environment—no matter the interaction, I can determine the system’s evolution without knowing any details about the environment’s degrees of freedom or its evolution: I treat the environment like a black box, everything relevant encoded in interaction vector field

Theorem (Curiel 2019)

The Euclidean geometry of ordinary space, the metrical structure of time, and the flat affine geometry of 4-dimensional Newtonian spacetime is entirely determined by the dynamical structure of a classical system.

in classical mechanics, evolution characterizes time and its geometry, while interaction (including “isolation”) characterizes space and its geometry; both jointly determine the full 4-dimensional flat affine geometry

the distinction between time and space is built in to the structure of the dynamics, as is the geometry of spacetime itself

this all generalizes naturally to Lagrangian mechanics, *not* to Hamiltonian mechanics (Curiel 2014)

Lagrangian mechanics

Theorem (Curiel 2014)

Given classical system with space of states $\mathcal{S}$ and families of vector fields $\mathfrak{D}$ and $\mathfrak{J}$:

- 1. one can reconstruct the system's configuration space $\mathcal{C}$ from $\mathcal{S}$, based on the affine structure of $\mathfrak{D}$;*
- 2. $\mathcal{S}$ is canonically isomorphic to $T\mathcal{C}$ (using the distinguished free dynamical vector field to define the isomorphism);*
- 3. $\mathfrak{D}$ is then isomorphic to the family of vector fields on $T\mathcal{C}$ representing all solutions to the Euler-Lagrange equation ("second-order vector fields", i.e., lifts of vector fields from configuration space to the tangent bundle);*
- 4. $\mathfrak{J}$ is isomorphic to the family of vector fields on $T\mathcal{C}$ representing generalized forces ("vertical vector fields", pointing straight up and down the fibers);*
- 5. in particular, the vertical vector fields have the structure of a vector space, and the second-order vector fields the structure of an affine space modeled on it.*

the geometry of the Euler-Lagrange equation

Theorem (Curiel 2014)

If a manifold $\mathcal{M}$ admits a formulation of the Euler-Lagrange equation, in the sense of having an operator mapping scalar fields to a family of vector fields $\mathfrak{D}$ having the appropriate structure (“integrable, complete almost-tangent structure”), then:

- 1. it is diffeomorphic to a tangent bundle;*
- 2. that operator allows one to construct configuration space $\mathcal{C}$, and to construct a canonical isomorphism between $\mathcal{M}$ and $T\mathcal{C}$ taking $\mathfrak{D}$ to the second-order vector fields;*
- 3. in particular $\mathfrak{D}$ is an affine space modeled on the vector space of vector fields on $\mathcal{M}$ mapped to the vertical vector fields on $T\mathcal{C}$.*

if I know only the space of states as an abstract manifold and how to solve the Euler-Lagrange equation, I can reconstruct **everything else**

⇒ the dynamics by itself automatically defines each of and encodes the difference between “configuration” and “velocity” and, correlatively, between “evolution” and “interaction”, and uniquely determines “isolation” (“free evolution”)

Interaction and Evolution in Classical Mechanics

Interaction and Evolution in Quantum Mechanics

Where Does This Leave Us?

1. dynamical vector fields (“evolutions”) are unitary flows on Hilbert space
2. unitary flows are exponentiated Hamiltonians (self-adjoint operators)
3. “interaction” is just adding another Hamiltonian
4. only fixed relation between “configuration” and “momentum” is canonical commutation relation

$$[Q, P] = i\hbar I$$

if I give you a Hilbert space and its family of self-adjoint operators, *i.e.*, the dynamics:

1. you can't distinguish interactions from evolutions ("external interventions" such as measurements)
2. you can't tell me what's configuration and what's momentum
3. you can't tell what is free evolution ("isolation")
4. indeed, even if I give you a "standard" Hamiltonian in some funky basis, and ask you to decompose it into its "free" part and its "interaction" part, you won't be able to do it

I need an explicit representation both of degrees of freedom of the environment, and their inter-twining with those of the system, in order to appropriately and adequately treat the system “during an interaction”. More specifically, I need:

1. *to change the space of states I use to treat the system*, now the tensor product of its “isolated” Hilbert space with that of the environment;
2. to change its set of physical quantities, now the algebra of observables on the tensor-product Hilbert space;
3. to change the structure of the quantities encoding evolution, now Hamiltonians on the tensor-product.

That most quantum of quantum mechanical phenomena has now made its entrance, *entanglement*.

$\implies$ no clean separation in quantum mechanics
between a system's degrees of freedom and those of
its environment

if I want to understand how a system evolves under interaction
with the environment, I have to know how to model the
environment's degrees of freedom and dynamics

How do we distinguish the Q s and the P s in quantum mechanics, and so define a “free” evolution? Two ways:

1. by fiat
2. introduce representation of Poincaré or Galileian group *à la* Wigner, and define Q as the generator of momentum translations, *etc.*

In both cases, we must explicitly and by hand hook the dynamics up to the background spacetime structure to get a principled distinction between configuration and momentum, and so define “free” and “interacting”

we don't get it from the dynamics alone
as in classical mechanics

Interaction and Evolution in Classical Mechanics

Interaction and Evolution in Quantum Mechanics

Where Does This Leave Us?

possible responses

1. modify quantum mechanics/look for interpretation that makes difference between “evolution” and “interaction” clear, as in classical mechanics—this is, implicitly, most common approach in most popular “interpretations” (many worlds with preferred basis, Bohm, GRW, . . . —but information-theoretic approaches?)
2. reconceptualize “interaction” in quantum mechanics so as to accord with these facts
3. get rid of the distinction between evolution and interaction altogether, and reconceptualize “dynamics”

(1) smells wrong to me—it doesn't take quantum mechanics seriously enough—like Einstein picking a preferred frame rather than reconceiving simultaneity

(2) may still be too conservative, given the experimental and mathematical facts

I'll briefly suggest points of contact between my observations and arguments and some quantum frameworks that may be along the lines of (3)

connection to indefinite causal orders *à la* Hardy's causaloid framework and Brukner *et al.*'s process matrix formalism?

conjectures:

1. configuration and momentum are not naturally and univocally distinguished by the dynamics, because different causal orders require different momentum operators, to respect the different null cones
2. one way to interpret a process matrix: as a fixing of the P s and Q s in the output Hilbert space

similarities, points of contact with Rovelli's relational quantum mechanics:

1. “properties of systems” refer to *interactions*, not to systems *simpliciter*
2. “all evolution is *relational*”, i.e., “evolution” is the *same thing* as “interaction”