Why de Broglie-Bohm theory is probably wrong

Shan Gao
Unit for History and Philosophy of Science
& Centre for Time, SOPHI, University of Sydney
Email: sgao7319@uni.sydney.edu.au

2010-6-25, Version 1.4

We investigate the validity of the field explanation of the wave function by analyzing the mass and charge density distributions of a quantum system. It is argued that a charged quantum system has effective mass and charge density distributing in space, proportional to the square of the absolute value of its wave function. This is also a consequence of protective measurement. If the wave function is a physical field, then the mass and charge density will be distributed in space simultaneously for a charged quantum system, and thus there will exist a remarkable electrostatic self-interaction of its wave function, though the gravitational self-interaction is too weak to be detected presently. This not only violates the superposition principle of quantum mechanics but also contradicts experimental observations. Thus we conclude that the wave function cannot be a description of a physical field. In the second part of this paper, we further analyze the implications of these results for the main realistic interpretations of quantum mechanics, especially for de Broglie-Bohm theory. It has been argued that de Broglie-Bohm theory gives the same predictions as quantum mechanics by means of quantum equilibrium hypothesis. However, this equivalence is based on the premise that the wave function, regarded as a Ψ-field, has no mass and charge density distributions, which turns out to be wrong according to the above results. For a charged quantum system, both Ψ-field and Bohmian particle have charge density distribution. This then results in the existence of an electrostatic self-interaction of the field and an electromagnetic interaction between the field and Bohmian particle, which is consistent with neither the predictions of quantum mechanics nor experimental observations. Therefore, de Broglie-Bohm theory as a realistic interpretation of quantum mechanics is probably wrong. Lastly, we suggest that the wave function is a description of some sort of ergodic motion (e.g. random discontinuous motion) of particles, and we also briefly analyze the implications of this suggestion for other realistic interpretations of quantum mechanics including many-worlds interpretation and dynamical collapse theories.

Key words: wave function; de Broglie-Bohm theory; Ψ-field; mass and charge density; protective measurement; ergodic motion of particles; many-worlds interpretation; dynamical collapse theories

1. Introduction

De Broglie-Bohm theory is an ontological interpretation of quantum mechanics initially proposed by de Broglie and later developed by Bohm (de Broglie 1928; Bohm 1952)[1]. According to the theory, a complete realistic description of a quantum system is provided by the configuration defined by the positions of its particles together with its wave function. Although the de Broglie-Bohm theory is mathematically equivalent to standard quantum theory, there is no clear consensus with regard to its physical interpretation. In particular, the interpretation of the wave function in this theory is still in hot debate even today. The wave function is generally taken as an objective physical field called Ψ-field[2]. As stressed by Bell (1981): "No one can understand this theory until he is willing to think of Ψ as a real objective field rather than just a probability amplitude". However, there are various views on exactly what field the wave function is. It has been regarded as a field similar to electromagnetic field (Bohm 1952), an active information field (Bohm and Hiley 1993), a field carrying energy and momentum (Holland 1993), and a causal agent more abstract than ordinary fields (Valentini 1997) etc.

In this paper, we will examine the validity of the field explanation of the wave function by analyzing the mass and charge density distribution of a quantum system. First, it is argued that a quantum system with mass *m* and charge *Q*, which is described by the wave function $\psi(x,t)$, has effective mass and charge density distributions $m|\psi(x,t)|^2$ and $Q|\psi(x,t)|^2$ in space respectively. This result is also a consequence of protective measurement. Moreover, we argue that the field explanation of the wave function entails the existence of electrostatic self-interaction for the wave function of a charged quantum system, as the charge density will be distributed in space *simultaneously* for a physical field. This not only violates the superposition principle of quantum mechanics but also contradicts experimental observations. Thus we conclude that the wave function cannot be a description of a physical field. Next, we investigate the implications of these results for de Broglie-Bohm theory. To begin with, since the wave function is not a physical field, taking it as a Ψ-field is improper. For a charged quantum system the remarkable electrostatic self-interaction of the field contradicts experimental observations. Thus the Ψ-field assumed in de Broglie-Bohm theory cannot exist in the actual world. Secondly, the assumed Bohmian particles cannot be real either. Inasmuch as the wave function has charge density distribution in space for a charged quantum system, there will exist an equally remarkable electromagnetic interaction between it and the Bohmian particles. This also contradicts the predictions of quantum mechanics and experimental observations. As a result, de Broglie-Bohm theory as a realistic interpretation of quantum mechanics is probably wrong. Lastly, we further suggest that the wave function is a description of some sort of ergodic motion (e.g. random discontinuous motion) of particles, and we also briefly discuss the implications of this suggestion for other realistic interpretations of quantum mechanics including many-worlds interpretation and dynamical collapse theories.

---

1 Among other differences, de Broglie's dynamics is first order while Bohm's dynamics is second order.

2 It should be pointed out that the wave function is also regarded as nomological, e.g. a component of physical law rather than of the reality described by the law (Dürr, Goldstein and Zanghì 1997; Goldstein and Teufel 2001). We will not discuss this view in this paper. But it might be worth noting that this non-field view may have serious drawbacks when considering the contingency of the wave function (see, e.g. Valentini 2009), and the results obtained in this paper seemingly disfavor this view too.

2. How do mass and charge distribute for a single quantum system?

The mass and charge of a charged classical system always localize in a definite position in space at each moment. For a charged quantum system described by the wave function $\psi(x,t)$, how do its mass and charge distribute in space then? We can measure the total mass and charge of the quantum system and find them in some region of space. Thus the mass and charge of a quantum system must also exist in space with a certain distributions if assuming a realistic view. Although the mass and charge distributions of a single quantum system seem meaningless according to the orthodox probability interpretation of the wave function, it should have a physical meaning in a realistic interpretation of the wave function such as de Broglie-Bohm theory[3].

As we think, the Schrödinger equation of a charged quantum system under an external electromagnetic potential already provides an important clue. The equation is

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\psi(x,t)}{\partial t}=\left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\left(\nabla-\frac{iQ}{\hbar c}A\right)^2+Q\varphi+V\right]\psi(x,t) \tag{1}$$

where m and Q is respectively the mass and charge of the system, φ and A are the electromagnetic potential, V is an external potential, $\hbar$ is Planck's constant divided by 2π, c is the speed of light. The electrostatic interaction term $Q\varphi\psi(x,t)$ in the equation seems to indicate that the charge of the quantum system distributes throughout the whole region where its wave function $\psi(x,t)$ is not zero. If the charge does not distribute in some regions where the wave function is nonzero, then there will not exist any electrostatic interaction there. But the term $Q\varphi\psi(x,t)$ implies that there exists an electrostatic interaction in all regions where the wave function is nonzero. Thus it seems that the charge of the quantum system should distribute throughout the whole region where its wave function is not zero. Furthermore, since the integral $\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}Q|\psi(x,t)|^2dx$ is the total charge of the system, the charge density distribution in space will be $Q|\psi(x,t)|^2$. Similarly, the mass density can be obtained from the Schrödinger equation of a quantum system with mass m under an external gravitational potential V_G:

[3] Unfortunately it seems that the orthodox probability interpretation of the wave function still influences people's mind even if they already accept a realistic interpretation of the wave function. One obvious example is that few people admit that the realistic wave function has energy density (Holland (1993) is a notable exception). If the wave function has no energy, then it seems very difficult to regard it as physically real. Even if Bohm interpreted the Ψ-field as "active information", he also admitted that the field has energy, though very little (Bohm and Hiley 1993). Once one admits that the wave function has energy density, then it seems natural to endow it with mass and charge density, which are two common sources of energy density.

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\psi(x,t)}{\partial t}=\left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\nabla^2+mV_G+V\right]\psi(x,t) \qquad (2)$$

The gravitational interaction term $mV_G\psi(x,t)$ in the equation also indicates that the (passive gravitational) mass of the quantum system distributes throughout the whole region where its wave function $\psi(x,t)$ is not zero, and the mass density distribution in space is $m|\psi(x,t)|^2$.

The above result can be more readily understood when the wave function is a complete realistic description of a single quantum system as in many-worlds interpretation and dynamical collapse theories. If the mass and charge of a quantum system does not distribute as above in terms of its wave function $\psi(x,t)$, then other supplement quantities will be needed to describe the mass and charge distributions of the system in space, while this obviously contradicts the premise that the wave function is a complete description. In fact, the dynamical collapse theories such as GRW theory already admit the existence of mass density (Ghirardi, Grassi and Benatti 1995).

In addition, even in de Broglie-Bohm theory, which takes the wave function as an incomplete description and admits supplement hidden variables (i.e. the trajectories of Bohmian particles accompanying the wave function), there are also some arguments for the above mass and charge density explanation (Holland 1993; Brown, Dewdney and Horton 1995). It was argued that since the Ψ-field depends on the parameters such as mass and charge, it may be said to be massive and charged (Holland 1993, p.79). Brown, Dewdney and Horton (1995), by examining a series of effects in neutron interferometry, argued that properties sometimes attributed to the "particle" aspect of a neutron, e.g., mass and magnetic moment, cannot straightforwardly be regarded as localized at the hypothetical position of the particle in Bohm's theory. They also argued that it is hard to understand how the Aharonov-Bohm effect is possible if that the charge of the electron which couples with the electromagnetic vector-potential is not co-present in the regions on all sides of the confined magnetic field accessible to the electron (Brown, Dewdney and Horton 1995, p.332).

One may object that de Broglie-Bohm theory and many-worlds interpretation seemingly never admit the above mass density explanation, and no existing interpretation of quantum mechanics including dynamical collapse theories endows charge density to the wave function either. As we think, however, protective measurement provides a more convincing argument for the existence of mass and charge density distributions[4]. The wave function of a single quantum system, especially its mass and charge density, can be directly measured by protective measurement. Therefore, a realistic interpretation of quantum mechanics should admit the mass and charge density explanation in some way; if it cannot, then it will be at least problematic concerning its explanation of the wave function.

[4] It is very strange for the author that most supporters of a realistic interpretation of quantum mechanics ignore protective measurement and its implications. Admittedly there have been some controversies about the meaning of protective measurement, but the debate mainly centers on the reality of the wave function. If one insists on a realistic interpretation of quantum mechanics such as de Broglie-Bohm theory, then the debate will be mostly irrelevant and protective measurement will have strict restrictions on the realistic interpretation.

3. Protective measurement and its answer

In this section, we will give a brief introduction of protective measurement and its implication for the existence of mass and charge density distributions. Different from the conventional measurement, protective measurement aims at measuring the wave function of a single quantum system by repeated measurements that do not destroy its state. The general method is to let the measured system be in a non-degenerate eigenstate of the whole Hamiltonian using a suitable interaction, and then make the measurement adiabatically so that the wave function of the system neither changes nor becomes entangled with the measuring device appreciably. The suitable interaction is called the protection.

As a typical example of protective measurement (Aharonov, Anandan and Vaidman 1993; Aharonov, Anandan and Vaidman 1996), we consider a quantum system in a discrete nondegenerate energy eigenstate $\psi(x)$. The protection is natural for this situation, and no additional protective interaction is needed. The interaction Hamiltonian for measuring the value of an observable A in the state is:

$$H_I = g(t)PA \tag{3}$$

where *P* denotes the momentum of the pointer of the measuring device, which initial state is taken to be a Gaussian wave packet centered around zero. The time-dependent coupling $g(t)$ is normalized to $\int_0^T g(t)dt = 1$, where T is the total measuring time. In conventional von Neumann measurements, the interaction H_I is of short duration and so strong that it dominates the rest of the Hamiltonian (i.e. the effect of the free Hamiltonians of the measuring device and the system can be neglected). As a result, the time evolution $\exp(-iPA/\hbar)$ will lead to an entangled state: eigenstates of A with eigenvalues a_i are entangled with measuring device states in which the pointer is shifted by these values a_i. Due to the collapse of the wave function, the measurement result can only be one of the eigenvalues of observable A, say a_i, with a certain probability p_i. The expectation value of A is then obtained as the statistical average of eigenvalues for an ensemble of identical systems, namely $<A>=\sum_i p_i a_i$. By contrast, protective measurements are extremely slow measurements. We let $g(t) = 1/T$ for most of the time *T* and assume that $g(t)$ goes to zero gradually before and after the period *T*. In the limit $T \to \infty$, we can obtain an adiabatic process in which the system cannot make a transition from one energy eigenstate to another, and the interaction Hamiltonian does not change the energy eigenstate. As a result, the corresponding time evolution $\exp(-iP<A>/\hbar)$ shifts the pointer by the expectation value $<A>$. This result strongly contrasts with the conventional measurement in which the pointer shifts by one of the eigenvalues of *A*.

It should be stressed that $T \to \infty$ is only an ideal situation[5], and a protective measurement can never be performed on a single quantum system with absolute certainty because of the tiny unavoidable entanglement (see also Dass and Qureshi 1999)[6]. For example, for any given values of *P* and *T*, the energy shift of the above eigenstate, given by first-order perturbation theory, is

$$\delta E = <H_I> = \frac{<A>P}{T} \tag{4}$$

Correspondingly, we can only obtain the exact expectation value $<A>$ with a probability very close to one, and the measurement result can also be the expectation value $<A>_\perp$, with a probability proportional to $1/T^2$, where $\perp$ refers to the normalized state in the subspace normal to the initial state $\psi(x)$ as picked out by first-order perturbation theory (Dass and Qureshi 1999). Therefore, an ensemble, which may be considerably small, is still needed for protective measurements.

Although a protective measurement can never be performed on a single quantum system with absolute certainty, the measurement is distinct from the standard one: in no stage of the measurement we obtain the eigenvalues of the measured variable. Each system in the small ensemble contributes the shift of the pointer proportional not to one of the eigenvalues, but to the expectation value. This essential novel point has been repeatedly stressed by the inventors of protective measurement (see, e.g. Aharonov, Anandan and Vaidman 1996). As we know, in the orthodox interpretation of quantum mechanics, the expectation values of variables are not considered as physical properties of a single system, as only one of the eigenvalues is observed in the outcome of the standard measuring procedure and the expectation value can only be defined as a statistical average of the eigenvalues. However, for protective measurements, we obtain the expectation value directly for a single system and not as a statistical average of eigenvalues for an ensemble. Since the expectation value of a variable can be directly measured for a single system, it must be a physical characteristic of a single system, not of an ensemble (e.g. as a statistical average of eigenvalues). This is a definite conclusion we can reach by the analysis of protective measurement.

In the following we will show that the mass and charge density can be measured by protective measurement as expectation values of certain variable for a single quantum system, and thus it is the physical property of the system (Aharonov and Vaidman 1993). Consider again a quantum system in a discrete nondegenerate energy eigenstate $\psi(x)$. The interaction Hamiltonian for measuring the value of an observable A_n in the state assumes the same form as

---

[5] Note that the spreading of the wave packet of the pointer also puts a limit on the time of the interaction (Dass and Qureshi 1999).

[6] It can be argued that only observables that commute with the system's Hamiltonian can be protectively measured with absolute certainty for a single system (see e.g. Rovelli 1994; Uffink 1999).

Eq. (3):

$$H_I = g(t)PA_n \tag{5}$$

where A_n is a normalized projection operator on small regions V_n having volume v_n, which can be written as follows:

$$A_n = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{v_n}, & x \in V_n \\ 0, & x \notin V_n \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

Then a protective measurement of A_n will yield the following result:

$$\langle A_n \rangle = \frac{1}{v_n} \int_{V_n} |\psi(x)|^2 dv = |\psi_n|^2 \tag{7}$$

It is the average of the density $|\psi(x)|^2$ over the small region V_n. When $v_n \to 0$ and after performing measurements in sufficiently many regions V_n we can find the whole density distribution $|\psi(x)|^2$ [7]. For a charged system with charge Q the density $|\psi(x)|^2$ times the charge yields the effective charge density $Q|\psi(x)|^2$. In particular, an appropriate adiabatic measurement of the Gauss flux out of a certain region will yield the value of the total charge inside this region, namely the integral of the effective charge density $Q|\psi(x)|^2$ over this region (Aharonov and Vaidman 1993; Aharonov, Anandan and Vaidman 1996). Similarly, we can measure the effective mass density of the system in principle by an appropriate adiabatic measurement of the flux of its gravitational field. Therefore, protective measurement shows that the mass and charge of a single quantum system described by the wave function $\psi(x)$ is indeed distributed throughout space with effective mass density $m|\psi(x)|^2$ and effective charge density $Q|\psi(x)|^2$ respectively.

Although protective measurement strongly suggests a realistic interpretation of the wave function, it does not directly tell us what the wave function is. There are two possible ways to explain the wave function in a realistic way. One view is to take the wave function of a single quantum system as a physical entity simultaneously distributing in space like a field. This view is assumed by de Broglie-Bohm theory, many-worlds interpretation and dynamical collapse theories

[7] This means that protective measurement can measure the density of the Ψ-field or pilot wave in the context of Bohm's theory, and it is a way of measuring the effect of the pilot wave without involving the Bohmian particle itself (see also Drezet 2006).

etc[8], and it is also supported by the inventors of protective measurement (Aharonov and Vaidman 1993)[9]. The other view is to take the wave function of a single quantum system as a description of some kind of ergodic motion of a particle (or corpuscle). This view is assumed by stochastic interpretation etc, and it was also discussed but rejected by Aharonov and Vaidman (1993). The essential difference between a field and the ergodic motion of a particle lies in the property of simultaneity. The field exists throughout space *simultaneously*, whereas the ergodic motion of a particle exists throughout space in a time-divided way. The particle is still in one position at any instant, and it is only during a time interval that the ergodic motion of the particle spreads throughout space. As we will see in the next section, these two explanations of the wave function can be distinguished by further analyzing the mass and charge density distributions of a single quantum system, and the former has already been refuted by experimental observations.

4. Why the wave function is not a physical field

Now we will investigate the implications of the existence of mass and charge density for the field explanation of the wave function[10]. For the sake of simplicity, we will restrict our discussions to the wave function of a single quantum system. The conclusion can be readily extended to many-body systems[11].

If the wave function is a physical field, then its mass and charge density will simultaneously distribute in space. This has two disaster results at least. One is that charge will not be quantized; the total charge inside a very small region can be much smaller than a basic charge for a single quantum system. This obviously contradicts the common expectation that charge should be quantized. But maybe our expectation needs to be revised. So this result is not fatal for the field explanation of the wave function. The other is that the wave function will not satisfy the superposition principle. For example, for the wave function of a single electron, different spatial parts of the wave function will have gravitational and electrostatic interactions, as these parts have mass and charge *simultaneously*.

Let's analyze the second result in more detail. Interestingly, the so-called Schrödinger-Newton equation, which was proposed for other purposes (Diosi 1984; Penrose 1998), just describes the gravitational self-interaction of the wave function. The equation for a single quantum system can be written as

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\psi(x,t)}{\partial t}=-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\frac{\partial^2\psi(x,t)}{\partial^2 x}-Gm^2\int\frac{|\psi(x',t)|^2}{|x-x'|}d^3x'\,\psi(x,t)+V\psi(x,t) \qquad (8)$$

where m is the mass of the quantum system, V is an external potential, and G is Newton's gravitational constant. Much work has been done to study the mathematical properties of this interesting equation (see, e.g. Harrison, Moroz and Tod 2003; Moroz and Tod 1999; Salzman

[8] According to Everett (1957), "the wave function is taken as the basic physical entity with *no a priori interpretation*", and "observers and object systems…They all are represented in a *single* structure, the field".

[9] Note that protective measurement itself does not entail the field explanation, and it just shows that there is some sort of mass and charge density distributing in space. The density may result from a physical field or the ergodic motion of a particle. As we think, it seems that the existence of some observables such as position in quantum mechanics already suggests the particle explanation. A field has no position property. Thus the expectation value of a variable must be a physical characteristic of the motion of a particle, not that of a field.

[10] For recent objections to the wave function ontology, see Monton (2002, 2006) and Wallace and Timpson (2009).

[11] It has been widely acknowledged that for many-body systems the wave functions living on configuration space can hardly be considered as real physical fields. Here we will show that even the wave function of a single quantum system, which lives on real space, cannot be regarded as a physical field either.

2005). Some experimental schemes have been also proposed to test its physical validity (Salzman and Carlip 2006). As we will see, although such gravitational self-interactions cannot yet be excluded by experiments[12], the existence of electrostatic self-interaction already contradicts experimental observations.

If there is also an electrostatic self-interaction, then the equation for a free quantum system with mass *m* and charge *Q* will be

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\psi(x,t)}{\partial t}=-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\frac{\partial^2\psi(x,t)}{\partial^2 x}+(kQ^2-Gm^2)\int\frac{|\psi(x',t)|^2}{|x-x'|}d^3x'\,\psi(x,t) \qquad (9)$$

where *k* is the Coulomb constant. Note that the gravitational self-interaction is an attractive force, while the electrostatic self-interaction is a repulsive force. It has been shown that the measure of the potential strength of a gravitational self-interaction is $\varepsilon^2=\left(\frac{4Gm^2}{\hbar c}\right)^2$ for a free particle with mass *m* (Salzman 2005). This quantity represents the strength of the influence of self-interaction on the normal evolution of the wave function; when $\varepsilon^2\approx 1$ the influence will be significant. Similarly, for a free charged particle with charge *Q*, the measure of the potential strength of the electrostatic self-interaction is $\varepsilon^2=\left(\frac{4kQ^2}{\hbar c}\right)^2$. As a typical example, for a free electron with charge *e*, the potential strength of the electrostatic self-interaction will be $\varepsilon^2=\left(\frac{4ke^2}{\hbar c}\right)^2\approx 1\times 10^{-3}$. This indicates that the electrostatic self-interaction will have significant influence on the evolution of the wave function of a free electron. If such an interaction indeed exists, it should have been detected by precise experiments on charged microscopic particles. As another example, consider the electron in the hydrogen atom. Since the potential of its electrostatic self-interaction is of the same order as the Coulomb potential produced by the nucleus, the energy levels of hydrogen atoms will be significantly different from those predicted by quantum mechanics and confirmed by experimental observations. Therefore, the electrostatic self-interaction cannot exist for the wave function of a charged quantum system. Since the field explanation of the wave function entails the existence of such electrostatic self-interactions, it cannot be right, i.e. the wave function cannot be a description of a physical field.

One may object to the above argument with the example of classical electromagnetic field. Electromagnetic field is a field, but it has no self-interaction. Thus a field does not require the

[12] It has been argued that the existence of a self-interaction term in the Schrödinger-Newton equation does not have a consistent Born rule interpretation (Adler 2007). The reason is that the probability of simultaneously finding a particle in different positions is zero. However, in a realistic interpretation of quantum mechanics where the wave function is regarded as a real physical entity rather than as a mere probability amplitude, the existence of gravitational self-interaction term seems quite natural. For example, the field interpretation can be consistent with conventional quantum measurement via a dynamical collapse process. As we think, one convincing objection is that if there is a self-gravitational interaction for the wave function of a charged particle, then there will also exist an electrostatic self-interaction because the charge density always accompanies the mass density, while the existence of electrostatic self-interaction is already inconsistent with experimental observations (see below). If this objection is valid, then the Schrödinger-Newton equation will be wrong, and moreover, the approach of semiclassical gravity will also be excluded (cf. Salzman and Carlip 2006).

existence of self-interaction. However, this is a common misunderstanding. The crux of the matter is that the non-existence of electromagnetic self-interaction results from the fact that electromagnetic field itself has no charge. If the electromagnetic field had charge, then there would also exist electromagnetic self-interaction due to the nature of field, namely the simultaneous existence of its properties in space. In fact, although electromagnetic field has no electromagnetic self-interaction, it does have gravitational self-interaction; the simultaneous existence of energy densities in different spatial locations for an electromagnetic field must generate a gravitational interaction, though the interaction is too weak to be detected by current technology.

One may further object that the superposition principle in quantum mechanics already prohibits the existence of the above self-interactions. But this is just the key point we use to argue against the field explanation of the wave function. Let's state the argument more explicitly. If the wave function of a charged quantum system is a physical field, then the different spatial parts of this field will have gravitational and electrostatic interactions. But the superposition principle in quantum mechanics, which has been verified within astonishing precision, does not permit the existence of such remarkable self-interactions. Therefore, the field explanation of the wave function is already refuted by the superposition principle of quantum mechanics. Even if the superposition principle may be violated when considering gravity (see, e.g. Penrose 1996)[13], it does hold true for electromagnetic interaction. There is precise experimental verification for the latter. Thus we conclude that the wave function cannot be a physical field.

5. Neither Ψ-field nor Bohmian particle is real

In the following we will investigate the implications of the above results for de Broglie-Bohm theory. The theory assumes the realistic existence of both Ψ-field and Bohmian particles. As we will argue below, however, these two kinds of assumed entities cannot be real according to the above results.

To begin with, since the wave function is not a physical field, taking it as a Ψ-field is improper. For a charged quantum system the remarkable electrostatic self-interaction of the field contradicts experimental observations. Thus the Ψ-field assumed in de Broglie-Bohm theory cannot exist in the actual world. Secondly, the assumed Bohmian particles cannot be real either. Inasmuch as the wave function has charge density distribution in space for a charged quantum system, there will exist an equally remarkable electromagnetic interaction between it and the Bohmian particles. This is also inconsistent with the predictions of quantum mechanics and experimental observations.

It has been argued that de Broglie-Bohm theory gives the precisely same predictions as quantum mechanics by means of quantum equilibrium hypothesis. Concretely speaking, the quantum equilibrium hypothesis provides the initial conditions for the guidance equation which make de Broglie-Bohm theory obey Born's rule in terms of position distributions. Moreover, since all measurements can be finally expressed in terms of position, e.g. pointer positions, this amounts to full accordance with all predictions of quantum mechanics. However, this equivalence is based

---

[13] Note that even if there is such a violation, its cause is probably not the self-gravitational interaction. The reason is that if there is a self-gravitational interaction for the wave function of a charged quantum system, then there will also exist an electrostatic self-interaction because the charge always accompanies the mass, while the existence of electrostatic self-interaction is already inconsistent with experimental observations.

on the premise that Ψ-field has no mass and charge density distributions. If the wave function has mass and charge density distributions as we have argued above, taking it as a Ψ-field will lead to some predictions (e.g. the existence of electrostatic self-interaction) that contradict both quantum mechanics and experimental observations.

Certainly, one can eliminate the electromagnetic interaction between the Ψ-field and Bohmian particles by depriving the Bohmian particles of mass and charge. But they will be not real particles any more. Then in what sense the de Broglie-Bohm theory provides a *realistic interpretation* of quantum mechanics? One may also want to deprive the Ψ-field of mass and charge density to eliminate the electrostatic self-interaction. But, on the one hand, the theory will break its physical connection with quantum mechanics, as the wave function in quantum mechanics has mass and charge density according to our analysis, and on the other hand, since protective measurement can measure the mass and charge density for a single quantum system, the theory will be unable to *explain* the measurement results either. Although de Broglie-Bohm theory can still exist in this way as a mathematical tool for experimental prediction (somewhat like the orthodox interpretation it tries to replace), it obviously departs from the initial expectations of de Broglie and Bohm, and in fact it already fails as a physical theory because of losing its explanation ability.

To sum up, the two realities assumed in de Broglie-Bohm theory, namely Ψ-field and Bohmian particles, are not real. Thus the theory as a realistic interpretation of quantum mechanics will naturally collapse. The basic reason is that de Broglie-Bohm theory improperly interprets the wave function as a Ψ-field, and moreover, it makes the situation worse by adding the Bohmian particles. In the next section, we will further investigate the physical meaning of the wave function and its implications for other realistic interpretations of quantum mechanics.

6. Further discussions

If the wave function is not a description of physical field as de Broglie-Bohm theory assumes, then exactly what does the wave function describe? There is already an important clue. It is that the superposition principle in quantum mechanics permits no existence of the self-interaction of the wave function in real space for a single quantum system. This indicates that the mass and charge density do not exist in different regions *simultaneously*. How is this possible? It naturally leads us to the second view referred to in Section 3, which takes the wave function as a description of some kind of ergodic motion of a particle. On this view, the effective mass and charge density are formed by time average of the motion of a charged particle, and they distribute in different locations at different moments. In other words, the mass and charge density exists in a time division way. At any instant, there is only a localized particle with mass and charge. Thus there will not exist any self-interaction for the wave function.

There are indeed some realistic interpretations of quantum mechanics that attempt to explain the wave function in terms of some sort of ergodic motion of particles. A well-known example is the stochastic interpretation of quantum mechanics (e.g. Nelson 1966). Nelson (1966) derived the Schrödinger equation from Newtonian mechanics via the hypothesis that every particle of mass m is subject to a Brownian motion with diffusion coefficient $\hbar/2m$ and no friction. In more technical terms, the quantum mechanical process is claimed to be equivalent to a classical Markovian diffusion process. On this interpretation, particles have continuous trajectories but no velocities, and the wave function is a statistical average description of their motion. However, it has been pointed out that the classical stochastic interpretations are inconsistent with quantum mechanics (Glabert, Hänggi and Talkner 1979; Wallstrom 1994). Glabert, Hänggi and Talkner (1979) argued that the Schrödinger equation is not equivalent to a Markovian process, and the various correlation functions used in quantum mechanics do not have the properties of the correlations of a classical stochastic process. Wallstrom (1994) further showed that one must add by hand a quantization condition, as in the old quantum theory, in order to recover the Schrödinger equation, and thus the Schrödinger equation and the Madelung hydrodynamic equations are not equivalent. In fact, Nelson (2005) also showed that there is an empirical difference between the predictions of quantum mechanics and his stochastic mechanics when considering quantum entanglement and nonlocality.

In addition, it has been generally argued that the classical ergodic models that assume continuous motion cannot be consistent with quantum mechanics (Aharonov and Vaidman 1993; Gao 2010)[14]. Classical ergodic models are plagued by the problems of infinite velocity and accelerating radiation (Aharonov and Vaidman 1993). In particular, a particle undergoing continuous motion, even if it has infinite velocity, cannot move throughout two spatially separated regions where the wave function of the particle may spread. Besides, the classical ergodic models entail the existence of a finite ergodic time, which is also inconsistent with the existing quantum theory (Gao 2010). Based on these results, it has been suggested that the wave function may describe random discontinuous motion of particles (Gao 2006a, 2006b, 2010). This new interpretation of the wave function can avoid the problems of classical ergodic models, and it also provides a natural realistic alternative to the orthodox view. On this interpretation, the square of the absolute value of the wave function not merely gives the probability of the particle being *found* in certain locations, but also gives the objective probability of the particle *being* there. Moreover, it seems that the theory of random discontinuous motion can also provide a promising solution to the notorious quantum measurement problem (Gao 2006a). However, the theory is still at its preliminary stage, and much study is still needed before a definite conclusion can be reached about the true meaning of the wave function.

If the wave function is not a description of physical field but a description of some sort of ergodic motion (e.g. random discontinuous motion) of particles, then the main realistic interpretations of quantum mechanics will be either rejected or revised. We have already discussed the de Broglie-Bohm theory in the last section. Here we can understand its wrongness more clearly. The theory takes the wave function as a real physical field (i.e. Ψ-field) and further adds the non-ergodic motion of Bohmian particles to interpret quantum mechanics[15]. But the wave function in quantum mechanics is a description of the ergodic motion of particles. Thus de Broglie-Bohm theory as a realistic interpretation of quantum mechanics should be rejected.

Lastly, we will give some brief comments on the many-worlds interpretation and dynamical collapse theories. These two theories both assume that the wave function is a real physical entity, and the dynamical collapse theories also explicitly assume the mass density ontology (Ghirardi,

---

[14] Note that some variants of stochastic interpretation assume that the motion of particles is discrete random jump (Bell 1986; Vink 1993; Barrett 2005). But since each random jump is only limited in a local region, and in particular, it reduces to the Bohmian trajectory in the continuum limit (Vink 1993), these models cannot be consistent with quantum mechanics either. In particular, they cannot explain the existence of effective mass and charge density, which is proportional to the square of the absolute value of the wave function.

[15] It has been generally argued that the time averages of Bohmian particle's positions typically differ markedly from the ensemble averages, and thus the motion of Bohmian particle is not ergodic (Englert, Scully, Süssmann and Walther 1992; Aharonov and Vaidman 1996; Aharonov, Englert and Scully 1999; Aharonov, Erez and Scully 2004).

Grassi and Benatti 1995). But, as we have argued, the mass density explanation can be valid only in terms of the ergodic motion of particles due to the observational restriction of electrostatic self-interaction, and the wave function should be a description of some ergodic motion of particles. Therefore, the ontology of these two theories needs to be revised from field to motion of particles.

However, we may still have ontology-revised many-worlds interpretation and dynamical collapse theories. The left problem is to determine which is basically right: the former denies the existence of wavefunction collapse while the latter admit its existence. If the wave function is really a description of the ergodic motion of particles, then it seems that quantum mechanics should be a one-world theory, not a many-worlds theory. The key point is that quantum superposition exists in a form of time division by means of the ergodic motion of particles, and there is only one observer (as well as one quantum system and one measuring device) all along in a continuous time flow during quantum evolution. If this argument is valid, then our definite conscious experience and the definite measurement outcomes (e.g. positions of pointer) in the unique world will further demand that there exists an objective process of wavefunction collapse, which is responsible for the transition from microscopic uncertainty to macroscopic certainty (e.g. in Schrödinger's cat thought experiment)[16]. Therefore, it seems that the many-worlds interpretation might be wrong, and the dynamical collapse theories may be in the right direction by admitting wavefunction collapse. But the argument here is very preliminary and undoubtedly needs to be further examined. We will leave this important issue for future study.

Acknowledgments

I am deeply grateful to Antony Valentini for his insightful criticism and encouragement and to Dean Rickles and Huw Price for their helpful advice and suggestions for many improvements. This work was supported by the Postgraduate Scholarship in Quantum Foundations provided by the Unit for History and Philosophy of Science and Centre for Time (SOPHI) of the University of Sydney.

References

Adler, S. L. (2007). Comments on proposed gravitational modifications of Schrödinger dynamics and their experimental implications. *J. Phys. A* 40, 755-764.

Aharonov, Y., Anandan, J. and Vaidman, L. (1993). Meaning of the wave function, *Phys. Rev.* A 47, 4616.

Aharonov, Y., Anandan, J. and Vaidman, L. (1996). The meaning of protective measurements, *Found. Phys.* 26, 117.

Aharonov, Y., Englert, B. G. and Scully M. O. (1999). Protective measurements and Bohm trajectories, *Phys. Lett.* A 263, 137.

Aharonov, Y., Erez, N. and Scully M. O. (2004). Time and Ensemble Averages in Bohmian Mechanics. *Physica Scripta* 69,81–83.

Aharonov, Y. and Vaidman, L. (1993). Measurement of the Schrödinger wave of a single particle,

[16] Certainly, this conclusion is only obtained based on experience, and the physical origin of the wavefunction collapse still needs to be investigated.

Phys. Lett. A 178, 38.
Aharonov, Y. and Vaidman, L. (1996). About position measurements which do not show the Bohmian particle position, in *Bohmian Mechanics and Quantum Theory: An Appraisal*, J. T. Cushing, A. Fine, S. Goldstein, eds. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
Barrett, J., Leifer, M. and Tumulka, R. (2005). Bell's jump process in discrete time. *Europhys. Lett.* 72, 685.
Bell, J. S. (1981) Quantum mechanics for cosmologists, in C. Isham, R. Penrose and D. Sciama eds, *Quantum Gravity 2*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. pp. 611-637.
Bell, J. S. (1986). Beables for quantum field theory. *Phys. Rep.* 137, 49-54.
Bohm, D. (1952). A suggested interpretation of quantum theory in terms of "hidden" variables, I and II. *Phys. Rev.* 85, 166-193.
Bohm D. and Hiley, B.J. (1993) *The Undivided Universe: An Ontological Interpretation of Quantum Theory*. London: Routledge.
Broglie, L. de. (1928). in: *Electrons et photons: Rapports et discussions du cinquième Conseil de Physique Solvay*, eds. J. Bordet. Paris: Gauthier-Villars. pp.105. English translation: G. Bacciagaluppi and A. Valentini (2009), *Quantum Theory at the Crossroads: Reconsidering the 1927 Solvay Conference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Brown, H. R., Dewdney, C. and Horton, G. (1995) Bohm particles and their detection in the light of neutron interferometry. *Found. Phys.* 25, 329.
Dass, N. D. H. and Qureshi, T. (1999). Critique of protective measurements. *Phys. Rev.* A 59, 2590.
Diósi, L. (1984). Gravitation and the quantum-mechanical localization of macro-objects. *Phys. Lett. A* 105,199-202.
Drezet, A. (2006). Comment on "Protective measurements and Bohm trajectories", *Phys. Lett.* A 350, 416.
Dürr, D., Goldstein, S., and Zanghì, N. (1997). "Bohmian mechanics and the meaning of the wave function", in Cohen, R. S., Horne, M., and Stachel, J., eds., Experimental Metaphysics — Quantum Mechanical Studies for Abner Shimony, Volume One; *Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science* 193, Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
Englert, B. G., Scully, M. O., Süssmann, G., Walther, H. (1992) *Z. Naturforsch*. Surrealistic Bohm Trajectories. 47a, 1175.
Everett, H. (1957). 'Relative state' formulation of quantum mechanics. *Rev. Mod. Phys*. 29, 454-462.
Gao, S. (2006a). A model of wavefunction collapse in discrete space-time. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* 45(10), 1943-1957.
Gao, S. (2006b). *Quantum Motion: Unveiling the Mysterious Quantum World.* Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk U.K.: Arima Publishing.
Gao, S. (2010). Meaning of the wave function. arXiv:1001.5085 [physics.gen-ph].
Ghirardi, G. C., Grassi, R. and Benatti, F. (1995). Describing the macroscopic world: Closing the circle within the dynamical reduction program. *Found. Phys.*, 25, 313–328.
Goldstein, S. and Teufel, S. (2001). "Quantum spacetime without observers: Ontological clarity and the conceptual foundations of quantum gravity", in Callender, C. and Huggett, N., eds., *Physics meets Philosophy at the Planck Scale*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Grabert, H., Hänggi, P. and Talkner, P. (1979). Is quantum mechanics equivalent to a classical

stochastic process? *Phys. Rev. A* 19, 2440–2445.
Harrison, R., Moroz, I. and Tod, K. P. (2003). A numerical study of the Schrödinger-Newton equations. *Nonlinearity* 16, 101-122.
Holland, P. (1993). *The Quantum Theory of Motion: An Account of the de Broglie-Bohm Causal Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Monton, B. (2002). Wave Function Ontology. *Synthese* 130, 265-277.
Monton, B. (2006). Quantum mechanics and 3N-dimensional space. *Philosophy of Science*, 73(5), 778–789.
Moroz, I. M. and Tod, K. P. (1999). An analytical approach to the Schrödinger-Newton equations. *Nonlinearity* 12, 201-16.
Nelson, E. (1966). Derivation of the Schrödinger equation from Newtonian mechanics. *Phys. Rev.* 150, 1079–1085.
Nelson, E. (2005). The mystery of stochastic mechanics, manuscript 2005-11-22.
Penrose, R. (1996). On gravity's role in quantum state reduction. *Gen. Rel. Grav.* 28, 581.
Penrose, R. (1998). Quantum computation, entanglement and state reduction. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. A* 356, 1927.
Rovelli, C. (1994). Meaning of the wave function - Comment, *Phys. Rev.* A 50, 2788.
Salzman, P. J. (2005). Investigation of the Time Dependent Schrödinger-Newton Equation, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California at Davis.
Salzman, P. J. and Carlip, S. (2006). A possible experimental test of quantized gravity. arXiv: gr-qc/0606120.
Uffink, J. (1999). How to protect the interpretation of the wave function against protective measurements, *Phys. Rev.* A 60, 3474.
Valentini, A. (1997). On Galilean and Lorentz invariance in pilot-wave dynamics. *Phys. Lett. A* 228, 215–222.
Valentini, A. (2009). The nature of the wave function in de Broglie's pilot-wave theory. Talk in PIAF '09 New Perspectives on the Quantum State Conference. http://pirsa.org/09090094/.
Vink, J. C. (1993). Quantum mechanics in terms of discrete beables. *Phys. Rev. A* 48, 1808.
Wallace, D. and Timpson, C. G. (2009). Quantum mechanics on spacetime I: spacetime state realism. PhilSci Archive 4621. Forthcoming in the British Journal for the Philosophy of Science.
Wallstrom, T. (1994). Inequivalence between the Schrödinger equation and the Madelung hydrodynamic equations. *Phys. Rev.* A 49, 1613–1617.