

The Invisible Reality of Quantum Mechanics: The Deterministic Perspective

Albert V Herrebrugh 

Netherland

According to the request of the author of this article, the affiliation has been secured with Hyperscience International Journal

avherrebrugh@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The fundamental deterministic nature of quantum mechanics (QM) is mathematically demonstrated by the modeling of the quantum (multiple) slit experiments; hence this paper is written from a deterministic perspective (DP) in quantum mechanics. Due to approximately 90 years of indeterminism and probabilistic statistical results, the theory consists of many interpretations and is often regarded as counterintuitive. The latter is in the deterministic perspective not the case and is illustrated with some examples. After a brief historic perspective, 'invisible' i.e. invisible entities of reality in mathematical treatment, are introduced. These entities are handled by mathematics indirectly i.e. are described in a transformed domain without variables violating the Heisenberg relation. In nature, i.e. on micro and macro levels, causality is fully 'entangled' with energy, information - in the meaning of ordering or coding - as well as time. In contrast with the macro scale with many forms and types of memory functions, without a memory property of quanta, causality is the bearer of information symmetry on the quantum scale. Further on in this DP paper: mathematical and philosophical consequences and influences in several paragraphs, regarding subjects such as 'free will' and expected 'threats to science', the Bell inequalities, Alice and Bob & entanglement, causality, information, retro-causality, spooky action, encryption and computing, teleportation, and in general interpretations rooted in indeterminacy in QM as well as associated topics on independence, fine-tuning. The last paragraph outlines the mathematical treatment of QM more extensively and may clarify references to the above-mentioned topics of discussion in QM further.

Keywords: Quantum Mechanics, Deterministic, Causality, Information, Fine Tuning, Independence, Probability, Entanglement, Teleportation, QM Mathematics

©2023 The Authors, Published by Hyperscience International Journal. This is an open-access article under the CC BY-NC
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

INTRODUCTION

QM has been built on a complex orthogonal vector space of n dimensions i.e. the Hilbert space, in which states of a quantum system are represented by complex vectors. Together with the use of linear algebra and matrix mechanics, this has been the mathematical basis for the theory to date, causality appeared in discussions usually afterwards. Physical reality in nature is the result of interactions leading to change, based upon energy transferred in the interactions (inter-reactive internal energy,

and/or external energy), also when seemingly spontaneously happening on a scale one cannot observe at all, meaning that in nature, changes occur by causality on all scales i.e. in DP. Cause and effect relations of interactions are in the roots of nature and therefore should be fundamentally incorporated by a mathematical causality description. In that case, a state-function $\psi(r, t)$ as the local evolving (discrete) function in spacetime for the quantum system, is the true bearer of the causality relations. In a system-theoretical model, the mathematical condition is that a(ny) spacetime causal

relation can be described by integrable functions of the cause leading to the effect with commutative acting mathematical operators. Causal relations in the state-function thus actually represent a key element in QM (nature) and knowledge about the relations and interactions creates further and deeper understanding of quantum behavior (cognitive, epistemic). Observation of objects by natural means is by a form of radiation i.e. photons (sight) and e.g. by man-made radar as well as tiny mass particles in electron microscopes, and an 'observation' or 'measurement' requires a tiny amount of energy of the object. This information-energy cannot be taken from quanta without changing their original state and state-function and is stated here as: 'a measurement of a quantum mechanical invisible yields an observable', indicating that an energy transformation takes place.

Eigenvalues are the vector space solution values of the state-function using matrix mechanics and linear algebra. As argued, without a collapse of a quantum state in an operation requiring information energy of the quanta, the values cannot be revealed by counterpart operators and therefore the resulting eigenvalues that are being revealed, are associated with transformations of invisibles in observable states: i.e. due to the usual mathematical approach with variables addressing objects representing the observed state, the state function is imposed to use collapsed values instead of exact values.

LOOKING BACK

A key starting point in quantum mechanics was formulated e.g. by von Neumann [1] on the mathematical treatment of quanta, and states that 'a measurement of a quantum mechanical observable yields an eigenvalue'.

The ontological entities of reality or as Einstein [2] and Bell [3] named them the elements of reality and the (may-) beables, were initially all considered to be observables, and in principle could be measured/observed and mathematically described, and as such they were embedded in physics, or as A. Einstein formulated: 'every element of the physical reality must have a counterpart in the [mathematics of] (author's addition) physical theory'.

This statement, explicitly taken up in the EPR paper [2], is valid, however not complete as it addresses quantum elements of reality without the energy transfers and related operations in reality performed on them: a quantum transfers into an observable only by energy transforms. In fact, and with mathematics of observables only, information energy was not regarded to influence any objects of study at all.

The state-function $\psi(r, t)$ is entirely determined by the manipulation of the quanta, be it in a slit-experiment, computational gate operation in a quantum computer or in a discrete change of energy level e.g. excitation in an atomic grid. Moving on to linear algebra and the complex vector space matrix mechanics, obviously the solutions of the vector space mathematics are complex state vectors, which

are considered as images of all states the state-function in spacetime can evolve into, and may include all space-vector superpositions possible-and this actually concluded the mathematics of matrix mechanics involved and yields eigenvalue results, which are as close as we can get this way to the exact solution. Superpositions of states (Dirac, [4]) also included partial states and mixed states and were facilitating probability interpretations of the theory.

without knowledge even of determinism in the heart of QM, Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen [2] at the time actually had valid reasons to reject QM for not being a complete theory, and supported this conviction with the tools available: the definition of completeness of a theory, the mathematics of observables, and thought experiments. The queste started in 1935 and created a lengthy debate with tons of paper literature in interpretations and philosophy.

The meaning of the complex state-vector solutions in matrix mechanics of states of quanta was at the time interpreted by Born [5] and was generally accepted literally 'sine qua non' as a completing part of the mathematical solution - with lasting consequences for QM indeterminacy being poured in concrete instead of being regarded as a human interpretation a posteriori, as Born himself might have realized, because it meant 'a priori' negation of causality on the quantum level of nature itself.

Even so, with a probability interpretation, quantum theory remained successful in applications, however since its conception not fully understood nor fully supported by the applied mathematics

REALITY AND MATHEMATICS

In the DP of slit experiments, the final quantum states remain invisible after manipulation in the slit and do not change without cause, leaving the slit i.e. are not in undefined state but remain invisible in an attained state, until detection of the quanta, when transformation into observables is manifest and e.g. in slit experiments, the 'patterns' are visible. This reveals behavior of a class of entities that may be described only indirectly by mathematics. Operations c.q. operators directly applied to these invisibles result in state changes i.e. partial or complete loss of the original state or property(ies) i.e. energy transformation, known as the Copenhagen 'collapse' of the states with related values in the 'collapsed' state-function.

To move forward in mathematical treatment and to comply with an adapted EPR statement of the relation between reality and theory, a first step in this direction is to extend the entities of reality with an additional class next to the class of observables, e.g. the class of invisible entities of reality or beagles, the invisibles separated from observables. Invisibles thus are defined as entities of reality that cannot be observed or measured without significant change of their energy or properties. The classes of entities are to be mutually exclusive, i.e. when an entity is part of one class, by

definition it cannot be part of the other class. As information is a coded or ordered form of energy (without memory function on quantum level, information is the order or code carried by energy, with the potential to reduce uncertainty), observables can be measured by neglecting the energy it takes to acquire the information of physical properties or state, i.e. can be observed and described directly by counterpart mathematics. This is not the case for quanta, as the information energy is in the same order of magnitude of quantum energy and consequently, drawing information directly from quanta results in state changes. There is no way to overcome this problem and to invent new mathematics e.g. with hidden variables accounting for the changes of energy, as we are stuck immediately in case there is no knowledge about what exactly happens e.g. in energy transformations. In comparison, in the virtual reality of mathematics, transformations impose the requirements for mathematical functions (analogue or digital e.g. step functions i.e. 'Stossvorgänge') describing causality by integrability over the time of interaction and can provide descriptions with variables without violating the Heisenberg relation-this is precisely the point where system-theory [6, 7] enters the stage.

The separation thus is proposed as the entities have different properties, i.e. satisfy different conditions in physical reality, and serves as well to separate invisibles from observables in mathematical treatment, as by definition there is no intersection in the sets of classes.

A further distinction, is in internal and external energy of an invisible. The internal part are the degrees of freedom; the total energy becomes manifest in e.g. transformations. In line, physical operations on/with quanta are distinguished in an external and internal part as well, with related counterparts of operators acting on internal and external energy states of e.g. photons and electrons.

Invisibles can have internal operators that affect their internal physical state; the energy required is provided by the local environment in an inter-(re-)active process with the invisible, and the total energy balance of the process is zero i.e. these processes contain phases of positive and negative (local) energy exchange (interaction) that do not require external energy. These are processes in the core of a state function ψ and cannot be observed, and require a thought experiment e.g.: invisibles leave tracks, as their inter-reactive speed with the direct environment is limited by c , therefore requires time and causes delays e.g. by (rotational) polarization changes, and in case of momentum changes, their trajectories are adapted i.e. when the inter-reactive processes effectively are taking place, they are in general slowing down the propagation of quantum energy-this can be (has been) measured-i.e. the signature of the invisible activity of internal operators. An example of the foregoing is the propagation of a photon in a glass fiber used in transmission, known for delivering internet super speeds. As the (assumed otherwise ideal) fiber is nowhere ideally

straight, the polarization and momentum of the photon are forced to adapt inter-reactively in the glass (amorphous) atom structure within boundary conditions of e.g. core and cladding (to confine the photon in the core); and the delay caused by the interactions can be measured (and treated in e.g. a dielectric constant); delay can be measured as well for (macro manifest) charge current values e.g. in copper based cables with dielectrics i.e. inter-reactive with construction (e.g. sheathing, shaping) materials.

Entities of reality are well known-both observables and invisibles are ubiquitous around us-and given that the entire framework of mathematics used in physics by definition is built on observables by associating numbers (-series) represented by variables in algebraic equations in which all kinds of operators are active, one may conclude that mathematics were tailored to describe the reality of the observable world in abstractions.

Without a separation of invisibles, and despite the assumed however questionable existence of 'hidden' variables, obviously persistent proposals have been made to somehow introduce the existence of hidden variables to explore quantum mechanics.

When external operators on invisibles produce transformed energy values, this implies that the only way to observe or measure an invisible is by imposing such an operator whereby the invisible becomes visible; exactly this happens in detection e.g. our retina, at the cost of its original state: it transforms into an observable form of energy, from then on to be processed and possibly stored as: information.

One of the examples of transformation, ubiquitously around us nowadays, are the (man-made) photons of e,m-radiation in the frequency bands of 2.4 and 5 GHz used to connect our smartphones - and everything else - with a Wi-Fi network, showing once more that QM actually is only one step away from everyday life.

The photons interact in accordance with the Copenhagen 'collapse' of their state-functions with e.g. metallic antennas and electrical charge is manifest in electrical voltage and current in the antennas, i.e. the macro detectable energy transformations. In terms of physics, the momentum/energy of the photons transforms, the Heisenberg relation is violated and loses validity as the exact location and momentum of the photon at the antenna at this point are revealed. The photon disappears and a current of charged particles is manifest in the antenna.

This is a system-theoretical approach and it remains unclear what actually happens in the transformation of photon energy: The thought experiment: the photon interacts with the atomic grid, transfers its energy fully and vanishes; the atoms thus deliver it instantaneously as kinetic energy to the electrons. The electrons can move relatively free in the metallic structure due to overlap in energy levels and cause a current of electrons i.e. each photon causes $h\nu = \frac{1}{2} m_e v_e^2$. i.e. much in same sense as the photoelectric effect, however below the threshold frequency. This then would be a

mathematical description of photon energy transfer from the thought experiment. But what happens exactly in the atom in the energy transfer? one cannot observe it and to date, we can only apply thought-experiments that fit with observable side-effects and boundary conditions as in e.g. high energy physics' experiments.

LOCAL CAUSALITY AND INFORMATION

Looking back, it is remarkable to observe that causality as a fundamental property of nature, never took a prominent part in the mathematical QM descriptions and has not been directly related to information, although causality has an extensive presence in the discussions in physics and philosophy. Causality and the notion 'in absence of a cause no changes', is an axiom in nature, i.e. as Gödel in his 1929 thesis and [8] pointed out in his incompleteness theorems that in an axiomatic theory, the system mathematics of the theory cannot prove consistency in the mathematical descriptions of nature i.e. physics.

However, it can be made plausible for quanta: when e.g. considering energy levels in mK near 0 K, where hardly interaction is expected, e.g. electrons may pair and cause superconductivity in specific materials i.e. at the tiniest scale and lowest temperatures, causality plays an extremely important role in nature. And at the other side of the spectrum, on the much larger scale and higher temperatures, one may appreciate what photons of the sun cause on earth. I.e. the 'arrow of time' in reality cannot be reversed for any physical process and causality does not support an adaptation of a result of a causal relation by going back 'in time' to alter or otherwise influence the cause in the past, as causality is related to interactive state changes, as a location on a time axis i.e. 'in time' (see §4), and one experiences the macro results of these changes on a daily basis in e.g. in many forms of memory e.g. own memories and all 'things' around us that were created in the past. A(ny) described result in quantum theory therefore becomes manifest in the macro world as a part of an event i.e. as result of a change in a 'state of reality' becoming the memory of the past.

Knowledge starts with collecting information-e.g. From observations and memory functions holding information - and associating this with other available information of internal and external sources; the associations are part of a processing function that e.g. in humans may trigger new thoughts, ideas and other associations e.g. the 'aha Erlebnis or eureka moment' to gain knowledge and insight.

When realizing that all the 'states of reality' of the past around us cannot enhance our knowledge about the cause of changes when information of the causes leading to the states of reality is not available-e.g. in our macro environment: stories, pictures, written information or messages in text and symbols, digitized information on (internet-) computers, smartphones, tablets, as well as knowledge residing in individuals etc. i.e. somehow stored in a memory function-

then, without knowledge of the cause it would be impossible to increase or enhance knowledge and move forward e.g. in science or daily life for that matter.

Causality and availability of information in a memory function therefore create a condition sine qua non to describe, gain insight and increase knowledge about nature: they are literally 'entangled' in order to understand nature.

A process of understanding does not change fundamentally when the subject of interest changes, here from the macro world to the micro quantum world: to gain knowledge one needs to access information and associate this with other information. In our brains these are natural processes and in principle are causality relations of information processing functions and storage i.e. memory functions.

In philosophical sense, information is everything with the potential to reduce uncertainty, and in nature on all energy levels and scales, information is to be carried by energy - in an ordered or coded form - to be able to pass on or transmit the information, e.g. DNA, content on the internet or in radio communication.

The notion of this strong relation between causality and information in nature is paramount as it provides the link of processing- and memory- functions with causality being present as well on a quantum scale.

An example is that 'non-locality' descriptions of e.g. entangled and again separated photons are to include information-energy: when the information (entanglement) is present (see §10), non-local causality is a fact and proven in experiments; when the information is not available, photons may or may not have a common cause i.e. don't have a traceable 'link' anymore or never had.

In the deterministic perspective (DP), the additional requirement of information availability is present as the attained and without causality unaltered states (and after separation of the once entangled quanta) only are known c.q. can be predicted when the information of entanglement is still present and not lost. Treatment of causality is then inevitably fully 'entangled' with information-energy, meaning that absence of information e.g. by destruction of the ordering or coding of energy, actually is the change, without any physical changes of the concerned quanta, as the information resided elsewhere and does not exist anymore, and the states of (once entangled) quanta are unrelated from that point on.

Vice versa, when a physical change occurs, e.g. assuming that one of the photons enters a black hole, the information of past entanglement is not destroyed and available i.e. one still can retrieve the original state after the object vanished - i.e. identical as in information (-functions) e.g. pictures, replica in the macro world regarding e.g. destroyed or eroded objects.

The foregoing means that no interaction e.g. signaling i.e. no 'spooky action' is required between the separated quanta, which is impossible anyway when e.g. one is captured by a black hole. A proposed action to signal the other quantum

cannot even be initiated when captured, as nothing escapes a lurking black hole. In a generalized way of assuming signaling (thus as well assuming speed v exceeds c (m/s) , therefore excludes signaling of eavesdropping in encryptions with entangled pairs when a change occurs in one of the quanta.

If knowledge does not persist in a memory or the memory function is non-existing, the information on entanglement is lost and probability predictions of the states are down from 100% with information to 50% without information of entanglement (see §10) i.e. the absence of information changes our predictions, but not the results i.e. states of the quanta. Ignorance influences decisions substantially.

Obviously, when results are presented in probabilities (Born) as statistical outcome, the foregoing reasoning stays the same, however the changes will never be detected in the already statistical ‘result’ without exact values, and interpretations become paramount.

In the description of local causality on the smallest scale thus the intense relation in causality & information is present as well, however must differ in terms of memory-function because in contrast to physicists or experimenters with (or access to) memory as creators of an entanglement, individual quanta do not have a memory property (i.e. have no ‘awareness’ of carrying information or being entangled or not) and one cannot observe what happens with the information!

The consequence is that the change and/or transformation in a causality description inherently must contain information of the cause in the result to transfer or pass on information in nature (see also §11) and i.e. in principle is including a minimum amount of an ordered form of energy serving as the memory function (the same separation of energy and information would apply to information on e.g. entropy which does not reside with the molecules of e.g. a hot gas that vanishes in a black hole. All energy in the gas cloud will be re-arranged without any (former) information left inside the hole. An observer may have stored the (e.g. measurement) information elsewhere as an ordered/coded form of energy, and the energy (of measurement) has already been taken from the gas cloud, lowering its temperature before entering the black hole - energy is the carrier of information only and molecules are not aware of entropy for that matter: the order can be in time, space or some property of quanta. This is where information-symmetry (Bell: local commutativity \rightarrow forward and backward in time \rightarrow ‘t Hooft: time reversibility invariance \rightarrow this paper: Information symmetry in quantum causality) on quantum scale enters the stage.

In manipulations of quanta, therefore the information memory is embedded in the result functions i.e. in the re-distribution or any order creation in the energy in time space: the information.

With this information one can deduce the cause, however cannot alter it as it is already in the past and can’t be undone.

We have argued that information is basically energy and that the information of order or code resides in a memory function. So what would happen when quanta carrying information enter a black hole?

When the order or code on the quantum scale is created by human interaction e.g. as creator of the experiment, this means that all resulting states entering the black hole will disappear by re-distribution of energy in a black hole i.e. only energy passes the horizon in re-distributed form - removing any information contained - to fit the black hole. The energy for re-arrangement is delivered by the hole and the information on the original distribution is kept stored in a memory function by the creator (and may be lost): as the quanta are not ‘aware’ of their distribution and information they carry and when quanta are of the same type e.g. photons of equal wavelength, they cannot be distinguished.

A consequence in the mathematical description of causality with regard to information is commutativity i.e. the information in the result is to be exact and good to reconstruct the cause (input and system in systems-theory), which does not relate to a time reversibility in physical processes but is an information-energy symmetry in causal relations of nature.

Indeed, it requires information availability in memory functions and processing functions as argued at the tiniest scale in nature, and as well in daily life that together may reduce our ignorance – nature has given humans in principle both functions.

Because of the information symmetry in causality, one should be able to reconstruct information in the cause functions from the result functions throughout quantum operations/manipulations for all macro-observable results as well.

When the causality relations are embedded in the description of a system (i.e. any operation with quanta) by commutative operators, consequently non-commutative operators in the treatment destroy a causality relation in information symmetry: mathematically there is no way to exactly reconstruct a cause (data-) function from a resulting correlation (data-) function i.e. the correlations are statistical functions showing statistical relations in probabilities that cannot reconstruct the exact mathematical functions, as data-points of input and output don’t have an unambiguous 1 to 1 relation.

This means that correlations as part of causality descriptions of reality, cannot yield the information carried in the cause functions by ambiguity and show ambiguous values.

The mathematical system-theoretical approach is built on causal functions that are the building (black-) boxes in the transformed domain where the boxes may be of biological incl. human, chemical, electrical, mechanical nature or any mix of these, and are characterized by i/o relations: input & interaction(s) as cause and output (result) as effect.

A direct consequence is that operations c.q. counterpart operators that cannot comply with information symmetry

thus are excluded a priori in causal system descriptions of nature: in principle all mathematical operators that are not commutative, are corrupting causality by ambiguity and consequently all derived results c.q. interpretations are not leading to exact results in QM.

It excludes e.g. use of cross (matrix) vector-products and cross correlations between functions or datasets of states i.e. a correlation operator cannot be used for descriptions of physical reality on quantum level, although useful in statistical tests of outcomes of hypotheses. Even when hidden variables would exist and such theories would be valid [hidden variables: a theory constructed for local realism assuming fundamental indeterminism in QM; is supposed to hold the information for measurement result and detector settings], correlations used in the theory would destroy information-symmetry in the causality relations and show ambiguity.

TIME AND (RETRO-) CAUSALITY

As addressed earlier, the arrow of time in reality cannot be reversed as in playing a recorded film backwards and reality is the spacetime environment where we are living in, and we can define and use a time axis for the location of a certain state of our universe in terms of events, fundamentally occurring as well at the smallest scale in causality.

Spacetime thus is a mathematical construction of 4 'dimensions' i.e. a model that one may use in mathematical descriptions [9]. In this mathematical concept, time itself is the axis of evolving changes in nature and may be defined in a reference frame of this entire evolving universe (i.e. nature, assumed to be a consistent – i.e. based on a consistent set of axioms – mathematically described system).

Each change of state in the evolving changes – starting at the tiniest scale – takes a new point i.e. a location on the time axis and throughout the universe, states of events may occupy the same point, as well in case events are unrelated in the universe.

A clock is used to be able to measure in the coordinate, in the same sense as a measure in space coordinates, and is produced and adjusted for a local reference frame e.g. earth. Spacetime thus is a mathematical construction of locations in space and time with an a-symmetrical time axis, and has a local orientation (light cones).

This way the time axis i.e. 'time' fits in a notion of a coordinated and 4-'dimensional' (actually 3-dimensional with time parameter axis; as the model is not mathematically consistent in a true dimensional description) spacetime of locations on the coordinates to define results of causality in nature anywhere in this universe in spacetime, however usually one sticks with the local earth RF.

Reference frames i.e. in the universe static or moving with local events (planets, stars, black holes etc.) as well show local deformations of spacetime in accordance with Einstein's relativity theory.

In observations, the local reference frame has to be defined as it has also to be accounted for in the earth moving reference frame e.g. biasing the observations to be treated as separate (from the observed object) events. Reality of a point in spacetime therewith are all locations that are not in the future, whereas the presence-on the time axis as a pivoting point of the light cones-is connecting past and future, sometimes referred to as local reality or local realism. The axis itself may be defined for the entire universe i.e. is in principle independent of behavior of a measuring device, as with space coordinates: there are no fundamental changes when measuring these in meters, inches, feet or yards and vice versa the measuring devices do not influence the coordinate system as defined, and this includes measuring of time on the time axis, be it in fortnights or seconds. The evolving changes in nature are not by itself bound by a time related measuring device such as a clock. The behavior of a measuring device i.e. clock is defined by the reference frame (RF) it is made for/in and does not influence other fundamentally evolving changes in the universe.

Ageing is based on causality e.g. by degeneration of cells, DNA etc. which obviously can be measured in time by a clock, however will give identical results only when calibrated for the reference frame where the measurement is taking place, calibrated in a local frame e.g. earth frame, incl. due to velocity and gravitational potentials observed time dilation and space deformations (curvature) in spacetime, showing the mathematical side in treatment of time (as parameter).

[So, in the twin paradox (which it actually is not), the twin brother who became astronaut, left the earth and returned 20 years (earth time) later, discovers that he actually looks the same age as his twin brother - because of unaffected causality - and he as well noticed that he got less presents celebrating his birthday e.g. only 15 times, just because he forgot to adjust his earth RF local clock, i.e. didn't update his time administration during the trip as for example in GPS satellites with local clocks - in earth RF - that must be adjusted for a GPS system to deliver correct results.]

Although our notion of time is a dynamical one, one may see the reality pivoting point as a fixed point on an axis, by interpreting a collection of all events at the location of the presence, that become instantly the past. Each point in the local reference frame of earth spacetime obviously includes e.g. events we were not yet aware of (e.g. information of Hubble, James Webb) and as well events that we are not aware of and may be observed in the future, as well as events that we may never be aware of. It also means that only local observations as event are near the present, and most observations are not (yet) available and these observations may become part of the axis as observed events in the future. Retro causality therefore is not making any sense by addressing influences on causes in a past or travelling backwards in 'time', as then also e.g. all related information transfers on (sub-)atomic scale, even including the non-

existing i.e. not held in some memory function e.g. lost, destroyed, forgotten, erased etc. information would have to be included in decryptions in a local e.g. Hilbert space.

In nature i.e. in this universe there is only events (the future) to influence, demonstrated as well by the enormous impact of human behavior, and the reality of the past consists only of relics in the present i.e. the remainders of the reality states.

THE STATE-FUNCTION

The state-function, with both the vector-space and superposition, is the fundamental basis of quantum mechanics. This state-function is the mathematical counterpart of the QM causality relations in nature and describes the physical reality of quantum states occurrences in time.

It therefore may be regarded the function that defines the sets of the states in a vector space, representing the actual manipulation or operation occurring in a quantum system.

The state-function's values are represented by the values of the (complex) vectors, however when ignorant about the sets of vectors representing a manipulation exactly, obviously one cannot retrieve any exact information on behavior of a quantum system from a vector space. The key is in the state-function giving insight in evolution of a quantum system. If a state-function is a spacetime function supposed to hold information on variables e.g. location and momentum p of invisibles at the same time, in algebraic matrix mechanics, the complex matrices representing both do not commute [and yield a relation $rp - pr = ihI_m$] i.e. a destruction of the causality relation because of the non-commutative matrix products.

This means that parts of the vector space don't (cannot) show the exact values when accessed for the actual values through variables: as no external operator is allowed for invisibles, one cannot reveal the actual vectors of a state or derive these from equations with (hidden) variables with operators. Because of this, the acquired eigenvalues are values of collapsed states as the result of the operators in matrix mechanics and linear algebra, and are to be regarded as the limit of what we can attain in prediction of the result by this mathematical approach.

BELL'S INEQUALITIES

Invisibles cannot be described directly by variables theories, and nature will show observables when using energy of invisibles of transformations in i.e. collapsed values and prevents variables theories to describe the original quantum states in nature exactly.

We argue here that the DP does not alter this equation, as one cannot access all required state values for variables on individual level at the same point in time.

What is clear, is that in a reality of collapsed values by use of variable theories, no exact values can be predicted as the

variables cannot hold the exact information of individual quanta of both momentum and location - the violation of the Heisenberg relation.

Correlation indicates that values acquired from correlated data, are unrelated to e.g. the already probabilistic values (as result of manipulations in quantum systems), however these values are all typically ambiguous due to destructive non-commutative operators in the relations, and certainly not suitable for a reconstruction of the cause dataset from a resulting dataset.

In case a correlation e.g. between datasets of results of similar operations however, it is not excluded (possibly even plausible) that values may end up closer to a deterministic result i.e. obtained value(s) of a quantum system in a statistical comparison. With the ability to setup the experiments independently and with free will, it may increase accuracy of results by statistical treatment of many experiments' results i.e. identical with proceedings in high energy experiments.

When all 'loopholes' - if possible - have been closed in the experiments, measured values are to finally approach the deterministic values, with an accuracy depending on noise levels of measurement only.

FINE TUNING, STATISTICAL INDEPENDENCE

The parameters in the slit-experiments may be adjusted by scientists fully exercising free will and to date a myriad of slit-experiments all over the world performed in all different laboratories with physically different setups and components at all different times, are resulting in the same pattern types. This doesn't seem a conspiracy of fine tuners that may cheat us with all the independent results (not even with statistics in the result functions).

The requirement is that experiments should be repeatable and when performed and setup with exactly the same parameters they should obviously demonstrate the same results as required in a verification process. Moreover, the exact differences can be predicted by knowledge of the experiment settings' differences in parameters e.g. from the model in [10].

The found determinism however accounts for the invisibles i.e. the state of invisibility of quanta without consequences of influencing free will and with statistical independence as is argued next.

"Determinism in QM is a threat to science"- often is being argued that, extrapolating determinism would lead mathematically to a fully predictable view of our universe with philosophical consequences of e.g. free will and thus a serious threat to science. Turning this reasoning around would be 'proof' of the indeterminacy of QM (which sounds circular).

However in the quantum case, because of the information-energy sensitivity, quanta cannot be directly observed nor measured, and any original state of an individual quantum

remains completely hidden from all and any type of observation(s), i.e. including our brains e.g. to initiate processes leading to influence or even control ‘free will’; the observers thus remain completely unaware in conscious and subconscious states, while they are fully able to exercise free will without any constraints or external control; the entire process may be performed even by (for the purpose controllable, strictly programmed) robotics; moreover, (changes and transforms of quanta) cannot be described in abstractions on the individual level of quanta with any direct variable theory as well as indirect system theory-therefore are fully shielding predictions on individual quantum behavior from any variable theories.

A priori knowledge of evolvment of or a pre-determined universe is impossible with invisibles: quantum behavior can be subjected to thought-experiments, deduced from boundary conditions and side-effects in experiments, or reconstructed i.e. deduced by the information in the causality relations on quantum level afterwards i.e. ‘a posteriori’ from results e.g. to determine the past reality of the cause gaining information, and are in full contrast to ‘threats to science’, as the gained information serves to increase knowledge and further understanding in science and daily life, similar as in research in high energy experiments in e.g. large hadron colliders, observations in Astrophysics and the reality of information transmission in the hardware base of the internet . Considering QM determinism ‘a threat to science’ actually is a negation of science itself.

THE ALLOCATION OF PROBABILITY

Deterministic results of the slit-experiments do not support indeterminism / probability as a fundamental property or result of quantum mechanics as the slit-experiment is a (full) quantum system in its own right .

States (i.e. the vectors) and linear combinations in quantum systems are deterministic, and probability then reflects the state of the observer only-being the translator into/from mathematics or creator of the experiment. Quanta are not required by assumption to be partly in different states of one property at the same time i.e. partially in two or more states (e.g. Dirac[4]) or mixed states of identical property, but evolve into different states in accordance with causality embedded the in time evolving state-function $\psi(r, t)$, with properties that vary from (extremely) dynamic to (semi-) static in super positioned states e.g. dynamic in speed and static in direction or vice versa e.g. quanta can be in more states however of different properties that may evolve related in state function ψ . This is not different from the classical ideas about particles, except for the mathematical treatment of invisibles. It as well indicates that Schrödinger himself was right about what is a strange and awkward result of the theory due to indeterminism by ‘a posteriori’ human interpretation, and to show this awkwardness he presented his cat story (instead became the hallmark of counter-

intuitively of QM due to - assumed fundamental – indeterminism). However, in nature his cat certainly is not dead when alive and vice versa – many (if not all) of these types of ‘results’ just evaporate in the DP .

The superposition principle as a linear combination of states in e.g. the Hilbert space remains intact, however without intrinsic probability, does not require a specific quantum mechanical interpretation; the vector space handles only direction and value vector properties and 4 spacetime coordinates i.e. all real values. More properties can be added e.g. for fields (polarization) and complex numbers when required are allowed as well .

It is important to realize though that the internal energy manipulations cannot be observed - in the sense of providing information without state changes – therefore the result, when expressed in probabilities, has no bearing on the actual state of the quantum system, but reflects the state of the observer, who is lacking exact information and is ‘ignorant’. All mathematical results evolving from this point include human intervention and pass on probability to the observer. Meaning as well Born’s addition [4], which introduced very much room for interpretation, but at the same time proved to be quite useful in continuing with the successful theory, be it without any exact mathematical results.

QUANTUM ENCRYPTION & COMPUTING

Because of the phenomenon of invisibility of quanta, it is obvious that when being observed, related changes of quanta may be relatively easy to detect in a scheme of encryption, by returning the detection values or measurement methods to the sender who then can compare them or deduce in case of measuring method, the value with the original sent values. A statistical measurement of many quanta then may provide the ‘eavesdropped’ or ‘clean’ information of the sent data. In a bright future this would create a safe transmission ‘encryption’ when quantum computers become available on the market. The reasoning is depending on observability of the quanta which can be detected due to (significant) state changes .

However, quanta may be copied, based on internal (reactive) energy exchange without altering their original state (see §10, §3) – entanglement and releasing photons is in research laboratories performed and in principle can be achieved .

Entanglement is a certain state of two quanta imposed by their environment, and seems to relate to the lowest internal energy state of two quanta in the environment energy level e.g. in the same sense as the Pauli principle in atoms - the phenomenon can be described by one state function. To produce the state in principle requires a tiny amount of energy, ideally the information energy and external energy to guide the photons in the environment for the manipulation. Therefore, entanglement of quanta without affecting the original state of the sent quantum and with a tiny amount of

external energy in principle is possible. In the DP the resulting state does not alter without a cause, and the for entanglement added and again separated quantum can be used for measurement: i.e. the data is detached in an inverted state and it would be quite simple to invert and read the information of the originally sent quanta. The original quantum may be replaced even as photons of identical wavelength in principle cannot be distinguished .

This process unfortunately renders the encryption fully transparent and without any knowledge of eavesdropping for the users of the ‘encrypted’ information exchange .

The use of entangled quanta is as well proposed using ‘spooky action’ when a change occurs with one of the quanta to signal eavesdropping. In case a physical change occurs e.g. one of the quanta meets a black hole, the proposed action to signal the other quantum cannot even be initiated when captured, as nothing escapes a black hole. Thus, destroying and replacing the quantum in general does not reveal any eavesdropping. Also, information of past entanglement is not destroyed and available i.e. one still can retrieve the (last) state when the object vanished and even replace it .

Without entering a detailed technical discussion, in a mainstream of development of quantum computers, therefore also quantum copy machines/computers will be developed that may be inserted e.g. in an optical data transmission line, as there is a market of criminal-governments and organized individuals, waiting around the corner as well.

Assume an UGP – (Unencryptable Good Privacy) scheme of encryption, with quantum computers waiting in our backyard, promising to crack the code in no-time because of the computer processing power they will bring in the future. Obviously, with the smallest and fastest objects such as photons, this promises a potential of an extreme level of processing -speed and -power per unit of space that may be attained, but is as well heavily depending on the hardware processing to control hardware gates of qubits.

Computers to date usually work with only two bits of information a ‘0’ and ‘1’ that can be processed sequentially per clock cycle in time. As we have 2 bits, the information passed on per cycle is $\log 2 \approx 0.3$ ($2 \log 2 = 1$ bit actually, but we’re interested in ratio of improvement). When increasing the number of levels (states) and combining these all in only 1 qubit, the information passed on will increase, however looking at the logarithmic relation, adding of additional levels is becoming less effective as it serves to increase the accuracy of information i.e. in principle, each additional bit-level becomes less efficient.

Let’s assume instead of two, 16 levels may be used per qubit – meaning that the quantum qubit can be in any of the 16 states where each state represents different information. The information that can be transferred then is $\log 16 \approx 1.2$ per cycle i.e. 4x more information than 2 levels. With 64 levels per qubit 6x, 256 levels 8x, 1024 levels 10x etcetera – which is not really mind-blowing .

It seems that a real ‘quantum leap’ of e.g. exponential growth in multi qubit processing, with photons and the related higher speed, in parallel with multi-core processing, when realized with an increased density of circuits (with minimum dissipation) using photons and with increasing efficiency of the amount of qubits being processed per cycle, may be reality one day and depends entirely on the hardware basis of ‘gates’ to handle and control quanta in their ‘natural’ speed, limited by the environment.

ENTANGLEMENT & ALICE AND BOB

One of the results we may use from the slit-experiments is that attained discrete states in quantum systems (i.e. without further - including ‘spontaneous’ - manipulation) may be treated as ‘a priori’ fixed states and that probabilities introduced by the Born interpretation relate to the state of the observer .

The entanglement of invisibles (see also §3), is an imposed state of two invisibles, attaining opposite state/property e.g. when their location is in the same energy environment and e.g. obeying a Pauli principle. Entanglement of two quanta can be described with one state function and is an effect on the internal energy state of the quanta e.g. spin, polarization or momentum in the environment facilitating entanglement. The information on entanglement or the entangled state therefore is not intrinsically kept with the individual quanta but as a property of the entangled system with the creator or observer. When separating the quanta without affecting their state, the states of the quanta are fixed a priori, and without measurement unknown by an observer who is ignorant .

When photons are entangled, one is e.g. in state $S(1)$, the other is in $S(0)$. The states are attained in the manipulation of entanglement, then the quanta are separated.

In case of separated photons of the entangled pair without individual state changes, that are sent to Alice’s and Bob’s labs, the causality is embedded in the entanglement (and operation of separation, assumed without changes, ending physical entanglement) and in the DP are leading to two fixed contrasting states and the probabilities can thus be derived from a priori states by a priori information not influenced by Alice’s or Bob’s actions of e.g. measurement. As expected, the treatment becomes straightforward for each photon state they have-without observation or measurement, the state of the photons is fixed and does not alter as manipulation has ended, or whether 1 or 2 systems are considered :

so Alice (A) could have $S(0)$ with $P(A, 0) = 0.5$ or $S(1)$ with $P(A, 1) = 0.5$, and Bob (B) has the identical information. The states in this example are mutually exclusive, so two combinations with each $P = 0.5$ describe physical reality in terms of probabilities:

$A \Leftrightarrow S(0)$ then $B \Leftrightarrow S(1)$, or $A \Leftrightarrow S(1)$ then $B \Leftrightarrow S(0)$,

in which all observers A and B are ignorant, unaware of the actual combination.

We now can use the relation to measure/observe the state of one quantum of the entangled pair and can exactly predict (with $P=1$ i.e. 100%) the other state even when separated lightyears without ‘spooky action’, even when swallowed by a black hole, however only with knowledge i.e. information of entanglement (a priori condition for a predicting observer, one might use the outcomes statistically e.g. as reference in quantum computing without observing the other quantum) . Without information of entanglement, reality states are $A \Leftrightarrow S(0)$ or $S(1)$ and $B \Leftrightarrow S(0)$ or $S(1)$ and the prediction is $P=0.5$ i.e. 50% .

A predicting observer is to have information about the entanglement, as the information is to be a priori available to ensure $P=1$. This information is held by the observer and is not part of the energy of the quanta, which are in their own unaltered state being locally allowed by their environment, and obviously unaware of entanglement.

There are no changes when A knows the state and B is ignorant or vice versa, or both A & B know or are ignorant. There is no occurrence of ‘spukhafte Fernwirkung’ as Einstein in his native language suspiciously addressed it, as the quanta are deterministic however invisible in their attained states.

TELEPORTATION

Often, this phenomenon of ‘teleportation’ is associated with quantum mechanics as well as captain Kirk’s ‘beam me up, Scotty’. Teleportation is known from earlier experiments. The phenomenon is being ubiquitously deployed ever since development after first experimental attempts by Hertz [11] and Marconi [12], and does not demonstrate requirements of entangled states, shared or mixed states or other concepts found in QM publications.

Teleportation of pure energy-states is a state-of-the-art technique in coded energy technology e.g., in transmission of information, by a way of energy coding whereby the original state of energy can be transformed without loss of the original information, because of the causality relation on quantum level.

In contrast with concepts in some QM papers on teleportation, the key is that the original information is not lost and may be retrieved fully (by saved data in case required in time), as should be the case from the QM state-function perspective, bearer of the local causality relations and the information; and this indeed was the purpose of the radio-technology in the first place.

Unaware of QM and teleportation, the early radio transmission experiments were the first to exploit the energy transformation to transfer original information of transducers into em-energy (man-made phased photons) that could be transmitted over much greater distances. The transformation and information recovery became in a later stage known as

modulation and de-modulation, and are nowadays deployed in analogue or digital form, with applications in wired, wireless radio and (optical) fiber transmission channels i.e. any- and everywhere located in the hardware base of the internet, including homes.

The amount of information per unit of time being ‘teleported’, requires a suitable channel e.g. with sufficient capacity for transmission of the required data (Nyquist, Shannon [10]); the in-sufficiency of capacity we sometimes may experience from a slow internet (channel) connection. The amount of data to beam cpt. Kirk, as well as the required channel with sufficient capacity to get him almost instantaneously to the right place – not even yet mentioning the amount of energy and <energy – information – energy> transformations which include matter, without failures to exactly reconstruct cpt. Kirk – all at the required energy level of mass transfers that however unfortunately are destructive for biological mass, render it impossible for bio-matter teleports to become part of reality.

DETERMINISTIC QM MATHEMATICS

In more detail the mathematics used in [13] are briefly outlined. This proposed mathematical treatment of QM leads to a q.e.d. of determinism in quantum mechanics. It has fundamental mathematical differences compared to the Schrödinger approach:

1. The Hamiltonian is modified, by substituting energy expressions with the quantum property momentum p for both photons and mass-particle quanta
2. Causality of nature is embedded in the state-function by the counterpart convolution operator for local causal interactions
3. All operator’s mandatory are commutative in the entire system-theoretical approach due to information symmetry on quantum level
4. Quanta is mathematically treated as invisibles instead of observables, excluding direct variable theory in descriptions, because of severe changes in momentum when information on energy is required from quanta e.g. for observation, measurement or other operations
5. The application of system-theoretical mathematics based upon integral transformations, replacing momentum p of quanta to arrive at frequency domain energy-amplitude (intensity) result functions of energy distributions.
6. The resulting functions are exact and predictive i.e. demonstrating the fundamental, deterministic character of quantum mechanics.

In the first step is proposed not to use energy directly in the model and avoid energy changes that should appear as vectors in the Hilbert space, not taking advantage of the properties of vector state descriptions in this space. The Hilbert space is required to be able to include all properties of the complex vectors to enable incorporating this with

operators in the evolving mathematical treatment. The substitution in the Hamiltonian facilitates linear functions of and it as well incorporates the energy value for both photons as mass particle quanta in the description.

With the assumption of conservation of quantum energy in the manipulation, the energies in the distributions are linear functions of momentum, in case of a constant speed and of the quanta without any external energy changes of quanta in the operation c.q. manipulation, in line with deterministic terms in a Hamiltonian of energy.

Causality is introduced in the system i/o approach as a fundamental part of nature, with the counterpart convolution operator for a description of the causal time functions in interaction leading to the result function. The source and system then represent the cause, leading to the result i.e. the effect. Note that the actual mathematical interactive function is not required for predictability. The pre-requisite is that on the interval of interaction, the condition for both functions is integrability over the interaction time to yield a result function.

Before taking step 3, we argue that information basically is ordered energy, which may be used to reduce the uncertainty of a property of an object, and that this energy is required for e.g. observation or measurement. The energy is in a coded or ordered (recognizable) form that has the potential to reduce the ignorance of the observer.

All the operators are required to support information-energy symmetry to allow partial or full re-constructions of the cause- from effect-functions after transformations, and therefore are to be mathematically commutative.

In further steps, the momentum function is being generalized in a Dirac pulse [7, 14, 15] of momentum in the system source. The source then can be considered ideal in terms of momentum. The energy spectrum density is renormalized to '1' to avoid zero or infinite energy values in the equations with variable r .

The definition and derivation of the Dirac function and renormalizing are both mandatory steps to be able to acquire mathematical information of the system-function of the operation, because the result of the convolution operator after transformation, transfers into the product operator in the transformed domain, and this result-function directly leads

to the description of the system in the domain i.e. energy re-distribution in spacetime [15, 16] which shows the distribution of the quanta after manipulation in the experiment.

An ideal input in momentum in system theory, by the convolution property thus reveals the system behavior of the experiment or operation in terms of frequencies in spatial locations, with results in the distribution function in momentum i.e. related to quanta energy in vacuum without external influences.

With the chosen Fourier transform, the distributions can be calculated for the quanta, as the frequencies k and the locations r are both exact variables i.e. (circle-)frequency k does not relate to (i.e. 'tag') properties of individual quanta which obey the Heisenberg relation i.e. no information is available on individual quanta. Therefore, the distributions demonstrate the intensity or amplitude of the energy of E_{ph} or E_m at spatial locations r and thereby reveal the behavior of the experiment as is visible in the detection plane, with exact mathematical functions i.e. spacetime energy location functions.

APPENDIX

Nature teaches that causality starts with energy transfers at the tiniest scale, preserving information and shaping our reality between the light cones where one experiences 'nearby' physical events and observes events by information reaching our location in spacetime. Richard Feynman stated in 1964: 'I think I safely can say that nobody understands quantum mechanics'-however, with determinism of invisibles in quantum mechanics, leaving little room for interpretations and conclusions with roots in indeterminism, we may begin to see the light at the end of the tunnel-and I may as well conclude that A. Einstein was right after all in his notion that pieces of the puzzle seemed to be missing in the successful theory. I believe in scientific progress, and I'm favoring Schrödinger' point of view: "The task is not to see what has never been seen before, but to think what has never been thought before about what you see every day" (in nature).

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Von Neumann, *Mathematical foundations of quantum mechanics: New edition*. Princeton university press, 2018.
- [2] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. J. P. r. Rosen, "Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?," vol. 47, no. 10, p. 777, 1935.
- [3] J. S. Bell, "The theory of local beables," 1975.
- [4] P. A. M. Dirac, *The principles of quantum mechanics* (no. 27). Oxford university press, 1981.
- [5] M. J. Z. f. p. Born, "Quantenmechanik der stoßvorgänge," vol. 38, no. 11-12, pp. 803-827, 1926.
- [6] R. A. Roberts, *Signals and linear systems*. Wiley, 1973.
- [7] J. G. Truxal, *Introductory system engineering*. McGraw-Hill College, 1972.
- [8] K. J. M. f. m. u. p. Gödel, "Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I," vol. 38, pp. 173-198, 1931.

- [9] S. J. M. s. a. h. y. l. Walter, "Minkowski's modern world," pp. 43-61, 2010.
- [10] C. E. J. A. S. m. c. Shannon and c. review, "A mathematical theory of communication," vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 3-55, 2001.
- [11] H. J. A. d. P. Hertz, "Ueber einen Einfluss des ultravioletten Lichtes auf die electricische Entladung," vol. 267, no. 8, pp. 983-1000, 1887.
- [12] F. G. Marconi, "Marconi and the invention of wireless communications," in *Proceedings of 1995 SBMO/IEEE MTT-S International Microwave and Optoelectronics Conference*, 1995, vol. 1, p. 5: IEEE.
- [13] A. V. J. H. I. J. Herrebrugh, "Determinism in Quantum Slit-Experiments: Quantum," vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 115-121, 2022.
- [14] H. Blok, *Integraaltransformaties in de elektrotechniek*. Technische Hogeschool Delft. Vakgroep theoretische electriciteitsleer, 1974.
- [15] M. J. Lighthill, *An introduction to Fourier analysis and generalised functions*. Cambridge University Press, 1958.
- [16] H. J. J. I. J. o. T. P. Bremermann, "Minimum energy requirements of information transfer and computing," vol. 21, pp. 203-217, 1982.