

Title: Reflections on quantum gravity in 2020

Speakers: Ted Jacobson

Collection: Quantum Gravity 2020

Date: July 17, 2020 - 1:00 PM

URL: <http://pirsa.org/20070020>

Reflections on QG (in) 2020

Ted Jacobson, University of Maryland, 17 July 2020



QG? how did we get here?

QM 19th century hints from structure of matter (especially spectra), thermodynamics of gases. In closing days of 19th century, two key developments:

- Planck's discovery that thermal equilibrium of radiation requires $E = h\nu$
- Zeeman's discovery that atoms contain very light charges, whose orbits can be shifted by an external magnetic field and are somehow quantized

Discoveries happened *then* thanks to developments in *technology*: improved ability to precisely measure *spectra*. 25 more years of technology, experiments, and theory achieved QM — a *very* strange theory that would not have been discovered without observations to lead us by the nose.


GR A fusion of Newtonian gravity and Maxwellian electrodynamics, deduced by Einstein purely theoretically from these inputs, together with deep intuition about the importance of the equivalence principle and background independence. *No* new technology or experiments played a role.



Starobinsky inflation

$$R + \alpha R^2$$

Contains a slow roll potential, and a universal reheating mechanism, and matches the observed tilt and amplitude of primordial fluctuations with one free parameter: $\alpha \sim 10^{10} l_p^2$



the fly in the ointment: unnatural value, and unnatural to restrict to R^2 given this value of α

But there is something special about R^2 : it is the *only* higher curvature term that can be added without producing higher time derivative instabilities when taken nonperturbatively. Perhaps that's essential. I cannot believe the success of this model is an accident.

The fly in the ointment



Tensor modes and non-Gaussianity

These are further predictions from the graviton modes and the nonlinearity of quantum GR.

They may or may not lie beyond observational reach.

Technological advances will help.



Desperately seeking other observations

Although not very well motivated, if true might provide observational windows on quantum gravity:

variation of fundamental constants

Lorentz violation

conspicuous extra dimensions

diffusion

black hole firewalls

extra fundamental fields

quantum decoherence

...

Here too, technological developments help. Particularly promising are atomic clocks with 10^{-18} precision, and light and matter interferometers. We can always hope for surprises, and in any case it's good science to place strong constraints on such possibilities.



...but we are more ambitious...

want to understand things we can perhaps never see:
black hole singularities, baby universes, the origin of the
universe, eternal inflation...

forgive us our sins



QG2020

Paradigms:

GR all the way

EFT
scattering
asymptotic safety
CDT
LQG, spin foams

GR \subset "M-theory"

strings and branes
AdS/CFT

"from scratch"

causal sets
group field theory
tensor models

Issues

UV

asking for a theory valid
at all scales [foolish?]

IR

observables
time
black hole information
unitarity?
Hilbert space
soft modes
cosmology



AdS/CFT

gravity without gravity

Emerged from string theory, but is “standalone” — could perhaps have emerged from straight QGR, and can make contact with other approaches.


Has certain enormous advantages both for the UV and the IR issues.

CFT has no scale, valid into the arbitrary UV.

Asymptotically AdS boundary condition introduces a *timelike boundary*, where we can use ordinary concepts of QM, time, observables, unitarity, and yet apparently also describe quantum gravity.

Although not “realistic,” to fully understand this should put us well on our way to more realistic settings for QG.

Brings into play quantum information theory, central role of entanglement in building emergent spacetime.



metric (and space) from entanglement

who rules the vacuum?

Unruh (1976) found that the vacuum fluctuations of quantum fields determine in the inertial structure of spacetime, i.e. the metric.

Conversely, the metric governs the vacuum fluctuations.

This always seemed uneconomical — a *redundancy* of structure. The vacuum of quantum fields and the metric should be unified.

AdS/CFT goes some way toward realizing this...albeit via entanglement of *boundary* vacuum fluctuations determining *bulk* metric. The (H)RT formula relates the area of bulk extremal surfaces—and thus the metric—to entanglement entropy in boundary subregions. Moreover, this correspondence implies that the metric satisfies the Einstein equation. And the entanglement even seems to account for the topological connectedness of space.



QG & unitarity ?

I don't think unitarity per se can make sense in quantum cosmology.

Inner product and probability are perhaps “emergent”.

Without probability, what is left in quantum mechanics?

1. Spectra of operators ?
2. Entanglement

Where does probability come from in QM?



“Relative State” Formulation of Quantum Mechanics*

HUGH EVERETT, III†

Palmer Physical Laboratory, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey

Shows the the Born rule is the unique assignment of probability that distributes over superpositions of *orthogonal* states.
(but it assumes Hilbert space inner product)

I see this as a Bayesian argument: if someone hands an alien QM without telling them the Born rule, and offers them the opportunity to make bets, the smart alien will quickly deduce that the Born rule is the only sensible way to choose their bets, given what they know already about the theory.

See Lubkin, for an operational version of this argument, based on entanglement structure of states:

An Application of Ideal Experiments to Quantum Mechanical Measurement Theory

Elihu Lubkin

Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

Received January, 1969; revised January, 1979

In the discussion Everett writes:

The “relative state” formulation will apply to all forms of quantum mechanics which maintain the superposition principle. It may therefore prove a fruitful framework for the quantization of general relativity. The formalism invites one to construct the formal theory first, and to supply the statistical interpretation later.

But it uses more than superposition: What to do if we don’t have the inner product? *Could probability be extracted from properties of entanglement alone, without appeal to an inner product? It seems not.*

Gell-Mann & Hartle suggest “Generalized QM,” to base the theory on a *decoherence functional* associated with a path integral. There the criterion of decoherence is presumably never met exactly, and this bothers me. If probability is only approximately meaningful, what is the theory *about*?



Theodore A. Jacobs...



Thanks!
to
the organizers
the speakers
the participants
the PI staff
and Perimeter Institute