

Quantum Fluctuations of Light: A Modern Perspective on Wave/Particle Duality

H. J. Carmichael

Department of Physics, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403-1274

Abstract. We review studies of the fluctuations of light made accessible by the invention of the laser and the strong interactions realized in cavity QED experiments. Photon antibunching, advocating the discrete (particles), is contrasted with amplitude squeezing which speaks of the continuous (waves). The tension between particles and waves is demonstrated by a recent experiment which combines the measurement strategies used to observe these nonclassical behaviors of light [Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3149 (2000)].

I INTRODUCTION

Our meeting celebrates one hundred years of the quantum. It was in October of 1900 that Planck stated his law for the spectrum of blackbody radiation for the first time publicly [1], and it was in December of that year that he presented a derivation of that law in a paper to the German Physical Society [2] in which he states: “We consider, however—this is the most essential point of the whole calculation— E to be composed of a very definite number of equal parts and use thereto the constant of nature $h = 6.55 \times 10^{-27}$ erg sec.” Planck introduced his “equal parts” so that he might apply Boltzmann’s statistical ideas to calculate an entropy. The ideas required that he make a finite enumeration of states and hence the discretization was necessitated by the statistical approach. The surprise for physics is that fitting the data required the discreteness to be kept while the more natural thing would be to take the size of the “parts” to zero at the end of the calculation.

The story of Planck’s discovery and what may or may not have been his attitude to the physical significance of the persisting discreteness is one to be told by others [3–6]. Looking backwards with the knowledge of a physicist trained in the modern era, the essence of the blackbody calculation is remarkably simple and provides a dramatic illustration of the profound difference that can arise from summing things discretely instead of continuously—i.e., making an integration. Mathematically, the difference is almost trivial, but why the physical world prefers a sum over an integral still escapes our understanding. Going, then, to the heart of the matter,

the solution to the blackbody problem may be developed from a calculation of the average energy of a harmonic oscillator of frequency ν in thermal equilibrium at temperature T . Taking a continuous energy variable $y = E/h\nu$ leads to the calculation

$$\frac{\int_0^\infty ye^{-yx} dy}{\int_0^\infty e^{-yx} dy} = -\frac{(1/x)'}{1/x} = \frac{1}{x}, \quad (1)$$

where we define

$$x \equiv \frac{h\nu}{kT}, \quad (2)$$

and k is Boltzmann's constant (' denotes differentiation with respect to x); the result is the one expected from the classical equipartition theorem. Taking a discrete energy variable, $E_n = nh\nu$, gives

$$\frac{\sum_{n=0}^\infty ne^{-nx}}{\sum_{n=0}^\infty e^{-nx}} = -\frac{[1/(1-e^{-x})]'}{1/(1-e^{-x})} = \frac{1}{e^x - 1}. \quad (3)$$

There is agreement between the sum and the integral for $x \ll 1$, when the average energy is made up from very many of Planck's "equal parts;" this is the domain of validity of the Rayleigh-Jeans formula. Outside this domain discreteness brings about Planck's quantum correction.

The pure formality of the difference is striking. The blackbody problem hardly demands that we take the energy quantum $h\nu$ too seriously, whether the oscillator be considered to be a material oscillator or a mode of the radiation field [7]. Indeed, summed over oscillators of all frequencies, the total energy is in effect continuous still. Considering the radiation oscillators, it has, in fact, only recently become possible to make a direct observation of discrete single-mode energies. Remarkably, measurement are made at microwave frequencies where the energy quantum is exceedingly small. The feat is accomplished using the strong dipole interaction between an atom excited to a Rydberg state and a mode of a superconducting microwave cavity cooled near absolute zero [8]; the system has become a paradigm for studies in cavity QED [9]. In this talk I will discuss other results from the interesting field of cavity QED, but for a physical system where the material and radiation oscillators have optical frequencies.

So Eqs. (1) and (3) contrast the discrete with the continuous. Of course, concepts of both characters enter into classical physics: Newton's mass point is discrete, the particle or atom is discrete, as are any "things" counted ... on the other hand the evolution over time unfolds continuously, the *location* of a particle lies in a continuum, Maxwell's waves are continuous. The important point about classical thinking is that ideas on the two sides remain apart from one another, even if they have sometimes competed, as, for example, in the varied attempts to account for the nature of light. Quantum physics on the other hand, as it developed in the three decades after Planck's discovery, found a need for an uncomfortable fusion of

the discrete and the continuous. Arguments about particles *or* waves gave way to a recognized need for particles *and* waves. Thus, throughout the period of the old quantum theory, from Planck until Heisenberg [10] and Schrödinger [11], a genuine “wave/particle duality” steadily emerged. The full history is complex [12–14] and I will mention only some of the most often quoted highlights.

Einstein, in a series of celebrated papers, lay down the important markers on the particle side [15]. Amongst other things, he brought Planck’s quantum into clear focus as a possible particle of light [16], argued that discreteness was essential to Planck’s derivation of the radiation law [17], and incorporated the quantum and its discreteness into a quantum dynamics which accounted for the exchange of energy between radiation and matter oscillators in a manner consistent with that law [18]. Adding to this, Bohr’s work connecting Planck’s ideas to fundamental atomic structure must be seen to support an argument on the particle side [19]. Yet Bohr, like most others, was opposed to Einstein’s tinkering with the conventional description of the free radiation field as a continuous wave.

The case on the side of the wave was easily made on the basis of interference phenomena. Nonetheless, over time it became clear that the particle idea could not simply be dismissed and it was suggested that the clue to a union lay, not in the nature of free radiation, but in the nature of the interaction of radiation with matter. Planck was among those to expressed this view [20]: “I believe one should first try to move the whole difficulty of the quantum theory to the domain of the interaction of matter with radiation.” The suggestion was followed up most seriously in a bold work authored by Bohr, Kramers, and Slater (BKS) [21] and based on a proposal of Slater’s [22]. The key element was not a part of Slater’s original proposal, however, which had waves—a “virtual radiation field”—guiding light particles [23]. For BKS there were no light particles. The virtual waves comprised the entire radiation field, radiated *continuously* by virtual material oscillators. The response of the matter to the continuous radiation obeyed a quite different rule though; following Einstein’s ideas on stimulated emission and absorption [18], the wave amplitude was to determine probabilities for *discrete* transitions (quantum jumps) between stationary states [24]. The aim was to retain both the continuity of Maxwell waves and the discreteness of quantized matter by confining each to its own domain.

There was a price to be paid for preserving the apartness, however. The BKS scheme was noncausal (stochastic) at a fundamental level and although energy and momentum were conserved on average, they would not be conserved by individual quantum events. Statistical energy conservation had been considered before; Einstein was one of those who had toyed with the idea [25]. BKS cast the idea in a concrete form with predictions that would be tested within less than a year. Their proposal was not entirely misguided; we meet with a “virtual” radiation field—though mathematically more sophisticated—in modern field theory. The fatal weakness was that their scheme did not causally connect the downward jump of an emitting atom with the subsequent upward jump of a particular absorbing atom. Direct correlation between quantum events was therefore excluded, yet correlation

was just what the X-ray experiments of Bothe and Geiger [26] and Compton and Simon [27] observed.

Quantum optics took up the theme of correlations between quantum events in the 1970s, as lasers began to be used for investigating the properties of light. This talk reviews a little of what has grown from those beginnings. Only a small piece of the history is covered since the main story I want to tell is about a particular experiment in cavity QED [28]. The experiment uncovers the tensions raised by wave/particle duality in a unique way, by detecting light as both particle and wave, correlating the measured wave property (radiation field amplitude) with the particle detection (photoelectric count). Thus, light is observed directly in both its character roles, something that has not been achieved in a single experiment before.

We will work up to the new results gradually. We begin with an updated statement of the BKS idea (Sect. II) which we use as a criterion to define what we mean when speaking of the nonclassicality of light. I will then say a few things about the cavity QED light source and what it is about cavity QED that makes its fluctuations of special interest (Sect. III). I first discuss the fluctuations in their separate particle and wave aspects: photon antibunching, seen if one correlates particle with particle (Sect. IV), is contrasted with quadrature squeezing which is seen if one correlates wave (amplitude) with wave (Sect. V). Individually, photon antibunching and quadrature squeezing each show light to be nonclassical by our criterion. Each may be explained however by modeling light as either purely particle or wave. Finally, I will describe the wave-particle correlations measured by Foster *et al.* [28] (Sect. VI), where neither conception alone can explain what is observed.

II A CRITERION FOR NONCLASSICALITY

Although there are still a few contrary voices, the opinion amongst physicists generally is that light—electromagnetic radiation at optical frequencies—must be quantized, with the introduction of Einstein’s light particle, in order to account for the full range of observable optical phenomena. Einstein stated his view that something of the sort might be the case in the introduction to his 1905 paper, where he writes [16]: “One should, however, bear in mind that optical observations refer to time averages and not to instantaneous values and notwithstanding the complete experimental verification of the theory of diffraction, reflexion, refraction, dispersion, and so on, it is quite conceivable that a theory of light involving the use of continuous functions in space will lead to contradictions with experience, if it is applied to the phenomena of the creation and conversion of light.”

Einstein identified specifically “the phenomena of the creation and conversion of light” as the point where contradictions might be found. Considering modern quantum optics experiments, it is indeed to the “conversion” or, more precisely, detection of the light that we look to define what is, or is not, a failure of the classical wave theory. Light is detected through the photoelectric effect where it is

responsible, through some process of conversion, for the appearance of countable events—i.e, the production of photoelectric pulses. If the light is to be a continuous wave, it interfaces awkwardly with the discreteness of the countable events. The BKS attempt at an interface is nevertheless remarkably successful in accounting for the action of the light from most sources on a detector. It is therefore commonly adopted as a criterion, or test, for those phenomena that truly contradict classical ideas. It is adopted in the spirit of Bohr’s comment to Geiger after he had learnt of Geiger’s new X-ray results [29]: “I was completely prepared [for the news] that our proposed point of view on the independence of the quantum process in separated atoms should turn out to be incorrect. The whole thing was more an expression of an attempt to achieve as great as possible application of classical concepts, rather than a completed theory.”

Figure 1 illustrates the BKS interface as it is applied to the photoelectric detection of light. On the left, the light is describe by a continuous wave, specified at the position of the detector by an electric field, $2A_t \cos(\omega_0 t + \phi_t)$, whose amplitude A_t and phase ϕ_t are generally fluctuating quantities (random variables at each time t). We consider the fluctuations to be slow compare to the frequency ω_0 of the carrier wave; thus, although the light has nonzero bandwidth it is still quasi-monochromatic. On the other side of the figure, the sequence of photoelectrons is discrete. Photoelectrons are produced at times t_1, t_2, \dots , with some number N_t of them generated up to the time t . The difficulty is to interface the continuity on the left with the discreteness on the right. This is done by allowing the amplitude of the wave to determine the “instantaneous” rate at which the random photoelectric detection events occur. With a suitable choice of units for A_t , the probability per unit time for a bound electron to be released between t and $t + dt$ is given by the local time average of the light intensity, A_t^2 .

The issue now is whether or not this model can account for what one observes with real photoelectric detectors and light sources. Specifically, is it always possible to choose a continuous stochastic process (A_t, ϕ_t) such that, in their statistical




FIGURE 1. Semiclassical photoelectric detection of quasi-monochromatic light couples a discrete stochastic process N_t (photoelectron counting sequence) to a continuous stochastic process $2A_t \cos(\omega_0 t + \phi_t)$ (classical electromagnetic field) through random detection events occurring, at time t , at the rate A_t^2 .

properties (correlations), the observed photoelectric detection sequences which constitute the experimental data can, in fact, be produced through the suggested rule? The short answer, as we would expect, is that it is not always possible to do so. On the other hand, for most light sources the BKS rule works just fine. It has actually been quite an experimental challenge to produce light for which the rule fails.

III LIGHT SOURCES AND THEIR FLUCTUATIONS

To start out we might ask how blackbody radiation fairs. By filtering a thermal source, such as a spectroscopic lamp, it is possible to produce quasi-monochromatic blackbody radiation. Consider then the fluctuations of such a light source. Let us calculate the variance of the quasimode energy as Einstein first did in 1909 [30]. The continuous variable approach of Eq. (1) makes the calculation appropriate to classical waves. Here we need the integration

$$\overline{y^2} = \frac{\int_0^\infty y^2 e^{-yx} dy}{\int_0^\infty e^{-yx} dy} = \frac{(1/x)''}{1/x} = 2\bar{y}^2, \quad (4)$$

where \bar{y} is the average energy, $1/x$; we obtain

$$\overline{\Delta y^2} \equiv \overline{y^2} - \bar{y}^2 = \bar{y}^2. \quad (5)$$

Alternatively, in the discrete variable approach of Eq. (3) we make the summation

$$\overline{n^2} = \frac{\sum_{n=0}^\infty n^2 e^{-nx}}{\sum_{n=0}^\infty e^{-nx}} = \frac{[1/(1 - e^{-x})]''}{1/(1 - e^{-x})} = 2\bar{n}^2 + \bar{n}, \quad (6)$$

where $\bar{n} = 1/(e^x - 1)$ is the average energy. In this case we arrive at

$$\overline{\Delta n^2} \equiv \overline{n^2} - \bar{n}^2 = \bar{n}^2 + \bar{n}. \quad (7)$$

Equation (7) is the result obtained by Einstein and taken by him as evidence that the theory of light would eventually evolve into “a kind of fusion” of wave and particle ideas: light possess both a wave character, which gives the \bar{n}^2 , and a particle character, which gives the \bar{n} [30–32].

It would appear, then, that the detection of blackbody radiation would be incorrectly described by the scheme of Fig. 1, since there the amplitude and energy of the light wave is continuously distributed, which should lead to Eq. (5), the incorrect result. This, however, is not the case at all; thermal light fluctuations do not meet our criterion for nonclassicality. In fact BKS made an attempt at the needed ‘fusion’. They did not eliminate particles to favor waves. They attempted only to keep the particles and waves separate. The separation recovers the two terms of Eq. (7) from two distinct (independent) levels of randomness. To see this we must identify the integer n , not with the free radiation field, but with the number of photoelectrons counted in a *measurement* of the field energy. The first term,

the wave-like term in Eq. (7), is then recovered from the randomness of the field amplitude A_t , just as in Eq. (5), while the second particle-like term is recovered from the additional randomness of the photoelectron counting sequence introduced by the rule governing the production of photoelectrons. Even if A_t fluctuates not at all the photoelectron number will still fluctuate. It will be Poisson distributed. The second term of Eq. (7) is recovered as the variance of the Poisson distribution (which equals its mean).

Laser light is a good approximation to the ideal, coherent Maxwell wave which produces only the Poisson fluctuations generated in the detection process. Of course, once one has a laser, one can make a whole range of fluctuating light sources by imposing noisy modulations of one sort or another. So long, however, as the fluctuations are imposed, and thus independent of the randomness introduced in generating the photoelectrons, nothing more regular than a Poisson photoelectron stream will be seen. Here, then, is the Achilles heel of the BKS approach; it permits only super-Poissonian photoelectron count fluctuations. Once again, the limitation involves a discounting of correlations at the level of single quantum events. To illustrate, imagine a light source in which the emitting atoms make their quantum jumps from higher to lower energy at perfectly regular intervals. In the particle view, the source sends out a regular stream of photons, which, supposing efficient detection, yields a regular, temporally correlated, photoelectron stream. Such a photoelectron stream is impossible in the BKS view; its observation would meet our criterion for nonclassicality.

Any experimental search for the disallowed correlations must begin with a method for engineering light's fluctuations on the scale of Planck's energy quantum. What one can do is begin with laser light and scatter it, through some material interaction, to produce light that fluctuates in an intrinsically quantum mechanical way. Coherent scattering is of no use, since it looks just like the laser light—neither is incoherent scattering in which the fluctuations simply arise from noisy modulations. The fluctuations must be caused by the “quantum jumpiness” in the matter; the experiment must be sensitive enough to see the effects of individual quantum events. This is rather a tall order, since if we have in mind scattering from a sample of atoms, say, the effect, on the fluctuations, of what any one atom is doing is generally very small. Happily, cavity QED comes to our aid.

The light source used in the experiment I wish to discuss is illustrated in Fig. 2. Basically, a beam of coherent light is passed through a dilute atomic beam—at right angles to minimize the Doppler effect. The light is resonant with a transition in the atoms, which make their “jumps” up and down while scattering some of the light, and hence add fluctuations to the transmitted beam. The incoherent part of this forwards scattering would be extremely small without the mirrors. They are essential; they form a resonator which enhances the fluctuations. We might understand the requirements for the resonator by observing that the goal (thinking of light particles) is to redistribute the photons in the incoming beam. The interaction of the atoms with a first photon must therefore change the probability for the transmission of the next. The strength of any such collusion between pairs of




FIGURE 2. Schematic of the cavity QED light source. The input laser light and Fabry-Perot cavity are both tuned to resonance with a dipole allowed transition in the atoms.

photons is set by Einstein’s induced emission rate in the presence of a single photon. This rate must be similar to the inverse residence time of a photon trapped between the mirrors. It follows that the resonator must be small so that the energy density of one photon is large, and the mirrors must be highly reflecting so that the residence time is long.

The experimental details go beyond the scope of this talk, but a few numbers might be of interest [33,34]. Typical resonator lengths are $100\text{-}500\mu\text{m}$ with 50,000 bounces of a photon between the mirrors before it escapes. The transverse width of the resonator mode is typically $30\mu\text{m}$, which means the resonator confines a photon within a volume of order 10^{-13}m^3 ; the electric field of that photon is approximately 10Vcm^{-1} . The duration of a fluctuation written onto the light beam may be estimated from the photon lifetime, $(L/c)N_{\text{bounce}} \sim 50\text{ns}$, where L is the resonator length and N_{bounce} is the number of mirror bounces. This is a long time compared with the speed of modern photoelectric detectors which makes it possible to observe the fluctuations directly in the time domain. We should note, also, that the fluctuations are extremely slow compared with the period of the carrier wave; a typical fluctuation will last more than 10^7 optical cycles.

It is not really necessary to understand what takes place inside the resonator. We are interested in the results of measurements made on the output beam and whether or not they can be reproduced by our detection model (Fig. 1) and *any* fluctuating wave $A_t \cos(\omega_0 t + \phi_t)$. One feature of the data is particularly noticeable though: an oscillation at a frequency of around 40MHz (see Figs. 4 and 9), which suggests that the fluctuations caused by the interaction with the atoms take the form of an amplitude modulation. The modulation is a fundamental piece of phenomenology from the world of cavity QED, referred to variously as a vacuum Rabi oscillation [35,36], a normal-mode oscillation [37], or a cavity polariton oscillation [38,39]. The physics involved is rather simple. The electric field of the resonator mode excited by the incident light obeys the equation of a harmonic oscillator, of frequency ω_0 . To a good approximation the electric polarization induced in the atoms by that field is also described as a harmonic oscillator (Lorentz oscillator model), also with

frequency ω_0 . The two oscillators couple through the interaction between the atoms and light; and coupled harmonic oscillators exchange energy coherently, back and forth, so long as the period of the exchange—determined by the inverse of the coupling strength—is shorter than the energy damping time. It is just this coherent energy exchange that is seen in the fluctuations. The small mode volume of the resonators used in cavity QED experiments ensures that the energy oscillation has a period shorter than the damping time—although there are still some 10^7 optical cycles during any one period.

IV PHOTON ANTIBUNCHING: A PROBE OF PARTICLE FLUCTUATIONS

Let us look first at a measurement that leads us towards the opinion that what is transmitted by the resonator is a stream of light particles. In Fig. 3, we return, with more details, to our criterion for nonclassicality. Here, in a somewhat arbitrary example, I have generated a realization of the photoelectric counts that might be produced for a particular wave $A_t \cos(\omega_0 t + \phi_t)$. It is of course unreasonable to use a realistic carrier frequency, and therefore the frequency in the picture is about a million times smaller—relative to the timescale of the fluctuations—than it would be in reality.

We see from the figure that there are correlations between what the wave is doing and the sequence of photoelectrons: when the wave amplitude is large the photoelectric counts come more quickly; when the wave amplitude is small there are gaps in the count sequence. There are also correlations, over time, within each of the time series. Thus, if at time t the intensity A_t^2 is high, it is likely that $A_{t+\tau}^2$ is also high for small positive and negative delays τ . Equivalently, if there is a photoelectron produced at time t , there is a larger than average chance that another is produced nearby at a delayed time $t + \tau$. Quantitative statements about the correlations can be made by introducing the correlation function




FIGURE 3. Monte-Carlo simulation of a photoelectric count sequence produced, with count rate A_t^2 , by the shown fluctuating electromagnetic field $A_t \cos(\omega_0 t + \phi_t)$.

$$g^{(2)}(\tau) \equiv \frac{\text{probability for a photoelectric detection at times } t \text{ and } t+\tau}{(\text{probability for a photoelectric detection at time } t)^2}, \quad (8)$$

where we will assume we are talking about stationary fluctuations, which simply means that all probabilities and averages are independent of t ; the correlation function depends only on the time difference τ .

According to the BKS detection model, photoelectrons are produced as random events at rate A_t^2 . The correlations in the photoelectron counting sequence are therefore connected to the fluctuations of the wave through the joint detection probability

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{probability for a photoelectric} \\ \text{detection at times } t \text{ and } t+\tau \end{array} \right\} \propto A_t^2 A_{t+\tau}^2; \quad (9)$$

there can be no stronger connection between events than can be expressed through the correlations of the continuous variable A_t . It is rather easy to see that this feature imposes constraints on the function $g^{(2)}(\tau)$. Specifically, averaging over the random variables A_t and $A_{t+\tau}$ one finds that the inequalities

$$g^{(2)}(0) - 1 \geq 0 \quad (10)$$

and

$$|g^{(2)}(\tau) - 1| \leq |g^{(2)}(0) - 1| \quad (11)$$

must hold. Inequality (10), for example, restates a point we have already noted; namely, that the BKS idea leads, unavoidably, to a photoelectron counting sequence that is more irregular than a Poisson process. The inequality relies on nothing more than the fact that the variance of A_t^2 must be positive. Needless-to-say, to take over Einstein's expression [16], inequalities (10) and (11) "lead to contradictions with experience." The data of Fig. 4, as an illustration, violate both.

In order to obtain the result shown in the figure, the photoelectric counts must be anticorrelated, in the sense that the appearance of a count at any particular time in the photoelectron count sequence makes it less, rather than more likely, that another will appear nearby. The phenomenon is called photon antibunching to contrast it with the photon bunching—positive correlation—seen with a source of blackbody radiation [40]. The simplest example of antibunched light is provided by the resonance fluorescence from a single atom [41] and the first observations of the phenomenon were made on the fluorescence from a dilute atomic beam [42]. More recently, beautiful measurements have been made on individual atoms, or more precisely, electromagnetically trapped ions [43]. The data of Fig. 4 were taken for a cavity QED source like the one illustrated in Fig. 2 [34]. Such a source produces a weak beam of antibunched light [44–46].

Photon antibunching is nonclassical by our adopted criterion. It is incompatible with the demarcation enforced by BKS between continuous light waves and discrete photoelectric counts. It is quite compatible, on the other hand, with a particle




FIGURE 4. Violation of the inequalities imposed on the intensity correlation function by the photoelectric detection scheme of Fig. 1. To satisfy the inequalities the correlation function should show a maximum greater than unity at zero delay; accepting the observed minimum, it must then lie entirely between the dashed lines. Figure reproduced from Ref. [34].

constitution for light. Indeed, there is nothing particularly peculiar, in principle, about a sequence of photoelectric counts more regular than a Poisson process, and such a sequence could be generated causally by a regular stream of light particles.

V QUADRATURE SQUEEZING: A PROBE OF WAVE FLUCTUATIONS

The only difficulty with the stream of light particles is that, looked at in another way, the same source of light does appear to be emitting a noisy wave. Whenever interference is involved, a wave nature for light seems unavoidable. There are, of course, numerous situations in which the interference of light is seen. We are all familiar, for example, with Young’s two-slit experiment. Considering wave aspects of the fluctuations of light calls for an interference experiment that is just a little bit more complex.

Balanced homodyne detection provides a method for directly measuring the amplitude of a light wave. The method is carried over from the microwave domain and was proposed in the 1980s [47] for detecting the fluctuations of what is known as quadrature squeezed light [48–50]. The light that produced Fig. 4, which is antibunched when photoelectron counts are considered, is quadrature squeezed when its amplitude is measured. Like photon antibunching, quadrature squeezing contradicts the BKS model of photoelectric detection; according to our criterion it is also nonclassical. It, however, leads us away from the stream of light particles and towards the view that light is indeed a noisy wave; not, on the other hand, exactly the wave BKS had in mind.

I find it most helpful to understand quadrature squeezing in an operational way, so I will proceed in this direction, and hopefully move ahead in a series of easy

steps. The basic idea in balanced homodyne detection is to interfere the signal wave, $A_t \cos(\omega t + \phi_t)$, with a reference or local oscillator wave, $A_{LO} \cos(\omega t + \phi_{LO})$, which ideally has a stable amplitude and phase. If the interference takes place at a 50/50 beam splitter as illustrated in Fig. 5 (the signal wave is injected where it says “no signal”), then there are in fact two output fields,

$$\text{field 1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[A_{LO} \cos(\omega t + \phi_{LO}) + A_t \cos(\omega t + \phi_t)], \quad (12a)$$

$$\text{field 2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[A_{LO} \cos(\omega t + \phi_{LO}) - A_t \cos(\omega t + \phi_t)], \quad (12b)$$

which respectively display constructive and destructive interference. These fields are separately detected, and the rates at which photoelectrons are generated in the two detectors, once again adopting the detection model of Fig. 1, are

$$\text{rate 1} \approx \frac{1}{2}[A_{LO}^2 + A_{LO}A_t \cos(\phi_{LO} - \phi_t)], \quad (13a)$$

$$\text{rate 2} \approx \frac{1}{2}[A_{LO}^2 - A_{LO}A_t \cos(\phi_{LO} - \phi_t)], \quad (13b)$$

where to obtain these expressions we square the fields, average over one carrier wave period, and drop the term A_t^2 under the assumption $A_t \ll A_{LO}$. The average photocurrents from the detectors are proportional to the rates (13a) and (13b), and when the photocurrents are subtracted, the average difference current provides a




FIGURE 5. In balanced homodyne detection, a coherent local oscillator field with frequency ω_0 matching that of the signal carrier wave is superposed with the signal at a 50/50 beam splitter. The resulting output light is detected with a pair of fast photodiodes and the two photocurrents subtracted to zero the mean “no signal” current. An electronic shot noise remains, uncanceled; it is necessarily present according to the scheme of Fig. 1 due to the randomness of the detection events that generate the photocurrents. The “no signal” noise width measures the size of this noise and scales with the amplitude of the local oscillator field and the square root of the detection bandwidth.




FIGURE 6. (a) A signal field of fixed amplitude and phase unbalances the homodyne detector so that the mean difference current moves away from zero while the noise width remains unchanged. (b) A fluctuating signal unbalances the detector in a noisy way, sweeping the difference current back and forth. This introduces additional low-frequency noise which must *increase* the overall noise width.

measurement of the amplitude A_t (consider the case $\phi_{LO} = \phi_t$). Thus, we have a device that measures the amplitude of a light wave and its operation depends explicitly on the capacity of waves to interfere.

We now turn to the issue of fluctuations. Imagine first that there is no signal injected. The two photocurrents are produced with equal photoelectron count rates, $\frac{1}{2}A_{LO}^2$. The average difference current is therefore zero. But according to the detection model of Fig. 1, individual detection events occur randomly, and independently at the two detectors; hence, the current fluctuates about zero. Since the counts are Poisson distributed, there is a

$$\text{“no signal” noise width} \propto \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}A_{LO}^2 + \frac{1}{2}A_{LO}^2} = A_{LO}. \quad (14)$$

This is an unavoidable background noise level and when a clean, noiseless signal is injected, to unbalance the detector, as illustrated in Fig. 6(a), the measurement of the signal amplitude is made against this background noise.

In the end, then, there is again a constraint, akin to inequalities (10) and (11), imposed by the detection model. To see what it is, consider finally the injection of a fluctuating signal. The signal adds a fluctuating offset, or unbalancing of the detector, which sweeps the “no signal” noise band backwards and forwards [Fig. 6(b)] to produce a *larger* overall noise width; for a fluctuating signal we must *add* the statistically independent

$$\text{signal noise width} \propto \sqrt{A_{LO}^2 \overline{A_t^2}} = A_{LO} \sqrt{\overline{A_t^2}} \quad (15)$$

to the “no signal” noise width, where $\overline{A_t^2}$ is the variance of the signal fluctuations. Thus, according to the BKS detection model, measuring the fluctuations of the light wave amplitude can never yield a noise width smaller than (14), the width that in more conventional language is called the *shot noise level*.

In reality smaller noise can be seen, and is seen, for squeezed light. The first successful experiment was performed in the mid-1980s [51] and squeezing for a cavity QED source like the one that produced the antibunched data of Fig. 4 was observed soon thereafter [52]. In general, the noise level is measured as a function of frequency. It is therefore characterized fully by a spectrum of squeezing. Figure 9(c) shows an example for a cavity QED source. The squeezing occurs around the frequency of the oscillation seen in Fig. 4.

Quadrature squeezing, like photon antibunching, reveals that a beam of light may exhibit smaller fluctuations—more regularity—than is permitted by the random events that make the interface between light waves and photoelectrons in Fig. 1. In the case of photon antibunching, we may imagine that the regular photoelectrons are seen because the light already, before interaction, possesses the discrete property revealed in the photoelectron counting data—i.e., the light beam is itself a stream of particles. With quadrature squeezing a similar tactic might be followed; the fluctuation properties of the photocurrent might be transferred, ahead of any interaction with the detector, to the beam of light. The one difficulty here, though, is that the injection of no light also generates photocurrent noise, which is the situation depicted in Fig. 5. The way around this obstacle is to say that a fluctuating wave is present—call it the vacuum fluctuations—even in absolute darkness, and that it is the interference of this “noisy darkness” with the local oscillator that is responsible for the “no signal” noise width. A smaller noise level can then be seen if one can deamplify the “noisy darkness” (vacuum fluctuations); the cavity QED system of Fig. 2 is a device that brings about deamplification.

I should stress that when one accounts for quadrature squeezing in this way, the vacuum fluctuations need not be encumbered by any abstractions of modern quantum field theory. The vacuum of radiation is literally filled with noisy waves, precisely in the way proponents of stochastic electrodynamics assert it to be [53,54].

VI WAVE-PARTICLE CORRELATIONS

What we have seen so far amounts to a fairly traditional view on wave/particle duality, although the players, photon antibunching and quadrature squeezing, are possibly unfamiliar; photon antibunching sits comfortably on the particle side, while quadrature squeezing, because of the role of interference, speaks for light as a wave. The recent experiment by Foster et al. [28] brings the duality into focus in a more perplexing way by putting both players into action at once. That is not to say that it demonstrates a contradiction, of the sort that would be met if, in a double-slit experiment, one could record the choice, slit 1 or slit 2, for the path of every particle, yet still observe an interference pattern on the screen. Nevertheless, data of the discrete, particle-type, and continuous wave-type are taken simultaneously, so that light is seen in the experiment to act as particle *and* wave. The experiment underscores the subtlety involved in the coexistence of waves and particles under Bohr’s complementarity, the illusive contextuality of quantum mechanical explanations.

Specifically, the apparently satisfying explanations given for photon antibunching and quadrature squeezing—passing whatever properties are seen in the data over to the light—appear, in this wider context, to be something of a deception.

The experimental apparatus is sketched in Fig. 7. At the top of the figure there is a cavity QED system which acts as the source of fluctuating light. The emitted light is divided between two detectors, one labeled **PARTICLE** which records discrete photoelectric counts, and the other labeled **WAVE** is a balanced homodyne detector. If all of the light were sent to just one detector, the apparatus could be used to measure either photon antibunching or quadrature squeezing. In fact, the detectors are running simultaneously. A count at the particle detector triggers the recording of the photocurrent at the wave detector output—a little before and a little after the time of the count—and many of these records are averaged to produce what appears on the oscilloscope. What might we expect to see from this *conditional* measurement of the wave amplitude? The experiment records the fluctuation of the amplitude of the wave that accompanies the arrival of a photon at the particle detector. How will the wave and particle properties be correlated?




FIGURE 7. Experimental apparatus used to measure wave-particle correlations for the cavity QED light source. Photoelectric detections at the avalanche photodiode (APD) trigger the recording of the photocurrent from the balanced homodyne detector (BHD). The correlator displays the cumulative average over many such records. Figure reproduced from Ref. [34].

In Fig. 8 I attempt to show what would be expected on the basis of the BKS detection model. A fluctuation from the light source is injected into the correlator at the lower left; I give it the sort of amplitude modulation evident in Fig. 4. The input wave is split, and passed on, at half size, to the two detectors. Now the triggering sets the time origin for the amplitude envelope function measured by the wave detector. The question, then, is, at what point in time is the particle detector most likely to fire ... the answer: when the fluctuation in the amplitude of the wave reaches its maximum. Strangely, the reality is exactly the opposite, as is seen from the data shown in Fig. 9(b). Figure 9(a) shows the corresponding particle-particle correlation function, $g^{(2)}(\tau)$, which in this case satisfies the inequalities (10)

and (10). In Fig. 9(c) we see the spectrum of squeezing, which might have been measured directly, but was in fact deduced from the correlation function plotted in Fig. 9(b).




FIGURE 8. Semiclassical analysis of the wave-particle correlator: The signal fluctuation incoming from the lower left is divided at a beam splitter into two parts, with one part sent to the particle detector and the other to the wave detector. Each “click” of the particle detector fixes the time origin, $\tau = 0$, for a sampling of the wave detector output over the duration of the fluctuation; the local oscillator phase is set to measure the amplitude of the wave envelope. According to the photoelectric detection scheme of Fig. 1, the particle detector “clicks” most often when the intensity is *maximum*. This should place the *maximum* of the measured wave amplitude at $\tau = 0$.




FIGURE 9. Nonclassical wave-particle correlations for the cavity QED light source: (a) the measured intensity correlation function is classically allowed, (b) the corresponding wave-particle correlation function, which should lie entirely within the shaded region according to the photoelectric detection scheme of Fig. 1, (c) the spectrum of squeezing obtained as the Fourier transform of (b); for a classical field the spectrum would lie entirely above the dashed line. Figure reproduced from Ref. [34].

There are stronger signatures of nonclassicality to be observed than this conversion of an expected maximum to a minimum. These may be stated quantitatively, as violations of inequalities like those of Eqs. (10) and (11) [55]. The most interesting says that the function plotted in Fig. 9(b) is constrained under the BKS detection model by an absolute upper bound, $h_{\theta^{\circ}}(\tau) \leq 2$. The bound is not violated in the figure, but is predicted to be violated in a more sensitive experiment by a factor of 10 or even 100. Considering the minimum itself, though; how is it to be understood; and what does it have to say about the interplay of waves and particles?

Of course a calculation within the modern mathematical framework for treating quantized fields predicts the minimum at $\tau = 0$. Merely calculating gives little physical insight though; for insight we turn to something more qualitative. First, I should expand a bit on what is shown in Fig. 8. Over an ensemble of triggered measurements, the phase of the modulated envelope function will vary from shot to shot. Two extreme cases are shown in Fig. 10. In both, according to the detection model of Fig. 1, triggering off a maximum of the envelope places a maximum of the measured field amplitude at $\tau = 0$ —the absolute locations of the maxima in the incoming fluctuations do not matter, only the correlation between locations in the two waves emerging from the beam splitter. The unexpected minimum of Fig. 9(b) may now be obtained, rather simply, by viewing the cases shown, not as two possible outcomes realized on distinct occasions—one *or* the other on any occasion—but as two possibilities that occur simultaneously, and yet retain their distinctness. The words “retain their distinctness” are essential. We are not to add together the waves shown bracketed in Fig. 11 as one would add classical waves. Each of these waves also has a discrete attribute, indicating an individuality with respect to its counterpart, as a whole, distinct, “one-particle wave”—the two pieces being assembled, the bracketed object is a “two-particle wave.” In modern language we would call it a two-photon wavepacket.

To explain the data we now assert, that at the beam splitter, the discreteness, or wholeness, comes into play, and one one-particle wave goes in either direction. We may then continue with the idea that the particle detector is most likely to fire when




FIGURE 10. Two possible signal fluctuations, centered, respectively, on a maximum and a minimum in the amplitude of the wave envelope. In either case the particle detector “clicks” most often on a maximum, which places the *maximum* of the measured wave amplitude at $\tau = 0$.




FIGURE 11. Schematic illustration of how the anomalous wave-particle correlations may be accounted for by combining wave and particle ideas. The alternatives in Fig. 10 are united as a single input fluctuation carried by a two-particle wave with correlated maxima and minima. The beam splitter then splits up the two-particle so as to preserve the wholeness of the individual waves. For either of the splittings shown, the correlation between maxima and minima is thus conveyed to the detectors so that the firing of the particle detector at the intensity maximum places the measured wave amplitude *minimum* at $\tau = 0$.

the intensity of the wave it sees is a maximum. With the now built in anticorrelation of modulation phases, whichever one-particle wave goes to the particle detector, the amplitude recorded by the wave detector is at a minimum at the triggering time. The two possibilities are shown in Fig. 11. There is of course a possibility that both one-particle waves go to the same detector; occurrences like this cannot, however, upset the correlation recorded by the data.

Thus, if we are to account for the correlations observed with the apparatus of Fig. 7, neither the particle stream that explained photon antibunching, nor the noisy wave that explained quadrature squeezing will do. We need a composite notion like the “two-particle wave” in order to embrace both pieces of the correlation, both the discrete triggering event and the continuously measured amplitude.

VII A CONCLUDING COMMENT

The main topics of my talk can be revisited in a short summary. We have seen how the BKS idea embodied in the photoelectric detection model of Fig. 1 is unable to account for certain correlations exhibited by the fluctuations of light. In these cases, an understanding of the correlations must relax the strict separation of particle and wave concepts carried over by BKS from classical theory. Substituting lasers for the blackbody sources studied by Planck, many experiments in recent years have observed such nonclassical correlations. The experiment of Foster et al. [28] is notable, in particular, because if its simultaneous measurement, and correlation, of the conflicting particle and wave aspects of light.

In a way, all of this serves only as an introduction to a second, more interesting, story. Looking to the quantum mechanics that eventually emerged over the years after Planck, surely, now, we can give an unproblematic account of what light really is? Unfortunately, in fact, we cannot, because we move here into new territory,

where we have to admit that although we have a formalism with which to calculate what we see, it is not at all unproblematic to put forward an ontology on which that formalism can rest. After BKS, Bohr’s thinking moved on to his ideas about complementarity [56,57]. Einstein never accepted these views, and on occasion dismissed them rather harshly [58]: “The Heisenberg-Bohr soothing philosophy—or religion?—is so finely chiseled that it provides a soft pillow for believers . . . This religion does dammed little for me.” Thus, the second story, the enunciation of exactly where quantum mechanics has led us, is an interesting one, but certainly also a difficult one to tell. All I can really do at the conclusion of this talk, is indicate how the scheme of Fig. 1 is changed to give a unified, quantum mechanical description of the incoming light from which the correct correlations can be extracted, whatever measurement is made.

The changed picture appears in Fig. 12 [59–61]. I must point out two things. In change number one, although, on the right, the photoelectrons are still conceived as a classical data record, the light on the left is accounted for in abstract form. It is no longer a wave of assigned quantitative value. It is represented by an *operator*, \hat{E} , which is defined, not by a value but by the actions it might take; the value of the wave emerges only when the operator acts—upon a second mathematical object, the state vector $|\psi_{\text{REC}}^t\rangle$. There is of course some mathematics that gives the explicit forms of \hat{E} and $|\psi_{\text{REC}}^t\rangle$. For an appreciation of the scheme, however, the mathematics is only a distraction.

Change number two, and an essential thing missing from the BKS proposal, is the label on the state vector, REC. Through this label, the state of the incoming light is allowed to depend on the history of the data record—the detection events that have already taken place. At the time of each event, \hat{E} acts on $|\psi_{\text{REC}}^t\rangle$ to annihilate a light particle, and in so doing updates the state of the incoming light to be consistent with the record of photoelectric counts. In this way, correlations at the level of the individual quantum events are taken into account. The communi-




FIGURE 12. The quantum trajectory treatment of the photoelectric detection of light couples the stochastic data record, N_t , to a stochastic state of the quantized electromagnetic field, $|\psi_{\text{REC}}^t\rangle$, through random detection events occurring, at time t , at the rate $\langle\psi_{\text{REC}}^t|\hat{E}^\dagger\hat{E}|\psi_{\text{REC}}^t\rangle$. The evolution of the quantum state becomes stochastic because there is a state reduction $|\psi_{\text{REC}}^t\rangle \rightarrow \hat{E}|\psi_{\text{REC}}^t\rangle$ (plus normalization) at the random times of the detection events.

cation through the label REC is what, today, quantum physicists call back action, or in other words the reduction of the state vector (or, less appealing, “collapse of the wavefunction”), applied here to the individual detection events. Without state reduction the Schrödinger equation entangles the two sides of Fig. 12. It offers a nonlocal description in terms of a global state vector. State reduction disentangles the state of the light from the realized photoelectrons, and the correlations we have called nonclassical are indirect evidence of this disentanglement.

Entanglement, nonlocality, state reduction, these are all words to remind us of the problematic issue of ontology. Other speakers will talk about them more directly [63,64,62]. It is difficult to say what will come from the attention these words are receiving one hundred years after Planck. Shall we come to understand better, perhaps through a refinement of our faculties of perception following from the amazing advances experimentation has made over these years. It might be appropriate to take the final thoughts on the subject from Max Planck [65]:

...“There is no doubt whatsoever that the stage at which theoretical physics has now arrived is beyond the average human faculties, even beyond the faculties of the great discoverers themselves. What, however, you must remember is that even if we progressed rapidly in the development of our powers of perception we could not finally unravel nature’s mystery. We could see the operation of causation, perhaps, in the finer activities of the atoms, just as on the old basis of the causal formulation in classical mechanics we could perceive and make material images of all that was observed as occurring in nature.

Where the discrepancy comes in to-day is not between nature and the principle of causality, but rather between the picture which we have made of nature and the realities in nature itself.”

REFERENCES

1. M. Planck, Verh. dt. Phys. Ges. **2**, 202 (1900).
2. M. Planck, Verh. dt. Phys. Ges. **2**, 237 (1900). English translations of this paper and Planck’s discussion remark [1] appear in D. ter Haar [3], pp. 79–81 and 82–90.
3. D. ter Haar, *The Old Quantum Theory* (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1967), pp. 3–14.
4. A. Pais, Rev. Mod. Phys. **51**, 863 (1979), pp. 867–71.
5. D. Murdoch, *Niels Bohr’s Philosophy of Physics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987), pp. 1–4.
6. J. Heilbron, “Compromises on the way to and from the Absolute,” this volume pp. ???–???
7. A derivation of Planck’s formula by averaging discrete energies for individual radiation field oscillators was given by Debye in 1910: P. Debye, Ann. Phys. (Leipz.) **33**, 1427 (1910). A closer connection between Eq. (3) and Planck’s work is made by taking the oscillator to be a material oscillator. Planck’s method for summing discrete states was not, however, based on a direct single oscillator average.
8. M. Brune, F. Schmidt-Kaler, A. Maali, J. Dreyer, E. Hagley, J.M. Raimond, and S. Haroche, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 1800 (1996).
9. P. Berman, ed., *Cavity Quantum Electrodynamics* (Academic Press, Boston, 1994).
10. W. Heisenberg, Z. Phys. **33**, 879 (1925).
11. E. Schrödinger, Ann. Phys. (Leipz.) **79**, 361 (1926).

12. R.H. Stuewer, *The Compton Effect* (Science History Publications, New York, 1975).
13. B.R. Wheaton, *The Tiger and the Shark, Empirical Roots of Wave-Particle Dualism* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1983).
14. D. Murdock [5], pp. 16–56.
15. A complete list of Einstein’s contributions with extensive commentary is given by A. Pais [4].
16. A. Einstein, *Ann. Phys.* **17**, 132 (1905). An English translation appears in D. ter Haar [3], pp. 91–107.
17. A. Einstein, *Ann. Phys.* **20**, 199 (1906).
18. A. Einstein, *Verh. Dtsch. Phys. Ges.* **18**, 318 (1916); *Phys. Z.* **18**, 121 (1917). An English translation of the second article appears in B. L. van der Waerden, *Sources of Quantum Mechanics* (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1967), Chap. 1.
19. N. Bohr, *Phil. Mag.* **26**, 1 (1913).
20. M. Planck, *Phys. Z.* **10**, 825 (1909).
21. N. Bohr, H.A. Kramers, and J.C. Slater, *Philos. Mag.* **47**, 785 (1924); *Z. Phys.* **24**, 69 (1924)
22. J.C. Slater, *Nature* **113**, 307 (1924).
23. J.C. Slater, *Nature* **116**, 278 (1925).
24. The ideas and background are reviewed in more detail in A. Pais [4], pp. 890–93 and D. Murdock [5], pp. 23–29.
25. A. Pais [4], p. 891.
26. W. Bothe and H. Geiger, *Naturwiss.* **13**, 440 (1925); *Z. Phys.* **32**, 639 (1925).
27. A.H. Compton and A.W. Simon, *Phys. Rev.* **25**, 306 (1925); *Phys. Rev.* **26**, 289 (1925).
28. G.T. Foster, L.A. Orozco, C.M. Castro-Beltran, and H.J. Carmichael, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 3149 (2000).
29. Quoted in [12], p. 301, from a letter, Bohr to Geiger, April 21, 1925, on deposit in the Archive for History of Quantum Physics in Philadelphia, Berkeley, and Copenhagen.
30. A. Einstein, *Phys. Z.* **10**, 185 (1909); *ibid.*, 817 (1909).
31. D. Murdock [5], pp. 8–10.
32. A. Pais [4], pp. 877–78.
33. G. Rempe, R.J. Thompson, H.J. Kimble, and R. Lalezari, *Opt. Lett.* **17**, 363 (1992).
34. G.T. Foster, S.L. Mielke, and L.A. Orozco, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 053821 (2000).
35. Y. Zhu, D.J. Gauthier, S.E. Morin, Q. Wu, H.J. Carmichael, and T.W. Mossberg, *Phys. rev. Lett.* **64**, 2499 (1990).
36. F. Bernadot, P. Nussenzvieg, M. Brune, J.M. Raimond, and S. Haroche, *Europhys. Lett.* **17**, 33 (1992).
37. M.G. Raizen, R.J. Thompson, R.J. Brecha, H.J. Kimble, and H.J. Carmichael, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 240 (1989); R.J. Thompson, G. Rempe, and H.J. Kimble, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 1132 (1992).
38. C. Weisbuch, M. Nishioka, A. Ishikawa, and Y. Arakawa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 3314 (1992).
39. R.P. Stanley, R. Houdré, U. Oesterle, M. Ilegems, and C. Weisbuch, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **65**, 2093 (1994).
40. R.H. Brown and R.Q. Twiss, *Nature* **177**, 27 (1956); **178**, 1046 (1956); *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **242**, 300 (1957); **243**, 291 (1957).
41. H.J. Carmichael and D.F. Walls, *J. Phys. B* **9**, L43 (1976); *ibid.*, 1199 (1976).
42. H.J. Kimble, M. Dagenais, and L. Mandel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **39**, 691 (1977); M. Dagenais and L. Mandel, *Phys. Rev. A* **18**, 2217 (1978).
43. F. Diedrich and H. Walther, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58**, 203 (1987).
44. P.R. Rice and H.J. Carmichael, *IEEE J. Quantum Electron* **QE 24**, 1352 (1988); H.J. Carmichael, R.J. Brecha, and P.R. Rice, *Optics Commun.* **82**, 73 (1991).
45. G. Rempe, R.J. Thompson, R.J. Brecha, W.D. Lee, and H.J. Kimble, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 1727 (1991)

46. S.L. Mielke, G.T. Foster, and L.A. Orozco, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 3948 (1998).
47. Y.P. Yuen and V.W.S. Chan, *Opt. Lett.* **8**, 177 (1983); errata, *ibid.*, 345 (1983).
48. D. Stoler, *Phys. Rev. D* **1**, 3217 (1970); **4**, 1925 (1971).
49. E.Y.C. Lu, *Lett. Nuovo Cimento* **2**, 1241 (1971).
50. H.P. Yuen, *Phys. Rev. A* **13**, 2226 (1976).
51. R.E. Slusher, L.W. Hollberg, B. Yurke, J.C. Mertz, and J.F. Valley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 2409 (1985).
52. M.G. Raizen, L.A. Orozco, Min Xiao, T.L. Boyd, and H.J. Kimble, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 198 (1987).
53. T.W. Marshall, *Proc. Roy. Soc. London* **276**, 475 (1963).
54. T.W. Marshall and E. Santos, *Found. Phys.* **18**, 185 (1988).
55. H.J. Carmichael, C.M. Castro-Beltran, G.T. Foster, and L.A. Orozco, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 1855 (2000).
56. N. Bohr, *Nature* **121**, 580 (1928); *Naturw.* **16**, 245 (1928).
57. N. Bohr, in *Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist*, ed. P. Schilpp (Tudor, New York, 1949), p. 199.
58. Quoted in A. Pais, *Niels Bohr's Times* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1991), p. 425, from a letter, Einstein to Schrödinger, reprinted in *Letters on Wave Mechanics*, ed. M. Klein (Philosophical Library, New York, 1967).
59. H.J. Carmichael, *An Open Systems Approach to Quantum Optics*, Lecture Notes In Physics: New Series m: Monographs, Vol. m18 (Springer, Berlin, 1993)
60. H.J. Carmichael, "Stochastic Schrödinger equations: What they mean and what they can do," in *Coherence and Quantum Optics VII*, eds. J.H. Eberly, L. Mandel, and E. Wolf (Plenum, New York, 1996), pp. 177–92
61. H.J. Carmichael, "Quantum jumps revisited: An overview of quantum trajectory theory," in *Quantum Future, From Volta and Como to the Present and Beyond*, eds. Ph. Blanchard and A. Jadczyk (Springer, Berlin, 1999), pp. 15–36
62. W. Wootters, "Quantum Entanglement as a Resource for Communication," this volume pp. ???–???
63. A. Shimony, "Quantum Nonlocality," this volume pp. ???–???
64. R. Omnes, "The New Face of Interpretation—New Problems," this volume pp. ???–???
65. M. Planck, *Where is Science Going*, reprinted by Ox Bow Press, Woodbridge, 1981, p. 220.