QUANTUM THEORY AT THE CROSSROADS

The 1927 Solvay conference was perhaps the most important meeting in the history of quantum theory. Contrary to popular belief, the interpretation of quantum theory was not settled at this conference, and no consensus was reached. Instead, a range of sharply conflicting views were presented and extensively discussed, including de Broglie's pilot-wave theory, Born and Heisenberg's quantum mechanics, and Schrödinger's wave mechanics. Today, there is no longer an established or dominant interpretation of quantum theory, so it is important to re-evaluate the historical sources and keep the interpretation debate open.

This book contains a complete translation of the original proceedings, with background essays on the three main interpretations of quantum theory presented at the conference, and an extensive analysis of the lectures and discussions in the light of current research in the foundations of quantum theory. The proceedings contain much unexpected material, including extensive discussions of de Broglie's pilot-wave theory (which de Broglie presented for a many-body system), and a theory of 'quantum mechanics' apparently lacking in wave function collapse or fundamental time evolution. This book will be of interest to graduate students and researchers in physics and in the history and philosophy of quantum theory.

GUIDO BACCIAGALUPPI is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Philosophy, University of Aberdeen. His research interests lie mainly in the philosophy of physics. He has contributed significantly to the development and critique of modal interpretations of quantum mechanics. He has since worked widely in various approaches to the foundations of quantum theory, as well as in the philosophy of probability and of time and in the history of quantum mechanics.

ANTONY VALENTINI is a Research Associate in the Theoretical Physics Group, Imperial College London. He has proposed that the universe began with a nonquantum distribution of hidden variables, which later relaxed to the quantum equilibrium state we see today. He has pioneered the development of the new physics of quantum non-equilibrium, in de Broglie–Bohm theory and in hidden-variables theories generally, and has explored its possible role in cosmology, black holes and information theory. He also works in the history and philosophy of modern physics.

QUANTUM THEORY AT THE CROSSROADS

Reconsidering the 1927 Solvay Conference

GUIDO BACCIAGALUPPI ANTONY VALENTINI



> CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi Cambridge University Press

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521814218

© G. Bacciagaluppi and A. Valentini 2009

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2009

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data Bacciagaluppi, Guido. Quantum theory at the crossroads : reconsidering the 1927 Solvay conference / Guido Bacciagaluppi, Antony Valentini. p. cm. Includes bibliographical references and index. 1. Quantum theory–Congresses. I. Valentini, Antony. II. Title. QC173.96.B33 2008 530.12–dc22 2008019585

ISBN 978-0-521-81421-8 hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

To the memory of James T. Cushing

Contents

Preface	XV
Abbreviations	xxi
Typographic conventions	xxiii
Note on the bibliography and the index	xxiii
Permissions and copyright notices	xxiii
Part I Perspectives on the 1927 Solvay conference	1
1 Historical introduction	3
1.1 Ernest Solvay and the Institute of Physics	3
1.2 War and international relations	6
1.3 Scientific planning and background	8
1.4 Further details of planning	15
1.5 The Solvay meeting	18
1.6 The editing of the proceedings	20
1.7 Conclusion	21
Archival notes	23
2 De Broglie's pilot-wave theory	27
2.1 Background	27
2.2 A new approach to particle dynamics: 1923–1924	33
2.2.1 First papers on pilot-wave theory (1923)	34
2.2.2 Thesis (1924)	39
2.2.3 Optical interference fringes: November 1924	49
2.3 Towards a complete pilot-wave dynamics: 1925–1927	51
2.3.1 'Structure': Journal de Physique, May 1927	55
2.3.2 Significance of de Broglie's 'Structure' paper	65

viii	i Contents		
	2.4	1927 Solvay report: the new dynamics of quanta	67
	2.5	Significance of de Broglie's work from 1923 to 1927	76
	Arch	ival notes	79
3	From	matrix mechanics to quantum mechanics	80
	3.1	Summary of Born and Heisenberg's report	81
	3.2	Writing of the report	84
	3.3	Formalism	85
		3.3.1 Before matrix mechanics	85
		3.3.2 Matrix mechanics	86
		3.3.3 Formal extensions of matrix mechanics	90
	3.4	Interpretation	92
		3.4.1 Matrix mechanics, Born and Wiener	93
		3.4.2 Born and Jordan on guiding fields, Bohr on collisions	94
		3.4.3 Born's collision papers	96
		3.4.4 Heisenberg on energy fluctuations	98
		3.4.5 Transformation theory	100
		3.4.6 Development of the 'statistical view' in the report	103
		3.4.7 Justification and overall conclusions	107
	Arch	ival notes	110
4	Schrö	odinger's wave mechanics	111
	4.1	4.1 Planning of Schrödinger's report	
	4.2 Summary of the report		114
	4.3	Particles as wave packets	116
	4.4	The problem of radiation	120
	4.5	Schrödinger and de Broglie	124
	4.6	The conflict with matrix mechanics	125
		4.6.1 Early days	126
		4.6.2 From Munich to Copenhagen	128
		4.6.3 Continuity and discontinuity	132
	Arch	ival notes	135
D	4 TT	Our stand from the form of the 1027 Selection of former	107
Par 5		Quantum foundations and the 1927 Solvay conference	13/
5	Qual	What is quantum theory?	139
	5.1 5.2	The measurement problem today	139
	5.2	5.2.1 A fundamental ambiguity	141
		5.2.1 A fundamental antiguity 5.2.2 Measurement as a physical process: quantum theory	141
		'without observers'	143

		Contents	ix
		5.2.3 Quantum cosmology	147
		5.2.4 The measurement problem in 'statistical' interpretations	
		of ψ	149
6	Interf	erence, superposition and wave packet collapse	152
	6.1	Probability and interference	152
		6.1.1 Interference in de Broglie's pilot-wave theory	153
		6.1.2 Interference in the 'quantum mechanics' of Born	
		and Heisenberg	155
	6.2	Macroscopic superposition: Born's discussion of the cloud	
		chamber	160
		6.2.1 Quantum mechanics without wave packet collapse?	161
	6.3	Dirac and Heisenberg: interference, state reduction	
		and delayed choice	164
	6.4	Further remarks on Born and Heisenberg's quantum mechanics	171
7	Local	ity and incompleteness	175
	7.1	Einstein's 1927 argument for incompleteness	175
	7.2	A precursor: Einstein at Salzburg in 1909	178
	7.3	More on non-locality and relativity	181
8	Time	, determinism and the spacetime framework	184
	8.1	Time in quantum theory	184
	8.2	Determinism and probability	189
	8.3	Visualisability and the spacetime framework	192
9	Guidi	ing fields in 3-space	197
	9.1	Einstein's early attempts to formulate a dynamical theory	
		of light quanta	197
	9.2	The failure of energy-momentum conservation	200
10	Scatte	ering and measurement in de Broglie's pilot-wave theory	205
	10.1	Scattering in pilot-wave theory	206
	10.2	Elastic and inelastic scattering: Born and Brillouin, Pauli	• • • •
	10.0	and de Broglie	209
	10.3	Quantum measurement in pilot-wave theory	220
	10.4	Recoil of a single photon: Kramers and de Broglie	221
11	Pilot-	wave theory in retrospect	224
	11.1	Historical misconceptions	226
	11.2	Why was de Broglie's theory rejected?	233
	11.3	Chieve in alternative pilot-wave theory (May 1927)	234
10	11.4 D	Objections: In 1927 and today	240
12	веуо	The stondard historical account	242
	12.1	The standard mistorical account	243
	12.2	rowards a historical revision	240

Х	Contents	
Part II	1 The proceedings of the 1927 Solvay conference	251
Н.	A. Lorentz †	255
Fif	th physics conference	257
The int	ensity of X-ray reflection (W. L. Bragg)	259
Th	e classical treatment of X-ray diffraction phenomena	259
Hi	story of the use of quantitative methods	261
Re	esults of quantitative analysis	264
In	terpretation of measurements of F	266
Ex	amples of analysis	269
Tł	e mechanism of X-ray scattering	277
Tł	e analysis of atomic structure by X-ray intensity	
	measurements	282
Th	e refraction of X-rays	285
Re	eferences	289
Di	scussion of Mr Bragg's report	291
Ne	otes on the translation	299
Disagr	eements between experiment and the electromagnetic theory	
of	radiation (A. H. Compton)	301
In	troduction	301
Th	e problem of the ether	303
Th	e emission of radiation	304
Th	e photoelectric effect	306
Ph	enomena associated with the scattering of X-rays	312
In	teractions between radiation and single electrons	317
Re	liability of experimental evidence	321
Su	mmary	322
Di	scussion of Mr Compton's report	324
Na	otes on the translation	339
The ne	w dynamics of quanta (L. de Broglie)	341
Ι	- Principal points of view	341
II.	– Probable meaning of the continuous waves Ψ	348
Ш	. – Experiments showing preliminary direct evidence for the	
	new Dynamics of the electron	356
Bi	bliography	362
Di	scussion of Mr de Broglie's report	364
Na	otes on the translation	371
Ouantu	m mechanics (M. Born and W. Heisenberg)	372
In	troduction	372
I	- The mathematical methods of quantum mechanics	373
II.	– Physical interpretation	383
	J	200

CAMBRIDGE

Contents	xi
III. – Formulation of the principles and delimitation of their scope	391
IV. – Applications of quantum mechanics	395
Conclusion	398
Bibliography	399
Discussion of Messrs Born and Heisenberg's report	402
Notes on the translation	404
Wave mechanics (E. Schrödinger)	406
Introduction	406
I. – Multi-dimensional theory	407
II. – Four-dimensional theory	414
III. – The many-electron problem	418
Discussion of Mr Schrödinger's report	425
Notes on the translation	430
General discussion of the new ideas presented	432
Causality, determinism, probability	432
Photons	450
Photons and electrons	453
Notes on the translation	470
Appendix	471
The transcripts of Bohr's main contributions	474
Verschaffelt's working notes for the discussions	483
Kramers' notes from the general discussion	498
Bibliography	502
Index	515

List of illustrations

Parts I and II

Chapter 6

6.1	Delayed-choice double-slit experiment.	page	165
6.2	Reconstruction of scattering scenarios discussed by Dirac		
	(Figs. (a), (b)) and Heisenberg (Fig. (c)).		167

Chapter 7

7.1	Hardy's simplified version of Einstein's argument.	177
7.2	Figure based on Einstein's 1909 argument for the existence of	
	localised light quanta.	179

Chapter 10

10.1	Scattering of a laterally limited wave by a finite diffraction grating,	
	showing the separation of the first-order beams from the zeroth-order	
	beam.	214
10.2	Scattering of a laterally unlimited wave by an infinite diffraction	
	grating.	215
10.3	True evolution of the electron-rotator wave function in Pauli's	
	example. Adapted from de Broglie (1956, p. 176).	218

Part III

 [Frontispiece]	253
 H. A. Lorentz	254

	List of illustrations	xiii
	W. L. Bragg's report	
1	[Bragg's Fig. 1]	266
2	[Bragg's Fig. 2]	270
3a	Distribution of electrons in sheets parallel to 0001.	271
3b	Distribution of electrons in sheets parallel to $10\overline{10}$.	272
3c	Distribution of electrons in sheets parallel to $11\overline{2}0$.	273
4	[Bragg's Fig. 4]	274
5	[Bragg's Fig. 5]	275
6	[Bragg's Fig. 6]	276
7	[Bragg's Fig. 7]	277
8	[Bragg's Fig. 8]	279
9	[Bragg's Fig. 9]	281
10	[Bragg's Fig. 10]	283
11	[Bragg's Fig. 11]	284

A. H. Compton's report

1	Longitudinal distribution of photoelectrons for X-rays of three	
	different effective wavelengths, according to Auger.	308
2	Lateral distribution of photoelectrons for incompletely polarised	
	X-rays, according to Bubb.	308
3	If the X-rays excite a recoil electron at an angle θ , the photon theory predicts a secondary β -particle at an angle φ .	320

Discussion of A. H. Compton's report

1	[Brillouin]	329
	Discussion of L. de Broglie's r	eport
1	[Brillouin]	367
2	[Brillouin]	368
3	[Brillouin]	369
	General discussion	
А	[Richardson's notes]	435
В	[Richardson's notes]	435
С	[Richardson's notes]	436
1	[Born]	439
2	[Einstein]	440
D	[Richardson's notes]	467

Preface

And they said one to another: Go to, let us build us a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name. And the Lord said: Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech.

(Genesis 11: 3–7)

Anyone who has taken part in a debate on the interpretation of quantum theory will recognise how fitting is the above quotation from the book of Genesis, according to which the builders of the Tower of Babel found that they could no longer understand one another's speech. For when it comes to the interpretation of quantum theory, even the most clear-thinking and capable physicists are often unable to understand each other.

This state of affairs dates back to the genesis of quantum theory itself. In October 1927, during the 'general discussion' that took place in Brussels at the end of the fifth Solvay conference, Paul Ehrenfest wrote the above lines on the blackboard. As Langevin later remarked, the Solvay meeting in 1927 was the conference where 'the confusion of ideas reached its peak'.

Ehrenfest's perceptive gesture captured the essence of a situation that has persisted for three-quarters of a century. According to widespread historical folklore, the deep differences of opinion among the leading physicists of the day led to intense debates, which were satisfactorily resolved by Bohr and Heisenberg around the time of the 1927 Solvay meeting. But in fact, at the end of 1927, a significant number of the main participants (in particular de Broglie, Einstein and Schrödinger) remained unconvinced, and the deep differences of opinion were never really resolved.

The interpretation of quantum theory seems as highly controversial today as it was in 1927. There has also been criticism – on the part of historians as well as physicists – of the tactics used by Bohr and others to propagate their views in

xvi

Preface

the late 1920s, and a realisation that alternative ideas may have been dismissed or unfairly disparaged. For many physicists, a sense of unease lingers over the whole subject. Might it be that things are not as clear-cut as Bohr and Heisenberg would have us believe? Might it be that their opponents had something important to say after all? Because today there is no longer an established interpretation of quantum mechanics, we feel it is important to go back to the sources and re-evaluate them.

In this spirit, we offer the reader a return to a time just before the Copenhagen interpretation was widely accepted, when the best physicists of the day gathered to discuss a range of views, concerning many topics of interest today (measurement, determinism, non-locality, subjectivity, interference and so on), and when three distinct theories – de Broglie's pilot-wave theory, Born and Heisenberg's quantum mechanics and Schrödinger's wave mechanics – were presented and discussed on an equal footing.

*

Since the 1930s, and especially since the Second World War, it has been common to dismiss questions about the interpretation of quantum theory as 'metaphysical' or 'just philosophical'. It will be clear from the lively and wide-ranging discussions of 1927 that at that time, for the most distinguished physicists of the day, the issues were decidedly *physical*: Is the electron a point particle with a continuous trajectory (de Broglie), or a wave packet (Schrödinger), or neither (Born and Heisenberg)? Do quantum outcomes occur when nature makes a choice (Dirac), or when an observer decides to record them (Heisenberg)? Is the non-locality of quantum theory compatible with relativity (Einstein)? Can a theory with trajectories account for the recoil of a single photon on a mirror (Kramers, de Broglie)? Is indeterminism a fundamental limitation, or merely the outcome of coarse-graining over something deeper and deterministic (Lorentz)?

After 1927, the Copenhagen interpretation became firmly established. Rival views were marginalised, in particular those represented by de Broglie, Schrödinger and Einstein, even though these scientists were responsible for many of the major developments in quantum physics itself. (This marginalisation is apparent in most historical accounts written throughout the twentieth century.) From the very beginning, however, there were some notes of caution: for example, when Bohr's landmark paper of 1928 (the English version of his famous Como lecture) was published in *Nature*, an editorial preface expressed dissatisfaction with the 'somewhat vague statistical description' and ended with the hope that this would not be the 'last word on the subject'. And there were a few outstanding alarm bells, in particular the famous paper by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen in 1935, and

Preface

the important papers by Schrödinger (in the same year) on the cat paradox and on entanglement. But on the whole, the questioning ceased in all but a few corners. A general opinion arose that the questions had been essentially settled, and that a satisfactory point of view had been arrived at, principally through the work of Bohr and Heisenberg. For subsequent generations of physicists, 'shut up and calculate' emerged as the working rule among the vast majority.

Despite this atmosphere, the questioning never completely died out, and some very significant work was published, for example by Bohm in 1952, Everett in 1957 and Bell in 1964 and 1966. But attitudes changed very slowly. Younger physicists were strongly discouraged from pursuing such questions. Those who persisted generally had difficult careers, and much of the careful thinking about quantum foundations was relegated to departments of philosophy.

Nevertheless, the closing decade of the twentieth century saw a resurgence of interest in the foundations of quantum theory. At the time of writing, a range of alternatives (such as hidden variables, many worlds, collapse models, among others) are being actively pursued, and the Copenhagen interpretation can no longer claim to be the dominant or 'orthodox' interpretation.

The modern reader familiar with current debates and positions in quantum foundations will recognise many of the standard points of view in the discussions reproduced here, although expressed with a remarkable concision and clarity. This provides a welcome contrast with the generally poor level of debate today: as the distinguished cosmologist Dennis Sciama was fond of pointing out, when it comes to the interpretation of quantum theory 'the standard of argument suddenly drops to zero'. We hope that the publication of this book will contribute to a revival of sharp and informed debate about the meaning of quantum theory.

Remarkably, the proceedings of the fifth Solvay conference have not received the attention they deserve, neither from physicists nor from historians, and the literature contains numerous major misunderstandings about what took place there.

*

The fifth Solvay conference is usually remembered for the clash that took place between Einstein and Bohr over the uncertainty relations. It is remarkable, then, to find that not a word of these discussions appears in the published proceedings. It is known that Einstein and Bohr engaged in vigorous informal discussions, but in the formal debates recorded in the proceedings they were relatively silent. Bohr did contribute to the general discussion, but this material was not published. Instead, at Bohr's request, it was replaced by a translation of the German version of his Como lecture, which appeared in *Naturwissenschaften* in 1928. (We do not reproduce

xviii

Preface

this well-known paper here.) The appending of this translation to the published proceedings may be the cause of the common misunderstanding that Bohr gave a report at the conference: in fact, he did not.

Born and Heisenberg present a number of unfamiliar viewpoints concerning, among other things, the nature of the wave function and the role of time and of probability in quantum theory. Particularly surprising is the seeming absence of a collapse postulate in their formulation, and the apparently phenomenological (or effective) status of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation. Born and Heisenberg's 'quantum mechanics' seems remarkably different from quantum mechanics (in the Dirac–von Neumann formulation) as we know it today.

De Broglie's pilot-wave theory was the subject of extensive and varied discussions. This is rather startling in view of the claim – in Max Jammer's classic historical study *The Philosophy of Quantum Mechanics* – that de Broglie's theory 'was hardly discussed at all' and that 'the only serious reaction came from Pauli' (Jammer 1974, pp. 110–11). Jammer's view is typical even today. But in the published proceedings, at the end of de Broglie's report there are 9 pages of discussion devoted to de Broglie's theory; and of the 42 pages of general discussion, 15 contain discussion of de Broglie's theory, with serious reactions and comments coming not only from Pauli but also from Born, Brillouin, Einstein, Kramers, Lorentz, Schrödinger and others. Even the well-known exchange between Pauli and de Broglie has been widely misunderstood.

Finally, another surprise is that in his report de Broglie proposed the many-body pilot-wave dynamics for a system of particles, with the total configuration guided by a wave in configuration space, and not just (as is generally believed) the one-body theory in 3-space. De Broglie's theory is essentially the same as that developed by Bohm in 1952, the only difference being that de Broglie's dynamics (like the form of pilot-wave theory popularised by Bell) is formulated in terms of velocity rather than acceleration.

This work is a translation of and commentary on the proceedings of the fifth Solvay conference of 1927, which were published in French in 1928 under the title *Électrons et Photons*.

*

We have not attempted to give an exhaustive historical analysis of the fifth Solvay conference. Rather, our main aims have been to present the material in a manner accessible to the general physicist, and to situate the proceedings in the context of current research in quantum foundations. We hope that the book will contribute to stimulating and reviving serious debate about quantum foundations in

Preface

xix

the wider physics community, and that making the proceedings available in English will encourage historians and philosophers to reconsider their significance.

Part I begins with a historical introduction and provides essays on the three main theories presented at the conference (pilot-wave theory, quantum mechanics, wave mechanics). The lectures and discussions that took place at the fifth Solvay conference contain an extensive range of material that is relevant to current research in the foundations of quantum theory. In Part II, after a brief review of the status of quantum foundations today, we summarise what seem to us to be the highlights of the conference, from the point of view of current debates about the meaning of quantum theory. Part III of the book consists of translations of the reports, of the discussions following them, and of the general discussion. Wherever possible, the original (in particular English or German) texts have been used. We have tacitly corrected minor mistakes in punctuation and spelling, and we have uniformised the style of equations, references and footnotes. (Unless otherwise specified, all translations of quotations are ours.)

Part I (except for Chapter 2), the reports by Compton, by Born and Heisenberg and by Schrödinger, and the Appendix to Part III are principally the work of Guido Bacciagaluppi. Chapter 2, all of Part II, the reports by Bragg and by de Broglie, and the general discussion in Part III are principally the work of Antony Valentini.

Chapters 2, 10 and 11 are based on a seminar, 'The early history of Louis de Broglie's pilot-wave dynamics', given by Antony Valentini at the University of Notre Dame in September 1997, at a conference in honour of the sixtieth birthday of the late James T. Cushing.

*

To James T. Cushing, physicist, philosopher, historian and gentleman, we both owe a special and heartfelt thanks. It was he who brought us together on this project, and to him we are indebted for his encouragement and, above all, his example. This book is dedicated to his memory.

Guido Bacciagaluppi wishes to express his thanks to the Humboldt Foundation, which supported the bulk of his work in the form of an Alexander-von-Humboldt Forschungsstipendium, and to his hosts in Germany, Carsten Held and the Philosophisches Seminar I, University of Freiburg, and Harald Atmanspacher and the Institut für Grenzgebiete der Psychologie und Psychohygiene, Freiburg, as well as to Jacques Dubucs and the Institut d'Histoire et de Philosophie des Sciences et des Techniques (CNRS, Paris 1, ENS), for support during the final phase. He also wishes to thank Didier Devriese of the Université Libre de Bruxelles, who is in charge of the archives of the Instituts Internationaux de Physique et de Chimie

XХ

Preface

Solvay, Université Libre de Bruxelles, for his kindness and availability, and Brigitte Parakenings (formerly Uhlemann) and her staff at the Philosophisches Archiv of the University of Konstanz, for the continuous assistance with the Archive for the History of Quantum Physics. Finally, he wishes to thank Jeff Barrett for suggesting this project to him in Utrecht one day back in 1996, as well as Mark van Atten, Jennifer Bailey, Olivier Darrigol, Felicity Pors, Gregor Schiemann and many others for discussions, suggestions, correspondence, references and other help.

Antony Valentini began studying these fascinating proceedings while holding a postdoctoral position at the University of Rome 'La Sapienza' (1994–6), and is grateful to Marcello Cini, Bruno Bertotti and Dennis Sciama for their support and encouragement during that period. For support in recent years, he is grateful to Perimeter Institute, and wishes to express a special thanks to Howard Burton, Lucien Hardy and Lee Smolin.

We are both grateful in particular to Tamsin van Essen at Cambridge University Press for her support and encouragement during most of the gestation of this book, and to Augustus College for support during the final stages of this work.

Abbreviations

AEA:	Albert Einstein Archives, Jewish National and University
	Library, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
AHQP:	Archive for the History of Quantum Physics.
AHQP-BSC:	Bohr Scientific Correspondence, microfilmed from the Niels
	Bohr Arkiv, Copenhagen.
AHQP-BMSS:	Bohr Scientific Manuscripts, microfilmed from the Niels Bohr
	Arkiv, Copenhagen.
AHQP-EHR:	Ehrenfest collection, microfilmed from the Rijksmuseum voor
	de Geschiedenis van de Natuurwetenschappen en van de
	Geneeskunde 'Museum Boerhaave', Leiden.
AHQP-LTZ:	Lorentz collection, microfilmed from the Algemeen Rijksar-
	chief, Den Haag (now in the Noord-Hollands Archief, Haarlem).
AHQP-RDN:	Richardson Collection, microfilmed from the Harry Ransom
	Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin.
AHQP-OHI:	Oral history interview transcripts.
IIPCS:	Archives of the Instituts Internationaux de Physique et de
	Chimie Solvay, Université Libre de Bruxelles.
Anne de Dhuis en Anne des Dhuis : Anne les des Dhuisile	

Ann. d. Phys. or Ann. der Phys.: Annalen der Physik.

Bayr. Akad. d. Wiss. Math. phys. Kl.: Sitzungsberichte der Mathematisch-Physikalischen Klasse der Königlich-Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (München).

Berl. Ber.: Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin).

Acad. Roy. Belg. or Bull. Ac. R. Belg. or Bull. Ac. roy. de Belgique or Bull. Ac. roy. Belgique or Bull. Ac. roy. Belg. or Bull. Ac. R. Belg., Cl. des Sciences: Bulletin de l'Académie Royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-arts de Belgique. Classe des Sciences.

Bull. Natl. Res. Coun.: Bulletin of the National Research Council (U.S.).

xxii

Abbreviations

- *Comm. Fenn.*: Commentationes Physico-mathematicae, Societas Scientiarum Fennica.
- *C. R.* or *C. R. Acad. Sc.* or *Comptes Rendus Acad. Sci. Paris*: Comptes Rendus Hebdomadaires des Séances de l'Académie des Sciences (Paris).
- *Gött. Nachr.*: Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. II., Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse.
- *J. de Phys.* or *Jour. de Phys.* or *Journ. Physique* or *Journ. d. Phys.*: Journal de Physique (until 1919), then Journal de Physique et le Radium.
- Jour. Frank. Inst.: Journal of the Franklin Institute.
- Lincei Rend.: Rendiconti Lincei.
- Manchester Memoirs: Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society, Memoirs and Proceedings.
- Math. Ann. or Mathem. Ann.: Mathematische Annalen.
- *Naturw.* or *Naturwiss.* or *Naturwissensch.* or *Naturwissenschaften*: Die Naturwissenschaften.
- *Nat. Acad. Sci. Proc.* or *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* or *Proc. Nat. Acad.*: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (U.S.).
- Phil. Mag.: Philosophical Magazine.
- *Phil. Trans.* or *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc.*: Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London.
- Phys. Rev.: Physical Review.
- Phys. Zeits. or Phys. Zeitsch. or Physik. Zts.: Physikalische Zeitschrift.
- *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* or *Proc. Cambr. Phil. Soc.* or *Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.*: Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society.
- Proc. Phys. Soc.: Proceedings of the Physical Society of London.
- Proc. Roy. Soc. or Roy. Soc. Proc.: Proceedings of the Royal Society of London.
- Upsala Univ. Årsskr.: Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift.
- Z. f. Phys. or Zts. f. Phys. or Zeit. f. Phys. or Zeits. f. Phys. or Zeitsch. f. Phys. or Zeitschr. f. Phys.: Zeitschrift für Physik.

Permissions and copyright notices

xxiii

Typographic conventions

The following conventions have been used.

Square brackets [] denote editorial amendments or (in the translations) original wordings; [?] denotes an uncertain reading.

Curly brackets { } denote additions (in original typescripts or manuscripts). Angular brackets < > denote deletions (in original typescripts or manuscripts).

Note on the bibliography and the index

The references cited in Parts I and II, and in the endnotes and editorial footnotes to Part III, are listed in our bibliography. The references cited in the original Solvay volume are found in the translation of the proceedings in Part III.

In the index, under entries for the conference participants, italic page numbers indicate spoken contributions.

Permissions and copyright notices

The material in the original published proceedings of the fifth Solvay conference has been translated and used courtesy of the Solvay institutes. We wish to record our personal thanks to the director, Prof. Marc Henneaux.

The frontispiece of the original publication is reproduced courtesy of Dunod Éditeur, Paris.

We have further prepared our versions of the conference reports with the following permissions.

The report by W. L. Bragg: courtesy of the Royal Institution of Great Britain.

The report by A. H. Compton: courtesy of the *The Journal of the Franklin Institute*, for the use of the version of Compton's paper in volume **205** (1928), pp. 155–78.

The report by L. de Broglie: courtesy of Prof. Georges Lochak and the Fondation Louis de Broglie.

The report by M. Born and W. Heisenberg: courtesy of Prof. Gustav Born and of the Werner Heisenberg Archive, Munich.

The report by E. Schrödinger: courtesy of Mrs Ruth Braunizer.

Parts of the general discussion have employed material with the following permissions.

xxiv

Permissions and copyright notices

Richardson's notes from the general discussion: courtesy of the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, The University of Texas at Austin, and courtesy of Dr Peter J. Richardson.

Einstein's manuscript of the beginning of his discussion contribution: ©Albert Einstein Archives, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel. Einstein's other discussion contributions: courtesy of the Albert Einstein Archives, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Dirac's manuscript of part of his discussion contributions: courtesy of the University Libraries, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.

The published excerpts of Bohr's discussion contributions, from N. Bohr, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, ed. J. Kalckar (1985), pp. 103 and 105: ©Elsevier and The Niels Bohr Archive, Copenhagen.

The Appendix is reproduced courtesy of The Niels Bohr Archive and (for Kramers' notes) Ms. S. M. Kramers. We thank the Niels Bohr Archive also for permission to quote from other materials in their collections, and thank in particular Dr Felicity Pors for her assistance.

Unpublished archival material in Parts I and II is quoted in part courtesy of the Archives of the Instituts Internationaux de Physique et de Chimie Solvay, Université Libre de Bruxelles, where we thank in particular Prof. Didier Devriese, and with the following permissions.

The letters by Born: courtesy of Prof. Gustav Born.

The letters by W. H. Bragg and W. L. Bragg: courtesy of the Royal Institution of Great Britain.

The interviews with de Broglie: courtesy of Prof. Georges Lochak and the Fondation Louis de Broglie.

The remark by Ehrenfest on pp. 3 and 8: courtesy of Museum Boerhaave, Leiden.

The letters by Heisenberg: courtesy of the Werner Heisenberg Archive, Munich, where we thank in particular Prof. Helmut Rechenberg.

The materials by Lorentz: courtesy of the Noord-Hollands Archief, Haarlem.

The letter from Schrödinger to Lorentz, 23 June 1927, AHQP-LTZ-13 and AHQP-41: courtesy of Mrs Ruth Braunizer.

The cover photographs are reproduced with the following permissions.

Portrait of Einstein: AIP Emilio Segrè Visual Archives, W. F. Meggers Gallery of Nobel Laureates.

Portrait of de Broglie: AIP Emilio Segrè Visual Archives, Physics Today Collection.

Permissions and copyright notices

XXV

Portrait of Heisenberg: AIP Emilio Segrè Visual Archives, Segrè Collection. Portrait of Schrödinger: AIP Emilio Segrè Visual Archives.

Portrait of Born: 'Voltiana', Como, Italy – 10 September 1927 issue, courtesy AIP Emilio Segrè Visual Archives.

Portrait of Bohr: National Archives and Records Administration, courtesy AIP Emilio Segrè Visual Archives.

Group photograph of the fifth Solvay conference: photograph by Benjamin Couprie, Institut International de Physique Solvay, courtesy AIP Emilio Segrè Visual Archives.