

Quantum Foundations II: Three no-go theorems

Hrvoje Nikolić

Institut Ruđer Bošković, Zagreb

Zagreb, IRB, 2020

Part 0.
MOTIVATION

Standard QM:

- the value a of an observable A is an eigenvalue: $A|a\rangle = a|a\rangle$
 \Rightarrow the system has some value only when $|\psi\rangle$ is an eigenstate: $|\psi\rangle = |a\rangle$
- but Schrödinger equation \Rightarrow superposition $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{a'} c_{a'} |a'\rangle$
 \Rightarrow to get a value we need a collapse $|\psi\rangle \rightarrow |a\rangle$.

Several problems with a collapse:

- Contextual (happens only when measurement is performed, not clear how exactly the system knows that it is measured).
- Nonlocal (happens in the whole universe at once).

Possible solution:

- Perhaps an observable (spin, position, ...) has some value v even when $|\psi\rangle$ is **not** an eigenstate $|a\rangle$?
 - If so, then perhaps collapse is **not** needed to get a value!
- Can it resolve all mysteries of QM?

- Such values v are often called “hidden variables” because they are not a part of the standard quantum formalism.
- However, this name is misleading because v are variables that we **actually observe** in experiments.
 - ⇒ They may be “hidden” to theorists, not to experimentalists.
 - ⇒ I will no longer call them “hidden variables”.

- Whatever those hypothetic values v are, they must be compatible with existing experiments.
- But existing experiments are all compatible with measurable predictions of standard QM.
 - ⇒ The values must be compatible with measurable predictions of standard QM.
 - ⇒ This poses strong restrictions on possible physical laws for v .

- It turns out that v **cannot** obey some classical properties that one would naively expect them to obey.
- Loosely speaking, v either must be $|\psi\rangle$ itself (!), or something that has some properties similar to $|\psi\rangle$.
- Those restrictions have forms of various **no-go theorems**.
- In the rest I present those theorems in more detail.

The theorems in nutshell:

Naive property 1:

- Measurement just reveals values v that existed before measurement.

No-go theorem 1. (contextuality) refutes it:

- The measurement must somehow **create** or **change** values v .

Naive property 2:

- Since we might get rid of nonlocal collapse, the change of v might be governed by a local law.

No-go theorem 2. (nonlocality) refutes it:

- The change of v must be governed by some **nonlocal** law.

Naive property 3:

- Since the actual value v might exist even without the eigenstate $|a\rangle$, the quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ might be just our subjective knowledge, it might not be objectively “real”.

No-go theorem 3. (ψ -onticity) refutes it:

- If v is **objectively “real”**, then so is $|\psi\rangle$.

Part 1.

PROOF OF CONTEXTUALITY

The first proof: Bell (1966).

The most famous proof: Kochen-Specker (1967).

I present a much simpler proof: Mermin (1990), Peres (1990).

Multiplication table for 9 numbers:

<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>		<i>abc</i>
<i>e</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>g</i>		<i>efg</i>
<i>i</i>	<i>j</i>	<i>k</i>		<i>ijk</i>
<hr/>				
<i>aei</i>	<i>bfj</i>	<i>cgk</i>		<i>aei · bfj · cgk = abc · efg · ijk</i>

Can we do the same for operators?

- Pauli matrices: $\sigma_x^2 = \sigma_y^2 = \sigma_z^2 = 1$, $\sigma_x \sigma_y \sigma_z = i$, $[\sigma_x, \sigma_y] = 2i\sigma_z$
- Eigenvalues of σ_x , σ_y , σ_z are ± 1 .
- Spin operator: $S_x = \frac{\hbar}{2}\sigma_x$, ...

Consider a composite system of two spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ particles.
 - In this system consider the following 9 observables:

$\sigma_x \otimes 1$	$1 \otimes \sigma_x$	$\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x$	1
$1 \otimes \sigma_y$	$\sigma_y \otimes 1$	$\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y$	1
$\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_y$	$\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_x$	$\sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z$	1
1	1	-1	$1 \cdot 1 \cdot (-1) \neq 1 \cdot 1 \cdot 1$

- operators in the same row commute (can be simultaneously measured)
- operators in the same column commute

However, $-1 \neq 1$

⇒ impossible to simultaneously assign values to all 9 observables.

⇒ Contextuality:

At least some of the values are created or changed by the measurement.

Note: We tried (and failed) to associate values with **composite** operators ($\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_y, \dots$),
 not with **local** operators ($\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \dots$)

Part 2.
PROOF OF NONLOCALITY

- In the proof of contextuality we proved that one cannot associate values with **composite** observables $(\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_y, \dots)$.
- We said nothing about values associated with **local** observables $(\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \dots)$.
- To prove nonlocality, we need to prove that one cannot associate values with **local** observables.
- However, nonlocality cannot be proved for any state.
- Nonlocality is state-dependent, it appears only for **entangled** states.

The first and most famous proof: Bell (1964).

- Uses $|\uparrow\rangle|\downarrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle|\uparrow\rangle$, easy to prepare in experiments.
- However, the proof is not simple mathematically.

I present the GHZ proof: Greenberger, Horne and Zeilinger (1989).

- simple mathematically
- uses a state of 3 entangled particles:

$$|\text{GHZ}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\rangle|\uparrow\rangle|\uparrow\rangle - |\downarrow\rangle|\downarrow\rangle|\downarrow\rangle)$$

- not easy to prepare in experiments

Here the following notation is used:

- eigenstates of operator σ_z : $\sigma_z|\uparrow\rangle = +|\uparrow\rangle$, $\sigma_z|\downarrow\rangle = -|\downarrow\rangle$
- direct product \otimes is understood
- for composite operators the following notation is used

$$\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_z \equiv \sigma_x^{(1)} \sigma_y^{(2)} \sigma_z^{(3)}$$

The state $|\text{GHZ}\rangle$ satisfies

$$\sigma_x^{(1)} \sigma_x^{(2)} \sigma_y^{(3)} |\text{GHZ}\rangle = \sigma_x^{(1)} \sigma_y^{(2)} \sigma_x^{(3)} |\text{GHZ}\rangle = \sigma_y^{(1)} \sigma_x^{(2)} \sigma_x^{(3)} |\text{GHZ}\rangle = +|\text{GHZ}\rangle$$

Now **assume**(!) that, for $|\text{GHZ}\rangle$, we can associate a value (number) s with each local observable, e.g. $\sigma_x^{(1)} \rightarrow s_x^{(1)}$

\Rightarrow The numbers must satisfy

$$s_x^{(1)} s_x^{(2)} s_y^{(3)} = s_x^{(1)} s_y^{(2)} s_x^{(3)} = s_y^{(1)} s_x^{(2)} s_x^{(3)} = +1$$

Multiply all three \Rightarrow

$$\left(s_x^{(1)} s_x^{(2)} s_x^{(3)} \right)^2 s_y^{(1)} s_y^{(2)} s_y^{(3)} = +1 \Rightarrow s_y^{(1)} s_y^{(2)} s_y^{(3)} = +1$$

But QM tells us that

$$\sigma_y^{(1)} \sigma_y^{(2)} \sigma_y^{(3)} |\text{GHZ}\rangle = -|\text{GHZ}\rangle$$

which is a contradiction!

\Rightarrow The assumption was wrong, it is not possible to simultaneously associate values with all local observables.

- Contradiction \Rightarrow s -values could not have been preexisting before measurement.
 \Rightarrow Measurement somehow creates or changes them (**contextuality**).

- Perfect **correlation**, e.g. $s_x^{(1)} s_x^{(2)} s_y^{(3)} = 1$.

correlation + contextuality \Rightarrow correlation could not have been prearranged.

\Rightarrow Correlation must somehow be arranged at the time of measurement.

\Rightarrow The 3 measurement apparatuses must somehow communicate with each other.

- But measurement apparatuses can be far away from each other.

\Rightarrow Somehow they must communicate instantaneously (or faster than c).

That's the proof of **nonlocality**!

Why can't nonlocality be used to send signals faster than light?

- **Signal** is an anthropomorphic concept:

Array of symbols (e.g. 01101...) **freely chosen** by a human agent, not randomly picked by nature.

- A human can prepare any $|\psi\rangle$ at will.

- E.g. $|\psi\rangle = |\uparrow\rangle|\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle|\downarrow\rangle$ guarantees the correlation $s_z^{(1)}s_z^{(2)} = 1$.

- But a human cannot choose in advance whether it will be $(s_z^{(1)}, s_z^{(2)}) = (1, 1)$ or $(s_z^{(1)}, s_z^{(2)}) = (-1, -1)$.

- Instead, nature picks one of those **randomly**.

(Or perhaps pseudorandomly, but we cannot distinguish between random and pseudorandom in practice.)

Some interpretations of QM still deny nonlocality.

- Different interpretations use different arguments.

The most frequent argument for locality: Signal locality.

- Nonlocality proved by the theorem cannot be used to send signals.

⇒ Nonlocality doesn't have practical consequences.

⇒ It's metaphysics, not physics.

Counterargument:

- If physics was **only** an empirical science, nonlocality would be metaphysics.

- But physics is based on empirical data **and** logic.

- Proof of nonlocality is a combination of both (correlation is an empirical fact, the rest is logic).

⇒ Proof of nonlocality is physical.

Which argument is more convincing?

- I leave the decision to you!

Part 3.
PROOF OF ψ -onticity

What is the meaning of the quantum state $|\psi\rangle$?

- Is it an objective property of a **single** system? (ψ -ontology)
- Or is it only a tool to calculate **probability**? (ψ -epistemology)

PBR theorem:

M.F. Pusey, J. Barrett, T. Rudolph, Nature Phys. **8**, 476 (2012).

Consists of

1. Mathematical definition of the difference between “ontological” and “epistemological” .
2. Technical proof (with the aid some auxiliary assumptions)
QM $\Rightarrow |\psi\rangle$ is ontological (objectively real)!

Main assumption in the proof:

- Some objective properties λ exist.

Example from classical probability - coin flipping:

To make it non-trivial, assume **unfair** coin flipping

$$p(\text{head}) \neq p(\text{tail})$$

- Are $p(\text{head})$ and $p(\text{tail})$ **intrinsic** properties of a **single** coin?
- If they are, we shall say that $p(\text{head})$ and $p(\text{tail})$ are **real** (objective) properties of the coin.

Two possibilities:

1. Unfair **coin**

- $p(\text{head}) \neq p(\text{tail})$ because the distribution of the coin-mass is not uniform
- this is a property of the **coin itself**
- from the knowledge of $\lambda = \text{mass distribution}$
 $\Rightarrow p(\text{head}), p(\text{tail})$ can be determined **uniquely**

2. Unfair **flipping**

- $p(\text{head}) \neq p(\text{tail})$ because the act of **flipping is unfair**
- this is **not** a property of the coin
- from the knowledge of $\lambda = \text{mass distribution}$
 $\Rightarrow p(\text{head}), p(\text{tail})$ can **not** be determined uniquely

This motivates the general **definition**:

**A probability distribution $\mu(\lambda)$ is *ontic*
(i.e., corresponds to something real)
iff it can be determined uniquely from the fundamental λ .**

Otherwise, $\mu(\lambda)$ is called **epistemic**.

Now apply to QM:

- QM is an unfair game (not all probabilities are equal).
- Is QM an unfair “coin” or an unfair “flipping”?


Analogy: coin flipping \leftrightarrow QM

set {head, tail} \leftrightarrow set of all different states in the Hilbert space $\{|\psi\rangle\}$


($|\psi\rangle$ is different from $|\psi'\rangle$ iff $|\psi'\rangle \neq c|\psi\rangle$.)

- In general, experimentalists do **not** have a full control over all fundamental degrees of freedom λ .

\Rightarrow When they prepare $|\psi\rangle$ in the laboratory, this actually means that they have prepared some **probability distribution** $\mu(\lambda)$:



Assume that for states $|\psi_1\rangle$, $|\psi_2\rangle$ their λ -distributions overlap:



- For $\lambda \in \text{overlap}$, one cannot know whether λ belongs to $\mu_1(\lambda)$ or $\mu_2(\lambda)$

$\Rightarrow \lambda$ does not uniquely determine $\mu(\lambda)$

\Rightarrow (by definition) $\mu(\lambda)$ is not ontic


$\Rightarrow |\psi\rangle$ is not ontic

\Rightarrow To prove that $|\psi\rangle$ is **not** ontic, it is sufficient to prove that there is **at least one pair** $|\psi_1\rangle$, $|\psi_2\rangle$ ($|\psi_1\rangle \neq c|\psi_2\rangle$) for which $\mu_1(\lambda)$ and $\mu_2(\lambda)$ do overlap.

⇒ The converse (that $|\psi\rangle$ is ontic)

is much more difficult to prove:

- One needs to prove that for **any pair** $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle$ ($|\psi_1\rangle \neq c|\psi_2\rangle$) the overlap does not exist:



- Yet, the PBR theorem proves exactly this!

This is not only difficult to prove (sketch in the next section), but also very surprising:

- The absence of overlap $\mu_1(\lambda)\mu_2(\lambda) = 0 \quad \forall \lambda$ is not surprising when $\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle = 0$.
- What is surprising is that $\mu_1(\lambda)\mu_2(\lambda) = 0 \quad \forall \lambda$ even when $\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle \neq 0$.

- Why is that surprising? Because

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle \neq 0 \\ \left[1 = \int da |a\rangle \langle a| \right] & \Rightarrow \int da \langle \psi_1 | a \rangle \langle a | \psi_2 \rangle \neq 0 \\ & \Rightarrow \langle \psi_1 | a \rangle \langle a | \psi_2 \rangle \neq 0 \text{ for some } a \\ \left[\rho_i(a) = |\langle a | \psi_i \rangle|^2 \right] & \Rightarrow \rho_1(a) \rho_2(a) \neq 0 \text{ for some } a \end{aligned}$$

and yet $\mu_1(\lambda) \mu_2(\lambda) = 0 \forall \lambda$.

- In other words, QM-distributions overlap,
but corresponding λ -distributions do not overlap!

Sketch of the proof:

- Here I present the proof of the absence of overlap for a simple example of a pair of non-orthogonal states. (PBR also generalize it to an arbitrary pair.)

2-dimensional Hilbert space with orthogonal basis $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$.
Another orthogonal basis $|+\rangle, |-\rangle$

$$|\pm\rangle = \frac{|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$$

Non-orthogonal pair $|0\rangle, |+\rangle$:

$$\langle 0|+\rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}$$


Goal: prove that $\mu_0(\lambda)\mu_+(\lambda) = 0 \forall \lambda$

Strategy: assume the opposite and derive a contradiction!

- assume overlap \Rightarrow finite probability p that $\lambda \in$ overlap

Consider two similar systems:

- each prepared either in $|0\rangle$ or $|+\rangle$
(but experimentalist does not know in which one it is prepared)



- probability of overlap in each is p
- assume they are statistically independent
- \Rightarrow probability of overlap in both is $P_{\text{joint}} = p \cdot p > 0$

⇒ **Consequence** of the assumed overlap:

There is a probability $P_{\text{joint}} > 0$ that the outcome will be consistent with **all four** possibilities for the initial preparation ($|0\rangle|0\rangle$, $|0\rangle|+\rangle$, $|+\rangle|0\rangle$, and $|+\rangle|+\rangle$)

Now compare it with predictions of QM:

- Measure the joint system in a specially chosen complete orthogonal basis:

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_1\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|0\rangle|1\rangle + |1\rangle|0\rangle], & |\phi_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|0\rangle|-\rangle + |1\rangle|+\rangle], \\ |\phi_3\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|+\rangle|1\rangle + |-\rangle|0\rangle], & |\phi_4\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|+\rangle|-\rangle + |-\rangle|+\rangle] \end{aligned}$$

- This basis has the property (notation: $|ab\rangle \equiv |a\rangle|b\rangle$)

$$\langle\phi_1|00\rangle = 0, \quad \langle\phi_2|0+\rangle = 0, \quad \langle\phi_3|+0\rangle = 0, \quad \langle\phi_4|++\rangle = 0$$

⇒ Whatever the outcome of a single measurement will be ($|\phi_1\rangle$, $|\phi_2\rangle$, $|\phi_3\rangle$, or $|\phi_4\rangle$), it is *certain* that it will **eliminate** one of the possibilities ($|00\rangle$, $|0+\rangle$, $|+0\rangle$, or $|++\rangle$).

⇒ $P_{\text{joint}} = 0$

⇒ Contradiction with the **Consequence** above! *Q.E.D.*

Possible topics for next talks:

Quantum Foundations III: Decoherence

Quantum Foundations IV: Instrumentalism and Bohmian mechanics

Quantum Found's V: Effective field theories and Bohmian mechanics

Quantum Foundations VI: Suggestions welcome