

Quantum Terrorism: Collective Vulnerability of Global Quantum Systems

N. F. Johnson,^{1,†,*} F. J. Gómez-Ruiz,^{2,*} F. J. Rodríguez,² & L. Quiroga.²

¹Physics Department, George Washington University, Washington D.C. 20052, U.S.A.

²Departamento de Física, Universidad de los Andes, A.A. 4976, Bogotá D. C., Colombia

[†]Corresponding author. E-mail: neiljohnson@email.gwu.edu

* These authors contributed equally to this work

Huge imminent investments in quantum technologies will bring concepts like a global quantum Internet and quantum Internet-of-Things, closer to reality. Our findings reveal a new form of vulnerability that will enable hostile groups of $N \geq 3$ quantum-enabled adversaries to inflict maximal disruption on the global quantum state in such systems. These attacks will be practically impossible to detect since they introduce no change in the Hamiltonian and no loss of purity; they require no real-time communication; and they can be over within a second. We also predict that such attacks will be amplified by the statistical character of modern extremist, insurgent and terrorist groups. A counter-measure could be to embed future quantum technologies within redundant classical networks.

Technology is rapidly moving toward an era that will fully embrace the true “spookiness” (e.g. action-at-a-distance) of quantum mechanics, where quantum mechanical information processing systems will offer unique advantages over current classical counterparts (*1–10*).

Enormous investments have been recently announced in quantum information technologies: in the United States with the new NSF ‘Quantum Leap’ initiative (11), in Europe (12) and in China (13). Among other global-scale applications, the idea of a quantum Internet is gaining significant traction (14–18).




Figure 1: Future quantum technologies. (a) Ultimate quantum technology limit in which an extended geographical space is covered by a quantum cloud within which the global quantum state is coherent. This could be a spatially-extended cavity of bosonic modes that contain arbitrary numbers of bosons (photons). A hostile group of N adversaries attack by applying a pulse interaction $\lambda(t)$ at speed v , corresponding to duration $2/v$. Our conclusions are insensitive to the precise shape of the pulse. (b) An intermediate, simpler version which could be achieved more quickly than (a) because of lower technological demand. It features smaller versions of the cavity in (a), which are then interconnected through separate quantum or classical communication channels.

Human nature, however, will likely remain unchanged. Just as human ingenuity can be used for good to drive quantum technology – which is the overriding narrative of most funding agencies (11) – it could also be used for bad (19–26). There is no reason to believe that human traits toward adversarial activities such as terrorism, extremism and even organized crime will

decrease in the future (19, 20). While much research has been done on considering individuals tampering with quantum information systems, such as an eavesdropper Eve in a quantum setup with Alice and Bob, recent and past history tell us that human adversaries tend to operate in groups (19, 21–25, 27) – with the added modern twist that they need not be in the same geographical location but just need a means of synchronizing their actions (e.g. through some common clock). Indeed, the notion that attacks are typically by a single lone wolf was recently debunked by Gill and co-workers (19) with similar conclusions reached from the study of online ISIS support in Ref. (21). The urgent question then arises: Are there new types of threats that existing or future groups of adversaries could pose to future global quantum systems?

Here we provide an affirmative answer to this question, i.e. we show that an entirely new form of threat arises by which a group of quantum-enabled adversaries can maximally disrupt the global quantum state of future systems in a way that is practically impossible to detect, and that is amplified by the way that humans naturally group into adversarial entities (21, 23–25, 28). We offer a possible countermeasure, but stress that there may be entire classes of such threats for which, as yet, there is no underlying scientific theory or understanding. Our analysis leverages the fact that whatever the future quantum technology, the necessary intercommunication across geographical distances will likely rely on electromagnetic waves – and hence a bosonic field of photons. Therefore we base our analysis around a model of a generic, global quantum system which has a global quantum state stored in a bosonic field (29).

Figure 1(a) shows arguably the ultimate limit of such quantum technology in which an extended geographical space serves as a quantum cloud within which the quantum state is kept coherent: specifically, a spatially extended cavity with bosonic modes that contain arbitrary numbers of bosons (photons) (30–32). Given the current experimental success in distributing entangled photons over large distances (33–35), photons will likely provide the quantum ‘glue’ that binds together large-scale future quantum technologies globally, including a quan-




Figure 2: **Unique disruption by hostile group.** **Top:** Complete orthogonality of the global quantum state is produced by a hostile group (left panel) applying a pulse attack $\lambda(t)$ at pulse speed $v = v^*$ simultaneously from anywhere within a cavity in Fig. 1. Since this final global quantum state for $v = v^*$ has no overlap with the initial one, the initial state cannot be filtered out from the final one – hence maximum disruption. This is fundamentally different from an attack by a lone wolf for whom there is no v that produces the same effect (right panel). The curve in the left panel is for group size $N = 3$ but is visually the same for any $N \geq 3$. We use an initial global quantum state of no photons here for simplicity, but our results can be generalized. **Bottom:** Schematic representation of disruption.

tum Internet-of-Things. To be fully quantum mechanical, the system size should be within the coherence length of non-local correlations. For recent medium- to long-range practical systems, we refer to Refs. (34, 36, 37). An intermediate version akin to Fig. 1(b) could be achieved more quickly, in which smaller versions of such quantum node systems are interconnected through separate quantum or classical communication channels. Though still extremely challenging, we note that quantum coherence within cavities has already been demonstrated experimentally in a wide range of laboratory systems including solid-state and quantum optics (38–40).

Our underlying theoretical model is purposely chosen to be simple enough that it allows de-

velopment of quantitative results and intuition, and yet is realistic enough to capture the highly non-trivial empirical nature of quantum light-matter interactions (41–43). Since the N adversaries who can interact with a particular cavity are ultimately humans or machines, we assign each adversary a single qubit as their instrument for interacting with the cavity and hence attacking the global quantum state within the cavity. In fact our results are unchanged irrespective of whether each qubit is controlled by a single human, a set of humans, another machine, an algorithm or a bot. We assume that each individual has modest capabilities: they are able to communicate classically once at some stage before the attack, concerning when to interact their qubit with the quantum cloud and with what temporal profile $\lambda(t)$. This classical communication can be achieved in many mundane ways, e.g. diffusion, announcement or pass-it-on meaning that the N adversaries do not need to know each other or show any active coordination or collaboration during the subsequent pulse attack when $\lambda(t)$ is non-zero. The interaction pulse $\lambda(t)$ can have a very short duration, e.g. a fraction of a second is possible using current cavity technology (44–48). Our results are similar for all up-down profile shapes and so we assume a triangular one for simplicity. The Hamiltonian is given by a time-dependent generalized Dicke-like model (29) which we integrate exactly numerically:

$$H_N(t) = \sum_{\beta} \omega a_{\beta}^{\dagger} a_{\beta} + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{\alpha_i \in i} \frac{\epsilon}{2} \sigma_{z, \alpha_i}^i + \sum_{\beta} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{\alpha_i \in i} \frac{\lambda(t)}{\sqrt{N}} (a_{\beta}^{\dagger} + a_{\beta}) \sigma_{x, \alpha_i}^i \quad (1)$$

where N is the number of adversaries attacking the cavity by implementing pulse $\lambda(t)$ at the same time. We assume the resonant condition $\epsilon = \omega$ which has indeed been demonstrated in many laboratory systems experimentally (44–48). σ_{p, α_i}^i denotes the two-level Pauli operators α_i for each adversarial individual i with $p = x, z$. The bosonic (photon) modes are denoted as $\{\beta\}$ (29). Though our results are obtained using Eq. (1), similar overall conclusions should follow from many variants of Eq. (1) due to an established universal dynamical scaling (29) and the fact that they typically generate similar types of phase diagrams, and hence have similar

collective states in the static λ limit (49–52). Indeed, we have already shown that for variants of Eq. (1) there is a universal dynamical scaling behavior for a particular class concerning their near-adiabatic behavior, in particular the Transverse-Field Ising model, the Dicke Model and the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick model (29).

Figure 2 (top, left panel) shows the resulting disruption inflicted on the global quantum state by a hostile group of $N \geq 3$ adversaries, who attack by applying a pulse interaction $\lambda(t)$ in Eq. 1. This is fundamentally different from the outcome for a lone wolf attacker ($N = 1$, Fig. 2 top right panel), for whom no possible choice of v reproduces this effect – nor can any number N of asynchronous lone wolf attacks. Our findings apply within the full quantum cavity in Fig. 1(a), or within any of the individual quantum cavities in Fig. 1(b). Figure 3 shows the corresponding entropy induced into the system. The pulse speed v at which the unique orthogonality for $N \geq 3$ occurs in Fig. 2 left panel, coincides within numerical error with the value at which the induced entropy is maximal in Fig. 3. This further supports our main conclusion that hostile groups of size $N \geq 3$ present a unique disruptive threat to such future quantum systems.

Our main findings can be summarized as follows. First, hostile groups of size $N \geq 3$ employing intermediate attack speeds v^* will generate maximal global quantum state disruption, i.e. the final global quantum state contains zero component of the initial one and the corresponding Von Neumann entropy is also a maximum within numerical uncertainty (Figs. 2 and 3). No amount of filtering can then recover the initial global quantum state. Second, within numerical uncertainty, the speed at which this maximal disruption is obtained v^* is insensitive to the hostile group size for $N \geq 3$ attackers, meaning that a general strategy is now available to future hostile groups of any size $N \geq 3$ that they can easily copy (i.e. plug-n-play) without needing to generalize or understand the underlying many-body quantum mechanics. Third, the attack requires no real-time communication, collaboration or cooperation between any of the N adversaries. They just need to agree ahead of time when to start the pulse, its maximum value $\lambda = 1$, and




Figure 3: **Entropy induced by attack.** Von Neumann entropy S_N throughout the attack (i.e. as a function of $\lambda(t)$ and hence starting and ending at $\lambda(t) = 0$) for a given pulse speed v and a given group size of attackers N . A hostile group of $N \geq 3$ attackers produces a final global quantum state with maximum entropy when $v = v^*$ within numerical error, and hence pulse duration $2/v^*$. Our numerical calculations suggest that essentially the same result holds for all higher N , with the additional impact that the value of the maximum entropy (and hence the disruption) increases with N (i.e. peak becomes increasingly red in the figure).

the speed v and hence duration $2/v$ of the pulse. From then on, they can operate independently as clock-synchronized individuals from any geographical location within one of the cavities in Fig. 1. Fourth, this attack leaves no clues that it has occurred based on the Hamiltonian (i.e. the Hamiltonian in Eq. 1 is unchanged after the pulse since $\lambda(t) = 0$ before and after) or based on the purity of the corrupted quantum state (i.e. quantum state purity remains one as long as there is no decoherence) and hence the attack can be practically impossible to trace. Fifth, the attack can be over within a second since interactions between material qubits and boson cavity modes




Figure 4: **Robustness to decoherence.** The quantum logarithmic negativity for an open version of our system (vertical axis) as a function of time during the pulse attack, and hence as a function of $\lambda(t)$. The quantum logarithmic negativity is a widely accepted entanglement measure for an open system, and incorporates the effects of natural decoherence and losses from the cavity following Eq. 2. Results are shown for hostile group sizes $N = 5$ (solid lines) and $N = 11$ (dashed lines) and for several values of decoherence κ . The results show a surprising robustness against decoherence and losses that increases with the size of the hostile group N that is inflicting the attack.

can be switched on and off very quickly using current technology (46–48). Sixth, the impact of the attack (Fig. 4) as measured in terms of an open-system generalization of the entropy from Fig. 3, appears to become more robust to natural decoherence as the hostile group size N increases further beyond 3. Our calculation that leads to this conclusion uses the density matrix approach of Ref. (53) and a widely accepted measure of the open-system entanglement, the quantum negativity $\mathcal{N}(\rho) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\left| \rho_q^\Gamma \right|_1 - 1 \right)$ where ρ_q^Γ is the partial transpose of ρ with respect to the electronic subsystem, and $\left| \hat{\mathcal{O}} \right|_1 \equiv \text{tr} \left\{ \sqrt{\hat{\mathcal{O}}^\dagger \hat{\mathcal{O}}} \right\}$ is the trace norm. The density matrix $\rho(t)$ evolves as (54):

$$\frac{d}{dt} \hat{\rho} = -i [H, \hat{\rho}] + 2\kappa (\bar{n} + 1) \mathcal{L}(\hat{\rho}; \hat{a}) + 2\kappa \bar{n} \mathcal{L}(\hat{\rho}; \hat{a}^\dagger) \quad (2)$$

where the Lindblad superoperator $\mathcal{L}(\rho; \hat{O})$ for the arbitrary operator \hat{O} is defined as $\hat{O}\rho\hat{O}^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\{\hat{O}^\dagger\hat{O}, \rho\}$ and $\{\bullet, \bullet\}$ is the traditional anti-commutator. κ is the damping rate and \bar{n} is the thermal mean photon number.

In stark contrast, lone-wolf attackers ($N = 1$) with no synchronization of their pulses, achieve a maximum disruption that is not only smaller (Fig. 2, top right panel) but which is fundamentally different in that the final global quantum state at $v = v^*$ still contains a finite amplitude of the initial state, and hence the correct state (i.e. initial state) can in principle be recovered using purification or distillation schemes. In fact, the perfect disruption produced by a group of size $N \geq 3$ could not strictly be achieved by any number of lone-wolf attackers, even if they each attack many times since the overlap (Fig. 2, top right panel) will always be non-zero. If we were to empower a single lone-wolf attacker with an extraordinary potential impact through a much larger λ , then it is in principle possible – but for $\lambda = 1$ we have shown that there is a fundamental difference between the impact of hostile individuals and hostile groups of size $N \geq 3$. This qualitative difference between $N = 1$ and $N \geq 3$ is also in complete contrast to classical conflict theory (55) where the disruption caused by hostile groups of size N is assumed to simply scale as N , N^2 or at most N^δ ($\delta > 2$) for any N .

Our final finding comes from exploring what happens if the $N \geq 3$ adversaries in the hostile group *do* choose to cluster together in some way during the pulse attack – even though they do not need to. Previous work (21, 23–25, 28) has shown that modern extremist, insurgent and terrorist groups tend to show a common power-law-like cluster distribution with exponent near 2.5 both offline and online (21, 23–25, 28), and hence that this is a natural pattern for how humans self-organize for adversarial activities. Such clustering might at first be expected to degrade the post-attack quantum state, akin to how islands of impurities might be expected to enhance single-particle scattering, and hence weaken the finding that the final state post-attack is orthogonal to the initial one. However, it has been shown experimentally (56) that the coherence

of a global many-body quantum state is actually *strengthened* if there are matter clusters with an approximate 2.5 power-law size distribution (56, 57). Taking the N adversaries as similarly clustered and allowing these clusters to generate a constant low-level background interaction with the quantum cloud – like the impurity clusters in the experiment in Ref. (56) – then the coherence and hence orthogonality of the final state should be similarly *strengthened* by any such adversarial clustering.

Countering this threat properly will require a new understanding of time-dependent quantum correlations in many-body light-matter systems. In the meantime, we note that the technology in Fig. 1(b) will likely arrive before that in Fig. 1(a), meaning that a network architecture of connected cavities will be built first. In such a scenario, it would be possible to build redundancy into the network: then even if a perfectly orthogonal final state is generated within one cavity by a hostile group attack at speed v^* , it would be unlikely that this would be achieved simultaneously within a separate cavity, and so error correction schemes could be carried out across all cavities where each cavity is now a network node, and each node is crudely treated as a two-level system.

Acknowledgments

NFJ acknowledges partial support from the Air Force under AFOSR grant FA9550-16-1-0247, and the National Science Foundation (NSF) under grant CNS 1522693. FJG-R, FJR and LQ acknowledge financial support from Facultad de Ciencias through UniAndes-2019 projects *Excited state quantum phase transition in driven Dicke model* and *Quantum thermalization and optimal control in many-body systems*. The views and conclusions contained herein are solely those of the authors and do not represent official policies or endorsements by any of the entities named in this paper.

References

1. See special set of “Quantum Horizons” articles in Physics World at <https://physicsworld.com/p/collections/quantum-horizons/>.
2. A. Ekert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 661 (1991).
3. S. Lloyd, *Nature* **406**, 1047 (2017).
4. N. Nickerson, Y. Li, S. Benjamin, *Nature Communications* **4**, 1756 (2013).
5. A. Ekert, R. Renner, *Nature* **507**, 443 (2014).
6. S. Barz, *et al.*, *Science* **335**, 303 (2012).
7. T. Albash, D. A. Lidar, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90**, 015002 (2018).
8. W. H. Zurek, *Physics Today* **67**, 44 (2014).
9. J. Dziarmaga, W. H. Zurek, M. Zwolak, *Nature Physics* **8**, 49 (2011).
10. X.-S. Ma, *et al.*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **110**, 1221 (2013).
11. The National Science Foundation funding in Quantum Technologies at https://www.nsf.gov/events/event_summ.jsp?cntn_id=296901.
12. European Commission in Quantum Technologies at <https://qt.eu> and <https://ktn-uk.co.uk/interests/quantum-technologies>.
13. National Natural Science Foundation of China <https://www.nsfc.gov.cn>.
14. S. Pirandola, S. L. Braunstein, *Nature* **532**, 169 (2016).
15. D. Castelvecchi, *Nature* **554**, 289 (2018).

16. S. Wehner, D. Elkouss, R. Hanson, *Science* **362** (2018).
17. S.-K. Liao, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 030501 (2018).
18. J.-G. Ren, *et al.*, *Nature* **549**, 70 (2017).
19. B. Schuurman, *et al.*, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* **0**, 1 (2018).
20. P. Gill, *et al.*, *Criminology and Public Policy* **16**, 99 (2017).
21. N. Johnson, *et al.*, *Science* **352**, 1459 (2016).
22. N. Johnson, *et al.*, *Science* **333**, 81 (2011).
23. N. Johnson, *et al.*, *Scientific Reports* **3**, 3463 (2013).
24. J. Bohorquez, *et al.*, *Nature* **462**, 911 (2009).
25. P. D. Manrique, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 048301 (2018).
26. N. F. Johnson, *Science* **355**, 801 (2017).
27. J. Robb, *Brave New War* (Wiley, New York, 2008).
28. M. Spagat, *et al.*, *PLOS ONE* **13**, 1 (2018).
29. O. L. Acevedo, L. Quiroga, F. J. Rodríguez, N. F. Johnson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 030403 (2014).
30. S. Ritter, *et al.*, *Nature* **484**, 195 (2012).
31. I. M. Mirza, J. C. Schotland, *Phys. Rev. A* **94**, 012309 (2016).
32. S. Lloyd, *Science* **321**, 1463 (2008).

- 33. J. Hofmann, *et al.*, *Science* **337**, 72 (2012).
- 34. B. Hensen, *et al.*, *Nature* **526**, 682 (2015).
- 35. C. Simon, W. T. M. Irvine, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 110405 (2003).
- 36. J. Yin, *et al.*, *Science* **356**, 1140 (2017).
- 37. A. Mishra, T. Albash, D. A. Lidar, *Nature Communications* **9**, 2917 (2018).
- 38. G. S. Agarwal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53**, 1732 (1984).
- 39. F. Herrera, F. C. Spano, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 238301 (2016).
- 40. C. Schneider, D. Porras, T. Schaetz, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **75**, 024401 (2012).
- 41. R. H. Dicke, *Phys. Rev.* **93**, 99 (1954).
- 42. K. Hepp, E. H. Lieb, *Annals of Physics* **76**, 360 (1973).
- 43. K. Hepp, E. H. Lieb, *Ann. Phys.* **76**, 360 (1973).
- 44. X. Gu, S.-N. Huai, F. Nori, Y.-x. Liu, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 063827 (2016).
- 45. W. Guerin, M. O. Araújo, R. Kaiser, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 083601 (2016).
- 46. J. Klinder, H. Kebler, M. Wolke, L. Mathey, A. Hemmerich, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112**, 3290 (2015).
- 47. S. A. Will, J. W. Park, Z. Z. Yan, H. Loh, M. W. Zwierlein, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 225306 (2016).
- 48. K. Baumann, C. Guerlin, F. Brennecke, T. Esslinger, *Nature* **464**, 1301 (2010).
- 49. C. F. Lee, N. F. Johnson, *Europhysics Letters* **81**, 37004 (2008).

- 50. T. C. Jarrett, C. F. Lee, N. F. Johnson, *Phys. Rev. B, Rapid Communications* **74**, 121301 (2006).
- 51. C. F. Lee, N. F. Johnson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 083001 (2004).
- 52. T. C. Jarrett, A. Olaya-Castro, N. F. Johnson, *Europhysics Letters* **77**, 34001 (2007).
- 53. O. L. Acevedo, L. Quiroga, F. J. Rodríguez, N. F. Johnson, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 032330 (2015).
- 54. H. P. Breuer, F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007).
- 55. N. MacKay, *Journal of the Operational Research Society* **66**, 2 (2015).
- 56. M. Fratini, *et al.*, *Nature* **466**, 841 (2010).
- 57. N. Johnson, *et al.*, *AIP Advances* p. 012114 (2011).