## Nonlocale ects in Fock space

A sher Peres

Department of Physics, Technion | Israel Institute of Technology, 32 000 Haifa, Israel

25 January 1995

## A bstract

If a physical system contains a single particle, and if two distant detectors test the presence of linear superpositions of one-particle and vacuum states, a violation of classical locality can occur. It is due to the creation of a two-particle component by the detecting process itself.

PACS: 03.65 Bz

E lectronic address: peres@ photon.technion.ac.il

It has been known for a long time that quantum systems consisting of two [1] or more [2, 3] distant particles display remarkable nonlocal e ects. Recently, a similar nonlocal e ect was predicted by Hardy [4] for a quantum system involving nomore than one photon. Hardy considered a state

$$j i = p J i_{a} D i_{b} + q D i_{a} J i_{b} + r D i_{a} D i_{b};$$
(1)

and various tests performed by two distant observers, A lice and Bob, who

nd a violation of classical locality. In the above equation,  $j_{1}$  and  $j_{1}$  denote the vacuum and one-particle states in a beam directed toward A lice;  $j_{1}$  and  $j_{1}$  likewise refer to a beam directed toward B ob; and p; q; r are num erical coe cients, none of which is zero. H ardy gave explicit instructions on how to actually perform these experiments, by means of beam splitters and parametric down conversion processes. The abundance of technical details is helpful for convincing the reader that the experiment is indeed feasible, but it som ewhat obscures the origin of the nonlocality.

As shown below, the latter is simply due to the creation of a component  $jli_a jli_b$  by the detecting process itself. To simplify the discussion, I shall restrict it to the case where

$$j i = (j i_a j i_b j i_a j i_b) = \frac{p}{2};$$
(2)

is a pure one-particle state, without vacuum component. Such a state could also be written without invoking Fock space notations, since it involves only ordinary quantum mechanics, with a given number of particles (one). How – ever, it is impossible to repeat Hardy's argument by using a rst-quantized form alism, for reasons that will soon be clear.

Note that the right hand side of Eq. (2) has the same structure as the singlet state of a pair of particles of spin  $\frac{1}{2}$ , if we reinterpret  $\hat{D}i_a$  and  $\hat{J}i_a$  as

representing particle a with spin up and down, respectively, and likewise for particle b. The route to nonlocality is now obvious.

Both A lice and Bob have a choice of two dimensional errent experiments. One is to test the mere presence of a particle, by measuring the projection operators  $P_a$  and  $P_b$  on the one-particle states  $jli_a$  and  $jli_b$ , respectively. A lice can also opt to test the projection operator  $P_{a^0}$  on the state  $\frac{1}{2}$  ( $jli_a + \frac{p}{3}jli_a$ ), namely a coherent superposition of one-particle and vacuum states. Independently of her decision, Bob can choose to test  $P_{b^0}$ , the projection operator on  $\frac{1}{2}$  ( $jli_b$ 

 $p \overline{3}jp_{i_b}$ ). There are therefore four dierent experiments, and quantum theory makes the following predictions, for the state j i in Eq. (2):

$$hP_{a^0}i = hP_{b^0}i = 0.5;$$
 (3)

$$h P_a P_b i = 0; (4)$$

$$h P_{a} P_{b^{0}} i = h P_{a^{0}} P_{b} i = h P_{a^{0}} P_{b^{0}} i = 0:375:$$
(5)

These results violate the Clauser-Home inequality [5] (a variant of Bell's inequality), namely

$$0 \quad h P_{a^0} + P_{b^0} \quad P_{a^0} P_{b^0} \quad P_{a^0} P_b \quad P_a P_{b^0} + P_a P_{b^1} \quad 1:$$
(6)

For the given j i, the actual value of the above expression is 0:125.

O by iously, the total num ber of particles is not conserved when we measure  $P_{a^0}$  or  $P_{b^0}$ , since these operators do not commute with the number operator. The apparatuses used by A lice and B obmust be able to create new particles, or supply some of their own. Nonlocal elects may thus appear for an initial state that contains a single particle, provided that the nalstatem ay contain two. (I did not include in this discussion the num erous auxiliary particles in the two measuring apparatuses, as H ardy did in ref. [4], because quantum

m echanical probabilities do not depend on the detailed structure of these apparatuses, and it is both custom ary  $[1{3}]$  and legitim at [6] to ignore the latter.)

This work was supported by the G erard Swope Fund, and the Fund for E ncouragement of R essarch.

- 1. J.S.Bell, Physics 1, 195 (1964).
- 2. D. M. Grænberger, M. Horne, and A. Zeilinger, in Bell's Theorem, Quantum Theory, and Conceptions of the Universe, ed. by M. Kafatos, Kluwer, Dordrecht (1989) p. 69.
- 3. N.D.Mermin, Am.J.Phys. 58, 731 (1990).
- 4. L. Hardy, Phys. Rev. Letters 73, 2279 (1994).
- 5. J.F.Clauser and M.A.Home, Phys. Rev. D 10, 526 (1974).
- 6. A .Peres, Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods, Kluwer, Dordrecht (1993), Chapt. 12.