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#### Abstract

If a physical system contains a single particle, and iftw $o$ distant detectors test the presence of linear supenpositions of one-particle and vacuum states, a violation of classical locality can occur. It is due to the creation of a tw o-particle com ponent by the detecting process itself.
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It has been known for a long time that quantum system $s$ consisting of two [1] or $m$ ore $[2,3]$ distant particles display rem arkable nonlocale ects. Recently, a sim ilar nonlocale ect was predicted by H ardy [4] for a quantum system involving no $m$ ore than one photon. H ardy considered a state

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i=p j i_{a} j 0 i_{b}+q j 0 i_{a} j i_{b}+r j 0 i_{a} j 0 i_{b} ; \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and various tests perform ed by two distant observers, $A$ lice and $B$ ob, who nd a violation of classical locality. In the above equation, j0i $\frac{i}{a}$ and $j 1 i_{a}$ denote the vacuum and one-particle states in a beam directed tow ard A lice; $j 0 i_{b}$ and $j i_{b}$ likew ise refer to a beam directed tow ard Bob; and p; q; r are num ericalcoe cients, none ofw hich is zero. H ardy gave explicit instructions on how to actually perform these experim ents, by $m$ eans ofbeam splitters and param etric dow $n$ conversion processes. The abundance of technical details is helpfiul for convincing the reader that the experim ent is indeed feasible, but it som ew hat obscures the origin of the nonlocality.

A s show $n$ below, the latter is sim ply due to the creation of a com ponent $j 1 i_{a} j i_{b}$ by the detecting process itself. To sim plify the discussion, I shall restrict it to the case where

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i=\left(j 1 i_{a} j 0 i_{b} \quad j 0 i_{a} j \mathcal{j} i_{b}\right)={ }^{p} \overline{2} ; \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

is a pure one-particle state, w ithout vacuum com ponent. Such a state could also be w ritten without invoking Fock space notations, since it involves only ordinary quantum m echanics, with a given num ber of particles (one). H ow ever, it is im possible to repeat H ardy's argum ent by using a rst-quantized form alism, for reasons that $w$ ill soon be clear.

N ote that the right hand side of Eq. (2) has the sam e stnucture as the singlet state of a pair of particles of spin $\frac{1}{2}$, if we reinterpret $j 0 i_{a}$ and $j i_{a}$ as
representing particle a w ith spin up and dow n , respectively, and likew ise for particle b. The route to nonlocality is now obvious.

B oth $A$ lige and Bob have a choice of two di erent experim ents. O ne is to test the $m$ ere presence of a particle, by $m$ easuring the projection operators $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{a}}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{b}}$ on the one-particle states $j i_{a}$ and $j i_{i_{b}}$, respectively. A lioe can also opt to test the projection operator $\mathrm{P}_{a^{0}}$ on the state $\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathrm{j} i_{a}+{ }^{\mathrm{P}}{ }^{3} j 0 i_{a}\right)$, nam ely a coherent supenposition ofone-particle and vacuum states. Independently of her decision, B ob can choose to test $\mathrm{P}_{b^{0}}$, the pro jection operator on $\frac{1}{2}$ ( $j 1 i_{\mathrm{b}}$ $\left.{ }^{\mathrm{p}}{ }^{3}-j i_{b}\right)$. There are therefore four di erent experim ents, and quantum theory $m$ akes the follow ing predictions, for the state $j$ i in Eq. (2):

$$
\begin{align*}
& h \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{a}^{\mathrm{i}}=\mathrm{h} \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{b}^{0}} \mathrm{i}=0: 5 ;  \tag{3}\\
& \mathrm{hP}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{i}=0 ;  \tag{4}\\
& \mathrm{hP}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{b}^{0}} \mathrm{i}=\mathrm{hP}_{\mathrm{a}^{0}} \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{i}=\mathrm{hP}_{\mathrm{a}^{0}} \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{b}^{0}} \mathrm{i}=0: 375: \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

These results violate the C lauserf ome inequality 5] (a variant of Bell's inequally), nam ely

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \quad h P_{a^{0}}+P_{b^{0}} \quad P_{a^{0}} P_{b^{0}} \quad P_{a^{0}} P_{b} \quad P_{a} P_{b^{0}}+P_{a} P_{b} i \quad 1: \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the given $j i$, the actual value of the above expression is $0: 125$.
O bviously, the totalnum ber ofparticles is not conserved when w em easure $P_{a^{0}}$ or $P_{b^{0}}$, since these operators do not com $m$ ute $w$ th the num ber operator. $T$ he apparatuses used by A lice and Bob m ust be able to create new particles, or supply som e of their own. $N$ onlocale ects $m$ ay thus appear for an initial state that contains a single particle, provided that the nalstate $m$ ay contain two. (I did not include in this discussion the num erous auxiliary particles in the two $m$ easuring 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 ate [6] to ignore the latter.)
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