

Quantum Evolution and Space-time Structure

quant-ph/9512004

George Svetlichny

Departamento de Matemática
Pontifícia Universidade Católica
Rua Marquês de São Vicente 225
22453 Gavea, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

Abstract

The Hilbert-space structure of quantum mechanics is related to the causal structure of space-time. The usual measurement hypotheses apparently preclude nonlinear or stochastic quantum evolution. By admitting a difference in the calculus of joint probabilities of events in space-time according to whether the separation is space-like or time-like, a relativistic nonlinear or stochastic quantum theory may be possible.

1 Nonlinear and stochastic quantum evolution

The motivation for considering nonlinear or stochastic quantum evolution is varied: fundamental speculation, presence of gravity, string theory, representations of current algebras, etc. On the other hand it is becoming progressively evident that nonlinear quantum mechanics (and possibly stochastic also) is a radical departure from conventional theory. This has already become apparent more than a decade ago. According to Bugajski ([1] and earlier references therein) such theories are classical theories with constraints, situated somewhere between classical and quantum mechanics. Haag and Bannier ([2]) pointed out that in Mielnik's nonlinear quantum mechanics ([3]) one can distinguish between two different convex combinations of pure states that lead to the same density matrix. This makes the state-space a

simplex, just as in classical theories, and, as it became apparent later, allows for superluminal signals. As has been pointed out by N. Gisin ([4, 5]) and G. Svetlichny ([6]) nonlinearity allows us to use EPR-type correlations and the instantaneous nature of state-vector collapse to send a signal across a space-like interval. Polchinski ([7]) argues that in Weinberg's nonlinear theory ([8, 9]) one can either communicate between separate branches of an Everett multiple-world universe or physical systems can react to the content of the experimenter's mind. Further peculiarities are that even for non-interacting systems, higher particle-number equations are not uniquely determined by one-particle equations ([10]), and that such ambiguities become important for particles with internal symmetries. In fact there are non-trivial obstructions to lifting symmetries from N -particles to $N + 1$ -particles ([11]).

2 Relativity constraints and problems

The presence of superluminal signals in nonlinear theories was the first indication that nonlinearity and relativity are in conflict. In fact the presence of such signals *per se* already contradicts relativity. To make this clear, consider a superluminal signaling device set up according to the state-collapse mechanism and that is to operate between two distant locations in the rest reference frame of two observers at relative rest. According to the mechanism explained in the cited articles, if at $t = 0$ the first observer changes over from measuring one observable to a suitable other, then the second observer, given a nonlinear time evolution, will, after a negligible time interval, detect a change in the expected value of the observable he is measuring and consequently receive a signal. We can say that for the second observer the onset of the signal is at $t = \tau > 0$ for some small τ . Onset is a physical event and so all observers ought to agree where in space-time it occurred. Consider how the same situation is seen in a reference frame of a moving observer. He would see a different initial state, and that the time-evolution is given by a possibly different nonlinear equation, and if special relativity holds, that collapse occurs in a different plane of simultaneity. The argument that leads to superluminal signals is sufficiently general that the moving observer will also expect these to exist, but now in relation to his plane of simultaneity, and so he would expect the onset of the signal along the second observer's world-line to be significantly different from what was determined before.

Since onset is an uncontestable physical fact, this is a contradiction.

Relativity constraints on quantum evolution is something that has not yet been fully explored. The problem arises with the measurement process. Consider a measurement with space-like separated instrumental events such as a correlation measurement upon a two particle system of the EPR type. In one frame the measurements on the two particles are simultaneous and so can be considered as just parts of a single measurement, while in another frame the two measurements are successive with intervening time evolution. These two descriptions must be equivalent and produce the same observable results. Thus relativity imposes constraints that relate the measurement process to the evolution. These constraints pose obvious difficulties for stochastic evolution, for in the frame where there is a single measurement the outcomes can be calculated from the measurement process algorithm applied to the state just prior to the measurement. In the other frame there is an intervening dissipative evolution, a dissipation not present in the first frame. It is questionable that one can maintain an equivalence of the two descriptions. That there are also difficulties for nonlinear evolution is not as apparent but they do exist and we shall refer to them later.

Another, but related, constraint comes about in considering a measurement process in a limited space-time region and two observers in relative motion at space-like separation from the measurement region such that for one observer the measurement has already taken place while for the other it has not. One observer would subject his state-description to a collapse while the other would not. These different descriptions must not have local observable effects and this is a constraint on the theory.

Another hint of these difficulties can be seen by considering the following commutator in the Lie algebra of the Poincare group.

$$[L_{0j}; P_j] = P_0 j$$

that is, the commutator of a boost generator and the collinear momentum is the energy. The moral is that one cannot impose on the time evolution, properties that one would not impose on neither space translation nor boosts.

One thus comes to the realization that for a relativistic nonlinear or stochastic quantum theory to be viable the measurement process must be modified. Once this is realized one must be aware that it is very easy to make certain types of trivial modifications. Let $T : H \rightarrow H$ be a nonlinear invertible

norm-preserving transformation of a Hilbert space H . Let $U(t)$ be a unitary quantum evolution operator and P a spectral projector of an observable. One has an obvious equivalence between the evolution and measurement processes as described by the two sides of the following diagram :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{P} U(t) & & T \mathbb{P} T U(t) \\ \mathbb{P} P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & T \mathbb{P} T P \end{array}$$

What one has done on the right-hand side is introduced curvilinear coordinates in Hilbert space but left physics alone. There are two ways of avoiding triviality. One would be to leave part of the formalism unmodified, such as in those proposals that modify the evolution but maintain the usual measurement process. The difficulty of this is that one runs the risk of contradiction. The other way is to deal only with invariant objects such as joint probability distributions of events in space-time. This is notoriously difficult but is the only way to achieve true insight into the problem.

3 Joint probabilities in quantum mechanics

Consider successive measurements with finite spectrum operators,

$$A = \sum_i x_i P_i; \quad B = \sum_j y_j Q_j;$$

performed on a (possibly mixed) heisenberg state represented by the density matrix ρ_0 . The joint probability of seeing outcomes $(i; j)$ for the two measurements is

$$P(i; j) = \text{Tr}(Q_j P_i \rho_0 P_i Q_j):$$

and the conditional probabilities are:

$$P(j|i) = \frac{\text{Tr}(Q_j P_i \rho_0 P_i Q_j)}{\text{Tr}(P_i \rho_0)} \quad (1)$$

$$P(i|j) = \frac{\text{Tr}(Q_j P_i \rho_0 P_i Q_j)}{\sum_k \text{Tr}(Q_k P_i \rho_0 P_i Q_k)} \quad (2)$$

Conditional probabilities are important in that they often correspond to what is measured in the laboratory. Very often in practice one does not execute

the observation procedure only in the instances that the preparation procedure is deemed successful. What does take place is that one performs a long experimental run and only a posteriori analyses those instances in which the preparation was deemed successful. This is most apparent for instance in high-energy physics. A simple model for what happens in practice would be to consider that there is some "gross" preparation procedure and two observation procedures. A long experimental run is executed and only the cases in which a particular outcome in one of the observations is realized are considered to be the cases in which the desired state of affairs has been created and for which the outcomes corresponding to the other observation procedure are then subsequently analyzed. Data for which some other outcome of the first observation is obtained are simply ignored. The procedure described above can be called an indirect preparation procedure. The normal attitude concerning it is that the compound procedure "execute a preparation procedure then execute an observation procedure and consider the operation successful if such and such outcome obtains" is a procedure just as legitimate for creating a state of affairs as any other. One collects data even if the indicated outcome, which we shall call the conditioning outcome, did not occur, merely for technological reasons, it would just be too difficult or impossible to set up the experiment in another way. Since by assumption the separate execution of the experiment in the long run do not interfere with each other, the fact that the instances of the desired state of affairs are imbedded in a larger set along with states of affairs of no interest is innocuous as mere data analysis weeds them out. Consider now the two observations introduced above in this light and consider one of them as the conditioning observation for an indirect state preparation. Now it is usual to consider the conditioning observations as taking place before the conditioned observation, what can be called pre-conditioning but since one performs the data analysis after all the data has been collected one could perform, post-conditioning, that is, conditioning on future events. It is instructive to contrast the two:

Pre-conditioning:

$$P(j|i) = \text{Tr}(Q_j P_i)$$

where $P_i = P_{i0} P_i = \text{Tr}(P_{i0})$.

The new density matrix P_i depends only on P_{i0} and not on the other compatible spectral projectors P_k , $k \neq i$.

Given P_{ij} , $P_{(jj)}$ depends only on Q_j and not on the other compatible spectral projectors $Q_k, k \neq i$.

Post-conditioning:

Unless $[A; B] = 0$, $P_{(ij)}$ depends not only on P_i, P_j and Q_j but also on the other projectors in the two spectral decompositions.

The "state of affairs" created by post-conditioning on outcome j depends on the outcome's "context", the other compatible projections $Q_k, k \neq i$. Contextual Conditioning

The above "state of affairs" breaks the equivalence class of experimental outcomes where two such are equivalent if they correspond to the same spectral projector.

One sees that for commuting observables, post-conditioning behaves exactly the same as pre-conditions. This means also that space-like conditioning behaves the same as time-like pre-conditioning. This last statement is a characteristic of quantum mechanics and may in fact be a determining condition in a relativistic theory. One can show ([12]) that Lorentz covariance imposes constraints on joint probabilities of events in space-time: Let I and J be two space-like separated instruments with outcomes a_1, \dots, a_n and b_1, \dots, b_m then,

$$P_{ij}^{I \wedge J}(W) = P_j^J(P_i^I(W))$$

$$P_{ij}^{I \wedge J} = P_j^J P_i^I$$

where P is probability W is a preparation procedure and P_i^I is the conditioning operator for indirect preparation. These constraints imposed in their non-contextual form on (adequately defined) compatible instruments lead in several axiomatic schemes ([13, 14, 15, 16, 17]) to a Hilbert-space model for physical propositions. From here one has arguments that lead to linearity of evolution ([18, 19, 20]).

The moral here seems to be that there is a relation (independently postulated by N. Gisin and G. Svetlichny) between space-time structure (relativistic causality in particular) and the Hilbert-space model of quantum mechanics. The fact that one must impose the relativistic constraints on all pairs of compatible instruments and not only on the space-like separated

ones has two implications. The first is that the identical behaviour of space-like conditioning and time-like pre-conditioning may be, along with Lorentz covariance, a determining condition for Hilbert-space quantum mechanics. Thus one may conjecture that any relativistic theory with non-contextual conditioning for future measurements (whether time-like or space-like) must be a Hilbert-space theory (with possible superselection sectors) with linearly implemented (probably deterministic) time evolution. The second implication is that for a relativistic nonlinear quantum mechanics to be possible, one probably has to introduce a discontinuity in the conditioning behavior for indirect preparations across the future-light cone and allow space-like conditioning to behave differently from future time-like.

Another possibility for a nonlinear theory would be to modify the measurement process to be contextual (as happens for post-conditioning) but still maintain that space-like and future time-like conditioning follow the same rules. Unfortunately we have no general results concerning this possibility though some preliminary results suggest that such theories face the same difficulties as the nonlinear non-contextual ones.

4 Possibilities for nonlinear relativistic quantum mechanics

From the discussion of the previous section one can conjecture that a nonlinear relativistic quantum mechanics can be achieved if space-like and future time-like conditioning behave differently. Since space-like cannot be changed to time-like by a Lorentz transformation, the proposal does not conflict with relativity, at least not superficially. The proposal avoids superluminal signals since these would only be related to space-like conditioning which would have to obey the constraints of the previous section which already preclude such signals ([12]). What must then be modified is the future time-like conditioning. To get some idea of such possible modification consider a free neutral scalar relativistic quantum field. For each limited space-time region O let $A(O)$ be the algebra of observables associated to O . Consider now a set of limited space-time regions $O_1; \dots; O_n$ which are so disposed that for any two, either all points of one are space-like in relation to all points of the other, or they are time-like. Assume the regions are numbered so that whenever one

is in the time-like future of another, then the first one has a smaller index. Let $P_i \in \mathcal{A}(O_i)$ be orthogonal projections that correspond to outcomes of measurements made in the corresponding regions. Let ψ represent a heisenberg state in some reference frame and prior to all measurements. According to the usual rules, the probability to obtain all the outcomes represented by the projections is:

$$\langle \psi | P_1 P_2 \dots P_n | \psi \rangle^2 :$$

A modification of the sort we are proposing would be, for instance, to replace in this formula P_i by $P_i B_i$ whenever there is a region O_j that is time-like past to the given one. This effectively differentiates between space-like and time-like conditioning. For this to be consistent and relativistic the presumably nonlinear operators B_i would have to satisfy certain constraints. If we can associate to a space-time region O a possibly nonlinear operator B_O such that

1. Operators assigned to space-like separated regions commute and the operator assigned to a region commutes with all projectors associated to a space-like separated region.
2. If $O = O^0$ and $P \in \mathcal{A}(O)$ is a projector then $P B_{O^0} = P B_O$
3. If $U(g)$ is a unitary operator representing the element g of the Poincare group then $B_{gO} = U(g) B_O U(g)$

then the above prescription would already constitute a nonlinear relativistic quantum theory. One still does not know how to compute joint probabilities for events in regions that are neither space-like nor time-like to each other but the case at hand would certainly have to be addressed and would constitute a first step. It is not yet known if an association $O \mapsto B_O$ satisfying these constraints exists. Even if it does not, the path toward a relativistic nonlinear quantum mechanics is now sufficiently clear that one may feel that such a mechanics may after all be possible in spite of the weighty arguments brought forth against it up to now.

Acknowledgment

The author thanks the Arnold Sommerfeld Institute for its kind invitation to the symposium and for financial support. This research was financed by the

Ministerio de Ciência e Tecnologia (MCT) and by the Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Tecnológico e Científico (CNPq), agencies of the Brazilian government.

References

- [1] Bugajski, S. International Journal of Theoretical Physics 30, 961 (1991)
- [2] Haag, R. and Bannier. U. Communications on Mathematical Physics 60, 1 (1978)
- [3] Mielnik, B. Communications on Mathematical Physics 37, 221 (1974)
- [4] Gisin, N. Helvetica Physica Acta 62, 363 (1989)
- [5] Gisin, N. Physics Letters A 143, 1 (1990)
- [6] Svetlichny, G. "Quantum Formalism and Superluminal Communication" Pontifícia Universidade Católica of Rio de Janeiro pre-print 1989, reissued as MAT 13/95 and also available electronically as quant-ph/9511002
- [7] Polchinski, J. Physical Review Letters 66, 397 (1991)
- [8] Weinberg, S. Physical Review Letters 62, 485 (1989)
- [9] Weinberg, S. Annals of Physics (NY) 194, 336 (1989)
- [10] Goldin, G. A. and Svetlichny, G. Journal of Mathematical Physics 35, 3322 (1994)
- [11] Svetlichny, G. Journal of Nonlinear Mathematical Physics, 2. 2-26 (1995)
- [12] Svetlichny, G. "Lorentz Covariance and the Covering Law", Pontifícia Universidade Católica of Rio de Janeiro pre-print 1993, reissued as MAT 15/95. An updated version will appear on the Los Alamos archives.
- [13] Pool, J. C. T. Communications on Mathematical Physics 9, 118 (1968)

- [14] Pool, J. C. T. Communications on Mathematical Physics 9, 212 (1968)
- [15] Guz, W. Reports on Mathematical Physics 16, 125 (1979)
- [16] Guz, W. Reports on Mathematical Physics 17, 385 (1980)
- [17] Gisin, N. Synthese 89, 287 (1991)
- [18] Giovannini, N. Journal of Mathematical Physics 22, 2389 (1981)
- [19] Giovannini, N. Journal of Mathematical Physics 22, 2397 (1981)
- [20] Jordan, T., F. American Journal of Physics 59, 606 (1991)