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Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) Paradox (1935)
- Realism and the incompleteness of quantum mechanics -

Schroedinger’s Cat (1935)
- Entanglement and macro-realism -

Maxwell’s Demon (1871)
- Thermodynamics of information processing -

main example:
EPR - From philosophy to practical application
Benjamin Schumacher and Michael Westmorland,

in “Quantum Processes, Measurement, and Information:”

This book is written from the conviction that a modern student of physics needs a broader set of concepts than conventional quantum mechanics textbooks now provide. Unitary time evolution, quantum entanglement, density operator methods, open systems, thermodynamics, concepts of communication, and information processing - all of these are at least as essential to the meaning of quantum theory as is solving the time-independent Schroedinger equation.
EPR - from philosophy to practical application

EPR (1935)  

Aharonov-Bohm (1957)  

Bell (1964)  

CHSH* (1969)  

Aspect et. al. (1982): Confirms predictions of QM over local hv theories.

Ekert (1991): Proposes quantum cryptographic protocol based on CHSH.

Jennewein et. al. (2000): Implement variation of Ekert protocol.

Bell States

spins 1/2: $|\psi\rangle = |\uparrow \downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow \uparrow\rangle$

photons: $|\psi\rangle = |H,V\rangle - |V,H\rangle$

$= |D,D\rangle - |\bar{D},D\rangle$

What Alice and Bob see with common detector settings:

$(H,V)$:

A

B

or

$(D,\bar{D})$:

or
Bell States

spins 1/2: \[ |\psi\rangle = |\uparrow \downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow \uparrow\rangle \]

photons: \[ |\psi\rangle = |H,V\rangle - |V,H\rangle \]
\[ = |D,\overline{D}\rangle - |\overline{D},D\rangle \]

What Alice and Bob see with common detector settings:

\((H,V)\): \[ \begin{array}{c} \text{A} \\ \text{B} \end{array} \]

or

\((D,\overline{D})\): \[ \begin{array}{c} \text{or} \\ \text{or} \end{array} \]
Choices of bases -
Alice and Bob have polarizing beam splitters

A

B

$\theta$
Probabilities with different polarization bases:

\[ C(A, B) \equiv P(0,0) + P(1,1) - P(0,1) - P(1,0) \]
\[ = \sin^2 \theta - \cos^2 \theta = -\cos 2\theta \]
No causal arrow in measurements

Lab Frame

Right-moving frame

Left-moving frame
The EPR Paradox

If, without in any way disturbing a system, we can predict with certainty (i.e., with probability equal to unity) the value of a physical quantity, then there exists an element of physical reality corresponding to this physical quantity.

Reality: If, without in any way disturbing a system, we can predict with certainty (i.e., with probability equal to unity) the value of a physical quantity, then there exists an element of physical reality corresponding to this physical quantity.

Locality: On one supposition we should, in my opinion, absolutely hold fast: the real factual situation of the system S2, is independent of what is done with the system S1, which is spatially separated from the former.

Since one can choose to measure either $x$ or $p$ of A, and thus predict with certainty the result of a measurement of $x$ or $p$ (respectively) of B, both $x$ and $p$ are elements of reality.

Since quantum mechanics doesn’t admit real values for both $x$ and $p$, it is incomplete. “We believe, however, that such a theory is possible.”
EPR - from philosophy to practical application

EPR (1935)  
\[ x_1, p_1 \quad \text{A} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{B} \quad x_2, p_2 \]

Aharonov-Bohm (1957)  
\[ e^- \quad \text{A} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{B} \quad e^+ \]

Bell (1964)  
\[ \pi^0 \quad \text{A} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{B} \quad e^+e^- \]

CHSH* (1969)  
\[ \gamma \quad \text{A} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{B} \quad \gamma \]

Aspect et. al. (1982): Confirms predictions of QM over local \( h \nu \) theories.

Ekert (1991): Proposes quantum cryptographic protocol based on CHSH.

Jennewein et. al. (2000): Implement variation of Ekert protocol.

Bell showed that a hidden variable model can reproduce perfect anticorrelations at $\theta = 0$ with random individual outputs. The correlation function is equal to

$$C(A,B) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) a(A,\lambda) b(B,\lambda)$$

where $a$ and $b$ are hidden variable measurement outcomes, and $\rho$ is a probability density function.

Here is a model: Let $\lambda$ denote an angle (like $A$ and $B$), set during the annihilation process, and let the ensemble be uniform, $\rho = 1/2\pi$. Then we take

$$a(A,\lambda) = \text{sgn}(45^\circ - |A - \lambda|),$$
$$b(B,\lambda) = \text{sgn}(|B - \lambda| - 45^\circ).$$
So the quantum mechanical prediction is:

\[ C(A,B) = \int d\lambda \, \rho(\lambda) \, a(A,\lambda) \, b(B,\lambda) \]

Hidden variables argument of Bell - CHSH

Bell showed that a hidden variable model can reproduce perfect anticorrelations at \( \theta = 0 \) with random individual outputs. The correlation function is equal to:

\[ C(A,B) = \frac{1}{2} \]

Here is a model: Let \( \lambda \) denote an angle (like A and B), set during the annihilation process, and let the ensemble be uniform, \( \rho = 1/2\pi \).

Then we take

\[ a(A,\lambda) = \text{sgn}(45^\circ - |A - \lambda|), \]
\[ b(B,\lambda) = \text{sgn}(|B - \lambda| - 45^\circ). \]
Hidden variables - more general

Show that there is NO local hidden variable model that reproduces the whole curve: Consider a combination of $C(A,B)$ with maximum at $22.5^\circ$.

$$S(A,B) = C(A,B) - C(A,B') + C(A',B) + C(A',B')$$

Hidden variable result is

$$S(A,B) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) \left\{ a(A,\lambda) \left[ b(B,\lambda) - b(B',\lambda) \right] + a(A',\lambda) \left[ b(B,\lambda) + b(B',\lambda) \right] \right\}.$$ 

$$\Rightarrow |S(A,B)| \leq 2.$$ 

QM result is

$$S(A,B) = -2\cos 2\theta - 2\cos(\pi/2 - 2\theta) = -2\sqrt{2}\cos(2\theta - \pi/4).$$
Experimental tests of quantum vs hidden variables predictions:


Closes loophole by achieving spacelike separation of detectors with truly random switching between bases while photons are enroute.

EPR - from philosophy to practical application

EPR (1935)  \[ x_1, p_1 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow x_2, p_2 \]

Aharonov-Bohm (1957)

Bell (1964)

CHSH* (1969)

Aspect et. al. (1982): Confirms predictions of QM over local hv theories.

Ekert (1991): Proposes quantum cryptographic protocol based on CHSH.

Jennewein et. al. (2000): Implement variation of Ekert protocol.

In the Ekert Protocol, A and B do measurements in 3 bases each.
The Ekert Protocol (1991)

Alice’s bases:

\[ \theta = 0, \pi/8, \pi/4, \]

Bob’s bases:

\[ \theta = \pi/8, \pi/4, 3\pi/16. \]

(E and F make elements of reality)

\[(A_2, B_1)\) and \((A_3, B_2)\) form secret key.

Eavesdroppers are detected by forming

\[ S(A,B) = C(A_1,B_1) - C(A_1,B_3) + C(A_3,B_1) + C(A_3,B_3). \]
Ekert (1991):

“It is not a mathematical difficulty of a particular computation, but a fundamental physical law that protects the system, and as long as quantum theory is not refuted as a complete theory the system is secure.”

Jennewein et. al. (2000)*

Implement a variant of the Ekert protocol with users separated by 360 m, that generates raw keys at 400-800 bits/s at bit error rates of about 3%.
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EPR - From philosophy to practical application
Schroedinger articles (1935 - 36):


About entanglement and separation:

“…the best possible knowledge of the whole does not necessarily include the best possible knowledge of all its parts, even though they may be entirely separate and therefore virtually capable of being ‘best possibly known,’…

I would not call that one but rather the characteristic trait of quantum mechanics, the one that enforces its entire departure from classical lines of thought.”

“Attention has recently been called to the obvious but very disconcerting fact that even though we restrict the disentangling measurements to one system, the representative obtained for the other system is by no means independent of the particular choice of observations which we select for that purpose and which by the way are entirely arbitrary. It is rather discomforting that the theory should allow a system to be steered or piloted into one or the other type of state at the experimenter’s mercy in spite of his having no access to it.”
Quantum Teleportation

Bell measurement finds one of 4 states, $|B_i\rangle$

$\Rightarrow U_i$

One-qubit state $|\psi\rangle$

output $|\psi\rangle$
Birth of the Cat (1935)

“One can even set up quite ridiculous cases. A cat is penned up in a steel chamber, along with the following device (which must be secured against direct interference by the cat): in a Geiger counter there is a tiny bit of radioactive substance, so small, that perhaps in the course of an hour one atom decays, but also, with equal probability, perhaps none; if it happens, the counter tube discharges and through a relay releases a hammer which shatters a small flask of hydrocyanic acid. If one has left the entire system to itself for an hour, one would say that the cat still lives if meanwhile no atom has decayed. The psi-function of the entire system would express this by having in it the living and dead cat (pardon the expression) mixed or smeared out in equal parts.”

It is typical of these cases that an indeterminacy (in) the atomic domain becomes transformed into macroscopic indeterminacy, which can then be resolved by direct observation.
Einstein letter to Schroedinger (1950)

You are the only contemporary physicist, besides Laue, who sees that one cannot get around the assumption of reality, if only one is honest. Most of them simply do not see what sort of risky game they are playing with reality as something independent of what is experimentally established. Their interpretation is, however, refuted most elegantly by your system of

radioactive atom + amplifier + charge of gunpowder + cat in a box,

in which the psi-function of the system contains both the cat alive and blown to bits. Nobody really doubts that the presence of absence of the cat is something independent of the act of observation.

Childhood of the Cat - related developments


Adulthood - making Schroedinger Cat states -

First observed superpositions in squid circuits:


  C. Van der Wal et. al. (2000), Science,

Entanglement of three superconducting qubits:


Coupling a superconducting qubit to a mechanical resonator:
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EPR - From philosophy to practical application
Birth of the Demon

Clausius (1856) states the 2nd Law: Heat cannot flow from a colder body to a hotter body without an accompanying process (ie, work).

Boltzmann (1866) and Clausius (1871) both claim to derive the second law (as an exact law) from mechanics. Boltzmann claims priority (1871) and Clausius rebuts.

Maxwell knew that the 2nd law was valid only statistically. He commented on the above argument in a letter (1873) to Peter Guthrie Tait:

“Hamiltonian’s Principle, the while, soars along in a region unvexed by statistical considerations …”

Maxwell had conceived of the demon in 1867, but introduced him publicly only in (1871), in his book “Theory of Heat.”
In “Theory of Heat” (1871):

... This is the second law of thermodynamics, and it is undoubtedly true as long as we can deal with bodies only in mass, and have no power of perceiving or handling the separate molecules of which they are made up. But if we conceive of a being whose faculties are so sharpened that he can follow every molecule in its course, such a being, whose attributes are as essentially finite as our own, would be able to do what is impossible to us... He will thus, without expenditure of work, raise the temperature of B and lower that of A, in contradiction to the second law of thermodynamics.
The Life of the Demon

Birth: Maxwell (1871) - in “Theory of Heat.”

Childhood: Szilard’s Engine (1929) - entropy and measurement

Brillouin and Gabor (1951) - light signals

Adulthood: Landauer’s Principle (1961) - entropy and erasure

Bennett (1982) - resolution of the paradox

Feynman (1982): - “Quantum mechanical computers”

Piechocinska (2000) - proof of Landauer’s principle (C and Q)

Vedral (1999) - error correction with demon (C and Q)
Work extracted per (isothermal) cycle is $W = kT \ln 2$. 

Szilard 1929
Bennett arguments

1) Measurements can be done reversibly.

2) Erasure is irreversible, and costs an entropy of at least

$$\Delta S = k \ln 2$$

per bit, on average.
Conclusions:

Maxwell’s Demon and Schroedinger’s Cat are alive and thriving, and EPR remains one of the most important wrong papers ever written.

1) The 2nd Law is unthreatened by real or artificial intelligence; on the contrary, it is a useful tool in analyzing their processes.

2) There is no intrinsic size limit found in Schroedinger Cat states to date,

3) And no intrinsic distance limit for the persistence of entanglement.