2

On the Einstein–Podolsky–Rosen paradox*

1 Introduction

The paradox of Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen[1] was advanced as an argument that quantum mechanics could not be a complete theory but should be supplemented by additional variables. These additional variables were to restore to the theory causality and locality[2]. In this note that idea will be formulated mathematically and shown to be incompatible with the statistical predictions of quantum mechanics. It is the requirement of locality, or more precisely that the result of a measurement on one system be unaffected by operations on a distant system with which it has interacted in the past, that creates the essential difficulty. There have been attempts[3] to show that even without such a separability or locality requirement no 'hidden variable' interpretation of quantum mechanics is possible. These attempts have been examined elsewhere[4] and found wanting. Moreover, a hidden variable interpretation of elementary quantum theory[5] has been explicitly constructed. That particular interpretation has indeed a grossly non-local structure. This is characteristic, according to the result to be proved here, of any such theory which reproduces exactly the quantum mechanical predictions.

2 Formulation

With the example advocated by Bohm and Aharonov[6], the EPR argument is the following. Consider a pair of spin one-half particles formed somehow in the singlet spin state and moving freely in opposite directions. Measurements can be made, say by Stern–Gerlach magnets, on selected components of the spins σ_1 and σ_2. If measurement of the component $\sigma_1 \cdot \mathbf{a}$, where $\mathbf{a}$ is some unit vector, yields the value $+1$ then, according to quantum mechanics, measurement of $\sigma_2 \cdot \mathbf{a}$ must yield the value -1 and vice versa. Now we make the hypothesis[2], and it seems one at least worth

considering, that if the two measurements are made at places remote from one another the orientation of one magnet does not influence the result obtained with the other. Since we can predict in advance the result of measuring any chosen component of σ_2, by previously measuring the same component of σ_1, it follows that the result of any such measurement must actually be predetermined. Since the initial quantum mechanical wave function does not determine the result of an individual measurement, this predetermination implies the possibility of a more complete specification of the state.

Let this more complete specification be effected by means of parameters λ. It is a matter of indifference in the following whether λ denotes a single variable or a set, or even a set of functions, and whether the variables are discrete or continuous. However, we write as if λ were a single continuous parameter. The result A of measuring $\sigma_1 \cdot \mathbf{a}$ is then determined by $\mathbf{a}$ and λ, and the result B of measuring $\sigma_2 \cdot \mathbf{b}$ in the same instance is determined by $\mathbf{b}$ and λ, and

$$A(\mathbf{a}, \lambda) = \pm 1, B(\mathbf{b}, \lambda) = \pm 1. \tag{1}$$

The vital assumption[2] is that the result B for particle 2 does not depend on the setting $\mathbf{a}$, of the magnet for particle 1, nor A on $\mathbf{b}$.

If $\rho(\lambda)$ is the probability distribution of λ then the expectation value of the product of the two components $\sigma_1 \cdot \mathbf{a}$ and $\sigma_2 \cdot \mathbf{b}$ is

$$P(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) A(\mathbf{a}, \lambda) B(\mathbf{b}, \lambda) \tag{2}$$

This should equal the quantum mechanical expectation value, which for the singlet state is

$$\langle \sigma_1 \cdot \mathbf{a}\, \sigma_2 \cdot \mathbf{b} \rangle = - \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b} \tag{3}$$

But it will be shown that this is not possible.

Some might prefer a formulation in which the hidden variables fall into two sets, with A dependent on one and B on the other; this possibility is contained in the above, since λ stands for any number of variables and the dependences thereon of A and B are unrestricted. In a complete physical theory of the type envisaged by Einstein, the hidden variables would have dynamical significance and laws of motion; our λ can then be thought of as initial values of these variables at some suitable instant.

3 Illustration

The proof of the main result is quite simple. Before giving it, however, a number of illustrations may serve to put it in perspective.

Firstly, there is no difficulty in giving a hidden variable account of spin measurements on a single particle. Suppose we have a spin half particle in a pure spin state with polarization denoted by a unit vector $\mathbf{p}$. Let the hidden variable be (for example) a unit vector λ with uniform probability distribution over the hemisphere $\lambda \cdot \mathbf{p} > 0$. Specify that the result of measurement of a component $\sigma \cdot \mathbf{a}$ is

$$\text{sign} \, \lambda \cdot \mathbf{a}', \tag{4}$$

where $\mathbf{a}'$ is a unit vector depending on $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{p}$ in a way to be specified, and the sign function is $+1$ or -1 according to the sign of its argument. Actually this leaves the result undetermined when $\lambda \cdot \mathbf{a}' = 0$, but as the probability of this is zero we will not make special prescriptions for it. Averaging over λ the expectation value is

$$\langle \sigma \cdot \mathbf{a} \rangle = 1 - 2\theta'/\pi, \tag{5}$$

where θ' is the angle between $\mathbf{a}'$ and $\mathbf{p}$. Suppose then that $\mathbf{a}'$ is obtained from $\mathbf{a}$ by rotation towards $\mathbf{p}$ until

$$1 - \frac{2\theta'}{\pi} = \cos \theta \tag{6}$$

where θ is the angle between $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{p}$. Then we have the desired result

$$\langle \sigma \cdot \mathbf{a} \rangle = \cos \theta \tag{7}$$

So in this simple case there is no difficulty in the view that the result of every measurement is determined by the value of an extra variable, and that the statistical features of quantum mechanics arise because the value of this variable is unknown in individual instances.

Secondly, there is no difficulty in reproducing, in the form (2), the only features of (3) commonly used in verbal discussions of this problem:

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}) = -P(\mathbf{a}, -\mathbf{a}) = -1 \\ P(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = 0 \quad \text{if } \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b} = 0 \end{array} \right\} \tag{8}$$

For example, let λ now be unit vector λ, with uniform probability distribution over all directions, and take

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} A(\mathbf{a}, \lambda) = \text{sign} \, \mathbf{a} \cdot \lambda \\ B(a, b) = -\text{sign} \, \mathbf{b} \cdot \lambda \end{array} \right\} \tag{9}$$

This gives

$$P(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = -1 + \frac{2}{\pi} \theta, \tag{10}$$

where θ is the angle between a and b, and (10) has the properties (8). For comparison, consider the result of a modified theory[6] in which the pure singlet state is replaced in the course of time by an isotropic mixture of product states; this gives the correlation function

$$-\frac{1}{3}\mathbf{a}\cdot\mathbf{b} \tag{11}$$

It is probably less easy, experimentally, to distinguish (10) from (3), than (11) from (3).

Unlike (3), the function (10) is not stationary at the minimum value -1 (at $\theta = 0$). It will be seen that this is characteristic of functions of type (2).

Thirdly, and finally, there is no difficulty in reproducing the quantum mechanical correlation (3) if the results A and B in (2) are allowed to depend on $\mathbf{b}$ and $\mathbf{a}$ respectively as well as on $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$. For example, replace $\mathbf{a}$ in (9) by $\mathbf{a}'$, obtained from $\mathbf{a}$ by rotation towards $\mathbf{b}$ until

$$1 - \frac{2}{\pi}\theta' = \cos\theta,$$

where θ' is the angle between $\mathbf{a}'$ and $\mathbf{b}$. However, for given values of the hidden variables, the results of measurements with one magnet now depend on the setting of the distant magnet, which is just what we would wish to avoid.

4 Contradiction

The main result will now be proved. Because ρ is a normalized probability distribution,

$$\int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) = 1, \tag{12}$$

and because of the properties (1), P in (2) cannot be less than -1. It can reach -1 at $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b}$ only if

$$A(\mathbf{a}, \lambda) = -B(\mathbf{a}, \lambda) \tag{13}$$

except at a set of points λ of zero probability. Assuming this, (2) can be rewritten

$$P(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = -\int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) A(\mathbf{a}, \lambda) A(\mathbf{b}, \lambda). \tag{14}$$

It follows that if **c** is another unit vector

$$P(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}) - P(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{c}) = -\int d\lambda \rho(\lambda)[A(\mathbf{a},\lambda)A(\mathbf{b},\lambda) - A(\mathbf{a},\lambda)A(\mathbf{c},\lambda)]$$

$$= \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda)A(\mathbf{a},\lambda)A(\mathbf{b},\lambda)[A(\mathbf{b},\lambda)A(\mathbf{c},\lambda) - 1]$$

using (1), whence

$$|P(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}) - P(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{c})| \leqslant \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda)[1 - A(\mathbf{b},\lambda)A(\mathbf{c},\lambda)]$$

The second term on the right is $P(\mathbf{b},\mathbf{c})$, whence

$$1 + P(\mathbf{b},\mathbf{c}) \geqslant |P(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}) - P(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{c})| \tag{15}$$

Unless P is constant, the right hand side is in general of order $|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{c}|$ for small $|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{c}|$. Thus $P(\mathbf{b},\mathbf{c})$ cannot be stationary at the minimum value (-1 at $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{c}$) and cannot equal the quantum mechanical value (3).

Nor can the quantum mechanical correlation (3) be arbitrarily closely approximated by the form (2). The formal proof of this may be set out as follows. We would not worry about failure of the approximation at isolated points, so let us consider instead of (2) and (3) the functions

$$\bar{P}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{-\mathbf{a}\cdot\mathbf{b}}$$

where the bar denotes independent averaging of $P(\mathbf{a}',\mathbf{b}')$ and $-\mathbf{a}'\cdot\mathbf{b}'$ over vectors $\mathbf{a}'$ and $\mathbf{b}'$ within specified small angles of $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$. Suppose that for all $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ the difference is bounded by ε:

$$|\bar{P}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}) + \mathbf{a}\cdot\mathbf{b}| \leqslant \varepsilon \tag{16}$$

Then it will be shown that ε cannot be made arbitrarily small.

Suppose that for all a and b

$$|\overline{\mathbf{a}\cdot\mathbf{b}} - \mathbf{a}\cdot\mathbf{b}| \leqslant \delta \tag{17}$$

Then from (16)

$$|\bar{P}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}) + \mathbf{a}\cdot\mathbf{b}| \leqslant \varepsilon + \delta \tag{18}$$

From (2)

$$\bar{P}(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda)\bar{A}(\mathbf{a},\lambda)\bar{B}(\mathbf{b},\lambda) \tag{19}$$

where

$$|\bar{A}(\mathbf{a}, \lambda)| \leqslant 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |\bar{B}(\mathbf{b}, \lambda)| \leqslant 1 \tag{20}$$

From (18) and (19), with $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b}$,

$$d\lambda \rho(\lambda)[\bar{A}(\mathbf{b}, \lambda)\bar{B}(\mathbf{b}, \lambda) + 1] \leqslant \varepsilon + \delta \tag{21}$$

From (19)

$$\bar{P}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) - \bar{P}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda)[\bar{A}(\mathbf{a}, \lambda)\bar{B}(\mathbf{b}, \lambda) - \bar{A}(\mathbf{a}, \lambda)\bar{B}(\mathbf{c}, \lambda)]$$

$$= \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda)\bar{A}(\mathbf{a}, \lambda)\bar{B}(\mathbf{b}, \lambda)[1 + \bar{A}(\mathbf{b}, \lambda)\bar{B}(\mathbf{c}, \lambda)]$$

$$- \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda)\bar{A}(\mathbf{a}, \lambda)\bar{B}(\mathbf{c}, \lambda)[1 + \bar{A}(\mathbf{b}, \lambda)\bar{B}(\mathbf{b}, \lambda)]$$

Using (20) then

$$|\bar{P}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) - \bar{P}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c})| \leqslant \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda)[1 + \bar{A}(\mathbf{b}, \lambda)\bar{B}(\mathbf{c}, \lambda)]$$

$$+ \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda)[1 + \bar{A}(\mathbf{b}, \lambda)\bar{B}(\mathbf{b}, \lambda)]$$

Then using (19) and (21)

$$|\bar{P}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) - \bar{P}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c})| \leqslant 1 + \bar{P}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) + \varepsilon + \delta$$

Finally, using (18),

$$|\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{c} - \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b}| - 2(\varepsilon + \delta) \leqslant 1 - \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{c} + 2(\varepsilon + \delta)$$

or

$$4(\varepsilon + \delta) \geqslant |\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{c} - \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b}| + \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{c} - 1 \tag{22}$$

Take for example $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{c} = 0$, $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{c} = 1/\sqrt{2}$. Then

$$4(\varepsilon + \delta) \geqslant \sqrt{2} - 1$$

Therefore, for small finite δ, ε cannot be arbitrarily small.

Thus, the quantum mechanical expectation value cannot be represented, either accurately or arbitrarily closely, in the form (2).

5 Generalization

The example considered above has the advantage that it requires little imagination to envisage the measurements involved actually being made.

In a more formal way, assuming[7] that any Hermitian operator with a complete set of eigenstates is an 'observable', the result is easily extended to other systems. If the two systems have state spaces of dimensionality greater than 2 we can always consider two-dimensional subspaces and define, in their direct product, operators σ_1 and σ_2 formally analogous to those used above and which are zero for states outside the product subspace. Then for at least one quantum mechanical state, the 'singlet' state in the combined subspaces, the statistical predictions of quantum mechanics are incompatible with separable predetermination.

6 Conclusion

In a theory in which parameters are added to quantum mechanics to determine the results of individual measurements, without changing the statistical predictions, there must be a mechanism whereby the setting of one measuring device can influence the reading of another instrument, however remote. Moreover, the signal involved must propagate instantaneously, so that such a theory could not be Lorentz invariant.

Of course, the situation is different if the quantum mechanical predictions are of limited validity. Conceivably they might apply only to experiments in which the settings of the instruments are made sufficiently in advance to allow them to reach some mutual rapport by exchange of signals with velocity less than or equal to that of light. In that connection, experiments of the type proposed by Bohm and Aharonov[6], in which the settings are changed during the flight of the particles, are crucial.

Acknowledgement

Notes and references

1   A. Einstein, N. Rosen and B. Podolsky, *Phys. Rev.* **47**, 777 (1935); see also N. Bohr, *Phys. Rev.* **48**, 696 (1935), W. H. Furry, *Phys. Rev.* **49**, 393 and 476 (1936), and D. R. Inglis, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **33**, 1(1961).

2   'But on one supposition we should, in my opinion, absolutely hold fast: the real factual situation of the system S_2 is independent of what is done with the system S_1, which is spatially separated from the former.' A. Einstein in *Albert Einstein, Philosopher Scientist*, Edited by P. A. Schilp, p. 85, Library of Living Philosophers, Evanston, Illinois (1949).

3 J. von Neumann, *Mathematische Grundlagen der Quanten-mechanik*. Verlag Julius-Springer, Berlin (1932), (English translation: Princeton University Press (1955); J. M. Jauch and C. Piron, *Helv. Phys. Acta* **36**, 827 (1963).

4 J. S. Bell, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **38**, 447 (1966).

5 D. Bohm, *Phys. Rev.* **85**, 166 and 180 (1952).

6 D. Bohm and Y. Aharonov, *Phys. Rev.* **108**, 1070 (1957).

7 P. A. M. Dirac, *The Principles of Quantum Mechanics* (3rd Ed.) p. 37. The Clarendon Press, Oxford (1947).