

The role of von Neumann and Lüders postulates in the EPR-Bohm-Bell considerations: Did EPR make a mistake?

Andrei Khrennikov
School of Mathematics and Systems Engineering
University of Växjö, S-35195, Sweden

November 14, 2018

Abstract

We show that the projection postulate plays a crucial role in the discussion on the so called "quantum nonlocality", in particular in the EPR-argument. We stress that the original von Neumann projection postulate was crucially modified by extending it to observables with degenerate spectra (the Lüders postulate) and we show that this modification is highly questionable from a physical point of view, and is the real source of "quantum nonlocality". The use of the original von Neumann postulate eliminates this problem: instead of an [action at a distance]-nonlocality we obtain a classical measurement nonlocality, which is related to the synchronization of two measurements (on the two parts of a composite system). It seems that Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen did mistake in their 1935-paper: if one uses correctly von Neumann projection postulate, no "elements of reality" can be assigned to entangled systems. Our analysis of the EPR and projection postulate makes clearer Bohr's considerations in his reply to Einstein.

1 Introduction

We shall show that the main source of debate in the EPR argument [1], as well as in the discussion on the EPR-Bohm and Bell's inequality [2, 3], is the misuse of von Neumann's projection postulate [4].

The projection postulate (PP) plays indeed a crucial role in the EPR argument [1]. We consider a composite system $s = (s_1, s_2)$. Assigning an element of reality to s_2 on the basis of a measurement performed on s_1 is fundamentally based on the PP. Although von Neumann had presented strong physical arguments stressing that the PP should be applied only to observables with nondegenerate spectra [4], it was nevertheless applied by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen [1] in the case of observables with degenerate spectra. This misapplication of von Neumann's projection postulate [4] was later on formalized as a custom by Lüders [5].

Hence, we show that the EPR-argument is in fact based on an improper extension of von Neumann's postulate, and that as such it should not be considered as a valid attack against the Copenhagen interpretation (which is itself based solely on von Neumann's axiomatic [4]). It means that

Quantum Mechanics can (but, in principle, need not) be interpreted as a complete and local theory.

Our analysis shows that measurements on entangled systems, as predicted by QM formalism, are nonlocal. However, such a measurement nonlocality is essentially a classical synchronization nonlocality and has nothing to do with action-at-a-distance. Thus, instead of the “state-nonlocality,” everything is reduced to nonlocality of the (classical) design of the EPR-experiment.

The presence of a measurement nonlocality in the EPR-Bohm experiment implies the violation of the conditions of Bell’s theorem and, hence, provides a possibility to violate Bell’s inequality, cf. works of Hess and Philipp on the role of the time parameter in the EPR-Bell framework, [6]–[7].

We remind that the projection postulate is nowadays formulated in the following form:

PP: *Let a be a physical observable described by a self-adjoint operator \hat{a} having purely discrete spectrum. Any measurement of the observable a on the pure quantum state ψ induces a transition from the state ψ into one of the eigenvectors e_a^k of the operator \hat{a} .*

It is in this form that the projection postulate was used by EPR in [1] as well as in numerous discussions on “quantum nonlocality.”

Recently I submitted as arXiv-preprint another paper on the role of the projection postulate in the EPR-argument, see [8]. This paper contains a detailed (step by step) analysis of the EPR-considerations. I should do this, because I received a lot of critical comments on the present paper in which it was claimed that the projection postulate did not play an important role in the EPR-paper. Another recent preprint [9] is devoted to the role of von Neumann’s projection postulate in quantum teleportation and main quantum algorithms. The main conclusion of the latter paper is that quantum teleportation would not provide the expected result (if one keeps to the orthodox Copenhagen). Roughly speaking quantum teleportation is an artifact of the misuse of von Neumann’s postulate. On the other hand, quantum information schemes incorporated in known quantum algorithms are consistent with von Neumann’s postulate.

2 Quantum description of measurements on composite systems

Let H_1 and H_2 be two complex finite dimensional Hilbert spaces, $\dim H_i \geq 2$. Let $\hat{a}_1 : H_1 \rightarrow H_1$ and $\hat{a}_2 : H_2 \rightarrow H_2$ be two self-adjoint operators. The Hilbert space H_i represents (quantum) states of the system $s_i, i = 1, 2$. The operator \hat{a}_i represents an observable a_i corresponding to measurements on $s_i, i = 1, 2$. The composite system $s = (s_1, s_2)$ is described by the tensor product space $H = H_1 \otimes H_2$.

The operators $\hat{A}_1 = \hat{a}_1 \otimes I$ and $\hat{A}_2 = I \otimes \hat{a}_2$ represent partial measurements A_1 and A_2 on $s : a_1$ on s_1 and a_2 on s_2 , respectively.

To simplify considerations, we assume that both operators \hat{a}_1 and \hat{a}_2 have purely discrete nondegenerate¹ spectra. We consider eigenvectors e_i^α

¹The latter condition is redundant. We would like just to emphasize that degeneration of spectra in H_i does not play any role. Even operators with nondegenerate spectra in H_i induce operators with degenerate spectra in H .

and e_2^β of these operators: $\hat{a}_1 e_1^\alpha = \lambda_1^\alpha e_1^\alpha, \alpha = 1, \dots, N_1 = \dim H_1$ and $\hat{a}_2 e_2^\beta = \lambda_2^\beta e_2^\beta, \beta = 1, \dots, N_2 = \dim H_2$.

By taking two arbitrary (independent) eigenvectors for each operator we construct an "entangled state":

$$\psi = c_1 e_1^i \otimes e_2^j + c_2 e_1^i \otimes e_2^i, |c_1|^2 + |c_2|^2 = 1. \quad (1)$$

Suppose a measurement of A_1 was performed on the composite system $s = (s_1, s_2)$, i.e., a_1 was performed on s_1 . Suppose that the result

$$A_1 = \lambda_1^i$$

was obtained. This measurement is represented by the operator $\hat{A}_1 = \hat{a}_1 \otimes I$.

By the projection postulate PP the state ψ is projected onto

$$\psi_1^{ij} = e_1^i \otimes e_2^j.$$

Thus instantaneously (and in principle without any interaction of the A_1 -measurement device with the system s_2) the state of s_2 is changed. It became sharply determined: $\hat{A}_2 \psi_1^{ij} = \lambda_2^j \psi_1^{ij}$, and hence $A_2 = \lambda_2^j$.

This is nothing else than the so called "quantum nonlocality". To get it one need not appeal to Bell's inequality [2], [3] (and hidden variables at all).² If one takes this into account Bell's considerations would play a subsidiary role. The main problem is to explain "quantum nonlocality" as it follows from the quantum formalism.

3 Abuse of von Neumann's projection postulate

By reading von Neumann's book [4] I found that the modern formulation PP of the projection postulate, see introduction, is not the original von Neumann's formulation at all. One extremely important condition is omitted. It is the condition of *non degeneration of spectrum* of the quantum observable. The formulation PP is, in fact, Lüders' postulate [5] and not at all von Neumann's one [4].

Opposite to Lüders, von Neumann sharply separated the cases of non-degenerate and degenerate spectra. The PP could be applied only in the first case. In the second case the result $a = \lambda$ does not determine any definite state. To obtain a definite state, one should perform a refinement d of the a -measurement, such that $a = f(d)$ and d is represented by an operator \hat{d} having nondegenerate spectrum.

Let us go back to the situation described in section 2. Here the operators \hat{A}_1 and \hat{A}_2 (corresponding to measurements on s_1 and s_2) always have degenerate spectra:

If e.g. $\hat{a}_1 e = \lambda e, e \in H_1$, then $\hat{A}_1 \psi = \lambda \psi$ for any $\psi = e \otimes \phi \in H, \phi \in H_2$. (We just remind that $\dim H_2 \geq 2$).

By von Neumann the result $A_1 = \lambda_1^j$ does not induce projection onto a definite pure state. The state of the system $s = (s_1, s_2)$ is not determined after such a *partial* measurement!

Thus if one follows really the Copenhagen interpretation, no trace of "quantum nonlocality" would be found.

²I remark that precisely in this way the EPR-Bohm experiment was presented by Alain Aspect in his talk at the Växjö conference [10]: by measuring polarization of s_1 , one projects the state of the composite system and makes the state of s_2 determined, see also [11].

4 Von Neumann's postulate and "classical nonlocality"

What would von Neumann recommend to do to get the definite post measurement state? He would recommend to perform a refinement A of the A_1 -measurement which would be represented by an operator, say \hat{A} , having nondegenerate spectrum.

The crucial point is that one could not construct such a refinement \hat{A} by operating only in H_1 , i.e., by using operators of the form

$$\hat{A} = \hat{C} \otimes I, \hat{C} : H_1 \rightarrow H_1.$$

One should consider "nonlocal measurements" which are represented by operators acting in the complete tensor product $H = H_1 \otimes H_2$.

In particular, one can not create a nondegenerate refinement of the s_1 -spin measurement via modification of the spin operator in $H_1 = \mathbf{C}^2$. The corresponding nondegenerate operator is nontrivial in the whole $H = \mathbf{C}^4$.

The simplest refinement \hat{A} can be constructed as $\hat{A}e_1^\alpha \otimes e_2^\beta = \gamma_{\alpha\beta}e_1^\alpha \otimes e_2^\beta$, where $\gamma_{\alpha\beta} \neq \gamma_{\alpha'\beta'}$, if $\alpha \neq \alpha'$ or $\beta \neq \beta'$.

Example. (Spin refinement) Let $\hat{a}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^3 x_i \sigma_i$ and $\hat{a}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^3 y_i \sigma_i$, where σ_i are Pauli matrices. Here $H_1 = H_2 = \mathbf{C}^2$, hence, $H = \mathbf{C}^4$. Consider eigenvectors $\hat{a}_i e_i^\pm = \pm e_i^\pm, i = 1, 2$. We consider the following encoding: $-- = 00 = 0, +- = 10 = 1, -+ = 01 = 2, ++ = 11 = 3$. We now set $\hat{A}e_1^\alpha \otimes e_2^\beta = \alpha\beta e_1^\alpha \otimes e_2^\beta$. This operator has nondegenerate spectrum $\lambda = 0, 1, 2, 3$. We have $\hat{A}_1 = f_1(\hat{A})$, where $f_1(\alpha\beta) = \alpha$. In the same way $\hat{A}_2 = f_2(\hat{A})$, where $f_2(\alpha\beta) = \beta$. By von Neumann only measurement of the observable A represented by \hat{A} induces projection of the entangled state ψ onto the pure state $e_1^\alpha \otimes e_2^\beta$ (in the case of the result $\lambda = \alpha\beta$). Thus, instead of mysterious "quantum nonlocality" (or state nonlocality), we have measurement nonlocality which is purely classical nonlocality.

Measurement which is performed on a composite system $s = (s_1, s_2)$ consisting of two spatially separated parts is, of course, nonlocal. It is not surprising that it is represented by a "nonlocal operator" \hat{A} , cf. [12]. Nothing nonlocal happens with the state of s . Only (classical) design of the experiment is nonlocal.

5 Simultaneous measurement of two compatible observables

I expect that my previous arguments on classical measurement nonlocality in experiments with entangled systems would be criticized in the following way: "There is nothing about measurement nonlocality, since one can perform, instead of measurement of a nonlocal observable A , simultaneous measurements of two compatible observables A_1 and A_2 . The crucial point is that the operators \hat{A}_1 and \hat{A}_2 commute."

Such an argument would be based on another von Neumann postulate, namely about measurement of compatible observables [4], p. 200-201:

(PC) *The probability that in the state ψ the quantities with (commuting)³ operators $\hat{R}_1, \dots, \hat{R}_n$ take on values from respective intervals*

³"Commuting" was absent in the original postulate. Von Neumann formulated (PC) first for arbitrary self-adjoint operators, but then after analyzing it he pointed out that they should commute.

$\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_n$ is

$$\|E_1(\Delta_1) \dots E_n(\Delta_n)\psi\|^2,$$

where $E_1(\lambda), \dots, E_n(\lambda)$ are resolutions of the identity belonging to $\widehat{R}_1, \dots, \widehat{R}_n$, respectively.

One may say that in measurements for entangled states one can consider simultaneous measurement of two compatible observables represented by the operators $\widehat{A}_1 = \widehat{a}_1 \otimes I$ and $A_2 = I \otimes \widehat{a}_2$, $[\widehat{A}_1, \widehat{A}_2] = 0$. Hence the story is about simultaneous measurement of compatible observables and not about measurement of "nonlocal" observable A represented by \widehat{A} .

Again by reading von Neumann [4], p. 201-206, we understand that the above argument does not take into account the crucial fact that *simultaneous measurement of two compatible observables is not reduced to separate measurement of each of them*. By the conventional quantum formalism simultaneous measurement of a and b given by \widehat{a} and \widehat{b} , $[\widehat{a}, \widehat{b}] = 0$, is performed in the following way.

One should construct an observable d (having nondegenerate spectrum) represented by \widehat{d} such that $\widehat{a} = f_1(\widehat{d})$ and $\widehat{b} = f_2(\widehat{d})$. Then simultaneous measurement of a and b is performed in two steps:

- a) measurement of d ;
- b) a and b are obtained as $a = f_1(d)$ and $b = f_2(d)$.

Therefore in the case of measurements on composite systems, $s = (s_1, s_2)$, one could not (!) proceed without (classically) nonlocal measurement of a refinement A given by \widehat{A} .

What does it mean physically?

It means that one should make synchronized measurement on both systems. Then the result $\lambda = \alpha\beta$ should be decoded into $A_1 = \alpha, A_2 = \beta$. After this one can calculate e.g. the correlation $\langle A_1 A_2 \rangle$ between A_1 and A_2 . Nonlocality appears here via synchronization. An observer to whom such a synchronization is not available would not be able to find the right matching between the results of A_1 and A_2 -measurements.

Thus the EPR-Bohm experiment is really nonlocal, but it is measurement nonlocally which is completely classical time synchronization nonlocality.

6 The original EPR experiment

It is evident that Alain Aspect simply borrowed "quantum nonlocality" argument [11] from EPR. Thus the root of misunderstanding was in the original paper [1].

Let now $H_1 = H_2 = L_2(\mathbb{R}^3, dx)$. Let a_1 and a_2 be observables represented by operators \widehat{a}_1 and \widehat{a}_2 with purely discrete nongenerate spectra:

$$\widehat{a}_i e_i^\alpha = \lambda_i^\alpha e_i^\alpha, i = 1, 2.$$

Any state $\psi \in H = H_1 \otimes H_2$ can be represented as

$$\psi = \sum_{\alpha, \beta} c_{\alpha, \beta} e_1^\alpha \otimes e_2^\beta,$$

where $\sum_{\alpha, \beta} |c_{\alpha, \beta}|^2 = 1$. Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen claimed that measurement of A_1 given by $\widehat{A}_1 = \widehat{a}_1 \otimes I$ induces projection of ψ onto

one of states $e_1^\alpha \otimes u, u \in H_2$. In particular, for a state of the form $\psi = \sum_\gamma c_\gamma e_1^\gamma \otimes e_2^\gamma$ one of states $e_1^\gamma \otimes e_2^\gamma$ would be realized. Thus by performing measurement on the s_1 with the result λ_1^γ the "element of reality $a_2 = \lambda_2^\gamma$ " is assigned to s_2 .

However, the EPR considerations did not match von Neumann's projection postulate, because the spectrum of \hat{A}_1 is degenerate. Finally, (after consideration of operators with discrete spectra), Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen considered operators of position and momentum having continuous spectra. According to von Neumann [4] one should proceed by approximating operators with continuous spectra by operators with discrete spectra.

Thus by von Neumann to get "an element of reality" one should perform measurement of "nonlocal observable" A given by a nonlocal refinement of e.g. $\hat{A}_1 = \hat{q}_1 \otimes I$ and $\hat{A}_2 = I \otimes \hat{p}_2$.

We point out that von Neumann's viewpoint coincides with Bohr's viewpoint in his reply to Einstein [14]. Unfortunately, Bohr did not use mathematical arguments of von Neumann [4] to explain to Einstein why to produce "an element of reality" for the subsystem s_2 one should measure A on $s = (s_1, s_2)$ and not just e.g. A_1 on s_1 .

7 Bell's inequality

What are consequences of our analysis of the EPR-Bohm and the EPR experiments for Bell's considerations?

7.1 Measurement nonlocality as opposed to action at the distance

The main consequence is that classical random variables (if they exist) for A_1 and A_2 measurements should have the form $A_1(\lambda) = f_1(d(\lambda)), A_2(\lambda) = f_2(d(\lambda))$, where $d(\lambda)$ is the variable corresponding to synchronized measurement on both systems. Since $d \equiv d_{A_1, A_2}$, Bell's condition of locality is violated. Therefore it is nothing surprising that Bell's inequality can be violated.

The crucial point is that such *measurement nonlocality* has nothing to do with action at the distance. It is classical time synchronization nonlocality, cf. works of Hess and Philipp on the role of the time parameter in the EPR-Bell framework, [6]-[7]. The authors of these papers rightly stressed the role of analysis of time synchronization in measurements on pairs of entangled photons.

7.2 Time synchronization and time window

The time synchronization viewpoint in the EPR-Bohm experiment means that experimenters should couple in time two clicks of detectors corresponding to measurements on the first and second subsystems, respectively. Of course, such a time coupling is nonlocal. Roughly speaking if Alice and Bob count the first and the second types of clicks, respectively, they should call each other to couple their clicks in time. This procedure has nothing to do with QM. It is a classical nonlocal design of the experiment.

Which consequences for studies on Bell's inequality has this viewpoint to the EPR-Bohm experiment?

First of all, the time synchronization viewpoint to the problem of locality (based on the correct application of von Neumann's projection postulate) stressed the role of time coupling in the EPR-Bohm experiment. Consider following settings of polarization beam splitters in the EPR-Bohm experiment: 1) a for measurements on the first subsystem; 2) b for measurements on the second subsystem. Suppose that one measures the pair of observables which are represented by operators $\hat{A} = \hat{a} \otimes I$ and $\hat{B} = I \otimes \hat{b}$. In the real experiment one could not expect the detectors would click simultaneously. The first and the second photons can have different delays induced by passing through polarization beam splitters and electro-optic modulators, see [17] for details and references. Moreover, I would like to point to another source of delays. In modern experiments a pair of entangled photons is produced via interaction of a laser pulse with the crystal. It is important for us that photons are emitted not simultaneously. Thus delays can appear from the very beginning.

Thus in the real EPR-Bohm experiment (in opposite the ideal one) time synchronization is more complicated. It is not the coincidence time synchronization, but synchronization by using the time window, see [17] for details.

Let A -measurements and B -measurement produce clicks at the moments:

$$\begin{aligned} t_1^a, t_2^a, \dots, t_N^a, \\ t_1^b, t_2^b, \dots, t_M^b \end{aligned}$$

(in general $N \neq M$).

Suppose that a time window Δ is fixed. Then two clicks are coupled to the same measurement iff

$$|t_j^a - t_j^b| \leq \Delta. \quad (2)$$

This condition is definitely nonlocal! Hence, in the real EPR-Bohm experiment measurement nonlocality via time synchronization is even more evident than in the ideal experiment.

Can one simulate numerically the EPR-Bohm correlations by using time synchronization argument?

The answer is to be positive, see [18]- [20].

In principle, one may expect that it would be done, since the time window condition (3) induces unfair sampling, see []. Since some pairs of clicks violate (3), they are not taken into account. If one were to choose another setting for the second polarization beam splitter, say b' , then another collections of pairs of clicks and hence pairs of photons would be selected via the time window condition:

$$|t_j^a - t_j^{b'}| \leq \Delta. \quad (3)$$

Of course, design of a natural algorithm essentially supported this point, [18]- [20].

7.3 Frequency approach to the EPR-Bohm experiment

The time synchronization consequence of our analysis of the role of von Neumann's postulate for the EPR-Bohm experiment also supports the frequency (von Mises) approach to Bell's inequality, see [21]-[23]. It is very natural to consider collectives (random sequences) given by sequences of

pairs of clicks which are selected via the time window condition. By operating with frequency probability, instead of measure-theoretic probability (which was used by Bell [3]: it was denoted by $d\rho(\lambda)$), I obtain the EPR-Bohm correlations in the local realistic (in the sense of absence of action at the distance) framework, see [21]-[23].

7.4 Probabilistic (in)compatibility

On the other hand, in the presence of time synchronization it is extremely unnatural to assume as Bell did that all observables (measured in a few incompatible experiments) can be represented by random variables on the same probability space: $a(\lambda), b(\lambda), b'(\lambda), \dots$ (so one can use the unique probability measure $d\rho(\lambda)$ which does not depend on experimental settings). The latter assumption was called in [24] probabilistic compatibility assumption - PC. Its role in Bell's argument was studied in detail [24]. In particular, it was pointed out that violation of PC (and hence Bell's inequality) has been studied in probability theory and statistics during the last hundred years.

7.5 Contextuality

Finally, we remark about contextuality. As was pointed by Bell [3], contextuality – in the sense of taking into account simultaneous measurements of compatible observables – blocks derivations of Bell-type inequalities, see S. Gudder [13] for deep analysis of relation between contextuality and Bell's theorem. The crucial point is that Bell personally considered nonlocality as the state nonlocality and not the measurement one. Therefore contextuality was explained in such a way: it can be generated by nonlocal state reduction. In our approach contextuality can be naturally explained by classical (time synchronization) measurement nonlocality.

8 Lessons

The main lesson of our considerations (which is especially important for students) is that one should start with reading of original sources (such as [1], [14], [4], [5]), even if such sources are considered as difficult for reading. Unfortunately, deepness of investigations is often interpreted as unclearness of presentation. The book of von Neumann [4] still provides the deepest analysis of quantum foundations (even comparing with the most advanced modern books).

9 Did EPR make a mistake?

Recently Karl Hess wrote in his Email-comment on this preprint: "Did EPR make a mistake? I was sure that they proved incompleteness of quantum mechanics."

The answer is not so simple, since the whole EPR-story is very complicated. In fact, this story is not about QM by itself, but about its interpretations. EPR wanted to show that QM endowed with the Copenhagen interpretation is not complete. It is crucial that they did not claim that QM endowed with any interpretation is incomplete. The main problem is that EPR did not formulate precisely the interpretation under attack! It

was more or less clear that it was the interpretation of Bohr and Heisenberg.

As we have already pointed out, EPR's argument was heavily based on the projection postulate. They definitely assigned it to the criticized interpretation. The possibility to apply the projection postulate for operators having degenerate spectra played the fundamental role in the EPR-considerations.

However, one might be curious: "Would fathers of the Copenhagen interpretation accept such a (mis?) use of the projection postulate?" Shortly the question is "Was EPR's argument against the real Bohr-Heisenberg interpretation? May be it was simply based on EPR's misinterpretation of views of Bohr and Heisenberg?"

I remark that in this framework it would be better to speak about views of concrete persons, since the "Copenhagen interpretation" is an extremely diffuse collection of views, see Arcady Plotnitsky [15] for details. I have not yet studied well views of Heisenberg. But I read Bohr's reply [14] to Einstein. I have the impression that Bohr wrote to Einstein (unfortunately, in nonmathematical terms) that no "element of reality" can be "created" by measurement on a single sub-system. To create an "element of reality" one should perform measurement on the second sub-system. This is nothing else than von Neumann's refinement measurement!

I would say that in 1935 EPR misinterpreted the Copenhagen interpretation (at least the Bohr-von Neumann one). They attacked a sort of "perverse Copenhagen interpretation" based on abuse of the von Neumann projection postulate.⁴ They demonstrated that QM endowed with this EPR-version of the Copenhagen interpretation was incomplete.⁵ However, the EPR-argument did not imply that QM with the real (Bohr-von Neumann) Copenhagen interpretation was incomplete.

Unfortunately, the situation was not clarified at the very beginning. Bohr's reply was not sufficiently clear and it was not coupled to von Neumann's book. And later the EPR-story developed in really unexpected way. The pseudo-Copenhagen interpretation of EPR became the orthodox Copenhagen interpretation. In particular, Bohr's reply and hence his views were ignored. Nowadays Lüders' postulate is widely used, instead of von Neumann's projection postulate. Thus the EPR arguments became fundamentally important and their stimulated Bell toward his inequality argument. He definitely believed that QM is not complete (as it was "proved" by EPR). And incompleteness was understood in the EPR-fashion.

One may ask: "Is it the end of the hidden variable story?" Not at all. It is just a new beginning. Instead of the EPR-incompleteness and assigning to a hidden variable λ values of quantum observables, $\lambda \rightarrow a(\lambda)$, we can analyze possibilities of more complicated couplings between prequantum and quantum worlds, see e.g. [16].

Conclusion. *The EPR paradox is a consequence of misinterpretation of the Copenhagen interpretation based on the vague application of von Neumann's projection postulate.*

⁴Von Neumann's book was being on the book-shell in Einstein's office. Did Einstein read it?

⁵So called quantum nonlocality was considered as totally absurd at that time.

10 Appendix: Projection postulate

After discussions with a few hundred scientists working in quantum foundations and quantum information (who visited my university during a series of Växjö conferences on quantum foundations) it became completely clear that the majority has even no idea about the difference between von Neumann's and Lüders' projection postulates (PPs). Those who knew the story about PP expressed their strong opinion that von Neumann's book is old fashioned and at the very beginning many things were not sufficiently clear. Later a lot in quantum foundations was clarified. In particular, Lüders clarified PP which was formulated by von Neumann in the very complicated form. I strongly disagree with such a common opinion. The story is not about simplification of von Neumann's arguments. It is about misunderstanding of the basis postulate of QM. As was already pointed out, the root of Lüders' misunderstanding was in similar misunderstanding of PP by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen in their fundamental article [1]. Therefore I find important to present this appendix containing practically forgotten comparing of von Neumann's PP and Lüders' PP. Finally, we recall that this comparison is extremely important not only for quantum foundations, EPR-paradox, Bell's inequality. The difference between two forms of PP should be pointed out even without any relation to mentioned questions. We recall that the basic definition of quantum conditional probability which is widely used in quantum information theory is based on Lüders PP and not on von Neumann's one!

It should be emphasized that comparison of two PPs is not of only theoretical value. In principle, it can be tested experimentally: either the post-measurement state is pure (as Lüders and quantum majority claimed) or it is really not well defined. Of course, one should understand better the meaning of "non well defined state." However, we prefer to come back to this problem in a coming article.

10.1 Lüder's Projection Postulate

It is very important for our further considerations to remark that if spectrum of an operator \hat{a} is *degenerate* then (according to von Neumann [4]) the observation of the result $a = \alpha_k$ *does not induce the transition of the initial pure state ψ into a new pure state*. In such a case the resulting state is not determined. It can be determined only through a subsequent measurement of an observable d refining the original observable a . After such a refining measurement we obtain not a pure state, but a statistical mixture.

However, in the contemporary formulations of "the von Neumann projection postulate" the cases of nondegenerate and degenerate spectra are not distinguished! In fact, this was not the original von Neumann invention, but it was a new postulate proposed by G. Lüders in 1951, [5] :

Lüders Projection Postulate. *For any operator \hat{a} with purely discrete spectrum, a measurement of the corresponding observable a giving the result $a = \alpha$, where $\alpha \in \text{Spec}(\hat{a})$, always produces the projection of the initial state ψ onto the state*

$$\psi_\alpha = \frac{P_\alpha \psi}{\|P_\alpha \psi\|}, \quad (4)$$

where as always P_α is the orthogonal projector onto the subspace corresponding to the eigenvalue α .

The crucial point is that by the Lüders' PP the post-measurement state is also a pure state independently of degeneration of spectrum.

However, von Neumann emphasized a few times in [4] that “ if the eigenvalue α is multiple, then the state ϕ after the measurement is not uniquely determined by the knowledge of the result of the measurement,” p. 218.

The post-measurement state ϕ is not determined. What does it mean? J. von Neumann pointed out that to determine ϕ one should determine a subsequent measurement procedure which corresponds to the choice of a concrete orthonormal basis in the subspace

$$\mathcal{H}_\alpha = P_\alpha^a \mathcal{H}.$$

This ambiguity in the determination of the post-measurement state is an important difficulty in foundations of quantum mechanics.⁶

10.2 Von Neumann's and Lüders' postulates for mixed states

Let ψ be a pure state and let P be a projector. By Lüders' postulate after measurement of the observable represented by P that gives the result 1 the initial pure state ψ is transformed again into a pure state, namely,

$$\psi' = \frac{P\psi}{\|P\psi\|}.$$

Thus for corresponding density operators we have:

$$\rho_{\psi'} = \psi' \otimes \psi' = \frac{P\psi \otimes P\psi}{\|P\psi\|^2}.$$

We remark that $(P\psi \otimes P\psi)\phi = \langle \phi, P\psi \rangle P\psi$ and that $(P\rho_\psi P)\phi = \langle P\phi, \psi \rangle P\psi$. As $P^* = P$, we obtain that

$$\rho_{\psi'} = \frac{P\rho_\psi P}{\|P\psi\|^2}. \quad (5)$$

Finally, we see that $\|P\psi\|^2 = \langle P\psi, P\psi \rangle = \langle P^2\psi, \psi \rangle = \langle P\psi, \psi \rangle = \text{Tr } \rho_\psi P$. Thus:

$$\rho_{\psi'} = \frac{P\rho_\psi P}{\text{Tr } \rho_\psi P}. \quad (6)$$

In this way Lüders' postulate is represented in the framework of density operators (still in the case of pure states). Gerhart Lüders generalized this formula (without any doubt) to an arbitrary state ρ . If we measure the observable represented by a projector P for the ensemble of systems described by ρ and then select a new ensemble corresponding to the result 1, we get the state:

$$\rho' = \frac{P\rho P}{\text{Tr } \rho P}. \quad (7)$$

⁶Let us take this problem seriously. It might be interpreted as a sign of *incompleteness of quantum mechanics*: the quantum formalism does not determine the post-measurement state in the case of observables represented by operators with degenerate spectra. However, von Neumann did not interpret this problem in such a way. It may be that success of Lüders' modification of the von Neumann projection postulate is due to common wish to escape this problem.

Let now consider an arbitrary self-adjoint operator with purely discrete spectrum:

$$\hat{a} = \sum_m \alpha_m P_m, \quad \alpha_m \in \mathbf{R}, \quad P_m P_l = \delta_{ml} P_l. \quad (8)$$

G. Lüders pointed out [5] that in a measurement of \hat{a} the initial state ρ is transformed into

$$\rho' = \sum_m P_m \rho P_m. \quad (9)$$

It is easy to see that such a ρ' is again positive and self-adjoint and its trace equals to one. This is Lüders' postulate for the transformation of a state ρ through a measurement of an observable represented by \hat{a} . The crucial Lüders' assumption is that, *for a pure state after a measurement of \hat{a} and selection with respect to the value α_m , we always obtain again a pure state.*

Von Neumann had the completely different viewpoint on such a transformation [4]. As was already pointed out, even for a pure state ψ the result will not again be a pure state (if the operator has degenerated spectrum).

Let \hat{a} have nondegenerate spectrum. Thus all P_m are one dimensional projectors (onto eigenvectors $\{e_m\}$ of \hat{a}). Then by the von Neumann projection postulate a measurement of a giving the result $a = \alpha_m$ really induces the projection of the original pure state ψ onto e_m . The transformation of the density operator is given by:

$$\rho_{\psi'} = \sum_m P_m \rho_{\psi} P_m \quad (10)$$

(so in the nondegenerate case Lüders' approach coincides with von Neumann's one). Starting with an arbitrary initial state ρ we obtain the state:

$$\rho' = \sum_m P_m \rho P_m. \quad (11)$$

We remark that, since all projectors are one dimensional, we have: $(P_m \rho P_m) \phi = P_m (\langle \phi, e_m \rangle \rho e_m) = \langle \rho e_m, e_m \rangle \langle \phi, e_m \rangle e_m = \langle \rho e_m, e_m \rangle P_m \phi$. Thus we can rewrite (10) as von Neumann wrote:

$$\rho' = \sum_m \langle \rho e_m, e_m \rangle P_m. \quad (12)$$

Let us start with a pure state ψ . If \hat{a} has degenerate (discrete) spectrum, then according to von Neumann [4] a measurement of a giving the value $a = \alpha_m$ *does not induce a projection of ψ* . The result will not be a pure state (in particular, not $\psi_m = P_m \psi$). Moreover, the resulting state is not determined. Only a subsequent measurement of an observable d such that $a = f(d)$ and d is represented by the operator \hat{d} with nondegenerate spectrum will determine the final state.

Let $\hat{a} = P$ be an orthogonal projector onto a subspace \mathcal{H}_0 of the state space \mathcal{H} . Let us choose in \mathcal{H}_0 an orthonormal basis $\{\phi_n\}$. The basis $\{\phi_n\}$ can be completed to an orthonormal basis in \mathcal{H} : $\{\phi_n, \phi'_l\}$. Let us take two sequences of real numbers $\{\gamma_n\}, \{\gamma'_n\}$ such that all numbers are distinct. We define the corresponding self-adjoint operator \hat{d} having eigenvectors $\{\phi_n, \phi'_l\}$ and eigenvalues $\{\gamma_n, \gamma'_n\}$:

$$\hat{d} = \sum_n \gamma_n P_{\phi_n} + \sum_n \gamma'_n P_{\phi'_n}.$$

Its domain of definition is given by

$$D(\hat{d}) = \{\psi \in \mathcal{H} : \psi = \sum_n \gamma_n^2 |\langle \psi, \phi_n \rangle|^2 + \sum_n (\gamma'_n)^2 |\langle \psi, \phi'_n \rangle|^2 < \infty\}.$$

J. von Neumann postulated [4] that one can construct a physical observable d described by the operator \hat{d} . Measurement of d can be considered as measurement of the observable a , because $a = f(d)$, where f is some function such that $f(\gamma_k) = 1$ and $f(\gamma'_k) = 0$. But the d -measurement (without post-measurement selection with respect to eigenvalues) produces the statistical mixture:

$$\bar{\rho} = \sum_n |\langle \psi, \phi_n \rangle|^2 P_{\phi_n} + \sum_n |\langle \psi, \phi'_n \rangle|^2 P_{\phi'_n}.$$

Since we can choose $\{\phi_n\}$ and $\{\phi'_n\}$ in many ways, by obtaining the result $a = \alpha_k$ we cannot determine the post-measurement state.

If we start with an arbitrary state ρ and an arbitrary self-adjoint operator \hat{a} with purely discrete spectrum, then we can determine the post-measurement state only with the aid of the subsequent measurement of an observable $d, a = f(d)$, described by the operator \hat{d} with nondegenerate spectrum. We denote by $\{\phi_{km}\}$ bases in subspaces $\mathcal{H}_m = P_m \mathcal{H}$. Then by von Neumann

$$\rho' = \sum_m \sum_k \langle \rho \phi_{km}, \phi_{km} \rangle P_{\phi_{km}}. \quad (13)$$

It seems that experimental investigations to compare von Neumann's or Lüders' laws of transformation of states have never been performed. It is amazing! It is not so complicated to check whether after measurement of an observable a (represented by a self-adjoint operator with degenerate purely discrete spectrum) the post measurement state is a pure state (Lüders' postulate) or some statistical mixture (von Neumann's viewpoint).

10.3 Conditional probability

As in the classical Kolmogorov and von Mises probabilistic models, in QM Born's postulate about the probabilistic interpretation of quantum states should be completed by a definition of conditional probability. We present the contemporary definition which is conventional in quantum logic and quantum information theory⁷ :

Definition. *Let physical observables a and b be represented by self-adjoint operators with purely discrete (may be degenerate) spectra:*

$$\hat{a} = \sum_m \alpha_m P_m^a, \quad \hat{b} = \sum_m \beta_m P_m^b, \quad (14)$$

where P_m^a and P_m^b are projectors on subspaces corresponding to eigenvalues α_m and β_m .

Let ψ be a pure state and let $P_k^a \psi \neq 0$. Then the probability to get the value $b = \beta_m$ under the condition that the value $a = \alpha_k$ was observed in the preceding measurement of the observable a on the state ψ is given by

$$\mathbf{P}_\psi(b = \beta_m | a = \alpha_k) \equiv \frac{\|P_m^b P_k^a \psi\|^2}{\|P_k^a \psi\|^2} \quad (15)$$

⁷This definition is based on Lüders postulate. Von Neumann's assumption that observable should have nondegenerate spectrum was totally ignored.

Sometimes the symbol $\mathbf{P}_\psi(P_m^b|P_k^a)$ is used. Set

$$\psi_k^a = \frac{P_k^a \psi}{\|P_k^a \psi\|}.$$

Then

$$\mathbf{P}_\psi(b = \beta_m | a = \alpha_k) = \|P_m^b \psi_k^a\|^2 = \mathbf{P}_{\psi_k^a}(b = \beta_m)$$

Let \hat{a} has nondegenerate spectrum. We can write:

$$\mathbf{P}_\psi(b = \beta_m | a = \alpha_k) = \|P_m^b e_k^a\|^2$$

(here $\hat{a}e_k^a = \alpha_k e_k^a$). Thus the conditional probability in this case does not depend on the original state ψ . We can say that the memory about the original state was destroyed.

If also the operator \hat{b} has nondegenerate spectrum then we have:

$$\mathbf{P}_\psi(b = \beta_m | a = \alpha_k) = |\langle e_m^b, e_k^a \rangle|^2$$

and

$$\mathbf{P}_\psi(a = \alpha_k | b = \beta_m) = |\langle e_k^a, e_m^b \rangle|^2.$$

By using symmetry of the scalar product we obtain:

Let both operators \hat{a} and \hat{b} have purely discrete nondegenerate spectra and let $P_k^a \psi \neq 0$ and $P_m^b \psi \neq 0$. Then conditional probability is symmetric and it does not depend on the original state ψ :

$$\mathbf{P}_\psi(b = \beta_m | a = \alpha_k) = \mathbf{P}_\psi(a = \alpha_k | b = \beta_m) = |\langle e_m^b, e_k^a \rangle|^2.$$

We now invent the notion of conditional probability for a quantum statistical state given by a density operator ρ . Let two observables be represented by operators (14). Then the probability to get the value $b = \beta_m$ under the condition that the value $a = \alpha_k$ has been observed in the preceding measurement of the observable a on the state ρ is given by

$$\mathbf{P}_\rho(b = \beta_m | a = \alpha_k) = \text{Tr } \rho_k^a P_m^b, \quad \text{where } \rho_k^a = \frac{P_k^a \rho P_k^a}{\text{Tr } \rho P_k^a}. \quad (16)$$

Here (according to Lüders) the density operator ρ_k^a describes the quantum state after the result $a = \alpha_k$ was obtained. We shall also use the notation $\mathbf{P}_\rho(P_m^b|P_k^a)$ for $\mathbf{P}_\rho(b = \beta_m | a = \alpha_k)$.

We remark that the validity of the conventional (Lüders' type) definition of conditional probability in QM can be in principle tested experimentally. Unfortunately, such experimental tests have never been performed.

References

- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777–780 (1935).
- [2] J. S. Bell, On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen Paradox, Physics 1, 195 (1964)
- [3] J. S. Bell, *Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics*. Cambridge Univ. Press (1987).
- [4] J. von Neumann, *Mathematical foundations of quantum mechanics*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J., 1955.
- [5] G. Lüders, Ann. Phys., Lpz **8**, 322 (1951).
- [6] K. Hess and W. Philipp, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sc. **98**, 14224 (2001); Europhys. Lett. **57**, 775 (2002).

- [7] K. Hess and W. Philipp, “Bell’s theorem: critique of proofs with and without inequalities”, in *Foundations of Probability and Physics-3*, AIP Conference Proceedings Ser. **750**, Melville, New York, 2005, pp. 150-157.
- [8] A. Khrennikov, On the problem of completeness of QM: von Neumann against Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen. arXiv:0804.2006.
- [9] A. Khrennikov, Analysis of the role of von Neumann’s projection postulate in the canonical scheme of quantum teleportation and main quantum algorithms. arXiv:0805.3258.
- [10] Proceedings of Conference *Foundations of Probability and Physics-3*, A. Yu. Khrennikov, ed., American Institute of Physics, Ser. Conference Proceedings, **750**, Melville, NY, 2005.
- [11] A. Aspect, Bell’s Theorem : The Naive View of an Experimentalist. <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0402001>.
- [12] S. Filipp and K. Svozil, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 130407 (2004).
- [13] S. Gudder, *Quantum Probability*, Academic Press, 1998.
- [14] N. Bohr, Phys. Rev. **48**, 696 (1935).
- [15] A. Plotnitsky, Reading Bohr: Physics and Philosophy (Fundamental Theories of Physics), Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 2007.
- [16] Khrennikov, Analysis of explicit and implicit assumptions in the theorems of J. Von Neumann and J. Bell. *Journal of Russian Laser Research*, **28**, 244-254(2007).
- [17] G. Weihs, “A test of Bell’s inequality with spacelike separation,” in *Proc. Conf. Foundations of Probability and Physics-4*, Melville, NY: American Institute of Physics, Ser. Conference Proceedings, vol. 889, pp. 250-262, 2007.
- [18] K. De Raedt, K. Keimpema, H. De Raedt, K. Michielsen, and S. Miyashita, *The European Physical Journal B*, **53**, 139-142 (2006).
- [19] H. De Raedt, K. De Raedt, K. Michielsen, K. Keimpema, and S. Miyashita, *The Physical Society of Japan* **76**, 104005 (2007).
- [20] S. Zhao, H. De Raedt, K. Michielsen, *Found. Phys.* (2007).
- [21] A. Yu. Khrennikov, *Interpretations of Probability*. Utrecht/Tokyo: VSP Int. Sc. Publishers, 1999 (second edition, 2004).
- [22] A. Yu. Khrennikov, Frequency analysis of the EPR-Bell argumentation. *Foundations of Physics*, **32**, 1159-1174 (2002).
- [23] A. Yu. Khrennikov, Frequency derivation of the EPR-Bohm correlations. *Il Nuovo Cimento*, **119**, N2, 131-147 (2004).
- [24] A. Yu. Khrennikov, Bell’s inequality: Physics meets Probability, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0709.3909>.