

Ramon Lapiedra

# The fail of determinism and the limits of Bohm hidden variable theory

Received: date / Accepted: date

**Abstract** We give a counter example to show that determinism as such is in contradiction to quantum mechanics. More precisely, we consider a simple quantum system and its environment, including the measurement device, and make the assumption that the time evolution of the global system, the quantum system plus this environment, is determinist, i. e., the time evolution is given by a dynamical trajectory from some initial conditions. From this, we prove a type of Bell inequalities which are violated by quantum mechanics, reaching the conclusion that our quantum system evolves in a non deterministic way. In order to seize the interest of this conclusion, one must realize that it cannot be reached from the present experimental violation of Bell inequalities predicted by quantum mechanics, since this violation is compatible with non-local realism.

PACS.03.65.Ud PACS.03.65.Ta

## 1 Introduction

Let us consider the time evolution of an isolated physical system, either classical or quantum. Does it always exist, as a matter of principle, a trajectory which, from some initial conditions, gives the values of the different quantities of the system at any time? This is the problem of determinism as such, i. e., determinism without any supplementary conditions, in the natural world. Obviously, determinism as such, or simply determinism for short, is sometimes present in the world, but the problem is if determinism is always

---

Ramon Lapiedra  
Departament d'Astronomia i Astrofísica, Universitat de València, 46100 Burjassot,  
València, Spain  
Tel.: 34-96-3543077  
Fax: 34-96-3543083  
E-mail: ramon.lapiedra@uv.es

present irrespective of our capacity of prediction in practice. Thus, for our proposal here it will be enough to give an example where determinism fails, meaning that it enters in contradiction to quantum predictions. This is what are we going to do along the present paper.

Nevertheless, before this, we will consider two objections that, from the very beginning, could be raised against this goal.

The first one would be to say that we are just referring to the time evolution of an isolated physical system, while one could always doubt if there is any physical system which can be considered really isolated.

We will see in the following Section that this objection can be easily neutralized, so let us consider in some detail the second objection, which could be phrased as follows: is not the above claimed fail of determinism denied by the kind of realism still allowed by the reported experimental violation [1] [2] of Bell inequalities [3] [4]? Notice that, as it is very well known, this violation entails the fail of local realism, but not the fail of the non-local one, i. e., the violation does not deny realism as such. In other words, we could keep realism as such in front of this experimental violation if we renounced to keep locality by leaving aside special relativity, which, on the other side, would raise tremendous experimental and theoretical problems. But, we do not need to have recourse to such a strong assumption in order to leave aside locality since, as pointed out by Bell [5], we also could rely on a vast *conspiracy* which, in the frame of determinism, would arrange the causally unconnected hidden variable values in order to produce the correlations, between the two particle measurement outcomes, which are responsible for the observed violation of Bell inequalities. In other words, the *conspiracy* would make compatible realism as such with the experimental violation of Bell's inequalities. Then, could not this *conspiracy* also be invoked to see, from the very beginning, that the above claimed fail of determinism as such must be erroneous? We will see in the next Section that this is not the case by actually proving, in a certain case, that determinism enters in contradiction to quantum mechanics. The reason why non local realism can be reconciled with the violation of Bell inequalities but not with determinism is that the determinism assumption is a stronger condition than realism assumption in the case of an EPR experiment. In the last case, one assumes the existence of some hidden variables values behind the outcomes of a couple of measurements performed on two entangled particles, without asking that these hidden values remain the same after performing this couple of measurements. On the contrary, in the case of determinism, one assumes some common hidden variable values (the unknown initial conditions) behind all the successive spontaneous responses of the isolated system along any lapse of time.

Perhaps some reader will find nonsense to resort to such a fantastic idea as the one of the above *conspiracy* to keep non-locality. Nevertheless, the author does not know what could be more fantastic, wether this *conspiracy* or what is at stake in the present paper, i. e., the absence of determinism. Thus, from this point of view, to consider the possibility of this *conspiracy*, as it is made in the present paper, is not only convenient but even necessary.

Finally, one could also ask whether this claimed fail of determinism could encompass, for example, the case of a quantum particle, since it is widely

claimed that Bohm [6] has actually built a non-local realistic theory which reproduces all quantum predictions: a non-local realistic theory where any quantum particle would have its own well defined trajectory, at least in the absence of measurement, and so a deterministic theory to a certain extent. Then, perhaps this determinism could still be preserved in Bohm's theory framework, when successive measurements on the particle are present. However, in Section 3, we will see that, whatever could be the merits of the Bohm theory, the theory cannot produce this determinism in the presence of measurement and at the same time agree with quantum mechanics (QM), since this determinism enters in contradiction to QM.

## 2 Determinism as such, the entailed Bell inequalities and its violation

Let it be a free half one spin particle, on which we perform the following ideal experiment: we first fix three space directions given by the unit 3-vectors  $\mathbf{a}$ ,  $\mathbf{b}$  and  $\mathbf{c}$ . Then, we measure successively the particle spin, each time along one of the precedent directions randomly selected.

Let us consider the physical system composed of the half one spin particle plus the experimental device, including the part of this device that selects randomly the measurement direction among the three initially fixed directions. Now, assume strict determinism in the evolution of this global system. By this I mean that not only the spin measurement outcomes, say  $\pm 1$ , are determined from some given initial conditions, but also the successively selected measurement directions, let this random selection be performed by a *free* subject or by any other means. (Notice that I do not put any restrictions on these assumed initial conditions. In particular, they could range over space-time regions not causally connected). Then, because of this deterministic assumption, a time dependent 3-vector function  $\mathbf{x}(t)$  exists such that, for the times  $t_n$ ,  $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N$ , in which the successive measurements are performed, the vector function takes the values  $\mathbf{a}$ , or  $\mathbf{b}$ , or  $\mathbf{c}$ , and  $\mathbf{x}(t) = 0$  for  $t \neq t_n$ . Furthermore, a two-valued function  $s(t_n)$  exists too such that  $s(t_n) = \pm 1$ , according to the obtained spin value outcomes. With  $S$  a convenient function we can then write  $s(t_n) = S[t_n, \mathbf{x}(t_n)]$ .

Imagine, for simpleness, that the experimentalist performs his measurements according to a constant time rate, that is  $t_n = (n - 1)\delta t$ , such that the first measurement is performed at time  $t = 0$ , corresponding to  $n = 1$  and the last one at  $t = (N - 1)\delta t$  with  $N$  taking a very large value. Following similar reasonings by Leggett and Garg [7][8], let us define

$$D(t_n, \delta t) \equiv s(t_n)s(t_n + \delta t) + s(t_n + \delta t)s(t_n + 2\delta t) - s(t_n)s(t_n + 3\delta t). \quad (1)$$

Now, consider the subensemble  $\{i\}$  of the values of  $n$  such that we have

$$\mathbf{x}(t_i) = \mathbf{a}, \quad \mathbf{x}(t_i + \delta t) = \mathbf{b}, \quad \mathbf{x}(t_i + 2\delta t) = \mathbf{c}, \quad \mathbf{x}(t_i + 3\delta t) = \mathbf{a}. \quad (2)$$

Then, consider  $D(t_i, \delta t)$ . Because of the fact that the only possible values of the function  $s(t_n)$  are  $\pm 1$ , it is easy to see that the following inequality

$$D(t_i, \delta t) \equiv s(a)s(b) + s(b)s(c) - s(c)s(a) \leq 1, \quad (3)$$

where we have used the notation  $s(t_i) \equiv s(a)$ ,  $s(t_i + \delta t) \equiv s(b)$ ,  $s(t_i + 2\delta t) \equiv s(c)$ ,  $s(t_i + 3\delta t) \equiv s(a)$ , is satisfied for any value of  $t_i$ . Then, we obviously have

$$\langle D(t_i, \delta t) \rangle \leq 1, \quad (4)$$

for the mean value,  $\langle D(t_i, \delta t) \rangle$ , over the different  $t_i$ . That is,

$$s(ab) + s(bc) - s(ca) \leq 1, \quad (5)$$

with the mean value  $s(ab) \equiv \langle s(a)s(b) \rangle$  and similarly for  $s(bc)$  and  $s(ca)$ .

These three mean values can in principle be experimentally measured. Then, the inequality can be, in principle, experimentally tested in order to test the original assumption of determinism in nature.

Notice that, as it has been said in the Introduction, this inequality only would work for an isolated system. Nevertheless, if a new part, not considered up to here, of the general environment were finally supposed to affect, sensibly enough, the original system, the inequality would then refer to the new system enlarged with this new environment part. Of course, it is to be expected that the larger this affecting environment become, the lesser become the possibility, if any, of violating the resulting inequality.

But, coming back to the question of testing inequality (5), whatever could be the practical difficulties to perform the kind of experiment we are considering, the three mean values in (5) can be calculated as the corresponding expected values dictated by quantum mechanics. These values become  $s(ab) = \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b}$  and similarly for  $s(bc)$  and  $s(ca)$ . Thus, inequality (5) becomes

$$\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{c} - \mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{a} \leq 1, \quad (6)$$

which is maximally violated for  $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{c} = 0$  and  $\mathbf{b} = (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{c})/\sqrt{2}$ , in which case the left hand side of inequality (6) reaches the maximum value  $\sqrt{2}$  [9][10].

Thus, for the global system consisting of a 1/2-spin particle plus the measurement device, including the device part that selects the measurement directions, the assumed determinism enters in contradiction with quantum mechanics.

This fail of determinism could come from the quantum system, or from the measurement device (or from both). Nevertheless, we always could do the direction selection by a well determined procedure: one compatible with the equality of the three probabilities of obtaining one or another direction from the three initially fixed ones. Of course, this deterministic procedure is not expected to change the measurement outcomes. As a result, whatever could be the extent of a hypothetical environment acting on the particle which is submitted to successive measurements, we have proved that determinism for this particle and quantum mechanics are incompatible. In other words, there is no trajectory for this quantum particle whatever it were the kind of realism associated to the initial conditions: local or non-local *contextual*[11] realism, or even realism of a *conspiratory* nature.

Now, in according to what I have said at the end of the Introduction, it seems that the claimed non existence of this trajectory should also be considered from the point of view of the Bohm hidden variable theory, in order to see that there is no contradiction between the claimed non determinism and this theory. In the next section we explain why this is actually the case.

---

### 3 The limits of Bohm theory of hidden variables

Let us consider in detail to what extent is it really true that Bohm's hidden variable theories (HVT) can predict the existence of dynamical trajectories and at the same time be consistent with QM. It is true that Bohm [6] proves that his theory gives the same probability of finding a particle in a given position that QM does. From this, he concludes that his "interpretation is capable of leading in all possible experiments to identical predictions to those obtained from the usual interpretation", that is to say, from those obtained from QM. Then, when considering an entangled extended system, as in Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen experiments (similar to the ones considered by Bell in his seminal papers), Bohm assumes that his realism is non-local. In this way, his non-local HVT can explain the observed violation of the ordinary Bell inequalities, in agreement with QM, without having to give up realism (see [3] for example).

But is it always this way? Is it true that we can devise actual non-local HVT that lead to the same predictions that QM, *for all conceivable experiments*? Let us make some considerations in order to show why, from the very beginning, it is dubious that HVT, even if allowing for non-local realism, could always agree with QM to the extent of assigning a dynamical trajectory to each quantum particle when measurements are present. That is, to the extent of assuming determinism.

First of all, in these theories, each time that one performs a measurement on the particle position, if one wants to complete, beyond the obtained outcome, the precedent particle trajectory with a new trajectory piece, one must provide the probability density of the particle position just after this outcome. The provided probability becomes the new initial probability. Then, this new initial probability must be taken the same as the one dictated by standard QM if we want the HVT to agree henceforth with QM. After this, in the HVT framework, one does not need to worry about how this initial probability evolves in time until one performs a subsequent measurement, since, in the absence of any measurement, HVT are just designed to predict the same probability evolution as the one predicted by Schrödinger equation. But, as we will see in a moment, the real point is that when some consecutive different measurements are performed on the same particle [10], one expects to find some well definite correlations among the corresponding outcomes: the correlations dictated by QM that lead, for example, to the violation of inequalities (6).

More precisely: either in QM or in HVT, the probabilities of each measurement outcome is given by the corresponding initial quantum state of the particle, just the state previous to the measurement. In HVT, these initial quantum states are supplemented with the assumed initial values of some non-local hidden variables,  $\lambda$ , leading to the deterministic time evolution of the system, in the absence of measurement. This determinism preserves, as it must be, the quantum evolution of the outcome probabilities. These initial  $\lambda$  values can always be established and this is the great triumph of Bohm theory. Nevertheless, the point here is that these  $\lambda$  values, which mimics so perfectly well the quantum evolution of the above probabilities, in the

absence of measurement, have nothing to do with the explanation of the quantum correlations which are behind the reported quantum violation of inequalities (6). It has nothing to do *since these correlations have only to do with the quantum fact that these initial  $\lambda$  values need to be different before and after a given measurement on the particle*, while they have to be the same if one assumes uncritically that we always can have deterministic dynamical trajectories for quantum particles in the framework of HVT theories. In other words, from the very beginning, and as we have done in the present paper, one should ask whether those quantum correlations will always be compatible with determinism, that is, with the assumption that some common initial conditions,  $\lambda$ , local or not, are behind all the successive measurements along the trajectory of a quantum particle. Then, the answer to this question has to be negative since, in the precedent Section, we have seen in detail how the inequality (6), which comes from the assumption of determinism, is violated by the corresponding quantum predictions.

Thus, it seems that there is no room left "for models that force Nature to mimic the concept of trajectory" as it is still expected in [12].

To summarize: according to the above discussions, either Quantum Mechanics, or determinism as such, must be false. So, if on the ground of its general success we accept QM, we must conclude that determinism as such should contradict experiments, an statement that would deserve being tested. Then the answer to the Leggett question [8] of "it is indeed realism rather than locality which has to be sacrificed?" would be 'yes'. All in all: against Einstein's old dream, it seems that QM cannot be completed to the extent to allow for the existence of trajectories for quantum particles even when accounting for all its actual environment.

**Acknowledgements** This work has been supported by the Spanish Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, MEC-FEDER project No.FIS2006-06062.

## References

1. A. Aspect, *Nature*, **398**, 189 (1999)
2. M. A. Rowe *et al.*, *Nature*, **409**, 791 (2001)
3. J. S. Bell, *Physics*, **1**, 195 (1964)
4. J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony and R. A. Holt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **26**, 880 (1969)
5. J. S. Bell, *Journal de Physique*, Colloque C2, suppl. number 3, **42**, 41 (1981)
6. D. Bohm, *Phys. Rev.*, **85**, 166 and 180 (1952)
7. A. J. Leggett, A. Garg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **54**, 857 (1985)
8. A. J. Leggett, *Rep. Prog. Phys.*, **71**, 022001 (2008)
9. Č. Brukner, S. Taylor, S. Cheung, V. Vedral, *arXiv:quant-ph/0402127 v1*
10. R. Lapiedra, *Europhys. Lett.*, **75**, 202 (2006)
11. A. Peres, *Quantum theory: concepts and methods*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht (1995)
12. A. Suarez, arXiv:0801.3050v1 [quant-ph].