

Bell Inequalities and Maximally Realistic Causal Quantum Mechanics

S. M. Roy^{1,*}

¹*INSA Emeritus Scientist, Homi Bhabha Centre for Science Education,
TIFR, V. N. Purav Marg, Mankhurd, Mumbai - 400 088.*

The De Broglie-Bohm (DeBB)[18] Causal Quantum Mechanics played a crucial role in Bell's discovery [6] that quantum mechanics violates EPR local reality [3], and also in Bell's search for an exact quantum mechanics. The experiments of Aspect et al [25] confirm quantum correlations between plane polarizations of two photons and violation of Bell's inequalities by a factor $\sqrt{2}$. I prove that similar experiments with elliptic polarizers can also show quantum violations of Bell's inequality by the same factor. I summarize our construction of a maximally realistic causal quantum mechanics in n -dimensional configuration space [21]. Phase space Bell inequalities and 'Marginal Theorems' [33] play a crucial role.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.65.Ud, 42.50.-p

1. Introduction

Standard Quantum Field Theory incorporates the principle of 'no signalling faster than light' by means of the hypothesis that Field Observables at spacelike separation commute. Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen (EPR)[3] enunciated a different principle, the "Local Reality Principle" or "Einstein Locality" and used it to claim that description of the quantum mechanical state by the wave function alone is incomplete. Bell demonstrated [4] that the De Broglie-Bohm (DeBB)[18] Causal Quantum Mechanics (which adds position as a hidden variable with distribution identical to quantum position probability density) explicitly violated local reality. He then made the startling discovery that any theory which agrees with quantum correlations must violate Bell inequalities [6] implied by Einstein locality. I summarize Bell's inequalities and experiments [25] on correlations of plane polarizations of photons which confirm quantum correlations and violate Bell's inequalities by a factor $\sqrt{2}$. I suggest similar experiments with elliptic polarizers and show that those quantum correlations also violate Bell's inequality by the same factor. The basic reason for quantum violation of Bell inequalities is the context dependence of quantum probabilities. 'Local Reality' implies existence of joint probabilities of some non-commuting observables which cannot be measured with one experimental arrangement.

Bell considered the DeBB causal theory as the most serious attempt towards an exact quantum mechanics because it avoids an ill-defined division of the world into quantum system and classical observer. However, the DeBB theory fails to reproduce quantum probabilities of momentum [19]. Virendra Singh and I [21] constructed a causal quantum mechanics in n -dimensional configuration space exactly reproducing the quantum probabilities of $n + 1$ complete commuting sets (CCS) of observables

including position and momentum, as marginals of one positive phase space density. Auberson et al [33] derived phase space Bell inequalities and marginal theorems to show that the Roy-Singh causal quantum mechanics is maximally realistic: there exist quantum states for which no more than $n+1$ CCS of observables may be reproduced as marginals of one positive phase space density. There are exceptional states, viz. those with positive Wigner function [16] for which quantum probabilities of 2^n CCS agree with corresponding marginals of the Wigner function. Banaszek et al [35] showed that even these quantum states can violate Bell's inequalities on correlations of certain operators such as displaced parity operators. This extends the context dependence seen in standard and maximally realistic causal quantum mechanics to observables non-diagonal in position or momentum.

Quantum states, unlike classical states, do not specify values of positions q and momenta p of particles. They only yield probabilities of finding values of q (or p) if q (or p), were to be measured. Joint probabilities of a complete commuting set (CCS) of observables are specified, but joint probabilities of any two non-commuting observables such as q and p are not. Further, quantum states for a system consisting of two sub-systems cannot in general be written as products of individual wave functions for the two sub-systems but only as superpositions of such products. Such states are called entangled or non-separable [1].

In standard quantum mechanics causality/determinism does not hold. Consider a quantum superposition $\alpha|z+\rangle + \beta|z-\rangle$ for a spin-1/2 particle, where $|z+\rangle$ and $|z-\rangle$ are eigenstates of σ_z with eigenvalues $+1$ and -1 respectively. When the same state is prepared repeatedly and passed through a Stern-Gerlach apparatus to measure σ_z ,

$$\alpha|z+\rangle + \beta|z-\rangle \rightarrow \text{STERN - GERLACH} \rightarrow \pm \quad (1)$$

quantum mechanics cannot predict whether the result $+$ or the result $-$ will occur in a given trial; it merely says that a fraction $|\alpha|^2$ of the particles ends up at the detector corresponding to $\sigma_z = +1$, and a fraction $|\beta|^2$

*Electronic address: shasanka1@yahoo.co.in, smroy@hbcse.tifr.res.in

goes to the detector corresponding to $\sigma_z = -1$. Thus different results (going to one detector or the other) arise from exactly the same cause (the same initial state). Of course this lack of causality might be restored in a theory in which the wave function is not a complete description of the state of the system.

Another striking example is that of a particle passing through a narrow hole on to a hemispherical fluorescent screen. Although described by the same wave function spread nearly uniformly over the hemisphere, in repeated trials the particle arrives at different points on the screen.

Einstein in 1933 [2] expressed dissatisfaction with quantum theory being merely a set of rules about the statistics of measurement results :“I still believe in the possibility of giving a model of reality which shall represent events themselves and not merely the probability of their occurrence”, and more specifically,[2] (p. 666) “ I am, in fact, rather firmly convinced that the essentially statistical character of contemporary quantum theory is solely to be ascribed to the fact that this (theory) operates with an incomplete description of physical systems ”.

Finally Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen [3] posed the question “Can Quantum Mechanical Description of Physical Reality be Considered Complete?”. Formulating and applying a 'local reality principle' on an entangled state of two spatially separated sub-systems S_1 and S_2 which have interacted in the past they concluded : “While we have thus shown that the wave function does not provide a complete description of the physical reality, we left open the question of whether or not such a description exists. ”

This open question opened a treasure trove in front of John Bell [4] . He had just demolished all arguments against hidden variables in quantum mechanics [5] as being unreasonable, and advocated the De Broglie-Bohm (DeBB) Causal Quantum Theory [18] as an explicit counterexample. DeBB added position as additional variable to the specification of the quantum state ,e.g. $\{\psi, x_1, x_2\}$ for a two particle system . Bell considered this system in Stern-Gerlach type magnetic fields. He showed that in the case of EPR type entangled states the DeBB trajectory of particle 1 depends on the trajectory of 2 and hence on the analyzing fields acting on 2, however far these may be from particle 1 . Thus the DeBB theory, while agreeing with position predictions of usual quantum mechanics, provided an explicit causal mechanism of violating Einstein's Local Reality principle.

This led Bell to the next seminal question: must every hidden variable account of quantum mechanics have this extraordinary non-local character ? The answer, 'Yes', is given by Bell's theorem [6] : every Local Hidden Variable (LHV) theory must violate quantum mechanics. Bell's theorem is regarded by some as the most fundamental discovery of the 20th century [8].Bell's theorem was later generalized by Wigner [7] who demonstrated a conflict of Einstein locality with quantum mechanics without explicit mention of hidden variables.

2. Einstein's Principle of Local Reality and the EPR Paradox

Einstein Locality. Suppose two systems S_1 and S_2 which have interacted in the past have now separated and are experimented upon by two observers in spatially separated regions. Observed properties of the two sub-systems can ofcourse be correlated due to past interactions. Einstein insisted however on a local reality principle ,[2],p.85: “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.”

The meaning of 'real factual situation' in Einstein's formulation is clarified by the definition of 'physical reality' in the landmark paper of Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen [3]: “ 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.” In this sense ,in quantum mechanics an observable has physical reality only in it's eigen states.


Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen applied the principle of local reality to argue that Quantum Mechanics is incomplete. Consider a two particle system. In quantum mechanics, the position observable \hat{q}_i and the momentum observable \hat{p}_i cannot be simultaneously specified sharply; but the observables $\hat{q}_1 - \hat{q}_2$ and $\hat{p}_1 + \hat{p}_2$ are commuting observables and there is a quantum state

$$|\hat{q}_1 - \hat{q}_2 = q_0\rangle|\hat{p}_1 + \hat{p}_2 = p_0\rangle \quad (2)$$

in which they are specified arbitrarily sharply, and have values q_0 and p_0 . Ignore momentarily the difficulty that such states are not normalizable, a difficulty removed later by Bohm and Aharonov by considering spin observables. Suppose observers A and B are spacelike separated. In such a state, if B chooses to measure q_2 she predicts q_1 with certainty (without disturbing that particle since it is spatially separated), and hence q_1 must have physical reality; equally, if she chooses to measure p_2 she predicts p_1 to have reality. By the principle of local reality, reality for particle 1 must be independent of choices made by observer B. Hence, both q_1 and p_1 must have physical reality for particle 1. No quantum state allows simultaneously sharp q_1 and p_1 . Thus, EPR conclude that quantum theory must be incomplete.

EPR envisaged that an extension (or completion) of quantum mechanics agreeing with local reality would be possible. Bell's theorem shattered this hope .

3. EPR Experiment, Local Hidden Variables and Bell's Theorem



John S. Bell




FIG. 1: EPR-Bohm-Aharonov Experiment




FIG. 2: Classical Explanation of EPR-Anticorrelations

Bell formulated the EPR local reality idea for two particles emitted in opposite directions, using correlations $\langle AB \rangle$ between measured values $A = \pm 1$ for one particle and $B = \pm 1$ for the other. Although the idea is primarily meant for relativistic particles such as photons, the first theoretical application was to the non-relativistic Bohm-Aharonov [28] example of two spin-half particles or two qubits (quantum bits) prepared in a singlet state

$$|\Psi\rangle = |\uparrow\downarrow - \downarrow\uparrow\rangle/\sqrt{2} = |\swarrow\searrow - \searrow\swarrow\rangle/\sqrt{2} \quad (3)$$

at a source S and then flying apart. Two observers, each equipped independently, (e.g. with rotatable Stern-Gerlach magnets) measure arbitrary components of the

particle spin chosen during the flight of the particles such that the measurements are spacelike separated. Since the singlet state is rotationally symmetric, the spin components measured along any direction by the two observers must be opposite. Observer 1 can predict with certainty the result of measurement of any component of $\vec{\sigma}^{(2)} \cdot \vec{a}$ by observer 2 by previously measuring the same component $\vec{\sigma}^{(1)} \cdot \vec{a}$ for particle 1. Since Einstein locality implies that the choice of magnet orientation made by the remote observer 1 does not affect the result obtained by observer 2, the result of any such observation must be predetermined. The initial quantum wave function does not specify the result of an individual measurement; therefore the predetermination requires a more complete specification of the state, say by adding additional variables ('hidden variables') λ .

Hidden variables achieving perfect anti-correlation (in each individual shot) between $+$ and $-$ results along the same direction poses no problem for classical visualization. E.g. two discs could be shot off along opposite directions with initial markings $+$ and $-$ on the two discs being anticorrelated for every direction. We may even allow probabilistic rather than deterministic hidden variables. Bell showed however, that the imperfect correlations predicted by quantum mechanics conflict with local reality. Suppose the hidden variables λ , with probability distribution $\rho(\lambda)$, determine the probability $p_1^r(\lambda, \vec{a})$ of observing the value $r = \pm 1$ of $A(a)$ corresponding to the quantum observable $\vec{\sigma}^{(1)} \cdot \vec{a}$ and the probability $p_2^s(\lambda, \vec{b})$ of observing the value $s = \pm 1$ of $B(b)$ corresponding to the quantum observable $\vec{\sigma}^{(2)} \cdot \vec{b}$. **Einstein locality** allows only Local Hidden Variables (LHV) such that $p_1^r(\lambda, \vec{a})$ and $p_2^s(\lambda, \vec{b})$ are independent of the orientations of the remote measuring apparatus. Then the probability $p^{r,s}(a, b)$ of observing $A(a) = r$ and $B(b) = s$ is,

$$LHV : p^{r,s}(a, b) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) p_1^r(\lambda, \vec{a}) p_2^s(\lambda, \vec{b}), \quad (4)$$

and the correlation $P(a, b) = \langle A(a)B(b) \rangle$ is predicted to be,

$$\begin{aligned} P(a, b) &= \sum_{r=\pm 1, s=\pm 1} r s p^{r,s}(a, b) \\ &= \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) \bar{A}(\lambda, a) \bar{B}(\lambda, b), \text{ where,} \\ \bar{A}(\lambda, a) &= p_1^+(\lambda, \vec{a}) - p_1^-(\lambda, \vec{a}), |\bar{A}(\lambda, a)| \leq 1, \\ \bar{B}(\lambda, b) &= p_2^+(\lambda, \vec{b}) - p_2^-(\lambda, \vec{b}), |\bar{B}(\lambda, b)| \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

These LHV correlations were shown to conflict with the quantum values $P_{QM}(a, b) = \langle \vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{a} \vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \vec{b} \rangle$, when we consider four possible measurements, with two orientations a, a' on one side and two orientations b, b' on the other side.

Wigner's proof of Bell's Theorem. Without any restriction to non-relativistic contexts, Bell's hypothesis

actually allows the construction of a joint probability

$$p^{r,r',s,s'}(a,a',b,b') = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) p_1^r(\lambda, \vec{a}) p_2^s(\lambda, \vec{b}) \times p_1^{r'}(\lambda, \vec{a}') p_2^{s'}(\lambda, \vec{b}') \quad (5)$$

for $A(a), A(a'), B(b), B(b')$ to have the values r, r', s, s' respectively, such that the result of any of the four feasible experiments can be obtained as a “marginal”. E.g.

$$p^{r,s}(a,b) = \sum_{r'=\pm 1, s'=\pm 1} p^{r,r',s,s'}(a,a',b,b'). \quad (6)$$

The experimental correlation $\langle A(a)B(b) \rangle$ is then,

$$P(a,b) = \sum_{r=\pm 1, s=\pm 1} r s p^{r,s}(a,b) \quad (7)$$

with similar expressions for $P(a',b), P(a,b'), P(a',b')$. Hence, using the positivity of probabilities,

$$\begin{aligned} & |P(a,b) - P(a,b')| + |P(a',b) + P(a',b')| \\ & \leq \sum_{r,s,r',s'} (|r(s-s')| + |r'(s+s')|) p^{r,r',s,s'}(a,a',b,b') \\ & = 2 \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

which is the Bell-CHSH [6] local reality inequality **without any restriction to non-relativistic contexts**. Here we used $|r(s-s')| + |r'(s+s')| = 2$ and the requirement that the joint probability summed over all values of r, s, r', s' must be unity.

In contrast, Quantum Mechanics gives,

$$P_{QM}(a,b) = -\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}. \quad (9)$$

The choice of coplanar vectors such that $\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b} = -\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}' = \vec{a}' \cdot \vec{b} = \vec{a}' \cdot \vec{b}' = 1/\sqrt{2}$ yields the value $2\sqrt{2}$ for the left-hand side of the Bell-CHSH inequality in gross violation of local reality! It has been proved [9] that this is the maximum violation possible for two qubit states. It has also been proved that every two qubit entangled pure state must violate a Bell-CHSH inequality [10].

Multiple settings, multiparticles, Local Reality versus Separability The Bell-CHSH inequalities use two settings at each site and are not sufficient to guaranty local reality: independent local reality inequalities with M settings at one site and N settings at the other have been obtained [11]. For N qubits but two settings at each detector, local reality Bell inequalities may be violated by a factor $2^{(N-1)/2}$ [29],[30]. For quantum computation, the more relevant property is ‘entanglement’ or its opposite, viz. ‘separability’. Quantum separability has been shown to imply inequalities exponentially stronger than local reality Bell inequalities for large N [31]. They are violated by a factor 2^{N-1} by some entangled states; these states are natural candidates to exploit in seeking improvements over classical computation.




FIG. 3: Transparency 13 of Bell’s TIFR lecture (1982)

4. EPR-Bell Experiments on Two Photons with Linear and Elliptic Polarizers

We come now to relativistic tests. Measurements of plane polarizations on two photon states suggested by Bell[12] and carried out by Alain Aspect and others [25] verified the quantum predictions, and disproved the EPR local reality hypothesis. I summarize their results and also propose analogous EPR-Bell experiments using elliptic polarizers/analyzers. I show that quantum correlations in the proposed experiments with elliptic polarization detectors on both sides violate Bell-CHSH inequalities by a factor $\sqrt{2}$, but experiments detecting plane polarization on one side and elliptic polarization on the other do not violate local reality inequalities.

The decay of the 1S_0 state of Positronium, or of π^0 yields the two photon state of zero angular momentum

$$|\Psi\rangle_- = (|x\rangle|y\rangle - |y\rangle|x\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = i(|+\rangle|-\rangle - |-\rangle|+\rangle)/\sqrt{2}, \\ & |\pm\rangle \equiv (|x\rangle \pm i|y\rangle)/\sqrt{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $|x\rangle, |y\rangle$ denote photons polarized in x, y directions and $|\pm\rangle$ are circularly polarized photons. Experiments on atomic cascade photons [25] have used the state,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi\rangle_+ &= (|x\rangle|x\rangle + |y\rangle|y\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \\ &= (|+\rangle|-\rangle + |-\rangle|+\rangle)/\sqrt{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

For both $|\Psi\rangle_\pm$, as the two photons travel in opposite directions, they have the same circular polarization and the total spin angular momentum is zero. The states can be reexpressed in the basis of states $|\theta\rangle$ plane polarized in arbitrary directions, and corresponding elliptically polarized states $|\theta\rangle_E$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\theta\rangle &\equiv \cos\theta|x\rangle + \sin\theta|y\rangle; \\ |\theta\rangle_E &\equiv \cos\theta|x\rangle + i\sin\theta|y\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi\rangle_- &= (|\theta\rangle|\theta + \pi/2\rangle - |\theta + \pi/2\rangle|\theta\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \\ &= -i(|\theta\rangle_E|\theta + \pi/2\rangle_E - |\theta + \pi/2\rangle_E|\theta\rangle_E)/\sqrt{2}; \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi\rangle_+ &= (|\theta\rangle|\theta\rangle + |\theta + \pi/2\rangle|\theta + \pi/2\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \\ &= -(|\theta\rangle_E|-\theta\rangle_E + |\theta + \pi/2\rangle_E|-\theta - \pi/2\rangle_E)/\sqrt{2}; \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

For both $|\Psi\rangle_\pm$ a plane polarization measurement on one photon forces the other into a plane polarized state, and an elliptic polarization measurement on one forces the other photon into an elliptic polarization state. EPR locality says that the choice of measurement on one photon cannot affect the real situation of the distant second photon; this would have the paradoxical implication that the second photon is both plane polarized and elliptically polarized!

Consider now a generalized Bell-type experiment (see Fig. 3) in which the initial state can be $|\Psi\rangle_\pm$, and analyser settings a, a' and b, b' can be chosen to transmit plane or elliptically polarized photons $|\theta\rangle$ or $|\theta\rangle_E$, with any desired values of θ . Suppose $A_{L,E}(a) = \pm 1$ and $B_{L,E} = \pm 1$ correspond to transmission or non-transmission of the photon by the left-analyzer and right-analyzer respectively, the subscripts L, E corresponding to Linear and Elliptic polarization. If the left analyzer is set to transmit $|\theta\rangle_E = |a\rangle_E$ photons, and the right analyzer is set to transmit $|\theta\rangle_E = |b\rangle_E$ photons, noting that ${}_E\langle a|a + \pi/2\rangle_E = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (P_{E,E}(a, b))_\pm &= \pm \langle \Psi | A_E(a) B_E(b) | \Psi \rangle_\pm \\ &= \pm \langle \Psi | (|a\rangle\langle a| - |a + \pi/2\rangle\langle a + \pi/2|)_E \\ &\times (|b\rangle\langle b| - |b + \pi/2\rangle\langle b + \pi/2|)_E | \Psi \rangle_\pm \\ &= \pm \cos(2(a \pm b)). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (P_{L,L}(a, b))_\pm &= \pm \langle \Psi | A_L(a) B_L(b) | \Psi \rangle_\pm \\ &= \pm \langle \Psi | (|a\rangle\langle a| - |a + \pi/2\rangle\langle a + \pi/2|) \\ &\times (|b\rangle\langle b| - |b + \pi/2\rangle\langle b + \pi/2|) | \Psi \rangle_\pm \\ &= \pm \cos(2(a - b)). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} (P_{L,E}(a, b))_\pm &= \pm \langle \Psi | A_L(a) B_E(b) | \Psi \rangle_\pm = \pm \cos 2a \cos 2b \\ (P_{E,L}(a, b))_\pm &= \pm \langle \Psi | A_E(a) B_L(b) | \Psi \rangle_\pm = \pm \cos 2a \cos 2b \end{aligned}$$

This gives,

$$\begin{aligned} |P_{E,E}(a, b) - P_{E,E}(a, b')|_\pm + \\ |P_{E,E}(a', b) + P_{E,E}(a', b')|_\pm &= 2\sqrt{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

if

$$\{2a, 2b, 2a', 2b'\} = \{0, \pi/4, \pi/2, 3\pi/4\}, \quad (19)$$

thus violating the Bell-CHSH [6] local reality inequality by a factor $\sqrt{2}$, just as for linear polarization correlations $(P_{L,L}(a, b))_\pm$. No violation is predicted for $(P_{L,E}(a, b))_\pm$ and $(P_{E,L}(a, b))_\pm$ with linear polarizers on one side and elliptic polarizers on the other. We expect that experiments with elliptical polarizers will give new confirmation of quantum mechanics and strong violation of local reality.

5. Causal quantum theory a step towards an exact quantum theory?

John Bell's seminar at TIFR in 1982, 'What in the world is quantum mechanics about exactly?', detailed exposition 'Towards An Exact Quantum Mechanics' [27], and lectures 'against measurement' [24] exemplify his relentless search for an exact quantum theory. Bell considered a quantum mechanics which gives nothing except the statistics of measurement results to be fundamentally ambiguous because it requires an undefinable boundary between the quantum object and the classical measuring apparatus. "Nobody knows what quantum mechanics says **exactly** about any situation. For nobody knows where the boundary really is, between wavy quantum system and the world of particular events. **This is the problem of quantum mechanics**" [27]. Bell repeatedly emphasized that 'the de Broglie-Bohm picture disposes of the necessity to divide the world somehow into system and apparatus' [13]. He constructed a relativistic version 'beables for quantum field theory' which was a 'quantum field theory without observers, or observables, or measurements, or systems, or apparatus, or wave function collapse, or anything like that' [14].

The reason the DeBB causal theory does not need measurements is that the state is specified by the wave function plus additional or hidden variables, the positions of all the particles in the world, $\{|\psi\rangle(t), \vec{x}(t)\}$. For non-relativistic particles, it prescribes the phase space density,

$$\rho_{dBB} = |\psi(\vec{x}, t)|^2 \delta(\vec{p} - \vec{p}_{dBB}(\vec{x}, t)), \quad (20)$$

where $\vec{p}_{dBB} = \vec{\nabla} S(\vec{x}, t)$ and $\psi = R \exp(iS/\hbar)$, with R and S real. For any ensemble of configuration space points whose density is equal to the quantum position

probability density at $t = 0$, the continuity equation following from the Schrödinger equation ensures that the equality holds for all time. However Takabayasi [19] pointed out that the quantum momentum probability density is not reproduced,

$$\int \rho_{dB} d\vec{x} \neq |\langle \vec{p} | \psi(t) \rangle|^2.$$

Maximally Realistic Causal Quantum Mechanics. This unsatisfactory feature of the DeBB theory [20], the breaking of the fundamental symmetry between position and momentum can be removed. Standard Quantum mechanics does not specify joint probabilities of noncommuting observables. For any complete commuting set (CCS) of observables A, the quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ specifies the probability of observing the eigenvalues α as $|\langle \alpha | \psi \rangle|^2$, if A were to be measured. If B is another CCS with eigenvalues β , but $[A, B]$ is non-zero, the analogous probabilities $|\langle \beta | \psi \rangle|^2$ refer to a different context or experimental situation where B is measured. Each context corresponds to the experimental arrangement to measure one CCS of observables, because non-commuting A and B cannot be accurately measured simultaneously,

Can we do better in causal quantum mechanics? Can we remove the asymmetry between position and momentum? In n dimensional configuration space Singh and I [21] were able to construct a new causal quantum mechanics in which the quantum probability densities of $n + 1$ CCS including \vec{x} and \vec{p} are simultaneously reproduced as marginals of one positive definite phase space density. The individual trajectories are given by a c -number causal Hamiltonian and hence the phase space density is constant along the trajectory (Liouville property). We also conjectured that there exist states for which it is impossible to reproduce probabilities of more than $n + 1$ CCS as marginals of a positive definite phase space density. This conjecture was proved by Auberson et al [33] using phase space Bell inequalities. In this sense the new mechanics is ‘‘maximally realistic’’. For $n = 1$, Roy and Singh [21] constructed two simple phase space densities which have this property,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(x, p, t) &= |\psi(x, t)|^2 \delta(p - \hat{p}(x, t)) \\ &= |\tilde{\psi}(p, t)|^2 \delta(x - \hat{x}(p, t)), \\ \text{if } |\psi(x, t)|^2 &= \left| \frac{\partial \hat{p}(x, t)}{\partial x} \right| |\tilde{\psi}(p, t)|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(x, p, t) &= |\langle x | \psi(t) \rangle|^2 |\langle p | \psi(t) \rangle|^2 \\ &\times \delta \left(\int_{-\infty}^p dp' |\langle p' | \psi(t) \rangle|^2 - \int_{-\infty}^{\epsilon x} dx' |\langle \epsilon x' | \psi(t) \rangle|^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $\epsilon = \pm 1$ correspond respectively to $\hat{p}(x, t)$ being non-decreasing and non-increasing functions. This phase space density corresponds to evolution of position and

momentum according to a c -number causal Hamiltonian of the form

$$H_c(x, p, t) = \frac{1}{2m} (p - A(x, t))^2 + V(x, t), \quad (23)$$

with both $A(x, t)$ and $V(x, t)$ having parts which depend on the wave function. Thus there are two quantum potentials instead of just one in the DeBB theory.

However, to reproduce quantum probabilities for another pair of canonically conjugate observables which are linear combinations of position and momentum, an analogous but different phase space density is needed. This is an example of context dependence surviving in the new causal mechanics.

In higher dimensions there is a pleasant surprise: 2^n phase space densities, each reproducing quantum probabilities of $n + 1$ CCS can be constructed. E.g. for $n = 2$, we can build four phase space densities ($\epsilon_1 = \pm 1, \epsilon_2 = \pm 1$) for each of which the quantum probability densities of three different complete commuting sets (CCS) of observables, e.g. $(X_1, X_2), (P_1, X_2), (P_1, P_2)$ is simultaneously realized as marginals. Explicitly, the positive definite phase space density

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\vec{x}, \vec{p}, t) &= |\psi(x_1, x_2, t)|^2 |\psi(p_1, x_2, t)|^2 |\psi(p_1, p_2, t)|^2 \\ &\times \delta(A_1) \delta(A_2) \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &\equiv \int_{-\infty}^{p_1} |\psi(p'_1, x_2, t)|^2 dp'_1 - \int_{-\infty}^{\epsilon_1 x_1} |\psi(\epsilon_1 x'_1, x_2, t)|^2 dx'_1, \\ A_2 &\equiv \int_{-\infty}^{p_2} |\psi(p_1, p'_2, t)|^2 dp'_2 - \int_{-\infty}^{\epsilon_2 x_2} |\psi(p_1, \epsilon_2 x'_2, t)|^2 dx'_2 \end{aligned}$$

reproduces as marginals the correct quantum probability densities $|\psi(x_1, x_2, t)|^2, |\psi(p_1, x_2, t)|^2$ and $|\psi(p_1, p_2, t)|^2$. (Note that $\psi(p_1, x_2, t)$ and $\psi(p_1, p_2, t)$ denote appropriate Fourier transforms of $\psi(x_1, x_2, t)$).

Context dependence. Replacing $\psi(p_1, x_2, t)$ by $\psi(x_1, p_2, t)$ in Eqn. 24 we obtain a **different** phase space density which reproduces quantum probability densities of $(X_1, X_2), (X_1, P_2), (P_1, P_2)$. The difference illustrates that context dependence, although less severe than in standard quantum mechanics, persists in causal quantum mechanics.


Experimental tests. This is largely unexplored. A preliminary idea is that the different experimental arrangements corresponding to realization of the different phase space densities may involve theories of approximate joint measurements of non-commuting observables [22]. E.g. for $n = 1$, suppose the system with position observable \hat{q} (with conjugate \hat{p}) interacts with an apparatus which has two commuting observables \hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2 (with conjugate operators \hat{p}_1, \hat{p}_2 with the Arthurs-Kelly interaction $H_{A-K} = K(\hat{q}\hat{p}_1 + \hat{p}\hat{p}_2)$ during time T such that $KT = 1$. Then approximate values of system position q and momentum p can be extracted from accurate observation of x_1, x_2 , obeying $\langle q - x_1 \rangle = 0, \langle p - x_2 \rangle = 0$ and

$$(\Delta x_1)^2 = (\Delta q)^2 + b^2, \quad (\Delta x_2)^2 = (\Delta p)^2 + \frac{1}{4b^2}, \quad (25)$$

where $b/\sqrt{2}$ is the initial uncertainty of apparatus variable x_1 prepared in a Gaussian state. Hence, for good approximation of both q and p distributions, we also need,

$$\Delta q \Delta p \gg 1, (\Delta p)^{-1} \ll b \ll \Delta q. \quad (26)$$

A critical test of the $R-S$ distribution with $\epsilon = 1$ against the $A-K$ distribution will be to compare the positions of the momentum peaks $p_{R-S}(q)$ and $p_{A-K}(q)$. This has been performed by Arunabha Roy [23] for the spreading free particle Gaussian wave function of the single slit case (see Fig. 4). Such tests for $n \geq 2$ might extend our



The ratio R_2 of the difference between the most probable value and expectation value of momentum in the Arthurs-Kelly joint measurement model to that in Roy-Singh causal quantum mechanics is plotted versus the ratio R_2 of the position measurement precision, b , to the position width of a Gaussian wave packet. There is excellent agreement between the two models in the relevant region of small R_2 and large uncertainty product, R_2 , being between 1 and 0.99 for $R_2 < 0.09$ and $\Delta q, \Delta p > 10$.

FIG. 4: Comparison of Arthurs-Kelly Joint measurement with Roy-Singh causal quantum-mechanics. Courtesy: A. S. Roy.

understanding of context dependence.

Relativistic extensions Extensions of the DeBB theory to Bose [18] and Fermi fields [14] exist. Such extensions for the maximally realistic causal theory are largely unexplored. The free electromagnetic field Hamiltonian is a sum of an infinite number of oscillator Hamiltonians, one for each mode. A first approach might be to apply the $n = 1$ Roy-Singh procedure to each mode separately.

6. The $n+1$ marginal theorem: phase space Bell inequalities

Quantum mechanics predicts only one of the 2^n probability densities $|\psi(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n)|^2$ in each measurement context, where each ω_i can be q_i or p_i . The 'n+1 marginal theorem'[33] asserts that at most $n + 1$ of them can be simultaneously realized as marginals of a single positive definite phase space density. It is crucial in establishing that the Roy-Singh causal mechanics is 'maximally realistic'. We illustrate the proof for $n = 2$ case. Consider a four dimensional phase space with position variables q_1, q_2 and momentum variables p_1, p_2 . Let $\{\sigma_{qq}(q_1, q_2), \sigma_{qp}(q_1, p_2), \sigma_{pq}(p_1, q_2), \sigma_{pp}(p_1, p_2)\}$ be normalized probability distributions for an arbitrary pure

quantum state $|\psi\rangle$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{qq}(q_1, q_2) &= |\langle q_1, q_2 | \psi \rangle|^2, \quad \sigma_{qp}(q_1, p_2) = |\langle q_1, p_2 | \psi \rangle|^2, \\ \sigma_{pq}(p_1, q_2) &= |\langle p_1, q_2 | \psi \rangle|^2, \quad \sigma_{pp}(p_1, p_2) = |\langle p_1, p_2 | \psi \rangle|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

or of the analogous form obtained by replacing $|\langle \xi | \psi \rangle|^2$ by $\langle \xi | \hat{\rho} | \xi \rangle$ for a state with density operator $\hat{\rho}$. Is it possible to find a non-negative and normalized phase space density $\rho(\vec{q}, \vec{p})$ of which $\sigma_{qq}, \sigma_{qp}, \sigma_{pq}, \sigma_{pp}$ are marginals? i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \int dp_1 dp_2 \rho(\vec{q}, \vec{p}) &= \sigma_{qq}(q_1, q_2), \\ \int dp_1 dq_2 \rho(\vec{q}, \vec{p}) &= \sigma_{qp}(q_1, p_2), \\ \int dq_1 dp_2 \rho(\vec{q}, \vec{p}) &= \sigma_{pq}(p_1, q_2), \\ \int dq_1 dq_2 \rho(\vec{q}, \vec{p}) &= \sigma_{pp}(p_1, p_2). \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

In $2n$ dimensional phase space, the Wigner function

$$\begin{aligned} W(\vec{q}, \vec{p}, t) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int d\vec{y} \exp(i\vec{p} \cdot \vec{y}) \\ &\langle \vec{q} - \vec{y}/2 | \psi(t) \rangle \langle \psi(t) | \vec{q} + \vec{y}/2 \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

satisfies all these marginal conditions. However, Hudson proved the theorem [17] that the only pure states with non-negative Wigner functions are those with Gaussian wave functions in \vec{q} -space. Hence, in general, the Wigner function is not a solution to the problem we posed.

Phase space Bell inequalities come to the rescue [33]. Consider the functions $r(q_1, q_2), s(q_1, p_2), t(p_1, q_2), u(p_1, p_2)$, defined by

$$\begin{aligned} r(q_1, q_2) &= \text{sgn} F_1(q_1) \text{sgn} F_2(q_2), \\ s(q_1, p_2) &= \text{sgn} F_1(q_1) \text{sgn} G_2(p_2), \\ t(p_1, q_2) &= \text{sgn} G_1(p_1) \text{sgn} F_2(q_2), \\ u(p_1, p_2) &= -\text{sgn} G_1(p_1) \text{sgn} G_2(p_2), \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where F_1, F_2, G_1, G_2 are arbitrary nonvanishing functions. Then, it is obvious that for every (q_1, q_2, p_1, p_2) .

$$r(q_1, q_2) + s(q_1, p_2) + t(p_1, q_2) + u(p_1, p_2) = \pm 2. \quad (31)$$

Suppose that a non-negative normalized phase space density $\rho(\vec{q}, \vec{p})$ satisfying the four marginal conditions (28) exists. Multiplying eq.(31) by $\rho(\vec{q}, \vec{p})$ and integrating over phase space, we deduce the phase space Bell inequalities,

$$|S| \leq 2, \quad (32)$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} S &\equiv \int dq_1 dq_2 r(q_1, q_2) \sigma_{qq}(q_1, q_2) \\ &+ \int dq_1 dp_2 s(q_1, p_2) \sigma_{qp}(q_1, p_2) \\ &+ \int dp_1 dq_2 t(p_1, q_2) \sigma_{pq}(p_1, q_2) \\ &+ \int dp_1 dp_2 u(p_1, p_2) \sigma_{pp}(p_1, p_2). \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

A long calculation establishes that the inequality (32) is maximally violated for

$$|\psi\rangle_{\pm}(q_1, q_2) = [1 \pm e^{i\pi/4} \text{sgn}(q_1) \text{sgn}(q_2)] / [2\sqrt{2}] \\ \times h_L(|q_1|) h_L(|q_2|); h_L(q) \equiv \theta(L - q) / \sqrt{(q + 1) \ln(L + 1)}, \\ F_i(q_i) = q_i, G_i(p_i) = p_i, (i = 1, 2)$$

which yields $S \rightarrow \pm 2\sqrt{2}$, for $L \rightarrow \infty$. This proves the $n + 1$ marginal theorem for $n = 2$. Generalizations of the proof to arbitrary n are also given in [33]. More general optimal wave functions for quantum optical tests have been constructed by Wenger et al [34].

7. Bell inequality violations by states with positive Wigner function

Banaszek et al [35] made the brilliant discovery, missed by Bell, that EPR-Bell non-locality depends not only on the quantum state but also on the observables measured. This work adds an essential dimension to the foundations of quantum theory. In his 1964 paper on the EPR paradox, Bell never used the original EPR state, Eq.(2), perhaps because of its non-normalizability. Curiously, he returned to it in 1986 [14]. He wrote that the EPR state has no non-locality problem, because it admits a positive definite Wigner function [16], which provides a local classical model of joint probability of position and momentum. The two mode squeezed vacuum (TMSV) state produced by non-degenerate optical parametric amplification (NOPA) is a regularized EPR state:

$$|TMSV\rangle = \exp(\zeta^* a_1 a_2 - \zeta a_1^\dagger a_2^\dagger) |0\rangle, \quad \zeta = r \exp(i\theta).$$

For $\theta = \pi$, defining quadrature operators,

$$\hat{q}_k = \frac{a_k + a_k^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}}; \quad \hat{p}_k = \frac{a_k - a_k^\dagger}{i\sqrt{2}} \quad (34)$$

$$\langle q_1, q_2 | TMSV \rangle = \pi^{-1/2} \exp(-\exp(-2r) \frac{(q_1 + q_2)^2}{4} \\ - \exp(2r) \frac{(q_1 - q_2)^2}{4}) \rightarrow_{r \rightarrow \infty} 2 \exp(-r) \delta(q_1 - q_2).$$

Being Gaussian, it has a non-negative Wigner function, and confirms Bell's claim, provided only q, p measurements are considered. However, Banaszek et al [35] showed that this EPR state, inspite of a positive Wigner function, violates Bell inequalities on correlations of phase space displaced parity operators:

$$A_i(\alpha_i) = D_i(\alpha_i) P_i D_i(\alpha_i^*), P_i = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dq_i |q_i\rangle \langle -q_i| \\ D_i(\alpha_i) = \exp(\alpha_i a_i^\dagger - \alpha_i^* a_i), \alpha_i = (q_i + ip_i) / \sqrt{2}. \quad (35)$$

Being unitary transforms of the parity operator, the $A_i(\alpha_i)$ have eigenvalues ± 1 just like the spin components used by Bell, and the standard Bell-CHSH inequalities with $a, b, a', b' \rightarrow \alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta'$ follow for the correlations $P(\alpha, \beta) = \langle A_1(\alpha) A_2(\beta) \rangle$. Using the representation of the Wigner function for n -dimensional configuration space [37] in terms of the A_i , for the TMSV state with $\theta = \pi$,

$$W(\vec{q}, \vec{p}) = (\pi\hbar)^{-2} \text{Tr} \hat{\rho} A_1(\alpha_1) A_2(\alpha_2) \\ = (\pi\hbar)^{-2} \exp\{-\cosh(2r)(q_1^2 + q_2^2 + p_1^2 + p_2^2) \\ + 2\sinh(2r)(q_1 q_2 - p_1 p_2)\}, \quad (36)$$

Banaszek et al [35] could reach quantum values upto 2.19 for the left-hand side of Eqn. (8) for special choices of phase space displacements, $r \rightarrow \infty$ in violation of local reality. Chen et al [36] confirmed their conclusion by reaching a value $2\sqrt{2}$ for the left-hand side of Eqn.(8) for the same state by using $P(a, b) = \langle \vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{a} \vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \vec{b} \rangle$, where the $\vec{\sigma}_i$ are pseudo-spin operators related to the parity operator. However, for any canonical pair, the Wigner function, when positive definite, could provide a possible joint probability distribution of operators such as $|q\rangle\langle q|, |p\rangle\langle p|$ which are diagonal in position or momentum. The parity operator fails this criterion.

I thank Vandana Nanal, Editor, Physics News for the invitation to write this article and for suggestions on improving the manuscript, I also thank G. Auberson, G. Mahoux and Virendra Singh for valuable suggestions on the manuscript.

-
- [1] E. Schrödinger, *Naturwissenschaften* **23** (1935) 807-12, 823-828, 844-849; *Proc. Cambridge philosophical society* **31** (1935) 555-563, and **32** (1936) 446-452.
[2] A. Einstein, *Philosopher Scientist*, P.A. Schilp Ed., Library of Living Philosophers, Evanston, Ill. (1949). See esp. Einstein's 'autobiographical notes' and replies by N. Bohr here and in N. Bohr, *Phys. Rev.* **48** (1935) 696. See also, reprints of related articles in *Quantum Theory and Measurement*, J. A. Wheeler and W. H. Zurek Eds., Princeton (1983).
[3] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen, *Phys. Rev.* **47**

- (1935) 777.
[4] J. S. Bell, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **38** (1966) p.447.
[5] e.g. J. Von Neumann, *Math. Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, Princeton University Press (1955), A.M. Gleason, *J. Math. & Mech.* **6**, 885 (1957); S. Kochen and E.P. Specker, *J. Math. & Mech.* **17**, 59 (1967)
[6] J. S. Bell, *Physics* **1** (1964) 195; J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **26** (1969) 880.
[7] E. P. Wigner, *Amer. Journ. Physics* **38** (1970) 1005.
[8] Stapp, *Phys. Rev.* **D3** (1971) 1303; *Nuovo Cim.* **B29**

- (1975) 270; *Found. of Phys.* **9** (1979) 1 .
- [9] B. S. Cirel'son, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **4**, 93 (1980).
- [10] N. Gisin, *Phys. Lett. A* **154** , 201 (1991); N. Gisin and A. Peres, *Phys. Lett. A* **162** , 1517 (1992).
- [11] S. M. Roy and V. Singh, *J. Phys. A, Math. Gen.* **11**,L167 (1978); A. Garg and N. D. Mermin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**,1220 (1982).
- [12] J. S. Bell, 'The theory of local beables', TH-2053-CERN (1975), reprinted in J. S. Bell, 'Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics ', Cambridge University Press (1987), p.52, and TIFR seminar (1982),transparency 13,reproduced here; *ibid.* 'Atomic cascade photons and quantum mechanical non-locality', p.105 and in 'Comments on atomic and molecular physics' **9** (1980) p.121.
- [13] J. S. Bell, in p.171 of 'Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics ', Cambridge University Press (1987).
- [14] J. S. Bell, *Physics Rep.* **137** (1986) p.49-54, and 'Beables for quantum field theory',CERN-TH 4035/84 (1984), reprinted in p. 173 , 'Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics ', Cambridge University Press (1987).
- [15] J. S. Bell, *Ann. (N.Y.) Acad. Sci.* **480**, 263 (1986)
- [16] E. Wigner, *Phys. Rev.* **40**, 749 (1932).
- [17] R. L. Hudson, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **6**, 249 (1974); F. Soto and P. Claverie, *J. Math. Physics* **24**, 97 (1983).
- [18] L. de Broglie, "Nonlinear Wave Mechanics, A Causal Interpretation", (Elsevier 1960); D. Bohm, *Phys. Rev.* **85**, 166; 180 (1952); D. Bohm and J.P. Vigier, *Phys. Rev.* **96**, 208 (1954).
- [19] T. Takabayasi, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **8**, 143 (1952).
- [20] P.R. Holland, "The Quantum Theory of Motion" (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993); D. Bohm and B.J. Hiley, "The Undivided Universe", (Routledge, London, 1993).
- [21] S.M. Roy and V. Singh, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A10**, 709 (1995); S.M. Roy and V. Singh, *Phys. Lett.* **A255**, 201 (1999)
- [22] E. Arthurs and J. L. Kelly, Jr., *Bell System Tech. J.* **44**,725 (1965); K. Husimi, *Proc. Phys. Math. Soc. Japan*, **22**,264 (1940), S. L. Braunstein, C. M. Caves and G. J. Milburn, *Phys. Rev.* **A43**,1153 (1991); S. Stenholm, *Ann. Phys.* **218**,233 (1992); P. Busch, T. Heinonen and P. Lahti, *Phys. Reports* **452**,155 (2007); E. Arthurs and M. S. Goodman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**,2447 (1988); S. Gudder, J. Haglerand W. Stulpe, *Found. Phys. Lett.* **1**(1988)287.
- [23] Arunabha S. Roy, private communication.
- [24] J. S. Bell, "Against "Measurement" ", Proceedings Erice Conference on Sixty-Two Years of Uncertainty: Historical, Philosophical and Physical Enquiries into the Foundations of Quantum Mechanics, 5-15 August 1989 , Edited by Arthur I. Miller, p.17;
- [25] A. Aspect, P. Grangier and G. Roger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **47** (1981) 460 and **49** (1982) 91; A. Aspect, J. Dalibard and G. Roger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49** (1982) 1804.
- [26] R. H. Dicke and J. P. Wittke, 'Introduction to Quantum Mechanics', p.119-121 , Addison-Wesley (1960).
- [27] J. S. Bell, "Towards an exact quantum mechanics", In Symposium :Festschrift Julian Schwinger on his 70th birthday, Singapore,World Scientific ,1989, S. D. Deser and R. Finkelstein (Eds.)
- [28] D. Bohm and Y. Aharonov, *Phys. Rev.* **108** (1957) 1070.
- [29] N. D. Mermin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65** (1990) 1838.
- [30] S. M. Roy and V. Singh, presentation at the Erice conference [24](unpublished) and *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67** (1991) 2761.
- [31] S. M. Roy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**,010402 (2005).
- [32] M. Ardehalli, *Phys. Rev. A* **46** (1992) 5375; A. V. Belinskii and D. N. Klyshko, *Phys. Usp.* **36** (1993) 653; N. Gisin and H. Bechmann-Pasquinucci, *Phys. Lett. A* **246** (1998) 1.
- [33] G. Auberson, G. Mahoux, S. M. Roy and V. Singh, *Phys. Lett. A* **300**,327(2002); *Journ. Math. Phys.* **44**,2729-2747 (2003) and **45**,4832-4854 (2004).
- [34] J.Wenger, M.Hafezi, Fr Grossshans, R. Tualle-Brouiri and P. Grangier, *Phys.Rev.A* 012105 (2003).
- [35] K. Banaszek and K. Wdkiewicz, *Phys. Rev. A* **58**, 4345(1998); Experimental confirmation:A. Kuzmich, I. A. Walmsley, and L. Mandel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85** , 1349 (2000).
- [36] Zeng-Bing Chen, Jian-Wei Pan, Guang Hou, and Yong-De Zhang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**,040406-1 (2002); Zeng-Bing Chen and Yong-De Zhang, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 044102 (2002).
- [37] A. Royer, *Phys. Rev. A* **15**, 449 1977; B.-G. Englert, *J. Phys. A* **22**, 625 1989; H. Moya-Cessa and P. L. Knight, *Phys. Rev. A* **48**, 2479 1993.