

# Potentiality, Entanglement and Passion-at-a-Distance<sup>†</sup>

Joy Christian

Wolfson College, University of Oxford, Oxford OX2 6UD, United Kingdom

Electronic address : joy.christian@wolfson.oxford.ac.uk

This essay is a review of *Potentiality, Entanglement and Passion-at-a-Distance: Quantum Mechanical Studies for Abner Shimony, Volume Two*; Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science, Volume 194; edited by Robert S. Cohen, Michael Horne and John Stachel (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997), xi + 268 pp., ISBN 0-7923-4453-7, Cloth £81.00.

Among our two most basic physical theories quantum mechanics enjoys a special status, thanks to its distinctive and counterintuitive characteristics such as ‘potentiality’, ‘entanglement’ and ‘non-locality’. To be sure, general relativity is its worthy rival in beauty, internal coherence and unprecedented empirical precision, but in its ability to arouse acrimonious debates over a possible *interpretation* of its formalism quantum theory stands second to none. There is, of course, no disagreement over the set of rules embedded in the quantum formalism for predicting experimental outcomes. But these rules are disconcertingly silent on how one should picture the underlying quantum *reality*. And when an attempt is made to provide such a picture, one is faced with some curious and fascinating metaphysical dilemmas never before encountered in the history of physics. The nineteen essays in *Potentiality, Entanglement and Passion-at-a-Distance* – a Festschrift dedicated to Abner Shimony, who is renowned for his pioneering contributions to the subject – cover a wide range of issues related to these dilemmas. The contributions – almost all of which are by eminent workers in the field – are not intended for the uninitiated, and require sophistication in physics well beyond the undergraduate level.

The neo-Aristotelian notion of quantum-mechanical *potentiality* as a novel metaphysical modality of nature – situated between mere logical possibility and *bona fide* actuality – was favoured by Heisenberg, and has been exuberantly endorsed by Shimony (1978, 1998). According to this notion, the quantum-mechanical statevector represents a network of potentialities governed by the well-known *linear* Schrödinger dynamics. A potentiality for a physical property is far more than a mere (objective) indefiniteness of that property, since it also includes further structure such as non-classical correlations between quantum constituents (Shimony 1998). By contrast, *actuality* – ‘emerging’ ontologically via a controlled or uncontrolled ‘act of measurement’ – embodies definiteness, resulting from a loss of quantum correlations. In terms of these notions, the quantum-mechanical measurement problem is simply an acute problem of unequivocally understanding the phenomenologically prolific *transitions* from potentialities to actualities – i.e., understanding the ubiquitous transitions between these two completely distinct metaphysical modalities.

If potentialities are as real as actualities, then can one observe a network of such potentialities? In more familiar terms: Is the quantum state observable? This is the question asked in two of the contributions to the Festschrift. Aharonov and Vaidman pose this question very differently from Busch. They introduce a variant of the notion of ‘protective measurement’ (previously introduced by them in collaboration with Anandan) to ‘observe’ the quantum state of a single system, and generalize it to Aharonov’s two-vector formulation of quantum mechanics. Busch, on the other hand, explores the issue within the general representation of observables as positive operator valued measures, and concludes that “the quantum state is not an observable [in the usual quantum-mechanical sense], but [nevertheless] not unobservable”.

---

<sup>†</sup> To appear in *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* (1999).

One of the most profound manifestations of potentiality is, of course, quantum entanglement, which entails that the quantum-mechanical ‘whole’ is profusely and quantitatively more than simply ‘the sum of its parts’. Since not all quantum-mechanical states are entangled states (some being product states), an immediate question that arises about a given quantum state is whether or not it is entangled. More precisely: “Is it algorithmically decidable whether a given quantum-mechanical state is entangled or not?” And “if not, can we effectively decide whether or not a state is within [a given Hilbert-space distance]  $\varepsilon$  of a product state?” Amusingly enough, as Myrvold reports in his contribution to the *Festschrift*, the first of these two “decision problem[s] for entanglement” was posed to Shimony by Aspect in a dream! The second problem was subsequently posed by Shimony (fully conscious!) to Myrvold, who in his contribution reaches the conclusion that the question “Is there a product state within [a given Hilbert-space distance]  $\varepsilon$  of  $\psi$ ?” is almost decidable, but not quite. That is to say, for a given Hilbert-space vector  $\psi$  and a real number  $\varepsilon$ , there is an algorithmic procedure that gives an affirmative answer to this question if there happens to be a product state (say  $\chi$ ) less than a distance  $\varepsilon$  away from  $\psi$  (i.e., if  $\|\psi - \chi\| < \varepsilon$ ), and a negative answer if all product states are further than the distance  $\varepsilon$  from  $\psi$ . However, not surprisingly (not, that is, to an expert in orthodox computability theory), the algorithm fails to terminate if the distance of the nearest product state from  $\psi$  is *exactly* equal to  $\varepsilon$ . In other words, the question whether  $\psi$  is precisely a product state (i.e., whether  $\|\psi - \chi\| = \varepsilon = 0$ ) is effectively undecidable!

In addition to this analysis by Myrvold, about a third of the contributions in the *Festschrift* are devoted to quantum entanglement and its implication of ‘non-locality’. Since the non-locality harboured within quantum entanglement seems devoid of any ‘action-at-a-distance’ (it does not lead to sending a ‘signal’ faster than light), Shimony has humourously used the expression ‘passion-at-a-distance’ to describe it: hence the appearance of this locution in the title of the *Festschrift*. At times, borrowing a political aphorism, Shimony has also referred to this curious state of affairs as ‘peaceful coexistence’ between quantum non-locality and the causal requirements of special relativity. There are some remarkable contributions in the *Festschrift* which examine this issue of ‘peaceful coexistence’. Particularly noteworthy is the analysis by Popescu and Rohrlich, who, following Shimony, raise one of the most daring questions of all: “Why is quantum mechanics what it is?” In particular: Is it possible for non-locality and causality to peacefully coexist in any other theory besides quantum mechanics? Curiously enough, by constructing some explicit models, Popescu and Rohrlich demonstrate that quantum mechanics is *not* the only theory that is hospitable to both non-locality and causality; although quantum-mechanical non-locality is certainly different in character from any non-locality that could be accommodated in the general framework of classical physics.

Of course, the historical roots of quantum non-locality can be traced back (at least) to the pioneering argument put forward by Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen (EPR) in 1935. It is then somewhat surprising, considering the purported threat of action-at-a-distance central to this argument, that so little attention is given to its special-relativistic reformulation. One reason for this neglect is perhaps the difficulties involved in translating the argument into a relativistic context. In their contribution to the *Festschrift*, Redhead and La Rivière discuss the problematics of such a translation, paying particular attention to the need for a relativistic modification of the *reality criterion* of EPR. They note that precisely in this reality criterion a blatantly nonrelativistic assumption of absolute time ordering among the measurement events occurring in the two branches of an entangled system enters the EPR argument, necessitating a modified criterion for the relativistic systems. One such relativistic reality criterion for the attribution of elements of reality that is *not* contingent on the time ordering of the actualizations of potentialities has been previously proposed by Ghirardi and Grassi. However, Redhead and La Rivière argue that the Ghirardi-Grassi criterion is

flawed by an ambiguously stated locality principle and an assumption of determinism hidden in the use of counterfactuals, undermining their claimed peaceful coexistence between quantum mechanics and special relativity. Elsewhere in the Festschrift Ghirardi provides a vigorous defence for the Ghirardi-Grassi criterion against these charges by Redhead and La Rivière. Judging from this stimulating exchange it appears, however, that a satisfactory relativistic formulation of the EPR argument is still very much an open question.

Returning to the notion of quantum-mechanical potentiality, it is worth noting that the notion not only lends metaphysical clarity to quantum mechanics, but also allows a convenient classification of different (realist) approaches to the interpretational problems infesting the theory (Shimony 1998). These approaches fall roughly into three broad categories, which – divulging my own order of preference on the matter – I propose to call: (1) regressive approaches, (2) fallacious approaches, and (3) progressive approaches.

The first among these downplay the metaphysical innovations brought about by quantum mechanics; in particular, they downplay the concepts of indefiniteness and potentiality by attempting to reduce them – by hook or by crook – to mere reflections of ignorance. A prime example of such a regressive approach which tries to undermine the conceptual revolutions brought about by quantum theory is the ‘hidden variables’ programme (including the de Broglie-Bohm theory). It remains to be seen whether any such counterrevolutionary approach is eventually successful in reducing quantum mechanics (especially relativistic quantum field theory) to a mere glorified version of (classical) statistical mechanics.

The second category of approaches – to their credit – embrace potentialities wholeheartedly, but deny actualizations of these potentialities. They acknowledge *appearances* of such actualizations, but view these appearances as purely phenomenological aspects of the world. The examples here are ‘the many-worlds interpretation’ of quantum mechanics and various decoherence theories. Such an approach takes the formalism of quantum theory too seriously, prematurely extrapolating it to *all* physical scales (from microscopic to cosmological), and thereby commits – as Whitehead would have put it – ‘the fallacy of misplaced concreteness’. Indeed, in the light of the extraordinary specialness of Planck-scale physics\*, the *a priori* extrapolation by some *seventeen* orders of magnitude (e.g., in the mass scale) required by these approaches to maintain the universality of the quantum formalism can hardly be viewed as rational.

Finally, the third category of approaches, which actually go beyond the confining formalism of quantum mechanics (e.g., a Pearle-GRW-type theory), not only recognizes the metaphysical innovations brought about by quantum mechanics, such as potentialities, but also takes the proliferation of actualities in the world to be more than a mere phenomenological experience. That is, these approaches put actuality on a par with potentiality, and take both to be equally genuine ontological attributes of the world. Unfortunately, although they make some headway towards explaining the process of the actualization of potentialities (but see below), as yet there is no empirical support for these innovative approaches. Furthermore, they face immense theoretical and conceptual difficulties. Nevertheless, since a reconciliation between quantum mechanics and general relativity – the other (often unfairly neglected) pillar of 20<sup>th</sup> century physics – is as yet beyond the

---

\* The Planck scale is indeed quite dramatically more special compared to any other better-understood scale in physics, since, near it (e.g., near the big bang or a black hole), some *evenhanded* interplay between the fundamental tenets of quantum mechanics and general relativity is undoubtedly taking place. What is more, understanding this interplay would almost certainly necessitate some radically unorthodox ideas, since the non-dynamical spacetime structure axiomatic to quantum theories is utterly anathematic to the very essence of general relativity, with its *dynamical* picture of spacetime. In the light of these facts, and because the conventional distinction between ‘microscopic’ and ‘macroscopic’ ceases to be meaningful near the Planck scale, it is rather presumptuous – if not naive – to maintain that only general relativity breaks down near this unique physical scale while quantum mechanics escapes it unscathed. For further discussion on these and related issues see (Christian 1998).

horizon, and such a reconciliation will almost certainly bring about a major revolution in notions as basic as causality and time, the proponents of this third category are more than justified in looking beyond the straitjacket of orthodox quantum theory. Indeed, the problem of the actualization of potentialities is best viewed not merely as a problem to be solved within the framework of quantum mechanics, but rather as a glorious opportunity to go beyond the confines of quantum theory in order to comply with the ineluctable demands of general relativity.

In this Volume Two of the Festschrift, there are no articles adhering to a regressive approach belonging to category (1) above; there are a few in Volume One, however. The category (2) of fallacious approaches fares better in this respect, in that there are several articles in this category; although there is no explicit adherent of ‘many-worlds’ in these articles. Refreshingly enough, however, there is at least one essay – that by Ghirardi and Weber – which explicitly advocates going beyond the bounds of quantum mechanics, *à la* the Pearle-GRW programme, and hence belongs to the category (3) of progressive approaches. Going beyond quantum mechanics is, of course, easier said than done, and the task Ghirardi and Weber set out to accomplish is far from trivial. In the Pearle-GRW programme we are asked to accept an *ad hoc* assumption: “besides the standard [quantum-mechanical] evolution, physical systems are subjected to spontaneous localizations occurring at random times and affecting their elementary constituents.” If this assumption is accepted without reservations, then we are promised the much wanted ‘holy grail’: a universal dynamics which remains valid for both micro and macro systems, is conducive to an ‘individual interpretation’ for these systems, and – most importantly – provides an “account for the emergence, at the appropriate level, of definite properties of individual physical systems”. Remarkably enough, as is now well-known, the Pearle-GRW programme does succeed in achieving the first part of this goal. Unfortunately, however, due to the infamous ‘tail problem’, the attempt miserably fails when it comes to providing a convincing account for the *ontic* emergence of definite properties.

Ghirardi and Weber mount a desperate but – at least in my view – ultimately unsuccessful attempt (as does Pearle differently in Volume One) to convince us that the ‘tail problem’ is not really a problem at all, if the Pearle-GRW model is interpreted ‘correctly’. The issue is really quite simple: their unified dynamics reduces all superposed states of a sufficiently macroscopic body, such as  $\alpha | \text{here} \rangle + \beta | \text{there} \rangle$ , to *almost* disjoint states – either  $| \text{here} \rangle$  or  $| \text{there} \rangle$ , but not quite, because the unwanted complex coefficient of such a superposition, say  $\beta$ , is – albeit extremely small ( $\beta \ll \alpha$ ) – never exactly zero, leaving a small but infinite ‘tail’ in the wrong part of the wavefunction. Although this is good enough ‘for all practical purposes’ (which is what the Ghirardi-Weber attempt of reinterpretation boils down to), from the metaphysical perspective the ‘tail’ is disastrous. For, clearly, as long as the ‘tail’ remains in either explicit or implicit form, a Pearle-GRW-type approach makes not an *iota* of improvement over the standard quantum measurement theory with respect to the metaphysical problem of the actualization of potentialities. Since no amount of reinterpretation of Pearle-GRW formalism can make the unwanted coefficients vanish, the efforts of Pearle in Volume One and that of Ghirardi and Weber in the present volume are distressingly futile, leaving Schrödinger’s Cat to remain as haunting as ever!

The ‘tails’ in the Pearle-GRW programme are but a symptom of a much deeper problem. Let us not forget that these models begin with an *ad hoc* assumption of ‘spontaneous localizations occurring at random times’. This assumption is purely phenomenologically motivated, and the authors offer little physical underpinning – if any – for this awkward process. To be sure, one comes across some quasi-physical notions in the literature such as ‘quantum fluctuations of spacetime’ offered as a physical reason behind the assumption, but in the absence of a consistent quantum theory of gravity such ill-understood (if not entirely meaningless) notions do

little to comfort one's unease with the crudeness of the process. Clearly, a more honest approach would be to view the 'tail problem' as symptomatic of a much deeper physical problem – that of understanding the *actual* physics underlying the mechanism of quantum state reduction. In this context, the Pearle-GRW approach should be contrasted with the (slightly) related proposal by Penrose (1996, Christian 1998), who at least identifies the fundamental *physical* culprit, the *raison d'être* for state reduction – namely the irreconcilable conflict between principles of superposition and general covariance, albeit as yet without a detailed theory.

That gravity should be responsible for quantum state reduction is an intriguing proposition, gaining strength from the fact that *all* attempts to reconcile gravity with the quantum formalism have failed. There are two contributions in the Festschrift which touch upon some of the acute issues faced by any attempt to 'unify' general relativity and quantum mechanics. In a thought provoking essay, Anandan highlights a parallel between Einstein's efforts to create a *relativistic* theory of gravity and the task we face of creating a '*quantum* theory of gravity'. Drawing lessons from this observation, he proposes quantum versions of the principles of equivalence and general covariance. Howard, on the other hand, after distinguishing between the two possible senses of non-locality discussed above, notices that, unlike the 'peaceful coexistence' (*à la* Shimony) between the quantum-mechanical non-locality and the causal requirements of special relativity, there is no peaceful coexistence between the event-ontologies of *general* relativity and quantum mechanics, and sketches a programme for 'quantum gravity' which could put the two theories in ontological harmony. However, he seems to be completely oblivious of Penrose's twistor programme for 'quantum gravity' (now well in its thirties), which is not only conceptually and mathematically far more sophisticated than Howard's embryonic suggestion, but also – since 'non-locality' is an intrinsic feature of the twistor space – goes a long way towards making 'peace' between the two ontologies.

Out of the nineteen contributions in the Festschrift, I have discussed but a handful, and even those only impressionistically. There is a lot to choose from. In particular, there are contributions from some of the most eminent workers in the field such as d'Espagnat, Hardy, Mermin, Mittelstaedt, Peres, Primas, Rimini, Stachel, and Stein, and it is impossible to do justice to their varied viewpoints in this limited space. Although some of the articles in the Festschrift are quite demanding – and at times rather trite – I highly recommend the collection as providing much food for thoughts on quantum dilemmas.

Finally, at the end of the Festschrift we are given a bibliography of Shimony's publications starting from 1947. The length of this bibliography is impressive enough, but what is even more impressive is the uncanny versatility of Shimony's scholarly mind. For instance, in addition to his enviable contributions in pure philosophy, philosophy of physics, theoretical physics, and experimental physics, we come across his work on philosophy of biology, sociology, several collections of his metaphysical poems and plays, and even a delightful little children's book!

## References:

- Christian, J. (1998) 'Why the Quantum Must Yield to Gravity', <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/gr-qc/9810078>. To appear in C. Callender and N. Huggett (eds), *Physics Meets Philosophy at the Planck Scale* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Penrose, R. (1996) 'On Gravity's Role in Quantum State Reduction', *General Relativity and Gravitation* **28**, 581-600.
- Shimony, A. (1978) 'Metaphysical Problems in the Foundations of Quantum Mechanics', *International Philosophical Quarterly* **18**, 3-17.
- Shimony, A. (1998) 'Philosophical and Experimental Perspectives on Quantum Physics', the 6<sup>th</sup> Vienna Circle Lecture, Institute of Vienna Circle, Vienna. Unpublished.