Quantum theory and local causality

Gábor Hofer-Szabó

Research Centre for the Humanities, Budapest

Local causality

Bell, 1988: Local causality "is the idea that what you do has consequences only nearby, and that any consequences at a distant place will be weaker and will arrive there only after the time permitted by the velocity of light. Locality is the idea that consequences propagate continuously, that they don't leap over distances."

Local causality

Rédei, 2014: Local causality "is not a single property a physical theory can inprinciple have but an intricately interconnected web of features."

- I. What is a local physical theory?
- **II.** Bell's local causality in a local physical theory
- III. Other locality and causality concepts
 - a. Local primitive causality
 - b. Common Cause Principle
 - c. Causal Markov Condition
- IV. Bell's inequalities and "noncommutative beables"

- \mathcal{M} : globally hyperbolic spacetime
- \mathcal{K} : covering collection of bounded, globally hyperbolic regions of \mathcal{M}
- (\mathcal{K}, \subseteq) : directed poset

Discretized two dimensional Minkowski spacetime:



 A local physical theory (LPT) is an association of algebras to spacetime regions satisfying isotony and microcausality.

• Isotony: if $V_1 \subset V_2$, then $\mathcal{N}(V_1)$ is a unital subalgebra of $\mathcal{N}(V_2)$



• Microcausality: if $V_A \subset V'_B$, then $[\mathcal{N}(V_A), \mathcal{N}(V_B)] = 0$



 A local physical theory is classical (LCT) if the local algebras are commutative and quantum (LQT) if they are noncommutative.

• Examples:



• Example 1. Deterministic LCT



Local algebras:



Local algebras:

























Stochastic dynamics: with probability *p*



• Stochastic dynamics: with probability 1 - p



II. Bell's local causality

Bell, 1990: "A theory will be said to be locally causal if the probabilities attached to values of local beables in a space-time region V_A are unaltered by specification of values of local beables in a space-like separated region V_B, when what happens in the backward light cone of V_A is already sufficiently specified, for example by a full specification of local beables in a space-time region V_C."



Basic terms:

- 1. "The *beables* of the theory are those entities in it which are, at least tentatively, to be taken seriously, as corresponding to something real."
- 2. "there *are* things which **do go faster than light**. British sovereignty is the classical example. When the Queen dies in London (long may it be delayed) the Prince of Wales, lecturing on modern architecture in Australia, becomes instantaneously King."
- 3. "*Local* beables are those which are definitely associated with particular space-time regions. The electric and magnetic fields of classical electromagnetism, $\mathbf{E}(t, x)$ and $\mathbf{B}(t, x)$ are again examples."

Basic terms:

4. "It is important that region V_C completely shields off from V_A the overlap of the backward light cones of V_A and V_B ."



Basic terms:

5. "And it is important that events in V_C be **specified completely**. Otherwise the traces in region V_B of causes of events in V_A could well supplement whatever else was being used for calculating probabilities about V_A ."

Translation:

- ${\scriptstyle \bullet} \hspace{0.1 cm} \text{``local beable''} \longrightarrow \text{element of a local algebra}$
- $\hfill \label{eq:second}$ "complete specification" \longrightarrow an atomic element of a local algebra

• "shielder-off region" \longrightarrow

 $L_1: V_C \subset J_-(V_A)$ $L_2: V_A \subset V_C''$ $L_3: V_C \subset V_B''$



- Definition. A LPT is called (Bell) locally causal, if
 - for any pair of projections $A \in \mathcal{N}(V_A)$ and $B \in \mathcal{N}(V_B)$ supported in spacelike separated regions, and
 - for every locally normal and faithful state ϕ establishing a correlation between A and B, $\phi(AB) \neq \phi(A)\phi(B)$, and
 - for any spacetime region V_C satisfying L_1 L_3 , and
 - for any *atomic event* C_k in $\mathcal{N}(V_C)$:

$$\frac{\phi(C_k A B C_k)}{\phi(C_k)} = \frac{\phi(C_k A C_k)}{\phi(C_k)} \frac{\phi(C_k B C_k)}{\phi(C_k)}$$

III. Other locality and causality concepts

- a. Local primitive causality
- b. Common Cause Principle
- c. Causal Markov Condition
• Local primitive causality: $\mathcal{N}(V) = \mathcal{N}(V'')$ for any $V \in \mathcal{K}$



Proposition:

 Any atomic LPT satisfying local primitive causality is locally causal.

Reichenbach's Common Cause Principle: If there is a correlation between two events and there is no direct causal (or logical) connection between them, then there always exists a common cause of the correlation.

- Correlation: $\phi(AB) \neq \phi(A)\phi(B)$
- **Common cause:** partition $\{C_k\}_{k \in K}$ of the unit

$$\frac{\phi(C_k A B C_k)}{\phi(C_k)} = \frac{\phi(C_k A C_k)}{\phi(C_k)} \frac{\phi(C_k B C_k)}{\phi(C_k)}$$

- Correlation: $\phi(AB) \neq \phi(A)\phi(B)$
- **Common cause:** partition $\{C_k\}_{k \in K}$ of the unit

$$\frac{\phi(C_k A B C_k)}{\phi(C_k)} = \frac{\phi(C_k A C_k)}{\phi(C_k)} \frac{\phi(C_k B C_k)}{\phi(C_k)}$$

• Commuting / Noncommuting common cause: $\{C_k\}_{k\in K}$ is commuting / not commuting with A and B

Common Cause Principle:



Weak Common Cause Principle:



Local causality:



• Localization of V_C



• Localization of V_C



• Localization of V_C



Proposition:

A covering collection gives rise to a causal set.
 Any shielder-off region is a d-separating set.



IV. Bell inequalities

IV. Bell inequalities



III. Local causality and the Bell inequalities

• A nice **parallelism**:

Local causality \implies Bell inequalities Common Cause Principle \implies Bell inequalities

IV. Bell inequalities

Proposition:

- Joint common cause ⇒ Bell inequalities
- Joint common cause + commutativity => Bell inequalities

IV. Bell inequalities

Proposition:

- Local causality \Rightarrow Bell inequalities
- Local causality + commutativity => Bell inequalities

Conclusions

- Bell's notion of local causality presupposes a clear-cut framework integrating probabilistic and spatiotemporal entities. This goal can be met by introducing the notion of a LPT.
- In this general framework one can define Bell's notion of local causality and show sufficient conditions on which a LPT will be locally causal.
- There is a nice parallelism between local causality and the CCPs: Bell's inequalities cannot be derived from neither unless the LPT is classical or the common cause is commuting.

References

- J.S. Bell, Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (2004).
- J. Butterfield, "Stochastic Einstein Locality Revisited," *Brit. J. Phil. Sci.*, **58**, 805-867, (2007).
- J. Earman and G. Valente, "Relativistic causality in algebraic quantum field theory," Int. Stud. Phil. Sci., 28 (1), 1-48 (2014).
- **R**. Haag, *Local Quantum Physics*, (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1992).
- J. Henson, "Non-separability does not relieve the problem of Bell's theorem," *Found. Phys.*, 43, 1008-1038 (2013).
- G. Hofer-Szabó, M. Rédei and L. E. Szabó, The Principle of the Common Cause, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013
- G. Hofer-Szabó and P. Vecsernyés, "On the concept of Bell's local causality in local classical and quantum theory," J. Math. Phys., 56, 032303 (2015).
- G. Hofer-Szabó and P. Vecsernyés, "Quantum Theory and Local Causality," (submitted).
- **T**. Norsen, "J.S. Bell's concept of local causality," *Am. J. Phys*, **79**, 12, (2011).
- M. Rédei, "Reichenbach's Common Cause Principle and quantum field theory," *Found. Phys.*, 27, 1309-1321 (1997).
- M. Rédei and J. S. Summers, "Local primitive causality and the Common Cause Principle in quantum field theory," *Found. Phys.*, **32**, 335-355 (2002).

II. Bell's local causality in a LPT

• **Complete specification** of beables in a region $V \in \mathcal{K}$:

$$\phi(X) \mapsto \phi_{\mathcal{T}}(X) := \frac{\phi \circ \mathcal{T}}{(\phi \circ \mathcal{T})(\mathbf{1})}$$

by a completely positive map \mathcal{T} on the quasilocal observables obeying the following properties:

 \mathbf{P}_1 : the restriction of $\phi_{\mathcal{T}}$ to the local algebra $\mathcal{N}(V)$ is pure,

 $\mathbf{P}_2: B\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{1}) = \mathcal{T}(B) = \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{1})B$ hold for local observables *B* supported in *V*'.

II. Bell's local causality in a LPT

- Definition. A LPT is called (Bell) locally causal, if
 - for any pair of projections $A \in \mathcal{N}(V_A)$ and $B \in \mathcal{N}(V_B)$ supported in spacelike separated regions, and
 - for every locally normal and faithful state ϕ establishing a correlation between A and B, $\phi(AB) \neq \phi(A)\phi(B)$, and
 - ${\scriptstyle {\rm {\scriptstyle S}}}$ for any spacetime region V_C satisfying L1- L3, and
 - $\hfill \hfill \hfill$

 $\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(AB) = \phi_{\mathcal{T}}(A)\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(B).$

Local primitive causality: holds in deterministic LCTs



Local primitive causality: does not hold in stochastic
 LCTs



Local primitive causality implies local determinism: for any two states ϕ and ϕ' and $V \in \mathcal{K}$, if $\phi|_{\mathcal{N}(V)} = \phi'|_{\mathcal{N}(V)}$ then $\phi|_{\mathcal{N}(V'')} = \phi'|_{\mathcal{N}(V'')}$ $V^{\prime\prime}$ V

... which further implies stochastic Einstein locality



Remarks:

- Local primitive causality is a dependence relation.
 Local causality is an independence relation.
- Local primitive causality does not rely on the notion of state, it is exclusively a property of the net.
 Local causality does depend on the state.

Similarities:

- 1. Both local causality and the CCPs are properties of a LPT represented by a net $\{\mathcal{N}(V), V \in \mathcal{K}\}$.
- 2. The core mathematical requirement of both principles is the **screening-off condition**:

$$\frac{\phi(C_k A B C_k)}{\phi(C_k)} = \frac{\phi(C_k A C_k)}{\phi(C_k)} \frac{\phi(C_k B C_k)}{\phi(C_k)}$$

3. **Bell's inequalities** can be derived from both principles. (But see below.)

Differences:

- 1. For local causality the screening-off condition is required for **every** atomic event. For the CCPs it is required only for events of **one** partition.
- 2. For local causality the screening-off condition is required only for **atomic** events. For the CCPs one is looking for **nontrivial** common causes.
- For local causality screener-offs are localized
 'asymmetrically' in the past of V_A (or V_B). For the CCP they are localized 'symmetrically' in the joint / common past of V_A and V_B.

Stochastic LCT	Theory of causal graphs
covering collection \mathcal{K}	causal graph \mathcal{G}
spacetime regions	vertices
	arrows
	parents
	descendants
shielder-off region	d-separating set

 ${\scriptstyle \bullet} \,$ Covering collection ${\cal K}$



• Causal graph \mathcal{G}



• V_C is shielding off V_A from V_B



• C is **d-separating** A from B



A path \mathcal{P} : $A \to B \leftarrow C \leftarrow D \to E \to F$



A path \mathcal{P} : $A \to B \leftarrow C \leftarrow D \to E \to F$

Three types of vertices:

- Common effect (collider): $A \rightarrow B \leftarrow C$
- Common cause: $C \leftarrow D \rightarrow E$
- Intermediary cause: $D \to E \to F$

A path \mathcal{P} : $A \to \mathbf{B} \leftarrow C \leftarrow D \to E \to F$

Three types of vertices:

- Common effect (collider): $A \rightarrow B \leftarrow C$
- Common cause: $C \leftarrow D \rightarrow E$
- Intermediary cause: $D \to E \to F$

Idea:

- Only common causes and intermediary causes transmit causal dependence; colliders do not.
- Conditioning on non-colliders blocks, conditioning on colliders introduces causal dependence.
- A path \mathcal{P} : $A \to \mathbf{B} \leftarrow C \leftarrow D \to E \to F$
 - The causal dependence between A and B is blocked by a set S on P if there is
 - $\hfill \hfill \hfill$
 - at least one collider E such that either E or a descendant of E is not in S.
 - For example:
 - $S = \{B, C\}$ is blocking, since C is a non-collider in S
 - S' = {B} is not blocking, since there is no collider outside S and non-collider inside S'

- The two vertices are d-separated by S if causal dependence is blocked on every path connecting them.
- Denotation: $A \perp _d B \mid S$
- Bayesian networks: all probabilistic independencies are implied by the Causal Markov Condition via d-separation:

$$A \perp\!\!\!\perp_d B \mid S \implies A \perp\!\!\!\perp_p B \mid S$$

• The causal graph is faithful if

 $A \perp\!\!\!\perp_d B \mid S \quad \iff \quad A \perp\!\!\!\perp_p B \mid S$

A and B are d-separated by C:



A and B are d-separated by C':



A and B are *not* d-separated by C'':

