


QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKABLES II QUANTUM [UN]
SPEAKABLES II QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKABLES
II QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKABLES II QUANTUM [UN]
SPEAKABLES II QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKABLES II
QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKABLES II QUANTUM [UN]
SPEAKABLES II QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKABLES
II QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKABLES II QUANTUM [UN]
SPEAKABLES II QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKABLES
II QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKABLES II QUANTUM [UN]
SPEAKABLES II QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKABLES
II QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKABLES II QUANTUM [UN]
SPEAKABLES II QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKABLES
II QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKABLES II QUANTUM [UN]
SPEAKABLES II QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKABLES
II QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKABLES II QUANTUM [UN]
SPEAKABLES II QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKABLES



Reinhold Bertlmann
Anton Zeilinger (Eds.)

QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKABLES II

Half a Century of
Bell's Theorem

QUANTUM [UN] SPEAKABLE
S II QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKAB
LES II QUANTUM [UN]SPE
AKABLES II S QUANTUM [U
NISPEAKABLES II QUAN
TUM [UN] SPEAKABLES II
QUANTUM [UN] SPEAKABLE
S II QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKAB
LES II QUANTUM [UN]SPE
AKABLES II S QUANTUM [U
NISPEAKABLES II QUAN
TUM [UN] SPEAKABLES II
QUANTUM [UN] SPEAKABLE
S II QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKAB
LES II QUANTUM [UN]SPE
AKABLES II S QUANTUM [U
NISPEAKABLES II QUAN
TUM [UN] SPEAKABLES II

THE FRONTIERS COLLECTION

Series editors

Avshalom C. Elitzur

Iyar The Israel Institute for Advanced Research, 76225 Rehovot, Israel

e-mail: avshalom@iyar.org.il

Laura Mersini-Houghton

Department of Physics, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill,

NC 27599-3255, USA

e-mail: mersini@physics.unc.edu

Thanu Padmanabhan

Inter-University Centre for Astronomy and Astrophysics, 411007 Pune, India

e-mail: paddy@iucaa.in

Maximilian Schlosshauer

Department of Physics, University of Portland, Portland, OR 97203, USA

e-mail: schlossh@up.edu

Mark P. Silverman

Department of Physics, Trinity College, Hartford, CT 06106, USA

e-mail: mark.silverman@trincoll.edu

Jack A. Tuszynski

Department of Physics, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB T6G 1Z2, Canada

e-mail: jtus@phys.ualberta.ca

Rüdiger Vaas

Center for Philosophy and Foundations of Science, University of Giessen,

35394 Giessen, Germany

e-mail: ruediger.vaas@t-online.de

THE FRONTIERS COLLECTION

Series Editors

A.C. Elitzur L. Mersini-Houghton T. Padmanabhan M. Schlosshauer
M.P. Silverman J.A. Tuszynski R. Vaas

The books in this collection are devoted to challenging and open problems at the forefront of modern science, including related philosophical debates. In contrast to typical research monographs, however, they strive to present their topics in a manner accessible also to scientifically literate non-specialists wishing to gain insight into the deeper implications and fascinating questions involved. Taken as a whole, the series reflects the need for a fundamental and interdisciplinary approach to modern science. Furthermore, it is intended to encourage active scientists in all areas to ponder over important and perhaps controversial issues beyond their own speciality. Extending from quantum physics and relativity to entropy, consciousness and complex systems—the Frontiers Collection will inspire readers to push back the frontiers of their own knowledge.

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/5342>

For a full list of published titles, please see back of book or [springer.com/series/5342](http://www.springer.com/series/5342)

Reinhold Bertlmann · Anton Zeilinger
Editors

QUANTUM [UN]SPEAKABLES II

Half a Century of Bell's Theorem

 Springer

Editors

Reinhold Bertlmann
Faculty of Physics
University of Vienna
Vienna
Austria

Anton Zeilinger
Faculty of Physics, Vienna Center for
Quantum Science and Technology (VCQ)
University of Vienna
Vienna
Austria

and

Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum
Information (IQOQI)
Austrian Academy of Sciences
Vienna
Austria

ISSN 1612-3018

ISSN 2197-6619 (electronic)

THE FRONTIERS COLLECTION

ISBN 978-3-319-38985-1

ISBN 978-3-319-38987-5 (eBook)

DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-38987-5

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016947171

© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2017

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by Springer Nature

The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG Switzerland

Preface

John Stewart Bell was without doubt one of the most influential scientists of the second half of the twentieth century. His scope of the research was very broad. Starting in accelerator physics in the 1950s at Harwell and Malvern, he soon turned to particle physics. In particular, after moving to CERN in 1960, he considered particle physics as a “job” he got paid for, but he certainly was enthusiastic about doing it. Parallel to his “job”, he worked continuously on his “hobby”, the foundations of quantum mechanics, the field he is most famous for, until his untimely death on 1 October 1990.

In all these areas, Bell made outstanding contributions. Let us mention just a few.

Already Bell’s Ph.D. thesis included a fundamental paper “Time reversal in field theory”. In that work, he proved independently from Gerhart Lüders and Wolfgang Pauli the celebrated CPT theorem, a basic symmetry of Nature that leaves a physical system unchanged under the joint action of charge conjugation C , parity inversion P and time reversal T .

Bell’s most far-reaching contribution to particle physics, developed together with Roman Jackiw, was the discovery of the so-called Adler–Bell–Jackiw anomaly, which is responsible for the decay of the pion into two photons. It turned out to be the key to a deeper understanding of quantum field theory.

In accelerator physics, Bell wrote several papers, alone or in collaboration with William Walkinshaw at Harwell, mostly on how to focus a bunch of electrons or protons in a linear accelerator. At CERN, he collaborated with his wife Mary who was working in the Accelerator Research Group. Together they published several papers, for example on electron cooling in storage rings.

A particularly attractive work, in our opinion, was Bell’s combination of the Unruh effect of quantum field theory with accelerator physics. The idea was to use the polarization of accelerated electrons as a thermometer that measures the temperature of the blackbody radiation experienced by the electrons. The results, small but measurable, were published together with Jon Leinaas.

Of course, John Bell is most famous for his contributions to the foundations of quantum mechanics. This topic attracted his interest already in the late 1940s while he was a student at Queen's University Belfast, got stimulated in the 1950s by Bohm's reinterpretation of quantum mechanics and culminated in 1964 when he was on sabbatical in the USA. There, he wrote his two seminal papers. The first one (but published secondly due to a delay in the publishing journal) was "*On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics*", where he discovered that non-contextual hidden variable theories are in conflict with quantum mechanics. The second one, "*On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox*", contained the celebrated Bell inequality, or what is called Bell's theorem, stating that any local realistic theory disagrees with quantum mechanics.

Thus, the year 2014 marked the 50th anniversary of Bell's theorem, one of the most significant developments in quantum theory. For us, it was immediately clear that we had to organize some kind of celebration. Discussing this idea with our colleagues, we received such a huge and enthusiastic response that our initial intention finally resulted in the conference "*Quantum [Un]Speakables II: Half a Century of Bell's Theorem*", which took place June 18th–22nd at the University of Vienna. About 400 scientists of the quantum foundations community attended. We were also very happy and felt privileged that Mary Bell took the effort to come as a *Guest of Honour* and to speak at the opening. The major part of the contributions to the conference is collected in this book.

As is well known by now, when John Bell started to work on the foundations of quantum mechanics, there was hardly any interest in such topics. Even worse, working on foundations was not considered to be a proper topic for a physicist. The first who had the courage to carry out an experiment on Bell inequalities was John Clauser in the 1970s; he had to struggle enormously to get the resources for doing the experiment. The situation began to change after the experiments of Aspect in the 1980s. Slowly, the community began to realize that there was something essential to Bell's theorem. The third generation of Bell experiments commenced in the 1990s and has extended into the twenty-first century. It has taken advantage of new technologies, such as spontaneous parametric downconversion, which is an effective way to create entangled photons. Also, more recently, it became possible to create entanglement in other systems, such as atoms or ions in traps or superconducting devices. In such experiments, the case against local realism, the viewpoint excluded by Bell's theorem, and for quantum mechanics became stronger and stronger, and more and more loopholes for the experiments were closed.

Also in the 1990s, the field of applications of entangled states and of Bell's theorem opened up. This was signified by experiments on quantum teleportation, quantum cryptography, long-distance quantum communication and the realization of some of the basic entanglement-based concepts in quantum computation.

Today, Bell's theorem and the underlying physics of entangled states have become cornerstones of the evolving technology of quantum information. Violation of Bell's inequality has become a litmus test for the realization of quantum entanglement in the laboratory. It has become part of the common understanding that a loophole-free Bell experiment is the final and definitive demonstration that

quantum cryptography can be unconditionally secure. Also, entanglement swapping, the teleportation of an entangled state, is central for quantum repeaters, which are expected to be the backbone of a future worldwide quantum internet. Furthermore, Bell’s theorem, as a fundamental contradiction between local realism and quantum mechanics, has been extended to higher dimensions and multiparticle systems.

The number of citations of Bell inequalities over the last decades is shown in Fig. 1.

Nowadays, physicists agree that John Bell would have definitely received the Nobel Prize for his outstanding contributions to the foundations of quantum mechanics if he had lived longer. This was, for instance, expressed explicitly by Daniel Greenberger in an interview given at the conference *Quantum [Un]Speakables II* in Vienna:

Of course, people more and more appreciate John Bell’s beautiful work. He was essentially starting the field, his work was totally seminal, and if he were alive he certainly would have won the Nobel Prize!

We also want to mention that Bell was not only an outstanding scientist with a sharp and clear view of Nature, but also a man of honest character and high morals. The late Abner Shimony expressed his appreciation for Bell, which we fully share, in the following way:




Fig. 1 Number of citations of Bell’s paper according to Google Scholar (February 2016)

Fig. 2 The Belfast City Council named a street “*Bells Theorem Crescent*” in the Titanic Quarter of Belfast to honour its eminent scientist John Stewart Bell. *Photo* Joan Whitaker



His [Bell’s] passion for understanding, uncompromising honesty, simplicity of lifestyle and demeanour, dignity, courtesy, generosity to other scientists, and passion for social justice were combined into a character that was inspiring to all who had the privilege to be acquainted with him.

In 2014, the city of Belfast honoured John Bell as “*one of Northern Ireland’s most eminent scientists*”. The City Council named a street after his theorem “*Bells Theorem Crescent*” in the Titanic Quarter of Belfast, bending their rule of avoiding streets being named after individuals (see Fig. 2). Today, the Technical College, renamed Belfast Metropolitan College, that Bell attended is situated in that location. Furthermore, the Naughton Gallery at Queen’s University Belfast organized the exhibition “*Action at a distance: The life and legacy of John Stewart Bell*” combined with lectures about Bell at the university.

Finally, we would like to mention that the late Walter Thirring, Austria’s most prominent theoretical physicist, who was a member of the International Advisory Board of our conference series, in his last years developed a deep interest in Bell’s theorem and published several papers about it together with Heide Narnhofer and one of the editors (R.A.B.). When working on Bell’s ideas, Thirring said:

I have to apologize to John Bell that I recognized the significance of Bell’s theorem only so late.

Thirring's original German phrasing was:

Ich muss John Bell Abbitte leisten, dass ich erst so spät die Bedeutung von Bell's Theorem erkannt habe.

This collection of articles is based to some extent on presentations made at the conference "Quantum [Un]Speakables II" in Vienna. However, where possible, contributors have made an effort to write at a level accessible to non-specialists and have also updated and expanded their texts as necessary. We are confident that the result will be of interest to graduate students and researchers in quantum theory, specifically in the conceptual foundations of quantum mechanics. But it will be also of value to philosophers and historians of science working in this field, as well as providing stimulating reading for many scientifically literate persons from other fields.

The current volume would not exist without our editor at Springer, Angela Lahee. Her unequivocal support right from the beginning and her continuing feedback and guidance were invaluable for the making of this book.

The organization of the conference in Vienna would have been impossible without the financial support of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, the SFB Foundations and Applications of Quantum Science, the Vienna Center for Quantum Science and Technology (VCQ), the Science and Research Funding of the City of Vienna, and the University of Vienna. We are very grateful to Andrea Aglibut who managed the whole organization of the conference with great commitment and charm and thank her for supporting the editing process of the present book. We are grateful to the numerous students who helped us with the organization, in particular to Bernhard Wittmann and Robert Fickler who were responsible for the technical run. Last but not least, our thanks go to the Austrian Central Library for Physics, in particular to Gerlinde Fritz and Daniel Winkler for the video documentation and to Rudi Handl for taking a complete photographic record of the event.

Vienna, Austria

Reinhold Bertlmann
Anton Zeilinger

Contents

Part I John Stewart Bell—The Man

- 1 **Address to Participants at Quantum [Un]Speakables II.** 3
Mary Bell
- 2 **John Stewart Bell, Quantum Information and Quantum Information Theory.** 5
Andrew Whitaker
- 3 **Bell’s Universe: A Personal Recollection** 17
Reinhold Bertlmann

Part II Bell’s Theorem—Fundamental Issues

- 4 **Why QBism Is Not the Copenhagen Interpretation and What John Bell Might Have Thought of It** 83
N. David Mermin
- 5 **On the Quantum Measurement Problem.** 95
Časlav Brukner
- 6 ***Causarum Investigatio* and the Two Bell’s Theorems of John Bell.** 119
Howard M. Wiseman and Eric G. Cavalcanti
- 7 ***Whose Information? Information About What?*** 143
Jeffrey Bub
- 8 **Quantum Theory: It’s Unreal.** 155
Terence Rudolph
- 9 **The Universe Would Not Be Perfect Without Randomness: A Quantum Physicist’s Reading of Aquinas** 167
Valerio Scarani

**10 Bell’s Theorem Tells Us *Not* What Quantum Mechanics *Is*,
but What Quantum Mechanics *Is Not* 175**
Marek Żukowski

Part III Contextuality

11 The Unspeakable Why 189
Adán Cabello

12 A Reconstruction of Quantum Mechanics 201
Simon B. Kochen

Part IV Bell Inequalities—Theory

**13 A Quantum Mechanical Bound for CHSH-Type
Bell Inequalities 239**
Michael Epping, Hermann Kampermann and Dagmar Bruß

14 Bell Inequalities with Retarded Settings 261
Lucien Hardy

15 How to Avoid the Coincidence Loophole 273
Jan-Åke Larsson

**16 Bringing Bell’s Theorem Back to the Domain of Particle
Physics and Cosmology 291**
Beatrix Hiesmayr

Part V Quantum Topics

17 Black Box Quantum Mechanics 307
Antonio Acín and Miguel Navascués

**18 Quantum Measurement of Spins and Magnets,
and the Classical Limit of PR-Boxes 321**
Nicolas Gisin

**19 The Dynamical Roles Played by Mass and Proper
Time in Physics 331**
Daniel M. Greenberger

20 On Spatial Entanglement Wave Functions 339
Michael Horne

Part VI Entanglement Features

21 Analysing Multiparticle Quantum States 345
Otfried Gühne, Matthias Kleinmann and Tobias Moroder

22 Few-Body Entanglement Manipulation 365
 C. Spee, J.I. de Vicente and B. Kraus

Part VII Neutron Interferometry

23 Search for Hidden Observables in Neutron Experiments 383
 Helmut Rauch

24 What Does Quantum Theory Tell Us? A Matter-Wave Approach 393
 Yuji Hasegawa

Part VIII Bell Inequalities—Experiment

25 Nonlocality and Quantum Cakes, Revisited. 415
 Bradley G. Christensen and Paul G. Kwiat

26 An Early Long-Distance Quantum Experiment 425
 Gregor Weihs

27 Quantum Information Experiments with Free-Space Channels. 433
 Yuan Cao, Qiang Zhang, Cheng-Zhi Peng and Jian-Wei Pan

28 Bell’s Theorem, Bell Inequalities, and the “Probability Normalization Loophole” 451
 John F. Clauser

29 On Loopholes and Experiments 485
 Marissa Giustina

30 New Dimensions for Entangled Photons: The Role of Information 503
 Anton Zeilinger

Appendix 519

Contributors

Antonio Acín ICFO–Institut de Ciències Fòniques, Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, Castelldefels, Barcelona, Spain; ICREA–Institutio Catalana de Recerca i Estudis Avançats, Barcelona, Spain

Mary Bell European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN), Geneva, Switzerland

Reinhold Bertlmann Faculty of Physics, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

Dagmar Bruß Heinrich-Heine-University Düsseldorf, Düsseldorf, Germany

Časlav Brukner Vienna Center for Quantum Science and Technology (VCQ), Vienna, Austria; Institute of Quantum Optics and Quantum Information (IQOQI), Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna, Austria; Faculty of Physics, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

Jeffrey Bub Philosophy Department, Institute for Physical Science and Technology, Joint Center for Quantum Information and Computer Science, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA

Adán Cabello Departamento de Física Aplicada II, Universidad de Sevilla, Sevilla, Spain

Yuan Cao Shanghai Branch, National Laboratory for Physical Sciences at Microscale and Department of Modern Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Shanghai, China; CAS Centre for Excellence and Synergetic Innovation Centre in Quantum Information and Quantum Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui, China

Eric G. Cavalcanti School of Physics, University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

Bradley G. Christensen Department of Physics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL, USA

John F. Clauser J. F. Clauser and Associates, Walnut Creek, CA, USA

J.I. de Vicente Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

Michael Epping Heinrich-Heine-University Düsseldorf, Düsseldorf, Germany

Nicolas Gisin Group of Applied Physics, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

Marissa Giustina Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information (IQOQI), Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna, Austria; Vienna Center for Quantum Science and Technology (VCQ), Vienna, Austria; Faculty of Physics, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

Daniel M. Greenberger City College of New York (CCNY), City University of New York (CUNY), New York, NY, USA

Otfried Gühne Faculty IV for Science and Technology, University of Siegen, Siegen, Germany

Lucien Hardy Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, Waterloo, ON, Canada

Yuji Hasegawa Atominstytut, Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria

Beatrix Hiesmayr Faculty of Physics, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

Michael Horne Department of Physics and Astronomy, Stonehill College, Easton, MA, USA

Hermann Kampermann Heinrich-Heine-University Düsseldorf, Düsseldorf, Germany

Matthias Kleinmann Department of Theoretical Physics, University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, Bilbao, Spain

Simon B. Kochen Mathematics Department, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA

B. Kraus Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria

Paul G. Kwiat Department of Physics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL, USA

Jan-Åke Larsson Institutionen för systemteknik, Linköpings Universitet, Linköping, Sweden

N. David Mermin Laboratory of Atomic and Solid State Physics, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA

Tobias Moroder Faculty IV for Science and Technology, University of Siegen, Siegen, Germany

Miguel Navascués Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information (IQOQI), Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna, Austria

Jian-Wei Pan Shanghai Branch, National Laboratory for Physical Sciences at Microscale and Department of Modern Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Shanghai, China; CAS Centre for Excellence and Synergetic Innovation Centre in Quantum Information and Quantum Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui, China

Cheng-Zhi Peng Shanghai Branch, National Laboratory for Physical Sciences at Microscale and Department of Modern Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Shanghai, China; CAS Centre for Excellence and Synergetic Innovation Centre in Quantum Information and Quantum Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui, China

Helmut Rauch Atominstitut, Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria

Terence Rudolph Faculty of Natural Sciences, Imperial College London, London, UK

Valerio Scarani Centre for Quantum Technologies and Department of Physics, National University of Singapore, City Area, Singapore

C. Spee Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria

Gregor Weihs Institute for Experimental Physics, University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria

Andrew Whitaker School of Mathematics and Physics, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, UK

Howard M. Wiseman Centre for Quantum Dynamics, Griffith University, Brisbane, QLD, Australia

Anton Zeilinger Vienna Center for Quantum Science and Technology (VCQ), Vienna, Austria; Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information (IQOQI), Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna, Austria; Faculty of Physics, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

Qiang Zhang Shanghai Branch, National Laboratory for Physical Sciences at Microscale and Department of Modern Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Shanghai, China; CAS Centre for Excellence and Synergetic Innovation Centre in Quantum Information and Quantum Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui, China

Marek Żukowski Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, University of Gdansk, Gdansk, Poland

Part I
John Stewart Bell—The Man

Chapter 1

Address to Participants at Quantum [Un]Speakables II

Mary Bell

I thank everyone for coming to the meeting. J.S.B. would have been amazed to see so many people here.

I first saw John in the autumn of 1949 when he first arrived at the Theory Division of A.E.R.E. After a few months he agreed to go to Malvern where a small group (already part of A.E.R.E.) under Bill Walkinshaw was working on short electron accelerators. Later on, I joined the group. At that time, only desk calculators were available, so it was a different world from now. As you may have read, he always referred to himself as a ‘quantum engineer’. He must have become aware of a class difference between physicists and so-called engineers. Recently, I have seen a number of such references. In the book ‘Quantum Enigma’ by Bruce Rosenblum and Fred Kuttner, they express great surprise that, after graduation, John took a job involving an ‘almost engineering role’. In fact, he liked the work a lot. However, not everyone has the same attitude. Later, when we went to Stanford, we were amused at immigration. The officer didn’t think much of John’s description as a ‘theoretical physicist’, but was very impressed by mine as ‘mathematical engineer’.

Later, the Malvern group moved to Harwell to join the rest of A.E.R.E. The Theory Division had a number of groups, but we all had tea or coffee together, and it was there that John and Franz Mandl had many friendly arguments about quantum mechanics, arguments which they both enjoyed.

In 1953, he was offered a year at a University on his usual salary. In the end he chose Birmingham where Rudolf Peierls was professor. He saw a lot of the late Paul Matthews there. The first part of his thesis was the T.C.P. theorem. On his return to Harwell he joined the Nuclear Physics Group of the Theoretical Physics Division, at that time headed by the late Tony Skyrme. In 1960 we moved to CERN, as John thought that he would like to work in high-energy physics.

M. Bell (✉)

European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN), CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland

As he always said, the quantum mechanics foundations was a hobby. Most of the time he was thinking about other things. As he had a wide knowledge people often consulted him. At the end of 1963 we went for a year to Stanford. It was there that the inequality was thought out during a week-end.

There was not a lot of interest at first. Most people took the Tini Veltman attitude. As he writes in his book "Facts and Mysteries in Elementary Particle Physics", Tini asked John: "Why are you doing this? Does it make the slightest difference in the calculations such as I am doing?" To which Tini says John answered: "You are right, but are you not interested and curious about the interpretation?"

Gradually, more people began to take an interest, many of them here today. It also attracted a number of non-physicists. John always said that CERN was like a railway station with many passers-by. On one occasion when he arrived in the morning, he found his blackboard filled with questions. A stranger wished to write a paper with him. It was to consist of the questions, with the answers supplied by John.

Of course, he had many visits from well-known physicists, many of whom I am pleased to see here today.

Chapter 2

John Stewart Bell, Quantum Information and Quantum Information Theory

Andrew Whitaker

It is traditional to take virtually for granted [1, 2] that John Bell's work on the foundations of quantum theory led fairly directly to the founding of the discipline of quantum information theory, and thus it is natural to give Bell credit perhaps for the very existence of this subject.

This tradition obviously provides a massive boost to anyone, in the present or in the future, who has the task of describing Bell's importance and demonstrating his stature to non-scientists as well as to scientists. Anybody not interested in such arcane matters as determinism, locality and realism may be excited by his having provided the means of breaking codes, of running safe and efficient elections, or even of teleportation.

Of course looking at events historically there is every reason to take the influence of Bell on quantum information theory as obvious and beyond question. Many of the people involved in foundational studies moved on seamlessly to work on quantum information, though they were joined there, particularly in the study of quantum computation, by many with little genuine interest or understanding of Bell's work, and Mermin [3] has pointed out in his introduction to quantum computation how little physics is needed to work in this area.

Experimental and theoretical techniques designed for one or other of the areas of quantum foundations and quantum information theory were often capable of being adapted to be used in work on the other. For example experimental methods used in the study of quantum teleportation [4] were the basis of those used to demonstrate the existence of the GHZ states [5].

And of course it is also natural to bring up the matter of entanglement. It is surely fair to take note of Bell's importance in the full realisation of the significance of entanglement. Its importance was probably first pointed out by EPR and was stressed by Schrödinger, particularly in his famous statement that it was 'not *one*

A. Whitaker (✉)

School of Mathematics and Physics, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast BT7 1NN, UK
e-mail: a.whitaker@qub.ac.uk

but *the* characteristic feature of quantum mechanics, the one that enforces the entire departure from classical thought' [6].

Subsequently, however, it was not discussed in a substantial way until Bell used it in his important discoveries [7, 8]. Then, of course, and almost entirely as a result of his influence and his theorems, it became central in at least all the standard examples met in both quantum foundational studies and quantum information theory. It must surely be fair to give him credit for that. So we may feel quite happy in talking about Bell's major part in the development of quantum information theory. But it is still slightly different to claim that his work was its main theoretical stimulus or underpinning.

We may remember David Deutsch, who was, at least in many people's views, the genuine founder of the study of quantum computation [9]. His important insight, obvious enough in retrospect, was that, not only must there be a subject of quantum computation, with its own theoretical basis, but that, at least from a rigorous point of view, we do not have classical and quantum computation on an equal footing, any more than classical and quantum physics are on an equal footing.

Rather quantum physics and quantum computation are fundamental, and classical physics and classical computation, are again, in principle, merely good approximations, often extremely good approximations, to the quantum versions.

Thus Deutsch declared that the classical theory of computation, unchallenged for more than fifty years, was obsolete, and it was necessary to rewrite the Church-Turing argument to meet quantum-mechanical requirements [10]. (Turing, Deutsch said, had restricted his argument to paper, thinking, or at least acting as though he thought, that paper was classical, but it wasn't—it was quantum.)

Incidentally Mermin [3] has effectively made a reply to Deutsch's point about the primacy of the quantum computer. To say that a quantum computer is one that obeys the laws of quantum mechanics, he says, is a temptation to be resisted. It would imply that any laptop or even a mainframe computer is a quantum computer, and that is just not how we think of things. Rather: 'A quantum computer is one whose operation exploits certain very special transformations of its internal state'.

For the present argument, the important and obvious point is that Deutsch's argument had nothing to do with the work of Bell. Rather in terms of analysis of quantum theory it had a close, perhaps a symbiotic, relationship with one of Deutsch's other core beliefs, that in many worlds [10, 11]. For Deutsch, the existence of many worlds could be read straight off from quantum theory by any unprejudiced student, but, if that argument was questioned, he could argue that they certainly explained the possible vast speed-up of a quantum computer—the calculations were being carried out in the many worlds; this is known, of course, as *parallelism* [9, 10].

Deutsch's claim that quantum computation relies on many worlds and parallelism has been strongly criticised by Steane [12], who argues that a quantum computer requires only a single universe, and that is misleading to argue that quantum computers perform more operations than those allowed by a single universe.

Steane himself has suggested that the real source of speed-up in quantum computation is entanglement. As we have already said entanglement is indeed present, and indeed seemingly centrally important, in the examples normally

considered, so it seems to be a very natural suggestion. However various arguments have shown that quantum computation may proceed with the usual speed-up without any entanglement at all [13–15].

As well as parallelism and entanglement, the combination of superposition and interference has been suggested, but certainly does not *guarantee* any speed-up as compared to classical computation.

Another contender is contextuality, which was essentially Bell’s response [7] to the demonstration by Kochen and Specker [16] that without contextuality hidden variables could not exist. Contextuality says that measurement depends on context—the result of measuring physical quantity A depends on whether it is measured together with physical quantity B or C . Again it may be relevant for the speed-up in quantum computation in some cases [17].

Indeed every attempt to isolate ‘the’ ingredient of effective quantum computation, essential in every case, seems doomed to failure. Overall none of these factors seem to be either necessary or sufficient for quantum computational speed-up. It may, in the end, be best just to say that the power of quantum computation is a result of a fusion of every aspect of quantum theory, different elements of quantum computation relying on different aspects of quantum theory [18].

While on the question of the centrality of entanglement in quantum information theory, we will remember, of course, that one of the central methods of quantum cryptography, BB84, of course, at least in its basic form [19], does not rely at all on entanglement. Indeed it requires only the most elementary aspects of quantum theory, well-known in fact from the 1920s.

In fact when we analyse the extent to which John Bell’s work led to quantum information theory, we have two big difficulties. First, as we have seen, it is difficult or impossible to understand what the essential features of quantum information theory actually are. But secondly, over and above the actual mathematical logic of Bell’s inequalities, there are very different understandings of what the conclusions of the experiments will be, once all loopholes are removed. Some, perhaps most, believe they show that local realism is impossible [20]. Some believe that non-locality has actually been demonstrated [21, 22]. Still others just say they show that Copenhagen was right all along [23].

However first we will try to discover Bell’s actual views on the idea of information. To what extent might he have found palatable the views of those, such as Brukner and Zeilinger [24], Vedral [25], Wheeler [26], Lloyd [27], and many others, who stress the primacy of information? While those mentioned have a wide range of views, they might be summed up by saying that they regard information as the fundamental quantity in the universe, and that using this idea to derive the basic laws of physics makes clear the reason for their quantum nature.

At first sight it is unlikely that Bell would have given much support to this set of ideas, as it seems that his only comment on information comes in his famous or notorious paper *Against “measurement”*, originally presented at the Erice conference *62 years of uncertainty* in August 1989, and published in *Physics World* in August 1990 [28], sadly at about the time of Bell’s sudden death.

This paper, of course, was a diatribe against a list of words that Bell claimed were used illegitimately to ‘explain’ the results of quantum mechanical experiments. Most of the words were criticised either for implying an artificial division of the world between measuring and measured systems, with the intention of being cavalier about interactions across the divide, or alternatively for defying precise definition. Of course ‘measurement’ was, in his view, the ‘worst’, and most of the rest of the paper is used to savage various attempts to use this word to explain how the results of experiments are produced, those of Dirac [29], Landau and Lifshitz [30], Gottfried [31] and van Kampen [32].

All of the words except one—‘system’, ‘apparatus’, ‘environment’, ‘microscopic’, ‘macroscopic’, ‘reversible’, ‘irreversible’, ‘observable’ and ‘measurement’ itself clearly relate to Bell’s bugbear about conventional approaches to quantum theory—the ‘shifty split’ between apparatus and system. Bell had been suspicious of this division from his earliest days as a student of quantum theory, and had been actively hostile to it for many years, so it was scarcely surprising that all these words appeared on his hit list [33, 34].

Much more surprising was the inclusion of the word ‘information’. The only comment is: ‘Information? *Whose* information? Information about *what*?’ The inclusion of this word is indeed surprising because there is little other evidence that Bell had been particularly concerned with the use or misuse of this word, or its (possible) synonym, ‘knowledge’.

There is no doubt that these words had often been used in a way that was quite capable of annoying Bell. They were often used, by quite a variety of writers, to provide what seemed to be an easy ‘explanation’ of the conceptual problems of quantum theory, but which in fact explained nothing and avoided all the real problems.

Perhaps the simplest misunderstanding is just to assume that *all* a measurement or an experiment does is to provide information about a property of an observed system that we may regard as existing before, during and after the measurement process. There is every temptation to regard the actual system just as conventionally or classically as we wish, with all observables having precise values at all times—in a sense the measured system is not itself really part of the quantum world, which is *just* the information.

That may perhaps apply just when we gather information for the first time. Collapse of wave-function occurs when we have some prior knowledge but perform an observation or experiment to bring our knowledge up to date. Naturally our information changes. So in this approach collapse appears to be altogether a straightforward process, merely representing the alterations in our brain when we take in factual information. Collapse need not imply any change of any type in the observed system.

Of course there may be complications. It may be that we initially know the value of s_x and come to know the value of s_y . We must then recognise that our knowledge of s_x is defunct. But a knowledge or information interpretation certainly does not necessitate, but may often encourage, the belief that all properties of a system (such

as s_x and s_y) *have* precise values at all times even though our information about these values is necessarily limited.

Bell may well have seen such interpretations claiming all the conceptual gains of hidden variables without accepting any of the accompanying difficulties of such theories, the labour in their creation, or, of course, the struggle in analysing and making sense of their own properties.

While it has been said that Bell had no particular target in mind, it may be suggested that his criticism was rather obliquely on the practically universal belief that quantum theory is about the results of measurements, rather than what actually ‘exists’, and just a little less obliquely on the well-known views of John von Neumann and Eugene Wigner.

For von Neumann, [35] final collapse was in the ‘abstract ego’ or perhaps mind of the observer, not too far from talking in terms of knowledge. Bell was, of course, a great admirer of Wigner, but he did make Wigner’s idea of consciousness [36] performing the required collapse of wave-function one of his three ‘romantic’, and hence in Bell’s view ‘bad’ worlds of quantum mechanics. (The kind of interpretation that brought in the same type of stochastic terms mathematically and so in what Bell took to be a more professional or ‘unromantic’ way, and was thus a ‘good’ world became exemplified in GRW [37].) Thus Wigner may also have been in his sights in this paper.

Another suggestion is that of a paper of Cavalcanti and Wiseman [38], that studies two of Bell’s papers in which he analyses his theorem in a little more depth than when it was originally presented. These are ‘The theory of local beables’ [39] from 1976, and ‘La nouvelle cuisine’ [40], published after his death in 1990.

In these papers, having reached the general existence of non-locality, Bell asks whether this implies that ‘we’ can signal faster than light. He produces an argument showing that this is not possible, and his argument in itself is not much different from that produced by others. He divides his ‘beables’ into two classes, ‘controllables’ and ‘uncontrollables’. Controllables may send or receive signals, but uncontrollables may only receive them. What he calls an ‘exercise’ in quantum mechanics shows that a change in a controllable variable cannot result in a change in a spacelike separated region.

However his words show a lot less enthusiasm for the analysis and the very idea of signal locality. To give a proper answer to the question, he says, or in other words to discuss signal locality, actually requires at least a schematic theory of ‘what “we” can do’, or in other words ‘a fragment of a theory of human beings’. Clearly he is unhappy about the use of such anthropocentric ideas as ‘controllability’ and, in the background, ‘information’.

In the later paper he questions whether ‘no signalling faster than light’ can be an expression of the fundamental causal structure of theoretical physics, but he rejects the idea. ‘No signalling’, he says, should really be expressed as ‘We cannot signal faster than light’, which, he says, immediately provokes the question: ‘Who do we think “we” are?’

Do ‘we’ include chemists or just physicists?

Plants or just animals?

Calculators or just computers?

The ‘we’ who can ‘signal’, he says are the same ‘we’ who can manipulate ‘external fields’, and, in particular, the same ‘we’ who take ‘measurements’.

So in this paper, written at about the same time as ‘Against “measurement”’, we do seem to have reached the closest connection between ‘information’ and the other words on Bell’s banned list.

Of Bell’s questions, the first—‘Whose information?’ may have genuinely been a request for a coherent answer, one which was actually to be supplied over the next years. Probably more likely is that it was intended to be pointing out that Bell considered to be an obvious inconsistency of the idea—surely different people must have different amounts of information. As we shall see, this was not necessarily a defect of the theory.

The other question—‘Knowledge about what?’—perhaps brought out Bell’s main frustration. Information, he assumed, must be about something, in which case, why not discuss what it is actually about? In other words return the discussion to atoms, molecules, electrons and discuss, for example, how they behave at a measurement, and which if their properties may have values simultaneously. Bell may have felt that talk of information or knowledge may not have actually been wrong, but rather unhelpful; it may have failed to distinguish between things that we are prohibited from knowing by the laws of quantum theory, and those that we could know but have not bothered to find out!

In terms of the later development of quantum information theory it may be remarked that there are perhaps two different definitions of information being used. What we may call information¹ is by definition telling you about something—it has some content. Thus a parent might see their child’s scribble—it has no meaning, no information. When the parent is told that it is in fact a picture of him or her, it immediately becomes information¹. Bell, it must be assumed, was thinking of information¹. Information as in information theory, classical or quantum, is information².

Bell’s paper was regarded as a polemic, and it was not surprising that quite a few replies were sent to *Physics World*, among them letters from Gottfried [41] and van Kampen [42] defending their arguments, and from Squires [43] supporting Bell.

The most interesting was from Peierls [44], which managed to include, in a totally non-contrived manner, both of Bell’s targets, measurement *and* information. Peierls was a great admirer of Bell. He had given Bell his first chance to enter genuinely mainstream physics by advocating his move at Harwell to a division devoted to tackling such problems as quantum field theory and particle physics [34], and, for the rest of Bell’s career, Peierls had probably been split between admiration of his mathematical ability and his honesty, and horror at his constant attacks on the conventional interpretations of quantum theory [45]. A conspiracy theorist might think that Bell had deliberately included the attack on ‘information’ to allow Peierls to give full rein to his beliefs.

Peierls regarded himself as a complete believer in Bohr's views, to the extent that he rejected the term 'Copenhagen interpretation'. For him, using this term implied that there were several interpretations of quantum theory, of which Copenhagen was just one. For Peierls, there was only one interpretation, so if you say 'Copenhagen interpretation' you really mean 'quantum mechanics' [46].

Yet Peierls' reply to Bell, titled 'In defence of "measurement"', seemed to be very different from what would come from the mouth of Bohr or Heisenberg, being, as stated above, in terms of knowledge, indeed very much along the lines sketched above in a rather cavalier way but with care taken to avoid the obvious problems. In our previous terms, Peierls' knowledge was presumably still information¹.

If our knowledge is complete, by which Peierls meant the greatest that could be allowed by the laws of quantum theory, in particular the uncertainty principle, we may represent this knowledge with a wave-function. However for less knowledge we must use a density-matrix. Uncontrolled disturbances may reduce our knowledge. Measurement may increase it. If we start with the wave-function case and gain new information, some of the previous information must be lost, and so on.

When there is a change of knowledge, Peierls says that the density-matrix must obviously change, but this is not a physical process so we should certainly not expect the change to follow the Schrödinger equation. This argument does indeed seem an excellent way of giving some explanation of von Neumann's poser of the contrast between type 2 processes, processes outside of measurement, which follow the Schrödinger equation, and type 1 processes, measurements, which follow completely different dynamics such as collapse.

On the first of Bell's questions—whose information?—rather than regarding the question as a means of ridiculing the whole idea, Peierls produced an intelligent and convincing answer. His basic point is that the knowledge of different observers must not contradict each other. Contradiction would occur if one observer 'knew' that s_z was $+1/2$, while another 'knew' that it was $-1/2$, but it would also occur if one 'knew' that s_z was $+1/2$ while another 'knew' that s_y was $+1/2$. Mermin [47] says that Peierls uses two conditions. A strong one is that the density-matrices of the two observers must commute, while a weaker one is just that the product of the two density-matrices must not be zero.

Mermin also points out that Peierls does not answer Bell's other question—information about what? He may have felt that the whole point of the Bohr approach was that one need not, could not and should not answer it. It might be surmised, though, that if an observer *knows* that s_z is $+1/2$, then even an orthodox interpretation would admit that there is a system with s_z equal to $+1/2$. It would probably prefer, though, not to comment on the values of s_y or s_x .

Mermin reports that he was initially on Bell's side in his clash with Peierls, but his view was changed by sustained interaction with those involved in quantum computation, who were convinced that quantum theory was 'self-evidently and unproblematically' a theory of information. In our previous terms, this is, of course, information².

Like Peierls, Mermin was keen to answer the question—Whose information? By demonstrating a subtlety of entanglement, he was able to demonstrate a weakness in Peierls’ strong condition and to suggest improvements, thus again demonstrating that, if Bell thought the question showed up the weakness of the whole position, he was definitely wide of the mark.

However Mermin rejected altogether Bell’s other question—Information about what? He described this as a fundamentally metaphysical question and considered that it should not distract ‘tough-minded physicists’. It is not possible, he says, to discover whether information is about something objective or just about other information, and one certainly should not waste time trying to do so. Of course this is information².

And of course once one recognises the primacy of information, the whole argument from the quantum to information may be reversed. Rather one argues from information to the physical Universe. For Brukner and Zeilinger [24], the obvious quantisation of information is the cause of the quantisation we see in the Universe. For Vedral [25], information is the only entity on which we may base our most fundamental theories; for example evolution is *purely* the inheritance of information with occasional changes of the basic units, the genes. For Wheeler [26] too, the concept of information may unlock some of the most basic mysteries of the Universe. For Lloyd [27], the Universe is just a quantum computer, and what it computes is just its own behaviour. Smolin [48] believed that quantum information is a possible alternative to string theory as an attempt to solve the most basic problems of physics. And so on.

Now let us return to Bell. It must seem bizarre to allocate credit to him for this development, when his only contribution consisted of seven words, of which four were the same—‘information’, and also when he seemed to end up on the wrong side of the argument. Yet it may also be said that Bell did not believe in wasting words. He took an issue that had maybe been under the radar for half a century, challenged some basic assumptions, and asked precisely the telling questions, the questions that would take others so far, even if they took them to regions which would have surprised him.

I now want to go back to the beginning of quantum computation and the work of Richard Feynman. If you take the founder of quantum computation as David Deutsch, as I have done, it is natural, following Brown [49], to think of Feynman’s earlier work as rather analogous to ‘the old quantum theory’, the period between 1900 and 1925 when many important results were obtained but without any rigorous foundation to the work.

Feynman published two important papers, the first, a conference paper from 1981, published in 1982 under the title ‘Simulating physics with computers’ [50], and the second, ‘Quantum mechanical computers’ [51], published in 1985.

In the first he asks a number of important questions about simulations. In each case the simulation must be exact, and the computational work required must increase only in proportion to the size of the system being studied, not exponentially.

First he shows that a classical system may simulate a classical system, but it cannot simulate a quantum system. He then asks if it can simulate the quantum system probabilistically. The answer is again—no, but in this case Feynman has to provide a detailed argument. He examines in some detail an EPR system, and calculates the probabilities all the way through. Everything works out well—with the exception that some probabilities used in the course of the analysis, not in the answers, have to be negative. Feynman now demonstrates why negative probabilities cannot be avoided, and he effectively works through a proof of Bell's theorem.

Tony Hey, who has edited both Feynman's own work in this area (with Robin Allen) [52], and also more recent papers by his collaborators [53], comments [53] that 'Only Feynman could discuss "hidden variables", the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox and produce a proof of Bell's Theorem, without mentioning John Bell!'

Hey appears to assume that Feynman had encountered Bell's work, but had perhaps forgotten the name of the originator and worked through the analysis himself.

It must be said that Feynman did have form for this kind of sloppiness. Most significantly, in 1957 George Sudarshan, as a research student being supervised by Robert Marshak, had demonstrated in great detail that the structure of the weak interaction was of a V-A type (vector minus axial vector). However Feynman and Murray Gell-Mann were privately informed of this result and thought about the matter themselves, but forgetting their source of information, published the result in their own names and gained priority over Sudarshan and Marshak. Feynman did write later that: 'The V-A theory was discovered by Sudarshan and Marshak, and published by Feynman and Gell-Mann.' [54–56].

But it is, of course, quite possible that Feynman did produce the Bell-type analysis independently of Bell. Gottfried and Mermin [57] do say that the actual analysis is 'extraordinarily elementary'. Presumably it is having the motivation to think about the matters that is requires a special intellect [57, 58], and Bell and Feynman would both come into that category.

It may be stressed then that for Feynman it is Bell's theorem that makes going beyond classical computers inevitable, and he discusses very briefly the possibility of quantum computers or 'universal quantum simulators'.

However more interestingly he remarks that he often has fun trying to squeeze the difficulty of quantum mechanics into a smaller and smaller place—to isolate the essential difficulty, so as to give the possibility of analysing it in detail. He feels that he has located it in the contrast between two numbers—one required by quantum theory, the other the demand of classical theory—a direct result of a Bell type of analysis.

Thus the significance of Bell's work, according to Feynman, can scarcely be over-exaggerated. It is the core element of quantum theory!

Let us briefly turn to Quantum Key Distribution (QKD). It is well-known that Nicolas Gisin, Antonio Acín and co-workers have produced much detailed analysis of the part that the Bell Inequalities play in many aspects and many variants of QKD.

Here I just want to pick up on one important point that they make [59]. It would perhaps normally be said that QKD relies on the fact that, if Alice and Bob are sufficiently entangled, then Eve is effectively factorised out. Yet it could be the case that Alice and Bob share a space of higher dimension that is separable, and thus the method for QKD becomes insecure. This is easily shown to be the case for BB84.

Usual proofs of the security of QKD rely on entanglement theory, and thus they assume that Alice and Bob share knowledge of the fixed dimension of the Hilbert space of their system. If this assumption, which is in fact rather arbitrary, cannot be made, QKD must involve the violation of some Bell inequality. Thus yet again we see the crucial role played by Bell's theorem.

We are seeing that, while quantum theory is obviously different from classical theory in many ways, in many cases at least the core of the difference or the essential discrimination is just Bell's inequality or a result of Bell's inequality.

We may think of Holland's comment [60] in his book on Bohmian mechanics. He was answering a complaint that Bohm theory was trying to restore classicality to quantum theory. His reply was that Bohm theory fully recognised the great differences between quantum and classical theory. In fact, he said, it gave a possibility of discussing classical and quantum mechanics in the same language, but not of reducing one to the other. But it might be said that the task could not be a total success, precisely because of non-locality, or in other words yet again a result of Bell's theorem.

We might well contemplate adjusting Schrödinger's comment mentioned at the beginning of this discussion to obtain the rather striking statement that it is not (just) entanglement but actually Bell's theorem and its implications that are 'not one but the characteristic trait of quantum mechanics, the one that enforces the entire departure from classical thought.'

References

1. R.A. Bertlmann, A. Zeilinger (eds.), *Quantum [Un]speakables: From Bell to Quantum Information* (Springer, Berlin, 2002)
2. A. Whitaker, *The New Quantum Age: From Bell's Theorem to Quantum Computation and Teleportation* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2012)
3. N.D. Mermin, *Quantum Computer Science: An Introduction* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007)
4. D. Bouwmeester, J.-W. Pan, K. Mattle, M. Eibl, H. Weinfurter and A. Zeilinger, experimental quantum teleportation. *Nature* **390**, 575 (1997)
5. D. Bouwmeester, J.-W. Pan, M. Daniell, H. Weinfurter, A. Zeilinger, Observation of three-photon Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger entanglement. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 1345 (1999)
6. E. Schrödinger, Die gegenwärtige Situation in der Quantenmechanik. *Naturwissenschaften* **23**, 807, 823, 844 (1935); translated by J.D. Trimmer as The present situation in quantum mechanics, in *Quantum Theory and Measurement*, ed. by J.A. Wheeler, W.H. Zurek (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1983), p. 152
7. J.S. Bell, On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **38**, 447 (1966)

8. J.S. Bell, On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964)
9. D. Deutsch, Quantum theory, the Church-Turing principle and the universal quantum computer. *Proc. R. Soc. A* **400**, 97 (1985)
10. D. Deutsch, *The Fabric of Reality* (Allen Lane, London, 1997)
11. D. Deutsch, Quantum theory as a universal physical theory. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **24**, 1 (1985)
12. A.M. Steane, A quantum computer only needs one universe. *Stud. History Philos. Modern Phys.* **34**, 469 (2003)
13. R. Jozsa, N. Linden, On the role of entanglement in quantum computational speed-up. *Proc. R. Soc. A* **459**, 2011 (2003)
14. B.P. Lanyon, M. Barbieri, M.P. Almeida, A.G. White, Experimental quantum computing without entanglement. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 20051 (2008)
15. M. Van den Nest, Universal quantum computation with little entanglement. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 060504 (2013)
16. S. Kochen, E.P. Specker, The problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics. *J. Math. and Mech.* **17**, 59 (1967)
17. M. Howard, J. Wallman, V. Veitch, J. Emerson, Contextuality supplies the ‘magic’ for a quantum computation. *Nature* **510**, 351 (2014)
18. P. Ball, Questioning quantum speed. *Phys. World* **27**(1), 38 (2014)
19. C.H. Bennett and G. Brassard, Quantum cryptography: public-key distribution and coin tossing, in *Proceedings of 1984 IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing* (IEEE, New York, 1984), pp. 175–179
20. T. Scheidl, R. Ursin, J. Kofler, S. Ramelow, X.-S. Ma, T. Herbst, L. Ratschbacher, A. Fedrizzi, N.K. Langford, T. Jennewein, A. Zeilinger, Violation of local realism with freedom of choice. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **107**, 19708 (2010)
21. T. Norsen, Against ‘realism’. *Found. Phys.* **37**, 311 (2007)
22. N. Gisin, Non-realism: deep thought or a soft option? *Found. Phys.* **42**, 80 (2012)
23. J. Hebor, *The Standard Conception as Genuine Quantum Realism* (University Press of Southern Denmark, Odense, 2005)
24. Č. Brukner and A. Zeilinger, Quantum physics as physics of information, in *Quo Vadis Quantum Mechanics?*, ed. by A. Elitzur, S. Dolev, N. Kolenda (Berlin, Springer, 2005)
25. V. Vedral, *Decoding Reality: The Universe as Quantum Information* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010)
26. J.A. Wheeler, *Geons, Black Holes and Quantum Foam: A Life in Physics* (Norton, New York, 1998)
27. S. Lloyd, *Programming the Universe: A Quantum Computer Scientist Takes on the Cosmos* (Knopf, New York, 2006)
28. J.S. Bell, Against ‘measurement’. *Phys. World* **3**(8), 33 (1990)
29. P.A.M. Dirac, *Quantum Mechanics*, 4th edn. (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1948)
30. L.D. Landau, E.M. Lifshitz, *Quantum Mechanics*, 3rd edn. (Pergamon, Oxford, 1977)
31. K. Gottfried, *Quantum Mechanics* (Benjamin, New York, 1966)
32. N.G. van Kampen, Ten theorems about quantum mechanical measurements. *Phys. A* **153**, 97 (1988)
33. J. Bernstein, *Quantum Profiles* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1991)
34. A. Whitaker, *John Stewart Bell and Twentieth-Century Physics: Vision and Integrity* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2016)
35. J. von Neumann, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1955)
36. E. Wigner, Remarks on the mind-body problem, in *The Scientist Speculates*, ed. by I.J. Good (Heinemann, London, 1961), pp. 284–302
37. G.-C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini, T. Weber, Unified dynamics for microscopic and macroscopic systems. *Phys. Rev. D* **34**, 470 (1986)
38. E.G. Cavalcanti, H.M. Wiseman, Bell nonlocality, signal locality and unpredictability (or what Bohr could have told Einstein at Solvay had he known about Bell experiments). *Found. Phys.* **42**, 1329 (2012)