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Abstract

In this paper we provide arguments against the dominant role played by the notion of pure state within the orthodox textbook account of quantum mechanics. We will argue that the origin of this notion is intrinsically related to the widespread empirical-positivist understanding of physics according to which ‘theories describe actual observations of subjects (or agents)’. We will then show how there exists, within the notion of pure state, an inconsistent scrambling of two mutually incompatible definitions. On the one hand, a contextual (basis dependent) operational definition which attempts to provide an intuitive physical grasp in terms of the certain predictions of measurement outcomes; and on the other hand, an invariant (basis independent) purely abstract mathematical definition which has no direct physical content. We end the paper with a discussion of a possible way of out of this metaphysical-operational conundrum through following an interpretation of the Born rule in terms of the intensive quantification of physical existents.
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1 Pure States in Quantum Mechanics

The notion of pure state plays an essential role within the many debates that take place today within the orthodox literature discussing about Quantum Mechanics (QM) as well as within its most recent technical developments and applications within quantum information processing. Its role, introduced during the axiomatic formulation of the theory in the 1930s, has become increasingly dominant establishing an ontological primacy over the so called mixed states. As explained by David Mermin [21, p. 758]: “[P]eople distinguish between pure and mixed states. It is often said that a system is in a pure state if we have maximum knowledge of the system, while it is in a mixed state if our knowledge of the system is incomplete.” The explicit reference to “our knowledge” is strictly related to the well known operational definition of a pure state: ‘If a quantum system is prepared in such way that one can devise a maximal test yielding with certainty (probability = 1) a particular outcome, then it is said that the quantum system is in a pure state.’ In turn, the notion of maximal test allows to interpret a quantum observable as being an actual property —i.e., a property that will yield the answer yes when being measured [25]. It is then stated that the pure state of a quantum system is described by a unit vector in a Hilbert space which in Dirac’s notation is written as $|\psi\rangle$. 


Depending on the basis, a pure state in $\mathcal{H}$ is also represented by a, so called, superposition of states:

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum a_i |\varphi_i\rangle$$

As a consequence, depending on the choice of the basis, a pure state might also yield uncertain results. Indeterminate or potential properties pertaining to superposed states might, or might not become actualized in a future instant of time; they are uncertain properties which cannot be considered as elements of physical reality (in the EPR sense [18]) nor interpreted in terms of ignorance (see e.g., [25]). Asher Peres explains this important point in the following manner:

“According to quantum theory, we have a choice between different, mutually incompatible tests. For example, we may orient the Stern-Gerlach magnet in any direction we please. Why then is such a Stern-Gerlach test called complete? The reason can be stated as the following postulate:

**A. Statistical determinism.** If a quantum system is prepared in such a way that it certainly yields a predictable outcome in a specified maximal test, the various outcomes of any other test have definite probabilities. In particular, these probabilities do not depend on the details of the procedure used for preparing the quantum system, so that it yields a specific outcome in the given maximal test. A system prepared in such a way is said to be in a pure state.” [23] p. 66

The notion of pure state can be also extended to density operators. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a Hilbert space. A density operator $\rho$ (i.e. a positive trace class operator with trace 1) is called a state. Being positive and self-adjoint, the eigenvalues of $\rho$ are non-negative and real and it is possible to diagonalize it. Pure states are represented by rank 1 matrices matrices which in their diagonal form will be given by $(1, 0, \ldots, 0)$. In this case, $\rho$ is equal to $vv^\dagger$ for some normalized vector $v \in \mathcal{H}$. Thus, if the rank of $\rho$ is grater than 1 (or equivalently if $\text{Tr}(\rho^2) < 1$), the state is called a mixed state; or in short, a mixture. For example, the vector $\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$, $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$, gives the following density matrix:

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} |\alpha|^2 & \alpha\beta \\ \overline{\alpha\beta} & |\beta|^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

Notice that, if $\rho$ is a pure state (i.e., $\text{Tr}(\rho^2) = 1$), there always exists a basis in which the matrix can be diagonalized as:

$$\rho_{pure} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Unlike the case of pure states, mixtures cannot be represented as a unit vector, $|\psi\rangle$. Instead, mixed states are conceived as mixtures of pure states and represented as convex sums of them:

$$\rho_{mix} = \sum_i p_i \rho_i^{pure} = \sum_i p_i |\Psi_i\rangle\langle\Psi_i|$$

Thus, while pure states guarantee the existence of an observable which, if measured, will be obtained with certainty (probability equal to 1), mixed states do not. There will exist no single context of measurement (no basis) for which a mixed state will predict with certainty a yes-no answer for a specific observable. Unlike, pure states, mixtures are interpreted in terms of ignorance regarding the pure state in which the quantum system really is. As remarked by Nancy Cartwright in [3]: “The ignorance interpretation asserts that each member of the collection is in one of the pure states in the sum —it is only our ignorance which prevents us from telling the right pure state for any specific member.” Thus, contrary to the case of pure states, when considering mixed states, all observables are uncertain; they all possess a probability

---

1The reference to ‘mixtures’—as contra-posed to ‘pure states’— is extremely problematic for it erases the fundamental distinction between quantum mixture and classical mixture; a well known distinction in the specialized literature which Bernard d’Espagnat termed proper and improper (see [14] chap. 6).
which pertains to the open interval $(0, 1)$. Furthermore, unlike the indeterminate or potential properties present within quantum superpositions, mixtures restore an ignorance interpretation about pure states. As remarked by Cartwright: “The ignorance interpretation is the orthodox interpretation for mixtures, and should not be confused with the ignorance interpretation for superpositions, which has been largely abandoned.” As an example of a mixed state (i.e., $\text{Tr}(\rho^2) < 1$) we can consider the following diagonal matrix,

$$
\rho_{\text{mixed}} = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{1}{2} & 0 \\
0 & \frac{1}{2}
\end{pmatrix}
$$

This mixed state provides minimal knowledge about the pure state the quantum system is presupposed to be in. Since there is 50 percent chance we have maximal ignorance about the actual state of affairs.

This is the way in which pure states and mixtures are commonly presented within the orthodox literature. In this paper we attempt to expose the fact that there exists an essential inconsistency already present within the just mentioned definitions of ‘pure state’—which are commonly applied, depending on the context of analysis, within the specialized literature. The definition of pure state was not introduced by mere chance. In fact, this notion was essential in the application of the positivist understanding of physical theories to so called “minimal interpretation” of QM. This “minimal interpretation” presented by Paul Dirac [16] and John von Neumann [28] in the beginning of the 1930s soon became the orthodox textbook formulation of the theory of quanta. But before considering the intrinsic technical difficulties of the definition of pure state, in order to understand in depth the already rotten roots of “purity” we require some historical context to which we will now turn our attention.

2 The 20th Century Positivist Re-Foundation of Physics

In the 20th Century, due to the coming into power of positivism and its empiricist anti-metaphysical agenda, physics as a discipline was subject to a deep re-foundation. Since the ancient Greeks, physics had been always understood as a discipline which attempted to describe or express \textit{physis}—a kernel Greek concept later on translated as ‘reality’ [4]. The attempt of physicists was to capture aspects of reality through theories. Their aim was to theoretically \textit{represent} physical reality. Of course, the nature and meaning of this \textit{representation} was not unproblematic. In the 17th Century, Immanuel Kant, a physicist himself, inaugurated a critical account of \textit{representation} through which the naive idea of ‘unveiling’ \textit{reality as it is} was severely questioned. As part of the revolt against those who naively believed in the possibility of discovering \textit{reality in itself}, at the end of the 19th Century, Machian positivism begun to deconstruct the very foundation of classical mechanics itself. Ernst Mach presented a critical analysis of the notions of absolute space and time implied by Newton’s theory. His investigations led him to the conclusion that science is nothing but the systematic and synoptical recording of data of experience. In his \textit{Analysis of Sensations}, Mach concluded that primary sensations constitute the ultimate building blocks of science, inferring at the same time that scientific concepts are only admissible if they can be defined in terms of sensations. From this empiricist standpoint he argued strongly against the existence of \textit{atoms}. Metaphysical speculation—understood now as a discourse attempting to go beyond the observed phenomena—should be erased from scientific inquiry and research. The crisis produced by Mach turned physics away from (classical) metaphysical presuppositions and closer back to “common sense” human perception. The result was the coming into being of a completely new idea of physical understanding. Theories would not be regarded anymore as describing or expressing—in some way—reality. This idea was too metaphysical, too pretentious. Instead, theories had to be understood in a seemingly more modest manner, namely, as a simple ‘economy of (human) experience’.

The critical Machian attack against classical Newtonian metaphysics, played also an essential role in the development of both Relativity and the theory of quanta. But even though QM was developed taking into account 19th Century positivists anti-metaphysical ideas\footnote{Heisenberg’s matrix mechanics which made explicit use of Mach’s principle of observability is an excellent example. As} it remained anyhow strongly linked
to atomist metaphysics. This scrambling produced very soon a paradoxical entanglement between two mutually incompatible positions, namely, atomist substantivalism that maintained—in metaphysical terms—the existence of unobservable atoms, and Machian empirical-positivism which grounding itself in observed phenomena affirmed the need to eradicate all a priori metaphysical notions from physics—including of course that of ‘atom’. However, regardless of the obvious inconsistencies, very soon, the critical analysis of the Newtonian metaphysical picture was forgotten and atomist metaphysics became regarded—even by positivists—as part of our “common sense” understanding of the world.

Joining forces with positivism, after the IIWW, instrumentalism helped to replace the original foundation of physics grounded on the old metaphysical notion of physis by a more pragmatic one relative to actual observations of agents. As remarked in [22] Cartwright mentions that “[U.S.] Americans in general had little anxiety about the metaphysical implications of the quantum theory; and their attitude was entirely rational given the operationalist-pragmatist-style philosophy that a good many of them shared.” Today, the entanglement between, on the one hand, an empiricist (anti-metaphysical) instrumentalist account of physics as a discipline making exclusive reference to “common sense” observations, and on the other, a deeply rooted classical language making reference to (unobservable) microscopic particles has crated what might be called a curious “sophistic substantialism” (see for a detailed discussion [8]). This strange paradoxical conjunction finds its Archimedian point in the notion of actuality which plays a double role within the debates about the philosophical foundation of QM. Indeed, actuality has two different—not necessarily compatible—meanings and uses which have been confused and scrambled within the orthodox literature. Firstly, there is an empiricist understanding of actuality as the hic et nunc experience of an individual agent. According to Bas van Fraassen [27, p. 197], one the most prominent contemporary empiricists: “the only believe involved in accepting a scientific theory is belief that it is empirically adequate: all that is both actual and observable finds a place in some model of the theory. So far as empirical adequacy is concerned, the theory would be just as good if there existed nothing at all that was either unobservable or not actual. Acceptance of the theory does not commit us to belief in the reality of either sort of thing.” This first meaning of actuality can be resumed in the following manner:

**Definition 2.1 (Empiricist Actuality)** Actuality as making reference to hic et nunc observations of subjects (or agents).

Secondly, actuality is also—implicitly—understood in metaphysical terms as characterizing a mode of existence independent of observations. In the XVII Century, within the Newtonian mechanical description of the world, any indetermination—related in the Aristotelian scheme to the potential realm of being—was erased from the physical representation of reality. Within classical mechanics, every physical system could be described exclusively by means of its actual properties. As remarked by Dennis Dieks:

“In classical physics the most fundamental description of a physical system (a point in phase space) reflects only the actual, and nothing that is merely possible. It is true that sometimes states involving probabilities occur in classical physics: think of the probability distributions in statistical mechanics. But the occurrence of possibilities in such cases merely reflects our ignorance about what is actual. The statistical states do not correspond to features of the actual system (unlike the case of the quantum mechanical superpositions), but quantify our lack of knowledge of those actual features.” [15, p. 124]

This second understanding of actuality which can be defined without any reference whatsoever to observability is of course purely formal and metaphysical. As discussed in detail in [11], an Actual State of Affairs (ASA) can be defined as a closed system considered in terms of a set of actual (definite valued) properties which can be thought as a map from the set of properties to the \{0,1\}. Specifically, an ASA is a function $\Psi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ from the set of properties to \{0,1\} satisfying certain compatibility conditions.

---

remarked by Osnaghi et al. in [22] “During the 1920s and 1930s, the ideas which were to be identified with the ‘orthodox view’ of quantum mechanics became quite popular. The positivist flavour of the approach developed by Heisenberg, Jordan, Born and Pauli was not only in tune with the cultural climate of continental Europe between the two wars, but was also well suited to cope with the change of paradigm that atomic phenomena seemed to demand.”
We say that the property \( P \in G \) is true if \( \Psi(P) = 1 \) and \( P \in G \) is false if \( \Psi(P) = 0 \). The evolution of an ASA is formalized by the fact that the morphism \( f \) satisfies \( \Phi f = \Psi \). Diagrammatically,

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
G_{t_1} & \xrightarrow{f} & G_{t_2} \\
\Psi \downarrow & & \Phi \downarrow \\
\{0, 1\} & & \\
\end{array}
\]

Then, given that \( \Phi(f(P)) = \Psi(P) \), the truth of \( P \in G_{t_1} \) is equivalent to the truth of \( f(P) \in G_{t_2} \). This formalization comprises the idea that the properties of a system remain existent through the evolution of the system. The model allows then to claim that the truth or falsity of a property is independent of particular observations. Or in other words, binary-valuations are a formal way to capture the classical actualist (metaphysical) representation of physics according to which the properties of objects preexist to their measurement.

**Definition 2.2 (Metaphysical Actuality)** Actuality as making reference to a mode of existence defined in terms of definite binary valuedness of properties which evolve completely independently of subjects and their measurements.

Maybe the best exposure of this same scrambling also present within the orthodox understanding of QM is the definition of **Element of Physical Reality** presented in the famous 1935 paper by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen [18].

**Element of Physical Reality:** *If, without in any way disturbing a system, we can predict with certainty (i.e., with probability equal to unity) the value of a physical quantity, then there exists an element of reality corresponding to that quantity.*

As remarked by Diederik Aerts and Massimiliano Sassoli de Bianchi [11 p. 20]: “An element of reality is a state of prediction: a property of an entity that we know is actual, in the sense that, should we decide to observe it (i.e., to test its actuality), the outcome of the observation would be certainly successful.” It is in this way that the relation between observation and reality is pasted together. Reality is not anymore defined in terms of a theoretical representation, but instead in terms of “common sense” observability. It is interesting to notice that the notion of pure state in QM has an analogous role to the one played by actuality within the present widespread empirical-positivist understanding and analysis of physical theories. Just like the notion of actuality has a double reference, on the one hand to a metaphysical mode of existence and on the other to empirical observation, the notion of pure state scrambles a specific type of contextual measurement in which certainty is restored with a non-contextual mathematical purely abstract definition which lacks a direct operational reference. As we shall see in the following sections, this tension —threatening inconsistency— found within the definition(s) of ‘pure state’ is found not only at the philosophical level of analysis, it is also —maybe more importantly— already present within its formal definition itself. In order to address this problem it is of outmost importance to remind the kernel role of invariance and objectivity within the empirical testing of physical theories.

3 Physical Invariance, Objectivity and Empirical Testing

Objective physical concepts require an invariant reference which is not dependent on a specific basis. Consequently, the question regarding the invariance of operational statements becomes kernel to any consistent physical discourse. As remarked by Max Born [2]: “the idea of invariant is the clue to a rational concept of reality, not only in physics but in every aspect of the world.” In physics, it is the invariance present in the mathematical formalism of the theory which allows us to determine what is to be considered the same irrespectively of the perspective from which it is being represented. Invariants capture the objective non-contextual content of a theory by providing a consistent translation between
different reference frames. Consequently, only invariant notions can be considered independently and beyond a particular experimental situation (i.e., a context or basis). In physics, invariants are quantities having the same value for any reference frame. The transformations that allow us to consider the physical magnitudes from different frames of reference have the property of forming a group. In the case of classical mechanics we have the Galilei transformations which keep space and time apart, while in relativity theory we have the Lorentz transformations which introduce an intimate connection between space and time coordinates. Of course, restricting ourselves to physical magnitudes that remain always the same, independently of the reference frame, does not provide a dynamical picture of the world, instead such description only provides a static table of data. Obviously such description is completely uninteresting for physics, which always attempts to describe, not only how the world is but —far more importantly— how the world changes. Thus, that which matters the most for physical description is the invariant variations of physical magnitudes, that is, the dynamical magnitudes which vary but can be considered still the same (e.g., position, velocity, momentum, energy, etc.). The difference within the identity. More specifically, in physics it is not only important to consider magnitudes that vary with respect to a definite reference frame (S), but also the consistent translation that allows us to consider that same variation with respect to a different frame of reference (S'). This relation (of the values between S and S') is also provided via the transformation laws. Such transformations include not only the dynamics of the observables but also the dynamics between the different observers (see also [10]). Even though the values of physical magnitudes might also vary from one reference frame to the other —due to the dynamics between reference frames—, in both classical physics and relativity theory there is a consistent translation between the values of magnitudes of different frames secured by the transformation laws. The position of a rabbit running through a field and observed by a distant passenger of a high speed train can be translated to the position of that same rabbit now taken from the perspective of another passenger waiting on the platform of the station. The fact that the values of position, momentum, etc., can be consistently translated from one reference frame to the other allows us to assume that these physical observables bear an objective real existence completely independent of the specific choice of the reference frame pertaining to each observer. It is this consistency within translation which allows the physicist to claim that: the rabbit has a set of dynamical properties (position, a momentum, etc.) independently of any of his particular observers such as those in the train and on the platform. The important point of this aspect of invariance within physical theories is that observables of the physical system can be then regarded as independent of the observers, and consequently, as non-contextual. It is only then that we can thus claim that such properties are dynamical variations that pertain to the physical system itself. The same reasoning can be applied to coordinate transformations in the phase space $\Gamma$. If we consider a set of observables in a coordinate system, $S$, and perform a transformation of coordinates (e.g., a rotation) to a new system, $S'$, then the values of the observables will be also consistently translated from the system $S$ to the system $S'$. Such consistency, which is again secured by the transformation, is the objectivity condition which allows us to consider the observables as preexistent to the choice of the coordinate system (i.e., the mathematical representation from which we choose to describe our system). It is in this way, that mathematical invariance allows us to detach the empirical subject (i.e., the particular observer performing the experiment) from the objective theoretical representation of physical reality.

But of course, invariance is not the only required feature for physical notions which also need to provide a clear operational content which allows to test empirically if the concept is or is not the case in a given situation. The relation between a mathematical formalism, a conceptual scheme and experience is not a “self evident” given within physical theories. In fact, this interrelation is one of the most complex and subtle aspects within theory construction. Albert Einstein addressed it explicitly when developing

---

3In more general terms, as discussed in [11], it is exactly this formal aspect which allows us to talk in terms of an Actual State of Affairs (ASA) that evolves in time; i.e., a dynamical description in terms of the variation of (objective) definite valued observables (or ‘dynamical properties’) independent of the (subjective choice of the) perspective (or reference frame) from which they are being observed. Even in relativity theory, due to the Lorentz transformations, one can still consider ‘events’ as the building blocks of physical reality.
his special theory of relativity, arguing that every physical concept should be able to provide an explicit operational connection to both physical reality and experience. Something which—he also stressed—pure mathematics lacks completely.

“We cannot ask whether it is true that only one straight line goes through two points. We can only say that Euclidean geometry deals with things called ‘straight lines,’ to each of which is ascribed the property of being uniquely determined by two points situated on it. The concept ‘true’ does not tally with the assertions of pure geometry, because by the word ‘true’ we are eventually in the habit of designating always the correspondence with a ‘real’ object; geometry, however, is not concerned with the relation of the ideas involved in it to objects of experience, but only with the logical connection of these ideas among themselves.” [17, p. 2]

Pure mathematics does not need to provide a conceptual understanding of its abstract notions. In this respect, Einstein remarked the fundamental distinction between purely abstract mathematical notions and physical concepts. When discussing the concept of simultaneity he explained the following:

“The concept does not exist for the physicist until he has the possibility of discovering whether or not it is fulfilled in an actual case. We thus require a definition of simultaneity such that this definition supplies us with the method by means of which, in the present case, he can decide by experiment whether or not both the lightning strokes occurred simultaneously. As long as this requirement is not satisfied, I allow myself to be deceived as a physicist (and of course the same applies if I am not a physicist), when I imagine that I am able to attach a meaning to the statement of simultaneity. (I would ask the reader not to proceed farther until he is fully convinced on this point.)” [17, p. 26]

Thus, there must always exist within a physical theory something like an “operational methodology” which allows to connect its physical concepts and mathematical formalism with physical experience. Following this line of reasoning, in [7] we provided the following related definition of ‘meaningful operational statement’ which comprises the operational requirement of physical concepts as related to the mathematical formalism of a theory. In the context of this discussion we are now able to extend this definition:

**Meaningful Operational Statement:** Every operational statement within a theory capable of predicting the outcomes of possible measurements must be considered as meaningful with respect to the representation of physical reality provided by that theory in connection to a specific frame of reference or basis.

In order to be consistent, a physical concept must be both mathematically invariant and operationally grounded. Any physical notion must provide, not only a conceptual representation allowing to understand what is going on according to the theory, but also the conditions of its testing in a given experimental situation. Furthermore, in order to provide a meaningful objective discourse both operational and conceptual definitions must be essentially invariant. Since the democracy implied by scientific practice must allow any observer to refer to a physical concept in a consistent manner its operational content cannot depend on a preferred basis or reference frame.

### 4 The (Non-)Contextual Definition(s) of ‘Pure State’

An exposure of the tension found within the already mentioned incompatible reference to the notion of actuality is also present in QM within the definition(s) of pure state. As we mentioned above, there is a coexistence present in the literature provided by two distinct definitions. While there is an operational definition of pure state grounded on a specific context (or basis) of inquiry, there is also a non-contextual definition of purity which is provided in purely abstract mathematical terms. Let us analyze these two different definitions in some detail.

The operational (contextual) definition of pure state rests on a specific type of measurement called *maximal test*. Such a test is maximal in the case we obtain with *certainty* (probability = 1) the observable
in question: if we measure the state $|\psi\rangle$ (in its correspondent basis) we are certain that we will obtain the measurement result related to this state. This definition rests on the explicit reference to the particular basis (or context) in which the vector in Dirac’s notation can be written as a single term, namely, as $|\psi\rangle$. We say that the definition is ‘contextual’ because it makes explicit reference to only one context between the many possible ones. It is only when we arrange the experimental set up in this particular basis that we will obtain a certain (probability = 1) result. It is only the certainty within measurement which reflects the purity of a quantum system. Exactly the same actualist intuition appears in the case of density operators where the state $\rho$ is a pure state, only if there exists a basis in which the matrix can be diagonalized as:

$$\rho_{\text{pure}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

This contextual definition has the purpose to secure the existence of one observable which will be certain, and consequently actual, if measured.

**Definition 4.1 (Operational Contextual Definition of Pure State)** Given a quantum system in the state $|\psi\rangle$, there exists an experimental situation (or context) in which the test of it will yield with certainty (probability = 1) its related outcome.

In short, a state which is pure is one which provides certainty about measurement.

On the contrary, mathematical physicists—who care not so much about experimental testing of theories—apply to their reasonings a seemingly different definition of pure state. This definition makes reference to a purely abstract mathematical feature of vectors, namely, that when considered in terms of density operators their norm is 1, that is, $\rho$ is a pure state if $\text{Tr}(\rho^2) = 1$, or equivalently when $\rho = \rho^2$. This mathematical definition makes no reference whatsoever to any specific basis. It is basis independent.

**Definition 4.2 (Mathematical Non-Contextual Definition of Pure State)** An abstract vector in Hilbert space $\Psi$ without any reference to a specific basis[^5]. Or in terms of density operators, an operator $\rho$ which is a projector where $\text{Tr}(\rho^2) = 1$ or $\rho = \rho^2$.

In this case, unlike the previous definition, the notion of pure state is invariant and obviously non-contextual. As discussed in [1], in purely abstract mathematical terms we can always talk about a vector without making reference to a basis. Thus, the abstract vector $\Psi$ makes reference to the state $|\psi\rangle$, but also to any rotation $\sum a_i|\varphi_i\rangle_i$. But while the state $|\psi\rangle$ will be certain if measured, the state $\sum a_i|\varphi_i\rangle_i$ will be not. The same happens with the density operator $\rho$ which makes no reference whatsoever to any specific basis (see for discussion[^5]).

This operational-mathematical conundrum has its root in a confusion present within the specialized literature, namely, that between a mathematical equivalence and a physical one. Indeed, that which is equivalent from a mathematical perspective of analysis is not a necessarily equivalent from a physical standpoint. As we discussed above—and explicitly remarked by Einstein—, a physical concept does not exist—for the physicist—until he has the possibility of discovering whether or not it is fulfilled in an actual case. Since the operational content of a pure state is only related to certainty, and in the case of QM certain predictions are only found in one single basis, the purity of a state can be only tested within a single frame of reference (or basis). This becomes explicit through the derivation of a Corollary to the Kochen-Specker theorem in [10] which shows that there does not exist a valuation for the dynamical properties that constitute a physical system.

[^5]: A density matrix can be diagonalized, thus giving a set of eigenvalues $0 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \ldots \leq \lambda_n \leq 1$ with $\sum \lambda_i = 1$. If $\text{Tr}(\rho^2) = 1$, then $\lambda_1 = \ldots = \lambda_{n-1} = 0$ and $\lambda_n = 1$. Hence, $\text{rk}(\rho) = 1$ and then $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ and $\rho = \rho^2$. Conversely, if $\rho = \rho^2$ it has eigenvalues $0$ or $1$, but from $\sum \lambda_i = 1$ it follows $\lambda_1 = \ldots = \lambda_{n-1} = 0$ and $\lambda_n = 1$. Hence, $\text{Tr}(\rho^2) = 1$.

[^5]: Like in [12] we distinguish here between the purely abstract vector $\Psi$ and its specific representation in a basis $|\psi\rangle$. 
Dynamical Properties (VIDP) that the set of dynamical properties that constitute a physical system must be invariant under transformations of frames or coordinates. We say that the context \( A \) commutes with the context \( B \) if \( AB = BA \) for all \( A \in A \) and \( B \in B \). In particular, if \( A \) is maximal and commutes with \( B \), then \( B \subseteq A \) and any LV defined over \( A \) is defined over \( B \). We have the following result,

**Theorem 4.3** Let \( v \) be a LV defined over a maximal context \( A \) and let \( x \in \mathcal{H} \) be any vector. There exists a rotation of \( x \) where \( v \) is defined and there exists a rotation where \( v \) is not defined. In particular, valuations are not preserved under rotations.

**Proof:** see [10]. \( \square \)

The previous theorem implies that under a rotation in \( \mathcal{H} \) the valuation is lost. Even though the vector \( x \in \mathcal{H} \) is fixed, the coordinate system is fundamental in order to valuate \( x \). We must choose another valuation or else the value of \( x \) may not be defined. Consequently, we find the following Corollary to Kochen-Specker Theorem.

**Corollary 4.4** If the dimension of the Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H} \) is greater that 2, then the VIDP of a vector in \( \mathcal{H} \) is precluded.

This Corollary makes explicit the fact that the operational definition of pure state can only make sense in single basis, and consequently, cannot be regarded as an invariant definition.

In order to fix ideas, given a pure state written in the \( x \)-basis as a unit vector \( | \uparrow_x \rangle \), we know that if we measure this state in the same \( x \)-basis we will obtain with certainty a result related with this state. The probability of observing a measurement related to the state \( | \uparrow_x \rangle \), given we prepare the experimental set up in the \( x \)-basis, will be equal to unity. Of course, in this last statement it is the conditional which is of outmost importance ‘given we prepare the experimental set up in the \( x \)-basis’. However, if we consider the same unit vector now measured in the \( z \)-basis, for which we represent our state as \( c_1 | \uparrow_z \rangle + c_2 | \downarrow_z \rangle \), there will be no certainty with respect to the measurements that could be performed. Now, a simple question shows the equivocity within the definition(s) of pure state: is the state \( c_1 | \uparrow_z \rangle + c_2 | \downarrow_z \rangle \) pure or is it not? While the operational definition referring to \( | \uparrow_x \rangle \) provides maximal information, the mathematical definition of pure state which refers to any other possible decomposition of the vector (e.g., \( c_1 | \uparrow_z \rangle + c_2 | \downarrow_z \rangle \)) clearly does not. While from an operational viewpoint the state written in the \( z \)-basis does not relate to a maximal test (i.e., there is no certainty, and consequently no purity regarding the possible measurement results), from a mathematical viewpoint since it is the same unit vector, the state is considered as pure. The difficulty raises because in QM the basis (or reference frame) is linked to an operational content which is not considered from an abstract mathematical (basis-independent) perspective. Even though all states provide a meaningful probabilistic link to operational statements, within the orthodox account —through the introduction of the notion of purity—the only predictions considered as relevant are those related to probability equal to 1. This distinction however, is not addressed within the mathematical definition of purity which treats all states on equal footing.

To sum up, while the operational definition of purity has meaning in terms of certain measurements but is non-invariant (it can be only observed within a single basis referring to a single experimental situation), the mathematical definition of pure state is invariant but has no operational counterpart. Thus, depending on the choice of the definition, the concept of purity is either invariant or non-invariant, operational or purely abstract. This situation is obviously problematic for any physical theory that would attempt to provide a consistent meaning to the concepts it talks about. The notion of pure state has a double definition, on the one hand, in terms of a contextual (non-invariant) measurement, and on the other, in terms of a purely invariant (non-contextual) abstract mathematical feature of vectors. We find here a shift with no relation of continuity between the contextual “common sense” operational account and its abstract mathematical counterpart. Threatening inconsistency, pure states are used and defined in a seemingly paradoxical manner, both contextual and non-contextual, both invariant and non-invariant.
5  Restoring the Democracy of States: Intensive Valuations

In this paper we have discussed the untenability of the notion of pure state in the orthodox formalism of QM. As we argued, the definition of a physical concept cannot be both invariant and non-invariant or operational and non-operational. If purity is regarded as a property of quantum systems, from an operational standpoint of analysis —unlike the case of the rabbit which possesses all its properties independently of the reference frame from which it is being witnessed—a quantum state will reflect its purity only within a preferred basis. The purity of a state (i.e., its certainty regarding an experimental test) does not exist in all possible bases. Purity is a preferred basis non-invariant property. As we have attempted to make clear, this is a serious drawback for any consistent interpretation of a physical concept. However, we believe there is a way out of this operational-mathematical conundrum created by the artificial introduction of binary certainty within the orthodox quantum formalism.

The first thing we must acknowledge in order to advance in a consistent manner is that the reference to pure states has been introduced on metaphysical grounds, but is not essential to the orthodox formalism of the theory. The distinction introduced by this notion between projection operators in completely artificial. However, as we have discussed in [6], if certainty is extended beyond binary values and considered in intensive terms it is still possible to restore an objective invariant account of the mathematical formalism of the theory. The key for this procedure is to respect the mathematical formalism and its invariant structure given by the Born rule. As it is well known, a Corollary of the Kochen-Specker theorem [19] is that in quantum theory there is no invariance of observables when considering the binary valuations of properties pertaining to different contexts; i.e., there does not exist a Global Binary Valuation. However, as shown in [11], if we give up the restriction implied by binary certainty—which, in turn, is applied to the interpretation of the mathematical formalism through the notion of pure state—and advance towards an intensive definition of physical quantities, it is then possible to restore a Global (Intensive) Valuation for all projection operators without any inconsistencies. As mentioned above, the key which opens this possibility is the invariant character of the Born rule itself which, taken seriously, implies that the elements of physical reality described by QM are not of a binary nature. Instead, they require an intensive form of quantification. Consequently, If we finally abandon the metaphysical picture of binary-type observations (or properties), there is space to restore theoretical objectivity and the subjects (or agents) performing experiments can be regarded as completely detached from the quantum theoretical representation of physical reality (see for a detailed discussion [9, 11, 12, 13]). QM has been dogmatically constrained by particle metaphysics and binary testing. We believe that the price that we must be willing to pay for a proper understanding of the theory of quanta is the reconsideration of its conceptual reference. Something that was already remarked by Wolfgang Pauli almost one century ago:

“When the layman says ‘reality’ he usually thinks that he is speaking about something which is self-evidently known; while to me it appears to be specifically the most important and extremely difficult task of our time to work on the elaboration of a new idea of reality.” [20, p. 193]
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