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It is argued that the three main quantum interpretations, Copenhagen, de Broglie-Bohm, and Many-Worlds, support the Principle Q (Quantum): Not all what matters for physical phenomena is contained in space-time. This principle underpins Born’s rule as well. So Principle Q may be the best way to defining Quantum “from more fundamental principles”.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The beginning of Quantum is marked by interference experiments with single particles: Double-Slit is paramount. For the sake of our discussion it is convenient to refer to a variant of this experiment using a Mach-Zehnder interferometer as sketched in Fig.1. The output ports of the second beam-splitter BS1 (the output ports of the interferometer) are monitored by corresponding detectors D(0) and D(1): If the outcome (i.e.: which of the two detectors counts) were determined before detection by the path the particle travels, then half of the time D(0) should count and half of the time D(1), and the interference pattern would disappear, what is not the case.

The experiment shows that with sufficiently weak intensity of light, only one of the two detectors clicks: either D(0) or D(1) (photoelectric effect). Nevertheless, for calculating the counting rates of each detector one must take into account information about the two paths leading from the laser source to the detector (interference effect): The counting rate depends sinusoidally on the optical path-length difference.

The whole “weirdness” of Quantum is contained in this result:

It is this result and similar ones that led the founding fathers to the insight that in quantum experiments the outcomes are not determined before detection. This is the basis of the “Bell theorem” proving that quantum experiments violate criteria of local causality (Bell’s inequalities) [1], and “Kochen and Specker theorem” proving that measurements on quantum systems are contextual (depend on what the experimenter decides to measure) [2].

And it is also worth mentioning that this result defines also the qubit. The pioneer quantum technologies, cryptography (BB84-protocol) and computing (Deutsch-algorithm), have been discovered and first technologically implemented using single qubit interference.

 Nonetheless, although one easily accepts “Bell’s nonlocality” (violation of Bell’s inequalities by space-like separated measurements) and “KS contextuality” as signatures of Quantum, one continues to wonder about what is properly Quantum in single-particle interference, or ask why the qubit is Quantum.

There is some irony in this: Demonstrating Bell’s nonlocality involves space-like multipartite systems, and hence does not apply to Hilbert spaces with prime dimension: plays a decisive role in 2 qubits systems correspond
ing to “four state systems” or Hilbert spaces with \( d = 4 \),
but has no significance in single particle spin 3/2 systems,
which also correspond to Hilbert spaces with \( d = 4 \). And
contextuality is certainly more general than Bell nonlo-
cality, since it is holds for any system with a number of
systems equal or larger than 3 (Hilbert space with \( d > 2 \)),
however it does not characterize single-particle interference
experiments (Fig.1), and in particular the qubit.

On the other hand one may wonder why a so success-
ful theory like quantum physics bears different interpre-
tations whose advocates like to present them as strongly
opposite to each other. As it has been pointed out, a
good theory should need no interpretation [3] [4].

In this letter we will comparatively discuss the three
main interpretations Copenhagen, de Broglie-Bohm, and
Many-Worlds in the light of the following two principles:

- **Principle A (Accessibility):** All that is in space-
time is accessible to observation (except in case of
space-like separation).

- **Principle Q (Quantum):** Not all what matters for
physical phenomena is contained in space-time.

We argue that Principle A should be acknowledged by
any sound experimental science. On this basis we show
that Principle Q is somewhat hidden in all the three
interpretations: These are not that divergent from each
other, but rather different ways of stating the same
Principle Q. Additionally this Principle Q characterises
already two-state experiments like that in Fig.1. The qubit
is the cornerstone of Quantum, and having it does not
require systems with more than 2 states (Hilbert space
\( d > 2 \)). So we conclude proposing to found Quantum on
Principle Q.

In searching for “more fundamental principles” behind
quantum formalism Max Born provides a useful compass:
“[it] is a philosophical question for which physical argu-
ments alone are not decisive.” [5]

## II. Copenhagen

Single particle interference led to the Copenhagen (“or-
thodox”) interpretation, which considers crucial the mo-
moment of detection and postulates a so called “wavefunc-
tion collapse”. This rather cryptical name conflates two
different assumptions:

a) The decision of the outcome (which of the two de-
tectors counts) happens at the moment of detection.

b) At detection the outcome becomes “irreversibly
recorded” and can be observed.

The different pictures discussed in the following regard
assumption a). Interpretations regarding assumption b) will
be discussed in a separated paper and will allow us
to complete the definition of Quantum.

Assumption a) implies “nonlocal” coordination of de-
tection events, or more accurately of decisions at detector-
between “to count” or “not to count”.

As it is well known, Einstein argued against this “non-
locality at detection” already in 1927, at the 5th Solvay
conference in Bruxelles [6]. He did this on the basis of
the famous gedanken-experiment in Fig.2 concluding (er-
roneously) to a conflict with relativity:

“But the interpretation [II], according to which \(|\psi|^2 \) expresses
the probability that this particle is found at a given point,
assumes an entirely peculiar mechanism of action at a distance,
which prevents the wave continuously distributed in space from
producing an action in two places on the screen. In my opinion,
one can remove this objection only in the following way, that
one does not describe the process solely by the Schrödinger
wave, but that at the same time one localises the particle during
the propagation. I think that Mr de Broglie is right to search in
this direction. If one works solely with the Schrödinger waves,
interpretation II of \(|\psi|^2 \) implies to my mind a contradiction
with the postulate of relativity.” [6]

Here Einstein is referring to Max Born’s interpreta-
tion in his seminal paper in 1926 [3], and the gedanken-
experiment Einstein proposes (Fig.2) is a simplified
version of the scattering of an electron by an atom Born
discusses in his paper. Einstein sharply perceived that
Born’s interpretation is linked to nonlocal coordination
of detectors. In fact it was the impossibility of explaining
this coordination by “causal evolution” what motivated
Born to his celebrated statistical interpretation, as we
discuss later in Section VIII.

Astonishingly Einstein’s gedanken-experiment in 1927
has been first realized using todays techniques in 2012
[7]. In this experiment (Fig.3) single photons impinge
into a beam-splitter BS and thereafter get detected. The
two detectors A and B monitoring the output ports of
BS are located so that the decision “to count” or “not
to count” at A is space-like separated and therefore lo-

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{FIG. 2: Einstein’s gedanken-experiment: Let S be a di-
aphragm provided with a small opening O, and P a hemi-
}
\text{spherical photographic film of large radius. Electrons impinge
on S in the direction of the arrows. “There are de Broglie
waves, which impinge approximately normally on S and are
diffracted at O. Behind S there are spherical waves, which
reach the screen P and whose intensity at P is responsible
[maßgebend] for what happens at P.” (See [6] p. 486: in the
text both ‘P’ and ‘S’ are confusedly referred to as “screen”
(écran)).
\end{align*}
\]
cally independent from the decision “to count” or “not to count” at B. The experiment tests and rules out the assumption that this correlation can be explained by some sort of local coordination through signals with \( v \leq c \): Even if the decision at A is locally independent of the decision at B, both decisions yield correlated results. On the other hand this nonlocal coordination cannot be used to signal faster than light from one detector to the other. The experiment also highlights something Einstein did not mention: Nonlocality is necessary to preserve such a fundamental principle as energy conservation.

Einstein understood that the quantum mechanical description of single particle experiments involves nonlocality, but was not ready to swallow this.

III. DE BROGLIE-BOHM

Another important player at the 5th Solvay Conference was Louis de Broglie. He presented an interpretation different from the Copenhagen one, the so called “pilot-wave” picture: In the experiment of Fig. 3 the particle always follows a well determined path from the source to a detector, but there is a “pilot wave”, an undetectable mathematical entity, that guides the particle to one or other of the detectors taking account of the optical path-length difference to producing the characteristic interference fringes predicted by Quantum Mechanics.

Unfortunately Einstein misinterpreted de Broglie’s “pilot wave” as a local alternative to the nonlocal “Schrödinger waves” (the quantum mechanical “wavefunction”), as the quotation in the preceding Section reveals. The kind of “wave” Einstein had in mind was sort of “ghost-wave” propagating in ordinary space-time by the alternative path to the localised path the material particle takes: it carries neither energy nor momentum, and travels at the same speed of the particle. Thereby one can assume that the outcome becomes determined when the “ghost-wave” joins the particle at beam-splitter BS1, and explain interference avoiding nonlocal coordination of decisions at detectors. Nonetheless one pays the price of admitting entities propagating in space-time that are inaccessible to observation even in principle.

In other words, to save relativistic local causality Einstein was unconsciously discarding the Principle A, which is in fact the fundamental principle of any experimental science.

Eight years later (1935) Einstein proposed a new thought experiment with two particles in the famous EPR paper. It looks like if Einstein had smelled that his “ghost-waves” do not allow to escape nonlocality in entanglement experiments. It may be also that he was not ready to get rid of Principle A after all. As a matter of fact he never endorsed definitely the “ghost-wave” model and abandoned his 1927 argument in favor of the more complicated EPR one, arguing that Quantum Mechanics cannot be considered complete. But then the question arises: Which kind of variables was Einstein searching for to complete Quantum Mechanics?

In whichever way one looks at it one can’t help concluding he was looking for variables which are observable in principle even if they couldn’t be detected by available experimental techniques. In this sense it has been claimed Einstein was supporting an “epistemic” view that considers the quantum probabilities as “lack of knowledge”. This “epistemic view” bears a problem: If the variables are in principle accessible to observation, the experimenter could in principle know in advance which path the particle will take, and thwart the appearance of interferences by changing the length of the other path. Thus, to fit interference experiments “epistemicism” has to assume that nature coaxes the experimenter to adapt his/her choices to the properties the particle carries. At the end of the day Einstein was denying the freedom of the experimenter, that is, endorsing Superdeterminism.

Notice that Copenhagen can also be considered an “epistemic” description, in the sense that the “wavefunction” describes only the possible knowledge we can have about the “system”, but does not contain information about the outcome of a single quantum event. In Bohr’s wording: “There is no quantum world. There is only an abstract quantum physical description. It is wrong to think that the task of physics is to find out how nature is. Physics concerns what we can say about nature.” However there is a big difference: “Bohr’s epistemicism” acknowledges that the information lacking in the “wavefunction” is inaccessible to observation in principle and, therefore, is not contained in space-time. If by “world” one refers to “what is contained in space-time”, then “there is no quantum world”, but there is a mathematical quantum reality existing in a mental realm we cannot access with our senses. The “epistemic” description either endorses Superdeterminism or Principle Q.

Seventeen years after the EPR-paper David Bohm published an article applying de Broglie’s picture to describe the EPR gedanken-experiment. In this context it became clear that the “empty-wave” has nothing to do with a “ghost-wave” propagating locally within the ordinary 3-space, but is rather a mathematical en-
tity defined in the so called “3N-space or configuration space” (\[I\] p. 128). Additionally, the wave acts like a quantum potential involving action at a distance with infinite velocity to produce space-like separated correlated detections at the two sides of the setup. Because de Broglie-Bohm postulates a “preferred frame” defining a “before-after” relationship between two space-like correlated events it conveys the idea of nonlocal action at a distance: one of the events is the cause and the other the effect. However experimenters cannot use this “effect” to communicate faster than light. This amounts to say that the “before-after” relationship is a quality inaccessible to real measurement, and therefore not contained in the observable world, that is, space-time. In other words, the “wave” guides the “material particle” from outside the ordinary space-time, i.e.: nonlocally.

The idea of causal action at a distance in the Bohmian picture inspired John Bell to find a criterion for deciding between Bohmian quantum nonlocal causality and Einsteins relativistic local one by means of entanglement experiments: The meanwhile famous Bell inequalities [1]. Since 1982 a number of well-known experiments have ruled out Einsteins locality, upholding the quantum mechanical predictions with increasing accurateness. Additionally, Bohmian picture inspired the “before-before” experiment [11], which ruled out the nonlocal causal view that “one event happens first and the other after”, and led to the insight that “the correlations come from outside space-time” [12].

Ironically, because of the “prejudice” of temporal causality de Broglie-Bohm could better than Copenhagen bring into focus that quantum correlations cannot be explained by signals bounded by the velocity of light, and triggered “nonlocality research”.

One may be tempted to think that de Broglie-Bohm is “less weird” than Copenhagen since at least the former assumes well localized material particles and thereby an ontological substrate. This would mean to overlook Louis de Broglie's big discovery that material particles behave like waves: Particles are localized material entities only apparently, actually they consist in immaterial waves. It is the very fundamental idea of the “wave-packet”. Shaping a “wave-packet” means weaving “local particles” with “nonlocal threads” (plane-waves) using the tool of “Fourier transforms”. The idea that “local” and “nonlocal” are inseparably united in the quantum phenomena is undoubtedly the main characteristic of the “particle-pilot wave” model. Nonetheless the idea was already present in de Broglie’s “wave-packet” description for particles, and indeed in a way which was fully acknowledged and worked out by the Copenhagen founding fathers:

- Describing interference in experiments like that of Fig[1], requires the notion of “wave-packet” characterized by a coherence-time and coherence-length, and yields the sinusoidal dependence on phases characteristic of quantum correlations [13]. Depending on the optical path-length difference the same “wave-packet” behaves like if it were a “wave” producing phase-dependent counting rates, or like if it were a “particle” producing phase-independent counting rates.

- The impossibility of sharply measuring both a variable and its Fourier transformed is the root of Heisenberg’s uncertainty principle.

- “Single particle interference” implies that each jointly outcome of the corresponding detectors should be considered a single measurement result coming from outside space-time: Different phases define in general different bases and different measurements incompatible with each other.

- De Broglie’s idea of the electron as wave-packet plays a crucial role in Max Born’s description of collision processes, where he introduces his rule for calculating probabilities of outcomes in quantum experiments [1]. Born’s paper shows well that de Broglie’s view supports Copenhagen: Quantum “particles” like an electron and an atom are abstract mathematical descriptions that combine to build a compound wave-function describing the scattering of an electron by an atom. So particles exist in a mental realm till they become materialised in one of different possible experimental outcomes (we comment on this more extensively in Section [VIII]).

The important lesson of the whole story is that the “de Broglie-Bohm” interpretation is itself essentially nonlocal, although it can be misunderstood as local in single-particle experiments, as Einstein did. Copenhagen and de Broglie-Bohm are two different ways of stating Principle Q, rather than two interpretations irreconcilable with each other.

IV. MANY-WORLDS

The strongest reaction against the “quantum collapse” came from the so called Many-Worlds interpretation (MWI).

This interpretation goes back to the relative state formulation of Quantum Mechanics proposed by Hugh Everett 1957 [14]. “The fundamental idea of the MWI [...] is that there are myriads of worlds in the Universe in addition to the world we are aware of. In particular, every time a quantum experiment with different possible outcomes is performed, all outcomes are obtained, each in a different world, even if we are only aware of the world with the outcome we have seen.” [15].

The parallel worlds and observers resulting at each quantum experiment are in principle “experimentally” inaccessible to each other.

Many-Worlds has been formulated in various ways. David Deutsch uses the “Multiverse” formulation to explain the notion of a “quantum computer” [16]. The
meaning of Many-Worlds is particularly well brought to light in the formulation “Parallel lives” by Gilles Brassard and Paul Raymond-Robichaud. According to this version: “When Alice pushes a button on her box, she splits in two, together with her box. One Alice a sees the red light flash on her box, whereas the other A* sees the green light flash. Both Alices, A and A*, are equally real. However, they are now living parallel lives: they will never be able to see each other or interact with each other. In fact, neither Alice is aware of the existence of the other, unless they infer it by pure thought as the only reasonable explanation for what they will experience when they test their boxes.”

Variants and extensions of Many-Worlds are properly characterized by Frauchiger-Renner’s statement: “Their common feature is that they do not postulate a physical mechanism that singles out one particular measurement outcome, although observers have the perception of single outcomes.” This characterization points also to what may be a main inconsistency of Many-Worlds:

Indeed, according to Leibniz’s principle, “if there is no possible perceptible difference between two objects, then these objects are the same, not superficially, but fundamentally.” As far as one keeps to this principle, if Alice in our world can never be able to see the other Alice*, then one should conclude that Alice* has no physical reality at all: Things that cannot in principle be perceived by the senses do not exist within space-time. And if the existence of Alice* can be inferred by reasoning but cannot in principle be perceived by the senses, this means that Alice* exists outside space-time.

But one could object: Wouldn’t the latter statement imply that events that happened in the distant past, about which we just read in history books, but which we cannot (and could not) perceive with our senses, do not exist?

We access such events through observations we perform today: archaeological vestiges or writings documenting them (see British museum). So these events happened in our space-time. A past event that is in principle inaccessible to any observation we can perform does not belong to the physical reality we can describe.

The Alice* in the “parallel-lives” interpretation is something we cannot access through any observation in our world but only through reasoning. Accordingly, Alice* lives outside our space-time, and is inaccessible to our senses. This amounts to say that Alice* is a mental entity outside my observable reality.

“Parallel lives” makes clear that “Copenhagen” and “Many-Worlds” are basically equivalent: Both interpretations imply that the “physical reality” we live in is more than what we can access with our senses. We discuss this further in the coming Section V.

V. ERNST SPECKER’S “INFUTURABILIEVEN” AND ALL-POSSIBLE-WORLDS

Consider a conventional Bell experiment: On one side of the setup Alice measures by switching her apparatus either on position $a_1$ or $a_2$, and gets outcome either 1 or 0 in each measurement; on the other side far away, Bob measures by switching his apparatus either on position $b_1$ or $b_2$, and gets outcome either 1 or 0 in each measurement. Suppose a measurement with joint choice $[a_1,b_2]$ yields the coincidence outcome [1,0]. According to Many-Worlds the other possible outcomes $[1,1], [0,1], [0,0]$ are realized in parallel worlds and observed by corresponding clones of Alice and Bob.

However, Many-Worlds to be consistent should also consider all the possible choices Alice and Bob can do, and assume that the other three possible joint choices $[a_1,b_1], [a_2,b_1], [a_2,b_2]$ are realized in parallel worlds as well. Paraphrasing Nicolas Gisin: In Many-Worlds the experimenter should not be merely a passive observer, but play an active role.

This completed version of Many-Worlds leads straightforwardly to our proposal of “All-Possible-Worlds”: In the context of Ernst Specker’s “infuturabilien” parable one can consider that an “omniscient mind” assigns a well-defined outcome for each of the four possible choices Alice and Bob can make. For different rounds of a same experiment (say $[a_1,b_2]$) assignments are done so that after many rounds the experimenters will observe joint outcomes distributed according to the quantum mechanical “Born’s rule”, and hence violating Bell’s inequalities.

“All-Possible-Worl ds” illustrates well what quantum contextuality means: The omniscient mind assigns results to each possible choice and each possible round, however the assignment is not done for each single choice of Alice and each single choice of Bob separately, but to each possible pair of choices jointly. Consequently for each round the outcome assignment for Alice’s choice (say $a_1$) depends on whether Bob chooses $b_1$ (to perform experiment $[a_1,b_1]$) or $b_2$ (to perform experiment $[a_1,b_2]$).

This also means that the outcome (the “collapse”, understood in the sense of Assumption a) in Section II is actually the result of two decisions, that of the omniscient mind (when this assigns outcomes to all possible experiments) and that of the experimenter (when this decides to perform a determined experiment). Detection (the measurement) does not “single out” the outcome, it rather makes it visible.

Many-Worlds has the enormous merit of having brought to light an important idea hidden in the Quantum: The physical reality consists in all possible experiments (choices) humans of all times can perform, the
VI. FREE-WILL AS AXIOM OF QUANTUM

The conclusions in the preceding Sections can be strengthened on the basis of Simon Kochen’s reconstruction of quantum mechanics \[26\, 27\]. This reconstruction illustrates well that any interpretation assuming free-will acknowledges Principle \(Q\).

The corner stone of Kochen’s reconstruction is found in the following quotation referring to EPR experiments:

“How can correlations between spin components of two particles subsist when these spin components do not have values? To understand how this can happen it is necessary to distinguish between events that have already happened and future contingent events. Thus, for instance, if \(a \lor b\) is currently true, then either \(a\) is true or \(b\) is true. When future events are considered, this no longer the case: if \(a \lor b\) is certain to happen, it is not the case that \(a\) is certain to happen or \(b\) is certain to take place.” \[27\]

As a famous example of this logical feature Kochen refers to Aristotle’s sea battle: “A sea-fight must either take place to-morrow or not, but it is not necessary that it should take place to-morrow, neither is it necessary that it should not take place, yet it is necessary that it either should or should not take place tomorrow. Since propositions correspond with facts, it is evident that when in future events there is a real alternative, and a potentiality in contrary directions, the corresponding affirmation and denial have the same character.” \[27\]

Here one implicitly introduces the following Definition: An event \(a\) is called future contingent with relation to a future time \(T\), if to establish whether \(a\) takes place or not one has necessarily to await time \(T\).

It is interesting to compare Aristotle’s example of the “sea battle” with the statement: “The Sun will raise to-morrow at time \(T\) at point \(P\) of the horizon”.

The “sea battle” is a future contingent event with relation to “tomorrow”. By contrast, according to classical physics the raising of the Sun is not a future contingent event because it is assumed we can know today about it with certainty.

According to the Definition above it is impossible even in principle to predict with certainty whether event \(a\) will take place or not on the basis of the currently observable data, that is on the basis of information stored within space-time.

This is the same as assuming that on the basis of classical physics we can establish neither that “\(a\) will happen at time \(T\)” nor that “\(a\) will not happen at time \(T\)”. In other words the Definition of future contingents is equivalent to assuming that whether event \(a\) happens or not at time \(T\) depends on information coming from outside space-time at time \(T\). And this is nothing other than assuming Principle \(Q\).

The classical view implies actually that no event is future contingent: Classically, any event results necessarily through causal evolution.

In case of Aristotle’s sea battle Principle \(Q\) amounts to postulate human free will, i.e.: steering of outcomes in human brains happening from outside space-time; this might also be the reason why Thomas Aquinas postulates that “the universe would not be perfect without randomness” \[28\]. Quantum experiments (single-particle Mach-Zehnder interference, single-particle spin 1 Stern-Gerlach, EPR-Bell experiments) allow us to go beyond: We postulate free will on the part of the experimenter and observe correlations between space-like separated detection events; thereby we experimentally demonstrate information coming from outside space-time in devices other than human brains. This is the very meaning of “the Free-Will Theorem” \[27\, 29\].

In this very sense Nicolas Gisin emphasizes that Free-Will is an axiom of physics. Interestingly Gisin relies on the French philosopher Jules Lequyer \[30\], who was strongly motivated by harmonizing divine omniscience and future contingent events, the “Infuturabilitien” question which later inspired Erns Specker as well (Section \(V\)).

It is noteworthy that Kochen’s reconstruction of quantum mechanics is based on single particle Mach-Zehnder interference experiments and introduces the sinusoidal dependence on phases \[26\]. Even if no physical motivation is given for such a dependence, Kochen’s reconstruction makes it plain that any attempt to get Quantum from principles assumes (openly or hiddenly) non-local ingredients and the construction of “wave-packets” by means of “Fourier transforms”.

In summary Kochen’s “logical” reconstruction of quantum physics rests on Principle \(Q\). So one can’t help admiring how much quantum physics was already contained in Aristotle’s logical description about the “sea battle”. Quantum is intrinsically related to those assumptions allowing us to shape rationally our ordinary daily life.

VII. MEANING AND AUTHORSHIP COME FROM OUTSIDE SPACE-TIME

All the different interpretations of Quantum either hidden deny the freedom of the experimenter (and therefore lead to Superdeterminism and are not proper in-
terpretations of Quantum), or acknowledge Principles A and Q.

Consider now the outcomes my brain produces while I am typewriting this article. One could compare the brain to the quantum interferometer in Fig.1. Depending of the physiological parameters of my brain an experimenter may be capable of predicting how many percent of each character of the alphabet (‘a’, ‘b’, ‘c’, ...) there will be in the final text (similarly as he/she predicts e.g.: 57% of bit ‘1’ and 43% bit ‘0’ in the experiment of Fig.1). By contrast there is no science (and there never will be one) capable of predicting the order of the characters in the final text (the particular bit-string 1,1,0,0,0,1,1,... resulting after many rounds in the same experiment), and therefore the message I want convey. I mentally steer my brain’s outcomes, that is, the sequences of bits they consist in, from outside space-time. This order, which is inaccessible in principle to observation, is what communication is all about and makes our life meaningful.

Postulating that the order the outcomes appear is beyond what physics can predict amounts to acknowledge that authorship responsible for this order is outside space-time. We assume such an authorship when we take for granted conservation of personal identity in daily life. This conservation is so fundamental that without it any legal and social order would break down: We could neither claim for rights nor keep bank accounts. We assuming it all the time while publishing scientific articles and commenting each other’s papers. “Identity” as my agreement to identify with the person named on my passport, drivers license, bank and google accounts each and every morning, is more than a world-line; reducing my life to time-flow mean condemning myself to be none.

If there is no theory capable of predicting each single choice a “human experimenter” decides to make or the outcome the omniscient mind assigns to each single round of the experiment we choose to perform, then there is no theory of everything. We can only find theories allowing us to predict statistical distribution of outcomes. But as Chris Fuchs wisely states: “Finding a theory of merely one aspect of everything is hardly something to be ashamed of: It is the loftiest achievement physics can "merely" one aspect of everything is hardly something to struggle to account for basic physical conditions in the problem of single electrons being scattered by atoms [5], an experiment which as said (Section II) Einstein simplified to the gedanken-experiment in Fig.2 to argue that Born’s interpretation implies non-local coordination at detection.

For the sake of simplicity we reproduce the essential of Born’s argument in the context of the experiment in Fig.1 using current standard notation:

The quantum mechanical description in terms of a wavefunction leads to an expression of the form:

$$|\psi\rangle = c_0|0\rangle + c_1|1\rangle$$

...where $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ denote the outcome ‘D(0) counts’, respectively ‘D(1) counts’; and $c_0$, $c_1$ are complex numbers resulting from summing amplitudes over paths from the source to detector D(0), respectively D(1).

According to the “corpuscular” picture one gets only one outcome: Either D(1) counts or D(0) counts. However in the right hand side of Equation (1) appear together the two possible outcomes: D(1) counts and D(0) counts. So Equation (1) does not describe a causal evolution from the source to a single detector: “From the standpoint of our quantum mechanics there is no quantity that in any individual case causally fixes the consequence of the collision.” [5] This amounts to say that the conditions ensuring that only one of the two detectors counts lay beyond space-time and are inaccessible in principle. They may derive from “a preestablished harmony” (“eine prästabilisierte Harmonie”) [5].

Born’s is facing the following dilemma: On the one hand to behave rationally in the world we need receipts allowing us to predict things to some extent. On the other hand the fundamental fact that the outcome’s assignment is inaccessible in principle because it is not contained in space-time and does not emerge through causal evolution entails that there is no receipt allowing us to predict each single outcome. The only possible interpretation is that Equation (1) does not allow us to predict with certainty but only to make a guess. Probability is a measure of how accurate such a guess may be. So we have to derive these probabilities from the quantities $c_0$, $c_1$ in Equation (1), Born concludes.

So, Born’s claim that quantum physics “only specifies probabilities, and not definite outcomes” [22] is derived from “more fundamental principles”, mainly the need to account for correlated decisions at detection “in absence of conditions ensuring a causal evolution”. In stating that “the only possible explanation” of the “wave function” is probabilistic Max Born was in fact assuming Principle Q: Quantum phenomena cannot be explained exclusively by local causality but require “nonlocality at detection", as Einstein well understood (Section II).

Stating that quantum physics is “intrinsically probabilistic” [5] amounts to state that Quantum refers to a realm which is not fully contained in space-time and precludes explanation by causal evolution.

Born’s interpretation is amazingly close to the picture “All-Possible-Worlds” described in Section IV:

- The “preestablished harmony” corresponds to the
assignments the omniscient mind makes for all possible experimental choices humans of all times can freely make (a finite number as explained in [23]).

- “Giving up determinism” corresponds to the assumption that humans can freely chose which of the possible worlds they want to live in.

- “Absence of conditions ensuring a causal evolution” means that the state of the omniscient mind is outside space-time, i.e.: contains correlated events that are not predetermined by the past light-cone.

From the perspective of the omniscient mind, Born’s rule probabilities mean the frequency of occurrences of an outcome in the sequence of assignments this mind does, which is the actual observed frequency in experiment. In this sense the rule uses “frequentist probabilities” and can be considered objective (as BornF in [35]).

From the perspective of the human experimenter, Born’s rule quantifies a subjective belief about the outcome of a future measurement under conditions of irreducible uncertainty [4]. This interpretation (characteristic of QBism [33, 34]) reflects the incapacity of principle of particles as "wave-packets" ([33] states that "the agents belief about a sequence of assignments the omniscient mind makes for all possible experimental choices humans of all times can freely make (a finite number as explained in [23]).")

This preestablished harmony ensures that “[we] can make rational decisions in the face of uncertainty” [4], and behave rationally in the world we live in. So the objective view and the subjective become unified in “All-Possible-Worlds”.

In the same line of thinking one could also say that Max Born was introducing probabilities to face “lack of knowledge”. Nonetheless not “knowledge” we would be able to get hold of with better apparatuses, but one that is inaccessible to any apparatus we can built. By contrast Boltzmann thermodynamics probabilities appear as a convenient tool to calculate a situation where it is very difficult but not impossible to take account of each single case. Interestingly at the end of his paper Born feels the necessity to stress the difference between his “statistical interpretation” and the “thermodynamical-statistical” one.

So, stating that quantum physics is “epistemic” [9] amounts to acknowledge Principle Q once again.

Furthermore Born’s reasoning is based on de Broglie’s idea that a particle can be considered a wave packet obtained by summing up plane waves of different frequencies according to a Fourier transform relation (Section [13]). The very introduction of “wave packets” amounts to assume (paraphrasing Wheeler) (local) ‘it’ from (non-local) ‘qubit’ as primitive for Quantum. This means that the “quantum algebra” (leading to violation of Bell inequalities, “Tsirelson bound” and contextuality) emerges in the context of experiments like that of Fig.1 [13]. In particular the sum of the probabilities for the counting rates of D(1) and D(0) has to be 1, and hence in Equation [1] it holds that: |c_0|^2 + |c_1|^2 = 1 (unitary transformations); and in an experiment with the detectors watching BS0 instead of BS1, the algebra must lead to the classical probabilities. Such algebraic properties of the wavefunction formalism led Born to the famous footnote correction (in [3], p. 865) that the probabilities are given by |c_i|^2, i ∈ {0, 1}, and not by c_i.

From this perspective “nonlocal coordination of decisions at detectors” bears also “contextuality” (characterizing Hilbert spaces with d ≥ 3) and “Bell’s nonlocality” (characterizing Hilbert spaces with d ≥ 4, d non prime), and so rules the whole quantum realm (Hilbert space with d ≥ 2).

In summary: Max Born did not introduced his rule as a “probabilistic axiom”. He derived it from more fundamental principles “without relying on an a priori notion of probabilities” [35], mainly from “absence of conditions ensuring causal evolution”, irreducible uncertainty, and the Hilbert space properties embedded in the description of particles as “wave-packets” (it from qubit).

One can easily see that the derivation of Born’s rule from three “operational postulates or primitives” in [34] contains much of Born’s reasoning we have referred to. This becomes clear if one does not forget to introduce detectors into the definition of “measurement”: Measurements without detectors have no outcomes. Mateus Araújo remarks that [36] leaves hanging the question: “Why does the Born rule only specifies probabilities and not definite outcomes?” [32]. In fact the question could be answered because “absence of conditions assuring a causal evolution” or “preestablished harmony” is implicitly assumed in the postulate “states”.

It is also noteworthy that in [35] the authors claim to derive Born’s rule from “two alternative non-probabilistic physical postulates” together with “certain natural assumptions concerning the agent’s reasoning” that “do not depend on quantum mechanics”. As we have seen, this is actually what Max Born did: Assumption “Symmetry” in [35] states that “the agents belief about a sequence of outcomes obtained by repeating the same prepare-and-measure experiment does not depend on how the sequence is ordered”; this amounts to assume that the order of the sequence is beyond what physics can predict and therefore “absence of conditions ensuring causal evolution” (Section [VII]). Assumption “Overlap” implicitly involves nonlocal coordination at detection. And Assumption “Repeat” implicitly contains the Hilbert space algebra to calculate a path’s amplitude.

IX. CONCLUSION

As early as 1927 Einstein was perfectly aware that single-particle nonlocality, later demonstrated in the experiment of [7], is the source where Quantum emerges
from. His denial of this feature ignited a debate that crystallised into three main interpretations of quantum theory: Copenhagen, de Broglie-Bohm, and Many-Worlds. In this letter we have shown that these interpretations are different ways of stating the same from different perspectives: Not all what matters for physical phenomena is contained in space-time (Principle Q).

The three interpretations highlight different relevant aspects, which can be unified into the “All-Possible-Worlds” picture: The quantum realm is a huge collection of All-Conceivable-Histories. Paraphrasing John A. Wheeler: The entirety of quantum phenomena, rather than being built on particles or fields of force or multidimensional geometry, is built upon billions upon billions of elementary human decisions (p.32, note 35). Without “human free choices”, no physical reality! Personal identity and free will are axioms of science included in Principle Q, natural assumptions about rational reasoning and behavior.

Principle Q underpins Max Born’s introduction of probabilities into quantum physics. The founding fathers undoubtedly derived Quantum from “a set of experimentally motivated postulates” [37] or “more fundamental principles” [35], which in the light of nonlocality and contextuality acquire a much deeper meaning: By postulating “absence of conditions ensuring causal evolution” and knowledge which is in principle inaccessible to the human experimenter, they were assuming Principle Q.

Quantum means endorsing Principle Q, which we assume all the time to found rationally interpersonal relationship. Quantum “weirdness” is helping us to realize how wonderful ordinary life is.


