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Measurements play a crucial role in doing physics: Their results provide the basis on which we adopt or reject physical theories. In this note, we examine the effect of subjecting measurements themselves to a measurability: We assume that theories account for interactions so that they are empirically traceable, and that observations necessarily go with such an interaction with the observed system. In consequence of these assumptions, we are lead to contextual theories. Contextuality becomes a means to render interactions, thus also measurements, empirically tangible. The measurement becomes problematic if one tries to commensurate the assumption of tangible interactions with the notion of a spectator theory, i.e., with the idea that measurement results are read off without effect. The measurement “problem,” thus, presents itself as the collision of different epistemologic stances.

I. INTRODUCTION

The infamous Wigner’s-friend experiment \(1\) serves to illustrate the measurement problem \(2\): If we imagine Wigner performing a measurement on his friend who measured another system, there are different—in fact, incommensurable—uses of the term “measurement:"

(M1) If the friend’s “measurement” of a state in an equal superposition with respect to his measurement basis is regarded as an interaction between two systems—modeled by a physical evolution—, then it corresponds to a unitary on the joint system, yielding an entangled joint state;

(M2) if the “measurement” leads to exclusively one of several possible outcomes, and, thus, allows to judge the validity of a theory.

Statements \(\text{[M1]}\) and \(\text{[M2]}\) conflict as follows: The linearity of quantum mechanics cannot be reconciled with value-definiteness—i.e., the outcome being exclusively one of several possibilities.

The incommensurability is not so much a peculiarity—or defect—of quantum mechanics. Instead, we argue that it appears in theories that (a) account for interactions so that they are empirically significant, (b) require that an observation necessarily goes with such an interaction, (c) are falsifiable, and (d) in which experimental results have a minimal stability. The first two requirements render an observation itself empirically traceable. They are combined in the interaction assumption:

(IntA) Interactions are empirically traceable. An observation necessitates such an interaction.

The last requirement \(\text{[d]}\) is a generalization of Popper’s characterization of physics being concerned with reproducible effect \(\text{[4]}\) to the demand that asking the same question twice will yield the same answer:

\[
\text{(ISys)} \quad \exists \text{ conditions under which two equivalent, subsequent measurements performed on the same system yield the same answer. These conditions are independent of the questions asked.}
\]

A system satisfying these conditions will be called isolated.

II. DESCRIBING SYSTEMS

We discuss how to abstractly represent measurements in light of falsifiability and \(\text{(ISys)}\). We follow the path of quantum logic \(\text{[2],[12]}\)—without actually referring to quantum mechanics—, and rely on notions of ordered sets and lattices as briefly summarized in the Appendix. Along the way, we put the program into a new perspective.

We think of a measurement as an inquiry about a binary question, i.e., about a question with two possible answers \(t\) and \(f\). The binary questions are represented by elements in a set \(\mathbb{Q}\). By the requirement \(\text{(ISys)}\) there exists an equivalence relation on \(\mathbb{Q}\), such that under appropriate conditions, two equivalent questions \(\alpha \sim \beta\) with \(\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Q}\) yield equal answers. Let us denote by \(\mathcal{Q}\) the corresponding set of equivalence classes. To ensure falsifiability \(\text{[13]}\), we assume that for any equivalence class \(a \in \mathbb{Q}\), there exists a unique complementary class \(\neg a \in \mathbb{Q}\) such that an inquiry about any question in \(\neg a\) yields \(t\) and only if an inquiry about any question in \(a\) yields \(f\).

We assume that the elements in \(\mathbb{Q}\) allow for a partial temporal order: If a measurement corresponding to \(\alpha\) is performed before another one \(\beta\), then \(\alpha < \beta\). The conditional on \(\mathbb{Q}\), i.e., \(\alpha \rightarrow \beta\), is defined as follows:

---

1 “Indeed the scientifically significant physical effect may be defined as that which can be regularly reproduced by anyone who carries out the appropriate experiment in the way prescribed.” \(\text{[4],[1],[8]}, \text{emphasis in original}\)

2 Subsequently, we denote elements in \(\mathbb{Q}\) by Greek letters, elements in \(\mathcal{Q}\) by Latin letters, and variables representing answers to elements in \(\mathbb{Q}\) by the corresponding capital Latin letters.
If the inquiry about \( \alpha \) yields \( \tau \), then a subsequent inquiry about \( \beta >_t \alpha \) yields \( \tau \).

The conditional on \( \mathcal{Q} \) induces an order relation on the set of equivalence classes, \( a < b \) for \( a, b \in \mathcal{Q} \), if verifying the order relation does not break the equivalence: If we inquire about consecutive questions

\[
\alpha <_t \beta <_t \alpha' <_t \beta', \text{ with } \alpha \to \beta, \ \alpha \sim \alpha', \ \beta \sim \beta',
\]

then we assume to still obtain equal answers for \( \alpha \) and \( \alpha' \), as well as for \( \beta \) and \( \beta' \). Thus, we demand that the sublattice generated by \( \{a, \neg a, b, \neg b\} \) is distributive if \( a < b \). If there exist elements 0 and 1 such that \( a \land \neg a = 0 \) and \( a \lor \neg a = 1 \) for all \( a \in \mathcal{Q} \), then the above sublattice requirement renders the complement defined above order-reversing and leaves us with an orthocomplemented lattice of classes of equivalent questions \( (\mathcal{Q}, <) \).

To ensure the distributivity of the sublattice defined above, we require the lattice to be orthomodular, i.e., to satisfy the following:

If \( a < b \), then \( a \land (\neg a \lor b) = b \).

### III. INTERACTING SYSTEMS

We now turn to the question how to ensure the interaction assumption \( (\text{Int}A) \). An obvious way to trace interactions is to “ask the system whether it interacted.” This assumes the existence of a corresponding equivalence class \( q_{\text{int}} \in \mathcal{Q} \). If we inquire consecutively about \( \alpha <_t \sigma \) with \( \sigma \in q_{\text{int}} \), then we expect \( \sigma \) to yield \( \tau \) independent of the result of the inquiry about \( \alpha \). This should also hold for \( \neg \alpha \). It follows that \( q_{\text{int}} \bowtie \alpha \lor \neg \alpha \), and, therefore, \( q_{\text{int}} = 1 \). Thus, the interaction assumption cannot be realized by a single inquiry about questions in a special equivalence class in \( \mathcal{Q} \).

Yet, we can establish within \( \mathcal{Q} \) whether an interaction occurred by how questions relate to one another. In particular, if we aim to position the characteristic “having interacted” dichotomously to “being isolated” as described in \( (\text{IntSys}) \), then the former characteristic is expected to be relational as is the latter. Following this path, we demand that equivalent questions \( \sigma, \sigma' \in q_{\text{int}} \) inquired about before and after an interaction corresponding to an inquiry about a question \( \alpha \in \mathcal{Q} \) with \( \sigma <_t \alpha <_t \sigma' \) do not necessarily yield the same answer independent of what the result of the inquiry about \( \alpha \) is. For the equivalence classes this entails

\[
(q_{\text{int}} \land \alpha) \lor (q_{\text{int}} \land \neg \alpha) \neq q_{\text{int}}.
\]

That is, \( q_{\text{int}} \) is incompatible with \( a \). Equivalently, the sublattice generated by \( q_{\text{int}} \) and \( a \) is not distributive (see Appendix). As compatibility in an orthomodular lattice is symmetric, the interaction corresponding to inquiries about questions in \( q_{\text{int}} \) can be traced inversely with inquiries about questions in \( a \).

To ensure that all elements in \( \mathcal{Q} \) correspond to traceable interactions, we require that in the orthomodular lattice \( \mathcal{Q} \), the sublattice \( \mathcal{Z} \) of elements compatible with all other elements in the lattice, called the center, contains merely 1 and 0. The requirement for \( \mathcal{Q} \) to form an orthomodular lattice with trivial center is sufficient to satisfy the interaction assumption. Subsequently, we turn to the question whether it is necessary.

### A. Assigning probabilities

The above discussion is inspired by quantum mechanics.

The set of orthogonal projectors on a Hilbert space \( \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{H}) \) forms an atomic, orthomodular lattice with the order relation

\[
P < Q \iff \text{P(H) is subspace of Q(H)}.
\]

Gleason’s theorem establishes a one-to-one correspondence between probability distributions over \( \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{H}) \) and density matrices if \( \text{dim} \mathcal{H} \geq 3 \). With projectors forming equivalence classes along a real time parameter,

\[
\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qm}} = \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{H}) \times \mathbb{R}, \text{ and } \mathcal{Q} = \mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{H}),
\]

quantum mechanics carries the lattice structure before assigning probabilities. A priori, the lattice structure of \( \mathcal{Q} \) is not evident: A theory does not primarily make statements about the relation \( \alpha \to \beta \).

More generally, theories yield probability distributions for time-ordered sequences of questions \( (\text{IntSys}) \), i.e.,

\[
P \bigl( (\alpha_1, A_1), (\alpha_2, A_2), \ldots \bigr)
\]

with \( \alpha_i \in \mathcal{Q}, \alpha_i <_t \alpha_{i+1}, A_i \in \{t, f\} \),

where neither \( \mathcal{Q} \) has a pre-established conditional, nor \( \mathcal{Q} \) a natural lattice structure. Then, the requirement \( (\text{IntSys}) \) that consecutive equivalent questions

\[
\alpha \sim \beta, \ \alpha <_t \beta, \ \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{Q}
\]

3If \( a < b \), then

\[
b \land \neg a = (a \lor b) \land \neg a = (a \land \neg a) \lor (b \land \neg a)
\]

by distributivity. With \( a \land \neg a = b \land \neg b \),

\[
b \land \neg a = (b \land \neg b) \lor (b \land \neg a) = b \land (\neg a \lor \neg b),
\]

thus, \( \neg a > \neg b \).

4Imagine inquiring about \( \sigma <_t \alpha <_t \alpha' <_t \sigma' \) where \( \sigma, \sigma' \in q_{\text{int}}, \alpha \in a, \alpha' \in \neg a \). Then, \( \sigma \neq \sigma' \). The same is the case for \( \sigma, \sigma' \in \neg q_{\text{int}} \).

5See, e.g., \[12\].

6In this approach, a map, analogous to the Born rule, is an essential part of physical theories. In classical mechanics, for example, such a “Born rule” consists of assigning deterministic probabilities to subsets of phase space. As we discuss below, this is only possible because the subset lattice is a Boolean lattice.
yield equal answers $A, B \in \{t, f\}$ translates to
\[ P(A = B) = P(A = 1, B = 1) + P(A = 0, B = 0) = 1. \]

Let us consider the possibility that the probability derives from a unary function
\[ \mu : \Omega \to [0, 1] \]
such that $\mu(\alpha)$ is the probability for the answer to $\alpha$ to be $t$. From the above formulation of \( \text{ISys} \) it follows that
\[ P(A = B) = \mu(\alpha)\mu(\beta) + (1 - \mu(\alpha))(1 - \mu(\beta)) = 1 \]
which is the case if and only if $\mu(\alpha) = \mu(\beta) = 0$ or $\mu(\alpha) = \mu(\beta) = 1$. Thus, the function $\mu : \Omega \to \{0, 1\}$ takes merely two values, and is constant within an equivalence class $\alpha \in \Omega$. Therefore, there is an induced function $\mu' : \Omega \to \{0, 1\}$. An immediate consequence is that if the question $q_{\text{ans}}$ from above is an element $Q$, then inquiring about the question “whether the system interacted” yields either always $t$ or always $f$, independently of inquiries about any other question. This is a contradiction with \( \text{IntA} \). A theory satisfying both \( \text{ISys} \) and \( \text{IntA} \) cannot allow for an assignment of probabilities to elements in $\Omega$ independent of inquiries about other, non-equivalent questions: The theory is contextual \[13, 14].

To ensure a minimal detectability of inquiries and their corresponding interactions, we are lead to assume the following, similar to Heisenberg uncertainty: For any $\alpha \in \Omega$ there exist equivalent $\beta_1 \sim \beta_2, \beta_1 < \alpha \sim \beta_2$ such that
\[ P(B_1 \neq B_2) = \sum_{A, B} P(B, A, \neg B) \geq \varepsilon \]
for some $\varepsilon > 0$.

To connect this back to the lattice formalism, we ask: Does a contextual theory satisfying \( \text{ISys} \) and \( \text{IntA} \) give rise to an orthomodular lattice on $\Omega$? Employing the contextuality, we define the order relation $a < b$ by
\[ P((\beta, t) | (\alpha, t)) = 1 \]
\[
\forall \alpha \in a, \beta \in b, \text{ and }
\]
\[ P(A_1 = A_2) = \sum_{A, B} P(A, B, A) = 1 \]
\[
\forall \alpha_i \in a, \beta \in b, \alpha_1 < \beta < \alpha_2, \text{ and the complement } \neg a \text{ by }
\]
\[ a' \in \neg a \iff P((\alpha', f)) | (\alpha, t)) = 1 \text{ and } P((\alpha', t)) | (\alpha, f)) = 1. \]

Assuming falsifiability, we demand that the complement exists and is unique. While this yields a complemented and weakly modular poset, it is not clear whether it also constitutes an orthomodular lattice. For the remainder of this text, we assume that $\Omega$ forms an orthomodular lattice.

The converse of the above consideration is: What probability distributions can be assigned to an orthomodular lattice? Let us assume that $\Omega$ forms such a lattice and that $\mu' : \Omega \to [0, 1]$ is a function that satisfies
\[ \mu'(0) = 0, \quad \mu'(1) = 1; \]
if $a, b$ are compatible, then
\[ \mu'(a) + \mu'(b) = \mu'(a \land b) + \mu'(a \lor b); \]
if $\mu'(a_i) = 1$ then $\mu'(\wedge_1 a_i) = 1$.

If we impose \( \text{ISys} \), then, with the same reasoning as above, $\mu'$ is a dispersion-free state \[17]. From Theorem I in \[17\] and Theorem 1 in \[18\], it follows that if there exists a dispersion-free state on $\Omega$ then the center $\mathcal{Z}$ is not trivial. Therefore, if we require \( \text{IntA} \) and \( \text{ISys} \), then any assignment of probabilities to elements in $\Omega$ must be contextual.

**IV. ISOLATED SYSTEMS**

After the discussion in Section III, we are now able to explicate the notion of an isolated system consistent with the two assumptions \( \text{ISys} \) and \( \text{IntA} \). A system is isolated if and only if inquiries about any two equivalent questions $\alpha \sim \beta, \alpha, \beta \in \Omega$ yield equal answers with certainty.

To empirically verify whether a system is isolated—at least for the time between two inquiries—one inquiries about any two equivalent questions and compares the thus obtained answers. If the answers differ, then the inquiries detect an intermediate inquiry about a non-compatible question, and the system is not isolated. While the equality of the answers is necessary, it is, however, not sufficient for the system to be isolated.

This empirical test is an essential ingredient in a key-distribution protocol like \[19\]. Inversely, any theory satisfying the assumptions \( \text{IntA} \) and \( \text{ISys} \) allows for a similar protocol.

**V. INTERACTIONS WITHIN A JOINT SYSTEM**

We now turn to interactions within an isolated system, i.e., between different parts of a joint system. Two systems, $S_1$ and $S_2$, together can again be regarded as one system assuming that the ability to refer to $S_1$ and $S_2$ suffices to refer to the corresponding combined system. The joint system consisting of $S_1$ and $S_2$ is denoted $S_1 \times S_2$.

In \[8\], Piron shows that an orthomodular lattice has a trivial center if and only if it is irreducible, i.e., the lattice cannot be written as a direct union, defined as follows: The direct product of orthocomplemented lattices $L_i$ with $i \in I$, forms another orthocomplemented lattice $L^P$ with the order relation
\[ x > y, x, y \in L^P \iff x_i > y_i \forall i \in I \]
and the orthocomplementation
\[ \neg x = (\neg x_1, \ldots, \neg x_i, \ldots). \]
It follows from [IntA] that the lattice $Q_c$ cannot be the direct product of lattices $Q_1$ and $Q_2$. We imagine $S_2$ to be a friendly experimenter measuring $S_1$, inspired by the Wigner’s-friend experiment [1]. Let us, for now, merely consider $S_1$: Before and after our friend inquires about a non-trivial $\alpha \in Q_1$ we inquire about two equivalent $\alpha' \sim \alpha''$ that belong to an equivalence class incompatible to the one represented by $\alpha$. The joint system $S_1 \times S_2$ is however isolated. Thus, the equivalence classes of the joint system are not induced by the subsystems if they interact: Despite, $\alpha' \sim \alpha''$ in $Q_1$, $(\alpha', 1) \not\sim (\alpha'', 1)$ in $Q_c$. The friend’s inquiry about a non-trivial $\alpha \in a \in Q_1$ is characterized as follows:

If $(\alpha_1, \sigma) \leq (\alpha_2, \beta) \in Q_c$ with $\alpha_i, \alpha \in a \in Q_1$, then $\alpha_1 \leftrightarrow \alpha_2$ and $\alpha_1 \leftrightarrow \beta$, for some $\sigma$.

A measurement effects an implication that reaches across systems. It is a case not accounted for in a product lattice. In particular, the measurement establishes the equivalence between $(\sigma, \alpha_1)$ and $(\beta, \alpha_2)$ in $Q_c$ while $\sigma$ and $\beta$ might not be equivalent in $Q_2$. Let us denote $m \in Q$ the equivalence class of $(\sigma, \alpha_1)$ and $(\beta, \alpha_2)$. The characteristics also implies: $(a, 1)$ and $(a, 0)$ are equivalence classes in $Q_c$ with $(a, 0) < m < (a, 1)$. In particular, the equivalence class $n \in Q_c$ represented by $(\sigma, \alpha'_1)$ is incompatible with $(a, 0)$ and $(a, 1)$ if $\alpha' \in Q_1$ is incompatible with $a \in Q_1$. Therefore, also $n$ and $m$ are incompatible.

To empirically test whether the two subsystems $S_1$ and $S_2$ interact with one another, one empirically tests the equivalence relation on $Q_c$ by inquiring about questions in the same equivalence class and verifying that their answers match (see Section IV). Imagine, we initially inquired about a question in $n$. To verify that $S_c$ is isolated, and, thus, the two subsystems interacted, we inquire about a later element in $n$. By the incompatibility of $n$ and $(a, 1)$, we cannot at the same time empirically test whether the system interacted, and know about the result of the measurement.

We encounter the measurement problem: We cannot meaningfully—i.e., with the suitable empirical support—speak of the measurement as an interaction between two systems, while maintaining the idea of the measurement yielding definite results.

VI. THE EPISTEMIC IMPORT: SPECTATOR THEORIES

The measurement problem unfolds if we compromise the Interaction Assumption [IntA] in order to save the measurement and its result from contextual dependences. Thus, the measurement problem exposes the idea that we can read off measurement results without effects for the measured system—the idea of a spectator theory.

The theory of knowing is modelled after what was supposed to take place in the act of vision. The object refracts light to the eye and is seen; it makes a difference to the eye and to the person having an optical apparatus, but none to the thing seen. The real object is the object so fixed in its regal aloofness that it is a king to any beholding mind that may gaze upon it. A spectator theory of knowledge is the inevitable outcome. [20 §1, p.26]

The quest for certain measurement results is an epistemic problem: If knowledge is scientific knowledge and science is natural science, then the anchor of our knowledge is observation and measurement. And if knowledge must be constituted of certainties, then these observations cannot carry contextual dependences [7].

For Dewey in his pragmatic critique of absolute knowledge, quantum mechanics promises to get the natural sciences back on the path instituted by Galileo: The path of a dissolution of the distinction between immutable absolute knowledge and practical activity guided by belief.

The work of Galileo was not a development, but a revolution. It marked a change from a qualitative to the quantitative or metric; from the heterogeneous to the homogeneous; from intrinsic forms to relations; from aesthetic harmonies to mathematical formulae; from contemplative enjoyment to active manipulation and control; from rest to change; from eternal objects to temporal sequence. The idea of a two-realm scheme persisted for moral and religious purposes; it vanished for purposes of natural science. [20, §4, p.92]

For Dewey, Heisenberg uncertainty was less of a problem for maintaining physics as a spectator theory, but rather a door opener towards overcoming the idea itself.

The element of indeterminateness is not connected with defect in the method of observation, but is intrinsic. The particle observed does not have fixed position or velocity, for it is changing all the time because of interaction: specifically, in this case, interaction with the act of observing, or more strictly, with the conditions under which an observation is possible; for it is not the ‘mental’ phase of observation which makes the difference. Since either position or velocity may be

---

[7] The spectator theory relates to correspondence theories of truth, as Habermas points out: “The meaning of knowledge itself becomes irrational—in the name of rigorous knowledge. In this way the naive idea that knowledge describes reality becomes prevalent. This is accompanied by the copy theory of truth, according to which the reversibly univocal correlation of statements and matters of fact must be understood as isomorphism. Until the present day this objectivistic has remained the trademark of a philosophy of science that appeared on the scene with Comte’s positivism.” [21] [II, p.68f, emphasis in original] The criticism of spectator theories relates to critiques of correspondence theories of truth as, e.g., in [22 23].
fixed at choice, leaving the element of indeterminacy on the other side, both of them are shown to be conceptual in nature. That is, they belong to our intellectual apparatus for dealing with antecedent existence, not to fixed properties of that existence. An isolation of a particle for measurement is essentially a device for regulation of subsequent perceptual experience. [20, §8, p.194, emphasis in original]

The “intrinsic element of indeterminateness” is taken as an indicator for the participatory and practical elements of knowing.

The change [that Heisenberg uncertainty calls for] for the underlying philosophy and logic of science is, however, very great. In relation to the metaphysics of the Newtonian system it is hardly less than revolutionary. What is known is seen to be a product in which the act of observation plays a necessary rôle. Knowing is seen to be a participant in what is finally known. Moreover, the metaphysics of existence as something fixed and therefore capable of literally exact mathematical description and prediction is undermined. Knowing is, for philosophical theory, a case of specially directed activity instead of something isolated from practice. The quest for certainty by means of exact possession in mind of immutable reality is exchanged for search for security by means of active control of the changing course of events. Intelligence in operation, another name for method, becomes the thing most worth winning. The principle of indeterminacy. It marks the acknowledgment, within scientific procedure itself, of the fact that knowing is one kind of interaction which goes on within the world. [20, §8, p.195f]

Dewey, expecting the eye-opening effects of quantum mechanics, disregards his own, earlier concern about the Galilean revolution:

But—and this ‘but’ is of fundamental importance—in spite of the revolution, the old conceptions of knowledge as related to an antecedent reality and of moral regulation as derived from properties of this reality, persisted. [20, §4, p.92]

The idea of immutable knowledge did not only survive the Galilean but also the quantum revolution. It merely changed what could be absolutely known. With a theory that satisfies [IntA] and [ISys] we cannot expect to know answers to all questions that a system can be inquired about. But we can still hope for either some properties to be more fundamental than others—the Bohmian way out of the problem—or for the theory to expose the real structure of the world—the Everetttian, or Parallel Lives, way out of the problem. In both cases, there remains a real and absolute element antecedent to any act of knowing that can be known at least “in principle.”[8] This saves an essential aspect of spectator theories, namely, the positivist idea that we can gain access to something that is independent of our act of knowing.

If, however, the measurement problem reminds us that “Knowing is seen to be a participant in what is finally known.” [20, §8, p.195f]—just as antecedent “meaning” is a myth [24]—, then we are led to a very different reflection [25]. Following Habermas, we are in fact led to unwind the positivist removal of reflection [11]. The idea that cognition must be scientific cognition can be understood as a belief that we have put into the scientific act of knowing, and not something that the world imposes on us. The measurement “problem” opens the door for reflection, for imagining new ways of looking at science and of doing physics [20].

VII. CONCLUSION

The requirement that there are isolated systems for which inquiries about equivalent questions yield equal answers combined with the demand for traceable interactions leads to contextual theories. With measurements corresponding to an interaction between two systems, we face a measurement problem: We cannot meaningfully—i.e., with the suitable empirical support—speak of the measurement as an interaction between two systems while maintaining the idea of the measurement yielding definite results. As such, the measurement problem exposes an incompatibility between epistemological stances beyond

8The term “in principle”—very much like “demons”—are used to indicate that something is exempt from actual experience [20].
9The idea has been established before by Fleck: “Denn Erkennen ist weder passive Konzent lung noch Erwerb einzig möglicher Einsicht im fertig Gegebenen. Es ist ein tätiges, lebendiges Beziehung sein, ein Umformen und Umgeformtwerden, kurz ein Schaffen. [. . .] Erkenntnisse werden von Menschen gebildet, aber auch umgekehrt: sie bilden Menschen.” [27, p.48] — “For cognition is neither passive contemplation nor acquisition of uniquely possible insight in the readily given. It is an active, lively partaking in relationships, a shaping and being reshaped, in short a creative act. [. . .] Insights are formed by people, but also inversely: they form people.” [27, p.48, own translation]
10“[T]hat we disavow reflection is positivism.” [21, p.vii, emphasis in original]
11“From then on, the theory of knowledge had to be replaced by a methodology emptied of philosophical thought. For the philosophy of science that has emerged since the mid-nineteenth century as the heir of the theory of knowledge is methodology pursued with a scientistic self-understanding of the sciences. ‘Scientism’ means science’s belief in itself: that is, the conviction that we can no longer understand science as one form of possible knowledge, but rather must identify knowledge with science.” [21, §4, p.4, emphasis in original]
quantum mechanics: The idea that knowledge is constituted of absolute certainties entails a spectator theory. A spectator theory, does, however, preclude empirical evidence for interactions during measurements, i.e., for evidence that our knowledge has support from outside of us, support from our contact with the world around us.

The incompatibility turns into a tension within positivism: The idea of an external source for our knowledge conflicts with the adherence to a spectator theory needed to ensure absolute knowledge.
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APPENDIX: A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO LATTICES

Definition 1 (Lattice). A partially ordered set \((L, \leq)\) with unique greatest lower bound \(a \wedge b\) and unique least upper bound \(a \vee b\) is called a lattice.
(a) If the lattice has a minimal element 0 and a maximal element 1, then the lattice is called **bounded**.

(b) An **orthocomplementation** is a map \( a \mapsto \neg a \) such that
\[
a \land \neg a = 0, \quad a \lor \neg a = 1, \quad \text{if } a \neq b : \neg a > \neg b.
\]

(c) In an orthocomplemented lattice \( L \), two elements \( a, b \) are **orthogonal**, denoted \( a \perp b \), if \( a < \neg b \), or, equivalently, \( b < \neg a \)—using the order reversing property of the ortho-complementation.

(d) An orthocomplemented lattice \( L \) is **orthomodular** if it satisfies weak modularity, i.e., for all \( a, b \in L \):
\[
a \land (\neg a \lor b) = a,
\]
or, equivalently, if \( a > b \):
\[
a \land (\neg a \lor b) = a.
\]

(e) A lattice \( L \) is **distributive** if for any \( a, b, c \in L \)
\[
a \land (b \lor c) = (a \lor b) \land (a \lor c).
\]

**Definition 2** (Compatibility). Two elements in a lattice, \( a, b \in L \) are called **compatible**, if the lattice generated by \( \{a, \neg a, b, \neg b\} \) is distributive.

If for \( a, b \in L \)
\[
a \land (\neg a \lor b) = b \quad \neg b \land (b \lor \neg a) = \neg a,
\]
then the elements
\[
0, a, \neg a, b, \neg b, a \land \neg b, \neg a \lor b, 1
\]
form the distributive sublattice generated by \( \{a, \neg a, b, \neg b\} \).

**Theorem 1** (Compatibility I). In an orthomodular lattice \( L \), \( a \) and \( b \) are compatible if and only if
\[
(a \land b) \lor (\neg a \land b) = b.
\]

The proof consists of combining Theorem (2.15) and (2.17) in [8].

**Proof.** If the sublattice is distributive, then
\[
(a \land b) \lor (a \land \neg b) = a \quad \text{and} \quad (a \land b) \lor (\neg a \land b) = b.
\]

It remains to show that \( \neg a \lor b = \neg a \lor \neg b \) and \( \neg a \land b = \neg a \land \neg b \).

As \( a > (a \land b) \), we employ orthomodularity,
\[
a = (a \land b) \lor (a \land \neg (a \land b)) = (a \land b) \lor (a \land \neg b),
\]
which proves the symmetry of compatibility. Further, we have to show equalities of the form
\[
(a \land b) \lor \neg b = a \land \neg b. \tag{3}
\]

Note, first, that in any lattice \( a \land b < b \) and, therefore,
\[
(a \land b) \lor \neg b = a \land \neg b.
\]

Applying orthomodularity, i.e., \( c_2 \lor (\neg c_2 \lor c_1) = c_1 \), yields
\[
(a \lor \neg b) \land (a \lor b) \lor (\neg a \lor b) = (a \lor b) \lor \neg b = b
\]
and, thus, we obtain \( \neg b \).

Note the important role of weak modularity in the proof above.

**Theorem 2** (Compatibility II). In an orthomodular lattice \( L \), \( a \) is compatible with \( b \) if and only if there exists mutually orthogonal elements \( a', b', c \in L \) such that
\[
a = a' \lor c \quad b = b' \lor c.
\]

**Proof.** If \( a \) and \( b \) are compatible, then
\[
(a \land b) \lor (\neg a \land b) = b
\]
\[
(a \land b) \lor (a \land \neg b) = a
\]
and thus we can set
\[
c := a \land b \quad a' := a \land \neg b \quad b' := b \land \neg a
\]
which yields the orthogonal elements. If, inversely, \( a \) and \( b \) can be expressed in the above form, then
\[
\neg a \land b = \neg a' \land \neg c \land (b' \lor c)
\]
\[
= b' \land \neg a' = b'
\]
using weak modularity. Furthermore,
\[
a \land b = (a' \lor c) \land (b' \lor c)
\]
\[
< (a' \lor c) \land (\neg a' \lor c)
\]
\[
= (a' \lor c) \land \neg a' = c
\]
using weak modularity again, and, thus, with
\[
a \land b = (a' \lor c) \land (b' \lor c) > c
\]
we obtain \( a \land b = c \). This yields \( \neg b \).

**Theorem 3** (Existence of dispersion-free states). On an orthomodular lattice \( L \), there exists a dispersion-free state if and only if there exists an atom in the center of the lattice.

We follow the proof of Theorem I in [17] and the proof of Theorem 1 in [18].
Proof. We first show that the existence of a dispersion-free state $\mu$ implies that there is an element in the center of $L$ different from 0 and 1. Let $L_\mu := \{a \in L \mid \mu(a) = 1\}$. Note that $L_\mu \neq \emptyset$. For any totally ordered subset $T$ of $L_\mu$, the element $a_0 = \wedge\{a \in T\} \in L_\mu$ by the properties of a dispersion-free state. Thus, with Zorn’s Lemma, $L_\mu$ has a minimal element $a_m$.

Let us now show that $a_m \leq a \forall a \in L_\mu$: If $a_1 \in L_\mu$, then there must exist an $a_2 \neq 0$ with $a_2 < a_m$. Otherwise $a_m \wedge a_1 = 0$ which contradicts the requirement of a dispersion-free state. By weak modularity and Theorem 1, there exist an $b \in L$ orthogonal to $a_2$ such that $a_2 \lor b = a_m$.

If $\mu(a_2) = 0$, then $\mu(b) = 1$ and, thus, $b \in L_\mu$ and $b < a_m$, thus, $b = a_m$. But then, $a_2 = 0$ and we obtain a contradiction, and we conclude that $\mu(a_2) = 1$. This yields, again, $a_2 = a_m$, and then $a_m < a_1$.

We now show that $a_m$ lies in the center of $L$: For any $b \in L_\mu$, $a_m < b$ and the two commute by weak modularity. If $b \notin L_\mu$, then with $\mu(b) + \mu(-b) = \mu(b \lor -b) = \mu(1) = 1$ it follows $-b \in L_\mu$. Thus, $a_m < -b$ and, therefore, $a_m$ is compatible with $-b$ and thus with $b$.

Now, we show that $a_m$ is an atom in $L$, i.e., $\forall b \in L, b < a_m$ either $b = a_m$ or $b = 0$. It suffices to show that if $b \notin L, b < a$ then $b = 0$: In this case, $-b \in L_\mu$, and $-b > a_m > b$. Therefore, $b \land b < b \land -b = 0$.

It remains to construct a dispersion-free state from an atom $a$ in the center of $L$: Let $\mu(a) = 1$. Any $b \in L$ commutes with $a$, and thus $a \land b$ exists and $a \land b < a$. Since $a$ is an atom, either $a \land b = 0$ and, therefore, $b = 0$ and $\mu(b) = 0$, or $a \land b = a$. In the latter case, $a < b$ and $\mu(b) = 1$. Thus, $\mu$ is dispersion-free.

Lemma 1 (Incompatible elements). If $a < b$ and $a$ are not compatible with $c$ for some $a, b, c \in L$, then also $b$ and $c$ are incompatible.

Proof. We have to show: If $a < b$ and $b$ is compatible with $c$, then also $a$ is compatible with $c$. Let us consider

\[ a \land \neg c = a \land \neg c' \land \neg d \quad \text{Thm} 2, c = c' \lor d \]
\[ = a \land b' \land \neg d \quad c' \perp b' \]
\[ = a \land b' \quad d \perp b' \]
\[ = a \land b = a \quad a < b \]

and thus

\[ (a \land c) \lor (a \land \neg c) = (a \land c) \lor a = a . \]

\[ \square \]