arXiv:1912.10880v1 [quant-ph] 23 Dec 2019

Are Non-Boolean Event Structures the Precedence or Consequence of Quantum Probability?

Christopher A. Fuchs[1] and Blake C. Stacey[1]

[1] *Physics Department, University of Massachusetts Boston*

(Dated: February 16, 2022)

In the last five years of his life Itamar Pitowsky developed the idea that the formal structure of quantum theory should be thought of as a Bayesian probability theory adapted to the empirical situation that Nature's events just so happen to conform to a non-Boolean algebra. QBism too takes a Bayesian stance on the probabilities of quantum theory, but its probabilities are the personal degrees of belief a sufficiently-schooled agent holds for the consequences of her actions on the external world. Thus QBism has two levels of the personal where the Pitowskyan view has one. The differences go further. Most important for the technical side of both views is the quantum mechanical Born Rule, but in the Pitowskyan development it is a theorem, not a postulate, arising in the way of Gleason from the primary empirical assumption of a non-Boolean algebra. QBism on the other hand strives to develop a way to think of the Born Rule in a pre-algebraic setting, so that it itself may be taken as the primary empirical statement of the theory. In other words, the hope in QBism is that, suitably understood, the Born Rule is quantum theory's most fundamental postulate, with the Hilbert space formalism (along with its perceived connection to a non-Boolean event structure) arising only secondarily. This paper will avail of Pitowsky's program, along with its extensions in the work of Jeffrey Bub and William Demopoulos, to better explicate QBism's aims and goals.

I. DEDICATION BY CAF

This paper was written too late to appear in the memorial volume for Itamar Pitowsky edited by Meir Hemmo and Orly Shenker [1], but it is never too late to tribute dear friends. Itamar Pitowsky and Bill Demopoulos came into my life as a package. I met Itamar in 1997 at the Sixth UK Conference on Conceptual and Mathematical Foundations of Modern Physics in Hull, England. It was my first quantum foundations conference, and to tell the truth I was a little ashamed to be there: Indeed I had to work up the nerve to ask my postdoctoral advisor John Preskill if I might use some of my funding for such a frilly thing. And it was a frilly thing — only one talk in the whole meeting made any impression on me, Itamar's on simplifying Gleason's theorem. It blew me away. When I got home, I studied his paper [2] with meticulous care, not just for the math, but also for its programmatic character. I found something so alluring in how he presented the big picture of his efforts at the end, I pledged to one day write a paper myself ending with nearly the same words: "More broadly, Theorem 6 is part of the attempt to understand the mathematical foundations of quantum mechanics. In particular, it helps to make the distinction between its physical content and mathematical artifact clear."

Well, I must have made an impression on Itamar too, as he described me to Bill Demopoulos as "a Wunderkind of quantum information". (If we could only recapture our youths!) One thing led to another, from more than 1,300 email exchanges, to many long, thoughtful

walks at Bill's farm in Ontario. Both men made an indelible impression on me. Professionally, what set them apart from other philosophers of physics is that, rather than try to dissuade me from developing QBism, they both were sources of constant encouragement. But there was so much more than our professional relationships between us. At least in the case of Bill's passing, it was not so sudden as Itamar's that I was able to tell him I love him.

This paper is dedicated to Itamar and Bill.

II. INTRODUCTION

QBism is a relative newcomer among interpretations of quantum mechanics. Though it has identifiable precursors, no mature statement of it existed in the literature before 2009–2010 [3, 4]. Indeed, even the pre-QBist writings of the developers themselves contain much that QBism flatly contradicts [5]. One brief summary is that QBism is

> an interpretation of quantum mechanics in which the ideas of *agent* and *experience* are fundamental. A "quantum measurement" is an act that an agent performs on the external world. A "quantum state" is an agent's encoding of her own personal expectations for what she might experience as a consequence of her actions. Moreover, each measurement outcome is a personal event, an experience specific to the agent who incites it. Subjective judgments thus comprise much of the quantum machinery, but the formalism of the theory establishes the standard to which agents should strive to hold their expectations, and that standard for the relations among beliefs is as objective as any other physical theory [6].

This is not the kind of move that one takes lightly. Only the stunning empirical success of quantum mechanics, coupled with the decades of confusion over its conceptual foundations, could have compelled the codification of thoughts like these into a detailed, systematized research program. The practical triumphs of quantum physics imply that the questions of conceptual foundations should be taken seriously, while the perennial debate, ceaseless and without clarification, implies that a radical step is necessary.

When compared against most interpretations of the quantum, QBism requires perspective shifts of an almost virtiginous character. For starters, it insists upon a stringently personalist Bayesianism. The problem with physicists and probability is that when one has vast heaps of data, pretty much any even half-baked interpretation of probability is good enough to scrape by. It is not until we push further into matters of principle that mediocrity begins to pose a real hazard. Fortunately, physicists are trained to shed intuitions that prove counterproductive. We could once get by with acting like the data points which help shape probability assignments actually *determine* them, but then, we also got along for quite a while thinking that heavy bodies must fall faster than light ones.

Likewise, foregrounding the concept of *agent* means taking a first-person perspective, and first-person singular at that [7]. This means rephrasing, and sometimes even rethinking, some discussions of quantum matters. For example, a first-person take on quantum communication protocols is that, fundamentally, Alice wants to be confident that Bob will react in the way she needs after she has intervened in the world by sending a message. For if Alice had no concern for the consequences returning to her or the potential suffering of those she regards as kin, then she would abandon the photonics and just throw a bottle into the sea.

Some changes in language end up being rather modest, though, in scale if not in eventual implication. QBism makes no category distinction between quantum states and probability distributions; the former are just examples of the latter in a coordinate system adapted for atomic and molecular physics [8]. Thus, the QBist avoids locutions like "the quantum state of the system" in favor of "*my* quantum state *for* the system" — not too many letters changed, but with a great deal of history behind the difference. A QBist exposition might say, "Suppose a physicist Alice ascribes a quantum state ρ," a turn of phrase that is philosophically justified while also sounding quite natural, since ascribing quantum states is a thing that working physicists actually do.

This example illustrates the peculiar flipside of QBist radicalism. After traversing the wilds of personalist Bayesian probability and the further realms of participatory realism [9], one arrives with a new appreciation of home. Certain habits of more innocent days turn out to be philosophically justified, or at least justifiable; one learns that one can do quantum foundations and quantum *physics* at the same time.

So, now that we've gotten a little bit of seeming almost-paradox on our fingers, it would be good to sort out what is and is not a shocking departure. How does QBism situate itself with respect to those other interpretational programs that share some of its morphology, either by convergence or common ancestry?

III. TWO LEVELS OF PERSONALISM

Introducing a collection of correspondence, CAF identified three characteristics of QBism that distinguish it from prior interpretations [10, p. ix].

> First is its crucial reliance on the mathematical tools of quantum information theory to reshape the look and feel of quantum theory's formal structure. Second is its stance that two levels of radical "personalism" are required to break the interpretational conundrums plaguing the theory. Third is its recognition that with the solution of the theory's conundrums, quantum theory does not reach an end, but is the start of a great journey.

We will return to the first point later (it is the motivation for the technical work that occupies most of our time not given over to teaching and administration). In this section, we will focus on the second point, the need for two levels of personalism. A pivotal moment in the history of QBism was the realization that one level did not suffice, even though that was already one more than many were willing to grant!

We have already met a significant part of the first layer in the introduction, where we noted that in QBism, quantum states are the possessions of the agent who asserts them. This is already enough to get booted from a philosophy-of-physics meeting, but we've hardly gotten started. Chasing the demands of self-consistency, we find that other elements of the quantum formalism must *also* be given the same status as quantum states, that is, the status of personalist Bayesian probability assignments. One important example is *the association of specific POVM elements with potential future experiences.* A positive-operator-valued measure, or POVM for short, is the basic notion of measurement in quantum information theory. Briefly put, a POVM is a collection of positive semidefinite operators on a Hilbert space that sum to the identity operator on that space, and each of the operators (or "effects") in the set corresponds to a possible outcome of the measurement that the POVM represents [11, 12].

In contrast, in the tradition of Bub, Demopoulos, and Pitowsky one moves from quantum to classical by replacing the space of possible events with a non-Boolean algebra. Quantum probability is Bayesian probability on this algebraic structure. Events are tied to projectors on Hilbert space, and this binding is in essence an objective fact of nature [13]. This leads quickly to trouble [14]. For suppose that a physicist Alice starts her day with a subjective probability assignment, encoded as a density operator ρ. She then performs a measurement and obtains an outcome, which will be associated with some projector Π. She updates her state assignment accordingly, replacing ρ with Π. But now, *her probabilities have been locked to an objective value.* In order for the personalism of quantum-state assignments not to collapse into triviality, there has to be more flexibility. (For additional discussion on this point, see the 10 January 2007 entry drawn from correspondence with Bub, Demopoulos, Pitowsky, and Veiko Palge in Appendix B.)

The thorn that spurred the development of the second level of personalism was the old thought-experiment known as "Wigner's Friend" or the puzzle of the observer being observed [8]. This is a tale — *not* as old as time, though within the insular world of quantum foundations, it may seem so — a tale of two agents and one quantum system. The agents could be Wigner and his friend, or in the lingo of quantum information, Alice and Bob. The story begins with Alice and Bob having a conversation. They both agree, let us say, that a quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ expresses their beliefs about the system. (If they are inclined to the Bayesian school, they don't *have* to agree at this stage. $|\psi\rangle$ is a catalogue of expectations, or bluntly put, a compendium of beliefs. But let's say they do agree so far.) Moreover, they agree that at a given time, Alice will perform an experiment upon the system, a measurement which both Alice and Bob say is represented by some mathematical structure such that if Alice observes outcome i, she will update her expectations to the state vector $|i\rangle$. Then, Bob walks away and leaves the room. Alice is alone with the system. Time passes, and the agreed-upon moment of measurement goes by.

What, now, is the "correct" state that each physicist should have chosen for the system? Alice, everyone concurs, should have selected some vector $|i\rangle$. But what about Bob? Unless he holds Alice somehow exempt from quantum mechanics, he would express his beliefs about her, in principle, with a quantum state ρ, and a time-evolution operator family U_t with which he can adjust those expectations and calculate probabilities pertaining to different times. Before Bob interacts with Alice or the other system, he would write a joint state for the two, a quantity of the form

$$U_t \left(\rho \otimes |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\right) U_t^\dagger \tag{1}$$

which will in general be an entangled state. Bob's state for the system will be a partial trace of this, typically a mixed state completely different from $|i\rangle$.

Either Alice or Bob could be deemed "incorrect"; for if either "had all the information" they would arguably be forced to adopt the state assignment of the other.

> And so the back and forth goes. Who has the *right* state of information? The conundrums simply get too heavy if one tries to hold to an agent-independent notion of correctness for otherwise personalistic quantum states. A QBist dispels these and similar difficulties by being conscientiously forthright. *Whose information?* "Mine!" *Information about what?* "The consequences (for *me*) of *my* actions upon the physical system!" It's all "I-I-me-me mine," as the Beatles sang [8].

Lately, there has been a resurgence of interest in Wigner's Friend — a growth industry, by the standards of quantum foundations. These recent elaborations of Wigner's Friend wrap

it around a no-hidden-variables argument [15–18]. QBism, having answered the original conundrum on its own terms, finds nothing troubling about these elaborations. (Pusey regards an extended Wigner's Friend puzzle as "actually good news" for QBism and for Rovelli's Relational Quantum Mechanics [17]. For a comparison and contrast between QBism and Rovellian RQM, see [6]; for a critical evaluation of various statements made about QBism in this niche of the literature, see [19].)

IV. GLEASON'S THEOREM

Gleason's theorem is, in our experience, less well-known among physicists than some of its conceptual descendants and confrères. The original statement had the mildly intimidating language of finding "all measures on the closed subspaces of a Hilbert space" [20]. In more detail, Gleason defined a *frame function* of weight W for a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ to be a function $f : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that if $\{x_i\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}$ then

$$\sum f(x_i) = W. \tag{2}$$

A frame function is *regular* if there exists a self-adjoint operator T acting on $\mathcal{H}$ such that $f(x)$ is given by an inner product

$$f(x) = (Tx, x) \tag{3}$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$. Gleason proves, by ingenious and somewhat arduous means, that all nonnegative frame functions in three or more dimensions are regular.

If the weight of a frame function is 1, then that function begins to look like a probability assignment. In physics language, Gleason showed that if measurement outcomes are represented by vectors in orthonormal bases, then any consistent ascription of probabilities to measurement outcomes must take the form of the Born Rule. The definition of frame functions assumes that probability ascriptions are *noncontextual* [21]: The function f sends a vector to a number in the unit interval, regardless of what basis that vector may be a part of. Rather remarkably, Gleason's proof yields both the set of valid density operators and the Born Rule. Quite an economy of postulates! It is easy to see why an attempt to rebuild quantum theory on a better axiomatic footing might proceed by way of Gleason's theorem. As Wilce put it [22],

> The point to bear in mind is that, once the quantum-logical skeleton [the lattice of closed subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$] is in place, the remaining statistical and dynamical apparatus of quantum mechanics is essentially fixed. In this sense, then, quantum mechanics — or, at any rate, its mathematical framework — *reduces to* quantum logic and its attendant probability theory.

Why, then, have the QBist and QBist-adjacent efforts at reconstructing quantum theory skipped past Gleason's theorem? Part of the answer lies in that invocation of "the quantum-logical skeleton": As any good biologist knows, bones are not simple affairs [23], and presuming a working skeleton is asking for quite the sophisticated development already!

Gleason begins with a Hilbert space and orthonormal bases upon it. How, then, should we arrive at Hilbert space? Pitowsky presents an argument for getting to the point where Gleason can take over, a *representation theorem* for lattices that satisfy a certain set of conditions inspired by quantum mechanics [24]. He admits a gap in this argument, partly closed

by another remarkable theorem, this one by Maria Pia Solèr [25, 26]. But the QBist concern is more fundamental: Those lattice-theoretic conditions hail from *the quantum physics of the 1930s,* when "uncertainty" was the shocking feature, long before the discovery of more subtle mysteries like the violation of Bell inequalities. We can always take a fundamentally classical theory, a theory of local degrees of freedom, and *hide those variables* by imposing an "uncertainty principle" [27, 28]. The resulting theories include features like the no-cloning theorem, incompatible observables, and even interference between paths in a Mach–Zehnder interferometer. This modern perspective, informed by studies into questions like what a quantum computer requires to outperform a classical emulation of one, takes the glamor away from the notions in which quantum logic was grounded.

The original version of Gleason's theorem fails if the Hilbert space is two-dimensional. Why? When $d = 2$, one cannot hold one basis vector in place and twirl the others around to generate multiple distinct bases. So, the constraints assumed by Gleason are too weak to carry real implicative weight. One might, for example, paint the northern hemisphere of the Bloch sphere all over with 1's, and the southern hemisphere with 0's. The resulting assignment of probabilities to von Neumann measurements — remember, orthonormal bases in $d = 2$ are pairs of antipodal points on the Bloch sphere — would be consistent with Gleason's rules, yet no choice of density operator ρ can yield those probabilities. This pesky difficulty is obviated if one follows the practice of quantum information theory and broadens the notion of *measurement* beyond the von Neumann definition to the wider class of POVMs. Doing so allows a proof of a Gleason-type result that is both simpler to prove and applicable in $d = 2$ where Gleason's was not [29, 30]. For additional discussion, see [31–33].

The general good cheer created by shifting the fundamental notion of measurement to POVMs led QBism further from the quantum-logic tradition.

V. NON-BOOLEANITY AS A CONSEQUENCE

In this section, we will derive non-Booleanity as a consequence of a more fundamental manifestation of quantum strangeness, the nonexistence of intrinsic hidden variables. We will step through this argument for the case where it is simplest, a single qubit, which is already enough to derive a theory with noncommuting observables. Having gotten that far, we will briefly outline two approaches to generalizing the argument and thus deriving quantum theory in higher dimensions.

The centerpiece of the QBist program for reconstructing quantum theory is the concept of a *reference measurement.* This is an experiment with the property that if an agent possesses a probability distribution over its outcomes, she can calculate the probabilities that she should use for any other measurement. In classical particle mechanics, a reference measurement would be an experiment that reads off the position and momentum of all particles in the system, thereby locating it within phase space and allowing the agent to extrapolate the full dynamical trajectory. Any other experiment — say, observing the total angular momentum — is essentially a coarse-graining of the information that the reference measurement provides. If Alice expresses her uncertainty about the system's phase-space coordinates as a probability distribution over phase space, then she can calculate her probabilities for the possible results of a coarse-grained observation by convolving that "Liouville density" with an appropriate kernel.

Classical mechanics has the property that if two Liouville densities are distinguishable by a coarse-grained measurement, then they are nonoverlapping. Quantum physics violates

this principle, in a way that we can make precise.

Consider the following scenario [34]. An agent Alice has a physical system of interest that she plans to perform either one of two experimental protocols upon. In one protocol, she will send the system directly into a measuring device and obtain an outcome. In the other, she will pass the system through a reference measurement first and then send it into the device from the first protocol. Let H_i denote the possible outcomes of the reference measurement and D_j the possible outcomes of the other. Then Alice can write her expectations for the results of these two protocols as $P(H_i, D_j)$, for sending the system into the D_j device via the reference H_i experiment first, and $Q(D_j)$, for going directly into the D_j device. Probability theory itself imposes no bond between these expectations: different conditions, different probabilities! But the additional assumption that the reference measurement simply reads off the pre-existing physical condition of the system, *an ontological assumption on top of probability theory,* does furnish a link:

$$Q(D_j) = \sum_i P(H_i, D_j) = \sum_i P(H_i)P(D_j|H_i). \tag{4}$$

The first equality here is a *physical* assumption, while the second is mandated by logic. That is, if Alice rejects the second equality — the "Law of Total Probability" — she is being Dutch-book incoherent, whereas if she rejects the first, she is just being skeptical about the applicability of classical intuition. Quantum physics provides a replacement for the first equality. Instead of marginalizing over H_i as in the previous expression, one performs a "quantum marginalization":

$$Q(D_j) = \mu\left(P(H_i, D_j)\right). \tag{5}$$

The exact form of the function μ will depend upon the choice of POVM used as the reference measurement.

To make this more concrete, let us take the case where the system of interest is a single qubit. Then a reference measurement can be any POVM whose effects span the space of Hermitian operators on the Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^2$. For example, let the reference measurement be a POVM whose effects are proportional to rank-1 projectors that form a regular tetrahedron inscribed in the Bloch sphere. A convenient indexing is to let a and b take the values ± 1, and to write

$$H_{ab} = \frac{1}{4}\left(I + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(a\sigma_x + b\sigma_y + ab\sigma_z)\right). \tag{6}$$

These four operators sum to the identity and span the space as desired. With

$$P(H_{ab}) = \mathrm{tr}(\rho H_{ab}) \tag{7}$$

by the Born Rule, we have

$$Q(D_j) = \mathrm{tr}(\rho D_j) = \sum_{ab}\left[3P(H_{ab}) - \frac{1}{2}\right]P(D_j|H_{ab}). \tag{8}$$

Here, we have defined

$$P(D_j|H_{ab}) = 2\mathrm{tr}(D_j H_{ab}) \tag{9}$$

as Alice's probability of obtaining the outcome D_j *given* that her preparation for the system is the state proportional to H_{ab}.

In this case, the function μ takes the form of the classical Law of Total Probability but with an elementwise affine map applied to the probability vector $P(H_{ab})$. Said another way, Eq. (8) *is* the Born Rule, written in explicitly probabilistic language throughout.

We see that picking a reference measurement establishes a mapping from density matrices into a probability simplex, thereby furnishing a wholly probabilistic way to write the quantum theory of a qubit. Importantly, in this representation not all probability vectors correspond to valid quantum states. The state space $\mathcal{P}$ is the ball in $\mathbb{R}^4$ within which

$$\frac{1}{6} \leq \sum_{a,b} P(H_{ab})P'(H_{ab}) \leq \frac{1}{3}, \ \forall \ P, P' \in \mathcal{P}. \tag{10}$$

The pure states will be exactly those that saturate the upper bound on their Euclidean norm. Orthogonal states are *maximally distant,* saturating the lower bound, but the lower bound is not zero. As we prove in Appendix A, this is in fact a very general result, holding true for any reference measurement: Quantum states that are orthogonal in Hilbert space are overlapping probability distributions.

We can turn this idea around. Let's forget quantum theory for the moment and take the relation

$$Q(D_j) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[\alpha P(H_i) - \beta\right] P(D_j|H_i) \tag{11}$$

as the defining axiom of a probabilistic theory. That is, let's say that this expression, which "breaks" classical intuition in the minimal way possible, is the empirical rule on top of probability theory that tells us how to "marginalize" over an experiment that is not merely ignored, but *unperformed.* Probability vectors $P(H)$ and conditional probability matrices $P(D|H)$ are consistent with one another if they always yield valid probability vectors $Q(D)$ when combined in this way. This provides a reciprocal consistency condition between the set of valid $P(H)$ and the set of valid $P(D|H)$, which we can turn into a condition on the set of valid $P(H)$ by making some fairly mild assumptions relating those two sets. For instance, we can posit that the state of maximal indifference, the flat probability vector, is a valid $P(H)$, and that posteriors from maximal indifference are valid priors. (For some conceptual background, see the 7 January 2011 entry drawn from correspondence with Demopoulos in Appendix B.) This implies that, if the $P(H)$ are column vectors, then any row in a matrix $P(D|H)$ is the transpose of some valid $P(H)$, up to overall scaling:

$$P(D_j|H_i) = \gamma P'(H_i). \tag{12}$$

The condition that $Q(D_j)$ be always nonnegative then yields

$$\alpha \sum_i P(H_i)P'(H_i) - \beta \sum_i P'(H_i) \geq 0, \tag{13}$$

which by normalization simplifies to

$$P \cdot P' \geq \frac{\beta}{\alpha}. \tag{14}$$

Pairs that saturate this bound are maximally distant from one another and imply a $Q(D_j)$ of 0. Moreover, because $Q(D)$, $P(H)$ and $P(D|H)$ must themselves be properly normalized, we have that

$$1 = \alpha - N\beta. \tag{15}$$

We follow the guiding principle that our theory should be as broadly applicable as possible, so the structures within it should have no "distinguishing marks or scars" that would make them peculiar to particular physical situations. Likewise, we want the sets we derive to be *maximal* with respect to the constraints we apply: To do otherwise would be to implicitly admit an additional constraint, and thus to be making more empirical assumptions on top of the basic "nonclassical marginalization" rule originally posited. Therefore, our set $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ of valid probability vectors must have the property that any two points in it have a Euclidean inner product greater than β/α, and including *any additional point* would spoil that property.

This is already enough to make available some useful tools from higher-dimensional geometry. Given a point P in the probability simplex Δ, the *polar* of P is the set of all vectors in $\mathbb{R}^N$ whose elements sum to unity and which have an inner product with P that is greater than or equal to β/α. The polar of a set is the set of all vectors that are in the polars of all the points in the given set:

$$A^* = \left\{ u : \sum_i u(i) = 1,\ u \cdot v \geq \frac{\beta}{\alpha}\ \forall v \in A \right\}. \tag{16}$$

The requirement that a state space $\mathcal{P}$ be maximal implies that it is a *self-polar* subset of the probability simplex [34].

To move in the direction of quantum theory, we introduce a concept of dimension in terms of *Mutually Maximally Distant* sets. For any self-polar subset of the probability simplex, there must be a smallest sphere that encloses it, i.e., the circumscribing sphere of the state space. The states on this sphere are states of maximal confidence with respect to the reference measurement. We define a Mutually Maximally Distant set in $\mathcal{P}$ to be a set of points on the intersection of $\mathcal{P}$ and its circumscribing sphere such that any two points in the set saturate the lower bound on the inner product, β/α. This is the tool we need to establish an information-theoretic notion of "dimension": The dimension of a system is the largest possible size of a set of hypotheses, each of which are assertions of maximal confidence, and any two of which are maximally distinct from each other. (This is the natural counterpart of classical probability theory, where hypotheses of maximal confidence are Kronecker delta functions.) A brief derivation [34, 35] shows that

$$d = 1 + \frac{r_{\text{out}}^2}{r_{\text{mid}}^2}, \tag{17}$$

where r_{out} is the radius of the circumscribing sphere and

$$r_{\text{mid}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N\alpha}} \tag{18}$$

is the radius of the *mid-sphere*, the sphere around the barycenter within which any two points always have an inner product that satisfies the lower bound.

The fundamental "bit" in our theory is a system whose state space $\mathcal{P}_{\text{bit}}$ meets the following condition. The maximal size of a set of points, any two of which are maximally distant from each other, is equal to exactly 2. In other words, given any hypothesis of maximal confidence about the system, there exists exactly one other hypothesis of maximal confidence fully distinct from it. (And if this applied only to *some* of those extremal hypotheses, then the state space would have "distinguishing marks and scars" indicating some other empirical

constraint that we are not allowing at this level of generality.) For our state space $\mathcal{P}_{\rm bit}$ to have this geometrical property and to satisfy the maximality condition given above, it must be a *ball* within the probability simplex in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Moreover, we can say which ball it is, because unless we invoke further empirical additions to probability theory, we have to use the distance scale that is already available to us, meaning that $\mathcal{P}_{\rm bit}$ is the *inscribed ball of the probability simplex.* That is, to satisfy the condition $d = 2$, we must have $r_{\rm out} = r_{\rm mid}$, and both of them are in turn fixed to the value

$$r_{\rm out} = r_{\rm mid} = r_{\rm in} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N(N-1)}}. \tag{19}$$

We still have to fix the Euclidean dimension N for the fundamental "bit" system. There are multiple ways of doing so [34], each of which suggest different "foil theories" to quantum mechanics. However, even before fixing N, we know already that as long as the "nonclassical marginalization" rule (11) is indeed nonclassical (that is, $\beta > 0$), our theory will spurn explanation in terms of intrinsic hidden variables. With $N = 4$, we recover the Bloch ball and the theory of a single qubit, including all the POVMs that can be performed upon it. This is already enough to prove the impossibility of underlying hidden variables: While a qubit theory restricted to von Neumann measurements can be explained classically, fully general POVMs upon a qubit cannot [36].

In order to reach this conceptual point as quickly as possible, we have stepped only lightly upon the algebraic manipulations. For more detailed treatments, see [3] and [34], as well as [37, 38].

Having derived the theory of a single qubit, one way forward would be to compose them. An argument based on Einstein locality, and using the postulate of a reference measurement to justify a Gleason-type noncontextuality condition, gives the tensor-product rule for composing state spaces [14, 39]. This still leaves open the question of why the joint states for, say, a bipartite system of two qubits should be the *positive semidefinite* operators on the tensor-product space. A voyage into the literature yields at least one answer to this question [40, 41], but the assumptions involved may feel unsatisfying — mathematically over-powered or physically under-motivated.

Another option, and the one we prefer, is to start with Eq. (11) and take it as the basic way to express the nonexistence of intrinsic hidden variables for systems of all dimensionalities d. In the same manner as before, this yields a theory defined by a *qplex,* a proper subset of the probability simplex in $\mathbb{R}^{d^2}$. Any two points P and P' in a qplex $\mathcal{P}$ satisfy the inequalities

$$\frac{1}{d(d+1)} \leq P \cdot P' \leq \frac{2}{d(d+1)}. \tag{20}$$

For details on how to go from the very general-looking Eq. (11) to these particular inequalities, see [34]. The remaining challenge is then to identify the qplexes that are isomorphic to quantum state space — the *Hilbert qplexes* — among all the possibilities, and to do so in the most economical possible way. Current research focuses on relaxing the conditions that are known to work, and understanding the geometrical structures that are necessary to establish the isomorphism, which turn out to be quite captivating entities [42–48].

Assuming that the Law of Total Probability is the way to "marginalize" over an unperformed experiment, and the desire for distinguishable states to be nonoverlapping distributions, are expressions of faith in hidden variables. QBism holds that the way to make progress is to let go of this faith and encourage something more interesting in its place. This

analysis echoes Demopoulos' criticism of the early Putnam, in which Demopoulos points out how a worldview can reduce to being a hidden-variable one even if it was not formulated with a specific ontology — Bohmian or de Broglian, say — explicitly in mind [49]:

> By claiming to avoid hidden variables, Putnam almost certainly meant that he could avoid a theory like Bohm's or de Broglie's. For Putnam, such theories are characterized by their invocation of special forces to account for the disturbance by measurement. Since he nowhere appeals to such forces, Putnam believes his account to be free of an appeal to hidden variables. The idea that his interpretation of the logical connectives assumes an underlying space of truth-value assignments — and that it is therefore a hidden variable interpretation of quantum mechanics after all — appeals to an abstract notion of hidden variable theory, one which was only beginning to emerge when Putnam wrote his paper, and one with which he was at the time almost certainly unfamiliar.

VI. INTERLUDE: THE PBR THEOREM

In the previous section, we explored the consequences of abandoning the notion that *distinguishable* means *nonoverlapping.* This provides a convenient setting to discuss the Pusey–Barrett–Rudolph (PBR) theorem [50]. The PBR theorem is a "no hidden variables" argument, or to say it more precisely, an argument that hidden variables will end up being redundant. Following the tradition of what nowadays is called the "ontological models framework" [51], it tries to express quantum probabilities as being due to ignorance of underlying ontic states, and then shows that different quantum states must correspond to nonoverlapping distributions over the ontic state space. The crucial feature of the ontological models framework is that probabilities for experiment outcomes are calculated using the Law of Total Probability:

$$\mathrm{tr}\rho E = \int d\lambda \, P_\rho(\lambda) P(E|\lambda). \tag{21}$$

By adopting the Born Rule in the "quantum marginalization" form of Eq. (11) as a fundamental postulate, we spurn this framework from first principles onward. And because QBism lies outside of the ontological models framework, preferring to find its realism on a more subtle and stimulating level, the PBR theorem has little to say about it. Indeed, the PBR theorem has no *direct* impact on QBism at all, though it may have the indirect effect of indicating that half-hearted attempts at interpreting quantum theory in an informational way do not go far enough.

The PBR theorem relies upon a compatibility criterion between quantum states that was first codified by Caves, CAF and Schack [52], based on an earlier proposal by Peierls [53, p. 11]. Bub has an admirably concise exposition of the PBR theorem, in an essay where he also raises the intriguing question of proving analogues of it in nonclassical theories that are not quantum mechanics. He shows that an analogue of the PBR theorem can be proved in a nonclassical and nonquantum setting that he calls "Bananaworld" [54].

VII. DEMOPOULOS

The interpretational work of Demopoulos owes much to Pitowsky. He credits Pitowsky for advancing and defending "the view that the ψ–function represents a state of belief about

a system rather than its physical state" [55]. Demopoulos regards the probabilities in quantum physics as being probabilities over "effects", which are explicitly *not* the effects that comprise POVMs [49]. Rather, they "are to be thought of as the traces of particle interactions on systems for which we have 'admissible' theoretical descriptions in terms of their dynamical properties" [55]. It is ultimately difficult to draw a line between this and, for instance, Pauli's imagery of data recorded "by objective registering apparatus, the results of which are objectively available for anyone's inspection" [56]. Therefore, we find Demopoulos' interpretation vulnerable to critiques in the Wigner's Friend tradition.

That said, there is much in Demopoulos' writing that aligns with QBism, and in the interests of solidarity and emotional positivity, we will spend much of this section talking about that.

First, let us get out of the way one of the more significant divisions between QBism and the position that Demopoulos articulated. From the standpoint of the former, the latter tends to slide back to a rather Bohrian view that quantum phenomena must be treated through classical intermediary apparatus, with a definition of *classical* that may have more to do with stable record-keeping than with the details of Newtonian or Maxwellian dynamics.

Quoting a letter that CAF wrote to Demopoulos on 9 January 2011 [10]:

> I didn't see that you strengthened your defense against my charge of a kind of dualism. Maybe I'm still missing something. When you write, "Such systems are epistemically accessible to an extent that systems which are characterized only in terms of their eternal properties and their effects are not," I would think that you're admitting that there are (at least) two distinct kinds of systems in the world: Those that have a certain type of epistemic accessibility and those that do not, and that that epistemic accessibility is not characterized by things to do with the observer's situation, but rather the with system's itself. [...] And you don't weaken my accusation any either by writing on page 18: "This kind of conceptual dependence, does not preclude the application of quantum mechanics to systems that record effects. Although it is largely a matter of convenience which systems are, and which are not, taken to record effects, it is not wholly a matter of convenience." The phrase 'not wholly a matter of convenience' again points me to an ontic distinction between two types of system. Again, a reason for my saying, "dualism". Similarly with respect to your sentence, "This leaves entirely open the empirical question of why it is that some systems appear to be amenable to descriptions that are expressible in the framework of classical mechanics." I.e., you don't explain why, but there is an empirical distinction between two kinds of system.
>
> I'm not saying there's anything necessarily philosophically wrong with a dualism; mostly it is that it just doesn't match my taste, and doesn't feel like the right direction for moving physics forward. It adds a bigger burden on the physicist than I'd rather him have: For now, for each lump of matter, he'll have to — in some mysterious way — come to a conclusion of whether it supports dynamical properties or not. How does he do that? Where you leave us is where Bohr left us — as far as I can tell, in just telling us "it must be so, but I'm not going to tell you where/how to make that distinction" ... i.e., that there must be two kinds of system for us to build our evidentiary base for the quantumly treatable ones at all.
>
> Imagine my going up to Rainer Blatt and saying, "Rainer, I just found this

> nice rock on the beach. You think you might be able to use it as a component in that quantum computer you want to build?" Asher Peres would say, "Of course he can use it as a component; it is just a matter of money. With enough money, any old rock can be polished into a quantum computer." But if it ain't so, then it must be a burden on physics to say when it can and when it cannot be done. My guess is that Rainer will never be able to codify and make explicit such a criterion of distinction; he'll never be able to tell me which tests he must perform to certify my rock ineligible for quantum computation.

When discussing Gleason's work, Demopoulos considers *two-valued measures,* maps from the closed subspaces of a Hilbert space to the pair $\{0, 1\}$. He notes [55],

> It is evident that generalized two-valued measures and generalized truth-value assignments are formally interchangeable with one another, whatever the conceptual differences between probability measures and truth-value assignments.

QBism stresses the "conceptual differences": Its preferred school of Bayesianism forcefully rejects the idea that a probability-1 assignment indicates pre-existing physical truth. This leads to dismissing the EPR criterion of reality.[1] As CAF wrote to Demopoulos on 29 November 2007 [10], regarding the paper eventually published as [49]:

> Where I do take issue with what you write is the very difficult issue of probability 1. If I understand you correctly, I disagree with the first sentence of the first full paragraph from page 22: "The representation of an elementary particle as a function which, when presented with an experimental configuration, yields an effect, is interchangeable with its representation as a class of propositions only when the effects are predictable with 0-1 probability."
>
> For, I would say, not even then.

Additional discussion on this point can be found in the 24 June 2006 entry drawn from correspondence with Bub in Appendix B.

Having established this difference in content and in taste, we can now proceed to matters of greater agreement. Demopoulos writes [49],

> Instead of providing a solution to the long-standing issues involving measurement and the paradoxes, the discovery of "the logic of quantum mechanics" revealed a new and different problem, namely, the impossibility of interpreting the probabilities of the theory so that every proposition belonging to a particle is non-contextually determinately true or false. Rather than refuting classical logic, this discovery should be seen as refuting the idea that the probabilities are interpretable as the probabilities of such propositions. Ironically, the consequences of quantum mechanics for logic are almost the precise opposite of what

[1] Likewise, it implies that "incompatible" quantum-state assignments do not have to indicate different intrinsic physical conditions of a system. Two quantum states ρ and ρ' are incompatible in the Peierlsian sense if there exists a measurement for which ascribing ρ implies the outcome probabilities $(0, 1)$, whereas ascribing ρ' implies the outcome probabilities $(1, 0)$. Shifting one's state assignment from ρ to ρ' thus changes a probability-0 assignment into probability-1, but the agent has no obligation to regard this as a shift of a pre-existing physical property, for the same reason that they do not take EPR as gospel.

> Quine and Putnam imagined they might be. If anything, the problem of hidden variables upholds the centrality of classical logic in our theorizing about the physical world, while allowing that the Boolean algebraic structures, which are so closely associated with classical logic, are not appropriate for every use of probability in physics.

QBism finds much to like here. Rather than stressing the "classical logic" language, QBism speaks in terms of *internal self-consistency*: Within a given scenario fixed by an agent's choice of action, the agent's mesh of beliefs should hold together, i.e., they should be Dutch-book coherent. Moreover, the notion of Dutch-book coherence is, after a fashion, built upon "classical logic". That is, one way of expressing the basic precept of it is that an agent should not assign different probabilities to events whose descriptions can be translated to one another by Boolean manipulations. The Law of Total Probability itself follows from Dutch-book coherence, but it is "not appropriate for every use of probability in physics".

QBism has been accused of being "instrumentalism" with tiresome regularity. In this regard, it is helpful to recall Demopoulos' response to that charge being leveled at his own interpretation. Replying to the accusation that his view would make quantum physics "a mere heuristic for prediction", Demopoulos noted [49],

> What is at issue is the interpretation of the quantum algorithm for assigning probabilities and for reasoning from the position of uncertainty which such probabilities necessarily signify. This leaves a considerable degree of realism intact. First, there is nothing in the view that denies the existence of elementary particles [...]. Secondly, the view allows that there is a plethora of properties which elementary particles are unproblematically represented as having; these include all of their eternal or non-dynamical properties. Both they and the particles themselves are real objects of theoretical investigation.

QBism reserves the right to quarrel with the letter of this creed, but it is in accord with the spirit of it.[2] The technical work outlined in §V above is a fundamentally realist investigation of exactly the type that Demopoulos indicates.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have availed ourselves of Pitowsky's program and its extensions, particularly the work of William Demopoulos, to better explicate QBism's aims and goals.

The Pitowskyan interpretation of quantum mechanics is, chiefly, the idea that the formal structure of quantum theory should be seen as a Bayesian probability theory, adapted to the empirical situation that Nature's events conspire to conform to a non-Boolean algebra. QBism also gives a Bayesian reading of quantum probabilities, but it instead regards them as the personal degrees of belief a savvy agent might hold for personal experiences arising from her actions on the external world. Thus QBism has two levels of personalism, whereas the Pitowskyan view has only one.

---

[2] For example, a working field theorist might devalue the word *particle,* or at least drop many connotations of it. But her motivation to do so would be based on the Unruh effect or on spacetime curvature invalidating a choice of positive-frequency subspace [57]. These reasons would have little to do with the "interpretation of quantum mechanics" as that topic has socially been defined. For more on QBism and QFT, see [6].

As we have seen, the differences go further and get into the technical meat of quantum information. The Born Rule is crucially important for the technical developments of both views, but in the Pitowskyan tradition it is a theorem, derived per Gleason from the underlying assumption of a non-Boolean algebra. In contrast, QBism strives to place the Born Rule in a pre-algebraic setting, so that it itself may shine forth as the primary empirical statement of the theory. The QBist approach to reconstructing quantum theory hopes that, in the right language, the Born Rule is quantum theory's most fundamental postulate, with the Hilbert space formalism arising as a consequence. There remains a certain *à la carte* aspect to the reconstruction of quantum theory from the Born Rule; the aspiring reconstructor has at some junctures her choice of secondary postulates to invoke, though they mostly have the character of asking that the resulting structures be as mathematically unremarkable as possible so that all the *physics* can be loaded into the Born Rule. We have stepped through this in the special case of a single qubit and the POVMs thereupon.

The distinctions between QBism and the Bub–Demopoulos–Pitowsky school manfiest in shifts of technical emphasis. We have seen, for example, how the QBist reconstruction program plays down Gleason's theorem and the quantum-logic tradition. On a deeper and more conceptual level, the two diverge in their theories of truth. There is, at least implicitly, a sentiment for a correspondence theory of truth in how Bub, Pitowsky and Demopoulos approach the quantum. By contrast, QBism invokes a Jamesian, pragmatist attitude. This is a move that is unfamiliar to many in the present-day philosophy-of-physics circles, as evidenced by Timpson's needing to define it for the professionals who read *Stud. Hist. Phil. Mod. Phys.* [58] with a footnote:

> Pragmatism is the position traditionally associated with the nineteenth and early twentieth century American philosophers P[ei]rce, James and Dewey; its defining characteristic being the rejection of *correspondence* notions of truth in which truths are supposed to mirror an independently existing reality after which we happen to seek, in favour of the thought that truth may not be separated from the process of enquiry itself. The caricature slogan for the pragmatist's replacement notion (definition) of truth is that 'Truth is what works!' in the business of the sincere and open investigation of nature.

(The authors admit a fondness for James, not just on account of his ideas but also because he writes to be understood — indeed, to make the life of the mind a thing that is *felt*.)

This turn to pragmatism has concrete expression in the QBist rejection of the EPR criterion and sidelining of the ontological models framework. To a QBist, trying to recast all quantum probabilities as ordinary, neoclassical ignorance is to miss the point entirely. One way or another, such efforts end as baroque restatements of their starting point. Much more intriguing are nontrivial reproductions of *portions* of quantum theory within such a framework, since these illustrate how some "quantum" behaviors are only *weakly nonclassical*. Among these are the no-cloning theorem and the fact that there is generally no good Boolean "and" operation for experiments — for spin-$\hat{x}$ and spin-$\hat{z}$ measurements upon a bit system, to pick an easy example. In turn, this demonstration indicates that quantum logic put its emphasis in the wrong place. This is no slight to its pioneers, only a retrospective judgment based on discoveries after their time. (As scientists, we belong to the last profession of romantics [59], the last to believe in geniuses — and John von Neumann was certainly one of those.)

Like we are with many subjects, we are quite willing to raid the quantum-logic bookshelf to find inspiration for technical conjectures [60], but non-Booleanity is not where we are

seeking the fundamental lesson of quantum mechanics. For us it is a consequence, not a presumption. More broadly, writing the Born Rule as Eq. (11) is part of the attempt to understand the mathematical foundations of quantum mechanics. In particular, it helps to make the distinction between its physical content and mathematical artifact clear.

IX. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported in part by the John Templeton Foundation. The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the John Templeton Foundation. CAF was further supported in part by the John E. Fetzer Memorial Trust, and grants FQXi-RFP-1612 and FQXi-RFP-1811B of the Foundational Questions Institute and Fetzer Franklin Fund, a donor advised fund of Silicon Valley Community Foundation.

Appendix A: Even Orthogonal Quantum States are Overlapping Probability Distributions

We begin by generalizing Eq. (6) to an arbitrary four-outcome reference measurement $\{H_i\}$ for a qubit. This is the minimum number of outcomes necessary for a qubit reference measurement; any fewer, and the POVM elements could not span the state space [61]. Given any qubit state ρ, at most one element of the set $\{H_i\}$ can be orthogonal to it, and so at most one entry in the vector $P(H)$ can equal zero. Consequently, any two qubit states ρ and ρ' will have probabilistic representations with overlapping support.

To generalize further and encompass systems of arbitrary dimension, as well as reference measurements that are not necessarily minimal, first we show that we can focus our attention on pure states. We can write any density matrix as a convex combination of rank-1 projectors, say in the matrix's eigenbasis, so if we have two quantum states

$$\rho := \sum_i c_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|, \;\; \rho' := \sum_j c'_j \left|\psi'_j\right\rangle\left\langle\psi'_j\right|, \tag{A1}$$

then their Hilbert–Schmidt inner product is just a weighted average:

$$\mathrm{tr}\rho\rho' = \sum_{ij} c_i c'_j \left|\left\langle\psi_i\middle|\psi'_j\right\rangle\right|^2. \tag{A2}$$

Let us say that the probabilistic representations of these basis vectors are

$$s_i(k) := \mathrm{tr}H_k|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|, \;\; s'_j(k) := \mathrm{tr}H_k\left|\psi'_j\right\rangle\left\langle\psi'_j\right|. \tag{A3}$$

Then, the inner product of ρ and ρ' is a weighted average of the "B-inner products" of these probability vectors:

$$\mathrm{tr}\rho\rho' = \sum_{ij} c_i c'_j \, s_i^{\mathrm{T}} B s'_j, \tag{A4}$$

where the matrix B is the inverse of the Gramian of the reference measurement:

$$[B^{-1}]_{mn} = \mathrm{tr}H_m H_n. \tag{A5}$$

The B-inner product of two valid probability vectors is bounded below by zero. What does this imply for the ordinary Euclidean inner product, i.e., the dot product? In particular, can the dot product ever be zero itself? To understand this, it suffices to consider two pure states, since per the above discussion, mixing cannot lower their inner products. Suppose that $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\psi'\rangle$ are two different pure states in dimension d. They define a subspace of the full space of Hermitian operators on $\mathbb{C}^d$. Let H_k^{P} denote the images of the reference-measurement effects projected into this subspace. Any quantum state living within this subspace will have the same inner products with the H_k^{P} as it did with the original H_k. Thus,

$$s(k) := \langle\psi|H_k|\psi\rangle = \langle\psi|H_k^{\mathrm{P}}|\psi\rangle, \tag{A6}$$

and likewise for s', the probabilistic representation of $|\psi'\rangle$.

Imagine that $s \cdot s'$ were zero. Because each entry in either vector is nonnegative, this can only happen when s and s' have completely disjoint supports. In other words, some of the H_k^{P} will be orthogonal to $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, and some will be orthogonal to $|\psi'\rangle\langle\psi'|$. And for each value of k, at least one of these options will obtain.

In the qubit-sized subspace defined by $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\psi'\rangle$, there is a unique state orthogonal to $|\psi\rangle$ and a unique state orthogonal to $|\psi'\rangle$. Call these $|\psi_\perp\rangle$ and $|\psi'_\perp\rangle$; they are antipodal to $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\psi'\rangle$ respectively on the Bloch sphere for this subspace. Each of the H_k^{P} must be proportional either to $|\psi_\perp\rangle$ or to $|\psi'_\perp\rangle$. But this means that the H_k^{P} cannot span the subset of state space given by $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\psi'\rangle$ — the reference measurement cannot be "informationally complete" on this subspace, for any such measurement must have at least *four* distinct outcomes to cover a qubit. Consequently, the proposal that $s \cdot s' = 0$ contradicts the assumption that we had a working reference measurement in the first place. And so, for any reference measurement H_k whatsoever, the dot product of valid probability vectors will always be greater than zero, even when the corresponding quantum states are orthogonal.

Appendix B: Additional Excerpts of Correspondence

Itamar Pitowsky to CAF, 5 May 2001:

> Of course, you can print [our correspondence]. The whole thing is a wonderful idea. Historians of science often complain that published articles never tell even half the story of science, because they don't let you see the false starts, misleading intuitions, errors, or even how a sound idea is baked. Correspondence makes the story come alive, but it usually takes almost a century to publish, and it's done only in cases of the likes of Einstein. ... Your collection arrives on the scene almost in real time, very nice.

CAF to Itamar Pitowsky, 26 June 2002:

> I too used to think that the [partial Boolean algebra] approach was the way to go if one wanted to build up a theory along quantum logical lines. But now, I'm not so convinced of it. That is because I am starting to think that quantum mechanics is more analogous to the epistemological theory Richard Jeffrey calls "radical probabilism" than anything else. From that view, there are "probabilities all the way down" with one never getting hold of the truth values of *any* propositions. Rüdiger Schack and I just discovered a wealth of material on Jeffrey's webpage http://www.princeton.edu/~bayesway/.

In any case, I think what this leads to is that we ought to be focusing much more on characterizing quantum mechanics solely in terms of the "logic" of POVMs than anything else — these being the structures analogous to what crops up in Jeffrey's "probability kinematics." Thus, if one is looking to characterize PBAs, the best task might be to focus on the kinds of PBAs that POVMs generate, rather than the ones of Kochen and Specker based solely on standard measurements. [...] Beyond that, I am now of the mind that all one really ever needs for understanding quantum mechanics is a *single* Boolean algebra that is kept safely in the background (solely) for reference. The rest of the theory (and indeed all real-world measurement) is about probability kinematics with respect to that algebra.

CAF to Bill Demopoulos, 21 April 2004:

As you argued in your earlier letter to me (one from last year sometime), our views — or maybe just our languages — may not be so incompatible as one might think. However, I am left with the feeling that this is only a contingent feature of the particular stages of the game we happen to be at, at the moment. In particular, from my own view, I think it is quite important that we strive to stop thinking of quantum states as states of knowledge about the *truth value* of this or that proposition (even if truth value is not invariant with respect to 'experimental arrangement' — the idea you are toying with). My feeling is that the imagery of measurement outcomes mapping to truth values (in this context anyway) will only cloud our vision for how to take the next big step.

What is the next big step? I think it is a deeper understanding of how — very literally — the world "is in the making" (to use a Jamesian phrase). To try to make that idea at least graspable (if not either clear or consistent yet), and to try to show you quantum theory's role in all this, let me attach four letters I've written recently. They're contained within the attached files.[3] I think they are my best statements to date of what I am shooting for; and I think that goal fundamentally conflicts with the idea of "measurement" propositions having truth values in the conventional sense.

That is not to say, however, that I am yet ready to give up on the idea of physical systems having autonomous properties. The question is, what can still be pinned down as a property in the conventional sense?

CAF to Bill Demopoulos, 17 February 2006:

Let me try to consider a situation and 1) try to imagine what you would say of it (but probably in my idiosyncratic language), followed by 2) what I think I would say of it ... and then see if there is a substantial distinction.

Start with a finite dimensional Hilbert space, say of dimension 3, and imagine it indicative of some real physical system within an observer's concern. From that Hilbert space, let us form all possible sets of three mutually orthogonal

[3] In the large samizdat [10], see the 24 June 2002 note "The World is Under Construction" to Wiseman; the 27 June 2002 note "Probabilism All the Way Up" to Wiseman; the 12 August 2003 note "Me, Me, Me" to Mermin and Schack; and the 18 August 2003 note "The Big IF" to Sudbery and Barnum.

one-dimensional projection operators. That is, let us consider all possible sets of the form $\{P_1, P_2, P_3\}$.

What is it that you would say of those sets? If I understand you correctly, it is this. Each such set $\{P_1, P_2, P_3\}$ corresponds to a set of mutually exclusive properties that the system can possess. At any given time, one of those projectors will have a truth value 1 and the other two will have values 0. Now consider a potentially different such set $\{Q_1, Q_2, Q_3\}$; again, at any given time, one of those projectors will have a truth value 1 and the other two will values 0. What is interesting in your conception, if I understand it, is that even if two elements happen to be identified between those two sets — for instance, if $P_1 = Q_3$ — there is *no requirement* that P_1 and Q_3 need have the same truth value; P_1 might have the truth value 0, whereas Q_3 might have the truth value 1. Another way to say this is that the truth-value assignments depend upon the whole set and not simply the individual projection operators. For you, all the identification $P_1 = Q_3$ amounts to is that the *probability* for the truth value of P_1 within the set $\{P_1, P_2, P_3\}$ is the *same* as the *probability* for the truth value of Q_3 within the set $\{Q_1, Q_2, Q_3\}$. (If you were a Bayesian about probabilities — though I don't think you are — you would say, "Well P_1 has whatever truth value it does, and Q_3 has whatever truth value it does (each within their appropriate set of mutually exclusive triples), but my degree of belief about the truth value of P_1 is the same as my degree of belief about the truth value of Q_3. That is the rule I am going to live by.") Then it follows from Gleason's theorem that there exist no probability assignments for the complete (i.e., continuously infinite) set of triples that are not of the quantum mechanical form. In particular, one can never sharpen one's knowledge to a delta function assignment for *each* triple. This is how you cash out the idea of an 'incompletely knowable domain.'

That is a novel idea, and if I understand it correctly, I like it.

However, now let me contrast my characterization of you with what I think has been my working conception. I prefer not to think of the triples $\{P_1, P_2, P_3\}$ as sets of mutually exclusive *properties* inherent within the system all by itself, but rather *actions* that can be taken upon the system by an external *agent*. Each *set* of such projectors corresponds to a distinct action; what the individual elements within each set represent are the (generally unpredictable) *consequences* of that action. What are the consequences in operational terms? Distinct sensations within the agent. The reason I insist on calling them consequences, rather than "sensations" full stop, is because I want to make it clear that the domain of what we are talking about is sensations that come about through the action of an agent *upon* the external world.

The essential idea of [what was to become QBism] is that no element of a set $\{P_1, P_2, P_3\}$ has a truth value before the action of the agent. Rather the truth value — if you want to call it that (maybe it is not the best terminology) — is generated (or given birth to) in the process. At that point, one of the P_i stands in autonomous existence (within the agent), whereas the other two fall.

I hope I have characterized both of us accurately!

Here is the question that has been troubling me. Is there any real distinction (one that makes an pragmatic difference) between our views? You say the truth value is there and revealed by the measurement, and I say it's made by the

measurement and wasn't there beforehand. So what?

If there is a pragmatic distinction, Steven van Enk and I through discussions this week have come to believe that it may show up most clearly in how you and I would treat counterfactuals with regard to measurement. Let us take a situation where an agent ascribes a quantum state ρ to the system; contemplating the measurement $\{P_1, P_2, P_3\}$, we know that he will ascribe probabilities according to the Born rule $\mathrm{tr}(\rho P_i)$ for the various outcomes. Suppose he now performs that measurement and actually gets value P_2.

What does getting that outcome teach him about the quantum system? I think you would say it reveals which of the three mutually exclusive properties the system actually had. On the other hand, I would say it teaches him nothing about the system per se; the outcome P_2 is just the consequence of his action. What is the implication of this on counterfactuals? Here's at least one.

Suppose after you get your outcome, you contemplate magically having performed a distinct measurement $\{Q_1, Q_2, Q_3\}$ instead. I think you're careful to point out in your paper that the knowledge of P_2 carries no implication for what you would have found with this other imaginary measurement. But what happens if you conceptually transform this measurement $\{Q_1, Q_2, Q_3\}$ to one closer and closer to the original, i.e., to $\{P_1, P_2, P_3\}$? In the *limit* when the two are identical again, I think you would say that knowledge of the outcome P_2 in the original case implies that P_2 will also be the outcome in the limiting counterfactual case. But what would I say? From my conception, there is no reason at all to believe that the limiting counterfactual case will give rise to the same outcome P_2. The best one can do, either in the original case or the counterfactual case, is to say that an outcome i will arise with probability $\mathrm{tr}(\rho P_i)$. In fact, a counterfactual analysis with this kind of result may be the very meaning of the idea that quantum measurements are generative of their outcomes.

CAF to Jeffrey Bub, 24 June 2006:

Bubism 1. *The transition from classical to quantum mechanics involves replacing the representation of properties as a Boolean lattice, i.e., as the subsets of a set, with the representation of properties as a certain sort of non-Boolean lattice.*

The? I would rather say *one possible way of looking at* the transition from classical to quantum mechanics involves blah, blah, blah. And, you partially recover from this a few paragraphs later where you write:

Bubism 2. *Of course, other ways of associating propositions with features of a Hilbert space are possible, and other ways of assigning truth values, including multi-valued truth value assignments and contextual truth value assignments. Ultimately, the issue here concerns what we take as the salient structural change involved in the transition from classical to quantum mechanics, and this depends on identifying quantum propositions that take the same probabilities for all quantum states.*

But let me hang on this point for a moment despite your partial recovery. For when you say things like, "Fuchs misses the essential point," you should realize

that that judgement (at most) comes from within a context very different from the one I am working in.

I would, for instance, never say "the representation of properties in quantum mechanics involves as a certain sort of non-Boolean lattice." That is just not the context I'm working in. Similarly, I would not say, as you say in the next section, "Somehow, a measurement process enables an indeterminate property, that is neither instantiated nor not instantiated by a system in a given quantum state, to either instantiate itself or not with a certain probability." — i.e., I would not say that a measurement process instantiates any *property* at all for a quantum system.

Instead, the setting for our quantum Bayesian program (i.e., the particular one of Caves, Schack, and me), is one where all the *properties* intrinsic to a quantum system are timeless and have no dynamical character whatsoever — moreover, those properties have nothing to do with particular quantum state assignments or particular quantum measurement outcomes. In that way, the idea of a non-Boolean lattice simply doesn't apply to them.

John Sipe recently made a nice write-up of our view for his book that, I think, brings this one difference between you and me into pretty stark relief. Maybe it's worthwhile to quote it at length, as it may lay the groundwork for a good bit of our later discussion:

> This interpretation shares some features with operationalism. *Measurements*, for example, are understood in a manner close to that adopted by an operationalist. They are characterized by POVMs, and those abstract elements are associated with tasks in the laboratory undertaken with gadgets that are part of the primitives of the theory. The result of any such measurement is simply one of a possible number of outcomes, and there is no talk of these measurements "revealing" the value of any variable, in the sense that an arbitrarily precise position measurement in classical mechanics is often described as revealing the position of a particle. Yet, compared to the operationalist's quiet, unassuming terminology of "tasks" and "outcomes," advocates of this interpretation adopt a more active manner of speaking, referring to "actions" (or even "interventions") undertaken by an agent, and the "consequences" that those actions elicit.
>
> This indicates a role for the observer (or agent) in this interpretation that is more significant than the role played by such a person in operational quantum mechanics. The significance of that role becomes clear when we consider the reference of density operators in this interpretation. Density operators do not refer to sets of tasks that define *preparations*, as they do in operational quantum mechanics. Rather, a density operator is taken to encode the beliefs of an agent concerning the probabilities of different consequences of possible future actions. While these beliefs may be *informed* by knowledge of the tasks involved in setting up the particular gadgetry associated with a preparation, they are not *determined* by it. Hence there is not a unique, "correct" density operator necessarily associated with each preparation procedure, as there is in operational quantum mechanics.

In the present view two different researchers, one more skilled in quantum mechanics than the other, could adopt different density operators after being identically informed of the details of a particular preparation procedure. One density operator might be more successful than the other in predicting the possible consequences of future actions, but each would be the correct density operator *for that agent* insofar as it correctly encoded that agent's beliefs.

Thus, while the abstract elements in the theory associated with measurements are identified with tasks in the laboratory, as in operationalism, the abstract elements in the theory associated with preparations are identified with beliefs of the agent, signaling a kind of empiricist perspective.

So in contrast to operational quantum mechanics, where density operators are necessarily updated following a measurement — since the combination of the previous preparation and the measurement constitutes a new preparation, and an operationalist associates the new density operator with *that* — in this view there is no necessary updating of a density operator in the light of measurement outcomes, since there is no *necessary* connection between the consequences of an agent's action (more prosaically, "measurement outcomes") and his or her beliefs. After all, foolish researchers, like foolish men and women more generally, could choose not to modify their beliefs concerning the consequences of future actions despite their knowledge of the consequences of recent ones. And note that even wise researchers will not update their beliefs concerning future actions until they *know* the consequences of recent ones; hence a wise researcher's "personal density operator" (the only kind of density operator there is in this view!) will not change until that researcher is actually aware of a measurement outcome.

Other abstract elements in the theory, such as the dimension of the Hilbert space, and the dimensions of various factor spaces, are actually associated with instances of attributes of physical objects. Hence with respect to the reference of *these* abstract elements this interpretation is realist. The manner in which this works can best be seen by first reviewing the role measurement outcomes play in revealing aspects of the universe in realist classical mechanics, and then comparing that with the role such outcomes play in this interpretation of quantum mechanics.

An arbitrarily precise position measurement of a bead moving along a wire, in realist classical mechanics, reveals the position of the particle, the instance (say, $x = 10\,\mathrm{cm}$) of a particular attribute (bead position) of a physical object (bead) that actually exists in Nature. In contrast, a usual Stern–Gerlach device oriented along the z direction *does not*, in this interpretation of quantum mechanics, reveal the z-component of angular momentum, or for that matter anything else. The particular outcome of one experimental run is simply a consequence of performing the experiment. Nonetheless, repeated ex-

perimentation *does* reveal that the electron associated with the atom passing through the device should be taken as a spin-1/2 particle. Here the attribute under consideration is taken to be *internal angular momentum*, and the instance – the irreducible representation appropriate to the particle of interest – *spin-1/2*. The role of an "instance of an attribute" in this interpretation is not to specify one of a number of possible expressions of existence, as it is in realist classical mechanics, but rather to specify one class of possible beliefs – the one that the theory recommends – about the consequences of future interventions of a particular type.

Note that, at least within nonrelativistic physics, the instances of the attributes in this interpretation are fixed. A spin-1/2 particle remains a spin-1/2 particle. Thus there are no dynamical variables in this theory, only nondynamical variables analogous to the mass of a particle in nonrelativistic classical mechanics. The point of physics is to identify these nondynamical variables. Repeated interventions by experimentalists, and the careful noting of the range of consequences that those interventions elicit, is how these fixed instances are discovered.

In this interpretation of quantum mechanics, with its mix of operationalist, empiricist, and realist identification of abstract elements in the theory, these fixed instances specify the [[agent independent features]] of the "quantum world," and it is the business of physics to figure them out. This is done by experimentation, and the theoretical linking of basis vectors in the appropriate Hilbert space with various measurements, providing an "anchor" for those basis kets to our experience, the consequences of our actions. Particularly significant is the Hamiltonian operator and its basis kets [[in Caves' particular version of all this]]. As time evolves during what is colloquially described as "unitary evolution," we have the option to modify our beliefs or to modify the anchors of those beliefs; the first strategy corresponds to the usual Schrödinger picture, the second to the Heisenberg picture.

Regardless of the strategy, the [[properties intrinsic to the]] quantum world of this interpretation [[are]] a fixed, static thing. [[This aspect of the quantum world]] is a frozen, changeless place. Dynamics refers not to the quantum world, but only to our actions, our experiences, and our beliefs as agents. Or, more poetically (à la Chris), life does not arise from our interventions; it is our interventions.

John doesn't represent us correctly in every detail of this presentation — for the purpose at hand, it only seemed essential to modify him in a few instances, which I have have marked with double brackets [[·]] — but I would say he is roughly on track, and he certainly gets it that we are not concerned with the usual way of ascribing properties to quantum systems via the values of measurement outcomes or probability-1 predictions (i.e., the eigenvector-eigenvalue link).

Which brings me back again to your paper:

Bubism 3. *For a quantum state, the properties represented by Hilbert space*

subspaces are not partitioned into two such mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive sets: some propositions are assigned no truth value. Only propositions represented by subspaces that contain the state are assigned the value 'true,' and only propositions represented by subspaces orthogonal to the state are assigned the value 'false.' This means that propositions represented by subspaces that are at some non-zero or non-orthogonal angle to the ray representing the quantum state are not assigned any truth value in the state, and the corresponding properties must be regarded as indeterminate or indefinite: according to the theory, there can be no fact of the matter about whether these properties are instantiated or not.

You see, my way of looking at things wouldn't even allow me to say what you say here. It is just a very different world that I am working in.

To try to make this point, let me quote a couple of emails I wrote to Bas van Fraassen a few months ago. It started with my saying this:

> The way I view quantum measurement now is this. When one performs a "measurement" on a system, all one is really doing is taking an *action* on that system. From this view, time evolutions or unitary operations etc., are not actions that one can take on a system; only "measurements" are. Thus the word measurement is really a misnomer — it is only an action. In contradistinction to the old idea that a measurement is a query of nature, or a way of gathering information or knowledge about nature, from this view it is just an action on something external — it is a kick of sorts. The "measurement device" should be thought of as being like a prosthetic hand for the agent — it is merely an extension of him; in this context, it should not be thought of as an independent entity beyond the agent. What quantum theory tells us is that the formal structure of all our possible actions (perhaps via the help of these prosthetic hands) is captured by the idea of a Positive-Operator-Valued Measure (or POVM, or so-called "generalized measurement"). We take our actions upon a system, and in return, the system gives rise to a reaction — in older terms, that is the "measurement outcome" — but the reaction is in the agent himself. The role of the quantum system is thus more like that of the philosopher's stone; it is the catalyst that brings about a transformation (or transmutation) of the agent.
>
> Reciprocally, there [[may]] be a transmutation of the system external to the agent. But the great trouble in quantum interpretation — I now think — is that we have been too inclined to jump the gun all these years: We have been misidentifying where the transmutation indicated by quantum mechanics (i.e., the one which quantum theory actually talks about, the "measurement outcome") takes place. It [[may]] be the case that there are also transmutations in the external world (transmutations in the system) in each quantum "measurement", BUT that is not what quantum theory is about. [[Quantum mechanics]] is only a hint of that more interesting transmutation. [[Instead, the main part of quantum mechanics is about how]] the agent

> and the system [[together bring about]] a little act of creation that ultimately has an autonomy of its own.

which led to the following dialogue:

> **van Fraassenism 1.** *Writers on the subject have emphasized that the main form of measurement in quantum mechanics has as result the value of the observable at the end of the measurement – and that this observable may not even have had a definite value, let alone the same one, before.*
>
> Your phrase "*may not* even have a definite value" floated to my attention. I guess this floated to my attention because I had recently read the following in one of the Brukner/Zeilinger papers,
>
> > Only in the exceptional case of the qubit in an eigenstate of the measurement apparatus the bit value observed reveals a property already carried by the qubit. Yet in general the value obtained by the measurement has an element of irreducible randomness and therefore cannot be assumed to reveal the bit value or even a hidden property of the system existing before the measurement is performed.
>
> I wondered if your "may not" referred to effectively the same thing as their disclaimer at the beginning of this quote. Maybe it doesn't. Anyway, the Brukner/Zeilinger disclaimer is a point that Caves, Schack, and I now definitely reject: From our view all measurements are generative of a *non*-preexisting property regardless of the quantum state. I.e., measurements never reveal "a property already carried by the qubit." For this, of course, we have to adopt a Richard Jeffrey-like analysis of the notion of "certainty" — i.e., that it too, like any probability assignment, is a state of mind — or one along (my reading of) Wittgenstein's — i.e., that "certainty is a tone of voice" — to make it all make sense, but so be it.

and

> **van Fraassenism 2.** *Suppose that an observer assigns eigenstate $|a\rangle$ of A to a system on the basis of a measurement, then predicts with certainty that an immediate further measurement of A will yield value a, and then makes that second measurement and finds a. Don't you even want to say that the second measurement just showed to this observer, as was expected, the value that A already had? He does not need to change his subjective probabilities at all in response to the 2nd measurement outcome, does he?*
>
> It is not going to be easy, because this in fact is what Schack and I are actually writing a whole paper about at the moment — this point has been the most controversial thing (with the Mermin, Unruh, Wootters, Spekkens, etc., crowd) that we've said in a while, and it seems that it's going to require a whole paper to do the point justice. But I'll still try to give you the skinny of it:

- Q: He does not need to change his subjective probabilities at all in response to the 2nd measurement outcome, does he?
- A: No he doesn't.
- Q: Don't you even want to say that the second measurement just showed to this observer, as was expected, the value that A already had?
- A: No I don't.

The problem is one of the very consistency of the subjective point of view of quantum states. The task we set before ourselves is to completely sever any supposed connections between quantum states and the actual, existent physical properties of the quantum system. It is only from this — if it can be done, and of course we try to argue it can be done — that we get any "interpretive traction" (as Chris Timpson likes to say) for the various problems that plague QM. [[. . .]]

This may boil down to a difference between the Rovellian and the Bayesian/Paulian approach; I'm not clear on that yet. [[. . .]] Rovelli relativizes the states to the observer, even the pure states, and with that — through the eigenstate-eigenvalue link — the values of the observables. I'm not completely sure what that means in Rovelli-world yet, however.

I, on the other hand, do know that I would say that a measurement intervention is always generative of a new fact in the world, whatever the measurer's quantum state for the system. If the measurer's state for the system *happens* to be an eigenstate of the Hermitian operator describing the measurement intervention, then the measurer will be confident, *certain* even, of the consequence of the measurement intervention he is about to perform. But that *certainty* is in the sense of Jeffrey and Wittgenstein above — it is a "tone of voice" of utter confidence. The world could still, as a point of principle, smite the measurer down by giving him a consequence that he predicted to be impossible. In a traditional development — with ties to a correspondence theory of truth — we would then say, "Well, that proves the measurer was wrong with his quantum state assignment. He was wrong before he ever went through the motions of the measurement." But as you've gathered, I'm not about traditional developments. Instead I would say, "Even from my view there is a sense in which the measurer's quantum state is *wrong*. But it is *made wrong* by the *actual* consequence of the intervention — it is made wrong on the fly; its wrongness was not determined beforehand." And that seems to be the main point of contention.

Particularly this is going to be a key point when I finally come to the analysis in Section 7 of your paper.

CAF to Veiko Palge and Bill Demopoulos, 14 November 2006:

The best answer I can give you, I think, is that neither of these kinds of structures [sigma-algebras or noncommutative generalizations] map onto what I'm thinking.

The main reason for this is that I think it is incorrect to think of the process of "quantum measurement" either 1) as the *revelation* of a property inherent in the system under observation, or 2) as the *production* of such a property in the system. And without that, I don't think there is enough glue to bind the events occurring in quantum measurements together into an algebraic structure (say, a lattice or a Boolean algebra, or even a partial Boolean algebra, where there are Boolean algebras tied together at the edges) — at least not in any useful sense that intrigues me as a physicist. [...] I think there is a fruitful similarity between what [Bill] and I are seeking, even if we ultimately diverge. It is this: In both our views — and they are the only places I've ever seen this style of idea — even when two measurements share a common element (say a given projector P_i), there is no implication of a common truth value being imposed on P_i across the measurements. The reason for this for Bill is that the system's properties are bound up with the whole orthogonal family of projectors the individual P_i happens to be embedded within. In contrast, the reason for this for me is that I don't think of quantum measurement outcomes as signifying properties intrinsic to the system — they are simply consequences of actions for me. What makes the element P_i identified across measurements — for both of us — is not truth value, but that the *probabilities* for P_i are identical in both cases. What this means particularly from my Bayesian way of thinking is that a judgment is being made: I, the agent, am identifying *this* potential outcome of this measurement with *that* potential outcome of that measurement because I judge their probabilities equal under all imaginable circumstances. (See Section 4.1 of my quant-ph/0205039.) It is not that they are identified in Nature itself. Thus, for me, I think, there is no good sense in which they lie in the same event space at all.

CAF to Veiko Palge, 10 January 2007:

Let me start with your first sentence: "It seems that one of the main reasons you reject a well-structured event space is that it assumes a realistic interpretation: its elements would correspond to intrinsic properties of quantum systems." That is the wrong direction of reasoning — though I am probably the cause of this misimpression through the restrictive choices of readings I recommended to you. It is not that I reject a well-structured event space because it *assumes* its elements would correspond to intrinsic properties of quantum systems, but rather this is the *result* of a thoroughgoing subjective interpretation of probabilities within the quantum context. What cannot be forgotten is that quantum-measurement outcomes, by the usual rules, *determine* posterior quantum states. And those posterior quantum states in turn determine further probabilities.

Thus, if one takes the timid, partial move that Itamar and Jeff Bub, say, advocate — i.e., simply substituting one or another nonBoolean algebra for the space of events, and leaving the rest of Bayesian probability theory seemingly intact — then one ultimately ends up re-objectifying what had been initially supposed to be subjective probabilities. That is: When I look at the click, and note that it is value i, and value i is rigidly — or I should say, *factually* — associated with the projector Π_i in some nonBoolean algebra, then I have no choice (through Lüders rule) but to assign the posterior quantum state Π_i to

the system. This means the new quantum state Π_i will be as factual as the click. And any new probabilities (for the outcomes of further measurements) determined from this new quantum state Π_i will also be factual.

So, the starting point of the reasoning is to *assume* that there is a category distinction between probabilities and facts (this is the subjectivist move of de Finetti and Ramsey). Adding the ingredient of the usual rules of quantum mechanics, one derives a dilemma: If there is a rigid, factual connection between the clicks i and elements Π_i of an algebraic structure, then probabilities are factual after all. Holding tight to my assumption of a category distinction between facts and probabilities, I end up rejecting the idea that there is a unique, factual mapping between i and Π_i. [...]

[Now let] me return to your paragraph before signing off. If I read this question of yours in isolation: "Can't one just take the elements as corresponding to clicks and blips in the measurement apparatus?" Then at one level my answer is, "Of course; I've never said otherwise." What is at issue here is whether the events — the clicks and blips themselves — fall within the kind of algebraic structure you speak of, or whether it is something else (something a conceptual layer above the events) that falls within it. From the [proto-QBist] point of view, for a single device with clicks i, one agent might associate the clicks with a set of orthogonal projectors Π_i, and another agent might associate them with a set of noncommuting effects (i.e., POVM elements) E_i. This was the sense in which I meant there is no stand-alone event space at all: For us, the algebraic structure of the events (the clicks and blips), their level of commutivity or noncommutivity and whatnot, is just as subjective as the quantum state. The clicks i themselves are objective (in the sense of not being functions of the subject's beliefs or degrees of belief), but their association with a particular set of operators E_i is a subjective judgment.

I hope this completely answers your question now.

But let me extend the discussion a little to try to give you a more positive vision of what we're up to. The starting point is the category distinction between facts and probabilities applied to the quantum measurement context. From this we glean that quantum operations and quantum states are of the same level of subjectivity. But that is not our ending point. Because, implicit in everything we have said there are these autonomous, realistically-interpreted quantum systems: The agent has to interact with the quantum system to receive his quantum measurement outcome. No quantum system, no measurement outcome. Thus the [proto-QBist] position is more than a kind of positivism or operationalism. The objects of the external world with which we interact have a certain kind of active power, and we become aware of the presence of that active power particularly in the course of quantum measurement. When we kick on a quantum system it surprises us with a kick back.

Can we say anything more explicit about the active power? Can we give it some mathematical shape? Yes, I think we can, but that is a research project. Still, I think the hints for it are already in place ... and indeed they are in the quantum formalism, as we would expect them to be. One of the hints is this: The Born transformation rule. When we make probability assignments in quantum mechanics, we are assuming more than de Finettian / Ramseyian

coherence. We assume that if we set the probabilities for the outcomes of this measurement this way, then we should set the probabilities for the outcomes of that measurement that way and the rule of transformation is a linear one. This, from the [proto-QBist] view, is the content of the Born rule (see the last section in the attached paper). And it is empirical, contingent: A different world than the one we live in might have had a different transformation rule. So, if we're looking for something beyond personal probabilities in quantum mechanics, that is a point to take seriously. It hints of some deep property of our world, and I'd like to know what that property is. [. . .]

Though [the proto-QBists] banish the algebraic structure of Hilbert space from having anything to do with a fundamental event space (and in this way their quantum Bayesianism differs from the cluster of ideas Pitowsky and Bub are playing with), they do not banish the algebraic structure from playing any role whatsoever in quantum mechanics. It is just that the algebraic structure rears its head at the conceptual level of coherence rather than in a fundamental event space. It is not that potential events are objectively tied to together in an algebraic way, but that our gambling commitments (normatively) *should be*. This is another point of contact between my view and Bill's.

CAF to Bill Demopoulos, 7 January 2011:

Take a POVM consisting of operators E_k. I.e., these are positive semi-definite operators that sum to the identity operator. Thus they might seem like mysterious abstract entities (perhaps properties of the system, or properties of the 'measuring device', or maybe something still weirder, though surely agent-independent). But, via a fiducial SIC POVM in the sky (as I talk about in my papers), one can map these operators to a set of conditional probabilities $p(i|k)$ in a one-to-one fashion. That is, these operators contain nothing over and above the prescription of a probability assignment. There is nothing to them mathematically but that — nothing is lost by thinking of them in these terms, as probability assignments. Similarly, the philosophical point should be this: That there is nothing conceptually more than this either.

So, what should one call the "outcome" of a quantum measurement? Well, for the agent it is an experience "k" . . . but what meaning does that have for him? How could he articulate it? What does it mean to him? How will he change his behavior with regard to it? The answer is: It is $p(i|k)$. It is a probability distribution conditioned on k. The only operational handle the agent has on k is through the assignment he makes, $p(i|k)$.

But all probabilities (for the personalist Bayesian) are subjectively given (i.e., functions of the agent only, his history and experiences, not the object). And thus, I guess, my resistance to part of your way of thinking about effects. (Of course, as you should know by now, I am in serious agreement with you in other ways . . . in fact, probably with you more than with any other living philosopher.)

---

[1] M. Hemmo and O. Shenker, editors, *Quantum, Probability, Logic: The Work and Influence of Itamar Pitowsky*, (Springer Nature, London, 2020).

[2] I. Pitowsky, "Infinite and Finite Gleason's Theorems and the Logic of Indeterminacy," *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **39** (1997), 218–228.

[3] C. A. Fuchs and R. Schack, "Quantum-Bayesian Coherence," arXiv:0906.2187 (2009). A condensed version was later printed as *Reviews of Modern Physics* **85** (2013), 1693.

[4] C. A. Fuchs, "QBism, the Perimeter of Quantum Bayesianism," arXiv:1003.5209 (2010).

[5] B. C. Stacey, "Ideas abandoned en route to QBism," arXiv:1911.07886 (2019).

[6] J. B. DeBrota and B. C. Stacey, "FAQBism," arXiv:1810.13401 (2018).

[7] N. D. Mermin, "Why QBism is not the Copenhagen interpretation and what John Bell might have thought of it," in *Quantum [Un]Speakables II: Half a Century of Bell's Theorem*, edited by R. Bertlmann and A. Zeilinger, (Springer, Berlin, 2017), pp. 83–94; arXiv:1409.2454.

[8] C. A. Fuchs and B. C. Stacey, "QBism: Quantum Theory as a Hero's Handbook." In *Proceedings of the International School of Physics "Enrico Fermi," Course 197 – Foundations of Quantum Physics*, edited by E. M. Rasel, W. P. Schleich and S. Wölk (Italian Physical Society, 2019), pp. 133–202. arXiv:1612.07308.

[9] C. A. Fuchs, "On Participatory Realism," in *Information and Interaction: Eddington, Wheeler, and the Limits of Knowledge*, edited by I. T. Durham and D. Rickles, (Springer, Berlin, 2016), pp. 113–134. arXiv:1601.04360.

[10] C. A. Fuchs, *My Struggles with the Block Universe* (2014). Edited by B. C. Stacey, with a foreword by M. Schlosshauer. arXiv:1405.2390.

[11] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods* (Kluwer, 1993).

[12] M. A. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information,* tenth anniversary edition (Cambridge University Press, 2010).

[13] J. Bub and I. Pitowsky, "Two dogmas about quantum mechanics," arXiv:0712.4258 (2007).

[14] C. A. Fuchs, "Quantum mechanics as quantum information (and only a little more)," arXiv:quant-ph/0205039 (2002).

[15] D. Frauchiger and R. Renner, "Quantum theory cannot consistenty describe the use of itself," *Nature Communications* **9** (2018), 3711, arXiv:1604.07422.

[16] Č. Brukner, "On the quantum measurement problem," arXiv:1507.05255. In *Quantum [Un]Speakables II* (Springer-Verlag, 2017).

[17] M. Pusey, "An inconsistent friend," *Nature Physics* **14,** 10 (2018), 977–978.

[18] J. Bub, " 'Two Dogmas' Redux," arXiv:1907.06240 (2019).

[19] B. C. Stacey, "On QBism and Assumption (Q)," arXiv:1907.03805 (2019).

[20] A. M. Gleason, "Measures on the closed subspaces of a Hilbert space," *Indiana University Mathematics Journal* **6,** 4 (1957), 885–93.

[21] H. Barnum, C. M. Caves, J. Finkelstein, C. A. Fuchs and R. Schack, "Quantum probability from decision theory?," *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A* **456** (2000), 1175–82, arXiv:quant-ph/9907024.

[22] A. Wilce, "Quantum Logic and Probability Theory." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2017 Edition), edited by E. N. Zalta.

[23] R. Black (writing as B. Switek), *Skeleton Keys: The Secret Life of Bone* (Riverhead Books, 2019).

[24] I. Pitowsky, "Quantum mechanics as a theory of probability." In *Physical Theory and its Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Jeffrey Bub*, edited by W. Demopoulos and I. Pitowsky (Springer, 2006). arXiv:quant-ph/0510095.

[25] M. P. Solèr, "Characterization of hilbert spaces by orthomodular spaces," *Communications in Algebra* **23** (1995), 219–43.

[26] A. Prestel, "On Solèr's characterization of Hilbert spaces," *Manuscripta Mathematica* **86** (1995), 225–38.

[27] R. W. Spekkens, "Evidence for the epistemic view of quantum states: A toy theory," *Physical Review A* **75** (2007), 032110, arXiv:quant-ph/0401052.

[28] R. W. Spekkens, "Reassessing claims of nonclassicality for quantum interference phenomena," PIRSA:16060102 (2016).

[29] P. Busch, "Quantum states and generalized observables: A simple proof of Gleason's theorem," *Physical Review Letters* **91** (2003), 120403, arXiv:quant-ph/9909073.

[30] C. M. Caves, C. A. Fuchs, K. K. Manne and J. M. Renes, "Gleason-type derivations of the quantum probability rule for generalized measurements," *Foundations of Physics* **34** (2004), 193–209, arXiv:quant-ph/0306179.

[31] H. Granström, *Gleason's Theorem*. Master's thesis, Stockholm University, 2006.

[32] V. J. Wright and S. Weigert, "A Gleason-type theorem for qubits based on mixtures of projective measurements," *Journal of Physics A* **52** (2019), 055301, arXiv:1808.08091.

[33] V. J. Wright and S. Weigert, "Gleason-type theorems from Cauchy's functional equation," *Foundations of Physics* **49** (2019), 594–606.

[34] M. Appleby, C. A. Fuchs, B. C. Stacey and H. Zhu, "Introducing the Qplex: A novel arena for quantum theory," *European Physical Journal D* **71** (2017), 197, arXiv:1612.03234.

[35] M. Appleby, Å. Ericsson and C. A. Fuchs, "Properties of QBist state spaces," *Foundations of Physics* **41** (2011), 564–79, arXiv:0910.2750.

[36] R. W. Spekkens, "Contextuality for preparations, transformations, and unsharp measurements," *Physical Review A* **71** (2005), 052108, arXiv:quant-ph/0406166.

[37] C. A. Fuchs and B. C. Stacey, "Some negative remarks on operational approaches to quantum theory." In *Quantum Theory: Informational Foundations and Foils*, edited by G. Chiribella and R. W. Spekkens (Springer, 2016), arXiv:1401.7254.

[38] B. C. Stacey, "Quantum theory as symmetry broken by vitality," arXiv:1907.02432 (2019).

[39] H. Barnum, C. A. Fuchs, J. M. Renes and A. Wilce, "Influence-free states on compound quantum systems," arXiv:quant-ph/0507108 (2005).

[40] H. Barnum, S. Beigi, S. Boixo, M. B. Elliott and S. Wehner, "Local quantum measurement and no-signaling imply quantum correlations," *Physical Review Letters* **104** (2010), 140401, arXiv:0910.3952.

[41] G. de la Torre, L. Masanes, A. J. Short and M. P. Müller, "Deriving quantum theory from its local structure and reversibility," *Physical Review Letters* **109** (2012), 90403, arXiv:1110.5482.

[42] G. Zauner, *Quantendesigns: Grundzüge einer nichtkommutativen Designtheorie*. PhD thesis, University of Vienna, 1999. http://www.gerhardzauner.at/qdmye.html.

[43] J. M. Renes, R. Blume-Kohout, A. J. Scott and C. M. Caves, "Symmetric informationally complete quantum measurements," *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **45** (2004), 2171–2180, arXiv:quant-ph/0310075.

[44] A. J. Scott and M. Grassl, "Symmetric informationally complete positive-operator-valued measures: A new computer study," *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **51** (2010), arXiv:0910.5784.

[45] M. Appleby, S. Flammia, G. McConnell and J. Yard, "SICs and algebraic number theory," *Foundations of Physics* **47** (2017), 1042–59, arXiv:1701.05200.

[46] C. A. Fuchs, M. C. Hoang and B. C. Stacey, "The SIC question: History and state of play," *Axioms* **6** (2017), 21, arXiv:1703.07901.

[47] J. B. DeBrota and B. C. Stacey, "Lüders Channels and the Existence of Symmetric-

Informationally-Complete Measurements," *Physical Review A* **100** (2019), 062327, arXiv:1907.10999.

[48] J. B. DeBrota, C. A. Fuchs and B. C. Stacey, "Symmetric Informationally Complete Measurements Identify the Irreducible Difference between Classical and Quantum," forthcoming in *Physical Review Research*, arXiv:1805.08721.

[49] W. Demopoulos, "Effects and propositions," *Foundations of Physics* **40** (2010), 368–89, arXiv:0809.0659.

[50] M. F. Pusey, J. Barrett and T. Rudolph, "On the reality of the quantum state," *Nature Physics* **8** (2012), 475, arXiv:1111.3328.

[51] N. Harrigan and R. W. Spekkens, "Einstein, incompleteness, and the epistemic view of quantum states," *Foundations of Physics* **40** (2010), 125, arXiv:0706.2661.

[52] C. M. Caves, C. A. Fuchs and R. Schack, "Conditions for compatibility of quantum-state assignments," *Physical Review A* **66** (2002), 062111, arXiv:quant-ph/0206110.

[53] R. Peierls, *More Surprises in Theoretical Physics* (Princeton University Press, 1991).

[54] J. Bub, "Bananaworld: Quantum mechanics for primates," arXiv:1211.3062 (2012).

[55] W. Demopoulos, "Generalized probability measures and the framework of effects." In *Probability in Physics*, edited by Y. Ben-Menahem and M. Hemmo (Springer, 2012).

[56] W. Pauli, *Writings on Physics and Philosophy*, edited by C. P. Enz and K. von Meyenn, (Springer-Verlag, 1994).

[57] R. M. Wald, *Quantum Field Theory in Curved Spacetime and Black Hole Thermodynamics* (The University of Chicago Press, 1994).

[58] C. Timpson, "Quantum Bayesianism: A study," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **39** (2008), 579–609, arXiv:0804.2047.

[59] J. Gleick, *Genius: The Life and Science of Richard Feynman* (Pantheon, 1992).

[60] B. C. Stacey, "Sporadic SICs and exceptional Lie algebras," arXiv:1911.05809 (2019).

[61] J. B. DeBrota, C. A. Fuchs and B. C. Stacey, "Analysis and Synthesis of Minimal Informationally Complete Quantum Measurements," arXiv:1812.08762 (2019).