

The De-Relationalizing of Relational Quantum Mechanics

Blake C. Stacey¹

¹*Physics Department, University of Massachusetts Boston*

(Dated: November 8, 2022)

A recent phase transition in the relational interpretation of quantum mechanics (RQM) is situated in its historical context, and the novelty of the post-transition viewpoint is questioned.

Relational Quantum Mechanics (RQM) is an approach to interpreting quantum theory first proposed by Rovelli in the Before Times [1]. Recently, RQM has been critiqued by several authors [2–7]. Perhaps in response to some of these critiques, Adlam and Rovelli published a significant revision to RQM which, in so many words, backs away from the relationalism that had characterized the interpretation [8]. The change can be illustrated by a thought-experiment in the vein of Wigner’s Friend, or the “observer observed”. Bob stands outside a room, which he believes to contain Alice and a system, e.g., a qubit. We can contemplate two different kinds of consistency conditions regarding this scenario. Suppose that Bob can measure either Alice, the qubit, or both in succession. Bob might ask Alice, “What did you get when you measured the qubit in the σ_z basis?” He might then expect that if he measures the qubit in the σ_z basis himself, he will get the same answer that he heard from Alice. This is a *first-person* consistency condition: It is phrased entirely in terms of what Bob experiences and expects. We can also imagine a *third-person* kind of consistency, which is not about Bob’s sense data, but rather about facts generally available. A third-person consistency condition might say that Alice’s measurement outcome is a fact-for-all, and Bob is guaranteed to get the same value if he performs the same measurement. Previously, Rovelli had endorsed a premise of

Relativity of comparisons: it is meaningless to compare the accounts relative to any two systems except by invoking a third system relative to which the comparison is made.

In other words, there is no meaningful comparison between Alice and Bob, except as seen by Charlie. The revision by Adlam and Rovelli replaces this first-person orientation with a third-person assumption of

Cross-perspective links: In a scenario where some observer Alice measures a variable V of a system S , then provided that Alice does not undergo any interactions which destroy the information about V stored in Alice’s physical variables, if Bob subsequently measures the physical variable representing Alice’s information about the variable V , then Bob’s measurement result will match Alice’s measurement result.

Up until this point, while the RQM literature endorsed up front a strong form of relationalism, when one dug into the details, the writing backed away from it. For example, measurement outcomes were treated as relative to an observer, but the *choice of which measurement was made* would tacitly be treated as a publically available fact [9]. Now, the idea that used to be implicitly or equivocally stated is brought up front as an axiom. Indeed, Alice’s choice of measurement, her other interactions, her measurement outcome, Bob’s choice

of measurement and the result he obtains are all public, third-person facts in this account. The very statement of the assumption makes them, in principle, facts-for-all. If Bob had no way of being aware of whether or not Alice had disrupted her physical variables, then the assumption would be a dead letter, entirely inconsequential to his conduct as a scientist.

So, the assumption *must* matter. But this leads to difficulties. Take, say, this line from Adlam and Rovelli:

[T]he event is an absolute, observer-independent fact, but the value v is relativized to Alice because at this stage Alice is the only observer who has this information about S , although other observers could later come to have the same information by interacting appropriately with either Alice or S .

Is there that big a separation between this view and the one Pauli expressed in 1958 [10]?

Further, personal qualities of the observer do not come into the theory in any way—the observation can be made by objective registering apparatus, the results of which are objectively available for anyone’s inspection.

Or, is there a difference of substance between Adlam and Rovelli’s observers who “come to have the same information” and Bohr’s “unambiguously communicable information” [11]? For Adlam and Rovelli, those other observers need “access to Alice and the ability to perform appropriate measurements”; for Bohr, they need a “reference to a complete experimental arrangement” [11]. How much daylight have the decades brought?

The clearest indication that the original RQM paper was a forward step beyond old debates was Rovelli’s call to reconstruct quantum theory from physical principles. He made a forceful case that we could see conceptual progress from technical work in that regard. This naturally raises a question: What cash value does the introduction of “cross-perspective links” have for rederiving the quantum formalism? To advance beyond where the effort stood in 1996, we have to augment the principles suggested in the original RQM paper with axioms that avoid the trap of “reconstructing” a theory that can be explained using local hidden variables. (Local hidden variables can do a lot, including emulate quantum entanglement; one lesson of Bell and those that followed is that Schrödinger’s claim that entanglement held the essence of quantum theory didn’t go far enough [12–15].) We could dodge this trap by forcefully rejecting local hidden variables at the starting point — foregrounding the exotic character of quantum theory [16, 17]. Or, less dramatically, mathematical assumptions like the continuity of various important sets can be invoked, bringing us back eventually to quantum theory [7]. Replacing “relativity of comparisons” with “cross-perspective links” does nothing discernable for the latter: It is a null move, making those mathematical assumptions neither more nor less motivated than they were before. As far as the former approach goes, the replacement makes a first-principles rejection of hidden variables harder to motivate, since it makes quantum theory sound *less interesting*. It demands that the theory turn out “benignly humdrum” [18].

By applying the standard quantum formalism to a system interacting with an environment, one can show that under the right conditions, the density matrix of the system will be approximately diagonal in a given basis. But approximately diagonal is not exactly so; in order to treat the off-diagonal entries as effectively zero, one needs reason to regard small numbers as negligible. The standard formalism provides this via the Born rule, which can take us from small magnitudes in a density matrix to small probabilities. (Hence why attempts to *derive* the Born rule from such scenarios turn out circular sooner or later. One can

always try breaking the circle by introducing new postulates, but if the justification of the project in the first place was economy of postulates, this hardly seems better.) Moreover, even a density matrix that is exactly diagonal,

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} p_1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & p_2 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & p_3 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & p_d \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

is not the same as a density matrix that is zero everywhere except in a single entry. Likewise, any calculation within standard quantum theory that might justify when a “cross-perspective link” could be said to exist will have a statistical character. By manipulating density matrices, Bob can conclude that he can act as though a “cross-perspective link” exists, with some numerical level of certitude. But this is only a statement about what Bob expects he can do with low probability of contradiction, not a statement about what *is*.

The “cross-perspective link” postulate tries to promote first-person data to third-person, but it has no firm grounds on which to say when that move can be made. We are back to Bell’s “shifty split” [19], to asking how heavy or thermalized an apparatus must be to qualify as “classical” [20].

Lahti and Pelonpää have recently argued that the “cross-perspective link” postulate is “a disguised form of the projection postulate leading to a ‘global collapse’ of the state of the interacting pair” [21]. This conclusion is difficult to dodge. In broad terms, if Alice obtains a value v of some nondegenerate von Neumann observable V , then her state for the observed system is updated to the eigenstate of V corresponding to that value, $|v\rangle$. But if her value v is a fact-for-all, then the data establishing the correctness of the state $|v\rangle$ is factual for all. If “cross-perspective links” are consequential, then $|v\rangle$ should be anybody and everybody’s state for that system. Adlam and Rovelli downplay this, arguing that Bob’s state for the system should reflect his entire history of interactions with it, and thus its state relative to Bob might not be $|v\rangle$. But this seems to ignore the weight of the “cross-perspective links” assumption. If the fact of Alice obtaining an outcome v is as good for Bob as obtaining it himself, then it should override his past history, just as Bob performing a von Neumann measurement himself would.

This note is based on remarks originally made at [SciRate](#).

-
- [1] C. Rovelli, “Relational quantum mechanics,” *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **35** (1996), 1637–78. [arXiv:quant-ph/9609002](#).
 - [2] R. Muciño, E. Okon and D. Sudarsky, “Assessing Relational Quantum Mechanics,” [arXiv:2105.13338](#) (2021).
 - [3] J. L. Pienaar, “A quintet of quandaries: Five no-go theorems for Relational Quantum Mechanics,” *Foundations of Physics* **51** (2021), 97, [arXiv:2107.00670](#).
 - [4] Č. Brukner, “Qubits are Not Observers — A No-Go Theorem,” [arXiv:2107.03513](#) (2021).
 - [5] R. Muciño, E. Okon and D. Sudarsky, “A Reply to Rovelli’s Response to Our ‘Assessing Relational Quantum Mechanics’,” [arXiv:2107.05817](#) (2021).

- [6] J. L. Pienaar, “[QBism and Relational Quantum Mechanics compared](#),” *Foundations of Physics* **51** (2021), 96, [arXiv:2108.13977](#).
- [7] B. C. Stacey, “On relationalist reconstructions of quantum theory,” [arXiv:2109.03186](#) (2021).
- [8] E. Adlam and C. Rovelli, “Information is Physical: Cross-Perspective Links in Relational Quantum Mechanics,” [arXiv:2203.13342](#) (2022).
- [9] J. B. DeBroda and B. C. Stacey, “FAQBism,” [arXiv:1810.13401](#) (2018).
- [10] W. Pauli, “Albert Einstein and the development of physics”. In *Writings on Physics and Philosophy* (Springer-Verlag, 1994), pp. 117–23. Edited by C. P. Enz and K. von Meyenn.
- [11] N. Bohr, “Quantum Physics and Philosophy—Causality and Complementarity”. In *The Philosophical Writings of Niels Bohr, Volume III: Essays 1958–1962 on Atomic Physics and Human Knowledge* (Ox Bow Press, 1987), pp. 1–7.
- [12] J. S. Bell, “[On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen Paradox](#),” *Physics Physique Fizika* **1** (1964), 195–200.
- [13] R. F. Werner, “[Quantum states with Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen correlations admitting a hidden-variable model](#),” *Physical Review A* **40** (1989), 4277–81.
- [14] R. W. Spekkens, “[Evidence for the epistemic view of quantum states: A toy theory](#),” *Physical Review A* **75** (2007), 032110, [arXiv:quant-ph/0401052](#).
- [15] L. Hausmann, N. Nurgalieva and L. del Rio, “A consolidating review of Spekkens’ toy theory,” [arXiv:2105.03277](#) (2021).
- [16] B. C. Stacey, “Quantum Theory as Symmetry Broken by Vitality,” [arXiv:1907.02432](#) (2019).
- [17] J. B. DeBroda, C. A. Fuchs, J. L. Pienaar and B. C. Stacey, “[Born’s rule as a quantum extension of Bayesian coherence](#),” *Physical Review A* **104** (2021), 022207, [arXiv:2012.14397](#).
- [18] N. D. Mermin, “[What’s Wrong with This Pillow?](#),” *Physics Today* **42** (1989), 9, 11.
- [19] N. D. Mermin, “[Making better sense of quantum mechanics](#),” *Reports on Progress in Physics* **82** (2018), 012002, [arXiv:1809.01639](#).
- [20] K. Camilleri and M. Schlosshauer, “[Niels Bohr as Philosopher of Experiment: Does Decoherence Theory Challenge Bohr’s Doctrine of Classical Concepts?](#),” *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **49** (2015), 73–83, [arXiv:1502.06547](#).
- [21] P. Lahti and J.-P. Pelonpää, “An Attempt to Understand Relational Quantum Mechanics,” [arXiv:2207.01380](#) (2022).