

A possibilistic no-go theorem on the Wigner’s friend paradox

Marwan Haddara and Eric G. Cavalcanti

Centre for Quantum Dynamics, Griffith University, Gold Coast, Queensland 4222, Australia

(Dated: May 25, 2022)

In a recent work, Bong *et al.* [1] proved a no-go theorem demonstrating a contradiction between a set of assumptions called “Local Friendliness” (LF) and certain quantum phenomena on an extended version of the Wigner’s friend scenario. The LF assumptions can be understood as the conjunction of two independent assumptions: Absoluteness of Observed Events (AOE) and Local Agency (LA). The proof of the LF theorem, however, implicitly assumes the validity of standard probability theory for dealing with sets of events that AOE implies to have simultaneously well-defined values. Here we present a probability-free version of the Local Friendliness theorem. The argument is phrased in the language of possibilities, which we make formal by using a modal logical approach. It relies on a slightly weaker version of Local Agency, which we call “Possibilistic Local Agency”.

Introduction.— Bell’s theorem [2] shows that there exist quantum correlations that cannot be reproduced by any Local Hidden Variable (LHV) model. The correlations demonstrating that impossibility are identified via the violation of Bell inequalities—constraints of the space of possible device-independent correlations that bound the set of LHV correlations. A LHV model can be derived from various alternative sets of premises regarding physical theories [3, 4], and the violations of Bell inequalities can thus be taken to imply the impossibility to construct a theory simultaneously satisfying all premises in any such “LHV-complete” set.

The derivation of the Bell inequalities, however, also assumes the validity of standard probability theory to make various inferences from sets of metaphysical premises to the existence of a LHV model, and from a LHV model to Bell inequalities. This opens the question [5] whether Bell’s theorem may be resolved by rejecting the applicability of probability theory in those derivations, rather than any of the metaphysical premises.

The famous no-go theorems by Greenberger, Horne and Zeilinger (GHZ) [6] and Hardy [7, 8], among others, show that it is possible to prove a version of Bell’s theorem without direct use of probability theory. Instead, those proofs demonstrate the failure of a deterministic local hidden variable model, via a set of logical contradictions involving whether or not it is *possible* for certain events to occur, according to a given theory, rather than their *probabilities*. These have been referred to as proofs of Bell’s theorem without inequalities [9].

Along a recent line of research [10–14] surrounding different versions of the ‘Wigner’s friend’ thought experiment [15], a new quantum no-go theorem, the Local Friendliness (LF) no-go theorem, has been introduced [1]. The LF no-go theorem is similar in spirit to Bell’s theorem in the sense that the metaphysical premises going into it are phrased in a manner independent of the details of any particular physical theory or the degrees of freedom of the systems that make up the scenario. The premises underlying the LF no-go theorem are however *weaker* than those of Bell’s theorem, and so violations

of LF inequalities puts strictly stronger constraints on theories compatible with such phenomena [1, 4].

Just as with Bell’s theorem, however, the LF no-go theorem uses probability theory to make inferences. Most importantly, it involves assigning a joint probability distribution to sets of variables that can be inferred to have simultaneously well-defined values, given the premise of *Absoluteness of Observed Events* [1]. Thus one may wonder whether it could be possible to formulate a probability-free version of the LF no-go theorem, analogous to the Hardy and GHZ theorems.

In this work it is shown that an inequality-free version of the LF theorem can indeed be formulated. The proof is inspired by observations [11, 16, 17] regarding the similarities of Hardy’s paradox [7, 8] and the no-go theorem of Frauchiger and Renner (FR) [10], where a logical contradiction arises from certain premises in an extended Wigner’s friend scenario. However, some of the assumptions in the FR proof directly refer to quantum theory (QT). In contrast, our result is theory-independent.

In ref [18] the FR no-go theorem [10] was phrased in terms of *epistemic modal logic* — a logic designed to deal with statements about knowledge. Their conclusion was that such a logic is in general inadequate for modelling the knowledge of agents in an extended Wigner’s friend scenario. Inspired by that approach, we also formalise our argument using modal logic. However, in this paper the so-called *alethic modalities* [19], namely those of possibility and necessity are considered (in this paper, those modalities refer to *physical*, rather than logical or metaphysical, possibility). From this perspective, the approach taken here bears similarities with recent works on inequality-free non-classicality notions such as [20–23], where probability distributions are replaced with “possibility distributions”, which indicate which outcomes are physically possible and which outcomes are not physically possible in a given experiment.

The Extended Wigner’s Friend Scenario (EWFS).— It is assumed that the experiments can be described in a relativistic space-time, specifying a light-cone structure. In a particular instance of an EWFS two superobservers,




FIG. 1: Spacetime diagram for the type of two-party two-friend EWFS considered in this paper. C, D correspond to observations made by Charlie and Debbie. Observation of the variable A is in the future light cone (FLC) of the intervention X by Alice, resp. B is in the FLC of Y by Bob. Alternatively X is not in the past light cone (PLC) of B, Y, C, D and Y is not in the PLC of A, X, C, D .

Alice and Bob, are performing experiments at space-like separation. Alice and Bob each have a nearby friend, Charlie and Debbie respectively, and one of the two measurements that they can perform consists of opening a door to their friends laboratory and asking for the result of an observation made in that laboratory. Let X, Y denote the intervention variables for Alice and Bob with values $x, y \in \{1, 2\}$. Let A, B denote the observations of Alice and Bob with values $a, b \in \{0, 1\}$ for each measurement. The intervention $X = 1$ corresponds to Alice opening the door to Charlie’s lab, which is otherwise sealed shut, and asking for the result $C = c \in \{0, 1\}$ and then assigning $A = c$. Similarly the setting $Y = 1$ of Bob corresponds to asking Debbie for her result $D = d \in \{0, 1\}$. The spatio-temporal relations of the type of scenario described here are illustrated in Fig. 1.

The Local Friendliness model.— “Local Friendliness” can be stated as a conjunction of two principles: Absoluteness of Observed Events (AOE) and Local Agency (LA) [1, 4].

Definition 1 (Absoluteness of Observed Events). *Every observed event is an absolute single event, not relative to anything or anyone.*

Definition 2 (Local Agency). *Any intervention is uncorrelated with any set of relevant events outside its future light cone.*

The term ‘intervention’ in Definition 2 refers to a choice of values for variables that are assumed to be controllable by experimenters. An intervention must be made via external variables in a manner appropriate for randomized experimental trials of a given phenomenon.

In an ordinary bipartite Bell scenario, the conjunction of these two premises allows the behaviour to be anything compatible with the general no-signalling model,

as the assumption of AOE does not indicate that there should be any ‘elements of reality’ or local hidden variables associated with unperformed experiments. While Local Friendliness may seem innocuous from this perspective, it has nontrivial consequences in the context of extended Wigner’s friend scenarios.

In EWF scenarios like the one described above, the assumption of AOE effectively imposes that the outcomes observed by the friends possess values that have an existence independently of whether a superobserver decides to read that value or not. Those values can then be interpreted to take the role of hidden variables for some of the measurements.

The set of correlations for the superobservers consistent with the LF hypothesis in such scenarios has been shown to form a convex polytope, and so can be characterized by a finite set of inequalities. The LF polytope is in general a subset of the no-signaling polytope and always contains the corresponding Bell polytope with example scenarios where the latter inclusion is strict highlighting the fact that the implications of AOE are in general weaker than the hypothesis of LHV’s [1].

From the perspective of seeking an inequality-free no-go theorem, Definition 2 needs to be revised, as it is phrased in terms of probabilistic notions. We propose the following possibilistic locality condition, which turns out to be sufficient for our purpose.

Definition 3 (Possibilistic Local Agency). *If a set of events E is possible, then for any intervention Z not in the past light cone of any of the events in E , E is possible in conjunction with any value of Z .*

The idea is that given a specification of an experimental context, a physical theory may put limits to what types of behaviour can be observed in a given run of the experiment. From the perspective of a probabilistic theory, such as QT, multiple outcomes could be considered possible. If an event is predicted to occur with zero probability, we say that this event is (physically) impossible in this experimental context. PLA is the assumption that whether or not something is possible in one location does not depend on a distant or future intervention.

PLA is evidently guaranteed when considering possibilities that arise from probabilistic models that satisfy LA. This is because by the definition of LA, an intervention is statistically independent of any events not in its FLC and hence the possibilities of events which are not in the FLC of the intervention are unchanged as well. On the other hand PLA is weaker than LA in the sense that if the possibilities implied by a probabilistic model violate PLA then the probabilities of that model violate LA, but the converse does not have to hold. That is, a probabilistic model violating LA may still obey PLA. We call the conjunction of AOE and PLA *Possibilistic Local Friendliness* (PLF). For the reasons above, PLF is a weaker assumption than LF.

For superobservers in the type of spatiotemporal relations of Fig. 1, PLF implies that the possibilities in Alice’s lab are unchanged by Bob’s intervention and vice versa, which we call *Possibilistic No-Signalling* (PNS) (a similar assumption was defined in refs. [20, 21]). The fact that the converse does not generally hold is the content of the following theorem.

Theorem 4. *There exists Possibilistic No-Signalling phenomena in an EWFS which violate Possibilistic Local Friendliness.*

Sketch of the proof.— We will use the two-party two-friend EWFS described before to demonstrate that the assumptions of AOE and PLA cannot in general be maintained together even if the possibilities for the superobservers obey PNS.

Suppose that the conditions of the EWF experiment are such that the events

$$E_1 =^{def} (A = 1, B = 1, X = 2, Y = 2) \quad (1)$$

are considered to be possible together, while the events

$$E_2 =^{def} (A = 0, B = 1, X = 1, Y = 2) \quad (2)$$

$$E_3 =^{def} (A = 1, B = 0, X = 2, Y = 1) \quad (3)$$

$$E_4 =^{def} (A = 1, B = 1, X = 1, Y = 1) \quad (4)$$

are considered to be impossible for Alice and Bob in the spatio-temporal configuration displayed in Fig. 1. For example, a probabilistic theory could give E_1 a nonzero probability, while for $E_2 - E_4$ a zero probability. These conditions are consistent with the principle of PNS, for example, if all the other unspecified sets of events are possible.

Now by the assumption of AOE, the event E_1 can be thought to occur along with some well-defined values of the outcomes c, d . So that in fact the set of events

$$(A = 1, B = 1, C = c, D = d, X = 2, Y = 2) \quad (5)$$

can be considered possible, for at least some c, d , while the sets $E_2 - E_4$ ought to be impossible in conjunction with any values for c, d . Applying PLA to (5), the following sets of events are possible at least for some a, a', b, b' :

$$(A = a, B = 1, C = c, D = d, X = 1, Y = 2) \quad (6)$$

$$(A = 1, B = b, C = c, D = d, X = 2, Y = 1) \quad (7)$$

$$(A = a', B = b', C = c, D = d, X = 1, Y = 1) \quad (8)$$

Note that the values of c, d are the same in each of the lines (5-8), as neither of the interventions are in their past light cones. By construction of the protocol, along with AOE, when $X = 1$, $A = c$ and when $Y = 1$, $B = d$. These imply that the following sets are possible:

$$(A = c, B = 1, C = c, D = d, X = 1, Y = 2) \quad (9)$$

$$(A = 1, B = d, C = c, D = d, X = 2, Y = 1) \quad (10)$$

$$(A = c, B = d, C = c, D = d, X = 1, Y = 1) \quad (11)$$

Then by line (9) and consistency with E_2 it must be that $c \neq 0$. Similarly by line (10) and consistency with E_3 it must be that $d \neq 0$ and finally by line (11) with E_4 both $c, d \neq 1$. This is a contradiction, since now all the possible values for c, d are exhausted. Hence the assumptions of AOE and PLA cannot be maintained together with the conditions laid out on lines (1-4) in an EWFS.

Notably the possibilistic conditions on lines (1-4) are exactly of the kind that lead to Hardy’s paradox [7, 8] and can be reproduced in quantum mechanics. For completeness, it will be shown in the latter part of the paper that such phenomena can be lifted to the EWF scenario.

We will next formalise this line of reasoning using the Kripke-semantics of modal logic.

Basics of modal logic.— The brief overview in this section is mostly based on ref [19].

The alphabet for the modal logic we consider consists of a set Ω of propositional variables $p_1, p_2 \dots \in \Omega$, the familiar logical connectives $\neg, \wedge, \vee, \leftrightarrow, \rightarrow$ together with the modal operators \diamond for “possibly” and \square for “necessarily” along with the parentheses $()$. More complex formulas are formed from these by the following conditions:

- C1:** All the propositional variables are formulas.
- C2:** If Q is a formula, then $\neg Q, \diamond Q$ and $\square Q$ are formulas.
- C3:** If Q and G are formulas, then so are $(Q \wedge G), (Q \vee G), (Q \leftrightarrow G)$ and $(Q \rightarrow G)$.
- C4:** There are no other formulas.

Following the usual convention, the parentheses may be dropped for readability where there is no risk of confusion.

The common semantics for many modal logics is based on the so called Kripke-models. A Kripke-model M is a triple $M = \langle W, R, V \rangle$, where W is a non-empty set of *possible worlds*, $R \subset W \times W$ is a binary relation between worlds called *accessibility relation* and V is a *valuation function*, i.e. a mapping $V : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(W)$ from the set of propositional variables to subsets of W , indicating in which worlds the propositional variables are true. The notation wRw' is used to indicate that w' is accessible from w , or that w' is a possible world from the perspective of w .

The notation $M, w \vDash Q$ (“ \vDash ” is read as “entails”) is used when Q is true in the world w of the model M , and $M, w \not\vDash Q$ when it is untrue. For a $p \in \Omega$, $M, w \vDash p$ is equivalent to saying $w \in V(p)$. The truth conditions for the propositional connectives are defined as in ordinary propositional logic by the conditions

$$M, w \vDash \neg Q \text{ iff } M, w \not\vDash Q, \quad (12)$$

$$M, w \vDash G \wedge Q \text{ iff } M, w \vDash G \text{ and } M, w \vDash Q, \quad (13)$$

$$M, w \vDash G \vee Q \text{ iff } M, w \vDash G \text{ or } M, w \vDash Q, \quad (14)$$

$$M, w \vDash G \rightarrow Q \text{ iff } M, w \not\vDash G \text{ or } M, w \vDash Q, \quad (15)$$

and so on. Which is to say, that the truth conditions of classical propositional logic hold in each individual world. Here “iff” is short for “if and only if”.

The truth conditions for the modal formulas are defined as follows:

$$M, w \models \Box Q \text{ iff } M, w' \models Q \quad \forall w' \text{ s.t. } wRw' \quad (16)$$

$$M, w \models \Diamond Q \text{ iff } M, w' \models Q \text{ for some } w' \text{ s.t. } wRw' \quad (17)$$

If $\forall w \in W$, it holds that $M, w \models Q$, then the formula Q is said to be valid in the model M . The notation $M \models Q$ is used when Q is valid in the model.

Notably, when evaluating modal statements like $\Box Q$, one only needs to account for the worlds that are accessible from the reference world w . The accessibility relation plays a very important role along the set of possible worlds W . For example, the intuitive statement $(\Box Q \rightarrow Q)$, meaning “if necessarily Q then Q ” may not be valid, unless wRw i.e. the relation is reflexive. Another intuitive statement $\Box Q \rightarrow \Diamond Q$ can fail unless every world has access to some world. We will not enforce any general conditions on R based on intuitive readings of \Box or \Diamond and instead aim to phrase the argument based on minimal assumptions.

Formal proof of Theorem 4.— Let $M = \langle W, R, V \rangle$ be a model defined relative to a set Ω of propositional variables, the elements of which are interpreted to represent statements about physical observations in an EWFS of the type $(A = 0), (B = 0)\dots$ and so on. The notation $(A = 0, B = 0 \dots Y = 1)$ is used for conditions of the type $(A = 0) \wedge (B = 0) \wedge \dots \wedge (Y = 1)$.

Let w_0 be a world of reference where the possibilities related to the EWFS are evaluated. The assumptions about the possibilities in the experiment on lines (1-4) directly translate to

$$M, w_0 \models \Diamond E_1 \wedge \neg \Diamond E_2 \wedge \neg \Diamond E_3 \wedge \neg \Diamond E_4, \quad (18)$$

By AOE, each variable must have exactly one value in every possible world. That is, for every $F \in \{A, B, C, D\}$,

$$M, w_0 \models \Box((F = 0) \wedge \neg(F = 1)) \vee (\neg(F = 0) \wedge (F = 1)), \quad (19)$$

with similar conditions for X, Y . PLA implies that, for any set of events E , and for any value z of an intervention Z not in the past light cone of any of the events in E ,

$$M, w_0 \models (\Diamond E \rightarrow \Diamond(E, Z = z)). \quad (20)$$

Finally, the protocol for measurement choices $X = 1$ and $Y = 1$ corresponds to

$$M, w_0 \models \Box((X = 1) \rightarrow (A = C)) \quad (21)$$

$$M, w_0 \models \Box((Y = 1) \rightarrow (B = D)), \quad (22)$$

where $A = C$ is shorthand for

$$((A = 0) \wedge (C = 0)) \vee ((A = 1) \wedge (C = 1)). \quad (23)$$




FIG. 2: Graphical representation of the argument. $\Diamond E_1$ and AOE imply the existence of an accessible world w_1 in which $(E_1, C = c, D = d)$ is true for some values of C, D . PLA with the space-time relations of the variables then imply the existence of three accessible worlds w_2, w_3, w_4 in which different interventions X, Y have been chosen, with the same fixed values C, D . Once the reading of $X, Y = 1$ is taken into account, it follows that if $C = 0$ then w_2 is inconsistent with $\neg \Diamond E_2$, if $D = 0$ then w_3 conflicts with $\neg \Diamond E_3$ and w_4 conflicts with $\neg \Diamond E_4$ when $C = 1, D = 1$ so that a contradiction cannot be avoided.

Technically, for consistency with the physical picture, the \vee above should be an exclusive-or, but this detail makes no difference for the argument and in any case, that requirement is guaranteed by (19).

Now by (13) the assumption (18) can be true only if:

$$M, w_0 \models \Diamond E_1 \quad (24)$$

The truth conditions for \Box, \wedge, \vee allow one to combine the use of line (19) for C, D with line (24) to get the condition

$$\exists(c, d) M, w_0 \models \Diamond(E_1 \wedge (C = c) \wedge (D = d)), \quad (25)$$

where the terms with negations have been dropped from formulas of the type $(F = f) \wedge \neg(F = f')$ for C, D by using the implication $\Diamond(Q \wedge G) \rightarrow \Diamond Q$ which follows from the truth conditions for \wedge . Here, the ‘ \exists ’ over c, d is understood as a disjunction of propositions of the above type over all possible values of c, d .

From (25) onwards, the proof follows the earlier sketch and will not be repeated in full. The crux of the argument is that for any c, d one can use PLA and combine with (19, 21, 22) in a way that implies a contradiction with (18). This thought chain is depicted compactly in terms of the network structure of the Kripke model in Fig. 2.

The argument presented here is independent of quantum mechanics. Quantum theory does, however, in principle allow for the type of possibilistic conditions described on (18) and hence, any theory compatible with quantum predictions leads to similar contradictions and

therefore has to abandon AOE or PLA. This is the content of theorem 5 below.

Theorem 5. *There exist quantum predictions on an EWFS that are incompatible with Possibilistic Local Friendliness.*

Proof. Consider the quantum-mechanical model in which Charlie and Debbie share a qubit pair prepared in state

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|0\rangle_{S_A}|0\rangle_{S_B} + |0\rangle_{S_A}|1\rangle_{S_B} + |1\rangle_{S_A}|0\rangle_{S_B}), \quad (26)$$

where $|0\rangle_{S_{A/B}}, |1\rangle_{S_{A/B}}$ form an orthonormal basis for $\mathbb{C}^2 \simeq \mathcal{H}_{S_A}, \mathcal{H}_{S_B}$. Charlie and Debbie perform two-outcome measurements which are described, from their perspective, with projective elements $|0\rangle\langle 0|_{S_{A/B}}, |1\rangle\langle 1|_{S_{A/B}}$. From the perspective of Alice and Bob, the laboratories including S_A and S_B evolve unitarily to

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi\rangle &= U_A \otimes U_B [|\xi\rangle_{F_A} \otimes |\psi\rangle_{S_A S_B} \otimes |\xi\rangle_{F_B}] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|C_0\rangle \otimes |D_0\rangle + |C_0\rangle \otimes |D_1\rangle + |C_1\rangle \otimes |D_0\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Here $|\xi\rangle_{F_A} \in \mathcal{H}_{F_A}$ and $|\xi\rangle_{F_B} \in \mathcal{H}_{F_B}$ refer to the state vectors of Charlie and Debbie and their laboratories in the beginning of the experiment; U_A and U_B are the unitaries that correlate each laboratory with their qubit upon measurement; $|C_0\rangle, |C_1\rangle$ refer to orthogonal state vectors of the joint system F_A and S_A after Charlie having observed outcome 0/1, and similarly for Debbie.

Alice's measurement corresponding to the setting $X = 1$ may consist of the elements $A_1(a) = |C_a\rangle\langle C_a|$ and similarly for Bob $B_1(b) = |D_b\rangle\langle D_b|$. Let the settings $X = 2$ and $Y = 2$ correspond to the projective measurements

$$\begin{aligned} A_2(0) &= |C_+\rangle\langle C_+| & A_2(1) &= |C_-\rangle\langle C_-| \\ B_2(0) &= |D_+\rangle\langle D_+| & B_2(1) &= |D_-\rangle\langle D_-|, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where $|C_\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|C_0\rangle \pm |C_1\rangle]$ and so on. The proof concludes by noting that a direct calculation of $P(ab|xy) = \langle \Psi | A_x(a) \otimes B_y(b) | \Psi \rangle$ produces the possibilistic structure used in the proof of Theorem 4:

$$\begin{aligned} P(1, 1|1, 1) &= 0, & P(0, 1|1, 2) &= 0 \\ P(1, 0|2, 1) &= 0, & P(1, 1|2, 2) &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

Conclusions.— We have constructed a possibilistic version of the Local Friendliness no-go theorem by exhibiting a logical contradiction under the assumption that the possibilities for the superobservers in an EWFS are of the type that lead to Hardy's paradox. The result does not presuppose quantum mechanics. However, under the assumption that QT holds even on the scale of

observers one gets a no-go theorem for the type of possibilities predicted by QT. The conclusion is of foundational interest, as the assumptions that lead to this Possibilistic LF no-go theorem are weaker than those of the original LF no-go theorem [1], which are in turn weaker than those that are required to derive Bell's theorem.

The Possibilistic LF theorem refers to idealised predictions, and is thus not amenable to experimental test—similarly to the Hardy and GHZ paradoxes, and unlike Bell's theorem and the original LF no-go theorem. Nevertheless, it shows that any resolution of the contradiction in the original LF no-go theorem that merely involves the use of probability theory in that proof cannot also apply in the ideal limit. It thus provides a logical argument against that alternative.

While we have demonstrated our result by considering a very particular EWFS, the definition of PLA and the formal approach using the Kripke semantics of modal logic should be readily adaptable to the consideration of more general scenarios, with different numbers of superobservers and friends respectively. It would be interesting to see, for example, if some multipartite EWF scenarios would allow for demonstrations of a PLF no-go theorem with a possibilistic structure of the GHZ-type [6, 9]. More general questions of interest include the formulation of necessary or sufficient possibilistic conditions for contradictions in various EWFS and whether or not such conditions could be reproducible in QT.

From another perspective, this result casts some doubt on whether or not a logic described with Kripke-structures can be correct for reasoning about the possible courses of events in space-time allowed for by general theories that satisfy PLA. Indeed, the emergence of a contradiction suggests that a 'complete story' of physically possible events in space-time shouldn't perhaps be told in terms of propositions with definite truth values for all observations. To repeat a point made in ref [18]; it may be that the possible worlds in Kripke models are too classical for quantum (or more general) settings. In light of this, it would be interesting to see if the modal logic framework could be generalized somehow to be more consistent with the quantum phenomena, while reducing to the classical notions for events about which information is accessible to the superobservers at the end of the experiment.

Acknowledgements.— This work was motivated by a discussion with Jacob Barandes and Matt Leifer following a talk presented by EGC [24]. EGC acknowledges useful discussions with Cristhiano Duarte on the topic of modal logic. We thank Howard Wiseman for feedback on a draft of the paper. This work was supported by the Australian Research Council Future Fellowship FT180100317, and grant number FQXi-RFP-CPW-2019 from the Foundational Questions Institute and Fetzer Franklin Fund, a donor advised fund of Silicon Valley Community Foundation.

-
- [1] K.-W. Bong, A. Utreras-Alarcón, F. Ghafari, Y.-C. Liang, N. Tischler, E. G. Cavalcanti, G. J. Pryde, and H. M. Wiseman, *Nature Physics* **16**, 1199 (2020).
- [2] J. S. Bell, *Physics Physique Fizika* **1**, 195 (1964).
- [3] H. M. Wiseman and E. G. Cavalcanti, in *Quantum [Un]Speakables II: Half a Century of Bell's Theorem*, edited by R. Bertlmann and A. Zeilinger (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2017), chap. **Causarum Investigatio and the Two Bell's Theorems of John Bell**, pp. 119–142.
- [4] E. G. Cavalcanti and H. M. Wiseman, *Entropy* **23**, 925 (2021).
- [5] I. Pitowsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48**, 1299 (1982).
- [6] D. M. Greenberger, M. A. Horne, and A. Zeilinger, in *Bell's Theorem, Quantum Theory and Conceptions of the Universe*, edited by M. Kafatos (Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 1989), chap. **Going Beyond Bell's Theorem**, pp. 69–72.
- [7] L. Hardy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 2981 (1992).
- [8] L. Hardy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 1665 (1993).
- [9] D. M. Greenberger, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and A. Zeilinger, *American Journal of Physics* **58**, 1131 (1990).
- [10] D. Frauchiger and R. Renner, *Nature Communications* **9**, 3711 (2018).
- [11] Č. Brukner, *Entropy* **20**, 350 (2018).
- [12] V. Baumann and S. Wolf, *Quantum* **2**, 99 (2018).
- [13] R. Healey, *Foundations of Physics* **48**, 1568 (2018).
- [14] P. Allard Guérin, V. Baumann, F. Del Santo, and Č. Brukner, *Communications Physics* **4**, 93 (2021).
- [15] E. P. Wigner, in *Philosophical Reflections and Syntheses*, edited by J. Mehra (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1995), chap. **Remarks on the Mind-Body Question**, pp. 247–260.
- [16] M. F. Pusey, *Nature Physics* **14**, 977 (2018).
- [17] S. Aaronson, *It's hard to think when someone hadamards your brain* (2018), <https://scottaaronson.blog/?p=3975>.
- [18] N. Nurgalieva and L. del Rio, in Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on *Quantum Physics and Logic*, Halifax, Canada, 3-7th June 2018, edited by P. Selinger and G. Chiribella (Open Publishing Association, 2019), vol. 287 of *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science*, pp. 267–297.
- [19] V. Rantala and A. Virtanen, *Johdatus modaalilogiikkaan* (Gaudeamus Kirja/Oy Yliopistokustannus University Press Finland Ltd, Helsinki, 2004), ISBN 978-952-495-622-2 (pdf).
- [20] S. Mansfield and T. Fritz, *Foundations of Physics* **42**, 709 (2012).
- [21] S. Abramsky, *Studia Logica* **101**, 411 (2013).
- [22] S. Mansfield, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 022122 (2017).
- [23] L. Santos and B. Amaral, *Phys. Rev. A* **104**, 022201 (2021).
- [24] *Harvard Foundations of Physics Workshop Series* (2020), <https://harvardfop.jacobbarandes.com/previous-events/20201022c>.