

## Editorial Introduction

R.A. Rynasiewicz

Published online: 20 January 2010  
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2010

**Keywords** Bub · Quantum mechanics · Hidden variables · Algebraic logic · Modal interpretation · Entanglement · Quantum information

Jeff is the best counterexample I know to the age-old adage, you can't teach an old dog new tricks, indeed, to an even stronger dictum, viz., old dogs can't learn new tricks, taught or not.

Philosophers are familiar with the “have theory, will travel” syndrome: the same old position is rewrapped in the jargon of newer fashions and peddled anew. And physicists are all too familiar with the so-called Einstein syndrome (even if it isn't true of the historical Einstein), viz., the brain, even of a genius, has enough synaptic plasticity to accommodate at best one conceptual revolution and hence hardly two (or, as Heisenberg reports Einstein to have said, a good joke should not be told too often).

To proceed with construction of the counterexample, I remind many readers of what they know well. Jeff spent his grad and postgrad years searching with Bohm for new (and viable) hidden variable theories. After the two most famous “no go” results of Bell [1] and of Kochen and Specker [2], Jeff took the lead in the algebraic logic approach in *The Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics* [3]. From there he went on to develop what can reasonably be deemed the most sophisticated version of the so-called modal interpretations of quantum mechanics in *Interpreting the Quantum World* [4]. During this time, Jeff immersed himself in the burgeoning literature on quantum computation and serendipitously (was forced to)<sup>1</sup> read the earliest sources (Einstein and

---

<sup>1</sup>At the time, Jeff complained that he didn't “have a single historical bone in his body.”

especially Schrödinger) that teased out, and brought to conscious attention, the concept of entanglement. As a result, almost before the ink was dry on *Interpreting the Quantum World*, Jeff realized the possibility of an information-theoretic characterization of quantum mechanics, resulting in the Bub-Clifton-Halvorson theorem [5]. And, as most readers know, the journals have since been abuzz with discussions of quantum mechanics as a science of information.

It is but with modesty that the following papers are dedicated to Jeff's many contributions. They grew out of a commemorative meeting of the annual conference series, New Directions in the Foundations of Physics, a conference series Jeff initiated in 2002 and, with a little help from his friends, has maintained since. That meeting commemorated Jeff's 65th birthday. We are happy to note that Demopoulos and Pitowski put out a commemorative collection of essays [6] just a bit prior to that birthday. We lament that the present issue appears a bit after, indeed, enough after that Jeff is now older in years but, on the up-side, commensurately wiser.

## References

1. Bell, J.S.: On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox. *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964)
2. Kochen, S., Specker, E.P.: The problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics. *J. Math. Mech.* **17**, 59 (1967)
3. Bub, J.: *The Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*. Reidel, Dordrecht/Boston (1974)
4. Bub, J.: *Interpreting the Quantum World*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge/New York (1997)
5. Clifton, R., Bub, J., Halvorson, H.: Characterizing quantum theory in terms of information-theoretic constraints. *Found. Phys.* **33**, 1561 (2003)
6. Demopoulos, W., Pitowski, I.: *Physical Theory and Its Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Jeffrey Bub*. Springer, Dordrecht (2006)