

EPILOGUE

SEVENTEEN QUESTIONS and close to three hundred responses later, what have we learned? Trying to draw objective conclusions would be like trying to propose a definitive interpretation of David Lynch's *Mulholland Drive*. With both the film and this interview book, everyone will take away something different. It's a freedom as deliberate as desired.

Neither do I intend to launch into a tedious question-by-question summary, nor a grand analysis complete with pie charts. Instead, let me focus on one particular observation. In my introductions to Questions 3 and 12, I talked a lot about warring interpretive factions. But perhaps that's an outdated image. I think the interviews make it overwhelmingly clear that what's happening today is more accurately described as a sharp contrast, in mindset and approach, between an interpretation-focused, realist, ontological camp on the one hand, and a reconstruction-focused, epistemic-informational camp on the other.

The people in the first camp are wedded to the idea that we ought to exorcise observers from the picture and make quantum mechanics, as Bub (page 67) puts it, "conform to some ideal of classical comprehensibility," by embedding quantum mechanics into a realist interpretive framework with an explicit ontology. The people in the second camp pursue some form of reconstructive approach infused with the spirit of quantum information, heeding Wheeler's why-the-quantum call and taking an epistemic view of the formalism.

Let me expand these characterizations a little. The interpretation-focused, realist, ontological camp roughly thinks like this. Let's take standard quantum mechanics as our starting point, because we already know that its (statistical) predictions match our observations. In particular, we won't attempt to rederive the formalism from deeper principles. But we cannot accept the standard textbook presentation of quantum mechanics: it makes quantum mechanics into a ragtag creature, studded with severe deformities and clinically deluded in its talk of "observers" and "measurements." We are appalled that hardly anyone else seems to notice or care. And so we take it upon ourselves to fashion some new clothes for quantum mechanics, such that it may better match our expectations and join the ranks of what we consider proper physical theories.

Take the interview responses from people partial to de Broglie–Bohm and collapse approaches as an example. Many of these responses display an outspoken disdain for textbook quantum mechanics, which is denounced as “internally inconsistent” (Ghirardi, page 47) and “unprofessionally vague and ambiguous” (Goldstein, quoting Bell, page 49). The goal becomes to lift the “smokescreen of the Copenhagen interpretation” (Valentini, page 54). This entails, among other things, a firm commitment to “beables,” that is, to an ontology, because “accounts that are vague or noncommittal about their beables are not precise physical theories at all” (Maudlin, page 52). So building a satisfactory quantum theory requires, first of all, the specification of a definite ontology—particles in de Broglie–Bohm, mass densities (or “flashes”) in collapse theories—and the specification of its dynamics. Crucially, statements referring to observers and measurements are to be purged from the formulation of the theory, based on the reductionist argument that such structures cannot have fundamental status but must instead be understood in terms of the beables of the theory. The pre-Socratic philosopher Democritus believed that “in truth, there is nothing but atoms and the void.” For a Bohmian, then, “in truth,” there is nothing but particles and guiding fields. For a collapse theorist, “in truth,” there is nothing but mass densities and their nonlinear evolution. For an Everettian, “in truth,” there is nothing but the global wave function and the Schrödinger equation. Quantum theory is thus made to largely feel like a classical, materialistic theory, save for some interpretation-specific idiosyncrasies, such as the abstract, nonlocal ontology of the Everett picture.

The reconstruction-focused, epistemic-informational camp, in contrast, thinks like this. Let’s start neither from the ready-made quantum formalism, nor from some kind of prejudice about a prerequisite ontology that’s to be mounted onto quantum mechanics like a luggage rack on a car. Crucially, we see the prominent, fundamental role of observers and measurements in quantum theory not as a critical flaw to be remedied at all costs, but as a constructive starting point. We see it as something suggestive of fundamentally new ways of thinking about physics, about nature, about the role and status of physical theories, and about the relationship between subject and object. The fact that observers and measurements prominently appear in the axioms of quantum mechanics doesn’t mean that they’re to be regarded as entities *physically* different from other objects in our world, as is often suggested (usually by critics of Copenhagen-style quantum mechanics). Rather, it is the *application* of the quantum formalism that requires a split between observed and observer, because this formalism is essentially a kind of map for observers navigating the world; it is not the world itself. Our goal, then, is to pick out the features of the world that inform the structure of the formalism—the features that make quantum theory such an excellent map. On this reading, we consider it misguided to try to turn quantum theory into an all-inclusive nothing-but-atoms-and-the-void picture. It can be done, but it comes at a high price (think many worlds and Bohmian nonlocality), and, most of all, we will likely not have learned one deep thing about nature in the process.

I’ll be the first to admit that this characterization of the two camps is oversimplified. The interviews in this book display all the nuances and fill in all the blanks I couldn’t capture here. For example, there are reconstructionists who emphasize the importance of giving an ontological account, or who lean toward an ontological con-

cept of information. There are also people who embrace epistemic or informational attitudes toward the quantum formalism but stay clear of the business of reconstruction.

Be that as it may, I think an overall dichotomy is evident from the interview responses, and it makes for a recurring, overarching theme in this book. It's a dichotomy that's not altogether new, but one that has definitely become increasingly pronounced as ever more people approach foundational questions through reconstructions and information theory. The interview responses also make clear that we're witnessing not just a superficial methodological difference, but a separation that runs much deeper—all the way down to fundamentally distinct attitudes toward theory building, toward what a physical theory is, can be, and should strive to be. The puzzles of quantum mechanics, it seems, spur people into two diametrically opposed forms of action. That's not to imply a profound incompatibility or antagonism between the two camps. They each have their merits and shortcomings, and perhaps they are best regarded as complementary, as Bacciagaluppi suggests (page 202). Yet these approaches and their proponents still correlate to radically different temperaments.

If this book has shown one thing, then it is that the field of quantum foundations is humming with more activity than ever. The subject has clearly outgrown its popular image as some sort of idle philosophical exercise without cash return, as feel-good poetry not befitting a scientifically-minded person eager for clear answers. From technical results to experiments, quantum foundations has come of age.

Are we today any closer to answering the grand questions? Or are we simply caught in a web of more opinions, approaches, and infinitesimal increments of understanding? I think what can be said with reasonable confidence—something that I've already hinted at in the prologue and that the interviews in this book have hopefully amply demonstrated—is that we have acquired a more nuanced grasp of those grand questions than a contemporary of, say, Bohr or Einstein had. We have also assembled a larger, and continuously expanding, toolbox for tackling these questions. At the same time, at the deeper level, we may still feel stuck in a morass of the kind that had already stopped the founding fathers of quantum mechanics in their tracks. This may be frustrating, but it is also an enduring testament to the theory's depth and enigmatic beauty.

GLOSSARY

THIS GLOSSARY LISTS some of the key terms appearing in this book. A much more detailed discussion of many of these terms can be found in the *Compendium of Quantum Physics: Concepts, Experiments, History and Philosophy*, edited by Daniel Greenberger, Klaus Hentschel, and Friedel Weinert (Springer, 2009). The *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, online at <http://plato.stanford.edu>, is also an authoritative source of information. It has comprehensive entries—some written by our interviewees—on staples such as EPR, the Bell and Kochen–Specker theorems, the measurement problem, entanglement, quantum information, decoherence, quantum logic, and the common interpretations (Copenhagen, Everett, collapse theories, Bohmian mechanics, and modal and relational interpretations).

beable A term coined by John Bell for the observer-independent ontological entity that, in Bell’s view, a physical theory ought to make reference to. Bell intended the term and concept of beables as a counterbalance to the prevalent notion of a primacy of observables and observation in quantum theory:

In particular, we will exclude the notion of “observable” in favour of that of “beable.” The beables of the theory are those elements which might correspond to elements of reality, to things which exist. Their existence does not depend on “observation.” Indeed observation and observers must be made out of beables.

Beables are a hobbyhorse of adherents of Bohmian mechanics and, to a lesser extent, collapse theories—theories that had enjoyed Bell’s personal endorsement.

Bell–Kochen–Specker theorem See KOCHEN–SPECKER THEOREM.

Bell’s inequalities First derived by John Bell in the 1960s, these mathematical expressions show that no local hidden-variables theory—as defined by Bell in terms of a set of locality assumptions—can fully reproduce the predictions of quantum theory (Bell’s theorem). A Bell inequality involves combinations of expectation values for measurements on a bipartite system prepared in an entangled quantum state. If the probability functions used to calculate these expectation values are assumed to

obey certain locality conditions, then the expression will be bounded from above. If, however, the expectation values are computed using the usual rules of quantum mechanics, the bound can be violated. Experiments have so far ruled in favor of quantum mechanics, though loopholes remain. See [Question 8](#), *Bell's Inequalities*, for more.

Bell's theorem See [BELL'S INEQUALITIES](#).

Bohmian mechanics A hidden-variables interpretation of quantum mechanics, developed by David Bohm in the 1950s as a modification of Louis de Broglie's original pilot-wave proposal. Bohmian mechanics describes the deterministic motion of particles along determinate trajectories. The distribution of the trajectories is given by the quantum equilibrium distribution $|\psi|^2$. This choice ensures that statistical predictions agree with those of standard quantum mechanics. While the wave function is transformed via the Schrödinger equation, the particle positions evolve according to the so-called guiding equation. The wave function acts as a "guiding field" that generates a velocity field followed by the particles. There are also versions using nonequilibrium initial distributions and de Broglie's original equation of motion. Therefore, the more general term "de Broglie–Bohm theory" is sometimes used. See also [HIDDEN-VARIABLES INTERPRETATION](#) and [PILOT-WAVE THEORY](#).

Born rule One of the axioms of standard quantum mechanics. In its most elementary form, it states that the probability of finding the value o_i in a measurement of an observable with eigenstates $\{|o_i\rangle\}$ and spectrum $\{o_i\}$ is given by $|\langle o_i|\psi\rangle|^2$, where $|\psi\rangle$ is the state vector of the measured system immediately prior to measurement.

coherence See [SUPERPOSITION](#).

collapse postulate One of the axioms of standard quantum mechanics. It states that a measurement (introduced axiomatically in standard quantum mechanics) instantaneously changes the quantum state of the measured system into one of the eigenstates of the measured observable. See also [BORN RULE](#).

collapse theory An umbrella term for theories that add to quantum mechanics an explicit mechanism for wave-function collapse. As such, they make predictions different from standard quantum mechanics for certain situations. Collapse can be implemented by adding stochastic terms to the Schrödinger equation, or by postulating the occurrence of instantaneous, stochastic wave-function "hits" (or by combining these ideas). A well-known collapse theory is the [GRW THEORY](#).

Copenhagen interpretation An umbrella term for a variety of viewpoints associated with members and disciples of the "Copenhagen circle" of Niels Bohr, Werner Heisenberg, Nathan Rosenfeld, and others. Don Howard has argued that "[u]ntil Heisenberg coined the term in 1955, there was no unitary Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics." According to Jan Faye, "today the Copenhagen interpretation is mostly regarded as synonymous with indeterminism, Bohr's correspondence principle, Born's statistical interpretation of the wave function, and Bohr's complementarity interpretation of certain atomic phenomena." It has also become popular

to throw wave-function collapse, positivism, subjectivism, and the fundamental role of the human observer into the mix, even though such concepts are mostly alien to the spirit of Bohr's own philosophy, which focused on the complementarity principle and the irreducibility of classical concepts.

de Broglie–Bohm theory See BOHMIAN MECHANICS.

decoherence A quantum-mechanical process whereby interactions of a quantum system with its environment lead to uncontrollable and practically irreversible entanglement between the two partners. Decoherence explains why it is so difficult in practice to prepare certain quantum states and to observe interference effects—especially in the case of mesoscopic and macroscopic systems, for which decoherence is extremely fast and virtually inescapable. Decoherence is an application of the standard quantum formalism to open quantum systems; as such, it is neither an interpretation nor a new theory. Yet it is often invoked in foundational discussions, for example, when addressing aspects of the measurement problem. It's also a cornerstone of Everett-style interpretations. Decoherence is a lively subject of experimental investigation and a feared enemy of quantum computers.

density matrix See QUANTUM STATE.

dynamical-reduction theory See COLLAPSE THEORY.

Einstein–Podolsky–Rosen paradox See EPR PARADOX.

EPR paradox An argument presented in a seminal 1935 paper by Albert Einstein, Boris Podolsky, and Nathan Rosen, claiming to demonstrate the incompleteness of quantum mechanics. See page 162 for a brief introduction.

entanglement A genuine quantum phenomenon whereby two systems become “quantum-correlated.” Formally, two systems are said to be entangled if they cannot be afforded with their own state vectors. Entanglement is sometimes described as a process by which systems lose their individuality and fuse into a quantum-mechanical whole (“quantum holism”), but there is disagreement about whether this metaphysical picture is actually appropriate. Suffice to say, entanglement implies that there exist physical properties that can be measured on the composite system but not be inferred from measurements on the subsystems. Entanglement underlies classic quantum paradoxes, such as EPR and Schrödinger's cat, and is a cornerstone of quantum information theory.

Everett interpretation Also known as the relative-state interpretation of quantum mechanics, it was proposed in the 1950s by Hugh Everett, then a Ph.D. student of John Wheeler's. Everett wanted to address the measurement problem and rid the theory of its system–observer dualism. He disposed of the collapse postulate and tried to show that nonetheless—even when no particular measurement outcome is singled out—our *subjective* experience of definite measurement outcomes (as well as their correct quantum statistics) could be recovered. Everett emphasized the principle of relativity of quantum states: each component in the uncollapsed superposition state at the conclusion of a von Neumann measurement describes a correlation be-

tween a definite state of the system and a definite state of the observer, with the latter state then interpreted as *relative* to the system's being in a particular state. Serious gaps in Everett's argument motivated later efforts to develop Everett's ideas into a coherent, satisfactory interpretation; see MANY-WORLDS INTERPRETATION.

gedankenexperiment A thought experiment (from the German word *Gedanke*, meaning "thought"). Famous examples relevant to the theme of this book are SCHRÖDINGER'S CAT and WIGNER'S FRIEND.

GRW theory A collapse theory postulating a spontaneous, stochastic spatial localization of the wave function. Named after its inventors GianCarlo Ghirardi, Alberto Rimini, and Tullio Weber. See also COLLAPSE THEORY.

hidden-variables interpretation An interpretation of quantum mechanics that adds to the wave function additional variables that specify the physical state of the system more accurately than the wave function alone could do. To avoid a clash with the predictions of quantum mechanics, the hidden variables must remain experimentally inaccessible. A well-known hidden-variables interpretation is BOHMIAN MECHANICS. See also Question 8, *Bell's Inequalities*.

interference In quantum mechanics, the phenomenon that observed distributions of events may have a distinctly nonclassical shape in (typically) space or time. The most famous example is the spatial interference pattern observed in the double-slit experiment with particles. Classically, the expected pattern would be two partially overlapping peaks (the sum of the contributions from each individual slit). The observed quantum-mechanical pattern, however, has an oscillatory shape ("interference fringes"). The formal account of interference rests on the fact that a quantum superposition represents a linear combination of probability *amplitudes* rather than actual probabilities. This means that the corresponding probability distribution contains additional crossterms ("interference terms"), which modulate the classically expected distribution.

Kochen–Specker theorem A no-go theorem that, together with Bell's theorem, imposes severe constraints on the structure of a viable hidden-variables theory. Derived by Simon Kochen and Ernst Specker in 1967, it may also be read as a powerful argument against naive realism, by implying that measurements cannot in general be construed as simply revealing objectively preexisting properties of the world. Specifically, the theorem proves that in quantum mechanics, it is not possible in general to assign values to a set of observables defined for a quantum system of Hilbert-space dimension greater than two such that (1) all these values are definite at all times, and (2) the value assignment is independent of how the value is eventually measured—say, independent of the choice of other co-measured observables ("non-contextuality"). Some authors prefer the term "Bell–Kochen–Specker theorem," arguing that the derivation of the Kochen–Specker theorem shares a key step with the (earlier) proof of Bell's theorem.

many-minds interpretation See MANY-WORLDS INTERPRETATION.

many-worlds interpretation An interpretation that develops the basic ideas of Everett's relative-state interpretation into the full-blown picture of a single quantum universe—represented by an all-encompassing wave function—containing a myriad of constantly branching, effectively classical worlds. “Our” observed world then corresponds to one such branch. Many-worlds interpretations were popularized by Bryce DeWitt in the 1970s and by David Deutsch in the 1980s. A variant is the class of “many-minds” interpretations proposed by David Albert and Barry Loewer, Dieter Zeh, Michael Lockwood, and others. See also **EVERETT INTERPRETATION**.

measurement problem The difficulty of reconciling the smooth, linear, reversible Schrödinger evolution of quantum states with the occurrence of definite events in the world of our experience. The measurement problem is one of the classic problems in the foundations of quantum mechanics. See **Question 7, *The Measurement Problem***.

modal interpretation A class of interpretations of quantum mechanics. One characteristic feature is the definition of rules that permit the assignment of a definite value to a system even when the system is not in an eigenstate of the corresponding observable. The first modal interpretation was proposed in the 1970s by Bas van Fraassen. There, a system is described by the following two different states. (1) The *value state*, which specifies the values of physical quantities possessed by the system at a given time. (2) The *dynamical state*, which determines the evolution of the system—that is, the possible future value states. It coincides with the ordinary quantum state vector, but it never collapses.

no-cloning theorem A theorem of quantum mechanics showing that it is impossible (except by sheer luck) to duplicate an unknown quantum state.

no-go theorem An umbrella term for theorems that demonstrate an incompatibility between what quantum mechanics *allows* us to do and what we'd *like* to do—be it implementing particular actions, constructing particular hidden-variables models, or continuing to believe in particular worldviews. For examples, see **BELL'S INEQUALITIES**, **KOCHEN-SPECKER THEOREM**, **NO-CLONING THEOREM**, and **NO-SIGNALING THEOREM**.

nonlocality In the context of quantum mechanics, this term chiefly has two meanings. (1) The impossibility of describing correlations between outcomes of local measurements, performed at two different locations, in terms of a local hidden-variables model. (2) Actual physical action-at-a-distance, where the physical situation in one region instantaneously influences the physical situation in another, arbitrarily distant region.

no-signaling theorem A theorem showing that quantum mechanics does not enable us to use entangled quantum states for the instantaneous transmission of information between distant partners.

philosophy The art of skillfully questioning and analyzing subtle yet fundamental matters that the man on the street either takes for granted or does not regard as having practical bearing on his survival. The term is also sometimes employed by tough-

minded scientists to dismiss issues that they do not regard as having any practical bearing on their survival.

physics The art of skillfully observing, analyzing, and quantifying patterns and relationships in the universe, and of formulating laws that capture and correctly predict these patterns.

pilot-wave theory A hidden-variables interpretation presented by Louis de Broglie at the 1927 Solvay meeting. De Broglie derived an equation for the motion of particles, each endowed with definite position and momentum values (which are the hidden variables), and demonstrated how interference effects could be understood on the basis of such particle trajectories. De Broglie's theory was later revived by David Bohm and developed into **BOHMIAN MECHANICS**. See also **HIDDEN-VARIABLES INTERPRETATION**.

PR box A model for studying the properties of (hypothetical) "superquantum" theories. Named after its inventors Sandu Popescu and Daniel Rohrlich. See Jeffrey Bub's introduction to PR boxes, page 68.

QBism Christopher Fuchs's term for his research program of elucidating the larger metaphysical implications of Quantum Bayesianism.

QBit A variant spelling of *qubit*, preferred and promoted by David Mermin. See **QUBIT**.

Quantum Bayesianism At the core, the view that quantum states encapsulate the subjective degrees of belief of an agent and are nothing but a tool the agent uses in navigating the world he is immersed in. Developed by Carl Caves, Christopher Fuchs, and Rüdiger Schack, the approach is grounded in personalist Bayesian probability theory and is nourished by insights from quantum information theory. See also **QBISM**.

quantum computer A device that exploits the laws of quantum mechanics to speed up a computation. There are several known quantum algorithms for solving certain problems faster than any classical (i.e., nonquantum) computer could do. The most famous examples are Shor's algorithm for factoring large numbers and Grover's algorithm for finding an element in a list. The heart of a quantum computer is an array of qubits, which can be physically realized in various ways (photons, trapped ions, two-level atoms, nuclear spins, coupled quantum dots, and so on). Gates are implemented via unitary operations acting on the qubits; one- and two-qubit gates are sufficient to perform any quantum computation. (There's an alternative equivalent approach—called measurement-based, or cluster-state, computation—which proceeds from a highly entangled initial state and implements the computation via a series of projective measurements.) Building a quantum computer is one of the holy grails of quantum science and engineering; to date, only proof-of-principle devices containing a handful of qubits have been realized.

quantum gravity An area of research devoted to finding a satisfactory physical theory that would unify quantum mechanics and general relativity. String theory is cur-

rently the most popular approach, followed by loop quantum gravity. All of the existing theories, however, have their problems, and so the field is best described as work in progress.

quantum information theory A recasting of quantum mechanics as a theory concerned with the flow, processing, and manipulation of information. It provides a new lens for looking at the structure and capabilities of quantum mechanics. It has also led to practical offshoots, such as protocols for completely secure communication. There is, moreover, the promise of a quantum computer. In absence of a clarifying hyphen, the term “quantum information theory” may be read as both “a theory of quantum information” and “a quantum-mechanical information theory.” This is a healthy ambiguity. See also QUANTUM COMPUTER and Question 9, *Quantum Information*.

quantum state The mathematical object for describing the state of an individual quantum system. So-called pure states are represented by complex vectors or functions (“wave functions”) in a Hilbert space; they provide, at least according to standard quantum mechanics, a complete description of the physical state of an individual system. Mixed states, formally represented by density matrices, are used in the following two situations. (1) To represent a classical, ignorance-interpretable probability distribution (ensemble) of pure states, one of which is actually realized by the system. (2) To encapsulate the statistics of all possible measurements that can be carried out on a system that is entangled with another system. In this case, the mixture is *not* ignorance-interpretable, because the presence of entanglement prohibits the assignment of a pure state to the system. See also WAVE FUNCTION and Question 4, *Quantum States*.

qubit Short for *quantum bit*, it refers to any quantum system with a two-dimensional Hilbert space. It is a prominent player in quantum information theory and the building block of quantum computers. While a classical bit has a value of either 0 (“off”) or 1 (“on”), the state of a qubit will in general be a linear superposition of the form $\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$.

reconstruction A rederivation of the structure of quantum mechanics from a set of fundamental principles. Several such principles have been suggested to date; the challenge is to find principles that are sufficiently basic *and* uniquely specify quantum theory. Reconstructions are work in progress and may be considered either a complement or an alternative to the program of interpreting quantum mechanics. See Question 10, *Reconstructions*.

relative-state interpretation See EVERETT INTERPRETATION.

Schrödinger equation An equation specifying the evolution of the quantum state of an isolated, unmeasured system.

Schrödinger’s cat A thought experiment devised by Schrödinger in 1935. It can be seen as a particularly vivid illustration of the measurement problem. The setup consists of a cat confined to a box together with an unstable atom that, at the moment

of its decay, triggers a hammer breaking a vial of poison. According to quantum mechanics, the state of the atom is at all times described by a superposition of “not decayed” and “decayed.” Unitary evolution leads to entanglement between all systems present, resulting in a seemingly grotesque superposition of two states that our experience deems mutually exclusive: one component of the superposition contains a live cat (together with an undecayed atom, untriggered hammer, and the vial intact), while the other component describes a dead cat (together with a decayed atom, triggered hammer, and the poison released). The second part of the paradox is established when an outside observer opens the box to look at the cat. According to the collapse postulate, such an act of observation will instantaneously reduce the superposition to one of its components. In Schrödinger’s words, the “indeterminacy originally restricted to the atomic domain becomes transformed into macroscopic indeterminacy, which can then be *resolved* by direct observation.” This raises the question of the state of the cat *before* the observer opens the box. See Arthur Fine’s *The Shaky Game: Einstein, Realism, and the Quantum Theory* (Chicago, 1996) for an in-depth analysis of the history of Schrödinger’s cat paradox and Einstein’s influence.

SQUID An abbreviation for *superconducting quantum interference device*. A SQUID is a macroscopic quantum system consisting of a ring of superconducting material interrupted by thin, insulating barriers called Josephson junctions. At low temperatures, pairs of electrons of opposite spin condense into bosons (“Cooper pairs”) and tunnel through the junctions. This leads to the flow of a persistent, resistance-free “supercurrent,” which induces a magnetic flux threading the ring. In 1980 Anthony Leggett suggested that SQUIDS could be used to create quantum superpositions of macroscopically distinct flux states. In 2000 coherent superpositions of microampere supercurrents traveling in opposite directions around the loop were experimentally observed by Jonathan Friedman et al. and Caspar van der Wal et al.

state vector A normalized complex vector in a Hilbert space, representing a pure quantum state. See also QUANTUM STATE.

superposition A (pure) quantum state that is written as a linear combination of other (pure) quantum states. Such a quantum-mechanical superposition is often referred to as *coherent*, to emphasize the fact that it defines a new physical state of an individual system—rather than a statistical (“classical”) distribution of the component states, with one of the states realized in the system. See also INTERFERENCE and SUPERPOSITION PRINCIPLE.

superposition principle A kinematical concept of quantum mechanics, grounded in the linearity of Hilbert space. It states that any linear combination $\sum_n \alpha_n |\psi_n\rangle$ of quantum states $|\psi_n\rangle$ is again a valid quantum state. See also SUPERPOSITION.

von Neumann measurement A formal scheme describing the entangling interaction between two quantum systems. It is often used to formalize a “measurement-like” unitary interaction between a system and an apparatus, both treated as quantum systems. Since no definite outcome is singled out at the conclusion of a von Neumann

measurement, the scheme is sometimes referred to as *premeasurement* and serves as a classic—albeit not the most general—illustration of the measurement problem.

wave function A complex vector or function in a Hilbert space, representing a pure quantum state. In traditional parlance, wave functions are mostly associated with a continuous function of real parameters that refer to the relevant degrees of freedom of the system (usually position, momentum, or spin). A wave function describes a probability amplitude; its mod-squared value $|\psi(x, t)|^2$ specifies the probability of finding the value x in an appropriate measurement at time t (Born rule). See also QUANTUM STATE.

wave packet A wave function that is peaked in the relevant variable. An example is a coherent state, which is narrowly peaked in both position and momentum space.

Wigner's friend A variant of the Schrödinger-cat gedankenexperiment, devised by Eugene Wigner in the early 1960s. The cat is replaced by a human observer ("Wigner's friend") inside a sealed laboratory. The decay of the atom triggers now merely a flash of light. The observer is instructed to assign a definite quantum state depending on whether she has seen a flash. On the other hand, from the perspective of a second, outside observer, the contents of the laboratory will evolve into a superposition of states associated, in particular, with different states of *consciousness* of Wigner's friend. For Wigner, this was a particularly absurd and unacceptable state of affairs. For more, see page 90, Časlav Brukner's answer to Question 11 (page 217), and Christopher Fuchs's answer to Question 5 (page 114).

INDEX

Note: A page reference to a person's name means that the corresponding text makes significant mention of that person—say, in the form of a quote, an anecdote, or a substantial description and acknowledgment of the person's work.

A

ABL formula 280
abortion 237
absolutism 62
action-at-a-distance 44, 48, 60, 103, 162, 165,
170, 178–179, 288
AdS/CFT correspondence 270
aether 60, 103, 113, 186, 203–204, 239, 287
agent 64, 78, 95–96, 101, 115–116, 129, 131–132,
135, 171, 220
Aharonov, Yakir 221
Aharonov–Bohm effect 134
algae 274
American Airlines 6
American Pragmatism 253–254
anthropic principle 244
Appleby, Marcus 132
Aristotelian dynamics 82, 270
Arndt, Markus 215
arrow of time 41, 52, 268
artificial intelligence 244
Aspect, Alain 29
Austin Powers 26
Austin, Texas 35

B

baby 188
baby factories 274
Bayesian sum rule 46
Baym, Gordon 31–32

beables *see also* ontology, 49, 52, 62, 74–75, 79,
97–99, 131, 268, 295
beer 181
Bell's inequalities 44–45, 67, 161–180, 183, 216,
276, 295–296
determinism and 172, 177–178
experimental tests of 25, 44–45, 164–165,
174–175, 219, 222
loopholes and 170, 174–175, 219, 251–252
violations of 30, 44, 161–180, 228, 287
Bell's theorem *see* Bell's inequalities
Bell, John 29, 47, 49, 63, 97, 144, 148, 150, 155,
161–164, 172, 201, 210, 240, 243, 251–252,
259, 295
Bertlmann's socks 161, 178
bigoted 21
birthing 109, 172, 249
black holes 82, 158, 223, 261, 264, 270, 272, 282,
283
information loss from 54, 82, 234, 264, 270
block universe 109, 110, 114, 240, 253
Blood Meridian vii
Bohm box 113
Bohm, David 25, 29, 82–83, 203
Bohmian mechanics *see also*
de Broglie–Bohm theory, 25, 31,
44, 45, 75–77, 79, 80, 82–83, 98–99, 113,
116–117, 150–151, 163, 296
Bohr, Niels 53, 59, 79, 161, 182, 208, 218, 232,
258, 297
Bohr–Einstein dialogue 36, 66, 251, 266
Boltzmann, Ludwig 138

Boolean algebra 68, 146
 Born rule 86, 128, 146, 213, 280, 296
 derivation of 46, 123–124, 205, 213, 224–225
 in de Broglie–Bohm theory 40, 81–82, 120
 violations of 40, 54, 81, 217, 223–224
 buckyballs 157, 215, 219, 221

C

Calasso, Roberto 109
 causal structure 51, 100–101, 118, 153, 207, 267, 287
 chance *see* randomness
 Cheshire cat 112
 classical concepts 33, 42, 56, 62, 258, 297
 classical mechanics 57, 60, 105, 162, 273
 classical physics 33, 43, 258, 273
 closed timelike curves 263–264
 collapse 27, 67, 156, 187, 213, 221–222, 271, 276–277, 285
 collapse postulate 33, 48, 296
 collapse theories 40, 45, 63, 65–66, 69–70, 73–74, 77–78, 80, 92, 97, 99, 111, 116, 129, 132–133, 151, 216, 264–265, 271, 296
 Bell correlations in 165–166
 experimental tests of 40, 218–220, 230
 violation of energy conservation in 209
 communism 238
 complementarity principle 62, 140, 296–297
 completeness *see* incompleteness
 complexity
 communication 175, 275–276
 computational 56, 264, 275–276
 consciousness 53, 57, 137, 148, 217–218, 230, 233, 244, 260, 277
 conservation of energy 209
 collapse theories and 209
 consistent histories 52, 79, 103, 149–150, 177, 232, 280–281
 contextuality 131, 170, 252, 298
 Copenhagen interpretation 54, 61, 64, 71, 75–76, 78, 79, 85, 103, 156, 159, 228, 231, 238–239, 256, 296–297
 as a postwar myth 61, 296
 Copernicus, Nicolas 116
 correlations without correlata 232
 correspondence principle 56, 296
 cosmology 53, 138–139, 223, 269–270
 cowboy 147
 cruciverbalism 12

D

Daneri–Loinger–Prosperi theory 27–28

dappled world 110
 dark matter 279
 Davies, Paul xi, 29
 de Finetti theorem 135, 253
 de Finetti, Bruno 126–127
 decoherence 20, 40, 56, 62, 64, 65, 70, 85–86, 95, 106–108, 123, 143, 146, 149, 152, 155–157, 159–160, 213, 218–219, 224, 229, 247, 250, 264, 285, 297
Deepwater Horizon 23
 detector clicks 42, 218
 determinism 28, 109–124, 136, 138, 203, 258
 Bell's inequalities and 172, 177–178
 Deutsch, David 29, 62, 228
 Dewey, John 204
 DeWitt, Bryce 71
 de Broglie, Louis 82–83, 104
 de Broglie–Bohm theory *see also* Bohmian mechanics, 33, 34, 40, 55, 65–66, 70, 75–77, 81–83, 111–112, 114, 118, 120–121, 146–147, 167, 270, 296
 probabilities in 129, 132–133, 138
 quantum states in 91–92, 97, 98
 Dirac, Paul 250
 Don Quixote 249
 don't ask, don't tell 255
 Donald, Matthew 254
 double-slit experiment 35, 98, 106, 133, 154, 194, 215, 219, 222, 224, 298
 Dr. Evil 26
 Durant, Will 172

E

einselection *see* environment-induced superselection
 Einstein, Albert 28, 32, 44, 60, 69, 93, 94, 109, 116–117, 131, 158, 171–172, 176, 189, 190, 207, 211, 240, 249, 258–259, 282, 288
 Einstein–Podolsky–Rosen *see* EPR
 electrodynamics 60, 273
 elk hunting 35
 ensemble interpretation 33, 79, 133, 149, 155
 entanglement 43, 45, 56, 67, 69, 72, 122, 141–142, 152–153, 174–175, 224–225, 276, 297
 love and 32
 entanglement-assisted invariance 123–124, 140
 test of 224–225
 envariance *see* entanglement-assisted invariance
 environment-induced superselection 86
 EPR 25, 31–32, 162, 173, 194, 251–252, 254, 256
 criterion of reality 137, 171

equivalence principle 29, 50, 212, 266, 277–278
 Everett interpretation *see also* many-worlds
 interpretation, 34, 40–41, 45, 55, 62, 65–66,
 77, 83–86, 114, 147, 150, 152, 228, 232–234,
 246, 271, 297–298
 Bell correlations in 166, 173, 178
 Bohr and 235
 emergent randomness in 110–111, 121–123,
 136
 probabilities in 85, 121–123, 129, 136, 234,
 250
 quantum states in 92, 98–99, 107
 everyday language 57, 80, 140, 182, 260
 evolution 35, 177, 204, 277
 existential interpretation 86, 247
 experimental metaphysics 164
 expletives 95

F

FAPP 28, 152–153, 243, 250–251
 Faraday, Michael 103–104
 Faye, Jan 296
 Feyerabend, Paul 238
 Feynman, Richard 35–36, 112, 134, 215
 Fine, Arthur 162
 for all practical purposes *see* FAPP
 free will 109–110, 130, 166, 170, 172, 239, 258,
 260
 Fuchs, Christopher 52, 129, 136, 191, 233, 280

G

Gardner, Martin 254
 gauge 134, 270
 gedankenexperiments 215–225, 263, 275, 298
 Gell-Mann, Murray 281
 general relativity 33, 50–51, 192, 207, 261–272,
 282
 quantum mechanics and 50, 221, 222,
 261–272
 generalized probabilistic theories 41–42,
 67–69, 200
 genetic mutations 143
 geodesic domes 32
 Ghirardi–Rimini–Weber theory *see* collapse
 theories
Ghost in the Atom, The xi, 29
 GHZ 173, 177, 179, 283
 Gleason's theorem 123, 131, 230
 Goldstein, Shelly 31
 Grover's algorithm 55, 300
 GRW theory *see* collapse theories
 guiding equation 74–76, 296

guiding field 45, 70, 90, 91, 98, 292, 296
 gunpowder 94

H

halfway house 190
 Hardy, Lucien 112, 205, 264
 Hartle, James 147–148
 Heisenberg, Werner 61, 92, 131, 258
 hidden variables 25, 33–34, 80, 83, 112–113, 117,
 162–164
 hidden-variables theory 33–34, 40, 54–55, 83,
 162–164, 175, 298
 Hilbert space 34, 41, 51, 67–69, 71, 75, 78,
 145–146, 188–189, 192, 283
 Hiley, Basil 29
 Howard, Don 61, 296
 Humean mosaic 131
 Hyperion 143

I

IBM Corporation 96, 219
 idealism 245, 258
 identity crisis 87
 incompleteness 25, 32, 151, 161–162, 203
 indeterminacy principle *see* uncertainty
 principle
 indeterminism *see also* randomness, 44,
 109–124, 131, 257, 296
 information 42, 57, 106–108, 122, 134, 148, 159,
 181–197, 272, 283
 ontological conception of 185–186
 information-based interpretation 63–69, 85,
 92, 183, 191, 229, 291–293
 instrumentalism 46, 252
 interference 66, 69, 134, 153, 155–157, 298
 interference experiment 215, 217–222, 224, 275
 interpretation 20, 59–86, 202, 291–293
 beliefs and 237–247
 Bohmian *see* Bohmian mechanics,
 de Broglie–Bohm theory
 choice of 61–86, 216, 227–235, 237–247
 collapse *see* collapse theories
 consistent-histories *see* consistent histories
 Copenhagen *see* Copenhagen interpreta-
 tion
 de Broglie–Bohm *see* de Broglie–Bohm
 theory, Bohmian mechanics
 ensemble *see* ensemble interpretation
 Everett *see* Everett interpretation,
 many-worlds interpretation
 information-theoretic *see* information-
 based interpretation

many-minds *see* many-minds interpretation, many-worlds interpretation, Everett interpretation
 many-worlds *see* many-worlds interpretation, Everett interpretation
 modal *see* modal interpretation
 operational *see* operationalism
 pilot-wave *see* de Broglie–Bohm theory, Bohmian mechanics
 reconstruction vs. 199–213
 statistical *see* ensemble interpretation
 utility of 62–63, 71–73
 it from bit 27, 57, 191
It's a Wonderful Life 170
 Ithaca interpretation 79, 136–137, 232

J

James, William 62, 114–115, 170, 240
 jazz guitar 14
Jeopardy! 96, 219
 Joos, Erich 149

K

Kansas 179
 Kant, Immanuel 258
 Kennedy assassination 231
 Kerry, John 237
 kiss of death 37, 255
 kissing frogs 231
 Kochen–Specker theorem 105, 170, 179, 183, 230, 252, 283, 298
Kreisgang 43
 Kuhn, Thomas 237, 273

L

Laplace's principle of indifference 126, 139
Last Picture Show, The 26
 law without law 27, 110
 Lebanon 70
 Leggett's inequality 30, 179
 Leggett, Anthony 32
 live free or die 240
 loop quantum gravity 50, 242, 270–271, 301
 Lorentz contraction 69, 145, 229, 285
 Lorentz covariance 178, 270
 Lorentz transformations 60, 211
 Lorentz, Hendrik Antoon 203–204, 239
 Louisiana 23
Love and Death 285
 lunar vacations 274

M

Mach, Ernst 56, 246, 258, 260
Magic Flute, The 2
 Malin, Shimon 93
 many worlds in denial 77
 many-minds interpretation *see also*
 many-worlds interpretation, Everett
 interpretation, 69, 111, 150
 many-worlds interpretation *see also* Everett
 interpretation, 53, 55, 69, 71–72, 77, 80,
 83–85, 107, 111, 150, 159, 232, 244, 299
 marijuana 132
Marriage of Cadmus and Harmony, The 109
 Marxists 19
 Maudlin, Tim 252
 Maxwell's demon 34, 57
 Maxwell, James Clerk 273
 McCarthy, Cormac vii
 measurement 88–89, 105, 156, 250, 273
 as primitive notion 142, 144, 187, 190, 202
 coarse-grained 43
 problem of *see* measurement problem
 repeatability of 195–197, 213
 measurement problem 30, 34, 43–44, 47–50,
 54, 55, 57, 121, 141–160, 192, 234, 267, 271,
 299
 Mermin, David 102, 186–187
 meteorology 125, 277
 modal interpretation 20, 150, 299
 Mohs's scale 131, 132
 monism 62, 114, 172
 Montana, Alberto 100–101, 230
 Mount Everest 157
 Mount Quantum Information 21
Mulholland Drive 291
 Murphy's law of causality 118

N

nanomechanical quantum systems 215, 263,
 275
 Nelson's stochastic mechanics 75, 92, 230
 New Hampshire 240
 Newtonian gravity 51, 60, 103–104
 Newtonian mechanics *see* classical mechanics
 Niels Bohr Institute 59
 no signaling 67–69, 94, 113, 145, 200, 204, 239,
 299
 no-cloning theorem 33, 36, 89, 190, 200, 271,
 299
 noncommutativity 276
 noncontextuality 183, 252, 298

nonlocality 33–34, 43, 44, 53, 80–82, 134, 165,
170–171, 173, 175–177, 267, 299
in space-time 100, 153
signaling and 33–34, 81–82
without entanglement 72

O

Obama, Barack 87
observation 48–49, 52, 57, 130, 192
observer 45–47, 57, 72, 78, 130, 148, 217–218
fictitious 93
observer-participancy 286
Occam's razor 61
Omaha, Nebraska 21
omniscient being xi, 285–289
existence of 285, 287, 288
ontological excess baggage 100, 112, 230
ontology 33, 49, 61, 64, 74–75, 78, 97, 101, 102,
153–154, 189, 192, 202, 208, 210–212, 243,
291–293
operationalism 42, 93, 101, 153, 189, 202–203,
207, 211–212, 258, 260, 269
Orwellian doublespeak 114

P

Pais, Abraham 254
paleontology 84
Pauli, Wolfgang 245, 254, 286
peaceful coexistence 34, 110
Pearle, Philip 52, 153
Peierls, Rudolf 29, 53, 71
Penrose, Roger 218, 220–222, 265, 271
Peres, Asher 70–71, 144, 145, 170, 176–177
Perimeter Institute 21, 276
philistinism 249
philosophy 39, 249–260, 299–300
pilot wave 91, 103–105
pilot-wave theory *see* de Broglie–Bohm
theory, Bohmian mechanics
Pitowsky, Itamar 145, 252
Planck length 279
Planck mass *see* Planck scale
Planck scale 221–223, 263, 269, 276
plumbing 253
pluralism 114
pluriverse 114–116, 170, 172
pocket calculator 125
pointer states 36, 86, 107, 108, 123
Popper, Karl 137
positivism 119, 152, 238, 241, 252, 255, 297
postmodernism 132
PR box 44, 68, 112–113, 168–169, 183, 204, 276

preferred basis 69, 130, 229
principal principle 65, 129, 131
probabilities 125–140
as degrees of belief 65, 78, 96, 128–132, 135,
147–148
as relative frequencies 126–127, 135
from symmetries 126–127, 136
in de Broglie–Bohm theory 129, 132–133,
138
in the Everett interpretation 85, 121–123,
129, 136, 234, 250
irreducibility of 67, 112, 130, 137, 144, 167,
241
meaning of 65, 125–140
subjective vs. objective 125–140
proper time 50, 266

Q

QBism *see* Quantum Bayesianism
Quantum Bayesianism 46–47, 64, 65, 78–79,
90, 92, 95–96, 114–116, 129, 131–132, 148,
171–172, 253, 300
quantum computer 55–56, 102, 187, 189, 275,
282, 300
quantum Darwinism 107–108, 196
quantum error correction 194
quantum field theory 41, 56, 75, 138, 224, 259,
262, 263, 268
Bohmian 117
quantum foundations
careers in 21, 37, 189, 256
experiments in 215–225, 282
future developments in 273–284
implications of quantum information for
181–197
pressing problems in 39–57
renaissance of 20, 164
role of philosophy in 249–260
role of temperament in 237–247
quantum gravity 50–51, 54, 63, 76, 101, 118,
153–154, 189, 191, 207, 221–222, 231–232,
261–272, 279, 287, 300–301
quantum holism 94, 102, 297
quantum information 20, 41, 55, 66–67, 139,
181–197, 301
quantum information theory 73, 91, 181–197,
228, 280, 301
quantum mechanics
(in)completeness of *see* incompleteness
arrow of time in 41, 52, 268
as a user's manual 115, 147
classical concepts in *see* classical concepts
early years of 20

experimental disproof of 40, 52, 63, 216,
 222–224, 230, 232, 234, 276–277, 279,
 282–283
 general relativity and 50, 221, 222, 261–272
 interpretation of *see* interpretation
 mass in 50, 266, 277–279
 operational approach to *see* operationalism
 randomness in *see* randomness
 reconstructions of *see* reconstructions
 textbook presentation of 23, 34, 41, 155, 213,
 229, 247
 time in 50, 263, 266–267, 270
 without quantum states 46–47
 quantum states 87–108, 301
 crypto-ontic interpretation of 93
 epistemic interpretation of 45–47, 52,
 72–73, 78, 80, 90–91, 93–96, 101–103,
 106–107, 128, 147–148, 185, 191, 229–230,
 291–293
 in de Broglie–Bohm theory 91–92, 97, 98
 in the Everett interpretation 92, 98–99,
 107
 meaning of 33, 43, 45, 48, 49, 52–53, 60,
 87–108, 133–135, 153, 161–162
 nuclear holocaust and 45
 ontic interpretation of 45, 89–90, 93, 98,
 100, 105–107, 128
 quantum mechanics without 46–47
 quantum theory *see* quantum mechanics
 qubit 43, 66, 68, 102, 112, 301
 flux *see also* SQUID, 189
 putrit 71

R

random-number generator 119
 randomness 28, 66, 109–124, 128, 152–153
 realism 54, 56, 85, 111, 167, 179, 189, 207, 242,
 243, 245, 258, 259, 271, 279, 291–293
 reconstructions 41–42, 45–47, 63, 64, 67–69,
 142, 185, 190, 199–213, 239, 279, 291–293,
 301
 Red Army Faction 62
 reduction postulate *see* collapse postulate
 reductionism 116, 132, 292
 relative frequencies 126–127, 133–135
 relative-state interpretation *see* Everett
 interpretation
 relativity *see* general relativity, special
 relativity
 republican banquet 115
 Rorschach test 87

S

Saunders, Simon 252
 Schrödinger's cat 70, 83–84, 89, 133, 139, 149,
 215, 224, 274–275, 301–302
 Schrödinger, Erwin 43, 53, 94, 215
 Sciama, Dennis 244
 Scotch tape 71
 second quantum revolution 164
 sex 215
 Shannon information 57, 69, 183–184, 194, 195
 Shimony, Abner 24, 34, 164, 232
 Shor's algorithm 55, 193, 300
 shut up and calculate 31, 59, 63, 103, 194, 256
 signaling 33–34, 44, 64, 67, 113, 219, 289
 sit-in 181
 Smolin, Lee 242
 Solvay congress 20, 93, 261, 300
*Speakables and Unspeakables in Quantum
 Mechanics* 161
 special relativity 35, 60, 203–204, 207,
 209–210, 288
 nonlocality and 48
 Specker, Ernst 252
 Spekkens, Rob 41, 72, 185, 191
 SQUID 79, 219, 302
 Stairs, Allen 253
Star Trek 26
 statistical interpretation *see* ensemble
 interpretation
 Stern–Gerlach experiment 86, 121
 storytelling 71
 string theory 50, 270–271, 289, 300
Structure of Scientific Revolutions, The 237
 subquantum demon 34
 suicide 170
 superposition 215, 218, 219, 221, 263, 302
 superposition principle 73, 76, 234, 275, 283,
 286, 302
 Szilárd, Leó 57

T

Taylor, John 29
 temperament x, 61, 229, 237–247, 256, 293
 terrorist 62, 139
 theory of everything 241, 261, 277, 279, 286,
 289
 thought experiments *see* gedankenexperi-
 ments
 three-slit experiment 54
 time dilation 69, 201, 203
 totalitarianism 238
 Tsirelson bound 67, 169, 204

Tumulka, Roderich 97
 Turing machine 264, 275
 Turing test 174, 220

U

uncertainty principle 34, 57, 81–83, 91, 97, 120,
 122, 218, 287
 unification 261–272
 United States politics 13, 237

V

value voter 237
 Vienna Circle 26, 246
 von Neumann entropy 183, 184, 194
 von Neumann measurement 90, 148, 302–303
 von Neumann's no-hidden-variables proof
 28, 117, 163, 203
 von Neumann, John 163
 von Weizsäcker, Carl Friedrich 239, 251
 Vonnegut, Kurt 215

W

Wallace, David 252
 wave function *see* quantum states
 collapse of *see* collapse

nomological interpretation of 99, 265
 of the universe 45, 53, 62, 99, 102, 136, 147,
 265, 269
 tails of 65, 92
 wave-packet reduction *see* collapse
 Wheeler, John 27, 29, 35–37, 45, 112, 160, 249,
 285–286
 Wigner's friend 90–91, 116, 130, 172, 217–218,
 222, 303
 Wigner, Eugene 255
Wizard of Oz, The 179
 Wootters, William 36
 word-music 69

X

xenophobia 238

Y

young and foolish 62, 229, 232, 277, 286

Z

Zeh, Dieter 62, 123, 149
 Zeilinger, Anton 66, 130, 164, 219–220
 Żukowski, Marek 250
 Zurek, Wojciech 45