# Quantum value indefiniteness

Karl Svozil[*]

*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Vienna University of Technology,*

*Wiedner Hauptstraße 8-10/136, A-1040 Vienna, Austria*

## Abstract

The indeterministic outcome of a measurement of an individual quantum is certified by the impossibility of the simultaneous, unique, definite, deterministic pre-existence of all conceivable observables from physical conditions of that quantum alone.

[*] svozil@tuwien.ac.at; http://tph.tuwien.ac.at/˜svozil

## I. INTRODUCTION

One of the most astounding consequences of the assumption of the validity of the quantum formalism in terms of Hilbert spaces [1] is the apparent impossibility of its classical interpretation. More precisely, a classical interpretation of a quantum logical structure [2] is either identified with a Boolean algebra, or at least with a homomorphic embedding (structurally preserving all quantum logical relations and operations) into some Boolean algebra [3]. Quantum logics are obtained by identifying (unit) vectors (associated with the one-dimensional subspaces corresponding to the linear spans of the vectors, and with the corresponding one dimensional projectors) with elementary yes-no propositions. The logical *and, or,* and *not* operations are identified with the set theoretic intersection, with the linear span of two subspaces, and with forming the orthogonal subspace, respectively. Suppose further that orthogonality among subspaces indicates mutual exclusive propositions or experimental outcomes.

Then, in at least three-dimensional Hilbert (sub)spaces, there does not exist a (classical) truth assignment on (finite sets of) elementary yes-no propositions which would

**(Rule 1—"countable additivity:"):** ascribe truth to exactly one observable outcome among each set of maximal commeasurable mutually exclusive outcomes, and falsity to the others, such that

**(Rule 2—"noncontextuality:"):** for "overlapping" link observables belonging to more than one commeasurable set of observables, henceforth called *context,* the truth value remains the same, independent of the particular commeasured observables [4–15].

Proofs (e.g., [5]) could be finitistic and by contradiction (i.e., *via reductio ad absurdum*), so there should not be any metamathematical issues about their applicability in physics. Countable additivity (Rule 1) is the basis of a theorem [16–19] by Gleason which derives the Born rule $\langle \mathbf{A} \rangle = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho \mathbf{A})$, where $\langle \mathbf{A} \rangle$ and $\rho$ stand for the expectation value of an observable $\mathbf{A}$ and for the quantum state, respectively.

Yet, there are metaphysical issues related to the impossibility of a classical interpretation of the quantum formalism; in particular the explicit and indispensible use of *counterfactuals* in the argument [20]. Remarkably, this has been already emphasized in the first announcement of the formal result [4]. Counterfactuals are "observables" which *could* have been measured *if* the experimenter *would have* chosen a different, i.e., complementary, measurement setup, but *actually*

*chose another* (complementary) one. Hence, from the point of view of the quantum formalism, any proof of the impossibility of a classical interpretation of quantum mechanics uses complementary observables, which cannot possibly be simultaneously measured. Pointedly stated, from a strictly operational point of view, due to quantum complementarity [21, p. 7], the entities occurring in the proofs cannot physically coexist.

So, it may not be totally unjustified to ask why one should bother about nonoperational quantities and their consequences at all? There may be two affirmative apologies for the use of counterfactuals: First, although these observables could not be measured simultaneously, they are perfectly reasonable physical observables if the experimenter chooses to measure them. Secondly, through a measurement setup involving two correlated particles, two complementary observables can be measured counterfactually [22] on two space-like separated [23] but entangled [24–26] particles. Because of constraints on the uniqueness of the arguments, this "indirect measurement" cannot be extended to more than two counterfactual observables [27].

Quantum "value (in)definiteness," sometimes also termed "counterfactual (in)definiteness" [28], refers to the (im)possibility of the simultaneous existence of definite outcomes of conceivable measurements under certain assumptions [e.g. noncontextuality; see Rule 2 above] — that is, unperformed measurements can(not) have definite results [29]. "(In)determinacy" often (but not always) refers to the absence (presence) of causal laws — in the sense of the principle of sufficient reason stating that every phenomenon has its explanation and cause — governing a physical behavior. Thus "value (in)definiteness" relates to a static property, whereas "(in)determinacy" is often used for temporal evolutions. Sometimes, quantum value indefiniteness is considered as one of the expressions of quantum indeterminacy; another expression of quantum indeterminacy is, for instance, associated with the (radioactive) decay of some excited states [30, 31].

In what follows we shall review some explicit physical consequences of the impossibility to interpret the quantum formalism classically. We shall also review consequences for the construction of quantum mechanical devices capable of generating particular indeterministic outcomes [32–41], which have been already discussed in an article [42] by Calude and the author.

Any particular maximal set of (mutually exclusive) observables will be called *context* [43]. It constitutes a "maximal collection of co-measurable observables," or, stated differently, a "classical mini-universe" located within the continuity of complementary quantum propositions. The spectral theorem suggests that a context can be formalized by a single "maximal" self-adjoint operator, such that there exist "maximal" sets of mutually compatible, co-measurable, mutually

exclusive orthogonal projectors which appear in its spectral decomposition (e.g., [1, Sec. II.10, p. 90, English translation p. 173], [5, § 2], [44, pp. 227,228], and [45, § 84]).

## II. CONTEXTUAL INTERPRETATION

In a "desperate" attempt to save realism [46], Bell [47–50] proposed to abandon the noncontextuality assumption Rule 2 that the truth or falsity of an individual outcome of a measurement of some observable is independent of what other (mutually exclusive) observables are measured "alongside" of it. In Bell's own words [48, Sec. 5], the "danger" in the implicit assumption is this[51]:

> *"It was tacitly assumed that measurement of an observable must yield the same value independently of what other measurements may be made simultaneously. … The result of an observation may reasonably depend not only on the state of the system … but also on the complete disposition of the apparatus."*

This "contextual interpretation" of quantum mechanics will be henceforth called *contextuality*.

Notice that contextuality does not suggest that any *statistical* property is context dependent; this would be ruled out by the Born rule, which is context independent. Instead, the contextual interpretation claims that the *individual outcome* — Bell's "result of an observation" — depends on the context. This is somewhat similar to the parameter independence but outcome dependence of correlated quantum events [52].

The exact formalization or causes of this type of "contextual outcome dependence" remains an open question. Individual quantum events are generally *conventionalized* to happen acausally and indeterministically [53, 54]; according to the prevalent quantum canon [55], *"… for the individual event in quantum physics, not only do we not know the cause, there is no cause."* In this belief system, indeterminism can be trivially certified by the convention of the "random outcome" of individual quantum events, a view which is further "backed" by our inability to "come up" with a causal model, and by the statistical analysis [56] of the assumption of stochasticity and randomness of strings generated *via* the context mismatch between preparation and measurement. Nevertheless, one should always keep in mind that this kind of indeterminism may be epistemic and not ontic. Furthermore, due to the ambiguities of a formal definition, and by reduction to the halting problem [57–62], the incomputablity, and even more so randomness, of arbitrary (finite) sequences remains provably unprovable [63].

4

### A. Violation of probabilistic bounds

For the sake of getting a more intuitive understanding of quantum contextuality, a few examples of its consequences will be discussed next. As any violations of Boole-Bell type elements of physical reality indicate the impossibility of its classical interpretation by probabilistic constraints [64–67], every violation of Boole-Bell type inequalities can be re-interpreted as (experimental) "proof of contextuality" [68–71]. Indeed, as expressed by [15], *"Because of the lack of spacelike separation between one observer's choice and the other observer's outcome, the immense majority of the experimental violations of Bell inequalities does not prove quantum nonlocality, but just quantum contextuality."* Alas, while certainly most (with the exception of, e.g., [23]) experimental violations of Bell inequalities do not prove quantum nonlocality, these statistical violations are no direct proof of contextuality in general. Nevertheless, they may indicate counterfactual indefiniteness [28].

Note that in a geometric framework [64–67, 72–75], Boole-Bell type inequalities are just the *facet inequalities* of a classical probability (correlation) polytope obtained by (i) forming all probabilities and joint probabilities of independent events, (ii) taking all two-valued measures (interpretable as truth assignments) associated with this structure, (iii) for each of the probabilities and joint probabilities forming a vector whose components are the (encoded truth) values (either "0" or "1") of the two-valued measures (hence, the dimensionality of the problem is equal to the number of entries corresponding to probabilities and joint probabilities); every such vector is a vertex of the *correlation polytope*, (iv) applying the Minkoswki-Weyl representation theorem (e.g., [76, p.29]), stating that every convex polytope has a dual (equivalent) description as the intersection of a finite number of half-spaces. Such facets are given by linear inequalities, which are obtained from the set of vertices by solving the (computationally hard [77]) *hull problem*. The inequalities coincide with Boole's *"conditions of possible experience,"* and with Bell type inequalities.

Any "proof" of contextuality based on Boole-Bell type inequalities necessarily involves the *statistical* behavior of many counterfactual quantities contained in Boole-Bell type inequalities. These quantities cannot be obtained simultaneously, but merely one after another in different experimental configuration runs involving "lots of particles." Due to the statistical nature of the argument and its implicit improvable assumption that contextuality — that is, the abandonment of Rule 2 — is the only possible cause for the violations of the classical probabilistic bounds, these "proofs" lack the *sufficiency* of the formal argument.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathbf{A}_1\{\mathbf{B}_1\} & +\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ +\ \cdot\ \cdots \\
\mathbf{A}_1\{\mathbf{B}_2\} & -\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ -\ \cdot\ \cdots \\
\mathbf{A}_2\{\mathbf{B}_1\} & \cdot\ -\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ +\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ -\ \cdot\ \cdots \\
\mathbf{A}_2\{\mathbf{B}_2\} & \cdot\ +\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ -\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ +\ \cdot\ \cdots \\
\mathbf{B}_1\{\mathbf{A}_1\} & \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ -\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ -\ +\ \cdots \\
\mathbf{B}_1\{\mathbf{A}_2\} & \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ +\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ +\ -\ \cdots \\
\mathbf{B}_2\{\mathbf{A}_1\} & \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ +\ \cdot\ \cdot\ -\ \cdot\ \cdot\ -\ \cdot\ \cdots \\
\mathbf{B}_2\{\mathbf{A}_2\} & \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ \cdot\ -\ \cdot\ \cdot\ +\ \cdot\ \cdot\ +\ \cdot\ \cdots
\end{array}
$$

TABLE I. Hypothetical counterfactual contextual outcomes of an experiment capable of violating the Boole-Bell type inequalities involving binary outcomes (denoted by "−, +") of two observables (subscripts "1, 2") on two particles (denoted by "$\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$"). The expression "$\mathbf{X}\{\mathbf{Y}\}$" stands for "observable $\mathbf{X}$ measured alongside observable $\mathbf{Y}$." Time progresses from left to right; rows contain the individual conceivable, potential measurement values of the eight observables $\mathbf{A}_1\{\mathbf{B}_1\}$, $\mathbf{A}_1\{\mathbf{B}_2\}$, $\mathbf{A}_2\{\mathbf{B}_1\}$, $\mathbf{A}_2\{\mathbf{B}_2\}$, $\mathbf{B}_1\{\mathbf{A}_1\}$, $\mathbf{B}_1\{\mathbf{A}_2\}$, $\mathbf{B}_2\{\mathbf{A}_1\}$, and $\mathbf{B}_2\{\mathbf{A}_2\}$ which "simultaneously co-exist." Dots indicate any value in $\{-,+\}$.

## B. Tables of counterfactual "outcomes"

Previously, tables of hypothetical and counterfactual experimental outcomes have been used to argue against the noncontextual classical interpretation of the quantum probabilities [28, 29, 78]. In what follows tables of contextual outcomes violating Rule 2 will be enumerated which could be compatible with quantum probabilities. These tables may serve as a demonstration of the kind of behavior which is required by (hypothetical and counterfactual) individual events capable of rendering the desired violations of Boole-Bell type violations of bounds on classical probabilities.

Let "$\mathbf{X}\{\mathbf{Y}\}$" stand for "observable $\mathbf{X}$ measured alongside observable (or context) $\mathbf{Y}$." Consider the hypothetical counterfactual outcomes enumerated in Table I for simultaneous quantum observables associated with the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt inequality

$$|\mathbf{A}_1\{\mathbf{B}_1\}\mathbf{B}_1\{\mathbf{A}_1\} + \mathbf{A}_1\{\mathbf{B}_2\}\mathbf{B}_2\{\mathbf{A}_1\} + \mathbf{A}_2\{\mathbf{B}_1\}\mathbf{B}_1\{\mathbf{A}_2\} - \mathbf{A}_2\{\mathbf{B}_2\}\mathbf{B}_2\{\mathbf{A}_2\}| \leq 2. \tag{1}$$

They are contextual, as for some cases $\mathbf{X}\{\mathbf{Y}_1\} \neq \mathbf{X}\{\mathbf{Y}_2\}$, as indicated in the enumeration. (Note that noncontextuality would imply the independence of $\mathbf{X}$ from $\mathbf{Y}$; i.e., $\mathbf{X}\{\mathbf{Y}_1\} = \mathbf{X}\{\mathbf{Y}_2\} = \mathbf{X}$.)

The difference between "truth tables" associated with configurations for the statistical argu-

ments against value indefiniteness involving Boole-Bell type inequalities on the one hand, and for direct proofs (e.g. by the Kochen-Specker theorem) on the other hand, is that the former tables need not always contain contextual assignments — although it can be expected that the violations of noncontextuality should increase with increasing deviations from the classical Boole-Bell bounds on joint probabilities[79] — whereas the latter tables require some violation(s) of noncontextuality at every single column. For example, in the compact 18-vector configuration allowing a Kochen-Specker proof introduced in [14, 80] and depicted in Fig. 1, one is forced to violate the noncontextuality assumption Rule 2 for at least one link observable. This can be readily demonstrated by considering all 36 entries per column in Table II, Whether one violation of the noncontextuality Rule 2 is enough for consistency (i.e., the necessary extent of the violation of contextuality) with the quantum probabilities remains unknown.

If such signatures of contextuality exist cannot be decided experimentally, as direct observations are operationally blocked by quantum complementarity. Thus this type of contextuality remains metaphysical.

## C. Indirect simultaneous tests

There exist "explosion views" of counterfactual configurations involving singlet or other correlated states of two three- and more state particles which, due to the counterfactual uniqueness properties [27], are capable of indirectly testing the quantum contextuality assumption [83] by a simultaneous measurement of two complementary contexts [22]. For the sake of explicit demonstration, consider Fig. 2 depicting three orthogonality (Greechie) diagrams of such configurations of observables. Every diagram is representable in three- or four-dimensional vector space.

For the configuration depicted in Fig. 2a), contextuality predicts that there exist experimental outcomes with $\mathbf{A}\{\mathbf{B},\mathbf{C}\} \neq \mathbf{A}\{\mathbf{D},\mathbf{E}\}$. As detailed quantum mechanical calculations [83] show, this is not predicted by quantum mechanics.

For the configuration depicted in Fig. 2b), contextuality predicts that there exist experimental outcomes with $\mathbf{A}\{\mathbf{B},\mathbf{C},\mathbf{D}\} \neq \mathbf{A}\{\mathbf{G},\mathbf{H},\mathbf{I}\}$, as well as $\mathbf{A}\{\mathbf{G},\mathbf{H},\mathbf{I}\} = \mathbf{D}\{\mathbf{E},\mathbf{F},\mathbf{G}\} = 1$, and their cyclic permutations.

For the configuration depicted in Fig. 2c), contextuality predicts that there exist experimental outcomes with $\mathbf{A}\{\mathbf{B},\mathbf{C},\mathbf{D}\} \neq \mathbf{A}\{\mathbf{B},\mathbf{E},\mathbf{F}\}$, as well as $\mathbf{B}\{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{C},\mathbf{D}\} \neq \mathbf{B}\{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{E},\mathbf{F}\}$. Again, this is not predicted quantum mechanically [83].

FIG. 1. (Color online) Greechie diagram of a finite subset of the continuum of blocks or contexts embeddable in four-dimensional real Hilbert space without a two-valued probability measure [14, 80] . The proof of the Kochen-Specker theorem uses nine tightly interconnected contexts $\mathbf{a} = \{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}\}$, $\mathbf{b} = \{\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{G}\}$, $\mathbf{c} = \{\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{I}, \mathbf{J}\}$, $\mathbf{d} = \{\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{L}, \mathbf{M}\}$, $\mathbf{e} = \{\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{O}, \mathbf{P}\}$, $\mathbf{f} = \{\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{A}\}$, $\mathbf{g} = \{\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{I}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{R}\}$, $\mathbf{h} = \{\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{L}, \mathbf{N}\}$, $\mathbf{i} = \{\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{O}, \mathbf{Q}\}$ consisting of the 18 projectors associated with the one dimensional subspaces spanned by $\mathbf{A} = (0, 0, 1, -1)$, $\mathbf{B} = (1, -1, 0, 0)$, $\mathbf{C} = (1, 1, -1, -1)$, $\mathbf{D} = (1, 1, 1, 1)$, $\mathbf{E} = (1, -1, 1, -1)$, $\mathbf{F} = (1, 0, -1, 0)$, $\mathbf{G} = (0, 1, 0, -1)$, $\mathbf{H} = (1, 0, 1, 0)$, $\mathbf{I} = (1, 1, -1, 1)$, $\mathbf{J} = (-1, 1, 1, 1)$, $\mathbf{K} = (1, 1, 1, -1)$, $\mathbf{L} = (1, 0, 0, 1)$, $\mathbf{M} = (0, 1, -1, 0)$, $\mathbf{N} = (0, 1, 1, 0)$, $\mathbf{O} = (0, 0, 0, 1)$, $\mathbf{P} = (1, 0, 0, 0)$, $\mathbf{Q} = (0, 1, 0, 0)$, $\mathbf{R} = (0, 0, 1, 1)$. Greechie diagram representing atoms by points, and contexts by maximal smooth, unbroken curves. Every observable proposition occurs in exactly two contexts. Thus, in an enumeration of the four observable propositions of each of the nine contexts, there appears to be an *even* number of true propositions. Yet, as there is an odd number of contexts, there should be an *odd* number (actually nine) of true propositions.

Experiment will clarify and decide the contradiction between the predictions by the contextuality assumption and quantum mechanics, but it is not too unreasonable to suspect that the quantum predictions will prevail. As a consequence, and subject to experimental falsification, any *ad hoc* "ontic" contextuality assumption might turn out to be physically unfounded.

One may argue that quantum contextuality only "appears" if measurement configurations are encountered which do not allow a set of two-valued states. The same might be said for measurement configurations allowing only a "meager" set of two-valued states which cannot be used for

| | |
|---|---|
| **A{a}** | 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 ⋯ |
| **A{f}** | 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 ⋯ |
| **B{a}** | 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 ⋯ |
| **B{i}** | · 0 · 0 0 · · 0 · · 0 0 · ⋯ |
| **C{a}** | 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 ⋯ |
| **C{h}** | · · · · · · · · · · · · · ⋯ |
| **D{a}** | 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 ⋯ |
| **D{b}** | · · · · · · · · · · · · · ⋯ |
| … | · · · · · · · · · · · · · ⋯ |
| **P{e}** | · · · · · · · · · · · · · ⋯ |
| **P{f}** | 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 ⋯ |
| **Q{g}** | · · · · · · · · · · · · · ⋯ |
| **Q{f}** | 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 ⋯ |
| **R{i}** | 0 · 0 · · 0 0 · 0 0 · · 0 ⋯ |
| **R{f}** | 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 ⋯ |

TABLE II. (Color online) Hypothetical counterfactual contextual outcomes of experiments associated with a compact proof of the Kochen-Specker theorem [14, 80] involving binary outcomes "0" or 1" of 18 observables, adding up to one within each of the nine contexts denoted by "**a**, …, **i**". The expression "**X**{**y**}" stands for "observable **X** measured alongside the context **y**." Time progresses from left to right; rows contain the individual conceivable, potential measurement values of the observables **A**{**a**}, …, **R**{**i**} which "simultaneously co-exist." Dots indicate any value in $\{0, 1\}$ subject to at least one violation of the noncontextuality assumption, that is, $\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{y}) \neq \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{y}')$ for $\mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{y}'$.

the construction of any homomorphic (i.e. preseving relations and operations among quantum propositions) embedding into a classical (Boolean) algebra. Alas, configurations of observables such as the one depicted in Fig. 2a) are just subconfigurations of proofs of the Kochen-Specker theorem [5], in particular their $\Gamma_2$ and $\Gamma_3$; so it would be difficult to imagine why Fig. 2a) feature context independence because of the experimenter takes into account only *two* contexts, whereas context dependence is encountered when the experimenter has in mind, say, the *entire* structure of all the 117 Kochen-Specker contexts contained in $\Gamma_3$.

FIG. 2. (Color online) Diagrammatical representation of interlinked contexts by Greechie (orthogonality) diagrams (points stand for individual basis vectors, and entire contexts are drawn as smooth curves): a) two tripods with a common leg; b) three interconnected fourpods (this configuration with tripods would be irrepresentable in three-dimensional vector space [81, 82]); b) two contexts in four dimensions interconnected by two link observables.

## III. CONTEXT TRANSLATION PRINCIPLE

In view of the inapplicability of the quantum contextuality assumption and the fact that, although quantized systems can only be prepared in a certain single context[84] quantized systems yield measurement results when measured "along" different, nonmatching context, one may speculate that the measurement apparatus must be capable of "translating" between the preparation context and the measurement context [85]. Variation of the capabilities of the measurement apparatus to translate nonmatching quantum contexts with its physical condition yields possibilities to detect this mechanism.

In this scenario, stochasticity is introduced *via* the context translation process; albeit not necessarily an irreversible, irreducible one, as the unitary quantum state evolution (in-between measurements) is deterministic, reversible and one-to-one [86]. Nevertheless, one may further speculate that, at least for finite experimental time series and for finite algorithmic tests, any such quasi-deterministic form of stochasticity will result in very similar statistical behaviors as is predicted for acausality.

Context translation might present an "epistemic" contextuality, since the "complete disposition of the measurement apparatus" (see Bell [48, Sec. 5]) may enter in the translation function $\tau$

formalizing the "state reduction"

$$\rho \longrightarrow \tau_{D(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y})}(\rho) \in S_{\mathbf{X}}, \tag{2}$$

where $\rho$ stands for the quantum state, $S_{\mathbf{X}}$ for the spectrum of the operator $\mathbf{X}$, $D$ for the "disposition of the apparatus," $\mathbf{X}$ for the observable and $\mathbf{Y}$ for the context.

In general, even in the absence of some concrete "translation mechanism," $\tau$ is subject to some probabilistic constraints, such as Malus' law [87]. In order to be able to account for the nonlocal quantum correlation functions even at space-like separations [23] $\tau$ should also be nonlocal. Ideally, if preparation and measurement context match, and if $\rho$ is in some eigenstate $\mathbf{E}_i$ of $\mathbf{X}$ with an associated eigenvalue $x_i$, then Eq. (2) reduces to its context and apparatus independent form $\mathbf{E}_i \longrightarrow \tau_{D(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{Y})}(\mathbf{E}_i) = \tau_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{E}_i) = x_i$ for all $\mathbf{E}_i$ in the spectral sum $\mathbf{X} = \sum_i x_i \mathbf{E}_i$. This reduction postulate appears to be the reason for an absence of contextuality in the "explosion view" type configurations discussed above.

For all the other cases, the measurement apparatus will introduce a stochastic element which, in this scenario, is the reason for the quantum indeterminism of individual events. Of course, the *degree of stochasticity* will depend on the context mismatch, and on the "disposition of the apparatus." But again, as for the *ad hoc* "ontic" type of contextuality discussed above, in no way can the measurement outcome of an individual particle be completely determined by a pre-existing element of physical reality [22] of that particle alone. In this sense, as only observables associated with one context have a definite value and all other observables have none, one is lead to a quasi-classical "effective value indefiniteness," giving rise to a natural classical theory not requiring value definiteness.

## IV. SUMMARY

We have discussed the "current state of affairs" with regard to the interpretation of quantum value indefiniteness, and the limited operationalizability of its interpretation in terms of *context dependence (contextuality)* of observables. Of course, due to complementarity, quantum counterfactuals are not directly simultaneously measurable; and thus — despite the prevalence of counterfactuals in quantum information, communication and computation theory — anyone considering their physical existence is, to paraphrase von Neumann's words [88], at least empirically, *"in a state of sin."*

In any case, the absence of classical interpretations of the quantum formalism, and in particular the strongest expression of it — the absence of any global truth function for quantum systems of three or more mutually exclusive outcomes — presents the possibility to render a quantum random number generator by preparing a quantum state in a particular context and measuring it in another. As has been pointed out already by Calude and the author [42], the resulting measurement outcomes are "quantum certified" (i.e., true with respect to the validity of quantum mechanics) and do not correspond to any pre-existing physical observable of the "isolated" individual system before the measurement process. Exactly how this kind of quantum oracle for randomness operates remains open. One may hold that, somehow, due to the lack of determinacy, this type of randomness emerges "out of nowhere" and essentially is irreducible [55, 89]. One may also put forward the idea that, at least when complementarity is involved, quantum randomness is rendered by a quasi-classical context translation which maps an incompatible preparation context into some outcome, thereby introducing stochasticity. In any case, for all practical purposes, the resulting oracles for randomness, when subjected to tests [56], might be "hardly differentiable" from each other even asymptotically.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

---

[1] John von Neumann, *Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik* (Springer, Berlin, 1932) English translation in Ref. [90].

[2] Garrett Birkhoff and John von Neumann, "The logic of quantum mechanics," Annals of Mathematics **37**, 823–843 (1936).

[3] Cristian Calude, Peter Hertling, and Karl Svozil, "Embedding quantum universes into classical ones," Foundations of Physics **29**, 349–379 (1999).

[4] Ernst Specker, "Die Logik nicht gleichzeitig entscheidbarer Aussagen," Dialectica **14**, 239–246 (1960), reprinted in Ref. [91, pp. 175–182]; English translation: *The logic of propositions which are not simultaneously decidable*, Reprinted in Ref. [92, pp. 135-140].

[5] Simon Kochen and Ernst P. Specker, "The problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics," Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics (now Indiana University Mathematics Journal) **17**, 59–87 (1967), reprinted in Ref. [91, pp. 235–263].

[6] Neal Zierler and Michael Schlessinger, "Boolean embeddings of orthomodular sets and quantum logic," Duke Mathematical Journal **32**, 251–262 (1965).

[7] Václav Alda, "On 0-1 measures for projectors I," Aplikace matematiky (Applications of Mathematics) **25**, 373–374 (1980).

[8] Václav Alda, "On 0-1 measures for projectors II," Aplikace matematiky (Applications of Mathematics) **26**, 57–58 (1981).

[9] Franz Kamber, "Die Struktur des Aussagenkalküls in einer physikalischen Theorie," Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse **10**, 103–124 (1964).

[10] Franz Kamber, "Zweiwertige Wahrscheinlichkeitsfunktionen auf orthokomplementären Verbänden," Mathematische Annalen **158**, 158–196 (1965).

[11] Asher Peres, "Two simple proofs of the Kochen-Specker theorem," Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General **24**, L175–L178 (1991), reprinted in Ref. [93, pp. 186-200].

[12] N. D. Mermin, "Hidden variables and the two theorems of John Bell," Reviews of Modern Physics **65**, 803–815 (1993).

[13] Karl Svozil and Josef Tkadlec, "Greechie diagrams, nonexistence of measures in quantum logics and Kochen–Specker type constructions," Journal of Mathematical Physics **37**, 5380–5401 (1996).

[14] Adán Cabello, José M. Estebaranz, and G. García-Alcaine, "Bell-Kochen-Specker theorem: A proof with 18 vectors," Physics Letters A **212**, 183–187 (1996).

[15] Adan Cabello, "Experimentally testable state-independent quantum contextuality," Physical Review Letters **101**, 210401 (2008).

[16] Andrew M. Gleason, "Measures on the closed subspaces of a Hilbert space," Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics (now Indiana University Mathematics Journal) **6**, 885–893 (1957).

[17] Itamar Pitowsky, "Infinite and finite Gleason's theorems and the logic of indeterminacy," Journal of Mathematical Physics **39**, 218–228 (1998).

[18] Fred Richman and Douglas Bridges, "A constructive proof of Gleason's theorem," Journal of Functional Analysis **162**, 287–312 (1999).

[19] Anatolij Dvurečenskij, *Gleason's Theorem and Its Applications* (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1993).

[20] Karl Svozil, "Quantum scholasticism: On quantum contexts, counterfactuals, and the absurdities of quantum omniscience," Information Sciences **179**, 535–541 (2009).

[21] Wolfgang Pauli, "Die allgemeinen Prinzipien der Wellenmechanik," in *Handbuch der Physik. Band V, Teil 1. Prinzipien der Quantentheorie I*, edited by S. Flügge (Springer, Berlin, Göttingen and Heidelberg, 1958) pp. 1–168.

[22] Albert Einstein, Boris Podolsky, and Nathan Rosen, "Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?" Physical Review **47**, 777–780 (1935).

[23] Gregor Weihs, Thomas Jennewein, Christoph Simon, Harald Weinfurter, and Anton Zeilinger, "Violation of Bell's inequality under strict Einstein locality conditions," Physical Review Letters **81**, 5039–5043 (1998).

[24] Erwin Schrödinger, "Die gegenwärtige Situation in der Quantenmechanik," Naturwissenschaften **23**, 807–812, 823–828, 844–849 (1935), English translation in Ref. [94] and in Ref. [95, pp. 152-167].

[25] Erwin Schrödinger, "Discussion of probability relations between separated systems," Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society **31**, 555–563 (1935).

[26] Erwin Schrödinger, "Probability relations between separated systems," Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society **32**, 446–452 (1936).

[27] Karl Svozil, "Are simultaneous Bell measurements possible?" New Journal of Physics **8**, 39, 1–8 (2006), quant-ph/0401113.

[28] T. Murata, "Quantum nonlocality without counterfactual definiteness?" Foundations of Physics Letters **3**, 325–342 (1990).

[29] Asher Peres, "Unperformed experiments have no results," American Journal of Physics **46**, 745–747 (1978).

[30] Helge Kragh, "The origin of radioactivity: from solvable problem to unsolved non-problem," Archive for History of Exact Sciences **50**, 331–358 (1997).

[31] Helge Kragh, "Subatomic determinism and causal models of radioactive decay, 1903-1923," (2009), rePoSS: Research Publications on Science Studies 5. Department of Science Studies, University of Aarhus.

[32] Karl Svozil, "The quantum coin toss—testing microphysical undecidability," Physics Letters A **143**, 433–437 (1990).

[33] J. G. Rarity, M. P. C. Owens, and P. R. Tapster, "Quantum random-number generation and key sharing," Journal of Modern Optics **41**, 2435–2444 (1994).

[34] Thomas Jennewein, Ulrich Achleitner, Gregor Weihs, Harald Weinfurter, and Anton Zeilinger, "A fast and compact quantum random number generator," Review of Scientific Instruments **71**, 1675–1680 (2000), quant-ph/9912118.

[35] André Stefanov, Nicolas Gisin, Olivier Guinnard, Laurent Guinnard, and Hugo Zbinden, "Optical quantum random number generator," Journal of Modern Optics **47**, 595–598 (2000).

[36] Ma Hai-Qiang, Wang Su-Mei, Zhang Da, Chang Jun-Tao, Ji Ling-Ling, Hou Yan-Xue, and Wu Ling-An, "A random number generator based on quantum entangled photon pairs," Chinese Physics Letters **21**, 1961–1964 (2004).

[37] P. X. Wang, G. L. Long, and Y. S. Li, "Scheme for a quantum random number generator," Journal of Applied Physics **100**, 056107 (2006).

[38] M. Fiorentino, C. Santori, S. M. Spillane, R. G. Beausoleil, and W. J. Munro, "Secure self-calibrating quantum random-bit generator," Physical Review A **75**, 032334 (2007).

[39] Karl Svozil, "Three criteria for quantum random-number generators based on beam splitters," Physical Review A **79**, 054306 (2009), arXiv:quant-ph/0903.2744.

[40] Osung Kwon, Young-Wook Cho, and Yoon-Ho Kim, "Quantum random number generator using photon-number path entanglement," Applied Optics **48**, 1774–1778 (2009).

[41] S. Pironio, A. Acín, S. Massar, A. Boyer de la Giroday, D. N. Matsukevich, P. Maunz, S. Olmschenk, D. Hayes, L. Luo, T. A. Manning, and C. Monroe, "Random numbers certified by Bell's theorem," Nature **464**, 1021–1024 (2010).

[42] Cristian S. Calude and Karl Svozil, "Quantum randomness and value indefiniteness," Advanced Science Letters **1**, 165–168 (2008), arXiv:quant-ph/0611029.

[43] Karl Svozil, "Contexts in quantum, classical and partition logic," in *Handbook of Quantum Logic and Quantum Structures*, edited by Kurt Engesser, Dov M. Gabbay, and Daniel Lehmann (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2009) pp. 551–586, arXiv:quant-ph/0609209.

[44] M. A. Neumark, "Principles of quantum theory," in *Sowjetische Arbeiten zur Funktionalanalysis. Beiheft zur Sowjetwissenschaft*, Vol. 44, edited by Klaus Matthes (Gesellschaft für Deutsch-Sowjetische Freundschaft, Berlin, 1954) pp. 195–273.

[45] Paul R.. Halmos, *Finite-dimensional vector spaces* (Springer, New York, Heidelberg, Berlin, 1974).

[46] Walter Terence Stace, "The refutation of realism," Mind **43**, 145–155 (1934), reprinted in [96, pp. 364-372].

[47] Niels Bohr, "Discussion with Einstein on epistemological problems in atomic physics," in *Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist*, edited by P. A. Schilpp (The Library of Living Philosophers, Evanston, Ill., 1949) pp. 200–241.

[48] John S. Bell, "On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics," Reviews of Modern Physics **38**, 447–452 (1966), reprinted in Ref. [97, pp. 1-13].

[49] Peter Heywood and Michael L. G. Redhead, "Nonlocality and the Kochen-Specker paradox," Foundations of Physics **13**, 481–499 (1983).

[50] Michael Redhead, *Incompleteness, Nonlocality, and Realism: A Prolegomenon to the Philosophy of Quantum Mechanics* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1990).

[51] Bell cites Bohr's remark [47] about *"the impossibility of any sharp separation between the behavior of atomic objects and the interaction with the measuring instruments which serve to define the conditions under which the phenomena appear."*.

[52] Abner Shimony, "Controllable and uncontrollable non-locality," in *Proceedings of the International Symposium... Proceedings of the International Symposium Foundations of Quantum Mechanics in the Light of New Technology*, edited by Susumu Kamefuchi and Nihon Butsuri Gakkai (Physical Society of Japan, Tokyo, 1984) pp. 225–230, see also J. Jarrett, *Bell's Theorem, Quantum Mechanics and Local Realism*, Ph. D. thesis, Univ. of Chicago, 1983; *Nous*, **18**, 569 (1984).

[53] Max Born, "Zur Quantenmechanik der Stoßvorgänge," Zeitschrift für Physik **37**, 863–867 (1926).

[54] Max Born, "Quantenmechanik der Stoßvorgänge," Zeitschrift für Physik **38**, 803–827 (1926).

[55] Anton Zeilinger, "The message of the quantum," Nature **438**, 743 (2005).

[56] Cristian S. Calude, Michael J. Dinneen, Monica Dumitrescu, and Karl Svozil, "Experimental evidence of quantum randomness incomputability," Phys. Rev. A **82**, 022102 (2010).

[57] Hartley Rogers, Jr., *Theory of Recursive Functions and Effective Computability* (MacGraw-Hill, New York, 1967).

[58] Martin Davis, *The Undecidable. Basic Papers on Undecidable, Unsolvable Problems and Computable Functions* (Raven Press, Hewlett, N.Y., 1965).

[59] Jon Barwise, *Handbook of Mathematical Logic* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1978).

[60] H. Enderton, *A Mathematical Introduction to Logic*, 2nd ed. (Academic Press, San Diego, 2001).

[61] Piergiorgio Odifreddi, *Classical Recursion Theory, Vol. 1* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1989).

[62] George S. Boolos, John P. Burgess, and Richard C. Jeffrey, *Computability and Logic*, 5th ed. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007).

[63] Cristian Calude, *Information and Randomness—An Algorithmic Perspective*, 2nd ed. (Springer, Berlin, 2002).

[64] Itamar Pitowsky, "From George Boole to John Bell: The origin of Bell's inequality," in *Bell's Theorem, Quantum Theory and the Conceptions of the Universe*, edited by M. Kafatos (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1989) pp. 37–49.

[65] Itamar Pitowsky, "George Boole's 'conditions of possible experience' and the quantum puzzle," The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science **45**, 95–125 (1994).

[66] Itamar Pitowsky, "The range of quantum probabilities," Journal of Mathematical Physics **27**, 1556–1565 (1986).

[67] Itamar Pitowsky, *Quantum Probability—Quantum Logic* (Springer, Berlin, 1989).

[68] Yuji Hasegawa, Rudolf Loidl, Gerald Badurek, Matthias Baron, and Helmut Rauch, "Quantum contextuality in a single-neutron optical experiment," Physical Review Letters **97**, 230401 (2006).

[69] H. Bartosik, J. Klepp, C. Schmitzer, S. Sponar, A. Cabello, H. Rauch, and Y. Hasegawa, "Experimental test of quantum contextuality in neutron interferometry," Physical Review Letters **103**, 040403 (2009), arXiv:0904.4576.

[70] Elias Amselem, Magnus Rådmark, Mohamed Bourennane, and Adán Cabello, "State-independent quantum contextuality with single photons," Physical Review Letters **103**, 160405 (2009).

[71] G. Kirchmair, F. Zähringer, R. Gerritsma, M. Kleinmann, O. Gühne, A. Cabello, R. Blatt, and C. F. Roos, "State-independent experimental test of quantum contextuality," Nature **460**, 494–497 (2009), arXiv:0904.1655.

[72] M. Froissart, "Constructive generalization of Bell's inequalities," Nuovo Cimento B **64**, 241–251 (1981).

[73] Boris S. Cirel'son (=Tsirel'son), "Quantum generalizations of Bell's inequality," Letters in Mathematical Physics **4**, 93–100 (1980).

[74] Boris S. Cirel'son (=Tsirel'son), "Some results and problems on quantum Bell-type inequalities," Hadronic Journal Supplement **8**, 329–345 (1993).

[75] Itamar Pitowsky and Karl Svozil, "New optimal tests of quantum nonlocality," Physical Review A **64**, 014102 (2001), quant-ph/0011060.

[76] Günter M. Ziegler, *Lectures on Polytopes* (Springer, New York, 1994).

[77] Itamar Pitowsky, "The physical Church-Turing thesis and physical computational complexity," Iyyun **39**, 81–99 (1990).

[78] Günther Krenn and Anton Zeilinger, "Entangled entanglement," Physical Review A **54**, 1793–1797 (1996).

[79] Note that for stronger-than-quantum correlations [98, 99] rendering a maximal violation of the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt inequality by $\mathbf{A}_1\{\mathbf{B}_1\}\mathbf{B}_1\{\mathbf{A}_1\} + \mathbf{A}_1\{\mathbf{B}_2\}\mathbf{B}_2\{\mathbf{A}_1\} + \mathbf{A}_2\{\mathbf{B}_1\}\mathbf{B}_1\{\mathbf{A}_2\} - \mathbf{A}_2\{\mathbf{B}_2\}\mathbf{B}_2\{\mathbf{A}_2\} = \pm 4$, if $\mathbf{A}_1\{\mathbf{B}_2\} = \mathbf{A}_2\{\mathbf{B}_2\}$, then $\mathbf{B}_2\{\mathbf{A}_1\} = -\mathbf{B}_2\{\mathbf{A}_2\}$, and if $\mathbf{B}_1\{\mathbf{A}_2\} = \mathbf{B}_2\{\mathbf{A}_2\}$, then $\mathbf{A}_2\{\mathbf{B}_1\} = -\mathbf{A}_2\{\mathbf{B}_2\}$.

[80] Adán Cabello, "Kochen-Specker theorem and experimental test on hidden variables," International Journal of Modern Physics **A 15**, 2813–2820 (2000), quant-ph/9911022.

[81] Gudrun Kalmbach, *Orthomodular Lattices* (Academic Press, New York, 1983).

[82] Pavel Pták and Sylvia Pulmannová, *Orthomodular Structures as Quantum Logics* (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1991).

[83] Karl Svozil, "Proposed direct test of a certain type of noncontextuality in quantum mechanics," Physical Review A **80**, 040102 (2009).

[84] We would even go so far to speculate that the ignorance of state preparation resulting in mixed states is an epistemic, not ontologic, one. Thus all quantum states are "ontologically" pure.

[85] Karl Svozil, "Quantum information via state partitions and the context translation principle," Journal of Modern Optics **51**, 811–819 (2004), quant-ph/0308110.

[86] Hugh Everett, "'relative state' formulation of quantum mechanics," Reviews of Modern Physics **29**, 454–462 (1957), reprinted in Ref. [95, pp. 315-323].

[87] Časlav Brukner and Anton Zeilinger, "Malus' law and quantum information," Acta Physica Slovaca **49**, 647–652 (1999).

[88] John von Neumann, "Various techniques used in connection with random digits," National Bureau of Standards Applied Math Series **12**, 36–38 (1951), reprinted in *John von Neumann, Collected Works, (Vol. V)*, A. H. Traub, editor, MacMillan, New York, 1963, p. 768–770.

[89] Anton Zeilinger, "A foundational principle for quantum mechanics," Foundations of Physics **29**, 631–643 (1999).

[90] John von Neumann, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1955).

[91] Ernst Specker, *Selecta* (Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1990).

[92] Clifford Alan Hooker, *The Logico-Algebraic Approach to Quantum Mechanics. Volume I: Historical Evolution* (Reidel, Dordrecht, 1975).

[93] Asher Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods* (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1993).

[94] J. D. Trimmer, "The present situation in quantum mechanics: a translation of Schrödinger's "cat paradox"," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society **124**, 323–338 (1980), reprinted in Ref. [95, pp. 152-167].

[95] John Archibald Wheeler and Wojciech Hubert Zurek, *Quantum Theory and Measurement* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1983).

[96] Walter Terence Stace, "The refutation of realism," in *Readings in Philosophical Analysis*, edited by Herbert Feigl and Wilfrid Sellars (Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York, 1949) pp. 364–372, previously published in *Mind* **53**, 349-353 (1934).

[97] John S. Bell, *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987).

[98] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, "Quantum nonlocality as an axiom," Foundations of Physics **24**, 379–358 (1994).

[99] Günther Krenn and Karl Svozil, "Stronger-than-quantum correlations," Foundations of Physics **28**, 971–984 (1998).