Roots and (re)sources of value (in)definiteness *versus* contextuality

Karl Svozil[*]
Institute for Theoretical Physics, Vienna University of Technology, Wiedner Hauptstrasse 8-10/136, 1040 Vienna, Austria
(Dated: April 14, 2020)

In Itamar Pitowsky's reading of the Gleason and the Kochen-Specker theorems, in particular, his Logical Indeterminacy Principle, the emphasis is on the *value indefiniteness* of observables which are not within the preparation context. This is in stark contrast to the prevalent term *contextuality* used by many researchers in informal, heuristic yet omni-realistic and potentially misleading ways. This paper discusses both concepts and argues in favor of value indefiniteness in all but a continuum of contexts intertwining in the vector representing a single pure (prepared) state. Even more restrictively, and inspired by operationalism but not justified by Pitowsky's Logical Indeterminacy Principle or similar, one could identify with a "quantum state" a single quantum context – aka the respective maximal observable, or, in terms of its spectral decomposition, the associated orthonormal basis – from the continuum of intertwining context, as per the associated maximal observable actually or implicitly prepared.

Keywords: Value indefiniteness, Pitowsky's Logical Indeterminacy Principle, Quantum mechanics, Gleason theorem, Kochen-Specker theorem, Born rule

I. INTRODUCTION

An upfront *caveat* seems in order: The following is a rather subjective narrative of my reading of Itamar Pitowsky's thoughts about classical value indeterminacy on quantum logical structures of observables, amalgamated with my current thinking on related issues. I have never discussed these matters with Itamar Pitovsky explicitly; therefore the term "my reading" should be taken rather literally; namely as taken from his publications. In what follows classical value indefiniteness on collections of (intertwined) quantum observables will be considered a consequence, or even a synonym, of what he called indeterminacy. Whether or not this identification is justified is certainly negotiable; but in what follows this is taken for granted.

The term value indefiniteness has been stimulated by recursion theory (Odifreddi 1989, Rogers, Jr. 1967, Smullyan 1993), and in particular by *partial functions* (Kleene 1936) – indeed the notion of partiality has not diffused into physical theory formation, and might even appear alien to the very notion of functional value assignments – and yet it appears to be necessary (Abbott et al 2012, 2014, 2015) if one insists (somewhat superficially) on classical interpretations of quantized systems.

Value indefiniteness/indeterminacy will be contrasted with some related interpretations and approaches, in particular, with contextuality. Indeed, I believe that contextuality was rather foreign to Itamar Pitowsky's thinking: the term *"contextuality"* appears marginally – as in "a different context" – in his book *Quantum Probability - Quantum Logic* (Pitowsky 1989b), nowhere in his reviews on Boole-Bell type inequalities (Pitowsky 1989a, 1994), and mostly with reference to *contextual quantum probabilities* in his late writings (Pitowsky 2006). The emphasis on value indefiniteness/indeterminacy was, I believe, independently shared by Asher Peres as well as Ernst Specker.

I met Itamar Pitowsky (Bub and Demopoulos 2010) personally rather late; after he gave a lecture entitled *"All Bell Inequalities"* in Vienna (ESI - The Erwin Schrödinger International Institute for Mathematical Physics 2001) on September 6th, 2000. Subsequent discussions resulted in a joint paper (Pitowsky and Svozil 2001) (stimulating further research (Colins and Gisin 2004, Sliwa 2003)). It presents an application of his correlation polytope method (Pitowsky 1986, 1989a,b, 1991, 1994) to more general configurations than had been studied before. Thereby semi-automated symbolic as well as numeric computations have been used.

Nevertheless, the violations of what Boole called (Boole 1862, p. 229) *"conditions of possible experience,"* obtained through solving the hull problem of classical correlation polytopes, was just one route to quantum indeterminacy pursued by Itamar Pitowsky. One could identify at least two more passages he contributed to: One approach (Pitowsky 2003, 2006) compares differences of classical with quantum predictions through conditions and constraints imposed by certain intertwined configurations of observables which I like to call *quantum clouds* (Svozil 2017b). And another approach (Hrushovski and Pitowsky 2004, Pitowsky 1998) pushes these predictions to the limit of logical inconsistency; such that any attempt of a classical description fails relative to the assumptions. In what follows we shall follow all three pursuits and relate them to new findings.

II. STOCHASTIC VALUE INDEFINITENESS/INDETERMINACY BY BOOLE-BELL TYPE CONDITIONS OF POSSIBLE EXPERIENCE

The basic idea to obtain all classical predictions – including classical probabilities, expectations as well as consistency constraints thereof – associated with (mostly complementary; that is, non-simultaneously measurable) collections of observables is quite straightforward: Figure out all "extreme" cases or states which would be classically allowed. Then construct all classically conceivable situations by forming suitable combinations of the former.

* svozil@tuwien.ac.at; http://tph.tuwien.ac.at/~svozil

Formally this amounts to performing the following steps (Pitowsky 1986, 1989a,b, 1991, 1994):

- Contemplate about some concrete structure of observables and their interconnections in intertwining observables – the quantum cloud.
- Find all two-valued states of that quantum cloud. (In the case of "contextual inequalities" (Cabello 2008) include all variations of true/1 and false/0, irrespective of exclusivity; thereby often violating the Kolmogorovian axioms of probability theory even within a single context.)
- Depending on one's preferences, form all (joint) probabilities and expectations.
- For each of these two-valued states, evaluate the joint probabilities and expectations as products of the single particle probabilities and expectations they are formed of (this reflects statistical independence of the constituent observables).
- For each of the two-valued states, form a tuple containing these relevant (joint) probabilities and expectations.
- Interpret this tuple as a vector.
- Consider the set of all such vectors – there are as many as there are two-valued states, and their dimension depends on the number of (joint) probabilities and expectations considered – and interpret them as vertices forming a convex polytope.
- The convex combination of all conceivable two-valued states yields the surface of this polytope; such that every point inside its convex hull corresponds to a classical probability distribution.
- Determine the conditions of possible experience by solving the hull problem – that is, by computing the hyperplanes which determine the inside–versus–outside criteria for that polytope. These then can serve as necessary criteria for all classical probabilities and expectations considered.

The systematic application of this method yields necessary criteria for classical probabilities and expectations which are violated by the quantum probabilities and expectations. Since I have reviewed this subject exhaustively (Svozil 2018c, Sect. 12.9) (see also Ref. (Svozil 2017a)) I have just sketched it to obtain a taste for its relevance for quantum indeterminacy. As is often the case in mathematical physics the method seems to have been envisioned independently a couple of times. From its (to the best of my knowledge) inception by Boole (Boole 1862) it has been discussed in the measure theoretic context by Chochet theory (Bishop and Leeuw 1959) and by Vorobev (Vorob'ev 1962). Froissart (Cirel'son (=Tsirel'son) 1993, Froissart 1981) might have been the first explicitly proposing it as a method to generalized Bell-type inequalities. I suggested its usefulness for non-Boolean cases (Svozil 2001) with "enough" two-valued states; preferable sufficiently many to allow a proper distinction/separation of all observables (cf. Kochen and Specker's Theorem 0 (Kochen and Specker 1967, p. 67)). Consideration of the pentagon/pentagram logic – that is, five cyclically intertwined contexts/blocks/Boolean subalgebras/cliques/orthonormal bases popularized the subject and also rendered new predictions which could be used to differentiate classical from quantized systems (Badziąg et al 2011, Bub and Stairs 2009, 2010, Klyachko 2002, Klyachko et al 2008).

A *caveat:* the obtained criteria involve multiple mutually complementary summands which are not all simultaneously measurable. Therefore, different terms, when evaluated experimentaly, correspond to different, complementary measurement configurations. They are obtained at different times and on different particles and samples.

Explicit, worked examples can, for instance, be found in Pitowsky's book (Pitowsky 1989b, Section 2.1), or papers (Pitowsky 1994) (see also Froissart's example (Froissart 1981)). Empirical findings are too numerous to even attempt a just appreciation of all the efforts that went into testing classicality. There is overwhelming evidence that the quantum predictions are correct; and that they violate Boole's conditions of possible classical experience (Clauser 2002) relative to the assumptions (basically non-contextual realism and locality).

So, if Boole's conditions of possible experience are violated, then they can no longer be considered appropriate for any reasonable ontology forcing "reality" upon them. This includes the realistic (Stace 1934) existence of hypothetical counterfactual observables: "unperformed experiments seem to have no consistent outcomes" (Peres 1978). The inconsistency of counterfactuals (in Specker's scholastic terminology *infuturabilities* (Specker 1960, 2009)) provides a connection to value indefiniteness/indeterminacy – at least, and let me again repeat earlier provisos, relative to the assumptions. More of this, piled higher and deeper, has been supplied by Itamar Pitowsky, as will be discussed later.

III. INTERLUDE: QUANTUM PROBABILITIES FROM PYTHAGOREAN "VIEWS ON VECTORS"

Quantum probabilities are vector based. At the same time those probabilities mimic "classical" ones whenever they must be classical; that is, among mutually commuting observables which can be measured simultaneously/concurrently on the same particle(s) or samples – in particular, whenever those observables correspond to projection operators which are either orthogonal (exclusive) or identical (inclusive).

At the same time, quantum probabilities appear "contextual" (I assume he had succumbed to the prevalent nomenclature at that late time) according to Itamar Pitowsky's late writings (Pitowsky 2006) if they need not be classical: namely among non-commuting observables. (The term "needs not" derives its justification from the finding that there exist situations (Moore 1956, Wright 1990) involving complementary observables with a classical probability interpretation (Svozil

2005)).

Thereby, classical probability theory is maintained for simultaneously co-measurable (that is, non-complementary) observables. This essentially amounts to the validity of the Kolmogorov axioms of probability theory of such observables within a given context/block/Boolean subalgebra/clique/orthonormal basis, whereby the probability of an event associated with an observable

- is a non-negative real number between 0 and 1;
- is 1 for an event associated with an observable occurring with certainty (in particular, by considering any observable or its complement); as well as
- additivity of probabilities for events associated with mutually exclusive observables.

Sufficiency is assured by an elementary geometric argument (Gleason 1957) which is based upon the Pythagorean theorem; and which can be used to explicitly construct vector-based probabilities satisfying the aforementioned Kolmogorov axioms within contexts: Suppose a pure state of a quantized system is formalized by the unit state vector $|\psi\rangle$. Consider some orthonormal basis $\mathscr{B} = \{|\mathbf{e}_1\rangle, \ldots, |\mathbf{e}_n\rangle\}$ of $\mathscr{V}$. Then the square $P_\psi(\mathbf{e}_i) = |\langle\psi|\mathbf{e}_i\rangle|^2$ of the length/norm $\sqrt{\langle\psi|\mathbf{e}_i\rangle\langle\mathbf{e}_i|\psi\rangle}$ of the orthogonal projection $(\langle\psi|\mathbf{e}_i\rangle)\,|\mathbf{e}_i\rangle$ of that unit vector $|\psi\rangle$ along the basis element $|\mathbf{e}_i\rangle$ can be interpreted as the probability of the event associated with the $0-1$-observable (proposition) associated with the basis vector $|\mathbf{e}_i\rangle$ (or rather the orthogonal projector $\mathsf{E}_i = |\mathbf{e}_i\rangle\langle\mathbf{e}_i|$ associated with the dyadic product of the basis vector $|\mathbf{e}_i\rangle$); given a quantized physical system which has been prepared to be in a pure state $|\psi\rangle$. Evidently, $1 \leq P_\psi(\mathbf{e}_i) \leq 1$, and $\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_\psi(\mathbf{e}_i) = 1$. In that Pythagorean way, every context, formalized by an orthonormal basis $\mathscr{B}$, "grants a (probabilistic) view" on the pure state $|\psi\rangle$.

It can be expected that these Pythagorean-style probabilities are different from classical probabilities almost everywhere – that is, for almost all relative measurement positions. Indeed, for instance, whereas classical two-partite correlations are linear in the relative measurement angles, their respective quantum correlations follow trigonometric functions – in particular, the cosine for "singlets" (Peres 1993). These differences, or rather the vector-based Pythagorean-style quantum probabilities, are the "root cause" for violations of Boole's aforementioned conditions of possible experience in quantum setups.

Because of the convex combinations from which they are derived, all of these conditions of possible experience contain only *linear* constraints (Beltrametti and Bugajski 1996, Beltrametti and Mączyński 1991, 1993, 1994, 1995, Beltrametti et al 1995, Boole 1854, 1862, Del Noce 1995, Dvurečenskij and Länger 1994, 1995a,b, Fréchet 1935, Hailperin 1965, 1986, Länger and Mączyński 1995, Pulmannová 2002, Pykacz and Santos 1991, Sylvia and Majernik 1992, Ursic 1984, 1986, 1988). And because linear combinations of linear operators remain linear, one can identify the terms occurring in conditions of possible experience with linear self-adjoint operators, whose sum yields a self-adjoint operator, which stands for the "quantum version" of the respective conditions of possible experience. This operator has a spectral decomposition whose min-max eigenvalues correspond to the quantum bounds (Filipp and Svozil 2004a,b), which thereby generalize the Tsirelson bound (Cirel'son (=Tsirel'son) 1980). In that way, every condition of possible experience which is violated by the quantum probabilities provides a direct criterium for non-classicality.



FIG. 1. The convex structure of classical probabilities in this (Greechie) orthogonality diagram representation of the Specker bug quantum or partition logic is reflected in its partition logic, obtained through indexing all 14 two-valued measures, and adding an index $1 \leq i \leq 14$ if the ith two-valued measure is 1 on the respective atom. Concentrate on the outermost left and right observables, depicted by squares: Positivity and convexity requires that $0 \leq \lambda_i \leq 1$ and $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_7 + \lambda_{10} + \lambda_{13} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{14} \lambda_i = 1$. Therefore, if a classical system is prepared (a generalized urn model/automaton logic is "loaded") such that $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 1$, then $\lambda_7 + \lambda_{10} + \lambda_{13} = 0$, which results in a TIFS: the classical prediction is that the latter outcome never occurs if the former preparation is certain.

IV. CLASSICAL VALUE INDEFINITENESS/INDETERMINACY BY DIRECT OBSERVATION

In addition to the "fragmented, explosion view" criteria allowing "nonlocality" *via* Einstein separability (Weihs et al 1998) among its parts, classical predictions from quantum clouds – essentially intertwined (therefore the Hilbert space dimensionality has to be greater than two) arrangements of contexts – can be used as a criterium for quantum advantage over (or rather "otherness" or "distinctiveness" from) classical predictions. Thereby it is sufficient to observe of a single outcome of a quantized system which directly contradicts the classical predictions.

One example of such a configuration of quantum observables forcing a "one-zero rule" (Svozil 2009b) because of a true-implies-false set of two-valued classical states (TIFS) (Cabello et al 2018) is the "Specker bug" logic (Kochen and Specker 1965, Fig. 1, p. 182) called "cat's cradle" (Pitowsky 2003, 2006) by Itamar Pitowsky (see also Refs. (Belinfante 1973, Fig. B.l. p. 64), (Stairs 1983, p. 588-589), (Clifton 1993, Sects. IV, Fig. 2) and (Pták and Pulmannová 1991, p. 39, Fig. 2.4.6) for early discussions), as depicted in Fig. 1.

For such configurations, it is often convenient to represent both its labels as well as the classical probability distributions in terms of a partition logic (Svozil 2005) of the set of two-valued states – in this case, there are 14 such classical states. Every maximal observable is characterized by a context. The atoms of this context are labeled according to the indices of the two-valued measure with the value 1 on this atom. The axioms of probability theory require that, for each two-valued state, and within each context, there is exactly one such atom. As a result, as long as the set of two-valued states is separating (Kochen and Specker 1967, Theorem 0), one obtains a set of partitions of the set of two-valued states; each partition corresponding to a context.

Classically, if one prepares the system to be in the state $\{1,2,3\}$ – standing for any one of the classical two-valued states 1, 2 or 3 or their convex combinations – then there is no chance that the "remote" target state $\{7,10,13\}$ can be observed. A direct observation of quantum advantages (or rather superiority in terms of the frequencies predicted with respect to classical frequencies) is then suggested by some faithful orthogonal representation (FOR) (Cabello et al 2010, Lovász et al 1989, Parsons and Pisanski 1989, Solís-Encina and Portillo 2015) of this graph. In the particular Specker bug/cats cradle configuration, an elementary geometric argument (Cabello 1994, 1996) forces the relative angle between the quantum states $|\{1,2,3\}\rangle$ and $|\{7,10,13\}\rangle$ in three dimensions to be not smaller than $\arctan\left(2\sqrt{2}\right)$, so that the quantum prediction of the occurrence of the event associated with state $|\{7,10,13\}\rangle$, if the system was prepared in state $|\{1,2,3\}\rangle$ is that the probability can be at most $|\langle\{1,2,3\}|\{7,10,13\}\rangle|^2 = \cos^2\left[\arctan\left(2\sqrt{2}\right)\right] = \frac{1}{9}$. That is, on the average, if the system was prepared in state $|\{1,2,3\}\rangle$ at most one of 9 outcomes indicates that the system has the property associated with the observable $|\{7,10,13\}\rangle\langle|\{7,10,13\}|$. The occurrence of a single such event indicates quantum advantages over the classical prediction of non-occurrence.

This limitation is only true for the particular quantum cloud involved. Similar arguments with different quantum clouds resulting in TIFS can be extended to arbitrary small relative angles between preparation and measurement states, so that the relative quantum advantage can be made arbitrarily high (Abbott et al 2015, Ramanathan et al 2018). Classical value indefiniteness/indeterminacy comes naturally: because – at least relative to the assumptions regarding non-contextual value definiteness of truth assignments, in particular, of intertwining, observables – the existence of such definite values would enforce non-occurrence of outcomes which are nevertheless observed in quantized systems.

Very similar arguments against classical value definiteness can be inferred from quantum clouds with true-implies-true sets of two-valued states (TITS) (Badziąg et al 2011, Belinfante 1973, Boschi et al 1997, Cabello 1997, Cabello and García-Alcaine 1995, Cabello et al 1996, 2013, 2018, Chen et al 2013, Clifton 1993, Hardy 1992, 1993, Johansen 1994, Pitowsky 1982, Stairs 1983, Vermaas 1994). There the quantum advantage is in the non-occurrence of outcomes which classical predictions mandate to occur.

V. CLASSICAL VALUE INDEFINITENESS/INDETERMINACY PILED HIGHER AND DEEPER: THE LOGICAL INDETERMINACY PRINCIPLE

For the next and final stage of classical value indefiniteness/indeterminacy on quantum clouds (relative to the assumptions) one can combine two logics with simultaneous classical TIFS and TITS properties at the same terminals. That is, suppose one is preparing the same "initial" state, and measuring the same "target" observable; nevertheless, contemplating the simultaneous counterfactual existence of two different quantum clouds of intertwined contexts interconnecting those fixated "initial" state and measured "target" observable. Whenever one cloud has the TIFS and another cloud the TITS property (at the same terminals), those quantum clouds induce contradicting classical predictions. In such a setup the only consistent choice (relative to the assumptions; in particular, omni-existence and context independence) is to abandon classical value definiteness/determinacy. Because the assumption of classical value definiteness/determinacy for any such logic, therefore, yields a complete contradiction, thereby eliminating prospects for hidden variable models (Abbott et al 2012, 2015, Svozil 2017b) satisfying the assumptions.

Indeed, suppose that a quantized system is prepared in some pure quantum state. Then Itamar Pitowsky's (Hrushovski and Pitowsky 2004, Pitowsky 1998) *indeterminacy principle* states that – relative to the assumptions; in particular, global classical value definiteness for all observables involved, as well as context-independence of observables in which contexts intertwine – any other distinct (non-collinear) observable which is not orthogonal can neither occur nor not occur. This can be seen as an extension of both Gleason's theorem (Gleason 1957, Zierler and Schlessinger 1965) as well as the Kochen-Specker theorem (Kochen and Specker 1967) implying and utilizing the non-existence of any two-valued global truth assignments on even finite quantum clouds.

For the sake of a concrete example consider the two TIFS and TITS clouds – that is, logics with 35 intertwined binary observables (propositions) in 24 contexts – depicted in Fig. 2 (Svozil 2018b). They represent quantum clouds with the same terminal points $\{1\} \equiv \{1'\}$ and $\{2,3,4,5,6,7\} \equiv \{1',2',3',4',5'\}$, forcing the latter ones (that is, $\{2,3,4,5,6,7\}$ and $\{1',2',3',4',5'\}$) to be false/0 and true/1, respectively, if the former ones (that is, $\{1\} \equiv \{1'\}$) are true/1.

Formally, the only two-valued states on the logics depicted in Figs. 2(a) and 2(b) which allow $v(\{1\}) = v'(\{1'\}) = 1$ requires that $v(\{2,3,4,5,6,7\}) = 0$ but $v'(\{1',2',3',4',5'\}) = 1 - v(\{2,3,4,5,6,7\})$, respectively. However, both these logics have a faithful orthogonal representation (Abbott et al 2015, Table. 1, p. 102201-7) in terms of vectors which coincide in $|\{1\}\rangle = |\{1'\}\rangle$, as well as in $|\{2,3,4,5,6,7\}\rangle = |\{1',2',3',4',5'\}\rangle$, and even in all of the other adjacent observables.

The combined logic, which features 37 binary observables (propositions) in 26 contexts has no longer a classical interpre-



FIG. 2. (a) TIFS cloud, and (b) TITS cloud with only a single overlaid classical value assignment if the system is prepared in state $|1\rangle$ (Svozil 2018b). (c) The combined cloud from (a) and (b) has no value assignment allowing $36 = \{\}$ to be true/1; but still allows 8 classical value assignments enumerated by Table I, with overlaid partial coverage common to all of them. A faithful orthogonal realization is enumerated in Ref. (Abbott et al 2015, Table. 1, p. 102201-7).

tation in terms of a partition logic, as the 8 two-valued states enumerated in Table I cannot mutually separate (Kochen and Specker 1967, Theorem 0) the observables 2, 13, 15, 16, 17, 25, 27 and 36, respectively.

It might be amusing to keep in mind that, because of non-separability (Kochen and Specker 1967, Theorem 0) of some of the binary observables (propositions), there does not exist a proper partition logic. However, there exist generalized urn (Wright 1978, 1990) and finite automata (Moore 1956, Schaller and Svozil 1995, 1996) model realisations thereof: just consider urns "loaded" with balls which have no colored symbols on them; or no such balls at all, for the binary observables (propositions) 2, 13, 15, 16, 17, 25, 27 and 36. In such cases it is no more possible to empirically reconstruct the underlying logic; yet if an underlying logic is assumed then – at least as long as there still are truth assignments/two-valued states on the logic – "reduced" probability distributions can be defined, urns can be loaded, and automata prepared, which conform to the classical predictions from a convex combination of these truth assignments/two-valued states – thereby giving rise to "reduced" conditions of experience *via* hull computations.

For global/total truth assignments (Hrushovski and Pitowsky 2004, Pitowsky 1998) as well as for local admissibility rules allowing partial (as opposed to total, global) truth assignments (Abbott et al 2012, 2015), such arguments can be extended to cover all terminal states which are neither collinear nor orthogonal. One could point out that, insofar as a fixed state has to be prepared the resulting value indefiniteness/indeterminacy is state dependent. One may indeed hold that the strongest indication for quantum value indefiniteness/indeterminacy is the *total absence/non-existence* of two-valued states, as exposed in the Kochen-Specker theorem (Kochen and Specker 1967). But this is rather a question of nominalistic taste, as both cases have no direct empirical testability; and as has already been pointed out by Clifton in a private conversation in 1995: *"how can you measure a contradiction?"*

VI. THE "MESSAGE" OF QUANTUM (IN)DETERMINACY

At the peril of becoming, as expressed by Clauser (Clauser 2002), "evangelical," let me "sort things out" from my own very subjective and private perspective. (Readers adverse to "interpretation" and the semantic, "meaning" aspects of physical theory may consider stop reading at this point.)

Thereby one might be inclined to follow Planck (against Feynman (Clauser 2002, Mermin 1989a,b)) and hold it as being not too unreasonable to take scientific comprehensibility, rationality, and causality as a (Planck 1932, p. 539) (see also (Earman 2007, p. 1372)) *"heuristic principle, a sign-post … to guide us in the motley confusion of events and to show us the direction in which scientific research must advance in order to attain fruitful results."*

So what does all of this – the Born rule of quantum probabilities and its derivation by Gleason's theorem from the Kolmogorovian axioms applied to mutually comeasurable observables, as well as its consequences, such as the Kochen-Specker theorem, the plethora of violations of Boole's conditions of possible experience, Pitowsky's indeterminacy principle and more recent extensions and variations thereof – "try to tell us?"

First, observe that all of the aforementioned postulates and findings are (based upon) assumptions; and thus consequences of the latter. Stated differently, these findings are true not in the absolute, ontologic but in the epistemic sense: they hold relative to the axioms or assumptions made.

#	1	2	3	4					···									···									···						34	35	36	37
1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1
2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
4	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
5	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
6	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
7	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
8	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0

TABLE I. Enumeration of the 8 two-valued states on 37 binary observables (propositions) of the combined quantum clouds/logics depicted in Figs. 2(a) and 2(b). Row vector indicate the state values on the observables, column vectors the values on all states per the respective observable.

Thus, in maintaining rationality one needs to grant oneself – or rather one is forced to accept – the abandonment of at least some or all assumptions made. Some options are exotic; for instance, Itamar Pitowsky's suggestions to apply paradoxical set decompositions to probability measures (Pitowsky 1983, 1986). Another "exotic escape option" is to allow only unconnected (non-intertwined) contexts whose observables are dense (Godsil and Zaks 1988, 2012, Havlicek et al 2001, Meyer 1999). Some possibilities to cope with the findings are quite straightforward, and we shall concentrate our further attention to those (Svozil 2009b).

A. Simultaneous definiteness of counterfactual, complementary observables, and abandonment of context independence

Suppose one insists on the simultaneous definite omni-existence of mutually complementary, and therefore necessarily counterfactual, observables. One straightforward way to cope with the aforementioned findings is the abandonment of context-independence of intertwining observables.

There is no indication in the quantum formalism which would support such an assumption, as the respective projection operators do not in any way depend on the contexts involved. However, one may hold that the outcomes are context dependent as functions of the initial state and the context measured (Dzhafarov et al 2017, Svozil 2009a, 2012); and that they actually "are real" and not just "idealistically occur in our imagination;" that is, being *"mental through-and-through"* (Segal and Goldschmidt 2017, 2018). Early conceptualizations of context-dependence aka contextuality can be found in Bohr's remark (in his typical Nostradamus-like style) (Bohr 1949) on *"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."* Bell, referring to Bohr, suggested (Bell 1966), Sec. 5) that *"the result of an observation may reasonably depend not only on the state of the system (including hidden variables) but also on the complete disposition of the apparatus."*

However, the common, prevalent, use of the term "contextuality" is not an explicit context-dependent form, as suggested by the realist Bell in his earlier quote, but rather a situation where the classical predictions of quantum clouds are violated. More concretely, if experiments on quantized systems violate certain Boole-Bell type classical bounds or direct classical predictions, the narratives claim to have thereby "proven contextuality" (e.g., see Refs. (Amselem et al 2009, Bartosik et al 2009, Bub and Stairs 2010, Cabello 2008, Cabello et al 2008, Hasegawa et al 2006) and Ref. (Cabello et al 2013) for a "direct proof of quantum contextuality").

What if we take Bell's proposal of a context dependence of valuations – and consequently, "classical" contextual probability theory – seriously? One of the consequences would be the introduction of an *uncountable multiplicity* of counterfactual observables. An example to illustrate this multiplicity – comparable to de Witt's view of Everett's relative state interpretation (Everett III 1973) – is the uncountable set of orthonormal bases of $\mathbb{R}^3$ which are all interconnected at the same single intertwining element. A continuous angular parameter characterizes the angles between the other elements of the bases, located in the plane orthogonal to that common intertwining element. Contextuality suggests that the value assignment of an observable (proposition) corresponding to this common intertwining element needs to be both true/1 and false/0, depending on the context involved, or whenever some quantum cloud (collection of intertwining observables) demands this through consistency requirements.

Indeed, the introduction of multiple quantum clouds would force any context dependence to also implicitly depend on this general perspective – that is, on the respective quantum cloud and its faithful orthogonal realization, which in turn determines the quantum probabilities *via* the Born-Gleason rule: Because there exist various different quantum clouds as "pathways interconnecting" two observables, context dependence needs to vary according to any concrete connection between the prepared and the measured state.

A single context participates in an arbitrary, potentially infinite, multiplicity of quantum clouds. This requires this one context to "behave very differently" when it comes to contextual value assignments. Alas, as quantum clouds are hypothetical constructions of our mind and therefore *"mental through-and-through"* (Segal and Goldschmidt 2017, 2018), so appears context dependence: as an idealistic concept, devoid of any empirical evidence, created to rescue the *desider-*

atum of omni-realistic existence.

Pointedly stated, contextual value assignments appear both utterly *ad hoc* and abritrary – like a *deus ex machina* "saving" the *desideratum* of a classical omni-value definite reality, whereby it must obey quantum probability theory without grounding it (indeed, in the absence of any additional criterium or principle there is no reason to assume that the likelihood of true/1 and false/0 is other than 50:50); as well as highly discontinuous. In this latter, discontinuity respect, context dependence is similar to the earlier mentioned breakup of the intertwine observables by reducing quantum observables to disconnected contexts (Godsil and Zaks 1988, 2012, Havlicek et al 2001, Meyer 1999).

It is thereby granted that these considerations apply only to cases in which the assumptions of context independence are valid throughout the entire quantum cloud – that is, uniformly: for every observable in which contexts intertwine. If this were not the case – say, if only a single one observable occurring in intertwining contexts is allowed to be context-dependent (Simmons 2017, Svozil 2012) – the respective clouds taylored to prove Pitowsky's Logical Indeterminacy Principle and similar, as well as the Kochen-Specker theorems do not apply; and therefore the aforementioned consequences are invalid.

B. Abandonment of omni-value definiteness of observables in all but one context

Nietzsche once speculated (Nietzsche 1887, 2009-,,) that what he has called *"slave morality"* originated from superficially pretending that – in what later Blair (aka Orwell) called (aka George Orwell) *"doublespeak"* – weakness means strength. In a rather similar sense the lack of comprehension – Planck's *"sign-post"* – and even the resulting inconsistencies tended to become reinterpreted as an asset: nowadays consequences of the vector-based quantum probability law are marketed as *"quantum supremacy"* – a *"quantum magic"* or *"hocus-pocus"* (Svozil 2016) of sorts.

Indeed, future centuries may look back at our period, and may even call it a second "renaissance" period of scholasticism (Specker 1960). In years from now historians of science will be amused about our ongoing queer efforts, the calamities and "magic" experienced through our painful incapacity to recognize the obvious – that is, the non-existence and therefore value indefiniteness/indeterminacy of certain counterfactual observables – namely exactly those mentioned in Itamar Pitowsky's indeterminacy principle.

This principle has a positive interpretation of a quantum state, defined as the maximal knowledge obtainable by simultaneous measurements of a quantized system; or, conversely, as the maximal information content encodable therein. This can be formalized in terms of the *value definiteness* of a single (Grangier 2002, Svozil 2002, 2004, 2018b, Zeilinger 1999) context – or, in a more broader (non-operational) perspective, the continuum of contexts intertwined by some prepared pure quantum state (formalized as vector or the corresponding one-dimensional orthogonal projection operator). In terms of Hilbert space quantum mechanics this amounts to the claim that the only value definite entity can be a single orthonormal basis/maximal operator; or a continuum of maximal operators whose spectral sum contain proper "true intertwines." All other "observables" grant an, albeit necessarily stochastic, value indefinite/indeterministic, view on this state.

If more than one context is involved we might postulate that all admissable probabilities should at least satisfy the following criterium: they should be classical Kolmogorov-style *within* any single particular context (Gleason 1957). It has been suggested (Aufféves and Grangier 2017, 2018) that this can be extended and formalized in a quantum multi-context environment by a double stochastic matrix whose entries $P(\mathbf{e}_i,\mathbf{f}_j)$, with $1 \le i,j \le n$ (n is the number of distinct "atoms" or exclusive outcomes in each context) are identified by the conditional probabilities of one atom $\mathbf{f}_j$ in the second context, relative to a given one atom $\mathbf{e}_i$ in the first context. The general multi-context case yields row stochastic matrices (Svozil 2018a). Various types of decompositions of those matrices exist for particular cases:

- By the Birkhoff-von Neumann theorem double stochastic matrices can be represented by the Birkhoff polytope spanned by the convex hull of the set of permutation matrices: let $\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_k \ge 0$ such that $\sum_{l=1}^{k}\lambda_l = 1$, then $P(\mathbf{e}_i,\mathbf{f}_j) = \left[\sum_{l=1}^{k}\lambda_l\Pi_l\right]_{ij}$. Since there exist $n!$ permutations of n elements, k will be bounded from above by $k \le n!$. Note that this type of decomposition may not be unique, as the space spanned the permutation matrices is $\left[(n-1)^2+1\right]$-dimensional; with $n! > (n-1)^2+1$ for $n>2$. Therefore, the bound from above can be improved such that decompositions with $k \le (n-1)^2+1 = n^2-2(n+1)$ exist (Marcus and Ree 1959). Formally, a permutation matrix has a quasi-vectorial (Mermin 2007) decomposition in terms of the canonical (Cartesian) basis, such that, $\Pi_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n}|\mathbf{e}_j\rangle\langle\mathbf{e}_{\pi_i(j)}|$, where $|\mathbf{e}_j\rangle$ represents the n-tuple associated with the jth basis vector of the canonical (Cartesian) basis, and $\pi_i(j)$ stands for the ith permutation of j.

- Vector based probabilities allow the following decomposition (Aufféves and Grangier 2017, 2018): $P(\mathbf{e}_i,\mathbf{f}_j) = \text{Trace}\left(\mathsf{E}_i\mathsf{R}\mathsf{F}_j\mathsf{R}\right)$, where E_i and F_i are elements of contexts, formalized by two sets of mutually orthogonal projection operators, and R is a real positive diagonal matrix such that the trace of R^2 equals the dimension n, and $\text{Trace}\left(\mathsf{E}_i\mathsf{R}^2\right)=1$. The quantum mechanical Born rule is recovered by identifying $\mathsf{R}=\mathbb{I}_n$ with the identity matrix, so that $P(\mathbf{e}_i,\mathbf{f}_j) = \text{Trace}\left(\mathsf{E}_i\mathsf{F}_j\right)$.

- There exist more "exotic" probability measures on "reduced" propositional spaces such as Wright's 2-state dispersion-free measure on the pentagon/pentagram (Wright 1978), or another type of probability measure based on a discontinuous 3(2)-coloring of the set of all unit vectors with rational coefficients (Godsil and Zaks 1988, 2012, Havlicek et al 2001, Meyer 1999) whose decomposition appear to be *ad hoc*; at least for the time being.

Where might this aforementioned type of stochasticism arise from? It could well be that it is introduced by interactions with the environment; and through the many uncontrollable and, for all practical purposes (Bell 1990), huge number of degrees of freedom in unknown states.

The finiteness of physical resources needs not prevent the specification of a particular vector or context. Because any other context needs to be operationalized within the physically feasible means available to the respective experiment: it is the measurable coordinate differences which count; not the absolute locatedness relative to a hypothetical, idealistic absolute frame of reference which cannot be accessed operationally.

Finally, as the type of context envisioned to be value definite can be expressed in terms of vector spaces equipped with a scalar product – in particular, by identifying a context with the corresponding orthonormal basis or (the spectral decomposition of) the associated maximal observable(s) – one may ask how one could imagine the origin of such entities? Abstractly vectors and vector spaces could originate from a great variety of very different forms; such as from systems of solutions of ordinary linear differential equations. Any investigation into the origins of the quantum mechanical Hilbert space formalism itself might, if this turns out to be a progressive research program (Lakatos 1978, 2012), eventually yield to a theory indicating operational physical capacities beyond quantum mechanics.

VII. BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON ITAMAR PITOWSKY

I am certainly not in the position to present a view of Itamar Pitowsky's thinking. Therefore I shall make a few rather anecdotal observations. First of all, he seemed to me as one of the most original physicists I have ever met – but that might be a triviality, given his *opus.* One thing I realized was that he exhibited a – sometimes maybe even unconscious, but sometimes very outspoken – regret that he was working in a philosophy department. I believe he considered himself rather a mathematician or theoretical physicist. To this I responded that being in a philosophy department might be rather fortunate because there one could "go wild" in every direction; allowing much greater freedom than in other academic realms. But, of course, this had no effect on his uneasiness.

He was astonished that I spent a not so little money (means relative to my investment capacities) in an Israeli internet startup company which later flopped, depriving me of all but a fraction of what I had invested. He told me that, at least at that point, many startups in Israel had been put up intentionally only to attract money from people like me; only to collapse later.

A late project of his concerned quantum bounds in general; maybe in a similar – graph theoretical and at the time undirected to quantum – way as Grötschel, Lovász and Schrijver's theta body (Cabello et al 2014, Grötschel et al 1986). The idea was not just deriving absolute (Cirel'son (=Tsirel'son) 1980) or parameterized, continuous (Filipp and Svozil 2004a,b) bounds for existing classical conditions of possible experience obtained by hull computations of polytopes; but rather genuine quantum bounds on, say, Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen type setups.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I kindly acknowledge enlightening criticism and suggestions by Andrew W. Simmons, as well as discussions with Philippe Grangier on the characterization of quantum probabilities. All remaining misconceptions and errors are mine. The author acknowledges the support by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): project I 4579-N and the Czech Science Foundation: project 20-09869L.

Abbott AA, Calude CS, Conder J, Svozil K (2012) Strong Kochen-Specker theorem and incomputability of quantum randomness. Physical Review A 86:062,109, doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.86.062109, URL https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.86.062109, arXiv:1207.2029

Abbott AA, Calude CS, Svozil K (2014) Value-indefinite observables are almost everywhere. Physical Review A 89:032,109, doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.89.032109, URL https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.89.032109, arXiv:1309.7188

Abbott AA, Calude CS, Svozil K (2015) A variant of the Kochen-Specker theorem localising value indefiniteness. Journal of Mathematical Physics 56(10):102201, doi:10.1063/1.4931658, URL https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4931658, arXiv:1503.01985

Amselem E, Rådmark M, Bourennane M, Cabello A (2009) State-independent quantum contextuality with single photons. Physical Review Letters 103(16):160,405, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.160405, URL https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.160405

Auffèves A, Grangier P (2017) Recovering the quantum formalism from physically realist axioms. Scientific Reports 7(2123):43,365 (1–9), doi:10.1038/srep43365, URL https://doi.org/10.1038/srep43365, arXiv:1610.06164

Auffèves A, Grangier P (2018) Extracontextuality and extravalence in quantum mechanics. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences 376(2123):20170,311, doi:10.1098/rsta.2017.0311, URL https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2017.0311, arXiv:1801.01398

Badziąg P, Bengtsson I, Cabello A, Granström H, Larsson JA (2011) Pentagrams and paradoxes. Foundations of Physics 41:414–423, doi:10.1007/s10701-010-9433-3, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s10701-010-9433-3

Bartosik H, Klepp J, Schmitzer C, Sponar S, Cabello A, Rauch H, Hasegawa Y (2009) Experimental test of quantum contextuality in neutron interferometry. Physical Review Letters 103(4):040,403, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.040403, URL https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.040403, arXiv:0904.4576

Belinfante FJ (1973) A Survey of Hidden-Variables Theories, International Series of Monographs in Natural Philosophy, vol 55. Pergamon Press, Elsevier, Oxford, New York, doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-017032-9.50001-7, URL https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-017032-9.50001-7

Bell JS (1966) On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics. Reviews of Modern Physics 38:447–452, doi: 10.1103/RevModPhys.38.447, URL https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.38.447

Bell JS (1990) Against 'measurement'. Physics World 3:33–41, doi:10.1088/2058-7058/3/8/26, URL https://doi.org/10.1088/2058-7058/3/8/26

Beltrametti EG, Bugajski S (1996) The Bell phenomenon in classical frameworks. Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General Physics 29:247–261, doi:10.1088/0305-4470/29/2/005, URL https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/29/2/005

Beltrametti EG, Mączyński MJ (1991) On a characterization of classical and nonclassical probabilities. Journal of Mathematical Physics 32:1280–1286, doi:10.1063/1.529326, URL https://doi.org/10.1063/1.529326

Beltrametti EG, Mączyński MJ (1993) On the characterization of probabilities: A generalization of Bell's inequalities. Journal of Mathematical Physics 34:4919–4929, doi:10.1063/1.530333, URL https://doi.org/10.1063/1.530333

Beltrametti EG, Mączyński MJ (1994) On Bell-type inequalities. Foundations of Physics 24:1153–1159, doi:10.1007/bf02057861, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/bf02057861

Beltrametti EG, Mączyński MJ (1995) On the range of non-classical probability. Reports on Mathematical Physics 36:195–213, doi:10.1016/0034-4877(96)83620-2, URL https://doi.org/10.1016/0034-4877(96)83620-2

Beltrametti EG, Del Noce C, Mączyński MJ (1995) Characterization and deduction of Bell-type inequalities. In: Garola C, Rossi A (eds) The Foundations of Quantum Mechanics — Historical Analysis and Open Questions: Lecce, 1993, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp 35–41, doi:10.1007/978-94-011-00298"˙3, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-0029-8_3

Bishop E, Leeuw KD (1959) The representations of linear functionals by measures on sets of extreme points. Annals of the Fourier Institute 9:305–331, doi:10.5802/aif.95, URL https://doi.org/10.5802/aif.95

Bohr N (1949) Discussion with Einstein on epistemological problems in atomic physics. In: Schilpp PA (ed) Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist, The Library of Living Philosophers, Evanston, Ill., pp 200–241, doi:10.1016/S1876-0503(08)70379-7, URL https://doi.org/10.1016/S1876-0503(08)70379-7

Boole G (1854) An Investigation of the Laws of Thought. URL http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/15114

Boole G (1862) On the theory of probabilities. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London 152:225–252, doi: 10.1098/rstl.1862.0015, URL https://doi.org/10.1098/rstl.1862.0015

Boschi D, Branca S, De Martini F, Hardy L (1997) Ladder proof of nonlocality without inequalities: Theoretical and experimental results. Physical Review Letters 79:2755–2758, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.79.2755, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.79.2755

Bub J, Demopoulos W (2010) Itamar Pitowsky 1950-2010. Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part B: Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics 41(2):85, doi: 10.1016/j.shpsb.2010.03.004, URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsb.2010.03.004

Bub J, Stairs A (2009) Contextuality and nonlocality in 'no signaling' theories. Foundations of Physics 39:690–711, doi: 10.1007/s10701-009-9307-8, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s10701-009-9307-8

Bub J, Stairs A (2010) Contextuality in quantum mechanics: Testing the Klyachko inequality. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1006.0500, arXiv:1006.0500

Cabello A (1994) A simple proof of the Kochen-Specker theorem. European Journal of Physics 15(4):179–183, doi:10.1088/0143-0807/15/4/004, URL https://doi.org/10.1088/0143-0807/15/4/004

Cabello A (1996) Pruebas algebraicas de imposibilidad de variables ocultas en mecánica cuántica. PhD thesis, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid, Spain, URL http://eprints.ucm.es/1961/1/T21049.pdf

Cabello A (1997) No-hidden-variables proof for two spin- particles preselected and postselected in unentangled states. Physical Review A 55:4109–4111, doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.55.4109, URL https://doi.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.55.4109

Cabello A (2008) Experimentally testable state-independent quantum contextuality. Physical Review Letters 101(21):210401, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.101.210401, URL https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.101.210401, arXiv:0808.2456

Cabello A, García-Alcaine G (1995) A hidden-variables versus quantum mechanics experiment. Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General Physics 28:3719–3724, doi:10.1088/0305-4470/28/13/016, URL https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/28/13/016

Cabello A, Estebaranz JM, García-Alcaine G (1996) Bell-Kochen-Specker theorem: A proof with 18 vectors. Physics Letters A 212(4):183–187, doi:10.1016/0375-9601(96)00134-X, URL https://doi.org/10.1016/0375-9601(96)00134-X, arXiv:quant-ph/9706009

Cabello A, Filipp S, Rauch H, Hasegawa Y (2008) Proposed experiment for testing quantum contextuality with neutrons. Physical Review Letters 100:130,404, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.100.130404, URL https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.100.130404

Cabello A, Severini S, Winter A (2010) (non-)contextuality of physical theories as an axiom. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1010.2163, arXiv:1010.2163

Cabello A, Badziag P, Terra Cunha M, Bourennane M (2013) Simple Hardy-like proof of quantum contextuality. Physical Review Letters 111:180,404, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.180404, URL https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.180404

Cabello A, Severini S, Winter A (2014) Graph-theoretic approach to quantum correlations. Physical Review Letters 112:040,401, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.040401, URL https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.040401, arXiv:1401.7081

Cabello A, Portillo JR, Solís A, Svozil K (2018) Minimal true-implies-false and true-implies-true sets of propositions in noncontextual hidden-variable theories. Physical Review A 98:012,106, doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.98.012106, URL https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.98.012106, arXiv:1805.00796

Chen JL, Cabello A, Xu ZP, Su HY, Wu C, Kwek LC (2013) Hardy's paradox for high-dimensional systems. Physical Review A 88:062,116, doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.88.062116, URL https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.88.062116

Cirel'son (=Tsirel'son) BS (1980) Quantum generalizations of Bell's inequality. Letters in Mathematical Physics 4(2):93–100, doi:10.1007/BF00417500, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00417500

Cirel'son (=Tsirel'son) BS (1993) Some results and problems on quantum Bell-type inequalities. Hadronic Journal Supplement 8:329–345, URL http://www.tau.ac.il/~tsirel/download/hadron.pdf

Clauser J (2002) Early history of Bell's theorem. In: Bertlmann R, Zeilinger A (eds) Quantum (Un)speakables: From

Bell to Quantum Information, Springer, Berlin, pp 61–96, doi:10.1007/978-3-662-05032-3‘‘˙6, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-05032-3_6

Clifton RK (1993) Getting contextual and nonlocal elements-of-reality the easy way. American Journal of Physics 61(5):443–447, doi:10.1119/1.17239, URL https://doi.org/10.1119/1.17239

Colins D, Gisin N (2004) A relevant two qbit Bell inequality inequivalent to the CHSH inequality. Journal of Physics A: Math Gen 37:1775–1787, doi:10.1088/0305-4470/37/5/021, URL https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/37/5/021, arXiv:quant-ph/0306129

Del Noce C (1995) An algorithm for finding Bell-type inequalities. Foundations of Physics Letters 8:213–229, doi:10.1007/bf02187346, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02187346

Dvurečenskij A, Länger H (1994) Bell-type inequalities in horizontal sums of boolean algebras. Foundations of Physics 24:1195–1202, doi:10.1007/bf02057864, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02057864

Dvurečenskij A, Länger H (1995a) Bell-type inequalities in orthomodular lattices. I. Inequalities of order 2. International Journal of Theoretical Physics 34:995–1024, doi:10.1007/bf00671363, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00671363

Dvurečenskij A, Länger H (1995b) Bell-type inequalities in orthomodular lattices. ii. inequalities of higher order. International Journal of Theoretical Physics 34:1025–1036, doi:10.1007/bf00671364, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00671364

Dzhafarov EN, Cervantes VH, Kujala JV (2017) Contextuality in canonical systems of random variables. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences 375(2106):20160,389, doi:10.1098/rsta.2016.0389, URL https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2016.0389, arXiv:1703.01252

Earman J (2007) Aspects of determinism in modern physics. Part B. In: Butterfield J, Earman J (eds) Philosophy of Physics, Handbook of the Philosophy of Science, North-Holland, Amsterdam, pp 1369–1434, doi:10.1016/B978-044451560-5/50017-8, URL https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-044451560-5/50017-8

ESI - The Erwin Schrödinger International Institute for Mathematical Physics (2001) Scientific report for the year 2000. URL https://www.esi.ac.at/material/scientific-reports-1/2000.pdf, eSI-Report 2000

Everett III H (1973) The many-worlds interpretation of quantum mechanics. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, pp 3–140

Filipp S, Svozil K (2004a) Generalizing Tsirelson's bound on Bell inequalities using a min-max principle. Physical Review Letters 93:130,407, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.93.130407, URL https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.93.130407, arXiv:quant-ph/0403175

Filipp S, Svozil K (2004b) Testing the bounds on quantum probabilities. Physical Review A 69:032,101, doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.69.032101, URL https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.69.032101, arXiv:quant-ph/0306092

Fréchet M (1935) Généralisation du théorème des probabilités totales. Fundamenta Mathematicae 25(1):379–387, URL http://eudml.org/doc/212798

Froissart M (1981) Constructive generalization of Bell's inequalities. Il Nuovo Cimento B (1971-1996) 64:241–251, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02903286, 10.1007/BF02903286

(aka George Orwell) EAB (1949) Nineteen Eighty-Four (aka 1984). Twentieth century classics, Secker & Warburg, Cambridge, MA, URL http://gutenberg.net.au/ebooks01/0100021.txt

Gleason AM (1957) Measures on the closed subspaces of a Hilbert space. Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics (now Indiana University Mathematics Journal) 6(4):885–893, doi:10.1512/iumj.1957.6.56050, URL https://doi.org/10.1512/iumj.1957.6.56050

Godsil CD, Zaks J (1988, 2012) Coloring the sphere, URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1201.0486, University of Waterloo research report CORR 88-12, arXiv:1201.0486

Grangier P (2002) Contextual objectivity: a realistic interpretation of quantum mechanics. European Journal of Physics 23(3):331–337, doi:10.1088/0143-0807/23/3/312, URL https://doi.org/10.1088/0143-0807/23/3/312, arXiv:quant-ph/0012122

Grötschel M, Lovász L, Schrijver A (1986) Relaxations of vertex packing. Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B 40(3):330–343, doi:10.1016/0095-8956(86)90087-0, URL https://doi.org/10.1016/0095-8956(86)90087-0

Hailperin T (1965) Best possible inequalities for the probability of a logical function of events. The American Mathematical Monthly 72(4):343–359, doi:10.2307/2313491, URL https://doi.org/10.2307/2313491

Hailperin T (1986) Boole's Logic and Probability: Critical Exposition from the Standpoint of Contemporary Algebra, Logic and Probability Theory, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, vol 85, 2nd edn. Elsevier Science Ltd, URL https://www.elsevier.com/books/booles-logic-and-probability/hailperin/978-0-444-87952-3

Hardy L (1992) Quantum mechanics, local realistic theories, and lorentz-invariant realistic theories. Physical Review Letters 68:2981–2984, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.68.2981, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.68.2981

Hardy L (1993) Nonlocality for two particles without inequalities for almost all entangled states. Physical Review Letters 71:1665–1668, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.71.1665, URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.71.1665

Hasegawa Y, Loidl R, Badurek G, Baron M, Rauch H (2006) Quantum contextuality in a single-neutron optical experiment. Physical Review Letters 97(23):230401, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.97.230401, URL 10.1103/PhysRevLett.97.230401

Havlicek H, Krenn G, Summhammer J, Svozil K (2001) Colouring the rational quantum sphere and the Kochen-Specker theorem. Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General 34:3071–3077, doi:10.1088/0305-4470/34/14/312, URL https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/34/14/312, arXiv:quant-ph/9911040

Hrushovski E, Pitowsky I (2004) Generalizations of Kochen and Specker's theorem and the effectiveness of Gleason's theorem. Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part B: Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics 35(2):177–194, doi:10.1016/j.shpsb.2003.10.002, URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsb.2003.10.002, arXiv:quant-ph/0307139

Johansen HB (1994) Comment on "getting contextual and nonlocal elements-of-reality the easy way". American Journal of Physics 62:471, doi:10.1119/1.17551, URL https://doi.org/10.1119/1.17551

Kleene SC (1936) General recursive functions of natural numbers. Mathematische Annalen 112(1):727–742, doi:10.1007/BF01565439, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01565439

Klyachko AA (2002) Coherent states, entanglement, and geometric invariant theory, URL https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0206012, arXiv:quant-ph/0206012

Klyachko AA, Can MA, Binicioğlu S, Shumovsky AS (2008) Simple test for hidden variables in spin-1 systems. Physical Review Letters 101:020,403, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.101.020403, URL https://doi.org//10.1103/PhysRevLett.101.020403, arXiv:0706.0126

Kochen S, Specker EP (1965) Logical structures arising in quantum theory. In: The Theory of Models, Proceedings of the 1963 International Symposium at Berkeley, North Holland, Amsterdam, New York, Oxford, pp 177–189, URL https://www.elsevier.com/books/the-theory-of-models/addison/978-0-7204-2233-7, reprinted in Ref. (Specker 1990, pp. 209-221)

Kochen S, Specker EP (1967) The problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics. Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics (now Indiana University Mathematics Journal) 17(1):59–87, doi:10.1512/iumj.1968.17.17004, URL https://doi.org/10.1512/iumj.1968.17.17004

Lakatos I (1978, 2012) The Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes. Philosophical Papers Volume 1. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, UK, doi:10.1017/CBO9780511621123, URL https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511621123, edited by John Worrall and Gregory Currie

Länger H, Mączyński MJ (1995) On a characterization of probability measures on boolean algebras and some orthomodular lattices. Mathematica Slovaca 45(5):455–468, URL http://eudml.org/doc/32311

Lovász L, Saks M, Schrijver A (1989) Orthogonal representations and connectivity of graphs. Linear Algebra and its Applications 114-115:439–454, doi:10.1016/0024-3795(89)90475-8, URL https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3795(89)90475-8, special Issue Dedicated to Alan J. Hoffman

Marcus M, Ree R (1959) Diagonals of doubly stochastic matrices. The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics 10(1):296–302, doi:10.1093/qmath/10.1.296, URL https://doi.org/10.1093/qmath/10.1.296

Mermin DN (1989a) Could Feynman have said this? Physics Today 57:10–11, doi:10.1063/1.1768652, URL https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1768652

Mermin DN (1989b) What's wrong with this pillow? Physics Today 42:9–11, doi:10.1063/1.2810963, URL https://doi.org/10.1063/1.2810963

Mermin DN (2007) Quantum Computer Science. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, doi:10.1017/CBO9780511813870, URL https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813870

Meyer DA (1999) Finite precision measurement nullifies the Kochen-Specker theorem. Physical Review Letters 83(19):3751–3754, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.3751, URL https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.3751, arXiv:quant-ph/9905080

Moore EF (1956) Gedanken-experiments on sequential machines. In: Shannon CE, McCarthy J (eds) Automata Studies. (AM-34), Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, pp 129–153, doi:10.1515/9781400882618-006, URL https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400882618-006

Nietzsche F (1887, 2009-) Zur Genealogie der Moral (On the Genealogy of Morality). URL http://www.nietzschesource.org/#eKGWB/GM, digital critical edition of the complete works and letters, based on the critical text by G. Colli and M. Montinari, Berlin/New York, de Gruyter 1967-, edited by Paolo D'Iorio

Nietzsche FW (1887, 1908; 1989, 2010) On the Genealogy of Morals and Ecce Homo. Vintage, Penguin, Random House, URL https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/121939/on-the-genealogy-of-morals-and-ecce-homo-by-friedrich-nietzsche-edited-with-a-commentary-by-walter-kaufmann/9780679724629/, translated by Walter Arnold Kaufmann

Odifreddi P (1989) Classical Recursion Theory, Vol. 1. North-Holland, Amsterdam

Parsons T, Pisanski T (1989) Vector representations of graphs. Discrete Mathematics 78:143–154, doi:10.1016/0012-365x(89)90171-4, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/10.1016/0012-365x(89)90171-4

Peres A (1978) Unperformed experiments have no results. American Journal of Physics 46:745–747, doi:10.1119/1.11393, URL https://doi.org/10.1119/1.11393

Peres A (1993) Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht

Pitowsky I (1982) Substitution and truth in quantum logic. Philosophy of Science 49:380–401, doi:10.2307/187281, URL https://doi.org/10.2307/187281

Pitowsky I (1983) Deterministic model of spin and statistics. Physical Review D 27:2316–2326, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.27.2316, URL https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.27.2316

Pitowsky I (1986) The range of quantum probabilities. Journal of Mathematical Physics 27(6):1556–1565

Pitowsky I (1989a) From George Boole to John Bell: The origin of Bell's inequality. In: Kafatos M (ed) Bell's Theorem, Quantum Theory and the Conceptions of the Universe, Fundamental Theories of Physics, vol 37, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp 37–49, doi:10.1007/978-94-017-0849-4"˙6, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-0849-4_6

Pitowsky I (1989b) Quantum Probability — Quantum Logic, Lecture Notes in Physics, vol 321. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, doi:10.1007/BFb0021186, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0021186

Pitowsky I (1991) Correlation polytopes their geometry and complexity. Mathematical Programming 50:395–414, doi:10.1007/BF01594946, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01594946

Pitowsky I (1994) George Boole's 'conditions of possible experience' and the quantum puzzle. The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science 45:95–125, doi:10.1093/bjps/45.1.95, URL https://doi.org/10.1093/bjps/45.1.95

Pitowsky I (1998) Infinite and finite Gleason's theorems and the logic of indeterminacy. Journal of Mathematical Physics 39(1):218–228, doi:10.1063/1.532334, URL https://doi.org/10.1063/1.532334

Pitowsky I (2003) Betting on the outcomes of measurements: a bayesian theory of quantum probability. Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part B: Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics 34(3):395–414, doi:10.1016/S1355-2198(03)00035-2, URL https://doi.org/10.1016/S1355-2198(03)00035-2, quantum Information and Computation, arXiv:quant-ph/0208121

Pitowsky I (2006) Quantum mechanics as a theory of probability. In: Demopoulos W, Pitowsky I (eds) Physical Theory and its Interpretation, The Western Ontario Series in Philosophy of Science, vol 72, Springer Netherlands, pp 213–240, doi:10.1007/1-4020-4876-9˙10, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-4876-9_10, arXiv:quant-ph/0510095

Pitowsky I, Svozil K (2001) New optimal tests of quantum nonlocality. Physical Review A 64:014,102, doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.64.014102, URL https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.64.014102, arXiv:quant-ph/0011060

Planck M (1932) The concept of causality. Proceedings of the Physical Society 44(5):529–539, URL https://doi.org/10.1088/0959-5309/44/5/301

Pták P, Pulmannová S (1991) Orthomodular Structures as Quantum Logics. Intrinsic Properties, State Space and Probabilistic Topics, Fundamental Theories of Physics, vol 44. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht

Pulmannová S (2002) Hidden variables and Bell inequalities on quantum logics. Foundations of Physics 32:193–216, doi:10.1023/a:1014424425657, URL https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1014424425657

Pykacz J, Santos E (1991) Hidden variables in quantum logic approach reexamined. Journal of Mathematical Physics 32:1287–, doi:10.1063/1.529327, URL https://doi.org/10.1063/1.529327

Ramanathan R, Rosicka M, Horodecki K, Pironio S, Horodecki M, Horodecki P (2018) Gadget structures in proofs of the Kochen-Specker theorem. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.00113, arXiv:1807.00113

Rogers, Jr H (1967) Theory of Recursive Functions and Effective Computability. MacGraw-Hill, The MIT Press, New York, Cambridge, MA

Schaller M, Svozil K (1995) Automaton partition logic versus quantum logic. International Journal of Theoretical Physics 34(8):1741–1750, doi:10.1007/BF00676288, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00676288

Schaller M, Svozil K (1996) Automaton logic. International Journal of Theoretical Physics 35:911–940, doi:10.1007/BF02302381, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02302381

Segal A, Goldschmidt T (2017, 2018) The necessity of idealism. In: Idealism: New Essays in Metaphysics, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, pp 34–49, doi:10.1093/oso/9780198746973.003.0003, URL https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198746973.003.0003

Simmons AW (2017) How (maximally) contextual is quantum mechanics? URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.03766, arXiv:1712.03766

Sliwa C (2003) Symmetries of the Bell correlation inequalities. Physics Letters A 317:165–168, doi:10.1016/S0375-9601(03)01115-0, URL https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375-9601(03)01115-0, arXiv:quant-ph/0305190

Smullyan RM (1993) Recursion Theory for Metamathematics. Oxford Logic Guides 22, Oxford University Press, New York, Oxford

Solís-Encina A, Portillo JR (2015) Orthogonal representation of graphs. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1504.03662, arXiv:1504.03662

Specker E (1960) Die Logik nicht gleichzeitig entscheidbarer Aussagen. Dialectica 14(2-3):239–246, doi:10.1111/j.1746-8361.1960.tb00422.x, URL https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-8361.1960.tb00422.x, english traslation at https://arxiv.org/abs/1103.4537, arXiv:1103.4537

Specker E (1990) Selecta. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, doi:10.1007/978-3-0348-9259-9, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-0348-9259-9

Specker E (2009) Ernst Specker and the fundamental theorem of quantum mechanics. URL https://vimeo.com/52923835, video by Adán Cabello, recorded on June 17, 2009

Stace WT (1934) The refutation of realism. Mind 43(170):145–155, doi:10.1093/mind/XLIII.170.145, URL https://doi.org/10.1093/mind/XLIII.170.145

Stairs A (1983) Quantum logic, realism, and value definiteness. Philosophy of Science 50:578–602, doi:10.1086/289140, URL https://doi.org/10.1086/289140

Svozil K (2001) On generalized probabilities: correlation polytopes for automaton logic and generalized urn models, extensions of quantum mechanics and parameter cheats. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0012066, arXiv:quant-ph/0012066

Svozil K (2002) Quantum information in base n defined by state partitions. Physical Review A 66:044,306, doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.66.044306, URL https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.66.044306, arXiv:quant-ph/0205031

Svozil K (2004) Quantum information via state partitions and the context translation principle. Journal of Modern Optics 51:811–819, doi:10.1080/09500340410001664179, URL https://doi.org/10.1080/09500340410001664179, arXiv:quant-ph/0308110

Svozil K (2005) Logical equivalence between generalized urn models and finite automata. International Journal of Theoretical Physics 44:745–754, doi:10.1007/s10773-005-7052-0, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s10773-005-7052-0, arXiv:quant-ph/0209136

Svozil K (2009a) Proposed direct test of a certain type of noncontextuality in quantum mechanics. Physical Review A 80(4):040102, doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.80.040102, URL https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.80.040102

Svozil K (2009b) Quantum scholasticism: On quantum contexts, counterfactuals, and the absurdities of quantum omniscience. Information Sciences 179:535–541, doi:10.1016/j.ins.2008.06.012, URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2008.06.012

Svozil K (2012) How much contextuality? Natural Computing 11(2):261–265, doi:10.1007/s11047-012-9318-9, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/s11047-012-9318-9, arXiv:1103.3980

Svozil K (2016) Quantum hocus-pocus. Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics (ESEP) 16(1):25–30, doi:10.3354/esep00171, URL https://doi.org/10.3354/esep00171, arXiv:1605.08569

Svozil K (2017a) Classical versus quantum probabilities and correlations. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.08915, arXiv:1707.08915

Svozil K (2017b) Quantum clouds. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1808.00813, arXiv:1808.00813

Svozil K (2018a) Kolmogorov-type conditional probabilities among distinct contexts. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.10424, arXiv:1903.10424

Svozil K (2018b) New forms of quantum value indefiniteness suggest that incompatible views on contexts are epistemic. Entropy 20(6):406(22), doi:10.3390/e20060406, URL https://doi.org/10.3390/e20060406, arXiv:1804.10030

Svozil K (2018c) Physical [A]Causality. Determinism, Randomness and Uncaused Events. Springer, Cham, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-70815-7, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-70815-7

Sylvia P, Majernik V (1992) Bell inequalities on quantum logics. Journal of Mathematical Physics 33:2173–2178, doi:10.1063/1.529638, URL https://doi.org/10.1063/1.529638

Ursic S (1984) A linear characterization of NP-complete problems. In: Shostak RE (ed) 7th International Conference on Automated Deduction: Napa, California, USA May 14–16, 1984 Proceedings, Springer New York, New York, pp 80–100, doi:10.1007/978-0-387-34768-4"¨5, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-34768-4_5

Ursic S (1986) Generalizing fuzzy logic probabilistic inferences. In: Proceedings of the Second Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, AUAI Press, Arlington, Virginia, United States, UAI'86, pp 303–310, URL http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=3023712.3023752, arXiv:1304.3114

Ursic S (1988) Generalizing fuzzy logic probabilistic inferences. In: Lemmer JF, Kanal LN (eds) Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence 2 (UAI1986), North Holland, Amsterdam, pp 337–362

Vermaas PE (1994) Comment on "getting contextual and nonlocal elements-of-reality the easy way". American Journal of Physics 62:658, doi:10.1119/1.17488, URL https://doi.org/10.1119/1.17488

Vorob'ev NN (1962) Consistent families of measures and their extensions. Theory of Probability and Its Applications 7:147–163, doi:10.1137/1107014, URL https://doi.org/10.1137/1107014

Weihs G, Jennewein T, Simon C, Weinfurter H, Zeilinger A (1998) Violation of Bell's inequality under strict Einstein locality conditions. Physical Review Letters 81:5039–5043, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.5039, URL https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.5039

Wright R (1978) The state of the pentagon. A nonclassical example. In: Marlow AR (ed) Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Theory, Academic Press, New York, pp 255–274, URL https://www.elsevier.com/books/mathematical-foundations-of-quantum-theory/marlow/

978-0-12-473250-6
Wright R (1990) Generalized urn models. Foundations of Physics 20(7):881–903, doi:10.1007/BF01889696, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01889696
Zeilinger A (1999) A foundational principle for quantum mechanics. Foundations of Physics 29(4):631–643, doi:10.1023/A:1018820410908, URL https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018820410908
Zierler N, Schlessinger M (1965) Boolean embeddings of orthomodular sets and quantum logic. Duke Mathematical Journal 32:251–262, doi:10.1215/S0012-7094-65-03224-2, URL https://doi.org/10.1215/S0012-7094-65-03224-2, reprinted in Ref. Zierler and Schlessinger (1975)
Zierler N, Schlessinger M (1975) Boolean embeddings of orthomodular sets and quantum logic. In: Hooker CA (ed) The Logico-Algebraic Approach to Quantum Mechanics: Volume I: Historical Evolution, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp 247–262, doi:10.1007/978-94-010-1795-4˙14, URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-1795-4_14