

A single space-time is too small for all of Wigner’s friends

Jacques L. Pienaar¹

¹*QBism Group, University of Massachusetts Boston,
100 Morrissey Boulevard, Boston MA 02125, USA*

Recent no-go theorems on interpretations of quantum theory featuring an assumption of ‘Absoluteness of Observed Events’ (AOE) are shown to have an unexpectedly strong corollary: one cannot reject AOE and at the same time assume that the ‘observed events’ in question can all be embedded within a single background space-time common to all observers. Consequently, all interpretations that reject AOE must follow QBism in rejecting a ‘block universe’ view of space-time.

INTRODUCTION

If [QBism’s] analysis of “Wigner’s friend” [is] right, the universe is not one in a very rigid sense, but rather more truly a pluriverse.

– Chris Fuchs, Ref [1], p21 (2010).

A number of ‘extended Wigner’s friend’ (EWF) no-go theorems, which combine elements of the classic Wigner’s friend thought experiment with Bell’s theorem, have challenged the assumption of *Absoluteness of Observed Events (AOE)*, namely the assumption that the outcome of any measurement performed by an observer¹ has a unique definite value that is not relative to the observer who measured it [2–13] (for a review, see Ref. [14]). This has led to increased interest in so-called *perspectival* interpretations, which reject AOE; notably this includes QBism [1, 15, 16] and Relational Quantum Mechanics (RQM) [17, 18], among others [19–21].

Here we show that rejecting AOE is not in general sufficient to escape a contradiction with the other assumptions in the aforementioned no-go theorems: one must also reject the implicit assumption that all events can be embedded (when they occur) within a single classical background space-time, *ie.* within a ‘block universe’.

The idea that rejecting AOE introduces a fundamental tension with space-time is not new: Cavalcanti captured the essential point eloquently in a 2021 article on QBism’s account of Wigner’s friend:

If we reject AOE [...] the classical notion of event must also be challenged. In this sense the events that are definite for the friend but not for Wigner could be said to not be in “Wigner’s space-time”, but occurring in a “Wigner bubble”. –Ref [22], p26 (2021).

The radical implication here is that Wigner and his friend cannot regard themselves as embedded within a single

space-time that encompasses all events that occur relative to both of them.

Cavalcanti points out in the same article that QBism has long embraced this radical consequence², citing correspondence with Fuchs dating from 2007 [22, 24]. QBism regards space-time primarily as an “abstract diagram” which any agent can use as a tool to navigate the spatio-temporal aspects of their own experience [15, 25]; as such it should not be mistaken for a *description* of an objective reality independent of the agent. Thus, the fact that multiple agents use the same diagram only implies (at most) that these agents’ experiences individually relate to space-time in a similar way; it does not imply that the space-time diagram describes an ontological ‘arena’ that all agents inhabit, which exists independently of their navigational activities.

Instead, QBism suggests that space-time *cannot* be so unified at the fundamental level: as Fuchs writes in 2011, “The key lesson [of Wigner’s friend] is that each part of the universe has plenty that the rest of the universe can say nothing about. That which surrounds each of us is more truly a pluriverse” [26].

Although this radical move might seem natural to QBists, other perspectival interpretations might wish to take a more conservative line and resist this conclusion. It is therefore important to supplement the qualitative argument with a formal proof that rejecting AOE implies rejecting a single space-time. Here we provide such a proof.

CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS

Since our argument can be made to work for almost any of the extended Wigner’s Friend scenarios discussed in the literature, we shall formulate it using a conceptual framework that is broad enough to encompass all such cases. The typical scenario involves an *experiment* consisting of a set of *observers* labeled A, B, C, \dots , where

¹ We use the term ‘observer’ broadly to mean any entity that can perform measurements; its precise meaning will depend on one’s interpretation of quantum theory.

² Indeed, it is in the very title of Fuchs’ second samizdat: “My Struggles with the Block Universe” (2014) [23].

each observer has access to a distinct set of physical quantities they can measure.

Remark: In order to accommodate perspectival interpretations, it is important that all of the concepts and terminology used here – such as experiment, observers, outcomes, *etc.* – should be understood provisionally as only referring to things which are well-defined relative to some particular observer whose viewpoint we *implicitly* adopt for the purposes of describing the set-up. Whenever we need to make explicit reference to this ultimate observer, we shall refer to them simply as ‘the spectator’. This conceptual device protects our argument from being accused of presupposing ‘a view from nowhere’, which is incompatible with perspectival interpretations.

To continue: in any given *run* of the experiment, each observer chooses to measure one of the quantities available to them and obtains an outcome which may be supposed to exist at least *relative to them*, if not relative to other observers. For simplicity (and without significant loss of generality) we assume each observer chooses to measure just one quantity selected from a set of precisely N quantities accessible to them, and that all quantity measurements have M possible outcomes. Then observers A, B, C, \dots can be associated with variables (conventionally labeled by letters from the end of the alphabet) $x, y, z, \dots \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ representing their respective *measurement settings*, *ie.* the ‘choice’ of which quantity to measure; furthermore the observers’ respective *measurement outcomes* are represented by variables $a, b, c, \dots \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$.

In any given experimental run, we shall assume that all observers are required to communicate (say, via classical channels) their choices of setting variables x, y, z, \dots to the spectator, who may therefore assign definite unique values to all of the setting variables at the end of the run. The situation is different for the outcome variables, since the kinds of scenario contemplated by the no-go theorems entail that the outcome values obtained by some observers may not be communicable to other observers, so no single observer (including the spectator) can have access to all these values at the end of a run.

This raises a question as to whether, in any given experiment, we risk any inconsistency by *assuming* that the outcome variables a, b, c, \dots of all observers simultaneously have definite unique values in each run; this is equivalent to assuming AOE. (Note that if we *do* assume AOE, then we are explicitly *not* adopting a perspectival interpretation, since the presumed outcome values in AOE are uniquely defined for all observers.)

Regardless of whether one accepts the assumption AOE, one might still want to retain another basic assumption, namely that the relevant experiment takes place within a single classical background space-time that encompasses all relevant observers, measurements, and their outcomes; we call this the *classical background space-time assumption (CB)*. For those seeking a more

conservative perspectival interpretation than QBism (*ie.* one which does not necessitate the replacement of block space-time with a ‘pluriverse’ or similar notion) CB is a desirable assumption because it justifies excluding space-time itself from the set of objects that can only be defined relative to some observer. For instance, if CB holds, we can drop the indexical on (say) “observer A ’s space-time” and just refer to a single “space-time” for all observers.

We stress that all the scenarios described in the EWF no-go theorems are, as written, perfectly compatible with CB. Our main result is to prove that this is not generally the case, since a minor modification of any of these scenarios makes it logically inconsistent to maintain CB when rejecting AOE. We prove this in the next section.

MAIN RESULT

Our first step to proving this result is to formalize the assumption CB and prove that it implies a weaker assumption that we call *Absolute Localizability of Observed Events (ALOE)*. ALOE states that all outcome *variables* in an experiment can be simultaneously located in space-time in each run, and their locations in a given run agreed upon by all observers, regardless of whether or not they have simultaneously well-defined *values* for all observers in each run (that is, regardless of whether or not AOE holds).

To make sense of this, it is sufficient to employ an operational protocol that enables the spectator to verify the space-time location of every outcome variable, whether or not its value is defined. Let us therefore imagine that whenever an observer (say A) performs a measurement, she records the space-time co-ordinates of her outcome value at the moment when it occurs relative to herself, using a fixed co-ordinate system previously agreed upon by all observers (which must exist, since we are assuming CB), and subsequently communicates these co-ordinates to the spectator via classical channel, together with her measurement settings. In this manner, the communicated co-ordinates may be taken to conventionally *define* what we mean by “the space-time locations of the outcome variable a ”, regardless of whether or not a has a well-defined *value* relative to the spectator’s standpoint.

We can summarize the basic idea as follows: in order for the variable a to be operationally assigned an absolute location in space-time in each experimental run (hence for ALOE to hold), it is sufficient that (i) a has a unique definite *value* relative to its observer A ; (ii) the observer A can locate a in space-time; (iii) A can communicate the space-time location of a (if not its value) to the spectator. This shows that ALOE can hold even if AOE does not. Thus it would not be logically inconsistent for a perspectival interpretation to maintain ALOE even in the absence of AOE, or to put it in a slogan, to maintain that “measurement outcomes are relative to the

observer, but space-time is shared by everyone”. However, it turns out that this position *is* inconsistent with quantum theory, as we will shortly see.

Having established the meaning of ALOE, we now provide a more formal proof of the fact that CB implies ALOE. First, some definitions: a *space-time event*, or just ‘event’, is a point in a smooth and differentiable (hence ‘classical’) manifold \mathcal{M} , which can be parameterized in any local patch by co-ordinates of the form $x^\mu := (x^0, x^1, x^2, x^3)$, where x^0 conventionally represents the time co-ordinate. Physically, an event is an infinitesimal region of space-time uniquely identifiable by what happens there³.

When an observer (say A) observes an outcome, thereby establishing its definite unique value relative to (at least) himself, it is natural to assume that this happens in the neighbourhood of some space-time event $e \in \mathcal{M}_A$, where \mathcal{M}_A is a manifold that represents the local region of space-time inhabited by A . We may call this assumption *relative locality* of outcomes. Since it does not contravene the assumptions of any of the no-go theorems (and indeed is implicitly presumed by them), we hereafter assume it holds for all outcome variables under consideration.

Let us now restrict attention to (say) A ’s outcome a , and let \mathcal{O}_a be the set of all values that a could possibly take in any given experimental run. Define A ’s *localization map* $\mathcal{L}_A : \mathcal{O}_a \mapsto \mathcal{M}_A$ as the map which assigns each one of A ’s possibly observable outcome values to the corresponding space-time event where A would observe it to occur (in any run when it does occur). Let $\epsilon_a \subset \mathcal{M}_A$ be the image of the set \mathcal{O}_a under the map \mathcal{L}_A . Similar definitions can be made for all observers. The assumption CB then amounts to the following: *there exists an embedding of all observers’ manifolds $\mathcal{M}_A, \mathcal{M}_B, \mathcal{M}_C, \dots$ as submanifolds of some single manifold⁴ \mathcal{M}* . With these definitions, we can now prove the key result:

Proposition: CB implies ALOE. *Proof:* Since all observers’ manifolds can be embedded in a single background space-time \mathcal{M} (per CB), the set of all outcome values which can possibly occur in any given run of the experiment, represented by the union $\mathcal{O}_a \cup \mathcal{O}_b \cup \mathcal{O}_c \cup \dots$, can be mapped onto a corresponding set of events $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{M}$, namely the union $\epsilon_a \cup \epsilon_b \cup \epsilon_c \cup \dots$, where the mapping of each outcome to its corresponding event is simply the localization map for the relevant observer. (Thus, for

instance, A ’s localization map assigns each value of outcome variable a to some event in A ’s manifold \mathcal{M}_A , and the embedding of \mathcal{M}_A into \mathcal{M} identifies every such event with a unique event in \mathcal{M} . Then the absolute space-time location of the variable a in any given run of the experiment is defined to be the element of $\epsilon_a \subset \mathcal{M}$ that corresponds to the value that a takes relative to A in that run). Therefore ALOE is satisfied. \square

The above result makes explicit that the space-time location of an outcome variable can vary with the value of the outcome in each run. However, note that in the kinds of scenarios contemplated by the EWF theorems, if one elects to reject AOE then one cannot assume that all outcomes simultaneously *have* definite values in each run; in such cases the only way to maintain that the outcome *variables* all have well-defined space-time locations in each run (*ie.* to maintain ALOE) is to require that these locations be fixed in each run *independently* of the outcomes’ values. This suggests a way to modify the EWF theorems so as to make it impossible to satisfy ALOE while rejecting AOE, namely, by modifying the set-up such that the space-time locations of the outcomes are correlated with their values.

For a simple example of how this could be achieved, note that in most no-go theorems the significant measurements (*ie.* those performed by the “friends” whose outcomes may not be well-defined relative to other observers) are taken to be projective measurements on logical qubits, without specifying how the qubits are physically implemented. Suppose then that we implement each qubit using the polarization degrees of freedom of a single photon. Detection involves passing it through a polarizing beamsplitter to one of two detectors situated in different locations, and the location of the detector that clicks indicates the value of the measured polarization; that is, the outcome of the measurement is automatically correlated with its space-time location.

With this modification, knowing the space-time location of an outcome (relative to the one who observes it) entails knowing its value, since the two are correlated. Thus, if ALOE is satisfied, then so too is AOE. Conversely, if one wishes to reject AOE as a response to the (suitably modified) EWF no-go theorem of one’s choice, then one is also forced to reject ALOE, and then by the preceding theorem, one must also reject CB.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We remark on two main consequences of the foregoing result concerning locality and space-time in perspectival interpretations.

Firstly, many of the EWF no-go theorems include an assumption of “*locality*”, which one might hope to retain by rejecting AOE; after all, one usually only accepts one horn of a multi-horned dilemma on the condition of being

³ A standard trick is to imagine space-time filled with a sufficiently rich set of ‘test particles’ whose world-line intersections can then be used to uniquely label the space-time events where they occur. Of course, these test particles must be modeled as classical point particles for this to work.

⁴ Of course, \mathcal{M} is implicitly itself the space-time of an observer, namely the spectator; but as remarked at the end of the previous section, CB entitles us to forget the indexical and refer to \mathcal{M} simply as everybody’s space-time manifold.

able to avoid the other horns. However, our result shows that for no-go theorems where ‘locality’ is defined using terms that presume CB, such as ‘space-like separation’ and ‘light cones’, one cannot retain the relevant notion of locality by rejecting AOE.

Although perspectival interpretations cannot therefore be ‘local’ by traditional definitions of that term, it remains possible that they may be compatible with some more nuanced conception of locality that does not require CB. In particular, while both QBism and RQM have claimed to be ‘local’ in some sense [15, 27], these claims have been disputed by others [22, 28], with the criticisms leveraging the fact that the definition of ‘locality’ becomes ambiguous without AOE.

The most direct way to answer such criticisms is therefore to provide an explicit definition of ‘locality’ that does not require AOE. One strategy which appears natural in light of the present work would be to define ‘locality’ as the requirement that *relative locality* holds for each observer (as defined in the previous section). Accordingly, space-time concepts should always be indexed to a specific observer, for instance we may take the “space-time of observer A ” to refer to the manifold \mathcal{M}_A equipped with some metric, such that space-time intervals are only defined between events that occur relative to A and which are therefore embeddable in \mathcal{M}_A .

Secondly, the reader might well be alarmed that interpretations of ostensibly *non-relativistic* quantum theory should have led us to radically revise our notion of space-time, especially since the thought experiments leading us to that conclusion all tacitly assume that quantum gravity effects are negligible. However, this may turn out to be an unexpected feature, rather than a flaw, if it turns out that these questions can be answered within the context of a definite proposal for a quantum structure of space-time. In particular, we speculate that there may be a connection to a currently active field of research in quantum gravity based on a principle of ‘relative locality’ (see *eg.* [29–31]); this remains to be explored.

Acknowledgements: This work was made possible through the support of Grant 62424 from the John Templeton Foundation. The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the John Templeton Foundation. Thanks to John DeBrotta, Rüdiger Schack, Marcus Appleby, Blake Stacey, and Chris Fuchs for feedback on an early draft.

-
- [1] C. A. Fuchs, QBism, the Perimeter of Quantum Bayesianism, arXiv preprint (2010).
 [2] Č. Brukner, A No-Go Theorem for Observer-Independent Facts, *Entropy* **20**, 350 (2018).
 [3] D. Frauchiger and R. Renner, Quantum the-

- ory cannot consistently describe the use of itself, *Nature Communications* **9**, 3711 (2018).
 [4] K.-W. Bong, A. Utreras-Alarcón, F. Ghafari, Y.-C. Liang, N. Tischler, E. G. Cavalcanti, G. J. Pryde, and H. M. Wiseman, A strong no-go theorem on the Wigner’s friend paradox, *Nature Physics* **16**, 1199 (2020).
 [5] M. Pusey, Is QBism 80% complete, or 20%? (2017), YouTube video.
 [6] M. Leifer, What are Copenhagenish interpretations and should they be? (2020), YouTube video.
 [7] R. Healey, Quantum Theory and the Limits of Objectivity, *Foundations of Physics* **48**, 1568 (2018).
 [8] G. Leegwater, When Greenberger, Horne and Zeilinger Meet Wigner’s Friend, *Foundations of Physics* **52**, 68 (2022).
 [9] N. Ormrod and J. Barrett, A no-go theorem for absolute observed events without inequalities on (2022), arXiv:2209.03940 [quant-ph].
 [10] P. Allard Guérin, V. Baumann, F. Del Santo, and Č. Brukner, A no-go theorem for the persistent reality of Wigner’s friend’s perception, *Communications Physics* **4**, 1 (2021).
 [11] H. M. Wiseman, E. G. Cavalcanti, and E. G. Rieffel, A “thoughtful” Local Friendliness no-go theorem: a prospective experiment with new assumptions to suit, *Quantum* **7**, 1112 (2023).
 [12] M. Haddara and E. G. Cavalcanti, A possibilistic no-go theorem on the Wigner’s friend paradox, *New Journal of Physics* **25**, 093028 (2023).
 [13] A. Utreras-Alarcón, E. G. Cavalcanti, and H. M. Wiseman, Allowing Wigner’s friend to sequentially measure incompatible observables (2023), arXiv:2305.09102 [quant-ph].
 [14] D. Schmid, Y. Ying, and M. Leifer, A review and analysis of six extended Wigner’s friend arguments (2023), arXiv:2308.16220 [quant-ph].
 [15] C. A. Fuchs, N. D. Mermin, and R. Schack, An introduction to QBism with an application to the locality of quantum mechanics, *American Journal of Physics* **82**, 749 (2014), <https://doi.org/10.1119/1.4874855>.
 [16] C. A. Fuchs and B. C. Stacey, QBism: Quantum Theory as a Hero’s Handbook, in *Proceedings of the International School of Physics “Enrico Fermi” C* edited by E. M. Rasel, W. P. Schleich, and S. Wölk (IOS Press, Amsterdam; Società Italiana di Fisica, Bologna, 2018, 2018) pp. 133–202.
 [17] C. Rovelli, Relational Quantum Mechanics, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **35**, 1637 (1996).
 [18] F. Laudisa and C. Rovelli, Relational Quantum Mechanics, in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by E. N. Zalta (Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2021) spring 2021 ed.
 [19] R. A. Healey, Representation and the quantum state (2021), to appear in Valia Allori (ed.) *Quantum Mechanics and Fundamentality*. Springer.
 [20] H. Zwirn, Convivial Solipsism as a maximally perspectival interpretation, arXiv preprint 10.48550/arXiv.2310.06815 (2023).
 [21] D. Dieks, Perspectival Quantum Realism, *Foundations of Physics* **52**, 95 (2022).
 [22] E. G. Cavalcanti, The View from a Wigner Bubble, *Foundations of Physics* **51**, 39 (2021).
 [23] C. A. Fuchs, M. Schlosshauer, and B. C. Stacey,

- My Struggles with the Block Universe (2015).
- [24] C. A. Fuchs, private communication (2023).
- [25] N. D. Mermin, Commentary: What I think about Now, *Physics Today* **67**, 8 (2014).
- [26] C. A. Fuchs, Interview with a Quantum Bayesian, in *Elegance and Enigma: The Quantum Interviews*, The Frontiers Collection, edited by Schlosshauer (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011).
- [27] P. Martin-Dussaud, C. Rovelli, and F. Zalamea, The Notion of Locality in Relational Quantum Mechanics, *Foundations of Physics* **49**, 96 (2019).
- [28] J. Pienaar, Comment on “The Notion of Locality in Relational Quantum Mechanics”, *Foundations of Physics* **49**, 1404 (2019).
- [29] G. Amelino-Camelia, L. Freidel, J. Kowalski-Glikman, and L. Smolin, Principle of relative locality, *Physical Review D* **84**, 084010 (2011).
- [30] G. Amelino-Camelia, L. Freidel, J. Kowalski-Glikman, and L. Smolin, Relative locality: a deepening of the relativity principle, *International Journal of Modern Physics D* **20**, 2867 (2011).
- [31] L. Freidel, R. G. Leigh, and D. Minic, Modular Spacetime and Metastring Theory, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **804**, 012032 (2017).