

Refutation of the quantum probability rule

© Copyright 2018 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/VL4 with \top as the designated *proof* value, \perp as contradiction, \mathbb{N} as truthity (non-contingency), and \mathbb{C} as falsity (contingency). The 16-valued truth table is row-major and horizontal.

LET: p, q, r, s : E, f, m, n; $\&$ And; $+$ Or; $>$ Imply; $=$ Equivalent, is;

From: Caves, C.M.; Fuchs, C.A.; Manne, K.; Renesi, J.M. (2003). "Gleason-type derivations of the quantum probability rule for generalized measurements". arxiv.org/pdf/quant-ph/0306179.pdf

III. The quantum probability rule, A. Linearity with respect to the non negative rationals: Every frame function is trivially additive, for consider two POVMs, $\{E_1, E_2, E_3\}$ and $\{E_1 + E_2, E_3\}$. Clearly both are POVMs if either is, and the frame-function requirement immediately yields $f(E_1) + f(E_2) = f(E_1 + E_2)$. (3.2)

From this we obtain a homogeneity property for multiplication by rational numbers. We can break an effect nE into m pieces to form the effect $(n/m)E$. Using the additivity property twice, we obtain

$$mf(n/m)E = f(nE) = nf(E) \Rightarrow f(n/m)E = (n/m)f(E) . \quad (3.3)$$

The function f is thus established to be linear in the non negative rationals. We can extend to full linearity by proving continuity.

We evaluate the antecedent of Eq. 3.3 and rewrite it as

$$mf(n/m)E = (f(nE)=nf(E)) \quad (3.3.1)$$

$$((r\&q)\&((s\backslash r)\&p)) = ((q\&(s\&p))=((s\&q)\&p)); \quad \text{FFFF FFF\textu FFFF FFFF} \quad (3.3.2)$$

Eq. 3.3.2 as rendered diverges from contrarity by one value \u .

We weaken the argument of Eq. 3.3.1 by removing either $f(nE)$ or $nf(E)$ since they are equal.

$$mf(n/m)E = (nf(E)) \quad (3.4.1)$$

$$((r\&q)\&((s\backslash r)\&p)) = ((s\&q)\&p); \quad \text{TTTT TT\textu TT\textu TT\textu} \quad (3.4.2)$$

Eq. 3.4.2 is *not* tautologous, diverging by three values of _ .

From Eqs. 3.3.2 and 3.4.2, this means subsequent assertions do not follow. Hence the function f is not established to be linear, and continuity (or homogeneity) of f cannot be proved.

Remark: In 1935 von Neumann stopped "believing" in Hilbert space. Rosinger, E.E. (2004). What is wrong with von Neumann's theorem on "no hidden variables". arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0408191, quoting: Birkhoff, G.D. (1961). Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics. 2:158, American Mathematical Society, with the respective letter dated 13 November 1935.