Consistent Histories and QBism

Quantum Foundations · Module 6 — Interpretations

Node 6.5

Position in Knowledge Graph

System: Quantum Foundations **Structural Domain:** Interpretations **Node:** 6.5

Two twentieth-century interpretive frameworks developed after Copenhagen, many-worlds, and Bohmian mechanics, each dissolving the measurement problem in a different way.

Consistent histories — due to Robert Griffiths (1984), Roland Omnès, and in a closely related form to Murray Gell-Mann and James Hartle — is a framework in which quantum mechanics is formulated as a theory about sequences of events (histories) rather than states at fixed times. Classical probabilities are assigned to histories, but only within self-consistent *frameworks*, and different frameworks may describe the same physical situation in mutually exclusive ways. There is no objective collapse; there is no single universal description; there is only the choice of framework plus decoherence.

QBism (Quantum Bayesianism) — due to Christopher Fuchs, Rüdiger Schack, and David Mermin — is a radically agent-centered reading in which the wavefunction is not a physical property of any system but a personal degree of belief held by an individual agent about their own future measurement outcomes. The Born rule is a normative constraint on rational beliefs, and "collapse" is just Bayesian updating when the agent learns a new fact. Measurement is the agent's personal experience.

Both approaches abandon the idea of an observer-independent objective wavefunction. Both reproduce all standard predictions. Both draw on Bayesian probability theory as an organizing principle. They differ in whether there is a shared objective world at all (CH says yes, subject to framework choice; QBism says the only thing "objective" is the formalism itself).

Formal Statement

Consistent histories

A **history** H_α is a sequence of projection operators $P^{(1)}_{\alpha_1}, P^{(2)}_{\alpha_2}, \ldots, P^{(n)}_{\alpha_n}$ at times $t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_n$, where each $P^{(k)}_{\alpha_k}$ projects onto some subspace of the Hilbert space at time t_k. Intuitively, H_α describes a possible sequence of events: "at t_1 the property α_1 held, then at t_2 the property α_2 held, and so on."

The **class operator** for a history is the time-ordered product

$$C_\alpha = P^{(n)}_{\alpha_n}(t_n)\, P^{(n-1)}_{\alpha_{n-1}}(t_{n-1}) \cdots P^{(1)}_{\alpha_1}(t_1),$$

in the Heisenberg picture (so each $P^{(k)}_{\alpha_k}(t_k) = U(t_k)^\dagger P^{(k)}_{\alpha_k} U(t_k)$ for unitary U).

The **decoherence functional** on a set of histories is

$$D(\alpha, \beta) = \mathrm{Tr}\left(C_\alpha\, \rho_0\, C^\dagger_\beta\right),$$

where ρ_0 is the initial state. The set of histories is **consistent** (or **decoherent**) if

$$\text{Re } D(\alpha, \beta) = 0 \quad \text{whenever } \alpha \neq \beta.$$

Equivalently, the diagonal of the decoherence functional gives real nonnegative probabilities $p(\alpha) = D(\alpha, \alpha)$ that sum to 1 and satisfy the classical sum rules. A stronger condition, *strong decoherence*, requires $D(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ for $\alpha \neq \beta$.

Framework-dependence. Two different sets of histories may each be consistent, yet make contradictory claims about what happened. Consistent histories accepts this: the "correct" description of a physical situation depends on the framework (choice of projector set at each time), and different frameworks are mutually incompatible but each internally valid.

QBism

In QBism, a quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ (or density operator ρ) is not a property of any system. It is a **catalogue of personal probabilities** that an agent assigns to the possible outcomes of measurements they might perform. When the agent performs a measurement and learns the result, they update $|\psi\rangle$ by Bayesian conditionalization on the outcome — this is "collapse," and it is not a physical process but a belief revision.

The Born rule is a normative rule: given that an agent holds belief state ρ and will measure POVM $\{E_i\}$, their probabilities for outcomes must be $p(i) = \text{Tr}(\rho E_i)$. Deviating from this rule would make the agent susceptible to a Dutch book — a set of bets guaranteed to lose.

SIC-POVMs (symmetric informationally complete POVMs) play a privileged role in QBism: a SIC-POVM in d-dimensional Hilbert space consists of d^2 rank-one projectors $\{|\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|/d\}$ with $|\langle\phi_i|\phi_j\rangle|^2 = 1/(d+1)$ for $i \neq j$. Any state ρ can be reconstructed from the probabilities it assigns to a SIC measurement, and the Born rule can be rewritten as an "urgleichung" that looks like a deformation of classical total probability. QBists read this as evidence that quantum mechanics *is* Bayesian probability theory for agents in a fundamentally stochastic world, with the deformation encoding the constraints of unitarity.

No objective collapse

Both frameworks reject objective collapse: CH because there is no single objective wavefunction at all, only framework-relative histories; QBism because the wavefunction is personal, so "collapse" is just the agent updating their own beliefs. In both cases, the measurement problem — how to reconcile unitary evolution with definite outcomes — dissolves, because one of the two rules is reinterpreted as something other than a physical dynamical process.

Intuition

Consistent histories. Imagine watching a movie of a quantum system. At each time step, you have a choice of coarse-graining: which properties to "ask about." A framework is a consistent choice of questions at each time, such that the answers can be assigned joint classical probabilities. The key insight is that there is no single privileged framework — you can ask "was the particle in the left half?" at t_1, or you can ask "what was its momentum?" at t_1, but not both in the same framework, because the two questions correspond to non-commuting projectors and do not satisfy the consistency condition. Consistent histories tells you: pick a framework, compute your probabilities, do not mix frameworks. This is a formalization of Copenhagen's contextual "you have to specify your experimental setup" rule, extended to multiple times and framed as a choice of classical sub-theory within quantum mechanics.

QBism. Imagine you are an agent with a catalogue of beliefs about what the universe will do next. Some of your beliefs are "classical" (the coin will land heads with probability 1/2), and some are "quantum" (this photon will be detected at the upper detector with probability $|\alpha|^2$). The quantum beliefs are just beliefs; they live in your head. The universe is not in a quantum state — only *your description of it* is. When you measure, you learn something new, and you update your beliefs. The next time someone asks you to predict something, you use your updated beliefs. There is no physical collapse because there was never a physical wavefunction. The measurement problem dissolves by relocating the wavefunction from the world to the agent's belief state.

Both interpretations take the Bayesian analogy seriously. In frequentist statistics, probabilities are objective features of the world; in Bayesian statistics, they are degrees of belief. The tension between "collapse is a real process" and "collapse is an update rule" mirrors the frequentist-versus-Bayesian tension in statistics, and both CH and QBism are Bayesian in spirit.

The disagreement between CH and QBism is over *whose* beliefs and *how shared* they are. Consistent histories is "objective Bayesian" in the Jaynes sense — the framework is a choice, but once you pick it, the probabilities are determined by the quantum formalism and are the same for anyone using that framework. QBism is "subjective Bayesian" — each agent has their own personal state, and there is no requirement that agents agree.

Structural Role

- **Dissolving the measurement problem through framework relativity.** Both CH and QBism deny that there is a single objective physical state that must either collapse or not. CH says: there are multiple consistent descriptions, each internally classical; the "measurement problem" arises only if you try to impose a single description. QBism says: there is one description per agent, and "measurement" is that agent's own experience.
- **Formalizing Copenhagen.** Consistent histories can be read as a mathematically precise version of Copenhagen's complementarity: Bohr's choice of experimental setup becomes the framework choice, and the Heisenberg cut becomes the coarse-graining at each time. QBism can be read as the radicalization of Copenhagen's epistemic reading: the wavefunction really is only knowledge, and that knowledge belongs to a specific agent.
- **Bayesian reconstruction programs.** QBism is closely tied to attempts to *derive* the Born rule from decision theory and Bayesian rationality (Fuchs's work on SIC-POVMs, Appleby, and others). If successful, these would show that quantum mechanics is the unique consistent extension of Bayesian probability to a world with certain non-classical constraints.
- **Compatibility with special relativity.** Both CH and QBism are naturally local in the sense that there is no objective faster-than-light influence: CH because histories are framework-relative and the framework is a choice made by the analyst; QBism because updates are agent-local and there is no "collapse" propagating across space. This contrasts with Bohmian mechanics, which is explicitly nonlocal.
- **Criticisms.** Consistent histories is accused of proliferating frameworks (there are many consistent sets, and the formalism does not say which to use). QBism is accused of solipsism (if the wavefunction is personal, is the world real at all?) — a charge Fuchs and Mermin dispute by distinguishing between the wavefunction (agent-centric) and the world (which is real but not captured by the wavefunction).

Mathematical Development

The decoherence functional and consistency

Let ρ_0 be the initial density operator and C_α the class operator for history α. The probability assigned to history α is

$$p(\alpha) = \mathrm{Tr}(C_\alpha \rho_0 C_\alpha^\dagger).$$

For these probabilities to obey the classical sum rule — i.e., for the probability of the union of two disjoint histories to be the sum of their individual probabilities — the off-diagonal decoherence functional must vanish:

$$D(\alpha, \beta) = \mathrm{Tr}(C_\alpha \rho_0 C_\beta^\dagger) \approx 0, \qquad \alpha \neq \beta.$$

When this holds, the set is consistent and classical probability reasoning applies within it. Typically, decoherence (Module 5) provides the mechanism: if each projector at each time is coarse-grained over a pointer-basis partition of an environment, the decoherence functional suppresses off-diagonal elements exponentially in the environment size.

Framework examples

Consider a qubit in the initial state $\rho_0 = |+\rangle\langle+|$, evolved trivially (no dynamics), with two projector sets at a single time:

- Framework A: $\{P_0 = |0\rangle\langle 0|, P_1 = |1\rangle\langle 1|\}$. Probabilities: $p(0) = p(1) = 1/2$.
- Framework B: $\{P_+ = |+\rangle\langle+|, P_- = |-\rangle\langle-|\}$. Probabilities: $p(+) = 1, p(-) = 0$.

Both frameworks are consistent and give valid descriptions. They are mutually incompatible: framework A says "the bit is 0 with probability 1/2," framework B says "the bit is + with certainty." Consistent histories says: pick one. Do not try to assign joint probabilities across frameworks — that would correspond to non-commuting projectors and would violate consistency.

SIC-POVMs and the Born rule in QBism

A SIC-POVM in $\mathcal{H}_d$ is a set of d^2 rank-1 operators $E_i = \Pi_i/d$ with $\Pi_i = |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|$ and pairwise overlaps $|\langle\phi_i|\phi_j\rangle|^2 = 1/(d+1)$ for $i \neq j$. A state ρ can be reconstructed from its SIC probabilities $p_i = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho E_i)$ as

$$\rho = (d+1)\sum_i p_i \Pi_i - \mathbb{1}.$$

In QBism, these SIC probabilities are the fundamental objects: the agent's belief state is specified by giving $(p_1, \ldots, p_{d^2})$. The Born rule for an arbitrary measurement $\{M_j\}$ can then be rewritten as

$$q(j) = \sum_i \left[(d+1)p_i - \frac{1}{d}\right] r(j|i),$$

where $r(j|i) = \mathrm{Tr}(\Pi_i M_j)$ is the conditional probability of the outcome j given the "reference measurement" outcome i. This looks like classical total probability $q(j) = \sum_i p_i r(j|i)$ with a characteristic quantum correction. QBists argue this form shows that quantum mechanics is "Bayesian probability with a twist" — the twist being the specific deformation required by Hilbert space structure.

Dutch book argument for the Born rule

If an agent's betting quotients on quantum outcomes do not satisfy the Born rule, a clever opponent can construct a combination of bets that guarantees the agent loses money regardless of outcomes. This is the Dutch book argument, and in QBism it is the normative basis for the Born rule: a rational agent is one whose betting is not Dutch-bookable, and for quantum measurements the unique Dutch-book-free assignment is $p_i = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho E_i)$.

Worked Example

EPR in QBism

Consider an EPR singlet $|\psi\rangle = (|01\rangle - |10\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ shared between Alice and Bob. Alice measures her qubit in the Z basis and obtains outcome 0.

In Copenhagen, one would say Bob's qubit has "collapsed" to $|1\rangle$, and this collapse is nonlocal and puzzling (how does Bob's qubit know what Alice measured?).

In QBism: the wavefunction is Alice's personal belief state about her own future measurements. Before her measurement, she held the belief $|\psi\rangle$ about the joint system; this is a statement about her own betting odds for various joint outcomes, nothing more. When she measures and obtains 0, she updates her belief state. Her new belief about Bob's qubit is $|1\rangle$ — but this is *Alice's* belief, held in Alice's head, not a physical property of Bob's qubit.

Bob, from his perspective, holds his own belief state. He has not yet measured, so his belief about his qubit is still the reduced density matrix $I/2$ derived from the singlet. There is no moment at which Bob's qubit physically collapses, because there is no physical wavefunction. When Alice tells Bob her outcome, Bob updates his belief to match Alice's prediction, but this update is local — the information traveled classically from Alice to Bob.

The nonlocality of EPR, in QBism, is the nonlocality of correlations, not of causal influences. No physical thing happens at Bob's location at the moment of Alice's measurement. The only thing that happens is that Alice updates her personal belief state — and that belief state lives in Alice's head, not in the world. Bell's theorem is a constraint on the joint probability tables of the agents' beliefs, not on hidden variables or causal propagation.

Double-slit in consistent histories

Consider a particle passing through a double-slit apparatus with two possible paths. Three frameworks:

Framework A (which-path): projectors P_L, P_R onto the left/right slit at the intermediate time, plus final position at the screen. If a which-path detector is present, this framework is consistent (decoherence makes $D(L, R) \approx 0$ on the screen), and probabilities add classically: the interference pattern disappears.

Framework B (no which-path question): only project on the screen position at the final time. This framework is consistent (trivially, since it is a single-time measurement), and the probability distribution is the full interference pattern $|\psi_L + \psi_R|^2$.

Framework C (which-path and screen, no detector): tries to assign joint probabilities to "the particle went left" and "it hit position x on the screen." This framework is *not* consistent when there is no decoherence between slit paths, because $D(L, R) = \mathrm{Tr}(C_L \rho_0 C_R^\dagger)$ is generically nonzero due to interference. So one is forbidden from asking "which slit did it go through and where did it land?" in the absence of a which-path detector — not because of physical impossibility but because the joint question does not correspond to a consistent history.

This recovers the standard quantum story: you can talk about which slit (and destroy interference via a detector that decoheres the path) or about screen position with interference, but not both. Consistent histories formalizes this as a rule about which frameworks are allowed.

Cross-Links

- **Module 5.4 (Decoherence mechanisms):** The decoherence functional in consistent histories is driven by the same physical decoherence that selects pointer bases. Consistency is the formal analogue of "branches don't interfere."
- **Module 6.2 (Copenhagen):** Both CH and QBism can be read as mathematical refinements of Copenhagen. CH formalizes the framework-dependence; QBism formalizes the epistemic reading.

- **Module 6.3 (Many-worlds):** Consistent histories can be seen as "decoherent many-worlds without the ontological commitment to all branches being real." QBism goes in the opposite direction — there are no branches, only agent beliefs.
- **Module 10.1 (Bell's theorem):** QBism sidesteps Bell nonlocality by treating the wavefunction as personal; CH sidesteps it by treating frameworks as choices rather than objective facts. Both deny the premise of Bell's theorem that there is an observer-independent joint probability distribution.
- **Module 10.4 (SIC-POVMs):** QBism's mathematical core rests on SIC-POVM structures, which are conjectured to exist in every finite dimension.
- **Statistics — Bayesian inference:** QBism is explicit about its Bayesian character. The Born rule plays the role of a Dutch-book-free prior; measurement updates are Bayesian conditionalization.

Structural Compression

Invariant: There is no objective wavefunction collapse. Quantum mechanics is a framework for assigning (framework-relative or agent-relative) probabilities to events. The measurement problem dissolves because one of its premises — that there is a single objective wavefunction that must either evolve unitarily or collapse — is denied.

Mechanism: Consistent histories: decoherence functional $D(\alpha, \beta)$ vanishing off-diagonal within a chosen framework of projector sequences. QBism: the wavefunction is an agent's personal belief state, the Born rule is a Dutch-book-free constraint, and measurement updates are Bayesian conditionalization.

Cross-System Echo: Bayesian probability theory, in which probabilities are degrees of belief and updates are conditionalizations, is the direct structural cousin of QBism. Framework-relative probability assignments in consistent histories echo the structure of reference frames in relativity — different observers may use different coordinates, and no single one is privileged, but each is internally consistent.

Exercises

1. Write out the decoherence functional explicitly for a two-time history on a qubit with initial state $|+\rangle$, projectors P_0, P_1 at time t_1, and P_+, P_- at time t_2. Determine whether the set is consistent.
2. Show that the decoherence functional's diagonal entries give probabilities that sum to 1 whenever the projectors at each time form a complete set of orthogonal projectors.
3. Construct two consistent frameworks for a qubit that assign mutually contradictory probabilities to the same "event." Explain why this is not a contradiction in consistent histories.
4. For the SIC-POVM in $d = 2$, write out the four projectors explicitly (they are rank-1 projectors onto the vertices of a regular tetrahedron inscribed in the Bloch sphere). Verify the overlap condition.
5. Explain the Dutch book argument for the Born rule: why would an agent with non-Born-rule beliefs lose money to a clever opponent?
6. Describe the EPR experiment from a QBist perspective. In what sense is there no nonlocality, and what does Bell's theorem become in this framing?
7. Argue, structurally, why consistent histories and QBism can be seen as Bayesian refinements of Copenhagen. What does each take from the Copenhagen tradition, and what does each add?

Quantum Foundations · Module 6 — Interpretations · Node 6.5
Concepts: bayesian-updating, conditional-probability, density-matrix
Prerequisites: 6.1
Enables: 6.6

hbar.university — own.your.cognition