On the measurement problem with entangled photons and the possibility of local hidden variables

EUGEN MUCHOWSKI

2018-06-11

Abstract – It is shown that there is no remote action with polarization measurements of photons in singlet state. A model is presented introducing a hidden parameter which determines the polarizer output. This model is able to explain the polarization measurement results with entangled photons. It refutes Bell’s Theorem.
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Introduction The polarization behaviour of entangled photons is widely discussed. A general overview is given by Laloe [1]. The paper of Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen (EPR) [2] had initiated a discussion whether the theory of quantum mechanics (QM) is incomplete. The EPR argument when applied to entangled photons says as follows (see also Aspect et al. [3]): suppose we have a pair of entangled photons in singlet state. Both photons are propagating in opposite directions towards polarization measuring devices A and B consisting of polarizing beam splitters and detectors. A coincidence measuring device encounters coinciding events at the two detectors. When after measurement of the polarization of one photon the polarization of the other photon can be predicted in advance with certainty, there must exist an element of physical reality corresponding to this physical quantity according to EPR.

John Bell [4] has stated that it is impossible to explain the predictions of quantum mechanics with a model based upon real local variables. QM were a nonlocal theory, many authors claim [5], and there would be action at a distance in order to have a far distant photon forced to a particular polarization upon measurement of the peer photon. This action at a distance would be faster than light as was experimentally proved by some authors including Weihl [6]. However, it was stated, that no information transport is possible through the quantum channel of entangled photons [7]. Some authors have established nonlocal models in order to explain the predictions of QM, see Leggett [8]. Branciard and others [9] have experimentally falsified Leggett’s model in agreement with QM. Englert [10] has stated “It is true that joint probabilities that result from quantum processes can have stronger correlations than those available by non quantum simulations;” and finally concludes quantum theory is a local theory. This assertion connotes that the measured value is defined before measurement. Otherwise, if the measured value would be created with the measurement, a correlation between the outcomes of measurements at different sides would demand nonlocal effects. The measurement problem is thus closely connected with the EPR paradox. This paper will help to understand the experimental results. Such an understanding is intended to rely on local effects only. An argument is given in Section 2. Following it there are no nonlocal actions involved with polarization measurements of photons in singlet state. In Section 3 a model is presented which describes the behaviour of polarized photons using a statistical parameter. Whether this is in contradiction to Bell’s theorem is also discussed in Section 3. The model will give an idea how entanglement works.

Photons in singlet state do not exhibit action at a distance Suppose we have a pair of entangled photons in singlet state. Both photons are propagating in opposite directions towards polarization measuring devices consisting of polarizer P1 with detectors D1-1 and D1-2 at side 1 and polarizer P2 with detectors D2-1 and D2-2 at side 2. A coincidence measuring device encounters simultaneous events at the two detectors D1-1 and D2-1 or at D1-2 and D2-2, respectively. The polarizing angles can be adjusted at each side.

Figure 1: Temporal sequences of creating and detecting entangled photon pairs. The SEPP (source of entangled photon pairs) emits photons in singlet state \(|\Psi_{12}\rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}(|H_1V_2\rangle - |V_1H_2\rangle)| propagating in opposite directions towards adjustable polarizers and detectors. A coincidence measuring device not seen in the picture encounters matching events. Time axes for each photon are shown at the bottom. At time t_0 the photon pair leaves the source. At time t_1 photon 1 has left the polarizer P1 and is detected in the detector D1-1 at time t_2. At time t_3 photon 2 has left P2 and is detected at time t_4. The polarization angles are defined in the x-y-plane which is perpendicular to the propagation direction of the photons. The coordinate system is left handed and the same for both sides with the x-axis in horizontal and the y-axis in vertical direction. The z-axis is in
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propagation direction of photon 1 and opposite to the propagation direction of photon 2.

The Hilbert space for the combined system is $H_{12} = H_1 \otimes H_2$. Normalized base vectors are $|H_1\rangle$ and $|V_1\rangle$ for system 1 at side 1 and $|H_2\rangle$ and $|V_2\rangle$ for system 2 at side 2. $|H_1\rangle$ and $|H_2\rangle$ correspond to the x-axis and $|V_1\rangle$ and $|V_2\rangle$ correspond to the y-axis. Photon 1, as a convention, is measured before photon 2.

Suppose now the polarizer P1 is set to 0°/90°. Before photon 1 entered the polarizer P1 the pair was in the singlet state $|\Psi_{12}\rangle$. In the following we only look at those photon 1 which are detected in detector D1-1 behind the 0° exit of P1. They are experimentally identified by the identity of the time stamp of the detector click of D1-1. After detecting photon 1 at time $t_1$ in the detector D1-1 we know photon 1 was in state $|H_1\rangle$ between $t_1$ and $t_2$. This is due to preparation by P1.

Upon hitting the detector D1-1 photon 1 has ceased to exist and the singlet state no longer describes the state of the photon pair. Photon 2 must thus be in another state. We can calculate this state from the evaluation of the experimental findings. With the polarizer P2 set to an arbitrary angle $\delta$ the probability $P$ for photon 2 to pass the polarizer at $\delta$ after photon 1 had passed P1 at 0° is according to the experimental results [6] $P = \sin^2(\delta)$.

According to Born’s rule this is possible only if photon 2 was in state $|V_2\rangle$ before measurement at P2 so that

$$P = \cos^2(\delta-90°) = \sin^2(\delta). \quad (1)$$

As there is no physical action upon photon 2 after it had left the source it is in state $|V_2\rangle$ just after $t_0$. There is no action at a distance from photon 1 upon photon 2. Nonlocality is therefore not a necessary consequence of entanglement. The abovementioned does also apply to the detection of photon 1 at any polarization angle $\alpha$ and the polarizer setting $\beta$ at side 2 with $\delta=\beta-\alpha$ because the experimental results are rotationally invariant. Photon 2 is then in state $-\sin(\alpha)|H_2\rangle + \cos(\alpha)|V_2\rangle$ just after $t_0$. With $\delta = 90°$ follows $P = 1$ and photon 2 is found with certainty behind the $\beta$ exit of P2. How it can be understood that the setting of the polarizer at side 1 defines the polarization of photon 2 is subject of the model discussed in the following section.

**Model describing the statistical behaviour of entangled photons**

EPR [2] have stated quantum physics were incomplete as it does not account for the physical reality given by the fact that measured values can be predicted in advance to a measurement as we have seen in the previous section. See Fine [11] for a detailed discussion of the EPR paradox. Below a model is presented which describes the behaviour of polarized photons using a statistical parameter.

That such a model may be in contradiction to Bell’s theorem which forbids the existence of hidden parameters will be discussed also. The model assumptions show which conditions have to be met in order to reproduce the experimental results and to fulfil the requirements of quantum physics. The model should and does explain the following characteristics:

1. The measured value of a polarization measurement is determined before the measurement,
2. The QM predictions of polarization measurements with single photons according to Born’s rule,
3. The mechanism of entanglement by a parameter,
4. The locality of the polarization measurements with entangled photons,
5. Rotational invariance of the polarization measurements with entangled photons,
6. The QM predictions of polarization measurements with entangled photons,
7. The model violates Bell’s inequality,
8. Measurement results of subsequent measurements are not predictable.

![Figure 2: Geometrical derivation of a deterministic distribution of polarized photons onto polarizer outputs. The representation of the photon states occurs in the Bloch circle. The incoming photon has a polarization of 0°. The polarizer is set to the angle $\delta$. We are looking for a rule which determines whether the photon takes the output $\delta$ or the output $\delta+90°$. For this purpose, a parameter is introduced which is evenly distributed over the incoming photons in the value range $-1<\lambda<+1$. By projecting the unit vector with direction $2\delta$ onto the horizontal, the horizontal diameter is divided into the sections of the length $1+\cos(2\delta)$ and $1-\cos(2\delta)$, or after conversion $2\cos^2(\delta)$ and $2\sin^2(\delta)$. Photons with $\lambda<\cos(2\delta)$ are assigned to the polarizer output $\delta$, while photons with $\lambda>\cos(2\delta)$ take the output $\delta+90°$.](image.png)
M4 establishes how the p-state depends on the statistical parameter \( \lambda \).

M5 accounts for the entanglement of the singlet state.

M6 accounts for the fact that photons don’t have a memory of previous states after a measurement.

The six assumptions are described in detail in the following:

**Model assumption M1:**

A propensity state called p-state determines which polarizer output a photon will take. A photon in p-state \( \alpha \) would pass a polarizer set to \( \alpha \) with certainty.

**Purpose:** introducing the physical entity propensity state, called p-state, determining the polarization behaviour

**Model assumption M2:**

A statistical parameter is introduced, the value of which determines in which of two orthogonal p-states a photon is. \( \lambda \) has the value range \(-1 < \lambda < +1\) and a normalized probability distribution \( p(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2} \) with \( \int_{-1}^{1} d\lambda p(\lambda) = 1 \).

**Purpose:** controlling the statistical distribution of p-states

**Model assumption M3:**

Photons from an ensemble in the same p-state have the polarization (state) given by the p-state. This assumption refers to entangled photons only where the polarization of the incoming photons is unknown. With not entangled prepared photons the polarization is determined by the preparation.

**Purpose:** Accounting for the fact that the polarization of entangled photons is unknown but is defined after a measurement at one side as shown in Section 2.

It is assumed that a photon can be simultaneously in different p-states depending on the value of a parameter \( \lambda \) and a chosen direction relative to the polarization of the photon. That means some of the photons with polarization \( \alpha \) are also in p-state \( \beta \) and thus pass a polarizer set to \( \beta \) with certainty. As p-state and polarization are different physical entities ambiguous polarization states are excluded.

Entangled photons are generated by a common source on the side 1 with the polarization \( \varphi_1 = 0^\circ \) and on the side 2 with the polarization \( \varphi_2 = 90^\circ \) or on the side 1 with the polarization \( \varphi_1 = 90^\circ \) and on the side 2 with the polarization \( \varphi_2 = 0^\circ \). We now look at side 1 with the polarizer setting \( \alpha/\alpha + \pi/2 \): Incoming photons have the polarization \( \varphi_1 = 0^\circ \) or \( \varphi_1 = 90^\circ \). Outgoing photons leave the polarizer either through the output with the setting \( \alpha \) or through the output with the setting \( \alpha + \pi/2 \).

Let \( \delta \) be the angle between the polarizer setting \( \alpha \) and the polarization of the incoming photon. Then we get \( \delta = \alpha - \varphi_1 \) and a polarization function \( A(\delta, \lambda) \) can be defined, which indicates the p-state of the photon before a subsequent measurement. \( A(\delta, \lambda) \) can have the values +1 and -1. The representation of the photon p-states occurs in the Bloch circle. From the projection of the double angle \( 2\delta \), a rule can be constructed which determines whether the arriving photon of polarization \( \varphi_1 \) is in p-state \( \delta + \varphi_1 \) corresponding to \( A(\delta, \lambda) = +1 \) or in p-state \( \delta + 90^\circ + \varphi_1 \) corresponding to \( A(\delta, \lambda) = -1 \). See Figure 2. Being in p-state \( \alpha = \delta + \varphi_1 \) means the photon would pass the polarizer output \( \alpha \) with certainty.

**Model assumption M4:**

For \( 0^\circ < \delta < \pi/2 \):

For incoming photon 1 with polarization \( \varphi_1 \) and polarizer P1 setting \( \alpha \) we get \( \delta = \alpha - \varphi_1 \) and we define

\[
A(\delta, \lambda) = +1 \quad \text{for} \quad -1 < \lambda < \cos(2\delta),
\]

meaning photon 1 is in p-state \( \alpha \) given by the polarizer setting and

\[
A(\delta, \lambda) = -1 \quad \text{for} \quad \cos(2\delta) < \lambda < 1,
\]

meaning photon 1 is in p-state \( \alpha + \pi/2 \) perpendicular to the polarizer setting.

**Purpose:** establishing how the p-state depends on the statistical parameter \( \lambda \).

This explains property #1: The measured value of a polarization measurement is determined before the measurement.

With \( \varphi_1 = 0^\circ \) we get \( \delta = \alpha - \varphi_1 = \alpha \).

With \( \varphi_1 = 90^\circ \) and polarizer P1 setting \( \alpha + \pi/2 \) we get \( \delta = \alpha + \pi/2 - \pi/2 = \alpha \) as well and from eq. (2)

\[
A(\delta, \lambda) = 1 \quad \text{for} \quad -1 < \lambda < \cos(2\delta),
\]

meaning photon 1 is in p-state \( \alpha + \pi/2 \) given by the polarizer setting and

\[
A(\delta, \lambda) = -1 \quad \text{for} \quad \cos(2\delta) < \lambda < 1,
\]

meaning photon 1 is in p-state \( \alpha \) perpendicular to the polarizer setting.

Polarizers have two outputs whose polarizations are perpendicular to each other. It must be ensured that, for a given value of \( \lambda \), the same output is always determined regardless of which of the two polarizer outputs is chosen for the determination of \( \delta \). This is achieved by applying different formulas for \( 0^\circ < \delta < \pi/2 \) and for \( -\pi/2 < \delta < 0^\circ \). Let \( \alpha \) be the chosen polarizer output and \( \phi \) the polarization of the incoming photon so \( \delta = \alpha - \phi \).

For the other polarizer output \( \alpha + \pi/2 \) we obtain for the angle \( \delta \) between the polarizer output and the polarization \( \phi \) of the incoming photon

\[
\delta = \alpha + \pi/2 - \phi = \theta + \pi/2.
\]

With \( 0^\circ < \delta < \pi/2 \) it follows \( \pi/2 - \delta < \pi \) which is equivalent to \( -\pi/2 < \delta < 0^\circ \) for the calculation of \( \cos(2\delta) \).

Thus it is defined

\[
A(\lambda, \delta') = -1 \quad \text{for} \quad -1 < \lambda < \cos(2\delta')
\]

\[
A(\lambda, \delta') = +1 \quad \text{for} \quad -\cos(2\delta') < \lambda < 1.
\]

With \( 2\delta' = 2\delta + \pi \) we get

\[
\cos(2\delta') = \cos(2\delta + \pi) = -\cos(2\delta)
\]

and we obtain

\[
A(\lambda, \delta') = -1 \quad \text{for} \quad -1 < \lambda < \cos(2\delta')
\]

\[
A(\lambda, \delta') = +1 \quad \text{for} \quad \cos(2\delta') < \lambda < 1.
\]

Note that with the change of the polarizer exit from \( \alpha \) to \( \alpha + \pi/2 \) the sign of \( A(\lambda, \delta') \) also changes. This means for any setting of the polarizers we can restrict ourselves to the polarizer output with \( 0^\circ < \delta < \pi/2 \) and calculate the measurement results from eqs. (2) and (3).

Geometrical calculations yield

\[
1 + \cos(2\delta) = 2\cos^2(\delta)
\]

and

\[
1 - \cos(2\delta) = 2\sin^2(\delta).
\]

Using equation (2) the horizontally
polarized photon 1 is found behind the output $\alpha$ of the polarizer P1 with the probability
\[ P_\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\pi/2} d\delta = \cos^2(\delta). \]

With $\delta = \alpha$ we obtain the same $P_\alpha$ for a photon in state $|H\rangle$ to be found in state $\cos(\alpha)|H\rangle + \sin(\alpha)|V\rangle$ according to QM from Born’s rule.

This explains property #2: The QM predictions of polarization measurements with single photons according to Born’s rule.

With entangled photons we have polarization measurement also on side 2 denoted with $B(\lambda, \delta)$. Here $\delta$ is again the angle between the polarizer setting and the polarization of the incoming photon. If the incoming photon on side 1 comes with polarization $q_1 = 0^\circ$ the partner photon on side 2 comes with polarization $q_2 = 90^\circ$ and vice versa. In order to account for the correlation between the entangled photons we introduce

Model assumption M5:

*Photons of an entangled pair share the same value of the parameter $\lambda$. The rules for the distribution of the incoming photons onto the two output directions of the polarizer are also valid for the partner photon on side 2.*

This reflects a property of the singlet state with the coordinate systems on both sides being of different handedness with respect to the propagation directions of the photons.

With perpendicular polarizer setting on side 1 and side 2 $\delta$ is equal for both sides and it follows for an entangled pair
\[ B(\lambda, \delta) = A(\delta, \lambda). \]

This explains property #3: The mechanism of entanglement by a parameter and property #4: The locality of the polarization measurements with entangled photons.

For incoming photon 1 with polarization $q_1 = 0^\circ$ and polarizer P1 set to $\alpha$ having incoming photon 2 with polarization $q_2 = 90^\circ$ and polarizer P2 setting $\beta = \alpha + \pi/2$ we obtain from equations (4) and (11)
\[ B(\delta, \lambda) = +1, \text{ for } -1 < \lambda < \cos(2\delta), \]
meaning photon 2 is in p-state $\alpha + \pi/2 = \beta$ and from equation (5) and (11)
\[ B(\delta, \lambda) = -1 \text{ for } \cos(2\delta) < \lambda < 1, \]
meaning photon 2 is in p-state $\alpha - \pi/2 = \alpha$. For incoming photon 1 with polarization $q_1 = 90^\circ$ and polarizer P1 set to $\alpha + \pi/2$ having incoming photon 2 with polarization $q_2 = 0^\circ$ and polarizer P2 setting $\beta = \alpha$ we obtain from equation (2) and (11)
\[ B(\delta, \lambda) = 1 \text{ for } -1 < \lambda < \cos(2\delta) \]
meaning photon 2 is in p-state $\alpha = \beta$. From equation (3) and (11)
\[ B(\delta, \lambda) = -1 \text{ for } \cos(2\delta) < \lambda < 1 \]
meaning photon 2 is in p-state $\alpha + \pi/2 = \beta + \pi/2$, where $\delta = \beta - 0^\circ = \alpha$.

With equations (2) and (5) we see all photon 1 is in the same p-state $\alpha$ for each value of $\delta$ and for $-1 < \lambda < 1$ although from different incoming photons.

From equations (12) and (15) we obtain all partner photon 2 are in the same p-state $\alpha + \pi/2$ for each value of $\delta$ and for $-1 < \lambda < 1$, again from different incoming photons.

Photons selected by polarizer P1 are in p-state $\alpha$ and are part of an ensemble with the polarization $\alpha$. This follows from model assumption M3.

The partner photons 2 are in p-state $\alpha + \pi/2$ and are part of an ensemble with the polarization $\alpha + \pi/2$. This follows from model assumption M3 as well. They are coupled with photon 1 by equation (11).

With photon 1 in polarization state $q_1 = \alpha$ and photon 2 in polarization state $q_2 = \alpha + \pi/2$ we can rotate the coordinate system by an angle $\alpha$ and get $q'_1 = q_1 - \alpha = \alpha - \alpha = 0^\circ$ and $q'_2 = q_2 - \alpha = \alpha + \pi/2 - \alpha = 90^\circ$ and $\beta' = \beta - \alpha$ and $\alpha'=\alpha-\alpha=0^\circ$.

This explains Property #5: Rotational invariance of the polarization measurements with entangled photons.

For incoming photon 1 with polarization $q'_1 = 0^\circ$ and polarizer P1 set to $\alpha' = 0^\circ$ having incoming photon 2 with polarization $q'_2 = 90^\circ$ and polarization P2 setting $\beta'$ we obtain from equation (12) exchanging $\beta$ with $\beta'$
\[ B(\delta, \lambda) = +1, \text{ for } -1 < \lambda < \cos(2\lambda), \]
meaning photon 2 is in p-state $\beta'$ and from equation (13)
\[ B(\delta, \lambda) = -1, \text{ for } \cos(2\beta) < \lambda < 1, \]
meaning photon 2 is in p-state $\beta' - \pi/2$,
with $\delta = \beta' - \pi/2$.

For incoming photon 1 with polarization $q'_1 = 90^\circ$ and polarizer P1 set to $\alpha' = \pi/2$ having incoming photon 2 with polarization $q'_2 = 0^\circ$ and polarizer P2 setting $\beta' = -\pi/2$ we obtain from equation (14) exchanging $\beta$ with $\beta'$
\[ B(\delta, \lambda) = +1 \text{ for } -1 < \lambda < \cos(2\lambda), \]
meaning photon 2 is in p-state $\beta' - \pi/2$ and from equation (15)
\[ B(\delta, \lambda) = -1 \text{ for } \cos(2\beta) < \lambda < 1, \]
meaning photon 2 is in p-state $\beta' - \pi/2 + \pi/2 = \beta'$
with $\delta = \beta' - \pi/2 - 0^\circ$.

The expectation value of a common measurement with polarizers P1 and P2 is
\[ E(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{1} A^* (\alpha, \lambda) \cdot B^* (\beta, \lambda) d\lambda, \]
where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are the polarizer settings at side 1 and side 2 respectively and
\[ A^* (\alpha, \lambda) = A (\delta(\alpha, \lambda)), \text{ where } \delta(\alpha) = \alpha - \alpha = 0 \text{ and } B^* (\beta, \lambda) = B (\delta(\beta, \lambda)), \text{ where } \delta(\beta) = \beta - \alpha - \pi/2. \]
With $A(0, \lambda) = 1$ and $B(0, \lambda)$ from equations (16) and (17) where $\delta = \beta' - \pi/2 = \beta - \alpha - \pi/2$ it follows from equation (20)
\[ E(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{1} \cos(2\lambda) d\lambda - \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{1} \cos(2\lambda) d\lambda = \cos^2(\beta) - \sin^2(\beta) - \sin^2(\beta - \alpha) - \cos^2(\beta - \alpha) = - \cos(2(\beta - \alpha)) \]
The same result is obtained using $A(0, \lambda) = -1$ and $B(\delta(\beta), \lambda)$ from equations (18) and (19).

The probability $P_{\alpha\beta}$ to measure a photon 2 polarization at $\beta$ after photon 1 was measured at $\alpha$ can be obtained from

$$E(\alpha, \beta) = 1^*P_{\alpha\beta} - 1^*(1 - P_{\alpha\beta}) \text{ yielding}$$

$$P_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + E(\alpha, \beta)) = \sin^2(\beta - \alpha).$$

The same result is obtained by the following consideration:

All photons 2 which pass P2 at $\beta$ are in p-state $\beta$ and in consequence of model assumption M3 also in polarization state $\beta$. With the premises of equations (12) and (15) all matching photon 2 are in p-state $\alpha + \pi/2$. Thus $\delta = \alpha + \pi/2 - \beta$ and the probability $P_\beta$ for photon 2 with polarization $\beta$ to be in p-state $\alpha + \pi/2$ can be obtained from equation (10) as $P_\beta = \cos^2(\delta) = \sin^2(\beta - \alpha)$.

This explains property #6: The QM predictions of polarization measurements with entangled photons.

As the expectation value $E(\alpha, \beta)$ from equation (21) does exactly match the predictions of quantum physics it also violates Bells [4] inequality. This explains property #7: The model violates Bells inequality as quantum physics does.

What is the reason for this? Bell did assume the correlation between the measurement at both side must not depend on the setting of the polarizers. This is what is called noncontextuality. This restriction is not necessary for a local model. The model presented is local. The measurement values on each side are determined independent of the setting of the polarizers but the correlation between the measurement values on both side does indeed depend on the setting of the polarizers. This difference is the reason that the model presented here violates Bells inequality whereas Bells model does not.

Bell had cited Einstein [12] "But one supposition we should in my opinion, absolutely hold fast: the real factual situation of the system $S_2$ is independent of what is done with the system $S_1$, which is spatially separated from the former." This supposition is fulfilled with the model above as the measurement values on each side are determined independent of the setting of the polarizers. The rule determining which polarizer exit a photon will take is the same for both sides. Dependencies between the photons on either side originate from the shared parameter $\lambda$ and not from a nonlocal influence of photon 1 upon photon 2.

Model assumption M6:

We assume that $\lambda$ is indeterminate and uniformly distributed after a measurement.

Purpose: accounting for the fact that photons don’t have a memory of previous states after a measurement.

After a preparation the polarizer output of the next measurement is determined by the parameter $\lambda$, but it can not be predicted which polarizer output the photon will pass after a further subsequent measurement. How this indeterminacy is realized can not be said at the moment. However, this is a local effect which applies to single photons as well as to entangled photons. The ensemble of photons covers the full range $-1 < \lambda < 1$ after passing a polarizer and a photon has the polarization $\alpha$ after passing a polarizer with setting $\alpha$. That explains property #8: Measurement results of subsequent measurements are not predictable.

From the model above we get an idea how entanglement works. From the six model assumptions M1-M6 only M3 and M5 refer to entanglement. The other four assumptions apply to single photons as well. Particularly M3 is significant. It states that an ensemble of photons with a particular polarization state can arise from two different input photons. This is the real reason for the rotational invariance of the polarization behaviour of entangled photons.

Results, Discussion and Conclusion

Photons in singlet state do not exhibit action at a distance. Nonlocality is therefore not a consequence of entanglement. Experimental results on entangled photons can be explained without assuming non-local effects. This means measured values are not generated upon the measurement, they already exist beforehand and thus quantum mechanics does not violate the principle of causality, at least for polarization measurements. If the measured value exists before the measurement, the measurement is a selection of existing states. This supports Einstein’s view of the meaning of the wave function as a description of an ensemble.

It was argued by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen [2] quantum physics were incomplete as it does not predict the exact measurement result for each photon. A hidden parameter model was presented, able to complete the formalism of quantum physics for the case of polarized photons. Bell’s Theorem has been refuted by presenting a counter example. Relations between measurement results of the photons on either side do not come from nonlocal effects but rather originate from the shared parameter $\lambda$ which connects them from the moment they are created by the common source. The model also made use of a propensity state which determines a subsequent polarization measurement. According to the model the quantum mechanical state again describes an ensemble. The individual parts differ by the value of a parameter.

However, the model presented above is an enhancement but no replacement of the formalism of quantum physics. Enhancement means that the model correctly describes certain phenomena in detail where QM does not give answers. These phenomena are the polarization measurements at linearly polarized photons including entangled photons where QM only describes probabilities. The model is valid if it is free of contradictions. Generally, the formalism of QM is not in question.
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