

# Bell inequalities and counterfactual definiteness

Justo Pastor Lambare

## Abstract

Counterfactual definiteness is widely considered as one of the key assumptions necessary for the obtention of Bell inequalities although J. S. Bell did not explicitly mention such a hypothesis in his celebrated 1964 theorem. We explain why Bell's omission was not because he considered it a natural implicit assumption but because it is indeed unnecessary for the obtention of his inequality. We point out the inconsistent way the counterfactual definiteness hypothesis is used by many researchers and that, although it passes unnoticed most of the times because it does not alter Bell theorem's final conclusions, it is fundamentally incorrect and has caused much confusion in some quarters that reject the Bell theorem owed to problems related with this inconsistent presumption. We explain the natural assumption that is implicit in the mathematical operations that lead to the inequalities and, although it is seldom explicitly elucidated, avoids the inconsistent use of the counterfactual definiteness hypothesis.

## 1 Introduction

John S. Bell conceived his theorem as a continuation of the Einstein, Podolski and Rosen [1] criticism on the completeness of quantum theory and although his result analytically proved the impossibility for local realistic theories to reproduce the statistical predictions of quantum mechanics, it is considered that the last word resides in the experimental verification of his inequalities.

There are different versions of Bell theorem and Bell inequalities, hence to simplify the discussion, we will mainly concentrate on the 1964 version of the theorem [2] and use the Clauser, Horn, Shimmony, Holt (CHSH) [3] form of Bell inequality.

Bell theorem may also have different interpretations, so in that sense, it is controversial. Although Bell himself interpreted it as bearing exclusively on locality matters [4–7] many physicists and philosophers of science interpret it as a dual condition on locality and realism [8–11].

Our intention is not to challenge the implications of the Bell theorem regarding locality and realism but to disprove the uncanny claim that Bell inequalities require some strong form of counterfactual reasoning a stance that, notwithstanding its contradictory nature, has become so widespread that it can be considered to be an orthodox view. That said, it is important to point out the the problems addressed here are not universal and many authors, including John Bell himself, correctly avoid the use of the puzzling assumption we explain and refute.

It is also important to warn students and teachers of these incorrect presentations of the Bell inequalities because they are commonly found in the literature and are particularly attractive because they simplify the derivation to a certain extent. [12]

Before proceeding any further we recall the definition of counterfactual definiteness:

**Counterfactual Definiteness(CFD)** is defined as the assumption allowing one to assume the definiteness of results of measurements, which were actually not performed on a given individual system.

Although this mild form of counterfactual definiteness is characteristic of classical realistic theories, the way CFD is usually and incorrectly understood when used to derive Bell inequalities is a modified stronger version:

**Strong Counterfactual Definiteness(SCFD)** is defined as the assumption allowing one to assume that a theoretical result based on experiments, some of which are not supposed to be performed or are impossible to execute, can be compared and contrasted with results obtained through actually performed experiments.

More specifically our intention is not to prove that counterfactual definiteness does not enter in any form into the Bell theorem underlying assumptions, but to refute the common idea that the process of deriving the inequality associated with the theorem requires in a fundamental way the strong version of such hypothesis.

Given that the term strong counterfactual definiteness does not exist in the literature and that both versions, CFD and SCFD are not differentiated, whenever we refer to counterfactual definiteness in the strong sense, we will add the acronym SCFD in parenthesis.

We prove, not only that SCFD is a stronger assumption than CFD, but that it is mathematically inconsistent. Perhaps the best way to perceive the problem is through a concrete example showing the difference between CFD and SCFD highlighting the inconsistent nature of the latter. We include such an example in appendix A.

Claims for the need of the counterfactual definiteness(SCFD) assumption for the obtention of Bell inequalities are frequently found in the literature [8, 11, 13–30]. It is also supported by those who see the theorem as an irrelevant and erroneous result [13–20], often because of its use.

## 2 Derivation of the Bell Inequality

We succinctly review a derivation of the inequality to identify the origin of the problem.

- $A(a_1, \lambda)$ : spin value ( $\pm 1$ ) measured by Alice in direction  $a_1$ .
- $A(a_2, \lambda)$ : spin value ( $\pm 1$ ) measured by Alice in direction  $a_2$ .
- $B(b_1, \lambda)$ : spin value ( $\pm 1$ ) measured by Bob in direction  $b_1$ .
- $B(b_2, \lambda)$ : spin value ( $\pm 1$ ) measured by Bob in direction  $b_2$ .

The correlation term is given by

$$E(a_i, b_k) = \int \rho(\lambda) A(a_i, \lambda) B(b_k, \lambda) d\lambda; \quad i, k \in \{1, 2\} \quad (1)$$

By adequately adding the correlation terms

$$S = E(a_1, b_1) - E(a_1, b_2) + E(a_2, b_1) + E(a_2, b_2) \quad (2)$$

$$= \int \rho(\lambda) C(\lambda) d\lambda \quad (3)$$

$$|S| \leq \int \rho(\lambda) |C(\lambda)| d\lambda \quad (4)$$

$$\leq \int \rho(\lambda) 2 d\lambda \quad (5)$$

$$\leq 2 \int \rho(\lambda) d\lambda \quad (6)$$

$$\leq 2 \quad (7)$$

The term  $C(\lambda)$  in (3) is given by

$$A(a_1, \lambda)B(b_1, \lambda) - A(a_1, \lambda)B(b_2, \lambda) + A(a_2, \lambda)B(b_1, \lambda) + A(a_2, \lambda)B(b_2, \lambda) \quad (8)$$

The last equation is a crucial step of the derivation and a source of bewilderment because it is necessary to have the same value of  $\lambda$  in the four addends of (8) to properly factorize the equation and find the bound of 2 for  $|S|$ . Another derivation using summation symbols instead of integrals is given in appendix B.

### 3 Genesis of the Allegations. Use of not Performed Measurements

The inappropriate assessment of expression (8) is the source of the allegations for the need of the counterfactual definiteness hypothesis(SCFD).

Each term in (8) is the product of two numbers  $A(a_i, \lambda)$  and  $B(b_k, \lambda)$  measured on each member of an entangled pair of particles; considering that the equation contains four such terms then a total of four different generating events are needed, however it is impossible to generate four pairs with the same  $\lambda$  value since the experimenter has no control over the hidden variables.

Thus, a way out of this impasse is to posit the assumption that only one term of (8) is factual while the other three merely represent results not actually measured. Henry Pierce Stapp [29] conveniently expressed this as:

*Of these eight numbers only two can be compared directly to experiment. The other six correspond to the three alternative experiments that could have been performed but were not.*

Unless we postulate the strong form of the counterfactual definiteness hypothesis, this interpretation reduces (8), and therefore the CHSH inequality, to an unfalsifiable thought experiment since a theoretical result including results of experiments which are not supposed to be performed, by its very definition, cannot be contrasted with results obtained in actually performed experiments, or as Asher Peres once put it [28]:

*Unperformed experiments have no results.*

Peres' dictum sometimes is ascribed a quantum mechanical meaning, *i.e.*, it is only quantum mechanics which forbids unperformed experiments to have any definite result while in classical physics, being a realistic theory, it is permitted to talk about the definiteness of results of unperformed experiments.

However, even admitting that in a classical model, not performed experiments do have definitive results(CFD), this cannot bridge the logical inconsistency implied by the comparison of results obtained through actually performed experiments with theoretical results obtained under the condition that parts of those experiments were not performed(SCFD).

An example of a practical case showing the use of SCFD, and its difference with CFD, is included in appendix A.

## 4 Impossible to Perform Measurements

There is another common and equally inappropriate although slightly different assessment of (8) that brings in counterfactual reasoning(SCFD) in the form of *mutually incompatible or exclusive experiments*. In this case (8) is supposed to imply the simultaneous unrealizable measurements of the spin of a single particle in two different directions. Recently Joy Christian [17,18], adopting this interpretation of (8), called it

*Surprising oversight in the derivation of the Bell-CHSH inequalities.*

According to Joy, given this *serious conceptual oversight*, Bell's theorem does not even deserve to be considered a mathematical theorem in the strict sense

Event#	A's result	B's result	A's setting	B's setting	$\lambda$
1	+1	-1	$a_1$	$b_1$	unknown
2	-1	+1	$a_2$	$b_2$	unknown
3	-1	+1	$a_2$	$b_1$	unknown
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$

Table 1: Experimental Results

of the word; we may agree with Joy Christian in that there is a serious conceptual oversight however it is unfair to ascribe it to John Stewart Bell.

Another interpretation of Bell inequalities claiming the existence of incompatible measurements associated with the existence or nonexistence of joint probabilities is addressed in appendix C

## 5 Interpretation not Involving Counterfactual Definiteness(SCFD)

To interpret (8) properly, it is necessary to consider the following points:

- It is crucial to appreciate that (8) does not “literally” represent one experiment nor it implies any constraint on the experimental procedure; it is merely a mathematical expression formed with data obtained through already performed experiments.
- The four different experimental results in (8) were arranged to contain the same value of  $\lambda$  by reordering all the data obtained after the whole Bell test was completed and is the consequence of a hypothesis of “statistical regularity”(more on that ahead).
- The value of  $\lambda$  is unknown, and it is not even known to exist, which does not mean that we can simply delete them(unless careful assumptions are stated<sup>1</sup>) because they incarnate the agents of “physical reality” that are supposed to restore local realism.

Table 1 shows a summary of the actual data that would be obtained in an idealized experiment with 100% percent detection efficiency. A and B stand

---

<sup>1</sup>See, for instance, A. Legget [31]

for Alice and Bob, respectively. Each row corresponds to a single generating event that is assigned the same “unknown” value of the hidden variable. Please notice that unlike Richard Gill’s counterfactual spreadsheet [11], table 1 does not contain unobserved values.

The experimental data in table 1 do not allow one to directly evaluate the conflictive equation (8) because one would not know how to choose from it four distinct rows that would correspond to the same values of hidden variables, however they do allow us to calculate each term of (2) which is all we need to know. An example showing the correct interpretation of (8) through the use of a naive analogy is given in appendix D.

What then is the use of the outrageous equation (8)?, steps (3) through (7) in the derivation are used to evaluate what the final result would be if the assumed hypotheses are valid and in that sense (8) is a fundamental piece of the derivation. The main assumed hypotheses that permit us to write (8) are:

1. Existence of the functions

$$A : [0, 2\pi] \times (-\infty, +\infty) \rightarrow \{-1, +1\} \quad (9)$$

$$B : [0, 2\pi] \times (-\infty, +\infty) \rightarrow \{-1, +1\} \quad (10)$$

2. After the experiment has been run for a sufficiently long time, all values of  $\lambda$  are randomly repeated for the different settings used in the experiment. It is this implicit assumption that legitimizes the rearrangement of the registered data in four groups as in (8). However, it must be clear that this reordering is purely conceptual, not because some rows in table 1 are counterfactual, but because we do not know the corresponding values of  $\lambda$ .

Notice that violation of the inequality is usually ascribed to the infringement of the first hypothesis. The second hypothesis is what Willy De Baere [32] termed *The reproducibility hypothesis* and probably its violation is not an interesting alternative from a physical point of view otherwise it should have been noticed long time ago as a possible loophole.

## 6 Possible Loopholes

We are interested only in theoretical loopholes, i.e., some hidden assumptions that may be violated, and we did not mention explicitly. The most obvious

are the following.

- Contextuality. Our derivation did not consider the hidden variables of the measuring devices.
- Free will. We did not mention that the parties can freely choose their device settings and that they are supposed to be uncorrelated with the hidden variables.

Though it is possible to find more *hidden assumptions*(see for instance *ref.* [9]), none of them are related to any form of counterfactual reasoning and the ones mentioned before can be considered to be the most important and were discussed elsewhere [19, 33–35].

## 7 Conclusions

We have shown that the common reliance on the counterfactual definiteness hypothesis(SCFD) for the obtention of Bell inequalities can be avoided through the use a more realistic assumption, namely, a “statistical regularity” that De Baere<sup>2</sup> dubbed the reproducibility hypothesis.

The attainment of the bound equal to 2 in the CHSH inequality does not necessarily imply the use of results of experiments that were not or that cannot be performed; if that were the case, the CHSH inequality could have been considered unfalsifiable rendering useless all experiments designed to test it.

The most natural way of interpreting equation (8) probably was so evident to Bell<sup>3</sup> that he never bothered to painstakingly explain the assumptions implied in the passage from step (2) to step (3) of his derivation, namely:

- The four different experiments in (2) imply the same range of hidden variables.
- The four different experiments in (2) imply the same relative frequencies, *i.e.*, the same distribution function  $\rho$ .
- Application of the commutative, associative and distributive properties of the arithmetic operations involved.

---

<sup>2</sup>Ironically De Baere used his hypothesis to reject the theorem [32]

<sup>3</sup>Bell’s 1964 derivation does not follow exactly the one presented here, but the general idea applies equally.



From a strictly mathematical viewpoint the three conditions above may be seen as reducing to the *free will hypothesis*, however, from a physical standpoint it is more than that, it also demands the reproducibility hypothesis, i.e., it is not sufficient the simple independence of  $\rho$  from the device settings; it is also necessary that the  $\lambda$  values be repeated for different experiments performed with different settings (see B). A quantitative analysis of how much violation of this principle is admissible for the inequalities to hold may be relevant as a possible loophole. Michael Hall [36] has made a quantitative analysis on relaxing *measurement independence* that may be interpreted as including a relaxation on *free will* and also on *reproducibility hypothesis*.

Although claims for the need of SCFD began in the early '70s [29], perhaps Bell could not anticipate that it would become an orthodox understanding of his derivation for both, those who accept his theorem and, those who reject it often because of its use.

However, there was one occasion that, under the request of an editor, Bell responded to some refutations of the theorem and among them was one in which the authors of an article [37], perplexed by the explicit appearance of the same value of hidden variable in more than one pair of entangled particles, misinterpreted an expression similar to (8) as implying multiple measurements on the same particle, a stance that later became to be known by the expression *mutually incompatible or exclusive experiments*, Bell's response was [38]:

*But by no means. We are not at all concerned with sequences of measurements on a given particle, or of pairs of measurements on a given pair of particles. We are concerned with experiments in which for each pair the "spin" of each particle is measured once only.*

This passage shows that Bell definitively rejected the *mutually incompatible experiments* idea, and we can reasonably surmise that if he intended to use the infamous *unperformed experiments* instead, he would have explicitly noticed it.

We contend that the reproducibility hypothesis is a much more acceptable assumption than SCFD, that it is naturally suggested by the mathematical manipulations Bell implemented in his derivations, and that to relinquish local realism we need a more compelling rationale than the logical contradiction implied by the strong counterfactual definiteness argument.

We can distinguish three different attitudes among researchers who consider counterfactual definiteness(SCFD) a necessary hypothesis:

- Tolerance. Those who consider it an inoffensive form of realism and nothing more [6, 8, 20, 22, 26–30].
- Rejection. Those who see in the hypothesis a reason to dismiss the implications of the theorem [13–17, 19, 21].
- Reconciliation. Those who look for ways to fix it in order to save the theorem [11, 23–25].

Part of the allegations regarding the requirement of the counterfactual definiteness hypothesis(SCFD) may also be attributed to a common negligent derivation of the inequalities as discussed in *ref.* [12].

Finally, the important message that can be retrieved from our discussion is that to avoid spreading confusion in the future, it is important to include the statistical regularity hypothesis along with other usually stated assumptions such as free will, as well as an explication of the meaning of (8) as a mere reordering of data collected in already performed measurements and not as representing impossible or not performed experiments.

## A Example for CFD vs. SCFD

We present here an hypothetical experiment and a theoretical calculation using SCFD for the prediction of its result hoping to make evident the inconsistent use of CFD. We insist the the problem does not consist in denying the possibility of CFD correctly predicting what would have been the result of an experiment if instead of measuring with this setting the experimenter would have used this other setting, etc.; the problem consists in the comparison of the result of a hypothetical experiment that cannot be actually reproduced with the result a real experiment.

Our experiment involves two groups comprised of two persons, Alice and Betty in group one and Bob and John in group two. Each group lives in different countries but they synchronize their watches and at a previously accorded time each group gets together to generate a list of  $N$  numbers chosen out of two possibilities: 1 and  $-1$ . The member to choose the number in each group is decided by coin tossing in  $N$  different events. Technical details, that

we do not need to consider, assure that coin tossing and the election of numbers take place as space-like separated events.

The list of  $N$  numbers generated by each group will be sent to an experimental physicist who will evaluate the expression.

$$S_f = |\langle A^{(1)}B^{(1)} \rangle - \langle A^{(1)}B^{(2)} \rangle + \langle A^{(2)}B^{(1)} \rangle + \langle A^{(2)}B^{(2)} \rangle| \quad (11)$$

where  $\langle A^{(1)}B^{(1)} \rangle$  is the average of the products of the numbers chosen by Alice and Bob,  $\langle A^{(1)}B^{(2)} \rangle$  the average corresponding to Alice and John and similarly  $\langle A^{(2)}B^{(1)} \rangle$  and  $\langle A^{(2)}B^{(2)} \rangle$  for Betty. The subindex  $f$  in  $S$  indicates that the average is evaluated with the experimental results that were actually performed.

To predict the outcome of the experiment we will assume that our physicist is one of the supporters of the use of SCFD. Let us call “an event” the simultaneous joint election of a number by one member of each group, then assuming CFD we can define the following mathematical expression associated with event  $\#j$ <sup>4</sup>

$$s_j = A_j^{(1)}B_j^{(1)} - A_j^{(1)}B_j^{(2)} + A_j^{(2)}B_j^{(1)} + A_j^{(2)}B_j^{(2)} \quad (12)$$

Each event generates only one term contained in (12), the other three are results of experiments that could have been performed but were not. In fact, suppose Alice chose the number represented by  $A_j^{(1)}$  and Bob the number  $B_j^{(1)}$  yielding the result  $A_j^{(1)}B_j^{(1)}$  then, if instead of Bob, it was John who chose the number  $B_j^{(2)}$  the result would have been  $A_j^{(1)}B_j^{(2)}$  instead of  $A_j^{(1)}B_j^{(1)}$  and similarly for the other two counterfactual results. We also have

$$s_j = A_j^{(1)}(B_j^{(1)} - B_j^{(2)}) + A_j^{(2)}(B_j^{(1)} + B_j^{(2)}) \quad (13)$$

$$s_j = \pm 2 \quad (14)$$

From (12) and (14)

$$\langle s_j \rangle = \langle A_j^{(1)}B_j^{(1)} \rangle - \langle A_j^{(1)}B_j^{(2)} \rangle + \langle A_j^{(2)}B_j^{(1)} \rangle + \langle A_j^{(2)}B_j^{(2)} \rangle$$

$$|\langle s_j \rangle| = \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_j s_j \right| \quad (15)$$

$$|\langle s_j \rangle| \leq 2 \quad (16)$$

$$S_{cf} \leq 2 \quad (17)$$

---

<sup>4</sup>We are following a derivation given by Eberhard [27] which is typical of authors using SCFD.

The subindex  $cf$  indicates that  $S_{cf}$  is evaluated including counterfactual results, i.e, experiments that could have been performed but were not. It is interesting to notice that, if we are going to take SCFD seriously, the above derivation does not suffer from the “*finite statistical loophole*” [39] since the result is assured independently of  $N$ . This fact alone should be enough to turn on an inconsistency alarm.

On the other hand, even accepting that the results of the not performed measurements are counterfactually definite(CFD), this does not justify the assumption  $S_f = S_{cf}$ (SCFD); however, the physicist is convinced that the experiment is according to the dictates of local realism and, especially after the famous loophole-free 2015 experiments [40–42], is sure to use SCFD, that for him is the same as CFD, to predict the result of an actual experiment and assumes that  $S_f = S_{cf}$ , i.e., he is convinced that no matter what selection of numbers are made by the people in each group, the result cannot surpass the bound 2.

He decides to challenge a psychologist to actually run the experiment and bets him 50 to 1(odds 50/1) that  $S_f \leq 2$ . The psychologist notices that it is not impossible to obtain a result  $2 > S_f$  and decides to accept the physicist’s challenge. In fact, it is not hard to imagine combinations of results that would yield  $2 < S_f \leq 4$ .

The present example does not pretend to be a counterexample for the Bell theorem, it is only an example of the inapplicability of the strong counterfactual hypothesis(SCFD) that, contrary to orthodox wisdom, it is an assumption that goes far beyond the realism hypothesis or counterfactual definiteness(CFD).

It is also important to notice at this point that it is not a problem to add hypothetical terms to a mathematical expression whenever those terms add to zero, i.e., they do not change the value of the equation. Although this observation is trivial, it seems that people tend to forget it when it comes to the derivation of Bell inequalities. In fact, the addition of the three counterfactual terms in (12) do not add to zero and this has the following consequences:

- Although the existence of the hypothetical counterfactual terms is warranted by CFD and we can speculate and philosophize all we want with the result obtained with this method, it is mathematically inconsistent to compare this theoretical result with an experimental outcome since there is no experiment that can reproduce what is being calculated.

- Again we insist that there is no problem with adding “imaginary” results, even when they cannot be experimentally reproduced, the problem is when they do not add to zero so they significantly alter the outcome. Since the result obtained with this incorrect procedure is, after all, the correct one, the error generally passes unnoticed, this, however, should not be a justification for its employment. One frequent conceptual mistake committed by those employing SCFD is the belief that they are just making use of the realism hypothesis and, although the realism hypothesis in Bell’s derivation is a controversial issue [4, 10], it does not help to have an incorrect way of using it.
- The result obtained through this method is tautological; for any experimental value assigned to one of the terms in (12), the bound 2 is automatically verified. Thus, the result of any experiment giving two different values  $\{1, -1\}$  and calculated in this manner has the same bound. The contradiction here should be obvious since it is well known that there exists local realistic models that violate Bell inequalities and, being locally realistic, the CFD hypothesis in its SCFD version predicts a bound equal to two. Please notice that the models we mention as violating Bell inequalities should not be interpreted as counterexamples to the Bell theorem<sup>5</sup> but as counterexamples to the use of SCFD to predict an experimental result.

On the other hand, John S. Bell never committed such mistakes although he occasionally used the the trick of adding hypothetical terms in his derivations [43].

## B Alternative derivation of Bell inequality

We repeat the derivation given in sec. 2 using summation symbols to see more concretely how the reproducibility hypothesis arises. We shall follow the derivation given by Willy De Baere [32] in 1984. Now instead of (1) and

---

<sup>5</sup>They are not counterexamples because these models do not satisfy the physical hypotheses considered adequate for spin-entangled systems.

(2) we have

$$E(a_i, b_k) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_j A(a_i, \lambda_j^{[ik]}) B(b_k, \lambda_j^{[ik]}) \quad (18)$$

$$S = E(a_1, b_1) - E(a_1, b_2) + E(a_2, b_1) + E(a_2, b_2) \quad (19)$$

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_j \left( A(a_1, \lambda_j^{[11]}) B(b_1, \lambda_j^{[11]}) - A(a_1, \lambda_j^{[12]}) B(b_2, \lambda_j^{[12]}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + A(a_2, \lambda_j^{[21]}) B(b_1, \lambda_j^{[21]}) - A(a_2, \lambda_j^{[22]}) B(b_2, \lambda_j^{[22]}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Notice that for  $N \rightarrow \infty$  we have

$$E(a_i, b_k) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_j A(a_i, \lambda_j^{[ik]}) B(b_k, \lambda_j^{[ik]}) \rightarrow \int \rho(\lambda) A(a_i, \lambda) B(b_k, \lambda) d\lambda \quad (21)$$

The use of summation symbols makes more conspicuous the fact that a re-ordering similar to (8) allowing for a proper factorization to derive the bound 2 for the inequality, is only possible if we assume in (20)

$$\lambda_j^{(ik)} = \lambda_j^{(i'k')} = \lambda_j; \quad i, k, i', k' \in \{1, 2\}; j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \quad (22)$$

which means that the hidden variables are supposed to repeat its values in the experiments with different settings, allowing (20) to be written as

$$S = \frac{1}{N} \left( \sum_j A(a_i, \lambda_j) [B(b_i, \lambda_j) - B(b_k, \lambda_j)] + A(a_k, \lambda_j) [B(b_i, \lambda_j) + B(b_k, \lambda_j)] \right) \quad (23)$$

Of course, we can assume that all this is implicit when we use the same probability distribution function  $\rho$  for the different settings in the derivation, however, our point is that the use of finite sums in the derivation, instead of integrals, makes more obvious the physical assumptions necessary to accomplish a rational derivation avoiding the appeal to logical inconsistencies such as SCFD. In this case (23), contrary to (17), is subjected to the “*finite statistical loophole*” [39] since the reproducibility hypothesis is statistical in nature and an exact repetition of hidden variables cannot be expected for a finite  $N$ .

## C The Joint Probabilities Conundrum

Even though our intention is not to analyze rejections of the Bell theorem, we discuss this case because it is closely related to the counterfactual defi-

nitensness(SCFD) assumption and it also has caused much confusion in some quarters.

There is a stance that rejects the physical implications of the Bell theorem [13–16, 19, 21, 26] under the disguise of a mathematical theorem of probability theory formulated by George Boole in the mid-eighteen hundreds and later completed by Arthur Fine [44] in the early 1980s. The theorem states necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of joint probabilities.

According to this *Joint Probability Interpretation*(JPI), violations of the Bell inequality,  $|S| \leq 2$ , are consequence of the non existence of a joint probability function for the four “incompatible” measurements in (8) therefore, such violations have no consequence whatsoever on matters of local realism.

Although the first part of the above paragraph is logically correct, the inference that this mathematical interpretation deprives the Bell theorem of its physical implications is incorrect(see below (29),(30) and (31)). There are three possible different misinterpretations contained in the alluded inference that somehow interfere with one another and contribute to the confusion:

First, there are no incompatible measurements in (8) to begin with, as explained in the section 5. The claim that (8) implies incompatible measurements is the reason why the interpretations discussed in sections 3 and 4 recourse to counterfactual definitensness(SCFD), so the JPI stance suffers from the same predicaments explained in those sections.

A second argument upholds that even admitting (8) does not physically imply the realization of incompatible measurements, the mere writing down of such expression already involves the existence of a joint probability, then Boole’s theorem renders the Bell inequality irrelevant as a condition for local realism since the inequality would be tautologically satisfied. Although this reasoning looks appealing when perfunctory taken, it is misleading since it is not forbidden for a mathematical expression to posses different and otherwise unrelated interpretations.

As an example of this kind of incorrect reasoning, let us consider the equation describing the nuclear decay of a radioactive material

$$\frac{dN}{dt} = -kN \tag{24}$$

Supporters of the JPI would claim that (24) is irrelevant for describing the nuclear decay of any substance given that it is well known since Newton’s times that such an equation only describes the cooling of bodies and thus have no implications on matters of decaying substances. However, a correct

interpretation would consider the fact that (24) also describes the cooling of bodies as a subsidiary result which does not prevent the description of nuclear decay by the same equation; likewise, in the Bell theorem case the fact that the inequality  $|S| \leq 2$  is necessary for the existence of joint probabilities does not preclude its interpretation as a necessary condition for local realism, irrespective of the fact that it is correct to assert that violations of the inequality are owed to the nonexistence of a JPI.

Before proceeding to the third case, let us summarize the logical implications so far analyzed. Let the acronyms  $LR$ ,  $BI$  and  $JP$  stand for local realism, Bell inequality and joint probabilities respectively, then the logical relationship between them given by the Bell theorem and the theorems of Boole and Fine is,

$$(LR \xRightarrow{Bell} BI) \wedge (BI \xLeftrightarrow{Fine-Boole} JP) \quad (25)$$

There is no valid argument that starting from (25) can lead to any of the following implications

$$(JP \xRightarrow{Boole} BI) \implies \neg(LR \xRightarrow{Bell} BI) \quad (26)$$

$$(BI \xRightarrow{Fine} JP) \implies \neg(LR \xRightarrow{Bell} BI) \quad (27)$$

$$(BI \xLeftrightarrow{Fine-Boole} JP) \implies \neg(LR \xRightarrow{Bell} BI) \quad (28)$$

The false implications (26), (27) and (28), are very useful to analyze the different arguments, for instance, the fallacious reasoning presented above after the introduction of the acronym JPI is disclosed by (27), since

$$(BI \xRightarrow{Fine} JP) \iff (\neg JP \implies \neg BI) \quad (29)$$

Thus, although, it is true that

$$\neg JP \implies \neg BI \quad (30)$$

this cannot invalidate

$$LR \xRightarrow{Bell} BI \quad (31)$$

The third argument held by the JPI exploits the fact that according to (25), the Bell theorem can be reduced to

$$LR \implies JP \quad (32)$$



Since  $JP$  is a joint probability for measurements that are impossible to perform jointly, the Bell theorem implies a contradiction, therefore, it is itself contradictory. This argument would be valid if the mere mathematical existence of the joint probabilities of measurements enforced its physical realization, however, such an interpretation is unwarranted. A thorough discussion of the physical irrelevance of the existence of joint probabilities in the Bell theorem context can be found in *refs.* [45, 46] by Shimony and Stevlichny *et al.* respectively.

Some researchers have analyzed and devised experiments [26, 47] simultaneously measuring the spin of one particle in two different directions to purportedly conform to the requirements of the CHSH inequality, however, as we have seen such experiments would be unrelated to the actual requirements of a CHSH inequality test as it is also explained in *ref.* [48].

## D Naive Example for eq. (8)

Another trivial example may help us to elucidate better the roll of (8) in the derivation of Bell inequality. Let us say we have five balls in a box supposed to be numbered from 1 to 5, say B1 is the ball marked with the number one and so on. We are not allowed to see the numbers directly, but we are permitted to run the following test to check the correct numbering.

The experiment consists of the random extraction of each ball from the box until it is empty, a clerk, who is allowed to watch the numbers, writes down the number  $i_k$  marked on each ball as they come up in each extraction and is allowed to tell us only the result of adding all numbers after the last ball was extracted.

According to Bell, we can write:

$$\sum_{k=1}^5 i_k = i_1 + i_2 + i_3 + i_4 + i_5 \quad (33)$$

$$= 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 \quad (34)$$

$$= (1 + 5) * 5/2 \quad (35)$$

$$= 15 \quad (36)$$

Thus, using the formula for the sum of an arithmetic progression in (35), the result of this experiment, according to Bell, is 15.

In this example the analogous of (8) is equation (34):

- Like in (8) the real order of extraction is not reproduced by (34)
- Like in (8) the numerical values supposed to exist are conveniently rearranged according to mathematical rules.
- Like in a Bell-CHSCH scenario all the values in (34) would be “real” only the order of the terms is “counterfactual.”
- If the marked values  $i_k$  are called hidden values and the final result calculated by the clerk is not equal to 15, then we would know that there is something wrong with the hidden value hypothesis which is analogous to the case of violation of the Bell inequality.

A difference though between this trivial example and the Bell inequality is that while (8), as usually interpreted, is impossible to reproduce in an experiment, (34) is only highly improbable but not impossible, however, the important point is that neither of them is supposed to be actually reproduced to validate the final result.

## References

- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolski, and Rosen N. Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete? *Phys.Rev.*, 47:777–780, 1935.
- [2] J.S. Bell. On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. *Physics*, 1:195–200, 1964.
- [3] J.F. Clauser, M.A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R.A. Holt. Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variables theories. *Phys.Rev.Lett.*, 23:640–657, 1969.
- [4] T. Maudlin. What Bell did. *Journal of Physics A*, 47:424010, 2014.
- [5] T. Norsen. Against “realism”. *Found. Phys.*, 37:311–454, 2007.
- [6] F. Laudisa. Counterfactual reasoning, realism and quantum mechanics: Much ado about nothing? *Erkenn*, pages 1–16, 2018.
- [7] F. Laudisa. Stop making sense of Bell’s theorem and nonlocality? *European Journal for Philosophy of Science*, 8:293–306, 2018.

- [8] M. Zukowski and C. Brukner. Quantum non-localityit ain't necessarily so.... *Phys. A: Math. Theor.*, 47:424009, 2014.
- [9] H. M. Wiseman. The two Bell's theorems of John Bell. *J. Phys. A*, 47:424001, 2014.
- [10] R. F. Werner. Comment on "What Bell did". *J. Phys. A*, 47:424011, 2014.
- [11] D. Gill. Statistics, causality and Bell's theorem. *Statistical Science*, 29:512–528, 2014.
- [12] J. P. Lambare. On the CHSH form of Bell's inequalities. *Found. Phys.*, 47:321–326, 2017.
- [13] K. Hess. The Bell theorem as a special case of a theorem of Bass. *Found. Phsy.*, 35:1749–1767, 2005.
- [14] M. Kupczynski. Entanglement and quantum nonlocality demystified. *AIP Conf. Proc.*, (1508):253, 2012.
- [15] M. Kupczynski. Causality and local determinism versus quantum non-locality. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 504(1):012015, 2014.
- [16] M. Kupczynski. Bell inequalities, experimental protocols and contextuality. *Found. Phys.*, 45:735–753, 2015.
- [17] J. Christian. Quantum correlations are weaved by the spinors of the euclidean primitives. *R. Soc open sci.*, 5:180526, 2018.
- [18] J. Christian. Bells theorem versus local realism in a quaternionic model of physical space. *IEEE Access*, 7:133388–133409, 2019.
- [19] T. M. Nieuwenhuizen. Is the contextuality loophole fatal for the derivation of Bell inequalities? *Found. Phys.*, 41:580–591, 2011.
- [20] S. Boughn. Making sense of Bell's theorem and quantum nonlocality. *Found. of Phys.*, 47:640–657, 2017.
- [21] W. M. Muynck. *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics, and Empiricist Approach*, chapter The Bell inequality in quantum mechanics, pages 471–478. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002.

- [22] N. Herbert and Karush. Generalization of Bell's theorem. *Found. Phys.*, 8:313–317, 1978.
- [23] S. Wolf. Nonlocality without counterfactual reasoning. *Phys. Rev. A*, 92:052102, 2015.
- [24] B. Skyrms. Counterfactual definiteness and local causation. *Philosophy of Science*, 49 B:43–50, 1982.
- [25] M. R. Forster. Counterfactual reasoning in the Bell-EPR paradox. *Philosophy of Science*, 53:133–144, 1986.
- [26] W. M. Muynck, W. De Baere, and H. Martens. Interpretations of quantum mechanics, joint measurements of incompatible observables, and counterfactual definiteness. *Found. Phys.*, 24:1589–1664, 1994.
- [27] P. Eberhard. Bell's theorem without hidden variables. *Nuov. Cim.*, 38 B:75–79, 1977.
- [28] A. Peres. Unperformed experiments have no results. *American Journal of Physics*, 46:745–747, 1978.
- [29] H. P. Stapp. S-matrix interpretation of quantum theory. *Phys. Rev. D*, 6 B:1303–1320, 1971.
- [30] G. Blaylock. The EPR paradox, Bell's inequality, and the question of locality. *American Journal of Physics*, 78:111–120, 2010.
- [31] A. J. Leggett. *The Problems of Physics*, chapter Skeletons in the cupboard, pages 164–166. Oxford University Press, 1987.
- [32] W. De Baere. On conditional Bell inequalities and quantum mechanics. *Nuovo Cimento*, 40:488–492, 1984.
- [33] *Speakable and Unsayable in Quantum Mechanics*, chapter Introduction to the hidden variable question, pages 36–37. 2004.
- [34] J. S. Bell. Bertlmann's socks and the nature of reality. *Journal of Physique*, 42:41–61, 1981.
- [35] J. P. Lambare. On Nieuwenhuizen's treatment of contextuality in Bell's theorem. *Found. Phys.*, 47:1591–1596, 2017.

- [36] Michael J. W. Hall. Local deterministic model of singlet state correlations based on relaxing measurement independence. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 105:250404, Dec 2010.
- [37] L. De La Peña, A. M. Cetto, and T. A. Brody. On hidden-variable theories and Bell’s inequality. *Lett. Nuovo Cimento*, 5:177–181, 1972.
- [38] J.S. Bell. Locality in quantum mechanics: reply to critics. *Epistemological Letters*, pages 2–6, 1975.
- [39] Jan-Åke Larsson. Loopholes in Bell inequality tests of local realism. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 47(42):424003, oct 2014.
- [40] B. Hensen et al. Loophole-free Bell inequality violation using electron spins separated by 1.3 kilometers. *Nature*, 526:682–686, 2015.
- [41] M. Giustina et al. Significant-loophole-free test of Bell’s theorem with entangled photons. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 115:250401, 2015.
- [42] L. K. Shalm et al. Strong loophole-free test of local realism. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 115:250402, 2015.
- [43] J. S. Bell. On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 38:447–452, 1966.
- [44] A. Fine. Hidden variables, joint probability, and the Bell inequalities. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 48:291–295, 1982.
- [45] A. Shimony. Contextual hidden variables theories and Bell’s inequalities. *Brit. J. Phil. Sci.*, 35:25–45, 1984.
- [46] G. Svetlichny, M. Readhead, H. Brown, and J. Butterfield. Do the Bell inequalities require the existence of joint probability distributions. *Philosophy of Science*, 55:387–401, 1988.
- [47] E. F. G. van Heusden and T. M. Nieuwenhuizen. Simultaneous measurement of non-commuting observables in entangled systems. *The European Physical Journal Special Topics*, 227:2209–2219, march 2019.

- [48] H. P. Stapp. Comments on “Interpretations of quantum mechanics, joint measurement of incompatible observables, and counterfactual definiteness”. *Foundations of Physics*, 24(12):1665–1669, dec 1994.