

Bell inequalities and counterfactual definiteness

Justo Pastor Lambare

June 9, 2022

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 propose an alternate and more natural assumption that is implicit in the mathematical operations that lead to the inequalities arguing that this interpretation is closer to Bell's views.

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 an orthodox view.

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 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 imaginary results of measurements that were not or are impossible to perform can be compared and contrasted with results of actually performed measurements on a given individual system.

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 the strong version of such a 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.

Claims for the need of the counterfactual definiteness(SCFD) assumption for the obtention of Bell inequalities are frequently found in the literature [8, 11–28]. It is also supported by those who see the theorem as an irrelevant and erroneous result [12–18], often because of the 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 (± 1) measured by Alice in direction a_1 .
- $A(a_2, \lambda)$: spin value (± 1) measured by Alice in direction a_2 .
- $B(b_1, \lambda)$: spin value (± 1) measured by Bob in direction b_1 .
- $B(b_2, \lambda)$: spin value (± 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 λ in the four addends of (8) to properly factorize the equation and find the bound of 2 for $|S|$.

3 Genesis of the Allegations. Use of not Performed Measurements

The inappropriate assessment of expression (8) is the source of all allegations about the need for 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 λ 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 [27] 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 based on experiments which are not supposed to be performed, by its the very definition, cannot be contrasted with results obtained in actually performed experiments, or as Asher Peres once put it [26]:

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 actual performed experiments with theoretical results obtained under the condition that those experiments were not performed(SCFD).

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 [16], adopting this interpretation of (8), call 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 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.

5 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 definiteness(SCFD) assumption.

There is a stance that rejects the physical implications of the Bell theorem [12–15, 17, 19, 24] 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 [29] in the 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. 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 we shall explain in the next section. The claim that (8) implies incompatible

measurements is the reason why the interpretations discussed in sections 3 and 4 recourse to counterfactual definiteness(SCFD), so the JPI stance suffers from the same predicaments explained in those sections.

Second, even admitting that (8) does not physically imply the realization of incompatible measurements, the mere writing down of such an expression already involves the existence of a joint probability, thus the inequality is irrelevant as a condition for local realism. This argument, however, is unjustified since it is not forbidden for a mathematical expression to possess different and logically unrelated interpretations.

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

$$\frac{dN}{dt} = -kN \quad (9)$$

Supporters of the JPI would claim that (9) 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 (9) 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.

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,

$$LR \xRightarrow{Bell} BI \xRightarrow{Fine-Boole} JP \quad (10)$$

There is no logical argument that starting from (10) can lead to any of the following implications

$$(JP \xRightarrow{Boole} BI) \implies \neg(LR \xRightarrow{Bell} BI) \quad (11)$$

$$(BI \xRightarrow{Fine} JP) \implies \neg(LR \xRightarrow{Bell} BI) \quad (12)$$

$$(BI \xRightarrow{Fine-Boole} JP) \implies \neg(LR \xRightarrow{Bell} BI) \quad (13)$$

The third argument held by the JPI exploits the fact that according to (10), the Bell theorem can be reduced to

$$LR \implies JP \tag{14}$$

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 highly dubious. A thorough discussion of the physical irrelevance of the existence of joint probabilities in the Bell theorem context can be found in *refs.* [30, 31] by Shimony and Stevlichny *et al.* respectively.

6 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 λ 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 λ is unknown, and it is not even known to exist, which does not mean that we can simply delete them(unless careful assumptions are stated¹) 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 for Alice and Bob, respectively. Each row corresponds to a single generating

¹See, for instance, A. Legget [32]

Event#	A's result	B's result	A's setting	B's setting	λ
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

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.

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

$$A : [0, 2\pi] \times (-\infty, +\infty) \rightarrow \{-1, +1\} \quad (15)$$

$$B : [0, 2\pi] \times (-\infty, +\infty) \rightarrow \{-1, +1\} \quad (16)$$

2. After the experiment has been run for a sufficiently long time, all values of λ 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 λ .

Notice that violation of the inequality is usually ascribed to the infringement of the first hypothesis. The second hypothesis is what Willy De Baere [33] 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 a long time ago.

6.1 A Naive Example

A 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:

$$\sum_{k=1}^5 i_k = i_1 + i_2 + i_3 + i_4 + i_5 \quad (17)$$

$$= 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 \quad (18)$$

$$= (1 + 5) * 5/2 \quad (19)$$

$$= 15 \quad (20)$$

Thus, using the formula for the sum of an arithmetic progression in (19), the result of this experiment, according to Bell, is 15.

In this example the analogous of (8) is equation (18):

- Like in (8) the real order of extraction is not reproduced by (18)
- 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 (18) 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.

7 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 [17, 34–36].

8 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 of a more realistic assumption, namely, a “statistical regularity” that De Baere² 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 Bell³ 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.

²Ironically De Baere used his hypothesis to reject the theorem [33]

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

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

Although claims for the need of SCFD began in the early '70s [27], perhaps he 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 contained in 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, 18, 20, 24–28].

- Rejection. Those who see in the hypothesis a reason to dismiss the implications of the theorem [12–17, 19].
- Reconciliation. Those who look for ways to fix it in order to save the theorem [11, 21–23].

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.* [39].

Finally, the important message that can be retrieved from our discussion is that to avoid spreading confusion in the future, it is important to explicitly include the statistical regularity hypothesis along with other usually stated assumptions such as free will.

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] K. Hess. The bell theorem as a special case of a theorem of bass. *Found. Phys.*, 35:1749–1767, 2005.
- [13] M. Kupczynski. Entanglement and quantum nonlocality demystified. *AIP Conf. Proc.*, (1508):253, 2012.
- [14] M. Kupczynski. Causality and local determinism versus quantum non-locality. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 504(1):012015, 2014.
- [15] M. Kupczynski. Bell inequalities, experimental protocols and contextuality. *Found. Phys.*, 45:735–753, 2015.
- [16] J. Christian. Quantum correlations are weaved by the spinors of the euclidean primitives. *R. Soc open sci.*, 5:180526, 2018.
- [17] T. M. Nieuwenhuizen. Is the contextuality loophole fatal for the derivation of bell inequalities? *Found. Phys.*, 41:580–591, 2011.
- [18] S. Boughn. Making sense of Bell's theorem and quantum nonlocality. *Found. of Phys.*, 47:640–657, 2017.
- [19] W. M. Muynck. *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics, and Empiricist Approach*, chapter The Bell inequality in quantum mechanics, pages 471–478. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002.
- [20] N. Herbert and Karush. Generalization of bell's tehorem. *Found. Phys.*, 8:313–317, 1978.
- [21] S. Wolf. Nonlocality without counterfactual reasoning. *Phys. Rev. A*, 92:052102, 2015.
- [22] B. Skyrms. Counterfactual definiteness and local causation. *Philosophy of Science*, 49 B:43–50, 1982.

- [23] M. R. Forster. Counterfactual reasoning in the Bell-EPR paradox. *Philosophy of Science*, 53:133–144, 1986.
- [24] 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.
- [25] P. Eberhard. Bell’s theorem without hidden variables. *Nuov. Cim.*, 38 B:75–79, 1977.
- [26] A. Peres. Unperformed experiments have no results. *American Journal of Physics*, 46:745–747, 1978.
- [27] H. P. Stapp. S-matrix interpretation of quantum theory. *Phys. Rev. D*, 6 B:1303–1320, 1971.
- [28] G. Blaylock. The epr paradox, bell’s inequality, and the question of locality. *American Journal of Physics*, 78:111–120, 2010.
- [29] A. Fine. Hidden variables, joint probability, and the bell inequalities. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 48:291–295, 1982.
- [30] A. Shimony. Contextual hidden variables theories and bell’s inequalities. *Brit. J. Phil. Sci.*, 35:25–45, 1984.
- [31] 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.
- [32] A. J. Leggett. *The Problems of Physics*, chapter Skeletons in the cupboard, pages 164–166. Oxford University Press, 1987.
- [33] W. De Baere. On conditional Bell inequalities and quantum mechanics. *Nuovo Cimento*, 40:488–492, 1984.
- [34] *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics*, chapter Introduction to the hidden variable question, pages 36–37. 2004.
- [35] J. S. Bell. Bertlmann’s socks and the nature of reality. *Journal of Physique*, 42:41–61, 1981.

- [36] J. P. Lambare. On nieuwenhuizen treatment of contextuality in Bell's theorem. *Found. Phys.*, 47:1591–1596, 2017.
- [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] J. P. Lambare. On the CHSH form of Bells inequalities. *Found. Phys.*, 47:321–326, 2017.