

# Bell inequalities and counterfactual definiteness

Justo Pastor Lambare

## Abstract

Counterfactual definiteness is characteristic of classical realistic theories and is usually mentioned as one of the fundamental hypothesis of Bell theorem, however, the way this hypothesis is commonly understood when applied to the derivation of the Bell inequalities is fundamentally incorrect and mathematically inconsistent. This situation has caused interpretational problems leading some authors to draw inaccurate conclusions while others, noticing the inconsistency, have criticized and rejected Bell's result without realizing that John Stewart Bell never made such an incorrect assumption in his celebrated 1964 theorem or in any later versions thereon. We expound on the natural supposition that is implicit in the mathematical hypotheses and operations that lead to the inequalities and, although it is seldom explicitly elucidated, avoids the frequent inconsistent application of the counterfactual definiteness hypothesis.

## 1 Introduction

John S. Bell conceived his theorem as a continuation of the Einstein, Podolski and Rosen(EPR) [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 prove that a common derivation of the Bell inequality is based on an incorrect interpretation that, in spite of its contradictory nature, has become so widespread that it can be considered as an orthodox view.

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 counterfactual definiteness is characteristic of classical realistic theories, the way it is usually applied to derive the Bell inequality, has a devastating and mostly unnoticed effect; it annihilates its falsifiability. On the other hand, if we want to keep this usual interpretation, and at the same time do not lose falsifiability, we would need to postulate an additional different and stronger assumption:

**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.

The strong counterfactual definiteness hypothesis(SCFD) is nonexistent in the literature because it is unconsciously taken to be equivalent to, or implied by, counterfactual definiteness(CFD); however, we contend that SCFD is not merely different from CFD, but that it is intrinsically contradictory and mathematically inconsistent.

Given that, at first glance, the difference between SCFD and CFD may seem obscure and unconvincing; a mere triviality, perhaps the best way to perceive the problem is through a concrete example showing the difference and highlighting the inconsistent nature of the strong counterfactual definiteness hypothesis. We include such an example in Appendix A. The definitive mathematical proof of SCFD's inconsistency is given in Appendix B, while in the rest of the letter we expose the problem and explicate how it can be rationally avoided.

## 2 Derivation of the Bell Inequality

We succinctly review a derivation of the inequality to identify the origin of the problem. The main assumptions used in the derivation are locality, measurement independence, and realism. While realism (and CFD) was considered by Bell (and EPR) as a consequence of locality, others consider it an independent assumption, however, this polemic is not important for our discussion. Measurement independence means that the distribution function  $\rho$  of the hidden variables is independent from the device setting variables, while locality justifies the form of the following functions:

- $A(a_1, \lambda)$ : 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 crucial for the derivation and a frequent 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  $|S|$ . Although we only discuss deterministic hidden variable models, basically the same problem is present in stochastic models.

Another derivation using summation symbols instead of integrals is given in Appendix C.

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

The inappropriate assessment of expression (8) is the source of the problem we are dealing with. 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 or identify 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 imaginary results.

Henry Pierce Stapp [13] expressed this in a categorical and straightforward way:

*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.*

To appreciate the problem with this interpretation, and understand how SCFD enters the scene, it is crucial to realize that the importance of Bell’s result, as different from the EPR argument, lies in the falsifiability of his inequalities, and that this is possible only if each term in (8) has a counterpart in the real world with which it can be compared and contrasted. The interpretation given above clearly and explicitly excludes this possibility for three of the four experiments in (8). We shall refer to this irreproducible interpretation of (8) with the acronym UI8 standing for “Untestable Interpretation of Equation (8)”.

Please notice that the untestability of UI8 cannot be resolved by CFD, although CFD correctly predicts the results of the three imaginary not performed experiments, such predictions do not turn them falsifiable since they are forever banished from existence once one of the four possible experiments is performed, i.e., we can correctly predict the counterfactual results we would have obtained if we performed the experiments that we didn’t, but we cannot run an experiment where we actually obtain all those results. Can untestability be made more conspicuous?

There is one caveat though, if the imaginary terms corresponding to the not performed experiments cancel each other and add to zero not altering the result that is being calculated, their inclusion notwithstanding their irreproducibility, would not be a problem, however those terms do not add to zero. This is discussed in detail in Appendix A.

Since UI8 per se is not inconsistent, a way to circumvent the irreproducibility problem would be to declare UI8 as falsifiable by use of the strong counterfactual definiteness hypothesis, however, if we do that, explicitly recognizing that SCFD is different from CFD, we would find that SCFD is mathematically inconsistent (Appendix B). It is important to notice the difference between CFD and SCFD, otherwise we would conclude that CFD itself is inconsistent, which clearly it is not, being merely a consequence of classical determinism and noncontextuality<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Contextuality means that the measuring process affects or even creates what is being measured, so that measuring devices do not just passively disclose preexisting values.

The reader may complain that the author is being too delicate, maybe we can disregard the difference between SCFD and CFD altogether, after all we get the correct bound anyway, the difference is too subtle, and it is not even clear that there is one.

We believe that such misgivings are appropriately responded in Appendices A and B.

## 4 Impossible to Perform Measurements

There is another common and equally inappropriate, although slightly different, assessment of (8) that brings in unfalsifiability 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 [14, 15], 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 of the word; we agree with Joy Christian in that there is a serious conceptual oversight, however, it is unfair to ascribe it to John Stewart Bell.

## 5 Interpretation not Involving Unfalsifiability

To interpret (8) properly, as a falsifiable expression, each one of its terms must have a counterpart in the real world, i.e., it should be possible to associate each of its four terms with the results of either actual, or realizable experiments.

The association of the terms in (8) with results of actual experiments “should be possible” and this means that it is not necessary to actually perform an experiment to accomplish the association, it is enough to be able to “imagine” a real experiment where this is possible<sup>2</sup>. Thus, it is irrelevant

---

<sup>2</sup>UI8 so eloquently described by H. P. Stapp cannot be imagined to be reproduced

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

whether we associate the terms in (8) with the results of possible(falsifiable) thought experiments, or with the results of actual experiments already performed in the past, or to be performed in the future.

To facilitate the grammatical expressions we shall assume the the experiment was already performed in the past and consider the following points to see how this correspondence between theoretical prediction and actual facts is possible:

- The four different terms in (8) correspond to four actual experimental results that were arranged to contain the same value of  $\lambda$  by reordering the data obtained after the whole Bell test was completed and is the consequence of a hypothesis of “statistical regularity” naturally implied by measurement independence and the mathematical steps followed in the derivation.
- The value of  $\lambda$  is unknown, and it is not even known to exist, which does not mean that we can simply delete them<sup>3</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 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.

---

by a real experiment, i.e., if we chose to measure spin in one direction we could not have actually also measured it in another different direction. Even if experimentalists ever come up with a method to measure simultaneously in both directions [16, 17] then we would be talking about a different experiment and not a Bell inequality test [18].

<sup>3</sup>Unless careful assumptions are stated, see Ref. 19.

The experimental data in table 1 do not allow one to directly and explicitly 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) with actual results 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 and uniformly repeated for the different settings used in the experiment. This assumption, implied by measurement independence, legitimizes the rearrangement of the actual 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  $\lambda$ (see Appendix D).

Notice that violation of the inequality is usually ascribed to the infringement of the first hypothesis. The second hypothesis is what Willy De Baere [20,21] termed the *reproducibility hypothesis* and probably its violation is not an interesting alternative, otherwise it should have been given more attention as a possible loophole; however, Michael Hall [22] discusses this possibility as a relaxation on measurement independence.

## 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. Although we mentioned measurement independence, we did not explicitly mention that it implies 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 strong counterfactual reasoning and the ones mentioned before can be considered to be the most important and were discussed elsewhere [23–26].

## 7 Conclusions

Although the UI8 view of the Bell inequality is admissible as a hypothetical imaginary result, it becomes inconsistent when compared with the result of an actual experiment.

The assumption that the Bell inequality can be falsified by experiments when the UI8 is involved requires the strong counterfactual definiteness hypothesis, however, this contradictory assumption is usually taken to be equivalent to, or implied by CFD, and no inconsistency is noticed except by those who reject the Bell theorem as a consequence of this problem.

Thus, the UI8 deprives the Bell inequality of its mayor virtue, i.e, its falsifiability, making Bell’s argument no different from the EPR’s reasoning.

On the other hand, the most natural way of interpreting (8) probably was so evident to Bell that he never bothered to painstakingly explain the implicit assumption allowing the passage from step (2) to step (3) of his derivation<sup>4</sup>. This assumption – statistical regularity – is mathematically expressed by the independence of the distribution function  $\rho$  on the setting variables and is termed measurement independence.

Measurement independence allows for a rational understanding of (8), not as containing unperformed experiments, but as a result of a statistical regularity that De Baere<sup>5</sup> dubbed the *reproducibility hypothesis*.

---

<sup>4</sup>Bell’s 1964 derivation does not follow exactly the one presented here, but the general idea applies equally.

<sup>5</sup>Ironically De Baere used his hypothesis to reject the theorem [20,21]

However, the *reproducibility hypothesis* is not the only way to make sense of the Bell inequality, for instance, Sir Anthony J. Legget [19] assumes counterfactual definiteness(CFD) and then introduces the concept of *objective local theory* avoiding inconsistencies in his derivation.

We can distinguish three different attitudes among researchers who adopt the UI8 interpretation:

- Tolerance. Those who implicitly consider CFD equivalent to SCFD without noticing any inconsistency [6, 8, 13, 16, 27–31].
- Rejection. Those who see in it a reason to dismiss the implications of the theorem [15, 23, 32–37].
- Reconciliation. Those who look for ways to fix it in order to save the theorem [11, 38–40].

Part of the allegations supporting the UI8 view may also be attributed to a common negligent derivation of the inequalities as discussed in Ref. 12.

Finally, to avoid spreading confusion in the future, it is important to emphasize that measurement independence implies at least two physically different facts, namely, *reproducibility hypothesis* and *free will*. Although the latter has been given much attention in the literature, the omission of any explicit reference to the statistical regularity or *reproducibility hypothesis* has produced much confusion.

# Appendices

## A Example for CFD vs. SCFD

Here we assume the strong counterfactual definiteness(SCFD) hypothesis for the prediction of the result of a possible experiment according to the UI8 view.

We shall see that the problem does not arise as a consequence of denying to CFD the possibility of 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; the problem arises from a theoretical calculation that, by its very conception, cannot be reproduced by

actual experiments thus, we should not expect any correspondence between theoretical predictions and actual results.

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 at each location 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.

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

Where  $\langle A^{(1)}B^{(1)} \rangle$  is the average of the products of the numbers chosen simultaneously 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.

A theoretical division of a physics department of some university around the world is asked to predict the outcome of the experiment. Our guess is that 90% of physicists in that department are advocates the UI8 view, so the official result would be calculated according to the following method<sup>6</sup> [29]: 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  $\#j$

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

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 actual 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

---

<sup>6</sup>Of course, we are not claiming they will actually proceed in this way for this particular case, however, that is exactly what they do when predicting the result for the Bell inequality.

$A_j^{(1)} B_j^{(1)}$  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)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle s_j \rangle &= \langle A_j^{(1)} B_j^{(1)} \rangle - \langle A_j^{(1)} B_j^{(2)} \rangle + \langle A_j^{(2)} B_j^{(1)} \rangle + \langle A_j^{(2)} B_j^{(2)} \rangle \\ |\langle s_j \rangle| &= \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_j s_j \right| \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

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

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

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*” [41] since this theoretical result is assured independently of  $N$  without the need to take the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . This fact alone should be enough to turn on an inconsistency alarm. Thus, 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) to predict the result of the real experiment.

We insist that the problem with this procedure is not the counterfactual definiteness hypothesis, but the incorrect identification of CFD with its strong version SCFD, i.e., we can rightfully ponder all we want about the predicted result  $S_{cf}$  but the minute we assume  $S_{cf} = S_f$  we produce an uncontestable contradiction<sup>7</sup>, in fact, it is not hard to imagine combinations of results that would yield  $2 < S_f \leq 4$ , so the inconsistency should be obvious at this point.

---

<sup>7</sup>The situation resembles Bohr’s response to EPR, while EPR speculated with what would have been the result if instead of performing this experiment we would have performed that other experiment, Bohr said no you shall not compare  $S_{cf}$  with  $S_f$ ; on the other hand, Bell inequalities, unlike the EPR thought experiment and UI8, is all about what has actually happened and not about what would have happened if we measure this instead of that. However, SCFD, unlike the EPR reasoning, is so defective that probably the analogy is not faithful.

The present example does not pretend to be a counterexample for the Bell theorem, it is only an example of the unfalsifiability of the UI8 application.

It is also important to notice that neither is 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 the Bell inequalities. In fact, the addition of the three counterfactual terms in (12) suffers from two simultaneous defects that make it untenable: they are neither experimentally reproducible nor add to zero.

They are experimentally irreproducible because it is not possible to verify the results of four different experiments when the execution of one excludes the actual existence of the other three. They do not add to zero because three terms having  $\pm 1$  values cannot cancel each other. It is worth insisting on the following points:

- Although the hypothetical existence of the counterfactual terms is warranted by CFD and we can legitimately speculate and philosophize all we want with the result predicted with this method( $S_{cf}$ ), it is fundamentally inconsistent to compare this theoretical result with a real experimental outcome( $S_f$ ) when there is no experiment that can reproduce what is being calculated.
- There is no problem with adding “imaginary” results, the problem arises when these hypothetical results, besides of being experimentally irreproducible, 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.
- The result obtained through this method is tautological; for any experimental value found for the actual term in (12), the bound 2 is automatically verified for  $S_{cf}$ . Observe that the theoretical calculation involves  $4N$  terms only  $N$  of which can be associated with results of actual experiments, the other  $3N$  terms have no counterparts in the real world and were not arrange to add to zero so there is no reason to expect that  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} S_{cf} = S_f$ .
- One frequent conceptual mistake made by those committed to the UI8 is the belief that the problem with which Bell theorem confronts us can

be easily avoided by renouncing realism or CFD when, in fact, the problem is with the irreproducibility of UI8 and the strong counterfactual definiteness hypothesis(SCFD).

On the other hand, John S. Bell never committed such conceptual mistakes although he occasionally used the the trick of adding hypothetical terms in his derivations.<sup>8</sup>

As further proof of the widespread stance adopting the UI8 view and the interpretational problems it involves we shall explicitly mention three instances:

- In an article published by a prestigious physics journal we can read [38] “Nonlocal correlations are usually understood through the outcomes of alternative measurements(on two or more parts of a system) that cannot altogether actually be carried out in an experiment. Indeed, a joint input-output - e.g., measurement-setting-outcome- behavior is nonlocal if and only if the outputs for all possible inputs cannot coexist consistently. It has been argued that this counterfactual view is how Bell’s inequalities and their violations are to be seen”.
- In an excellent book on the interpretation of quantum mechanics [43] we find “But it also remains true that, in practice it is never possible to realize more than one of the four experiments that are necessary to obtain a violation of the BCHSH inequalities: for a given pair, one has to choose a single orientation of the analyzers for the measurement, so that all other orientations will remain forever in the domain of speculations.”
- It is well known in the field Asher Peres’ dictum “Unperformed experiments have no results” [30]. In the conclusions part of his manuscript he wrote “There are two possible attitudes in the face of these results. One is to say that it is illegitimate to speculate about unperformed experiments. In brief “Thou shalt not think”. Physics is then free from many epistemological difficulties. For instance, it is not possible to formulate the EPR paradox.”

The untestability that the first two interpretations imply are conspicuously exposed by the phrases *..that cannot altogether actually be carried out in*

---

<sup>8</sup>His hypothetical terms always added to zero [42].

*an experiment... in the first case, and in the second case, But it also remains true that, in practice it is never possible to realize more than one of the four experiments that are necessary to obtain a violation of the BCHSH inequalities....*

In the third case, the UI8 view made the author miss the point that the crucial difference between EPR and Bell inequalities is precisely the falsifiability of the latter, allowing Peres to adopt a stance similar to the one Bohr adopted with respect to EPR, namely, that it is illegitimate to speculate about unperformed experiments.

It should be clear by now that Bell inequalities tell us what has actually happened in performed experiments, not what would have happened if....; unfortunately, what will forever remain counterfactual is what would have been the reactions of Einstein and Bohr if John Bell would have been born thirty years earlier.

## **B Mathematical proof of SCFD's inconsistency**

Since ingrained beliefs are not easy to abandon it may be hard to accept the difference between CFD and SCFD. Thus, one might think that the example given in Appendix A is silly and faulty, or maybe the values that people have to choose to make  $S_f > 2$  are so highly improbable that we can altogether dismiss this possibility, or perhaps if the bound 2 is ever violated it may be explained by a yet not understood workings of the mind that obey quantum mechanical rules entangling the minds of the people involved in the experiment producing instantaneous telepathic communication.

To rule out any such speculations and give definitive mathematical proof that SCFD fails to predict the result of an actual experiment correctly, we need a local realistic model<sup>9</sup> that mathematically violates Bell inequality while the application of SCFD predicts that such a feat is impossible.

Fortunately, there are plenty of such examples in the literature, many of them claiming to be counterexamples of Bell theorem. Of course, they do not constitute counterexamples for the Bell theorem simply because they do not satisfy all the hypotheses of the theorem, however, they are valid examples of local realistic models that violate Bell inequality.

---

<sup>9</sup>In fact we only need the realism hypothesis.

Following a model given by Michel Feldmann [44] and adapting his notation to the one we used in sec. 2 with  $\lambda \in [0, 2\pi]$

$$A(a_i, \lambda) = \text{sgn}(\cos(\lambda - a_i)) \quad (18)$$

$$B(b_i, \lambda) = \text{sgn}(\cos(\lambda - b_i)) \quad (19)$$

$$\rho(\lambda, u) = \frac{1}{4} |\cos(\lambda - u)|, \text{ where } u = a_i \text{ or } u = b_i \quad (20)$$

In Feldmann's model  $\rho$  depends only on one setting but this does not introduce any ambiguities because his consistency equations are fulfilled

$$E(a_i, b_k) = \int_0^{2\pi} \rho(\lambda, a_i) A(\lambda, a_i) B(\lambda, b_k) d\lambda = \int_0^{2\pi} \rho(\lambda, b_k) A(\lambda, a_i) B(\lambda, b_k) d\lambda \quad (21)$$

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \rho(\lambda, a_i) A(\lambda, a_i) d\lambda = \int_0^{2\pi} \rho(\lambda, b_k) A(\lambda, a_i) d\lambda = 0 \quad (22)$$

With these definitions it is easy to compute

$$E(a_i, b_k) = \cos(a_i - b_k) \quad (23)$$

This means that Feldmann's local realistic model reproduces the quantum mechanical correlations (except for the sign) thus violating the CHSH inequality for certain appropriate settings. Let us follow two different methods to predict the result of an experiment that is according to Feldmann's model.

## B.1 Prediction assuming SCFD

Since Feldmann's model is realistic and strong counterfactual definiteness (SCFD) is believed to be the same as counterfactual definiteness (CFD) we can use the same method employed in Appendix A, thus replacing

$$A_j^{(1)} = A(a_1, \lambda_j) \quad (24)$$

$$A_j^{(2)} = A(a_2, \lambda_j) \quad (25)$$

$$B_j^{(1)} = A(b_1, \lambda_j) \quad (26)$$

$$B_j^{(2)} = A(b_2, \lambda_j) \quad (27)$$

in equations (12) through (16)

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} | \langle s_j \rangle | \leq 2 \quad (28)$$

$$S_{cf} \leq 2 \quad (29)$$



The result for this case is again  $S_{cf} \leq 2$  that we know contradicts (23), therefore we have mathematically proved that SCDF fails to predict the result of an experiment it is supposed to predict correctly.

## B.2 Prediction without assuming SCFD

If we try to use the method employed in Appendix C we would find that (32) does not reduce to (35) because the reproducibility hypothesis (34) is not fulfilled this time owed that in Feldmann's model the distribution function depends explicitly on the settings, this means that we cannot assume that the hidden variables are uniformly distributed with respect to the different settings and the equations fail to predict a bound of 2 for  $S$ . This highlights again the crucial role of the *reproducibility hypothesis* to make sense of Bell's result.

## C 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 [20, 21] in 1984. Now instead of (1) and (2) we have

$$E(a_i, b_k) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_j A(a_i, \lambda_j^{[ik]}) B(b_k, \lambda_j^{[ik]}) \quad (30)$$

$$S = E(a_1, b_1) - E(a_1, b_2) + E(a_2, b_1) + E(a_2, b_2) \quad (31)$$

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_j \left( A(a_1, \lambda_j^{[11]}) B(b_1, \lambda_j^{[11]}) - A(a_1, \lambda_j^{[12]}) B(b_2, \lambda_j^{[12]}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + A(a_2, \lambda_j^{[21]}) B(b_1, \lambda_j^{[21]}) - A(a_2, \lambda_j^{[22]}) B(b_2, \lambda_j^{[22]}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

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

$$E(a_i, b_k) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_j A(a_i, \lambda_j^{[ik]}) B(b_k, \lambda_j^{[ik]}) \rightarrow \int \rho(\lambda) A(a_i, \lambda) B(b_k, \lambda) d\lambda \quad (33)$$

The use of summation symbols makes more conspicuous the fact that a reordering similar to (8) allowing for a proper factorization to derive the bound 2 for the inequality, is possible only if we assume in (32)

$$\lambda_j^{(ik)} = \lambda_j^{(i'k')} = \lambda_j; \quad i, k, i', k' \in \{1, 2\}; j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \quad (34)$$

which means that the hidden variables are supposed to repeat regularly its values in the experiments with different settings, allowing (32) to be written as

$$S = \frac{1}{N} \left( \sum_j A(a_i, \lambda_j)[B(b_i, \lambda_j) - B(b_k, \lambda_j)] + A(a_k, \lambda_j)[B(b_i, \lambda_j) + B(b_k, \lambda_j)] \right) \quad (35)$$

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.

Equation (35), contrary to (17), is subjected to the “*finite statistical loop-hole*” [41] since the reproducibility hypothesis is statistical in nature and an exact regular repetition of hidden variables cannot be expected for a finite  $N$ .

## 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:

$$\sum_{k=1}^5 i_k = i_1 + i_2 + i_3 + i_4 + i_5 \quad (36)$$

$$= 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 \quad (37)$$

$$= (1 + 5) * 5/2 \quad (38)$$

$$= 15 \quad (39)$$

Thus, using the formula for the sum of an arithmetic progression in (38), the result of this experiment, according to Bell, is 15.

In this example the analogous of (8) is equation (37):

- Like in (8) the real order of extraction is not reproduced by (37)
- 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 (37) are 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.

## 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-locality it 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] H. P. Stapp. S-matrix interpretation of quantum theory. *Phys. Rev. D*, 6 B:1303–1320, 1971.
- [14] J. Christian. Bells theorem versus local realism in a quaternionic model of physical space. *IEEE Access*, 7:133388–133409, 2019.
- [15] J. Christian. Quantum correlations are weaved by the spinors of the euclidean primitives. *R. Soc open sci.*, 5:180526, 2018.
- [16] 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.
- [17] 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.
- [18] 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.
- [19] A. J. Leggett. *The Problems of Physics*, chapter Skeletons in the cupboard, pages 164–166. Oxford University Press, 1987.
- [20] W. De Baere. On conditional Bell inequalities and quantum mechanics. *Nuovo Cimento*, 40:488–492, 1984.

- [21] W. De Baere. On the significance of Bell’s inequality for hidden-variables theories. *Lettere Al Nuovo Cimento*, 39(11):234–238, 1984.
- [22] Michael J. W. Hall. Local deterministic model of singlet state correlations based on relaxing measurement independence. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 105:250404, Dec 2010.
- [23] T. M. Nieuwenhuizen. Is the contextuality loophole fatal for the derivation of Bell inequalities? *Found. Phys.*, 41:580–591, 2011.
- [24] *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics*, chapter Introduction to the hidden variable question, pages 36–37. 2004.
- [25] J. S. Bell. Bertlmann’s socks and the nature of reality. *Journal of Physique*, 42:41–61, 1981.
- [26] J. P. Lambare. On Nieuwenhuizen’s treatment of contextuality in Bell’s theorem. *Found. Phys.*, 47:1591–1596, 2017.
- [27] S. Boughn. Making sense of Bell’s theorem and quantum nonlocality. *Found. of Phys.*, 47:640–657, 2017.
- [28] N. Herbert and Karush. Generalization of Bell’s theorem. *Found. Phys.*, 8:313–317, 1978.
- [29] P. Eberhard. Bell’s theorem without hidden variables. *Nuov. Cim.*, 38 B:75–79, 1977.
- [30] A. Peres. Unperformed experiments have no results. *American Journal of Physics*, 46:745–747, 1978.
- [31] G. Blaylock. The EPR paradox, Bell’s inequality, and the question of locality. *American Journal of Physics*, 78:111–120, 2010.
- [32] K. Hess. The Bell theorem as a special case of a theorem of Bass. *Found. Phys.*, 35:1749–1767, 2005.
- [33] M. Kupczynski. Entanglement and quantum nonlocality demystified. *AIP Conf. Proc.*, (1508):253, 2012.
- [34] M. Kupczynski. Causality and local determinism versus quantum nonlocality. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 504(1):012015, 2014.

- [35] M. Kupczynski. Bell inequalities, experimental protocols and contextuality. *Found. Phys.*, 45:735–753, 2015.
- [36] L. Sica. The ultimate loophole in bell’s theorem: The inequality is identically satisfied by data sets composed of  $\pm 1$  assuming merely that they exist. *Open Physics*, 15:577–585, 2017.
- [37] W. M. Muynck. *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics, and Empiricist Approach*, chapter The Bell inequality in quantum mechanics, pages 471–478. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002.
- [38] S. Wolf. Nonlocality without counterfactual reasoning. *Phys. Rev. A*, 92:052102, 2015.
- [39] B. Skyrms. Counterfactual definiteness and local causation. *Philosophy of Science*, 49 B:43–50, 1982.
- [40] M. R. Forster. Counterfactual reasoning in the Bell-EPR paradox. *Philosophy of Science*, 53:133–144, 1986.
- [41] Jan-Åke Larsson. Loopholes in Bell inequality tests of local realism. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 47(42):424003, oct 2014.
- [42] J. S. Bell. On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 38:447–452, 1966.
- [43] F. Laloë. *Do We Really Understand Quantum Mechanics?*, chapter Bell theorem, pages 58–59. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [44] Michel Feldmann. New loophole for the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. *Foundations of Physics Letters*, 8(1):41–53, 1995.