

# Superdeterministic hidden-variables models I: nonequilibrium and signalling

Indrajit Sen<sup>1,\*</sup> and Antony Valentini<sup>1,2,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy,  
Clemson University, Kinard Laboratory,  
Clemson, SC 29634, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Augustus College,  
14 Augustus Road,  
London SW19 6LN UK*

(Dated: March 27, 2020)

This is the first of two papers which attempt to comprehensively analyse superdeterministic hidden-variables models of Bell correlations. We first give an overview of superdeterminism and discuss various criticisms of it raised in the literature. We argue that the most common criticism, the violation of ‘free-will’, is incorrect. We take up Bell’s intuitive criticism that these models are ‘conspiratorial’. To develop this further, we introduce nonequilibrium extensions of superdeterministic models. We show that the measurement statistics of these extended models depend on the physical system used to determine the measurement settings. This suggests a fine-tuning in order to eliminate this dependence from experimental observation. We also study the signalling properties of these extended models. We show that although they generally violate the formal no-signalling constraints, this violation cannot be equated to physical signalling, in the sense of information transfer between the wings. We therefore suggest that the so-called no-signalling constraints be more appropriately named the marginal-independence constraints. We discuss the mechanism by which marginal-independence is violated in superdeterministic models. We use this to delineate the superdeterministic contribution to the net change in marginals for a hybrid nonlocal superdeterministic model (in nonequilibrium). Lastly, we consider a hypothetical scenario where two experimenters use the apparent-signalling of a superdeterministic model to communicate with each other. This scenario suggests another conspiratorial feature peculiar to superdeterminism. These suggestions are quantitatively developed in the second paper.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Orthodox quantum mechanics abandons realism in the microscopic world for an operationalist account consisting of macroscopic preparations and measurements performed by experimenters. This abandonment has led to several difficulties about the interpretation of quantum mechanics [1, 2]. Contrary to the expectations of many of the early practitioners of the theory, these difficulties have only grown more acute with time, as quantum mechanics has come to be applied to newer fields like cosmology and quantum gravitation. One option to resolve these long-standing difficulties is to restore realism in the microscopic world. This restoration is the goal of hidden-variables reformulations of quantum mechanics. The general form of such a reformulation can be illustrated quite simply. Consider a quantum experiment where the system is prepared in a quantum state  $\psi$  and a measurement  $M$  (defined by a Hermitian operator) is subsequently performed upon it. Orthodox quantum mechanics predicts, for an ensemble, an outcome probability  $p(k|\psi, M)$  for obtaining the  $k^{\text{th}}$  outcome. This outcome probability can be expanded, using the standard rules of probability theory, as

$$p(k|\psi, M) = \int d\lambda p(k|\psi, M, \lambda) \rho(\lambda|\psi, M) \quad (1)$$

in terms of  $\lambda$  which label the hidden-variables currently inaccessible to the experimenters. A hidden-variables model of this experiment must define, first, the hidden-variables  $\lambda$ , second, the distribution  $\rho(\lambda|\psi, M)$  of  $\lambda$ ’s over the ensemble, and third, the distribution  $p(k|\psi, M, \lambda)$  of outcomes given a particular  $\lambda$ . Note that, in general, equation (1) involves a correlation between  $\lambda$  and the future measurement setting  $M$ .

On the other hand, one of the most important results in the interpretation of quantum mechanics, Bell’s theorem [1], assumes there to be no correlation between the hidden variables and the measurement settings. Without

---

\*Electronic address: isen@clemson.edu

†Electronic address: antonyv@clemson.edu

this assumption, called ‘measurement-independence’ [3–6] in recent literature, local hidden-variables models of quantum mechanics cannot be ruled out via Bell’s theorem. The physical interpretation of such a correlation is currently a matter of debate. There are retrocausal models [7–14] that posit that the future measurement settings causally affect  $\lambda$  backwards in time. We do not discuss these models here. The subject of this paper, and a subsequent one denoted by  $\mathcal{B}$  [15], is a comprehensive analysis of superdeterministic models (for examples, see refs. [16, 17]).

In this paper, a superdeterministic model is defined as one having the following properties:

1. Determinism: Every event in the universe is determined given past conditions. In the present context, the specific implication is that the choices of measurement settings made by the experimenters are also determined given the initial conditions. Note that this is just a consequence of applying determinism to the entire universe.
2. Contingent correlation between  $\lambda$  and the ‘setting mechanism’: The hidden-variables  $\lambda$  are correlated with the mechanism that determines the measurement settings, in such a way that  $\lambda$  and the measurement settings become correlated. For example, the measurement settings might be determined by the wavelength of photons emitted by a distant quasar. Then, the photon emission process at the quasar, and thereby the wavelength of the photons emitted, has to be correlated with the hidden variables describing the quantum system in our laboratory. Note that this correlation is postulated to be contingent, not law-like. That is, this correlation is a consequence of the initial conditions of the universe.

The conjunction of these two properties provides the physical basis for the violation of measurement-independence in superdeterminism. Note that we have defined superdeterministic models to have a correlation between  $\lambda$  and the setting mechanism (such that a correlation between  $\lambda$  and the measurement settings is produced), instead of only a correlation between  $\lambda$  and the measurement settings. This is an important distinction to make. In general, a correlation between  $\lambda$  and the setting mechanism implies a correlation between  $\lambda$  and the measurement settings, but the converse implication is not true. For example, retrocausal models also posit a correlation between  $\lambda$  and the measurement settings, but this correlation is not a consequence of an underlying correlation between  $\lambda$  and the setting mechanism. This distinction has sometimes been obscured in the literature. As a case in point, the authors of refs. [18, 19] take the correlation between  $\lambda$  and the measurement settings to be part of the definition of superdeterminism. Even if one defines superdeterminism in this manner, the model in ref. [19] appears to not violate measurement-independence. The model uses certain rationality conditions to eliminate particular combinations of measurement settings. But these conditions do not depend on the hidden-variables state<sup>1</sup>. Thus, the measurement settings appear to have no correlation with  $\lambda$ . Therefore, this model does not appear to be a bona fide example of superdeterminism as usually understood.

It is useful to distinguish between two types of superdeterministic models, which we may call type I and type II. In a type I model, the correlation between  $\lambda$  and the setting mechanism can be explained in terms of either past common causes or causal influences between them. In a type II model, the correlation is accepted as a peculiarity of the initial condition of the universe without further explanation. In this case, events having no common past can also be correlated given the appropriate initial conditions (see Fig. 1). To illustrate the difference, consider the recent experiment [20] where photons from 7.78 billion years ago were used to choose the measurement settings for a Bell experiment. Consider the events corresponding to the photon emission and the experiment. The overlap in the past lightcones of these events comprised  $\sim 4\%$  of the total space-time volume of the past lightcone of the experiment. In a type I model of the experiment, the correlation between the hidden variables and the measurement settings originates exclusively from this tiny space-time volume of the common past. In a type II model however, the correlation arises from the initial condition of the entire universe at the time of big bang. Therefore, the experiment does not significantly constrain type II superdeterministic models.

Superdeterministic models circumvent Bell’s theorem and reproduce the Bell correlations in a local manner. However, these models have been widely criticised in the literature [21–23]. These criticisms can be broadly divided into two arguments. The first argument, which is directed against determinism, is that they conflict with our apparent sensation of ‘free-will’, since the experimenters’ choices of measurement settings are completely determined from past conditions in these models. This criticism is based on the common misconception that human volition (or ‘free-will’) can be explained by indeterminism. But in fact indeterminism arguably makes ‘free-will’ even harder to explain, since the choices an experimenter makes would then have no cause at all. If an agent makes a choice for no reason, then the agent should be surprised by the choice - since nothing in the past, not even the agent’s own

---

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, equation (30) in ref. [19].




FIG. 1: The two classes of superdeterministic models. The time is mapped on the  $y$ -axis and the distance on the  $x$ -axis. The big bang singularity is mapped onto the  $t = 0$  surface. Part *a*) of the figure depicts a type I model, where the correlation between two events A and B is either due to common causes in their common past (shaded in blue) or due to a causal connection from A to B (if B lies within the forward lightcone of A). Part *b*) of the figure depicts a type II model, where two events A and B are correlated due to the initial conditions at  $t = 0$ , without any need for common causes or causal connections between them. The information about the initial conditions has been divided into the past exclusive to A (shaded in red), and the past exclusive to B (shaded in blue). In a type II model, the information shaded in blue is correlated with the information shaded in red such that the events A and B are correlated.

thoughts and feelings, can explain it [24]. Such misconceptions about ‘free-will’ are also arguably undermined by recent advances in neuroscience, which appear to demonstrate that a human subject’s choice is encoded in his brain activity up to 10 s before the choice enters the subject’s conscious awareness [25].

It has sometimes been argued that the assumption of ‘free-will’ is essential for the scientific method. For example, Zeilinger writes “This is the assumption of ‘free-will’. It is a free decision what measurement one wants to perform...This fundamental assumption is essential to doing science. If this were not true, then, I suggest, it would make no sense at all to ask nature questions in an experiment, since then nature could determine what our questions are, and that could guide our questions such that we arrive at a false picture of nature.” [26] The argument clearly brings out a tension between the two basic assumptions of science: first, that nature is described by laws; second, that these laws can be experimentally tested. This tension arises because the experimenters are themselves part of nature, and thus described by the same laws. However, the solution cannot be to uncritically fall back upon ‘free-will’, as that violates the first assumption. There needs to be an in-depth philosophical enquiry into the implications of abandoning the indeterministic notion of ‘free-will’ for science. Pending such an enquiry, it is premature to describe superdeterministic models as unscientific.

Recently, Hardy [27] has proposed testing a hybrid model where the universe is local and superdeterministic except for conscious human minds which are assumed to have ‘free-will’; that is, human choices introduce genuinely new information into the universe in this model. This information then spreads out from the event location at a speed equal to or less than that of light. The model predicts that the Bell inequalities will be violated in all cases except when human beings are used to choose the measurement settings. Recently a group of researchers, called ‘The Big Bell Test Collaboration’, used humans to choose the measurement settings for a Bell experiment [28]. The motivation for the experiment was to test such a hybrid model of the universe (although the assumptions of the model were less unambiguously stated than by Hardy). They found that Bell inequalities are violated even when humans choose the measurement settings. The hybrid model is therefore falsified by the experiment; but it is not clear which part of the model is the culprit: the assumption that humans have ‘free-will’, or that the rest of the universe is local and superdeterministic.

The second argument is that superdeterministic models are ‘conspiratorial’. The charge of conspiracy against such models was made by Bell, who wrote [29]

“Now even if we have arranged that [the measurement settings]  $a$  and  $b$  are generated by apparently random radioactive devices, housed in separate boxes and thickly shielded, or by Swiss national lottery machines, or by elaborate computer programmes, or by apparently free willed experimental physicists, or by some combination of all of these, we cannot be sure that  $a$  and  $b$  are not significantly influenced by the same factors  $\lambda$  that influence [the measurement results]  $A$  and  $B$ . But this way of arranging quantum

mechanical correlations would be even more mind boggling than one in which causal chains go faster than light. Apparently separate parts of the world would be deeply and conspiratorially entangled...”

Unfortunately, this argument was never developed quantitatively. Therefore, it has been possible to argue that conspiracy is just a psychological notion (‘mind boggling’), that cannot be used to judge a model which, after all, correctly reproduces the Bell correlations.

The purpose of this article and  $\mathcal{B}$  is to comprehensively analyse the feasibility of superdeterministic models of Bell correlations. In this article we lay the groundwork by a study of the properties of superdeterministic models in nonequilibrium. In  $\mathcal{B}$  we use our results from this study to quantitatively develop the notion of conspiracy. The present article is structured as follows. We first introduce nonequilibrium extensions of superdeterministic models in section II. An intuitive definition of conspiracy based on fine-tuning is immediately suggested. The section also points out that the formal no-signalling constraints fail to capture the physical meaning of signalling, as the transfer of information, for these models. In section III, we review the mechanism by which nonlocal deterministic models violate formal no-signalling [30] (in nonequilibrium). Using a similar approach, we develop a mechanism for superdeterministic models in section IV. We then consider the case of a hybrid model that is both nonlocal and superdeterministic in section V. We show how the net charge in marginals can be separated into nonlocal and superdeterministic components, using the difference in the mechanisms, for such a model. In section VI, we discuss another conspiratorial feature of superdeterminism that emerges in signalling. We conclude with a discussion in section VII.

## II. NONEQUILIBRIUM AND SIGNALLING IN SUPERDETERMINISTIC MODELS

A scientific theory has two logically separate components: the initial or boundary conditions (which are contingent) and the laws (which are immutable). Delineating these two in a hidden-variables model naturally leads to the concept of nonequilibrium, as follows:

a) The hidden-variables distribution specified at the time of preparation is an *initial condition*. A particular distribution (the ‘equilibrium’ distribution) reproduces the quantum predictions, but the model inherently contains the possibility of other ‘nonequilibrium’ distributions as different initial conditions<sup>2</sup>.

b) The mapping from the hidden variables to the measurement outcomes constitutes the *dynamics* of the model, and is therefore law-like. This mapping is applicable to all possible initial conditions. Thus, any hidden-variables model encodes a wide variety of physical situations corresponding to different initial conditions. Only one of these situations corresponds to that predicted by quantum mechanics.

The concept of nonequilibrium was first proposed in the context of de Broglie-Bohm theory [33, 34], but the concept does not depend on the details of any particular theory. Nonequilibrium has been further studied for general nonlocal models [30] and a particular retrocausal model [12]. In recent years, the view that hidden-variables models have to be fine-tuned to reproduce quantum predictions has become more accepted using results from the causal discovery approach [35].

For a superdeterministic model, the novel addition to this argument is the contingent nature of the correlation between  $\lambda$  and the measurement settings. As discussed in the Introduction, this correlation is a consequence of the correlation between  $\lambda$  and the setting mechanism. This correlation is contingent – and therefore variable. In general,  $\lambda$  may be correlated with each setting mechanism in a different way. For illustration, consider that the local measurement setting at each wing of a Bell experiment is chosen by using one of two pseudo-random number generators. The output of either setting mechanism is a measurement setting, say  $M_x$  (corresponding to  $\hat{\sigma}_x$ ) or  $M_y$  (corresponding to  $\hat{\sigma}_y$ ), for that run. Let us label the output of the setting mechanisms at wing A (B) by the variables  $\alpha_i$  ( $\beta_j$ ), where  $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$  and  $\alpha_i, \beta_j \in \{M_x, M_y\}$ . The hidden-variables distribution will then be given by<sup>3</sup>  $\rho(\lambda|\alpha_i, \beta_j)$ . These constitute four logically independent distributions. In general, these will be different, giving rise to different measurement statistics. Thus, *the choice of setting mechanism can affect the measurement statistics for a nonequilibrium extension of a superdeterministic model*. This property is unique to superdeterminism, as the setting

<sup>2</sup> It has been argued by Durr et al. [31] that the equilibrium distribution is typical (with respect to the equilibrium measure), and that this rules out nonequilibrium distributions. However, while the equilibrium distribution is typical with respect to the equilibrium measure, it is untypical with respect to a nonequilibrium measure [32]. Thus, the argument is really circular.

<sup>3</sup> The dependence of the hidden-variables distribution on the quantum state is implicit, and is suppressed hereafter for convenience.

mechanisms are not correlated with  $\lambda$  in other hidden-variables models. We intuitively expect that superdeterministic models have to be fine-tuned so that there is no experimental signature of the choice of setting mechanism. In  $\mathcal{B}$  we formulate this intuition quantitatively.

Let us now consider the signalling properties of these models. Consider the set of runs where the  $i^{\text{th}}$  and  $j^{\text{th}}$  setting mechanisms are used to select the measurements  $M_x$  and  $M_y$  at the first and second wing respectively. For these runs the measurement statistics are given by

$$\overline{AB} = \int d\lambda A(\lambda, M_x) B(\lambda, M_y) \rho(\lambda | \alpha_i = M_x, \beta_j = M_y) \quad (2)$$

$$\overline{A} = \int d\lambda A(\lambda, M_x) \rho(\lambda | \alpha_i = M_x, \beta_j = M_y) \quad (3)$$

$$\overline{B} = \int d\lambda B(\lambda, M_y) \rho(\lambda | \alpha_i = M_x, \beta_j = M_y) \quad (4)$$

where  $A(\lambda, M_x)$  and  $B(\lambda, M_y)$  (called ‘indicator functions’) determine the local measurement outcomes at wing A and B respectively. The Bell correlations will be reproduced only if  $\rho(\lambda | \alpha_i = M_x, \beta_j = M_y) = \rho_{\text{eq}}(\lambda | M_x, M_y)$ . If this condition is not met, then  $\overline{AB} \neq \langle \hat{\sigma}_{\hat{x}} \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{\hat{y}} \rangle$ ,  $\overline{A} \neq \langle \hat{\sigma}_{\hat{x}} \rangle$  and  $\overline{B} \neq \langle \hat{\sigma}_{\hat{y}} \rangle$ . Since the Bell correlations satisfy the formal no-signalling constraints<sup>4</sup>, one intuitively expects that the new statistics will violate them in general.

It is useful to point out here that the notion of no-signalling was criticised by Bell [36] to rest on concepts “which are desperately vague, or vaguely applicable”. His criticism was based on the ground that “the assertion that ‘we cannot signal faster than light’ immediately provokes the question: Who do we think *we* are?”. This anthropocentric criticism is brought to a head in the context of superdeterminism, where the experimenters’ choices of measurement settings are explicitly considered as variables internal to the model (as the outputs of the setting mechanisms). For a superdeterministic model, the violation of formal no-signalling is not equivalent to physical signalling, that is, information transfer between the wings. To understand this, consider the effect of changing the measurement setting say at wing B from  $M_B \rightarrow M'_B$ . The hidden-variables distribution will change from  $\rho(\lambda | \alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B) \rightarrow \rho(\lambda | \alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B)$  – not due to a causal effect of the change  $M_B \rightarrow M'_B$ , but because the distribution is statistically correlated (due to past initial conditions) with the setting mechanism output  $\beta$ . That is, the hidden-variables distribution does not functionally depend on the future measurement settings; it is only correlated with them. The local indicator function  $A(\lambda, M_A)$  is also functionally independent of  $M_B$ . Thus, the information about the change  $M_B \rightarrow M'_B$  is not physically transferred from wing B to A. This is true in both equilibrium and in nonequilibrium. The violation of formal no-signalling in nonequilibrium (analogous to that of Bell inequalities in equilibrium) arises as a peculiarity of the statistical correlation between the setting mechanism and  $\lambda$ . Thus, violation of the formal no-signalling constraints cannot be equated to physical signalling (as the transfer of information from one place to another) in a superdeterministic context. For this reason, we may call superdeterministic signalling as ‘apparent-signalling’, and *the so-called no-signalling constraints may be more appropriately called ‘marginal-independence’ constraints*.

In section VI, we discuss this further in the context of superdeterministic conspiracy. Currently, we pivot our attention to the hidden-variables mechanism by which marginal-independence is violated. In the next section we review this mechanism for nonlocal deterministic models, as discussed in ref. [30].

### III. MARGINAL-INDEPENDENCE IN NONLOCAL DETERMINISTIC MODELS

Consider the standard Bell scenario [37], where two spin-1/2 particles are prepared in the spin-singlet state and subsequently subjected to the local measurements  $M_A$  (corresponding to the operator  $\hat{\sigma}_{\hat{a}} \otimes \hat{I}$ ) and  $M_B$  (corresponding to the operator  $\hat{I} \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{\hat{b}}$ ) in a spacelike separated manner. A nonlocal deterministic model, which specifies the measurement outcomes by the nonlocal indicator functions  $A(\lambda, M_A, M_B)$  and  $B(\lambda, M_A, M_B)$ , reproduces the Bell correlations for

---

<sup>4</sup> The no-signalling constraints are, in general, of the form that the local probability (unconditioned over  $\lambda$ ) of an event A does not depend non-trivially on an event B which is space-like separated from the event A, that is,  $p(A|B) = p(A|B')$ . In the context of the Bell correlations, this is translated to the form  $p(x|X, Y) = p(x|X, Y')$ , where  $x$  is the local measurement outcome at the first wing and  $X, Y$  are the local measurement settings at the first and second wing respectively.




FIG. 2: Schematic illustration of signalling in nonlocal models. Part a) of the figure represents the initial case where the measurement settings at the two wings are  $M_A$  and  $M_B$ . The hidden-variables distribution has been assumed to be uniform for simplicity. Upon changing  $M_B \rightarrow M'_B$  some of the  $\lambda$ 's which initially gave  $A = +1(-1)$  'flip their outcomes' to subsequently give  $A = -1(+1)$  due to nonlocality. If the distribution satisfies marginal-independence, for example the equilibrium distribution  $\rho_{eq}(\lambda)$ , then the set of  $\lambda$ 's that flip their outcomes from  $+1 \rightarrow -1$ , represented by the 'transition set'  $T_A(+, -)$ , has the same measure as the set of  $\lambda$ 's that flip their outcomes from  $-1 \rightarrow +1$ , represented by  $T_A(-, +)$ . This case is illustrated in part b) of the figure, where the measures of  $T_A(+, -)$  and  $T_A(-, +)$  are equal. For a nonequilibrium distribution however, the measure of the two transition sets are not equal in general, which leads to signalling. This is illustrated in part c) of the figure. Here  $S_{A+(-)} = \{\lambda | A(\lambda, M_A, M_B) = +(-)1\}$  and  $S'_{A+(-)} = \{\lambda | A(\lambda, M_A, M'_B) = +(-)1\}$ .

an 'equilibrium' distribution of hidden variables  $\rho_{eq}(\lambda)$ . Consider nonequilibrium distributions  $\rho(\lambda) \neq \rho_{eq}(\lambda)$  for the model (with the same indicator functions). The joint outcome distribution can be expanded as

$$\overline{AB} = \int d\lambda A(\lambda, M_A, M_B) B(\lambda, M_A, M_B) \rho(\lambda) \quad (5)$$

while the marginal outcome distributions can be expanded as

$$\overline{A} = \int d\lambda A(\lambda, M_A, M_B) \rho(\lambda) \quad (6)$$

$$\overline{B} = \int d\lambda B(\lambda, M_A, M_B) \rho(\lambda) \quad (7)$$

Equations (6) and (7) depend on the measurement settings at both the wings. Thus, one intuitively expects that a change in one of the measurement settings will in general change both the marginal outcome distributions, thus

violating marginal-independence<sup>5</sup>. It can however be that, for some special hidden-variables distributions, changing a measurement setting affects the marginal outcome distribution only at that same wing, as is true, for example, for the equilibrium distribution  $\rho_{eq}(\lambda)$ . Let us formalise this intuition clearly.

Consider changing the measurement setting  $M_B$  (corresponding to  $\hat{\sigma}_{\tilde{b}}$ )  $\rightarrow M'_B$  (corresponding to  $\hat{\sigma}_{\tilde{b}'}$ ). We may define the sets  $S_{A+} = \{\lambda|A(\lambda, M_A, M_B) = +1\}$ ,  $S_{A-} = \{\lambda|A(\lambda, M_A, M_B) = -1\}$  and  $S'_{A+} = \{\lambda|A(\lambda, M_A, M'_B) = +1\}$ ,  $S'_{A-} = \{\lambda|A(\lambda, M_A, M'_B) = -1\}$ . Clearly  $S_{A+} \cap S_{A-} = S'_{A+} \cap S'_{A-} = \emptyset$ , and the set  $S = \{\lambda|\rho(\lambda) > 0\}$  can be partitioned as  $S = S_{A+} \cup S_{A-} = S'_{A+} \cup S'_{A-}$ . We may also define the ‘transition sets’  $T_A(+, -) = S_{A+} \cap S'_{A-}$  (the set of  $\lambda$ 's that transition from giving  $A = +1$  to  $A = -1$  upon changing  $M_B \rightarrow M'_B$ ) and  $T_A(-, +) = S_{A-} \cap S'_{A+}$  (the set of  $\lambda$ 's that transition from giving  $A = -1$  to  $A = +1$  upon changing  $M_B \rightarrow M'_B$ ). The property that an arbitrary distribution  $\rho(\lambda)$  must possess to be marginal-independent can then be expressed as simply the equality of the measures of the two transition sets (see Fig. 2), that is

$$\int_{T_A(+, -)} d\lambda\rho(\lambda) = \int_{T_A(-, +)} d\lambda\rho(\lambda) \quad (8)$$

This equality means that the fraction of the ensemble making a transition from  $+1 \rightarrow -1$  is equal to the fraction of the ensemble making the reverse transition (a form of ‘detailed balancing’ [30]), so that the marginal distribution at A is unchanged (under a change of measurement setting at B). On the other hand, if this equality is violated for the given settings  $M_A, M_B, M'_B$  – as will be the case for a general nonequilibrium distribution – then for those settings the marginal at A will change and there will be a nonlocal signal from B to A [38]. The change in the marginal at A, in this case, will be

$$\int_{T_A(-, +)} d\lambda\rho(\lambda) - \int_{T_A(+, -)} d\lambda\rho(\lambda) \quad (9)$$

$$= \int_{S_{A-} \cap S'_{A+}} d\lambda\rho(\lambda) - \int_{S_{A+} \cap S'_{A-}} d\lambda\rho(\lambda) \quad (10)$$

$$= \left( \int_{S_{A-} \cap S'_{A+}} d\lambda\rho(\lambda) + \int_{S_{A+} \cap S'_{A+}} d\lambda\rho(\lambda) \right) - \left( \int_{S_{A+} \cap S'_{A-}} d\lambda\rho(\lambda) + \int_{S_{A+} \cap S'_{A+}} d\lambda\rho(\lambda) \right) \quad (11)$$

$$= \int_{S'_{A+}} d\lambda\rho(\lambda) - \int_{S_{A+}} d\lambda\rho(\lambda) \quad (12)$$

where, in the last line, we have used the relations  $(S_{A-} \cap S'_{A+}) \cup (S_{A+} \cap S'_{A+}) = S'_{A+}$  and  $(S_{A+} \cap S'_{A-}) \cup (S_{A+} \cap S'_{A+}) = S_{A+}$ . In the next section, we use the present discussion as a prototype to analyse marginal-independence in superdeterministic models.

#### IV. MARGINAL-INDEPENDENCE IN SUPERDETERMINISTIC MODELS

Consider a superdeterministic model of the Bell scenario, where the measurement outcomes are specified by the local indicator functions  $A(\lambda, M_A)$  and  $B(\lambda, M_B)$ . Here  $M_A$  ( $M_B$ ) corresponds to the operator  $\hat{\sigma}_{\tilde{a}} \otimes \hat{I}$  ( $\hat{I} \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{\tilde{b}}$ ). The model reproduces the Bell correlations for an equilibrium distribution of hidden variables  $\rho_{eq}(\lambda|M_A, M_B)$ . Consider a nonequilibrium distribution  $\rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B) \neq \rho_{eq}(\lambda|M_A, M_B)$ , where  $\alpha$  ( $\beta$ ) labels the output of the setting mechanism that determines the measurement setting at wing A (B).

Let us examine the details at the hidden-variables level when a measurement setting is changed, say  $M_B \rightarrow M'_B$ . We define the sets  $S_{M_B} = \{\lambda|\rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B) > 0\}$ ,  $S_{M'_B} = \{\lambda|\rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B) > 0\}$ ,  $S = S_{M_B} \cup S_{M'_B}$  and partition the set  $S$  as

$$S = S_{A+} \cup S_{A-}; \quad S_{A+} \cap S_{A-} = \emptyset \quad (13)$$

<sup>5</sup> In section VI, we discuss that the violation of marginal-independence implies a physical signal for nonlocal models. Therefore, we currently use the term signal when these constraints are violated.




FIG. 3: Schematic illustration of apparent-signalling in supedeterministic models. Part a) of the figure shows the hidden-variables distribution, assumed to be uniform for simplicity, when the measurement settings are  $M_A$  and  $M_B$  at wings A and B respectively. The blue portion of the graph represents  $\lambda$ 's belonging to the set  $S_{A+} = \{\lambda | \lambda \in S \wedge A(\lambda, M_A) = +1\}$ , and the red portion represents  $\lambda$ 's belonging to the set  $S_{A-} = \{\lambda | \lambda \in S \wedge A(\lambda, M_A) = -1\}$ . If the hidden-variables distribution is marginal-independent, then upon changing  $M_B \rightarrow M'_B$ , the measures of the sets  $S_{A+}$  and  $S_{A-}$  will remain constant. This is illustrated in part b), where the measures of the sets  $S_{A+}$  and  $S_{A-}$  remain unchanged, although the distribution has changed from  $\rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B) \rightarrow \rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B)$ . In general, for a nonequilibrium distribution, the measures of  $S_{A+}$  and  $S_{A-}$  will change. This is illustrated in part c) of the figure.

where  $S_{A+} = \{\lambda | \lambda \in S \wedge A(\lambda, M_A) = +1\}$  and  $S_{A-} = \{\lambda | \lambda \in S \wedge A(\lambda, M_A) = -1\}$ . The measure of the set  $S_{A+}$  with respect to the distribution  $\rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B)$  ( $\rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B)$ ) determines the marginal probability that  $A = +1$  when the measurement setting at wing B is  $M_B$  ( $M'_B$ ). For marginal-independence, we must have

$$\int_{S_{A+}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B) = \int_{S_{A+}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B) \quad (14)$$

Since the measure of the set  $S$  is 1 with respect to both the distributions, we can use equations (13) and (14) to get

$$\int_{S_{A-}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B) = \int_{S_{A-}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B) \quad (15)$$

Equations (14) and (15) can be restated together as

$$\int_{S_{A+(-)}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B) = \int_{S_{A+(-)}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B) \quad (16)$$

Thus, for marginal-independence, the measures of the sets  $S_{A+}$  and  $S_{A-}$  must remain constant when  $M_B$  is changed to  $M'_B$ . For nonequilibrium distributions, the measures will change in general (see Fig. 3). This can be intuitively



thought of in the following manner. Changing  $M_B \rightarrow M'_B$  ‘reshuffles’ the distribution  $\rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B)$  in the set  $S$  to  $\rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B)$ . Reshuffling implies that if the distribution is increased at some region of  $\lambda$ , then it has to be equally decreased at another region to keep the total measure constant. In the case of the equilibrium distribution, the sets  $S_{A+}$  and  $S_{A-}$  are reshuffled separately. This keeps the measures of  $S_{A+}$  and  $S_{A-}$  constant, although the distribution changes inside both the sets. In general, the distribution is reshuffled *across the entire set*  $S$ . The measures of  $S_{A+}$  and  $S_{A-}$  consequently change in general, violating marginal-independence. The change in the marginal at A, in this case, will be given by

$$\int_{S_{A+}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B) - \int_{S_{A+}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B) \quad (17)$$

Comparing this to equation (12), it becomes evident that this mechanism is completely different from that discussed for nonlocal deterministic models in the previous section. In the case of nonlocality, marginal-independence is violated due to inequality of the measures of the transition sets  $T_A(-, +)$  and  $T_A(+, -)$ . There are no transition sets in the superdeterministic case. The mapping from  $\lambda$  to the measurement outcomes is not affected by the change of measurement settings – the distribution of  $\lambda$  itself changes. The change in marginals (in nonequilibrium) occurs due to change in the measures of  $S_{A+}$  and  $S_{A-}$  when  $M_B$  is changed to  $M'_B$ . In the next section, we apply this distinction for the case of a nonlocal superdeterministic model.

## V. MARGINAL-INDEPENDENCE IN NONLOCAL SUPERDETERMINISTIC MODELS

Up until now we have discussed the mechanisms by which nonlocal and superdeterministic models violate marginal-independence (in nonequilibrium) separately. It is important to verify that these mechanisms continue to be well-defined in more complicated circumstances. In this section, we consider a hybrid hidden-variables model that is nonlocal as well as superdeterministic. We show how the two mechanisms operate separately in such a hybrid model<sup>6</sup>.

Consider a model with nonlocal indicator functions  $A(\lambda, M_A, M_B)$  and  $B(\lambda, M_A, M_B)$ , and a hidden-variables distribution  $\rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B)$ , where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are the outputs of the setting mechanisms at wings A and B respectively. Let the model reproduce the Bell correlations for a particular equilibrium distribution  $\rho_{eq}(\lambda|M_A, M_B)$ .

Consider the change in the marginal outcome distribution at A when the measurement setting at wing B is changed from  $M_B \rightarrow M'_B$ . We define the sets  $S_{M_B} = \{\lambda|\rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B) > 0\}$ ,  $S_{M'_B} = \{\lambda|\rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B) > 0\}$  and  $S = S_{M_B} \cup S_{M'_B}$  in analogy with section IV. The set  $S$  can be partitioned in two ways:

$$S = S_{A+} \cup S_{A-}; \quad S_{A+} \cap S_{A-} = \emptyset \quad (18)$$

$$S = S'_{A+} \cup S'_{A-}; \quad S'_{A+} \cap S'_{A-} = \emptyset \quad (19)$$

where  $S_{A+(-)} = \{\lambda|\lambda \in S \wedge A(\lambda, M_A, M_B) = +(-)1\}$  and  $S'_{A+(-)} = \{\lambda|\lambda \in S \wedge A(\lambda, M_A, M'_B) = +(-)1\}$ . We define the transition sets  $T(-, +) = S_{A-} \cap S'_{A+}$  and  $T(-, -) = S_{A+} \cap S'_{A-}$  in analogy with section III. The measure of the set  $S_{A+}$  with respect to the distribution  $\rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B)$  determines the marginal probability that  $A = +1$  when the measurement setting at wing B is  $M_B$ . Likewise, the measure of the set  $S'_{A+}$  with respect to the distribution  $\rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B)$  determines the marginal probability that  $A = +1$  when the measurement setting at wing B is  $M'_B$ . For marginal-independence, one must have

$$\int_{S'_{A+}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B) = \int_{S_{A+}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B) \quad (20)$$

For nonequilibrium distributions, this condition will not be fulfilled in general. In that case, the change in the marginal at A will be

$$\eta_{tot} = \int_{S'_{A+}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B) - \int_{S_{A+}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda|\alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B) \quad (21)$$

We now separate the nonlocal and superdeterministic contributions to  $\eta_{tot}$ . We know that nonlocal signalling

---

<sup>6</sup> It is an interesting open question whether it is possible to disentangle the different mechanisms at work for all hybrid models.




FIG. 4: Schematic illustration of decomposition of the net change in marginal into nonlocal and superdeterministic components for a nonlocal superdeterministic model. Part *a*) of the figure illustrates the initial case when the measurement settings are  $M_A$  and  $M_B$  at wings A and B respectively. The distribution has been assumed to be uniform for simplicity. The blue (red) region of the graph represents  $\lambda$ 's which give the outcome  $+1$  ( $-1$ ) at wing A. Part *d*) of the figure illustrates the final case when the measurement setting at wing B has changed from  $M_B \rightarrow M'_B$ . The blue/red regions have changed due to the nonlocality and the distribution has changed due to the superdeterministic correlations. Part *b*) illustrates the hypothetical case when changing  $M_B \rightarrow M'_B$  affects only the blue/red regions without changing the distribution. It, in turn, also illustrates the hypothetical case when changing  $M'_B \rightarrow M_B$  affects only the distribution without changing the blue/red regions. Part *c*) illustrates the hypothetical case when changing  $M_B \rightarrow M'_B$  affects only the distribution without changing the blue/red regions. In turn, it also illustrates the hypothetical case when changing  $M'_B \rightarrow M_B$  affects only the blue/red regions without changing the distribution. To calculate the nonlocal contribution to the change in marginals  $\eta_{non}$ , we average over the change in the marginal between parts *a*) and *b*), and parts *c*) and *d*). For the superdeterministic contribution to  $\eta_{sup}$ , we average over the change in the marginal between parts *a*) and *c*), and parts *b*) and *d*). The net change in marginal (that is, between parts *a*) and *d*)) is  $\eta_{tot} = \eta_{sup} + \eta_{non}$ .

occurs due to  $\lambda$ 's flipping their outcomes from  $+1(-1) \rightarrow -1(+1)$ , the distribution remaining constant. We may define the nonlocal contribution as the change in the marginal at A due to these transitions averaged over both the distributions:

$$\eta_{non} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \left( \int_{T(-,+)} d\lambda \rho(\lambda | \alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B) - \int_{T(+,-)} d\lambda \rho(\lambda | \alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B) \right) + \left( \int_{T(-,+)} d\lambda \rho(\lambda | \alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B) - \int_{T(+,-)} d\lambda \rho(\lambda | \alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B) \right) \right] \quad (22)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left[ \left( \int_{S'_{A+}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda | \alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B) - \int_{S_{A+}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda | \alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B) \right) + \left( \int_{S'_{A+}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda | \alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B) - \int_{S_{A+}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda | \alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B) \right) \right] \quad (23)$$

where, in the last line, we have used equation (12).

Similarly, we know that superdeterministic apparent-signalling occurs due to reshuffling of the distribution, the indicator functions remaining constant. We may define the superdeterministic contribution as the change in the marginal at A due to the reshuffling averaged over both the indicator functions:

$$\eta_{sup} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \left( \int_{S'_{A+}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda | \alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B) - \int_{S'_{A+}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda | \alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B) \right) + \left( \int_{S_{A+}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda | \alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B) - \int_{S_{A+}} d\lambda \rho(\lambda | \alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B) \right) \right] \quad (24)$$

It is easy to verify that

$$\eta_{tot} = \eta_{non} + \eta_{sup} \quad (25)$$

Thus, the net change in the marginal at wing A can be broken down into a nonlocal component and a superdeterministic component separately (see Fig. 4). If there is no nonlocality in the model, that is,  $S_{A+} = S'_{A+}$ , then it can be verified that  $\eta_{non} = 0$  and  $\eta_{tot} = \eta_{sup}$ . Likewise, if there is no superdeterminism in the model, that is,  $\rho(\lambda | \alpha = M_A, \beta = M_B) = \rho(\lambda | \alpha = M_A, \beta = M'_B)$ , then  $\eta_{sup} = 0$  and  $\eta_{tot} = \eta_{non}$ . Equations (23) and (24), therefore, reduce to equations (12) and (17) respectively as limiting cases. For marginal-independence, we must have  $\eta_{tot} = 0$ . This can be either for a distribution, for example the equilibrium distribution, for which both  $\eta_{non}$  and  $\eta_{sup}$  are equal to 0. Or, it can be that both are non-zero for a nonequilibrium distribution, but they exactly cancel each other out. In general, both  $\eta_{non}$  and  $\eta_{sup}$  will be non-zero and fail to cancel each other out exactly, leading to violation of marginal-independence.

## VI. THE CONSPIRATORIAL CHARACTER OF SUPERDETERMINISTIC SIGNALLING

In section II, we discussed that superdeterministic signalling is apparent, that is, the violation of marginal-independence (formal no-signalling) is not equivalent to transfer of information between the wings. In this section, we argue, first, that apparent-signalling is a unique feature of superdeterministic models, and second, that it is indicative of the conspiratorial character of these models.

We argue about the uniqueness by considering violation of formal no-signalling vis-a-vis physical signalling for other hidden-variables models. Let us first consider nonlocal models. The indicator function at the first wing  $A(\lambda, M_A, M_B)$  functionally depends on the measurement setting  $M_B$  at the second wing. That is, the information about the distant measurement setting is superluminally transferred at the hidden-variables level. This constitutes a physical signal, and is present, in fact, at all times. It is, however, impossible to detect this when the measurement statistics are calculated for an equilibrium ensemble, as discussed in section III. In nonequilibrium, this signal manifests itself at the macroscopic level as the generic violation of marginal-independence. For nonlocal models, then, the violation of marginal-independence confirms the presence of an actual physical signal. Next, consider retrocausal models. In these models, the hidden-variables distribution  $\rho(\lambda | \psi, M_A, M_B)$  at the time of preparation is functionally dependent on the future measurement settings  $M_A$  and  $M_B$ , analogous to its functional dependence on the past preparation setting (denoted by the quantum state  $\psi$ ). Thus, there is a signal at the hidden-variables level from the future to the past. The indicator functions  $A(\lambda, M_A)$ ,  $B(\lambda, M_B)$  themselves have no functional dependence on the distant measurement settings, but the marginal outcome distributions in general do, because of the functional dependence of the hidden-variables distribution itself<sup>7</sup> (see equations (3) and (4)). Therefore, in general, there is a signal between the wings at the hidden-variables level via a ‘zig-zag’ [39] route where, first, the future measurement setting at one wing retrocausally affects the hidden-variables distribution at the time of preparation, second, this distribution causally affects the marginal outcome distribution at the other wing in the future. In nonequilibrium, the generic violation of marginal-independence reflects the presence of this signal (see, for example, ref. [12]). In a local superdeterministic model, on the other hand, no information is transferred between the wings. Violation of marginal-independence implies only a statistical correlation between local outcomes and distant settings.

---

<sup>7</sup> There is an exception. If  $\lambda$  is separable, that is  $\lambda = (\lambda_A, \lambda_B)$ , and the marginal equilibrium distributions satisfy  $\rho_{eq}(\lambda_A | \psi, M_A, M_B) = \rho_{eq}(\lambda_A | \psi, M_A, M'_B)$  and  $\rho_{eq}(\lambda_B | \psi, M_A, M_B) = \rho_{eq}(\lambda_B | \psi, M'_A, M_B)$ , then the marginal outcome distributions do not functionally depend on the distant measurement settings in equilibrium. However, this is not true in general for nonequilibrium distributions. For an example of such a model, and a discussion of this point, see ref. [12]



FIG. 5: Pictorial illustration of the conspiratorial character of apparent-signalling. Consider a superdeterministic model of spin-singlet pairs with a nonequilibrium hidden-variables distribution, for which the measurement statistics violate marginal-independence. The two experimenters may exploit this to construct an ‘instantaneous telephone’ to communicate with each other. The red telephone wires represent a conduit through which information from one wing can reach, and thereby causally influence, the other wing. Since there is no information transfer between the wings in a superdeterministic model (see section II), the telephone wires are cut at both wings. But the fact remains that marginal-independence is violated, which the experimenters may exploit for communication. Say the experimenter at the first wing speaks a message A into this telephone. The experimenter at the second wing hears the message A at his end, but this is, according to superdeterminism, only a coincidence. In principle, she could have heard a message A’, but  $A'=A$  is *arranged* by the past initial conditions. Say the second experimenter replies back with a message B. The first experimenter then hears the correct message B, but this is again purely coincidental. The two experimenters can continue to have an arbitrarily long conversation using this telephone, without any information physically exchanged between them. Any model that generates a sequence of events which appears to be causally connected, but are in fact, simply flukes, appears conspiratorial intuitively.

This apparent-signalling clearly brings out a conspiratorial feature of superdeterminism. The experimenter at wing A (B) of the Bell scenario can influence the marginal outcome distribution at wing B (A), because marginal-independence is violated. Practically, this constitutes a signalling procedure, but the physical interpretation is that the local marginals and the distant settings are only statistically correlated, due to past initial conditions. This leads to a scenario where the entire sequence of messages exchanged between the two experimenters is explained as a statistical coincidence (see Fig. 5). It is much more natural, intuitively, to regard a conversation as an actual exchange of information between the conversationalists. A ‘series of coincidences mimicking an actual conversation’ appears conspiratorial intuitively; in  $\mathcal{B}$  we show that such series of coincidences are endemic in superdeterminism, and quantify the conspiracy involved.

## VII. CONCLUSION

In an effort to isolate key conspiratorial features of superdeterministic models, we have introduced nonequilibrium extensions of superdeterministic models and explored their various properties. Our exercise has provided us with two leads. First, in section II we showed that different setting mechanisms in general lead to different measurement statistics in nonequilibrium. This implies that the model must be fine-tuned so that such effects do not appear in practice. Second, we showed in section VI that, in nonequilibrium, correlations can conspire to resemble a physical signal. In  $\mathcal{B}$ , we use our results to develop two separate ways to quantify the conspiratorial character of superdeterminism.

We also found that the formal no-signalling constraints fail to capture the intuitive idea of signalling, as the transfer of information from one location to another, for superdeterministic models. The violation of these constraints implies only a statistical correlation (due to initial conditions) between the local marginals and the distant settings. Therefore, we have suggested that the so-called no-signalling constraints may be more appropriately called marginal-independence constraints, and concluded that there is only an apparent-signal in superdeterministic models when these constraints are violated. The issue of signalling in superdeterministic hidden-variables models was also briefly raised in refs. [5, 40], where it was argued that the concept of signalling is not physically meaningful for these models (even if marginal-independence is violated). The argument is that the experimenters are not able to choose the measurement settings ‘at will’ in such models. However, such a reasoning would imply that there is no meaningful signalling in classical electrodynamics, which would run counter to our understanding of classical

physics<sup>8</sup>. We have argued that there are no physical signals in superdeterministic models for a different reason: although marginal-independence is violated in nonequilibrium, there is no physical transfer of information between the wings.

Lastly, we have discussed the hidden-variables mechanism by which superdeterministic models violate marginal-independence, and have distinguished this mechanism from that of nonlocal models. Thus, although hidden-variables models in general violate marginal-independence in nonequilibrium, the physical meaning of this violation is different for different kinds of models. We were able to apply this distinction to separate the nonlocal and superdeterministic contributions to the net change in marginals for a hybrid model that is nonlocal as well as superdeterministic.

- 
- [1] J. S. Bell. *Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics: Collected papers on quantum philosophy*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004.
- [2] G. Bacciagaluppi and A. Valentini. *Quantum theory at the crossroads: reconsidering the 1927 Solvay conference*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2009. Part II, Chapter 5.
- [3] M. J. Hall. Local deterministic model of singlet state correlations based on relaxing measurement independence. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 105(25), 2010.
- [4] J. Barrett and N. Gisin. How much measurement independence is needed to demonstrate nonlocality? *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 106(10):100406, 2011.
- [5] M. J. Hall. The significance of measurement independence for Bell inequalities and locality. In *At the Frontier of Spacetime*. Springer, 2016.
- [6] A. S. Friedman, A. H. Guth, M. J. Hall, D. I. Kaiser, and J. Gallicchio. Relaxed Bell inequalities with arbitrary measurement dependence for each observer. *Phys. Rev. A*, 99(1):012121, 2019.
- [7] O. C. de Beaugregard. Time symmetry and the Einstein paradox. *Il Nuovo Cimento B (1971-1996)*, 42, 1977.
- [8] J. G. Cramer. The transactional interpretation of quantum mechanics. *Rev. Mod. Phys*, 58(3), 1986.
- [9] H. Price. *Time's arrow & Archimedes' point: new directions for the physics of time*. Oxford Univ. Press, USA, 1997.
- [10] R. I. Sutherland. Causally symmetric Bohm model. *Stud. Hist. Philos. Sci. B*, 39(4), 2008.
- [11] K. Wharton. Quantum states as ordinary information. *Information*, 5(1), 2014.
- [12] I. Sen. A local  $\psi$ -epistemic retrocausal hidden-variable model of Bell correlations with wavefunctions in physical space. *Found. Phys*, 49(2), 2019.
- [13] I. Sen. The effect of time-dilation on Bell experiments in the retrocausal Brans model. *Proc. R. Soc. A*, 476(2234):20190546, 2020.
- [14] K. Wharton and N. Argaman. Bell's theorem and spacetime-based reformulations of quantum mechanics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.04313*, 2019.
- [15] I. Sen and A. Valentini. Superdeterministic hidden-variables models II: nonequilibrium and signalling. To be published.
- [16] C. H. Brans. Bell's theorem does not eliminate fully causal hidden variables. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.*, 27(2), 1988.
- [17] G. Hooft. The cellular automaton interpretation of quantum mechanics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1405.1548*, 2014.
- [18] S. Hossenfelder and T. Palmer. Rethinking superdeterminism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.06462*, 2019.
- [19] T. Palmer. Discretisation of the Bloch sphere, Invariant set theory and the Bell theorem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.01734*, 2019.
- [20] D. Rauch, J. Handsteiner, A. Hochrainer, J. Gallicchio, A. S. Friedman, C. Leung, B. Liu, L. Bulla, S. Ecker, F. Steinlechner, et al. Cosmic bell test using random measurement settings from high-redshift quasars. *Phys. Rev. Lett*, 121(8), 2018.
- [21] J. S. Bell, A. Shimony, M. A. Horne, and J. F. Clauser. An exchange on local beables. *Dialectica*, pages 85–110, 1985.
- [22] H. Price and K. Wharton. A live alternative to quantum spooks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.06712*, 2015.
- [23] S. Pironio. Random choices and the locality loophole. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.00248*, 2015.
- [24] R. Scruton. *Modern philosophy: An introduction and survey*. A&C Black, 2012.
- [25] C. S. Soon, M. Brass, H.-J. Heinze, and J.-D. Haynes. Unconscious determinants of free decisions in the human brain. *Nat. Neurosci.*, 11, 2008.
- [26] A. Zeilinger. *Dance of the photons: from Einstein to quantum teleportation*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2010.
- [27] L. Hardy. Proposal to use humans to switch settings in a Bell experiment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.04620*, 2017.
- [28] C. Abellan, A. Acin, A. Alarcon, O. Alibart, C. Andersen, F. Andreoli, A. Beckert, F. Beduini, A. Bendersky, M. Bentivegna, et al. Challenging local realism with human choices. *Nature*, 557, 2018.
- [29] J. S. Bell. Bertlmann's socks and the nature of reality. *Le Journal de Physique Colloques*, 42, 1981.
- [30] A. Valentini. Signal-locality in hidden-variables theories. *Phys. Lett. A*, 297(5-6), 2002.

---

<sup>8</sup> See also the Introduction for a discussion of the relationship between ‘will’ and fundamental randomness.

- [31] D. Dürr, S. Goldstein, and N. Zanghi. Quantum equilibrium and the origin of absolute uncertainty. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 67, 1992.
- [32] A. Valentini. Foundations of statistical mechanics and the status of the Born rule in de Broglie-Bohm pilot-wave theory. In *Statistical Mechanics and Scientific Explanation: Determinism, Indeterminism and Laws of Nature*. World Scientific, 2019.
- [33] A. Valentini. Signal-locality, uncertainty, and the subquantum H-theorem. I. *Phys. Lett. A*, 156(1-2), 1991.
- [34] A. Valentini. Signal-locality, uncertainty, and the subquantum H-theorem. II. *Phys. Lett. A*, 158(1-2), 1991.
- [35] C. J. Wood and R. W. Spekkens. The lesson of causal discovery algorithms for quantum correlations: Causal explanations of Bell-inequality violations require fine-tuning. *New J. Phys.*, 17(3), 2015.
- [36] J. S. Bell. La nouvelle cuisine. In *Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics: Collected papers on quantum philosophy*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004.
- [37] J. S. Bell. The theory of local beables. In *Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics: Collected papers on quantum philosophy*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004.
- [38] A. Valentini and H. Westman. Dynamical origin of quantum probabilities. *Proc. R. Soc. A*, 461(2053):253–272, 2005.
- [39] H. Price and K. Wharton. Disentangling the quantum world. *Entropy*, 17(11), 2015.
- [40] L. Sheridan, V. Scarani, et al. Bell tests with min-entropy sources. *Phys. Rev. A*, 87(6), 2013.