Abstract. Usually the ‘hidden variables’ of Bell’s theorem are supposed to describe the pair of Bell particles. Here a semantic shift is proposed, namely to attach the hidden variables to a stochastic medium or field in which the particles move. It appears that under certain conditions one of the premises of Bell’s theorem, namely ‘measurement independence’, is not satisfied for such ‘background-based’ theories, even if these only involve local interactions. Such theories therefore do not fall under the restriction of Bell’s no-go theorem. A simple version of such background-based models are Ising models, which we investigate here in the classical and quantum regime. We also propose to test background-based models by a straightforward extension of existing experiments. The present version corrects an error in the preceding version.
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1. Introduction.

Bell’s original article [1] proved that in certain correlation experiments quantum mechanics is in contradiction with ‘deterministic and local hidden variable theories’. Deterministic hidden variable theories (HVTs) aim at ‘completing’ quantum mechanics by describing certain quantum properties (as spin, \( \sigma \)) as deterministic functions of yet unknown additional variables (\( \lambda \)). Bell’s theorem concerns ‘local’ HVTs: they invoke only forces that propagate at a (sub)luminal speed and that are localized in space (i.e. that become negligible beyond a certain range) [1]. Clauser and Horne [2], Bell [3] and other authors proved that the theorem could be generalized to include stochastic HVTs, in which it is not the value of the property \( \sigma \) that is determined (i.e. \( \sigma = f(\lambda) \) exists), but the probability that \( \sigma \) has a certain value given some additional variables (i.e. \( P(\sigma|\lambda) \) is defined). Since then it was proven that this stochastic variant of Bell’s theorem follows from the conjunction of three assumptions, which are commonly termed ‘outcome independence’ (OI), ‘parameter independence’ (PI), and ‘measurement independence’ (MI) [4-6]. As we will recall in
Section 2, it is usually assumed that OI and PI must necessarily hold in a local hidden variable system; to justify MI one invokes, additionally, an argument based on ‘free will’ (see e.g. [3, 6-7, 11-12]). Much recent work has been devoted to relaxing the conditions OI, PI, MI [6-10], allowing to derive relaxed Bell inequalities [6], or to reproduce the quantum correlations of the singlet state by mathematical toy models [6-10] (for a recent review see Ref. [6]). In the first part of this article we will investigate these conditions in well-known systems from statistical mechanics, namely Ising lattices, by performing a Bell-type experiment on them. First we will focus on static Bell experiments, i.e. in which the analyzer angles are not switched. This will make us acquainted with these conditions and give us the physical insight needed for the second part, where real, in particular dynamic, Bell experiments will be considered.

The Bell experiment was performed many times in increasingly ideal conditions. The essential improvement in the most recent tests consisted in closing various loopholes, such as the locality loophole [13-15]. By using dynamic analyzers and other sophisticated equipment these remarkable experiments sought to impose locality (i.e. OI and PI) [13-14], so to ensure that no long-range influences could exist and explain the quantum results. The very recent experiment [15] addressed moreover the ‘freedom-of-choice’ loophole: it aimed at not only imposing OI and PI but also MI, again by an impressive experimental set-up. In all these experiments the Bell inequality was violated and the quantum prediction corroborated [13-15]. As a result, there is now a solid and quite general belief in the physics and quantum philosophy communities that local HVTs are impossible.

A question of obvious interest is whether the conditions OI, PI, MI necessarily hold in all local systems on which one can perform a Bell-type correlation experiment. If one of these conditions does not hold in a given realistic system, then the BI cannot be derived for it, and is possibly violated. This, in turn, would imply that the system in question might teach us something about a hidden reality underlying the real Bell experiment. OI, PI, MI are conditions of probabilistic independence (see Section 2). Therefore good candidates to study them are highly correlated systems, where their validity seems a priori questionable. In Ref. [24] we already showed that spin-lattices are an interesting study case; here we investigate new configurations of such spin-lattices and, especially, elaborate and refine several of the claims of Ref. [24]. In particular, we will investigate here the case of dynamic Bell experiments. If one
performs thought experiments on spin-lattices that imitate Bell’s experiment (for static analyzers), one can calculate whether OI, PI, and MI are valid, as well as whether the Bell Inequality (BI) is satisfied. In Section 3 and 4 it will be shown that classical Ising lattices, described by the usual spin-1/2 Ising Hamiltonian, can strongly violate the Bell inequality – for certain geometrical configurations and for certain (realistic) parameter sets. We will retrace this to violation of MI. Interestingly, Ising-lattices are local systems. Note first that the Ising Hamiltonian does of course not describe a direct ‘spin-spin’ interaction: its precise expression (Eq. (11)) arises through a Coulomb potential combined with Pauli’s exclusion principle, as is well explained e.g. by Feynman [17]. So the interactions $J_{ij}$ are mediated by a force field, which is obviously Lorentz-invariant, so local in this sense. Moreover the Ising Hamiltonian explicitly neglects interactions beyond near neighbors by putting the interaction constants $J_{ij}$ between far-apart nodes equal to zero. As a consequence Ising lattices satisfy the Clauser-Horne factorability condition [2], the usual definition of locality in stochastic systems, as we will recall below.

In view of these results, an obvious question arises: is it possible to find a general physical framework in which MI does not hold, and for which Bell’s theorem is therefore not applicable? In Section 6 we argue that such a general hidden-variable framework exists: namely models that invoke a stochastic ‘background’ medium or field in which the Bell-particles move. In other words, we propose a semantic shift in the meaning of the term ‘hidden variables’ (HVs): in the models we consider these variables describe the background medium rather than the particles. We will argue (Section 6) that under this paradigm shift background-based HV theories escape from Bell’s theorem: even in the most advanced dynamic experiment [15], MI can be violated in a local, physically bona fide manner. Spin-lattices can be seen as a simple example of background-based theories.

Thus we do of course not reject Bell’s theorem as a mathematical result, which obviously follows from its premises. But it seems there are cogent arguments for the idea that at least one of these premises, namely MI, is not a reasonable assumption for a wide class of local HV models if the HVs describe a background medium.

For proposing this semantic shift we are not only motivated by our results on spin-lattices, but also by recently published ‘sub-quantum’ theories. There actually exists a whole class of models that attempt to explain certain aspects of quantum mechanics based on a stochastic ‘zero-
point field’ or vacuum field (see e.g. [19-21] and references therein). In these theories quantum particles as electrons etc. interact with a background field, adopting as a consequence a Brownian motion from which the quantum statistics would arise. Recently it was claimed that double-slit interference and entanglement can be explained in this manner (see e.g. [19]). It has already been observed [19] that there is a link between these zero-point field theories and recent and spectacular experiments performed on classical systems that mimic quantum behavior [22-23]. In the latter experiments oil droplets show quantum-like behavior (including double-slit interference, tunneling and quantization of angular momentum), also by interaction with a background field, namely an external vibration [22-23]. It is then tempting to see a link between the background-based theories we will investigate here and the mentioned sub-quantum theories [19-21] and even the experiments [22-23]. A common denominator is that these all invoke a stochastic background medium or field.

Another introductory remark is in place. In the following we will consider HV models for Bell-type correlation experiments. These are ‘HV’ models in the sense that the probabilities which can be measured in a Bell experiment, namely \( P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2|a, b) \), \( P(\sigma_1) \) etc. (definitions given below), can be ‘explained’, i.e. calculated by summing over other variables – the HVs. So in our model systems \( P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2|\lambda) \), \( P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2|\lambda, a, b) \), \( P(\sigma_1|\lambda) \) etc. are defined and can be calculated – the first thing one asks of a HV model. In Section 5 we will deal with HV models in which the HVs have a quantum origin. A priori the BI can also be derived for that case, as e.g. emphasized by Bell in [3] (see also footnote 14 of [2]). We will show that investigating this case is instructive for several reasons. Comparing classical and quantum Ising lattices allows to compare classical and quantum correlation, beyond entanglement (we consider quantum systems that are not entangled). Moreover, one can study OI, MI, PI also in these systems (Section 5). On the other hand ‘quantum HV’ models may be found conceptually tricky. Our goal is essentially to introduce the topic; readers may skip Section 5 without loss of information as concerns all important conclusions of the article.

2. Conditions for deriving the BI. Definitions.
Let us first define ‘outcome independence’ (OI), ‘parameter independence’ (PI) (or ‘no-signaling’), and ‘measurement independence’ (MI), the (minimal) conditions of probabilistic independence on which all derivations of the BI are based (for stochastic models). In a Bell-type experiment one measures the correlations \(P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2|a,b)\), i.e. the joint probabilities to measure a value ‘\(\sigma_1\)’ (±1) on the left particle and ‘\(\sigma_2\)’ on the right particle, given that the value of the analyzer variable on the left is ‘a’, and ‘b’ on the right. (Note we will often use expressions as \(P(x)\) instead of \(P(x=X)\); there will be no risk of confusion.) A HV model assumes that these correlations can be explained by HVs \(\lambda\) with a distribution \(\rho\). Indeed, assuming the existence of HVs and using standard rules of probability theory one has:

\[
P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2|a,b) = \int \int P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2|a,b,\lambda) \rho(\lambda|a,b)d\lambda = \int P(\sigma_1|\sigma_2,a,b,\lambda) P(\sigma_2|a,b,\lambda) \rho(\lambda|a,b)d\lambda. \tag{1}
\]

If each of the following 3 conditions (OI, PI, MI) is satisfied:

\[
P(\sigma_1|\sigma_2,a,b,\lambda) = P(\sigma_1|a,b,\lambda) \text{ for all } (\lambda,\sigma_1,\sigma_2) \tag{2}
\]
\[
P(\sigma_2|a,b,\lambda) = P(\sigma_2|b,\lambda) \text{ for all } \lambda \text{ and similarly for } \sigma_1 \tag{3}
\]
\[
\rho(\lambda|a,b) = \rho(\lambda|a',b') \equiv \rho(\lambda) \text{ for all } (\lambda,a,b) \tag{4}
\]

then it follows from (1) that:

\[
P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2|a,b) = \int P(\sigma_1|a,\lambda) P(\sigma_2|b,\lambda) \rho(\lambda)d\lambda. \tag{5}
\]

From (5) the Bell inequality (BI) is derived by only using algebra. Actually, all known derivations of generalized Bell inequalities are based on assumptions equivalent to (or stronger than) OI, MI and PI [6]. If a HV model would reproduce the quantum correlation for the singlet state:

\[
P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2|a,b) = \frac{1}{4}(1 - \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \cos(a-b)) \tag{6}
\]

and therefore violate the BI, it must violate at least one of the assumptions OI, PI, MI. Conversely, if OI, PI or MI does not hold for a given HV model, the latter can possibly violate the BI; but this needs to be calculated for the given model. In the literature toy models have been given reproducing (6) by violating, for instance, MI [6-8], PI [10], and MI and OI [9]. Thus violation of OI, PI and MI can be considered ‘resources’ for going beyond the BI.
In the following it will be useful to precisely quantify to which degree a HV model violates OI, PI, or MI. To that end we will use measures introduced by Hall in [6-7], which we will term, for obvious reasons, Outcome Dependence (OD), Parameter Dependence (PD) and Measurement Dependence (MD):

$$\text{OD} = \sup_{(a,b,\lambda)} \sum_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2} \left| P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \mid a, b, \lambda) - P(\sigma_1 \mid a, b, \lambda).P(\sigma_2 \mid a, b, \lambda) \right|$$ \hspace{1cm} (7)

$$\text{PD} = \sup_{(a,a',b,\sigma_2, \lambda)} \left| P(\sigma_2 \mid a, b, \lambda) - P(\sigma_2 \mid a', b, \lambda) \right|$$ \hspace{1cm} (8)

$$\text{MD} = \sup_{(a,a',b,b')} \left[ \int d\lambda \cdot \left| \rho(\lambda \mid a, b) - \rho(\lambda \mid a', b') \right| \right].$$ \hspace{1cm} (9)

Here \( \sup(Y) \) indicates the maximum value of \( Y \) when varying the parameters \( X \) over all their values. PD in (8) can also be defined with respect to \( \sigma_1 \), but we will mostly consider symmetric systems in which both measures coincide.

In the following the ‘factorability’ condition of Clauser and Horne [2] is needed; it stipulates that:

$$P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \mid a, b, \lambda) = P(\sigma_1 \mid a, \lambda).P(\sigma_2 \mid b, \lambda) \text{ for all } (\lambda, \sigma_1, \sigma_2).$$ \hspace{1cm} (10)

Note that this condition is the conjunction of OI (2) and PI (3) above. The condition (10) has been proposed by Clauser and Horne as a reasonable locality assumption that would be a necessary consequence of relativistic locality. Since their seminal paper, (10) has become the usual definition of locality for probabilistic systems. It is however essential to realize that it is nowhere proven, as far as we know, that any system that is local in Bell’s sense\footnote{To be explicit, when stating ‘local in Bell’s sense [1]’ we mean ‘based on interactions that are sub-luminal and decaying over space, so negligible after a certain distance’ – the bona fide physical forces we know.} \cite{bell} necessarily satisfies (10), so is local in the sense of Clauser-Horne [2].

Indeed, relatively few research efforts have been devoted to investigating whether the assumptions (2-4) and (10) necessarily hold in all local systems. Since in the most sophisticated experiments the measurement events have a spacelike separation, it is always assumed that locality is imposed in these experiments, and that PI, OI and MI necessarily hold. One critical analysis was given by Shimony et al. in [11], reviewed in [12], in which the authors argue that MI in (4) may be violated due to ‘ancient’ correlations between \( \lambda \) and (a, b): it is not excluded...
that correlations exist between \( \lambda \) and \((a, b)\) at the moment of measurement which are a remnant of their common causal past. But it is usually assumed that such correlations would violate ‘free will’, and that therefore MI must hold [3, 6, 11-12, 15]. The argument goes as follows: \( \lambda \) in (4) cannot depend on \((a, b)\) because then \((a, b)\) would depend on \( \lambda \) (by standard reciprocity of probabilistic dependence); but \( a \) and \( b \) can be ‘freely chosen’ and can therefore not depend on variables \( \lambda \) – variables that moreover determine \( \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_2 \). We will argue in the next Sections this argument does not hold if the HV are associated with a background medium. As we will see in detail in Section 6, the authors of Ref. [15] have rendered MI particularly plausible (under the standard meaning of ‘HVs’) by creating in their experiment a spacelike separation between the emission event and the setting choice events. Still, we will argue that even this experiment is not conclusive under our semantic shift. Besides MI, also OI can be questioned; in Ref. [24] we give further arguments.

As far as we know the conditions (2-4) have not been studied in realistic systems from statistical mechanics. Interesting candidates are highly correlated systems, since in such systems (2-4) seem \textit{a priori} questionable. First we will investigate Bell-type experiments on such systems using static analyzers; in Section 6 using dynamic analyzers.


Countless texts state that any classical and local system on which a Bell-type correlation experiment is performed, will satisfy the BI. Or more generally that any local ‘HV’ system (in the sense defined in Section 1) should satisfy the BI. That this phrasing, as stated, is wrong is shown by following example. Consider 7 spins (of electrons, ions,...) on a hexagonal lattice (Fig. 1) interacting through the Ising Hamiltonian

\[
H(\theta) = - \sum_{i,j} J_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j - \sum_i h_i \sigma_i.
\]

The \( \sigma_i \) can take the values \( \pm 1 \); \( J_{ij} \) represents the interaction between \( \sigma_i \) and \( \sigma_j \) and ranges over first neighbors; and the \( h_i \) are local magnetic fields. At given temperature \( 1/\beta \) a configuration \( \theta = (\sigma_a, \sigma_b, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_5) \) occurs with the Boltzmann probability

\[
P(\theta) = \frac{e^{-\beta H(\theta)}}{Z}, \quad \text{with} \quad Z = \sum_{\theta} e^{-\beta H(\theta)},
\]

(12)
where $Z$ is the partition function. Note that Hamiltonian (11) is always considered a classical Hamiltonian [16-18]. The $\sigma_i$ are classical variables, not Pauli operators as in the quantum treatment (Section 5); however in some anisotropic magnetic materials, when only one spin direction ($z$) matters, (1) coincides with the quantum description [16,18]. The $\sigma_i$ do not need to be spins, they can represent atomic occupation in a crystal or a lattice gas, deviation from equilibrium position in a network of springs, etc.: the Hamiltonian (11) is ubiquitous. Note finally that in magnetic systems, for which the Ising Hamiltonian is most often used, the interactions $J_{ij}$ arise through a Coulomb potential combined with the Pauli exclusion principle$^2$.

Consider now a Bell-type thought experiment, in which Alice and Bob share an ensemble of such 7-‘spin’ systems. Each system is kept at the same low temperature. Alice and Bob measure each two spins on every system of the ensemble, Alice $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_a$, Bob $\sigma_2$ and $\sigma_b$. (This supposes that the hexagons are ‘oriented’, so that our experimenters know where the nodes 1, 2, a and b lie; but in the next Sections we will encounter systems in which this assumption is not even necessary.) After finishing the whole run, Alice and Bob sit together and determine joint probabilities as $P^{++}(a,b) \equiv P(\sigma_1=+1, \sigma_2 =+1 \mid \sigma_a, \sigma_b)$; these probabilities can be determined for any of the 4 possible couples $(a,b) \equiv (\sigma_a, \sigma_b) = (\pm 1, \pm 1)$ by postselecting 4 subsensembles from the total run – exactly as in the real Bell experiments. (Here $a \equiv \sigma_a$ and $b \equiv \sigma_b$ correspond to the analyzer variables in Bell’s original experiment. The spin values $\sigma_3, \sigma_4, \sigma_5$ can be considered

\[ 2 \text{ The quantum treatment shows that the } J_{ij} \text{ correspond to the exchange integrals } \int \psi^*_a V \psi_a d^3x_1 d^3x_2, \text{ with } V \text{ the Coulomb potential and } \psi_{ab}(x_1,x_2) = \psi_a(x_1) \psi_b(x_2) \text{ (here } \psi_{ab}(x_{1(2)}) \text{ are the single electron eigenfunctions located at } x_1 \text{ and } x_2 \text{ respectively) ([17] Chap. 7).} \]
‘HV’s’. Indeed, Alice and Bob do not even need to know what is located on nodes 3, 4, 5 – we know it’s spins.) They then determine the average product \( \langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \rangle_{a,b} \) for the 4 couples (a,b):

\[
\langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \rangle_{a,b} = P^{++}(a,b) + P^-(a,b) - P^+(a,b) - P^{+-}(a,b)
\]

\[= 1 - 2[P^+(a,b) + P^+(a,b)]. \tag{13}\]

Putting \( a=b=+1 \) and \( a'=b'=-1 \) the quantity

\[
BI = \langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \rangle_{a,b} + \langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \rangle_{a',b} + \langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \rangle_{a,b'} - \langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \rangle_{a',b'} \tag{14}\]

can thus be measured (and calculated), exactly as in Bell’s original experiment. This system is local in the usual sense \([1-2]\). It is local in Bell’s sense \([1]\) because the Coulomb interactions between lattice points are of course Lorentz-invariant. Moreover there is no interaction between the ‘left’ and ‘right’ sides of the lattice, i.e. between \((\sigma_1, \sigma_a)\) and \((\sigma_2, \sigma_b)\): the interactions \(J_{ij}\) range only over first neighbors \((J_{ij} \text{ is taken } = 0 \text{ otherwise})\). Importantly, it is also local in the sense that the Clauser-Horne factorability condition \((10)\) is satisfied, as will be calculated below, with \(\lambda \equiv (\sigma_3, \sigma_4, \sigma_5)\) or any subset thereof.

If one would apply Bell’s theorem to above correlation experiment, considering that it corresponds to a local HV system, one might expect that \( BI \leq 2 \) \([25]\). To calculate \( BI \) by using \((13)\), recall that a conditional probability as e.g.

\[
P(\sigma_1 = +1, \sigma_2 = +1 \mid \sigma_a = +1, \sigma_b = -1) = \frac{P(\sigma_1 = +1, \sigma_2 = +1, \sigma_a = +1, \sigma_b = -1)}{P(\sigma_a = +1, \sigma_b = -1)}. \tag{15}\]

Then, any probability \( P(\eta) \) with \( \eta \) an \( m \)-spin configuration \((m \leq 7)\) is given by:

\[
P(\eta) = \sum_{\theta(\eta)} P(\theta), \tag{16}\]

where the sum runs over the \( 2^7 \) 7-spin configurations \( \theta(\eta) \) that ‘contain’ \( \eta \). \( P(\theta) \) is the Boltzmann factor in \((12)\), involving the Hamiltonian \((11)\). By numerical simulation it is then straightforward to determine all probabilities necessary to calculate \( BI \).

One finds that the Bell-CHSH inequality is violated in this system for a wide range of parameters \( J_{ij} \) and \( h_i \) (we always put \( \beta = 1 \), as usual \([16]\)). For instance, under the constraint that all \( h_i \) and \( J_{ij} \) are identical, one finds that the maximum value of \( BI \approx 2.2 \) (e.g. for \( h_i=0.9 \) and \( J_{ij}=0.7 \), which are realistic values \([16]\)). Under the constraint that the \( J_{ij} \) are identical and that \( h_1=h_2=h_3=h_4=h_5 \), we find for the maximum: \( BI = 2.82843 (= 2\sqrt{2} + 3.10^{-6} \), almost the
value for the singlet state, by an amusing coincidence). This occurs for $J_{ij} = 1.69$, $h_1 = 4.88$ and $h_3 = 0$.

Now, above violation of the Bell inequality can of course be explained. An essential characteristic of Ising lattices is that they are strongly correlated, even if the number of sites ($N$) is large. Indeed, for positive $J_{ij}$ Hamiltonian (11) favors spin alignment, so that e.g. $P(\sigma_i = +1, \sigma_j = +1) > P(\sigma_i = +1)P(\sigma_j = +1)$ even if $\sigma_i$ and $\sigma_j$ are far apart. This leads to collective behaviour (ferromagnetism if the $\sigma_i$ are spins) and phase transitions [16]. More generally we have that:

$$P(\sigma_i = \epsilon, \sigma_j = \delta) \neq P(\sigma_i = \epsilon)P(\sigma_j = \delta) \quad \text{for all } i, j < N \text{ and } \epsilon, \delta = \pm 1,$$

(17)
i.e. the system variables are fully pairwise correlated [24]. The 3 sufficient conditions for the BI to hold in a HV model are OI, PI and MI. If one of these conditions does not hold, the BI cannot be derived anymore, and is possibly violated. What happens in above system is that MI in (4) is invalid for all parameter sets $(h, J)$ and that for some parameter sets $(h, J)$ the BI is violated. Indeed, it is straightforward to calculate for above system that:

$$P(\sigma_i = \sigma, \sigma_j = \sigma') \neq P(\sigma_i = \sigma)P(\sigma_j = \sigma') \quad \text{for any } \sigma_i \text{ and any } (\sigma, \sigma') \neq (\sigma', \sigma)$$

(18)
where $\sigma_i = (\sigma_3, \sigma_4, \sigma_5)$ or any subset thereof $(\sigma_i = \pm 1)$; so MI in (4) does not hold.

To quantify to which degree a HV model for given $(h, J)$ violates OI, PI or MI, let us calculate OD, PD and MD in (7-9), applied to Fig. 1. Since we are dealing with a discrete system the integral over the probability densities in (9) must be replaced by a sum over probabilities. By making the substitutions: $a \rightarrow \sigma_a$; $b \rightarrow \sigma_b$; $\lambda \rightarrow \sigma_\lambda = (\sigma_3, \sigma_4, \sigma_5)$ it is straightforward to numerically compute that, for the parameters leading to $BI \approx 2\sqrt{2}$, $MD = 1.73$ (its maximum theoretical value is 2) and $OD = PD = 0$ (exactly). $MD \neq 0$ is equivalent to violation of MI, and $OD = PD = 0$ imply that OI and PI are exactly satisfied. Therefore the locality condition (10) is also satisfied: the system is local in the sense of Clauser and Horne [2].

In the case of real Bell experiments, it is generally inferred that violation of MI implies that the ‘freely chosen’ parameters $(a, b)$ would be ‘causally determined’ by some HV $\lambda$. It is usually believed this contradicts any reasonable conception of ‘free will’, and that one therefore should assume that MI necessarily holds in a local Bell-experiment. However, in the above thought experiment this inference does not apply, as we will now prove. The crucial point is to
realize that Alice and Bob can do two equivalent experiments (Ex1 and Ex2) to determine the
needed probabilities, exactly as in real Bell experiments. Either (Ex1) they postselect 4 sub-
ensembles out of one long run (in order to determine the probabilities $P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2|\sigma_a, \sigma_b)$ for the 4
possible couples of $(\sigma_a, \sigma_b)$-values), as described above. But if Bob and Alice have sufficiently
sophisticated technological means to control $\sigma_a$ and $\sigma_b$, i.e. set $\sigma_a$ and $\sigma_b$ to either +1 or -1 at
their whim, they can do 4 consecutive experiments. The dynamics of the system (Eq. (11) and
(12)) remain unchanged in this second experiment. Therefore all probabilities $P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2|\sigma_a, \sigma_b)$,
$P(\lambda|\sigma_a, \sigma_b)$ and $P(\sigma_a, \sigma_b|\lambda)$ can be calculated for both experiments with the rules given above,
and these probabilities are (of course) identical in both experiments. In view of the importance of
this point for the following, let us prove it.

Ex1) In this experiment the ensemble evolves fully ‘on its own’; Alice just measures $\sigma_1$
and $\sigma_a$, Bob $\sigma_2$ and $\sigma_b$. They then compute the probabilities $P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2|\sigma_a, \sigma_b)$ by counting
frequencies within 4 sub-sets (there are 4 couples of $(\sigma_a, \sigma_b)$-values). They will find:

$$P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2 | \sigma_a, \sigma_b) = \frac{P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_a, \sigma_b)}{P(\sigma_a, \sigma_b)} = \frac{P(\eta_1)}{P(\eta_2)} = \frac{\sum_{\theta(\eta_1)} e^{-\beta H(\theta)}}{\sum_{\theta(\eta_2)} e^{-\beta H(\theta)}},$$

Here we used the fact that any probability $P(\eta)$, with $\eta$ an m-spin configuration ($m \leq 7$), is given
by (16).

Ex2) A second way to determine the $P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2|\sigma_a, \sigma_b)$ is available to Bob and Alice if they
can control $\sigma_a$ and $\sigma_b$. They then can do 4 consecutive experiments each corresponding to a
given value of $\sigma_a$ and $\sigma_b$. In that case they will find:

$$P^*(\sigma_1, \sigma_2 | \sigma_a, \sigma_b) = \frac{P^*(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_a, \sigma_b)}{P^*(\sigma_a, \sigma_b)} = \frac{P^*(\eta_1)}{1},$$

where the asterisk reminds us that the probability is determined in an experiment in which $\sigma_a$ and
$\sigma_b$ have a given value. Now with (12) we have:

$$P^*(\eta_1) = \sum_{\theta(\eta_1)} P^*(\theta) = \sum_{\theta(\eta_1)} e^{-\beta H(\theta)} \frac{1}{Z^*}.$$
\[ Z^* = \sum_{\theta(\eta,\zeta)} e^{-fH(\theta)}. \] (22)

Thus all probabilities of Ex1 and Ex2 are identical.

As a consequence both experiments lead to violation of MI and the BI to the same degree, even if in the second experiment \( \sigma_a \) and \( \sigma_b \) are set in a manifestly free manner by Alice and Bob. Specifically, we also have (18), MD, in experiment Ex2 \(^3\). Ergo: violation of MI in this system does not arise through ‘superdeterminism’ or ‘absence of free will’, but through an ordinary Coulomb interaction between neighboring nodes. We will show in Section 6 that essentially the same mechanism can arise in a dynamical system in which the two Bell particles move and the analyzers are switched.

Notice that this result bears an interesting link with published investigations of the premises of Bell’s theorem [26-28]. These texts question the general validity of MI essentially based on a detailed interpretation of probability. Here we focus on physical arguments on how MD may arise.

4. Further examples (classical case).

It appears that above case is not an exception, and that the BI can be violated in a wide range of 1-D and 2-D spin lattices, for a wide range of parameter sets \( h_i, J_{ij} \). As another example, consider the ‘spin’ system of Fig. 2 (10 subsystems, say ions or electrons, on a square lattice) described by Hamiltonian (11). We could equally well consider a lattice where a and b are located on the edges, below nodes 1 and 2. Consider again a correlation experiment in which BI in (14) is measured.

\(^3\) This implies that we also have in these models that \( P(a,b|\lambda) \neq P(a,b|\lambda') \) in general, again even if Alice & Bob may choose to set \((a,b)\) in whatever sequence, with whatever frequency, they fancy. The point is that one should not understand this as a manifestation of a causal determination of the freely chosen \((a,b)\) by \( \lambda \). An infinity of such systems exist. Think e.g. of \( P(x|\lambda) \) with \( x = \) half-life of a nucleus, \( T = \) experimental temperature (suppose that a few discrete values of \( x \) and \( T \) are sampled). If one performs 1000 experiments measuring \( x \) at different \( T \)'s, \( P(T|x) \neq P(T) \) in general even if one chooses \( T \) freely.
In order to determine BI we need to calculate sums over Boltzmann probabilities $P(\theta)$, with $\theta$ now a 10-spin configuration $(\sigma_a, \sigma_b, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_8)$. By numerical simulation one finds, e.g. for the values $h_i=1$ (all $i$), and $J_{ij}=1.4$ (first neighbours), that $BI = 2.24 > 2$ (the value 2.24 is at least a local maximum). If one allows the magnetic fields $h_i$ to vary over the sites (keeping left-right symmetry), the BI can be violated to a much higher degree. For instance, for $h_1=h_2=h_5=h_8=1.9$, $h_3=h_4=h_5=h_6=0.4$, $J_{ij} = 2.0$, $BI = 2.883$, which can again be compared to $2\sqrt{2} \approx 2.83$, the value for the singlet state.

Here too the resource for violating the BI is measurement dependence, MD. For $\lambda \rightarrow \sigma_\lambda \equiv (\sigma_3, \sigma_4, \ldots, \sigma_8)$ OD, PD, and MD can again be calculated. For instance, for $h_i=1$, $J_{ij}=1.4$ leading to $BI = 2.24$ (see above) one obtains $MD = 1.77$. For the parameter set leading to $BI = 2.88$ (cf. parameters given above), one finds $MD = 1.99$. In both cases $OD = PD = 0$ (exactly): the system is again local according to [2].

In sum, we find that these systems are local both according to the definitions of Bell [1] and Clauser-Horne [2]; it will be interesting to compare them to the quantum case in the next Section. Importantly, one can confirm this agreement of both locality criteria by investigating the system in Fig. 3. Let us take here interactions $J_{ij}$ that are different from zero.
for first and second neighbours. That means that there are delocalized ‘left-right’ interactions between $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$, $\sigma_a$ and $\sigma_b$, $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_b$ and $\sigma_2$ and $\sigma_a$ – the system is nonlocal in Bell’s sense. If we take $h_i=1$, $J_{ij}=1$ (first neighbours), $J_{ij}=0.5$ (second neighbours), then the ‘left-right’ interactions are $J_{12}=1$, $J_{ab}=1$, $J_{ib}=0.5$, and $J_{2a}=0.5$. For these parameters one finds that $BI=2.32$, $MD=0.03$, $PD=0.78$, and $OD=0.15$. Since PD and OD are $\neq 0$, the system is also nonlocal in the sense of Clauser-Horne [2]. Our conclusion is that the Clauser-Horne factorability condition (10) appears to be a good characterization of Bell locality in these systems. But as said before, it is nowhere proven that all systems that are local in Bell’s sense are local in the sense of Clauser-Horne. We shall contest that inference in the next Section.

5. Quantum case.

A different type of systems is obtained by considering one of the quantum versions of Hamiltonian (11), describing e.g. other magnetic materials than (11). In that case one deals with HV models in which the HV have a quantum origin; but as noted in the Introduction the BI can also be derived for that case [3]. Ref. [3] is one of the only texts that attempts to derive or justify the Clauser-Horne factorability condition (10), instead of merely positing it as a ‘reasonable’ consequence of locality. Essentially Bell’s argument in [3] says that if one fixes all variables ($\lambda$) that have a causal influence on both $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$, the two latter variables are independent, i.e. we have (10). Now, nothing in Bell’s reasoning leading to (10) and the BI hinges on the fact that the HVs are classical; the BI can according to that argument equally well be derived if the HVs have a quantum origin, as emphasized by Bell\textsuperscript{4} himself [3]. Interestingly, such ‘quantum’ HV systems (with HVs different from the quantum state) seem rarely or never investigated. Spin-lattices give us the opportunity to compare classic and quantum HV systems; therefore we will briefly have a look at the quantum case as a first step of a wider research program.

\textsuperscript{4} Bell says on p. 56 [3]: “It is notable that in this argument nothing is said about the locality, or even localizability, of the variable $\lambda$. These variables could well include, for example, quantum mechanical state vectors, which have no particular localization in ordinary space time. It is assumed only that the outputs A and B, and the particular inputs a and b, are well localized.” A and B correspond to $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$ in our notation.
Consider, then, following ‘quantum Ising’ Hamiltonian, intensively studied in recent years in the context of quantum phase transitions [18]:

\[ H = -J \sum_{ij} \hat{\sigma}_{z,i} \hat{\sigma}_{z,j} - hJ \sum_i \hat{\sigma}_{x,i}. \]  

The \( \hat{\sigma}_z \) and \( \hat{\sigma}_x \) are now the Pauli spin matrices; \( \hat{\sigma}_z \) is diagonal as usual and has (on each site \( i \)\) eigenstates \( |\uparrow\rangle_i \) and \( |\downarrow\rangle_i \) with eigenvalues \( \sigma_i = \pm 1 \). Note that this is a genuine quantum Hamiltonian having no classical equivalent. The first sum runs over all nearest neighbour pairs; \( h \) is now a dimensionless coupling constant ranging from very large (\( h >> 1 \)) to very low (\( h << 1 \)) values, each regime being characterized by qualitatively different quantum states. Remarkably, and quite universally, there is a critical value \( h_c \approx 1 \) at which a quantum phase transition occurs in the ground state (\( T \approx 0 \)) [18]. For our purpose it is sufficient to consider the ‘weak-coupling’ regime \( h << 1 \), since in that case the calculations are analytically tractable while (23) shows infinite-range correlations. As we argued above, that is a favorable condition for violation of the BI.

Then, for a rectangular \( N \)-spin lattice as in Fig. 4 (\( N \geq 10 \)), the energies of the ground and first excited states are ([18], p. 64):

\[ E_0 = -2NJ, \ E_1 = E_0 + 8J, \ E_{2n} = E_0 + 12J, \ E_2 = E_0 + 16J, \ E_3 = E_0 + 14J. \]  

\[ \text{FIGURE 4. N spins on a rectangular lattice.} \]

Here \( E_0 \) is the energy of the ground state \( \phi_0 = \prod_i |\uparrow\rangle_i \) (all \( N \) spins up), \( E_1 \) of the first excited states \( \phi_{1,i} = |\downarrow\rangle_i \prod_{j \neq i} |\uparrow\rangle_j \) (there are \( N \) such states having one spin down), similarly for \( E_2 \) (2 spins flipped on 2 sites that aren’t nearest neighbours) and \( E_3 \) (3 spins flipped) (note \( E_3 < E_2 \)). \( E_{2n} \) is the energy of states having 2 nearest neighbour (hence the index ‘n’) spins flipped (there are \( N/2 \) such states if the lattice of Fig. 4 is horizontally stretched-out). At low enough temperatures only these states will be accessible, and we can restrict the calculation to them. Let Alice and
Bob share an ensemble of such N-spin lattices and measure each two spins (e.g. on the outermost nodes of the lattice), $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_a$ in Alice’s case, and $\sigma_2$ and $\sigma_b$ in Bob’s. From their combined results they determine the probabilities $P(\sigma_1=+1, \sigma_2=-1 \mid \sigma_a, \sigma_b)$ and $P(\sigma_1=-1, \sigma_2=+1 \mid \sigma_a, \sigma_b)$ needed to calculate $B_I$ in (14). Bob and Alice will find following values ($\theta(\eta)$ is as before an N-spin configuration that contains $\eta$):

\[
P_1 \equiv P(\sigma_1=+1, \sigma_2=-1, \sigma_a=+1, \sigma_b=+1) = P(\eta) = \sum_{\theta(\eta)} \sum_{\phi_{i,j}} P(\theta|\phi_{i,j})P(\phi_{i,j})
\]

\[
= \sum_{\theta(\eta)} \sum_{\phi_{i,j}} \left| \langle \theta|\phi_{i,j} \rangle \right|^2 P(\phi_{i,j}) = \sum_{\theta(\eta)} \sum_{\phi_{i,j}} \left| \langle \uparrow \downarrow \uparrow \downarrow \uparrow \downarrow \uparrow \downarrow |\phi_{i,j} \rangle \right|^2 . P(\phi_{i,j})
\]

\[
= \sum_{\theta(\eta)} \sum_{\phi_{i,j}} \delta(\theta, \phi_{i,j}) P(E_i) = P(E_i) + P(E_{2n}) + (N-5).P(E_2) + \binom{N-4}{2}.P(E_3).
\]  

(25)

Here the wave functions $\langle \theta \rangle$ are products (N factors) of the form $\langle \uparrow \downarrow \uparrow \downarrow \uparrow \downarrow \uparrow \downarrow |\phi_{i,j} \rangle$. Further, $\delta(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Kronecker-$\delta$; $P(E_i)$ is the Boltzmann factor $e^{-\beta E_i}/Z$; and $\binom{N}{p} = N!/[p!(N-p)!]$. All other probabilities $P(\eta)$ needed are calculated in a similar manner by carefully counting how often an excited state $\phi_i$ occurs in the sum over $\theta(\eta)$. One finds:

\[
P_2 \equiv P(\sigma_a=+1, \sigma_b=+1) = P(E_0) + (N-2).P(E_i) + (N/2 - 2).P(E_{2n}) + \binom{N-3}{2} . P(E_3).- (N/2 - 2) . P(E_2) + \binom{N-2}{3} . P(E_3)
\]

\[
P_3 \equiv P(\sigma_a=+1, \sigma_b=-1, \sigma_a=+1, \sigma_b=-1) = P(E_2) + (N-4).P(E_3)
\]

\[
P_4 \equiv P(\sigma_a=+1, \sigma_b=-1) = P(E_i) + P(E_{2n}) + (N-3).P(E_2) + \binom{N-2}{2} . P(E_3)
\]

\[
P_5 \equiv P(\sigma_a=+1, \sigma_b=-1, \sigma_a=-1, \sigma_b=-1) = P(E_3)
\]

\[
P_6 \equiv P(\sigma_a=-1, \sigma_b=-1) = P(E_2) + (N-2).P(E_3).
\]

(26)

Finally one obtains:

\[
B_I = 2 + 4 \cdot \frac{P_5}{P_6} - 4 \cdot \frac{P_1}{P_2} - 8 \cdot \frac{P_3}{P_4}.
\]  

(27)
For given $N$ the maximum value of $BI$ is reached when $J$ becomes sufficiently large ($J \approx 2$); we then have that $P(E_0) \gg P(E_1) \gg P(E_{2n}) \gg P(E_3) \gg P(E_2)$ (see (24)). This leads to a simple result:

$$BI_{\text{max}(N)} = 2 + \frac{4}{N-2} \quad (N \geq 10, J \geq 2).$$

(28)

The absolute maximum occurs for $N = 10$ and $J \geq 2$: $BI = 2.5$, clearly violating the BI. $BI$ as a function of $J$ is shown in Fig. 5 for $N = 10$, 14 and 100. Not surprisingly, and as in the classical lattices, the BI is violated strongest when correlation is strongest in the system, i.e. when $N$ is minimum and $J$ maximum. It is also possible to determine $MD$, $PD$ and $OD$ for the above quantum system. For $N = 10$ and $J = 2$ one finds $MD \approx 1.49$, $PD \approx 0.49$, $OD \approx 0.98$; $BI$ is then $\approx 2.5$.

![Graph showing BI as a function of J for the quantum case of Fig. 4 and N = 10 (diamonds), 14 (squares) and 100 (triangles).]

FIGURE 5. BI in (14) as a function of J, for the quantum case of Fig. 4 and N = 10 (diamonds), 14 (squares) and 100 (triangles).

So this is a system containing HVs; still it can violate the BI for certain parameter values (in the case of static analyzers). Note that the $\lambda$ are eigenvalues of $\hat{\sigma}_z$ on the nodes other than 1, 2, a, b, and that the wave functions are not entangled. Since the spin dynamics of this system is also mediated by a Coulomb potential, just as in the classical case, it is local in Bell’s sense [1]: the model only assumes first neighbour interaction (and it evidently does not assume superluminal interaction). On the other hand the fact that $PD \neq 0 \neq OD$ implies that the Clauser-Horne factorability is not satisfied, so that it is nonlocal in the sense of Ref. [2].
The conclusion we are tempted to draw (we cannot give a definite proof), is that the Clauser-Horne factorability condition (10) appears to be a too restrictive condition to describe all local HV systems. If that is true, the conditions OI (and PI) would be too restrictive in turn; there could exist a local hidden reality underlying the Bell experiment that violates them. That would be an important conclusion: it is much easier to reproduce the precise quantum correlations of the Bell experiment by a local HVT if it may violate, besides MI, also OI [6]. That OI may be violated in a local HV reality underlying the Bell experiment was already argued in Ref. [24] on completely different grounds (see also below), and may find corroboration here. On the other hand the HVs of the above system have a quantum origin\(^5\). In the framework of HVTs it is more straightforward to remain in the classical domain, as we will do again in the next Section.

Let us again emphasize that the aim of the above thought experiments was to gain insight in the general physical validity and meaning of MI, PI, OI in concrete examples. These conditions of probabilistic independence are the direct ‘resources’ for violation of the BI, as was investigated in detail in Ref. [6]. Since these conditions can be violated in regular physical systems, we are by now motivated to see whether this can teach us something about real, in particular dynamic, Bell experiments.

6. Generalization. Background-based theories and existing Bell experiments.

Based on the results of Sections 4-5 involving classical Ising lattices, an obvious question arises. Besides the particular case of spin-lattices, does a general theoretical framework or a general physical system exist for which measurement independence is violated – while yet being local ? If such a theory or system exists, it trivially escapes from Bell’s no-go theorem; the Bell inequality presupposes MI.

It seems that a general class of MI-violating theories indeed exists, namely those that involve a background medium or field that interacts with the Bell particles and analyzers – much as happens in Ising-like systems. To see why, it seems it suffices to operate a simple paradigm shift, and attribute the HVs not to the Bell particles, but to the medium surrounding the analyzers.

\(^5\) One might argue that it is to be expected that in a quantum system the BI and the ‘locality’ condition (10) are violated. After all, in a Bell experiment on a singlet state the BI is violated; and (10) is also violated if one associates \(\lambda\) with the singlet state. But again, recall that Bell’s argument in Ref. [3] incites to investigate HV systems in which the HVs have a quantum origin. And Fig. 5 shows that whether the BI is violated depends on \((J, N)\).
If one splits the HVs $\lambda$ in ‘left’ and ‘right’ variables ($\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$; in general these are sets), describing the medium in the close environment of the left and right analyzers, then it seems obvious that $\lambda_1$ may very well be correlated with $a$ and $\lambda_2$ with $b$. Such correlation can arise simply due to the physical interaction of the analyzers with their environment, here the surrounding ‘$\lambda$-medium’. In other words,

$$\rho(\lambda_1,\lambda_2|a,b) \neq \rho(\lambda_1,\lambda_2|a',b')$$

(A in general, i.e. for some values of $(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,a,b,a',b')$.)

A similar observation has already been made before by Butterfield (Ref. [31], p. 58). Result (29), MD, is formally exactly what we calculated for spin-lattices (cf. Eq. (18)). (In spin-lattices, the HVs $\lambda$ or $(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)$ in (29) correspond to the spins located between the left and right ends of the lattices. These spins indeed describe a stochastic medium interacting with the Bell particles ($\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$) and analyzers ($\sigma_a$ and $\sigma_b$).)

Let us now prove that this reasoning is still valid for the most advanced dynamic Bell experiment [15], which tries to impose not only MI but also OI and PI by switching analyzer settings. It is essential to explicitly show that background-based theories can survive dynamic Bell tests, since in the case of spin-lattices we only considered static Bell experiments. To this end, we will construct an elementary model for [15] that violates MI in a local and non-superdeterministic way.

The goal of the crucial experiment [15] was to simultaneously close, for the first time, various loopholes, essentially the locality and ‘freedom-of-choice’ loopholes. As the authors clearly explain [15]: “The locality loophole arises when Alice’s measurement result can in principle be causally influenced by a physical (subluminal or luminal) signal from Bob’s measurement event or Bob’s choice event, and vice versa. The best available way to close this loophole is to space-like separate every measurement event on one side from both the measurement [outcome independence] and setting choice [setting independence] on the other side.” In other words, in this manner OI and PI would be imposed in the experiment. This loophole was already addressed in [13-14], but not simultaneously with the freedom-of-choice loophole. “Experimentally, the freedom-of-choice loophole can only be closed if Alice’s and Bob’s setting values are chosen by random number generators and also if the transmission of any physical signal between their choice events and the particle pair emission event is excluded, i.e., these events must be space-like separated […]” [15]. The authors assume that in this way MI
necessarily holds in the experiment. Summarizing, the essential experimental conditions of the experiment in Ref. [15] were the following:

E1) The measurement events were SLS;
E2) The left (right) measurement event was SLS from the choice of b (a);
E3) The setting choice events were SLS;
E4) The emission event and the setting choice events were SLS.

Spacelike separation between relevant events was obtained by fast and random switching of the settings, and/or by the fact that in some reference frame the events happened simultaneously (SLS is invariant under Lorentz transformation). In particular, condition E4), imposing MI, was realized as follows: the bit corresponding to a setting choice, determined by a random number generator on average at the time of emission of a pair (hence SLS), was fed into a delay line and subsequently activated the analyzer (an electro-optic modulator) at the arrival time of the particles (see [15]). The switching frequency was 1 MHz, implying that the analyzers kept their settings on average during 1\(\mu\)s. Based on the results of Ref. [15], doubtlessly an experimental tour-de-force, it is now generally believed that the locality loophole is closed, thanks to E1)-E2), and also the vital and newly addressed freedom-of-choice loophole, due to E4).

We will now consider a slightly simplified experiment mimicking [15] to a sufficient degree (we do not need to be concerned with the fact that the original experiment used an asymmetric configuration and therefore an asymmetric delay line: Alice was closer to the source than Bob [15]).

![Diagram](image)

**FIGURE 6.** An experiment mimicking the experiment of Ref. [15].

Particles 1 and 2 leave a source S and are measured at \(t_0\) when arriving at points 1 and 2.
In our simplified experiment, the two particles leave a source S at a speed close enough to the speed of light, following the dashed trajectories in Fig. 6. Alice and Bob use random number generators to choose, at a frequency of 1 MHz, between two values for the analyzer angles a and b (located at nodes a and b). They measure the spins $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$ at time $t_0$, the moment the particles arrive at nodes 1 and 2, which are close to nodes a resp. b, since particles and analyzers interact. In order to impose the relevant SLS in the S-frame, it is sufficient to require that Alice’s and Bob’s number generators determine a and b at the moment the pair leaves S ($t = 0$), and that the electronic signals corresponding to these choices are delayed and applied to the analyzers during a 1$\mu$s interval around $t_0$, exactly as in [15]. Then we have precisely the conditions of SLS of Ref. [15], including those needed for OI and PI, as one easily verifies.

Suppose now that following hidden reality underlies the experiment (hypotheses H1-H3):

H1) In essence, our HV model will only assume that particles and analyzers interact with a ‘background $\lambda$-field’ or ‘background medium’ (particles) characterized by HVs $\lambda$. For definiteness, suppose the particles or the field are lead-out on a lattice as in Fig. 6. This will allow us to draw a parallel with the preceding Sections, but we definitely do not need the lattice for our conclusion, as will become clear. Thus suppose that at nodes 3, 4,...8 of the lattice sit particles that are characterized by $\lambda_3$, $\lambda_4$,.. $\lambda_8$; the $\lambda_i$ are stochastic parameters. Also assume that all $\lambda_i$ can only take two values ($\pm 1$) – call the $\lambda_i$ ‘generalized spins’. Note that stochastic properties taking two discrete values are not rare in classical physics: it occurs e.g. in lattice gases, where a site can be occupied or not, or in hydrodynamic systems, where vortices can turn in two directions only (vorticity = $\pm 1$), etc..

H2) The particles 1 and 2 are characterized by their spins $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$ and HVs $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$; the analyzers are characterized by $\lambda_a$ and $\lambda_b$, besides by a and b. Suppose that $\lambda_a$ and $\lambda_b$ are determined by a and b simply by: $\lambda_{a(b)} = a(b)$. Similarly, $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$ are determined by $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ by $\sigma_{1(2)} = \lambda_{1(2)}$. Thus $P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2|a,b) = P(\lambda_1, \lambda_2|\lambda_a, \lambda_b)$ for all parameter values. So when Alice or her random number generator sets her analyzer to angle a, $\lambda_a$ assumes a value equal to a. If we also assume the convention that a and b only take the values $\pm 1$, which is enough for verifying the BI, then all the $\lambda_i$ only take values $\pm 1$.  

21
H3) All $\lambda_i$ (i = a,b,1,…,8) interact, via some Hamiltonian, with close (say 1st and 2nd) neighbors only: the interaction is local.

As an example, one could suppose that at the time of measurement ($t_0$) the interaction between the $\lambda_i$ is described by a generalized Ising Hamiltonian ($n = 10$):

$$H(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_n) = c_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{1i} \lambda_i + \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} c_{2ij} \lambda_i \lambda_j + \sum_{i,j,k=1}^{n} c_{3ijk} \lambda_i \lambda_j \lambda_k + \ldots$$  (30)

Expression (30) is just a Taylor expansion of a general Hamiltonian $H(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_n)$ depending on n ‘spin’ DOF. The Ising Hamiltonian corresponds to the 2 lowest-order ‘spin’-dependent terms in (30), with $\lambda_i = \sigma_i$, $c_{1i} = -h_i$, $c_{2ij} = -J_{ij}$. Stochastic lattice gases are also described by these two terms, so (30) is appropriate also for a dynamical system. In both the latter examples one only considers close neighbor interaction, as we do (H3). If one could also assume that the configuration probability of a 10-‘spin’ configuration $\theta = (\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_n)$ is given by a Boltzmann probability as in (12), then the results of Section 4 would have proven that in our HV system MI and the BI can be violated (all equations of motion are identical, if one neglects the $c_{3ijk}$ in (30) as usual). However in our experiment mimicking the experiment of Ref. [15] Alice and Bob switch $\lambda_a$ and $\lambda_b$ at a high speed and therefore the Boltzmann probability is not applicable, since the latter expression presupposes thermal equilibrium. The point is we do not need the Boltzmann probability neither the form of the Hamiltonian for our argument. The only observation we need to make is the following: independently of the Hamiltonian, at the time of measurement ($t_0$) $\lambda_a$ and $\lambda_b$ have had enough time to make causal contact with nearest neighbors ($\lambda_6$ and $\lambda_8$ respectively, cf. Fig. 6). Indeed, in [15] the settings remained constant for a duration of the order of 1µs, which corresponds to a causal range $R = 300$ m. Therefore, if the 1st neighbors of nodes a and b, i.e. nodes 6 and 8, are positioned closer than $R$ (suppose this is the case), then $\lambda_a(\lambda_b)$ and $\lambda_6(\lambda_8)$ are time-like separated. Now, if the HV $\lambda_6(\lambda_8)$ can have interacted with $\lambda_a(\lambda_b)$, then in general we have that:

$$P(\lambda_6, \lambda_8|\lambda_a,\lambda_b) \neq P(\lambda_6, \lambda_8|\lambda_a',\lambda_b'),$$

$$\Rightarrow P(\lambda_3, \lambda_4,\ldots, \lambda_8|\lambda_a,\lambda_b) \neq P(\lambda_3, \lambda_4,\ldots, \lambda_8|\lambda_a',\lambda_b'),$$

6 Here $\lambda_i$ is the occupation number of site i ($\lambda_i = 0$ or 1), $c_{1i}$ the local chemical potential and $c_{2ij}$ an interaction potential (typically a Lennard-Jones potential).
because of assumption H2). This is formally exactly what we calculated in Eq. (18) for spin-lattices. But that means that MI can be violated for a wide class of local models (that include these variables \((\lambda_6, \lambda_8)\), *through simple physical interaction between neighbour nodes*).

In a general field vocabulary our point is even more straightforward: the analyzers may interact with ‘something’ (say a \(\lambda\)-field) which interacts in turn with the particles. The first interaction may create a correlation between the analyzer settings and the field-values in their vicinity, from which our conclusion immediately follows. In general a correlation can be created between the variables \((a, \lambda, \sigma_1)\) and similarly between \((b, \lambda, \sigma_2)\). Such a strong correlation occurs in spin-lattices, where it may also lead to violation of the BI; in [24] we termed this solution to Bell’s theorem ‘supercorrelation’.

One way to resume is the following: *an experiment as [15] can decouple the left and right wings, but not the analyzers from their nearby environment*. Therefore it appears that for this experiment a wide class of local HVTs is conceivable in principle, which involve a background medium or field that interacts with particles and analyzers, and which do not satisfy MI, a premise of all derivations of the BI. Such background-based theories do therefore not fall under the restriction of Bell’s no-go theorem, and are in principle possible. Of course, there is still a long way to go from this conclusion to the construction of a realistic HVT, one that reproduces all quantum probabilities.

7. Interpretation, and closing the loophole.

The origin of the discrepancy between our conclusion and the one of e.g. Ref. [15] is quite obvious, and related to what one accepts as ‘HVs’. One standardly interprets HVs as describing intrinsic properties of the particles. The particles ‘carry’ the HVs with them from source to analyzer. This is obviously a legitimate and certainly the first idea that comes to mind when one wants to explain statistic outcomes of spin measurements by HVs; it very probably corresponds to Bell’s initial intuition and it is the interpretation of Ref. [15]. But in the above model (H1-H3) the HVs describe a stochastic property of a background medium that can obviously interact with, and be influenced by, the analyzers.
Importantly, note that our model exploits the freedom-of-choice loophole without superdeterminism (in our model the angles a and b are not determined by the $\lambda$; a and b can be freely and/or randomly set and the setting event is SLS from the emission event). As we saw in Section 3, one almost always assumes that if SLS is imposed as in [15], superdeterminism is the only possible explanation of measurement dependence, i.e. the assumption that “the settings are not chosen independently from the properties of the particle pairs” [15]. But we have shown here this is not the case if the HVs describe a background medium. Recall that we already illustrated this point in Section 3 for a static Bell experiment on spin-lattices. In such lattices the ‘$\lambda$-particles’, described by the set $\sigma_\lambda$ (cf. definition under Eq. (18)), can be considered to form a stochastic medium. In general measurement dependence can arise through interaction of the analyzers with a local stochastic field, in a manner fully compatible with free will, much as happens in the Ising lattices.

At this point it is tempting to make a link between our model involving a (background) field or medium, and both the experiments of Couder et al. [22-23] and the ‘zero-point field’ HVTs that were developed to explain for instance double-slit interference [19]. The intriguing common denominator between all these experiments and models is, it seems, that they are based on a (background) field that creates a strong correlation between the system variables (on left and right sides). For instance, in the well-known experiments of Couder et al. [22-23] oil droplets mimic quantum behavior when excited by a vibrating oil bed. The wave field generated by the external vibration (the $\lambda$-field for us, or a component of it) creates a correlation between the outcomes ($\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$ above) and the ‘context’ of the experiment (i.e. the geometry of the oil bed and slits, playing the role of analyzers above). In the same way in our model the $\lambda$-field couples with the analyzers and the particles, thus determining $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$; the first coupling, i.e. between field and analyzers, causes measurement dependence. Note finally that the correlation we invoked in our model occurs on the left and right sides separately; but in principle it can even be more pervading. Nothing prevents that there could exist e.g. a correlation between $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$ – a fact that is actually quite intuitive if one recalls that in the singlet state a symmetry exists between both spins [24].
Importantly, the above results suggest that one can experimentally close the loophole we exploit, namely by increasing the switching frequency of the analyzer settings. Let us briefly develop this point, because it seems to apply to the whole class of background-based models. If the polarization direction in a Bell experiment is switched rapidly enough in the time interval \((0, t_0)\), one expects that a \(\lambda\)-field or medium will at most experience a smeared-out or averaged influence from the analyzer settings. In other words \(\rho(\lambda)\) in (4) may depend on \((a,a',b,b')\) but not just on \((a,b)\). But that is equivalent to MI: the same distribution for \(\lambda\) applies to the 4 subensembles for \((a,b)\); the BI can again be derived. Therefore an experiment with high enough switching frequency would allow to discriminate between quantum mechanics and background-based theories; it appears the same reasoning holds for all such background-based theories. It seems difficult to predict at which frequencies this decoupling occurs, but a first estimation may be possible\(^7\) and indicates that it would occur in the GHz range. Even if such an experiment represents a technological challenge, it may be close to being feasible\(^8\).

Note that in order that a background-based model predicts the correct quantum correlations for the singlet state, maybe it will also have to violate OI, not only MI. Indeed, there is one essential ingredient that has not yet been used in our analysis (the elementary model \(H1-H3\)), namely the fact that the left and right spins \((\sigma_1\) and \(\sigma_2)\) are connected through the conservation of total spin in the singlet state. As argued above, such a symmetry may, it seems, correlate the two spins even at the time of measurement, and even if the spins weakly interact with a background medium. This will in general lead to violation of OI, as is quite obvious from its definition, given in Section 2. Note that it has already been argued that in such a system with a conservation law OI is a very questionable condition (Ref. [32], p. 26) – it is actually counterintuitive. Moreover, our findings in Section 5 on quantum Ising lattices give support to the idea that OI can be violated in local systems. In short, we conjecture that if the HVs are associated with a background medium, OI and PI are jointly a sufficient condition for locality, but that OI is not a necessary condition.

\(^7\) If one assumes that the coupling breaks down when the causal range \(R\) becomes of the order of the typical length of the polarizers (or of the minimum polarizer length that still can be used to measure polarization), say 10 cm, one finds a decoupling frequency of the order of a few GHz.

\(^8\) As communicated by Gregor Weihs.
Simultaneous violation of MI and OI results in a cumulative resource for violating the BI, as proven in [6]. In Ref. [6] it was also shown that violation of MI is the strongest resource, as compared to OI and PI, for reproducing the singlet correlations (MD = 0.28 suffices). While in Refs. [6-7] MD ≠ 0 is identified with giving up on free will, here we have shown that MD ≠ 0 can be achieved in physical systems without giving up on free will.

8. Conclusion.

The general approach of this article was to start from an investigation of the premises of the Bell inequality (MI, OI, PI) in well-known systems from statistical mechanics; and to see whether this can tell something about real Bell experiments. In Sections 3-5 we showed that in static Bell experiments on Ising lattices, both governed by a classical (11) or quantum (23) Hamiltonian, the BI can be strongly violated. These Ising lattices are ‘HV’ systems in the sense that they allow to explain (to calculate) the Bell probabilities \( P(\sigma_1, \sigma_2|a,b) \), \( P(\sigma_1) \) etc. by summing over the values of \( \lambda \), or, equivalently, by a formula as Eq. (1). The classical Ising-lattices are local in the usual sense because 1) they involve only local near-neighbor interaction and 2) they accordingly satisfy the Clauser-Horne factorability condition (which is, in accordance with a popular wisdom, at least a sufficient condition for locality in Bell’s sense). However in the case of the quantum Ising Hamiltonian (23) this factorability condition is violated. We showed that in the classical Ising systems ‘measurement independence’ (MI) is invalid for any parameter choice; in the quantum case MI, PI and OI are invalid. We further found that whether the BI is violated in these lattices depends on the parameter values of the models. Importantly, we showed that MI is always violated in these systems even if \( a \) and \( b \) are freely chosen. This proved that in this system measurement dependence is not due to superdeterminism, conspiracy or violation of ‘free will’: it happens through bona fide Coulomb interaction between nearby nodes. This simple result on spin-lattices incited us in the second part of the article to investigate whether a general framework exists in which MI is violated, also in dynamic Bell experiments.

We argued that such a framework exists. It seems it suffices to make a simple semantic shift in the meaning of ‘HVs’, namely to attach the HVs of Bell’s theorem to a background medium or field, rather than to the Bell-particles. Spin-lattices can be seen as a quite general model of a stochastic medium; a generalized Ising Hamiltonian can be seen as a model for a
dynamic (background) medium, as recalled in Section 6. We argued that, under this semantic shift, MI is not a reasonable assumption, even for local models, and even for the advanced experiment [15]. If this is correct, ‘background-based theories’ do not to fall under the restriction of Bell’s no-go theorem, and are not excluded as candidates for completing quantum mechanics.

We are well aware that to make our conclusion entirely concrete, a full background-based model reproducing all quantum probabilities of the Bell experiment is needed. But this seems not an impossible task; and some candidates may have been investigated already [19-21]. Finally, we proposed an experiment to test such background-based theories, by a straightforward extrapolation of existing experiments.
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