

The Violation of Bell's Inequality Represents Nothing

Zhengjun Cao, Lihua Liu

Abstract. The Bell's mathematical formulation for EPR paradox, especially Bell's inequality, had interested many physicists and philosophers. We revisit the famous formulation and investigate the related arguments, just from a mathematical point of view. We find: (1) there is a key assumption inconsistent with the general hidden variable theory; (2) the mutual independence between measurements has been thoroughly neglected in the past decades; (3) the inequality involves three pairs of particles, not as generally imagined to measure only a pair of particles. The findings could provide a new glimpse into the old and hot issue.

Keywords: EPR paradox; Bell's inequality; hidden variable theory; mutual independence.

1 Introduction

The Bell's inequality plays a key role in modern quantum entanglement. It has become the foundation of quantum computer theory. The Copenhagen interpretation for quantum mechanics says that a measurement causes an instantaneous collapse of the wave function and the quantum system after the collapse is random. Einstein, et al. [1] insisted that quantum mechanics was incomplete and proposed a thought experiment (EPR paradox). In 1964, J. Bell [2] mathematically formulated EPR paradox and constructed an inequality. In the past decades, many experiments have been designed to test the Bell's inequality and its like [3–7]. Today, Bell's inequality is of great importance to quantum information and computation [8–10].

In this note, we revisit the Bell's mathematical formulation. We concentrate only on a necessary assumption in the original argument. We find that the assumption is not consistent with the general hidden variable theory [11]. The mutual independence of measurements in his formulation has been neglected in the past decades. Besides, the inequality involves (at least) three pairs of particles, not as generally imagined to measure only a pair of particles. We hope the new glimpses into the hot topic could interest more readers.

2 Bell's inequality

2.1 Review of the original argument

Suppose a pair of spin one-half particles formed somehow in the singlet spin state and moving freely in opposite directions. Measure the spins $\vec{\sigma}_1$ and $\vec{\sigma}_2$. If measurement of $\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{d}$, where \vec{d} is a unit vector, yields the number +1, then measurement of $\vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \vec{d}$ must yield -1.

Z. Cao is with Department of Mathematics, Shanghai University, Shanghai, 200444, China.

L. Liu is with Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Maritime University, Shanghai, 201306, China. Email: liulh@shmtu.edu.cn

Let this more complete specification be effected by means of parameters λ . Without loss of generality, we write as if λ were a single continuous parameter. The result A of measuring $\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{a}$ is then determined by \vec{a} and λ , and the result B of measuring $\vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \vec{b}$ in the same instance is determined by \vec{b} and λ , and

$$A(\vec{a}, \lambda) = \pm 1, \quad B(\vec{b}, \lambda) = \pm 1 \quad (1)$$

Now, if $\rho(\lambda)$ is the probability distribution of λ then the expectation value of the product of the two components $\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{a}$ and $\vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \vec{b}$ is

$$P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = \int \rho(\lambda) A(\vec{a}, \lambda) B(\vec{b}, \lambda) d\lambda \quad (2)$$

This should equal the quantum mechanical expectation value, which for the singlet state is $\langle \vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{a}, \vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \vec{b} \rangle = -\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}$.

Since ρ is a normalized probability distribution, $\int \rho(\lambda) d\lambda = 1$. Because of the properties (1), P in (2) cannot be less than -1 . It can reach -1 at $\vec{a} = \vec{b}$ only if

$$A(\vec{b}, \lambda) = -B(\vec{b}, \lambda) \quad (3)$$

except at a set of points λ of zero probability. **Assuming this**, (2) can be rewritten as

$$P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = - \int \rho(\lambda) A(\vec{a}, \lambda) A(\vec{b}, \lambda) d\lambda \quad (4)$$

It follows that \vec{c} is another unit vector

$$\begin{aligned} P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) - P(\vec{a}, \vec{c}) &= - \int \rho(\lambda) [A(\vec{a}, \lambda) A(\vec{b}, \lambda) - A(\vec{a}, \lambda) A(\vec{c}, \lambda)] d\lambda \\ &= \int \rho(\lambda) A(\vec{a}, \lambda) A(\vec{b}, \lambda) [A(\vec{b}, \lambda) A(\vec{c}, \lambda) - 1] d\lambda \end{aligned}$$

using (1), whence $|P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) - P(\vec{a}, \vec{c})| \leq \int \rho(\lambda) [1 - A(\vec{b}, \lambda) A(\vec{c}, \lambda)] d\lambda$. The second term on the right is $P(\vec{b}, \vec{c})$, whence

$$|P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) - P(\vec{a}, \vec{c})| \leq 1 + P(\vec{b}, \vec{c}) \quad (5)$$

2.2 What assertion essentially involved

As we see, the equality (3) corresponds to the physical interpretation that a pair of entangled particles have opposite measuring results if they are projected on the same vector. It holds on the condition that $\vec{a} = \vec{b}$. Likewise, the equality (4) holds on the same condition.

By analogy, if there does not exist any hidden variable, using Bell's mathematical formulation we denote the measuring result of particle $\vec{\sigma}_1$ with respect to the vector \vec{b} by $A(\vec{b})$, and that of particle $\vec{\sigma}_2$ with respect to the same vector by $B(\vec{b})$. According to the Copenhagen interpretation, it gives

$$A(\vec{b}) = -B(\vec{b}) \quad (6)$$

The above assertion was just questioned by Einstein, et al. [1] or hidden-variable theory [11]. So, the assumption $A(\vec{b}, \lambda) = -B(\vec{b}, \lambda)$ is *not loyally consistent with the hidden-variable theory*, instead consistent with the Copenhagen interpretation, associated with a fictitious symbol λ . We refer to Table 1 for the explicit differences between the two interpretations.

Table 1: Two different assertions for measurements

	spin $\vec{\sigma}_1$	spin $\vec{\sigma}_2$	Unitized measuring results
Unit vector	\vec{b}	\vec{b}	
Copenhagen interpretation	$A(\vec{b})$	$B(\vec{b})$	$A(\vec{b}) = -B(\vec{b})$
Hidden-variable theory	$A(\vec{b}, \lambda)$	$B(\vec{b}, \lambda)$	$A(\vec{b}, \lambda) = 0, \text{ or } \pm B(\vec{b}, \lambda)$

In the Bell's original argument, the above violation of the general hidden-variable theory has never been discussed. We would like to stress that the inequality (5) does not hold without this violation. So, it seems groundless to use the equality to justify the hidden-variable theory.

3 The example for distinguishing two formulations

In his paper [2], Bell presented an example to show that his mathematical formulation was incompatible with the statistical predictions of quantum mechanics.

3.1 The original argument

Consider the functions $\overline{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{b})$ and $-\overline{\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}}$, where the bar denotes independent averaging of $P(\vec{a}', \vec{b}')$ and $-\vec{a}' \cdot \vec{b}'$ over vectors \vec{a}' and \vec{b}' within specified small angles of \vec{a} and \vec{b} . Suppose that for all \vec{a} and \vec{b} the difference is bounded by ϵ :

$$|\overline{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) + \overline{\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}}| \leq \epsilon \quad (7)$$

and that $|\overline{\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}} - \vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}| \leq \delta$. Then we have

$$|\overline{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) + \vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}| \leq \epsilon + \delta \quad (8)$$

From (2)

$$\overline{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = \int \rho(\lambda) \overline{A}(\vec{a}, \lambda) \overline{B}(\vec{b}, \lambda) d\lambda \quad (9)$$

where

$$|\overline{A}(\vec{a}, \lambda)| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |\overline{B}(\vec{b}, \lambda)| \leq 1 \quad (10)$$

From (8) and (9), with $\vec{a} = \vec{b}$,

$$\int \rho(\lambda) [\overline{A}(\vec{b}, \lambda) \overline{B}(\vec{b}, \lambda) + 1] d\lambda \leq \epsilon + \delta \quad (11)$$

From (9),

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) - \bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{c}) &= \int \rho(\lambda) [\bar{A}(\vec{a}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{b}, \lambda) - \bar{A}(\vec{a}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{c}, \lambda)] d\lambda \\
&= \int \rho(\lambda) \bar{A}(\vec{a}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{b}, \lambda) [1 + \bar{A}(\vec{b}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{c}, \lambda)] d\lambda \\
&\quad - \int \rho(\lambda) \bar{A}(\vec{a}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{c}, \lambda) [1 + \bar{A}(\vec{b}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{b}, \lambda)] d\lambda
\end{aligned}$$

Using (10) then

$$|\bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) - \bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{c})| \leq \int \rho(\lambda) [1 + \bar{A}(\vec{b}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{c}, \lambda)] d\lambda + \int \rho(\lambda) [1 + \bar{A}(\vec{b}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{b}, \lambda)] d\lambda$$

Then using (9) and (11)

$$|\bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) - \bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{c})| \leq 1 + \bar{P}(\vec{b}, \vec{c}) + \epsilon + \delta \quad (12)$$

Finally, using (8), we get $|\vec{a} \cdot \vec{c} - \vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}| \leq 1 - \vec{b} \cdot \vec{c} + 4(\epsilon + \delta)$.

Take for example $\vec{a} \cdot \vec{c} = 0, \vec{a} \cdot \vec{b} = \vec{b} \cdot \vec{c} = 1/\sqrt{2}$. Then $4(\epsilon + \delta) \geq \sqrt{2} - 1$. Therefore, for small finite δ, ϵ cannot be arbitrarily small. Thus, the quantum mechanical expectation value cannot be represented, either accurately or arbitrarily closely, in the form (2).

3.2 The neglected mutual independence

Notice that in the original argument, the symbol $\bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{b})$ is formulated twice:

- the averaging of $P(\vec{a}', \vec{b}')$ over vectors \vec{a}' and \vec{b}' within specified small angles of \vec{a} and \vec{b} ;
- $\bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = \int \rho(\lambda) \bar{A}(\vec{a}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{b}, \lambda) d\lambda$, which is the analogy of equality (2).

Actually, for any approximations \vec{a}' and \vec{b}' , by Bell's formulation (2) we have

$$P(\vec{a}', \vec{b}') = \int \rho(\lambda) A(\vec{a}', \lambda) B(\vec{b}', \lambda) d\lambda \quad (13)$$

In theory, the mathematical expectation for (\vec{a}, \vec{b}) is

$$\bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = \int_{\Omega} \left[\int \rho(\lambda) A(\vec{a}', \lambda) B(\vec{b}', \lambda) d\lambda \right] d\omega \quad (14)$$

where $d\omega$ denotes the probability of pair (\vec{a}', \vec{b}') at ω . From (13) and (14), it leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \rho(\lambda) \bar{A}(\vec{a}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{b}, \lambda) d\lambda &= \int_{\Omega} \left[\int \rho(\lambda) A(\vec{a}', \lambda) B(\vec{b}', \lambda) d\lambda \right] d\omega \\
&= \int \rho(\lambda) \left[\int_{\Omega} A(\vec{a}', \lambda) B(\vec{b}', \lambda) d\omega \right] d\lambda
\end{aligned}$$

which holds on the condition that

$$\bar{A}(\vec{a}, \lambda)\bar{B}(\vec{b}, \lambda) = \int_{\Omega} A(\vec{a}', \lambda)B(\vec{b}', \lambda)d\omega \quad (15)$$

It implies that $A(\vec{a}', \lambda)$ and $B(\vec{b}', \lambda)$ are mutually independent [12]. See Table 2 for the different conditions for inequalities.

Table 2: Different Conditions for inequalities

Inequality	Conditions
$ P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) - P(\vec{a}, \vec{c}) \leq 1 + P(\vec{b}, \vec{c})$	$A(\vec{a}, \lambda) = -B(\vec{a}, \lambda)$, $A(\vec{b}, \lambda) = -B(\vec{b}, \lambda)$, $A(\vec{c}, \lambda) = -B(\vec{c}, \lambda)$ consistent with Copenhagen interpretation
$ \bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) - \bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{c}) \leq 1 + \bar{P}(\vec{b}, \vec{c}) + \epsilon + \delta$	$A(\vec{a}', \lambda)$, $B(\vec{b}', \lambda)$, $A(\vec{b}', \lambda)$, $B(\vec{c}', \lambda)$, mutually independent, inconsistent with Copenhagen interpretation

We would like to stress that the inequality (5) is consistent with Copenhagen interpretation, but its approximation (12) is inconsistent with it. So, we believe that the above example is insufficient to justify the incompatibility of two interpretations.

4 How many pairs of particles are needed

In the Bell's formulation, the notations in (1) and (2) are seemingly independent on the measured spins $\vec{\sigma}_1$ and $\vec{\sigma}_2$. This causes some misunderstandings. More precisely, they can be further rewritten as

$$A_{\vec{\sigma}_1}(\vec{a}, \lambda) = \pm 1, \quad B_{\vec{\sigma}_2}(\vec{b}, \lambda) = \pm 1 \quad (1')$$

$$P_{\vec{\sigma}_1, \vec{\sigma}_2}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = \int \rho(\lambda) A_{\vec{\sigma}_1}(\vec{a}, \lambda) B_{\vec{\sigma}_2}(\vec{b}, \lambda) d\lambda \quad (2')$$

In this case, the original inequality becomes

$$|P_{\vec{\sigma}_1, \vec{\sigma}_2}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) - P_{\vec{\sigma}_1, \vec{\sigma}_2}(\vec{a}, \vec{c})| \leq 1 + P_{\vec{\sigma}_1, \vec{\sigma}_2}(\vec{b}, \vec{c}) \quad (5')$$

It implies that the same spin $\vec{\sigma}_1$ should be measured twice to obtain $A_{\vec{\sigma}_1}(\vec{a}, \lambda)$ and $A_{\vec{\sigma}_1}(\vec{b}, \lambda)$, if $\vec{a} \neq \vec{b}$. So does the spin $\vec{\sigma}_2$, in order to obtain $B_{\vec{\sigma}_2}(\vec{b}, \lambda)$ and $B_{\vec{\sigma}_2}(\vec{c}, \lambda)$. This contradicts the quantum collapse theory. Taking into account this contradiction, the inequality (5') should be modified as

$$|P_{\vec{\sigma}_1^1, \vec{\sigma}_2^1}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) - P_{\vec{\sigma}_1^2, \vec{\sigma}_2^2}(\vec{a}, \vec{c})| \leq 1 + P_{\vec{\sigma}_1^3, \vec{\sigma}_2^3}(\vec{b}, \vec{c}) \quad (5'')$$

which involves at least three pairs of particles (to be measured). This requirement is definitely incompatible with the EPR thought experiment. Unfortunately, the inconsistency has never been exhibited

5 Further discussions

Note that the Bell's formulation and argument remain unchanged, if the (hidden) variable λ is replaced by any other (unhidden) variable χ . That means the fictitious variable λ is not truly invoked in the original mathematical reasoning. In view of this fact, we think, proving or disproving the above equality is insufficient to invalidate the hidden-variable theory.

The research of quantum computer in the past three decades was mainly propelled by quantum entanglement theory. But we have noticed that the advancement of quantum computing machines was discouraging. In 2019, Google announced the achievement of quantum supremacy [13]. In 2022, IBM unveiled the world's largest quantum computer at 433 qubits [14]. In 2024, Google's claim of quantum supremacy has been completely smashed [16]. Very recently, Google and XPRIZE have launched \$5m prize to find actual uses for quantum computers [15]. This prize could calm some quantum entanglement fanatics down.

6 Conclusion

In this note, we revisit the Bell's argument for Bell's inequality from a mathematical point of view. We clarify two different assertions for measurements in the EPR thought experiment. We think, violating Bell's inequality is insufficient to refute the general hidden-variable theory. For readers' convenience, the Bell's original paper is also appended.

References

- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, N. Rosen, *Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete*, Phys. Rev. 47(10), 777-780 (1935).
- [2] J. Bell, *On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox*, Physics, 1, 195-200 (1964).
- [3] A. Aspect et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 47, 460 (1981), 49, 91 (1982); 49, 1804 (1982).
- [4] J. F. Clauser and M. A. Horne, *Experimental consequences of objective local theories*, Phys. Rev. D 10, 526-535 (1974).
- [5] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony and R. A. Holt, *Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 23, 880-884 (1969).
- [6] J. F. Clauser and A. Shimony, *Bell's theorem: experimental tests and implications*, Reports on Progress in Physics 41, 1881 (1978).
- [7] P. Grangier, G. Roger and A. Aspect, *Experimental evidence for a photon anticorrelation effect on a beam splitter: a new light on single-photon interferences*, Europhysics Letters 1, 173-179 (1986).
- [8] I. Bengtsson, K. Życzkowski, *Geometry of Quantum States, An Introduction to Quantum Entanglement*, Cambridge University Press (2006).
- [9] M. B. Plenio, S. Virmani, *An introduction to entanglement measures*, Quant. Inf. Comp. 7, 1 (2007).
- [10] E. G. Steward, *Quantum Mechanics: Its Early Development and the Road to Entanglement*, Imperial College Press (2008).
- [11] D. Bohm, *Quantum Theory*, Prentice-Hall (1951).
- [12] K. L. Chung, F. AitSahlia, *Elementary Probability Theory*, Springer, New York (2003).
- [13] D. Cossins, *It's official: Google has achieved quantum supremacy*, <https://www.newscientist.com/article/2220968-its-official-google-has-achieved-quantum-supremacy/> (2019).

- [14] K. P. Callaghan, *IBM unveils world's largest quantum computer at 433 qubits*, <https://www.newscientist.com/article/2346074-ibm-unveils-worlds-largest-quantum-computer-at-433-qubits/> (2022).
- [15] A. Wilkins, *Google launches \$5m prize to find actual uses for quantum computers*. <https://www.newscientist.com/article/2420137-google-launches-5m-prize-to-find-actual-uses-for-quantum-computers/> (2024).
- [16] M. Sparkes, *Google's claim of quantum supremacy has been completely smashed*, <https://www.newscientist.com/article/2437886-googles-claim-of-quantum-supremacy-has-been-completely-smashed/> (2024).

ON THE EINSTEIN PODOLSKY ROSEN PARADOX*

J. S. BELL†

Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin

(Received 4 November 1964)

I. Introduction

THE paradox of Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen [1] was advanced as an argument that quantum mechanics could not be a complete theory but should be supplemented by additional variables. These additional variables were to restore to the theory causality and locality [2]. In this note that idea will be formulated mathematically and shown to be incompatible with the statistical predictions of quantum mechanics. It is the requirement of locality, or more precisely that the result of a measurement on one system be unaffected by operations on a distant system with which it has interacted in the past, that creates the essential difficulty. There have been attempts [3] to show that even without such a separability or locality requirement no "hidden variable" interpretation of quantum mechanics is possible. These attempts have been examined elsewhere [4] and found wanting. Moreover, a hidden variable interpretation of elementary quantum theory [5] has been explicitly constructed. That particular interpretation has indeed a grossly non-local structure. This is characteristic, according to the result to be proved here, of any such theory which reproduces exactly the quantum mechanical predictions.

II. Formulation

With the example advocated by Bohm and Aharonov [6], the EPR argument is the following. Consider a pair of spin one-half particles formed somehow in the singlet spin state and moving freely in opposite directions. Measurements can be made, say by Stern-Gerlach magnets, on selected components of the spins $\vec{\sigma}_1$ and $\vec{\sigma}_2$. If measurement of the component $\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{a}$, where \vec{a} is some unit vector, yields the value +1 then, according to quantum mechanics, measurement of $\vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \vec{a}$ must yield the value -1 and vice versa. Now we make the hypothesis [2], and it seems one at least worth considering, that if the two measurements are made at places remote from one another the orientation of one magnet does not influence the result obtained with the other. Since we can predict in advance the result of measuring any chosen component of $\vec{\sigma}_2$, by previously measuring the same component of $\vec{\sigma}_1$, it follows that the result of any such measurement must actually be predetermined. Since the initial quantum mechanical wave function does *not* determine the result of an individual measurement, this predetermination implies the possibility of a more complete specification of the state.

Let this more complete specification be effected by means of parameters λ . It is a matter of indifference in the following whether λ denotes a single variable or a set, or even a set of functions, and whether the variables are discrete or continuous. However, we write as if λ were a single continuous parameter. The result A of measuring $\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{a}$ is then determined by \vec{a} and λ , and the result B of measuring $\vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \vec{b}$ in the same instance is determined by \vec{b} and λ , and

*Work supported in part by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission

†On leave of absence from SLAC and CERN

$$A(\vec{a}, \lambda) = \pm 1, B(\vec{b}, \lambda) = \pm 1. \quad (1)$$

The vital assumption [2] is that the result B for particle 2 does not depend on the setting \vec{a} , of the magnet for particle 1, nor A on \vec{b} .

If $\rho(\lambda)$ is the probability distribution of λ then the expectation value of the product of the two components $\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{a}$ and $\vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \vec{b}$ is

$$P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) A(\vec{a}, \lambda) B(\vec{b}, \lambda) \quad (2)$$

This should equal the quantum mechanical expectation value, which for the singlet state is

$$\langle \vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{a} \vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \vec{b} \rangle = -\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}. \quad (3)$$

But it will be shown that this is not possible.

Some might prefer a formulation in which the hidden variables fall into two sets, with A dependent on one and B on the other; this possibility is contained in the above, since λ stands for any number of variables and the dependences thereon of A and B are unrestricted. In a complete physical theory of the type envisaged by Einstein, the hidden variables would have dynamical significance and laws of motion; our λ can then be thought of as initial values of these variables at some suitable instant.

III. Illustration

The proof of the main result is quite simple. Before giving it, however, a number of illustrations may serve to put it in perspective.

Firstly, there is no difficulty in giving a hidden variable account of spin measurements on a single particle. Suppose we have a spin half particle in a pure spin state with polarization denoted by a unit vector \vec{p} . Let the hidden variable be (for example) a unit vector $\vec{\lambda}$ with uniform probability distribution over the hemisphere $\vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{p} > 0$. Specify that the result of measurement of a component $\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{a}$ is

$$\text{sign } \vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{a}', \quad (4)$$

where \vec{a}' is a unit vector depending on \vec{a} and \vec{p} in a way to be specified, and the sign function is +1 or -1 according to the sign of its argument. Actually this leaves the result undetermined when $\vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{a}' = 0$, but as the probability of this is zero we will not make special prescriptions for it. Averaging over $\vec{\lambda}$ the expectation value is

$$\langle \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{a} \rangle = 1 - 2\theta'/\pi, \quad (5)$$

where θ' is the angle between \vec{a}' and \vec{p} . Suppose then that \vec{a}' is obtained from \vec{a} by rotation towards \vec{p} until

$$1 - \frac{2\theta'}{\pi} = \cos \theta \quad (6)$$

where θ is the angle between \vec{a} and \vec{p} . Then we have the desired result

$$\langle \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{a} \rangle = \cos \theta \quad (7)$$

So in this simple case there is no difficulty in the view that the result of every measurement is determined by the value of an extra variable, and that the statistical features of quantum mechanics arise because the value of this variable is unknown in individual instances.

Secondly, there is no difficulty in reproducing, in the form (2), the only features of (3) commonly used in verbal discussions of this problem:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} P(\vec{a}, \vec{a}) &= -P(\vec{a}, -\vec{a}) = -1 \\ P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) &= 0 \text{ if } \vec{a} \cdot \vec{b} = 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \tag{8}$$

For example, let λ now be unit vector $\vec{\lambda}$, with uniform probability distribution over all directions, and take

$$\left. \begin{aligned} A(\vec{a}, \vec{\lambda}) &= \text{sign } \vec{a} \cdot \vec{\lambda} \\ B(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) &= -\text{sign } \vec{b} \cdot \vec{\lambda} \end{aligned} \right\} \tag{9}$$

This gives

$$P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = -1 + \frac{2}{\pi} \theta, \tag{10}$$

where θ is the angle between a and b , and (10) has the properties (8). For comparison, consider the result of a modified theory [6] in which the pure singlet state is replaced in the course of time by an isotropic mixture of product states; this gives the correlation function

$$-\frac{1}{3} \vec{a} \cdot \vec{b} \tag{11}$$

It is probably less easy, experimentally, to distinguish (10) from (3), than (11) from (3).

Unlike (3), the function (10) is not stationary at the minimum value -1 (at $\theta = 0$). It will be seen that this is characteristic of functions of type (2).

Thirdly, and finally, there is no difficulty in reproducing the quantum mechanical correlation (3) if the results A and B in (2) are allowed to depend on \vec{b} and \vec{a} respectively as well as on \vec{a} and \vec{b} . For example, replace \vec{a} in (9) by \vec{a}' , obtained from \vec{a} by rotation towards \vec{b} until

$$1 - \frac{2}{\pi} \theta' = \cos \theta,$$

where θ' is the angle between \vec{a}' and \vec{b} . However, for given values of the hidden variables, the results of measurements with one magnet now depend on the setting of the distant magnet, which is just what we would wish to avoid.

IV. Contradiction

The main result will now be proved. Because ρ is a normalized probability distribution,

$$\int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) = 1, \tag{12}$$

and because of the properties (1), P in (2) cannot be less than -1 . It can reach -1 at $\vec{a} = \vec{b}$ only if

$$A(\vec{a}, \lambda) = -B(\vec{a}, \lambda) \tag{13}$$

except at a set of points λ of zero probability. Assuming this, (2) can be rewritten

$$P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = - \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) A(\vec{a}, \lambda) A(\vec{b}, \lambda). \tag{14}$$

It follows that \vec{c} is another unit vector

$$\begin{aligned} P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) - P(\vec{a}, \vec{c}) &= - \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) [A(\vec{a}, \lambda) A(\vec{b}, \lambda) - A(\vec{a}, \lambda) A(\vec{c}, \lambda)] \\ &= \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) A(\vec{a}, \lambda) A(\vec{b}, \lambda) [A(\vec{b}, \lambda) A(\vec{c}, \lambda) - 1] \end{aligned}$$

using (1), whence

$$|P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) - P(\vec{a}, \vec{c})| \leq \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) [1 - A(\vec{b}, \lambda) A(\vec{c}, \lambda)]$$

The second term on the right is $P(\vec{b}, \vec{c})$, whence

$$1 + P(\vec{b}, \vec{c}) \geq |P(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) - P(\vec{a}, \vec{c})| \quad (15)$$

Unless P is constant, the right hand side is in general of order $|\vec{b} - \vec{c}|$ for small $|\vec{b} - \vec{c}|$. Thus $P(\vec{b}, \vec{c})$ cannot be stationary at the minimum value (-1 at $\vec{b} = \vec{c}$) and cannot equal the quantum mechanical value (3).

Nor can the quantum mechanical correlation (3) be arbitrarily closely approximated by the form (2). The formal proof of this may be set out as follows. We would not worry about failure of the approximation at isolated points, so let us consider instead of (2) and (3) the functions

$$\bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) \text{ and } \overline{-\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}}$$

where the bar denotes independent averaging of $P(\vec{a}', \vec{b}')$ and $-\vec{a}' \cdot \vec{b}'$ over vectors \vec{a}' and \vec{b}' within specified small angles of \vec{a} and \vec{b} . Suppose that for all \vec{a} and \vec{b} the difference is bounded by ϵ :

$$|\bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) + \overline{\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}}| \leq \epsilon \quad (16)$$

Then it will be shown that ϵ cannot be made arbitrarily small.

Suppose that for all a and b

$$|\overline{\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}} - \vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}| \leq \delta \quad (17)$$

Then from (16)

$$|\bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) + \vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}| \leq \epsilon + \delta \quad (18)$$

From (2)

$$\bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) \bar{A}(\vec{a}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{b}, \lambda) \quad (19)$$

where

$$|\bar{A}(\vec{a}, \lambda)| \leq 1 \text{ and } |\bar{B}(\vec{b}, \lambda)| \leq 1 \quad (20)$$

From (18) and (19), with $\vec{a} = \vec{b}$,

$$\int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) [\bar{A}(\vec{b}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{b}, \lambda) + 1] \leq \epsilon + \delta \quad (21)$$

From (19)

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) - \bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{c}) &= \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) [\bar{A}(\vec{a}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{b}, \lambda) - \bar{A}(\vec{a}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{c}, \lambda)] \\ &= \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) \bar{A}(\vec{a}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{b}, \lambda) [1 + \bar{A}(\vec{b}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{c}, \lambda)] \\ &\quad - \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) \bar{A}(\vec{a}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{c}, \lambda) [1 + \bar{A}(\vec{b}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{b}, \lambda)] \end{aligned}$$

Using (20) then

$$|\bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) - \bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{c})| \leq \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) [1 + \bar{A}(\vec{b}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{c}, \lambda)] \\ + \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) [1 + \bar{A}(\vec{b}, \lambda) \bar{B}(\vec{b}, \lambda)]$$

Then using (19) and 21)

$$|\bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) - \bar{P}(\vec{a}, \vec{c})| \leq 1 + \bar{P}(\vec{b}, \vec{c}) + \epsilon + \delta$$

Finally, using (18),

$$|\vec{a} \cdot \vec{c} - \vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}| - 2(\epsilon + \delta) \leq 1 - \vec{b} \cdot \vec{c} + 2(\epsilon + \delta)$$

or

$$4(\epsilon + \delta) \geq |\vec{a} \cdot \vec{c} - \vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}| + \vec{b} \cdot \vec{c} - 1 \quad (22)$$

Take for example $\vec{a} \cdot \vec{c} = 0$, $\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b} = \vec{b} \cdot \vec{c} = 1/\sqrt{2}$ Then

$$4(\epsilon + \delta) \geq \sqrt{2} - 1$$

Therefore, for small finite δ , ϵ cannot be arbitrarily small.

Thus, the quantum mechanical expectation value cannot be represented, either accurately or arbitrarily closely, in the form (2).

V. Generalization

The example considered above has the advantage that it requires little imagination to envisage the measurements involved actually being made. In a more formal way, assuming [7] that any Hermitian operator with a complete set of eigenstates is an "observable", the result is easily extended to other systems. If the two systems have state spaces of dimensionality greater than 2 we can always consider two dimensional subspaces and define, in their direct product, operators $\vec{\sigma}_1$ and $\vec{\sigma}_2$ formally analogous to those used above and which are zero for states outside the product subspace. Then for at least one quantum mechanical state, the "singlet" state in the combined subspaces, the statistical predictions of quantum mechanics are incompatible with separable predetermination.

VI. Conclusion

In a theory in which parameters are added to quantum mechanics to determine the results of individual measurements, without changing the statistical predictions, there must be a mechanism whereby the setting of one measuring device can influence the reading of another instrument, however remote. Moreover, the signal involved must propagate instantaneously, so that such a theory could not be Lorentz invariant.

Of course, the situation is different if the quantum mechanical predictions are of limited validity. Conceivably they might apply only to experiments in which the settings of the instruments are made sufficiently in advance to allow them to reach some mutual rapport by exchange of signals with velocity less than or equal to that of light. In that connection, experiments of the type proposed by Bohm and Aharonov [6], in which the settings are changed during the flight of the particles, are crucial.

I am indebted to Drs. M. Bander and J. K. Perring for very useful discussions of this problem. The first draft of the paper was written during a stay at Brandeis University; I am indebted to colleagues there and at the University of Wisconsin for their interest and hospitality.