Why Bell's experiment is meaningless

Han Geurdes

GDS applied mathematics BV
Netherlands

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract

We demonstrate that a Bell experiment asks the impossible of a Kolmogorovian correlation. An Einstein locality explanation in Bell's format is therefore excluded beforehand by way of the experimental and statistical method followed.

Bell's correlation formula; basic probability

1 Introduction

In 1935, Einstein Podolsky and Rosen initiated a debate about the foundation of quantum theory in [1]. Their work established what has been called entanglement.

1.1 Bell Experiment

Bell experiments need no further introduction. One can find a proper example in e.g. Weiss's experiment of 1998 [2].

Let's take $x = \angle(a, b)$, the angle in the plane orthogonal to the direction of propagation. The angle is in the interval $0 \leq x < 2\pi$. The positioning is orthogonal the line of travelling of the two entangled particles from the source S towards the observations at Alice and Bob. The unity setting vector, a, refers to Alice's instrument. The unity vector, b, refers to Bob's instrument. For photons it suffices to look at the orthogonal plane.

Suppose there are N number of entangled photon pairs in the experiment. During the experiment the spin of the photons are measured. If we subsequently denote $N(x|eq)$ the number of up-up or down-down spin pair measurements in the total of N pairs under the angle, x. $N(x|eq)$ is equal to the sum of the countings $C(x|up, up)$ and $C(x|down, down)$.

The left "up" in up-up is Alice's measurement. The right "up" is Bob's. Similar for the other combinations. Moreover, with the assumption of perfect measurement the number of up-down or down-up measurements $N(x|neq)$, is equal to $N - N(x|eq)$.

1.2 Correlation

It is common practice in spin-spin entangled experiments to compute the Kolmogorovian Bell correlation [3] as a raw product moment (rpm) correlation

$$R(x) = \frac{N(x|neq) - N(x|eq)}{N} \tag{1}$$

It is then easy to see that

$$R(x) = 1 - 2F(x) \tag{2}$$

With $F(x) = \frac{N(x|eq)}{N}$.

1.3 Quantum Correlation

It is well known that the quantum correlation is $Q(x) = \cos(x)$. This can, via simple trigonometry, also be written like

$$Q(x) = 1 - 2\sin^2(x/2) \tag{3}$$

If we then want to know if it is possible for a Bell type correlation to be equal to the quantum correlation it follows that $F(x)$ must be equal to $\sin^2(x/2)$. Can this be accomplished?

2 Probability

For clarity, the hypotheses are

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &: R(x) \text{ cannot be equal to } Q(x) \\ H_1 &: R(x) \text{ can be equal to } Q(x) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

In the first place let us note that $F(x)$ is the frequency, $N(x|eq)/N$, of a random variable X where the "eq" must be observed under angle x. The angle x is a real continuous variable in the interval between 0 and 2π. Secondly, the $F(x)$ is, for a continuous random variable, associated to the probability

$$P[y < X < x] = F(x) - F(y) \tag{5}$$

Let us then look at $P[0 \leq X < x]$ and employ the implicit requirement that when $R(x)$ from Eq(2) is equal to $Q(x)$ from Eq(3) it then follows that

$$P[0 \leq X < x] = F(x) \tag{6}$$

However, if $F(x) = \sin^2(x/2)$, then a negative probability is inevitable. This is not possible for a Kolmogorovian probability.

2.1 Example

Let us first look at $y = 3\pi/2$ then, $F(y) = \sin^2(y/2)$

$$P[0 \leq X < y] = \sin^2(3\pi/4) = 0.5 \tag{7}$$

When $x = 2\pi - (\pi/4)$, i.e. $F(x) = \sin^2(x/2)$, it follows that $x > y$. Moreover,

$$P[0 \leq X < x] = F(\pi - (\pi/8)) \approx 0.1465 \tag{8}$$

Then note that interval $0 \leq X < x$ embraces $0 \leq X < y$. Further, the intervals $y \leq X < x$ and $0 \leq X < y$, have no common elements. Hence we may deduce: $P[0 \leq X < x] = P[0 \leq X < y] + P[y \leq X < x]$.

This however implies that

$$0.1465 \approx 0.5 + P[y \leq X < x] \tag{9}$$

And therefore we must have that $P[y \leq X < x] < 0$. This is not possible with a Kolmogorovian probability based correlation function like Bell's.

3 Conclusion

In the first place it must be noted that the present criticism on Bell experiment rpm correlation methodology stands not on its own. Others like e.g. Hess [4] have voiced doubts about Bell proofs as well.

In the second place the following is discussed. When we ask the question whether or not in a spin-spin entangled Bell experiment, the quantum correlation can be produced from a Kolmogorovian based correlation, an impossible requirement is implicit. Such a Kolmogorovian correlation is required to not be a Kolmogorovian entity.

In other words: The Kolmogorovian correlation in this kind of experiments hasn't a chance to come close to quantum. Not because of the fact that a local Kolmogorovian explanation is absent in nature. It is because the test in experiment with rpm correlation asks the logically impossible of a local hidden variables model. Other combinations for Eqs (1)-(3) also run into a conflict with Kolmogorovian probability.

An experiment with rpm correlation is pointless. This means that violation of the famous CHSH is meaningless. It does not allow any conclusion about the presence or absence of an Einsteinian explanation of incompleteness of quantum theory in nature. Such an explanation is excluded beforehand via the experimental and statistical method followed. The reason is that by means of a contradictory requirement, the hypothesis H_1 in Eq(4) has been logically excluded from the observations. Therefore we may claim that the rpm correlation experiments are meaningless. Note, our finding is not an alternative to the CHSH inequality. For, $\sin^2(x/2)$ isn't a quantum probability in $0 \leq x < 2\pi$ either. It represents a flaw in the statistics employed in experiments testing that inequality in nature.

Declarations

The author has no conflict of interest. The work was not funded.
All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article.

References

[1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen, Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considred complete, Phys. Rev. 47,777, 1935.

[2] G. Weiss, T. Jennewein, C. Simon, H. Weinfurther and A. Zeilinger, Violation of Bell's inequality under strict Einstein locality conditions, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 5093, 1998.

[3] J.S. Bell, On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox, Physics 1, 195, 1964.

[4] K. Hess, Einstein local counter arguments and counter examples to Bell type proofs, J. Mod. Phys. 14, 89, 2023.