

# Local realism generalized, EPR refined, Bell's theorem refuted

Gordon Watson\*

**Abstract:** This open letter challenges *Annals of Physics*' Editors and Bell's supporters on this front: in the context of Bell's theorem – after AoP (2016:67) – ‘it's a proven scientific fact that a violation of local realism has been demonstrated theoretically and experimentally.’ We show that such claims under the Bellian canon are curtailed by its foundation on a naive realism that is known to be false; ie, under Bohr's old insight (in our terms), a test may disturb the tested system. Further: (i) We define a general all-embracing local realism – CLR, commonsense local realism – the union of local-causality (no causal influence propagates superluminally) and physical-realism (some physical properties change interactively). (ii) Under CLR, with EPR-based variables (and without QM), a thought-experiment delivers a local-realistic account of EPRB and GHZ in 3-space. (iii) Under EPR, mixing common-sense with undergrad math/physics in the classical way so favored by Einstein, we interpret QM locally and realistically. (iv) We find the flaw in Bell's theorem: Bell's 1964:(14a)  $\neq$  Bell's 1964:(14b) under EPRB. (v) EPR (1935) famously argue that additional variables will bring locality and causality to QM's completion; we show that they are right. (vi) Even more famously, Bell (1964) cried ‘impossible’ against such variables; we give the shortest possible refutation of his claim. (vii) Using Bell's (1988:88) moot gloss on a fragment of von Neumann's work, we conclude: ‘There's *nothing* to Bell's theorem – nor Bellian variants like CHSH (1969), Mermin (1990), Peres (1995); nor Bellian endorsements like those by Bricomont, du Sautoy, Goldstein *et al.*, Maudlin, Norsen, Shimony – it's not just flawed, it's *silly*; its assumptions nonsense; it's not merely false but *foolish*' and misleading. (viii) Our results accord with common-sense, QM, Einstein's principles, EPR's belief and Bell's hopes and expectations.

**Keywords:** Bell's error, causality, CLR, completeness, EPR, EPRB, equivalence, locality, realism

**Notes to the Reader:** (i) Paragraphs and equations are numbered to facilitate discussion, improvement, correction. (ii) Texts freely available online (see **7 References**) are taken as read. (iii) In accord with convention, the term *particle* here includes objects with a *wavicle* nature. (iv) Via particle-polarizer interactions, our machine-generated *P-functions* relate to *prevalence* – the source of expectations  $\langle . | . \rangle$  – *prevalence* is thus equivalent to objective probability and its rules. (v) All results here accord with quantum theory and experiment; there is no doubting here that we live in a quantum world. (vi) The muses here are engineers who rejoiced in the move from log-tables to bamboo slide-rules. (vii) Taking math to be the best logic, we let it flow. Some key equations follow:

- (5) – the result of an old thought-experiment.
- (17) – Bell's theorem refuted.
- (20) – EPR modified to accord with the thought-experiment that delivers (5).
- (31) – Mermin's (1990) variant of GHZ refuted.
- (35) – an open challenge to all Bellians.
- (37) – Bell's naive limiting assumption? Or does he go simpler?
- (38) – proof of an important result under (35).
- (39) – the shortest possible refutation of Bell's theorem.
- (40) – the shortest possible refutation of CHSH (1969) and Peres 1995:(6.03).
- (42) – the absurdity of a famous Bellian claim.
- (44) – the absurdity of Bell's (1964) ‘impossibility’ theorem.
- (49) – the absurdity of CHSH (1969) and Peres 1995:(6.03).
- (50) – the equivalence classes behind (5).

---

\*QED, 1A Netherton Park Ave, Armidale NSW 2350 Australia. [eprb@me.com](mailto:eprb@me.com) Ref: BTR18v1. Date: 20161001-31.

# 1 Introduction

#1.0. “Einstein argued that the EPR correlations can be made intelligible only by completing the quantum mechanical account in a classical way,” Bell (2004:86). “In a complete physical theory of the type envisioned by Einstein, the hidden variables would have dynamical significance and laws of motion; *our  $\lambda$  can be thought of as initial values of these variables at some suitable instant,*” Bell (1964:196); *emphasis added*. We agree; but we show at #F2.5 and #6.3, alas, that Bell naively takes his  $\lambda$  to be *final values*.

#1.1. Following Bell’s (1964) example – merging his valid formalisms with principles consistent with EPRB – we work with  $\lambda$  as initial pristine variables to account for EPRB correlations in a classical way. Our postulates match Einstein’s principles (causality, completeness, locality, reality, separability; with no exceptions) and EPR’s belief (see #3.0-3.1 below).

#1.2. Taking realism to be the view that external reality exists and has definite properties, our core principle is common-sense local realism (CLR), the union of local-causality (no causal influence propagates superluminally) and physical-realism (some physical properties change interactively).

#1.3. Then, since CLR generalizes local realism and precludes nonlocal mechanisms, we find erroneous parameters and unphysical assumptions associated with Bellian conclusions like these:

Bell’s theorem: “In a theory in which parameters are added to [QM] 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,” Bell (1964:199). “Detailed analysis [Bell’s theorem] shows that any classical account of these correlations has to contain just such a ‘spooky action at a distance’ as Einstein could not believe in ... [rendering] Einstein’s conception of the world untenable,” Bell (2004:86). We prove the contrary; see #6.0.

#1.4. Such errors – at odds with EPR/EPRB, and of Bell’s own making – void Bell’s impossibility theorem and its kin. Against this, and at one with EPR/EPRB, we deliver a common-sense locally-causal understanding of EPRB and GHZ in 3-space; all done in the classical way so favored by Einstein.

#1.5. Our theory, WM – dubbed wholistic mechanics in 1989, after a discussion with David Mermin re his (1988) – seeks to unify QM and relativity. Accepting Einstein-separability (eg, Laudisa 1995), our particles are presumed separable; rejecting ideas like *inseparable entanglement* (Feingold & Peres 1985), each pair being a *single nonlocal indivisible entity* (Mermin 1985), etc.

#1.6. The key to our study is a thought-experiment; developed in 1989, reading Mermin (1988). But here we reverse the order. With Fig.1 capturing technical aspects of our study – and Fig.2 giving the thought-experiment that helps make sense of it all – our debt to Mermin (1988) is clear.

#1.7. Starting out, Bell (1964:195) boldly claims, ‘nonlocality is the characteristic of *any* hidden-variable theory which reproduces exactly the QM predictions;’ *emphasis added*. Norsen (2015:1) agrees. But the later Bell (on the subject of locality, and as late as 1988), says, “There certainly remains something to be said [about locality], some illumination to be found,” Bell (1988:121).

#1.8. Thus, given our results – with nonlocality having no place here, thanks to (1) – we offer the illumination that Bell (1988:121) sought along with Einstein and EPR. The key is CLR – our generalization of local realism – which embraces and goes beyond Bell’s naive limitations.

#1.9. To that end, this letter proceeds as follows:

- (a) – we define an idealized experiment  $E$  in 3-space and under Einstein-completeness; Fig.1.
- (b) – we run  $F$ , a thought-experiment, to deliver the equivalence classes in  $E$ ; Fig.2.
- (c) – we derive the correct result (Bell’s ‘impossible’ relation) from (a) and (b); (17).
- (d) – given (c) – ie, *the QM result* – Bell’s canon collapses immediately; eg, (31), (39), (40).
- (e) – under the above, we deliver EPR’s belief; #3.0-3.1.
- (f) – we support the above by applying our principles to a three-particle GHZ setting; (31).
- (g) – we are now ready to formally locate the error in Bell’s theorem and issue a challenge; (35).
- (h) – simple inanity indices show the absurdity in Bellian relations; (41)-(49).
- (i) – supporting Einstein’s insistence, EPR’s belief and Bell’s hope, we conclude; **5 Conclusions**.

## 2 Analysis

#2.0. In WM, with its precise math, the big and the small merge smoothly; after Bell (2004:190). You learn by doing it; for though you think you know it, you have no certainty until you succeed; after Sophocles (c. 496-406 BCE). Importantly: only the impossible is impossible.

$$A^\pm \equiv \pm 1 = [\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}^\pm] \leftarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^\pm) \leftarrow \Delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm \leftarrow q(\lambda_i) \leftarrow S_E \rightarrow q(\mu_i) \rightarrow \Delta_{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}^\pm \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{b}}^\pm) \rightarrow [\hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{b}}^\pm] = \pm 1 \equiv B^\pm$$

$\parallel$  Alice’s locale  $\parallel$   $\parallel$ Source $\parallel$   $\parallel$  Bob’s locale  $\parallel$

**Figure 1:** Experiment  $E$ , based on the idealized EPRB experiment in Bell (1964).

#F1.1. In 3-space, and under Einstein-completeness, every relevant element of the subject reality is shown. Since  $A$  and  $B$  are discrete, we employ discrete variables  $\lambda_i, \mu_i$ . This rigor accords with our take on EPRB and Bell’s (1964:195) indifference.

#F1.2. With pristine spin-related properties  $\lambda_i$  and  $\mu_i$ , spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  particles  $q(\lambda_i)$  and  $q(\mu_i)$  emerge from  $S_E$  via a spin-conserving decay such that  $\lambda_i + \mu_i = 0$ . The particles interact with dichotomic linear-polarizer-analyzers ( $\Delta_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}^\pm$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  any direction-vector in 3-space) – freely and independently operated by Alice and Bob – built from polarizers  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}^\pm$  and analyzers  $[\hat{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{x}}^\pm]$ . These interactions/events are locally-causal and spacelike-separated. Thus, under Einstein (1949:85) – the real factual situation of  $q(\mu_i)$  is independent of what is done with  $q(\lambda_i)$  that is spatially separated from  $q(\mu_i)$  – the respective pristine elements (though initially correlated) are physically independent.

#F1.3. If the output of the interaction  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm q(\lambda_i)$  is  $q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+)$ , then  $q(\lambda_i) \sim q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+)$  where  $\sim$  denotes *has the same output under*  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm$  (a dichotomic operator that dyadically partitions its domain); etc. The polarized particle  $q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+)$  goes to an analyzer which reports – schematically, via its inner-product function  $[\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}^+]$  – the  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$ -related spin-projection  $A_i^+ = +1$  in units of  $s\hbar$ ; with intrinsic spin  $s = \frac{1}{2}$  here; etc.

#F1.4. Re our technical capacity and to submit proposals for run-time, see #6.1

#2.1. From Fig.1: two spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  particles  $q(\lambda_i)$  and  $q(\mu_i)$  with pristine spin-related properties  $\lambda_i$  and  $\mu_i$  – multivectors in 3-space, each incorporating spin  $s$  – emerge from a spin-conserving decay such that

$$\lambda_i + \mu_i = 0; \text{ ie, } \mu_i = -\lambda_i \equiv \lambda_i^- \text{ for notational convenience.} \quad (1)$$

#2.2. (1) shows the correlation of  $\lambda_i$  and  $\mu_i$ , the pristine EPR-based variables we use to form a more complete locally-causal specification of  $E$ . Since one pristine property may be pairwise represented in terms of its twin, let’s first focus on  $\lambda_i$  and call it the primary random variable for now (for the choice and the name matter not). Then  $\mu_i$  becomes the secondary variable (for now) with  $\mu_i = \lambda_i^-$ ; see #6.2.

$$\begin{aligned}
& [G|R] \leftarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^\pm) \leftarrow \Delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm \leftarrow q(\lambda_i) \leftarrow S_F \rightarrow q(\mu_i) \rightarrow \Delta_{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}^\pm \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{b}}^\pm) \rightarrow [G|R] \\
[G|R] \leftarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^\pm) \leftarrow \Delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm \leftarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^\pm) \leftarrow \delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm \leftarrow q(\lambda_i) \leftarrow S_F \rightarrow q(\mu_i) \rightarrow \Delta_{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}^\pm \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{b}}^\pm) \rightarrow [G|R] \\
[G|R] \leftarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^\pm) \leftarrow \Delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm \leftarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^\pm) \leftarrow \delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm \leftarrow q(\lambda_i) \leftarrow S_F \rightarrow q(\mu_i) \rightarrow \delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^\pm) \rightarrow \Delta_{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}^\pm \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{b}}^\pm) \rightarrow [G|R] \\
\ll \quad \text{Alice's locale} \quad \ll \quad \ll \text{Source} \ll \quad \ll \quad \text{Bob's locale} \quad \ll
\end{aligned}$$

**Figure 2:** Experiment  $F - F$  for *Figment* – the essence of experiment  $E$  in Fig.1.

#F2.1. See Fig.1 for operating protocols, etc. Apart from new analyzers, the main departure from  $E$  is the new source  $S_F$ ;  $F$  being a thought-experiment.

#F2.2. To resolve alleged mysteries in Fig.1, we build three equivalent experiments (shown above) around a fantasy-source  $S_F$ .  $S_F$  delivers identical particle-pairs on demand; each pair identically tagged  $q(\lambda_i), q(\mu_i)$ . Differing from  $E$  in Fig.1, each analyzer now reports its results via green ( $G = +1$ ) or red ( $R = -1$ ) lights. The following paired-results are observed over any fair run of the experiment:

$$\text{If the detectors have the same setting, the lights flash different colors.} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{In all runs of the experiment, same and different colors flash equally.} \quad (3)$$

#F2.3. Recalling that Alice's and Bob's direction-vectors ( $\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}$ ) can take any orientation in 3-space – whereas, under  $F$ ,  $q(\lambda_i)$  and  $q(\mu_i)$  are always the same – the following relation captures the observations in (2)-(3):

$$\langle AB | E \rangle = \langle AB | F \rangle = \frac{1}{2}(GG + RR) \sin^2 \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}) + \frac{1}{2}(GR + RG) \cos^2 \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}) \quad (4)$$

$$= \sin^2 \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}) - \cos^2 \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}) = -\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{b}} \quad \because G = +1, R = -1. \text{ QED. } \blacksquare \quad (5)$$

#F2.4. The clue to (4), from highschool, is that the required prevalence relations come thus: convert Malus' classical  $\cos^2$  Law for the relative intensity of beams of polarized photons (spin  $s = 1$ ) to a law for spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  particles (spin  $s = \frac{1}{2}$ ). We can then derive an exact solution for two of the above experiments: at the same time satisfying the results for the topmost experiment, which is essentially  $E$  in Fig.1.

#F2.5. We then see that  $q(\lambda_i) \neq q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+)$  and  $q(\mu_i) \neq q(\hat{\mathbf{b}}^+)$ . For, in breach of (2), the lights would not flash different colors when the detectors are set the same;  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$  being arbitrary, within a run or from run to run. (This argument is definitive against the naivety of d'Espagnat (1979) and Bell (1980); they infer contrariwise at #6.3 and into trouble as we'll see.)

#F2.6. However, weaker than an equality relation ( $=$ ), an equivalence relation ( $\sim$ ) meets all our needs: if the output of  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm q(\lambda_i)$  is  $q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+)$ , then  $q(\lambda_i) \sim q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+)$  where  $\sim$  denotes *has the same output under  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm$* ; etc. Noting that  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm$  is typical of the tools we use on any  $q(\cdot)$ , we return to Fig.1 with new insights – see #6.4 – and work to do.

#2.3. Under  $E$ , Fig.1, from the well-known action of a linear-polarizer  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm$  on polarized particles  $q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+)$ , we can match a laboratory operation  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+) \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+)$  with the interaction  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm q(\lambda_i) \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+)$ ; etc. We also know that  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm$  is a dichotomic operator that dyadically partitions its domain. Then – with  $\sim$  the the equivalence relation *has the same output under  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm$*  – for the  $i$ -th and  $j$ -th particles we have:

$$\text{If } \delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm q(\lambda_i) \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+) \text{ then } q(\lambda_i) \sim q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+) \quad \because \delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+) \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+) \text{ exclusively.} \quad (6)$$

$$\text{If } \delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm q(\lambda_j) \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^-) \text{ then } q(\lambda_j) \sim q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^-) \quad \because \delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^-) \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^-) \text{ exclusively.} \quad (7)$$

#2.4. That is, from (6): polarizing-operator  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^{\pm}$  delivers  $q(\lambda_i)$  and  $q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+)$  to the same codomain, and it is impossible for  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^{\pm}$  to deliver  $q(\lambda_i)$  and  $q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+)$  to two different codomains. An equivalence relation  $\sim$  thus holds between  $q(\lambda_i)$  and  $q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+)$  under  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^{\pm}$ ; etc. So, consistent with our acceptance of Bell's 1964:(1), the analyzer-functions and outputs in Fig.1 (and their expectations) can be written:

$$A(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \lambda) = A^{\pm} = \cos(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \lambda | \lambda \sim \hat{\mathbf{a}}^{\pm}) = \pm 1; \langle A | E \rangle = 0 \because P(\lambda \sim \hat{\mathbf{a}}^+ | E) = P(\lambda \sim \hat{\mathbf{a}}^- | E) = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (8)$$

$$B(\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \mu) = B^{\pm} = \cos(\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \mu | \mu \sim \hat{\mathbf{b}}^{\pm}) = \pm 1; \langle B | E \rangle = 0 \because P(\mu \sim \hat{\mathbf{b}}^+ | E) = P(\mu \sim \hat{\mathbf{b}}^- | E) = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (9)$$

#2.5. In words, LHS (8) reads: given  $q(\lambda)$  equivalent to  $q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+)$ ,  $\cos(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \lambda | \lambda \sim \hat{\mathbf{a}}^+)$  denotes the cosine of the angle  $(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{a}}^+)$ : so the outcome is  $A^+ = +1$ ; etc. Thus, from (8)-(9) and Fig.1, WM is locally-causal: because  $A^{\pm}$  and  $B^{\pm}$  are locally-caused by precedent local events  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^{\pm}q(\lambda_i)$  and  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}^{\pm}q(\mu_i)$  which are spacelike-separated; etc.

#2.6. Now, given hidden random variables  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ , the expectations in (8) and (9) are zero. But (1) invokes  $P(XY) = P(X)P(Y|X) = P(Y)P(X|Y)$ ; the prevalence relation, a truism, that cannot fail. Under  $E$ ,  $A_i^+$  and  $B_i^+$  are pairwise correlated via the pairwise correlation of  $\lambda_i$  and  $\mu_i$  in (1); etc.

#2.7. So we now move to derive  $\langle AB | E \rangle$ , the expectation for experiment  $E$ , via the prevalence of the outcomes in (8) and (9) under conjunction. [See discussion at #6.5-6.6.] Since primacy is arbitrary, (#2.2), and given the correlation in (1), the following string of prevalence relations holds:

$$P(\lambda \sim \hat{\mathbf{a}}^+ | E, \mu \sim \hat{\mathbf{b}}^+) = P(\mu \sim \hat{\mathbf{b}}^+ | E, \lambda \sim \hat{\mathbf{a}}^+) = P(\lambda^- \sim \hat{\mathbf{b}}^+ | E, \lambda \sim \hat{\mathbf{a}}^+) = P(\lambda \sim \hat{\mathbf{b}}^- | E, \lambda \sim \hat{\mathbf{a}}^+) \quad (10)$$

$$= P(\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}^{\pm}q(\lambda \sim \hat{\mathbf{a}}^+) \rightarrow q(\lambda \sim \hat{\mathbf{b}}^-) | E) = P(\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}^{\pm}q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+) \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{b}}^-) | E) = \cos^2 s(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+, \hat{\mathbf{b}}^-) = \sin^2 \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}). \quad (11)$$

#2.8. The prevalence relation LHS (11) is, we see, equivalent to a classical test on spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  particles of known polarization. So, per RHS (11), this prevalence relation is given by Malus'  $\cos^2 s(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+, \hat{\mathbf{b}}^-)$  Law for the relative intensity of beams of polarized spin- $s$  particles. Then, since our equivalence relations hold under prevalence functions  $P$ , we say that  $P$  is well-defined under  $\sim$  and is thus a law. That is,  $P$  under  $\sim$  is Malus' Law generalized to entangled particles as follows:

$$P(\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}^{\pm}q(\lambda \sim \hat{\mathbf{a}}^+) \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{b}}^+) | E) = P(\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}^{\pm}q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+) \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{b}}^+) | E) = \cos^2 \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+, \hat{\mathbf{b}}^+) = \cos^2 \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}); \quad (12)$$

$$P(\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}^{\pm}q(\lambda \sim \hat{\mathbf{a}}^-) \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{b}}^+) | E) = P(\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}^{\pm}q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^-) \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{b}}^+) | E) = \cos^2 \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^-, \hat{\mathbf{b}}^+) = \sin^2 \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}); \text{ etc.} \quad (13)$$

#2.9. Given the experimentally validated (and QM-supported) relations in (12)-(13) – [see #6.7 for their direct relevance to QM via WM] – we now derive  $\langle AB | E \rangle$  using (8)-(13):

$$\langle A^+ B^+ | E \rangle = P(\lambda \sim \hat{\mathbf{a}}^+ | E) \cos(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \lambda | \lambda \sim \hat{\mathbf{a}}^+) P(\mu \sim \hat{\mathbf{b}}^+ | E, \lambda \sim \hat{\mathbf{a}}^+) \cos(\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \mu | \mu \sim \hat{\mathbf{b}}^+) \quad (14)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} P(\mu \sim \hat{\mathbf{b}}^+ | E, \lambda \sim \hat{\mathbf{a}}^+) = \frac{1}{2} \sin^2 \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}); \text{ from(10)-(11)}. \quad (15)$$

$$\text{Similarly: } \langle A^+ B^- | E \rangle = \langle A^- B^+ | E \rangle = -\frac{1}{2} \cos^2 \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}); \langle A^- B^- | E \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sin^2 \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}). \quad (16)$$

$$\therefore \langle AB | E \rangle = \langle A^+ B^+ | E \rangle + \langle A^+ B^- | E \rangle + \langle A^- B^+ | E \rangle + \langle A^- B^- | E \rangle = -\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{b}}. \text{ QED. } \blacksquare \quad (17)$$

$$\text{Finally: } P(AB = +1 | E) = \sin^2 \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}). P(AB = -1 | E) = \cos^2 \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}). \quad (18)$$

#2.10. (17) thus reproduces the results of quantum theory in full accord with EPR and EPRB (a 2-particle setting). So we next show the validity and utility of (1)-(18) in a 3-particle setting.

#2.11. To that end – beginning at #3.1 with a small refinement of EPR to fully accord with (1)-(18) – we reproduce the results of quantum theory in the context of a 3-particle experiment, Mermin (1990; 1990a). With its supposed 'always-vs-never refutation' of EPR, Mermin's GHZ/Bell-based analysis is (for us) a crucial all-or-nothing test of our perception of EPR against that of Bell and Mermin.

### 3 Mermin's 'always-vs-never refutation of EPR' refuted

#3.0. EPR's belief: 'We shall be satisfied with the following criterion, which we regard as reasonable. If, without any way disturbing a system, we can predict with certainty (ie, with prevalence equal to unity) the value of a physical quantity, then there exists an element of physical reality corresponding to this physical quantity,' after EPR (1935:777). "While we have thus shown that the wave function does not provide a complete description of the physical reality, we left open the question of whether or not such a description exists. *We believe, however, that such a theory is possible,*" EPR (1935:780); *emphasis added*.

#3.1. EPR's belief delivered: "If, without in any way disturbing  $q(\mu_i)$ , Alice can predict with certainty that Bob's result will be  $B_i = -1$  when he tests  $q(\mu_i)$  with  $\Delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^{\pm}$  (which may be a disturbance), then elements of reality  $\Delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^{\pm}$  and  $q(\mu_i \sim \hat{\mathbf{a}}^-)$  mediate Bob's result. Thus the element of reality corresponding to Bob's  $B_i = -1$  result will be  $q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^-)$ ," after Watson (1998:417; 1999). So here's how Alice predicts Bob's result after observing the outcome of her test  $\Delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^{\pm} q(\lambda_i) \Rightarrow A_i = +1$ :

$$A_i = +1 \because \delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^{\pm} q(\lambda_i) \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+) \rightarrow [\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}^+] = +1. \therefore q(\lambda_i) = q(\lambda_i \sim \hat{\mathbf{a}}^+). \therefore q(\mu_i) = q(\mu_i \sim \hat{\mathbf{a}}^-). \quad (19)$$

$$\therefore \delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^{\pm} q(\mu_i) = \delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^{\pm} q(\mu_i \sim \hat{\mathbf{a}}^-) \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^-) \rightarrow [\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}^-] = -1 = B_i. \text{ QED. } \blacksquare \text{ And vice-versa.} \quad (20)$$

#3.2. Thus showing that EPR is valid in the context of (1)-(18) – ie, after #3.1, EPR local realism equates to CLR – we now consider experiment  $M$ , Mermin's (1990; 1990a) 3-particle variant of GHZ (1989). Respectively, consistent with our notation for the polarizer orientations: three spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  particles with spin-related properties  $\lambda, \mu, \nu$  emerge from a spin-conserving decay such that (taking  $\nu$  to be the tertiary variable; see #2.2),

$$\lambda + \mu + \nu = \pi. \therefore \nu = \pi - \lambda - \mu. \quad (21)$$

#3.3. The particles separate in the y-z plane and interact with spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  polarizers that are orthogonal to the related line of flight. Let  $a, b, c$  denote the angle of each polarizer's principal-axis relative to the positive x-axis; let the test results be  $A, B, C$ . Then, as in LHS (8)-(9) with two particles, let

$$A(a, \lambda) = A^{\pm} = \cos(a - \lambda | \lambda \sim a^{\pm}) = \pm 1, \quad (22)$$

$$B(b, \mu) = B^{\pm} = \cos(b - \mu | \mu \sim b^{\pm}) = \pm 1, \quad (23)$$

$$C(c, \nu) = C^{\pm} = \cos(c - \nu | \nu \sim c^{\pm}) = \pm 1. \quad (24)$$

#3.4. Via the principles in (1)-(18) – and nothing more – we now derive  $\langle ABC | M \rangle$ , the expectation for experiment  $M$ . (The qualifier  $M$  is missing from (25) to limit its length; explanatory notes follow.)

$$\langle A^+ B^+ C^+ | M \rangle$$

$$= P(\lambda \sim a^+) \cos(a - \lambda | \lambda \sim a^+) P(\mu \sim b^+) \cos(b - \mu | \mu \sim b^+) P(\nu \sim c^+ | \lambda \sim a^+, \mu \sim b^+) \cos(c - \nu | \nu \sim c^+) \quad (25)$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} P(\nu \sim c^+ | M, \lambda \sim a^+, \mu \sim b^+) = \frac{1}{4} P((\pi - \lambda - \mu) \sim c^+ | M, \lambda \sim a^+, \mu \sim b^+) \quad (26)$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} P((\pi - a^+ - b^+) \sim c^+ | M) = \frac{1}{4} \cos^2 \frac{1}{2} (\pi - a^+ - b^+ - c^+) = \frac{1}{4} \sin^2 \frac{1}{2} (a + b + c). \quad (27)$$

$$\text{Similarly: } \langle A^+ B^- C^- | M \rangle = \langle A^- B^+ C^- | M \rangle = \langle A^- B^- C^+ | M \rangle = \frac{1}{4} \sin^2 \frac{1}{2} (a + b + c), \text{ and} \quad (28)$$

$$\langle A^+ B^+ C^- | M \rangle = \langle A^+ B^- C^+ | M \rangle = \langle A^- B^+ C^+ | M \rangle = \langle A^- B^- C^- | M \rangle = -\frac{1}{4} \cos^2 \frac{1}{2} (a + b + c). \quad (29)$$

$$\therefore \langle ABC | M \rangle \equiv \Sigma \langle A^{\pm} B^{\pm} C^{\pm} | M \rangle \quad (30)$$

$$= \sin^2 \frac{1}{2} (a + b + c) - \cos^2 \frac{1}{2} (a + b + c) = -\cos(a + b + c). \text{ QED. } \blacksquare \quad (31)$$

$$\text{Finally: } P(ABC = +1 | M) = \sin^2 \frac{1}{2} (a + b + c). P(ABC = -1 | M) = \cos^2 \frac{1}{2} (a + b + c). \quad (32)$$

#3.5. (27) follows from (26) via the allocation of the equivalence relations in the conditioning space to the related variables. Thus, in words, LHS (27) is one-quarter the prevalence that  $\nu$  — ie,  $\nu \sim (\pi - a^+ - b^+)$  — will be equivalent to  $c^+$  under  $\delta_c^{\pm}$ .

#3.6. In other words: LHS (27) =  $\frac{1}{4}P(\delta_c^\pm q(\nu \sim \pi - a^+ - b^+) \rightarrow q(c^+))$  = RHS (27) via Malus' (now generalized) Law; ie, this is the three-particle variant of (15) in the two-particle EPRB example above.

#3.7. (31) is the correct result for experiment  $M$ : delivering Mermin's (1990a:733) *crucial minus sign*. That is, from (32):  $\langle ABC | M \rangle = -1$  when  $(a + b + c) = 0$ . Thus, consistent with CLR and classical rules for operators and functions in 3-space, we again deliver classically-intelligible EPR correlations.

#3.8. With (17), (20), and now (31) – as one with EPR but so clearly in conflict with the Bellian conclusions cited at #1.3 above – we turn to Bell's work to find our differences.

## 4 Bell's theorem misses its target

#4.0. Bell's dictum: "We are not at all concerned with sequences of measurements on a given particle, or of pairs of measurements on a given particle. We are concerned with experiments in which for each pair the 'spin' of each particle is measured once only," Bell (2004:65); from 1975. "It is a matter of indifference . . . whether  $\lambda$  denotes a single variable or a set, or even a set of functions, and whether the variables are discrete or continuous. However, [Bell writes] as if  $\lambda$  were a single continuous parameter," Bell (1964:195).  $\lambda$  may denote "any number of hypothetical additional complementary variables needed to complete QM in the way envisaged by EPR," Bell (2004:242). NB: we work with discrete variables.

#4.1. To establish the famed inequality in Bell 1964:(3), Bell (1964:197) takes us to his proof via 'Contradiction – The main result will now be proved.' That is, we are taken to Bell 1964:(15) via Bell 1964:(14), vector  $\mathbf{c}$ , and three unnumbered equations.

#4.2. Numbering them (14a)-(14c), and using the principles that rightly deliver (17), (20), (31), we now audit Bell's derivation of his 1964:(15). In our terms,  $\stackrel{?}{=}$  denotes a questionable Bellian relation; each one false, as we'll see next.

#4.3. In  $E$  (ie, EPRB per Fig.1 above), let  $3n$  random particle-pairs be equally distributed over three randomized polarizer-pairings  $(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{b})$ ,  $(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{c})$ ,  $(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$ . With each particle-pair uniquely indexed, let  $n$  be such that (for convenience in presentation and to an adequate accuracy hereafter; but see #6.8):

$$\text{Bell 1964:(14a)} = \langle AB | E \rangle - \langle AC | E \rangle = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [A(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \lambda_i)A(\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \lambda_i) - A(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \lambda_{n+i})A(\hat{\mathbf{c}}, \lambda_{n+i})] \quad (33)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n A(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \lambda_i)A(\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \lambda_i)[A(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \lambda_i)A(\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \lambda_i)A(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \lambda_{n+i})A(\hat{\mathbf{c}}, \lambda_{n+i}) - 1] \stackrel{?}{=} \text{Bell 1964:(14b)}. \quad (34)$$

$$\therefore |\langle AB | E \rangle - \langle AC | E \rangle| \leq 1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n A(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \lambda_i)A(\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \lambda_i)A(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \lambda_{n+i})A(\hat{\mathbf{c}}, \lambda_{n+i}) \stackrel{?}{=} \text{Bell 1964:(14c)}. \blacksquare \quad (35)$$

$$\therefore |\langle AB | E \rangle - \langle AC | E \rangle| \leq 1 - \langle AB | E \rangle \langle AC | E \rangle \stackrel{?}{=} \text{LHS Bell 1964:(15)} \leq 1 + \langle BC | E \rangle. \quad (36)$$

#4.4. In (34)-(35), we use  $A(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \lambda_i)A(\mathbf{b}, \lambda_i) = \pm 1$  from (8)-(9). The central term in (35) is the correct discrete form of LHS (35), which equals LHS (36) as follows: the random variables (RVs) generated by  $\lambda_i$  and  $\lambda_{n+i}$  are independent, and the expectation over the product of two independent RVs is the product of their individual expectations. Given [say] "that Bell's theorem is as mathematically robust as they come," du Sautoy (2016:170) – (35) challenges logicians, mathematicians, philosophers and physicists alike – please show your workings and remove the  $\stackrel{?}{=}$  from (35) under EPR or EPRB.

#4.5. So we now study the physical significance of Bell's mathematical reductions – now made clear in the line below his 1964:(14c) – that the rightmost term in (36) is  $\langle BC|E \rangle$ . To that end (in anticipation and protected by our  $\overset{?}{\equiv}$ ),  $\langle BC|E \rangle$  is already there, the rightmost term in RHS (36). With all terms in (33)-(36) known to us from (17), we can readily decipher and test each reduction. However, before that, we first test the remaining  $n$  particles – ie, those indexed  $2n+i$  to  $3n$  – over the polarizer-pairing  $(\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \hat{\mathbf{c}})$ . We find  $\langle BC|E \rangle = -\hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}}$ , confirming our (17)-based prediction.

#4.6. Consistent with Bell's dictum (#4.0), and given (17), (35) is decisive. Under our assumption that the likes of  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  are random variables (multivectors incorporating spin  $s$ ) in 3-space, it is prevalence zero that any particle-pairs are the same in our analysis. If this assumption is relaxed to satisfy (35) – that crucial test that Bell's theorem fails – then Bell's theorem goes through under

$$\lambda_i = \lambda_{n+1} = \lambda_{2n+1}. \quad (37)$$

#4.7. Alas for Bell, (37) – unrealistic, in our terms, and against the spirit of EPR – crashes at the next hurdle. For (37) delivers Bell's 1964:(15), which falls at (39); or (44) if you prefer. In that (37) appears to be the basis for many variants of Bell's theorem – though  $\lambda$  is little studied in the Bellian literature – they fall too.

#4.8. Many combinations of direction-vectors in 3-space yield interesting truisms; honoring an old friend and mentor, we call each a Bourne relation. Thus, given four direction-vectors  $(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}, \hat{\mathbf{d}})$  in 3-space, here are three such truisms with their consequents:

$$(i) \quad |(\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{b}}) - (\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}})| + (\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{b}})(\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}}) \leq 1. \quad \therefore |(\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{b}}) - (\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}})| \leq 1 - (\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{b}})(\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}}). \quad \blacksquare \quad (38)$$

$$(ii) \quad |(\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{b}}) - (\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}})| + (\hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}}) \leq \frac{3}{2}. \quad \therefore |(\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{b}}) - (\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}})| \not\leq 1 - (\hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}}). \quad \blacksquare \quad (39)$$

$$(iii) \quad |(\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{b}}) + (\hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}}) + (\hat{\mathbf{c}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{d}}) - (\hat{\mathbf{d}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}})| \leq 2\sqrt{2}. \quad \therefore |(\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{b}}) + (\hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}}) + (\hat{\mathbf{c}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{d}}) - (\hat{\mathbf{d}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}})| \not\leq 2. \quad \blacksquare \quad (40)$$

#4.9. In the light of (17): (i) RHS (38) confirms *our result* at LHS (36). (ii) Contrariwise – see RHS (36) – (39) is the shortest possible refutation of Bell's 1964:(15); and hence of his theorem. (iii) (40), as we'll see at #4.12-4.13, refutes variants of Bell's theorem like Peres 1990:(6.30) and CHSH (1969).

#4.10. For those who prefer more conventional tests as proof that Bell's work here is in error, let our polarizer direction-angles be such that  $(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}) = (\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \hat{\mathbf{c}})$ ,  $(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}) = 2(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}})$ , with an inanity-index  $\mathbf{I}$  ( $\mathbf{I} > 0$  revealing absurdity; denoted  $\blacktriangle$ ). Then, using (17) and suppressing our now-proven doubt ( $\overset{?}{\equiv}$ ) in favor of two Bellian claims under EPRB — (i) for equality ( $\equiv$ ) in (36); (ii) that LHS Bell 1964:(15)  $\geq$  RHS Bell 1964:(15) — we have:

$$(i) \quad \mathbf{I}_{\text{Bell 1964:(15)=LHS(36)}} \equiv \frac{\text{LHS(36)}}{\text{RHS(36)}} - 1 = \frac{|1 - (\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{b}})(\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}})|}{1 - \hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}}} - 1; \quad (41)$$

$$\text{whence, for } -\frac{\pi}{2} < (\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}) < +\frac{\pi}{2} : \mathbf{I}_{\text{Bell 1964:(15)=LHS(36)}} > 0. \quad \blacktriangle \quad \frac{\text{Lim}_{(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}) \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{I}_{\text{Bell 1964:(15)=LHS(36)}}}{(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}) \rightarrow 0} = 4. \quad \blacktriangle \quad (42)$$

$$(ii) \quad \mathbf{I}_{\text{Bell 1964:(15)=LHS(36)}} \equiv \frac{\text{RHS Bell 1964(15)}}{\text{LHS Bell 1964(15)}} - 1 = \frac{|(\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{b}}) - (\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}})|}{1 - \hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}}} - 1; \quad (43)$$

$$\text{whence, for } -\frac{\pi}{2} < (\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}) < +\frac{\pi}{2} : \mathbf{I}_{\text{Bell 1964:(15)}} > 0. \quad \blacktriangle \quad \frac{\text{Lim}_{(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}) \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{I}_{\text{Bell 1964:(15)}}}{(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}) \rightarrow 0} = 2. \quad \blacktriangle \quad (44)$$

#4.11. The tacit inequality in Bell's (14a)-(14b) thus reveals Bell's consequent error under EPRB:

$$\text{Bell's error: Bell 1964:(14a)} \neq \text{Bell 1964:(14b)} \Rightarrow \text{LHS 1964:(15)} \not\geq \text{RHS 1964:(15)}. \quad (45)$$

#4.12. With Bell's theorem thus doubly refuted, similar anomalies attach to Bell-inequalities in general. Peres' version of the CHSH (1969) inequality is an example. In our terms, Peres (1995:164) has, "If several [particle-pairs] are tested, we have for the  $j$ -th pair"

$$A_j(B_j - D_j) + C_j(B_j + D_j) \equiv \pm 2. \quad (46)$$



#4.13. So, by observation, the average of (46) over many pairs cannot exceed two; a result known as the CHSH (1969) inequality. To prove that Peres and CHSH are in error under CLR, let the polarizer direction-angles be  $(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}) = (\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}) = (\hat{\mathbf{c}}, \hat{\mathbf{d}})$ ,  $(\hat{\mathbf{d}}, \hat{\mathbf{a}}) = 3(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}})$ ; let  $\{k\} = \{i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , similar to #4.3; let  $\mathbf{I}$  be an appropriate inanity-index. Then, under (17), Peres 1995:(6.30) leads to this:

$$|\langle AB \rangle_{\{k\}} + \langle BC \rangle_{\{n+k\}} + \langle CD \rangle_{\{2n+k\}} - \langle DA \rangle_{\{3n+k\}}| \leq 2. \quad (47)$$

$$\therefore \mathbf{I}_{\text{Peres 1995:(6.30)}} \equiv \frac{\text{LHS (47)}}{\text{RHS (47)}} - 1 = \frac{|(\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{b}}) + (\hat{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{c}}) + (\hat{\mathbf{c}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{d}}) - (\hat{\mathbf{d}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}})|}{2} - 1; \quad (48)$$

whence, for  $-\pi < (\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}) < +\pi : \mathbf{I}_{\text{Peres 1995:(6.30)}} > 0$  for more than 75% of that range.  $\blacktriangle$  (49)

#4.14. So, thanks to the  $q(\lambda_{wn+i}) \subseteq Q$  particle-family – with no two particles necessarily the same – most Bell inequalities fall to the same analysis. Indeed, for us – but against Bell himself, Goldstein, Maudlin, Mermin, Peres, and many others – it’s worth repeating Bell’s dictum from #4.0:

“We are not at all concerned with sequences of measurements on a given particle, or of pairs of measurements on a given particle. We are concerned with experiments in which for each pair the ‘spin’ of each particle is measured once only,” Bell (2004:65); from 1975.

#4.15. So where do we differ? We who never doubted that each of Einstein’s passions [#1.1.] is true – we who operate under EPR’s belief [#3.0] – versus Bellians with their stated aim (and claim) to do the same? The short answer is this: we differ because – generalizing local realism under CLR – we take EPR’s belief seriously and Bellians do not; see (17), (20), (31), (35), (39), (40), (42), (44), (49).

#4.16. For now, with our math still doing the talking, we rest our case. Confident that WM meets EPR’s belief (#3.0), we endorse Bell’s hope – so similar to EPR’s – and move to conclude:

CLR delivers Bell’s (2004:167) hope, ‘Let us hope that these analyses [these impossibility proofs] also may one day be illuminated, perhaps harshly, by a simple constructive model’ of reality based on Einstein’s local causality; echoing Bell’s sentiment (2004:167) that ‘what is proved by impossibility proofs is lack of imagination.’ “Now, it’s my feeling that all this [AAD] and no [AAD] business will go the same way [eg, as the ether]. But someone will come up with the answer, with a reasonable way of looking at these things. If we are lucky it will be to some big new development like the theory of relativity. Maybe someone will just point out that we were being rather silly, and it won’t lead to a big new development. But anyway, I believe the questions will be resolved,” Bell (1990:9).

## 5 Conclusions

#5.1. Generalizing local realism under CLR – and Einstein-separability – we’ve here advanced many missions: Einstein’s, EPR’s, Bell’s, our own. That is, relying on EPR’s belief at #3.0 – ie, using EPR-based parameters  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  – and accepting *locality* without question: (i) our more complete specification of EPRB’s physics has succeeded. (ii) Bell’s misleading ambit claim for his  $\lambda$  is exposed. (iii) Bell’s rejection of Einstein’s worldview is quashed. (iv) Bell’s ambivalence re AAD is resolved.

#5.2. Taking Bell (1964) to be based on the likes of d’Espagnat-style inferences to classicality, we show that Bell misses his target; ie, EPR. For – as shown at (33)-(36) – Bell’s theorem and its variants are based on Bell’s error: Bell’s 1964:(14a)  $\neq$  1964:(14b) under EPRB. Thus, under EPR and EPRB, Bell’s famous duo – impossibility 1964:(3) and inequality 1964:(15), with many variants – are false and therefore inadmissible as critiques of Einstein/EPR.

#5.3. Contra Bell at #1.3: In a theory in which correlated CLR parameters like  $\lambda_i$  and  $\mu_i$  are added to QM to determine the results of individual measurements, without changing the statistical predictions, there is no mechanism whereby the setting of one measuring device can influence the reading of another instrument, however remote. For, as shown at #3.1, local elements of reality mediate the pairwise correlation of each (ie, each wholly local) result.

#5.4. We began on the right track: starting with (1), an ironclad fact, then adding a function to Bell's 1964:(1) to give (8)-(9). We thus arrived at (17), (20), (31), etc, via facts associated with equivalence relations and prevalence theory. In that these equations yield the same result as QM, we deliver Einstein's hope that EPR-style correlations might be understood in a classical way.

#5.5. Under CLR – and contrary to Bell's (1980) view at #6.3 – we were right to allow that polarizer/particle interaction may perturb a particle. Bell – in bypassing such perturbation in line with d'Espagnat's analysis – limits the validity of his theorem to systems consistent with this error. Under CLR, the consequent strong classicality in Bell's theorem is replaced by the weaker reality of equivalence relations. Thus, unlike the Bellian canon, WM reaches beyond the classical.

#5.6. Based on the rightness of CLR and equivalence relations, WM readily refutes the important all-or-nothing test of Bell's ideas in Mermin (1990a). And WM is Lorentz invariant, for Bell (1964:199) – at #1.3 – missed the following fact and its association with the broad reach of equivalence relations and their crucial role in science: 'similar tests on similar things produce similar results, and correlated tests on correlated things produce correlated results, without mystery,' Watson (1998; 1999).

#5.7. We are thus able to correctly analyze multi-particle experiments via real operators in 3-space; without recourse to AAD, Hilbert-space, non-locality; nor the impossible requirement to fully specify a hidden variable in a given spacetime region, per Bell (2004:242); etc.

#5.8. Given our successful endorsement of EPR, further considerations for a wholesale reinterpretation of QM remain: 'collapse' as the Bayesian updating of an equivalence class via prior correlations; 'states' as multivectors in 3-space; 'measurements' as tests; 'wave-particle duality' as an equivalence relation?

#5.9. In sum: A logic error – seemingly associated with a naive realism – limits Bell's theorem, its kin and their claims, to experiments with statistically independent outcomes: thus missing the key to a local-realistic understanding of the foundational EPR/EPRB, related experiments (eg, Aspect 2004), and QM in general. That key is this: causally independent outcomes may be statistically related. Thus, in line with Bell's (1982:997) hope for a simple constructive model – and as one with Bell's early motivation; see #6.9 – CLR prevails harshly against much nonsense in physics.

#5.10. Finally, using Bell's (1988:88) moot gloss on a fragment of von Neumann's work, we conclude: 'There's nothing to Bell's theorem – nor variants like CHSH (1969), Mermin (1990), Peres (1995); nor endorsements by Bricomont, du Sautoy, Goldstein *et al.*, Maudlin, Norsen, Shimony – it's not just flawed, it's silly; not merely false but foolish' and misleading. And though Bell (1990:13) and many others insist *you cannot get away with locality* – we do just that – thanks to Einstein, EPR and (1).

## 6 Notes

#6.0. In the spirit of Einstein/EPR, we come to QM and Bell bearing gifts: we bring realistic parameters that bypass Bell's (1964:199) *strange mechanisms*; and 'we determine the results of individual measurements, without changing the statistical predictions'. As we'll show, we succeed because the poorly-defined variables that Bell tests are unrealistic under both EPR and EPRB. Thus, in that we too add parameters to QM – however, unlike Bell, we clearly add them under EPRB – so we too are licensed to test our 'added-variable theory' against Bell and his theorem. Let's return to #1.3 and see.

#6.1. Under experiment *E* (Fig.1), to confirm prevalence relations – including our generalization of Malus' Law at #2.8 – we allow experiments like  $\delta_{\mathbf{b}}^{\pm} q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+) \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{b}}^+) \oplus q(\hat{\mathbf{b}}^-)$ . We hold enough dichotomic-polarizers (and single-channel variants  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}^+, \delta_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}^-$ ), to conduct any number of experiments. Moreover, given good online links, experiments may be setup by or with any subset of the team {us, Alice, Bob}. To be part of the team – or perhaps seeking run-time – please return to #F1.4.

#6.2. Under an ironclad conservation law, via (1) and its variables, we start with Bell’s dilemma – re locality and action-at-a-distance (AAD) – resolved. In our terms:

‘These additional variables are to restore causality and locality to QM’, after Bell (1964:195): with Bell’s endnote, ‘the real factual situation of  $q(\mu_i)$  is independent of what is done with  $q(\lambda_i)$  that is spatially separated from  $q(\mu_i)$ ’, Einstein (1949:85); and vice-versa.

In that (as we’ll soon see), Bell walks away from such variables, his long-faced dilemma follows: ‘I cannot say that AAD is required in physics. *I can say that you cannot get away with no AAD.* You cannot separate off what happens in one place and what happens in another. *Somehow they have to be described and explained jointly.* That’s the fact of the situation; Einstein’s program fails, that’s too bad for Einstein, but should we worry about that? *Maybe we have to learn to accept not so much AAD, but the inadequacy of no AAD. That’s the dilemma.* We are led by analyzing this situation to admit that, somehow, distant things are connected, or at least not disconnected. I don’t know any conception of locality that works with QM. *So I think we’re stuck with nonlocality.* There’s no energy transfer and there’s no information transfer either. That’s why I’m always embarrassed by the word action; so I step back from asserting that there is AAD and *I say only that you cannot get away with locality.* You cannot explain things by events in their neighbourhood. But, I am careful not to assert that there is AAD,’ after Bell (1990); *emphasis added*, [sics] suppressed.

Others, following Bell and not helping, vary from surprised to certain: eg, Goldstein *et al.* (2011), ‘In light of Bell’s theorem, [many] experiments ... establish that our world is non-local. This conclusion is very surprising, since non-locality is normally taken to be prohibited by the theory of relativity.’ Shimony (1988:4), ‘I think it very likely future experiments will continue to support quantum nonlocality.’ Maudlin (2014), ‘Non-locality is here to stay ... the world we live in is non-local.’ Bricmont (2016:112), ‘there are nonlocal physical effects in Nature.’ Understanding the above, and this – (1) also debunks Shimony’s ‘passion-at-a-distance’, ‘objective indefiniteness’, etc., – please return to #2.2.

#6.3. #6.2 shows our early departure from Bellian ways of thinking, backed by an ironclad law. Our next departure follows; ie, in our terms *and* in the context of EPR/EPRB – though seemingly motivated by a desire shared with Einstein and us for a return to *classicality*, as in relativity – Bell invokes an over-strength and unfit equivalence-relation (that of equality). To put it plainly, Bell walks away from (1) – with its pristine variables – and equates them to ‘measured’ outcomes. (Fortunately, we have CLR – our generalization of local realism – and Bohr on our side):

Here’s Bell’s (1980:7): ‘To explain this dénouement [of Bell’s theorem] without mathematics I cannot do better than follow d’Espagnat (1979; 1979a).’

Here’s d’Espagnat (1979:166), recast for EPRB *with added emphasis*: ‘A physicist can infer that in every pair, one particle has the property  $A^+$  and the other has the property  $A^-$ . Similarly, he can conclude that in every pair one particle has the property  $B^+$  and one  $B^-$ , and one has property  $C^+$  and one  $C^-$ . *These conclusions require a subtle but important extension of the meaning assigned to our notation  $A^+$ .* Whereas previously  $A^+$  was merely one possible outcome of a measurement made on a particle, it is converted by this argument into an attribute\* of the particle itself. To be explicit, if some unmeasured particle has the property that a measurement along the axis  $A$  would give the definite result  $A^+$ , then that particle is said to have the property  $A^+$ . *In other words, the physicist has been led to the conclusion that both particles in each pair have definite spin components at all times. ... This view is contrary to the conventional interpretation of QM, but it is not contradicted by any fact that has yet been introduced.* \*a pristine attribute, contra Bell at #1.0.

Bohr’s insight, here supported by Bell, bolsters our case against such naively primitive views: ‘Bohr’s insight ... the result of a ‘measurement’ does not in general reveal some preexisting property of the ‘system’, but is a product of both ‘system’ and ‘apparatus’,’ Bell (2004: xi-xii). CLR’s physical-realism – *some physical properties change interactively*

– is consistent with Bohr’s insight: “It seems to me that full appreciation of [Bohr’s insight] would have aborted most of the ‘impossibility proofs’ [[like Bell’s *impossibility* theorem, 1964:(3)]]], and most of ‘quantum logic’,” Bell (2004: xi-xii). For “the quantum postulate implies that any observation of atomic phenomena will involve an interaction with the agency of observation not to be neglected,” Bohr (1928:580). We agree. Understanding that we have here Bell’s crude – soon to be fateful – departure from Bohr-Einstein-EPR-us, please return to #F2.5.

#6.4. Re equivalence relations, classes, dynamics and Malus’ Law generalized (#2.8):

$$[q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+)] \equiv \{q(\lambda) \in Q : q(\lambda) \sim q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+)\}, [q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^-)] \equiv \{q(\lambda) \in Q : q(\lambda) \sim q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^-)\}; \blacksquare \quad (50)$$

where  $q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^\pm)$  denotes a dynamic equivalence class (DEC): termed *dynamic* because subject to dynamic transformations like  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}^\pm q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^\pm) \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{b}}^\pm)$ , with *relevant prevalence* given by Malus’ Law. (50) thus shows that  $Q$  is partitioned dyadically under the mapping  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm q(\lambda) \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^\pm)$ . So  $\sim$  on the elements of  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm$ ’s domain denotes: *has the same output/image under  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^\pm$* ; etc. The quotient set  $S$  is thus a set of two diametrically-opposed extremes:  $S/\sim = \{q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+), q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^-)\}$ , a maximal antipodean discrimination; a powerful dynamic push-pull duo, consistent with our trigonometric arguments being dynamical processes. Note that direction-vectors like  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$ , unit-vectors under geometry, are operators under WM when representing the physical action of polarizers in the arguments of trigonometric functions. For example, given a macroscopic wire-grid polarizer, the conducting wires might be represented by unit-vectors in 3-space, but an impinging unpolarized beam of microwaves drives electrons within the wires, thereby generating an alternating current (Hecht 1975:104). In WM, modeling micro-(quantum)-reality, the wires have become operators, the transmitted beam being strongly linearly polarized orthogonal to the wires. Polaroid-sheet is a molecular analog. Similarly, (50) relates new (to us) quantum things  $q(\lambda)$  to old familiar classical things  $q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^\pm)$  via  $\sim$ . Without such relations, science would hardly be possible.

Re (50): “... the unavoidable interaction between the objects and the measuring instruments sets an absolute limit to the possibility of speaking of a behaviour of atomic objects which is independent of the means of observation,” Bohr (1958:25). Please return to #F2.6.

#6.5. The *slightest correlation* reinforces that never-can-be-false prevalence relation in #2.6; it’s a truism. And Bell recognizes the centrality of *correlation* (which is by no means slight) in EPRB:

Recasting Bell (2004:208) in line with experiment *E*: “There are no ‘messages’ in one system from the other. The inexplicable [sic] correlations of quantum mechanics do not give rise to signalling between noninteracting systems. Of course, however, there may be correlations (eg, those of EPRB) and if something about the second system is given (eg, that it is the other side of an EPRB setup) and something about the overall state (eg, that it is the EPRB singlet state) then inferences from events in one system [eg,  $A^+$  from Alice’s detector] to events in the other [eg,  $B^+$  from Bob’s detector] are possible.”

#6.6. Further, when outcomes are highly correlated – as in EPRB, via (1) – stochastic independence is no proxy for local-causality: a view most gardeners with adjoining crops accept. So via our return to fundamentals, the following issue is resolved.

“One general issue raised by the debates over locality is to understand the connection between stochastic independence (probabilities multiply) [ie,  $P(XY) = P(X)P(Y)$ ] and genuine physical independence (no mutual influence) [ie, there is no mutual influence between  $A_i^+(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \lambda_i)$  and  $B_i^+(\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \mu_i)$ ]. It is the latter that is at issue in ‘locality,’ but it is the former that goes proxy for it in the Bell-like calculations. We need to press harder and deeper in our analysis here,” Arthur Fine, in Schlosshauer (2011:45).

NB: The later Bell fares no better. For he begins to rely “for example, on a full specification of local beables in a given space-time region,” Bell (2004:240). But how would such be fully specified for  $q(\lambda_j)$ , yet to be tested by  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}^\pm$  or  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{y}}}^\pm$ ?

Factorizability is often “taken as the starting point of the analysis. Here we preferred to see it not as the *formulation* of ‘local causality’, but as a consequence thereof,” Bell (2014:243). Our (10)-(13) show the way through Bell’s factorization dilemma; thereby confirming Bell’s (2004:239) ‘utmost suspicion’ – he did throw the baby out with the bathwater. Treading carefully on slippery slopes, please return to #2.7.

#6.7. See Aspect (2002:5-7) for a troubled (but, in our case, helpful) discussion of Malus’ Law in the context of QM and photons ( $s = 1$ ). Then read it in our terms, trouble-free dynamically and consistent with Aspect’s experimental results. Further, though not developed here, our trigonometric arguments are dynamical processes. For example, let the dynamics relate to the interaction in  $\delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^{\pm} q(\lambda_i) \rightarrow q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+)$ . This may be viewed as the operator composition  $\Delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^{\pm} \cdot \delta(\hat{\mathbf{a}}) \circ q(\lambda_i) \rightarrow \Delta_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}}^{\pm} \cdot q(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^+) \simeq \hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}^+ = +1 = A_i^+$ . So  $A_i$  here is now the output of the [now integrated] analyzer-function; a green light, say. Thus – understanding the basis for the schematic representation of the analyzer-function by  $[\mathbf{a} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}^+]$  in #F1.3 and elsewhere – please return to #2.9.

#6.8. Knowing from prior study that Bell’s error starts with (14b) – but cautious here re the totality of Bell’s poor or unstated assumptions in the context of EPR/EPRB – we defer discussion of (14a)-(14b) until Bell commits to a claim after his 1964:(14c). Our results being the same under either option, please return – with Bell’s late (but soon to be seen *erroneous*) claim – to #4.3.

#6.9. Our unity of purpose carries the day:

“Now nobody knows just where the boundary between the classical and quantum domain is situated. . . . More plausible to me is that we will find that there is no boundary. It is hard for me to envisage intelligible discourse about a world with no classical part -- no base of given events, be they only mental events in a single consciousness, to be correlated. On the other hand, it is easy to imagine that the classical domain could be extended to cover the whole. The wave functions would prove to be a provisional or incomplete description of the quantum-mechanical part, of which an objective account would become possible. It is this possibility, of a homogeneous account of the world, which is for me the chief motivation of the study of the so-called ‘hidden variable’ possibility,” Bell (2004:28-29), in 1971. Given Bell’s chief motivation and #4.4 – “Bell’s theorem is as mathematically robust as they come,” du Sautoy (2016:170) – we’d welcome an email from you, showing how to remove the  $\stackrel{?}{=}$  from (35) under EPR/EPRB; before you return to #5.9. Thanks.

## 7 References

- AoP. (2016). “[Annals of Physics 373: October 2016, 67–79.](#)”  
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0003491616300975>
- Aspect, A. (2002). “[Bell’s theorem: The naive view of an experimentalist.](#)”  
<http://arxiv.org/pdf/quant-ph/0402001v1.pdf>
- Bell, J. S. (1964). “[On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox.](#)” *Physics* 1: 195-200.  
[http://cds.cern.ch/record/111654/files/vol1p195-200\\_001.pdf](http://cds.cern.ch/record/111654/files/vol1p195-200_001.pdf)
- Bell, J. S. (1980). “[Bertlmann’s socks and the nature of reality.](#)” Geneva, CERN: TH.2926, 0-25.  
<http://cds.cern.ch/record/142461/files/198009299.pdf>
- Bell, J. S. (1982). “On the impossible pilot wave.” *Foundations of Physics*. 12: 989-999 (1982). In: Bell (2004: 159-168).
- Bell, J. S. (1988). “Interview.” *Mann & Crease* (1988:88).
- Bell, J. S. (1990). “[Indeterminism and nonlocality.](#)” Transcript of 22 January 1990, CERN Geneva. Bell, J. S. (1997). *Indeterminism and nonlocality. Mathematical Undecidability, Quantum Nonlocality & the Question of the Existence of God.* A. Driessen and A. Suarez. 83-100.

- <http://www.quantumphil.org/Bell-indeterminism-and-nonlocality.pdf>  
[80-minute video](#). Indeterminism and nonlocality; Bell's theorem and debate: John Bell, Antoine Suarez, Herwig Schopper, J M Belloc, G Cantale, John Layter, P Veija, P Ypes.  
<http://cds.cern.ch/record/1049544>
- Bell, J. S. (2004). *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics*. Cambridge, Cambridge University.
  - Bohr, N. (1928). "New problems in quantum theory." *Nature*, #3050 (14 Apr): 579-590.
  - Bohr, N. (1958). *Atomic Physics and Human Knowledge*. New York, John Wiley.
  - Bricmont, J. (2016). *Making Sense of Quantum Mechanics*. Cham, Springer International.
  - CHSH (1969). "[Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories.](#)" *Physical Review Letters* 23 (15): 880-884. <http://users.unimi.it/aqm/wp-content/uploads/CHSH.pdf>
  - d'Espagnat, B. (1979). "[The quantum theory and reality.](#)" *Scientific American* 241 (5): 158-181. [http://www.scientificamerican.com/media/pdf/197911\\_0158.pdf](http://www.scientificamerican.com/media/pdf/197911_0158.pdf)
  - d'Espagnat, B. (1979a). *A la Recherche du Réel*. Paris, Gauthier-Villars.
  - du Sautoy, M. (2016). *What We Cannot Know*. London, 4th Estate.
  - Einstein, A. (1949). *Autobiographical notes*. Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist. P. A. Schilpp. New York, Tudor Publishing. 1: 1-95.
  - EPR (1935). "[Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?](#)" *Physical Review* 47 (15 May): 777-780. <http://journals.aps.org/pr/pdf/10.1103/PhysRev.47.777>
  - Feingold, S. J., A. Peres. (1985). *Physics Today* 38, 15.
  - GHZ (1989). "[Going beyond Bell's theorem.](#)" in *Bell's Theorem, Quantum Theory and Conceptions of the Universe*. M. Kafatos. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic: 69-72. <http://arxiv.org/pdf/0712.0921v1.pdf>
  - Goldstein *et al.* (2011). "[Bell's theorem.](#)" *Scholarpedia*, 6(10): 8378, revision #91049. [http://www.scholarpedia.org/article/Bell%27s\\_theorem](http://www.scholarpedia.org/article/Bell%27s_theorem)
  - Hecht, E. (1975). *Schaum's Outline of Theory and Problems of Optics*. New York, McGraw-Hill.
  - Laudisa, F. (1995). *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 46: 309-329.
  - Mann, C., R. Crease. (1988). "Interview: John Bell." *Omni* (May): 84-88, 90, 92, 121.
  - Maudlin, T. (2014). "[What Bell did.](#)" <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1408.1826.pdf>
  - Mermin, N. D. (1985). *Physics Today* 38, 138-142.
  - Mermin, N. D. (1988). *Spooky actions at a distance: Mysteries of the quantum theory*. *The Great Ideas Today 1988*. M. J. Adler. Chicago, Encyclopædia Britannica Inc: 2-53.
  - Mermin, N. D. (1990). "[What's wrong with these elements of reality?](#)" *Physics Today* 43(June): 9, 11. <http://www.phy.pku.edu.cn/~qiongyihe/content/download/3-2.pdf>
  - Mermin, N. D. (1990a). "[Quantum mysteries revisited.](#)" *American Journal of Physics* 58(8): 731-734. <http://www.physics.smu.edu/scalise/P5382fa15/Mermin1990a.pdf>
  - Norsen, T. (2015). "[Are there really two different Bell's theorems?](#)" <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1503.05017.pdf>
  - Peres, A. (1995). *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods*. Dordrecht, Kluwer.
  - Schlosshauer, M., Ed. (2011). *Elegance and Enigma: The Quantum Interviews*. Heidelberg, Springer.
  - Shimony, A. (1988). "Letters." *Scientific American* 259(7): 4.
  - Watson, G. (1998). "Bell's theorem refuted: Real physics and philosophy for quantum mechanics." *Physics Essays* 11(3): 413-421.
  - Watson, G. (1999). "Erratum for some typesetting errors in: Bell's theorem refuted: Real physics and philosophy for quantum mechanics (1998) - 11(3): 413-421." *Physics Essays* 12(1): 191.