

EPR-Bohm experiment, projection postulate and time synchronization nonlocality

Andrei Khrennikov

School of Mathematics and Systems Engineering
University of Växjö, S-35195, Sweden

March 26, 2019

Abstract

We show that the projection postulate plays a crucial role in the discussion on the so called "quantum nonlocality", in particular in the EPR-argument. We stress that the original von Neumann projection postulate was crucially modified by extending it to observables with degenerate spectra (the Lüders postulate) and we show that this modification is highly questionable from a physical point of view, and it is the real source of "quantum nonlocality". The use of the original von Neumann postulate eliminates this problem: instead of "action at the distance"-nonlocality, we obtain a classical measurement nonlocality. The latter is related to the synchronization of two measurements (on the two parts of a composite system). It seems that EPR did mistake in their 1935-paper: if one uses correctly von Neumann projection postulate, no "elements of reality" can be assigned to entangled systems. Our analysis of the EPR and projection postulate makes clearer Bohr's considerations in his reply to Einstein.

1 Introduction

We shall show that the main source of debate induced by the EPR argument [1] as well as later discussion on the EPR-Bohm experiment and Bell's inequality [2, 3] is the misuse of von Neumann's projection postulate [4].

The projection postulate (PP) plays indeed the crucial role in the EPR argument [1]. We consider a composite system $s = (s_1, s_2)$. Assigning an element of reality to s_2 on the basis of a measurement performed on s_1 is fundamentally based on the PP. Although von Neumann had presented strong physical arguments stressing that the PP should be applied only to observables with nondegenerate spectra [4], it was nevertheless applied by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen [1] in the case of observables with degenerate spectra. This misapplication of von Neumann's projection postulate [4] was later on formalized as a custom by Lüders [5].

Hence, we show that the EPR-argument is in fact based on an improper extension of von Neumann's postulate, and that as such it should not be considered as a valid attack against the Copenhagen interpretation (which is itself based solely on von Neumann's axiomatic [4]). It means that

Quantum Mechanics can (but, in principle, need not) be interpreted as a complete and local theory.

Our analysis shows that measurements on entangled systems, as predicted by QM formalism, are nonlocal. However, such a measurement nonlocality is essentially a classical synchronization nonlocality and has nothing to do with action-at-a-distance. Thus, instead of the "state-nonlocality," everything is reduced to nonlocality of the (classical) design of the EPR-experiment.

The presence of a measurement nonlocality in the EPR-Bohm experiment implies the violation of the conditions of Bell's theorem and, hence, provides a possibility to violate Bell's inequality, cf. works of Raedt et al [6]– [8] on numerical simulation for the EPR-Bohm correlations via time window synchronization.

We remind that the projection postulate is nowadays formulated in the following form:

PP: *Let a be a physical observable described by a self-adjoint operator \hat{a} having purely discrete spectrum. Any measurement of the observable a on the pure quantum state ψ induces a transition from the state ψ into one of the eigenvectors e_a^k of the operator \hat{a} .*

It is in this form that the projection postulate was used by EPR in [1] as well as in numerous discussions on "quantum nonlocality."

2 Tensor product description of measurements

Let H_1 and H_2 be two complex finite dimensional Hilbert spaces, $\dim H_i \geq 2$. Let $\hat{a}_1 : H_1 \rightarrow H_1$ and $\hat{a}_2 : H_2 \rightarrow H_2$ be two self-adjoint operators. The Hilbert space H_i represents (quantum) states of the system $s_i, i = 1, 2$. The operator \hat{a}_i represents an observable a_i corresponding to measurements on $s_i, i = 1, 2$. The composite system $s = (s_1, s_2)$ is described by the tensor product space $H = H_1 \otimes H_2$.

The operators $\hat{A}_1 = \hat{a}_1 \otimes I$ and $\hat{A}_2 = I \otimes \hat{a}_2$ represent partial measurements A_1 and A_2 on $s : a_1$ on s_1 and a_2 on s_2 , respectively.

To simplify considerations, we assume that both operators \hat{a}_1 and \hat{a}_2 have purely discrete nondegenerate¹ spectra. We consider eigenvectors e_1^α and e_2^β of these operators: $\hat{a}_1 e_1^\alpha = \lambda_1^\alpha e_1^\alpha, \alpha = 1, \dots, N_1 = \dim H_1$ and $\hat{a}_2 e_2^\beta = \lambda_2^\beta e_2^\beta, \beta = 1, \dots, N_2 = \dim H_2$.

By taking two arbitrary (independent) eigenvectors for each operator we construct an "entangled state":

$$\psi = c_1 e_1^i \otimes e_2^j + c_2 e_1^j \otimes e_2^i, |c_1|^2 + |c_2|^2 = 1. \quad (1)$$

Suppose a measurement of A_1 was performed on the composite system $s = (s_1, s_2)$, i.e., a_1 was performed on s_1 . Suppose that the result

$$A_1 = \lambda_1^i$$

was obtained. This measurement is represented by the operator $\hat{A}_1 = \hat{a}_1 \otimes I$.

¹The latter condition is redundant. We would like just to emphasize that degeneration of spectra in H_i does not play any role. Even operators with nondegenerate spectra in H_i induce operators with degenerate spectra in H .

By the projection postulate PP the state ψ is projected onto

$$\psi_1^{ij} = e_1^i \otimes e_2^j.$$

Thus instantaneously (and in principle without any interaction of the A_1 -measurement device with the system s_2) the state of s_2 is changed. It became sharply determined: $\widehat{A}_2 \psi_1^{ij} = \lambda_2^j \psi_1^{ij}$, and hence $A_2 = \lambda_2^j$.

This is nothing else than the so called "quantum nonlocality". To get it one need not appeal to Bell's inequality [2], [3] (and hidden variables at all).² If one takes this into account Bell's considerations would play a subsidiary role. The main problem is to explain "quantum nonlocality" as it follows from the quantum formalism.

3 Observables with degenerate spectra: measurement does not induce projection!

By reading von Neumann's book [4] I found that the modern formulation PP of the projection postulate, see introduction, is not the original von Neumann's formulation at all. One extremely important condition is omitted. It is the condition of *non degeneration of spectrum* of the quantum observable. The formulation PP is, in fact, Lüders' postulate [5] and not at all von Neumann's one [4].

Opposite to Lüders, von Neumann sharply separated the cases of non-degenerate and degenerate spectra. The PP could be applied only in the first case. In the second case the result $a = \lambda$ does not determine any definite state. To obtain a definite state, one should perform a refinement d of the a -measurement, such that $a = f(d)$ and d is represented by an operator \widehat{d} having nondegenerate spectrum.

Let us go back to the situation described in section 2. Here the operators \widehat{A}_1 and \widehat{A}_2 (corresponding to measurements on s_1 and s_2) always have degenerate spectra:

If e.g. $\widehat{a}_1 e = \lambda e$, $e \in H_1$, then $\widehat{A}_1 \psi = \lambda \psi$ for any $\psi = e \otimes \phi \in H$, $\phi \in H_2$. (We just remind that $\dim H_2 \geq 2$).

By von Neumann the result $A_1 = \lambda_1^j$ does not induce projection onto a definite pure state. The state of the system $s = (s_1, s_2)$ is not determined after such a *partial* measurement!

Thus if one follows really the Copenhagen interpretation, no trace of "quantum nonlocality" would be found.

4 Refinement measurements

What would von Neumann recommend to do to get the definite post measurement state? He would recommend to perform a refinement A of the A_1 -measurement which would be represented by an operator, say \widehat{A} , having nondegenerate spectrum.

The crucial point is that one could not construct such a refinement \widehat{A} by operating only in H_1 , i.e., by using operators of the form

$$\widehat{A} = \widehat{C} \otimes I, \widehat{C} : H_1 \rightarrow H_1.$$

²I remark that precisely in this way the EPR-Bohm experiment was presented by Alain Aspect in his talk at the Växjö conference [9]: by measuring polarization of s_1 , one projects the state of the composite system and makes the state of s_2 determined, see also [10].

One should consider "nonlocal measurements" which are represented by operators acting in the complete tensor product $H = H_1 \otimes H_2$.

In particular, one can not create a nondegenerate refinement of the s_1 -spin measurement via modification of the spin operator in $H_1 = \mathbf{C}^2$. The corresponding nongenerate operator is nontrivial in the whole $H = \mathbf{C}^4$.

The simplest refinement \hat{A} can be constructed as $\hat{A}e_1^\alpha \otimes e_2^\beta = \gamma_{\alpha\beta}e_1^\alpha \otimes e_2^\beta$, where $\gamma_{\alpha\beta} \neq \gamma_{\alpha'\beta'}$, if $\alpha \neq \alpha'$ or $\beta \neq \beta'$.

Example. (Spin refinement) Let $\hat{a}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^3 x_i \sigma_i$ and $\hat{a}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^3 y_i \sigma_i$, where σ_i are Pauli matrices. Here $H_1 = H_2 = \mathbf{C}^2$, hence, $H = \mathbf{C}^4$. Consider eigenvectors $\hat{a}_i e_i^\pm = \pm e_i^\pm, i = 1, 2$. We consider the following encoding: $-- = 00 = 0, +- = 10 = 1, -+ = 01 = 2, ++ = 11 = 3$. We now set $\hat{A}e_1^\alpha \otimes e_2^\beta = \alpha\beta e_1^\alpha \otimes e_2^\beta$. This operator has nondegenerate spectrum $\lambda = 0, 1, 2, 3$. We have $\hat{A}_1 = f_1(\hat{A})$, where $f_1(\alpha\beta) = \alpha$. In the same way $\hat{A}_2 = f_2(\hat{A})$, where $f_2(\alpha\beta) = \beta$. By von Neumann only measurement of the observable A represented by \hat{A} induces projection of the entangled state ψ onto the pure state $e_1^\alpha \otimes e_2^\beta$ (in the case of the result $\lambda = \alpha\beta$). Thus, instead of mysterious "quantum nonlocality" (or state nonlocality), we have measurement nonlocality which is purely classical nonlocality.

Measurement which is performed on a composite system $s = (s_1, s_2)$ consisting of two spatially separated parts is, of course, nonlocal. It is not surprising that it is represented by a "nonlocal operator" \hat{A} , cf. [11]. Nothing nonlocal happens with the state of s . Only (classical) design of the experiment is nonlocal.

5 Compatible observables

I expect that my previous arguments on classical measurement nonlocality in experiments with entangled systems would be criticized in the following way: "There is nothing about measurement nonlocality, since one can perform, instead of measurement of a nonlocal observable A , simultaneous measurements of two compatible observables A_1 and A_2 . The crucial point is that the operators \hat{A}_1 and \hat{A}_2 commute."

Such an argument would be based on another von Neumann postulate, namely about measurement of compatible observables [4], p. 200-201:

(PC) *The probability that in the state ψ the quantities with (commuting)³ operators $\hat{R}_1, \dots, \hat{R}_n$ take on values from respective intervals $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_n$ is*

$$\|E_1(\Delta_1) \dots E_n(\Delta_n)\psi\|^2,$$

where $E_1(\lambda), \dots, E_n(\lambda)$ are resolutions of the identity belonging to $\hat{R}_1, \dots, \hat{R}_n$, respectively.

One may say that in measurements for entangled states one can consider simultaneous measurement of two compatible observables represented by the operators $\hat{A}_1 = \hat{a}_1 \otimes I$ and $A_2 = I \otimes \hat{a}_2$, $[\hat{A}_1, \hat{A}_2] = 0$. Hence the story is about simultaneous measurement of compatible observables and not about measurement of "nonlocal" observable A represented by \hat{A} .

Again by reading von Neumann [4], p. 201-206, we understand that the above argument does not take into account the crucial fact that *simultaneous measurement of two compatible observables is not reduced to*

³"Commuting" was absent in the original postulate. Von Neumann formulated (PC) first for arbitrary self-adjoint operators, but then after analyzing it he pointed out that they should commute.

separate measurement of each of them. By the conventional quantum formalism simultaneous measurement of a and b given by \hat{a} and \hat{b} , $[\hat{a}, \hat{b}] = 0$, is performed in the following way.

One should construct an observable d (having nondegenerate spectrum) represented by \hat{d} such that $\hat{a} = f_1(\hat{d})$ and $\hat{b} = f_2(\hat{d})$. Then simultaneous measurement of a and b is performed in two steps:

- a) measurement of d ;
- b) a and b are obtained as $a = f_1(d)$ and $b = f_2(d)$.

Therefore in the case of measurements on composite systems, $s = (s_1, s_2)$, one could not (!) proceed without (classically) nonlocal measurement of a refinement A given by \hat{A} .

What does it mean physically?

It means that one should make synchronized measurement on both systems. Then the result $\lambda = \alpha\beta$ should be decoded into $A_1 = \alpha$, $A_2 = \beta$. After this one can calculate e.g. the correlation $\langle A_1 A_2 \rangle$ between A_1 and A_2 . Nonlocality appears here via synchronization. An observer to whom such a synchronization is not available would not be able to find the right matching between the results of A_1 and A_2 -measurements.

Thus the EPR-Bohm experiment is really nonlocal, but it is measurement nonlocally which is completely classical time synchronization nonlocality.

6 EPR experiment

It is evident that Alain Aspect simply borrowed "quantum nonlocality" argument [10] from EPR. Thus the root of misunderstanding was in the original paper [1].

Let now $H_1 = H_2 = L_2(R^3, dx)$. Let a_1 and a_2 be observables represented by operators \hat{a}_1 and \hat{a}_2 with purely discrete nongenerate spectra:

$$\hat{a}_i e_i^\alpha = \lambda_i^\alpha e_i^\alpha, i = 1, 2.$$

Any state $\psi \in H = H_1 \otimes H_2$ can be represented as

$$\psi = \sum_{\alpha, \beta} c_{\alpha\beta} e_1^\alpha \otimes e_2^\beta,$$

where $\sum_{\alpha, \beta} |c_{\alpha\beta}|^2 = 1$. Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen claimed that measurement of A_1 given by $\hat{A}_1 = \hat{a}_1 \otimes I$ induces projection of ψ onto one of states $e_1^\alpha \otimes u$, $u \in H_2$. In particular, for a state of the form $\psi = \sum_\gamma c_\gamma e_1^\gamma \otimes e_2^\gamma$ one of states $e_1^\gamma \otimes e_2^\gamma$ would be realized. Thus by performing measurement on the s_1 with the result λ_1^γ the "element of reality $a_2 = \lambda_2^\gamma$ " is assigned to s_2 .

However, the EPR considerations did not match von Neumann's projection postulate, because the spectrum of \hat{A}_1 is degenerate. Finally, (after consideration of operators with discrete spectra), Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen considered operators of position and momentum having continuous spectra. According to von Neumann [4] one should proceed by approximating operators with continuous spectra by operators with discrete spectra.

Thus by von Neumann to get "an element of reality" one should perform measurement of "nonlocal observable" A given by a nonlocal refinement of e.g. $\hat{A}_1 = \hat{q}_1 \otimes I$ and $\hat{A}_2 = I \otimes \hat{p}_2$.

We point out that von Neumann's viewpoint coincides with Bohr's viewpoint in his reply to Einstein [13]. Unfortunately, Bohr did not use mathematical arguments of von Neumann [4] to explain to Einstein why to produce "an element of reality" for the subsystem s_2 one should measure A on $s = (s_1, s_2)$ and not just e.g. A_1 on s_1 .

7 Bell's inequality

What are consequences of our analysis of the EPR-Bohm and the EPR experiments for Bell's considerations?

7.1 Measurement nonlocality as opposed to action at the distance

The main consequence is that classical random variables (if they exist) for A_1 and A_2 measurements should have the form $A_1(\lambda) = f_1(d(\lambda))$, $A_2(\lambda) = f_2(d(\lambda))$, where $d(\lambda)$ is the variable corresponding to synchronized measurement on both systems. Since $d \equiv d_{A_1, A_2}$, Bell's condition of locality is violated. Therefore it is nothing surprising that Bell's inequality can be violated.

The crucial point is that such *measurement nonlocality* has nothing to do with action at the distance. It is classical time synchronization nonlocality.

7.2 Time synchronization and time window

The time synchronization viewpoint in the EPR-Bohm experiment implies that experimenters should couple in time two clicks of detectors corresponding to measurements on the first and second subsystems, respectively. Of course, such a time coupling is nonlocal. Roughly speaking if Alice and Bob count the first and the second types of clicks, respectively, they should call each other to couple their clicks in time. This procedure has nothing to do with QM. It is a classical nonlocal design of the experiment.

Which consequences for studies on Bell's inequality has this viewpoint on the EPR-Bohm experiment?

First of all, the time synchronization viewpoint on the problem of locality (based on the correct application of von Neumann's projection postulate) stressed the role of time coupling in the EPR-Bohm experiment. Consider following settings of polarization beam splitters in the EPR-Bohm experiment: 1) a for measurements on the first subsystem; 2) b for measurements on the second subsystem. Suppose that one measures the pair of observables which are represented by operators $\hat{A} = \hat{a} \otimes I$ and $\hat{B} = I \otimes \hat{b}$. In the real experiment one could not expect that the detectors would click simultaneously. The first and the second photons can have different delays induced by passing through polarization beam splitters and electro-optic modulators, see [14] and especially [15], [6]–[8] for details and references. Moreover, I would like to point to another source of delays. In modern experiments a pair of entangled photons is produced via interaction of a laser pulse with the crystal. It is important for us that photons are emitted not simultaneously. Thus delays can appear from the very beginning.

Thus in the real EPR-Bohm experiment (in opposite the ideal one) time synchronization is more complicated. It is not the coincidence time synchronization, but synchronization by using the time window, see [14] and especially [15] for details.

Let A -measurements and B -measurement produce clicks at the moments:

$$\begin{aligned} t_1^a, t_2^a, \dots, t_N^a, \\ t_1^b, t_2^b, \dots, t_M^b \end{aligned}$$

(in general $N \neq M$).

Suppose that a time window Δ is fixed. Then two clicks are coupled to the same measurement iff

$$|t_j^a - t_j^b| \leq \Delta. \quad (2)$$

This condition is definitely nonlocal! Hence, in the real EPR-Bohm experiment measurement nonlocality via time synchronization is even more evident than in the ideal experiment.

Can one simulate numerically the EPR-Bohm correlations by using time synchronization argument?

The answer is to be positive, see [6]–[8].

In principle, one may expect that it would be done, since the time window condition (3) induces unfair sampling, see [16], [17]. Since some pairs of clicks violate (3), they are not taken into account. If one were chosen another setting for the second polarization beam splitter, say b' , then another collections of pairs of clicks and hence pairs of photons would be selected via the time window condition:

$$|t_j^a - t_j^{b'}| \leq \Delta. \quad (3)$$

Of course, design of a natural algorithm [6]–[8] essentially supported this point.

7.3 Frequency approach to the EPR-Bohm experiment

The time synchronization consequence of our analysis of the role of von Neumann's postulate for the EPR-Bohm experiment also supports the frequency (von Mises) approach to Bell's inequality, see [18], [19], [20]. It is very natural to consider collectives (random sequences) given by sequences of pairs of clicks which are selected via the time window condition. By operating with frequency probability, instead of measure-theoretic probability (which was used by Bell [2]: it was denoted by $d\rho(\lambda)$), I obtained the EPR-Bohm correlations in the local realistic (in the sense of absence of action at the distance) framework, see [20].

7.4 Probabilistic (in)compatibility

On the other hand, in the presence of time synchronization it is extremely unnatural to assume, as Bell did, that all observables (measured in a few incompatible experiments) can be represented by random variables on the same probability space: $a(\lambda), b(\lambda), b'(\lambda), \dots$ (so one can use the unique probability measure $d\rho(\lambda)$) which does not depend on experimental settings). The latter assumption was called in [21] the probabilistic compatibility assumption - PC. Its role in Bell's argument was studied in

detail [18]. In particular, it was pointed out that violation of PC (and hence Bell's inequality) has been studied in probability theory and statistics during the last hundred years.

7.5 Contextuality

Finally, we remark about contextuality. As was pointed by Bell [3], contextuality – in the sense of taking into account simultaneous measurements of compatible observables – blocks derivations of Bell-type inequalities, see S. Gudder [12] for deep analysis of relation between contextuality and Bell's theorem. The crucial point is that Bell personally considered nonlocality as the state nonlocality and not the measurement one. Therefore contextuality was explained in such a way: it can be generated by nonlocal state reduction. In our approach contextuality can be naturally explained by classical (time synchronization) measurement nonlocality.

8 Did EPR make a mistake?

The answer is not so simple, since the whole EPR-story is very complicated. In fact, this story is not about QM by itself, but about its interpretations. EPR wanted to show that QM endowed with the Copenhagen interpretation is not complete. It is crucial that they did not claim that QM endowed with any interpretation is incomplete. The main problem is that EPR did not formulate precisely the interpretation under attack! It was more or less clear that it was the interpretation of Bohr and Heisenberg.

As we have already pointed out, EPR's argument was heavily based on the projection postulate. They definitely assigned it to the criticized interpretation. The possibility to apply the projection postulate for operators having degenerate spectra played the fundamental role in the EPR-considerations.

However, one might be curious: "Would fathers of the Copenhagen interpretation accept such a (mis?) use of the projection postulate?" Shortly the question is "Was EPR's argument against the real Bohr-Heisenberg interpretation? May be it was simply based on EPR's misinterpretation of views of Bohr and Heisenberg?"

I remark that in this framework it would be better to speak about views of concrete persons, since the "Copenhagen interpretation" is an extremely diffuse collection of views, see Arcady Plotnitsky [22] for details. I have not yet studied well views of Heisenberg. But I read Bohr's reply [13] to Einstein. I have the impression that Bohr wrote to Einstein (unfortunately, in nonmathematical terms) that no "element of reality" can be "created" by measurement on a single sub-system. To create an "element of reality" one should perform measurement on the second sub-system. This is nothing else than von Neumann's refinement measurement!

I would say that in 1935 EPR misinterpreted the Copenhagen interpretation (at least the Bohr-von Neumann one). They attacked a sort of "perverse Copenhagen interpretation" based on abuse of the von Neumann projection postulate.⁴ They demonstrated that QM endowed with this EPR-version of the Copenhagen interpretation was incomplete.⁵ How-

⁴Von Neumann's book was being on the book-shell in Einstein's office. Did Einstein read it?

⁵So called quantum nonlocality was considered as totally absurd at that time.

ever, the EPR-argument did not imply that QM with the real (Bohr-von Neumann) Copenhagen interpretation was incomplete.

Unfortunately, the situation was not clarified at the very beginning. Bohr's reply was not sufficiently clear and it was not coupled to von Neumann's book. And later the EPR-story developed in really unexpected way. The pseudo-Copenhagen interpretation of EPR became the orthodox Copenhagen interpretation. In particular, Bohr's reply and hence his views were ignored. Nowadays Lüders' postulate is widely used, instead of von Neumann's projection postulate. Thus the EPR arguments became fundamentally important and their stimulated Bell toward his inequality argument. He definitely believed that QM is not complete (as it was "proved" by EPR). And incompleteness was understood in the EPR-fashion.

One may ask: "Is it the end of the hidden variable story?" Not at all. It is just a new beginning. Instead of the EPR-incompleteness and assigning to a hidden variable λ values of quantum observables, $\lambda \rightarrow a(\lambda)$, we can analyze possibilities of more complicated couplings between prequantum and quantum worlds, see e.g. [23].

Conclusion. *The EPR paradox is a consequence of misinterpretation of the Copenhagen interpretation based on the vague application of von Neumann's projection postulate.*

References

- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, N. Rosen, *Phys. Rev.* **47**, 777–780 (1935).
- [2] J. S. Bell, On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen Paradox, *Physics* 1, 195 (1964)
- [3] J. S. Bell, *Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics*. Cambridge Univ. Press (1987).
- [4] J. von Neumann, *Mathematical foundations of quantum mechanics*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J., 1955.
- [5] G. Lüders, *Ann. Phys., Lpz* **8**, 322 (1951).
- [6] K. De Raedt, K. Keimpema, H. De Raedt, K. Michielsen, and S. Miyashita, *The European Physical Journal B*, **53**, 139-142 (2006).
- [7] H. De Raedt, K. De Raedt, K. Michielsen, K. Keimpema, and S. Miyashita, *The Physical Society of Japan* **76**, 104005 (2007).
- [8] S. Zhao, H. De Raedt, K. Michielsen, *Found. Phys.* (2007).
- [9] Proceedings of Conference *Foundations of Probability and Physics-3*, A. Yu. Khrennikov, ed., American Institute of Physics, Ser. Conference Proceedings, **750**, Melville, NY, 2005.
- [10] A. Aspect, Bell's Theorem : The Naive View of an Experimentalist. <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0402001>.
- [11] S. Filipp and K. Svozil, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 130407 (2004).
- [12] S. Gudder, *Quantum Probability*, Academic Press, 1998.
- [13] N. Bohr, *Phys. Rev.* **48**, 696 (1935).
- [14] G. Weihs, T. Jennewein, C. Simon, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 81, pp. 5039-5042, 1998.

- [15] G. Weihs, "A test of Bell's inequality with spacelike separation," in *Proc. Conf. Foundations of Probability and Physics-4*, Melville, NY: American Institute of Physics, Ser. Conference Proceedings, vol. 889, pp. 250-262, 2007.
- [16] G. Adenier, A. Khrennikov, "Anomalies in EPR-Bell experiments," in *Proc. Conf. Quantum theory: reconsideration of foundations—3*, Melville, NY: American Institute of Physics, Ser. Conference Proceedings, vol. 810, pp. 283-293, 2006.
- [17] G. Adenier, A. Khrennikov, *J. Phys. B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics*, vol. 40 (1), pp. 131-141, 2007.
- [18] A. Yu. Khrennikov, *Interpretations of Probability*. Utrecht/Tokyo: VSP Int. Sc. Publishers, 1999 (second edition, 2004).
- [19] A. Yu. Khrennikov, Frequency analysis of the EPR-Bell argumentation. *Foundations of Physics*, **32**, 1159-1174 (2002).
- [20] A. Yu. Khrennikov, Frequency derivation of the EPR-Bohm correlations. *Il Nuovo Cimento*, **119**, N2, 131-147 (2004).
- [21] A. Yu. Khrennikov, Bell's inequality: Physics meets Probability, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0709.3909>.
- [22] A. Plotnitsky, *Reading Bohr: Physics and Philosophy (Fundamental Theories of Physics)*, Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 2007.
- [23] Khrennikov, Analysis of explicit and implicit assumptions in the theorems of J. Von Neumann and J. Bell. *Journal of Russian Laser Research*, **28**, 244-254(2007).