

On Bell's Theorem and Causality

Nathan Argaman*

Physics department, N.R.C.N., P.O. Box 9001 Be'er Sheva 84190, ISRAEL.

(July 8, 2008)

Einstein held that the formalism of Quantum Mechanics (QM) entails “spooky actions at a distance,” and that a complete description should provide similar predictions without violating locality. However, in the 60's, Bell showed that the predictions of QM would disagree with *any* locally causal theory. Expecting that the non-local quantum phenomena discussed would be verified experimentally, Bell argued for a retreat from the principles of relativity theory. It is emphasized here that Bell also tacitly assumed microscopic causality, in the sense that the future can never affect the past, even for non-local theories. Others (Feynman and Wheeler, Costa de Beauregard, Cramer, Price) advocated abandoning microscopic causality. Indeed, as causality contradicts time-reversal symmetry, it is questionable in the context of microscopic theories. In this article, the original proof of Bell's theorem is repeated, with the assumption of causality emphasized, and the possibilities for non-local and/or non-causal models are discussed. One of the simplest retro-causal models available, one which is stochastic and provides an appealing description of the specific quantum correlations discussed by Bell, is presented. The conclusion is that Einstein's “spooky actions” may occur “in the past” rather than “at a distance.” While this avoids the conflict with relativity, achieving a deeper understanding of quantum mechanics on this basis will require significant developments. Future research routes include generalizing the simple retro-causal model directly, and/or developing stochastic a-causal descriptions of a “sub-quantum” microscopic level.

* E-mail: argaman@mailaps.org .

I. Introduction

Nobody understands Quantum Mechanics (QM).¹ One of the most significant paradoxes posed by QM is its violation of Bell-type inequalities.^{2,3} The assumptions underlying these inequalities are so strongly entrenched, that many expected QM to fail when the relevant experiments were made. In spite of such expectations, the natural phenomena observed violated the associated Bell inequalities in precisely the manner predicted by QM.⁴ It has been proposed that the weakest of Bell's assumptions is that causality – the assumption that the past cannot depend on the future – holds not only in the macroscopic context but also in a strict microscopic sense.^{5,6,7,8} However, the possibility of constructing retro-causal models elicits much skepticism, as it is not sufficiently clear how the assumption of microscopic causality can be avoided without leading to paradoxes.

The purpose of the present work is to clarify the role causality plays in the derivation of Bell's inequality, to provide a succinct description of one applicable retro-causal model, and to examine some of its implications. A longer-term goal is to develop, using similar ideas, an alternative formulation of QM, and, ultimately, of Quantum Field Theory, including non-Abelian gauge fields. Such developments will clearly not lead to experimentally testable predictions distinct from those of standard QM. Rather, they should prove useful in developing appropriate concepts, in a manner similar to the reformulation of QM in terms of path integrals. With the objective of reproducing the results of standard QM theory in mind, all experimental difficulties regarding, e.g., the inefficiencies of detectors, will be ignored here. Similarly, philosophical difficulties with concepts such as physical reality and causation will not be addressed – the discussion will focus instead on the properties of mathematical models⁹ which are required to reproduce the (mathematical) predictions of QM.

The proof of Bell's theorem is reproduced with commentary in Sec. II, and the retro-causal model is presented in Sec. III. The scope of these two sections is limited to the specific setup considered by Bell. Sec. IV describes two research routes which may be pursued in attempting to widen the scope of retro-causal descriptions to all quantum phenomena. The conclusions are summarized in Sec. V.

II. Bell's theorem

Adapting Bell's discussion² to entangled photons,⁴ consider two spatially-separated measurement apparatuses, and a source of pairs of photons situated midway between them (see Fig. 1). Each apparatus consists of a polarizing beam splitter and two detectors, one for each of the polarized




Fig 1: Schematic sketch of the setup considered by Bell, adapted to photons. S represents the source of entangled pairs of photons, the dot-dashed boxes represent the measuring apparatuses, and the arrows mark the paths of the photons. Each apparatus contains a polarizing beam splitter (PBS) represented by a crossed rectangle, and a pair of detectors represented by crescents. The angles a and b extend out of the plane of this figure, and measure the preferred polarization direction of each PBS (say, relative to the vertical). If the photon on the left (or the right) has the preferred polarization, it is deflected towards the detector labeled $A = 1$ (or $B = 1$), whereas if it has the perpendicular polarization, it reaches the other detector, resulting in $A = -1$ (or $B = -1$). The elements of the setup are considered perfect, so that shortly after each time the source is activated, two detectors click, one on the left and one on the right, and the associated values of A and B may be recorded. For large distances between the source and the apparatuses, the apparatus settings (a and b) can be changed while the photons are in flight. The correlations between A and B are described by Eqs. (1) and (2), and can be measured by repeating the experiment many times.

split beams. Each time the source is activated, a pair of photons is emitted, with one reaching the left apparatus and the other reaching the right apparatus. The orientation of the polarizing beam splitter on the left is denoted a (this is an angle, and is defined modulo π) and the result of the measurement is denoted $A = 1$ if the photon activates the detector associated with the split beam polarized along a , and $A = -1$ if it activates the other detector, i.e., is found to be polarized perpendicular to a . Similarly, b denotes the orientation of the polarizing beam splitter on the right, and the result of the measurement there is denoted B . Perfect detector efficiencies are assumed, as noted above. The source (also assumed to be perfect) may consist, e.g., of a Calcium atom which is activated by exciting it into a state of zero angular momentum, $j = 0$. The Calcium atom decays in a radiative cascade, passing through an intermediate state with $j = 1$,

and reaching its $j = 0$ ground state. The two photons emitted thus have a total angular momentum of 0, and are in the singlet state.

For a given choice of the orientations a and b (the free variables), QM provides the probabilities, $P(A, B | a, b)$, for the four alternative experimental outcomes, $A = \pm 1, B = \pm 1$. It is convenient to specify these probabilities by stating the expectation values of the individual outcomes,

$$(1) \quad \langle A \rangle = \langle B \rangle = 0 ,$$

and the correlator,

$$(2) \quad P_{\text{QM}}(a, b) \equiv \langle AB \rangle = \cos(2a - 2b)$$

(Bell's original discussion of spin-1/2 particles, rather than photons, involves perfect anti-correlations for identical orientations, $P_{S=1/2}(a, b) = -1$ for $a = b$, rather than perfect correlations, $P_{\text{QM}}(a, b) = 1$ in this case; this leads to inessential minus signs in subsequent expressions). In other words, the probability of obtaining $A = 1$ or $A = -1$ are completely random, 50% each, regardless of the orientations a and b , and the same holds for B ; only the correlations are non-trivial. These probabilities are subject to experimental tests through repeated measurements. The QM description is slightly different for cases where one measurement is performed before the other, although Eqs. (1) and (2) are retained. In such cases the description involves a non-local "collapse of the wavefunction," in the sense that, e.g., knowledge of a and A immediately affects the manner in which the probabilities for the measurement of B are evaluated (descriptions in terms of "no-collapse interpretations" of QM are also non-local in this sense). Note, however, that control of the free variables can not be used to transmit signals non-locally, e.g., $\langle B \rangle$ is independent of a .

Einstein viewed the abovementioned non-locality as unacceptable, and held that the description of QM needs to be completed by adding more details, which may differ from one pair of photons to the next. In the famous paper of Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen¹⁰ (EPR), it was shown that in order to maintain locality, these additional details would have to completely determine the subsequent results of the A and B measurements, i.e., knowledge of them would allow definite

predictions to be made with a probability of 100%. The additional details were referred to as “elements of physical reality” in Ref. 10, but elsewhere they were called “hidden variables,” and widely attacked. In fact, several “no-hidden-variables theorems” were formulated, but in 1952 Bohm, following ideas of de Broglie, presented a valid hidden-variables theory – Bohmian mechanics¹¹ – in which QM is indeed complemented in a manner which makes all predictions deterministic, depending only on the details of the initial conditions of the hidden variables. Ironically, this theory was quite explicitly non-local! Bell set out¹² to prove that complementing QM in a manner which would restore locality is impossible, i.e., that the premises of EPR are mutually contradictory. Notice that in all of this discussion, causality – in the sense that the future can not affect the past (arrow of time) – was (naturally) taken for granted.

In order to check whether the non-local correlations described in Eq. (2) could be due to common causes in the past, Bell introduced the notation λ for the set of all the properties of each pair of photons before any measurement is made on them, taking into account the possibility that these properties may vary from one pair to the next. The “elements of physical reality” of EPR are to be included in λ , as are any additional hidden variables. Note that no assumption is being made here, as λ is not restricted in any way – it may represent a complicated set of parameters and functions, a single continuous or discrete variable, a constant, or even an empty set (if the properties of the pair include internal degrees of freedom which evolve through a deterministic dynamics, then only their initial values need to be included in λ). The assumption of *causality* implies that λ does not depend on a and b (and on A and B), because it represents properties of the pair of photons before any interaction with the beam splitters and detectors occurs. The free-variable status of a and b , inherent in the setup, guarantees that these do not depend on λ (or on any other properties of the system), and therefore causality implies that λ is statistically independent of a and b .¹³ The assumption of *locality* implies that A does not depend on the orientation b of the distant beam-splitter or the measurement result B there (similarly, B does not depend on a and on A). Thus, a locally causal description, in attempting to reproduce Eqs. (1) and (2), may employ any type of λ , but must supply a distribution $\rho(\lambda)$ of values of λ , and rules by which the probabilities for $A = \pm 1$ are determined by a and λ , and similarly rules for B , given b and λ . Bell showed that there can be no such description.

Bell’s proof² proceeded in three steps. The first step follows EPR in deducing that A must be completely determined by a and λ . The assumption that A is independent of b and B does

allow for the possibility that a stochastic element comes into play. Such a situation would be described by a probability distribution $p(A|a, \lambda)$, rather than a simple function $A(a, \lambda)$. But if $b = a$ then the actual value of A can not be random and must instead be equal to B , according to Eq. (2) – in this case QM predicts the value of A with a probability of 100% (perfect correlations). Thus, A cannot be stochastic and must be completely determined by a and λ , and this dependence may be denoted by $A(a, \lambda)$. As A is assumed independent of b , the same dependence must apply when $b \neq a$ as well. The similarly defined $B(b, \lambda)$ must share the same dependence, $B(b, \lambda) = A(b, \lambda)$ (this shows that the information within λ that determines the polarizations A and B is “duplicated,” and “carried” by each photon individually). The second step of Bell’s proof consists of writing the correlator $\langle AB \rangle$ as

$$(3) \quad P_{\text{Bell}}(a, b) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) A(a, \lambda) A(b, \lambda),$$

(if λ is discrete, summation rather than integration is understood), and deriving an inequality for correlators of this type. The derivation uses the facts that $\rho(\lambda)$ is never negative and is normalized, and that $A^2 = 1$. It involves introducing a third orientation c , and noting that from

$$(4) \quad P_{\text{Bell}}(a, b) - P_{\text{Bell}}(a, c) = \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) A(a, \lambda) A(b, \lambda) [1 - A(b, \lambda) A(c, \lambda)]$$

one may obtain, by taking the absolute value of the integrand,

$$(5) \quad |P_{\text{Bell}}(a, b) - P_{\text{Bell}}(a, c)| \leq \int d\lambda \rho(\lambda) [1 - A(b, \lambda) A(c, \lambda)] = 1 - P_{\text{Bell}}(b, c).$$

This is the original Bell’s inequality, adapted to photon polarizations. The third step consists of substituting Eq. (2) for the correlators within the inequality, and noting that it is violated. Indeed, using nearby values of b and c , the left hand side is linear in $|b - c|$ whereas the right hand side is quadratic, violating the inequality. Thus, the quantum phenomena described by Eq. (2) are incompatible with any locally causal model.

The essential difference between the presentation here and Bell’s work lies in the explicit statement of the assumption of causality, as distinct from the assumption of locality (or local causality) emphasized by Bell. This opens the door to a discussion of non-causal models, in

addition to the standard discussion of non-local theories. Before turning to this discussion (in the next section), an attempt to clarify three common misconceptions will be made. Firstly, note that inequalities of the type of Eq. (5) are amenable to experimental tests, and have repeatedly been falsified experimentally, including “delayed choice” experiments, in which the values of a and b are varied while the photons are in flight, thus preventing a situation in which λ could depend on a and b without contradicting causality. It is customary to view such experiments as providing better and better evidence that “local realism” is violated in Nature, implying the question which of the two – “locality” or “realism” – must be rejected.¹⁴ As QM is vindicated in these experiments, and “local realism” is refuted, it is somewhat inconvenient that QM itself serves also as one of the premises that leads to Eq. (5) – the perfect correlations predicted by QM for the case $a = b$ were used in the EPR argument at the beginning of the derivation. One is thus tempted to separate the first step from the second step of Bell’s proof, and to note that Bell’s inequality, and similarly the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) inequality³ – the inequality which has been most thoroughly examined experimentally⁴ – are derived for models with hidden variables λ which are deterministic in the sense that they determine the result A of the measurement a through a function $A(a, \lambda)$. As a result, the term “realism” is interpreted¹⁴ as meaning “determinism.” However, it must be stressed that the deterministic character of the hidden variables has been derived in the first step of Bell’s proof, rather than introduced as a separate assumption. Moreover, the CHSH inequality has been shown to hold for local non-deterministic hidden variables as well.¹⁵ The notion of rejecting “realism” (in the “determinism” sense) and retaining local causality is thus clearly untenable.

What then is the correct interpretation of the term “realism” in the present context? As this question does not have a good answer,¹⁶ it is best to follow Bell’s later work,¹⁷ and use the phrase “local causality” rather than the phrase “local realism” (this does not ignore that more philosophical assumptions – that Nature is describable by mathematical models which may be sought using the scientific method – are also implied). It is relevant to note here¹⁸ that the term “elements of physical reality,” which was used in the EPR article¹⁰ to describe deterministic hidden variables, was introduced only through a sufficient condition, leaving the door open to stochastic realistic elements. In fact, Einstein found it necessary to repeatedly stress that locality (“the independent existence of the physical reality present in different parts of space,”) rather than determinism was the issue, his quote “God does not play dice” notwithstanding.¹⁹ It is perhaps amusing to note that the present misconception involving “realism” is in some sense a direct descendant of this old misunderstanding regarding determinism. Bell’s attempts²⁰ at clarifying

this point are thus seen to have been as unsuccessful as Einstein's (and it is very unlikely that the present modest attempt will fare any better!).

A second misconception arises from an overemphasis on the notion that the non-local quantum effects propagate faster than light, and thus violate relativistic causality. Indeed, for a long time, Bell took the view that QM and fundamental relativity stand in apparent conflict,² and even advocated a return to the concept of the aether.^{21,22} However, relativity is a time-reversal symmetric theory, and relativistic causality arises only when the symmetry is broken and an arrow of time is imposed on the theory. The conflict thus arises not between QM and relativity, but between QM, relativity and the arrow of time.

Taking the arrow of time for granted leads also to a third misconception.⁸ Bell's inequalities arise from the mutual independence of the hidden variables λ and the settings of the measurement apparatuses a and b . The violation of the inequalities thus appears to require a correlation between them, and it is often thought that the only way to set up such a correlation is to imagine that a and b are *not* free variables,²³ and are instead determined by a common cause in the past, which also determines λ . Such an explanation has been called super-deterministic by Bell,¹⁷ and is associated with a denial of the free will of the experimenters who might be randomly choosing the values of a and b at the last moment. It is relevant to mention here that such super-deterministic explanations are of a conspiratorial nature,²⁴ and that such conspiracies, if postulated, would undermine any scientific investigation. However, for the present purposes – analyzing which types of models can reproduce the results of QM – it is simply unnecessary to bring in such philosophically complex concepts as free will. It suffices instead to note that the standard setup of QM takes a and b to be free variables, and that this feature must be retained if QM is to be faithfully reproduced. The next section describes an explicit toy-model which, by denying causality, succeeds in generating the required correlations between a , b and λ , without renouncing the free-variable status of a and b . This is done by positing that the hidden variables are determined by causes *in their future*, rather than taking the correlations to be generated by common causes in the past.⁸

III. Retro-causal model

One manner of clarifying the implications of Bell's theorem is to consider concrete models which violate the assumptions of the theorem, and are thus capable of reproducing Eqs. (1) and (2). Bell used this tool in his original work,² including a simple non-local model, which will be discussed

below. A non-causal model may be obtained²⁵ by taking λ to be an angle which accepts one of the values $a, a + \pi/2, b, b + \pi/2$, with equal probabilities, i.e., by assuming that

$$(6) \quad \rho(\lambda|a,b) = \frac{1}{4} \left[\delta(\lambda - a) + \delta\left(\lambda - a - \frac{\pi}{2}\right) + \delta(\lambda - b) + \delta\left(\lambda - b - \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \right].$$

Here λ represents the linear polarization of the photons belonging to each pair. The model thus assumes that the photons are emitted by the source with polarizations which “anticipate” the directions of the apparatuses to be encountered in the future – a blatant and explicit violation of causality. The subsequent interaction with each apparatus follows the standard probability rules for single-photon polarization measurements:

$$(7) \quad p(A|a, \lambda) = \begin{cases} \cos^2(a - \lambda) & A = 1 \\ \sin^2(a - \lambda) & A = -1 \end{cases},$$

together with the corresponding expression for $p(B|b, \lambda)$ (this is Malus’ law, discovered at the beginning of the 19th century in the context of many-photon beams). It is straightforward to derive Eqs. (1) and (2) from Eqs. (6) and (7). In fact, each one of the possible values of λ in Eq. (6) separately leads to the quantum-mechanical correlations of Eq. (2). For example, if $\lambda = a + \pi/2$ then $A = -1$ with certainty, and $B = 1$ or -1 with probabilities of $\sin^2(a - b)$ and $\cos^2(a - b)$ respectively (when $b = a$ or $b = a + \pi/2$, the values of both A and B are selected with certainty, resulting in the perfect correlations mentioned above). The resulting contribution to the correlator $\langle AB \rangle$ is equal to $P_{\text{QM}}(a, b)$. It is necessary to introduce λ as a *stochastic* variable with equal probabilities for $\lambda = a$ and for $\lambda = a + \pi/2$ (and similarly for $\lambda = b, b + \pi/2$) in order to reproduce also Eq. (1). In Eq. (6), equal weights have been chosen for *all* values of λ , for symmetry reasons (aesthetics).

This retro-causal model is appealing in its simplicity. It is nevertheless difficult to accept, mainly²⁶ for two reasons: (a) we are not used to retro-causal thinking – in fact, we usually expect such effects to lead to paradoxes – and (b) it is not clear at present whether the model can be generalized to other quantum phenomena. However, it is clear that such a model avoids the clash with relativity, and instead requires one to question the standard notions regarding the arrows of time. Reflection reveals that these notions, when considered within a microscopic context, are

not at all on a firm footing. As paradoxes would indeed arise if information could be sent back in time, it is important to realize that λ represents an “inaccessible” quantity, which can not be simply measured at the source (for if it were, one could send signals to a and b instructing them to avoid the values $\lambda, \lambda + \pi/2$, resulting in a paradoxical situation). For a source consisting of a Ca atom, one may easily imagine an attempt to measure λ by interrogating the intermediate $j = 1$ state of the radiative cascade, and measuring its spin. Such a measurement would destroy the EPR correlations of the photon pair, just as a “which path” measurement destroys the interference pattern in a two-slit experiment. Specifically, such a measurement would amount to setting up a third apparatus, with an orientation c , and a measurement result C , such that the usual EPR correlations of Eq. (2) would hold between C and either A or B , according to which apparatus measures the first photon of the cascade. The absence of EPR correlations involving the second photon in the cascade (together with the well-known rule that EPR correlations do not allow signaling – in this case, $\langle C \rangle = 0$) ensures that no causality paradoxes arise.

In fact, one may legitimately turn the argument around, and point out that one of the bizarre properties of QM – the fact that it requires the inaccessibility of some physical quantities, such as the “which path” variables – may thus receive a “natural” explanation. After all, if one assumes that fundamental microscopic phenomena are not constrained by causality (motivated, e.g., by symmetry arguments and relativity theory), whereas macroscopic phenomena are, then one is led directly to consider retro-causal theories, and any such theory must involve inaccessible variables in order to avoid paradoxes.⁸ The issue of whether self-consistent microscopic models which are not causal are possible at all, and further, whether such models may be compatible with a macroscopic description which obeys strict causality, will be discussed further in the next section.

It is appropriate at this point to compare this model to other theoretical descriptions which reproduce Eqs. (1) and (2), including standard, orthodox QM. In orthodox QM, the photon pair is described by a wavefunction, which evolves deterministically until the measurements are made. At that point, a stochastic and non-local event occurs, following Born’s probability rules. It is also possible to reproduce Eqs. (1) and (2) with completely deterministic, but non-local dynamics, while ascribing the different possible outcomes of the measurements to different initial conditions. As already mentioned, Bell devised a simple model of this type, and included it in Ref. 2 to provide context and clarity. In the photon version of that model, the initial condition λ is taken to be a uniformly distributed random angle, and B is taken as 1 if $|\lambda - b| < \pi/4$ and -1

	“Initial conditions” λ	Dynamics determining results A and B
Retro-causal model	$\lambda \in [0, \pi)$ is an angle. It depends on a and b in a stochastic, retro-causal manner. $p(\lambda a, b)$ is discrete, Eq. (6).	Stochastic (except for $a = \lambda, \lambda + \pi/2$). See Eq. (7) for $p(A a, \lambda)$ and $p(B b, \lambda)$
Quantum Mechanics	λ is the wavefunction ψ .	Stochastic and non-local , $p(A, B a, b, \lambda)$ provided.
Bell's non-local model	$\lambda \in [0, \pi)$ is an angle, and is uniformly distributed.	Deterministic and non-local , $A(a, b, \lambda)$ and $B(b, \lambda)$ provided.
Bohmian Mechanics	λ consists of the wavefunction ψ and initial particle positions \mathbf{r}_i . The coordinates \mathbf{r}_i are (usually) assumed distributed according to ψ .	Deterministic and non-local , $A(a, b, \lambda)$ and $B(a, b, \lambda)$ provided.

Table 1: Different ways of reproducing the Bell's-inequality-violating correlations, Eq. (2). Bell's non-local model is naturally generalized by Bohmian mechanics. Finding general non-causal models remains a challenge.

otherwise. A is taken to depend on a , λ and b – it is taken as 1 if $|\lambda - a'| < \pi/4$ and -1 otherwise, where the angle a' is chosen so as to reproduce Eq. (2), according to $1 - (2/\pi)(2a - 2a') = \cos(2a - 2b)$. This toy-model has a somewhat artificial character, as is typical for mathematical-demonstration models of this type.²⁷ The different models discussed, including Bohmian mechanics,²⁸ are summarized and compared in Table 1, which is accompanied by a sketch in Fig. 2.

As there are many equivalent formulations and models of quantum phenomena, quite a few more lines could be added to the table. In the present context, it is especially relevant to mention retro-causal models.^{29,30} However, some of these models do not explicitly provide expressions for the measurement results A and B or their probabilities, treating them instead as given “final conditions,” and are therefore not directly comparable to the models listed in the table. It may be useful for the promoters of the various available descriptions to discuss their preferred models in terms corresponding to adding lines to this table.




Fig 2: Space-time sketch comparing alternatives for mathematical models of quantum correlations. The full arrows describe the paths of the photons from the source to the measuring apparatuses. In nonlocal models (dotted double arrow) the mathematical description of the state of the system propagates linearly from the past into the future, but output variables corresponding (e.g.) to the left apparatus may depend on variables describing the right apparatus. In retro-causal models (dashed arrows) propagation of mathematical information from the apparatuses backwards in time to the source is allowed, and thus no instantaneous “action at a distance” is needed. In these models, the variables which carry information which has propagated into the past represent microscopic physical quantities (attributes of “quantum fluctuations”), which must be inaccessible at the macroscopic level (“hidden”) – otherwise, paradoxes would arise. The next section suggests a quest for mathematical descriptions which reconcile a-causal propagation of information at the microscopic level with an arrow of time (causality) applicable to macroscopic, irreversibly-registered information.

Three additional remarks are in order:

(i) A full description of the physical phenomena relevant to the measurement processes must involve irreversibility. For example, in the above retro-causal model, Eq. (6), the possible values of λ are determined by the four detectors which irreversibly record the result of the polarization measurements, and not by the presence of the polarizing beam-splitters themselves. After all, if, within the a apparatus, the two detectors are removed and the two partial beams are carefully recombined using an additional polarizing beam splitter, then a similar apparatus with an orientation c can be placed beyond the a apparatus, and the value of c , rather than a , will play a role in determining λ . As usual in QM, one can treat a measurement as having been performed only when the result has been amplified and irreversibly recorded.

(ii) It is of interest to discuss the symmetry or asymmetry of the different descriptions with respect to exchanging a and b . Bell's toy-model is not symmetric, but it is not essentially difficult to symmetrize it. Asymmetric versions of the other descriptions also exist – if the b measurement occurs earlier in time, then the standard QM description has b and λ determining the probabilities of the possible values of B , with the wavefunction collapsing into a state λ' which depends on b and B , and with λ' and a later determining the probabilities for A . An asymmetric version of the retro-causal model described above is obtained by taking

$$\rho(\lambda|b) = \frac{1}{2} \left[\delta(\lambda - b) + \delta\left(\lambda - b - \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \right] \text{ instead of Eq. (6), with } \lambda \text{ independent of } a. \text{ The}$$

simplicity of the model is evident in the fact that the prescription for the probabilities of A and B , Eq. (7), is unchanged.

(iii) The assumptions of locality and causality are “inseparable,” in the sense that (a) violations of causality indirectly imply violations of locality (if λ depends on a and B depends on λ , then B depends indirectly on a), and (b) if relativistic arguments are accepted, then violations of locality, which are instantaneous in one reference frame, represent also violations of causality in other reference frames. Furthermore, any non-causal model of the type discussed here can be “translated” into a non-local model, and vice versa. For example, λ of Eq. (6) can be replaced by a random integer n from 1 to 4, thus becoming independent of a and b , and then an angle $\lambda'(n, a, b)$ can be defined as associated with a later time, but in a manner such that λ' retains all the properties of the previous λ , and is used in the same manner. Conversely, any non-local model can be “translated” into a non-causal one, by evaluating A and B at the source, and including them as elements of the set λ .³¹ This “mathematical equivalence” between the classes of non-local models and non-causal models should not blind us to the fact that locality and causality are physically distinct, and in particular, direct non-locality clashes with the principles of relativity. Retro-causality not only does not clash with relativity – it instead requires that the past light-cones sometimes be treated in a manner similar to the usual treatment of future light-cones, thus encouraging us to respect the time-reversal symmetry of the relativistic point of view.

IV. Routes for generalization

The comparison made in Table 1 leads naturally to the following question: Can the given retro-causal, stochastic model be generalized to all known quantum phenomena, in analogy with the fact that Bohmian mechanics provides a general description belonging to the same “deterministic-

nonlocal” class as the simple model of Bell? There are two avenues which one could possibly pursue in tackling this question. The first would be a step-by-step approach, wherein one would seek simple retro-causal models capable of describing specific surprising quantum phenomena, e.g., those involved in formulating “improved” Bell’s inequalities,^{32,33} or the intricate phenomena involved in quantum computation schemes.^{34,35} The second avenue would involve seeking a more fundamental description. After all, Bohmian mechanics has several distinctive features which make it stand out as significantly more than a generalization of a discrete toy-model (apart from having been formulated earlier). For example, it provides a description of measurements in which the “pointer” degrees of freedom are treated in a manner identical to the microscopic ones, in contrast with the toy-model descriptions and with standard QM, wherein the variables representing measurement results (e.g., A and B) are of a separate class. In this sense, Bohmian mechanics “does not suffer from the measurement problem.” Although the possible importance of the first avenue is emphasized here, it will not be discussed further. The remainder of this section will be devoted to preliminaries concerning the second avenue.

Keeping in mind (i) the stochastic nature of the simple retro-causal model, (ii) the time-reversal symmetry typical of microscopic theories, and (iii) the success of quantum field theories in high-energy physics, it is perhaps natural to seek a more fundamental description by pursuing a “stochastic field approach.” A prototypical example of such a description is given by the stochastic quantization method of Parisi and Wu.³⁶ This method constitutes an alternative formulation of Quantum Field Theory (QFT), in the same sense that the original Feynman path integrals provided an alternative formulation for standard QM. It specifies³⁷ a probability density $P[\Phi(\vec{r}, t)]$ for field configurations $\Phi(\vec{r}, t)$, in a manner which reproduces all the standard correlation functions for the fields, as known from perturbative QFT. The probabilities specified by $P[\Phi(\vec{r}, t)]$ are conventional, real probabilities, in contrast with the complex probability amplitudes which have become standard in QM; the fields involved do, however, acquire imaginary components.³⁸

The microscopic prescription for $P[\Phi(\vec{r}, t)]$ is symmetric under time-reversal. How can such a description be consistent with known time-asymmetries, e.g., those evident in the rules for using QM to predict the results of measurements, or those involved in the irreversible phenomena of the macroscopic world? The difficulties involved in reconciling irreversibility and time’s arrows with time-reversal-symmetric microscopic theories have been puzzling for a very long time. For example, already in the 19th century, Boltzmann argued that, given a low-entropy configuration in

the present, one should expect entropy to go up in both the future *and* the past directions. If the universe had lasted for a long enough time, significant fluctuations in the entropy would be inevitable, and therefore the existence of a low entropy at present was not particularly problematic. However, in this picture not memories, nor fossil evidence, can be trusted, because the lower-entropy situation implied by them would require an (immensely) more unlikely fluctuation than the fluctuation required to produce the present low-entropy state, with the memories and fossils in place!⁸ As is well known, these difficulties can be avoided by singling out initial conditions for special treatment. Indeed, the use of appropriate initial (rather than final) conditions allowed Boltzmann to break the time-reversal symmetry of classical mechanics and to derive his H-theorem, and make the connection with macroscopic thermodynamics.

Can the same technique – breaking the time-reversal symmetry by imposing initial conditions – be useful also in the context of the stochastic field approach? Note that imposing initial conditions breaks the time-reversal symmetry of deterministic and stochastic theories in quite different manners. A deterministic, time-reversal symmetric theory gives a set of rules (typically, differential equations) which determine the configurations at all times, once the configuration at any specific time t_0 is given. The theory may also allow for external forces or fields – e.g., Maxwell’s equations for the electromagnetic field, with the charge and current densities treated as external fields. If initial conditions are used within such a framework, i.e., the time t_0 for which the field configuration is considered to be externally given is the earliest time considered, then causality follows. Specifically, when comparing two situations with identical initial conditions and external fields, except for a difference in the values of the external fields at a point \vec{r}_1 and time t_1 , with $t_1 > t_0$, one finds that the two situations have identical field configurations for all times between t_0 and t_1 . In the abovementioned case of Maxwell’s equations, the field configurations will be the same everywhere outside the future light-cone of the point (\vec{r}_1, t_1) , i.e. one obtains relativistic local causality.³⁹

If the theory is not deterministic but stochastic, the theoretical rules determine only the probabilities associated with different space-time configurations, even if the configuration variables at one specific time, t_0 , are fully specified. In the notation used above, one may modify $P[\Phi(\vec{r}, t)]$ by removing all configurations for which $\Phi(\vec{r}, t_0)$ deviates from the given set of initial conditions. Clearly, time-reversal symmetry will be broken by this procedure (for




Fig 3: Sketch of space-time regions which may be affected by initial conditions and external fields, allowing two points to be made:

- I. Using the example of Maxwell’s equations for a deterministic, time-reversal symmetric theory, the external application of an oscillating dipole at (\vec{r}_1, t_1) can produce outgoing waves in the regions marked by the empty ovals, but cannot affect the fields in the full ovals – the presence of incoming waves is completely determined by the initial conditions. For a stochastic theory, the field configuration is not completely specified by these conditions, and the application of the dipole may affect the details of the fluctuating fields (the vacuum fluctuations?) in the regions marked by the filled ovals as well. Thus, stochasticity and retro-causality are interrelated, at least in the presence of initial conditions.
- II. A significant route for further research, in the context of stochastic field theories, would be a search for mathematical descriptions of a “dissipative detector” (capable of “clicking”), which could be “placed” in the regions marked by the ovals. The search should focus on cases in which the “firing rate” of the “detector” is affected by the oscillating dipole only for the empty ovals, and not for the filled ovals, even though the detailed field distribution there is modified. This would correspond to the impossibility of signaling into the past.

times later than t_0), but strict microscopic causality need not follow (see Fig. 3, point D). In other words, a comparison of the two situations which differ only in the external fields applied at (\vec{r}_1, t_1) may now reveal differences between the two also at times between t_0 and t_1 .

There are many intriguing issues which may be raised in the context of such descriptions. For example, if the stochastic rules allow for only “small” fluctuations around classical determinism, then one may expect “effective causality” to emerge for “macroscopically large” fluctuations. In what sense could this happen? Can one add “sources” and “detectors” to such descriptions? The

description of a source may be given simply by an oscillating dipole coupled to the “electromagnetic field,” where the behavior of the dipole is described as an external field. Presumably, an irreversible detector would be described by a large number of degrees of freedom associated with a single position in space, and initialized in a collective metastable state (in rough correspondence to a photomultiplier tube).⁴⁰ If properly coupled to the “electromagnetic field,” such a detector would have a “firing rate” which would depend on the fluctuations in the field. Can one devise a description in which the existence of a “source” in a region near (\vec{r}_1, t_1) would affect the “firing rate” of a detector only near the future light-cone of (\vec{r}_1, t_1) , even though the details of the fluctuations in $\Phi(\vec{r}, t)$ are modified by the presence of the source also for times before t_1 ? (See Fig. 3, point II).

If such a description can be devised, the meaning of “measurement” would be quite indirect, in the sense that the implication that the presence of a “click” in the detector (switching out of the metastable state) has on the behavior of the electromagnetic field is quite different from the implication of a statement such as “the value of the field at point \vec{r}_2 and time t_2 is Φ_2 .” It would be nontrivial to deduce the implication that the result of one “measurement” has on the propensities of other “measurements” to yield other results. However, if the stochastic field is subject to rules which are local in an appropriate sense, then it is reasonable to expect that all of the information contained in measurements performed up to a certain time t can be embedded into a mathematical construct, which would represent the “state of the system” at that time. This “state” would then depend on time in a manner which preserves information, except at points in time at which other measurements are made. For a successful theory, this should correspond to unitary evolution, punctuated by “quantum jumps” at the times at which measurements are involved.

V. Conclusions

Bell’s theorem shows that quantum phenomena do exhibit “spooky actions at a distance,” defying Einstein’s intuition. The retro-causal model described above shows that “spooky actions in the past” may account for these phenomena without clashing with relativity. In other words, attributing “foresight” rather than “telepathy” to quantum degrees of freedom may be appropriate, as long as it is emphasized that the non-classical processes alluded to are confined to a sub-microscopic level, and are incapable of transmitting macroscopically-registered signals.

Constructing a general theory of quantum phenomena along retro-causal lines similar to those employed by the model would be desirable, but would not represent a truly microscopic description, as the irreversibility of registering measurement results remains implicit. Some preliminary ideas regarding microscopic stochastic descriptions were discussed, but only touched vaguely on the explicit description of irreversible measurements. When compared to standard QM, these ideas lead to the view that QM is a description following only the irreversibly registered part of the information regarding a system; therefore it is natural to have conservation of information – unitary evolution – punctuated by “jumps” whenever additional information is registered. We conclude that it is necessary to focus on irreversibility and the arrow of time, in exploring quantum phenomena.

Given the persistence of pre-20th-century ideas on causality and determinism, all of the suggestions above are likely to be controversial (although more radical approaches have been seriously considered⁴¹). However, there should be wide agreement that the practice of not explicitly mentioning causality and time’s arrow when enumerating Bell’s assumptions is misleading, and should cease.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank J. Berkovitz, A.C. Elitzur, O.J.E. Maroney, T. Norsen, E. Pazy, H. Price, R. Sutherland, H. Westman and A. Zeilinger for helpful discussions.

¹ R.P. Feynman, *The Character of Physical Law* (M.I.T., Cambridge, 1967), p.129.

² J.S. Bell “On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox,” *Physics* **1**, 195-200 (1964). Note that the word “causality” appears here in the meaning of “complete causality,” i.e., determinism. “Causality” was used by Bell in the sense of an arrow of time in later publications. Reprinted in *John S. Bell on The Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, M. Bell, K. Gottfried and M. Veltman, Eds. (World Scientific, Singapore, 2001) and in J.S. Bell, *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics*, revised edition (Cambridge University, Cambridge, 2004). Chapter numbers in the latter are given here and below as (2 in S&U).

³ J.F. Clauser, M.A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R.A. Holt, “Proposed Experiment to Test Local Hidden-Variable Theories,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880-3 (1969).

⁴ A representative of the available experimental references is: A. Aspect, J. Dalibard, and G. Roger, “Experimental Test of Bell’s Inequalities Using Time-Varying Analyzers,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 1804-7 (1982); see also references therein.

⁵ J.A. Wheeler and R.P. Feynman, “Interaction with the Absorber as the Mechanism of Radiation,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **17**, 157-81 (1945).

⁶ O. Costa de Beauregard, “Une réponse à l’argument dirigé par Einstein, Podolsky, et Rosen contre l’interprétation bohrienne des phénomènes quantiques,” *Comptes Rendus Acad. Sci. Paris* **236**, 1632 (1953).

⁷ J.G. Cramer “The transactional interpretation of quantum mechanics,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **58**, 647-87 (1986). Note that the authors of Refs. 6 and 7 have, many years later, taken their arguments much further, resulting in publications which are, at best, very speculative (including discussions of paranormal phenomena and of signaling backwards in time, respectively). While this may constitute a remarkable history-of-science phenomenon, it does not detract from the validity of the original arguments.

⁸ H. Price, “A neglected route to realism about quantum mechanics,” *Mind* **103**, 303-36 (1994); *Time’s Arrow and Archimedes’ Point* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996).

⁹ J.S. Bell, “Free Variables and Local Causality,” *Epistemological Letters*, No. 15 (1977) (10 in S&U).

¹⁰ A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, “Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?” *Phys. Rev.* **47**, 777-80 (1935).

¹¹ D. Bohm, “A Suggested Interpretation of the Quantum Theory in Terms of ‘Hidden’ Variables. I,” *Phys. Rev.* **85**, 166-79 (1952).

¹² J.S. Bell, “On the Problem of Hidden Variables in Quantum Mechanics,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **38**, 447-52 (1966) (1 in S&U).

¹³ λ need not be statistically independent of A and B , but as these are the output variables, its distribution $\rho(\lambda)$ must be defined in a manner independent of them (one may also argue here that knowledge of A without knowledge of a is meaningless, and therefore could not affect $\rho(\lambda)$, but this would be superfluous).

¹⁴ See, e.g., S. Gröblacher, T. Paterek, R. Kaltenbaek, Č. Brukner, M. Żukowski, M. Aspelmeyer, and A. Zeilinger, “An experimental test of non-local realism,” *Nature* **446**, 871-5 (2007); A. Aspect, “To be or not to be local,” *Nature* **446**, 866-7 (2007).

¹⁵ See note 10 in J.S. Bell, “Introduction to the hidden-variable question,” in *Proceedings of the International School of Physics “Enrico Fermi”, Course II: Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (New York, Academic, 1971) pp. 171-81 (4 in S&U), and note 15 in J.F. Clauser, and M.A. Horne, “Experimental consequences of objective local theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **10**, 526-35 (1974).

¹⁶ T. Norsen, “Against ‘Realism’,” *Foundations of Physics* **37**, 311-40 (2007).

¹⁷ J.S. Bell, “La nouvelle cuisine,” in *Between Science and Technology*, A. Sarlemijn and P. Kroes, Eds. (Elsevier, North Holland, 1990), pp. 97-115 (24 in S&U).

¹⁸ Another relevant point is that the fact that quantum mechanics contradicts the simplest type of “realism,” in the sense that it is incompatible with the class of “non-contextual” models, was known already before

Bell's work – see, e.g., J.S. Bell, “On the impossible pilot wave,” *Found. Phys.* **12**, 989-99 (1982) (17 in S&U). Here “non-contextual” models are those in which “measurements” of quantum “observables” simply reveal pre-existing values of the physical quantities being measured (“reality”), and these values are taken to be independent of which set of compatible quantum observables is being simultaneously “measured.” See also J. Bell, “Against ‘measurement’,” *Physics World* **3**(8), 33-40 (1990) (23 in S&U); S. Kochen, and E. Specker, “The Problem of Hidden Variables in Quantum Mechanics,” *J. of Math. and Mech.* **17**, 59-87 (1967).

¹⁹ See, e.g., N.D. Mermin, “Is the moon there when nobody looks? Reality and the quantum theory,” *Phys. Today* **38**(4), 38-47 (1985).

²⁰ J.S. Bell, “Bertlmann’s socks and the nature of reality,” *J. de Physique* **42**, C2 41-61 (1981) (16 in S&U).

²¹ See the conclusions of Ref. 2 and of Ref. 20, and J.S. Bell, “How to teach special relativity,” *Progress in Scientific Culture* **1**(2) (1976) (9 in S&U). Bell retreated from this position in “Are there quantum jumps?” In *Schrodinger. Centenary of a polymath* (Cambridge U. Press, 1987) (22 in S&U).

²² See also T. Maudlin, *Quantum Non-Locality and Relativity* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1994).

²³ For example, J.S. Bell, in “Free variables and local causality,” *Epistemological Letters* No. 15 (1977) (12 in S&U) says: ‘It has been assumed that the settings of instruments are in some sense free variables ...’ For me this means that the values of such variables have implications only in their future light cones.

²⁴ A. Shimony, M.A. Horne, J.F. Clauser, ‘Comment on “The Theory of Local Beables”,’ *Epistemological Letters*, No. 13 (1976) [reproduced in *Dialectica* **39**, 97-102 (1985)].

²⁵ See, e.g., Fig. 1 of Ref. 7.

²⁶ Bell also mentioned a “lapse ... into fatalism” as an objection to retro-causality, but (a) philosophical views should not prevent scientific progress, e.g., a dislike of determinism or of action-at-a-distance did not prevent Newton’s development of the classical description of mechanics and gravitation; (b) it is not clear that the space-time (block universe) view does not already imply fatalism to the same extent. See Chap. 9 in *Time’s Arrow and Archimedes’ Point*, Ref. 8.

²⁷ A.J. Leggett, “Nonlocal Hidden-Variable Theories and Quantum Mechanics: An Incompatibility Theorem,” *Found. Phys.* **33**, 1469-93 (2003).

²⁸ The table refers to the standard, non-relativistic version of Bohmian mechanics – it is irrelevant to the present discussion that adapting Bohmian mechanics to photons may require a relativistic extension.

²⁹ S. Goldstein and R. Tumulka, “Opposite arrows of time can reconcile relativity and nonlocality,” *Class. Quantum Grav.* **20**, 557-64 (2003).

³⁰ R. Sutherland, “Causally Symmetric Bohm Model,” arXiv:quant-ph/0601095v2 (2006). See additional references in footnote 20 therein.

³¹ In fact, the transactional interpretation of Ref. 7 can be viewed as obtained by transforming in this manner standard QM into a retro-causal model.

³² D.M. Greenberger, M.A. Horne, A. Shimony, and A. Zeilinger, “Bell’s theorem without inequalities,” *Am. J. Phys.* **58**, 1131-43 (1990).

³³ A.C. Elitzur, and S. Dolev, “Multiple Interaction-Free Measurement as a Challenge to the Transactional Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics,” in *Frontiers of Time, Retrocausation – Experiment and Theory*, D.P. Sheehan, Ed., AIP Conf. Proc. 683 (AIP, 2006).

³⁴ It is perhaps to be expected that as the number of degrees of freedom or of q-bits involved grows, models of this type should become exponentially more complicated. This is based both on the exponential parallelism employed in quantum computation schemes, and on the similarity of the ideas used here to those of the transactional interpretation, Ref. 7, which for many particles would apparently require a transaction across configuration-space–time.

³⁵ It may be particularly challenging to develop such models for setups in which the result of a measurement made at one time is used to decide which measurement will subsequently be performed. This issue was raised by Maudlin²² as criticism of the transactional interpretation.

³⁶ G. Parisi and Y.-S. Wu, “Perturbation theory without gauge fixing,” *Scientica Sinica* **24**, 483-96 (1981); For some references and numerical results see J. Berges and I.-O. Stamatescu, “Simulating nonequilibrium quantum fields with stochastic quantization techniques,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 202003-1-4 (2005).

³⁷ In fact, a “fifth time” τ is involved, and the prescription gives a “time-dependent” probability density $P_\tau[\Phi]$ with the desired $P[\Phi]$ obtained in the $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ or “equilibrium” limit. These details, as well as those associated with the regularization required for the treatment of Minkowski space-time, are not necessarily relevant to the present general discussion.

³⁸ See, e.g., A A Migdal, “Stochastic quantization of field theory,” *Sov. Phys. Uspekhi* **29**, 389-411 (1986).

³⁹ Note that this argument relies on the complete specification of the initial conditions; if they are specified only up to some accuracy, then the remaining “fluctuations” may replace stochasticity in supplying the freedom necessary for retro-causality.

⁴⁰ Presumably, strict irreversibility would obtain in the limit of an infinitely large number of degrees of freedom, or an infinitely large jump in the entropy upon switching out of the metastable state. It would be of further interest to study cases in which irreversibility were not strict, especially in the context of quantum computation, in which exponentially complex computations are to be carried out by a relatively few degrees of freedom – it would be necessary to check whether an exponentially large “cost” in terms of the entropy change required in the detectors might be involved.

⁴¹ The prime example is called Quantum Logic; See, e.g., J. Bub, *The Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics* (Reidel, Dordrecht, 1974).