

A local scheme accounting for EPR quantum correlations

A. Matzkin

Laboratoire de Spectrométrie physique (CNRS Unité 5588),

Université Joseph-Fourier Grenoble-1,

BP 87, 38402 Saint-Martin d'Hères, France

Abstract

A model for two entangled systems in an EPR setting is shown to reproduce the quantum-mechanical outcomes and expectation values. Each system is represented by a small sphere containing a point-like particle embedded in a localized field, and the measurements are postulated to induce a random local interaction. The two-spin $1/2$ problem in the singlet state is tackled by introducing an initial correlation at the source between the fields and the particle positions of each subsystem. The averages of spin measurements along arbitrary axes are obtained without appealing to nonlocal effects. The ensuing violation of the Bell inequalities is allowed by the field, whose role is to contextualize the particles position. The model, while not supplementing the information given by the quantum-mechanical state, shows that for non-commuting observables it is incorrect to infer a unique “element of reality” from the existence of correlations with unit probability.

I. INTRODUCTION

In their celebrated paper [1], Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen (EPR) argued that quantum mechanics was incomplete on the ground that for entangled states the formalism predicts with certainty the measurement outcomes of noncommuting observables although they cannot have simultaneous reality. They argued the alternative to incompleteness was to make the reality of one particle's properties depend on the measurement made on the other particle, irrespective of their spatial separation. EPR concluded: “*no reasonable definition of reality could permit this*” nonlocal action at-a-distance. In a seminal work [2], Bell showed that local models based on a distribution of hidden variables (HV) intended to complete quantum mechanics must satisfy an inequality involving averages taken over the hidden variable distributions. He also showed that in certain circumstances the average values of two-particle quantum observables violate these inequalities. The popular view among physicists is that these violations 'prove' that quantum mechanics is non-local. Specialists in the field tend to be more cautious, emphasizing the incompatibility between the so-called 'local realism' and quantum mechanics. However, it is seldom mentioned that Bell-type models are only a subset of the local models that can be envisaged. Indeed, Bell's theorem [3, 4] is grounded on two important assumptions: (a) the HV ascribe an elementary probability for any 2- particle outcome; (b) this probability factorizes into two single particle probabilities, leading to the existence [5] of a joint probability function for all the observables entering the inequality (though there is no such probability according to quantum mechanics). General arguments seem to indicate that these assumptions arise from a particular reading of EPR but are by no means necessary ingredients in order to enforce locality [6, 7]. In this work we go further by explicitly putting forward a local scheme compatible with quantum mechanical predictions. The model, developed for the prototypical spin-1/2 pair, describes each system by postulating a particle *and* a classical field. The measurement outcome will be seen to depend on the particle position and on an interaction of the field with the measurement apparatus, the probabilities being given by relative field intensities. We will first put forward the model for a *single* particle. We will then naturally extend the model to the two-particle case, and show how, by introducing a correlation *at the source*, the model reproduces the quantum predictions that violate the Bell inequalities without involving action at a distance.

II. SINGLE FIELD-PARTICLE SYSTEM

Let a single spin-1/2 be represented by a field-particle system assumed to be composed of a small sphere, with the position of its center in the laboratory frame being denoted by \mathbf{x} and the internal spherical variables relative to the center of the sphere by $\mathbf{r} \equiv (r, \theta, \phi)$ (see Fig. 1a). A classical scalar field $F(\mathbf{r})$ is defined on the spherical surface. The point-like particle sits still at a fixed (but unknown position) on the sphere. We are interested in measuring the polarization of the particle, i.e., its internal angular momentum projection along a given axis¹. Let ε_b denote the polarization along an axis b making an angle θ_b with the z axis. We assume that the possible outcomes $\varepsilon_b = \pm 1$ can be obtained, the result depending in a manner to be described below (i) on the position occupied by the the field on the spherical surface and (ii) on the position of the particle. The field F is assumed to occupy a minimal area consisting of a hemisphere centered on any axis, the value of the field at any point being given by the projection of that point on the axis. Let Σ_{+a} denote the positive half-sphere centered on the axis a making an angle θ_a with the z axis, and $F_{\Sigma_{+a}}$ denote the field distributed on that hemisphere. $F_{\Sigma_{+a}}(\mathbf{r})$ is thus defined by

$$F_{\Sigma_{+a}}(\mathbf{r}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{a} / \pi R^2 & \text{if } \mathbf{r} \in \Sigma_{+a} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (1)$$

R being the radius of the sphere (for simplicity we will take all the axes to be coplanar with z). The mean value of $F_{\Sigma_{+a}}(\mathbf{r})$ taken over the positive hemisphere centered on the b axis Σ_{+b} is given by

$$\langle F_{\Sigma_{+a}} \rangle_{\Sigma_{+b}} = \int_{\Sigma_{+b}} F_{\Sigma_{+a}}(\mathbf{r}) d\hat{\mathbf{r}} = \cos(\theta_b - \theta_a), \quad (2)$$

where $d\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ denotes the spherical surface element for a sphere of radius R . The only requirement we make on the particle's position is that it must be embedded within the field: the particle cannot be in a field free region of the sphere.

When the polarization ε_b is measured we postulate that the measuring apparatus along b interacts with the field $F_{\Sigma_{+a}}$. Let $[a + b]$ and $[a - b]$ denote the directions lying halfway

¹ From a physical standpoint, what we have called here the position of the particle should more properly be called the position of the particle's angular momentum $\mathbf{r}_0 \times \mathbf{p}$ relative to the center of the sphere (the particle thus lies on the sphere in the plane perpendicular to the internal angular momentum). We will not make explicitly this distinction in this paper.

between the axes a (of the distribution) and b or $-b$ (of the measuring direction), with respective angles $(\theta_b + \theta_a)/2$ and $(\theta_b + \pi + \theta_a)/2$. We will assume that the field-apparatus interaction results in a *rotation* of the original pre-measurement field $F_{\Sigma_{+a}}$ toward both of the apparatus axes, $F_{\Sigma_{+a}} \rightarrow F_{\Sigma_{\pm b}}$ (Fig 1b). A definite outcome $\varepsilon_b = \pm 1$ depends on which of the hemispheres $\Sigma_{\pm b}$ the particle is after the interaction; this position is supposed not to depend *only* on the pre-measurement position but also on the field and the interaction². The probability that the particle ends up in $\Sigma_{\pm b}$ is given by the relative value of the squared average of the intermediate 'half-rotated' field $F_{\Sigma_{[a\pm b]}}$ over the post-measurement hemisphere Σ_{+b} or Σ_{-b} , yielding in accordance with Eq. (2)

$$P_{\Sigma_{+a}}(\varepsilon_b = +1) = \left| \left\langle F_{\Sigma_{[a+b]}} \right\rangle_{\Sigma_{+b}} \right|^2 / N = \cos^2 \frac{\theta_b - \theta_a}{2} \quad (3)$$

$$P_{\Sigma_{+a}}(\varepsilon_b = -1) = \left| \left\langle F_{\Sigma_{[a-b]}} \right\rangle_{\Sigma_{-b}} \right|^2 / N = \sin^2 \frac{\theta_a - \theta_b}{2} \quad (4)$$

with $N = \left| \left\langle F_{\Sigma_{[a+b]}} \right\rangle_{\Sigma_{+b}} \right|^2 + \left| \left\langle F_{\Sigma_{[a-b]}} \right\rangle_{\Sigma_{-b}} \right|^2$. Eqs. (3) and (4) match the probabilities of measurements made on a single spin-1/2, reading in the standard notation $|\langle \pm b | +a \rangle|^2$. If b and a are taken to be the same, then one has $\Sigma_{[a+a]} \equiv \Sigma_{+a}$ and

$$P_{\Sigma_{+a}}(\varepsilon_a = +1) = \left\langle F_{\Sigma_{[a+a]}} \right\rangle_{\Sigma_{+a}} = 1 \quad (5)$$

$$P_{\Sigma_{+a}}(\varepsilon_a = -1) = \left\langle F_{\Sigma_{[a-a]}} \right\rangle_{\Sigma_{-a}} = 0. \quad (6)$$

Hence a field $F_{\Sigma_{+a}}$ corresponds to a well-defined positive polarization along the a axis. The symmetry axis of the field distribution coincides with the post-measurement axis, the field-apparatus interaction may change the position of the particle though it remains within the hemisphere Σ_{+a} : the polarization outcome is then known with certainty. Because the particle stays in the same hemisphere, Eqs. (5)-(6) can be given an interpretation in terms of the particle's position:

$$P_{\Sigma_{+a}}(\varepsilon_a = +1) = P_{\Sigma_{+a}}(\mathbf{r} \in \Sigma_{+a}) = 1 \quad (7)$$

$$P_{\Sigma_{+a}}(\varepsilon_a = -1) = P_{\Sigma_{+a}}(\mathbf{r} \in \Sigma_{-a}) = 0. \quad (8)$$

² The model is compatible with a deterministic ascription provided it depends on the field, eg one can assume $\varepsilon_b(F_{\Sigma_{+a}}) = \pm 1$ if $\mathbf{r}_0 \cdot \mathbf{w}_{a,b} \geq 0$, where $\mathbf{w}_{a,b}$ is a vector coplanar with a and b defined by its angle $\theta_w = \theta_a + \pi(1 - \cos(\theta_b - \theta_a))/2$, but such an assumption turns out to be unsequential.

On the other hand when b and a lie along different directions, the polarization along b only acquires a value $\varepsilon_b = \pm 1$ *after* the field has interacted with the measurement apparatus and rotated toward the measurement axis. A straightforward consequence is that the measurements do not commute, and thus joint polarization measurements along different axes are undefined.

Since fields obey the principle of superposition, we can envisage arbitrary superpositions of fields defined on different hemispheres. But fields defined on different hemispheres turn out to be *equivalent* to a field defined on a single hemisphere. Indeed it is easy to see that one can write

$$F_{\Sigma_{+u}} \sim \cos\left(\frac{\theta_u - \theta_b}{2}\right)F_{\Sigma_{+b}} + \sin\left(\frac{\theta_u - \theta_b}{2}\right)F_{\Sigma_{-b}}, \quad (9)$$

meaning that although the two fields on the right and left handside of Eq. (9) are different – they are not defined on the same hemispherical surfaces –, they lead to exactly the same predictions. Indeed, when measurements are made along *any* axis b' the averages of the fields entering (9) obey

$$\left\langle F_{\Sigma_{[u+b']}} \right\rangle_{\Sigma_{+b'}} = \cos\left(\frac{\theta_u - \theta_b}{2}\right) \left\langle F_{\Sigma_{[b+b']}} \right\rangle_{\Sigma_{+b'}} + \sin\left(\frac{\theta_u - \theta_b}{2}\right) \left\langle F_{\Sigma_{[-b+b']}} \right\rangle_{\Sigma_{+b'}} = \cos\left(\frac{\theta_u - \theta_{b'}}{2}\right). \quad (10)$$

Hence the left and right handside of Eq. (9) define an *equivalence class*. By employing the mapping between a Hilbert space ray and a field defined on the appropriate hemispherical surface Eq. (9) can be generalized to an arbitrary superposition of fields. From the particle standpoint, the existence of the equivalence class implies, by Eqs. (7)-(8) that we can ascribe for any field defined on the entire sphere the hemisphere $\mathbf{r} \in \Sigma_{+u}$ to which the particle belongs with certainty; then the part of the field defined on the opposite hemisphere $\mathbf{r} \in \Sigma_{-u}$ is inactive (i.e. it interferes destructively with the fields arising from an apparatus measuring the polarization along *any* axis). As a simple example consider the field distribution over the entire sphere $F_{\Sigma_a} \equiv (F_{\Sigma_{+a}} - F_{\Sigma_{-a}}) / \sqrt{2}$; it is equivalent to $F_{\Sigma_{+(a+\pi/2)}}$, hence the part of the field defined on $\Sigma_{-(a+\pi/2)}$ vanishes when measurements are made – it is therefore inactive or “empty”.

III. TWO-PARTICLE SYSTEM

Assume now an initial two-particle system is fragmented into two subsystems flying apart in opposite directions. Each of the two particles, labeled 1 and 2, is embedded in a field




FIG. 1: (a) A system is represented by a point-like particle lying on the surface of a small sphere, on which a field is defined. The particle position \mathbf{r}_0 is unknown; the minimal surface occupied by the field is a hemisphere, here centered on the positive a axis. (b) Post-measurement situation after the polarization of the system pictured in (a) has been measured along the b axis, yielding an outcome $\varepsilon_b = +1$: the field has rotated and is now centered on the b axis. The outcome probabilities depend on the average of the intermediate field $F_{\Sigma_{[a\pm b]}}$. (c) An initial 2-particle system has fragmented into 2 subsystems (at \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2), each carrying a particle embedded in a field. As a result of the fragmentation, the fields between opposite hemispheres of each subsystem are correlated (as symbolized by the colouring) and the particle positions lie on opposite points on the respective sphere.

defined on the surface of a small sphere. \mathbf{x}_1 (resp. \mathbf{x}_2) denotes the position of the subsystem 1 (resp. 2) sphere in the laboratory frame; the internal variables within each sphere are labeled by \mathbf{r}_1 and \mathbf{r}_2 . As soon as the fragmentation process is completed, the positions of each point-like particle as well as the fields are fixed, the polarization of each system depending on the field distribution and the particle position on its spherical surface. We will choose the initial correlation to correspond to the compound having zero polarization at least along an axis a (but see below). Assuming the total polarization is conserved, the fields and particle positions must be initially correlated such that $\varepsilon_a^1 + \varepsilon_a^2 = 0$. Regarding the particle positions we must set

$$\mathbf{r}_1 = -\mathbf{r}_2. \quad (11)$$

thus ensuring that for any direction the particles will lie in opposite hemispheres. Concerning the fields, different configurations can be envisaged. We will distinguish two type of fields: separable and non-separable fields.

A field $F(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)$ will be said to be *separable* if it can be factorized as $F(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = G^1(\mathbf{r}_1)H^2(\mathbf{r}_2)$, where G and H are single particle fields. In this case, the results obtained for

the single particle system can be directly transposed to the two-particle case. For example employing the notation introduced above, let

$$F_S(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = F_{\Sigma_{+a}^1}^1 F_{\Sigma_{-a}^2}^2. \quad (12)$$

If the polarization along a is measured, then the only non-vanishing probability is $P_S(\varepsilon_a^1 = +1, \varepsilon_a^2 = -1)$. This means that F_S defines the total polarization along the a axis ε_a to be zero, $\varepsilon_a = \varepsilon_a^1 + \varepsilon_a^2 = 0$, a consequence of the original correlation imposed at the source. Particle 1's (resp. 2) position changes when ε_a^1 (resp. ε_a^2) is measured due to the field-apparatus interaction, but it remains in the pre-measurement hemisphere, \mathbf{r}_1 on the surface Σ_{+a}^1 and \mathbf{r}_2 on Σ_{-a}^2 . For any other direction any of the joint outcomes ($\varepsilon_b^1 = \pm 1, \varepsilon_{b'}^2 = \pm 1$) can be obtained, with a corresponding probability factorizing into single particle probabilities of the type given by Eqs. (3)-(4); for example

$$P_S(\varepsilon_b^1 = 1, \varepsilon_{b'}^2 = 1) = \left| \left\langle F_{\Sigma_{[a+b]}^1}^1 \right\rangle_{\Sigma_{+b}} \right|^2 \left| \left\langle F_{\Sigma_{[-a+b']}^2}^2 \right\rangle_{\Sigma_{+b'}} \right|^2 \quad (13)$$

(we will not write explicitly the normalization factors in the rest of the paper). For each subsystem, the measurement result depends on whether the particle ends up in $\Sigma_{\pm b}^1$ or $\Sigma_{\pm b'}^2$ as a result of the field-apparatus interaction. Note that the field $F_{\bar{S}}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = F_{\Sigma_{-a}^1}^1 F_{\Sigma_{+a}^2}^2$ also conserves the polarization in the a direction with opposite signs relative to F_S . However, to achieve anti-correlations of the polarization in a more general fashion than is allowed by fields such as F_S or $F_{\bar{S}}$, one must work with non-separable fields.

A *non-separable* field F cannot be factorized. It can be obtained in particular by summing separable terms,

$$F(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \sum_{ij} \alpha_{ij} F_{\Sigma_i}^1(\mathbf{r}_1) F_{\Sigma_j}^2(\mathbf{r}_2), \quad (14)$$

where the α_{ij} are real coefficients. Since the arbitrary field (14) does not in general abide by the position correlation (11), we will restrict our discussion to a specific choice of non-separable field. As a guiding example we shall consider $F_{\aleph}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = (F_S - F_{\bar{S}})/\sqrt{2}$, reading

$$F_{\aleph}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (F_{\Sigma_{+a}^1}^1 F_{\Sigma_{-a}^2}^2 - F_{\Sigma_{-a}^1}^1 F_{\Sigma_{+a}^2}^2). \quad (15)$$

As seen above, the fields F_S and $F_{\bar{S}}$ are separable and imply the respective correlations $\varepsilon_a^1 = -\varepsilon_a^2 = \pm 1$, i.e. the vanishing of the total polarization along a . This property is conserved by F_{\aleph} since

$$P_{\aleph}(\varepsilon_a^1 = \pm 1, \varepsilon_a^2 = \mp 1) = \left| \langle F_{\aleph} \rangle_{\Sigma_{\pm a}^1 \Sigma_{\mp a}^2} \right|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \quad (16)$$

whereas $P_{\mathbb{N}}(\varepsilon_a^1 = \pm 1, \varepsilon_a^2 = \pm 1) = 0$. These probabilities reflect the correlations imposed by the field. This is what makes the non-separable field $F_{\mathbb{N}}$ different from a separable field defined separately on both hemispheres of each subsystem, such as $F_{\Sigma_a}^1 F_{\Sigma_b}^2$.

When the polarization is measured along the a axis both particles remain in the pre-measurement hemispheres, so that the two-particle probabilities can be interpreted in terms of conditional probabilities depending on the positions. For instance

$$P_{\mathbb{N}}(\varepsilon_a^1 = \pm 1, \varepsilon_a^2 = \pm 1) = P_{\mathbb{N}}(\varepsilon_a^1 = \pm 1)P_{\mathbb{N}}(\varepsilon_a^2 = \pm 1 | \varepsilon_a^1 = \pm 1) \quad (17)$$

where the last term denotes a conditional probability is translated as

$$P_{\mathbb{N}}(\varepsilon_a^1 = \pm 1, \varepsilon_a^2 = \pm 1) = P(\mathbf{r}_1 \in \Sigma_{\pm a}^1)P(\mathbf{r}_2 \in \Sigma_{\pm a}^2 | \mathbf{r}_1 \in \Sigma_{\pm a}^1) \quad (18)$$

However, according to Eq. (11), the conditional probability $P(\mathbf{r}_2 \in \Sigma_{\pm a}^2 | \mathbf{r}_1 \in \Sigma_{\pm a}^1)$ vanishes since the particles lie on opposite hemispheres by virtue of the initial conditions. On the other hand $P(\mathbf{r}_2 \in \Sigma_{\mp a}^2 | \mathbf{r}_1 \in \Sigma_{\pm a}^1) = 1$ by virtue of (11), and since $P(\mathbf{r}_1 \in \Sigma_{\pm a}^1) = 1/2$, Eq. (16) is recovered in terms of the particles' positions.

Let us now investigate measurements along arbitrary directions a' for particle 1 and b' for particle 2, and consider

$$P_{\mathbb{N}}(\varepsilon_{a'}^1 = 1, \varepsilon_{b'}^2 = 1) = \frac{1}{2} \left| \left\langle F_{\Sigma_{[a+a']}}^1 \right\rangle_{+a'} \left\langle F_{\Sigma_{[-a+b']}}^2 \right\rangle_{+b'} - \left\langle F_{\Sigma_{[-a+a']}}^1 \right\rangle_{+a'} \left\langle F_{\Sigma_{[a+b']}}^2 \right\rangle_{+b'} \right|^2. \quad (19)$$

This probability depends on the correlated local averages of the fields rotated by the local interaction of each field with the measurement apparatus along the axes a' and b' . It can be simplified by using the expressions employed for the single particle averages: we then see that the expression between $|\dots|$ reduces to $\cos(\frac{\theta_{b'} - \theta_{a'}}{2})$ and is independent of a . Therefore $P_{\mathbb{N}}$ does not depend on the direction a of the single-particle fields that define $F_{\mathbb{N}}$ in Eq. (15). This implies the *equivalence* between fields $F_{\Sigma_{+a}}^1 F_{\Sigma_{-a}}^2 - F_{\Sigma_{-a}}^1 F_{\Sigma_{+a}}^2$ defined by different directions a , i.e. for any $b \neq a$

$$F_{\Sigma_{+a}}^1 F_{\Sigma_{-a}}^2 - F_{\Sigma_{-a}}^1 F_{\Sigma_{+a}}^2 \sim F_{\Sigma_{+b}}^1 F_{\Sigma_{-b}}^2 - F_{\Sigma_{-b}}^1 F_{\Sigma_{+b}}^2. \quad (20)$$

Both of these fields lead exactly to the same predictions for measurements along arbitrary axes and can thus not be distinguished. Hence the notation $F_{\mathbb{N}}$ should be employed for the *equivalence class* of all the fields obeying (20), grounded on the rotational symmetry of the non-separable field.

One consequence is that when computing $P_{\mathbb{N}}(\varepsilon_a^1, \varepsilon_b^2)$ one can use any of the forms (20). For example consider

$$P_{\mathbb{N}}(\varepsilon_a^1 = +1, \varepsilon_b^2 = +1) = \frac{1}{2} \left| \left\langle F_{\Sigma_{+a}^1}^1 \right\rangle_{\Sigma_{+a}^1} \left\langle F_{\Sigma_{[-a+b]}^2} \right\rangle_{\Sigma_{+b}^2} \right|^2, \quad (21)$$

where we have used $F_{\mathbb{N}}$ as given by the left handside of Eq. (20). In terms of the particle positions, we can spell out this probability as

$$P_{\mathbb{N}}(\varepsilon_a^1 = +1, \varepsilon_b^2 = +1) = P(\mathbf{r}_1 \in \Sigma_{+a}^1) P(\varepsilon_b^2 = +1 | \mathbf{r}_1 \in \Sigma_{+a}^1) \quad (22)$$

$$= P(\mathbf{r}_1 \in \Sigma_{+a}^1) P(\varepsilon_b^2 = +1 | \mathbf{r}_2 \in \Sigma_{-a}^2) \quad (23)$$

$$= P(\mathbf{r}_1 \in \Sigma_{+a}^1) P_{\Sigma_{-a}^2}(\varepsilon_b^2 = +1). \quad (24)$$

A measurement along a keeps the position of particle 1 in the same hemisphere so the outcome $\varepsilon_a^1 = +1$ is univocally associated with $\mathbf{r}_1 \in \Sigma_{+a}^1$, which by the initial correlation (11) implies $\mathbf{r}_2 \in \Sigma_{-a}^2$. Knowing $\mathbf{r}_2 \in \Sigma_{-a}^2$ implies in turn that the field in Σ_{+a}^2 is inactive, a single-system property described below Eq. (10). The conditional probability hence becomes a *single system probability* involving the field $F_{\Sigma_{-a}^2}$. One may also choose the form given by the right hand-side of Eq. (20). Then

$$P_{\mathbb{N}}(\varepsilon_a^1 = +1, \varepsilon_b^2 = +1) = \frac{1}{2} \left| \left\langle F_{\Sigma_{[-b+a]}^1} \right\rangle_{\Sigma_{+a}^1} \left\langle F_{\Sigma_{+b}^2} \right\rangle_{\Sigma_{+b}^2} \right|^2 \quad (25)$$

and in terms of the particle positions

$$P_{\mathbb{N}}(\varepsilon_a^1 = +1, \varepsilon_b^2 = +1) = P(\mathbf{r}_2 \in \Sigma_{+b}^2) P(\varepsilon_a^1 = +1 | \mathbf{r}_1 \in \Sigma_{-b}^1) \quad (26)$$

$$= P(\mathbf{r}_2 \in \Sigma_{+b}^2) P_{\Sigma_{-b}^1}(\varepsilon_a^1 = +1). \quad (27)$$

In this case the interpretation is that a measurement along b does not modify the hemisphere in which particle 2 lies. The outcome $\varepsilon_b^2 = +1$ is a consequence of $\mathbf{r}_2 \in \Sigma_{+b}^2$, hence $\mathbf{r}_1 \in \Sigma_{-b}^1$ and the single particle probability $P_{\Sigma_{-b}^1}(\varepsilon_a^1 = +1)$ is obtained from the average of the rotated field $F_{\Sigma_{[-b+a]}^1}$. There are thus several accounts allowing to compute the probabilities, relying on the fact that the measured correlations can arise from different but strictly equivalent field configurations. These accounts *are not compatible*: Eq. (22) specifies that $\mathbf{r}_1 \in \Sigma_{+a}^1$ while assuming the field is given by the left handside of Eq. (20), whereas Eq. (26) indicates that $\mathbf{r}_1 \in \Sigma_{-b}^1$ when the field is given by the right handside of Eq. (20). But the field restricted to subsystem 1 cannot be given at the same time by the right *and* left handsides of Eq. (20).

Therefore concluding from Eqs. (22) and (26) that $\mathbf{r}_1 \in \Sigma_{+a}^1 \cap \Sigma_{-b}^1$ (and $\mathbf{r}_2 \in \Sigma_{-a}^2 \cap \Sigma_{+b}^2$) would be *incorrect*. Put differently the equivalence class defined by Eq. (20) holds relative to the two-particle system, but relative to a single subsystem the specific form taken for $F_{\mathbb{N}}$ – the local field – has different implications regarding the relation between the particle position and a given outcome: the particle position associated with an outcome depends on the unknown form taken by $F_{\mathbb{N}}$, but the probabilities do not. Note that the incompatibility of the accounts in terms of the particles is grounded on the non-commutativity of the field measurements (the conclusion $\mathbf{r}_1 \in \Sigma_{+a}^1 \cap \Sigma_{-b}^1$ could indeed hold for commuting observables).

The probabilities for events involving only one of the particles are obtained as usual by summing the marginals. For example for particle 1 measurements

$$P_{\mathbb{N}}(\varepsilon_a^1 = \pm 1) = \sum_{\varepsilon_b^2} P_{\mathbb{N}}(\varepsilon_a^1 = \pm 1, \varepsilon_b^2) = \frac{1}{2} |\langle F_{\Sigma_{\pm a}^1}^1 \rangle_{\Sigma_{\pm a}^1}|^2 = P(\mathbf{r}_1 \in \Sigma_{\pm a}^1) = \frac{1}{2} \quad (28)$$

which, as required, does not depend on the direction or the outcome of particle 2 measurements. The expectation value for two-particle measurements along the axes a and b for particles 1 and 2 respectively, given by

$$E_{\mathbb{N}}(a, b) = \sum_{\varepsilon_a^1 \varepsilon_b^2} \varepsilon_a^1 \varepsilon_b^2 P_{\mathbb{N}}(\varepsilon_a^1 \varepsilon_b^2) \quad (29)$$

is readily computed from the expressions analog to Eq. (21) or (25), yielding the result $E_{\mathbb{N}}(a, b) = -\cos(\theta_b - \theta_a)$. The probabilities $P_{\mathbb{N}}$ and the expectation value match those of the well-known quantum-mechanical correlations for two spin-1/2 entangled in the singlet state. Bell's inequality

$$|E_{\mathbb{N}}(a, b) - E_{\mathbb{N}}(a, b')| + |E_{\mathbb{N}}(a', b) + E_{\mathbb{N}}(a', b')| \leq 2 \quad (30)$$

is consequently violated, the maximal violation $2\sqrt{2}$ being obtained for angles $(a, b, a', b') = (0, \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{4})$.

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The present dual field-particle model reproduces the EPR correlations without involving non-locality (i.e. action at a distance): a measurement carried out on one of the field-particle system does not modify the field or the particle position of the other system. The fact that

the field is non-separable does not involve nor imply non-locality: non-separability is the only way to account for correlations between fields in more than one region originating from the fragmentation of a compound system. The field configuration, as well as the particle positions, are set at the source so that the polarizations are anticorrelated along any direction. They are modified *locally* by the measurement process. An interpretation of the outcomes in terms of the particles' positions is possible by introducing a conditional probability provided a specific representation of the non-separable field is adopted, this choice hinging on the existence of an equivalence class of fields all leading to the same predictions. Above, we have introduced $F_{\mathbb{R}}$ as physically realized by one of the *unknown* equivalent forms; but one might rather prefer to see these forms as different representations of a unique physical field defined as the equivalence class itself.

Several differences between our model and Bell-type LHV models deserve to be pointed out. First, note that the probabilities are obtained from average field intensities, not from elementary probabilities averaged over HV distributions $\rho(\lambda)$. It is known that in general classical fields do not have to obey Bell-type inequalities [8]. Here, the fields (i) are not necessarily positive valued, (ii) can interfere, and (iii) define equivalence classes. Field measurements are *non-commutative*, whereas LHV models assume factorizable elementary probabilities $p(\varepsilon_a^1, \varepsilon_b^2, \lambda) = p(\varepsilon_a^1, \lambda)p(\varepsilon_b^2, \lambda)$, leading to the existence of global joint probabilities³ (e.g. $P_{\mathbb{R}}(\varepsilon_a^1, \varepsilon_{a'}^1, \varepsilon_b^2, \varepsilon_{b'}^2)$) that in quantum mechanics can only be defined for *commuting* operators [5]. If the hemispherical fields in the expression $F_{\Sigma+a}^1 F_{\Sigma-a}^2 - F_{\Sigma-a}^1 F_{\Sigma+a}^2$ were replaced by probability distributions for the particle, then the equivalence (20) would not hold and the conditional probabilities appearing in Eqs. (22) or (26) would imply that one of the particle's distribution depends on the outcome obtained on the other [9, 10]. Introducing a field allows to contextualize the particles's behaviour while keeping the physical predictions invariant. A description in terms of known particle positions is possible for both observers measuring ε_a^1 and ε_b^2 at space-like separated stations provided each of them takes for the field the form in Eq. (20) inducing no measurement disturbance for his/her subsystem; alternatively, Eq. (19) gives the probability without allowing to infer a particle position. We see that the particles' positions are pre-determined, and can play the role of hidden-

³ The existence of joint probability functions $P(\varepsilon_a^1, \varepsilon_{a'}^1, \varepsilon_b^2, \varepsilon_{b'}^2)$ is sufficient to enforce the Bell inequality (30) without even assuming the existence of hidden variables.

variables, but they do not ascribe probabilities by themselves. The field configurations can also be taken as hidden variables and they do ascribe probabilities but only as members of an equivalence class that does not give a more complete specification than afforded by the quantum-mechanical state.

These last remarks lead us back to the original EPR argument. The model developed in this paper allows to give the following answer to their dilemma. To predict an outcome with certainty (EPR’s criterion of reality), we have seen that for a single particle system it is necessary to know the direction of the hemispherical field covering the particle’s position. In the two particle system, this is tantamount to knowing the exact form of $F_{\mathbb{N}}$ (i.e. the no-interaction axis, say a): then measuring ε_a^1 allows to infer on which hemisphere $\Sigma_{\pm a}$ lies \mathbf{r}_1 , and given the initial correlation one knows then that $\mathbf{r}_2 \in \Sigma_{\mp a}$ with certainty. But in practice the exact form of $F_{\mathbb{N}}$ *is not known*: then the sole knowledge of ε_a^1 after its measurement does not create an unambiguous “element of reality” for subsystem 2, because it does not allow to infer the hemispherical position of particle 2 previous to measuring ε_b^2 (each form of $F_{\mathbb{N}}$ giving rise to a different situation within each subsystem). Would the exact form of $F_{\mathbb{N}}$ known to be along a , then measuring ε_b^2 would modify subsystem 2’s field and particle position, without affecting in any way subsystem 1 and independently of any measurements carried out on it. We therefore conclude that for non-commuting observables, it is incorrect to infer a unique “element of reality” from the existence of correlations with unit probability. At least one of the observers (but most probably both of them) would then be taking an epistemological inference for a real property of Nature [6].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank Peter Morgan (Yale) for fruitful exchanges on random fields in the context of Bell’s theorem.

[1] Einstein A, Podolsky B and Rosen N 1935 Phys. Rev. 47 777

[2] Bell J S 1964, Physics 1 195

[3] Clauser J F and Shimony A 1978 Rep. Prog. Phys. 41 1881

- [4] Bell J S 1971 in B. d'Espagnat (Ed.) *Foundations of quantum mechanics*, Academic Press, New York, p. 171
- [5] Fine A 1982 J. Math. Phys. 23 1306
- [6] Jaynes E T 1989, in J. Skilling (Ed.), *Maximum-Entropy and Bayesian Methods*, Kluwer, Dordrecht p. 1
- [7] Khrennikov A 2007, AIP Conf. Proc. Vol. 962 121
- [8] Morgan P 2006 J. Phys. A 39 7441
- [9] Matzkin A 2008 J. Phys. A 41 085303
- [10] Matzkin A 2008 Phys. Rev. A 77 062110