

George Boole and the Bell inequalities

Elemér E Rosinger

*Department of Mathematics
and Applied Mathematics
University of Pretoria
Pretoria
0002 South Africa
eerosinger@hotmail.com*

Abstract

As shown by Pitowsky, the Bell inequalities are related to certain classes of probabilistic inequalities dealt with by George Boole, back in the 1850s. Here a short presentation of this relationship is given. Consequently, the Bell inequalities can be obtained *without* any assumptions of physical nature, and merely through mathematical argument.

0. Preliminary remarks

The importance of the typically quantum phenomenon of *entanglement* is well known. This issue of entanglement has been, and still is of special focus in Quantum Mechanics, not least due to its intimate connection to such fundamental disputes as *locality* versus *nonlocality*, and the related literature is indeed vast. It is also of major importance in the fast emerging theory of Quantum Computation.

The first time an entanglement based argument was used in a critically important manner in Quantum Theory was in the celebrated EPR paper.

Nearly three decades after the EPR paper had appeared in 1935, John Bell published in 1964 what amounted to a surprising *conflict* between

predictions of a classical world view based on the principle of locality, and on the other hand, those of Quantum Mechanics. The classical world view based on locality led J Bell to certain inequalities which, however, proved to be *contradicted* by Quantum Mechanics, namely, by certain properties of suitably chosen entangled EPR pairs. And this contradiction could be observed in effective quantum mechanical experiments, such as conducted for instance in 1982 by A Aspect et.al., see Maudlin.

Here it should be mentioned again that, as often in science, the related terminology which entered the common use tends to misplace the focus. Indeed, the main point in J Bell's contribution is not about inequalities, but about the fact that they lead to the mentioned contradiction. Furthermore, there are by now a number of other similar arguments which all lead to such contradictions with Quantum Mechanics.

Needless to say, it is well known that ever since its very inception in the 1920s, Quantum Mechanics has been witnessing an ongoing foundational controversy related to its interpretation, some of the earlier major stages of this controversy being those between N Bohr and A Einstein. However, as not seldom in such human situations, a certain saturation, stationarity and loss of interest may set in after some longer period of time has failed to clarify enough the issues involved.

The surprising result of J Bell happened to appear after most of the founding fathers of Quantum Mechanics had left the scene, and proved to inaugurate a fresh line of controversies, see Bell, Cushing & McMullin, Maudlin.

Here, an attempt is presented to recall in short the essential aspects of J Bell's result. Clearly, at least to the extent that this result is essentially connected to the typically quantum phenomenon of entanglement, it may be expected to be relevant for a better understanding, and thus further development of both Quantum Theory and Quantum Computation.

Also, a relatively less well know aspect of Bell type inequalities is pre-

sented here, namely that, these inequalities are among a larger class of *purely probabilistic* inequalities, a class whose study was started by George Boole, with the first results published in the appendix of his book "The Laws of Thought", back in 1854. This purely mathematical study of the respective inequalities was later further extended in the work of a number of mathematicians and probabilists, see details in Pitowsky.

Needless to say, this fact does in no way detract from the importance and merit of J Bell's result. Indeed, unlike J Bell, it is obvious that G Boole and his mentioned followers, including certain probabilists in more recent times, did not consider the quantum mechanical implications of such inequalities. In this way, the importance and merit of J Bell's result is to single out for the first time certain rather simple inequalities which are supposed to be universally valid, provided that a classical setup and locality are assumed, and then show that the respective inequalities do to a quite significant extent conflict with Quantum Mechanics, involving in this process such important issues as entanglement and locality versus nonlocality.

There is a special interest in pointing out the fact that the Bell type inequalities can be established by a *purely mathematical argument*, as was done, for instance, by the followers of G Boole. In this regard it is important to note that both in the work of J Bell, as well as in the subsequent one of many of the physicists who dealt with this issue, the true nature of such inequalities is often quite obscured by a complicated mix of physical and mathematical argument. Such an approach, however, is unnecessary, and can of course create confusions about the genuine meaning, scope and implications of J Bell's result.

The fact however is that regardless of the considerable generality of the framework underlying such inequalities, and thus of the corresponding minimal conditions required on locality, one can nevertheless obtain the respective inequalities through purely mathematical argument, and *without* any physical considerations involved, yet they turn out even to be testable *empirically*. And in a surprising manner, they fail tests which are of a quantum mechanical nature. And this failure is both on theoretical and empirical level. In other words, the Bell in-

equalities contradict theoretical consequences of Quantum Mechanics, and on top of that, they are also proven wrong in quantum mechanical experiments such as those conducted by Aspect et.al.

The impact of Bell's inequalities is only increased by the fact that they require such *minimal* conditions, yet they deliver a clear cut and unavoidable *conflict* with Quantum Mechanics.

Let us also note the following. J Bell, when obtained his inequalities, he was concerned with the issue of the possibility, or otherwise, of the so called *deterministic, hidden variable* theories for Quantum Mechanics. This issue arose from the basic controversy in the interpretation of Quantum Mechanics, and aimed to eliminate the probabilistic aspects involved typically in the outcome of measurements. One way in this regard was to consider Quantum Mechanics *incomplete*, and then add to it the so called hidden variables, thus making the theory deterministic by being able a priori to specify precisely the measurement results.

By the way, the very title of the EPR paper was raising the question whether Quantum Mechanics was indeed complete, and suggested the experiment with entangled quantum states in order to justify that questioning.

Regarding the term hidden variables, once again we are faced with a less than proper terminology. Indeed, as it is clear from the context in which this term has always been used, one is rather talking about *missing variables*, or perhaps variables which have been missed, overlooked or disregarded, when the theory of Quantum Mechanics was set up. Details in this regard can be found in Holland, where an account of the de Broglie-Bohm causal approach to Quantum Mechanics is presented.

In view of this historical background, the effect of Bell's inequalities is often *wrongly* interpreted as proving that a deterministic hidden variable theory which is subjected to the principle of locality is not possible.

However, it is important to note that such a view of Bell's inequalities

is *not* correct. Indeed, by giving up determinism, or the hidden variables, one still remains with Bell's inequalities, since these inequalities *only* assume a classical framework in which the locality principle holds.

1. Boole Type Inequalities

In his mentioned book G Boole was concerned among others with conditions on all possible experience or experimentation, this being the factual background to logic and the laws of thought. Needless to say, G Boole assumed automatically a classical and non-quantum context which was further subjected to the principle of locality.

Here we shall limit ourselves to a short presentation of some of the relevant aspects. Let therefore A_1, \dots, A_n be arbitrary $n \geq 2$ events, and for $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq n$, let p_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k} be the probability of the simultaneous event $A_{i_1} \cap A_{i_2} \cap \dots \cap A_{i_k}$.

One of the questions G Boole asked was as follows. Suppose that the only information we have are the probabilities p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n of the respective individual events A_1, \dots, A_n . What are under these conditions on information the best possible estimates for the probabilities of $A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_n$ and $A_1 \cap A_2 \cap \dots \cap A_n$?

G Boole gave the following answers which indeed are correct

$$(1.1) \quad \max \{ p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n \} \leq P(A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_n) \leq \min \{ 1, p_1 + p_2 + \dots + p_n \}$$

$$(1.2) \quad \max \{ 0, p_1 + p_2 + \dots + p_n - n + 1 \} \leq P(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap \dots \cap A_n) \leq \min \{ p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n \}$$

And these are the best possible inequalities in general, since for suitable particular cases equality can hold in each of the four places.

A rather general related result is the so called *inclusion-exclusion principle* of Henri Poincaré

$$\begin{aligned}
(1.3) \quad P(A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_n) &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} p_i - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} p_{ij} + \\
&+ \sum_{1 \leq i < j < k \leq n} p_{ijk} + \dots + (-1)^{n+1} p_{12 \dots n}
\end{aligned}$$

This however requires the knowledge of the probabilities of all the simultaneous events $A_{i_1} \cap A_{i_2} \cap \dots \cap A_{i_k}$, with $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq n$.

A question with less demanding data, yet with more of them than required in (1.1) and (1.2), is the following. Suppose we know the probabilities p_i of the events A_i , with $1 \leq i \leq n$, as well as the probabilities p_{ij} of the simultaneous events $A_i \cap A_j$, with $1 \leq i < j \leq n$.

What is then the best possible estimate for the probability of $A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_n$?

Unfortunately, this question is computationally intractable, Pitowsky. However, C E Bonferroni gave some answers in 1936, one of which is that

$$(1.4) \quad \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} p_i - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} p_{ij} \leq P(A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_n)$$

and here it is interesting to note that (1.4) generates easily $2^n - 1$ other independent inequalities by the following procedure. We take any $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq n$, and replace in (1.4) the events A_{i_l} , for $1 \leq l \leq k$, with their complementary sets.

Now the important fact to note is that Bell's inequalities result from (1.4) in this way, in the case of $n = 3$.

It follows therefore that Bell's inequalities are of a purely mathematical nature, and as such, only depend on classical probability theory.

By the way, Boole's inequalities and its further developments have been presented in well known monographs of mathematics and probability theory, some of them as recently as in 1970, and related research has continued in mathematics and in probability theory till the present day, Pitowsky. As so often however, due to extreme specialization and the corresponding narrowing of interest, such results seem not to be

familiar among quantum physicists. In this regard it may be worth mentioning that Pitowsky himself is a philosopher of science.

2. The Bell Effect

There are by now known a variety of ways which describe the phenomenon brought to light for the first time by Bell's inequalities. In order to avoid complicating the issues involved, we shall present here one of the most simple such ways, Maudlin.

This phenomenon, which one can call the *Bell effect* is a *contradiction* resulting between Quantum Mechanics, and on the other hand, what can be done in a classical setup which satisfies the principle of locality. The Bell inequalities are only one of the ways, and historically the first, which led to such a contradiction. They will be presented in section 4. What is given here is a simple and direct argument leading to the mentioned kind of contradiction.

Certain *entangled* quantum particles can exhibit the following behaviour. After they become spatially separated, they each can be subjected to three different experiments, say, A, B and C, and each of them can produce one and only one of two results, which for convenience we shall denote by R and S, respectively.

What is so uniquely specific to these entangled quantum particles is the behaviour described in the next three conditions which such particles do satisfy.

Condition 1. When both particles are subjected to the same experiment, they give the same result.

Condition 2. When one of the particles is subjected to A and the other to B, or one is subjected to B and the other to C, they will in a large number of experiments give the same result with a frequency of $3/4$.

Condition 3. When one of the particles is subjected to A and the other to C, then in a large number of experiments they will give the same result with a frequency $1/4$.

Now, the surprising fact is that *no* experiment in a classical setup in which the principle of locality holds can come anywhere near to such a behaviour.

And strangely enough, that includes as well the case when two conscious participants, and not merely two physical entities would be involved. In such a case, when conscious participants are present, we shall see the experiments A, B and C as questions put to the two participants, while the results R and S will be seen as their respective answers.

Such are indeed the wonders of *entanglement* and of certain EPR pairs that some of their performances, like for instance those which satisfy conditions 1, 2 and 3 above, *cannot* be reproduced in a classical context which obeys the locality principle, even if attempted by two conscious participants.

Indeed, a simple analysis shows that the best two such conscious participants can do is to decide to give the same answers, when asked the same questions. This means that any possible *strategy* of the two participants has to be *joint* or identical, and as such, it is given by a function

$$f : \{ A, B, C \} \longmapsto \{ R, S \}$$

Clearly, there are 8 such joint strategies, namely

| | <i>A</i> | <i>B</i> | <i>C</i> |
|---|----------|----------|----------|
| 1 | <i>R</i> | <i>R</i> | <i>R</i> |
| 2 | <i>R</i> | <i>R</i> | <i>S</i> |
| 3 | <i>R</i> | <i>S</i> | <i>R</i> |
| 4 | <i>R</i> | <i>S</i> | <i>S</i> |
| 5 | <i>S</i> | <i>R</i> | <i>R</i> |
| 6 | <i>S</i> | <i>R</i> | <i>S</i> |
| 7 | <i>S</i> | <i>S</i> | <i>R</i> |
| 8 | <i>S</i> | <i>S</i> | <i>S</i> |

(2.1)

Now it is obvious that by choosing only these 8 joint strategies, condition 1 above will be satisfied.

From the point of view of satisfying conditions 2 and 3 above, the strategy pairs (1, 8), (4, 5), (3, 6) and (2, 7) are equivalent. Therefore, we only remain with four distinct strategies to consider, namely

| | <i>A</i> | <i>B</i> | <i>C</i> | |
|-------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| (2.2) | 1 | <i>R</i> | <i>R</i> | <i>R</i> |
| | 2 | <i>R</i> | <i>R</i> | <i>S</i> |
| | 3 | <i>R</i> | <i>S</i> | <i>R</i> |
| | 4 | <i>R</i> | <i>S</i> | <i>S</i> |

At this point the two participants can further improve on their attempt to satisfy conditions 2 and 3 above by randomizing their joint strategies. For that purpose, they can choose four real numbers $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in \mathbf{R}$, such that

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta &\geq 0 \\ \alpha + \beta + \gamma + \delta &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

and use their joint strategies 1, 2, 3 and 4 with the respective frequencies $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$. A simple computation will show that conditions 2 and 3 above will further impose on $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ the relations

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \gamma + \delta &= 1/4 \\ \beta + \gamma &= 1/4 \\ \beta + \delta &= 3/4 \end{aligned}$$

However, (2.3) and (2.4) yield

$$(2.5) \quad \gamma = -1/8$$

thus a *contradiction*.

Here it is important to note that the *locality* principle was assumed in (2.1) - (2.5). In other words, each of the two participants could be asked questions, without the question asked from one of them having any effect on the answer of the other. Indeed, the two participants could be asked different questions, and each of them would only reply according to the question asked, and according to their joint strategy, which they happened to use at the moment.

The fact that the setup in (2.1) - (2.5) is *classical*, that is, it is not specifically quantum mechanical, is obvious.

3. Bell's Inequalities

For convenience we shall consider two entangled quantum particles which are in a situation even simpler than in section 3, Cushing & McMullin. Namely, each of the particles can only be subjected to two different experiments, and as before, each such experiment can only give one of two results.

In view of the specific quantum mechanical setup considered, the experiments to which the two particles are subjected can be identified with certain angles in $[0, 2\pi]$ which define the directions along which quantum spins are measured. As far as the results obtained, they can be identified with quantum spins, and as such will be denoted by $+$ and $-$, respectively. Finally, when the same experiment is performed on both particles, it is assumed that due to their entanglement and momentum conservation, the results are always different, that is, one result is $+$, while the other is $-$.

Locality, as before, will mean that, when far removed in space from one another, each particle can be subjected to any experiment independently, and the result does not depend on what happens with the other particle.

Having done a large number of experiments on such two particles, let us denote by

$$(3.1) \quad p_{1,2}(\alpha_i, \beta_j \mid x, y)$$

the probability that experiment $\alpha_i \in [0, 2\pi]$, with $i \in \{ 1, 2 \}$, on particle 1 yields the result $x \in \{ +, - \}$, and at the same time experiment $\beta_j \in [0, 2\pi]$, with $j \in \{ 1, 2 \}$, on particle 2 yields the result $y \in \{ +, - \}$.

Similarly we denote by

$$(3.2) \quad p_1 (\alpha_i | x), \quad p_2 (\beta_j | y)$$

the respective probabilities that experiment $\alpha_i \in [0, 2\pi]$, with $i \in \{ 1, 2 \}$, on particle 1 yields the result $x \in \{ +, - \}$, and that experiment $\beta_j \in [0, 2\pi]$, with $j \in \{ 1, 2 \}$, on particle 2 yields the result $y \in \{ +, - \}$.

Now based alone on the assumption of locality, one obtains *Bell's inequality*

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} -1 \leq & p_{1,2} (\alpha_1, \beta_1 | +, +) + p_{1,2} (\alpha_1, \beta_2 | +, +) + \\ & + p_{1,2} (\alpha_2, \beta_2 | +, +) - p_{1,2} (\alpha_2, \beta_1 | +, +) - \\ & - p_1 (\alpha_1 | +) - p_2 (\beta_2 | +) \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, by changing the indices of the angles and the spin values, one can obtain further variations of this inequality.

What suitable quantum mechanical experiments can give are very good approximations of the relations

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} p_{1,2} (\alpha, \beta | +, +) &= p_{1,2} (\alpha, \beta | -, -) = (1/2) \sin^2(\alpha - \beta)/2 \\ p_{1,2} (\alpha, \beta | +, -) &= p_{1,2} (\alpha, \beta | -, +) = (1/2) \cos^2(\alpha - \beta)/2 \\ p_1 (\alpha | +) &= p_2 (\beta | -) = 1/2 \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha, \beta \in [0, \pi]$.

Now let us return to the Bell inequality in (3.3) and take following angles for the experiments

$$(3.5) \quad \alpha_1 = \pi/3, \quad \alpha_2 = \pi, \quad \beta_1 = 0, \quad \beta_2 = 2\pi/3$$

in which case we obtain the *contradiction*

$$(3.6) \quad -1/8 \geq 0$$

As shown in Pitowsky, the Bell inequality in (3.3), as well as its mentioned variants follow from the Bonferroni inequalities in (3).

Let us conclude the issue of Bell's inequalities, and more importantly, of the Bell Effect, by noting that the resulting contradictions show the existence of relevant physics *beyond* any classical framework which obeys the principle of locality.

And the quantum mechanical experiments which, together with Bell's inequalities, deliver the above contradictions are therefore part of such a physics, even if Quantum Mechanics as a theory is still quite far from having at last settled its foundational controversies.

As far as *entangled* quantum particles, or in general, systems are concerned, they are some of the simplest quantum phenomena to lead to the Bell Effect, and thus beyond the classical and local framework. This is therefore one of the reasons why they can offer possibilities in quantum computation which cannot be reached anywhere near by usual electronic digital computers, which obviously belong to realms of physics that are classical and subjected to the locality principle.

4. Locality versus Nonlocality

The original EPR paper, then the de Broglie-Bohm causal interpretation, as well as Bell's inequalities have focused a considerable attention on the issue of locality versus nonlocality. And in view of what appear to be obvious reasons, there is a rather unanimous and strong dislike of nonlocality among physicists. A typical instance of such a position is illustrated by the next citation from a letter of A Einstein to Max Born, see Maudlin, or Born :

... If one asks what, irrespective of quantum mechanics, is characteristic of the world of ideas of physics, one is first of all struck by the following : the concepts of physics relate to a real outside world, that is, ideas are established relating to things such as bodies, fields, etc., which claim "real existence" that is independent of the perceiving subject - ideas which, on the other hand, have been brought into as secure a relationship as possible with the sense-data. It is further characteristic of these physical objects that they are thought of as arranged in a space-time continuum. An essential aspect of this arrangement of things in physics is that they lay claim, at a certain time, to an existence independent of one another, provided these objects "are situated in different parts of space". Unless one makes this kind of assumptions about the independence of the existence (the "being-thus") of objects which are far apart from one another in space - which stems in the first place from everyday thinking - physical thinking in the familiar sense would not be possible. It is also hard to see any way of formulating and testing the laws of physics unless one makes a clear distinction of this kind. This principle has been carried to extremes in the field theory by localizing the elementary objects on which it is based and which exist independently of each other, as well as the elementary laws which have been postulated for it, in the infinitely small (four dimensional) elements of space.

The following idea characterizes the relative independence of objects far apart in space (A and B) : external influence on A has no direct influence on B; this is known as the "principle of contiguity", which is used consistently in the field theory. If this axiom were to be completely abolished, the idea of laws which can be checked empirically in the accepted sense, would become impossible...

However, as often happens in the case of strongly felt dislikes, the reactions involved may prove to be exaggerated. And in the case of nonlocality this seems to happen.

Indeed, certain milder, fast diminishing forms of nonlocality have been

around in physics, and some of them, like the gravitational effect of a mass, were introduced by no lesser contributors than Isaac Newton. Of course, the gravitational effect of a given mass, although it decreases fast, namely, with the square of the distance, it is nevertheless not supposed to vanish completely anywhere. A similar thing is supposed to happen with the electric charge, according to Culomb's law.

On the other hand, certain nonlocality effects in the case of entangled quantum particles are *not* supposed to diminish at all with the distance separating the particles.

What seems to happen, however, is that there is a significant reluctance to admit even one single, and no matter how narrow and well circumscribed instance of a *nondiminishing nonlocality*. Such a reluctance appears to be based on the perception that the acceptance of even one single such nondiminishing nonlocality would instantly bring with it the collapse of nearly all of the theoretical body of physics.

In other words, it is considered that physical theory, as it stands, is *critically unstable* with respect to the incorporation of even one single nondiminishing nonlocality.

Clearly, if indeed such may be the case, then that should rather be thoroughly investigated, instead of being merely left to perceptions as part of an attitude which, even if by default, treats it as a taboo.

After all, a somewhat similar phenomenon was still going on less than four centuries ago, when the idea of Galileo that our planet Earth is moving was felt to be an instant and mortal threat to the whole edifice of established theology.

References

Auletta G : Foundations and Interpretations of Quantum Mechanics, In the Light of a Critical Historical Analysis of the Problems and of a Synthesis of the Results. World Scientific, 2000

Bell J S : Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993

Cushing J T, McMullin E (Eds.) : Philosophical Consequences of Quantum Theory, Reflections on Bell's Theorem. Univ. Notre Dame Press, 1989

d'Espagnat B : Conceptual Foundations of Quantum Mechanics. Benjamin, 1976

de Muynck W M : Foundations of Quantum Mechanics, an Empiricist Approach. Kluwer, Dordrecht, 2002

Einstein A, Podolsky B, Rosen N : Can quantum mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete ? Physical Review, 47 (1935), 777-780

Holland P R : The Quantum Theory of Motion, an Account of the de Broglie-Bohm Causal Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993

Isham C J : Lectures on Quantum Theory, Mathematical and Structural Foundations. Imperial College press, 1995

Maudlin T : Quantum Non-Locality and Relativity, Metaphysical Intimations of Modern Physics. Blackwell, Oxford, 2002

Pitowsky I : From George Boole to John Bell - the origins of Bell's inequalities. In Kafatos M (Ed.) Bell's Theorem, Quantum Theory and Conceptions of the Universe. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1989, pp. 37-49

Rosinger E E : Basics of Quantum Computation (to appear)

Ruskai M B : Confusion about Bohm. The Mathematical Intelligencer, vol. 23, no. 4, fall 2001, 23-27

Sudbery A : Quantum Mechanics and the Particles of Nature,
An Outline for Mathematicians. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1986