

Bell's theorem in the presence of classical communication

N. David Mermin

Laboratory of Atomic and Solid State Physics

Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853-2501

I explain what kinds of correlation or even direct classical communication between detectors invalidate Bell's theorem, and what kinds do not.

The immediate occasion for this note is the rejection by Karl Hess and Walter Philipp [1] of my simple demonstration [2] that their refutation [3] of an elementary version of Bell's theorem [4] cannot be correct. Rather than belabor misconceptions¹ in [3], I prefer to examine a question of more general interest. Let us turn Hess and Philipp upside down and explore the extent to which Bell's theorem *survives*, not only if, following Hess and Philipp, we take advantage of properties of the detectors correlated by the time on local synchronized clocks, but even if we allow further correlation of the detectors through direct straightforward ongoing classical communication between them. How much censorship must be imposed on the content of that communication for Bell's theorem to remain valid?

The answer, which will surprise few who have thought much about Bell's theorem, is that the theorem remains valid even if the detectors are allowed to communicate with each other continuously throughout a long series of runs, provided only that each detector is forbidden during the course of each run from giving the other any information whatever about the setting it has randomly been given in that run. Aside from that single necessary² constraint the detectors can conspire in each run in any way they like.³

To make things clear and simple I examine the question for the particular geometry used in [2] and [4], but the argument can easily be generalized. In each of a long series of

¹ Among other problems, their rejection of [2] relies on a misunderstanding of what I mean by "extended instruction sets".

² If information on the settings of the detectors can be communicated before the detectors signal a result then the quantum mechanical data (or any other data) can be trivially simulated classically.

³ Clearly detector responses that are driven by non-communicating but internal computer programs, correlated only by synchronized clocks, satisfy this constraint, so the proof below that Bell's theorem survives such coordination of the detectors provides an alternative demonstration to that in [2] that Hess and Philipp are mistaken.

runs one of three settings — labeled 1, 2, or 3 — is randomly and independently assigned to each of the two detectors. It is useful to introduce the term “wing” to refer jointly to a particle and the detector that it eventually arrives at.⁴ The choice of setting for each wing is unknown to the other wing, and the only constraint on the communication between wings is that each is forbidden to reveal the value of its setting to the other.⁵ Once the settings have been randomly, independently, and secretly established for both wings and the wings have had any further communications they wish — always under the prohibition against revealing their settings — a light flashes red (R) or green (G) in each wing and the run ends. The accumulated data in many runs have two important features: (i) the lights flash the same colors whenever the settings are the same; (ii) when the data are examined without regard to the settings they are found to be quite random — in particular the same colors flash as often as different colors.⁶

Can we construct a classical explanation for this data that respects the fact that neither wing has any information about the setting in the other wing when the lights flash? The first feature of the data to account for is (i), that the lights invariably flash the same colors when the settings are the same. With classical communication there is no problem arranging for this without violating the prohibition on revealing the settings. In every run, after each wing has taken into account whatever conditions it might deem relevant, the two wings agree on what color they will both flash for *each* of the three possible settings. The communication leading to such agreement passes the censor because it reveals no information whatever about the actual setting in each wing. The wings must negotiate such an agreement in every run, whether or not the actual settings are the same, because they do not know whether or not the settings are the same but do know that there is a $33\frac{1}{3}\%$ chance that they are.

But this essentially unique classical explanation of feature (i) of the data cannot accomodate feature (ii), because it requires each run of the experiment to be one of eight

⁴ “Wings” in the sense of wings of a mansion: east wing, west wing, etc. I borrow the term from philosophers, who like to talk about the “wings of the experiment”.

⁵ We can also allow the particles to communicate with each other (or with either detector) even after they have left the source, provided, as with the detectors, we forbid each particle from revealing to the other wing any information it has discovered about the setting of its own detector.

⁶ Such data are produced by two spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ particles in the singlet state, when the detectors are Stern-Gerlach magnets, the three settings are associated with measuring the spin along a particular set of three coplanar directions 120° apart, and R and G signal spin-up and spin-down at one detector, while signalling spin-down and spin-up at the other.

types:⁷ those in which the agreed-upon colors to be flashed in either wing for settings 1, 2, or 3 are RRG, RGR, GRR, GGR, GRG, RGG, RRR, or GGG. The first six of these types each result in the same colors flashing 5/9 of the time.⁸ The last two types result in the same colors always flashing. Therefore, no matter what colors are agreed upon in each run, when all the data from all the runs are examined without regard to what the actual settings were, the same colors will be found to flash at least 5/9 of the time (Bell's inequality). This contradicts feature (ii) of the data, that the same colors flash only half the time. So no such classical explanation is possible (Bell's theorem).

This proof of Bell's theorem allows arbitrary communication between the two wings, provided no information is revealed about the settings. The proof clearly allows variations in time of the conditions of the detectors or the particles or both (independently), which can be correlated either by synchronized clocks (as in the model of Hess and Philipp) or (in the more general case considered here) by direct classical communication between the wings. The proof allows complex information to be available in either wing, carried by either the particles or the detectors or both. The correlations allowed between the wings clearly include and go well beyond the correlations envisaged by Hess and Philipp. But Bell's theorem continues to hold.

Acknowledgment. Supported by the National Science Foundation, Grant No. PHY0098429.

References

- [1] Karl Hess and Walter Philipp, quant-ph/0207110.
- [2] N. David Mermin, quant-ph/0206118.
- [3] Karl Hess and Walter Philipp, quant-ph/0103028, Section 3.2.
- [4] N. David Mermin, *Physics Today* **38**, April 1985, p. 38.

⁷ In earlier forms of Bell's theorem the possibilities for coordinating behavior between the two wings are much more constrained than they are here. But even when the two wings cannot directly talk to each other, they can still characterize each run as one of these eight types and act accordingly, which is essential for any classical explanation of feature (i), by exploiting common information acquired by the particles before they leave their common source. Hess and Philipp additionally emphasize the possibility of using information available only at the detectors.

⁸ An RRG run, for example produces the same colors for settings 11, 22, 33, 12, and 21, while it produces different colors for settings 13, 23, 31, and 32; and the nine possibilities are equally likely.