

Causal Boundaries of Bell's Inequality

Point Ontology, Field Ontology, and the Assumptions That Separate Them

Gerd Graßhoff 
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Deutsches Museum
gerd.grasshoff@hu-berlin.de

ABSTRACT

Bell's inequality plays the role of an empirical foundation: experiments show it is violated, so at least one assumption used to derive it must be false. The force of this *reductio ad absurdum* depends on two things — the deductive validity of every step of the derivation, and the explicitness of every assumption. Graßhoff, Portmann, and Wüthrich (2005, GPW) derive a Bell-type inequality from nine explicit assumptions, replacing the single common hidden variable of earlier derivations with Reichenbach's weaker Principle of Common Cause applied to a separate common cause for each correlation. Laidlaw (2026) argues, from another direction, that Bell's local causality is not implied by local action: in a field ontology, strictly local field-field interactions can violate factorizability. We read Laidlaw's toy model through GPW's formal structure. Its first-measured wing satisfies the locality assumptions LOC2 and LOC3, but its later-measured wing does not, because the remote setting enters the later outcome through the entanglement bond. This is the familiar failure of parameter independence in Bohm-type models; what differs is the reading. Here the dependence is carried by local interactions between distributed fields, not by a signal between points. The derivation of the minimal theories is therefore blocked for that wing. Since a failed proof route is not a proof of non-derivability, we state the claim as a proposition with an explicit countermodel condition, and separate what is logically shown from what Laidlaw's model must still satisfy. The paper then fixes the empirical frontier from the primary sources and proposes tests of Laidlaw's range-dependent decoherence prediction that survive correlated noise: a time-shift law for Bell-state coherence, a delay matrix that separates light-travel lag from fibre delay, and a dephasing sum rule that is independent of the spatial correlation of the noise.

KEYWORDS Bells inequality · local causality · common cause · field ontology · minimal theories · distributed interaction

Table of contents

1 Introduction: Bell's Inequality as an Empirical Foundation	2
2 The GPW Minimal Derivation	3
2.1 The experimental setup	3
2.2 The nine assumptions	4
2.3 The derivation: from common causes to the inequality	6
3 Laidlaw's Argument	8
3.1 Local causality and what Laidlaw adds	8
3.2 Fields and the two types of interaction	8
3.3 The toy model: EPR correlations from local interactions	9
3.4 The falsifiable prediction	10
4 Auditing GPW's Assumptions Against Laidlaw's Model	10
4.1 How GPW's assumptions relate to Jarrett's and Shimony's conditions	10
4.2 Assumptions the model satisfies: PCORR, EX, NOWM, SEP	11
4.3 LOC1: satisfied for outcomes, and its usual justification is exposed	11
4.4 PCC and NO-CONS: not analysed by Laidlaw	12
4.5 LOC2 and LOC3: the breaking point is one-sided	12
5 The Boundary Map	13
6 Empirical Gaps and Discriminating Tests	14
6.1 The empirical frontier	14

6.2 Testing H1 against a family, not a strawman	15
6.3 A hard look at the CHSH route	16
6.4 Four experiments	17
6.4.1 E1 — The delay matrix	17
6.4.2 E2 — The dephasing sum rule	17
6.4.3 E3 — Lag or bond fragility?	18
6.4.4 E4 — Circuits	18
6.4.5 Control C — the detectors-off round	18
6.5 What the outcomes would mean	19
6.6 Statistical requirements and controls	19
6.7 Outlook: what the field reading may connect to	19
7 Discussion and Prospectus	19
7.1 What is established	19
7.2 What is conjectural	20
7.3 Why the programme is worth investigating	20
7.4 Open problems	20
References	21
Bibliography	21

■ 1 Introduction: Bell's Inequality as an Empirical Foundation

When John Bell derived his famous inequality in 1964, he gave physicists and philosophers a tool of remarkable power: a statement about observable probabilities that follows from a set of causal assumptions, and that experiment can check [1]. The measured correlations in Einstein–Podolsky–Rosen–Bohm spin experiments violate the inequality. This violation is therefore evidence that at least one of the assumptions used in the derivation is false.

The evidential force of this argument depends on two conditions being met. First, every step from the assumptions to the inequality must be deductively valid — nothing smuggled in. Second, every assumption must be stated explicitly so that the falsification tells us something definite about which ones we must abandon. If either condition fails, the violation of the inequality teaches us less than we thought.

Both conditions have been scrutinised. On the side of assumptions, Hofer-Szabó, Rédei, and Szabó (1999) observed that the standard derivations assume something stronger than Reichenbach's Principle of Common Cause [3]: they posit a single common hidden variable for all the different measurement correlations simultaneously — what they called a *common common cause*. Nothing in the Principle of Common Cause requires this identification, yet the identification is present in the probabilistic reconstructions of the Bell argument on which the subsequent literature was built, those of Wigner (1970) and van Fraassen (1982). Graßhoff, Portmann, and Wüthrich (2005) (hereafter GPW) responded by showing that a Bell-type inequality can be derived even from the weaker assumption that each correlation has its own separate common cause variable, with no requirement that these coincide. GPW work within the Wigner–van Fraassen event-type framework and inherit its notation and its strategy of expanding joint probabilities over hidden-cause values; what they remove from it is the common common cause. GPW themselves state their claim comparatively, as a derivation from a weaker notion of local causality than the earlier ones; we follow that modest reading.

On the side of what assumptions mean, Norsen (2011) and others have clarified Bell's own concept of local causality and its relationship to relativity theory. More recently, Laidlaw (2026) has argued from a different angle: the local causality assumption used in Bell's theorem is not simply a consequence of local action and special relativity. In his view the usual lightcone analysis presumes, without announcement, that the physical reality corresponding to an observable event is well localised near that event. In a distributed field ontology, Laidlaw argues and illustrates with a toy model, factorizability can be violated by strictly local field–field interactions; local action is not broken.

These two lines of analysis — GPW's formal reconstruction of assumptions and Laidlaw's ontological argument — can be brought together. Two GPW assumptions, Locality 2 and Locality 3 (LOC2, LOC3), license the discharge of the remote setting from a sufficient condition. Read in Laidlaw's toy model, that discharge holds for the wing measured first and fails for the wing measured later. This is the event-type counterpart of the failure of parameter independence in Bohm-type models; what is new is the local-action reading of that failure, and the consequence that the minimal theories of GPW's Step 2 cannot be derived for the later wing. We state exactly how much of this is proved and how much depends on Laidlaw's model.

This paper works out that analysis in full. Section 2 restates the GPW derivation with all nine assumptions and traces every inference step, with a worked violation. Section 3 presents Laidlaw's argument: his statement of local realism, the taxonomy of field-field interactions, the toy model, and the falsifiable prediction. Section 4 audits each GPW assumption against that model, relates GPW's assumptions to Jarrett's and Shimony's decomposition, and locates the breaking point. Section 5 states the result as a theorem (GPW), a proposition (independence of the remaining assumptions) and a corollary, and says what each of them does not show. Section 6 gathers the empirical frontier from the primary sources and develops four experiments that test Laidlaw's range-dependent prediction against a family of standard-model alternatives, not a single one. Section 7 separates what is established from what is conjectural and lists the open problems.

■ 2 The GPW Minimal Derivation

This section restates the derivation of G. Graßhoff, S. Portmann, and A. Wüthrich [6] in full. Everything in it — the choice of the nine assumptions, their formulation, the two-valued common cause lemma, the passage to minimal theories, and the final inequality — is GPW's, and the reader who wants the original argument should consult that paper. The restatement here is close but not merely repetitive: it flags at each step which assumption is consumed, because the audit in Section 4 turns on exactly that bookkeeping. Equation numbers in brackets, such as (24), refer to GPW's text. We have checked every step of Steps 1 to 3 line by line; all of GPW's algebra is valid as stated.

The formal apparatus GPW work in is not their own invention, and it matters for what follows that its provenance be stated. GPW take over the probabilistic reconstruction of the Bell argument given by Wigner (1970) and expanded by van Fraassen (1982), whom they cite in the version reprinted in the Cushing and McMullin volume (1989). From that reconstruction come the commitment to *event types* as the bearers of probability, the setting-conditional notation, and the strategy of deriving the inequality by expanding joint probabilities over the values of a hidden common cause. Van Fraassen's development of that framework is the immediate source of the form in which GPW state the derivation, and the derivation inherits its assumptions along with its notation. The precursor to GPW's own treatment is A. Wüthrich [10].

■ 2.1 The experimental setup

Consider the EPR-Bohm spin experiment [4], [11]. Two spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ particles are prepared in the quantum singlet state — a state of zero total angular momentum in which any measurement on one particle is perfectly anti-correlated with the same measurement on the other — and sent to two spatially separated measurement stations. At the left station, an experimenter can choose to measure the spin of the left particle along one of three directions $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$; at the right station, independently, along one of the same three directions $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

i Notation

GPW work throughout with *event types*, not individual token events, following the terminology of Wigner (1970) as expanded by van Fraassen (1982). A token event is a single occurrence in one run of the experiment; an event type is the general kind of which individual occurrences are instances. This distinction matters: probabilities are defined over event types, measurable as relative frequencies across all runs.

- L_i denotes the event type *the left apparatus is set to direction i* .
- R_j denotes the event type *the right apparatus is set to direction j* .
- L_i^a denotes the event type *the left measurement in direction i yields outcome a* , where $a \in \{+, -\}$ (spin-up or spin-down).
- R_j^b is the analogous type for the right wing.
- $p(X)$ is the probability of event type X , measured as relative frequency.
- $p(X \wedge Y)$ is the probability that both X and Y occur in the same run.
- $p(X|Y) = p(X \wedge Y)/p(Y)$ is the conditional probability of X given Y .
- $p_{ij}(\cdot)$ is shorthand for $p(\cdot | L_i \wedge R_j)$: probability given the choice of settings i (left) and j (right).

Quantum mechanics predicts, for the singlet state and measurement directions separated by angle φ_{ij} [(3)–(6) in GPW]:

$$p_{ij}(L_i^+ \wedge R_j^+) = p_{ij}(L_i^- \wedge R_j^-) = \frac{1}{2} \sin^2 \frac{\varphi_{ij}}{2},$$

$$p_{ij}(L_i^+ \wedge R_j^-) = p_{ij}(L_i^- \wedge R_j^+) = \frac{1}{2} \cos^2 \frac{\varphi_{ij}}{2}.$$

In plain language: when both experimenters choose the same direction ($\varphi_{ii} = 0$), one always gets spin-up and the other spin-down — perfect anti-correlation. When their directions are perpendicular ($\varphi = \pi/2$), results are uncorrelated. Individual outcomes on each side are completely random: $p_{ij}(L_i^+) = p_{ij}(R_j^+) = \frac{1}{2}$, regardless of the other wing's setting [(7)–(8)]. The letter φ is reserved for this angle throughout; Laidlaw's model uses other letters (Section 3.3).

2.2 The nine assumptions

GPW aim to derive a Bell-type inequality from the smallest set of assumptions that makes the derivation deductively valid. They identify nine such assumptions [6]. All nine statements below are theirs; where an assumption has an earlier source — Reichenbach for the Principle of Common Cause, Fine for the significance of the two-outcome condition — the source is named, but the formulation that does the work in the derivation is GPW's.

Assumption 1 — Perfect correlation (PCORR). When both stations are set to the same direction i , the outcomes are perfectly anti-correlated:

$$p_{ii}(R_i^- | L_i^+) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad p_{ii}(L_i^+ | R_i^-) = 1.$$

In plain language: finding spin-up on the left in direction i guarantees spin-down on the right, and vice versa. This is the singlet-state prediction at $\varphi_{ii} = 0$. Actual experiments do not achieve exactly perfect correlation; the deviation is conventionally attributed to imperfect state preparation, alignment and detector inefficiency.

Assumption 2 — Separability (SEP). In any run of the experiment, the coinciding instances of L_i^a and R_j^b are distinct events — not two descriptions of the same occurrence. This rules out the trivial “event identity” explanation of perfect correlation that a tossed coin gives for *heads up* and *tails down*: those are not two events but two aspects of one.

Assumption 3 — Locality 1 (LOC1). No event of type L_i^a is causally relevant for any event of type R_j^b , and vice versa. In plain language: measurement outcomes in the two wings do not cause each other. GPW motivate it by the fact that the instances of L_i^a and R_j^b in each run can be made space-like separated. It is stated as a causal assumption; the motivation is an argument for it, not part of it.

Assumption 4 — Principle of Common Cause (PCC). If two event types are statistically correlated and the correlation cannot be explained by direct causation or by event identity, there exists a common cause variable.

i Common cause variable

A common cause variable V takes values $q \in \{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k\}$ with $\sum_q p(Vq) = 1$ such that, for each value q ,

$$p(A \wedge B | Vq) = p(A | Vq) \cdot p(B | Vq).$$

This condition is called *screening off*: given the value of the common cause, knowing A provides no additional information about B .

Reichenbach (1956) formulated this principle for a common cause *event type* C , the special case in which the variable has the two values C and $\neg C$. GPW credit the formulation for general common cause variables to Hofer-Szabó and Rédei (2004) and to Placek (2000). The crucial move is GPW's (2005), and it is what makes their assumption set weaker than the usual one: PCC requires only that each correlation has *some* common cause variable. It does not require the same variable to screen off all correlations simultaneously. The common cause variable for the pair (L_1^+, R_2^+) may be entirely different from the one for (L_2^+, R_3^+) . GPW report that the derivations of Bell-type inequalities known to them all make the stronger identification, which Hofer-Szabó, Rédei and Szabó (1999) had isolated and named the *common common cause*; GPW's contribution is to show that the identification is dispensable.

Applied to the EPRB experiment: PCORR, SEP, LOC1 and PCC together imply, on GPW's argument (2005), that each EPRB correlation has its own separate common cause variable V_{ij}^{+-} (GPW's Result 1, eq. (19)). For the parallel settings $L_i \wedge R_i$ the perfect correlation then allows the variable to be reduced to a two-valued common cause event type C_{ii}^{+-} that screens off L_i^+ from R_i^- (Step 1 below).

Assumption 5 — Exactly one of exactly two outcomes (EX). Each measurement always yields exactly one of two possible outcomes, spin-up or spin-down:

$$p_{ii}(L_i^+) + p_{ii}(L_i^-) = 1, \quad p_{ii}(L_i^+ \wedge L_i^-) = 0,$$

and similarly for the right wing. As Fine (1982) noted, actual runs sometimes register no outcome, which is normally attributed to detector inefficiency and left out of the statistics. If part of the no-outcome runs are instead caused by the hidden variable, empirically adequate models can be built that reproduce the quantum correlations, including the violation of the inequality (GPW cite Szabó and Szabó–Fine for such models). EX explicitly excludes that class.

Assumption 6 — Locality 2 (LOC2). If the conjunction $L_i \wedge R_i \wedge X$ is a sufficient condition for L_i^+ , then $L_i \wedge X$ alone is sufficient for L_i^+ . (And similarly for the right wing: if $L_j \wedge R_j \wedge Y$ suffices for R_j^+ , then $R_j \wedge Y$ alone suffices.) Here “sufficient” is used as in GPW's eqs. (24) and (32): the conjunction is followed by the outcome with probability one. The condition X is arbitrary; GPW place no restriction on it.

In plain language: the remote setting R_i contributes nothing to the sufficiency of the local conditions for L_i^+ , because it is space-like separated from that outcome. If a combination of conditions forces the left outcome to be spin-up, the right setting is causally irrelevant and may be dropped. Note that this is a *discharge rule for sufficient conditions*, not a screening-off condition: it lets one delete a conjunct, and it is what turns the parallel-setting result into a statement about every run.

Assumption 7 — No outcome without measurement (NOWM). An outcome event L_i^+ cannot occur if the left apparatus is not set to direction i :

$$p(L_i^+ \wedge \neg L_i) = 0,$$

and similarly for all other outcome types. Without a properly configured measurement apparatus, there is no measurement outcome.

Assumption 8 — Locality 3 (LOC3). If the conjunction $L_i \wedge R_i \wedge X$ is a sufficient condition for the *non-occurrence* of L_i^+ (i.e., for $\neg L_i^+$), then $L_i \wedge X$ alone is sufficient for $\neg L_i^+$. (And similarly for $\neg R_j^+$.)

In plain language: the right-wing setting cannot be causally necessary for the left outcome to be *absent* either. LOC3 is the negative counterpart of LOC2.

Assumption 9 — No conspiracy (NO-CONS). The common cause event types are not causally influenced by, and do not causally influence, the measurement operations. GPW take this causal independence to imply the statistical independence of the conjunctions of common cause event types that occur in the derivation. Formally [eq. (39)], for the index pairs used below:

$$p(C_{ii}^{+-} \wedge \neg C_{jj}^{+-} \mid L_i \wedge R_j) = p(C_{ii}^{+-} \wedge \neg C_{jj}^{+-}).$$

In plain language: the probability that these particular combinations of common causes occur does not change when we condition on which measurement directions the experimenters chose. This blocks so-called conspiracy models, in which the source's hidden state is correlated with the experimenter's future choices. Only the three pairs (1, 2), (2, 3), (1, 3) are used; the formula does not assert independence for every event built from the C 's.

2.3 The derivation: from common causes to the inequality

The three steps that follow are GPW's (2005). Step 1 is the lemma that reduces a common cause variable for a perfect correlation to a two-valued event type; Step 2 is where the localisation assumptions LOC2 and LOC3 are consumed and is therefore the step the rest of this paper examines; Step 3 recovers the inequality in the form Wigner (1970) and van Fraassen (1982) had derived it from stronger premises.

Step 1 — Two-valued common cause lemma. Fix a perfect correlation, that is, two event types A and B with $p(A \mid B) = p(B \mid A) = 1$, and let V be a common cause variable that screens them off from each other. Split the value set I of V into

$$I^+ = \{q : p(A \wedge Vq) \neq 0\}, \quad I^- = \{q : p(A \wedge Vq) = 0\}.$$

Then $p(A \mid Vq) = 0$ for $q \in I^-$ [(20)]. For $q \in I^+$, screening off and perfect correlation give $p(A \mid Vq) = p(A \mid B \wedge Vq) = 1$ [(21)] and likewise $p(B \mid Vq) = 1$ [(22)]; for $q \in I^-$ one finds $p(B \mid Vq) = 0$ [(23)]. Thus a value of V in I^+ is necessary and sufficient for A and for B . The disjunctions $C = \bigvee_{q \in I^+} Vq$ and $\neg C = \bigvee_{q \in I^-} Vq$ form a two-valued common cause *event type*. For the parallel settings of the EPRB experiment, with $A = L_i^+$ and $B = R_i^-$, this is the event type C_{ii}^{+-} of GPW's eqs. (24)–(25):

$$p_{ii}(L_i^+ \mid C_{ii}^{+-}) = p_{ii}(R_i^- \mid C_{ii}^{+-}) = 1, \quad p_{ii}(L_i^+ \mid \neg C_{ii}^{+-}) = p_{ii}(R_i^- \mid \neg C_{ii}^{+-}) = 0.$$

So far only PCORR, SEP, LOC1 and PCC were used. EX now identifies the complement: because an outcome is always exactly one of + and –, the event type $\neg C_{ii}^{+-}$ is necessary and sufficient for the opposite outcomes L_i^- and R_i^+ [(28)–(29)]:

$$p_{ii}(L_i^- \mid \neg C_{ii}^{+-}) = p_{ii}(R_i^+ \mid \neg C_{ii}^{+-}) = 1, \quad p_{ii}(L_i^- \mid C_{ii}^{+-}) = p_{ii}(R_i^+ \mid C_{ii}^{+-}) = 0.$$

All statements of Step 1 hold for the parallel settings $L_i \wedge R_i$, since that is where PCORR applies.

Step 2 — Minimal theories (MTH). This is the step that uses LOC2 and LOC3. It converts statements that hold under parallel settings into statements about the left wing alone and the right wing alone [6]. By

(24), the conjunction $C_{ii}^{+-} \wedge L_i \wedge R_i$ is sufficient for L_i^+ . By LOC2 with $X = C_{ii}^{+-}$ the remote setting R_i is discharged, and $C_{ii}^{+-} \wedge L_i$ alone is sufficient for L_i^+ . This conjunction is *minimally* sufficient: without L_i there is no outcome (NOWM), and without C_{ii}^{+-} the sufficiency is lost, so no conjunct can be dropped a second time.

For necessity, (25) gives that $\neg C_{ii}^{+-} \wedge L_i \wedge R_i$ is sufficient for $\neg L_i^+$ [(32)]. By LOC3 with $X = \neg C_{ii}^{+-}$, again R_i is discharged: $\neg C_{ii}^{+-} \wedge L_i \rightarrow \neg L_i^+$ [(33)]. Contraposition gives $L_i^+ \wedge L_i \rightarrow C_{ii}^{+-}$ [(34)], hence $L_i^+ \wedge L_i \rightarrow C_{ii}^{+-} \wedge L_i$ [(35)]. By NOWM, $L_i^+ \rightarrow L_i$, so $L_i^+ \rightarrow C_{ii}^{+-} \wedge L_i$: the conjunction is necessary as well. It is therefore a minimal sufficient and necessary condition – a *minimal theory* in the sense of Graßhoff and May (2001).

Applying the same reasoning to the right wing, with (28)–(29) in place of (24)–(25), gives $R_j \wedge \neg C_{jj}^{+-}$ as a minimal theory for R_j^+ . The four minimal theories used in Step 3 are:

$$\begin{aligned} C_{11}^{+-} \wedge L_1 &\Leftrightarrow L_1^+, & C_{22}^{+-} \wedge L_2 &\Leftrightarrow L_2^+, \\ \neg C_{22}^{+-} \wedge R_2 &\Leftrightarrow R_2^+, & \neg C_{33}^{+-} \wedge R_3 &\Leftrightarrow R_3^+. \end{aligned}$$

In plain language: spin-up on the left in direction 1 occurs if and only if the apparatus is set to direction 1 *and* the common cause event type C_{11}^{+-} is instantiated; spin-up on the right in direction 2 occurs if and only if the right apparatus is set to direction 2 *and* C_{22}^{+-} is *not* instantiated (because C_{22}^{+-} drives the anti-correlated outcome in the parallel-settings case).

Two things are worth stating that the derivation uses without saying. First, these equivalences are asserted for *all* runs, including runs with unequal settings such as $L_1 \wedge R_2$, although C_{ii}^{+-} was introduced through the parallel-setting run; the discharge of the remote setting is what carries the statement over. Second, this requires that “ C_{11}^{+-} is instantiated” mean the same in a run with settings $L_1 \wedge R_2$ as in one with $L_1 \wedge R_1$. Both are in the derivation as GPW give it; we flag them because Section 4 shows where they are exposed.

Step 3 – The Bell inequality. From the four minimal theories and NOWM, GPW express the joint outcome probabilities across different settings in terms of the common cause event types [(36)–(38)]:

$$\begin{aligned} p(L_1^+ \wedge R_2^+ \wedge L_1 \wedge R_2) &= p(L_1 \wedge C_{11}^{+-} \wedge R_2 \wedge \neg C_{22}^{+-}), \\ p(L_2^+ \wedge R_3^+ \wedge L_2 \wedge R_3) &= p(L_2 \wedge C_{22}^{+-} \wedge R_3 \wedge \neg C_{33}^{+-}), \\ p(L_1^+ \wedge R_3^+ \wedge L_1 \wedge R_3) &= p(L_1 \wedge C_{11}^{+-} \wedge R_3 \wedge \neg C_{33}^{+-}). \end{aligned}$$

Dividing by $p(L_i \wedge R_j)$ and applying NO-CONS turns each right-hand side into an unconditional probability of a combination of common causes. Expanding each over the remaining common cause gives [(40)–(42)]:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{12}(L_1^+ \wedge R_2^+) &= p(C_{11}^{+-} \wedge \neg C_{22}^{+-} \wedge C_{33}^{+-}) + p(C_{11}^{+-} \wedge \neg C_{22}^{+-} \wedge \neg C_{33}^{+-}), \\ p_{23}(L_2^+ \wedge R_3^+) &= p(C_{11}^{+-} \wedge C_{22}^{+-} \wedge \neg C_{33}^{+-}) + p(\neg C_{11}^{+-} \wedge C_{22}^{+-} \wedge \neg C_{33}^{+-}), \\ p_{13}(L_1^+ \wedge R_3^+) &= p(C_{11}^{+-} \wedge C_{22}^{+-} \wedge \neg C_{33}^{+-}) + p(C_{11}^{+-} \wedge \neg C_{22}^{+-} \wedge \neg C_{33}^{+-}). \end{aligned}$$

Both terms on the right-hand side of the third equation appear in the sum of the right-hand sides of the first two: the second term of the first equation and the first term of the second. The sum of the first two exceeds the third by two further non-negative probabilities. This yields the Bell inequality in the Wigner form [4], [5] – now, on GPW’s derivation (2005), resting on separate common causes rather than a common common cause:

$$p_{13}(L_1^+ \wedge R_3^+) \leq p_{12}(L_1^+ \wedge R_2^+) + p_{23}(L_2^+ \wedge R_3^+).$$

In plain language: the probability of getting spin-up on both sides when measuring along directions 1 and 3 is at most the sum of the corresponding probabilities for directions 1–2 and 2–3.

A worked violation. Take three coplanar directions with $\varphi_{12} = \varphi_{23} = 60^\circ$ and $\varphi_{13} = 120^\circ$. The quantum predictions give $p_{12} = p_{23} = \frac{1}{2} \sin^2 30^\circ = 0.125$ and $p_{13} = \frac{1}{2} \sin^2 60^\circ = 0.375$. BELL would require $0.375 \leq 0.25$. It fails by 0.125. The quantum prediction itself, with no experiment yet, contradicts the conjunction of the nine assumptions. The inequality has been falsified experimentally, beginning with the time-varying-analyser test of A. Aspect, J. Dalibard, and G. Roger [16] and definitively in the loophole-free tests of B. Hensen and others [17], M. Giustina and others [18], and L. K. Shalm and others [19] (Section 6.1).

Summary of the derivation. The inequality BELL follows deductively from exactly these nine assumptions: PCORR, SEP, LOC1, PCC, EX, LOC2, NOWM, LOC3, NO-CONS. Its falsification therefore establishes that at least one of these nine assumptions is false. This is the result of G. Graßhoff, S. Portmann, and A. Wüthrich [6], and the analysis that follows asks which of *these nine* – in GPW's formulation, not a stronger one – a field ontology allows one to keep.

3 Laidlaw's Argument

3.1 Local causality and what Laidlaw adds

Bell's concept of local causality [7], [20] says that the probability of an outcome in one wing, given a complete specification of the relevant past, is not further changed by settings or outcomes in the other wing. In the event-type notation of Section 2 this is factorizability [GPW's eq. (9)]:

$$p(L_i^a \wedge R_j^b \mid Vq \wedge L_i \wedge R_j) = p(L_i^a \mid Vq \wedge L_i) \cdot p(R_j^b \mid Vq \wedge R_j).$$

Here V is a variable describing the past. GPW take it to be the total state of the overlap of the backward light cones of the two outcomes, and note that Butterfield's proposal, the union of the cones, changes nothing in what follows. Jarrett (1984) and Shimony (1993) split factorizability into two conditions. *Outcome independence* says that V screens off the two outcomes from each other; *parameter independence* says that the outcome in one wing does not depend on the setting in the other. GPW's assumptions are related to this split, but they are not the same conditions; the relation is spelled out in Section 4.

Laidlaw (2026) argues that factorizability is not implied by local action and special relativity alone. He states *local realism* as three conditions: *local beables* (the ontology is specified on physical space), *local action* (only colocated parts of the ontology interact; fields at different space points do not), and *no superluminal movement* (nothing exceeds the characteristic velocity c). His further point is a remark on the lightcone analysis of Bell experiments: it “simply presumes that all the physical reality corresponding to an event ... is well localised in its immediate vicinity”, and is thereby restricted to pointlike models of the quanta. In a field model the physical reality behind an observable event is spread over space, and an interaction that produces a pointlike observable, such as a detector click, need not itself be pointlike.

i Attribution

Laidlaw states three conditions and one remark. The reading of that remark as a fourth, *unstated component* of local causality is ours, not Laidlaw's. Where we need a name for it we say *event-locality of the substrate*: the physical reality corresponding to an observable event is confined to the neighbourhood of that event. This is a reconstruction, offered so that the audit in Section 4 has something definite to test.

3.2 Fields and the two types of interaction

In a field ontology every quantum is a field defined over all space, and an interaction between two fields is distributed over space, not passed from a source point to a target point. Laidlaw distinguishes two basic forms of local interaction, both ongoing at every space point:

i Field–field interactions (Laidlaw, Section 2.4)

Type I. Instantaneous interactions between *different* fields at the same place. The total momentum of each field system changes immediately.

Type II. Retarded self-interactions that distribute the resulting transients to other places *in the same* field, cell to neighbouring cell, at speed at most c .

Laidlaw motivates the distributed picture by the treatment of virtual photons in QED, which he reads as momentum eigensolutions (plane waves) and proposes to take literally as distributed interaction quanta. That reading is Laidlaw's own; it is not presented here as the standard interpretation of QED, and his toy model is explicitly not a model of QED interactions.

3.3 The toy model: EPR correlations from local interactions

Laidlaw's demonstrative model is a de Broglie–Bohm version of the EPR experiment with four field subsystems, each defined over all space and divided into small locally connected cells: Alice's electron field A , Bob's electron field B , and the measurement fields M_A and M_B . The relevant hidden variables are the direction of the field's angular-momentum density and a space-independent phase. Laidlaw's own symbols for these did not survive the text extraction we worked from, so we write $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ for the direction and ϑ for the phase; these letters are ours. The angle between $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_A$ and Alice's measurement axis $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$ is θ_A . (The letter φ is kept for the angle between the two measurement directions, as in Section 2.)

The model assumes that Alice measures first: “spin measurements on different particles commute, so it can be assumed that Alice's measurement comes first”. Three mechanisms are specified.

Mechanism 1 – Correlations at a distance. A nearest-neighbour (Type II) proportional control rule keeps the angular-momentum direction uniform across cells, removing perturbations at speed c :

$$\frac{d\hat{\mathbf{m}}_{A,i}}{dt} = \gamma [(\hat{\mathbf{m}}_{A,i+1}(t_r) - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_{A,i}(t)) + (\hat{\mathbf{m}}_{A,i-1}(t_r) - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_{A,i}(t))],$$

where $t_r = t - r_s/c$ is the retarded time, r_s the cell spacing and γ a constant. The rule is motivated by the phase correlations across the wavefield that matter-beam interference requires.

Mechanism 2 – Distributed spin measurement (Laidlaw's Eq. 4). Alice's measurement field acts on her electron field by a Type I interaction in every cell at the same time t_{mA} . In cell i the outcome is

$$A_i = \text{sgn}[\sin(\omega t_{mA}) - f(\theta_{A,i})], \quad f(\theta) = -\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2} \cos \theta\right),$$

where ω is a frequency common to all cells. The rule is “just a sinusoid offset by some function of the angle”, sampled at the effectively random measurement time. Because $\theta_{A,i}$ and t_{mA} are the same in all cells (by Mechanism 1), every cell returns the same sign. If x is uniform on $[0, 2\pi)$, then $P(\sin x > f) = (\pi - 2 \arcsin f)/2\pi$, which is Laidlaw's stated consequence of his Eq. (4); with the f above this equals $\frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos \theta_A)$, the quantum probability. A product form $\text{sgn}[\sin(\omega t) \cdot f(\theta)]$ would instead return $P = \frac{1}{2}$ for every angle, because f does not change sign with x . The extracted text of Eq. (4) shows a garbled operator; the subtraction is fixed by Laidlaw's description (“a sinusoid offset by some function”) and by the probability formula that he derives from it (checked numerically).

Mechanism 3 – Entanglement bonds. The singlet requires zero total angular momentum. Laidlaw models it as a Type I interaction between the colocated parts of A and B in every cell, a Hooke-type rule for the alignment error $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_{ij}$ between $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_{A,i}$ and the counteraligned $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_{B,j}$ in the colocated cells ($i + j = n$), with a constant λ_{ij} (Laidlaw's Eq. 5):

$$\frac{d\hat{\mathbf{m}}_{A,i}}{dt} = -\lambda_{ij} |\hat{\mathbf{m}}_{A,i}| \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{ij}, \quad \frac{d\hat{\mathbf{m}}_{B,j}}{dt} = +\lambda_{ij} |\hat{\mathbf{m}}_{B,j}| \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{ij}.$$

Unlike Mechanism 1, this rule has no retardation: in each small region $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_B$ follows $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_A$ at once.

The sequence in the model, following Laidlaw's Figure 1 and its caption, is this. At Alice's measurement $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_A$ is rotated over all space to Alice's axis $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$, and the bond simultaneously counteraligns $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_B$ to $-\hat{\mathbf{a}}$, "which are then broken". Bob's later measurement, by Mechanism 2, acts on B with the angle between $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_B$ and his axis $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$, and reproduces the quantum correlation $C(a, b) = -\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{b}}$. Every interaction is a Type I or Type II interaction between colocated entities, so local action is preserved, and no signal travels from Alice to Bob. In the model's ordering the asymmetry is plain: **Bob's outcome depends on Alice's setting, and Alice's outcome does not depend on Bob's**. Laidlaw also states that Type I interactions are restricted to the entangled pair and to each side's own measurement interaction: Alice's measurement field does not interact with Bob's electron or with his measurement field, and vice versa.

The toy model is a proof of concept. Laidlaw stresses that it is "not intended faithfully to represent" spin measurements in quantum mechanics or QED. The measurement rule is described as local, deterministic and time-dependent; decoherence enters through environmental noise on the hidden variables, not through the measurement rule.

3.4 The falsifiable prediction

Laidlaw's second contribution is a range-dependent decoherence prediction. In the usual account the CHSH parameter $\mathcal{B}$ (the combination of four correlation functions that quantum mechanics can push above 2) depends only on the delay t between preparation and the Bell measurement, and on the single-qubit coherence time T_{coh} , and each of the two measurements contributes a factor $e^{-t/T_{\text{coh}}}$ to a correlation function:

$$\mathcal{B}(t) \approx 2\sqrt{2} e^{-2t/T_{\text{coh}}}.$$

There is no dependence on the Alice–Bob range r . In the field model Laidlaw argues that Alice's measurement projects her near field and, at the same moment, the far field of her electron that is already in Bob's neighbourhood. The far field has received no control from the near field during the light-travel interval $\tau = r/c$ before the measurement. The near-field measurement then contributes one extra factor $e^{-\tau/T_{\text{coh}}}$, and the far-field measurement a second, so that

$$\mathcal{B}(t, \tau) \approx 2\sqrt{2} e^{-2(t+\tau)/T_{\text{coh}}}, \quad \tau = r/c.$$

Laidlaw calls this a heuristic estimate that "may understate the effect"; it is an argument about noise, whereas the rest of his paper is about causal structure. He adds a second, qualitative effect: the strength of the entanglement bond falls with range as $1/r^2$, which makes the entangled state more fragile. And he proposes a separate measurement-problem test, "Hypothesis 2", that we take up as a positive control in Section 6.4.

4 Auditing GPW's Assumptions Against Laidlaw's Model

We now ask, for each of GPW's nine assumptions [6], whether Laidlaw's toy model [8] satisfies it, and whether the *standard justification* of the assumption survives in a field ontology. Two questions must be kept apart. An assumption can be true of a model although its usual justification fails, and it can be false of a model although the justification seems compelling. The audit is ours; the assumptions are GPW's, in the formulation of Section 2.2; the model is Laidlaw's, with Alice measuring first, and idealised (noise-free) unless stated. Where the model says nothing, we say so and do not fill the gap.

4.1 How GPW's assumptions relate to Jarrett's and Shimony's conditions

Bell's factorizability splits into two conditions [21], [22]: outcome independence (the past V screens off the outcomes from each other) and parameter independence (the outcome in one wing does not depend on the setting in the other). GPW state their assumptions at the level of event types and of sufficient and necessary conditions, so the correspondence is one of analogy, not of equivalence:

Table 1 GPW's assumptions and the Jarrett–Shimony decomposition. The exact relation of LOC2 and LOC3 to parameter independence is open.

Jarrett–Shimony	GPW counterpart	How close
Outcome independence (screening off by V)	PCC, in the form of eq. (10) or (19)	Same content, but GPW ask for a separate V_{ij}^{+-} for each correlation
Parameter independence	LOC2 and LOC3	Analogue for <i>sufficient</i> and <i>necessary</i> conditions (probability one), stated as discharge rules; not the general probabilistic condition
No direct causal link between the outcomes	LOC1	Same content
Independence of V from the settings	NO-CONS	Same content, restricted to the conjunctions used in Step 3

The map has a consequence. LOC2 and LOC3 do not “together establish factorizability” in the separate-common-cause setting. Factorizability is the *conjunction* of an outcome-independence analogue and a parameter-independence analogue. LOC2 and LOC3 are only the second of the two.

4.2 Assumptions the model satisfies: PCORR, EX, NOWM, SEP

PCORR is a statement about measured frequencies. In the noise-free model, parallel settings give $C = -\hat{a} \cdot \hat{b} = -1$, so PCORR holds. But it is an idealisation in both pictures, and the field model changes its status: Laidlaw's prediction (Section 3) is a correlation that is degraded, by a factor $e^{-2\tau/T_{\text{coh}}}$, in proportion to range. PCORR therefore does not “survive unchanged”; it survives only in the noise-free limit. This connects to GPW's own remark that no experiment achieves perfect correlation, and that they could not derive a Bell-type inequality without PCORR while allowing separate common causes [6, Section V].

EX says each run yields exactly one of two outcomes. It concerns the structure of the evidence and holds in the model, where each measurement returns a sign. Fine's caveat [14] is unchanged: models that make some no-outcome runs depend on the hidden state are excluded by EX under any ontology.

NOWM says no outcome occurs without a configured measurement. In the model an outcome requires the interaction between the electron field and the measurement field, so NOWM holds.

SEP says the coinciding instances of L_i^a and R_j^b are distinct events. The registrations in the two laboratories are distinct events. The *substrates* (the fields A and B that co-occupy all space) are not distinct in the same sense, but SEP is a claim about the events GPW name, so it holds.

4.3 LOC1: satisfied for outcomes, and its usual justification is exposed

LOC1 says that no outcome event type in one wing is causally relevant for an outcome event type in the other. In the model, Alice's registered outcome does not cause Bob's; both are effects of distributed interactions, and the pointlike click is caused by the interaction, not the reverse. So LOC1, *as a claim about the registered outcomes*, holds. What does not hold in the model is that Bob's outcome is independent of Alice's *setting*: that is parameter dependence, and LOC1 is silent about it. The standard justification for LOC1 (spacelike separation, hence no retarded connection, hence causal irrelevance) does presuppose that the causal relata are events located where they are registered. Laidlaw's model shows that this step can fail. The point-localisation load therefore sits not only in LOC2 and LOC3: the justification of LOC1 rests on it too. In the field reading LOC1 must be defended as an independent assumption about the registered events, not derived from relativity.

■ 4.4 PCC and NO-CONS: not analysed by Laidlaw

PCC is an existence claim: for each correlation there is a common cause variable that screens off. If a model is deterministic given a complete description of the pre-measurement state and both settings, then screening off holds for the variable that contains that description. So the model satisfies PCC in the weak, formal sense. GPW use more than that: the variable must be reduced to an event type C_{ii}^{+-} (Step 1) that enters all four minimal theories, and it must be independent of the settings (NO-CONS). Laidlaw does not state either condition, and we have not derived them for his model. In the model the natural reading is that C_{ii}^{+-} is the event type “Alice’s outcome along i would be +”, a function of the preparation state and of t_{mA} ; this is independent of the later settings if the preparation is. That is a plausible reading, not a result.

NO-CONS. One might think that a field ontology needs a stronger, “cell-by-cell” independence condition, and that Laidlaw’s control mechanism satisfies it. This is vacuous. By Mechanism 1 the hidden variables take the same value in every cell, so independence cell by cell is just independence. The condition that does matter is the one GPW state: independence of the relevant conjunctions of common cause event types from the settings. The model is silent on how the settings are chosen, apart from the remark that the choices a and b are themselves distributed variables set up by Type I processes. NO-CONS therefore holds of the model only under the additional assumption that the settings are chosen independently of the preparation.

■ 4.5 LOC2 and LOC3: the breaking point is one-sided

The failure has a direction. It would be wrong to say that Bob’s measurement co-determines Alice’s outcome, so that without Bob “the outcome remains probabilistic”. That contradicts the model, in which Alice measures first and the bond then aligns B , and it contradicts the treatment of PCC above (Alice’s outcome “does not depend on what Bob’s apparatus does”). Taken literally it would also let Alice’s marginal change when Bob stops measuring, that is, allow signalling.

The left-wing halves hold. Take LOC2 for the left wing: if $L_i \wedge R_i \wedge X$ suffices for L_i^+ , then $L_i \wedge X$ suffices. In the model Alice’s outcome is fixed by her axis, by $\hat{m}_A$, and by the phase and t_{mA} ; Bob’s setting does not enter, because Alice’s measurement precedes it and the bond is broken. So R_i can be discharged. The same argument holds for LOC3 on the left.

The right-wing halves fail. Take LOC2 for the right wing with Y the pre-measurement state. Under the parallel settings $L_j \wedge R_j$, the bond rotates $\hat{m}_B$ to $-\hat{a}_j$ and Bob measures along $\hat{b}_j = \hat{a}_j$: the angle θ_B is 0 or π , $f = \pm 1$, and Bob’s outcome is fixed. So $L_j \wedge R_j \wedge Y$ suffices for $R_j^\pm$, with the sign given by Y . Now remove L_j . If Alice measures along another direction $i \neq j$, the bond rotates $\hat{m}_B$ to $-\hat{a}_i$ instead, and Bob’s outcome has probability $\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \cos \varphi_{ij})$, the sign fixed by Alice’s would-be outcome (which is part of Y), not probability one. So $R_j \wedge Y$ is not sufficient, and the discharge of L_j is not licensed. The same construction defeats the right-wing half of LOC3. In words: **the remote setting can be dropped from the sufficient condition for the wing measured first, but not for the wing measured later, because the earlier measurement has rewritten the later wing’s state through the entanglement bond.**

Consequence for the derivation. Step 2 needs LOC2 and LOC3 for both wings. Two of the four minimal theories, $R_2 \wedge \neg C_{22}^{+-} \leftrightarrow R_2^+$ and $R_3 \wedge \neg C_{33}^{+-} \leftrightarrow R_3^+$, use the right-wing halves. In the model, whether R_2^+ occurs in a run with settings $L_1 \wedge R_2$ depends on the direction of Alice’s setting, not only on $\neg C_{22}^{+-}$. So GPW’s route to those two minimal theories is blocked, and Step 3 cannot proceed. The left-wing theories go through.

Two caveats.

1. *The ordering is frame-dependent.* For spacelike separated measurements there is no invariant fact about which came first. Laidlaw assumes Alice first because the measurements commute. In a frame where Bob measures first, the roles of the wings swap. The statement “the later wing fails” is therefore not by itself a covariant statement. A physical model must either say what fixes the order or show that the outcome statistics do not depend on it. This is open. Distinctions between the order of events and the order of

interventions, of the kind drawn in histories approaches [23], may be relevant here; we do not claim they resolve it.

2. *A local-action reading is not a locality proof.* The dependence of Bob's outcome on Alice's setting is carried in the model by Type I interactions between colocated fields, including Alice's distributed measurement field in Bob's laboratory. Whether that counts as "local" is exactly Laidlaw's point, and whether it counts as a *signal* is the question of whether the dependence shows up in Bob's marginal. It does not: the model reproduces the quantum marginals, which do not depend on Alice's setting. The dependence is at the level of the hidden variables, as in de Broglie–Bohm theory.

5 The Boundary Map

The results of the audit fall into three statements of different logical status. We keep them apart, because stating them as one theorem would claim more than the argument supports.

Theorem 1 (GPW). The conjunction of the nine assumptions PCORR, SEP, LOC1, PCC, EX, LOC2, NOWM, LOC3 and NO-CONS entails the Bell inequality BELL.

Theorem 1 is ontology-free. It is a claim about entailment between propositions, and it is valid or not independently of what the world is like; each step can be checked line by line. It says nothing about field or point ontology. Ontology enters only when one asks whether the nine propositions can be *justified*, that is, whether the reasons offered for them apply.

Proposition 2 (independence, relative to Laidlaw's model). Let M be Laidlaw's toy model with Alice measuring first, noise-free. Then:

- (a) The left-wing halves of LOC2 and LOC3 hold in M ; the right-wing halves fail in M (Section 4.5).
- (b) Consequently GPW's derivation of the minimal theories $R_2 \wedge \neg C_{22}^{+-} \leftrightarrow R_2^+$ and $R_3 \wedge \neg C_{33}^{+-} \leftrightarrow R_3^+$ is blocked in M , and with it Step 3.
- (c) PCORR, SEP, LOC1, EX and NOWM hold in M . If PCC and NO-CONS also hold in M in GPW's sense, then the seven-assumption conjunction {PCORR, SEP, LOC1, PCC, EX, NOWM, NO-CONS} does *not* entail BELL, because M reproduces the quantum correlations and these violate BELL (worked example in Section 2).

Statements (a) and (b) are proved for the model as specified. Statement (c) is conditional on two properties of the model that Laidlaw does not state and that we have not derived. The reason for the caution is a point of logic. That a proof route fails does not show that no proof exists. Non-entailment of BELL from the seven assumptions needs a *countermodel* that satisfies all seven and violates BELL, and that is what (c) provides once its condition is met. The failure of the right-wing halves alone provides only (b).

Corollary 3 (what the violations exclude). The violation of BELL refutes the conjunction of the nine assumptions (Theorem 1). By Proposition 2 it does not refute the seven-assumption conjunction in M . The assumptions that the violation forces one to give up are, in M , the right-wing discharge rules of LOC2 and LOC3. Whether giving up those discharge rules amounts to giving up *local action* depends on how "causal irrelevance" is read. On the point-event reading, on which spacelike separation of the registrations settles causal irrelevance, it does. On Laidlaw's reading, on which the causal relata are distributed interactions between colocated fields, it does not. The experiments do not decide between the readings; they exclude models that accept all nine.

What is and is not new. The logical content of Proposition 2, that a model can reproduce the quantum correlations while violating a parameter-independence condition for the later-measured wing, is not new: de Broglie–Bohm theory is the standard example, and it is the reason the Bell literature distinguishes parameter from outcome independence. What the field reading adds is a different interpretation of that failure: the dependence is carried by local interactions between distributed fields, not by an influence between points;

and a definite, testable prediction (Section 6) that is tied to that interpretation. Whether the interpretation is coherent in detail (frame-dependence of the wing order, the source of the bond) is open.

Relation to GPW's remark on PCORR. GPW note that they could not derive a Bell-type inequality without perfect correlation while allowing separate common causes, and that since measured correlations are never perfect it is “not obvious how such a model could be refuted” [6, Section V]. In the field picture the same worry acquires a physical content. The bond keeps counteralignment only against noise, with finite binding energy, and Laidlaw's own prediction is that the correlation at range is *weaker* by a factor tied to the light-travel time. Whether PCORR, or a weakening of it, is derivable in a field theory or must be treated as empirically primitive remains open.

Relation to Szabó's question. GPW describe the question that Szabó (2000) left open. A model can be built in which each correlation has its own common cause variable that screens off and satisfies parameter independence, but in Szabó's model the conjunctions of the common cause events correlate with the measurement operations. Can all three requirements be met together: separate common cause variables that screen off, parameter independence, and no correlation with the measurement choices? GPW's derivation answers no, for models that meet the nine assumptions and reproduce the quantum predictions. Laidlaw's model does not give a positive answer. It reproduces the quantum correlations and avoids correlation between the state and the settings only by *violating parameter independence for the later wing*, which is a different horn of the same trilemma. The Szabó question is therefore not reopened by the field model; the field model is one more way of paying the price that GPW's result already makes visible.

6 Empirical Gaps and Discriminating Tests

6.1 The empirical frontier

Table 2 states the current record on each of five frontiers, and Table 3 lists the runs that set them. Every figure in both tables was read in the primary source (abstract or text) except where a dagger marks it as not re-checked. The census is not a literature survey: “none in the census” means none among these runs.

Table 2 Current empirical boundaries of Bell tests [17], [18], [19], [25], [26], [27], [28].

Frontier	Current record in the census	Set by
Local realism, loopholes closed as stated by the authors	violated	Hensen 2015, Giustina 2015, Shalm 2015, Rosenfeld 2017, Storz 2023
Longest baseline of a run its authors call loophole-free	1.3 km	Hensen 2015
Largest loophole-free sample	$N > 10^6$, $S = 2.0747 \pm 0.0033$ (30 m)	Storz 2023
Longest baseline of any Bell test in the census	1203 km, $S = 2.37 \pm 0.09$	Yin 2017
Farthest-back setting choice	$\gtrsim 7.8$ Gyr	Rauch 2018
Joint scan of hold time t and range r with an independent single-qubit T_{coh}	none in the census	—

The table is a map of what has been *bounded*, not a ranking. Local realism with the main loopholes closed is an empirical fact. The longest baseline with all of them closed is Hensen's 1.3 km. The longest baseline overall is Yin's satellite link, which the authors describe as violating a Bell inequality “under strict Einstein locality conditions”; it is a free-space link, like the 144 km link of Ursin. Cosmic Bell tests [28], [29] push the setting choice into the past and bound NO-CONS. They do not bound H1. Finally, experiments bounding a finite

speed of the hypothetical Bell influence [30] constrain models in which the setting dependence *propagates*; Laidlaw's Type I interaction is instantaneous, so they do not apply to it.

Table 3 Census of the runs behind Table 2. † not re-checked (source not re-read).

Experiment	Platform	r	Result	Stated in the source	Checked
Aspect 1982	photons	lab	CH-type, 5σ	time-varying analyzers	†
Weihs 1998	photons	400 m	$S = 2.73 \pm 0.02$	locality enforced	yes
Tittel 1998	photons	10.9 km	16σ raw, no subtraction	—	yes
Ursin 2007	photons	144 km	$S = 2.508 \pm 0.037$	—	yes
Hensen 2015	NV spins	1.3 km	$S = 2.42 \pm 0.20$, $N = 245$	loophole-free	yes
Giustina 2015	photons	58 m	11.5σ (Eberhard form)	“most significant loopholes”	yes
Shalm 2015	photons	spacelike	adjusted $p = 2.3 \times 10^{-7}$	loophole-free	yes
Rosenfeld 2017	Rb atoms	398 m	$S = 2.221 \pm 0.033$	detection, locality	yes
Handsteiner 2017	photons	Vienna	$S = 2.502$ (run 2)	locality; fair sampling assumed	yes
Yin 2017	photons	1203 km	$S = 2.37 \pm 0.09$	strict Einstein locality	yes
Rauch 2018	photons	La Palma, source–station 500 m, 534 m	$S = 2.65$ (pair 1)	locality; fair sampling assumed	yes
Storz 2023	circuits	30 m	$S = 2.0747 \pm 0.0033$, $N > 10^6$	loophole-free	yes
Wang 2025	photons	lab	$S = 2.275 \pm 0.057$	unentangled photons	yes

Notes on Table 3. Aspect's S in the Clauser–Horne form is bounded by 0 and is not the CHSH parameter. Giustina reports an Eberhard J -value; 11.5σ is the reported violation. Shalm's p -value is the value adjusted for the predictability of the setting choices. Handsteiner's $S = 2.502$ is run 2 of two; Rauch's $S = 2.65$ is pair 1 of two, and the quoted p -value accounts for “corrupt” settings. Wang leaves locality and sampling open by design and does not move any row of Table 2. The “Stated in the source” column records only what the abstract or text claims; a dash means the abstract makes no claim, not that a loophole is open.

What the census cannot do. The runs differ in platform, noise environment and measurement timing. A collection of published (r, S) pairs therefore gives no controlled bound on a range-dependent term: every closed frontier minimises the hold time t , precisely to close the locality loophole, and the point of the tests below is that they need no spacelike separation.

6.2 Testing H1 against a family, not a strawman

One could set Laidlaw's prediction against a single alternative, “the standard model”, stated as a CHSH parameter that does not depend on range. That alternative is too weak, for a reason internal to standard

physics: **noise at the two stations can be spatially correlated**, and then the standard model itself predicts a range-dependent coherence (Laidlaw cites Szańkowski and Cywiński [31] for the role of spatial and temporal noise correlations; we have not re-read that paper). For the two classes of Bell state the sign of the effect differs. For phase noise ϕ_A, ϕ_B on the two qubits, the coherence of a ϕ^+ -type state, $(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, decays with the sum $\phi_A + \phi_B$; the coherence of a ψ^- -type state, $(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, with the difference $\phi_A - \phi_B$. Fully correlated noise cancels in the difference, so singlet-type states are immune to it. If the correlation of the noise falls with range, singlet-type coherence *falls with range*, in the same direction as H1's prediction, and ϕ^+ -type coherence rises. A drop of the CHSH parameter at long range is therefore not by itself evidence for H1.

We restate the two hypotheses so that they are testable against such a family. Let $C_r(t)$ be the coherence (correlator contrast) of a Bell state held for a time t after preparation at range r , and $\tau = r/c$ the vacuum light time between the stations.

i Hypotheses as a time-shift law

H0 (point ontology, standard theory). $C_r(t) = C_0(t)$ for uncorrelated local noise; for correlated noise the dependence on r enters only through the noise correlation, with opposite signs for ϕ^+ -type and ψ^- -type states.

H1 (Laidlaw). $C_r(t) = C_0(t + \kappa\tau)$ with $\kappa = 1$, independent of the state. The lag τ is the geometric r/c , not the optical delay in a fibre.

The time-shift law needs no assumption about the shape of the decay. For exponential decay $C_0(t) = e^{-2t/T_{\text{coh}}}$ it reproduces Laidlaw's $\mathcal{B}(t, \tau) \approx 2\sqrt{2}e^{-2(t+\tau)/T_{\text{coh}}}$. The point of the formulation is that κ is a quantity to be *measured*, with H1 predicting 1 and H0 predicting 0 for uncorrelated noise, and that the experiments below are built so that a nonzero effect cannot be produced by correlated noise alone.

Two points matter for design. First, the optical delay in a fibre is not the lag of H1: Laidlaw's $\tau = r/c$ (about $4.33 \mu\text{s}$ at 1.3 km) is a geometric light time; a fibre delay of the same length is a control, not the effect. Second, decoherence in NV centres is not a single exponential, and Ramsey (T_2^*) and echo or dynamical-decoupling (T_2) times differ by an order of magnitude; the "single-qubit lifetime" must be measured with the *same pulse sequence* as the Bell state, or the comparison is not like with like.

6.3 A hard look at the CHSH route

The direct route is to detect a CHSH difference of 0.22 between 10 m and 1.3 km at $2t/T_{\text{coh}} = 0.1$. Three points reduce the value of that plan.

1. **The ideal value 2.56 is unattainable.** Hensen's $S = 2.42$ corresponds to an apparatus visibility of about 0.86 against the ideal $2\sqrt{2}$. If the visibility multiplies the decoherence factor, H0 predicts about 2.19 and H1 about 2.00 at Laidlaw's working point: the H1 value sits at the classical bound. Ratios, not absolute values, are the safe comparison.
2. **The CHSH inequality is not the inequality of the derivation.** The derivation of Section 2 is in the Wigner form with PCORR; an experiment measures CHSH correlators at imperfect visibility. The bridge between the two (a Wigner-form test at imperfect correlation) needs the weakening of PCORR that GPW themselves could not supply. A direct comparison of the quantum coherence between ranges avoids the problem.
3. **It is expensive.** Resolving 0.22 at five standard deviations needs $\sigma_S \approx 0.031$ on each baseline. The standard error of the CHSH parameter is $\sigma_S \approx k/\sqrt{N}$ with $k \approx 3.2$ (from the correlator variance at Hensen's visibility; $N = 245$ gives 0.20, in agreement with the reported value). That is $N \approx 10^4$ heralded trials per baseline. At the 2015 rate of 245 trials in 220 h, which is 1.1 trials per hour, this is about 9,000 h per baseline, roughly 18,000 h for the pair.

The experiments below measure the coherence directly. A Bell violation is not needed, and the regime of strong decoherence, where the effect is large, becomes accessible.

6.4 Four experiments

The natural platform is the architecture of Hensen and colleagues (2015): two NV electron spins in diamond, entangled by a heralded photon, read out with high fidelity, and already operated at $r = 1.3$ km. The pair is event-ready: coherence is computed only on heralded trials, so fibre loss changes the rate, not the statistic. The coherence time is a laboratory control: it can be lengthened by dynamical decoupling and shortened by injected magnetic noise. That is the property the experiments use.

6.4.1 E1 – The delay matrix

Question. Does the coherence at long range equal the short-range coherence at a later time, and does the shift follow the geometric light time?

Design. A 2×2 factorial design with two factors: **range** (short, $r_s \approx 10$ m, $\tau \approx 33$ ns; long, $r_L = 1.3$ km, $\tau \approx 4.33$ μ s) and **fibre spool** (none; an added optical delay of the same length as the long-range light time, about 0.86 km of fibre at $0.66 c$, in the heralding path at short range). At short range, first measure the decay curve $C_0(t)$ on a grid of hold times without assuming any functional form. Then measure C at the working hold time in each cell, and read off the *equivalent delay* δ defined by $C_r(t) = C_0(t + \delta)$. Here t is the actual hold time of the cell, including any added delay. The estimate is $\hat{\kappa} = \delta/\tau$.

Range	Spool	H0, uncorrelated noise	H1
short	none	$\delta = 0$	$\delta = 0$
short	added	$\delta = 0$	$\delta = 0$
long	none	$\delta = 0$	$\delta = \tau$
long	added	$\delta = 0$	$\delta = \tau$

Why it is sensitive. For an exponential decay the ratio $C_r/C_0 = e^{-2\tau/T_{\text{coh}}}$ is independent of the hold time. It is 0.91 for $T_{\text{coh}} = 96$ μ s but 0.51 for $T_{\text{coh}} = 13$ μ s. Shortening T_{coh} by injected noise therefore increases the signal enormously. At a hold time of 4.8 μ s in both ranges, about 800 events per cell separate H1 from H0 at five standard deviations for T_{coh} between about 13 and 30 μ s, against about 2,000 at 96 μ s (Table 4). Two cells then take about 1,400 h at the 2015 event rate, about one order of magnitude less than the CHSH route.

6.4.2 E2 – The dephasing sum rule

Question. Can a range effect be separated from correlated noise without measuring the noise?

Result. Suppose the dephasing phases ϕ_A, ϕ_B are jointly Gaussian with arbitrary variances and an arbitrary correlation ρ . Then the coherences satisfy

$$C_{\phi^+} C_{\psi^-} = (C_A C_B)^2,$$

where C_A and C_B are the single-qubit Ramsey coherences at the same hold time. The reason is elementary: with the common factor $\exp(-\frac{1}{2}(\sigma_A^2 + \sigma_B^2))$, the ϕ^+ -type state contributes $\exp(-\rho\sigma_A\sigma_B)$ and the ψ^- -type state contributes $\exp(+\rho\sigma_A\sigma_B)$, and the two cancel in the product. A Monte Carlo check with $\rho = 0, 0.5, 0.9$ confirms it. In words: **correlated noise helps one Bell state exactly as much as it hurts the other, and the product does not see it.**

Prediction. H0 gives $Q \equiv C_{\phi^+} C_{\psi^-} / (C_A C_B)^2 = 1$ whatever the noise correlation. If H1's lag factor $e^{-2\kappa\tau/T_{\text{coh}}}$ applies to both Bell states, then $Q = e^{-4\kappa\tau/T_{\text{coh}}}$, a deficit $4\kappa\tau/T_{\text{coh}}$ in the exponent. The sum rule is entanglement-specific and needs no model of the spatial correlation.

Design. The ϕ^+ - and ψ^- -type states differ by a local flip on one node, so one apparatus prepares both. Measure Q at r_s (a control that must give $Q = 1$ within errors; it also diagnoses non-Gaussian noise, since the sum

rule fails for it) and at r_L . The signal is the change $\Delta \ln Q = -4\kappa\tau/T_{\text{coh}}$. The single-qubit measurements need no heralding and are cheap, so the cost is in the heralded events (Table 4).

6.4.3 E3 – Lag or bond fragility?

Question. Laidlaw predicts two range effects: the light-travel lag and a qualitative $1/r^2$ weakening of the bond. Can they be separated?

Design. Fit, at each range, the model

$$\ln C_r(t; T_{\text{coh}}) = a_r - \frac{2t}{T_r} - \frac{2\kappa\tau}{T_{\text{coh}}}.$$

Three effects have distinct signatures in the two controls, the hold time t and the injected-noise level that sets T_{coh} . The **lag** adds a term that does not depend on t but is proportional to $1/T_{\text{coh}}$. A **range-dependent loss of visibility** (herald fidelity, phase drift of the optical link, timing jitter) shifts the intercept a_r independently of T_{coh} . **Bond fragility** changes the decay rate $1/T_r$ itself. A grid of three values of t times three of T_{coh} at each range identifies the three parameters. If the lag is present but the rate is unchanged, the bond effect is not seen at this range; if the rate changes but κ stays zero, the field-model prediction has the second, qualitative effect only.

6.4.4 E4 – Circuits

Question. Can the test be carried to a platform with a much higher event rate?

The circuit link of Storz and colleagues (2023) has $r = 30$ m, so $\tau \approx 100$ ns, and delivered $N > 10^6$ trials. With $T_{\text{coh}} \sim 50 \mu\text{s}$ the H1 deficit is $4\tau/T \approx 0.008$ (Table 4): at that link length, the effect is invisible unless the measurement runs to some 7×10^4 heralded events per Bell state. Two link lengths are needed, and a longer link of order 300 m would bring the requirement to about 1,400 heralded events, seconds of data on a superconducting platform. **This is conditional on the link and on a further assumption.** Laidlaw's argument for the lag is about the far field of a magnetic electron; whether it transfers to charge or flux qubits in a cryogenic link is not argued, and a null result on circuits would test less than one on NV spins.

Table 4 Sample sizes for a five-standard-deviation detection of the H1 deficit in Q (E2), assuming abundant single-qubit shots and hold times of $4.8 \mu\text{s}$ (NV) and $1 \mu\text{s}$ (circuit). For E1 with $t = 4.8 \mu\text{s}$: about 800 events per cell at $T_{\text{coh}} = 13\text{--}30 \mu\text{s}$, 1,200 at $50 \mu\text{s}$, 2,000 at $96 \mu\text{s}$. All figures are illustrative: the contrasts are computed for uncorrelated noise.

Platform, range	T_{coh}	τ	Q_{H1}	Heralded events per Bell state (E2)
NV, 1.3 km	$13 \mu\text{s}$	$4.33 \mu\text{s}$	0.26	≈ 440
NV, 1.3 km	$30 \mu\text{s}$	$4.33 \mu\text{s}$	0.56	≈ 360
NV, 1.3 km	$96 \mu\text{s}$	$4.33 \mu\text{s}$	0.83	≈ 710
NV, 400 m	$30 \mu\text{s}$	$1.33 \mu\text{s}$	0.84	$\approx 2,000$
Circuit, 30 m	$50 \mu\text{s}$	$0.10 \mu\text{s}$	0.99	$\approx 72,000$
Circuit, 300 m	$50 \mu\text{s}$	$1.0 \mu\text{s}$	0.92	$\approx 1,400$

6.4.5 Control C – the detectors-off round

Laidlaw's "Hypothesis 2" says that the entangled state is not projected until classical information about the result is available in principle. Its test uses two rounds after each herald: rotate onto a first CHSH axis and fire the readout laser with the detectors off, then rotate onto a different axis and fire the laser with the detectors on. If the hypothesis holds, the second round still violates the inequality. It is sometimes taken as a third protocol. It is not a test of field against point ontology, and as a test of the hypothesis it is ill-posed: fluorescence photons carry the state information into the environment whether or not a detector records

them, and accounts of decoherence in which redundant proliferation of information suffices [32] lead one to expect a round-two value at or below 2 under standard theory. We keep it as a *positive control*: a first-round exposure without detection that leaves the second-round violation intact would be a result about the measurement problem in its own right, and one that destroys the pair confirms the design's reading of its own signals.

6.5 What the outcomes would mean

Observation	Reading
$\hat{\kappa} \approx 1$ in E1, $Q < 1$ in E2 with $Q = 1$ at short range, no shift in the spool cell	Supports the lag term of H1 on this platform
$\hat{\kappa} \approx 0$, $Q = 1$	Refutes the lag term as Laidlaw formulates it on this platform; does not refute every field ontology
Shift at long range for ψ^- -type only, $Q = 1$	Correlated noise (standard physics)
Shift in the short-range spool cell	Effect follows the heralding-path delay, not distance
$Q \neq 1$ at short range	Non-Gaussian noise, or a defect in the sequence; sum rule not applicable
Rate change without κ (E3)	Bond fragility, a different claim

6.6 Statistical requirements and controls

Commit to the predicted values of δ and Q from the independently measured t , τ and T_{coh} before unblinding. Measure the single-qubit coherence time with the same pulse sequence as the Bell-state coherence, on the same day, at each node. Admit only heralded trials. Record the geometric distance and the optical delay separately; plot against both. Restore or re-measure T_{coh} after any change of the magnetic environment. Spacelike setting choice is not part of these tests and may be omitted.

6.7 Outlook: what the field reading may connect to

Two recent papers on adjacent questions may connect to the analysis, and we cite them as pointers, not as applications. Centeno and colleagues (2026)(2026) propose a *coordination principle*, a multipartite extension of Reichenbach's principle: perfect randomised coordination among N parties requires a common cause. It is the multipartite counterpart of the distinction GPW exploit, between pairwise common causes and a single common cause, and it invites an analysis of GHZ-type experiments in the style of Section 2. Anastopoulos and Savvidou (2026) distinguish the order of events from the order of interventions in a histories framework; that distinction may bear on the frame-dependence of the wing order noted in Section 4.5. We have not tested either connection.

7 Discussion and Prospectus

7.1 What is established

The following statements are checkable by others.

1. **The GPW derivation is valid.** Given the nine assumptions in the form stated in Section 2.2, the Wigner-form inequality follows (Theorem 1). We found no error in GPW's algebra.
2. **The exact place where the derivation breaks in Laidlaw's model.** With Alice measuring first, the right-wing (later-measured) halves of LOC2 and LOC3 fail. The left-wing halves hold (Proposition 2a, b). This failure is of the type known as parameter dependence.
3. **The field reading does not save all nine assumptions.** Whether the remaining seven suffice for a countermodel depends on PCC and NO-CONS holding in the model, which Laidlaw does not state (Proposition 2c, conditional).

4. **LOC1 changes its justification.** On the point-event reading it follows from spacelike separation; on the field reading it is a further physical assumption about the absence of direct interaction between distributed outcomes.

7.2 What is conjectural

Laidlaw's toy model is a proof of concept, not a physical theory. It specifies local evolution rules for abstract field variables; it does not propose a dynamical law for electrons or photons. The binding energy E_B and the $1/r^2$ weakening of the bond remain free or qualitative. The order of the two measurements, which decides which wing carries the dependence, is frame-dependent; we have noted the problem but not resolved it (Section 4.5).

The time-shift law $C_r(t) = C_0(t + \kappa\tau)$ is different in kind. Once t , τ and T_{coh} are measured, H1 names a value of κ , and the experiments of Section 6.4 can be specified as designs rather than wishes. What remains conjectural is whether the factor $e^{-2\tau/T_{\text{coh}}}$ is the right transcription of the statement that Alice's far field has been without near-field control for a time τ . A null result would refute that transcription on the platform tested, not every field ontology.

Finally, this paper has located the breaking point but has not constructed an alternative derivation. We have not derived a Bell-type inequality from assumptions appropriate to a field ontology.

7.3 Why the programme is worth investigating

Three considerations, stated modestly.

First, testability. The lag term is a definite hypothesis with a stated null. Retrocausal, many-worlds and superdeterministic readings make no comparable range-dependent prediction at present, and the hypothesis can be probed on an existing platform at a cost of order 10^3 heralded events (Table 4) rather than the 10^4 per baseline of a CHSH comparison. Correlated noise, the standard rival, is controlled by the sum rule of E2.

Second, a more precise account of what Bell's theorem excludes. The derivation shows which assumptions are jointly excluded; the model shows which of them a field reading gives up. That is information about the *interpretation of locality*, not a new derivation.

Third, the Hofer-Szabó-Rédei-Szabó question. The separate-common-cause programme [2], [12], [24] asks whether separate common causes can screen off without correlating with the settings. Laidlaw's model gives an answer by paying with parameter dependence in the later wing; whether other field models pay differently is open.

7.4 Open problems

Problems 1–3 and 6 are theoretical; 4 and 5 are experimental.

1. **Can a Bell-type inequality be derived from field-appropriate locality assumptions?** LOC2 and LOC3 fail for the later wing. Is there a weaker condition that still yields an inequality, or does the field reading block all such inequalities?
2. **What is the field counterpart of LOC2?** It would specify what statistical independence, if any, holds between distributed outcomes and remote distributed setting interactions.
3. **Is there a general answer to the Szabó question for distributed common causes?** Laidlaw's model is one instance.
4. **Does the coherence at range r equal the short-range coherence at time $t + \kappa\tau$?** This is E1 to E3. A measured $\hat{\kappa}$ consistent with 0 at the sample sizes of Table 4 refutes the lag term on that platform; $\hat{\kappa} \approx 1$ with $Q < 1$ in E2 and no shift in the spool cell supports it; an effect that does not track τ is a different claim.
5. **Does the same sum-rule deficit appear on circuit links?** E4, conditional on the transfer argument from magnetic far fields, which Laidlaw does not make.

6. **How does the field reading relate to quantum field theory?** QFT treats particles as excitations of fields over all space. Does its treatment of EPR correlations derive LOC2 and LOC3 for both wings, or leave them as assumptions? A photonic version of E1 could be the empirical counterpart, but only after the NV run has set the scale.

Acknowledgements. This paper was prepared with AI assistance by Famulus Lektor (OpenScienceTechnology GmbH). The text was checked line by line against the cited sources. Correspondence on the open problems is welcome.

References

Bibliography

- [1] J. S. Bell, "On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Paradox," *Physics*, vol. 1, pp. 195–200, 1964.
- [2] G. Hofer-Szabó, M. Rédei, and L. E. Szabó, "On Reichenbach's Common Cause Principle and Reichenbach's Notion of Common Cause," *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, vol. 50, pp. 377–399, 1999.
- [3] H. Reichenbach, *The Direction of Time*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1956.
- [4] E. P. Wigner, "On Hidden Variables and Quantum Mechanical Probabilities," *American Journal of Physics*, vol. 38, pp. 1005–1009, 1970.
- [5] B. C. van Fraassen, "The Charybdis of Realism: Epistemological Implications of Bell's Inequality," *Synthese*, vol. 52, pp. 25–38, 1982.
- [6] G. Graßhoff, S. Portmann, and A. Wüthrich, "Minimal Assumption Derivation of a Bell-Type Inequality," *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, vol. 56, pp. 663–680, 2005, doi: 10.1093/bjps/axi037.
- [7] T. Norsen, "Bell's Concept of Local Causality," *American Journal of Physics*, vol. 79, pp. 1261–1275, 2011.
- [8] A. Laidlaw, "Bell's Concept of Local Causality Does Not Preclude Bell Correlations in Local Realist Field Ontologies," *Academia Quantum*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2026, doi: 10.20935/AcadQuant8384.
- [9] J. T. Cushing and E. McMullin, Eds., *Philosophical Consequences of Quantum Theory: Reflections on Bell's Theorem*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- [10] A. Wüthrich, *Quantum Correlations and Common Causes*. in Bern Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science. Bern, 2004.
- [11] D. Bohm, *Quantum Theory*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1951.
- [12] G. Hofer-Szabó and M. Rédei, "Reichenbachian Common Cause Systems," *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, vol. 43, no. 7–8, pp. 1819–1826, 2004, doi: 10.1023/B:IJTP.0000048822.29070.0c.
- [13] T. Placek, *Is Nature Deterministic?*. Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press, 2000.
- [14] A. Fine, "Hidden Variables, Joint Probability, and the Bell Inequalities," *Synthese*, vol. 50, pp. 279–294, 1982.
- [15] G. Graßhoff and M. May, "Causal Regularities," pp. 85–114, 2001.
- [16] A. Aspect, J. Dalibard, and G. Roger, "Experimental Test of Bell's Inequalities Using Time-Varying Analyzers," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 49, pp. 1804–1807, 1982.
- [17] B. Hensen and others, "Loophole-Free Bell Inequality Violation Using Electron Spins Separated by 1.3 Kilometres," *Nature*, vol. 526, pp. 682–686, 2015.

- [18] M. Giustina and others, "Significant-Loophole-Free Test of Bell's Theorem with Entangled Photons," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 115, p. 250401, 2015.
- [19] L. K. Shalm and others, "Strong Loophole-Free Test of Local Realism," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 115, p. 250402, 2015.
- [20] J. S. Bell, "The Theory of Local Beables," in *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- [21] J. P. Jarrett, "On the Physical Significance of the Locality Conditions in the Bell Arguments," *Noûs*, vol. 18, pp. 569–589, 1984.
- [22] A. Shimony, "Search for a Naturalistic World View," vol. 2, 1993.
- [23] C. Anastopoulos and N. Savvidou, "Superposition of Dynamics, Indefinite Causal Order, and Quantum Histories." 2026.
- [24] L. E. Szabó, "Attempt to Resolve the EPR-Bell Paradox via Reichenbach's Concept of Common Cause," *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 901–911, 2000, doi: 10.1023/A:1003691216444.
- [25] W. Rosenfeld and others, "Event-Ready Bell Test Using Entangled Atoms Simultaneously Closing Detection and Locality Loopholes," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 119, p. 10402, 2017.
- [26] S. Storz and others, "Loophole-Free Bell Inequality Violation with Superconducting Circuits," *Nature*, vol. 617, pp. 265–270, 2023, doi: 10.1038/s41586-023-05885-0.
- [27] J. Yin and others, "Satellite-Based Entanglement Distribution over 1200 Kilometers," *Science*, vol. 356, pp. 1140–1144, 2017, doi: 10.1126/science.aan3211.
- [28] D. Rauch and others, "Cosmic Bell Test Using Random Measurement Settings from High-Redshift Quasars," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 121, p. 80403, 2018.
- [29] J. Handsteiner and others, "Cosmic Bell Test: Measurement Settings from Milky Way Stars," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 118, p. 60401, 2017.
- [30] J. Yin, Y. Cao, H.-L. Yong, J.-G. Ren, and others, "Lower Bound on the Speed of Nonlocal Correlations without Locality and Measurement Choice Loopholes," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 110, p. 260407, 2013, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.260407.
- [31] P. Szańkowski, M. Trippenbach, Ł. Cywiński, and Y. B. Band, "The Dynamics of Two Entangled Qubits Exposed to Classical Noise: Role of Spatial and Temporal Noise Correlations," *Quantum Information Processing*, vol. 14, no. 9, pp. 3367–3397, 2015, doi: 10.1007/s11128-015-1044-7.
- [32] N. Ormrod, T. van der Lugt, Y. Ying, and J. K. Korbicz, "Decoherence without the State: A Causal Quantum Darwinist Approach." 2026.
- [33] D. Centeno, A. Coquet, M. Ciudad Alañón, L. Tendick, M.-O. Renou, and E. Wolfe, "Coordination Requires a Common Cause in Quantum Theory." 2026.
- [34] D. Centeno, A. Coquet, M. Ciudad Alañón, L. Tendick, M.-O. Renou, and E. Wolfe, "A Missing Causal Principle: Coordination." 2026.