

# Against ‘Realism’

Travis Norsen

*Marlboro College  
Marlboro, VT 05344*

---

## Abstract

We examine the prevalent use of the phrase “local realism” in the context of Bell’s Theorem and associated experiments, with a focus on the question: what exactly is the “realism” in “local realism” supposed to mean? Carefully surveying several possible meanings, we argue that all of them are flawed in one way or another as attempts to point out a second premise (in addition to locality) on which the Bell inequalities rest, and (hence) which might be rejected in the face of empirical data violating the inequalities. We thus suggest that this vague and abused phrase “local realism” should be banned from future discussions of these issues, and urge physicists to revisit the foundational questions behind Bell’s Theorem.

*Key words:* Local Realism, Bell’s Theorem, EPR, Quantum Non-Locality

---

## 1 Introduction

I should begin by clarifying the title. I am actually *not* against realism. I am a realist – at least in several widely-used senses of the term. What I am against is the use of the *word* ‘realism’ in a certain context, just as J.S. Bell was (without in any way being professionally or morally opposed to the taking of measurements) “Against ‘Measurement’.” [1, pg 213-231]

The context in which I am against the use of the word ‘realism’ is: Bell’s Theorem, the EPR argument, Aspect’s and other empirical tests of Bell’s inequalities, and surrounding issues. The reason I am against the word ‘realism’ is twofold: first, it is almost never clear what exactly a given user means by the term, i.e., which of several possible (and very different) senses of ‘realism’ is being referred to; and second, the point that will occupy us for most of the

---

*Email address:* [norsen@marlboro.edu](mailto:norsen@marlboro.edu) (Travis Norsen).

present paper, *none* of these possibly-meant senses of ‘realism’ turn out to have the kind of relevance that the users seem to think they have.

As far as I know, the ‘realism’ problem was first pointed out about ten years ago, in an essay by Tim Maudlin. After noting, and answering, the long-standing misconception that Bell’s theorem applied only to local *deterministic* theories – a misconception Bell himself struggled against<sup>1</sup> for decades, and which continues to this day – Maudlin notes

“Recently, a new bogeyman seems to have been found: realism. Thus Hardy states: ‘In 1965 Bell demonstrated that quantum mechanics is not a local realistic theory. He did this by deriving a set of inequalities and then showing that these inequalities are violated by quantum mechanics.’ .... The conversational implication is that Bell’s theorem only applies to local *realistic* theories, so that locality (and hence perhaps also consistency with Relativity) can be recovered if one only jettisons realism.” [3, pg 304]

But, as Maudlin goes on to briefly explain, this conversational implication is false.

The problem only seems to have gotten worse since Maudlin’s paper. Hits for the phrase “local realism” in the journals published by the American Physical Society show an almost perfect exponential increase in the last 20 years.<sup>2</sup> To hint at the pervasiveness of this terminology – and to give a sense of how it is typically used – here is a selection of statements, all from acceptably prestigious physicists and published in acceptably peer-reviewed journals, in which the phrase “local realism” (or its equivalent) appears:

- “John Bell showed that the quantum predictions for entanglement are in conflict with local realism.” [4]

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, in “Bertlmann’s socks and the nature of reality” [1, pg 139-158] Bell writes: “It is remarkably difficult to get this point across, that determinism is not a *presupposition* of the analysis. There is a widespread and erroneous conviction that for Einstein determinism was always *the* sacred principle.” And there is a footnote, following the word “Einstein” which reads as follows: “And his followers [by which Bell clearly means himself]. My own first paper on this subject ... starts with a summary of the EPR argument *from locality to* deterministic hidden variables. But the commentators have almost universally reported that it begins with deterministic hidden variables.”

<sup>2</sup> For *Physical Review Letters* alone, the number of papers using the phrase ‘local realism’ for the years 1985 - 2005 are as follows: 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 2, 5, 2, 1, 0, 0, 4, 3, 7, 4, 6, 10, 4, 16, 13. Note also that the rate of increase for “local realism” is significantly higher than that for other related keywords such as “Bell’s Theorem” and “hidden variables”. So the increased usage of “local realism” cannot be blamed simply on the overall increase in numbers of *PRL* papers generally, or papers pertaining to the foundations of QM in particular.

- “I ... illustrate the basic mathematical conflict between the kind of predictions made by quantum mechanics and those that Bell showed to follow from the plausible constraints of a local realism.” [5]
- “ ‘Bell’s Theorem’ is the collective name for a family of arguments .... [having] the format  $E\&H \rightarrow I$  where  $E$  is a description of a type of experimental setup involving pairs of particles emitted from a common source,  $H$  is a physical hypothesis which typically expresses some version of ‘realism’ and some version of ‘locality’, and  $I$  is an inequality concerning correlations.... Insofar as  $H$  is typically in part a metaphysical hypothesis (e.g., by expressing some version of physical realism), one has brought experiment to bear upon a metaphysical question.” [6]
- “In 1964 John S. Bell ... showed that the tenets of local realistic theories impose a limit on the extent of correlation that can be expected when different spin components are measured. The limit is expressed in the ... Bell inequality.” [7]
- “Starting in 1965, Bell and others constructed mathematical inequalities whereby experimental tests could distinguish between quantum mechanics and local realistic theories. Many experiments have since been done that are consistent with quantum mechanics and inconsistent with local realism.” [8]
- “[L]ocal realism holds that one can assign a definite value to the result of an impending measurement of any component of the spin of either of the two correlated particles, whether or not that measurement is actually performed. .... In 1964, however, Bell showed that ... this escape [i.e., local realism] from the conundrum is not only incompatible with the orthodox interpretation of quantum mechanics, but it is also inconsistent with the *quantitative numerical predictions* of quantum mechanics.” [9]
- “Bell’s theorem establishes that the quantum theory and the theory of relativity, or more properly the absence of instantaneous action at a distance, cannot both be correct if we wish to maintain the philosophical principle known as ‘realism.’ The absence of actions at a distance has come to be known as ‘locality,’ and so Bell’s theorem shows an incompatibility between local realism and quantum mechanics.” [2]
- “Bell’s theorem changed the nature of the [Bohr-Einstein] debate. In a simple and illuminating paper, Bell proved that Einstein’s point of view (local realism) leads to algebraic predictions (the celebrated Bell’s inequality) that are contradicted by the quantum-mechanical predictions.... The issue was no longer a matter of taste, or epistemological position: it was a quantitative question that could be answered experimentally...” [10]

And finally, Wikipedia – that great barometer of popular understanding (and misunderstanding) – asserts the meaning of Bell’s Theorem bluntly: “either quantum mechanics or local realism is wrong.” [11]

Since (roughly) the late 1970’s, the claim that Bell’s inequality is a constraint on ‘local realism’ has clearly been widespread. (Previously, it had been typ-

ically characterized as a constraint on local deterministic theories or local hidden-variable theories.) So, if my thesis (that ‘realism’ has no valid place whatsoever in these discussions) is correct, it follows that the underlying confusions are quite serious.

Of course, whether users of the phrase ‘local realism’ are mis-using and/or abusing the term ‘realism’ can only be established if we know (which, by the way, requires that *they* know) what they mean by it. Since, unfortunately, they typically don’t tell us what they mean,<sup>3</sup> we will survey four different senses of realism that, one might think, could be relevant – the only four, by the way, that I could think of as even remotely plausibly relevant.

Our goal is thus to attempt to answer the question: what, exactly, do all these physicists mean by ‘realism’ when they say that Bell’s inequality is based on (and hence experiment has refuted) ‘local realism’? As we will argue, no sensible answer is forthcoming, and so we will end with some speculation about the origins of, and misconceptions underlying, this confused terminology.

I should clarify one other thing before we get started with our tour of realisms. My title is, obviously, in homage to Bell, who wrote so eloquently (as noted above) “Against ‘Measurement’.” But the similarity is rather limited. Here is what Bell said about the word whose abuse he discussed in that article:

“I am convinced that the word ‘measurement’ has now been so abused that the field would be significantly advanced by banning its use altogether, in favour for example of the word ‘experiment’.” [1, pg 166]

My complaint against ‘realism’ is different in two ways. First, I do not think the word should be banned altogether. As I said, I’m actually *for* several different kinds of realism, and I think the word ‘realism’ (appropriately specified) is perfectly good terminology for those views, and should be kept. What I’m against is specifically the use of the term ‘realism’ in the phrase ‘local realism’ in the context of the EPR-Bell issues where, I will argue, it has no place. So my purpose isn’t, after all, to argue that the term should be banned, but simply to explain why the term has no valid place in discussion of these particular issues. A second (related) difference with Bell’s complaint against ‘measurement’ is

---

<sup>3</sup> One notable exception is Ref. [2], which contains an admirably detailed and at times clear-headed discussion of the meaning of this phrase. Unfortunately, what the authors define as ‘realism’ already includes (most of) Bell’s definition of ‘locality’, and what they define as ‘locality’ turns out to be a pointless irrelevancy. (Specifically, their ‘contextual variables’  $\mu$  – hidden variables pertaining to the measuring instruments – could simply be shuffled into the already-existing symbol  $\lambda$  with no loss of generality; in fact, this simplification would allow a shortcut to their Equation (6) but with the probability factors under the integrand defined more simply.) So in the end their discussion is not a model of clarity.

that I have no different term in mind (paralleling ‘experiment’ for Bell), whose use I will urge in place of ‘realism’. Since, as I will argue, ‘realism’ simply has no place in these discussions to begin with, there is no need to replace it with some other, less misleading terminology, once its inappropriate use is ceased.

Let us then begin our tour of realisms. We will start with ‘naive realism’ – or, more precisely, a certain sort of hidden variable view that nicely parallels, in the context of physical measurements,<sup>4</sup> the naive realist view of perception. We will then briefly touch on so-called ‘scientific realism’ before moving on to ‘perceptual realism’ and then, finally, ‘metaphysical realism’.

## 2 Naive Realism

In the philosophy of perception, Naive Realism is the view that all features of a perceptual experience have their origin in a corresponding feature of the perceived object. For example, a Naive Realist will say that, when someone sees a red apple, the experienced redness resides in the apple, as a kind of intrinsic property that is passively revealed in the perceptual experience. Likewise in a case of experiencing the coolness of water when one plunges one’s arm into it: the Naive Realist explains the experience by positing an intrinsic “coolness property” of the water which is passively revealed in the act of perception. Naive Realism may be contrasted with alternative theories of perception in which some aspects of either the content or the form of the experience is contributed, not by the perceived object, but by the perceiving subject. Examples of such alternatives would include Locke’s theory and the associated distinction between primary and secondary qualities (with Naive Realism retained for the primary qualities only), J.J. Gibson’s ecological-realist account (according to which active interactions between the perceived object and the subject’s perceptual apparatus determine the form in which certain real features of the object are experienced [12]), and subjectivist accounts (in which none of the features of the perceptual experience arise from external facts about the object). What all of these have in common is the idea that the perceiving subject (or more specifically his perceptual apparatus) contributes *something* to the conscious experience. Naive Realism, in contrast to all of these, is the belief that the identity of the perceptual apparatus contributes nothing to the experienced product: the experience is simply a revealing (or passive re-creation) of intrinsic features of the perceived object.

The philosophy of perception, however, is not our topic. What does any of the above have to do with physics in general or Bell’s Theorem in particular? Quite a bit, as it turns out. For there is a surprisingly exact parallel between

---

<sup>4</sup> ...or perhaps I should say “physical *experiments*”...

the just-described theories of perception, and several possible attitudes toward “measurement” in physics.

For the remainder of the current paper, we will use the term Naive Realism to refer to the following view: whenever an experimental physicist performs a “measurement” of some property of some physical system (e.g., the position of an electron, or the temperature of a certain sample of liquid) the *outcome* of that measurement is simply a passive revealing of some pre-existing intrinsic property of the object. Thus, if the digital thermometer reads  $42.6\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ , that is because, prior to the insertion of the thermometer, the liquid already possessed the property of having temperature  $42.6\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ . And likewise, if the position measurement on the electron results in the electron being found *here*, that is because, prior to the measurement (i.e., prior to any interaction between the electron and the measuring apparatus) the electron really was, already, *here*.

This last sort of case is particularly important since, according to orthodox quantum theory, electrons don’t (in general) have definite positions – a point made most strikingly by Bohr’s colleague Pascual Jordan: “the electron is forced [by our measurement] to a decision. We compel it *to assume a definite position*; previously it was, in general, neither here nor there; it had not yet made its decision for a definite position.” [1, pg 142] According to orthodox quantum theory, the wave function alone provides a complete description of the state of a particle, and this wave function does not (in general) attribute any single particular position attribute to the particle. Thus, orthodox quantum theory contradicts Naive Realism, and instead upholds some physics-measurement-analogue of the non-naive-realist or subjectivist theories of perception mentioned above.

In traditional foundations-of-physics terminology, what we are here calling Naive Realism is thus the idea of a Non-Contextual Hidden Variable Theory (HVT).<sup>5</sup> And this raises immediately the crucial issue: it was already known,

---

<sup>5</sup> This is to be contrasted both with orthodox quantum theory – which is not a HVT in any sense – and with Contextual HVTs such as Bohmian Mechanics. Note that a Contextual HVT is a HVT for which (what physicists traditionally refer to as) “measurements” of *at least some* properties do not simply reveal pre-existing values of those properties. In Bohmian Mechanics, for example, position measurements *do* simply reveal pre-existing particle positions, but everything else is contextual: momentum, spin, energy, and other non-position “observables” do not simply have their pre-existing values revealed by the corresponding measurements. There are several possible types of contextuality, all of which can be illustrated using the example of Bohm’s theory. In some cases (such as momentum measurements) the particle *can* be thought of as possessing a pre-measurement value for the momentum (if this is simply defined as the mass times the time-derivative of the position), but this pre-measurement value is *not* (generally) the value that appears as the outcome of a “measurement of the momentum.” (Due to the effective

prior to Bell's Theorem and prior to any experimental tests of Bell's inequalities, that Non-Contextual HVTs (i.e., Naive Realist theories) are wrong, are not empirically viable. It was known through the "no-hidden-variable" theorems of von Neumann, Gleason, Kochen and Specker, and Bell himself. [1, pg 1-13, 159-168] (See also [14] and note that the "no-hidden-variable" theorem of Bell referred to here is Bell's *first*, less celebrated, theorem – the simplified version of Gleason's theorem he proved in the 1964 paper, infamously unpublished until 1966, called "On the problem of hidden variables in quantum theory".) These theorems are proofs of various versions of the following claim: it is mathematically impossible to consistently assign pre-measurement values to all possible observables of a quantum system, such that (a) measurements simply reveal these pre-measurement values and (b) the values are consistent with the quantum mechanical predictions (for which we have strong independent empirical support). More specifically, the theorems show that the value assigned to a given observable must *depend* on which (set of) compatible observables are to be measured simultaneously – that is, the value assigned to a given observable must depend on the entire measurement *context*, i.e., hidden variables must (in at least some cases) be contextual. Or put negatively: Non-Contextual HVTs are ruled out.

---

collapse of the wave function, however, the outcome of the "momentum measurement" *does* match the post-measurement momentum of the particle.) In other cases (such as measurements of spin components), the particles don't even *possess* the relevant kinds of properties at all: it's not that the particle has pre-measurement spin components which differ, in general, from the outcomes of the spin component measurements; rather, the particle simply doesn't have any such property as "spin" (neither before, nor during, nor after the measurement). The relevant "spin properties" reside elsewhere: in the interaction between the particle's associated guiding wave and the particular measurement apparatus (Stern-Gerlach device, say) which is performing the measurement. In the literature, the phrase "contextual property" is often used to describe features like spin as conceived in Bohmian Mechanics. This terminology is unfortunate, because (as hopefully this brief discussion indicates) a so-called "contextual property" may not be a property at all. See Ref. [13] for a more detailed and highly illuminating discussion. It should also be mentioned that the points being raised here are closely connected with Bell's reasons for being "Against 'Measurement'." The central point of his article is that the *word* 'measurement' conversationally implies Naive Realism – something which, as will emerge in the current section of this paper, we already know with certainty cannot be true. Yet the conversational implication remains, and is hard to resist. Bell thought that the Naive Realist attitude that was implied by the misleading use of the word "measurement" (misleading because in many "measurements" nothing is actually being measured!) was behind much, if not all, of the apparent paradoxicalness of quantum mechanics (and the various weird attempts to deal with it such as "quantum logic"). The reader is referred to Bell's paper and the elaboration of Daumer *et al.* for more details. See also Bell's essay "On the impossible pilot wave."

It would be very odd, then, if the ‘realism’ in ‘local realism’ meant Naive Realism, i.e., Non-Contextual hidden variables. For then the much-trumpeted experimental proof against ‘local realism’ would mean that we had either to reject locality – for which the theory of relativity provides strong support – or Naive Realism – which is already known to be wrong, and which we should thus *already have rejected*. Such a dilemma would hardly call for trumpets. And so it seems unlikely that the ‘realism’ in ‘local realism’ *could* mean Naive Realism.<sup>6</sup>

Actually, though, there is more to say here. For the vast majority of published proofs of Bell’s Theorem do appear to assume the existence of local, Non-Contextual hidden variables, i.e., what Mermin has dubbed “instruction sets”: parameters that one thinks of as being carried by the particles which tell them whether to be spin-up or spin-down along various axes if the corresponding measurement is made. [15] Such theories clearly exemplify Naive Realism. So perhaps, after all, the derivation of Bell-type inequalities *does* require a Naive Realist premise – and the ‘realism’ in ‘local realism’ *is* Naive Realism?

If this is what the users of ‘local realism’ have in mind, however, it simply shows that they have not properly understood Bell’s derivation. There are two related crucial points here.

First, while it is true that many derivations of Bell inequalities use Naive Realist “instruction sets”, this is not an *independent* assumption. As Bell himself repeatedly stresses (see, for example, the remarks quoted in Footnote 1 above), the existence of these local, deterministic, non-contextual hidden variables (i.e., the existence of Mermin-type “instruction sets”) is not simply assumed, but is *inferred* – from Locality plus a certain subset of the quantum mechanical predictions, using (in essence) the EPR argument. [16] Logically, therefore, it is misleading to claim that the Bell inequalities are derived from Locality *and* Naive Realism – and hence equally misleading to claim that empirical violations of Bell inequalities permit some kind of choice between rejecting Locality and rejecting Naive Realism. Any such choice is illusory, for the (modified) EPR argument proves that Locality *entails* Naive Realism. Thus, to have to choose one of them to reject, is to have to reject Locality.

---

<sup>6</sup> It should be mentioned, though, that this is what many of those who use this phrase *do* appear to mean by it. See, e.g., Ref. [9]. This paper is one of the earliest I’ve found (other than d’Espagnat’s *Scientific American* article, Ref. [7]) which uses the phrase ‘local realism’ and is notable also because the author actually makes some attempt to *define* the phrase. However, two important points emerge in a footnote: the author isn’t himself completely clear what he means by the phrase, and he confesses that his ‘local realism’ is a stronger assumption than is necessary to arrive at a Bell-type inequality. This latter point especially will be emphasized in the subsequent discussion in the current paper.

Second, it is possible to derive a Bell-type inequality *without* the Naive Realist instruction sets (i.e., without the EPR-motivated deterministic, non-contextual hidden variables). In particular, the so-called CHSH inequality (named for its discoverers Clauser, Horne, Shimony and Holt [17]) can be derived from the assumption of Locality *alone*. Nothing else (such as determinism, hidden variables, counter-factual definiteness, etc.) need be assumed. [18] This fact, unfortunately, was obscured in the original CHSH paper. They described their own derivation as being based on the assumed existence of hidden variables which go beyond the orthodox quantum description of states in terms of wave-functions only: “Suppose now that [the outcomes  $A$  and  $B$  are] due to information carried by and localized within each particle... The information, which emphatically is not quantum mechanical, is part of the content of a set of hidden variables, denoted collectively by  $\lambda$ .” Despite these statements, however, the mathematical derivation itself requires no assumptions whatever about the content of  $\lambda$ . In the context of Bell’s definition of local causality (i.e., Bell Locality),  $\lambda$  refers to a theory’s proposed *complete description* of the state of the particle pair prior to measurement. But – and this generality is precisely why Bell’s theorem is so *interesting* – this could be *any* theory. For example, orthodox quantum theory is in principle covered, with the identification  $\lambda = \Psi$ . Thus, the only assumption actually used in the formal derivation of the CHSH inequality is (Bell’s “local causality”, i.e., Bell-) Locality. And so the empirically observed violation of the CHSH inequality can only be blamed on a failure of the Locality assumption, i.e., the nonlocality of nature.

To summarize, one simply does not need an assumption of Naive Realism in order to derive an empirically testable Bell-type inequality. One needs only the Locality assumption. And so, whatever the ‘realism’ in ‘local realism’ is supposed to mean, it cannot be Naive Realism.

Before moving on to our other candidates for the meaning of ‘realism’ in ‘local realism’, let’s address one possible worry. Perhaps ‘realism’ refers to some other, less naive, class of hidden variables (less naive, that is, than the Mermin-type deterministic non-contextual instruction sets). For example, perhaps we are supposed to understand the ‘realism’ in ‘local realism’ as allowing some sort of non-deterministic or contextual hidden variable theory.

But the two arguments already given show that this cannot be right. Taking them in the opposite order this time, the CHSH inequality can be derived without any hidden variable assumption at all (non-contextual or otherwise; deterministic or non-deterministic; naive or sophisticated) and, anyway, an appropriately-modified EPR argument proves that Locality *requires* the naive, Mermin-style deterministic non-contextual instruction sets. [16] So the ‘realism’ in ‘local realism’ must not only not be Naive Realism as we have defined it here – it must not be any kind of hidden variable assumption *at all*. And

so if we are looking for a sense of ‘realism’ whose use in ‘local realism’ would actually be warranted, we will have to look elsewhere.

### 3 Scientific Realism

What other senses of ‘realism’ might be intended by the authors who claim that ‘local realism’ is refuted by Bell’s theorem and the associated experiments? Perhaps they mean Scientific Realism. In the philosophy of science, this is the doctrine that we can and should accept well-established scientific theories as providing a literally-true description of the world. Scientific Realism is the doctrine that we should *believe* the ontologies posited by our best scientific theories. It is normally contrasted with Instrumentalism – the idea that theories are merely “instruments” for making empirical predictions, and their ontologies (especially in regard to unobservables) are not to be taken literally. For example, because of the overwhelming theoretical and empirical success of the atomic theory of matter, a Scientific Realist would urge us to accept that, in fact, matter is made of atoms – that the ontology of atoms is not merely a useful fiction (as the Instrumentalist would hold) but a literally true description of matter’s actual constitution. [19]

Perhaps the users of ‘local realism’ think that Bell’s Theorem is likewise based on the assumed-literal-truth of some particular scientific theory – that is, perhaps what they mean by the ‘realism’ in ‘local realism’ is Scientific Realism.

But this, I think, can be dispensed with immediately. The most widely accepted theory of the phenomena relevant to Bell’s Theorem is orthodox quantum mechanics (OQM). So if an appeal to Scientific Realism were being made here, it would evidently be made in support of OQM. But nobody (I think) believes that Bell’s inequality is premised on the assumed truth of OQM; if anything, people widely accept the opposite – that Bell’s theorem refutes only some odd, un-orthodox sort of theory that one probably shouldn’t have believed in anyway (and so, whatever type of theory that is, its allegedly being assumed as a premise in the derivation could hardly be motivated by an appeal to Scientific Realism).

And even this represents a confusion. For, as mentioned above, Bell-type inequalities can be derived without any assumptions whatever about the specific nature of the covered theories (other than that they respect Locality). That is, *all* local theories must respect the inequalities (and are hence apparently ruled out by the experiments). Nature, therefore, is not local (in the sense of respecting relativity’s prohibition on superluminal causation).<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> See Ref. [16] for a careful discussion of Bell’s definition of Locality, which we use

Someone who grasps that this is the correct way to understand the significance of Bell's theorem – but who misunderstands the content of the theorem – might plausibly invoke Scientific Realism. For example, someone might erroneously believe that Bell's argument for non-locality consists of the following: OQM (or Bohmian Mechanics, or whatever one's favorite empirically-viable version of quantum theory happens to be) is a good, widely-accepted, theoretically and empirically successful theory – and it is non-local – so therefore nature is non-local. Such an argument would invoke Scientific Realism in justifying the leap from OQM (or whichever) being a “good, ...” theory, to its corresponding with nature. But, obviously, such an argument simply represents a confusion. It is precisely the fact that Bell's Theorem is *general* – that it is *not* based on the assumed truth of any particular candidate theory – that makes the theorem so interesting and so profound.

What about the assumption which *is* required to arrive at a Bell-type inequality, namely Locality? Isn't this supposed to be motivated by relativity theory (and specifically its prohibition on superluminal causation), and isn't an appeal to Scientific Realism needed to warrant taking this prohibition seriously, as a real fact about nature? But this wouldn't help in making sense of 'local realism', for that phrase clearly makes explicit already the Locality assumption. And once that assumption is made explicit, there is no point in specifying additionally the reason why one should take the assumption seriously. Locality is an assumption from which Bell-type inequalities can be derived; that it is assumed, is perfectly adequate to make the logical structure of the argument clear. And anyway, the upshot of the argument is precisely that the Locality assumption cannot be correct. No matter how seriously one takes it, experiment refutes it. So while Scientific Realism might have some role to play in emphasizing the profundity of Bell's theorem,<sup>8</sup> it cannot help us in understanding the meaning of 'local realism'.

So, it seems, the 'realism' in 'local realism' cannot mean Scientific Realism. We will have to dig deeper if we are to find some justification for this popular terminology.

---

throughout.

<sup>8</sup> Or more likely, Bell's theorem would be used as an argument against some versions of Scientific Realism (namely, versions which take something like “the consensus of the scientific community” as the required warrant for believing in the literal truth of a theory). For Bell's theorem and the associated experiments prove that – the “consensus of the community” for most of the last century to the contrary notwithstanding – some important aspects of relativity theory are either flat wrong, or less fundamental or universal than nearly everyone believed.

## 4 Perceptual Realism

By “Perceptual Realism”<sup>9</sup> I will mean the idea that sense perception provides a primary and direct access to facts about the world – i.e., that what we are aware of in normal perception is *the world*, and not any sort of subjective fantasy, inner theater, or mental construction. [20] Note that this presupposes that there *is* an external world – a doctrine I will call Metaphysical Realism and to which we will turn later. Perceptual Realism is specifically the claim that ordinary sense perception reveals real facts about this external world, that the appropriate perceptual experience provides a sufficient basis for accepting the *truth* of ordinary perceptual judgments (e.g., “There is a table in front of me”, “My cat Buster is looking out the window”, and “That light is currently glowing red, not green”).

Perceptual Realism denies that we are systematically *deluded*, about the real state of the world, by our perceptual experience. It may thus be contrasted, for example, to Platonic Idealism, according to which true reality is nothing like the familiar perceptual world of material objects moving and interacting. If, really, there is *not* a table in front of me (or there both is and isn’t a table, or there is really no such thing as solid entities such as tables, or I am really a brain in a vat and the whole of my perceptual experience is a delusion fed to me by evil scientists) then Perceptual Realism would be false.

It is worth noting at the outset that Perceptual Realism is the foundation of *empiricism* and hence of modern empirical science. Leaving aside the possibility of cognitive nihilism, any denial of Perceptual Realism will necessarily put forth some alleged alternative to sense experience as the proper source of ideas, i.e., as our primary means of contact with the external world. Such alternatives (e.g., mystic revelations, rationalistic deductions from a priori self-evidencies, innate ideas, instincts and intuitions) are familiar to most scientists – familiar, that is, as the kinds of nonsense we have to fight against *as* scientists.

---

<sup>9</sup> The arguments in this section are similar to, and inspired by, Tim Maudlin’s discussion in Ref. [3] Note that what I call Perceptual Realism is related to the property of theories that, in Maudlin’s terminology, makes them “standard”. Specifically, the relation is this: any of Maudlin’s “standard theories” can be accepted as true without having to deny the truth of ordinary perceptual judgments, i.e., without rejecting Perceptual Realism. As Maudlin explains, “Any non-standard interpretation must do considerable violence to our basic conception of the physical world. ...[I]t cannot contain physical events or objects ... that even vaguely correspond to the world as it appears to us. If [for example] it seems to us that a needle on a piece of apparatus moves one way rather than another at a particular time and place, or a particle detector clicks at a particular time and place, a non-standard interpretation must insist that nothing at all which reflects those supposed events takes place in the corresponding regions of space-time.”

At the risk of giving a false impression of the narrowness of Perceptual Realism, let us briefly underline its importance to empirical science by pointing to an important class of examples. The meaning of “empirical” in “empirical science” is the idea that our more abstract ideas (e.g., scientific theories) are grounded ultimately in data about the world that comes from experience – and specifically, for theories, *experiment*. And what is an experiment? It is a controlled intervention in nature from which we may infer something about nature – in short, experiment is our way of posing specific pointed questions to nature, and receiving equally pointed answers. Note especially the obvious importance of our being able to receive the answer. In a typical experiment, the *outcome* will be registered in the position (or some other perceptually-obvious feature) of a macroscopic object – e.g., the position, along some scale, of a pointer or “needle”, the color of some flashing light, or a number projected on a computer screen or printed on a sheet of paper. What we wish to stress here is the role of Perceptual Realism in grounding our ability to become aware of the outcome of the measurement. If we can look at the flashing light and be systematically deluded about its color (e.g., we think it’s red when it’s green and vice versa, or our seeing red or green has no correlation whatever to the actually-flashed color) then Perceptual Realism is false – and empirical science is hopelessly doomed.

What could such a fundamental philosophical principle as Perceptual Realism have to do with Bell’s Theorem? Let us get into this by raising the example of the Many Worlds Interpretation (MWI) of quantum theory, which has occasionally been suggested as a counterexample to the understanding of Bell’s theorem I have expressed above – namely, that Bell’s theorem (and the associated experiments) prove that no local theory can be empirically viable. Orthodox quantum mechanics is certainly not a counterexample to this claim: it is manifestly nonlocal, with the nonlocal dynamics appearing specifically in the so-called “collapse postulate”. The basic motivation of the MWI is to restore Locality by simply dismissing, as unnecessary, the collapse postulate and retaining only the (local) unitary dynamics (Schrödinger’s equation or its appropriate generalization). The resulting theory is then manifestly local, thus (it is claimed) proving that, after all, relativistic causality can be maintained in the face of Bell’s Theorem.

Of course, this program runs quickly into the problem of Schrödinger’s cat. Without the collapse postulate, the cat does not end up dead *or* alive, but, with certainty, in an entangled superposition of dead *and* alive. Specifically, the unitary dynamics generates a massively entangled state in which the cat (and likewise virtually all familiar macroscopic objects) do not possess the familiar sorts of determinate properties (such as being definitely alive or definitely dead, definitely here as opposed to definitely there, etc.). In other words, the ontology posited by MWI – the story it tells about the actual state of the external world – is radically at odds with our perceptual experience. We

see a cat that is either definitely alive or definitely dead, but according to MWI these perceptions are *delusional*. Really – in actual fact – the cat is *not* definitely dead, and it is *not* definitely alive either; it is in an (entangled) superposition of dead *and* alive. And, simply put, that is not what we see when we look. Different versions of the basic MWI theory [21] give different accounts of the precise relation between consciousness and the posited real state of the world – but what they all have in common is a radical failure of correspondence between perceptual experience and this posited real state, i.e., what they have in common is the need to reject Perceptual Realism.

The crucial point is that MWI is, in fact, not a counterexample to the understanding of Bell’s Theorem I’ve advocated here – namely, that what Bell’s Theorem proves is that no local theory can be consistent with the data acquired in (for example) Aspect’s experiment. MWI contains no argument against Bell’s proof that no local theory can explain that data. What it does contain (if only by implication) is the need to reject that data as fallacious, to reject as a delusion the belief that the experiments actually *had* the outcomes reported in Aspect’s paper.

Let us be painfully concrete. Imagine Alice and Bob sitting at spatially-separated locations, randomly setting the dial on their (say) Mermin-type “contraptions” (i.e., rotatable Stern-Gerlach devices or polarizing filters), noting whether the light on top of the device flashes red or green for a given run, and then writing this outcome down in a lab notebook so that their two data sets can be later compared and the appropriate correlation coefficients computed. The point is: for each run of the experiment, Alice perceives that either the red light or the green light has flashed, and writes down the corresponding outcome in her lab notebook. But, according to MWI, *every single one of these reports is false*. In actual fact, according to MWI, what happens as each particle passes through the measurement apparatus is that the apparatus gets into an entangled superposition of the red-light-flashing and green-light-flashing states. Thus, according to MWI’s description of the world, for *none* of the experimental runs did the light flash one or the other of the definite colors. Alice’s perception to the contrary is a *delusion*, and so her data notebook is full of falsehoods,<sup>10</sup> and so the real relationships between Alice’s and Bob’s experiments are not reflected in the correlation coefficients that end up getting reported in the published paper. In short, it’s not that Bell’s Theorem

---

<sup>10</sup> Technically, one should follow the unitary evolution into the pencil marks in the notebook, and say that those too end up in complicated entangled superpositions – thus rendering the marks more plausibly consistent with the real outcomes of the experiments. But this just moves the problem back without answering it, for Alice (and, later, Bob) *sees* pencil marks indicating either “red light flashed” or “green light flashed” – and, on this account, neither of these corresponds to the real state of the pencil marks in the notebook. And so the beliefs which form the basis for the later-published data appearing to violate Bell’s inequalities, are still delusional.

(as I have explained its implications here) is wrong; it's that we are wrong to think that Bell's inequalities are, in fact, violated. [22]

So might the 'realism' in 'local realism' mean Perceptual Realism? The idea of MWI as a counter-example to the claim that Bell proved the inevitability of non-locality, might have suggested this. But as we have argued, MWI drives its wedge not into this understanding of Bell's Theorem per se, but, rather, into the idea that the outcomes of certain experiments were what we thought they were (based on, among other things, direct perception of the positions of pointers, the colors of flashing lights, and – more in line with the actual experiments – numerals projected on computer screens). Putting the same point differently, Perceptual Realism is *not* an assumption that goes into the derivation of Bell's inequalities, so it would make no sense to interpret theorist's claims that the inequalities reflect 'local realism' as referring to Locality and Perceptual Realism.

On the other hand, Perceptual Realism *is* needed to arrive at the claim that Bell's inequalities are, in fact, violated. But this doesn't help make sense of the phrase 'local realism' either, since an experimentalist could never claim to have empirically refuted the 'realism' in 'local realism' if 'realism' means Perceptual Realism. It's not that the experimental data leaves open a choice between which of two premises – Locality or Perceptual Realism – to reject. To accept the data at face value *is* implicitly to endorse Perceptual Realism – thus leaving Locality as the only possible premise to reject. One could indeed follow MWI in retaining Locality by rejecting Perceptual Realism, but this is not a move one makes as a response to the experimental data; rather, it is a move one makes to justify rejecting the data as systematically failing to reflect the true state of the world.

So it does not seem possible that the 'realism' in 'local realism' means Perceptual Realism.

Since we have raised the issue, it is worth spending a moment to assess MWI's strategy of maintaining Locality by rejecting Perceptual Realism. The problem with this strategy is implicit in what we've said already about the fundamentality of Perceptual Realism to modern empirical science, but it is worth making this more explicit. Consider a hypothetical example: a new drug is discovered which, it is thought, might have cancer-fighting properties. So an empirical trial is undertaken, in which cancer patients are randomly assigned either the new drug or a placebo. After several years, the outcome is not good: *all* of the patients given the drug have died, while the death rate among those given the placebo is around 50% – typical, let us say, for similar unmedicated patients.

The obvious inference here is that the drug has a negative effect on the health

of the cancer patients: it doesn't cure them, it *kills* them! But a different conclusion could be reached if we are willing to entertain a rejection of Perceptual Realism. Suppose a medical researcher proposes a theory according to which giving this drug to cancer patients has two effects: first, the patients are cured of their cancer, and second, the doctors who dispensed the drugs are afflicted with a permanent hallucinatory state in which they (delusionally) believe that their patients have died. Still suffering from these delusions, they write articles for JAMA reporting the data as I described it in the previous paragraph, and conclude that under no circumstances should this drug (which is in fact, according to this theory, the cure for cancer!) be given to any more cancer patients.<sup>11</sup>

Does any scientist think that such a “theory” could or should be taken seriously by the medical community? (That is a purely rhetorical question to which the answer is obvious. But the following question probably warrants explicit and open discussion, since the physics community apparently does not regard its answer as obvious.) And isn't the Many Worlds Interpretation of quantum theory precisely parallel to this in all relevant respects?

Advocates of MWI typically try to spin things away from the direction I've just indicated. It's not, they argue, that our perceptual judgments are *delusional* – rather, it's only that they are *incomplete*. When we see a living cat or a green light, it's not that our experience fails to correspond to the real state of the world – rather, we experience only *part* of the world, specifically, one of the many “worlds” (or more accurately, one of the many terms in the universal wave function which completely describes the real state of *the* world). So, they claim, the apparent non-correspondence between my perceptual experience of (say) a living cat and the real state of the world (which involves the cat being in an entangled superposition of alive and dead), is no more problematic than the fact that, for example, I can perceive (currently) the objects in this room but not the top of the Empire State Building. To perceive a *part* of the whole universe, is still to perceive validly. One cannot take omniscience as the standard of valid perception, and so (it is argued) MWI actually does not require a rejection of Perceptual Realism.

This objection, however, trades on a significant abuse of the word “part”. I accept as a crucial principle that one must reject omniscience as the standard of validity, across all of epistemology. To be perceptually aware of some fact *is* to be perceptually aware, and this awareness does not become delusional merely because there are some additional facts out there in the world of which one is not (currently) aware. But it is crucial here – and indeed it is essential to

---

<sup>11</sup> To make the story more closely parallel to MWI, we should add that the permanent hallucinatory state afflicts everyone else, too, so that the real state of the patients becomes *in principle* unobservable.

the meaning of “part” – that the various facts not contradict one another. For some awareness to represent a “partial” awareness of reality, it must be that it can be *consistently supplemented* with other such partial awarenesses. For example, what makes my perception of the table in front of me an awareness of “part” of reality is that the table’s presence here is *consistent* with (for example) the presence of an antenna on the top of the Empire State Building – something I might later perceive without needing (on pain of contradiction) to *revise* my earlier judgment about the table. By contrast, if someone proposed that the perception of a table here is “part” of a wider reality which includes also the non-presence of the table here, we would have a different reaction. “X” can be understood as a “part” of “X and Y” – but not as a “part” of “X and not-X”.

Of course, a quantum mechanical *superposition* is not exactly the same as the English word “and”. For example, the phrase “this particle is here” might map onto a certain quantum mechanical state vector (an eigenvector of the position operator for this particle, with eigenvalue “here”). And the phrase “this particle is not here” might map onto some other (orthogonal) state vector. But it would not be quite right to map the conjunction of the two phrases (using “and”) onto the superposition of the two mentioned quantum states. For one thing, there is not one, but many possible superpositions (in which the relative amplitudes and phases of the two terms are varied), so any claim that this mapping is proper would be vague. And more importantly, the conjunction of those two English phrases is a *logical contradiction*, while the superposition of the two quantum states is just some other (perfectly legitimate) quantum state. And this brings us to the point. The argument against MWI is not (as the previous paragraph might have suggested): “the real state of things (as conceived in that theory) involves a contradiction and we couldn’t possibly perceive that.” It’s not the *contradictoriness* of “X and not-X” which is the real problem, for the “and” here really denotes quantum mechanical superposition – thus, “X and not-X” is simply some quantum state (a perfectly legitimate, non-contradictory one, it is conceded). The problem is that this quantum state does not attribute to the world the sort of properties it would need to render our perceptual judgments true – even true merely as descriptions of “parts” of the world. The point is that a particular term in a quantum superposition is not a “part” of the state in any literal sense. The particular term and the superposition are simply, according to quantum theory, two distinct alternatives, either of which might correctly describe the real state of the system at some moment, but which are (like “X” and “not-X”) mutually exclusive. Both cannot obtain simultaneously.

In a way, this comes back to the *completeness doctrine*, which MWI retains from OQM – the idea that there are no hidden-variables, nothing other than the state vector to describe the real states of things or to pick out one term in the expansion of the world’s state vector as “the real state.” The point

is: the complete state vector (i.e., the particular linear combination of terms that the unitary evolution generates) *is* the posited real state. To take the simplest possible example, suppose a particle's wave function is a superposition of "here" and "there" eigenstates. And suppose some person believes that "the particle is definitely there." Well, unless one rejects the completeness doctrine (and attributes some definite hidden-variable position to the particle, as in Bohmian Mechanics, or in some other way picks out one term in the superposition as physically/ontologically special), such a belief is simply false. For, translated into the language of OQM or MWI, the belief in question is precisely the belief that the particle is in the "there" eigenstate. And, by hypothesis, it isn't. The person believes the particle's state to be something other than it is, i.e., the belief is false.

And it is exactly the same with complicated multi-particle states. If the real state of the particles constituting a cat is, according to MWI, an entangled superposition of "living" and "dead" configurations, then *that* is the real state of the cat. If someone believes the state is something else, his belief is not a "partial truth" – it is a plain, ordinary falsehood, because it is the belief that the state is something which *contradicts* the actual (posited) state. And if that false belief is based on direct perceptual experience, it is so much the worse for Perceptual Realism. This is the fundamental reason why we must understand MWI as requiring ordinary perceptual judgments to be *delusional* and not just "partial." According to MWI, the world just simply is not the way it looks to us. It's not that we experience only a part of reality, but that what we experience radically fails to correspond to reality. MWI cannot escape the need to reject Perceptual Realism.

And this brings us back to our earlier claim that Perceptual Realism is a foundational principle for modern empirical science. To seriously entertain a scientific theory which requires us to reject Perceptual Realism is to engage in a vicious sort of large-scale circularity, as David Albert has pointed out. [23] To the extent that a theory poses as scientific, it asks to be considered as a possible best explanation of a certain class of empirical data. In the case of MWI, this includes primarily all of the data on which Schrödinger's equation and its various relativistic extensions rest. But at the same time, the associated need to reject Perceptual Realism requires us to dismiss *that same data* as not actually reflecting the true state of the world. A theory like MWI would evidently have us dismiss as delusional the very evidence that is supposed to motivate belief in the fundamental equations that define the theory – a very uncomfortable logical position, to be sure.

Let us formulate this important point in positive form. There is no possibility that one day in the future scientists will go into a laboratory, do some sophisticated experiments, and infer from the outcomes of those experiments that our eyes systematically delude us about the state of things in the world.

Such a scenario is impossible because it involves a logical contradiction: the conclusion reached by the imaginary future scientists undercuts the imagined evidentiary basis for that conclusion. The claim that the conclusion should be believed *because of that evidence*, is therefore *self-refuting*. Perceptual Realism is thus an *axiom* (in the Aristotelian sense of passing the test of reaffirmation-through-denial) for modern empirical science: any allegedly empirical-scientific argument against Perceptual Realism would be self-refuting. Looked at this way, it is hard to understand what kind of evidence an MWI advocate might offer in favor of that theory.

There is one other important point to be made against MWI's being taken seriously as a viable version of quantum theory. For MWI, the rejection of Perceptual Realism is general. It requires us to reject not just the data apparently showing violations of Bell's inequalities, and not just the data underlying the specific equations (e.g., Schrödinger's) that define the dynamics of that theory, but to reject, in principle, all the data coming from all experiments. And this includes, in particular, all of the experimental data that is normally taken to support relativity theory and the associated account of space-time structure – the saving of which was the only real motivation for taking MWI seriously in the first place! So not only is MWI apparently self-refuting in terms of its actual dynamical content; it is self-refuting also in regard to its basic motivation. As Maudlin explains this point, accepting MWI would mean accepting that

“physical reality contains nothing like a relativistic space-time containing localized events and objects which even approximately correspond to the events and objects we think we see. In such a circumstance, it is hard to see why we would continue to hold the relativistic account of space-time structure seriously, since that account is based on observations which were taken to report objects and events in space-time. In short, it is hard to see why we would seriously believe that we had gotten the deep structure of space-time right if we had gotten questions about whether, for example, a needle on an instrument actually moved to the right or the left wrong.” [3, pg 287]

The bottom line is the impossibility of any scientific basis for any (allegedly scientific) theory requiring the rejection of Perceptual Realism. MWI requires such a rejection, and hence cannot be taken seriously as a scientific theory. But, to return to the main development, this is only relevant by way of refuting the idea that the ‘realism’ in ‘local realism’ might justifiably denote Perceptual Realism. As we argued earlier, it doesn't, so we will have to continue digging if we are to find some relevant sense of ‘realism’.

## 5 Metaphysical Realism

Despite our harsh criticisms of MWI in the previous section, there is one aspect of the theory which we fully support: it accepts the existence of a single, objective, external world “out there” whose existence and identity is independent of anyone’s awareness (or, in the case of MWI, not) of it. That is, even MWI endorses what I will call Metaphysical Realism. This Realism accepts the existence of an external world, but without necessarily requiring anything specific in regard to its similarity to the world of our perceptual experience or the account of any particular scientific theory. What can Metaphysical Realism be contrasted with? It seems the only possible contrast would be outright solipsism – the doctrine that “it’s all just ideas in my head.” Even a thoroughgoing subjectivist idealism which says (say) that we all create our own experience out of whole cloth, evidently acknowledges the real, objective existence of (at least) those other (subjective-experience-creating) individuals. Likewise, the traditional brain-in-vat scenario must accept the real physical existence of brains, vats, and the evil scientists (or computers or whatever is running things). To reject Metaphysical Realism one must reject the real external existence of *anything* outside of one’s own mind – i.e., one must endorse solipsism.

The implication is that, if one is to use any words with anything like their ordinarily intended meanings, one is tacitly assuming Metaphysical Realism. So it should not be surprising that Bell’s Theorem (a specific instance of, among other things, using certain words with their ordinary meanings) rests on Metaphysical Realism. This manifests itself most clearly in Bell’s use of the symbol  $\lambda$  to refer to a (candidate theory’s) *complete description* of the state of the relevant physical system – a usage which obviously presupposes the real existence of the physical system possessing some particular set of features that are or aren’t described in the theory. Putting it negatively, without Metaphysical Realism, there can be no Bell’s theorem. Metaphysical Realism can (thus) be thought of as a premise that is needed in order to arrive at a Bell-type inequality.

And so it seems we may have finally discovered the meaning of the ‘realism’ in ‘local realism’. One *cannot*, as suggested earlier, derive a Bell-type inequality from the assumption of Locality alone; one needs in addition this particular Realism assumption. This therefore explains the ‘local realism’ terminology and explains precisely the nature of the two assumptions we are entitled to choose between in the face of the empirical violations of Bell’s inequality. On this interpretation, we must either reject Locality or reject Metaphysical Realism.

I do not know for sure that this isn’t what the users of ‘local realism’ have

in mind. There is, in favor of this interpretation, the fact that Metaphysical Realism really is assumed in deriving the Bell inequalities, and so, in principle, one could react to the empirical violation of the inequalities either by rejecting Locality (and maintaining Metaphysical Realism) or by rejecting Metaphysical Realism.

But there is a crucial point that speaks against this interpretation. Notice that the last sentence of the previous paragraph did not include the perhaps-expected parenthetical “and maintaining Locality”. This was because the choice between rejecting Locality and rejecting Metaphysical Realism is not a choice in the ordinary sense – in particular, one cannot “save Locality” by rejecting Metaphysical Realism. This is because the very idea of “Locality” *already presupposes* Metaphysical Realism, a point that is undeniable once we remember what we are using the term “Locality” to mean: the requirement that all causal influences between spatially-separated physical objects propagate sub-luminally.

The point here is this: to reject Metaphysical Realism is precisely to hold that there *is no external physical world*. And once one rejects the existence of a physical world, there simply is no further issue about whether or not causal influences in it propagate exclusively slower than the speed of light (as required by Locality). Or put it this way: “Locality” is the requirement that relativity’s description of the fundamental structure of space-time is correct (and, somewhat more precisely, complete). But relativity theory is thoroughly “realist” in the sense of Metaphysical Realism. If there is no physical world external to my consciousness, then, in particular, there is no space-time whose structure might correspond to the relativistic description – and so that description’s status would be the same as, for example, that of claims about the viscosity of phlogiston or theories about the vascular structure of unicorns: false in the strongest possible sense. And so the idea of giving up Metaphysical Realism as an *alternative* to giving up Locality (relativity’s account of space-time structure) is simply nonsense.<sup>12</sup>

We may put this point in formal logical terms with the assertion that

Locality  $\rightarrow$  Metaphysical Realism,

---

<sup>12</sup> A similar point is made by Raymond Chiao and John Garrison in Ref. [24]. Note also that the position being argued against here (that we might save Locality by rejecting Metaphysical Realism) commits what philosopher Ayn Rand referred to as “the fallacy of the stolen concept” – the fallacy consisting in the attempt to maintain a given concept (here, ‘Locality’) while rejecting a deeper concept on which the first hierarchically depends. The former concept is “stolen” because, having denied the underlying context which provides its meaning, one has no cognitive right to its use. For a detailed discussion see Ref. [25].

the idea being that a proper fleshing-out of the meaning of “Locality” manifests a tacit assumption of Metaphysical Realism, such that any meaningful talk about Locality (such as saying that it is true, but including also saying that it is false!) entails that Metaphysical Realism is already accepted as true.

And this suggests that, if the ‘realism’ in ‘local realism’ is indeed Metaphysical Realism, the conversational implication noted by Maudlin – that we might save Locality by rejecting Realism – is patently false. We *cannot* choose between rejecting Locality and rejecting Metaphysical Realism (with the other being “saved”). We may reject Locality (and save Metaphysical Realism) – or we may reject Metaphysical Realism *and with it any meaningful claims about Locality, the causal structure of the world, and literally everything else that every concept and theory in the entire history of physics has purported to be about*. Faced with Bell’s Theorem and the empirical data showing violations of Bell’s inequalities, we must reject Locality – or simply shut down cognitively and refrain from saying anything about anything. This is roughly equivalent to the “choice” one faces when confronted with the problem: “What is  $2 + 2$ ?” And this is really just another way of saying that there is no choice at all.

And so it really doesn’t make any sense after all to interpret the ‘realism’ in ‘local realism’ as meaning Metaphysical Realism. At best, the phrase would then be a pointless redundancy, much streamlined by replacing it simply with ‘Locality’. (At worst, the phrase would seem to be a bizarre invitation to accept something that is quite literally, clinically, insane.)

Despite its insanity, some otherwise-serious physicists do apparently endorse a rejection of Metaphysical Realism. One disturbing recent example is the paper by Matteo Smerlak and Carlo Rovelli. [26] They lobby for a “relational” interpretation of quantum mechanics and an abandonment of what they refer to as “strict Einstein realism” – a doctrine that they define using Einstein’s own words (“there exists a physical reality independent of ... perception”) and which clearly matches what we are here calling Metaphysical Realism.<sup>13</sup> As

---

<sup>13</sup> Speaking of “conversational implications”, it’s amusing that Smerlak and Rovelli refer to Metaphysical Realism as “*strict Einstein realism*” – the implication being that what they are advocating as an alternative is some *less strict* form of realism. But, simply put, that is not the case. What they are advocating is the complete rejection of the most fundamental type of realism, i.e., they are endorsing solipsism. Actually this too is amusing, for Smerlak and Rovelli explicitly deny that they advocate solipsism: “It is far from the spirit of RQM to assume that each observer has a ‘solipsistic’ picture of reality, disconnected from the picture of all other observers.” Yet, clearly, this is precisely what they *do* advocate: for example, in their analysis of a simple EPR correlation experiment, it emerges that, when Alice and Bob get together later to compare results, Alice need not hear Bob reporting the same value for the outcome of his experiment that Bob himself believes he saw. The authors apologize for this by noting that, at least, “everybody hears everybody else stating

it turns out, what’s “relational” in “relational QM” (RQM) is reality itself: there is no such thing as reality *simpliciter*; there is only reality-for-X (where X is some physical system, typically a conscious observer). Advocates of RQM thus use the word “reality” to mean what people normally mean by the word “knowledge”. That some fact is, say, “real-for-Alice” simply means (translating from RQM back to normal English) that Alice is aware of it. And, crucially, what is real-for-Alice need not be real-for-Bob: “different observers can give different accounts of the same sequence of events.”

This bizarre attempt at making sense of quantum theory is related to a wider program that might be called the “Information Interpretation of QM”. According to this view, the various interpretive paradoxes and allegedly-only-apparent non-locality are explained away by interpreting the quantum formalism to be fundamentally *about* “information”. The quantum mechanical wave function in particular is regarded, not as a direct description (complete or otherwise) of physical states, but as an encapsulation of some observer’s information. It is then not so surprising that different observers could attribute different quantum states to the same one physical system. Unfortunately, bringing in the concept of “information” seems to only move the problems without actually resolving them. For, as Bell pointed out, saying that quantum theory provides an encapsulation of information immediately raises several questions:

“*Information? Whose information? Information about what?*” [1, pg 215]

Indeed, the idea of interpreting quantum mechanical wave functions as merely summarizing some observer’s limited information (and not providing a complete description of the physical states of systems) is not some radical new answer to the EPR “paradox” – it was the very *point* of the EPR paper to suggest this!

Of course, Einstein and his collaborators took for granted Metaphysical Realism, and so to them if quantum mechanics didn’t provide complete descriptions of the real states of physical systems, that only spoke to the need to find a better theory. The innovation of Rovelli and Smerlak is thus evidently to point out that this whole line of reasoning falls apart if one rejects Metaphysical Realism. And indeed it does, but this can hardly be considered a resolution of any interpretive paradox, much less a refutation of the claim that Bell’s theorem proves the inevitability of non-locality. For Smerlak and Rovelli’s theory (which they claim as “local”) emerges, on inspection, to be local only in an empty sense (the only sense possible in the context of solipsism): *everything*

---

that they see the same elephant he sees” and report that “[t]his, after all, is the best definition of objectivity.” Well, perhaps it is the best definition of objectivity that remains possible once one has abandoned Metaphysical Realism, but it is certainly not what scientists normally mean by “objectivity”.

*that happens, happens in the same place – namely, inside my head.*<sup>14</sup> There are no faster-than-light causal influences between spatially separated physical events, simply because there are no spatially separated physical events.

Is this the best those who deny Bell’s proof of the inevitability of non-locality can do? Tim Maudlin, in the previously cited article, remarked that

“[i]f there is something objectionable about [accepting nonlocality and accordingly rejecting relativity theory as the final word in space-time structure], we should consider carefully just how objectionable it is, since there is no point in doing something even *more* objectionable just to retain the relativistic account of space-time.”

This is a fantastic argument against the Many Worlds Interpretation considered in the previous section, with its ridiculously extravagant ontology and its need to reject one of the fundamental philosophical principles underlying modern empirical science. It’s hard to imagine how anyone could consider it reasonable to give up so much for so (relatively) little. Our point here is that the corresponding argument against Relational/Informational Quantum Mechanics is *even stronger*: in this case, it’s not just that one is giving up a lot to save a little, but that one is giving up *everything* to save *nothing*.

In the paper in which he revealed his now-famous hoax, Alan Sokal had this to say about the post-modern nonsense his hoax article had parodied:

“What concerns me is the proliferation, not just of nonsense and sloppy thinking per se, but of a particular kind of nonsense and sloppy thinking: one that denies the existence of objective realities, or (when challenged) admits their existence but downplays their practical relevance. .... There is a real world; its properties are not merely social constructions; facts and evidence do matter. What sane person would contend otherwise?” [27]

It is depressing indeed that this same kind of nonsense and sloppy thinking is now apparently being taken seriously by some eminent physicists.

---

<sup>14</sup>Though technically, the concept of “head” (and for that matter “inside” and “my”) is meaningless in the context of RQM, for, at least as normally understood, such words refer to physical objects (and relations between them) that exist independent of perception. This is a nice illustration of the point made earlier: once you reject Metaphysical Realism, the whole idea of physical objects moving and interacting in space-time – which captures the entire content of physics – loses any meaning.

## 6 Conclusions

We have surveyed four different ‘realism’ concepts. Each has some relation to Bell’s Theorem and related issues. Yet none of them has provided a promising candidate for what users of the phrase ‘local realism’ mean by ‘realism’ – which leads me to speculate that the users of that phrase don’t, themselves, know what they mean, and that the phrase has, in fact, become widespread through sheer, unthinking inertia. At very least, I hope the present analysis will put users of this dubious phrase on the defensive: anyone who claims that Bell’s Theorem is a theorem about ‘local realist’ theories (and/or who claims that the associated experiments have empirically refuted ‘local realism’ and thus leave us with a choice between rejecting Locality and rejecting Realism) needs to explain clearly what they mean by ‘realism’.

How did the phrase ‘local realism’, whose meaning is so unclear, appear in the first place? Where did it come from and why has it persisted? I spent some time searching the literature for this phrase, but I am by no means confident that the earliest example I found (d’Espagnat’s quoted in the introduction) represents Patient Zero. So I don’t know for sure how to answer these questions. But I will offer here some speculations.

The best hypothesis I can come up with is that the phrase ‘local realism’ is meant to capture, simultaneously, several views held by quantum theory’s most famous critic: Albert Einstein. Einstein, as the creator of relativity theory, certainly endorsed Locality (and, I think, would clearly have endorsed Bell’s mathematical formulation thereof). Einstein was also a Metaphysical Realist – a point captured perhaps most eloquently by Wolfgang Pauli, in a 1954 letter to Max Born, who seemed reluctant to accept that it was Metaphysical Realism, and not an insistence on determinism, which constituted Einstein’s jumping-off point for dissatisfaction with quantum theory. Here is the relevant portion of the letter:

“Einstein gave me your manuscript to read; he was *not at all* annoyed with you, but only said that you were a person who will not listen. This agrees with the impression I have formed myself insofar as I was unable to recognise Einstein whenever you talked about him in either your letter or your manuscript. It seemed to me as if you had erected some dummy Einstein for yourself, which you then knocked down with great pomp. In particular, Einstein does not consider the concept of ‘determinism’ to be as fundamental as it is frequently held to be (as he told me emphatically many times), and he denied energetically that he had ever put up a postulate such as (your letter, para. 3): ‘the sequence of such conditions must also be objective and real, that is, automatic, machine-like, deterministic.’ In the same way, he *disputes* that he uses as a criterion for the admissibility of

a theory the question: ‘Is it rigorously deterministic?’ Einstein’s point of departure is ‘realistic’ rather than ‘deterministic’...” [28, pg 221]

Or, as Einstein himself elaborated his belief in Metaphysical Realism:

“If one asks what ... 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 a ‘real existence’ that is independent of the perceiving subject...” [28, 170]

Finally, as discussed in an earlier section, Einstein evidently believed in deterministic non-contextual hidden variables for (at least, it would seem) the class of experiments relevant to the EPR-Bell correlations. (He believed in them because of the EPR argument: the only way to account for the correlations *locally* is to posit such hidden variables. [16]) In the language of the present paper, this means that Einstein advocated (at least in some domain) Naive Realism.

My hypothesis is then that the contemporary phrase ‘local realism’ represents a kind of sloppy packaging of these three principles endorsed by Einstein: Metaphysical Realism, Locality, and Naive Realism. Then, in a kind of perpetuation of the old Bohr-Einstein debates, many contemporaries insist on seeing virtually all interpretive issues surrounding quantum theory along the following party lines: Bohr vs. Einstein, which gets translated into: (orthodox) quantum mechanics vs. local realism.

The first part of my hypothesis is supported by the widespread use of the phrase ‘local realism’ to underwrite what might otherwise be rather blatant equivocations on the term ‘realism’. For example, consider the following passage from a recent essay by Anton Zeilinger:

“most physicists view the experimental confirmation of the quantum predictions [i.e., the observed violations of Bell’s inequality] as evidence for nonlocality. [I don’t think he’s right about “most”. Most physicists believe this supports orthodox QM as against “local realism”, i.e., supports Bohr as against Einstein. But, continuing...] But I think that the concept of reality itself is at stake, a view that is supported by the Kochen-Specker paradox. This observes that even for single particles it is not always possible to assign definite measurement outcomes, independently of and prior to the selection of specific measurement apparatus in the specific experiment.” [4]

And, Zeilinger goes on to conclude, “the distinction between reality and our knowledge of reality, between reality and information, cannot be made.” And finally: “what can be said in a given situation must ... define ... what can exist.” Summarizing the apparent (attempt at) logic: the Kochen-Specker the-

orem shows that Naive Realism is false. And therefore, Zeilinger concludes, “the concept of reality itself” is refuted. There is no reality (in the sense of Metaphysical Realism) – only information, i.e., ideas in our minds.

But, as we can now plainly see, this is based on a sloppy equivocation. That Naive Realism is false, doesn’t entail that Metaphysical Realism is false. But packaging these (and more) into a single phrase – whose meaning is roughly “all that stuff Einstein believed after he went senile” – obfuscates any such fine distinctions. Avoiding such equivocations (and the ridiculously, if not viciously, extravagant conclusions to which they lead) is one of the best arguments for carefully scrutinizing any use of the term ‘realism’.

The other half of my hypothesis about the origins and inertia of ‘local realism’ is supported by the widespread belief that the experimental tests of Bell’s inequality constitute an *experimentum crucis* between orthodox quantum theory and deterministic/realistic/hidden-variable alternatives – such that the Bell-inequality-violating results provide decisive and dramatic support for orthodox quantum theory (and, it is often suggested, provide the final empirical proof that Bohr was right and Einstein was wrong). Mermin, for example, writes that “If the data in such an experiment are in agreement with the numerical predictions of quantum theory, then Einstein’s philosophical position has to be wrong.” [29]

But misunderstanding could not be more complete. To achieve a correct understanding, we must begin by unpackaging the various ideas that are confusingly tied together by ‘local realism.’ Starting at the beginning, does one accept Metaphysical Realism? If not, there is nothing more to be said – certainly nothing more to be said that should be of any interest to *physicists*. Then: does one accept Perceptual Realism? If not, then there is no point discussing relativity or quantum mechanics qua scientific theories, and no possibility of discussing how best to make sense of the empirical data collected by Aspect and others.

With those preliminaries out of the way, we can finally raise the question of Locality, i.e., respect for relativity’s prohibition on superluminal causation. A natural first question would be: is orthodox quantum theory a local theory? The answer is plainly “no”. (The collapse postulate is manifestly not Lorentz invariant, and this postulate is crucial to the theory’s ability to match experiment.) And so then: Might we construct a new theory which makes the same empirical predictions as orthodox quantum theory, but which restores locality? (In other words, might we blame OQM’s apparent non-locality on the fact that it is dealing with wrong or incomplete state descriptions?) The answer – provided by Bell’s Theorem – turns out to be “no”. We are *stuck* with the non-locality, which emerges as a real fact of nature – one which ought to be of more concern to more physicists. And we are left with a freedom to

decide among the various candidate theories (all of them non-local, e.g., OQM, Bohmian Mechanics, and GRW) using criteria that have nothing directly to do with EPR or Bell's Theorem – e.g., the clarity and precision with which they can be formulated, to what extent they suffer from afflictions such as the measurement problem, and (looking forward) to what extent they continue to resolve old puzzles and give rise to new insights.

I would like to draw specific attention to the crucial historical point at which, I think, the community's understanding first goes significantly off the tracks: Einstein's objections to OQM, and the EPR argument in particular. Too many physicists apparently fail to grasp the EPR argument *as an argument*. Instead, they understand it as merely some vague expression of a philosophical desire for 'local realism', as if this whole package had simply been asserted arbitrarily as something Einstein liked or wanted and which OQM, to his disappointment, didn't respect.

This is nicely (i.e., clearly, i.e., painfully) exhibited in the first two sentences of a recent experimental report in *Nature*:

“Local realism is the idea that objects have definite properties whether or not they are measured, and that measurements of these properties are not affected by events taking place sufficiently far away. Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen used these reasonable assumptions to conclude that quantum mechanics is incomplete.” [8]

Kudos to Rowe *et al.* for making, at least, some attempt to define the pernicious phrase 'local realism.' But I wish to call attention to the second sentence, in particular the statement that 'locality' and 'realism' (as defined in the first sentence) were *assumptions* made by EPR. This represents exactly the confusion I just mentioned – specifically, the failure to grasp that EPR presented an *argument from Locality to* outcome-determining hidden variables (i.e., Naive Realism). [30] This argument simply must be grasped and appreciated before one can properly understand the meaning and implications of Bell's Theorem.

So I will conclude by pleading with the physics community to re-visit these crucial foundational issues. We must reject the thoughtless and confused use of terminology such as 'local realism' – and all of the misunderstandings on which this terminology rests, and which the terminology, in turn, helps perpetuate. Einstein and Bell still have much to teach us about physics – and, indeed, about 'realism' – but before we can learn we must set aside our prior misconceptions and allow ourselves to actually listen.

## References

- [1] J. S. Bell, *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics* (Second Edition), Cambridge University Press, 2004
- [2] M. Ferrero, T.W. Marshall, and E. Santos, “Bell’s theorem: local realism versus quantum mechanics”, *AmJPhys*, 58(7), 683-688 (1990)
- [3] T. Maudlin, “Space-Time in the Quantum World” in J. T. Cushing, A. Fine, and S. Goldstein (eds.), *Bohmian Mechanics and Quantum Theory: An Appraisal*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996
- [4] A. Zeilinger, “The message of the quantum”, *Nature* Vol. 438, 8 December 2005, pg 743
- [5] H. Price, “A Neglected Route to Realism about Quantum Mechanics”, *Mind*, New Series, Vol. 103, No. 411. (July, 1994), pages 303-336
- [6] A. Shimony, “Critique of the Papers of Fine and Suppes, *PSA: Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association*, Vol. 1980, Volume Two: Symposia and Invited Papers (1980), pages 572-580
- [7] B. d’Espagnat, “The Quantum Theory and Reality”, *Scientific American*, 241 # 5, November 1979, pages 158-181
- [8] M.A. Rowe et al, “Experimental violation of a Bell’s inequality with efficient detection”, *Nature*, Vol. 409, 15 February 2001, pg 791-4
- [9] N.D. Mermin, “Quantum mechanics vs local realism near the classical limit: A Bell inequality for spin  $s$ ”, *Phys Rev D*, Vol 22, 356-361
- [10] A. Aspect, “Bell’s inequality test: more ideal than ever”, *Nature*, Vol 398, 18 March 1999, pages 189-90
- [11] Wikipedia entry on “Bell’s Theorem”, June 9, 2006, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bell's\\_theorem](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bell's_theorem)
- [12] J. J. Gibson, *The Senses Considered as Perceptual Systems*, Houghton Mifflin (Boston, 1966)
- [13] M. Daumer, D. Dürr, S. Goldstein, N. Zanghi, “Naive Realism about Operators”, *Erkenntnis* **45**: 379-397; quant-ph/9601013
- [14] N. D. Mermin, “Simple Unified Form for the Major No-Hidden-Variables Theorems”, *Physical Review Letters*, Vol. 65, Number 27, 31 December 1990, pages 3373-3376; N. D. Mermin, “Hidden Variables and the two theorems of John Bell”, *Reviews of Modern Physics*, Vol. 65, No. 3, July 1993, pages 803-815.
- [15] Proofs of Bell’s Theorem (i.e., derivations of Bell’s inequality) which use this Naive Realist approach include Bell’s own discussion in “Bertlmann’s socks and the nature of reality” in Ref. [1]; Mermin’s derivation in “Is the moon there when

- nobody looks? Reality and the quantum theory”, *Physics Today*, April 1985, pages 38-47; and many other papers and textbooks including, for example, J.J. Sakurai, *Modern Quantum Mechanics*, Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1994.
- [16] T. Norsen, “Bell Locality and the Nonlocal Character of Nature”, quant-ph/0601205, forthcoming in *Foundations of Physics Letters*
- [17] J.F. Clauser, M.A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R.A. Holt, “Proposed Experiment to Test Local Hidden-Variable Theories,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 880 (1969)
- [18] T. Norsen, “Counter-Factual Meaningfulness and the Bell and CHSH Inequalities”, quant-ph/0606084
- [19] R. Boyd, “Scientific Realism” in The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/scientific-realism/>
- [20] For a detailed philosophical defense of Perceptual Realism, see David Kelley, *The Evidence of the Senses: A Realist Theory of Perception*, Louisiana State University Press, 1986
- [21] D. Albert and B. Loewer, “Interpreting the Many Worlds Interpretation”, *Synthese* **77**, 195-213 (1988)
- [22] The clearest philosophical work on the Many Worlds Interpretation has been done by David Albert. For a more systematic discussion of the claim that MWI necessitates a rejection of Perceptual Realism, see D. Albert, *Quantum Mechanics and Experience*, Harvard University Press, 1992
- [23] This point is mentioned also in David Albert, *Quantum Mechanics and Experience*, op cit
- [24] R. Chiao and J. Garrison, “Realism or Locality: Which Should We Abandon?”, *Foundations of Physics* **29** 553-560 (1999)
- [25] Leonard Peikoff, *Objectivism: The Philosophy of Ayn Rand*, Dutton, 1991, pages 129-141
- [26] M. Smerlak and C. Rovelli, “Relational EPR”, quant-ph/0604064
- [27] A.D. Sokal, “A Physicist Experiments with Cultural Studies”, *Lingua Franca*, May/June 1996
- [28] Irene Born, trans., *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, 1971
- [29] N.D. Mermin, “Is the moon there when nobody looks? Reality and the quantum theory”, *Physics Today*, April 1985, pages 38-47
- [30] For a recent attempt to clarify and revive the EPR argument, see T. Norsen, “Einstein’s Boxes”, *AmJPhys*, 73(2), February 2005, pages 164-176