CAUSATION

International Journal Of Science

No 1, 2006, pp. 1-20.
http://www.causation.de/

Causation and the law of independence.

Calendar

Conference and Workshop Call for Papers

January 6-12, 2007:
International Joint Conference on Automated Reasoning
(IJCAR 2007) ,
Hyderabad, India

Look at:

http://www.philosophyconferences.com/
http://www2.informatik.hu-berlin.de/lics/logic-confs/index.html
http://www.illc.uva.nl/NewsandEvents/

Contents *News*

Peer Reviewed

None Peer Reviewed

- none -

---

http://www.causation.de/

ISSN 1863-9542

Jever, Germany, November, 2006.

Bell's Theorem Under Pressure.

Bell's theorem as such is based on a linear combination of correlations. Correlation analyisis is known to commit the so called "cum hoc ergo propter hoc" fallacy. Thus, it appears reasonable, that the book on Bell's theorem could be closed. See also Guillaume ADENIER, A Refutation of Bell's Theorem.

Jever, Germany, November, 2006.

Petri Nets 2007

28th INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON APPLICATION AND THEORY OF PETRI NETS AND OTHER MODELS OF CONCURRENCY

Siedlce, Poland, June 25-29, 2007.

Contact e-mail:
atpn2007@ap.siedlce.pl
http://atpn2007.ap.siedlce.pl/

The conference is about the progress in the application and theory of Petri nets. The participants of conference are from industry, universities and research institutions. Typically, the conferences have about 150-200 participants.

Causation and the law of independence.

By Ilija Barukčić

Jever, Germany. http://www.barukcic-causality.com/

Barukcic@t-online.de

Abstract

Titans like Bertrand Russell or Karl Pearson warned us to keep our mathematical and statistical hands off causality and at the end David Hume too. Hume's philosophy has dominated discussion about causality for a long time. But more and more researchers are working hard on this field and trying to do it better. Much of the recent philosophical or mathematical writings on causation either addresses to Bayes networks, to the counterfactual approach to causality developed in detail by David Lewis, to Reichenbach's Principle of the Common Cause or to the Causal Markov Condition. None of this approaches to causation investigated the relationship between causation and the law of independence to a necessary extent. Only, may an effect occur in the absence of a cause? May an effect fail to occur in the presence of a cause? In so far, what does constitute the causal relation? On the other hand, if it is unclear what does constitute the causal relation, maybe we can answer the question, what does not constitute the causal relation. This publication will prove, that the law of independence defines causation to some extent **ex negativo**.

1. Introduction

Attempts to analyse the relationship between cause and effect in terms of probability theory are based on the fact that causes can raise (Patrick Suppes (1970)) or lower (Germund Hesslow (1976)) the probabilities of their effects. Probabilistic theories of causation offer a potential advantage over regularity theories (especially John Stuart Mill (1843), John Mackie (1974)), probabilistic approaches to causation are compatible with indeterminism.

2. Methods

According to David Hume, causes are followed by their effects or the asymmetry of causation (Hausman (1998)) is based on the temporal asymmetry between cause and effect. It is a remarkable fact that the definition of causation in terms of temporal asymmetry has a number of disadvantages. Firstly. The position "*post hoc, ergo propter hoc*" is known to be a logical fallacy. Secondly. The regularity approach to causation is known to be incompatible with quantum mechanics and Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle. Thirdly. If the cause as such happens only before the effect, this rules out that the cause can happen after its effect. Thus, if causes only precede their effects in (space) time then it seems plausible, however, that there is no causation at all. Hence, because of the many well-known difficulties with the definition of causation in terms of temporal asymmetry another approach to causation is necessary.

3. Results

Causal investigation of the world around us using the tools of probability theory is often based on random variables. For a variety of reasons this appears to be reasonable. It is common to distinguish “the cause” as such and “a cause” (Mill (1843)). The first difficulty is to define, what is a cause, what is an effect. There are various, usually imprecise definitions of cause (f. e. Aristotle's doctrine of the four causes) and effect. In order to avoid certain major errors of definition, let us just talk about the cause or about the effect.

Theorem 1.

The determination of an effect by a cause and vice versa.
Let C_t denote the cause, something existing independently of human mind and consciousness, at the (space) time t. Let $E(C_t)$ denote the expectation value of the cause at the (space) time t. Let $E(C_t) \neq 0$. Let E_t denote the effect something other existing independently of human mind and consciousness, at the (space) time t. Let $E(E_t)$ denote the expectation value of the effect at the (space) time t. Let $E(C_t , E_t)$ denote the expectation value of cause and effect at the (space) time t. Let $\sigma(C_t , E_t)$ or $Cov(C_t , E_t)$ denote the covariance of cause and effect at the (space) time t. Then, according to the law of independence, one of the fundamental concepts in probability theory, the effect is independent from the cause and vice versa, if

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma (C_t , E_t) = Cov(C_t , E_t) = E(C_t , E_t) - (E(C_t) * E(E_t)) = 0.}$$

Proof of the Theorem 1.

$$\boldsymbol{+ C_t = + C_t}$$

The starting point of our proof is the identity of $\boldsymbol{+C_t = +C_t}$ (Barukčić 2006a, pp. 55-60, pp. 44-46). C_t is only itself, simple equality with itself, it is only self-related and unrelated to an other, it is distinct from any relation to an other, C_t contains nothing other but only itself. In this way, there does not appear to be any relation to an other, any relation to an other is removed, any relation to an other has vanished. Consequently, C_t is just itself and thus somehow the absence of any other determination. C_t is in its own self only itself and nothing else. In this sense, C_t is identical only with itself, C_t is thus just the 'pure' C_t. Let us consider this in more detail, C_t is not the transition into its opposite, the negative of C_t is not as necessary as the C_t itself, C_t is not confronted by its other. C_t is without any opposition or contradiction, is not against an other, is not opposed to an other, is identical only with itself and has passed over into pure equality with itself or C_t is without any local hidden variable.

But lastly, although identity and difference are somehow different, identity is not difference, identity is in its own self different. Thus, C_t immediately negates itself. C_t is at the same (space) time in its self-sameness different from itself and thus self-contradictory. Since $C_t = C_t$ it excludes at the same (space) time the other out of itself, it is C_t and it is nothing else, it is at the same (space) time not Not-C_t, C_t is thus non-being as the non-being of its other. In excluding its own other out of itself C_t is excluding itself in its own self. By excluding its other, C_t makes itself into the other of what it excludes from itself, or C_t makes itself into its own opposite, C_t is thus simply the transition of itself into its opposite. C_t is therefore alive only in so far as it contains such a contradiction within itself.

The non-being of its other is at the end the sublation of its other. This non-being is the non-being of itself, a non-being which has its non-being in its own self and not in another, each contains thus a reference to its other. Not-C_t is the pure other of C_t . But at the same (space) time, Not-C_t only shows itself in order to vanish, the other of C_t is not. C_t and Not-C_t are distinguished and at the same (space) time both are related to one and the same C_t , each is that what it is as distinct from its own other. Identity is thus to some extent at the same (space) time the vanishing of otherness. C_t is itself and its other, C_t has its determinateness not in an other, but in its own self. C_t is thus self-referred and the reference to its other is only a self-reference. On closer examination C_t therefore is, only in so far as its Not-C_t is, C_t has within itself a relation to its other. In other words, C_t is in its own self at the same (space) time different from something else or C_t is something. It is widely accepted that something is different from nothing, thus while $C_t = C_t$ it is at the same (space) time different from nothing or from **non** - C_t **.** From this it is evident, that the other side of the identity $C_t = C_t$ is the fact, that C_t cannot at the same (space) time be C_t and not C_t. In fact, if $C_t = C_t$ then C_t is not at the same (space) time non C_t. What emerges from this consideration is, therefore, even if $C_t = C_t$ it is a self-contained opposition. C_t is only in so far as C_t contains this contradiction within it, C_t is inherently self-contradictory. C_t is thus only as the other of the other. In so far, C_t includes within its own self its own non-being, a relation to something else different from its own self. Thus, C_t is at the same (space) time the unity of identity with difference. C_t is itself and at the same (space) time its other too, C_t is thus contradiction. Difference as such imply contradiction because it unites sides which are, only in so far as they are at the same (space) time not the same. C_t is only in so far as the other of C_t, the non-C_t is. C_t is thus that what it is only through the other, through the non-C_t, through the non-being of itself. Thus we obtain

$$+C_t - C_t = 0.$$

$+C_t$ and $-C_t$ are negatively related to one another and both are indifferent to one another, C_t is separated in the same relation. C_t is itself and its other, it is self-referred, its reference to its other is thus a reference to itself, its non-being is thus only a moment in it. C_t is in its own self the opposite of itself, it has within itself the relation to its other, it is a simple and self-related negativity. Each of them are determined against the other, the other is in and for itself and not as the other of an other. C_t is in its own self the negativity of itself. C_t therefore is, only in so far as its non-being is and vice versa. Non - C_t therefore is, only in so far as its non-being is, both are through the non-being of its other, both as opposites cancel one another in their combination.

Further, the identity of $C_t = C_t$ is an identity over time. Time as such involves in a very general way something like an alteration. C_t undergoes alteration, it goes outside itself. In general, any alteration of C_t, the cause, raises subtle problems. How can the cause remain the same and yet change? If C_t changes, must there be a cause for this change or is an uncaused change possible? Is it extremely implausible to deny caused change? Thus, if $C_t = C_t$ and if C_t changes too, then C_t must at the same (space) time at least be non-identical to itself. In so far, C_t must include a difference within itself or to say it more mathematically, there must be an expectation value of C_t. According to Kolmogorov it holds true that **"If *x* and *y* are equivalent then *E(x) = E(y)* ."** (Kolmogorov 1956, p. 39). Thus we obtain the next equation

$$E(C_t) = E (C_t).$$

If $C_t = C_t$ then $E(C_t) = E(C_t)$. This does not mean that it must hold true that $C_t = E(C_t)$! If it is only that $C_t = C_t$, how can an advance to something different be made? Let us assume, that the cause C_t is not alone. In other words, it is true that

$$E(C_t) * \mathbf{1} = E (C_t).$$

Let **$E(E_t) = E(E_t)$.** Let **$E(E_t) \neq 0$**, thus **$E(E_t)/E(E_t)$** = **1**. It is $E(E_t) = E(E_t)$ and $E(C_t) = E(C_t)$ but both are not one. The self-identity of both is thus the indifference of each towards the other which is distinguished from it. In the same relation, both are rigidly held as separated., both have a separate existence and are without any relation to an other. In this case, a cause has no relation to an effect, nothing changes by the cause, effect E_t is like it is, thus we obtain

$$E(C_t) * (E(E_t) / E(E_t)) = E(C_t)$$

or

$$E(C_t) * E(E_t) = E(C_t) * E(C_t)$$

Each of both stands isolated from each other, is separated from each other, each is only on its own. By this separation of one from the other, both are related not to one another, each is valid on its own and without any respect to an other. In so far, according to Kolmogorov, it is " **E(X Y)** = ... = E(X E(Y)) **= E(X) * E(Y)** " (Kolmogorov 1956, p. 60). Thus we obtain

$$E(C_t, E_t) = E(C_t) * E(E_t)$$

or

$$E(C_t, E_t) - E(C_t) * E(E_t) = 0$$

However, in general, if the effect is independent from the cause and vice versa or if the cause is independent from itself and equally determining itself, that is to say, if the probability of the cause p(C) is either p(C) = 1 or p(C) = 0, then

no causal relationship

between cause and effect can be proofed or established by the tools of probability theory or statistics in this case. In so far, it holds true that

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma(C_t, E_t) = Cov(C_t, E_t) = E(C_t, E_t) - (E(C_t) * E(E_t)) = 0.}$$

Q. e. d.

4. Discussion

If cause and effect are independent from each other, if the cause is only for itself and without any relation to an other, if the cause is independent from itself and equally **determining** itself (Barukčić 2006a, p.44), then it is true that

$$\sigma (C_t , E_t) = Cov(C_t , E_t) = E(C_t ,E_t) - (E (C_t) * E(E_t)) = 0.$$

If $\sigma(C_t , E_t) \neq 0$, this not a clear proof by the tools of probability theory or statistics that there is a causal relationships between C_t and E_t. We can only state that is not possible to extract causal relationships from data with the tools of probability theory or statistics, if $\sigma(C_t , E_t) = 0$. In so far, the law of independence, one of the fundamental laws in nature, statistics and probability theory is valid for the relationship between cause and effect too. If the effect at the same (space) time is independent from the cause and vice versa, if the cause at the same (space) time independent from the effect, then it holds true that

$$\sigma (C_t , E_t) = Cov(C_t , E_t) = E(C_t , E_t) - (E (C_t) * E(E_t)) = 0.$$

Under this circumstances it is difficult to proof or establish a causal relationship by the tools of probability theory or statistics. As long as $\sigma(C_t , E_t) \neq 0$, it appears to be possible to use the tools of probability theory or statistics to extract causal relationships from data. Causation is in so far to some extent the other of independence and at the same (space) time an absolutely necessary part of independence (Barukčić 2006a, p. 44) too, independence defines thus causation to some extent **ex negativo.**

Acknowledgement

This publication is part of my work presented by me at the XXIIIrd International Biometric Conference scheduled from July 16-21, 2006 in Montréal, Canada. In particular, I am extremely grateful to the Scientific Program Committee of the XXIIIrd International Biometric Conference and especially to Alain Vandal for the trust and support provided by reviewing and accepting my paper entitled: "New Method for Calculating Causal Relationships" for presentation at the XXIIIrd International Biometric Conference in Montréal, Canada. I am very grateful to Agnes M. Herzberg and M.E. Thompson.

References

Barukčić, Ilija. (1989). *Die Kausalität*. 1. Ed. Hamburg: Wissenschaftsverlag.
Barukčić, Ilija. (2006a). *Causality. New Statistical Methods*. Hamburg: Books on Demand. pp. 488.
Barukčić, Ilija. (2006b). *New Method For Calculating Causal Relationships*, Montréal: XXIII International Biometric Conference, July 16 - 21 2006.
Eells, Ellery. (1991). *Probabilistic Causality*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
Einstein, Albert. (1908a). "Über das Relativitätspnnzip und die aus demselben gezogenen Folgerungen," *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik* 4: 411-462.
Einstein, Albert. (1908b). "Berichtigungen zu der Arbeit: Über das Relativitätspnnzip und die aus demselben gezogenen Folgerungen," *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik* 5: 98-99.
Hausman, Daniel. (1998). *Causal Asymmetries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hesslow, Germund. (1976). "Discussion: Two Notes on the Probabilistic Approach to Causality," *Philosophy of Science* 43: 290 - 292.
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1998). *Hegel's science of logic*, Edited by H. D. Lewis, Translated by A. V. Miller. New York: Humanity Books.
Hume, David. (1748). *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*.
Kolmogorov, A. N. (1933). *[Grundbegriffe der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung, 1933] Foundations of the Theory of Probability,* Transl. Nathan Morrison, sec. Ed. Repr. 1956, New York: Chelsea Publishing Company.
Mackie, John. (1974). *The Cement of the Universe*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Mill, John Stuart. (1843). *A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive*. London: Parker and Son.
Noordhof, Paul. (1999). "Probabilistic Causation, Preemption and Counterfactuals," *Mind* 108**:** 95 - 125.
Pearl, Judea. (2000). *Causality: Models, Reasoning, and Inference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Reichenbach, Hans. (1956). *The Direction of Time*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
Salmon, Wesley. (1980). "Probabilistic Causality," *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 61**:** 50 - 74.
Spirtes, Peter, Clark Glymour, and Richard Scheines. (2000). *Causation, Prediction and Search*, Second Edition. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
Suppes, Patrick. (1970). *A Probabilistic Theory of Causality*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.

Published: December 15th, 2006.
Revision: February 12th, 2007.

Causation **1** (2006), 11-17.

Local hidden variable theorem.

By Ilija Barukčić[*, 1,2]

[1] Jever, Germany.
[2] http://www.barukcic-causality.com/

Abstract

Quantum mechanics does not predict the outcome of measurements with certainty. Does the statistical nature of quantum mechanics imply that quantum mechanics is incomplete or is the reality as such both, nondeterministic and deterministic? Is it possible at all to predict the outcome of each measurement with certainty? The question naturally arises, is there some deeper reality hidden beneath quantum mechanics? Are local hidden variables incompatible with observations? Is the hope for a so-called local hidden variable theory for quantum mechanics still alive? This publication will refute Bell's theorem by the proof that

there are local hidden variables.

Key words: Einstein–Podolsky–Rosen paradox, Bell's inequality, Realism, Nonlocality, Correlation, Causation.

1. Background

The assumption that particle attributes have definite values independent of the act of observation appears to be somehow reasonable. Physical processes occurring at one place should have no immediate effect on the elements of reality at another location. This is known as the principle of locality (Bohm, 1952). The desire for a local realist theory seems to be somehow a consequence of special relativity. The famous Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox (EPR paradox) assumes local realism too. In recent years, however, doubt has been cast on local realist theories. In other words, it turns out that there is a serious challenge to local realism and thus on special relativity too. Roughly speaking, John S. Bell's (Bell, 1964) crucial attack on local realism has increased the tension between the locality of Relativity Theory and Quantum Nonlocality at a maximum. However, the book is not completely closed on Bell's theorem. Is there a experimental resolution of the conflict between Local Realistic Theories and Quantum Mechanics?

2. Material and Methods

John S. Bell, a former staff member of CERN (European Organisation for Nuclear Research) published his theorem in the year 1964. John S. Bell's theorem seems to be mathematically-technically correct. Thus, at this point, however, it is important to put some light on the background of Bell's theorem from a purely theoretical standpoint. At least two different questions are raised by reflection upon our investigations concerning Bell's theorem. First. First of all, per Bell's theorem, **either** local realism **or** quantum mechanics is wrong, both cannot be correct at the same (space) time. Upon assumption that quantum mechanics and local realism are equally correct, what conclusions can be drawn about Bell's theorem? In this case, Bell's theorem cannot be correct, although mathematically-technically it is correct. A variety of Bell test experiments suggest that Bell's inequality is violated. Is there a conclusion that is logically justified? Second. Can we rely on correlation. Does correlation imply causation? Is it possible to escape Bell's implications?

[*] Corresponding author: e-mail: Barukcic@t-online.de, Phone: +00 49 44 23 - 991111, Fax: +00 49 44 23 991112. GMT + 1h.

Bell's thought experiment

"Two suitable particles, suitably prepared (in the 'singlet spin state') , are directed from a common source towards two widely separated magnets followed by detecting screens. Each time the experiment is performed each of the two particles is deflected either up or down at the corresponding magnet. Whether either particle separately goes up or down on a given occasion is quite unpredictable. But when one particle goes up the other always goes down and vice-versa. After a little experience it is enough to look at one side to know also about the other." (Bell 1981, p. C2-42).

Is there a cause for this behaviour, a local hidden variable? According to Bell, correlation can be used without any problem to proof for causation. In so far, many have overlooked the fact that **Bell jumps to a conclusion about causation** between random variables **which is based on a correlation** between events that occur simultaneously. Does correlation really imply causation? Surely not.

3. Results

Let us assume that the value of any physical quantity can be predicted with absolute certainty prior to performing a measurement or otherwise disturbing. In so far, let any quantum-level object have a definite and well defined state that determines the values of all other measurable properties. Let distant objects do not exchange information faster than the speed of light. This well defined properties are sometimes called *local hidden variables*.

Theorem 1. **There are local hidden variables I.**

Let

X_t	denote something existing independently of human mind and consciousness, f. e. a measurable random variable, a quantum mechanics object etc. at the (space) time t,
$(h)_t + (\text{not } h)_t = X_t$	denote that something that is existing independently of human mind and consciousness, f. e. a measurable random variable, a quantum mechanics object etc. at the (space) time t is determined by a local hidden and a local non-hidden part (variable), there is no third between the local hidden and a local non-hidden part, **tertium non datur**,
h_t	denote the local **hidden** (dark or secret) **part (variable)** of something existing independently of human mind and consciousness**,** f. e. of a random variable or of a quantum mechanics object X_t etc. at the (space) time t, the local hidden part of X_t,
$(\text{not } h)_t$	denote the local **not-hidden part (variable)** of something existing independently of human mind and consciousness**,** f. e. of a random variable or of a quantum mechanics object X_t etc. at the (space) time t, the local not-hidden of X_t,
$E(X_t)$	denote the expectation value of something existing independently of human mind and consciousness, f. e. a measurable random variable, a quantum mechanics object etc. at the (space) time t,
$\sigma(X_t)^2$	denote the variance of something existing independently of human mind and consciousness, f. e. a measurable random variable, a quantum mechanics object etc. at the (space) time t,
t	denote the (space) time,

then

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma(X_t)^2 = E(X_t^2) - E(X_t)^2 = 0.}$$

Proof by contradiction of the theorem 1.
Let us assume, that the opposite of our theorem above is true. Thus, let us assume **there are no local hidden variables**. Recall, we have defined that

$$\mathbf{h_t + (not\ h)_t = X_t.} \tag{1}$$

Our assumption is that **there are no local hidden variables**, we set $\mathbf{h_t = 0}$. We obtain the next equation.

$$(\mathbf{h_t = 0}) + (\text{not h})_t = X_t \tag{2}$$

$$\mathbf{0} + (\text{not h})_t = X_t \tag{3}$$

$$\mathbf{(not\ h)_t = X_t} \tag{4}$$

Our assumption is according to a proof by contradiction there are no local hidden variables. Thus, we obtained an **identity** of $\mathbf{(not\ h)_t}$, the part of $\mathbf{X_t}$ that is locally not hidden and measured and $\mathbf{X_t}$ itself. In other words, the locally not hidden or measured part of $\mathbf{X_t}$ is the whole $\mathbf{X_t}$ itself, there is nothing else, no locally hidden part. We cannot distinguish between $\mathbf{(not\ h)_t}$ and $\mathbf{X_t}$ both are identical and are the same. In so far, since $(\text{not h})_t = \mathbf{X_t}$ we obtain the next equation.

$$\mathbf{X_t = X_t .} \tag{5}$$

$$X_t * X_t = X_t * X_t . \tag{6}$$

$$X_t^{\,2} = X_t * X_t \tag{7}$$

$$E (X_t^{\,2}) = E (X_t * X_t) \tag{8}$$

$$E (X_t^{\,2}) = E (X_t) * E (X_t) \tag{9}$$

$$E (X_t^{\,2}) = E (X_t)^{2} \tag{10}$$

$$E (X_t^{\,2}) - E (X_t)^{2} = 0 \tag{11}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma(X_t)^2 = E (X_t^{\,2}) - E (X_t)^{2} = 0.} \tag{12}$$

Q. e. d.

Consequently, if our assumption above is true that X_t has not a local hidden variable, then the variance of X_t must be equal to zero. In so far, if we perform some measurements on X_t and if we have found at the same time that $\boldsymbol{\sigma(X_t)^2 = 0}$ then we have equally found, that there is no local hidden variable inside (Barukčić 2006, p. 55-60) the investigated X_t. Otherwise, every time when $\boldsymbol{\sigma(X_t)^2 \neq 0}$ we found equally, that there is a local hidden variable inside X_t. According to the proof above, we must accept that there are indeed local hidden variables. In so far, Bell's theorem is refuted. But the proof above is not a proof, that quantum mechanics is incomplete or wrong, not at all. The proof above is only a proof, that every thing that exists independently of human mind and consciousness as such is inherently contradictory, it is the unity and the struggle between the local hidden and local not-hidden part within itself. The expression $\mathbf{X_t = X_t}$ is an existing contradiction. How can X_t be equal only to itself and nothing else? If X_t is equal only to itself and nothing else, if X_t is without any local hidden variable, if X_t is only **the pure** $\mathbf{X_t}$, then the variance of X_t must be equal to 0 or $\boldsymbol{\sigma(X_t)^2 = 0}$. In this case, X_t is no longer the unity of identity and difference, X_t doesn't change at all, X_t is and stay during all space and time just the same X_t . The theoretical question here is if X_t never changed, how was it possible for X_t to begin, how could it become that what it is, it is X_t, and this is something that is different from nothing. In so far, if it is only true that $X_t = X_t$, then it is impossible for X_t to begin, because if X_t is, X_t is not just beginning. On the other hand, in so far as X_t is not, then X_t does not begin. If X_t *is not* and if X_t would begin, then X_t must change at least from not X_t to X_t. Can X_t change as such although it is true that $\boldsymbol{\sigma(X_t)^2 = 0}$. It is obvious, that any alteration of X_t raises subtle problems. Thus, X_t or something else can change only is so far as it has incompatible properties within itself (a local hidden variable) and yet remains the same, if it is an existing contradiction. So, if X_t is only X_t and without a local hidden variable then there is no becoming, X_t just stays X_t , no changes, no movement, all is like it is, there is no development or **$\sigma(X_t)^2 = 0$**. It is impossible for X_t to change, in so far, as X_t changes, it is no longer X_t, it is something else. The changing of X_t implies that X_t does not remain X_t but passes into its other, into its local hidden variable and vice versa and may be much more then this. It is obvious, that this is an infinitely important proof. In other words, if there are no local hidden variables, if it is only true that **$X_t = X_t$, how can the variance of X_t** under this condition **be unequal to zero?**

Hypothetical syllogism

In propositional logic, a hypothetical syllogism expresses a rule of inference of the following form:

$$A \rightarrow B. \quad B \rightarrow C. \quad \text{Therefore, } \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}.$$

Example:

Driving a car (=A)	$\rightarrow$	Traffic accident (=B).	(13)
Traffic accident (=B)	$\rightarrow$	Deadly event (=C).	(14)
Therefore,			
Driving a car (=A)	$\rightarrow$	Deadly event (=C).	(15)

Thus, set A as there is no local hidden variable or ($\mathbf{h_t = 0}$) . Set B as $X_t = X_t$. Set C as $\sigma(X_t)^2 = 0$.

Theorem 2. There are local hidden variables II.

Proof based on hypothetical syllogism.

Premises.

$$(h_t = 0) \rightarrow (X_t = X_t) \text{ , which follows from (1),(2),(3),(4),(5).} \quad (16)$$

$$(X_t = X_t) \rightarrow (\sigma(X_t)^2 = 0) \text{ , which follows from (5),(6),(7),(8),(9),(10),(11), (12).} \quad (17)$$

Conclusio.

$$\mathbf{(h_t = 0) \rightarrow (\sigma(X_t)^2 = 0)} \quad (18)$$

Q. e. d.

This is one of the most important proofs in physics, there are local hidden variables. The accuracy or the truth of our conclusion above depends on the soundness of the reasoning from the premises above to our conclusion and on the truth of our premises above. We assumed that there is no local hidden variable h_t or in other words, $h_t = 0$. In so far, our argument is valid and all of its premises are true. Therefore, it is a sound argument. To say it in broken English: **if X_t has not a local hidden variable, if X_t is only itself and nothing else, if X_t is only the pure X_t , if it is true that** $X_t = X_t$ **then the variance of X_t must be equal to zero or $\sigma(X_t)^2 = 0$**. Consequently, we are in great trouble, if we deny local hidden variables if $\sigma(X_t)^2 > 0$. In so far,

"**The variance in this sense is a measure of the inner contradictions of a random variable, of changes, of struggle within this random variable itself, or the greater $\sigma(X)^2$ of a random variable, the greater the inner contradictions of this random variable**" (Barukčić 2006, p.57).

Bell's theorem is refuted by our proof above, that there are local hidden variables in objective reality. Only, with our proof above, it is not proofed that the local hidden part of $\mathbf{X_t}$ stands in any relation to the local not-hidden part of $\mathbf{X_t}$. In so far, the local hidden part of $\mathbf{X_t}$ must not have anything in common with the local not hidden part of $\mathbf{X_t}$ as such. What could this mean?

Theorem 3. The independence of the local hidden part and the local not hidden part of something.

X_t	denote something existing independently of human mind and consciousness, f. e. a measurable random variable, a quantum mechanics object etc. at the (space) time t,
$(h)_t + (\text{not } h)_t = X_t$	denote that something that is existing independently of human mind and consciousness, f. e. a measurable random variable, a quantum mechanics object etc. at the (space) time t is determined by a local hidden and a local non-hidden part (variable), there is no third between the local hidden and a local non-hidden part, **tertium non datur**,
h_t	denote the **local hidden** (dark or secret) **part (variable)** of something existing independently of human mind and consciousness**,** f. e. of a random variable or of a quantum mechanics object X_t etc. at the (space) time t, the local hidden part of X_t,
$(\text{not } h)_t$	denote the local **not-hidden part (variable)** of something existing independently of human mind and consciousness**,** f. e. of a random variable or of a quantum mechanics object X_t etc. at the (space) time t, the local not-hidden of X_t,
$E(h_t)$	denote the expectation value the local **hidden (**dark or secret) **part** of something existing independently of human mind and consciousness**,** f. e. of a random variable or of a quantum mechanics object X_t etc. at the (space) time t, the local hidden part of X_t,
$E(\text{not } h_t)$	denote the expectation value the local **not-hidden part** of something existing independently of human mind and consciousness**,** f. e. of a random variable or of a quantum mechanics object X_t etc. at the (space) time t, the local not-hidden part of X_t,
$\sigma((\text{not } h)_t , (h_t))$	denote the co-variance of the local hidden and the local not-hidden part of something existing independently of human mind and consciousness, f. e. of measurable random variables, of quantum mechanics objects etc. at the (space) time t,
t	denote the (space) time. Let $(\text{not } h)_t$ be independent from (h_t), let both have no influence on each other, let both not depend on each other,

then

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma((\text{not } h)_t , (h_t)) = E((\text{not } h)_t , (h_t)) - (E((\text{not } h)_t)*E(h_t)) = 0 .}$$

Proof of the theorem 2.

Let us assume, that there is no relationship between $(\text{not } h)_t$ and its local hidden variable h_t . Thus, we have only the pure $(\text{not } h)_t$. We obtain the basic equation.

$$\boldsymbol{(\text{not } h)_t = (\text{not } h)_t .} \tag{19}$$

$$E((\text{not } h)_t) = E ((\text{not } h)_t) \tag{20}$$

This basic identity is not changed at all by the next operation. We obtain the next equation.

$$E((\text{not } h)_t)*(\quad \mathbf{1} \quad) = E ((\text{not } h)_t) \tag{21}$$

Our assumption is that there is a local hidden part (h_t) inside something that is different from 0. Only, this local hidden part (h_t) inside something has nothing to do with the local non-hidden part $(\text{not } h)_t$ of the same something X_t. In so far, let $\mathbf{E(h_t) \neq 0}$**.** Equally it is true that $\mathbf{E(h_t) / E(h_t) = 1}$. Thus, we obtain the next equation.

ISSN 1863-9542

$$E((\text{not } h)_t)*(E(h_t) / E(h_t)) = E ((\text{not } h)_t) \quad (22)$$
$$E((\text{not } h)_t)* E(h_t) = E ((\text{not } h)_t) * E(h_t) \quad (23)$$
$$E((\text{not } h)_t , (h_t)) = E ((\text{not } h)_t) * E(h_t) \quad (24)$$
$$E((\text{not } h)_t , (h_t)) - (E ((\text{not } h)_t) * E(h_t)) = 0 \quad (25)$$
$$\boldsymbol{\sigma((\text{not } h)_t , (h_t)) = E((\text{not } h)_t , (h_t)) - (E((\text{not } h)_t)*E(h_t)) = 0 .} \quad (26)$$

Q. e. d.

If something that is existing independently of human mind and consciousness possesses a local hidden part h_t that is absolutely independent from the local not hidden part $(\text{not } h)_t$ of the same something, then it must hold true, that

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma((\text{not } h)_t , (h_t)) = 0,}$$

otherwise, once again we are in trouble. On the other hand, if

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma((\text{not } h)_t ,(h_t)) \neq 0}$$

then it is proofed, that the local hidden part h_t of something existing independently of human mind and consciousness and the local not-hidden part non-h_t of the same of something existing independently of human mind and consciousness are somehow depending on each other, are related to one an other, the one cannot without its other and vice versa.

4. Discussion

Bell is using correlation for his purposes, he is assuming that correlation implies causation. Bell prematurely claims without a proof that events which occur together (the measurement of Alice (A) is in causal relationship with the measurement of Bob (B)) are already caused by each other. In so far, that which had to be proofed is prematurely assumed as being correct before and without a proof as such. Bell has committed the typical cum hoc ergo propter hoc fallacy (Hackett, 1970) that is to say: A occurs in correlation to B, therefore, A causes B. Bell is observing only a correlation between A and B but making conclusion about causation. In other words, Bell has committed the correlation implies causation fallacy. "The EPRB correlations are such that the result of the experiment on one side immediately foretells that on the other, whenever the analyzers happen to be parallel. If we do not accept the intervention on one side as a causal influence on the other, we seem obliged to admit that the results on both sides are determined in advance anyway, independently of the intervention on the other side, by signals from the source and by the local magnet setting. But this has implications for non-parallel settings which conflict with those of quantum mechanics. So we cannot dismiss intervention on one side as a causal influence on the other." (Bell 1981, p. C2-52). Only, correlation has nothing to do with causation (Barukčić 2006, p. 46, p. 314, p. 341-343) this is already proofed and secured.

It is known, that the inequalities of Bell's theorem are violated. On the one hand, this does provide massive empirical evidence against correlation implies causation and thus against correlation analysis as such. On the other hand, this does not provide any positive empirical evidence in favour of Quantum Mechanics and equally this does not provide any empirical evidence against local realism.

Bell's theorem and a variety of Bell test experiments have definitely ended all dreams of those that had causality hopes for correlation. This is what Bell's theorem expresses and nothing more. Nobody can seriously believe that there is anything more in Bell's theorem.

Bell's theorem is based on the "cum hoc ergo propter hoc" logical fallacy, it is misleading as it is itself a logical fallacy. **Bell's theorem is the most profound logical fallacy of science**, it is the definite and best proof known, that correlation analysis contradicts Relativity Theory and Quantum mechanics and is thus a useless and dangerous statistical methodology.

Consequently, taking Bell's theorem for granted, or in other words, if we rely on correlation, then we must equally claim that the "spooky action at a distance" occurs (Einstein 1935) or according to Bell, telepathy is scientifically verified.

In so far, it's time to close the book on Bell's theorem, definitely.

This publication has proofed that the variance of something, of a random variable etc., is the best proof known, that the assumption of local realism and local hidden variables is correct. In accordance with Einstein et. al. we are "forced to conclude that the quantum-mechanical description of physical reality given by wave functions is not complete" (Einstein et. al. 1935, p. 780).

But contrary to expectation, our proof of the existence of local hidden variables is not a proof that quantum mechanics is incorrect. The correctness of quantum mechanics can be judged by the degree of agreement between quantum mechanics and the objective reality as such. While quantum mechanics is describing the objective reality the way the same is, in development, in change, quantum mechanics is because of this not an incomplete theory. The objective reality, independent of any theory, in development and change is as such if you will incomplete and full of contradictions.

Acknowledgement
I am very grateful to Agnes M. Herzberg and M.E. Thompson. I am grateful to Abner Shimony's very critical remarks from November, 27th 2006.
Published: December 15 th, 2006.
Revision: February 12th, 2007. May 05th, 2007.

References

Barukčić, Ilija (2006). Causality. New Statistical Methods. Second Edition. Books On Demand. Hamburg. pp. 488.

Barukčić, Ilija. (2006b). New Method For Calculating Causal Relationships, Montréal: XXIII International Biometric Conference, July 16 - 21, 2006.

Bell, J.S. (1964). “On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox,” *Physics* **1**, 195-200.

Bell, J.S. (1966). “On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics,” *Reviews of Modern Physics* **38**, 447-452.

Bell, J. S. (1981) “Bertlmann’s socks and the nature of reality,” *Journal de Physique*, Colloque C2, suppl. au numero 3, Tome **42,** pp C2 41-61.

Bohm, D. (1952), “A suggested interpretation of the quantum theory in terms of ‘hidden’ variables,” I. *Physical Review* **85**, 166-179; II. *Physical Review* **85**, 180-193.

Einstein, A., Podolsky, B., and Rosen, N. (1935), “Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?” *Physical Review* **47**, 770-780.

Fischer, David Hackett. (1970). *Historians' Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought.* Harper & Row, pp. 167-169.

Hegel, G. W. H. *Hegel's science of logic*, Edited by H. D. Lewis, Translated by A. V. Miller (New York: Humanity Books, 1998), pp. 844.

Heisenberg, W. (1927). “Über den anschaulichen Inhalt der quantentheoretischen Kinematik und Mechanik,” *Zeitschrift für Physik* **43**, 172-198.

Thompson, M. E. (2006). "Reviews. Causality. New Statistical Methods. I. Barukčić," Editor Dr. A. M. Herzberg, International Statistical Institute. *Short Book Reviews*, Volume 26, No. 1, p. 6.

Advertisement

Next

Volume:

Gastric

Cancer

...

CAUSATION

International Journal Of Science

No. 1, 2006, pp. 1-20.
http://www.causation.de/

Local hidden varia-bles.

ISSN 1863-9542