

Universe as a Single Solution

Universe as a Single

Solution

Reinterpreting

Bell's Theorem in a Globally Constrained System

Author: Rowan Brad Quni-Gudzinis **Affiliation:** QNFO **Contact:** rowan.quni@qnfo.org **ORCID:** 0009-0002-4317-5604 **ISNI:** 0000 0005 2645 6062 **DOI:** <https://papers.qnfo.org/papers/universe-as-a-single-solution/>
Publication Date: 2025-10-18 **Version:** 1.0

Abstract: This paper re-examines the conclusions drawn from Bell's theorem by critically analyzing its third, often unexamined, premise: Statistical Independence. While the experimental violation of Bell's inequality has traditionally forced a choice between locality and realism, this work argues that abandoning Statistical Independence is a more physically and philosophically coherent path. We propose a framework for a Globally Constrained Deterministic System (GCDS), in which the universe is treated as a single, self-consistent solution governed by a deterministic evolution law. In such a system, the correlation between a particle's properties and a detector's setting is not a conspiracy but a necessary consequence of a shared common cause in the universe's past. This approach preserves both locality and realism. We demonstrate how a GCDS can provide a coherent explanation for quantum correlations, the emergence of probability, and the measurement problem. We conclude that Bell's theorem should not be seen as a "no-go" theorem for local realism, but as a diagnostic tool that reveals the necessity of global constraints in any such theory. The experimental violations are reinterpreted as the first direct evidence for this global structure.

Keywords: Bell's theorem, superdeterminism, local realism, statistical independence, global constraints, common cause, epistemic probability

1.0 The Bell

Dichotomy and the Unexamined Premise

John Stewart Bell's theorem, and the subsequent experimental verification of its predictions, stands as one of the most profound and unsettling discoveries in the history of science. For decades, its interpretation has presented a stark choice between two foundational principles of classical physics: locality, the principle that objects are influenced only by their immediate surroundings, and realism, the notion that physical systems possess definite properties independent of observation. The overwhelming experimental evidence against the predictions of local realism has led to a widespread, albeit uneasy, consensus that our universe is fundamentally non-local, a conclusion that sits in deep tension with the principles of special relativity.

This paper argues that this dichotomy is incomplete. Bell's theorem does not rest on two premises, but three. The third, a seemingly innocuous assumption known as Statistical Independence, is almost always taken for granted. By questioning this unexamined premise, a third path emerges—one that preserves both locality and realism. This path leads to the conclusion that the universe is a globally constrained deterministic system, and that the violations of Bell's inequality are not evidence of non-locality, but are the first direct experimental signatures of this global structure.

1.1 The Standard

Interpretation of Bell's Theorem

The power of Bell's theorem lies in its ability to take a philosophical debate, initiated by Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen, and transform it into a matter of experimental arbitration. The results of these experiments have been decisive, forcing the physics community to confront the radical nature of quantum reality.

1.1.1 The Forced

Choice Between Locality and Realism

The standard interpretation of the experimental violation of Bell's inequality is that one must abandon either locality or realism. If one holds to realism—the belief that particles have definite, pre-existing properties (like spin direction) before they are measured—then the observed correlations between distant entangled particles must be coordinated by some form of faster-than-light influence. This is the path of non-locality. Conversely, if one holds strictly to locality, as demanded by relativity, then one must conclude that the properties of a particle are not real until a measurement is performed; the act of measurement itself helps to create the outcome. This path abandons realism as classically conceived. Landmark experiments, beginning with those of Aspect, Dalibard, and Roger, have consistently confirmed the predictions of quantum mechanics and violated the limits imposed by local realism, thereby cementing this difficult choice as a central feature of modern physics (Aspect, Dalibard, & Roger, 1982).

1.1.2 The

Marginalization of the Third Assumption

The formal proof of Bell's theorem, however, relies on a third assumption, typically called Statistical Independence or "Freedom of Choice." This is the assumption that the properties of the particles being measured are not correlated with the choice of settings on the measurement devices. This premise is often considered so self-evident that it is not even mentioned as a negotiable part of the theorem's foundation. Yet, Bell himself was more circumspect. He acknowledged that this assumption was a choice, not a logical necessity, noting that the "usual assumption of 'free will' is... a matter of taste" (Bell, 1987). This paper takes Bell's own cautious footnote as its starting point, arguing that this "matter of taste" is, in fact, the key to resolving the paradox.

1.2 The Thesis:

A Third Path via Global Constraints

This work argues that abandoning the assumption of Statistical Independence is a more physically and philosophically coherent path than abandoning either locality or realism. The central thesis is that the universe operates as a single, globally constrained deterministic system, a framework in which the assumption of Statistical Independence is necessarily and fundamentally violated from first principles.

1.2.1 Reframing

Bell's Theorem as a Diagnostic Tool

From this perspective, Bell's theorem is not a "no-go" theorem for local realism. Instead, it is a powerful diagnostic tool that proves something different and more interesting: any viable local, deterministic theory *must* be one in which the states of subsystems are globally correlated. The theorem proves that reality cannot be "factorizable" into statistically independent local parts. The experimental violations of Bell's inequality are thus reinterpreted as the primary empirical evidence *for* these global constraints.

1.2.2 Outline of the Argument

The paper will proceed as follows. Section 2.0 provides a rigorous formalization of Bell's theorem, carefully distinguishing its three core premises: local causality, the existence of objective properties ("beables"), and Statistical Independence. Section 3.0 introduces the alternative framework of a Globally Constrained Deterministic System (GCDS), defining its axioms and showing how it necessarily violates the assumption of Statistical Independence. Section 4.0 demonstrates the explanatory power of the GCDS model by applying it to the core mysteries of quantum correlations, the origin of probability, and the measurement problem. Finally, Section 5.0 proactively addresses the most significant objections to this view, such as the "fine-tuning" argument, and outlines a concrete, falsifiable research program for deriving the formalism of quantum mechanics from the GCDS axioms.

2.0 The

Formalism and Inescapable Power of Bell's Theorem

To appreciate the third path this paper proposes, one must first grasp the inescapable power of Bell's theorem within its own domain. Bell's work was a triumph of physical reasoning, transforming a seemingly metaphysical debate about the nature of reality into a question that could be answered by experiment. This section provides a formal breakdown of the theorem, isolating the three distinct assumptions that form its logical foundation.

2.1 The EPR Argument and

Bell's Beables

The modern context for Bell's theorem begins with the famous 1935 paper by Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen (EPR) (Einstein, Podolsky, & Rosen, 1935). EPR argued for the incompleteness of quantum mechanics by establishing a criterion for an "element of reality": if, without in any way disturbing a system, we can predict with certainty the value of a physical quantity, then there exists an element of reality corresponding to that quantity.

Consider a pair of entangled particles in a spin singlet state, moving in opposite directions. If an observer measures the spin of the first particle along the z-axis and finds it to be "up," they can predict with certainty that a measurement of the second particle's spin along the z-axis will yield "down." Since this prediction is made without physically interacting with the second particle, EPR concluded that the spin of the second particle must be a pre-existing element of reality. Bell took this concept and gave it a more formal, less philosophically loaded name: a "beable." He used the symbol λ to represent the complete set of all beables that fully specifies the objective state of the entangled pair (Bell, 1964).

2.2 Bell's Formalization

of Local Causality

Bell's primary achievement was to translate the EPR argument into a precise mathematical language. The combination of realism (the existence of beables) and locality is more accurately termed "local causality."

2.2.1

The Hidden Variable Λ as the Complete Specification of Beables

The variable λ represents the complete state of the particles. In a deterministic local realist theory, the outcome of a measurement is a function of the beables λ and the setting of the local measurement device. For a measurement at detector A with setting 'a', the outcome is $A(\lambda, a)$, and for detector B with setting 'b', the outcome is $B(\lambda, b)$.

The apparent randomness of quantum mechanics is attributed to our ignorance of the precise value of λ , which is assumed to vary from one particle pair to the next according to some probability distribution $\rho(\lambda)$.

2.2.2 The

Mathematical Condition for Local Causality

The principle of local causality is expressed mathematically by asserting that the outcome at one detector is independent of the setting of the other, spacelike separated detector. Once the beables λ are specified, they “screen off” any further correlation between the measurement events. This is formalized as:

$$P(A|\lambda, a, b) = P(A|\lambda, a) \text{ and } P(B|\lambda, a, b) = P(B|\lambda, b)$$

This means the probability of outcome A, given the full state λ and both settings, depends only on λ and the local setting ‘a’. This is the mathematical embodiment of locality.

2.3 The Crucial

Assumption: Statistical Independence

The third and final assumption is the most critical for the argument of this paper. It is a condition on the relationship between the beables of the particles and the settings of the detectors.

2.3.1 The

Formal Definition and Its Causal Implication

Statistical Independence is the assumption that the distribution of the beables λ is not correlated with the choice of measurement settings ‘a’ and ‘b’. Mathematically, this is stated as:

$$\rho(\lambda|a, b) = \rho(\lambda)$$

This means that the specific properties of the particle pair being generated at the source are statistically independent of the future settings that will be chosen by the measurement devices. In causal terms, it asserts that the process that produces the particles does not share a common cause with the processes that choose the settings.

2.3.2 The

Philosophical Justification: “Freedom of Choice”

This assumption is intuitively powerful and is often called “Freedom of Choice.” It is justified by appealing to the idea that experimenters are free to choose their measurement settings, or that the settings can be determined by processes, such as quantum random number generators or light from distant quasars, that are causally disconnected from the particle source. To deny this assumption seems to imply a universe where the particles “know” in advance how they will be measured, or where the experimenter’s choice is not truly free but is determined by the particle’s state.

2.4

The Derivation of the Bell-CHSH Inequality and Its Experimental Violation

From these three assumptions—the existence of beables (λ), local causality, and Statistical Independence—one can derive a testable constraint on the statistical correlations between the measurement outcomes. The most well-known form of this constraint is the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) inequality (Clauser, Horne, Shimony, & Holt,

1969):

$$|E(a, b) - E(a, b') + E(a', b) + E(a', b')| \leq 2$$

Here, $E(a, b)$ is the correlation function for measurements with settings ‘a’ and ‘b’. Quantum mechanics predicts that for certain choices of settings, this value can reach $2\sqrt{2} \approx 2.828$.

Decades of increasingly precise and “loophole-free” experiments have overwhelmingly confirmed the predictions of quantum mechanics, demonstrating a clear and robust violation of the Bell-CHSH inequality (Hensen et al., 2015). The experimental verdict is in: the world we live in does not obey the conjunction of these three assumptions. At least one of them must be false.

3.0

The Third Path: A Globally Constrained Deterministic System (GCDS)

The experimental verdict against local realism, as defined by Bell’s three premises, is definitive. The conventional response has been to sacrifice either locality or realism. This section explores the third path: a framework that preserves both by rejecting the assumption of Statistical Independence. This is not a mere “loophole” but a foundational principle rooted in a different conception of the universe—one governed by global consistency conditions.

3.1

Reframing the “Loophole” as a Foundational Principle

The rejection of Statistical Independence is often dismissed as “superdeterminism” and pejoratively framed as a grand conspiracy in which the universe fine-tunes its initial conditions to trick physicists. This paper argues that this framing is a category error. The violation of Statistical Independence should instead be seen as the signature of a new physical principle: global self-consistency in a deterministic universe. This view, advocated by theorists such as Gerard ‘t Hooft and Tim Palmer, posits that the laws of physics are not merely local marching orders but also global constraints on the possible states of the universe (‘t Hooft, 2016; Palmer, 2009). In such a system, the correlation between a particle’s properties and a detector’s setting is no more conspiratorial than the correlation between the 10th and the 100th digit of pi; both are logical consequences of the same underlying structure.

3.2 The Axioms of a GCDS

To move beyond philosophical framing, we can define a Globally Constrained Deterministic System (GCDS) with a set of formal axioms.

3.2.1

Axiom 1: Global State Monism and Deterministic Evolution

The universe is a single, unified system. Its complete state, Ψ_{univ} , can be represented as a single point on a universal state space manifold, M . The evolution of this state is governed by a deterministic flow, $\varphi_t : M \rightarrow M$, which maps the state at one time to the state at another. All observable phenomena—particles, fields, measurement devices, and observers—are not fundamental, independent entities but are sub-patterns or projections of the single global state Ψ_{univ} .

3.2.2 Axiom

2: Correlation of Subsystems via Common Cause

As a direct consequence of Axiom 1, all subsystems at a time ‘t’ share a common cause in the past state of the universe, $\Psi_{univ}(t_0)$, where t_0 lies in their shared past light cone. Therefore, the states of any two subsystems (such as a particle and a detector) are not, and cannot be, fundamentally independent. They are necessarily correlated by the constraints imposed by the global evolution law φ_t , which only permits globally self-consistent trajectories on the manifold M.

3.3 How Global

Constraints Invalidate the Bell Proof

A system governed by these axioms does not satisfy the premises of Bell’s theorem. The theorem remains a valid mathematical proof, but its starting assumptions are not applicable to a GCDS.

3.3.1 The

Necessary Violation of Statistical Independence

In a GCDS, the state of the measurement device, which determines the setting ‘a’, and the state of the particle, described by the beables λ , are both determined by the past state of the universe $\Psi_{univ}(t_0)$. Because they share a common cause, they cannot be statistically independent. Therefore, the condition $\rho(\lambda|a, b) = \rho(\lambda)$ is fundamentally violated. It is not an ad-hoc violation but a necessary feature of the system’s structure. With this premise removed, the derivation of the Bell-CHSH inequality is no longer valid.

3.3.2 The Common Cause Causal

Structure

The causal structure of the GCDS model can be contrasted explicitly with the structure assumed in Bell’s proof.

Standard Bell Setup: This model assumes two independent causal chains. One chain begins at the particle source and determines the beables λ . A separate, independent set of causal chains determines the settings ‘a’ and ‘b’. The causal structure is: (Source $\rightarrow \lambda$) and (Independent Causes $\rightarrow a, b$).

GCDS Causal Structure: This model proposes a single, overarching causal chain. A past state of the universe, $\Psi_{univ}(t_0)$, is the common cause for both the beables and the settings. The causal structure is: ($\Psi_{univ}(t_0) \rightarrow \lambda$) AND ($\Psi_{univ}(t_0) \rightarrow a, b$). This common cause is precisely the structure that the assumption of Statistical Independence forbids.

3.4 The Geometry of

Constraint: Invariant Sets

The concept of a global constraint can be given a more precise, geometric meaning. The correlations in a GCDS are not arbitrary; they are enforced by the geometry of the space of allowed states.

3.4.1 The Universal

State Space and Its Attractor

While the total state space M may be vast, the deterministic evolution φ_t does not necessarily explore all of it. Over cosmological timescales, the trajectory of the universe, $\Psi_{univ}(t)$, may be confined to a proper subset $A \subset M$. This subset is an invariant set, or attractor, of the dynamical system. This invariant set may have a much lower dimension than the ambient space M and could possess a complex, fractal geometry.

3.4.2 Correlations as

Geometric Necessity

The existence of an invariant set provides a powerful, geometric explanation for the violation of Statistical Independence. The correlations between the beables λ and the settings (a, b) are not a result of fine-tuning initial conditions within the vast space M. Rather, they are a geometric necessity enforced by the structure of the invariant set A. The universe is constrained to lie on A, and on this subset, not all combinations of (λ , a, b) are possible. The observed quantum correlations are a direct reflection of the geometric properties of this universal attractor.

4.0 A GCDS Model of Quantum

Phenomena

A framework that abandons Statistical Independence must do more than simply invalidate the premises of Bell's theorem; it must also provide a coherent, local, and realistic explanation for the quantum phenomena that Bell's theorem addresses. This section demonstrates how the axioms of a Globally Constrained Deterministic System (GCDS) offer a new foundation for understanding quantum correlations, the nature of probability, and the measurement problem.

4.1 The Nature of Quantum

Correlations

In a GCDS, the correlations that violate Bell's inequality are not the result of non-local influences. Instead, they are a necessary consequence of the global self-consistency of the universe, enforced by a deterministic evolution law acting on a single, unified state.

4.1.1 Logical

Entailment versus Causal Influence

The core conceptual shift in the GCDS model is from causal influence to logical entailment. The state of particle A does not *cause* the state of particle B. Rather, the state of the universe Ψ_{univ} *logically entails* the states of both A and B, including the settings of the detectors that will measure them.

An analogy is helpful: consider the digits of the number pi. The 10th digit and the billionth digit are correlated. This correlation is not established by a signal traveling from one digit to the other; it is established because both digits are determined by the same underlying algorithm. They are logically entailed by the definition of pi. Similarly, in a GCDS, the outcomes of an EPR experiment are correlated because they are sub-patterns of a single, globally consistent solution. The correlation is acausal and non-local in spacetime, but it is local and necessary in the "logical space" of the universal evolution law.

4.1.2 Generalization of

Conservation Laws

This principle of global constraint is not entirely alien to physics; it can be understood as a powerful generalization of familiar conservation laws. The law of conservation of momentum, for instance, is a global constraint on a closed system. The momenta of individual particles are not independent; they are correlated in a way that ensures the total

momentum remains constant. The GCDS framework proposes that a similar, but far more comprehensive, constraint applies to the entire configuration of the universe. The law φ_t does not just conserve a few scalar quantities; it conserves the consistency of the entire universal pattern, thereby correlating all its constituent parts.

4.2 The

Emergence of Probability and the Born Rule

A deterministic theory must explain the origin of probability. In the GCDS model, probability is not a fundamental feature of reality but an emergent, epistemic tool for observers who have incomplete information about the global state.

4.2.1

The Quantum State as an Epistemic, Conditional Probability Distribution

The wavefunction, or quantum state vector ψ , is not an objective beable in the GCDS framework. It is not the true state of the system, which is given by the beables λ (as a sub-pattern of Ψ_{univ}). Instead, the wavefunction is a mathematical device that represents an observer's partial knowledge. It is a conditional probability distribution over the true beables λ , given the information I available to the observer:

$$\psi \approx P(\lambda|I)$$

This epistemic view means that the quantum state describes what we know about reality, not reality itself.

4.2.2

Deriving the Born Rule from the Invariant Set Measure

The GCDS framework proposes a concrete path toward deriving the Born rule ($p = |\psi|^2$). As described in Section 3.4, the deterministic evolution φ_t confines the state of the universe to a lower-dimensional invariant set, A , within the total state space M . This dynamical evolution induces a natural, physical measure, μ , on this invariant set. For a chaotic system, this measure is ergodic, meaning it describes the long-term fraction of time the system's trajectory spends in any given region of A .

The Born rule is hypothesized to be the statistical distribution predicted by this invariant set measure μ , as seen by an embedded observer. An observer preparing a system in a state described by ψ is, in reality, constraining the universal state Ψ_{univ} to a specific sub-region of the invariant set A . The probability of a particular outcome is then given by the measure μ of the subset of that region corresponding to that outcome. The research program, outlined in Section 5.3, is to demonstrate that this formally derived probability matches the squared amplitude prescribed by the Born rule.

4.3 The

Measurement Problem and Wavefunction Collapse

The epistemic view of the quantum state provides a straightforward resolution to the long-standing measurement problem.

4.3.1 "Collapse" As a

Bayesian Information Update

If the wavefunction is a description of knowledge, then its “collapse” is not a physical process. It is an information update. When an observer performs a measurement and obtains an outcome, their knowledge of the system changes. They update their probability distribution to reflect this new information. This is a standard application of Bayes’ theorem:

$$P(\lambda|I_{initial} + \text{Measurement Outcome}) \propto P(\text{Outcome}|\lambda) \cdot P(\lambda|I_{initial})$$

The new state, $P(\lambda|I_{final})$, is sharply peaked around the beables λ consistent with the observed outcome. The “collapse” is the observer learning something that was, in the deterministic reality of the GCDS, always the case.

4.3.2 The Observer as a

Correlated Subsystem

This resolution dissolves the mystery of the “Heisenberg cut”—the arbitrary line between the quantum system and the classical observer. In a GCDS, there is no such cut. The observer and their measurement apparatus are subsystems governed by the same deterministic law φ_t as the particle being measured. They are part of the single universal state Ψ_{univ} and are, as a matter of principle, correlated with the system they observe. The measurement is simply an interaction between two correlated sub-patterns of a single, unified reality, and the “collapse” is the record of that interaction being registered in the memory of the observer sub-pattern.

5.0

Addressing Objections and Defining a Research Program

A framework that proposes a local, deterministic, and globally constrained reality must confront several powerful and long-standing objections. This section addresses the most significant of these—the “fine-tuning” or “conspiracy” argument—and outlines a concrete, falsifiable research program to move the GCDS model from a conceptual framework to a testable scientific theory.

5.1 The “Fine-Tuning”

or “Conspiracy” Objection

The most common and intuitive objection to any theory that violates Statistical Independence is that it requires an unbelievable “conspiracy.” The universe, the argument goes, would have to meticulously “fine-tune” the initial conditions of the particles and detectors to reproduce the quantum correlations, effectively rigging every experiment in advance.

5.1.1

Global Consistency versus Anthropomorphic Conspiracy

This paper contends that the “conspiracy” objection is a category error that arises from applying anthropomorphic concepts of agency and intention to the impersonal laws of physics. The GCDS does not “conspire” to produce outcomes any more than the laws of geometry “conspire” to make the digits of pi what they are. The laws of physics, in this view, are not just local rules for time-evolution but are also global consistency conditions on the state of the universe. The system simply does not admit solutions in which the beables λ and the settings (a, b) are not correlated in the precise way required to produce the observed statistics. The correlation is a feature of the law itself, not a feature of a particular, fine-tuned initial condition.

5.1.2

The Inapplicability of Standard Measure-Theoretic Arguments

A more formal version of the fine-tuning objection argues that the set of “conspiratorial” initial conditions required to violate Statistical Independence must be of “measure zero” in the total space of all possible initial conditions. This would make such a universe infinitely improbable.

This argument, however, implicitly assumes a uniform, physically meaningful measure on the total state space M . In the GCDS framework, this assumption is invalid. The deterministic evolution φ_t confines the state of the universe to a lower-dimensional invariant set, A . The only physically relevant measure is the natural, ergodic measure μ that is supported *on this invariant set*. Within the context of the invariant set A , the correlations required to violate Bell’s inequality are not rare (measure zero) but are generic (measure one). The states that would satisfy Bell’s inequality are the ones that are impossible—they do not lie on the attractor and thus have a physical probability of zero.

5.2

Falsifiability and Potential Experimental Signatures

A scientific theory must be falsifiable. While a GCDS reproduces the predictions of quantum mechanics by design, it is not necessarily identical to it. The global constraints may produce subtle, observable deviations from the standard quantum statistical picture.

5.2.1

A Proposed Test: Time-Series Analysis of Setting-Outcome Correlations

Standard quantum mechanics assumes that the outcomes of repeated measurements are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.). In a GCDS, while the global law is deterministic, the sequence of states visited by a series of experiments on the invariant set A may not be i.i.d. The global constraint could introduce subtle time-lagged correlations between the sequence of measurement settings and the sequence of outcomes.

A concrete, falsifiable prediction can be formulated:

Hypothesis: In a sufficiently long time-series of data from a Bell-type experiment, there exist non-zero time-lagged correlations between the sequence of detector settings and the sequence of measurement outcomes that are not predicted by standard quantum mechanics.

This can be tested by calculating the time-lagged mutual information, $I(\{a_i\}; \{A_{i+\tau}\})$, between the sequence of detector settings $\{a_i\}$ and the sequence of outcomes $\{A_i\}$ at a time lag τ . Standard quantum theory predicts this value will be zero for all $\tau > 0$. A GCDS could, in principle, predict a specific, non-zero signature for this function. A statistically significant, non-zero result would be strong evidence against standard quantum mechanics and in favor of a GCDS.

5.3 A

Concrete Research Program: Deriving Quantum Mechanics

The ultimate goal of the GCDS program is not merely to provide an “interpretation” of quantum mechanics, but to derive its entire mathematical formalism from a more fundamental, deterministic theory. This constitutes a well-defined, albeit extremely challenging, research program with three main steps.

5.3.1

Step 1: Defining the Universal State Space and Its Invariant Set

The first task is to identify the mathematical nature of the universal state space M and the geometric structure of its invariant set A . This is a problem of fundamental ontology. Promising avenues include exploring state spaces based on discrete structures, such as cellular automata, or number-theoretic structures, where the invariant set might be related to concepts from p-adic analysis or fractal geometry. The goal is to find a structure whose geometric properties naturally encode the symmetries of the Standard Model.

5.3.2 Step

2: Identifying the Deterministic Evolution Law

The second task is to discover the explicit form of the deterministic evolution law φ_t . This law must be of a form that naturally gives rise to a low-dimensional invariant set with the geometric properties identified in Step 1. This may involve exploring principles from geometric dynamics, information theory (such as the principle of maximal algorithmic complexity), or number theory.

5.3.3

Step 3: Deriving the Effective Hilbert Space Formalism

The final and most difficult step is to perform the “statistical mechanics” of the invariant set A . This involves showing how the familiar Hilbert space formalism of quantum mechanics emerges as the correct statistical description for embedded observers who are probing the geometry of A . This would involve:

Deriving the quantum state (wavefunction) as a representation of a conditional probability distribution on A .

Deriving the Born rule from the natural ergodic measure μ on A .

Deriving the Schrödinger equation as the effective equation of motion for the evolution of these probability distributions.

Successfully completing these three steps would represent a complete derivation of quantum mechanics from a local, deterministic, and globally constrained reality.

6.0 Conclusion

6.1

Summary: Bell’s Theorem as a Guidepost to Global Consistency

Bell’s theorem is not an obstacle to a local and deterministic worldview but a crucial guidepost. It has definitively shown that any local, deterministic theory capable of reproducing the results of quantum mechanics must be one in which subsystems are not statistically independent. It forces us to confront the profound interconnectedness of the universe. Rather than proving that reality is “spooky,” it proves that it cannot be fragmented into independent parts. The experimental violation of Bell’s inequality is the signature of this unbroken wholeness, a direct empirical confirmation that the universe is governed by global consistency conditions.

6.2

Final Outlook: The Prospect of a Unified, Local, and Deterministic Universe

The GCDS approach, while challenging and non-standard, restores the possibility of a physical reality that is fully compliant with the principles of locality and determinism that form the bedrock of relativity and, indeed, of scientific inquiry itself. It suggests that the strangeness of quantum mechanics is not an intrinsic feature of reality, but an artifact of our limited, subsystem perspective. By taking seriously the third path offered by Bell's theorem, we open a research program that aims to derive the statistical laws of quantum mechanics from a deeper, deterministic, and unified cosmology. This path, if successful, would not only resolve the foundational paradoxes of quantum theory but could also provide a new framework for unifying the conceptual foundations of quantum mechanics and general relativity.

References

- 't Hooft, G. (2016). *The Cellular Automaton Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*. Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-41285-6
- Aspect, A., Dalibard, J., & Roger, G. (1982). Experimental Test of Bell's Inequalities Using Time-Varying Analyzers. *Physical Review Letters*, 49(25), 1804–1807. DOI: 10.1103/physrevlett.1804
- Bell, J. S. (1964). On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen Paradox. *Physics Physique Fizika*, 1(3), 195–200. DOI: 10.1103/physicsphysiquefizika.195
- Bell, J. S. (1987). *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics: Collected Papers on Quantum Philosophy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Clauser, J. F., Horne, M. A., Shimony, A., & Holt, R. A. (1969). Proposed Experiment to Test Local Hidden-Variable Theories. *Physical Review Letters*, 23(15), 880–884. DOI: 10.1103/physrevlett.880
- Einstein, A., Podolsky, B., & Rosen, N. (1935). Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete?. *Physical Review*, 47(10), 777–800. DOI: 10.1103/physrev.777
- Hensen, B., Bernien, H., Dréau, A. E., Reiserer, A., Kalb, N., Blok, M. S., ... & Hanson, R. (2015). Loophole-free Bell inequality violation using electron spins separated by 1.3 kilometres. *Nature*, 526(7575), 682–686. DOI: 10.1038/nature15759
- Palmer, T. N. (2009). The invariant set postulate: a new geometric framework for the foundations of quantum theory and the role played by gravity. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 465(2110), 3165–3187. DOI: 10.1098/rspa.0080