



- C-3 The requirement of hidden autonomy (HA) or non-contextuality, as it is sometimes called.
- C-4 Finally, (Bell 1)–(Bell 4) rely on classical (Kolmogorovian) probability calculus.

As was said before, none of the sets of the assumptions is hold sacrosanct. Making a not too impartial assessment, it is rather unlikely that assumptions C-2 or C-3 went wrong. Since I am not too resistant to the project of generalizing the probability calculus, I might try to put the blame on probability. But this is not going to work, since GHZ arguments are not in this sense probabilistic.²⁷ Thus, something must be wrong with our way of thinking about the functioning of parameters. But the possible reasons of why conditions C-1 must go point in opposite directions. One possibility is that we put too much determinism in these conditions and make the causes too deterministic, meaning the world is more chancy than LC or CC permit. The other option is the claim that conditions C-1 fail because they capture only a part of the truth. In this vein, an outcome is partially determined by the parameter, the other part of the determination being provided by a non-local influence of a spatially separated region. Similarly, local causality fails because besides local causes there are also some non-local influences.

Be that as it may, both the options leave us with the hard task to understand how non-local causation may work.

Acknowledgments. Supported by KBN grant 191/H01/97/12 and Furgal Fund.

²⁷ GHZ are probabilistic in respect to their testing; no probability calculus is needed to derive them, however.

TOMASZ PLACEK
Institute of Philosophy
Jagiellonian University
ul. Grodzka 52
31-044 Kraków, Poland
e-mail: uzplacek@cyf-kr.edu.pl