

Review of: "On the Bell Experiment and Quantum Foundation"

Oleksandr Kholod¹

¹ Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Mr. Emeritus Professor Inge Svein Helland, I have read both the first preprint and the second preprint of your article "On the Bell Experiment and the Quantum Foundation". Thank you, colleague, for the honor of being among the readers of your ideas!

After reading the article, I have some thoughts about the ideas you have expressed.

1. Because social solipsism is "the philosophical view that one can only know one's own mind and that knowledge of other minds follows from analogy." (Social Solipsism (2023, Aug 16). Claude-instant. <https://poe.com/Claude-instant>), as I can analyze your preprint only from the standpoint of social solipsism. It follows that I can understand your concept, colleague, only by analogy, which means that your knowledge to me is another mind that offers only inferences, not knowledge directly known.

2. All my own observations about the feelings and mental states of Alice, Bob, and Charlie are only my inferences about not my feelings and mental states. Therefore, I am biased in my judgments and conclusions, which means that I am far from the truth.

3. Dear Mr. Inge Svein Helland, You write: "Any process of seeking knowledge can be called an epistemic process." I can NOT agree with your opinion because:

1) calling episteme the paradigm of knowledge of any historical era, I claim that without such a paradigm (not a system) of knowledge, it is impossible to search for knowledge at all;

2) there is nothing to rely on;

3) among those who started looking for knowledge from scratch, there are few who found such new knowledge,

4) therefore, not every search for knowledge should be called an epistemic process.

4. Your point that "Quantum theory should be seen as a mathematical model, a model related to the consciousness of an observer or the collective consciousness of a common group of observers" caused me to disagree. I already expressed my opinion in my first response to your first preprint.

5. I welcome and support your opinion: "quantum theory is not directly a theory about the world, but a theory about

knowledge of the world by an actor." Indeed, observing the world gives subjective knowledge about the world. Such knowledge should not explain the origin of the world or its transformation. An actor is always subjective. Moreover, subjective knowledge is knowledge only when a person operates with subjective information, that is, that which is accessible to him for understanding. Therefore, any knowledge of the world by an actor is subjective, which means that it cannot claim to reflect objective reality. In this sense, quantum theory is a violation of objective reality.

6. The wording is difficult to prove: "every description of the world must be attributed to the mind of some actor. So let's introduce an actor, Charlie, who observes the results of Alice and Bob." Dear Mr. Inge Svein Helland, if the three mentioned actors have independent observations, they, the actors, will form independent pictures of the world and in no way will you, as the fourth observer Inge, be able to know (much less measure) the results of the three independent actors Alice, Bob and Charlie. In this case, all your mathematical superimpositions on non-mathematical arguments of mine, as the fifth actor, will be destroyed.

7. I also dispute your statement that "Every description of reality must be attributed to the mind of an actor (or relative to the common mind of a group of communicating actors). In order to accept the observations, we seem to be forced to conclude that the minds of these actors must be limited in certain contexts.' Dear colleague, the limitation of contexts should not be taken into account in your thinking, because such subjective factors cannot be calculated mathematically. My last remark is more related to the reference to the psychological interpretation of the term "consciousness" (in the sense of R. Penrose (1994)).

Thank you for taking the time to read my opinion.

Peace to you, colleague!!!