

## CORRIGENDUM

The CHSH auxiliary assumption is not correctly given as (14) (p. 481) but rather by the much weaker statement that ensemble averages (over hidden  $\lambda$  giving rise to joint detection after passing polarization analysers at the two wings) do not depend on the parameter settings,  $a$  and  $b$ . That is, where  $D_{1,2}(\lambda)$  takes on the value 1 for joint detection and 0 otherwise and where  $\mu(\lambda)$  is a measure over the state space independent of  $a$  and  $b$ , the verbal description of their assumption ([9], 881) may be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int D_{1,2}(\lambda) P(\lambda \mid a \wedge b) d\mu(\lambda) \\ &= \int D_{1,2}(\lambda) P(\lambda \mid a' \wedge b) d\mu(\lambda) = \\ &= \int D_{1,2}(\lambda) P(\lambda \mid a \wedge b') d\mu(\lambda) = \\ &= \int D_{1,2}(\lambda) P(\lambda \mid a' \wedge b') d\mu(\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

which is clearly implied by, but does not imply, (14). (In fact, (14) expresses an auxiliary assumption needed by Bell in [4], cf. [23].) I am grateful to Abner Shimony for calling this to my attention. Of course, the independence claims of the text involving (14), as well as the derivation from mixing (n. 15), hold *a fortiori* for the integrated form just given.

Also, it should be noted that SEL itself is too strong if we wish to consider theories whose most complete *statistical* states evolve indeterministically. Taking such theories into account only reinforces the independence claims of this paper.