**The EPR argument: Assumptions, deductive consequence, and distinct logical possibilities**

The EPR (Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen) argument and Bohr's response to it stand out as one of the most significant conceptual debates in the history of science. However, the question of what the premises or assumptions of the EPR argument are remains contentious. Bell, Maudlin, and several other thinkers who can be called proponents of the locality camp argue that locality is the only principal assumption in the EPR argument. Consequently, according to the locality camp, the experimental violation of Bell’s inequality which is a deductive consequence of the EPR explanation of quantum entanglement shows that the world is not local. This conclusion faces opposition from several critics. They argue that Bell's inequality is derived from a combination of principles, of which locality is just one. So, the violation only confirms at least one of those assumptions is wrong, not necessarily locality itself. I critically analyze the debate between the locality camp and its critics, arguing that both sides share the assumption that the EPR explanation is the only possible local explanation for quantum entanglement. I explore the logical possibility of a non-EPR local explanation.