

# Why devil plays dice?

Andrzej Dragan\*

*Institute of Theoretical Physics, University of Warsaw, Hoża 69, 00-681 Warsaw, Poland*

Principle of Relativity involving all, not only subluminal, inertial frames leads to the disturbance of causal laws in a way known from the fundamental postulates of Quantum Theory. We show how quantum indeterminacy based on complex probability amplitudes with superposition principle emerges from Special Relativity.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Experiments devised to test Bell's theorem [1] indicate that the fundamental laws of physics can't be formulated using local and deterministic mode of description. According to Einstein who disbelieved the fundamental meaning of Quantum Theory, and his famous metaphor the dice are indeed being played by someone. By who?

The purpose of this paper is to show that, ironically, the reason for such a mysterious behavior of Nature originates from a more fundamental theory - Special Relativity. It is well known that considering superluminal particles or inertial observers leads to violations of a causal mode of description. In this paper we show however, that such considerations do not lead neither to the possibility of sending superluminal information nor to any acausal paradoxes but only to the known quantum features, such as indeterminacy of the result of a single measurement and the description of motion involving complex amplitudes undergoing linear superposition.

In Sec. II we show that no superluminal communication is possible even if the tachyons interacting with matter existed, in Sec. III we derive the transformations for all inertial observers and introduce extended version of the Principle of Relativity. Sec. IV and V present how quantum description of motion with complex amplitudes undergoing linear superposition arises when we account for superluminal observers. In Sec. VI we discuss the possibility of existence of tachyons and Sec. VII concludes the paper. Detailed mathematical considerations are shifted to Appendices A and B.

## II. REASON FOR ACAUSALITY

Suppose that some local and controllable process is responsible for the emission of a tachyon with the velocity  $w > c$  by a massive particle at rest - we will denote this event A - see Fig. 1a). After a while the tachyon reaches a detector located at a distant point - event B in Fig. 1a). Other inertial observer moving with a relative subluminal velocity  $V > c^2/w$  finds out that the time ordering of the events is opposite - Fig. 1b). He observes a tachyon




FIG. 1: Spacetime diagrams of a process of sending a tachyon as seen by two inertial observers: a) particle emitted from A and absorbed in B, b) reversed process in a different inertial frame.

emitted by the detector B and reaching the emitter A after a while. Let us answer the following question - what process taking place in the detector B in the second inertial frame could be responsible for the act of emission of the tachyon? Obviously, no such reason may exist in the past world-line of the detector B, as we assumed that the process behind the tachyon's emission takes place locally in A. This indicates that in the second inertial frame the act of emission of the tachyon from the detector B is absolutely *spontaneous and deprived of any cause*. Since no frame is preferred we deduce that the emission A in the first inertial frame also had to be spontaneous. Our conclusion is that *there is no local, deterministic theory that could describe emission of a tachyon*. Since it must be a spontaneous process, *no tachyon can be used in superluminal communication*, because the information sent over by a local observer would be completely out of control. No causal paradoxes arise.

To characterize the process of decay of a "classical" particle into a given pair of particles one has to specify six components of the momenta of the products of the decay. There are only four equations expressing the conservation of energy and momentum, so the momenta of the products of the decay can't be set uniquely (with one exception that will be discussed later). It follows from the analogous reasoning as above that there can be no local deterministic theory that could determine the momentum of the emitted tachyon. Its momentum must be therefore attributed spontaneously.

\*e-mail: dragan@fuw.edu.pl

### III. ALL INERTIAL OBSERVERS

Consider two inertial frames (unprimed and primed) in a relative motion with the velocity  $\mathbf{V}$ . Our goal is to determine the most general form of a transformation of coordinates between the two frames. The only assumption that we impose is the Galilean Principle of Relativity [2]. It follows that the possible transformation must be linear so that equations do not distinguish any instant of time or point in space and the coefficients must be functions of the relative velocity only. From the Principle of Relativity we also obtain the inversed transformation. Assuming the relative motion along the common  $x$  and  $x'$  axis we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} x' &= A(V)x + B(V)t, \\ x &= A(-V)x' + B(-V)t'. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

From the definition of a relative motion the point  $x' = 0$  is described in the unprimed frame by the equation  $x = Vt$ . Therefore from the first equation (1) we get  $\frac{B(V)}{A(V)} = -V$ . Using this identity we can narrow down the set of possible transformations (1) to the form:

$$\begin{aligned} x' &= A(V)(x - Vt), \\ t' &= A(V) \left( t - \frac{A(V)A(-V) - 1}{V^2 A(V)A(-V)} Vx \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Consider three inertial frames in a relative motion along the  $x \parallel x' \parallel x''$  axis. Let the primed frame move with the velocity  $V_1$  relative to the unprimed frame, and let the bised frame move with the velocity  $V_2$  relative to the primed one. We determine the transformation between the bised and unprimed system of coordinates:

$$\begin{aligned} x'' &= A(V_1)A(V_2)x \left( 1 + V_1V_2 \frac{A(V_1)A(-V_1) - 1}{V_1^2 A(V_1)A(-V_1)} \right) \\ &\quad - A(V_1)A(V_2)(V_1 + V_2)t. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Let us assume that if an object **A** moves with a velocity  $\mathbf{V}$  relative to an object **B** then **B** moves relative to **A** with the velocity  $-\mathbf{V}$ . Therefore the transformation above should remain unchanged after the interchange  $V_1 \leftrightarrow V_2$ . Hence we obtain the condition:

$$\frac{A(V_1)A(-V_1) - 1}{V_1^2 A(V_1)A(-V_1)} = \frac{A(V_2)A(-V_2) - 1}{V_2^2 A(V_2)A(-V_2)}. \quad (4)$$

The equality of an unknown function for two arbitrary arguments  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  means that the function must be constant:

$$\frac{A(V)A(-V) - 1}{V^2 A(V)A(-V)} = K. \quad (5)$$

Consider a frame with a clock with an inversed mechanism, so that the time flow and all the velocities have the opposite signs. If the time reversal does not change the spatial coordinates then from the equation (2) we obtain

the condition  $A(-V) = A(V)$  allowing us to determine  $A(V) = \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-KV^2}}$ . After the choice of a sign that guarantees a smooth transition  $x' \rightarrow x$  when  $V \rightarrow 0$  we obtain the final form of the transformation from the equations (2):

$$\begin{aligned} x' &= \frac{x - Vt}{\sqrt{1 - KV^2}}, \\ t' &= \frac{t - KVx}{\sqrt{1 - KV^2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The fundamental constant  $K$  determining a relation between spatial dimension  $x$  and the temporal dimension  $t$  can be equal to zero, be positive or negative. The first two options correspond to Galilean and Lorentz transformations, respectively. The scenario of a negative  $K$  describes the world with a four-dimensional Euclidean space with the fourth dimension  $t$  stretched by a factor of  $\sqrt{-K}$ , and the derived transformation is just a rotation in the plane  $xt$  by the angle  $\tan \alpha = \sqrt{-KV}$ . There are four spacetime dimensions known, coefficients  $K$  describing the relations between pairs of spatial dimensions are all equal to  $-1$  and the coefficients relating time and space are all measured to be equal to  $1/c^2$ .

To determine the transformation for the perpendicular spatial direction we note that it must be time-independent. The only isotropic transformation is therefore of the form  $y' = C(V)y$ ,  $z' = C(V)z$ . Let us consider a process of inserting a key into a keyhole with the velocity  $V$ . If  $|C(V)| < 1$  then in the rest frame of the keyhole the key is perpendicularly contracted and it can fit in even more easily. However in the key's rest frame the keyhole is contracted and key can't fit in at all. The same inconsistency is obtained for  $|C(V)| > 1$ , so we conclude that the only allowable transformation yields  $C(V) = \pm 1$ . Since we demand that for  $V \rightarrow 0$  the transformation becomes identity, we obtain  $y' = y$  and  $z' = z$ .

The transformation law (6) is determined only for the subluminal velocities  $V < c$ . One can however derive the formulas for the case of superluminal velocities as well. We will consider the case of an antisymmetric function  $A(-V) = -A(V)$ . This assumption leads to the conclusion that the time reversal  $t \rightarrow -t$  and consequently  $V \rightarrow -V$  yield the transformation  $x' \rightarrow -x'$  and  $t' \rightarrow t'$ . This follows directly from the equations (2). The reason for such a surprising symmetry law will become clear when we derive the final form of the equations. From the formula (5) with  $K = \frac{1}{c^2}$  we obtain  $A(W) = \pm \frac{W/|W|}{\sqrt{W^2/c^2 - 1}}$  determined for  $W > c$  (from now on we will use  $W$ 's to denote superluminal velocities and Greek symbols to denote quantities in superluminal frames). The extra  $W/|W|$  factor is the only antisymmetric function of  $W$  of modulus equal to one. The sign of the function  $A(W)$  is

not uniquely determined therefore we obtain [3]:

$$\begin{aligned}\chi' &= \pm \frac{W}{|W|} \frac{x - Wt}{\sqrt{W^2/c^2 - 1}}, \\ \tau' &= \pm \frac{W}{|W|} \frac{t - Wx/c^2}{\sqrt{W^2/c^2 - 1}},\end{aligned}\quad (7)$$

where  $\chi'$  is spatial and  $\tau'$  temporal dimension related to the superluminal observer moving with the given velocity  $W$ . The last statement is supported by the fact that a temporal axis of a frame co-moving with a given object must coincide with the world-line of the object.

As an example example we consider the observer moving with an infinite velocity along the  $x$  axis. It follows that he perceives the spatial dimension  $x$  as the temporal dimension  $\tau$  and the temporal dimension  $t$  as the spatial dimension  $\chi$  (we choose the negative sign):

$$\begin{aligned}\chi &= ct, \\ c\tau &= x.\end{aligned}\quad (8)$$

This relation justifies the unusual symmetry of the superluminal transformation discussed previously - the time reversal operation  $t \rightarrow -t$  must be related to  $\chi \rightarrow -\chi$ , not  $\tau \rightarrow -\tau$ , as in the subluminal case. For the two-dimensional spacetime all the inertial frames including the superluminal ones could be postulated to be completely undistinguishable by any laws of physics. In the four-dimensional spacetime, however, the issue is much more delicate, because of the transformation properties of the remaining coordinates  $y$  and  $z$  [3]. To deduce their transformation law we can repeat the same reasoning, as for the subluminal case. In this case there is no zero-velocity limit, so the transversal coordinates are defined up to a sign. Let us denote the four-position of the superluminal observer with  $(\chi', c\tau'_x, c\tau'_y, c\tau'_z)$  and assume the remaining coordinates to be  $c\tau'_y = \pm y$  and  $c\tau'_z = \pm z$ . Using these and the equations (7) we derive the transformation law for the spacetime interval:

$$c^2 \Delta t^2 - \Delta \mathbf{r}^2 = \Delta \chi'^2 - c^2 \Delta \boldsymbol{\tau}'^2, \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathbf{r} = (x, y, z)$  and  $\boldsymbol{\tau}' = (\tau'_x, \tau'_y, \tau'_z)$ . To guarantee the preservation of the interval we *define* the interval in the superluminal frame as the right-hand side of the above equation. As we have already pointed out a temporal axis of a frame co-moving with a given object must coincide with the world-line of the object, hence  $\tau'_x$  must be temporal and  $\chi'$  - spatial coordinate. The nature of the remaining coordinates  $\tau'_y$  and  $\tau'_z$  is recognized as temporal dimensions due to their sign in the metric (the same as  $\tau'_x$ ). The transformations (7) together with the perpendicular coordinate transformation is an element of the Lorentz Group, corresponding to the subluminal velocity  $V = c^2/w$  therefore they preserve the light-cone structure of the spacetime. The inside-cone four-vectors remain inside the light-cone after an arbitrary transformation and the outside-cone four-vectors remain outside.

The only new characteristics of the superluminal observer is that all his time-like four-vectors are (by the definition) outside-cone vectors and the spatial four-vectors live inside the cone. The fact that there are three temporal dimensions  $\boldsymbol{\tau}$  and a single spatial dimension  $\chi$  will be discussed later, at this point we only guess that the spacetime seen from a tachyonic inertial frame has completely different physical properties from the properties known from subluminal frames of reference. This seems to essentially limit the possibility of formulation the Principle of Relativity for all inertial frames [3], although all subluminal frames are relativistically equivalent to each other and so are all the superluminal frames. However we can sustain a weaker postulate, necessary in any scheme involving the concept of spacetime. The postulated version of the Principle of Relativity for all the frames will be stated in the following way: *if a physical process or event takes place in one inertial frame, it will also take place in any other inertial frame.* The considered process or event may possibly have quite different properties according to distinguishable character of the metric in subluminal and superluminal frames but, the fact that it took place can't depend on the frame of reference.

The transformation between two superluminal frames can be already deduced from the reversed transforms between a stationary frame and two arbitrary superluminal frames. It turns out that such transformation does not depend on the sign of the transformation (6), which shows that the choice of the sign is, to some degree, only a matter of convention.

Lorentz transformation between sub- and for superluminal frames has several testable properties, for example a superluminal object moving with the velocity  $w$  along the  $x$  axis is observed as longitudinally distorted in such a way that its length  $\Delta x$  equals:

$$\Delta x = \pm \frac{w}{|w|} \Delta \chi \sqrt{w^2/c^2 - 1}, \quad (10)$$

where  $\Delta \chi$  is the object's stationary length. There is also a new form of the time flow disturbance of a superluminal clock:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta t &= \mp \frac{w}{|w|} \frac{\Delta \tau_x}{\sqrt{w^2/c^2 - 1}}, \\ \Delta \tau_y &= \Delta \tau_z = 0\end{aligned}\quad (11)$$

so that for  $w = \sqrt{2}c$  the length and the time flow are the same in the stationary and the tachyon's rest frame.

Finally, in Appendix A we derive and discuss the simplest candidates for the energy-momentum four-vector of a tachyon of a mass parameter  $\mu$ , helicity  $\acute{s} = \pm 1$  (inevitable in the description) and velocity  $\mathbf{w}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}E &= \frac{\acute{s} \mu c^2}{\sqrt{w^2/c^2 - 1}}, \\ \mathbf{p} &= \frac{\acute{s} \mu \mathbf{w}}{\sqrt{w^2/c^2 - 1}},\end{aligned}\quad (12)$$




FIG. 2: Elastic emission of a tachyon: a) by a massive particle, b) by another tachyon, c) process b) seen by a different inertial observer.

where the transformation law for  $\acute{s}$  takes the form  $\acute{s}' = \acute{s} \text{sgn}(c^2 - \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{V})$ . Consider a decay presented in Fig. 2a), when the decaying particle reverses its velocity while emitting an infinitely fast moving tachyon. The tachyon's momentum equals  $\mu c$ , and the direction of the emission coincides with the direction of the velocity of the decaying particle. For given masses  $m$  and  $\mu$  and the velocity  $\mathbf{v}$  no other process of decay is possible - this is the above mentioned exception when the conservation laws uniquely define the momenta of the products of the decay. While the momentum is well determined, the position of the tachyon is completely unknown as it travels with the infinite velocity. This seems consistent with the conclusions of the Heisenberg's Principle of Uncertainty.

#### IV. PREFERRED SCALES

We have shown that the process of emission shown in Fig. 2a) can't be described by a local deterministic theory. The same follows for the process shown in Fig. 2b) - one can see this by taking the point of view of another observer - Fig. 2c). It is clear that it is not possible to attribute to any of the tachyons a hidden parameter that would govern the process and determine the moment of its occurrence.

However, according to the transformation (8) the diagram 2b) shows how infinitely fast moving observer perceives the process of the decay of a massive particle into a pair of massive particles. From the Principle of Relativity we conclude that the concept of hidden variables steering the process of the decay of massive particles cannot be introduced also in subluminal inertial frames. If there is no local deterministic parameter in superluminal frames, there cannot be local deterministic parameters in subluminal frames. Therefore *all the possible processes of decay must be spontaneous*.

The reasoning above agrees with our knowledge of the processes taking place in the realm of elementary particles but seems to contradict our experience with macroscopical, massive objects. For example an ordinary bomb explodes into many pieces at a well defined instant of time. Obviously the moment of explosion can be foreseen in advance. We propose the following solution of this paradox.

An act of decay is an acausal phenomenon i.e. different particles will decay at random instants with some probability density  $\varrho$  defined for a unit of proper time assigned to the decaying particle (if the particle has no "memory" of its past then  $\varrho$  should be constant). The unit of  $\varrho$  cannot be expressed with the units of a mass and velocity only. Therefore there must be a new fundamental constant having the unit of time, or equivalently the unit of space. The new constant can have also any other dimensionality that can be scaled into the unit of time using mass and velocity. For the historical reason we assume this fundamental constant to have the unit of an angular momentum - the Planck's constant  $\hbar$ :

$$[\varrho] = \left[ \frac{\mu c^2}{\hbar} \right]. \quad (13)$$

There is only one more fundamental constant known that has a dimensionality allowing one to recover the unit of time - it is the gravitational constant  $G$ , in a flat space-time, however, it cannot play any meaningful role.

Considering spontaneous acts of decay leads inevitably to a preferred time-scale of the process. This scale, proportional to  $\hbar$  turns out to be, for the most processes, much shorter than a typical time-scale of processes observed in the macroscopical world. Therefore for the most of the „macroscopical“ processes the probabilities of possible decays are approximately equal to one.

Describing the classical domain does not involve considering systems containing a huge number of subsystems, but rather taking into account the time-scales (or spatial scales) much larger than the scales typical for the spontaneous processes. There are many physical systems containing large number of particles, which reveal quantum properties when observed in the proper scales. A free neutron has an average lifetime of 10 minutes. This means that a bomb triggered by a decay of a single neutron will explode in a random moment, introducing a fundamental indeterminacy into the macroscopical world. This example illustrates that it is not a number of particles, but the typical time-scale that determines the classical (or quantum) character of the process.

Going back to the example of exploding bomb we conclude that the indeterminacy of the moment of explosion is still present, although on a tiny time-scale. The probability of an explosion within a microsecond is practically equal to unity and that is why such an explosion may seem to be deterministic on the classical scales.

Another interesting question arising from the fact that all the decays must be spontaneous is the following: if we can't send messages with sources of tachyons, how can we send messages with sources of massive particles? The asymmetry originates from the fact that we can shield a source of massive particles and modulate the signal by uncovering the source, but we cannot do it with sources of tachyons. From the diagrams in Fig. 1 it follows that every object capable of absorbing tachyons must also emit them, hence no shielding is possible.




FIG. 3: Spacetime diagrams showing: a) motion of a particle observed from two inertial frames. In the rest frame  $(ct, x)$  a tachyon departs from A, reflects in  $\alpha$  and goes back to B. In the frame moving infinitely fast  $(c\tau, \chi)$  a source  $\alpha$  emits a particle which travels both towards A and B simultaneously; b) particle emitted in a superposition state from A, reflected at  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  and detected at B; c) process b) seen by a different inertial observer; d) particle emitted in A turns into a superposition after scattering in  $\alpha$  - another observer sees a triple superposition of a particle emitted in  $\alpha$ ; e) multiple non-intersecting paths allowed for a particle moving between A and B; f) intersecting paths - an example of a non-classical behavior of a particle that can be described using the rules of the classical probability.

## V. SUPERPOSITION OF WORLD-LINES

Consider the frame  $(ct, x)$  in which a particle of a well-defined momentum is emitted in A - Fig. 3a). Let it be reflected in  $\alpha$  and arrive at B. The particle that reaches B must first come across the path  $A\alpha$  and then across the path  $\alpha B$ . Therefore if the observer places two detectors in the points intersecting the two pathways then the detection of the particle on the path  $A\alpha$  precludes the particle from being detected on the path  $\alpha B$  and *vice versa*. If the particle is detected on the path  $\alpha B$  then it could not have been absorbed earlier on the path  $A\alpha$ . From the Principle of Relativity it follows that the same situation must take place in all inertial frames. Another observer moving infinitely fast along the  $x$  axis, who describes the same spacetime with the coordinates  $(c\tau, \chi)$  will interpret the same course of events in a different way. According to him there is a source located at  $\alpha$  that emits a particle with an uncertain momentum. After the emission the particle can arrive either at the point A or B, but if the observer places two detectors on paths  $\alpha A$  and  $\alpha B$ , only one of these detectors can absorb the particle emitted in  $\alpha$ . This indicates that we have to attribute two world-lines to a single particle, but when we try to localize the particle, its presence is revealed on a single pathway only - we will call such a phenomenon a *superposition* of world-lines.

Let us try to find a relativistically invariant expression characterizing a spacetime path of a particle moving along two world-lines. The unknown invariant expression  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{path}}$  for a given double path may depend only on

the relativistic invariants assigned to the space-time path and the energy-momentum of the particle. There is *only one* invariant not depending on the shape of the path - the relativistic scalar product of the four-position and the four-momentum - it will be called a phase  $\phi$ . For a particle having the energy  $E$ , momentum  $\mathbf{p}$  and moving along a given pathway the phase equals:

$$\phi_{\text{path}} = \hbar^{-1} \int_{\text{path}} (E dt - \mathbf{p} \cdot d\mathbf{r}), \quad (14)$$

where the proportionality constant has been introduced to keep the phase dimensionless. The phase multiplied by the constant factor  $\hbar/mc^2$  can be also interpreted as the proper time or a classical action associated with the path. Let us investigate how such a double path transforms to another frame of reference. Consider a situation when a tachyonic particle is emitted in A - Fig. 3b) and reflected in  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  so that speed is decreased on both paths. None of the two paths is distinguished therefore the invariant  $\mathcal{P}$  should be a symmetric function of the phases calculated for the two paths:

$$\mathcal{P}(\phi_1, \phi_2) = \mathcal{P}(\phi_2, \phi_1), \quad (15)$$

where the indices refer to the paths  $A\alpha B$  and  $A\beta B$  traversed by the particle - Fig. 3b). Observing the same process from a moving frame of reference gives a different picture of the situation - Fig. 3c). The moving observer claims that the particle is emitted in  $\alpha$  and follows two paths. One of them leads directly to B and on the other the particle is scattered twice - in A and  $\beta$ , and consecutively reaches B. In this inertial frame the invariant  $\mathcal{P}$  is described by different paths 1' referring to  $\alpha B$  and 2' referring to  $\alpha A\beta B$  with the respective phases:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{1'} &= \phi_1 - \phi_{A\alpha}, \\ \phi_{2'} &= \phi_2 + \phi_{\alpha A}, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where  $\phi_{\alpha A} = -\phi_{A\alpha}$ . For an arbitrary process described by a closed space-time loop, as in Fig. 3b) or 3c) the phase  $\phi_{\alpha A}$  can take an arbitrary value, therefore from the condition

$$\mathcal{P}(\phi_1, \phi_2) = \mathcal{P}(\phi_{1'}, \phi_{2'}), \quad (17)$$

and the equation (15) follows that  $\mathcal{P}$  must be a symmetric function of the phase difference only  $\mathcal{P}(|\phi_1 - \phi_2|)$ . We see that such an invariant cannot be factorized into a sum of functions  $P$  depending on the single paths only:

$$\mathcal{P}(|\phi_1 - \phi_2|) \neq P(\phi_1) + P(\phi_2). \quad (18)$$

The problem of the particle's motion along two space-time paths can be generalized to multiple paths using the induction method. Suppose a particle emitted in A and reflected in  $\alpha$  finds itself in a superposition of two world lines - Fig. 3d). One of the lines is directed towards the event B, while the other one towards some other event B'. Another observer viewing the process finds the particle in

a superposition of three world-lines originating from the event  $\alpha$ . The further generalization is straightforward.

A relativistic invariant describing  $n$  non-intersecting spacetime paths linking two events will be denoted  $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n)$  - see Fig. 3e). In order to determine its explicit form we will postulate the following four axioms. We will assume that the invariant  $\mathcal{P}$  must be a smooth function of phases only and does not depend on the paths' topology. The function must also be completely symmetric, i.e. for an arbitrary permutation  $\pi$  of an  $n$ -element set we have:

$$\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) = \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\phi_{\pi(1)}, \phi_{\pi(2)}, \dots, \phi_{\pi(n)}). \quad (19)$$

The third axiom demands that the function does not depend on the arrow of time, therefore it must be invariant under the inversion:

$$\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) = \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(-\phi_1, -\phi_2, \dots, -\phi_n). \quad (20)$$

In order to introduce the last axiom let us go back to

the discussion of the expression (18). According to this equation in the simplest case of the two paths the invariant  $\mathcal{P}$  does not factorize into a sum of two expressions, as required for the classical probability [4]. This is the consequence of a non-classical character of a superposition. However there is a special case when the rules of the classical probability may apply to the presently developed formalism. The fourth axiom expresses the probability-like character of the invariant  $\mathcal{P}$ . Consider a set of intersecting paths shown in Fig. 3f) - if  $n$  paths linking  $A$  and  $\alpha$  traversed by a particle intersect with  $m$  paths between  $\alpha$  and  $B$  then the presence of a particle in a spacetime location  $\alpha$  is certain. In this case we can apply the law of composition of classical probabilities. If our invariant function  $\mathcal{P}$  is to express the probability for a particle to take a given composite path then in the considered case the probability should be a product of two probabilities for the motion along the paths linking  $A$  with  $\alpha$  and the paths linking  $\alpha$  with  $B$ . This is the content of our last axiom:

$$\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) \mathcal{P}^{(m)}(\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_m) = \mathcal{P}^{(nm)}(\phi_1 + \xi_1, \phi_1 + \xi_2, \phi_1 + \xi_3, \dots, \phi_n + \xi_m). \quad (21)$$

Since we can permute the arguments appearing on the left-hand side of the equation, the arguments of the function on the right-hand side must involve sums of all the possible pairs of phases  $\phi_i + \xi_j$ . In the above condition we have also used the first axiom assuming that the invariant expression describing  $n$  non-intersecting paths depicted in Fig. 3e) coincides with the expression describing  $n$  intersecting paths shown in Fig. 3f). Let us underline that the above set of axioms is a set of necessary, but not sufficient conditions for the invariant  $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n)$  to define a probability.

One can easily check that the following function is smooth and obeys the conditions (19), (20), and (21):

$$\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) = \frac{1}{n^{\mathcal{A}}} (e^{\alpha\phi_1} + e^{\alpha\phi_2} + \dots + e^{\alpha\phi_n}) (e^{-\alpha\phi_1} + e^{-\alpha\phi_2} + \dots + e^{-\alpha\phi_n}), \quad (22)$$

where  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\alpha$  are arbitrary constants. In Appendix B we show that a general solution of the problem is given by a product of arbitrarily many basic solutions of the form (22).

For an infinite number of paths the expression (22) becomes infinite for any real  $\alpha$ . In order to keep the invariant finite for arbitrary phases one has to take into account only imaginary  $\alpha = \pm i|\alpha|$ . The modulus  $|\alpha|$  can be associated with an arbitrary value of the Planck's constant  $\hbar$ , so without the loss of generality we can assume  $|\alpha| = 1$  for a basic solution. If we consider  $n$  identical paths and demand  $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\phi, \phi, \dots, \phi) = \mathcal{P}^{(1)}(\phi)$  we obtain the condition  $\mathcal{A} = 2$ . Hence we can introduce the following notation:

$$\langle B|A \rangle = \frac{1}{n} (e^{i\phi_1} + e^{i\phi_2} + \dots + e^{i\phi_n}), \quad (23)$$

where  $A$  and  $B$  are two spacetime events and the sum extends over all  $n$  allowable paths connecting events  $A$  and  $B$ . In this notation we have  $\langle A|B \rangle^* = \langle B|A \rangle$  and our

simplest probability-like relativistic invariant reduces to:

$$\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) = \langle A|B \rangle \langle B|A \rangle. \quad (24)$$

So it goes. Considering infinite number of paths linking two spacetime events we end up with the Feynmanian theory in which one has to take into account a sum over all possible histories with complex amplitudes based on classical action attributed to each path.

This picture can be intuitively understood on the ground of a weird hypothesis that in the class of superluminal inertial frames there are three temporal dimensions and each of them flows exactly as it happens with the single temporal dimension in subluminal frames. The last statement demands the abandonment of the concept of the world-line when considering superluminal observers. For such observers no arrow of time is preferred therefore it is natural to assume that all the objects observed by a superluminal observer grow older along all directions of time  $\tau$ . Consequently in the arbitrary superluminal frame every physical object traversing a given point in the

spacetime should have a three-dimensional world-line - a world-*sphere* attributed to it. The above peculiar principle leads to the well-known experimental facts observed in the subluminal frames. From the Principle of Relativity it follows that in the arbitrary subluminal frame every particle must also have a space-time *sphere* attributed to it in each space-time location of the particle. The last statement is known as a part of the Huygens' Principle originally formulated to describe light and many years later discovered to apply also to any matter. The Principle states that *every point in space traversed by light is a source of a new spherical wave*. What follows is that in order to describe a motion of a particle one has to take into account all possible space-time paths, which we have just concluded on the ground of the four elementary axioms.

## VI. SYMMETRIES

Let us consider a scenario when a particle described by one of the four-momentum (12) exists in Nature. In order to calculate its energy and momentum one has to determine not only the particle's mass and velocity, but also an additional parameter  $\acute{s}$ . The only known scalar intrinsic degree of freedom of a free, uncharged particle is its helicity. Let us therefore study the case, when  $\acute{s}$  has the symmetry properties of the helicity. The time reversal transformation  $T$  leaves the helicity unchanged, while the spatial reflection  $P$  changes its sign:

$$\begin{aligned} T\acute{s} &= \acute{s} \\ P\acute{s} &= -\acute{s}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Suppose that a process of decay of a massive particle and a particle described by (12) takes place, as depicted in Fig. 1a). We assume that the total energy and momentum is conserved. The time reversal operation  $T$  changes signs of velocities, therefore both four-vectors (12) transform identically and  $T$  is a symmetry of the process. However, under the parity transformation  $P$  the considered four-vectors change in a different fashion, which means that after the spatial reversal  $P$  neither energy, nor momentum will be conserved in the process. This shows that the process will have no right to take place.

These considerations are based on the assumption that  $\acute{s}$  has the properties of the helicity. One can, however, take into account particles of different types, characterized by  $\acute{s}$  obeying other transformation rules, so that other symmetries apply to the considered types of decays, in particular the time reversal wouldn't have to be a symmetry. If we assume that the conjugation  $C$  reverses the direction of  $\acute{s}$  (as discussed in detail in Appendix A) and we demand the overall operation of CPT to be a symmetry then either the parity or the time reversal symmetry must be broken in the interaction of given particles.

The latter is represented by:

$$\begin{aligned} T\acute{s} &= -\acute{s} \\ P\acute{s} &= \acute{s}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Existence of tachyons interacting with matter, whose energy and momentum depend on the velocity and the helicity parameter  $\acute{s}$  according to the expression (12) leads to the violation of the parity symmetry, which, as we know is not obeyed in the weak interactions. This suggests that tachyonic particles play some role in the weak interactions and the present mode of description of these interactions should be understood only as an effective theory.

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

We have shown that the disturbances of causal laws resulting from the extension of the Principle of Relativity to superluminal frames coincide with the laws known from the basic postulates of Quantum Theory. There's a method in the madness - it follows that Quantum Theory is relativistic to the roots and the term "non-relativistic quantum mechanics" is an oxymoron like "non-relativistic electrodynamics". The presented results do not indicate that the tachyons must exist, however it would be surprising if they didn't. There are not too many new predictions, except for the suspicion that the tachyons should take part in the weak interactions. Moreover the deeper understanding of the roots of Quantum Theory may be helpful in constructing the still unknown quantum theory of gravity. It seems necessary that such a theory should take into account not only subluminal, but also superluminal class of local observers.

### Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Iwo Białyński-Birula, Szymon Charzyński, Tomasz Masłowski, Bogdan Mielnik, Jan Mostowski, Krzysztof Pachucki, and Paweł Ziń for interesting conversations.

### APPENDIX A: DERIVATION OF THE ENERGY-MOMENTUM FOUR-VECTORS

A four-vector  $A^\square \equiv (A^0, \mathbf{A})$ , by the definition transforms to the inertial frame moving with the velocity  $\mathbf{V}$  according to the formulas:

$$\begin{aligned} A^{0'} &= \frac{A^0 - \frac{\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{V}}{c}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{V^2}{c^2}}}, \\ \mathbf{A}' &= \mathbf{A} - \frac{\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{V}}{V^2} \mathbf{V} + \frac{\frac{\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{V}}{V^2} \mathbf{V} - A^0 \frac{\mathbf{V}}{c}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{V^2}{c^2}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (A1)$$

We are looking for all the four-vectors  $A^\square$  that do transform in a covariant way, thus obeying the equation:

$$A^{\square'}(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{A}^\square) = A^\square(\mathbf{v}', \mathcal{A}'^\square), \quad (\text{A2})$$

where  $\mathbf{v}$  is velocity transforming according to the formula:

$$\mathbf{v}' = \frac{\sqrt{1 - \frac{V^2}{c^2}} (\mathbf{v} - \frac{\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{V}}{V^2} \mathbf{V}) - \mathbf{V} + \frac{\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{V}}{V^2} \mathbf{V}}{1 - \frac{\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{V}}{c^2}}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

and  $\mathcal{A}^\square \equiv (\mathcal{A}^0, \mathcal{A})$  is an additional parameter - a value of the four-vector  $A^\square$  in a selected inertial frame.

It turns out that there are only four linearly independent four-vectors  $A^\square$  obeying the condition (A2):

$$\left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}}, \frac{\mathbf{v}/c}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}} \right), \quad (\text{A4a})$$

$$\left( \frac{\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{v}/c}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}}, \mathbf{s} - \frac{\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{v}}{v^2} \mathbf{v} + \frac{(\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{v})\mathbf{v}/v^2}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}} \right), \quad (\text{A4b})$$

$$\left( \frac{\text{sgn}(\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{w})}{\sqrt{w^2/c^2 - 1}}, \frac{\text{sgn}(\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{w}) \mathbf{w}/c}{\sqrt{w^2/c^2 - 1}} \right), \quad (\text{A4c})$$

$$\left( \frac{\frac{w^2/c^2}{\sqrt{w^2/c^2 - 1}} - |\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{w}|/c}{|\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{w}|/c - \sqrt{w^2/c^2 - 1}}, \frac{\frac{w/c}{\sqrt{w^2/c^2 - 1}} - \text{sgn}(\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{w})\mathbf{s}}{|\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{w}|/c - \sqrt{w^2/c^2 - 1}} \right), \quad (\text{A4d})$$

where the function  $\text{sgn}(x)$  returns the sign of its argument  $x$  and  $\mathbf{s}$  is a dimensionless unit vector or pseudo-vector undergoing a Wigner-Thomas precession by Lorentz transform. The first pair of four-vectors is defined for subluminal velocities  $|\mathbf{v}| < c$  and the second pair for the superluminal velocities  $|\mathbf{w}| > c$ . Moreover the parameters determining the four-vectors (A4c) and (A4d) must obey the condition  $w^2 - c^2 < (\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{w})^2$ . The proof is following.

Suppose that the frame of reference for which  $A^\square = \mathcal{A}^\square$  is the frame for which  $\mathbf{v} = 0$  then the transition to a frame moving with a relative velocity  $-\mathbf{V}$ , for which  $\mathbf{v}' = \mathbf{V}$  yields:

$$\begin{aligned} A^0(\mathbf{V}, \mathcal{A}^\square) &= \frac{\mathcal{A}^0 + \frac{\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathbf{V}}{c}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{V^2}{c^2}}}, \\ \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{V}, \mathcal{A}^\square) &= \mathcal{A} - \frac{\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathbf{V}}{V^2} \mathbf{V} + \frac{\frac{\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathbf{V}}{V^2} \mathbf{V} + \mathcal{A}^0 \frac{\mathbf{V}}{c}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{V^2}{c^2}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

Assuming that  $\mathcal{A}^\square \equiv (1, 0)$  and replacing  $\mathbf{V}$  with  $\mathbf{v}$  we obtain the inside-cone four-vector (A4a). Taking  $\mathcal{A}^\square \equiv (0, \mathbf{s})$  we get the outside-cone four-vector (A4b).

Let us discuss the transformation rules for the direction  $\mathbf{s}$  parameterizing the four-vector (A4b). Let us denote the Lorentz transformation for the velocity  $\mathbf{V}$  with  $\Lambda(\mathbf{V})$

and the velocity transformation (A3) with  $\Gamma(\mathbf{V})$ . The covariance condition (A2) in an arbitrary inertial frame takes the following form:

$$\Lambda(\mathbf{V}) A^\square(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{s}) = A^\square(\Gamma(\mathbf{V})\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{s}'), \quad (\text{A6})$$

where  $\mathbf{s}'$  is unknown. Using the definition of  $\mathbf{s}$ :  $A^\square(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{s}) = \Lambda(-\mathbf{v})(0, \mathbf{s})$  and the property of boosts  $\Lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{V}) = \Lambda(-\mathbf{V})$  we obtain the relation:

$$(0, \mathbf{s}') = \Lambda(\Gamma(\mathbf{V})\mathbf{v}) \Lambda(\mathbf{V}) \Lambda(-\mathbf{v})(0, \mathbf{s}). \quad (\text{A7})$$

The above series of boosts relating three inertial frames in a non-collinear relative motion is a spatial rotation [5] called the Wigner-Thomas rotation. Such transformation does not affect the temporal coordinate of the four-vector and therefore there are no further complications in the transformation law of the four-vector (A4a).

Let us now consider a situation, when in a given frame of reference the velocity parameter has the direction  $\mathbf{s}$  and an infinite magnitude. Now we choose this frame to define  $\mathcal{A}^\square$ . The transformation formula (A3) with the frame's relative velocity  $-\mathbf{V}$  after replacing  $\mathbf{v}'$  with  $\mathbf{w}$  yields:

$$\frac{\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{V}}{c^2} \mathbf{w} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{V^2}{c^2}} \left( \mathbf{s} - \frac{\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{V}}{V^2} \mathbf{V} \right) + \frac{\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{V}}{V^2} \mathbf{V}. \quad (\text{A8})$$

Let us notice that reversing the sign of  $\mathbf{s}$  in the equation (A8) does not change the equation itself, therefore the relations between the velocities  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{V}$  remain unchanged. This means that  $\mathbf{s}$  can have transformation properties of a vector or a pseudo-vector, which has very important implications to the symmetries of the collision processes discussed in Sec. VI.

The transformation law for the four-vector (A2) in the considered frame of reference has the form:

$$\begin{aligned} A^0(\mathbf{w}, \mathcal{A}^\square) &= \frac{\mathcal{A}^0 + \frac{\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathbf{V}}{c}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{V^2}{c^2}}}, \\ \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{w}, \mathcal{A}^\square) &= \mathcal{A} - \frac{\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathbf{V}}{V^2} \mathbf{V} + \frac{\frac{\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathbf{V}}{V^2} \mathbf{V} + \mathcal{A}^0 \frac{\mathbf{V}}{c}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{V^2}{c^2}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A9})$$

Taking  $\mathcal{A}^\square \equiv (0, \mathbf{s})$  ( $\mathbf{s}$  is the only preferred direction in space; moreover this condition guarantees that  $\mathbf{A}$  being a candidate for momentum has the direction of velocity) and using (A8) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} A^0(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}) &= \frac{\frac{\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{V}}{c}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{V^2}{c^2}}}, \\ \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}) &= \frac{\frac{\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{V}}{c} \frac{\mathbf{w}}{c}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{V^2}{c^2}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A10})$$

The above four-vector is expressed as a function of the velocity  $\mathbf{V}$  that can be interpreted as the relative velocity



of a frame in which  $\mathbf{w}$  attains infinite magnitude and the direction  $\mathbf{s}$ . We wish now to express the four-vector as an explicit function of  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{s}$ .

Let us take a scalar product of the equation (A8) with the (pseudo)vector  $\mathbf{s}$ . We obtain the condition  $(\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{V})(\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{w}) > 0$ . Taking a square of the equation (A8) and using the above identity we get:

$$\frac{\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{V}}{c} = \frac{\sqrt{1 - \frac{V^2}{c^2}}}{\sqrt{\frac{w^2}{c^2} - 1}} \text{sgn}(\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{w}). \quad (\text{A11})$$

After putting this expression into (A10) we obtain the outside-cone four-vector (A4c).

The last of the four-vectors (A4) is obtained by assuming in equations (A9) the condition  $\mathcal{A} = (1, 0)$  leading to:

$$\begin{aligned} A^0(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{V^2}{c^2}}}, \\ \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}) &= \frac{\frac{\mathbf{V}}{c}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{V^2}{c^2}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A12})$$

To express the above formulas with the velocity  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{s}$  we will transform the equation (A8) to a new form. Using the formula (A11) we get:

$$\frac{\mathbf{V}}{1 + \sqrt{1 - \frac{V^2}{c^2}}} = \mathbf{w} - \text{sgn}(\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{w}) \sqrt{w^2 - c^2} \mathbf{s}. \quad (\text{A13})$$

Taking a square of the equation (A13) we determine the Lorentz factor:

$$\sqrt{1 - \frac{V^2}{c^2}} = \frac{|\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{w}| - \sqrt{w^2 - c^2}}{\frac{w^2}{\sqrt{w^2 - c^2}} - |\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{w}|}. \quad (\text{A14})$$

Hence the explicit form of the relative velocity of the two considered inertial frames:

$$\mathbf{V} = c^2 \frac{\mathbf{w} - \text{sgn}(\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{w}) \sqrt{w^2 - c^2} \mathbf{s}}{w^2 - |\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{w}| \sqrt{w^2 - c^2}}, \quad (\text{A15})$$

and the inside-cone four-vector (A4d). Taking a scalar product of the equation (A15) with  $\mathbf{w}$  we obtain the equality  $\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{V} = c^2$  determining the relation between the superluminal velocity  $\mathbf{w}$  and the velocity  $\mathbf{V}$  of the inertial frame in which  $\mathbf{w}$  becomes infinite.

The covariance condition (A6) for the four-vector (A4c) in an arbitrary inertial frame leads to the equation:

$$\frac{\text{sgn}(\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{w})}{\sqrt{w^2/c^2 - 1}} \frac{1 - \frac{\mathbf{w} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{V}}}{c^2}}{\sqrt{1 - \tilde{V}^2/c^2}} = \frac{\text{sgn}(\mathbf{s}' \cdot \mathbf{w}')}{\sqrt{w'^2/c^2 - 1}}, \quad (\text{A16})$$

where  $\mathbf{w}'$  is the velocity and  $\mathbf{s}'$  the direction parameterizing the four-vector (A4c) in a new inertial frame moving

with a relative velocity  $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$ . Taking the square of the equation (A3) and using it in the above expression we obtain:

$$\text{sgn}(\mathbf{s}' \cdot \mathbf{w}') = \text{sgn}(\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{w}) \text{sgn}(c^2 - \mathbf{w} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{V}}). \quad (\text{A17})$$

During the transformation to a new inertial frame, the direction  $\mathbf{s}$  follows in general the Wigner-Thomas precession. That's why the sign of the energy and momentum of a tachyon is changed if and only if the relative velocity  $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$  of a new inertial frame is such that  $\mathbf{w} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{V}} > c^2$ , i.e. the tachyon becomes an anti-tachyon. Let us find the transformation law for the direction  $\mathbf{s}$ . From the covariance requirement (A6) we obtain:

$$\Lambda(\tilde{\mathbf{V}})A^\square(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}) = A^\square(\mathbf{w}', \mathbf{s}'), \quad (\text{A18})$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$  is the velocity of the new inertial frame,  $\mathbf{w}' = \Gamma(\tilde{\mathbf{V}})\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{s}'$  is unknown. This condition for the four-vectors (A4c) and (A4d) yields, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{w}', \mathbf{s}'))\Lambda(\tilde{\mathbf{V}})\Lambda(-\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}))(0, \mathbf{s}) &= (0, \mathbf{s}'), \\ \Lambda(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{w}', \mathbf{s}'))\Lambda(\tilde{\mathbf{V}})\Lambda(-\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}))(1, 0) &= (1, 0), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A19})$$

where  $\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s})$  is given by the expression (A15). The above equations can be satisfied only if the three consecutive Lorentz transformations on the left-hand side are equivalent to some Wigner-Thomas rotation. This is possible if and only if transformations' arguments are related via the velocity transformation (A3):

$$\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{w}', \mathbf{s}') = \mathbf{V}'(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}), \quad (\text{A20})$$

where  $\mathbf{V}' = \Gamma(\tilde{\mathbf{V}})\mathbf{V}$ . Substituting it into the first of the equations (A19) we obtain the condition defining the parameter  $\mathbf{s}$  in a frame moving with the velocity  $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$ :

$$\mathbf{s}' = \Lambda(\Gamma(\tilde{\mathbf{V}})\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}))\Lambda(\tilde{\mathbf{V}})\Lambda(-\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}))\mathbf{s}. \quad (\text{A21})$$

At the end, let us notice that the magnitude of the velocity  $\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s})$  can't exceed the magnitude of  $c$ . Taking the square of the equation (A13) and imposing this condition we obtain the following inequality:

$$w^2 - c^2 < (\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{w})^2, \quad (\text{A22})$$

that limits the choice of possible parameters of the four-vectors (A4c) and (A4d) in subluminal frames.

Energy and momentum of a tachyon with a mass parameter  $\mu$ , velocity  $\mathbf{w}$  and "helicity"  $\hat{s} = \text{sgn}(\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{w})$  given by the expression (A4c) or (12) have the properties that energy tends to zero and momentum decreases to the minimum value  $\mu c$  when the velocity increases. Energy and momentum increases to infinity when the velocity tends to the velocity of light, so crossing the border of  $|\mathbf{w}| = c$  is not energetically possible. Therefore in the two-dimensional case the behavior of tachyons is fully analogical to the behavior of massive particles if only we

interchange the temporal and spatial components of the considered four-vectors.

From the velocity transformation formula (A3) for the superluminal velocities one can conclude that observing a tachyon moving with the velocity  $\mathbf{w}$  from a reference frame following the tachyon with a velocity  $\mathbf{V}$  increases, not decreases the tachyon's velocity. When the velocity  $\mathbf{V}$  of the inertial frame is such that  $\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{V} = c^2$ , the tachyon escapes with an infinite velocity. In an inertial frame such that  $\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{V} > c^2$ , the tachyon's energy becomes negative and its momentum gets reversed in respect to the tachyon's velocity. In the spirit of Feynman one can say that in this inertial frame the tachyon becomes its anti-particle [6]. If we accompany each world-line with an arrow pointing towards the direction of the propagation in spacetime then a tachyon that moves in a stationary frame with the velocity  $\mathbf{w}$  ahead in time, observed from the inertial frame for which  $\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{V} > c^2$  moves backwards in time. To make sure that the emission of a tachyon is fully equivalent to an absorption of an anti-tachyon we have to prove that the energy and momentum reverse their signs in the same inertial frame in which the velocity becomes infinite, so that reversing the sign of  $\mathbf{s}$  is equivalent to changing a tachyon into its anti-particle. We have shown that it happens indeed - the sign function that regulates the sign of energy and momentum in expression (A4c) obeys the transformation rule (A17). Therefore one can always reinterpret the emitted anti-tachyon with negative energy as an absorbed tachyon with positive energy. The interchange procedure is equivalent to changing the sign of  $\mathbf{s}$  and must be related to the charge conjugation operation  $\mathbf{C}$ , as discussed in Sec. VI.

## APPENDIX B: DERIVATION OF ALL THE PROBABILITY-LIKE RELATIVISTIC INVARIANTS

Let  $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n)$  and  $\mathcal{R}^{(n)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n)$  be arbitrary smooth functions obeying all the conditions (19), (20), and (21). We find that the product  $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n)\mathcal{R}^{(n)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n)$  is also smooth and obeys the above axioms. Therefore in order to obtain a general solution obeying all the axioms, we need to find all the special solutions that are irreducible to the product of other solutions. Consider a Taylor expansion of a smooth, completely symmetric function  $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n)$ . From the Cauchy's theorem on symmetric many-variable polynomials [7] it follows that it can be expressed in terms of a power series of the symmetric functions  $E^{(k)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i^k$  in the form:

$$\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l=1}^{\infty} \alpha_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l}^{(n)} \times E^{(k_1)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) \cdots E^{(k_l)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n). \quad (\text{B1})$$

The set of symmetric polynomials  $E^{(k)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n)$  for the given  $n$  and any  $k \leq n$  is algebraically independent. It follows that the coefficients  $\alpha_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l}^{(n)}$  such that  $k_1 + k_2 + \dots + k_l \leq n$  are uniquely defined. We assume that the Taylor expansion of the function  $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n)$  is divergent, therefore for  $n$  large enough the coefficients  $\alpha_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l}^{(n)}$  with  $k_1 + k_2 + \dots + k_l > n$  are negligible, which justifies our treatment of all the polynomials  $E^{(k)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n)$  as algebraically independent. In the limit of  $n \rightarrow \infty$  our treatment is strict.

Let us start with finding the solution such that  $\alpha_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l}^{(n)} = 0$  for  $l \geq 2$ . In this case the invariant (B1) reduces to:

$$\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k^{(n)} E^{(k)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n). \quad (\text{B2})$$

Inputting this expression into the condition (21) yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k^{(n)} E^{(k)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \alpha_s^{(m)} E^{(s)}(\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_m) \\ = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \alpha_t^{(nm)} E^{(t)}(\phi_1 + \xi_1, \phi_1 + \xi_2, \dots, \phi_n + \xi_m). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B3})$$

Using the definition of  $E^{(n)}$  and Newton's formula we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} E^{(t)}(\phi_1 + \xi_1, \phi_1 + \xi_2, \dots, \phi_n + \xi_m) \\ = \sum_{r=0}^t \binom{t}{r} E^{(r)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) E^{(t-r)}(\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_m). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B4})$$

Inserting the above relation into (B3) and using mutual independence of the polynomials  $E^{(k)}$  we obtain the condition for the coefficients  $\alpha_k^{(n)}$ :

$$k!s! \alpha_k^{(n)} \alpha_s^{(m)} = (k+s)! \alpha_{k+s}^{(nm)}, \quad (\text{B5})$$

which is the Cauchy equation with the following solution:

$$\alpha_k^{(n)} = \frac{1}{n^{\mathcal{A}}} \frac{\alpha^k}{k!}, \quad (\text{B6})$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  are arbitrary constants. Putting this into the equation (B2) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) &= \frac{1}{n^{\mathcal{A}}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha^k}{k!} E^{(k)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) \\ &= \frac{1}{n^{\mathcal{A}}} (e^{\alpha\phi_1} + e^{\alpha\phi_2} + \dots + e^{\alpha\phi_n}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B7})$$

Let us try to find out if the above special case generates all possible solutions, or there are other irreducible functions obeying the axioms (19) and (21). Consider the

case of  $\alpha_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l}^{(n)} = 0$  for  $l > N$  in (B1). In this case we have:

$$\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) = \sum_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_N=0}^{\infty} \alpha_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_N}^{(n)} \quad (\text{B8})$$


---


$$E^{(k_1)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) \cdots E^{(k_N)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n).$$

By substituting this into the axiom (21) we obtain the following condition:

$$\sum_{\sigma, \sigma'} \alpha_{k_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, k_{\sigma(N)}}^{(n)} \alpha_{s_{\sigma'(1)}, \dots, s_{\sigma'(N)}}^{(m)} = \sum_{\pi, \pi'} \binom{k_{\pi(1)} + s_{\pi'(1)}}{k_{\pi(1)}} \cdots \binom{k_{\pi(N)} + s_{\pi'(N)}}{k_{\pi(N)}} \alpha_{k_{\pi(1)} + s_{\pi'(1)}, \dots, k_{\pi(N)} + s_{\pi'(N)}}^{(nm)}, \quad (\text{B9})$$

where  $\sigma$ ,  $\sigma'$ ,  $\pi$ , and  $\pi'$  are arbitrary permutations of an  $N$ -element set. Without a loss of generality we can assume that the coefficients  $\alpha_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_N}^{(n)}$  are completely symmetric functions of  $k_i$ , because any nonsymmetric component does not contribute to the overall sum (B8) anyway. This assumptions yields:

$$N!k_1!k_2! \cdots k_N!s_1!s_2! \cdots s_N! \alpha_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{(n)} \alpha_{s_1, \dots, s_N}^{(m)} = \sum_{\pi} (k_1 + s_{\pi(1)})! \cdots (k_N + s_{\pi(N)})! \alpha_{k_1 + s_{\pi(1)}, \dots, k_N + s_{\pi(N)}}^{(nm)}, \quad (\text{B10})$$


---

with the following solution:

$$\alpha_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_N}^{(n)} = \frac{1}{n^{\mathcal{A}'}} \sum_{\pi} \alpha_1^{k_{\pi(1)}} \alpha_2^{k_{\pi(2)}} \cdots \alpha_N^{k_{\pi(N)}}, \quad (\text{B11})$$

where  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_N$  are arbitrary constants. Let us verify what is the unknown function obeying axioms (19)

---

and (21) by putting (B11) into the equation (B8):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) &= \frac{1}{n^{\mathcal{A}'}} \sum_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_N=0}^{\infty} \frac{\sum_{\pi} \alpha_1^{k_{\pi(1)}} \alpha_2^{k_{\pi(2)}} \cdots \alpha_N^{k_{\pi(N)}}}{N!k_1!k_2! \cdots k_N!} E^{(k_1)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) \cdots E^{(k_N)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) \\ &= \frac{1}{n^{\mathcal{A}'}} \sum_{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_N=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_1^{k_1} \alpha_2^{k_2} \cdots \alpha_N^{k_N}}{k_1!k_2! \cdots k_N!} E^{(k_1)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) \cdots E^{(k_N)}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n) \\ &= \frac{1}{n^{\mathcal{A}'}} (e^{\alpha_1 \phi_1} + e^{\alpha_1 \phi_2} + \dots + e^{\alpha_1 \phi_n}) \cdots (e^{\alpha_N \phi_1} + e^{\alpha_N \phi_2} + \dots + e^{\alpha_N \phi_n}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B12})$$


---

This shows that the only special case obeying the given axioms and generating the general solution of the problem is given by the expression (B7). To complete the proof we notice that the axiom (20) demands to take

into account only the products of pairs of solutions (B7) with opposite signs  $\alpha$  and  $-\alpha$ , as shown in the formula (22).

[1] J. S. Bell, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964).

[2] Considerations based on similar assumptions, but in a much more complicated form appeared for the first time in W. Ignatowsky, *Arch. Math. Phys* **17** (1910) and P. Frank and H. Rothe, *Ann. der Phys.* **34**, 825 (1911); the presented reasoning is a modified version of the derivation

by A. Szymacha, in *Przestrzeń i ruch* (Wydawnictwo UW, Warsaw 1997).

[3] L. Machildon, A. F. Antippa, and A. E. Everett, *Can. J. Phys.* **61**, 256 (1983); L. Machildon, A. F. Antippa, and A. E. Everett, *Phys. Rev. D* **27**, 1740 (1983).

[4] R. T. Cox, *Am. J. Phys.* **14**, 1 (1946).

- [5] E. Wigner, *Ann. Math.* **40**, 149 (1939).
- [6] R. P. Feynman, *Phys. Rev.* **76**, 167 (1949).
- [7] W. Sierpiński, *Zasady Algebry Wyższej*, (Warszawa 1946).
- [8] J. Aczél, *Functional Equations and Their Applications*, (Academic Press, New York 1966).