A new look at Bell's inequalities and Nelson's theorem

Benjamin Schulz *

March 4, 2021

Abstract

In 1985, Edward Nelson, who is known for the foundation of the so called ,,stochastic mechanics", made an interesting remark on Bell's theorem. Nelson analyzed the theorem in the light of classical fields, which behave randomly. He found that if a stochastic hidden variable theory fulfills certain conditions, the inequalities of John Bell could be violated. Moreover, Nelson was able to prove that this could happen without any instantaneous communication between the two spatially separated measurement stations. Since Nelson's paper got almost overlooked by physicists, we try to review his comments on the theorem. We argue, that a modification of Nelson's stochastic mechanics, published recently in "Annalen der Physik", can be extended to a theory which fulfills the requirements from Nelson's analysis. The article proceeds discussing this theory in connection with spinning particles to derive the Pauli equation. Then, we investigate Bohms version of the EPR experiment. Finally, we mention that the theory could perhaps be relativistically extended and useful for the formulation of quantum mechanics in curved spacetimes.

Contents

*Department für Physik, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Theresienstrasse 37, 80333 München, Germany, Benjamin.Schulz@physik.uni-muenchen.de

1 Introduction

In 1935, Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen (EPR) wrote an article, in which they denied that quantum theory would be a complete theory of nature [1]. Around 1951, Bohm gave a more testable outline of the so called ,,EPR paradox" [2]. He described a thought experiment with one source that ejects particles having opposite spin to two separate Stern-Gerlach magnets with variable orientations. Then, in 1964 John S. Bell published a theorem about this paradox in form of an inequality. It made clear, that hidden variable theories which fulfill certain realistic conditions Bell called ,,locally causal"(the most detailed explanation of this terminus was made by Bell in [6]), would be in difference with quantum mechanics. In his original publication [3], Bell wrote: ,,if hidden parameters would be added to quantum mechanics, there must be a mechanism, whereby the setting of one measuring device can influence another spatially separated device", and the signal involved has to ,,propagate instantaneously". Bell's first contribution underwent several modifications. By the time, more and more instructive proofs of his inequality were constructed by him and others. All fundamental articles of Bell on this problem were collected in [4]. Finally in 1969, the inequality was brought by Clauser, Holt, Shimony and Horne (CHSH) into a form suitable for experimental investigation [5].

In 1985, Princeton mathematician Edward Nelson tried to analyze Bell's theorem with full mathematical rigor. The result of his analysis was, that Bell's definition of ,,locally causal" which is the starting point to derive Bell's inequalities, could be divided into two separate conditions. Both were necessary to derive the inequalities, but only one of them has to hold, when a hidden parameter theory should not include instantaneous signals. Nelson published his result twice [7, 8] (with a small correction in [9] to make the theorem compatible with Mermin's presentation [10]) and there exist works from mathematicians e.g. [11], giving further insightful analysis of it. Unfortunately, Nelson's Paper got almost overlooked by physicists. One reason might be, that it was written in the language of advanced mathematical probability theory. Another reason was, that Edward Nelson did not succeed to modify his own alternative interpretation of quantum mechanics [13, 14], to account for the requirements which his theorem defined for a hidden parameter theory without instantaneous signaling effects. Furthermore, the two counterexamples of theories he gave that would do so, were rather artificial stochastic processes. They were written in the language of advanced mathematical probability theory and without proper physical foundation.

This article begins with a short introduction to the necessary mathematical concepts in section 2. In section 3, we review Nelson's contribution to a mathematically rigorous understanding of Bell's inequalities. The physical implications of his theorem are analyzed in section 4. In section 5 and 6 it is shown, that a modification of Nelson's stochastic mechanics which has been published in "Annalen der Physik" [15], fulfills the requirements of Nelson's theorem. We extend this theory to include spinning particles described by the Pauli equation in section 7. Entangled spin states are discussed in section 8, where it is shown in detail how their correlations emerge, but without any instantaneous signaling effects. In section 9, we review some arguments against Nelson's thoughts about Bell's theorem which have occured in the literature, concluding them to be unfounded. The article closes with section 10, mentioning the possible use of the theory developed here, for a reasonable foundation of a quantum theory in curved spacetimes.

Since Nelson's analysis of Bell's theorem might have been overlooked by physicists because of Nelson's usage of advanced probability theory, the article starts with an exposition of the necessary mathematical background, including the notations Nelson used.

2 Basics of mathematical probability theory

2.1 Probability spaces

Probabilistic experiments are described with a so called probability space $\left(\Omega, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \mathrm{P}\right)$. Ω is the set of theoretically possible events $\omega \in \Omega$. Events may be combined to form new events by intersection, union and complement. If A is an event, then the complement $\complement A$ denotes the events not in A. If A and B are events, then the event $A \cap B$ defines the outcomes which are in both A and B. Similarly the event $A \cup B$ consists of all outcomes which are in A or in B. Union and intersection follow the distributive law. For three events A,B and C, we have

$$\left(A \bigcup B\right) \bigcap C \equiv \left(A \bigcap C\right) \bigcup \left(B \bigcap C\right). \tag{1}$$

Often, one wants to consider a collection of events that may be freely combined by these operations. Therefore, one defines the terminology of a sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ on Ω. Whenever events are combined by intersection, union or complement, the resulting outcome is still an event in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$. The sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ fulfills the following properties:

- The set $\Omega \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$
- For all sets $A \in \overline{\mathcal{F}} \Rightarrow \complement A \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$
- For every sequence $(A_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$, the union $\bigcup_n A_n \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$.

If a sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ has only finitely many events, then it is determined by a partition of Ω. This is a collection of nonempty exclusive subsets of Ω whose union is Ω. The other events in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ are obtained by taking unions of these events. We say, that $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ is generated by this partition.

For example, the experiment of tossing two coins which come up heads (H) or tails (T) has four possible outcomes. The set of outcomes is $\Omega = (HH, HT, TH, TT)$. The sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ is generated by the partition of Ω into 4 events (HH), (HT), (TH) and (TT). It consists of 16 elements: The set Ω itself, the impossible event $\varnothing$, the events (HH), (HT), (TH), (TT) and the 10 possible different unions of the events in the partition.

Sometimes, one is interested only in partial information about the outcome of an experiment. For instance, we might only be interested in the total numer of heads. This information is contained in a smaller sub-sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{sub} \subset \overline{\mathcal{F}}$. It is generated by the partition of Ω into three events (HH), (HT, TH) and (TT). $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{sub}$ consists of Ω, the impossible event $\varnothing$, the three events in the partition and the three possible different unions etween them.

Finally, one needs a probability measure P to define a probabilty space. It is a function $\mathrm{P} : \overline{\mathcal{F}} \mapsto [0, 1]$ with the following properties:

- For the sure event Ω, we have $\mathrm{P}(\Omega) \equiv 1$.
- The probability of the impossible event $\varnothing$ is $\mathrm{P}(\varnothing) \equiv 0$
- $\forall A \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$, we get $0 \leq \mathrm{P}(A) \leq 1$.
- For every sequence of events $(A_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ which are pairwise disjoint: $A_i \bigcap A_j = \varnothing$, $(i \neq j \in \mathbb{N})$, the probability measure P fulfills the additivity rule $\mathrm{P}\left(\bigcup_n A_n\right) = \sum_n \mathrm{P}(A_n)$

It follows, that if two events $A, B \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ are complementary $\left(B = \complement A\right)$, we have

$$\mathrm{P}(A) + \mathrm{P}(B) = \mathrm{P}(A) + \mathrm{P}\left(\complement A\right) = \mathrm{P}(\Omega) = 1. \tag{2}$$

Two events $A, B \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ are called equivalent, if the event that A happens is determined by B happening and vice-versa. Equivalence of events can be expressed as

$$\mathrm{P}(A) = \mathrm{P}\left(A \bigcap B\right) = \mathrm{P}(B). \tag{3}$$

Furthermore, we define two events to be independent, if

$$\mathrm{P}\left(A \bigcap B\right) = \mathrm{P}\left(A\right)\mathrm{P}\left(B\right) \tag{4}$$

and the conditional probability of an event A given the event B is defined as:

$$\mathrm{P}\left(A|\, B\right) \equiv \frac{\mathrm{P}\left(A \bigcap B\right)}{\mathrm{P}\left(B\right)} \tag{5}$$

2.2 Random variables and stochastic processes

Often, one is not interested in a single outcome but on more complex data related to a probabilistic experiment. This maybe the sum of the numbers on a dice after it was rolled for two times. With the probability space $\left(\Omega, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \mathrm{P}\right)$ and another space $\left(\Omega', \overline{\mathcal{F}}'\right)$ with a set Ω' and sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'$, these values can be described with an $\overline{\mathcal{F}} - \overline{\mathcal{F}}'$ measurable mapping:

$$X : \Omega \mapsto \Omega' \tag{6}$$

X is called a random variable. We define the expectation value of a random variable X that is integrable on Ω with respect to P by

$$\mathrm{EX}_{\Omega}\left[X\right] \equiv \int_{\Omega} X \mathrm{dP} \tag{7}$$

where $\int_{\Omega} \mathrm{dP} = \mathrm{P}(\Omega) = 1$.

In Physical situations, one often has randomness which varies over a parameter, for example time. This gives raise to the definition of a stochastic process. A stochastic process is defined as a family of random variables

$$\left(X_t\right)_{t \in I} : \Omega \mapsto \Omega' \tag{8}$$

where the parameter t lies in an interval I and is called parameter-set.

We say that two stochastic processes are equivalent under a probability measure P if they lead to equal probability distributions. We define for any set $A' \in \Omega'$ the event $\left(X_t^{-1}(A')\right) \equiv \{X_t \in A'\}$, writing $\{A'\}$ for short. We call $\{A'\}$ the event, that X_t lies in A' and say $\{A'\}$ is generated by X_t. The probability of $\{A'\}$ is $\mathrm{P}\left(X_t \in A'\right)$ and we will abbreviate it as $\mathrm{P}_{X_t}\left\{A'\right\}$. With this notation, two stochastic processes X_t and Y_t are equivalent if, for any set $A' \in \Omega'$, the following relation holds:

$$\mathrm{P}_{X_t}\left\{A'\right\} = \mathrm{P}_{Y_t}\left\{A'\right\} \tag{9}$$

2.3 Enlarging a probability space

Sometimes, it is necessary to enlarge a probability space $\left(\Omega, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \mathrm{P}\right)$ because it turns out to be inadequate for the problem at hand. It may be possible to give a more complete description with another space $\left(\Omega'', \overline{\mathcal{F}}'', \mathrm{P}''\right)$. Since the description is more detailed, there should be a rule, that assigns to each outcome $\omega'' \in \Omega''$ a corresponding outcome $\omega \in \Omega$. For any event $A'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$, the rule should assign a set in Ω which should be an event $A \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$. In this case, we will say $A \subset_{\in} A''$ and $A \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ is called the event corresponding to $A'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$. A similar notation will be used for the sigma algebras $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{F}}''$. We will define the notation $\overline{\mathcal{F}} \subset_{\in} \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$ to indicate, that the events in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}''$ have their corresponding events in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$.

The probability for the union of events $\bigcup_n \left(A''_n\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'' : A''_n \supset_{\ni} A$ should be equal to the probability of A:

$$\mathrm{P}''\left(\bigcup_n \left(A''_n\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'' : A''_n \supset_{\ni} A\right) \equiv \mathrm{P}\left(A\right). \tag{10}$$

Finally, if two events $A'', B'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$ are exclusive: $A'' \bigcap B'' = \varnothing$, then their corresponding events $A, B \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$, where $A \subset_{\in} A''$, $B \subset_{\in} B''$, are also exclusive: $A \bigcap B = \varnothing$. With two exclusive events $A, B \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ and $A \subset_{\in} A''$, the event $B \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ does not correspond to $A'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$. We will say $B \not\subset_{\notin} A''$.

An example of an enlarged probability space would be the set of outcomes for a coin toss, rolled for three times. The coin may come up in the first toss with head (h) or tail (t) and the set of outcomes would be

$$\Omega = (h, t)\,.$$

Now the coin may be thrown twice again, with results (H) for head and (T) for tail. The enlarged set of outcomes would become

$$\Omega'' = (hHH, hHT, hTH, tHH, tHT, tTH)\,.$$

The rule, that relates this larger set of outcomes in Ω'' to outcomes in Ω is to ignore the second and third toss. Thus the rule assigns to outcomes $A'' = (hHT) \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$ and $B'' = (hTT) \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$ the outcome $C = (h) \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$, where $C \subset_{\in} A''$ as well as $C \subset_{\in} B''$ is the event $C \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ corresponding to both $A'', B'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$. For the event $D = (t) \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$, we have $D \not\subset_{\notin} A''$ and $D \not\subset_{\notin} B''$, since D does correspond neither to A'' nor to B''. Furthermore, the probability of the event, where the first coin is coming up heads, $\mathrm{P}\,(h)$ in $\left(\Omega, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \mathrm{P}\right)$ is the same as $\mathrm{P}''\,(hHH \cup hHT \cup hTH \cup hTT)$ in $\left(\Omega'', \overline{\mathcal{F}}'', \mathrm{P}''\right)$.

For later, it will be useful if we define the intersection between two events $A'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$ and $B \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ from the smaller space as

$$A'' \bigcap_{\ni} B \equiv A \bigcap B, \tag{11}$$

where $A \subset_{\in} A''$ is the event in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ corresponding to $A'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$. Let the event A'' be a union of two events $B'', C'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$, i.e. $A'' = B'' \bigcup C''$. Then, the intersection of this union with an event $D \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ yields:

$$\begin{aligned} A'' \bigcap_{\ni} D &= \left(B'' \bigcup C''\right) \bigcap_{\ni} D \\ &= \left(B \bigcup C\right) \bigcap D \\ &= \left(B \bigcap D\right) \bigcup \left(C \bigcap D\right) \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $B \subset_{\in} B''$ and $C \subset_{\in} C''$ are the events in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ corresponding to $B'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$ and $C'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$.

One may compute the conditional probability in the larger space for the event of the outcome of two heads in the second and third toss (HH) with respect to the event of a tail (t) in the first toss: $\mathrm{P}''\,((tHH \cup hHH)\,|(tHH \cup tHT \cup tTT \cup tTH))$. Such experiments are the reason for Nelson's definition of a conditional probability of an event A'' in a probability space $\left(\Omega'', \overline{\mathcal{F}}'', \mathrm{P}''\right)$ with respect to the sigma algebra of a smaller space $\left(\Omega, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \mathrm{P}\right)$. It is a random variable

$$\begin{aligned} X(A'') &\equiv \mathrm{P}''\left(A'' \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}\right.\right) \\ &= \mathrm{P}''\left(A'' \left| \bigcup_n (\omega''_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'' : \omega''_n \supset_{\ni} A \right.\right) \\ &= \frac{\mathrm{P}''\left(A'' \bigcap \left(\bigcup_n (\omega''_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'' : \omega''_n \supset_{\ni} A\right)\right)}{\mathrm{P}''\left(\bigcup_n (\omega''_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'' : \omega''_n \supset_{\ni} A\right)} \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where we have defined the event in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ coresponding to $A'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$ as $A \subset_{\in} A''$.

In the coin tossing experiment above, $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ would be generated by the events (h, t). For example, if $A'' = (tTH)$, with one head and a tail in the second and third outcome, as well as a tail in the first outcome, we would get

$$X\,(tTH) = \mathrm{P}''\,((tTH)\,|(tHH \cup tTT \cup tHT \cup tTH))\,.$$

The interpretation of $X(A'')$ is as the revised probability that an event $A'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$ will occur, given the extra information about which events in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ occur for this outcome. The random variable $X(A'')$ is

measurable with respect to the $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'' - [0,1]$, because the event A'' is in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}''$. With $A'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$, there exists a set $A \subset_{\in} A''$, where $A \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$. We define $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{sub} \subset \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ to be the sigma algebra generated by a partition of the set A. Then, $X(A'')$ is additionally measurable with respect to $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{sub} - [0,1]$.

Faris states in [11], that we can compute the unconditional probability $\mathrm{P}''(A'')$ by taking the expectation value of $X(A'')$ on $A \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ with respect to P:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{EX}_{\mathrm{A,P}}\left[X\left(A''\right)\right] &= \mathrm{EX}_{\mathrm{A,P}}\left[\mathrm{P}''\left(A''\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}\right.\right)\right] \\
&= \int_A \mathrm{P}''\left(A''\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}\right.\right)\mathrm{dP} \\
&= \int_A \frac{\mathrm{P}''\left(A'' \bigcap \left(\bigcup_n \left(\omega_n''\right)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'' : \omega_n'' \supset_{\ni} A\right)\right)}{\mathrm{P}''\left(\bigcup_n \left(\omega_n''\right)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'' : \omega_n'' \supset_{\ni} A\right)}\mathrm{dP} \\
&= \frac{\mathrm{P}''\left(A'' \bigcap \left(\bigcup_n \left(\omega_n''\right)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'' : \omega_n'' \supset_{\ni} A\right)\right)}{\mathrm{P}''\left(\bigcup_n \left(\omega_n''\right)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'' : \omega_n'' \supset_{\ni} A\right)}\mathrm{P}(A) \\
&= \mathrm{P}''\left(A'' \bigcap \left(\bigcup_n \left(\omega_n''\right)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'' : \omega_n'' \supset_{\ni} A\right)\right) \\
&= \mathrm{P}''\left(A''\right) \qquad (14)
\end{aligned}$$

In the fifth line, we have used that the probabilities $\mathrm{P}(A)$ and $\mathrm{P}''\left(\bigcup_n \left(\omega_n''\right)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'' : \omega_n'' \supset_{\ni} A\right)$ in the two spaces $\left(\Omega'', \overline{\mathcal{F}}'', \mathrm{P}''\right)$ and $\left(\Omega, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \mathrm{P}\right)$ are equal.

3 Nelson's analysis on Bell's Theorem

3.1 The setup of an EPR experiment in theory

An EPR experiment consists of a particle source which ejects pairs of particles with opposite spin to two spatially separated measurement devices 1 and 2. The direction of the spins is measured at each device with a Stern-Gerlach magnet that can be rotated in arbitrary directions perpendicular to the axis of the particle trajectory. Let $\phi_{jt_{\vec{\mu}}} : \Omega \mapsto \Omega'$ be a family of j stochastic processes $(1 \leq j \leq S \in \mathbb{N})$ with parameter set $t_{\vec{\mu}}$. The vector valued entity $\vec{\mu}$ denotes the axis of the detector. It can be chosen by the experimentalist freely at will. The parameter t denotes the time during which the j-th. particle flights. It starts at time $t_{\vec{\mu}} = 0_{\vec{\mu}}$ from the source and arrives at $t_{\vec{\mu}} = T_{\vec{\mu}}$ $(T > 0)$ in the detector. As a convention, the random variable $\phi_{j(t=T)_{\vec{\mu}}}$ will be written $\phi_{j\vec{\mu}}$.

We now set up two families of stochastic processes $\phi_{1jt_{\vec{\mu}}}$ and $\phi_{2jt_{\vec{\nu}}}$ that describe $j = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, S$ particle pairs. The particles in each j-th. pair are sent to the corresponding Stern-Gerlach magnet. We denote the events generated by $\phi_{1j\vec{\mu}}$, $\phi_{2j\vec{\nu}}$ at the detectors 1 and 2 with $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$ and $\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}\}$. These outcomes could depend on the preparation of the particles by the source. Therefore, we need a sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S$ associated with the events $\left\{x_{\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$ at preparation stage generated by $\phi_{1j(t=0)_{\vec{\mu}}}, \phi_{2j(t=0)_{\vec{\mu}}}$, in addition to the sigma algebras $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1, \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2$ associated with the events by $\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1\right\}$ and $\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2\right\}$ at the detectors.

Spin observables only have values $(\uparrow, \downarrow)$ and this gives rise to a set $\Omega'_{1(2)} = (\uparrow, \downarrow)$ in the measurable space at both detectors. Accordingly, the sigma algebras $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1$ and $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2$ are equal. Moreover, they are independent from the axes of the Stern-Gerlach magnets chosen by the experimenter. This is not the case for the probability measures of the events at the detectors. The probability of an event $\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1\right\}$ at 1 depends on $\phi_{1j\vec{\mu}}$ and the probability for an event $\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2\right\}$ at 2 depends on $\phi_{2j\vec{\nu}}$. Therefore, we may write the probability measure for both events at 1 and 2 as $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1j\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2j\vec{\nu}}}$. If the experiment is done with infinitely many particle pairs $S \to \infty$, we denote the corresponding probability measure for the events at 1 and 2 with $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}$.



Figure 1: EPR experiment, the dashed lines illustrate the particle trajectories

3.2 Active locality

To analyze the EPR experiment, Nelson defined two different forms of locality: Active locality and passive locality. The meaning of active locality is:

Whatever axes the experimenter chooses at one measurement device e.g. at 2, it does not change the probabilities of an event happening at 1, as long as 1 does not lie in the future cone of 2. We can mathematically define this as follows:

Let the event $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$ at 1 be generated by $\phi_{1j\vec{\mu}}$. Then, the stochastic processes $\phi_{2j(t=\tau)_{\vec{\nu}}}$, $\phi_{2j(t=\tau')_{\vec{\nu}'}}$ with parameter sets $\tau_{\vec{\nu}}$, $\tau'_{\vec{\nu}'}$ must be equivalent under $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1j\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2j(t=\tau)_{\vec{\nu}}}}\{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$, as long as the spatial region of the measurement of $\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}$ does not lie in the future cones of where the random variables $\phi_{2j(t=\tau)_{\vec{\nu}}}$ and $\phi_{2j(t=\tau')_{\vec{\nu}'}}$ are measured:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1j\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2j(t=\tau)_{\vec{\nu}}}}\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\} = \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1j\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2j(t=\tau')_{\vec{\nu}'}}}\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\} \tag{15}$$

For $\phi_{1j\vec{\mu}}$ to be actively local, eq. (15) has to hold for each j and a similar condition has to be true for any event $\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}\}$ at 2 generated by $\phi_{2j\vec{\nu}}$:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1j(t=\tau)_{\vec{\mu}}},\phi_{2j\vec{\nu}}}\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}\} = \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1j(t=\tau')_{\vec{\mu}'}},\phi_{2j\vec{\nu}}}\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}\} \tag{16}$$

In eq. (16), the event $\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}\}$ must not lie in the future cones of where the random variables $\phi_{1j(t=\tau)_{\vec{\mu}}}$, $\phi_{1j(t=\tau')_{\vec{\mu}'}}$ are measured. Since these conditions are to hold for each j, they are also valid under $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2(t=\tau)_{\vec{\nu}}}}\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1(t=\tau)_{\vec{\mu}}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}\}$ with infinitely many particles.

We can condition the events $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1$ and $\{\sigma_{2\vec{\mu}}\} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2$ with respect to the sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_S$ of a smaller space generated by $\phi_{1(t=0)_{\vec{\mu}}}$ and $\phi_{2(t=0)_{\vec{\nu}}}$, where $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_S \subset_{\in} \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1$ and $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_S \subset_{\in} \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2$. If $\phi_{1j\vec{\mu}}$, $\phi_{2j\vec{\nu}}$ are actively local, the conditional probabilities $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2(t=\tau)_{\vec{\nu}}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\middle|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1(t=\tau)_{\vec{\mu}}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}\middle|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$ will have similar properties as in (15,16), due to the definition of (13):

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2(t=\tau)_{\vec{\nu}}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\middle|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\} &= \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2(t=\tau')_{\vec{\nu}'}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\middle|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\} \\
\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1(t=\tau)_{\vec{\mu}}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}\middle|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\} &= \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1(t=\tau')_{\vec{\mu}'}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}\middle|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

3.3 Passive locality

Now, we consider random events which are spacelike separated but taking place simultaneously. In a probability description, these events could be dependent or independent. The assumption of passive locality is, that if they are dependent, there must be prior preparation events such that the separated events are conditionally independent given the preparation. It is possible to have active locality without passive locality, since one can have dependence of random events which is not explained by a preparation without intervention or signaling. We can define passive locality mathematically as follows:

The spacelike separated locations of the two detectors 1 and 2 are defined such, that there exists an area S in the intersection of their past cones (see figure 1). This is the place of the particle source, where the

stochastic processes $\phi_{1(t=0)_{\vec{\mu}}}$ and $\phi_{2(t=0)_{\vec{\nu}}}$ at the preparation stage generate a sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S$. Then, two families of stochastic processes $\phi_{1jt_{\vec{\mu}}}$ and $\phi_{2jt_{\vec{\nu}}}$ are called passively local, if the conditional probabilities of outcomes $\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1\right\}$ and $\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2\right\}$ given $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S$ are independent for every axis $\vec{\mu}, \vec{\nu}$:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} = \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \tag{18}$$

3.4 Nelson's theorem

With this notation, quantum mechanics fulfills the following properties:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} = \downarrow\right\} \quad = \quad \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \downarrow \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow\right\} = 1 \tag{19}$$

$$\left|\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}\right) + \mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}'\right) + \mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu}',\vec{\nu}\right) - \mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu}',\vec{\nu}'\right)\right| > 2 \tag{20}$$

In eq. (20), $\mathrm{E}(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})$ is the so called „correlation coefficient". It is defined through

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}\right) \quad \equiv \quad & \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \uparrow\right\} + \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \downarrow \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \downarrow\right\} \\ & -\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \downarrow\right\} - \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \downarrow \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \uparrow\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Equation (19) implies, that if the axes of the Stern-Gerlach detectors are the same, the spin values measured at 1 and 2 are always opposite. Eq. (20) is, as shall be shown below, in conflict with theories where active and passive locality holds. In Nelson's form, Bell's theorem states: If active and passive locality hold (19) and (20) cannot be fulfilled simultaneously. Nelson's proof from [7, 8] (with corrections in [9]) goes as follows: Passive locality demands for events $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow\}$ at 1 and $\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \downarrow\}$ at 2, that:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \downarrow \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \quad = \quad & \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \\ & \cdot\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \downarrow \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Active locality implies, that the actions which happen in 2 can only affect anything in its future cone. Since 1 does not lie in that cone, nothing what happens in 2 can affect the probabilities measured at 1. Therefore, the processes $\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}$ and $\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}$ are equivalent in the probability measure for any result of $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$ at 1:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \quad = \quad \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \equiv P_{\vec{\mu}} \tag{23}$$

An analogous expression is true for the events at 2:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \downarrow \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} = \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\nu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \downarrow \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \tag{24}$$

But (19) gives $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\nu}} = \uparrow\}$ in the right side of (24). Hence, we can write for the coordinates ν:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \downarrow \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\} \quad = \quad \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\{\sigma_{1\vec{\nu}} = \uparrow \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\} \equiv P_{\vec{\nu}} \tag{25}$$

Plugging (23) and (25) back to (22) we get:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \downarrow \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \quad = \quad P_{\vec{\mu}} P_{\vec{\nu}} \tag{26}$$

The sum of the probabilities for two complementary measurement results $\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \uparrow\}$ and $\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \downarrow\}$ at 2 must be unity. Therefore, with (25)

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \uparrow \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} = 1 - P_{\vec{\nu}}. \tag{27}$$

For events $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \downarrow\}$ and $\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \uparrow\}$ passive locality and (27) yield:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \downarrow \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \uparrow \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \quad &= \quad \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \downarrow \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \uparrow \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \\ &= \quad \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \downarrow \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} (1 - P_{\vec{\nu}}) \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Since active locality holds, we can write for measurement results $\{\sigma_{1\mu} =\downarrow\}$ at 1:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} =\downarrow \left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\} &= \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} =\downarrow \left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\} \\ &= 1-\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} =\uparrow \left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\} = 1-P_{\vec{\mu}} \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

After inserting (29) result into (28) we arrive at

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} =\downarrow \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} =\uparrow \left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\} = (1-P_{\vec{\mu}})(1-P_{\vec{\nu}}). \tag{30}$$

In the same way, we can derive the relations

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} =\uparrow \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} =\uparrow \left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\} = P_{\vec{\mu}}(1-P_{\vec{\nu}}) \tag{31}$$

and

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} =\downarrow \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} =\downarrow \left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\} = (1-P_{\vec{\mu}})P_{\vec{\nu}}. \tag{32}$$

If we write the correlation coefficient defined in (21), but with the conditional probabilities above, we arrive using (31), (32), (26) and (30) at

$$\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right) = P_{\vec{\mu}}(1-P_{\vec{\nu}}) + (1-P_{\vec{\mu}})P_{\vec{\nu}} - P_{\vec{\mu}}P_{\vec{\nu}} - (1-P_{\vec{\mu}})(1-P_{\vec{\nu}}). \tag{33}$$

Now, with four arbitrarily chosen axes μ, μ' and $\vec{\nu}, \vec{\nu}'$ at the stations 1 and 2, the following inequality can be computed:

$$\left|\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right) + \mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}'\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right) + \mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu}',\vec{\nu}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right) - \mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu}',\vec{\nu}'\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right)\right| \leq 2 \tag{34}$$

We get this result because the conditional probabilities in $\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right)$ are all in the range $0 \leq \mathrm{P} \leq 1$. Since probability measures are generally in this range, eq. (34) holds for the unconditional probabilities too:

$$|\mathrm{E}(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}) + \mathrm{E}(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}') + \mathrm{E}(\vec{\mu}',\vec{\nu}) - \mathrm{E}(\vec{\mu}',\vec{\nu}')| \leq 2 \tag{35}$$

This is the so called Clauser-Holt-Shimony-Horne inequality [5]. It is a version of Bells statement in [3]

$$|\mathrm{E}(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}) - \mathrm{E}(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}')| - \mathrm{E}(\vec{\nu},\vec{\nu}') \leq 1 \tag{36}$$

which can be similarly derived. Both (35) and (36) are violated in quantum mechanics and this violation was confirmed experimentally [16]

The analysis of Nelson leads to two possibilities: Since Bell's inequalities can only be derived assuming that **active and passive locality** holds, in a theory that reproduces quantum mechanics either **active locality or passive locality** has to be violated. A violation of active locality would mean that action at a distance is possible. On the other hand, a violation of passive locality would simply imply, that the events at 1 and 2 are not conditionally independent given a prior preparation. The latter condition can be realized by families of stochastic processes without communication between the separated EPR measurement stations because stochastic processes can produce dependencies of random events (which is not due to a preparation stage) without intervention or signaling.

4 What implies the failure of passive locality - a deeper analysis

Stochastic processes can be constructed such, that they act on each particle actively local but still are violating passive locality. This was shown explicitly by Nelson with two examples in [7, 8]. The first was a rather ad-hoc construction of a stochastic process fulfilling the Klein-Gordon equation and the second was a variant of his stochastic mechanics applied to relativistic field theory. Unfortunately the latter had no tempting particle interpretation as Nelson's original theory [13, 14] had, where particles move on stochastic paths. Hence this „stochastic field theory" was never developed extensively. The goal of this article is to

show, that a more physically motivated hidden variable theory published in this journal [15] violates Bell's inequalities without any communication between the two measurement stations in the EPR setup. But to do this, we need to analyze the implications of Nelson's theorem further.

We begin by evaluating some deeper consequences of passive locality. Faris shows in [11], that passive locality, combined with relation (19) from quantum mechanics leads immediately to another condition, he calls „deterministic passive locality". Suppose, as in the EPR experiment, two spatially separated events happen or not happen always together with probability 1. Then, deterministic passive locality states that this must be, because they are equivalent to some random event at a prior preparation stage. Given a complete description of the results at the preparation, the subsequent events are determined. Therefore, all randomness lies in the preparation. Deterministic passive locality is defined mathematically as follows:

Let the events $\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1\right\}$ at 1 and $\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2\right\}$ at 2 be equivalent with respect to $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}$ and passive locality hold. Then, there is an event $\left\{x_{\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$ at preparation stage which $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$ and $\{\sigma_{2\vec{\mu}}\}$ are both equivalent to.

In his contribution, Faris states that a similar proof is presented by Redhead [40] at pp. 101-102. Redhead claims, this result would have been discovered at first by Suppes and Zanotti who gave a different proof in [12]. The exposition given in this article follows closely the derivation of Faris in [11]:

The events $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$ and $\{\sigma_{2\vec{\mu}}\}$ are defined such, that they are equivalent under $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}$:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\} = \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}}\right\} = \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\{\sigma_{2\vec{\mu}}\} \tag{37}$$

Passive locality demands

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} = \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \tag{38}$$

and because of $0 \leq \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}} \leq 1$ we have

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \leq \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\}. \tag{39}$$

The random variable $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\}$ is measurable with respect to a sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{subS} \subset \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S$, generated by the partition of a set $\left\{\Upsilon \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\} \subset_{\in} \{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$ which defines the event in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S$ corresponding to $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$. As shown in section 2, we can compute the unconditional probability of $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$, if we take the expectation value of $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\}$ on the set Υ, with respect to a probability measure $\mathrm{P}_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\mu}}$ for the events at preparation stage:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\} = \mathrm{EX}_{\Upsilon,\mathrm{P}_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\mu}}}\left[\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\}\right]. \tag{40}$$

Since an intersection of two events is also an event, we can write:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}}\right\} = \mathrm{EX}_{\Upsilon,\mathrm{P}_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\mu}}}\left[\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\}\right] \tag{41}$$

The events $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$ and $\{\sigma_{2\vec{\mu}}\}$ are equivalent by (37). Hence it follows from (41) and (40), that their expectation values are equal. Therefore, we can conclude with (39) that:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} = \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \tag{42}$$

And similarly

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} = \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\}. \tag{43}$$

With the assumption of passive locality we get, using (42) and (43):

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} &= \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \\
&= \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \\
&= \left(\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\}\right)^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

This implies, that the conditional probability $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\}$ can only have the two values 0 and 1. We denote the event, when this random variable has the value one by $\{\tilde{x}_{\vec{\mu}}\}$ and the event, when it is zero by $\{\tilde{y}_{\vec{\mu}}\}$. Then, the event $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$ is the union of these exclusive events: $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\} \equiv \{\tilde{y}_{\vec{\mu}}\} \bigcup \{\tilde{x}_{\vec{\mu}}\}$.

The probability $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\}$ is measurable with respect to $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{subS}$. Because $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{subS} \subset \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S$, all elements of $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{subS}$ are also in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S$. In turn, there exists an event $\left\{x_{\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$ where $\{x_{\vec{\mu}}\} \subset_{\in} \{\tilde{x}_{\vec{\mu}}\}$. Under the probability measure $\mathrm{P}_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\mu}}$ for the events at preparation stage, this event $\{x_{\vec{\mu}}\}$ has the same probability as its corresponding event $\{\tilde{x}_{\vec{\mu}}\}$ under $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}$. Similarly there must exist an event $\left\{y_{\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$ of the same probability as $\{\tilde{y}_{\vec{\mu}}\}$ with $\{y_{\vec{\mu}}\} \subset_{\in} \{\tilde{y}_{\vec{\mu}}\}$.

The event $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$ can only have the coditional probabilities of 1 or 0. If we computate the unconditional probabilities of $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$, $\{\tilde{x}_{\vec{\mu}}\}$ and $\{x_{\vec{\mu}}\}$ with this property in mind, we see that these events occur with equal probability:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\} &= \mathrm{EX}_{\Upsilon,\mathrm{P}_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\mu}}}\left[\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\}\right] \\
&= \mathrm{EX}_{\Upsilon,\mathrm{P}_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\mu}}}\left[\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\tilde{x}_{\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\}\right] \\
&= \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\{\tilde{x}_{\vec{\mu}}\} \\
&= \mathrm{P}_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\mu}}\{x_{\vec{\mu}}\}. \qquad (45)
\end{aligned}$$

The events $\{\tilde{y}_{\vec{\mu}}\}$ and $\{\tilde{x}_{\vec{\mu}}\}$ are exclusive. Therefore, their corresponding events $\{x_{\vec{\mu}}\}$, $\{y_{\vec{\mu}}\}$ are also exclusive. Hence, we can compute for the intersection of $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\} \bigcap_{\ni} \{x_{\vec{\mu}}\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\} \bigcap_{\ni} \{x_{\vec{\mu}}\} &= \left(\{\tilde{y}_{\vec{\mu}}\} \bigcup \{\tilde{x}_{\vec{\mu}}\}\right) \bigcap_{\ni} \{x_{\vec{\mu}}\} \\
&= \left(\{y_{\vec{\mu}}\} \bigcap \{x_{\vec{\mu}}\}\right) \bigcup \left(\{x_{\vec{\mu}}\} \bigcap \{x_{\vec{\mu}}\}\right) \\
&= \{x_{\vec{\mu}}\} \qquad (46)
\end{aligned}$$

And the following equality holds:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\mu}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \bigcap_{\ni} x_{\vec{\mu}}\right\} = \mathrm{P}_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\mu}}\{x_{\vec{\mu}}\} \qquad (47)$$

The equations (45) and (47) lead to the conclusion that $\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1\right\}$ is equivalent to $\left\{x_{\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$. Similarly, the event $\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2\right\}$ is equivalent to the same $\left\{x_{\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$, due to

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\} &= \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\} \\
&= \left(\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\}\right)^2. \qquad (48)
\end{aligned}$$

This is the definition of deterministic passive locality given above.

While Nelson's proof in section 3 made only use of passive locality, a derivation of Bell's original statement (36) involving the condition of ,,deterministic passive locality" directly can be found in [11].

Passive locality rules out dependence of random events at distant locations that is not explained by prior preparation events. Deterministic passive locality, which is a consequence of passive locality plus the observed equivalent events in quantum mechanics, states that there are no outcomes that do not have an equivalent event at preparation stage.

The failure of deterministic passive locality implies for the spin trajectories of two particles in an EPR experiment, that for the time of their flight from the source to the measurement apparatus, each particle has to undergo a separate stochastic process, constantly changing its spin orientation from up to down and vice-versa. The stochastic processes must be designed such, that each outcome at the detectors is not equivalent to an earlier event at the particle source. Additionally, the two particles spin directions have to be always opposite at any time and this without violating active locality. If these conditions can be fulfilled, Bell's inequalities will be violated without instantaneous signaling between the two measurement stations 1 and 2.

5 Fritsche's hidden variable theory and the locality problem

5.1 Derivation of the single particle Schroedinger equation

In 2003, L. Fritsche and M. Haugk [15] published a modification of Nelson's stochastic mechanics. It is, in contrast to Nelson's original contribution [13, 14], an actively local theory with a non-markovian stochastic process. Moreover, it can, if slightly modified, be made to violate passive locality. Here, we will not discuss in detail how the (many-particle) Schroedinger equation (and the corresponding quantum mechanical operators) can be derived from this process, because it is fully described in the original article. Instead, we focus our discussion on aspects of superposed states and show the theory to be actively local, in order to have enough material that we are able to explain how the correlations in entangled states emerge.

The starting point to derive Fritsche's theory is, to interpret the energy time uncertainty relation $\Delta E \Delta t \approx \hbar/2$ as an indication, that in quantum mechanics, energy is only conserved strictly in physical interactions, but not otherwise. Particles are assumed to be under statistical energy fluctuations. In Fritsches theory, there occurs a deviation ΔE of the particles energy E during the time interval Δt, after which the initial energy E has to be restored on the average. Therefore, kinetic energy is thought to be conserved on the average only. The second assumption is in spirit of Ballentines famous statistical ensemble interpretation [39]. In this interpretation, the quantum state vector $|\psi\rangle$ does not represent an individual particle, but a statistical ensemble of infinitely many of them. For this reason, the probability of finding an electron of a hydrogen atom in a volume Ω given by

$$\mathrm{p}(\Omega) \equiv \int_{\Omega} \psi^*(\vec{r})\psi(\vec{r})\mathrm{d}^3 r, \tag{49}$$

were $\psi(\vec{r})$ is the electrons wave-function, describes the following situation: To get all the information of $p(\Omega)$ experimentally, one has to prepare infinitely many identical hydrogen atoms with the same state (including the same orientation in space). Then, one has to measure on each atom, if one finds the electron in Ω and one must compute its probability of being there in the infinitely large ensemble. Accordingly, to describe the probabilistic time evolution of the statistical ensemble of electrons in a quantum mechanical system, one has to deal with an infinitely large number of sample trajectories. To model energy conservation on the average for this ensemble, Fritsche and Haugk divide it into two sub-ensembles with equal average velocities, and therefore the same average kinetic energy. In one sub-ensemble, every particle then undergoes a Brownian motion with a negative friction coefficient during a time-step Δt, and in the other one, each particle underlies the same process, but with a positive friction coefficient.

For a single particle with rest mass m_0, we begin with two Langevin equations for j-th trajectories on a coarse grained timescale τ, at which the Brownian motion process takes place:

$$\begin{aligned} m_0 \ddot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_j^{\mathrm{B}} + \frac{m_0}{\tau}\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_j^{\mathrm{B}} &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}_j^{\mathrm{ext}} + \vec{\mathrm{F}}_j^{\mathrm{Brown}} \\ m_0 \ddot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_j^{\mathrm{A}} - \frac{m_0}{\tau}\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_j^{\mathrm{A}} &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}_{\mathrm{j}}^{\ \mathrm{ext}} + \vec{\mathrm{F}}_j^{\mathrm{Brown}} \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

The three dimensional vector

$$\vec{\mathrm{x}}_j^{\mathrm{A(B)}} \equiv \left(\mathrm{x}_{j1}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(t), \mathrm{x}_{j2}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(t), \mathrm{x}_{j3}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(t)\right)$$

is the hidden position variable for the j-th sample trajectory of the particle in the A(B) ensemble at time t, where $1 \leq j \leq S \in \mathbb{N}$. The vector $\vec{\mathrm{F}}_j^{\mathrm{ext}}$ is an arbitrary external force field and

$$\vec{\mathrm{F}}_j^{\mathrm{Brown}} \equiv \left(\mathrm{F}_{j1}^{\mathrm{Brown}}(t), \mathrm{F}_{j2}^{\mathrm{Brown}}(t), \mathrm{F}_{j3}^{\mathrm{Brown}}(t)\right) \tag{51}$$

is the random force the j-th particle is subjected to. It is assumed to have a Gaussian distribution

$$\mathrm{P}\left\{\mathrm{F}_{jk}^{\mathrm{Brown}}(t)\right\} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}C} e^{-\left(\mathrm{F}_{jk}^{\mathrm{Brown}}(t)/C\right)^2} \tag{52}$$

in each coordinate, where C is a constant. The Gaussian distribution should be independent for every coordinate k and trajectory j. Now, one can separate the sample trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_j^{\mathrm{A(B)}}$ into a sum, caused by the random and the external force:

$$\vec{\mathrm{x}}_j^{\mathrm{A(B)}} = \vec{\mathrm{x}}_{rj}^{\mathrm{A(B)}} + \vec{\mathrm{x}}_{cj}^{\mathrm{A(B)}} \tag{53}$$

Because $\vec{\mathrm{F}}_j^{\mathrm{Brown}}(t)$ is independent in each coordinate, there does not exist any dependence between different components of the velocities $\dot{\mathrm{x}}_{rj1}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}, \dot{\mathrm{x}}_{rj2}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}, \dot{\mathrm{x}}_{rj3}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}$, as well as there is no dependence between $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{cj}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}, \vec{\mathrm{x}}_{rj}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}$. With this property in mind, the authors of [15] average in each of the two sub-ensembles A and B about all j-th sample trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_j^{\mathrm{A(B)}}$, after the ensemble was made infinitely large ($S \to \infty$). Finally, they arrive at two differential equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}} + \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}\right) + \left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}} - \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}\right)\vec{\nabla}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}} + \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}\right) + \nu\Delta\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}} + \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}\right) &= \frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}} - \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}\right) + \left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}} + \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}\right)\vec{\nabla}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}} - \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}\right) - \nu\Delta\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}} - \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}\right) &= \frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

In (54), $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}$ denotes the average external force at point $\vec{r} = (r_1, r_2, r_3)$ and time t. The vector valued entity

$$\begin{aligned}
\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}} &\equiv \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\epsilon_j(\vec{r},t)\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_j^{\mathrm{A(B)}}}{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\epsilon_j(\vec{r},t)} \\
&\equiv \left(v_1^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(r_1,t), v_2^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(r_2,t), v_3^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(r_3,t)\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

is the average velocity of the ensemble, where:

$$\epsilon_j(\vec{r},t) \equiv \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \vec{\mathrm{x}}_j^{\mathrm{A(B)}} \text{at time t is in a small volume } \mathrm{d}^3r \text{ around } \vec{r} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Additionally, we have the so called osmotic average velocity:

$$\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}} \equiv \left(u_1^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(r_1,t), u_2^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(r_2,t), u_3^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(r_3,t)\right)$$

It is connected to the probability density $\rho^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(\vec{r},t)d\vec{r}$ of finding a particle in the ensemble at point $(\vec{r},t)$ via

$$\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}} = \mp\nu\vec{\nabla} ln\left(\rho^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(\vec{r},t)/\rho_0\right). \tag{56}$$

Here, ρ_0 is a constant reference density without physical importance and $\nu \equiv \frac{k_B T\tau}{m_0}$ is the friction coefficient of the Brownian motion, depending on the temperature T of the heath-bath and Boltzmann's constant k_B . Without loss of generalization, ν can be written as

$$\nu \equiv \frac{\hbar}{2m_0}. \tag{57}$$

Since we derive a non-relativistic system, it is possible that the random force is eventually for some events near infinity and the particle may be driven to $\vec{r} = \infty$ at a certain time-step t with infinitely large velocity. However, in physical situations important for the non-locality issues discussed later in this article, relativistic effects certainly will occur, in the sense that particles are not allowed to move faster than the speed of light. Then, if an ensemble of quantum particles is emitted at a point $(\vec{r}_0, t_0)$, for example by a decaying atomic nucleus, it can only reach points $(\vec{r},t)$ within the future cone of $(\vec{r}_0, t_0)$. Accordingly, the functions $\vec{\mathrm{u}}, \vec{\mathrm{v}}, \rho(\vec{r},t)$ are defined only for these $(\vec{r},t)$.

Before the two ensembles underwent a Brownian motion, it was ensured, that their average velocity was equal:

$$\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}} = \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}} \tag{58}$$

It is shown in [15], that this constraint implies $\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}} = \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}$ also. After the first time step (58), does not hold anymore, since the A system gains energy compared to the B system. To prevent this, we have to interchange $j_1, j_2, j_3, \ldots$ trajectories of fast particles from the A ensemble, with as many trajectories $j_1', j_2', j_3', \ldots$ of slow particles from the B system until

$$\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}(\vec{r}, t+\Delta t) = \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{r}, t+\Delta t)$$

holds. Then we can compute the arithmetic mean of the two diffusion equations for the A and B systems at time $t + \Delta t$. After this was done, we restart the diffusion process again for the next time-step, but with another division into two sub-ensembles, where a condition similar to (58) holds. As is shown in [15], the time evolution of the overall system is described by the following diffusion equation:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\vec{\mathrm{v}} + \left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{v}} + \left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{u}}\right) + \nu\Delta\vec{\mathrm{u}} \quad = \quad \frac{d}{dt}\vec{\mathrm{v}} - \left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{u}}\right) + \nu\Delta\vec{\mathrm{u}} = \frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} \tag{59}$$

One can now define the function

$$\psi(\vec{r},t) \equiv \pm\sqrt{\rho(\vec{r},t)}e^{i\varphi(\vec{r},t)}$$

which is connected to the ensemble average velocity $\vec{\mathrm{v}}$ through $\vec{\mathrm{v}} \equiv \frac{\hbar}{m_0}\vec{\nabla}\varphi(\vec{r},t)$ (We note, that the latter equation can only be written, since one can prove that $\vec{\mathrm{v}}$ is curl free). After some computations, the authors of [15] are able to cast eq. (59) directly in form of the time dependent Schroedinger equation:

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\psi(\vec{r},t)}{\partial t} = \left(\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t) + \hat{\mathrm{V}}^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r},t)\right)\psi(\vec{r},t) = \left(\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t) + \hat{\mathrm{V}}^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r},t)\right)\psi(\vec{r},t) \tag{60}$$

In eq. (60), $\hat{\mathrm{V}}^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r},t) \equiv \vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}$ stands for an external potential and $\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t) \equiv -\frac{\hbar^2\Delta}{2m_0}$ is the free particle Hamiltonian.

The stochastic process for the infinitely large ensemble of single particles with trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_j$ leads to a differential equation encoding the ensemble average velocities $\vec{\mathrm{v}}, \vec{\mathrm{u}}$ in a wave-function. For the interpretation of a quantum mechanical state $|\psi\rangle$, this implies, that all the information $|\psi\rangle$ carries is about the evolution of average velocities from a statistical ensemble. It does reveal nothing about individual particles. One should mention, that the quantum mechanical operators, measurable operator-eigenvalues and uncertainty relations can be derived from the given formalism, as is fully documented in [15].

5.2 Quantum states in superpositions

Before we can discuss the locality properties of the theory above and the physics behind entanglement in many particle systems, we turn our attention to superpositions of two states in a single particle system. The Schroedinger equation is linear. Therefore, the sum of two solutions $\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r},t)$ and $\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r},t)$ i.e.

$$\Psi(\vec{r},t) \equiv a\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r},t) + b\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r},t) \tag{61}$$

is also a solution of (60). In this case, one would get mixing terms in $\rho(\vec{r},t)$

$$\rho(\vec{r},t) = a^2\psi_\uparrow^2(\vec{r},t) + b^2\psi_\downarrow^2(\vec{r},t) + a^*b\psi_\uparrow^*(\vec{r},t)\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r},t) + b^*a\psi_\downarrow^*(\vec{r},t)\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r},t) \tag{62}$$

and in turn, the equations for (56) would become quite complicated. Accordingly, we need to make a basis change to get simpler equations.

The physical information of (61) is, that for a given particle of the ensemble, we have a probability of a^2 that it belongs to the $\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r},t)$ ensemble and a probability of b^2 to find it in in the $\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r},t)$ system. Since both states are solutions of the same Schroedinger equation, we can write the physical information of this system in the form given below:

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar\frac{\partial\Psi(\vec{r},t)}{\partial t} &= \left(\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t) + \hat{\mathrm{V}}^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r},t)\right)\Psi(\vec{r},t) \\ i\hbar\frac{\partial\left(b\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r},t) + a\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r},t)\right)}{\partial t} &= \left(\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t) + \hat{\mathrm{V}}^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r},t)\right)\left(a\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r},t) + b\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r},t)\right) \qquad (63) \\ &= \begin{cases} i\hbar\frac{\partial a\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r},t)}{\partial t} = \left(\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t) + \hat{\mathrm{V}}^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r},t)\right)a\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r},t) \\ + \\ i\hbar\frac{\partial b\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r},t)}{\partial t} = \left(\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t) + \hat{\mathrm{V}}^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r},t)\right)b\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r},t) \end{cases} \qquad (64) \end{aligned}$$

With basis vectors in Dirac notation defined through $|\psi_\uparrow\rangle \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \equiv |+\rangle$ and $|\psi_\downarrow\rangle \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \equiv |-\rangle$, we get the following coefficients in coordinate representation:

$$c_\uparrow(\vec{r},t) \equiv \langle\psi_\uparrow|\Psi(\vec{r},t)\rangle = a\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r},t) \quad \text{and} \quad c_\downarrow(\vec{r},t) \equiv \langle\psi_\downarrow|\Psi(\vec{r},t)\rangle = b\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r},t)$$

Hence, the overall state vector $|\Psi(\vec{r},t)\rangle$ becomes:

$$|\Psi(\vec{r},t)\rangle = c_\uparrow |\psi_\uparrow\rangle + c_\downarrow |\psi_\downarrow\rangle \tag{65}$$

Now, the probability density can be written without mixing terms:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(\vec{r},t) &= \langle\Psi(\vec{r},t)\,|\Psi(\vec{r},t)\,\rangle \\ &= a^2\psi_\uparrow^*(\vec{r},t)\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r},t) + b^2\psi_\downarrow^*(\vec{r},t)\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r},t) \\ &= a^2\rho_\uparrow(\vec{r},t) + b^2\rho_\downarrow(\vec{r},t)\end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

For a^2 and b^2, it follows from $\int \rho_{\uparrow(\downarrow)}(\vec{r}_1,t)\mathrm{d}^3r = 1$ and $\int \rho(\vec{r},t)\mathrm{d}^3\vec{r} = 1$, that $a^2+b^2=1$.

We can derive the two Schroedinger equations for the states $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ with the same methods as given before. Starting from four Langevin equations with hidden trajectory variables for the ensembles $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$, we are lead to the following differential equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}+\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}\right)+\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}\right)\vec{\nabla}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}+\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}\right)+\nu\Delta\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}+\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}\right) &= \frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}\right)+\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}+\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}\right)\vec{\nabla}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}\right)-\nu\Delta\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}\right) &= \frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}+\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}\right)+\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}\right)\vec{\nabla}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}+\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}\right)+\nu\Delta\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}+\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}\right) &= \frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}\right)+\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}+\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}\right)\vec{\nabla}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}\right)-\nu\Delta\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}\right) &= \frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}
\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

The vectors $\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\uparrow(\downarrow)}, \vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow(\downarrow)}$ denote the ensemble average velocities of the states $\uparrow$ ($\downarrow$). In this notation, the four equations in (67) would define two separate particle systems, with the particles belonging to one ensemble $\uparrow$ or $\downarrow$ for all the time. For a given single particle of a superposed state, there has to be a probability greater than 0 for it to be found in each one of these states. Therefore, the eqs. (67) cannot describe a state in a superposition and we have to modify the derivation.

The two systems are no more separate, if we demand, that the $\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}})$ ensemble is averaged over with the $\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}})$ system. To ensure energy conservation on the average, we are forced to do an interchange procedure, where the slower particles $j_1, j_2, j_3, \ldots$ from the $\mathrm{B}\uparrow$ ($\mathrm{B}\downarrow$) ensemble are interchanged with the same number of faster particles $j_1', j_2', j_3', \ldots$ from the $\mathrm{A}\downarrow$ ($\mathrm{A}\uparrow$) system. This has to be done with as many particles until

$$\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}(\vec{r},t) = \vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{r},t), \quad \vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}(\vec{r},t) = \vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{r},t) \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}(\vec{r},t) = \vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{r},t), \quad \vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}(\vec{r},t) = \vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{r},t) \tag{68}$$

holds. If we add the $\mathrm{A}\uparrow$ and $\mathrm{B}\downarrow$, as well as the $\mathrm{A}\downarrow$ and the $\mathrm{B}\uparrow$ system together, we arrive at two equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}+\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}\right)+\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}\right)+\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}\right)+\nu\Delta\left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}+\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}\right) \\
&\qquad = \frac{1}{m_0}\left(\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}+\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}\right) \\
&\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}+\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}\right)+\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}\right)+\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}\right)+\nu\Delta\left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}+\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}\right) \\
&\qquad = \frac{1}{m_0}\left(\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}+\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

They can be summed together, yielding:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}+\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}+\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}+\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}\right)+\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}\right)+\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}\right) \\
&+\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}\right)+\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}\right)+\nu\Delta\left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}}+\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}}+\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}}+\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}}\right) \\
&\qquad = \frac{2}{m_0}\left(\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}+\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

Both equations in (69) contain A and B as well as $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ ensembles. They describe the average behavior of equations of motion under the same random and external forces. Hence, we have:

$$\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}} = \vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}} \equiv \vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow, \quad \vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{B}} = \vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow^{\mathrm{A}} \equiv \vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}} = \vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}} \equiv \vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow, \quad \vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{B}} = \vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow^{\mathrm{A}} \equiv \vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow \tag{71}$$

With the conditions in (71), we can write $2\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow = \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_\uparrow + \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_\uparrow$ and $2\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow = \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_\downarrow + \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_\downarrow$ as well as $2\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow = \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_\uparrow + \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_\uparrow$ and $2\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow = \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_\downarrow + \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_\downarrow$. Now, eq. (70) becomes:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow + \vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow\right) + \left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow - \vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow\right) + \left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow - \vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow\right) + \nu\Delta\left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow + \vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow\right) = \frac{1}{m_0}\left(\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} + \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}\right) \tag{72}$$

This equation is sum of two separate differential equations for the ensemble averages of the $\uparrow$ and the $\downarrow$ state. It may be written in a form

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\uparrow - \left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow\right) + \nu\Delta\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\uparrow &= \frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} \\ + & \\ \frac{d}{dt}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_\downarrow - \left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow\right) + \nu\Delta\vec{\mathrm{u}}_\downarrow &= \frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} \end{cases} \tag{73}$$

from which the two Schroedinger equations (64) can be derived.

The procedure given above also works with an arbitrary number of states $|\psi_1(\vec{r},t)\rangle$, $|\psi_2(\vec{r},t)\rangle$, ..., $|\psi_{\mathcal{N}}(\vec{r},t)\rangle$ which define a general superposition with weighting factors a_i:

$$|\Psi(\vec{r},t)\rangle \equiv \sum_i^{\mathcal{N}} a_i\,|\psi_i(\vec{r},t)\rangle \tag{74}$$

The weighting factors of these states define different probabilities of a given particle to be found in one particular state. Therefore, the $\mathcal{N}$ ensembles in the corresponding differential equations for the separate states must contain different numbers of particles. The state $|\psi_i(\vec{r},t)\rangle$ has to be computed with an ensemble of Sa_i^2 trajectories $j_1, j_2, j_2, \ldots, j_{Sa_i^2}$. This ensures, that there is a chance of a_i^2 to find the particle in the ensemble associated with $|\psi_i(\vec{r},t)\rangle$.

Furthermore, the interchanging procedure must be defined differently. One has to interchange the trajectories j and j' between the ensembles $\mathrm{B}i, \mathrm{A}k$ with the state numbers $1 \leq i,k \leq \mathcal{N}$. The numbers i,k have to be chosen randomly but with equal probability for each state. The different probabilities of finding a given particle in the separate states $|\psi_i(\vec{r},t)\rangle$, $|\psi_k(\vec{r},t)\rangle$ only arise due to the in-equal size of the ensembles.

After the necessary interchanges have been taken place, one may add the $\mathcal{N}$ differential equations in one step and split them up into separate equations for the $1,2,3\ldots,\mathcal{N}$ systems analogous to (73). We note, that due to the form of (56), nothing about the weighting factors a_i^2 in the probability density appears in $\vec{\mathrm{v}},\vec{\mathrm{u}}$. Therefore, one has to re-introduce this information after one gets from the separated system in eq. (64) to the superposed eq. (63).

5.3 Locality properties of Fritsche's theory with single particle systems

Now, we turn to the locality properties of the stochastic process described above, switching for the moment to a single particle system that is not in a superposed state. We note, that there is no dynamical coupling between different trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_j$ and $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{j'}$ $(j \neq j')$. $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_j$ is an arbitrary force field acting only on the j-trajectory, $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_j$ is required to be a Gaussian distribution independent for each j and the corresponding Langevin equation (50) contains no couplings between different $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_j, \vec{\mathrm{x}}_{j'}$ too. Nevertheless, the time evolution of different trajectories will be correlated. These correlations arise because of the interchanging procedure. It compares the velocities of the j-th. particle at each point $(\vec{r},t)$ with the ensemble averages $\vec{\mathrm{v}}(\vec{r},t)$ from all particles and may change the differential equation of the j-th. in the next time step.

If something happens to a large set of trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{j'}$ at a point $(\vec{r}',t')$, and if this point lies in the past cone of another point $(\vec{r},t)$, some of the the changed trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{j'}$ may arrive at $(\vec{r},t)$. This will influence the ensemble average $\vec{\mathrm{v}}(\vec{r},t)$. The interchanging procedure compares the velocity of a particle with trajectory $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_j$ that arrived at $(\vec{r},t)$ with $\vec{\mathrm{v}}(\vec{r},t)$. Then, it may place the particle in a new differential equation and its trajectory might change to $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{B(A)}}_j$ in the next time-step. Hence, the particle trajectory $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_j$ at $(\vec{r},t)$ will be influenced by what happens at $(\vec{r}',t')$, even if it never went through $(\vec{r}',t')$. This effect is important in double slit experiments, where a particles trajectory going through the first slit is influenced if the second slit is open or not.

It must be emphasized, that this interchanging procedure does not introduce a dynamical coupling between the trajectories. Instead, the comparison of the particles velocity with the ensemble averages is only a statistical model to account for the idea of kinetic energy conservation on the average in a stochastic theory. That there are no dynamical couplings between the particles of the ensemble can be seen experimentally in so called self-interferometry experiments. The typical example is Neutron interferometry [17], where ,,usually, at one time, there is only one neutron in the interferometer, if at all because at that time, the next neutron has not yet been borne and is still contained in the uranium nuclei of the reactor fuel" [18].

Furthermore, a trajectory can only be influenced at $(\vec{r},t)$, if the place $(\vec{r}',t')$, where some intervention was made, lies in the past cone of $(\vec{r},t)$. This implies, that there does not exist any violation of active locality, neither in terms of $\vec{\mathrm{v}}$, $\vec{\mathrm{u}}$ nor in terms of the trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_j^{\mathrm{A(B)}}$. We now want to see, if active locality persists when we consider many particle systems.

5.4 Derivation of the many particle Schroedinger equation

The many particle Schroedinger equation can be derived, if the three dimensional coordinate space of the single particle problem is expanded into a $3\mathrm{N}$ dimensional space for N particles. We start with the Langevin equations of the j-th particle trajectory in the ensemble for an n-th particle state, where $(1 \leq n \leq \mathrm{N})$:

$$\begin{aligned} m_0\ddot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_{jn}^{\mathrm{B}} + \frac{m_0}{\tau}\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_{jn}^{\mathrm{B}} &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}_{jn}^{\mathrm{ext}} + \vec{\mathrm{F}}_{jn}^{\mathrm{Brown}} + \sum_{n'\neq n}^{\mathrm{N}} \vec{\mathrm{F}}_{jn,j'n'}^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{jn},\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{j'n'}) \\ m_0\ddot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_{jn}^{\mathrm{A}} - \frac{m_0}{\tau}\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_{jn}^{\mathrm{A}} &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}_{jn}^{\mathrm{ext}} + \vec{\mathrm{F}}_{jn}^{\mathrm{Brown}} + \sum_{n'\neq n}^{\mathrm{N}} \vec{\mathrm{F}}_{jn,j'n'}^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{jn},\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{j'n'}) \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

In eq. 75, an additional force term $\vec{\mathrm{F}}_{jn,j'n'}^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{jn},\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{j'n'})$, corresponding to inter-particle forces between the particle states n and $n' \neq n$ may be present. From the two Langevin equations in 75, the authors of [15] derive differential equations for the A and B systems, completely analogous to the single particle case:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NB}}+\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{NB}}\right) + \left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NB}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{NB}}\right)\vec{\nabla}^{\mathrm{N}}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NB}}+\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{NB}}\right) + \nu\Delta^{\mathrm{N}}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NB}}+\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{NB}}\right) &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}_{\mathrm{ext}}^{\mathrm{N}} \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NA}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{NA}}\right) + \left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NA}}+\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{NA}}\right)\vec{\nabla}^{\mathrm{N}}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NA}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{NA}}\right) - \nu\Delta^{\mathrm{N}}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NA}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{NA}}\right) &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}_{\mathrm{ext}}^{\mathrm{N}} \end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

Now, the average external force $\vec{\mathrm{F}}_{\mathrm{ext}}^{\mathrm{N}}$ corresponds to a $3\mathrm{N}$ dimensional vector for the different particle states, with m_{0n} as the rest masses of the n-th particle:

$$\vec{\mathrm{F}}_{\mathrm{ext}}^{\mathrm{N}} \equiv \left(\left(\frac{\vec{\mathrm{F}}_1^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_1)}{m_{01}} + \sum_{n'\neq 1}^{\mathrm{N}}\frac{\vec{\mathrm{F}}_{1,n'}^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_{n'},t)}{m_{01}}\right),\ldots,\left(\frac{\vec{\mathrm{F}}_N^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_{\mathrm{N}})}{m_{0N}} + \sum_{n'\neq \mathrm{N}}^{\mathrm{N}}\frac{\vec{\mathrm{F}}_{\mathrm{N},n'}^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_{\mathrm{N}},\vec{r}_{n'},t)}{m_{0\mathrm{N}}}\right)\right)$$

Similarly, the three dimensional ensemble averages $\vec{\mathrm{u}}$ and $\vec{\mathrm{v}}$ are replaced by $3\mathrm{N}$ dimensional entities depending on the $3\mathrm{N}$ coordinates of the various particles $\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}} \equiv (\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,\ldots,\vec{r}_{\mathrm{N}})$:

$$\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NA(B)}} \equiv \left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_1^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(\vec{r}_1,t),,\ldots,\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\mathrm{N}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(\vec{r}_{\mathrm{N}},t)\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{NA(B)}} \equiv \left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_1^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(\vec{r}_1,t),,\ldots,\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\mathrm{N}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(\vec{r}_{\mathrm{N}},t)\right)$$

The components of the ensemble averages $\vec{\mathrm{u}}_n^{\mathrm{N}}\left(\vec{r}_n^{\mathrm{N}},t\right), \vec{\mathrm{v}}_n^{\mathrm{N}}\left(\vec{r}_n^{\mathrm{N}},t\right), (1 \leq n \leq \mathrm{N})$ are computed with the j-th trajectories for each single particle state n separately. Therefore $\vec{\mathrm{v}}_n^{\mathrm{N}}, \vec{\mathrm{u}}_n^{\mathrm{N}}$ depend only on the same n-th component of $\vec{r}_n^{\mathrm{N}}$.

To derive the many particle Schroedinger equation, an interchange between the trajectories corresponding to slow particles from the B ensemble and fast particles from the A ensemble is necessary after each time-step until

$$\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t) = \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NB}}(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t) \tag{77}$$

holds. Here, we have to note an additional subtlety which arises only in multi particle systems. Previously, we have defined an interchange of trajectories such, that trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_j^{\mathrm{A}}, \vec{\mathrm{x}}_{j'}^{\mathrm{B}}$ which obey the Langevin equations of the A and B system at time t, will become $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_j^{\mathrm{B}}, \vec{\mathrm{x}}_{j'}^{\mathrm{A}}$ after the interchange and their behavior is governed by the Langevin equations B and A. In a multi-particle system one has to ensure, that such an

interchange between trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{jn}, \vec{\mathrm{x}}_{j'n'}$ occurs only within the same particle state $n = n'$. Otherwise, one would loose active locality, since the ensembles n and n' might be subjected to different external forces. Then, an interchange of trajectories between different states n, n' would couple the separate particle states, even if no inter-particle forces are present. Fortunately, since (77) is defined for each state n separately, the interchange procedure can well be confined within each single particle state only.

Now, one can compute the arithmetic mean from the two differential equations in (76) and gets, analogous to the single particle case an equation:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}} - \left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}}\vec{\nabla}^{\mathrm{N}}\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}}\right) + \nu\Delta^{\mathrm{N}}\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}} = \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\mathrm{ext}}. \tag{78}$$

From (78), the many particle Schroedinger equation

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\Psi\left(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t\right)}{\partial t} = \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\mathrm{N}} -\frac{\hbar^2\left(\vec{\nabla}^n\right)^2}{2m_{0n}} + \hat{\mathrm{V}}_{\mathrm{ext}}\left(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t\right)\right)\Psi\left(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t\right) \tag{79}$$

can be derived, similar to the single particle case before. Here,

$$\hat{\mathrm{V}}_{\mathrm{ext}}\left(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t\right) \equiv \sum_{n=1}^{\mathrm{N}}\hat{\mathrm{V}}_{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_n) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n,n'=1,n\neq n'}^{\mathrm{N}}\hat{\mathrm{V}}_{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_n,\vec{r}_{n'}) \tag{80}$$

is the external potential which might contain interparticle couplings $V_{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_n,\vec{r}_{n'}) \equiv \vec{\nabla}^{(n,n')}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_{n,n'}(\vec{r}_n,\vec{r}_{n'},t)$, additionally to single particle forces $\hat{\mathrm{V}}_{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_n) \equiv \vec{\nabla}^n\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_n(\vec{r}_n)$.

5.5 Locality properties of Fritsche's theory with many particle systems

We now assume, that terms like $V_{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_n,\vec{r}_{n'})$ are absent. To see that our theory is actively local, we note that with the absence of inter-particle forces, there are no terms interconnecting different trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{jn}, \vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j'n'}$, where $n' \neq n$ denote different particle states. Neither the Gaussian force (51) nor the Langevin equations (75) without inter-particle forces contain such a coupling. This remains true after the formation of the ensemble averages $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}}_n(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}}_n,t), \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}}_n(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}}_n,t)$ since they are computed with the $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{jn}$ trajectories for each single particle state n separately.

The decision, if a trajectory $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{jn}$ changes its ensemble in the interchanging procedure relies only on the jn-th. particles' velocity $\left|\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_{jn}\right|$ and the ensemble average $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}}_n(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}}_n,t)$ of its state n. Therefore, trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{jn}$ are never coupled in any way to the trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{j'n'}$ of other particle states $n' \neq n$.

Even if the ensemble average $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}}_n(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}}_n,t)$ of a single particle may depend on j different sample trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_j$, as long as they lie in the past cone of $\vec{r}$, such a dependence does not exist between $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}}_n(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}}_n,t)$ and the trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{jn'}$ from other states $n' \neq n$ in the many particle system.

5.6 Entangled states in Fritsche's theory

That there does not exist any dynamical coupling between different states of a many particle system doesn't imply, that correlations between them are forbidden. In section 8, we will introduce further conditions on the Gaussian distributed Brownian force $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{jn}$ in a completely local framework. These conditions will be such, that under certain circumstances, the trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{jn}$ change their ensemble from A to B simultaneously with the trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{jn'}$ of another state $n' \neq n$. Then, correlations between the separate particle ensembles, and hence their single particle wave-functions will emerge. The resulting many particle wave-functions are commonly called entangled states:

$$|\Psi(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|\psi_1(\vec{r}_1,t)\rangle \otimes |\psi_2(\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle - |\psi_2(\vec{r}_1,t)\rangle \otimes |\psi_1(\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle\right) \tag{81}$$

Such states were observed in massive fermionic systems for the first time in neutral B-Mesons [19]. The overall state vector $|\Psi(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle$ is an element in the product Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \equiv \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ with $|\psi(\vec{r}_1,t)\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $|\psi(\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2$ denoting the single particle solutions. $|\Psi(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle$ is a superposition of the two

states $|\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle \equiv |\psi_1(\vec{r}_1,t)\rangle \otimes |\psi_2(\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle$ and $|\chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle \equiv |\psi_2(\vec{r}_1,t)\rangle \otimes |\psi_1(\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle$. Thereby, the corresponding multi-particle Schroedinger equation can be written analogous to (64) as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{i\hbar\partial\Psi(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)}{\partial t} &= \hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\Psi(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) && (82)\\
&= \frac{i\hbar}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{\partial\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)}{\partial t} - \frac{i\hbar}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{\partial\chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)}{\partial t} && (83)\\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) && (84)\\
&= \begin{cases} \frac{i\hbar}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{\partial\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) \\ - \\ \frac{i\hbar}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{\partial\chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) \end{cases} && (85)
\end{aligned}$$

The system consists of two ensembles $\vec{r}_1$ and $\vec{r}_2$, the particles of which can be in different states $|\psi_1(\vec{r}_1)\rangle$ or $|\psi_2(\vec{r}_1)\rangle$ for the $\vec{r}_1$ ensemble and $|\psi_1(\vec{r}_2)\rangle$ or $|\psi_2(\vec{r}_2)\rangle$ for the $\vec{r}_2$ ensemble. To describe the dynamics of the $\vec{r}_1$ particles, the A1(B1) system of $|\psi_1(\vec{r}_1)\rangle$ must be averaged with the B2(A2) ensemble of $|\psi_2(\vec{r}_1)\rangle$ and the same has to be done with the $\vec{r}_2$ particles. During this procedure, one has to ensure that each pair of particle trajectories for the $\vec{r}_1$ and $\vec{r}_2$ system will change its state simultaneously. We will show in the context with Bohms EPR experiment, how this can be achieved, even if the trajectories of the $\vec{r}_1$ and $\vec{r}_2$ ensembles are independently modeled.

For now, we only note, that without interparticle-forces, it is in fact a requirement for the particle trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{j1}$ and $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{j2}$ not to be interconnected in any way. This may also be seen with the following example by Edward Nelson [7]: If one induces an external measurement process on the n-th particle of a multi-particle system, one may get information about the hidden variable $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{jn}$. The measurement device may change $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{jn}$ in a way, that correlations with all the other particle trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{j'n'}$, where $n' \neq n$ are lost. Since the different particle systems are uncoupled, an interaction happening on the n-th. particle ensemble can in no way influence the properties of the particles in the n' system. Let $\mathcal{H} \equiv \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ be the product Hilbert space above, with a Hamiltonian

$$\hat{\mathrm{H}} \equiv \hat{\mathrm{H}}_1 \otimes 1_2 + 1_1 \otimes \hat{\mathrm{H}}_2, \tag{86}$$

where $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2$. The time evolution for any observable $\hat{\mathrm{A}}_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1$ in the Heisenberg picture

$$\hat{\mathrm{A}}_{\hat{\mathrm{H}}}(t) \equiv e^{it\hat{\mathrm{H}}}\hat{\mathrm{A}}_1 e^{-it\hat{\mathrm{H}}} = e^{it\hat{\mathrm{H}}_1}\hat{\mathrm{A}}_1 e^{-it\hat{\mathrm{H}}_1} \otimes 1_2 \tag{87}$$

is completely independent of $\mathcal{H}_2$, even if $|\Psi(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ is described by an entangled state. As Nelson put it: „no matter how systems may be correlated, there is no way of telling, what [external] forces the second system is being subjected to, as long as they are not dynamically coupled."

In this context, we mention that Nelson's original theory could not reproduce the example above [7]. He identified $\vec{\mathrm{v}}(\vec{r},t)$ and $\vec{\mathrm{u}}(\vec{r},t)$ not as average velocities of an ensemble, but as real particle properties. With this assertion, the splitting of the many particle Schroedinger equation in (85) was not possible, as was any sort of interchanging procedure between particles in the A1(B1) and B2(A2) ensemble. Accordingly, active locality was lost in Nelson's original formulation and the same problems occurred as in Bohmian mechanics. There, it is well known that the derivation of the many particle Schroedinger equation is only possible, if a highly non-trivial dependency between the „particle velocities" has to be introduced, without any physical foundation. Interestingly, Nelson himself has shown recently [20], that $\vec{\mathrm{v}}(\vec{r},t), \vec{\mathrm{u}}(\vec{r},t)$ cannot correspond to properties of individual particles, since this would lead to measurable differences between his original theory and ordinary quantum mechanics.

6 Spin in a Fritsche-like hidden variable theory

6.1 Simple estimations

Nelson's derivation of the Schroedinger equation was quickly extended to include particle spin, but without proper physical interpretation [21]. By the time, more physically motivated derivations of the Pauli equation were developed. One by Faris [22, 23], and another one by the author of the modification of Nelson's

stochastic mechanics discussed above [24]. Unfortunately, these frameworks did either violate active locality, or they did not contain any mechanism which would change a particles spin state after its emission. Thereby, none of these theories led to a violation of deterministic passive locality only. Here, we propose a theory of spinning particles providing such a mechanism.

Beginning with an example of [24], we try to interpret the spin of a particle as a rotation around a chosen axis. We let the particle rotate around an axis $\vec{r}_0$ under energy fluctuations $\Delta E \Delta t \approx \hbar/2$. For the rotational energy, we have from classical mechanics $E = \frac{\Theta}{2}\omega_0^2$. The inertial tensor is given by $\Theta = m_0 r^2$ with a distance r from the chosen axis. The angular velocity is $\omega_0 = \frac{2\pi}{T}$ and T is the time of a complete rotation. If we identify Δt with T and ΔE with E, we may write

$$\Delta E \Delta t = \frac{1}{2} m_0 r \cdot r \frac{2\pi}{T} \frac{2\pi}{T} T = m_0 v r \pi = \pi s \approx \hbar/2. \tag{88}$$

Here, $v = \frac{2\pi r}{T}$ is the particle's velocity and

$$s = m_0 v r \approx \frac{\hbar}{2\pi} \tag{89}$$

defines its angular momentum. Apparently, s is independent of the particle's mass and the radius of the rotation. The arguments above were only estimations. For later, it will be useful if we set the magnitude of the average angular momentum of spin to $s = \hbar/2$. From the time dependent Schroedinger equation, one can derive the so called Ehrenfest theorem $\frac{d}{dt}\left\langle \hat{\vec{\mathrm{v}}} \right\rangle = \left\langle \vec{\mathrm{F}} \right\rangle$. This equation implies for the angular momentum operator $\hat{\vec{\mathrm{L}}} = \vec{r} \times m_0 \hat{\vec{\mathrm{v}}}$, that $\hat{\vec{\mathrm{L}}}$ may not vanish in the case of $\hbar \to 0$. Since the so called spin should go to zero in the classical limit, s must be independent of $\hat{\vec{\mathrm{L}}}$ and we must expand our description.

6.2 The Stern-Gerlach effect

We assume the random forces to bring the particles in a rotational motion. Their rotation can be in the left direction denoted by $\uparrow$, or in the right direction related to the chosen axis denoted by $\downarrow$. With the additional spin directions, we get four Langevin equations for the particles in the A and B systems defined through $\mathrm{A}\uparrow$, $\mathrm{A}\downarrow$, $\mathrm{B}\uparrow$, $\mathrm{B}\downarrow$:

$$\begin{aligned}
m_0 \ddot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow j} + \frac{m_0}{\tau} \dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow j} &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_j + \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j\uparrow} \\
m_0 \ddot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow j} - \frac{m_0}{\tau} \dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow j} &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_j + \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j\uparrow} \\
m_0 \ddot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow j} + \frac{m_0}{\tau} \dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow j} &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_j + \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j\downarrow} \\
m_0 \ddot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow j} - \frac{m_0}{\tau} \dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow j} &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_j + \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j\downarrow}
\end{aligned} \tag{90}$$

With these equations, after some computations, we might arrive at four differential equations similar to (67) in section 5. For free particles which are not specially prepared, the two spin states occur in a superposition of $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ states. As explained in section 5, the interpretation of such a superposition is, that a given particle of the superposed system must have a non-vanishing probability to be found in each one of the component states. Therefore, we have to interchange trajectories between the $\mathrm{A}\uparrow$ ($\mathrm{A}\downarrow$) and $\mathrm{B}\downarrow$ ($\mathrm{B}\uparrow$) ensemble. Afterwards, the following conditions hold

$$\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow} = \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow}, \qquad \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow} = \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow} \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow} = \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow}, \qquad \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow} = \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow} \tag{91}$$

and we get two differential equations analogous to (69).

Here we note, that the interchange of trajectories between different spin states only takes place, if the external forces on the $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ systems are equal: $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_{j\uparrow} = \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_{j\downarrow} = \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_{j}$. The interchanging procedure is only a model for the energy-restoring ability of the fluctuations from the vacuum. If the external forces would induce a higher potential energy difference between the $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ ensembles than the energy fluctuations could restore (what actually happens in a Stern-Gerlach magnet), one would be left up with two separate systems of particles which would not change their spin state anymore. Then, the interchange in each of the separate spin systems would happen between the differential equations for the $\mathrm{A}\uparrow$ and $\mathrm{B}\uparrow$ as well as the $\mathrm{A}\downarrow$ and $\mathrm{B}\downarrow$ ensembles separately.

As long as both $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ systems are prepared under equal external forces, the trajectory interchange occurs between the different $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ states. Since the dynamics of the two ensembles is equal, we have:

$$\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow} = \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow} \equiv \vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\uparrow}, \qquad \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow} = \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow} \equiv \vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\downarrow} \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow} = \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow} \equiv \vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow}, \qquad \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow} = \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow} \equiv \vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\downarrow} \ . \tag{92}$$

As in (72) and (73) of section 5, we can add the two remaining differential equations from (69) to a sum for the $\uparrow$ and for the $\downarrow$ system. Finally, we re-separate the parts of this equation into two Schroedinger equations for the wave-functions of $\psi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t)$ and $\psi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r},t)$.

For a single particle, the overall effect of this interchanging procedure is, that it does as often belong to the $\uparrow$ state as to the $\downarrow$ state. A nice drawing of this process is given by Penrose for Dirac particles in [28]. It is this effect, whereby the possibility for a violation of deterministic passive locality does arise.

Similar to (66), we are now in a position to describe the behavior of the overall system by decomposing the probability density $\rho(\vec{r},t)$ as

$$\rho(\vec{r},t) = a^2\rho_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t) + b^2\rho_{\downarrow}(\vec{r},t). \tag{93}$$

And like in (65), we can write the overall quantum state $|\Psi(\vec{r},t)\rangle$ with

$$|\Psi(\vec{r},t)\rangle \equiv \begin{pmatrix} a\psi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t) \\ b\psi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r},t) \end{pmatrix} = a\psi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t)\,|+\rangle + b\psi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r},t)\,|-\rangle\,. \tag{94}$$

From here on, we can follow closely [24] to derive the rest of the Pauli equation and the spin operators. If an external magnetic field is applied in the direction of our chosen axis, the energy of $\psi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t)$ decreases with magnitude $\mu_B B$, whereas the energy of $\psi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r},t)$ increases by the same magnitude. The constant μ_B is called Bohr magneton

$$\mu_B \equiv \frac{e\hbar}{2m_0}. \tag{95}$$

It emerges, since the relativistic Dirac equation is, in contrast to the Pauli equation to be derived here, linear in all its derivatives. The necessity of this linearity, which is absent in the non-relativistic theory, changes the interaction of angular momentum with magnetic fields (If one does linearize the Schroedinger equation in a similar manner as it is typically done for Dirac's equation, one gets the same value for μ_B [25]).

Under a magnetic field in z direction, we have for the magnetic energy densities

$$\mu(\vec{r},t)_{\uparrow} \equiv -\mu_B B_z(\vec{r},t)\,|a|^2\,\psi^*_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t)\psi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t) \tag{96}$$

and

$$\mu(\vec{r},t)_{\downarrow} \equiv \mu_B B_z(\vec{r},t)\,|b|^2\,\psi^*_{\downarrow}(\vec{r},t)\psi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r},t). \tag{97}$$

With their sum

$$\mu(\vec{r},t) \equiv \mu_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t) + \mu_{\downarrow}(\vec{r},t) \tag{98}$$

The total magnetic energy density $\mu(\vec{r},t)$ can be cast as

$$\mu(\vec{r},t) = -\Psi^{+}(\vec{r},t)\mu_B\mathbf{B}\Psi(\vec{r},t), \tag{99}$$

where $\mathbf{B}$ is the matrix

$$\mathbf{B} \equiv B_z(\vec{r},t)\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{100}$$

The different coupling of the systems $\psi_{\uparrow(\downarrow)}(\vec{r},t)$ to magnetic fields gives raise to the Stern-Gerlach effect [26]. If atoms from an incident beam with equally distributed magnetic energy density enter a strong magnet, the two spin systems are subjected to different forces $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_{j\uparrow} \neq \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_{j\downarrow}$. Accordingly, they get deflected in opposite directions. Due to active locality, the interchanging procedure can happen only between trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j\uparrow/\downarrow}$, if they are at the same point $\vec{r}$ at a given time. The Stern-Gerlach magnet separates the trajectories which belong to different spin states spatially. Then, the interchanging procedure can take place

between trajectories of the same spin ensemble only. This is observed in so called double Stern-Gerlach experiments [27]. If one would place a second Stern-Gerlach magnet behind the first and let it have the same directional orientation, the parts of the beam which were previously separated would not split up again. In this way, the particle ensembles of a beam can be prepared to contain one spin state only. The repeated Stern-Gerlach experiment demonstrates both the locality and the non-markovian property of the stochastic process involved. The stochastic differential equation that obeys a particle at a given time depends, due to the comparison with the ensemble averages and the interchanging procedure, on what has happened to the ensembles before. Therefore, the stochastic process acting on a single particle has a kind of memory about the past interacions between the magnets and the ensemble the individual particle is placed in. Nevertheless, the stochastic process is a local one. After the two spin systems are spatially separated, they do not influence each other anymore.

6.3 The Pauli equation

In [15], the Schroedinger equation under a magnetic field with its Hamiltonian

$$\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t) \equiv \frac{\left(i\hbar\vec{\nabla} - e\hat{\vec{\mathrm{A}}}\left(\vec{r},t\right)\right)^2}{2m_0} + \hat{\mathrm{V}}^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r},t) \tag{101}$$

was derived from a Brownian motion process. If the two rotating systems undergo this process, their energy density maybe written as superposition:

$$\psi_{\uparrow}^{*}(\vec{r},t)\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t)\psi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t) + \psi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r},t)\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t)\psi_{\downarrow}^{*}(\vec{r},t) = \Psi^{+}(\vec{r},t)\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t)\Psi(\vec{r},t) \tag{102}$$

To include the energy from the interaction of the spin rotation with a magnetic field, we must add $\mu(\vec{r},t)$ to get the Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t) - \mu_B\mathbf{B}(\vec{r},t)$. We note, that the effect of $\mu_B\mathbf{B}(\vec{r},t)$ on each ensemble is that of a potential. Since time dependent Schroedinger equation was derived under an arbitrary external potential, we can write a first equation for a spinning particle:

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\Psi(\vec{r},t)}{\partial t} = \left(\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t) - \mu_B\mathbf{B}(\vec{r},t)\right)\Psi(\vec{r},t) \tag{103}$$

If the magnetic field $\vec{B}$ has another direction as the rotating axis of the spinning particles, one must change its coordinate system. This can be done via linear transformations $\vec{B}' \equiv \mathbf{Q}\vec{B}$. $\mathbf{Q}$ defines a rotation matrix consisting of three independent rotations around Euler angles ψ, ϕ, θ. It is known from classical mechanics ([29]) that a general rotation matrix $\mathbf{Q}$ can be written as

$$\mathbf{Q} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} e^{\frac{i}{2}(\psi+\phi)}cos(\theta/2) & ie^{\frac{i}{2}(\psi-\phi)}sin(\theta/2) \\ ie^{-\frac{i}{2}(\psi-\phi)}sin(\theta/2) & e^{-\frac{i}{2}(\psi+\phi)}cos(\theta/2) \end{pmatrix} \tag{104}$$

and we observe, that $\mathbf{Q}$ is unitary. If we write the vector of the magnetic field $\vec{B}$ in matrix form as

$$\mathbf{B} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} B_z & B_x - iB_y \\ B_x + iB_y & -B_z \end{pmatrix} \tag{105}$$

we get, using (104), the magnetic field $\vec{B}$ in the rotated coordinate system with a new axis z':

$$\mathbf{B}' = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{Q}^{+} = \begin{pmatrix} B_{z'} & B_x - iB_y \\ B_x + iB_y & -B_{z'} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{106}$$

The matrix $\mathbf{B}$ can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{B} = B_x\sigma_{\mathbf{x}} + B_y\sigma_{\mathbf{y}} + B_z\sigma_{\mathbf{z}}, \tag{107}$$

where $\sigma_{\mathbf{x}}, \sigma_{\mathbf{y}}, \sigma_{\mathbf{z}}$ are the so called Pauli matrices. Writing the Pauli matrices as a vector $\vec{\sigma} \equiv (\sigma_{\mathbf{x}}, \sigma_{\mathbf{y}}, \sigma_{\mathbf{z}})$ we have:

$$\mathbf{B} = \vec{B}\vec{\sigma} \tag{108}$$

Now we must derive, how $\Psi(\vec{r},t)$ changes, if the coordinate system of the magnetic field $\mathbf{B}$ is rotated into

$$\mathbf{B}' = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{Q}^{+}. \tag{109}$$

The energy density does not change in a rotation:

$$u(\vec{r},t) = u'(\vec{r},t). \tag{110}$$

If we set

$$\Psi'(\vec{r},t) \equiv \mathbf{Q}\Psi(\vec{r},t) \tag{111}$$

we get the energy density in the rotated system

$$u'(\vec{r},t) = \Psi^{+}(\vec{r},t)\mathbf{Q}^{+}\mathbf{B}'\mathbf{Q}\Psi(\vec{r},t). \tag{112}$$

This is the same as $u(\vec{r},t)$, if we assume that

$$\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{Q}^{+}\mathbf{B}'\mathbf{Q}. \tag{113}$$

Since $\mathbf{Q}$ is unitary, the following identity holds:

$$\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{Q}^{+} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^{+}\mathbf{B}'\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^{+} = \mathbf{B}' \tag{114}$$

It exactly defines the transformation law of $\mathbf{B}$ in (109). Finally, with (113), (107) and the right hand side of (112), we can write the time dependent Pauli equation for a spinning particle :

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\Psi(\vec{r},t)}{\partial t} = \left(\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t) - \mu_B\vec{B}(\vec{r},t)\vec{\sigma}\right)\psi(\vec{r},t) \tag{115}$$

For the description of the spin direction in a magnetic field, only the Euler angles θ and ϕ are necessary and one can select $\psi \equiv -\pi/2$ without loss of generalization. The projection of the rotated unit vector $\vec{e}'_x$ in the x/y plane of the original, non-rotated coordinate system encloses an angle φ with the x-axis. This angle is related to the Euler angle ϕ by $\phi \equiv \varphi + \pi/2$. Then, with (111) and (104), the components $\psi'_{\uparrow(\downarrow)}(\vec{r},t)$ of the spinor (94) in a coordinate system which is rotated relative to $\vec{B}$ have the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi'_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t) &= \psi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t)\left(e^{i\varphi/2}cos(\theta/2)\,|+\rangle - e^{i\varphi/2}sin(\theta/2)\,|-\rangle\right) \\
\psi'_{\downarrow}(\vec{r},t) &= \psi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r},t)\left(e^{-i\varphi/2}sin(\theta/2)\,|-\rangle + e^{-i\varphi/2}cos(\theta/2)\,|+\rangle\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{116}$$

A more common situation is, that the magnetic field of a Stern-Gerlach apparatus lies in the rotated coordinate system $\vec{B}'$ and one wants to know the spinor $\Psi(\vec{r},t) = \mathbf{Q}^{+}\Psi'(\vec{r},t)$. Applying (104) yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t) &= \psi'_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t)\left(e^{-i\varphi/2}cos(\theta/2)\,|+\rangle + e^{i\varphi/2}sin(\theta/2)\,|-\rangle\right) \\
\psi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r},t) &= \psi'_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t)\left(-e^{-i\varphi/2}sin(\theta/2)\,|-\rangle + e^{i\varphi/2}cos(\theta/2)\,|+\rangle\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{117}$$

6.4 The spin operator

Finally, we try to derive the so called spin-operator. Both particle ensembles each have an average spin angular momentum of $\pm\hbar/2$. Therefore, the overall expectation value of spin in the z direction can be written as weighed sum

$$\langle S_z\rangle \equiv \frac{\hbar}{2}\int\left(|a|^2\,|\psi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t)|^2 - |b|^2\,|\psi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r},t)|^2\right)\mathrm{d}^3r. \tag{118}$$

Analogous to the matrix $\mathbf{B}$, we can simplify this expression with a matrix

$$\mathbf{S}_z \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{119}$$

to the form

$$\langle S_z \rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2} \int \psi^+(\vec{r},t) \mathbf{S}_z \psi(\vec{r},t) \mathrm{d}^3 r. \tag{120}$$

For the spin in the z' direction of an arbitrary rotated coordinate system, we have $\mathbf{S}_{z'} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{S}_z\mathbf{Q}^+$ or $\mathbf{S}_{z'} = \frac{\hbar}{2}\vec{a}\vec{\sigma}$. Here, the vector valued entity $\vec{a}$ is an unit vector $\vec{a} \equiv (cos(\varphi)sin(\theta), sin(\varphi)sin(\vartheta), cos(\vartheta))$ in spherical coordinates. It defines the z' direction of the new coordinate system in which the spin is measured. With this notation, the so called spin operator is defined as

$$\hat{\vec{\mathbf{S}}} \equiv \frac{\hbar}{2}\vec{\sigma} \tag{121}$$

where $\mathbf{S}_{z'} = \vec{a}\hat{\vec{\mathbf{S}}}$. Lastly, the average value $\langle S_{z'} \rangle$ becomes

$$\langle S_{z'} \rangle = \int \psi^+(\vec{r},t) \mathbf{S}_{z'} \psi(\vec{r},t) \mathrm{d}^3 r = \vec{a} \left\langle \vec{\mathbf{S}} \right\rangle \tag{122}$$

with

$$\left\langle \vec{\mathbf{S}} \right\rangle = \int \psi^+(\vec{r},t) \hat{\vec{\mathbf{S}}} \psi(\vec{r},t) \mathrm{d}^3 r. \tag{123}$$

7 Entangled systems with spin

7.1 Transformation of the entangled state into equations of motion

As in the case of the many particle Schroedinger equation, we can extend the coordinate space to derive the N particle Pauli equation. From now on, we will assume that there are no forces which interconnect the different particle systems and that external forces are equal for them. We start our discussion with a state of two entangled particle ensembles having opposite spin

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) &\equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\psi(\vec{r}_1,t) \left|-\right\rangle \otimes \psi(\vec{r}_2,t) \left|+\right\rangle - \psi(\vec{r}_1,t) \left|+\right\rangle \otimes \psi(\vec{r}_2,t) \left|-\right\rangle \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) - \chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) \right), \end{aligned} \tag{124}$$

where we have defined

$$\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) \equiv \psi(\vec{r}_1,t) \left|-\right\rangle \otimes \psi(\vec{r}_2,t) \left|+\right\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) \equiv \psi(\vec{r}_1,t) \left|+\right\rangle \otimes \psi(\vec{r}_2,t) \left|-\right\rangle .$$

Analogous to (85), the two particle Pauli equation can be written with these definitions as:

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Psi(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) &= \hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\Psi(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} i\hbar \frac{\partial \chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2)}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2) \\ - \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} i\hbar \frac{\partial \chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2)}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2) \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{125}$$

The overall probability density for the two particle ensembles in this system is

$$\rho(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) \equiv \frac{1}{2}\rho_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) + \frac{1}{2}\rho_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) \tag{126}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) &\equiv \chi_1^+(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) \\ &= \psi^*(\vec{r}_1,t)\psi(\vec{r}_1,t) \left\langle - \right| \left. - \right\rangle \otimes \psi^*(\vec{r}_2,t)\psi(\vec{r}_2,t) \left\langle + \right| \left. + \right\rangle \\ &= \rho_{1\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1,t) \otimes \rho_{1\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2,t) \end{aligned} \tag{127}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) &\equiv \chi_2^+(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\\ &= \psi^*(\vec{r}_1,t)\psi(\vec{r}_1,t)\left\langle+|+\right\rangle\otimes\psi^*(\vec{r}_2,t)\psi(\vec{r}_2,t)\left\langle-|-\right\rangle\\ &= \rho_{2\uparrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)\otimes\rho_{2\downarrow}(\vec{r}_2,t).\end{aligned} \tag{128}$$

The expression for the osmotic velocity of a many particle system is defined by

$$\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}}(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t)\equiv-\frac{\hbar}{2m_0}\vec{\nabla}^{\mathrm{N}}ln\left(\rho(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t)/\rho_0\right). \tag{129}$$

After the tensor product of the two particle probability density $\rho_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)$ is converted by the logarithm laws into a sum of expressions, we can write for $\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\chi 1}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\chi 1}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) &= -\frac{\hbar}{2m_0}\vec{\nabla}^{\mathrm{N}}\left(ln\left(\left(\rho_{1\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)\right)_1/\rho_0\right)+ln\left(\left(\rho_{1\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2,t)\right)_2/\rho_0\right)\right)\\ &= \begin{pmatrix}-\frac{\hbar}{2m_0}\vec{\nabla}ln\left(\left(\rho_{1\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)\right)_1/\rho_0\right)\\ -\frac{\hbar}{2m_0}\vec{\nabla}ln\left(\left(\rho_{1\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2,t)\right)_2/\rho_0\right)\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1)\\ \vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2)\end{pmatrix}\equiv\begin{pmatrix}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{1\downarrow}\\ \vec{\mathrm{u}}_{2\uparrow}\end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned} \tag{130}$$

Similarly, $\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\chi 2}$ in the Pauli equation for $\chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)$ is of the form $\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\chi 2}(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t)\equiv\begin{pmatrix}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{1\uparrow}\\ \vec{\mathrm{u}}_{2\downarrow}\end{pmatrix}$. The definition of the average velocity $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}}\left(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t\right)$ for a many particle ensemble is

$$\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}}\left(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t\right)\equiv\frac{\hbar}{m_0}\vec{\nabla}^{\mathrm{N}}\varphi(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t) \tag{131}$$

where $\varphi(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t)$ is the phase of the many particle wave-function

$$\Psi(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t)\equiv\pm\sqrt{\rho(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}})}e^{i\varphi(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}})}. \tag{132}$$

Writing $\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)$ in the form of (132)

$$\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)=\sqrt{\rho_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)}e^{i\varphi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1)}\otimes\sqrt{\rho_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2,t)}e^{i\varphi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2)}, \tag{133}$$

we can identify the overall phase of $\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)$ as

$$\varphi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)=\varphi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)+\varphi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2,t). \tag{134}$$

This yields for $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\chi 1}$:

$$\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\chi 1}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)=\frac{\hbar}{m_0}\vec{\nabla}^{\mathrm{N}}\varphi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)=\begin{pmatrix}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1)\\ \vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2)\end{pmatrix}\equiv\begin{pmatrix}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{1\downarrow}\\ \vec{\mathrm{v}}_{2\uparrow}\end{pmatrix} \tag{135}$$

For $\chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)$, we get $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\chi 2}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\equiv\begin{pmatrix}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{1\uparrow}\\ \vec{\mathrm{v}}_{2\downarrow}\end{pmatrix}$ in completely the same way.

The expressions for $\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\chi 1},\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\chi 2},\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\chi 1},\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\chi 2}$ imply, that the Pauli equation (125) for the entangled state can be decomposed into 2 two component differential equations:

$$\begin{cases}\begin{pmatrix}\frac{d}{dt}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{1\downarrow}-\left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{1\downarrow}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{1\downarrow}\right)+\nu\Delta\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{1\downarrow}=\frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_1\\ \frac{d}{dt}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{2\uparrow}-\left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{2\uparrow}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{2\uparrow}\right)+\nu\Delta\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{2\uparrow}=\frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_2\end{pmatrix}\\ \begin{pmatrix}\frac{d}{dt}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{1\uparrow}-\left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{1\uparrow}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{1\uparrow}\right)+\nu\Delta\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{1\uparrow}=\frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_1\\ \frac{d}{dt}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{2\downarrow}-\left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{2\downarrow}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{2\downarrow}\right)+\nu\Delta\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{2\downarrow}=\frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_2\end{pmatrix}\end{cases} \tag{136}$$

where $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_2=\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_1$. These four equations are equivalent to (125), but they contain the ensemble averages $\vec{\mathrm{u}}$ and $\vec{\mathrm{v}}$ of each particle system directly. The equations (136) can be similarly derived as the two equations in (73) but for the $\vec{r}_1$ and $\vec{r}_2$ particle ensemble separately.

7.2 How the correlations of entangled states emerge in the local hidden variable theory

The source of the particle pairs in the EPR experiment produces particles with a defined spin direction. However, it is not able to prepare the spin states in separate beams like a Stern-Gerlach magnet because it does not divide the two spin ensembles spatially. Hence, the spin state of the particle ensemble produced is a superposition of an $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ state. As described in section 7, the individual particles in such a system have to undergo an interchanging procedure between the A $\uparrow$ and B $\downarrow$ or the B $\uparrow$ and A $\downarrow$ ensembles. The trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{\uparrow/\downarrow 1jt}$ of the $\vec{r}_1$ particles have to change their $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{1\downarrow}$ ($\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{1\uparrow}$) and $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{1\uparrow}$ ($\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{1\downarrow}$) system during their flight and an analogous procedure has to happen with the $\vec{r}_2$ trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{\uparrow/\downarrow 2jt}$ between $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{2\downarrow}$ ($\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{2\uparrow}$) and $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{2\uparrow}$ ($\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{2\downarrow}$).

We note that it is possible here, to threat the $\vec{r}_1$ and $\vec{r}_2$ states completely separate because they represent uncoupled statistical ensembles. They may even be spatially separated, in a way that there is no contact between them. A measurement on one particle ensemble, say $\vec{r}_1$, would change the external force $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_1$. Then, the equations governing the $\vec{r}_1$ system would be different from the equations for $\vec{r}_2$ and correlations in (136) between both ensembles would be lost. Because the equations for the $\vec{r}_2$ system are not be changed by something that happens in the $\vec{r}_1$ system, the particles in the $\vec{r}_2$ ensemble are not affected by measurements happening with $\vec{r}_1$ particles.

To discuss the correlations in entangled states, we write the time dependent spin trajectory of the j-th particle in the $\vec{r}_{1(2)}$ particle system as stochastic process $\phi_{1(2)jt_{\vec{\mu}}}$ which can take values $\{\uparrow,\downarrow\}$. If one can ensure that

$$\phi_{1jt_{\vec{\mu}}} \neq \phi_{2jt_{\vec{\mu}}} \tag{137}$$

for all times t, one has exact anti-correlations between the spins of the j-th particle pair during its flight. It is this property, that gives raise to the form of (124), describing two paired systems of infinitely many particle trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{1(2)jt}$, where the spins of the particles in each j-th. pair are always opposite and which ensemble average velocities obey the two particle Pauli equation.

In an EPR experiment, the two particles start having opposite spin and the same initial speed due to momentum conservation. Therefore, at time $t = 0$ they will be placed in the same A(B) ensemble, but in the opposite spin system. During the flight of the particles to the detectors at later times $t > 0$, the trajectory interchange has to be done such, that if a particle changes its A(B) ensemble, its spin state has to change to the opposite value at the same time. Similarly, if a particle changes its spin, its A(B) ensemble must change also. Transitions $\{\mathrm{B}\uparrow\} \rightarrow \{\mathrm{A}\uparrow\}$, $\{\mathrm{B}\downarrow\} \rightarrow \{\mathrm{A}\downarrow\}$, $\{\mathrm{A}\uparrow\} \rightarrow \{\mathrm{A}\downarrow\}$ or $\{\mathrm{B}\uparrow\} \rightarrow \{\mathrm{B}\downarrow\}$ are not allowed, since then, the particle affected would not be described any more by a superposition of an $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ state, where energy converation on the average holds.

The particles are interchanged from $\{\mathrm{A}\uparrow\}$ ($\{\mathrm{A}\downarrow\}$) to $\{\mathrm{B}\downarrow\}$ ($\{\mathrm{B}\uparrow\}$) if they are moving too fast in the A system. Similarly the particles are changed from $\{\mathrm{B}\uparrow\}$ ($\{\mathrm{B}\downarrow\}$) to $\{\mathrm{A}\downarrow\}$ ($\{\mathrm{A}\uparrow\}$) if they are moving too slow in the B system. If inter-particle forces and external forces are absent, the velocity of the particles is induced by the random forces $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{1(2)j}$ only. Hence, if we demand that

$$\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{1j}(t) = \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{2j}(t) \tag{138}$$

for each time t, the velocities of the j-th trajectories from the $\vec{r}_1$ and $\vec{r}_2$ particles will be equal for all times, after the particles started with the same velocity in the identical A(B) ensemble. Accordingly, the particles will change their A(B) system in the same way during their flight. Each placement in another A(B) ensemble changes the particles spin state to the opposite. Since the spin ensemble of the particles is opposite from the beginning at $t = 0$, the spin trajectories of both particles will take opposite values $\phi_{1jt_{\vec{\mu}}} \neq \phi_{2jt_{\vec{\mu}}}$ for all times $t > 0$.

The requirement (138) may be achieved with a random force field that has the identical values at every point $\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}}$ at time t. But as will be shown below, exact anti-correlations of spin states can also be achieved within a local mechanism as a result of their common past.

The only constraint on the random force in (51) was, that it has a Gaussian distribution. Now consider the following mechanism: A real random number generator sets the starting value δ_j for two pseudo random number generators of same type for every j-th particle pair created by the source. Pseudo random number generators are deterministic procedures which, if initialized with the same starting value δ_j, always produce the same series. Let the two separated generators produce Gaussian distributions $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{1j}(t)$, $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{2j}(t)$

associated with the random forces for j-th trajectory of the $\vec{r}_1$ and $\vec{r}_2$ particles. Then (138) holds and the j-th spin trajectories of both particles will change their state simultaneously in opposite way.

At first sight, one may think that such a procedure would set up a deterministic passive local theory. Indeed, for the random forces $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{1j}(t)$, $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{2j}(t)$, there is a preparation event δ_j which determines all later values of $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{1j}(t)$ and $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{2j}(t)$. But the proof in section 4 was only with regards to elements of the sigma algebras $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S$, $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1$, $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2$. They are sets of possible results from spin measurements in the measurable space Ω' that emerges through $\phi_{1jt_{\vec{\mu}}}, \phi_{2jt_{\vec{\nu}}} : \Omega \mapsto \Omega'$. The elements in Ω' are in no way related to the random force. Clearly, there is no bijective mapping

$$\Gamma : \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{1(2)j}(t) \mapsto \Omega' \tag{139}$$

since $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{1(2)j}(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ has a Gaussian distribution and Ω' is confined to two values $\Omega' = (\uparrow, \downarrow)$ only. Thereby a violation of deterministic passive locality will be possible.

Let the j-th spin trajectory of particle 1 with velocity $\left|\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow 1jt}\right|$ start in the $\mathrm{A}\uparrow$ ensemble at time $t = 0$ with direction $\vec{\mu}$ i.e.: $\phi_{1j(t=0)_{\vec{\mu}}} \equiv \uparrow$. This particle will have to be placed in the $\mathrm{B}\downarrow$ ensemble, if its velocity $\left|\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow 1jt}\right|$ is higher than the arithmetic mean

$$\left|\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{AB}(\vec{r}_1, t)\right| \equiv \mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}_1, t) = \frac{\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{r}_1, t) + \mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{B}}(\vec{r}_1, t)}{2}$$

of the ensemble average velocities from the $\mathrm{A}\uparrow$ and the $\mathrm{B}\downarrow$ system. For a given random starting value $\delta_j \in \mathbb{R}$ of the pseudo random number generators, let the Brownian force for particle 1 at time t_1 take the value

$$\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{1j}(t = 1, \delta_1) \equiv \xi_1. \tag{140}$$

The velocity $\left|\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow 1j(t=1)}\right|$ is a function of $\vec{F}^{\ \mathrm{Brown}}_{1j}(t_1, \delta_1)$. Now, we assume ξ_1 to be such, that $\left|\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow 1j(t=1)}\right| \leq \mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}_1, t = 1)$. Then, at time $t = 1$ no change of the spin trajectory takes place and we get:

$$\phi_{1j(t=0)_{\vec{\mu}}} = \phi_{1j(t=1)_{\vec{\mu}}}.$$

Similarly at time $t = 2$ let

$$\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{1j}(t_2, \delta_j) \equiv \xi_2 \tag{141}$$

be such that $\left|\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow 1j(t=2)}\right| \leq \mathrm{v}^{AB}(\vec{r}_1, t = 2)$. Still, no change of $\phi_{1j(t=2)_{\vec{\mu}}}$ happens and we can write:

$$\phi_{1j(t=0)_{\vec{\mu}}} = \phi_{1j(t=1)_{\vec{\mu}}} = \phi_{1j(t=2)_{\vec{\mu}}}. \tag{142}$$

Now it may be, that for another starting value $\delta'_j \in \mathbb{R}$ of the pseudo random number generator, one has $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{1j}(t = 1, \delta'_j) = \lambda_1 = \xi_1$ as well, and thereby

$$\phi_{1j(t=0)_{\vec{\mu}}} = \phi_{1j(t=1)_{\vec{\mu}}}$$

again. But for $t = 2$ one may get with δ'_j

$$\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{1j}(t = 2, \delta'_j) \equiv \lambda_2 \neq \xi_2 \tag{143}$$

where λ_2 is such that $\left|\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow 1j(t=2)}\right| > \mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}_1, t = 2)$. In this situation, the particle in the $\mathrm{A}\uparrow$ ensemble would be placed in the $\mathrm{B}\downarrow$ ensemble at time $t = 2$, taking the velocity $\left|\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow 1j(t=2)}\right|$. For the spin trajectories, we would have:

$$\phi_{1j(t=0)_{\vec{\mu}}} = \phi_{1j(t=1)_{\vec{\mu}}} \neq \phi_{1j(t=2)_{\vec{\mu}}}. \tag{144}$$

It follows, that there cannot exist a preparation event $\left\{\phi_{1j(t=0)_{\vec{\mu}}} \equiv x_{\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$ which is equivalent to later events $\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1\right\}$ generated by $\phi_{1j(t=T,T>0)_{\vec{\mu}}}$. The same is true for the $\phi_{2jt_{\vec{\mu}}}$ particles and so deterministic passive locality is violated. It suffices to assume the Gaussian distributed random forces $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{1j}, \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{2j}$

to have a ,,memory" dependent of their past. Then, one can construct a theory in which the spin trajectories $\phi_{1jt_{\vec{\mu}}}$, $\phi_{2jt_{\vec{\mu}}}$ violate deterministic passive locality and hence the Bell's inequalities.

We have to note, that even if the model with the pseudo random number generators may look artificial, it would nevertheless be difficult to test. One does not have access to $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{1(2)j}(t,\delta_j)$ but only to events $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$, $\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}\}$ generated by the spin variables $\phi_{1j(t=T)_{\vec{\mu}}}$ and $\phi_{2j(t=T)_{\vec{\nu}}}$. Because the initial value δ_j is assumed to be a real random number, the statistics of $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$, $\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}\}$ would equal the properties of real random numbers if infinitely many particle pairs j ($S \to \infty$, where $1 \leq j \leq S \in \mathbb{N}$) are considered.

Of course, the author has to admit the somewhat incomplete nature of this article because the model given is artificial and may well be replaced by a more natural one. To give a more physical reason for eq. (138) one would need further studies.

The condition of deterministic passive locality is very substantial. Hence it may be violated with many other hidden variable theories which are all sharing the property, that the results at one measuremet apparatus do not influence events at another spatially separated one. Besides from Edward Nelson, who gave two examples of such theories, the author of the present study wants to mention, that recently another, although less physically motivated model with the same locality features was published in [30]. The authors of this article do not study Bell's theorem in the language of advanced probability theory as it was done by Nelson, but they seem to share his opinion about the meaning of passive locality.

Here, we wish to leave it at that with a citation by Edward Nelson from a popular talk. It shows that behavior, similar to that of entangled states, is in fact commonly observed in stochastically evolving systems and not at all confined to quantum mechanical objects [31]:

"The snowflake problem is this: The inexhaustible variety of snowflakes makes it evident that chance plays a major role in their development, yet they always preserve hexagonal symmetry – how does a portion of the snowflake growing at random on one side know to grow in precisely the same fashion as its partner all the way over on the other side? This is mysterious but not beyond understanding". [8] "Similar phaenomena are well known to occur in the study of random fields.[...] Perhaps the results of correlated spin experiments are ultimately no more, and no less, mysterious than is the random growth of snowflakes with hexagonal symmetry".

8 Objections against Nelson's theorem

8.1 The argument of Zeilinger

The basic observation in Nelson's reasoning is, that if two dynamically uncoupled stochastic processes $\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}$ and $\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}$ depend on their common past, they may produce dependent events $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$ and $\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}\}$ at later times and we have:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\bigcap\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\} \neq \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\} \tag{145}$$

This statement, although mathematically correct, has raised criticisms from physicists since it was made. For example, in his famous introductory textbook, Ballentine's [32] writes:

,,There has been some debates as to whether the factorization of the probability is justified by the locality condition alone, or whether it requires some additional stronger assumptions. If so, the contradiction may be blamed on those additional assumptions. The issue is subtle, but fortunately it is now irrelevant, since the new proof in [33] does not make use of probability".

That the work in [33] does not make use of probability is true, however, it does only account for deterministic hidden variable theories. The authors are aware of this, noting at page 1138 in their article:

,,The salvaging strategy could consist in [...] giving up the idea, that the complete state λ predetermines the outcomes of the measurements. Instead, it would be assumed [...] that there is only a definite probability that particle 1 will trigger detector d' [...]. The type of theory envisaged by this strategy is often called a stochastic local theory in contrast to a deterministic local theory which has been considered so far in this paper".

They then go on, writing that stochastic hidden variable theories would be impossible. They claim this would have been thoroughly investigated in [34, 35]. Furthermore, they mention the existence of so called ,,equivalence theorems" [36, 37]. Those are said to show, that each stochastic hidden variable theory could be duplicated by a deterministic equivalent. But in all the articles they cite, every author only derives or considers theories in which passive locality holds ([35] make this assumption at pp. 528 in their eqs.

(2, 2'), [34] makes it in his eq. (5), [36] at page 776 in eq. (7a), and [37] at pp. 1306 and 1308). In fact, it is only for this case, in which an equivalence to a deterministic theory can be proven. As we have shown in section 4, in the case of quantum mechanics, passive locality is equivalent to a condition which is called ,,deterministic passive locality". The definition of deterministic passive locality is, that spin values $\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1\right\}, \left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2\right\}$ generated by $\phi_{1j(t=T,T>0)_{\vec{\mu}}}$ and $\phi_{2j(t=T,T>0)_{\vec{\mu}}}$ are equivalent to a prior spin value $\left\{x_{\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$ generated by both $\phi_{1j(t=0)_{\vec{\mu}}}$ and $\phi_{2j(t=0)_{\vec{\mu}}}$ happening at preparation time. As explained in section 8, such an equivalence does not exist anymore if the particles are driven by a Gaussian distributed stochastic force $\vec{\mathrm{F}}_j^{\mathrm{Brown}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}$, the strength of which at time $t = T, T > 0$ may even be defined by some random value $\delta_j \in \mathbb{R}$ at preparation time $t = 0$. Therefore, our theory is not affected by the arguments of [33].

8.2 The argument of Dürr

Furthermore, there exist claims which try to derive Bell's theorem in its original form (36) but without the assumption of passive locality. These ,,derivations" (e.g. [38]) do not write the inequality with probability measures $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}$ for events $\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1\right\}$, $\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} \in, \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2\right\}$ in separated probability spaces with different measurable spaces at the two detectors. Instead, they are using a measure $\mathrm{P}_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\mu}}$ for events $\left\{x_{\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$ on one! single probability space only. This is problematic, because there is no coupling between the two hilbert spaces of the two quantum states in the entangled system (124). Hence, if one computes the correlation coefficient

$$\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu}, \vec{\nu}\right) \equiv \left\langle \Psi \left| \left(\vec{\mu}\vec{\sigma}\right)_1 \otimes \left(\vec{\nu}\vec{\sigma}\right)_2 \right| \Psi \right\rangle \tag{146}$$

with (124), one is definitely lead to probability measures $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}$ and to events in two separate probability spaces.

Nevertheless, it was possible in Bell's original papers to use a measure $\mathrm{P}_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\mu}}$ on a single probability space, becuse he mentioned the assumption of passive locality explicitly. Then, with the proof in section 4, one can trace back the events at the detectors 1 and 2 to equivalent ones at the common preparation stage. There, a probability measure $\mathrm{P}_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\mu}}$ suffices, since all the particles are in direct contact with each other and their measurement results are in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S$. With the assumption of passive locality, a theory violating Bell's inequalities with events $\left\{x_{\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$ in $\mathrm{P}_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\mu}}$ will also violate them for events $\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1\right\}$, $\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} \in, \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2\right\}$ in $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}$. Unfortunately, many papers which try to derive Bell's inequalities without the use of the passive locality argument, seem not to mention that the expressions of quantum mechanics define probability measures in different probability spaces for the spatially separated detectors in the EPR experiment. But as is shown in [11], it is this, what makes the assumption of passive locality necessary in derivations of Bell's inequalities.

8.3 The argument of Redhead, stability against disturbances

A different argument against stochastic hidden variable theories was raised by Redhead in [40] (who presents in his book at pp. 98 a proof of Bell's theorem that is very similar to that of Nelson, although with some differences). He argues, that stochastic hidden parameter theories would be impossible and advances this opinion with the following observation: Redhead asserts, that under natural conditions, one can never exclude small disturbances which might happen erroneously to a single particle (maybe through a random disturbance by the gases of the air in the laboratory). He then defines a very small perturbation $0 < \delta << 1$ confined to a part of the overall Hilbert space e.g. $\mathcal{H}_2 \in \mathcal{H}$, that acts on a wavefunction:

$$\psi(\vec{r}_2, t) \rightarrow \psi(\vec{r}_2, t) + \delta\psi(\vec{r}_2, t) \tag{147}$$

Under this perturbation, the entangled state (124) will transform to

$$\Psi(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\psi(\vec{r}_1, t) \left|-\right\rangle \otimes (1+\delta)\psi(\vec{r}_2, t) \left|+\right\rangle - \psi(\vec{r}_1, t) \left|+\right\rangle \otimes (1+\delta)\psi(\vec{r}_2, t) \left|-\right\rangle\right). \tag{148}$$

Redhead concludes that the exact correlations observed in EPR experiments will be lost under such a perturbation. Nevertheless, entanglement can be experimentally investigated through long distances, where small perturbations acting on single particles cannot be avoided.

Yet, in spirit of the so called ensemble interpretation of Ballentine [39], a quantum mechanical state $|\psi(\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle$ may not describe individual particles, but rather an infinitely large statistical ensemble of trajectories. In this case, a perturbation like (147) would correspond to a disturbance of a whole statistical ensemble of infinitely many particles for a sufficiently long time. Moreover, if defined as above, δ would act on every particle of this system in exactly the same way. This has nothing to do with a small erroneous disturbance that may happen accidentially to individual particles in the laboratory.

In this context, we want to mention that our theory is in some sense especially robust against small disturbances, at least if they act on individual particles in the ensemble of a quantum state. We define a disturbance $\delta_{1j}(t)$ on the j-th. trajectory of a particle in the $\vec{r}_1$ ensemble to be small, if its value is considerably lower than the average velocities of the A and B systems

$$0 < \delta_{1j}(t) << \mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{B}}(\vec{r}_1,t) < \mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{r}_1,t) \tag{149}$$

and if it is small enough not to change the statistics of the overall ensemble:

$$\left|\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{r}_1,t) - \mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{B}}(\vec{r}_1,t)\right| >> 2\delta_{1j}(t) \tag{150}$$

Now it may be, that this disturbance $\delta_{1j}(t)$ leads to a slightly different velocity of e.g. the j-th particle in the $\mathrm{A}\uparrow$ system at time t:

$$\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}'^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow 1jt} \equiv \dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow 1jt} + \delta_{1j}(t) \tag{151}$$

We assume that $\delta_{1j}(t)$ is fluctuating with zero mean. The particle is placed from the $\mathrm{A}\uparrow$ ensemble in the $\mathrm{B}\downarrow$ system if its velocity is higher than $\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}_1,t)$. Since the average of $\delta_{1j}(t)$ is assumed to be zero, the disturbance does not contribute to $\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}_1,t)$. The perturbation $\delta_{1j}(t)$ will only be able to change the ensemble the single particle $\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow 1jt}$ is placed in, if

$$\left|\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}_1,t) - \dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}'^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow 1jt}\right| \leq |\delta_j(t)| \tag{152}$$

holds. This condition cannot affect many particles. The expression

$$\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}_1,t) \equiv \frac{\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{r}_1,t) + \mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{B}}(\vec{r}_1,t)}{2}$$

is the arithmetic mean of average velocities from A and B with $\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{r}_1,t) > \mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{B}}(\vec{r}_1,t)$. The trajectory $\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}'^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow 1jt}$ is in A and with (149), we can write

$$\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}_1,t) < \mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{r}_1,t) = \left|\overline{\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow 1jt}}\right| \approx \left|\overline{\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}'^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow 1jt}}\right| \tag{153}$$

for a trajectory of velocity around the average. With (153), we have

$$\left|\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}_1,t) - \left|\overline{\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}'^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow 1jt}}\right|\right| \approx \left|\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}_1,t) - \mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{r}_1,t)\right| = \left|\frac{\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{r}_1,t) - \mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{B}}(\vec{r}_1,t)}{2}\right| \tag{154}$$

and due to (150), the inequality (152) can not hold for trajectories of average velocity. The distribution of the velocities for the individual particles is generated by a stochastic force which has a Gaussian distribution. Accordingly, most particles in the A system will have a velocity that does not differ too greatly from the velocity of the ensemble average $\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{r}_1,t)$. Hence, it follows that (152) does not hold for most particles, too.

Due to the small number of particles which change their spin state because of $\delta_{1j}(t)$, the disturbance leads only to a reduced efficiency of the entanglement, but not to its breakdown. For this reason, the theory we have constructed is especially robust against small disturbances unavoidable in a laboratory, in contrast to the claims by [40].

9 Conclusions and outlook

9.1 What has been archived

The most popular argument against hidden variable theories with particle trajectories is, as commonly believed from Bell's words: „that [those theories] require a mechanism, whereby the setting of one measuring device can influence the reading of another device". And: „Moreover, the signal involved must propagate instantaneously". As shown by Edward Nelson whose analysis we reviewed here, this assertion is physically unfounded. Two specially designed stochastic processes can yield dependent results at two separated locations without any contact at all. This in fact suffices to violate Bells inequalities. We have mathematically analyzed, what such a dependence really does imply and we have constructed a corresponding theory by ourselves.

9.2 Possibility of relativistic extension

Unfortunately, this theory has, at least till now, no relativistic extension. Stochastic mechanics of the original form in which Nelson wrote it down, had severe conceptual difficulties in the relativistic domain. These problems arose due to its formulation in configuration space. There, one can show that it is impossible to formulate a relativistic stochastic process in a mathematically rigorous way (although, with some additional assumptions, the Klein-Gordon equation can be derived [41]). Unlike in Nelson's original formulation, the theory of Fritsche exists in euclidean (phase) space, where this severe problem is absent. To translate Fritsche's theory in the relativistic domain, one would need a fully formulated theory of special relativistic Brownian motion (at least if one would try to derive the theory from Langevin equations). Unfortunately, although such a theory certainly must exist (since non-relativistic Brownian motion does), it seems, that besides from some recent attempts [42–44], no one was able to write it down completely.

In this context, we want to mention that [15] write at pp. 386, their eqs. (54) can, after an approximation, directly be casted into the Navier-Stokes equations. We have in (54) for the A system:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}\right)+\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}+\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}\right)\vec{\nabla}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}\right)-\nu\Delta\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}\right)=\frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} \tag{155}$$

Noting that $\vec{\mathrm{v}}_c^{\mathrm{A}}=\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}$, we are able to write:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_c^{\mathrm{A}}+\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_c^{\mathrm{A}}+2\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}\right)\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_c^{\mathrm{A}}-\nu\Delta\vec{\mathrm{v}}_c^{\mathrm{A}}=\frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} \tag{156}$$

If we set $\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}=\vec{\nabla}\rho(\vec{r},t)=0$ and $\rho\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}=-\vec{\nabla}p(\vec{r},t)$, where $p(\vec{r},t)$ is the pressure and $\rho\equiv m_0\rho(\vec{r},t)$ defines the mass density, we get the Navier-Stokes equation of a fluid:

$$\rho\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_c^{\mathrm{A}}+\rho\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_c^{\mathrm{A}}\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_c^{\mathrm{A}}\right)-\nu\rho\Delta\vec{\mathrm{v}}_c^{\mathrm{A}}+\vec{\nabla}p(\vec{r},t)=0 \tag{157}$$

For (157), a manifestly covariant form in special and even in general relativity is known. To derive (157) in a relativistic setting, one typically starts from relativistic Boltzmann equations. Because of the close similarity between (157) and (54), it seems at least plausible that it might be possible to formulate Fritsche's theory in a relativistic setting.

9.3 Problems of standard quantum mechanics in curves spacetimes, which might be absent in Fritsche's model

It is known, that in curved spacetime there exists an ambiguity, if one wants to derive quantum mechanical operators. Usually, we are advised by the correspondence principle to make the replacement $p_i\rightarrow\hat{\mathrm{p}}_i=-i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial q_i}$ for the momentum operator with q_i as the generalized coordinate of the particle. In Cartesian coordinates, the Hamilton function is $\mathrm{H}\equiv\frac{p_x^2+p_y^2+p_z^2}{2m_0}$. With the replacement rule of the correspondence principle, we can derive the quantum mechanical Hamilton operator as:

$$\hat{\mathrm{H}}=-\frac{\hbar}{2m_0}\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}+\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2}+\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2}\right)=-\frac{\hbar}{2m_0}\Delta \tag{158}$$

We may convert its Laplacian in cylindrical coordinates ρ, φ, z and get the Hamiltonian for the new coordinate system:

$$\hat{\mathrm{H}} = -\frac{\hbar}{2m_0}\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\rho^2} + \frac{\partial}{\rho\partial\rho} + \frac{\partial^2}{\rho^2\partial\varphi^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2}\right). \tag{159}$$

Now, we want to derive this operator in cylindrical coordinates from the beginning. We start with the classical Lagerange function

$$\mathcal{L}(q_i, \dot{q}_i) \equiv \frac{m_0}{2}(\dot{\rho}^2 + \rho^2\dot{\varphi}^2 + \dot{z}^2). \tag{160}$$

If we insert the particles momentum $p_\rho = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\dot{\rho}} = m_0\dot{\rho}$, $p_\varphi = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\dot{\varphi}} = m_0\rho^2\dot{\varphi}$, $p_z = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial\dot{z}} = m_0\dot{z}$, we get the following expression for $\mathrm{H}(p_i, q_i, \dot{q}_i) \equiv \sum p_i\dot{q}_i - \mathcal{L}$:

$$\mathrm{H}(p_i, q_i, \dot{q}_i) = p_\rho\dot{\rho} + p_\varphi\dot{\varphi} + p_z\dot{z} - \mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2m_0}\left(p_\rho^2 + \frac{p_\varphi^2}{\rho^2} + p_z^2\right) \tag{161}$$

After the usage of the replacement-rules defined by correspondence principle, one arrives at:

$$\hat{\mathrm{H}} = -\frac{\hbar}{2m_0}\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\rho^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\rho^2\partial\varphi^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2}\right) \tag{162}$$

Unfortunately, (162) is different from (159) and wrong. This problem is present in the path integral formalism in similar form. It implies, that the naive rules of the correspondence principle do only work if applied on Cartesian coordinates. In the curved space times of general relativity, there is no such coordinate system. Thereby, one cannot give, for example, an unambiguous expression for the probability density of an electron near the singularity of a black hole.

Unlike in ordinary quantum mechanics, in stochastic mechanics the quantum mechanical operators are not simply defined as replacement rules. Instead, their expressions are derived completely from classical equations (see [15] at pp. 290). It might well be, that it is possible to extend Fritsche's theory to special and general relativity via a derivation of its classical diffusion equations (54) from relativistic Boltzmann equations. Then, as in the Cartesian case, one might get information about the form of the quantum mechanical operators. In turn, one might be able to understand the behavior of quantum objects near spacetime singularities.

Acknowledgements: The author wants to thank prof. Edward Nelson from Princeton University, prof. Lothar Fritsche from Technical University Clausthal and phd. Klaus Hornberger from Ludwig-Maximilians University Munich for helpful discussions and suggestions.

References

[1] A. Einstein, B. Podolski, N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. 47, pp. 777 (1935)

[2] D. Bohm, Quantum Theory, (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ 1951), pp. 614-619

[3] J. S. Bell, On The Einstein Podolsky Rosen Paradox, in [4]

[4] J. S. Bell, Speakable and unspeakable in Quantum mechanics, (Cambridge University Press 1987)

[5] J. F. Clauser, R. A. Holt, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, Phys. Rev. Lett. 23, pp. 880 (1969)

[6] J. S. Bell, The theory of local be-ables, in [4]

[7] E. Nelson, Field theory and the future of stochastic mechanics, in Stochastic Processes in Classical and Quantum Systems, Proc. Ascona, Switzerland 1985, eds: S. Albeverio, G. Casati, D. Merlini, Lecture Notes in Physics 262 (Springer, Berlin 1988), pp. 438

[8] E. Nelson, The locality problem in Stochastic Mechanics, in New techniques and ideas in quantum measurement theory, eds: D. Greenberger, Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. 480, pp. 533 (1986)

[9] E. Nelson, Stochastic mechanics and random fields, in Ecole d'Ete de Probabilites de Saint Flour XV-XVII, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1362, (Springer, Berlin 1985-87), pp. 427

[10] N. D. Mermin, Bringing home the atomic world: Quantum mysteries for anybody, Am. J. Phys. 49, pp. 940 (1981)

[11] W. G. Faris, Probability in quantum mechanics, Appendix to D. Wick, The Infamous Boundary: Seven Decades of Controversy in Quantum Physics (Birkhauser, Boston 1995)

[12] P. Suppes, M. Zanotti, On the Determinism of Hidden Variable Theories with Strict Correlation and Conditional Statistical Independence of Observables, In P. Suppes (Eds.), Logic and probability in quantum mechanics (Dordrecht: Reidel 1976), pp. 445-455

[13] E. Nelson, Derivation of the Schroedinger equation from Newtonian Mechanics, Phys. Rev. 150, pp. 1079 (1966)

[14] E. Nelson, Quantum Fluctuations (Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ 1985)

[15] L. Fritsche, M. Haugk, A new look at the derivation of the Schrödinger equation from Newtonian Mechanics, Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) 12, pp. 371 (2003)

[16] A. Aspect, J. Dalibard, G. Roger, Experimental test of Bell's inequalities using time-varying analyzers Phys. Rev. Lett. vol. 49, pp. 1804 (1982)

[17] H. Rauch, Neutron Interferometry (Oxford University Press 2000)

[18] H. Rauch, Reality in Neutron Interference Experiments, Found. Phys. 23, pp. 7 (1993)

[19] A. Go for the Belle Collaboration, Observation of Bell inequality violation in B mesons, J. Mod. Opt. 51, pp. 991 (2004), arXiv:quant-ph/0310192

[20] E. Nelson, The mystery of stochastic mechanics, conference talk, available at http://www.math.princeton.edu/~nelson/papers/talk.pdf

[21] T. Dankel, stochastic mechanics with spin, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 37, pp. 192 (1971)

[22] W. G. Faris, A stochastic picture of spin, Stochastic Processes in Quantum Theory and Statistical Physics, eds. S. Albeverio, Ph. Combe, M. Sirugue-Collin (Springer, Berlin 1982), pp. 154

[23] W. G. Faris, Spin correlations in stochastic mechanics, Foundations of Physics 12, pp. 1 (1982)

[24] L. Fritsche, M. Haugk, Anschauliche Quantenmechanik, unpublished manuscript

[25] J. M. Levy-Leblond, Comm. Math. Phys. 6, pp. 286 (1967)

[26] O. Stern, W. Gerlach, Z. Phys. 9, pp. 349 (1922)

[27] T. E. Phipps, O. Stern, Z. Phys. 73, pp. 185 (1932)

[28] R. Penrose, The Road To Reality, A complete guide to the laws of the universe (Vintage Books, London, 2005), pp. 630 figure 25.1 a)

[29] H. Goldstein, Classical Mechanics, (Addison-Wesley, 2nd. edition 1980), pp. 143-158

[30] H. De Raedt, K. De Raedt, K. Michielsen, K. Keimpema, S. Miyashita, Event-by-event simulation of quantum phenomena: Application to Einstein-Podolosky-Rosen-Bohm experiments, J. Comp. Theor. Nanosci. 4, pp. 957 (2007), arXiv:0712.3781v2

[31] E. Nelson, space time chance, popular talk, available at http://www.math.princeton.edu/~nelson/papers/cti.html

[32] L. Ballentine, Quantum Mechanics, A modern development (World Scientific 1998), pp. 608

[33] D. Greenberger, M. Horne, A. Shimony, A. Zeilinger, Bell's theorem without inequalities, Am. J. Phys. 58, pp. 1131 (1990)

[34] J. S. Bell, Introduction to the hidden variable question, in [4]

[35] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, Experimental consequences of objective local theories, Phys. Rev. D10, pp. 526 (1974)

[36] H. P. Stapp, Locality and reality, Found. Phys. 10, pp. 767 (1980)

[37] A. Fine, Joint distributions, quantum correlations and commuting observables, J. Math Phys, 23, pp. 1306 (1982)

[38] D. Dürr, Bohmsche Mechanik als Grundlage der Quantenmechanik (Springer, Berlin 2001), pp. 182

[39] L. Ballentine, Rev. Mod. Phys. 42, pp. 358 (1970)

[40] M. Redhead, Incompleteness, nonlocality and realism (Clarendon Press, Oxford 1987)

[41] M. Pavon, On the stochastic mechanics of the free relativistic particle, J. Math. Phys. 42, pp. 4846 (2001), arXiv:quant-ph/0108139v1

[42] J. Dunkel, P. Hänggi, Relativistic Brownian motion: From a microscopic binary collision model to the Langevin equation, Phys. Rev. E74, pp. 051106 (2006); Erratum: E74, pp. 069902 (2006) arXiv:cond-mat/0607082v4

[43] J. Dunkel, P. Talkner, P. Hänggi, Relativistic diffusion processes and random walk models, Phys. Rev. D75, 043001 (2007), arXiv:cond-mat/0608023v3

[44] D. Cubero, J. Casado-Pascual, J. Dunkel, P. Talkner, P. Hänggi, Thermal equilibrium and statistical thermometers in special relativity, Phys. Rev. Lett. 99, pp. 170601 (2007), arXiv:0705.3328v2