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

Benjamin Schulz *

March 24, 2019

Abstract

In 1985, Edward Nelson, who is known for the foundation of a theory called ,,stochastic mechanics", made an interesting remark about 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 to derive the quantum mechanical formalism of spinning particles and the Pauli equation from the said formalism. Then, we investigate Bohms version of the EPR experiment. Additionally, other setups like entanglement swapping or time and position correlations are shortly explained from the viewpoint of our local model. 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 of 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 conditions would be in difference with quantum mechanics. Bell called these conditions "locally causal" and the most detailed explanation of this terminus was made by him in [6].

In his first publication about that topic, 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" [3]. However, Bell's first contribution underwent several modifications. By the time, more and more instructive proofs of his inequality were constructed by him and others. A collection with all of Bell's fundamental articles can be found 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, if 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 found his own interpretation of quantum mechanics [14, 15] to be in difference with the requirements of his theorem for a model without instantaneous signaling effects. Furthermore, the two theories, for which Nelson was able to show that they fulfilled the necessary conditions, were rather artificial stochastic processes. They were written in the language of advanced mathematical probability theory and without proper physical foundation.

The present article begins at section 2, with a short introduction to the necessary mathematical concepts. In section 3, we review Nelson's contribution to a mathematically rigorous understanding of Bell's inequalities. The physical implication of that contribution is discussed in section 4. A modification of Nelson's stochastic mechanics published in "Annalen der Physik" [16] is reviewed in section 5. There, is shown that this theory fulfills Nelson's requirements for a realistic model which is compatible with quantum mechanics. In section 6, we extend this theory to include spinning particles described by the Pauli equation. Entangled

spin states are discussed in section 7, where it is shown in detail how their correlations emerge without any instantaneous signaling effects. In section 8, we review some arguments against Nelson's thoughts about Bell's theorem which have occurred in the literature. We come to the conclusion that these arguments are unfounded. Finally, we mention the possible use of our theory for a reasonable foundation of quantum mechanics in curved space-times at section 9.

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 $\left(\Omega, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \mathrm{P}\right)$. The set Ω consists of the theoretically possible events $\omega \in \Omega$. They can 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.

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 $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$. A sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ is defined by 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 $\bigcup_n A_n \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$.

A sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ 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 (with exeption of $\varnothing$) 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 theoretically possible events is $\Omega = (HH \bigcup HT \bigcup TH \bigcup TT)$. The sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ is generated by the partition of Ω into 4 events (HH), (HT), (TH), (TT) and consists of 16 elements: The impossible event $\varnothing$, the events (HH), (HT), (TH), (TT) and the 11 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 just be interested in the total number of heads. This information is contained in a smaller sub sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{sub} \subset \overline{\mathcal{F}}$. It is generated by a partition of Ω into three events (HH), $(HT \bigcup TH)$ and (TT). The sub sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{sub}$ consists of the impossible event $\varnothing$, the three events in the partition and the four different possible unions between them.

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

- 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 $\mathrm{P}\left(\bigcup_n A_n\right) = \sum_n \mathrm{P}(A_n)$.

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

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

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

$$\mathrm{P}\left(A\right) = \mathrm{P}\left(A \bigcap B\right) = \mathrm{P}\left(B\right). \tag{2}$$

Furthermore, we define two events to be independent, if

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

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

$$\mathrm{P}\left(A|\, B\right) \equiv \frac{\mathrm{P}\left(A \bigcap B\right)}{\mathrm{P}\left(B\right)} \tag{4}$$

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. Using 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:

$$X : \Omega \mapsto \Omega' \tag{5}$$

This mapping X is called a random variable. In case X is integrable on Ω with respect to P, it has an expectation value

$$\mathrm{EX}_{\Omega}\left[X\right] \equiv \int_{\Omega} X \mathrm{dP}, \tag{6}$$

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

We define for any set $A' \in \Omega'$ the event $\left(X^{-1}(A')\right) \equiv \{X \in A'\}$, writing $\{A'\}$ for short. We call $\{A'\}$ the event, that X lies in A' and say $\{A'\}$ is generated by X. The probability of $\{A'\}$ is $\mathrm{P}\left(X^{-1}(A')\right)$ and we will abbreviate it as $\mathrm{P}_X\left\{A'\right\}$. With this notation, two random variables X and Y are equivalent under P if, for any set $A' \in \Omega'$, the following relation holds:

$$\mathrm{P}_X\left\{A'\right\} = \mathrm{P}_Y\left\{A'\right\} \tag{7}$$

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

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

The parameter t is called parameter-set and lies in an interval I. Two stochastic processes X_t and Y_t are equivalent under a probability measure P, if for any set $A' \in \Omega'$ and $t \in I$

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

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 $A'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$, this rule should assign a set in Ω which is an event $A \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$. Then, we will write $A \subset_{\in} A''$, and $A \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ is called the event corresponding to $A'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$. In case an event $B \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ does not correspond to an event $A'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$, we use the notation

$B \not\subset_{\notin} A''$. Furthermore, we define, that if two events $A'', B'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$ are exclusive: $A'' \bigcap B'' = \varnothing$, their corresponding events $A, B \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$, where $A \subset_{\in} A''$ and $B \subset_{\in} B''$, are also exclusive: $A \bigcap B = \varnothing$.

Similar definitions will be used for sigma algebras. If all the elements of a sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ from a smaller space correspond to an event in sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}''$ from a larger space, we write $\overline{\mathcal{F}} \subset_{\in} \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$.

There have to be rules, which relate the probabilities of events from the larger space to their corresponding ones from the smaller space. A reasonable definition is the following: The probability for the union of events $\bigcup_n (A''_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'' : A''_n \supset_{\ni} A$ should be equal to the probability of A:

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

An example of an enlarged probability space can be given by a coin which is 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

$$\Omega = \left(h \bigcup t\right).$$

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

$$\Omega'' = \left(hHH \bigcup hHT \bigcup hTH \bigcup tHH \bigcup tHT \bigcup tTH\right).$$

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

For later, it will be useful, to define the intersection between an event $A'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$ and another event $B \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ from the smaller space as

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

where A is the event in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ corresponding to $A'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$.

One may compute the conditional probability of an outcome in the larger space, e.g. the event of two heads in the second and third toss (HH), with respect to an outcome in the smaller space, e.g a tail (t) in the first toss:

$$X(tHH) \equiv \mathrm{P}''(tHH \,|(tHH \cup tHT \cup tTT \cup tTH)). \tag{12}$$

Such experiments are the reason for Nelson's definition of the 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

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

In eq. (13), A is the event in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ which corresponds to $A'' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}''$.

The random variable $X(A'')$ is measurable with respect to the $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'' - [0,1]$, because the event A'' is in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}''$. From the definition of $X(A'')$ in eq. (13), it follows that there exists a set $A \subset_{\in} A''$, with $A \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$.

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

Sometimes, it is useful to 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 $\mathrm{P}''\left(\bigcup_n \left(\omega_n''\right)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'' : \omega_n'' \supset_\ni A\right)$ from 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 of Bell's theorem

3.1 The setup of the EPR experiment in theory



Figure 1: Space-time diagram of an EPR experiment, the dashed lines illustrate the particle trajectories

An EPR experiment consists of two measurement devices 1 and 2 which are space-like separated, as well as a particle source in the intersection of their past cones. The source ejects j pairs of particles, where $1 \leq j \leq S \in \mathbb{N}$, to the two detectors (see fig. 1). The particles in each pair have opposite spin and opposite momentum. At each device, the direction of the spins is measured with a Stern-Gerlach magnet. These magnets can be rotated around an arbitrary direction, perpendicular to the axis of the particle trajectory $\vec{z}$. The direction of the magnets is called $\vec{\mu}$ for detector 1 and $\vec{\nu}$ for detector 2.

Now, we set up two families of stochastic processes $\phi_{j1t_{\vec{z}}} : \Omega \mapsto \Omega'$ and $\phi_{j2t_{\vec{z}}} : \Omega \mapsto \Omega'$. The processes $\phi_{j1t_{\vec{z}}}$ and $\phi_{j2t_{\vec{z}}}$ define the time dependent function for the spin values of the j-th. particles, which are sent to detector 1 and 2. They are called the particle's "spin trajectory". Spin observables only have values $(\uparrow, \downarrow)$ what gives rise to a set $\Omega' = (\uparrow \bigcup \downarrow)$ in the measurable space of $\phi_{j1t_{\vec{z}}}$ and $\phi_{j2t_{\vec{z}}}$. As parameter of the spin trajectories, the vector $\vec{z}$ corresponds to the axis around which the described particle rotates. If it rotates in

the left direction with respect to $\vec{z}$, we have $\phi_{j1(2)t_{\vec{z}}} = \uparrow$ and a rotation in the right direction is defined by $\phi_{j1(2)t_{\vec{z}}} = \downarrow$. The value t is the time, during which the particle flights. It starts at time $t = 0$ from the source and arrives at $t = T$, where $T > 0$, in the Stern-Gerlach magnet.

The measurement devices could change the particle's properties, including the spin. In an EPR Experiment, the part of the detectors that might influence the particles are the axes $\vec{\mu}$ and $\vec{\nu}$. They can be chosen by the experimenter at will.

With the Stern-Gerlach magnets influencing the outcomes of the experiment, we have to describe the measurement results by device dependent random variables. For the two detectors 1 and 2, we write them as $\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}}$ and $\phi_{j2\vec{\nu}}$. The way, how these variables are connected to the processes $\phi_{j1t_{\vec{z}}}$ and $\phi_{j2t_{\vec{z}}}$ will be postponed at the moment. For now, we only denote the events generated by $\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}}$ and $\phi_{j2\vec{\nu}}$ as $\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$ and $\{\sigma_{j2\vec{\nu}}\}$. We define them to be elements of a corresponding sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1$ or $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2$.

The stochastic processes $\phi_{j1t_{\vec{z}}}$, $\phi_{j2t_{\vec{z}}}$, and hence the random variables $\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}}$, $\phi_{j2\vec{\nu}}$ could depend on the preparation of the particles by the source. Therefore, we need two events, generated by $\phi_{j1,t=0_{\vec{z}}}$ and $\phi_{j2,t=0_{\vec{z}}}$. These events will be called $\left\{x_{j1\vec{z}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$ and $\left\{x_{j2\vec{z}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$. They are elements of a sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S$ and we say, that they happen at preparation stage. Furthermore, the events at the detectors must be defined to take place in an enlarged probability space, where $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \subset_{\in} \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1$ and $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \subset_{\in} \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2$

Since spin values can only be up or down, $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1$ and $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2$ are equal. Moreover, they are independent from the axes of the Stern-Gerlach magnets chosen by the experimenter. Yet, the events $\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1\right\}$ and $\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\nu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2\right\}$ depend on the axes of the detectors. It follows, that we must define a whole family of axis dependent probability measures $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\nu}}}\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}, \sigma_{j2\vec{\nu}}\}$ for them.

If the experiment is done with infinitely many particle pairs ($S \to \infty$), we write the necessary sigma algebras as $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty} \subset_{\in} \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{1\infty}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty} \subset_{\in} \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{2\infty}$. The events at the detectors are defined by

$$\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{1\infty}\right\} = \bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} \left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1\right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{2\infty}\right\} = \bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} \left\{\sigma_{j2\vec{\nu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2\right\}, \tag{15}$$

with a family of probability measures $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}, \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}\}$.

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 selects 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 $\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$ at 1 be generated by $\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}}$. The area of 1 where $\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$ is measured, has to be disjoint from the future cone of a region 2 with another axis dependent measurement device. At 2, different axes $\vec{\nu} \neq \vec{\nu}'$ are chosen. These axes influence the measurement results through the random variables $\phi_{j2\vec{\nu}}$ and $\phi_{j2\vec{\nu}'}$. We define a theory to be actively local, if $\phi_{j2\vec{\nu}}$ and $\phi_{j2\vec{\nu}'}$ are equivalent for the event $\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$ under $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\nu}}}\{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$, i.e.

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\nu}}}\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\} = \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\nu}'}}\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\} \tag{16}$$

Eq. (16) has to hold for each j and a similar condition should be true for any event $\{\sigma_{j2\vec{\nu}}\}$ at 2, generated by $\phi_{j2\vec{\nu}}$:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\nu}}}\{\sigma_{j2\vec{\nu}}\} = \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}'},\phi_{j2\vec{\nu}}}\{\sigma_{j2\vec{\nu}}\} \tag{17}$$

In eq. (17), the spatial region of 2 must be disjoint from the future cone of 1 and we should have $\vec{\mu}' \neq \vec{\mu}$ for the axes of detector 1.

Since eq. (16) and eq. (17) are to hold for each j, they also have to be valid under $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}\}$, with infinitely many particles are used.

We can condition the events $\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{1\infty}\right\}$ and $\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{2\infty}\right\}$ with respect to $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}$. In an actively local theory, the conditional probabilities $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\}$ will have similar properties as in the eqs. (16) and (17), due to the definition of eq. (13):

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\} &= \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}'}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\} \\
\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\} &= \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}'},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

3.3 Passive locality

In this section, we consider random events which are 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 say, passive locality holds, if the conditional probabilities of the outcomes $\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1\right\}$ and $\left\{\sigma_{j2\vec{\nu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2\right\}$ given $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S$ are independent for every pair of axes $\vec{\mu}$ and $\vec{\nu}$:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}} \bigcap \sigma_{j2\vec{\nu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\} = \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\} \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j2\vec{\nu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\} \tag{19}$$

In case we repeat the experiment with infinitely many particle pairs, we get a similar relation:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\} = \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\} \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\} \tag{20}$$

3.4 Nelson's theorem

With the notation of the preceding sections, quantum mechanics fulfills the following properties:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} = \downarrow\right\} = \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \downarrow \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow\right\} = 1 \tag{21}$$

$$\left|\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}\right) + \mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}'\right) + \mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu}',\vec{\nu}\right) - \mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu}',\vec{\nu}'\right)\right| > 2 \tag{22}$$

In eq. (22), $\mathrm{E}(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})$ is the so called „correlation coefficient", a function defined through

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}\right) \equiv\ & \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \uparrow\right\} + \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \downarrow \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \downarrow\right\} \\
& - \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \downarrow\right\} - \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \downarrow \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \uparrow\right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Equation (21) 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. (22) 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 eq. (21) and eq. (22) 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:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow \bigcap \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \downarrow \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\} &= \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\} \\
&\quad \cdot \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} = \downarrow \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

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 $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$ at 1:

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

An analogous expression is true for the events at 2:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}=\downarrow\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\}=\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\nu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}=\downarrow\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\} \tag{26}$$

On the other hand, eq. (21) yields $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\nu}}=\uparrow\}$ in the right side of eq. (26). Hence, we can write for the coordinates ν:

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

Plugging eq. (25) and eq. (27) back to eq. (24) we arrive at

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}=\uparrow\bigcap\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}=\downarrow\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\} \quad = \quad P_{\vec{\mu}}P_{\vec{\nu}}. \tag{28}$$

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 eq. (27), we get

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}=\uparrow\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\}=1-P_{\vec{\nu}}. \tag{29}$$

Since active locality holds, a similar result can be written for the measurement results $\{\sigma_{1\mu}=\downarrow\}$ at 1:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}=\downarrow\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\} &= \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}=\downarrow\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\}\\ &= 1-\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}=\uparrow\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\}=1-P_{\vec{\mu}}\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Due to passive locality, we have for the events $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}=\downarrow\}$ and $\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}=\uparrow\}$, by using eq. (30) and eq. (29):

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

In the same way, we can derive the relations

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

and

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}=\downarrow\bigcap\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}=\downarrow\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right\}=\left(1-P_{\vec{\mu}}\right)P_{\vec{\nu}}. \tag{33}$$

Because of eq. (32), eq. (33), eq. (28) and eq. (31), the correlation coefficient defined in eq. (23), but with conditional probabilities, becomes:

$$\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right) \quad = \quad P_{\vec{\mu}}\left(1-P_{\vec{\nu}}\right)+\left(1-P_{\vec{\mu}}\right)P_{\vec{\nu}}-P_{\vec{\mu}}P_{\vec{\nu}}-\left(1-P_{\vec{\mu}}\right)\left(1-P_{\vec{\nu}}\right) \tag{34}$$

Now, using four arbitrary axes $\vec{\mu},\vec{\mu}'$ and $\vec{\nu},\vec{\nu}'$ at the two stations 1 and 2, the following inequality can be computed:

$$\left|\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right)+\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}'\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right)+\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu}',\vec{\nu}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right)-\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu}',\vec{\nu}'\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right)\right|\leq 2 \tag{35}$$

We got this result, because the conditional probabilities of $\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right.\right)$ are all in the range $0\leq\mathrm{P}\leq 1$. Since probability measures are generally in that range, an analogue inequality must be true for the unconditional probabilities:

$$\left|\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}\right)+\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}'\right)+\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu}',\vec{\nu}\right)-\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu}',\vec{\nu}'\right)\right|\leq 2 \tag{36}$$

Eq. (36) is the so called Clauser-Holt-Shimony-Horne inequality [5]. It is a version of Bells statement in [3]

$$\left|\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}\right)-\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}'\right)\right|-\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\nu},\vec{\nu}'\right)\leq 1 \tag{37}$$

which can be similarly derived. Both eq. (36) and eq. (37) are violated in quantum mechanics and this violation was confirmed experimentally [17].

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 the detectors 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 measurement stations, because stochastic processes can produce dependencies on 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 [14, 15] had, where particles move on stochastic paths. Hence this „stochastic field theory" was never developed extensively. The present article aims to show, that a more physically motivated hidden variable theory published in [16] violates Bell's inequalities without any communication between the two measurement stations in the EPR setup. To reach our goal, 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 (21) from quantum mechanics, leads immediately to another condition, which 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 determined by some random event at the prior preparation stage. Therefore, all randomness lies in the preparation. Deterministic passive locality is defined mathematically as follows:

Let the events $\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1\right\}$ at 1 and $\left\{\sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2\right\}$ at 2 be equivalent with respect to $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}$ and passive locality hold. Then, there is an event $\{x_{j\vec{z}}\} = \left\{x_{j1\vec{z}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\} \bigcap \left\{x_{j2\vec{z}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$ at preparation stage. This event does not depend on the detector's axis $\vec{\mu}$, and is corresponding as well as equivalent to both $\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$ and $\{\sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}}\}$.

In his contribution, Faris states that a similar result is presented by Redhead in [46] at pp. 101-102. Redhead claims, it would have been discovered at first by Suppes and Zanotti in [12]. Recently, another derivation was given by Conway and Kochen (who called it "free will theorem" to emphasize its implication of the particles' random behavior) [13]. The exposition given in this article follows closely the derivation of Faris in [11]:

Passive locality demands

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}} \bigcap \sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} = \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \tag{38}$$

and because of $0 \leq \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}} \leq 1$ we have

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}} \bigcap \sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\} \leq \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\}. \tag{39}$$

The random variable $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\}$ is measurable with respect to a sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{subS} \subset \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S$. This sub sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{subS}$ is generated by the partition of a set $\left\{\Upsilon \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\} \subset_{\in} \{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$ which defines the events in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S$ corresponding to $\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$. As shown in section 2, we can compute the unconditional probability of $\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$, if we take the expectation value of $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\}$ on the set Υ, with respect to a probability measure for the events in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S$. Due to active locality, an event which belongs to the earlier preparation stage cannot be modified by the decisions made at a later measurement stage. It follows, that we can write each event from $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S$ in a form $\{x_{j\vec{z}}\}$, that does not depend on the detectors axes. For these events, we may use a single, axis independent probability measure $\mathrm{P}_{j\vec{z}}\{x_{j\vec{z}}\}$. Finally, we have for the unconditional probabilities of $\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\} = \mathrm{EX}_{\Upsilon,\mathrm{P}_{j\vec{z}}}\left[\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\}\right]. \tag{40}$$

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

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}} \bigcap \sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}}\right\} = \mathrm{EX}_{\Upsilon,\mathrm{P}_{j\vec{z}}}\left[\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}} \bigcap \sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}} \left| \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S \right.\right\}\right] \tag{41}$$

The events $\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$ and $\{\sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}}\}$ are defined such, that they are equivalent under $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\nu}}}$:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\} = \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}} \bigcap \sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}}\right\} = \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\{\sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}}\} \tag{42}$$

Hence, it follows from eq. (40) and eq. (41), that their expectation values are equal. Therefore, we can conclude with eq. (39):

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\bigcap\sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\}=\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\} \tag{43}$$

And similarly

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\bigcap\sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\}=\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\}. \tag{44}$$

With the assumption of passive locality we get, using eq. (43) and eq. (44):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\} &= \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\bigcap\sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\}\\ &= \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\}\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\}\\ &= \left(\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\}\right)^2.\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

This implies, that the conditional probability $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\}$ can only have the two values 0 and 1. We denote the event, when this random variable has the value one by $\{\tilde{x}_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$ and the event, when it is zero by $\{\tilde{y}_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$. Then, the event $\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$ is the union of these two exclusive events: $\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}\equiv\{\tilde{y}_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}\bigcup\{\tilde{x}_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$.

The probability $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\}$ 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 $\left\{x_{j1\vec{z}}\in\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$, where $\{x_{j1\vec{z}}\}\subset_\in\{\tilde{x}_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$. Under the probability measure $\mathrm{P}_{j\vec{z}}$ for the events at preparation stage, this event $\{x_{j1\vec{z}}\}$ has the same probability as its corresponding event $\{\tilde{x}_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$ under $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}$. Similarly, there must exist an event $\left\{y_{j1\vec{z}}\in\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$ of the same probability as $\{\tilde{y}_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$, with $\{y_{j1\vec{z}}\}\subset_\in\{\tilde{y}_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$.

The event $\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$ can only have the conditional probabilities 1 or 0. If we compute the unconditional probabilities of $\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$, $\{\tilde{x}_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$ and $\{x_{j1\vec{z}}\}$ having this property in mind, we observe that these three events occur with equal probability:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\} &= \mathrm{EX}_{\Upsilon,\mathrm{P}_{j\vec{z}}}\left[\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\}\right]\\ &= \mathrm{EX}_{\Upsilon,\mathrm{P}_{j\vec{z}}}\left[\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\tilde{x}_{j1\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\}\right]\\ &= \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\{\tilde{x}_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}\\ &= \mathrm{P}_{j\vec{z}}\{x_{j1\vec{z}}\}.\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

The events $\{\tilde{y}_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$ and $\{\tilde{x}_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$ are exclusive. Therefore, their corresponding events $\{x_{j1\vec{z}}\}$, $\{y_{j1\vec{z}}\}$ are also exclusive. Hence, we get for the intersection of $\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}\bigcap_\ni\{x_{j1\vec{z}}\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}\bigcap_\ni\{x_{j1\vec{z}}\} &= \left(\{\tilde{y}_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}\bigcup\{\tilde{x}_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}\right)\bigcap_\ni\{x_{j1\vec{z}}\}\\ &= \left(\{y_{j1\vec{z}}\}\bigcap\{x_{j1\vec{z}}\}\right)\bigcup\left(\{x_{j1\vec{z}}\}\bigcap\{x_{j1\vec{z}}\}\right)\\ &= \{x_{j1\vec{z}}\}\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

And the following equality holds:

$$\mathrm{P}_{j\vec{z}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\bigcap_\ni x_{j1\vec{z}}\right\} = \mathrm{P}_{j\vec{z}}\{x_{j1\vec{z}}\} \tag{48}$$

The equations eq. (46) and eq. (48) lead to the conclusion that $\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\in\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1\right\}$ is equivalent to $\left\{x_{j1\vec{z}}\in\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$. Similarly, the event $\left\{\sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}}\in\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2\right\}$ is equivalent to an event $\left\{x_{j2\vec{z}}\in\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$ of the same probability as $\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$, due to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\} &= \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\bigcap\sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\}\\ &= \left(\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{j2\vec{\mu}}}\left\{\sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}}\left|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right.\right\}\right)^2.\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

With the intersection $\{x_{j\vec{z}}\} = \left\{x_{j1\vec{z}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\} \bigcap \left\{x_{j2\vec{z}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$, we get an event which does not depend on the detector's axis, and is corresponding as well as equivalent to both $\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$ and $\{\sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}}\}$. In turn, deterministic passive locality holds.

While Nelson's proof in section 3 made only use of passive locality, a derivation of Bell's original statement eq. (37), 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 of quantum mechanics states: Every outcome at the detectors must be determined by an event at preparation stage.

The failure of deterministic passive locality implies for the spin trajectories in a hidden variable description of the EPR experiment: During the time of its flight from the source to the measurement apparatus, each particle has to undergo a stochastic process, constantly changing its spin orientation from up to down and vice-versa, with all outcomes not determined by an earlier event at the source. Additionally, because of eq. (21), the spin directions of the two particles in every pair have to be opposite at any time. For a theory compatible with relativity theory, this all must happen such, that active locality is preserved.

If these conditions can be fulfilled, Bell's inequalities will be violated without instantaneous signaling between the two measurement stations 1 and 2. And, as shall be shown in the next sections of this article, there is no reason to believe, that hidden variable theories are unable to do so.

5 Fritsche's hidden variable theory and the locality problem

5.1 Derivation of the single particle Schroedinger equation from Brownian motion

In 2003, L. Fritsche and M. Haugk [16] published a modification of Nelson's stochastic mechanics. It is, in contrast to Nelson's original contribution [14, 15], an actively local theory with a non-markovian stochastic process. Moreover, it can, if slightly modified, be made to violate passive locality only. 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, the focus of this section is on superposed states and we show the theory to be actively local when many particle systems are considered. In turn, we will have enough material to explain how the correlations in entangled states emerge.

The starting point to derive the modified stochastic mechanics of [16] 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 Fritsche's 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 Ballentine's famous statistical ensemble interpretation [45]. 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 to find the electron of a hydrogen atom in a volume Ω at time t, given by

$$\mathrm{p}(\Omega, t) \equiv \int_{\Omega} \psi^*(\vec{r}, t)\psi(\vec{r}, t)\mathrm{d}^3 r, \tag{50}$$

were $\psi(\vec{r}, t)$ is the electrons wave-function, describes the following situation: To get all the information of $p(\Omega, t)$ 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 at time t after the preparation of the state. Finally, one must compute the electron's 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 these trajectories 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. After each time step, some of the particles are interchanged between the two sub-ensembles, until kinetic energy of the latter agrees again. At this point, the entire procedure is repeated.

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

$$\begin{aligned} m_0\ddot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_j^{\mathrm{B}}(t) + \frac{m_0}{\tau}\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_j^{\mathrm{B}}(t) &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}_j^{\mathrm{ext}}(t) + \vec{\mathrm{F}}_j^{\mathrm{Brown}}(t) \\ m_0\ddot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_j^{\mathrm{A}}(t) - \frac{m_0}{\tau}\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_j^{\mathrm{A}}(t) &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}_{\mathrm{j}}^{\ \mathrm{ext}}(t) + \vec{\mathrm{F}}_j^{\mathrm{Brown}}(t) \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

The three dimensional vector $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_j^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(t)$ defines the hidden position variable for the j-th sample trajectory of a particle in the A(B) ensemble at time t, where $1 \leq j \leq S \in \mathbb{N}$. $\vec{\mathrm{F}}_j^{\mathrm{ext}}(t)$ is an arbitrary external force field and $\vec{\mathrm{F}}_j^{\mathrm{Brown}}(t)$ denotes the random force, the j-th particle is subjected to. This random force 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. One can separate the sample trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_j^{\mathrm{A(B)}}$ into a sum, caused by the random and the external force:

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

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 $\dot{\mathrm{x}}_{rj1}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(t), \dot{\mathrm{x}}_{rj2}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(t), \dot{\mathrm{x}}_{rj3}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(t)$, as well as there is no dependence between $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{cj}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(t), \vec{\mathrm{x}}_{rj}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(t)$. With this property in mind, the authors of [16] average in each of the two sub-ensembles A and B about all j-th sample trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_j^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(t)$, after the ensemble was made infinitely large ($S \to \infty$). Finally, they arrive at two differential equations:

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

In eq. (54), $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} \equiv (\mathrm{F}_1^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r},t), \mathrm{F}_2^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r},t), \mathrm{F}_3^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r},t))$ denotes the average external force at point $\vec{r} \equiv (r_1, r_2, r_3)$ and time t. The vector valued entity

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

is the average velocity of the ensemble, where:

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

Additionally, we have the so called osmotic average velocity $\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}$. 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

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}} &\equiv \mp\nu\vec{\nabla}ln\left(\rho^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(\vec{r},t)/\rho_0\right) \\ &= \left(u_1^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(\vec{r},t), u_2^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(\vec{r},t), u_3^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(\vec{r},t)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

In eq. (56), 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 for some events near infinity. Under this circumstances, a particle may be driven to $\vec{r} = \infty$ at a certain time-step t with an 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 [16], that this constraint implies $\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}} = \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}$ also. After the first time step, eq. (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

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

holds. 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 eq. (58) holds.

At every time step, can compute the arithmetic mean of the two diffusion equations for the A and B systems. As is shown in [16], the time evolution of the overall system is described by the following diffusion equation:

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

If the Brownian forces were absent, we would have $\vec{\mathrm{u}} = 0$ with eq. (59) becoming the equation of motion for a classical particle.

For the description of quantum systems, will assume the random forces to be present. We try to simplify eq. (59) with the definition of a function

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

This function 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 show that $\vec{\mathrm{v}}$ is curl free). After some computations, the authors of [16] are able to cast eq. (59) directly in form of the time dependent Schroedinger equation:

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\psi(\vec{r}, t)}{\partial t} = \hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r}, t)\psi(\vec{r}, t) \tag{60}$$

In eq. (60), $\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r}, t)$ denotes the Hamiltonian operator

$$\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r}, t) \equiv -\frac{\hbar^2\Delta}{2m_0} + \hat{\mathrm{V}}^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}, t) \tag{61}$$

with $\hat{\mathrm{V}}^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}, t)$ as the potential of the external forces $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} \equiv -\vec{\nabla}\hat{\mathrm{V}}^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}, t)$. The stochastic process for the infinitely large ensemble of single particles with trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_j(t)$ leads to a differential equation, encoding the ensemble average velocities $\vec{\mathrm{v}}$ and $\vec{\mathrm{u}}$ 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 [16].

5.2 Quantum states in superpositions

Before we can discuss the locality properties of Fritsche's theory 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.

$$\Psi(\vec{r}, t) \equiv a\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r}, t) + b\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r}, t) \tag{62}$$

is also a solution of eq. (60). With eq. (62), one would get mixing terms in $\rho(\vec{r},t)$:

$$\rho(\vec{r},t) = a^2\psi_\uparrow^2(\vec{r},t) + b^2\psi_\downarrow^2(\vec{r},t) + a^*b\psi_\uparrow^*(\vec{r},t)\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r},t) + b^*a\psi_\downarrow^*(\vec{r},t)\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r},t) \tag{63}$$

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

The physical information of the superposed state (62) 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 it without loss of information in the form given below:

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

$$= \begin{cases} i\hbar\frac{\partial a\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r},t)}{\partial t} = \hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t)a\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r},t) \\ + \\ i\hbar\frac{\partial b\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r},t)}{\partial t} = \hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t)b\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r},t) \end{cases} \tag{65}$$

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

$$|\Psi(\vec{r},t)\rangle = c_\uparrow|\psi_\uparrow\rangle + c_\downarrow|\psi_\downarrow\rangle \tag{66}$$

and the probability density can be written without mixing terms:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\vec{r},t) &= \langle\Psi(\vec{r},t)|\Psi(\vec{r},t)\rangle \\ &= a^2\psi_\uparrow^*(\vec{r},t)\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r},t) + b^2\psi_\downarrow^*(\vec{r},t)\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r},t) \\ &= a^2\rho_\uparrow(\vec{r},t) + b^2\rho_\downarrow(\vec{r},t) \end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

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 $\downarrow$ in eq. (65) with the same methods as given before. The derivation begins with four Langevin equations

$$\begin{aligned} m_0\ddot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_{j\uparrow}^{\mathrm{B}}(t) + \frac{m_0}{\tau}\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_{j\uparrow}^{\mathrm{B}}(t) &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}_j^{\mathrm{ext}}(t) + \vec{\mathrm{F}}_{j\uparrow}^{\mathrm{Brown}}(t) \\ m_0\ddot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_{j\uparrow}^{\mathrm{A}}(t) - \frac{m_0}{\tau}\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_{j\uparrow}^{\mathrm{A}}(t) &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}_j^{\mathrm{ext}}(t) + \vec{\mathrm{F}}_{j\uparrow}^{\mathrm{Brown}}(t) \\ m_0\ddot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_{j\downarrow}^{\mathrm{B}}(t) + \frac{m_0}{\tau}\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_{j\downarrow}^{\mathrm{B}}(t) &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}_j^{\mathrm{ext}}(t) + \vec{\mathrm{F}}_{j\downarrow}^{\mathrm{Brown}}(t) \\ m_0\ddot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_{j\downarrow}^{\mathrm{A}}(t) - \frac{m_0}{\tau}\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}_{j\downarrow}^{\mathrm{A}}(t) &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}_j^{\mathrm{ext}}(t) + \vec{\mathrm{F}}_{j\downarrow}^{\mathrm{Brown}}(t) \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

and appropriate hidden trajectory variables for the A $\uparrow$, B$\uparrow$, A$\downarrow$ and B$\downarrow$ ensembles. After some steps, we are lead to the following differential equations:

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

The vectors $\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\uparrow(\downarrow)}, \vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow(\downarrow)}$ are the ensemble average velocities of the states $\uparrow$ ($\downarrow$). In this notation, the four equations in eq. (69) would define two separate particle systems, with the particles belonging to one ensemble $\uparrow$ or $\downarrow$ 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. (69) cannot describe a state in a superposition and we have to modify the derivation of eq. (65).

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

$$\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t) = \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r},t), \quad \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t) = \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r},t) \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r},t) = \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t), \quad \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r},t) = \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t) \tag{70}$$

holds. If we add the A$\uparrow$ and B$\downarrow$, as well as the A$\downarrow$ and the B$\uparrow$ ensembles, we arrive at two equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow} + \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow}\right) + \left[\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow} - \left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow}\right] + \left[\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow} - \left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow}\right] + \nu\Delta\left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow} + \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow}\right) \\
&\qquad = \frac{1}{m_0}\left(\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} + \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}\right) \\
&\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow} + \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow}\right) + \left[\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow} - \left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow}\right] + \left[\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow} - \left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow}\right] + \nu\Delta\left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow} + \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow}\right) \\
&\qquad = \frac{1}{m_0}\left(\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} + \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

They can be summed together, yielding:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow} + \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow} + \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow} + \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow}\right) + \left[\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow} - \left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow}\right] + \left[\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow} - \left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow}\right] \\
&+ \left[\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow}\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow} - \left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow}\right] + \left[\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow} - \left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow}\right] + \nu\Delta\left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow} + \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow} + \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow} + \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow}\right) \\
&\qquad = \frac{2}{m_0}\left(\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} + \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

Both equations in eq. (71) contain A and B as well as $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ systems. They describe the average behavior of equations of motion under the same random and external forces. Hence, we have:

$$\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow} = \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow} \equiv \vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\uparrow}, \quad \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow} = \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow} \equiv \vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\downarrow} \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow} = \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow} \equiv \vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow}, \quad \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow} = \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow} \equiv \vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\downarrow} \tag{73}$$

With eq. (73), 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. (72) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\uparrow} + \vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\downarrow}\right) + \left[\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\uparrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\uparrow} - \left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow}\right] + \left[\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\downarrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\downarrow} - \left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\downarrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\downarrow}\right] + \nu\Delta\left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow} + \vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\downarrow}\right) \\
&\qquad = \frac{1}{m_0}\left(\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} + \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

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

$$\begin{cases}
\frac{d}{dt}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\uparrow} - \left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow} + \nu\Delta\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow} &= \frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} \\
+ & \\
\frac{d}{dt}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\downarrow} - \left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\downarrow}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\downarrow} + \nu\Delta\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\downarrow} &= \frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}
\end{cases} \tag{75}$$

from which the two Schroedinger equations eq. (65) can be derived.

The two conditions eq. (70) and eq. (73) imply, that the average velocities $\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\uparrow} = \vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\downarrow} \equiv \vec{\mathrm{v}}$ and $\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow} = \vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\downarrow} \equiv \vec{\mathrm{u}}$ are equal. Hence, the equations in (65) describe two oscillating systems with identical dynamics.

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

$$|\Psi(\vec{r},t)\rangle \equiv \sum_i^{\mathcal{N}} a_i\,|\psi_i(\vec{r},t)\rangle \tag{76}$$

The weighting factors of these states define different probabilities of a given particle to be found in one particular state. Therefore, the ensembles in the corresponding $\mathcal{N}$ diffusion equations 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 exchange 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 indices $1 \leq i,k \leq \mathcal{N}$. 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 $|\psi_i(\vec{r},t)\rangle$ and $|\psi_k(\vec{r},t)\rangle$ only arise due to the in-equal size of their corresponding 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 eq. (75). We remark, that because of eq. (56), nothing about the weighting factors a_i^2 in the probability density appears in $\vec{\mathrm{v}}, \vec{\mathrm{u}}$. Hence, one has to re-introduce this information after one gets from the separated system in eq. (65) to the superposed eq. (64).

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

In this section, we turn to the locality properties of the stochastic process described above. We observe, that in the Langevin equations (51), there is no dynamical coupling between different trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j\uparrow(\downarrow)}(t)$ and $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j'\uparrow(\downarrow)}(t)$ with $j \neq j'$. $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_{j}(t)$ is an arbitrary force field, only acting on the j-trajectory and $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j}(t)$ is required to be a Gaussian distribution independent for each j. Nevertheless, the time evolution of different trajectories will be correlated because of the interchange mechanism.

If something happens to a large set of trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j'\uparrow(\downarrow)}(t)$ 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 may arrive at $(\vec{r},t)$. The ensemble average $\vec{\mathrm{v}}(\vec{r},t)$ is computed with all trajectories in $(\vec{r},t)$. Therefore, what has happened at $(\vec{r}',t')$ can modify $\vec{\mathrm{v}}(\vec{r},t)$. The interchange procedure compares the velocity of an arbitrary single particle trajectory $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j\uparrow(\downarrow)}(t)$, which arrived at $(\vec{r},t)$ with the changed $\vec{\mathrm{v}}(\vec{r},t)$. For the next time step, dependent on the result of the comparison, the particle might be placed in a new differential equation B(A), where $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j\uparrow(\downarrow)}(t)$ will be renamed to $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{B(A)}}_{j\downarrow(\uparrow)}(t)$.

As a consequence, the particle trajectory $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j\uparrow(\downarrow)}(t)$ at $(\vec{r},t)$ will be influenced by what happens at $(\vec{r}',t')$, even if it never was at $(\vec{r}',t')$. This effect is important in double slit experiments, where a particles trajectory, after the passage of one slit, depends on whether the second slit is open or not, no matter if the particle went through the second slit.

It is important, that $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j\uparrow(\downarrow)}(t)$ at $(\vec{r},t)$ can only be influenced, if the place $(\vec{r}',t')$ where some intervention was made, lies in the past cone of $(\vec{r},t)$. In turn, there does not exist any violation of active locality.

We emphasize, that the exchange mechanism does not introduce a direct dynamical coupling between the trajectories. Instead, the comparison of the particle's 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 individual particles of the ensemble can be seen experimentally in so called self-interferometry experiments. The typical example is Neutron interferometry [18], 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" [19].

5.4 Derivation of the many particle Schroedinger equation

In this section, we want to explore, whether active locality persists when we consider many particle systems. 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 $1 \leq n \leq \mathrm{N}$:

$$\begin{aligned} m_0 \ddot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{jn}(t) + \frac{m_0}{\tau}\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{jn}(t) &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_{jn}(t) + \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{jn}(t) + \sum_{\substack{n'=1 \\ n' \neq n}}^{\mathrm{N}} \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_{jn}\left(\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{jn}(t), \vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j'n'}(t), t\right) \\ m_0 \ddot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{jn}(t) - \frac{m_0}{\tau}\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{jn}(t) &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_{jn}(t) + \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{jn}(t) + \sum_{\substack{n'=1 \\ n' \neq n}}^{\mathrm{N}} \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_{jn}\left(\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{jn}(t), \vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j'n'}(t), t\right) \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

In eq. (77), a sum of additional force terms $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_{jn}\left(\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{jn}(t), \vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j'n'}(t), t\right)$, corresponding to inter-particle forces between the particle states n and $n' \neq n$ may be present. From the two Langevin equations (77), the authors of [16] derive differential equations of the A and B systems, completely analogous to the single particle case:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NB}} + \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{NB}}\right) + \left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NB}} - \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{NB}}\right) \cdot \vec{\nabla}^{\mathrm{N}}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NB}} + \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{NB}}\right) + \nu\Delta^{\mathrm{N}}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NB}} + \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{NB}}\right) &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\mathrm{ext}} \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NA}} - \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{NA}}\right) + \left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NA}} + \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{NA}}\right) \cdot \vec{\nabla}^{\mathrm{N}}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NA}} - \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{NA}}\right) - \nu\Delta^{\mathrm{N}}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NA}} - \vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{NA}}\right) &= \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\mathrm{ext}} \end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

In contrast to the single particle case, $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\mathrm{ext}}$ is a 3N dimensional vector:

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

It consists of the average single particle force $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_{n}(\vec{r}_n, t)$ and of an average inter-particle force $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_{n}(\vec{r}_n, \vec{r}_{n'}, t)$. Both forces are acting on the n-th particle state with rest mass m_{0n}. Similarly, the three dimensional ensemble averages $\vec{\mathrm{u}}$ and $\vec{\mathrm{v}}$ are replaced by 3N dimensional entities. They depend on the 3N coordinates $\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}} \equiv (\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, \ldots, \vec{r}_{\mathrm{N}})$ from the various particles in the following way:

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

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

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

$$\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NA}}(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}}, t) = \vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{NB}}(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}}, t) \tag{79}$$

holds.

Here, we have to note an additional subtlety which does only arise in many particle systems. It has to be ensured, that exchanges between two trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{jn}(t)$ and $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{B(A)}}_{j'n'}(t)$ are confined within the same particle state $n = n'$. An interchange between trajectories of different states n and $n' \neq n$ would couple the corresponding particle ensembles, even if no inter-particle forces are present. This would cause a general impossibility to define single particle operators acting on only one state n of a many particle system. Fortunately, due to the specific coordinate dependence of the ensemble averages $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}}$ and $\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}}$, eq. (79) is defined for every state n separately. Therefore, the exchange procedure can well be confined within each single particle state only.

After the trajectory exchange, one can compute the arithmetic mean of the two differential equations in eq. (78) and gets, analogous to the single particle case, a simple diffusion equation:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}} - \left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}} \cdot \vec{\nabla}^{\mathrm{N}}\right)\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}} + \nu\Delta^{\mathrm{N}}\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}} = \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\mathrm{ext}}. \tag{80}$$

From eq. (80), the many particle Schroedinger equation

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\Psi\left(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t\right)}{\partial t}=\hat{H}(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t)\Psi\left(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t\right) \tag{81}$$

can be derived, similar to the single particle case before. In eq. (81) the Hamiltonian operator becomes

$$\hat{H}(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t)\equiv\sum_{n=1}^{\mathrm{N}}\frac{-\hbar^2\Delta^{\mathrm{n}}}{2m_{0n}}+\hat{\mathrm{V}}_{\mathrm{ext}}\left(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t\right). \tag{82}$$

Its external potential

$$\hat{\mathrm{V}}_{\mathrm{ext}}\left(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t\right)\equiv\sum_{n=1}^{\mathrm{N}}\hat{\mathrm{V}}_{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_n,t)+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=1}^{\mathrm{N}}\sum_{\substack{n'=1\\n'\neq n}}^{\mathrm{N}}\hat{\mathrm{V}}_{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_n,\vec{r}_{n'},t) \tag{83}$$

is connected to the n-th component of $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{ext}$ via $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{ext,n}\equiv-\frac{\vec{\nabla}^{\mathrm{n}}}{m_{0\mathrm{n}}}V_{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t)$.

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

In this section, we assume all inter-particle terms to be absent. We observe, that with the absence of inter-particle forces like $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_{jn}\left(\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{jn}(t),\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j'n'}(t),t\right)$, there are no terms in eq. (77) which interconnect different trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{jn}(t)$ and $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j'n'}(t)$, where $n'\neq n$ denotes a different particle state with trajectories j'. This is true also for the ensemble averages $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}}_n(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}}_n,t)$ and $\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}}_n(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}}_n,t)$, since they are calculated with the $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{jn}(t)$ trajectories for each single particle state n separately.

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

The ensemble average $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}}_n(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}}_n,t)$ for the n-th particle may depend on j different sample trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{jn}(t)$, as long as they lie in the past cone of $(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}}_n,t)$. However, such a dependence does not exist between $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}}_n(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}}_n,t)$ and the trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j'n'}(t)$ of other states $n'\neq n$ in the many particle system. As a result, we conclude, that active locality holds in Fritsche's hidden variable theory.

5.6 Entangled states in Fritsche's theory

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

$$|\Psi(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle\equiv\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|\psi_1(\vec{r}_1,t)\rangle\otimes|\psi_2(\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle-|\psi_2(\vec{r}_1,t)\rangle\otimes|\psi_1(\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle\right) \tag{84}$$

are commonly called entangled. They were observed in massive fermionic systems for the first time in flavour states of B-Mesons [20]. Those particles have the unwanted property to decay rapidly and the violation of Bell's inequality could only be confirmed after an interpolation. A later experiment used spin states of entangled protons [21]. Protons are stable particles and no interpolation was necessary.

The overall state vector $|\Psi(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle$ is an element in the product Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}\equiv\mathcal{H}_1\otimes\mathcal{H}_2$. It is a superposition of the two product states

$$|\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle\equiv|\psi_1(\vec{r}_1,t)\rangle\otimes|\psi_2(\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle \tag{85}$$

and

$$|\chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle \equiv |\psi_2(\vec{r}_1,t)\rangle \otimes |\psi_1(\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle\,, \tag{86}$$

where $|\psi_1(\vec{r}_1,t)\rangle\,, |\psi_2(\vec{r}_1,t)\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $|\psi_1(\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle\,, |\psi_2(\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2$ denote the single particle solutions. The entangled state solves a many-particle Schroedinger equation with an Hamiltonian operator

$$\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) \equiv \sum_{n=1}^{2} \frac{-\hbar^2\Delta^{\mathrm{n}}}{2m_{0n}} + \sum_{n=1}^{2} \hat{\mathrm{V}}_{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_n,t), \tag{87}$$

which has no inter-particle forces and whose external potentials agree at each time t:

$$\hat{\mathrm{V}}_{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_1,t) = \hat{\mathrm{V}}_{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_2,t) \tag{88}$$

The corresponding Schroedinger equation can be written, analogous to eq. (65), as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{i\hbar\partial\Psi(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)}{\partial t} &= \hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\Psi(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) \\
\frac{i\hbar}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{\partial\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)}{\partial t} - \frac{i\hbar}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{\partial\chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)}{\partial t} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) \\
&= \begin{cases} \frac{i\hbar}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{\partial\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) \\ - \\ \frac{i\hbar}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{\partial\chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

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 $\vec{r}_2$ system. To describe the dynamics of the $\vec{r}_1$ particles, the A1(B1) ensemble 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 j-th pair of particle trajectories in the $\vec{r}_1$ and $\vec{r}_2$ system changes its state simultaneously. We will show in the context with Bohm's EPR experiment, how this can be achieved, even if the trajectories of the two different ensembles are disconnected from each other.

For now, we only remark, that without interparticle-forces, it is in fact a requirement for the particle trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{j1}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(t)$ and $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{j'2}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(t)$ not to be interconnected directly 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 $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{jn}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(t)$. The measurement device may change $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{jn}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(t)$ in a way, that correlations with all the other particle trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}_{j'n'}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}(t)$ 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 operator

$$\hat{\mathrm{H}} \equiv \hat{\mathrm{H}}_1 \otimes 1_2 + 1_1 \otimes \hat{\mathrm{H}}_2, \tag{90}$$

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

$$\hat{\mathrm{A}}_{\hat{\mathrm{H}}}(t) \equiv e^{it\hat{\mathrm{H}}}\hat{\mathrm{A}}_1 e^{-it\hat{\mathrm{H}}} = e^{it\hat{\mathrm{H}}_1}\hat{\mathrm{A}}_1 e^{-it\hat{\mathrm{H}}_1} \otimes 1_2 \tag{91}$$

is completely independent of $\mathcal{H}_2$, even if $|\Psi(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ is described by the entangled state of eq. (84). 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]. The reason was, that Nelson 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, neither the splitting of the many particle Schroedinger equation in eq. (89), nor any sort of interchanging procedure between the particles in the A1(B1) and B2(A2) ensemble was possible. Accordingly, active locality was lost in Nelson's original formulation of stochastic mechanics, similarly as in Bohmian mechanics. For the latter (see [44] for a general introduction), it is well known, that the derivation of the many particle Schroedinger equation is only possible, if a highly

non-trivial dependency between the "Bohmian trajectories" of different states has to be introduced, at odds with the theory of relativity and without any physical foundation. Interestingly, Nelson himself has shown recently in [23], that $\vec{v}(\vec{r},t)$ and $\vec{u}(\vec{r},t)$ cannot correspond to properties of individual particles, since this would lead to measurable differences between his original theory and ordinary quantum mechanics. A similar observation was made for "Bohmian trajectories" earlier in [22].

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 [24]. By the time, more physically motivated derivations of the Pauli equation were developed. One by Faris [25, 26] and another one by the author of the modification of Nelson's stochastic mechanics discussed above [27]. 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. In this section, we propose a theory of spinning particles providing such a mechanism.

Beginning with an example of [27], we try to interpret the spin of a particle as rotation around a chosen axis $\vec{z}$. We let the particle rotate around this axis 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

$$\Delta E \Delta t = \frac{1}{2} m_0 r \cdot r \frac{2\pi}{T}\frac{2\pi}{T} T = m_0 v r \pi = \pi s \approx \hbar/2. \tag{92}$$

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

$$s = m_0 v r \approx \frac{\hbar}{2\pi} \tag{93}$$

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 spin angular momentum to $s = \hbar/2$ on the average. From the time dependent Schroedinger equation, one can derive the so called Ehrenfest theorem $\frac{d}{dt}\left\langle \hat{\vec{\mathrm{v}}} \right\rangle = \left\langle \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} \right\rangle$, where $\left\langle \hat{\vec{\mathrm{v}}} \right\rangle$ is the expectation value of the velocity operator. This equation implies for the angular momentum operator $\hat{\vec{\mathrm{L}}} = \hat{\vec{r}} \times m_0 \hat{\vec{\mathrm{v}}}$, 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

Particle states of spin $1/2$ occur in a superposition of $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ states, if the particles are not specially prepared. Hence, we have to make a similar computation as in section 5.2. Here however, the trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j\uparrow(\downarrow)}(t)$ of eq. (68) describe particles in rotational motion. Their rotation can be in the left- or in the right direction with respect to the chosen axis $\vec{z}$. Particles rotating in the left direction are denoted by $\uparrow$ whereas particles rotating in the right direction are identified by $\downarrow$. Eventually, we arrive after some calculations at the four differential equations of eq. (69).

As explained before, the interpretation of a state in a superposition is, that a given particle from the superposed system must have a non-vanishing probability to be found in each one of the component states. Accordingly, we have to interchange trajectories between the A$\uparrow$ (A $\downarrow$) and B$\downarrow$ (B $\uparrow$) ensembles before we get to the differential equations in eq. (71).

For a single particle, the effect of this exchange 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 [31]. It is this procedure, whereby the possibility for a violation of deterministic passive locality does arise.

At the end of the calculation in section 5.2, we were able to describe the behavior of the overall system by a probability density

$$\rho(\vec{r},t) = a^2\rho_\uparrow(\vec{r},t) + b^2\rho_\downarrow(\vec{r},t) \tag{94}$$

and a quantum state

$$|\Psi(\vec{r},t)\rangle \equiv \begin{pmatrix} a\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r},t) \\ b\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r},t) \end{pmatrix} = a\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r},t)\,|+\rangle + b\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r},t)\,|-\rangle\,, \tag{95}$$

both in form of a sum composed of the two rotating systems.

From here on, we can closely follow [27] to derive the rest of quantum mechanics for spinning particles. If an external magnetic field $B_{\vec{z}}(\vec{r},t)$ in the direction of $\vec{z}$ is applied, the energy of $\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r},t)$ decreases with magnitude $\mu_B B_{\vec{z}}(\vec{r},t)$, whereas the energy of $\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r},t)$ increases by the same magnitude. The constant μ_B is called Bohr magneton

$$\mu_B \equiv \frac{e\hbar}{2m_0}. \tag{96}$$

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 [28]).

Under $B_{\vec{z}}(\vec{r},t)$, we have for the magnetic energy densities

$$\mu_\uparrow(\vec{r},t) \equiv -\mu_B B_{\vec{z}}(\vec{r},t)\,|a|^2\,\psi^*_\uparrow(\vec{r},t)\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r},t) \tag{97}$$

and

$$\mu_\downarrow(\vec{r},t) \equiv \mu_B B_{\vec{z}}(\vec{r},t)\,|b|^2\,\psi^*_\downarrow(\vec{r},t)\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r},t). \tag{98}$$

With their sum

$$\mu(\vec{r},t) \equiv \mu_\uparrow(\vec{r},t) + \mu_\downarrow(\vec{r},t), \tag{99}$$

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

$$\mu(\vec{r},t) = -\Psi^+(\vec{r},t)\mu_B\mathbf{B}_{\vec{z}}\Psi(\vec{r},t), \tag{100}$$

where

$$\mathbf{B}_{\vec{z}} \equiv B_{\vec{z}}(\vec{r},t)\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{101}$$

The different coupling of the systems $\psi_{\uparrow(\downarrow)}(\vec{r},t)$ to magnetic fields gives raise to the Stern-Gerlach effect [29]. 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 $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_{j\uparrow}(t) \neq \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_{j\downarrow}(t)$. Accordingly, they get deflected in opposite directions. Due to active locality, the interchanging procedure can only happen between trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j\uparrow(\downarrow)}(t)$, if they are at the same point $(\vec{r},t)$ in space-time. The Stern-Gerlach magnet separates trajectories which belong to different spin states spatially. Then, the exchange procedure can take place between trajectories of the same spin ensemble only. This is observed in so called double Stern-Gerlach experiments [30]. 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 interactions 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 [16], the Schroedinger equation under a magnetic field with its Hamiltonian

$$\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t) \equiv \frac{\left(-i\hbar\vec{\nabla} - e\hat{\vec{\mathrm{A}}}\left(\vec{r},t\right)\right)^2}{2m_0} + e\Phi(\vec{r},t) + \hat{\mathrm{V}}^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r},t) \tag{102}$$

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

$$\psi^*_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t)\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t)\psi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r},t) + \psi^*_{\downarrow}(\vec{r},t)\hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t)\psi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r},t) = \Psi^+(\vec{r},t)\hat{\mathbf{H}}\Psi(\vec{r},t), \tag{103}$$

where we have used the definition

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}} \equiv \hat{\mathrm{H}}(\vec{r},t)\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{104}$$

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

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\Psi(\vec{r},t)}{\partial t} = \left(\hat{\mathbf{H}} - \mu_B\mathbf{B}_{\vec{z}}\right)\Psi(\vec{r},t) \tag{105}$$

If the magnetic field $\vec{B}(\vec{r},t)$ has another direction as the rotating axis of the spinning particles, one must change its coordinate system. This can be done via linear transformations $\vec{B}'(\vec{r},t) \equiv \mathbf{Q}\vec{B}(\vec{r},t)$, where $\mathbf{Q}$ defines a rotation matrix. It is known from classical mechanics (see e.g. [32]), that a general rotation matrix can be given by

$$\mathbf{Q} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} e^{\frac{i}{2}(\psi+\phi)}cos(\theta/2) & ie^{\frac{i}{2}(\psi-\phi)}sin(\theta/2) \\ ie^{-\frac{i}{2}(\psi-\phi)}sin(\theta/2) & e^{-\frac{i}{2}(\psi+\phi)}cos(\theta/2) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{106}$$

with Euler angles ψ, ϕ and θ. We can write the general vector of a magnetic field $\vec{B}(\vec{r},t)$ in matrix form as

$$\mathbf{B} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} B_z(\vec{r},t) & B_x(\vec{r},t) - iB_y(\vec{r},t) \\ B_x(\vec{r},t) + iB_y(\vec{r},t) & -B_z(\vec{r},t) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{107}$$

Obviously, $\mathbf{B}$ can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{B} = B_x(\vec{r},t)\sigma_{\mathbf{x}} + B_y(\vec{r},t)\sigma_{\mathbf{y}} + B_z(\vec{r},t)\sigma_{\mathbf{z}}, \tag{108}$$

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

$$\mathbf{B} = \vec{B}(\vec{r},t)\vec{\sigma} \tag{109}$$

Using eqs. (106) and (107), the magnetic field $\vec{B}'(\vec{r},t)$ in matrix form and a rotated coordinate system is given by

$$\mathbf{B}' = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{Q}^+. \tag{110}$$

We must derive, how $\Psi(\vec{r},t)$ changes, after this transformation took place. The energy density at a point $(\vec{r},t)$ remains equal after a rotation of the coordinate system:

$$u(\vec{r},t) = u'(\vec{r},t) \tag{111}$$

If we define

$$\Psi'(\vec{r},t) \equiv \mathbf{Q}\Psi(\vec{r},t), \tag{112}$$

we get the energy density in the transformed system:

$$u'(\vec{r},t) = \Psi^+(\vec{r},t)\mathbf{Q}^+\mathbf{B}'\mathbf{Q}\Psi(\vec{r},t) \tag{113}$$

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

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

Since $\mathbf{Q}$ in eq. (106) is unitary, the following identity holds with eq. (114):

$$\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^+\mathbf{B}'\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^+ = \mathbf{B}' = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{Q}^+ \tag{115}$$

Eq. (115) exactly defines the transformation law of $\mathbf{B}$ in eq. (110). Finally, with the right hand side of eq. (113), eq. (114) and eq. (109), we can write the time dependent Pauli equation for a spinning particle :

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\Psi(\vec{r},t)}{\partial t} = \left(\hat{\mathbf{H}} - \mu_B\vec{B}(\vec{r},t)\vec{\sigma}\right)\psi(\vec{r},t) \tag{116}$$

A common situation is, that the magnetic field $\vec{B}(\vec{r},t)$ of a Stern-Gerlach apparatus lies in a coordinate system, that is rotated with respect to the orientation of an incoming spinor $\Psi'(\vec{r},t)$. Especially in EPR experiments, one has to compute $\Psi(\vec{r},t) = \mathbf{Q}^+\Psi'(\vec{r},t)$.

For the description of the spin direction in a magnetic field, only the Euler angles θ and ϕ are necessary and one can select $\psi = -\pi/2$ without loss of generalization. The projection of the rotated unit vector $\vec{e}_x{}'$ in the $\vec{e}_z/\vec{e}_y$ plane of the original, non-rotated coordinate system, encloses an angle φ with the $\vec{e}_x$ axis. This angle is related to the Euler angle ϕ by $\phi \equiv \varphi + \pi/2$.

Applying the adjoint of eq. (106) with those simplifications on a spinor $\psi'_\uparrow(\vec{r},t)\,|+\rangle$ yields

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

and for a $\psi'_\downarrow(\vec{r},t)\,|-\rangle$ state, we get

$$\psi(\vec{r},t) = \psi'_\downarrow(\vec{r},t)\left(-e^{-i\varphi/2}sin(\theta/2)\,|+\rangle + e^{i\varphi/2}cos(\theta/2)\,|-\rangle\right). \tag{118}$$

6.4 The spin operator

Finally, we will 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 $\vec{z}$ direction can be written as weighed sum:

$$\langle S_{\vec{z}}\rangle \equiv \frac{\hbar}{2}\int\left(|a|^2\,|\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r},t)|^2 - |b|^2\,|\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r},t)|^2\right)\mathrm{d}^3r \tag{119}$$

we can simplify this expression with a matrix

$$\mathbf{S}_{\vec{z}} \equiv \frac{\hbar}{2}\begin{pmatrix}1 & 0\\ 0 & -1\end{pmatrix} \tag{120}$$

to a form

$$\langle S_{\vec{z}}\rangle = \int\psi^+(\vec{r},t)\mathbf{S}_{\vec{z}}\psi(\vec{r},t)\mathrm{d}^3r. \tag{121}$$

For the spin with respect to the direction of an unit vector $\vec{z}' = \vec{\mu}$ from an arbitrary rotated coordinate system, we have, analogous to eq. (108) the relation $\mathbf{S}_{\vec{z}'} = \frac{\hbar}{2}\vec{\mu}\vec{\sigma}$. Often, the axis $\vec{\mu}$ is written in spherical coordinates $\vec{\mu} \equiv (cos(\varphi)sin(\theta), sin(\varphi)sin(\vartheta), cos(\vartheta))$.

Using this notation, a "spin operator" can be defined as

$$\hat{\vec{\mathbf{S}}} \equiv \frac{\hbar}{2}\vec{\sigma} \tag{122}$$

and we observe that $\mathbf{S}_{\vec{z}'} = \vec{\mu}\hat{\vec{\mathbf{S}}}$. Finally, the average value $\langle S_{\vec{z}'}\rangle$ becomes

$$\langle S_{\vec{z}'}\rangle = \int\psi^+(\vec{r},t)\mathbf{S}_{\vec{z}'}\psi(\vec{r},t)\mathrm{d}^3r = \vec{\mu}\left\langle\vec{\mathbf{S}}\right\rangle, \tag{123}$$

where

$$\left\langle\vec{\mathbf{S}}\right\rangle = \int\psi^+(\vec{r},t)\hat{\vec{\mathbf{S}}}\psi(\vec{r},t)\mathrm{d}^3r. \tag{124}$$

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 their external forces coincide at each time.

We start our discussion with a state

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) &\equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\psi(\vec{r}_1,t)\left|-\right\rangle\otimes\psi(\vec{r}_2,t)\left|+\right\rangle-\psi(\vec{r}_1,t)\left|+\right\rangle\otimes\psi(\vec{r}_2,t)\left|-\right\rangle\right)\\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)-\chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\right).\end{aligned} \tag{125}$$

It describes two ensembles of entangled particles with the same rest mass m_0 and opposite spin. The one particle spin states in the first line of eq. (125) are all eigenstates with respect to a chosen axis $\vec{z}$ and in the second line, we have defined the functions

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

The state in eq. (125) is the solution of a two particle Pauli equation without external electromagnetic fields. This leads to a Hamiltonian operator

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\equiv\left(\sum_{n=1}^{2}\frac{-\hbar^2\Delta^{\mathrm{n}}}{2m_{0n}}+\sum_{n=1}^{2}\hat{\mathrm{V}}_{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_n,t)\right)\begin{pmatrix}1&0\\0&1\end{pmatrix}, \tag{126}$$

where the external potentials for the two particle systems agree at each time t:

$$\hat{\mathrm{V}}_{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_1,t)=\hat{\mathrm{V}}_{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_2,t) \tag{127}$$

Similar as in eq. (89), the Pauli equation for the state of eq. (125) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Psi(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) &= \hat{\mathbf{H}}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\Psi(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\\ &= \begin{cases}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}i\hbar\frac{\partial\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2)}{\partial t}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\hat{\mathbf{H}}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2)\\ -\\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}i\hbar\frac{\partial\chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2)}{\partial t}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\hat{\mathbf{H}}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2)\end{cases}\end{aligned} \tag{128}$$

For the particle ensembles described by eq. (128), the overall probability density is given by

$$\rho(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\equiv\frac{1}{2}\rho_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)+\frac{1}{2}\rho_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t), \tag{129}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) &\equiv \chi_1^{+}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\\ &= \psi^*(\vec{r}_1,t)\psi(\vec{r}_1,t)\left\langle-\right|\left.-\right\rangle\otimes\psi^*(\vec{r}_2,t)\psi(\vec{r}_2,t)\left\langle+\right|\left.+\right\rangle\\ &\equiv \rho_{1\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)\otimes\rho_{1\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2,t)\end{aligned} \tag{130}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) &\equiv \chi_2^{+}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\chi_2(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\\ &= \psi^*(\vec{r}_1,t)\psi(\vec{r}_1,t)\left\langle+\right|\left.+\right\rangle\otimes\psi^*(\vec{r}_2,t)\psi(\vec{r}_2,t)\left\langle-\right|\left.-\right\rangle\\ &\equiv \rho_{2\uparrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)\otimes\rho_{2\downarrow}(\vec{r}_2,t).\end{aligned} \tag{131}$$

Probability densities of many particle states are connected to the corresponding osmotic velocities via

$$\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}}(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t)\equiv-\frac{\hbar}{2m_0}\vec{\nabla}^{\mathrm{N}}ln\left(\rho(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t)/\rho_0\right). \tag{132}$$

Hence, after the tensor product in $\rho_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)$ is converted by the logarithm laws into a sum, we get for $\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\chi 1}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\chi 1}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) &= -\frac{\hbar}{2m_0}\vec{\nabla}^{\mathrm{N}}\left(ln\left(\left(\rho_{1\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)\right)_1/\rho_0\right)+ln\left(\left(\rho_{1\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2,t)\right)_2/\rho_0\right)\right)\\ &= \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\hbar}{2m_0}\vec{\nabla}ln\left(\left(\rho_{1\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)\right)_1/\rho_0\right)\\ -\frac{\hbar}{2m_0}\vec{\nabla}ln\left(\left(\rho_{1\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2,t)\right)_2/\rho_0\right)\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)\\ \vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2,t)\end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned} \tag{133}$$

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 $\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\chi 2}(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t)\equiv\begin{pmatrix}\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)\\ \vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_2,t)\end{pmatrix}$.

The definition of the average velocity $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}}\left(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t\right)$ for a many particle ensemble is

$$\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}}\left(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t\right)\equiv\frac{\hbar}{m_0}\vec{\nabla}^{\mathrm{N}}\varphi(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t), \tag{134}$$

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

$$\Psi(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}},t)\equiv\pm\sqrt{\rho(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}})}e^{i\varphi(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}})}. \tag{135}$$

Writing $\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)$ in the form of eq. (135)

$$\chi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)=\sqrt{\rho_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)}e^{i\varphi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1)}\otimes\sqrt{\rho_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2,t)}e^{i\varphi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2)}, \tag{136}$$

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

$$\varphi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)=\varphi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)+\varphi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2,t). \tag{137}$$

This yields

$$\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\chi 1}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)=\frac{\hbar}{m_0}\vec{\nabla}^{\mathrm{N}}\varphi_1(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)=\begin{pmatrix}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)\\ \vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2,t)\end{pmatrix} \tag{138}$$

and we get $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{N}}_{\chi 2}(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t)\equiv\begin{pmatrix}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)\\ \vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_2,t)\end{pmatrix}$ 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 eq. (128) with the entangled state in eq. (125) can be decomposed into 2 two component differential equations, where $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_2(\vec{r}_2,t)=\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_1(\vec{r}_1,t)$:

$$\begin{cases}\begin{pmatrix}\frac{d}{dt}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)-\left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)+\nu\Delta\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)=\frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_1(\vec{r}_1,t)\\ \frac{d}{dt}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2,t)-\left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2,t)\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2,t)+\nu\Delta\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2,t)=\frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_2(\vec{r}_2,t)\end{pmatrix}\\ \begin{pmatrix}\frac{d}{dt}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)-\left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)+\nu\Delta\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)=\frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_1(\vec{r}_1,t)\\ \frac{d}{dt}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_2,t)-\left(\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_2,t)\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_2,t)+\nu\Delta\vec{\mathrm{u}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_2,t)=\frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_2(\vec{r}_2,t)\end{pmatrix}\end{cases} \tag{139}$$

Eq. (139) is equivalent to eq. (128), but it contains the ensemble averages $\vec{\mathrm{u}}$ and $\vec{\mathrm{v}}$ of each particle system directly. All equations in eq. (139) can be similarly derived as the two equations in eq. (75), but the derivation must be done for the $\vec{r}_1$ and $\vec{r}_2$ particle ensembles separately.

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

Having converted the entangled state into equations of motion that can be derived from the previously discussed hidden variable model, we will investigate in detail how the correlations of entangled systems emerge from the viewpoint of these hidden variables.

The source in the EPR experiment does produce particles of a defined spin direction with respect to the axis $\vec{z}$. 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 states of the particles emerging from the source are a superposition of an $\uparrow$ and a $\downarrow$ state. As described in section 7.2 the individual particles in such a system have to undergo an exchange procedure between the A$\uparrow$ and B$\downarrow$ or the B$\uparrow$ and A$\downarrow$ ensembles. The trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j\uparrow(\downarrow)1}(t)$ of the $\vec{r}_1$ particles have to switch between their $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)$ and $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)$ system as well as their $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)$ and $\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1,t)$ ensemble in eq. (139) during their flight. An analogous procedure has to happen with the $\vec{r}_2$ trajectories.

We observe, that it is possible, to threat the $\vec{r}_1$ and $\vec{r}_2$ states completely disconnected, because in eq. (139) 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 $\vec{r}_1$, might change the potential $\hat{\mathrm{V}}_{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_1,t)$ in eq. (126. Along with this goes a change of the external force $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_1(\vec{r}_1,t)$. If the action of the device was such, that $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_1(\vec{r}_1,t) \neq \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_2(\vec{r}_2,t)$ at certain times t, the equations governing the $\vec{r}_1$ system would be different from the equations for $\vec{r}_2$. As a result, correlations in eq. (139) between both ensembles would be lost. Obviously, the dynamics of the $\vec{r}_2$ system is not be changed by something that happens with the $\vec{r}_1$ ensemble.

For the discussion of the EPR experiment, it is important to note, that there will be still correlations between the two particle systems, if the experimenters at both measurement stations 1 and 2 choose the settings of their devices in a way, that $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_1(\vec{r}_1,t) = \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_2(\vec{r}_2,t)$ for all times t. This is exactly the situation, when the two separated Stern-Gerlach magnets are rotated in the same axis $\vec{\mu} = \vec{\nu}$ and the experiment is done with (infinitely) many particle pairs.

To connect the present discussion with the content of section 3, we recall the definition of the spin trajectories as stochastic processes $\phi_{j1t_{\vec{z}}}$ and $\phi_{j2t_{\vec{z}}}$. We have $\phi_{j1(2)t_{\vec{z}}} = (\uparrow)$, if the trajectory $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j1(2)}(t)$ at time t is in an $\uparrow$ ensemble with respect to $\vec{z}$ and $\phi_{j1(2)t_{\vec{z}}} = (\downarrow)$, if the trajectory is in the $\downarrow$ system at this time.

One gets exact anti-correlations between the spins of the j-th particle pair during its flight, if one can ensure that

$$\phi_{j1t_{\vec{z}}} \neq \phi_{j2t_{\vec{z}}} \tag{140}$$

for all times t. This property gives raise to the state in eq. (125). It is a state, which describes the solution of a Pauli equation with two separate particle ensembles, whose spin states are oscillating in an opposite way.

During the flight of the particles to the detectors, the trajectory exchange has to be done such, that if a trajectory 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. Otherwise, the trajectory affected would not be described any more by a superposition of an $\uparrow$ and a $\downarrow$ state, where energy conversation on the average holds.

The particles are interchanged from $\{\mathrm{A}\uparrow\}$ ($\{\mathrm{A}\downarrow\}$) to $\{\mathrm{B}\downarrow\}$ ($\{\mathrm{B}\uparrow\}$), when they are moving too fast in the A system. Similarly, a change from $\{\mathrm{B}\uparrow\}$ ($\{\mathrm{B}\downarrow\}$) to $\{\mathrm{A}\downarrow\}$ ($\{\mathrm{A}\uparrow\}$) occurs, when their velocity is too slow in the B system.

In each pair, the particles start having opposite spin and the same initial speed, due to momentum conservation. Therefore, at time $t = 0$, the trajectories from each pair will be placed in the same A(B) ensemble, but in the opposite spin system.

With inter-particle forces being absent and equal external forces, any differences in the velocity of the two entangled particles can be caused by the random forces $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j1(2)}$ only. Hence, we may demand that

$$\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j1}(t) = \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j2}(t) \tag{141}$$

for all j and each time t. Then, the velocities of the two entangled trajectories from every particle pair will coincide at all times, after they started with the same speed 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 particle's 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 $\phi_{j1t_{\vec{z}}} \neq \phi_{j2t_{\vec{z}}}$ for all times $t > 0$.

The requirement of eq. (141) may be achieved with a time dependent random force field which is distributed though the whole space and whose values are identical at every point $\left(\vec{r}^{\mathrm{N}}\right)$. Such an assumption

would not contradict the theory of special relativity, because for two forces to be equal at separated points, one must not necessarily incorporate a signaling mechanism between those points into the theory. This can be easily seen by an explicit construction of a local model, where eq. (141) holds.

The only constraint on the random forces was, that they have a Gaussian distribution. Now consider the following mechanism: A real random number generator sets a value λ_j for each j-th particle pair. This value λ_j is similar to the hidden parameter in Bell's original work [3], but independent for each j-th particle pair generated by the source.

In our model, λ_j serves as the starting value for two pseudo random number generators of the same type. Pseudo random number generators are deterministic procedures which, if initialized with the same starting value λ_j, always produce the same series. Let the two generators produce Gaussian distributed, time dependent series $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j1}(t,\lambda_j)$ and $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j2}(t,\lambda_j)$. These series are the random forces of the j-th trajectories for the $\vec{r}_1$ and $\vec{r}_2$ particles. Because they only depend on their common starting value, eq. (141) holds at each time. There is no signaling mechanism between the two disconnected forces, since they simply depend on their common past.

We have to remark, that even if the model with the pseudo random number generators may look terribly artificial, it would nevertheless be difficult to test. One does not have access to $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j1(2)}(t,\lambda_j)$, but only to the events $\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$, $\{\sigma_{j2\vec{\nu}}\}$ generated by the random variables $\phi_{j1\vec{\mu}}$ and $\phi_{j2\vec{\nu}}$. Because the initial value λ_j is assumed to be a real random number, the statistics of $\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{1\infty}\right\}$ and $\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{2\infty}\right\}$ would equal the properties of real random numbers, if infinitely many particle pairs j are considered.

At first sight, one may think, that our a procedure would set up a deterministic passively local theory. Indeed, for $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j1}(t,\lambda_j)$ and $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j2}(t,\lambda_j)$, there is a preparation event λ_j which determines all later values of these forces. However, the proof in section 4 was only with regards to elements of the,sigma algebras $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S$, $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1$ and $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2$. They are sets of possible results from spin measurements in the measurable space Ω' that emerges through $\phi_{j1t_{\vec{z}}}, \phi_{j2t_{\vec{z}}} : \Omega \mapsto \Omega'$. The elements in Ω' are in no way related to the random force. Clearly, there is no bijective mapping

$$\Gamma : \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j1(2)}(t) \mapsto \Omega', \tag{142}$$

since $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j1(2)}(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ has a Gaussian distribution and Ω' is confined to two values $\Omega' = (\uparrow \bigcup \downarrow)$ only. Thereby a violation of deterministic passive locality will be possible.

Let the spin trajectory $\phi_{j=1,1,t_{\vec{z}}}$ of a particle, which is in a pair $j = 1$ and will fly to detector 1, start in the A$\uparrow$ ensemble. The velocity of this particle at time $t = 0$ can be denoted by $\left|\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{j=1,\uparrow 1}(t=0)\right|$ and the particle's spin trajectory at that time is $\phi_{j=1,1,t=0_{\vec{z}}} = \uparrow$. The particle will have to be placed in the B$\downarrow$ ensemble, if its velocity $\left|\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{j=1,\uparrow 1}(t)\right|$ is higher than the arithmetic mean

$$\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}_1,t) \equiv \frac{\left|\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{r}_1,t)\right| + \left|\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}(\vec{r}_1,t)\right|}{2} \tag{143}$$

of the ensemble average velocities from the A$\uparrow$ and the B$\downarrow$ system.

The velocity $\left|\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{j=1,\uparrow 1}(t)\right|$ is a function of $\vec{F}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j=1,1}(t,\lambda_{j=1})$. For a given random starting value $\lambda_{j=1} \in \mathbb{R}$ of the pseudo random number generators, we let the Brownian force at time $t = 1$ take a value

$$\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j=1,1}(t=1,\lambda_{j=1}) \equiv \xi_1. \tag{144}$$

It may be, that ξ_1 leads to a particle velocity of $\left|\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{j=1,\uparrow 1}(t=1)\right| \leq \mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}_1,t=1)$. Then, no change of the spin trajectory takes place and we get:

$$\phi_{j=1,1,t=0_{\vec{z}}} = \phi_{j=1,1,t=1_{\vec{z}}}.$$

Similarly, at time $t = 2$, let

$$\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j=1,1}(t_2,\lambda_{j=1}) \equiv \xi_2 \tag{145}$$

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

$$\phi_{j=1,1,t=0_{\vec{z}}} = \phi_{j=1,1,t=1_{\vec{z}}} = \phi_{j=1,1,t=2_{\vec{z}}}. \tag{146}$$

There could be another pair $j = 2$, for which the particle 1 that goes through detector 1 starts in the A$\uparrow$ ensemble. This particle may be driven by another random starting value $\lambda_{j=2} \neq \lambda_{j=1}$. Obviously, it is well possible, that we have at $t = 1$:

$$\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j=2,1}(t = 1, \lambda_{j=2}) \equiv \delta_1 = \xi_1 \tag{147}$$

and thereby

$$\phi_{j=2,1,t=0_{\vec{z}}} = \phi_{j=2,1,t=1_{\vec{z}}} \tag{148}$$

again. Yet, for $t = 2$, we may get with $\lambda_{j=2}$

$$\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j=2,1}(t = 2, \lambda_{j=2}) \equiv \delta_2 \neq \xi_2, \tag{149}$$

where δ_2 is such, that $\left|\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{j=2,\uparrow 1}(t = 2)\right| > \mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}_1, t = 2)$. As a consequence, the particle in the A$\uparrow$ ensemble would be placed in the B$\downarrow$ ensemble at this time, taking the velocity $\left|\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{B}}_{j=2,\downarrow 1}(t = 2)\right|$. If so, the spin trajectory would become:

$$\phi_{j=2,1,t=0_{\vec{z}}} = \phi_{j=2,1,t=1_{\vec{z}}} \neq \phi_{j=2,1,t=2_{\vec{z}}}. \tag{150}$$

When the particles arrive in the Stern-Gerlach magnets of the EPR experiment, their spin states transform with axis dependent probabilities to an up or to a down state once again, due to the application of $\mathbf{Q}$ from eq. (106). By eq. (117) and eq. (118), the axes of the magnets can be selected in a way, that for a certain outcome, these probabilities are different from unity. In this case, the decision, to what spin ensemble an individual trajectory $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j1(2)}(t)$ will change, is random. Since the only probabilistic elements in our theory are the Brownian forces, they must be solely responsible for that random decision. The requirement of eq. (141) is, that for two entangled trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j1}(t)$ and $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j2}(t)$, the time dependent Brownian forces coincide at each time t. If the two detectors in the EPR experiment have identical settings $\vec{\mu} = \vec{\nu}$, the external forces in eq. (139) also agree at every time t: $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_1(\vec{r}_1, t) = \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}}_2(\vec{r}_2, t)$

In other words: If the settings of the detectors in an EPR experiment coincide, the entangled trajectories $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j1}(t)$ and $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A(B)}}_{j2}(t)$ are under equal forces at each time. Accordingly, as described above, the two trajectories would change their positions, velocities, as well as their A and B ensemble simultaneously in the same, but their spin ensemble in an exactly opposite way. It is this mechanism, which gives rise to the observed correlations at the detectors.

It is well known, that entanglement phenomena are not restricted to spin states, but can be observed in other observables. For example, there exist experiments with regards to "Bell inequalities in position and time" [34], [35]. They are explained by our local model, since it leads to exactly correlated behaviour of not only spin but entire particle trajectories in position and time.

That our theory reproduces the results of quantum mechanics by the violation of passive locality, can be easily seen by selecting an angle $\theta = 2\pi$ at the measurement devices in eq. (117) and eq. (118). For the up state in eq. (146) at $t = 2$, one would then get a spin up result in detector 1 for sure. Similarly, for spin state in eq. (150) at $t = 2$, a down state would be measured in the detector with probability 1. These are opposite measurement results for two particles $j = 1$ and $j = 2$, that started both with spin up at the source and went to detector 1. Hence, the preparation event $\{\phi_{j1,t=0_{\vec{z}}}\} \equiv \{x_{j1\vec{z}}\}$ cannot determine a specific result $\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}}\}$, if an arbitrary axis $\vec{\mu}$ was chosen at detector 1. A similar statement is true for the $\phi_{j2t_{\vec{z}}}$ particles, which make their way to detector 2. It follows, that there does not exist an event $\{x_{j\vec{z}}\} = \left\{x_{j1\vec{z}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\} \bigcap \left\{x_{j2\vec{z}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_S\right\}$ at preparation stage, which is corresponding and equivalent to both $\left\{\sigma_{j1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_1\right\}$ and $\left\{\sigma_{j2\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_2\right\}$ for arbitrary axes $\vec{\mu}$ and $\vec{\nu}$. Obviously, deterministic passive locality does not hold.

To violate Bell's inequalities in the EPR experiment with a local model, it may suffice to assume the Gaussian distributed random forces $\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j1}(t), \vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{Brown}}_{j2}(t)$ to have a „memory", dependent of their common past.

An objection against such a model could seem to be experiments with entanglement swapping [33]. In those setups, the pairs of entangled particles are generated by two spatially separated sources. To describe these experiments with the model above, two changes have to be made:

The area of the particle source in section 3.1 has to be replaced with a slice in which the two particle sources are. This slice must only be disjoint from the future cones of both measurement devices 1 and 2 and all proves in section 3 and 4 work as before. In section 7.2, eq. (141) has to hold for the Brownian forces at the two separated particle sources. Nevertheless, it is possible to find a spatial region, where the past cones of the two sources intersect. At this place, a common cause λ_j could well be established, leading to eq. (141).

Hence, even with entangled particles generated by two independent sources, there is no need for hidden variable theories to include an instantaneous connection between spatially separated regions.

The author has to admit the somewhat incomplete nature of this article because the model developed above is artificial. To give a more physical reason for eq. (141), one would need further studies. In fact, passive locality may be violated with many other hidden variable theories, all sharing the property, that the results at one measurement apparatus do not influence the events at another spatially separated one. Besides from Edward Nelson, who gave two examples of such theories, a different model with similar locality features was published recently in [36]. The authors of this article do not study Bell's theorem in the language of advanced mathematical probability, 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 which is similar to entanglement is in fact commonly observed in stochastically evolving systems and not at all confined to quantum mechanical objects:

"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" [37]. "Similar phenomena 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].

8 Objections against Nelson's theorem

8.1 The argument of Ballentine and Zeilinger

The basic observation in Nelson's reasoning is, that two disconnected random variables $\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}$ and $\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}$ may produce dependent events $\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$ and $\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}\}$, implying a failure of passive locality:

$$\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\bigcap\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right\}\neq\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right\}\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}|\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{S\infty}\right\} \tag{151}$$

This statement, although mathematically correct, has raised criticisms from physicists since it was made. For example, in his famous introductory textbook, Ballentine [38] 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 [39] does not make use of probability".

That the work in [39] does not make use of probability is true, however, it only does account for deterministic hidden variable theories of a sort, where the events at the particle source are equivalent to the events at the detectors. The authors are aware of this, noting at page 1138 in their article:

,,The salvaging strategy could consist in [...] 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 these so called "stochastic local theories" would be impossible. They claim, this would have been thoroughly investigated in [40, 41]. Furthermore, they mention the existence of so called ,,equivalence theorems" [42, 43]. Those are said to show, that each stochastic local hidden variable theory could be duplicated by a deterministic passively local one. But in all the articles they cite, every author only considers theories, where passive locality is assumed to hold ([40] makes this assumption in his eq. (5), [41] make it at pp. 528 in their eqs. (2, 2'), [42] at page 776 in eq. (7a), and [43] at pp. 1306 and 1308). In fact, it is only for this case, where an equivalence to deterministic passive locality can be proven. We conclude, that the proof in [39] does not call actively local hidden variable theories into question, where only passive locality fails.

8.2 The argument of Dürr

Furthermore, there exist claims, which try to derive Bell's theorem in its original form eq. (37), but without the assumption of passive locality. These „derivations" (e.g. [44]) do not write the inequality with a whole family of probability measures $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}$ for events $\left\{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{1\infty}\right\}$ and $\left\{\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{2\infty}\right\}$ in separated probability spaces at the two detectors. Instead, they are using an axis independent measure $\mathrm{P}_{\vec{z}}$ for, nevertheless, axis dependent events $\left\{x_{\vec{\mu}\vec{\nu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{\infty}\right\}$ in one single probability space, with a sigma algebra $\mathcal{F}'_{\infty}$ for the many particles produced by the source.

This is problematic, because if we compute the correlation coefficient

$$\mathrm{E}\left(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}\right) \equiv \left\langle \Psi \left| \left(\vec{\mu}\vec{\sigma}\right)_1 \otimes \left(\vec{\nu}\vec{\sigma}\right)_2 \right| \Psi \right\rangle \tag{152}$$

with the state of eq. (125), we are definitely lead to eq. (23), and to a family of several probability measures $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}$ dependent on the detector's axis. Furthermore, the quantum mechanical expressions for eq. (152) lead to events in two separate probability spaces, since there is no coupling between the two Hilbert spaces of the two quantum states in eq. (125). By using one probability measure in a single space and axis dependent events produced by the particle source, we would only be able to investigate theories, where the outcomes associated with the detector's axes are completely determined by intrinsic particle properties.

Clearly, this condition is unrealistic, because the choice of these axes is made by the experimenter at will. Even if quantum mechanics provides the necessary rules for computing outcomes after the particles have interacted with a measurement device, they are not an intrinsic particle property. Quantum mechanics provides these rules, since it is not only a theory about ensemble averages of particles, but also one about their interaction with the environment. Any reasonable hidden variable description of quantum mechanics should take care of this by strictly separating the external influence of measurement operators from intrinsic particle properties. It follows, that one has to model the EPR experiment with an enlarged probability space. Then, the events generated by the source can take place in the smaller space and do not depend on the detectors axes, whereas the axis dependent outcomes at the detectors happen in the enlarged space with a family of measures $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}$.

Nevertheless, it was possible for Bell in his original papers to confine himself to a single measure $\mathrm{P}_{\vec{z}}$ on one probability space, because he explicitly assumed passive locality to hold. With this assumption and 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. Due to active locality, the events produced earlier at the source cannot depend on the settings at the detectors. Accordingly, in a theory which is passively local, it is possible to work with a single, axis independent probability measure $\mathrm{P}_{\vec{z}}$ for axis independent events in one probability space.

Conversely, one must infer the property of passive locality, if one wants to derive the (experimentally relevant) inequalities for $\mathrm{P}_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}},\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}$ and events in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{1\infty}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'_{2\infty}$, by using versions of Bell's inequalities for $\mathrm{P}_{\vec{z}}$ and axis independent events at the preparation stage. A proof of Bell's theorem that goes exactly this way can be found in [11].

8.3 The argument of Redhead, stability against disturbances

A different argument against stochastic hidden variable theories was raised by Redhead in [46] (who presents in his book at pp. 98 a proof of Bell's theorem which 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). Redhead then defines, what he calls "the most general perturbation" that "is not a phase shift" as

$$u(\vec{n},\vartheta) \equiv e^{(\vec{\sigma}\vec{n})_2 \vartheta/2}, \tag{153}$$

where $\vec{n}$ is an arbitrary unit vector and ϑ is an angle about $0 \leq \vartheta < 4\pi$. This perturbation should be confined to one part of the overall Hilbert space, e.g. $\mathcal{H}_2$ only. Then, the entangled state in eq. (125) will transform to

$$\Psi'(\vec{r}_1,\vec{r}_2,t) \to \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\psi(\vec{r}_1,t)\left|-\right\rangle \otimes \left(u(\vec{n},\vartheta)\psi(\vec{r}_2,t)\left|+\right\rangle\right) - \psi(\vec{r}_1,t)\left|+\right\rangle \otimes \left(u(\vec{n},\vartheta)\psi(\vec{r}_2,t)\left|-\right\rangle\right)\right). \tag{154}$$

Redhead concludes, that with $\Psi'(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t)$, the exact correlations observed in EPR experiments will be lost for certain axes of the detectors. Nevertheless, entanglement can be experimentally investigated through long distances over 100 kilometers in the air [47], where small perturbations acting on single particles cannot be avoided.

Yet, in spirit of Ballentine's ensemble interpretation [45], 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 eq. (153) would correspond to a disturbance of a whole statistical ensemble of infinitely many particles for a sufficiently long time. Moreover, if defined as above, $u(\vec{n}, \vartheta)$ acts on every particle of that system in exactly the same way. This has nothing to do with a small erroneous disturbance that may happen accidentally to individual particles in the laboratory.



Figure 2: Velocity distribution of the particles in the A ensemble. Only those particles within a very small velocity interval of width $\left|\vec{\delta}_{j1}(t)\right|$ around $\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}, t)$ will be interchanged because of the disturbance.

In this context, we want to show, that our theory is in some sense especially robust against small disturbances, at least if they act on individual particles. For a long distance entanglement experiment, it is a reasonable requirement, to expect large uncorrelated external forces $\vec{\mathrm{F}}_2^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_2, t)$ and $\vec{\mathrm{F}}_1^{\mathrm{ext}}(\vec{r}_1, t)$, which act on the particles during their flight, to be absent. It is well known, that without external forces, the Langevin equations (51) lead to a Maxwell distribution of the particles' velocity. Accordingly, most $\vec{r}_1$ particles in the A or B ensembles have a velocity around one center $\approx \left|\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{r}_1, t)\right|$ or $\approx \left|\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{B}}(\vec{r}_1, t)\right|$.

Without loss of generalization, we assume that a small disturbance $\vec{\delta}_{j1}(t)$ leads to a slightly different velocity of the j-th. $\vec{r}_1$ particle in the A$\uparrow$ ensemble at a point $(\vec{r}_1, t)$ in space-time:

$$\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}'^{\mathrm{A}}_{j\uparrow 1}(t) \equiv \dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{j\uparrow 1}(t) + \vec{\delta}_{j1}(t) \tag{155}$$

We define $\vec{\delta}_{j1}(t)$ to be small, if the half-width of the particles' velocity distribution is far greater than $\left|\vec{\delta}_{j1}(t)\right|$. Moreover, the disturbance should be small enough, that the perturbation can't change the statistics of the whole ensemble through the trajectory exchange mechanism. The latter requirement is equivalent to the condition

$$\left|\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}_1, t) - \left|\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{r}_1, t)\right|\right| >> \left|\vec{\delta}_{j1}(t)\right|. \tag{156}$$

Additionally, we expect the components of $\vec{\delta}_{j1}(t)$ to be fluctuating with zero mean.

A particle is replaced from the A$\uparrow$ to the B$\downarrow$ system, if its velocity $\left|\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}'^{\mathrm{A}}_{j\uparrow 1}(t)\right|$ is higher than $\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}_1, t)$. Since the average of each component in $\vec{\delta}_{j1}(t)$ is assumed to be zero, the disturbance does not contribute to $\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}_1, t)$. Hence,

$$\left|\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}_1, t) - \left|\dot{\vec{\mathrm{x}}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{j\uparrow 1}(t)\right|\right| < \left|\vec{\delta}_{j1}(t)\right| \tag{157}$$

has to hold, if the perturbation $\vec{\delta}_{j1}(t)$ is the only reason for $\vec{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{A}}_{j\uparrow 1}(t)$ to be placed in an ensemble. The particles fulfilling eq. (157) are in a small velocity interval of width $\left|\vec{\delta}_{j1}(t)\right|$ around $\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}_1, t)$ (see fig. 2).

Since $\left|\vec{\delta}_{j1}(t)\right|$ is assumed to be much smaller than the half-width of the particles' velocity distribution, the number of trajectories for which eq. (157) holds, will be low. Because of

$$\left|\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{B}}(\vec{r}_1,t)\right| < \mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{AB}}(\vec{r}_1,t) < \left|\mathrm{v}^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{r}_1,t)\right|, \tag{158}$$

eq. (156) and eq. (157), the interval in which the disturbance is able to change the ensemble of a particle, is far away from the center $\left|\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}(\vec{r}_1,t)\right|$, where most trajectories are found. This further reduces the number of particles that can be affected by $\vec{\delta}_{j1}(t)$.

We conclude, that only a very small number of trajectories changes its (spin-) ensemble solely because of $\vec{\delta}_{j1}(t)$. Hence, the disturbance merely results in 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 [46].

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 and thereby violate Bell's 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, our 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 define a relativistic stochastic process in a mathematically rigorous way (although, with some additional assumptions, the Klein-Gordon equation can be derived [48]). Unlike in Nelson's original formulation, the theory of Fritsche exists in euclidean (phase) space, where this severe problem is absent. To rewrite Fritsche's modification of stochastic mechanics in a manifestly covariant form, 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). Regrettably, although such a theory certainly must exist (since non-relativistic Brownian motion does), it seems, that besides from some recent attempts [49–51], no one was able to write it down completely.

At this point, we want to mention that the authors of [16] show at pp. 386, their eqs. (54) can, after an approximation, directly be casted into the Navier-Stokes equations. We have in eq. (54) for the A system:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}\right)+\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}+\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}\right)\cdot\vec{\nabla}\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}\right)-\nu\Delta\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}^{\mathrm{A}}-\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}\right)=\frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} \tag{159}$$

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

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_c^{\mathrm{A}}+\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_c^{\mathrm{A}}+2\vec{\mathrm{u}}^{\mathrm{A}}\right)\cdot\vec{\nabla}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_c^{\mathrm{A}}-\nu\Delta\vec{\mathrm{v}}_c^{\mathrm{A}}=\frac{1}{m_0}\vec{\mathrm{F}}^{\mathrm{ext}} \tag{160}$$

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:

$$\rho\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\vec{\mathrm{v}}_c^{\mathrm{A}}+\rho\left(\vec{\mathrm{v}}_c^{\mathrm{A}}\cdot\vec{\nabla}\right)\vec{\mathrm{v}}_c^{\mathrm{A}}-\nu\rho\Delta\vec{\mathrm{v}}_c^{\mathrm{A}}+\vec{\nabla}p(\vec{r},t)=0 \tag{161}$$

For eq. (161), a manifestly covariant form in special and even in general relativity is known. To derive eq. (161) in a relativistic setting, one typically starts from relativistic Boltzmann equations. Because of the close similarity between eq. (161) and eq. (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 space-times, which might be absent in Fritsche's model

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

$$\hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathrm{free}} = -\frac{\hbar}{2m_0}\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}+\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2}+\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2}\right) = -\frac{\hbar}{2m_0}\Delta \tag{162}$$

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

$$\hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathrm{free}} = -\frac{\hbar}{2m_0}\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \rho^2}+\frac{\partial}{\rho\partial \rho}+\frac{\partial^2}{\rho^2\partial \varphi^2}+\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2}\right). \tag{163}$$

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

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{free}}(q_i, \dot{q}_i) \equiv \frac{m_0}{2}(\dot{\rho}^2 + \rho^2\dot{\varphi}^2 + \dot{z}^2). \tag{164}$$

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

$$\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{free}}(p_i, q_i, \dot{q}_i) = p_\rho\dot{\rho} + p_\varphi\dot{\varphi} + p_z\dot{z} - \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{free}} = \frac{1}{2m_0}\left(p_\rho^2 + \frac{p_\varphi^2}{\rho^2} + p_z^2\right) \tag{165}$$

After using the replacement rules defined by correspondence principle, we arrive at:

$$\hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathrm{free}} = -\frac{\hbar}{2m_0}\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \rho^2}+\frac{\partial^2}{\rho^2\partial \varphi^2}+\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2}\right) \tag{166}$$

Unfortunately, eq. (166) is different from eq. (163) and wrong. A similar problem is present in the path integral formalism in similar form (although for path integrals, there seems to exist a recently developed technique overcoming these problems [52]). This paradox 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 [16] 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, but for curved space-times. As a result, we could be able to understand the behavior of quantum objects near space-time 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] J. Conway, S. Kochen, The Free Will Theorem, Found. Phys 36, pp. 1441 (2006), arXiv:quant-ph/0604079v1

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

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

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

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

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

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

[20] 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

[21] H. Sakai, T. Saito, T. Ikeda, K. Itoh, T. Kawabata, H. Kuboki, Y. Maeda, N. Matsui, C. Rangacharyulu, M. Sasano, Y. Satou, K. Sekiguchi, K. Suda, A. Tamii, T. Uesaka, and K. Yako1, Spin Correlations of Strongly Interacting Massive Fermion Pairs as a Test of Bell's Inequality, Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 150405 (2006)

[22] B. G. Englert, M. O. Scully, G. Süssmann, H. Walther, Surrealistic Bohm Trajectories, Z. Naturforsch 47a, pp. 1175 (1992)

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

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

[25] 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

[26] W. G. Faris, Spin correlations in stochastic mechanics, Found. Phys. 12, pp. 1 (1982)

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

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

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

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

[31] 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)

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

[33] R. Kaltenbaek, R. Prevedel, M. Aspelmeyer, A. Zeilinger, High-fidelity entanglement swapping with fully independent sources, arXiv:0809.3991

[34] J. D. Franson, Bell inequality for position and time, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 2205 (1989)

[35] C. Gneiting, K Hornberger, Bell test for the free motion of material particles, http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.1448

[36] 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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[47] R. Ursin, F. Tiefenbacher, T. Schmitt-Manderbach, H. Weier, T. Scheidl, M. Lindenthal, B. Blauensteiner, T. Jennewein, J. Perdigues, P. Trojek, B. Oemer, M. Fuerst, M. Meyenburg, J. Rarity, Z. Sodnik, C. Barbieri, H. Weinfurter, A. Zeilinger, Free-Space distribution of entanglement and single photons over 144 km, Nature Physics 3, pp. 481 (2007)

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

[49] 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

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

[51] 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

[52] H. Kleinert, Path Integrals in Quantum Mechanics, Statistics, Polymer Physics, and Financial Markets, chapter 10, 4th edition (World Scientific, Singapore, 2004), also available at http://users.physik.fu-berlin.de/˜kleinert/b5/psfiles/pthic10.pdf