

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

Benjamin Schulz
 Department für Physik,
 Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München
 Theresienstrasse 37, 80333 München, Germany*

May 18, 2019

Abstract

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

1 Introduction

In 1935 Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen (EPR) wrote an article [1] in which they denied, that quantum theory would be a complete theory of nature. Around 1951, Bohm [2] gave a more testable outline of the so called „EPR paradox“. He described a thought experiment with one source that ejects particles having opposite spin to two separate measurement devices containing Stern-Gerlach magnets with variable orientations. Then, in 1964 John S. Bell published a theorem about this paradox in form of an inequality. It made clear that hidden variable theories, which fulfill certain realistic conditions Bell called „locally causal“, would be in difference with quantum mechanics. In his original publication [3], Bell wrote: „if hidden parameters would be added to quantum mechanics, there must be a mechanism, whereby the setting of one measuring device can influence another spatially separated device“, and the signal involved has to „propagate instantaneously“. Bell's first contribution underwent several modifications. By the time, more and more instructive proofs of his inequality were constructed by him and others. All fundamental articles of Bell on this problem were published 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“ (the most detailed explanation of this condition was made by Bell in [6]), which is the starting point to derive Bell's inequalities, could be divided into two separate conditions. Both were necessary to derive the inequalities, but only one of them has to hold, when a hidden parameter theory should not include instantaneous signals. Nelson published his result twice [7,8] (with a small correction in [9] to make the theorem compatible with Mermin's presentation [10]) and there exist works from mathematicians e.g. [11], which give further insightful analysis of it. Unfortunately, Nelson's Paper got almost overlooked by physicists. One reason might be, that it was written in the language of advanced mathematical probability theory. Another reason was, that Edward Nelson did not succeed to modify his own alternative interpretation of quantum mechanics [13, 14] to account for the requirements which his theorem defined for a hidden parameter theory without instantaneous signaling

*Benjamin.Schulz@physik.uni-muenchen.de

effects. Furthermore, the two counterexamples of theories he gave that would do so, were rather artificial stochastic processes. They were written in the language of advanced mathematical probability theory and without proper physical foundation.

This article begins with a short introduction to the necessary mathematical concepts in section 2. In section 3, we review Nelson's contribution to a mathematically rigorous understanding of Bell's inequalities. The physical implications of his theorem are analyzed in section 4. In section 5 and 6 it is shown, that a modification of Nelson's stochastic mechanics which has been published in "Annalen der Physik" [15] fulfills the requirements of Nelson's theorem. We extend this theory to include spinning particles in section 7. Entangled spin states are discussed in section 8, where it is shown in detail how their correlations emerge. In section 9, we review some arguments against Nelson's thoughts about Bell's theorem which have occurred in the literature, concluding them to be unfounded. The article closes with section 10, mentioning the possible use of the theory developed here for a reasonable foundation of a quantum theory in curved spacetimes.

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

2 Basics of mathematical probability theory

Probabilistic experiments are described with a so called probability space $(\Omega, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, P)$. Ω is the set of theoretically possible events $\omega \in \Omega$. Events may be combined to form new events by intersection, union and complement. If A is an event, then the complement $\complement A$ denotes the events not in A . If A and B are events, then the event $A \cap B$ denotes the outcomes which are in both A and B . Similarly the event $A \cup B$ consists of 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 $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$. The sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ fulfills the following properties: The set $\Omega \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ and 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 $\bigcup A_n \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$. If a sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ has only finitely many events, then it is determined by a partition of Ω . This is a collection of nonempty exclusive subsets of Ω whose union is Ω . The other events in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ are obtained by taking unions of these events. We say, that $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ is generated by this partition.

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

Finally, one needs a probability measure P to define a probability space. For the sure event Ω we have $P(\Omega) = 1$. The probability of the impossible event \emptyset is $P(\emptyset) = 0$ and $\forall A \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ we have $0 \leq P\{A\} \leq 1$. For events $A, B \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$, the probability measure P fulfills the additivity rule $P\{A \cup B\} = P\{A\} + P\{B\}$. This gives

$$P\{A\} + P\{\complement A\} = P\{\Omega\} = 1.$$

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

$$P\{A\} = P\{A \cap B\} = P\{B\}.$$

Furthermore, we define two events to be independent, if

$$P\{A \cap B\} = P\{A\} P\{B\}$$

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

$$P\{A|B\} = \frac{P\{A \cap B\}}{P\{B\}}$$

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

$$X : \Omega \mapsto \Omega'$$

X is called a random variable. We say, that events in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}'$ are generated by X . We denote the expectation value of a random variable X that is integrable with respect to P by

$$Ex[X] = \int X dP$$

where $\int dP = 1$.

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

$$(X_t)_{t \in I} : \Omega \mapsto \Omega'$$

where the parameter t lies in an interval I and is called parameter-set. We say that two stochastic processes X_t and Y_t are equivalent under a probability measure P if they lead to equal probability distributions. Then, for any event $A' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'$ we have:

$$P\{X_t \in A'\} = P\{Y_t \in A'\}$$

Sometimes it is necessary to enlarge a probability space $(\Omega, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, P)$ 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 $(\Omega', \overline{\mathcal{F}}', P')$. 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 an event $A' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'$ the rule should assign a set in Ω which should be an event $A \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$. In this case, we will say $A \subseteq_{\in} A'$. Finally, the events $A \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ and $A' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'$ should have equal probabilities in both spaces:

$$P\{A\} = P'\{A'\}$$

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

$$\Omega = \{h, t\}.$$

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

$$\Omega' = \{HHh, HT h, TH h, HHt, HTt, THt\}.$$

The rule, that relates this larger set of outcomes in Ω' to outcomes in Ω is to ignore the second and third toss. Thus the rule assigns to outcomes $A' = \{HT h\} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'$ and $B' = \{TT h\} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'$ the outcome $C = \{h\} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ where $C \subseteq_{\in} A'$ and $C \subseteq_{\in} B'$. Furthermore, the probability of the event of the first coin coming up heads, $P\{h\}$ in $(\Omega, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, P)$ is the same as $P'\{HHh \cup HT h \cup TH h \cup TT h\}$ in $(\Omega', \overline{\mathcal{F}}', P')$.

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

$$X = P'\{A' | \overline{\mathcal{F}}\} = P'\left\{A' \left| \bigcup_{\omega' \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}'} : \omega' \supseteq \left\{ \bigcup_{\omega \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}} : \omega \subseteq_{\in} A' \right\} \right. \right\}.$$

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

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

$$X = P' \{ \{Aht\} | \{HHt \cup TTt \cup HTt \cup THt\} \}.$$

Faris states in [11], that X fulfills the following properties:

- X is measurable with respect to $\overline{\mathcal{F}} - [0, 1]$.
- If $G \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$, we have for an event E : $X \{E \cap G\} = P' \{E \cap G | \overline{\mathcal{F}}\} = P' \{E | \overline{\mathcal{F}}\}$ if $E \subset_{\in} G$ and $X \{E \cap G\} = P' \{E \cap G | \overline{\mathcal{F}}\} = 0$ for events $E \not\subset_{\in} G$.
- We can compute the unconditional probability $P' \{E\}$ by taking the expectation value of $X \{E\}$:

$$Ex [X \{E\}] = Ex [P' \{E | \overline{\mathcal{F}}\}] = P' \{E\}$$

3 Nelson's analysis on Bell's Theorem

An EPR experiment consists of a particle source that ejects pairs of particles with opposite spin to two spatially separated measurement devices 1 and 2. The direction of the spins is measured at each device with a Stern-Gerlach magnet that can be rotated in arbitrary directions perpendicular to the axis of the particle trajectory. Let $\phi_{jt_{\vec{\mu}}}$ be a family of j stochastic processes ($1 \leq j \leq S \in \mathbb{N}$) with parameter set $t_{\vec{\mu}}$. $\vec{\mu}$ denotes the axis of the detector. It can be chosen by the experimentalist freely at will. t denotes the time during which the j -th. particle flights. It starts at time $t_{\vec{\mu}} = 0_{\vec{\mu}}$ from the source and arrives at $t_{\vec{\mu}} = T_{\vec{\mu}}$ in the detector. As convention, we denote the random variable $\phi_{jT_{\vec{\mu}}}$ with $\phi_{j\vec{\mu}}$.

We now set up two families of stochastic processes $\phi_{1jt_{\vec{\mu}}}$ and $\phi_{2jt_{\vec{\nu}}}$ that describe the $j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, S$ particle pairs. The particles in each pair are sent to the corresponding Stern-Gerlach magnet. We denote the events generated by $\phi_{1j\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2j\vec{\nu}}$ at the detectors 1 and 2 with $\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}$ and $\sigma_{2\vec{\nu}}$. These outcomes could depend on the preparation of the particles by the source. Therefore, we need a sigma algebra $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_X$ associated with the events at preparation stage generated by $\phi_{1j0_{\vec{\mu}}}, \phi_{2j0_{\vec{\nu}}}$, in addition to the sigma algebras $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_1, \overline{\mathcal{F}}_2$ generated by $\phi_{1j\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_1$ and $\phi_{2j\vec{\nu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_2$ at the detectors.

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

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

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

Let the event $\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_1$ at 1 be generated by $\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}$. Then, the stochastic processes $\phi_{2\tau_{\vec{\nu}}}, \phi_{2\tau'_{\vec{\nu}'}}$ with parameter sets $\tau_{\vec{\nu}}, \tau'_{\vec{\nu}'}$ must be equivalent under $P_{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}, \sigma_{2\tau_{\vec{\nu}}}} \{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\}$, as long as the spatial region of the measurement of σ_1 does not lie in the future cones of the regions where the random variables $\phi_{2\tau_{\vec{\nu}}}$ and $\phi_{2\tau'_{\vec{\nu}'}}$ are measured:

$$P_{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}, \sigma_{2\tau_{\vec{\nu}}}} \{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\} = P_{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}, \sigma_{2\tau'_{\vec{\nu}'}}} \{\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}\} \quad (1)$$

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

$$P_{\sigma_{1\tau_{\vec{\nu}}}, \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}}} \{\sigma_{2\vec{\mu}}\} = P_{\sigma_{1\tau'_{\vec{\nu}'}, \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}}}} \{\sigma_{2\vec{\mu}}\} \quad (2)$$




Figure 1: EPR experiment

In eq. (2), the event $\sigma_2 \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_2$ must not lie in the future cone of the regions where the random variables $\phi_{1\tau_{\vec{v}}}, \phi_{1\tau'_{\vec{v}'}}$ are measured.

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

For all bounded spacelike separated regions 1 and 2, there exists a region X disjoint from their future cones (X may realistically lie in the intersection of the past cones of 1 and 2, see figure 1), such that the conditional probabilities of outcomes $\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \in \mathcal{F}_1$ at 1 and $\sigma_{2\vec{v}} \in \mathcal{F}_2$ at 2 given $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_X$ are conditionally independent for every axis $\vec{\mu}, \vec{v}$:

$$P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{v}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \cap \sigma_{2\vec{v}} | \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} = P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{v}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} | \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} \cdot P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{v}}} \left\{ \sigma_{2\vec{v}} | \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} \quad (3)$$

With this notation, quantum mechanics fulfills the following properties:

$$P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{v}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow \cap \sigma_{2\vec{v}} = \downarrow \right\} = P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{v}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \downarrow \cap \sigma_{2\vec{v}} = \uparrow \right\} = 1 \quad (4)$$

$$|E(\vec{\mu}, \vec{v}) + E(\vec{\mu}, \vec{v}') + E(\vec{\mu}', \vec{v}) - E(\vec{\mu}', \vec{v}')| > 2 \quad (5)$$

In eq. (5), $E(\vec{\mu}, \vec{v})$ is the so called „correlation coefficient“:

$$E(\vec{\mu}, \vec{v}) = P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{v}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow \cap \sigma_{2\vec{v}} = \uparrow \right\} + P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{v}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \downarrow \cap \sigma_{2\vec{v}} = \downarrow \right\} - P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{v}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow \cap \sigma_{2\vec{v}} = \downarrow \right\} - P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{v}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \downarrow \cap \sigma_{2\vec{v}} = \uparrow \right\} \quad (6)$$

Equation (4) 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. (5) is, as shall be shown below, in conflict with theories where active and passive locality holds. In Nelson's form, Bell's theorem states, that if active and passive locality hold (4) and (5) cannot be fulfilled simultaneously. Nelson's proof [7, 8] (with corrections in [9]) goes as follows: Passive locality demands for events $\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow$ at 1 and $\sigma_{2\vec{v}} = \downarrow$ at 2 that:

$$P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{v}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow \cap \sigma_{2\vec{v}} = \downarrow | \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} = P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{v}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow | \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{v}}} \left\{ \sigma_{2\vec{v}} = \downarrow | \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\}. \quad (7)$$

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 $\phi_{2\vec{v}}$ and $\phi_{2\vec{\mu}}$ are equivalent in the probability measure for any result of $\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}$ at 1:

$$P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{v}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow | \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} = P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{\mu}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} = \uparrow | \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} = P_{\vec{\mu}} \quad (8)$$

An analogous expression is true for the events at 2:

$$P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\nu}}} \{ \sigma_{2\bar{\nu}} = \downarrow | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X \} = P_{\phi_{1\bar{\nu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \{ \sigma_{2\bar{\nu}} = \downarrow | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X \} \quad (9)$$

But (4) gives $\sigma_{1\bar{\nu}} = \uparrow$ in the right side of (9). Hence, we can write for the coordinates ν :

$$P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\nu}}} \{ \sigma_{2\bar{\nu}} = \downarrow | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X \} = P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\nu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\bar{\nu}} = \uparrow | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X \} = P_{\bar{\nu}} \quad (10)$$

Plugging (8) and (10) back to (7) we get:

$$P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\nu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} = \uparrow \cap \sigma_{2\bar{\nu}} = \downarrow | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X \} = P_{\bar{\mu}} P_{\bar{\nu}} \quad (11)$$

Similarly, we have, due to passive locality:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\nu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} = \downarrow \cap \sigma_{2\bar{\nu}} = \uparrow | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X \} &= P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\nu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} = \downarrow | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X \} \\ &P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\nu}}} \{ \sigma_{2\bar{\nu}} = \uparrow | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X \} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The sum of the probabilities for two complementary measurement results for $\sigma_{2\nu}$ at 1 must be unity, i.e.

$$P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\nu}}} \{ \sigma_{2\bar{\nu}} = \uparrow | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X \} + P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\nu}}} \{ \sigma_{2\bar{\nu}} = \downarrow | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X \} = 1. \quad (13)$$

Therefore, can write with (10)

$$P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\nu}}} \{ \sigma_{2\bar{\nu}} = \uparrow | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X \} = 1 - P_{\bar{\nu}} \quad (14)$$

and substitute this into (12)

$$P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\nu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} = \downarrow \cap \sigma_{2\bar{\nu}} = \uparrow | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X \} = P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\nu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} = \downarrow | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X \} (1 - P_{\bar{\nu}}). \quad (15)$$

Due to active locality, an equivalent equation of (13) for $\sigma_{1\mu}$ yields:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\nu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} = \downarrow | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X \} &= P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} = \downarrow | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X \} \\ &= 1 - P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} = \uparrow | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X \} = 1 - P_{\bar{\mu}} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

If we insert this result into (15) we arrive at

$$P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\nu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} = \downarrow \cap \sigma_{2\bar{\nu}} = \uparrow | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X \} = (1 - P_{\bar{\mu}}) (1 - P_{\bar{\nu}}). \quad (17)$$

In the same way, we can derive the relations

$$P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\nu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} = \uparrow \cap \sigma_{2\bar{\nu}} = \uparrow | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X \} = P_{\bar{\mu}} (1 - P_{\bar{\nu}}) \quad (18)$$

and

$$P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\nu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} = \downarrow \cap \sigma_{2\bar{\nu}} = \downarrow | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X \} = (1 - P_{\bar{\mu}}) P_{\bar{\nu}}. \quad (19)$$

If we write the correlation coefficient defined in (6) but with the conditional probabilities above, we arrive using (18), (19), (11) and (17) at

$$E(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu} | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X) = P_{\bar{\mu}} (1 - P_{\bar{\nu}}) + (1 - P_{\bar{\mu}}) P_{\bar{\nu}} - P_{\bar{\mu}} P_{\bar{\nu}} - (1 - P_{\bar{\mu}}) (1 - P_{\bar{\nu}}). \quad (20)$$

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

$$|E(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu} | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X) + E(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu}' | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X) + E(\bar{\mu}', \bar{\nu} | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X) - E(\bar{\mu}', \bar{\nu}' | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X)| \leq 2 \quad (21)$$

We get this result because the conditional probabilities in $E(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu} | \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X)$ are all in the range $0 \leq P \leq 1$. Since probability measures are generally in this range eq. (21) holds for the unconditional probabilities too:

$$|E(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu}) + E(\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu}') + E(\bar{\mu}', \bar{\nu}) - E(\bar{\mu}', \bar{\nu}')| \leq 2 \quad (22)$$

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

$$|E(\vec{\mu}, \vec{\nu}) - E(\vec{\mu}, \vec{\nu}')| - E(\vec{\nu}, \vec{\nu}') \leq 1 \quad (23)$$

which can be similarly derived. Both (22) and (23) are violated in quantum mechanics and this violation was confirmed experimentally.

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

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

The fact, that stochastic processes can be designed such, that they act on each particle actively local but still are violating passive locality was shown explicitly by Nelson with two examples [7, 8]. The first was a rather ad-hoc construction of a stochastic process fulfilling the Klein-Gordon equation and the second was a variant of his stochastic mechanics applied to relativistic field theory. Unfortunately the latter had no tempting particle interpretation as Nelson's original theory [13, 14] had, where particles move on stochastic paths. Hence this „stochastic field theory” was never developed extensively. The goal of this article is to show, that a more physically motivated hidden variable theory published in this journal [15] violates Bell's inequalities without any communication between the two measurement stations in the EPR setup. But to do this, we need to analyze the implications of Nelson's theorem further.

We begin by evaluating some deeper consequences of passive locality. Faris shows in [11] that passive locality, combined with relation (4) from quantum mechanics leads immediately to another condition he calls „deterministic passive locality”. Suppose, as in the EPR experiment, two spatially separated events happen or not happen always together with probability 1. Then, deterministic passive locality states that this must be, because they are equivalent to some random event at a prior preparation stage. Given a complete description of the results at the preparation, the subsequent events are determined. Therefore, all randomness lies in the preparation. Deterministic passive locality is defined mathematically as follows:

Let the events $\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_1$ and $\sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_2$ be equivalent with respect to $P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}$ and passive locality hold. Then, there is an event $\overline{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X$ to which $\sigma_{1\vec{\mu}}$ and $\sigma_{2\vec{\mu}}$ are both equivalent with respect to $P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{\mu}}}$.

In his contribution, Faris states that a similar proof is presented by Redhead [38] at pp. 101-102. Redhead claims this result would have been discovered at first by Suppes and Zanotti who gave a different proof in [12]. The exposition given in this article follows closely the derivation of Faris in [11]:

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

$$P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{\mu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \} = P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{\mu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \cap \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} \} = P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{\mu}}} \{ \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} \} \quad (24)$$

Passive locality demands

$$P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{\mu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \cap \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} | \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \} = P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{\mu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} | \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \} P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{\mu}}} \{ \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} | \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \} \quad (25)$$

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

$$P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{\mu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \cap \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} | \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \} \leq P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{\mu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} | \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \}. \quad (26)$$

In section 1, we gave for the unconditional probabilities of general events the following results:

$$P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{\mu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \cap \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} \} = Ex \left[P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{\mu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \cap \sigma_{2\vec{\mu}} | \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \} \right] \quad (27)$$

and

$$P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{\mu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \} = Ex \left[P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{\mu}}} \{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} | \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \} \right]. \quad (28)$$

Since $\sigma_{1\bar{\mu}}$ and $\sigma_{2\bar{\mu}}$ are equivalent by (24), it follows from (27) and (28) that their expectation values are equal. Therefore, we can conclude with (26) that:

$$P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} \cap \sigma_{2\bar{\mu}} \mid \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} = P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} \mid \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} \quad (29)$$

and similarly

$$P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} \cap \sigma_{2\bar{\mu}} \mid \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} = P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \left\{ \sigma_{2\bar{\mu}} \mid \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\}. \quad (30)$$

With the assumption of passive locality, we get, using (29) and (30):

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} \mid \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} &= P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} \cap \sigma_{2\bar{\mu}} \mid \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} \\ &= P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} \mid \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \left\{ \sigma_{2\bar{\mu}} \mid \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} \\ &= P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} \cap \sigma_{2\bar{\mu}} \mid \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\}^2 \\ &= P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} \mid \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

This implies that the conditional probability $P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} \mid \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\}$ can only have the two values 0 and 1. We denote the event, when this random variable has the value one by \bar{x} . We have $\bar{x} \subset \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}}$ and since the conditional probability of its occurrence is measurable with respect to $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_X$ we can write $\bar{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X$. Accordingly, the probabilities of \bar{x} and $\sigma_{1\bar{\mu}}$ are equal:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} \right\} &= Ex \left[P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} \mid \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} \right] \\ &= Ex \left[P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \left\{ \bar{x} \mid \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} \right] = P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \left\{ \bar{x} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Because $\bar{x} \subset \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}}$, one can compute the intersection between \bar{x} and $\sigma_{1\bar{\mu}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} \cap \bar{x} \right\} &= Ex \left[P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} \cap \bar{x} \mid \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} \right] \\ &= Ex \left[P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \left\{ \bar{x} \mid \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} \right] = P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}} \left\{ \bar{x} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

The equations (32) and (33) lead to the conclusion that $\sigma_{1\bar{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_1$ is equivalent to $\bar{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X$. Similarly $\sigma_{2\bar{\mu}} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_2$ is equivalent to the same $\bar{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X$ under $P_{\phi_{1\bar{\mu}}, \phi_{2\bar{\mu}}}$. This is the definition of deterministic passive locality given above.

While Nelson's proof made only use of passive locality, a derivation of Bell's original statement (23) involving the condition of „deterministic passive locality” directly can be found in [11].

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

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

5 Fritsche's theory and superposed states

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

superposed states and show the theory to be actively local in order to have enough material that we are able to explain how the correlations in entangled states emerge.

The starting point to derive Fritsche's theory is to interpret the energy time uncertainty relation $\Delta E \Delta t \approx \hbar/2$ as an indication, that in quantum mechanics energy is only conserved strictly in physical interactions but not otherwise. Particles are assumed to be under statistical energy fluctuations. The idea is, that during the time interval Δt there occurs a deviation ΔE from the energy E which has to be restored after Δt on the average. Therefore, kinetic energy is thought to be conserved on the average only. The second assumption is in spirit of Ballentines famous statistical ensemble interpretation [37]. In this interpretation, the quantum state vector $|\psi\rangle$ does not represent an individual particle, but a statistical ensemble of infinitely many of them. Therefore, the probability of finding an electron of a hydrogen atom in a volume Ω given by

$$p(\Omega) = \int_{\Omega} \psi^*(\vec{r})\psi(\vec{r})d^3r, \quad (34)$$

were $\psi(\vec{r})$ is the electrons wave-function, describes the following situation: To get all the information of $p(\Omega)$ experimentally, one has to prepare infinitely many identical hydrogen atoms with the same state (including the same orientation in space). Then, one has to measure on each atom, if one finds the electron in Ω and one must compute its probability of being there in the infinitely large ensemble. Accordingly, to describe the probabilistic time evolution of the statistical ensemble of electrons in a quantum mechanical system, one has to deal with an infinitely large number of sample trajectories. To model energy conservation on the average for this ensemble, Fritsche and Haugk divide it at first 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.

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

$$\begin{aligned} m_0\ddot{x}_j^B + \frac{m_0}{\tau}\dot{x}_j^B &= \vec{F}_j^{ext} + \vec{F}_j^{Brown} \\ m_0\ddot{x}_j^A - \frac{m_0}{\tau}\dot{x}_j^A &= \vec{F}_j^{ext} + \vec{F}_j^{Brown} \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

The three dimensional vector

$$\vec{x}_j^{A/B} = \left(x_{j1}^{A/B}(t), x_{j2}^{A/B}(t), x_{j3}^{A/B}(t) \right)$$

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

$$\vec{F}_j^{Brown} = \left(F_{j1}^{Brown}(t), F_{j2}^{Brown}(t), F_{j3}^{Brown}(t) \right) \quad (36)$$

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

$$P \{ F_{jk}^{Brown}(t) \} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi C}} e^{-(F_{jk}^{Brown}(t)/C)^2} \quad (37)$$

in each coordinate where C is a constant. The Gaussian distribution should be independent for each for each coordinate k and trajectory j . One may now separate the sample trajectories $\vec{x}_j^{A/B}$ into a sum, caused by the random and the external force

$$\vec{x}_j^{A/B} = \vec{x}_{rj}^{A/B} + \vec{x}_{cj}^{A/B}. \quad (38)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\vec{v}^B + \vec{u}^B) + (\vec{v}^B - \vec{u}^B) \vec{\nabla} (\vec{v}^B + \vec{u}^B) + \nu \Delta (\vec{v}^B + \vec{u}^B) &= \frac{1}{m_0} \vec{F}^{ext} \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\vec{v}^A - \vec{u}^A) + (\vec{v}^A + \vec{u}^A) \vec{\nabla} (\vec{v}^A - \vec{u}^A) - \nu \Delta (\vec{v}^A - \vec{u}^A) &= \frac{1}{m_0} \vec{F}^{ext} \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

In (39), \vec{F}^{ext} denotes the average external force at point $\vec{r} = (r_1, r_2, r_3)$ and time t . The vector valued entity

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{v}^{A/B} &= \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \epsilon_j(\vec{r}, t) \dot{\vec{x}}_j^{A/B}}{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \epsilon_j(\vec{r}, t)} \\ &= \left(v_1^{A/B}(r_1, t), v_2^{A/B}(r_2, t), v_3^{A/B}(r_3, t) \right)\end{aligned}\quad (40)$$

is the average velocity of the ensemble, where:

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

Additionally, we have the so called osmotic average velocity

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

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

$$\vec{u}^{A/B} = \mp \nu \nabla \ln \left(\rho^{A/B}(\vec{r}, t) / \rho_0 \right). \quad (41)$$

Here, ρ_0 is a constant reference density without physical importance and $\nu = \frac{k_B T \tau}{m_0}$ 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

$$\nu = \frac{\hbar}{2m_0}. \quad (42)$$

Since we derive a non-relativistic system, it is possible that the random force is eventually for some events near infinity and the particle may be driven to $\vec{r} = \infty$ at a certain time-step t . 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. Therefore, 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 $\vec{u}, \vec{v}, \rho(\vec{r}, t)$ 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

$$\vec{v}^B = \vec{v}^A. \quad (43)$$

It is shown in [15] that this constraint also implies $\vec{u}^B = \vec{u}^A$. After the first time step (43), 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, \dots trajectories of fast particles from the A ensemble with as many trajectories $j_{1'}, j_{2'}, j_{3'}, \dots$ of slow particles from the B system until

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

holds. Then we can compute the arithmetic mean of the two diffusion equations for the A and B systems at time $t + \Delta t$. After this was done, we restart the diffusion process again for the next time-step, but with another division into two sub-ensembles, where a condition similar to (43) holds. As shown in [15] the time evolution of the overall system is described by the following diffusion equation:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \vec{v} + \left(\vec{v} \vec{\nabla} \right) \vec{v} + \left(\vec{u} \vec{\nabla} \right) \vec{u} + \nu \Delta \vec{u} = \frac{d}{dt} \vec{v} - \left(\vec{u} \vec{\nabla} \right) \vec{u} + \nu \Delta \vec{u} = \frac{1}{m_0} \vec{F}^{ext} \quad (44)$$

One can now define the function

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

which is connected to the ensemble average velocity through $\vec{v} = \frac{\hbar}{m_0} \vec{\nabla} \varphi(\vec{r}, t)$ (We note, that the latter equation can only be written, since one can prove that \vec{v} is curl free). After some computations, the authors of [15] are able to cast the diffusion equation (44) directly in form of the time dependent Schroedinger equation:

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi(\vec{r}, t)}{\partial t} = \left(\hat{H}(\vec{r}, t) + V^{ext} \right) \psi(\vec{r}, t) = \left(\hat{H}(\vec{r}, t) + V(\vec{r}, t) \right) \psi(\vec{r}, t) \quad (45)$$

In eq. (45) $V^{ext} = \vec{\nabla} \vec{F}^{ext}$ stands an external potential and $\hat{H}(\vec{r}, t) = -\frac{\hbar^2 \Delta}{2m_0}$ is the free particle Hamiltonian.

The stochastic process for the infinitely large ensemble of single particles with trajectories \vec{x}_j leads to a differential equation encoding the ensemble average velocities \vec{v}, \vec{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 of a statistical ensemble. It does reveal nothing about individual particles. One should mention, that the quantum mechanical operators, measurable operator-eigenvalues and uncertainty relations can be derived from the given formalism, as is fully documented in [15].

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

$$\Psi(\vec{r}, t) = a\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r}, t) + b\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r}, t) \quad (46)$$

is also a solution of (45). In this case, one would get mixing terms in $\rho(\vec{r}, t)$:

$$\rho(\vec{r}, t) = a^2 \psi_\uparrow^2(\vec{r}, t) + b^2 \psi_\downarrow^2(\vec{r}, t) + a^* b \psi_\uparrow^*(\vec{r}, t) \psi_\downarrow(\vec{r}, t) + b^* a \psi_\downarrow^*(\vec{r}, t) \psi_\uparrow(\vec{r}, t) \quad (47)$$

In turn, the equations for (41) would become quite complicated. Accordingly, we need to make a basis change to get simpler equations.

The physical information of (46) is, that for a given particle of the ensemble, we have a probability of a^2 that it belongs to the $\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r}, t)$ ensemble and a probability of b^2 to find it in in the $\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r}, t)$ system. Since both states are solutions of the same Schroedinger equation, we can write the physical information of this system in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar \frac{\partial \Psi(\vec{r}, t)}{\partial t} &= \left(\hat{H}(\vec{r}, t) + V(\vec{r}, t) \right) \Psi(\vec{r}, t) \\ i\hbar \frac{\partial (b\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r}, t) + a\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r}, t))}{\partial t} &= \left(\hat{H}(\vec{r}, t) + V(\vec{r}, t) \right) (a\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r}, t) + b\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r}, t)) \\ &= \begin{cases} i\hbar \frac{\partial a\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r}, t)}{\partial t} = \left(\hat{H}(\vec{r}, t) + V(\vec{r}, t) \right) a\psi_\uparrow(\vec{r}, t) \\ + \\ i\hbar \frac{\partial b\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r}, t)}{\partial t} = \left(\hat{H}(\vec{r}, t) + V(\vec{r}, t) \right) b\psi_\downarrow(\vec{r}, t) \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (48) \quad (49)$$

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

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

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

$$|\Psi(\vec{r}, t)\rangle = c_\uparrow |\psi_\uparrow\rangle + c_\downarrow |\psi_\downarrow\rangle \quad (50)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\vec{r}, t) &= \langle \Psi(\vec{r}, t) | \Psi(\vec{r}, t) \rangle \\ &= a^2 \psi_\uparrow^*(\vec{r}, t) \psi_\uparrow(\vec{r}, t) + b^2 \psi_\downarrow^*(\vec{r}, t) \psi_\downarrow(\vec{r}, t) \\ &= a^2 \rho_\uparrow(\vec{r}, t) + b^2 \rho_\downarrow(\vec{r}, t) \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

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

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

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\vec{v}_\uparrow^B + \vec{u}_\uparrow^B) + (\vec{v}_\uparrow^B - \vec{u}_\uparrow^B) \vec{\nabla} (\vec{v}_\uparrow^B + \vec{u}_\uparrow^B) + \nu \Delta (\vec{v}_\uparrow^B + \vec{u}_\uparrow^B) &= \frac{1}{m_0} \vec{F}^{ext} \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\vec{v}_\uparrow^A - \vec{u}_\uparrow^A) + (\vec{v}_\uparrow^A + \vec{u}_\uparrow^A) \vec{\nabla} (\vec{v}_\uparrow^A - \vec{u}_\uparrow^A) - \nu \Delta (\vec{v}_\uparrow^A - \vec{u}_\uparrow^A) &= \frac{1}{m_0} \vec{F}^{ext} \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\vec{v}_\downarrow^B + \vec{u}_\downarrow^B) + (\vec{v}_\downarrow^B - \vec{u}_\downarrow^B) \vec{\nabla} (\vec{v}_\downarrow^B + \vec{u}_\downarrow^B) + \nu \Delta (\vec{v}_\downarrow^B + \vec{u}_\downarrow^B) &= \frac{1}{m_0} \vec{F}^{ext} \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\vec{v}_\downarrow^A - \vec{u}_\downarrow^A) + (\vec{v}_\downarrow^A + \vec{u}_\downarrow^A) \vec{\nabla} (\vec{v}_\downarrow^A - \vec{u}_\downarrow^A) - \nu \Delta (\vec{v}_\downarrow^A - \vec{u}_\downarrow^A) &= \frac{1}{m_0} \vec{F}^{ext} \tag{52}
\end{aligned}$$

The velocities $\vec{v}_{\uparrow(\downarrow)}, \vec{u}_{\uparrow(\downarrow)}$ denote the ensemble averages for the state \uparrow (\downarrow). In this notation, the four equations in (52) would define two separate particle systems, with the particles belonging to one ensemble \uparrow or \downarrow for all the time. For a given single particle of a superposed state, there has to be a probability > 0 for it to be found in each one of these states. Therefore, the eqs. (52) cannot describe a state in a superposition and we have to modify the derivation. The two systems are no more separate, if we demand, that the \vec{v}_\uparrow^B (\vec{v}_\downarrow^B) ensemble is averaged over with the \vec{v}_\downarrow^A (\vec{v}_\uparrow^A) system. We are forced to do an interchange procedure, where the slower particles j_1, j_2, j_3, \dots from the $B\uparrow$ ($B\downarrow$) ensemble are interchanged with the same number of faster particles $j_{1'}, j_{2'}, j_{3'}, \dots$ from the $A\downarrow$ ($A\uparrow$) system. This has to be done with as many particles until

$$\vec{v}_\uparrow^B(\vec{r}, t) = \vec{v}_\downarrow^A(\vec{r}, t) \quad \vec{u}_\uparrow^B(\vec{r}, t) = \vec{u}_\downarrow^A(\vec{r}, t) \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{v}_\downarrow^B(\vec{r}, t) = \vec{v}_\uparrow^A(\vec{r}, t) \quad \vec{u}_\downarrow^B(\vec{r}, t) = \vec{u}_\uparrow^A(\vec{r}, t) \tag{53}$$

holds. Then, if we add the $\uparrow A$ and $\downarrow B$, as well as the $\downarrow A$ and the $\uparrow B$ system together, we arrive at two equations:

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

They can be summed together, yielding:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\vec{v}_\uparrow^B + \vec{v}_\uparrow^A + \vec{v}_\downarrow^B + \vec{v}_\downarrow^A) + (\vec{v}_\uparrow^B \vec{\nabla} \vec{v}_\uparrow^B - \vec{u}_\uparrow^B \vec{\nabla} \vec{u}_\uparrow^B) + (\vec{v}_\uparrow^A \vec{\nabla} \vec{v}_\uparrow^A - \vec{u}_\uparrow^A \vec{\nabla} \vec{u}_\uparrow^A) \\
+ (\vec{v}_\downarrow^B \vec{\nabla} \vec{v}_\downarrow^B - \vec{u}_\downarrow^B \vec{\nabla} \vec{u}_\downarrow^B) + (\vec{v}_\downarrow^A \vec{\nabla} \vec{v}_\downarrow^A - \vec{u}_\downarrow^A \vec{\nabla} \vec{u}_\downarrow^A) + \nu \Delta (\vec{u}_\uparrow^B + \vec{u}_\uparrow^A + \vec{u}_\downarrow^B + \vec{u}_\downarrow^A) \\
&= \frac{2}{m_0} (\vec{F}^{ext} + \vec{F}^{ext}) \tag{55}
\end{aligned}$$

Both equations in (54) contain A and B as well as \uparrow and \downarrow ensembles. They describe the average behavior of equations of motion under the same random and external forces. Therefore, we have:

$$\vec{v}_\uparrow^B = \vec{v}_\uparrow^A = \vec{v}_\uparrow \quad \vec{u}_\uparrow^B = \vec{u}_\uparrow^A = \vec{u}_\uparrow \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{v}_\downarrow^B = \vec{v}_\downarrow^A = \vec{v}_\downarrow \quad \vec{u}_\downarrow^B = \vec{u}_\downarrow^A = \vec{u}_\downarrow \tag{56}$$

With eq. (56), we can write $2\vec{v}_\uparrow = \vec{v}_\uparrow^B + \vec{v}_\uparrow^A$ and $2\vec{v}_\downarrow = \vec{v}_\downarrow^B + \vec{v}_\downarrow^A$ as well as $2\vec{u}_\uparrow = \vec{u}_\uparrow^B + \vec{u}_\uparrow^A$ and $2\vec{u}_\downarrow = \vec{u}_\downarrow^B + \vec{u}_\downarrow^A$. Now eq. (55) becomes the expression:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\vec{v}_\uparrow + \vec{v}_\downarrow) + (\vec{v}_\uparrow \vec{\nabla} \vec{v}_\uparrow - \vec{u}_\uparrow \vec{\nabla} \vec{u}_\uparrow) + (\vec{v}_\downarrow \vec{\nabla} \vec{v}_\downarrow - \vec{u}_\downarrow \vec{\nabla} \vec{u}_\downarrow) + \nu \Delta (\vec{u}_\uparrow + \vec{u}_\downarrow) \\
&= \frac{1}{m_0} (\vec{F}^{ext} + \vec{F}^{ext}) \tag{57}
\end{aligned}$$

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

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}\vec{v}_\uparrow - (\vec{u}_\uparrow \vec{\nabla} \vec{u}_\uparrow) + \nu \Delta \vec{u}_\uparrow = \frac{1}{m_0} \vec{F}^{ext} \\ + \\ \frac{d}{dt}\vec{v}_\downarrow - (\vec{u}_\downarrow \vec{\nabla} \vec{u}_\downarrow) + \nu \Delta \vec{u}_\downarrow = \frac{1}{m_0} \vec{F}^{ext} \end{cases} \quad (58)$$

from which the two Schroedinger equations (49) can be derived.

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

$$|\Psi(\vec{r}, t)\rangle = \sum_i^{\mathcal{N}} a_i |\psi_i(\vec{r}, t)\rangle \quad (59)$$

The weighting factors of these states define different probabilities of a given particle to be found in one particular state. Therefore, the \mathcal{N} ensembles in the corresponding differential equations for the separate states must contain different numbers of particles. The state $|\psi_i(\vec{r}, t)\rangle$ has to be computed with an ensemble of Sa_i^2 trajectories $j_1, j_2, j_3, \dots, j_{Sa_i^2}$. This ensures, that there is a chance of a_i^2 to find the particle in the ensemble associated with $|\psi_i(\vec{r}, t)\rangle$.

Furthermore, the interchanging procedure must be defined differently. One has to interchange the trajectories j and j' between the ensembles Bi, Ak with the state numbers $1 \leq i, k \leq \mathcal{N}$. The numbers i, k have to be chosen randomly but with equal probability for each state. The different probabilities of finding a given particle in the separate states only arise due to the in-equal size of the ensembles.

After the necessary interchanges have been taken place, one may add the \mathcal{N} differential equations in one step and split them up into separate equations for the $1, 2, 3, \dots, \mathcal{N}$ systems analogous to (58). We note that due to the form of (41), no information about weighting factors a_i^2 in the probability density appears in \vec{v}, \vec{u} . Therefore, one has to re-introduce this information after one gets from the separated system in eq. (49) to the superposed eq. (48).

6 Fritsche's theory with many particles, active locality and entanglement

Now, we turn to the locality properties of the stochastic process described above, switching for the moment to a single particle system that is not in a superposed state. We note, that there is no dynamical coupling between different trajectories \vec{x}_j and \vec{x}_k ($j \neq k$). \vec{F}_j^{ext} is an arbitrary force field acting only on the j -trajectory, \vec{F}_j^{Brown} is required to be a Gaussian distribution independent for each j and the corresponding Langevin equation (35) contains no couplings between different trajectories j, k too. Nevertheless, the time evolution of the different trajectories \vec{x}_j will be correlated. These correlations arise because of the interchanging procedure which compares the velocities of the particles \vec{x}_j at each point (\vec{r}, t) with the ensemble averages $\vec{v}(\vec{r}, t), \vec{u}(\vec{r}, t)$ of all particles and may change the differential equation of \vec{x}_j in the next time step.

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

It must be emphasized, that this interchanging procedure does not introduce a dynamical coupling between the trajectories. Instead the comparison of the particles velocity with the ensemble averages is only a statistical model to account for the idea of kinetic energy conservation on the average in a stochastic theory. That there are no dynamical couplings between the particles of the ensemble can be seen experimentally in so called self-interferometry experiments. The typical example is Neutron interferometry [16], 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” [17].

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

The many particle Schroedinger equation can be derived if we expand the three dimensional coordinate space of the single particle problem into a $3N$ dimensional space for N particles. We start with the Langevin equations of the j -th particle trajectory in the ensemble for the n -th particle ($1 \leq n \leq N$):

$$\begin{aligned} m_0 \ddot{\vec{x}}_{jn}^B + \frac{m_0}{\tau} \dot{\vec{x}}_{jn}^B &= \vec{F}_{jn}^{ext} + \vec{F}_{jn}^{Brown} + \sum_{n' \neq n}^N \vec{F}_{jn, j'n'}^{ext}(\vec{x}_{jn}, \vec{x}_{j'n'}) \\ m_0 \ddot{\vec{x}}_{jn}^A - \frac{m_0}{\tau} \dot{\vec{x}}_{jn}^A &= \vec{F}_{jn}^{ext} + \vec{F}_{jn}^{Brown} + \sum_{n' \neq n}^N \vec{F}_{jn, j'n'}^{ext}(\vec{x}_{j'n'}, \vec{x}_{j'n'}) \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

In eq. 60, an additional force term $\vec{F}_{jn, j'n'}^{ext}(\vec{x}_{j'n'}, \vec{x}_{j'n'})$ corresponding to inter-particle forces between the particle states n and $n' \neq n$ may be present. From the two Langevin equations in 60, the authors of [15] derive differential equations for the A and B systems completely analogous to the single particle case:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\vec{v}^{NB} + \vec{u}^{NB}) + (\vec{v}^{NB} - \vec{u}^{NB}) \vec{\nabla}^N (\vec{v}^{NB} + \vec{u}^{NB}) + \nu \Delta^N (\vec{v}^{NB} + \vec{u}^{NB}) &= \vec{F}_{ext}^N \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\vec{v}^{NA} - \vec{u}^{NA}) + (\vec{v}^{NA} + \vec{u}^{NA}) \vec{\nabla}^N (\vec{v}^{NA} - \vec{u}^{NA}) - \nu \Delta^N (\vec{v}^{NA} - \vec{u}^{NA}) &= \vec{F}_{ext}^N \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

The average external force \vec{F}_{ext}^N now corresponds to a $3N$ dimensional vector for the different particle states

$$\vec{F}_{ext}^N = \left(\left(\frac{\vec{F}_1^{ext}(\vec{r}_1)}{m_{01}} + \sum_{n' \neq 1}^N \frac{\vec{F}_{2, n'}^{ext}(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_{n'}, t)}{m_{01}} \right), \dots, \left(\frac{\vec{F}_N^{ext}(\vec{r}_N)}{m_{0N}} + \sum_{n' \neq N}^N \frac{\vec{F}_{N, n'}^{ext}(\vec{r}_N, \vec{r}_{n'}, t)}{m_{0N}} \right) \right)$$

with m_{0n} as the rest masses of the n -th. particle. Similarly, the three dimensional ensemble averages \vec{u} and \vec{v} are replaced by $3N$ dimensional entities

$$\vec{v}^{NA/B} = \left(\vec{v}_1^{A/B}(\vec{r}_1, t), \dots, \vec{v}_N^{A/B}(\vec{r}_N, t) \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{u}^{NA/B} = \left(\vec{u}_1^{A/B}(\vec{r}_1, t), \dots, \vec{u}_N^{A/B}(\vec{r}_N, t) \right)$$

depending on the coordinates of the various particles $\vec{r}^{2N} = (\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, \dots, \vec{r}_N)$. The components of the ensemble averages $\vec{u}_n^N(\vec{r}_n^N, t)$, $\vec{v}_n^N(\vec{r}_n^N, t)$, ($1 \leq n \leq N$) are computed with the j -th trajectories for each single particle state n separately. Therefore \vec{v}_n^N, \vec{u}_n^N depend only on the same n -th component of \vec{r}_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

$$\vec{v}^A(\vec{r}^{2N}, t) = \vec{v}^B(\vec{r}^{2N}, t) \quad (62)$$

holds. Here, we have to note an additional subtlety which arises only in multi particle systems. Previously, we have defined an interchange of trajectories such, that trajectories \vec{x}_j^A, \vec{x}_k^B which obey the Langevin equations of the A and B system at time t will become \vec{x}_j^B, \vec{x}_k^A after the interchange and their behavior is defined through the Langevin equations B and A. In a multi-particle system one has to ensure, that such an interchange of trajectories $\vec{x}_{jn}, \vec{x}_{kn'}$ occurs only between trajectories of the same particle state $n = n'$. Otherwise, one would loose active locality, since the ensembles n and n' might be subjected to different external forces. Then, an interchange of a trajectory between different states n, n' would couple the different particle states even if no inter-particle forces are present. Fortunately, since (62) is defined for each state n separately, the interchange procedure can well be confined within one single particle state only.

Now, one can compute the arithmetic mean from the two differential equations in (61) and gets, analogous to the single particle case:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \vec{v}^N - (\vec{u}^N \vec{\nabla}^N \vec{u}^N) + \nu \Delta^N \vec{u}^N = \vec{F}_{ext}^N. \quad (63)$$

From (63), the many particle Schrodinger equation

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \Psi(\vec{r}^N, t)}{\partial t} = \left(\sum_{n=1}^N -\frac{\hbar^2 (\vec{\nabla}^n)^2}{2m_{0n}} + V_{ext}(\vec{r}^N, t) \right) \Psi(\vec{r}^N, t) \quad (64)$$

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

$$V_{ext}(\vec{r}^N, t) = \sum_{i=1}^N V_{ext}(\vec{r}_i) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^N V_{ext}(\vec{r}_i, \vec{r}_j) \quad (65)$$

is the external potential which might contain interparticle couplings $V_{ext}(\vec{r}_i, \vec{r}_j)$. We now assume, that terms like $V_{ext}(\vec{r}_i, \vec{r}_j)$ are absent.

To see that our theory is actively local, we note that with the absence of inter-particle forces there are no terms interconnecting the different components of $\dot{x}_{jin}^{A/B}, \dot{x}_{jkn'}^{A/B}$, where n and $n' \neq n$ denote different particle states. Neither the Gaussian force (36) nor the Langevin equations (60) without inter-particle forces contain such a coupling. This remains true after the formation of the ensemble averages $\bar{v}_n^N(\vec{r}_n^N, t), \bar{u}_n^N(\vec{r}_n^N, t)$ since they are computed with the \vec{x}_{jn} trajectories for each single particle state n separately.

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

The decision, if a trajectory \vec{x}_{jn} changes its ensemble relies only on its own velocity $|\dot{\vec{x}}_{jn}|$ and the ensemble averages $\bar{v}_n^N(\vec{r}_n^N, t), \bar{u}_n^N(\vec{r}_n^N, t)$ of its state n . Since the interchanging procedure of trajectories \vec{x}_{jn} in a multi particle state is confined to interchanges within the same state, the trajectories \vec{x}_{jn} are never coupled in any way to the differential equations of trajectories $\vec{x}_{jn'}$ from other particle states $n' \neq n$.

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

$$|\Psi(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\psi_1(\vec{r}_1, t)\rangle \otimes |\psi_2(\vec{r}_2, t)\rangle - |\psi_2(\vec{r}_1, t)\rangle \otimes |\psi_1(\vec{r}_2, t)\rangle) \quad (66)$$

Such states were observed in massive fermionic systems at first in neutral B-Mesons [18]. The overall state vector $|\Psi(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t)\rangle$ is an element in the product Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ with $|\psi(\vec{r}_1, t)\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $|\psi(\vec{r}_2, t)\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2$ denoting the single particle solutions. $|\Psi(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t)\rangle$ is a superposition of the two states $|\chi_1(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t)\rangle = |\psi_1(\vec{r}_1, t)\rangle \otimes |\psi_2(\vec{r}_2, t)\rangle$ and $|\chi_2(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t)\rangle = |\psi_2(\vec{r}_1, t)\rangle \otimes |\psi_1(\vec{r}_2, t)\rangle$. Thereby, the corresponding multi-particle Schrodinger equation can be written analogous to (49) as:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{i\hbar \partial \Psi(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t)}{\partial t} &= \hat{H}(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \Psi(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \\ \frac{i\hbar}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\partial \chi_1(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t)}{\partial t} - \frac{i\hbar}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\partial \chi_2(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t)}{\partial t} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{H}(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \chi_1(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{H}(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \chi_2(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{i\hbar}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\partial \chi_1(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t)}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{H}(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \chi_1(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \\ - \\ \frac{i\hbar}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\partial \chi_2(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t)}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{H}(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \chi_2(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \end{cases} \quad (67) \end{aligned}$$

The system describes two ensembles \vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2 the particles of which can be in different states $|\psi_1(\vec{r}_1)\rangle$ or $|\psi_2(\vec{r}_1)\rangle$ for the \vec{r}_1 ensemble and $|\psi_1(\vec{r}_2)\rangle$ or $|\psi_2(\vec{r}_2)\rangle$ for the \vec{r}_2 ensemble. To describe the dynamics of the \vec{r}_1 ensemble, the A1(B1) system of $|\psi_1(\vec{r}_1)\rangle$ must be averaged with the B2(A2) ensemble of $|\psi_2(\vec{r}_1)\rangle$ and the same has to be done with the \vec{r}_2 particles. During this procedure, one has to ensure that each pair of j -th particle trajectories \vec{x}_{j1} and \vec{x}_{j2} of the \vec{r}_1 and \vec{r}_2 system will change their state simultaneously. We

will show in the context with Bohms EPR experiment, how this can be achieved even if the trajectories of the \vec{r}_1 and \vec{r}_2 ensembles are independently modeled.

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

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_1 \otimes 1_2 + 1_1 \otimes \hat{H}_2 \quad (68)$$

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

$$e^{it\hat{H}} \hat{A}_1 e^{-it\hat{H}} = e^{it\hat{H}_1} \hat{A}_1 e^{-it\hat{H}_1} \otimes 1_2 \quad (69)$$

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

In this context, we mention, that Nelson’s original theory could not reproduce the example above [7]. He identified $\vec{v}(\vec{r}, t)$ and $\vec{u}(\vec{r}, t)$ not as average velocities of an ensemble, but as real particle properties. With this assertion, the splitting of the many particle Schroedinger equation in (67) was not possible, as was any sort of interchanging procedure between particles in the $A1(B1)$ and $B2(A2)$ ensemble. Accordingly, active locality was lost in Nelson’s original formulation and the same problems occurred as in Bohmian mechanics. There, it is well known that the derivation of the many particle Schroedinger equation is only possible if a highly non-trivial dependency between the „particle velocities” has to be introduced, without any physical foundation. Interestingly, Nelson himself has shown recently [19], that $\vec{v}(\vec{r}, t)$, $\vec{u}(\vec{r}, t)$ cannot correspond to properties of individual particles, since this would lead to measurable differences between his original theory and ordinary quantum mechanics.

7 Spin in a Fritsche-like hidden variable theory

Nelson’s derivation of the Schroedinger equation was quickly extended to include particle spin, but without proper physical interpretation [20]. By the time, more physically motivated derivations of the Pauli equation were developed. One by Faris [21, 22], and another one [23] by the author of the modification of Nelson’s stochastic mechanics discussed above. Unfortunately, these frameworks did either violate active locality, or they did not contain any mechanism which would change a particles spin state after its emission. Thereby none of these theories led to a violation of deterministic passive locality only. Here, we try to propose a theory of spinning particles providing such a mechanism.

Beginning with an example of [23], we try to interpret the spin of a particle as a rotation around a chosen axis. We let the particle rotate around an axis \vec{r}_0 under energy fluctuations $\Delta E \Delta t \approx \hbar/2$. For fluctuations in the rotational energy we have from classical mechanics $\Delta E = \frac{\Theta}{2} \omega_0^2$. 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 written for the time of a complete rotation. If we identify Δt with T , we may write

$$\Delta E = \frac{1}{2} m_0 r \cdot r \frac{2\pi}{T} \frac{2\pi}{T} T = m_0 v r \pi = \pi s \approx \hbar/2. \quad (70)$$

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

$$s = m_0 v r \approx \frac{\hbar}{2\pi} \quad (71)$$

denotes its angular momentum. Apparently, s is independent of the particle’s mass and the radius of the rotation. The arguments above were only estimations. For later, it will be useful if we set the magnitude of the average angular momentum of spin to $s = \hbar/2$. From the time dependent Schroedinger equation, one can derive the so called Ehrenfest theorem $\frac{d}{dt} \langle \vec{v} \rangle = \langle \vec{F} \rangle$. This equation implies for the angular




Figure 2: particles on a rotating trajectory

momentum operator $\vec{L} = \vec{r} \times m_0 \vec{v}$ that \vec{L} may not vanish in the case of $\hbar \rightarrow 0$. Since the so called spin should go to zero in the classical limit, s must be independent of \vec{L} and we must expand our description.

In the derivation of the Schrodinger equation, we were led to two differential equations. One which average energy decreases and the other with increasing average energy. This behavior of the two equations was modeled via their different ensemble average velocities

$$\vec{v}^B = \vec{v}_c - \vec{u} \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{v}^A = \vec{v}_c + \vec{u}. \quad (72)$$

With the demand, that $\vec{v}^B = \vec{v}^A$ after each time-step, energy conservation on the average was ensured. In our previous derivation, we had not included the possibility, that the random forces might set the particle on a rotating trajectory. Then, as we will see below, the definitions above are not enough to warrant energy conservation on the average.

Assume, the only forces in the system are the quantum fluctuations ($\vec{v}_c = 0$). Furthermore, let the average of the particles at time t being pushed on a trajectory rotating in the left direction with regards to our chosen axis. Now $+\vec{u}$ may be their average trajectories tangent vector. According to our previous considerations, in the next time step, some of the particles would undergo a transition with velocity $-\vec{u}$ as tangent to their new trajectory. Unfortunately (see fig. 2), this might be a rotation in the left direction of our chosen axis too. Therefore, the angular velocity of some of the particles would increase and they would gain rotational energy at each time-step. The differential equations governing the system would be classical transport equations.

To prevent this situation, we divide our two statistical ensembles of trajectories again into two systems: One denoted by \uparrow for particles rotating in the right direction and the other by \downarrow for particles rotating in the left direction related to the chosen axis. The trajectories of the \uparrow system have to be interchanged with the \downarrow system and vice-versa. This ensures, that rotational energy is conserved on the average. We start with four Langevin equations for the individual particles in the $A \uparrow, A \downarrow, B \uparrow, B \downarrow$ ensembles:

$$\begin{aligned} m_0 \ddot{x}_{\uparrow j}^B + \frac{m_0}{\tau} \dot{x}_{\uparrow j}^B &= \vec{F}_j^{ext} + \vec{F}_j^{Brown\uparrow} \\ m_0 \ddot{x}_{\uparrow j}^A - \frac{m_0}{\tau} \dot{x}_{\uparrow j}^A &= \vec{F}_j^{ext} + \vec{F}_j^{Brown\uparrow} \\ m_0 \ddot{x}_{\downarrow j}^B + \frac{m_0}{\tau} \dot{x}_{\downarrow j}^B &= \vec{F}_j^{ext} + \vec{F}_j^{Brown\downarrow} \\ m_0 \ddot{x}_{\downarrow j}^A - \frac{m_0}{\tau} \dot{x}_{\downarrow j}^A &= \vec{F}_j^{ext} + \vec{F}_j^{Brown\downarrow} \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

As in the case of the superposed single particle system, we get four differential equations equal to (52). From the Langevin equations above, it can be easily seen, that, if a particle would be governed by e.g an \uparrow system for all the time, its rotational energy would have to increase. At each step, the particle would be subjected to a force which puts it under a rotating trajectory. The plus sign of the B ensemble in the second time step leads to a velocity in the opposite direction of the A system. This is exactly what would strengthen the angular velocity of a rotation around an axis (see Fig. 2). To prevent this effect, we must interchange trajectories between the $A \uparrow (A \downarrow)$ and $B \downarrow (B \uparrow)$ ensemble. After the interchanging procedure we have

$$\vec{v}_{\uparrow}^B = \vec{v}_{\downarrow}^A \quad \vec{u}_{\uparrow}^B = \vec{u}_{\downarrow}^A \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{v}_{\downarrow}^B = \vec{v}_{\uparrow}^A \quad \vec{u}_{\downarrow}^B = \vec{u}_{\uparrow}^A \quad (74)$$

as well as we can get two differential equations analogous to (54).

Here we note, that the interchange of trajectories between different spin states only takes place, if the external forces on the \uparrow and \downarrow systems are equal $\vec{F}_{\uparrow}^{ext} = \vec{F}_{\downarrow}^{ext} = \vec{F}_j^{ext}$. The interchanging procedure is only a model for the energy-restoring ability of the fluctuations from the vacuum. If the external forces would induce a higher potential energy difference between the \uparrow and \downarrow ensembles than the energy fluctuations

could restore (what actually happens in a Stern-Gerlach magnet), one would be left up with two separate systems of particles which would not change their spin state anymore. Now, the interchange in each of the separate spin systems would happen between differential equations for A and B ensembles, with forces that are not able to induce any further rotation. Thereby, the spin state of the particles would remain constant.

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

$$\vec{v}_{\uparrow}^B = \vec{v}_{\uparrow}^A = \vec{v}_{\uparrow} \quad \vec{v}_{\downarrow}^B = \vec{v}_{\downarrow}^A = v_{\downarrow} \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{u}_{\uparrow}^B = \vec{u}_{\uparrow}^A = \vec{u}_{\uparrow} \quad \vec{u}_{\downarrow}^B = \vec{u}_{\downarrow}^A = \vec{u}_{\downarrow} . \quad (75)$$

Analogous to (57) and (58), we can add the two remaining differential equations to a sum for the \uparrow and for the \downarrow system. Then, we re-separate the parts of this equation into two Schrodinger equations for the states $\psi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}, t)$ and $\psi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}, t)$. For a single particle, the overall effect of this interchanging procedure is, that it does as often belong to the \uparrow state as to the \downarrow state. A nice drawing of this process is given by Penrose for Dirac particles in [27]. It is this effect whereby the possibility for a violation of deterministic passive locality does arise.

Similar to (51) we are now in a position to describe the behavior of the overall system by decomposing the probability density $\rho(\vec{r}, t)$ as

$$\rho(\vec{r}, t) = a^2 \rho_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}, t) + b^2 \rho_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}, t) \quad (76)$$

and (50) we can denote the overall quantum state $|\Psi(\vec{r}, t)\rangle$ with

$$|\Psi(\vec{r}, t)\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} a\psi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}, t) \\ b\psi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}, t) \end{pmatrix} = a\psi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}, t) |+\rangle + b\psi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}, t) |-\rangle . \quad (77)$$

From here on, we can follow closely [23] to derive the rest of the Pauli equation and the spin operators. If an external magnetic field is applied, the energy of $\psi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}, t)$ decreases with magnitude $\mu_B B$, whereas the energy of $\psi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}, t)$ increases by the same magnitude. The constant μ_B is called Bohr magneton

$$\mu_B = \frac{e\hbar}{2m_0} . \quad (78)$$

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 Schrodinger equation in a similar manner as it is typically done for Dirac's equation, one gets the same value for μ_B [24]). Under a magnetic field in z direction, we have for the magnetic energy densities

$$\mu(\vec{r}, t)_{\uparrow} = -\mu_B B_z(\vec{r}, t) |a|^2 \psi_{\uparrow}^*(\vec{r}, t) \psi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}, t) \quad (79)$$

and

$$\mu(\vec{r}, t)_{\downarrow} = \mu_B B_z(\vec{r}, t) |b|^2 \psi_{\downarrow}^*(\vec{r}, t) \psi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}, t) . \quad (80)$$

With their sum

$$\mu(\vec{r}, t) = \mu_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}, t) + \mu_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}, t) \quad (81)$$

$\mu(\vec{r}, t)$ can be cast as

$$\mu(\vec{r}, t) = -\Psi^+(\vec{r}, t) \mu_B \mathbf{B} \Psi(\vec{r}, t) \quad (82)$$

where \mathbf{B} is the matrix

$$\mathbf{B} = B_z(\vec{r}, t) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} . \quad (83)$$

The different coupling of the systems $\psi_{\uparrow(\downarrow)}(\vec{r}, t)$ to magnetic fields gives raise to the Stern-Gerlach effect [25]. If atoms from an incident beam with equally distributed magnetic energy density enter a strong magnet, the two different rotating systems get deflected in opposite directions. This effect occurs since the energy that the magnets depose on the spinning systems is stronger than the energy which the quantum

fluctuations can restore. Therefore, 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 be split up again. This is the observation in repeated stern Gerlach experiments [26].

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

$$\hat{H}(\vec{r}, t) = \frac{\left(i\hbar\vec{\nabla} - e\vec{A}(\vec{r}, t)\right)^2}{2m_0} + V(\vec{r}, t) \quad (84)$$

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

$$\psi_{\uparrow}^*(\vec{r}, t)\hat{H}(\vec{r}, t)\psi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}, t) + \psi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}, t)\hat{H}(\vec{r}, t)\psi_{\downarrow}^*(\vec{r}, t) = \Psi^\dagger(\vec{r}, t)\hat{H}(\vec{r}, t)\Psi(\vec{r}, t). \quad (85)$$

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

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\Psi(\vec{r}, t)}{\partial t} = \left(\hat{H}(\vec{r}, t) - \mu_B\mathbf{B}(\vec{r}, t)\right)\Psi(\vec{r}, t) \quad (86)$$

If the magnetic field \vec{B} has another direction as the rotating axis of the spinning particles, one must change its coordinate system. This can be done via linear transformations $\vec{B}' = \mathbf{Q}\vec{B}$. \mathbf{Q} is a rotation matrix, consisting of three independent rotations around Euler angles ψ, ϕ, θ . It is known from classical mechanics ([28]) that a general rotation matrix \mathbf{Q} can be written as

$$\mathbf{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{\frac{i}{2}(\psi+\phi)}\cos(\theta/2) & ie^{\frac{i}{2}(\psi-\phi)}\sin(\theta/2) \\ ie^{-\frac{i}{2}(\psi+\phi)}\sin(\theta/2) & e^{-\frac{i}{2}(\psi+\phi)}\cos(\theta/2) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (87)$$

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

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} B_z & B_x - iB_y \\ B_x + iB_y & -B_z \end{pmatrix} \quad (88)$$

we can, with help of (87), write the rotation of \vec{B} from z to a new axis z' :

$$\mathbf{B}' = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{Q}^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} B_{z'} & B_x - iB_y \\ B_x + iB_y & -B_{z'} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (89)$$

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

$$\mathbf{B} = \vec{B}_x\sigma_x + \vec{B}_y\sigma_y + \vec{B}_z\sigma_z \quad (90)$$

where the matrices $\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z$ are the so called Pauli matrices. With $\vec{\sigma} = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$ we have:

$$\mathbf{B} = \vec{B}\vec{\sigma} \quad (91)$$

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

$$\mathbf{B}' = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{Q}^\dagger. \quad (92)$$

Since the energy density does not change in a rotation we have

$$u(\vec{r}, t) = u'(\vec{r}, t). \quad (93)$$

If we now set

$$\Psi'(\vec{r}, t) = \mathbf{Q}\Psi(\vec{r}, t) \quad (94)$$

we get the relation

$$\Psi'^+(\vec{r}, t)\mathbf{B}\Psi'(\vec{r}, t) = u'(\vec{r}', t) = \Psi^+(\vec{r}, t)\mathbf{Q}^+\mathbf{B}'\mathbf{Q}\Psi(\vec{r}, t). \quad (95)$$

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

$$\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{Q}^+\mathbf{B}'\mathbf{Q}. \quad (96)$$

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

$$\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{Q}^+ = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^+\mathbf{B}'\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^+ = \mathbf{B}' \quad (97)$$

It exactly defines the transformation law of \mathbf{B} in (92). Finally with (94) and (96) we can write the time dependent Pauli equation for a spinning particle in a rotated magnetic field \mathbf{B}' :

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\Psi(\vec{r}, t)}{\partial t} = \left(\hat{H}(\vec{r}, t) - \mu_B\mathbf{B}(\vec{r}, t)\vec{\sigma}\right)\psi(\vec{r}, t) \quad (98)$$

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 x/y plane of the non-rotated coordinate system encloses an angle φ with the x -axis. This angle is connected to the Euler angle ϕ according to $\phi = \varphi + \pi/2$. Then, with (94), the spinors $\psi'_{\uparrow(\downarrow)}(\vec{r}, t)$ in the rotated coordinate system of \vec{B}' the have the form:

$$\psi'_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}, t) = \psi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}, t) \left(e^{i\varphi/2}\cos(\theta/2)|+\rangle - e^{-i\varphi/2}\sin(\theta/2)|-\rangle \right) \quad (99)$$

$$\psi'_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}, t) = \psi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}, t) \left(e^{-i\varphi/2}\sin(\theta/2)|-\rangle - e^{i\varphi/2}\cos(\theta/2)|+\rangle \right). \quad (100)$$

A more common situation is, that the magnetic field of a Stern-Gerlach apparatus is in the \vec{B}' coordinate system. One often wants to know the spinor $\psi(\vec{r}, t) = \mathbf{Q}^+\psi'(\vec{r}, t)$ which is:

$$\psi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}, t) = \psi_0(\vec{r})e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}E_0t} \left(e^{-i(\varphi-\omega_1t)/2}\cos(\theta/2)|+\rangle + e^{i(\varphi-\omega_1t)/2}\sin(\theta/2)|-\rangle \right) \quad (101)$$

$$\psi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}, t) = \psi_0(\vec{r})e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}E_0t} \left(-e^{-i(\varphi-\omega_1t)/2}\sin(\theta/2)|-\rangle + e^{i(\varphi-\omega_1t)/2}\cos(\theta/2)|+\rangle \right) \quad (102)$$

In these equations, we have already separated the coordinate dependence from the energy dependent part of the wave-function. The latter changes in the magnetic field according to

$$\psi_0(\vec{r}, t) = \psi_0(\vec{r})e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar}E_{0\uparrow\downarrow}t}, \quad (103)$$

where $\omega_l = \frac{2\mu_B B_z}{\hbar}$ is the Larmor frequency.

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

$$\langle S_z \rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2} \int d\vec{r} \left(|a|^2 |\psi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}, t)|^2 - |b|^2 |\psi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}, t)|^2 \right). \quad (104)$$

Analogous to the matrix \mathbf{B} we can write this expression with a matrix

$$\mathbf{S}_z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (105)$$

in the form

$$\langle S_z \rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2} \int \psi^+(\vec{r}, t)\mathbf{S}_z\psi(\vec{r}, t). \quad (106)$$

For the component of spin in the z coordinate of an arbitrary rotated coordinate system, we have $\mathbf{S}_{z'} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{S}_z\mathbf{Q}^+$ or $\mathbf{S}_{z'} = \frac{\hbar}{2}\vec{a}\vec{\sigma}$. The vector valued entity \vec{a} is an unit vector $\vec{a} = (\cos(\varphi)\sin(\theta), \sin(\varphi)\sin(\theta), \cos(\theta))$

in spherical coordinates. It defines the z' direction of the new coordinate system in which the spin is measured. With this notation, we can write the so called spin operator as

$$\vec{S} = \frac{\hbar}{2} \vec{\sigma} \quad (107)$$

with $\mathbf{S}_{z'} = \vec{a} \vec{S}$. The average value $\langle S_{z'} \rangle$ then becomes

$$\langle S_{z'} \rangle = \int \psi^\dagger(\vec{r}, t) \mathbf{S}_{z'} \psi(\vec{r}, t) d\vec{r} = \vec{a} \langle \vec{S} \rangle \quad (108)$$

where

$$\langle \vec{S} \rangle = \int \psi^\dagger(\vec{r}, t) \vec{S} \psi(\vec{r}, t) d\vec{r}. \quad (109)$$

8 Entangled systems with spin

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

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\psi(\vec{r}_1, t) |-\rangle \otimes \psi(\vec{r}_2, t) |+\rangle - \psi(\vec{r}_1, t) |+\rangle \otimes \psi(\vec{r}_2, t) |-\rangle) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\chi_1(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) - \chi_2(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t)), \end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

where we have defined

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

Analogous to (67), the two particle Pauli equation can be written with these definitions as:

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) &= \hat{H}(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \Psi(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} i\hbar \frac{\partial \chi_1(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2)}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{H}(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \chi_1(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2) \\ - \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} i\hbar \frac{\partial \chi_2(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2)}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{H}(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \chi_2(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2) \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

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

$$\rho(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) = \frac{1}{2} \rho_1(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) + \frac{1}{2} \rho_2(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \quad (112)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) &= \chi_1^\dagger(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \chi_1(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \\ &= \psi^*(\vec{r}_1, t) \psi(\vec{r}_1, t) \langle - | - \rangle \otimes \psi^*(\vec{r}_2, t) \psi(\vec{r}_2, t) \langle + | + \rangle \\ &= \rho_{1\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1, t) \otimes \rho_{1\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2, t) \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_2(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) &= \chi_2^\dagger(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \chi_2(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \\ &= \psi^*(\vec{r}_1, t) \psi(\vec{r}_1, t) \langle + | + \rangle \otimes \psi^*(\vec{r}_2, t) \psi(\vec{r}_2, t) \langle - | - \rangle \\ &= \rho_{2\uparrow}(\vec{r}_1, t) \otimes \rho_{2\downarrow}(\vec{r}_2, t). \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

The expression for the osmotic velocity in a many particle system is given as

$$\vec{u}^N(\vec{r}^N, t) = -\frac{\hbar}{2m_0} \vec{\nabla}^N \ln(\rho(\vec{r}^N, t)/\rho_0). \quad (115)$$

After the tensor product of the two particle probability density $\rho_1(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t)$ is converted by the logarithm laws into a sum of expressions, we can write for $\vec{u}_{\chi_1}^N(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{u}_{\chi_1}^N(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) &= -\frac{\hbar}{2m_0} \vec{\nabla}^N \left(\ln((\rho_{1\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1, t))_1 / \rho_0) + \ln((\rho_{1\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2, t))_2 / \rho_0) \right) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\hbar}{2m_0} \vec{\nabla} \ln((\rho_{1\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1, t))_1 / \rho_0) \\ -\frac{\hbar}{2m_0} \vec{\nabla} \ln((\rho_{1\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2, t))_2 / \rho_0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \vec{u}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1) \\ \vec{u}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \vec{u}_{1\downarrow} \\ \vec{u}_{2\uparrow} \end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned}\quad (116)$$

Similarly, $\vec{u}_{\chi_2}^N$ in the Pauli equation for $\chi_2(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t)$ is of the form $\vec{u}_{\chi_2}^N(\vec{r}^N, t) = \begin{pmatrix} \vec{u}_{1\uparrow} \\ \vec{u}_{2\downarrow} \end{pmatrix}$. Furthermore, the expression for the velocity $\vec{v}^N(\vec{r}^N, t)$ is

$$\vec{v}^N(\vec{r}^N, t) = \frac{\hbar}{m_0} \vec{\nabla}^N \varphi(\vec{r}^N, t) \quad (117)$$

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

$$\Psi(\vec{r}^N, t) = \pm \sqrt{\rho(\vec{r}^N)} e^{i\varphi(\vec{r}^N)}. \quad (118)$$

Writing $\chi_1(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t)$ in the form of (118)

$$\chi_1(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) = \sqrt{\rho_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1, t)} e^{i\varphi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1)} \otimes \sqrt{\rho_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2, t)} e^{i\varphi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2)}, \quad (119)$$

we can identify the overall phase of χ_1 as

$$\varphi_1(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) = \varphi_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1, t) + \varphi_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2, t). \quad (120)$$

This yields for $\vec{v}_{\chi_1}^N$:

$$\vec{v}_{\chi_1}^N(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) = \frac{\hbar}{m_0} \vec{\nabla}^N \varphi_1(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) = \begin{pmatrix} \vec{v}_{\downarrow}(\vec{r}_1) \\ \vec{v}_{\uparrow}(\vec{r}_2) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \vec{v}_{1\downarrow} \\ \vec{v}_{2\uparrow} \end{pmatrix} \quad (121)$$

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

The expressions for $\vec{u}_{\chi_1}^N, \vec{u}_{\chi_2}^N, \vec{v}_{\chi_1}^N, \vec{v}_{\chi_2}^N$ imply, that the Pauli equation (111) for the entangled state can be decomposed into a difference of 2 two component differential equations:

$$\begin{cases} \left(\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \vec{v}_{1\downarrow} - \left(\vec{u}_{1\downarrow} \vec{\nabla} \vec{u}_{1\downarrow} \right) + \nu \Delta \vec{u}_{1\downarrow} &= \frac{1}{m_0} \vec{F}_1^{ext} \\ \frac{d}{dt} \vec{v}_{2\uparrow} - \left(\vec{u}_{2\uparrow} \vec{\nabla} \vec{u}_{2\uparrow} \right) + \nu \Delta \vec{u}_{2\uparrow} &= \frac{1}{m_0} \vec{F}_2^{ext} \end{aligned} \right) \\ - \\ \left(\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \vec{v}_{1\uparrow} - \left(\vec{u}_{1\uparrow} \vec{\nabla} \vec{u}_{1\uparrow} \right) + \nu \Delta \vec{u}_{1\uparrow} &= \frac{1}{m_0} \vec{F}_1^{ext} \\ \frac{d}{dt} \vec{v}_{2\downarrow} - \left(\vec{u}_{2\downarrow} \vec{\nabla} \vec{u}_{2\downarrow} \right) + \nu \Delta \vec{u}_{2\downarrow} &= \frac{1}{m_0} \vec{F}_2^{ext} \end{aligned} \right) \end{cases} \quad (122)$$

where $\vec{F}_2^{ext} = \vec{F}_1^{ext}$. These four equations are equivalent to (111) but they contain the ensemble averages \vec{u} and \vec{v} of each particle system directly. Eqs. (122) can be similarly derived as the two equations in (58) but for the \vec{r}_1 and \vec{r}_2 particle ensemble separately.

During the derivation, it has to be ensured that for each particle in the ensemble, kinetic energy is conserved on the average. Therefore, sometimes an interchange of the \vec{r}_1 trajectories $\vec{x}_{\uparrow/\downarrow 1jt}^{A/B}$ between the $\vec{v}_{1\downarrow}^A$ ($\vec{v}_{1\uparrow}^A$) and the $\vec{v}_{1\uparrow}^B$ ($\vec{v}_{1\downarrow}^B$) system has to take place. And an analogous procedure has to happen with the \vec{r}_2 trajectories $\vec{x}_{\uparrow/\downarrow 2jt}^{A/B}$ between the $\vec{v}_{2\downarrow}^A$ ($\vec{v}_{2\uparrow}^A$) and the $\vec{v}_{2\uparrow}^B$ ($\vec{v}_{2\downarrow}^B$) ensembles during the derivation.

We note that it is possible, to threat the \vec{r}_1 and \vec{r}_2 states completely separate because they represent uncoupled statistical ensembles. They may even be spatially separated, in a way that there is no contact between them. The necessary interchanges between the trajectories can well be confined to take place between trajectories of \vec{r}_1 and \vec{r}_2 separately.

A measurement on one particle system, say \vec{r}_1 , would change the external force \vec{F}_1^{ext} . Hence, it would induce a difference between \vec{F}_1^{ext} and \vec{F}_2^{ext} . Then, the equations governing the \vec{r}_1 ensemble would be different from the equations for \vec{r}_2 and correlations in (122) between both systems would be lost. Because the equations for the \vec{r}_2 system would not change, the particles in the \vec{r}_2 are not affected by measurements of \vec{r}_1 .

The interchanging procedure between the $\uparrow, \downarrow, A, B$ ensembles for the \vec{r}_1 and \vec{r}_2 particles leads to the picture of two particles changing their spin from \uparrow to \downarrow and vice-versa during their flight from the source to the detectors. In an EPR experiment, the two particles start having opposite spin and the same initial speed due to momentum conservation. Therefore, at time t_0 they will be placed in the same A/B ensemble, but in the opposite spin system. During the flight of the particles to the detectors at time $t > t_0$, the trajectory interchange has to be done such, that if a particle changes its A/B ensemble, its spin state has to change to the opposite value at the same time. Similarly, if a particle changes its spin, its A/B ensemble must change also. Transitions $\{B, \uparrow\} \rightarrow \{A, \uparrow\}$, $\{B, \downarrow\} \rightarrow \{A, \downarrow\}$, $\{A, \uparrow\} \rightarrow \{A, \downarrow\}$ or $\{B, \uparrow\} \rightarrow \{B, \downarrow\}$ are not allowed, since then, the particle affected would loose energy conservation on the average.

We denote the time dependent spin trajectory of the j -th particle in the $\vec{r}_{1(2)}$ particle system as stochastic process $\phi_{1(2)jt}$ which can take values $\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$. If one can ensure that

$$\phi_{1jt} \neq \phi_{2jt} \quad (123)$$

for all times t , one has exact anti-correlations between the spins of the j -th particle pair during its flight. It is this property which gives raise to the form of (110), describing two paired systems of infinitely many particle trajectories $\vec{x}_{1(2)jt}$ where the spins of the particles in each pair are always opposite and which ensemble average velocities obey the two particle Pauli equation.

The particles are interchanged from $\{A, \uparrow\}$ ($\{A, \downarrow\}$) to $\{B, \downarrow\}$ ($\{B, \uparrow\}$) if they are moving too fast in the A system. Similarly the particles are changed from $\{B, \uparrow\}$ ($\{B, \downarrow\}$) to $\{A, \downarrow\}$ ($\{A, \uparrow\}$) if they are moving too slow in the B system. At time t_0 both particles have the same velocity and are placed in the same A or B ensemble. If inter-particle forces and external forces are absent, the velocity of the particles is induced by the random forces $\vec{F}_{1(2)j}^{Brown}$ only. If we demand that

$$\vec{F}_{1j}^{Brown}(t) = \vec{F}_{2j}^{Brown}(t) \quad (124)$$

for each time t , the velocities of the j -th trajectories from the \vec{r}_1 and \vec{r}_2 particles will be equal for all times. Accordingly, the particles will change their A/B system in the same way. Each placement in another A/B ensemble changes the particles spin state to the opposite. Since the spin ensemble of the particles is opposite from the beginning at t_0 , the spin trajectories of both particles will always take opposite values $\phi_{1jt} \neq \phi_{2jt}$ for all times t .

The requirement (124) may be achieved with a random force field that has equal values at every point \vec{r}^N at time t . But as will be shown below, exact anti-correlations of spin states can also be achieved within a local mechanism as a result of their common past. The only constraint for the random force (36) was, that it has a Gaussian distribution. Now consider the following mechanism: A real random number generator sets the starting value δ_j for two pseudo random number generators of same type for every j -th particle pair created by the source. Pseudo random number generators are deterministic procedures which, if initialized with the same starting value δ_j , always produce the same series. Let the two separated generators produce Gaussian distributions $\vec{F}_{1j}^{Brown}(t)$, $\vec{F}_{2j}^{Brown}(t)$ associated with the random forces for j -th trajectory of the \vec{r}_1 and \vec{r}_2 particles. Then (124) holds and the j -th spin trajectories of both particles will change their state simultaneously in opposite way.

At first sight, one may think that such a procedure would set up a deterministic passive local theory. Indeed, for the random forces $\vec{F}_{1j}^{Brown}(t)$, $\vec{F}_{2j}^{Brown}(t)$, there is a preparation event δ_j which determines all later values of $\vec{F}_{1j}^{Brown}(t)$ and $\vec{F}_{2j}^{Brown}(t)$. But the proof in section 4 was only with regards to elements of the sigma algebras $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_X, \overline{\mathcal{F}}_1, \overline{\mathcal{F}}_2$. They are sets of events $\sigma_1 \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_1, \sigma_2 \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_2, \overline{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X$ from possible spin measurements generated by $\phi_{1jT}, \phi_{2jT}, \phi_{1j0}, \phi_{2j0}$ and not of events from the random force. Clearly, there is no bijective mapping

$$\Gamma : \vec{F}_{1(2)j}^{Brown}(t) \mapsto \phi_{1(2)jt} \quad (125)$$

since $\vec{F}_{1(2)j}^{Brown}(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ has a Gaussian distribution and $\phi_{1(2)jt}$ is confined to two values $\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$ only. Thereby a violation of deterministic passive locality will be possible.

Let the j -th spin trajectory of particle 1 with velocity $\left| \dot{x}_{\uparrow 1jt}^A \right|$ start in the $A \uparrow$ ensemble at time t_0 , that is: $\phi_{1jt_0} = \uparrow$. This particle will have to be placed in the $B \downarrow$ ensemble, if its velocity $\left| \dot{x}_{\uparrow 1jt}^A \right|$ is higher than the arithmetic mean $\left| \vec{v}^{AB}(\vec{r}_1, t) \right| = v^{AB}(\vec{r}_1, t)$ of the ensemble average velocities from the $A \uparrow$ and the $B \downarrow$ system. For a given random starting value $\delta_j \in \mathbb{R}$ of the pseudo random number generators, let the Brownian force for particle 1 at time t_1 take the value

$$\vec{F}_{1j}^{Brown}(t_1, \delta_1) = \xi_1. \quad (126)$$

The velocity $\left| \dot{x}_{\uparrow 1jt_1}^A \right|$ is a function of $\vec{F}_{1j}^{Brown}(t_1, \delta_1)$. Now, we assume ξ_1 to be such that $\left| \dot{x}_{\uparrow 1jt_1}^A \right| \leq \vec{v}^{AB}(\vec{r}_1, t_1)$. Then, at time t_1 no change of the spin trajectory takes place and we get:

$$\phi_{1jt_0} = \phi_{1jt_1}.$$

Similarly at time t_2 let

$$\vec{F}_{1j}^{Brown}(t_2, \delta_j) = \xi_2 \quad (127)$$

be such that $\left| \dot{x}_{\uparrow 1jt_2}^A \right| \leq \vec{v}^{AB}(\vec{r}_1, t_2)$. Still, no change of ϕ_{1jt_2} happens and we can write:

$$\phi_{1jt_0} = \phi_{1jt_1} = \phi_{1jt_2}. \quad (128)$$

Now it may be, that for another starting value $\delta'_j \in \mathbb{R}$ of the pseudo random number generator, one has $\vec{F}_{1j}^{Brown}(t_1, \delta'_j) = \lambda_1 = \xi_1$ as well and thereby

$$\phi_{1jt_0} = \phi_{1jt_1}$$

again. But for t_2 one may get with δ'_j

$$\vec{F}_{1j}^{Brown}(t_2, \delta'_j) = \lambda_2 \neq \xi_2 \quad (129)$$

where λ_2 is such that $\left| \dot{x}_{\uparrow 1jt_2}^A \right| > \vec{v}^{AB}(\vec{r}_1, t_2)$. In this situation, the particle in the $A \uparrow$ ensemble would be placed in the $B \downarrow$ ensemble at time t_2 , taking the velocity $\left| \dot{x}_{\downarrow 1jt_2}^B \right|$. For the spin trajectories, we would have:

$$\phi_{1jt_0} = \phi_{1jt_1} \neq \phi_{1jt_2}. \quad (130)$$

Thereby, it cannot exist a preparation event $\bar{x} = \phi_{1jt_0} \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_X$ which is equivalent to later events $\sigma_1 \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}_1$ generated by $\phi_{1jT; (T>0)}$. The same is true for the ϕ_{2jt} particles and so deterministic passive locality is violated. It suffices to assume the Gaussian distributed random forces $\vec{F}_{1j}^{Brown}, \vec{F}_{2j}^{Brown}$ to have a „memory“ dependent of their past. Then, one can construct a theory in which the spin trajectories ϕ_{1jt}, ϕ_{2jt} violate deterministic passive locality and hence the Bell's inequalities.

We have to note, that even if the model with the pseudo random number generators may look artificial, it would nevertheless be difficult to test. One does not have access to $\vec{F}_{1(2)j}^{Brown}(t, \delta_j)$ but only to events σ_1, σ_2 generated by the spin variables ϕ_{1jT} and ϕ_{2jT} . Because the initial value δ_j is assumed to be a real random number, the statistics of σ_1, σ_2 generated by ϕ_{1jT} and ϕ_{2jT} would equal the properties of real random numbers if infinitely many particle pairs j ($S \rightarrow \infty$, where $1 \leq j \leq S \in \mathbb{N}$) are considered.

Of course, the author has to admit the somewhat incomplete nature of this article because the model given is artificial and may well be replaced by a more natural one. To give a more physical reason for eq. (124) one would need further studies. Here, we wish to leave it at that with a citation by Edward Nelson from a popular talk. It shows that such behavior is in fact commonly observed in stochastically evolving systems and not at all confined to quantum mechanical objects [29]:

”The snowflake problem is this: The inexhaustible variety of snowflakes makes it evident that chance plays a major role in their development, yet they always preserve hexagonal symmetry – how does a portion of the snowflake growing at random on one side know to grow in precisely the same fashion as its partner all the way over on the other side? This is mysterious but not beyond understanding”. [8] “Similar 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”.

9 Objections against Nelson's theorem

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

$$P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{\nu}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} \cap \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} | \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} \neq P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{\nu}}} \left\{ \sigma_{1\vec{\mu}} | \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{\nu}}} \left\{ \sigma_{2\vec{\nu}} | \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X \right\} \quad (131)$$

This statement, although mathematically correct, has raised criticisms from physicists since it was made. For example, in his famous introductory textbook, Ballentine's [30] 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 [31] does not make use of probability”.

The statement, that the work in [31] does not make use of probability is true, however, it does only account for deterministic hidden variable theories. The authors are aware of this, noting at page 1138 of their paper:

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

They then go on, writing that stochastic hidden variable theories would be impossible. They claim this would have been thoroughly investigated in [32, 33]. Furthermore, they mention the existence of so called „equivalence theorems” [34, 35]. Those are said to show, that each stochastic hidden variable theory could be duplicated by a deterministic equivalent. But in all the articles they cite, every author only derives or considers theories in which passive locality holds ([33] make this assumption at pp. 528 in their eqs. (2, 2'), [32] makes it in his eq. (5), [34] at page 776 in eq. (7a), and [35] at pp. 1306 and 1308). In fact, it is only for this case, in which an equivalence to a deterministic theory can be proven. As we have shown in section 4, in the case of quantum mechanics passive locality is equivalent to a condition which is called „deterministic passive locality”. The definition of deterministic passive locality is, that spin values $\sigma_1 \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_1, \sigma_2 \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_2$ generated by ϕ_{1jT} and ϕ_{2jT} are equivalent to a prior spin value $\vec{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X$ happening at a preparation time $t_0 < T$. As explained in section 8, such an equivalence does not exist anymore if the particles are driven by a Gaussian distributed stochastic force $\vec{F}_j^{Brown}(t) \in \mathbb{R}$, the strength of which at time t may even be defined by some random value $\delta_j \in \mathbb{R}$ at preparation time t_0 . Therefore, our theory is not affected by the arguments of [31].

Furthermore, there exist claims which try to derive Bell's theorem in its original form (23) but without the assumption of passive locality. These „derivations” (e.g. [36]) do not write the inequality with probability measures $P_{\phi_{1\vec{\mu}}, \phi_{2\vec{\nu}}}$ for events σ_1, σ_2 in separated spaces with different sigma algebras $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_1, \overline{\mathcal{F}}_2$ at the two detectors. Instead, they are using a measure for events $\vec{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_X$ on one! single probability space only. This is problematic, since if one computes the correlation coefficient

$$E(\vec{\mu}, \vec{\nu}) = \langle \Psi | (\vec{\mu}\vec{\sigma})_1 \otimes (\vec{\nu}\vec{\sigma})_2 | \Psi \rangle \quad (132)$$

from the quantum mechanical expressions with Ψ defined as in (110), one is definitely lead to probability measures for events in two separate spaces. Nevertheless, it was possible in Bell's original papers to use a probability measure on a single space, because he mentioned the assumption of passive locality explicitly. Then, with the proof in section 4, one can trace back the events at the detectors 1 and 2 to equivalent ones at the common preparation stage. There, a probability measure on a single space suffices since all the particles are in direct contact with each other and in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_X$. With the assumption of passive locality, a theory violating Bell's inequalities in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_X$ will also violate them in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_1, \overline{\mathcal{F}}_2$. Unfortunately, many papers which try to derive Bell's inequalities without the use of the passive locality argument, seem not to mention that the expressions of quantum mechanics define probability measures in separate spaces for the spatially separated detectors in the EPR experiment. But as is shown in [11], it is this, what makes the assumption of passive locality necessary in derivations of Bell's inequalities.

A different argument against stochastic hidden variable theories was raised by Redhead [38] (who presents in his book at pp. 98 a proof 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 disturbance by the gases of the air in the laboratory). He then defines a very small perturbation $0 < \delta \ll 1$ confined to a part of the overall Hilbert space, e.g. $\mathcal{H}_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ that acts on a wavefunction

$$\psi(r_2, t) \rightarrow \psi(r_2, t) + \delta\psi(r_2, t) \quad (133)$$

Under this perturbation, the entangled state (110) will transform to:

$$\Psi(\vec{r}_1, \vec{r}_2, t) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\psi(\vec{r}_1, t) |-\rangle \otimes (1 + \delta)\psi(\vec{r}_2, t) |+\rangle - \psi(\vec{r}_1, t) |+\rangle \otimes (1 + \delta)\psi(\vec{r}_2, t) |-\rangle) \quad (134)$$

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

Yet, in spirit of the so called ensemble interpretation of Ballentine [37], a quantum mechanical state $\psi(r_2, t)$ may not describe individual particles but rather an infinitely large statistical ensemble of trajectories. In this case, a perturbation like (133) would correspond to a disturbance of a whole statistical ensemble of infinitely many particles for a sufficiently long time. Moreover, if defined as above, δ would act on every particle of this ensemble in exactly the same way. This has nothing to do with a small erroneous disturbance that may happen to individual particles in the laboratory.

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

$$0 < \delta_{1j}(t) \ll v^B(\vec{r}_1, t) < v^A(\vec{r}_1, t) \quad (135)$$

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

$$|v^A(\vec{r}_1, t) - v^B(\vec{r}_1, t)| \gg 2\delta_{1j}(t) \quad (136)$$

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

$$\dot{\vec{x}}_{\uparrow 1jt}^A = \dot{\vec{x}}_{\uparrow 1jt}^A + \delta_{1j}(t) \quad (137)$$

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

$$\left| v^{AB}(\vec{r}_1, t) - \dot{\vec{x}}_{\uparrow 1jt}^A \right| \leq |\delta_j(t)| \quad (138)$$

holds. This condition cannot affect many particles. The expression

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

is the arithmetic mean of average velocities from A and B with $v^A(\vec{r}_1, t) > v^B(\vec{r}_1, t)$. Since $\dot{\vec{x}}_{\uparrow 1jt}^A$ is in A, we can write

$$v^{AB}(\vec{r}_1, t) < v^A(\vec{r}_1, t) = \overline{\dot{\vec{x}}_{\uparrow 1jt}^A} \quad (139)$$

on the average. Therefore with

$$\left| v^{AB}(\vec{r}_1, t) - \overline{\dot{\vec{x}}_{\uparrow 1jt}^A} \right| = \left| v^{AB}(\vec{r}_1, t) - v^A(\vec{r}_1, t) \right| = \left| \frac{v^A(\vec{r}_1, t) - v^B(\vec{r}_1, t)}{2} \right| \quad (140)$$

and (136), the inequality (138) does not hold for trajectories of average velocity. The distribution of the velocities for the individual particles is generated by a stochastic force which has a Gaussian distribution. Therefore, most particles in the A system will have a velocity that does not differ very much from the velocity of the ensemble average $v^A(\vec{r}_1, t)$. Hence, it follows that (138) does not hold for most particles, too.

Due to the small number of particles which change their spin state because of $\delta_{1j}(t)$, the disturbance leads only to a reduced efficiency of the entanglement but not to its breakdown. For this reason, the theory we have constructed is especially robust against small disturbances unavoidable in a laboratory, in contrast to the claims by [38].

10 Conclusions and outlook

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

Unfortunately, this theory has, at least till now, no relativistic extension. Stochastic mechanics in the original form in which Nelson wrote it down, had severe conceptual difficulties in the relativistic domain. These problems arose due to its formulation in configuration space. There, one can show that it is impossible to formulate a relativistic stochastic process in a mathematically rigorous way (although, with some additional assumptions, the Klein-Gordon equation can be derived [39]). Unlike in Nelson's original formulation, the theory of Fritsche exists in euclidean (phase) space where this severe problem is absent. To translate Fritsche's theory in the relativistic domain, one would need a fully formulated theory of special relativistic Brownian motion (at least if one would try to derive the theory from Langevin equations). Unfortunately, although such a theory certainly must exist (since non-relativistic Brownian motion does), it seems, that besides from recent fruitful attempts [40–42], no one was able to write it down completely.

In this context, we want to mention that [15] write at pp. 386, their eqs. (39) can, after an approximation, directly be casted into the Navier-Stokes equations. We have in (39) for the A system:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\vec{v}^A - \vec{u}^A) + (\vec{v}^A + \vec{u}^A) \vec{\nabla} (\vec{v}^A - \vec{u}^A) - \nu \Delta (\vec{v}^A - \vec{u}^A) = \frac{1}{m_0} \vec{F}^{ext} \quad (141)$$

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

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \vec{v}_c^A + (\vec{v}_c^A + 2\vec{u}^A) \vec{\nabla} \vec{v}_c^A - \nu \Delta \vec{v}_c^A = \frac{1}{m_0} \vec{F}^{ext} \quad (142)$$

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

$$\rho \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \vec{v}_c^A + \rho \left(\vec{v}_c^A \vec{\nabla} \vec{v}_c^A \right) - \nu \rho \Delta \vec{v}_c^A + \vec{\nabla} p(\vec{r}, t) = 0 \quad (143)$$

For (143) a manifestly covariant form in special and even in general relativity is known. To derive (143) in a relativistic setting, one typically starts from relativistic Boltzmann equations. Because of the close similarity between (143) and (39), it seems at least plausible that it might be possible to formulate Fritsche's theory in a relativistic setting.

It is known, that in curved spacetime there exists an ambiguity if one wants to derive quantum mechanical operators. Usually, we are advised by the correspondence principle to make the replacement $p_i \rightarrow \hat{p}_i = -i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial q_i}$ for the momentum operator with q_i as the generalized coordinate of the particle.

In Cartesian coordinates, the Hamilton is function $H = \frac{p_x^2 + p_y^2 + p_z^2}{2m_0}$. With the replacement rule of the correspondence principle, we can derive the quantum mechanical Hamilton operator as:

$$H = -\frac{\hbar}{2m_0} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right) = -\frac{\hbar}{2m_0} \Delta \quad (144)$$

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

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{\hbar}{2m_0} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} + \frac{\partial}{\rho \partial \rho} + \frac{\partial^2}{\rho \partial \varphi^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \right). \quad (145)$$

Now, we want to derive this operator in cylindrical coordinates from the beginning. We start with the classical Lagrange function $\mathcal{L}(q_i, \dot{q}_i) = \frac{m_0}{2}(\dot{\rho} + \rho^2 \dot{\varphi}^2 + \dot{z}^2)$. If we insert the particles momentum $p_\rho = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{\rho}} = m_0 \dot{\rho}$, $p_\varphi = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{\varphi}} = m_0 \rho^2 \dot{\varphi}$, $p_z = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{z}} = m_0 \dot{z}$ we get an expression for $H(p_i, q_i, \dot{q}_i) = \sum p_i \dot{q}_i - \mathcal{L}$:

$$H(p_i, q_i, \dot{q}_i) = p_\rho \dot{\rho} + p_\varphi \dot{\varphi} + p_z \dot{z} - \mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \left(p_\rho^2 + \frac{p_\varphi^2}{\rho^2} + p_z^2 \right) \quad (146)$$

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

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{\hbar}{2m_0} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \rho^3} + \frac{\partial}{\rho^2 \partial \varphi^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \right) \quad (147)$$

Unfortunately, (147) is different from (145) and wrong. This problem is present in the path integral formalism in similar form. It implies, that the naive rules of the correspondence principle do only work if applied on Cartesian coordinates. In the curved space times of general relativity there is no such coordinate system. Thereby one cannot give, for example, an unambiguous expression for the probability density of an electron near the singularity of a black hole.

Unlike in ordinary quantum mechanics, in stochastic mechanics the quantum mechanical operators are not simply defined as replacement rules. Instead their expressions are derived completely from classical equations (see [15] at pp. 290). It might well be, that it is possible to extend Fritsche's theory to special and general relativity via a derivation of its classical diffusion equations (39) from relativistic Boltzmann equations. Then, as in the Cartesian case one might get information about the form of the quantum mechanical operators. In turn, one might be able to understand the behavior of quantum objects near spacetime singularities.

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

References

- [1] A. Einstein, B. Podolski, N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. 47, pp. 777 (1935)
- [2] D. Bohm, Quantum Theory, (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ 1951), pp. 614-619
- [3] J. S. Bell, On The Einstein Podolsky Rosen Paradox, in [4]
- [4] J. S. Bell, Speakable and unspeakable in Quantum mechanics, (Cambridge University Press 1987)
- [5] J. F. Clauser, R. A. Holt, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, Phys. Rev. Lett. 23, pp. 880 (1969)
- [6] J. S. Bell, The theory of local be-ables, in [4]
- [7] E. Nelson, Field theory and the future of stochastic mechanics, in Stochastic Processes in Classical and Quantum Systems, Proc. Ascona, Switzerland 1985, eds: S. Alberverio, G. Casati, D. Merlini, Lecture Notes in Physics 262 (Springer, Berlin, 1988), pp. 438
- [8] E. Nelson, The locality problem in Stochastic Mechanics, in New techniques and ideas in quantum measurement theory, eds: D. Greenberger, Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. 480, pp. 533 (1986)
- [9] E. Nelson, Stochastic mechanics and random fields, in Ecole d'Ete de Probabilites de Saint Flour XV-XVII, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1362, (Springer, Berlin 1985-87), pp. 427

- [10] N. D. Mermin, Bringing home the atomic world: Quantum mysteries for anybody, *Am. J. Phys.* 49, pp. 940 (1981)
- [11] W. G. Faris, Probability in quantum mechanics, Appendix to D. Wick, *The Infamous Boundary: Seven Decades of Controversy in Quantum Physics* (Birkhauser, Boston, 1995)
- [12] P. Suppes, M. Zanotti, On the Determinism of Hidden Variable Theories with Strict Correlation and Conditional Statistical Independence of Observables. In P. Suppes (Eds.), *Logic and probability in quantum mechanics* (Dordrecht: Reidel 1976), pp. 445-455
- [13] E. Nelson, Derivation of the Schroedinger equation from Newtonian Mechanics, *Phys. Rev.* 150, pp. 1079 (1966)
- [14] E. Nelson, *Quantum Fluctuations* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1985)
- [15] L. Fritsche, M. Haugk, A new look at the derivation of the Schrödinger equation from Newtonian Mechanics, *Ann. Phys. (Leipzig)* 12, pp. 371 (2003)
- [16] H. Rauch, *Neutron Interferometry* (Oxford University Press 2000)
- [17] H. Rauch, Reality in Neutron Interference Experiments, *Found. Phys.* vol 23. No 1, pp. 7 (1993)
- [18] A. Go, for the Belle Collaboration, Observation of Bell Inequality violation in B mesons, arXiv:quant-ph/0310192
- [19] E. Nelson, The mystery of stochastic mechanics, conference talk, available at <http://www.math.princeton.edu/~nelson/papers/talk.pdf>
- [20] T. Dankel, stochastic mechanics with spin, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 37, pp. 192 (1971)
- [21] 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
- [22] W. G. Faris, Spin correlations in stochastic mechanics, *Foundations of Physics* 12, pp. 1 (1982)
- [23] L. Fritsche, M. Haugk, *Anschauliche Quantenmechanik*, unpublished manuscript
- [24] J. M. Levy-Leblond, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 6, pp. 286 (1967)
- [25] O. Stern, W. Gerlach, *Z. Phys.* 9, pp. 349 (1922)
- [26] T. E. Phipps, O. Stern, *Z. Phys.* 73, pp. 185 (1932)
- [27] 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)
- [28] H. Goldstein, *Classical Mechanics*, (Addison-Wesley, 2nd. edition 1980), pp. 143-158
- [29] E. Nelson, space time chance, popular talk, available at <http://www.math.princeton.edu/~nelson/papers/cti.html>
- [30] L. Ballentine, *Quantum Mechanics, A modern development*, (World Scientific 1998), pp. 608
- [31] D. Greenberger, M. Horne, A. Shimony, A. Zeilinger, Bell's theorem without inequalities, *Am. J. Phys.* 58, pp. 1131 (1990)
- [32] J. S. Bell, Introduction to the hidden variable question, in [4]
- [33] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, Experimental consequences of objective local theories, *Phys. Rev. D* 10, pp. 526 (1974)
- [34] H. P. Stapp, Locality and reality, *Found. Phys.* 10, pp. 767 (1980)
- [35] A. Fine, Joint distributions, quantum correlations and commuting observables, *J. Math Phys.* 23, pp. 1306 (1982)

- [36] D. Dürr, *Bohmsche Mechanik als Grundlage der Quantenmechanik*, (Springer, Berlin 2001), pp. 182
- [37] L. Ballentine, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 42, pp. 358 (1970)
- [38] M. Redhead, *Incompleteness, nonlocality and realism*, (Clarendon Press, Oxford 1987)
- [39] M. Pavon, On the stochastic mechanics of the free relativistic particle, *J. Math. Phys.* 42, pp. 4846 (2001), arXiv:quant-ph/0108139v1
- [40] 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
- [41] J. Dunkel, P. Talkner, P. Hänggi, Relativistic diffusion processes and random walk models, *Phys. Rev.* D75, 043001 (2007), arXiv:cond-mat/0608023v3
- [42] 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