

Emergence of quantum mechanics from classical statistics

C. Wetterich

Institut für Theoretische Physik

Universität Heidelberg

Philosophenweg 16, D-69120 Heidelberg

The conceptual setting of quantum mechanics is subject to an ongoing debate from its beginnings until now. The consequences of the apparent differences between quantum statistics and classical statistics range from the philosophical interpretations to practical issues as quantum computing. In this note we demonstrate how quantum mechanics can emerge from classical statistical systems. We discuss conditions and circumstances for this to happen. Quantum systems describe isolated subsystems of classical statistical systems with infinitely many states. The state of the subsystem can be characterized by the expectation values of a few observables. They define a density matrix, and all the usual laws of quantum mechanics follow. No concepts beyond classical statistics are needed for quantum physics - the differences are only apparent and result from the particularities of those classical statistical systems which admit a quantum mechanical description.

A realization of quantum mechanics as a classical statistical system may shed new light on the conceptual interpretation of experiments based on entanglement, as teleportation or quantum cryptography [1]. One may even speculate that steps in quantum computing [2] could be realized by exploiting classical statistics. Recently, classical statistical ensembles that are equivalent to four-state and two-state quantum mechanics have been constructed explicitly [3, 4]. This constitutes a proof of equivalence of few-state quantum statistics and classical statistics for infinitely many degrees of freedom. In view of the particular manifolds of classical states for these examples one may wonder, however, if quantum statistical systems are very special cases of classical statistics, or if they arise rather genuinely under certain conditions. In this note we argue that quantum statistics can indeed emerge rather generally if one describes small “isolated” subsystems of classical ensembles with an infinity of states.

An atom in quantum mechanics is an isolated system with a few degrees of freedom. This contrasts with quantum field theory, where an atom is described as a particular excitation of the vacuum. The vacuum in quantum field theory is a complicated object, involving infinitely many degrees of freedom. In a fundamental theory of particle physics, which underlies the description of atoms, collective effects as spontaneous symmetry breaking are crucial for its understanding. Our treatment of atoms in the context of classical statistics is similar to the conceptual setting of quantum field theory. A classical statistical system with infinitely many states describes the atom and its environment. The quantum statistical features become apparent if one concentrates on a subsystem that describes the isolated atom.

Probabilistic observables

The most crucial effect of the embedding of the subsystem into classical statistics for infinitely many states is the appearance of probabilistic observables for the description of the subsystem. For a given state of the subsystem - which will be associated with a quantum state - they have a probability distribution of values rather than a fixed value as for the standard classical observables. This avoids conflicts of our classical statistical description with

the Kochen-Specker theorem [5]. For subsystems that are equivalent to M -state quantum mechanics the spectrum of the possible outcomes of measurements for the probabilistic observables contains at most M different real values γ_α . In a given quantum state the probabilistic observable is characterized by probabilities w_α to find γ_α , where w_α depends on the state. The simplest example are two-level observables, which can resolve only one bit, such that $\gamma_1 = 1$, $\gamma_2 = -1$.

Let us consider a subsystem that can be described by n discrete two-level-observables $A^{(k)}$ that only take the values $+1$ or -1 for any state τ of the classical statistical ensemble. We assume that these observables form a basis in a sense to be specified later. The simplest quantum mechanical analogue for $n = 3$ is two-state quantum mechanics with $A^{(k)}$ corresponding to three orthogonal “spins” in an appropriate normalization. This may be viewed as an atom with spin one half where only the spin degree of freedom is resolved, as for example in Stern-Gerlach type experiments. For arbitrary n , we denote the average of $A^{(k)}$ by ρ_k ,

$$\rho_k = \langle A^{(k)} \rangle = \sum_{\tau} p_{\tau} A_{\tau}^{(k)}, \quad -1 \leq \rho_k \leq 1, \quad (1)$$

with classical probabilities $p_{\tau} \geq 0$ for the states τ of the classical statistical ensemble. As usual, one has $\sum_{\tau} p_{\tau} = 1$. The possible values of the observables $A^{(k)}$ in a classical state τ are $A_{\tau}^{(k)} = \pm 1$.

We will assume that the n numbers ρ_k are the only information that is needed for a computation of expectation values for the observables of the subsystem. In this sense, the state of the subsystem is characterized by the n expectation values of the basis observables $A^{(k)}$. Only a very limited amount of the information contained in the probability distribution $\{p_{\tau}\}$ for the total system is needed for the subsystem. Quantum mechanics is “incomplete statistics” in the sense of ref. [6].

Our first question concerns a classification of possible observables for the subsystem under these conditions. It is straightforward to define rescaled observables $cA^{(k)}$ by $(cA^{(k)})_{\tau} = cA_{\tau}^{(k)}$, $\langle cA^{(k)} \rangle = c\rho_k$. We associate to each $A^{(k)}$

an n -dimensional unit vector $e^{(k)}$ with components $e_m^{(k)} = \delta_m^k$. The rescaled observables A obey

$$\langle A \rangle = \rho_k e_k^{(A)}, \quad (2)$$

where repeated indices are summed and the vector $e^{(A)}$ reads $e^{(A)} = ce^{(k)}$ if $A = cA^{(k)}$. One may use $c = \hbar/2$ if A describes a spin with standard units of angular momentum. Other units may be employed for alternative interpretations, as for example occupation number $n = (1 + A^{(3)})/2$ which equals one for occupied and zero for empty. (Contrary to widespread belief, \hbar is not a genuine property of quantum mechanics, but rather an issue of units.)

We may investigate further possible observables whose expectation values obey $\langle A \rangle = \sum_k c_k \langle A^{(k)} \rangle$ for all probability distributions $\{p_\tau\}$. (Such observables may correspond to rotated spins in the quantum mechanical analogue.) We can associate to each such observable the vector $e^{(A)} = \sum_k c_k e^{(k)}$, $e_k^{(A)} = c_k$, such that eq. (2) remains valid. If such observables exist for arbitrary real c_k this allows a definition of linear combinations of observables as represented by linear combinations of the associated vectors e . For $C = c_A A + c_B B$ one has $e^{(C)} = c_A e^{(A)} + c_B e^{(B)}$, $\langle C \rangle = c_A \langle A \rangle + c_B \langle B \rangle$. Explicit constructions of such observables in terms of probabilistic observables can be found in [4]. We are interested in the general properties of the observables that can be constructed as linear combinations of the “basis observables” $A^{(k)}$. For example, one typical question may ask if two of them can have simultaneously a sharp value.

A “classical eigenstate” of an observable A is an ensemble for which A has a “sharp value” with vanishing dispersion, $\langle A^2 \rangle - \langle A \rangle^2 = 0$. For example, the eigenstate of the observable $A^{(k)}$ with “classical eigenvalue” one has $p_\tau = 0$ whenever $A_\tau^{(k)} = -1$. The maximal number of sharp “basis observables” $A^{(k)}$ can be characterized by the “purity” P of the ensemble,

$$P = \rho_k \rho_k. \quad (3)$$

(Note that P depends on the set of basis observables that characterize the subsystem.) For $P = 0$ one finds equipartition with $\langle A \rangle = 0$ for all observables. Obviously, \bar{M} sharp observables require $P \geq \bar{M}$, since at least for \bar{M} values of k one needs $\rho_k = \pm 1$. For an ensemble with $P = 1$ at most one observable $A^{(k)}$ can be sharp. Typical classical ensembles that describe isolated quantum systems will have a maximal purity smaller than n , such that not all $A^{(k)}$ can have sharp values simultaneously. We recall that the purity (3) is a statistical property involving expectation values. For a given classical state τ all observables $A^{(k)}$ have a sharp value.

Density matrix and wave function

For M an integer obeying $M \geq P + 1$ we may represent the ρ_k by an $M \times M$ hermitean “density matrix”.

$$\rho = \frac{1}{M}(1 + \rho_k L_k). \quad (4)$$

The matrices L_k [3] are $SU(M)$ -generators $k = 1..M^2 - 1$,

obeying

$$\text{tr} L_k = 0, \quad L_k^2 = 1, \quad \text{tr}(L_k L_l) = M \delta_{kl}. \quad (5)$$

The matrix ρ has indeed the properties of a density matrix,

$$\text{tr} \rho = 1, \quad \rho_{\alpha\alpha} \geq 0, \quad \text{tr} \rho^2 = \frac{1}{M}(1 + P) \leq 1. \quad (6)$$

In analogy to quantum mechanics, a “classical pure state” obeys $\rho^2 = \rho$ and therefore requires $P = M - 1$. We can also associate to any observable A an operator \hat{A} such that the quantum mechanical rule for the computation of expectation values holds ($e_k \equiv e_k^{(A)} = c_k$)

$$\hat{A} = e_k L_k, \quad \langle A \rangle = \rho_k e_k = \text{tr}(\rho \hat{A}). \quad (7)$$

We will concentrate on the minimal M needed for a given maximal purity of the ensemble. If $n < M^2 - 1$ only part of the $SU(M)$ -generators L_k are used as a basis for the observables.

Many characteristic features of the observables A can now be inferred from standard quantum mechanics, as demonstrated by a few examples. For $M = 2$ at most one of the three possible two-level-observables $A^{(k)}$ can have a sharp value. This occurs for an ensemble where the density matrix describes a quantum mechanical pure state, $\rho = \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \hat{A})$, $\text{tr} \rho^2 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \text{tr} \hat{A}^2 = 1$, with $\hat{A}^{(k)} = L_k = \tau_k$. For such an ensemble the expectation value of the two orthogonal two-level-observables must vanish, $\langle A^{(l)} \rangle = 0$ for $l \neq k$. Thus, whenever one basis observable is sharp, the two others have maximal uncertainty, as for the spin one half system in quantum mechanics. Another example for $M = 4$ describes two different two-level-observables (say the z -direction of two spins S_z^1, S_z^2) by $L_1 = \text{diag}(1, 1, -1, -1)$ and $L_2 = \text{diag}(1, -1, 1, -1)$. The product of the two spins is represented by $L_3 = \text{diag}(1, -1, -1, 1)$. Consider an ensemble characterized by $\rho_3 = -1$, $\rho_1 = \rho_2 = 0$. For this ensemble one has $\langle A^{(1)} \rangle = \langle A^{(2)} \rangle = 0$ such that for both two-level-observables the values $+1$ and -1 are randomly distributed in the ensemble. Nevertheless, $\langle A^{(3)} \rangle = -1$ indicates that the two “spins” are maximally anticorrelated. Whenever the first spin takes the value $+1$, the second one necessarily assumes -1 and vice versa. This is the characteristics of an entangled quantum state. Our third example considers the observable S corresponding to the sum $\hat{S} = L_1 + L_2$. For the particular pure state density matrices $(\hat{\rho}_m)_{\alpha\beta} = \delta_{m\alpha} \delta_{m\beta}$ one has $\langle S \rangle = 2$ (for $m = 1$), $\langle S \rangle = 0$ (for $m = 2, 3$) and $\langle S \rangle = -2$ (for $m = 4$). Thus S has the properties of a total spin, composed of two half integer spins (say $S_z = S_z^1 + S_z^2$).

The density matrix can be diagonalized by a unitary transformation. In consequence, any pure state density matrix can be written in the form $\rho = U \hat{\rho}_m U^\dagger$ for a suitable U , with $UU^\dagger = 1$. This allows us to “take the root” of a pure state density matrix by introducing the quantum mechanical wave function ψ_α as an M -component complex normalized vector, $\psi^\dagger \psi = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\alpha\beta} &= \psi_\alpha \psi_\beta^*, \quad \psi_\alpha = U_{\alpha\beta} (\hat{\psi}_m)_\beta, \\ (\hat{\psi}_m)_\beta &= \delta_{m\beta}, \quad \langle A \rangle = \psi^\dagger \hat{A} \psi. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

All the usual rules for expectation values in quantum mechanical pure states apply.

Algebra of observables

The vector $e^{(A)}$ is sufficient for a determination of the expectation value of A in any state of the subsystem (characterized by ρ_k). However, the typical observables for the subsystem are probabilistic observables and we further have to specify the probability distribution for a possible outcome of measurements for every state ρ_k . For a given M we consider observables with a spectrum of at most M different values γ_α . The probabilities to find γ_α in the state ρ_k of the subsystem are denoted by $w_\alpha(\rho_k) \geq 0$, $\sum_\alpha w_\alpha(\rho_k) = 1$, $\langle A \rangle = \sum_\alpha w_\alpha(\rho_k) \gamma_\alpha = \rho_k e_k$. The expectation value $\langle A \rangle = \text{tr}(\rho \hat{A})$ is invariant under a change of basis by unitary transformations, $\rho \rightarrow \rho' = U \rho U^\dagger$, $\hat{A} \rightarrow \hat{A}' = U \hat{A} U^\dagger$. We may choose a basis with diagonal $\hat{A}' = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_M)$, $\langle A \rangle = \sum_\alpha \rho'_{\alpha\alpha} \lambda_\alpha$, suggesting that the spectrum γ_α can be identified with the eigenvalues λ_α of the operator \hat{A} , and $w_\alpha(\rho_k) = \rho'_{\alpha\alpha}$. We will choose probabilistic observables defined in this way. In summary, we can associate to each hermitean quantum operator a classical probabilistic observable, with a spectrum of possible measurement values given by the eigenvalues of the operator. The classical probability for the outcome of the measurement in a given state is the corresponding diagonal element of the density matrix in a basis where \hat{A} is diagonal.

We can now consider powers of the probabilistic observable A , $\langle A^p \rangle = \sum_\alpha w_\alpha(\rho_k) \gamma_\alpha^p$. The observable A^p should belong to the observables of the subsystem, since it can be associated with p measurements of A , multiplying the p measurement results that must be identical. We can therefore associate an operator \hat{A}_p to the observable A^p , $\langle A^p \rangle = \text{tr}(\rho \hat{A}_p)$. This is realized by $\hat{A}_p = \hat{A}^p$ and we conclude $\langle A^p \rangle = \text{tr}(\rho \hat{A}^p)$. For $\langle A^2 \rangle = \text{tr}(\rho \hat{A}^2)$ a classical eigenstate of A obeys $\text{tr}(\rho \hat{A})^2 = \text{tr}(\rho \hat{A}^2)$ and the possible classical eigenvalues are the eigenvalues of the operator \hat{A} . The spectrum of possible outcomes of individual measurements equals the values of the observable $\{A_\tau\}$ in the classical states τ . It consists of the eigenvalues of \hat{A} . If a pure state is an eigenstate of A one has $\hat{A}\psi = \lambda\psi$ with $\lambda \equiv \lambda_\alpha = \gamma_\alpha$ one of the eigenvalues of \hat{A} . All the laws of quantum mechanics apply for the classical observables, as for example Heisenberg's uncertainty relation based on the commutator of the associated operators.

The one to one correspondence between classical probabilistic observables and quantum operators allows for the introduction of a product $A \circ B$ between the classical observables, which is associated to the operator product $\hat{A}\hat{B}$. Together with linear combinations, this defines an algebra for the classical observables. We observe $A^2 = A \circ A$. We emphasize that the product $A \circ B$ is *not* the pointwise product $A \cdot B$ where $(A \cdot B)_\tau = A_\tau B_\tau$. We will see next that a particular use of the "quantum product" $A \circ B$ for classical observables arises from an investigation of conditional probabilities.

Conditional correlations

Beyond a rule for the computation of expectation val-

ues of observables, any theory must provide a prediction for the outcome of two consecutive measurements. After a first measurement of the observable A the result of a subsequent measurement of another observable B is, in general, influenced by the first measurement. The measurement of A has changed the ensemble and the knowledge of the observer. For simplicity we concentrate on two-level-observables, $\hat{A}^2 = \hat{B}^2 = 1$, $\langle A^2 \rangle = \langle B^2 \rangle = 1$. The probability of finding $B = 1$ after a measurement $A = 1$ amounts to the *conditional probability* $(w_+^B)_+^A$. After the measurement $A = 1$ the ensemble must be an eigenstate to the eigenvalue $\hat{A} = 1$ - otherwise a subsequent measurement of A would not necessarily yield the same value as the first one. Then B is measured under this condition.

Correspondingly, the *conditional correlation* $\langle BA \rangle$ multiplies the measured values of A and B , weighed with the probabilities that they occur

$$\langle BA \rangle = (w_+^B)_+^A w_{+,s}^A - (w_-^B)_+^A w_{+,s}^A - (w_+^B)_-^A w_{-,s}^A + (w_-^B)_-^A w_{-,s}^A, \quad (9)$$

with $\langle A \rangle = w_{+,s}^A - w_{-,s}^A = \text{tr}(\rho \hat{A})$ and $w_{+,s}^A + w_{-,s}^A = 1$, $(w_+^B)_\pm^A + (w_-^B)_\pm^A = 1$. The use of conditional correlations for measurements in our classical statistical system avoids conflicts with Bell's inequalities [7]. The latter are formulated for pointwise correlations in classical statistics, which reflect measurements that do no influence each other. We take here the attitude that there is only one given reality, but physicists can at best give a statistical description of it. The "fundamental laws" are genuinely of a statistical nature [8] and only establish relations within different possibilities for the history of the real world. Measuring for an observable A in a given state the value $\gamma_{\bar{\alpha}}$ simply eliminates the other possible alternatives (which may have nonvanishing probabilities $w_{\alpha \neq \bar{\alpha}}$). After the measurement of A it makes only sense to ask what are the outcomes of other measurements under the condition that A has been measured to have the value $\gamma_{\bar{\alpha}}$.

After the first measurement $A = 1$ the density matrix ρ_{A+} must describe an eigenstate of A , $\text{tr}(\hat{A} \rho_{A+}) = 1$. (Otherwise a subsequent measurement of A could find a value different from one, which is a contradiction to a realistic notion of a physical observable.) The subsequent measurement of B involves this state,

$$(w_+^B)_+^A - (w_-^B)_+^A = \text{tr}(\hat{B} \rho_{A+}). \quad (10)$$

For $M = 2$ the matrix ρ_{A+} is unique, $\rho_{A+} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \hat{A})$, such that

$$(w_\pm^B)_+^A = \frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{1}{4} \text{tr}(\hat{B} \hat{A}), \quad (w_\pm^B)_-^A = \frac{1}{2} \mp \frac{1}{4} \text{tr}(\hat{B} \hat{A}) \quad (11)$$

However, for $M > 2$ one has $\text{tr}(\hat{A} \rho_{A+}) = 1$ for

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{A+} &= \frac{1}{M}(1 + \hat{A} + X), \quad \text{tr}(\hat{A} X) = 0, \\ \text{tr} X &= 0, \quad \text{tr} X^2 = M(P - 1), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

with

$$\rho_{A+}^2 - \rho_{A+} = \frac{1}{M^2}(X^2 + \{\hat{A}, X\}) - \left(1 - \frac{2}{M}\right) \rho_{A+}. \quad (13)$$

A necessary condition for ρ_{A+} describing a pure state is $\text{tr}X^2 = M(M-2)$, $P = M-1$.

We may distinguish between a ‘‘maximally destructive measurement’’ where all information about the original ensemble except for the value of A is lost, and a ‘‘minimally destructive measurement’’ for which an original pure state remains a pure state after the measurement. A maximally destructive measurement is described by $X = 0$ in eq. (12), leading to

$$\langle B \rangle_{A+} = (w_{+}^B)_+^A - (w_{-}^B)_+^A = \frac{1}{M} \text{tr}(\hat{B}\hat{A}) = \langle BA \rangle_{\text{max}}. \quad (14)$$

Here we denote by $\langle BA \rangle_{\text{max}}$ the conditional correlation for maximally destructive measurements and use that ρ_{A-} obtains from ρ_{A+} by changing the sign of \hat{A} in eq. (12) (with $X = 0$). We can use $\langle BA \rangle_{\text{max}}$ for the definition of a scalar product between the observables B and A , since it does not depend on the initial ensemble. The two-level observables $A^{(k)}$ form an orthogonal basis in this sense, $\langle A^{(k)} A^{(l)} \rangle_{\text{max}} = \delta_{kl}$.

A minimally destructive measurement of $A = 1$ projects out all states with $A = -1$, without further changes of the original ensemble and associated density matrix ρ

$$\rho_{A\pm} = \frac{1}{2(1 \pm \langle A \rangle)} (1 \pm \hat{A}) \rho (1 \pm \hat{A}), \quad (15)$$

such that $(w_{\pm,s}^A = (1 \pm \langle A \rangle)/2)$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle BA \rangle &= \text{tr}(\hat{B}\rho_{A+})w_{+,s}^A - \text{tr}(\hat{B}\rho_{A-})w_{-,s}^A \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\{\hat{A}, \hat{B}\}\rho). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The conditional correlation for minimally destructive measurements in the classical statistical ensemble corresponds precisely to the expression of this correlation in quantum mechanics. It involves the anticommutator of the quantum mechanical operator product.

Pure states play a special role since they describe classical ensembles with minimal uncertainty for a given integer P . For $M = 4$ a pure state has purity $P = 3$ and three different observables can have sharp values, corresponding to the maximum number of three commuting quantum mechanical operators. For $P > 1$, $M = P + 1$ and $\{L_k, L_l\} = 2\delta_{kl} + 2d_{klm}L_m$ the condition for a pure state, $\rho_k[\rho_l d_{klm} - (M-2)\delta_{km}] = 0$, is not automatically obeyed for all ρ_k with $\rho_k \rho_k = P$. For a pure state, the ‘‘copurity’’ $C = \text{tr}[(\rho^2 - \rho)^2]$ must also vanish. While the purity P is conserved by all orthogonal $SO(n)$ transformations of the vector (ρ_k) , pure states are transformed into pure states only by the subgroup of $SU(M)$ transformations. The $SU(M)$ transformations are realized as unitary transformations of the wave function ψ , where the overall phase of ψ remains unobservable since it does not affect ρ in eq. (8). In our classical statistical description of quantum phenomena, the particular role of the classical pure states constitutes the basic origin for the unitary transformations in quantum mechanics. Just as in quantum mechanics, we can write the density matrix ρ for an arbitrary ensemble as a linear combination of pure state density matrices.

Quantum time evolution

Consider next some continuous time evolution of the classical probability distribution $\{p_\tau\}$. It relates the ensemble at time t_2 to the ensemble at some earlier time t_1 , and induces a transition from $\rho_k(t_1)$ to $\rho_k(t_2)$,

$$p_\tau(t_2) = \tilde{S}_{\tau\rho}(t_2, t_1) p_\rho(t_1), \quad \rho_k(t_2) = S_{kl}(t_2, t_1) \rho_l(t_1). \quad (17)$$

We may decompose the transition matrix S_{kl} into the product of an orthogonal matrix \hat{S}_{kl} , which preserves the length of the vector $(\rho_1 \dots, \rho_n)$ and therefore the purity, and a scaling d , $S_{kl} = \hat{S}_{kl} d$. For an infinitesimal evolution step this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho_k(t) &= T_{kl} \rho_l(t) + D \rho_k(t), \quad D = \partial_t \ln d(t, t_1), \\ T_{kl} &= -T_{lk} = \partial_t \hat{S}_{km}(t, t_1) \hat{S}_{lm}(t, t_1). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

For a given maximal purity during the evolution, eq. (18) can be rewritten as an equation for the density matrix ρ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho_{\alpha\beta} &= -i[H, \rho]_{\alpha\beta} + R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \left(\rho_{\gamma\delta} - \frac{1}{M} \delta_{\gamma\delta} \right) \\ &+ D(\rho_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{M} \delta_{\alpha\beta}). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

This corresponds to a split of the infinitesimal $SO(n)$ transformation $\delta\rho_k = T_{kl}\rho_l$ into a unitary part corresponding to the subgroup $SU(M)$ and represented by the hermitean Hamiltonian $H = H_k L_k + H_0$, and remaining rotations of $SO(n)/SU(M)$ represented by R or \tilde{T}_{kl} ,

$$\begin{aligned} T_{kl} &= -2f_{klm} H_m + \tilde{T}_{kl}, \quad [L_k, L_l] = 2if_{klm} L_m, \\ \tilde{T}_{kl} &= \frac{1}{M} R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} (L_k)_{\beta\alpha} (L_l)_{\gamma\delta}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

In general, H, R and D may depend on ρ_k .

We are interested in possible partial fixed points of the evolution for which $R = 0$ and $D = 0$, while H is independent of ρ_k . (Partial fixed points of this type have been found explicitly in the classical time evolution of non-relativistic boson fields [9].) Then eq. (19) reduces to the linear von-Neumann equation for the density matrix. In case of a pure state density matrix this implies the Schrödinger equation $i\partial_t \psi = H\psi$. One recovers the unitary time evolution of quantum mechanics. The more general evolution equation away from the ‘‘unitary partial fixed point’’ can describe ‘‘decoherence’’ [10] as a decrease of purity for $D < 0$, or ‘‘syncoherence’’ as the approach to the pure state partial fixed point with increasing purity for $D > 0$. The latter typically accounts for a situation where the subsystem described by the observables $A^{(k)}$ can exchange energy with the environment. An example is the evolution from a mixed state of atoms in different energy states to a pure state of atoms in the ground state by virtue of radiative decay of the excited states. A static pure state density matrix obtains as usual as a solution of the quantum mechanical eigenvalue problem $H\psi = E_j\psi$.

If H is independent of ρ_k it can be considered as an observable of the subsystem, $H = H_k L_k + H_0$, with fixed coefficients H_k, H_0 . By Noether’s theorem it is associated

with the energy of the subsystem, where E_j denotes the possible energy eigenvalues. (If one wants to use standard energy units one replaces $H \rightarrow H/\hbar$.) On the other hand, R and D account for the interactions of the subsystem with its environment. They vanish in the limit of “perfect isolation” of the subsystem. If the interactions with the environment are strong enough, the subsystem is typically not evolving toward the equipartition fixed point, $\rho_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{M}\delta_{\alpha\beta}$, but rather towards a Boltzmann type density matrix $\rho \sim \exp[-\beta(H + \mu_i N_i)]$ (for conserved quantities N_i and chemical potentials μ_i), which may be close to a pure state density matrix if the temperature $T = \beta^{-1}$ is small as compared to the typical separation of the two lowest energy eigenvalues E_j . In contrast, if the isolation from the environment becomes efficient fast enough, the subsystem follows subsequently its own unitary time evolution, as well known from quantum mechanics.

Conclusions

We have obtained all laws of quantum mechanics from classical statistics, including the concept of probability amplitudes ψ and the associated superposition of states with interference and entanglement, as well as the unitary time evolution. Our setting can be extended to include observ-

ables like location and momentum by considering many two-level observables on a space-lattice and taking the limit of vanishing lattice spacing. In our statistical mechanics setting quantum mechanics describes isolated subsystems of a larger ensemble that also includes the environment. Isolation does not mean that the subsystem can be described by classical probabilities for the states of the subsystem. It rather relates to a separated time evolution of the subsystem which can be described by quantities only associated to the subsystem, without explicit reference to the environment.

We do not intend to enter here the debate if quantum mechanics or classical statistics are more fundamental -it is well known that classical statistics can be obtained as a limiting case of quantum mechanics. In our view classical statistics and quantum mechanics are two sides of the same medal. This may have far reaching consequences, as the possibility that the late time asymptotic state of a classical ensemble is given by the equilibrium ensemble of quantum statistics, or that certain steps in quantum computations can find a classical analogue. We find it remarkable that the conceptual foundations of quantum mechanics need not to go beyond the concepts of classical statistics.

-
- [1] D. Bouwmeester, J. W. Pan, K. Mattle, M. Eibl, H. Weinfurter, A. Zeilinger, *Nature* **390** (1997) 575
- [2] R. Feynman, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **21** (1982) 467; D. Deutsch, *Proc. R. Soc. London* **A400** (1985) 97; J. I. Cirac, P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74** (1995) 4091
- [3] C. Wetterich, arXiv: 0809.2671
- [4] C. Wetterich, arXiv: 0810.0985
- [5] S. Kochen, E. P. Specker, *Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics* **17** (1967), 59; N. D. Mermin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65** (1990) 3373; A. Peres, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **24** (1991) L175
- [6] C. Wetterich, in “Decoherence and Entropy in Complex Systems”, ed. T. Elze, p. 180, Springer Verlag 2004, arXiv: quant-ph/0212031
- [7] J. S. Bell, *Physica* **1** (1964) 195
- [8] C. Wetterich, *Nucl. Phys.* **B314** (1989) 40; *Nucl. Phys.* **B397** (1993) 299
- [9] C. Wetterich, *Phys. Lett.* **B399**(1997) 123
- [10] H. D. Zeh, *Found. Phys.* **1** (1970) 69; E. Joos, H. D. Zeh, *Z. Phys.* **B59** (1985) 273; E. Joos, H. D. Zeh, C. Kiefer, D. Giulini, J. Kupsch, I.-O. Stamatescu, “Decoherence and the appearance of the classical world”, Springer 2003; W. Zurek, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75** (2003) 715