

Quantum Mechanics – A Theory of dynamics for ”Space”

Su-Peng Kou^{1,*}

¹Center for Advanced Quantum Studies, Department of Physics,
Beijing Normal University, Beijing, 100875, China

Till now, the foundation of quantum mechanics is still mysterious. To explore the mysteries in the foundation of quantum mechanics, people always take it for granted that quantum processes must be some types of fields/objects on a rigid space. In this paper, we give a new idea – the space is no more rigid and matter is really the certain changing of ”space” itself rather than extra things on it. According to the new idea, the dynamics for ”space” leads to quantum mechanics. Based on this starting point, we develop a new framework on the foundation of quantum mechanics that may have a far-reaching impact on modern physics in future.

I. PROBLEM OF QUANTUM FOUNDATION

Physics involves the study of matter and its motion on spacetime. One goal of physics is to understand the underlying physical reality and its rules. For the objects in our usual world, people call them ”classical” that are accurately described by *classical mechanics*. According to classical theory, matter is point-like object (or rigid object) with mass that obeys classical mechanics, between which there exists the inverse-square law of universal *gravitation interaction*. In Newton’s classical mechanics, the space (without considering general relativity) is rigid and regarded as an invariant background or an invariant stage. The general relativity provides an alternative description of gravity as a geometric property of *spacetime*[1]. Although matter is still object on spacetime, they could curve spacetime. From Hamilton’s principle, the equations of motion is obtained by minimizing the action of the classical system. In principle, after giving a starting condition, the moving processes during time evolution could be predicted, i.e., the positions, the velocities and the accelerations at certain time are all known. In summary, ”classical” means ”locality” and ”separable structure”.

Although in our usual world, classical mechanics is both natural to understand and successful to characterize different (classical) phenomena. However, in microcosmic world, the objects obey *quantum mechanics* (also known as quantum physics or quantum theory). In quantum mechanics, the motion of a *quantum object* is be fully described by certain wave functions $\psi(x,t)$. Now, the space (without considering general relativity) is also assumed to be an invariant background or an invariant stage. According to quantum mechanics, the energy is *quantized* and can only change by discrete amounts, i.e. $E = \hbar\omega$ where \hbar is Planck constant. The Schrödinger equation $i\hbar\frac{d\psi(x,t)}{dt} = \hat{H}\psi(x,t)$ describes how wave-functions evolve, playing a role similar to Newton’s second law in classical mechanics. Here, the Hamiltonian \hat{H} is a Hermitian operator. In quantum mechanics, there

are several fundamental principles in quantum mechanics: wave-particle duality (objects exhibit both ‘wave-like’ behaviors and ‘particle-like’ behavior), uncertainty principle (attempting to measure one attribute such as velocity or position may cause another attribute to become less measurable), and superposition principle (a wave-function superimposes multiple co-existing states that have different probabilities). In addition, due to long range *entanglement*, the quantum states show *non-locality*.

Today, quantum mechanics becomes a fundamental branch of physics that agrees very well with experiments and provides an accurate description of the dynamic behaviors of microcosmic objects. However, quantum mechanics is far from being well understood. Einstein said, “*there is no doubt that quantum mechanics has grasped the wonderful corner of truth... But I don’t believe that quantum mechanics is the starting point for finding basic principles, just as people can’t start from thermodynamics (or statistical mechanics) to find the foundation of mechanics.*” The exploring of the underlying physics of quantum mechanics and the development of new quantum foundation are going on since its establishment[2]. There are a lot of attempts, such as De Broglie’s pivot-wave theory[3], the Bohmian hidden invariable mechanics[4], the many-world theory[5], the Nelsonian stochastic mechanics[6], ...

After one decade, the exploration to develop a new foundation for quantum mechanics is not successful. I believe that the reason is people always have their view overshadowed by the trivial and ignore the overall image. The situation can be compared with an ancient fable – *blind man feel an elephant*, only touching some part of it, and concluding what the ”elephant” is like. To answer to the mystery of quantum mechanics, people have several physical essential factors separately, i.e., ”classical mechanics”, ”classical object”, ”quantum object”, ”quantum entanglement”, ”gravity”, ”spacetime”, ”quantum measurement” ... We try to organize these pieces and make up a coherent overall picture intuitively.

In this paper, after organizing different physical essential factors, we conclude that ”*the elephant*” – a coherent overall picture of our universe is just ”*spacetime*” and then *claim the solving of the problem of quantum foun-*

*Corresponding author; Electronic address: spkou@bnu.edu.cn

dation. All these physical essential factors can be unified into "spacetime", i.e., different physics objects and different physical motions all correspond to different types of changings of the same "spacetime". To accurately and globally characterize the "spacetime", we develop a new mathematic theory (we call it *variant theory*) by generalizing usual local "field" to non-local "space". By variant theory, we have the power to recover the intrinsic "non-local" structure of a quantum world.

This paper is organized as below. In Sec. II, we give a new idea for the problem for quantum foundation – the matter is really a certain change of "spacetime" itself rather than extra things on it. This idea becomes the starting point of this paper. In Sec. III, to characterize the dynamics of "spacetime", we generalize usual "field" to "space" and develop a new mathematic theory – *variant theory*. In Sec. IV, by applying variant theory to dynamics for space, we develop a complete theory of quantum mechanics. In Sec. V and VI, we discuss the relationship between quantum mechanics and classical mechanics and develop the measurement theory for quantum mechanics. Finally, the conclusions are drawn in Sec. VII.

II. NEW IDEA FOR QUANTUM FOUNDATION – QUANTUM MECHANICS AS A THEORY OF DYNAMICS FOR "SPACETIME"

In this paper, we try to develop a new theoretical framework of quantum mechanics. *What is the crux of the problem for quantum foundation?* In modern physics, all physical objects belong to two classes – matter and spacetime. People are familiar to all kinds of physical processes of classical systems in a rigid space, and take it for granted that all physical processes without considering general relativity are similar to this. Therefore, to explore the mysteries of quantum mechanics, people always studies the dynamics of some types of objects on a rigid space and *failed* again and again. Then, we may ask, *is this really true? can all physical processes be intrinsically described by the processes of extra objects on a rigid space?*

An inspiring idea is that *the particle is basic block of spacetime and the spacetime is made of matter*. This idea becomes the crux of the problem for quantum foundation. Therefore, according to this idea, the matter is really a certain change of "spacetime" itself rather than extra things on it. Different physical processes may correspond to different types of changings of "spacetime" without introducing matter at beginning. This is the *new idea* for the foundation of quantum mechanics and then becomes starting point of this paper. Based on this starting point, we try to answer above questions and solve the problem of quantum foundation.

III. MATHEMATIC FOUNDATION FOR QUANTUM MECHANICS – VARIANT THEORY

In this section, to characterize different types of changings of "spacetime", we develop a new mathematic theory by generalizing usual "field" to "space". We call the new mathematic structure to be *variant theory*. In the following parts, for simplicity, we always denote "spacetime" as "space" and take "time" as a special dimension similar to other spacial dimensions.

A. Compact Lie group and usual fields

In modern physics, the processes of extra objects on a rigid space are always described by "field" that spreads throughout a large region of space in which each point has a physical quantity associated with it. Therefore, "field" becomes one of most important physical object in modern physics. To characterize "field", local functions are introduced. We then take a "field" of a (compact) Lie group G as example.

For a (compact) Lie group G , g is the group element. For example, for (non-Abelian) $SO(N)$ group, the group element is $g = e^{i\Theta}$ where $\Theta = \sum_{a=1}^{(n-1)n/2} \theta^a T^a$ and θ^a are a set of $(n-1)n/2$ constant parameters, and T^a are $(n-1)n/2$ $n \times n$ matrices representing the generators of the Lie algebra of $SO(N)$. In general, we have spinor representation for $SO(N)$ group. By introducing Gamma matrices obeying Clifford Algebra Γ^a , $\{\Gamma^a, \Gamma^b\} = 2\delta^{ab}$, the generators of the Lie algebra of $SO(N)$ become $-\frac{i}{4}[\Gamma^a, \Gamma^b]$. For the case of $N = 3$, both Gamma matrices and the generators for $SO(3)$ Lie group are Pauli matrices $\sigma^x, \sigma^y, \sigma^z$.

A field of group G is described by the mapping between the group space G (or the space of group elements) and Cartesian space C_d . This mapping for a field is denoted by a mapping between group element and space point. In brief, the field $g(x)$ of group G can be regarded as a *point-to-point mapping*. The field is described by function $g(x)$ that denotes an element of group (not an operation). Fig.2(b) is an illustration of the mapping for usual field of compact $U(1)$ group where $\phi(x) = -i \ln(g(x))$. In general, to define a field $g(x)$, one must choose an initial one, or its *reference*. In Fig.2(c), we choose the reference for group G as a constant phase angle $\phi(x) = \phi_0$. In Fig.2(d), we show field $\phi(x)$ of $U(1)$ group with function's reference $\phi_0 = 0$. Difference functions are normalized by the reference, the relative deviation becomes true result.

B. Clifford group space

1. 1D changing space for non-compact $U(1)$ group – a special Clifford group space

To define a variant, we firstly introduce another new concept – *Clifford group space*. Everyone is familiar




FIG. 1: (Color online) (a) An illustration of one dimensional Cartesian space C_1 ; (b) An illustration of a mapping between the elements for compact $U(1)$ group to the points in the one dimensional Cartesian space C_1 ; (c) An illustration of the reference for $U(1)$ group, $\phi(x) = \phi_0 = 0$; (d) The illustration of a general field of compact $U(1)$ group.

with the Cartesian space. Cartesian space is mathematic space described by the coordinate x that are a series of numbers arranged in size order (See Fig.2(a)). Using similar idea, we define a simplest example for Clifford group space for non-compact $U(1)$ group that is a special Clifford group space:

Definition – 1D Clifford group space $C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi)$: A 1D Clifford group space $C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi)$ of non-compact $U(1)$ group is described by a series of numbers of group element $\phi = -i \ln(g)$ arranged in size order. Here, ϕ is phase angle of non-compact $U(1)$ group and $g = e^{i\phi}$ is group element. $\Delta\phi$ denotes the total size of the changing space that turns to infinite, i.e., $\Delta\phi \rightarrow \infty$. "1" denotes dimension.

For a 1D Clifford group space $C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi)$, the *space element* is $\delta\phi$ ($\delta\phi \rightarrow 0$); or $\delta\phi$ is the *piece* of 1D Clifford group space $C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi)$. Therefore, $C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi)$ is regarded as a mathematical set of N infinitesimal changing of group element ($N \cdot \delta\phi \rightarrow \infty$).

There are two types of changings of the 1D Clifford group space $C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi)$:

1) Globally *shift* the 1D Clifford group space $C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi)$ without changing its size: For a 1D Clifford group space $C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi)$, under a globally shift $\delta\phi$, the phase of it changes, $\phi \rightarrow \phi + \delta\phi$. The operation of such a globally shift is denoted by $\hat{U}^T(\delta\phi) = e^{i\delta\phi}$. Now, the size of it is still $\Delta\phi$;

2) Globally *expand* or *contract* with changing its size: Under contraction/expansion, the original 1D Clifford group space $C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi)$ turns into a new one $C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi')$. Under the changing of "contraction", the total sizes $\Delta\phi$ of 1D Clifford group space becomes larger, i.e.,

$$C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi) \rightarrow C_{l,1}((\Delta\phi)') \text{ with } (\Delta\phi)' - \Delta\phi > 0;$$

Under the changing of "expansion", the total sizes $\Delta\phi$ of 1D Clifford group space becomes smaller, i.e., $C_{l,1}$

$$C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi) \rightarrow C_{l,1}((\Delta\phi)') \text{ with } (\Delta\phi)' - \Delta\phi < 0.$$

The operation of contraction/expansion on 1D Clifford group space $C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi)$ is $\hat{U}^{C/E}(\delta\phi) = e^{i((\delta\phi) \cdot \hat{K})}$ where $\delta\phi = (\Delta\phi)' - \Delta\phi$ and $\hat{K} = -i \frac{d}{d\phi}$.

We can also denote the 1D Clifford group space $C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi)$ with total changing $\Delta\phi$ by a group of infinitesimal operations,

$$\prod_i (\hat{U}^{C/E}(\delta\phi_i)) = \hat{U}^{C/E}(\sum_i \delta\phi_i) \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{U}^{C/E}(\delta\phi_i) = e^{i((\delta\phi_i) \cdot \hat{K})}$ and $\hat{K} = -i \frac{d}{d\phi}$. Here, the i -th operation $\hat{U}^{C/E}(\delta\phi_i)$ generates a space element that is infinitesimal group operation labeled by i and $\sum_i \delta\phi_i =$

$\Delta\phi \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, for "field" of a compact $U(1)$ group, the "space" is group elements; for a 1D Clifford group space $C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi)$, the "space" is a group of changing pieces (or group operations).

2. d -dimensional Clifford group space

Using similar approach, we define a d -dimensional Clifford group space $C_{l,d}(\Delta\phi^\mu)$:

Definition – d -dimensional Clifford space: A d -dimensional Clifford space $C_{l,d}(\Delta\phi^\mu)$ is described by d series of numbers of group element ϕ^μ arranged in size order with unit "vector" as Gamma matrices Γ^μ obeying Clifford algebra $\{\Gamma^i, \Gamma^j\} = 2\delta^{ij}$. The total size along μ -direction of $C_{l,d}$ is $\Delta\phi^\mu$.

A d -dimensional Clifford group space $C_{l,d}(\Delta\phi^\mu)$ obeys non-commutating geometry due to $\{\Gamma^\mu, \Gamma^\nu\} = 2\delta^{\mu\nu}$ [7]. Therefore, on d -dimensional Clifford group space $C_{l,d}(\Delta\phi^\mu)$, the parallelogram rule for vectors is similar to Cartesian space. For two vectors on $C_{l,d}(\Delta\phi^\mu)$, $\phi_A = \phi_{A,\mu} e^\mu$ and $\phi_B = \phi_{B,\mu} e^\mu$, the add and subtract rules become

$$\phi_A \pm \phi_B = \sum_\mu (\phi_{A,\mu} e^\mu + \phi_{B,\mu} e^\mu). \quad (2)$$

The distance between ϕ_A and ϕ_B becomes

$$|\phi_A - \phi_B|^2 = \sum_\mu (\phi_{A,\mu} e^\mu - \phi_{B,\mu} e^\mu)^2. \quad (3)$$

There are three types of changings of the d -dimensional Clifford group space $C_{l,d}(\Delta\phi^\mu)$:

1) Globally *shifts* $C_{l,d}(\Delta\phi^\mu)$ along different directions without changing its size, i.e., $\phi^\mu \rightarrow \phi^\mu + \delta\phi^\mu$: The operation of such a globally shift is $\hat{U}^T(\delta\phi^\mu) = e^{i\delta\phi^\mu \Gamma^\mu}$. Now, the size of it is still $\Delta\phi^\mu$;

2) Globally *rotating* $C_{l,d}(\Delta\phi^\mu)$ from μ -direction to ν -direction: The operation is $\hat{U}^R(\delta\phi^{\mu\nu}) = e^{\delta\phi^{\mu\nu} \Gamma^\mu \Gamma^\nu}$ where




FIG. 2: (Color online) An illustration of changing rate $d\phi^a/dx$ of a general variant that is mapping between Clifford group space $C_{l,1}$ (changing space of non-compact $U(1)$ group) on one dimensional Cartesian space C_1 . $\delta\phi^a/\delta x$ is integer multiple k_0 and thus quantized.

($\Gamma^{ab} = -\frac{1}{4}[\Gamma^a, \Gamma^b]$). That means the operation of globally rotating obeys a compact $SO(4)$ group;

3) Globally *expand* or *contract* $C_{l,d}(\Delta\phi^\mu)$ along different directions with changing its size: The operation of contraction/expansion on Clifford group space is $\hat{U}^{C/E}(\delta\phi^\mu) = e^{i((\delta\phi^\mu) \cdot \hat{K}^\mu)}$ where $\delta\phi^\mu = (\Delta\phi^\mu)' - \Delta\phi^\mu$ and $\hat{K}^\mu = -i\frac{d}{d\phi^\mu}$. Due to noncommutative geometry, the changings for $C_{l,d}(\Delta\phi^\mu)$ from contraction and expansion become very complex. This leads to a curved Clifford group space. In the following parts, we will address this issue.

C. Variant

First, we define 1D *variant* – an object of one dimensional Clifford group space $C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi)$ on usual Cartesian space C_1 .

Definition – 1D variant V_1 : A variant is a mapping between a one dimensional Clifford group space $C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi)$ and Cartesian space C_1 with total size Δx , i.e.,

$$V[\Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0] : C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi) = \{\delta\phi\} \iff C_1 = \{\delta x\} \quad (4)$$

where \iff denotes an ordered mapping under fixed changing rate of integer multiple k_0 .

We then take a 1D variant $V_1[\Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0]$ as an example to show a mapping between Clifford group space $C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi)$ and Cartesian space C_1 .

According to definition, for a 1D variant $V_1[\Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0]$, we have

$$\delta\phi_i = k_0 n_i \delta x_i \quad (5)$$

where k_0 is a constant real number and n_i is an integer number. $k_0 n_i$ is changing rate for i -th space element, i.e., $k_0 n_i = \delta\phi_i/\delta x_i$. Under the mapping, each of the infinitesimal space element of $C_{l,1}(\Delta\phi)$ is marked by a given position x_i in 1D Cartesian space C_1 , i.e., $\delta\phi_i \rightarrow \delta\phi_i(x_i)$ or $n_i \rightarrow n_i(x_i)$. Therefore, for the 1D variant $V_1[\Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0]$, we have a series of numbers of infinitesimal space elements to record its information, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} V_1[\Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0] : \{n_i\} \\ = (\dots n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5, n_6, \dots). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

In addition, for a usual field described by function $g(x)$, n_i can be freely varied fractional number; while for a variant V_1 , n_i are only integer number. Different variants are characterized by different distributions of n_i . To show a variant, one can see Fig.3.

Next, we define *variant* – an object of d -dimensional Clifford group space $C_{l,d}(\Delta\phi^\mu)$ on usual Cartesian space C_d .

Definition – Variant $V_d[\Delta\phi^\mu, \Delta x^\mu, k_0]$: A variant is a mapping between a d -dimensional Clifford group space $C_{l,d}$ with total size $\Delta\phi^\mu$ and Cartesian space C_d with total size Δx^μ , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} V_d[\Delta\phi^\mu, \Delta x^\mu, k_0] : C_{l,d} = \{\delta\phi^\mu\} \\ \iff C_d = \{\delta x^\mu\} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where \iff denotes an ordered mapping under fixed changing rate of integer multiple k_0 .

In summary, the key difference between a usual "field" and a "variant" (we may regard it as a special "field" under quantization constraint) is to replace "group element" in usual "field" $g(x)$ to "space elements" $\delta\phi$ in a "variant" $V_d[\Delta\phi^\mu, \Delta x^\mu, k_0]$: Clifford group space $C_{l,d}(\Delta\phi^\mu)$ represents the "space" of group operations; while the usual group space $g(x)$ represents the "space" of group elements. So, a variant is really a configuration of particular distribution of a lot of space elements $\delta\phi$.

D. Example 1: uniform variant – a variant with one type of space elements

In above section, we introduce a new mathematic object – variant that is a space mapping between a d -dimensional Clifford group space $C_{l,d}$ and Cartesian space C_d . In this part, we show a special type of variant with only one type of space elements – *uniform variant*.

Definition – d -dimensional uniform variant $V_{d,0}[\Delta\phi^\mu, \Delta x^\mu, k_0]$: $V_{d,0}[\Delta\phi^\mu, \Delta x^\mu, k_0]$ is defined by an ordered mapping between a d -dimensional Clifford group space $C_{l,d}$ and the d -dimensional Cartesian space C_d , i.e.,

$$V_{d,0}[\Delta\phi^\mu, \Delta x^\mu, k_0] : \{\delta\phi^\mu\} \iff^0 \{\delta x^\mu\}. \quad (8)$$

where \iff^0 denotes an ordered mapping under fixed changing rate of integer multiple k_0^μ , and μ labels the spatial




FIG. 3: (Color online) (a) An illustration of a mapping between changing space of non-compact U(1) group (Clifford group space) $C_{l,1}$ to the one dimensional Cartesian space C_1 ; (b) and (c) characterize a uniform variant (or variant's reference) via phase angle ϕ and its changing rate $d\phi/dx$, respectively. k_0 denotes the constant changing rate; (d) The illustration of geometric representation for a uniform variant (or variant's reference). Now, the uniform variant is a helical line around the one dimensional x -axis. We show the relation between the compact phase angle φ and the non-compact phase angle ϕ of the non-compact U(1) group.

direction. Subscript "0" means "uniform". In particular, the total size $\Delta\phi^\mu$ of $C_{l,d}$ matches the total size Δx^μ of C_d , i.e., $\Delta\phi^\mu = k_0^\mu \Delta x^\mu$. See the illustration in 4(a).

In particular, a uniform variant is phenomenon of *space synchronous*. To characterize such a space synchronous, we introduce *hybrid symmetry*. For variant's reference V_0 with infinite size ($\Delta x \rightarrow \infty$), we have the following correspondence,

$$\mathcal{T}(\delta x^\mu) \rightarrow U^T(\delta\phi^\mu) = e^{i\cdot\delta\phi^\mu\Gamma^\mu} \quad (9)$$

where $\mathcal{T}(\delta x^\mu)$ is the spatial translation operation on C_d along x^μ -direction and $U^T(\delta\phi^\mu)$ is translation operation on Clifford group space $C_{l,d}$, and $\delta\phi^\mu = k_0^\mu \delta x^\mu$. That means when one translate along Cartesian space C_d δx^μ , the corresponding shifting along Clifford group space $C_{l,d}$ is $\delta\phi^\mu = k_0^\mu \delta x^\mu$.

In addition, the hybrid symmetry indicates a generalized global rotation operation defined by

$$\hat{U}^R \cdot \hat{R}_{\text{space}} \quad (10)$$

where \hat{U}^R is SO(d) rotation operator on Clifford group space $\hat{U}^R \Gamma^I (\hat{U}^R)^{-1} = \Gamma^{I'}$, and \hat{R}_{space} is SO(d) rotation operator on Cartesian space, $\hat{R}_{\text{space}} x^I \hat{R}_{\text{space}}^{-1} = x^{I'}$. After doing a generalized global rotation operation $\hat{U}^R \cdot \hat{R}_{\text{space}}$, the variant is invariant!

We then take a 1D uniform variant $V_{1,0}[\Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0]$ as an example. For a uniform variant $V_{1,0}[\Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0]$, there exists only one type of space elements,

$$\delta\phi_i \equiv k_0 \delta x_i \quad (11)$$

with fixed changing rate $\frac{d\phi}{dx} = k_0 = \frac{\pi}{a}$. Now, the ordered mapping " \Leftrightarrow^0 " can be denoted by the series of same number "1", i.e.,

$$\{n_i\} = (\dots 1, 1, 1, 1, \dots). \quad (12)$$

Fig.4(b) and Fig.4(c) is an illustration of a 1D uniform variant $V_{1,0}[\Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0]$ via ϕ and its changing rate $\frac{d\phi}{dx}$.

In addition, we point out that there exists a corresponding geometric picture for uniform variant. In general, a uniform variant $V_{1,0}[\Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0]$ can be regarded as a special complex field $z_0(x)$ in Cartesian space as

$$z_0(x) = \exp(i\phi(x))$$

where $\phi(x) = \phi_0 + k_0 x$. To give its geometric picture, we map the original complex field $z(x) = \text{Re } \xi(x) + i \text{Im } \eta(x)$ for a variant to a line $\{x, \xi(x), \eta(x)\}$ in three dimensions. In Fig.4(d) of its geometric picture from $z_0(x) = \exp(ik_0 x + i\phi_0)$, a uniform variant corresponds to a spiral line on a cylinder with fixed radius.

E. Example 2: quasi-uniform variant – a variant with two types of space elements

Another special case of variant is *quasi-uniform variant* $V_{d,q}$ with two types of space elements. In general, a quasi-uniform variant can be regarded as a deformed uniform variant $V_{d,0}$, including *perturbative contraction*, *expansion*, or *fragmentation* processes.

1. Quasi-uniform variant as perturbed uniform variant

To get a quasi-uniform variant $V_{1,q}[(\Delta\phi^\mu)', (\Delta x^\mu)', k_0']$, we perturb a uniform variant $V_{1,0}[\Delta\phi^\mu, \Delta x^\mu, k_0]$. According to the perturbation condition, we have

$$1 \gg \left| \frac{[(\Delta\phi^\mu)' - \Delta\phi^\mu]}{\Delta\phi^\mu} \right|,$$

$$(\Delta x^\mu)' = \Delta x^\mu = \frac{\Delta\phi^\mu}{k_0},$$

$$k_0' = k_0.$$

To make it clear, we give the definition of it.

Definition – d-dimensional quasi-uniform variant $V_{d,q}[\Delta\phi^\mu, \Delta x^\mu, k_0]$: The quasi-uniform variant $V_{d,q}[\Delta\phi^\mu, \Delta x^\mu, k_0]$ is defined by a mapping between a d-dimensional Clifford group space $C_{l,d}$ with two types of space elements $\delta\phi^A, \delta\phi^B$ and d-dimensional Cartesian space C_d with one type of space elements δx , i.e.,

$$V_{d,q}[\Delta\phi^\mu, \Delta x^\mu, k_0] : \{\delta\phi^A, \delta\phi^B\} \in C_{l,d} \\ \Leftrightarrow \{\delta x\} \in C_d \quad (13)$$

where

$$\Delta\phi^\mu = \sum_i \delta\phi^A + \sum_j \delta\phi_j^B, \quad (14)$$

$$\left| \sum_i \delta\phi^A \right| \gg \left| \sum_j \delta\phi_j^B \right|.$$

Now, the ordered mapping " \Leftrightarrow " can be denoted by the series of number "1" and "0" or the series of number "1" and "2", i.e.,

$$\{n_i\} = (\dots, 1, 0, 1, 1, \dots) \quad (15)$$

or

$$\{n_i\} = (\dots, 1, 1, 1, 2, \dots). \quad (16)$$

As a result, the quasi-uniform variant is determined by the distribution of the space elements $\delta\phi^B$ (those space elements denoted by "0" or "2" in above serieses) on Cartesian space C_d .

In following parts, we discuss the descriptions for quasi-uniform variant. To describe a (quasi-uniform) variant, the first step is to set its *reference*. To choose its reference, in general, we have two choices – one is a constant, i.e., $\phi^\mu = \phi_0$, the other is the uniform variant $V_{d,0}[\Delta\phi^\mu, \Delta x^\mu, k_0]$. In the following parts, we call the first "constant reference" and the second "varying reference", respectively. For simplicity, we show the twp types of descriptions for quasi-uniform variant by taking a 1D quasi-uniform variant of non-compact U(1) group as an example.

2. "Space" description for quasi-uniform variant

We then show "space" description for quasi-uniform variant of non-compact U(1) group $V_{1,q}[(\Delta\phi)', \Delta x, k_0]$ by perturbing a uniform variant $V_{1,0}[(\Delta\phi), \Delta x, k_0]$, i.e.,

$$V_{1,0}[(\Delta\phi), \Delta x, k_0] \rightarrow V_{1,q}[(\Delta\phi)', \Delta x, k_0]. \quad (17)$$

Therefore, the quasi-uniform variant is designed by adding a distribution of the space elements $\delta\phi_i^B(x_i)$ on a 1D uniform variant with a fixed total phase changing $\Delta\phi^B = \sum_i \delta\phi_i^B(x_i) \ll (\Delta\phi^\mu)' = \sum_i \delta\phi^A + \sum_j \delta\phi_j^B$.

Now, the reference is a constant angle, i.e., $\phi^\mu = \phi_0^\mu$. Then, the original complex field $z_0(x)$ for a uniform variant $V_{1,0}[(\Delta\phi), \Delta x, k_0]$ turns into another complex field $z(x)$ for $V_{1,q}[(\Delta\phi), \Delta x, k_0]$, i.e.,

$$z_0(x) \rightarrow z(x) = \hat{U}^{C/E}(\delta\phi^B)z_0 \quad (18)$$

where $\hat{U}^{C/E}(\delta\phi^B) = \prod_i \hat{U}^{C/E}(\delta\phi_i^B(x_i))$ denote a series of group operations with $\hat{U}^{C/E}(\delta\phi_i^B(x_i)) = e^{i((\delta\phi_i^B) \cdot \hat{K})}$ and $\hat{K} = -i \frac{d}{d\phi}$. Here, the i-th group operation $\hat{U}^{C/E}(\delta\phi_i^B(x))$ at x generates a space element. This is "space" description for a 1D quasi-uniform variant $V_{1,q}[(\Delta\phi), \Delta x, k_0]$.




FIG. 4: (Color online) (a) An illustration of changing rate $d\phi/dx$ of one dimensional quasi-uniform variant under "space" description. Now, there are two types of changing elements $\delta\phi^A = k_0\delta x$, $\delta\phi^B = 0$. And, we have $\left| \sum_i \delta\phi_i^A \right| \gg \left| \sum_j \delta\phi_j^B \right|$; (b) The corresponding "field" description for one dimensional quasi-uniform variant in (a). Now, there are two types of changing elements $\delta\phi^A = 0$, $\delta\phi^B = -k_0\delta x$; (c) shows a uniform distribution of changing pieces for a one dimensional quasi-uniform variant under "field" description; (d) The illustration of geometric representation of a uniform distribution of changing pieces for a one dimensional quasi-uniform variant under "field" description.

Let us show the "space" description in detail. We have split the total phase changing $\Delta\phi^B = \sum_i \delta\phi_i^B(x_i)$ into N pieces, each of which is $\delta\phi_i^B(x_i)$ phase-changing. For the case of single space element $\delta\phi_i^B(x_i)$ at x_i , the function is given by

$$\phi(x) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -\frac{\delta\phi_i}{2}, \quad x \in (-\infty, x_0] \\ -\frac{\delta\phi_i}{2} + k_0x, \quad x \in (x_i, x_i + \delta x_i] \\ \frac{\delta\phi_i}{2}, \quad x \in (x_i + \delta x_i, \infty) \end{array} \right\}. \quad (19)$$

See the illustration in Fig.5(a), which is an illustration of a 1D quasi-uniform variant's derivative via ϕ under "space" description.

For higher dimensional variant $V_{d,q}$, we can use similar approach to obtain its "space" description. For a variant in higher dimensions $V_{d,q}$, the complex field turns into

$$z_0(\vec{x}) \rightarrow z(\vec{x}) = \hat{U}^{C/E}(\delta\phi^B)z_0$$

where

$$\hat{U}^{C/E}(\delta\phi^B) = \prod_\mu \prod_i (\hat{U}^{C/E})^\mu \quad (20)$$

with

$$(\hat{U}^{C/E})^\mu = e^{i \int \Gamma^\mu[\phi(\vec{x}_i) \cdot \hat{K}] dx}.$$

Here, the vector \vec{x} is $(x^{\mu 1}, x^{\mu 2}, \dots, x^{\mu d})$.

3. "Field" description for quasi-uniform variant

By setting reference to be uniform variant $V_{d,0}$, we have a "field" description for a variant $V_{d,q}$, under which the "space elements" $\delta\phi_i^B(x)$ are considered as extra objects on rigid space (Cartesian space). Then, a quasi-uniform variant $V_{d,q}$ becomes a configuration of particular distribution of a lot of "space elements" $\delta\phi_i^B(x)$. We also take a 1D quasi-uniform variant $V_{1,q}[(\Delta\phi)', \Delta x, k_0]$ of the non-compact $U(1)$ group as an example to show its "field" description.

By setting $V_{0,q}[\Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0]$ to be reference, the original variant $V_{0,q}[\Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0]$ that is described by a series of number "1", $\{n_i\} = (\dots, 1, 1, 1, \dots)$ is reduced into another $V_{0,q}[0, \Delta x, k_0]$ that is described by a series of number "0", $\{n_i\} = (\dots, 0, 0, 0, \dots)$. As a result, under "field" description, a quasi-uniform variant $V_{1,q}[(\Delta\phi)', \Delta x, k_0]$ that is described by a series of number "1" and "0", $\{n_i\} = (\dots, 1, 0, 1, 1, \dots)$ or a series of number "1" and "2", $\{n_i\} = (\dots, 1, 1, 1, 2, \dots)$ is reduced into $V_{1,q}[(\Delta\phi)' - \Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0]$ that is described by $\{n_i\} = (\dots, 0, -1, 0, 0, \dots)$ or $\{n_i\} = (\dots, 0, 0, 0, 1, \dots)$. Therefore, under varying reference, the contribution from background (or uniform variant) becomes ignored.

Then, for $V_{1,q}[\Delta\phi^B, \Delta x, k_0]$ ($\Delta\phi^B = (\Delta\phi)' - \Delta\phi$), we split the total phase changing into N pieces, i.e., $\Delta\phi^B = \sum_i \delta\phi_i^B(x_i)$. The complex field $z(x)$ for $V_{1,q}[\Delta\phi^B, \Delta x, k_0]$ turns into

$$z(x) = \hat{U}^{C/E}(\delta\phi)z_0 \quad (21)$$

where $z_0 = 1$ and $\hat{U}^{C/E}(\delta\phi) = \prod_i \hat{U}^{C/E}(\delta\phi_i(x))$ with $\hat{U}^{C/E}(\delta\phi_i(x)) = e^{i((\delta\phi_i) \cdot \hat{K})}$, and $\hat{K} = -i \frac{d}{d\phi}$. The total phase angle changing is $\Delta\phi^B = \sum_i \delta\phi_i$. See the illustration in Fig.5(b), which is an illustration of a 1D quasi-uniform variant's derivative via ϕ under "field" description.

In Fig.5(c), we show an illustration of a 1D quasi-uniform variant (changing rate via ϕ) that corresponds to a straight dotted line. In addition, we provide the corresponding geometric picture for this "space" description. See Fig.5(d). In Fig.5(d), a quasi-uniform variant corresponds to a spiral dotted line on a cylinder with fixed radius. In Fig.5(c) and Fig.5(d), each dot denotes a changing piece $\delta\phi_i^B(x_i)$ with fixed changing rate k_0 .

Finally, we get "field" description for a quasi-uniform variant $V_{1,q}[(\Delta\phi)', \Delta x, k_0]$ by obtaining the distribution of the extra space elements $\delta\phi_i^B(x)$ for another $V_{1,q}[\Delta\phi^B, \Delta x, k_0] = V_{1,q}[(\Delta\phi)' - \Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0]$ by removing the contribution from its background (the uniform variant) $V_{1,0}[\Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0]$. Now, the information of the original variant is changed into the information of its perturbation on a uniform variant. For a quasi-uniform variant in higher dimensions $V_{d,q}$, we can use similar approach to obtain its "field" description.




FIG. 5: (Color online) The comparison between usual "field" and "variant" (or "space mapping")

F. A short summary for variant

In this section, we develop a new mathematic theory – variant theory that can characterize dynamics for space. Variant is a special "field" under constraint. Fig.6 is a table to show the difference between a field and a variant (or a "space"). For each variant, we have two types of descriptions – "space" description and "field" description. According to the intrinsic relationship between them, when knowing one description, we can translate it to the other. This powerful mathematic theory can help us understand the counterintuition quantum mechanics by "space" dynamics.

IV. A NEW THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR QUANTUM MECHANICS – DYNAMICS FOR "SPACE"

In this section, we will develop a new theoretical framework for quantum mechanics. We point out that all issues about quantum mechanics are relevant to the dynamics of "space", and the variant theory becomes the suitable mathematic approach to underhand quantum mechanics.

A. Physical reality in quantum mechanics

What's physical reality in quantum mechanics? This is the key point to develop a new theoretical framework for quantum mechanics. For quantum mechanics, the physical reality is *physical variants*, a predecessor of quantum spacetime. To define a physical reality for certain mechanics, there are two aspects, one is about the geometric property, the other is about the dynamic property. So, we give the definition for physical variants:

Definition: A physical variant is d-dimensional variant with regular motion.

To accurate define a physical variant, we must consider its spatial and tempo hybrid symmetries, that correspond to its geometry and dynamic properties, respectively.

On the one hand, we consider the geometry property that can be characterized by a hybrid symmetry, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{T}(\delta x^i) \rightarrow U^T(\delta \phi^i) = e^{i \cdot \delta \phi^i \Gamma^i}, \quad i = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d, \quad (22)$$

where $\delta \phi^i = k_0^i \delta x^i$ and Γ^i are the Gamma matrices obeying Clifford algebra $\{\Gamma^i, \Gamma^j\} = 2\delta^{ij}$. Therefore, $U^T(\delta \phi^i)$ is (spatial) translation operation on Clifford group space rather than the generators of a (non-compact) SO(d) group. k_0^i is wave vector along i-direction.

On the other hand, we consider the dynamic property that can also be characterized by another hybrid symmetry, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{T}(\delta t) \rightarrow U^T(\delta \phi^t) = e^{i \cdot \delta \phi^t \Gamma^t}, \quad (23)$$

where $\delta \phi^t = \omega_0 \delta t$ and Γ^t is another Gamma matrix anti-commuting with Γ^i , $\{\Gamma^i, \Gamma^t\} = 2\delta^{it}$. Therefore, $U^T(\delta \phi^t)$ is (tempo) translation operation on Clifford group space. ω_0 is an "angular momentum" of the system.

As a result, the physical reality of our world is really a physical variant that is described by a mapping between d+1 dimensional Clifford group space $C_{l,d+1}$ to a rigid spacetime C_{d+1} .

$$\{\delta \phi^\mu\} \in C_{l,d+1} \iff \{\Delta x^\mu\} \in C_{d+1}. \quad (24)$$

Here, μ labels the direction of $d + 1$ spacetime. In this paper, we focus on this case and give the key Hypothesis about physical reality.

Hypothesis: Physical reality in quantum mechanics is a physical variant $V_{d+1}^{\text{phy}}(\Delta \phi^\mu, \Delta x^\mu, k_0, \omega_0)$ that is described by a mapping between Clifford group space $C_{l,d+1}$ to a rigid spacetime C_{d+1} .

From above Hypothesis of physical variant, we always have finite spatial changing rate, i.e., $k_0 \neq 0$. The direct physical consequence of this fact is *linear dispersion relation* and thus an *emergent Lorentz invariant*. In general, we may assume the dispersion of the system is $\omega(k)$. Near $k = k_0$, after linearization, $\omega = \omega_0 + c(k - k_0)$, we have an effective "light" velocity, i.e., $c = \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial k} |_{k=k_0}$. In other words, the changing of k_0 will change "light" velocity c .

Because the momentum of physical variant V_{d+1}^{phy} has a uniformly distribution, the momentum density $\rho_{p_i} = \frac{\Delta p_i}{\Delta V}$ is constant. Then, we have

$$\rho_{p_i}(k_0 + \delta k_i) = \rho_E(k_0) + \frac{\delta \rho_E}{\delta k_i} |_{k_i=k_0} \delta k_i + \dots \quad (25)$$

where $\frac{\delta \rho_E}{\delta k_i} |_{k_i=k_0} = \rho_J^i$ is called the density of (effective) "angular momentum". On the other hand, because the energy of physical variant V_{d+1}^{phy} has a uniformly distribution, the energy density $\rho_E = \frac{\Delta E}{\Delta V}$ is constant. Then, we

have

$$\rho_E(\omega_0 + \delta \omega) = \rho_E(\omega_0) + \frac{\delta \rho_E}{\delta \omega} |_{\omega=\omega_0} \delta \omega + \dots \quad (26)$$

where $\frac{\delta \rho_E}{\delta \omega} |_{\omega=\omega_0} = \rho_J^E$ is called the density of (effective) "angular momentum". In the following parts, we assume the symmetry of physical variant along spatial direction and tempo direction, i.e.,

$$\frac{\delta \rho_E}{\delta k_i} |_{k_i=k_0} = \frac{\delta \rho_E}{\delta \omega} |_{\omega=\omega_0} = \rho_J. \quad (27)$$

Therefore, the "angular momentum" ρ_J for an element particles is just Planck constant \hbar . This is the natural result of linearization of energy density ρ_E via ω near ω_0 .

Based on above this Hypothesis, we will develop a new, complete theoretical framework for quantum mechanics step by step.

B. Elementary particle as information unit and the emergence of quantization in quantum mechanics

To develop a new, complete theoretical framework for quantum mechanics, an important question is *How does quantization appear in quantum mechanics? and what does \hbar mean?* To answer these questions, one must answer other more fundamental ones, i.e., *"what is the information unit of physical reality for quantum mechanics and what's elementary particle?"* In this part, we will answer all these questions and show how quantization of quantum mechanics emerges.

1. Elementary particle – information unit of physical variant

First of all, we give an accurate definition to an elementary particle.

An elementary particle is a π -phase changing of Clifford group space $C_{l,d+1}$ for a physical uniform variant V_{d+1}^{phy} along an arbitrary direction (including time direction). If the total size of the Clifford group space V_{d+1}^{phy} for a physical uniform variant $V_{d+1}^{\text{phy}}(\Delta \phi^\mu, \Delta x^\mu, k_0, \omega_0)$ along μ -direction is $\Delta \phi^\mu$, when there exists an extra elementary particle, the total size of $C_{l,d+1}$ turns into $\Delta \phi^\mu \pm \pi$. Therefore, the original physical variant becomes a new one that is denoted by $V_{d+1}^{\text{phy}}(\Delta \phi^\mu \pm \pi, \Delta x^\mu, k_0, \omega_0)$, of which an information unit is π -phase changing along an arbitrary direction (including time direction). It is obvious that in Clifford group space $C_{l,d+1}$, an elementary particle will never be divided.

Then, we provide the mathematical definition of an elementary particle on a physical uniform variant $V_{d+1}^{\text{phy}}(\Delta \phi^\mu, \Delta x^\mu, k_0, \omega_0)$:

Definition – An elementary particle is a physical variant denoted by $V_{d+1}^{\text{particle}}(\Delta \phi^\mu \pm \pi, \Delta x^\mu, k_0, \omega_0)$ that is a

mapping between a $d+1$ dimensional Clifford group space $C_{l,d+1}$ with total size $\Delta\phi^\mu \pm \pi$ along μ -direction and Cartesian space C_{d+1} with total size Δx^μ , i.e.,

$$V_{d+1}^{\text{particle}}(\Delta\phi^\mu \pm \pi, \Delta x^\mu, k_0, \omega_0) : \\ C_{l,d+1}(\Delta\phi^\mu \pm \pi) = \{\delta\phi^\mu\} \iff C_d = \{\delta x^\mu\} \quad (28)$$

where \iff denotes an ordered mapping under fixed changing rate of integer multiple k_0 along spatial direction and fixed changing rate of integer multiple ω_0 along time direction.

Remark: The topological invariant of elementary particle is classified by the homotopy classes $\pi_{d-1}(S_{d-1}) = \mathbb{Z}$. This will be addressed in the following parts in detail. Therefore, an elementary particle has shape of hedgehog, i.e., for 1D case, it becomes a *domain wall*; For 2D case, it becomes a *quantized flux*; For 3D case, it becomes a *magnetic monopole* with unit magnetic charge. According to this fact, the elementary particle is indeed elementary and cannot be divided into smaller particle in physics.

2. Emergence of quantization in quantum mechanics

Then, we discuss the emergence of quantization in quantum mechanics.

Let us take an elementary particle on a 1D physical variant $V_1^{\text{particle}}(\Delta\phi \pm \pi, \Delta x, k_0)$ of non-compact $U(1)$ group as an example. Now, an elementary particle is a π -phase changing of Clifford group space $C_{l,1}$, i.e., $\sum_i (\delta\phi_i^B) = \pi$. In a word, the generation/annihilation of an elementary particle leads to contraction/expansion changing of the changing space $C_{l,1}$. This is the geometric property for an elementary particle.

Fig.7(a) and Fig.7(b) shows an elementary particle on a 1D physical uniform variant under "space" description. Now, the reference is ϕ_0 . In Fig.7(c) and Fig.7(d), we consider "field" description, of which we have a varying reference $z_0(x) = \exp(ik_0x + i\phi_0)$. The 1D physical uniform variant $V_1^{\text{phy}}(\Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0)$ is really considered as "vacuum" and its effect is removed. Therefore, under "field" description, the original quasi-uniform variant $V_1^{\text{particle}}(\Delta\phi \pm \pi, \Delta x, k_0)$ is reduced into $V_1^{\text{particle}}(\pm\pi, \Delta x, k_0)$. In both cases, the size of an elementary particle is l_p .

On the other hand, an elementary particle has its specific dynamic property – fixed "angular momentum". Because the uniform physical variant $V_1^{\text{phy}}(\Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0)$ with total phase changing $\Delta\phi$ can be regarded as a composite system with $N = \Delta\phi/\pi$ identical elementary particles, each of which is π -changing. Then, for an elementary particle with fixed length $\frac{\pi}{k_0} = \frac{l_p}{2}$ along different spatial directions, the "angular momentum" of it is a




FIG. 6: (Color online) (a) and (b) show "space" description of an elementary particle on a 1D physical uniform variant and choosing the reference to be $\phi_0 = 0$. The size of the elementary particle is l_p ; In (c) and (d) show "field" description of the quasi-uniform variant by choosing the reference to be the 1D uniform one $z_0(x) = \exp(ik_0x + i\phi_0)$. The size of the elementary particle is l_p . Under "field" description, the 1D physical uniform variant is considered as "vacuum" and its effect is removed.

constant

$$J_F = \rho_J \cdot \left(\frac{\pi}{k_0}\right)^3 = \left(\frac{l_p}{2}\right)^3 \rho_J$$

that play the role of Planck constant \hbar in quantum mechanics. $l_p = \frac{2\pi}{k_0}$ is just the well known Planck constant. This fact will be discussed in following parts.

In $(d+1)$ -dimensional variant, an elementary particle is also π -phase changing along an arbitrary direction, i.e., $\sum_i ((\delta\phi_i^B)^\mu) = \pi$. The volume in arbitrary d -dimensional sub-manifold of an elementary particle is $V_F = \left(\frac{l_p}{2}\right)^d$. The finite volume leads to finite "angular momentum" $J_F = \rho_J \cdot V_F$ that corresponds to Planck constant \hbar in quantum mechanics.

3. "Classical" picture for physical variant

In this part, we show a "classical" picture for physical variant by projection.

In usual classical picture for the world, an elementary particle is a "point mass" and moves on a rigid space. Under projection, an elementary particle indeed turns into a "mass point". Here, the "point" is an infinitesimal point in mathematics representation rather than a physical "point" with finite size. Therefore, we call it "classical" picture.

To get a "classical" picture, we map the original complex field of a $d+1$ dimensional physical variant $z(x) = \text{Re } \xi(\vec{x}) + i \text{Im } \eta(\vec{x})$ to a super-membrane $\{\vec{x}, \xi(\vec{x}), \eta(\vec{x})\}$

in $d+3$ dimensions. We then introduce the (*knot*) *projection* of a super-membrane along a given direction θ on $\{\xi, \eta\}$ 2D space. In mathematics, the projection is defined by

$$\hat{P}_\theta \begin{pmatrix} \xi(\vec{x}) \\ \eta(\vec{x}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_\theta(\vec{x}) \\ [\eta_\theta(\vec{x})]_0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (29)$$

where $\xi_\theta(\vec{x})$ is variable and $[\eta_\theta(\vec{x})]_0$ is constant. In the following parts we use \hat{P} to denote the projection operators. Because the projection direction out of super-membrane is characterized by an angle θ in $\{\xi, \eta\}$ space, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \xi_\theta \\ \eta_\theta \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & \sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & -\cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} \quad (30)$$

where θ is angle mod(2π), i.e. $\theta \bmod 2\pi = 0$. So the super-membrane is described by the function

$$\xi_\theta(\vec{x}) = \xi(\vec{x}) \cos \theta + \eta(\vec{x}) \sin \theta. \quad (31)$$

In the following parts, we call $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ *projection angle*.

Under projection, each elementary particle corresponds to a solution of the equation

$$\hat{P}_\theta[z(x)] \equiv \xi_\theta(x) = 0.$$

We call the equation to be *zero-equation* and its solutions to be *zero-solution*. In the following parts, for simplicity, we call a zero-solution to be a "zero".

We point out that the existence of a zero is independent on the directions of projection angle θ . When one gets a zero-solution along a given direction θ , it will never split or disappear whatever changing the projection direction, $\theta \rightarrow \theta'$. Therefore, an elementary particle corresponds to a zero (or zero solution of zero equation). This fact again indicates the indivisibility of an elementary particle.

For 1D physical uniform variant $V_1^{\text{phy}}(\Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0)$ of non-compact U(1) group described by plane wave $z(x) \sim e^{ik_0 \cdot x}$, there exist periodic zeros. From the zero-equation $\xi_\theta(x) = 0$ or $\cos(k_0 x - \theta) = 0$, we get the zero-solutions to be

$$x = l_p \cdot n + \frac{l_p}{\pi} \left(\theta + \frac{\pi}{2} \right) \quad (32)$$

where n is an integer number. The zero density ρ_{zero} is

$$\rho_{\text{zero}} = \frac{k_0}{\pi} = \frac{1}{l_p}. \quad (33)$$

Fig.8 shows a 1D crystal of zeros of a projected line. One can see that each crossing corresponds to a zero.

In Fig.9(a) and Fig.9(b), we show the "classical" picture for a physical variant $V_1^{\text{particle}}(\Delta\phi \pm \pi, \Delta x, k_0)$ with an extra zero (or an extra elementary particle) under "space" description and that under "field" description, respectively. For the "classical" picture under "field" description, with ignoring the effect from the 1D physical uniform variant. Now, a physical uniform variant is projected to a system without zero!




FIG. 7: A crystal of zeroes from projection on a uniform variant, of which each zero corresponds to an elementary particle.




FIG. 8: (a) "Classical" picture for a physical variant with an extra zero (or an extra elementary particle) under "space" description; (b) "Classical" picture for a physical variant with an extra zero (or an extra elementary particle) under "field" description.

Next, we discuss the case of $(d+1)$ -dimensional physical variant $V_{d+1}^{\text{particle}}(\Delta\phi^\mu \pm \pi, \Delta x^\mu, k_0, \omega_0)$. A $(d+1)$ -dimensional physical variant $V_{d+1}^{\text{particle}}(\Delta\phi^\mu \pm \pi, \Delta x^\mu, k_0, \omega_0)$ corresponds to a $(d+1)$ -dimensional super-membrane in $(d+3)$ -dimensional space $\{\vec{x}, \xi(\vec{x}), \eta(\vec{x})\}$ ($\vec{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d)$) where $z(\vec{x}) = \xi(\vec{x}) + i\eta(\vec{x})$. The zeros for a $(d+1)$ -dimensional physical variant is defined from the projection of a $(d+1)$ -dimensional super-membranes in $(d+2)$ -dimensional space. Along e^μ -direction, for $(d+1)$ -dimensional physical variant described by $z(x^\mu) = e^{-i\Gamma^\mu k_0 x^\mu}$, the elementary particle along μ -direction corresponds to a

solution of the equation

$$\hat{P}_\theta[z(x^\mu)] \equiv \xi_\theta^\mu(x^\mu) = 0$$

where θ is the same projection angle for all directions. From the zero-equation $\xi_\theta(\vec{x}, t) = 0$ or $\cos(k_0 x^\mu - \theta) = 0$, we get the zero-solutions to be

$$x^\mu = l_p \cdot n \quad (34)$$

where n is an integer number and $\theta = -\frac{\pi}{2}$. Now, we have a (d+1)-dimensional super-lattice from periodic (d+1)-dimensional zeros.

Therefore, under projection, each zero corresponds to an elementary particle and a physical variant becomes a crystal of zeros. This fact means that the spacetime of world is also composed of elementary particles and the block of space (or strictly speaking, spacetime) is an elementary particle!

4. Summary

In summary, an elementary particle is a π -phase changing of Clifford group space $C_{l,d+1}$ on a physical uniform variant $V_{d+1}^{\text{phy}}(\Delta\phi^\mu, \Delta x^\mu, k_0, \omega_0)$ along an arbitrary direction (including time direction). From different point view, an elementary particle shows different picture,

Elementary particle in quantum mechanics
= Information unit for physical variant,

or

Elementary particle in quantum mechanics
= π -phase changing along an arbitrary direction
(including time direction),

or

Elementary particle in quantum mechanics
= Topological object classified by $\pi_{d-1}(S_{d-1}) = \mathcal{Z}$,

or

Elementary particle in quantum mechanics
= A zero solution of zero solution,

or

Elementary particle in quantum mechanics
= Block of spacetime with fixed volume V_F ,

or

Elementary particle in quantum mechanics
= Object with fixed "angular momentum" J_F .

In the end, we found that the quantization in quantum mechanics comes from the fact of an elementary particle with fixed "angular momentum", i.e.,

Quantization in quantum mechanics

= Elementary particle with fixed "angular momentum"

and

Fixed "angular momentum" J

= Planck constant \hbar .

C. Quantum states for single elementary particle

To develop a new, complete theoretical framework for quantum mechanics, another important question is *How to characterize the motions and changings for physical reality?* To answer this questions, one must answer other more fundamental one, i.e., "what is quantum motion of physical reality in quantum mechanics?" An very important fact that in Clifford group space of non-compact group $C_{l,d+1}(\Delta\phi^\mu)$, an elementary particle cannot be divided; while after space mapping, in Cartesian space C_d an elementary particle can be divided and always becomes fragmented. *The changings of distribution of changing pieces of an elementary particle in Cartesian space C_d are quantum motion of physical reality in quantum mechanics!* Different distribution of changing pieces are different states in quantum mechanics. However, in "classical" picture, an elementary particle is projected to a zero that also cannot be divided. Correspondingly, in "classical" picture under projection, quantum motion of physical reality becomes a *strange* "classical" motion for "mass point".

1. Definition of quantum states for an elementary particle

Remark: Due to $\pi \ll \Delta\phi$, a physical variant with an extra elementary particle $V_{d+1}^{\text{particle}}(\Delta\phi^\mu \pm \pi, \Delta x^\mu, k_0, \omega_0)$ is quasi-uniform variant.

According to above remark, $V_{d+1}^{\text{particle}}(\Delta\phi^\mu \pm \pi, \Delta x^\mu, k_0, \omega_0)$ is approximatively represented by a mapping between a Clifford group space $C_{l,d+1}$ with two types of space elements $\delta\phi^A, \delta\phi^B$ and the Cartesian space C_{d+1} with one type of space elements δx^μ , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} V_{d+1}^{\text{particle}}(\Delta\phi^\mu \pm \pi, \Delta x^\mu, k_0, \omega_0) : \\ \{\delta\phi^A, \delta\phi^B\} \in C_{l,d+1} \\ \Leftrightarrow \{\delta x\} \in C_{d+1} \quad (35) \end{aligned}$$

As a result, $V_{d+1}^{\text{particle}}(\Delta\phi^\mu \pm \pi, \Delta x^\mu, k_0, \omega_0)$ is determined by the distribution of the space elements $\delta\phi^B$ on a physical uniform variant $V_{d+1}^{\text{phy}}(\Delta\phi^\mu, \Delta x^\mu, k_0, \omega_0)$, of which the summation of total space elements along arbitrary direction is π , i.e., $\sum_i (\delta\phi_i^B) = \pi$.

Therefore, the quantum motion of physical reality in quantum mechanics is local contraction/expansion of "space" with fixed size ($\Delta\phi^\mu \pm \pi$) that corresponds to the evolution of the distribution of the space elements $\delta\phi^B$ on a physical uniform variant $V_{d+1}^{\text{phy}}(\Delta\phi^\mu, \Delta x^\mu, k_0, \omega_0)$, i.e.,

Quantum motion for an elementary particle
 \iff The evolution of the distribution of
the space elements $\delta\phi^B$ on a
physical uniform variant.

After acknowledging the quantum motion of physical reality in quantum mechanics, we show the approach to characterize this type of motions. It was known that in variant theory, there are two types of descriptions: one is "space" description that is a complete description to characterize the dynamics for space, the other is "field" description for the distribution of the extra changing pieces. However, there exist more descriptions/pictures to characterizing quantum motion – "wave function" description, a compact version of "field" description that is standard description in quantum mechanics, and a "classical" picture under projection.

In the following parts, by taking a 1D physical variant of non-compact U(1) group with an extra elementary particle as an example we show the different descriptions/pictures for quantum motion of physical reality in quantum mechanics.

2. "Space" description for the quantum states

Firstly, we discuss "space" description for quantum states. We take a 1D quasi-uniform variant $V_1^{\text{particle}}(\Delta\phi \pm \pi, \Delta x, k_0)$ of the non-compact U(1) group as an example.

Under "space" description, the reference is constant angle ϕ_0 . Now, the physical uniform variant $V_1^{\text{phys}}(\Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0)$ becomes a special complex field in Cartesian space as $z_0(x) = \exp(i\phi(x))$ where $\phi(x) = \phi_0 + k_0 x$.

When we consider the quasi-uniform variant $V_1^{\text{particle}}(\Delta\phi \pm \pi, \Delta x, k_0)$ by adding a distribution of the space elements $\delta\phi_i^B(x_i)$ at x_i with a fixed total phase changing $\sum_i \delta\phi_i^B(x_i) = \pi$. Then, the original complex field $z_0(x)$ turns into another one, $z_0(x) \rightarrow z(x) = \hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{\text{C/E}}(x)z_0$ where $\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{\text{C/E}}(x, t) = \prod_i \hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{\text{C/E}}(\delta\phi_i^B(x_i))$ denote a series of group operations with $\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{\text{C/E}}(\delta\phi_i^B(x_i)) = e^{i((\delta\phi_i^B) \cdot \hat{K})}$ and $\hat{K} = -i\frac{d}{d\phi}$. Here, the i -th group operation $\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{\text{C/E}}(\delta\phi_i^B(x))$ at x generates an infinitesimal space element. In particular, from the point view of variants, $\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{\text{C/E}}(x)$ corresponds to a small contraction or increase of the Clifford group space.




FIG. 9: An illustration of "field" description of four different quantum states for an elementary particle, that is a π phase changing. The green spot denotes the position of the zero under projection in "classical" picture. (a) An unified elementary particle; (b) A fragmented elementary particle that is split into two pieces; (c) A fragmented elementary particle that is split three pieces; (d) A fragmented elementary particle that is split into infinite pieces. The blue points denote the changing pieces for the elementary particle with $N \rightarrow \infty$.

In summary, from the "space" description for quantum mechanics, it is a function for variants themselves that characterizes the dynamics for "space", i.e.,

The function for whole "space"
 \iff "Space" description
for quantum states.

3. "Field" description for quasi-uniform variant

Secondly, we discuss "field" description for quantum states. We also take a 1D quasi-uniform variant $V_1^{\text{particle}}(\Delta\phi \pm \pi, \Delta x, k_0)$ of the non-compact U(1) group as an example.

Under "field" description, the corresponding variant's reference turns into the physical uniform variant $z_0(x) = \exp(i(\phi_0 + k_0 x))$. Or, one must set $z_0(x) = \exp(i(\phi_0 + k_0 x))$ to be 1. For this case, the "space elements" are considered as extra objects on Cartesian space. Then, a quasi-uniform variant becomes a configuration of particular distribution of a lot of "space elements" $\delta\phi_i^B(x)$.

By setting $V_1^{\text{phys}}(\Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0)$ to be reference, the contribution from background (or uniform variant) is ignored. The physical quasi-uniform variant is effectively reduced into $V_1^{\text{particle}}(\pm\pi, \Delta x, k_0)$. We then split the total π -phase changing into N pieces. As a result, the complex field $z(x)$ for $V_1^{\text{particle}}(\pm\pi, \Delta x, k_0)$ turns into

$$z(x) = \hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{\text{C/E}}(\delta\phi_i^B)z_0 \quad (36)$$

where $z_0 = 1$ and $\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{\text{C/E}}(\delta\phi_i^B) = \prod_i \hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{\text{C/E}}(\delta\phi_i^B(x))$ with $\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{\text{C/E}}(\delta\phi_i^B(x)) = e^{i((\delta\phi_i^B) \cdot \hat{K})}$, and $\hat{K} = -i \frac{d}{d\phi}$. The total phase angle changing is $\sum_i \delta\phi_i^B = \pi$. Fig.10 is an illustration of "field" description of four different quantum states for an elementary particle, that is a π phase changing. The green spot denotes the position of the zero under projection in "classical" picture.

Finally, we get "field" description for a quantum state by obtaining the distribution of the extra space elements $\delta\phi_i^B(x)$.

4. "Wave function" description for the quantum states – a "field" description with space compactification

Thirdly, we discuss the "wave function" description for quantum states of $V_1^{\text{particle}}(\Delta\phi \pm \pi, \Delta x, k_0)$, that is a "field" description with compactification. In particular, "wave function" description is usual description for quantum mechanics that is familiar to people.

To derive "wave function" description for quantum states, the first step is to do compactification on the changing space of non-compact U(1) group. After compactification, the non-compact U(1) group of $\phi(x)$ is reduced to a compact one, i.e.,

$$\phi(x) = 2\pi Q(x) + \varphi(x).$$

We then relabel the changing space $C_{l,1}$ by two numbers $(\varphi(x), Q(x))$: $\varphi(x)$ is phase angle of a compact U(1) group ($\varphi(x) = \varphi(x) + 2\pi$, and $\varphi(x) \in [0, 2\pi) \in \text{compact U(1)}$), the other is the winding number $Q(x) \in [0, N]$. After mapping it onto the 1D Cartesian space, each winding number Q_i corresponds to a position X_i in Cartesian space C_1 . As a result, the position of $C_{l,1}$ is denoted by two values, one is (discrete) coordinate X , the other is a compact phase angle φ . Now, the quasi-uniform variant turns into a "field" of compact U(1) group on discrete lattice X . The lattice distance is $l_0 = 2\pi/k_0 = 2l_p$. Consequently, the space elements for $\delta\phi_i^B$ turn into $\delta\varphi_i$ and become "object" on discrete lattice sites X . Under compactification, the reference for physical variant naturally becomes a "varying" one.

Because the lattice site has no size, on such a lattice, the phase changing $\delta\varphi_i$ is only phase changing without spatial changing, i.e., $\delta x_i = 0$. This is key different between "wave function" description and "field" description. So, we say that the information of "space" becomes hidden in "wave function" description.

Let us show the detail. We consider a general distribution of a physical quasi-uniform variant $V_1^{\text{particle}}(\pm\pi, \Delta x, k_0)$ on lattice X of winding number by adding N space elements on a varying reference $z_0 = 1$. Now, each of space element can be regarded as $\frac{\Delta\varphi}{N}$ phase-changing on given lattice sites. The function is written as

$$z(X) = \hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{\text{C/E}}(X)z_0$$




FIG. 10: (Color online) (a) Quantum states under "field" description; (b) Quantum states under "wave function" description. The difference between two figures is compactification or non-compactification. In addition, the sizes of space pieces on Cartesian space are difference: under "field" description, the size on Cartesian space is finite; while under "wave function", it is zero. See the pictures in magnifiers in both figures.

where $z_0 = 1$ and $\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{\text{C/E}}(X)$ is a generation operator for an elementary particle,

$$\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{\text{C/E}}(X) = \prod_{i=1}^N \hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{\text{C/E}}(\delta\varphi_i(X_i)).$$

Now, the infinitesimal space elements $\delta\phi_i^B$ turns into the phase changing of compact U(1) "field" $\delta\varphi_i$. For an elementary particle, the total phase angle changing of compact U(1) "field" is fixed to $\Delta\varphi = \sum_i \delta\varphi_i = \pi$. To compare the difference between "field" description and "wave function" description, we plot an illustration in Fig.11.

We then denote $\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{\text{C/E}}(x, t)$ to a creation operator $a^\dagger(x, t)$ or annihilation operator $a(x, t)$ for an elementary particle. This will lead to the usual quantum mechanics for an elementary particle. For an arbitrary quantum state, a generalized function is defined by

$$z(X) = \sum_k a_k \exp(ik \cdot X)$$

where a_k is the amplitude of given plane wave k . However, the information of the internal structure for an elementary particle disappears. The size of an elementary particle on Cartesian space is zero. From $a^\dagger(x, t)$ or $a(x, t)$ we will never know the changing rate k_0 of changing pieces.

The second step is to do *continuation*. In long wave limit, we replace the discrete numbers X by continuum coordinate x , and have

$$z(X) \rightarrow z(x). \quad (37)$$

As a result, a generalized function for quantum state is changed into

$$z(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int c_k \exp(ik \cdot x) dk$$

where c_k is the amplitude of given plane wave k .

In third step, we do *normalization*, i.e.,

$$z(x) \rightarrow \psi(x) = C \cdot z(x) \quad (38)$$

where the normalization factor $C = \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{\Delta V}}$ guarantees the total number of elementary particle is 1.

Finally, we derive a "wave function" description for quantum states of an elementary particle. $\psi(x)$ is just the *wave function* in usual quantum mechanics as

$$\psi(x) = \sqrt{\Omega(x)} e^{i\varphi(x)}, \quad (39)$$

where the phase angle $\varphi(x)$ becomes the quantum phase angle of wave function, $\Omega(x) = \int \psi^*(x)\psi(x)dx$ denotes the density of changing pieces ρ_{piece} .

We give a proof on the result of $\Omega(x) = \int \psi^*(x)\psi(x)dx$. The density of changing pieces ρ_{piece} is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{piece}} &= \sum_{i=1}^N \delta\varphi_i \\ &= C^2 \int z^* \hat{K} z d\phi = \left\langle \frac{\hat{K}}{\Delta V} \right\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where $\hat{K} = -i\frac{d}{d\phi}$. We can either label a piece by its position i_x on Cartesian space or label it by ϕ_i on Clifford group space. Here ϕ_i denotes a sorting of ordering of ϕ on Clifford group space from small to bigger and i_x denotes a sorting of coordination x with a given order. Each $\delta\phi_i$ corresponds to an i_x . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{piece}} &= \left\langle \frac{\hat{K}}{\Delta V} \right\rangle = C^2 \int z^* \hat{K} z d\phi \quad (41) \\ &= C^2 \sum_{i_\phi} \left[z(t, (x_0)_{i_\phi}) \right]^* \hat{K} \left[z(t, (x_0)_{i_\phi}) \right] \\ &= C^2 \sum_{i_x} \left[z(t, (x_0)_{i_x}) \right]^* \hat{K} \left[z(t, (x_0)_{i_x}) \right] \\ &= C^2 \int z(\vec{x}, t)^* \hat{K} [z(\vec{x}, t)] dV \\ &= \frac{1}{\Delta V} \psi^*(\vec{x}, t) \left(-i\frac{d}{d\phi}\right) \psi(\vec{x}, t) dV \\ &= \psi^*(\vec{x}, t) \psi(\vec{x}, t) = \Omega(\vec{x}, t). \end{aligned}$$

In the following parts, during the processes of quantum measurement, under the assumption of quantum ensemble the density of changing pieces ρ_{piece} is found to be the density of elementary particles, i.e., $\rho_{\text{particle}} = \rho_{\text{piece}} = \int \psi^*(x)\psi(x)dx$.

In summary, for quantum mechanics, it is wave functions that characterize the distribution of extra space elements with zero size on Cartesian space, i.e.,

"Wave function" description for quantum states
 \iff Description for extra space elements
 with compactification.

In addition, we emphasize that an elementary particle is indivisible in Clifford group space $C_{l,d+1}$ of non-compact group. However, it is divisible in Cartesian space. Therefore, an elementary particle may spread the whole system rather than localizes a given point. The weight for finding a particle is obvious proportional to local density of the space elements of it. Although the elementary particle can split and the size of it becomes zero, "angular momentum" \hbar is conserved after summarizing all pieces.

5. Recovering the non-local character for quantum states from wave functions

In this part, we show the relationship between two descriptions for quantum states and provide the approach to recover the non-local character for quantum states from wave functions. The key point is to derive "space" description for a physical quasi-uniform variant from its "wave function" description. This will help people to understand the non-local phenomena in quantum mechanics clearly.

It was known that wave function is a function describing the distribution of extra space elements. To recovering the non-local character for quantum states from wave functions, there are three procedures – 1) *change reference* from "varying" reference to "constant" one, 2) *non-compactification*, 3) *obtaining finite size* for an elementary particle. Let us show it in detail.

Our starting point is a wave function $\psi(x)$ that can be re-written into formula for extra changing pieces on rigid space,

$$\psi(x) \rightarrow z(x) = \hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{C/E}(\delta\varphi)z_0$$

where $z_0 = 1$ and $\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{C/E}(\delta\varphi) = \prod_i \hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{C/E}(\delta\varphi_i(x_i))$ denote a series of group operations with $\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{C/E}(\delta\varphi_i(x_i)) = e^{i((\delta\varphi_i) \cdot \hat{K})}$ and $\hat{K} = -i\frac{d}{d\phi}$.

To recover its non-local "space" structure, the first step is to change reference. The function's reference of a varying complex field in Cartesian space as $z_0(x) = \exp(i(\phi_0 + k_0x))$ must be replaced by a constant complex value $z_0(x) = \exp(i\varphi_0)$. In second step, we replace the compact phases $\varphi(x)$ in wave functions by a non-compact one, i.e., $\varphi(x) \rightarrow \phi(x) = \varphi(x) + 2\pi X$. In third step, the zero size of space elements of wave function $\delta\varphi_i(x_i) \neq k_0\delta x_i$ on Cartesian space is replaced by a finite size of them $\delta\phi_i^B(x_i) = k_0\delta x_i$. Finally, we get "space" description for the corresponding variant,

$z(x) = \hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{C/E}(\delta\phi^B)z_0$ where $z_0(x) = \exp(i(\phi_0 + k_0x))$ and $\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{C/E}(\delta\phi^B) = \prod_i \hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{C/E}(\delta\phi_i^B(x_i))$ denote a series of group operations with $\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{C/E}(\delta\phi_i^B(x_i)) = e^{i((\delta\phi_i^B) \cdot \hat{K})}$ and $\hat{K} = -i\frac{d}{d\phi}$. The non-local character of a wave function is obtained in $z(x)$.

For example, we consider a simple quantum state for a particle that is described by $\psi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L_x}}e^{ikx}$. This is a plane wave with finite wave vector k . According to above discussion, to get "space" description, we do non-compactification by $\varphi \rightarrow \phi$. Therefore, we have the uniform distribution of all space elements as $\phi(x) = k \cdot x$ where k is constant. This corresponds to a quasi-uniform variant with same phase for all space pieces, each of which is an identical space element with $\frac{\Delta\phi}{N}$ phase-changing and $\delta x_i = \frac{\Delta\phi}{k_0N}$ size on Cartesian space,

$$z(x) = \prod_{i=1}^N \hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{C/E}(\delta\phi = \frac{\Delta\phi}{N}, \phi_i = kx_i)z_0$$

where the reference is the uniform variant $z_0(x) = \exp(i(\phi_0 + k_0x))$. $\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{C/E}(\delta\phi = \frac{\Delta\phi}{N}, \phi_i = kx_i) = e^{i \int [\phi(x) \cdot \hat{K}] dx}$ is a generation operator, where

$$\phi(x) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \phi_0, \quad x \in (-\infty, x_0] \\ \phi_0 - k_0(x - x_0), \quad x \in (x_0, x_0 + a] \\ \phi_0 + \frac{\Delta\phi}{N}, \quad x \in (x_0 + a, \infty) \end{array} \right\},$$

with $\hat{K} = -i\frac{d}{d\phi}$.

Using similar approach, we can the non-local description for an arbitrary quantum state after knowing its wave function.

6. "Classical" picture for the quantum states under projection

Fourthly, we discuss "classical picture" for quantum states under (knot) projection. From above discussion, under projection, for each elementary particle, we have a zero, of which the position x is determined by zero-equation $\xi_\theta(x) = 0$.

After projection under "space" description, the physical quasi-uniform variant $V_1^{\text{particle}}(\Delta\phi \pm \pi, \Delta x, k_0)$ becomes a crystal of zeros with a missing zero or an extra zero. The missing zero or an extra zero corresponds to the extra elementary particle. On the other hand, after projection under "field" description, the physical quasi-uniform variant $V_1^{\text{particle}}(\pm\pi, \Delta x, k_0)$, there only exists single zero. See the zero for different quantum states in Fig.9. In the part, we will discuss the "classical" picture for quantum states of an elementary particle based on "field" description.

When we do projection on a quantum state $\psi(x)$ along θ direction, there exists a zero at a given position $x = x_0^\theta$. When there exists changing of phase angle of the quantum state $\phi \rightarrow \phi'$, the zero's position will be changed,

i.e., $x = x_0^\theta \rightarrow x' = x_0^{\theta'}$. To obtain the more information of the quantum state, we need to do more times of projection by tuning various projection angles θ . Therefore, under projection, the information for a quantum state is always *incomplete*.

According to "classical" picture, an interesting property for quantum mechanics is "spooky motion" for elementary particle. We take a time-dependent one dimensional quantum state $\psi(x, t)$ as an example. For $\psi(x, t)$, we do projected representant along θ direction on $\{\xi, \eta\}$ 2D plane. If θ is fixed, the position of zero solution $\bar{x}(\theta)$ becomes time dependent. If we consider the zero to be a real elementary particle, its trajectory is *strange*. The speed of zero's motion could turn to infinite. For example, for plane wave $\psi(x) = e^{i\omega t + ikx}$ under "wave function" description, we can recover the corresponding "field" description. Under "field" description, the changing pieces of an elementary particle becomes uniformly distributed throughout the system. Therefore, during the time interval $\Delta t = \frac{\pi}{\omega}$, the projected angle θ will be effectively changed π . Consequently, the zero will go through the whole system from one end to the other during the time interval $\Delta t = \frac{\pi}{\omega}$. The "speed" of the zero is $\frac{L_x}{\frac{\pi}{\omega}}$ that turns to infinite $\frac{L_x}{\frac{\pi}{\omega}} \rightarrow \infty$ in thermodynamic limit.

Another interesting property is the "probability" for quantum mechanics. Now, we randomly do projection by considering the projection angle θ to be a random number. Let us calculate the probability for a changing piece $\Delta\phi = \frac{\pi}{N}$ with a zero solution under a projection. The probability for a changing piece with a zero solution is defined by the average of the projection angle. If there exists a zero solution at $\bar{x}(\bar{\theta})$ for a given projection angle $\bar{\theta}$, we call $\bar{\theta}$ the permitted projection angle; If there doesn't exist knot solution for a given projected angle $\bar{\theta}$, we call $\bar{\theta}$ the unpermitted projection angle. Thus, the probability of a changing piece is obtained as $\frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\bar{\theta} = \frac{1}{N}$ where $\int d\bar{\theta} = \frac{2\pi}{N}$ denotes the summation of all permitted projected angles $\bar{\theta}$. For a changing piece, the probability for finding a zero is just its particle number, i.e., $\frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\bar{\theta} = \langle \hat{K} \rangle = \frac{1}{N}$. As a result, if we ignore the contribution from background (the uniform variant), the probability density $n(x) = \frac{1}{\Delta V_p} \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\bar{\theta}$ for finding a zero is obtained as

$$n(x) = \left\langle \frac{\Delta \hat{K}}{\Delta V_p} \right\rangle \equiv \rho_{\text{piece}}(x). \quad (42)$$

This result indicates that the probability density for finding an elementary particle is equal to the density of changing piece $\rho_{\text{piece}}(x)$.

When people try to understand quantum mechanics, they always insist on classical picture. According to usual classical picture, they have a hidden assumption – "the elementary particle is an indivisible point on a rigid space". Now, based on the "classical" picture of quantum states, we have same situation – the elementary particle in quantum mechanics is indeed an indivisi-




FIG. 11: Logic structure of kinetic theory for quantum mechanics. In this figure, we show the intrinsic relationship between different descriptions/pictures for quantum mechanics.

ble point with zero size on a rigid space. Therefore, until now, everyone could understand why quantum mechanics is very strange. The situation looks like that blind man feeling an elephant. In addition, the existence of such a "classical" picture leads to the existence of a lot of "misleading" confused interpretations of quantum mechanics, such hidden invariable interpretation, many world interpretation, stochastic interpretation... In the end of the paper, we will discuss this issue in detail.

7. Summary

In Fig.12, we show logic structure for kinetic theory for quantum mechanics. In Fig.13, we show the properties of an elementary particle under different descriptions/pictures. Now, the intrinsic relationship between different descriptions/pictures for quantum mechanics becomes clear! According to it, the description in usual quantum mechanics is just "wave function" description, that is a special "field" description with compactification. In particular, for an arbitrary wave function $\psi(x)$, we can recover its non-local character by doing non-compactification and changing reference from "varying" reference to "constant" one.

In the end of this part, we address completeness of quantum mechanics. Einstein had questioned the completeness of quantum mechanics until he died. In this section, we confirm to the *incompleteness* of quantum mechanics. Let us give a short explanation. In usual quantum mechanics that is a theory under "wave function" description, the original information about k_0 losses and the size of an elementary particle turns into zero on Cartesian space. As a result, the dynamics for "space" is reduced to particle's motion on rigid space. In a word, *it is the information losing that leads to incompleteness of*

	Properties on changing space	Properties on Cartesian space
"Space" description	Indivisible object with π phase changing	A group of changing pieces with finite size l_p
"Field" description	Indivisible object with π phase changing	A group of changing pieces with finite size l_p
"Wave function" description	Indivisible object with π phase changing	A group of changing pieces with zero size
"Classical" picture	A point	A point

FIG. 12: Comparison between properties of an elementary particle under different descriptions/pictures for quantum mechanics. In this figure, we show that for single elementary particle, "space" description is equivalent to "field" description, and "wave function" description and "classical" picture for quantum mechanics are both "incomplete".

quantum mechanics!

D. Quantum states for many elementary particles

To develop a new, complete theoretical framework for quantum mechanics, another important question is *What is the relationship between different information units of physical reality?* In this part, by taking a 1D physical variant as an example, we will answer this question and show "space"/"field" description of quantum states for two or more elementary particles. In addition, from point view of "space"/"field" description, we show that the fermionic statistics and quantum entanglement come from the intrinsic "space" character for many elementary particles.

1. Different descriptions of quantum states for many elementary particles

Firstly, we define a system with many elementary particles. Because each elementary particle is a π -phase changing on Clifford group space, a system with n elementary particles is an $n\pi$ -phase changing on Clifford group space. Due to $n\pi \ll \Delta\phi$, this physical variant with extra n elementary particles $V_1^{\text{particle}}(\Delta\phi \pm n\pi, \Delta x, k_0)$ is also quasi-uniform.

Under "space" description, $V_1^{\text{particle}}(\Delta\phi \pm n\pi, \Delta x, k_0)$ is defined by a mapping between $C_{1,1}$ with two types of space elements $\delta\phi^A, \delta\phi^B$ and the Cartesian space C_1 with

one type of space elements δx , i.e.,

$$V_1^{\text{particle}}(\Delta\phi \pm n\pi, \Delta x, k_0) : \begin{aligned} \{\delta\phi^A, \delta\phi^B\} &\in C_{l,1} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \{\delta x\} \in C_1 \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

where k_0 , denotes fixed changing rate, $\Delta\phi \pm n\pi$ denotes the total size of Clifford group space. As a result, $V_1^{\text{particle}}(\Delta\phi \pm n\pi, \Delta x, k_0)$ is determined by the distribution of the space elements $\delta\phi^B$ on a physical uniform variant $V_1^{\text{phy}}(\Delta\phi, \Delta x, k_0)$, of which the summation of total space elements is $n\pi$, i.e., $\sum_i (\delta\phi_i^B) = n\pi$.

Under "field" description, the reference is a physical uniform variant V_C^{phy} that is a special complex field in Cartesian space as $z_0(x) = \exp(i\phi(x))$ where $\phi(x) = \phi_0 + k_0x$. The quasi-uniform variant is effectively reduced into $V_1^{\text{particle}}(\pm n\pi, \Delta x, k_0)$. When we consider the quasi-uniform variant by adding a distribution of the space elements $\delta\phi_i^B(x_i)$ at x_i with a fixed total phase changing $\sum_i \delta\phi_i^B(x_i) = n\pi$. Then, the original complex field $z_0(x)$ turns into another complex field $z(x)$ for $V_1^{\text{particle}}(\pm n\pi, \Delta x, k_0)$, $z_0(x) \rightarrow z(x) = \hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{C/E}(\delta\phi^B)z_0$ where $\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{C/E}(\delta\phi^B(x, t)) = \prod_{j=1}^n (\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{C/E})^j(x, t)$, and j denotes the index of different elementary particles. Now, $(\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{C/E})^j(x, t) = \prod_i \hat{U}_j(\delta\phi_i^B(x_i))$ corresponds to the generation of j -th elementary particle with $(\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{C/E})^j = e^{i((\delta\phi_i^B) \cdot \hat{K}_j)}$ and $\hat{K}_j = -i \frac{d}{d\phi_j}$. Under "field" description, the size of space elements is finite, i.e., $\delta\phi_i^B(x_i) = k_0\delta x_i$.

Under "wave function" description, we get the description of usual quantum mechanics. This is a well known description. Now, the size of space elements of wave function on Cartesian space is zero, i.e., $\delta x_i = 0$.

2. Fermionic statistics

To distinguish the statistics for the particles, we consider two particles in 1D case. Firstly, we point out that the identicality of different elementary particle. In mathematics, the functions of two particles for same quantum state have the same formula. For example, the operators to generate elementary particles are defined by $\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{C/E}(\delta\phi^B(x, t)) = \prod_{j=1}^n (\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{C/E})^j(x, t)$ where $(\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{C/E})^j = e^{i((\delta\phi_i^B) \cdot \hat{K}_j)}$ and $\hat{K}_j = -i \frac{d}{d\phi_j}$. Arbitrary changing pieces for the two particles are identical. So, the elementary particles are identical particle.

Next, we study the quantum statistics for elementary particles. Because an elementary particle in 1D case is a π -changing, when there exists an extra elementary particle, the periodic boundary condition of systems along arbitrary direction is changed into anti-periodic boundary condition. As a result, elementary particles (topological defects of spacetime) obey fermionic statistics.




FIG. 13: Under "wave function" description, we shows the extra π phase shifting under exchanging two elementary particles A and B with zero size on Cartesian space. Therefore, elementary particles obey fermionic statistics.

For two static particles, we have

$$\Psi(x, x') \rightarrow \hat{U}_{\text{particle},1}^{C/E}(x', t) \cdot \hat{U}_{\text{particle},2}^{C/E}(x, t)z_0 \quad (44)$$

where $\hat{U}_{\text{particle},1/2}^{C/E}(x', t)$ denotes the operation generating an elementary particle with π -phase changing. After exchanging two particles, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(x', x) &\sim [\hat{U}_{\text{particle},1}^{C/E}(x', t) \cdot \hat{U}_{\text{particle},2}^{C/E}(x, t)]z_0 \quad (45) \\ &\rightarrow \Psi(x, x') = -[\hat{U}_{\text{particle},2}^{C/E}(x', t) \cdot \hat{U}_{\text{particle},1}^{C/E}(x, t)]z_0 \\ &\rightarrow -\Psi(x, x'). \end{aligned}$$

Under "wave function" description, we then introduce the second quantization representation for fermionic particles by defining fermionic operator $c^\dagger(x)$ as

$$\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{C/E}(x', t) \implies c^\dagger(x, t). \quad (46)$$

According to the fermionic statistics, there exists anti-commutation relation

$$\{c(x, t), c^\dagger(x, t)\} = \delta(x - x'). \quad (47)$$

In "wave function" description, the illustration of fermionic statistics is shown in Fig.14. An extra π phase changing is obtained under exchanging two elementary particles with zero size on Cartesian space.

In summary, the fermionic statistics comes from the algebraic relationship (or tensor category) between two elementary particles and indicates a *non-trivial "space" character* under "field"/"space" description, i.e.,

$$\text{Fermionic statistics for elementary particles} \quad (48)$$

\iff Topological relationship between two information units of "space".




FIG. 14: (a) The function for a 2π -particle with 2 particles under "field" description; (b) A geometric representation for a unified 2π -particle with correlated 2 zeros under "field" description

3. Quantum entanglement

Quantum entanglement is a physical phenomenon for many-body systems. According to quantum entanglement, the quantum state of each particle cannot be described independently of the others, even when the particles are separated by a large distance. In this part, we show the approach to recover its "space" character from traditional wave functions. This will help people to understand this strange non-local phenomena in quantum mechanics clearly.

An entangled state for n -body quantum system comes from new type of particles – $n\pi$ -particle that is a composite object with n π -phase changings. In general, the quantum states for a $n\pi$ -particle cannot be reduced into a product state of the wave-function for n particles and become entangled.

Under "field" description, the function for a unified 2π -knot is given by

$$z_{2\pi} = \exp[i\phi_{2\pi}(x)], \quad (49)$$

with

$$\phi_{2\pi}(x) = \begin{cases} \phi_0, & x \in (-\infty, x_0] \\ \phi_0 + k_0(x - x_0), & x \in (x_0, x_0 + 2a] \\ \phi_0 + 2\pi, & x \in (x_0 + 2a, \infty) \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

where ϕ_0 is constant. See the illustration of a 2π -particle under "field" description in Fig.15. The space elements for entangled two particles comes from particle pieces of 2π -particle rather than from two independent two π -particles.

The concept of composite particle can be generalized to the entangled states for $n\pi$ -particles. Under "field" description, the function for unified elementary particle is given by

$$z_{n\pi} = \exp[i\phi_{n\pi}(x, t)], \quad (51)$$

with

$$\phi_{n\pi}(x) = \begin{cases} \phi_0, & x \in (-\infty, x_0] \\ \phi_0 + k_0(x - x_0), & x \in (x_0, x_0 + na] \\ \phi_0 + n\pi, & x \in (x_0 + na, \infty) \end{cases}. \quad (52)$$

In summary, the entangled states for two particles indicates a fact that the $n\pi$ -particles must be considered a unified object or a composite object with $n\pi$ phase changing. Quantum entanglement comes from the coherent quantum motion for $n\pi$ -particles (that is a composite object of n particles) and indicates a *hidden "spacetime" structure* for quantum states of multi-particles, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Quantum entanglement} && (53) \\ &\iff \text{coherent quantum} \\ &\text{motion for } n\pi\text{-particles.} \end{aligned}$$

In the end, we address issue of quantum entanglement from point view of "classical" picture. In "classical" picture under "field" description, n elementary particles are projected into n zeroes (or n "classical" objects) on rigid space. The coherent motion of $n\pi$ -particles leads to correlated motion of these n "classical" objects. This phenomenon is very strange. We can see that it is the mathematical *projection* that is responsible for all physical anomaly. To naturally understand this strange phenomenon, one must recover their "space" character.

4. Summary

In summary, the quantum entanglement comes from the coherent quantum motion for a unified object of n particles (that is $n\pi$ -particle) and indicates a *hidden "space" structure* of many particles, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Quantum entanglement} && (54) \\ &\iff \text{Hidden "space" structure} \\ &\text{of many particles.} \end{aligned}$$

E. Time-evolution of a quantum states and the emergence of Schrödinger equation

To uncover the underlying physics of quantum mechanics, an important question is *what law does the time evolution of physical reality obey and what's the corresponding equation? or why the time-evolution of a quantum states of an elementary particles obeys Schrödinger equation?* We then discuss the time-evolution of a given state in a physical variant and try to derive Schrödinger equation.

When there exists an additional particle on uniform variant, the total volume of the system slightly changes

$$H \rightarrow H' = H + \Delta H \quad (55)$$

where $\Delta H \propto \Delta V$ is the volume changing, and $\Delta V \ll V$. On the other hand, the energy of a particle is described by a slightly changing of angular velocity on the system, $\omega_0 \rightarrow \omega_0 + \Delta\omega$. Because the system rotates globally with very fast angular velocity, i.e., $\omega_0 \gg \Delta\omega$, the energy changing of a particle with fixed angular momentum \hbar is obtained as

$$\Delta H = J_{\text{particle}} \cdot \Delta\omega = \hbar \cdot \Delta\omega. \quad (56)$$

From the wave-function $\psi(\vec{x}, t) = \sum_p c_p e^{-i\Delta\omega \cdot t + i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{x}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Delta\omega \rangle &= \int \psi^*(x, t) \Delta\omega \psi(x, t) dV_P \\ &= \int [\sum_p c_p^* e^{i\Delta\omega \cdot t - i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{x}}] (i \frac{\partial}{\partial t}) \\ &\times [\sum_{p'} c_{p'} e^{-i\Delta\omega \cdot t + i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{x}}] dV_P \\ &= \int \psi^*(\vec{x}, t) (i \frac{d}{dt}) \psi(\vec{x}, t) dV_P. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

These results ($E = \hbar \cdot \Delta\omega$ and $\Delta\omega \rightarrow \hat{\omega} = i \frac{d}{dt}$) indicates that the energy becomes operator

$$E \rightarrow \hat{H} = \hbar \cdot i \frac{d}{dt}. \quad (58)$$

As a result we derive the Schrödinger equation for particles as

$$i\hbar \frac{d\psi(\vec{x}, t)}{dt} = \hat{H}\psi(\vec{x}, t) \quad (59)$$

where \hat{H} is the Hamiltonian of elementary particles. For the eigenstate with eigenvalue E ,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}\psi(\vec{x}, t) &= E\psi(\vec{x}, t) \\ &= \hbar \cdot \Delta\omega \psi(\vec{x}, t), \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

the wave-function becomes $\psi(\vec{x}, t) = f(\vec{x}) \exp(\frac{iEt}{\hbar})$ where $f(\vec{x})$ is spatial function.

Schrödinger equation is an inevitable result of linearization behavior of particle's energy around a periodically motion $\omega_0 \rightarrow \omega_0 + \Delta\omega$. Therefore, the time-evolution of a quantum states of an elementary particles obeys Schrödinger equation, i.e.,

Schrödingere quation

\iff An equation for perturbation on periodical motion of space.

V. REDEFINING CLASSICAL PHYSICS VIA DYNAMICS FOR SPACE

In above discussion, we show that quantum world really comes from a physical variant. However, in our usual world, the objects are "classical" that obey classical mechanics rather than quantum mechanics. *How to explain this fact from the starting point of quantum mechanics?* In this part, we will answer this question and develop a Monism theory for our world.

A. The definition of "classical object"

Before developing a Monism theory for our world, we must answer one more fundamental question, i.e., "What is classical object?" In classical mechanics, one assumes that all objects are classical and consist of the mass points. However, in quantum mechanics, the situation becomes complex. In this part, we will show that the classical objects on physical variant are really a mixed state for a whole quantum object with n particle.

Firstly, we define *Globally disordered quasi-uniform variant*.

Definition – Globally disordered quasi-uniform variant $\tilde{V}_{d,q}$: $\tilde{V}_{d,q}$ is defined by a disordered mapping between a d -dimensional Clifford group space $C_{l,d}$ and the d -dimensional Cartesian space C_d , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}_{d,q} : \{ \delta\phi^{\mu,A}, \delta\phi^{\mu,B} \} \in C_{l,d} \\ \iff^{\text{disorder}} \{ \delta x^\mu \} \in C_d. \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where \iff^{disorder} denotes a disordered mapping under fixed changing rate of integer multiple. The total size $\Delta\phi^{\mu,B}$ that corresponds to $n\pi$ -particle is much smaller than that of $\Delta\phi^{\mu,A}$ along an arbitrary direction.

In other word, the disordered quasi-uniform variant $\tilde{V}_{d,q}$ has a random distribution of changing pieces $\delta\phi_j^{\mu,B}$. It is obvious that a globally disordered quasi-uniform variant $\tilde{V}_{d,q}$ doesn't describe a usual (pure) quantum state. Instead, it describes the mixed state.

Next, we define the classical object by using the concept of globally disordered quasi-uniform variant $\tilde{V}_{d,q}$.

Definition – classical object: For an object of n particles and size L in Cartesian space C_d , it becomes a classical one if the corresponding quasi-uniform variant $V_{q,d}$ is globally disordered.

In quantum mechanics, the classical objects correspond to globally mixed states for n particles that really the decoherence of the degree of freedom of center of mass. Let us show the concept of classical object by using its "field" description.

During the first step, we unify the n particles into a single object – a composite object of $n\pi$ -particle. For example, under "field" description, the function for $n\pi$ -particle is given by

$$z = \exp[i\phi(x)], \quad (62)$$

with

$$\phi(x) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \phi_0, x \in (-\infty, x_0] \\ \phi_0 + k_0(x - x_0), x \in (x_0, x_0 + na] \\ \phi_0 + n\pi, x \in (x_0 + na, \infty) \end{array} \right\}. \quad (63)$$

Then, during the second step, we divide a complete Clifford group space of $n\pi$ -particle into N pieces ($N \rightarrow \infty$) in the region of L ($L \gg \frac{n}{k_0}$). During the third step, we consider a random distribution of all changing pieces. Now, $\phi(x)$ becomes a random number, i.e.,




FIG. 15: The comparison between a quantum object (a) and a classical object (b): for a quantum object (a), the changing pieces have ordered phase angle while the those of classical object (b) has globally disordered phase angle. In the magnifier of (a), we show that the changing rate for each piece is k_0 ; in the magnifier of (b), the changing piece turns into a point with a random phase.

$\phi(x) \in \text{rand}(0, k_0 L \cdot 2\pi)$ and function for variant is

$$z(x) \rightarrow z(x) = \prod_{j=1}^N (\hat{U}_{\text{particle}}^{\text{C/E}}(x', t))^j z_0$$

where $z_0 = \exp(ikx + i\phi_0)$ and $(x_0)_i$ is a random number.

Under "field" description, Fig.16 shows the difference between a quantum object and a classical object: for a quantum object, the changing pieces have ordered phase angle while those of classical objects have globally disordered phase angle. Under compactification, we return to its "wave function" description, and have a quantum state with random phase factor for the degree of freedom of center of mass. In the magnifier of (a), we show that the changing rate for each piece is k_0 ; in the magnifier of (b), the changing piece turns into a point with a random phase. Therefore, without "space" character, one can naturally believe that the classical object is certain object on a rigid space.

Finally, we discuss the motion of a system of n particles with random distribution of changing pieces. When far away, the system can be regarded as a mass point with total mass $M = n \cdot m$ where m is the mass for single particle. The dynamics for the "classical" object can be derived by considering Lorentz boost $x \rightarrow x' = x - vt$.

Under the Lorentz boost, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x) \rightarrow \psi(x') &= \hat{U}(\delta\phi_{\frac{1}{N}\text{-particle}, (x_0)_1 - vt}) \quad (64) \\ &\cdot \hat{U}(\delta\phi_{\frac{1}{N}\text{-particle}, (x_0)_2 - vt}) \dots \\ &\cdot \hat{U}(\delta\phi_{\frac{1}{N}\text{-particle}, (x_0)_N - vt}) \psi_0 \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^N \hat{U}(\delta\phi_{\frac{1}{N}\text{-particle}, (x_0)_i - vt}) \psi_0. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, the changing pieces have a globally moving with velocity v . Due to Lorentz invariant, we have the total energy and total momentum to be $E = \sqrt{\vec{p}^2 + M^2}$ and $\vec{p} = M\vec{v}$. These relationships between \vec{p} , E , \vec{v} indicate a classical mechanics. Here, we set "light" velocity c to be unit.

In summary, the emergent of classical object comes from disordered changing pieces. In a word, "disorder is difference"!

B. Classification of physical processes

In above parts, we show that the classical objects are a group of changing pieces with random distribution and the quantum objects are a group of changing pieces with regular distribution. There are four types of processes in our world, U-process, C-process, R-process, R^{-1} -process.

U-process denotes a process of unitary time evolution in quantum mechanics, that is characterized by Schrödinger equation. Now, the regular distribution of the changing pieces for a quantum object smoothly changes. We may denote a U-process by

$$V_{d,q1} \implies V_{d,q2} \quad (65)$$

where $V_{d,q1}$ and $V_{d,q2}$ are the original ordered quasi-uniform variant and final ordered quasi-uniform variant, respectively. Here, " \implies " means time evolution.

C-process denotes a process of time evolution in classical mechanics, that is characterized by Newton equation. Now, one disordered distribution of the changing pieces for a classical object globally shift. We may denote a C-process by

$$\tilde{V}_{d,q1} \implies \tilde{V}_{d,q2} \quad (66)$$

where $\tilde{V}_{d,q1}$ and $\tilde{V}_{d,q2}$ denote the original disordered quasi-uniform variant and final disordered quasi-uniform variant, respectively.

R-process denotes a process from a quantum object to a classical one, that is characterized by Master equation. Now, a regular distribution of the changing pieces for a quantum object suddenly changes into a disordered distribution of the changing pieces for a classical object. We may denote a R-process by

$$V_{d,q1} \implies \tilde{V}_{d,q2} \quad (67)$$




FIG. 16: An illustration of four types of processes between classical object and quantum object

where $V_{d,q1}$ and $\tilde{V}_{d,q2}$ denote the original ordered quasi-uniform variant and final disordered quasi-uniform variant, respectively.

R^{-1} -process denotes a process from a classical object to a quantum one. Now, A disordered distribution of the changing pieces for a classical object changes into a regular distribution of the changing pieces for a quantum object. This is a process in measurement to prepare a quantum state. We may denote a R^{-1} -process by

$$\tilde{V}_{d,q1} \implies V_{d,q2} \quad (68)$$

where $\tilde{V}_{d,q1}$ and $V_{d,q2}$ denote the original disordered quasi-uniform variant and final ordered quasi-uniform variant, respectively.

Fig.17 shows the four types of processes between classical object and quantum object.

VI. MEASUREMENT THEORY IN QUANTUM MECHANICS

A. Physical reality of measurement

In physics, measurement is a very important issue. People obtain the physical properties of certain systems through experiments and test the rationality of physical laws. In particular, in quantum mechanics, measurement is quite different from that in classical mechanics. Then, a question is "How to measure the motions for physical reality in quantum mechanics?" According to the Copenhagen interpretation, there exists phenomenological "wave-function collapse" during measurement process. The wave-function collapse is random and indeterministic and the predicted value of the measurement is described by a probability distribution. In this part, to answer above question, one must answer a more funda-

mental question, i.e., "What is physical reality measurement in quantum mechanics?"

In classical mechanics, during the measurement process, we may assume that there at least exist three physical objects – measured object (classical object A), the surveyors or instruments (classical object B), and fixed spacetime. One describes measured object (classical object A) by the surveyors or instruments (classical object B). In mathematic, the measurement process can be considered as a time evolution of classical objects on rigid spacetime, i.e.,

$$\text{Classical measurement: } \tilde{V}_{d,qA} \implies \tilde{V}_{d,qA'}. \quad (69)$$

During measurement, the classical object A changes to the classical object A'.

However, the situation for quantum measurement becomes complex. To develop a measurement theory for quantum mechanics, we firstly analyse the physical reality of the measurement processes in quantum mechanics. During the measurement in quantum mechanics, people try to know the information of quantum objects described by its local description or wave functions $\psi(\vec{x}, t)$. Therefore, during this process, we may assume that there at least exist three physical objects – measured object (quantum objects described by wave function $\psi(\vec{x}, t)$), the surveyors (instruments on fixed spacetime), and the fixed spacetime. It is obvious that the surveyors (or the instruments) are large, complex classical objects. This is an *assumption* for quantum measurement. In other words, the surveyors (or the instruments) are a group of changing pieces with random distribution.

B. Quantum measurement: acquisition of global information via indirect classical measurement

In above parts, we show the physical reality of quantum measurement, based on which we define the measurement processes in quantum mechanics.

Definition – quantum measurement: The quantum measurement is a measurement of information of an unknown quantum state from the changings of classical states of instruments B, i.e.,

$$\text{Quantum measurement: } \tilde{V}_{d,qB} \implies \tilde{V}_{d,qB'}. \quad (70)$$

Therefore, from above definition, quantum measurement is "indirect" measurement.

Let us give a detail explanation. Before quantum measurement, we have quantum object A (the original measured quantum object) and classical object B (the original classical surveyors). During measurement, the quantum object A changes to another (we denote it by A') and the classical object of instrument B changes to another B'. One knows the total energy, total momentum (and other global physical conserved quantities) of the quantum object A by checking the difference between B and B'. In other words, in mathematic, the measurement

process in quantum mechanics can be really considered as a classical one between the original classical object B and the final classical object B' on rigid spacetime, i.e.,

Quantum measurement \rightarrow Classical measurement:

$$\tilde{V}_{d,qB} \implies \tilde{V}_{d,qB'}. \quad (71)$$

This is actually very understandable: measurement is to see certain changings of the instruments by surveyors. We then extrapolate the quantum states from the changings of the instruments.

C. Quantum measurement: decoherence

Although quantum measurement is an "indirect" measurement, people want to know the final state of quantum object (or A'). We point out that A' is a classical object on rigid spacetime after the measurement process, that is denoted by the following process, i.e.,

$$\text{Quantum measurement: } V_{d,qA} \implies \tilde{V}_{d,qA'}. \quad (72)$$

Let us give a detail explanation. To obtain the global information of quantum measured object (for example, the energy, or the momentum), one need to transfer it to classical surveyors. The more complete the energy/momentum transfers, the more accurate the measurement results. After energy/momentum transfers, the quantum states of quantum objects become decoherence. As a result, the final state of the measured quantum object is a static classical object that is a group of static changing pieces with random distribution and without residue energy/momentum. So, during quantum measurement there must exist a R-process that denotes a process from a quantum object to a classical one. This is called decoherence in traditional quantum physics.

It was already known that during quantum measurement, there exists *decoherence* for quantum objects. To accurate characterize the quantum measurement processes and show decoherence, the theory is about the open quantum mechanics and already matured. By using the theory of open quantum mechanics, one may consider the quantum measured objects to be a sub-system coupling a thermal bath that is classical system. In principle, one can derive the detailed results of the decoherence by solving the master equation.

In summary, from above discussion, after quantum measurement, people obtain the global information of quantum measured objects and loss its internal information at the same time. The physical reality of quantum measured objects changes. Therefore, there indeed exists "wave-function collapse" during measurement process that corresponds to R-process that denotes a process from a quantum object to a classical one.

D. The probability in quantum measurement

In quantum mechanics, U-process, a process of unitary time evolution is deterministic and characterized by Schrödinger equation. However, the situation becomes quite different during quantum measurement that corresponds to random R-process. *Why R-process (or the wave-function collapse) is random and indeterministic and the predicted value of the measurement is described by a probability distribution?* Let us answer this question.

To prove above result, our starting point is the non-local "space" picture of final measured state that is a group of static changing pieces with random distribution. Then, we introduce a new concept of "quantum ensemble":

Definition – quantum ensemble: A quantum ensemble is an ensemble of a lot of same final measured state, of which all space elements are identical and cannot be distinguishable.

Remark: Without additional internal information, due to indistinguishability each changing piece has the same probability (that is $\frac{1}{N}$) to find an elementary particle.

Let us show the detail on the probability in quantum measurement. Now, after quantum measurement, the original quantum object becomes decoherence. We have a group of static changing pieces with random distribution, each of which is $\frac{1}{N}$ particle. We consider a lot of same final measured state (for example, n particle, $n \rightarrow \infty$). This is a system with $n \times N$ identical space elements. Such a quantum ensemble is characterized by a group of static changing pieces for n particle. Among $n \times N$ space elements, arbitrary N changing pieces correspond to a particle. If the density of changing pieces is ρ_{piece} , the density of a changing pieces is just $\frac{1}{N}\rho_{\text{particle}}$ that is just the probability to find a particle in a given region $\psi^*(\vec{x}, t)\psi(\vec{x}, t)\Delta V$. We emphasize that although one obtains a "classical" object from quantum one, the quantum measurement is different from "knot" projection classical. One should distinguish them and doesn't mix up.

From point view of quantum mechanics, the probability in quantum mechanics comes from the measurement. During quantum measurement, quantum objects turn into a classical. Fig.18 shows the comparison between statistical probability in statistical physics and quantum probability in quantum measurement. Einstein had said, "Quantum mechanics is certainly imposing. But an inner voice tells me that it is not yet the real thing. The theory says a lot, but does not really bring us any closer to the secret of the 'old one'. I, at any rate, am convinced that He does not throw dice." Then, in principle, a classical observer will never obtain complete information of a quantum object that is described by wave functions. And, it is indeed the decoherence (or R-process) that throws dice!

F. Application 2: Schrödinger’s cat paradox

	Statistical probability	Quantum probability
Physical reality	Many elementary particles	A particle that split into infinite changing pieces
Physical state	Chaotic multi-particle system	Chaotic system of many changing pieces for a particle
Application	Statistical Physics and Thermodynamics	Quantum measurement

FIG. 17: Comparison between statistical probability in statistical physics and quantum probability in quantum measurement




FIG. 18: An illustration of measurement-decoherence effect in double-slit experiment

E. Application 1: Double-slit experiment

In this section, we give an explanation on the double-slit experiment.

Before measurement in double-slit experiment, the particle can be regarded as a group of changing pieces with regular distribution, that is described by the wave-function. There is no classical path. There exists particular interference pattern on the screen that agrees to the prediction from quantum mechanics. If there exists an additional observer near one of a slit, R-process occurs. The original quantum object changes into a classical one that is a group of changing pieces with random distribution. Now, the result of measurement is like a classical result. As a result, the phase coherence is destructed and the interference disappears. See the illustration in Fig.19.

Another famous puzzle of quantum foundation is the Schrödinger’s cat paradox. In this part, we solve the paradox.

Firstly, we need to analyse the physical reality of this special process. In particular, there at least exist five physical objects – the measured object (quantum objects described by wave function $\psi(\vec{x}, t)$), the instrument to detect quantum states, the cat, the device for killing cats and the fixed spacetime. It is obvious that the instrument to detect quantum states, the cat, the device for killing cats are all large, complex classical objects. We denote the measured object, the instrument to detect quantum states, the cat, the device for killing cats to be quantum object A, classical object B, C, D, respectively. The key point is when the R-process (or decoherence, or wave-function collapse) occurs, at which the quantum object turns into a classical one. It is obvious the R-process occurs between quantum object A and classical object B. After the R-process, the classical object B changes into classical object B’. After it, all processes occur between classical object B, C, D that have nothing to do with quantum measurement and will have no mystery.

Because the wave-function collapse at first step, all processes after it are classical. As a result, there definitely doesn’t exist a ”quantum state” of dead cat and living cat.

VII. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION:

In this paper, we will answer the question and give a new framework on the foundation of quantum mechanics. In particular, quantum mechanics is generalized to dynamics for ”space”, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\text{Quantum mechanics} \\
 &\text{(an incomplete phenomenological theory)} \\
 &\implies \text{dynamics for "space"} \\
 &\text{(a complete microscopic theory)}. \tag{73}
 \end{aligned}$$

See the dynamics for space of quantum mechanics in Fig.22. Physical laws emerge from regular changings on spacetime. In the new theory of quantum mechanics, ”locality” is replaced by ”non-locality” – particles are non-local objects and have an effect on the whole ”space”; ”separability” is replaced by ”unification” – matters and their motion are different types of changings of the same object (physical variant). In particular, elementary particles are changings of ”space” rather than extra objects on it.

In the end of the paper, we provide the explanation of fundamental principles in quantum mechanics from ”space” dynamics.

Firstly, we discuss complementarity principle. In quantum mechanics, complementarity principle is fundamental proposed by Born. From the point view of ”space-

Quantum mechanics	\implies	Theory of dynamics for "space"
Physical reality	\implies	Physical variant (or quantum spacetime)
Matter	\implies	Contraction/expansion of "space"
Motion	\implies	Local contraction/expansion of "space" with fixed size
Quantization	\implies	Elementary particle's "angular momentum"
Particle's statistics	\implies	Topological relationship between two unit of a "space"
Quantum entanglement	\implies	Hidden "space" structure of Many elementary particles
Schrödinger equation	\implies	An equation for perturbation on periodical motion of "space"

FIG. 19: (Color online) Quantum mechanics as a dynamics for "space"

time" dynamics, it comes from complementarity property of particles: On the one hand, an elementary particle has fixed changings in Clifford group space – a topological phase-changing $\Delta\phi^\mu = \pi$; On the other hand, its quantum state has a phase angle ϕ_0 that is determined by wave function. One cannot exactly determine the phase angle of an elementary particle by observing its phase-changing. We call this property to be complementarity principle in quantum mechanics.

Secondly, we discuss wave–particle duality. Wave–particle duality is the fact that elementary particles exhibit both particle-like behavior and wave-like behavior. As Einstein wrote: *"It seems as though we must use sometimes the one theory and sometimes the other, while at times we may use either. We are faced with a new kind of difficulty. We have two contradictory pictures of reality; separately neither of them fully explains*

the phenomena of light, but together they do". Here, we point out that wave–particle duality of quantum particles is really a duality between a topological unit of Clifford group space and its mapping to real space. On one hand, in Clifford group space a particle is a fixed topological phase-changing object and can never be divided into two parts. Thus, it shows particle-like behavior; On the other hand, after mapping onto real space it looks like a wave and shows wave-like behavior that is characterized by wave-functions.

Thirdly, we discuss uncertainty principle. For quantum mechanics, the uncertainty principle is related to the "fragmentation" of an elementary particle in real space. Now, an elementary particle may spread the whole system rather than localizes a given point. And, the weight for finding a particle is obvious proportional to local density of the space elements of it. The momentum denotes the spatial distribution of changing pieces; the energy denotes the temporal distribution of changing pieces. For example, a uniform distribution of changing pieces $\psi(x, t) \sim e^{-i\omega t + i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{x}}$ describes by a wave-function of a plane wave has fixed projected momentum $\vec{p} = \hbar\vec{k}$. For this case, we know momentum of the particle but it has no given position. Another example is an elementary particle with unified changing pieces $\psi(x, t) \sim \delta(\vec{x} - \vec{x}_0)$ that can be regarded as a superposition state of $\psi(x, t) \sim \sum_k e^{-i\omega t + i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{x}}$. For this case, we know the position of the particle but it has no given momentum.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by NSFC Grant No. 11974053, 12174030.

[1] A. Einstein. Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Berlin (Math Physics), 844 (1915).
 [2] M. Jammer, *The philosophy of quantum mechanics* (Wiley, New York, 1974).
 [3] De Broglie, L., *The Current interpretation of Wave Mechanics. A Critical Study* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1964).
 [4] D. Bohm, Phys. Rev. 85, 166 (1952); Phys. Rev. 85, 180 (1952).

[5] H. Everett, Rev. Mod. Phys. 29, 454 (1957).
 [6] E. Nelson, Phys. Rev. 150, 1079 (1966).
 [7] A. Connes, *Noncommutative Geometry*, Academic Press, 1994.
 [8] R. Jackiw and C. Rebbi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 36, 1116 (1976); P. Hasenfratz and G. 't Hooft, 36, 1119 (1976); A. S. Goldhaber, 36, 1122 (1976).