

# Stochastic Mechanics Without Ad Hoc Quantization: Theory And Applications To Semiclassical Gravity

# **Stochastic Mechanics Without Ad Hoc Quantization: Theory And Applications To Semiclassical Gravity**

**Stochastische mechanica zonder  
ad hoc quantisatie:  
theorie en toepassingen op  
semi-klassieke zwaartekracht**

(met een samenvatting in het Nederlands)

## **Proefschrift**

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor  
aan de Universiteit Utrecht  
op gezag van de rector magnificus, prof. dr. G. J. van der Zwaan,  
ingevolge het besluit van het college voor promoties  
in het openbaar te verdedigen  
op donderdag 19 oktober 2017 des middags te 12.45 uur

door

**Maaneli Derakhshani**

geboren op 3 oktober 1985  
te Rancho Palos Verdes, Verenigde Staten van Amerika

Promotoren: Prof. dr. R. B. Mann  
Prof. dr. L. T. G. Theunissen  
Copromotor: Dr. G. Bacciagaluppi



## Papers and Publications

- **Chapter 2**

A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: Zitterbewegung Stochastic Mechanics I  
Maaneli Derakhshani  
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1510.06391>

- **Chapter 3**

A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: Zitterbewegung Stochastic Mechanics II  
Maaneli Derakhshani  
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.08838>

- **Chapter 4**

Semiclassical Newtonian Field Theories Based On Stochastic Mechanics I  
Maaneli Derakhshani  
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1701.06893>

- **Chapter 5**

Semiclassical Newtonian Field Theories Based On Stochastic Mechanics II  
Maaneli Derakhshani  
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.02472>

Work which is not directly part of this dissertation (but is referenced throughout):

- Probing Gravitational Cat States In Canonical Quantum Theory vs. Objective Collapse Theories

Maaneli Derakhshani  
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1609.01711>

- Probing a Gravitational Cat State: Experimental Possibilities

Maaneli Derakhshani  
*Journal of Physics: Conference Series, Volume 1, conference 1 (2016)*  
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1603.04430>

- Newtonian Semiclassical Gravity in the Ghirardi-Rimini-Weber Theory with Matter Density Ontology  
Maaneli Derakhshani  
*Physics Letters A, Volume 378, Issue 14-15 (2014)*  
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1304.0471>
- The Newtonian Limit Of Stochastic Gravity Doesn't Entail The Many-Body Stochastic Schrödinger -Newton Equations Or Gravitationally-Induced Wavefunction Collapse  
Maaneli Derakhshani  
*(In preparation)*
- On Multi-Time Correlations And Effective Collapse In Stochastic Mechanics  
Maaneli Derakhshani and Guido Bacciagaluppi  
*(In preparation)*

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I</b>	<b>19</b>
2.1	Introduction . . . . .	19
2.2	Nelson-Yasue Stochastic Mechanics . . . . .	23
2.3	Wallstrom's Criticism . . . . .	31
2.4	Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion . . . . .	34
2.4.1	One free particle . . . . .	35
2.4.2	Classical Hamilton-Jacobi statistical mechanics for one free particle . . .	37
2.4.3	One particle interacting with external fields . . . . .	39
2.4.4	Classical Hamilton-Jacobi statistical mechanics for one particle interact- ing with external fields . . . . .	43
2.5	Zitterbewegung Stochastic Mechanics . . . . .	45
2.5.1	One free particle . . . . .	45
2.5.2	One particle interacting with external fields . . . . .	56
2.5.3	The central potential revisited . . . . .	65
2.6	Conclusion . . . . .	66
2.7	Acknowledgments . . . . .	66
<b>3</b>	<b>A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II</b>	<b>67</b>
3.1	Introduction . . . . .	67
3.2	Nelson-Yasue Stochastic Mechanics for Many Particles . . . . .	68
3.3	Interpretation of the Nelson-Yasue wavefunction . . . . .	78
3.4	Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion for Many Particles . . .	83
3.4.1	Free <i>zbw</i> particles . . . . .	83
3.4.2	Classical Hamilton-Jacobi statistical mechanics for free <i>zbw</i> particles . .	84
3.4.3	External fields interacting with <i>zbw</i> particles . . . . .	86
3.4.4	Classical Hamilton-Jacobi statistical mechanics for <i>zbw</i> particles inter- acting with external fields . . . . .	89
3.4.5	Classically interacting <i>zbw</i> particles . . . . .	91

# Contents

3.4.6	Classical Hamilton-Jacobi statistical mechanics for two interacting <i>zbw</i> particles . . . . .	96
3.4.7	Remarks on close-range interactions . . . . .	101
3.5	Zitterbewegung Stochastic Mechanics . . . . .	102
3.5.1	Free <i>zbw</i> particles . . . . .	102
3.5.2	Classical fields interacting with <i>zbw</i> particles . . . . .	119
3.5.3	Remark on on close-range interactions . . . . .	132
3.6	Plausibility of the Zitterbewegung Hypothesis . . . . .	132
3.7	Comparison to Other Answers . . . . .	137
3.8	Conclusion . . . . .	141
3.9	Acknowledgments . . . . .	141
<b>4</b>	<b>Semiclassical Newtonian Field Theories Based On Stochastic Mechanics I</b>	<b>143</b>
4.1	Introduction . . . . .	143
4.2	Overview of ZSM for many free particles . . . . .	147
4.3	ZSM-Newton/Coulomb: Basic equations . . . . .	159
4.4	Schrödinger-Newton/Coulomb equations as mean-field theories . . . . .	176
4.5	Comparison to other semiclassical Newtonian field theories . . . . .	190
4.5.1	Comparison to non-hidden-variable approaches . . . . .	190
4.5.2	Comparison to alternative hidden-variable approaches . . . . .	194
4.6	Conclusion . . . . .	207
4.7	Acknowledgments . . . . .	208
<b>5</b>	<b>Semiclassical Newtonian Field Theories Based On Stochastic Mechanics II</b>	<b>209</b>
5.1	Introduction . . . . .	209
5.2	Large $N$ center-of-mass approximation in ZSM-Newton/Coulomb . . . . .	211
5.2.1	General approach . . . . .	211
5.3	Classical nonlinear Schrödinger equation for large $N$ center-of-mass motion . . . . .	224
5.3.1	Oriols et al.'s derivation . . . . .	224
5.3.2	Conditional Madelung equations . . . . .	225
5.3.3	Comments on the classical nonlinear Schrödinger equation . . . . .	230
5.4	Recovering classical Newtonian gravity for many macro particles . . . . .	230
5.5	Recovering classical Vlasov-Poisson mean-field theory . . . . .	233
5.6	Incorporating environmental decoherence . . . . .	235
5.7	Conclusion . . . . .	236



<b>6</b>	<b>Appendix to Chapter 2</b>	<b>239</b>
6.1	Proof of the 1-particle Stochastic Variational Principle . . . . .	239
6.2	Classical Zitterbewegung in the Central Potential . . . . .	240
<b>7</b>	<b>Appendix to Chapter 3</b>	<b>243</b>
7.1	Proof of the $N$ -particle Stochastic Variational Principle . . . . .	243
<b>8</b>	<b>Summary and Outlook</b>	<b>245</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Samenvatting</b>	<b>247</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>About the author</b>	<b>249</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>251</b>



## Preface

This thesis is the culmination of a nearly decade-long journey. The journey started when I was a sophomore undergraduate at Stony Brook University (SBU), excitedly learning about Nelson's stochastic mechanics and the "Wallstrom criticism" thereof from the papers of Dr. Guido Bacciagaluppi, and from discussions with Prof. Sheldon (Shelly) Goldstein at Rutgers University. Having found stochastic mechanics a compelling way to make sense of quantum mechanics, I was determined to find an answer to the criticism. I explored various possibilities to no avail until, one day, out of sheer luck, I stumbled upon a dusty, yellow-paged book entitled "Observation and Interpretation: A Symposium of Philosophers and Physicists", in the bookcase of Dr. John Noé, the Director of the Laser Teaching Center at SBU. (Thank you for the book, John.)

This book, published in 1957, had among its contributions a little-known paper by David Bohm entitled "A proposed explanation of quantum theory in terms of hidden variables at a sub-quantum-mechanical level". In this paper, Bohm sketches a model - which he credits to Louis de Broglie (in fact, Bohm's model was just a slight reformulation of an idea suggested by de Broglie in the latter's Ph.D thesis, an idea which also happens to be the precursor to the de Broglie-Bohm pilot-wave theory) - of an elementary particle as a localized periodic process of fixed frequency in a hypothetical sub-quantum medium. Invoking the Lorentz transformation of special relativity, Bohm shows how the model recovers a quantization condition of Bohr-Sommerfeld type for the phase of the periodic process, and how this quantization condition is related to the single-valuedness condition on wavefunctions in quantum mechanics. In fact, the quantization condition obtained in the model of de Broglie and Bohm is precisely what's needed for stochastic mechanical theories to recover the Schrödinger equation of non-relativistic quantum mechanics (as I will explain in the thesis). And it was precisely the lack of justification for this quantization condition in stochastic mechanics that Wallstrom emphasized and criticized in the late 80's and early 90's. So it became clear to me how to answer the criticism - reformulate Nelson's stochastic mechanics so as to consistently incorporate the model of de Broglie and Bohm.

Throughout my circuitous path through graduate school, I persistently worked on this problem, hoping to base my Ph.D thesis on it. Eventually I would find the opportunity to do so under the supervision of Guido (mentioned above), Prof. Robb Mann (at the University of Waterloo), Prof. Bert Theunissen (at Utrecht University), and the flagship of Utrecht Uni-

## *Contents*

versity. Along the way, I extended the reformulated stochastic mechanics to the domain of semiclassical Newtonian gravity, finding that it has advantages over other approaches to semiclassical Newtonian gravity (e.g., the Schrödinger-Newton equation). The result is the thesis before you.

Maaneli (Max) Derakhshani  
Utrecht, February 28, 2022.

## Acknowledgements

So many people to thank. **Guido Bacciagaluppi**, for taking a chance on me as his first Ph.D candidate at Utrecht University, for always being a sounding board to my thoughts and ideas, for sharpening my thinking and writing, for helping me learn more about the foundations of physics than I could have on my own, for his open-mindedness, and just generally being one of the most kind and fair individuals I have ever known. **Bert Theunissen**, for his immense help with all things administrative, and his general enthusiasm and hospitality at the Director of the Descartes Centre. **Dennis Dieks**, for many enjoyable discussions about the foundations of physics, for helpful critical feedback on my work, for encouragement, for advice on funding possibilities in The Netherlands, and for his help in general with the Ph.D process (including being part of my thesis committee). **F. A. (Fred) Muller**, for his enthusiasm for foundations of physics, for his hospitality, and for enjoyable discussions. **Robb Mann**, for taking a chance on me when I approached him about being my co-supervisor many years ago, for hosting me one month in his group at the University of Waterloo in the summer of 2014, for inviting me up to his cottage for a weekend with his other students, for allowing me to write an ambitious grant proposal with him, for being a sounding board to my thoughts and ideas, and for his inspirational breadth of physics knowledge. **Bei-Lok Hu**, for taking a chance on me many years ago when I was an isolated physics graduate student, for his consistent and enthusiastic support of my career, for writing a paper with me despite not being a student at his academic institution, for being a sounding board for my thoughts and ideas, for integrating me into his network of colleagues (from whom I have learned an immense amount of physics), for inspiring me with his physics work from the time when I was an undergraduate, and for taking time out of his very busy schedule to be on my thesis committee. The other members of my thesis committee - **Ward Struyve**, **Nino Zanghì**, and **Harvey Brown**, thank you for taking the time to do this. I also want to thank **Ward** for many helpful discussions over the years about physics and career moves, for inspiring me with his work and persistence since the time I was an undergraduate, for his admirable patience and generosity, and for being a most reliable friend and colleague.

My office mates, **Fedde Benedictus**, **Ivan Flis**, **Noortje Jacobs**, **Jesper Oldenberger**, and **Steven Van Der Laan**, for many enjoyable discussions about science, philosophy, history, Dutch culture and politics, and American culture and politics. My Utrecht/Amsterdam/Rotterdam colleagues working in the foundations of physics, **Fedde Benedictus**, **Sebastian De Haro**,

**Gijs Leegwater**, **Leon Loveridge**, and **Ruward Mulder**, for many enjoyable discussions about the foundations of physics. Special thanks to **Ruward Mulder** for doing the Dutch translation of the thesis summary (samenvatting) in Chapter 9. And my other colleagues in the Descartes Centre HPS Masters program, for providing a supportive, lively, and friendly atmosphere to work in.

Physics mentors and Professors who I'd like to recognize from Nebraska: **Herman Bate-laan**, for taking a chance on me, for his stead-fast moral and career support, and for his infectious enthusiasm for physics and life. **Brad Shadwick**, for many enjoyable and enlightening discussions about physics, for support of my career, and for teaching me plasma physics. **Kees Uiterwaal**, for his administrative and moral support. Clemson: **Dieter Hartmann**, for his infectious enthusiasm for physics and astronomy, for his invaluable personal and career advice, for his consistent moral and career support, for allowing me to conduct an unorthodox 'reading course' on quantum field theory when I was a graduate student at Clemson University, and for the kinship we had during my time at Clemson (which was invaluable to me during those years). **Catalina Marinescu**, for taking a chance on me, for her moral support, and for understanding that I chose a different path. Stony Brook: **Hal Metcalf**, for being one of my inspirations when I was an undergraduate physics student at Stony Brook, for taking a chance on me when I approached him as a bright-eyed freshman eager to do physics research, for his encouragement to pursue my ideas and interests, for facilitating invaluable educational and research opportunities that most undergrads never get, for his moral and career support, and for his understanding that I took a different career path in physics. **John Noé**, for craftily recruiting me into his 2005 summer group at the Laser Teaching Center, for giving me my first hands-on experience with physics research, for believing I had potential in physics and helping me hone that potential, for being a sounding board to my half-baked ideas during my undergrad years, for allowing me to live out one of my dreams in working on a sonoluminescence apparatus, for training me how to think on my feet with physics, for giving me invaluable experience tutoring and interviewing high school students in the Laser Teaching Center, for allowing me to practically live at the Laser Teaching Center all throughout my undergraduate years, and for the book that eventually led me to write this thesis. **Fred Goldhaber**, for allowing me to drop in on his office hours (even when I wasn't taking any courses with him) and ask random physics questions for hours on end, for patiently indulging my ill-formed thoughts and ideas at the time, for helping me make one of my dreams a reality by co-creating and co-teaching (along with Bob Crease) a course on the philosophy of quantum mechanics and allowing me to play a role in it, for his moral support and guidance during my undergrad years, and for his support of my career over the years. **Martin Roček**, for offering to do reading courses with me on advanced physics topics when I was a Freshman undergrad, and for giving me valuable first-hand exposure to the working mind of a theoretical physicist. **William Divine Linch**

**III**, for countless impromptu sessions of teaching me advanced physics topics for several hours on end in his office, for endless discussions over beer about life in general, and for being the first example I had seen of a highly skilled theoretical physicist with impressive fashion style. Miscellaneous: **Shelly Goldstein**, for generously tutoring me in the foundations of quantum mechanics, for being a role model and the first example I had seen of someone who could synthesize world-class expertise in physics, philosophy, and mathematics, for generously allowing me to visit him at Rutgers countless times, for integrating me into his network of colleagues, for morally encouraging me when I felt intellectually isolated at my home institution, and for his care and concern on a personal level. **Rodi Tumulka**, for also teaching me about the foundations of quantum mechanics, for his immense patience and generosity, for his inspiring knowledge of physics, mathematics, and philosophy, and for many enjoyable days visiting Rutgers. **Michael Kiessling**, for many enjoyable and informative discussions about the foundations of physics. **Detlef Dürr**, for the offer long ago to visit LMU and work with him and his students on Wheeler-Feynman electrodynamics and Bohmian mechanics. **Seth Putterman**, for allowing me an unforgettable 2 month experience working on sonoluminescence-related experiments in his labs at UCLA, and for understanding that I chose a different career path. **Dan Cole**, for taking a chance on me when I was a high school student, for teaching me about stochastic electrodynamics, for many enjoyable discussions about physics and philosophy, and for allowing me to work with him and his Ph.D student (**Wilson Zou**) at Boston University for a summer. And many thanks to **Wilson** for patiently working with me during that summer. **Michael Ibison**, for many enjoyable physics discussions and consistent support of my career goals. And last but not least, **Hal Puthoff**, for being the very first physicist to mentor me, for encouraging my interests in fundamental and foundational physics questions, and for inspiring me with his wide-ranging and creative work.

Other philosophy mentors: **Tim Maudlin**, for being an inspiration, for being my first exposure to a world-class philosopher of physics, and for coming to Stony Brook to give a talk when I invited him as President of the Stony Brook Math Club (the best talk in the history of the Math Club). **Patrick Grim**, for countless discussions in his office during my undergrad years at Stony Brook, for moral support, for encouraging my interest in philosophy of physics, and for being my first professor of philosophy. **Bob Crease**, for encouraging my interest in philosophy of physics, and for co-creating and co-teaching (along with **Fred Goldhaber**) the philosophy of quantum mechanics course that I wanted so badly.

Other teachers, colleagues, and friends who've supported me in one way or another over the years, and from whom I've benefitted from physics and philosophy-related discussions. Nebraska: Salem Elzway, Eric Jones, Sam Keramati, and Omid Zandi. Clemson: Eugen Dumitrescu, Chris Grau, Dhruva Kulkarni, Todd May, and Courtney McGahee. Stony Brook: Azure Hansen, Brendan Keller, the various members of the Math Club crew, and Michael

## *Contents*

Schwartz. Miscellaneous: Niayesh Afshordi, Charis Anastopoulos, Johann Baptista, Stanley Brodsky, Jeffrey Bub, Philip Chew, Afshin Goodarzi, Sara Goodarzi, Ed Gruber, Bassam Helou, Eric Dennis, Lajos Diósi, Jonathan Inbal, William Michael Kallfelz, Owen Maroney, James Mattingly, George Musser Jr, Shapour Neshatfar, Travis Norsen, Huw Price, Alexander Smith, Antoine Tilloy, Steve Weinstein, Hans Westman, Ken Wharton, Howard Wiseman, and many others which time prevents me from mentioning.

My neurosurgeons, **Dr. Stefanie Rifkinson-Mann**, **Dr. Neil Feldstein**, and **Dr. Saadi Ghatan**, for life-saving surgeries.

My parents, **Saba** and **Reza**, my brother, **Kaaran**, and my aunt, **Fari**. Who always believed in my abilities, never pushed me into a life that I didn't want, and patiently supported me all these years as I pursued my Ph.D. And finally my late uncle, **Zabi**, who enthusiastically supported my scientific and philosophical interests, and taught me at an early age how to think critically and skeptically about the world.



## Quotes

These quotes have inspired me scientifically and philosophically over the years.

### Albert Einstein

I have no special talents. I am only passionately curious. - *Einstein to Carl Seelig (1952)*

It is difficult to believe that this [the quantum mechanical] description is complete. It seems to make the world quite nebulous unless somebody, like a mouse, is looking at it. The problem is to understand that one can observe the particle with a lantern. - *Einstein, lecture at the J. A. Wheeler relativity seminar, 1954*

I fully agree with you about the significance and educational value of methodology as well as history and philosophy of science. So many people today - and even professional scientists - seem to me like somebody who has seen thousands of trees but has never seen a forest. A knowledge of the historic and philosophical background gives that kind of independence from prejudices of his generation from which most scientists are suffering. This independence created by philosophical insight is - in my opinion - the mark of distinction between a mere artisan or specialist and a real seeker after truth. *Einstein to Thornton, 7 December 1944, EA 61-574*

One is struck [by the fact] that the theory (except for the four dimensional space) introduces two kinds of physical things, i.e., (1) measuring rods and clocks, (2) all other things, e.g., the electromagnetic field, the material point, etc. This, in a certain sense, is incoherent; strictly speaking measuring rods and clocks would have to be represented as solutions of the basic equations, not, as it were, as theoretically self-sufficient entities.<sup>17</sup> [There was the] obligation, however, of eliminating [this incoherence] at a later stage of the theory. But one must not legalize the mentioned sin so far as to imagine that intervals are physical entities of a special type,

## Contents

essentially different from other physical variables (“reducing physics to geometry”, etc.). *Einstein, Autobiographical Notes, 1949*

How does it happen that a properly endowed natural scientist comes to concern himself with epistemology? Is there no more valuable work in his specialty? I hear many of my colleagues saying, and I sense it from many more, that they feel this way. I cannot share this sentiment. When I think about the ablest students whom I have encountered in my teaching, that is, those who distinguish themselves by their independence of judgment and not merely their quick-wittedness, I can affirm that they had a vigorous interest in epistemology. They happily began discussions about the goals and methods of science, and they showed unequivocally, through their tenacity in defending their views, that the subject seemed important to them. Indeed, one should not be surprised at this. *Einstein, “Ernst Mach”, Physikalische Zeitschrift (1916)*

It has often been said, and certainly not without justification, that the man of science is a poor philosopher. Why then should it not be the right thing for the physicist to let the philosopher do the philosophizing? Such might indeed be the right thing to do a time when the physicist believes he has at his disposal a rigid system of fundamental laws which are so well established that waves of doubt can't reach them; but it cannot be right at a time when the very foundations of physics itself have become problematic as they are now. At a time like the present, when experience forces us to seek a newer and more solid foundation, the physicist cannot simply surrender to the philosopher the critical contemplation of theoretical foundations; for he himself knows best and feels more surely where the shoe pinches. In looking for an new foundation, he must try to make clear in his own mind just how far the concepts which he uses are justified, and are necessities. *Einstein, “Physics and Reality” in the Journal of the Franklin Institute Vol. 221, Issue 3 (March 1936)*

Roughly stated the conclusion is this: Within the framework of statistical quantum theory there is no such thing as a complete description of the individual system. More cautiously it might be put as follows: The attempt to conceive the quantum-theoretical description as the complete description of the individual systems leads to unnatural theoretical interpretations, which become immediately unnecessary if one accepts the [p. 672] interpretation that the description refers to ensembles of systems and not to individual systems. In that case the whole “egg-walking” performed in order to avoid the “physically real” becomes superfluous. There exists,

however, a simple psychological reason for the fact that this most nearly obvious interpretation is being shunned. For if the statistical quantum theory does not pretend to describe the individual system (and its development in time) completely, it appears unavoidable to look elsewhere for a complete description of the individual system in doing so it would be clear from the very beginning that the elements of such a description are not contained within the conceptual scheme of the statistical quantum theory. With this one would admit that, in principle, this scheme could not serve as the basis of theoretical physics. Assuming the success of efforts to accomplish a complete physical description, the statistical quantum theory would, within the framework of future physics, take an approximately analogous position to the statistical mechanics within the framework of classical mechanics. I am rather firmly convinced that the development of theoretical physics will be of this type; but the path will be lengthy and difficult. *Einstein, in P. A. Schlipp, Albert-Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist*

The reciprocal relationship of epistemology and science is of noteworthy kind. They are dependent upon each other. Epistemology without contact with science becomes an empty scheme. Science without epistemology is - insofar as it is thinkable at all - primitive and muddled. However, no sooner has the epistemologist, who is seeking a clear system, fought his way through to such a system, than he is inclined to interpret the thought-content of science in the sense of his system and to reject whatever does not fit into his system. The scientist, however, cannot afford to carry his striving for epistemological systematic that far. He accepts gratefully the epistemological conceptual analysis; but the external conditions, which are set for him by the facts of experience, do not permit him to let himself be too much restricted in the construction of his conceptual world by the adherence to an epistemological system. He therefore must appear to the systematic epistemologist as a type of unscrupulous opportunist: he appears as realist insofar as he seeks to describe a world independent of the acts of perception; as idealist insofar as he looks upon the concepts and theories as the free inventions of the human spirit (not logically derivable from what is empirically given); as positivist insofar as he considers his concepts and theories justified only to the extent to which they furnish a logical representation of relations among sensory experiences. He may even appear as Platonist or Pythagorean insofar as he considers the viewpoint of logical simplicity as an indispensable and effective tool of his research. *Einstein, in P. A. Schlipp, Albert-Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist*

## John Stewart Bell

It would seem that the theory [quantum mechanics] is exclusively concerned about “results of measurement”, and has nothing to say about anything else. What exactly qualifies some physical systems to play the role of “measurer”? Was the wavefunction of the world waiting to jump for thousands of millions of years until a single-celled living creature appeared? Or did it have to wait a little longer, for some better qualified system ... with a Ph.D.? If the theory is to apply to anything but highly idealized laboratory operations, are we not obliged to admit that more or less “measurement-like” processes are going on more or less all the time, more or less everywhere. Do we not have jumping then all the time? The first charge against “measurement”, in the fundamental axioms of quantum mechanics, is that it anchors the shifty split of the world into “system” and “apparatus”. A second charge is that the word comes loaded with meaning from everyday life, meaning which is entirely inappropriate in the quantum context. When it is said that something is “measured” it is difficult not to think of the result as referring to some preexisting property of the object in question. This is to disregard Bohr’s insistence that in quantum phenomena the apparatus as well as the system is essentially involved. If it were not so, how could we understand, for example, that “measurement” of a component of “angular momentum” ... in an arbitrarily chosen direction ... yields one of a discrete set of values? When one forgets the role of the apparatus, as the word “measurement” makes all too likely, one despairs of ordinary logic ... hence “quantum logic”. When one remembers the role of the apparatus, ordinary logic is just fine. In other contexts, physicists have been able to take words from ordinary language and use them as technical terms with no great harm done. Take for example the “strangeness”, “charm”, and “beauty” of elementary particle physics. No one is taken in by this “baby talk”. ... Would that it were so with “measurement”. But in fact the word has had such a damaging effect on the discussion, that I think it should now be banned altogether in quantum mechanics. - *Bell, Against Measurement (1990)*

Is it not clear from the smallness of the scintillation on the screen that we have to do with a particle? And is it not clear, from the diffraction and interference patterns, that the motion of the particle is directed by a wave? De Broglie showed in detail how the motion of a particle, passing through just one of two holes in screen, could be influenced by waves propagating through both holes. And so influenced that the particle does not go where the waves cancel out, but is attracted to where

they cooperate. This idea seems to me so natural and simple, to resolve the wave-particle dilemma in such a clear and ordinary way, that it is a great mystery to me that it was so generally ignored. - *Bell, Speakable and Unspeakeable in Quantum Mechanics*

... in physics the only observations we must consider are position observations, if only the positions of instrument pointers. It is a great merit of the de Broglie-Bohm picture to force us to consider this fact. If you make axioms, rather than definitions and theorems, about the “measurement” of anything else, then you commit redundancy and risk inconsistency. - *Bell, Speakable and Unspeakeable in Quantum Mechanics*

## Richard Feynman

[After a discussion of the measurement problem in quantum mechanics] This is all very confusing, especially when we consider that even though we may consistently consider ourselves always to be outside observers when we look at the rest of the world, the rest of the world is at the same time observing us ... . Does this mean that my observations become real only when I observe an observer observing something as it happens? This is an horrible viewpoint. Do you seriously entertain the thought that without observer there is no reality? Which observer? Any observer? Is a fly an observer? Is a star an observer? Was there no reality before 109 B.C. before life began? Or are you the observer? Then there is no reality to the world after you are dead? I know a number of otherwise respectable physicists who have bought life insurance. By what philosophy will the universe without man be understood? In order to make some sense here, we must keep an open mind about the possibility that for sufficiently complex systems, amplitudes become probabilities.... - *Feynman, Lecture Notes on Gravitation*

## Imre Lakatos

In the new, post-1925 quantum theory the ‘anarchist’ position became dominant and modern quantum physics, in its ‘Copenhagen interpretation’, became one of the main standard bearers of philosophical obscurantism. In the new theory Bohr’s notorious ‘complementarity principle’ enthroned [weak] inconsistency as a basic ultimate feature of nature, and merged subjectivist positivism and antilogical

## Contents

dialectic and even ordinary language philosophy into one unholy alliance. After 1925 Bohr and his associates introduced a new and unprecedented lowering of critical standards for scientific theories. This led to a defeat of reason within modern physics and to an anarchist cult of incomprehensible chaos. - *Lakatos, Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programs (1970)*

## Leo Tolstoy

The most difficult subjects can be explained to the most slow-witted man if he has not formed any idea of them already; but the simplest thing cannot be made clear to the most intelligent man if he is firmly persuaded that he knows already, without a shadow of doubt, what is laid before him. - *Tolstoy, The Kingdom of God is Within You (1894)*

I know that most men, including those at ease with problems of the highest complexity, can seldom accept even the simplest and most obvious truth if it be such as would oblige them to admit the falsity of conclusions which they have delighted in explaining to colleagues, which they have proudly taught to others, and which they have woven, thread by thread, into the fabric of their lives. - *Tolstoy, What is Art? (1897)*

## Steve Jobs

Your time is limited, so don't waste it living someone else's life. Don't be trapped by dogma - which is living with the results of other people's thinking. Don't let the noise of other's opinions drown out your own inner voice. And most important, have the courage to follow your heart and intuition. They somehow already know what you truly want to become. Everything else is secondary. - *Jobs, Stanford Commencement Address (2005)*

... almost everything - all external expectations, all pride, all fear of embarrassment or failure - these things just fall away in the face of death, leaving only what is truly important. Remembering that you are going to die is the best way I know to avoid the trap of thinking you have something to lose. You are already naked. There is no reason not to follow your heart. - *Jobs, Stanford Commencement Address (2005)*

# 1 Introduction

In the foundations of quantum mechanics, it is recognized that there are three logically distinct possibilities for solving (or dissolving) the quantum measurement problem [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] - (1) the wavefunction evolves linearly and deterministically but is not the complete description of a quantum system; (2) the wavefunction may or may not be the complete description of a quantum system, but the linear and deterministic evolution of the wavefunction is not exact; and (3) the wavefunction may or may not be the complete description, but its linear and deterministic evolution is exact, and ‘measurements’ of quantum systems don’t have determinate outcomes (despite appearances). Historically, the dominant theoretical instantiations of these three respective possibilities have been (1) the de Broglie-Bohm pilot wave theory (a.k.a. Bohmian mechanics), (2) dynamical collapse theories (such as the GRW, CSL, and Diósi-Penrose theories), and (3) Everett’s many-worlds theory (and variants thereof).

What these three dominant approaches have in common is that they all posit the time-dependent Schrödinger equation (or some slight stochastic nonlinear modification thereof) as part of the fundamental dynamical laws of physics (or derivative from a time-independent Schrödinger-like equation such as the Wheeler-DeWitt equation), and the universal wavefunction (corresponding to either the time-dependent  $N$ -particle wavefunction or the Wheeler-DeWitt wavefunctional) as part of either the fundamental ontology or the fundamental physical laws [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 4, 14, 15, 16, 5, 17]. On the one hand, this is a methodologically straightforward approach to modifying or supplanting standard quantum mechanics with an empirically viable non-relativistic quantum theory that’s free of the measurement problem. Indeed, as long as the aforementioned approaches involve an appropriate set of ‘local beables’ (i.e., objectively existing physical variables on space-time) [18], the dynamics of which supervene on the evolution of the universal wavefunction (or on time-dependent wavefunctions for subsystems, defined in terms of the universal wavefunction), all of these approaches (with the possible exception of many-worlds theories, in my view) give mathematically and conceptually clear accounts of how determinate measurement outcomes arise (or appear to arise) from the space-time histories of the local beables, when ‘microscopic’ quantum systems interact with ‘macroscopic’ quantum systems. On the other hand, it is not clear that it is *necessary* to posit the time-dependent Schrödinger equation (or some slight stochastic nonlinear modification thereof) as part of the fundamental dynamical laws (or as derivative from a time-independent Schrödinger-like equation), and the universal wavefunction as part of the fundamental ontology

## 1 Introduction

(i.e., as a fundamental, *nonlocal* beable) or the fundamental physical laws. One might even question (as I would) whether it is viable to regard the universal wavefunction (a complex-valued or real field on an extremely high-dimensional space corresponding to configuration space) as part of the fundamental ontology or the fundamental physical laws.<sup>1</sup> At the very least, it seems fair to say that it is still an open question whether the aforementioned interpretations of the universal wavefunction (within the various solutions to the measurement problem where they're applied) are in fact viable, with no consensus on this issue among specialists in the foundations of quantum mechanics. (And let me emphasize that, although the above discussion is primarily couched in the language of non-relativistic quantum mechanics, all of it can be carried over to the context of quantum field theory, more or less unchanged.)

Perhaps, instead, there exists a theoretical framework that makes it possible to understand the Schrödinger equation as a phenomenological equation, and the wavefunction as a derived quantity that (in some sense) reflects an array of local beables over and above the local beables that directly determine the outcomes of measurements. In this way, the fundamental ontology of the physical world would involve only local beables, and the wavefunction and Schrödinger equation would simply be effective descriptions of these local beables and their more fundamental dynamical laws. If such a framework exists, it is surely a scientifically and philosophically worthwhile project to develop it, work out its consequences, and see how it compares to the more 'standard' options for addressing the measurement problem, particularly in cases where the more standard options are known to still have difficulties or ambiguities (e.g., the domains of semiclassical gravity and quantum gravity).

The stochastic mechanics framework, initiated by Fényes in 1952 [21], rediscovered by Nelson in 1966 [22], and developed by legions of physicists and mathematicians up until the '80's

---

<sup>1</sup>This is beyond the scope of the Introduction, but I shall nevertheless elaborate a bit: In my view, it is not clear what it means to say that configuration space, and the universal wavefunction on configuration space, have observer-independent existences 'out there' in the physical world, in parallel with or more fundamental than 3-space and the material objects in the 3-space of everyday experience, as in certain readings of the de Broglie-Bohm theory and dynamical collapse theories [6, 19, 20, 5, 13, 14, 15]. I also regard the functionalist-emergence arguments of Albert [19, 20, 5] and Wallace [4] as problematic on conceptual and technical grounds, making it difficult for me to accept intelligibility of the claim that the universal wavefunction on configuration space, perhaps in conjunction with a world particle at a point in configuration space (as in Albert's version of the de Broglie-Bohm theory), constitutes the fundamental ontology of the physical world. With regard to nomic interpretations of the universal wavefunction in theories such as de Broglie-Bohm [9, 12, 17], I am of the view that a nomic interpretation only really makes sense if the universal wavefunction ends up being time-independent, unique, and uncontrollable (by us or anything else), as suggested by Dürr-Goldstein-Zanghì [9, 12]; however, for certain reasons, I tend to be skeptical that this will pan out, as I tend to be skeptical (for a variety of reasons) that canonical approaches to quantum gravity, where the universal wavefunction is indeed time-independent and uncontrollable (though not necessarily unique!), are the correct ways to 'quantize' Einstein gravity (if that is even necessary at all, and in my view that is not yet clear).



and early '90's [23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29], has, since its inception, been one of the leading candidates for a theoretical framework of the type explained above. In terms of solving the measurement problem, it is a version of option (1) insofar as it aims to recover the wavefunction and deterministic Schrödinger evolution as a universally valid, effective statistical description of a classical-like ether medium on space-time that interacts with point (or point-like) masses immersed in the ether, causing the latter to undergo a classical Markovian diffusion process that conserves the total energy of the particles on the average. In stochastic mechanics, it is the conservative diffusions of the positions of the particles, in conjunction with a decoherence-driven dynamical process known as 'effective collapse', that determines the outcomes of measurements in accord with probabilities given by the Born rule [30, 31, 32, 33]. Conversely, once the wavefunction of a quantum system is known in stochastic mechanics, one can construct the corresponding diffusion process for the particles, along with the assumption that the initial particle positions are randomly distributed according to the Born rule (though this assumption can be justified on other physical grounds).

In fact, the stochastic mechanics framework was regarded by Edward Nelson [23, 34, 35], perhaps its most influential contributor, as a phenomenological stepping-stone to an eventual physical theory of the ether and its interaction with point masses. In his monograph "Quantum Fluctuations" [36], Nelson anticipated that this physical theory would describe the ether as a classical electromagnetic background field that interacts locally and deterministically with point charges, and that the stochasticity of the evolution of the point charges would arise as a result of imposing infrared and UV cutoffs on the charge-field coupling, and taking the cutoffs to infinity. Nelson also argued that this charge-field coupling with infrared and UV cutoffs (and the cutoffs taken to infinity) could violate Bell's local causality, even though it would not violate what Nelson called the "locality principle", i.e., that "if we couple the [electromagnetic] field to a [charge] current in a [spacetime] region, only the behavior of the field in the future light cone of that region will be affected" [36]. However, as Nelson acknowledged decades later [personal communication], he was never able to make his suggestion work. (And, I must admit, it was never clear to me how the theory he sketched could violate local causality without violating what he called the locality principle.) Moreover Nelson abandoned stochastic mechanics in the '80's because he realized that the Markovian nature of the conservative diffusions (under the assumption that the diffusions indeed correspond to single-valued wavefunctions) entails dynamical nonlocality for the evolutions of the stochastic mechanical particles in a multi-particle system. To quote him,

If something is physically real, then it cannot be affected instantaneously by a widely separated perturbation. This is the locality principle, and it poses a severe challenge to stochastic mechanics. This is because the diffusion occurs on con-

## 1 Introduction

figuration space, and if we have several particles, possibly widely separated, the component of the drift for any particular particle will in general be a function of the positions of all the particles. [36]

Furthermore, Nelson believed that “a theory that violates locality is untenable” [36]. In addition to these objections, Nelson also claimed that stochastic mechanics predicts different multi-time correlation functions than standard quantum mechanics, and he questioned why anyone should believe the stochastic mechanical prediction over the standard quantum mechanical prediction [23, 35].

Of course, as is well-known, Bell’s theorem implies that any theory that’s in agreement with the empirical predictions of standard quantum mechanics for Bell-type experiments, must violate locality in Bell’s sense (unless, perhaps, if one denies that measurements have determinate outcomes, as in many-worlds theories). (Let me also emphasize here that Bell’s notion of local causality is neither the same as nor in conflict with the ‘local commutativity’ condition in standard quantum field theory, as Bell emphasized [37]. That is why a theory can be nonlocal in the sense of Bell, and still satisfy local commutativity, as is the case with standard quantum field theory.) As is also well-known, experiments have repeatedly confirmed the violation of Bell’s inequality. So if stochastic mechanics does entail dynamical nonlocality as described in the above quote, and if this dynamical nonlocality entails violation of Bell’s inequality in exact agreement with standard quantum mechanics (hence experiment), this would seem like just what the doctor ordered, rather than a reason to reject stochastic mechanics. From this point of view, it seems fair to say that Nelson’s reasons for abandoning stochastic mechanics were misguided. This being said, I do not think it is misguided to hope for a physical model of the stochastic mechanical ether as a field/medium on space-time (in fact, this would arguably be the most natural way to understand the stochastic mechanical picture of the world). After all, the fact that a theory may not be locally causal doesn’t logically entail that some or all of the beables of the theory must live on a high-dimensional space like configuration space. On the contrary, it is entirely possible to have a non-local causal, empirically viable, non-relativistic theory of exclusively local beables, as demonstrated by Norsen [38, 39] in the context of the de Broglie-Bohm theory. And as I will argue in Chapter 3, there is even reason to think that a non-Markovian extension of stochastic mechanics may allow for a reformulation of the theory exclusively in terms of a finite number of local beables (in contrast to the de Broglie-Bohm model of Norsen, which requires a countable infinity of local beables or an ad hoc truncation thereof), while recovering Markovian stochastic mechanics in a certain limit.

As for Nelson’s claim that stochastic mechanics predicts different multi-time correlations than standard quantum mechanics, it has been shown by Blanchard et al. [40] that Nelson’s analysis was mistaken - in repeated ideal position measurements of a single-particle stochastic

mechanical system, the stochastic process changes because the stochastic mechanical drifts are functions of the wavefunction, and the wavefunction undergoes collapse in each measurement. Blanchard et al. interpret the collapse of the wavefunction as taking the post-measurement evolution of the wavefunction to be governed by the usual Schrödinger equation, but with the initial condition that the wavefunction is a delta function at the point where the system particle is found. In this way, they show that the stochastic mechanical multi-time correlations are in exact agreement with the standard quantum mechanical multi-time correlations. Of course, a more proper treatment of this problem would make use of the effective collapse process mentioned earlier; in other words, the post-measurement wavefunction would correspond to the component of the system-apparatus-environment entangled state that the system particle has occupied during the decoherence process corresponding to the position measurement. It will be shown in future work that effective collapse indeed resolves the apparent disagreement between multi-time correlations in stochastic mechanics vs. standard quantum mechanics.

Arguably the only substantive objection that's been raised against the viability of stochastic mechanics is due to Wallstrom, who pointed out in the late '80's [41] and early '90's [25] that extant stochastic mechanical theories face one of two problems - either they allowed for fewer solutions than the set of single-valued solutions of the Schrödinger equation, or they allowed for more solutions. The reason, in essence, is that stochastic mechanical theories derive the 'Madelung equations' for a pair of fields,  $S$  and  $\rho$ , where  $S$  is a velocity potential that generates the current velocity field of the diffusion process, and  $\rho$  is the single-time probability density for the diffusion process. These fields are then combined via the 'Madelung transformation' into a wavefunction  $\psi = \sqrt{\rho} \exp(iS/\hbar)$  that's assumed to satisfy the time-dependent Schrödinger equation. However, if the  $S$  field is assumed to be single-valued (as in certain versions of stochastic mechanics), then while  $\psi$  will also be single-valued, this will exclude wavefunctions with angular momentum, i.e., wavefunctions with phase factors of the form  $\exp(im\varphi)$ , where  $m$  is integral and  $S = m\varphi$  is a multi-valued function. (If we permit  $S$  to have jump discontinuities, then it can be shown that  $\nabla\psi$  will develop a singularity, which is not permissible on physical grounds.) Alternatively, if  $S$  field is allowed to be multi-valued (as in most versions of stochastic mechanics), then there is no why it should satisfy the Bohr-Sommerfeld quantization condition  $\oint_L \nabla S \cdot d\mathbf{x} = nh$ , where  $L$  is any closed loop,  $n$  is an integer, and  $h$  is Planck's constant. Yet, in standard quantum mechanics, this quantization condition is exactly what follows from requiring that wavefunctions be single-valued while allowing multi-valued phases; and whereas there are natural physical justifications for requiring  $\psi$  to be single-valued (e.g., that  $|\psi|^2$  has the interpretation of a probability density, and that  $\psi$  satisfies the linear superposition principle), those justifications do not carry over to the Madelung equations. In addition, if one allows  $S$  to be arbitrarily multi-valued, then it can be shown that there exists a continuum of solutions to the Madelung equations that don't correspond to any single-valued solution of

## 1 Introduction

the Schrödinger equation, as in case of the central potential problem. These issues will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2.

(As an interesting historical aside, Shelly Goldstein [personal communication] told me that he recognized the issues raised by Wallstrom years before Wallstrom did; but I am unaware of Shelly writing about it prior to Wallstrom’s papers, apart from pointing out in [30] that there are two cases in which conservative diffusions don’t correspond to any single-valued solution of Schrödinger’s equation: (i) conservative diffusions corresponding to the excited energy levels of the hydrogen atom, where the diffusions are decomposed into conservative diffusions separated by the nodal surfaces of the excited levels; and (ii) conservative diffusions in a multiply-connected configuration space, such as the configuration space in the Aharonov-Bohm effect situation. Wallstrom, in turn, told me [personal communication] that David Hestenes claims to have observed the issues raised by Wallstrom back in the 1960’s, but never bothered to publish about it. Wallstrom [personal communication] also gives priority of credit to Takehiko Takabayasi, who in 1952 made the point about the mathematical inequivalence between Schrödinger’s equation and the Madelung equations without the quantization condition on  $S$ , and was apparently the first to do so in the historical record [42]. Interestingly, though, Takabayasi pointed out this inequivalence not in the context of stochastic mechanical theories but rather versions of quantum mechanics that take the Madelung equations as primitive, such as Madelung’s 1926 interpretation and Bohm’s 1952 reformulation of pilot-wave theory. And yet, the first version of stochastic mechanics was proposed by Fényes in 1952 [21], which Takabayasi was aware of [42] and critiqued on completely different grounds! It’s also interesting to mention that, despite his other criticisms of stochastic mechanics, Nelson never commented on Wallstrom’s criticism in print, and I do not know what Nelson thought of it. And it is unfortunately too late to ask Nelson, who passed away in 2014.)

As I will discuss near the end of Chapter 3, many have attempted to answer the Wallstrom criticism over the years; but, for different reasons, none of the answers presented thus far have been satisfactory. The lack of a satisfactory answer to Wallstrom’s criticism is what motivated me to search for an answer many years ago. As I explained in the Preface, it turns out that de Broglie suggested a model in his 1923 Ph.D thesis [43, 44, 45] that seems just right for addressing the criticism, if imported into certain versions of stochastic mechanics (the versions that allow  $S$  to be multi-valued, such as Nelson’s).

In a nutshell, de Broglie suggested that each elementary particle of rest mass  $m_0$  could be thought of as a spatially localized periodic process (or ‘clock particle’) of constant angular frequency  $\omega_0$  in the translational rest frame of the particle, with the relation between  $m_0$  and  $\omega_0$  given by  $\hbar\omega_0 = m_0c^2$ . The precisely physical nature of this localized periodic process was left unspecified, but de Broglie hypothesized that there exists a “phase wave” in 3-space that oscillates in step with the localized periodic process at the same location (although not neces-

sarily driving the periodic process). Then, applying a Lorentz transformation to the lab frame, de Broglie found that the phase of this periodic process has space and time dependence, and by the “theorem of the harmony of phases”, remains in step with the phase of the accompanying wave, the latter of which travels in the same direction as the particle with superluminal phase velocity  $V = c^2/v$ , where  $v$  is the speed of the particle in the lab frame. (The superluminality of the wave is the reason it is called a “phase wave” - the wave is viewed as a “distribution in space of the phases of a phenomenon” [43], rather than a wave that carries energy.) Correspondingly, de Broglie showed that when many phase waves of nearby frequencies have phase velocities in the direction of motion of the particle, and the velocities of the phase waves vary with the frequencies of the waves, then the group velocity of the superposition of these phase waves equals the subluminal velocity of the particle in the lab frame; hence the energy of the particle plus its accompanying phase waves always propagates at subluminal speed. De Broglie further went on to show that Maupertuis’ Principle applied to the particle coincides with Fermat’s Principle applied to the accompanying phase wave, and hence that the possible trajectories of the particle correspond to the rays of the phase wave. He also showed by explicit example that these results hold for the particle and accompanying phase wave propagating through external fields. Finally, from these results, de Broglie showed that the phase of the periodic process comprising the particle changes around a closed space-time orbit by integer multiples of  $2\pi$ , and that this corresponds exactly to the Bohr-Sommerfeld quantization condition. The argument was as follows: given that a trajectory of a moving particle is identical to a ray of a phase wave, where the frequency is constant (because total energy is constant) but the velocity is variable, the propagation of the particle plus phase wave is analogous to “a liquid wave in a channel closed on itself but of variable depth” [43]. Then, in order to have a stable regime, the length  $l$  of the channel must be resonant with the wave. This leads to the resonance condition  $l = n\lambda$  if the wavelength is constant, and  $\oint (v/V)dl = n$  in the general case, where  $n$  is an integer.

As I also explained in the Preface, I first learned about de Broglie’s model through an obscure 1957 paper [46] by Bohm, who suggested a slight variation of de Broglie’s model. In Bohm’s model, an elementary particle is hypothesized to be a spatially localized mean periodic process, of fixed mean frequency  $\omega_0$ , at the “sub-quantum level”, where again the precise physical nature of the periodic process (as well as the precise physical nature of the sub-quantum level) is left unspecified. Bohm then shows that, in a fixed coordinate frame where the particle has constant speed  $v$ , the Lorentz-transformed mean phase of this particle takes the form of the phase of a free particle wavefunction at a particular space-time point, i.e.,  $\delta\phi = \omega_0\delta t \rightarrow \delta\phi(\mathbf{x}, t) = (\omega_0/m_0c^2)[E\delta t - \mathbf{p} \cdot \delta\mathbf{x}]$ , where  $E = \gamma m_0c^2$  and  $\mathbf{p} = \gamma m_0\mathbf{v}$ , with  $\gamma$  being the gamma factor. Then, Bohm writes, “Let us consider how  $\phi$  changes as one goes around a virtual circuit (in which the time as well as the position may change). If we add up all

## 1 Introduction

the phase changes in such a circuit the consistency of the theory requires that  $\oint \delta\phi$  shall be an integral multiple of  $2\pi$ , and likewise for a circuit in which time is held fixed (otherwise, we will contradict the hypothesis that there is a well-defined mean phase at each point in space)” [46]. Moreover, because the phase of this particle corresponds to the relativistic action of the particle, which can be noticed by defining  $S = -\hbar\phi$  with  $\hbar := m_0c^2/\omega_0$ , Bohm finds that  $\oint \delta S = nh$ , which is again just the Bohr-Sommerfeld quantization condition. Bohm then observes that this condition is equivalent for the condition of single-valuedness of the wavefunction in quantum mechanics, using the definition  $\psi = \text{Exp}(iS/\hbar)$ . A variation of this model was also given by Bohm in 1985 [47], but I won’t review it here.

Thus the primary objective of this thesis is to reformulate Nelson’s stochastic mechanics so as to consistently incorporate (with appropriate modifications) the above model(s) of de Broglie and Bohm, and thereby explain how the condition  $\oint_L \nabla S \cdot d\mathbf{x} = nh$  could arise naturally, rather than imposed ad hoc or by making logically-circular appeals to the single-valuedness requirement for wavefunctions. This is taken up in Chapters 2 and 3, with each Chapter accompanied by an abstract.

A secondary objective of this thesis is to: (i) use the reformulated stochastic mechanics to formulate fundamentally-semiclassical theories of Newtonian gravity and electrodynamics; (ii) compare these theories to existing formulations of semiclassical Newtonian gravity and electrodynamics; (iii) show that the stochastic mechanical theories are consistent, empirically viable theories of (fundamentally-)semiclassical Newtonian gravity and electrodynamics, with certain conceptual and technical advantages over extant semiclassical theories based on either standard quantum theory or measurement-problem-free alternative quantum theories; and (iv) show that the stochastic mechanical theories can recover classical Newtonian gravity under certain (physically reasonable) conditions. The reason for doing all this (apart from it being intrinsically interesting to me) is that semiclassical Newtonian gravity is becoming a hot topic these days in the physics literature, with the vast majority of discussions centered around the Schrödinger-Newton equations [48, 49, 28] and models of fundamentally-semiclassical gravity based on dynamical collapse theories [50, 49, 51, 52]. There’s also the interesting and long-standing question as to whether or not a consistent and empirically viable version of fundamentally-semiclassical gravity can be constructed (and, relatedly, whether gravity needs to be quantized at all). To show that stochastic mechanics can contribute something novel and useful to these discussions should (hopefully) boost general interest in stochastic mechanics among physicists and philosophers of physics, apart from showing that the Wallstrom criticism is no longer a (seemingly) decisive objection to it. These tasks are taken up in Chapters 4 and 5, and each Chapter is again accompanied by an abstract.

The thesis closes with a Summary and Outlook section, a *samenvatting* in het Nederlands, and a brief *curriculum vitae*.

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

Wallstrom's criticism of existing formulations of stochastic mechanics is that they fail to derive quantum theory because they require an ad hoc quantization condition on the postulated velocity potential,  $S$ , in order to derive single-valued Schrödinger wave functions. We propose an answer to this criticism by modifying the Nelson-Yasue formulation of non-relativistic stochastic mechanics for a spinless particle with the following hypothesis: a spinless Nelson-Yasue particle of rest mass  $m$  continuously undergoes a driven steady-state oscillation of 'zitterbewegung' (*zbw*) frequency,  $\omega_c = (1/\hbar) mc^2$ , in its instantaneous mean forward (and backward) translational rest frame. With this hypothesis we show that, in the lab frame,  $S$  arises from imposing the constraint of conservative diffusions on the time-symmetrized steady-state phase of the *zbw* particle, satisfies the required quantization condition, and evolves in time by the Hamilton-Jacobi-Madelung equations (when generalized to describe a statistical ensemble of *zbw* particles). The paper begins by reviewing Nelson-Yasue stochastic mechanics and Wallstrom's criticism, after which we develop a classical model of a particle of rest mass  $m$  constrained to undergo the hypothesized *zbw* oscillation, with the purpose of making clear the physical assumptions of the *zbw* model without the added complications of stochastic mechanics. We develop the classical model for the spinless one-particle case, without and with field interactions, and then carry out the analogous developments for the Nelson-Yasue version of this model. Using this 'zitterbewegung stochastic mechanics' (ZSM), we readily derive the single-valued wave functions of non-relativistic quantum mechanics for a spinless particle in the analyzed cases. We also apply ZSM to the case of a central potential and show that it predicts angular momentum quantization. This paper sets the foundation for Part II, which will (primarily) work out the many-particle version of ZSM.

### 2.1 Introduction

Since its introduction by Fényes in 1952 [21], the goal of the stochastic mechanics research program has been to derive quantum theory from a classical-like statistical mechanics of particles undergoing Brownian motion. Towards this end, non-relativistic and relativistic models of stochastic mechanics have been constructed for both spin-0 particles [21, 22, 53, 36, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79,



## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

80, 81] and spin-1/2 particles [82, 71, 83, 84, 80]. A non-relativistic theory of single-time and multi-time measurements has also been developed [40, 30, 31, 32, 33], as have extensions of non-relativistic stochastic mechanics to finite temperature and non-equilibrium open systems [54, 85, 86, 68, 87]. Field theoretic generalizations also exist, for the cases of scalar fields [88, 89, 90, 59, 91], Maxwell fields [92, 93], vector-meson fields [94], the linearized gravitational field [95], coupling to dissipative environments [89, 96], non-Abelian gauge theory [55], bosonic string theory [97], M-theory [74], and background-independent quantum gravity [75]. However, Wallstrom [41, 25] pointed out that extant formulations of stochastic mechanics ultimately fail to derive quantum mechanics because they require an “ad hoc” quantization condition on the postulated velocity potential,  $S$ , in order to recover single-valued Schrödinger wave functions. Moreover, this criticism appears to generalize to the field-theoretic and quantum gravitational versions of stochastic mechanics developed before, during, and after Wallstrom’s publications, insofar as they require analogous quantization conditions and don’t seem to give non-circular justifications for them.

Since Wallstrom, sporadic attempts have been made to answer his criticism [98, 25, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104]. However, in our view, all these attempts are either problematic or limited in their applicability to stochastic mechanics (the follow up paper, Part II, will give a discussion). Nevertheless, if a convincing answer can be found, stochastic mechanics may once again be viewed as a viable research program, and one that (in our view) offers elegant solutions to many of the foundational problems with quantum mechanics. As examples, stochastic mechanics would provide: (1) an unambiguous solution to the quantum measurement problem (the local beables of the theory on which measurement outcomes depend are point masses with definite trajectories at all times) [30, 31, 32, 33]; (2) a novel and unambiguous physical interpretation of the wave function (it is epistemic in the sense of being defined from field variables describing a fictitious ensemble of point masses undergoing conservative diffusions; and it has ontic properties in the specific sense that the evolutions of said variables are constrained by beables over and above the point masses) [36, 25, 27]; (3) an explanation for why the position basis is preferred in decoherence theory (the form of the Schrödinger Hamiltonian is a consequence of the particle diffusion process happening in position space) [99, 68]; and (4) a justification for the symmetry postulates for wave functions of identical particles (they arise from natural symmetry conditions on the particle trajectories, with the possibility of parastatistics being excluded) [36, 30, 66].

In this connection, it is worth mentioning that some of the aforementioned virtues of stochastic mechanics, such as (1) and (4), are shared by de Broglie-Bohm theories [6, 8, 10, 105, 14, 106, 29]; conversely, virtually all of the technical results obtained from de Broglie-Bohm theories can be directly imported into stochastic mechanics (basically because stochastic mechanics contains the dynamical equations of de Broglie-Bohm theories as a subset).



This being said, stochastic mechanics (if viable) has a notably significant difference from the ‘standard’ approaches to interpreting or reformulating or replacing the quantum formalism in a realist way that solves the measurement problem, those being many-worlds theories [11, 4, 16], de Broglie-Bohm theories [6, 8, 10, 105, 14, 106], and dynamical collapse theories [13, 107, 15]. In all these approaches, the wave function is interpreted as fundamental and ontic (or as some kind of physical law [12, 14, 17]), and the Schrödinger equation (or some nonlinear modification of it) is taken as a dynamical law. So if stochastic mechanics succeeds in deriving the Schrödinger equation and wave function, it constitutes (arguably) the first example of a measurement-problem-free ontological reconstruction of quantum mechanics in which the wave function could be considered (in a well-defined sense) as genuinely derived and epistemic, and the Schrödinger evolution as phenomenological rather than law-like<sup>1</sup>. Thus stochastic mechanics would (if viable) constitute a couterexample to an implicit assumption that motivates the aforementioned standard approaches - that the wave function and Schrödinger equation must be part of the fundamental ontology (or laws) and dynamical laws, respectively, in order to have a realist alternative to standard quantum theory that solves the measurement problem, is empirically adequate, and has a coherent physical/ontological interpretation.

It is also noteworthy that, as a dynamical theory of particle motion in which probabilities play no fundamental role, stochastic mechanics shares with de Broglie-Bohm theories the ability to justify the “quantum equilibrium” density  $|\psi|^2$  from typicality arguments [112] and from dynamical relaxation of non-equilibrium densities to future equilibrium [30, 64, 65, 67]. As a result, stochastic mechanics can, on its own terms, be regarded as a more general physical theory that contains quantum mechanics as a fixed point - and outside this fixed point, it admits the possibility of non-equilibrium physics, e.g., measurements more precise than the uncertainty principle allows and superluminal signaling [36, 113, 114, 115]. We will also argue

---

<sup>1</sup>The recent “Many-Interacting-Worlds” (MIW) theory of Hall, Deckert, and Wiseman [108], shares some of these features in that it recovers the Schrödinger wave function as an effective, mean-field description of a large number of real classical worlds interacting through a non-classical (quantum) force. On the other hand, it seems that their approach is also subject to Wallstrom’s criticism in that they also have to assume the quantization condition (or something like it) on the dynamics of their classical worlds. Similar comments apply to the “Prodigal QM” theory of Sebens [109].

Similarly, the “Trace Dynamics” theory of Steven Adler [110, 107, 111, 15] aims to derive the quantum formalism as an approximation to the thermodynamic limit of a statistical mechanical description of Grassmannian matrices living on space-time. However, Trace Dynamics requires certain ad hoc assumptions, namely that the state-vector in the thermodynamic description has a norm-preserving nonlinear stochastic evolution. Such an assumption is ad hoc because it seems to have no justification from within the assumptions of Trace Dynamics, whereas it presumably should have such a justification in order to sustain the claim that Trace Dynamics derives the quantum formalism in a certain approximation. (This view is also espoused by Bassi et al. in [15].) In this sense, it seems fair to say that the norm-perserving assumption is to Trace Dynamics what the quantization condition is to (extant formulations of) stochastic mechanics.

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

in Part II [27] that quantum non-equilibrium states are more plausibly motivated in stochastic mechanics than in deterministic de Broglie-Bohm theories.

For all these reasons and more, it seems worthwhile to consider whether the central obstacle for the stochastic mechanics research program - Wallstrom's criticism - can be surmounted. The objective of this series of papers is to suggest how non-relativistic stochastic mechanics for spinless particles can be modified to provide a non-ad-hoc physical justification for the required quantization condition on  $S$ , and thereby recover all and only the single-valued wave functions of non-relativistic quantum mechanics. In this paper, we propose to modify the Nelson-Yasue formulation [36, 56] of non-relativistic stochastic mechanics for a spinless particle with the following hypothesis: a spinless particle of rest mass,  $m$ , bounded to a harmonic potential of natural frequency,  $\omega_c = (1/\hbar) mc^2$ , and immersed in Nelson's hypothetical ether medium (appropriately modified in its properties), undergoes a driven steady-state oscillation of 'zitterbewegung' (*zbw*) frequency,  $\omega_c$ , in its instantaneous mean forward (and backward) translational rest frame. With this hypothesis we show that, in the lab frame, the stochastic mechanical velocity potential,  $S$ , arises from imposing the constraint of conservative diffusions on the time-symmetrized steady-state phase of the *zbw* particle, implies the needed quantization condition, and evolves by the stochastically derived Hamilton-Jacobi-Madelung equations (when generalized to describe a statistical ensemble of *zbw* particles). This modification of Nelson-Yasue stochastic mechanics (NYSM), which we term 'zitterbewegung stochastic mechanics' (ZSM), then allows us to derive the single-valued wave functions of non-relativistic quantum mechanics for a spinless particle. The problem of justifying the quantization condition is thereby reduced to justifying the zitterbewegung hypothesis. Accordingly, it is among the tasks of Part II to argue that the hypothesis can be justified in terms of physical/dynamical models and can be plausibly generalized to particles with spin as well as relativistic particles and fields.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In section 2, we give a concise review of the formal derivation of the Schrödinger equation from NYSM for a single, spinless particle in an external scalar potential. (Such a review will be useful for the reader who is unfamiliar with NYSM, and essential for following the logic and presentation of the arguments later in the paper.) In section 3, we review the Wallstrom criticism. In section 4, we introduce a classical model of a spinless zitterbewegung particle which implies the quantization condition for the phase of its oscillation, excluding and including interactions with external fields. In each case, we extend the model to a classical Hamilton-Jacobi statistical mechanics involving a Gibbsian ensemble of such particles, with the purpose of making as clear as possible the physical assumptions of the model in a well-established classical physics framework that has conceptual and mathematical similarities to stochastic mechanics. In section 5, we construct a Nelson-Yasue stochastic mechanics for the zitterbewegung particle (ZSM), excluding and including field interactions. In this way we derive one-particle Schrödinger equations with single-valued wave functions that

have (generally) multi-valued phases, and use the hydrogen-like atom as a worked example.

This paper lays the foundation for Part II, where we will: (1) develop the (non-trivial) many-particle cases of ZSM, (2) explicate the beables of ZSM, (3) assess the plausibility and generalizability of the zitterbewegung hypothesis, and (4) compare ZSM to other proposed answers to Wallstrom’s criticism.

## 2.2 Nelson-Yasue Stochastic Mechanics

In Edward Nelson’s non-relativistic stochastic mechanics [22, 53, 36], it is first hypothesized that the vacuum is pervaded by a homogeneous and isotropic “ether” fluid with classical stochastic fluctuations of uniform character.<sup>2</sup> To ensure that observers in the ether can’t distinguish absolute rest from uniform motion, it is further hypothesized that the interaction of a point mass with the ether is a frictionless diffusion process.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, a point particle of mass  $m$  within this frictionless ether will in general have its position 3-vector  $\mathbf{q}(t)$  constantly undergoing diffusive motion with drift, as modeled by the first-order stochastic differential equation,

$$d\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)dt + d\mathbf{W}(t). \quad (2.1)$$

The vector  $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$  is the deterministic “mean forward” drift velocity of the particle, and  $\mathbf{W}(t)$  is the Wiener process modeling the effect of the particle’s interaction with the fluctuating ether.

The Wiener increment,  $d\mathbf{W}(t)$ , is assumed to be Gaussian with zero mean, independent of  $d\mathbf{q}(s)$  for  $s \leq t$ , and with covariance,

$$E_t [d\mathbf{W}_i(t)d\mathbf{W}_j(t)] = 2\nu\delta_{ij}dt, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $E_t$  denotes the conditional expectation at time  $t$ .

Note that although Equations (2.1-2) are formally the same as those used for the kinematical description of classical Brownian motion in the Einstein-Smoluchowski (ES) theory, the physical context is different; the ES theory uses (2.1-2) to model the Brownian motion of macroscopic

---

<sup>2</sup>The microscopic constituents of this ether are left unspecified by Nelson; however, he suggests by tentative dimensional arguments relating to the choice of diffusion constant in Eq. (2.3) (namely, that we can write  $\hbar = e^2/\alpha c$ , where  $\alpha$  is the fine-structure constant and  $e$  the elementary charge) that it may have an electromagnetic origin [36].

<sup>3</sup>Nelson points out [36] that this frictionless diffusion process is an example of “conservative diffusions”, or diffusions in which the ensemble-averaged energy of the particle is conserved in time (for a time-independent external potential). In other words, on the (ensemble) average, there is no net transfer of energy between the particle and the fluctuating ether, in contrast to classical Brownian diffusions which are fundamentally dissipative in character.

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

particles in a classical fluid in the large friction limit [53], whereas Nelson uses (2.1-2) to model frictionless stochastic motion (i.e., “conservative diffusions” [36]) for elementary particles interacting with a fluctuating ether fluid that permeates the vacuum.

In this connection, it is further hypothesized that the magnitude of the diffusion coefficient  $\nu$  is proportional to the reduced Planck's constant, and inversely proportional to the particle mass  $m$  so that

$$\nu = \frac{\hbar}{2m}. \quad (2.3)$$

In addition to (2.1), the particle's trajectory  $\mathbf{q}(t)$  can also satisfy the time-reversed equation

$$d\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t)dt + d\mathbf{W}_*(t), \quad (2.4)$$

where  $\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$  is the mean backward drift velocity, and  $d\mathbf{W}_*(t) = d\mathbf{W}(-t)$  is the backward Wiener process. The  $d\mathbf{W}_*(t)$  has all the properties of  $d\mathbf{W}(t)$ , except that it is independent of  $d\mathbf{q}(s)$  for  $s \geq t$ . With these conditions on  $d\mathbf{W}(t)$  and  $d\mathbf{W}_*(t)$ , (2.1) and (2.4) respectively define forward and backward Markov processes on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ .

The forwards and backwards transition probabilities defined by (2.1) and (2.4), respectively, should be understood, in some sense, as ontic probabilities [116, 117]. (Generally speaking, ‘ontic probabilities’ can be understood as probabilities about objective physical properties of the  $N$ -particle system, as opposed to ‘epistemic probabilities’ [118] which are about our ignorance of objective physical properties of the  $N$ -particle system.) Just how ‘ontic’ these transition probabilities should be is an open question. One possibility is that these transition probabilities should be viewed as phenomenologically modeling complicated deterministic interactions of a massive particle (or particles) with the fluctuating ether, in analogy with how equations such as (2.1) and (2.4) are used in the ES to phenomenologically model the complicated deterministic interactions of a macroscopic particle immersed in a fluctuating classical fluid of finite temperature [53]. Another possibility is that the fluctuations of the ether are irreducibly stochastic, and this irreducible stochasticity is ‘transferred’ to a particle immersed in and interacting with the ether. We prefer the former possibility, but acknowledge that the latter possibility is also viable.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Concerning whether or not the forward and backwards transition probabilities should be understood as ‘objective’ (i.e., as chances governed by natural law) versus ‘subjective’ (i.e., encoding our expectations or degrees of belief) [119, 120, 121], this seems to depend on whether the transition probabilities are merely phenomenological (in which case they would seem to be subjective) or reflect irreducible stochasticity in the ether (in which case they would seem to be objective). Our preference for viewing the transition probabilities as phenomenological seems to commit us to the subjective view, but the objective view also seems viable (the objective view is taken by Bacciagaluppi in [99, 67]). It is worth noting that, under the objective view, the backwards transition probabilities can be regarded as being just as objective/law-like as the forwards

Associated to the trajectory  $\mathbf{q}(t)$  is the probability density  $\rho(\mathbf{q}, t) = n(\mathbf{q}, t)/N$ , where  $n(\mathbf{q}, t)$  is the number of particles per unit volume and  $N$  is the total number of particles in a definite region of space. Corresponding to (2.1) and (2.4), then, are the forward and backward Fokker-Planck equations,

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot [\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}, t)\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)] + \frac{\hbar}{2m}\nabla^2 \rho(\mathbf{q}, t), \quad (2.5)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot [\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}, t)\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)] - \frac{\hbar}{2m}\nabla^2 \rho(\mathbf{q}, t), \quad (2.6)$$

where we require that  $\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)$  satisfies the normalization condition,

$$\int \rho_0(\mathbf{q}) d^3 q = 1. \quad (2.7)$$

We emphasize that, in contrast to the transition probabilities defined by (2.1) and (2.4), the probability distributions satisfying (2.5) and (2.6) are epistemic distributions in the sense that they are distributions over a Gibbsian ensemble of identical systems (i.e., the distributions reflect our ignorance of the actual positions of the particles). Nevertheless, for an epistemic distribution satisfying (2.5) or (2.6) at time  $t$ , its subsequent evolution will be determined by the ontic transition probabilities so that the distribution at later times will partly come to reflect ontic features of the  $N$ -particle system, and may asymptotically become independent of the initial distribution.<sup>5</sup> Of course, the asymptotic distribution would still be epistemic in the sense of encoding our ignorance of the actual particle positions, even though it would be determined by the ontic features of the system.

A frictionless (hence energy-conserving or conservative) diffusion process such as Nelson's should have a time-symmetric probability density evolution. The Fokker-Planck equations (2.5-6), on the other hand, describe time-asymmetric evolutions in opposite time directions. The reason is that, given all possible solutions to (2.1), one can define as many forward processes as there are possible initial distributions satisfying (2.5); likewise, given all possible solutions to (2.4), one can define as many backward processes as there are possible 'initial' distributions satisfying (2.6). Consequently, the forward and backward processes are both underdetermined, and neither (2.1) nor (2.4) has a well-defined time-reversal. We must therefore restrict the diffusion process to simultaneous solutions of (2.5) and (2.6).

---

transition probabilities (but see [118] for a different view).

<sup>5</sup>I thank Guido Bacciagaluppi for emphasizing this point.

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

Note that the sum of (2.5) and (2.6) gives the continuity equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot [\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}, t) \rho(\mathbf{q}, t)], \quad (2.8)$$

where

$$\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}, t) := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}, t) + \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}, t)] \quad (2.9)$$

is called the “current velocity” field. As it stands, this current velocity field could have vorticity. But if vorticity is allowed, then the time-reversal operation on (5.8) will change the orientation of the curl, thus distinguishing time directions [122, 123, 67]. So we impose

$$\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}, t) = \frac{\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)}{m}, \quad (2.10)$$

or that the current velocity field is irrotational. Accordingly, (2.8) becomes

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot \left[ \frac{\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)}{m} \rho(\mathbf{q}, t) \right], \quad (2.11)$$

a time-reversal invariant evolution equation for the single-time density  $\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)$ .

Physically speaking, the  $S$  function in (2.10-11) has the interpretation of a velocity potential connected with a Gibbsian ensemble of fictitious, non-interacting, identical particles with density  $\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)$ , where each particle in the ensemble differs from the other in its initial position (hence the dependence of  $S$  on the generalized coordinate  $\mathbf{q}$ ) and initial irrotational velocity given by (2.10).<sup>6</sup> It is thereby analogous to the  $S$  function in the Hamilton-Jacobi formulation of classical statistical mechanics for a single point particle [126, 127, 6, 128, 129, 130].

Note also that subtracting (2.5) from (2.6) yields equality on the right hand side of

$$\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{q}, t) := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}, t) - \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}, t)] = \frac{\hbar}{2m} \frac{\nabla \rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}, \quad (2.12)$$

where  $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{q}, t)$  is called the “osmotic velocity” field (because it has the same dependence on the density as the velocity acquired by a classical Brownian particle in equilibrium with respect to an external force, in the ES theory [22, 53, 36]).

---

<sup>6</sup>Of course, one can still add to  $\nabla S$  a solenoidal vector field of any magnitude and, upon insertion into (2.8), recover the same continuity equation [124, 125]. But the assumption of only irrotational flow velocity is the simplest one, and as we already mentioned, it follows from the requirement of time symmetry for the  $\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)$  of the diffusion process.

As a consequence of (2.9), (2.10), and (2.12), we have that  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{b}_* = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}$ , which when inserted back into (2.5) and (2.6), respectively, reduce both Fokker-Planck equations to the time-reversal invariant continuity equation (2.11). So the combination of (2.9), (2.10), and (2.12) fixes  $\rho$  as the common, single-time, ‘equilibrium’ probability density (in analogy with a thermal equilibrium density) for solutions of (2.1) and (2.4), even though it is a time-dependent density.

In our view, the physical meaning of (2.12) has been misconstrued by some researchers [131, 24, 100, 132] to imply that  $\rho$  must be interpreted as the physical cause of the osmotic velocity of Nelson’s particle. We want to stress that this is not the case, and that such an interpretation would be logically and physically inconsistent with the definition of  $\rho$  as a probability density. Instead, Nelson physically motivates his osmotic velocity by analogy with the osmotic velocity in the ES theory [22, 53] - essentially, he postulates the presence of an external (i.e., not sourced by the particle) potential,  $U(\mathbf{q}, t)$ , which couples to the particle via some coupling constant,  $\mu$ , such that  $R(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \mu U(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$  defines a ‘potential momentum’ for the particle.<sup>7</sup> (Hereafter we shall permit ourselves to refer to  $U(\mathbf{q}, t)$  and  $R(\mathbf{q}, t)$  interchangeably as the ‘osmotic potential’.) When  $U(\mathbf{q}, t)$  is spatially varying, it imparts to the particle a momentum,  $\nabla R(\mathbf{q}, t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}$ , which is then counter-balanced by the ether fluid’s osmotic impulse pressure,  $(\hbar/2m) \nabla \ln[n(\mathbf{q}, t)]|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}$ . This leads to the equilibrium condition  $\nabla R/m = (\hbar/2m) \nabla \rho/\rho$  (using  $\rho = n/N$ ), which implies that  $\rho$  depends on  $R$  as  $\rho = e^{2R/\hbar}$  for all times. Hence, the *physical cause* of  $\mathbf{u}$  is  $R$  (or technically  $U$ ), and (2.12) is just a mathematically equivalent and convenient rewriting of this relation.

So far our discussion has been restricted to the first-order stochastic differential equations for Nelson’s particle, and the associated Fokker-Planck evolutions. In order to discuss the second-order dynamics for Nelson’s particle, we must first motivate Nelson’s analogues of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck mean derivatives. In the Itô calculus, the mean forward and backward derivatives of a solution  $\mathbf{q}(t)$  satisfying (2.1) and (2.4) are respectively defined as

$$D\mathbf{q}(t) = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0^+} E_t \left[ \frac{q(t + \Delta t) - q(t)}{\Delta t} \right], \quad (2.13)$$

---

<sup>7</sup>It should be emphasized that  $U(\mathbf{q}, t)$  is not defined over an ensemble of systems, but is a real physical field on 3-space analogous to the classical external potential,  $V(\mathbf{q}, t)$ , that causes the osmotic velocity of a Brownian particle in the E-S theory. Nelson does not specify whether  $U(\mathbf{q}, t)$  is sourced by the ether or is an independently existing field on space-time, nor does he specify whether the coupling  $\mu$  corresponds to any of the fundamental force interactions of the Standard Model. These elements of his theory are phenomenological hypotheses that presumably should be made more precise in a ‘deeper’ extension of stochastic mechanics. Nonetheless, as we will see in Part II, the many-particle extension of stochastic mechanics puts additional constraints on how the osmotic potential should be understood.



## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

and

$$D_*\mathbf{q}(t) = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0^+} E_t \left[ \frac{q(t) - q(t - \Delta t)}{\Delta t} \right]. \quad (2.14)$$

Because  $d\mathbf{W}(t)$  and  $d\mathbf{W}_*(t)$  are Gaussian with zero mean, it follows that  $D\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$  and  $D_*\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$ . To compute the second mean derivative,  $D\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$  (or  $D_*\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$ ), we must expand  $\mathbf{b}$  in a Taylor series up to terms of order two in  $d\mathbf{q}(t)$ :

$$d\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \frac{\partial \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)}{\partial t} dt + d\mathbf{q}(t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} dq_i(t) dq_j(t) \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)}{\partial q_i \partial q_j} + \dots \quad (2.15)$$

From (2.1), we can replace  $dx_i(t)$  by  $dW_i(t)$  in the last term, and when taking the conditional expectation in (2.13), we can replace  $d\mathbf{q}(t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$  by  $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$  since  $d\mathbf{W}(t)$  is independent of  $\mathbf{q}(t)$  and has mean 0. Using (2.2-3), we then obtain

$$D\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \nabla + \frac{\hbar}{2m} \nabla^2 \right] \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t), \quad (2.16)$$

and likewise

$$D_*\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \nabla - \frac{\hbar}{2m} \nabla^2 \right] \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t). \quad (2.17)$$

Using (2.16-17), along with Newton's 2nd law, Nelson wanted to construct an expression for the 'mean acceleration' of the particle consistent with the principle of time-symmetry. He proposed

$$m\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \frac{m}{2} [D_*D + DD_*] \mathbf{q}(t) = -\nabla V(\mathbf{q}, t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}. \quad (2.18)$$

Physically, this equation says that the mean acceleration Nelson's particle feels in the presence of an external (conservative) force is the equal-weighted average of its mean forward drift  $\mathbf{b}$  transported backwards in time, with its mean backward drift  $\mathbf{b}_*$  transported forwards in time. It is this peculiar mean dynamics that preserves the time-symmetry of Nelson's diffusion process.

Of course, other time-symmetric mean accelerations are possible. For example,  $(1/2)[D^2 + D_*^2]\mathbf{q}(t)$ , or any weighted average of this with (2.18). So it may be asked: what other physical principles (if any) privilege Nelson's choice? As first shown by Yasue [56, 57] and later adopted by Nelson [36], a physically well-motivated stochastic variational principle can give (2.18).<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>Another widely used stochastic variational principle is the one due to Guerra and Morato [60]. We don't use their approach because it entails an  $S$  function that's globally single-valued, which excludes the possibility of systems with angular momentum [41] and therefore will not be applicable to our proposed answer to



Consider the ensemble-averaged, time-symmetric mean action

$$\begin{aligned} J &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)^2 + \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t)^2 \right] - V(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \right\} dt \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{v}^2 + \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{u}^2 - V \right\} dt \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

In other words, for a particle in a (possibly) time-dependent potential  $V$ , undergoing the Markov processes given by (2.1) and (2.4) with the restriction to simultaneous solutions of the Fokker-Planck equations via (2.9), (2.10), and (2.12), a time-symmetric mean Lagrangian can be defined by averaging together the mean Lagrangians associated with the forward and backward processes. The ensemble averaged action obtained from this time-symmetric mean Lagrangian then corresponds to (2.19), where  $\mathbb{E}[\dots]$  denotes the absolute expectation. Upon imposing the conservative diffusion condition through the variational principle,

$$J = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{v}^2 + \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{u}^2 - V \right\} dt \right] = \text{extremal}, \quad (2.20)$$

a straightforward computation (see Appendix 6.1) shows that this implies (2.18) as the equation of motion. If, instead, we had allowed the mean kinetic energy terms in (2.19) to not be positive-definite and used the alternative time-symmetric mean kinetic energy,  $(1/2)m\mathbf{b}\mathbf{b}_* = (1/2)m(\mathbf{v}^2 - \mathbf{u}^2)$ , then it can be shown [133, 24, 62] that imposing (2.20) would give the alternative time-symmetric mean acceleration involving the derivatives  $[D^2 + D_*^2]$ .<sup>9</sup> So Nelson's mean acceleration choice is justified by the principle of time-symmetry *and* the natural physical requirement that all the contributions to the mean kinetic energy of the Nelsonian particle should be positive-definite.

By applying the mean derivatives in (2.18) to  $\mathbf{q}(t)$ , using that  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{b}_* = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}$ , and removing the dependence of the mean acceleration on the actual particle trajectory  $\mathbf{q}(t)$  so that  $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$  gets replaced by the mean acceleration field  $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}, t)$ , a straightforward computation

---

Wallstrom's criticism.

<sup>9</sup>Additionally, Davidson [62] showed that by defining a Lagrangian of the form  $(1/2)m[(1/2)(\mathbf{b}^2 + \mathbf{b}_*^2) - (\beta/8)(\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_*)^2]$ , where  $\beta$  is a constant, the resulting equation of motion is also equivalent to the usual Schrödinger equation, provided that the diffusion coefficient  $\nu = (1/\sqrt{1 - \beta/2})\frac{\hbar}{2m}$ . We can see, however, that our criterion of restricting the kinetic energy terms in the Lagrangian to only terms that are positive-definite, excludes Davidson's choice of Lagrangian too.

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

gives

$$\begin{aligned} m\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}, t) &= m \left[ \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}, t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}, t) - \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{q}, t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{q}, t) - \frac{\hbar}{2m} \nabla^2 \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{q}, t) \right] \\ &= \nabla \left[ \frac{\partial S(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} + \frac{(\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t))^2}{2m} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2 \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}} \right] = -\nabla V(\mathbf{q}, t). \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

The mean acceleration field  $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}, t)$  describes the possible mean accelerations of the actual particle given all of the possible spatial locations that the actual particle can occupy at time  $t$ . In other words,  $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}, t)$  is the mean acceleration field connected with the set of fictitious particles forming the Gibbsian ensemble that reflects our ignorance of the actual trajectory  $\mathbf{q}(t)$  [6]. Integrating both sides of (2.21), and setting the arbitrary integration constants equal to zero, we then obtain the Quantum Hamilton-Jacobi equation,

$$-\frac{\partial S(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} = \frac{(\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t))^2}{2m} + V(\mathbf{q}, t) - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2 \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}}, \quad (2.22)$$

which describes the total energy field over the possible positions of the actual point mass, and upon evaluation at  $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{q}(t)$ , the total energy of the point mass along its actual trajectory.

Although the last term on the right hand side of (2.22) is often called the “quantum potential”, we note that it arises here from the osmotic kinetic energy term in (2.19). So the quantum potential must be physically understood in stochastic mechanics as a kinetic energy field (which hereafter we prefer to call the ‘quantum kinetic’ for accuracy of meaning) arising from the osmotic velocity field.

The pair of nonlinear equations coupling the evolution of  $\rho$  and  $S$ , as given by (2.11) and (2.22), are generally known as the Hamilton-Jacobi-Madelung (HJM) equations, and can be formally identified with the imaginary and real parts of the Schrödinger equation under polar decomposition [42, 6]. Therefore, (2.11) and (2.22) can be formally rewritten as the Schrödinger equation,

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 \psi(\mathbf{q}, t) + V(\mathbf{q}, t) \psi(\mathbf{q}, t), \quad (2.23)$$

where  $\psi(\mathbf{q}, t) = \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)} e^{iS(\mathbf{q}, t)/\hbar}$ . In contrast to other ontological formulations of quantum mechanics, this wave function must be interpreted as an epistemic field in the sense that it encodes information about the possible position and momenta states that the actual particle can occupy at any instant, since it is defined in terms of the ensemble variables  $\rho$  and  $S$ .

<sup>10</sup> Although the treatment here did not include coupling to electromagnetic potentials, it is straightforward to do so [36] (see also Appendix 6.1 ).

## 2.3 Wallstrom's Criticism

In the previous section, we referred to the correspondence between the HJM equations and (2.23) as only formal because we had not considered the boundary conditions that must be imposed on solutions of the Schrödinger equation and the HJM equations, respectively, in order for mathematical equivalence to be established. In standard quantum mechanics, it is well-known that physical wave functions satisfying the Schrödinger equation are required to be single-valued. For the HJM equations, it was not specified in the Nelson-Yasue derivation whether  $S$  is assumed to be single-valued, arbitrarily multi-valued, or multi-valued in accordance with a quantization condition. Wallstrom [41, 25] showed that for all existing formulations of stochastic mechanics, all these possible conditions on  $S$  are problematic in one way or another.

If  $S$  is constrained to be single-valued, then stochastic mechanical theories exclude single-valued Schrödinger wave functions with angular momentum. This is so because single-valued wave functions with angular momentum have phase factors of the form  $\exp(im\varphi)$ , where  $m$  is an integer and  $\varphi$  is the azimuthal angle, which implies that  $S(\varphi) = m\hbar\varphi$ . By contrast, if  $S$  is assumed to be arbitrarily multi-valued, they produce all the single-valued wave functions of the Schrödinger equation, along with infinitely many multi-valued 'wave functions', which smoothly interpolate between the single-valued wave functions. This can be seen by comparing solutions of the Schrödinger and HJM equations for a two-dimensional central potential,  $V(\mathbf{r})$  [41]. The Schrödinger equation with  $V(\mathbf{r})$  has single-valued wave functions of the form  $\psi_m(\mathbf{r}, \varphi) = R_m(\mathbf{r})\exp(im\varphi)$ , where  $\psi_m(\mathbf{r}, \varphi) = \psi_m(\mathbf{r}, \varphi + 2\pi n)$ , implying that  $m$  is an integer. For the HJM equations, however, the solutions  $\rho_m = |R_m(\mathbf{r})|^2$  and  $\mathbf{v}_m = (m\hbar/mr)\hat{\varphi}$  don't require  $m$  to be integral. To see this, consider the effective central potential,  $V_a(\mathbf{r}) = V(\mathbf{r}) + a/r^2$ , where  $a$  is a positive real constant. For this potential, consider the Schrödinger equation with stationary solution  $\psi_a(\mathbf{r}, \varphi) = R_a(\mathbf{r})\exp(i\varphi)$ , where  $m = 1$  and radial component corresponding to the ground state solution of the radial equation. This wave function yields osmotic and current

---

<sup>10</sup>Though it may not be obvious here, this interpretation of the Nelson-Yasue wave function is not undermined by the Pusey-Barrett-Rudolph theorem [134]. Whereas this theorem assumes factorizability/separability of the "ontic state space", the ontic osmotic potential,  $U$ , which is encoded in the amplitude of the wave function via  $R$  and plays a role in the particle dynamics via (21), is in general not separable when extended to the  $N$ -particle case (as will be shown in Part II [27]).

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

velocities,  $\mathbf{u}_a$  and  $\mathbf{v}_a$ , which satisfy (2.11) and (2.21) with the potential  $V_a$ :

$$0 = \frac{\partial \rho_a}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v}_a \rho_a), \quad (2.24)$$

$$0 = \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}_a}{\partial t} = -\nabla \left( V + \frac{a}{r^2} \right) - \mathbf{v}_a \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_a + \mathbf{u}_a \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_a + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 \mathbf{u}_a. \quad (2.25)$$

Using  $\mathbf{v}_a = (\hbar/mr) \hat{\varphi}$  and  $\mathbf{v}_a \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_a = \nabla [m\mathbf{v}_a^2/2]$ , we can then rewrite (2.25) as

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= -\nabla V - \nabla \left( \frac{a}{r^2} + \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{v}_a^2 \right) + \mathbf{u}_a \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_a + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 \mathbf{u}_a \\ &= -\nabla V - \frac{m}{2} \nabla \left( \frac{2ma}{\hbar^2} + 1 \right) \mathbf{v}_a^2 + \mathbf{u}_a \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_a + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 \mathbf{u}_a. \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

This gives us  $\mathbf{v}'_a = \mathbf{v}_a \sqrt{2ma/\hbar^2 + 1}$  and  $\mathbf{u}'_a = \mathbf{u}_a$ . Note that since  $a$  is a constant that can take any positive real value,  $\mathbf{v}'_a$  is not quantized, and yet it is a solution of the HJM equations. By contrast, in the quantum mechanical version of this problem, we would have  $V_a(\mathbf{r}) = V(\mathbf{r}) + m^2/2r^2$ , where  $m = \sqrt{2ma/\hbar^2 + 1}$  would be integral due to the single-valuedness condition on  $\psi_m$ . In other words, the  $\mathbf{v}_a$  and  $\mathbf{u}_a$  in stochastic mechanics only correspond to a single-valued wave function when  $a$  is an integer, and this is true of all systems of two dimensions or higher. Equivalently, we may say that the HJM equations predict a continuum of energy and momentum states for the particle, which smoothly interpolate between the quantized energy and momentum eigenvalues predicted by the quantum mechanical case.<sup>11</sup>

The only condition on  $S$  (and hence the current velocity  $\mathbf{v}_a$ ) that allows stochastic mechanics to recover all and only the single-valued wave functions of the Schrödinger equation is the condition that the change in  $S$  around any closed loop  $L$  in space (with time held constant) is

---

<sup>11</sup>Before Wallstrom's critiques, it was pointed out by Alberverio and Hoegh-Krohn [135] as well as Goldstein [30] that, for the cases of stationary bound states with nodal surfaces that separate the manifold of diffusion into disjoint components, Nelson's equations (the HJM equations and his stochastic differential equations) contain more solutions than Schrödinger's equation. In addition, Goldstein [30] was the first to point out that solutions exist to the HJM equations which don't correspond to any single-valued solution of the Schrödinger equation, for the case of a multiply-connected configuration space. Nevertheless, Wallstrom's example of extraneous solutions is of a more general nature, as it applies to a simply-connected space where the diffusion process is not separated into disjoint components.

equal to an integer multiple of Planck's constant,<sup>12</sup> or

$$\oint_L dS = \oint_L \nabla S \cdot d\mathbf{q} = nh. \quad (2.27)$$

But this condition is arbitrary, Wallstrom argued, as there's no reason in stochastic mechanics why the change in  $S$  along  $L$  should be constrained to an integer multiple of  $h$ . Indeed, assuming this condition amounts to assuming that wave functions are single-valued, which amounts to assuming that the solution space of the Nelson-Yasue stochastic mechanical equations is equivalent to the solution space of the quantum mechanical Schrödinger equation. Such an assumption cannot be made, however, in a theory purporting to *derive* the Schrödinger equation of quantum mechanics.

These arguments notwithstanding, one might question whether the requirement of single-valued wave functions in quantum mechanics is any less arbitrary than imposing (2.27) in stochastic mechanics. This is not the case. The single-valuedness condition, as usually motivated, is a consequence of imposing two completely natural boundary conditions on solutions of (2.23): (a) that the solutions satisfy the linear superposition principle [136, 41], and (b) that  $|\psi|^2$  can be physically interpreted as a probability density [137, 138, 139].<sup>13</sup> Condition (a) is natural to the single-valuedness requirement because of the linearity of the Schrödinger equation, and condition (b) is natural to it because a probability density is, by definition, a single-valued function on its sample space. Moreover, it can be shown that if (a) doesn't hold then (b) doesn't hold for any linear superposition of two or more solutions. To illustrate this, consider the free particle Schrödinger equation on the unit circle,  $S^1$ :<sup>14</sup>

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial \theta^2} = E\psi. \quad (2.28)$$

The un-normalized wave function satisfying this equation is of the form  $\psi(\theta) = Ne^{ik\theta}$ , where  $k = \frac{r}{\hbar} \sqrt{2mE}$ . For this wave function to satisfy (b),  $k$  (and hence the energy  $E$ ) can take any positive value among the real numbers since obviously  $|\psi|^2 = N^2$ . Consider now a superposition

---

<sup>12</sup>Wallstrom notes that Takabayasi [42] was first to recognize the necessity of this quantization condition and suggests [private communication] that priority of credit for this discovery should go to him [25]. However, it seems that Takabayasi only recognized this issue in the context of Bohm's 1952 hidden-variables theory, even though Fényes proposed the first formulation of stochastic mechanics that same year [21]. Wallstrom appears to have been the first in the literature to recognize and discuss the full extent of this inequivalence in the context of stochastic mechanical theories.

<sup>13</sup>Henneberger et al. [140] argue that the single-valuedness condition on wave functions is strictly a consequence of the linear superposition principle. However, this nuance is inessential to our arguments.

<sup>14</sup>This argument was relayed to the author by T. Wallstrom [private communication].

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

of the form  $\psi_s(\theta) = N (e^{ik_1\theta} + e^{ik_2\theta})$ , which leads to the density

$$|\psi_s|^2 = 2N^2 (1 + \cos [(k_1 - k_2)\theta]). \quad (2.29)$$

If  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  are allowed to take non-integer values, then  $(k_1 - k_2)$  can also take non-integer values, and the density formed from the superposition can be multi-valued, thereby violating (b). Condition (a) will also be violated since, although a single wave function in the superposition satisfies (b), the superposition does not; so the set of wave functions of the form  $\psi(\theta) = Ne^{ik\theta}$ , where  $k$  can take non-integer values, does not form a linear space. If, however,  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  are integers, then so is  $(k_1 - k_2)$ , and conditions (a) and (b) will be satisfied since  $|\psi_s|^2$  will always be single-valued. Correspondingly, it follows that the energy and momentum of the particle on the unit circle will be quantized with  $e^{i2\pi \frac{E}{\hbar} \sqrt{2mE}} = 1 = e^{i2\pi n}$  yielding  $E_n = \frac{p_\theta^2}{2mr^2} = \frac{n^2 \hbar^2}{2mr^2}$ , where  $n$  is an integer.

The wave functions constructed from stochastic mechanics will therefore satisfy only (b) if  $S$  is arbitrarily multi-valued, while they will satisfy (a) and (b) together only when (2.27) is imposed. But as previously mentioned, (2.27) is ad hoc in stochastic mechanics, and assuming it to obtain only single-valued wave functions is logically circular if the objective of stochastic mechanics is to derive quantum mechanics. The challenge then is to find a physically plausible justification for (2.27) strictly within the assumptions of existing formulations of stochastic mechanics, or otherwise some new formulation. Accordingly, we shall now begin the development of our proposed justification through a reformulation of Nelson-Yasue stochastic mechanics (NYSM).

## 2.4 Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion

Here we develop a classical model of a particle of mass  $m$  constrained in its rest frame to undergo a simple harmonic oscillation of (electron) Compton frequency, and show that it gives rise to a quantization condition equivalent to (2.27). Our model motivates the quantization condition from essentially the same physical arguments used by de Broglie in his “phase-wave” model [43, 44] and by Bohm in his subquantum field-theoretic models [46, 47]. However, it differs from both de Broglie’s model and Bohm’s models in that we do not need to refer to fictitious “phase waves”, nor assume that our particle is some localized distribution of a (hypothetical) fluctuating subquantum field [46], nor assume a non-denumerable infinity of “local clocks” at each point in space-time [47]. We start by developing the free particle case, extend it to a classical Hamilton-Jacobi (HJ) statistical mechanical description, and repeat these steps with the inclusion of interactions with external fields.

## 2.4 Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion

The purpose of this section is three-fold: (i) to explicitly show, without the added conceptual complications of stochastic mechanics, the basic physical assumptions underlying our particle model; (ii) to show how our model can be consistently generalized to include interactions with external fields; (iii) to show, using a well-established formulation of classical statistical mechanics that has conceptual and mathematical similarities to stochastic mechanics, how our model can be consistently generalized to a statistical ensemble description (which will also be necessary in the stochastic mechanical case), and how doing so gives a quantization condition equivalent to (2.27) for a ‘classical’ wave function satisfying a nonlinear Schrödinger equation. No attempt will be made here to suggest a physical/dynamical model for the zitterbewegung motion. A framework for a physical model is given in section 5, while a discussion of possible physical models is reserved for Part II.

### 2.4.1 One free particle

Suppose that a classical particle of rest mass  $m$  is rheonomically constrained to undergo a periodic process with constant angular frequency,  $\omega_0$ , about some fixed point in 3-space,  $\mathbf{q}_0$ , in a Lorentz frame where the particle has translational velocity  $\mathbf{v} = d\mathbf{q}_0/dt = 0$ . The exact nature of this process is not important for the argument that follows, as long as it is periodic. For example, this process could be an oscillation or (if the particle is spinning) a rotation. But since we are considering the spinless case, we will take the periodic process to be some kind of oscillation. The constancy of  $\omega_0$  implies that the oscillation is simply harmonic with phase  $\theta = \omega_0 t_0 + \phi$ . Although the assumption of simple harmonic motion implies that  $\theta$  is a continuous function of the particle’s position, in the translational rest frame, it must be the case that the phase change  $\delta\theta$  at any fixed instant  $t_0$  will be zero for some translational displacement  $\delta\mathbf{q}_0$ . Otherwise, such a displacement would define a preferred direction in space given by  $\nabla\theta(\mathbf{q}_0)$ . Hence, in the translational rest frame, we can write

$$\delta\theta = \omega_0 \delta t_0, \quad (2.30)$$

where  $\delta t_0$  is the change in proper time.

If we Lorentz transform to the lab frame where the particle has constant translational velocity,  $\mathbf{v}$ , and undergoes a displacement  $\delta\mathbf{q}(t)$  in  $\delta t$ , then  $\delta t_0 = \gamma (\delta t - \mathbf{v} \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t)/c^2)$  and (2.30) becomes

$$\delta\theta(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \omega_0 \gamma \left( \delta t - \frac{\mathbf{v} \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t)}{c^2} \right), \quad (2.31)$$

where  $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{1 - \mathbf{v}^2/c^2}$ . Recalling that for a relativistic free particle we have  $E = \gamma mc^2$

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

and  $\mathbf{p} = \gamma m \mathbf{v}$ , (2.31) can be equivalently expressed as

$$\delta\theta(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \frac{\omega_0}{mc^2} (E\delta t - \mathbf{p} \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t)). \quad (2.32)$$

Suppose now that the oscillating particle is physically or virtually<sup>15</sup> displaced around a closed loop  $L$  (i.e., a continuous, non-self-intersecting loop that is otherwise arbitrary) in which both position and time can vary. The consistency of the model requires that the accumulated phase change be given by

$$\oint_L \delta\theta(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \frac{\omega_0}{mc^2} \oint_L (E\delta t - \mathbf{p} \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t)) = 2\pi n, \quad (2.33)$$

where  $n$  is an integer. This follows from the assumption that the oscillation is simply harmonic in the particle's rest frame, which makes  $\theta$  in the lab frame a single-valued function of  $\mathbf{q}(t)$  (up to an additive integer multiple of  $2\pi$ ). Indeed, if (2.33) were not true, we would contradict our hypothesis that the oscillating particle has a well-defined phase at each point along its space-time trajectory.

If we further make the 'zitterbewegung' (*zbw*) hypothesis that  $m = m_e = 9.11 \times 10^{-28}g$  and  $\omega_0/m_e c^2 = 1/\hbar$  so that  $\omega_0 = \omega_c = 7.77 \times 10^{20} rad/s$ , which is the electron Compton angular frequency, then we can define  $\bar{\theta} =: -\frac{1}{\hbar}S$  and (2.33) can be rewritten as

$$\oint_L \delta S(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \oint_L (\mathbf{p} \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t) - E\delta t) = nh. \quad (2.34)$$

Finally, for the special case of loop integrals in which time is held fixed ( $\delta t = 0$ ), (2.34) reduces to

$$\oint_L \mathbf{p} \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t) = nh, \quad (2.35)$$

which we may observe is formally identical to the Bohr-Sommerfeld-Wilson quantization condition.

By integrating (2.32) and using the Legendre transformation, it can be shown that the phase of the free *zbw* particle is, equivalently, its relativistic action up to an additive constant, or

---

<sup>15</sup>Because we permit a virtual displacement where time changes, we cannot use the definition of a virtual displacement often found in textbooks [141, 142] (which assumes time is fixed under the displacement). Instead, we use the more refined definition of virtual displacements proposed by Ray & Shamanna [143], namely that a virtual displacement is the difference between any two (unequal) "allowed displacements", or  $\delta\mathbf{q}_k = d\mathbf{q}_k - d\mathbf{q}'_k$ , where  $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , and an allowed displacement is defined as  $d\mathbf{q}_k = \mathbf{v}_k dt$ , where  $\mathbf{v}_k$  are the "virtual velocities", or the velocities allowed by the mechanical constraints of a given system.



## 2.4 Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion

$S(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q}(t) - Et - \hbar\phi = -mc^2 \int_{t_i}^t dt' / \gamma + C$ .<sup>16</sup>, where  $\phi$  is the initial phase constant. Recognizing also that  $\mathbf{p} = \hbar\gamma\omega_c \mathbf{v} / c^2 = \hbar\gamma \mathbf{k}$  and  $E = \hbar\gamma\omega_c$ , the translational 3-velocity of the particle can be obtained from  $S(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$  as  $\mathbf{v} = (1/\gamma m) \nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}$ , and the total relativistic energy as  $E = -\partial_t S(\mathbf{q}, t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}$ . It follows then that  $S(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$  is a solution of the classical relativistic Hamilton-Jacobi equation,

$$-\partial_t S(\mathbf{q}, t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = \sqrt{m^2 c^4 + (\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t))^2 c^2}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}. \quad (2.36)$$

In the non-relativistic limit,  $v \ll c$ ,  $S(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \approx m\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{q}(t) - \left(mc^2 + \frac{mv^2}{2}\right)t - \hbar\phi$ , and (2.36) becomes

$$-\partial_t S(\mathbf{q}, t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = \frac{(\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t))^2}{2m}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} + mc^2, \quad (2.37)$$

where  $\mathbf{v} = (1/m) \nabla S|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = (1/m)\hbar \mathbf{k}$  and satisfies the trivial classical Newtonian equation

$$m\mathbf{a} = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla\right) \nabla S = 0. \quad (2.38)$$

We find then that, in the non-relativistic limit, the oscillation frequency of the *zbw* particle has two parts - a low frequency oscillation,  $\omega_{dB} = \hbar k^2 / 2m$ , which modulates the high frequency oscillation  $\omega_c$ .

Evidently (2.37) has the form of the non-relativistic dispersion relation  $E = \hbar^2 k^2 / 2m + mc^2$ , which naively suggests that one can obtain the free-particle Schrödinger equation for a plane wave by introducing operators  $\hat{p} = -i\hbar \nabla$  and  $\hat{E} = i\hbar \partial_t$  such that  $\hat{p}\psi = \hbar k\psi$ ,  $\hat{E}\psi = \hbar\omega\psi$ , and  $i\hbar \partial_t \psi = -(\hbar^2 / 2m) \nabla^2 \psi$  for  $\psi(\mathbf{q}, t) = Ae^{i(\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q} - Et)/\hbar}$ . However, there is no physical wave for such a plane wave to be identified with in our model. Such a plane wave and Schrödinger equation are nothing more than abstract, mathematically equivalent re-writings of the *zbw* particle energy equation (2.37). On the other hand, as we will see next, a *nonlinear* Schrödinger equation that describes the dynamical evolution of a statistical ensemble of identical *zbw* particles is derivable from the classical HJ description of the ensemble.

### 2.4.2 Classical Hamilton-Jacobi statistical mechanics for one free particle

Suppose that the actual position and momentum of a *zbw* particle,  $(\mathbf{q}(t), \mathbf{p}(t))$ , are unknown. Then we must resort to the description of a classical (i.e., Gibbsian) statistical ensemble of

<sup>16</sup>The proof is as follows. From  $L = -mc^2/\gamma$ , the Legendre transform gives  $E = \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{v} - L = \gamma mv^2 + mc^2/\gamma = \gamma mc^2$  and  $L = \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{v} - E$ . So for the free *zbw* particle,  $S = \int L dt + C = \int (\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{v} - E) dt + C = \int (\mathbf{p} \cdot d\mathbf{q} - E dt) + C = \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q} - Et + C$  (absorbing the integration constants arising from  $d\mathbf{q}$  and  $dt$  into  $C$ ).

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

fictitious, identical, non-interacting *zbw* particles [6], which differ from each other only by virtue of their initial positions, velocities, and (possibly) phases. (Consideration of this in the classical context will be helpful for seeing how our model can be incorporated into stochastic mechanics.) In terms of the *zbw* phase, this change in description corresponds to replacing  $\delta S(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$  by  $dS(\mathbf{q}, t) = \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q}, t) \cdot d\mathbf{q} - E(\mathbf{q}, t)dt$ , which we obtained from replacing  $\mathbf{q}(t)$  by  $\mathbf{q}$ , where  $\mathbf{q}$  labels a *possible* position in 3-D space that the actual *zbw* particle could occupy at time  $t$ . Integrating  $dS(\mathbf{q}, t)$  then gives  $S(\mathbf{q}, t) = \int \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q}, t) d\mathbf{q} - \int E(\mathbf{q}, t)dt + C$ , where  $C = \hbar\phi$  is just the initial phase constant. So  $S(\mathbf{q}, t)$  is a phase *field* connected with the ensemble,  $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q}, t) = \nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)$  is the corresponding translational momentum field, and  $E(\mathbf{q}, t) = -\partial_t S(\mathbf{q}, t)$  is the total energy field. Note that, for any initial  $\mathbf{q}$  and  $t$ , the constant  $\phi$  can be given any value on the interval  $[0, 2\pi]$ ; i.e., the initial phase constant associated with any member of the ensemble can be freely specified on that interval. (Of course, this phase constant does not affect the momentum field or the total energy field, as these fields are obtained from space-time derivatives of the phase field. Thus there are many phase fields corresponding to a unique momentum field and total energy field.)

Now, in the specific case of the free *zbw* particle,  $p = \text{const}$  and  $E = \text{const}$  for each member of the ensemble. So the infinitesimal phase change connected with the ensemble is just  $dS(\mathbf{q}, t) = \mathbf{p} \cdot d\mathbf{q} - E dt$ , yielding  $S(\mathbf{q}, t) = \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q} - Et + C$  upon integration.

With this phase field in hand, we can now construct a classical HJ statistical mechanics for our *zbw* particle. Essentially,  $S(\mathbf{q}, t)$  and  $\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)$  will respectively satisfy the classical Hamilton-Jacobi equation,

$$-\partial_t S(\mathbf{q}, t) = \frac{(\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t))^2}{2m} + mc^2, \quad (2.39)$$

and the trivial classical Newtonian equation,

$$m\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}, t) = \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}, t) \cdot \nabla \right) \nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t) = 0. \quad (2.40)$$

If we now suppose that the density of ensemble particles per unit volume in an element  $d^3q$  surrounding the point  $\mathbf{q}$  at time  $t$  is given by the function  $\rho(\mathbf{q}, t) \geq 0$ , which satisfies the normalization condition  $\int \rho_0(\mathbf{q}) d^3q = 1$ , then it is straightforward to show [6] that  $\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)$  evolves in time by the continuity equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot \left[ \frac{\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)}{m} \rho(\mathbf{q}, t) \right]. \quad (2.41)$$

## 2.4 Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion

Accordingly,  $\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)$  carries the interpretation of the probability density for the actual *zbw* particle position  $\mathbf{q}(t)$ . And since  $S(\mathbf{q}, t)$  is a field over the possible positions that the actual *zbw* particle can occupy at time  $t$ , where for each possible position the actual *zbw* particle's phase will satisfy the relation (2.35),  $S(\mathbf{q}, t)$  will be a single-valued function of  $\mathbf{q}$  and  $t$  (up to an additive integer multiple of  $2\pi$ ) and satisfy

$$\oint_L dS(\mathbf{q}, t) = \oint_L \nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t) \cdot d\mathbf{q} = nh. \quad (2.42)$$

The use of exact differentials in (2.42) indicates that the loop integral is now an integral of the momentum field along any closed *mathematical* loop in 3-space with time held constant; that is, a closed loop around which the actual particle with momentum  $\mathbf{p}$  *could potentially be displaced*, starting from any possible position  $\mathbf{q}$  it can occupy at fixed time  $t$ . This tells us that the circulation of the momentum field is quantized, in contrast to an ordinary classical statistical mechanical ensemble for which the momentum field circulation need not satisfy (2.42).

Finally, we can combine (2.39) and (2.41) into the nonlinear Schrödinger equation [126, 127, 6, 128, 129, 130],

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 \psi(\mathbf{q}, t) + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2 |\psi(\mathbf{q}, t)|}{|\psi(\mathbf{q}, t)|} \psi(\mathbf{q}, t) + mc^2 \psi(\mathbf{q}, t), \quad (2.43)$$

with general solution  $\psi(\mathbf{q}, t) = \sqrt{\rho_0(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{v}_0 t)} e^{iS(\mathbf{q}, t)/\hbar}$ , which is single-valued because of (2.42). (Note that  $C$  will contribute a global phase factor,  $e^{iC/\hbar}$ , which cancels out from both sides.) As an example of a specific solution, the complex phase  $e^{iS/\hbar}$  takes the form of a plane-wave,  $S = \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q} - Et + \hbar\phi$ , while the initial probability density,  $\rho_0$ , can take the form of a Gaussian that propagates with fixed profile and speed  $v$  (in contrast to a Gaussian density in free particle quantum mechanics, which disperses over time).

We have thereby shown that extending our free *zbw* particle model to a classical HJ statistical mechanics allows us to derive a nonlinear Schrödinger equation with single-valued wave functions. Next we will incorporate interactions of the *zbw* particle with external fields.

### 2.4.3 One particle interacting with external fields

To describe the interaction of our *zbw* particle with fields, let us reconsider the change in the *zbw* phase in the rest frame. In terms of the rest energy of the *zbw* particle, we can rewrite

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

(2.30) as

$$\delta\theta = \omega_c \delta t_0 = \frac{1}{\hbar} (mc^2) \delta t_0. \quad (2.44)$$

Any additional contribution to the energy of the particle, such as from a weak external gravitational field (e.g. the Earth's gravitational field) coupling to the particle's mass  $m$  via  $\Phi_g = \mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{q}$ , will then modify (2.44) as

$$\delta\theta = (\omega_c + \kappa(\mathbf{q}))|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}_0} \delta t_0 = \frac{1}{\hbar} (mc^2 + m\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}))|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}_0} \delta t_0, \quad (2.45)$$

where  $\kappa = \omega_c \Phi_g / c^2$ . In other words, the gravitational field shifts the  $z\bar{b}w$  frequency in the rest frame by a very small amount. For example, if  $|\mathbf{g}| = 10^3 \text{ cm/s}^2$  and is in the  $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$  direction, and we take  $|\mathbf{q}| = 100 \text{ cm}$ , then  $\kappa \approx \omega_c \times 10^{-16}$ . Here we have approximated the point at which the  $z\bar{b}w$  particle interacts with the external gravitational field to be just its equilibrium position,  $\mathbf{q}_0$ , because the displacement  $|\mathbf{q}| \gg \lambda_c$ , allowing us to approximate the interaction with the mass as point-like.<sup>17</sup>

In addition, we could allow the  $z\bar{b}w$  particle to carry charge  $e$  (so that it now becomes a classical charged oscillator, subject to the hypothetical constraint that it does not radiate electromagnetic energy in its rest frame, or the constraint that the oscillation of the charge is radially symmetric so that there is no net energy radiated [144, 145, 146], or constrained to correspond to one of the non-spherically-symmetric charge distributions considered by Bohm and Weinstein [147] for which the retarded self-fields cause the charge distribution to oscillate at a fixed frequency without radiating) which couples to an external (and possibly space-time varying) electric field such that  $\Phi_e = \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{q}, t) \cdot \mathbf{q}$ , where  $\mathbf{q}$  is the displacement vector in some arbitrary direction from the field source. Here again we can make the point-like approximation, as in laboratory experiments the displacement of a particle from a field source is typically on the centimeter scale, making  $|\mathbf{q}| \gg \lambda_c$ . Then

$$\delta\theta = (\omega_c + \kappa(\mathbf{q}_0) + \varepsilon(\mathbf{q}_0, t_0)) \delta t_0 = \frac{1}{\hbar} (mc^2 + m\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}_0) + e\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}_0, t_0)) \delta t_0, \quad (2.46)$$

where  $\varepsilon = \omega_c (e/mc^2) \Phi_e$ . Assuming  $\mathbf{E}$  has an experimental value of  $\sim 10^5 \text{ V/cm} \approx .03 \text{ stV/cm}$ , which is the upper limit laboratory field strength that can be produced in Stark effect experiments [148], and  $|\mathbf{q}| = 1 \text{ cm}$ , then  $\varepsilon \approx \omega_c \times 10^{-5}$ , which is also a very small shift.

If we now transform to the laboratory frame where the  $z\bar{b}w$  particle has nonzero but variable

---

<sup>17</sup>This appears to be the same assumption made by de Broglie for his equivalent model, although he never explicitly says so. Bohm, to the best of our knowledge, never extended his models to include field interactions.

## 2.4 Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion

translational velocity, (2.46) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\theta(\mathbf{q}(t), t) &= \left[ (\omega_{dB} + \kappa(\mathbf{q}) + \varepsilon(\mathbf{q})) \gamma \left( \delta t - \frac{\mathbf{v}_0(\mathbf{q}, t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}}{c^2} \right) \right]_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} \\
&= \frac{1}{\hbar} \left[ (\gamma mc^2 + \gamma m\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}) + e\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}, t)) \delta t \right. \\
&\quad \left. - (\gamma mc^2 + \gamma m\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}) + e\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}, t)) \frac{\mathbf{v}_0(\mathbf{q}, t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}}{c^2} \right]_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} \\
&= \frac{1}{\hbar} (E(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \delta t - \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t)),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.47}$$

where  $E = \gamma mc^2 + \gamma m\Phi_g + e\Phi_e$  and  $\mathbf{p} = m\mathbf{v} = (\gamma mc^2 + \gamma m\Phi_g + e\Phi_e) (\mathbf{v}_0/c^2)$ . (Note that the term  $e\Phi_e$  is unaffected by the Lorentz transformation because it doesn't involve the particle's rest mass.) Here the velocity  $\mathbf{v}_0$  is that of a free particle, while  $\mathbf{v}$  is the adjusted velocity due to the presence of external potentials. In this moving frame, we can also have the *zbw* particle couple to an external magnetic vector potential<sup>18</sup> such that  $\mathbf{v} \rightarrow \mathbf{v}' = \mathbf{v} + e\mathbf{A}_{ext}/\gamma mc$  (and  $\gamma$  depends on  $v$ ). Although the physical influence of the fields now allows the  $\omega$  and  $\mathbf{k}$  of the particle to vary as a function of position and time, the phase of the oscillation is still a well-defined function of the particle's space-time location; so if we displace the oscillating particle around a closed loop, the phase change is still given by

$$\oint_L \delta\theta(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \frac{1}{\hbar} \oint_L (E(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \delta t - \mathbf{p}'(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t)) = 2\pi n, \tag{2.48}$$

or

$$\oint_L \delta S(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \oint_L (\mathbf{p}'(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t) - E(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \delta t) = nh. \tag{2.49}$$

For the special case of a loop in which time is held fixed, we then have

$$\oint_L \nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t) = \oint_L \mathbf{p}'(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t) = nh, \tag{2.50}$$

or

$$\oint_L m\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t) = nh - \frac{e}{c} \oint_L \mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t), \tag{2.51}$$

where the last term on the right hand side of (2.51) is, by Stokes' theorem, the magnetic flux

---

<sup>18</sup>We could of course also include a gravitational vector potential, but for simplicity we'll just stick with the magnetic version.

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

enclosed by the loop.

We can also integrate (2.47) and rewrite in terms of  $S(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$  to obtain

$$S(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \int_{\mathbf{q}_i(t_i)}^{\mathbf{q}(t)} \mathbf{p}'(\mathbf{q}(s), s) \cdot d\mathbf{q}(s) - \int_{t_i}^t E(\mathbf{q}(s), s) ds - \hbar\phi, \quad (2.52)$$

where  $\phi$  is the initial phase constant and (2.52) is equivalent (up to an additive constant) to the relativistic action of a particle in the presence of external fields.<sup>19</sup> As before, the translational kinetic 3-velocity of the particle can be obtained from  $S(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$  as  $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)/\gamma m = (1/\gamma m)\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} - e\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)/\gamma mc$ , and the total relativistic energy as  $E(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = -\partial_t S(\mathbf{q}, t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}$ . It then follows that  $S(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$  is a solution of the classical relativistic Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$-\partial_t S(\mathbf{q}, t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = \sqrt{m^2 c^4 + \left( \nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t) - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}, t) \right)^2 c^2}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} + \gamma m \Phi_g(\mathbf{q}(t)) + e \Phi_e(\mathbf{q}(t), t). \quad (2.53)$$

When  $v \ll c$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} S(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \approx & \int_{\mathbf{q}_i(t_i)}^{\mathbf{q}(t)} m \mathbf{v}'(\mathbf{q}(s), s) \cdot d\mathbf{q}(s) - \\ & - \int_{t_i}^t \left( mc^2 + \frac{1}{2m} \left[ \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q}(s), s) - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}(s), s) \right]^2 + m \Phi_g(\mathbf{q}(s)) + e \Phi_e(\mathbf{q}(s), s) \right) ds - \hbar\phi, \end{aligned} \quad (2.54)$$

and (2.53) becomes

$$-\partial_t S(\mathbf{q}, t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = \frac{\left( \nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t) - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}, t) \right)^2}{2m}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} + mc^2 + m \Phi_g(\mathbf{q}(t)) + e \Phi_e(\mathbf{q}(t), t), \quad (2.55)$$

with  $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = (1/m)\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} - e\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)/mc$  and satisfies the classical Newtonian

---

<sup>19</sup>The proof is as follows. From  $L = -mc^2/\gamma - \gamma m \Phi_g - e \Phi_e + e \frac{\mathbf{v}}{c} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{ext}$ , the Legendre transform gives  $E = \mathbf{p}' \cdot \mathbf{v} - L = \gamma m v^2 + mc^2/\gamma + \gamma m \Phi_g + e \Phi_e = \gamma m c^2 + \gamma m \Phi_g + e \Phi_e$  and  $L = \mathbf{p}' \cdot \mathbf{v} - E$ . So,  $S = \int L dt + C = \int (\mathbf{p}' \cdot \mathbf{v} - E) dt + C = \int (\mathbf{p}' \cdot d\mathbf{q} - E dt) + C$ .

equation of motion,

$$\begin{aligned}
 m\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) &= \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \nabla \right) \left[ \nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t) - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}, t) \right] |_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} \\
 &= -\nabla [m\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}) + e\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}, t)] |_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} - \frac{e}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} |_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \times \mathbf{B}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}(t), t).
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.56}$$

Incidentally, if we choose  $\Phi_e$  as the Coulomb potential for the hydrogen atom and set  $\mathbf{B}_{ext} = 0$ , then our model is empirically equivalent to the Bohr model of the hydrogen atom (the demonstration of this can be found in Appendix 6.2). As in the previous section, we now want to extend our model to a classical HJ statistical mechanics.

#### 2.4.4 Classical Hamilton-Jacobi statistical mechanics for one particle interacting with external fields

Suppose now that, in the lab frame with  $v \ll c$ , we do not know the actual position  $\mathbf{q}(t)$  of the *zbw* particle. Then the phase (2.54) becomes the phase field

$$\begin{aligned}
 S(\mathbf{q}, t) &= \int_{\mathbf{q}(t_i)}^{\mathbf{q}(t)} m\mathbf{v}'(\mathbf{q}(s), s) \cdot d\mathbf{q}(s) |_{\mathbf{q}(t)=\mathbf{q}} \\
 &\quad - \int_{t_i}^t \left( mc^2 + \frac{1}{2m} \left[ \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q}(s), s) - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}(s), s) \right]^2 + m\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}(s)) + e\Phi_c(\mathbf{q}(s), s) \right) ds |_{\mathbf{q}(t)=\mathbf{q}} - \hbar\phi.
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.57}$$

To obtain the equations of motion for  $S(\mathbf{q}, t)$  and  $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}, t)$  we will apply the classical analogue of Yasue's variational principle, in anticipation of the method we will use for constructing ZSM.

First we introduce the ensemble-averaged action/phase functional (inputting limits between initial and final states),

$$\begin{aligned}
 J &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\mathbf{q}(t_i)}^{\mathbf{q}(t_f)} m\mathbf{v}' \cdot d\mathbf{q}(t) - \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \left( mc^2 + \frac{1}{2m} \left[ \mathbf{p} - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext} \right]^2 + m\Phi_g + e\Phi_e \right) dt - \hbar\phi \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} m\mathbf{v}^2 + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext} \cdot \mathbf{v} - mc^2 - m\Phi_g - e\Phi_e \right\} dt - \hbar\phi \right],
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.58}$$

where the equated expressions are related by the usual Legendre transformation. Imposing the variational constraint,

$$J = \text{extremal}, \tag{2.59}$$

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

a straightforward computation exactly along the lines of that in Appendix 6.1 yields (2.56), which, upon replacing  $\mathbf{q}(t)$  by  $\mathbf{q}$ , corresponds to the classical Newtonian equation,

$$\begin{aligned} m\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}, t) &= \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}, t) \cdot \nabla \right) \left[ \nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t) - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}, t) \right] \\ &= -\nabla [m\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}) + e\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}, t)] - \frac{e}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}, t) \times \mathbf{B}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}, t), \end{aligned} \quad (2.60)$$

where  $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}, t) = (1/m)\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t) - e\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}, t)/mc$  corresponds to the kinetic velocity field. By integrating both sides and setting the integration constant equal to the rest mass, we then obtain the classical Hamilton-Jacobi equation for (2.57),

$$-\partial_t S(\mathbf{q}, t) = \frac{(\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t) - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}, t))^2}{2m} + mc^2 + m\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}) + e\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}, t). \quad (2.61)$$

Because the momentum field couples to the vector potential, it can be readily shown that  $\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)$  now evolves by the modified continuity equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot \left[ \left( \frac{\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)}{m} - \frac{e}{mc} \mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}, t) \right) \rho(\mathbf{q}, t) \right], \quad (2.62)$$

which preserves the normalization,  $\int \rho_0(\mathbf{q}) d^3q = 1$ . As before,  $S(\mathbf{q}, t)$  is a field over the possible positions that the actual *zbw* particle can occupy at time  $t$ . Since for each possible position the actual *zbw* particle's phase will satisfy the relation (2.50),  $S(\mathbf{q}, t)$  will be a single-valued function of  $\mathbf{q}$  and  $t$  (up to an additive integer multiple of  $2\pi$ ) and

$$\oint_L \nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t) \cdot d\mathbf{q} = nh. \quad (2.63)$$

Finally, we can combined (2.61) and (2.62) into the nonlinear Schrödinger equation,

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \frac{[-i\hbar \nabla - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext}]^2}{2m} \psi + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2 |\psi|}{|\psi|} \psi + m\Phi_g \psi + e\Phi_e \psi + mc^2 \psi, \quad (2.64)$$

with wave function  $\psi(\mathbf{q}, t) = \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)} e^{iS(\mathbf{q}, t)/\hbar}$ , which is single-valued because of (2.63). (Again,  $C$  will contribute a global phase  $e^{iC/\hbar}$  which drops out.)



## 2.5 Zitterbewegung Stochastic Mechanics

We are now ready to extend the classical *zbw* model developed in section 4 to Nelson-Yasue stochastic mechanics for all the same cases. In doing so, we will show how this ‘zitterbewegung stochastic mechanics’ (ZSM) avoids the Wallstrom criticism and explain the ‘quantum-classical correspondence’ between the ZSM equations and the classical HJ statistical mechanical equations. We will also apply ZSM to the central potential problem considered by Wallstrom, to demonstrate how angular momentum quantization emerges and therefore that the solution space of ZSM’s HJM equations is equivalent to the solution space of the quantum mechanical Schrödinger equation.

### 2.5.1 One free particle

As in NYSM, we take as our starting point that a particle of rest mass  $m$  is immersed in Nelson’s hypothesized ether and has a 3-space coordinate  $\mathbf{q}(t)$  undergoes a frictionless diffusion process according to the stochastic differential equations,

$$d\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)dt + d\mathbf{W}(t), \quad (2.65)$$

for the forward-time direction, and

$$d\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t)dt + d\mathbf{W}_*(t), \quad (2.66)$$

for the backward-time direction. As in NYSM,  $d\mathbf{W}$  is the Wiener process satisfying  $E_t[d\mathbf{W}] = 0$  and  $E_t[d\mathbf{W}^2] = (\hbar/m)dt$ . Now, in order to incorporate the *zbw* oscillation as a property of the particle, we must amend Nelson’s original phenomenological hypotheses about his ether and particle with the following additional hypotheses of phenomenological character: <sup>20</sup>

1. Nelson’s ether is not only a stochastically fluctuating medium in space-time, but an oscillating medium with a spectrum of angular frequencies superposed at each point in 3-space. More precisely, we imagine the ether as a continuous (or effectively continuous) medium composed of a countably infinite number of fluctuating, stationary, spherical waves <sup>21</sup> superposed at each point in space, with each wave having a different (constant)

---

<sup>20</sup>Meaning, we will follow Nelson’s approach of provisionally not offering an explicit physical model of the ether, and de Broglie-Bohm’s approach of provisionally not offering an explicit physical model for the *zbw* particle, beyond the hypothetical characteristics listed here. However, these characteristics should be regarded as general constraints on any future physical model of Nelson’s ether, the *zbw* particle, and the dynamical coupling between the two.

<sup>21</sup>These ether waves could be fundamentally continuous field variables or perhaps collective modes arising from

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

angular frequency,  $\omega_0^k$ , where  $k$  denotes the  $k$ -th ether mode. (If we assume an upper frequency cut-off for our modes as the inverse Planck time, this will imply an upper bound on the Compton frequency of an elementary particle immersed in the ether, as we will see from hypothesis 3 below.) The relative phases between the modes are taken to be random so that each mode is effectively uncorrelated with every other mode.

2. The particle of rest mass  $m$ , located in its instantaneous mean forward translational rest frame (IMFTRF), i.e., the frame in which  $D\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = 0$ , at some point  $\mathbf{q}_0$ , is bounded to a harmonic oscillator potential with fixed natural frequency  $\omega_0 = \omega_c = (1/\hbar)mc^2$ . In keeping with the phenomenological approach of ZSM and the approach taken by de Broglie and Bohm with their *zbw* models, we need not specify the precise physical nature of this harmonic oscillator potential. This task is left for a future physical model of the ZSM particle.
3. The particle's center of mass, as a result of being immersed in the ether, undergoes an approximately frictionless translational Brownian motion (due to the homogeneous and isotropic ether fluctuations that couple to the particle by possibly electromagnetic, gravitational, or some other means), as already described by (2.65-66); and, in its IMFTRF, undergoes a driven oscillation about  $\mathbf{q}_0$  by coupling to a narrow band of ether modes that resonantly peaks around the particle's natural frequency. However, in order that the oscillation of the particle doesn't become unbounded in its kinetic energy, there must be some mechanism by which the particle dissipates energy back into the ether modes so that, on the average, a steady-state equilibrium regime is reached for the oscillation. That is to say, on some hypothetical characteristic short time-scale,  $\tau$ , the average energy absorbed from the driven oscillation by the resonant ether modes equals the average energy dissipated back to the ether by the particle. We note that the average, in the present sense, would be over the random phases of the ether modes. (Here we are taking inspiration from stochastic electrodynamics [149, 150], where it has been shown that a classical charged harmonic oscillator immersed in a classical electromagnetic zero-point field has a steady-state regime where the phase-averaged power absorbed by the oscillator balances the phase-averaged power radiated by the oscillator back to the zero-point field, yielding a steady-state oscillation at the natural frequency of the oscillator [149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154]. However, in keeping with our phenomenological approach, we will not propose a specific mechanism for this energy exchange in ZSM, only provisionally assume that it occurs somehow.) Accordingly, we suppose that, in

---

nonlinear coupling between (hypothetical) discrete constituents of the ether. Both possibilities are logically compatible with what follows.

this steady-state regime, the particle undergoes a steady-state *zbw* oscillation of angular frequency  $\omega_c$  about  $\mathbf{q}_0$  in its IMFTRF, as characterized by the ‘fluctuation-dissipation’ relation,  $\langle H \rangle_{\text{steady-state}} = \hbar\omega_c = mc^2$ , where  $\langle H \rangle_{\text{steady-state}}$  is the conserved random-phase-average energy associated with the steady-state oscillation.

It follows then that, in the IMFTRF, the mean forward steady-state *zbw* phase change is given by

$$\delta\bar{\theta}_{0+} := \omega_c \delta t_0 = \frac{mc^2}{\hbar} \delta t_0, \quad (2.67)$$

and the cumulative forward steady-state *zbw* phase, obtained from the indefinite integral of (2.67), is

$$\bar{\theta}_{0+} = \omega_c t_0 + \phi = \frac{mc^2}{\hbar} t_0 + \phi_+, \quad (2.68)$$

where  $\phi_+$  is the initial (forward) phase constant.

The reason for starting our analysis with the IMFTRF goes back to the fact that, before constraining the diffusion process to simultaneous solutions of the forward and backward Fokker-Planck equations associated to (2.65-66), neither the forward nor the backward stochastic differential equations (2.65-66) have well-defined time reversals. So the forward and backward stochastic differential equations describe independent, time-asymmetric diffusion processes in opposite time directions, and we must start by considering the steady-state *zbw* phase in each time direction separately. We chose to start with the more intuitive forward time direction.

For the *zbw* particle in the instantaneous mean backward translational rest frame (IMBTRF), i.e., the frame defined by  $D_*\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = 0$ , its mean backward steady-state *zbw* phase change is given by

$$\delta\bar{\theta}_{0-} := -\omega_c \delta t_0 = -\frac{mc^2}{\hbar} \delta t_0, \quad (2.69)$$

and

$$\bar{\theta}_{0-} = (-\omega_c t_0) + \phi = \left(-\frac{mc^2}{\hbar} t_0\right) + \phi_-. \quad (2.70)$$

Note that, in the above construction, both the diffusion coefficient  $\nu = \hbar/2m$  and the (reduced) *zbw* period  $T_c = 1/\omega_c = \hbar/mc^2$  are scaled by  $\hbar$ . This is consistent with our hypothesis that the ether is the common physical cause of both the frictionless diffusion process and the steady-state *zbw* oscillation. Had we not proposed Nelson’s ether as the physical cause of the steady-state *zbw* oscillation as well as the frictionless diffusion process, the occurrence of  $\hbar$  in both of these particle properties would be inexplicable and compromising for the plausibility of our proposed modification of NYSM.

It should be stressed here that it is not possible to talk of the *zbw* phase in a rest frame

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

other than the IMFTRF or IMBTRF of the  $zbw$  particle, as we cannot transform to a frame in which  $d\mathbf{q}(t)/dt = 0$ , since such an expression is undefined for the (non-differentiable) Wiener process.

Now suppose we Lorentz transform back to the lab frame. For the forward time direction, this corresponds to a boost of (2.67) by  $-\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$  where  $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \neq 0$ . Approximating the transformation for non-relativistic velocities so that  $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{1 - \mathbf{b}^2/c^2} \approx 1 + \mathbf{b}^2/2c^2$ , the forward steady-state  $zbw$  phase change (2.67) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\bar{\theta}_+(\mathbf{q}(t), t) &:= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t [E_+(D\mathbf{q}(t))\delta t - mD\mathbf{q}(t) \cdot (D\mathbf{q}(t))\delta t] \\ &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t [E_+\delta t - m\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}_+(t)], \end{aligned} \quad (2.71)$$

where

$$E_+(D\mathbf{q}(t)) = mc^2 + \frac{1}{2}m|D\mathbf{q}(t)|^2 = mc^2 + \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{b}^2, \quad (2.72)$$

neglecting the momentum term proportional to  $\mathbf{b}^3/c^2$ , and where  $\delta\mathbf{q}_+(t)$  in (2.71) corresponds to the physical, translational, mean forward displacement of the  $zbw$  particle, defined by

$$\delta\mathbf{q}_+(t) = [D\mathbf{q}(t)]\delta t = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)\delta t. \quad (2.73)$$

The first line on the right hand side of (2.71) is the straightforward stochastic generalization of the Lorentz-transformed classical  $zbw$  phase (just as Yasue's mean action functional (2.19) is the straightforward stochastic generalization of the ordinary action functional in classical mechanics [57]) for non-relativistic velocities. Note, however, that the conditional expectation  $E_t[\dots]$  in (2.71) is redundant since the right hand side of (2.71) involves terms depending only on the mean forward velocity  $D\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$ , where  $D$  already involves taking a conditional expectation (see the definitions (2.13) and (2.14) in section 2). However, in the more general case of a  $zbw$  particle in an external potential  $V_{ext}$ , a case we will consider in the next section, the conditional expectation cannot be dropped since there will be an external-potential-dependent term in  $E_+$  that will depend directly on  $\mathbf{q}(t)$  via  $V_{ext}(\mathbf{q}(t))$ . The expectation will also be useful for giving a natural connection between the integral of the time-symmetrized analogue of (2.71) (which we will introduce shortly) and Yasue's mean action functional, as we will show later in this section.

For the backward time direction, the Lorentz transformation to the lab frame corresponds to a boost of (2.69) by  $-\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$  where  $\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \neq 0$ . Then the backward steady-state  $zbw$

phase change (2.69) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\bar{\theta}_-(\mathbf{q}(t), t) &:= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t [-E_-(D_*\mathbf{q}(t))\delta t + mD_*\mathbf{q}(t) \cdot (D_*\mathbf{q}(t)) \delta t] \\ &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t [-E_-\delta t + m\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}_+(t)],\end{aligned}\quad (2.74)$$

where

$$E_-(D_*\mathbf{q}(t)) = mc^2 + \frac{1}{2}m|D_*\mathbf{q}(t)|^2 = mc^2 + \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{b}_*^2, \quad (2.75)$$

and where  $\delta\mathbf{q}_-(t)$  in (2.74) corresponds to the physical, translational, mean backward displacement of the *zbw* particle, defined by

$$\delta\mathbf{q}_-(t) = [D_*\mathbf{q}(t)] \delta t = \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t)\delta t. \quad (2.76)$$

(Notice that  $\delta\mathbf{q}_+(t)$  and  $\delta\mathbf{q}_-(t)$  are not equal in general since  $\delta\mathbf{q}_+(t) - \delta\mathbf{q}_-(t) = (\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_*)\delta t \neq 0$  in general.) Since, at this stage, the forward and backward steady-state *zbw* phase changes, (2.71) and (2.74), are independent of one another, each must equal  $2\pi n$  when integrated along a closed loop  $L$  in which both time and position change. Otherwise we will contradict our hypothesis that, up to this point, the *zbw* particle has a well-defined steady-state phase at each point along its mean space-time trajectory in the forward or backward time direction.

In the lab frame, the forward and backward stochastic differential equations for the *zbw* particle's translational motion are as before

$$d\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)dt + d\mathbf{W}(t), \quad (2.77)$$

and

$$d\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t)dt + d\mathbf{W}_*(t), \quad (2.78)$$

with corresponding Fokker-Planck equations

$$\frac{\partial\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot [\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}, t)\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)] + \frac{\hbar}{2m}\nabla^2\rho(\mathbf{q}, t), \quad (2.79)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot [\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}, t)\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)] - \frac{\hbar}{2m}\nabla^2\rho(\mathbf{q}, t). \quad (2.80)$$

Restricting the diffusion process to simultaneous solutions of (2.79) and (2.80) via

$$\mathbf{v} := \frac{1}{2}[\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}_*] = \frac{\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)}{m} \quad (2.81)$$

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

and

$$\mathbf{u} := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_*] = \frac{\hbar}{2m} \frac{\nabla \rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)} \quad (2.82)$$

reduces the forward and backward Fokker-Planck equations to

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot \left[ \frac{\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)}{m} \rho(\mathbf{q}, t) \right], \quad (2.83)$$

with  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{b}_* = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}$ . We also follow Nelson in postulating the presence of an external osmotic potential  $U(\mathbf{q}, t)$  which couples to the  $zbw$  particle as  $R(\mathbf{q}, t) = \mu U(\mathbf{q}, t)$ , and by the same reasoning discussed in section 2, imparts an osmotic velocity  $\nabla R/m = (\hbar/2m) \nabla \rho/\rho$ . We then have  $\rho = e^{2R/\hbar}$  for all times.

To obtain the 2nd-order time-symmetric mean dynamics for the translational motion of the  $zbw$  particle, we will use the variational principle of Yasue. To do this, we must first define the time-symmetrized steady-state phase change of the  $zbw$  particle in the lab frame, via a symmetric combination of the forward and backward steady-state  $zbw$  phase changes (2.71) and (2.74). This is natural to do since (2.71) and (2.74) correspond to the same frame (the lab frame), and since (2.71) and (2.74) are no longer independent of one another as a result of the constraints (2.81-82). Taking the difference between (2.74) and (2.71), we obtain (replacing  $\delta t \rightarrow dt$ , hence  $\delta \mathbf{q}_{+,-}(t) \rightarrow d\mathbf{q}_{+,-}(t)$ )

$$\begin{aligned} d\bar{\theta}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) &:= \frac{1}{2} [d\bar{\theta}_+(\mathbf{q}(t), t) - d\bar{\theta}_-(\mathbf{q}(t), t)] \\ &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t \left[ E(D\mathbf{q}(t), D_*\mathbf{q}(t))dt - \frac{m}{2} (\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot d\mathbf{q}_+(t) + \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot d\mathbf{q}_-(t)) \right] \\ &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t \left[ E dt - \frac{m}{2} \left( \mathbf{b} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_+(t)}{dt} + \mathbf{b}_* \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_-(t)}{dt} \right) dt \right] \\ &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t \left[ \left( E - \frac{m}{2} \left( \mathbf{b} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_+(t)}{dt} + \mathbf{b}_* \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_-(t)}{dt} \right) \right) dt \right] \\ &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t \left[ \left( E - \frac{m}{2} (\mathbf{b}^2 + \mathbf{b}_*^2) \right) dt \right] \\ &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t [(E - (m\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{v} + m\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u})) dt] \\ &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t \left[ \left( mc^2 - \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{v}^2 - \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{u}^2 \right) dt \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.84)$$

where, from (2.72) and (2.75), we have defined

$$E = \frac{1}{2}(E_+ + E_-) = mc^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{b}^2 + \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{b}_*^2 \right] = mc^2 + \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{v}^2 + \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{u}^2, \quad (2.85)$$

and where we have used (2.73) and (2.76) in (2.84).

It is important to note that because  $\bar{\theta}_+$  and  $\bar{\theta}_-$  are no longer independent of one another, it is no longer the case that  $\delta\bar{\theta}_+$  and  $\delta\bar{\theta}_-$  will each equal  $2\pi n$  when integrated along a closed loop  $L$  in which both time and position change. However, the consistency of our theory does require that  $\oint_L \delta\bar{\theta} = 2\pi n$ , otherwise we would contradict our hypothesis that the *zbw* particle, after restricting to simultaneous solutions of (2.79) and (2.80), has a well-defined and unique steady-state phase at each 3-space location it can occupy at each time, regardless of time-direction. Note also that, without the constraints (2.81-82), we would always have  $\oint_L \delta\bar{\theta}_+ = 2\pi n$  and  $\oint_L \delta\bar{\theta}_- = 2\pi n$ , hence  $\oint_L \delta\bar{\theta} = 0$ . In other words, a time-symmetrized “phase” defined from the subtractive combination of  $\bar{\theta}_+$  and  $\bar{\theta}_-$ , without the constraints (2.81-82), would be globally single-valued instead of single-valued up to an additive integer multiple of  $2\pi$ .

Now, from the last line of (2.84), we can integrate and define the time-symmetric steady-state phase-principal function as

$$I(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = -\hbar\bar{\theta}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) := \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_i}^t \left( \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{v}^2 + \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{u}^2 - mc^2 \right) dt' - \hbar\phi | \mathbf{q}(t) \right], \quad (2.86)$$

where the expectation on the right hand side is now conditional on the Nelsonian path  $\mathbf{q}(t)$ . (Note that the interchangeability of the expectation and the time integral follows from Fubini’s theorem in stochastic calculus, since the integral of the conditional expectation and the conditional expectation of the integral are both required to be finite quantities here [155].) We note that (2.86) is formally identical to the  $W$  function introduced by Yasue in [57], and from which Yasue shows that the variation  $\delta W/\delta\mathbf{q}(t)$  implies the current velocity relation (2.81) with  $W$  in place of  $S$ . The latter result also applies to (2.86), given the formal identity between  $I$  and  $W$ , however we will use a different approach to connect  $\nabla I$  with the current velocity (2.81). Also, whereas Yasue’s  $W$  function isn’t constrained to satisfy  $\oint_L \delta W = nh$ , (2.86) does satisfy  $\oint_L \delta I = nh$  since it is explicitly defined in terms of the phase function  $\bar{\theta}$ .

By a slight modification of (2.86), we can also define the steady-state phase-action functional

$$J := I_{if} = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \left[ \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{v}^2 + \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{u}^2 - mc^2 \right] dt - \hbar\phi \right], \quad (2.87)$$

where  $\phi$  is the initial phase constant, and where (2.87) differs from (2.86) by the end-point at

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

$t_f$  being fixed and  $E[\dots]$  being the absolute expectation. It is easily seen that (2.87) is just Yasue's time-symmetric ensemble-averaged action functional, Eq. (2.19) in section 2, with  $V = 0$ , inclusion of the rest-energy term  $-mc^2$ , and inclusion of the initial phase constant  $\phi$ .

Note, also, that from the second to last line of (2.84), we can obtain the cumulative, time-symmetric, steady-state phase at a time  $t$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bar{\theta}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E \left[ \int_{t_i}^t (E - (m\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{v} + m\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u})) dt' | \mathbf{q}(t) \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E \left[ \int_{t_i}^t ((E - m\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u}) - m\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{v}) dt' | \mathbf{q}(t) \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E \left[ \int_{t_i}^t (H - m\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{v}) dt' | \mathbf{q}(t) \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E \left[ \int_{t_i}^t \left( H - \frac{m}{4} (D\mathbf{q}(t') + D_*\mathbf{q}(t')) \cdot (D + D_*) \mathbf{q}(t') \right) dt' | \mathbf{q}(t) \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E \left[ \int_{t_i}^t H dt' - \int_{\mathbf{q}(t_i)}^{\mathbf{q}(t)} \frac{m}{2} (D\mathbf{q}(t') + D_*\mathbf{q}(t')) \cdot D\mathbf{q}(t') | \mathbf{q}(t) \right] + \phi,
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.88}$$

where

$$H := E - m\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u} = mc^2 + \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{v}^2 - \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{u}^2, \tag{2.89}$$

and where we have used the fact that  $0.5(D + D_*)\mathbf{q}(t) = (\partial_t + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{q}(t)$ , and  $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = (\partial_t + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{q}(t) =: D\mathbf{q}(t)/Dt$ , and  $D\mathbf{q}(t) = (D\mathbf{q}(t)/Dt)dt$ . Now, given an integral curve  $\mathbf{Q}(t)$  of the current velocity/momentum field, i.e., a solution of

$$m \frac{d\mathbf{Q}(t)}{dt} = m\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{Q}(t), t) = \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{Q}(t), t) = \nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)}, \tag{2.90}$$

and given that  $\bar{\theta}(\mathbf{q}, t) = \bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}(t)=\mathbf{q}}$  is a field on 3-space representing the possible phases that the actual *zbw* particle could have at a point  $\mathbf{q}$  at time  $t$  (up to addition of a constant), we can also evaluate  $\bar{\theta}(\mathbf{q}, t)$  with respect to  $\mathbf{Q}(t)$ , which allows us to drop the conditional expectation (since  $\mathbf{Q}(t)$  is deterministic) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bar{\theta}(\mathbf{Q}(t), t) &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} \int_{t_i}^t \left[ H - m\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{Q}(t'), t') \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{Q}(t')}{dt'} \right] dt' + \phi \\
 &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} \left[ \int_{t_i}^t H dt' - \int_{\mathbf{Q}(t_i)}^{\mathbf{Q}(t)} \mathbf{p} \cdot d\mathbf{Q}(t') \right] + \phi.
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.91}$$



Here (2.91) corresponds to the time-symmetrized steady-state phase of the *zbw* particle in the lab frame, evaluated along the *zbw* particle's 'time-symmetric mean trajectory', where the time-symmetric mean trajectory corresponds to an integral curve of the current velocity field, i.e., (2.90). That the time-symmetric mean trajectories should correspond to integral curves of the current velocity field can be seen from the fact that the single-time probability density  $\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)$ , after imposing (2.81-82), is a solution of the continuity equation (2.83), from which it follows that the possible mean trajectories of the *zbw* particle are the flow lines of the probability current  $\rho\mathbf{v}$ , i.e., the solutions of (2.90) for all possible initial conditions  $\mathbf{Q}(0)$ .

Now, taking the total differential of the left hand side of (2.91) gives

$$d\bar{\theta} = \nabla\bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)}d\mathbf{Q}(t) + \partial_t\bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)}dt. \quad (2.92)$$

This allows us to identify

$$\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{Q}(t), t) = -\left(\frac{mc^2}{\omega_c}\right)\nabla\bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)} = \nabla S|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)}, \quad (2.93)$$

where we have used (2.92) along with (2.91) and (2.90). Thus the current velocity of the *zbw* particle can be identified with the gradient of the *zbw* particle's time-symmetrized steady-state phase with respect to the location of the *zbw* particle at time  $t$  in the lab frame, given the assumption that the current velocity is integrable, i.e., given (2.81) and (2.90). Accordingly, the  $S$  function can be identified with (2.91). In addition, (2.92) along with (2.91) relates the  $H$  function to  $\bar{\theta}$  (hence  $S$ ) by

$$H(\mathbf{Q}(t)) = \left(\frac{mc^2}{\omega_c}\right)\partial_t\bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)} = -\partial_t S|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)}. \quad (2.94)$$

From (2.94), (2.93), and (2.91), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} S(\mathbf{Q}(t), t) &= \int_{\mathbf{Q}(t_i)}^{\mathbf{Q}(t)} \mathbf{p} \cdot d\mathbf{Q}(t') - \int_{t_i}^t H dt' - \hbar\phi \\ &= \int_{t_i}^t \left[ \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{Q}(t'), t')^2 + \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{Q}(t'), t')^2 - mc^2 \right] dt' - \hbar\phi = I(\mathbf{Q}(t), t), \end{aligned} \quad (2.95)$$

and

$$\oint_L \delta S(\mathbf{Q}(t), t) = \left(-\frac{mc^2}{\omega_c}\right) \oint_L \delta\bar{\theta}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \oint_L [\mathbf{p} \cdot \delta\mathbf{Q}(t) - H\delta t] = nh. \quad (2.96)$$

We will use these last two expressions for later comparisons.

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

As an aside, let us recall that after restricting the forward and backward diffusions to simultaneous solutions of (2.79-80), we had  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{b}_* = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}$ . So the IMFTRF and the IMBTRF will not coincide since for  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u} = 0$  it will not generally be the case that  $\mathbf{b}_* = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u} = 0$ . Nevertheless, we can define an instantaneous mean (time-)symmetric rest frame (IMSTRF) as the frame in which  $\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}_* = 2\mathbf{v} = 0$ . In the IMSTRF, (2.88) or (2.91) or (2.95) reduces to  $\bar{\theta} = (\omega_c/mc^2) [(mc^2 - \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{u}^2)t + \phi]$ , since  $\mathbf{v} = 0$  and  $\partial_t \rho = 0$ . This shows that the kinetic energy term due to the osmotic velocity contributes a tiny shift to the steady-state *zbw* phase (2.88) or (2.91) or (2.95) in the IMSTRF (since, in the non-relativistic regime,  $\mathbf{u}^2/c^2 \ll 1$ ).

Returning now to (2.87), the imposition of the conservative-diffusions constraint implies extremality of (2.87), which further implies (see Appendix 6.1) Nelson's mean acceleration equation,

$$m\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \frac{m}{2} [D_*D + DD_*] \mathbf{q}(t) = 0. \quad (2.97)$$

Computing the derivatives in (2.97), and using that  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{b}_* = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} m\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) &= m \left[ \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}, t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}, t) - \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{q}, t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{q}, t) - \frac{\hbar}{2m} \nabla^2 \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{q}, t) \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} \\ &= \nabla \left[ \frac{\partial S(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} + \frac{(\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t))^2}{2m} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2 \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}} \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.98)$$

Integrating both sides of (2.98) gives the total translational energy of the *zbw* particle along the stochastic trajectory  $\mathbf{q}(t)$ :

$$\tilde{E}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = -\frac{\partial S(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = mc^2 + \frac{(\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t))^2}{2m} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2 \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}, \quad (2.99)$$

where we have set the integration constant equal to the *zbw* particle's rest energy. Alternatively, we can again consider integral curves of the current velocity/momentum field, but where now the integral curves are obtained from solutions of

$$m \frac{d^2 \mathbf{Q}(t)}{dt^2} = m (\partial_t \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}) \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)} = -\nabla \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2 \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}} \right) \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)}, \quad (2.100)$$

i.e., the mean acceleration equation (2.98), rewritten so that only the  $\mathbf{v}$ -dependent terms are kept on the left hand side. Then we can replace  $\mathbf{q}(t)$  in (2.99) with  $\mathbf{Q}(t)$  to obtain the total translational energy associated with the *zbw* particle's time-symmetric mean trajectory, i.e.,

$\tilde{E}(\mathbf{Q}(t), t)$ . Moreover, we can express the solution of (2.99) in terms of  $\mathbf{Q}(t)$ , thereby obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} S(\mathbf{Q}(t), t) &= \int_{\mathbf{Q}(t_i)}^{\mathbf{Q}(t)} \mathbf{p} \cdot d\mathbf{Q}(t') - \int_{t_i}^t \tilde{E} dt' - \hbar\phi \\ &= \int_{t_i}^t \left[ \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{Q}(t'), t')^2 - \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2 \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{Q}(t'), t')}}{\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{Q}(t'), t')}} \right) - mc^2 \right] dt' - \hbar\phi \\ &= \int_{t_i}^t \left[ \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{v}^2 + \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{u}^2 + \frac{\hbar}{2} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} - mc^2 \right] dt' - \hbar\phi. \end{aligned} \quad (2.101)$$

We identify (2.101) as the conservative-diffusion-constrained, time-symmetrized, steady-state phase (action) of the *zbw* particle in the lab frame, evaluated along an integral curve  $\mathbf{Q}(t)$  obtained from (2.100).

Notice that the last line of (2.101) differs from the last line of (2.95) only by addition of the term involving  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$ . (The equality between the last two lines of (2.101) follows from the well-known fact that the quantum kinetic can be decomposed as  $(-\hbar^2/2m) \rho^{-1/2} \nabla^2 \rho^{1/2} = 0.5m\mathbf{u}^2 - (\hbar^2/4m) \rho^{-1} \nabla^2 \rho$  [113], and by the product rule,  $0.5m\mathbf{u}^2 - (\hbar^2/4m) \rho^{-1} \nabla^2 \rho = -0.5m\mathbf{u}^2 - m(\hbar/2m) \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$ .)

Notice also that the equation of motion for (2.101) differs from the equation of motion for the classical *zbw* particle phase by the presence of the quantum kinetic entering into (2.98-99). The two phases might appear to be connected by the ‘classical limit’  $(\hbar/2m) \rightarrow 0$ , but this is only a formal connection since such a limit corresponds to deleting the presence of the ether, thereby also deleting the physical mechanism that we hypothesize to cause the *zbw* particle to oscillate at its Compton frequency. The physically realistic ‘classical limit’ for (2.98-99) corresponds to situations where the quantum kinetic and quantum force are negligible. Such situations will arise (as in the dBB theory) whenever the center of mass of a system of particles is sufficiently large and environmental decoherence is appreciable [156, 157, 106, 29].

Inasmuch as (2.101) is a well-defined phase function of the *zbw* particle’s time-symmetric mean trajectory  $\mathbf{Q}(t)$  in the lab frame (because it was derived from applying the variational principle to (2.87), the latter of which was defined in terms of (2.84), which we argued must satisfy  $\oint_L \delta\bar{\theta} = 2\pi n$ ), if we integrate  $\delta S(\mathbf{Q}(t), t)$  around a closed loop  $L$  in which time and position may change, we will have

$$\oint_L \delta S(\mathbf{Q}(t), t) = \oint_L [\mathbf{p} \cdot \delta\mathbf{Q}(t) - \tilde{E} \delta t] = nh, \quad (2.102)$$

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

and for a special loop in which time is held fixed,

$$\oint_L \nabla S|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)} \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}(t) = \oint_L \mathbf{p} \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}(t) = nh. \quad (2.103)$$

Otherwise, we would contradict our hypothesis that the *zbw* particle still has a well-defined, time-symmetrized, steady-state phase at each 3-space location it can occupy along a mean trajectory  $\mathbf{Q}(t)$  in either time direction, after the constraint of conservative diffusions has been imposed. (Notice that (2.102) differs from (2.96) by  $\tilde{E}$  replacing  $H$ , and that  $\tilde{E} - H = -(\hbar/2)\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$ .) If we also consider the time-symmetrized steady-state phase field,  $S(\mathbf{q}, t)$ , which is a field over the possible locations of the actual *zbw* particle (as described in section 4.2), then by applying the same physical reasoning above to each possible initial position that the *zbw* particle can occupy, it follows that the net change of the phase field along any mathematical loop in space (with time held fixed) will be

$$\oint_L dS(\mathbf{q}, t) = \oint_L \mathbf{p} \cdot d\mathbf{q} = nh. \quad (2.104)$$

(The justification for (2.104) where  $\rho = 0$  is discussed in section 5.2, since such “nodal points” commonly arise in the presence of bound states.)

The total energy field  $\tilde{E}(\mathbf{q}, t)$  will correspondingly be given by (2.99) when  $\mathbf{Q}(t)$  is replaced by  $\mathbf{q}$ . So with (2.104), (2.99), and (2.83), we can construct the 1-particle Schrödinger equation,

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 \psi(\mathbf{q}, t) + mc^2 \psi(\mathbf{q}, t), \quad (2.105)$$

where  $\psi(\mathbf{q}, t) = \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)} e^{iS(\mathbf{q}, t)/\hbar}$  is a single-valued wave function as a result of (2.104). As in the classical case, the constant  $C = \hbar\phi$  will contribute a global phase factor  $e^{iC/\hbar}$  which cancels out from both sides of (2.105). We thereby have a formulation of free-particle ZSM that recovers the usual free-particle Schrödinger equation.

### 2.5.2 One particle interacting with external fields

Suppose again that the particle undergoes a steady-state *zbw* oscillation in the IMFTRF, but now carries charge  $e$  so that it is a classical charged harmonic oscillator of some type (subject again to the hypothetical constraint of no electromagnetic radiation emitted when there is no translational motion; or the constraint that the oscillation of the charge is radially symmetric so that there is no net energy radiated; or, if the ether turns out to be electromagnetic in nature as Nelson suggested [36], then that the steady-state *zbw* oscillation is due to a balancing be-

tween the random-phase-averaged electromagnetic energy absorbed from the charged harmonic oscillator's driven oscillation, and the random-phase-averaged electromagnetic energy radiated back to the ether, much like in stochastic electrodynamics [149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154]). Then, in the presence of an external electric potential  $\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}_0(t_0), t_0) = \mathbf{E}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}_0(t_0), t_0) \cdot \mathbf{q}_0(t_0)$ , where  $\mathbf{q}_0(t_0)$  is the positional displacement of the *zbw* particle in some arbitrary direction from the field source (again making the point-like approximation for  $|\mathbf{q}_0| \gg \lambda_c$ ) and satisfies the forward stochastic differential equation (2.77) with  $\mathbf{b} = 0$ , the *zbw* phase change in this IMFTRF is shifted by

$$\delta\bar{\theta}_{0+} = E_t [(\omega_c + \varepsilon(\mathbf{q}_0(t_0), t_0)) \delta t_0] = \frac{1}{\hbar} (mc^2 \delta t_0 + E_t [e\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}_0(t_0), t_0) \delta t_0]), \quad (2.106)$$

where  $\varepsilon(\mathbf{q}_0(t_0), t_0) = \omega_c (e/mc^2) \Phi_e(\mathbf{q}_0(t_0), t_0)$ . Direct integration gives

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\theta}_{0+} &= E \left[ \int_{t_a}^{t_0} (\omega_c + \varepsilon(\mathbf{q}_0(t'_0), t'_0)) dt'_0 | \mathbf{q}_0(t_0) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \left( mc^2 t_0 + E \left[ e \int_{t_a}^{t_0} \Phi_e(\mathbf{q}_0(t'_0), t'_0) dt'_0 | \mathbf{q}_0(t_0) \right] \right) + \phi. \end{aligned} \quad (2.107)$$

In the IMBTRF,

$$\delta\bar{\theta}_{0-} = -E_t [(\omega_c + \varepsilon(\mathbf{q}_0(t_0), t_0)) \delta t_0] = -\frac{1}{\hbar} (mc^2 \delta t_0 + E_t [e\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}_0(t_0), t_0) \delta t_0]). \quad (2.108)$$

Direct integration gives

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\theta}_{0-} &= -E \left[ \int_{t_a}^{t_0} (\omega_c + \varepsilon(\mathbf{q}_0(t'_0), t'_0)) dt'_0 | \mathbf{q}_0(t_0) \right] \\ &= -\frac{1}{\hbar} \left( mc^2 t_0 + E \left[ e \int_{t_a}^{t_0} \Phi_e(\mathbf{q}_0(t'_0), t'_0) dt'_0 | \mathbf{q}_0(t_0) \right] \right) + \phi. \end{aligned} \quad (2.109)$$

Now suppose we Lorentz transform back to the lab frame. For the forward time direction, this corresponds to a boost of (2.106) by  $-\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$  where  $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \neq 0$ . Approximating the transformation for non-relativistic velocities so that  $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{1 - \mathbf{b}^2/c^2} \approx 1 + \mathbf{b}^2/2c^2$ , (2.106) becomes

$$\delta\bar{\theta}_+(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t [E_+(\mathbf{q}(t), D\mathbf{q}(t), t) \delta t - m\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_+(t)], \quad (2.110)$$

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

where

$$E_+(\mathbf{q}(t), D\mathbf{q}(t), t) = mc^2 + \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{b}^2 + e\Phi_e, \quad (2.111)$$

neglecting the momentum term proportional to  $\mathbf{b}^3/c^2$ . Again we take  $\delta\mathbf{q}_+(t)$  to correspond to (2.73). For the backward time direction, we have a boost of (2.108) by  $-\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$  where  $\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \neq 0$ , hence

$$\delta\bar{\theta}_-(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t [-E_-(\mathbf{q}(t), D_*\mathbf{q}(t), t)\delta t + m\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}_-(t)], \quad (2.112)$$

where

$$E_-(\mathbf{q}(t), D_*\mathbf{q}(t), t) = mc^2 + \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{b}_*^2 + e\Phi_e. \quad (2.113)$$

Again we take  $\delta\mathbf{q}_-(t)$  to correspond to (2.76).

As in the free particle case, at this stage, the forward and backward steady-state *zbw* phase changes, (2.110) and (2.112), are independent of one another. So both (2.110) and (2.112) must equal  $2\pi n$  when integrated along a closed loop  $L$  in which both time and position change. Otherwise we will contradict our hypothesis that, up to this point, the *zbw* particle has a well-defined mean forward or backward steady-state phase at each point along its mean forward or backward space-time trajectory.

In the lab frame, the forward and backward stochastic differential equations for the translational motion are once again

$$d\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) + d\mathbf{W}(t), \quad (2.114)$$

and

$$d\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t) + d\mathbf{W}_*(t), \quad (2.115)$$

with corresponding Fokker-Planck equations

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot [\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}, t)\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)] + \frac{\hbar}{2m}\nabla^2 \rho(\mathbf{q}, t), \quad (2.116)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot [\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}, t)\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)] - \frac{\hbar}{2m}\nabla^2 \rho(\mathbf{q}, t). \quad (2.117)$$

Let us now suppose that an external magnetic field  $\mathbf{B}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}, t) = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}, t)$  is also present. Then, restricting ourselves to simultaneous solutions of (2.116-117) via

$$\mathbf{v} := \frac{1}{2}[\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}_*] = \frac{\nabla S}{m} - \frac{e}{mc}\mathbf{A}_{ext} \quad (2.118)$$

and

$$\mathbf{u} := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_*] = \frac{\hbar}{2m} \frac{\nabla \rho}{\rho} \quad (2.119)$$

entails that (2.116-117) reduce to

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot \left[ \left( \frac{\nabla S}{m} - \frac{e}{mc} \mathbf{A}_{ext} \right) \rho \right]. \quad (2.120)$$

We can then write  $\mathbf{b}' = \mathbf{v}' + \mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{b}'_* = \mathbf{v}' - \mathbf{u}$ , where we recall that  $\mathbf{v}' = \mathbf{v} + (e/mc)\mathbf{A}_{ext}$ , implying  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}' - (e/mc)\mathbf{A}_{ext}$  and  $\mathbf{b}_* = \mathbf{b}'_* - (e/mc)\mathbf{A}_{ext}$ . Once again the osmotic potential  $R(\mathbf{q}, t) = \mu U(\mathbf{q}, t)$  imparts to the particle an osmotic velocity  $\nabla R/m = (\hbar/2m) \nabla \rho/\rho$  (see section 2), implying  $\rho = e^{2R/\hbar}$  for all times.

As in the free particle case, we can obtain the 2nd-order time-symmetric mean dynamics from Yasue's variational principle.

Since (2.110) and (2.112) correspond to the same (lab) frame and are no longer independent because of (2.118-119), it is natural to define the time-symmetric steady-state *zbw* particle phase in the lab frame by taking the difference between (2.110) and (2.112) (under the replacements  $\mathbf{b} \rightarrow \mathbf{b}'$  and  $\mathbf{b}_* \rightarrow \mathbf{b}'_*$  in the mean forward and mean backward momentum contributions

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

to the phases):

$$\begin{aligned}
d\bar{\theta}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) &:= \frac{1}{2} [d\bar{\theta}_+(\mathbf{q}(t), t) - d\bar{\theta}_-(\mathbf{q}(t), t)] \\
&= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t \left[ E(\mathbf{q}(t), D\mathbf{q}(t), D_*\mathbf{q}(t), t) dt - \frac{m}{2} (\mathbf{b}'(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot d\mathbf{q}_+(t) + \mathbf{b}'_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot d\mathbf{q}_-(t)) \right] + \phi \\
&= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t \left[ E dt - \frac{m}{2} \left( \mathbf{b}' \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_+(t)}{dt} + \mathbf{b}'_* \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_-(t)}{dt} \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
&= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t \left[ \left( E - \frac{m}{2} \left( \mathbf{b}' \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_+(t)}{dt} + \mathbf{b}'_* \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_-(t)}{dt} \right) \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
&= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t \left[ \left( E - \frac{m}{2} (\mathbf{b}' \cdot \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}'_* \cdot \mathbf{b}_*) \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
&= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t \left[ \left( E - \frac{m}{2} \left( \mathbf{b}^2 + \frac{e}{mc} \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{ext} + \mathbf{b}_*^2 + \frac{e}{mc} \mathbf{b}_* \cdot \mathbf{A}_{ext} \right) \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
&= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t \left[ \left( E - \frac{m}{2} (\mathbf{b}^2 + \mathbf{b}_*^2) - \frac{e}{c} \left( \frac{\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}_*}{2} \right) \cdot \mathbf{A}_{ext} \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
&= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t \left[ \left( E - (m\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{v} + m\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u}) - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{ext} \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
&= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} E_t \left[ \left( mc^2 + e\Phi_e - \frac{1}{2} m\mathbf{v}^2 - \frac{1}{2} m\mathbf{u}^2 - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{ext} \right) dt \right] + \phi.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.121}$$

where, using (2.111) and (2.113), along with the constraints (2.118) and (2.119), we have defined

$$\begin{aligned}
E(\mathbf{q}(t), D\mathbf{q}(t), D_*\mathbf{q}(t), t) &= mc^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} m\mathbf{b}^2 + \frac{1}{2} m\mathbf{b}_*^2 \right] + e\Phi_e \\
&= mc^2 + \frac{1}{2} m\mathbf{v}^2 + \frac{1}{2} m\mathbf{u}^2 + e\Phi_e.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.122}$$

As in the free particle case, the consistency of our theory requires that the time-symmetrized steady-state *zbw* phase change of the *zbw* particle in the lab frame, (2.121), satisfies  $\oint_L \delta\bar{\theta} = 2\pi n$ . Otherwise we would contradict our hypothesis that the *zbw* particle, under the time-symmetric constraints (2.118-119), has a well-defined and unique steady-state phase at each 3-space location it can occupy at each time, regardless of time direction.

Using the integral of (2.121) in the definition of the steady-state phase-principal function

$$I = -\frac{mc^2}{\omega_c} \bar{\theta} = E \left[ \int_{t_i}^t \left( \frac{1}{2} m\mathbf{v}^2 + \frac{1}{2} m\mathbf{u}^2 + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{ext} - mc^2 - e\Phi_e \right) dt' | \mathbf{q}(t) \right] - \hbar\phi, \tag{2.123}$$



we can define the steady-state phase-action functional as

$$J = I_{if} = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \left( \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{v}^2 + \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{u}^2 + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{ext} - mc^2 - e\Phi_e \right) dt' \right] - \hbar\phi. \quad (2.124)$$

Equation (2.124) is just Yasue's mean action functional, Eq. (6.1) in Appendix 6.1, but with the inclusion of the rest-energy term  $-mc^2$  and the time-symmetrized initial phase constant  $\phi$ .

Note, also, that from the second to last line of (2.121), we can write the cumulative, time-symmetric, steady-state phase at a time  $t$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\theta}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_i}^t \left( E - (m\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{v} + m\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u}) - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{ext} \right) dt' \mid \mathbf{q}(t) \right] + \phi \\ &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_i}^t \left( (E - m\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u}) - m\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{v} - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{ext} \right) dt' \mid \mathbf{q}(t) \right] + \phi \\ &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_i}^t \left( H - m\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{v} - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{ext} \right) dt' \mid \mathbf{q}(t) \right] + \phi \\ &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_i}^t H dt' - \int_{\mathbf{q}(t_i)}^{\mathbf{q}(t)} \left( m\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}(t'), t') + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}(t'), t') \right) \cdot d\mathbf{q}(t') \mid \mathbf{q}(t) \right] + \phi, \end{aligned} \quad (2.125)$$

where

$$H := E - m\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u} = mc^2 + \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{v}^2 - \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{u}^2 + e\Phi_e. \quad (2.126)$$

Now, given an integral curve  $\mathbf{Q}(t)$  obtained from

$$m \frac{d\mathbf{Q}(t)}{dt} = \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{Q}(t), t) = \nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t) \big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)} - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{Q}(t), t), \quad (2.127)$$

we can replace (2.125) with

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\theta}(\mathbf{Q}(t), t) &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} \int_{t_i}^t \left( H - m\mathbf{v} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{Q}(t')}{dt'} - \frac{e}{c} \frac{d\mathbf{Q}(t')}{dt'} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{Q}(t'), t') \right) dt' + \phi \\ &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} \left[ \int_{t_i}^t H dt' - \int_{\mathbf{Q}(t_i)}^{\mathbf{Q}(t)} \left( \mathbf{p} + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext} \right) \cdot d\mathbf{Q}(t') \right] + \phi. \end{aligned} \quad (2.128)$$

The total differential of the left hand side of (2.128) gives

$$d\bar{\theta} = \nabla \bar{\theta} \big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)} d\mathbf{Q}(t) + \partial_t \bar{\theta} \big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)} dt. \quad (2.129)$$

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

Hence,

$$\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{Q}(t), t) + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{Q}(t), t) = - \left( \frac{mc^2}{\omega_c} \right) \nabla \bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)} = \nabla S|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)}. \quad (2.130)$$

Thus the current velocity, plus the correction due to the external vector potential, corresponds the gradient of the *zbw* particle's time-symmetrized steady-state phase at the location of the *zbw* particle, and  $S$  can again be identified with the time-symmetrized steady-state action/phase function of the *zbw* particle in the lab frame. Along with

$$H(\mathbf{Q}(t), t) = \left( \frac{mc^2}{\omega_c} \right) \partial_t \bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)} = -\partial_t S|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)}, \quad (2.131)$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} S(\mathbf{Q}(t), t) &= \int_{t_i}^t \left( \mathbf{p} + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext} \right) \cdot d\mathbf{Q}(t') - \int_{t_i}^t H dt' - \hbar \phi \\ &= \int_{t_i}^t \left[ \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{v}^2 + \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{u}^2 + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{ext} - mc^2 - e \Phi_e \right] dt' - \hbar \phi = I(\mathbf{Q}(t), t), \end{aligned} \quad (2.132)$$

and

$$\oint_L \delta S(\mathbf{Q}(t), t) = \left( -\frac{mc^2}{\omega_c} \right) \oint_L \delta \bar{\theta}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \oint_L [\mathbf{p}' \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}(t) - H \delta t] = nh. \quad (2.133)$$

Recall that after restricting the forward and backward diffusions to simultaneous solutions of (2.116-117), we have  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{b}_* = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}$ . So the IMFTRF and the IMBTRF will not coincide since, for  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u} = 0$ , it will generally not be the case that  $\mathbf{b}_* = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u} = 0$ . This motivates defining an instantaneous mean (time-)symmetric rest frame (IMSTRF) as the frame in which  $\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}_* = 2\mathbf{v} = 0$ . In the IMSTRF, (2.128) reduces to  $\bar{\theta} = (\omega_c/mc^2) \left[ (mc^2 - \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{u}^2) t + \int_{t_i}^t e\Phi_e(\mathbf{Q}_0, t') dt' \right] + \phi$ , since  $\mathbf{v} = 0$  and  $\partial_t \rho = 0$ . So the external potential contributes a tiny shift to the time-symmetrized steady-state *zbw* phase in the IMSTRF, along with the kinetic energy term involving the osmotic velocity.

Applying the conservative diffusion constraint to the steady-state phase/action functional (2.124), we recover the mean acceleration equation

$$m\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \frac{m}{2} [D_* D + D D_*] \mathbf{q}(t) = e \left[ -\frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{A}_{ext}}{\partial t} - \nabla \Phi_e + \frac{\mathbf{v}}{c} \times \mathbf{B}_{ext} \right] |_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}. \quad (2.134)$$

Applying the mean derivatives in (2.133), we find

$$\begin{aligned} m\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) &= m \left[ \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} - \frac{\hbar}{2m} \nabla^2 \mathbf{u} \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} \\ &= e \left[ -\frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{A}_{ext}}{\partial t} - \nabla \Phi_e + \frac{\mathbf{v}}{c} \times \mathbf{B}_{ext} \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.135)$$

Integrating both sides gives

$$\tilde{E}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = -\frac{\partial S(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = mc^2 + \left[ \frac{(\nabla S - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext})^2}{2m} + e\Phi_e - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2 \sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}, \quad (2.136)$$

where we have fixed the integration constant equal to the particle rest energy. Alternatively, we can again consider integral curves of the current velocity/momentum field, but where now the integral curves are obtained from solutions of

$$\begin{aligned} m \frac{d^2 \mathbf{Q}(t)}{dt^2} &= m (\partial_t \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}) \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)} \\ &= -\nabla \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2 \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}} \right) \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)} + e \left[ -\frac{1}{c} \partial_t \mathbf{A}_{ext} - \nabla \Phi_e + \frac{\mathbf{v}}{c} \times \mathbf{B}_{ext} \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.137)$$

i.e., the mean acceleration equation (2.98), rewritten so that only the  $\mathbf{v}$ -dependent terms are kept on the left hand side. Then we can replace  $\mathbf{q}(t)$  in (2.136) with  $\mathbf{Q}(t)$  to obtain  $\tilde{E}(\mathbf{Q}(t), t)$ . The corresponding general solution, i.e., the time-symmetrized steady-state phase/action of the *zbw* particle in the lab frame, after having imposed the conservative diffusion constraint on (2.124), is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} S(\mathbf{Q}(t), t) &= \int_{\mathbf{Q}(t_i)}^{\mathbf{Q}(t)} \left( \mathbf{p} + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext} \right) \cdot d\mathbf{Q}(t') - \int_{t_i}^t \tilde{E} dt' - \hbar \phi \\ &= \int_{t_i}^t \left[ \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{v}^2 - \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2 \sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right) + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{ext} - mc^2 - e\Phi_e \right] dt' - \hbar \phi \\ &= \int_{t_i}^t \left[ \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{v}^2 + \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{u}^2 + \frac{\hbar}{2} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{ext} - mc^2 - e\Phi_e \right] dt' - \hbar \phi. \end{aligned} \quad (2.138)$$

Notice that the last line of (2.138) differs from the last line of (2.132) only by addition of the term involving  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$ .

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

As also in the free particle case, the equation of motion for (2.138) differs from the equation of motion for the classical *zbw* particle phase by the presence of the quantum kinetic in (2.135-136). Our earlier discussion of the quantum-classical correspondence applies here as well.

Insofar as (2.138) is a well-defined phase function, if we integrate  $\delta S(\mathbf{Q}(t), t)$  around a closed loop  $L$  in which time and position may change, we will have

$$\oint_L \delta S(\mathbf{Q}(t), t) = \oint_L [\mathbf{p}' \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}(t) - \tilde{E} \delta t] = nh, \quad (2.139)$$

and for a special loop in which time is held fixed,

$$\oint_L \delta S(\mathbf{Q}(t)) = \oint_L \nabla S|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)} \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}(t) = \oint_L \mathbf{p}' \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}(t) = nh. \quad (2.140)$$

Considering also the *zbw* phase field  $S(\mathbf{q}, t)$ , which we recall is a field over the possible locations of the actual *zbw* particle, and applying the same physical reasoning above to each possible initial position that the *zbw* particle can occupy, it follows that the net phase change along any mathematical loop in space (with time held fixed) will be given by

$$\oint_L \nabla S \cdot d\mathbf{q} = \oint_L \mathbf{p}' \cdot d\mathbf{q} = nh. \quad (2.141)$$

The corresponding total energy field  $E(\mathbf{q}, t)$  is given by (2.136) when  $\mathbf{Q}(t)$  is replaced by  $\mathbf{q}$ . From (2.141), (2.136), and (2.120), we can then construct the 1-particle Schrödinger equation in external fields as

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \frac{[-i\hbar \nabla - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext}]^2}{2m} \psi + e\Phi_e \psi + mc^2 \psi, \quad (2.142)$$

where  $\psi(\mathbf{q}, t) = \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)} e^{iS(\mathbf{q}, t)/\hbar}$  is a single-valued wave function as a consequence of (2.141).

At this point, it is worth observing an important difference between the (time-symmetrized steady-state *zbw*) phase field evolving by (2.136) and the classical *zbw* phase field evolving by Eq. (2.61) in section 4.4. In the former case, the nonlinear coupling to the density  $\rho$  via the quantum kinetic implies that, at nodal points (i.e., where  $\rho = \psi = 0$ ), such as found in excited states of the hydrogen atom or quantum harmonic oscillator, the phase field develops a singularity where both  $\mathbf{v} = \nabla S$  and  $\mathbf{u} = (\hbar/2m) \nabla \ln \rho$  diverge. Moreover, (2.141) implies that the phase field along a closed loop  $L$  undergoes a discontinuous jump of magnitude  $nh$  if the loop happens to cross a nodal point. Neither of these observations are inconsistent with our hypothesis that the steady-state phase of the actual *zbw* particle is a well-defined function of the actual particle's mean space-time trajectory (or any mean space-time trajectory it can

potentially realize), since it can be readily shown that the particle's actual (mean or stochastic) trajectory never hits a nodal point [22, 36, 158, 159, 6].<sup>22</sup> Indeed, if the phase field would not undergo the discontinuous jump at a nodal point, then this would imply that there are mean trajectories near nodes for which the actual particle does not have a well-defined mean phase, thereby contradicting our hypothesis. By contrast, for the classical *zbw* phase field, there is no reason for it to be undefined at nodal regions since there is no nonlinear coupling to the (inverse of the) probability density. Rather, the fact that the classical phase field also satisfies a condition of the form (2.141) implies that it changes discontinuously across a discontinuity in the external potential,  $V$ , and takes discrete values for changes along a closed loop  $L$  encircling the discontinuity in  $V$  (as demonstrated for the hydrogen-like atom in Appendix 6.2).

We thus have a formulation of ZSM in external fields that avoids the Wallstrom criticism and is ready to be applied to the central potential example considered in section 3.

### 2.5.3 The central potential revisited

With ZSM in hand, we can now return to the central potential example considered by Wallstrom, and show how ZSM gives the same result as quantum mechanics.

For the effective central potential,  $V_a(\mathbf{r}) = V(\mathbf{r}) + a/r^2$ , we found that the HJM equations implied  $\mathbf{v}'_a = \mathbf{v}_a \sqrt{2ma/\hbar^2 + 1}$  and  $\mathbf{u}'_a = \mathbf{u}_a$ , where  $\mathbf{v}_a = (\hbar/mr) \hat{\varphi}$ . The problem in standard NYSM was that the constant  $a$  could take any positive real value, making  $\mathbf{v}'_a$  not quantized. By contrast, in the quantum mechanical version,  $m = \sqrt{2ma/\hbar^2 + 1}$  would be integral due to the single-valuedness condition on  $\psi_m$ .

In the ZSM version of this problem, the *zbw* phase field in the lab frame,  $S_a = \hbar\varphi$ , satisfies

$$\oint \frac{dS_a}{d\varphi} d\varphi = \oint \hbar d\varphi = mh, \quad (2.143)$$

as a consequence of the reasoning used in section 5.2. Accordingly, for the effective *zbw* phase field,  $S'_a = \hbar\sqrt{2ma/\hbar^2 + 1}\varphi = \hbar\varphi'$ , we will also have

$$\oint \hbar\sqrt{2ma + 1} d\varphi = \oint \hbar d\varphi' = mh, \quad (2.144)$$

<sup>22</sup>A simple proof [6] of this for the actual mean trajectory can be given as follows. First, note that the actual particle's initial mean position,  $\mathbf{q}(0)$ , can never be at nodal points (since this would contradict the physical meaning of  $\rho$  as the probability density for the particle to be at position  $\mathbf{q}$  at time  $t$ ). Now, rewrite  $\partial_t \rho = -\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v}\rho)$  as  $(\partial_t + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla) \rho = -\rho \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}$ . Along the actual mean trajectory,  $\mathbf{q}(t)$ , we then have  $(d/dt) \ln[\rho(\mathbf{q}(t), t)] = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}$ . Solving this gives  $\rho(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \rho_0(\mathbf{q}_0) \exp[-\int_0^t (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t')} dt']$ , which implies that if  $\rho_0(\mathbf{q}_0) > 0$ , then  $\rho(\mathbf{q}(t), t) > 0$  for all times. Correspondingly, from  $\rho(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$  we obtain  $R(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = R_0(\mathbf{q}_0) - (\hbar/2) \int_0^t (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t')} dt'$ , which never becomes undefined if  $R_0(\mathbf{q}_0)$  is not undefined.

## 2 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM I

where  $m = \sqrt{2ma/\hbar^2 + 1}$  is integral. So ZSM predicts quantized energy-momentum in the central potential case, in accordance with quantum mechanics.

### 2.6 Conclusion

To answer Wallstrom's criticism, we first developed a classical *zbw* model (based on the earlier models of de Broglie and Bohm) which implies a quantization condition reminiscent of the Bohr-Sommerfeld-Wilson condition. We did this excluding and including interactions with external fields, and formulated the classical Hamilton-Jacobi statistical mechanics of each case. We then extended this model to Nelson-Yasue stochastic mechanics - which we termed *zitterbewegung* stochastic mechanics (ZSM) - and showed, using the same two cases, that it allows us to recover the Schrödinger equation for single-valued wave functions with (in general) multi-valued phases. Finally, we showed that ZSM works for the concrete case of a two-dimensional central potential.

In Part II, our approach will be generalized to the case of many *zbw* particles, excluding and including (external and inter-particle) field interactions, the latter of which turns out to be a non-trivial task. We will also: (i) elaborate on the beables of ZSM, (ii) assess the plausibility and generalizability of the *zbw* hypothesis, and (iii) compare ZSM to other (previously) proposed answers to Wallstrom's criticism.

### 2.7 Acknowledgments

It is a pleasure to acknowledge helpful discussions with Guido Bacciagaluppi, Dieter Hartmann, and Herman Batelaan. I am also grateful to Guido for carefully reading an earlier draft of this paper and making useful suggestions for improvements. Lastly, I thank Mike Towler for inviting me to talk on an earlier incarnation of this work at his 2010 de Broglie-Bohm research conference in Vallico Sotto, Tuscany, Italy.

## 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom’s Criticism: ZSM II

The “zitterbewegung stochastic mechanics” (ZSM) answer to Wallstrom’s criticism, introduced in Part I [160], is extended to many particles. We first formulate the many-particle generalization of Nelson-Yasue stochastic mechanics (NYSM), incorporating external and classical interaction potentials. Then we formulate the many-particle generalization of the classical zitterbewegung *zbw* model introduced in Part I, for the cases of free particles, particles interacting with external fields, and classically interacting particles. On the basis of these developments, ZSM is constructed for classically free particles, as well as for particles interacting both with external fields and through inter-particle scalar potentials. Throughout, the beables of ZSM (based on the many-particle formulation) are made explicit. Subsequently, we assess the plausibility and generalizability of the *zbw* hypothesis. We close with an appraisal of other proposed answers, and compare them to ZSM.

### 3.1 Introduction

This paper is a direct continuation of the preceding paper, Part I [160]. There we proposed an answer to the Wallstrom criticism of stochastic mechanical theories by modifying Nelson-Yasue stochastic mechanics (NYSM) for a single non-relativistic particle with the following hypothesis: Nelson’s hypothetical stochastic ether medium that drives the conservative diffusions of the particle, also induces steady-state harmonic oscillations of zitterbewegung (*zbw*) frequency in the particle’s instantaneous mean forward/backward translational rest frame. We then showed that, in the lab frame, the function  $S$  arises from imposing the constraint of conservative diffusions on the time-symmetrized steady-state phase of the *zbw* particle, satisfies the required quantization condition, and evolves in time by the Hamilton-Jacobi-Madelung equations (when generalized to describe a statistical ensemble of *zbw* particles). This allowed us to recover the Schrödinger equation for single-valued wavefunctions with (potentially) multi-valued phases, for the cases of a free particle and a particle interacting with external fields (the latter of which we illustrated with the two-dimensional central potential problem). We termed this modification of NYSM “zitterbewegung stochastic mechanics” or ZSM.

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

The approach of this paper is similar to that of Part I. In section 2, we formulate the many-particle generalization of NYSM and point out where in the derivation of the many-particle Schrödinger equation the Wallstrom criticism applies. Section 3 discusses how to properly physically interpret the wavefunction in NYSM. Section 4 formulates the classical model of constrained zitterbewegung motion for the cases of many free particles, many particles interacting with external fields, and classically interacting particles. Section 5 generalizes ZSM to the cases of many free particles, many particles interacting with external fields, and classically interacting particles; throughout, the beables<sup>1</sup> of ZSM are made explicit. Section 6 assesses the plausibility and generalizability of the *zbw* hypothesis through multiple considerations. Finally, Section 7 appraises other proposed answers to Wallstrom's criticism, and compares them to ZSM.

## 3.2 Nelson-Yasue Stochastic Mechanics for Many Particles

The first non-relativistic,  $N$ -particle, stochastic mechanical reconstruction of the  $N$ -particle Schrödinger equation was given by Loffredo and Morato [162], who used the Guerra-Morato variational formulation.<sup>2</sup> However, as noted in footnote 9 of Part I [160], the Guerra-Morato formulation is not applicable to ZSM because the Guerra-Morato variational principle entails a globally single-valued  $S$  function, and this excludes the possibility of single-valued wavefunctions with multi-valued phases, which excludes the possibility of single-valued wavefunctions with multi-valued phases (as in systems with angular momentum [41, 25]. Koide [163] has given a brief two-particle extension of the non-relativistic Nelson-Yasue formulation, for the case of a classical interaction potential, but otherwise no comprehensive  $N$ -particle Nelson-Yasue reconstruction of the  $N$ -particle Schrödinger equation has been given (to the best of our knowledge). Accordingly, we shall develop the  $N$ -particle extension of NYSM before extending ZSM to the many-particle case. This will also be useful for identifying the various points of demarcation between NYSM and ZSM in the many-particle formulation. For completeness, we will incorporate coupling of the particles to external (scalar and vector) potentials and to each other through scalar interaction potentials.

---

<sup>1</sup>This term was coined by J.S. Bell [18] as a play on “observables” in standard quantum mechanics. It refers to “those elements which might correspond to elements of reality, to things which exist. Their existence does not depend on ‘observation.’ Indeed observation and observers must be made out of beables” [161].

<sup>2</sup>Prior to Loffredo-Morato, Nelson [36] and Bacciagaluppi [66] employed  $N$ -particle extensions of stochastic mechanics for scalar particles. However, they did so by assuming (rather than reconstructing) the  $N$ -particle Schrödinger equation, and constructing  $N$ -particle extensions of the stochastic mechanical equations of motion from solutions of the  $N$ -particle Schrödinger equation. The  $N$ -particle stochastic mechanical equations obtained by Nelson and Bacciagaluppi are formally the same as those obtained by Loffredo-Morato.



### 3.2 Nelson-Yasue Stochastic Mechanics for Many Particles

As in the single-particle formulation of NYSM [22, 53, 36], we hypothesize that the vacuum of 3-D space is pervaded by a homogeneous and isotropic ether fluid with classical stochastic fluctuations that impart a frictionless, conservative diffusion process to a point particle of mass  $m$  and charge  $e$  immersed within the ether. Accordingly, for  $N$  point particles of masses  $m_i$  and charges  $e_i$  immersed in the ether, each particle will in general have its position 3-vector  $\mathbf{q}_i(t)$  constantly undergoing diffusive motion with drift, as modeled by the first-order forward stochastic differential equations

$$d\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t)dt + d\mathbf{W}_i(t). \quad (3.1)$$

Here  $q(t) = \{\mathbf{q}_1(t), \mathbf{q}_2(t), \dots, \mathbf{q}_N(t)\} \in \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ ,  $\mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t)$  is the deterministic mean forward drift velocity of the  $i$ -th particle (which in general may be a function of the positions of all the other particles, such as in the case of particles interacting with each other gravitationally and/or electrostatically), and  $\mathbf{W}_i(t)$  is the Wiener process modeling the  $i$ -th particle's interaction with the ether fluctuations. (Recall that “mean”, here, refers to averaging over the Wiener process in the sense of the conditional expectation at time  $t$ .)

The Wiener increments  $d\mathbf{W}_i(t)$  are assumed to be Gaussian with zero mean, independent of  $d\mathbf{q}_i(s)$  for  $s \leq t$ , and with variance

$$\mathbb{E}_t [d\mathbf{W}_{in}(t)d\mathbf{W}_{im}(t)] = 2\nu_i\delta_{nm}dt, \quad (3.2)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_t$  denotes the conditional expectation at time  $t$ . We then hypothesize that the magnitudes of the diffusion coefficients  $\nu_i$  are given by

$$\nu_i = \frac{\hbar}{2m_i}. \quad (3.3)$$

In addition to (3.1), we also have the backward stochastic differential equations

$$d\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t)dt + d\mathbf{W}_{i*}(t), \quad (3.4)$$

where  $\mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t)$  are the mean backward drift velocities, and  $d\mathbf{W}_{i*}(t)$  are the backward Wiener processes. As in the single-particle case, the  $d\mathbf{W}_{i*}(t)$  have all the properties of  $d\mathbf{W}_i(t)$  except that they are independent of the  $d\mathbf{q}_i(s)$  for  $s \geq t$ . With these conditions on  $d\mathbf{W}_i(t)$  and  $d\mathbf{W}_{i*}(t)$ , Eqs. (3.1) and (3.4) respectively define forward and backward Markov processes for  $N$  particles on  $\mathbb{R}^3$  (or, equivalently, for a single particle on  $\mathbb{R}^{3N}$ ).

The forwards and backwards transition probabilities defined by (3.1) and (3.4), respectively, should be understood, in some sense, as ontic probabilities [116, 117]. (Broadly speaking,

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

'ontic probabilities' can be understood as probabilities about objective physical properties of the  $N$ -particle system, as opposed to 'epistemic probabilities' [118] which are about our ignorance of objective physical properties of the  $N$ -particle system.) Just how 'ontic' these transition probabilities should be is an open question. One possibility is that these transition probabilities should be viewed as phenomenologically modeling the complicated deterministic interactions of a massive particle (or particles) with the fluctuating ether, in analogy with how equations such as (3.1) and (3.4) are used in the Einstein-Smoluchowski theory [53] to phenomenologically model the complicated deterministic interactions of a macroscopic particle immersed in a fluctuating classical fluid of finite temperature. Another possibility is that the fluctuations of the ether are irreducibly stochastic, and this irreducible stochasticity is 'transferred' to a particle immersed in and interacting with the ether. We prefer the former possibility, but acknowledge that the latter possibility is also viable.<sup>3</sup>

Associated to the trajectories  $\mathbf{q}_i(t)$  is the  $N$ -particle probability density  $\rho(q, t) = n(q, t)/N$  where  $n(q, t)$  is the number of particles per unit volume. Corresponding to (3.1) and (3.4), then, are the  $N$ -particle forward and backward Fokker-Planck equations

$$\frac{\partial \rho(q, t)}{\partial t} = - \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \cdot [\mathbf{b}_i(q, t) \rho(q, t)] + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \rho(q, t), \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \rho(q, t)}{\partial t} = - \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \cdot [\mathbf{b}_{i*}(q, t) \rho(q, t)] - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \rho(q, t), \quad (3.6)$$

where we assume that the solutions  $\rho(q, t)$  in each time direction satisfy the normalization condition

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} \rho_0(q) d^{3N}q = 1. \quad (3.7)$$

In contrast to the transition probabilities defined by (3.1) and (3.4), the probability distributions satisfying (3.5) and (3.6) are epistemic distributions in the sense that they are distribu-

---

<sup>3</sup>Concerning whether or not the forward and backwards transition probabilities should be understood as 'objective' (i.e., as chances governed by natural law) versus 'subjective' (i.e., encoding our expectations or degrees of belief) [119, 120, 121], this seems to depend on whether the transition probabilities are merely phenomenological (in which case they would seem to be subjective) or reflect irreducible stochasticity in the ether (in which case they would seem to be objective). Our preference for viewing the transition probabilities as phenomenological seems to commit us to the subjective view, but the objective view also seems viable (the objective view is taken by Bacciagaluppi in [99, 67]). It is worth noting that, under the objective view, the backwards transition probabilities can be regarded as being just as objective/law-like as the forwards transition probabilities (but see [118] for a different view).

tions over a Gibbsian ensemble of identical systems (i.e., the distributions reflect our ignorance of the actual positions of the particles). Nevertheless, for an epistemic distribution satisfying (3.5) or (3.6) at time  $t$ , its subsequent evolution will be determined by the ontic transition probabilities so that the distribution at later times will partly come to reflect ontic features of the  $N$ -particle system, and may asymptotically become independent of the initial distribution.

<sup>4</sup> Of course, the asymptotic distribution would still be epistemic in the sense of encoding our ignorance of the actual particle positions, even though it would be determined by the ontic features of the system.

Up to this point, (3.5) and (3.6) correspond to independent diffusion processes in opposite time directions. <sup>5</sup> To fix the diffusion process uniquely for both time directions, we must constrain the diffusion process to simultaneous solutions of (3.5) and (3.6).

Note that the sum of (3.5) and (3.6) yields the  $N$ -particle continuity equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho(q, t)}{\partial t} = - \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \cdot [\mathbf{v}_i(q, t) \rho(q, t)], \quad (3.8)$$

where

$$\mathbf{v}_i(q, t) := \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{b}_i(q, t) + \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q, t)) \quad (3.9)$$

is the current velocity field of the  $i$ -th particle. We shall also require that  $\mathbf{v}_i(q, t)$  is equal to the gradient of a scalar potential  $S(q, t)$  (since, if we allowed  $\mathbf{v}_i(q, t)$  a non-zero curl, then the time-reversal operation would change the orientation of the curl, thus distinguishing time directions [122, 67]). And for particles classically interacting with an external vector potential  $\mathbf{A}_i^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_i, t)$ , the current velocities get modified by the usual expression

$$\mathbf{v}_i(q, t) = \frac{\nabla_i S(q, t)}{m_i} - \frac{e_i}{m_i c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_i, t). \quad (3.10)$$

So (3.8) becomes

$$\frac{\partial \rho(q, t)}{\partial t} = - \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \cdot \left[ \left( \frac{\nabla_i S(q, t)}{m_i} - \frac{e_i}{m_i c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_i, t) \right) \rho(q, t) \right], \quad (3.11)$$

---

<sup>4</sup>I thank Guido Bacciagaluppi for emphasizing this point.

<sup>5</sup>In fact, given all possible solutions to (3.1), one can define as many forward processes as there are possible initial distributions satisfying (3.5); likewise, given all possible solutions to (3.4), one can define as many backward processes as there are possible ‘initial’ distributions satisfying (3.6). Consequently, the forward and backward processes are both underdetermined, and neither (3.1) nor (3.4) has a well-defined time-reversal.

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

which is now a time-reversal invariant evolution equation for  $\rho$ .

The function  $S$  is an  $N$ -particle velocity potential, defined here as a field over the possible positions of the particles (hence the dependence of  $S$  on the generalized coordinates  $\mathbf{q}_i$ ), and generates different possible initial irrotational velocities for the particles via (3.10). We make no assumptions at this level as to whether or not  $S$  can be written as a sum of single-particle velocity potentials. Rather, this will depend on the initial conditions and constraints specified for a system of  $N$  Nelsonian particles, as well as the dynamics we obtain for  $S$ . For example, for  $N$  particles constrained to interact with each other through a classical Newtonian gravitational and/or electrostatic potential, and  $S$  evolving by the  $N$ -particle generalization of the quantum Hamilton-Jacobi equation (which will turn out to be the case), we will find that  $S$  won't be decomposable into a sum as long as the interactions are appreciable. On the other hand, for  $N$  non-interacting particles, we will find that  $S$  evolving by the quantum Hamilton-Jacobi equation can (in certain cases) be written as  $\sum_{i=1}^N S_i(\mathbf{q}_i, t)$ .

Note also that subtracting (3.5) from (3.6) yields the equality on the right hand side of

$$\mathbf{u}_i(q, t) := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{b}_i(q, t) - \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q, t)] = \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i \rho(q, t)}{\rho(q, t)}, \quad (3.12)$$

where  $\mathbf{u}_i(q, t)$  is the osmotic velocity field of the  $i$ -th particle. From (3.10) and (3.12), we then have  $\mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{u}_i$  and  $\mathbf{b}_{i*} = \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}_i$ , which when inserted back into (3.5) and (3.6), respectively, returns (3.11). Thus  $\rho$  is fixed as the unique, single-time, 'quantum equilibrium' distribution for the solutions of (3.1) and (3.4), and evolves by (3.11). Moreover, the epistemic probabilities associated with  $\rho$  are now fully determined by the ontic transition probabilities corresponding to solutions of (3.1) and (3.4).

As in the single-particle case, we can give physical meaning to the osmotic velocities by analogy with the Einstein-Smoluchowski theory: We postulate the presence of an external "osmotic" potential (which we will formally write as a field on the  $N$ -particle configuration space, in analogy with a classical  $N$ -particle external potential),  $U(q, t)$ , which couples to the  $i$ -th particle as  $R(q(t), t) = \mu U(q(t), t)$  (we assume that the coupling constant  $\mu$  is identical for particles of the same species), and imparts to the  $i$ -th particle a momentum,  $\nabla_i R(q, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)}$ . This momentum then gets counter-balanced by the ether fluid's osmotic impulse pressure,  $(\hbar/2m_i) \nabla_i \ln[n(q, t)]|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)}$ . This leads to the equilibrium condition  $\nabla_i R/m_i = (\hbar/2m_i) \nabla_i \rho/\rho$  (using  $\rho = n/N$ ), which implies that  $\rho$  depends on  $R$  as  $\rho = e^{2R/\hbar}$  for all times. So the osmotic velocity of the  $i$ -th particle is the 'equilibrium velocity' that the  $i$ -th particle would acquire in the absence of any current velocity  $\nabla_i S/m_i$ . (Note that the sense here in which the osmotic velocity is an equilibrium velocity is different from the sense in which  $\nabla_i S$  is an equilibrium velocity; the latter is an equilibrium velocity in the sense that it's the

velocity that transports the quantum equilibrium distribution  $\rho$  on configuration space via the continuity equation (3.11).)

It might be thought that, as an external potential (in the sense of a potential not sourced by the particle), it should be reasonable to assume that  $R$  is a separable function of the  $N$  coordinates so that we can write  $R(q, t) = \sum_{i=1}^N R_i(\mathbf{q}_i, t)$ . However, we know from the single-particle case that the evolution of  $R$  depends on the evolution of  $S$  (through the continuity equation for  $\rho$ ), and that the evolution of  $S$  depends on the classical potential  $V$ . Since, for many particles,  $V$  can be an interaction potential (such as an  $N$ -particle Coulomb potential), and since we expect to find that the  $N$ -particle evolution equations for  $R$  and  $S$  are the  $N$ -particle generalizations of the HJM equations, we should expect  $R$  to possibly depend on the positions of all the other particle coordinates as a consequence of its nonlinear coupling to  $S$ .

From a more physical point of view, it would be reasonable to expect that  $R$  functionally depends on the coordinates of all the other particles if either (i) the source of the potential  $U$  dynamically couples to all the particles in such a way that the functional dependence of  $U$  is determined by the magnitude of inter-particle physical interactions, or (ii)  $U$  is an independently existing field in space-time that directly exchanges energy-momentum with the particles. Since, by Nelson's hypothesis, each particle undergoes a conservative diffusion process through the ether, on the (ensemble) average, the energy-momentum of each particle is a constant (assuming no time-dependent classical external potentials are present). This suggests that the source of  $U$  should be Nelson's ether <sup>6</sup> (otherwise the diffusions would not be conservative). So the functional dependence of  $U$  must be determined by the (hypothetical) dynamical coupling of the ether to the particles, and whether or not the particles classically interact with one another. In this way, it is conceivable how  $U$  could have a non-separable functional dependence on the coordinates associated with all the particles. Moreover, we should expect the 'strength' of the non-separability (i.e., the inter-particle correlations) of  $U$  to be proportional to the strength of the classical interactions between the particles. (As it turns out, a dust grain undergoing Brownian motion in a nonequilibrium plasma induces an electrostatic osmotic potential from the plasma through an analogous mechanism to what we've sketched here [164]; moreover, the corresponding Fokker-Planck equation for the stationary probability distribution in velocity space is formally equivalent to Eq. (3.5) here.)

Since we do not at present have a physical model for Nelson's ether and its dynamical interactions with the particles, in practice, hypothesis (i) in the previous paragraph gets implemented via Eq. (3.11) (which, as we've noted, equivalently describes the time-evolution of  $R$  and

---

<sup>6</sup>So the idea would be that the ether fluid produces a potential field  $U$  that imparts a momentum of  $\nabla_i(\mu U)$  to each particle, causing the particles to scatter through the ether constituents and thereby experience a counter-balancing osmotic impulse pressure of magnitude  $(\hbar/2m_i) \nabla_i \ln[n]$ .

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

thereby the time-evolution of the coupling of the particles to  $U$ ) and Yasue's stochastic variational principle for the particles. Thus, for  $N$  particles constrained to interact with each other through a classical Newtonian gravitational and/or electrostatic potential, and  $R$  coupled to  $S$  by the  $N$ -particle HJM equations, we will indeed see that  $R$  (and hence  $\rho$ ) is not separable, from which we can deduce that  $U$  will also be non-separable. On the other hand, in the case of non-interacting particles, we will find that it is possible to have  $R(q, t) = \sum_{i=1}^N R_i(\mathbf{q}_i, t)$  (hence  $\rho(q, t) = \prod_{i=1}^N \rho_i(\mathbf{q}_i, t)$ ). So, for now, we will keep writing the general form  $R = R(q, t)$ .

In order to formulate the second-order dynamics of the particles, we need to construct the  $N$ -particle generalizations of Nelson's mean forward and backward derivatives. This generalization is straightforwardly given by

$$D\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0^+} E_t \left[ \frac{q_i(t + \Delta t) - q_i(t)}{\Delta t} \right], \quad (3.13)$$

and

$$D_*\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0^+} E_t \left[ \frac{q_i(t) - q_i(t - \Delta t)}{\Delta t} \right]. \quad (3.14)$$

By the Gaussianity of  $d\mathbf{W}_i(t)$  and  $d\mathbf{W}_{i*}(t)$ , we obtain  $D\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t)$  and  $D_*\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t)$ . To compute  $D\mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t)$  (or  $D_*\mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t)$ ), we expand  $\mathbf{b}_i$  in a Taylor series up to terms of order two in  $d\mathbf{q}_i(t)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t) &= \frac{\partial \mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t)}{\partial t} dt + \sum_{i=1}^N d\mathbf{q}_i(t) \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{b}_i(q, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n,m} dq_{in}(t) dq_{im}(t) \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{b}_i(q, t)}{\partial q_{in} \partial q_{im}}|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

From (3.1), we can replace  $dq_i(t)$  by  $dW_i(t)$  in the last term, and when taking the conditional expectation at time  $t$  in (3.13), we can replace  $d\mathbf{q}_i(t) \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{b}_i|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)}$  by  $\mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t) \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{b}_i|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)}$  since  $d\mathbf{W}_i(t)$  is independent of  $\mathbf{q}_i(t)$  and has mean 0. From (3.2), we then obtain

$$D\mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t) = \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t) \cdot \nabla_i + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \right] \mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t), \quad (3.16)$$

and likewise

$$D_* \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t) = \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t) \cdot \nabla_i - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \right] \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t). \quad (3.17)$$

Using (3.16-17), and assuming the particles also couple to an external electric potential,  $\Phi_i^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_i(t), t)$ , as well as to each other by the Coulomb interaction potential  $\Phi_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_i(t), \mathbf{q}_j(t)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N(j \neq i)} \frac{e_j}{|\mathbf{q}_i(t) - \mathbf{q}_j(t)|}$  we can then construct the  $N$ -particle generalization of Yasue's ensemble-averaged, time-symmetric mean action:

$$\begin{aligned} J &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{b}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{b}_{i*}^2 \right] + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \cdot \frac{1}{2} (D + D_*) \mathbf{q}_i(t) - e_i [\Phi_i^{ext} + \Phi_c^{int}] \right\} dt \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \cdot \mathbf{v}_i - e_i [\Phi_i^{ext} + \Phi_c^{int}] \right\} dt \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}[\dots]$  denotes the absolute expectation, and we note that  $\mathbf{v}_i(q(t), t) = \frac{1}{2} (D + D_*) \mathbf{q}_i(t)$ .

Upon imposing the conservative diffusion constraint through the  $N$ -particle generalization of Yasue's variational principle

$$J = \text{extremal}, \quad (3.19)$$

a straightforward computation (see Appendix 7.1) shows that (3.19) implies

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} [D_* D + D D_*] \mathbf{q}_i(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N e_i \left[ -\frac{1}{c} \partial_t \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} - \nabla_i (\Phi_i^{ext} + \Phi_c^{int}) + \frac{\mathbf{v}_i}{c} \times (\nabla_i \times \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}) \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)}. \quad (3.20)$$

Moreover, since the  $\delta \mathbf{q}_i(t)$  are independent (as we show in Appendix 7.1), it follows from (3.20) that we have the equations of motion

$$\begin{aligned} m_i \mathbf{a}_i(q(t), t) &= \frac{m_i}{2} [D_* D + D D_*] \mathbf{q}_i(t) \\ &= \left[ -\frac{e_i}{c} \partial_t \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} - e_i \nabla_i (\Phi_i^{ext} + \Phi_c^{int}) + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{v}_i \times (\nabla_i \times \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}) \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Applying the mean derivatives in (3.20), using that  $\mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{u}_i$  and  $\mathbf{b}_{i*} = \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}_i$ , and replacing  $q(t)$  with  $q$  in the functions on both sides, straightforward manipulations

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

show that (3.20) turns into

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \left[ \partial_t \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{u}_i - \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \mathbf{u}_i \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ -\frac{e_i}{c} \partial_t \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} - e_i \nabla_i (\Phi_i^{ext} + \Phi_c^{int}) + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{v}_i \times (\nabla_i \times \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Using (3.10) and (3.12), integrating both sides of (3.22), and setting the arbitrary integration constants equal to zero, we then obtain the  $N$ -particle quantum Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\begin{aligned} -\partial_t S(q, t) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{[\nabla_i S(q, t) - \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_i, t)]^2}{2m_i} \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^N e_i [\Phi_i^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_i, t) + \Phi_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{q}_j)] - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho(q, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(q, t)}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

which describes the total energy of the possible mean trajectories of the *zbw* particles, and, upon evaluation at  $q = q(t)$ , the total energy of the actual particles along their mean trajectories. So (3.11) and (3.23) together define the  $N$ -particle HJM equations.

Note that, as a consequence of the non-separability of  $\Phi_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{q}_j)$ , we will not be able to write (3.23) as a sum of total energies for each particle (unless the particles are sufficiently spatially separated from each other that we can effectively neglect this interaction term), which means  $S(q, t) \neq \sum_{i=1}^N S_i(\mathbf{q}_i, t)$ . Indeed, as a consequence of this non-separability, we can now see from the coupling of (3.11) and (3.23) that  $R$  (and hence  $U$ ) will also be non-separable since its evolution depends on  $\nabla_i S$  through (3.11). We can make this more explicit by writing the general solutions,  $S$  and  $R$ , to (3.23) and the differentiated form of (3.11), respectively. For (3.23), the general solution takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} S(q, t) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \int \mathbf{p}_i(q, t) \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i \\ &- \sum_{i=1}^N \int \left[ \frac{[\mathbf{p}_i(q, t) - \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_i, t)]^2}{2m_i} + e_i [\Phi_i^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_i, t) + \Phi_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{q}_j)] - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho(q, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(q, t)}} \right] dt. \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

For the differentiated form of (3.11), the general solution  $R$  can be found most easily by first solving (3.11) directly in terms of  $\rho$  and then using the relation  $\rho = e^{2R/\hbar}$ . Rewriting (3.11)



as  $(\partial_t + \sum_i^N \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla_i) \rho = -\rho \sum_i^N \nabla_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i$ , we have  $(d/dt) \ln[\rho] = -\sum_i^N \nabla_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i$ . Solving this last expression yields

$$\rho(q, t) = \rho_0(q_0) \exp\left[-\int_0^t \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i\right) dt'\right]. \quad (3.25)$$

The osmotic potential obtained from  $\rho$  then takes the form

$$R(q, t) = R_0(q_0) - (\hbar/2) \int_0^t \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i\right) dt'. \quad (3.26)$$

Accordingly, we see clearly that  $R$  depends on  $S$  through  $\mathbf{v}_i$ , and that  $S$  depends on  $R$  through the quantum kinetic. So the non-separability of  $\Phi_c^{int}$  alone entails non-factorizability of  $S(q, t)$ , which entails non-factorizability of  $R(q, t)$ , which entails non-factorizability of the quantum kinetic.<sup>7</sup> That is, the nonlinear coupling between (3.24) and (3.26) entails that  $S$  is actually non-separable by virtue of the non-separability of  $\Phi_c^{int}$  and (as a consequence thereof) that the quantum kinetic is non-separable. Thus we've explicitly shown, from the  $N$ -particle HJM equations, that the presence of classical interactions between Nelsonian particles means that the  $N$ -particle osmotic potential cannot be written as a separable sum of  $N$  osmotic potentials associated to each particle.

Let us now combine (3.11) and (3.23) into an  $N$ -particle Schrödinger equation and write down the most general form of the  $N$ -particle wavefunction. To do this, we first need to impose the  $N$ -particle generalization of the quantization condition

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \nabla_i S(q, t) \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i = nh, \quad (3.27)$$

which, by (3.26), also constrains the osmotic potential sourced by the ether. Then we can combine (3.11) and (3.23) into

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi(q, t)}{\partial t} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \frac{[-i\hbar \nabla_i - \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_i, t)]^2}{2m_i} + e_i (\Phi_i^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_i, t) + \Phi_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{q}_j)) \right] \psi(q, t), \quad (3.28)$$

where the single-valued  $N$ -particle wavefunction in polar form is  $\psi(q, t) = \sqrt{\rho(q, t)} e^{iS(q, t)/\hbar}$ .

---

<sup>7</sup>In Part I, we explained that we prefer to call the “quantum potential” the “quantum kinetic” in order to emphasize its physical origin in the kinetic energy term associated with the osmotic velocity of a Nelsonian particle.

### 3.3 Interpretation of the Nelson-Yasue wavefunction

How should we understand the NYSM-derived wavefunction satisfying (3.28)? Is it part of NYSM's physical ontology, i.e., is it a beable? Or should it be viewed as strictly epistemic, i.e., strictly reflecting our ignorance about ontic aspects of an  $N$ -particle NYSM system?

Straight off the bat, we can see that  $\psi(q, t)$  is defined in terms of  $\rho(q, t)$  and  $S(q, t)$ . As noted in section 2,  $\rho(q, t)$  is an epistemic distribution in that it reflects our ignorance of the actual positions of the particles; hence  $\rho(q, t)$  is not a beable. As also noted in section 2,  $S(q, t)$  is a field over the possible positions of the actual particles and describes the possible current velocities that the actual particles can have at each possible point in 3-space they can occupy at time  $t$ ; hence  $S(q, t)$  is also not a beable. Since  $\psi(q, t)$  is defined in terms of  $\rho(q, t)$  and  $S(q, t)$ , we must conclude that  $\psi(q, t)$  is also not a beable in NYSM. Rather,  $\psi(q, t)$  can be said to be epistemic in the precise sense that it's defined in terms of  $\rho(q, t)$  and  $S(q, t)$ , and these latter two variables reflect our ignorance about ontic properties of the actual particles (their actual positions and velocities). In other words,  $\psi(q, t)$  "represents our knowledge of the underlying reality" [165], rather than being an element of the underlying reality.

However, even though  $\psi(q, t)$  is not a beable, it does indirectly reflect certain ontic aspects of the  $N$ -particle system in NYSM. In particular, the evolution of  $\rho(q, t)$  depends on the evolution of  $R(q, t)$  via  $\rho = e^{2R/\hbar}$ , where  $R(q, t) = \mu U(q, t)$  and where  $U(q, t)$  is a beable. So  $\rho(q, t)$  reflects an ontic aspect of the system, namely the system's osmotic potential field  $U(q, t)$ , and by extension so does  $\psi(q, t)$  through its modulus. Additionally, recall from section 2 that the introduction of  $S(q, t)$  through the constraint  $\mathbf{v}_i = m_i^{-1} \nabla_i S$  implies that the ether, which is a beable of NYSM, is irrotational, and this irrotationality is an ontic property of the ether.  $S(q, t)$  also encodes the presence of classical fields in the system (which can be reasonably regarded as beables, in the sense that the electromagnetic field is typically regarded as a beable) via the quantum Hamilton-Jacobi equation (3.23-24), while also satisfying an ontic (law-like) constraint via the quantization condition (3.27). So insofar as  $S(q, t)$  reflects ontic aspects of the system, namely the irrotationality of the ether, the presence of classical fields in the system, and the quantization constraint on the current velocities of the particles, so does  $\psi(q, t)$  through its complex phase.

It is worth emphasizing the significant conceptual differences between  $S(q, t)$  and  $U(q, t)$ , despite their formal mathematical similarities: Even though both are fields on configuration space  $\mathbb{R}^{3N}$ , and even though both enter into the stochastic differential equations of motion (3.1) and (3.4) -  $S(q, t)$  generating the current velocities, and  $U(q, t)$  generating the osmotic velocities - one field (the  $U(q, t)$  field) is a beable and the other (the  $S(q, t)$  field) isn't (though it reflects ontic aspects/properties of a beable, the ether). Additionally,  $S(q, t)$  is subject to the quantization condition (3.27), which only indirectly constrains the evolution of  $U(q, t)$  via

(3.26).

It is also worth emphasizing that the epistemic features of the  $N$ -particle NYSM wavefunction are not in logical contradiction with the Pusey-Barrett-Rudolph (PBR) theorem [134]: One of the assumptions of the PBR theorem is that it is possible to prepare  $N$  systems independently, with quantum states  $\psi_{q_1}, \dots, \psi_{q_N}$ , which results in ontic states  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N$  distributed according to the product distribution  $\mu_{q_1}(\lambda_1)\mu_{q_2}(\lambda_2)\dots\mu_{q_N}(\lambda_N)$ . However, the ontic states of  $N$ -particle NYSM, which include the  $N$ -particle osmotic potential, will in general not conform to this ‘independence assumption’, because the  $N$ -particle osmotic potential is in general non-separable, as we will show later on in this section. In the special cases where the PBR independence assumption is effectively satisfied in  $N$ -particle NYSM, the NYSM wavefunction qualifies as (effectively) “psi-ontic” (to use PBR’s terminology) in the precise sense that (effectively) distinct pure states satisfying the  $N$ -particle Schrödinger equation would (effectively) have non-overlapping distributions for  $\lambda$ . Yet, it seems clear that the NYSM wavefunction being psi-ontic in PBR’s sense would not be logically inconsistent with the NYSM wavefunction not being a beable (in Bell’s sense, see footnote 2) and having epistemic features in the precise sense we’ve already explained.

To see why the  $N$ -particle osmotic potential is in general non-separable, and to get a better feel for the conceptual and technical interplay between the  $\psi$ ,  $R$ , and  $S$  fields, it is worth considering a concrete example involving an entangled state.

Consider the case of 2 distinguishable particles, where particle 1 is associated with a wavepacket  $\psi_A$  and particle 2 is associated with a packet  $\psi_B$ . If, initially, the particles are classically non-interacting and there are no correlations between them, then the joint wavefunction is the product state (suppressing the  $t$  variable for simplicity)

$$\psi_f(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) := \psi_A(\mathbf{q}_1)\psi_B(\mathbf{q}_2). \quad (3.29)$$

We can also construct a non-factorizable solution of (3.28) by writing

$$\psi_{nf}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) := \text{Norm} [\psi_A(\mathbf{q}_1)\psi_B(\mathbf{q}_2) + \psi_C(\mathbf{q}_1)\psi_D(\mathbf{q}_2)]. \quad (3.30)$$

If the summands in (3.30) negligibly overlap by virtue of either  $\psi_A \cap \psi_C \approx \emptyset$  or  $\psi_B \cap \psi_D \approx \emptyset$  ( $\text{Norm}$  = normalization factor), then the system wavefunction is ‘effectively factorizable’; that is, the 2-particle wavefunction associated with the actual particles at time  $t$  is effectively either  $\psi_f = \psi_A(\mathbf{q}_1)\psi_B(\mathbf{q}_2)$  or  $\psi_f = \psi_C(\mathbf{q}_1)\psi_D(\mathbf{q}_2)$ . On the other hand, if we ‘turn on’ the classical interaction  $\Phi_c^{int}$ , evolution by (3.28) will make the overlap of the summands non-negligible, and the system wavefunction will not be effectively factorizable [6]. Consequently, from (3.30),

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

we will have a non-separable 2-particle velocity potential given by

$$S_{nf}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) := -\frac{i\hbar}{2} \ln \left( \frac{\psi_{nf}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)}{\psi_{nf}^*(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)} \right). \quad (3.31)$$

The probability density will also be non-factorizable since it becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{nf}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) := |\psi_{nf}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)|^2 = Norm^2 \left\{ e^{2(R_{A1}+R_{B2})/\hbar} + e^{2(R_{C1}+R_{D2})/\hbar} \right. \\ \left. + 2e^{(R_{A1}+R_{C1}+R_{B2}+R_{D2})/\hbar} \cos[(S_{A1} + S_{B2} - S_{C1} - S_{D2})/\hbar] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

And the corresponding non-separable 2-particle osmotic potential takes the form

$$R_{nf}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) := \hbar \ln (|\psi_{nf}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)|), \quad (3.33)$$

where  $|\psi_{nf}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)| = \sqrt{\rho_{nf}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)}$ .

By the mathematical equivalence of (3.28) with the equation set (3.11)-(3.23)-(3.27), we can see that (3.33) and (3.31) will be coupled solutions of (3.11) and (3.23), respectively. On the other hand, when the summands of  $\psi_{nf}$  have effectively disjoint support in configuration space (e.g., in the case of particles sufficiently separated that their classical interaction can be neglected), the system wavefunction becomes effectively factorizable again. In this case, the system velocity potential is either  $S_f = S_{A1} + S_{B2}$  or  $S_f = S_{C1} + S_{D2}$ , the probability density reduces to  $\rho_f \approx N^2 (e^{2(R_{A1}+R_{B2})/\hbar} + e^{2(R_{C1}+R_{D2})/\hbar})$ , and the system osmotic potential is either  $R_f = R_{A1} + R_{B2}$  or  $R_f = R_{C1} + R_{D2}$ .

Incidentally, this latter case most clearly illustrates how, from the stochastic mechanics viewpoint, the wavefunction plays the role of an epistemic variable while also reflecting some of the ontic properties of the physical system: The modulus-square of the factorizable two-particle wavefunction describes the position density for a statistical ensemble of two-particle systems, while the  $R$  and  $S$  functions encoded in the factorizable two-particle wavefunction represent the *possible*  $R$  and  $S$  functions that the actual particles actually 'have' at time  $t$ ; concurrently, the possible  $R$  and  $S$  functions for the two-particle system reflect objectively real properties of Nelson's ontic ether, insofar as  $R_{A1}$  ( $R_{B2}$ ) and  $R_{C1}$  ( $R_{D2}$ ) correspond to (effectively) disjoint regions of the ontic osmotic potential sourced by the ether  $U_{A1}$  ( $U_{B2}$ ) and  $U_{C1}$  ( $U_{D2}$ ), and insofar as  $S_{A1}$  ( $S_{B2}$ ) and  $S_{C1}$  ( $S_{D2}$ ) reflect the irrotationality of the ether in regions  $A$  and  $B$  and regions  $C$  and  $D$ . This confirms the properties of the osmotic potential and its relation to the velocity potential that we observed from the solutions of the  $N$ -particle HJM equations, for the cases of classically interacting and non-interacting distinguishable particles.

### 3.3 Interpretation of the Nelson-Yasue wavefunction

However, we should note that the linearity of (3.28) entails non-factorizable solutions for the case of classically non-interacting identical bosons or fermions. (To justify the symmetrization postulates, we can import Bacciagaluppi's finding [66] that the symmetrization postulates are derivable from the assumption of symmetry of the Nelsonian particle trajectories in configuration space.) For identical bosons or fermions, we simply replace  $\psi_C(\mathbf{q}_1)\psi_D(\mathbf{q}_2)$  in (3.30) with  $\pm\psi_A(\mathbf{q}_2)\psi_B(\mathbf{q}_1)$ , and similarly for  $S_{nf}$ ,  $\rho_{nf}$ , and  $R_{nf}$ . Then, if particle 1 and particle 2 start out without any classical interaction, we will initially have  $\psi_A \cap \psi_B \approx \emptyset$  (approximately, because the wavepackets never have completely disjoint support in configuration space, even in the non-interacting case); if the packets of these particles then move towards each other and overlap such that  $(\langle \mathbf{q}_1 \rangle - \langle \mathbf{q}_2 \rangle)^2 \leq \sigma_A^2 + \sigma_B^2$ , where  $\sigma_A$  and  $\sigma_B$  are the widths of the packets, the resulting wavefunction of the 2-particle system will be given by (3.30) with  $\psi_A \cap \psi_B \neq \emptyset$  [6]. Physically, the appreciable overlap of the wavepackets implies that the initially independent osmotic potentials possibly associated with particle 1 ( $R_{A1}$  or  $R_{B1}$ ) and particle 2 ( $R_{A2}$  or  $R_{B2}$ ), respectively, become non-separable by virtue of their joint support in configuration space becoming non-negligible. So the resulting motion of particle 1 will have a non-separable physical dependence on part of the osmotic potentials possibly associated with particle 2 (and vice versa), a dependence which is instantaneous between the particles in 3-space (since the  $N$ -particle quantum kinetic in (3.23) acts instantaneously on the two particles at time  $t$ ). Of course, for classically non-interacting identical particles, the 2-particle wavefunction will satisfy  $\psi_A \cap \psi_B = \emptyset$  again once the wavepackets pass each other and their overlap becomes negligible; but if the particles are classically interacting via  $\Phi_c^{int}$  the non-separability will persist until the particles are sufficiently spatially separated that  $\Phi_c^{int} \approx 0$ .

Thus the linearization of the HJM equations into Schrödinger's equation, through the use of condition (3.27), makes possible non-separable/non-local correlations between (distinguishable or identical) particles not admitted by the HJM equations alone (since the solutions of the HJM equations don't generally satisfy the superposition principle without (3.27), as we know from Wallstrom [41]).<sup>8</sup> In fact, such solutions tell us that the two-particle wavefunction for identical bosons (interacting or non-interacting) must always be given by (3.30), where the joint support of the summands never completely vanishes and can increase appreciably due to

---

<sup>8</sup>To be clear, we are not claiming that the HJM equations, without the quantization condition, do not admit solutions that make possible EPR-type correlations between particles. It seems plausible that they do, considering that classical Liouville statistical mechanics (with an epistemic restriction akin to the Heisenberg uncertainty principle) does so [166], and that even without the quantization condition stochastic mechanics reproduces the uncertainty relations. But whether solutions exist that are non-local enough to entail violations of the continuous-variable Bell inequality [167] seems unclear. Answering this question requires a detailed mathematical study of the analytic solutions of the HJM equations, without the quantization condition imposed. To the best of our knowledge, this has yet to be done.

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

(classical or non-classical) interactions between the particles [6].

This last realization complicates the interpretation of the space in which Nelson's ether lives versus the space in which the particles live: we started out by postulating that the ether lives in 3-D space, but have found that once the constraints (3.19) and (3.27) are imposed, the  $R$  and  $S$  functions (which, as we've seen, reflect objectively real properties of the ether) are in general not separable, and thus (mathematically) always live in  $3N$ -dimensional configuration space. If we take this mathematical non-factorizability of  $R$  and  $S$  as a literal indication about the ontic nature of the ether, then this would seem to force us to infer that the ether must actually live in  $3N$ -dimensional configuration space, and therefore regard configuration space as an ontic space in its own right. We could then say (to whatever extent one finds this plausible) that the ether and osmotic potential live in configuration space, but that there are still  $N$  ontic particles living in an (also) ontic 3-D space, and postulate that the two sets of beables can somehow causally interact with each other via the set (3.1)-(3.4)-(3.21), despite living in independent ontic spaces. (This situation is analogous to a common interpretation of the de Broglie-Bohm theory, where the fundamental ontology consists of an ontic wavefunction living in an ontic  $3N$ -dimensional configuration space, and  $N$  ontic particles living in an ontic 3-D space; one then postulates a one-way causal relationship between the wavefunction and the  $N$  particles via the "guiding equation" [6, 8, 7].)

Alternatively, if one finds it unintelligible to say that beables living in two independent ontic spaces can causally interact (or even that one set of beables merely naturally supervenes on the other set), we could suppose (in analogy with Albert's "flat-footed" interpretation of the de Broglie-Bohm theory [19, 20]) that the representation of  $N$  particles in 3-D space is a mathematical fiction and that the ontic description is actually a single particle in  $3N$ -dimensional configuration space. This has the virtue that it is straightforward to assert that this single particle causally interacts with Nelson's ether (since they both live in the same ontic space). The cost is that one now has to employ a complicated (philosophical) functional analysis [19, 20, 5] of how the form of the interaction potential  $\Phi_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{q}_j)$  in the quantum Hamilton-Jacobi equation (3.23) makes it possible to recover  $N$  particles in 3-D space as an emergent ontology; additionally, this view seems logically inconsistent with the fact that the non-separable  $R$  and  $S$  functions are *consequences of* extremizing the action (3.18), defined in terms of  $N$  contributions, if there aren't really  $N$  particles diffusing in 3-D space to which those  $N$  contributions correspond.

A third possibility is that the configuration-space representation of  $R$  and  $S$  is somehow just an abstract encoding of a complicated array of ontic fields in space-time that nonlocally connect the motions of the particles. In practice, we might implement this by analogy with Norsen's "TELB" approach to the de Broglie-Bohm theory [38, 39]: Taylor-expand the  $R$  and  $S$  functions in configuration space into  $N$  one-particle  $R$  and  $S$  functions, each coupled to a

### 3.4 Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion for Many Particles

countably infinite hierarchy of “entanglement fields” in space-time that implement the nonlocal connections between the motions of the particles. The upshot of this approach is that one can maintain that Nelson’s ether lives in plain-old 3-D space along with  $N$  particles. A drawback is the immense complexity of positing a countable infinity of ontic fields in space-time, in order to reproduce all the information encoded in the  $R$  and  $S$  functions in configuration space. To be sure, this last possibility is more speculative than the former two (since it would be non-trivial to actually construct such a variant of NYSM); but we think it is ultimately the most intelligible and fruitful one for stochastic mechanics (for reasons discussed in sections 4 and 5).

Of course, the validity of constructing the non-separable solutions (3.30-33) in NYSM depends on the plausibility of imposing (3.27). But such a condition is arbitrary from the point of view of (3.11) and (3.23), insofar as we have reconstructed those equations from the Nelson-Yasue assumptions. This, in essence, is Wallstrom’s criticism applied to the  $N$ -particle case. Our task then is to reformulate  $N$ -particle NYSM into  $N$ -particle ZSM.

## 3.4 Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion for Many Particles

In developing  $N$ -particle ZSM, it will be helpful to first develop the  $N$ -particle version of our classical *zbw* model, for free particles, particles interacting with external fields, and particles interacting with each other through Coulomb forces. As we will see, even at the classical level, the  $N$ -particle extension turns out to be non-trivial.

### 3.4.1 Free *zbw* particles

Let us now suppose we have  $N$  identical, non-interacting *zbw* particles in space-time, and no external fields present. In other words, the  $i$ -th particle has rest mass  $m_i$  (taking  $i = 1, \dots, N$ ) and is rheonomically constrained to undergo an unspecified oscillatory process with constant angular frequency  $\omega_{ci}$  about some fixed point in 3-space  $\mathbf{q}_{0i}$  in a Lorentz frame where  $\mathbf{v}_i = d\mathbf{q}_{0i}/dt = 0$ . Then, in a fixed Lorentz frame where  $\mathbf{v}_i \neq 0$ , the *zbw* phase for the  $i$ -th free particle takes the form (using  $\theta_i =: -\frac{\omega_{ci}}{m_i c^2} S_i = -\frac{1}{\hbar} S_i$ )

$$\delta S_i(\mathbf{q}_i(t), t) = (\mathbf{p}_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) - E_i \delta t), \quad (3.34)$$

where  $E_i = \gamma_i m_i c^2$ . So for each particle, we will have

$$\oint_L \delta S_i(\mathbf{q}_i(t), t) = \oint_L (\mathbf{p}_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) - E_i \delta t) = n\hbar, \quad (3.35)$$



### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

which implies

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \delta S_i(\mathbf{q}_i(t), t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L (\mathbf{p}_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) - E_i \delta t) = nh. \quad (3.36)$$

In the non-relativistic limit, the  $i$ -th *zbw* phase is

$$S_i(\mathbf{q}_i(t), t) \approx m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{q}_i(t) - \left( m_i c^2 + \frac{m_i v_i(\mathbf{q}_i(t), t)^2}{2} \right) t + \hbar \phi_i, \quad (3.37)$$

and satisfies the classical HJ equation

$$E_i(\mathbf{q}_i(t), t) = -\partial_t S_i(\mathbf{q}_i, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} = \frac{(\nabla_i S_i(\mathbf{q}_i, t))^2}{2m_i}|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} + m_i c^2. \quad (3.38)$$

We can also define the total system energy as the sum of the individual energies of each *zbw* particle:

$$E(q(t), t) = -\partial_t S(q, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(\nabla_i S(q, t))^2}{2m_i}|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} + \sum_{i=1}^N m_i c^2, \quad (3.39)$$

where we have used  $E = -\partial_t S = \sum_{i=1}^N E_i = -\sum_{i=1}^N \partial_t S_i = -\partial_t \sum_{i=1}^N S_i$ . Accordingly, we can define the ‘joint phase’ of the  $N$ -particle system as the sum

$$S(q(t), t) = \sum_{i=1}^N S_i(\mathbf{q}_i(t), t) \approx \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{v}_i(q(t), t) \cdot \mathbf{q}_i(t) - \left( \sum_{i=1}^N m_i c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i v_i(q(t), t)^2}{2} \right) t + \hbar \sum_{i=1}^N \phi_i, \quad (3.40)$$

which satisfies (3.39). Correspondingly, we can rewrite (3.36) as

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \nabla_i S|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) = nh, \quad (3.41)$$

for displacements along closed loops with time held fixed. We are now ready to formulate the HJ statistical mechanics for  $N$  free particles.

#### 3.4.2 Classical Hamilton-Jacobi statistical mechanics for free *zbw* particles

If the actual positions of the *zbw* particles are unknown, then  $\mathbf{q}_i(t)$  gets replaced by  $\mathbf{q}_i$ , and the non-relativistic joint *zbw* phase becomes a field over the possible positions of the actual



### 3.4 Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion for Many Particles

*zbw* particles, namely

$$S(q, t) \approx \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{v}_i(q, t) \cdot \mathbf{q}_i - \sum_{i=1}^N \left( m_i c^2 + \frac{m_i v_i(q, t)^2}{2} \right) t + \sum_{i=1}^N \hbar \phi_i, \quad (3.42)$$

where  $\mathbf{v}_i(q, t) = \nabla_i S(q, t)/m_i$  and satisfies

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \nabla_i S \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i = nh, \quad (3.43)$$

and

$$E(q, t) = -\partial_t S = \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \frac{(\nabla_i S)^2}{2m_i} + m_i c^2 \right]. \quad (3.44)$$

The physical independence of the particles further implies

$$E_i = -\partial_t S_i = \frac{(\nabla_i S_i)^2}{2m_i} + m_i c^2, \quad (3.45)$$

where

$$S(q, t) = \sum_{i=1}^N S_i(\mathbf{q}_i, t), \quad (3.46)$$

and

$$\oint_L \nabla_i S_i \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i = nh. \quad (3.47)$$

As (3.42) is defined from the sum of  $N$  independent phase fields, Eq. (3.46), the corresponding velocity fields,  $\mathbf{v}_i(q, t)$ , are also physically independent of one another. Consequently, for the trajectory fields obtained from integrating  $\mathbf{v}_i(q, t)$ , the associated  $N$ -particle probability density  $\rho(q, t) = n(q, t)/N$  can be taken in most cases to be factorizable into a product of  $N$  independent probability densities (for simplicity, we ignore the special case of classical correlations corresponding to when  $\rho$  is a mixture of factorizable densities; but see [67] for a discussion of classical correlations in a related context):

$$\rho(q, t) = \prod_i^N \rho_i(\mathbf{q}_i, t), \quad (3.48)$$

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

where (3.48) satisfies  $\rho(q, t) \geq 0$ , the normalization condition  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} \rho_0(q) d^{3N}q = 1$ , and evolves by the  $N$ -particle continuity equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = - \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \cdot \left[ \left( \frac{\nabla_i S}{m_i} \right) \rho \right], \quad (3.49)$$

which by (3.48) implies

$$\frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial t} = - \nabla_i \cdot \left[ \left( \frac{\nabla_i S_i}{m_i} \right) \rho_i \right]. \quad (3.50)$$

We can then combine (3.44) and (3.49) to obtain a single-valued  $N$ -particle classical wave-function  $\psi(q, t) = \sqrt{\rho_0(\mathbf{q}_1 - \mathbf{v}_1 t, \dots, \mathbf{q}_N - \mathbf{v}_N t)} e^{iS(q, t)/\hbar}$  satisfying the  $N$ -particle nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 |\psi|}{|\psi|} + m_i c^2 \right] \psi, \quad (3.51)$$

which implies

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi_i}{\partial t} = \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 |\psi_i|}{|\psi_i|} + m_i c^2 \right] \psi_i, \quad (3.52)$$

since

$$\psi(q, t) = \prod_i^N \psi_i(\mathbf{q}_i, t). \quad (3.53)$$

Having completed the description of  $N$  free particles, we now develop the slightly less trivial case of *zbw* particles interacting with external fields.

#### 3.4.3 External fields interacting with *zbw* particles

To describe the interaction of our *zbw* particles with external fields, consider first the change in the *zbw* phase of the  $i$ -th particle in its rest frame:

$$\delta \theta_i(t_0) = \omega_{ci} \delta t_0 = \frac{1}{\hbar} (m_i c^2) \delta t_0. \quad (3.54)$$

### 3.4 Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion for Many Particles

The coupling of the particle to (say) the Earth's external gravitational field leads to a small correction (in the now instantaneous rest frames of the particles) as follows:

$$\delta\theta_i(\mathbf{q}_{0i}, t_0) = [\omega_{ci} + \kappa_i(\mathbf{q}_{0i})] \delta t_0 = \frac{1}{\hbar} [m_i c^2 + m_i \Phi_{gi}^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_{0i})] \delta t_0, \quad (3.55)$$

where  $\kappa_i = \omega_{ci} \Phi_{gi}^{ext}/c^2$ . As in the single particle case, we have approximated the coupling as point-like since we assume  $|\mathbf{q}_i| \gg \lambda_{ci}$ . Supposing also that the *zbw* particles carry charge  $e_i$  (so that they now become classical charged oscillators of some identical type), their point-like couplings to a space-time varying external electric field lead to additional (small) phase shifts of the form

$$\delta\theta_i(\mathbf{q}_{0i}, t_0) = [\omega_{ci} + \kappa_i(\mathbf{q}_{0i}) + \varepsilon_i(\mathbf{q}_{0i}, t_0)] \delta t_0 = \frac{1}{\hbar} [m_i c^2 + m_i \Phi_{gi}^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_{0i}) + e_i \Phi_{ei}^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_{0i}, t_0)] \delta t_0, \quad (3.56)$$

where  $\varepsilon_i = \omega_{ci} (e_i/m_i c^2) \Phi_{ei}^{ext}$ .

Transforming to the lab frame where the *i*-th *zbw* particle has nonzero but variable translational velocity, (3.56) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\theta_i(\mathbf{q}_i(t), t) &= \left[ (\omega_{dBi} + \kappa_i(\mathbf{q}_i(t))) + \varepsilon_i(\mathbf{q}_i(t), t) \right] \gamma_i \left( \delta t - \frac{\mathbf{v}_{0i}(\mathbf{q}_i(t), t) \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t)}{c^2} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \left[ (\gamma_i m_i c^2 + \gamma_i m_i \Phi_{gi}^{ext} + e_i \Phi_{ei}^{ext}) \delta t - (\gamma_i m_i c^2 + \gamma_i m_i \Phi_{gi}^{ext} + e_i \Phi_{ei}^{ext}) \frac{\mathbf{v}_{0i} \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t)}{c^2} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar} (E_i \delta t - \mathbf{p}_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (3.57)$$

where  $E_i = \gamma_i m_i c^2 + \gamma_i m_i \Phi_{gi}^{ext} + e_i \Phi_{ei}^{ext}$  and  $\mathbf{p}_i = m_i \mathbf{v}_i = (\gamma_i m_i c^2 + \gamma_i m_i \Phi_{gi}^{ext} + e_i \Phi_{ei}^{ext}) (\mathbf{v}_{0i}/c^2)$ . Incorporating coupling to an external vector potential, we have  $\mathbf{v}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{v}'_i = \mathbf{v}_i + e_i \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}/\gamma_i m_i c$  (where  $\gamma_i$  depends on the time-dependent  $v_i$ ).

Now, even under the physical influence of the external fields, the phase of the *i*-th particle's oscillation is a well-defined function of its space-time location. Thus, if we displace the *i*-th particle around a closed loop, the phase change is still given by

$$\oint_L \delta\theta_i = \frac{1}{\hbar} \oint_L [E_i \delta t - \mathbf{p}'_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t)] = 2\pi n, \quad (3.58)$$

or

$$\oint_L \delta S_i = \oint_L [\mathbf{p}'_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) - E_i \delta t] = nh. \quad (3.59)$$

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

Accordingly, we will also have

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \delta S_i = \sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L [\mathbf{p}'_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) - E_i \delta t] = nh. \quad (3.60)$$

Moreover, for the special case of a loop in which time is held fixed, we have

$$\oint_L \nabla_i S_i|_{\mathbf{q}_i=\mathbf{q}_i(t)} \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) = \oint_L \mathbf{p}'_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) = nh, \quad (3.61)$$

or

$$\oint_L m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) = nh - \frac{e_i}{c} \oint_L \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t). \quad (3.62)$$

Likewise

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \nabla_i S_i|_{\mathbf{q}_i=\mathbf{q}_i(t)} \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \mathbf{p}'_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) = nh, \quad (3.63)$$

which is equivalent to

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) = nh - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{e_i}{c} \oint_L \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t). \quad (3.64)$$

Integrating (3.57) and rewriting in terms of  $S_i$ , we obtain

$$S_i = \int [\mathbf{p}'_i \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i(t) - E_i dt] - \hbar \phi_i, \quad (3.65)$$

and thus

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^N S_i = \sum_{i=1}^N \int [\mathbf{p}'_i \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i(t) - E_i dt] - \sum_{i=1}^N \hbar \phi_i. \quad (3.66)$$

When  $v_i \ll c$

$$\begin{aligned} S \approx & \sum_{i=1}^N \int m_i \mathbf{v}'_i \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i(t) - \\ & - \sum_{i=1}^N \int \left( m_i c^2 + \frac{1}{2m_i} \left[ \mathbf{p}_i - \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right]^2 + m_i \Phi_{gi}^{ext} + e_i \Phi_{ei}^{ext} \right) dt - \sum_{i=1}^N \hbar \phi_i, \end{aligned} \quad (3.67)$$

### 3.4 Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion for Many Particles

and satisfies

$$-\partial_t S|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(\nabla_i S - \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext})^2}{2m_i} |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} + \sum_{i=1}^N [m_i c^2 + m_i \Phi_{gi}^{ext} + e_i \Phi_{ei}^{ext}], \quad (3.68)$$

where the kinetic velocity,  $\mathbf{v}_i = (1/m_i) \nabla_i S|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} - e_i \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}/m_i c$ , satisfies the classical Newtonian equation of motion

$$\begin{aligned} m_i \ddot{\mathbf{q}}_i(t) &= \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla_i \right) \left[ \nabla_i S - \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right] |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} \\ &= -\nabla_i [m_i \Phi_{gi}^{ext} + e_i \Phi_{ei}^{ext}] |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} - \frac{e_i}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}}{\partial t} |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{v}_i \times \mathbf{B}_i^{ext}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.69)$$

As in the previous section, we now want to extend our model to a classical HJ statistical mechanics for  $N$ -particles.

#### 3.4.4 Classical Hamilton-Jacobi statistical mechanics for zbw particles interacting with external fields

If in the lab frame we do not know the actual positions of the *zbw* particles, then  $\mathbf{q}_i(t)$  gets replaced by  $\mathbf{q}_i$ , and the phase (3.67) becomes a field over the possible positions of the *zbw* particles. In the  $v_i \ll c$  approximation

$$\begin{aligned} S(q, t) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathbf{q}_i(t_i)}^{\mathbf{q}_i(t)} m_i \mathbf{v}'_i(q(s), s) \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i(s) |_{\mathbf{q}_j(t)=\mathbf{q}_j} \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{t_i}^t \left( m_i c^2 + \frac{1}{2m_i} \left[ \mathbf{p}_i(q(s), s) - \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}(q(s), s) \right]^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + m_i \Phi_{gi}^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_i(s)) + e_i \Phi_{ei}^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_i(s), s) \right) ds |_{\mathbf{q}_j(t)=\mathbf{q}_j} - \sum_{i=1}^N \hbar \phi_i. \end{aligned} \quad (3.70)$$

To obtain the equations of motion for  $S$  and  $\mathbf{v}_i$  we will now apply the classical analogue of Yague's  $N$ -particle variational principle, in anticipation of the method we will use for constructing  $N$ -particle ZSM (we did not do this in the free-particles case because there the dynamics of the particles is trivial).

First we define the ensemble-averaged  $N$ -particle phase/action (inputting limits between

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

initial and final states),

$$\begin{aligned}
 J &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \int_{\mathbf{q}_{iI}}^{\mathbf{q}_{iF}} m_i \mathbf{v}'_i \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i(t) - \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \left( m_i c^2 + \frac{1}{2m_i} \left[ \mathbf{p}_i - \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right]^2 + m_i \Phi_{gi}^{ext} + e_i \Phi_{ei}^{ext} \right) dt - \hbar \phi_i \right] \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \cdot \mathbf{v}_i - m_i c^2 - m_i \Phi_{gi}^{ext} - e_i \Phi_{ei}^{ext} \right\} dt - \sum_{i=1}^N \hbar \phi_i \right],
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.71}$$

where the equated expressions are related by the usual Legendre transformation. Imposing the variational constraint

$$J = \text{extremal}, \tag{3.72}$$

a straightforward computation exactly along the lines of the Appendix yields (3.69). And, upon replacing  $\mathbf{q}_i(t)$  by  $\mathbf{q}_i$ , we obtain the equation of motion for the acceleration field  $\mathbf{a}(q, t)$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_i \mathbf{a}_i &= \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla_i \right) \left[ \nabla_i S - \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right] \\
 &= -\nabla_i \left[ m_i \Phi_{gi}^{ext} + e_i \Phi_{ei}^{ext} \right] - \frac{e_i}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}}{\partial t} + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{v}_i \times \mathbf{B}_i^{ext},
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.73}$$

where  $\mathbf{v}_i = (1/m_i) \nabla_i S - e_i \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}/m_i c$  corresponds to the kinetic velocity field associated with the  $i$ -th particle.

Integrating both sides of (3.73), summing over all  $N$  terms, and setting the integration constants equal to the rest masses, we then obtain the classical  $N$ -particle Hamilton-Jacobi equation for (3.70)

$$-\partial_t S = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(\nabla_i S - \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext})^2}{2m_i} + \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ m_i c^2 + m_i \Phi_{gi}^{ext} + e_i \Phi_{ei}^{ext} \right]. \tag{3.74}$$

Correspondingly, the probability density  $\rho(q, t)$  now evolves by the modified  $N$ -particle continuity equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = - \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \cdot \left[ \left( \frac{\nabla_i S}{m_i} - \frac{e_i}{m_i c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right) \rho \right], \tag{3.75}$$

which preserves the normalization,  $\int \rho_0 d^{3N} q = 1$ . As in the free particle case, since  $S$  is a field over the possible positions that the actual  $zbw$  particles can occupy at a time  $t$ , and since for each possible position the phase of each  $zbw$  particle satisfies the condition (3.63), it follows

### 3.4 Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion for Many Particles

that  $S$  is a single-valued function of  $q$  and  $t$  (up to an additive integer multiple of  $2\pi$ ) and satisfies

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \nabla_i S \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i = nh. \quad (3.76)$$

Then we can combine (3.74-75) into the nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \frac{[-i\hbar \nabla_i - \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}]^2}{2m_i} + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 |\psi|}{|\psi|} + m_i \Phi_{gi}^{ext} + e_i \Phi_{ei}^{ext} + m_i c^2 \right] \psi, \quad (3.77)$$

with  $N$ -particle wavefunction  $\psi(q, t) = \sqrt{\rho(q, t)} e^{iS(q, t)/\hbar}$ , which is single-valued because of (3.76). We can also obtain the single-particle versions of (3.74-77) in the case that  $S$ ,  $\rho$ , and  $\psi$  satisfy the factorization conditions (3.46), (3.48), and (3.53), respectively.

We are now ready to develop the more involved case of classically interacting *zbw* particles.

#### 3.4.5 Classically interacting *zbw* particles

For simplicity we will consider just two *zbw* particles classically interacting through a scalar potential in the lab frame, under the assumptions that  $v_i \ll c$  and no external potentials are present. (Restricting the particles to the non-relativistic regime also avoids complications associated with potentials sourced by relativistic particles [168, 169].) In particular, we suppose that the particles interact through the Coulomb potential

$$V_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_1(t), \mathbf{q}_2(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^2 e_i \Phi_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_1(t), \mathbf{q}_2(t)) = \frac{e_1 e_2}{|\mathbf{q}_1(t) - \mathbf{q}_2(t)|}, \quad (3.78)$$

where we recall  $\Phi_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_i(t), \mathbf{q}_j(t)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{2(j \neq i)} \frac{e_j}{|\mathbf{q}_i(t) - \mathbf{q}_j(t)|}$ . Note that we make the point-like interaction assumption  $|\mathbf{q}_1(t) - \mathbf{q}_2(t)| \gg \lambda_c$ . So the motions of the particles are not physically independent in the lab frame, and this implies that the *zbw* oscillation of particle 1 (particle 2) in the lab frame is physically dependent on the position of particle 2 (particle 1), through the interaction potential (3.78). We can represent this physical dependence of the *zbw* oscillations by a non-separable joint phase change, which involves contributions from both particles in the

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

form

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\theta_{joint}^{lab}(\mathbf{q}_1(t), \mathbf{q}_2(t), t) &= \left[ \sum_{i=1}^2 \omega_{ic} + \sum_{i=1}^2 \omega_{ci} \frac{\mathbf{v}_i^2}{2c^2} + \sum_{i=1}^2 \omega_{ci} \left( \frac{e_i \Phi_c^{int}}{m_i c^2} \right) \right] |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} \\
&\times \left( \delta t - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{\mathbf{v}_{0i}}{c^2} \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) \right) |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^2 \left[ \omega_{ic} + \omega_{ci} \frac{\mathbf{v}_i^2}{2c^2} + \omega_{ci} \left( \frac{e_i \Phi_c^{int}}{m_i c^2} \right) \right] |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} \delta t \\
&- \sum_{i=1}^2 \omega_{ci} \left( \frac{\mathbf{v}_i}{c^2} \right) |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) \\
&= \frac{1}{\hbar} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^2 m_i c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2}{2} + V_c^{int} \right) |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} \delta t - \sum_{i=1}^2 \mathbf{p}_i |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.79}$$

Not surprisingly, when  $|\mathbf{q}_1(t) - \mathbf{q}_2(t)|$  becomes sufficiently great that  $V_c^{int}$  is negligible, (3.79) reduces to a sum of the physically independent phase changes associated with particle 1 and particle 2, respectively.

Now, even though the particles don't have physically independent phases because of  $V_c^{int}$ , it is clear that the *zbw* oscillation of particle 1 (particle 2) still has a well-defined individual phase at all times. Moreover, we can deduce from (3.79) the individual ('conditional') phase of a particle, given its physical interaction with the other particle via (3.78), in much the same way that "conditional wavefunctions" for subsystems of particles can be deduced from the universal wavefunction in the de Broglie-Bohm theory [112, 38].

To motivate this, let us first ask: in the instantaneous rest frame (IRF) of (say) particle 1, how will the phase associated with its *zbw* oscillation change in time for a co-moving observer that's continously monitoring the oscillation? The phase change associated with particle 1 in its IRF can be obtained from (3.79) simply by subtracting  $\omega_{c2}\delta t$  and setting  $\mathbf{v}_1 = 0$ , giving

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\theta_1^{rest}(\mathbf{q}_{01}(t), \mathbf{q}_2(t), t) &= \left[ \omega_{c1} + \omega_{c2} \left( \frac{\mathbf{v}_2^2}{2c^2} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^2 \omega_{ci} \left( \frac{e_i \Phi_c^{int}}{m_i c^2} \right) \right] |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} \delta t - \omega_{c2} \left( \frac{\mathbf{v}_2}{c^2} \right) |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_2(t) \\
&= \frac{1}{\hbar} \left[ \left( m_1 c^2 + \frac{m_2 \mathbf{v}_2^2}{2} + V_c^{int} \right) |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} \delta t - \mathbf{p}_2 |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_2(t) \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{3.80}$$

where  $\mathbf{q}_{01}(t)$  denotes the translational coordinate of particle 1 in its IRF (which, of course,



### 3.4 Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion for Many Particles

changes as a function of time due to the Coulomb interaction). In other words, (3.80) tells us how the Compton frequency of particle 1,  $\omega_{c1}$ , gets modulated by the physical coupling of particle 1 to particle 2, in the IRF of particle 1. Thus (3.80) represents the conditional phase change of particle 1 in its IRF. We can also confirm that when  $\Phi_c^{int} \approx 0$  the velocity of particle 2 no longer depends on the position of particle 1 at time  $t$ , leaving  $\delta\theta_1^{rest} = \omega_{c1}\delta t_0$ . Likewise we can obtain the conditional *zbw* phase of particle 2 in its IRF.

The conditional *zbw* phase of particle 1 in the lab frame where  $\mathbf{v}_1 \neq 0$  is just

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\theta_1^{lab}(\mathbf{q}_1(t), \mathbf{q}_2(t), t) &= \left[ \omega_{c1} + \sum_{i=1}^2 \omega_{ci} \left( \frac{\mathbf{v}_i^2}{2c^2} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^2 \omega_{ci} \left( \frac{e_i \Phi_c^{int}}{m_i c^2} \right) \right] |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} \delta t \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^2 \omega_{ci} \left( \frac{\mathbf{v}_i}{c^2} \right) |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \left[ \left( m_1 c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2}{2} + V_c^{int} \right) |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} \delta t - \sum_{i=1}^2 \mathbf{p}_i |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.81)$$

Equivalently, we can obtain (3.81) by just subtracting  $\omega_{c2}\delta t$  from (3.79). And likewise for the conditional *zbw* phase of particle 2 in the lab frame.

Recall that, by hypothesis, each *zbw* particle is essentially a harmonic oscillator. This means that when  $V_c^{int} \approx 0$  each particle has its own well-defined phase at each point along its space-time trajectory. Consistency with this hypothesis also means that when  $V_c^{int} > 0$  the joint phase must be a well-defined function of the space-time trajectories of *both* particles (since we posit that both particles remain harmonic oscillators despite having their oscillations physically coupled by  $V_c^{int}$ ). Then for a closed loop  $L$ , along which each particle can be physically or virtually displaced, the joint phase in the lab frame will satisfy

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 \oint_L \delta_i \theta_{joint}^{lab} = 2\pi n, \quad (3.82)$$

and for a loop in which time is held fixed,

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 \oint_L \mathbf{p}_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) = nh. \quad (3.83)$$

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

It also follows from (3.82) and (3.83) that

$$\oint_L \delta_1 \theta_{joint}^{lab} = 2\pi n, \quad (3.84)$$

and

$$\oint_L \mathbf{p}_1 \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_1(t) = nh, \quad (3.85)$$

where this time the closed-loop integration involves keeping the coordinate of particle 2 fixed while particle 1 is displaced along  $L$ . From (3.82-85), it will also be the case that

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 \oint_L \delta_i \theta_1^{lab} = 2\pi n, \quad (3.86)$$

and

$$\oint_L \delta_1 \theta_1^{lab} = 2\pi n. \quad (3.87)$$

Integrating (3.79) and multiplying through by  $\hbar$  yields (using  $S_{joint}^{lab} =: S$ )

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_{\mathbf{q}_i(t_i)}^{\mathbf{q}_i(t)} \mathbf{p}_i \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i(s) - \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_{t_i}^t \left( m_i c^2 + \frac{m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2}{2} + e_i \Phi_c^{int} \right) ds - \sum_{i=1}^2 \hbar \phi_i, \quad (3.88)$$

and evolves by

$$-\partial_t S|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} = \sum_{i=1}^2 m_i c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{(\nabla_i S)^2}{2m_i} |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} + V_c^{int}. \quad (3.89)$$

The conditional phase  $S_1^{lab} = S_1$  and its equation of motion only differ from (3.88-89) by subtracting  $m_2 c^2 t - \hbar \phi_2$ . Analogous considerations apply to particle 2. Finally, the acceleration of the  $i$ -th particle is obtained from the equation of motion

$$m_i \ddot{\mathbf{q}}_i(t) = [\partial_t \mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{p}_i] |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} = -\nabla_i V_c^{int} |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)}. \quad (3.90)$$

Another, more convenient way of modeling the case of two classically interacting *zbw* particles is by exploiting the well-known fact that a two-particle system with an interaction potential of the form (3.78) has an equivalent Hamiltonian of the form (ignoring the trivial CM motion)

$$E_{rel} = \frac{p_{rel}^2}{2\mu} + V_{rel}(|\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)|) + \mu c^2, \quad (3.91)$$

### 3.4 Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion for Many Particles

where the reduced mass  $\mu = m_1 m_2 / (m_1 + m_2)$  and  $V_{rel}(|\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)|) = V_c^{int}(|\mathbf{q}_1(t) - \mathbf{q}_2(t)|)$ . In other words, (3.91) describes a fictitious *zbw* particle of mass  $\mu$  and relative coordinate  $\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)$ , moving in an “external” potential  $V_{rel}(|\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)|)$ . This fictitious particle then has a Compton frequency,  $\omega_c^{red} = \mu c^2 / \hbar$ , and an associated phase change in the lab frame of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\theta_{rel}(\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)) &= \left( \omega_c^{red} + \omega_c^{red} \frac{\mathbf{v}_{rel}^2(\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t))}{2c^2} + \omega_c^{red} \frac{V_{rel}(|\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)|)}{\mu c^2} \right) \left( \delta t - \frac{\mathbf{v}_{0rel}(\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)) \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)}{c^2} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \left[ \left( \mu c^2 + \frac{\mu \mathbf{v}_{rel}^2}{2} + V_{rel} \right) \delta t - \mathbf{p}_{rel} \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_{rel}(t) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.92)$$

Upon integration, this of course gives

$$S_{rel} := -\hbar\theta_{rel} = \int [\mathbf{p}_{rel} \cdot d\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t) - E_{rel}dt] - \hbar\phi_{rel}, \quad (3.93)$$

which evolves in time by the HJ equation

$$-\partial_t S_{rel}|_{\mathbf{q}_{rel}=\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)} = \mu c^2 + \frac{(\nabla_{rel} S_{rel})^2}{2\mu}|_{\mathbf{q}_{rel}=\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)} + V_{rel}, \quad (3.94)$$

and gives the equation of motion

$$\mu \ddot{\mathbf{q}}_{rel}(t) = [\partial_t \mathbf{p}_{rel} + \mathbf{v}_{rel} \cdot \nabla_{rel} \mathbf{p}_{rel}]|_{\mathbf{q}_{rel}=\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)} = -\nabla_{rel} V_{rel}|_{\mathbf{q}_{rel}=\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)}. \quad (3.95)$$

Since this situation is formally equivalent to the case of a single *zbw* particle moving in an external field, we can immediately see that it follows

$$\oint_L \delta S_{rel} = nh, \quad (3.96)$$

and

$$\oint_L \mathbf{p}_{rel} \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_{rel}(t) = nh. \quad (3.97)$$

Furthermore, the physical equivalence between this coordinatization and the original two-particle coordinatization establishes that if phase quantization holds in one coordinatization it must hold in the other.

While we considered here only two *zbw* particles classically interacting through an electric scalar potential, all our considerations straightforwardly generalize to the case of many *zbw* particles classically interacting through electric scalar potentials as well as magnetic vector

potentials (and likewise for the gravitational analogues).

### 3.4.6 Classical Hamilton-Jacobi statistical mechanics for two interacting *zbw* particles

For a statistical mechanical description of two classically interacting *zbw* particles, the trajectories  $\{\mathbf{q}_1(t), \mathbf{q}_2(t)\}$  get replaced with the coordinates  $\{\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2\}$ , and the non-relativistic joint phase field in the lab frame is obtained from (3.88) as

$$S(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_{\mathbf{q}_i(t_i)}^{\mathbf{q}_i(t)} \mathbf{p}_i \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i(s) |_{\mathbf{q}_j(t)=\mathbf{q}_j} - \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_{t_i}^t \left[ m_i c^2 + \frac{m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2(\mathbf{q}_1(s), \mathbf{q}_2(s), s)}{2} + e_i \Phi_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_1(s), \mathbf{q}_2(s)) \right] ds |_{\mathbf{q}_j(t)=\mathbf{q}_j} - \sum_{i=1}^2 \hbar \phi_i, \quad (3.98)$$

and evolves by

$$-\partial_t S = \sum_{i=1}^2 m_i c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{(\nabla_i S)^2}{2m_i} + V_c^{int}, \quad (3.99)$$

where  $\mathbf{v}_i(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) = \nabla_i S(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)/m_i$ . Since (3.98) is a field over the possible positions of the actual *zbw* particles, and since for each possible initial position the phase of each *zbw* particle will satisfy relation (3.83), it follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 \oint_L \nabla_i S \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i = nh, \quad (3.100)$$

where  $L$  is now a mathematical loop in the 2-particle configuration space.

The two-particle probability density  $\rho(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t) \geq 0$  evolves by the two-particle continuity equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = - \sum_{i=1}^2 \nabla_i \cdot \left[ \left( \frac{\nabla_i S}{m_i} \right) \rho \right], \quad (3.101)$$

### 3.4 Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion for Many Particles

and the ensemble-averaged two-particle action is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} J &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^2 \left[ \int_{\mathbf{q}_{iI}}^{\mathbf{q}_{iF}} m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i(t) - \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \left( m_i c^2 + \frac{\mathbf{p}_i^2}{2m_i} + e_i \Phi_{ci}^{int} \right) dt - \hbar \phi_i \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{v}_i^2 - m_i c^2 - e_i \Phi_{ci}^{int} \right) dt - \sum_{i=1}^N \hbar \phi_i \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.102)$$

where the equated expressions are related by the usual Legendre transformation. Imposing

$$J = \text{extremal}, \quad (3.103)$$

straightforward manipulations along the lines of those in the Appendix yield (3.90). And, upon replacing  $\mathbf{q}_i(t)$  with  $\mathbf{q}_i$ , we obtain the classical Newtonian equation for the acceleration field  $\mathbf{a}_i(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)$ :

$$m_i \mathbf{a}_i = \partial_t \mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{p}_i = -\nabla_i V_c^{int}. \quad (3.104)$$

Now, we can obtain the conditional *zlw* phase field for particle 1 by evaluating the joint phase field at the actual position of particle 2 at time  $t$ , i.e.,  $S(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2(t), t) =: S_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t)$ . Taking the total time derivative we have

$$\partial_t S_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t) = \partial_t S(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{q}_2(t)} + \frac{d\mathbf{q}_2(t)}{dt} \cdot \nabla_2 S(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{q}_2(t)}, \quad (3.105)$$

where the conditional velocities

$$\frac{d\mathbf{q}_1(t)}{dt} = \mathbf{v}_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_1=\mathbf{q}_1(t)} = \frac{\nabla_1 S_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t)}{m_1}|_{\mathbf{q}_1=\mathbf{q}_1(t)}, \quad (3.106)$$

and

$$\frac{d\mathbf{q}_2(t)}{dt} = \mathbf{v}_2(\mathbf{q}_2, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{q}_2(t)} = \frac{\nabla_2 S_2(\mathbf{q}_2, t)}{m_2}|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{q}_2(t)}, \quad (3.107)$$

the latter defined from the conditional phase field  $S_2(\mathbf{q}_2, t)$  for particle 2. Inserting (3.105) into the left hand side of (3.99) and adding the corresponding term on the right hand side, we then find that the conditional phase field for particle 1 evolves by a ‘conditional HJ equation’, namely

$$-\partial_t S_1 = m_1 c^2 + \frac{(\nabla_1 S_1)^2}{2m_1} + \frac{(\nabla_2 S)^2}{2m_2}|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{q}_2(t)} - \frac{d\mathbf{q}_2(t)}{dt} \cdot \nabla_2 S|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{q}_2(t)} + V_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2(t)), \quad (3.108)$$

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

where  $V_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2(t))$  is the 'conditional potential' for particle 1; that is, the potential field that particle 1, at location  $\mathbf{q}_1$ , would 'feel' given the actual location of particle 2. The solution of (3.108) can be verified as

$$S_1 = \int \mathbf{p}_1 \cdot d\mathbf{q}_1 - \int \left[ m_1 c^2 + \frac{m_1 \mathbf{v}_1^2}{2} + \frac{m_1 \mathbf{v}_2^2}{2} - \mathbf{p}_2 \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_2(t)}{dt} + V_c^{int} \right] dt - \hbar \phi_1. \quad (3.109)$$

Notice here that the conditional phase field is a field on 3-D space. This makes perfect sense since, after all, the conditional phase refers to the phase associated to the *zbw* oscillation of particle 1, a real physical oscillation in 3-D space. It can also be verified that when (3.109) is evaluated at  $\mathbf{q}_1 = \mathbf{q}_1(t)$ , it is equivalent to  $S_{joint}^{lab}(\mathbf{q}_1(t), \mathbf{q}_2(t), t) - m_2 c^2 t + \hbar \phi_2$ .

Once again, since the conditional *zbw* phase field for particle 1 is a field over the possible positions that *zbw* particle 1 could actually occupy at time  $t$ , it will be the case that

$$\oint_L \nabla_1 S_1 \cdot d\mathbf{q}_1 = nh, \quad (3.110)$$

where  $L$  is a mathematical loop in 3-D space.

Likewise, we can obtain the conditional probability density for particle 1 by writing  $\rho(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2(t), t) =: \rho_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t)$ . Taking the total time derivative gives

$$\partial_t \rho_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t) = \partial_t \rho(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{q}_2(t)} + \frac{d\mathbf{q}_2(t)}{dt} \cdot \nabla_2 \rho(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{q}_2(t)}. \quad (3.111)$$

Inserting this on the left hand side of (3.101) and adding the corresponding term on the right hand side, we obtain the conditional continuity equation for particle 1:

$$\partial_t \rho_1 = -\nabla_1 \cdot \left[ \left( \frac{\nabla_1 S_1}{m_1} \right) \rho_1 \right] - \nabla_2 \cdot \left[ \left( \frac{\nabla_2 S}{m_2} \right) \rho \right] |_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{q}_2(t)} + \frac{d\mathbf{q}_2(t)}{dt} \cdot \nabla_2 \rho |_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{q}_2(t)}, \quad (3.112)$$

which implies  $\rho_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t) \geq 0$  and (upon suitable redefinition of  $\rho_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t)$ ) preservation of the normalization  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho_1(\mathbf{q}_1, 0) = 1$ .

The ensemble-averaged conditional action for particle 1 is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\mathbf{q}_{1I}}^{\mathbf{q}_{1F}} m_1 \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot d\mathbf{q}_1(t) - \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \left( m_1 c^2 + \frac{m_1 \mathbf{v}_1^2}{2} + \frac{m_2 \mathbf{v}_2^2}{2} - \mathbf{p}_2 \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_2(t)}{dt} + V_c^{int} \right) dt - \hbar \phi_1 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_1 \mathbf{v}_1^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_2 \mathbf{v}_2^2 - m_1 c^2 - V_c^{int} \right] dt - \hbar \phi_1 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.113)$$

### 3.4 Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion for Many Particles

where it can be readily confirmed that the equated lines are related by the Legendre transformation. Imposing

$$J_1 = \text{extremal}, \quad (3.114)$$

where the subscript 1 denotes that the variation is only with respect to  $\mathbf{q}_1(t)$ , straightforward manipulations analogous to those in the Appendix yield, upon replacing  $\mathbf{q}_1(t)$  with  $\mathbf{q}_1$ , the classical equation of motion for the conditional acceleration field of particle 1:

$$m_1 \mathbf{a}_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t) = [\partial_t \mathbf{p}_1 + \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{p}_1](\mathbf{q}_1, t) = -\nabla_1 V_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2(t)). \quad (3.115)$$

The conditional phase field, probability density, etc., for particle 2, are developed analogously.

We now turn to the formulation of our classical statistical mechanics in terms of the reduced mass *zbw* particle. Replacing  $\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)$  with  $\mathbf{q}_{rel}$ , the reduced mass *zbw* phase field

$$S_{rel}(\mathbf{q}_{rel}, t) = \int_{\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t_i)}^{\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)} \mathbf{p}_{rel} \cdot d\mathbf{q}_{rel}(s) |_{\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)=\mathbf{q}_{rel}} - \int_{t_i}^t \left( \mu c^2 + \frac{\mathbf{p}_{rel}^2}{2\mu} + V_{rel} \right) ds |_{\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)=\mathbf{q}_{rel}} - \hbar \phi_{rel}, \quad (3.116)$$

evolves by the reduced mass HJ equation

$$-\partial_t S_{rel} = \mu c^2 + \frac{(\nabla_{rel} S_{rel})^2}{2\mu} + V_{rel}, \quad (3.117)$$

and satisfies

$$\oint_L \nabla_{rel} S_{rel} \cdot d\mathbf{q}_{rel} = nh, \quad (3.118)$$

where  $L$  is a mathematical loop in 3-D space. Introducing the probability density for the reduced mass *zbw* particle,  $\rho_{rel}(\mathbf{q}_{rel}, t) \geq 0$ , it is straightforward to show it evolves by the continuity equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho_{rel}}{\partial t} = -\nabla_{rel} \cdot \left[ \left( \frac{\nabla_{rel} S_{rel}}{m_{rel}} \right) \rho_{rel} \right], \quad (3.119)$$

which preserves the normalization  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d^3 \mathbf{q}_{rel} \rho_{rel}(\mathbf{q}_{rel}, 0) = 1$ . The corresponding ensemble-

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

averaged action for the reduced mass particle is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} J_{rel} &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\mathbf{q}_{relI}}^{\mathbf{q}_{relF}} \mu \mathbf{v}_{rel} \cdot d\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t) - \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \left( \mu c^2 + \frac{\mathbf{p}_{rel}^2}{2\mu} + V_{rel} \right) dt - \hbar \phi_{rel} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \left( \frac{1}{2} \mu \mathbf{v}_{rel}^2 - \mu c^2 - V_{rel} \right) dt - \hbar \phi_{rel} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.120)$$

Imposing the constraint

$$J_{rel} = \text{extremal}, \quad (3.121)$$

we obtain after manipulations (and replacing  $\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)$  by  $\mathbf{q}_{rel}$ ) the equation of motion

$$\mu \mathbf{a}_{rel}(\mathbf{q}_{rel}, t) = \partial_t \mathbf{p}_{rel} + \mathbf{v}_{rel} \cdot \nabla_{rel} \mathbf{p}_{rel} = -\nabla_{rel} V_{rel}(|\mathbf{q}_{rel}|). \quad (3.122)$$

Let us now recover the nonlinear Schrödinger equations for each of the three cases we've considered.

The combination of (3.99)-(3.101) gives

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \sum_{i=1}^2 \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 |\psi|}{|\psi|} + m_i c^2 \right] \psi + V_c^{int} \psi, \quad (3.123)$$

where  $\psi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t) = \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)} e^{iS(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)/\hbar}$  is single-valued by (3.100).

Combining (3.108) and (3.112) gives the conditional nonlinear Schrödinger equation for particle 1:

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi_1}{\partial t} &= -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_1} \nabla_1^2 \psi_1 - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_1} \nabla_2^2 \psi|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{q}_2(t)} + V_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2(t)) \psi_1 + m_1 c^2 \psi_1 \\ &\quad + i\hbar \frac{d\mathbf{q}_2(t)}{dt} \cdot \nabla_2 \psi|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{q}_2(t)} + \left( \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_1} \frac{\nabla_1^2 |\psi_1|}{|\psi_1|} \right) \psi_1 + \left( \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_2} \frac{\nabla_2^2 |\psi|}{|\psi|} \right) |_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{q}_2(t)} \psi_1, \end{aligned} \quad (3.124)$$

where  $\psi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2(t), t) =: \psi_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t) = \sqrt{\rho_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t)} e^{iS_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t)/\hbar}$  is the conditional classical wavefunction for particle 1, and satisfies single-valuedness as a consequence of (3.110). Here  $d\mathbf{q}_2(t)/dt = (\hbar/m_2) \text{Im}\{\nabla_2 \ln(\psi_2)\}|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{q}_2(t)}$ , where  $\psi_2 = \psi_2(\mathbf{q}_2, t)$  is the conditional wavefunction for particle 2 and satisfies a conditional nonlinear Schrödinger equation analogous to (3.124). Note also that (3.124) can be obtained by taking the total time derivative of the



### 3.4 Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion for Many Particles

conditional wavefunction for particle 1

$$\partial_t \psi_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t) = \partial_t \psi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{q}_2(t)} + \frac{d\mathbf{q}_2(t)}{dt} \cdot \nabla_2 \psi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{q}_2(t)}, \quad (3.125)$$

inserting this on the left hand side of (3.123), adding the corresponding term on the right hand side, and subtracting  $m_2 c^2 \psi_1$ .

Finally, combining (3.117-119) gives the nonlinear Schrödinger equation for the fictitious reduced mass particle:

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi_{rel}}{\partial t} = \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \nabla_{rel}^2 + \frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \frac{\nabla_{rel}^2 |\psi_{rel}|}{|\psi_{rel}|} + \mu c^2 \right] \psi_{rel} + V(|\mathbf{q}_{rel}|) \psi_{rel}, \quad (3.126)$$

where  $\psi_{rel}(\mathbf{q}_{rel}, t) = \sqrt{\rho_{rel}(\mathbf{q}_{rel}, t)} e^{iS_{rel}(\mathbf{q}_{rel}, t)/\hbar}$  is a single-valued classical wavefunction. As with the linear Schrödinger equation of quantum mechanics, it is easily verified that (3.126) can be obtained from (3.123) by transforming the two-particle Hamiltonian operator to the center of mass and relative coordinates.

This completes the development of the classical HJ statistical mechanics for two classically interacting *zbw* particles. The generalization to  $N$  *zbw* particles interacting through their electric scalar and magnetic vector potentials (and the gravitational analogues thereof) is straightforward, but will not be given here due to unnecessary mathematical complexity.

#### 3.4.7 Remarks on close-range interactions

Throughout we have assumed the point-like interaction case,  $q_{rel}(t) = |\mathbf{q}_1(t) - \mathbf{q}_2(t)| \gg \lambda_c$ . But what changes when  $q_{rel}(t) = |\mathbf{q}_1(t) - \mathbf{q}_2(t)| \sim \lambda_c$ ? Not much. To show this, we adopt the approach of Zelevinsky [170] in modeling the deviation from point-like interactions with a Darwin interaction term as follows. Consider the (hypothesized) 3-D *zbw* oscillation/fluctuation around the relative coordinate,  $\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t) + \delta\mathbf{q}(t)$ , where  $\delta q_{max} = |\delta\mathbf{q}_{max}(t)| = \lambda_c$ . Taylor expand the (Coulomb or Newtonian) interaction potential into  $V_{int}(|\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t) + \delta\mathbf{q}(t)|) \approx V_{int}(|\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)|) + \delta\mathbf{q}(t) \cdot \nabla V_{int}(|\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)|) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \delta q^i(t) \delta q^j(t) \partial^i \partial^j V_{int}(|\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)|)$ . Then, under the reasonable assumptions that the mean and variance of the fluctuations are given by  $\langle \delta\mathbf{q}(t) \rangle = 0$  and  $\langle \delta q(t)^i \delta q(t)^j \rangle = \frac{1}{3} \langle \delta q(t)^2 \rangle \delta_{ij}$ , respectively, the fluctuation-averaged potential  $\langle V_{int}(|\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t) + \delta\mathbf{q}(t)|) \rangle = V_{int}(|\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)|) + \frac{1}{6} \langle \delta q(t)^2 \rangle \nabla^2 V_{int}(|\mathbf{q}_{rel}(t)|)$ . Finally, approximating  $\langle \delta q(t)^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \lambda_c^2$ , we find that the perturbation of the potential due to the fluctuations is  $\delta V \approx \frac{1}{12} \lambda_c^2 \nabla^2 V_{int} = \frac{1}{12} \lambda_c^2 4\pi K \delta(\mathbf{q})$ , if the interaction potential is of the general form,  $V_{int}(q) = K \hat{\mathbf{q}}/q$ , where  $K$  is a constant.

Note that because the *zbw* oscillation is a (rheonomic) constraint on each particle, the

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

Coulomb interaction between them never causes their oscillations to deviate from simple harmonic motion (even though their oscillation frequencies can slightly shift by an amount of the order  $(\omega_c V_{int})/\hbar$ ); so phase/momentum quantization for each particle is not altered, even when  $q_{rel}(t) \sim \lambda_c$ . Alternatively, we could relax the *zbw* constraint by assuming that when  $q_{rel}(t) \sim \lambda_c$ , a slight deviation from simple harmonic motion occurs because the Coulomb repulsion is sufficiently strong to impart a nonlinear perturbation to the internal harmonic potential of each *zbw* particle; but this perturbation should drop off rapidly as the particles move away from each other so that simple harmonic motion is quickly restored and the momentum quantization is stable again. Ideally, a physical model of the *zbw* particle would implement this latter possibility, but for the purposes of this paper, it will simply be assumed throughout that the Coulomb interaction does not alter the simple harmonic nature of the *zbw* oscillations.

## 3.5 Zitterbewegung Stochastic Mechanics

### 3.5.1 Free *zbw* particles

We take as our starting point the hypothesis that  $N$  particles of rest masses,  $m_i$ , and 3-D space positions,  $\mathbf{q}_i(t)$ , are immersed in Nelson's hypothesized ether and undergo conservative diffusion processes according to the stochastic differential equations

$$d\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t)dt + d\mathbf{W}_i(t), \quad (3.127)$$

and

$$d\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t)dt + d\mathbf{W}_{i*}(t), \quad (3.128)$$

where the forward Wiener processes  $d\mathbf{W}_i(t)$  satisfy  $E_t[d\mathbf{W}_i] = 0$  and  $E_t[d\mathbf{W}_i^2] = (\hbar/m_i)dt$ , and analogously for the backward Wiener processes. Note that we take the  $\mathbf{b}_i$  ( $\mathbf{b}_{i*}$ ) to be functions of all the particle positions,  $q(t) = \{\mathbf{q}_1(t), \mathbf{q}_2(t), \dots, \mathbf{q}_N(t)\} \in \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ . The reasons for this are: (i) all the particles are continuously exchanging energy-momentum with a common background medium (Nelson's ether) and thus are in general physically connected in their motions through the ether via  $\mathbf{b}_i$  ( $\mathbf{b}_{i*}$ ), insofar as the latter are constrained by the physical properties of the ether; and (ii) the dynamical equations and initial conditions for the  $\mathbf{b}_i$  ( $\mathbf{b}_{i*}$ ) are what will determine the specific situations under which the latter will be effectively separable functions of the particle positions and when they cannot be effectively separated. Hence, at this level, it is only sensible to write  $\mathbf{b}_i$  ( $\mathbf{b}_{i*}$ ) as functions of all the particle positions at a single time.

As in the single particle case, in order to incorporate the *zbw* oscillation as a property of each particle, we must amend Nelson's original phenomenological hypotheses about his ether

and particles with the  $N$ -particle generalizations of the new phenomenological hypotheses we introduced in Part I:

1. Nelson's ether is not only a stochastically fluctuating medium in space-time, but an oscillating medium with a spectrum of angular frequencies superposed at each point in 3-space. More precisely, we imagine the ether as a continuous (or effectively continuous) medium composed of a countably infinite number of fluctuating, stationary, spherical waves superposed at each point in space, with each wave having a different fixed angular frequency,  $\omega_0^k$ , where  $k$  denotes the  $k$ -th ether mode. The relative phases between the modes are taken to be random so that each mode is effectively uncorrelated with every other mode.
2. The particles of rest masses  $m_i$ , located at positions  $\mathbf{q}_{0i}$  in their respective instantaneous mean forward translational rest frames (IMFTRFs), i.e., the frames in which  $D\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \mathbf{b}_i(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = 0$ , are bounded to harmonic oscillator potentials with fixed natural frequencies  $\omega_{0i} = \omega_{ci} = (1/\hbar) m_i c^2$ . In keeping with the phenomenological approach of ZSM, and the approach taken by de Broglie and Bohm with their *zbw* models, we need not specify the precise physical nature of these harmonic oscillator potentials; this task is left for a future physical model of the ZSM particle.
3. Each particle's center of mass, as a result of being immersed in the ether, undergoes approximately frictionless translational Brownian motion (due to the homogeneous and isotropic ether fluctuations that couple to the particles by possibly electromagnetic, gravitational, or some other means), as modeled by Eqs. (3.127) and (3.128); and, in their respective IMFTRFs, undergo driven oscillations about  $\mathbf{q}_{0i}$  by coupling to a narrow band of ether modes that resonantly peak around their natural frequencies. However, in order that the oscillation of each particle doesn't become unbounded in kinetic energy, there must be some mechanism by which the particles dissipate energy back into the ether so that, on the average, a steady-state equilibrium regime is reached for their oscillations. So we posit that on short relaxation time-scales,  $\tau$ , which are identical for particles of identical rest masses, the average energy absorbed from the driven oscillation by the resonant ether modes equals the average energy dissipated back to the ether by a given particle. The average, in the present sense, would be over the random phases of the ether modes. (Here we are taking inspiration from stochastic electrodynamics [149, 150], where it has been shown that a classical charged harmonic oscillator immersed in a classical electromagnetic zero-point field has a steady-state condition where the phase-averaged power absorbed by the oscillator balances the phase-averaged power radiated by the oscillator back to the zero-point field; this yields a steady-state oscillation at the

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

natural frequency of the oscillator [149, 150, 151, 154]. However, in keeping with our phenomenological approach, we do not propose a specific mechanism for this energy exchange, only provisionally assume that it occurs somehow.) Thus, in the steady-state regime, each particle undergoes a steady-state *zbw* oscillation of angular frequency  $\omega_{ci}$  about its location  $\mathbf{q}_{0i}$  in its IMFTRF, as characterized by the ‘fluctuation-dissipation’ relation,  $\langle H_i \rangle_{\text{steady-state}} = \hbar\omega_{ci} = m_i c^2$ , where  $\langle H_i \rangle_{\text{steady-state}}$  is the conserved random-phase-average energy due to the steady-state oscillation of the  $i$ -th particle. Accordingly, if, relative to the ether, all the particles have zero mean translational motion, then we will have  $\sum_i^N \langle H_i \rangle_{\text{steady-state}} = \sum_i^N \hbar\omega_{ci} = \sum_i^N m_i c^2 = \text{const.}$

It follows then that, in the IMFTRF of the  $i$ -th particle, the mean forward steady-state *zbw* phase change is given by

$$\delta\bar{\theta}_{i+} := \omega_{ci}\delta t_0 = \frac{m_i c^2}{\hbar}\delta t_0, \quad (3.129)$$

and the corresponding cumulative mean forward steady-state phase at time  $t_0$  is

$$\bar{\theta}_{i+} = \omega_{ci}t_0 + \phi_i = \frac{m_i c^2}{\hbar}t_0 + \phi_{i+}. \quad (3.130)$$

Then the joint cumulative mean forward steady-state phase for all the particles will just be

$$\bar{\theta}_+ = \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\theta}_{i+} = \sum_{i=1}^N (\omega_{ci}t_0 + \phi_{i+}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{m_i c^2}{\hbar}t_0 + \phi_{i+} \right). \quad (3.131)$$

The reason for starting our analysis with the IMFTRFs goes back to the fact that, before constraining the diffusion process to simultaneous solutions of the forward and backward Fokker-Planck equations associated to (3.127-128), neither the forward nor the backward stochastic differential equations (3.127-128) have well-defined time reversals. So the forward and backward stochastic differential equations describe independent, time-asymmetric diffusion processes in opposite time directions, and we must start by considering the steady-state *zbw* phases in each time direction separately. So we chose to start with the more intuitive forward time direction.

For the  $i$ -th *zbw* particle in its instantaneous mean backward translational rest frame (IMBTRF), i.e., the frame defined by  $D_*\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t) = 0$ , its mean backward steady-state *zbw* phase change is given by

$$\delta\bar{\theta}_{i-} := -\omega_{ci}\delta t_0 = -\frac{m_i c^2}{\hbar}\delta t_0, \quad (3.132)$$

and

$$\bar{\theta}_{i-} = (-\omega_{ci}t_0) + \phi_{i-} = \left(-\frac{m_i c^2}{\hbar}t_0\right) + \phi_{i-}. \quad (3.133)$$

Then the cumulative joint mean backward steady-state phase for all the particles will just be

$$\bar{\theta}_- = \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\theta}_{i-} = \sum_{i=1}^N (\omega_{ci}t_0 + \phi_{i-}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{m_i c^2}{\hbar}t_0 + \phi_{i-}\right). \quad (3.134)$$

As in the single particle case, we note that both the diffusion coefficient  $\nu_i = \hbar/2m_i$  and the (reduced) *zbw* period  $T_{ci} = 1/\omega_{ci} = \hbar/m_i c^2$  are scaled by  $\hbar$ . This is consistent with our hypothesis that the ether is the common physical cause of both the frictionless diffusion processes and the steady-state *zbw* oscillations of the particles. Had we not proposed Nelson's ether as the physical cause of the *zbw* oscillations as well as the frictionless diffusions, the occurrence of  $\hbar$  in both of these properties of the particles would be inexplicable and compromising for the plausibility of our proposed modification of NYSM.

As also in the single particle case, we cannot talk of the *zbw* phases in rest frames other than the IMFTRFs or IMBTRFs of the particles, because we cannot transform to a frame in which  $d\mathbf{q}_i(t)/dt = 0$ , as this expression is undefined for the Wiener process.

Now suppose we Lorentz transform back to the lab frame. For the forward time direction, this corresponds to a boost of (3.129) by  $-\mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t)$ . Approximating the transformation for non-relativistic velocities so that  $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{(1 - \mathbf{b}_i^2/c^2)} \approx 1 + \mathbf{b}_i^2/2c^2$ , the mean forward steady-state joint phase change becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\bar{\theta}_+(q(t), t) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\omega_{ci}}{m_i c^2} \mathbb{E}_t [E_{i+}(D\mathbf{q}_i(t))\delta t - m_i D\mathbf{q}_i(t) \cdot (D\mathbf{q}_i(t))\delta t] \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N E_{i+}(D\mathbf{q}_i(t))\delta t - \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.135)$$

where

$$E_{i+}(D\mathbf{q}_i(t)) = m_i c^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i (D\mathbf{q}_i(t))^2 = m_i c^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{b}_i^2, \quad (3.136)$$

neglecting the momentum terms proportional to  $\mathbf{b}_i^3/c^2$ . We emphasize that the  $\delta\mathbf{q}_{i+}(t)$  in (3.135) corresponds to the physical, translational, mean forward displacement of the *i*-th *zbw* particle, defined by

$$\delta\mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) = (D\mathbf{q}_i(t))\delta t = \mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t)\delta t. \quad (3.137)$$

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

This will be important later.

For the backward time direction, the Lorentz transformation to the lab frame corresponds to a boost of (3.132) by  $-\mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t)$ . Then the mean backward steady-state joint phase change becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\bar{\theta}_-(q(t), t) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\omega_{ci}}{m_i c^2} E_t [-E_{i-}(D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t)) \delta t + m_i D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t) \cdot (D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t)) \delta t] \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar} E_t \left[ - \sum_{i=1}^N E_{i-}(D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t)) \delta t + \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t) \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_{i-}(t) \right],\end{aligned}\tag{3.138}$$

where

$$E_{i-}(D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t)) = m_i c^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i (D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t))^2 = m_i c^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{b}_{i*}^2.\tag{3.139}$$

The  $\delta \mathbf{q}_{i-}(t)$  in (3.138) corresponds to the physical, translational, mean backward displacement of the  $i$ -th *zbw* particle, as defined by

$$\delta \mathbf{q}_{i-}(t) = (D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t)) \delta t = \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t) \delta t.\tag{3.140}$$

(Notice that  $\delta \mathbf{q}_{i+}(t)$  and  $\delta \mathbf{q}_{i-}(t)$  are not equal in general since  $\delta \mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) - \delta \mathbf{q}_{i-}(t) = (\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}_{i*}) \delta t \neq 0$  in general.) Now since each *zbw* particle is essentially a harmonic oscillator, each particle has its own, effectively independent, well-defined forward steady-state phase at each point along its forward space-time trajectory, when  $\mathbf{b}_i(q, t) \approx \sum_i^N \mathbf{b}_i(\mathbf{q}_i, t)$ . Consistency with this hypothesis also means that when  $\mathbf{b}_i(q, t) \neq \sum_i^N \mathbf{b}_i(\mathbf{q}_i, t)$ , the forward steady-state joint phase must be a well-defined function of the space-time trajectories of *all the particles* (since we posit that all particles remain harmonic oscillators despite having their oscillations physically coupled through the common ether medium they interact with). Furthermore, since, at this stage, the forward and backward steady-state joint *zbw* phase changes, (3.135) and (3.138), are independent of one another, each must equal  $2\pi n$  when integrated along a closed loop  $L$  in which both time and position change. Otherwise, we will contradict our hypothesis that the system of *zbw* particles has a well-defined steady-state joint phase in each time direction.

In the lab frame, the forward and backward stochastic differential equations for the translational motion are again given by (3.127) and (3.128), and the corresponding forward and backward Fokker-Planck equations take the form

$$\frac{\partial \rho(q, t)}{\partial t} = - \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \cdot [\mathbf{b}_i(q, t) \rho(q, t)] + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \rho(q, t),\tag{3.141}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \rho(q, t)}{\partial t} = - \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \cdot [\mathbf{b}_{i*}(q, t) \rho(q, t)] - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \rho(q, t). \quad (3.142)$$

Restricting to simultaneous solutions of (3.137) and (3.138) entails the current velocity field

$$\mathbf{v}_i(q, t) := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{b}_i(q, t) + \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q, t)] = \frac{\nabla_i S(q, t)}{m_i}, \quad (3.143)$$

and the osmotic velocity field

$$\mathbf{u}_i(q, t) := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{b}_i(q, t) - \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q, t)] = \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i \rho(q, t)}{\rho(q, t)}. \quad (3.144)$$

Then (3.141) and (3.142) reduce to the continuity equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho(q, t)}{\partial t} = - \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \cdot \left[ \frac{\nabla_i S(q, t)}{m_i} \rho(q, t) \right], \quad (3.145)$$

with  $\mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{u}_i$  and  $\mathbf{b}_{i*} = \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}_i$ .

As we did for  $N$ -particle NYSM, we now postulate here the presence of an external (to the particle) osmotic potential,  $U(q, t)$ , which couples to the  $i$ -th particle as  $R(q(t), t) = \mu U(q(t), t)$  (assuming that the coupling constant  $\mu$  is identical for particles of the same species), and imparts to the  $i$ -th particle a momentum,  $\nabla_i R(q, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)}$ . This momentum then gets counter-balanced by the ether fluid's osmotic impulse pressure,  $(\hbar/2m_i) \nabla_i \ln[n(q, t)]|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)}$ , leading to the equilibrium condition  $\nabla_i R/m_i = (\hbar/2m_i) \nabla_i \rho/\rho$  (using  $\rho = n/N$ ), which implies  $\rho = e^{2R/\hbar}$  for all times. As discussed in section 2, it is expected that  $R$  generally depends on the coordinates of all the other particles. The reasons, to remind the reader, are that: (i) we argued, for reasons of consistency, that  $U$  should be sourced by the ether, and (ii) since the particles continuously exchange energy-momentum with the ether, the functional dependence of  $U$  will be determined by the dynamical coupling of the ether to the particles as well as the magnitude of the inter-particle physical interactions (whether through a classical inter-particle potential or, in the free particle case, just through the ether). To make this last point more explicit, suppose two classically non-interacting *zbw* particles of identical mass, each initially driven in their oscillations and translational motions by effectively independent regions of oscillating ether, each region sourcing the osmotic potentials  $U_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t)$  and  $U_2(\mathbf{q}_2, t)$ , move along trajectories that cause the spatial support of their dynamically relevant regions of oscillating ether to significantly overlap; then the particles will be exchanging energy-momentum with a common

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

region of oscillating ether modes, leading to an osmotic potential sourced by this common region of oscillating ether that depends on the motions (hence positions) of both particles, i.e.,  $U(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)$ . Indeed, this common region of oscillating ether will drive the subsequent steady-state *zbw* oscillations and translational Brownian motions of both particles, leading (after the constraint of conservative diffusions is imposed, as we will see) to a time-symmetrized steady-state joint phase  $S(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)$  whose gradient with respect to the  $i$ -th particle coordinate gives rise to the current velocity of the  $i$ -th particle, and to an osmotic counter-balancing of  $\nabla_i U(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)$ , which gives rise to the osmotic velocity of the  $i$ -th particle (as we've already seen). Mathematically, the non-linear coupling between the osmotic potential and the evolution of the (conservative-diffusions-constrained) time-symmetrized joint phase of the *zbw* particles can be seen by writing the solution to (3.145), which from section 2 is

$$\rho(q, t) = \rho_0(q_0) \exp\left[-\int_0^t \left(\sum_i^N \nabla_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i\right) dt'\right] = \rho_0(q_0) \exp\left[-\int_0^t \left(\sum_i^N \frac{\nabla_i^2 S}{m_i}\right) dt'\right], \quad (3.146)$$

giving

$$R(q, t) = R_0(q_0) - (\hbar/2) \int_0^t \left(\sum_i^N \frac{\nabla_i^2 S}{m_i}\right) dt', \quad (3.147)$$

Then we can infer from (3.146) that if a narrow bandwidth of common ether modes is driving the *zbw* oscillations of both particles (as described in hypothesis 3 above), the evolution of the osmotic potential (sourced by the common ether modes) will develop functional dependence on the positions of both particles. The precise form of this functional dependence and how it evolves in time will depend on the evolution equation for  $S$ , which we of course need to specify (but already know will end up being the  $N$ -particle quantum HJ equation).

To obtain the 2nd-order time-symmetric dynamics for the mean translational motions of the  $N$  particles, we will define the ensemble-averaged action Eq. (3.18) in terms of a symmetric combination of the forward and backward steady-state joint *zbw* phase changes (3.135) and (3.138). This is natural to do since (3.135) and (3.138) correspond to the same frame (the lab frame), and since (3.135) and (3.138) are no longer independent of one another as a result of the constraints (3.143-144).

First, we take the difference between (3.135) and (3.138) to get (replacing  $\delta t \rightarrow dt$  and



$$\delta \mathbf{q}_{i+,-}(t) \rightarrow d\mathbf{q}_{i+,-}(t)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 d\bar{\theta}(q(t), t) &:= \frac{1}{2} [d\bar{\theta}_+(q(t), t) - d\bar{\theta}_-(q(t), t)] \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\omega_{ci}}{m_i c^2} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ E_i(D\mathbf{q}_i(t), D_*\mathbf{q}_i(t)) dt - \frac{m_i}{2} (\mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t) \cdot d\mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) + \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t) \cdot d\mathbf{q}_{i-}(t)) \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N E_i dt - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} \left( \mathbf{b}_i \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_{i+}(t)}{dt} + \mathbf{b}_{i*} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_{i-}(t)}{dt} \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^N E_i - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} \left( \mathbf{b}_i \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_{i+}(t)}{dt} + \mathbf{b}_{i*} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_{i-}(t)}{dt} \right) \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^N E_i - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} (\mathbf{b}_i^2 + \mathbf{b}_{i*}^2) \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^N E_i - \sum_{i=1}^N (m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i + m_i \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i) \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \left( m_i c^2 - \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 - \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 \right) dt \right] + \phi,
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.148}$$

where  $\phi = \sum_{i=1}^N (\phi_{i+} - \phi_{i-})$ , and from (3.136) and (3.139), we have

$$E_i(D\mathbf{q}_i(t), D_*\mathbf{q}_i(t)) := m_i c^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{b}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{b}_{i*}^2 \right] = m_i c^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2. \tag{3.149}$$

Equation (3.148) is the time-symmetrized steady-state joint phase change of the *zbw* particles in the lab frame, before the constraint of conservative diffusions is imposed. Note that because  $\bar{\theta}_+$  and  $\bar{\theta}_-$  are no longer independent of one another, it is no longer consistent to have that  $\oint_L \delta \bar{\theta}_+$  and  $\oint_L \delta \bar{\theta}_-$  both equal  $2\pi n$ . However, the consistency of our theory does require that  $\oint_L \delta \bar{\theta} = 2\pi n$ , otherwise we will contradict our hypothesis that the system of  $N$  *zbw* particles, after imposing (3.143-144) has a well-defined and unique steady-state joint phase that functionally depends on the 3-space trajectories of the *zbw* particles.

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

Now, defining the steady-state joint phase-principal function

$$I(q(t), t) = -\hbar \bar{\theta}(q(t), t) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 - m_i c^2 \right) dt' \mid \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] - \hbar \sum_{i=1}^N (\phi_{i+} - \phi_{i-}), \quad (3.150)$$

we can use (3.150) to define the steady-state joint phase-action

$$J = I_{IF} = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 - m_i c^2 \right) dt' - \hbar \phi \right]. \quad (3.151)$$

It is straightforward to see that (3.151) is just Eq. (3.18) in section 2, with the potentials set equal to zero, and modulo the rest-energy terms and the time-symmetrized initial joint phase constant  $\phi$ .

Note, also, that from the second to last line of (3.148), we can write the cumulative, time-symmetric, steady-state joint phase at time  $t$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\theta}(q(t), t) &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \left( \sum_{i=1}^N E_i - \sum_{i=1}^N (m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i + m_i \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i) \right) dt' \mid \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \left( \sum_{i=1}^N (E_i - m_i \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i \right) dt' \mid \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \left( H - \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i \right) dt' \mid \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \left( H - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{4} (D \mathbf{q}_i(t') + D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t')) \cdot (D + D_*) \mathbf{q}_i(t') \right) dt' \mid \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t H dt' - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} \int_{\mathbf{q}_i(t_I)}^{\mathbf{q}_i(t)} (D \mathbf{q}_i(t') + D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t')) \cdot D \mathbf{q}_i(t') \mid \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi, \end{aligned} \quad (3.152)$$

where

$$H := \sum_{i=1}^N (E_i - m_i \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left( m_i c^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 - \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 \right), \quad (3.153)$$

and where we have used the fact that  $0.5(D + D_*) \mathbf{q}_i(t) = \left( \partial_t + \sum_j \mathbf{v}_j(q(t), t) \cdot \nabla_j \right) \mathbf{q}_i(t)$ ,

and  $\mathbf{v}_i(q(t), t) = \left( \partial_t + \sum_j \mathbf{v}_j \cdot \nabla_j \right) \mathbf{q}_i(t) =: D\mathbf{q}_i(t)/Dt$ , and  $D\mathbf{q}_i(t) = (D\mathbf{q}_i(t)/Dt) dt$ . Now, consider an integral curve  $\mathbf{Q}_i(t)$  of the  $i$ -th current velocity/momentum field, i.e., a solution of

$$m_i \frac{d\mathbf{Q}_i(t)}{dt} = m_i \mathbf{v}_i(Q(t), t) = \mathbf{p}_i(Q(t), t) = \nabla_i S(q, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)}. \quad (3.154)$$

Then we can replace the functional dependence of (3.152) on  $q(t)$  by  $Q(t)$ , obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\theta}(Q(t), t) &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_{t_I}^t \left[ H - \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{v}_i(Q(t'), t') \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{Q}_i(t')}{dt'} \right] dt' + \phi \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t H dt' - \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathbf{Q}_i(t_I)}^{\mathbf{Q}_i(t)} \mathbf{p}_i \cdot d\mathbf{Q}_i(t') \right] + \phi, \end{aligned} \quad (3.155)$$

where it should be noticed that we've dropped the conditional expectation. So (3.155) denotes the cumulative, time-symmetric, steady-state joint phase of the *zbw* particles, evaluated along the time-symmetric mean trajectories of the *zbw* particles, i.e., the integral curves of (3.154). That the time-symmetric mean trajectories of the *zbw* particles should correspond to the integral curves of (3.154) can be seen from the fact that the single-time joint probability density  $\rho(q, t)$ , after imposing the time-symmetric constraints (3.143-144), is a solution of the continuity equation (3.145), from which it follows that the possible mean trajectories of the *zbw* particles are the flow lines of the probability current  $\rho \mathbf{v}_i$ , i.e., the solutions of (3.154) for all possible initial conditions  $\mathbf{Q}_i(0)$ .

Now, taking the total differential of the left hand side of (3.155) gives

$$d\bar{\theta} = \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} d\mathbf{Q}_i(t) + \partial_t \bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} dt. \quad (3.156)$$

This allows us to identify

$$\mathbf{p}_i(Q(t), t) = -\hbar \nabla_i \bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} = \nabla_i S|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)}, \quad (3.157)$$

using (3.156) along with (3.155) and (3.143). Thus the  $i$ -th current velocity in the lab frame corresponds the gradient of the time-symmetrized steady-state joint phase of the *zbw* particles at the location of the  $i$ -th *zbw* particle, and  $S$  can be identified with the cumulative, time-symmetric, steady-state joint phase function of the *zbw* particles in the lab frame. In addition,

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

we have

$$H(Q(t), t) = \hbar \partial_t \bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{Q}_j(t)} = -\partial_t S|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{Q}_j(t)}. \quad (3.158)$$

From (3.158), (3.157), and (3.155), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} S(Q(t), t) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathbf{Q}_i(t_I)}^{\mathbf{Q}_i(t)} \mathbf{p}_i \cdot d\mathbf{Q}_i(t') - \int_{t_I}^t H dt' - \hbar \phi \\ &= \int_{t_I}^t \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 - m_i c^2 \right] dt' - \hbar \phi = I(Q(t), t), \end{aligned} \quad (3.159)$$

and

$$\oint_L \delta S(Q(t), t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L [\mathbf{p}_i(Q(t), t) \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}_i(t) - E_i(Q(t), t) \delta t] = nh. \quad (3.160)$$

We shall use these last two expressions for later comparisons.

Recall that after restricting the forward and backward diffusions to simultaneous solutions of (3.141-142), we have  $\mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{u}_i$  and  $\mathbf{b}_{i*} = \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}_i$ . So the IMFTRF and the IMBTRF will not coincide since, for  $\mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{u}_i = 0$ , it will generally not be the case that  $\mathbf{b}_{i*} = \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}_i = 0$ . Nevertheless, we can define an instantaneous mean (time-)symmetric rest frame (IMSTRF) as the frame in which  $\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{b}_{i*} = 2\mathbf{v}_i = 0$ . And the lab frame remains the lab frame.

Applying the conservative diffusion constraint through the extremality of (3.151), we obtain the mean acceleration equation

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} [D_* D + D D_*] \mathbf{q}_i(t) = 0. \quad (3.161)$$

Moreover, since the  $\delta \mathbf{q}_i(t)$  are independent (as shown in Appendix 7.1), it follows from (3.161) that we have the individual equations of motion

$$m_i \mathbf{a}_i(q(t), t) = \frac{m_i}{2} [D_* D + D D_*] \mathbf{q}_i(t) = 0. \quad (3.162)$$

By applying the mean derivatives in (3.161), and using that  $\mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{u}_i$  and  $\mathbf{b}_{i*} = \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}_i$ , straightforward manipulations give

$$\sum_{i=1}^N m_i \left[ \partial_t \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{u}_i - \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \mathbf{u}_i \right] |_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{Q}_j(t)} = 0. \quad (3.163)$$

Using (3.143-144), (3.163) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{a}_i(q(t), t) &= \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \left[ \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}_i(q, t)}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}_i(q, t) \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{v}_i(q, t) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - \mathbf{u}_i(q, t) \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{u}_i(q, t) - \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \mathbf{u}_i(q, t) \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)} \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \left[ \frac{\partial S(q, t)}{\partial t} + \frac{(\nabla_i S(q, t))^2}{2m_i} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho(q, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(q, t)}} \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)} = 0.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.164}$$

Integrating both sides of (3.164) and setting the arbitrary integration constants equal to the rest energies, we then have the  $N$ -particle quantum Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{E}(q(t), t) &:= \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{E}_i(q(t), t) \\
 &:= -\partial_t S(q(t), t) \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^N m_i c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(\nabla_i S(q, t))^2}{2m_i} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)} - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho(q, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(q, t)}} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)},
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.165}$$

describing the total energy of the actual particles along their stochastic trajectories  $q(t)$ . Alternatively, given the integral curves  $\mathbf{Q}_i(t)$  of the reformulated mean acceleration equation

$$m_i \frac{d^2 \mathbf{Q}_i(t)}{dt^2} = m_i (\partial_t \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{v}_i) \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{Q}_j(t)} = -\nabla_i \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho(q, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(q, t)}} \right) \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{Q}_j(t)}, \tag{3.166}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , we can replace  $q(t)$  by  $Q(t)$  and thereby obtain the total energy  $\tilde{E}(Q(t), t)$  of the actual *zbw* particles along their time-symmetric mean trajectories, the latter now given by

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

solutions of (3.166). The corresponding general solution of (3.165) is then given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 S(Q(t), t) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathbf{Q}_i(t_I)}^{\mathbf{Q}_i(t)} \mathbf{p}_i(Q(t'), t') \cdot d\mathbf{Q}_i(t') - \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{t_I}^t \tilde{E}_i(Q(t'), t') dt' - \sum_{i=1}^N \hbar \phi_i \\
 &= \int_{t_I}^t \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 - \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right) - m_i c^2 \right] dt' - \sum_{i=1}^N \hbar \phi_i \\
 &= \int_{t_I}^t \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 + \frac{\hbar}{2} \nabla_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i - m_i c^2 \right] dt' - \sum_{i=1}^N \hbar \phi_i.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.167}$$

We identify (3.167) as the conservative-diffusion-constrained, time-symmetric, steady-state joint phase associated with the *zbw* particles in the lab frame. Notice that the last line of (3.167) differs from the last line of (3.159) only by addition of the terms involving  $\nabla_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i$ .

Notice also that the dynamics for (3.167) clearly differs from the dynamics of the joint phase of the free classical *zbw* particles by the presence of the quantum kinetic in (3.165-166). As in the single-particle case, the two phases are formally connected by the ‘classical limit’ ( $\hbar/2m_i \rightarrow 0$ ), but this is only formal since such a limit corresponds to deleting the presence of the ether, thereby also deleting the physical mechanism that causes the *zbw* particles to oscillate at their Compton frequencies. The physically realistic ‘classical limit’ for the phase (3.167) corresponds to situations where the quantum kinetic and its gradient are negligible, which will occur (as in the dBB theory) whenever the center of mass of a system of interacting particles is sufficiently large and environmental decoherence is appreciable [156, 157, 106, 29].

Since each *zbw* particle is posited to essentially be a harmonic oscillator of (unspecified) identical type, each particle has its own, effectively independent, well-defined phase at each point along its time-symmetric mean space-time trajectory, when  $\mathbf{v}_i(q, t) \approx \sum_i^N \mathbf{v}_i(\mathbf{q}_i, t)$ . Consistency with this means that when  $\mathbf{v}_i(q, t) \neq \sum_i^N \mathbf{v}_i(\mathbf{q}_i, t)$ , the time-symmetric steady-state joint phase must be a well-defined function of the time-symmetric mean trajectories of *all* the particles (since we posit that all the particles remain harmonic oscillators, despite having their oscillations physically coupled through the common ether medium they interact with). Then, for a closed loop  $L$  along which each particle can be physically or virtually displaced, it follows that

$$\oint_L \delta S(Q(t), t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \left[ \mathbf{p}_i(Q(t), t) \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}_i(t) - \tilde{E}_i(Q(t), t) \delta t \right] = nh. \tag{3.168}$$

And for a closed loop  $L$  with  $\delta t = 0$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \mathbf{p}_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}_i(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \nabla_i S(q, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}_i(t) = nh. \quad (3.169)$$

If we also consider the joint phase field  $S(q, t)$ , a field over the possible positions of the *zbw* particles, then, as a result of the same physical reasoning applied to the  $i$ -th particle at any possible initial position it can occupy, we will have

$$\oint_L dS(q, t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \mathbf{p}_i \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i = \sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \nabla_i S(q, t) \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i = nh. \quad (3.170)$$

Notice that (3.170) constrains the osmotic potential as well, due to the coupling of  $S$  to  $R$  (hence  $U$ ) via (3.147). This makes physical sense since, as we observed earlier, the oscillating ether drives the *zbw* oscillations of the particles while also sourcing the osmotic potential that imparts the osmotic velocities to the particles.

Combining (3.170), (3.165), and (3.145), we can construct the  $N$ -particle Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi(q, t)}{\partial t} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 + m_i c^2 \right] \psi(q, t), \quad (3.171)$$

where the  $N$ -particle wavefunction  $\psi(q, t) = \sqrt{\rho(q, t)} e^{iS(q, t)/\hbar}$  is single-valued by (3.170).

How does the interpretation of the ZSM wavefunction differ from that of the NYSM wavefunction? The only difference comes from  $S(q, t)$  being the conservative-diffusion-constrained, time-symmetrized, steady-state, joint phase of the *zbw* particles in ZSM, as opposed to being an  $N$ -particle velocity potential satisfying a law-like quantization constraint of the form (3.170) in NYSM. This difference means that, in ZSM,  $S(q, t)$  reflects not only ontic aspects such as the irrotationality of the ZSM version of the ether, and the influence of classical fields on the *zbw* particles, it also reflects the steady-state oscillations of *zbw* particles immersed in the ether, as well as the (hypothesized) oscillations of the ether at each point in 3-D space. And it is a consequence of these last two ontic aspects of an  $N$ -particle ZSM system that the quantization condition (3.170) follows; in other words, the quantization condition is no longer a law-like constraint on  $S(q, t)$ , but a consequence of certain ontic properties of an  $N$ -particle ZSM system.

Note that since the solution space of the combination of (3.170), (3.165), and (3.145) is equivalent to the solution space of (3.171), any non-factorizable wavefunctions that can be

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

constructed as solutions of (3.171) will also be solutions (in  $\rho$  and  $S$  variables) of the combination of (3.170), (3.165), and (3.145). As an example, let us consider two identical, classically non-interacting bosons or fermions with initial wavefunction <sup>9</sup>

$$\psi_{nf}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) := Norm_{\pm} [\psi_A(\mathbf{q}_1)\psi_B(\mathbf{q}_2) \pm \psi_A(\mathbf{q}_2)\psi_B(\mathbf{q}_1)], \quad (3.172)$$

where particle 1 is associated with wavepacket  $\psi_A$  and particle 2 is associated with packet  $\psi_B$ , and the wavepackets satisfy  $\psi_A \cap \psi_B \approx \emptyset$ . Then, if the packets of these particles move towards each other and overlap such that  $(\langle \mathbf{q}_1 \rangle - \langle \mathbf{q}_2 \rangle)^2 \leq \sigma_A^2 + \sigma_B^2$ , the subsequent wavefunction of the 2-particle system will be (3.172) but with  $\psi_A \cap \psi_B \neq \emptyset$ . Moreover, in terms of  $\rho$  and  $S$  variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{nf}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) &:= |\psi_{nf}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)|^2 = Norm_{\pm}^2 \left\{ e^{2(R_{A1}+R_{B2})/\hbar} + e^{2(R_{A2}+R_{B1})/\hbar} \right. \\ &\quad \pm e^{[(R_{A1}+R_{B2}+R_{A2}+R_{B1})+i(S_{A2}+S_{B1}-S_{A1}-S_{B2})]/\hbar} \\ &\quad \left. \pm e^{[(R_{A1}+R_{B2}+R_{A2}+R_{B1})+i(S_{A1}+S_{B2}-S_{A2}-S_{B1})]/\hbar} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.173)$$

and

$$S_{nf}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, ) := -\frac{i\hbar}{2} \ln \left( \frac{\psi_{nf}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)}{\psi_{nf}^*(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)} \right), \quad (3.174)$$

where (3.173) satisfies (3.145), and (3.174) is a solution of (3.165) and satisfies (3.170). That is, the two particles will be entangled in their joint phase (3.174) and their joint osmotic potential obtained from (3.172) or (3.173):

$$R_{nf}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) := \hbar \ln (|\psi_{nf}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)|). \quad (3.175)$$

This scenario of entanglement formation between two identical bosons or fermions is essentially equivalent to the scenario we considered earlier for our justification of why the osmotic potential should have functional dependence on the positions of both particles: Eq. (3.174) is the conservative-diffusion-constrained, time-symmetric, steady-state joint phase that develops between the two particles from having their *zbw* oscillations driven by a common region of oscillating ether that forms when  $(\langle \mathbf{q}_1 \rangle - \langle \mathbf{q}_2 \rangle)^2 \leq \sigma_A^2 + \sigma_B^2$ . Likewise, (3.175) is the joint osmotic potential that arises from this common region of oscillating ether sourcing the osmotic potential.

---

<sup>9</sup>The Nelsonian derivation of the symmetry postulates given by Bacciagaluppi in [66], which allows us to write down a wavefunction like (3.172) (or its anti-symmetric counterpart), is consistent with the assumptions of ZSM and carries over without any change.



Additionally, Eqs. (3.170), (3.165), and (3.145) tell us how the non-local functional dependence of (3.175) on the positions of the two particles changes in time: for classically non-interacting particles, the non-local correlations become negligible when the 3-D spatial separation between the particles becomes sufficiently large, i.e., when the overlap of the wavepackets in the summands of (3.172) becomes negligible. Of course, the correlations never completely vanish because the overlap of the wavepackets in the summands of (3.172) never completely vanishes, implying that the common region of oscillating ether that physically connects the steady-state *zbw* oscillations and translational Brownian motions of the particles must, in some sense, extend over macroscopic distances in 3-D space.<sup>10</sup> That is, if we view the ether as a medium in 3-D space and not in 3N-dimensional configuration space, even though (3.174-175) are non-separable fields on configuration space. This last (TELB) view is indeed the one we take, since, as we stated earlier, we think it's the most conceptually plausible one among the present options.

To be sure, the interpretive issues we discussed in section 2 for NYSM apply just as well to ZSM. To review the options, one might view the mathematical non-factorizability of (3.174-175) as indicating that the oscillating ether medium lives in 3N-dimensional configuration space instead of 3D-space. Or, one might view the configuration space representation (3.174-175) as a mathematically convenient encoding of a much more complicated 3-D space representation of the joint phase field and joint osmotic potential of the particles, making it conceptually unproblematic to imagine the oscillating ether as a medium in 3-D space. In the former case, we then have the options of: (i) viewing the *zbw* particles as living in 3-D space, and positing a law-like dynamical relationship between the particles in 3-D space and the oscillating ether in 3N-dimensional configuration space; and (ii) viewing the particles in 3-D space as a fictitious representation of a single real *zbw* particle living at a definite point in 3N-dimensional configuration space, and taking the physical interactions between this particle and the ether as occurring in the configuration space. In the latter case, since both the particles and the oscillating ether would live in 3-D space (the TELB view), their physical interactions would occur there as well.

As with NYSM, the drawback of option 1 in the former case is that it seems mysterious and implausible that two sets of beables, living in completely independent physical spaces, should have a law-like dynamical relationship between them (i.e., why should oscillations of an ether

---

<sup>10</sup>More precisely, we have in mind that the regions of oscillating ether immediately surrounding each particle will directly drive their respective *zbw* oscillations, while the ether in between the two particles will non-locally encode physical correlations between the immediate regions of ether surrounding each particle, in a way consistent with the conservative diffusion constraint  $J = extremal$ , even if the two particles are macroscopically separated in 3-D space. Of course, the exact details of how Nelson's ether (under the amendments 1-3) would accomplish this await the construction of a physical model for it.

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

medium in a 3N-dimensional configuration space ‘drive’ the steady-state *zbw* oscillations of particles at definite positions in a 3-D space?). The drawback of option 2 is that while it’s conceptually more plausible how oscillations of the ether could drive the steady-state oscillations of the *zbw* particles (since they both live in the same physical space), it would then be necessary to employ a complicated philosophical functionalist analysis of the  $N$ -particle quantum Hamilton-Jacobi equation, in order to derive the image of  $N$  *zbw* particles moving in 3-D space; and we would be in the seemingly paradoxical situation of having *derived* the  $N$ -particle QHJ equation from an ensemble-averaged action defined from  $N$  contributions, under the starting hypothesis that there really are  $N$  particles diffusing in a 3-D space. Of course, the main shortcoming of the TELB view is that it remains speculative at the moment, since no such formulation of NYSM or ZSM exists at present; but it is not implausible that such a formulation can be constructed, and we have already sketched in section 2 one way it could be done. Thus we assume, provisionally, that a TELB formulation of ZSM exists and awaits discovery (unless shown otherwise), and base our interpretation of the beables of ZSM on this provisional assumption.

It is interesting to observe that the existence of entangled solutions such as (3.174-175) is a consequence of four physical constraints we’ve used in our construction of ZSM: (i) time-reversal invariance of the probability density via (3.145); (ii) the conservative diffusion constraint on the ensemble-averaged  $N$ -particle action (3.151); (iii) single-valuedness of the conservative-diffusion-constrained, time-symmetrized, joint phase field (up to an integer multiple of  $2\pi$ ) via (3.170); and (iv) the requirement that the particles, under the time-evolution constraints (3.143-170), satisfy a natural notion of identity under exchange of their coordinates, thereby yielding the symmetrization postulates associated with bosons and fermions [66] (though let us be clear that for classically interacting non-identical particles, entangled solutions can also arise by virtue of the previous three physical constraints). So ZSM offers a novel way to understand the emergence of continuous-variable entanglement nonlocality in terms of deeper ‘subquantum’ principles. One could then study how relaxing these physical constraints might lead to experimentally testable differences from the entangled solutions of the  $N$ -particle Schrödinger equation, in experimental tests of Bell inequalities for continuous-variable correlations [167].

Now, since we wish to view the particles as living at definite points in 3-D space, and their *zbw* oscillations as occurring in 3-D space, we should find a way of constructing the phase field associated with the  $i$ -th particle’s *zbw* oscillation in 3-D space. To do this, we can construct the conditional phase field and conditional osmotic potential field for the  $i$ -th particle from the solutions of (3.165) and (3.145) using (3.170). For generality and to avoid redundancy, we will give these constructions for the case of classically-interacting *zbw* particles in the next section.

### 3.5.2 Classical fields interacting with *zbw* particles

For completeness, we will describe *zbw* particles interacting with each other through a scalar (Coulomb) potential and with external vector and scalar potentials. For simplicity, we will restrict our attention to only two *zbw* particles.

We begin by supposing again that each particle undergoes a steady-state *zbw* oscillation in its IMFTRF, and that each *zbw* particle carries charge,  $e_i$ , making them classical charged harmonic oscillators of some identical type.<sup>11</sup> So the classical interaction between the particles is described by the interaction potential  $\Phi_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_i(t), \mathbf{q}_j(t)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{2(j \neq i)} \frac{e_j}{|\mathbf{q}_i(t) - \mathbf{q}_j(t)|}$ , under the point-like interaction assumption,  $|\mathbf{q}_1(t) - \mathbf{q}_2(t)| \gg \lambda_c$ . In addition, we allow coupling to an external electric potential  $\Phi_i^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_i(t), t)$  (again making the point-like approximation  $|\mathbf{q}_i| \gg \lambda_c$ ). Then the mean forward, steady-state, joint phase change of the particles in the lab frame is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\bar{\theta}_+(\mathbf{q}_1(t), \mathbf{q}_2(t), t) &= \text{E}_t \left[ \sum_{i=1}^2 \left( \omega_{ic} + \omega_{ci} \frac{\mathbf{b}_i^2}{2c^2} + \omega_{ci} \left( \frac{e_i \Phi_i^{ext}}{m_i c^2} + \frac{e_i \Phi_c^{int}}{m_i c^2} \right) \right) \left( \delta t - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{\mathbf{b}_{0i}}{c^2} \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) \right) \right] \\ &= \text{E}_t \left[ \sum_{i=1}^2 \left( \omega_{ic} + \omega_{ci} \frac{\mathbf{b}_i^2}{2c^2} + \omega_{ci} \left( \frac{e_i \Phi_i^{ext}}{m_i c^2} + \frac{e_i \Phi_c^{int}}{m_i c^2} \right) \right) \delta t - \sum_{i=1}^2 \omega_{ci} \left( \frac{\mathbf{b}_i}{c^2} \right) \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \text{E}_t \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^2 m_i c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{m_i \mathbf{b}_i^2}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^2 V_i^{ext} + V_c^{int} \right) \delta t - \sum_{i=1}^2 m_i \mathbf{b}_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.176)$$

The mean backward joint phase change  $\delta\bar{\theta}_-$  differs by  $\mathbf{b}_i \rightarrow -\mathbf{b}_{i*}$ ,  $\delta t \rightarrow -\delta t$ , and  $\delta \mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) \rightarrow \delta \mathbf{q}_{i-}(t)$ . Incorporating coupling to an external vector potential, we then have  $\mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{b}'_i - (e_i/m_i c) \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}$  and  $\mathbf{b}_{i*} = \mathbf{b}'_{i*} - (e_i/m_i c) \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}$ . When  $|\mathbf{q}_1(t) - \mathbf{q}_2(t)|$  becomes sufficiently great that  $V_c^{int}$  is negligible, (3.176) reduces to an effectively separable sum of the forward steady-state phase changes associated with particle 1 and particle 2, respectively. (Effectively, because the ether will of course still physically correlate the phase changes of the particles, even if

<sup>11</sup>Which we subject again to the hypothetical constraint of no electromagnetic radiation emitted when there is no translational motion; or the constraint that the oscillation of the charge is radially symmetric so that there is no net energy radiated; or, if the ether turns out to be electromagnetic in nature as Nelson suggested [36], then that the steady-state *zbw* oscillations of the particles are due to a balancing between the random-phase-averaged electromagnetic energy absorbed via the driven oscillations of the particle charges, and the random-phase-averaged electromagnetic energy radiated back to the ether by the particles.

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

negligibly.) We can then write

$$\delta\bar{\theta}_+(q(t), t) = \frac{1}{\hbar} E_t \left[ E_{joint+}(q(t), Dq(t), t) \delta t - \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{b}'_i(q(t), t) \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) \right], \quad (3.177)$$

where

$$E_{joint+} = \sum_{i=1}^2 m_i c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{m_i \mathbf{b}_i^2}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^2 V_i^{ext} + V_c^{int}. \quad (3.178)$$

Correspondingly,

$$\delta\bar{\theta}_-(q(t), t) = \frac{1}{\hbar} E_t \left[ -E_{joint-}(q(t), D_* q(t), t) \delta t + \sum_{i=1}^2 m_i \mathbf{b}'_{i*}(q(t), t) \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_{i-}(t) \right], \quad (3.179)$$

where

$$E_{joint-} = \sum_{i=1}^2 m_i c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{m_i \mathbf{b}_{i*}^2}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^2 V_i^{ext} + V_c^{int}. \quad (3.180)$$

As in the classical case, we can readily construct from (3.177) or (3.179) the corresponding mean forward or backward conditional phase change for particle 1 (particle 2), in the lab frame or IMFTRF/IMBTRF of particle 1 (particle 2). Likewise for the backward conditional phase change for particle 1 (particle 2).

Because each *zbw* particle is essentially a harmonic oscillator, when  $V_c^{int} \approx 0$ , each particle has its own well-defined forward/backward steady-state phase at each point along its mean forward/backward space-time trajectory. Consistency with this fact entails that for  $V_c^{int} > 0$ , the forward/backward steady-state joint phase must be a well-defined function of the mean forward/backward space-time trajectories of both particles (since we again posit that both particles remain harmonic oscillators even when physically coupled by  $V_c^{int}$ ). Furthermore, we note that at this stage (3.177) and (3.179) are independent of one another. Accordingly, for a closed loop  $L$  along which each particle can be physically or virtually displaced, the forward steady-state joint phase in the lab frame will satisfy

$$\oint_L \delta\bar{\theta}_+ = 2\pi n, \quad (3.181)$$

and likewise for the steady-state backward joint phase. It also follows from (3.181) that

$$\oint_L \delta_1 \bar{\theta}_+ = 2\pi n, \quad (3.182)$$

where the closed-loop integral here keeps the coordinate of particle 2 fixed while particle 1 is displaced along  $L$ .

In the lab frame, the forward and backward stochastic differential equations for the translational motion are then given by

$$d\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \left( \mathbf{b}'_i(q(t), t) - \frac{e_i}{m_i c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}(q(t), t) \right) dt + d\mathbf{W}_i(t), \quad (3.183)$$

and

$$d\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \left( \mathbf{b}'_{i*}(q(t), t) - \frac{e_i}{m_i c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}(q(t), t) \right) dt + d\mathbf{W}_{i*}(t), \quad (3.184)$$

with corresponding Fokker-Planck equations

$$\frac{\partial \rho(q, t)}{\partial t} = - \sum_{i=1}^2 \nabla_i \cdot \left[ \left( \mathbf{b}'_i(q, t) - \frac{e_i}{m_i c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}(q, t) \right) \rho(q, t) \right] + \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \rho(q, t), \quad (3.185)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \rho(q, t)}{\partial t} = - \sum_{i=1}^2 \nabla_i \cdot \left[ \left( \mathbf{b}'_{i*}(q, t) - \frac{e_i}{m_i c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}(q, t) \right) \rho(q, t) \right] - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \rho(q, t). \quad (3.186)$$

Restricting to simultaneous solutions of (3.185-186) leads us to the modified current velocity

$$\mathbf{v}_i := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{b}_{i*}] = \frac{\nabla_i S}{m_i} - \frac{e_i}{m_i c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}, \quad (3.187)$$

and the usual osmotic velocity

$$\mathbf{u}_i := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}_{i*}] = \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i \rho}{\rho}. \quad (3.188)$$

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

Then (3.185) and (3.186) reduce to

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = - \sum_{i=1}^2 \nabla_i \cdot \left[ \left( \frac{\nabla_i S}{m_i} - \frac{e_i}{m_i c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right) \rho \right], \quad (3.189)$$

where  $\mathbf{b}'_i = \mathbf{v}'_i + \mathbf{u}_i$  and  $\mathbf{b}'_{i*} = \mathbf{v}'_i - \mathbf{u}_i$  since  $\mathbf{v}'_i = \mathbf{v}_i + (e_i/m_i c) \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}$ , and  $\mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{b}'_i - (e_i/m_i c) \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}$ , and  $\mathbf{b}_{i*} = \mathbf{b}'_{i*} - (e_i/m_i c) \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}$ . The solution of (3.189) is just

$$\rho(q, t) = \rho_0(q_0) \exp \left[ - \int_0^t \left[ \sum_i^2 \nabla_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i \right] dt' \right] = \rho_0(q_0) \exp \left[ - \int_0^t \left[ \sum_i^2 \left( \frac{\nabla_i^2 S}{m_i} - \frac{e_i}{m_i c} \nabla_i \cdot \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right) \right] dt' \right]. \quad (3.190)$$

Here again we postulate an osmotic potential to which each particle couples via  $R(q(t), t) = \mu U(q(t), t)$ , which imparts momentum  $\nabla_i R(q, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)}$  that is counter-balanced by the osmotic impulse  $(\hbar/2m_i) \nabla_i \ln[n(q, t)]|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)}$ , giving the equilibrium condition  $\nabla_i R/m_i = (\hbar/2m_i) \nabla_i \rho/\rho$ . Thus  $\rho = e^{2R/\hbar}$  for all times and

$$R(q, t) = R_0(q_0) - (\hbar/2) \int_0^t \left[ \sum_i^2 \left( \frac{\nabla_i^2 S}{m_i} - \frac{e_i}{m_i c} \nabla_i \cdot \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right) \right] dt', \quad (3.191)$$

where  $S$  will end up playing the role of the conservative-diffusion-constrained, time-symmetrized, steady-state joint phase of the  $zbw$  particles.

As in the free particle case, we will obtain the 2nd-order time-symmetric mean dynamics for the  $zbw$  particles from Yasue's variational principle.

Since (3.177) and (3.179) correspond to the same (lab) frame and are no longer independent because of (3.187-188), it is natural to define the time-symmetrized steady-state joint  $zbw$  particle phase in the lab frame by taking the difference between (3.177) and (3.179) (under the replacements  $\mathbf{b}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{b}'_i$  and  $\mathbf{b}_{i*} \rightarrow \mathbf{b}'_{i*}$  in the mean forward and mean backward momentum

contributions to the phases):

$$\begin{aligned}
 d\bar{\theta}(q(t), t) &:= \frac{1}{2} [d\bar{\theta}_+(q(t), t) - d\bar{\theta}_-(q(t), t)] \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{i=1}^2 \left( E_i(q(t), D\mathbf{q}_i(t), D_*\mathbf{q}_i(t), t) dt - \frac{m_i}{2} (\mathbf{b}'_i \cdot d\mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) + \mathbf{b}'_{i*} \cdot d\mathbf{q}_{i-}(t)) \right) + \phi \right] \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{i=1}^2 E_i dt - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{m_i}{2} \left( \mathbf{b}'_i \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_{i+}(t)}{dt} + \mathbf{b}'_{i*} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_{i-}(t)}{dt} \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( E_{joint} - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{m_i}{2} \left( \mathbf{b}'_i \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_{i+}(t)}{dt} + \mathbf{b}'_{i*} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_{i-}(t)}{dt} \right) \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( E_{joint} - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{m_i}{2} (\mathbf{b}'_i \cdot \mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{b}'_{i*} \cdot \mathbf{b}_{i*}) \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( E_{joint} - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{m_i}{2} \left( \mathbf{b}_i^2 + \frac{e_i}{m_i c} \mathbf{b}_i \cdot \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} + \mathbf{b}_{i*}^2 + \frac{e_i}{m_i c} \mathbf{b}_{i*} \cdot \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right) \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( E_{joint} - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{m_i}{2} (\mathbf{b}_i^2 + \mathbf{b}_{i*}^2) - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{e_i}{c} \left( \frac{\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{b}_{i*}}{2} \right) \cdot \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( E_{joint} - \sum_{i=1}^2 (m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i + m_i \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^2 \left( m_i c^2 - \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 - \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 - \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^2 V_i^{ext} + V_c^{int} \right) dt \right] + \phi.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.192}$$

where  $\phi = \sum_{i=1}^2 (\phi_{i+} - \phi_{i-})$  and, using (3.178) and (3.180), along with the constraints (3.187)

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

and (3.188), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{joint} &:= \sum_{i=1}^2 E_i \\
&:= \frac{1}{2} [E_{joint+} + E_{joint-}] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^2 m_i c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{b}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{b}_{i*}^2 \right] + \sum_{i=1}^2 V_i^{ext} + V_c^{int} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^2 m_i c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^2 \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 \right] + \sum_{i=1}^2 V_i^{ext} + V_c^{int}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.193}$$

As in the free particle case, the consistency of our theory requires that (3.192) satisfies

$$\oint_L \delta \bar{\theta} = 2\pi n. \tag{3.194}$$

Otherwise we would contradict our hypothesis that, after imposing (3.187-188), the *zbw* particles have a well-defined, unique, steady-state joint phase at the 3-space locations that they can occupy at a time  $t$ .

Defining the steady-state joint phase-principal function

$$I = -\hbar \bar{\theta} = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \left( \sum_{i=1}^2 \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} - m_i c^2 - V_i^{ext} \right] - V_c^{int} \right) dt' | \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] - \hbar \phi, \tag{3.195}$$

allows us to define the joint phase-action

$$J = I_{IF} = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \left( \sum_{i=1}^2 \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} - m_i c^2 - V_i^{ext} \right] - V_c^{int} \right) dt' \right] - \hbar \phi. \tag{3.196}$$

Equation (3.196) is just Eq. (3.18) in section 2, with the addition of the rest-energy terms and the time-symmetrized initial joint phase constant  $\phi$ .

From the second to last line of (3.192), we can use Fubini's theorem in stochastic calculus



### 3.5 Zitterbewegung Stochastic Mechanics

to write the cumulative, time-symmetric, steady-state joint phase at time  $t$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\theta}(q(t), t) &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \left( E_{joint} - \sum_{i=1}^2 (m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i + m_i \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right) dt' | \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi \\
&= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \left( \left( E_{joint} - \sum_{i=1}^2 m_i \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i \right) - \sum_{i=1}^2 m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right) dt' | \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi \\
&= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \left( H - \sum_{i=1}^2 m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right) dt' | \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi \\
&= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \left( H - \sum_{i=1}^2 \left( \mathbf{p}_i + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right) \cdot \mathbf{v}_i \right) dt' | \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi \\
&= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t H dt' - \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_{\mathbf{q}_i(t_I)}^{\mathbf{q}_i(t)} \left( \mathbf{p}_i + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right) \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i(t') | \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.197}$$

where

$$H := E_{joint} - \sum_{i=1}^2 m_i \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i = \sum_{i=1}^2 m_i c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^2 \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 - \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 \right] + \sum_{i=1}^2 V_i^{ext} + V_c^{int}. \tag{3.198}$$

Now, consider an integral curve  $\mathbf{Q}_i(t)$  obtained from

$$m_i \frac{d\mathbf{Q}_i(t)}{dt} = m_i \mathbf{v}_i(Q(t), t) = \mathbf{p}_i(Q(t), t) = \nabla_i S(q, t) |_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{Q}_j(t)}. \tag{3.199}$$

Then we can replace the functional dependence of (3.197) on  $q(t)$  by  $Q(t)$ , obtaining

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\theta}(Q(t), t) &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_{t_I}^t \left[ H - \sum_{i=1}^2 \left( m_i \mathbf{v}_i + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right) \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{Q}_i(t')}{dt'} \right] dt' + \phi \\
&= \frac{1}{\hbar} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t H dt' - \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_{\mathbf{Q}_i(t_I)}^{\mathbf{Q}_i(t)} \left( \mathbf{p}_i + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right) \cdot d\mathbf{Q}_i(t') \right] + \phi,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.200}$$

where we've dropped the conditional expectation.

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

The total differential of the left hand side of (3.200) gives

$$d\bar{\theta} = \sum_{i=1}^2 \nabla_i \bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} d\mathbf{Q}_i(t) + \partial_t \bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} dt, \quad (3.201)$$

hence,

$$\mathbf{p}_i(Q(t), t) + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}(\mathbf{Q}_i(t), t) = -\hbar \nabla_i \bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} = \nabla_i S|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)}. \quad (3.202)$$

Thus the  $i$ -th current velocity in the lab frame, plus the correction due to the  $i$ -th external vector potential, corresponds the gradient of the time-symmetrized steady-state joint phase at the location of the  $i$ -th *zbw* particle, and  $S$  can again be identified with the cumulative, time-symmetric, steady-state joint phase function of the *zbw* particles in the lab frame. Along with

$$H(Q(t), t) = \hbar \partial_t \bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} = -\partial_t S|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)}, \quad (3.203)$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} S(Q(t), t) &= \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_{\mathbf{Q}_i(t_I)}^{\mathbf{Q}_i(t)} \left( \mathbf{p}_i + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \right) \cdot d\mathbf{Q}_i(t') - \int_{t_I}^t H dt' - \hbar \phi \\ &= \int_{t_I}^t \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^2 \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} - m_i c^2 - V_i^{ext} \right] - V_c^{int} \right\} dt' - \hbar \phi = I(Q(t), t). \end{aligned} \quad (3.204)$$

The restriction to simultaneous solutions of (3.185-186) means that the IMFTRF and the IMBTRF of the  $i$ -th *zbw* particle will not coincide since  $\mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{u}_i = 0$  will generally not entail  $\mathbf{b}_{i*} = \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}_i = 0$ . So we define an instantaneous mean (time-)symmetric rest frame (IMSTRF) as the frame in which  $\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{b}_{i*} = 2\mathbf{v}_i = 0$ , and the lab frame remains unchanged.

Applying  $J = extremal$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{m_i}{2} [D_* D + D D_*] \mathbf{q}_i(t) = \sum_{i=1}^2 e_i \left[ -\frac{1}{c} \partial_t \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} - \nabla_i (\Phi_i^{ext} + \Phi_c^{int}) + \frac{\mathbf{v}_i}{c} \times (\nabla_i \times \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}) \right] |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)}, \quad (3.205)$$

and from the independent  $\delta \mathbf{q}_i(t)$ , the individual equations of motion

$$\begin{aligned} m_i \mathbf{a}_i(q(t), t) &= \frac{m_i}{2} [D_* D + D D_*] \mathbf{q}_i(t) \\ &= \left[ -\frac{e_i}{c} \partial_t \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} - e_i \nabla_i (\Phi_i^{ext} + \Phi_c^{int}) + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{v}_i \times (\nabla_i \times \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}) \right] |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.206)$$

Applying the mean derivatives and using that  $\mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{u}_i$  and  $\mathbf{b}_{i*} = \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}_i$ , (3.206) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^2 m_i \left[ \partial_t \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{u}_i - \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \mathbf{u}_i \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^2 \left[ -\frac{e_i}{c} \partial_t \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} - e_i \nabla_i (\Phi_i^{ext} + \Phi_c^{int}) + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{v}_i \times (\nabla_i \times \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}) \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.207)$$

Integrating and setting the integration constants equal to the particle rest energies, we then get

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}(q(t), t) &= \sum_{i=1}^2 \tilde{E}_i(q(t), t) \\ &= -\partial_t S(q(t), t) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^2 m_i c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{[\nabla_i S(q, t) - \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_i, t)]^2}{2m_i} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^2 e_i [\Phi_i^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_i(t), t) + \Phi_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_i(t), \mathbf{q}_j(t))] - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho(q, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(q, t)}} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.208)$$

where the  $q(t)$  in (3.208) corresponds to the solution set of the stochastic differential equations (3.183-184). Alternatively, given the integral curves  $\mathbf{Q}_i(t)$  of the reformulated mean acceleration equation (3.206),

$$\begin{aligned} m_i \frac{d^2 \mathbf{Q}_i(t)}{dt^2} &= m_i (\partial_t \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{v}_i) \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{Q}_j(t)} = -\nabla_i \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho(q, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(q, t)}} \right) \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{Q}_j(t)} \\ &\quad + e_i \left[ -\frac{1}{c} \partial_t \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} - \nabla_i (\Phi_i^{ext} + \Phi_c^{int}) + \frac{\mathbf{v}_i}{c} \times \mathbf{B}_{ext}^i \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{Q}_j(t)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.209)$$

we can also obtain  $\tilde{E}(Q(t), t)$ . The general solution of (3.208), written in terms of  $Q(t)$ , is

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

given by

$$\begin{aligned}
S(Q(t), t) &= \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_{\mathbf{Q}_i(t_I)}^{\mathbf{Q}_i(t)} \mathbf{p}'_i \cdot d\mathbf{Q}_i(s) - \sum_{i=1}^2 \int_{t_I}^t \tilde{E}_i ds - \hbar\phi \\
&= \int_{t_I}^t \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^2 \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 - \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right) + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} - m_i c^2 - V_i^{ext} \right] - V_c^{int} \right\} ds - \hbar\phi \\
&= \int_{t_I}^t \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^2 \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 + \frac{\hbar}{2} \nabla_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} - m_i c^2 - V_i^{ext} \right] - V_c^{int} \right\} ds - \hbar\phi,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.210}$$

and corresponds to the conservative-diffusion-constrained, time-symmetric, steady-state joint phase for the *zbw* particles in the lab frame (hereafter, just the steady-state joint phase), evaluated along the time-symmetric mean trajectory of the *zbw* particles, i.e., solutions of (3.209) for initial conditions  $\mathbf{Q}_i(0)$ , and for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Replacing  $Q(t)$  with  $q$  on both sides of (3.210) yields the steady-state joint phase field over the possible positions of the *zbw* particles. Note the difference between the last lines of (3.210) and (3.204) via the terms involving  $\nabla_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i$ .

As in the classical model, we make the natural assumption that the presence of classical external potentials doesn't alter the harmonic nature of the steady-state *zbw* oscillations. Moreover, since each *zbw* particle is a harmonic oscillator, each particle has its own well-defined steady-state phase at each point along its time-symmetric mean trajectory. Accordingly, when  $V_c^{int}$  is not negligible, the steady-state joint phase must be a well-defined function of the mean trajectories of both particles (since we posit that all particles remain harmonic oscillators despite having their oscillations physically coupled through  $\Phi_c^{int}$  and through the common ether medium they interact with). So for a closed loop  $L$  along which each particle can be physically or virtually displaced, it follows that

$$\oint_L \delta S = \sum_{i=1}^2 \oint_L \left[ \mathbf{p}'_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}_i(t) - \tilde{E}_i \delta t \right] = nh, \tag{3.211}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 \oint_L \mathbf{p}'_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}_i(t) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \oint_L \nabla_i S|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}_i(t) = nh, \tag{3.212}$$

for a closed loop  $L$  with  $\delta t = 0$ . For the steady-state joint phase field  $S(q, t)$ , we can apply the same physical reasoning above to each *zbw* particle for each possible 3-space position that can

be occupied at time  $t$ , thereby implying

$$\oint_L dS(q, t) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \oint_L \mathbf{p}'_i \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i = \sum_{i=1}^2 \oint_L \nabla_i S \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i = nh. \quad (3.213)$$

Clearly (3.212-213) implies ‘phase quantization’ for each individual *zbw* particle, upon keeping all but the  $i$ -th coordinate fixed and performing the closed-loop integration. Combining (3.213), (3.208), and (3.189), we can construct the 2-particle Schrödinger equation for classically interacting *zbw* particles in the presence of external fields

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)}{\partial t} = \sum_{i=1}^2 \left[ \frac{[-i\hbar \nabla_i - \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_i, t)]^2}{2m_i} + m_i c^2 + e_i (\Phi_i^{ext}(\mathbf{q}_i, t) + \Phi_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{q}_j)) \right] \psi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t), \quad (3.214)$$

where  $\psi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t) = \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)} e^{iS(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)/\hbar}$  is single-valued via (3.213).

We would now like to specify the evolution of the conditional steady-state phase field and conditional probability density associated to each *zbw* particle. For simplicity, we first set  $\mathbf{A}_i^{ext} = \Phi_i^{ext} = 0$ . We then obtain the conditional steady-state phase field for particle 1 by writing  $S(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2(t), t) =: S_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t)$ . Taking the total time derivative gives

$$\partial_t S_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t) = \partial_t S(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)} + \frac{d\mathbf{Q}_2(t)}{dt} \cdot \nabla_2 S(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)}, \quad (3.215)$$

where the conditional velocities

$$\mathbf{v}_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_1=\mathbf{Q}_1(t)} := \frac{\nabla_1 S_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t)}{m_1} |_{\mathbf{q}_1=\mathbf{Q}_1(t)} = \frac{d\mathbf{Q}_1(t)}{dt}, \quad (3.216)$$

and

$$\mathbf{v}_2(\mathbf{q}_2, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)} := \frac{\nabla_2 S_2(\mathbf{q}_2, t)}{m_2} |_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)} = \frac{d\mathbf{Q}_2(t)}{dt}, \quad (3.217)$$

the latter defined from the conditional steady-state phase field,  $S_2(\mathbf{q}_2, t)$ , for particle 2. Likewise, for the conditional density for particle 1,  $\rho(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2(t), t) =: \rho_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t)$  and

$$\partial_t \rho_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t) = \partial_t \rho(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)} + \frac{d\mathbf{Q}_2(t)}{dt} \cdot \nabla_2 \rho(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)}. \quad (3.218)$$

Inserting (3.218) on the left hand side of (3.189) and adding the corresponding term on the

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

right hand side, we obtain the conditional continuity equation for particle 1:

$$\partial_t \rho_1 = -\nabla_1 \cdot \left[ \left( \frac{\nabla_1 S_1}{m_1} \right) \rho_1 \right] - \nabla_2 \cdot \left[ \left( \frac{\nabla_2 S}{m_2} \right) \rho \right] \big|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)} + \frac{d\mathbf{Q}_2(t)}{dt} \cdot \nabla_2 \rho \big|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)}, \quad (3.219)$$

which implies  $\rho_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t) \geq 0$  and (upon suitable redefinition of  $\rho_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t)$ ) preservation of the normalization  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho_1(\mathbf{q}_1, 0) = 1$ . Similarly, inserting (3.215) into the left hand side of (3.208) and adding the corresponding term on the right hand side, we find that the conditional steady-state phase field for particle 1 evolves by the conditional quantum Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\begin{aligned} -\partial_t S_1 = & m_1 c^2 + \frac{(\nabla_1 S_1)^2}{2m_1} + \frac{(\nabla_2 S)^2}{2m_2} \big|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)} - \frac{d\mathbf{Q}_2(t)}{dt} \cdot \nabla_2 S \big|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)} \\ & + V_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_1, t) - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_1} \frac{\nabla_1^2 \sqrt{\rho_1}}{\sqrt{\rho_1}} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_2} \frac{\nabla_2^2 \sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{\rho}} \big|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)} \end{aligned} \quad (3.220)$$

where  $V_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_1, t)$  is the ‘conditional interaction potential’ for particle 1. The solution of (3.219) can be verified as

$$\rho_1 = \rho_{01} \exp \left[ - \int_0^t \left[ \nabla_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t) + \nabla_2 \cdot \mathbf{v}_2(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t) \big|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)} \right] dt' \right], \quad (3.221)$$

from which we extract the conditional osmotic potential

$$R_1 = R_{01} - (\hbar/2) \int_0^t \left[ \nabla_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t) + \nabla_2 \cdot \mathbf{v}_2(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t) \big|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)} \right] dt', \quad (3.222)$$

while the solution of (3.220) is

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 = & \int_{\mathbf{Q}_1(t_I)}^{\mathbf{Q}_1(t)} \mathbf{p}_1 \cdot d\mathbf{Q}_1(t') \big|_{\mathbf{Q}_1(t)=\mathbf{q}_1} \\ & - \int_0^t \left[ m_1 c^2 + \frac{m_1 \mathbf{v}_1^2}{2} + \frac{m_1 \mathbf{v}_2^2}{2} - \mathbf{p}_2 \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{Q}_2(t)}{dt} + V_c^{int} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_1} \frac{\nabla_1^2 \sqrt{\rho_1}}{\sqrt{\rho_1}} + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_2} \frac{\nabla_2^2 \sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{\rho}} \big|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)} \right] dt' \big|_{\mathbf{Q}_1(t)=\mathbf{q}_1} - \hbar \phi_1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.223)$$

Hence (3.222) allows us to consistently ascribe a region of oscillating ether in 3-D space that sources a local (i.e., in 3-D space) osmotic potential that imparts the osmotic momentum to particle 1. Likewise, (3.223) lets us ascribe a region of oscillating ether in 3-D space that

directly drives the steady-state *zbw* oscillation of particle 1 in 3-D space. Note that when (3.223) is evaluated at  $\mathbf{q}_1 = \mathbf{Q}_1(t)$ , it is equivalent to  $S(\mathbf{q}_1(t), \mathbf{Q}_2(t), t) - m_2 c^2 t + \hbar \phi_2$ . As in the classical model, since the conditional steady-state phase field for particle 1 is a field over the possible positions of the *zbw* particles, it follows that

$$\oint_L \nabla_1 S_1 \cdot d\mathbf{q}_1 = nh, \quad (3.224)$$

where  $L$  is a mathematical loop in 3-D space.

With these results in hand, the conditional forward and backward stochastic differential equations for particle 1 can be straightforwardly obtained by writing  $\mathbf{b}_1 = \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{u}_1$ ,  $\mathbf{b}_{1*} = \mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{u}_1$ , and inserting these expressions into (3.183) and (3.184), respectively.

Also like in the classical model, we can define the steady-state conditional phase-action

$$J_1 = I_1^{IF} = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \left[ m_1 c^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_1 \mathbf{v}_1^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_2 \mathbf{v}_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_1 \mathbf{u}_1^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_2 \mathbf{u}_2^2 - V_c^{int} \right] dt - \hbar \phi_1 \right], \quad (3.225)$$

and then impose

$$J_1 = \text{extremal}, \quad (3.226)$$

we get the conditional mean acceleration for particle 1:

$$m_1 \mathbf{a}_1(\mathbf{q}_1(t), t) = \frac{m_1}{2} [D_* D + D D_*] \mathbf{q}_1(t) = -\nabla_1 V_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2(t))|_{\mathbf{q}_1=\mathbf{q}_1(t)}, \quad (3.227)$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 \frac{D\mathbf{v}_1(\mathbf{Q}_1(t), t)}{Dt} &= [\partial_t \mathbf{p}_1 + \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{p}_1] (\mathbf{q}_1, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_1=\mathbf{Q}_1(t)} \\ &= -\nabla_1 \left[ V_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2(t)) - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_1} \frac{\nabla_1^2 \sqrt{\rho_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t)}} \right] |_{\mathbf{q}_1=\mathbf{Q}_1(t)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.228)$$

and likewise for particle 2. Equation (3.228) is what we would obtain from computing the derivatives in (3.227) for  $i = 1$  (modulo the external potentials) and subtracting the  $\mathbf{u}_i$  dependent terms on both sides. Of course, it should be said that we cannot obtain (3.210) simply by integrating (3.220) and the analogous expression for particle 2, and then summing up the terms. This is because we obtained (3.220) directly from the full configuration space fields  $S$  and  $\rho$ , themselves obtained from extremizing (3.196).

For particle 2, the conditional steady-state phase field, probability density, etc., are defined

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

analogously.

Finally, combining (3.224), (3.220), and (3.219) gives us the conditional Schrödinger equation for particle 1:

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi_1}{\partial t} = & -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_1} \nabla_1^2 \psi_1 - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_1} \nabla_2^2 \psi|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)} + V_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2(t)) \psi_1 \\ & + m_1 c^2 \psi_1 + i\hbar \frac{d\mathbf{Q}_2(t)}{dt} \cdot \nabla_2 \psi|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.229)$$

where  $\psi_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t) = \sqrt{\rho_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t)} e^{iS_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t)/\hbar}$  is the single-valued conditional wavefunction for particle 1, and  $d\mathbf{Q}_2(t)/dt = (\hbar/m_2) \text{Im}\{\nabla_2 \ln(\psi_2)\}|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)}$ , where  $\psi_2 = \psi_2(\mathbf{q}_2, t)$  is the conditional wavefunction for particle 2, satisfying the analogous conditional Schrödinger equation. Like in the classical case, (3.229) can also be obtained from writing

$$\partial_t \psi_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t) = \partial_t \psi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)} + \frac{d\mathbf{Q}_2(t)}{dt} \cdot \nabla_2 \psi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)}, \quad (3.230)$$

inserting this on the left hand side of (3.214), adding the corresponding term on the right hand side, and subtracting  $m_2 c^2 \psi_1$  (again, modulo the external potentials).

The development of ZSM in relative coordinates is formally identical to the case of a single *zbw* particle in an external potential, and need not be explicitly given here.

This completes the formulation of ZSM for  $N$ -particles interacting with classical fields.

#### 3.5.3 Remark on on close-range interactions

Since the quantum kinetic doesn't depend on the inter-particle separation, its presence in the equation of motion (3.209) doesn't introduce any fundamentally new complications for the description of two-particle scattering in ZSM. So the account we gave of two-particle scattering in section 4.7 carries over to classically interacting particles in ZSM.

### 3.6 Plausibility of the Zitterbewegung Hypothesis

Ultimately, the plausibility of our suggested answer to Wallstrom hinges (in no particular order) on the plausibility of the *zbw* hypothesis, its incorporation into NYSM, and the generalizability of ZSM. So we should ask if: 1) ZSM can be consistently generalized to relativistic flat and curved spacetimes; 2) the *zbw* hypothesis can be generalized to incorporate electron spin; 3) ZSM has a conceivable field-theoretic extension; 4) a self-consistent physical model of the *zbw* particle, Nelson's ether (suitably amended for ZSM), and dynamical interaction between the



### 3.6 Plausibility of the Zitterbewegung Hypothesis

two, can be constructed; and 5) ZSM suggests testable new predictions and/or offers novel solutions to open problems in the foundations of quantum mechanics that justify its mathematical and conceptual complexity (relative to other hidden variable approaches to solving the measurement problem, such as the dBB theory).

Can ZSM be consistently generalized to relativistic flat and curved spacetimes? We have implicitly assumed throughout our paper that this is possible, based on our repeated use of the next-to-leading order approximation of the Lorentz transformation. But there is also good reason to expect that relativistic generalizations of ZSM to flat and curved spacetimes do exist. Stochastic mechanics based on the Guerra-Morato variational principle has already been given a consistent generalization to the case of relativistic spacetimes (flat and curved) by Dohrn and Guerra [70, 71, 72] as well as Serva [76]. An attempt was made by Zastawniak to give a relativistic flat-spacetime generalization of Yasue's variational principle [69], but it seems problematic since it doesn't address the problem of not having a normalizable spacetime probability density when the metric is not positive-definite. Fortunately, this problem can be resolved in the approaches of Dohrn-Guerra and Serva, and there seems to be no obstacle in adapting Dohrn and Guerra's methods or Serva's method to extend Yasue's variational principle to flat and curved spacetimes (currently in progress by us). Once done, we see no fundamental reason why a corresponding generalization of ZSM cannot be given.

Can the *zbw* hypothesis be generalized to incorporate electron spin? It seems plausible to us that it can. As is well-known, in standard relativistic quantum mechanics for spin-1/2 particles, the Dirac spinor satisfying the Dirac equation implies *zbw* of the corresponding velocity operator [171]. What's more, realist versions of relativistic quantum mechanics for spin-1/2 particles - the Bohm-Dirac theory [172, 6], the "zig-zag" model of de Broglie-Bohm theory by Colin & Wiseman [173] and Struyve [174], and the stochastic mechanical models of the Dirac electron by de Angelis et al. [84] and Garbaczewski [80] - all predict *zbw* as a real, continuous oscillation of the particle beable. In the de Broglie-Bohm theories, the *zbw* arises from imposing Lorentz invariance and the Dirac spinor algebra on the dynamics of the wavefunction (described by Dirac spinors in the Bohm-Dirac theory, or Weyl spinors in the zig-zag model), and then using this wavefunction in the definition of the guiding equation for the de Broglie-Bohm particle. Likewise, in the stochastic mechanical theories, the *zbw* beable arises from constructing Nelsonian diffusion processes from the Dirac wavefunction. The description of a physically real spin-based *zbw* can also be implemented in classical physics, namely in the Barut-Zanghì model of a classical Dirac electron [175, 176, 177, 178], which turns into the usual flat-space and curved-space versions of the Dirac equation (in the proper-time formulation) upon first-quantization by the standard methods [179, 180]. Here it is the imposition of relativistic covariance and the Dirac spinor algebra that leads to classical equations of motion for a massless (non-radiating) point charge circularly orbiting a center of

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

mass, the former moving with speed  $c$  and the latter moving translationally with sub-luminal relativistic speeds. So it is plausible to imagine a relativistic generalization of ZSM in which the Barut-Zanghì model of a *zbw* particle is implemented into a relativistic version of the Nelson-Yasue diffusion process (e.g., along the lines of Dohrn and Guerra), under the hypothesis that Nelson's ether has vorticity that imparts to the massless point charge a mean rotational motion of speed  $c$  and angular momentum  $\hbar/2$ , and derive from this spin-based *zbw* a relativistic generalization of the quantization condition, along with the Dirac equation for a double-valued Dirac spinor wavefunction. (The approaches of de Angelis et al. and Garbaczewski don't seem adequate for this task because they don't actually derive the zitterbewegung and Dirac equation from Nelson-Yasue diffusions; rather, they start from the Dirac equation and Dirac spinor wavefunction, and show that Nelsonian diffusions can be associated to them.) The non-relativistic limit of this ZSM theory should presumably then recover non-relativistic ZSM for a spinning *zbw* particle with angular momentum magnitude  $\hbar/2$ , along with a vorticity term added to the current velocity (as is known to arise from the non-relativistic limit of the relativistic guiding equation under Gordon decomposition in the Bohm-Dirac theory [125, 124]). Alternatively, we might try deducing a non-relativistic ZSM theory directly from Takabayasi's non-relativistic generalization of the Madelung fluid to spin-1/2 motion [181]. These tasks remain for a future paper.

Does ZSM have a field-theoretic generalization that recovers the predictions of relativistic quantum field theory for fermions and bosons? A generalization of ZSM to massive scalar or spinor fields seems in-principle unproblematic, but a generalization to massless fields (such as to describe the photon or gluon, which have no measured rest mass) would seem, at first sight, difficult (though not necessarily impossible <sup>12</sup>). Another possibility is to note that one can reproduce nearly all <sup>13</sup> the predictions of the Standard Model (SM) with a pilot-wave model for point-like fermions in which the Dirac sea is taken seriously (i.e., taken as ontological) [186]. In this model, no beables are introduced for the massless bosons, yet it recovers nearly all the predictions of the SM. So we might try constructing a version of relativistic ZSM for spin-1/2 particles in which the Dirac sea for fermions is taken seriously, and check if it can recover nearly

---

<sup>12</sup>For example, we might consider introducing small rest masses for the photon and gluon consistent with experimental bounds, which for the photon is  $< 10^{-14} eV/c^2$  [182] and for the gluon  $< 0.0002 eV/c^2$  [183], if both masses are to be produced by the Higgs mechanism. This would, of course, change the gauge symmetries of QED and QCD, but not in a way that can be experimentally discerned at energy scales above these lower-bounds [184].

<sup>13</sup>The single different prediction appears to be that this Dirac sea pilot-wave model predicts fermion number conservation, whereas the Standard Model predicts a violation of fermion number for sufficiently high energies (so-called anomalies of the Standard Model). To the best of our knowledge, no evidence has been found for fermion number violation thus far [185]. But as Colin and Struyve point out [186], even if fermion number violation is eventually observed, it may still be possible to model it in a Dirac sea picture.

### 3.6 Plausibility of the Zitterbewegung Hypothesis

all the predictions of the SM as well. If one insists on adding beables for the bosons, perhaps one could adapt the approach of Nielsen et al. [187, 188], who show how to introduce a Dirac sea for bosons in second-quantized field theory based on massive hypermultiplets. Finally, it seems plausible that one could make a ZSM generalization of bosonic string theory by constructing a Nelson-Yasue version of the model of Santos and Escobar [97], who use the Guerra-Morato variational principle to construct a stochastic mechanics of the open bosonic string (the idea being that the open bosonic string's instantaneous-rest-frame oscillations would play the role of the *zbw*, and would be hypothesized to be dynamically driven by resonant coupling to the ZSM version of Nelson's ether). All this remains for future work.

Can a self-consistent dynamical model of the *zbw* particle, Nelson's ether, and the physical interaction between the two, be constructed? We see no principled obstacle to this possibility. Furthermore, physical models of a real classical *zbw* particle have been constructed in the context of stochastic electrodynamics (SED), by Rueda & Cavelleri [189], Rueda [190, 191], de la Peña & Cetto [192], and Haisch & Rueda [193]. These models involve treating the electron as a structured object composed of a point charge with negligible (or zero) mass, harmonically bound to some non-charged center of mass, and driven to oscillate at near or equal to the speed of light (i.e., Compton frequency) by resonant modes of a classically fluctuating electromagnetic zero-point field. Additionally, in Rueda's model [190, 191], not only does the classical zero-point field drive the *zbw* oscillations, but the frequency cut-off generated by the *zbw* results in a non-dissipative, (effectively) Markovian diffusion process with diffusion coefficient  $\hbar/2m$ . Of course, these SED-based approaches should be cautioned; SED is known to have difficulties as a viable theory of quantum electrodynamical phenomena [194, 195], and it is not clear that these difficulties can be resolved (but see [196, 197, 198, 199, 200] for recent counter-arguments). Furthermore, we expect that any realistic physical model of the *zbw* particle should consistently incorporate the Higgs mechanism (or some subquantum generalization thereof) [201] as the process by which the self-stable *zbw* harmonic potential of rest-mass  $m$  is formed in the first place. Nevertheless, these SED-based models can at least be viewed as proofs of principle that the *zbw* hypothesis can be implemented in a concrete model; and, in a future paper, we will show how one of these SED-based models can in fact recover the quantization condition as an effective condition. But the task of constructing a physical model of the *zbw* particle, the ZSM version of Nelson's ether, and the physical/dynamical interaction between the two, which also incorporates spin and can be used to recover the Dirac/Pauli/Schrödinger equation, remains for future work.

Lastly, does ZSM suggest testable new predictions and/or novel solutions to open foundational problems in quantum mechanics? We claim it does. Since the equilibrium density  $\rho = |\psi|^2$ , ZSM's statistical predictions in equilibrium will agree with all the statistical predictions of non-relativistic quantum mechanics. But if  $\rho \neq |\psi|^2$ , we should expect differences, such

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

as position and momentum measurements with more precision than allowed by Heisenberg's uncertainty principle [115].<sup>14</sup> Accordingly, it would be possible, in principle, to experimentally detect the stochasticity of the particle trajectories, hence deviations from the mean trajectories satisfying the quantization condition. Under what physical conditions might we see nonequilibrium fluctuations? The most obvious possibility is by measuring the position or momentum of a Nelsonian particle on time-scales comparable to or shorter than the correlation time of the ether fluctuations. For ZSM, insofar as it's based on Nelson's white-noise diffusion process, the correlation timescale of the fluctuations is infinitesimal because of the assumption that the noise is white. Nelson stressed, however, that his white-noise (Markovian) assumption was only a simplifying one [36]; so one could instead consider a colored-noise (non-Markovian) description of conservative diffusions, to which Nelson's white-noise description is a long-time approximation (as is the case with all other known statistical fluctuation phenomena in nature [203]).<sup>15</sup> Then the true fluctuation timescale would be finite and one could work out the expected experimental signatures of the nonequilibrium dynamics on timescales comparable to some hypothetical finite correlation time  $\tau_{noise}$  (work on this is currently underway by us). In this connection, Montina's theorem [204] says that any ontic theory compatible with the predictions of a quantum system with Hilbert space dimensionality  $k$  must contain at least  $2k - 2$  continuous ontic variables, assuming that the theory has deterministic or stochastic Markovian dynamics (i.e., a dynamics that is local in time). Correspondingly,  $2k - 2$  turns out to be the minimum number of real-valued parameters required to describe a pure quantum state. On the other hand, Montina's theorem implies that an ontic theory with non-Markovian dynamics (i.e., dynamics which is nonlocal in time) could have fewer continuous ontic variables than  $2k - 2$ . Montina has demonstrated this in a toy model of a single ontic variable with stochastic evolution driven by time-correlated (colored) noise that exactly reproduces any unitary evolution of a qubit ( $\psi$  for a qubit has two degrees of freedom) [205, 206]. Extrapolating the implications of Montina's theorem to stochastic mechanics, we should expect that a non-Markovian extension of stochastic mechanics would recover an  $N$ -particle wavefunction that can be described by fewer than  $2k - 2$  real-valued parameters, where  $k$  would be the dimensionality of the Hilbert space associated to the  $N$ -particle wavefunction of Markovian stochastic mechanics (Markovian

---

<sup>14</sup>Everything we have said here is of course also true of the dBB theory [115]. However, in our view, a proper understanding of the origin of randomness in the dBB theory (the 'typicality' approach of Dürr-Goldstein-Zanghì [112]) entails that the existence of quantum nonequilibrium subsystems in the observable universe is extremely improbable, even in the context of early universe cosmology (for a different view, see [202]). By contrast, we will suggest here that this limitation of the dBB theory does not necessarily apply to ZSM.

<sup>15</sup>Of course, this idea could also be explored in NYSM with the quantization condition imposed ad-hoc. The advantage of ZSM, though, is that it makes the idea worth taking seriously as a possibility since ZSM gives an independent justification for the (more basic) quantization condition, without which the stochastic mechanics approach would be neither empirically viable nor plausible.

stochastic mechanics would be the  $\tau_{noise} \rightarrow 0$  limit of non-Markovian stochastic mechanics). And insofar as the  $N$ -particle wavefunction can be polar decomposed into  $N$ -particle  $R$  and  $S$  fields, the  $N$ -particle  $R$  and  $S$  fields of non-Markovian ZSM would presumably also require fewer real-valued parameters to describe than the  $N$ -particle  $R$  and  $S$  fields of Markovian ZSM. Moreover, since  $R$  and  $S$  directly reflect ontological elements of ZSM (see sections 3 and 5.1), the reduced complexity of the  $R$  and  $S$  fields of non-Markovian ZSM would imply that the ontological complexity of non-Markovian ZSM will be less than that of Markovian ZSM. It seems conceivable, then, that if we make a TELB [38, 39] version of non-Markovian ZSM by decomposing the  $N$ -particle  $R$  and  $S$  fields into  $N$  single-particle  $R$  and  $S$  fields (a pair for each particle), we may only require a finite number of (or perhaps zero) supplementary continuous ontic variables on 3-space in order to encode non-local correlations arising between *zbw* particles that are classically interacting and coupling to the common oscillating ether. If so, we would (arguably) then have a reasonably ontologically parsimonious TELB version of ZSM. This TELB version of ZSM would considerably strengthen the justification for our viewing the joint *zbw* phase  $S$  for an  $N$ -particle system as the joint phase of real physical oscillations about the actual 3-space locations of the *zbw* particles, while supporting our hypothesis that the ether is a medium that fundamentally lives in 3-space instead of configuration space.

### 3.7 Comparison to Other Answers

Several other answers to Wallstrom's criticism have been offered in the context of stochastic mechanics [98, 25, 100, 101, 103, 104]. Here we briefly review and assess each approach, and compare them to ZSM.

Smolin proposed [100] that Wallstrom's criticism could be answered by allowing discontinuities in the wavefunction - that is, for a given multi-valued wavefunction, one could introduce discontinuities at the multi-valued points to make it single-valued. The example he used is stochastic mechanics on  $S^1$ , where he argued that although the resultant wavefunction is not single-valued and smooth, it is well-known that almost every wavefunction in the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{L}^2(S^1)$  is discontinuous at one or many points, and yet each wavefunction is normalizable and gives well-defined (i.e., single-valued) current velocities. Smolin's proposal seems incomplete, however. Even if his proposal works for the multiply connected configuration space of the unit circle, how will it work in the more general cases of simply connected configuration spaces of dimensionality  $3N$ ? Wallstrom emphasizes, after all, that the inequivalence between the HJM equations and Schrödinger's equation applies to simply connected configuration spaces of two dimensions or greater [25]. (See also [202] for a critique of Smolin's approach.) To compare with ZSM, these concerns don't arise - the derived wavefunctions are single-valued and smooth,

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

and ZSM works for the general case of simply connected 3N-dimensional configuration space.

Carlen & Loffredo [98] considered stochastic mechanics on  $S^1$  and suggested to introduce a stochastic analogue of the quantization condition, which they argue is related in a natural way to the topological properties of  $S^1$ . They then showed that this stochastic analogue of the quantization condition establishes mathematical equivalence between stochastic mechanics and quantum mechanics on  $S^1$ . However, the difficulty with taking their proposal as a general answer is that it seems to only work in the special case of  $S^1$ , whereas Wallstrom's criticism applies to simply connected configuration spaces of two dimensions or greater, as mentioned earlier.

Fritzsche & Haugk [101] attempted to answer Wallstrom by motivating the quantization condition from the physical requirement that the probability density,  $|\psi|^2$ , should always be normalizable. To accomplish this, they first required that the velocity potential,  $S$ , be single-valued on a closed loop (in analogy with the definition of a single-valued magnetic scalar potential) via jump discontinuities. Constructing the wavefunction from this  $S$  function through an approach equivalent to Nelson's Newtonian formulation of stochastic mechanics, they then argued that the only way  $|\psi|^2$  can remain normalizable for a superposition of two eigenstates is if the phase difference between the eigenstates satisfies the quantization condition. The main problem with their approach lies in their non-trivial assumption that  $S$  can have jump discontinuities. As pointed out by Wallstrom [41, 25], allowing jump discontinuities in  $S$  implies that  $\nabla\psi = (\frac{1}{\hbar})(\nabla R + i\nabla S)\psi$  develops a singularity, which is physically inadmissible. Accordingly, the same technical concerns we raised towards Smolin's proposal apply here as well. We note, by contrast, that in ZSM,  $\nabla S$  is always continuous even though  $S$  is in general discontinuous (e.g., at nodal points of the probability density).

Wallstrom made the observation [25] that if one takes the quantization condition as an initial condition on the current velocity, then the time-evolution of the HJM equations will ensure that it is valid for all future times, in analogy with Kelvin's circulation theorem from classical fluid mechanics. So one might think to use this as a justification for the quantization condition in the context of the HJM equations. As he pointed out, however, this seems to require an extreme form of fine-tuning (why should the initial condition on the current velocity correspond exactly to the quantization condition?), and it is not clear that this initial condition would be stable for interacting particles. By contrast, we saw in ZSM that the *zbw* hypothesis combined with the Lorentz transformation implies the quantization condition so that it is not the result of fine-tuning (other than the assumption that the steady-state oscillation frequency in the IMFTRF/IMBTRF/IMSTRF is of fixed Compton magnitude). Moreover, we showed that in the case of classically interacting *zbw* particles, it can be plausibly argued that the quantization condition remains stable.

Bacciagaluppi [99] suggested that when the external potential  $V$  has time-dependence, the



complement of the nodal set of  $\rho$  may become simply connected in a neighborhood of a given time  $t$ . In other words, the time-dependence of  $V$  may make it possible to eliminate the nodes of  $\rho$  around which a multi-valued  $S$  accumulates values other than  $n\hbar$  (because  $S$  would have to be single-valued in that neighborhood of  $t$ ). While Bacciagaluppi's suggestion was intended as an abstract, mathematical argument, it is interesting to note that his proposal seems relevant to measurement situations when the interaction of a system with a pointer apparatus entails a time-dependent  $V$ ; in other words, Bacciagaluppi's suggestion might be used to argue that energy-momentum quantization arises as a dynamical effect of measurement interactions, as opposed to a measurement-independent property of particles in bound states (as in ZSM). We find this an intriguing possibility, but the technical details need to be developed for it to become a serious proposal.

Grössing et al. [104] constructed a model of a classical “walking bouncer” particle (essentially a harmonic oscillator of natural frequency  $\omega_0$ ) coupled to a dissipative thermal environment which imparts a stochastic, periodic, driving force. They then showed that in the large friction limit the mean stochastic dynamics of the bouncer satisfies what amounts to the quantization condition. They claim “this condition resolves the problem discussed by Wallstrom [20] about the single-valuedness of the quantum mechanical wavefunctions and eliminates possible contradictions arising from Nelson-type approaches to model quantum mechanics.” It is unclear to us that their model involves physically consistent assumptions;<sup>16</sup> but setting aside this concern, the main difficulty we see with their claim is that they don't show how to derive the HJM equations from their model (although they do show that their model yields the energy spectrum of the quantum harmonic oscillator), which is the context in which Wallstrom's critique applies. In addition, it is unclear how their model is consistent with NYSM since Nelson's diffusion process is a conservative one while their model assumes a dissipative diffusion process in a thermal environment. No such (apparent) inconsistency exists for ZSM, since we implemented the *zbw* hypothesis into NYSM in a manner consistent with Nelson's (suitably generalized) ether hypothesis. Nevertheless, in our view, Grössing et al.'s model (if it can be shown physically consistent) has value as a proof-of-principle that one can construct a physical model of a classical, harmonically oscillating particle coupled to some fluctuating, oscillating, ether-like background medium, and dynamically obtain the quantization condition.

Schmelzer [103] argued that in order to obtain empirical equivalence with quantum mechanics, it is sufficient for stochastic mechanics to only recover wavefunctions with simple zeros.

---

<sup>16</sup>They assume that their dissipative thermal environment corresponds to a classical “zero-point field” of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck statistical type, unknown positive temperature, and that imparts to the bouncer a total energy of  $\hbar\omega_0/2$ . But the zero-point fields of QED and SED are, by construction, frequency-cubed-dependent in their spectral density, non-dissipative in that they produce no Einstein-Hopf drag force, and *non-thermal* in that the zero-point motion they induce on charged particles persists at zero temperature [150, 207].

### 3 A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: ZSM II

He then showed that if one invokes the postulate,  $0 < \Delta\rho(\mathbf{x}) < \infty$  almost everywhere when  $\rho(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ , one obtains the quantization condition for simple zeros, i.e., where  $n = \pm 1$ . He also showed that this postulate corresponds to an “energy balance” constraint, namely, that the total energy density of the Nelsonian particle remains finite. Schmelzer suggested that it remains for subquantum theories to somehow dynamically justify the energy balance constraint. In our view, Schmelzer does not adequately justify his claim that simple zeros are sufficient to recover empirical equivalence with quantum mechanics (e.g., how can this account for energy level shifts in the hydrogen atom described by the Rydberg formula?); but if this can be shown, then we would concur that his proposal seems to be a non-circular, non-ad-hoc, empirically adequate justification for a limited version of the quantization condition. In ZSM, by contrast, the full quantization condition is obtained from the phase of the hypothesized *zbw* particle(s), with the proviso that it should be understood as a phenomenological stepping-stone to a physical theory of Nelson’s (suitable modified) ether, the *zbw* particle, and the dynamical interaction between the two.

Caticha and his collaborators [102, 208] have offered two routes to answering Wallstrom within the context of his “entropic dynamics” (ED) framework (essentially, a Bayesian inference version of stochastic mechanics). In the first route, Caticha appeals to Pauli [209], who suggested that the criterion for admissibility for wavefunctions is that they must form a basis for a representation of the transformation group for a given eigenvalue problem. He then suggests that this criterion is “extremely natural” from the perspective of a theory of inference since “in any physical situation symmetries constitute the most common and most obviously relevant pieces of information” [102]. However, it should be noted that Pauli’s criterion, more precisely, is that “repeated actions of the operators corresponding to physical quantities should not lead outside the domain of square-integrable eigenfunctions” [209]. In other words, Pauli’s criterion just requires that wavefunctions continue to satisfy the linearity of Schrödinger’s equation (i.e., the superposition principle), even after being acted upon by operators for physical quantities. But insofar as ED attempts to recover the Schrödinger equation from the HJM equations, such a criterion cannot be invoked in entropic dynamics without begging the question. In the second route, Bartolomeo and Caticha [208] take inspiration from Takabayasi’s generalization of the HJM equations to a spinning fluid [181]; they propose to interpret their postulated “drift potential”,  $\phi(\mathbf{x}, t)$ , as an angle describing particle spin, and thereby argue that the change of  $\phi$  along a closed loop in space must equal  $2\pi n$ . In fact, this argument is conceptually equivalent to the ones given by de Broglie [43, 44] and Bohm [46, 210, 47], and which we’ve used in ZSM. On the other hand, it should be noted that Bartolomeo and Caticha don’t actually model spin in ED, nor do they suggest to connect spin to the dynamical influence of an ether or background field (in contrast to ZSM). Indeed, Bartolomeo and Caticha admit that “ED is a purely epistemic theory. It does not attempt to describe the world.... In



fact ED is silent on the issue of what causative power is responsible for the peculiar motion of the particles” [208]. From our point of view, this makes their argument for the quantization condition less compelling than the one offered by ZSM, and ED less compelling as a satisfactory theory of quantum phenomena compared to the (programmatic) ontological approach offered by ZSM. Nevertheless, to whatever extent one views the Bayesian inference approach to physics as valuable and interesting, it appears that one can give a somewhat non-ad-hoc justification for the quantization condition via ED.

### 3.8 Conclusion

We have extended our classical *zbw* model and ZSM to the cases of free particles, particles in external fields, and classically interacting particles. Along the way, we have made explicit the beables of ZSM and suggested three possible approaches for parsing the beables into local vs. nonlocal types. In addition, we have given arguments for the plausibility of the *zbw* hypothesis and suggested new lines of research that could be pursued from the foundation provided here. We have also reviewed and compared several other proposals for answering the Wallstrom criticism, arguing that ZSM is the most general and viable approach of all of them presently.

We wish to emphasize once more that ZSM should not be viewed as a proposal for a fundamental physical theory of non-relativistic quantum phenomena; rather, it should be viewed as a provisional, phenomenological theory that provides the conceptual and mathematical scaffolding for an eventual physical theory of Nelson’s ether (amended for ZSM), the *zbw* particle, and the dynamical coupling between the two.

In his 1994 paper [25], Wallstrom wrote: “There seems to be nothing within the particle-oriented world of stochastic mechanics which can lead to what is effectively a condition on the ‘wave function’”. We would suggest that, given the example of ZSM, Wallstrom’s claim can no longer be sustained for all formulations of stochastic mechanics.

### 3.9 Acknowledgments

It is a pleasure to thank Guido Bacciagaluppi, Dieter Hartmann, and Herman Batelaan for helpful discussions and encouragement throughout this work. Special thanks to Guido for a careful reading of this paper and several helpful suggestions for improvements.



## 4 Semiclassical Newtonian Field Theories Based On Stochastic Mechanics I

This is the first in a two-part series in which we extend non-relativistic stochastic mechanics, in the ZSM formulation [26, 27], to semiclassical Newtonian gravity (ZSM-Newton) and semiclassical Newtonian electrodynamics (ZSM-Coulomb), under the assumption that the gravitational and electromagnetic fields are fundamentally classical (i.e., not independently quantized fields). Our key findings are: (1) a derivation of the usual  $N$ -particle Schrödinger equation for many particles interacting through  $q$ -number gravitational or Coulomb potentials, and (2) recovery of the ‘single-body’ Schrödinger -Newton and Schrödinger -Coulomb equations as mean-field equations valid for systems of gravitationally and electrostatically interacting identical particles, respectively, in the weak-coupling large  $N$  limit. We also compare ZSM-Newton/Coulomb to semiclassical Newtonian gravity and electrodynamics approaches based on standard quantum theory, dynamical collapse theories, and the de Broglie-Bohm theory.

### 4.1 Introduction

Semiclassical theories <sup>1</sup> of gravity and electrodynamics, based on the formalism of standard quantum theory, have been thoroughly studied over the past 55 years [211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 48, 225, 226, 227, 228, 207]. In the past 20 years or so, semiclassical Newtonian gravity based on the Schrödinger -Newton (SN) equation [229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 223, 242, 243, 15, 244, 245, 48, 224, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 49, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258] has become a popular focus of discussions in the foundations of quantum mechanics [230, 231, 236, 238, 15, 224, 50, 48, 248, 251, 257, 258], quantum gravity phenomenology [230, 231, 232, 234, 237, 239, 15, 244, 245, 248, 247, 246, 251, 249, 252, 250, 254, 256, 49, 258], and state-of-the-art AMO experimental physics [232, 259, 245, 250, 251, 254, 256, 255, 253, 49]. Variants of the SN equation, based on alternative formulations of quantum theory, have also been developed [260, 235, 261, 262, 263, 111, 15, 50, 264, 265, 266, 51, 49], mostly in the context of dynamical

---

<sup>1</sup>As in field theories where the matter sector is described within the framework of quantum mechanics or quantum field theory, and the gravity sector is described by classical (c-number) fields.

collapse theories [111, 50, 49, 235, 262, 263, 265, 261, 51]. Less discussion has been given to the possibility of semiclassical theories of gravity/electrodynamics based on ‘hidden-variables’<sup>2</sup> theories; the only instances we know of are Struyve [266], Kiessling [267], and Prezhdo-Brooksby [260] in the context of the de Broglie-Bohm (dBB) pilot-wave theory [268, 14, 10, 269]. Until now, no such discussion has been given in the context of stochastic mechanical hidden-variables theories [53, 22, 36, 131, 24, 26, 27].

A central reason for considering formulations of semiclassical gravity based on alternative quantum theories is that the SN equation, whether understood as a mean-field approximation to the standard exact quantum description of matter-gravity coupling [215, 221, 222, 223, 224, 48, 258] or as a fundamental theory describing matter-gravity coupling consistent with standard quantum theory [213, 214, 236, 223, 50, 48, 248, 247, 251, 252, 49], is either very limited in applicability or fatally problematic [214, 221, 220, 236, 222, 238, 48, 224, 50, 249, 257, 258].

Understood as a mean-field theory, the nonlinearity of the SN equation (or the stochastic SN equation, as will be discussed by us in [258]) means that its solutions lack consistent Born-rule interpretations [236, 238, 50, 224, 257] (see section 4 and subsection 5.1); instead, the SN solutions must be understood as describing self-gravitating *classical matter fields* that approximate quantum systems involving large numbers of identical particles that weakly interact<sup>3</sup> quantum-gravitationally [270, 271, 272, 224, 48, 258]. Moreover, only SN solutions with ‘small quantum fluctuations’ (i.e., solutions which don’t correspond to superpositions of effectively orthogonal classical field states, but rather Gaussian quantum states such as a coherent state) can have this physical interpretation [217, 229, 220, 50, 249, 49, 258], implying that the vast majority of SN solutions are (physically) superfluous.

Understood as a fundamental theory, the nonlinearity of the SN equation is fatal because the consequent lack of consistent Born-rule interpretations for the SN solutions destroys the standard quantum interpretation of the matter sector of fundamentally-semiclassical gravity based the SN equation (see subsection 5.1). A fundamentally-semiclassical description of matter-gravity coupling, based on the SN equation, would actually be a nonlinear classical field theory that makes empirical predictions (such as macroscopic semiclassical gravitational cat states; see section 4 for an example) grossly inconsistent with standard quantum mechanics and the world of lived experience [217, 229, 50, 220, 248, 49]. (Analogous comments apply to semiclassical electrodynamics based on the Schrödinger -Coulomb (SC) equation [225, 226]; see subsection 5.1 for a discussion.)

Another key motivation for considering formulations of semiclassical gravity based on alter-

---

<sup>2</sup>This phrase is somewhat misleading for the theories in question, but we will use it abusively due to its already widespread use in the literature.

<sup>3</sup>In the sense of the coupling scaling as  $1/N$ , where  $N$  is the number of particles.

native quantum theories is that while the standard exact quantum description of matter-gravity coupling yields semiclassical gravity as a consistent mean-field approximation, the matter sector of the standard exact quantum description is afflicted by the quantum measurement problem [273, 268, 274, 275, 2, 10, 15]. This puts a fundamental limitation on the domain of applicability of the standard exact quantum description (whether at the Newtonian level or the fully relativistic level), hence a fundamental limitation on the domain of applicability of semiclassical gravity (whether at the Newtonian level or the fully relativistic level). Namely, the standard exact quantum description and the mean-field semiclassical-gravitational description are only applicable to laboratory experiments involving the coupling of gravity to quantum matter, since laboratory experiments are the only places where the standard quantum formalism can be sensibly applied.

Thus it stands to reason that a formulation of quantum theory convincingly free of the measurement problem might, when extended to a semiclassical description of gravity (whether as a fundamental theory or a mean-field theory), yield a superior formulation of semiclassical gravity than the options based on standard quantum theory. Arguably, this suggestion has already been confirmed (at least at the Newtonian level) by dynamical collapse versions of fundamentally-semiclassical Newtonian gravity, insofar as the models of Derakhshani [50, 49] and Tilloy-Diósi [51, 52] seem to have consistent statistical interpretations while adequately suppressing gravitational cat state solutions at the macroscopic scale. In addition, the works of Struyve [266] and Prezhdo-Brooksby [260] suggest that the dBB theory offers a more empirically accurate semiclassical approximation scheme than does standard quantum theory, at least for simple examples considered at the relativistic level [266] and the Newtonian level [260, 266] (see subsection 5.2 for more detail); however, Struyve has pointed out [266] that the naive extension of dBB theory to fundamentally-semiclassical Einstein gravity does not yield a mathematically and physically consistent model <sup>4</sup>. In our assessment (see section 5.2), the various options for extending dBB theory to fundamentally-semiclassical Newtonian gravity/electrodynamics, do

---

<sup>4</sup>The reason, basically, is that a classical stress-energy tensor built out of a dBB field beable  $\phi_B(\mathbf{x}, t)$  entails covariant non-conservation of stress-energy, i.e.,  $\nabla^\mu T_{\mu\nu}(\phi_B) \neq 0$ , since  $\phi_B$  does not covariantly conserve total stress-energy along its space-time trajectory (because it satisfies the non-covariant wave equation  $g^{nm}\nabla_n\nabla_m\phi_B = -(-\det g_{nm})^{-1/2}\delta Q/\delta\phi_B$ , where  $Q$  is the quantum potential for  $\phi_B$ ). Thus  $T_{\mu\nu}(\phi_B)$  cannot be used on the right-hand-side of the classical Einstein equations, as this would violate the Bianchi identities  $\nabla^\mu G_{\mu\nu} = 0$ . Of course, alternative models of fundamentally-semiclassical Einstein gravity based on dBB theory may be possible to construct that *are* consistent, whether by considering modified theories of Einstein gravity that don't require covariant conservation of either the left hand side or right hand side of the modified classical Einstein equations (such as Scalar-Tensor theories in the 'Einstein frame',  $f(R)$  theories, and Unimodular Einstein gravity) [276], or by postulating new matter degrees of freedom in addition to the dBB field beable, where the new matter degrees of freedom exchange stress-energy-momentum with the dBB field beable in such a way that ensures covariant conservation of total stress-energy-momentum at all times. Such models have yet to be developed and studied, however, so this remains conjecture at the moment. An-

yield consistent models, but the empirical predictions of these models are either difficult to extract or demonstrably empirically inadequate. It would seem, then, that there does not yet exist a compelling and widely applicable model of semiclassical gravity based on a theory of hidden-variables, whether in the form of a fundamental theory of matter-gravity coupling or a mean-field approximation to an exact ‘quantum’ description of matter-gravity coupling.

The primary objectives of this two-part series are: (i) to construct a fundamentally-semiclassical theory of Newtonian gravity/electrodynamics within the framework of stochastic mechanics, in particular a new formulation of stochastic mechanics we have recently proposed [26, 27] to answer the long-standing “Wallstrom criticism”; (ii) to show that fundamentally-semiclassical Newtonian gravity/electrodynamics based on our new formulation of stochastic mechanics - which we call “zitterbewegung stochastic mechanics” (ZSM), hence ‘ZSM-Newton’ and ‘ZSM-Coulomb’ - has a consistent statistical interpretation and recovers the standard exact quantum description of matter-gravity coupling as an approximation (valid for all practical purposes), while also being free of the measurement problem; (iii) to show that the SN/SC equation and the stochastic SN/SC equation can be recovered as mean-field approximations for large numbers of identical ZSM particles that weakly interact <sup>5</sup> classical-gravitationally/electrostatically; and (iv) to show that ZSM-Newton/Coulomb yields a new ‘large- $N$ ’ prescription that makes it possible to: (a) accurately approximate the time-evolution of a large number of identical ZSM particles that strongly interact classical-gravitationally/electrostatically, within a consistent statistical interpretation; (b) avoid macroscopic semiclassical gravitational cat states and recover classical Newtonian gravity/electrodynamics for the center-of-mass descriptions of macroscopic particles; and (c) recover classical Vlasov-Poisson mean-field theory for macroscopic particles that weakly interact gravitationally/electrostatically.

In the present paper, we will carry out objectives (i-iii), leaving (iv) for Part II. We’ll also compare ZSM-Newton/Coulomb to semiclassical Newtonian gravity/electrodynamics theories based on standard quantum theory, dynamical collapse theories, and the de Broglie-Bohm theory.

The paper organization is as follows. Section 2 reviews ZSM for the case of many free particles. Section 3 formulates the basic equations of ZSM-Newton/Coulomb, explicates the

---

other possibility might be to derive a consistent semiclassical Einstein gravity description from a consistent semiclassical approximation to the dBB version of canonical quantum gravity, and then to simply reinterpret that semiclassical Einstein gravity description as a fundamentally-semiclassical description, as is sometimes done with the standard semiclassical Einstein equation [223, 248, 247]. This latter possibility remains a work in progress, as it is still an open question how to develop a consistent semiclassical approximation scheme for the dBB version of canonical quantum gravity. We refer the reader to the work of Struyve [266] for suggestions along these lines.

<sup>5</sup>Also in the sense of coupling scaling as  $1/N$ .

physical interpretation of those equations, and shows how the standard exact quantum description of matter-gravity coupling is recovered as a special case valid for all practical purposes. Section 4 shows how to recover the SN/SC equation and the stochastic SN/SC equation as mean-field approximations for large numbers of identical ZSM particles that weakly interact gravitationally/electrostatically. Finally, section 5 compares ZSM-Newton/Coulomb to extant theories of semiclassical Newtonian gravity/electrodynamics, pointing out conceptual and technical advantages entailed by ZSM-Newton/Coulomb, as well as possibilities for experimental discrimination between ZSM-Newton/Coulomb and these other semiclassical theories.

## 4.2 Overview of ZSM for many free particles

ZSM was developed in order to answer Wallstrom’s criticism of stochastic mechanical reconstructions of Schrödinger’s equation; namely, that they don’t give a plausible justification for the quantum mechanical requirement that wavefunctions (for spinless particles) must always be single-valued while allowing generally multi-valued phases [41, 25, 26]. In other words, why it should be that the wavefunction phase  $S$  (in polar form) must change along a closed loop in configuration space by integer multiples of Planck’s constant. A formulation of stochastic mechanics that plausibly answers this criticism is, in our view, a necessary condition for seriously considering extensions of stochastic mechanics to more general physical situations, hence why we will base our approach on the ZSM formulation.

To prepare for the formulation of ZSM-Newton/Coulomb, it is useful to first review ZSM for  $N$  particles that are classically non-interacting [27].

Our starting point is the following four phenomenological hypotheses.

First, we posit a Minkowski space-time that contains, on a  $t = \text{const}$  hypersurface,  $N$  harmonic oscillators centered around 3-space positions  $\mathbf{q}_{0i}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . As ZSM is a phenomenological framework, we need not specify here the precise physical nature of these harmonic oscillators (this task is left for future work). However, we assume that these oscillators have, in their respective translational rest frames, natural frequencies  $\omega_{ci} := (1/\hbar) m_i c^2$ , where  $c$  is the speed of light and the  $m_i$  are mass parameters that set the scales of the natural frequencies. It is reasonable to call these natural frequencies “Compton” frequencies, hence the label  $\omega_{ci}$ . We will refer to these oscillators hereafter as “zitterbewegung (*zbw*) particles” [26, 27].

Second, we adapt Nelson’s ether hypothesis [22, 277, 23, 34, 35] by supposing now that the Minkowski space-time is pervaded by a frictionless medium (which we will also call an “ether”), with the qualitative properties that (i) it is fluctuating everywhere with the same intensity, and (ii) it is an oscillating medium with a spectrum of modes superposed at each point in 3-space. More precisely, we imagine the ether as a continuous (or effectively continuous) medium

composed of a countably infinite number of fluctuating, stationary, spherical waves superposed at each point in space, with each wave having a different fixed angular frequency,  $\omega_0^k$ , where  $k$  denotes the  $k$ -th ether mode. The relative phases between the modes are taken to be random so that each mode is effectively uncorrelated with every other mode. Again, since ZSM is a phenomenological framework, specifying the precise physical nature of this ether is left to future work.

Third, we follow Nelson [22, 277, 36] in hypothesizing that each particle's center of mass, as a result of being immersed in the ether, undergoes an approximately *frictionless* translational Brownian motion (due to the homogeneous and isotropic ether fluctuations that couple to the particles by possibly electromagnetic, gravitational, or some other means), as modeled by the first-order stochastic differential equations

$$d\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t)dt + d\mathbf{W}_i(t). \quad (4.1)$$

Here the index  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , the particle trajectories  $q(t) = \{\mathbf{q}_1(t), \mathbf{q}_2(t), \dots, \mathbf{q}_N(t)\} \in \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ ,  $\mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t)$  are the mean forward drift velocities, and  $\mathbf{W}_i(t)$  are Wiener processes modeling each particle's interaction with the ether fluctuations. The Wiener increments  $d\mathbf{W}_i(t)$  are assumed to be Gaussian with zero mean, independent of  $d\mathbf{q}_i(s)$  for  $s \leq t$ , and with variance

$$E_t [d\mathbf{W}_{in}(t)d\mathbf{W}_{im}(t)] = 2\nu_i \delta_{nm}dt, \quad (4.2)$$

where  $E_t$  denotes the conditional expectation at time  $t$ . We then follow Nelson in hypothesizing that the magnitude of the diffusion coefficients  $\nu_i$  are defined by

$$\nu_i := \frac{\hbar}{2m_i}. \quad (4.3)$$

Along with (4.1), we also have the backward equations

$$d\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t) + d\mathbf{W}_{i*}(t), \quad (4.4)$$

where  $\mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t)$  are the mean backward drift velocities, and  $d\mathbf{W}_{i*}(t)$  are the backward Wiener processes. As in the single-particle case, the  $d\mathbf{W}_{i*}(t)$  have all the properties of  $d\mathbf{W}_i(t)$  except that they are independent of the  $d\mathbf{q}_i(s)$  for  $s \geq t$ . With these conditions on  $d\mathbf{W}_i(t)$  and  $d\mathbf{W}_{i*}(t)$ , equations (4.1) and (4.4) respectively define forward and backward Markov processes for  $N$  particles on  $\mathbb{R}^3$  (or, equivalently, for a single particle on  $\mathbb{R}^{3N}$ ). Having introduced



## 4.2 Overview of ZSM for many free particles

$\mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t)$  and  $\mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t)$ , let us also define the mean forward and mean backward derivatives:

$$D\mathbf{q}_i(t) := \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0^+} E_t \left[ \frac{q_i(t + \Delta t) - q_i(t)}{\Delta t} \right] = \mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t), \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$D_*\mathbf{q}_i(t) := \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0^+} E_t \left[ \frac{q_i(t) - q_i(t - \Delta t)}{\Delta t} \right] = \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t), \quad (4.6)$$

where we used the Gaussianity of  $d\mathbf{W}_i(t)$  and  $d\mathbf{W}_{i*}(t)$  in equations (4.1) and (4.4). Finding  $D\mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t)$  (or  $D_*\mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t)$ ) is straightforward: expand  $\mathbf{b}_i$  in a Taylor series up to terms of order two in  $d\mathbf{q}_i(t)$ , replace  $dq_i(t)$  by  $dW_i(t)$  in the last term, and replace  $d\mathbf{q}_i(t) \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{b}_i|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)}$  by  $\mathbf{b}_i(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{b}_i|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)}$  when taking the conditional expectation at time  $t$  (since  $d\mathbf{W}_i(t)$  is independent of  $\mathbf{q}_i(t)$  and has mean 0). We then have

$$D\mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t) = \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t) \cdot \nabla_i + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \right] \mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t), \quad (4.7)$$

and

$$D_*\mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t) = \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t) \cdot \nabla_i - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \right] \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t). \quad (4.8)$$

Note that we take the  $\mathbf{b}_i$  ( $\mathbf{b}_{i*}$ ) to be functions of  $q(t) = \{\mathbf{q}_1(t), \mathbf{q}_2(t), \dots, \mathbf{q}_N(t)\} \in \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ . The reasons are: (i) all the particles are continuously exchanging energy-momentum with a common background medium (the ether) and thus are in general physically connected in their translational motions via  $\mathbf{b}_i$  ( $\mathbf{b}_{i*}$ ), insofar as the latter are constrained by the physical properties of the ether; and (ii) the dynamical equations and initial conditions for the  $\mathbf{b}_i$  ( $\mathbf{b}_{i*}$ ) are what will determine the specific situations under which the latter will be effectively factorizable functions of the particle positions and when they cannot be effectively factorized. Hence, at this level, it is only sensible to write  $\mathbf{b}_i$  ( $\mathbf{b}_{i*}$ ) as functions of all the particle positions at a single time.

Fourth, we suppose that, in their respective IMFTRFs, i.e., the frames in which  $D\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \mathbf{b}_i(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = 0$ , the *zbw* particles undergo driven oscillations about  $\mathbf{q}_{0i}$  by coupling to a narrow band of ether modes that resonantly peak around their natural frequencies. However, in order that the oscillation of each particle doesn't become unbounded in kinetic energy, there must be some mechanism by which the particles dissipate energy back into the ether so that, on the average, a steady-state equilibrium regime is reached for their oscillations. So we posit that on short relaxation time-scales,  $\tau$ , which are identical for particles of identical rest masses, the average energy absorbed from the driven oscillation by the resonant ether modes

equals the average energy dissipated back to the ether by a given particle. (The average, in the present sense, would be over the random phases of the ether modes.) Thus, in the steady-state regime, each particle undergoes a steady-state *zbw* oscillation of angular frequency  $\omega_{ci}$  about its location  $\mathbf{q}_{0i}$  in its IMFTRF, as characterized by the ‘fluctuation-dissipation’ relation,  $\langle H_i \rangle_{\text{steady-state}} = \hbar\omega_{ci} = m_i c^2$ , where  $\langle H_i \rangle_{\text{steady-state}}$  is the conserved (random-phase-)average energy due to the steady-state oscillation of the  $i$ -th particle. Accordingly, if, relative to the ether, all the particles have zero mean translational motion, then we will have  $\sum_i^N \langle H_i \rangle_{\text{steady-state}} = \sum_i^N \hbar\omega_{ci} = \sum_i^N m_i c^2 = \text{const.}$

Now, as a consequence of this last hypothesis, it follows that in the IMFTRF of the  $i$ -th particle, the forward steady-state *zbw* phase change is given by

$$\delta\bar{\theta}_{i+} := \omega_{ci}\delta t_0 = \frac{m_i c^2}{\hbar}\delta t_0, \quad (4.9)$$

and the corresponding absolute forward steady-state phase is

$$\bar{\theta}_{i+} = \omega_{ci}t_0 + \phi_i = \frac{m_i c^2}{\hbar}t_0 + \phi_{i+}. \quad (4.10)$$

Then the joint forward steady-state phase for all the particles will just be

$$\bar{\theta}_+ = \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\theta}_{i+} = \sum_{i=1}^N (\omega_{ci}t_0 + \phi_{i+}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{m_i c^2}{\hbar}t_0 + \phi_{i+} \right). \quad (4.11)$$

The reason for starting our analysis with the IMFTRFs is that, at this stage, neither (4.1) nor (4.4) have well-defined time reversals [99, 26, 27], so the forward and backward stochastic differential equations (4.1) and (4.4) describe independent, time-asymmetric diffusion processes in opposite time directions. Hence we must start by considering the steady-state *zbw* phases in each time direction separately, and it is natural to start with the more intuitive forward time direction.

For the  $i$ -th *zbw* particle in its instantaneous mean backward translational rest frame (IMB-TRF), i.e., the frame defined by  $D_*\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t) = 0$ , its backward steady-state *zbw* phase change is given by

$$\delta\bar{\theta}_{i-} := -\omega_{ci}\delta t_0 = -\frac{m_i c^2}{\hbar}\delta t_0, \quad (4.12)$$

and

$$\bar{\theta}_{i-} = (-\omega_{ci}t_0) + \phi_{i-} = \left( -\frac{m_i c^2}{\hbar}t_0 \right) + \phi_{i-}. \quad (4.13)$$

## 4.2 Overview of ZSM for many free particles

Then the joint backward steady-state phase for all the particles will just be

$$\bar{\theta}_- = \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\theta}_{i-} = \sum_{i=1}^N (\omega_{ci} t_0 + \phi_{i-}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{m_i c^2}{\hbar} t_0 + \phi_{i-} \right). \quad (4.14)$$

We note that both the diffusion coefficient  $\nu_i = \hbar/2m_i$  and the (reduced) *zbw* period  $T_{ci} = 1/\omega_{ci} = \hbar/m_i c^2$  are scaled by  $\hbar$ . This is consistent with our hypothesis that the ether is the common physical cause of both the frictionless diffusion processes and the steady-state *zbw* oscillations of the particles. Had we not proposed Nelson's ether as the physical cause of the *zbw* oscillations as well as the frictionless diffusions, the occurrence of  $\hbar$  in both of these properties of the particles would be inexplicable and compromising for the plausibility of our proposed modification of NYSM.

Note also that we cannot transform to a frame in which  $d\mathbf{q}_i(t)/dt = 0$ , as this expression is undefined for the Wiener process. So we cannot talk of the *zbw* phases in rest frames other than in the IMFTRFs or IMBTRFs of the particles

If we Lorentz transform back to the lab frame in the forward time direction, this corresponds to a boost of (4.9) by  $-\mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t)$ . Approximating the transformation for non-relativistic velocities so that  $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{1 - \mathbf{b}_i^2/c^2} \approx 1 + \mathbf{b}_i^2/2c^2$ , the mean forward steady-state joint phase change becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\bar{\theta}_+(q(t), t) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\omega_{ci}}{m_i c^2} E_t [E_{i+}(D\mathbf{q}_i(t)) \delta t - m_i D\mathbf{q}_i(t) \cdot (D\mathbf{q}_i(t)) \delta t] \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar} E_t \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N E_{i+}(D\mathbf{q}_i(t)) \delta t - \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

where

$$E_{i+}(D\mathbf{q}_i(t)) = m_i c^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i (D\mathbf{q}_i(t))^2 = m_i c^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{b}_i^2, \quad (4.16)$$

neglecting the momentum terms proportional to  $\mathbf{b}_i^3/c^2$ . The  $\delta\mathbf{q}_{i+}(t)$  in (4.15) corresponds to the physical, translational, mean forward displacement of the *i*-th *zbw* particle, defined by

$$\delta\mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) = [D\mathbf{q}_i(t)] \delta t = \mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t) \delta t. \quad (4.17)$$

For the backward time direction, the Lorentz transformation to the lab frame corresponds to a boost of (4.12) by  $-\mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t)$ . Then the mean backward steady-state joint phase change

becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\bar{\theta}_-(q(t), t) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\omega_{ci}}{m_i c^2} E_t [-E_{i-}(D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t)) \delta t + m_i D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t) \cdot (D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t)) \delta t] \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar} E_t \left[ -\sum_{i=1}^N E_{i-}(D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t)) \delta t + \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t) \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_{i-}(t) \right],\end{aligned}\quad (4.18)$$

where

$$E_{i-}(D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t)) = m_i c^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i (D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t))^2 = m_i c^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{b}_{i*}^2. \quad (4.19)$$

The  $\delta \mathbf{q}_{i-}(t)$  in (4.18) corresponds to the physical, translational, mean backward displacement of the  $i$ -th *zbw* particle, as defined by

$$\delta \mathbf{q}_{i-}(t) = (D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t)) \delta t = \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t) \delta t. \quad (4.20)$$

(Notice that  $\delta \mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) - \delta \mathbf{q}_{i-}(t) = (\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}_{i*}) \delta t \neq 0$  in general.) Now since each *zbw* particle is essentially a harmonic oscillator, each particle has its own, effectively independent, well-defined forward steady-state phase at each point along its forward space-time trajectory, when  $\mathbf{b}_i(q, t) \approx \sum_i^N \mathbf{b}_i(\mathbf{q}_i, t)$ . Consistency with this hypothesis also means that when  $\mathbf{b}_i(q, t) \neq \sum_i^N \mathbf{b}_i(\mathbf{q}_i, t)$ , the forward steady-state joint phase must be a well-defined function of the space-time trajectories of *all the particles* (since we posit that all particles remain harmonic oscillators despite having their oscillations physically coupled through the common ether medium they interact with). Furthermore, since, at this stage, the forward and backward steady-state joint *zbw* phase changes, (4.15) and (4.18), are independent of one another, each must equal  $2\pi n$  when integrated along a closed loop  $L$  in which both time and position change. Otherwise, we will contradict our hypothesis that the system of *zbw* particles has a well-defined steady-state joint phase in each time direction.

Associated to (4.1) and (4.4) in the lab frame are the forward and backward Fokker-Planck equations

$$\frac{\partial \rho(q, t)}{\partial t} = -\sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \cdot [\mathbf{b}_i(q, t) \rho(q, t)] + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \rho(q, t), \quad (4.21)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \rho(q, t)}{\partial t} = -\sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \cdot [\mathbf{b}_{i*}(q, t) \rho(q, t)] - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \rho(q, t), \quad (4.22)$$

where  $\rho(q, t)$  is the probability density for the particle trajectories and satisfies the normaliza-

tion condition

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} \rho_0(q) d^{3N}q = 1. \quad (4.23)$$

Restricting to simultaneous solutions of (4.21-22) entails the current velocity field

$$\mathbf{v}_i(q, t) := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{b}_i(q, t) + \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q, t)] = \frac{\nabla_i S(q, t)}{m_i}, \quad (4.24)$$

and the osmotic velocity field

$$\mathbf{u}_i(q, t) := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{b}_i(q, t) - \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q, t)] = \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i \rho(q, t)}{\rho(q, t)}. \quad (4.25)$$

Hence (4.21-22) reduce to the continuity equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho(q, t)}{\partial t} = - \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \cdot \left[ \frac{\nabla_i S(q, t)}{m_i} \rho(q, t) \right], \quad (4.26)$$

with  $\mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{u}_i$  and  $\mathbf{b}_{i*} = \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}_i$ .

To give (4.25) a coherent physical interpretation, we introduce the presence of an external (to the particle) osmotic potential  $U(q, t)$  which couples to the  $i$ -th particle as  $R(q(t), t) := \mu U(q(t), t)$  (assuming that the coupling constant  $\mu$  is identical for particles of the same species), and imparts a momentum,  $\nabla_i R(q, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)}$ . This momentum then gets counter-balanced by the ether fluid's osmotic impulse pressure,  $(\hbar/2m_i) \nabla_i \ln[n(q, t)]|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)}$ , leading to the equilibrium condition  $\nabla_i R/m_i = (\hbar/2m_i) \nabla_i \rho/\rho$  (using  $\rho = n/N$ ), which implies  $\rho = e^{2R/\hbar}$  for all times. It is assumed that  $R$  generally depends on the coordinates of all the other particles because: (i) if  $U$  was an independently existing field on configuration space, rather than sourced by the ether, then the diffusions of the particles through the ether would not be conservative (i.e., energy conserving), in contradiction with Nelson's hypothesis that the diffusions *are* conservative, and (ii) since the particles continuously exchange energy-momentum with the ether, the functional dependence of  $U$  should be determined by the dynamical coupling of the ether to the particles as well as the magnitude of the inter-particle physical interactions (whether through a classical inter-particle potential or, in the free particle case, just through the ether).

To obtain the 2nd-order time-symmetric dynamics for the mean translational motions of the  $N$  particles, we must first define the time-symmetric, steady-state joint phase of the *zlw* particles, in terms of a symmetric combination of (4.15) and (4.18). This is natural to do since

(4.15) and (4.18) correspond to the same frame (the lab frame), and since (4.15) and (4.18) are no longer independent of one another as a result of constraints (4.24-25). From there, we can define Yasue's ensemble-averaged action [160, 27] and apply the stochastic variational principle.

Taking the difference between (4.15) and (4.18) yields (replacing  $\delta t \rightarrow dt$  and  $\delta \mathbf{q}_{i+,-}(t) \rightarrow d\mathbf{q}_{i+,-}(t)$ )

$$\begin{aligned}
 d\bar{\theta}(q(t), t) &:= \frac{1}{2} [d\bar{\theta}_+(q(t), t) - d\bar{\theta}_-(q(t), t)] \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t \left[ E_i(D\mathbf{q}_i(t), D_*\mathbf{q}_i(t))dt - \frac{m_i}{2} (\mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t) \cdot d\mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) + \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t) \cdot d\mathbf{q}_{i-}(t)) \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N E_i dt - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} \left( \mathbf{b}_i \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_{i+}(t)}{dt} + \mathbf{b}_{i*} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_{i-}(t)}{dt} \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^N E_i - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} \left( \mathbf{b}_i \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_{i+}(t)}{dt} + \mathbf{b}_{i*} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_{i-}(t)}{dt} \right) \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^N E_i - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} (\mathbf{b}_i^2 + \mathbf{b}_{i*}^2) \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^N E_i - \sum_{i=1}^N (m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i + m_i \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i) \right) dt \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \left( m_i c^2 - \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 - \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 \right) dt \right] + \phi,
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

where  $\phi = \sum_{i=1}^N (\phi_{i+} - \phi_{i-})$ , and from (4.16) and (4.19) we have

$$E_i(D\mathbf{q}_i(t), D_*\mathbf{q}_i(t)) := m_i c^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{b}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{b}_{i*}^2 \right] = m_i c^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2. \tag{4.28}$$

Equation (4.27) is the time-symmetrized steady-state joint phase change of the *zbw* particles in the lab frame, before the constraint of conservative diffusions is imposed. Note that because  $\bar{\theta}_+$  and  $\bar{\theta}_-$  are no longer independent of one another, it is no longer consistent to have that  $\oint_L \delta \bar{\theta}_+$  and  $\oint_L \delta \bar{\theta}_-$  both equal  $2\pi n$ . However, the consistency of our theory does require that  $\oint_L \delta \bar{\theta} = 2\pi n$ , otherwise we will contradict our hypothesis that the system of  $N$  *zbw* particles, after imposing (4.24-25) has a well-defined and unique steady-state joint phase that functionally

## 4.2 Overview of ZSM for many free particles

depends on the 3-space trajectories of the *z**b**w* particles.

From the second to last line of (4.27), we can apply the stochastic calculus version of Fubini's theorem to obtain the cumulative, time-symmetric, steady-state joint phase at time  $t$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\theta}(q(t), t) &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \left( \sum_{i=1}^N E_i - \sum_{i=1}^N (m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i + m_i \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i) \right) dt' | \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi \\
&= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \left( \sum_{i=1}^N (E_i - m_i \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i \right) dt' | \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi \\
&= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \left( H - \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i \right) dt' | \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi \\
&= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \left( H - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{4} (D \mathbf{q}_i(t') + D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t')) \cdot (D + D_*) \mathbf{q}_i(t') \right) dt' | \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi \\
&= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t H dt' - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} \int_{\mathbf{q}_i(t_I)}^{\mathbf{q}_i(t)} (D \mathbf{q}_i(t') + D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t')) \cdot D \mathbf{q}_i(t') | \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

where

$$H := \sum_{i=1}^N (E_i - m_i \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left( m_i c^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 - \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 \right), \tag{4.30}$$

and where  $0.5 (D + D_*) \mathbf{q}_i(t) = \left( \partial_t + \sum_j \mathbf{v}_j(q(t), t) \cdot \nabla_j \right) \mathbf{q}_i(t)$ , and  $\left( \partial_t + \sum_j \mathbf{v}_j \cdot \nabla_j \right) \mathbf{q}_i(t) =: D \mathbf{q}_i(t)/Dt$ , and  $D \mathbf{q}_i(t) = (D \mathbf{q}_i(t)/Dt) dt$ . From (4.29), we can define the steady-state joint phase-principal function

$$I(q(t), t) = -\hbar \bar{\theta}(q(t), t) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 - m_i c^2 \right) dt' | \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] - \phi, \tag{4.31}$$

and we can use (4.31) to define the steady-state joint phase-action

$$J = I_{IF} = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 - m_i c^2 \right) dt' - \hbar \phi \right]. \tag{4.32}$$

Now, consider an integral curve  $\mathbf{Q}_i(t)$  of the  $i$ -th current velocity/momentum field, i.e., a

solution of

$$m_i \frac{d\mathbf{Q}_i(t)}{dt} = m_i \mathbf{v}_i(Q(t), t) = \mathbf{p}_i(Q(t), t) = \nabla_i S(q, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)}. \quad (4.33)$$

Then we can replace (4.29)'s functional dependence on  $q(t)$  by  $Q(t)$ , obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\theta}(Q(t), t) &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_{t_I}^t \left[ H - \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{v}_i(Q(t'), t') \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{Q}_i(t')}{dt'} \right] dt' + \phi \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t H dt' - \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathbf{Q}_i(t_I)}^{\mathbf{Q}_i(t)} \mathbf{p}_i \cdot d\mathbf{Q}_i(t') \right] + \phi, \end{aligned} \quad (4.34)$$

where it should be noticed that we've dropped the conditional expectation. So (4.34) denotes the cumulative, time-symmetric, steady-state joint phase of the *zbw* particles, evaluated along the time-symmetric mean trajectories of the *zbw* particles, i.e., the integral curves of (4.33).

Now, taking the total differential of the left hand side of (4.34) gives

$$d\bar{\theta} = \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} d\mathbf{Q}_i(t) + \partial_t \bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} dt. \quad (4.35)$$

Then, comparing (4.35) with (4.34-33), we can identify

$$\mathbf{p}_i(Q(t), t) = -\hbar \nabla_i \bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} = \nabla_i S|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)}. \quad (4.36)$$

Thus the  $i$ -th current velocity in the lab frame corresponds the gradient of the time-symmetrized steady-state joint phase of the *zbw* particles at the location of the  $i$ -th *zbw* particle, and  $S$  can be identified with the cumulative, time-symmetric, steady-state joint phase function of the *zbw* particles in the lab frame.

Applying the variational principle to (4.32), i.e., the conservative diffusion constraint,

$$J = \text{extremal}, \quad (4.37)$$

straightforward computation shows that this yields

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} [D_* D + D D_*] \mathbf{q}_i(t) = 0. \quad (4.38)$$

Moreover, since the  $\delta \mathbf{q}_i(t)$  are independent (as shown in Appendix 7.1), it follows from (4.38)



## 4.2 Overview of ZSM for many free particles

that we have the individual equations of motion

$$m_i \mathbf{a}_i(q(t), t) = \frac{m_i}{2} [D_* D + D D_*] \mathbf{q}_i(t) = 0. \quad (4.39)$$

By applying the mean derivatives in (4.38), and using that  $\mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{u}_i$  and  $\mathbf{b}_{i*} = \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}_i$ , straightforward manipulations give

$$\sum_{i=1}^N m_i \left[ \partial_t \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{u}_i - \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \mathbf{u}_i \right] |_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)} = 0, \quad (4.40)$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{a}_i(q(t), t) &= \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \left[ \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}_i}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{u}_i - \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \mathbf{u}_i \right] (q, t) |_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \left[ \frac{\partial S(q, t)}{\partial t} + \frac{(\nabla_i S(q, t))^2}{2m_i} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho(q, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(q, t)}} \right] |_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.41)$$

Integrating both sides of (4.41) and setting the arbitrary integration constants equal to the rest energies, we then have the  $N$ -particle quantum Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}(q(t), t) &:= \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{E}_i(q(t), t) \\ &:= -\partial_t S(q(t), t) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N m_i c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(\nabla_i S(q, t))^2}{2m_i} |_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)} - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho(q, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(q, t)}} |_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.42)$$

describing the total energy of the actual particles along their stochastic trajectories  $q(t)$ . Alternatively, given the integral curves  $\mathbf{Q}_i(t)$  of the reformulated mean acceleration equation

$$m_i \frac{d^2 \mathbf{Q}_i(t)}{dt^2} = m_i (\partial_t \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{v}_i) |_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{Q}_j(t)} = -\nabla_i \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho(q, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(q, t)}} \right) |_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{Q}_j(t)}, \quad (4.43)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , we can replace  $q(t)$  by  $Q(t)$  and thereby obtain the total energy  $\tilde{E}(Q(t), t)$  of the actual *zbw* particles along their time-symmetric mean trajectories, the latter now specified

by (4.43). The corresponding general solution of (4.42) is then

$$\begin{aligned}
 S(Q(t), t) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathbf{Q}_i(t_I)}^{\mathbf{Q}_i(t)} \mathbf{p}_i(Q(t'), t') \cdot d\mathbf{Q}_i(t') - \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{t_I}^t \tilde{E}_i(Q(t'), t') dt' - \sum_{i=1}^N \hbar \phi_i \\
 &= \int_{t_I}^t \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 - \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right) - m_i c^2 \right] dt' - \sum_{i=1}^N \hbar \phi_i \\
 &= \int_{t_I}^t \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 + \frac{\hbar}{2} \nabla_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i - m_i c^2 \right] dt' - \sum_{i=1}^N \hbar \phi_i,
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.44}$$

which is the conservative-diffusion-constrained, time-symmetric, steady-state joint phase associated with the *zbw* particles in the lab frame.

Since each *zbw* particle is posited to essentially be a harmonic oscillator of (unspecified) identical type, each particle has its own, effectively independent, well-defined phase at each point along its time-symmetric mean space-time trajectory, when  $\mathbf{v}_i(q, t) \approx \sum_i^N \mathbf{v}_i(\mathbf{q}_i, t)$ . Consistency with this means that when  $\mathbf{v}_i(q, t) \neq \sum_i^N \mathbf{v}_i(\mathbf{q}_i, t)$ , the time-symmetric steady-state joint phase must be a well-defined function of the time-symmetric mean trajectories of *all* the particles (since we posit that all the particles remain harmonic oscillators, despite having their oscillations physically coupled through the common ether medium they interact with). Then, for a closed loop  $L$  along which each particle can be physically or virtually displaced, it follows that

$$\oint_L \delta S(Q(t), t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \left[ \mathbf{p}_i(Q(t), t) \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}_i(t) - \tilde{E}_i(Q(t), t) \delta t \right] = nh. \tag{4.45}$$

And for a closed loop  $L$  with  $\delta t = 0$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \mathbf{p}_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}_i(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \nabla_i S(q, t) |_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{Q}_j(t)} \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}_i(t) = nh. \tag{4.46}$$

If we also consider the joint phase field  $S(q, t)$ , a field over the possible positions of the *zbw* particles, then, as a result of the same physical reasoning applied to the  $i$ -th particle at any possible initial position it can occupy, we will have

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \mathbf{p}_i \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i = \sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \nabla_i S(q, t) \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i = nh. \tag{4.47}$$

### 4.3 ZSM-Newton/Coulomb: Basic equations

Combining (4.47), (4.42), and (4.26), we can construct the  $N$ -particle Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi(q, t)}{\partial t} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 + m_i c^2 \right] \psi(q, t), \quad (4.48)$$

where the  $N$ -particle wavefunction  $\psi(q, t) = \sqrt{\rho(q, t)} e^{iS(q, t)/\hbar}$  is single-valued by (4.47).

We should observe that the solutions of (4.48) are generally non-factorizable fields on 3N-dimensional configuration space, which implies non-separability of  $S$  and  $R$  (hence non-factorizability of  $\rho$ ) in general. Insofar as ZSM starts with the heuristic hypothesis of an ontic ether that lives in 3-space and couples to ontic  $zbw$  particles in 3-space, this would seem *prima facie* paradoxical, assuming one takes the mathematical representation of  $S$  and  $R$  as a literal indication of the ontic nature of the hypothesized ether (i.e., that if  $S$  and  $R$  live in configuration space, then so must the ether). As discussed at length in [27], there are three possible ways to resolve this apparent inconsistency: (i) postulate that the ether lives in configuration space, but, as a matter of physical law, determines the motion of  $N$   $zbw$  particles in 3-space; (ii) postulate that the ether lives in configuration space along with a  $zbw$  ‘world particle’ (in analogy with Albert’s formulation of the de Broglie-Bohm theory [5]), and employ a philosophical functionalist analysis to deduce the emergence of  $N$   $zbw$  particles floating in a common 3-space; and (iii) view the  $S$  and  $R$  fields on configuration space as convenient mathematical representations of some corresponding ontic fields on 3-space (in analogy with Norsen’s “TELB” approach to the de Broglie-Bohm theory [38, 39]) which couple to  $N$   $zbw$  particles in 3-space. As also discussed in [27], we view option (iii) to be the most natural and fruitful one for ZSM, and we will implicitly assume this viewpoint throughout this paper.

With the overview completed, we can now develop ZSM-Newton/Coulomb.

### 4.3 ZSM-Newton/Coulomb: Basic equations

ZSM-Newton/Coulomb is just the generalization of  $N$ -particle ZSM to include classical Newtonian gravitational and Coulomb interactions between the  $zbw$  particles.

We suppose again that each particle undergoes a steady-state  $zbw$  oscillation in its IMFTRF or IMBTRF, and now also that each  $zbw$  particle carries charge  $e_i$ , making them classical charged harmonic oscillators of identical type. (We subject these particles to the hypothetical constraint of no electromagnetic radiation emitted when there is no translational motion; or the constraint that the oscillation of the charge is radially symmetric so that there is no net energy radiated; or, if the ether turns out to be electromagnetic in nature as Nelson suggested [23, 34], then that the steady-state  $zbw$  oscillations of the particles are due to a balancing

between the random-phase-average electromagnetic energy absorbed via the driven oscillations of the particle charges, and the random-phase-average electromagnetic energy radiated back to the ether by the particles.) So the classical Newtonian gravitational and Coulomb interactions between the *zbw* particles are defined by the gravitational potential (in CGS units)

$$V_g^{int}(\mathbf{q}_i(t), \mathbf{q}_j(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i \Phi_g}{2} = - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N(j \neq i)} \frac{m_j}{|\mathbf{q}_i(t) - \mathbf{q}_j(t)|}, \quad (4.49)$$

and the Coulomb potential

$$V_c^{int}(\mathbf{q}_i(t), \mathbf{q}_j(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{e_i \Phi_c}{2} = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{e_i}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N(j \neq i)} \frac{e_j}{|\mathbf{q}_i(t) - \mathbf{q}_j(t)|} \quad (4.50)$$

respectively, under the point-like interaction assumption  $|\mathbf{q}_i(t) - \mathbf{q}_j(t)| \gg \lambda_c$ .

Then the forward joint *zbw* phase change of the particles in the lab frame (in the  $|\mathbf{b}_i| \ll c$  approximation) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \bar{\theta}_+(\mathbf{q}_i(t), \mathbf{q}_j(t), t) &= E_t \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \omega_{ic} + \omega_{ci} \frac{\mathbf{b}_i^2}{2c^2} + \omega_{ci} \left( \frac{\Phi_g}{2c^2} + \frac{e_i \Phi_c}{m_i c^2} \right) \right) \left( \delta t - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{b}_{0i}}{c^2} \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) \right) \right] \\ &= E_t \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \omega_{ic} + \omega_{ci} \frac{\mathbf{b}_i^2}{2c^2} + \omega_{ci} \left( \frac{\Phi_g}{2c^2} + \frac{e_i \Phi_c}{m_i c^2} \right) \right) \delta t - \sum_{i=1}^N \omega_{ci} \left( \frac{\mathbf{b}_i}{c^2} \right) \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar} E_t \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^N m_i c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i \mathbf{b}_i^2}{2} + V_g^{int} + V_c^{int} \right) \delta t - \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{b}_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.51)$$

The backward joint *zbw* phase change  $\delta \bar{\theta}_-$  differs by  $\mathbf{b}_i \rightarrow -\mathbf{b}_{i*}$ ,  $\delta t \rightarrow -\delta t$ , and  $\delta \mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) \rightarrow \delta \mathbf{q}_{i-}(t)$ .

Note that when  $|\mathbf{q}_i(t) - \mathbf{q}_j(t)|$  becomes sufficiently great that  $V_{g,c}^{int}$  is negligible, (4.51) reduces to an effectively separable sum of the forward steady-state phase changes for all the *zbw* particles. (Effectively, because the ether will of course still physically correlate the phase changes of the particles, even if negligibly.)

We can rewrite (4.51) in the form

$$\delta \bar{\theta}_+(q(t), t) = \frac{1}{\hbar} E_t \left[ E_{joint+}(q(t), Dq(t), t) \delta t - \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t) \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) \right], \quad (4.52)$$

### 4.3 ZSM-Newton/Coulomb: Basic equations

where

$$E_{joint+} = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i \mathbf{b}_i^2}{2} + V_g^{int} + V_c^{int}. \quad (4.53)$$

Correspondingly,

$$\delta \bar{\theta}_-(q(t), t) = \frac{1}{\hbar} \left[ -E_{joint-}(q(t), D_* q(t), t) \delta t + \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t) \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) \right], \quad (4.54)$$

where

$$E_{joint-} = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i \mathbf{b}_{i*}^2}{2} + V_g^{int} + V_c^{int}. \quad (4.55)$$

Because each *zbw* particle is essentially a harmonic oscillator, when  $V_{g,c}^{int} \approx 0$ , each particle has its own well-defined (forward/backward) steady-state phase at each point along its mean (forward/backward) space-time trajectory. Consistency with this fact entails that for  $V_{g,c}^{int} > 0$ , the (forward/backward) joint phase must be a well-defined function of the mean (forward/backward) space-time trajectories of both particles (since we again posit that both particles remain harmonic oscillators even when physically coupled by  $V_{g,c}^{int}$ ). Furthermore, we note that at this stage (4.52) and (4.54) are independent of one another. Accordingly, for a closed loop  $L$  along which each particle can be physically or virtually displaced, the forward steady-state joint phase in the lab frame will satisfy

$$\oint_L \delta \bar{\theta}_+ = 2\pi n, \quad (4.56)$$

and likewise for the steady-state backward joint phase. It also follows from (4.56) that

$$\oint_L \delta_1 \bar{\theta}_+ = 2\pi n, \quad (4.57)$$

where the closed-loop integral here keeps the coordinates of all the particles fixed except for particle 1, the latter of which is displaced along  $L$ .

In the lab frame, the forward and backward stochastic differential equations for the translational motion are

$$d\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \mathbf{b}_i(q(t), t) + d\mathbf{W}_i(t), \quad (4.58)$$

and

$$d\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \mathbf{b}_{i*}(q(t), t) + d\mathbf{W}_{i*}(t), \quad (4.59)$$

with corresponding Fokker-Planck equations

$$\frac{\partial \rho(q, t)}{\partial t} = - \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \cdot [(\mathbf{b}_i(q, t)) \rho(q, t)] + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \rho(q, t), \quad (4.60)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \rho(q, t)}{\partial t} = - \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \cdot [(\mathbf{b}_{i*}(q, t)) \rho(q, t)] - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \rho(q, t). \quad (4.61)$$

Restricting to simultaneous solutions of (4.60-61) leads us to

$$\mathbf{v}_i := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{b}_{i*}] = \frac{\nabla_i S}{m_i}, \quad (4.62)$$

and

$$\mathbf{u}_i := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}_{i*}] = \frac{\hbar}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i \rho}{\rho}. \quad (4.63)$$

Then (4.60-61) reduce to

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = - \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \cdot \left[ \frac{\nabla_i S}{m_i} \rho \right], \quad (4.64)$$

where we have  $\mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{u}_i$  and  $\mathbf{b}_{i*} = \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{u}_i$ .

Here again we postulate an osmotic potential to which each particle couples via  $R(q(t), t) = \mu U(q(t), t)$ , which imparts momentum  $\nabla_i R(q, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)}$  that is counter-balanced by the osmotic impulse from the ether,  $(\hbar/2m_i) \nabla_i \ln[n(q, t)]|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)}$ , giving the equilibrium condition  $\nabla_i R/m_i = (\hbar/2m_i) \nabla_i \rho/\rho$ . Thus  $\rho = e^{2R/\hbar}$  for all times

Now, taking the difference between  $\delta\bar{\theta}_+$  and  $\delta\bar{\theta}_-$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 d\bar{\theta}(q(t), t) &:= \frac{1}{2} [d\bar{\theta}_+(q(t), t) - d\bar{\theta}_-(q(t), t)] \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} E_t \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \left( E_i(q(t), D\mathbf{q}_i(t), D_*\mathbf{q}_i(t), t) dt - \frac{m_i}{2} (\mathbf{b}_i \cdot d\mathbf{q}_{i+}(t) + \mathbf{b}_{i*} \cdot d\mathbf{q}_{i-}(t)) \right) \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} E_t \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^N E_i dt - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} \left( \mathbf{b}_i \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_{i+}(t)}{dt} + \mathbf{b}_{i*} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_{i-}(t)}{dt} \right) dt \right) \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} E_t \left[ E_{joint} - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} \left( \mathbf{b}_i \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_{i+}(t)}{dt} + \mathbf{b}_{i*} \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{q}_{i-}(t)}{dt} \right) \right] dt + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} E_t \left[ E_{joint} - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} (\mathbf{b}_i \cdot \mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{b}_{i*} \cdot \mathbf{b}_{i*}) \right] dt + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} E_t \left[ E_{joint} - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} (\mathbf{b}_i^2 + \mathbf{b}_{i*}^2) \right] dt + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} E_t \left[ E_{joint} - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} (\mathbf{b}_i^2 + \mathbf{b}_{i*}^2) \right] dt + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} E_t \left[ E_{joint} - \sum_{i=1}^N (m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i + m_i \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i) \right] dt + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} E_t \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \left( m_i c^2 - \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 - \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 \right) + V_g^{int} + V_c^{int} \right] dt + \phi,
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.65}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_{joint} &:= \sum_{i=1}^N E_i \\
 &:= \frac{1}{2} [E_{joint+} + E_{joint-}] \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^N m_i c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{b}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{b}_{i*}^2 \right] + V_g^{int} + V_c^{int} \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^N m_i c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 \right] + V_g^{int} + V_c^{int}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.66}$$

As in the free particle case, the consistency of our theory requires that (4.65) satisfies

$$\oint_L \delta \bar{\theta} = 2\pi n. \tag{4.67}$$

Otherwise we would contradict our hypothesis that the *zbw* particle has a well-defined, unique, time-symmetric steady-state joint phase at each 3-space location it can occupy.

From the second to last line of (4.65), we can then obtain the cumulative, time-symmetric, steady-state joint phase at time  $t$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bar{\theta}(q(t), t) &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \left( \sum_{i=1}^N E_i - \sum_{i=1}^N (m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i + m_i \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i) \right) dt' | \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \left( \sum_{i=1}^N (E_i - m_i \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i) - \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i \right) dt' | \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \left( H - \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_i \right) dt' | \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \left( H - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{4} (D \mathbf{q}_i(t') + D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t')) \cdot (D + D_*) \mathbf{q}_i(t') \right) dt' | \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi \\
 &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t H dt' - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} \int_{\mathbf{q}_i(t_I)}^{\mathbf{q}_i(t)} (D \mathbf{q}_i(t') + D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t')) \cdot D \mathbf{q}_i(t') | \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] + \phi
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.68}$$



### 4.3 ZSM-Newton/Coulomb: Basic equations

where

$$H := \sum_{i=1}^N (E_i - m_i \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left( m_i c^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 - \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 \right) + V_g^{int} + V_c^{int}. \quad (4.69)$$

From (4.68), we can define the steady-state joint phase-principal function

$$I(q(t), t) = -\hbar \bar{\theta}(q(t), t) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 - m_i c^2 \right) - V_g^{int} - V_c^{int} \right) dt' \mid \mathbf{q}_j(t) \right] - \phi, \quad (4.70)$$

and we can use (4.70) to define the steady-state joint phase-action

$$J = I_{IF} = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 - m_i c^2 \right) - V_g^{int} - V_c^{int} \right) dt' - \hbar \phi \right]. \quad (4.71)$$

Now, given an integral curve  $\mathbf{Q}_i(t)$  of the  $i$ -th current velocity/momentum field, i.e., a solution of

$$m_i \frac{d\mathbf{Q}_i(t)}{dt} = m_i \mathbf{v}_i(Q(t), t) = \mathbf{p}_i(Q(t), t) = \nabla_i S(q, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)}, \quad (4.72)$$

we can replace (4.68)'s functional dependence on  $q(t)$  by  $Q(t)$ , obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\theta}(Q(t), t) &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_{t_I}^t \left[ H - \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \mathbf{v}_i(Q(t'), t') \cdot \frac{d\mathbf{Q}_i(t')}{dt'} \right] dt' + \phi \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \left[ \int_{t_I}^t H dt' - \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathbf{Q}_i(t_I)}^{\mathbf{Q}_i(t)} \mathbf{p}_i \cdot d\mathbf{Q}_i(t') \right] + \phi, \end{aligned} \quad (4.73)$$

Taking the total differential of the left hand side of (4.73) gives

$$d\bar{\theta} = \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} d\mathbf{Q}_i(t) + \partial_t \bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} dt. \quad (4.74)$$

Then, comparing (4.74) with (4.73-72), we can once again identify

$$\mathbf{p}_i(Q(t), t) = -\hbar \nabla_i \bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} = \nabla_i S|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)}. \quad (4.75)$$

Now, returning to (4.71), imposing extremality yields

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} [D_* D + D D_*] \mathbf{q}_i(t) = - \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \frac{[m_i \Phi_g(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{q}_j) + e_i \Phi_c(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{q}_j)]}{2} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)}, \quad (4.76)$$

for  $i, j = 1, \dots, N$  and  $i \neq j$ . And from the independent  $\delta \mathbf{q}_i(t)$ , we have the individual equations of motion

$$m_i \mathbf{a}_i(q(t), t) = \frac{m_i}{2} [D_* D + D D_*] \mathbf{q}_i(t) = - \nabla_i \frac{[m_i \Phi_g(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{q}_j) + e_i \Phi_c(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{q}_j)]}{2} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)}. \quad (4.77)$$

Following the same steps as in the previous section, we then get from (4.77) the quantum Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}(q(t), t) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{E}_i(q(t), t) \\ &= -\partial_t S(q, t) \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N m_i c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{[\nabla_i S(q, t)]^2}{2m_i} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{[m_i \Phi_g(\mathbf{q}_i(t), \mathbf{q}_j(t)) + e_i \Phi_c(\mathbf{q}_i(t), \mathbf{q}_j(t))]}{2} - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho(q, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(q, t)}} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.78)$$

Or, in terms of the integral curves of the reformulated mean acceleration equation,

$$\begin{aligned} m_i \frac{d^2 \mathbf{Q}_i(t)}{dt^2} &= m_i (\partial_t \mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_j \cdot \nabla_j \mathbf{v}_i) \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} \\ &= -\nabla_i \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho(q, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(q, t)}} \right) \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} - \nabla_i \frac{[m_i \Phi_g(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{q}_j) + e_i \Phi_c(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{q}_j)]}{2} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.79)$$

we can replace  $\tilde{E}(q(t), t)$  by  $\tilde{E}(Q(t), t)$ , and write the general solution of (4.78) as

$$\begin{aligned}
 S(Q(t), t) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathbf{Q}_i(t_I)}^{\mathbf{Q}_i(t)} \mathbf{p}_i(Q(t'), t') \cdot d\mathbf{Q}_i(t') - \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{t_I}^t \tilde{E}_i(Q(t'), t') dt' - \sum_{i=1}^N \hbar \phi_i \\
 &= \int_{t_I}^t \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 - \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right) - m_i c^2 - \frac{(m_i \Phi_g + e_i \Phi_c)}{2} \right] dt' - \sum_{i=1}^N \hbar \phi_i \\
 &= \int_{t_I}^t \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{v}_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i \mathbf{u}_i^2 + \frac{\hbar}{2} \nabla_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i - m_i c^2 - \frac{(m_i \Phi_g + e_i \Phi_c)}{2} \right] dt' - \sum_{i=1}^N \hbar \phi_i,
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.80}$$

which is the conservative-diffusion-constrained, time-symmetric, steady-state joint phase associated with the classical interacting *zbw* particles in the lab frame.

We make the natural assumption that the presence of classical external potentials doesn't alter the harmonic nature of the steady-state *zbw* oscillations. Moreover, since each *zbw* particle is a harmonic oscillator, each particle has its own well-defined steady-state phase at each point along its time-symmetric mean trajectory. Accordingly, when the classical interactions are not negligible, the steady-state joint phase must be a well-defined function of the mean trajectories of both particles (since we posit that all particles remain harmonic oscillators despite having their oscillations physically coupled through  $\Phi_{g,c}$  and through the common ether medium with which they interact). So for a closed loop  $L$  along which each particle can be physically or virtually displaced, it follows that

$$\oint_L \delta S = \sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \left[ \mathbf{p}_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}_i(t) - \tilde{E}_i \delta t \right] = nh, \tag{4.81}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^2 \oint_L \mathbf{p}'_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}_i(t) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \oint_L \nabla_i S|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}_i(t) = nh, \tag{4.82}$$

for a closed loop  $L$  with  $\delta t = 0$ . For the steady-state joint phase field  $S(q, t)$ , we can apply the same physical reasoning above to each *zbw* particle for each possible 3-space position that can be occupied at time  $t$ , thereby implying

$$\oint_L dS(q, t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \mathbf{p}'_i \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i = \sum_{i=1}^2 \oint_L \nabla_i S \cdot d\mathbf{q}_i = nh. \tag{4.83}$$

Applying the Madelung transformation to the combination of (4.83), (4.78), and (4.64), we can construct the  $N$ -particle Schrödinger equation for classically interacting  $zbu$  particles in the presence of external fields:

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi(q, t)}{\partial t} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 + m_i c^2 + \frac{m_i \hat{\Phi}_g(\hat{\mathbf{q}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{q}}_j)}{2} + \frac{e_i \hat{\Phi}_c(\hat{\mathbf{q}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{q}}_j)}{2} \right] \psi(q, t), \quad (4.84)$$

where  $\psi(q, t) = \sqrt{\rho(q, t)} e^{iS(q, t)/\hbar}$  is single-valued via (4.83). Note the inclusion of hats on the interaction potentials and their coordinates, in contrast to the quantum Hamilton-Jacobi (QHJ) equation (4.78). As shown by Holland [268] and Oriols & Mompert [105], there exists a correspondence between quantum operators in the Schrödinger equation, and c-number variables in the QHJ equation. For example, the quantum expectation value of the position operator corresponds to the ensemble averaged position coordinate via  $\langle \psi | \hat{\mathbf{q}} | \psi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} d^{3N} \mathbf{q} \psi^* \hat{\mathbf{q}} \psi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} d^{3N} \mathbf{q} \rho \mathbf{q} = \langle \mathbf{q} \rangle$ . For another example, the quantum expectation value of the Hamiltonian operator is equivalent to the ensemble average of the total energy in the QHJ equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi | \hat{H} | \psi \rangle &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} d^{3N} \mathbf{q} \psi^*(q, t) \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 + m_i c^2 + \frac{m_i \hat{\Phi}_g(\hat{\mathbf{q}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{q}}_j)}{2} + \frac{e_i \hat{\Phi}_c(\hat{\mathbf{q}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{q}}_j)}{2} \right] \right) \psi(q, t) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} d^{3N} \mathbf{q} \rho(q, t) \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ m_i c^2 + \frac{[\nabla_i S(q, t)]^2}{2m_i} + \frac{m_i \Phi_g(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{q}_j)}{2} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{e_i \Phi_c(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{q}_j)}{2} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho(q, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(q, t)}} \right] \right) = \langle H \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4.85)$$

So the classical potentials are, in effect, ‘quantized’ at the level of the Schrödinger equation,

insofar as they depend on  $q$ -number position coordinates and satisfy the Poisson equations <sup>6</sup>

$$\nabla^2 \hat{\Phi}_g = 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \delta^3(\mathbf{q} - \hat{\mathbf{q}}_i), \quad (4.86)$$

$$\nabla^2 \hat{\Phi}_c = -4\pi \sum_{i=1}^N e_i \delta^3(\mathbf{q} - \hat{\mathbf{q}}_i). \quad (4.87)$$

Accordingly, the equation set (4.84-87) gives a statistical mechanical description of  $N$  *zbw* particles undergoing Nelsonian diffusions, while interacting both gravitationally and electrostatically through the classical potentials (4.49-50).

Equations (4.84-87) correspond to the standard quantum mechanical equations for  $N$  particles interacting gravitationally or electrostatically in the Newtonian regime [270, 271, 272, 48], and that the standard quantum mechanical equations are the Newtonian limits of the standard theories of perturbatively quantized gravity and perturbative quantum electrodynamics [48, 248]. But because we derived (4.84-87) within the ZSM framework, we can go further than the standard quantum description. That is, we can use solutions of (4.84), or the equivalent solutions of the Madelung equations, (4.64) and (4.78) with (4.83), to deduce an ensemble of possible trajectories for the actual (*zbw*) particles.

In particular, it is readily shown that the  $i$ -th mean acceleration

$$m_i \mathbf{a}_i(q(t), t) = \frac{m_i}{2} [D_* D + D D_*] \mathbf{q}_i(t) = -\nabla_i \frac{[m_i \Phi_g(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{q}_j) + e_i \Phi_c(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{q}_j)]}{2} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_i = \mathbf{q}_j(t)}, \quad (4.88)$$

---

<sup>6</sup>The use of delta functions in the definitions of the mass and charge densities is justified because we are using the point-like approximation for interactions between the particles. In actuality, the mass and charge densities should presumably depend on some form-factor  $f(|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}_i|)$  which distributes the mass or charge of the particle on its Compton length-scale  $\lambda_c$ . Additionally, in scattering events where  $|\mathbf{q}_i(t) - \mathbf{q}_j(t)| \sim \lambda_c$  the point-like approximation will no longer hold and it will become necessary to include this form-factor in calculating the interactions. The precise expression for this form-factor will depend on the specific physical model used for the *zbw* particle, which at present we do not have (although see section 5 of [27] for a discussion of possibilities). Nevertheless, as we are only concerned here with the non-relativistic regime, the point-like approximation will suffice.

hence

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_i \frac{D\mathbf{v}_i(q, t)}{Dt} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} &= [\partial_t \mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{p}_i](q, t) \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} \\
 &= -\nabla_i \left[ \frac{m_i \Phi_g(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{q}_j)}{2} + \frac{e_i \Phi_c(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{q}_j)}{2} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho(q, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(q, t)}} \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.89}$$

Integrating this last equation for different possible initial conditions  $\mathbf{Q}_j(0)$  allows us to construct an ensemble of mean trajectories, only one of which is realized by the actual  $i$ -th *zbw* particle. We can then find the mean gravitational and Coulomb potentials, i.e., the gravitational and Coulomb potentials sourced by the actual *zbw* particles along their mean trajectories, as follows:

$$\nabla^2 \Phi_g^{m.t.} = 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \delta^3(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{Q}_i(t)), \tag{4.90}$$

$$\nabla^2 \Phi_c^{m.t.} = -4\pi \sum_{i=1}^N e_i \delta^3(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{Q}_i(t)), \tag{4.91}$$

where the superscript “*m.t.*” refers to the mean interaction potentials sourced by the mean trajectories of the actual *zbw* particles.

Actually, (4.90) doesn’t contain all the terms that contribute to the total mass-densities of the particles. The complete expression is

$$\nabla^2 \Phi_g^{m.t.} = 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ m_i + \frac{[\nabla_i S(Q(t), t)]^2}{2m_i c^2} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i c^2} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho(Q(t), t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(Q(t), t)}} \right] \delta^3(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{Q}_i(t)). \tag{4.92}$$

But in the  $v_i \ll c$  limit, the classical kinetic and quantum kinetic<sup>7</sup> energy terms are negligible relative to the rest-energy terms, allowing us to effectively neglect the contributions of the kinetic energies to the total mass-energy density of the particle.

From the solutions of (4.84), we can also construct an ensemble of possible stochastic trajectories for the  $i$ -th particle:

$$d\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \left[ \frac{\hbar}{m_i} \text{Im} \frac{\nabla_i \psi(q, t)}{\psi(q, t)} + \frac{\hbar}{m_i} \text{Re} \frac{\nabla_i \psi(q, t)}{\psi(q, t)} \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} dt + d\mathbf{W}_i(t), \tag{4.93}$$

<sup>7</sup>While the latter terms are referred to in the literature as “quantum potentials” [278, 113, 114, 279, 268, 10, 105], we prefer the term “quantum kinetics” [26, 27] since, in stochastic mechanics, they arise from the kinetic energy contributions of the osmotic velocities of the particles, as seen from the left hand side of (4.41).

#### 4.3 ZSM-Newton/Coulomb: Basic equations

$$d\mathbf{q}_i(t) = \left[ \frac{\hbar}{m_i} \text{Im} \frac{\nabla_i \psi(q, t)}{\psi(q, t)} - \frac{\hbar}{m_i} \text{Re} \frac{\nabla_i \psi(q, t)}{\psi(q, t)} \right] |_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)} dt + d\mathbf{W}_{i*}(t). \quad (4.94)$$

These stochastic trajectories can then be used in the definition of the mass and charge densities, implying *classically fluctuating* mass and charge densities, hence *classically fluctuating* gravitational and Coulomb potentials satisfying the Poisson equations

$$\nabla^2 \Phi_g^{s.t.} = 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \delta^3(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_i(t)), \quad (4.95)$$

$$\nabla^2 \Phi_c^{s.t.} = -4\pi \sum_{i=1}^N e_i \delta^3(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_i(t)), \quad (4.96)$$

where “s.t.” refers to the interaction potentials sourced by the stochastic trajectories of the actual *zbw* particles.

Thus we see here that there are three ‘levels’ of interaction potentials, with  $\Phi_{g,c}^{s.t.}$  being the most fundamental (in the sense of being the potentials sourced by the actual, stochastic trajectories of the actual *zbw* particles), followed by  $\Phi_{g,c}^{m.t.}$  (in the sense of being the potentials sourced by the mean trajectories of the actual *zbw* particles), and then  $\Phi_{g,c}$  or  $\hat{\Phi}_{g,c}$  (in the sense of being q-number potentials that reflect a statistical ensemble of possible potentials sourced by the possible mean trajectories of the actual *zbw* particles). Indeed the q-number interaction potentials  $\hat{\Phi}_{g,c}$  have physical meaning inasmuch as

$$\langle \psi | \hat{V}_g^{int} | \psi \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} d^{3N} \mathbf{q} \psi^* \hat{V}_g^{int} \psi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} d^{3N} \mathbf{q} \rho V_g^{int} = \langle V_g^{int} \rangle, \quad (4.97)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi | \nabla^2 \hat{\Phi}_g | \psi \rangle &= 4\pi \langle \psi | \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \delta^3(\mathbf{q} - \hat{\mathbf{q}}_i) | \psi \rangle \\ &= 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^N \int d^3 \mathbf{q}'_1 \dots d^3 \mathbf{q}'_N |\psi(\mathbf{q}'_1 \dots \mathbf{q}'_N, t)|^2 m_i \delta^3(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}'_i) \\ &= 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} d^{3N} \mathbf{q}' \rho(q', t) m_i \delta^3(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{Q}_i(t)) |_{\mathbf{Q}_i(t) = \mathbf{q}'_i} = \langle \nabla^2 \Phi_g \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (4.98)$$

and likewise for the Coulomb potentials.

Note the conceptual difference between the expected values of the interaction potentials, equation (4.97-98), and the potentials obtained from (4.90-91) (i.e., the potentials sourced by the mean trajectories of the actual *zbw* particles). The former are obtained from averaging the interaction potentials over  $N$  statistical ensembles of mean trajectories; the latter are obtained from using the integral curves of (4.79) in (4.90-91).

It is interesting to compare (4.98) to the Poisson equation associated with the  $N$ -body Schrödinger-Newton (SN) gravitational potential [229, 236, 48, 50, 248, 247, 49]:

$$\nabla^2 \Phi_g^{SN} = 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^N \int d^3 \mathbf{q}'_1 \dots d^3 \mathbf{q}'_N |\psi(\mathbf{q}'_1 \dots \mathbf{q}'_N, t)|^2 m_i \delta^3(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}'_i). \quad (4.99)$$

In the SN equations, the solution of (4.99) describes the net interaction potential sourced by  $N$  matter density fields on space-time (each field corresponding to an elementary ‘particle’), and this potential feeds back into the Hamiltonian of the Schrödinger equation to generate a nonlinear Schrödinger evolution. In ZSM-Newton, by contrast, the solution of (4.99) describes the ensemble-average of the net interaction potential sourced by the  $N$  point-like *zbw* particles, and this potential *does not* feed back into the (derived) Schrödinger Hamiltonian. Everything said here also holds for the Coulombic analogue of (4.99) and its comparison to the  $N$ -body Schrödinger-Coulomb equations [270, 271, 272, 50, 48]. (See subsection 5.1 for a more detailed comparison of ZSM-Newton/Coulomb to  $N$ -body Schrödinger-Newton/Coulomb.)

Earlier we observed that the complete expression for the mass densities of the *zbw* particles is given by the right hand side of (4.92). While we also noted that the classical and quantum kinetic energy terms can be neglected in the Newtonian regime, let us see what happens if we do use the solution of (4.92) in the QHJ equation (4.78) and the Schrödinger equation (4.84). For maximum clarity, we restrict to the two-particle case  $q = \{\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2\}$  and drop the Coulomb



potentials and rest-energy terms:

$$\begin{aligned}
 -\partial_t S(q, t) &= \sum_{i=1}^2 \left( \frac{[\nabla_i S(q, t)]^2}{2m_i} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho(q, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(q, t)}} \right) \\
 &\quad - \frac{\left[ m_1 + \frac{T_1(q, t)}{c^2} + \frac{Q_1(q, t)}{c^2} \right] \left[ m_2 + \frac{T_2(q, t)}{c^2} + \frac{Q_2(q, t)}{c^2} \right]}{|\mathbf{q}_1 - \mathbf{q}_2|} \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^2 \left( \frac{[\nabla_i S]^2}{2m_i} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right) \\
 &\quad - \frac{\left[ m_1 m_2 + m_1 \frac{T_2}{c^2} + m_1 \frac{Q_2}{c^2} + m_2 \frac{T_1}{c^2} + m_2 \frac{Q_1}{c^2} + \frac{T_1 T_2}{c^4} + \frac{T_1 Q_2}{c^4} + \frac{Q_1 T_2}{c^4} + \frac{Q_1 Q_2}{c^4} \right]}{|\mathbf{q}_1 - \mathbf{q}_2|},
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.100}$$

where  $T_i(q, t) := \frac{[\nabla_i S(q, t)]^2}{2m_i}$  and  $Q_i(q, t) := -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho(q, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(q, t)}}$ . We can see that the gravitational interaction energy between the two particles depends on their classical kinetic and quantum kinetic energy terms, along with their rest masses. Furthermore, using the Madelung transformation to combine the QHJ equation (4.100) with the continuity equation (4.64), we obtain the *nonlinear* two-particle Schrödinger equation

$$\begin{aligned}
 i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi(q, t)}{\partial t} &= - \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 \psi(q, t) \\
 &\quad - \left( \frac{\left[ m_1 m_2 + \frac{m_1 T_2}{c^2} + \frac{m_1 Q_2}{c^2} + \frac{m_2 T_1}{c^2} + \frac{m_2 Q_1}{c^2} + \frac{T_1 T_2}{c^4} + \frac{T_1 Q_2}{c^4} + \frac{T_2 Q_1}{c^4} + \frac{Q_1 Q_2}{c^4} \right]}{|\mathbf{q}_1 - \mathbf{q}_2|} \right) \psi(q, t),
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.101}$$

where

$$\frac{m_i T_j}{c^2} = \frac{m_i}{2m_j c^2} [\nabla_j S]^2 = \frac{\hbar^2 m_i}{2c^2 m_j^2} (\nabla_j \ln \psi)^2, \tag{4.102}$$

$$\frac{m_i Q_j}{c^2} = -\frac{\hbar^2 m_i}{2c^2 m_j^2} \frac{\nabla_j^2 \sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{\rho}} = -\frac{\hbar^2 m_i}{2c^2 m_j^2} \frac{\nabla_j^2 |\psi|}{|\psi|}, \tag{4.103}$$

$$\frac{T_1 T_2}{c^4} = \frac{[\nabla_1 S]^2 [\nabla_2 S]^2}{4m_1 m_2 c^4} = \frac{\hbar^2}{4c^4 m_1 m_2} (\nabla_1 \ln \psi)^2 (\nabla_2 \ln \psi)^2, \tag{4.104}$$

$$\frac{T_i Q_j}{c^4} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{4m_i m_j c^4} [\nabla_i S]^2 \frac{\nabla_j^2 \sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{\rho}} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{4m_i m_j c^4} (\nabla_i \ln \psi)^2 \frac{\nabla_j^2 |\psi|}{|\psi|}, \quad (4.105)$$

$$\frac{Q_1 Q_2}{c^4} = \frac{\hbar^4}{4m_1 m_2 c^4} \frac{(\nabla_1^2 \sqrt{\rho}) (\nabla_2^2 \sqrt{\rho})}{\rho} = \frac{\hbar^4}{4m_1 m_2 c^4} \frac{(\nabla_1^2 |\psi|) (\nabla_2^2 |\psi|)}{|\psi|^2}, \quad (4.106)$$

for  $i \neq j$  and  $\psi = \sqrt{\rho} e^{iS/\hbar}$ .

Because of the nonlinearity of (4.100), the 3-space coordinates  $\mathbf{q}_1$  and  $\mathbf{q}_2$  in the Green's function of the gravitational potential in (4.100) can no longer be interpreted as linear operators (hence why we don't put hats on them) and  $\psi$  no longer has a consistent Born-rule interpretation [257]. (That  $\psi$  of (4.100) has no consistent Born-rule interpretation means that Salcedo's "statistical consistency problem" for quantum-classical hybrid theories [242, 280] is not applicable in the present context, since Salcedo's problem assumes the validity of the Born rule and standard quantum measurement postulates for hybrid theories.) Nevertheless,  $\rho = |\psi|^2$  is still (by definition!) the stochastic mechanical position probability density for the two-particle system and still evolves by the continuity equation (4.64). The important conceptual distinction here is that the Born-rule interpretation of  $|\psi|^2$  refers to the probability per unit volume of possible outcomes of projective position measurements on the two-particle system, while the stochastic mechanical definition of  $|\psi|^2$  refers to the probability per unit volume for the particles to *be* at 3-space positions  $\{\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2\}$  at time  $t$  as a result of their stochastic evolutions via (4.93-94). Thus, a break-down of the Born-rule interpretation does not entail a break-down of the stochastic mechanical meaning of  $|\psi|^2$ .

Nonlinear Schrödinger equations, together with entangled states, are often said to imply superluminal signaling [281, 282, 67], due to the well-known theorem of Gisin [281]. However, as Bacciagaluppi has emphasized [67], superluminal signaling only follows *if* a theory with a nonlinear Schrödinger equation can also reproduce the usual phenomenology of wavefunction collapse with Born-rule probabilities. Since said phenomenology does not apply to solutions of (4.100), Gisin's theorem does not seem applicable here. Of course, it may still be the case that the nonlinear Schrödinger equation (4.100) implies superluminal signaling, but determining this depends on formulating a stochastic mechanical theory of measurement consistent with (4.100). Since the nonlinearity of (4.100) makes naive application of the standard stochastic mechanical theory of measurement [40, 30, 31, 32, 33] unreliable, it remains an open question what variant of the stochastic mechanical theory of measurement is consistent with (4.100). However, it is expected that such a variant will yield empirical predictions in close agreement with the empirical predictions of the standard stochastic mechanical theory of measurement applied to the linear counterpart of (4.100). The reason is that the nonlinear terms (4.102-106) are ridiculously tiny in magnitude compared to the leading term proportional to  $m_1 m_2$

in (4.100). So for all practical purposes, we can ignore the nonlinear terms in modeling the Newtonian gravitational interaction between the two *zbw* particles, leaving us back to the linear Schrödinger equation (4.84).

What about the ether's gravitational contribution? The answer to this will depend on the details of an explicit physical model of the ether, which we do not provide in this paper. Nevertheless, our phenomenological hypotheses about the ether say that it is a medium in space-time with superposed oscillations involving a countably infinite number of modes, and that it continuously exchanges energy-momentum with the *zbw* particles. So it is reasonable to assume that there must be some stress-energy-momentum associated with the ether. How this stress-energy-momentum gravitates is an open question, but a couple possibilities can be noted: (i) it doesn't gravitate at all, but rather the coupling of the ether to massive *zbw* particles somehow induces gravity on a Lorentzian manifold, in analogy with Sakharov's 'induced gravity' proposal<sup>8</sup> [219]; (ii) it gravitates, but its overall contribution to the total system energy density in the non-relativistic limit is negligible compared to the rest-energy of a *zbw* particle. In our view, if the ether hypothesis of ZSM is correct, one of these two possibilities must be correct, because all mass-energy quantities experimentally measured in high energy scattering experiments and nuclear binding/decay processes seem to come from three sources: (a) the sum of the rest-masses of the particles, (b) the relativistic kinetic energies of the particles, and (c) the mass-energy associated with interactions between particles via the known fundamental forces. We have provisional results that seem to support this view, in the way of a semiclassical general relativistic extension of ZSM involving a macroscopic model of the ether as a relativistic non-viscous fluid that gravitates via the Einstein equations, but gives a negligible contribution to the total rest-energy of a system of *zbw* particles in the non-relativistic limit. These results will be reported in a future paper. Hence, for this paper, we shall continue with neglecting the ether in gravitational effects (aside, of course, from the ether's physical influence on the particles through their *zbw* oscillations and translational motions).

Finally, note that we have ignored the contribution of gravitational and electrodynamical radiation reaction forces. In a separate paper, we will show how these radiation reaction forces can be consistently incorporated into ZSM-Newton/Coulomb through a stochastic generalization of Galley's variational principle for nonconservative systems [283].

---

<sup>8</sup>In Sakharov's approach, quantum vacuum fluctuations from matter fields don't gravitate through their stress-energy-momentum tensor; rather, one-loop vacuum fluctuations on a Lorentzian manifold (the latter left to 'flap in the breeze') generate an effective action that contains terms proportional to the Einstein-Hilbert action, the cosmological constant, plus "curvature-squared" terms [219].

## 4.4 Schrödinger-Newton/Coulomb equations as mean-field theories

We show in this section that ZSM-Newton/Coulomb recovers the ‘single-body’ Schrödinger-Newton/Coulomb equations [229, 233, 236, 237, 241, 15, 224, 50, 48, 248, 252, 258, 270, 271, 272] as mean-field approximations when the number of *zbn* particles is sufficiently large. For clarity, we separate out the gravitational and Coulomb interactions.

The main idea of a ‘mean-field’ (or ‘large  $N$ ’) theory is to approximate the evolution of many particles interacting (gravitationally and/or electromagnetically), when  $N$  is large (i.e.,  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ) and the interactions are weak (in the sense that the gravitational coupling between particles scales as  $1/N$ ) [272]. So for example, if a system of identical particles has the mean-field phase-space density  $f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t)$ , the mean-field approximation says that the force exerted on a particle in the system by the  $N$  other particles is approximated by averaging - with respect to the phase-space density - the force exerted on the particle at its 3-space location, from each point in the phase space. Mean-field theory can also be used to approximate the net (gravitational and/or electrostatic) force from a cloud of many weakly interacting identical particles, on an external (macroscopic or mesoscopic or microscopic) body such as a force-measurement probe.

It is instructive to first discuss the mean-field approximation scheme for a classical system of weakly interacting particles. Let us consider a slight variation on the example discussed by Golse in [272], namely, a system of  $N$  identical classical point particles, weakly interacting gravitationally, with  $6N$ -dimensional Hamiltonian

$$H(\mathbf{q}_1(t), \dots, \mathbf{q}_N(t); \mathbf{p}_1(t), \dots, \mathbf{p}_N(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{p_i^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{N} V_g^{int}, \quad (4.107)$$

where  $V_g^{int}(\mathbf{q}_i(t), \mathbf{q}_j(t)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N(j \neq i)} \frac{m^2}{|\mathbf{q}_i(t) - \mathbf{q}_j(t)|}$  and the  $1/N$  factor is the ‘weak-coupling scaling’<sup>9</sup>. Physically, the Hamiltonian (4.107) describes a collisionless dilute gas of gravitationally interacting non-relativistic particles, and is a special case of the Hamiltonian considered by Golse [272] and Bardos et al. [270, 271] (they considered (4.107) for an arbitrary, symmetric, smooth interaction potential). The dynamics for the point particles is generated by (4.107) via Hamilton’s equations  $\dot{\mathbf{q}}_i(t) = m^{-1} \nabla_{\mathbf{p}_i} H$  and  $\dot{\mathbf{p}}_i(t) = -\nabla_{\mathbf{q}_i} H$ . Consider now the empirical distribution for the  $N$  particles:  $f_N(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t) := N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta^3(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_i(t)) \delta^3(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}_i(t))$ , which

---

<sup>9</sup>Without the scaling,  $V_g^{int}$  diverge much faster than the total kinetic energy (a sum of  $N$  terms) as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , since the sum in  $V_g^{int}$  is composed of  $0.5 N(N-1)$  terms. With the scaling, however,  $N^{-1} V_g^{int}$  scales as  $N$  in the  $N \rightarrow \infty$  limit. Thus the weak coupling scaling ensures that  $V_g^{int}$  and the total kinetic energy scale in the same way in the  $N \rightarrow \infty$  limit.

#### 4.4 Schrödinger-Newton/Coulomb equations as mean-field theories

satisfies (in the sense of distributions) the Vlasov equation

$$\partial_t f_N + \mathbf{p} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{q}} f_N + \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \cdot [F_N(\mathbf{q}, t) f_N] = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \cdot [\nabla_{\mathbf{q}} V(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{q}_j) \delta_{\mathbf{q}}^3 \delta_{\mathbf{p}}^3], \quad (4.108)$$

where

$$F_N(\mathbf{q}, t) := -\nabla_{\mathbf{q}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^6} \int_{\mathbb{R}^6} V(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}') f_N d\mathbf{q}' d\mathbf{p}. \quad (4.109)$$

Then, in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , the system described by (4.107-109) is equivalent to a six-dimensional phase-space density  $f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t)$  (representing the density particles of mass  $m$  located at position  $\mathbf{q}$  with momentum  $\mathbf{p}$  at time  $t$ ) evolving by the ‘large  $N$ ’ Vlasov equation

$$\partial_t f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t) + \left\{ H^{m.f.}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t), f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t) \right\} = 0, \quad (4.110)$$

where the time-dependent “mean-field” Hamiltonian  $H^{m.f.}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t)$  is given by

$$H^{m.f.}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t) = \frac{p^2}{2m} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} m\Phi(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}') f(\mathbf{q}', \mathbf{p}, t) d^3\mathbf{p} d^3\mathbf{q}'. \quad (4.111)$$

The last term on the right hand side of (4.111) is the “mean-field” potential energy, i.e., the phase-space averaged potential energy of a particle of mass  $m$  at position  $\mathbf{q}$  at time  $t$ . It can be rewritten as

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} m\Phi(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}') \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f(\mathbf{q}', \mathbf{p}, t) d^3\mathbf{p} \right) d^3\mathbf{q}', \quad (4.112)$$

which tells us it should be interpreted, more precisely, as the sum of the elementary potentials created at position  $\mathbf{q}$  by one particle located at position  $\mathbf{q}'$  and distributed according to the 3-space particle number density

$$\rho(\mathbf{q}', t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f(\mathbf{q}', \mathbf{p}, t) d^3\mathbf{p}, \quad (4.113)$$

with normalization

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho(\mathbf{q}, t) d^3\mathbf{q} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t) d^3\mathbf{q} d^3\mathbf{p} = N. \quad (4.114)$$

Since we are considering a system of identical particles interacting gravitationally in the New-

tonian approximation, the elementary potentials are of the form

$$\Phi(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}') = -\frac{m}{|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}'|}. \quad (4.115)$$

So with (4.113) and (4.115), we can rewrite (4.111) as

$$H^{m.f.}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t) = \frac{p^2}{2m} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{m^2 \rho(\mathbf{q}', t)}{|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}'|} d^3 \mathbf{q}', \quad (4.116)$$

where  $\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)$  is the source in the Poisson equation

$$\nabla^2 \Phi_g^{m.f.} = 4\pi m \rho(\mathbf{q}, t). \quad (4.117)$$

Hence the mean-field Hamiltonian (4.116) describes, at time  $t$ , the total energy of a particle with momentum  $\mathbf{p}$  at position  $\mathbf{q}$  and with mean-field gravitational potential energy  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} m \Phi(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}') \rho(\mathbf{q}', t) d^3 \mathbf{q}'$ . Correspondingly, the position-space number density (4.113) can be shown to evolve by the continuity equation

$$\partial_t \rho(\mathbf{q}, t) = -\nabla \cdot \left( \frac{\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q}, t)}{m} \rho(\mathbf{q}, t) \right), \quad (4.118)$$

upon projecting the Liouville equation for  $f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t)$  into position space, where  $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q}, t)$  is the mean momentum

$$\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q}, t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\mathbf{p} f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t) d^3 \mathbf{p}}{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}. \quad (4.119)$$

It is interesting to consider the special case when

$$f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t) = \rho(\mathbf{q}, t) \delta^3 [\mathbf{p} - \nabla S_{cl}(\mathbf{q}, t)], \quad (4.120)$$

where  $S_{cl}(\mathbf{q}, t)$  is a single-valued classical velocity potential associated to a particle at position  $\mathbf{q}$  at time  $t$ . (This special case will be of interest for comparison to the mean-field description of ZSM-Newton/Coulomb.) We then have

$$\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q}, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\mathbf{p} f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t) d^3 \mathbf{p}}{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)} = \nabla S_{cl}(\mathbf{q}, t), \quad (4.121)$$

#### 4.4 Schrödinger-Newton/Coulomb equations as mean-field theories

and

$$H^{m.f.}(\mathbf{q}, \nabla S_{cl}, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{H^{m.f.}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t) f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t) d^3 \mathbf{p}}{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)} = \frac{[\nabla S_{cl}(\mathbf{q}, t)]^2}{2m} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{m^2 \rho(\mathbf{q}', t)}{|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}'|} d^3 \mathbf{q}'. \quad (4.122)$$

In this special ('Hamilton-Jacobi') case, (4.118) becomes

$$\partial_t \rho(\mathbf{q}, t) = -\nabla \cdot \left( \frac{\nabla S_{cl}(\mathbf{q}, t)}{m} \rho(\mathbf{q}, t) \right), \quad (4.123)$$

and (4.122) implies the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$H^{m.f.}(\mathbf{q}, \nabla S_{cl}, t) = -\partial_t S_{cl}(\mathbf{q}, t) = \frac{[\nabla S_{cl}(\mathbf{q}, t)]^2}{2m} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{m^2 \rho(\mathbf{q}', t)}{|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}'|} d^3 \mathbf{q}'. \quad (4.124)$$

Accordingly, the Madelung transformation on (4.123-124) yields the nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar \partial_t \chi_{cl}(\mathbf{q}, t) = \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 - \int d^3 \mathbf{q}' \frac{m^2 |\chi_{cl}(\mathbf{q}', t)|^2}{|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}'|} + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2 \sqrt{|\chi_{cl}|}}{\sqrt{|\chi_{cl}|}} \right) \chi_{cl}(\mathbf{q}, t), \quad (4.125)$$

with corresponding Poisson equation

$$\nabla^2 \Phi_g^{m.f.} = 4\pi m |\chi_{cl}(\mathbf{q}, t)|^2. \quad (4.126)$$

Here,  $\chi_{cl}(\mathbf{q}, t) = \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)} e^{iS_{cl}(\mathbf{q}, t)/\hbar}$  is the classical mean-field 'wavefunction', a collective variable describing the evolution of a large number of identical particles that weakly interact gravitationally. Note that the set (4.125-126) looks formally just like the single-body SN equations, but with the addition of an opposite-signed quantum kinetic defined in terms of the classical mean-field wavefunction. (In this sense, (4.125) is the mean-field generalization of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation of classical Hamilton-Jacobi mechanics [126, 127, 6, 128, 129, 130, 99, 106, 26, 27].) Likewise, if we had started with the description of  $N$  identical charged particles weakly interacting electrostatically, with Hamiltonian (4.124) under the replacement  $V_g^{int} \rightarrow V_c^{int}$ , then by taking the large  $N$  limit and considering the Hamilton-Jacobi case, we would obtain a nonlinear Schrödinger-Coulomb-like system identical to (4.125-126), with the charge  $-e$  replacing the mass  $m$ .

We shall now develop a similar mean-field approximation scheme for ZSM-Newton.

To model a dilute 'gas' of  $N$  identical ZSM particles interacting weakly through Newton-

nian gravitational forces, we introduce the  $N$ -particle quantum Hamilton-Jacobi equation (for simplicity we drop the rest-energy terms) with weak-coupling scaling:

$$-\partial_t S(q, t)|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{[\nabla_i S(q, t)]^2}{2m} |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} + \frac{1}{N} V_g^{int}(\mathbf{Q}_i(t), \mathbf{Q}_j(t)) - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla_i^2 \sqrt{\rho(q, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(q, t)}} |_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)}, \quad (4.127)$$

where  $S$  satisfies

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \oint_L \nabla_i S|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{Q}_j(t)} \cdot \delta \mathbf{Q}_i(t) = nh, \quad (4.128)$$

for a closed loop  $L$  with  $\delta t = 0$ .

Now, it is well-known in classical mechanics [284, 47, 142] that when harmonic oscillators of the same natural frequency are nonlinearly coupled, they eventually synchronize and oscillate in phase with each other. (The relative phase does oscillate, but in the long run those oscillations average out to zero.) Since the  $z\bar{b}w$  particles are essentially harmonic oscillators of identical natural frequencies and are nonlinearly coupled via  $V_g^{int}$ , it is reasonable to expect that, after some time, their oscillations eventually come into phase with each other. When this ‘phase-locking’ occurs between the  $z\bar{b}w$  particles, we can plausibly make the ansatz that

$$S(q, 0) = \sum_{i=1}^N S(\mathbf{q}_i, 0), \quad (4.129)$$

where all the  $S(\mathbf{q}_i, 0)$  are identical.

Furthermore, since the  $N$ -particle continuity equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho(q, t)}{\partial t} = - \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \cdot \left[ \frac{\nabla_i S(q, t)}{m} \rho(q, t) \right], \quad (4.130)$$

has the general solution

$$\rho(q, t) = e^{2R/\hbar} = \rho_0(q_0) \exp \left[ - \int_0^t \left( \sum_i^N \nabla_i \cdot \frac{\nabla_i S}{m} \right) dt' \right], \quad (4.131)$$



#### 4.4 Schrödinger-Newton/Coulomb equations as mean-field theories

the initial  $N$ -particle osmotic potential takes the form

$$R(q, t) = R_0(q_0) - (\hbar/2) \int_0^t \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i \cdot \frac{\nabla_i S}{m} \right) dt'. \quad (4.132)$$

So it is also plausible to make the ansatz

$$R(q, 0) = \sum_{i=1}^N R(\mathbf{q}_i, 0), \quad (4.133)$$

where all the  $R(\mathbf{q}_i, 0)$  are identical, which implies that the initial  $N$ -particle probability density factorizes into a product of identical single-particle densities:

$$\rho(q, 0) = \prod_{i=1}^N \rho(\mathbf{q}_i, 0). \quad (4.134)$$

From (4.134) it follows that (4.130) factorizes into  $N$  single-particle continuity equations at  $t = 0$ . Physically speaking, we can interpret (4.133-134) as corresponding to the assumptions that, at  $t = 0$ , the way that the particle-ether coupling happens, in the local neighborhood of each  $zbw$  particle, is identical for all  $zbw$  particles (hence identical osmotic potentials sourced by the ether regions in the local neighborhood of each  $zbw$  particle), and that the particles are interacting so weakly through  $V_g^{int}$  and the ether that they can be considered (effectively) physically independent of one another.

Now, it is physically plausible to conjecture that, in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,<sup>10</sup> the generation of correlations between the motions of the particles gets suppressed (because of the weak-coupling scaling) so that time-evolution by (4.130) yields

$$\rho(q, t) = \prod_{i=1}^N \rho(\mathbf{q}_i, t), \quad (4.135)$$

---

<sup>10</sup>Although we will not give a rigorous mathematical proof of this conjecture, we will see later in this section that the conjecture is corroborated by another large  $N$  argument that does have a rigorous mathematical justification. Specifically, the large  $N$  limit prescription that leads from the quantum  $N$ -body problem to the mean-field Schrödinger-Poisson equation that approximates a system of  $N$  quantum particles weakly interacting by  $1/r$  (e.g., Newtonian or Coulomb) potentials [270, 271, 272, 48, 248, 258].

and time-evolution by (4.127) yields

$$S(q, t) = \sum_{i=1}^N S(\mathbf{q}_i, t), \quad (4.136)$$

where  $\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)$  satisfies

$$\partial_t \rho(\mathbf{q}, t) = -\nabla \cdot \left( \frac{\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)}{m} \rho(\mathbf{q}, t) \right), \quad (4.137)$$

and  $S(\mathbf{q}, t)$  satisfies

$$-\partial_t S(\mathbf{q}, t) = \frac{[\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)]^2}{2m} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} m \Phi(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}') \rho(\mathbf{q}', t) d^3 \mathbf{q}' - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2 \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}}, \quad (4.138)$$

along with

$$\oint_L \nabla S \cdot d\mathbf{q} = nh. \quad (4.139)$$

Although  $S(\mathbf{q}, t)$  and  $\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)$  look formally like single-particle variables, they are, in fact, collective variables in a mean-field description of the exact many-body description given by (4.127-129) with (4.130) and (4.133). In particular,  $\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)$  has the physical meaning of the density of *zbw* particles of mass  $m$  occupying position  $\mathbf{q}$  at time  $t$ . Similarly,  $S(\mathbf{q}, t)$  is the *zbw* phase of a *zbw* particle at  $\mathbf{q}$  at time  $t$ . Accordingly, the last term on the right side of (4.138) is the quantum kinetic energy of a *zbw* particle at  $\mathbf{q}$  at  $t$ , and

$$V_g^{m.f.}(\mathbf{q}, t) = m \Phi_g^{m.f.}(\mathbf{q}, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} m \Phi(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}') \rho(\mathbf{q}', t) d^3 \mathbf{q}' \quad (4.140)$$

is the mean-field gravitational potential energy of the *zbw* particle at  $\mathbf{q}$  at  $t$ , where  $\Phi$  is the elementary potential given by (4.115) and  $\Phi_g^{m.f.}$  satisfies the Poisson equation

$$\nabla^2 \Phi_g^{m.f.} = 4\pi m \rho(\mathbf{q}, t). \quad (4.141)$$

It is worth observing that (4.137) can also be viewed as the position-space projection of the modified Vlasov equation

$$\partial_t f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t) + \frac{\mathbf{p}}{m} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{q}} f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t) + \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{q}, t) \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t) = 0, \quad (4.142)$$

#### 4.4 Schrödinger-Newton/Coulomb equations as mean-field theories

where the initial phase-space density is defined by  $f_0(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) := \rho_0(\mathbf{q})\delta^3[\mathbf{p} - \nabla S_0(\mathbf{q})]$  and

$$\begin{aligned} f_0(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) &:= \rho_0(\mathbf{q})\delta^3[\mathbf{p} - \nabla S_0(\mathbf{q})] \\ &\quad \Downarrow \\ f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t) &= \rho(\mathbf{q}, t)\delta^3[\mathbf{p} - \nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)], \end{aligned} \quad (4.143)$$

due time-evolution by (4.137), along with the normalization

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho(\mathbf{q}, t) d^3 \mathbf{q} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t) d^3 \mathbf{q} d^3 \mathbf{p} = N. \quad (4.144)$$

From (4.143) it follows that the position-space projection of a *zbw* particle's 3-momentum  $\mathbf{p}$  at position  $\mathbf{q}$  yields

$$\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q}, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{\mathbf{p} f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t) d^3 \mathbf{p}}{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)} = \nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t) \quad (4.145)$$

for all times, where  $\rho = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} f d^3 \mathbf{p}$ . The force term in (4.142) is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{q}, t) &:= -\nabla_{\mathbf{q}} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} m \Phi(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}') f(\mathbf{q}', \mathbf{p}, t) d^3 \mathbf{p} d^3 \mathbf{q} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2 \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}} \right] \\ &= -\nabla_{\mathbf{q}} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} m \Phi(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}') \rho(\mathbf{q}', t) d^3 \mathbf{q}' - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2 \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4.146)$$

and has the physical interpretation of the net force on a *zbw* particle at  $\mathbf{q}$  at  $t$ , due to spatial gradients of the mean-field gravitational potential energy *and* quantum kinetic energy of the *zbw* particle at  $\mathbf{q}$  at  $t$ . Correspondingly, it can be readily confirmed that the momentum-space projection of (4.142), in conjunction with  $f(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}, t) = \rho(\mathbf{q}, t)\delta^3[\mathbf{p} - \nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)]$ , yields <sup>11</sup>

$$\partial_t \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q}, t) + \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}, t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q}, t) = -\nabla_{\mathbf{q}} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} m \Phi(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}') \rho(\mathbf{q}', t) d^3 \mathbf{q}' - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2 \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}} \right]. \quad (4.147)$$

Now, applying the Madelung transformation to (4.137-139) yields the mean-field nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar \partial_t \chi(\mathbf{q}, t) = \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 - \int d^3 \mathbf{q}' \frac{m^2 |\chi(\mathbf{q}', t)|^2}{|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}'|} \right) \chi(\mathbf{q}, t), \quad (4.148)$$

---

<sup>11</sup>It is readily confirmed that the pressure tensor arising from the momentum-space projection of (4.142) vanishes, because of the delta function distribution in momentum in the definition of  $f$ .

with corresponding Poisson equation

$$\nabla^2 \Phi_g^{m.f.} = 4\pi m |\chi(\mathbf{q}, t)|^2, \quad (4.149)$$

where  $\chi(\mathbf{q}, t) = \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)} e^{iS(\mathbf{q}, t)/\hbar}$ . Here, the mean-field wavefunction is, like the classical mean-field wavefunction, a collective variable describing the evolution of a large number of identical *zbw* particles that weakly interact gravitationally. We note that, this time, the set (4.148-149) formally looks *exactly* like the single-body SN equations, but with the very different physical meaning as a mean-field approximation in the sense just explained. Similarly, if we had started with the description of  $N$  identical charged *zbw* particles interacting electrostatically, with QHJ equation (4.127) under the replacement  $V_g^{int} \rightarrow V_c^{int}$ , then by taking the large  $N$  limit as prescribed above, we would get a nonlinear Schrödinger-Coulomb system identical to (4.148-149) with  $-e$  replacing  $m$ .

Note that when the quantum kinetic and its first  $\nabla_{\mathbf{q}}$  are negligible relative to the mean-field gravitational potential energy and mean gravitational force, (4.148) effectively becomes the classical nonlinear Schrödinger equation (4.125), since (4.138) effectively becomes (4.124). This observation seems to suggest a ‘quantum-classical’ correspondence between the Hamilton-Jacobi case of the classical Vlasov-Poisson mean-field theory for a collisionless gas or plasma of non-relativistic interacting particles, and the mean-field approximation for  $N$ -particle ZSM-Newton/Coulomb. However, such a correspondence is only formal; we will later see that the reliability of (4.148-149), as a mean-field approximation, breaks down for macroscopic superposition states.

To confirm the validity of our mean-field approximation proposal for ZSM-Newton/Coulomb, let us reconsider the dilute gas of  $N$  identical ZSM particles interacting through Newtonian gravitational forces, but starting our description from the Schrödinger equation (4.84) (minus the rest-energy terms and the Coulomb potential) with weak-coupling scaling:

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi(q, t)}{\partial t} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{N} \frac{m \hat{\Phi}_g(\hat{\mathbf{q}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{q}}_j)}{2} \right] \psi(q, t), \quad (4.150)$$

where

$$\nabla^2 \hat{\Phi}_g = 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^N m \delta^3(\mathbf{q} - \hat{\mathbf{q}}_i) \quad (4.151)$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} |\psi(q, 0)|^2 d^{3N} \mathbf{q} = 1. \quad (4.152)$$

#### 4.4 Schrödinger-Newton/Coulomb equations as mean-field theories

Supposing all the particles are in the same single-particle pure state  $\chi(\mathbf{q})$  at  $t = 0$ , we can make the “Hartree ansatz”

$$\psi(q, 0) = \prod_{i=1}^N \chi(\mathbf{q}_i, 0), \quad (4.153)$$

where the  $\chi(\mathbf{q}_i, 0)$  are identical. Then, as shown by Golse [272] and Bardos et al. [270, 271], in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , the generation of correlations between particles in time indeed gets suppressed (in the quantum BBGKY hierarchy corresponding to (4.150-153)), and the time-dependent function  $\chi(\mathbf{q}, t)$  satisfies (4.148-149). Likewise for the electrostatic analogues of (4.150-151). Furthermore, we note that (4.150-151) is equivalent to (4.127-134) by virtue of the Madelung transformation. Presumably, then, there exists a Madelung BBGKY hierarchy corresponding to (4.127-134), for which one can rigorously prove that in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$  the mean-field Madelung equations (4.137-141) are recovered. We are unaware of such a proof in the mathematical physics literature, however.

Now, as a separate point, we can use the solution of (4.148-149) to calculate the mean trajectory of a *zbw* particle at position  $\mathbf{q}$  through the equations of motion

$$\frac{d\mathbf{Q}(t)}{dt} = \frac{\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)}{m} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)} = \frac{\hbar}{m} \text{Im} \frac{\nabla \chi(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\chi(\mathbf{q}, t)} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)}, \quad (4.154)$$

$$\begin{aligned} m \frac{d^2 \mathbf{Q}(t)}{dt^2} &= \left[ \partial_t \nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t) + \frac{\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)}{m} \cdot \nabla (\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)) \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)} \\ &= -\nabla \left[ m \Phi_g^{m.f.}(\mathbf{q}, t) - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\nabla^2 \sqrt{|\chi(\mathbf{q}, t)|}}{\sqrt{|\chi(\mathbf{q}, t)|}} \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{Q}(t)}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.155)$$

as well as the forward/backward stochastic trajectory through the stochastic equations of motion

$$d\mathbf{q}(t) = \left[ \frac{\hbar}{m} \text{Im} \frac{\nabla \chi(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\chi(\mathbf{q}, t)} + \frac{\hbar}{m} \text{Re} \frac{\nabla \chi(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\chi(\mathbf{q}, t)} \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} dt + d\mathbf{W}(t), \quad (4.156)$$

$$d\mathbf{q}(t) = \left[ \frac{\hbar}{m} \text{Im} \frac{\nabla \chi(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\chi(\mathbf{q}, t)} - \frac{\hbar}{m} \text{Re} \frac{\nabla \chi(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\chi(\mathbf{q}, t)} \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} dt + d\mathbf{W}_*(t). \quad (4.157)$$

Considering that (4.148-149) is the leading-order large  $N$  approximation to (4.150-153), trajectories calculated from (4.154-157) are expected to only very roughly agree with the exact trajectories calculated using the solutions of (4.150-151), whether for a dilute gas or plasma of identical *zbw* particles. Of course, in practice, it is impossible to show this explicitly as it is a non-trivial problem to numerically solve the system (4.150-151), even for just two particles.

Nonetheless, we can improve the mean-field approximation to (4.150-153) by including the next-order terms in the large  $N$  limit. This will be shown by us in full detail in [258], but the general reasoning can be sketched as follows: (i) take the Newtonian limit of the Einstein-Langevin equation of semiclassical stochastic Einstein gravity [222], (ii) describe the time evolution of a bosonic quantum matter field coupled to the Newtonian-limited Einstein-Langevin equation via the Heisenberg operator equation of motion, and (iii) take the large  $N$  limit so as to justify replacing the quantum operators in the Heisenberg equation of motion by their quantum expectation values with respect to a coherent state. The result is the ‘mean-field stochastic SN equations’

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \chi(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} = \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 + m \tilde{\Phi}_g^{m.f.} \right] \chi(\mathbf{q}, t), \quad (4.158)$$

$$\nabla^2 \tilde{\Phi}_g^{m.f.} = 4\pi \left[ m |\chi(\mathbf{q}, t)|^2 + \frac{\xi(\mathbf{q}, t)}{2c^2} \right], \quad (4.159)$$

$$\langle \xi(\mathbf{q}, t) \rangle_s = 0, \quad \langle \xi(\mathbf{q}_A, t_A) \xi(\mathbf{q}_B, t_B) \rangle_s = N(\mathbf{q}_A, \mathbf{q}_B; t_A, t_B), \quad (4.160)$$

$$N(\mathbf{q}_A, \mathbf{q}_B; t_A, t_B) := \text{Re} \left\{ m^2 c^4 \chi^*(\mathbf{q}_A, t_A) \chi(\mathbf{q}_B, t_B) \delta^3(\mathbf{q}_A - \mathbf{q}_B) \delta(t_A - t_B) - m^2 c^4 |\chi(\mathbf{q}_A, t_A)|^2 |\chi(\mathbf{q}_B, t_B)|^2 \right\}. \quad (4.161)$$

The bilocal field  $N(\mathbf{q}_A, \mathbf{q}_B; t_A, t_B)$  is known as the “noise kernel”, and essentially serves as a measure of small (i.e., Gaussian) quantum fluctuations of the mass-energy density of the  $N$ -particle system, as described by (4.160-161), between two nearby space-time points  $\{\mathbf{q}_A, t_A\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{q}_B, t_B\}$ . (Technically, the noise kernel defined by (4.160-161) is divergent due to the spatial delta function. This can be remedied by replacing the delta function with a smearing function [48, 249], but for our purposes this detail is inessential.) Furthermore, the noise kernel plays the role of the diffusion coefficient for the classical stochastic (colored) noise field  $\xi(\mathbf{q}, t)$  (where  $\langle \dots \rangle_s$  refers to the statistical average), the latter of which phenomenologically models the back-reaction of the quantum fluctuations on the gravitational field via  $\Phi_g^{m.f.+}$ .<sup>12</sup> In other words, the noise field in (4.159) reincorporates the quantum coherence of the gravitational potential to first-order in the large  $N$  approximation. To see this last point more explicitly, we can observe that the stochastic correction to  $\Phi_g^{m.f.}$

$$\Phi_g^s(\mathbf{q}, t) := -\frac{1}{c^2} \int d^3 \mathbf{q}' \frac{\xi(\mathbf{q}', t)}{2|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}'|}, \quad (4.162)$$

---

<sup>12</sup>The fact that the noise field is colored instead of white implies that  $\xi(\mathbf{q}, t)$  is a smooth function, which further implies that solutions of (4.158-159) are smooth functions.

is known [222] to formally reproduce the symmetrized two-point correlation function for the quantized (q-number) gravitational potential:<sup>13</sup>

$$\langle \Phi_g^s(\mathbf{q}_A, t_A) \Phi_g^s(\mathbf{q}_B, t_B) \rangle_s = \frac{1}{2} \langle \chi | \left\{ \hat{\Phi}_g(\mathbf{q}_A, t_A), \hat{\Phi}_g(\mathbf{q}_B, t_B) \right\} | \chi \rangle. \quad (4.163)$$

We say “formally” because the non-linear evolution (4.158-159) implies failure of the Born-rule interpretation for  $\chi$ . Thus the ‘expectation value’ of the right hand side of (4.163) cannot be understood as the standard quantum expectation value. However, since  $\chi$  does have a consistent stochastic mechanical statistical interpretation (namely,  $|\chi|^2$  corresponds to the number density of *zbw* particles at 3-space point  $\mathbf{q}$  at time  $t$ ), we can ascribe a stochastic mechanical statistical interpretation to the right hand side of (4.163), in the sense that it is equivalent (by the Madelung transformation) to the stochastic mechanical correlation function:

$$\langle \chi | \left\{ \hat{\Phi}_g(\mathbf{q}_A, t_A), \hat{\Phi}_g(\mathbf{q}_B, t_B) \right\} | \chi \rangle = 2 \int_{-\infty}^t dt_B \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d^3\mathbf{q}_B \rho(\mathbf{q}_B, t_B) \Phi_g(\mathbf{q}_A, t_A) \Phi_g(\mathbf{q}_B, t_B), \quad (4.164)$$

where  $\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}_A, t_A)$  and  $\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}_B, t_B)$  are solutions of the mean-trajectory Poisson equation (4.90).

Accordingly, if we use a solution of (4.158) in (4.154-157), the resulting trajectories should slightly better approximate the exact trajectories obtained from using the solutions of (4.150) for very large but finite  $N$ . Note that with a solution of (4.158), the trajectories constructed from integrating (4.154-155) contain classical (non-Markovian) stochastic fluctuations through the stochasticity of the solution of (4.158). On the other hand, the trajectories constructed from integrating (4.156-157) contain classical stochastic fluctuations through the solution of (4.158) *and* the (Markovian) stochasticity encoded in the Wiener process  $d\mathbf{W}$  ( $d\mathbf{W}_*$ ). Note, also, that even though (4.158-161) are formulated for the case of a dilute system of gravitationally interacting particles, they can also be applied to dilute systems of electrostatically interacting

---

<sup>13</sup>Equation (4.163) is deduced as follows. Start from the equality  $2 \langle h_{ab}(x_A) h_{cd}(x_B) \rangle_s = \langle \Psi | \left\{ \hat{h}_{ab}(x_A), \hat{h}_{cd}(x_B) \right\} | \Psi \rangle$ , where  $h_{ab}(x_A)$  is the classical stochastic metric perturbation at spacetime point  $x_A$  satisfying the regularized Einstein-Langevin equation (see equation (3.14) of [222]),  $\hat{h}_{ab}(x_A)$  is the quantum metric perturbation operator in the theory of perturbatively quantized gravity (which is equivalent to the weak-field limit of covariant path integral quantum gravity), and  $|\Psi\rangle$  is the quantum state for a quantum field  $\hat{\phi}(x)$  in the large  $N$  expansion of covariant path integral quantum gravity [215, 221, 222]. Implement the Newtonian limit by assuming  $v \ll c$ ,  $g_{ab} = \eta_{ab} + \delta\eta_{ab}$ , and  $1 \gg |T_{00}|/|T_{ij}|$ ; thus  $\Phi_g^s := \frac{1}{2}\hat{h}_{00}$  and  $\hat{\Phi}_g := \frac{1}{2}\hat{h}_{00}$ . Finally, take  $|\Psi\rangle$  to correspond to a coherent state with the complex field eigenvalue  $\chi$  [258]. (We will show in [258] that taking  $|\Psi\rangle$  to be a coherent state is equivalent to applying the Hartree ansatz to the many-body wavefunction  $\psi$  of the exact Newtonian quantized-gravitational level of description, and then taking the large  $N$  limit.) The result is (4.163).

particles, simply by replacing  $m\tilde{\Phi}_g^{m.f.} \rightarrow e\tilde{\Phi}_c^{m.f.}$  in (4.158-159), which implies the replacements  $\xi/c^2 \rightarrow -\xi/c$  in (4.159) and  $m^2c^4 \rightarrow e^2c^2$  in (4.159) and (4.161). Then the ‘stochastic mean-field Schrödinger-Coulomb equations’ provide a next-order correction to the large  $N$  limit of the electrostatic analogue of (4.158-159), and thereby partially reincorporate the quantum coherence of the  $N$ -particle electrostatic potential operator. (Presumably (4.163) holds in the electrostatic case as well, when we replace  $\Phi_g^s \rightarrow \Phi_c^s$  and  $\hat{\Phi}_g \rightarrow \hat{\Phi}_c$ , but this has yet to be explicitly shown.)

Finally, let us comment on the limitations of the mean-field approximations considered here.

First, the large  $N$  limit leading to (4.137-139) or (4.148-149) is only applicable when the inter-particle interactions are sufficiently weak that the independent-particle approximation is plausible. Some example applications of (4.148-149) to self-gravitating  $N$ -particle systems that conform reasonably well to the independent-particle approximation, are boson stars [285, 233, 286] and (when one includes short-range interactions between particles) Bose-Einstein condensates [287, 288]; for electrostatically self-interacting  $N$ -particle systems, the electrostatic analogue of (4.148-149) is widely used in condensed matter physics to model ‘jellium’ (i.e., homogeneous electron gas) systems [289, 290]. On the other hand, for strongly interacting  $N$ -particle systems such as (say) superconducting microspheres [259, 255, 253, 49], the independent-particle approximation is a poor one and the deterministic or stochastic SN/SC equations cannot be used.

Second, even for dilute  $N$ -particle systems, such as considered above, the mean-field approximations provided by (4.148-149) and (4.158-161) become empirically inadequate for calculating the gravitational force on an external (macroscopic or mesoscopic or microscopic) probe mass, when quantum fluctuations of the mass-energy density of the  $N$ -particle system become too large. As an example, for the dilute system of  $N$  gravitationally interacting ZSM particles, with total mass  $M = Nm$ , suppose that the solution of (4.148) or (4.158) takes the form of a Schrödinger cat state. In particular, an equal-weighted superposition of two identical Gaussian packets of width  $\sigma$ , where one is peaked at spatial location  $\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{L}$ , the other at  $-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{L}$ , with  $|\mathbf{L}| \gg \sigma$  and both packets having zero mean momentum:

$$\chi_{cat}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [\chi_{left}(\mathbf{x}) + \chi_{right}(\mathbf{x})] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{3/4}} \left[ e^{-\frac{(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{L}/2)^2}{4\sigma^2}} + e^{-\frac{(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{L}/2)^2}{4\sigma^2}} \right]. \quad (4.165)$$

Then the Poisson equation for the mass density corresponding to (4.149) or (4.159) takes the form

$$\nabla^2 \Phi_g^{m.f.} = 4\pi M |\chi(\mathbf{x})|^2 = 4\pi \left[ \frac{M}{2} |\chi_{left}|^2 + \frac{M}{2} |\chi_{right}|^2 \right], \quad (4.166)$$



#### 4.4 Schrödinger-Newton/Coulomb equations as mean-field theories

or

$$\nabla^2 \tilde{\Phi}_g^{m.f.} = 4\pi M |\chi(\mathbf{x})|^2 = 4\pi \left[ \frac{M}{2} |\chi_{left}|^2 + \frac{M}{2} |\chi_{right}|^2 + \frac{\xi(\mathbf{x}, 0)}{2c^2} \right], \quad (4.167)$$

with

$$\langle \xi(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle_s = 0, \quad \langle \xi(\mathbf{x}_A, t_A) \xi(\mathbf{x}_B, t_B) \rangle_s = N(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_B; t_A, t_B), \quad (4.168)$$

$$N(\mathbf{x}_A, \mathbf{x}_B; t_A, t_B) = \text{Re} \left\{ M^2 c^4 \chi_{cat}^*(\mathbf{x}_A, t_A) \chi_{cat}(\mathbf{x}_B, t_B) \delta^3(\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_B) \delta(t_A - t_B) - M^2 c^4 |\chi_{cat}(\mathbf{x}_B, t_B)|^2 |\chi_{cat}(\mathbf{x}_A, t_A)|^2 \right\}. \quad (4.169)$$

If the spatial separation between the two Gaussians is macroscopic, e.g.,  $\mathbf{L} = 1m$ , and if  $M = 1,000kg$ , then the classical gravitational field produced by (4.166) or (4.167-169) is totally unrealistic. For example, a probe corresponding to a macroscopic test mass passing through the mid-point of the two mass distributions will, according to (4.166), go undeflected, or, according to (4.167-169), will oscillate in between the two mass distributions before passing through with no mean deflection (because of the Gaussian property of the noise field). Both predictions are in stark contrast to what the exact  $N$ -particle description (4.150-151) would predict if  $\psi(q)$  takes the form of (4.165) and one applies the textbook quantum measurement postulates [137, 273] or the stochastic mechanical theory of measurement [40, 30, 31, 32, 33]; namely, that the test mass will either deflect towards the left mass distribution or the right mass distribution, with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$  each.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, apart from the fact that the solutions of (4.166) or (4.167-169) don't have consistent Born-rule interpretations [236, 238, 224, 50, 257], the stochastic mechanical statistical interpretation of the solutions of (4.166) or (4.167-169) doesn't predict a probed gravitational field that's any more consistent with the prediction obtained from (4.150-151). And, of course, all these issues with cat states apply as well in the electrostatic case.

As we will see in Part II, the limitations of the mean-field approximations considered above can be circumvented by employing a center-of-mass description of a large  $N$  system of ZSM-Newton/Coulomb particles. But next let us compare ZSM-Newton/Coulomb, developed thus far, to other semiclassical theories.

---

<sup>14</sup>Of course, the stochastic SN equations (and the Einstein-Langevin equation more generally) are formulated to handle only dilute  $N$ -particle systems with small quantum fluctuations in the matter sector. Cat state solutions clearly fall out of this regime, so it is not surprising that the stochastic SN equations make an empirically inadequate prediction in this case. In order to extend the stochastic SN equations to the case of non-Gaussian fluctuations, we would (presumably) need to incorporate into (4.158-159) the quantum coherence of the full  $n$ -point correlation function involving  $\hat{\Phi}_g$ , in terms of some suitable generalization of the noise kernel. This remains an open problem [222, 291, 258].

## 4.5 Comparison to other semiclassical Newtonian field theories

Here we compare ZSM-Newton/Coulomb, developed thus far, to other semiclassical Newtonian field theories proposed in the literature. In particular, we highlight conceptual advantages of the ZSM-Newton/Coulomb approach and possibilities for experimental discrimination.

### 4.5.1 Comparison to non-hidden-variable approaches

Anastopoulos and Hu (AH) [48] have shown that the mean-field SN equations (4.148-149) can be derived from the standard quantum field theoretic description of a scalar matter field interacting with perturbatively quantized gravity (hereafter PQG): simply take the Newtonian limit of PQG to obtain the  $N$ -particle Schrödinger equation (4.84), consider the case of weakly-coupled systems of identical particles, then apply the large  $N$  limit (as we did in (4.150-153)). Complementing their analysis, we will show in [258] that the mean-field SN equations follow from standard semiclassical Einstein gravity (SCEG) [222, 224, 48], under the following prescription: (i) take the Newtonian limit of the semiclassical Einstein equation (see (4.173) below) to obtain the Poisson equation with the quantum expectation value of the mass density operator as a source; (ii) describe the time evolution of a bosonic quantum matter field coupled to the Poisson equation via the Heisenberg equation of motion; and (iii) assume the large  $N$  limit so as to justify replacing the quantum operators in the Heisenberg equation of motion by their quantum expectation values with respect to a coherent state.

Likewise AH have shown [48] that the mean-field SC equations follow from standard relativistic QED: take the non-relativistic limit, consider a weakly-coupled system of identical particles, then take the large  $N$  limit. As with the gravitational case, we will also show in [258] that the mean-field SC equations follow from analogously applying steps (i-iii) to standard semiclassical relativistic electrodynamics (SCRED).<sup>15</sup>

Thus for weakly-coupled systems of identical particles, the large  $N$  limit scheme used in ZSM-Newton/Coulomb can also be employed in Newtonian PQG/QED; and in both cases one recovers the mean-field SN/SC equations. These results also agree with the Newtonian limits of SCEG and SCRED, when the latter are interpreted as mean-field theories for weakly-coupled systems of identical particles.

---

<sup>15</sup>The semiclassical Maxwell equation of SCRED is given by  $\nabla_\mu F^{\mu\nu} = \langle \psi | \hat{J}^\nu | \psi \rangle$ , where  $\hat{J}^\nu$  is the charge four-current operator,  $|\psi\rangle$  is some state-vector, and  $\nabla_\mu$  is the covariant derivative in case the background spacetime is curved. Taking the non-relativistic limit to obtain the semiclassical Poisson equation, describing the time evolution of a bosonic quantum matter field coupled to the semiclassical Poisson equation via the Heisenberg equation of motion, and assuming the large  $N$  limit so that the quantum operators in the Heisenberg equation of motion can be replaced by their quantum expectation values with respect to a coherent state, one obtains the mean-field SC system [258].

#### 4.5 Comparison to other semiclassical Newtonian field theories

It is notable that these correspondences follow despite ZSM-Newton/Coulomb treating the gravitational/Coulomb potentials as fundamentally classical fields sourced by point-like classical particles undergoing non-classical motions in 3-space. In this respect, the ZSM approach is unique among existing formulations of quantum theory that have been extended to fundamentally-semiclassical gravity or electrodynamics.

For example, it is well known [229, 234, 237, 50, 48, 248, 247, 251, 258] that if one formulates fundamentally-semiclassical gravity based on the equations of either standard non-relativistic quantum mechanics [229, 234, 237, 50, 48, 248, 247, 251, 258] or non-relativistic many-worlds interpretations [245, 50], one obtains the  $N$ -body SN equations

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi(q, t)}{\partial t} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} + \frac{m_i \Phi_g^{SN}}{2} \right] \psi(q, t), \quad (4.170)$$

and

$$\nabla^2 \Phi_g^{SN} = 4\pi m(\mathbf{q}, t) = 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^N \int d^3 \mathbf{r}_1 \dots d^3 \mathbf{r}_N |\psi(\mathbf{r}_1 \dots \mathbf{r}_N, t)|^2 m_i \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{r}_i), \quad (4.171)$$

where

$$\Phi_g^{SN} = - \sum_{j=1}^{N(j \neq i)} \int \frac{m_j(\mathbf{q}'_j, t)}{|\mathbf{q}_i - \mathbf{q}'_j|} d^3 \mathbf{q}'_1 \dots d^3 \mathbf{q}'_N. \quad (4.172)$$

It is also well-known [50, 48, 248, 247, 258] that (4.170-171) can be obtained from the Newtonian limit of the semiclassical Einstein equation

$$G_{nm} = \kappa \langle \psi | \hat{T}_{nm} | \psi \rangle, \quad (4.173)$$

if one naively assumes that (4.173) is valid even when  $\psi$  is a single-particle wavefunction, whether in a standard quantum theory reading or a many-worlds interpretation (re: the latter context, see [214, 245, 50]). However, like the mean-field SN equations, the solutions of (4.170-171) lack consistent Born-rule interpretations [236, 238, 224, 50, 257] and include the macroscopic gravitational cat states discussed in section 4. In other words, attempting to formulate fundamentally-semiclassical gravity, based on either standard quantum theory or many-worlds interpretations, results in a nonlinear classical-gravitational field theory that makes absurd empirical predictions. As another example, it was shown in [50, 49] that the  $N$ -body SN equations (with stochastic corrections to dynamically induce intermittent wavefunction collapse) arise naturally when one extends the GRW, CSL, and DP theories to fundamentally-

semiclassical gravity with a matter density ontology (called GRWmN, CSLmN, and DPmN, respectively). In contrast to SQM-Newton (where SQM = standard quantum mechanics) and MW-Newton (where MW = many worlds), GRWmN/CSLmN/DPmN have been shown to adequately suppress the empirically problematic macroscopic gravitational cat states while also having consistent statistical interpretations for pure states [50, 49]. Thus, these dynamical collapse theories of fundamentally-semiclassical Newtonian gravity are empirically viable. At the same time, these dynamical collapse theories also make slightly different empirical predictions from the Newtonian large  $N$  limit of PQG and SCEG; and given the empirical equivalence between Newtonian-large- $N$  PQG and SCEG, and  $N$ -particle ZSM-Newton (when the nonlinear terms of the latter are neglected), it will also be the case that these dynamical collapse theories make slightly different empirical predictions from  $N$ -particle ZSM-Newton (see [49] for further elaboration on this point). These slight differences in empirical predictions are entailed by the collapse-inducing stochastic correction terms, and the fact that these dynamical collapse theories still allow for stable gravitational cat states in a mesoscopic regime of masses [50, 49]. The slightly different empirical predictions of these collapse theories in the semiclassical-gravitational context may be testable by the next (or next-next) generation of state-of-the-art AMO experiments, as argued by us in [253, 49].

As yet another example, the Tilloy-Diósi (TD) model of fundamentally-semiclassical gravity makes use of the flash ontology within CSL or DP dynamics, to describe fundamentally-semiclassical Newtonian gravitational interactions between  $N$  particles, with no nonlinear feedback from the wavefunction [51, 52]. (One can also make a GRW analogue of the TD model, as pointed out by us in [50].) TD's (stochastic) analogue of the SN equations reads

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d|\psi\rangle}{dt} = & -\frac{i}{\hbar} \left( \hat{H} + \hat{V}_G \right) |\psi\rangle \\ & - \frac{1}{8\pi\hbar G} \int d\mathbf{r} \left( \nabla \hat{\Phi}(\mathbf{r}) - \langle \nabla \hat{\Phi}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle \right)^2 |\psi\rangle \\ & - \hbar(1+i) \int d\mathbf{r} \left( \hat{\Phi}(\mathbf{r}) - \langle \nabla \hat{\Phi}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle \right) \delta\rho(\mathbf{r}) |\psi\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (4.174)$$

up to a fixed spatial cut-off  $\sigma$ . Here the potential  $\hat{V}_G$  represents the usual Newtonian gravitational potential operator, while the non-Hermitian terms on the right give rise to decoherence and collapse of spatial superpositions of a massive particle. As shown by TD [51, 52], their model adequately suppresses macroscopic gravitational cat states and has a consistent statistical interpretation. By virtue of the non-Hermitian terms in (4.174), the TD model also makes slightly different predictions from both Newtonian-limited PQG and ZSM-Newton. These differences might also be testable by the next (or next-next) generation of state-of-the-art AMO

#### 4.5 Comparison to other semiclassical Newtonian field theories

experiments [49]. A notable difference between the TD model and ZSM-Newton is that the former predicts point-like mass distributions (which source the classical gravitational field) that discontinuously appear and disappear in space-time, because the flash ontology is used as the means of defining the mass density sources (we have previously made this point in regards to a GRW analogue of the TD model [50]); by contrast, the mass density sources in ZSM-Newton (the *zbw* particles) involve no such discontinuities. Another notable difference is that whereas the density operator corresponding to the solution (4.174) evolves by a linear master equation (thus retaining the usual statistical interpretation of mixtures of density operators and not allowing for superluminal signaling) [51, 52], the von-Neumann-Liouville equation corresponding to the nonlinear ZSM-Newton Schrödinger equation (4.101) will clearly be nonlinear, as will the master equation for a reduced density matrix obtained from performing a partial trace of the pure-state density matrix evolving by the aforementioned nonlinear von-Neumann-Liouville equation. This means that the nonlinear ZSM-Newton master equation will violate the interchangeability of mixing and evolution required to sustain the usual statistical interpretation of mixtures of density operators [257]. One would then have to rely on ‘conditional wave functions’ [10, 106, 27, 29] (see section 5.2.2 of the present paper for examples) and ‘conditional density matrices’ [292, 10, 293] in order to describe the dynamics of sub-systems of a ZSM-Newton system described by (4.101) or its  $N$ -particle generalization, and to extract statistical predictions for those sub-systems (assuming that a stochastic mechanical theory of measurement can be developed consistent with solutions of (4.101) and solutions of the corresponding nonlinear von-Neumann-Liouville equation). Since both the conditional wave function, defined from the solution of (4.101), and the conditional density matrix, defined from the solution of the nonlinear von-Neumann-Liouville equation corresponding to (4.101), have nonlinear evolutions, it is expected that statistical predictions extracted for entangled sub-systems will include superluminal signaling, assuming that the stochastic mechanical theory of measurement consistent with solutions of (4.101) reproduces the usual collapse phenomenology (as is required by Gisin’s theorem) [281, 67]. Showing this explicitly remains a task for future work.

Concerning theories of fundamentally-semiclassical electrodynamics, perhaps the best-known is Asim Barut’s “self-field QED” [225, 226, 227, 228]. This theory takes the Schrödinger-Coulomb (SC) analogue of (4.170-171) (and its relativistic generalization, the Dirac-Maxwell system) as its starting point and purports to reproduce the self-energy effects of non-relativistic and relativistic QED to all orders of perturbation linear in  $\alpha$ . However, there are more basic predictions of the theory that were left (apparently) unaddressed by Barut and his co-workers, and which seem to make the theory empirically inadequate. First, just like the SN equations, the SC analogue of (4.170-171) does not have a consistent Born-rule interpretation, thereby preventing a naive application of the standard quantum measurement postulates. Second, also just like the SN equations, the SC equations admit macroscopic electrostatic cat states as solu-

tions (i.e., the electrostatic analogue of the cat state example discussed in section 4), and these solutions are clearly not seen in the real world (incidentally, this rules out the possibility of many-worlds interpretations based on the SC equations, since the worlds would electrostatically interact with one another even for macroscopic superpositions). Third, even if one attempts to add stochastic corrections to the SC equations in the form of GRW/CSL/DP, numerical simulations of the SC equations indicate that a free particle wavepacket would undergo Coulomb self-repulsion (from the nonlinear electrostatic self-interaction), and this self-repulsion effect would lead to maxima in the two-slit experiment much too broad to be in agreement with existing experimental data [294]. As an alternative formulation of fundamentally-semiclassical electrodynamics based on dynamical collapse theories, we might consider a straightforward electrostatic analogue of TD's equation (4.174). Presumably such a theory would be free of the problems entailed by the nonlinearity of the SC equations (just as (4.174) is free of the problems entailed by the nonlinearity of the SN equations, since the density operator corresponding to (4.174) has a linear master equation evolution [51, 52]), but this remains to be shown. In any case, it would appear that, in comparison to theories of fundamentally-semiclassical electrodynamics based on standard quantum mechanics, many-worlds interpretations, and dynamical collapse theories with matter density ontology, ZSM-Coulomb is the only one among these that's empirically viable (within its non-relativistic domain of validity) insofar as it's empirically equivalent to the Newtonian limits of standard QED and SCRED (modulo the tiny empirical differences entailed by the nonlinear correction terms (4.102-106) discussed in section 3).

### 4.5.2 Comparison to alternative hidden-variable approaches

Other formulations of stochastic mechanics exist besides ZSM [21, 61, 57, 41, 25, 26, 27]. Moreover, dBB pilot-wave theory is the most well-developed hidden-variables formulation of quantum theory to date. Do these other hidden-variables theories have consistent and empirically adequate extensions to semiclassical Newtonian field theories, whether in the form of fundamentally-semiclassical theories or semiclassical approximations? How do they compare and contrast to ZSM-Newton/Coulomb?

As mentioned in section 2, all non-ZSM formulations of stochastic mechanics are subject to Wallstrom's criticism [41, 25, 99, 67, 26, 27] - they are all empirically inadequate because they either allow for too many solutions or too few solutions, compared to the Schrödinger equation of standard quantum mechanics. For those formulations that allow too many solutions, one can always impose by hand the quantization condition needed in order to make the solution spaces of those formulations isomorphic to the solution space of standard quantum mechanics [41, 25, 99, 67, 26, 27]. This is, of course, an ad hoc move, but one might view it as provisional

## 4.5 Comparison to other semiclassical Newtonian field theories

until such a condition can be justified by some non-ZSM modification of said formulations of stochastic mechanics. In this case, the amended formulations of stochastic mechanics would result in exactly the same mathematical descriptions of Newtonian gravity and electrodynamics as we've found for ZSM, both at the exact (i.e.,  $N$ -particle Schrödinger equation) level and the level of the mean-field approximation schemes. (Differences would arise, however, in physically motivating the mean-field approximation, e.g., ansatz (4.120) in section 4; since the  $S$  function would not be interpretable as the phase of a periodic phenomenon localized to the stochastic mechanical particle, such an ansatz would have to be imposed ad hoc.)

Concerning semiclassical de Broglie-Bohm theories, let us consider the possibilities separately.

### Comparison to fundamentally-semiclassical de Broglie-Bohm theories

There is some ambiguity in how to construct a dBB-based theory of fundamentally-semiclassical Newtonian gravity (or electrodynamics). First, one has to make a choice about which version of dBB dynamics to consider, i.e., the 'first-order' version or 'second-order' version [113, 114, 279, 268, 10, 269, 105, 14] (the choice one makes could potentially make a difference in how one formulates a dBB-based theory of fundamentally-semiclassical Newtonian gravity or electrodynamics). Second, one has to make a choice about which part of the dBB ontology (depending on how it's interpreted) - the wavefunction or the particles or both - plays the role of the mass (or charge) density that sources the classical gravitational (or electromagnetic) field; as it turns out, for versions of dBB in which the wavefunction is part of the ontic variables, there is no compelling reason why the particles (as opposed to the wavefunction, or at the exclusion of the wavefunction) should be used to define the mass (charge) density source for the classical gravitational (electromagnetic) field, even though that might seem like a *prima facie* natural choice.

Let us consider this last point in more detail for the gravitational case first, under the first-order 'dual space' version of non-relativistic dBB [113, 114, 7, 268, 279, 14]. In other words, the version of dBB theory that posits an ontic 3N-dimensional configuration space, occupied by an ontic 'universal wavefunction'  $\psi(\mathbf{q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{q}_N, t)$ , and an ontic 3-dimensional space (existing completely independently of the configuration space) occupied by  $N$  (spinless) particles with configuration  $Q(t) = \{\mathbf{Q}_1(t), \dots, \mathbf{Q}_N(t)\}$ . The universal wavefunction<sup>16</sup> evolves by the

---

<sup>16</sup>The universal wavefunction is required to satisfy the usual boundary conditions of single-valuedness, smoothness, and finiteness.



Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \left[ - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 + V^{int} \right] \psi, \quad (4.175)$$

where  $V^{int}$  is some scalar interaction potential to be specified and we assume the normalization  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{3N}} |\psi|^2 d^{3N}q = 1$ . The particles evolve by the guiding equation

$$\frac{d\mathbf{Q}_i(t)}{dt} = \frac{\hbar}{m_i} \text{Im} \frac{\nabla_i \psi}{\psi} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{Q}_j(t)} = \frac{\nabla_i S}{m_i} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{Q}_j(t)}, \quad (4.176)$$

for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , where the  $\nabla S$  form follows if we write  $\psi = |\psi|e^{iS/\hbar}$ . In addition, we have “equivariance” [10, 105, 14], i.e., the statement that if the initial particle configuration of the dBB system is distributed as  $\rho_0 = |\psi_0|^2$ , then this “quantum equilibrium distribution” [10, 105, 14] is preserved under time-evolution by the quantum continuity equation implicit in (4.175). In other words, the quantum continuity equation implicit in (4.175) entails the map  $|\psi_0|^2 \rightarrow |\psi_t|^2$ .

Notice that both the wavefunction and the particles ‘feel’ the mass parameters  $\{m_1, \dots, m_N\}$ . More specifically, the time-evolution of  $\psi$  (at every point in configuration space) through (4.175) explicitly depends on all the mass parameters via the kinetic energy operators, while the evolution of  $\mathbf{Q}_i(t)$  depends explicitly on only  $m_i$  but implicitly on all the other mass parameters through the positions of all the other particles. The dependence of the evolution of  $\psi$  on the mass parameters is made even more manifest by starting from the  $N$ -particle Bohm-Dirac theory [172, 268], i.e., the most straightforward relativistic  $N$ -particle extension of (4.175-176), and then taking the non-relativistic limit; we would find that the positive-energy components of the Dirac spinor in the Bohm-Dirac theory evolve by a corrected version of (4.175), where the correction terms are rest-energy terms  $\sum_{i=1}^N m_i c^2$  in the Hamiltonian operator.

One might think that since a classical gravitational field lives (by definition!) in 3-space, and since only the particles live in 3-space, this is why the particles should be the (point) sources for the gravitational field. However, recall that the right hand side of (4.171) gives a natural definition of a 3-space mass density in terms of  $\psi$  in configuration space.

Consequently, it would seem that inertial mass is a property of both the wavefunction and the particles, and there seems to be no justification for assuming that the particles *must be used solely* as the mass density sources for a classical gravitational field, if one wants to make a fundamentally-semiclassical Newtonian gravitational theory out of the present version of dBB. Not only that, if one allows  $\psi$  to have properties such as energy density, momentum density,



## 4.5 Comparison to other semiclassical Newtonian field theories

etc., one can define the Hamiltonian density

$$\mathcal{H} = \psi^* \left[ - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 + V^{int} + m_i c^2 \right] \psi. \quad (4.177)$$

This Hamiltonian density has the physical interpretation of the energy density stored in the ontic wavefunction, and indicates that the rest-energy terms, hence the  $m_i$ , compose the total mass-energy density of the wavefunction in configuration space. To be sure, nothing in the first-order version of dBB or the dual space version thereof *requires* that  $\psi$  have additional properties like energy density; but nothing excludes these additional properties either. In any case, *if* one allows  $\psi$  to have properties like energy density, then the present version of dBB theory seems to make a compelling case for (at least) taking  $\psi$  to be the mass density source for the classical gravitational field.

Given that the dBB theory under consideration is ambiguous about which part of its ontology should be used (or is most natural to use) as the mass density source for a classical gravitational field, let us consider the empirical consequences of using either the wavefunction or the particles or both.

If  $\psi$  is used as a source, then the Poisson equation for the classical gravitational field takes the SN form (4.171), and the Schrödinger equation (4.175) takes the SN form (4.170). Because the SN system (4.170-171) predicts that the components of a macroscopic superposition of position wavefunctions gravitationally interact with one another, this means that the evolution of the dBB particle configuration occupying one component of the macroscopic superposition will be influenced by the classical gravitational field sourced by the matter density associated with the other components. This will lead to evolutions of the dBB configuration that grossly disagree with experience. (For example, the evolution of the dBB configuration of the sun would be influenced by the classical gravitational field produced by a sun-mass density corresponding to an empty wave packet corresponding to a macroscopically distinct alternative spatial location for the sun). So we must conclude that this version of fundamentally-semiclassical dBB Newtonian gravity (hereafter, dBBfsc-Newton1 where “fsc” = “fundamentally-semiclassical”) is not empirically viable.

If the particles are used as point sources, then the Poisson equation takes the form

$$\nabla^2 \Phi_g = 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^N m_i \delta^3(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{Q}_i(t)), \quad (4.178)$$

where the  $\mathbf{Q}_i(t)$  are solutions of the guiding equation (4.176) for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . The solution

of (4.169) then yields the inter-particle gravitational potential energy, which depends on the actual positions of all the dBB particles at a single time, and feeds back into the Schrödinger equation (4.175), giving

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \left[ -\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 + V_g^{int}(\mathbf{Q}_i(t), \mathbf{Q}_j(t)) \right] \psi, \quad (4.179)$$

where

$$V_g^{int}(\mathbf{Q}_i(t), \mathbf{Q}_j(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i \Phi_g}{2} = -\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N(j \neq i)} \frac{m_j}{|\mathbf{Q}_i(t) - \mathbf{Q}_j(t)|}. \quad (4.180)$$

This version of dBBfsc-Newton (dBBfsc-Newton2) was also considered by Struyve [266], who suggested that it might constitute a viable alternative to the SN equations. (Kiessling considered the electrostatic analogue in [267].) However, it is not yet clear what the empirical predictions are of the system (4.179-180). Since in dBBfsc-Newton2 the evolution of  $|\psi_t|^2$  depends on the actual positions of all the particles at each time, the equivariance property breaks down and the standard means of showing that dBB theory is empirically adequate cannot be applied. The reason is that the derivation of the standard quantum formalism from standard dBB relies on the equivariance of  $|\psi_t|^2$ ; but since equivariance can't even be formulated in dBBfsc-Newton2, it is no longer consistent to assume that the dBB particle configuration is  $|\psi_t|^2$  distributed.

More precisely, in standard dBB, typicality needs to be time-independent (for many reasons) and one needs to prove the law of large numbers for subsystems of a dBB universe (i.e., that an ensemble of  $N$  subsystems of a dBB universe, each with the same effective wavefunction, will have relative frequencies of configuration coordinates that converges to the  $|\psi_t|^2$  distribution as  $N$  becomes large). [112, 10] Equivariance is necessary to ensure the time-independence of typicality, and equivariance plays a crucial technical role in proving the law of large numbers. Without equivariance, typicality will not be time-independent and one cannot prove the law of large numbers for said subsystems.

Nevertheless, it has been suggested by Goldstein [Struyve, personal communication] that it should be possible to extract statistical predictions from (4.179-180) by another argument. The argument suggested is as follows: given a stationary measure on Hilbert space  $d\mu$ , then the measure  $d\mu|\psi_0|^2$  will be preserved by the dynamics on the product space of Hilbert space and configuration space. Therefore, starting with an ensemble of systems all with (approximately) the same effective wavefunction, it is natural to take  $|\psi_0|^2$  as the initial position distribution (although, as time evolves, it is expected that the position distribution will deviate from the

## 4.5 Comparison to other semiclassical Newtonian field theories

$|\psi_0|^2$  distribution, due to the nonlinear dynamics). Assuming this works, it is worth noting that the nonlinearity of (4.179) entails a break-down of the general validity of the superposition principle. That is, the nonlinear evolution for  $\psi$  means that a linear superposition of two solutions to (4.179) at the same space-time point does not in general form a new solution, i.e., the solution space of (4.179) doesn't form a linear space. (As exceptions,  $\psi_1 + \psi_2$  will be a solution of a nonlinear wave equation if either  $\psi_2 = a\psi_1$ , where  $a$  is a constant, or if  $\psi_1$  and  $\psi_2$  have no common support [6].) So, at the moment, it seems unclear how dBBfsc-Newton2 will be able to account for quantum phenomena that rely on the general validity of the superposition principle, e.g., electron two-slit (or N-slit) interference and decoherence of two-state systems. Perhaps it can be argued that, because of the small magnitude of the gravitational interaction energy in (4.179), relative to the kinetic energy term and any external potentials that might arise in a given physical situation, the nonlinear time-evolution of solutions of (4.179) will still closely approximate the time-evolution of solutions of the usual linear Schrödinger equation in the aforementioned situations. In any case, the empirical predictions dBBfsc-Newton2 remain to be worked out.

Using both the wavefunction and the particles as mass density sources for classical gravitational fields (dBBfsc-Newton3) would entail the same ambiguities as dBBfsc-Newton2, and (even worse) the same empirically-inadequate predictions of dBBfsc-Newton1 (involving gravitational interactions between components of a macroscopic superposition of position wavefunctions).

We must therefore conclude that there does not appear to be, at present, an empirically viable formulation of dBBfsc-Newton that's based on the first-order dual-space version of dBB. (By "empirically viable", we mean 'shown to be consistent with' or 'likely to be consistent with' existing non-relativistic quantum mechanical experiments.) Moreover, we do not see how to obtain an empirically viable formulation of dBBfsc-Newton using other versions of first-order dBB theory, whether Albert's 'world particle' formulation<sup>17</sup> [5], Norsen's TELB formulation<sup>18</sup> [38, 39], or Dürr-Goldstein-Zanghì's (and Vassallo et al.'s 'Quantum Humeanist' [17]) nomo-

---

<sup>17</sup>Albert's formulation takes as fundamental ontological postulates (i) configuration space  $\mathbb{R}^{3N}$ , (ii)  $\psi$  in configuration space evolving by the  $N$ -particle Schrödinger equation, the latter defined in terms of a Hamiltonian that includes an  $N$ -particle interaction potential  $\hat{V}^{int}(\hat{\mathbf{q}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{q}}_j)$  that's written in a preferred coordinate system, and (iii) a single configuration point (the world particle) in  $\mathbb{R}^{3N}$ , evolving by the guidance equation. 3-space, and a configuration of particles in 3-space, are claimed to be emergent ontologies in the sense that they are claimed to arise from a philosophical-functionalist analysis of  $\hat{V}^{int}$  and the latter's influence on the motion of the world particle through  $\psi$ . Thus a fundamentally-semiclassical gravity version of dBB theory in Albert's formulation would correspond to just equations (4.170-171) of dBBfsc-Newton2, with the interpretation that the 'world particle' backreacts on  $\psi$  via the former's gravitational 'self-energy'.

<sup>18</sup>The TELB (Theory with Exclusively Local Beables) formulation differs from the dual space formulation in that 3-space is the only ontic space. This approach is (mathematically) motivated by Taylor-expanding  $\psi$  in

logical formulation <sup>19</sup>, [9, 10, 12, 269, 14]. As it turns out, second-order formulations of dBB, namely the “ontological interpretation” advocated by Bohm-Hiley [279] and Holland [268], don’t seem to change the situation either: their only difference from first-order formulations of dBB is that the Schrödinger equation and wavefunction are replaced by the Madelung equations for  $|\psi|$  and  $S$ , with the quantization condition imposed on the latter.

By comparison, while the ontology of ZSM-Newton involves more than just particles, it is clear from the very formulation of ZSM-Newton that the particles must be understood as possessors of inertial mass. This is manifest from (i) the definition of the rest-mass of a *zbu* particle as corresponding to the energy associated with the Compton frequency oscillation of the *zbu* particle in its rest frame, and (ii) the definition of the *i*-th Wiener process, which describes the stochastic evolution of the *i*-th particle position and depends on the *i*-th mass parameter through the diffusion coefficient  $\hbar/m_i$ . Furthermore, as we argued in section 3,

---

configuration space into an infinite hierarchy of nonlocally coupled fields in 3-space; more precisely, each particle has a single-particle wavefunction pushing it around via the guidance equation, but the single-particle wavefunction is coupled to an infinite hierarchy of 3-space “entanglement fields”, which are themselves non-locally coupled to the entanglement fields of every other particle (hence why they are called “entanglement” fields). The postulate  $\rho_0 = |\psi_0|^2$  is still imposed on the single-particle wavefunctions, and equivariance still holds. One could then define classical gravitational fields directly in terms of mass density sources built out of the single-particle wavefunctions, but this would just lead to a TELB version of the SN equation, which would entail all the empirically problematic predictions of the SN equation discussed in relation to dBBfsc-Newton1. And if one were to use the particles as point sources, instead (or in tandem with the single-particle wavefunctions), the ambiguities associated with dBBfsc-Newton2 would arise.

<sup>19</sup>The nomological formulation of Dürr-Goldstein-Zanghì (DGZ) is still conjectural, but the basic idea is that the ‘fundamental’ wavefunction is the time-independent Wheeler-DeWitt wavefunctional  $\Psi(h, \phi)$ , interpreted as part of *physical law* rather than physical ontology. Time-dependent wavefunctions are suggested to be derived, effective descriptions for ‘subsystems’ of the universe, and not part of physical ontology either. Only 3-space and particles living in 3-space constitute physical ontology. Accordingly, one cannot not use time-dependent wavefunctions in the definition of an SN-type classical mass-density source in 3-space, as this would be inconsistent with the expected Newtonian limit of the Wheeler-DeWitt equation (i.e., the usual linear Schrödinger equation involving a q-number gravitational interaction potential) [9, 12]. Nor could one use the dBB particles as point sources for a classical gravitational field coupling back to the time-dependent wavefunction, as this is inconsistent with the expected Newtonian limits of the Wheeler-DeWitt equation and the guiding equations for  $h$  and  $\phi$  (i.e., the equations of dBB-Newton). So the DGZ nomological formulation of dBB doesn’t seem compatible with fundamentally-semiclassical Newtonian gravity.

Vassallo et al.’s ‘Quantum Humeanist’ formulation of dBB gives  $\psi$ , evolving by the time-dependent Schrödinger equation, a nomological interpretation in the Humean sense (i.e., “being a variable in the law that achieves the simplest and most informative description of the change in the primitive ontology (e.g. relative particle positions) throughout the history of the universe” [17]), and takes as the fundamental (and only) ontology the distance relations among dBB point particles along with the ‘Humean mosaic’ traced out by those distance relations in time. Thus the Quantum Humeanist formulation is compatible with dBBfsc-Newton2.

## 4.5 Comparison to other semiclassical Newtonian field theories

while the ether of ZSM is expected to carry stress-energy, it is expected to be negligible in the Newtonian regime as well as conceptually different from the mass parameters that appear in the diffusion coefficient and the equations of motion for  $S$  and  $\rho$ . So, in contrast to dBB, ZSM seems to make the choice of the particles as mass density sources for a classical gravitational field, inevitable. Another difference from dBB is the following: recall from section 3 that, because the Schrödinger equation and wavefunction are derived in ZSM, the use of the particles as sources for a classical gravitational field doesn't entail the nonlinear coupling in (4.170-171); rather, as we saw in section 3, the gravitational field that does couple to the Schrödinger equation/wavefunction corresponds (to leading order) to  $\hat{V}_g^{int}(\hat{\mathbf{q}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{q}}_j)$ . This is why ZSM-Newton avoids a break-down of the equivariance property. So despite ZSM and dBB sharing many equations in common - the Schrödinger equation (4.174), the guiding equation (4.175), and equivariance of  $\rho_0 = |\psi_0|^2$  - and despite both theories sharing in common a “primitive ontology”<sup>20</sup> involving particles with definite 3-space trajectories, the different axioms on which ZSM and dBB are based lead to significantly different conclusions about how to formulate a theory of fundamentally-semiclassical Newtonian gravity, and the empirical viability thereof. Of course the empirical predictions entailed by the ZSM-Newton nonlinear Schrödinger equation (4.101) remain to be studied, and our comments about the inapplicability of the superposition principle to solutions of (4.179) apply just as well to ZSM-Newton with (4.101). So the empirical viability of ZSM-Newton with (4.101) is also an open question. This being said, one notable advantage of ZSM-Newton over dBBfsc-Newton2 is that one can still justifiably use the usual linear Schrödinger equation with  $\hat{V}_g^{int}(\hat{\mathbf{q}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{q}}_j)$  in the context of ZSM-Newton, because the contributions to the gravitational interactions from the nonlinear terms in (4.101) are miniscule compared to the leading-order term (i.e.,  $\hat{V}_g^{int}(\hat{\mathbf{q}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{q}}_j)$ ). So, at least at this level of approximation, ZSM-Newton already makes clearly testable predictions for Newtonian-gravitational experiments involving coherent (or decohered) quantum systems, and these predictions are extracted using the usual theory of measurement in conventional stochastic mechanics and standard dBB theory [49]. Moreover, those predictions will exactly coincide with the predictions of SQM-Newton, Newtonian PQG, and dBB-Newton (in quantum equilibrium).

It is a straightforward exercise to demonstrate that analogous conclusions follow from consideration of the electrodynamical case, i.e., dBBfsc-Coulomb theories vs. ZSM-Coulomb, except that ZSM-Coulomb doesn't have an analogue of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation (4.101), so the issues related to (4.101) don't arise in the ZSM-Coulomb case. All this said, we now wish to evaluate a well-known peculiarity of standard dBB theory involving charge-field coupling

---

<sup>20</sup>Primitive ontology is defined by Allori et al. [3] as “variables describing the distribution of matter in 4-dimensional space-time”.

(i.e., dBB-Coulomb), from the viewpoint of ZSM-Coulomb.

For a single-particle dBB system, in the presence of an external magnetic vector potential  $\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}, t)$ , the momentum operator in the Schrödinger equation gets a correction  $\hat{\mathbf{p}} \rightarrow \hat{\mathbf{p}} - e\mathbf{A}_{ext}$ . Now, consider the magnetic Aharonov-Bohm (AB) effect in dBB [295, 279, 268], where  $\mathbf{A}_{sol} = (\Phi/2\pi r)\hat{\theta}$  is the magnetic vector potential sourced by an infinitely long cylindrical solenoid with flux  $\Phi$ . For an electron wavepacket split into two partial packets passing on either side of the solenoid, where the paths  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  traversed by the packets form a loop  $C$  encircling the solenoid, the correction to the momentum operator entails a phase shift  $\psi \rightarrow \psi' = N' [\psi_1 + \psi_2 e^{ie\Phi/\hbar}] e^{(ie/\hbar) \int_{P_1} \mathbf{A}_{sol} \cdot d\mathbf{q}}$ , when the packets are recombined to form an interference pattern ( $N'$  is a normalization constant). Correspondingly, the position probability density associated to the interference pattern gets shifted as  $|\psi'|^2 = \rho' = N'^2 \{\rho_1 + \rho_2 + 2\sqrt{\rho_1}\sqrt{\rho_2}\cos[(S_1 - S_2)/\hbar - \delta]\}$ , where  $\delta = e\Phi/\hbar$ . Note that while the dBB particle moves along with only one of the packets around the solenoid, say the packet traversing path  $P_1$ , with modified momentum  $\mathbf{p} = \nabla S_1 - e\mathbf{A}_{sol}$ , both packets ‘feel’  $\mathbf{A}_{sol}$  since each picks up a phase factor  $\psi_a \rightarrow \psi_a e^{(ie/\hbar) \int_{P_a} \mathbf{A}_{sol} \cdot d\mathbf{q}}$  such that  $\Phi = \oint_C \mathbf{A}_{sol} \cdot d\mathbf{q} = \int_{P_1} \mathbf{A}_{sol} \cdot d\mathbf{q} - \int_{P_2} \mathbf{A}_{sol} \cdot d\mathbf{q}$  and  $\oint_C \mathbf{p} \cdot d\mathbf{q} = nh - e\Phi$ . In other words, even though the motion of the dBB particle is altered by the presence of the vector potential, suggesting (seemingly) that the charge  $e$  is a property localized to the dBB particle (like in classical electrodynamics), the fact that the ‘empty’ packet (i.e., the packet moving along  $P_2$ ) also picks up a phase factor, and that this phase factor contributes to the shift in the interference pattern of the recombined packets, suggests that charge is *also* a property carried by the (spatially delocalized) wavefunction [295, 279, 268, 296]. A completely analogous situation arises for the gravitational analogue of the magnetic AB effect, where  $\mathbf{A}_{sol}$  is the gravitomagnetic vector potential sourced by a solenoid carrying a mass (instead of charge) current, and all other expressions are identical except for the replacement  $e \rightarrow m$  [297]. Analogous considerations apply to the case of the electric/gravitoelectric AB effect.

Since the dBB treatment of the AB effect is formally the same as the ZSM-Coulomb/Newton treatment of the AB effect, this might seem to conflict with the ZSM-Coulomb/Newton hypothesis that the charge (rest mass) of a system is a property localized to *zbw* particles. However, there is no inconsistency. In ZSM-Coulomb/Newton, the finding that the empty packet in the AB effect picks up a phase factor that contributes to the shift in the interference pattern intensity is a *consequence* of the following set of postulates: (i) rest-mass and charge are intrinsic properties of *zbw* particles; (ii) the *zbw* particles, whose oscillations are dynamically driven by the ether medium, always have well-defined mean phases along their 3-space trajectories; and (iii) the diffusion process for the *zbw* particles in the ether satisfies the global constraint of being conservative. It might then be asked if ZSM-Coulomb/Newton gives physical insight into

#### 4.5 Comparison to other semiclassical Newtonian field theories

what it means, in terms of its proposed underlying ontological picture of the world, for empty packets to electromagnetically (or gravitationally) couple to external fields, even though it is the *zbw* particles that carry the rest-mass and charge of a system. We can sketch an answer as follows.

As discussed in [136, 137, 26], the superposition principle for wavefunctions is a consequence of the single-valuedness condition, and the single-valuedness condition on wavefunctions in ZSM follows from the union of postulates (ii) and (iii). And as we've discussed in [27], an empty packet describes possible alternative histories of a Nelsonian/*zbw* particle through a different region of the ether (the different region corresponding to the spatial support of the empty wavepacket in 3-space), while also indirectly reflecting spatio-temporal variations in that different region of the ether (because the ether-sourced osmotic potential  $U(q, t)$  changes as a function of space and time via the continuity equation and is constrained by boundary conditions in the environment). Thus the empty packet traversing path  $P_2$  reflects (indirectly) a region of the ether that's (spatio-temporally) varying along  $P_2$ , and the interference of the recombined packets reflects (indirectly) two regions of ether recombining and interfering while satisfying postulates (ii) and (iii). Since the ether medium is presumed to pervade all of 3-space, and since all components of the ether are presumed to be nonlocally connected to each other, the ether region corresponding to the empty packet is actually not physically independent of the ether region corresponding to the occupied packet. In other words, for the ether to maintain the quantization condition  $\oint_L \nabla S \cdot d\mathbf{q} = nh$  on the *zbw* particle, while maintaining that the diffusion of the *zbw* particle through the ether is conservative, it must know to compensate for the phase shift experienced by the *zbw* particle passing around the solenoid along  $P_1$ , by correspondingly shifting phase in the region that's spatio-temporally varying along  $P_2$ . How exactly this works (assuming the ZSM framework is correct) will presumably require developing an explicit physical model of the ether, the *zbw* particle, and the dynamical coupling of the two, in accord with postulates (i-iii). This is left for future work.

#### Comparison to semiclassical approximations in de Broglie-Bohm theory

As we've seen, there does not appear to exist an empirically viable formulation of dBBfsc-Newton/Coulomb. Nevertheless, it is possible to formulate semiclassical approximation schemes for the 'fully quantum' formulation of dBB Newtonian gravity/electrodynamics (hereafter, dBB-Newton/Coulomb).

The dBB-Newton/Coulomb theory corresponds to (4.175-176) with  $V^{int} = \hat{V}_{g,e}^{int}(\hat{\mathbf{q}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{q}}_j)$  (for simplicity, we neglect vector potentials). In other words the  $N$ -particle Schrödinger equation of dBB-Newton/Coulomb is identical to the  $N$ -particle Schrödinger equation of ZSM-Newton/Coulomb, when the nonlinear correction terms predicted by the latter are neglected.



The physical interpretation, however, is different.

In ZSM-Newton/Coulomb, the *zbu* particles carry rest-mass/charge and interact with one another through the classical gravitational/electrostatic fields they source. In dBB-Newton/Coulomb the particles are just points at definite locations, and  $\hat{V}_{g,e}^{int}(\hat{\mathbf{q}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{q}}_j)$  is a potential energy function on configuration space that influences the evolution of  $\psi$  in configuration space; so, to the extent that the particles ‘interact’ gravitationally or electrostatically, they only do so indirectly via the influence of  $\hat{V}_{g,e}^{int}(\hat{\mathbf{q}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{q}}_j)$  on  $\psi$  through the Schrödinger equation (4.175), and the influence of  $\psi$  on the evolution of the particles through the guiding equation (4.176). Thus the mean-field approximation scheme discussed in section 4 applies just as well to dBB-Newton/Coulomb.

Another dBB-based semiclassical approximation scheme has been suggested by Prezhdo-Brooksby [260] and elaborated on by Struyve [266]. Consider, for simplicity, the dBB theory with two-particle Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t)}{\partial t} = \left[ - \left( \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_1} \nabla_1^2 + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_2} \nabla_2^2 \right) + \hat{V}_{g,e}^{int}(\hat{\mathbf{q}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{q}}_2) \right] \psi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t). \quad (4.181)$$

The guiding equations for each particle are again given by (4.176), and the 2nd-order equations of motion are

$$m_1 \ddot{\mathbf{Q}}_1(t) = -\nabla_1 [V_g^{int}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2(t)) + Q(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2(t))] |_{\mathbf{q}_1=\mathbf{Q}_1(t)}, \quad (4.182)$$

$$m_2 \ddot{\mathbf{Q}}_2(t) = -\nabla_2 [V_g^{int}(\mathbf{Q}_1(t), \mathbf{q}_2) + Q(\mathbf{Q}_1(t), \mathbf{q}_2)] |_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)}, \quad (4.183)$$

where  $Q(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)$  is the total quantum potential of the two-particle system.

Now, the conditional wavefunction for particle 1, defined as  $\psi_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t) = \psi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2(t), t)$ , satisfies the conditional Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t)}{\partial t} = \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_1} \nabla_1^2 + V_{g,e}^{int}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2(t)) \right] \psi_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t) + K(\mathbf{q}_1, t), \quad (4.184)$$

where

$$K(\mathbf{q}_1, t) = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_2} \nabla_2^2 \psi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t) |_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)} + i\hbar \frac{d\mathbf{Q}_2(t)}{dt} \cdot \nabla_2 \psi(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, t) |_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)}. \quad (4.185)$$

Correspondingly, the conditional guiding equation for particle 1 is

$$\frac{d\mathbf{Q}_1(t)}{dt} = \frac{\hbar}{m_1} \text{Im} \frac{\nabla_1 \psi_1}{\psi_1} |_{\mathbf{q}_1=\mathbf{Q}_1(t)} = \frac{\nabla_1 S_1}{m_1} |_{\mathbf{q}_1=\mathbf{Q}_1(t)}, \quad (4.186)$$



#### 4.5 Comparison to other semiclassical Newtonian field theories

where  $S_1 = S_1(\mathbf{q}_1, t)$ . The Newtonian equation of motion for particle 2 is then

$$m_2 \ddot{\mathbf{Q}}_2(t) = -\nabla_2 [V_{g,e}^{int}(\mathbf{Q}_1(t), \mathbf{q}_2) + Q(\mathbf{Q}_1(t), \mathbf{q}_2)]|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\mathbf{Q}_2(t)}. \quad (4.187)$$

The semiclassical approximation is when  $m_2 \gg m_1$  and  $\psi$  varies slowly in  $\mathbf{q}_2$  (compared to  $\mathbf{q}_1$ ). Then  $K \approx 0$  and  $-\nabla_2 Q \approx 0$ . In other words the time-evolution of particle 2 depends (approximately) only on the classical interaction potential  $V_{g,e}^{int}$ , evaluated at the actual position of particle 1. And the time-evolution of particle 1 depends on  $\psi_1$  satisfying (approximately) (4.183) with  $K \approx 0$ , i.e., particle 1's effective Schrödinger equation that takes into account the back-reaction of particle 2 through  $V_{g,e}^{int}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2(t))$ . Note that, unlike models of dBBfsc-Newton/Coulomb, this semiclassical approximation scheme defines a consistent back-reaction between the two particles in the following sense: the conditional wavefunction of particle 1, in the semiclassical approximation, just corresponds to the effective wavefunction of particle 1, for which  $|\psi_1|^2$  satisfies an equivariance-like property (through the conditional quantum continuity equation implicit in (4.183)), even though the (semiclassically approximated) evolution of  $\psi_1$  still depends on the actual position of particle 2 through  $V_{g,e}^{int}$ .

By contrast, the standard QM semiclassical approximation scheme for two interacting particles [260, 266] is defined by

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi(\mathbf{q}_1, t)}{\partial t} = \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_1} \nabla_1^2 + V_{g,e}^{int}(\mathbf{q}_1, \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_2(t)) \right] \psi(\mathbf{q}_1, t), \quad (4.188)$$

$$m_2 \ddot{\overline{\mathbf{Q}}}_2(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d^3\mathbf{q}_1 |\psi(\mathbf{q}_1, t)|^2 [-\nabla_2 V_{g,e}^{int}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2)]|_{\mathbf{q}_2=\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_2(t)}, \quad (4.189)$$

where  $\psi(\mathbf{q}_1, t)$  is a single-particle wavefunction (as opposed to a conditional or effective wavefunction), and the back-reaction from particle 2 on particle 1 is via the average trajectory  $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}_2(t)$  inserted into  $V_{g,e}^{int}$  in (4.187).

Prezhdo and Brooksby [260] have compared the dBB-based semiclassical approximation scheme to this standard QM scheme, for the case of a light particle scattering off a heavy particle, where the heavy particle is bound to a fixed surface. They found that the dBB scheme is superior at tracking the scattering probability as a function of time (when compared to the exact quantum dynamics description), in addition to being computationally simpler to implement than the standard QM scheme.

Struyve [266] has applied the dBB-based scheme to a dBB version of scalar electrodynamics, as well as to a dBB version of canonical quantum gravity under the minisuperspace approximation<sup>21</sup>. In the latter case, he has compared the dBB-based scheme to the standard scheme

---

<sup>21</sup>Canonical quantum gravity under the minisuperspace approximation refers to the Wheeler-DeWitt equation

(applied to standard canonical quantum gravity under the minisuperspace approximation) for cases involving macroscopic superpositions of two Gaussians wavepackets. As it turns out, the dBB-based scheme yields better agreement with the exact dBB version of canonical quantum gravity under the minisuperspace approximation, than does the standard scheme <sup>22</sup>.

The dBB semiclassical approximation scheme for two interacting particles can, of course, be imported into ZSM-Newton/Coulomb. In this sense, the results obtained by Prezhdo-Brooksby are also results that follow from ZSM-Newton/Coulomb. However, in ZSM-Newton/Coulomb, we also have the option of implementing the back-reaction from particle 1 onto particle 2 via solutions of  $d\mathbf{q}_1(t) = (\text{Im} + \text{Re}) m_1^{-1} \hbar \nabla_1 \ln \psi_1|_{\mathbf{q}_1=\mathbf{q}_1(t)} dt + d\mathbf{W}(t)$ , the conditional stochastic differential equation for particle 1. Since the trajectories predicted by this stochastic differential equation differ from the trajectories predicted by the conditional guidance equation (4.185), we would expect differences in the predictions of the ZSM-Newton/Coulomb version as compared to the dBB version. Although, considering that the semiclassical approximation requires the mass of particle 2 to be much greater than particle 1, we would expect any differences to be very slight. Nevertheless, it would be interesting to revisit the cases studied by Prezhdo-Brooksby and Struyve, to see if the differences might be amenable to experimental/observational discrimination. (Revisiting Struyve’s analyses from the viewpoint of ZSM will of course require extending ZSM to relativistic field theories in flat and curved spacetimes, and to the spacetime metric itself. Future work will show how this can be done.)

---

$\mathcal{H}\Psi(h, \phi) = 0$  (and momentum constraint  $\mathcal{H}_i\Psi(h, \phi) = 0$ ), under the restriction that the 3-metric  $h$  and matter field  $\phi$  are homogeneous and isotropic [268, 223, 266]. This corresponds to a time-dependent homogeneous matter field  $\phi(t)$  in an FLRW metric with homogeneous scale factor  $a(t)$ . The Wheeler-DeWitt equation then takes the form  $(H_{metric} + H_{matter})\psi(a, \phi) = 0$ . In the dBB version [266], this latter form of the Wheeler-DeWitt equation is accompanied by guidance equations for the field beables  $a(t)$  and  $\phi(t)$ , which turn out to be coupled to each other via the phase  $S$  of  $\psi$ . In this way, the metric and matter field beables back-react on each other. It is worth mentioning that the minisuperspace approximation is also referred to in the literature as a ‘semiclassical’ approximation; it should not be confused with the dBB-based semiclassical approximation scheme, the latter of which is applied by Struyve *on top of* the minisuperspace approximation.

<sup>22</sup>Struyve did not compare the standard scheme to the standard quantum interpretation of the Wheeler-DeWitt equation, the reasoning being that the “problem of time” makes the standard quantum interpretation of the Wheeler-DeWitt equation incoherent. Nevertheless, Struyve pointed out that for approaches to quantum theory that associate approximately classical dynamics to macroscopic superpositions of Gaussian states (such as many-worlds interpretations [223]), the standard scheme is expected to do worse than the dBB scheme in approximating exact solutions of the Wheeler-DeWitt equation (assuming those non-dBB approaches to quantum theory yield consistent quantum interpretations of the Wheeler-DeWitt solutions in the first place).

## 4.6 Conclusion

We have shown how to formulate fundamentally-semiclassical Newtonian gravity/electrodynamics based on stochastic mechanics in the ZSM formulation. In addition, we have shown that ZSM-Newton/Coulomb has a consistent statistical interpretation, recovers the standard exact quantum description of matter-gravity coupling as a special case valid for all practical purposes (even though gravity remains fundamentally classical in the ZSM approach), and recovers the SN/SC and stochastic SN/SC equations as mean-field approximations. We have also compared ZSM-Newton/Coulomb to theories of semiclassical Newtonian gravity based on standard quantum theory, dynamical collapse theories, other possible formulations of stochastic mechanics, and the dBB pilot-wave theory. In doing so, we have highlighted conceptual and technical advantages entailed by ZSM-Newton/Coulomb, and indicated possibilities for experimentally testable differences.

In Part II, we will use ZSM-Newton/Coulomb to formulate a new ‘large- $N$ ’ prescription that makes it possible to consistently describe large numbers of identical (ZSM) particles *strongly interacting* classical-gravitationally/electrostatically. This new large- $N$  prescription will also make it possible to recover classical Newtonian gravity/electrodynamics for macroscopic particles, as well as classical Vlasov-Poisson mean-field theory for macroscopic particles weakly interacting gravitationally/electrostatically.

We wish to emphasize once more the two key results of the present paper: (i) while ZSM-Newton and ZSM-Coulomb treat the gravitational and Coulomb potentials, respectively, as fundamentally classical fields sourced by point-like classical particles undergoing non-classical (stochastic mechanical) motions in 3-space, these semiclassical theories nevertheless recover the standard quantum descriptions of Newtonian/non-relativistic gravitational/Coulombic interactions between particles; and (ii) the large  $N$  limit scheme of Golse [272] and Bardos et al. [270, 271], applied to ZSM-Newton/Coulomb, makes it possible to recover the same mean-field approximations as obtained from standard Newtonian PQG/SCEG and standard non-relativistic QED/SCRED (the SN/SC and stochastic SN/SC equations).

In a forthcoming standalone paper, we will show how to consistently incorporate gravitational and electrodynamical radiation reaction effects within ZSM-Newton and ZSM-Coulomb, respectively, through a stochastic mechanical generalization of Galley’s variational principle for nonconservative systems [283]. Further down the road, we will show how to extend ZSM to particles and fields in relativistic spacetimes, and then use that framework to formulate consistent hidden-variables theories of semiclassical Einstein gravity and semiclassical relativistic electrodynamics; we will then show that the Newtonian limits of these two theories yield ZSM-Newton and ZSM-Coulomb, respectively.

## **4.7 Acknowledgments**

It is a pleasure to thank Guido Bacciagaluppi, Ward Struyve, Roderich Tumulka, Bei-Lok Hu, and Dieter Hartmann for many helpful discussions. I am especially thankful to Guido and Ward for reading earlier drafts of this paper and making several useful suggestions to improve the paper.

## 5 Semiclassical Newtonian Field Theories Based On Stochastic Mechanics II

Continuing the development of the ZSM-Newton/Coulomb approach to semiclassical Newtonian gravity/electrodynamics [28], we formulate a ZSM-Newton/Coulomb version of the large  $N$  approximation scheme proposed by Oriols et al. [106]. We show that this new large  $N$  scheme makes it possible to self-consistently describe the center-of-mass evolution of a large number of gravitationally/electrostatically interacting, identical, *zbw* particles, without assuming that the particles are weakly coupled, and without entailing the problematic macroscopic semiclassical gravitational/electrostatic cat states characteristic of the mean-field Schrödinger-Newton/Coulomb equations. We also show how to recover  $N$ -particle classical Newtonian gravity/electrodynamics for many gravitationally/electrostatically interacting macroscopic particles (composed of many interacting *zbw* particles), as well as classical Vlasov-Poisson mean-field theory for macroscopic particles weakly interacting gravitationally/electrostatically. Finally, we outline an explicit model of environmental decoherence that can be incorporated into Oriols et al. scheme as applied to ZSM-Newton/Coulomb.

### 5.1 Introduction

This paper is a direct continuation of Part I [28]. There, we formulated fundamentally-semiclassical Newtonian gravity/electrodynamics based on stochastic mechanics in the ZSM formulation (ZSM-Newton/Coulomb). Our key results were: (i) ZSM-Newton/Coulomb has a consistent statistical interpretation; (ii) ZSM-Newton/Coulomb recovers the standard quantum description of non-relativistic matter-gravity/charge-field coupling as a special case valid for all practical purposes, even though the gravitational/electrostatic interaction between *zbw* particles is fundamentally classical; and (iii) ZSM-Newton/Coulomb recovers the ‘single-body’ Schrödinger-Newton/Coulomb (SN/SC) and stochastic SN/SC equations as mean-field approximations for systems of gravitationally/electrostatically interacting, identical, *zbw* particles, in the weak-coupling large  $N$  limit.

We also discussed some limitations of the mean-field SN/SC and stochastic SN/SC equations: (i) they are based on the assumption that interactions between *zbw* particles are sufficiently weak that the independent particle approximation is plausible; and (ii) the single-body

SN/SC and stochastic SN/SC equations admit solutions corresponding to macroscopic semiclassical gravitational/electrostatic cat states, and these cat states predict unphysical gravitational/electrostatic forces on external probe masses. (We also pointed out that the latter difficulty afflicts any formulation of fundamentally-semiclassical Newtonian gravity/electrodynamics based on the many-body SN/SC and stochastic SN/SC equations, as these equations also allow for such cat states.)

The primary objective of the present paper is to develop a new large  $N$  scheme for ZSM-Newton/Coulomb, that bypasses the limitations of the mean-field SN/SC and stochastic SN/SC equations.

Our scheme will be based on the one developed recently by Oriols et al. [106], who consider the center-of-mass (CM) motion of a system of  $N$  identical, non-relativistic, de Broglie-Bohm (dBB) particles coupled through interaction potentials of the form  $\hat{U}_{int}(\hat{x}_j - \hat{x}_k)$  and to external potentials of the form  $\hat{U}_{ext}(\hat{x}_j)$ . They show that, in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , the CM motion becomes effectively indistinguishable from classical Hamilton-Jacobi mechanics for a single massive particle in an external field.

Essentially, we will import the Oriols et al. scheme into ZSM-Newton/Coulomb. In doing so, we will find that it is possible to: (i) self-consistently describe the CM motion of large numbers of classically-gravitationally and/or classically-electrostatically interacting, identical, *zbu* particles, without an independent particle approximation; (ii) avoid macroscopic semiclassical gravitational and electrostatic cat states and recover many-particle classical Newtonian gravity and/or electrodynamics for the CM descriptions of gravitationally and/or electrostatically interacting macroscopic particles (where the macroscopic particles are composed of many interacting *zbu* particles); and (iii) recover classical Vlasov-Poisson mean-field theory for macroscopic particles that interact gravitationally and/or electrostatically, in the weak-coupling large particle number limit. We will also be led to suggest an explicit model of environmental decoherence that's consistent with the Oriols et al. scheme, and which could justify a crucial assumption of the scheme.

The outline of the paper is as follows. Section 2 implements the Oriols et al. scheme into ZSM-Newton/Coulomb, and shows how classical Newtonian dynamics for the center-of-mass of a many-particle system is recovered in the large  $N$  limit. Section 3 shows how to derive the classical nonlinear Schrödinger equation for the large  $N$  center-of-mass motion. Section 4 shows how to recover classical Newtonian gravity/electrodynamics for many gravitationally/electrostatically interacting macroscopic particles. Section 5 shows how to recover classical Vlasov-Poisson mean-field theory. Section 6 sketches an explicit model of environmental decoherence that's consistent with the Oriols et al. scheme applied to ZSM-Newton/Coulomb.

## 5.2 Large N center-of-mass approximation in ZSM-Newton/Coulomb

### 5.2.1 General approach

We begin by considering ZSM for N identical *zbw* particles in (for simplicity) 1-dimensional space, with configuration  $X(t) = \{x_1(t), \dots, x_N(t)\}$  and the ensemble-averaged, time-symmetric, joint *zbw* phase

$$\begin{aligned} J(X) &:= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{2} \left[ 2mc^2 + \frac{1}{2}m (Dx_i(t))^2 + \frac{1}{2}m (D_*x_i(t))^2 \right] - U(X(t), t) \right\} dt + \sum_{i=1}^N \phi_i \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ mc^2 + \frac{1}{2}mv_i^2(X(t), t) + \frac{1}{2}mu_i^2(X(t), t) \right] - U(X(t), t) \right\} dt + \sum_{i=1}^N \phi_i \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

where

$$Dx_i(t) = \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{b}_i(X(t), t) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} \right] x_i(t), \quad (5.2)$$

$$D_*x_i(t) = \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{b}_{i*}(X(t), t) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\hbar}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} \right] x_i(t). \quad (5.3)$$

The potential  $U(X(t), t)$  is assumed to take the general form

$$U(X(t), t) := \sum_{j=1}^N U_{ext}(x_j(t)) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1}^{N(j \neq k)} U_{int}(x_j(t) - x_k(t)), \quad (5.4)$$

and we assume the usual constraints

$$\mathbf{v}_i := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{b}_{i*}] = \frac{1}{m} \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_i}, \quad (5.5)$$

$$\mathbf{u}_i := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}_{i*}] = \frac{\hbar}{2m} \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_i}. \quad (5.6)$$

As a consequence of (5.5-6), the time-reversal invariant joint probability density  $\rho(X, t)$  evolves by

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left( \frac{\rho}{m} \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_i} \right), \quad (5.7)$$

and satisfies the normalization

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \rho_0(X) d^N X = 1. \quad (5.8)$$

The stochastic differential equations of motion for  $x_i(t)$  take the form

$$dx_i(t) = \left[ \frac{1}{m} \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\hbar}{2m} \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_i} \right] \Big|_{x_j=x_j(t)} dt + dW_i(t), \quad (5.9)$$

$$dx_i(t) = \left[ \frac{1}{m} \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\hbar}{2m} \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_i} \right] \Big|_{x_j=x_j(t)} dt + dW_{i*}(t), \quad (5.10)$$

where the  $dW_i$  are 1-dimensional Wiener processes satisfying Gaussianity, independence of  $dx_i(s)$  for  $s \leq t$ , and variance

$$\mathbb{E}_t [dW_i^2] = \frac{\hbar}{m} dt. \quad (5.11)$$

Analogous conditions apply to the backward Wiener processes  $dW_{i*}$ .

Note that, since we are considering the case of particle motion in a 1-dimensional space, we can disregard the quantization condition for (5.5) (we will come back to it later, though, when we consider the case of particle motion in a 3-dimensional Euclidean space).

Now, following Oriols et al. [106], we would like to redefine (5.1) in terms of the CM position  $x_{cm}(t)$  and relative positions  $\mathbf{y}(t) = \{y_2(t), \dots, y_N(t)\}$  such that no cross terms arise from the Laplacians in  $D$  and  $D_*$ . As shown by Oriols et al. [106], the coordinate transformation

$$x_{cm} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i, \quad (5.12)$$

$$y_j := x_j - \frac{(\sqrt{N} x_{cm} + x_1)}{\sqrt{N} + 1}, \quad (5.13)$$

makes it possible to rewrite the  $N$ -particle Schrödinger equation, with potential (5.4), in terms of  $x_{cm}$  and  $\mathbf{y} = \{y_2, \dots, y_N\}$  without cross terms arising from the Laplacian in the Schrödinger



## 5.2 Large N center-of-mass approximation in ZSM-Newton/Coulomb

Hamiltonian. Thus, applying (5.12-13) to (5.1), we obtain <sup>1</sup>

$$\begin{aligned}
 J(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}) &:= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \left\{ Mc^2 + \frac{m}{4} \left[ \left( \tilde{D}x_{cm}(t) \right)^2 + \left( \tilde{D}_{cm*}x_{cm}(t) \right)^2 \right] \right. \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{m}{4} \sum_{j=2}^N \left[ \left( \tilde{D}y_j(t) \right)^2 + \left( \tilde{D}_*y_j(t) \right)^2 \right] - U \right\} dt + \phi_{cm} + \phi_{rel} \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \left( Mc^2 + \frac{1}{2}M(v_{cm}^2 + u_{cm}^2) + \frac{1}{2}m \sum_{j=2}^N (v_j^2 + u_j^2) - U \right) dt + \phi_{cm} + \phi_{rel} \right],
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

where  $M = Nm$ , the CM velocities are given by

$$\mathbf{v}_{cm} := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{b}_{cm} + \mathbf{b}_{cm*}] = \frac{1}{m} \frac{\partial S(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}(t), t)}{\partial x_{cm}} \Big|_{x_{cm}=x_{cm}(t)}, \tag{5.15}$$

$$\mathbf{u}_{cm} := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{b}_{cm} - \mathbf{b}_{cm*}] = \frac{\hbar}{2m} \frac{1}{\rho(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}(t), t)} \frac{\partial \rho(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}(t), t)}{\partial x_{cm}} \Big|_{x_{cm}=x_{cm}(t)}, \tag{5.16}$$

the relative velocities are given by

$$\mathbf{v}_j := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{b}_j + \mathbf{b}_{j*}] = \frac{1}{m} \frac{\partial S(x_{cm}(t), \mathbf{y}, t)}{\partial y_j} \Big|_{\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{y}(t)}, \tag{5.17}$$

$$\mathbf{u}_j := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{b}_j - \mathbf{b}_{j*}] = \frac{\hbar}{2m} \frac{1}{\rho(x_{cm}(t), \mathbf{y}, t)} \frac{\partial \rho(x_{cm}(t), \mathbf{y}, t)}{\partial y_j} \Big|_{\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{y}(t)}, \tag{5.18}$$

and the transformed mean forward/backward derivatives take the form

$$\tilde{D}x_{cm}(t) = \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{b}_{cm} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} + \sum_{j=2}^N \mathbf{b}_j \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} + \frac{\hbar}{2M} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{cm}^2} + \sum_{j=2}^N \frac{\hbar}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_j^2} \right] x_{cm}(t) = \mathbf{b}_{cm}, \tag{5.19}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>The proof of this goes along the same lines as Appendix A.1 of Oriols et al. [106].

$$\tilde{D}_* x_{cm}(t) = \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{b}_{cm*} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} + \sum_{j=2}^N \mathbf{b}_{j*} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} - \frac{\hbar}{2M} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{cm}^2} - \sum_{j=2}^N \frac{\hbar}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_j^2} \right] x_{cm}(t) = \mathbf{b}_{cm*}, \quad (5.20)$$

and

$$\tilde{D} y_j(t) = \mathbf{b}_j, \quad (5.21)$$

$$\tilde{D}_* y_j(t) = \mathbf{b}_{j*}. \quad (5.22)$$

Accordingly, the continuity equation (5.7) becomes

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} (\rho v_{cm}) - \sum_{j=2}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} [\rho v_j], \quad (5.23)$$

and the forward stochastic differential equations of motion for  $x_{cm}(t)$  and  $y_j(t)$ , respectively, take the form

$$dx_{cm}(t) = \left[ \frac{1}{M} \frac{\partial S(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}(t), t)}{\partial x_{cm}} + \frac{\hbar}{2M} \frac{1}{\rho(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}(t), t)} \frac{\partial \rho(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}(t), t)}{\partial x_{cm}} \right] \Big|_{x_{cm}=x_{cm}(t)} dt + dW_{cm}(t), \quad (5.24)$$

and

$$dy_j(t) = \left[ \frac{1}{m} \frac{\partial S(x_{cm}(t), \mathbf{y}, t)}{\partial y_j} + \frac{\hbar}{2m} \frac{1}{\rho(x_{cm}(t), \mathbf{y}, t)} \frac{\partial \rho(x_{cm}(t), \mathbf{y}, t)}{\partial y_j} \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{y}(t)} dt + dW_j(t). \quad (5.25)$$

The  $dW_{cm}$  and  $dW_j$  are 1-dimensional Wiener processes satisfying Gaussianity, independence of  $dx_{cm}(s)$  and  $dy_j(s)$  for  $s \leq t$ , and variances

$$\mathbb{E}_t [dW_{cm}^2] = \frac{\hbar}{M} dt, \quad (5.26)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_t [dW_j^2] = \frac{\hbar}{m} dt, \quad (5.27)$$

respectively. Analogous relations for the backward stochastic differential equations can be written down as well.

We emphasize that (5.14) is equivalent to (5.1), the two being related by the coordinate

## 5.2 Large N center-of-mass approximation in ZSM-Newton/Coulomb

transformations (5.12-13). Thus, applying

$$J(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}) = \text{extremal}, \quad (5.28)$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{M}{2} [\tilde{D}_* \tilde{D} + \tilde{D} \tilde{D}_*] x_{cm}(t) + \frac{m}{2} \sum_{j=2}^N [\tilde{D}_* \tilde{D} + \tilde{D} \tilde{D}_*] y_j(t) \\ &= - \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} U(X, t)|_{X=X(t)} + \sum_{j=2}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} U(X, t)|_{X=X(t)} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.29)$$

By D'Alembert's principle, the variations  $\delta x_{cm}(t)$  and  $\delta \mathbf{y}(t)$  are independent of each other, and the  $\delta y_j(t)$  are independent for all  $j$ . So (5.29) separates into the pair

$$\frac{M}{2} [\tilde{D}_* \tilde{D} + \tilde{D} \tilde{D}_*] x_{cm}(t) = - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} U(X, t)|_{X=X(t)} = - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} U_{ext}(x_i)|_{x_i=x_i(t)}, \quad (5.30)$$

$$\frac{m}{2} \sum_{j=2}^N [\tilde{D}_* \tilde{D} + \tilde{D} \tilde{D}_*] y_j(t) = - \sum_{j=2}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} U(X, t)|_{X=X(t)} = - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=2}^N \sum_{j,k=1}^{N(j \neq k)} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} U_{int}(x_j - x_k)|_{X=X(t)}, \quad (5.31)$$

and (5.31) separates into

$$\frac{m}{2} [\tilde{D}_* \tilde{D} + \tilde{D} \tilde{D}_*] y_j(t) = - \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} U(X, t)|_{X=X(t)}, \quad (5.32)$$

for all  $j$  from 2, ...,  $N$ . The last equality on the right hand side (rhs) of (5.30) follows from the fact that the symmetry of  $U_{int}$  implies no net force on the CM, and the observation that  $\partial x_i / \partial x_{cm} = 1$  which follows from inverting (5.12); the last equality on the rhs of (5.31-32) follows from the fact that the forces on the relative degrees of freedom come only from  $U_{int}$ .

Computing the derivatives on the left sides of (5.30-31), and removing the evaluation at  $X = X(t)$  on both sides, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & M \left[ \partial_t \mathbf{v}_{cm} + \mathbf{v}_{cm} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} \mathbf{v}_{cm} - \mathbf{u}_{cm} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} \mathbf{u}_{cm} - \frac{\hbar}{2M} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{cm}^2} \mathbf{u}_{cm} \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{j=2}^N \left( \mathbf{v}_j \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \mathbf{v}_{cm} - \mathbf{u}_j \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \mathbf{u}_{cm} - \frac{\hbar}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_j^2} \mathbf{u}_{cm} \right) \right] = - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} U, \end{aligned} \quad (5.33)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 m \sum_{j=2}^N \left[ \partial_t \mathbf{v}_j + \sum_{j=2}^N \left( \mathbf{v}_j \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{u}_j \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \mathbf{u}_j \right) - \frac{\hbar}{2M} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{cm}^2} \mathbf{u}_j - \frac{\hbar}{2m} \sum_{j=2}^N \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_j^2} \mathbf{u}_j \right. \\
 \left. - \frac{\hbar}{2m} \sum_{j=2}^N \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_j^2} \mathbf{u}_j + \mathbf{v}_{cm} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} \mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{u}_{cm} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} \mathbf{u}_j \right] = - \sum_{j=2}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} U,
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.34}$$

where  $\mathbf{v}_{cm}$  ( $\mathbf{v}_j$ ) and  $\mathbf{u}_{cm}$  ( $\mathbf{u}_j$ ) are now velocity fields over the possible positions of the (CM and relative) particles. Thus, by integrating the positional derivatives on both sides of (5.33) and (5.34), respectively, and setting the arbitrary integration constants equal to zero (for simplicity), each equation yields the quantum Hamilton-Jacobi equation in CM and relative coordinates:

$$-\partial_t S = U + \frac{1}{2M} \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_{cm}} \right)^2 - \frac{\hbar^2}{2M} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{cm}^2} \sqrt{\rho} + \sum_{j=2}^N \left[ \frac{1}{2m} \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial y_j} \right)^2 - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_j^2} \sqrt{\rho} \right]. \tag{5.35}$$

Combining with (5.35) with (5.23), the Madelung transformation yields the coordinate-transformed Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2M} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{cm}^2} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \sum_{j=2}^N \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_j^2} + U \right] \psi, \tag{5.36}$$

where  $\psi(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}, t) = \sqrt{\rho(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}, t)} e^{iS(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}, t)/\hbar}$  is single-valued and smooth (because we're restricted to the configuration space of dimension  $\mathbb{R}^N$ ). As shown by Oriols et al. [106], (5.36) corresponds to the  $N$ -particle Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} + U \right] \psi, \tag{5.37}$$

where  $\psi(X, t) = \sqrt{\rho(X, t)} e^{iS(X, t)/\hbar}$ , under the coordinate transformations (5.12-13).

From the solution of (5.36), we can rewrite (5.24-25) as

$$dx_{cm}(t) = \left[ \frac{\hbar}{M} \text{Im} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} \ln \psi(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}(t), t) + \frac{\hbar}{M} \text{Re} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} \ln \psi(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}(t), t) \right] |_{x_{cm}=x_{cm}(t)} dt + dW_{cm}(t), \tag{5.38}$$

## 5.2 Large N center-of-mass approximation in ZSM-Newton/Coulomb

$$dy_j(t) = \left[ \frac{\hbar}{m} \text{Im} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \ln \psi(x_{cm}(t), \mathbf{y}, t) + \frac{\hbar}{m} \text{Re} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \ln \psi(x_{cm}(t), \mathbf{y}, t) \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{y}(t)} dt + dW_j(t). \quad (5.39)$$

Given an initial wavefunction  $\psi(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}, 0)$  and initial trajectories  $\{x_{cm}^h(0), \mathbf{y}^h(0)\}$ , where the  $h$  index labels a particular set of possible initial trajectories, the stochastic evolution of the CM and relative coordinates can be determined completely.

Let's now consider the 2nd-order time-evolution of the mean trajectories of the CM. Defining

$$Q_{cm} := -\frac{\hbar^2}{2M} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{cm}^2} \sqrt{\rho}, \quad (5.40)$$

$$\sum_{j=2}^N Q_j := -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \sum_{j=2}^N \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_j^2} \sqrt{\rho}, \quad (5.41)$$

we can rewrite (5.33) as

$$\begin{aligned} M \frac{d^2 \bar{x}_{cm}(t)}{dt^2} &= M \left[ \partial_t \mathbf{v}_{cm} + \mathbf{v}_{cm} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} \mathbf{v}_{cm} + \sum_{j=2}^N \mathbf{v}_j \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \mathbf{v}_{cm} \right] \Big|_{\substack{\mathbf{y}=\bar{\mathbf{y}}(t) \\ x_{cm}=\bar{x}_{cm}(t)}} \\ &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} \left[ U + Q_{cm} + \sum_{j=2}^N Q_j \right] \Big|_{\substack{\mathbf{y}=\bar{\mathbf{y}}(t) \\ x_{cm}=\bar{x}_{cm}(t)}}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.42)$$

and the  $j$ -th component of (5.34) as

$$\begin{aligned} m \frac{d^2 \bar{y}_j(t)}{dt^2} &= m \left[ \partial_t \mathbf{v}_j + \sum_{j=2}^N \mathbf{v}_j \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \mathbf{v}_j + \mathbf{v}_{cm} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} \mathbf{v}_j \right] \Big|_{\substack{\mathbf{y}=\bar{\mathbf{y}}(t) \\ x_{cm}=\bar{x}_{cm}(t)}} \\ &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \left[ U + Q_{cm} + \sum_{j=2}^N Q_j \right] \Big|_{\substack{\mathbf{y}=\bar{\mathbf{y}}(t) \\ x_{cm}=\bar{x}_{cm}(t)}}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.43)$$

where the bars denote that the solutions of (5.42-43) are mean trajectories, as opposed to the stochastic trajectories obtained from solutions of (5.38-39). We note that equation (5.42) corresponds to Equation (14) of Oriols et al. [106].

Now, consider  $M$  experimental preparations <sup>2</sup> of a system of  $N$  identical particles, described by (5.36), each with the same initial wavefunction  $\psi(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}, 0)$ . For each preparation, there will be a different set of “ $h$ -trajectories” [106], and because of the identity of the particles, they will all have the same marginal probability distribution:

$$\bar{\rho}(y_k, 0) := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{h=1}^M \delta(y - \bar{y}_k^h(0)), \quad (5.44)$$

where  $M$  is a very large number of preparations. When  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , the distribution of initial particle positions in a single  $h$ -preparation,

$$P(y_k, 0) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{h=1}^N \delta(y - \bar{y}_k^h(0)), \quad (5.45)$$

fills the entire support of (5.44), thereby giving

$$\bar{\rho}(y_k, 0) \approx P(y_k, 0) \quad (5.46)$$

for the vast majority of the  $M$  preparations, where ‘vast majority’ refers to the possible sets of  $N$  initial mean trajectories  $\bar{X}^h(t) = \{\bar{x}_1^h(t), \dots, \bar{x}_N^h(t)\}$  selected according to the initial probability density  $\rho(X, 0) = |\psi(X, 0)|^2$ . The fact that the possible set of initial trajectories is selected randomly according to  $|\psi(X, 0)|^2$  ensures that possible sets of initial trajectories which don’t satisfy (5.46) will be extremely rare; and because the  $|\psi(X, 0)|^2$  distribution is preserved in time by the equivariant evolution given by (5.23), such possible sets of initial trajectories not satisfying (5.46) will be extremely rare for all times. Thus, Oriols et al. [106] refer to wavefunctions with probability densities satisfying (5.46) as “wavefunctions full of particles” (WFPs).

As noted by Oriols et al. [106], however, there are  $N$ -particle wavefunctions which don’t satisfy (5.46). For example, a factorizable wavefunction  $\psi(X, 0) = \prod_{i=1}^N \phi(x_i, 0)$  in general won’t be a WFP because it won’t have the necessary bosonic or fermionic symmetry requirements to justify the independence of the marginal probability distributions for each  $x_i$  (the only exception being a bosonic wavefunction where all the  $\phi_i$  are equal, such as in the mean-field approximation). For another example, wavefunctions with strong quantum correlations between the particles (see equation D3 of Oriols et al. [106] for an example involving an unphysical macroscopic superposition state) won’t have a single  $h$ -preparation which, in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , fills

---

<sup>2</sup>‘Experimental’ could refer to an actual laboratory experiment or a natural physical process outside laboratories.

the entire support of (5.44); however, Oriols et al. [106] argue that “most of the wave functions associated to macroscopic objects fulfill the requirements of a wave function full of particles, i.e. they do not include strong quantum correlations between particles” (page 12). While they don’t explain why they argue that most wavefunctions associated to macroscopic objects don’t include strong quantum correlations between particles, their expectation can be justified from the following observation: in dBB and stochastic mechanics, macroscopic superposition states (in the real world) arise as a result of decoherence from system-environment interactions [30, 31, 32, 33, 10, 14], and such decoherence is always accompanied by “effective collapse” [30, 31, 32, 33, 10, 14]. Effective collapse being the process whereby a dBB/Nelsonian/ZSM particle (or collection of such particles) composing the system dynamically evolves into one of the effective system wavefunction components of a system-environment entangled state, the latter formed during an environmental decoherence process. Thus effective collapse ensures that, for all practical purposes, only *one* of the components of a system-environment entangled state (i.e., a macroscopic quantum superposition state) will be dynamically relevant to the future motion of a single-particle or multi-particle system coupled to a macroscopic environment. In other words, an environmentally decohered macroscopic object (composed of dBB/Nelsonian/ZSM particles), which are virtually all of the macroscopic objects in the real world (according to dBB and stochastic mechanics), can always be expected to have a many-particle effective wavefunction associated to it corresponding to a WFP. In section 6, we will say more about how environmental decoherence and effective collapse of large  $N$  systems might be modeled within the Oriols et al. scheme. In the mean time, we will continue with assuming pure states that satisfy (5.46) and thus correspond to WFPs.

Focusing now on the CM motion given by (5.42) and (5.38), we shall specify the conditions under which its classical limit is obtained. For convenience, we rewrite (5.42) as

$$M \frac{d^2 \bar{x}_{cm}(t)}{dt^2} = F_U + F_{cm} + F_{rel}. \quad (5.47)$$

Classicality conditions will be obtained from comparing the  $N$ -dependences of the three forces on the rhs of (5.47).

First we recall that, because of the symmetry of  $U_{int}$ , its net force on the CM is zero, leaving the only non-zero net force coming from  $U_{ext}$ :

$$F_U := -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} \sum_{i=1}^N U_{ext}(x_i) = -\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial U_{ext}(x_i)}{\partial x_i}. \quad (5.48)$$

Furthermore, if spatial variations of  $U_{ext}$  are much larger than the size of the  $N$ -particle system

under consideration <sup>3</sup> (which will typically be the case for classical external potentials on macroscopic lengthscales), then (5.48) can be approximated as (using  $\partial x_i / \partial x_{cm} = 1$ )

$$F_U = F_{ext} \approx -N \frac{\partial U_{ext}(x_{cm})}{\partial x_{cm}}, \quad (5.49)$$

which is exact for linear and quadratic potentials as pointed out by Oriols et al. [106]. Thus we have that  $F_U \propto N$ .

Second, Oriols et al. [106] note that the conditional probability distribution for the CM position can be found by considering the probability distribution of  $\bar{x}_{cm}^h(t)$  for a large number of different  $h$ -trajectories given by  $\bar{X}^h(t) = \{\bar{x}_1^h(t), \dots, \bar{x}_N^h(t)\}$ . For a WFP in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , the second and third moments of the distribution are zero (see Theorems 9-10 of Appendix D of Oriols et al. [106]). Hence, for very large but finite  $N$ , one can expect a normal distribution for the CM position:

$$\rho(\bar{x}_{cm}^h(t)) \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_{cm}} \exp\left(-\frac{[\bar{x} - \bar{x}_{cm}^h(t)]^2}{2\sigma_{cm}^2}\right), \quad (5.50)$$

where  $\sigma_{cm}$  is estimated (see Theorem 10 in Appendix D of Oriols et al. [106]) to be given by

$$\sigma_{cm}^2 \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{N}, \quad (5.51)$$

where  $\sigma^2$  is the variance of the marginal distributions, and where  $\bar{x}$  is the mean position of the CM. The relation between these last two variables can be seen as follows. First, we have (from Corollary 1 and Theorem 4 in Appendix B of Oriols et al. [106]) that

$$\bar{x} \equiv \bar{x}_i = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx x \bar{\rho}(x), \quad (5.52)$$

where  $\bar{\rho}(x)$  is the marginal probability density of the  $i$ -th particle <sup>4</sup> from which it follows (from

---

<sup>3</sup>More precisely, if, for an  $N$ -particle system with number density of width  $d$ , in the presence of an external potential  $U$  with scale of spatial variation given by  $L(U) = \sqrt{|U'|/U''|}$ , we have that  $d \ll L(U)$ . This statement is closely related to the classicality condition used in the Ehrenfest theorem and in the quantum-classical limit scheme of Allori et al. [156, 298, 10], i.e., that the de Broglie wavelength  $\lambda$  of a single-particle wavepacket of width  $\sigma$  (where  $\sigma \geq \lambda$ ) satisfies  $\lambda \ll L(U)$ .

<sup>4</sup>This is defined as  $\bar{\rho}(x) \equiv \bar{\rho}_i(x_i) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx_1 \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx_{i-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx_{i+1} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx_N \rho(X)$ . Furthermore, for identical particles, the marginal probability density satisfies  $\bar{\rho}_i(x_i) = \bar{\rho}_j(x_j)$  for  $i \neq j$  (see the proof of Theorem 3 in Appendix B of Oriols et al. [106]).



## 5.2 Large N center-of-mass approximation in ZSM-Newton/Coulomb

Corollary 2 in Appendix B of Oriols et al. [106]) that

$$\sigma^2 \equiv \sigma_i^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx (x - \bar{x}) \bar{\rho}(x). \quad (5.53)$$

Now, calculating  $Q_{cm}$  and  $F_{cm}$  in terms of  $\rho(\bar{x}_{cm}^h(t))$ , one obtains

$$Q_{cm} \approx \frac{\hbar}{2M\sigma_{cm}^2} \left( 1 - \frac{[\bar{x} - \bar{x}_{cm}(t)]^2}{\sigma_{cm}^2} \right), \quad (5.54)$$

$$F_{cm} \approx -\frac{\partial Q_{cm}}{\partial x_{cm}} \Big|_{x_{cm}=\bar{x}_{cm}(t)}^{\mathbf{y}=\bar{\mathbf{y}}(t)} \propto \frac{\hbar}{m\sigma^3} \sqrt{N}, \quad (5.55)$$

where it is used that  $\bar{x} - \bar{x}_{cm}(t) \approx \sigma/\sqrt{N}$ . Thus  $F_{cm} \propto \sqrt{N}$ .

Third, since we are dealing with identical particles, we have that  $\rho(x_{cm}, y_2, \dots, y_j, \dots) = \rho(x_{cm}, y_j, \dots, y_2, \dots)$ , and so the force  $F_{rel}$  can be rewritten as

$$F_{rel} := \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \sum_{j=2}^N \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \frac{\partial^2 \sqrt{\rho}}{\partial y_j^2} \right) \right] \Big|_{x_{cm}=\bar{x}_{cm}(t)}^{\mathbf{y}=\bar{\mathbf{y}}(t)}. \quad (5.56)$$

As emphasized by Oriols et al., the exchange symmetry in  $\rho$  means that a single preparation with  $N \rightarrow \infty$  is equivalent to  $h = \{1, \dots, N\}$  different preparations with  $\bar{y}_2^h(t)$  approximately filling the entire support of  $\rho$  in the  $y_2$  3-space. Accordingly, the quantum equilibrium distribution for the particles implies that the sum in (5.56) can be approximated by an integral that's weighted by  $\rho$ :

$$F_{rel} \approx N \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \int_{y_2} \left[ \rho \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \frac{\partial^2 \sqrt{\rho}}{\partial y_2^2} \right) \right] \Big|_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)}^{\bar{y}_3(t), \dots, \bar{y}_N(t)} dy_2 \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.57)$$

That (5.57) vanishes is due to a symmetric distribution of positive and negative summands (for an explicit proof, see Appendix E of Oriols et al. [106]). Thus  $F_{rel} \approx 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

To summarize, then, in the limit that  $N \rightarrow \infty$  for identical particles, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_U &\propto N, \\ F_{cm} &\propto \sqrt{N}, \\ F_{rel} &\rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.58)$$

So it is clear that the classical external force  $F_U$  grows much faster (under the stated conditions) than the two quantum forces, as the number of identical particles interacting through  $U_{int}$  becomes very large. This conclusion does not hold, of course, for the relative degrees of freedom, nor would we expect otherwise. In fact, we should expect that the positions of the individual elementary particles (or atoms) composing a macroscopic object will continue to have non-classical (quantum) dynamics, even when the dynamics of the CM position is approximately classical. A useful and interesting consequence of (5.58) is that quantum uncertainty becomes negligible: between any two preparations of an  $N$ -particle system,  $\bar{X}^h(t)$  and  $\bar{X}^l(t)$ , the CM trajectories and velocities will be very similar, i.e.  $\bar{x}_{cm}^h(t) \approx \bar{x}_{cm}^l(t)$  and  $\mathbf{v}_{cm}^h(t) \approx \mathbf{v}_{cm}^l(t)$ . Thus it is coherent to speak of fixing the initial position and velocity of the CM position in the present context, as is done in classical mechanics.

How large does  $N$  have to be for  $F_{cm}$  and  $F_{rel}$  to become negligible relative to  $F_U$ ? This was addressed by Oriols et al. in numerical simulations [106].

In one simulation (Appendix F of Oriols et al. [106]), an initial  $N$ -particle wavefunction for identical particles was constructed from pairs of Gaussian wave packets, with random dispersion and opposite random momenta and central positions (in other words, the packets move towards each other and eventually interfere), under the action of an external linear potential. The linear potential spans a lengthscale of  $\sim 10^{-7}m$ , while the packet widths are only  $\sim 10^{-10}m$ , thereby satisfying the condition that the classical external potential varies over lengthscales much greater than the size of the  $N$ -particle system. Half of the initial positions of the  $N$  particles were selected randomly according to the probability density of the left packet, the other half according to the probability density of the right packet, and then the evolution of the CM was computed under the influence of the three forces in (5.47). As a comparison, the classical CM was computed from Newton's law with the linear potential (i.e.,  $F_U$  alone), with the same initial CM position and velocity. The resulting trajectories were compared for  $N = 1$  through  $N = 20$  (see Figure 1 of Oriols et al. [106]). For  $N = 1$ , the relative error between the classical and quantum CM motions increases from zero to 45% in 2 picoseconds; for  $N = 20$ , the relative error increases from zero to less than 2% in the same duration. In other words, for  $N = 1$ , the classical and quantum CM motions significantly differ from each other in a very short time, as expected, while for  $N = 20$ , the two CM motions become effectively indistinguishable in a very short time. Moreover, even for  $N$  distinguishable particles, under the same conditions, Oriols et al. find that the relative error for  $N = 20$  increases from zero to around 5% in 2 picoseconds. It is remarkable that, under the stated conditions, relatively few particles are needed to reach the "large  $N$ " regime.

As a corollary to the above results, we note that, for the case of a WFP, the CM osmotic

## 5.2 Large N center-of-mass approximation in ZSM-Newton/Coulomb

velocity is given by

$$\mathbf{u}_{cm} = \frac{\hbar}{2M} \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_{cm}} \Big|_{x_{cm}=\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} \approx \frac{\hbar}{2m\sigma\sqrt{N}}, \quad (5.59)$$

while from (5.47) and (5.49) the CM current velocity is found to be

$$\mathbf{v}_{cm} = \frac{1}{M} \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_{cm}} \Big|_{x_{cm}=\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} \approx -\frac{1}{Nm} \int_{t_0}^t \left[ N \frac{\partial U_{ext}}{\partial x_{cm}} - F_{cm} \right] \Big|_{x_{cm}=\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} dt' + \mathbf{v}_{cm0}, \quad (5.60)$$

where the contribution from  $F_{rel}$  is neglected because, as we saw from (5.57), it rapidly approaches zero in the large  $N$  limit. Since  $F_{cm}$  is the only  $N$ -dependent term in (5.60) and scales like  $\sqrt{N}$ , we can see that in the large  $N$  limit, the dominant contribution to the CM current velocity will come from  $\partial U_{ext}/\partial x_{cm}$ . Accordingly, in the large  $N$  limit, the CM current velocity will dominate over the CM osmotic velocity (5.59). Thus, recalling the forward stochastic differential equation

$$dx_{cm}(t) = \left[ \frac{1}{M} \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_{cm}} + \frac{\hbar}{2M} \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_{cm}} \right] \Big|_{x_{cm}=x_{cm}(t)} dt + dW_{cm}(t), \quad (5.61)$$

where  $E_t [dW_{cm}^2] = \frac{\hbar}{M} dt$ , we can see that as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $E_t [dW_{cm}^2] \rightarrow 0$  and (5.61) reduces to

$$\frac{dx_{cm}(t)}{dt} \approx \frac{1}{M} \frac{\partial S_{cl}}{\partial x_{cm}} \Big|_{x_{cm}=x_{cm}(t)}. \quad (5.62)$$

The same follows, of course, for the backward stochastic differential equation.

Extending the above approach to the case of 3-space is formally straightforward, and entails the replacements  $\partial/\partial x_{cm} \rightarrow \nabla_{cm}$ ,  $\partial/\partial y_j \rightarrow \nabla_j$ ,  $x_{cm} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_{cm}$ ,  $\mathbf{y} \rightarrow \mathbf{r}$ , and inclusion of the quantization relation for the phase field  $S$ :

$$\oint_L \nabla_{cm} S(\mathbf{R}_{cm}, \mathbf{r}, t) \cdot d\mathbf{R}_{cm} + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \oint_L \nabla_j S(\mathbf{R}_{cm}, \mathbf{r}, t) \cdot d\mathbf{r}_j = nh. \quad (5.63)$$

This last ensures that the 3N-dimensional generalizations of (5.23) and (5.35) are indeed equivalent to the 3N-dimensional generalization of (5.36), and that  $\psi(\mathbf{R}_{cm}, \mathbf{r}, t)$  is single-valued with (generally) multi-valued phase.

### 5.3 Classical nonlinear Schrödinger equation for large $N$ center-of-mass motion

#### 5.3.1 Oriols et al.'s derivation

What form does the time-dependent Schrödinger equation for  $\psi(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}, t)$  take in the large  $N$  limit? Before presenting our answer, let us first review and critique the answer given by Oriols et al. [106].

Introduce the conditional  $S$  and  $\rho$  functions for the CM by the following definitions:

$$S_{cm}(x_{cm}, t) := S(x_{cm}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}(t), t), \quad \rho_{cm}(x_{cm}, t) := \rho(x_{cm}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}(t), t), \quad (5.64)$$

where  $S_{cm}$  satisfies

$$-\partial_t S_{cm} = \frac{1}{2M} \left( \frac{\partial S_{cm}}{\partial x_{cm}} \right)^2 + U(x_{cm}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}(t), t) + A, \quad (5.65)$$

with

$$A := Q_{cm} + \sum_{j=2}^N \left[ \frac{1}{2m} \left( \frac{\partial S_{cm}}{\partial y_j} \right)^2 + Q_j - v_j^h(t) \frac{\partial S_{cm}}{\partial y_j} \right], \quad (5.66)$$

and where  $\rho_{cm}$  satisfies

$$-\partial_t \rho_{cm} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} \left( \frac{1}{M} \frac{\partial S_{cm}}{\partial x_{cm}} \rho_{cm} \right) + B, \quad (5.67)$$

with

$$B := - \sum_{j=2}^N \left[ \frac{\partial \rho_{cm}}{\partial y_j} v_j^h(t) - \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \left( \frac{1}{m} \frac{\partial S_{cm}}{\partial y_j} \rho_{cm} \right) \right]. \quad (5.68)$$

Using the Madelung transformation, (5.65) and (5.67) can then be combined into the ‘conditional Schrödinger equation’ [27]

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar \partial_t \psi_{cm} = & -\frac{\hbar^2}{2M} \frac{\partial^2 \psi_{cm}}{\partial x_{cm}^2} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \sum_{j=2}^N \frac{\partial^2 \Psi(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}, t)}{\partial y_j^2} \Big|_{\mathbf{y}=\bar{\mathbf{y}}^h(t)} \\ & + i\hbar \sum_{j=2}^N v_j^h(t) \frac{\partial \Psi(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}, t)}{\partial y_j} \Big|_{\mathbf{y}=\bar{\mathbf{y}}^h(t)} + U(x_{cm}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}(t), t) \psi, \end{aligned} \quad (5.69)$$

### 5.3 Classical nonlinear Schrödinger equation for large N center-of-mass motion

where  $\psi_{cm}(x_{cm}, t) = \sqrt{\rho_{cm}(x_{cm}, t)} e^{iS_{cm}(x_{cm}, t)/\hbar}$  is the ‘conditional wavefunction’ in polar form.

Now, from the earlier observation that the large  $N$  limit implies

$$\left. \frac{\partial V}{\partial x_{cm}} \right|_{x_{cm}^h = \bar{x}_{cm}^h(t)} \gg \left. \frac{\partial \left( Q_{cm} + \sum_{j=2}^N Q_j \right)}{\partial x_{cm}} \right|_{\substack{\mathbf{y} = \bar{\mathbf{y}}(t) \\ x_{cm} = \bar{x}_{cm}(t)}}, \quad (5.70)$$

and noting that

$$0 = \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} \left( \frac{1}{2m} \left( \frac{\partial S_{cm}}{\partial y_j} \right)^2 - v_j^h(t) \frac{\partial S_{cm}}{\partial y_j} \right) \right] \Big|_{\substack{\mathbf{y} = \bar{\mathbf{y}}(t) \\ x_{cm}^h = \bar{x}_{cm}^h(t)}}, \quad (5.71)$$

it follows that  $A \approx 0$  along the CM trajectory. So (5.65) effectively corresponds to the classical Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the CM, in the large  $N$  limit.

Oriols et al. assert that it is reasonable to assume  $B = 0$ , since this turns (5.67) into the standard continuity equation for the large  $N$  CM Gaussian density (5.50). Thus (5.65) and (5.67) can be combined via the Madelung transformation to get the classical nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar \partial_t \psi_{cl} = \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2M} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{cm}^2} + U(x_{cm}, t) - Q_{cm} \right) \psi_{cl}, \quad (5.72)$$

where  $\psi_{cl}(x_{cm}, t) = \sqrt{\rho_{cl}(x_{cm}, t)} e^{iS_{cl}(x_{cm}, t)/\hbar}$  is the ‘classical wavefunction’ for the CM.

The problem with this derivation, in our view, is that no physical justification is given for why it is reasonable to take  $B = 0$ . The fact that such an assumption turns (5.67) into the standard continuity equation is of course true, but this doesn’t constitute an explanation for *why* it should be true. So let us turn now to our explanation for how (5.72) can be derived within the Oriols et al. framework, without having to assume that  $B = 0$  in (5.67).

#### 5.3.2 Conditional Madelung equations

To demonstrate effective decoupling of the CM and relative coordinates in the large  $N$  limit, it is convenient to focus first on the relative coordinates.

Consider the conditional Madelung variables  $\rho_{rel}(\mathbf{y}, t) := \rho(\bar{x}_{cm}(t), \mathbf{y}, t)$  and  $S_{rel}(\mathbf{y}, t) := S(\bar{x}_{cm}(t), \mathbf{y}, t)$ , with evolution equations

$$\partial_t \rho_{rel} = - \sum_{j=2}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \left[ \rho_{rel} \frac{\partial S_{rel}}{\partial y_j} \frac{1}{m} \right] - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} \left[ \rho \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_{cm}} \frac{1}{M} \right] \Big|_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} + \left( v_{cm}(t) \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_{cm}} \right) \Big|_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)}, \quad (5.73)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 -\partial_t S_{rel} = & \sum_{j=2}^N \frac{1}{2m} \left( \frac{\partial S_{rel}}{\partial y_j} \right)^2 + \sum_{j=2}^N \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho_{rel}}} \frac{\partial^2 \sqrt{\rho_{rel}}}{\partial y_j^2} \right) \\
 & + \frac{1}{2M} \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_{cm}} \right) |_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} - \left( \frac{\hbar^2}{2M} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \frac{\partial^2 \sqrt{\rho}}{\partial x_{cm}^2} \right) |_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} - v_{cm}(t) \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_{cm}} |_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} + U |_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)},
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.74}$$

where again

$$v_{cm}(t) = \frac{d\bar{x}_{cm}(t)}{dt} = \frac{1}{M} \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_{cm}} |_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t), \bar{\mathbf{y}}(t)}, \tag{5.75}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 U |_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} &= \left[ \sum_{j=1}^N U_{ext}(x_j) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1; j \neq k}^N U_{int}(x_j - x_k) \right] |_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} \\
 &= N U_{ext}(\bar{x}_{cm}(t)) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1; j \neq k}^N U_{int}(x_j - x_k).
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.76}$$

We will argue that, in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , the ‘global’  $S$  and  $\rho$  variables effectively decouple in  $\mathbf{y}$  and  $x_{cm}$ , thereby reducing (5.73-74) to the corresponding effective Madelung equations for the relative coordinates, and likewise for the conditional CM Madelung equations.

### Conditional-to-effective continuity equation

Equation (5.73) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \partial_t \rho_{rel} = & - \sum_{j=2}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \left[ \rho_{rel} \frac{\partial S_{rel}}{\partial y_j} \frac{1}{m} \right] - \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} \left( \rho \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_{cm}} \frac{1}{M} \right) - v_{cm}(t) \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_{cm}} \right] |_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} \\
 = & - \sum_{j=2}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \left[ \rho_{rel} \frac{\partial S_{rel}}{\partial y_j} \frac{1}{m} \right] - \left[ \frac{1}{M} \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_{cm}} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_{cm}} + \frac{1}{M} \rho \frac{\partial^2 S}{\partial x_{cm}^2} - \frac{1}{M} \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_{cm}} |_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}(t)} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_{cm}} \right] |_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.77}$$

We claim that, in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , all the terms in the last bracket on the rhs of (5.77) contribute only as time-dependent correction factors, and therefore can be dropped.

To see this, recall that when  $N \rightarrow \infty$  we have

$$M \frac{d^2 \bar{x}_{cm}(t)}{dt^2} \approx - \frac{\partial (N U_{ext}(x_{cm}))}{\partial x_{cm}} |_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} = -N \frac{\partial U_{ext}(x_{cm})}{\partial x_{cm}} |_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)}, \tag{5.78}$$

### 5.3 Classical nonlinear Schrödinger equation for large N center-of-mass motion

where  $U_{ext}$  spatially varies on macroscopic scales. Integrating (5.78) gives

$$\frac{d\bar{x}_{cm}(t)}{dt} = \frac{1}{M} \frac{\partial S(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}, t)}{\partial x_{cm}} \Big|_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t), \bar{\mathbf{y}}(t)} \approx -\frac{1}{m} \int_{t_0}^t \left( \frac{\partial U_{ext}}{\partial x_{cm}} \right) \Big|_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t')} dt' + v_{cm}(0) =: \frac{1}{M} \frac{\partial S_{cl}(x_{cm}, t)}{\partial x_{cm}} \Big|_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)}, \quad (5.79)$$

and thus

$$\frac{1}{M} \frac{\partial^2 S(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}, t)}{\partial x_{cm}^2} \Big|_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t), \bar{\mathbf{y}}(t)} \approx -\frac{1}{m} \int_{t_0}^t \left( \frac{\partial^2 U_{ext}}{\partial x_{cm}^2} \right) \Big|_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t')} dt' =: \frac{1}{M} \frac{\partial^2 S_{cl}(x_{cm}, t)}{\partial x_{cm}^2} \Big|_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)}, \quad (5.80)$$

which we see are effectively independent of  $\mathbf{y}$  and only depend on time.

Note, also, that the equation of motion for the relative positions is given by

$$m \frac{d^2 \bar{y}_j(t)}{dt^2} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1; j \neq k}^N U_{int} + Q_{cm} + \sum_{j=2}^N Q_j \right]. \quad (5.81)$$

where

$$\frac{d\bar{y}_j(t)}{dt} = -\frac{1}{m} \int_{t_0}^t \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1; j \neq k}^N U_{int} + Q_{cm} + \sum_{j=2}^N Q_j \right] \Big|_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}(t'), \bar{x}_{cm}(t')} dt' + v_j(0) = \frac{1}{m} \frac{\partial S}{\partial y_j} \Big|_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t), \bar{\mathbf{y}}(t)}. \quad (5.82)$$

In the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$m \frac{d^2 \bar{y}_j(t)}{dt^2} \approx -\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1; j \neq k}^N U_{int} + \sum_{j=2}^N Q_j \right] \quad (5.83)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\bar{y}_j(t)}{dt} &= \frac{1}{m} \frac{\partial S(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}, t)}{\partial y_j} \Big|_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t), \bar{\mathbf{y}}(t)} \\ &\approx -\frac{1}{m} \int_{t_0}^t \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1; j \neq k}^N U_{int} + \sum_{j=2}^N Q_j \right] \Big|_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}(t')} dt' + v_j(0) = \frac{1}{m} \frac{\partial S_{rel}(\mathbf{y}, t)}{\partial y_j} \Big|_{\bar{\mathbf{y}}(t)}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.84)$$

since the large  $N$  CM density (corresponding to a WFP) takes the form (5.50), implying the

## 5 Semiclassical Newtonian Field Theories Based On Stochastic Mechanics II

effective factorization

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \rho(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}, t) \approx \rho_{cl}(x_{cm}, t) \rho_{rel}(\mathbf{y}, t), \quad (5.85)$$

which leads to  $Q_{cm}$  taking the  $\mathbf{y}$ -independent form (5.54). Correspondingly, for all  $j = 2, \dots, N$ , equation (5.85) implies

$$Q_j(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}, t) \approx - \left( \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho_{rel}(\mathbf{y}, t)}} \frac{\partial^2 \sqrt{\rho_{rel}(\mathbf{y}, t)}}{\partial y_j^2} \right) = Q_j(\mathbf{y}, t), \quad (5.86)$$

which is effectively independent of  $x_{cm}$ .

In other words, in the large  $N$  limit, the relative coordinates evolve in time (effectively) independently of the CM coordinate.

Accordingly, it follows that (5.80) only contributes to (5.77) an uninteresting time-dependent factor of the form

$$\frac{1}{M} \left[ \rho(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}, t) \frac{\partial^2 S(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}, t)}{\partial x_{cm}^2} \right] |_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} \approx \frac{1}{M} \left[ \rho_{cl}(x_{cm}, t) \frac{\partial^2 S_{cl}(x_{cm}, t)}{\partial x_{cm}^2} \right] |_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} \rho_{rel}(\mathbf{y}, t), \quad (5.87)$$

while (5.79) along with (5.85) imply the time-dependent factors

$$\frac{1}{M} \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_{cm}} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_{cm}} \right) |_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} \approx \frac{1}{M} \left( \frac{\partial S_{cl}(x_{cm}, t)}{\partial x_{cm}} \frac{\partial \rho_{cl}(x_{cm}, t)}{\partial x_{cm}} \right) |_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} \rho_{rel}(\mathbf{y}, t), \quad (5.88)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{M} \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_{cm}} |_{\mathbf{y}=\bar{\mathbf{y}}(t)} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_{cm}} \right) |_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} \approx \frac{1}{M} \left( \frac{\partial S_{cl}(x_{cm}, t)}{\partial x_{cm}} \frac{\partial \rho_{cl}(x_{cm}, t)}{\partial x_{cm}} \right) |_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} \rho_{rel}(\mathbf{y}, t). \quad (5.89)$$

Hence, terms (5.87-89) might as well be dropped from (5.77), leaving

$$\partial_t \rho_{rel} \approx - \sum_{j=2}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \left[ \rho_{rel} \frac{\partial S_{rel}}{\partial y_j} \frac{1}{m} \right], \quad (5.90)$$

which is just the effective continuity equation for  $\rho_{rel}$ .



### Conditional-to-effective quantum Hamilton-Jacobi equation

Equation (5.74) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
 -\partial_t S_{rel} = & \sum_{j=2}^N \frac{1}{2m} \left( \frac{\partial S_{rel}}{\partial y_j} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2M} \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_{cm}} \right)^2 \Big|_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} - \frac{1}{M} \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_{cm}} \Big|_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t), \bar{\mathbf{y}}(t)} \cdot \frac{\partial S}{\partial x_{cm}} \Big|_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} \\
 & + \sum_{j=2}^N \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho_{rel}}} \frac{\partial^2 \sqrt{\rho_{rel}}}{\partial y_j^2} \right) - \left( \frac{\hbar^2}{2M} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \frac{\partial^2 \sqrt{\rho}}{\partial x_{cm}^2} \right) \Big|_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)} + U \Big|_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.91}$$

From the arguments in section 3.2.1, the large  $N$  limit entails that we can neglect the terms involving  $(\partial S / \partial x_{cm})|_{\bar{x}_{cm}(t)}$ , since they contribute only as time-dependent factors in (5.91) and drop out of the equations of motion for the relative coordinates.

Similarly, as noted in subsection 2.1, for large  $N$  the center-of-mass quantum kinetic takes the form (5.54), which means it contributes only an uninteresting time-dependent phase shift to  $S_{rel}$  in (5.91). And, as we showed in subsection 2.1, that the CM quantum kinetic takes the  $\mathbf{y}$ -independent form (5.54) means that the CM quantum kinetic drops out of the equations of motion for the relative positions, i.e., equations (5.81-82), and might as well also be dropped from (5.91).

Likewise, in  $U|_{x_{cm}(t)}$ , the external potential component  $\sum_{j=1}^N U_{ext}(x_j) = N U_{ext}(x_{cm})$  will also contribute to  $S_{rel}$  only a time-dependent phase shift, and thus can be dropped as well.

We are thereby left with the effective quantum Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$-\partial_t S_{rel} \approx \sum_{j=2}^N \frac{1}{2m} \left( \frac{\partial S_{rel}}{\partial y_j} \right)^2 + \sum_{j=2}^N \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho_{rel}}} \frac{\partial^2 \sqrt{\rho_{rel}}}{\partial y_j^2} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1; j \neq k}^N U_{int}. \tag{5.92}$$

Accordingly, we conclude that the ‘global’  $S$  function effectively decomposes as

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} S(x_{cm}, \mathbf{y}, t) \approx S_{cl}(x_{cm}, t) + S_{rel}(\mathbf{y}, t), \tag{5.93}$$

where  $S_{cl}(x_{cm}, t)$  evolves autonomously by its effective classical Hamilton-Jacobi equation (equation (5.65) with  $A \approx 0$ ), and likewise for  $\rho_{cl}(x_{cm}, t)$  (equation (5.67) with  $B \approx 0$ ). The Madelung transformation involving  $S_{cl}(x_{cm}, t)$  and  $\rho_{cl}(x_{cm}, t)$  then yields the classical nonlinear Schrödinger equation (5.72).

### 5.3.3 Comments on the classical nonlinear Schrödinger equation

As is well known [126, 127, 268, 128, 129, 130, 106, 26, 27], (5.72) can also be formally derived (with  $\hbar$  as a free parameter) from classical statistical mechanics of a single particle in an external scalar potential, in the Hamilton-Jacobi representation. What's different here is that (5.72) is an approximate description of the Schrödinger evolution for the CM of an  $N$ -particle system, with potential  $U$  (where the external component spatially varies on scales larger than the size of the  $N$ -particle system), in the limit that  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

In order to verify the robustness of (5.72) as an approximation to classical dynamics, Oriols et al. [106] numerically simulated a Gaussian wavepacket, defined by taking the square root of (5.50) and multiplying by  $\exp(ik_0 x_{cm})$ , evolving by (5.72) for two cases: a packet in free fall in external potential  $U = 2x_{cm}$ , and a packet oscillating in a harmonic oscillator potential  $U = x_{cm}^2/2$ . In both cases (Figures 2 and 3 of [106]), their simulations confirm that the packets do not disperse over time, and the CM trajectories (for different initial positions) closely mimic the CM trajectories one expects from classical mechanics.

Extending our derivation of (5.72) to the 3-dimensional case is formally straightforward, and requires inclusion of the quantization condition on the 3-dimensional generalization of the CM conditional phase field as follows:

$$\oint_L \nabla_{cm} S(\mathbf{R}_{cm}, \mathbf{r}(t), t) \cdot d\mathbf{R}_{cm} = \oint_L \nabla_{cm} S_{cm} \cdot d\mathbf{R}_{cm} = nh. \quad (5.94)$$

This assures that the 3-dimensional version of  $\psi_{cm}$  is single-valued with (generally) multi-valued phase.

A notable advantage of (5.72) as a 'large  $N$ ' approximation is that, in contrast to the mean-field SN and stochastic SN equations, (5.72) does not admit macroscopic superpositions of CM position states, and so does not predict macroscopic semiclassical gravitational/electrostatic cat states in the case that  $U_{int}$  corresponds to an  $N$ -body Newtonian gravitational/Coulomb potential (e.g., such as in a neutron star or the sun). Basically, this is because the nonlinearity of (5.72) means that any pair of solutions,  $\psi_1^{cl}$  and  $\psi_2^{cl}$ , cannot, in general, be superposed to form a more complex solution. Thus, only one positional wavepacket is associated to the evolution of the CM at any time.

## 5.4 Recovering classical Newtonian gravity for many macro particles

Suppose now that we have  $K$  many-particle systems, with CM masses  $\{M^i, \dots, M^K\}$ , where the  $i$ -th CM 'particle' is described by a pair of CM Madelung variables  $\{\rho_{cl}^i, S_{cl}^i\}$  evolving

#### 5.4 Recovering classical Newtonian gravity for many macro particles

by their own effective Madelung equations. Suppose, further, that these CM particles classically interact via macroscopically long-range classical gravitational (or electrostatic) potentials (i.e., potentials spatially varying on scales much larger than the sizes of the  $N$ -particle systems composing the CM particles). Then the K-body effective Madelung equations for these gravitationally interacting CM particles, are given by

$$-\partial_t \rho_{cl}^K \approx \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}^i} \left( \frac{1}{M^i} \frac{\partial S_{cl}^K}{\partial x_{cm}^i} \rho_{cl}^K \right), \quad (5.95)$$

$$-\partial_t S_{cl}^K \approx \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{1}{2M^i} \left( \frac{\partial S_{cl}^K}{\partial x_{cm}^i} \right)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^K U^i, \quad (5.96)$$

where the solution of (5.95) is a product state of narrow Gaussians

$$\rho_{cl}^K \approx \prod_{i=1}^K \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_{cm}^i} \exp \left( -\frac{[\bar{x}^i - x_{cm}^i]^2}{2[\sigma_{cm}^i]^2} \right) =: \prod_{i=1}^K \rho_{cl}^i, \quad (5.97)$$

the solution of (5.96) takes the form

$$S_{cl}^K \approx \left[ \sum_{i=1}^K \int p_{cm}^i dx_{cm}^i - \int \left( \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{1}{2M^i} (p_{cm}^i)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^K U^i \right) dt \right] - \sum_{i=1}^K \hbar \phi_{cm}^i =: \sum_{i=1}^K S_{cl}^i, \quad (5.98)$$

and the potential

$$U^i := \sum_{n=1}^{N^i} U_{ext}^i(x_n^i) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1}^{N^i(j \neq k)} U_{int}^i(x_j - x_k), \quad (5.99)$$

where

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N^i} U_{ext}^i(x_n^i) \approx N^i U_{ext}^i(x_{cm}^i) := -\frac{M^i}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{K(l \neq i)} \frac{M^l}{|x_{cm}^i - x_{cm}^l|}, \quad (5.100)$$

using  $(\partial x_n^i / \partial x_{cm}^i) = 1$ .

Notice that, despite the CM ‘particles’ gravitationally interacting via (5.100), the large- $N$  CM densities form a product state (5.97). This follows from our assumption that the gravitational potentials sourced by the CM ‘particles’ are (macroscopically) long-range, and therefore vary on distance scales much larger than the sizes of the  $N$ -particle systems composing the CM particles (i.e.,  $\sigma_{cm}^i \ll \sqrt{|U_{ext}^i|/|U_{ext}^{i'}|} [298, 156, 10]$ ). Recall from subsection 2.1 that

this was a necessary condition for showing that the large- $N$  density, corresponding to a WFP, takes the (approximately) Gaussian form of the factors in (5.97). Moreover, although the  $z$  $bw$  phases of the CM ‘particles’ are not physically independent, due to the non-separable potential (5.100) which physically influences each CM particle via the (approximately) classical equations of motion

$$M^i \frac{dx_{cm}^i(t)}{dt} \approx \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}^i} S_{cl}^K |_{x_{cm}^i = x_{cm}^i(t)}, \quad (5.101)$$

$$M^i \frac{d^2 x_{cm}^i(t)}{dt^2} \approx -N^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}^i} U_{ext}^i(x_{cm}^i, t) |_{x_{cm}^i = x_{cm}^i(t)} = M^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}^i} \sum_{l=1}^{K(l \neq i)} \frac{M^l}{2|x_{cm}^i - x_{cm}^l|} |_{x_{cm}^i = x_{cm}^i(t)}^{x_{cm}^l = x_{cm}^l(t)}, \quad (5.102)$$

it is still meaningful to speak of the  $z$  $bw$  phase of an individual CM ‘particle’ in the lab frame; the  $i$ -th CM ‘particle’, in the lab frame, has an associated  $z$  $bw$  phase  $S_{cl}^i$  that depends on the sum of all the potentials sourced by the  $K - 1$  other CM ‘particles’, at the space-time location of the  $i$ -th CM ‘particle’. Indeed, the net potential ‘seen’ by an individual CM particle, from the  $K - 1$  CM particles, looks like a slowly varying external potential as a consequence of  $\sigma_{cm}^i \ll \sqrt{|U_{ext}^i/U_{ext}^{i'}/U_{ext}^{i''}|}$ . Thus  $S_{cl}^i$  varies slowly as a function of  $U_{ext}^i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, K$ , much like the phase of a light wave moving through a medium of slowly (spatially) varying refractive index.

If we employ the Madelung transformation, (5.95-96) can be combined into the K-body version of (5.72):

$$i\hbar \partial_t \psi_{cl}^K = \sum_{i=1}^K \left( -\frac{\hbar^2}{2M^i} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{cm}^{i2}} + U^i - Q_{cm}^i \right) \psi_{cl}^K, \quad (5.103)$$

where

$$\psi_{cl}^K \approx \prod_{i=1}^K \sqrt{\rho_{cl}^i} e^{iS_{cl}^i/\hbar} =: \prod_{i=1}^K \psi_{cl}^i, \quad (5.104)$$

$$Q_{cm}^i := -\frac{\hbar^2}{2M^i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho_{cl}^K}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{cm}^{i2}} \sqrt{\rho_{cl}^K} \approx \frac{\hbar}{2M^i (\sigma_{cm}^i)^2} \left( 1 - \frac{[\bar{x}^i - x_{cm}^{hi}]^2}{[\sigma_{cm}^i]^2} \right). \quad (5.105)$$

So the Madelung variables for each large- $N$  CM particle define narrow (in position space) classical wavepackets  $\psi_{cl}^i$  satisfying the nonlinear Schrödinger equation (5.103).

An important property of the K-body system of large- $N$  CM ‘particles’ is that the CM particle trajectories can cross in configuration space. To see this, let us recall what the exact

## 5.5 Recovering classical Vlasov-Poisson mean-field theory

dBB/Nelsonian dynamics predict for a CM ‘particle’ associated to a pure state  $\Psi$ , when  $\Psi$  is a superposition of two (not necessarily narrow) Gaussian wavepackets in position space moving with fixed speeds in opposite directions towards each other. When the packets overlap in configuration space, the exact description says that an ensemble of identical CM particle trajectories, corresponding to each packet, will not cross but rather will abruptly (but not discontinuously) change directions and exit the overlapping region with the packets they did not initially occupy [268, 8, 10]. The physical reason for this non-classical behavior is that the pure state defines a single-valued momentum field in configuration space through  $p = \hbar \text{Im} \nabla \ln \Psi$ , which means that there will be a unique momentum for each point in the overlap region. Equivalently, the quantum forces from the quantum kinetic associated to  $\Psi$  in the overlap region push the trajectories away from each other and causes them to abruptly change directions. In the case of the K-body system, a superposition of two wavepackets can’t be applied since the packets associated to the large- $N$  CM ‘particles’ evolve by coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations (5.103), and any superposition of two packets doesn’t form a new solution of (5.103). Nevertheless, we can consider two, identical, large- $N$  CM particles, associated to two narrow Gaussian wavepackets moving in opposite directions towards each other and ask if their trajectories will cross (assume the two particles don’t classically interact or only negligibly so). Yes, because (i) the narrowness of the two packets (recall that  $\sigma_{cm} \equiv \frac{\sigma^2}{N}$ , and we have  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , implying that the amplitudes of the packets are effectively Dirac delta functions) ensures that they are effectively disjoint (hence don’t interfere) in position space, and (ii) the quantum force is absent from the large  $N$  equations of motion (5.101-102). So the large- $N$  CM ‘particles’ indeed move like classical mechanical particles, since classical mechanics predicts that particle trajectories can cross in configuration space (but not in phase space). Similar observations have been made by Benseny et al. in [299] and Dürr et al. in [10].

## 5.5 Recovering classical Vlasov-Poisson mean-field theory

We can now connect the K-body system of gravitationally interacting, large- $N$  CM ‘particles’ to the classical Vlasov-Poisson mean-field theory.

Assuming the special case of identical CM ‘particles’, multiplying the first term on the right hand side in (5.99) by  $1/K$  (the weak-coupling scaling [270, 271, 272]), and subtracting out the second term on the right hand side in (5.99) (since it will only yield a global phase factor), the K-body effective CM Madelung equations become

$$-\partial_t \rho_{cl}^K \approx \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}^i} \left( \frac{1}{M} \frac{\partial S_{cl}^K}{\partial x_{cm}^i} \rho_{cl}^K \right), \quad (5.106)$$

$$H_{cl}^K := -\partial_t S_{cl}^K \approx \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{1}{2M} \left( \frac{\partial S_{cl}^K}{\partial x_{cm}^i} \right)^2 - \frac{M^2}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^{K(l \neq i)} \frac{1}{2|x_{cm}^i - x_{cm}^l|}, \quad (5.107)$$

with solutions given by (5.97-98) for  $M^i = M$ . The classical equations of motion are just

$$p_{cm}^i(t) := M \frac{dx_{cm}^i(t)}{dt} \approx \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}^i} S_{cl}^K |_{x_{cm}^i = x_{cm}^i(t)}, \quad (5.108)$$

$$\frac{dp_{cm}^i(t)}{dt} = M \frac{d^2 x_{cm}^i(t)}{dt^2} \approx \frac{M^2}{K} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}^i} \sum_{l=1}^{K(l \neq i)} \frac{1}{2|x_{cm}^i - x_{cm}^l|} \Big|_{x_{cm}^i = x_{cm}^i(t), x_{cm}^l = x_{cm}^l(t)}. \quad (5.109)$$

Now, consider the empirical distribution for the  $K$  particles  $f_K(x_{cm}, p_{cm}, t) := K^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^K \delta(x_{cm} - x_{cm}^i(t)) \delta(p_{cm} - p_{cm}^i(t))$  satisfying (in the sense of distributions) the Vlasov equation

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t f_K + p_{cm} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} f_K + \frac{\partial}{\partial p_{cm}} [F_K(x_{cm}, t) f_K] \\ = \frac{1}{K^2} \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{\partial}{\partial p_{cm}} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}^i} \sum_{l=1}^{K(l \neq i)} \frac{M^2}{2|x_{cm}^i - x_{cm}^l|} \Big|_{x_{cm}^i = x_{cm}^i(t), x_{cm}^l = x_{cm}^l(t)} \right) \right. \\ \left. \times \delta(x_{cm} - x_{cm}^i(t)) \delta(p_{cm} - p_{cm}^i(t)) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5.110)$$

where

$$F_K(x_{cm}, t) := -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{cm}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{M^2}{|x_{cm} - x'_{cm}|} f_K dx'_{cm} dp_{cm}. \quad (5.111)$$

We recall that Golse [272] and Bardos et al. [270, 271] considered a D-dimensional generalization of (5.106-111)<sup>5</sup>, for an arbitrary, symmetric, smooth interaction potential  $V$ , and showed that for  $K \rightarrow \infty$  one obtains the D-dimensional Vlasov-Poisson mean-field equations (see also section 4 of Part I). Thus the system (5.106-111), in the limit  $K \rightarrow \infty$ , is equivalent to the 2-dimensional Vlasov-Poisson mean-field equations (hereafter, writing  $x_{cm} = x$  and  $p_{cm} = p$ ):

$$\partial_t f(x, p, t) + \left\{ H^{m.f.}(x, p, t), f(x, p, t) \right\} = 0, \quad (5.112)$$

---

<sup>5</sup>Regarding (5.106), Golse [272] and Bardos et al. [270, 271] take the empirical position distributions for the particles to be Dirac delta functions. The 1-dimensional Dirac delta function in position space is indeed a solution of (5.106), and note that the factors of (5.97) approach 1-dimensional Dirac delta functions as  $K \rightarrow \infty$ .

$$H_{cl}^{m.f.}(x, p, t) := \frac{p^2}{2M} + \int_{\mathbb{R}} M \Phi_g^{m.f.}(x, x', t) dx'. \quad (5.113)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 \Phi_g^{m.f.}}{\partial x^2} = 4\pi M \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x, p, t) dp = 4\pi M \rho(x, t), \quad (5.114)$$

$$F(x, t) := -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \int_{\mathbb{R}} M \Phi_g^{m.f.}(x, x', t) dx'. \quad (5.115)$$

Extending the above results to the D-dimensional case is formally straightforward.

## 5.6 Incorporating environmental decoherence

As discussed in subsection 2.1, environmental decoherence accompanied by effective collapse ensures that wavefunctions associated to macroscopic objects (composed of dBB/Nelsonian/ZSM particles) in the real world will not correspond to macroscopic quantum superpositions (i.e., involve strong quantum correlations). Thus it is reasonable to expect that wavefunctions associated to macroscopic objects in the real world will in general be WFPs. Though this expectation seems reasonable on general grounds, it would be even more convincing if we could demonstrate it in an explicit model of environmental decoherence in ZSM (or dBB). Here we sketch a suggestion for an explicit model.

There exists a well-known model of generalized Brownian motion in classical nonequilibrium statistical mechanics called the Kac-Zwanzig (KZ) model [300, 301, 302] (the quantum mechanical analogue is the well-known Caldeira-Leggett model [303, 304]). The KZ model describes a heavy particle coupled to an external field and a heat bath, the bath modeled as an  $N$ -particle system of light harmonic oscillators, where the system particle couples bilinearly to each bath particle, with possibly frequency-dependent coupling strength. The classical Newtonian equations of motion for the system particle and bath particles are thereby coupled, and if one integrates out the bath variables, one finds, under the assumptions that the bath is at thermal equilibrium at temperature  $T$  and has arbitrary spectral density, a non-Markovian Langevin equation describing the time-evolution of the system particle.

Relatedly, Chou et al. [305] have shown that if one replaces the heavy probe particle of the KZ model with a system of  $N$  interacting identical harmonic oscillators, and if one assumes bilinear coupling of identical strength between the system and bath position coordinates, then there exists a canonical transformation that makes it possible to separate out the CM of the system from its relative degrees of freedom in the system-bath Hamiltonian. In other words, the transformed Hamiltonian, in the system degrees of freedom, is of the same form

as the Schrödinger Hamiltonian in (5.36), the latter obtained from Oriols et al.'s coordinate transformation (5.12-13). Moreover, the transformed Hamiltonian entails that only the CM couples to the bath particles. Under the assumptions that (i) the system and bath are initially uncorrelated, (ii) the heat bath is initially at thermal equilibrium at temperature  $T$ , and (iii) the spectral density of the bath is arbitrary, Chou et al. then use the transformed Hamiltonian to define the unitary evolution of a system-bath density matrix. Tracing over the bath degrees of freedom, they find that the reduced density matrix for the system evolves by a non-Markovian master equation of Hu-Paz-Zhang type [306]. Such a master equation is, of course, well-known in the theory of quantum Brownian motion for open systems [307].

Our proposal, then, is to construct a KZ-type model from ZSM-Newton/Coulomb (or dBB-Newton/Coulomb), using the same starting assumptions as Chou et al., and applying the Oriols et al. scheme to the system and bath, respectively. This should make it possible to show that decoherence of the system wavefunction via interaction with the bath leads, under unitary evolution, to a macroscopic superposition of effectively orthogonal system-bath product states, and that such an evolution is accompanied by effective collapse of the system-bath configuration into one of the system-bath product states. In addition, the evolution of the system's CM particle position, with the bath variables integrated out, should be described by a non-Markovian modified Langevin equation, where the modifying terms are the quantum forces from the CM's quantum kinetic and the quantum kinetics of the relative degrees of freedom, and where both types of quantum kinetics are constructed from the effective system wavefunction to which the system configuration has collapsed. Then, taking the large particle number limits simultaneously for system and bath, it should be possible to show, by applying the arguments in section 3 of the present paper, that the equations of motion for the system and bath CM positions become effectively classical. In other words, we should recover the classical non-Markovian Langevin equation for the heavy particle in the classical KZ model.

The details of this proposal will be worked out in a stand-alone paper.

## 5.7 Conclusion

We have applied Oriols et al.'s large- $N$ -CM approximation scheme to a system of  $N$  identical, non-relativistic, *z**bw* particles interacting via potentials  $\hat{U}_{int}(\hat{x}_j - \hat{x}_k)$  and with external potentials  $\hat{U}_{ext}(\hat{x}_j)$ . This made it possible to: (i) self-consistently describe large numbers of identical *z**bw* particles interacting classical-gravitationally/electrostatically, without an independent particle approximation; (ii) avoid macroscopic semiclassical gravitational/electrostatic cat states and recover  $K$ -particle classical Newtonian gravity/electrodynamics for the CM descriptions of gravitationally/electrostatically interacting macroscopic particles (where the macroscopic



particles are built out of interacting *zbw* particles); and (iii) recover classical Vlasov-Poisson mean-field theory for macroscopic particles that interact gravitationally/electrostatically, in the weak-coupling large  $K$  limit. In addition, we have sketched a proposal for an explicit model of environmental decoherence consistent with the Oriols et al. large- $N$ -CM approximation scheme, the purpose of which is to explicitly demonstrate our claim that environmental decoherence plus effective collapse entails WFPs associated to real-world macroscopic objects.

We leave for future work the task of extending the ZSM-based large- $N$ -CM approximation scheme to relativistic massive particles and fields, in flat and curved spacetimes.



## 6 Appendix to Chapter 2

### 6.1 Proof of the 1-particle Stochastic Variational Principle

Following Yasue's presentation [57], let  $\mathbf{q}'(t) = \mathbf{q}(t) + \delta\mathbf{q}(t)$  be a variation of the sample path  $\mathbf{q}(t)$ , with end-point constraints  $\delta\mathbf{q}(t_i) = \delta\mathbf{q}(t_f) = 0$ . Let us also assume, for the sake of generality, that the particle has charge  $e$  and couples to the external magnetic vector potential,  $\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$ , as well as the external electric scalar potential,  $\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$ . Then the condition

$$\begin{aligned} J &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)^2 + \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t)^2 \right] + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) - e \Phi_e(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \right\} dt \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} m (D\mathbf{q}(t))^2 + \frac{1}{2} m (D_*\mathbf{q}(t))^2 \right] + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext} \cdot \mathbf{v} - e \Phi_e \right\} dt \right] = \text{extremal}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}[\dots]$  is the absolute expectation, is equivalent to the variation,

$$\delta J(\mathbf{q}) = J(\mathbf{q}') - J(\mathbf{q}), \quad (6.2)$$

up to first order in  $\|\delta\mathbf{q}(t)\|$ . So (6.2) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \delta J &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \left\{ \left[ \frac{1}{2} m (D\mathbf{q}(t) \cdot D\delta\mathbf{q}(t) + D_*\mathbf{q}(t) \cdot D_*\delta\mathbf{q}(t)) \right] \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ext} \cdot \frac{1}{2} (D\delta\mathbf{q}(t) + D_*\delta\mathbf{q}(t)) + \frac{e}{c} (\delta\mathbf{q}(t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{A}_{ext}) \frac{1}{2} (D\mathbf{q}(t) + D_*\mathbf{q}(t)) - e \nabla \Phi_e \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t) \right\} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} dt \right], \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

where we note that  $\mathbf{v} = \frac{1}{2} (D + D_*) \mathbf{q}(t)$  and is constrained by Eq. (2.10). Now, observing that for an arbitrary function,  $f(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_i}^{t_f} [f(\mathbf{q}(t), t) D\delta\mathbf{q}(t)] dt \right] = -\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_i}^{t_f} [\delta\mathbf{q}(t) D_* f(\mathbf{q}(t), t)] dt \right], \quad (6.4)$$

## 6 Appendix to Chapter 2

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_i}^{t_f} [f(\mathbf{q}(t), t) D_* \delta \mathbf{q}(t)] dt \right] = -\mathbb{E} \left[ \int d^3 \mathbf{q} \rho \int_{t_i}^{t_f} [\delta \mathbf{q}(t) D f(\mathbf{q}(t), t)] dt \right], \quad (6.5)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} (D + D_*) f(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} [D \mathbf{q}(t) + D_* \mathbf{q}(t)] \cdot \nabla \right\} f(\mathbf{q}, t) |_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}, \quad (6.6)$$

we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \delta J = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \left\{ \frac{m}{2} [D_* D + D D_*] \mathbf{q}(t) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{v} \times (\nabla \times \mathbf{A}_{ext}) + \frac{e}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{A}_{ext}}{\partial t} + e \nabla \Phi_e \right\} |_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} \delta \mathbf{q}(t) dt \right] + \vartheta(||\delta \mathbf{q}||). \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

From the variational constraint (6.1-2), it follows that the first-order variation of  $J$  must be zero for arbitrary sample-wise variation  $\delta \mathbf{q}(t)$ . Moreover, since the expectation is a positive linear functional, we will have the equation of motion

$$\frac{m}{2} [D_* D + D D_*] \mathbf{q}(t) = -e \left[ \nabla \Phi_e + \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{A}_{ext}}{\partial t} \right] |_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} + \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{v} \times (\nabla \times \mathbf{A}_{ext}) |_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} \quad (6.8)$$

for each time  $t \in [t_i, t_f]$  with probability one.

## 6.2 Classical Zitterbewegung in the Central Potential

Suppose that the non-relativistic *zbw* particle in the lab frame is moving in a circular orbit about some central potential,  $V(\mathbf{r})$ , where  $\mathbf{r}$  is the radius of the orbit. In this case, for the spherical coordinates  $(r, \alpha, \beta)$ ,  $r$  is fixed,  $\alpha$  varies with time, and  $\beta$  has the constant value  $\pi/2$ , giving translational velocities  $\mathbf{v}_r = \dot{r} = 0$  (and we require  $\ddot{r} = 0$ ),  $\mathbf{v}_\alpha = r\dot{\alpha}$ , and  $\mathbf{v}_\beta = r\dot{\beta} \sin \alpha = 0$ . The  $v \ll c$  approximated *zbw* phase change in the lab frame is then

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \theta(\alpha(t), t) &= (\omega_c + \omega_\alpha + \kappa(\mathbf{r})) \delta t - \frac{v_\alpha r \delta \alpha(t)}{c^2} \\ &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} \left[ \left( mc^2 + \frac{p_\alpha^2}{2mr^2} + V(\mathbf{r}) \right) \delta t - v_\alpha r \delta \alpha(t) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (6.9)$$

## 6.2 Classical Zitterbewegung in the Central Potential

where  $p_\alpha = mr^2\dot{\alpha}$ . Because the total energy of the system is constant, integrating this gives

$$\theta = \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2} \left[ \left( mc^2 + \frac{p_\alpha^2}{2mr^2} + V(\mathbf{r}) \right) t - p_\alpha \alpha(t) \right] + C, \quad (6.10)$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} S &= p_\alpha \alpha(t) - \left( mc^2 + \frac{p_\alpha^2}{2mr^2} + V(\mathbf{r}) \right) t + C \\ &= p_\alpha \alpha(t) - Et + C. \end{aligned} \quad (6.11)$$

Incidentally, we could have also obtained (6.11) by starting with the non-relativistic Lagrangian

$$L(\alpha(t), t) = \frac{1}{2}mr^2\dot{\alpha}(t)^2 - V(\mathbf{r}) - mc^2, \quad (6.12)$$

and using the Legendre transformation,

$$E = p_\alpha \dot{\alpha} - L = \frac{p_\alpha^2}{2mr^2} + V(\mathbf{r}) + mc^2, \quad (6.13)$$

to get

$$S = \int L dt + C = \int (p_\alpha \dot{\alpha} - E) dt + C = p_\alpha \alpha - Et + C. \quad (6.14)$$

Clearly (6.11) satisfies the classical Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$-\frac{\partial S}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2mr^2} \left( \frac{\partial S}{\partial \alpha} \right)^2 + V(\mathbf{r}), \quad (6.15)$$

where  $-\partial S/\partial t = E$  and  $\partial S/\partial \alpha = \mathbf{p}_\alpha = \mathbf{L}_\alpha$ , the latter being the constant angular momentum of the particle in the  $\hat{z}$ -direction.

Because the *z*bw oscillation is simply harmonic and the phase is a well-defined function of the particle position, the change in  $S$  will now be quantized upon fixed time integration around a closed (circular) orbit  $L$ . In other words, we will have

$$\oint_L p_\alpha \delta \alpha = 2\pi m v_\alpha r = n\hbar, \quad (6.16)$$

or

$$L_\alpha = m v_\alpha r = n\hbar, \quad (6.17)$$

where  $n$  is an integer. From (6.17) and the force balance equation (assuming a Coulomb force),

## 6 Appendix to Chapter 2

$mv_\alpha^2/r = (1/4\pi\epsilon_0)e^2/r^2$ , it follows that the radius is quantized as

$$r_n = \frac{4\pi\epsilon_0\hbar^2}{m_e e^2} n^2, \quad (6.18)$$

where for  $n = 1$ , (6.18) gives the Bohr radius. Inserting (6.18) into the force balance equation and recognizing that  $E = V/2$ , we then obtain the quantized energy states

$$E_n = \frac{E_1}{n^2}, \quad (6.19)$$

where  $E_1 = -e^2/8\pi\epsilon_0 r_1 = -13.6eV$  is precisely the magnitude of the ground state energy of the Bohr hydrogen atom.

We wish to emphasize that, whereas Bohr simply assumed a condition equivalent to (6.16) in order to stabilize the electron's circular orbit in the classical hydrogen atom, we *obtained* (6.16) just from the zitterbewegung hypothesis in the particle's instantaneous translational rest frame combined with the usual Lorentz transformation. In other words, in Bohr's model, (6.16) is imposed ad hoc while in our model it arises as a direct consequence of a relativistic (*zbw*) constraint on the particle's motion.

## 7 Appendix to Chapter 3

### 7.1 Proof of the N-particle Stochastic Variational Principle

Let  $\mathbf{q}'_i(t) = \mathbf{q}_i(t) + \delta\mathbf{q}_i(t)$  be variations of the sample paths  $\mathbf{q}_i(t)$ , with end-point constraints  $\delta\mathbf{q}_i(t_I) = \delta\mathbf{q}_i(t_F) = 0$ . Then, using  $\mathbf{b}_i = D\mathbf{q}_i(t)$  and  $\mathbf{b}_{i*} = D_*\mathbf{q}_i(t)$ , the condition

$$\begin{aligned} J &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i (D\mathbf{q}_i(t))^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i (D_*\mathbf{q}_i(t))^2 \right] \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \cdot \frac{1}{2} (D + D_*) \mathbf{q}_i(t) - e_i (\Phi_i^{ext} + \Phi_c^{int}) \right\} dt \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{1}{2} m_i v_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_i u_i^2 + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \cdot \mathbf{v}_i - e_i [\Phi_i^{ext} + \Phi_c^{int}] \right\} dt \right] = \text{extremal}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.1)$$

is equivalent to the variation,

$$\delta J(q) = J(q') - J(q), \quad (7.2)$$

up to first order in  $\|\delta\mathbf{q}_i(t)\|$ . So (7.2) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \delta J &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \left[ \frac{1}{2} m_i (D\mathbf{q}_i(t) \cdot D\delta\mathbf{q}_i(t) + D_*\mathbf{q}_i(t) \cdot D_*\delta\mathbf{q}_i(t)) \right] \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} \cdot \frac{1}{2} (D\delta\mathbf{q}_i(t) + D_*\delta\mathbf{q}_i(t)) + \frac{e_i}{c} (\delta\mathbf{q}_i(t) \cdot \nabla_i \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}) \mathbf{v}_i - e_i \nabla_i [\Phi_i^{ext} + \Phi_c^{int}] \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}_i(t) \right\} \Big|_{\mathbf{q}_j=\mathbf{q}_j(t)} dt \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (7.3)$$

Now, for an arbitrary function  $f_i(q(t), t)$ , we have the relations

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \sum_{i=1}^N [f_i(q(t), t) D\delta\mathbf{q}_i(t)] dt \right] = -\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \sum_{i=1}^N [\delta\mathbf{q}_i(t) D_* f_i(q(t), t)] dt \right], \quad (7.4)$$

## 7 Appendix to Chapter 3

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \sum_{i=1}^N [f_i(q(t), t) D_* \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t)] dt \right] = -\mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \sum_{i=1}^N [\delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) D f_i(q(t), t)] dt \right], \quad (7.5)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} (D + D_*) f_i(q(t), t) = \left\{ \partial_t + \frac{1}{2} [D \mathbf{q}_i(t) + D_* \mathbf{q}_i(t)] \cdot \nabla_i \right\} f_i(q, t) |_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)}. \quad (7.6)$$

So, using Eq. (3.9) in section 3.2, the integrand of (7.3) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \delta J = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{t_I}^{t_F} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{m_i}{2} [D_* D + D D_*] \mathbf{q}_i(t) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{v}_i \times (\nabla_i \times \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}) + \frac{e_i}{c} \partial_t \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} + e_i \nabla_i [\Phi_i^{ext} + \Phi_c^{int}] \right\} |_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)} \delta \mathbf{q}_i(t) dt \right] + \vartheta(\|\delta \mathbf{q}_i\|). \end{aligned} \quad (7.7)$$

From the variational constraint (7.1-2), and using the fact that the arbitrary variations (i.e., the virtual displacements in the generalized coordinates)  $\delta \mathbf{q}_i(t)$  are independent for all  $i$  by D'Alembert's principle [143], it follows that the first-order variation of  $J$  must be zero for each  $\delta \mathbf{q}_i(t)$ . Moreover, since the expectation is a positive linear functional, we will have the equations of motion

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{m_i}{2} [D_* D + D D_*] \mathbf{q}_i(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N e_i \left[ -\frac{1}{c} \partial_t \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} - \nabla_i (\Phi_i^{ext} + \Phi_c^{int}) + \left( \frac{\mathbf{v}_i}{c} \right) \times (\nabla_i \times \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}) \right] |_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)}, \quad (7.8)$$

and

$$\frac{m_i}{2} [D_* D + D D_*] \mathbf{q}_i(t) = \left[ -\frac{e_i}{c} \partial_t \mathbf{A}_i^{ext} - e_i \nabla_i (\Phi_i^{ext} + \Phi_c^{int}) + \frac{e_i}{c} \mathbf{v}_i \times (\nabla_i \times \mathbf{A}_i^{ext}) \right] |_{\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{q}_j(t)}, \quad (7.9)$$

for each time  $t \in [t_I, t_F]$  with probability one.



## 8 Summary and Outlook

In this dissertation we carried out two objectives. For the first objective, we proposed an answer to Wallstrom’s criticism of stochastic mechanics by reformulating Nelson’s stochastic mechanics (or, more precisely, Nelson-Yasue stochastic mechanics) so as to consistently incorporate the “zitterbewegung” particle model(s) of de Broglie and Bohm, and thereby explain how the quantization condition  $\oint_L \nabla S \cdot d\mathbf{x} = nh$  could arise naturally instead of by ad hoc imposition or by making logically-circular appeals to the single-valuedness of wavefunctions in standard quantum mechanics. This was done in Chapters 2 and 3, where we developed “zitterbewegung stochastic mechanics” (ZSM) for the single particle case and the  $N$ -particle case.

For the second objective, we (i) used ZSM to formulate fundamentally-semiclassical theories of Newtonian gravity and electrodynamics, which we termed “ZSM-Newton” and “ZSM-Coulomb”, respectively; (ii) compared ZSM-Newton and ZSM-Coulomb to existing formulations of semiclassical Newtonian gravity and electrodynamics; (iii) demonstrated that ZSM-Newton/Coulomb are consistent, empirically viable theories of semiclassical Newtonian gravity and electrodynamics, with conceptual and technical advantages over extant semiclassical theories based on either standard quantum theory or measurement-problem-free alternative quantum theories; and (iv) demonstrated that ZSM-Newton can recover classical Newtonian gravity (and classical mechanics more generally) in the large  $N$  limit of the center of mass description of a system of  $N$  gravitationally strongly interacting stochastic mechanical particles. This was done in Chapters 4 and 5.

Of course, as we have made clear throughout, there is much more work to be done. In terms of developing ZSM, it remains to be shown that it can be generalized to particles with spin, relativistic particles and fields (accounting for all of the Standard Model) on flat and curved spacetimes, open quantum systems, and non-Markovian conservative diffusions. It also remains to be shown that a physical (i.e., non-phenomenological) theory of the ZSM ether, the *zbw* particle, and the dynamical coupling between the two, can be developed, and that such a theory can justify the phenomenological assumptions of ZSM.

In terms of developing ZSM-Newton and ZSM-Coulomb, the former needs to be generalized to (at least) semiclassical Einstein gravity and perturbative quantum gravity, both for relativistic *zbw* particles and relativistic *zbw* fields; the latter needs to be generalized to perturbative QED for relativistic *zbw* particles and *zbw* fields. And all of the results shown for ZSM-Newton and ZSM-Coulomb should be shown for the aforementioned generalizations of

## 8 *Summary and Outlook*

ZSM-Newton and ZSM-Coulomb.

So although this thesis is the culmination of a nearly decade-long journey, it is also the start of another journey, one that could well take (at least) another decade. If I am fortunate enough, it won't be a solo journey, but if so, the work will be done; that is, until I reach the absolute limits of my intellectual abilities or experimental tests confirm a different version of quantum theory or compelling new theoretical arguments are posed against stochastic mechanical theories (including ZSM).

## 9 Samenvatting

De voornaamste taak van deze these is het herformuleren van een benaderingswijze van de kwantummechanica gebaseerd op de stochastisch-mechanische theorie van Edward Nelson en Kunio Yasue (hierna, Nelson-Yasue stochastische mechanica), op zo een manier dat de stochastisch-mechanische  $S$ -functie voldoet aan de Bohr-Sommerfeld-achtige kwantisatieconditie  $\oint_L \nabla S \cdot d\mathbf{x} = nh$ , zonder deze ad hoc aan te nemen noch te baseren op het logisch-circulaire beroep op de éénwaardigheid van de kwantummechanische golffunctie. Ik stel een antwoord voor op de zogenaamde “Wallstrom kritiek” jegens stochastisch-mechanische theorieën, die luidt dat de kwantisatieconditie ofwel ad hoc wordt gepostuleerd, ofwel wordt ingebracht door een logisch-circulair beroep op de éénwaardige golffuncties, en dat beide methoden de claim ondermijnen dat bestaande stochastisch-mechanische theorieën de kwantummechanica afleiden of onderliggen. Deze Wallstrom kritiek is lange tijd beschouwd als een definitieve weerlegging van de mogelijkheid om stochastisch-mechanische theorieën te gebruiken als grondslag voor kwantummechanica.

De voorgestelde herformulering van Nelson-Yasue stochastische mechanica, die ik “zitterbeweging stochastische mechanica” (ZSM) noem, is ontwikkeld door Nelson-Yasue stochastische mechanica op zorgvuldige en consistente wijze te combineren met het klassieke “zitterbeweging” deeltjesmodel van Louis de Broglie en David Bohm, waarin de kwantisatieconditie voortkomt uit het combineren van de aannames dat (i) een elementair deeltje correspondeert met een gelocaliseerd periodiek proces met constante Compton frequentie in het ruststelsel, en dat (ii) de Lorentztransformaties uit de speciale relativiteitstheorie kunnen worden toegepast. Met andere woorden, in ZSM wordt het puntdeeltje van Nelson-Yasue stochastische mechanica vervangen door het zitterbewegingsdeeltje van de Broglie en Bohm (met enkele kleine aanpassingen). Het zitterbewegingsdeeltje ondergaat het stochastische-mechanische diffusie proces uit de Nelson-Yasue theorie en vinden we de  $S$ -functie als een “evenwichtsfase” van het gelokaliseerde periodieke proces van het deeltje in het labstelsel, waarbij wordt voldaan aan de kwantisatieconditie. Dit is beschreven in de hoofdstukken (Chapters) 2 en 3, waarbij het geval voor één enkel deeltje met een uitgewerkt voorbeeld wordt geïllustreerd in hoofdstuk 2 en waarbij hoofdstuk 3 het meerdere-deeltjes geval en mogelijke uitbreidingen van ZSM bekijkt, en deze vergelijkt met andere suggesties om de kwantisatieconditie in stochastische mechanica te rechtvaardigen. In ieder hoofdstuk is een samenvatting opgenomen.

Een tweede doel van deze these is om (i) ZSM te gebruiken om fundamenteel-semi-klassieke

## 9 Samenvatting

theorieën van Newtoniaanse zwaartekracht en electrodynamica te formuleren; (ii) deze te vergelijken met bestaande formuleringen van semi-klassieke Newtoniaanse zwaartekracht en electrodynamica; (iii) te laten zien dat de theorieën gebaseerd op ZSM consistente, empirisch levensvatbare theorieën zijn van (fundamenteel-)semi-klassieke Newtoniaanse zwaartekracht en electrodynamica, met zekere conceptuele en technische voordelen ten opzichte van reeds bestaande semi-klassieke theorieën die ofwel gebaseerd zijn op orthodoxe kwantummechanica ofwel op alternatieve formuleringen van kwantummechanica die het meetprobleem omzeilen; en (iv) te laten zien dat theorieën die gebaseerd zijn op ZSM klassieke Newtoniaanse zwaartekracht kunnen reproduceren als er wordt voldaan aan bepaalde (fysisch acceptabele) voorwaarden. De motivatie voor het nastreven van deze doelen (naast de intrinsieke waarde die het voor mij heeft) is dat semi-klassieke Newtoniaanse zwaartekracht vandaag de dag een populair onderwerp is binnen de natuurkundige gemeenschap, waarbij er veel aandacht is voor de Schrödinger-Newton vergelijkingen en modellen van fundamenteel-semi-klassieke zwaartekracht gebaseerd op dynamisch verval. Er is ook de brandende vraag of het mogelijk is om een consistente en empirisch vruchtbare versie van fundamenteel-semi-klassieke zwaartekracht te ontwikkelen (en, daarmee, of het wel nodig is om zwaartekracht überhaupt te kwantiseren). Door te laten zien dat stochastische mechanica een originele en nuttige bijdrage kan leveren aan deze debatten, bovenop het aangeven dat Wallstroms kritiek niet langer een (op het oog) definitieve tegenwerping is, zou (hopelijk) een algemene interesse in stochastische mechanica moeten opwekken bij zowel natuurkundigen als filosofen. Deze onderwerpen worden aangesneden in hoofdstukken 4 en 5, wederom elk voorafgegaan door wetenschappelijke samenvattingen.

De these sluit af met een volledige samenvatting en een sectie gewijd aan verder onderzoek, en (naast deze Nederlandse samenvatting) een kort curriculum vitae.

## 10 About the author

Maaneli (Max) Derakhshani was born in Rancho Palos Verdes, California, on October 3rd, 1985. He was raised in Westchester County, New York, and lived there until the age of 18, graduating from Eastchester High School. Between ages 5 and 6, Maaneli underwent 5 neurosurgeries to correct two neurological conditions, Arnold Chiari Malformation and Hydrocephalus. This experience, and the after-effects of it, forever changed the course of his life. At the age of 9, Maaneli discovered physics, fell in love with the subject, and committed himself to someday becoming a physicist. Along the way, in his high school years, Maaneli discovered philosophy as his second love and became committed to synthesizing physics and philosophy in his university studies. However, these were no easy tasks, as he first had to pull himself out of the special education programs he was placed in after his surgeries. Although Maaneli faced resistance from some of his teachers in reaching his goal, eventually he succeeded; and, despite a setback at the age of 17 (when he was forced to undergo two more corrective neurosurgeries), he went on to complete an Intel Science Talent Search project on stochastic electrodynamics (with Prof. Daniel Cole at Boston University) before studying physics and philosophy at Stony Brook University. At Stony Brook, Maaneli worked on a sonoluminescence experiment in the Laser Teaching Center of John Noé, and on experimental quantum optics in the AMO group of Harold Metcalf. Along the way, he studied the foundations of quantum mechanics with ever-greater depth and interest, often traveling to Rutgers University to be tutored by Shelly Goldstein and Rodi Tumulka, and attending conferences such as the New Directions series in Maryland. Maaneli also initiated and helped design a course on the philosophy of quantum mechanics that was jointly taught by a physicist (Alfred Goldhaber) and a philosopher of science (Robert Crease); since then, the course has become officially part of the physics and philosophy programs, and a book has since been published based on it. Maaneli graduated from Stony Brook with the John S. Toll award for the “most outstanding physics senior”, along with other accolades. After taking a couple years off from academia to do physics research and have other life experiences, Maaneli enrolled in the physics graduate program of Clemson University. He earned his M.S. degree with a thesis in theoretical foundations of physics (under Prof. Dieter Hartmann), and then enrolled in the physics Ph.D program of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln (under the supervision of Prof. Herman Batelaan). After a two year stint, Maaneli switched to Utrecht University to complete his Ph.D in the theoretical foundations of physics, under the supervision of Dr. Guido Bacciagaluppi, Prof. Robb Mann, and Prof. Bert

## *10 About the author*

Theunissen.

## Bibliography

- [1] T. Maudlin. Three measurement problems. *Topoi* 14(1): 7-15, 1995.
- [2] M. Schlosshauer. Decoherence, the measurement problem, and the interpretations of quantum mechanics. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 76, 1267-1305, 2004, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0312059>.
- [3] V. Allori, S. Goldstein, R. Tumulka, and N. Zanghi (2012). Predictions and primitive ontology in quantum foundations: a study of examples. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1206.0019>.
- [4] David Wallace. *The Emergent Multiverse: Quantum Theory according to the Everett Interpretation*. Oxford University Press, 2012.
- [5] David Z. Albert. *After Physics*. Harvard University Press, Harvard, 2015.
- [6] P. R. Holland. *The Quantum Theory of Motion: An Account of the de Broglie-Bohm Causal Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993. "Hamilton-Jacobi formulation", "Gibbsian statistical ensemble", "nonlinear Schroedinger equation", and "continuity equation", Chapter 2; "polar decomposition", pp. 68-72; "nodal point(s)", pp. 85-86.
- [7] J. S. Bell. *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics*, chapter Quantum mechanics for cosmologists, pages 117–139. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [8] D. Bohm and B. J. Hiley. *The Undivided Universe: An Ontological Interpretation of Quantum Theory*. Routledge, 1995.
- [9] S. Goldstein and N. Zanghi. *Experimental Metaphysics: Quantum Mechanical Studies in Honor of Abner Shimony (Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science)*, chapter Bohmian mechanics and the meaning of the wave function. Kluwer Academic Publisher, 1995.
- [10] D. Duerr and S. Teufel. *Bohmian Mechanics: The Physics and Mathematics of Quantum Theory*. Springer, 2009.
- [11] V. Allori, S. Goldstein, R. Tumulka, and N. Zanghi. Many-worlds and schroedinger's first quantum theory. 2009, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0903.2211>.

## Bibliography

- [12] S. Goldstein and N. Zanghi. Reality and the role of the wavefunction in quantum theory. 2011, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1101.4575>.
- [13] G. Ghirardi. Collapse theories. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2011. (Available online at <http://plato.stanford.edu/>).
- [14] S. Goldstein. Bohmian mechanics. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2013, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/qm-bohm/>.
- [15] A. Bassi, K. Lochan, S. Satin, T. P. Singh, and H. Ulbricht. Models of wave-function collapse, underlying theories, and experimental tests. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 85, 471-527, 2013, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1204.4325>.
- [16] L. Vaidman. Many-worlds interpretation of quantum mechanics. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2014, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/qm-manyworlds/>.
- [17] A. Vassallo, D. A. Deckert, and M. Esfeld. Relationalism about mechanics based on a minminimal ontology of matter. *European Journal for Philosophy of Science*, 2016, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1609.00277>.
- [18] J. S. Bell. *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics*, chapter The theory of local beables, pages 52–62. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [19] D. Z. Albert. *Bohmian Mechanics and Quantum Theory: An Appraisal*, chapter Elementary Quantum Metaphysics, page 277. Springer, 1996.
- [20] D. Z. Albert. *The Wave Function: Essays on the Metaphysics of Quantum Mechanics*, chapter Wave Function Realism, page 52. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- [21] I. Fenyés. Eine wahrscheinlichkeitstheoretische begruending und interpretation der quantenmechanic. *Z. Physik*, 132:81–106, 1952.
- [22] E. Nelson. Derivation of the schroedinger equation from newtonian mechanics. *Phys. Rev.*, 150:1079–1085, 1966.
- [23] E. Nelson. *Quantum Fluctuations*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1985. <https://web.math.princeton.edu/~nelson/books/qf.pdf>.
- [24] A. Kyprianidis. The principles of a stochastic formulation of quantum theory. *Found. Phys.*, 22:1449–1483, 1992.



- [25] T. C. Wallstrom. Inequivalence between the schroedinger equation and the madelung hydrodynamic equations. *Phys. Rev. A*, 49:1613–1617, 1994.
- [26] M. Derakhshani. A suggested answer to wallstrom’s criticism: Zitterbewegung stochastic mechanics i. 2016, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.06391>.
- [27] M. Derakhshani. A suggested answer to wallstrom’s criticism: Zitterbewegung stochastic mechanics ii. 2016, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.08838>.
- [28] M. Derakhshani. Semiclassical newtonian field theories based on stochastic mechanics i. 2017, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1701.06893>.
- [29] M. Derakhshani. Semiclassical newtonian field theories based on stochastic mechanics ii. 2017, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.02472>.
- [30] S. Goldstein. Stochastic mechanics and quantum theory. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, Vol. 47, Nos. 5/6., 47:645–667, 1987. Quote on pp. 664, section 11.9.
- [31] M. Jibu, T. Misawa, and K. Yasue. Measurement and reduction of wavefunction in stochastic mechanics. *Phys. Lett. A*, 150:59–62, 1990.
- [32] P. Blanchard, M. Cini, and M. Serva. *Ideas and Methods in Quantum and Statistical Physics*, chapter The measurement problem in the stochastic formulation of quantum mechanics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.
- [33] G. Peruzzi and A. Rimini. Quantum measurement in a family of hidden-variable theories. *Foundations of Physics Letters*, 9:505–519, 1996, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9607004>.
- [34] E. Nelson. Field theory and the future of stochastic mechanics. *Stochastic Processes in Classical and Quantum Systems Lecture Notes in Physics*, 262:438–469, 1986.
- [35] E. Nelson. The mystery of stochastic mechanics. Manuscript, 2005-11-22.
- [36] E. Nelson. *Quantum Fluctuations*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1985. "Nelson-Yasue", pp. 73-77; "Physical interpretation of the wave function", pp. 81; "identical particles", pp. 100; "non-equilibrium physics", pp. 117-119; "electromagnetic origin", pp. 65; "conservative diffusions", pp. 65; "electromagnetic potentials", pp. 72-76; "nodal point", pp. 77-82. <https://web.math.princeton.edu/~nelson/books/qf.pdf>.
- [37] J. S. Bell. *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics*, chapter La Nouvelle Cuisine, pages 232–248. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.

## Bibliography

- [38] T. Norsen. The theory of (exclusively) local beables. *Found. Phys.*, 40:1858, 2010, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0909.4553>.
- [39] T. Norsen, D. Marian, and X. Oriols. Can the wave function in configuration space be replaced by single-particle wave functions in physical space? *Synthese Special Issue (forthcoming): Space-time and the wave function*, pages 1–24, 2014, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1410.3676>.
- [40] P. Blanchard, S. Golin, and M. Serva. Repeated measurements in stochastic mechanics. *Phys. Rev. D*, 34:3732, 1986.
- [41] T. C. Wallstrom. On the derivation of the schroedinger equation from stochastic mechanics. *Foundations of Physics Letters*, 2:113–126, 1989.
- [42] T. Takabayasi. On the formulation of quantum mechanics associated with classical pictures. *Prog. Theor. Phys.*, 8:143–182, 1952, <http://ptp.oxfordjournals.org/content/8/2/143>.
- [43] Louis-Victor de Broglie. *On the Theory of Quanta*. PhD thesis, University of Paris, 1925.
- [44] O. Darrigol. *Strangeness and soundness in Louis de Broglie’s early works*. L.S. Olschki, 1994.
- [45] G. Bacciagaluppi and A. Valentini. *Quantum Theory at the Crossroads: Reconsidering the 1927 Solvay Conference*, chapter De Broglie’s Pilot-wave theory. CUP, 2010, <https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0609184>.
- [46] D. Bohm. *Observation and Interpretation: A Symposium of Philosophers and Physicists*, chapter A proposed explanation of quantum theory in terms of hidden variables at a sub-quantum-mechanical level, pages 33–40. Butterworths Scientific Publications, 1957.
- [47] D. Bohm. *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, chapter Explanation of the quantization of action, pages 122–133. Routledge, 2002.
- [48] C. Anastopoulos and B. L. Hu. Problems with the newton-schroedinger equations. *New Journal of Physics*, 16, 085007, 2014, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1403.4921>.
- [49] M. Derakhshani. Probing gravitational cat states in canonical quantum theory vs. objective collapse theories. 2016, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1609.01711>.

- [50] M. Derakhshani. Newtonian semiclassical gravity in the grw theory with matter-density ontology. *Phys. Lett. A*, 378, 14-15, 990-998, March 2014, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1304.0471>.
- [51] A. Tilloy and L. Diosi. Sourcing semiclassical gravity from spontaneously localized quantum matter. *Phys. Rev. D* 93, 024026, 2016, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1509.08705>.
- [52] A. Tilloy and L. Diosi. Principle of least decoherence for newtonian semi-classical gravity. 2017, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.01856>.
- [53] E. Nelson. *Dynamical Theories of Brownian Motion*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1967. "Osmotic velocity", Chapters 4 and 13. <https://web.math.princeton.edu/~nelson/books/bmotion.pdf>.
- [54] K. Yasue. Stochastic quantization of wave fields and its application to dissipatively interacting fields. *J. Math. Phys.*, 19:1892, 1978.
- [55] K. Yasue. Stochastic quantization: A review. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 18:861–913, 1979.
- [56] K. Yasue. Quantum mechanics and stochastic control theory. *J. Math. Phys.*, 22:1010–1020, 1981.
- [57] K. Yasue. Stochastic calculus of variations. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 41:327–340, 1981.
- [58] K. Yasue. Derivation of relativistic wave equations in the theory of elementary domains. *Progress of Theoretical Physics*, 57:318–328, 1977.
- [59] F. Guerra. Structural aspects of stochastic mechanics and stochastic field theory. *Physics Reports*, 77:263–312, 1981.
- [60] F. Guerra and L. Morato. Quantization of dynamical systems and stochastic control theory. *Phys. Rev. D*, 27:1774–1786, 1983.
- [61] M. P. Davidson. A generalization of the fenyes-nelson stochastic model of quantum mechanics. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 3:271–277, 1979, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0112063>.
- [62] M. P. Davidson (2006). Stochastic mechanics, trace dynamics, and differential space - a synthesis. <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0602211>.

## Bibliography

- [63] M. Nagasawa. *Schroedinger Equations and Diffusion theory*. Birkhauser, 1996.
- [64] N. Cufaro-Petroni and F. Guerra. Quantum mechanical states as attractors for nelson processes. *Found. Phys.*, 25:297, 1995.
- [65] N. Cufaro-Petroni, S. De Martino, and S. De Siena. *New perspectives in the physics of mesoscopic systems*, chapter Non-equilibrium densities of Nelson processes. World Scientific, 1997.
- [66] G. Bacciagaluppi. Derivation of the symmetry postulates for identical particles from pilot-wave theories. 2003, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0302099>.
- [67] G. Bacciagaluppi. Non-equilibrium in stochastic mechanics. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 361:012017, 2012, <http://iopscience.iop.org/1742-6596/361/1/012017/>.
- [68] K. Kobayashi and Y. Yamanaka. Extension of nelson’s stochastic quantization to finite temperature using thermo field dynamics. *Phys. Lett. A*, 375:3243–3249, 2011, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1007.3603>.
- [69] T. Zastawniak. A relativistic version of nelson’s stochastic mechanics. *Europhysics Letters*, 13:13–17, 1990.
- [70] D. Dohrn and F. Guerra. Nelson’s stochastic mechanics on riemannian manifolds. *Lettere al Nuovo Cimento*, 22:121–127, 1978.
- [71] D. Dohrn, F. Guerra, and P. Ruggiero. *Feynman Path Integrals (Lecture Notes in Physics vol 106)*, chapter Spinning particles and relativistic particles in the framework of Nelson’s stochastic mechanics. Berlin: Springer, 1979.
- [72] D. Dohrn and F. Guerra. Compatibility between the brownian metric and the kinetic metric in nelson stochastic quantization. *Phys. Rev. D*, 31:2521–2524, 1985.
- [73] L. Smolin. *Quantum Concepts in Space and Time*, chapter Stochastic mechanics, hidden variables, and gravity. Oxford University Press, 1986.
- [74] L. Smolin. Matrix model as non-local hidden variables theories. 2002, <http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0201031>.
- [75] F. Markopoulou and L. Smolin. Quantum theory from quantum gravity. *Phys. Rev. D*, 70, 124029, 2004, <http://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0311059>.

- [76] M. Serva. Relativistic stochastic processes associated to klein-gordon equation. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincare*, 49:415–432, 1988.
- [77] R. Marra and M. Serva. Variational principles for a relativistic stochastic mechanics. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincare*, 53:97–108, 1990.
- [78] E. Aldrovandi, D. Dohrn, and F. Guerra. Stochastic action of dynamical systems on curved manifolds: The geodesic interpolation. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 31:639–648, 1990.
- [79] E. Aldrovandi, D. Dohrn, and F. Guerra. The lagrangian approach to stochastic variational principles on curved manifolds. *Acta Applicandae Mathematicae*, 26:219–236, 1992.
- [80] P. Garbaczewski. Relativistic problem of random flights and nelson’s stochastic mechanics. *Phys. Lett. A*, 164:6–16, 1992, <http://www.fiz.uni.opole.pl/pgar/documents/pla92b.pdf>.
- [81] L. M. Morato and L. Viola. Markov diffusions in comoving coordinates and stochastic quantization of the free relativistic spinless particle. *J. Math. Phys.*, 36:4691–4710, 1995.
- [82] T. G. Dankel Jr. Mechanics on manifolds and the incorporation of spin into nelson’s stochastic mechanics. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 37:192–221, 1970.
- [83] W. G. Faris. Spin correlation in stochastic mechanics. *Found. Phys.*, 12:1–26, 1982.
- [84] G. F. de Angelis, G. Jona-Lasinio, M. Serva, and N. Zanghi. Stochastic mechanics of a dirac particle in two spacetime dimensions. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, 19:865, 1986, <http://iopscience.iop.org/0305-4470/19/6/017/pdf/jav19i6p865.pdf>.
- [85] S. Roy and R. Llinas. Relevance of quantum mechanics on some aspects of ion channel function. *C. R. Biologies*, 332, 517-522, 2009.
- [86] S. Bhattacharya, S. Dutta, and S. Roy. Schroedinger-langevin equation and ion transport at nano scale. *Journal of Modern Physics*, 2, 231-235, 2011.
- [87] T. Koide and T. Kodoma. Stochastic variational method as quantization scheme i: Hamiltonian form and uncertainty relation. 2013, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1208.0258v2>.
- [88] F. Guerra and P. Ruggiero. New interpretation of the euclidean-markov field in the framework of physical minkowski space-time. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 31:1022, 1973.

## Bibliography

- [89] K. Yasue. Stochastic quantization of wave fields and its application to dissipatively interacting fields. *J. Math. Phys.*, 19:1892, 1978.
- [90] M. P. Davidson. The generalized fenyesh-nelson model for free scalar field theory. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 4:101–106, 1980, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0211097>.
- [91] T. Koide and T. Kodoma. Stochastic variational method as quantization scheme i: Field quantization of complex klein-gordon equation. *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. (9): 093A03*, 2015 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1306.6922V3>.
- [92] F. Guerra and M. I. Loffredo. Stochastic equations for the maxwell field. *Lettre al Nuovo Cimento*, 27:41–45, 1979.
- [93] T. Koide and T. Kodoma. Stochastic variational method as a quantization scheme ii: Quantization of electromagnetic fields. 2014, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1406.6295>.
- [94] S. De Siena, F. Guerra, and P. Ruggiero. Stochastic quantization of the vector-meson field. *Phys. Rev. D*, 27:2912– 2915, 1983.
- [95] M. P. Davidson. Stochastic quantization of the linearized gravitational field. *J. Math. Phys.*, 23:132–137, 1982, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0112076>.
- [96] S. C. Lim. Finite temperature field from stochastic mechanics. *Phys. Lett. B*, 188:239–245, 1987.
- [97] L. F. Santos and C. O. Escobar. Stochastic motion of an open bosonic string. *Phys. Lett. A*, 256, 89-94, 1999, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9806044v2>.
- [98] E. A. Carlen and M. I. Loffredo. The correspondence between stochastic mechanics and quantum mechanics on multiply connected configuration spaces. *Phys. Lett. A*, 141:9–13, 1989.
- [99] G. Bacciagaluppi. *Endophysics, Time, Quantum and the Subjective*, chapter A Conceptual Introduction to Nelson’s Mechanics, pages 367–88, <http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/8853/>. Singapore: World Scientific, 2005.
- [100] L. Smolin (2006). Could quantum mechanics be an approximation to another theory? <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0609109>.
- [101] L. Fritzsche and M. Haugk (2009). Stochastic foundation of quantum mechanics and the origin of particle spin. <http://arxiv.org/abs/0912.3442>.

- [102] A. Caticha. Entropic dynamics, time and quantum theory. *J. Phys. A.* 44:225303, 2011, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1005.2357>.
- [103] I. Schmelzer (2011). An answer to the wallstrom objection against nelsonian stochastics. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1101.5774>.
- [104] G. Groessing, J. M. Pascasio, and H. Schwabl. A classical explanation of quantization. *Found. Phys.*, 41:1437–1453, 2011, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0812.3561>.
- [105] X. Oriols and J. Mompart. *Applied Bohmian Mechanics: From Nanoscale Systems to Cosmology*, chapter Chapter 1: Overview of Bohmian Mechanics. Pan Stanford Publishing, Singapore, 2012.
- [106] X. Oriols, D. Tena, and A. Benseny. Natural classical limit for the center of mass of many-particle quantum systems. 2016, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.03988>.
- [107] S. Adler. Quantum theory as an emergent phenomenon: Foundation and phenomenology. *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* 361, 012002, 2012, <http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1742-6596/361/1/012002/meta>.
- [108] M. J. W. Hall, D. A. Deckert, and H. M. Wiseman. Quantum phenomena modeled by interactions between many classical worlds. *Phy. Rev. X*, 4:041013, 2014, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1402.6144>.
- [109] C. T. Sebens. Quantum mechanics as classical physics. *Philosophy of Science*, 82, pp. 266-291, 2015, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1403.0014>.
- [110] S. L. Adler. Statistical dynamics of global unitary invariant matrix models as pre-quantum mechanics. Draft of Adler’s 2004 book, Quantum Mechanics As An Emergent Phenomenon, <http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0206120>.
- [111] S. L. Adler. Incorporating gravity into trace dynamics: the induced gravitational action. *Class. Quant. Grav.* 30, 195015, Corrigendum 239501, 2013, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1306.0482>.
- [112] D. Duerr, S. Goldstein, and N. Zanghi. Quantum equilibrium and the origin of absolute uncertainty. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 67:843–907, 1992, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0308039v1>.
- [113] D. Bohm. A suggested interpretation of the quantum theory in terms of "hidden" variables. i. *Phy. Rev.* 85, 166, 1952.

## Bibliography

- [114] D. Bohm. A suggested interpretation of the quantum theory in terms of "hidden" variables. ii. *Phys. Rev.* 85, 180, 1952.
- [115] P. Pearle and A. Valentini. *Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Physics*, chapter Generalizations of Quantum Mechanics. Elsevier, North-Holland, 2006, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0506115>.
- [116] J. Uffink. *Handbook for Philosophy of Physics*, chapter Compendium of the Foundations of Classical Statistical Physics. Elsevier, North-Holland, 2006, <http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/2691/>.
- [117] G. Bacciagaluppi. *Probabilities, Causes and Propensities in Physics*, chapter Probability and time symmetry in classical Markov processes, pages 41–59. Springer Netherlands, 2011, <http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/3534/>.
- [118] F. Arntzenius. Indeterminism and the direction of time. *Topoi*, 14(1), 67-81, 1995.
- [119] R. Frigg and C. Hoefer. *The present situation in the philosophy of science*, chapter Determinism and chance from a Humean perspective, pages 351–371. Springer, 2010.
- [120] L. Glynn. Deterministic chance. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 61(1), 51-80, 2010.
- [121] N. Emery. Chance, possibility, and explanation. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 66(1), 95-120, 2015.
- [122] L. de la Pena and A. M. Cetto. Does quantum mechanics accept a stochastic support? *Found. Phys.* 12 1017-37, 1982.
- [123] M. Caliarì, G. Inverso, and L. M. Morato. Dissipation caused by a vorticity field and generation of singularities in madelung fluid. *New Journal of Physics* 6(1), pp. 69, 2004.
- [124] G. Bacciagaluppi. Nelsonian mechanics revisited. *Found. Phys. Lett.* 12, 1-16, 1999, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9811040>.
- [125] P. Holland and C. Philippidis. Implications of lorentz covariance for the guidance equation in two-slit quantum interference. *Phys. Rev. A* 67, 062105, 2003, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0302076>.
- [126] R. Schiller. Quasi-classical theory of the nonspinning electron. *Phys. Rev.*, 125:1100, 1962.



- [127] N. Rosen. The relation between classical and quantum mechanics. *American Journal of Physics*, 32:597–600, 1964.
- [128] P. Ghose. A continuous transition between quantum and classical mechanics. i. *Foundations of Physics vol. 32*, pp. 871-892, 32:871–892, 2002, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0104104>.
- [129] H. Nikolic. Classical mechanics without determinism. *Found. Phys. Lett.*, 19:553–566, 2006, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0505143>.
- [130] H. Nikolic. Classical mechanics as nonlinear quantum mechanics. *AIP Conf. Proc.*, 962:162–167, 2007, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0707.2319>.
- [131] D. Bohm and B. J. Hiley. Non-locality and locality in the stochastic interpretation of quantum mechanics. *Physics Reports*, 172:93–122, 1989.
- [132] L. Smolin. A real ensemble interpretation of quantum mechanics. *Foundations of Physics*, Vol. 42, 10, pp. 1239-1261, 2012, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1104.2822>.
- [133] H. Hasegawa. Self-contained framework of stochastic mechanics for reconstructing the onsager machlup theory. *Phys. Rev. D. 33 (8)*, 2508, 1986.
- [134] M. F. Pusey, J. Barrett, and T. Rudolph. On the reality of the quantum state. *Nature Physics*, 8:475–478, 2012, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1111.3328>.
- [135] S. Albeverio and R. Hoegh-Krohn. A remark on the connection between stochastic mechanics and the heat equation. *J. Math. Phys. 15*, 1745-1747, 1974.
- [136] E. Schroedinger. Die mehrdeutigkeit der wellefunktion. *Annalen der Physik*, 32:49–55, 1938.
- [137] D. Bohm. *Quantum Theory*. Prentice-Hall, 1951.
- [138] E. Merzbacher. Single valuedness of wave functions. *American Journal of Physics*, 30:237–247, 1962.
- [139] P. M. Matthews and K. Venkatesan. *A Textbook of Quantum Mechanics*. Mcgraw-Hill, 1979.
- [140] W. C. Henneberger and T. Opatrny. When is the wave function single-valued? *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 33:1783–1795, 1994.

## Bibliography

- [141] H. Goldstein, C. P. Poole, and J. Safko. *Classical Mechanics*. Pearson Education: 3rd, International Economy Edition edition, 2011.
- [142] J. V. Jose and E. Saletan. *Classical Dynamics: A Contemporary Approach*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 1 edition, 1998.
- [143] S. Ray and J. Shamanna. On virtual displacement and virtual work in lagrangian dynamics. *European Journal of Physics*, 27:311–329, 2006, <http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0510204>.
- [144] G. A. Schott. The electromagnetic field of a moving uniformly and rigidly electrified sphere and its radiationless orbits. *Phil. Mag. Vol. 15, Ser. 7*, 752-761, 1933.
- [145] G. A. Schott. The general motion of a spinning uniformly and rigidly electrified sphere, iii. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* 159, 548-570, 1937.
- [146] G. A. Schott. The uniform circular motion with invariable normal spin of a rigidly and uniformly electrified sphere, iv. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* 159, 570-591, 1937.
- [147] D. Bohm and M. Weinstein. The self-oscillations of a charged particle. *Phys. Rev.* 74, 1789-1798, 1948.
- [148] B. J. Bichsel, M. A. Morrison, N. Shafer-Rey, and E. R. I. Abraham. Experimental and theoretical investigation of the stark effect for manipulating cold molecules: Application to nitric oxide. *Phys. Rev. A*, 75:023410, 2007, <http://www.nhn.ou.edu/morrison/Research/Papers/BMS06.pdf>.
- [149] T. H. Boyer. Random electrodynamics: The theory of classical electrodynamics with classical electromagnetic zero-point radiation. *Phys. Rev. D*, 11:4, 1975.
- [150] T. H. Boyer. *Foundation of Radiation Theory and Quantum Electrodynamics*, chapter A brief survey of stochastic electrodynamics, pages 141–162. Plenum, New York, 1980.
- [151] H. E. Puthoff. Ground state pf hydrogen as a zero-point-fluctuation-determined state. *Phys. Rev. D* 35:10, 1987.
- [152] W. C.-H. Huang and H. Batelaan. Dynamics underlying the gaussian distribution of the classical harmonic oscillator in zero-point radiation. *Journal of Computational Methods in Physics*, 2013: 308538, 2013, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1206.5323>.

- [153] W. C.-H. Huang and H. Batelaan. Discrete excitation spectrum of a classical harmonic oscillator in zero-point radiation. *Found. Phys.* 45, 3, 333-353, 2015, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1206.6891>.
- [154] H. E. Puthoff. Quantum ground states as equilibrium particle-vacuum interaction states. *Quantum Studies: Mathematics and Foundations*, 3:1 pp. 5-10, 2016, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1204.1952>.
- [155] F. C. Klebaner. *Introduction to Stochastic Calculus with Applications*. Imperial College Press, 2005.
- [156] V. Allori. *Decoherence and the Classical Limit of Quantum Mechanics*. PhD thesis, Universita degli Studi di Genova, 2001, <http://www.niu.edu/vallori/tesi.pdf>.
- [157] G. E. Bowman. On the classical limit in bohm's theory. *Foundations of Physics*, Vol. 35, 4, pp. 605-625, 2005.
- [158] P. Blanchard and S. Golin. Diffusion process with singular drift fields. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 109, 421-435, 1987.
- [159] T. C. Wallstrom. A finite-energy bound on the approach of a diffusion to the zeros of its density. In *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, Volume 108, Number 3, 1990.
- [160] M. Derakhshani. A suggested answer to wallstrom's criticism: Zitterbewegung stochastic mechanics i. 2016, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.06391>.
- [161] J. S. Bell. *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics*, chapter Beables for quantum field theory, pages 173-180. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [162] M. I. Loffredo and L. M. Morato. Stochastic quantization for a system of n identical interacting bose particles. *J. Phys. A Math. Theor.* 40, 2007, <http://www.matapp.unimib.it/bertacchi/workshop07/morato.pdf>.
- [163] T. Koide. Classicalization of quantum variables and quantum-classical hybrids. *Phys. Lett. A* 379, 36, pages 2007-2012, 2015, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6321v3>.
- [164] B. I. Lev, V. B. Tymchyshyn, and A. G. Zagorodny. Brownian particle in non-equilibrium plasma. *Condensed Matter Physics*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 593-602, 2009.
- [165] M. S. Leifer. Is the quantum state real? an extended review of psi-ontology theorems. *Quanta* 3:67-155, 2014, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1409.1570>.

## Bibliography

- [166] S. D. Bartlett, T. Rudolph, and R. W. Spekkens. Reconstruction of gaussian quantum mechanics from liouville mechanics with an epistemic restriction. *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 012103, 2012, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1111.5057>.
- [167] E. G. Cavalcanti, C. J. Foster, M. D. Reid, and P. D. Drummond. Bell inequalities for continuous-variable correlations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 210405, 2007, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0705.1385>.
- [168] A. Komar. Interacting relativistic particles. *Phys. Rev. D*, 18:1887, 1978.
- [169] F. Rohrlich. Relativistic hamiltonian dynamics i. classical mechanics. *Annals of Physics*, 117:292–322, 1979.
- [170] Vladimir Zelevinsky. *Quantum Physics Volume 1: From Basics to Symmetries and Perturbations*, chapter Hydrogen Fine Structure, page 551. WILEY-VCH, 2011.
- [171] W. Greiner. *Relativistic Quantum Mechanics: Wave Equations*. Springer, 2000.
- [172] P. R. Holland. The dirac equation in the de broglie-bohm theory of motion. *Found. Phys.*, 22:1287–1301, 1992.
- [173] S. Colin and H. M. Wiseman. The zig-zag road to reality. *J. Phys. A.*, 44:345304, 2011, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1107.4909>.
- [174] W. Struyve. On the zig-zag pilot-wave approach for fermions. *J. Phys. A.*, 45:195307, 2012, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1201.4169>.
- [175] A. O. Barut and N. Zanghi. Classical model of the dirac electron. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 52:2009, 1984.
- [176] A. O. Barut and M. Pavsic. Classical model of the dirac electron in curved space. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 4:L41, 1987.
- [177] A. O. Barut and N. Unal. Generalization of the lorentz-dirac equation to include spin. *Phys. Rev. A*, 40:5404, 1989.
- [178] A. O. Barut, C. Onem, and N. Unal. The classical relativistic two-body problem with spin and self-interactions. *J. Phys. A.*, 23:1113, 1990.
- [179] A. O. Barut and M. Pavsic. Quantisation of the classical relativistic zitterbewegung in the schroedinger picture. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 4:L131, 1987.

- [180] A. O. Barut and I. H. Duru. Path integral formulation of quantum electrodynamics from classical particle trajectories. *Physics Reports*, 172:1–32, 1989.
- [181] T. Takabayasi. Vortex, spin and triad for quantum mechanics of spinspace particle.i. *Prog. Theoretical Physics*, Vol. 70, No. 1, 1983, <http://ptp.oxfordjournals.org/content/70/1/1.refs>.
- [182] E. Adelberger, G. Dvali, and A. Gruzinov. Photon mass bound destroyed by vortices. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 98:010402, 2007, <http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0306245>.
- [183] F. J. Yndurain. Limits on the mass of the gluon. *Phys. Lett. B*, 345:524–526, 1995.
- [184] A. S. Goldhaber and M. M. Nieto. Photon and graviton mass limits. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 82, pp. 939-979, 2010, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0809.1003>.
- [185] G. Durieux, J. Gerard, F. Maltoni, and C. Smith. Three-generation baryon and lepton number violation at the lhc. *Phys. Lett. B*, 721:82–85, 2013, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1210.6598>.
- [186] S. Colin and W. Struyve. A dirac sea pilot-wave model for quantum field theory. *J. Phys. A.*, 40:7309–7342, 2007, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0701085>.
- [187] H. B. Nielsen and M. Ninomiya (1998). Dirac sea for bosons. <http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9808108>.
- [188] Y. Habara, Y. Nagatani, H. B. Nielsen, and M. Ninomiya. Dirac sea and hole theory for bosons i - a new formulation of quantum field theories. *International Journal of Modern Physics A*, 23:2733–2769, 2008, <http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0603242>.
- [189] A. Rueda and G. Cavalleri. Zitterbewegung in stochastic electrodynamics and implications on a zero-point field acceleration mechanism. *Il Nuovo Cimento C*, 6:239–260, 1983.
- [190] A. Rueda. Stochastic electrodynamics with particle structure part i: Zero-point induced brownian behavior. *Found. Phys. Lett.*, 6:75–108, 1993.
- [191] A. Rueda. Stochastic electrodynamics with particle structure part ii - towards a zero-point induced wave behavior. *Found. Phys. Lett.*, 6:139–166, 1993.
- [192] L. de la Pena and A. M. Cetto. *The Quantum Dice: An Introduction to Stochastic Electrodynamics*, chapter 12. Kluwer Academic Publisher, 1996.

## Bibliography

- [193] B. Haisch and A. Rueda. On the relation between a zero-point-field-induced inertial effect and the einstein-de broglie formula. *Phys. Lett. A*, 268:224–227, 2000, <http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/gr-qc/9906084>.
- [194] D. T. Pope, P. D. Drummond, and W. J. Munro. Disagreement between correlations of quantum mechanics and stochastic electrodynamics in the damped parametric oscillator. *Phys. Rev. A*, 62:042108, 2000, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0003131>.
- [195] M. Genovese, G. Brida, M. Gramegna, F. Piacentini, E. Predazzi, and I. Ruo-Berchera. Experimental tests of hidden variable theories from dbb to stochastic electrodynamics. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 67:012047, 2007, <http://iopscience.iop.org/1742-6596/67/1/012047>.
- [196] A. Valdes-Hernandez, L. de la Pena, and A. M. Cetto. Bipartite entanglement induced by a common background (zero-point) radiation field. *Found. Phys.*, 41:843–862, 2011.
- [197] A. M. Cetto, L. de la Pena, and A. Valdes-Hernandez. Quantization as an emergent phenomenon due to matter-zero-point field interaction. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 361:012013, 2012.
- [198] L. de la Pena, A. M. Cetto, and A. Valdes-Hernandez. Quantum behavior derived as an essentially stochastic phenomenon. *Physica Scripta*, 2012:014008, 2012.
- [199] A. M. Cetto and L. de la Pena. Radiative corrections for the matter-zero-point field system: establishing contact with quantum electrodynamics. *Physica Scripta*, 2012:014009, 2012.
- [200] A. M. Cetto, L. de la Pena, and A. Valdes-Hernandez. Emergence of quantization: the spin of the electron. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 504:012007, 2014.
- [201] R. Penrose. *The Road to Reality*, chapter 25.2 The zigzag picture of the electron. Alfred A. Knopf, 2005.
- [202] A. Valentini. Inflationary cosmology as a probe of primordial quantum mechanics. *Phys. Rev. D*, 063513, 2010.
- [203] P. Hanggi and P. Jung. *Advances in Chemical Physics, Volume LXXXIX*, chapter Colored Noise In Dynamical Systems, pages 239–326. Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1995.
- [204] A. Montina. Exponential complexity and ontological theories of quantum mechanics. *Phys. Rev. A* 77, 022104, 2008, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0711.4770>.

- [205] A. Montina. State space dimensionality in short memory hidden variable theories. *Phys. Rev. A* 83, 032107, 2011, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1008.4415>.
- [206] A. Montina. Dynamics of a qubit as a classical stochastic process with time-correlated noise: minimal measurement invasiveness. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 108, 160501, 2012, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1108.5138>.
- [207] P. W. Milonni. *The Quantum Vacuum: An Introduction to Quantum Electrodynamics*. Academic Press, New York, 1994.
- [208] D. Bartolomeo and A. Caticha. Entropic dynamics: The schroedinger equation and its bohmian limit. In *MaxEnt 2015, the 35th International Workshop on Bayesian Inference and Maximum Entropy Methods in Science and Engineering*, 2015, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1512.09084>.
- [209] Wolfgang Pauli. *General Principles of Quantum Mechanics*, chapter Stationary States as Eigenvalue Problem, pages 47–48. Springer-Verlag, 1980.
- [210] D. J. Bohm and B. J. Hiley. The de broglie pilot wave theory and the further development of new insights arising out of it. *Foundations of Physics*, Vol. 12, No. 10, pp. 1001-1016, 1982.
- [211] C. Moeller. *Les Theories Relativistes de la Gravitation*. Colloques Internationaux CNRS 91, CNRS 91, Paris, 1962.
- [212] L. Rosenfeld. On the quantization of fields. *Nucl. Phys.*, 40:353, 1963.
- [213] T.W. Kibble and S. Randjbar-Daemi. Non-linear coupling of quantum theory and classical gravity. *J. Phys. A.*, 13:141, 1980.
- [214] D. N. Page and C. D. Geilker. Indirect evidence of quantum gravity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 47:979–982, 1981.
- [215] J. B. Hartle and G. T. Horowitz. Ground-state expectation value of the metric in the  $1/n$  or semiclassical approximation to quantum gravity. *Phys. Rev. D* 24, 257, 1981.
- [216] N. D. Birrell and P. C. W. Davies. *Quantum Fields in Curved Space*. Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- [217] L. H. Ford. Gravitational radiation by quantum systems. *Annals of Physics* 144, pp. 238-248, 1982.

## Bibliography

- [218] R. M. Wald. *Quantum Field Theory in Curved Spacetime and Black Hole Thermodynamics*. Chicago University Press, Chicago., 1994.
- [219] M. Visser. Sakharov’s induced gravity: a modern perspective. *Mod. Phys. Lett.*, A17:977–992, 2002, <http://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0204062>.
- [220] L. H. Ford. *100 Years of Relativity - Space-time Structure: Einstein and Beyond*, chapter Spacetime in Semiclassical Gravity. World Scientific, 2005, <http://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0504096>.
- [221] B. L. Hu, A. Roura, and E. Verdaguer. Induced quantum metric fluctuations and the validity of semiclassical gravity. *Phys. Rev. D* 70, 044002, 2004, <http://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0402029>.
- [222] B. L. Hu and E. Verdaguer. Stochastic gravity: Theory and applications. *Living Rev. Relativity*, 11:3, 2008, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0802.0658>.
- [223] C. Kiefer. *Quantum Gravity, third edition*. (Oxford University Press, Oxford), 2012.
- [224] B. L. Hu. Gravitational decoherence, alternative quantum theories and semiclassical gravity. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, Volume 504, conference 1*, 2014, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1402.6584>.
- [225] A. O. Barut. The revival of schroedinger’s interpretation of quantum mechanics. *Foundations of Physics Letters* 1 (1): 47-56, 1988.
- [226] A. O. Barut. Combining relativity and quantum mechanics: Schroedinger’s interpretation of psi. *Foundations of Physics* 18 (1): 95-105, 1988.
- [227] A. O. Barut and J. P. Dowling. Self-field quantum electrodynamics: The two-level atom. *Phys. Rev. A* 41, 2284, 1990.
- [228] A. O. Barut and J. P. Dowling. Quantum electrodynamics based on self-fields: On the origin of thermal radiation detected by an accelerated observer. *Phys. Rev. A* 41, 2277, 1990.
- [229] L. Diosi. Gravitation and quantum-mechanical localization of macro-objects. *Phys. Lett. A*, 105:199–202, 1984.
- [230] R. Penrose. On gravity’s role in quantum state reduction. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 28:581–600, 1996.



- [231] R. Penrose. Quantum computation, entanglement and state reduction. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. A*, 356:1927–1939, 1998.
- [232] W. Marshall, C. Simon, R. Penrose, and D. Bouwmeester. Towards quantum superpositions of a mirror. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 91:130401, 2003, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0210001>.
- [233] F. Siddhartha Guzman and L. Arturo Urena-Lopez. Newtonian collapse of scalar field dark matter. *Phys. Rev. D* 69, 124033, 68:024023, 2003, <http://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0303440>.
- [234] P. J. Salzman. *Investigation of the time dependent Schroedinger-Newton equation*. PhD thesis, University of California - Davis, 2005.
- [235] L. Diosi. Notes on certain newton gravity mechanisms of wavefuncwave localization and decoherence. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* 40, 2989-2995, 2007, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0607110>.
- [236] S. L. Adler. Comments on proposed gravitational modifications of schroedinger dynamics and their experimental implications. *J. Phys. A.*, 40:755–764, 2007, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0610255>.
- [237] S. Carlip. Is quantum gravity necessary? *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 25:154010, 2008, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0803.3456>.
- [238] J. van Wezel and J. van den Brink. Schroedinger-newton equation as a possible generator of quantum state reduction. *Phil. Mag.*, 88:1659–1671, 2008, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0803.4488>.
- [239] S. Boughn. Nonquantum gravity. *Found. Phys.*, 39:331–351, 2009, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0809.4218>.
- [240] J. R. van Meter. Schroedinger-newton ”collapse” of the wave function. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 28:215013, 2011, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1105.1579>.
- [241] D. Giulini and A. Grossardt. Gravitationally induced inhibitions of dispersion according to the schroedinger-newton equation. *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 28:195026, 2011, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1105.1921>.
- [242] L. L. Salcedo. Statistical consistency of quantum-classical hybrids. *Phys. Rev. A*(85) 022127, 86:022127, 2012, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1201.4237>.

## Bibliography

- [243] D. Giulini and A. Grossardt. The schroedinger-newton equation as non-relativistic limit of self-gravitating klein-gordon and dirac fields. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 29:215010, 2012, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1206.4250>.
- [244] D. Giulini and A. Grossardt. Gravitationally induced inhibitions of dispersion according to a modified schroedinger-newton equation for a homogeneous-sphere potential. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 30:155018, 2013, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1212.5146>.
- [245] H. Yang, H. Miao, D-S Lee, B. Helou, and Y. Chen. Macroscopic quantum mechanics in a classical spacetime. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 110:170401, 2013, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1210.0457>.
- [246] S. Colin, T. Durt, and R. Willox. Can quantum systems succumb to their own (gravitational) attraction? *Class. Quant. Grav.* 31, 245003, 2014, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1403.2982>.
- [247] D. Giulini and A. Grossardt. Centre-of-mass motion in multi-particle schroedinger-newton dynamics. *New Journal of Physics*, 16:075005, 2014, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1404.0624>.
- [248] M. Bahrami, A. Grossardt, S. Donadi, and A. Bassi. The schrodinger-newton equation and its foundations. *New J. Phys.* 16, 115007, 2014, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1407.4370>.
- [249] C. Anastopoulos and B. L. Hu. Probing a gravitational cat state. *Class. Quantum Grav.* 32, 165022, 2015, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1504.03103>.
- [250] A. Grossardt, J. Bateman, H. Ulbricht, and A. Bassi. Effects of newtonian gravitational self-interaction in harmonically trapped quantum systems. 2015, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.01262>.
- [251] M. Bahrami, A. Bassi, S. McMillen, M. Paternostro, and H. Ulbricht. Is gravity quantum? 2015, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1507.05733>.
- [252] S. Bera, R. Mohan, and T. P. Singh. Stochastic modification of the schrodinger-newton equation. *Phys. Rev. D* 92, 025054, 2015, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1504.05892>.
- [253] M. Derakhshani, C. Anastopoulos, and B. L. Hu. Probing a gravitational cat state: Experimental possibilities. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, Volume 701, conference 1 (arXiv version more up-to-date)*, 2016, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1603.04430>.
- [254] A. Grossardt, J. Bateman, H. Ulbricht, and A. Bassi. Optomechanical test of the schroedinger-newton equation. *Phys. Rev. D* 93, 096003, 2016, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.01696>.

- [255] H. Pino, J. Prat-Camps, K. Sinha, B. P. Venkatesh, and O. Romero-Isart. Quantum interference of a microsphere. (March 2016) <http://arxiv.org/abs/1603.01553>.
- [256] C. C. Gan, C. M. Savage, and S. Z. Scully. Optomechanical tests of a schroedinger-newton equation for gravitational quantum mechanics. 2016, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1512.04183>.
- [257] L. Diosi. Nonlinear schroedinger equation in foundations: summary of 4 catches. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, Volume 701, Number 1*, 2016, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.03772>.
- [258] M. Derakhshani. The newtonian limit of stochastic gravity differs from the many-body stochastic schroedinger-newton equations. 2017, forthcoming.
- [259] O. Romero-Isart, L. Clemente, C. Navau, A. Sanchez, and J. I. Cirac. Quantum magnetomechanics with levitating superconducting microspheres. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 109, 147205, 2012, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1112.5609>.
- [260] O. V. Prezhdo and C. Brooksby. Quantum backreaction through the bohmian particle. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 86, 32153219, 2001.
- [261] S. J. Landau, C. G. Scoccola, and D. Sudarsky. Cosmological constraints on non-standard inflationary quantum collapse models. *Phys. Rev. D.*, 85:123001, 2012, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1112.1830>.
- [262] L. Diosi. Gravity-related wave function collapse: mass density resolution. In *Invited talk at Sixth International Workshop DICE2012*, 2012, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1302.5365>.
- [263] L. Diosi. Gravity-related wave function collapse: Is superfluid he exceptional? In *Invited talk at the international workshop "Horizon of quantum physics: from foundations to quantum enabled technologies"*, 2012, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1302.5364>.
- [264] D. Kafri, J. M. Taylor, and G. J. Milburn. A classical channel model for gravitational decoherence. *New Journal of Physics*, 16(6):065020, 2014, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1401.0946>.
- [265] S. Nimmrichter and K. Hornberger. Stochastic extensions of the regularized schroedinger-newton equation. *Phys. Rev. D* 91, 024016, 2015, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1410.4702>.
- [266] W. Struyve. Semi-classical approximations based on bohmian mechanics. 2015, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1507.04771>.

## Bibliography

- [267] M. K. H. Kiessling. Quantum abraham models with de broglie-bohm laws of electron motion. *AIP Conf. Proc. vol. 844*, p. 206-227, 2006, <https://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0604069>.
- [268] P. R. Holland. *The Quantum Theory of Motion*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [269] D. Duerr, S. Goldstein, and N. Zanghi. *Quantum Physics Without Quantum Philosophy*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2012.
- [270] C. Bardos, F. Golse, and N. Mauser. Weak coupling limit of the n-particle schroedinger equation. *Methods and Applications of Analysis, Vol. 7, No. 2*, pp. 275-294, 2000.
- [271] C. Bardos, L. Erdos, F. Golse, N. Mauser, and H. T. Yau. Derivation of the schroedinger-poisson equation from the quantum n-body problem. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris. Ser. I 334*, pp. 515-520, 2002.
- [272] F. Golse. The mean-field limit for the dynamics of large particle systems. *Journées Equations aux derivees partielles*, pp. 1-47, 2003, <https://eudml.org/doc/93451>.
- [273] J. S. Bell. Against measurement. *Physics World*, 8:33-40, 1990.
- [274] A. Bassi and G. C. Ghirardi. A general argument against the universal validity of the superposition principle. *Phys. Lett. A*, 275, 373, 2000, <https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0009020>.
- [275] S. L. Adler. Why decoherence has not solved the measurement problem: A response to p. w. anderson. *Stud. Hist. Philos. Mod. Phys.* 34:135-142, 2003, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0112095>.
- [276] T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira, A. Padilla, and C. Skordis. Modified gravity and cosmology. *Physics Reports*, 1, pp. 1-89, 2012, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1106.2476>.
- [277] E. Nelson. *Dynamical Theories of Brownian Motion*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1967. "Osmotic velocity", Chapters 4 and 13. <https://web.math.princeton.edu/~nelson/books/bmotion.pdf>.
- [278] L. de Broglie. *A Introduction to the Study of Wave Mechanics*. Dutton, New York, 1930.
- [279] D. Bohm and B. J. Hiley. *The Undivided Universe*. Routledge, New York, 1993.
- [280] V. Gil and L. L. Salcedo. Canonical quantum-classical hybrid systems. 2016, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.05799>.

- [281] N. Gisin. Stochastic quantum dynamics and relativity. *Helvetica Physica Acta*, 62:363–371, 1989.
- [282] J. Polchinski. Weinberg’s nonlinear quantum mechanics and the einstein-podolsky-rosen paradox. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 66:397–400, 1991.
- [283] C. R. Galley. The classical mechanics of non-conservative systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 110, 174301, 2013, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1210.2745>.
- [284] H. Jehle and J. Cahn. Anharmonic resonance. *American Journal of Physics*, vol. 21, pp. 526, 1953.
- [285] R. Ruffini and S. Bonazzola. Systems of self-gravitating particles in general relativity and the concept of an equation of state. *Phys. Rev.* 187, 1767, 1969.
- [286] S. L. Liebling and C. Palenzuela. Dynamical boson stars. *Living Rev. Relativity* 15, 6, 2012, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1202.5809>.
- [287] P. H. Chavanis and T. Harko. Bose-einstein condensate general relativistic stars. *Phys. Rev. D* 86, 064011, 2012, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1108.3986>.
- [288] P. H. Chavanis. Collapse of a self-gravitating bose-einstein condensate with attractive self-interaction. 2016, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1604.05904>.
- [289] R. A. Broglia, G. Colo, G. Onida, and H. E. Roman. *Solid State Physics of Finite Systems: Metal Clusters, Fullerenes, Atomic Wires*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2004.
- [290] G. Giuliani and G. Vignale. *Quantum Theory of the Electron Liquid*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [291] B. L. Hu. Fractal spacetime in stochastic gravity? – views from anomalous diffusion and the correlation hierarchy. In *Invited talk at DICE2016 "Spacetime - Matter - Quantum Mechanics"*, 2016, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.08145>.
- [292] D. Duerr, S. Goldstein, R. Tumulka, and N. Zanghi. On the role of density matrices in bohmian mechanics. *Foundations of Physics* 35(3): 449-467, 2005, <https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0311127v1>.
- [293] M. Toros, S. Donadi, and A. Bassi. Bohmian mechanics, collapse models and the emergence of classicality. *J. Phys. A Math. Theor.* 49 355302, 2016, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1603.02541>.

## Bibliography

- [294] A. Grossardt. Personal communication. 2013.
- [295] C. Philippidis, D. Bohm, and R. D. Kaye. The aharonov-bohm effect and the quantum potential. *Il Nuovo Cimento B*, 71:75, 1982.
- [296] H. R. Brown, C. Dewdney, and G. Horton. Bohm particles and their detection in the light of neutron interferometry. *Foundations of Physics* 25 (2): 329-347, 1995.
- [297] M. A. Hohensee, B. Estey, P. Hamilton, A. Zeilinger, and H. Mueller. Force-free gravitational redshift: Proposed gravitational aharonov-bohm experiment. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 108, 230404, 2012, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1109.4887>.
- [298] V. Allori, D. Duerr, S. Goldstein, and N. Zanghi. Seven steps towards the classical world. *Journal of Optics B: Quantum and semiclassical Optics, Volume 4, number 4*, 2002, <https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0112005>.
- [299] A. Benseny, D. Tena, and X. Oriols. On the classical schroedinger equation. *Fluctuation and Noise Letters* 15, 1640011, 2016, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.00168>.
- [300] G. W. Ford, M. Kac, and P. Mazur. Statistical mechanics of assemblies of coupled oscillators. *J. Math. Phys.* 6, 504, 1965.
- [301] R. Zwanzig. Nonlinear generalized langevin equations. *Journal of Statistical Physics, Volume 9, Issue 3*, pp. 215-220, 1973.
- [302] W. Eberling and I. M. Sokolov. *Statistical Thermodynamics and Stochastic Theory of Nonequilibrium Systems: Series on Advances in Statistical Mechanics - Volume 8*, chapter Chapter 7, Brownian Motion, subsection 7.7: A non-Markovian Langevin equation, page 155. World Scientific, 2005.
- [303] A. O. Caldeira and A. J. Leggett. Path integral approach to quantum brownian motion. *Physica* 121A: 587, 1983a.
- [304] A. O. Caldeira and A. J. Leggett. Quantum tunnelling in a dissipative system. *Annals of Physics* 149: 374, 1983b.
- [305] C-H. Chou, B. L. Hu, and T. Yu. Quantum brownian motion of a macroscopic object in a general environment. *Physica A* 387, 432, 2008, <https://arxiv.org/abs/0708.0882v1>.
- [306] B. L. Hu, J. P. Paz, and Y. Zhang. Quantum brownian motion in a general environment: Exact master equation with nonlocal dissipation and colored noise. *Phys. Rev. D* 45, 2843, 1992.

- [307] M. A. Schlosshauer. *Decoherence and the Quantum-to-Classical Transition (The Frontiers Collection)*. Springer, 2008.