Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Mathematical Equivalence of Quantum and Classical Mechanics: A Proof-of-Concept for Reference Frame Representational Unity

Jesús Manuel Soledad Terrazas *

Posted Date: 22 July 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202507.1847.v1

Keywords: quantum mechanics; classical mechanics; reference frames; relativity; mathematical equivalence; spacetime unity; uncertainty principle; Schrödinger equation; free particle propagator; Galilean transformations; quantum foundations; representational equivalence; celestial bodies

Article

Mathematical Equivalence of Quantum and Classical Mechanics: A Proof-of-Concept for Reference Frame Representational Unity

Jesús Manuel Soledad Terrazas

Independent Researcher, Mexico; jesussoledadt@gmail.com

Abstract

We present a proof-of-concept demonstrating representational equivalence between quantum and classical mechanics through reference frame integration. By integrating a classical trajectory over all inertial reference frames, we derive the free-particle Schrödinger propagator, while projection onto a specific frame recovers the classical trajectory. We extend this analysis to celestial mechanics, showing that planets and galaxies would exhibit quantum behavior without the universal constancy of c. This bidirectional equivalence shows quantum and classical mechanics as convertible representations of the same reality, with extensions suggested in Spacetime Coherence Theory.

Keywords: quantum mechanics; classical mechanics; reference frames; relativity; mathematical equivalence; spacetime unity; uncertainty principle; Schrödinger equation; free particle propagator; Galilean transformations; quantum foundations; representational equivalence; celestial bodies

---

1. The Four-Dimensional Pencil Dot

Pick up a pencil, tap the sheet, and you get the tiniest mark a human hand can make. In standard treatments, that dot is often treated as a zero-dimensional ideal—a particle with no size and perfectly fixed position. Reality refuses to cooperate.

Look closer. The graphite speck already fills two coordinates on the page and carries its own depth because it is made of carbon atoms stacked in layers. That gives the dot three spatial dimensions. Add the fact that the dot never truly sits still and you reach four. While we observe, it rotates with Earth at close to a thousand kilometers per hour, orbits the Sun at thirty kilometers per second, and drifts through the galaxy at roughly six hundred kilometers per second. In every reference frame, the dot is in motion. No observer can pin it down to a single location without inheriting that motion.

The idea of a perfect point at rest belongs to mathematics, not to the physical world.

2. Why Classical Mechanics Works (And Where It Fails)

Classical mechanics survives in everyday life because we silently adopt Earth's gravity as a shared reference frame. The planet's massive gravitational pull supplies a convenient notion of "down," clocks tick together, and most nearby objects share nearly identical trajectories through space. Under these conditions, momentum spreads become negligible, position feels definite, and the fiction of absolute rest passes for truth.

Shrink the system to atomic scales, however, and gravity fades from the story. Mass drops, the planetary reference frame loses authority, and the quiet uncertainty we ignored becomes impossible to hide. In that frameless arena, position and motion are forever entangled.

What shows up in experiments as the Heisenberg uncertainty principle is simply the price of living in a universe with no preferred reference frame. Recent developments in quantum reference frames [6, 7] have begun exploring this connection, though without establishing the complete mathematical equivalence we demonstrate here.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 22 July 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1847.v1

3. From Relativity to Quantum Uncertainty

Einstein's special relativity eliminates absolute reference frames. This fundamental insight, combined with the indivisible nature of spacetime, leads directly to quantum uncertainty.

Let $\mathbf{X}^\mu = (ct, x, y, z)$ represent a four-dimensional spacetime event. Classical mechanics assumes separability:

$$\mathbf{X}^\mu = \mathbf{x} \oplus ct \quad \text{(Classical assumption)} \tag{1}$$

We assert fundamental indivisibility:

$$\mathbf{X}^\mu \neq \mathbf{x} \oplus ct \quad \text{(Spacetime unity)} \tag{2}$$

Position and momentum become projections of this unified four-vector:

$$\text{Position:} \quad \mathbf{x} = \mathcal{P}_{\text{space}}[\mathbf{X}^\mu] \tag{3}$$
$$\text{Momentum:} \quad \mathbf{p} = m\mathcal{P}_{\text{time}}[\partial_\tau \mathbf{X}^\mu] \tag{4}$$

where τ is the proper time.

Since $\mathbf{X}^\mu$ cannot be decomposed into independent spatial and temporal parts, both projections cannot be simultaneously specified with perfect precision. The non-commutativity of projection operators:

$$[\mathcal{P}_{\text{space}}, \mathcal{P}_{\text{time}}] \neq 0 \tag{5}$$

directly yields the canonical commutation relation:

$$[\hat{x}, \hat{p}] = i\hbar \tag{6}$$

and Heisenberg's uncertainty principle:

$$\Delta x \cdot \Delta p \geq \frac{\hbar}{2} \tag{7}$$

This mathematical structure aligns with recent work on quantum reference frame transformations [8], though our approach demonstrates a more fundamental representational equivalence.

4. Mathematical Proof of Equivalence

The pencil dot reveals why quantum and classical mechanics must be equivalent: they describe the same physical reality from different reference frame perspectives. We now prove this mathematically through what we term "reference frame representational equivalence."

4.1. Central Theorem

Theorem: A classical trajectory integrated over all inertial reference frames yields the quantum propagator; projecting the quantum state onto a single reference frame recovers the classical trajectory.

4.2. Forward Transformation: Classical → Quantum

Consider a free particle with mass m moving in one dimension.

Step 1: Classical trajectory in laboratory frame F_0

$$x_0 = 0 \quad \text{(initial position)} \tag{8}$$
$$v = \text{constant velocity} \tag{9}$$
$$x_{\text{classical}}(t) = x_0 + vt \tag{10}$$

Step 2: Same physical trajectory viewed from frame boosted by velocity u

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 22 July 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1847.v1

In the boosted frame, the particle's velocity becomes $(v - u)$. Each reference frame contributes a Galilean phase factor arising from the coordinate transformation, adjusted for the mean velocity:[1]

$$\phi(u; x, t) = \frac{m}{\hbar}\left(u(x - x_0 - vt) - \frac{1}{2}u^2 t\right) \tag{11}$$

Step 3: Integrate over all possible reference frames

The quantum wave function emerges by summing the classical trajectory over all inertial frames:

$$\psi(x, t) = \frac{m}{2\pi\hbar}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} du\, e^{i\phi(u;x,t)} \tag{12}$$

This is a Gaussian integral. To evaluate it, complete the square in the exponent:

The exponent is $i\frac{m}{\hbar}\left(u(x - x_0 - vt) - \frac{1}{2}u^2 t\right) = -\frac{imt}{2\hbar}u^2 + \frac{im(x-x_0-vt)}{\hbar}u$.

Let $\alpha = \frac{imt}{2\hbar}$, $\beta = \frac{im(x-x_0-vt)}{\hbar}$.

The integral $\int du\, e^{-\alpha u^2 + \beta u} = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha}}e^{\beta^2/4\alpha}$.

Substituting and simplifying yields:

$$\boxed{\psi(x, t) = \sqrt{\frac{m}{2\pi i\hbar t}}\exp\left[\frac{im(x - x_0 - vt)^2}{2\hbar t}\right]} \tag{13}$$

This is exactly the free-particle Schrödinger propagator centered on the classical trajectory.

To arrive at this solution: The Gaussian integral formula gives the prefactor $\frac{m}{2\pi\hbar}\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha}} = \frac{m}{2\pi\hbar}\sqrt{\frac{2\pi\hbar}{imt}} = \sqrt{\frac{m}{2\pi i\hbar t}}$ after algebraic simplification. The exponent $\beta^2/4\alpha$ simplifies to $\frac{im(x-x_0-vt)^2}{2\hbar t}$.

4.3. Reverse Transformation: Quantum → Classical

Now we demonstrate the inverse: how classical trajectories emerge from quantum states.

Step 1: Start with the quantum propagator

$$\psi(x, t) = \sqrt{\frac{m}{2\pi i\hbar t}}\exp\left[\frac{im(x - x_0 - vt)^2}{2\hbar t}\right] \tag{14}$$

Step 2: Project onto a specific reference frame u^*

To extract the classical trajectory in frame u^*, we identify the frame where the wave function is centered at the classical position with zero mean deviation. This corresponds to choosing $u^* = 0$ in the lab frame or shifting accordingly for other frames.

The center of the wave packet (where $|\psi|^2$ is maximum) follows the classical trajectory:

$$x(t) = x_0 + (v - u^*)t \tag{15}$$

$$p(t) = m(v - u^*) \tag{16}$$

For $u^* = 0$, we recover the lab frame trajectory $x_0 + vt$, $p = mv$.

To arrive at this: The probability density $|\psi(x,t)|^2 = \sqrt{\frac{m}{\pi\hbar t}}\exp\left[-\frac{m(x-x_0-vt)^2}{\hbar t}\right]$ is a Gaussian centered at $x = x_0 + vt$ with mean momentum mv. In a boosted frame by u^*, the center shifts by $-u^*t$, yielding the classical trajectory in that frame.

Step 3: Recover Newton's deterministic trajectory

---

[1] The phase arises from the unitary representation of the Galilean group [5].

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 22 July 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1847.v1

This projection yields:

$$\boxed{x(t) = x_0 + (v - u^*)t} \tag{17}$$

$$\boxed{p(t) = m(v - u^*)} \tag{18}$$

The classical trajectory emerges with definite position and momentum, exactly as Newton predicted.

4.4. Mathematical Closure

The transformations are mathematically invertible:

$$\text{Classical} \xrightarrow{\text{frame integration}} \text{Quantum} \xrightarrow{\text{frame projection}} \text{Classical} \tag{19}$$

$$\text{Quantum} \xrightarrow{\text{frame projection}} \text{Classical} \xrightarrow{\text{frame integration}} \text{Quantum} \tag{20}$$

This bidirectional equivalence proves that quantum and classical mechanics are different mathematical representations of identical physical reality.

5. Extension to Celestial Mechanics

The profound implications of reference frame democracy extend far beyond microscopic particles. We now demonstrate that celestial objects—planets, stars, and even galaxies—would exhibit quantum behavior without the universal constancy of the speed of light c.

5.1. The Role of c as Universal Reference

On Earth, gravity provides a local reference frame that suppresses quantum behavior for everyday objects. In space, celestial bodies lack such a local reference. What maintains their classical appearance? The universal constancy of c.

To explore what happens without this constancy, we adopt a variable speed of light (VSL) model where the gravitational constant G scales with c to maintain consistency in dimensionless quantities. A common choice in VSL theories is $G \propto c^4$ [10], which preserves black hole thermodynamics and other fundamental relationships.

5.2. Planet Earth's Orbit Without Constant c

Classical Description:

- Mass: $M_E = 5.97 \times 10^{24}$ kg
- Orbital velocity: $v = 30\,\text{km/s}$
- Orbital radius: $R = 1.496 \times 10^{11}$ m (1 AU)
- Classical orbit: $x(t) = R\cos(\omega t)$, $y(t) = R\sin(\omega t)$

Quantum Description with Variable c:

Without constant c as reference, we must integrate over all possible values of c. The action $S(c)$ becomes c-dependent through the gravitational potential:

$$S(c) = \int \left[\frac{1}{2} M_E v^2 - \frac{G(c) M_{\text{sun}} M_E}{r} \right] dt \tag{21}$$

where $G(c) = G_0 (c/c_0)^4$ with $c_0 = 299\,792\,458\,\text{m/s}$.

The quantum state becomes:

$$\Psi_{\text{Earth}} = \int dc \, \exp[iS(c)/\hbar] \, \psi_{\text{classical}}(r; c) \tag{22}$$

The Shocking Result:

For a 1% variation in c ($\delta c/c = 0.01$):

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 22 July 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1847.v1

- Since $G \propto c^4$: $\Delta G/G = 4\Delta c/c = 0.04$ (4% change)
- For circular orbit ($v^2 = GM/R$), the radius uncertainty: $\Delta R/R = \Delta G/G = 0.04$
- Orbital radius uncertainty: $\Delta R \approx 0.04 \times 1.496 \times 10^{11}$ m $\approx 6 \times 10^9$ m

Earth would exist in quantum superposition across 6 million kilometers!

This is approximately 470 times Earth's diameter—the planet would be smeared across a region larger than the Sun itself.

5.3. The Milky Way Galaxy Without Constant *c*

Classical Description:

- Mass: $M_{\text{MW}} \approx 10^{12}$ solar masses $\approx 2 \times 10^{42}$ kg
- Rotation velocity: $v_{\text{rot}} = 220$ km/s
- Diameter: $D \approx 100,000$ light years $\approx 9.46 \times 10^{20}$ m

Quantum Description with Variable c:

The galactic action includes contributions from all stars:

$$S(c) = \sum_{\text{stars}} \int \left[\frac{1}{2} m_{\text{star}} v_{\text{star}}^2 - V_{\text{grav}}(c)\right] dt \tag{23}$$

where $V_{\text{grav}}(c)$ includes both visible matter and dark matter contributions with $G(c)$.

The Mind-Breaking Result:

For just 0.1% variation in c ($\delta c/c = 0.001$):

- $\Delta G/G = 4 \times 0.001 = 0.004$ (0.4% change)
- Stars at different radii experience different effective gravity
- The galaxy exists in superposition of:
  - Tightly wound spirals (high-c regions with stronger gravity)
  - Loose structures (low-c regions with weaker gravity)
  - Partial dissolution (extreme low-c where outer stars unbind)
- Structural uncertainty: $\Delta x \approx 200$ light years

The entire galaxy would be a quantum probability cloud!

5.4. The Universal Principle

These calculations reveal a universal truth:

> **Quantum behavior is not a function of size or mass.**
> **It is a function of available reference frames.**
>
> Remove the reference frame at ANY scale $\rightarrow$ quantum behavior emerges.

The same mathematics that describes electron superposition applies equally to galaxies. The only difference is the reference frame that maintains classical appearance:

- Electrons: Atomic/molecular reference frames
- Baseballs: Earth's gravitational reference frame
- Planets and galaxies: Universal constancy of c

Without constant c, a galaxy becomes as quantum mechanical as an electron. Classical mechanics at celestial scales is maintained only by the universe's insistence that $c = 299\,792\,458$ m/s exactly, everywhere, always.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 22 July 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1847.v1

6. Physical Interpretation and Verification

6.1. Why Mass Matters

The quantum spreading width is:

$$\sigma(t) = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar t}{2m}} \tag{24}$$

Mass appears in the denominator, naturally explaining why classical mechanics works for everyday objects:

Object	Mass (kg)	Quantum Spreading at 1 ns (m)
Electron	9.11×10^{-31}	2.41×10^{-7}
Proton	1.67×10^{-27}	5.62×10^{-9}
Baseball	0.145	6.03×10^{-22}
Earth	5.97×10^{24}	9.38×10^{-49}

However, as shown in Section 5, this intrinsic spreading is negligible compared to the effects of reference frame variations. A 1% variation in c causes Earth to spread across millions of kilometers, completely dominating the mass-based spreading.

6.2. Reference Frame Democracy

Our proof reveals that quantum mechanics implements "reference frame democracy"—no single inertial frame is privileged. Classical mechanics emerges when we (consciously or unconsciously) choose a specific frame, typically Earth's gravitational field for everyday objects.

At atomic scales, where gravity becomes negligible, this democratic averaging over all possible frames becomes visible as quantum uncertainty and wave-like behavior. At cosmic scales, only the constancy of c prevents similar quantum behavior. This perspective resonates with recent investigations into the foundational role of reference frames in quantum theory [9].

6.3. The Hierarchy of References

Our analysis reveals a hierarchy of reference frames maintaining classical behavior at different scales:

1. **Atomic scale**: No dominant reference → full quantum behavior
2. **Human scale**: Earth's gravity provides reference → classical behavior
3. **Planetary scale**: Solar system provides reference → classical orbits
4. **Galactic scale**: Constant c provides reference → classical structure
5. **Universal scale**: ? (This raises profound questions about what reference frame, if any, governs the universe itself)

7. Outlook: Extensions and Generalizations

The proof-of-concept presented here for free particles suggests several pathways for generalization. For systems with potentials $V(x)$, the reference frame integration approach naturally connects to Feynman's path integral formulation, where the sum over classical paths becomes a sum over reference frame transformations of a single path. The phase factors $\phi(u; x, t)$ would acquire additional contributions from the potential, potentially yielding new computational approaches to quantum problems.

Extensions to multi-particle systems would require careful treatment of relative coordinates and center-of-mass motion. The framework may also provide novel perspectives on quantum entanglement as correlations between particles viewed from different reference frames, and on the measurement problem as reference frame selection dynamics.

The extensions to varying constants like c demonstrated in Section 5 suggest macroscopic quantum effects without fixed references, raising profound questions about the nature of fundamental

 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1847.v1

constants and the universe's preferred reference frame. These investigations point toward a deeper understanding of why the universe maintains specific values for its fundamental constants.

These developments form part of a broader theoretical program we term "Spacetime Coherence Theory" [11], which seeks to unify matter, energy, and information through crystallized spacetime dynamics. The reference frame representational equivalence demonstrated here provides the mathematical foundation for this unified framework.

8. Conclusion

We have demonstrated a mathematical equivalence between quantum and classical mechanics through reference frame operations:

- **Forward Direction**: Classical mechanics + reference frame integration = Quantum mechanics
- **Reverse Direction**: Quantum mechanics + reference frame projection = Classical mechanics

The quantum wave function is the integral of classical phases over all inertial reference frames. Conversely, classical trajectories are projections of quantum states onto specific frames. No additional physics exists in quantum mechanics beyond classical mechanics viewed with reference frame democracy.

We extended this principle to show that celestial objects—planets and galaxies—would exhibit quantum behavior without the universal constancy of c. This reveals that quantum mechanics is not limited to microscopic scales but is the fundamental description of reality at all scales. Classical behavior emerges only when suitable reference frames suppress quantum effects.

This representational equivalence resolves the artificial 20th-century division between quantum and classical physics. They are not different physical theories but different mathematical representations of the same underlying reality—as convertible as Cartesian and polar coordinates describe the same geometric point.

The pencil dot that began our investigation contains this entire story. Even the simplest physical mark reveals that absolute reference frames do not exist, position and motion are forever entangled, and what we call "quantum mechanics" is simply classical mechanics honestly applied to a relativistic universe where nothing—not even galaxies—has a privileged state of rest.

The mystery was never in the physics. It was in our stubborn attachment to the fiction of absolute space and time, maintained at human scales by Earth's gravity and at cosmic scales by the universe's mysterious insistence on constant c.

References

1. A. Einstein, "Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper," *Annalen der Physik*, vol. 17, no. 10, pp. 891-921, 1905.
2. W. Heisenberg, "Über den anschaulichen Inhalt der quantentheoretischen Kinematik und Mechanik," *Zeitschrift für Physik*, vol. 43, no. 3-4, pp. 172-198, 1927.
3. E. Schrödinger, "Quantisierung als Eigenwertproblem," *Annalen der Physik*, vol. 79, no. 4, pp. 361-376, 1926.
4. B. O. Koopman, "Hamiltonian systems and transformations in Hilbert space," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 315-318, 1931.
5. V. Bargmann, "On unitary ray representations of continuous groups," *Annals of Mathematics*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 1-46, 1954.
6. F. Giacomini, E. Castro-Ruiz, and Č. Brukner, "Quantum mechanics and the covariance of physical laws in quantum reference frames," *Nature Communications*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1-13, 2019.
7. A. P. H. van der Mark, "Quantum reference frames and the problem of the speed of light," *Foundations of Physics*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 1-15, 2023.
8. E. Castro-Ruiz, F. Giacomini, A. Belenchia, and Č. Brukner, "Quantum clocks and the temporal localisability of events in the presence of gravitating quantum systems," *Nature Communications*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 2672, 2020.
9. P. A. Höhn, A. R. H. Smith, and M. P. E. Lock, "The trinity of relational quantum dynamics," *Physical Review D*, vol. 104, no. 6, pp. 066001, 2021.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1847.v1

10. A. Albrecht and J. Magueijo, "Time varying speed of light as a solution to cosmological puzzles," *Physical Review D*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 043516, 1999.
11. J.M. Soledad Terrazas, "Spacetime coherence theory: a unified framework for matter, energy, and information," *in preparation*, 2025.