the general science journal

Timelessness Paradox

Roger J Anderton
R.J.Anderton@btinternet.com

According to Einstein: time does not exist. Einstein's theorising starts from contradiction and leads to paradoxes, one of these paradoxes is his belief in "timelessness". This "timelessness" is one of the issues at the heart of trying to unify Einstein's relativity with quantum physics.

Einstein early on in his famous 1905 paper on Special Relativity (SR) [1] says: "We will raise this conjecture (the purport of which will hereafter be called the "Principle of Relativity") to the status of a postulate, and also introduce another postulate, which is only apparently irreconcilable with the former, namely, that light is always propagated in empty space with a definite velocity *c* which is independent of the state of motion of the emitting body."

And he does not explain how they can be reconciled. In many of my papers I deal with how they might reconciled, and how what they mean seems to have changed with different users. But taking the statement as it stands that they are irreconcilable and accepting them as irreconcilable, it means that he is building on contradiction. (See my article "Heart of the contradiction of Special Relativity" - whereby some people manage to convince themselves into believing a contradiction when they decide to believe SR.)

If we look at the twin paradox: where person A observing B travelling at constant speed with a slower clock than A, then by relativity – the rest frame of B claims it is A's clock that is slower. Thus A claims B's clock as slower and B claims A's clock as slower.

What A could do is slow his clock down to the rate at which he sees of B's clock. Then by A's frame both clocks would go at the same rate. And by relativity – if A sees B 's clock as the same rate then from rest frame of B – clock A would be same rate as himself. i.e. both A and B should see their clocks as the same rate if A slows his clock rate down.

However, B could have looked from his frame and saw A's clock as slower, and slowed his clock down to match A's clock, then both clocks would go at same rate by relativity. i.e. if B slows his clock rate down to match B's clock then both A and B should see their clocks as the same rate.

This contradiction and many contradictions like this are ignored by Einstein believers:

(1) A slows his clock rate down to match B then both clocks are the same rate
(2) B slows his clock rate down to match A then both clock are the same rate.

Its amazes me that those who believe Einstein cannot see the contradiction that slowing down either clock makes them go at the same rate; when it is clearly nonsensical; instead they carry on with this line of thinking.

So proceeding with this line of thinking based on contradiction it leads Einstein to believe that time does not exist, a concept called "timelessness." A useful concept for those who want to believe in some sort of science fiction time travel.

I shall now go into the issue of Einstein's beliefs on "timelessness".

Gevin Giobran [2] says: "Surprising as it may be to most non-scientists and even to some scientists, Albert Einstein concluded in his later years that the past, present, and future all exist simultaneously."

He then quotes Einstein from his 1952 book on Relativity, as Einstein discusses Minkowski's Space World interpretation of relativity : "Since there exists in this four dimensional structure [space-time] no longer any sections which represent "now" objectively, the concepts of happening and becoming are indeed not completely suspended, but yet complicated. It appears therefore more natural to think of physical reality as a four dimensional existence, instead of, as hitherto, the evolution of a three dimensional existence."

According to Giobran: "Einstein's belief in an undivided solid reality was clear to him, so much so that he completely rejected the separation we experience as the moment of now. He believed there is no true division between past and future, there is rather a single existence."

Giobran then quotes Einstein saying: "...for us physicists believe the separation between past, present, and future is only an illusion, although a convincing one." as illustration of Einstein's belief.

It seems to me a 'cheek' that Einstein now deems that all physicists should think the same way on this issue. It is more like only Einstein and his believers have deceived themselves to think this way.

Giobran says: "Most everyone knows that Einstein proved that time is relative, not absolute as Newton claimed."

It is those who have deceived themselves to believe such things as that as being "proven" when they have not, which have now the timelessness paradox as part of their thinking process.

On embracing "timelessness" we have such people as Tim Folger, Discover magazine [3] telling us "Time may not exist" and tells us:

"Efforts to understand time below the Planck scale have led to an exceedingly strange juncture in physics. The problem, in brief, is that time may not exist at the most fundamental level of physical reality."

Folger credits this to Einstein: "The trouble with time started a century ago, when Einstein's special and general theories of relativity demolished the idea of time as a universal constant."

This change in our understanding of "time" is same as I noted earlier.

The consequence of this by Folger is:"One consequence is that the past, present, and future are not absolutes."

Also as noted earlier, "timelessness" in other words.

Folger: "Einstein's theories also opened a rift in physics because the rules of general relativity (which describe gravity and the large-scale structure of the cosmos) seem incompatible with those of quantum physics (which govern the realm of the tiny)."

In other words the existing problem in mainstream physics of trying to combine Einstein's relativity with quantum physics.

Folger wants to talk about one possible unification called Wheeler-DeWitt equation; of trying to unify "timelessness" to quantum physics. I don't want to get diverted to that.

I will pick up on Folger as he says: "Einstein proved, time is part of the fabric of the universe. Contrary to what Newton believed, our ordinary clocks don't measure something that's independent of the universe. In fact, says Lloyd [a physicist being cited], clocks don't really measure time at all."

Again the use of the word "proved" along with the person "Einstein". Its just all false once again, as regards the Newtonian way of doing things, Einstein NEVER proved to stop doing it that way.

Modern physics is thus based on the false claims of "proof" where there has been no "proof" and that leading to the acceptance of contradictions and the concepts such as "timelessness."

What is being said based on beliefs such as "timelessness" does not make much sense, and Folger reports on Rovelli: " Rovelli has been working with one of the world's leading mathematicians, Alain Connes of the College of France in Paris, on this notion. Together they have developed a framework to show how the thing we experience as time might emerge from a more fundamental, timeless reality. As Rovelli describes it, "Time may be an approximate concept that emerges at large scales—a bit like the concept of 'surface of the water,' which makes sense macroscopically but which loses a precise sense at the level of the atoms.""

Interestingly this is realised as not make much sense and phrases it as follows:

"Realizing that his explanation may only be deepening the mystery of time, Rovelli says that much of the knowledge that we now take for granted was once considered equally perplexing."

I.e. is accepting what is being said about "timelessness" is perplexing, but trying to tie it to other ideas in the past that were at first perplexing.

Rovelli says: "I realize that the picture is not intuitive. But this is what fundamental physics is about: finding new ways of thinking about the world and proposing them and seeing if they work. I think that when Galileo said that the Earth was spinning crazily around, it was utterly incomprehensible in the same manner. Space for Copernicus was not the same as space for Newton, and space for Newton was not the same as space for Einstein. We always learn a little bit more."

So, he has tied it to the Copernican revolution. Let's split the claim down a bit: "Space for Copernicus was not the same as space for Newton," - that claim seems nonsensical; he does not explain how it is different, but making that claim makes it easier to make the next claim: "and space for Newton was not the same as space for Einstein." And that is where I say the mistake occurred, we should go back to Newtonian physics, because these claims from Einstein believers of concepts like "timelessness" make no sense, and serve only as block to a unified theory of physics. (Because as illustrated the concept of "timelessness" from Einstein's relativity is being attempted to be unified with quantum physics.) Then finally the claim "We always learn a little bit more." - I disagree "we" have not learnt anything from "timelessness" - what we have is just people confused

and accepting contradictions if they believe in Einstein's relativity.

References

[1] ON THE ELECTRODYNAMICS OF MOVING BODIES By A. Einstein
June 30, 1905 http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/

[2] Albert Einstein and the Fabric of Time Gevin Giobran http://everythingforever.com/einstein.htm

[3] Newsflash: Time May Not Exist , by Tim Folger, Discover magazine, June 207 issue
http://discovermagazine.com/2007/jun/in-no-time/article_view?b_start:int=0&-C=