

Form Generates Form :

Time as a Second Order Oscillation From Indecision Between Heisenberg Uncertainty and Einstein Legality

Marvin E. Kirsh

Kirsh2152000@yahoo.com

© This paper is not for reproduction without permission of the author

ABSTRACT

Concerning time, relativity, the esoterics of time-space, the ordering of phenomenon into a proper orientation and superstructure with respect to unifying elements, one can employ a linear perspective that both delineates and affirms a perceived aparity to events. This resulting in a circular path shrouded with a lack of explanation founded on unresolvable question. In the creation of higher principles from the normal oscillations of daily cognition that are structured from experience, objective cognitive focus can fail from a lack of definition and perspective to perceived phenomenon and elements that formulate experienced time. This propensity, is a result of frustration to order the world from sensory input that is restricted to perceptions of size, shape, volume.. .i.e distances and proximities into some degree of logical accord. In this presentation, the root of all inquiry, change, and time is addressed, though of majority consent that it is inherently unorderable, statistical in nature, that it has a second order that is divisible into elements of the appropriate, proximal and direct, verses the inappropriate, distal, and indirect: other

than as victim of the linear and continuous, time is alternately explained as an evolved unperceived second order oscillation of the same identically perceived sensual factors of volume, shape size as functions of distance and angle of perspective.

PRELUDE

In this presentation, all processes of the physical world are, other than being conceptualized with the divisions of space, matter, energy and living things, are herein described as a single process of action and reaction, reduced in definition to a process of witness as both verb and subject in order to establish the uniqueness of all frames of reference, and on the same order as the communications, exclusively unique emissions and reflections in nature, or of intellect and without the existence of a universal perspective or natural constants. This notion is presented as a prelude in order to contradict the briefly outlined ideas that permeate current scientific interpretation of the world beginning with the Theory of Relativity by Albert Einstein (i.e. both general and special relativity), of the interpretation of unities and the definition of empirically applied concepts with an implied emphasis of the mathematical to the unknown. In contrast to the difficulty in the conceptual unification of the properties and processes of space and matter, it's composition of open volumes (volumes that contain surfaces that cannot be extracted to a common center point (i.e. spherical) and the deduced mutual contradictory sections of closed-space, deduced from witness of odd phenomenon to have other energetic and material properties distinct from those accountable for by the energy and gravitational phenomenon of the more proximal spaces of normal observation (general vs. special relativity), space is herein viewed as a homogeneous entity rather than a heterogeneous mathematical composite with both open and closed topological parts that are currently encompassed as a whole n-dimensional space-time.

Four new principles are introduced:

- 1) Life sciences and physical sciences are not of different phenomenon -e.g. form

generating form ₁₆, replication in the form of likenesses-self generation

- 2) Neither (the life or physical sciences) has really a tangible foundation in terms of constants and absolutes and are functions of the actions of, inclusive to all, uniquely named entities (e.g atoms-atom A, atom B ..etc)
- 3) The world is a product-process of only comparisons. Comparisons can describe distances, shapes and volumes, and possibly a fundamental shape and set of ratios to all things that can be related to existing peculiarities of the world(e.g. is a unique-uniquely named entity itself and compose of the same- sound and light, slow and fast oscillations, and the respective distinct mechanics of propagation)
- 4) In principle (the world) is nearly indistinguishable from self -how we know it and are yet unable to encompass it.

INTRODUCTION

Current conceptualizations of space and matter adhere singularly to maintain a view that highly assembled, ordered, and open with respect to the environment, biological structures reside within a unique subset of a broader heterogeneous space¹⁰. This conception leads to researches based meticulously on balance; equals and opposites, opposing forces, anti-matter, and a very asymmetrical model lacking a unified superstructure that can focus equally to define all components from the same conceptual perspective.. In this manuscript, nature, natural history, is viewed as the result of a unique volume creating process, composed of a one sided surface, an associated force related to surface area, and of definition with regards to point of perspective that no component can be beyond the frame of reference of at least one existing witness and for any component, there must exist at least one other component that, with respect to it, that is unknowable-beyond witness. . At the root of this reorganization, is a reorientation to exclude the total conceptions of relativity, space-time³ constructions of multi dimensions as a complete concept. A re-definition of plausible interpretation in scientific theory construction relying on mathematics is included, not only to provide a reorientation from models currently existing to witness an alternative and distinct version that precludes the former, but this reorientation also enables a new perspective that can be applied equally to either model as a test criterion for suitability.

A new component conceptualization that rigidly adheres to empirical foundations, that is perpetually self orienting that way(originating from and oriented towards the empirical) is added, the theory of relativity rejected on the basis of a lack of unity. To accomplish this, an analogy is created with the mathematical topology of volumes; as space is a volume it must fit a definition of open or closed. Subsequently all elements of models including the model itself as a suitable self description is tested with regards to the existence of center in it, itself as a center, and the empirical verses the theoretical. The fitness of the parallel drawn with respect to a central unity(if one exists) is the decided criterion for fitness and validity. Thus all abstract/theoretical

components(elemental parts and final geometry) are said to have a center theoretical surface that precludes the actual/empirical. In viewing this notion, its components, a unit model as an approximation construction component that is excluded from the empirical, centeredness as a non-existent fact of nature, an aparity between the model and the actual verses the concept an aparity potentially exists without the accepted distinction made between the notion of a pure thought held as a model and the normal acentered oscillations of the mind. Closedness is a theoretical property only and does not exist in nature.

CLOSED AND OPEN SPACE

Closed two dimensional spaces, spaces with surfaces that can be defined not to contain tears or holes cannot mathematically coexist in the same space with open surfaces. This follows from the fact that a surface is defined to be closed if and only if it is possible to define a focus point that is equidistant from all points of any surface area that can be derived from it. The converse is true for an open structure. It follows that there cannot exist within any space, that defines or encloses any number of open surfaces such that, within which, a change of with time can occur that can heal a tear in any space(create a closed surface)and for it to still contain an open space-as the healing of a single tear must heal all tears if the tear causing force(s) are derived from any series of unique events and able to function on all points in that space(i.e. the whole space is unique). Otherwise such forces can be defined to have existed with in the space at any point in time and the space not be considered to be open at *any* point in time. -i.e. if a space contains an open space it must be open itself.

Within a space that contains living things-motion, and energy processes, not only can there not exist any forces older or younger in age than the oldest open existing surface, there cannot exist, especially, any tear healing forces either, for the lifetime of the space. A space was always open with the same set of forces, if it is open.

As a corollary, a closed space cannot contain forces or energy processes at all, as they would cause tears. If one reflects carefully, singular or multiple forces at an inception

must act with equal displacements such that all movements originating from and descending from singular or multiple inceptions must be of the same parameters as the original forces-descended from them to be coordinated and aligned with respect to rates of displacement as transmissions from a unique origin that one can equally state that a space with a fixed rate of change is no different from a single rate of displacement of a single point. Ones' thoughts can drift to the possibility of multiple (more than two closed spaces of uniquely acting forces that can birth a space derived of multiple forces, but if the forces are *unique*, this would define an open space (without an extractable center)-and the whole existing original space - inclusive of all space, to be automatically defined as open, as well as any postulated subsets originally defined as a set of closed spaces-as a single topologically open space that *cannot* exist without non-tear healing forces and energy processes. Topologically closed spaces cannot exist in real two dimensional space.

A SPECIAL CASE VS A UNIQUE CASE

If instead of applying a center/universal focus to the world in efforts to describe it, one may center around, instead, the thought of "action and reaction". Light is able to perform work when it reflects. This process might be redefined as simple primordial example of communications of unique instances-emission and reflection-rather than as the special phenomenon dictated by the definition of a constant speed of light. In this interpretation, one might also be able to mathematically describe a unique force, of a space composed of a single surface (mobias-like strip) with a second order rate of change (square meters-area per second squared), dependant on v and c , @. Observed force and energy processes, facts of uniqueness, self, immunogenic systems might additionally be accounted for within this framework if surfaces are said to be self avoiding ⁴. An intuitive universal order to nature can be found from the natural self avoidance of a single surface, as its' prerequisite to exist, as a vast set of unique positions, categories of positions, of unique peculiarly arrived environmental parameters extended from its' own itself and its' own self avoidance. Such a surface, by apriori definition have no other possible properties or as a result to fail in self definition, massless/volumeless if

considered to be only an abstract construction, and exerting a force where ever one part approaches approximate the other. It cannot overlap with itself with out the creation of non-unique pluralities(of another definition) As examples of phenomenon that might relate to this description, chromosomes(which might be one sided open surfaces reflecting in structure the basic element of construction of the proposed model) have been recently shown to contract in response to a pulling force ^{8,9}, light is capable of existing, fluxing, via diffraction and reflection in restricted spaces ⁶-phenomenon potentially accounted for by facts of self avoidance.

THE DICOTOMY BETWEEN GENERAL AND SPECIAL RELATIVITY

Is relativity theory ^{1,2,5} either/both a completed notion and compatible with a completed notion, or a mathematical stepping stone(i.e as the mathematics of ,and constants related to a circle). Is a real, final synthesis related the same-in example , as a circle is related to the real world- as a perfect symmetry to the imperfections a natural snowflake. Though a natural snowflake-it's imperfections, can be elucidated from the contrast between the two, it is not evident that the reverse route from a snowflake to a perfect circle exists?(for example, if open systems and change be described mathematically to describe a perfect symmetry, can an imperfect symmetry be derived (in reverse) from mathematical description?) It is thus implied that all reasoning in this case excludes a valid deduction of reality....Thus, with respect to our understanding and on a second account with regards to unity and homogeneity in description, is relativity theory a poor candidate as a final construction, as a potential model for the comprehension of a unifying concept to nature. Is it not possible that, with the observation of unusual physical phenomenon that are beyond ordinary perception, experience and beyond witness, excessive dependency on mathematics to account for these events results in a contrived fitting? Dichotomies arising from contrived fittings have been repeatedly reduced with the same extended mathematical reliance, resulting in the creation of a near perfect fitting though as conceptually and visually heterogeneous as are the observed and predicted ambiguities from which they are fitted mathematically. It is thus restricted, in its contribution, to, a theory of light propagation and associated energy factors.

As human beings have the capacity to register change-the passing of time-could it not be more reasonable to assume the same capacity for all of nature; from the simple primitive actions of emission and reflection, to more complexly created observations involving multiple events. In such cases observation is mandatorially in the dark. Can extractions, extrapolations and projections to the existence of additional dimensions ¹⁰be simplified to the common perceptions of two dimensional space(open space), and all subsequent phenomenon and anomalies pursued from that orientation. It is conceivable, in this light, that vacancies with regards to position-place, total mathematical verses an intuitive lingual plus mathematical view, in initial constructions result is a false total picture.

It is not common sense that space with and without tears can coexist under the singular unique description/name "universe". One, the latter, a total mathematical construction, and the other, relational to common scientific objects-the velocity of light, energy and mass. Intuitively it appears that the uncertain, the realms of Heisenberg's uncertainty principle, have been filled with pointed and tangible mathematics of the principle itself, creating the delusion of an endless unknowable. Unknowable facts are not equal in description to failed conceptualizations.. If this is so, empirical testing should eventually diverge, possibly without a notice of invalidity resulting from the enormous magnitudes of empirical figures and certain characteristics of theory assumed to be untestable (i.e the existence of, and mass of a photon), especially in light of the fact that test for conceptual and empirical validity cannot discriminate clearly if initial theoretical conceptualizations are mandatorily needed in order to translate empirical .results. This stretching and extending of mental reach is a ubiquitous intellectual capacity,. ubiquitous, though, does not mean mathematically pure, in balance with nature or describable as so.

It is thus a very difficult conception to know the record player from the record where nature is concerned. This is evident in the continual surfacing of added factors involving the exogenous (imprinting, factors involving translation, and the environment) that complicate the theory of evolution.

As a suggestion, perhaps a void in theory attempts can be accounted for with deletions and additions in language descriptions. 'Cause and effect' can be replaced with 'intent and action' ("it decided to rain" } and a new description replacing this two-word

description, composed of the one word “witness”, as the source of all change (“witness rain”). A suitable new model is created from this one element (“witness”) of a universe of pairs and not three's (i.e. cause, effect and the velocity of light., versus .point A, point B, and the velocity of light). The word [“witness”-- A B] or simply [A B] can be applied with the assumption (in order to prevent the implication of N dimensional space); that there exists no other components(i.e. vacuums, constants, etc) but light, distance [distance A B]; witnesses A and B as a unique pair(i.e the witness number in any process is always equal to two). The propagation of light and its energetics can be assumed as a common element that is not necessary as a core of the final painting; as a volume defining process common to all elements-i.e distance [A B] can be composed of any number of prominent or non-prominent multiple intermediate elements {A.. . [C D] [E F] ...B} of which any separate events may or may not be witnessible/knowable from a given orientation, but mandatorially knowable from some(at least one) existing orientation and mandatorially unknowable from some (at least one) perspective- all perspectives are necessarily defined to reside within the same ordinary two dimensional space. This composite view describes space theoretically as a collection of mathematically describable space-volumes: and all total and subset theoretical views, inclusively without exact mathematical centers. Witness in theory construction cannot include a common mathematical reference to all elements or reference to any element that is unknowable from all perspectives.

Though the brain can have hands like a clock, when it writes mathematics, the hand cannot draw a perfect circle, only pictorial distances, shapes and volumes. Is there an exclusion to be conceived of that does not involve the elements "perceiving-witnessing" throughout and a "force" of mutual interaction, that necessarily requires further description?

Inclusion of closed spaces, the existence physical processes, in a model of the world, logically reduces the model to the mathematical parameters of a single point, that maybe is intuitively associated by those adhering to contrary views as an uncertain Heisenberg unit, that though is fitting in the same manner as a definition for the unknown/unknowable and perceived similarly suitable for conceived limited inductive application in a forward direction of time-i.e prediction, it is none the less still a single

unity and excluded from, by definition, processes involving witness, whether empirically witnessable, or theoretically construed as such..

Perhaps excess baggage introduced from the inclusion of universalites/constants, strains to unify and fit concepts to include the unknowable in mathematical form and minute description. create an odd mathematical shape as a substitute for asymmetrical perception and intuition-naturally existing asymmetries. Though at first glance it appears we are left without a scientific interpretation, a random chaos, space can then be described as replicating processes of witness generated volumes that lack mathematical centers and are asymmetric as a result of the peculiarities of the general properties of slow and fast motion and attributable to the properties of what is, regardless of how, or if, what composes a real picture. -i.e. a composition of volumes of related mathematical shapes (fig 1) defined by a synergism of very fast and slow witness associated change, empirically found replicating self- generating volumes and theoretically fitting ratios/dimensions; in which both the composed(nature) and the composer are difficulty perceived unequal to, or different from, the composition itself- and to include a force of surface interactions related to surface area. Usual scientific objectivity in this case, leaning away from self description, totally lacking in self description, for which there is no satisfactory common definition, not only, frustratingly, results in the creation of rigid mathematical interpretations, results in an intellectual quandary that persistently resembles in nature the same original enigma from which it embarked; the identification of self and a contrast/comparison with the world. Resulting interpretations are conceptually mistaken for it (the dichotomy between himself and the external), lending a false affirmation to the correct directions and validity of pursuits. Heisenbergs' uncertainty principle, I believe is not intended to define, or substitute, as an unattained description of the commonalties of the self with the external world, as a conceptual a source of objectivity. In more simple description interpretations themselves become replicating and self-generating and ignored as an aspect of the model which must include the life sciences, if not some aspect of the nature of all interactions and the process of witness. Current models have not advanced from those of antiquity, and are judged for their validity with the exact same first sense conceptualizations of how the world *appears* to function as a place of solid objects and motion. The model herein proposed,

not only introduced as a deductive, symmetrical conceptualization of which there is no mathematical reverse path from the actual, employs as a unity that which might be intuitively extended to the conflict of Einstein in the proposal of his general (verses special) theory. This entails not only disregarding previous notions of mathematical constants, and those of the definition of witness in original concepts-to begin construction with the only applicable perspective of one existing witness, and to describe as a conceptual unity a self avoiding massless single surface for all of space whose dimensions are describable by the laws of motion, of Einstein and Newton, of the very fast and slow propagations of energy and a force of avoidance related to surface area and the parameters of (self) approach.- such a surface is the coordinate system of points in space for all applications and has no definable center of itself or of any subset of points of the surface.

PERCEPTION AND THE NATURAL WORLD: HEISENBERG AND EINSTEIN : UNCERTAINTY, LEGALITY, AND INVISIBLE OSCILLATIONS

If one considers the uncertainty principle of Heisenberg ¹¹, that natural laws cannot not be deduced- position and momentum are impossible to know simultaneously, and the relativity theories of Einstein that seek to reorder the conceptual hierarchies of accepted natural law- basic order is not perceived directly from common sense of primary witness, it is possible to add to the list of phenomenon, appropriateness and inappropriateness of factors, applied to elements of direct witness. For example, consider a world mandatorially defined by distances and cannot exist without energy and openness. Can an origin, at least mechanism, be speculated for its' existence?. From a simple perspective, time is no more than distance and energy. If one takes into account facts of history, that behavior can be inappropriate to proximal environment (Nietzsche ^{14, 15}), that light can be captured at very low temperatures and velocities, relocated and released in its' initial form ¹², it is possible to present time as a fact of distance; of the differentials of displacements of the appropriate and the inappropriate; of a difference caused by the momentum imparted by light beams of

appropriate (proximal origin) and that of environmentally inappropriate (distal origin)-as a synergism of the various differentials of displacement and energy; yet, to be not as simple as elemental building components of a model, but as a unified principle, sole constituent to all frames of reference and that its' occurrence is both a second order function to the line of sight and oscillatory in that an exact nature regarding order of events (light imparted momentum verses distance) is meaningless but to state the existence of an oscillation, in terms of distance, unperceivable by means of the nature of its' second order period, component periods, synergismse.g. time.

ILLUSTRATION OF AN OPEN SPACE DEFINED BY V AND C

If one considers the two most familiar energies, the energy of motion $\frac{1}{2}mv^2$ (kinetic energy) an open space cannot be defined with c as a constant (as it is easy to define a center from the relation $ax^2 + by^2 = c^2$ (x a dependant variable and C a constant, a and b real numbers. However it is possible to define an open surface of the type $ax^2 + by^2$. For example consider the surface defined by the spherical emission of light from a moving body if c is a variable:

$$E/m = \frac{1}{2}v^2 + c^2 \quad \tan \theta = v/c \quad v/R = \sin \theta \quad c/R = \cos \theta$$

$$F(x) = v + 2c = 2\cos \theta + \sin \theta$$

$$F(y) = 2\cos \theta$$

$$R = (F(x)^2 + F(y)^2)^{.5}$$

(a motion of velocity v and light irradiation velocity c in two planes): only net changes (thus a rate of change from a starting $E/m = (v+c)^2$ is $(2v+2c) - (v+2c) = v$,

$$E/m[(v+c)(t=0)] - E/m[c(t)] =$$

$$1) \text{ if } v(0)=0 \quad E/m(c(0)) - E/m(c(t)) = E/m(v(t)) \quad E/m(c(0)) = E/m(t)$$

In this case ($v(0)=0$), E/m is conserved as well as energy, and can be defined as a natural constant that defines a state of zero work *accomplished* ' $E/m = 0$, though, does not necessarily define a lack of motion if motion can be accomplished from light energy alone (note 1) (see ref 7). This matter, though pertaining to the exact fact of confusion, failure in the definition of acceptable witness and perspective involving impetus, mass, and energy, is not a critical factor of this theory which purports the

similarly confusing existence of a one sided single dimensional continuous surface as a agent of force and sole element of (porous) containers (volumes). Again, this model, the object in Figure 1 , it's mathematics, energy relations, ratios, shape, is considered a better center point than the notions described of relativity, that either does not exist in (topologically) open real nature-i.e. in any exacting form, but to better depict, if it is a true conceptual center-orientation (if one does exist), the events of the processes of space(s), volume(s), to serve as a starting form.

(insert Fig 1)

note(1)- It is conceivable that all of the processes of the universe can be conducted with a net of zero work accomplished if light is considered the source of all momentum. That although it can supply energy applied to create movement, if it has no attributable mass then at it's (theoretical) source there is no motion, and hence no net motion throughout regardless of the accounting of energy changes and distribution and is no more tangible than the theoretical one-sided surface composition and force of self avoidance that is here in proposed.

- 1) Einstein, Albert *Physics and Reality* Journal of the Franklin Institute 221:3 359-382 March 1986
- 2) Norton, John *What was Einstein's Principle of Equivalence?* Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science Part A 16:3 203-246 September 1985
- 3) Huggett, Nick *Can Spacetime Help Settle Any Issues in Modern Philosophy?* Issues in Modern Philosophy Conference at The New York University November 2006
- 4) Einstein, T.L. *Survey of Self Avoiding Random Surfaces on Cubic Lattices: Issues, Controversies, and Results* IMA Volumes IN Mathematics and its Applications Springer-Verlag KG 1992
- 5) Einstein, Albert *The Meaning of Relativity* 5th ed. Princeton University Press Princeton N.J. 1955
- 6) Peccianti, M., Dyadyusha A, Kaczmarek M., Assanto, G. *Turnable Refraction and Reflection of Self Confined Light Beams* Nature Physics 2:737-742 November 2006 (Letters)
- 7) Leonhardt, L. *Optics Momentum in an Uncertain Light Nature* 444, 823-824 December 2006 News and Views
- 8) Fulconis, R. *Mechanism of Rec-A Mediated Homologous Recombination Revisited By Single Molecule Nanomanipulation* The EMBO Journal 25:4293-4304 September 2006
- 9) Bancaud, A., Conde, N., Silva, E., Barbi, M., Wagner, G., Allemand, J., Mozziconacci, J., Lavelle, C., Croquette, V., et al *Nature Structural and Molecular Biology* 13:444-450 May 2006
- 10) Cody, G. *Where in the Relativistic World Are We?* Philosophical Perspectives, 20, Metaphysics (2006).
- 11) Heisenberg, *Physics and Philosophy: The Revolution in Modern Science* (New York: Harper and Row, 1958). Lectures delivered at University of St. Andrews, Scotland, Winter 1955-56.
- 12) Naomi S. Ginsberg¹, Sean R. Garner¹ and Lene Vestergaard Hau¹
Coherent Control of Optical Information With Matter Wave Dynamics, Nature **445**, 623-626 (8 February 2007)

- 13) Lam, Vincent (2007) *The singular nature of space-time*. In [2006] Philosophy of Science Assoc. 20th Biennial Mtg (Vancouver): PSA 2006 Contributed Papers
- 14) *Beyond Good and Evil*. trans. Walter Kaufmann. New York: Random House, 1966.
- 15) *On the Genealogy of Morals*. trans. Walter Kaufmann and R.J. Hollingdale, in *On the Genealogy of Morals and Ecce Homo*. New York: Random House, 1967.
- 16) Kirsh M. E. *On the Nature of Natural Processes* 1981 Unpublished

Figure 1 [R,@,@]=







FIG 2 A. Reflected inappropriate light energy A is displaced to a new point of witness (orange lines)



B. Reflected appropriate (non-displaced) light energy B at new at the new point of witness point of witness (Blue lines)



C. Reflected appropriate (non-displaced) and inappropriate (displaced) light energies together delineate a set of distances D that delineate time



D.

