

## Re: How many things can happen in a single instant?

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-12/9151.html>

---

**From:** Mike Helland (*mobydikc\_at\_gmail.com*)

**Date:** 12/25/04

Date: 25 Dec 2004 02:35:41 -0800

jgreen@seol.net.au wrote:

> *Mike Helland wrote:*

>> *This seems to be a standard assumption people have:*

>>

>> *"If time did not exist, no event occurred."*

>

>>

>> *As you may know this the opposite of how I view things. Instead I*

> *would*

>> *say:*

>>

>> *"If no event occurred, time does not exist."*

>>

>> *So time is not a medium for change. It is not a continuum, and its*

> *not*

>> *even really a dimension. It is the analysis that something has*

> *changed.*

>> *It exists in the subjective conscious experience of an observer.*

**This**

>> *is consistent with special relativity's definition that "time is*

**what**

> *a*

>> *clock measures", with the implications of quantum mechanics and*

> *string*

>> *theory, and with what recent developments in the field have*

> *suggested.*

>>

>> *In other words, time is not a prerequisite for something happening,*

> *it*

>> *is a result of something happening.*

>>

>> *There's an easy way to wrap your head around this.*

>>

>> *Let's take the following situation with bleacher seats. Imagine you*

>> *have a stadium, and there are four people (A1-A4) sitting in a*

**single**

sci.physics: Re: How many things can happen in a single instant?

> > row:  
> >  
> > \_\_\_A1\_A2\_A3\_A4  
> >  
> > *And in the next row, are four more people (B1–B4), but sitting one  
> seat  
> > to the left, so we have:*  
> >  
> > \_\_\_A1\_A2\_A3\_A4  
> > B1\_B2\_B3\_B4  
> >  
> > *Finally, there is a third row, and those people (C1–C4) are sitting  
> one  
> > seat to the right of the original row. This is our picture:*  
> >  
> > \_\_\_A1\_A2\_A3\_A4  
> > B1\_B2\_B3\_B4  
> > \_\_\_\_\_C1\_C2\_C3\_C4  
> >  
> > *We now make the following rules:*  
> >  
> > *1. Consider that movement and time in the stadium is discrete*  
> >  
> > *We know that from quantum mechanics and Planck's Constant, such a  
> > suggestion might actually apply to nature*  
> >  
> > *2. Since time is discrete, consider that the smallest, indivisible  
> > interval of time is the time it takes to move one seat, and this  
> > interval is called an instant*  
> >  
> > *Ok. Now, in our picture, our row B will move one seat to the right,  
> and  
> > C one seat to the left, so that after an instant we have:*  
> >  
> > \_\_\_A1\_A2\_A3\_A4  
> > \_\_\_B1\_B2\_B3\_B4  
> > \_\_\_C1\_C2\_C3\_C4  
> >  
> > *In this instant of time, if we were sitting in row A, you would  
have  
> > seen row B and row C move one seat. Which makes sense, because our  
> > rules say that in one instant, the smallest indivisible interval of  
> > time, only movement from one seat to the next will occur.*  
> >  
> > *But what if you were sitting in row B? You would have seen row A  
move  
> a  
> > single seat, but row C would have moved 2 seats! How can, in the  
> > smallest indivisible interval of time where only movement by one  
seat  
> > is possible, can this be true? And doesn't that mean that if the*

Re: How many things can happen in a single instant?

sci.physics: Re: How many things can happen in a single instant?

> > *smallest indivisible unit of time corresponds to the movement of one seat, that by moving two seats, we've actually managed to divide the indivisible unit of time?*

> >

> > *There is an assumption here that all eight seats (four from row B, and four from row C) can move in a single instant. The assumption is multiple things may happen in a single instant.*

> >

> > *What if that assumption is not correct? In fact, let us assume it is wrong.*

> >

> > *Remember what I said at the top about time?*

> >

> > *If something moves, there is time. Not the other way around.*

> >

> > *That means that when a single seat moves in its smallest allowed motion, there is an instant of time. In our example eight seats are moving, so, based on this new view of time, there should be eight instants, not just one, which was the previous assumption.*

> >

> > *Therefore, the rules are not violated, since the seats would look like this after one instant:*

> >

> > *\_\_A1\_A2\_A3\_A4*

> > *B1\_B2\_B3\_\_B4*

> > *\_\_\_\_C1\_C2\_C3\_C4*

> >

> > *and this after two:*

> >

> > *\_\_A1\_A2\_A3\_A4*

> > *B1\_B2\_B3\_\_B4*

> > *\_\_C1\_\_C2\_C3\_C4*

> >

> > *If you follow this scheme, you will never observe a seat moving more than one seat away from you in a single instant, even when relative motion is involved.*

> >

> > ...

> >

> > *Right now our leading theory of mechanics is Relativistic Quantum Field Theory. A brief history of the idea is that we found Newtonian mechanics, we updated Newtonian mechanics and made it special relativity. Then we found quantum mechanics, something totally different from Newtonian mechanics. Making a field theory out of QM*

sci.physics: Re: How many things can happen in a single instant?

> > gave us QFT. And finally we combobulated special relativity, which  
is  
> > an evolution of Newtonian mechanics, with QFT as an afterthought.  
> >  
> > I suggest that the reason this path to a theory of everything has  
> > failed is because we made QFT relativistic by pairing it with old  
and  
> > incompatible Newtonian mechanics.  
> >  
> > What I've described in this post is the foundations for a brand new  
> > version of mechanics well suited for quantum phenomena that  
> implicitly  
> > contains the effects of special relativity, eliminating the need to  
> > force QM and the old Newtonian mechanics into the same hole, and  
> taking  
> > a new path to a theory of everything. We also avoid postulating  
into  
> > existence a speed limit, something that might come in handy since  
> > Newtonian mechanics and general relativity assume that changes to  
the  
> > force of gravity are propogated throughout space-time much faster  
> than  
> > the speed of light, making it difficult to find a workable theory  
of  
> > quantum gravity with a graviton that may only move at  $c$ .  
> >  
> > I've done this by asking a simple question "what can happen in an  
> > instant?"  
> >  
> > By the way, this puzzle is Zeno's fourth puzzle on time and motion.  
> In  
> > 2500 years it seems that no one has questioned the assumption that  
> > "many things can happen in one instant of time." By questioning  
that  
> > assumption, and postulating the antithesis, we have an extremely  
> > elegant solution, and an interpretation of mechanics that  
implicitly  
> > contains the effects of special relativity.  
> >  
> > If you disagree with me, you are essentially saying that "more than  
> one  
> > thing may happen in one instant of time."  
> >  
> > I see no reason to accept that as a fact (nor, as a consequence,  
any  
> of  
> > the physics that is built on that assumption).  
> >  
> > That leaves me with one question:  
> >  
> > Why do you accept the fact that many things may occur in a single

Re: How many things can happen in a single instant?

sci.physics: Re: How many things can happen in a single instant?

> > *instant?*

> >

> > --

> > <http://www.techmocracy.net>

>

> *"Nothing" happens in a "single instant".*

> *An "instant" is a marker in time, so DURATION occurs BETWEEN*

> *"instants".*

Fine, from one instant to the next.

If you review how the word instant was defined in the system, you'll see that is clearly what is meant:

> 1. *Consider that movement and time in the stadium is discrete*

> 2. *Since time is discrete, consider that the smallest, indivisible*

> *interval of time is the time it takes to move one seat, and this*

> *interval is called an instant*