

# A Physical Monism: Time as a Single Constituent of the Universe

**Marvin E. Kirsh<sub>1</sub>**  
[kirsh2152000@yahoo.com](mailto:kirsh2152000@yahoo.com)

1) Philosophy department California State University Los Angeles

## Abstract

*"The idea of the measuring rod and the idea of the clock contained within it in the theory of relativity do not find their exact correspondence in the real world. It is also clear that the solid body and the clock do not in the conceptual edifice of physics play the part of irreducible elements, but that of composite structures, which may not play any independent part in theoretical physics." Albert Einstein <sup>1</sup>*

In modern physics study, applied perspectives in approach logically result ubiquitously in the definition of existing of themselves constructions that connect with a physical reality only on the fact of perception of the initial phenomenon, the remainder built of conceptual entities and applied with the notion that if test of theory intersects with the empirical that it has a proposed validity. Thus any false notion providing a semblance of explanation can be pursued, possibly to false and acceptable constructions. Nearly, the total of all current pursuits involve elaborations of this type, parented from Albert Einstein's theory of relativity, which holds, though does not adhere, to, as a starting point immediate perceptions of time and distance/a geometry and energy/motion to approximate nature. This approach fails when a unity, unified concept is pursued, and common sense in the terms of ordinarily conceived plane geometry, ideas of elapsed time becomes replaced with dualisms, pluralities to account in logical addition for construed phenomenon(of which direct empirical testimony is again absent). Thus, with the current immediate sense notions of time and space a vast abstractness emerges that can give rise to question about initial ontology and epistemology.

In this presentation, I wish to make and elucidate the components of an analogy that has taken many forms in the historical pursuit of scholarship (e.g. monism verses dualism), and to support a new argument, related to the above stated notion in the quotation from Albert Einstein, that the world construed, of the measuring rod and the clock as basic elements which do not find their exact correspondence in the real world, can also be construed with an exact correspondence to the real world with the element of commonly known, and applied to the inanimate, time from which distance and perspective can be gotten. It is also in this case that philosophical and/or scientific entailments of notions result in both philosophical and scientifically different, distinct and mutually exclusive results. A mistaken notion, not necessarily philosophical, concerning the perception of a difference in notions, (though essential in order to originate the pursuit), in the cognitive construction of a "clock" and, that which, may actually exist, and is assumed inherent to nature, is challenged.

## Introduction and Discussion

As an analogy to the real world, consider a perfect circle verses the natural shape of an egg, or the irregularities of a snowflake, in example, a dualism of which either definition (natural verses mathematical/perfect) exists via contrast and comparison of possibilities, without which, and all that can be construed from definition, by it's existence, the world might be considered to be closed. The world is thus open, oriented that way, away from the closed. In Einstein's quotation above, a world constructed of lengths and time to define energy metabolizing volumes of space, the volumes are also open, or would remain to be open if not for the suggested factor of a vacuum to define a constant speed of light, also a consequence of a dualism to define space that is not empty. Concepts of birth and death are also the products of a dualism though empirically absolute beginnings and ends are not inherently witnessable. A dualistic approach to understanding, the natural inclination, as even the eye discriminates from contrasts, regards objects and objectivity apriorily and subsequently divests itself ontologically into another dualism the spirit/cognition/ soul verses the material and chemistry of a world of objects and matter. Attempts to define intelligence and brain processes with quantum mechanics, manipulate the internal components of living cells or of the atom are products of this divested ontology, and it itself (a divested ontology) is a product of a dualism- to invest in a *monism*<sup>2,3</sup> (*that does not appear to accommodate the observations of science*) or a dualism- from which the current compromise to attempt to create a science of everything, from dualistically originating postulates of

invisible entities and an innate knowing that the soul is intangible and invisible, owes its existence. Common sense with regards to the empirical is subverted in the areas of failed understanding, and emerges intertwined with mathematical and logical reasoning applied to the empirically untestable.

In the philosophies of George Berkeley<sup>4,5</sup> of the seventeenth century, the existence of matter is regarded as dependent upon the existence of the mind/spirit. This suggestion is reminiscent in its' composition to that discussed above of the empirically untestable, it is empirically unprovable, and yet contains no assumptions about modulation by invisible entities of the material world, which as suggested, appear as a divergence and divestment in the pursuit to attain a footing in the understanding of nature, and of which no other route to this end appears logically feasible, less only if it is possible to define a common connecting facet between mind and matter. The current situation and controversy is suitably analogous to time-space theory and the corresponding descriptive topology depicting space with open and closed parts, singularities and pluralities<sup>6</sup>. At its basic roots, the science of mind/cognition are matters of contrasts and differences<sup>7,8</sup>: e.g. the perception of time and the physical sciences measurement of physical change, change over time, emergence and transmission, one might challenge modern scientific ordering of the very basic elements, which today bear a constant speed of light, light propagation that manifests mass; cannot the property of mass be replaced with the property of time and force? Intra-atomic forces, extra atomic forces that hold atoms together; gravity a force of the attraction of mass –themselves might be factors of a manifestation of time; in the terms that uniqueness is required to define the existence of anything, one uniqueness must repel or avoid another, itself; as in the conceptualization of immunology/immunologically-distinct. Thus physical force might be entailed to any of all existence, even if the world itself is considered unique that it must avoid itself physically, that its' only constituent be time /life-time. In the case of the clock and measuring rod, one measures either distance, time or force. If one measures distance it depends on time and force-if one measures force it depends on time and distance, to measure time (even with clock run by a spring) one actually measures force and distance. The set [time, force, distance] might be same as the set [time]<sub>7</sub> if time entails both force and distance, is unique, and does not belong to itself, [repels itself by virtue of its' unique existence-is singular verses dual]. Thus, in this perspective, to account for weight and mass, time is theorized to entail force, distance, and mass (by virtue of a force(repulsion) of self approach related to density that manifests a property of solidness.) Time manifested from the cross-sectional area of a theoretical single one sided surface(a monism), from a force of self avoidance, as the cause and quantifier of force (that is also a manifestation of the existence of time) and whatever location related

particulars relating density and surface area that lead to the chemical and physical diversities of matter (similarly describable), entail the universe as a single whole particular<sup>7,8</sup>.

Thus, in this view, traversing intellectually from components of the clock and measuring rod, the component of time is all that remains, and remains with an exact correspondence in the real world as an irreducible element that can unite, analytically, mind and matter- i.e. all (the mind, the measuring rod, mass, volume, and matter etc.) as also entailed by, and entailing all, the physical and immaterial in a unified manner as time.

#### References

- 1) Tilton, H.B., Smarandache, F. ed. *Today'sTake On Einsteins' Relativity* Proceedings Of The Conference At Pima Community College East Campus Feb 18 2005 Pima College Press
- 2) The Catholic Encyclopedia, (monism) Volume X. Published 1911. New York: Robert Appleton Company. Nihil Obstat, October 1, 1911. Remy Lafort, S.T.D., Censor. Imprimatur. John Cardinal Farley, Archbishop of New York
- 3) Velmans, Prof Max (2007) *Reflexive Monism*. [Journal (Paginated)] (In Press)
- 4) Fogelin, Robert, 2001, *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Berkeley and The Principles of Human Knowledge* (Routledge, 2001)
- 5) Tipton, Ian C. 1994 *Berkeley: The Philosophy of Immaterialism* , Thoemmes
- 6) Lam, Vincent (2007) *The singular nature of space-time*. In [2006] Philosophy of Science Assoc. 20th Biennial Mtg (Vancouver): PSA 2006 Contributed Papers.
- 7) ....., *Form Generates Form: Time as A Second Order Variable From Indecision Between Heisenberg Uncertainty and Einstein Legality* (in review Ludus Vitalis)
- 8) ....., *Uniqueness and Self Belonging In Nature*, (in review Ludus Vitalis)