

# A Graph method for mapping changes in temporal and spatial phenomena with relativistic consequences

Daniel Brown<sup>1</sup>

Depts of Computer Science and Physics

*University College London*

*Gower Street London WC1E 6BT, U.K.*

February 8, 2020

## Abstract

A Directed Cyclic Graph is used to model interrelated vertices of fluctuating time, state and space using a cellular automata approach. This model predicts a variety of phenomena including a constant and maximum speed at which any moving entity can travel, time dilation effects in accordance with special relativity and an explanation for the non-local feature of collapse. The approach has proven amenable to computer modelling; a copy of the “SimulTime” program is available on request.

A further paper details the statistical implications for identifying the probability of locating a particle at a particular position in space.

---

<sup>1</sup>email: d.brown@cs.ucl.ac.uk

# 1 Introduction

Minsky (1982) considers a model of the universe using “a crystalline world of tiny, discrete ‘cells’, each knowing only what its neighbours do”. In Minsky’s model, appropriately correspondent properties such as a maximal speed emerge. However, Minsky found that the model rapidly lost coherence requiring increasing additional rules and the wrong time dilation factors emerged. Feynman (1982) also examined cellular automata models and was particularly concerned with simulating time on computers using a model of discrete time; he noted that “a very interesting problem is the origin of the probabilities in quantum mechanics”. Recent research, such as Jaroskiewicz (2000) has resurrected analysis of cellular automata using an approach dependent on the evaluation of non-local information. The current paper addresses these issues through a cellular automata method using several dimensions of time. Whilst Tegmark (1997) considered that 3 dimensions of space with more than one dimension of time produces “unpredictable” artifacts such as backward causation, this paper aims to demonstrate that this is not necessarily the case if the time dimensions are appropriately formulated.

The interrelated nature of space and time has not been thoroughly examined from the perspective of directed graphs, and yet as Pearl notes this is an excellent apparatus for study since “causality has been mathematicised” (Pearl 2000). In this paper, we investigate a directed graph representation of interrelated space, time and state structures and explore some of the properties that such a causal structure implies.

## 2 IFE Graphs

This paper makes use of a particular directed (cyclic) graph composed of Interrelated Fluctuating Entities (IFEs). The approach has two features of particular note: it is distributed and logical precedence has priority over all other conditions (including temporal precedence). A graph comprises a collection of entities (or nodes) which are connected together by links (edges). We can measure the value of any entity but to predict its value, we have to know also the values of other interrelated entities and the rules for their combination.

An Entity is defined through four principal components: its *elements*, the *rules* which govern the cycle between these elements, the *links or triggers* that

initiate cycling between elements, and the *layout* which specifies the graph mapping the links to other entities. Changes in the elements of one entity consequently cause changes in the elements of other connected entities. For convenience, we refer to the whole changing disturbance as an Interrelated Fluctuating Entity (IFE).

### 1. Elements

Each Entity contains a set number of elements. For example: (0,1,2,3,4,5). There are a minimum of 2 elements in an entity and a maximum of infinity. Once activated by a trigger, the entity will cycle through this set of elements in a fixed sequence governed by rules defining this cycling.

### 2. Rules governing the cycling between elements

On activation by a trigger (from another linked entity):

- (i) The entity can be defined to cycle only from one element to the next until a further trigger or to cycle through the complete set of elements following a single trigger
- (ii) Movement can be defined to cycle forward or backward through the set of elements
- (iii) On reaching a specified element value (e.g. 5 in the above instance) the entity can be determined to:
  - (a) return directly to the first element
  - (b) cycle back to the first element (1,2,3,4,5,4,3,2,1) where it may stop or continue to oscillate
  - (c) remain at the specified element value

### 3. Constellation and adjacency

A graph *combines* two or more separate entities. Since each entity comprises a sequence of elements, the position of one element of one entity in an IFE can be referenced in terms of the position of an element of another entity. e.g. one entity is adjacent to another entity of the same type in terms of another entity of a different type.

### 4. Links/triggers between adjacent entities

Each entity is triggered to start cycling through elements by a specified change in a logically linked entity. All links between IFEs are directed: a trigger by one entity logically activates the cycling of another entity. We will principally be concerned with directed cyclic graphs - (e.g. where element X triggers element Y and element Y triggers element X). An entity can be determined to activate an adjacent entity:

- (i) By any change in element value
- (ii) By passing through a certain specific element value

Different constellations of entities provide different interrelated effects. At the most simplistic, we can define a graph for “SWITCH” as the interrelated entities ON  $\{0, 1\}$  and BRIGHT  $\{0, 1\}$ . We define a directed link from ON to BRIGHT so that a specific change in ON element from  $0 \rightarrow 1$  triggers a change in BRIGHT element from  $0 \rightarrow 1$ .<sup>2</sup>

### Example 1 - Dominoes (time independent)

A sequence of falling Dominoes constitutes an example of two interrelated entities. With a layout of five dominoes in a one dimensional row, if we tip the first one over to the right then the next to its right will fall, which triggers the next one to fall...

We define an entity State  $R = \{0, h\}$  where 0 indicates an upright domino, and h indicates a fallen domino. Likewise the entity Space  $x = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$  where 0 indicates the first spatial position, 1 the next spatial position to the right etc...Then we can define the domino graph as the interrelated State and Space entities so each Space *element* has an associated State *entity*. Thus the graph has the form:  $((R), x)$ . The domino is the changing IFE disturbance (which can be measured through the State entity).

We apply a directed link so that if the State( $R=0$ ) entity at the first spatial position cycles to a fallen element( $R=h$ ), it triggers the spatially adjacent State entity to cycle to the next State element (which triggers the State entity at the next spatial position...). The logical rule for this algorithm, (where  $\rightarrow$  signifies a transition and  $\supset$  indicates a *logical* implication and  $x'$  and  $R'$  indicate adjacent elements in the respective entities  $x$  and  $R$ ) is:

A change in State  $dR$  of  $\{((R), x) \rightarrow ((R'), x)\} \supset$  a change in State  $dR$  at an adjacent Space such that  $\{((R), x') \rightarrow ((R'), x')\}$ .

i.e. at each spatial “cell” we apply we have a continuous loop:

LOOP  $\{((R), x) \rightarrow ((R'), x)\} \supset \{((R), x') \rightarrow ((R'), x')\}$   
 LOOP

Once the first State entity is activated, at the first spatial position, the other States will follow suit in sequence of their spatial position. However,

---

<sup>2</sup>Further directed links from BRIGHT to ON so that a change in BRIGHT element of  $0 \rightarrow 1$  triggers a change in ON of  $1 \rightarrow 0$ , and a change in ON element of  $1 \rightarrow 0$  triggers a change in BRIGHT of  $1 \rightarrow 0$  creates a short cycle.

there is no notion of time in this formulation. Time is not implicit in the model but is a construct only that arises itself as an interrelated fluctuating entity, which we consider in the next example.

### Example 2: Domino (Time Integrated)


To map the physical situation a little better we construct a “Toy” model from the entities of Time, State and Space. We utilise an infinite set of elements for Time  $T = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, \dots\}$  and 3 elements for the entity State R: 0 - vertical, h - tipping, 2h - face down/horizontal. So  $R=rh$  where  $r=\{0, 1, 2\}$ . As before we have the entity Space  $x = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$  - i.e. each of the 5 spatial positions is an equal distance  $dx=1$  units apart. We interrelate the Time(T), Space(x) and State(R) entities in the domino graph:  $((R),x,T)$ . - The extra bracket for R indicates that there is a distinct State *entity* for each *element* of Space and Time.

We define a directed link from State to Time such that a change in State triggers a Time counter to cycle through a number of beats  $s$ .

A directed link from Time to State counts  $s$  beats in Time and then triggers a change in domino State (we can simplify this to assert that “it takes  $s$  units of time to transition from one State to the next”).

A directed link from State to Space specifies that a change of State **where  $R'=h$**  in one domino spatial position  $x$  triggers a change in Time element at the *adjacent* spatial position  $x'$ , with the time measure but not the State carried forward to this next spatial position <sup>3</sup>.

The graph layout is therefore:



We can list the logical rules for this algorithm, where  $\rightarrow$  signifies a transition,  $T^+$  indicates the adjacent successor of  $T$  and  $\supset$  indicates a *logical*

---

<sup>3</sup>Note that triggering a change in domino State(R) at an adjacent spatial position is equivalent to a change in Space(dx) followed by a change in State(dR). We can theoretically dispense with the physical structure and regard the spatial layout abstractly as itself an IFE which interacts with the IFEs of State(R) and Time(T). In this case we employ both Time(T) and Space(x) as variable pointers of an array  $(x,T)$  in which is contained a constituent value of the variable of State(R). Hence when we analyse the disturbance, a change in Time(T) preserves a continuity in State(R) at the new  $(x,T)$ , but a change in Space(x) does not.

implication using a form of declarative programming:

1. a change in State dR of  $\{(R, x, T) \rightarrow (R^+, x, T)\} \supset$  a change in Time dT such that  $\{(R^+, x, T) \rightarrow (R^+, x, T^+)\}$
2. a change in Time dT of  $\{(R, x, T) \rightarrow (R, x, T^+)\} \supset$  a change in State dR such that  $\{(R, x, T^+) \rightarrow (R^+, x, T^+)\}$
3. a specific change in State dR where  $R^+ = h$  of  $\{(0, x, T) \rightarrow (h, x, T)\} \supset$  a change in Time at an adjacent IFE such that  $\{(0, x^+, 0) \rightarrow (0, x^+, T^+)\}$  (where  $T^+ = T + 1$ )<sup>4</sup>.

Because State and Space have finite numbers of elements, then if we apply rule 2.(iii)(c), the respective entities will eventually remain fixed on their final elements. Denoting the IFE as (State, Space, Time) i.e. (R,x,T) and starting with the first tipped domino, we obtain a cycle that moves:  $(h, 0, 0) \rightarrow (0, 1, 10) \rightarrow (h, 1, 10) \rightarrow (0, 2, 20) \rightarrow (h, 2, 20) \dots \rightarrow (0, 4, 40) \rightarrow (h, 4, 40) \rightarrow (h, 4, 50) \rightarrow (2h, 4, 50) \rightarrow (2h, 4, 60)$ .

Some points are worth making here.

1. Whilst the order of the programme is important - i.e. a change in Time associated with a change in State occurs logically prior to a change in Time due to a change in Space, both time changes occur in parallel “at the same time”.
2. Time is an entity which moves independently, “in advance” of the State change.
3. The precedence of logical change over temporal change permits both  $(R, x, T)$  and  $(R^+, x, T)$  - i.e. 2 distinct states (momentarily) coexist at the same spatial and temporal position, logically prior to the logically subsequent temporal transition.
4. Each domino has an associated local spatial Time(T) - which continues to cycle in tandem with State changes even after the IFE disturbance has moved on to the next spatial position - as each domino falls to its final horizontal state. Thus the last domino will register a time of 60 units.
5. If we view the disturbance as a form of entity, there is an ambiguity in the identity of that disturbance - since an element change in State(dR) of  $0 \rightarrow 1$  results in both a change in Space(dx) and a change in Time(dT) which results in a further change in State(dR). The progress of the disturbance

---

<sup>4</sup>this is equivalent to the Time entity incrementing and moving in spatial position i.e.  $(0, x, T) \rightarrow (0, x^+, T^+)$

therefore bifurcates <sup>5</sup> which we discuss further in the next example.

5. Increasing the value of the State element required to trigger a Time change at an adjacent Space element (e.g. so a State of 2h triggers a change in Time at an adjacent Space) slows down the progress of the disturbance.

### 3 Analysis of particles

In the wider universe, we typically explain that it is the matter but not its position or the time associated with that matter that constitutes the identity of a thing. However, at the microscopic level, these features cannot be considered as we might traditionally expect. We *define* a hypothetical subatomic particle (a theoretical unit of identity particle without sub-components) in terms of its State R, Space position x, and Time T and consider that it can change in state or in spatial position only.

We observe this particle precisely from one moment to the next. If nothing at all has changed in the State of the particle <sup>6</sup> then we assert that time will not have progressed from the point of view of the particle, and this defines our most stringent notion of invariance.

We make the following assumptions:

- (i) Time, Space and State advance in quantised units
- (ii) Time can only advance when change occurs
- (iii) change can only occur if there is either or both:
  - (a) change in State position
  - (b) change in Spatial position

There cannot *logically* be a change in Time without a change in either State or Space. Causally, therefore, for a given entity in a specific fixed

---

<sup>5</sup>This clarifies the celebrated paradox of the ship of Theseus. Over a period of time in order to repair a wooden ship (Ship 1) its planks are replaced one by one - but in addition the original planks are taken aside and reconstituted in identical architecture into another ship at a different location (Ship 2). Which ship is the original ship of Theseus... - To decide, we must define our criterion of identity: either continuity of matter over changing space and time (Ship 2) or continuity of space over changing matter and time (Ship 1). Both ships represent two parallel continuities of identity. This forms a useful model for an entity to be conceived as in two alternative spatial positions at the same time. How we regard the identity of an entity therefore affects both what and where we presume that entity to be. In particular, an entity can be viewed as at two different points in space at the same time, dependent on how we have tracked and how we collapse its identity.

<sup>6</sup>Specifically, we require a change in the time of the viewer (which implies a change in state of the viewer) without a change in time experienced by the particle.

spatial position, then with no change in State *there can be no change in Time*. If an entity changes spatial position or an entity changes State, then we assume that either of these changes triggers an increase in a quantity of Time. We shall NOT assume that these times are necessarily the same. We shall label them as “alpha-Time” for changes in State (with a unit of  $\mathbf{t}'$ ) and “beta-Time” for changes in Space (with a unit of  $\mathbf{t}^*$ ) respectively. Both of these changes can occur in parallel. We shall also define the “total-Time”  $T$  as a combination of these components such that  $T = (\alpha, \beta)$  which we leave deliberately unresolved at this stage <sup>7</sup>.

### Movement of particles

The propagation of a “Mexican wave” of fans undulating in football stadiums provides a helpful image which integrates the notion of time into that of the fans themselves, and we shall align this with the analysis of particles above, likening a particle to a fan disturbance rippling across a stadium. We assume each fan can move through a set of discrete States of standing up or sitting down.

The most significant feature derived from our analysis compared with the domino example is that a change in time triggered by a change in Space is distinct from the change in time triggered by a change in State.

To explore how fans propagate a wave to undulate across the stadium we select only two rows A and B <sup>8</sup>. Row A comprises  $n$  adjacent fans. In row B we are only concerned with two fans: one at the start of the row and the second at the  $n$ th position.

### DIAGRAM 1 - comparison of moving fan disturbance with static fans

Row A	$\triangle\triangle\triangle\triangle\triangle\triangle\triangle\triangle\triangle\triangle\triangle\triangle\triangle\triangle\triangle$	$\rightarrow$ moving fan event
Row B	$\triangle$ fan1	$\triangle$ fan $n$

The two fans in Row B (these are simply individual fans bouncing up and down and not interacting with other fans) measure time elapsed whilst remaining spatially stationary by counting State changes only. The “fan

---

<sup>7</sup>It is a principal purpose of this paper to explain the significance of the combination of these two elements for the advance of time.

<sup>8</sup>the lateral effects of entities on each other are significant; however here we shall examine just one spatial dimension.



disturbance” in Row A travelling from the position of fan 1 to the position of fan n also measures time elapsed. We synchronise time measurement initially between the first fan in row A and fan1 and fan n in row B (e.g. two fans run out at the same speed left and right from the middle of row B until they kick fan 1 in row B and fan 1 in Row A and fan n in row B which causes all three fans to start timing and for fan1 in row A to start moving). When the moving fan disturbance in row A is adjacent to fan n in row B, these fans give each other a kick and they stop timing and compare time measurements.

To model the situation we establish a graph connecting entities comprised of cycling elements of IFEs for State(R), Space(x), and distinct components of  $\alpha\text{Time}(st')$ ,  $\beta\text{Time}(t^*)$  as suggested by the above analysis where the elements and graph layout are summarised in the table below:

IFE	State(R=rh)	$\alpha\text{Time}(\alpha = rst')$	Space(x=ndx)	$\beta\text{Time}(\beta = nt^*)$
Elements	$(0, h, 2h \dots \infty)$	$(0, st', 2st' \dots \infty)$	$(0, d, 2d \dots \infty)$	$(0, t^*, 2t^* \dots \infty)$
Logic status	variable only	array pointer	array pointer	array pointer
Cycle Rule	cycle one element until next trigger	cycle s elements until next trigger	cycle one element until next trigger	cycle one element until next trigger
Units	dR=h	d $\alpha$ =st'	dx=d	d $\beta$ = $t^*$
Triggered by	d $\alpha$ or d $\beta$	dR	State(R) $\rightarrow$ ph	dx
Transition logic	N/A	State(rh) cont.	State(rh) discontin.	State(rh) discontin.
<b>Graph Layout</b> <div style="text-align: center;"> State(rh) <math>\rightarrow</math> Space(nd)  <math>\downarrow \uparrow \quad \uparrow \quad \downarrow</math>  <math>\alpha\text{Time}(st') \quad \beta\text{Time}(t^*)</math> </div>				

### Movement algorithm component

As in the previous example, we set up an algorithm for a moving particle disturbance:

- (i) Change in State(dR) of  $\{(R, x, \alpha, \beta) \rightarrow (R', x, \alpha, \beta)\} \supset$  a change in  $\alpha\text{Time}(d\alpha)$  such that  $\{(R', x, \alpha, \beta) \rightarrow (R', x, \alpha', \beta)\}$
- (ii) Change in  $\alpha\text{Time}(d\alpha)$  of  $\{(R, x, \alpha, \beta) \rightarrow (R, x, \alpha', \beta)\} \supset$  a change in State(dR) such that  $\{(R, x, \alpha', \beta) \rightarrow (R', x, \alpha', \beta)\}$
- (iii) A specific change in State(dR) of  $\{(R, x, \alpha, \beta) \rightarrow (ph, x, \alpha, \beta)\} \supset$  a change in  $\beta\text{Time}(d\beta)$  at the adjacent spaces  $x'$  (where  $x'=x+dx$  and  $x'=x-dx$ ) such that  $\{(Q, x', \alpha, \beta) \rightarrow (Q, x', \alpha, \beta')\}$  where Q is the existing State value

at  $(x', \alpha, \beta)$  and  $\alpha, \beta$  relate to the times at  $x$  <sup>9 10</sup>. Since it takes alpha-Time of (pst') to cycle to the (ph) State, (pst') is central to the speed of the IFE disturbance.

(iv) Change in  $\beta$ Time(d $\beta$ ) of  $\{(R, x, \alpha, \beta) \rightarrow (R, x, \alpha, \beta')\} \supset$  a change in State(dR) such that  $\{(R, x, \alpha, \beta') \rightarrow (R', x, \alpha, \beta')\}$

This algorithm is sufficient to define a disturbance which moves with a constant velocity through space and time. The disturbance has inertia and will continue to move indefinitely with this constant velocity - until it interacts with another entity. It will be noted that the change in beta-time is logically subsequent to the change in alpha-time. We shall define the rule for interaction next.

### Interaction algorithm component

The final position of an IFE is determined by an interaction. We define that all interactions between two IFEs can only occur where both IFEs have the same spatial position and the same Time Distance or Time Magnitude  $|T|$ , which is a combination of  $\alpha$ Time and  $\beta$ Time.

To calculate  $|T|$  we cannot simply add  $\alpha$ Time and  $\beta$ Time components. Whilst there are logical precedences in the application of rules for these increments in time, temporally they do not operate sequentially but simultaneously. **In order to combine these coterminous advances in time, which proceed along different axes of  $\alpha$ Time and  $\beta$ Time into a single total time magnitude, we make the following hypothesis: that as for two axes in space these axes in time are orthogonal and hence their combination comprises a simple pythagorean sum. It is remarkable that the consequence of these two orthogonal dimensions of time is both the theories of special relativity and quantum mechanics as will be shown.**

For an IFE disturbance with a Space-change trigger  $R \rightarrow ph$  and an interval between State changes of st', if this disturbance has moved a distance  $x=ndx$  and at this spatial position is in a State  $R=rh$ :

$$|T| = \sqrt{(nt^*)^2 + (npst' + rst')^2} \quad (1)$$

This indicates that following a series of n spatial movements, in the final nth spatial position there follows a variable r State movements (the value

---

<sup>9</sup>This rule for change in State applies in tandem with IFE rule (i).

<sup>10</sup>Adjacent Space entities will be triggered for each spatial dimension.

of  $\text{rst}'$  depends on the actual **detected** state position at the time of the interaction i.e.  $\text{rst}'$  depends on the IFE which interacts with it). - Note that  $r$  may exceed the Space-change trigger point i.e. we can have  $r > p$ .

If  $n$  is large i.e. a large distance has been travelled then the  $\text{rst}'$  term becomes insignificant and:

$$|T| \sim \sqrt{(nt^*)^2 + (npst')^2} = n\sqrt{(t^*)^2 + (pst')^2}$$

For two IFE's A  $\{(R_A, x_A, \alpha_A, \beta_A) \text{ with } d\alpha_A = (s_A t')\}$  and B  $\{(R_B, x_B, \alpha_B, \beta_B) \text{ with } d\alpha_B = (s_B t')\}$  an interaction can only occur if  $\{x_A = x_B\}$  AND  $\{|T_A| = |T_B|\}$

We can represent this by inserting in the algorithm the following check for an interaction:

$$\{(R, x, |(\alpha + d\alpha) + \beta|) \rightarrow (R', x, |(\alpha + d\alpha) + \beta|)\} \supset \text{INTERACTION}$$

i.e. if there is a change in State at the current Space position and Time magnitude *of when the IFE is about to be* then an interaction occurs. On an interaction occurring, the collapse function is initiated (see next section).

However, as we don't know these starting conditions then we have to use a statistical approach to calculate the probability of interaction at a particular spatial location. This method is described in detail in a separate paper and forms the basis of quantum mechanics.

### Collapse algorithm component

Because of the peculiarly *distributed* nature of the IFE construction (as highlighted in the Theseus boat paradox above) whilst an interaction occurs at a precisely defined combination of State( $R$ ) and Space( $x$ ), there still remains a set of active States at Space positions *at the same Time Magnitude* where the specific interaction does not occur. The collapse function removes these components (where  $\emptyset$  indicates a State null value and the initial State  $R \neq \emptyset$ ) and we define it as:

$$[\{(R, x+dx, \alpha, \beta) \rightarrow (\emptyset, x+dx, \alpha, \beta)\} \text{ OR } \{(R, x-dx, \alpha, \beta) \rightarrow (\emptyset, x-dx, \alpha, \beta)\}] \supset \{(R, x, \alpha, \beta) \rightarrow (\emptyset, x, \alpha, \beta)\}$$

i.e. an IFE monitors spatially adjacent IFEs and if a spatially adjacent IFE changes State to a null State then the monitoring IFE itself goes to a null State. The *logical position* of this monitoring algorithm is important: it sits in the loop which performs *single* increments of alpha-Time. Since this ensures continuous monitoring of adjacent cells, and *because of the precedence of logic over temporal advance* instantaneous collapses of IFE functions can

occur over over a wide region of space.

The process of collapse has been the subject of considerable debate which has centred on the implication for action at a distance or for “hidden variables”. e.g. Von Neuman (1955) asserted that for a wave/particle its mechanism for evolution in time through space and its mechanism for collapse are necessarily different. However, the algorithm for collapse described above, deriving from the precedence of logic over time and the momentary possibility of both  $(R, x, \alpha, \beta)$  and  $(R', x, \alpha, \beta)$  negates this assertion.

### Summary of algorithm

We can summarise the rules more compactly and completely. This requires them to be set up in a logic loop:

```

LOOP  $\{(R, x, \alpha, \beta) \rightarrow (R', x, \alpha, \beta)\} \supset \text{COLLAPSECHECK}; \text{ELSE LOOP}$ 
  INC  $\{(Q, x, |(\alpha + d\alpha) + \beta)|) \rightarrow (Q', x, |(\alpha + d\alpha) + \beta)|) \supset \text{INTERACT}$ 
     $(R', x, \alpha, \beta) \rightarrow (R', x, \alpha', \beta)$ 
     $\{(R, x, \alpha, \beta) \rightarrow (R, x, \alpha', \beta)\} \supset \{(R, x, \alpha', \beta) \rightarrow (R', x, \alpha', \beta)\}$ 
     $\{(R, x, \alpha, \beta) \rightarrow (ph, x, \alpha, \beta)\} \supset \{(Q, x', \alpha, \beta) \rightarrow (Q, x', \alpha, \beta')\}$ 
     $\{(R, x, \alpha, \beta) \rightarrow (R, x, \alpha, \beta')\} \supset \{(R, x, \alpha, \beta') \rightarrow (R', x, \alpha, \beta')\}$ 
  COLLAPSECHECK  $\{(R, x + dx, \alpha + s, \beta) \rightarrow (\emptyset, x + dx, \alpha + s, \beta)\} \text{ or } \{(R, x - dx, \alpha + s, \beta) \rightarrow (\emptyset, x - dx, \alpha + s, \beta)\}$ 
     $\supset (R, x, \alpha, \beta) \rightarrow (\emptyset, x, \alpha, \beta) \text{ AND LOOP}$ 
     $S = S + t'$ 
     $\{S \neq st'\} \supset \text{COLLAPSECHECK}; \text{ELSE } S = 0 \text{ AND INC}$ 
  INTERACT  $(R, x, \alpha, \beta) \rightarrow (\emptyset, x, \alpha, \beta); \text{LOOP}$ 

```

## 4 Properties of the model

1. A particle IFE comprises the moving disturbance of the interrelated fluctuating entities of State, alpha-Time, beta-Time and Space.

2. Each Space element is a distance  $dx$  apart from another: 0 indicates the position of the first element, 1 that of the next element ...99 the 100<sup>th</sup> element etc. Hence proceeding from the first element to the  $n$ th element, the Space distance is  $x = ndx$ .

3. Each State element is  $h$  units apart from another: 0 indicates the position of the first element, 1 that of the next (i.e.  $\{0, h, 2h, \dots\}$ ).<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup>There is no reason not to have negative States (“kneeling”). Thus State elements can advance through  $\{-h, -2h, -3h, \dots\}$ . However, we will not discuss these negative States in

4. A change in State entity dR triggers a change in  $\alpha$ Time ( $d\alpha=st'$  and s itself represents a trigger link such that after s cycles of t' an advance in State dR is triggered). Thus the Time recorded by a particle to reach a Space-change trigger point of ph is  $pst'$ .

5. All measurements of time depend upon movements of State change and each particle IFE can therefore ***itself measure time only through a change in  $\alpha$ Time( $st'$ )***. Each change of State(dR) triggers a local change in  $\alpha$ Time( $st'$ ) where local time applies to the Space position of the IFE disturbance.

6. It is notable that the (unresolved) total Time T:  $(\alpha,\beta)$  can be represented as a complex number. Using a notation of  $\beta$ Time as real and  $\alpha$ Time as imaginary:

$$\underline{T} = nt^* + \imath(np + r)st' \quad (2)$$

or where  $z = (p + r/n)s$  :

$$\underline{T} = n(t^* + \imath zt') \quad (3)$$

7. All interactions occur at the same Time Magnitude  $|\underline{T}| = \sqrt{TT^*} = \sqrt{(nt^*)^2 + (npst' + rst')^2}$ . For large n the residual  $rst'$   $\alpha$ -time component in calculations of time magnitude can often be ignored. For increasingly small distances, however, the  $rst'$  component assumes an increasingly proportion of the total Time.

8. Frequency is defined as  $f = \frac{1}{\imath(st')}$ . The ( $st'$ ) term indicates the Time to move from one State position to another.

9. We define Speed as the rate of change of Space over Time. At the maximum speed i.e. where there is a null State(R) trigger for a movement in Space then  $\alpha$ Time( $st'$ ) can be ignored and  $V_{max} = \frac{dx}{t^*}$ . c, the speed of light is consequently the constant that connects the smallest possible change in spatial distance d to the smallest discrete increase of beta-time  $t^*$ . This causal link between a change in State(dR), a change in Space(dx) and an associated change in  $\beta$ Time( $t^*$ ) is responsible for the maximum speed of light which occurs when there is a null Space-change trigger point ( $p = 0$ ) and there is a change in Space(dx) but no change in  $\alpha$ Time.

9. Each change in Space (instantaneously) triggers a change in  $\beta$ Time( $t^*$ ) - effectively the Time for the IFE disturbance propagate to an adjacent Space position. Since there is empirically a fine gradation in possible speeds, then

---

this paper

$t^* > t'$  and generally  $pst' \gg t^*$  <sup>12</sup>

$$v = \frac{nd}{|T|} = \frac{nd}{\sqrt{(nt^*)^2 + (npst' + rst')^2}} \quad (4)$$

10. Wavelength  $\lambda = v/f = \iota st'v$

$$\lambda = \frac{\iota(nd)(st')}{\sqrt{(nt^*)^2 + (npst' + rst')^2}} \quad (5)$$

11. A consequent maximum speed is implied for which an IFE can propagate through a medium. This occurs when the Space-change trigger point p is zero. i.e.

$$v_{max} = \frac{d}{\sqrt{(t^*)^2 + (0 + \frac{rst'}{n})^2}} \approx \frac{d}{t^*} \quad (6)$$

This represents<sup>13</sup> the time taken to move spatial distances by an entity where no state changes are occurring.  $v_{max}$  is the speed of light c, and the total absence of  $\alpha$ -time as a component in the time magnitude explains why such a speed cannot be exceeded and why for an entity travelling at such a speed, we would expect no time to be experienced by that entity (experienced time =  $\alpha$ -time =  $npst'$ ). For entities which move at the speed of light, such as the photon itself, time is experienced as static.

12. We define Energy as the rate of change of State over alpha-time. Then for a single change in state:  $e = \frac{h}{(st')}$ . h, Planck's constant represents the smallest possible discrete increase in State. In a collision of two IFEs A and B with state transition times of  $s_A$  and  $s_B$  (i.e. where energies are  $\frac{h}{s_A t'}$  and  $\frac{h}{s_B t'}$ ) then for A in a time  $s_A$  it moves h State units and in a time  $s_A s_B$  it moves  $s_B h$  units; correspondingly for B in a time  $s_A s_B$  it moves  $s_A h$  units. Thus in a time  $s_A s_B$  there is a total State change of  $h(s_A + s_B)$  units. Therefore the total combined energy is:  $e_{tot} = \frac{h(s_A + s_B)}{s_A s_B}$


---

<sup>12</sup>If there were a change in speed from  $c = \frac{dx}{\sqrt{(t^*)^2 + 0}}$  to the next fastest speed  $c' = \frac{dx}{\sqrt{(t^*)^2 + (spt')^2}}$  (and setting p=s=1) then were  $t' = t^*$  then  $c' \sim \frac{d}{\sqrt{2(t^*)^2}} = \frac{c}{\sqrt{2}}$  which is not the case. Hence  $t' \ll t^*$

<sup>13</sup>over a reasonable (any measurable) distance:  $n \gg (rst')$

13. Given a time magnitude  $|T| = \sqrt{(nt^*)^2 + (npst' + rst')^2}$  then **the occurrence, at the Space-change trigger State, of the bifurcation of identity to *both* a change in Space(dx) and its associated change in  $\beta\text{Time}(t^*)$ , and the change in  $\alpha\text{Time}(st')$  associated with its change in State(dR) results in an ambiguity: of where an entity is located in Space and what its State is.** Since n and r are variables, a range of alternative combinations of State(rh) and Space(ndx) positions can form the same Time magnitude  $|T|$  from variable components of  $\alpha\text{Time}$  and  $\beta\text{Time}$ . For a fixed  $|T|$  of magnitude  $|rst'|$  - assuming a null Space-change trigger (ie. a photon where  $p=0$ ) - this forms a “temporal arc” (see Diagram 2 below). The consequences of this are discussed in detail in a separate paper.

DIAGRAM 2 - temporal arc for a photon at a time magnitude  $|rst'|$



All points on the temporal arc have the same time magnitude.

## 5 The Magnitude of the Time Vector (over large distances)

Using diagram 1, we compare the time *measured/experienced* (i.e. alpha-time) by the spatially moving entity for it to move in Row A from point 1 to point n in the same row, with the time difference measured between the stationary entities in row B at points 1 and n.

We use the interaction rule that all interactions occur at the same time magnitude. At the point of interaction they must both have the same time *magnitude* and spatial position.

For the spatially moving entity, the time *experienced* is simply the  $\alpha\text{Time}$

pst'. However, because it moves spatially, then from equation (1) and assuming  $n$  is large its time magnitude  $|T|$  comprises both  $\alpha$ Time and  $\beta$ Time:  $|T| = \sqrt{(t^*)^2 + (pst')^2}$ . For the fan in the second row, because it interacts at the same Time magnitude, but does not move spatially, then it must experience alpha-time of  $\sqrt{(t^*)^2 + (pst')^2}$ . It is for this simple reason that “moving clocks run slow”.

Differences in experienced time between moving and stationary entities all stem from the indirect experience of beta-time.<sup>14</sup>

Using the example illustrated in Diagram 1 and the earlier definition (where for convenience  $z = (p + \frac{r}{n})s$ ) we have:  $T = n(t^* + \imath zt')$ , which is the total amount of time taken by the moving disturbance in row A to move from position 1 to position  $n$ . We can calculate the magnitude of this time vector as:

$$|T| = n\sqrt{(t^*)^2 + (zt')^2} \quad (7)$$

This simple equation is really all we need to express the theory of special relativity, for  $|T|$  expresses the total time magnitude and  $(zt')$  represents the time “experienced” by the moving IFE. To demonstrate accordance with the familiar model of the theory of relativity, we can further calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Speed } v &= \frac{nd}{n\sqrt{(t^*)^2 + (zt')^2}} \\ v &= \frac{d}{\sqrt{(t^*)^2 + (zt')^2}} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

For the photon travelling over a significant distance there is no trigger point (i.e.  $p=0$ ) and  $r/n$  will be comparatively very small with  $t^*$  then:

$$\text{Speed } c = \frac{nd}{nt^*} = \frac{d}{t^*} \quad (9)$$

Rearranging (7):

---

<sup>14</sup>A further consequence is that the probability of an interaction at a specific spatial point will decrease with distance as the larger the arc the greater the probability of an interaction elsewhere on the circumference of the arc. Thus for a beam of photons, we would expect the intensity of the beam to diminish - without the energy of an individual photon being weakened.



$$|T| = n \left( \frac{(t^*)^2}{\sqrt{(t^*)^2 + (zt')^2}} + \frac{(zt')^2}{\sqrt{(t^*)^2 + (zt')^2}} \right)$$

Substituting from (8) and (9) into the first part of the expression and rearranging the second part:

$$|T| = \frac{nv(t^*)}{c} + n(t^*zt') \frac{(zt')}{t^*} \sqrt{\frac{1}{(t^*)^2 + (zt')^2}}$$

Further rearranging:

$$|T| = \frac{nv(t^*)}{c} + n(t^*zt') \sqrt{\frac{(t^*)^2 + (zt')^2 - (t^*)^2}{(t^*)^2[(t^*)^2 + (zt')^2]}}$$

From which we obtain:

$$|T| = \frac{nv(t^*)}{c} + n(t^*zt') \sqrt{\frac{1}{(t^*)^2} - \frac{1}{(t^*)^2 + (zt')^2}} \quad (10)$$

But from (8) and (9) we have:

$$\frac{\sqrt{c^2 - v^2}}{c} = t^* \sqrt{\frac{1}{(t^*)^2} - \frac{1}{(t^*)^2 + (zt')^2}} \quad (11)$$

Substituting this expression into (10) we obtain:

$$|T| = \frac{nv(t^*)}{c} + n \frac{\sqrt{c^2 - v^2}}{c} (zt') \quad (12)$$

Now in terms of distance travelled x:

$$x = c(nt^*)$$

Substituting into (12) we arrive at:

$$|T| = n(zt') \sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2} + (v/c^2)x$$

Since  $n(zt')$  corresponds to  $\tau$  the amount of time experienced from the perspective of the moving entity (often referred to as the proper time) and  $|T|$  corresponds to the time observed by a stationary observer, this is the familiar Einstein-Lorentz expression:

$$\tau = \gamma(|T| - (vx/c^2)) \text{ where } \gamma = (1 - v^2/c^2)^{-1/2} \quad (13)$$

The simplicity and explanatory power of the vector approach in equation (7) is notable by comparison. Even in cases (such as in the calculation of combined velocities detailed in a parallel paper) where there may be an eruption of terms, it provides a fundamentally comprehensible approach naturally amenable to computer modelling <sup>15</sup>, which is not always the case with Einstein-Lorentz presentations.

All “relativistic” effects are fundamentally underpinned by time and time alone. Apparent alterations in distance arise from the perception of measured space through velocities which ultimately refer back to differences in experienced time derived from the difference between combination of  $\beta$ Time and  $\alpha$ Time.

## 6 Conclusions

The approach underpins significant aspects of the theories of relativity and quantum physics - including why the speed of light has a maximum, perceived differences in experienced time for moving and stationary entities, how the concepts for the speed of light  $c$  and Planck’s constant  $h$  are derived more fundamentally from the units of  $\alpha$ Time and  $\beta$ Time and non-localised effects involving the collapse function. If we take the Planck length as “the quantum of length” as equating to the distance  $d$  between possible spatial positions and the Planck time as “the time it would take a photon travelling at the speed of light to across a distance equal to the Planck length” then we can equate the Planck time to a unit of beta time  $t^*$ . However, Planck time is specifically not the smallest possible unit of increase in time, which would be a single increase in alpha time  $t'$ ; although methods for establishing this empirically are not easy to imagine. A further paper describes the statistical consequences of defined interaction at a specified Time Magnitude and the bifurcation of identity at the point of a change in Space. Detailed computer models and discussion are available from the author on request.

---

<sup>15</sup>Note Appendix

## 7 Acknowledgements

The assistance of University College London Computer Science department is gratefully acknowledged.

## 8 References

- (1) Feynman R (1982) "Simulating Physics with Computers", International Journal of Theoretical Physics, 21:467-488,
- (2) Jeffreys H (1939): "Theory of Probability" , OUP.
- (3) Gauss C F "Werke" (1863-1933), Gottingen: Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften,
- (4) Jaroszkiewicz G (2000) "Causal Implication and the Origin of Time Dilation" General Relativity and Quantum Cosmology, abstract gr-qc/0008022
- (5) Minsky M (1982) "Cellular vacuum", International Journal of Theoretical Physics, 21(6/7):537-551
- (6) Olds C D, Lax A, Davidoff G (2000) "The Geometry of Numbers", The Mathematical Association of America
- (7) Pearl J (2000) "Models, Reasoning and Inference", Cambridge University Press
- (8) Tegmark (1997) "On the dimensionality of spacetime", Classical and Quantum Gravity, 14, L69-L75
- (9) Von Neumann J (1955) "Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics", translated by R.T. Berger, Princeton. Princeton University Press.