

# Geometric Model of Time

Alik Vitali Perakh

2-11-2016

**Abstract:** *The purpose of this article is to provide an alternative, strictly geometric, interpretation for the observed phenomenon of time. This Geometric Model of Time (GMT) is consistent with both Theories of Relativity but goes beyond current explanations for the nature of and the apparent one-directionness of time - the so-called Arrow of Time.*

*Key elements of the model are:*

- 1. Our physical space (not space-time) is 4-dimensional. No separate time dimension exists either physically or as any necessary mathematical distinction. All dimensions are identical and symmetric. No one dimension can be singled out to be universally labeled as time.*
- 2. All physical objects in our universe are endowed with an axiomatic vectorial property we call velocity. The scalar value of this property (speed) is invariable and identical for all objects and is labeled as  $c$  (speed of light).*
- 3. The experience of time as we know it is an illusion resulting from the observer's motion through space at  $c$ . "Time" is the term given by each observer to their own individual direction of travel in our physical four-space.*

*This model is a better fit with observed phenomenon than current ones as well as being simpler and more elegant, elegance being defined as having symmetry (in the sense that it treats no dimension as being singular).*

## 1 Questions to be addressed

This model actually addresses two distinct, if related, questions:

1. What is time? (known as "the problem of time")
2. Why does time appear to only move in one direction? (known as "the question of the Arrow of Time")

## 2 Current problems with first question

The first question is often ignored in modern physics. It is simply accepted as just being there - another dimension by some interpretation, but one that is different

from the space dimensions.<sup>1</sup>

And even explanations such the entropy model (see next section) mostly only address the second question.

The Geometric Model of Time (GMT) suggested here addresses the first question. And in the process effectively eliminates the second question because the answer is implied in it.

Even Einstein and Minkowski related to their own models of time as a 4th dimension as merely a mathematical tool, not literally another physical dimension like space. The problem with that answer is it lacks the symmetry that physicists look for in identifying the laws of the universe. Why does one set of rules apply randomly to three dimensions and a different one to just single other dimension?

One of the well-established principles of physical sciences is that a rule with many exception is probably not the correct rule. Said another way the simplest explanation is usually the correct one.

### 3 Problems with current model of time as function of entropy

The most accepted current model for Time's Arrow, originally suggested by Eddington in 1928 and also propagated by Boltzmann, involves entropy as an indicator of the forward direction of time. Second law of thermodynamics tells us that entropy of the entire universe, as an isolated system, will always increase over time, or remain constant upon reaching maximum entropy state. Entropy model of time relies on this law to define the Arrow of Time as that direction of time in which the entropy of the universe increases.

There are a few issues with this model:

1. The model only works if the universe and time are assumed to be infinite. (In any arbitrarily sized finite space, entropy can randomly increase for limited periods of time. Only in an infinite amount of space can the total entropy be assumed to unquestionably average out as remaining same or increasing).
2. The total entropic state of this universe is assumed to be known (it actually cannot be), since the law is reached from noting that in all known cases entropy increased over sufficiently long time.

There is, of course, also a simple statistical explanation for this; namely there

---

<sup>1</sup>If M-theory is right, there may be more dimensions (10 or 11 depending on how they are expressed), but this does not in any way affect the ideas presented here. If anything, having 10 space-like dimensions and only one time-like one would make the asymmetry even more pronounced.

are more ways for any group of constituents to be arranged uniformly (i.e. - in higher entropy) than in a more ordered (low entropy) way. But this statement of law still assumes we know the state of the whole universe and therefore know it increases in entropy over time. Not an unreasonable conclusion, but not a proven one.

3. As stated above, in any arbitrarily sized finite space entropy can randomly decrease for limited periods of time, yet there is no definitive indication that time either stops or reverses in those limited sections of space.
4. Increase in entropy based on 2nd law does not apply on microscopic levels, only macroscopic ones. Yet, one would be hard-pressed to argue that there is no time on the microscopic level, especially when noting the fact that when taken together en-mass all microscopic events add up consistently with their macroscopic sums totals. This idea is similar to what is known as Loschmidt's Paradox, which can easily be found in any good encyclopedia and will not be restated here.

One can indeed argue that since microscopic events, unlike macroscopic ones, are reversible, there is in fact no Arrow of Time on those levels. But saying that there is no definitive single direction of an Arrow of Time, is not the same as saying time does not exist on those levels. After all, even if there is no one definitive direction of change, there is still a difference between the states of a particle in one moment and another.

5. Second Law of Thermodynamics does allow for entropy of even large system to decrease for short periods or even remain constant over long stretches of time if said system is at its highest state of disorder. However, it would be highly questionable to claim that this means that time would actually no longer exist or stand still in said region (although, granted, it may be difficult to measure, or even quantify).

As a demonstration let us have a thought experiment.

Most familiar clock mechanisms rely on increase in entropy, such as the unwinding of a previously wound spring and such, or even the internal chemical processes within our body. However, this is not strictly a requirement. This alone should tell you of entropy's shortcoming as a model, but let us look in more detail.

An example of such a clock is a perfect pendulum clock (one with zero efficiency losses).

One such clock could be formed by any object in space, sufficiently far from gravitational effects, spinning at a steady rate in relation to an observer.

Let us design such a clock by spinning a wheel with markings on it in deep space and at a steady rate in relation to us.

Let us now put the whole contraption inside a large box.

The entropy inside said box may decrease, remain the same, or increase at random

over any finite period of time. The very thinly populated particles of matter floating in space caught in the box during its construction may, purely by chance, all drift to be more densely concentrated in one area of the box than before. Yet, we'd still be able to observe and measure time as moving forward by counting the steady turns of our spinning wheel.

For simplicity, let us assume complete vacuum.

Of course if the observer is inside the box watching the wheel turn, then it is the observer's own internal clock that is adding to the entropy. Else they would not be able to know one moment of the wheel's position from another. This is reminiscent of the so-called Maxwell's Demon scenario.

However, if we place the observer outside the box (and therefore outside the isolated system), the system's total entropy will remain on average unchanged while it is sealed.

While the system remains closed and the observer outside, there is nothing we can say about the state of entropy inside the box, nor about the flow of time in it. That is part of the definition of the system being isolated. We may even call it a "Schrödinger's Wheel".

However, when the box is finally opened and we observe that the angle of the wheel has changed, we can say that time has continued flowing inside the box even while it was isolated despite the fact that there was no sum change in entropy. One can debate definitions and whether a tree really falls in a forest when no one is there to hear it, but it certainly meets all the criteria of what we experience as time.

Therefore time and entropy are only loosely connected at best.

It is as much an indicator for time as smoke from a train's chimney is an indicator of the direction of the train's movement. Useful one, to be sure, but not a fool-proof one.

Sure, in general and disregarding wind gusts one can use it to make good educated guesses of which way the train is going, but that is not to say that the smoke explains why the train goes one way and not the other, or how it came to leave the station in the first place.

In short, as Dr. Dave Goldberg, Associate Professor of Physics at Drexel University, puts it: Most would say that time makes entropy increase, not that entropy creates time.[1]

The Geometric Model of Time presented here eliminates the need to use entropy as part of the explanation.

The author, as some others have expressed, feels the entropy explanation gives us a mathematical general, though incomplete, way of breaking up time's symmetry, but it comes up somewhat short of explaining the mechanism by which time has "chosen" the direction it did for entropy to increase, nor why time has to always move at all. Entropy increases forward in time because the higher number of ways

a system can be arranged more uniformly, but that leaves something very lacking in explaining why time moves in the first place. Furthermore, the entropy model can only explain the Arrow of Time when averaged over arbitrarily minimal spans of time and volumes of space, but not below those (i.e. not within smaller regions of space over shorter stretches of time).

## 4 An Alternative Model of Time

To avoid getting caught in everyday preconceptions of space and time as we are used to thinking of them let us dispense with the terms space and time and instead only use the terms dimensions  $x$ ,  $y$ ,  $z$ , and  $t$ , and momentarily let go of all our preconceived intuitive notions of time and think of it as simply another dimensional axis.

Likewise, instead of "speed of light" let us use only  $c$  to help let go of our everyday concept of speed as a function of distance traveled over time. Instead let us think of it as simply a universal, unchanging, inherent, axiomatic property of any object within space (i.e. - our universe). Let us refer to this property as  $C$ , instead of "velocity" and to its numeric value as  $c$ .

It is similar to the way an electron's "spin" isn't literally a spin as such, but rather just a designation for a property which is somewhat akin of our everyday experience of a spinning object.

I am asking you to let go of these notions not so much because they are less correct, but because it will make the visualizations easier.

### 4.1 Recap of some established facts

Special Theory of Relativity tells us that nothing can travel through space ( $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $z$  dimensions) faster than  $c$ .

But in the four-space  $x$ ,  $y$ ,  $z$ ,  $t$  no object can travel faster OR slower than  $c$ . There is no other speed. As one speeds up along  $x$ ,  $y$ , or  $z$ , one slows down in  $t$ . It is not a constant limit - it is a constant, period.

Mathematically, this is already sufficiently well-established to not warrant repetition here. Anyone not already convinced of this fact can find proof via simple math or by way of a rudimentary on-line search (e.g. - [2] [3] [4]).

Now, a frame transformation is equivalent to simply tilting the axes in a 4-dimensional graph[5].

In other words, mathematically speaking, space and time are completely equivalent and fully interchangeable (which should have already been intuitively obvious from the similarity of the two Lorentz transformations).

Of course, the naturally occurring question is - What, then, accounts for our distinctly different experience of what we call time as compared to what we refer to as space?

The answer proposed here is - nothing. Not fundamentally, anyway. Mathematically speaking, the only difference is the velocity at which we are traveling along each of these axes.

The proposal of GMT is that the numbers tell us the reality. The rest is perceptual bias resulting from nothing more than our own tremendous speed at which we are traveling through  $t$ . Furthermore, traveling along any "space" dimension at  $c$  makes THAT dimension indistinguishable from our concept of time. i.e. it becomes the traveling object's "time".

Likewise the former  $t$  dimensions simply becomes one of the object's "space" dimensions.

All massive objects appear to be traveling in the same direction of time because they are at least partially co-moving in the four-dimensional space. That is their  $t$  directions are at least partially lined up.

This may be somewhat hard to grasp intuitively at first. After all, you can see space, but you can't see time. And you can go back and forth in space, but time only flows one way, or so it seems.

To help get over that hump, consider for a moment looking at a passing car as it goes by you on a freeway at 100 miles per hour and the way your vision of it seems to smear. Now try to imagine doing it at over five and a half million times that speed, while the space between you also stretches to infinity and your mutual notions of time or even simultaneity no longer match.

Chances are, your imagination fails. Our brains and senses are simply not wired to think that way and there is no comparable experience.

Which demonstrates how our intuitive sense of those things is simply not enough to make such determinations.

So let us examine these perceptions and reconsider them.

As suggested before, one must stop thinking of speed in the terms we are used to as distance of space traveled in certain time.

That is a useful convention in everyday life where most familiar objects speed through time remains nearly constant relative to us, but it loses all meaning when discussed in relativistic terms.

Now let us examine the differences more methodically and address them individually.

## 5 Geometric Model of Time

In 1949 Gödel proved that time cannot exist in any universe described by Theory of Relativity.

Likewise the renowned John Wheeler and some of his colleagues have argued that since dimensions are selected arbitrarily, no specific dimension of time can exist. In fact, time appears to disappear, so to speak, in the Wheeler-DeWitt equation.

Let us consider a hypothetical rotationally-symmetrical 4-dimensional space. All properties of each of all four dimensions are identical in all aspects and their designations are chosen at random save that they are always perpendicular to each other. Let us also imagine that it is a requirement of this space for any object in it to have a vectorial property of constant value and varying direction which we shall refer to as  $C$  as stated in the beginning of this article (or "four-space velocity", if you prefer). We shall call its non-varying scalar component speed and call its constant value  $c$  and select its units to be  $c=100\%$ , or 1 (A.K.A. - natural units).

We may further call the direction of any object's velocity its  $t$ .

Of course regardless of  $t$ 's direction, one can always take that vector's component onto any non-perpendicular axis.

The Geometric Model of Time proposes that it is indeed thus in our universe and all other phenomenon we perceive as time or as distinct space are in fact manifestations of the above described system.

Again, all objects have constant speed equal to  $c$ , only their  $C$  direction varies (and this gives their designated  $t$ ).

Special Relativity shattered two previously held misconceptions about time - it showed that the center of time's coordinates, the "now", is not universal, and that the rate of time's flow is not universal. GMT goes further to state that nor is time's direction universal. And upon taking that view the non-universality of the apparent rate of flow becomes implied.

Let us look at two objects  $A$  and  $B$  on such a system whose expressions of  $C$  (four-space velocity vector) are precisely lined up with each other. i.e. - they are precisely co-moving in direction.

Since their speeds are already identical, they will appear to be stationary relative to each other. Before GMT we would describe this as the two of them moving at same rate though time and being stationary in space relative to each other.

In other words, both have their vector  $C$  expressed exclusively in each other's  $t$  direction.

Now let us consider A the observer and B changing its direction (while still maintaining constant speed  $c$ ) slightly at an angle compared to A (Figure 1).




Figure 1

To the observer such object would appear to:

1. Be moving along x, y, or z (let us randomly designate the direction as x)
2. Slowing down along the observer's t.

Note that the axes show the objects' velocities (using natural units, where  $c=1$  and  $v_t$  and  $v_x$  are fractions of 1) and not their positions as one may be used to from Minkowski's equations. Here  $v'_x$  is the object's speed through space (in observer's frame of reference) and  $v'_t$  is their rate of movement through time (i.e.- the speed at which their time moves from the stationary observer's perspective), defined as the ratio between the moving object's time lapsed and observer's time lapsed. <sup>2</sup>

Notice that as B changes direction while its vector size remains the same and its angle relative to the A's vector changes, its tip traces out a circle of radius  $c$  around its base.

Of course, for practical reasons shown by Special Relativity (namely an objects relative mass increasing toward infinity as it speeds up in x and putting a cap on the vector veering more than 90 degrees) the shape is actually capped off at a semi-circle on the positive side of  $v_t$ .

As the vector angles away from the observer, its component onto the original  $v_t$  and  $v_x$  shrink and expand accordingly and can be given as follows:

$$v'_t = c * \cos(\sin^{-1} \frac{v'_x}{c}) \tag{1}$$

---

<sup>2</sup>If the reader prefers, we could easily formulate the same graph using "time" and distance traveled instead. If we use equivalent units (e.g.- seconds for time and light-seconds for space) or simply use Mankowski's convention of using "ct" instead of "t", then the velocity vector marked "c" in Figure 1 simply becomes always equal to t instead.



or, since  $c = 1$ :

$$v'_t = \cos(\sin^{-1} v'_x) \tag{2}$$

This demonstrates that the notions of a universal time which always flows in one direction, a fourth dimension that is somehow different from the other three, or even the concept of "time" in general, are all concepts completely unnecessary for the proper description of the universe. In other words, there is no evidence for the existence of any of any of these.

Of course, there is no evidence that any of these do not exist, either. But physical sciences only deal with things that have physical manifestation. Theretofore the question is irrelevant.

What, then are the advantages of this new description and what new answers or perspectives it can provide?

Let us look.

## **6 Why we appear to be able to move in time only in one direction**

GMT shows one can actually freely travel in either direction along any of the dimensions, including t.

Reversing direction in space, by definition, requires first decelerating and passing the zero speed point, even if for an instant, and then continuing acceleration in same direction, opposite from the original direction. Since all objects with mass with which we are familiar with are already traveling in what we usually consider the forward direction of t, in order to reverse direction they must first slow down in t to a stop and then pass it.

Since one cannot travel at any speed other than c, slowing down to zero in t requires speeding up in one of the other dimension to c. However, this is not possible since it would require an object with mass an infinite amount of energy. That is to say reversing direction in time is possible, but according to Special Theory of Relativity is simply not achievable without infinite supply of energy.

## **7 Why one particular direction and not the other**

The reason all observable physical objects appear to move in the same direction in time is that any object that happened to travel in the opposite direction at the moment of the Big Bang continues to get further from us in t with same difficulty in changing direction and therefore never intersects our path.

An experiment by Julian Barbour of the University of Oxford, Tim Koslowski of the University of New Brunswick and Flavio Mercati of the Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics involving a miniature simulated universe showed the spontaneous creation of two universes moving apart in different directions away from the experimental Big Bang moment[6].

Sean Carroll (ironically, a popular proponent of the entropy model of the Arrow of Time) and Jennifer Chen of Caltech suggested similar scenario in 2004[7]. Carroll and Alan Guth, father of the Inflationary Theory, have also announced they are currently working on such a model[8].

## 8 Why we can see space but not time

For a start, we cannot see space either. What we see are objects IN space. The problem is one can never observe anything directly. We can only receive particles arriving to us from an event. And the particles can not arrive at us faster then at  $c$ .

According to GMT, time is actually no more than our word for whatever direction we are traveling in at the speed of light in relation to local space (defined later herein).

Let's look at what happens when you try to look at an event while moving away from it at the speed of light -  $c$ . The light arriving to you will experience the typical redshift due to the Doppler Effect in the same manner as observed with remote galaxies subject to Hubble's law.

The equations for radial redshift are given as:

$$f_{observed} = f_{emitted} / \sqrt{\frac{1 + \frac{v}{c}}{1 - \frac{v}{c}}} \quad (3)$$

and

$$\lambda_{emitted} = \lambda_{observed} / \sqrt{\frac{1 + \frac{v}{c}}{1 - \frac{v}{c}}} \quad (4)$$

As one can easily see, this means that as the velocity  $v$  gets closer to  $c$ , the observed wavelength tends toward infinity and the solution becomes completely meaningless (due to division by zero) as  $v$  becomes  $c$ .

As wavelength moves toward infinity, frequency tends toward zero. A wave of infinite length and zero frequency is not a wave at all. It is a static field. In other words - it can deliver no ongoing information about the emitting object.

The situation with looking forward is reversed, but essentially the same. The wavelength becomes zero and the frequency infinite, making it as impossible to use the light to see the emitting event.

Of course "seeing" need not be literal. Any means of observation will do. So what about observing the future or past by use of other, slower than light, particles or objects?

A quick look demonstrates it is not much different.

When looking forward we are already subject to the universal speed limit  $c$ , thus using slower particles changes nothing. Looking backwards at an event from which we are receding at  $c$  using slower than  $c$  particles emitting or bouncing from it means said particles simply never catch up with us. We are moving away from the information faster than the information is coming to us.

Thus, the only way to see either backwards or forwards in a direction one is traveling along at  $c$  (i.e. - in time) is via faster-than-light communications, forbidden by relativity.

So much for seeing the past or future.

That having been said, the word is still out on tachyons. If, however, they do exist, one could indeed use them to get information - that is, to see - across time.

## 9 Why we can remember the past, but not the future

The answer to this question seems to escape us specifically because it is so exceedingly simple.

Best way one can put it is: For the same reason you can see your footprints in the sand behind you but not in front of you.

In other words, within GMT causality still applies.

Let us consider a line. We can name its end points A and C and any third point somewhere between them B.

We can say that A is the beginning of the line and C as the end, or the other way around. But what we cannot argue against is that B will still remain sequentially between them.

So if we have a vector pointing from A to C, the sequence will always be A-B-C and no other.


This will be true whether we are talking about time or space.

Thus if an observer is moving from A to C, at any given B between them all points between A and B will "precede" B and therefore can have causal affect with B and all points between B and C cannot.

This may be what a team of researchers at the Scientific Research Centre Bistra in Ptuj, Slovenia is talking about when they say that time is: "the numerical order of material change". Unfortunately they seem to provide no clear definition of it and scant clarification. Oddly, they also seem to alternately confirm that Minkowski space is inherently 4D and draw the opposite conclusions from their claims, stating time is completely separate from space.[9]

## 10 GMT and Gravitational Time Dilation

But time dilation and length contraction also happen due to gravity and not only motion. So we must examine if GMT still holds in such circumstance.



lic domain image

Pub-

Figure 2

Einstein's General Theory of Relativity tells us that mass warps space. In the common 2-dimensional attempt to visualize this effect shown in Figure 2, we see the grid-lines bend, but more importantly to our case, they also stretch out and move further and further apart from each other inside the gravity well. If we were to now recreate Figure 1 to demonstrate GMT in conditions inside a gravity well, this would have the effect of stretching out the scales on all axes. This would have the same effect as the elongation of distances (or, alternatively, as the shortening of the moving object by comparison, as more commonly expressed in relativistic length contraction equations) and of an object seeming to move through time slower. This is completely consistent with General Relativity (see Figure 3).




Figure 3

As in Figure 1, object A in Figure 3 is stationary relative to an observer, and object B is in motion. Both are inside a gravity well. Both appear to experience time dilation and length contraction relative to a hypothetical observer outside the gravity well in flat space. B also shows space expansion (i.e. - length contraction) and time dilation relative to A.

In other words, GMT still holds in full consistence with Theory of Relativity in warped space as well as it does in flat.

## 11 Time motion relative to what?

Since we are speaking of  $V_t$  for the observer themselves, an immediate questions that should come up is: "motion relative to what"?

The answer is - relative to local space.

The debate about the existence or non-existence of Absolute Space goes back to at least the time of Newton and Leibniz, but we need not necessarily stipulate Absolute Space as such. There need not necessarily be a universal frame of reference. One need only move relative to LOCAL space in order for this concept to make sense. By "local space" is meant the space in the immediate vicinity of the object's motion.

According to Newton: "Absolute Space in its own nature, without regard to anything external, remains always similar and immovable." But, of course, we now know it to be far from uniformly similar and immovable. Hubble's law and gravity

wells are some examples.

In other words, Absolute Space is commonly thought of as a uniform universal frame of reference, which cannot actually exist when space itself constantly changes in one location relative to another.

Space does, however, exist. We know space to have properties such as vacuum energy and positive or negative pressure. It can warp, shrink, and expand. It is not a nothingness.

Therefore it is quite conceivable that an object may be able to move relative to the space in its immediate vicinity at any given instance.

And that is exactly what is meant here by "local space".

Indeed, this is very reminiscent of the old aether concept, the existence of which was presumably disproved by the Michelson-Morley and subsequent experiments. But that is because the experiment was attempting to determine the direction of the earth's movement relative to this imaginary aether by comparing the difference in the velocities on one side of earth with that on the other, the assumption being that if the earth is flying through the aether, then one side is spinning with motion and one against it.

But we already know from GMT the velocity of ALL objects in the universe (such as measuring apparatuses on different sides of the earth) is ALWAYS  $c$ . So no such difference could ever be measured.

The experiment doesn't even factor in time, naturally assuming that space is 3D and all objects move through "time" one one direction. But if we take the model proposed by GMT, the experiment becomes pointless.

This point is so crucial, it must be restated: The reason experiments cannot measure the motion of an object relative to space is that this motion is always  $c$ , regardless of the object in question or the frame of reference.

Likewise, the motion of massless particles, such as EM radiation, can be thought of as always being perpendicular to that of mass particles, and therefore will always measure at  $c$  relation to a massive observer.

Some will feel that is the same as the argument for Absolute Space or a Preferred Frame. And indeed GMT implies space to be a Preferred Frame. However, in GMT no object can be stationary in this Preferred Frame, only space itself. In fact, no object can move in reference to it at any speed other than  $c$ .

No doubt, many will feel reluctance to bring back such seemingly archaic notions. Yet if one models time as a 4th dimension, whether as merely a mathematical tool or otherwise, such as in General Relativity, one fact remains undeniable and must be contended with - in such four-space the speed of any object relative to the coordinates always equals to  $c$ . Not zero. Not even unknown. Therefore such Preferred Frame MUST exist.

An alternative way to think about it is the one hinted at at the beginning of this paper. Since velocity is an axiom, one can think of it as simply an inherent, scalar unchanging property of all physical objects in our universe. In it's purest form it is not relative to anything. It just is. Although it's individual vectorial components CAN be taken relative to another object or vector.

It is a property that is an absolute requirement for any physical object in our universe. Moving at  $c$  through our four-space is simply synonymous with existing in it. If there is something that does not meet this requirement, it simply does not meet the current definition of physical existence.

Undoubtedly, this will be the most difficult shift in thinking to confront in understanding the concepts presented within this paper. It is highly counter-intuitive due tho the way we have been programmed to think about motion.

In everyday life we are used to thinking of distance and time as being axioms, their units defined by standards (such as a calendar increments, a king's foot, or a prototype platinum-iridium bar) and speed being defined as distance per time.

The modern scientific definition, however, leaves time and speed as axioms, their units defined by standards (decay of cesium 133 atom and speed of light in vacuum). Distance, in turn is defined via those.

But, of course, one could flip those definitions and take distance and speed to be axiomatic and define time using those.

GMT does exactly that, but then gets rid for time as a separate concept altogether. Velocity remains as much of an axiom as it already was.

We can continue to define the units of speed as fractions of  $c$  and units of distance as an integer number of Planck's lengths. Planck's length itself is a standard and can not be defined.

In fact if all the Planck's lengths in the universe suddenly doubled in size, and the universe along with it, we would have no way to tell.

## 12 Simplicity and symmetry

GMT's elegance (meaning simplicity and symmetry) manifests in other ways.

For example, currently, in order to describe a motion vector we need to specify three variables:

1. The direction of the vector
2. The rate of change along a "space" dimension
3. The rate of change along the "time" dimension

With GMT we need only specify the vector's direction.

Since the speed is constant, it need not be specified. The vector's component onto any specific axis is also already implied in the above information.

Another example is the fact that Minkowski's specially-defined space-time distance  $\Delta S$  now becomes simply "distance".

In another illustration take the concepts of time as space and accept them as being described as two different types of dimensions as is done in General Relativity.

For this we need to define or accept as axioms three terms:

1. The concept of space.
2. The concept of time.
3. The concept of dimension. For since both time and space are described as dimensions, but are not identical, the concept of dimension itself is a separate distinction.

In GMT, on the other hand, not only is "time" eliminated, but as a consequence we no longer have to distinguish between "space" and "dimension". The two become synonymous.

In addition, in GMT there is no longer need for the opposite sign in front of one of the dimensions as opposed to the other three, like in Minkowski's equations.

Where Minkowski's reads:

$$x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - ict^2 = 2 \tag{5}$$

GMT's equivalent, when using same units (where sec.=lightsec., etc.) all around , would be:

$$v_x^2 + v_y^2 + v_z^2 + v_t^2 = c^2 \tag{6}$$

eliminating that awkward asymmetry.

And when specifically using natural units, just:

$$v_x^2 + v_y^2 + v_z^2 + v_t^2 = 1 \tag{7}$$

And if one must have fixed distances instead of rates of motion, then one simply multiplies each variable by t - time elapsed in observer's frame of reference, before incorporating it into the equation, making it:

$$x'^2 + y'^2 + z'^2 + t'^2 = t^2 \tag{8}$$

Where  $x'$ ,  $y'$ ,  $z'$ , and  $t'$  are distances traveled in each dimension by a relatively-moving object and  $t$  is distance traveled by observer in its own time direction.

### 13 Falsifiability

In its current state, GMT is primarily a new interpretation of existing information. As such it may be in same standing as Hugh Everett's so-called Many-Worlds



interpretation of quantum physics as an alternative to the older Copenhagen interpretation.

Its usefulness comes from explaining more elegantly some of the existing known phenomenon and addressing some of the unanswered questions from the other models of time.

Unlike the above mentioned quantum physics interpretations, however, GMT is not inherently untestable.

For example, Charles R. Keeton of Rutgers and Arlie O. Petters of Duke developed a way to test for the existence of a 4th space dimension by looking for tell-tale miniature black holes within our own solar system[10]. National Science Foundation is funding their research which, as of last update, is awaiting data from the Fermi Gamma-ray Space Telescope (formerly Gamma-ray Large Area Space Telescope) launched by NASA in 2008.

Their methodology relates to a relatively-large curled-up dimension resulting from interpretations of a Randall-Sundrum brane-world model and therefore may not directly applicable for testing for 4-dimensional space as described by GMT, but it demonstrates the potential for such tests.<sup>3</sup>

Only time will tell (no pun intended) which models will hold in light of new discoveries. Meanwhile it is the author's hope it may at the very least give new direction for further research.

## 14 Possible scenarios for testability

As stated by Hubble's Law - the space in our universe is known to be expanding at approximately 68 m/sec per Megaparsec.

If time indeed exists as no more than a 4th dimension of space with no one of said four dimensions being unique, then the Geometric Model of Time predicts that time must also be expanding at same rate (adjusted for units, where 1 sec. = 1 light-second).

Let us take two objects (see Figure 4) A and B which are stationary relative to each other within space. That is to say there is no relative motion between them EXCEPT due to the expansion of space.

---

<sup>3</sup>The two scenarios are not mutually exclusive and if Keeton/Petters team's turns out proven, we may actually be in a 5-large-dimensional space with one dimension curled up and 4 flat. Author currently in dialog with Dr. Keeton to determine any unlikely overlaps in testability.




Figure 4

We start with A at  $t = 0$  and  $x = 0$ , and with B distance  $x = x_2$  away from it and also at  $t = 0$  (from A's perspective and using same definition of simultaneity as given originally by Einstein).

Now, let us consider the two objects at time  $t_2$  later.

A is now at  $t = t_2$  and  $x = 0$  (marked  $A_2$ ). In a static universe B would now be at  $t = t_2$  and  $x = x_2$  (shown as  $B_2$ ). However, in an expanding universe such as ours B would be at some larger distance  $x'_2$ .

And if, as the Geometric Model of Time predicts, time is indistinct from space than it should also be further away on the t axis by equal amount at a  $t = t'_2$  (marked by  $B'_2$ ).

That means that from A's perspective B traveled further in time. That is to say that to A it would appear as though time is moving faster for B.

Finding confirmation of this would serve as evidence for the validity of this Geometrical Model of Time.

## 15 Conclusion

A purely geometric interpretation of time and space, where there is no distinction between any of the four dimensions is consistent with Theory of Relativity and other observations, while providing a much simplified and more elegant description than currently generally accepted models.

## 16 Looking Forward

GMT also opens possibilities for new models or interpretations of other phenomenon, currently under development by the author, such as a reinterpretation of rest mass

as a kinetic energy of to the motion of an object through the t dimension, giving  $E = Mc^2$  a much more literal interpretation.

## References

- [1] Goldberg, Dave (2010, October 21). Does entropy increase with time or does it make time?. *Gizmodo*. Retrieved from <http://io9.gizmodo.com/5667872/does-entropy-increase-with-time-or-does-it-make-time>
- [2] Guy Gur-Ari (<http://physics.stackexchange.com/users/10965/guy-gur-ari>), Why are objects at rest in motion through spacetime at the speed of light?, URL (version: 2012-08-10): <http://physics.stackexchange.com/q/33862>
- [3] Mark M (<http://physics.stackexchange.com/users/11176/mark-m>), Why are objects at rest in motion through spacetime at the speed of light?, URL (version: 2012-08-10): <http://physics.stackexchange.com/q/3385>
- [4] Alik Vitali Perakh (<http://physics.stackexchange.com/users/99290/alik-vitali-perakh>), Why are objects at rest in motion through spacetime at the speed of light?, URL (version: 2015-11-22):
- [5] Lieber, L. R. and Lieber, H. G. *The Einstein Theory of Relativity*, 2008 edition. First Paul Dry Books, 1945, Philadelphia. p. 350. Print.
- [6] Barbour, Julian and Koslowski, Tim and Mercati, Flavio (2014). "Identification of a Gravitational Arrow of Time". *Physical Review Letters*, 113(18), 181101.
- [7] Carroll, Sean. *From Eternity to Here*. Penguin Group (USA) Inc., 2010. p. 361. Print.
- [8] Billings, Lee (2014, December 8). 2 Futures Can Explain Time's Mysterious Past. *Scientific American*. Retrieved from <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/2-futures-can-explain-time-s-mysterious-past/>
- [9] Amrit Sorli, Davide Fisaletti, and Dusan Klinar, (2011)."Replacing time with numerical order of material change resolves Zeno problems of motion". *Physics Essays*
- [10] Charles R. Keeton and Arlie O. Petters, (May 24, 2006)."Formalism for testing theories of gravity using lensing by compact objects. III. Braneworld gravity". *Physical Review D*