Title: Dynamic Time: The "Missing Link" in the Search for a Unified Theory?

Date: Apr 21, 2006 10:00 AM

URL: http://pirsa.org/06040021

Abstract: While modern theories lavishly invoke several spatial dimensions within models that seek to unify relativity theory and quantum mechanics, none seems to consider the possibility that a yet-unfamiliar aspect of time may do the work. I introduce the notion of Becoming and then consider its consequences for physical theory. Becoming portrays a possible aspect of time that is "curled" very much like the extra spatial dimensions in superstring theories. Within the resulting picture of spacetime, some fundamental aspects of quantum mechanics, special and general relativity, thermodynamics and modern cosmology fit in very naturally. The proposed model is not yet a scientific theory as it still lacks a rigorous formalism and experimental predictions, yet it points out an entire family of possible theories that merit serious consideration.

Spacetime Dynamics as a Possible Link between Quantum Mechanics and Relativity

Avshalom C. Elitzur Bar-Ilan University and Shahar Dolev Hebrew University



Becoming, Reality's Most Evaded Element

Block Universe? Presentism? Neither.

- Block Universe? Presentism? Neither.
- The Clue of Quantum Temporal Paradoxes

- Block Universe? Presentism? Neither.
- The Clue of Quantum Temporal Paradoxes
- The Hypothesis of Becoming and its Consequence

- Block Universe? Presentism? Neither.
- The Clue of Quantum Temporal Paradoxes
- The Hypothesis of Becoming and its Consequence
 - Spacetime "Growth"

- Block Universe? Presentism? Neither.
- The Clue of Quantum Temporal Paradoxes
- The Hypothesis of Becoming and its Consequence
 - Spacetime "Growth"
 - Wave Function Preceding Spacetime

- Block Universe? Presentism? Neither.
- The Clue of Quantum Temporal Paradoxes
- The Hypothesis of Becoming and its Consequence
 - Spacetime "Growth"
 - Wave Function Preceding Spacetime
 - Relativistic Effects Dynamized

- Block Universe? Presentism? Neither.
- The Clue of Quantum Temporal Paradoxes
- The Hypothesis of Becoming and its Consequence
 - Spacetime "Growth"
 - Wave Function Preceding Spacetime
 - Relativistic Effects Dynamized
 - Clues for Field Theories







Time: The Relativistic View All Events Coexist along Time

Time: The Relativistic View All Events Coexist along Time































The Block Universe Account of Time

All events – past, present and future – have the same degree of existence. There is no privileged "Now."

An Alternative to Block Universe: Presentism

Only present events are real. The idea of four dimensions and notions such as "spacetime" and "world line" are mere metaphors.

The Cure is Worse than the Disease

It is highly unlikely that all the relativistic relations are mere coincidences

Spacetime is a physical entity, interacting with mass and giving rise to curvatures, singularities, etc.
The Cure is Worse than the Disease

It is highly unlikely that all the relativistic relations are mere coincidences

Spacetime is a physical entity, interacting with mass and giving rise to curvatures, singularities, etc.

 It might entail a yet higher time (How fast does the "Now" move?) and so on to infinity of times

- It might entail a yet higher time (How fast does the "Now" move?) and so on to infinity of times
- 2. It seems to entail absolute simultaneity

Extra spatial dimensions

- Extra spatial dimensions
- Hyperspaces

- Extra spatial dimensions
- Hyperspaces
- Multiverse

- Extra spatial dimensions
- Hyperspaces
- Multiverse
- Etc.

All within the Block Universe!











 t_0 : Cat and deadly machine sealed in box

Pirsa: 06040021

Page 52/209



 t_1 : Lethal event occurring or not occurring

 t_0 : Cat and deadly machine sealed in box

Pirsa: 06040021



 t_{f} : Cat dead and decomposing

 t_1 : Lethal event occurring or not occurring

 t_0 : Cat and deadly machine sealed in box



 t_{f} : Cat dead and decomposing

OR



 t_{f} : Cat alive, but lean and unhappy

 t_1 : Lethal event occurring or not occurring

 t_0 : Cat and deadly machine sealed in box

• (HBT, 1958) Interference of two distant sources:



- (HBT, 1958) Interference of two distant sources:
 - Coherent light emitted by two sources



Pirsa: 06040021



- (HBT, 1958) Interference of two distant sources:
 - Coherent light emitted by two sources
 - 2. Light is split by the beam splitter



• (HBT, 1958) Interference of two distant sources:

- Coherent light emitted by two sources
- 2. Light is split by the beam splitter
- 3. Interference
- 4. All light reaches the same detector



• (HBT, 1958) Interference of two distant sources:

- Coherent light emitted by two sources
- 2. Light is split by the beam splitter
- 3. Interference
- 4. All light reaches the same detector



- (HBT, 1958) Interference of two distant sources:
 - Coherent light emitted by two sources
 - 2. Light is split by the beam splitter
 - 3. Interference
 - 4. All light reaches the same detector



 Even when the sources are so weak to produce a single photon at a time!



Pirsa: 06040021



1. An atom is prepared to be in the state $|y\uparrow>$



Pirsa: 06040021





- An atom is prepared to be in the state |y↑>
- 2. It is then split by a Stern-Gerlach Magnet into $|x\downarrow>$ and $|x\uparrow>$





- An atom is prepared to be in the state |y↑>
- 2. It is then split by a Stern-Gerlach Magnet into $|x\downarrow>$ and $|x\uparrow>$





- An atom is prepared to be in the state |y↑>
- 2. It is then split by a Stern-Gerlach Magnet into $|x\downarrow>$ and $|x\uparrow>$
- The two halves of the wave function are confined into boxes







- An atom is prepared to be in the state |y↑>
- 2. It is then split by a Stern-Gerlach Magnet into $|x\downarrow>$ and $|x\uparrow>$
- The two halves of the wave function are confined into boxes
- That are transparent for photons but opaque for the atoms





- An atom is prepared to be in the state |y↑>
- 2. It is then split by a Stern-Gerlach Magnet into $|x\downarrow>$ and $|x\uparrow>$
- The two halves of the wave function are confined into boxes
- That are transparent for photons but opaque for the atoms
- One of the boxes is placed on one arm of an interferometer

- An atom is prepared to be in the state |y↑>
- 2. It is then split by a Stern-Gerlach Magnet into $|x\downarrow>$ and $|x\uparrow>$
- The two halves of the wave function are confined into boxes
- That are transparent for photons but opaque for the atoms
- One of the boxes is placed on one arm of an interferometer
- 6. Such that if the atom is in that box and if the photon passes in that arm, absorption occurs with probability 1.

|x^> **○** |x↓>

- An atom is prepared to be in the state |y↑>
- 2. It is then split by a Stern-Gerlach Magnet into $|x\downarrow>$ and $|x\uparrow>$
- The two halves of the wave function are confined into boxes
- That are transparent for photons but opaque for the atoms
- One of the boxes is placed on one arm of an interferometer
- 6. Such that if the atom is in that box and if the photon passes in that arm, absorption occurs with probability 1.

he

- An atom is prepared to be in the state |y↑>
- 2. It is then split by a Stern-Gerlach Magnet into $|x\downarrow>$ and $|x\uparrow>$
- The two halves of the wave function are confined into boxes
- That are transparent for photons but opaque for the atoms
- One of the boxes is placed on one arm of an interferometer
- 6. Such that if the atom is in that box and if the photon passes in that arm, absorption occurs with probability 1.



- 1. An atom is prepared to be in the state $|y\uparrow>$
- 2. It is then split by a Stern-Gerlach Magnet into $|x\downarrow>$ and $|x\uparrow>$
- The two halves of the wave function are confined into boxes
- That are transparent for photons but opaque for the atoms
- One of the boxes is placed on one arm of an interferometer
- 6. Such that if the atom is in that box and if the photon passes in that arm, absorption occurs with probability 1.




- An atom is prepared to be in the state |y↑>
- 2. It is then split by a Stern-Gerlach Magnet into $|x\downarrow>$ and $|x\uparrow>$
- The two halves of the wave function are confined into boxes
- That are transparent for photons but opaque for the atoms
- One of the boxes is placed on one arm of an interferometer
- 6. Such that if the atom is in that box and if the photon passes in that arm, absorption occurs with probability 1.
- 7. Two Hardy atoms can be entangled into an EPR pair

 \bigcirc \bigcirc

The Hardy Atom

- An atom is prepared to be in the state |y↑>
- 2. It is then split by a Stern-Gerlach Magnet into $|x\downarrow>$ and $|x\uparrow>$
- The two halves of the wave function are confined into boxes
- That are transparent for photons but opaque for the atoms
- One of the boxes is placed on one arm of an interferometer
- 6. Such that if the atom is in that box and if the photon passes in that arm, absorption occurs with probability 1.
- 7. Two Hardy atoms can be entangled into an EPR pair

100 100

 \bigcirc \bigcirc

(Elitzur, Dolev & Zeilinger 2001)



(Elitzur, Dolev & Zeilinger 2001)







1. Two Hardy atoms in *x*-spin superposition (but not entangled)

he

11 11 1215



(Elitzur, Dolev & Zeilinger 2001)



1. Two Hardy atoms in *x*-spin superposition (but not entangled)

(Elitzur, Dolev & Zeilinger 2001)



- 1. Two Hardy atoms in *x*-spin superposition (but not entangled)
- 2. "Forbidden" detector clicks
- 3. Where did the photon come from? Ignorance begets entanglement!

(Elitzur, Dolev & Zeilinger 2001)



- 1. Two Hardy atoms in *x*-spin superposition (but not entangled)
- 2. "Forbidden" detector clicks
- 3. Where did the photon come from? Ignorance begets entanglement!

(Elitzur, Dolev & Zeilinger 2001)



- 1. Two Hardy atoms in *x*-spin superposition (but not entangled)
- 2. "Forbidden" detector clicks
- 3. Where did the photon come from? Ignorance begets entanglement!

1 1 2015

(Elitzur, Dolev & Zeilinger 2001)



- 1. Two Hardy atoms in *x*-spin superposition (but not entangled)
- 2. "Forbidden" detector clicks
- 3. Where did the photon come from? Ignorance begets entanglement!





1. Two Hardy atoms in *x*-spin superposition (but not entangled)





1. Two Hardy atoms in *x*-spin superposition (but not entangled)





1. Two Hardy atoms in *x*-spin superposition (but not entangled)





1. Two Hardy atoms in *x*-spin superposition (but not entangled)



(Elitzur, Dolev & Zeilinger 2001)



- 1. Two Hardy atoms in *x*-spin superposition (but not entangled)
- 2. "Forbidden" detector clicks
- 3. Where did the photon come from? Ignorance begets entanglement!
- The atoms are entangled (i.e. violate Bell's Inequality)

(Elitzur, Dolev & Zeilinger 2001)



- 1. Two Hardy atoms in *x*-spin superposition (but not entangled)
- 2. "Forbidden" detector clicks
- 3. Where did the photon come from? Ignorance begets entanglement!
- 4. The atoms are entangled (i.e. violate Bell's Inequality)

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|x_1 \uparrow \rangle | x_2 \downarrow \rangle - |x_1 \downarrow \rangle | x_2 \uparrow \rangle \right)$

- 1. Two Hardy atoms in *x*-spin superposition (but not entangled)
- 2. "Forbidden" detector clicks
- 3. Where did the photon come from? Ignorance begets entanglement!
- The atoms are entangled (i.e. violate Bell's Inequality)
- 5. Giving rise to EPR with the entangling event not in the past but in the future

(Elitzur, Dolev & Zeilinger 2001)



- 1. Two Hardy atoms in *x*-spin superposition (but not entangled)
- 2. "Forbidden" detector clicks
- 3. Where did the photon come from? Ignorance begets entanglement!
- The atoms are entangled (i.e. violate Bell's Inequality)
- 5. Giving rise to EPR with the entangling event not in the past but in the future

... or better call it: RPE

The Bell Inequality Violations

The results predicted by QM:

Measured Directions		Correlation
00	00	100%
300	300	100%
00	-300	75%
300	00	75%
-300	300	25% !
300	-300	25% !





 To prove non-locality, test the two Hardy atoms for Bell Inequality





- To prove non-locality, test the two Hardy atoms for Bell Inequality
- Use Spin measurement in 3 directions relative to the x-axis: 0°, 30°, and -30°

Pirsa: 06040021





- To prove non-locality, test the two Hardy atoms for Bell Inequality
- Use Spin measurement in 3 directions relative to the x-axis: 0°, 30°, and -30°
- For 0⁰, just inspect the two boxes ("which box" measurement)



- To prove non-locality, test the two Hardy atoms for Bell Inequality
- Use Spin measurement in 3 directions relative to the x-axis: 0°, 30°, and -30°
- For 0^o, just inspect the two boxes ("which box" measurement)
- For 30° and -30° directions, reunite the boxes, then split according to desired direction, and finally measure position



- To prove non-locality, test the two Hardy atoms for Bell Inequality
- Use Spin measurement in 3 directions relative to the x-axis: 0°, 30°, and -30°
- For 0^o, just inspect the two boxes ("which box" measurement)
- For 30° and -30° directions, reunite the boxes, then split according to desired direction, and finally measure position



- To prove non-locality, test the two Hardy atoms for Bell Inequality
- Use Spin measurement in 3 directions relative to the x-axis: 0°, 30°, and -30°
- For 0⁰, just inspect the two boxes ("which box" measurement)
- For 30° and -30° directions, reunite the boxes, then split according to desired direction, and finally measure position



- To prove non-locality, test the two Hardy atoms for Bell Inequality
- Use Spin measurement in 3 directions relative to the x-axis: 0°, 30°, and -30°
- For 0^o, just inspect the two boxes ("which box" measurement)
- For 30° and -30° directions, reunite the boxes, then split according to desired direction, and finally measure position





 0° direction ("which box") measurement allows only one history for the photon











 0° direction ("which box") measurement on the left atom

Pirsa: 06040021





 0° direction ("which box") measurement on the left atom

Pirsa: 06040021





- 0° direction ("which box") measurement on the left atom
- But a different direction (30⁰, -30⁰) measurement on the right atom



- 0° direction ("which box") measurement on the left atom
- But a different direction (30⁰, -30⁰) measurement on the right atom

Pirsa: 06040021





- 0° direction ("which box") measurement on the left atom
- But a different direction (30⁰, -30⁰) measurement on the right atom


- 0° direction ("which box") measurement on the left atom
- But a different direction (30⁰, -30⁰) measurement on the right atom
- Here too, there are Bell Inequality violations...





- 0° direction ("which box") measurement on the left atom
- But a different direction (30⁰, -30⁰) measurement on the right atom
- Here too, there are Bell Inequality violations...
- Which require a non-local effect between the left and the right atoms!



So, you end up with the following history:

- One atom is found to have blocked the photon's path.

- One atom is found to have blocked the photon's path.
- Hence, it appears that it could not interact with the other atom,

- One atom is found to have blocked the photon's path.
- Hence, it appears that it could not interact with the other atom,
- and therefore should not be entangled with it.

- One atom is found to have blocked the photon's path.
- Hence, it appears that it could not interact with the other atom,
- and therefore should not be entangled with it.
- But, by violating Bell's inequality, its "having blocked the photon" was affected by the measurement of the other atom!

So, you end up with the following history:

- One atom is found to have blocked the photon's path.
- Hence, it appears that it could not interact with the other atom,
- and therefore should not be entangled with it.
- But, by violating Bell's inequality, its "having blocked the photon" was affected by the measurement of the other atom!

Which is logically equivalent to saying...

THIS SENTENCE HAS NEVER BEEN WRITTEN :-)







Pirsa: 06040021







Pirsa: 06040021



 Two excited atoms A1 and A2 reside in cavities facing a beamsplitter











- Two excited atoms A1 and A2 reside in cavities facing a beamsplitter
- One detector clicks, source of the photon uncertain







- Two excited atoms A1 and A2 reside in cavities facing a beamsplitter
- One detector clicks, source of the photon uncertain





111111



- Two excited atoms A1 and A2 reside in cavities facing a beamsplitter
- One detector clicks, source of the photon uncertain





1111



- Two excited atoms A1 and A2 reside in cavities facing a beamsplitter
- One detector clicks, source of the photon uncertain





1 10



- $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|A1^*\rangle|A2\rangle |A1\rangle|A2^*\rangle)$



- Two excited atoms A1 and A2 reside in cavities facing a beamsplitter
- One detector clicks, source of the photon uncertain
- Thereby entangling the two atoms



 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|A1^*\rangle|A2\rangle - |A1\rangle|A2^*\rangle)$





- Two excited atoms A1 and A2 reside in cavities facing a beamsplitter
- One detector clicks, source of the photon uncertain
- Thereby entangling the two atoms
- An orthogonal measurement to excited/ground is introduced







- Two excited atoms A1 and A2 reside in cavities facing a beamsplitter
- One detector clicks, source of the photon uncertain
- Thereby entangling the two atoms
- An orthogonal measurement to excited/ground is introduced
- EPR
- Bell-inequality violated







- Two excited atoms A1 and A2 reside in cavities facing a beamsplitter
- One detector clicks, source of the photon uncertain
- Thereby entangling the two atoms
- An orthogonal measurement to excited/ground is introduced
- EPR
- Bell-inequality violated
- The liar paradox all over again

 One atom is found to be excited, which seems to indicate that it emitted no photon

- One atom is found to be excited, which seems to indicate that it emitted no photon
- Hence, it could not interact with the other atom and should not be entangled with it.

- One atom is found to be excited, which seems to indicate that it emitted no photon
- Hence, it could not interact with the other atom and should not be entangled with it.
- But, by violating Bell's inequality, its "having preserved its photon" is due to entanglement with the other atom!

Properties of a Quantum System between Measurements (Aharonov et al.)

- One atom is found to be excited, which seems to indicate that it emitted no photon
- Hence, it could not interact with the other atom and should not be entangled with it.
- But, by violating Bell's inequality, its "having preserved its photon" is due to entanglement with the other atom!

Properties of a Quantum System between Measurements (Aharonov et al.)

Properties of a Quantum System between Measurements (Aharonov *et al.*)

"Every quantum event is visited twice, once by the state vector coming from the pre-selection and then again by the vector coming backwards from the post-selection" (Aharonov, personal communication).





Pirsa: 06040021







The Road Less Traveled

The Assumption of Becoming

Events are created anew, one after another, in spacetime, according to their causal order. At any moment in time which one perceives as "Now," future events are not only unknown but objectively inexistent, to be created later as the Now "advances."

Becoming – The Ultimate Compactification?
Becoming – The Ultimate Compactification?

Becoming – The Ultimate Compactification?

It may make work just as well as extra space dimensions

Becoming – The Ultimate Compactification?

It may make work just as well as extra space dimensions

Where there are no events, there is neither space nor time (Mach)

Where there are no events, there is neither space nor time (Mach)

If there are no future events at any "Now," there is no spacetime in the future either. Spacetime must be "growing" in the future direction

Where there are no events, there is neither space nor time (Mach)

If there are no future events at any "Now," there is no spacetime in the future either. Spacetime must be "growing" in the future direction

A Cosmological Ring

A Cosmological Ring

Spacetime is preceded and bounded by nothingness

No Threat of Infinite Times

No Threat of Infinite Times

Let presentism hold for the 4-dimensional growing spacetime



"Time and space are necessary forms of any thought and of any PowerPoint slide"

No Threat of Infinite Times

Let presentism hold for the 4-dimensional growing spacetime



"Time and space are necessary forms of any thought and of any PowerPoint slide"



"Time and space are necessary forms of any thought"





R Naïve Becoming

Pirsa: 06040021

Naïve Becoming

6

Pirsa: 06040021



Page 164/209



5



Pirsa: 06040021



Page 165/209





Naïve Becoming

Pirsa: 06040021

100 100







Naïve Becoming

Pirsa: 06040021



Naïve Becoming

Pirsa: 06040021



Quantum interaction takes place beyond the "Now," hence outside of spacetime.

Quantum interaction takes place beyond the "Now," hence outside of spacetime.

Quantum interaction takes place beyond the "Now," hence outside of spacetime.

"Collapse" gives rise not only to the particle in its location, but to all the points in empty space where it *could* have been.

Quantum interaction takes place beyond the "Now," hence outside of spacetime.

"Collapse" gives rise not only to the particle in its location, but to all the points in empty space where it *could* have been.

The spacetime zone associated with this interaction emerges only as its *consequence.*
Pirsa: 06040021 Becoming at the quantum level



















The speed of light is more basic than space and time

The speed of light is more basic than space and time

Because the gravitational/electromagnetic interaction precedes the relative positioning of events.

General Relativity Dynamized

General Relativity Dynamized

Mass gives rise not only to spacetime curvature but to "bumps" in the Now plane

Naïve Becoming

Pirsa: 06040021

Consequence: The Origins of Time-Asymmetry

Consequence: The Origins of Time-Asymmetry

Becoming is the master arrow of time

Consequence: The Origins of Time-Asymmetry

Becoming is the master arrow of time Which creates spacetime intervals between events

Consequence: Mach Dynamized

Position, rather than being only *defined* by other positions, *emerges* due to the prespacetime interaction with these objects.

The wave function, upon "measurement," gives rise not only to the particles' position and momentum but to the entire spacetime region within which it *could* have resided.

The wave function, upon "measurement," gives rise not only to the particles' position and momentum but to the entire spacetime region within which it *could* have resided.

Hence the pre-spacetime interaction determines the distances between objects

The wave function, upon "measurement," gives rise not only to the particles' position and momentum but to the entire spacetime region within which it *could* have resided.

Hence the pre-spacetime interaction determines the distances between objects

Hence attraction and repulsion

The wave function, upon "measurement," gives rise not only to the particles' position and momentum but to the entire spacetime region within which it *could* have resided.

Hence the pre-spacetime interaction determines the distances between objects

The wave function, upon "measurement," gives rise not only to the particles' position and momentum but to the entire spacetime region within which it *could* have resided.

Hence the pre-spacetime interaction determines the distances between objects

Hence attraction and repulsion

A Research Program:

Take all pre-big-bang scenarions and apply them to the pre-spacetime stage of every event

A Research Program:

Take all pre-big-bang scenarions and apply them to the pre-spacetime stage of every event

E.g., Compactification as the mechanism for quantum collapse

The Road Less Traveled

The Road Less Traveled S Marry Forks F 5

What a pity to die at the dawn of relativity! (Herman Minkowski, 1909)