

# Time – Change

2022

Thomas A. Burns PhD.

Klamath Falls, Oregon

Time is any system we humans impose on reality to measure the rate of change of observed events. All such systems are based on the assumption that we can legitimately employ a perspective outside of the “observed” events.

The temporal system we humans use is based on the solar cycle: days broken down into hours, minutes, seconds, etc.; and days accumulated into months, seasons, years, decades, centuries, millennia, eras, epochs, etc. The entire system is based on a totally artificial, imposed starting point and a recognized singular location for “official” calculation/designation.

There are an infinite number of interrelated frequencies/cycles in reality that could be used as the bases for a time measurement system. Selecting one – the solar cycle – may be useful but it is totally arbitrary. Building worldviews – scientific or otherwise – based on this imposed time measurement system is fundamentally defective for two reasons.

First, no frequency system in reality is constant; all subsystems and the reality “system” as a whole are constantly changing – different “systems” at different rates. The only constant in reality is change. Accordingly a) the solar frequency cycle does not provide a constant to support a reliable time measuring system and b) such a solar based time system varies at a minimum due to the effect of gravity both within our planet’s system and especially outside this system at the solar and galactic levels. In reality, all causation is both systemic and changing.

Second, observations made and “captured” in a time measuring system require the observer to be able to assume an independent outside perspective. But, at every scale, all phenomena and entities are always fully integrated into an infinitely interconnected reality. Only when we view reality through our vastly limited human perceptual capabilities can we derive a comprehensive principle of separation among “things.” But there is no separation principle; and there is no validity for the human assumption that a legitimate outside perspective exists – within either everyday reality or science. When we accept these false claims, we artificially carve up reality into “separate” entities, variables and systems; and we constantly fail to discern the inherent interconnected state. An outside observer perspective is an illusion, if a pragmatically productive one within limited domains.

We humans [and especially scientists] must be aware of the fundamental limitations of the time measuring system that we have adopted for evaluating change. What may be useful is not necessarily either accurate or “True.”

## Time – Change, Clarification

Any effort to reduce a fundamental and important issue like Time to a one page statement is likely to prove incomplete. So, I offer the following clarification section to my statement above.

My key points in the above essay are: 1) Any time measurement system for assessing the rate of change in reality is arbitrary, 2) Any such system fails the test of being constant, and 3) Any such system requires an outside observer perspective which does not exist in a totally integrated reality. In offering these “observations,” I recognize that scientists presently cannot avoid adopting the outside observer perspective. The problem is that most scientists are oblivious to the underlying assumptions that apply in doing so and in proceeding to utilize an artificial change measuring system. Objectivity is an admirable scientific goal within the outside observer assumption, but it does not solve the underlying problem that in a totally connected reality where all phenomena share in a totally integrated identify at every scale, there is no outside observer option. We scientists have to be aware of the essential level problem we confront when we assume that we can adopt a perspective outside of the reality in which we are entirely contained.

As a scientist, I live within the problems science faces at the philosophical level. My contentions are not that science has not been productive in exploring the nature of reality, only that just as science accepts that all of its paradigms and theories are inherently partial truths dependent on the always incomplete state of knowledge, it must also recognize the other underlying weaknesses in the fundamental assumptions it makes in its investigative efforts. This is just truth seeking, not denial of science or confusion of science with fantasy or uninformed speculation. There are partial truths at every level, and distinguishing the degree of truth among them is a key function of science and critical thinking.

To date science has been focused mostly on trying to understand reality by pursuing the material dimension – from particles to galaxies to the universe as a physical whole. In the process, it has discovered an alternative perspective where our universe is thought to arise as pure energy that is the basis for later emerging very simple material phenomena that can develop into ever greater complexity [Big Bang theory]. One of these greater expressions of energy complexity is the array of organic entities – including humans. From this perspective, all material phenomena are understood as concentrations at different scales of immaterial energy waves and fields. As science itself reveals a universal reality totally integrated by these energy waves and fields, it vastly expands the options for conceiving reality within science and should substantially

impact our cultural worldviews. Interestingly, especially in many Asian countries where the existing worldview is more open to the significance of the immaterial, energy based science has exploded [particularly in the biological sciences and medicine]. The energy based perspective is extraordinarily exciting, but it brings with it challenges to our prevailing material perspective with its dependency on the assumptions of an objective outside observer and separation among physical “things.”

A new evolving science will hopefully find a way to integrate these different perspectives to achieve a more holistic “partial truth.” Philosophy of science has to consider the implications of the new immaterial energy approach to understanding reality and work to keep up with the associated alternative and integrative challenges. Expanding what the philosophy of science considers as required in science’s existing investigative procedures and reports is an allied concern [eg. the need for greater system based analysis and less simplistic thinking about “independent” variables and their causal relationships].

In pointing to some of the limitations of the material scientific perspective in science, I am not denying its value. I am just looking for a much more capable science that recognizes the limitations underlying all of its “partial truths.”