BRYTAN KELLY

Blink

An exploration of temporal dynamics

Contents

1

Essay 1: The Nature of Time

What is time? A physicist, a philosopher, and a monk would each offer separate answers, yet we all perceive something fundamentally similar. At its base, time serves as a simple index of action—something that measures change and becomes observable only through change itself. Time is essentially a byproduct of an unstable system.

Time as Experience

In our current state, we experience time as a stream passing through us. I prefer to think of it as a flip book: we are currently on frame 22 of this cosmic flip book. We cannot affect the past or truly control the future, and we rarely acknowledge the present moment because we are immersed within it.

Consider a car moving down the freeway. Without any temporal index, it's impossible to determine where it's going. But with just a few basic time references to observe change, we can quickly conclude that you should probably stop standing on the freeway staring at traffic. This illustrates the basics of

relativity—concepts pioneered and popularized by thinkers like Albert Einstein and modern minds that followed.

The Relativity of Observation

The fundamental idea is that everything exists relative to an observer over time. Without reference to consistent time, there is no coherence in a system—no meaning except the meaning we construct within it.

Imagine that earlier image of staring at a still frame of a freeway. Picture yourself as an AI seeing only that frozen moment. You might observe a white pickup truck facing your direction, but can you determine if it's stopped, moving toward you, or away from you? You can identify that there's a white truck, but you cannot create any meaningful continuation beyond that observation. All reference to past positions or future states is lost.

Time and Consciousness

The same principle applies to consciousness. Consider the concept of the brain as a semantic storytelling device: your personality and psyche are built upon a timed chronology of events, all related to each other through time. This temporal relationship is what makes you uniquely you.

You have a fingerprint in time, not space.

Perhaps at some point in the distant future, every atom that currently constitutes your body will reform somewhere else in the universe. But the chances are virtually zero that these atoms will occupy the exact same space at the exact same time, or that they will recreate the cascade of effects your existence

has generated at all previous timestamps.

Even if we imagine no major sociological or physiological changes to the universe—just your atoms arranged into the vague shape of you—the gravitational wells created by your atoms' positions still stretch across all of space and time, creating a very, very minor effect. But it is still an effect.

The Immutability of Temporal Position

Your placement in time and your relationship to it grants you an individualistic timestamp. This relationship to time cannot be inherently changed or redone. Unlike objects in space— where I might move a box from one location to another and back again at will—I cannot travel back and change an object's states in time to alter its location. Such actions would be full of paradoxes and obviously contradict the idea of a consistent temporal fingerprint.

This immutable nature of our temporal existence forms the foundation of our individual identity and our unique place in the universe's unfolding story.

Essay 2: The Ship of Theseus and the Temporal Fingerprint

I love paradoxes. They hold a special place in my heart, right beside cute puppy videos and obscure books that nobody has ever heard of—books I wouldn't recommend anyone actually read. One of my favorites is the Ship of Theseus. Here's how it goes:

"If a ship has all of its original parts replaced one by one, is it still the same ship?"

After much debate and philosophical hand-wringing, here is the answer: **No.**

Now, before you call me a heretic or suggest I commit myself to the local asylum for a "de-crankifying operation," I implore you to read the rest of my argument.

The Test of Time

Ask yourself this: If I left the Ship of Theseus in a sealed box for all eternity, would it still be the Ship of Theseus? Or what if it molded and the wood turned to mulch—would that pile

of compost be considered the same ship, given that its atomic makeup remains the same by weight?

Let's bring this closer to home. Say I have a model ship in my room that I'm quite fond of. My brother asks to play with it, drops it, and the mast of my great galleon breaks off. I briskly repair it by buying some hobby wood and replacing the broken piece. Is it the same ship I started with?

Obviously not. In fact, the second it changed states in any way through time, it ceased to be the same ship.

The Fallacy of Quantification

Traditional approaches try to solve this paradox through quantification. If we measure "ship-ness" by the proportion of original parts, it seems logical to set a threshold—perhaps 50/50, where anything above makes it still the original, anything below makes it something new.

Yet this approach fails in one crucial regard: **nothing that changes its state through time remains the same**. When something changes, it becomes a new, augmented version of itself. You can quantify this change by weight, height, sight, smell, or any other sense you can utilize, but I find the easiest solution lies through the index of time.

The Apple of Brytan

Let me illustrate with a simpler example. Imagine I have an apple on my desk that I've dubbed "The Apple of Brytan." If my coworker goes out and buys me an identical apple, is it the Apple of Brytan?

Now, what if he takes a bite out of my apple, then proceeds to

channel the dark arts and somehow makes the matter reappear exactly where it was before? Is it still the Apple of Brytan?

No. Even if he managed to restore the exact physical conditions of the apple, its placement in time would still have changed. Think of it as the apple's story—its temporal narrative has been altered.

Temporal Fingerprints

If the Ship of Theseus's story was altered by the mere passage of time, it might be called "The Ship of Theseus V2.0." Each moment in time changes the conditions of the ship, or of my apple, and any change made to it creates a new temporal fingerprint.

The only true Ship of Theseus exists in the exact, infinitesimally small moment when it was first named as such. It ceased to be the original Ship of Theseus one second—one millisecond, one picosecond—after its christening, because its placement in time had fundamentally changed.

The Resolution

This temporal approach resolves the paradox entirely. Objects don't maintain identity through physical continuity alone—they exist as unique entities at specific coordinates in spacetime. Every moment that passes creates a new version, a new chapter in their temporal story.

The Ship of Theseus paradox isn't really about parts and wholes. It's about time, change, and the fundamental nature of identity itself. Once we understand that identity is temporal rather than purely physical, the paradox dissolves into a simple

truth: everything is constantly becoming something new.

3

Essay 3: Strange Loops and Temporal Identity

Douglas Hofstadter is a visionary. His work "I Am a Strange Loop" entertained me immensely in my youth and sparked countless thoughts on identity, consciousness, and theories of everything. His concepts of self-reference and recursive systems opened doors to understanding how complexity emerges from seemingly simple patterns.

Defining Self-Referential Loops

Before diving deeper, I need to establish some vocabulary. A **self-referential loop** is exactly what it sounds like: a looping system that operates in reference to itself. I distinguish between two types:

Open loops encompass infinite series that are dependent on time and logic-based, unable to be separated from their temporal context. These systems evolve continuously and cannot be fully predicted without experiencing each time step.

Closed loops have emergent properties that establish quickly.

After one pass-through, they can be replicated consistently, making them pseudo self-referential loops—they appear self-referential but are actually deterministic.

Time-Dependent Self-Referential Loops

Let me introduce my favorite example of a time-dependent, fully self-referential loop: **prime numbers**.

This system can best be described as a loop that requires the dimensionality of time in a very real sense to function. Think of a system that evolves from itself over time, where there is no mathematical shortcut—no way to infer or logically continue the sequence with 100% accuracy without affecting the greater whole. You must simulate each step, check each number, experience each moment of the algorithm.

Prime Numbers as Strange Loops

Defining prime numbers as self-referential loops becomes quite elegant when viewed through this lens. Consider how we define a prime: a number divisible only by one and itself, with no divisors among all the numbers that come before it.

This definition inherently includes:

- A **past state** (all numbers before the current candidate)
- A **current state** (the number we're testing)
- A **future state** (the outcome of our divisibility test)

We have defined a dimensionality of time that, if removed, strips all meaning from primes themselves. You cannot determine if a number is prime without first establishing the primality of

all numbers before it. Each prime builds upon the foundation of all previous primes, creating an unbreakable chain through mathematical time.

Temporal Identity in Mathematical Systems

This reveals something profound: certain mathematical systems are **permanently intertwined with temporal identity**. They exist not as static objects but as processes—ongoing conversations between past, present, and future states.

The prime number sequence cannot be compressed, cannot be shortcut, cannot exist independently of its own history. Each prime emerges from the testing of all numbers before it, creating a strange loop where the definition of "prime" depends on the entire sequence of primes that came before.

Implications for Consciousness

If mathematical objects as fundamental as prime numbers require temporal identity to exist, what does this tell us about consciousness itself? Perhaps our sense of self, like the sequence of primes, cannot be separated from our temporal experience. We are not static entities but ongoing processes—strange loops that reference our own past states to determine our present and future.

Just as a prime number's identity emerges from its relationship to all previous numbers, our consciousness might emerge from our relationship to all our previous moments. We are self-referential systems operating in the dimension of time, unable to exist without our own temporal story.

The Strange Loop of Existence

Hofstadter showed us that consciousness might be a strange loop—a system that somehow creates itself through self-reference. But perhaps the loop is stranger than we thought. Perhaps it's not just self-referential but **temporally self-referential**—a system that creates itself not just through circular logic, but through the ongoing dance of past, present, and future states.

4

Essay 4: The Bootstrap Paradox of Existence

I appreciate the concept of bootstraps in a self-referential loop. Though the notion of something emerging from nothing but itself defies conventional logic, it serves as a conceptual stand-in and underpins faith in many religions. Consider the puzzle of existence itself—not through any specific mechanism, but why anything exists at all, why something arises from nothing. How did it originate, and why? Tracing this leads to a loop and paradox. Suppose a simulation theory holds true: what created the simulation, and what created that creator, and so on indefinitely? This yields an infinite recursion with no straightforward answer. Yet, since this totality manifests as the universe, a conceptual resolution emerges. Whatever underlies it all exists in a form that permits its own unfolding, suggesting a bootstrap system—one that pulls itself into being through its own being—as a way to frame the infinite recursion. This is mind-boggling and humbling. The idea that the universe has simply always existed sounds simplistic, as echoed in religious arguments worldwide, but alternatives revert to the

same paradox. A paradox-minimizing perspective is that the universe, beyond graspable logic—due to its all-encompassing nature, like not seeing the forest for the trees—establishes a system gaining coherence from internal dynamics and relies on nested self-referential loops, maintained in order by scales of time, to balance chaos. This view aligns with major and minor, raw and abstracted processes. It offers a basis for conceptualizing existence.

"The infinite regress of origins creates a cyclic paradox: each cause demands a prior cause ad infinitum. A bootstrap solution resolves this by self-referencing—existence pulls itself into being through its own loop, canceling the regress by making the cycle the origin, as no external start is logically possible without restarting the loop."