A SHORT MONOGRAPH ON THE INCONSISTENCY OF CAUSE AND EFFECT WITH THE CONSERVATION OF ENERGY

By

Peter Bissonnet

Does Cause and Effect automatically imply Conservation of Energy? This paper takes an extremely simplistic example and shows that there is an apparent inconsistency on the macroscopic level.

Suppose we have a controlled situation (not emotional or life and death), such that a man is sitting down in a chair and is conscious and awake. The requirement is that he does not act unless he 'thinks' to act. This eliminates his acting without being under the control of his mind. If his body reacted outside of the control of his conscious mind, since he is awake, then those around him would probably insist that he seek help. This same argument would not apply to someone asleep and tossing and turning, since his body would be under the control of his subconscious mind, and this happens to all human beings.

Again, he does not act unless he 'thinks' his body to act. He now thinks "I raise up my arms from the resting position." as he lifts up his arm several inches above his lap, where his hands have been in the resting position. Now let us return to the same situation before our subject lifted his arms. He now thinks " I raise up my body from the resting position." as he rises up from the chair to the standing position.

Let

E_{TA} = the energy of the *thought* to raise his arms

E_A = the actual energy used in raising his arms

E_{TB} = the energy of the *thought* to raise his body to the standing position.

E_B = the actual energy used in raising his body to the standing position.

The conservation of energy requires that $E_{TA} = E_A$ and $E_{TB} = E_B$ but $E_A < E_B$ based upon common sense in the movement of a larger mass versus a smaller mass, so that this then also makes $E_{TA} < E_{TB}$. However, E_{TA} required the use of a phrase of 9 words and E_{TB} required the use of a phrase of 9 words. Common sense also requires that the same amount of energy required to issue a thought of 9 words be the same as the amount of energy required to issue another 9 words. It must be accepted that the true 'Cause' began with the thought process, not with any electro-chemical process used in stimulating nerve and muscle tissue, as what is to prevent the electro-chemical process from acting on its own outside of the thought process - - we would once again have a person in need of help.

Clearly, there is an inconsistency between cause and effect and conservation of energy in this particular case. Could there be any other cases out there in which this inconsistency prevails on the macroscopic level?