Postulate of Time as an Imaginary Dimension(s), Physical Space as Real Dimensions, and the Behavior of Negative versus Positive Numbers

Noah G. King *(Eski)*

518-354-0396

eski@eski.info

http://eski.info/

Postulate: Imaginary dimensions are correspondent to time or chronological phenomena, where mathematical points and data are the conceptual real physical architecture encased, to be used to model reality as experienced. Additionally, negative numbers have long been thought to multiply to form positives, but mathematics is more easy as a whole when negative values always multiply to negatives, and are equivalent to positives save that the product between a negative and a positive is imaginary and thus both positive and negative. This proves that 3-dimensional reality is completely objective to infinite numbers of practical dimensions because they will always inherently simplify to three.

Evidence:

Point and function derivatives and integrals are logically symmetrical in/ex – trusive analysis of points on a graph. Logical series coordinate through time in a complex manner. Physically, it is deterministic that a major degree of time is to provide fragmented dimensional components with real and imaginary parts against each other or in systems in different parts of reality. Time is always the imaginary part of these functions, spatial dimensions are real and non-conformational, though time is an overarching container for these expressions. **Time therefore is not a line, number or dimension in itself: it is just the way things go.**

The reason that infinite dimensions nonlocalized and imaginary simplify as the best answer to space as effective 3-dimensional reality is true, is because while n numbers of dimensions imply n numbers to navigate space, any two objects of n dimensions have no way around each other except for because of the concept that there is theoretically a way around each direction, which therefore can be taken so that dimensions of reference + another dimension exist now that can be transcended for any dimension regardless of direction. But then, you have acknowledge that any (# dimensions) >= 3 n dimensional object does technically have one area whereat it can encase an n-1 dimension and doesn't even necessarily orient identically to its own relative correspondent depth axis, solely based on the logic that an object which has n-dimensional solid object can navigate across and have of measure a relative volumetric quality of another equal object. So a reference + depth + transcendental direction will always effectively result as an effect, to equate or analogize 3-dimensional experience. To have a shape which conforms on infinite dimensions or subinfinite, still implies a concentric space whereat it is true, a theoretical depth where it has a size which is numerical, and then a theoretical plane whereat it can navigate universally except for when it conflicts with the position of an equal. Realistically this implies the reason 3 axes adequately describe all space yet the dimensions can be much more enumerable and universal. They simply exist as 3 or less dimensions at any point in time, and to say that an object is less than 1 dimensional means it can have no better definition than zero/a point only because it has no more a way to define, navigate or refer to something of +3 dimensions to it.

Further Abstract Conclusions and Operator Theory:

In addition, negative numbers have long been thought to multiply to form positives, but mathematics is more easy as a whole when negative values always multiply to negatives, and are equivalent to positives save that the product between a negative and a positive is imaginary and thus both positive and negative. This can easily be tested and this methodical procedure simply requires less assumptions, while retaining the simplified functionality of all major applied mathematics functions and formulas. That is to also imply that:

1. +/- symbols as operators are directionally biased to add or subtract from the relevant direction of the handedness of graphs, so that adding two negatives produces further negatives, while subtracting a positive from a negative will add its value back towards/through zero.
2. Exponential graphs and radical graphs are to be considered for in that the signed power/root is simply going to become ambiguous when different, but treated as if it were as we currently see a positive root or power to a positive number, and the result is always the same, positive or negative, with the exception that the result

is indeterminate and imaginary(positive and negative) when the signs are on either hand, different.

Then, we can derive theoretically a variety of useful logical workarounds to achieve some of the other graphs we were more familiar with using the old style of numeric negativity:

a. (-1/(-x)) will result in the value -1/X, (+1/(+x)) will result in the value 1/X, but if the signs are different they will result in the consequent proper-sign (+/-)X/1, and the net absolute can be taken to result in graphs such as the continued 2^x, in the expression now absolute |-1/(2^x)|.
b. Multiplying a graph by (+/-)1 or other values, or even the symbol itself, can result in the negative or positive side of the graph flipping its orientation while the other stays the same.
c. We can then assume 0*0 is equal to 1 as well as 0/0 can equal 1, which fixes a hole in the logic behind factorials such as factorial 0=1. The factorization of zero is infinite but also empty but can equilibrate logically to one. 0*0 or 0/0 can also equal 2.
d. The imaginary number unit, i, can be supposed to simply alternate between positive and negative one in any power expression, with even numbers being the negative side unless i in parentheses is negative. To simply multiply by i would result in both positive and negative numbers.
e. Geometrically because dimensions simplify to three and numbers may be on a certain small-as-can-be scale in a grand unified theory, *for (+/-)adding and subtracting numbers, for any value v and 0<=number n|v<=1*, n(+/-)v = (positive or negative) n (+/-) v(+/-)n|v(+/-)1. For *1<=number n|v<=2*, n(+/-)v = (positive or negative) n (+/-) 2 (+/-) v. *2<=number n|v<=3*, n(+/-)v = (positive or negative) n (+/-) 3 (+/-) v.
   If n|v above 3, n(+/-)v = (positive or negative) n (+/-) 1 (+/-) v.
f. Possibly and at a geometrically inclined level to the last listed postulates, in dealing with the ease of calculation of values and such complex space, we can assume that when we are taking the dividend of a number by another number between absolute 0 and 2, the result may be more accurate for number theory and extrinsic, higher-value number theory

application when the result is taken by a subtraction of the difference from the value subtracted by the correspondent signed value from that signed value. So 1/1.5 = 1-(1.5-1). *This has implications for units in applied math, however*: This implies that units compared across each other should be measured by individual quanta as a base numeric input (i.e., not to scale amps by a number of electrons per second as a base input, count each electron) except when the quanta is scalar, can be given decimals, and not counted in a quanta-based fashion (such as when force blends into other forces and there is no definite natural quanta). Inverses are seldom used for exchanging non-(restrictively natural) number variables in applied math, anyways. When taking the inverse of a value above two, the symbolic notation may be easier for many forms of applied math to note the decimal part of any number greater than 2, or |n|-infscale(|n|+1/(inf)), or the rounded down value, to be summed as the inverse of the decimal fraction in itself as a type of adjacent component to that inverse. So, 1/2.5 could be written as 0.5 {0.5} or one half plus the decimal {0.5} in brackets or any other symbolic notation. Then to get something like the inverse of 6.333, .1666 {.333}, we can add the {.333} to any multiplied result of the inverse and add the value of .333 multiplied to the result, say 44.333= 7*6.333 = 7*1/(.166 {.333}) = 7*(1/.166 = 6) + 7*.333 = 44.333 of the integer part. To divide such value as 9 by 5.25, you can express: 9*1/(5+{.25}} which equals: 1.714… by doing 9/5 = 1.8 and divide the value again by 1+(.25/(5)), which is 1.05, and it is so that 1.8/1.05 = 9/5.25 = 1.714… and this works for all numbers. This is the simplest algebraic proof of division and multiplication but it implies that dividing 1 by a number between 0 and 1 should result so that 1/0.5 is equal to 1/0=inf, then divide the result by (1+(0.5/1)), then divide (inf) by 1+0.5/1. This obviously does not work and it is the only case this simplest proof can not work. So I prescribe that we can also assume that the inverse of values up to and including two be expressed as 1-(n-1) so that 1/0 can equal 2, and then you can divide that by 1.5 and you would get 1.333… which is still not exactly the inverse. This would still just be the common accepted inverse of

1+0.5 plus two times the difference from one, and that is far from what we want. Though, we can say the value of the inverse of 0.5 is either 1.5, or 2 because two is another natural number away from one which we use to define the inverse operation. This means values between 0 and 2 can have multiple inverses, or they can invert to form the inverse of two or more numbers if they are to be less than or equal to 0.5. The case where the inverse can be three numbers is 0, where it can be infinite, or 2, or 1 since you did not divide one by anything. To fix things further, because of the ambiguity of the multiplicative values below and above one, and for the fact that the scale of values from 0-1 and their inverses at 1-2 would otherwise be on a curvature that makes little sense to the difference of 1 to 0 and that before 2 there is no reference to the relative value of 1 as a real number, values below 1 which are to be inversed selectively as their difference from one across one to two, should be so that multiplying a value by a number less than 1 but greater than 0.5, and selectively down to 0 if the inverse is selected in 0-2 mode of function, will equate so that it is the same as dividing the value by 1 plus the difference it produces from 1, which is not the current convention of inverses. This postulate states it is so that, for any 0 <= a <= 1 which represents an inverse of a value 1 <= b <= 2 which is equal to 1+(1-a), the expressions are a*x = x/(1+(1-a)) and, b*x = x+x*(1-a), likewise x/a = x*(1+(1-a)) = x*b = x/a and x/b = x-x*(1-a) = x*a, which should actually be consistently the same difference across any numerator or factor for a or b, for whether a or b is a factor or denominator. This is all to save for when selectively we decide to use a value that is anywhere at or below 0.5, whereat it can be used as an alternative inverse to any value above 2. This means that the inverse of a value below or at 0.5 means both a value above or at 2, or simply up to two on a linear scale. *Any two values above 2 can still be used to create alternative possible fractions between 0 and 2, but their inverse pairs are one-sided and you cannot recover them back out so they are to represent an inverse of two numbers 0-2 unless you want to recover the original larger values with an extra variable.* To conclude this list entry, for any n <

1, to multiply it to number n to represent itself as a product of the operation for an inverse, and not a unique measurement, means to add its difference above 1 and divide the value it is effecting by this value. This is so that 1/1.5 = 0.5 and 0.5 * n = n/1.5 OR n/2. Then when you divide a number like 6 by a number like 3.333, you can say that 6/(3{.333}) = 6/3*(1-.333/3) = (6/3)/(1+.333/3) always, as a decimal divided by any real number becomes smaller, and is always smaller than one. This should be always true and intrinsically translative for subsequent applied uses of such an inverse number.

g. To divide any number by a value that is or is the inverse of a number not bound to become higher than 2, most cases you would only subtract the difference from one, so that for in division any number x divided by number n while 0<=n|x<=2: x/n = 1(+/-)(n|x)(+/-)x/n, and for values 1<=n|x<=3: x/n = x/n(+/-)(x|n). For values *x|n above 3:* x/n (+/-)2(+/-)x|n. value as an addend.

h. When multiplying numbers where both are not intrinsically calculated by inverse (dividing one) operations, a similar rule will follow: for 1<=x|n<=3, n*x = n*x(+/-)(x|n). For any value 0<=x|n<=2, n*x = x*n(+/-)1(+/-)(x|n). For values *x|n above 3*: x*n = x*n(+/-)2(+/-)x|n. If the second value besides x, labeled n, is within either of these ranges, take the rule for the higher number. Remember multiplying values between 0-2 will still also imply the difference from one is positive or negative towards that number direction. This way, however, if there is at or more than three values being multiplied, you should disregard this rule and perform the operation as if they were inverse or compressible to 0-1 values and as such simply multiply them without assuming this mechanic, but always add a single value of one to the end as in 1<=x|n<3. If one is already added this can be ignored.

i. As far as powers are concerned, we can consider the true value of a power p, not to be mistaken with the power scaled by the sum(2,p,n)*n interpretation of powers of number n, according to and supported by other articles in this book, to be equal as: n^p = ((**[in series]**(0,infscale(p),n))*((infscale(p)-infscale(p-1))+n*(p-infscale(p))-(p-infscale(p))))). |n|>3. If 0<=|n|<=3,

n^p = 3(+/-) (n|p)(+/-)((**[in series]**(0,infscale(p),n))*((infscale(p)- infscale(p-1))+n*(p-infscale(p))-(p-infscale(p))))).
For values above 3 use the normal definition of n^p but add or subtract or multiply or divide by the value 3 as well as p|n. Infscale(x) is defined as the lowest adjacent integer to any possible number with decimals, with the exception that if x is an integer it is absolute x-1.

j. At that case where you want to find roots, the nth root value of x would just be:
n-(n*(**[in series]**(0,infscale(p),1/n)*((infscale(p)-infscale(p-1))+(1/n)*(p-infscale(p))-(p-infscale(p)))), |n|>3.
If 0<=|n|<=3,
root(p,n) =
3 (+/-)(n|p)(+/-) n-(n*(**[in series]**(0,infscale(p),1/n) *((infscale(p)-infscale(p-1))+(1/n)*(p-infscale(p))-(p-infscale(p)))).
For values above 3 use the normal definition of root(p,n) but add or subtract or multiply or divide by the value 3, as well as p|n.

The last rule that would be added to this set of adoptions to be termed as ‘effective’ ‘actualitive’ or ‘causational’ mathematics are of special cases involving the number zero. If a number is a power or root multiple or dividend, addend or difference of zero, which all numbers technically are, in order to have gotten to this number through a numeric operation, you can now additionally add/subtract, multiply or divide, or use powers and roots to so many of such operations of such a value as 0=any decimal=1=any number=infinity. This is to imply all numbers can access each other in infinite ways and extend each other to infinity.

If all of these rules are followed you can assume numbers can be symbolized by four sets of three lines arranged in various conflicting/nonconflicting directions, and optionally intersected between their connections with up to four grid lines to total up to sixteen sets of counted value, and you can orient them with lines or colors that can connect them and use the relationships of these six major mathematical operations in their degrees of increase/decrease intensity to symbolize equational dynamics. It’s recommended to use no lines whatsoever but draw a box for variables. This is more or less the way symbols are done in your author’s language for ease.

When all these assumptions are held to, factoring a root value of any equation is as simple as this: if a polynomial of any degree or form is to equal to 0 at any point, those points can be found in conjunction by the use of the value 2 in place of x and to perform a operator-inverse calculation of the relevant values in this fashion: for addition, subtract and for subtraction, add. For multiplication, divide and for division, multiply, and for each term that multiplies or divides in succession with another of such a term, perform the same reversal on top of such multiplication and division directionally. Then, if there is powers and roots, reverse them but reverse them again on the opposite side of any division or multiplication that they are factored to. Preserve factors and non-variable numbers and put them in their respective places. Then for everything added or subtracted, remember they can be initially positive or negative at any point so multiply these terms individually by i.

For more inquiries, See the logical correspondence of any function, sequence or logical construct as a whole to be continuous of a logical degree, and that an imaginary number – rooted reflection of the trend to be identical to only a possible and self-sustaining neutral symmetrical system, or else a real logical cyclic phenomena. This is aligned to the structure and behavior of matter, or the logical order of any system of mathematics with sub or consequent derivatives (or removals from) or integrals (or additions to) of or without any mathematical systems, or any modifications thereat, especially those designed to model real systems we currently perceive. Such as for the case where the unit of a particular integer has a true spatial and metric meaning for any given circumstance and so as things scale in the physical or logical reality by these numbers being used, more rules apply to their behavior based on the assumed circumstance.