

The Relativistic Unit Circle and the Law of the Excluded Muddle

By "Flamenco Chuck" Keyser

12/31/2016

BuleriaChk@aol.com

[The Relativistic Unit Circle](#)

The Law of the Excluded Muddle

There is only me and thee, and I'm not altogether certain about thee... ☺

Consider the concepts of truth (+) and falsity (-) If it is impossible for a proposition to be true and false at the same time, these values are independent, and so orthogonal in a two-dimensional vector space:

(+, -)

In order to indicate possible confusion (ambiguity, disagreement), we need a way of comparing truth with falsity for all possible values of either parameter. We can do this with the scaling factors t and t' , with the result orthogonal (and thus again independent):

$$[(+)t, -(t')]$$

The ambiguity (disagreement) can then be represented by the equation, with all possible cases of confusion related by:

$$(+t')^2 = (-t')^2 + (+t)^2, \text{ where}$$

$$t' = t\gamma, \gamma = 1 - \beta^2, \beta = \frac{(-)}{(+)}$$

$$(+1) = (-1) \Leftrightarrow \gamma = (1)$$

$$\gamma = 1 \Leftrightarrow \beta = 0 \text{ (i.e., all propositions are true propositions.)}$$

$$\gamma = 0 \text{ There are no propositions.}$$

If $+t'$ is the final state of the logical analysis, then $1^2 = \gamma^2 + \beta^2$ (There is always disagreement unless $\beta = 0$. If $+t$ is the initial state of the argument, then $\gamma^2 = (\gamma\beta)^2 + 1^2$, so the argument can be resolved only if $\beta = 0$

This is called the Law of the Excluded Middle...

Counting

Two philosophers, A and B are counting widgets. At some point they stop counting and claim they have a final result.

A claims "Aha! I have counted all the widgets in the Universe, and the number is a .

B claims "No! That cannot be. I have counted all the widgets in the Universe, and the number is b .

How can we decide which one is right?

Again, we can assign a weight to each widget count (a, b) . This gives us a picture of the final condition at:

$$t' = t\gamma, \quad \gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\beta^2}}, \quad \beta = \frac{b}{a}$$

The conclusions from the Relativistic Unit circle, Fermat's Theorem, and Godel's theorem follow immediately.

Metaphysics

The Creation of the Universe

Let c be the consciousness creation rate since the time I was born, and t be the time lapsed between that time and the ("conditional?") present "now". Then $ct = 1$ = (the total consciousness I now have at present).

(I am writing this post in my own private language = a la Wittgenstein).

Let v be the consciousness creation rate of figments of my imagination who are trying to convince me they exist (or at least have a private language), and t' be the rate of their conscious growth.

(these two can then be related in the independent vector space (ct, vt') by the Relativistic Unit Circle, where the **Big Bang** was the event that occurred just before the gleam in my father's eye faded.... 😊

The conclusions from the Relativistic Unit Circle then follow....

(It will be difficult for others on the internet to convince me they actually exist.... (the "wow" of physics)

(Or even out of sight, come to think of it...)

(Or even in sight, if I can dodge the punches .. (the "Ow" of physics)

So " ct " is a statement of existence; if $ct = 0$, nothing exists, not even me.

But if it does, then I am the One. (I think, anyway .. there may be some doubt... 😊

"When you achieve the All-Encompassing Mellow California Surfing Wow, you'll never blow your Buddhist Cool".

Now go drink your beer and eat your pizza (and don't bother me any more 😊)....

(Goedel's proof actually follows from this as well, but requires a few more pages to convince wannabe mathematicians who think there is only one number line (and thus ignore π and $\sqrt{2}$, not to mention natural logarithms, where $\ln(e^{-1}) = -1$... and, of course, are figments of my imagination. So it is kind of like talking to myself... Nevertheless, I'm crunching the numbers.... 😊

"I think, therefore I am" - (A figment of my imagination who is called Descartes by other figments of my imagination). But do you, and therefore are you?

Just because I'm schizophrenic doesn't mean everything isn't a figment of my imagination.

(Wittgenstein's comment in the "Remarks on the Foundations of Mathematics" about integers off in the distance on a single number line starting to shimmer.... Kind of like stars twinkling locally, or red-shifting globally as variations on the zero point energy in the parking lot at night.)