

Here, There Is A Theory Wrestling With The Fact That It Cannot Be Known  
A Curve in One Dimension

“We must suppose the whole figure as it exists to be moved in some direction entirely different from any direction within it, and not made up of any directions within it” Charles H. Hinton describes this as fourth dimension, the capability in an object to move outside its own dimension and into another as a transitional plane that cannot be entirely separate from that plane from which it is moving, while at the same time, moving in such ways that are not necessarily commensurable to the plane from which it moves itself. Much the same way I imagine transitional space in and or theory, our capabilities in imagining these planes, like shadows of inference in shadowed space upon refractive distance. If you can pull the math from the language, its help is in tune, but its all just intuitive.

In a morphogenic field, there is an example of some of these transitory processes, not necessarily into other dimensions, but certainly as energy catalysts for other possibilities in spacial dynamics. The idea of working toward a fourth dimension does not tend to make as much sense to me as working toward a non-dimension. Not necessarily zero dimension itself, but a non-dimension comparable to it.

There is a dimension of transition between all of these dimensions, and the energy necessary in the transitioning is what I call and or, the space between of both and neither. Like a binary with a third component recognized in it's shifting and differentiation in phrase. The commonly understood phases of transportation of data and template between cells takes place within three different schematics; endocrine signaling, signaling with substances such as hormones that act on distant sets of target cells, paracrine signaling, target cells close to the signaling cell and signaling compound and effects only the cells adjacent such as in neurohormones catacholamines and gamma-amino-rutryric acids, and there is autocrine signaling, in which cells themselves respond to substances that they themselves release. The idea of a morphogenic field is probably a simplification of these three types of signaling, as well as their outcomes in activation of things like arachidonic acid, which in morphology creates path for the capabilities in manifesting eukosinoids, for example. (Proteus shape shifting again)

The idea of this transition in field mathematically, seems to me something like unlimited domain with finite extension in field; that is, like finding a housing for zero in imaginary. I want to start with a curve, in dimensional understanding, and from a curve in one dimension end in three dimensional with a sphere and work from there in searching out fourth dimension. A curve in one dimension is just and indicative of two dimensional circles and compiles to a three-dimensional sphere. A curve in one dimension doesn't make sense, because of the space created by the curve itself. Can you take the curve

and not the space that's created by bending it? Perhaps that space itself, that of a curve in one dimension is indicative of zero dimension as well; of fractal logic in an unlimited domain with finite extension in field. The field is a plane that we're trying to make not exist.

The problem with surmising a field is a time frame or with assuming a time frame upon a field is that we need unlimited domain. You can chart infinite with zero in tune, as a time frame, zero dimension and imaginary inferences upon that. Or I would guess. But that's all this is anyhow. I cannot understand why we would only want to search out these domains in the extremes; absolutes in small or large become contiguous, to try getting stuck in-between continuous time signals and discrete time signals, for example, to search out non-time seems a more natural postulate. Many would look for such postulates in extremes of absolutes in discrete or absolutes in continuous, but if there were a pause between such as we see in shifting and phase in potentiality, there is a possibility for nothing in the spaces between. This same space between being and or, the transitional non-plane of unlimited domain with finite extension in field (or infinite extension in field). Of course, it is like searching for nothing.

“There is no absolute line of demarcation between liquid and gas. The one can be made to pass into the other with no moment intervening in which it can be said that now a change of state has taken place.”

The gradient of inference within post synaptic space in threshold potential and ionic inference in the surrounding plasmic reticulum decides to a certain extent the ability of permeability in data transference and template. The point at which chemical data becomes electrical signal is essentially the same question as the point at which gas could turn to liquid, but in vectors that would probably be easier to digest. To know a position, field or plane of these interactions is more like asking the exact moment when chemical to electrical transition takes place within a dendrite; the precise moment that transition happens and the space within which that is capable of taking place can be marked according to the signal that is transferred from such instance. The instance itself seems simultaneous with the message; the digestion of the data the path itself in data as nutrients. Taking into account also, the threshold potentials in sending such a signal and its effect on the ability to convert a signal in medium is dependent on this amphipathic absorption as well as chemical conversion in transitional space.

In looking for a transitional field that doesn't technically exist aside from the non-existence of field itself, it's helpful for me to imagine the non-planar space of the shift from chemical to electrical data in the brain, but this is just an example of a starting place for wondering about the conversions and their rates, which honestly take place everywhere. It would, however, depend on the field in which you search as to the outcome of the wondering; to wonder of these paths within the firing of a synapse is to

wonder of life and the beginnings and ends of life itself, the capability in thought and wondering about these things at all. Not to mention the added fun in wondering about our capability in wondering about something that enables us to wonder about it.

((Si pas cos whatever sigma, stigma)) (si pas s(t)igma wat cos)

“in three-dimensional space there could be an infinite number of infinite planes”

In these types of mediums, in transitional imaginary sight intuitively wondering about dynamics of domain in which certain conversions between electrical and chemical data is able to take place, it is trying to find infinite domain for finite field; so in time and space there is the speed at which speed is not applicable. It is not trying to go faster than the speed of light, its trying to have no speed, to shift dimensions in a translation outside velocity. The other dimensions wouldn't exist to 'arrive at' if the velocity to carry something there was used; the transition itself is not a path. You cannot reach stillness, (clarity with no background) from light or darkness, but from the absence of both.

Maybe static is a good place to start. Supposed stillness readings in shifting and differentiation would assume a commensurable distance of some sort. Relieve distance of time, or vice versa; how are we to perceive the absence of both en mathematics? At the edges of conceptualizing both of them; that is, the absolutes of persistence, the concept of absolute light or absolute darkness would be one in the other. That is, absolute light is darkness, absolute darkness is light. Absolute cold would be hot, etc. ( $0 \infty 1$ ), ( $1 \infty 0$ ). The time spanning a decision in our minds, the transitional plane of the particians in invaginative space that template and accordingly digest as they move in decision making process is non-movement and storage of these inferences and their effected gradient, which is connotative of the space necessary for those decisions to be templates for other decisions made by our cells and by ourselves. The inference here to the point at which an absolute from another absolute can manifest matter from non; these energetics themselves in plane according to the dynamics within the decision making process about them. As in the capability to reason and rationalize an imaginary concept from a memory of other instances in language that are present for digestion. Those absolutes of 0 and 1 are not necessarily oppositional, especially in transitory non-space. Non-opposition polarities of inference in communicable data transcribed from chemical to electrical signal and the zones for transcriptions of this data, the template in DNA creating other templates necessary for the carrying out of data template within the rough endoplasmic rhiticulum, and for transcription and re-absorption of this data to the outside of the cell with energetics in the golgi apparatus.

Before the data is in template form, there is the actual forming of an accretion disk to accommodate a

pre-cursor of non-present data.

Here, inversion of division is not multiplication! And inverted root is not a square. The commensurable affected ratio of speed or distance combining in dividing intervals—trans-liminal space (non-sense) do not combine or divide as the affect on the actual interval, but rather, show postulate of division or multiplication; postulate of inverted space comparable in actual time ratio and space, but never exact. Space time ratio in non-commensurable postulates of trans-liminal (nospace, no time) non-sense regions. Compatible lineations in non-rehearsable interval combinations and ratio spacing. The idea of rehearse in phasing; shifting time differentiation in sampling theorem with familiarity compared to rehearsing. The idea, for example, that the data necessary in the coding of protien chain from nucleic inferences has a point at which in the rough endoplasmic riticulum it stops and splatters information about a bit, that is then picked up by metachromatic granules, these granules used as off-standing postulates within the cell for further coding within the nucleus and within the mitochondria; as a sort of cellular gradient, compared to the plasmic riticulum's gradient.

Coincidental path in rotation of void-mirror images, as a reflection devouring the original image in occidental ray, or refraction rays. The path is slightly spinning, so instead of trying to rid ourselves of this slight spin which 'wastes' energy, we use the spin to turn the image, image here in reference to energy in a certain patterning for electrical from chemical inferences. So the spin itself creates a continuous turn that can be manipulated to topple itself upside down, and spin again on an accidental axis to flip itself over again, while still spinning, and at the same time, causing that to continue spinning. The vectors for this motion being the edges of the plane within the domain in which the slight spin exists; that slight spin being in accordance with the golden ratio and the spiral energy of Pythagorean pentagrams. The vectors then are chaotic, and the vectors for chaos look something like elliptical pi, with understandings in irrational, unreal space that is dependent on a starting point at nothing, at which you can't start from. Perpetual motion can't start, it has to be already in motion. I believe that to find actual continual motion, we must in a universe of motion find actual stillness.

There is a premise used by Charles H. Hinton in an excerpt from Scientific Romances that states (in paraphrase) that I cannot know but for the spacial expression of their bodies in contrast to mine. He's speaking of his relation to others as a form in space, and as he began to dissect this, he decided that 'I cannot know anyone'. Their posturing in presupposition to assumptions on body cannot be solely judged as body, for this was sensory digestion of that body. "I can only know their posturing—and that only in accordance with my own bodies' perspective."

The spacial periphery and manipulations in perspective according to the senses is something that most mathematicians have wondered about (or gone insane with). He devised an arrangement of cubes to express in some way for himself the spacial relation of objects. "As long ago as Ptolemy, men have known that there is no such thing as an absolute up and an absolute down."

This makes me wonder what kind of absolutes there could be to any direction, and the spacial relations of the spaces present even between touching cubes are bound to be more evident of this concentration. Memory is indicative of these in-between spaces of planes; the non-sense regions, if you will. When Hilton turned the block upside down, he had to entirely re-memorize their spacial relations to each other as he saw from his perspective. There are planes, spaces, and spaces between planes, in the relation of objects in other dimensions, which is mainly what Hilton was concerned with. More concerning here is the relation of that which has no space or time to be related, but being able to find some sort of relationship with which to describe it. Such as, ratio in intervals in non-commensurable transliminal posturing relevant to non-time at zero. Like a long lost relative, whom I have never seen even in a photograph, who's presence I can imagine.

"...one in the investigation of the infinitely small, the other in the investigation of the infinitely great..." Hinton was speaking here of the search for the fourth dimensional energetics that he spent so much of his time with. I do not think that it is in the search of either the infinitely small nor the infinitely large, but in the perfect medium between them. The non-absolute in balances, and this plane that transforms an object to move it is more possible that in an extreme. As in turning to an expectation, and ending up at a different rotation altogether, parts of the rotation disappear, or the object itself disappears entirely. He's, of course, assuming an axis in medium, whereas I would like to imagine a plane with no axis and a medium with no plane. A plane, therefore, cannot rotate to take the place of the inversion, to rotational movement is non-absolute, non-commensurable and at the same time is trans-formative.

When two axis are put together, rotations will one way or another neutralize eachother. It's the assumption upon this neutralized rotation that becomes otherwise solely proportional to other rotations that allows those rotations to manifest; and just for being neutralized do not cease to perform function as assumed commensured space about an inferred medium. A twisting about a plane in our space depends on vectors in ratio that cannot be conceived of in much the same ways. That is to say, there are rotations and conversions that are contingent upon certain vectors within our existence that could not happen without this non-present persistent imaginary convergent that enables them. Analogous compensation in these neutralized positions from rotation do not always exist.

<0>.<0>.<0>.<0>))<<0[.<0>.<0>.<0>

Isolate the chemical reactions and it looks

like dead bodies

in jerking motions—

or we disappear for moments in time

breath filled in by

accommodations in our minds

we share fourrier

all lit up with lights

to see shadows transpose

movements from hieghts of mind

and oh, the lows—

Breathing, in-between, dark

captions of remembering

where my hands could hope to be

mouths filled with silences

left incomplete

repose, posturing

the postulates of grasping

the movements of stillness between

Paul Lockhart, in A Mathematicians Lament said, “by focusing on what and leaving out why, mathematics is reduced to an empty shell.”

The words I write in mathematics are not meant to make perfect sense; often times, they are stubborn insinuations on postulates that I barely grasp in language, let alone in symbol. However, these postulates can be just as useful to opening up new passages of thought as rigorous mathematics, if not more so. Certainly for me, at least, the understanding of the language applied and the way in which it is used is more important. The ideas in abstract construct are openings into possibilities in underlying perceptions of reality, as well.

Oftentimes, what most people get so frustrated about in math is that it's viewed as a concrete subject, not as open to interpretation as our language. But in working with and trying to learn to use

mathematics as a language in thought scape is opening up channels of understanding that would otherwise be closed off by this 'logical rigor'.

I oftentimes hear myself saying, no, I don't want a formula, I want to understand this in thought and intentions logically. I don't want to look at graph paper and 'plug in' equations, I want to understand the philosophical language in mathematics to be able to comprehend something like a curve from the actuality of the idea, not the formulas that have been applied to assume it. I'm glad nowadays for how little math I actually learned, and how much I get to wonder about in this fashion because of a lack of rigorous confusions. Of course, I get to wonder about some pretty absurd contradictions because of this as well.

“This is what comes from a misplaced sense of logical vigor: ugliness. The spirit of the argument has been buried under a heap of confusing formalism.” –Lockhart.

The zeroth law of thermodynamics, for example, is a relation of thermal equilibrium as an equivalence equation. It's necessary for the math to equate why a thermometer works, for example, but it is based on an assumption of unchanging constants over time, of which there logically cannot be a single one. So of course, not just in this instance, but in many and especially when worked to try and manifest in the world in which we actually exist (and not just the ones in our heads) these assumptions of that which is assumed get more and more preposterous to actual reason.

“...The perpetuation of this 'pseudo mathematics' this emphasis on the accurate yet mindless manipulation of symbols, creates its own culture and it's own set of values.” –Lockhart

Of course, hardly anyone can actually explain why a certain code works in one area and not in another, the instances it does and the fine lines of where it does not; but instead, these are codes or equations assumed as absolutes and applied in most formulas as such, with disregard to the actuality of happenstance and understanding that any law that is absolute has its exception according to circumstance and usage. Just as any linguist could tell you of any word, it depends on where you place it as to it's meaning.

There is a desperate need for more people writing in some sort of mathematics, even if some of it is pseudo garbage to the other extreme, to try and define some kind of linguistic mathematics that is applicable to many formulas as well as coherent to logical thought. And, that enables bumblebees to fly...

“The only way to get at the truth about our imaginations is to use our imaginations, and that is hard work.” –Lockhart

## Bibliography

Lockhart, Paul *A Mathematician's Lament*

Hinton, Charles H. Edited by Rudolf v.B.Rucker *Speculations on the Fourth Dimension* Dover Publications, Inc. 1980

Talbot, Michael *The Holographic Universe* Michael Talbot 1991

Changeux, Jean-Pierre and Connes, Alain edited and translated by M. B. DeBevoise *Conversations on Mind, Matter, and Mathematics* Princeton University Press 1995

Mach, Ernst *Introduction: The Anti-Metaphysical, The Analysis of Sensations* 1886