Re: On the muliplication of negative numbers

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008−07/msg02782.html

- *From*: papa_rios@xxxxxxxxxxx
- *Date*: Sun, 27 Jul 2008 14:47:05 −0700 (PDT)

On 27 jul, 17:29, "Spaceman" <space...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

> Uncle Ben wrote:
>
> > Consider 5 * 5 = 25. If one is silly enough to write 5 as 6+(−1), one
> > would have
> > (6+(−1))*(6+(−1)).=25
> >
> > By the distributive law, one could expand that to
> >
> > 6*6 + 6*(−1) + (−1)*6 + (−1)*(−1) = 25
> >
> > We all agree that 6*6=36. Now 6*(−1) = (−1)+(−1)+(−1)+(−1)+(−1)+(−1)
> > which reasonable people will agree amounts to −6. Similarly (−1)*6
> > = −6 again. So far, we have
> >
> > 25 = 36 +(−6) + (−6) + (−1)*(−1)
> > or
> > 25 = 24 + (−1)*(−1)
> >
> > which shows that (−1)*(−1) = 1. Ta−dah!
> >
> > As a gift, we get sq.rt.(1) = −1, Of course we already knew that
> > 1*1=1, so we have discovered by this simple and obvious means that
> > numbers can have two different square roots.

sq.rt.(16) = 4 or −4.

Very nice.
and of course that is what is taught in school and everyone
including me accepts such.
but..
Now try and think this way if you dare. (or you can just
"keep your rule" and forget alternate thoughts completely.)

Here is a different way to look at it.
Here is a simple number line but instead of negatives
we are going to use left and right.
l | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | r
There is no "negative" now.
Do you say that l*l = r^2?
and r*r also = r^2
Or would you treat r as the negative side and say
that r*r = l^2 and l*l=l^2?
anyways,
It is really sad that a different thought method
can have so many assholes telling me I do not know
basic math even though I know a