Re: On the muliplication of negative numbers

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008−07/msg02783.html

- *From*: "Spaceman" <spaceman@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Sun, 27 Jul 2008 17:52:58 −0400

papa_rios@xxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

> On 27 jul, 17:29, "Spaceman" <space...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
> 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 all about the basics
of −1*−1 = 1
(the multiplication of negatives as taught in school)
So,
Can you tell me what side is "truly" negative?
the left side, or the right side?
Or will you again just blab about "what is taught
and refuse to "think about other methods" at all
:)

––
James M Driscoll Jr
Creator of the Clock Malfunction Theory
Spaceman

You know nothing about logic, so whatever you say will logically be wrong just because you are saying it!.

To discuss your insane example, first you have to clearly state:
a) What is the definition of right (r) and left (l).

An observers right side and left side dufus.
If I need to explain right and left to you, you truly
must have problems putting your shoes on huh?

> b) What is the definition of 0.

nothing.
the center
straight in front of the observer.
Sheesh
Can't you think for yourself at all?

> c) What is the definition of the markings "|" and what level of
> rightness of leftness means, for instance two marks.

You can make them what you want,
That is the beauty of a numberline moron.
It is a scale that can be variable depending on the needed
scale of measurment.
You sure are not too smart huh?

> So you see, unless you clearly state your problem asking for r*r is
> nonsense.

Only nonsense to those that can't think on thier own and
need their hands held even when putting on shoes.

> Grow up! ilogical child

Poor Miguel
he can't tell which shoe goes on the correct foot
and he calls me the child.
LOL
He is truly stuck in ROM only mode.
:)
−−
James M Driscoll Jr
Creator of the Clock Malfunction Theory
Spaceman

.