

# Re: Proposal for an Improved Scientific Notation

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2006-09/msg02617.html>

---

- *From:* "Tom Potter" <[tdp1001@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:tdp1001@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 26 Sep 2006 20:04:28 +0800
- 

## A Better Number System

The current defined number systems, including naturals, integers, reals, complex, surreals, etc, present distorted views of reality, are inefficient, and express quantities with too much uncertainty.

I assert that the fundamental atoms of reality are cycles, and that all physical properties can be defined in terms of simple cycles, and cycle ratios.

The number system that would best define this cyclical reality would:

1. Have no zero, but would allow any point on a circle to be used as a reference point, to which all other points would be referenced.
2. Would have clockwise and counter-clockwise senses for the purpose of defining greater or less than.
3. Would use a binary addressing scheme for defining points about the circle.

As an example, let us assume that the universe ( Like lesser effects and epochs.) cycles, rather than "big bangs". In order to define a time interval on a universal scale, or for that matter, on any sub-universal scale, ( Such as the rotation of the Earth on its' axis, its' rotation about the Sun, etc.) all we have to do is:

1. Define some starting point.
2. Perform binary searches to find other points of interest.

For example, let us assume that a point is at 90 degrees plus the square root of 2 degrees. ( 91.414..... degrees.)

## Re: Proposal for an Improved Scientific Notation

The point would be defined as:

- +180 ( too high)
- 90 = 90 ( too low)
- + 45 = 135 ( too high)
- 22.5 = 112.5 ( too high)
- 11.25 = 101.25 ( too high)
- 5.625 = 95.625 ( too high)
- 2.8125 = 92.8125 ( too high)
- 1.40625 = 91.40625 ( too low)
- + 0.703125 = 92.109375 ( too high)

and so on to the accuracy we desire, or to the limit of resolution of the equipment we use to determine or express the points. Note that the uncertainty in our answer at any step is always plus or minus one digit.

Note that the point defined above would be expressed as:

++-----+

( And that NO zero place holders are needed!) ( Read my Usenet articles on zero.)

To Summarize:

1. Reality arises from events which are quanta (Integer).
2. Reality can be best expressed by using the number system defined above.
3. Zero can be any starting point. ( On a circle)
4. Infinity does not exist. ( Not a point on a circle)
5. Real numbers can be approached to any degree of accuracy with the greatest efficiency.
6. Integers are defined by subharmonic nulls about a circle.
7. Zero place value holders ( Which are illogical, as they tell us how much "nothing" is in the set of interest.) are not needed.
7. Auto correlation and Fourier analysis, follows naturally from an examination of point amplitude values located harmonically about a circle.

For more details on this,  
visit my web site.

---

Tom Potter

<http://home.earthlink.net/~tdp/>

<http://tdp1001.googlepages.com/home>

<http://no-turtles.com>

<http://www.frappr.com/tompotter>

Re: Proposal for an Improved Scientific Notation

<http://photos.yahoo.com/tdp1001>

<http://spaces.msn.com/tdp1001>

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/tom-potter/>

<http://tom-potter.blogspot.com>

—

Posted via a free Usenet account from <http://www.teranews.com>

.