

Edewlogics

Copyright 2023. All rights reserved.

On the nature of truth

Ade Ronke

Authors initial Notes

This essay is brought to you without prejudice, with great beliefs in truth, decency, dignity and inclusion in science. Please help make a true generational difference in the future of science and humanity. Donate to the free books for life cause today.

[DONATE TO SUPPORT THE FREE BOOKS FOR LIFE CAUSE](#)

There is a limitation to the originality of mimicry in the fallacy that the disposition of such limitation is rather that of some radical difference. The simple truth never strays far from its dooming complexity. Truth, as we accumulate content in this mathematical essay series, must be defined.

Truth is that which must be integratable and differentiable as a corroborative correspondence in space-time events. That is, truth is a function, It is a functioning attribution of conscious space-time evidentiary collaboration.

Let's get into the abstraction aspect of truth by employing analysis in mathematical-physics to differentiate between the words "constant" and "truth". What is the truth as we know it at the moment? Do we know it at the moment? Must we not get to the moment so we can know it? Must we not?

I call what I am about to discuss "a compactness" problem. No, not in terms of mathematical logic but rather that of the necessary coherence that must aid the projection of truth. Many scientists would like to believe the debate about the geometric and compositional reality of earth is no longer a debate. But evidence shows this is far from the nature of truth.

One of the reasons flat earthers make a point of ascribing flatness to the earth is because they don't observe "curves". Curves, as I will discuss further in the *an animated life (alw)* series, is the functional aspect of the procedural definition applicable to universal conceptions and probable discovery in composition. Is the earth flat, round, merely spherical or something entirely in between those, something yet unknown?

From our proximal understanding of earth as commoners rather than scientists, we walk on a somewhat flat ground. We see the ground. We're able to walk on it without tilting or correcting our upward stance in order to stand or walk. This observation cannot be denied. Do we walk upright on a close to linear plane or not? Is this linear plane in or below this round red inner core?

Here I will attempt simplicity in expressing that the projection of roundness is also problematic. Planets, such as earth, are defined as such to fit the mold of the necessity of rounding relative to the imposition of the sun's gravitational complex. That is, a planet's geometric confinement fits the need to shape its formation according to the complexes of the environment it exists in. We have to be aware of our environmental observations as earthians in a way some transcending deduction cannot possibly experience. Therefore, the flatness account cannot be removed from the roundness. Yet, if we consider the flatness of the ground on which we walk, which we must, I find that we must reject the red inner core attributed to earth. Our only other possibility is in some red globe located within earth's core which is somewhat inevitably flat.

If we discount the roundness, we must discount earth as a planet, which we can't. But this line of thought gets worse. Whatever could happen if the solar gravitation complex doesn't hold up, doesn't hold us up. Is there something we are yet missing that holds things up? Will we disintegrate into space and die if this happens? Is there an inner round core under our flat feet or is there a constant gravitational complex holding us in enlivening alignment we are yet to properly discover? Is it true or is it true? Or is it a "constant" enabling the "constant" that is the world we consciously observe as the world?

The relevance to truth here is impressive. For instance, the gravitational constant on earth is numeric outside of its being a force. We must discuss truth and numbers in mathematics. Numbers are constants. In the spirit of truth, they are abstract entities. In the body of application, observation, actualizations and such, they become functional. They are entities packed with meaning, understanding, value and functionality. I cannot imagine our world without them. And if this series holds implication, I need not profess my love for mathematical numerics and their representations.

There is this common and easily understood argument that allows us to say 2 is an even number. And from this fact, the argument goes that every number next in line in the positive number line to an even number, is an odd number. Here I must say something controversial but functional. 0(zero) is an even number. And there are many ways we can explore this premise but here we could simplify this to the additive and even-dividend domain. If we divide any number by zero, mathematics says the quotient(result) is undefined. When zero is the dividend, we say the quotient is zero. Are these mathematical assumptions true or are they true?

When we divide an even number by an even number, we get an even number or an odd number. But when we divide an even number by an odd number, we always get an even number. Evenness is assured in the quotient. Now to the additive. For this, we must from precedence, assume, at all times, based on the same argument with the number 2, that 1 is an odd number.

It is often assumed quite disastrously in science that moving to the negative line in the number line has no functional repercussion. That, quite frankly, can only be argued in the abstraction, some place where numbers can only be imagined and never in a world like ours where they are functional.

We have come to the additive aspect of the argument for the evenness of zero rather than the oddness. For this we must hypothesize that zero is even without discussing the consequences of such(we will in other publications). This enables us to cross towards the negative side from the very premise of the argument that the number before 0 which is 1 is odd and thus 0 must be even. This, I must tell you,

intuitively, is what happens in alternating sequences where there are no integral limit impositions. There is a complex imposition of continuity. Are such continuities true or are they true? The certainty in the discussion of alternating charges in numeric lines is in the existence of complexities.

To reduce the complications possible in such complex probabilities here, I must define falsehood. Falsehood is, from the definition of truth, as in the consequential infraction for the magnetic moment in *alw*, not entirely an absolute opposition to the truth but a necessary consequent. Truth must exist before falsehood can be established. And for this truth must possess a set attribute integratable and necessary. Falsehood is the differentiable aspect of truth. That is, it is the non-corroborative correspondence with respect to truth.

A functional truth for instance, is the fact that I am the author of this essay. Now, the consequence after the fact is that you may be reading it at this moment. That's the instance where falsehood may occur. You may be reading this essay or you may not be reading this essay at this moment. That may be disputable in your consciousness as it is your consciousness. The truth of the matter is inevitable and indisputable to me and must be to you. I am the author of this essay. If I didn't write this essay, you wouldn't be in doubt over the truth value of your participation relative to engendering and rendering of the understanding of the essay. If I didn't write it, you wouldn't be reading it.

The additive going in the positive line for the even zero is a consequential infraction that takes a simplex to a complex. That is a truth attributable. The truth to be determined is in what procedural pattern this is happening. That content will be a discussion for a book like *an animated life*. The additive to the even zero is -1 , the number that gets us the square root of i complex from $x^2 + 1 = 0$. While it is easy to assert that the -1 complex is odd, it is farthest from the truth. It is also not a falsehood. The falsehood is in the consequential infraction. In fact this number is expressed as something else entirely. It is also in the sphere of the magnetic moment. It is proximal in actualization and identification. That is, if it was a genetic trait, it is impossible to go outside the immediate reach of the genetic pool to get it. It is not odd, and I am at the moment inclined to tell you that to get any

further in the negative line you must invoke the positive numbers to maintain the evenness of zero. $1+1=0$, $2+2=0$, $3+3=0$, $4+4=0$, $5+5=0$, $6+6=0$... The validity of my assertion with regard to the complex mode of actualizable and viable optimization is still in the procedural phase and we must discuss this further in some future publication.

Parameters in graph theory for instance, or geometric calculus cannot compare to the attribution embodied in Medicine and Surgery's Anatomy and Physiology. There are set attributable truths with respect to anatomy and physiology ensuring its truth. It is from set attribution that we develop variations in formations and differentiations that call for recognition of anomalies and abnormalities.

The approach towards my works, all works, even fiction, is in ensuring active and procedural truth. I needed a definition for truth that captures this. The strong advent of unexpected attribution in artificial intelligence these days reminds me about the way I feel about some aspects of science and why scientists should never be fully trusted. They were supposed to be the epitome of the do-no-harm policy in science but they have become like the machines, the epitomes of harm without an ounce of human-actualizable thought.

They exist in a genetic degenerate possible world where harm-done and invested has to be persistently and consistently fought-off and conquered. That is harmful. It all looks like some horror movie I am watching giving birth to another horror movie in which the first horror movie antagonist you would have thought was the protagonist (but was erroneously predetermined as such because truth must own precedence) couldn't be trusted.

Trust matters because if it doesn't, some nonentity covered-up-down-left-right, coveted indignity does. The sanctity of my mind, decency and quest for inclusion in science and dignity in humanity matters to me. All these are evident in the definition of truth. It is fluid, it is vectored, it is an initiating pathway towards all things I hold dignifiable. This is what I want you to remember when I say I value truth in my blog, essays and books.

Authors concluding notes

If you hold the same values and would like to support further production of things like this analytic mathematical essay series, the blog and the books, please support the free books for life cause. You can choose to support music by RIL to support the free books for life cause. It's my way of ensuring humanity is connected by choice, as this essay may intuit, through music. Inclusion matters to me done in a decent, truthful and respectful manner. I write the music for the albums. RIL's music is alternative music with great respect for the conventional adoption, adaptation of the genre style involved. That is, it is an attempt to respect the functionality of the set attribute originally attached to the genre while edging towards further possibilities. If you are a fan of music, discover and support music by RIL. Thank you.

[DONATE TO SUPPORT THE FREE BOOKS FOR LIFE CAUSE](#)