The Set Mappings Generating Geometry and Physics

George. M. Van Treeck

Abstract. The Euclidean volume equation is derived from a set and limit-based foundation. Distance as a function of volume is used for simple derivations of the Minkowski distances (for example, Manhattan and Euclidean distance), the Minkowski inequality, and the properties of properties metric space. The Euclidean volume proof provides simpler and more rigorous derivations of Newton's gravity force and Coulomb's charge force equations (without using the inverse square law or Gauss's divergence theorem). The derivations of the gravity and charge force equations exposes a ratio (constant first derivative) principle that allows simpler derivations of the spacetime equations and some general relativity equations. A symmetry property can limit geometric distance and volume to 3 dimensions per ball and a limit of 3 3-dimensional balls. All proofs are verified in Coq.

Contents

1. Introduction

Metric space, Euclidean distance, and area/volume are opaque definitions in mathematical analysis [Gol76] [Rud76] motivated by Euclidean geometry [Joy98]. Deriving those definitions from a set and limit-based foundation, without relying on any of the primitives and relations of Euclidean geometry, explains aspects of geometry and physics that opaque definitions and point-set topology cannot provide, for example, the countable set mappings that makes a space flat and also makes Euclidean distance is the smallest distance in flat space.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 28A75, 28E15. Secondary 03E75, 51M99.

Cartesian geometry motivates the idea that the Cartesian product of mappings between the members of n number of disjoint intervals would converge to the product of interval lengths. But there have been no proofs of that idea, which is why integrals and measure theory define rather than derive area/volume as the product of interval lengths. In this article, a proof is presented that derives the product of interval lengths from a set of Cartesian product mappings by avoiding the circular logic of defining each n-tuple as a correspondence to an infinitesimal volume.

Distance as a function of volume is used for simple derivations of the Minkowski distances (for example, Manhattan and Euclidean distance), the Minkowski inequality, and the properties of properties metric space without relying on the notions of line, angle, triangle, rectangle, etc.

A symmetry constraint on the mapping between a set of integers and a set of domain intervals/dimensions (a totally ordered set) can limit geometric distance and volume to 3 dimensions per ball and a limit of 3 3-dimensional balls.

The Euclidean volume proof is used to provide simpler and more rigorous derivations of Newton's gravity force and Coulomb's charge force equations (without using the inverse square law or Gauss's divergence theorem). The derivations of the gravity and charge forces expose a ratio (constant first derivative) principle that generates the spacetime equations and some general relativity equations.

All the proofs in this article are trivial. But, to ensure confidence in the correctness, all the proofs in this article have been verified using using the Coq proof verification system [**Coq15**]. The formal proofs are in the Coq files, "euclidrelations.v" and "threed.v," at: `https://github.com/treeck/RASRGeometry`.

2. Ruler measure and convergence

Note: In order to compute areas and volumes, integrals divide all intervals into the *same* number subintervals (infinitesimals), where the size of the infinitesimals in each interval can *vary*, which makes it difficult for integrals to directly express the number of mappings between the p_x number of size c infinitesimals in one interval and the p_y number of size c infinitesimals in another interval.

In contrast to the integral, a ruler (measuring stick) measures the size of each interval *approximately* as the sum of the nearest integer number, p, of whole subintervals (infinitesimals), where each infinitesimal has the *same* size, c.

Definition 2.1. Ruler measure, M: $\forall\, [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R},\ \ s = b - a \ \wedge\ c > 0 \ \wedge$ $(p = floor(s/c) \ \vee\ p = ceiling(s/c)) \ \wedge\ M = \sum_{i=1}^{p} c = pc.$

Theorem 2.2. *Ruler convergence:* $M = \lim_{c \to 0} pc = s.$

The proof is trivial but is included here for completeness. The theorem, "limit_c_0_M_eq_exact_size," and formal proof is in the Coq file, euclidrelations.v.

Proof. (epsilon-delta proof)
By definition of the floor function, $floor(x) = max(\{y : \ y \leq x,\ y \in \mathbb{Z},\ x \in \mathbb{R}\})$:

$$\forall\, c > 0,\, p = floor(s/c) \ \wedge\ 0 \leq |floor(s/c) - s/c| < 1 \ \Rightarrow\ 0 \leq |p - s/c| < 1. \tag{2.1}$$

Multiply all sides of inequality 2.1 by c:

$$\forall\, c > 0, \quad 0 \leq |p - s/c| < 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad 0 \leq |pc - s| < |c|. \tag{2.2}$$

$$(2.3)\quad \forall\, \delta\ :\ |pc - s| < |c| = |c - 0| < \delta$$
$$\Rightarrow\quad \forall\, \epsilon = \delta:\ \ |c - 0| < \delta\ \wedge\ |pc - s| < \epsilon\ \ :=\ \ M = \lim_{c \to 0} pc = s.\quad \square$$

The following is an example of ruler convergence for the interval, $[0, \pi]$: $s = \pi - 0$, and $p = floor(s/c) \Rightarrow p \cdot c = 3.1_{c=10^{-1}},\ 3.14_{c=10^{-2}},\ 3.141_{c=10^{-3}}, \ldots, \pi_{\lim_{c \to 0}}$.

3. Euclidean Volume

LEMMA 3.1. *Equivalent infinitesimals:* $\forall\, c > 0,\ n \geq 0:\ \lim_{c\to 0} c^n = \lim_{c \to 0} c$.

PROOF.

$$(3.1)\qquad q > 1 \quad \wedge \quad n > 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad q^n > q > 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad 0 < 1/q^n < 1/q$$

$$(3.2)\qquad 0 < 1/q^n < 1/q \quad \wedge \quad c = 1/q \quad \Rightarrow \quad 0 < c^n < c.$$

$$(3.3)\qquad 0 < c^n < c \quad \Rightarrow \quad 0 < |c - c^n| < |c| = |c - 0|.$$

$$(3.4)\quad 0 < |c - c^n| < |c - 0| \quad \Rightarrow \quad \forall\, \delta:\ |c - c^n| < |c - 0| < \delta$$
$$\Rightarrow \quad \forall\, \epsilon = \delta:\ |c - 0| < \delta \quad \wedge \quad |c - c^n| < \epsilon := \lim_{c \to 0} c^n = 0.$$

$$(3.5)\qquad \lim_{c\to 0} c^n = 0 \quad \wedge \quad \lim_{c \to 0} c = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \lim_{c\to 0} c^n = \lim_{c \to 0} c. \qquad \square$$

DEFINITION 3.2. Countable Volume:

$$v_c = |\times_{i=1}^n x_i| = \prod_{i=1}^n |x_i|, \quad \bigcap_{i=1}^n x_i = \emptyset$$

THEOREM 3.3. *Euclidean volume, v, is length of the range interval, $[v_u, v_w]$, which is equal to product of domain interval lengths, $\{[a_1, b_1], [a_2, b_2], \ldots, [a_n, b_n]\}$:*

$$v = \prod_{i=1}^n s_i,\ \ v = v_w - v_u,\ \ s_i = b_i - a_i.$$

The formal proof, "Euclidean_volume," is in the Coq file, euclidrelations.v.

PROOF.
Use the ruler (2.1) to partition each of the domain intervals, $[a_i, b_i]$, into a set, x_i, containing p_i number of size c subintervals.

$$(3.6)\quad \forall\ i\ \ n\ \in\ \mathbb{N},\quad i\ \in\ [1, n],\quad c\ >\ 0\quad \wedge\quad floor(s_i/c)\ =\ p_i\ =\ |x_i|.$$

Apply the ruler convergence theorem (2.2) to equation 3.6:

$$(3.7)\qquad floor(s_i/c) = p_i \quad \Rightarrow \quad \lim_{c\to 0}(p_i \cdot c) = s_i.$$

$$(3.8)\quad v_c = \prod_{i=1}^n |x_i| \quad \wedge \quad |x_i| = p_i \quad \Rightarrow \quad v_c = \prod_{i=1}^n p_i$$
$$\Rightarrow \quad \lim_{c\to 0} v_c \cdot c = \lim_{c\to 0}(\prod_{i=1}^n p_i) \cdot c.$$

Note: that multiplying both sides of $v_c = \prod_{i=1}^n p_i$ by an infinitesimal volume, c^n, in the previous step would be defining volume as the sum of volumes, which is circular logic. Instead both sides were multiplied by c. Next, apply lemma 3.1 to equation 3.8:

$$(3.9)\quad \lim_{c\to 0} c^n = \lim_{c\to 0} c \quad \wedge \quad \lim_{c\to 0} v_c \cdot c = \lim_{c\to 0}(\prod_{i=1}^n p_i) \cdot c$$
$$\Rightarrow \quad \lim_{c\to 0}(v_c \cdot c) = \lim_{c\to 0}(\prod_{i=1}^n p_i) \cdot c^n = \lim_{c\to 0} \prod_{i=1}^n (p_i \cdot c).$$

By ruler convergence (2.2):

$$(3.10)\qquad \exists\, v \in \mathbb{R}:\ v_c = floor(v/c) \quad \Rightarrow \quad v = \lim_{c\to 0}(v_c \cdot c).$$

Combine equation 3.10 with equation 3.9:

$$v = \lim_{c\to 0}(v_c \cdot c) \quad \wedge \quad \lim_{c\to 0}(v_c \cdot c) = \lim_{c\to 0} \prod_{i=1}^{n}(p_i \cdot c) \\ \Rightarrow \quad v = \lim_{c\to 0} \prod_{i=1}^{n}(p_i \cdot c). \tag{3.11}$$

Combine equation 3.7 and equation 3.11:

$$\lim_{c\to 0}(p_i \cdot c) = s_i \quad \wedge \quad v = \lim_{c\to 0} \prod_{i=1}^{n}(p_i \cdot c) \quad \Rightarrow \quad v = \prod_{i=1}^{n} s_i. \tag{3.12}$$ □

4. Distance

4.1. n-distance.

DEFINITION 4.1. n-distance, d:

$$v = \prod_{i=1}^{n} d = d^n \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad d = v^{1/n}.$$

4.2. Minkowski distance. Only like types can be added together. For example, only scalars can be added to a scalar and only vectors can be added to a vector. Likewise, an n-volume can only be the sum of n-volumes.

THEOREM 4.2. *Minkowski distance: All distances that are a function of volume are Minkowski distances.*

$$v = \prod_{i=1}^{n} d = d^n \quad \Rightarrow \quad d = (\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{m} s_i^n)^{1/n}$$

The formal proof, "Minkowski_distance," is in the Coq file, euclidrelations.v.

PROOF.

$$\forall\, v, v_1, \cdots, v_m : v = \sum_{i=1}^{m} v_i \quad \wedge \quad v = d^n \quad \Rightarrow \quad d^n = v = \sum_{i=1}^{m} v_i. \tag{4.1}$$

An n-volume can only be the sum of n-volumes:

$$v = \sum_{i=1}^{m} v_i \quad \wedge \quad \exists\, s_i \in \mathbb{R} : \; s_i^n = v_i \\ \Rightarrow \quad v = d^n = \sum_{i=1}^{m} s_i^n \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad d = (\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{m} s_i^n)^{1/n}. \tag{4.2}$$ □

4.3. Countable distance. Applying the ruler to countable distance, d_c, generates the Minkowski distances.

DEFINITION 4.3. Countable distance, d_c:

$$d_c^n = \sum_{i=1}^{m} |x_i|^n.$$

LEMMA 4.4. *Countable distance generates Minkowski distance*

$$d_c^n = \sum_{i=1}^{m} |x_i|^n \quad \Rightarrow \quad d = (\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{m} s_i^n)^{1/n}.$$

PROOF. Apply the ruler (2.1), ruler convergence (2.2), and the equivalent infinitesimals lemma (3.1):

$$\exists\, d, s_1, \cdots, s_m \in \mathbb{R} : \; d_c = floor(d/c) \quad \wedge \quad |x_i| = floor(s_i/c) \quad \wedge \\ d_c^n = \sum_{i=1}^{m} |x_i|^n \quad \Rightarrow \quad d^n = \lim_{c\to 0}(d_c \cdot c)^n = \lim_{c\to 0} \sum_{i=1}^{m}(|x_i| \cdot c)^n = \sum_{i=1}^{m} s_i^n. \tag{4.3}$$ □

4.4. Minkowski inequality. All published proofs of the Minkowski inequality have assumed the triangle inequality, convexity, or Hőlder's inequality, which precludes using the proofs to derive the metric space triangle inequality. The Minkowski inequality, $(\sum_{i=1}^m a_i + b_i)^{1/n} \leq \sum_{i=1}^m a_i^{1/n} + \sum_{i=1}^m b_i^{1/n}$, is used in this article for the proof that the metric space triangle inequality is generated by the Minkowski distance. Therefore, a new proof of the Minkowski inequality, for all $n \in \mathbb{R}$, that does not assume the triangle inequality, convexity, or Hőlder's inequality is presented here.

THEOREM 4.5. *Minkowski inequality*

$\forall\, m, n \in \mathbb{N}, a_1, \cdots, a_m, b_1, \cdots, b_m \geq 0 : \sum_{i=1}^m (a_i+b_i)^{1/n} \leq \sum_{i=1}^m a_i^{1/n} + \sum_{i=1}^m b_i^{1/n}$.

PROOF. v_a and v_b are two n-volumes. Expand the n-volume, $(v_a^{1/n} + v_b^{1/n})^n$, using the binomial expansion:

$$\forall\, v_a, v_b \geq 0 : \quad v_a + v_b \leq (v_a + v_b + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \binom{n}{k} (v_a^{1/n})^{n-k} (v_b^{1/n})^k) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \binom{n}{k} (v_a^{1/n})^k (v_b^{1/n})^{n-k}) = (v_a^{1/n} + v_b^{1/n})^n. \tag{4.4}$$

$$v_a + v_b \leq (v_a^{1/n} + v_b^{1/n})^n \;\; \Rightarrow \;\; (v_a + v_b)^{1/n} \leq v_a^{1/n} + v_b^{1/n}. \tag{4.5}$$

$$(a_i+b_i)^{1/n} \leq a_i^{1/n} + b_i^{1/n} \;\Rightarrow\; \sum_{i=1}^m (a_i+b_i)^{1/n} \leq \sum_{i=1}^m a_i^{1/n} + \sum_{i=1}^m b_i^{1/n}. \tag{4.6}$$ □

4.5. Metric Space. Minkowski distance generates the properties of metric space. The formal proofs: symmetry, triangle_inequality, non_negativity, and identity_of_indiscernibles are in the Coq file, euclidrelations.v.

THEOREM 4.6. *Symmetry:* $d(s_1, s_2) = (\sum_{i=1}^2 s_i^p)^{1/p} \quad \Rightarrow \quad d(u, v) = d(v, u)$.

PROOF. By the commutative law of addition:

$$\forall\, p : 1 \leq p \leq 2, \quad d(s_1, s_2) = (\sum_{i=1}^2 s_i^p)^{1/p} = (s_1^p + s_2^p)^{1/p} \tag{4.7}$$
$$\Rightarrow \quad d(u, v) = (u^p + v^p)^{1/p} = (v^p + u^p)^{1/p} = d(v, u).$$ □

THEOREM 4.7. *Triangle Inequality:* $d(s_1, s_2) = (\sum_{i=1}^2 s_i^p)^{1/p} \quad \Rightarrow \quad d(u, w) \leq d(u, v) + d(v, w)$.

PROOF. $\forall\, p \geq 1, \quad k > 0, \quad u = s_1, \quad w = s_2, \quad v = w/k$:

$$(u^p + w^p)^{1/p} \leq ((u^p + w^p) + 2v^p)^{1/p} = ((u^p + v^p) + (v^p + w^p))^{1/p}. \tag{4.8}$$

Using the Minkowski's inequality (4.5):

$$(a + b)^{1/p} \leq a^{1/p} + b^{1/p} \tag{4.9}$$
$$\Rightarrow \quad (u^p + w^p)^{1/p} \leq ((u^p + v^p) + (v^p + w^p))^{1/p} \leq (u^p + v^p)^{1/p} + (v^p + w^p)^{1/p}.$$ □

THEOREM 4.8. *Non-negativity:* $d(s_1, s_2) = (\sum_{i=1}^2 s_i^p)^{1/p} \quad \Rightarrow \quad d(u, w) \geq 0$.

PROOF. By definition, the length of an interval is always ≥ 0:

$$\forall\, [a_1, b_1],\ [a_2, b_2], \quad s_1 = b_1 - a_1,\ s_2 = b_2 - a_2, \quad \Rightarrow \quad s_1 \geq 0,\ s_2 \geq 0. \tag{4.10}$$

$$s_1 \geq 0,\ s_2 \geq 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad d(s_1, s_2) = (\sum_{i=1}^2 s_i^p)^{1/p} \geq 0. \tag{4.11}$$ □

THEOREM 4.9. *Identity of Indiscernibles:* $d(w, w) = 0$.

PROOF. Apply the triangle inequality property (4.7):

$$\forall\, d(u,v) = d(v,w) = 0 \;\wedge\; d(u,w) \le d(u,v) + d(v,w) \;\Rightarrow\; d(u,w) \le 0. \tag{4.12}$$

Combine the non-negativity property (4.8) and the previous inequality (4.12):

$$d(u,w) \ge 0 \;\wedge\; d(u,w) \le 0 \;\Leftrightarrow\; 0 \le d(u,w) \le 0 \;\Rightarrow\; d(u,w) = 0. \tag{4.13}$$

Combine the result of step 4.13 and the condition, $d(u,v) = 0$, in step 4.12.

$$d(u,w) = 0 \;\wedge\; d(u,v) = 0 \;\Rightarrow\; w = v. \tag{4.14}$$

Combine the condition, $d(v,w) = 0$, in step 4.12 and the result of step 4.14.

$$d(v,w) = 0 \;\wedge\; w = v \;\Rightarrow\; d(w,w) = 0. \tag{4.15}$$

□

5. Applications to physics

5.1. Newton's gravity force equation. m_1 and m_2, are the sizes of two independent mass intervals, where each size c component of a mass interval exerts a force on each size c component of the other mass interval. If p_1 and p_2 are the number of size c components in each mass interval, then the total force, F, is equal to the total number of forces, which is proportionate to the Cartesian product, $p_1 \cdot p_2$, and proportionate to the size, c, of each component. Applying the volume proof (3.3) (and lemma 3.1):

$$\begin{aligned} &p_1 = floor(m_1/c) \quad \wedge \quad p_2 = floor(m_2/c) \quad \wedge \quad F := m_0 a \propto (p_1 p_2)c \\ &\quad\Rightarrow \quad F := m_0 a \propto \lim_{c\to 0}(p_1 p_2)c = \lim_{c\to 0}(p_1 p_2)c^2 = \lim_{c\to 0}(p_1 c \cdot p_2 c) = m_1 m_2, \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

where the force, F, is defined as the rest mass, m_0, times acceleration, a.

Note that integrals have no means of directly specifying the p_1 and p_2 of size c infinitesimals. Therefore, it is difficult to use integrals to rigorously derive: $\lim_{c\to 0}(p_1 p_2)c = m_1 m_2$.

$$\begin{aligned} &F := m_0 a = m_0 r/t^2 \propto m_1 m_2 \;\wedge\; m_0 = m_1 \;\Rightarrow\; r \propto m_1 \;\Rightarrow \\ &\qquad \exists\, m_G, r_c \in \mathbb{R} :\; r = (\mathrm{d}r/\mathrm{d}m)m_2 = (r_c/m_G)m_2, \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

where: r is Euclidean distance, t is time, and r_c/m_G is a unit-factoring proportion ratio.

$$\begin{aligned} &m_0 = m_1 \quad \wedge \quad r = (m_G/r_c)m_2 \quad \wedge \quad F = m_0 r/t^2 \\ &\qquad \Rightarrow \quad F = m_0 r/t^2 = (r_c/m_G)m_1 m_2/t^2. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

From equation the definition of force, $F := m_0 a$:

$$\textstyle\int_0^t a\mathrm{d}t = r/t \;\Rightarrow\; \exists\, t_c, r_c \in \mathbb{R} :\; t/r = (\mathrm{d}t/\mathrm{d}r) = t_c/r_c \;\Rightarrow\; t = (t_c/r_c)r. \tag{5.4}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &t = (t_c/r_c)r \quad \wedge \quad F = (r_c/m_G)m_1 m_2/t^2 \quad \Rightarrow \\ &\qquad F = (r_c/m_G)(r_c^2/t_c^2)m_1 m_2/r^2 = (r_c^3/m_G t_c^2)m_1 m_2/r^2 = G m_1 m_2/r^2, \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

where the gravitational constant, $G = r_c^3/m_G t_c^2$, has the SI units: $m^3 kg^{-1} s^{-2}$.

5.2. Coulomb's charge force. q_1 and q_2, are the sizes of two independent charge intervals, where each size c component of a charge interval exerts a force on each size c component of the other charge interval. If p_1 and p_2 are the number of size c components in each charge interval, then the total force, F, is equal to the total number of forces, which is proportionate to the Cartesian product, $p_1 \cdot p_2$, and proportionate to the size, c, of each component. Applying the volume proof (3.3) (and lemma 3.1):

$$p_1 = floor(q_1/c) \quad \wedge \quad p_2 = floor(q_2/c) \quad \wedge \quad F \propto (p_1 p_2)c \\ \Rightarrow \quad F := m_0 a \propto \lim_{c \to 0}(p_1 p_2)c = \lim_{c \to 0}(p_1 p_2)c^2 = \lim_{c \to 0}(p_1 c \cdot p_2 c) = q_1 q_2, \tag{5.6}$$

where the force, F, is defined as the rest mass, m_0, times acceleration, a.

$$F := m_0 a = m_0 r/t^2 \propto q_1 q_2 \quad \wedge \\ m_0 = (\mathrm{d}m/\mathrm{d}q)q_1 = (m_G/q_C)q_1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad r \propto q_1 \\ \Rightarrow \quad \exists\, q_C, r_c \in \mathbb{R} : \; r = (\mathrm{d}r/\mathrm{d}q)q_2 = (r_c/q_C)q_2, \tag{5.7}$$

where: r is Euclidean distance, t is time, m_G/q_C and r_c/q_C are unit-factoring proportion ratios.

$$m_0 = (m_G/q_C)q_1 \quad \wedge \quad r = (q_C/r_c)q_2 \quad \wedge \quad F = m_0 r/t^2 \\ \Rightarrow \quad F = m_0 r/t^2 = (m_G/q_C)(r_c/q_C)q_1 q_2/t^2 = (m_G r_c/q_C^2)q_1 q_2/t^2. \tag{5.8}$$

From equation the definition of force, $F := m_0 a$:

$$\textstyle\int_0^t a \mathrm{d}t = r/t \;\Rightarrow\; \exists\, t_c, r_c \in \mathbb{R} : \; t/r = (\mathrm{d}t/\mathrm{d}r) = t_c/r_c \;\Rightarrow\; t = (t_c/r_c)r. \tag{5.9}$$

$$t = (t_c/r_c)r \quad \wedge \quad a_G = r_c/t_c^2 \quad \wedge \quad F = (m_G r_c/q_C^2)q_1 q_2/t^2 \quad \Rightarrow \\ F = (r_c^2/t_c^2)(m_G r_c/q_C^2)q_1 q_2/r^2 = ((m_G a_G)r_c^2/q_C^2)q_1 q_2/r^2 = k_c q_1 q_2/r^2, \tag{5.10}$$

where the charge constant, $k_C = (m_G a_G)r_c^2/q_C^2$, has the SI units: Nm^2C^{-2}.

5.3. Spacetime equations. As shown in the derivations of Newton's gravity force (5.1) and Coulomb's charge force (5.2) equations: $r = (r_c/t_c)t = ct$, where $r_c/t_c = c$ is a unit-factoring proportion ratio. And, the smallest distance (and time) spanning the two inertial (independent, non-accelerating) frames of reference, $[0, r_1]$ and $[0, r_2]$, is the Euclidean distance, r.

$$r = ct \quad \Rightarrow \quad (ct)^2 = r_1^2 + r_2^2 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad r_1^2 = (ct)^2 - (x^2 + y^2 + z^2), \tag{5.11}$$

where $r_2^2 = x^2 + y^2 + z^2$, which is one form of Minkowski's flat spacetime interval equation [**Bru17**]. And the length contraction and time dilation equations also follow directly from $(ct)^2 = r_1^2 + r_2^2$, where $v = r_1/t$:

$$r_2^2 = (ct)^2 - r_1^2 \;\wedge\; L = r_2 \;\Rightarrow\; L^2 = c^2t^2 - v^2 \;\Rightarrow\; L = ct\sqrt{1 - (v/c)^2}. \tag{5.12}$$

$$L = ct\sqrt{1 - (v/c)^2} \quad \wedge \quad L_0 = ct \quad \Rightarrow \quad L = L_0\sqrt{1 - (v/c)^2}. \tag{5.13}$$

$$L = ct\sqrt{1 - (v/c)^2} \;\wedge\; t' = L/c \;\Rightarrow\; t' = t\sqrt{1 - (v/c)^2}. \tag{5.14}$$

5.4. Some general relativity equations: Combining the ratio (constant first derivative) equations into partial differential equations: $r = (r_c/m_G)m = ct \Rightarrow (r_c/m_G)m \cdot ct = r^2 \Rightarrow m = (m_G/r_c c)r^2/t = (m_G/r_c c)rv$. For a constant mass, m, a decrease in the distance, r, between two mass centers causes a decrease in time, t, (time slows down). v is the relativistic orbital velocity at distance, r. $(r_c/m_G)m \cdot (ct)^2 = r^3 \Rightarrow E = mc^2 = (m_G/r_c)r^3/t^2$. And $(ct)^2 = r^2 \Rightarrow c^2 = v^2 \Rightarrow (r_c/m_G)mv^2 = c^2 r \Rightarrow KE = mv^2/2 = (m_G c^2/2r_c)r$.

Given that $c = r_c/t_c \approx 3 \cdot 10^8 ms^{-1}$ and $G = r_c^3/m_G t_c^2 = (r_c/m_G)(r_c/t_c)^2 \approx 6.7 \cdot 10^{-11} m^3 kg^{-1} s^{-2} \Rightarrow r_c/m_G \approx (6.7 \cdot 10^{-11} m^3 kg^{-1} s^{-2}/(3 \cdot 10^8 m\ s^{-1})^2 \approx 7.4 \cdot 10^{-28} m\ kg^{-1}$, which can be used to quantify the constants in the previously derived equations. For example, $m = (m_G/r_c c)rv \approx (1/((7.4 \cdot 10^{-28} m\ kg^{-1})(3 \cdot 10^8 m\ s^{-1})))rv \approx (4.5 \cdot 10^{18} kg\ s\ m^{-2})rv$.

Likewise, for charge, $r = (r_c/q_C)q = ct \Rightarrow q = (q_C/r_c c)r^2/t = (q_C/r_c c)rv$, $E = qc^2 = (q_C/r_c)r^3/t^2$, and $KE = qv^2/2 = (q_C c^2/2r_c)r$. And if the ratio of an electron's mass to charge is m_G/q_C, then $m_G/q_C \approx 9.1 \cdot 10^{-31} kg/1.6 \cdot 10^{-19} C \approx 5.7 \cdot 10^{-12} kgC^{-1}$. And using Coulomb's constant in ratio form: $k_C = (r_c/t_c)^2(m_G r_c/q_C^2) \approx 9 \cdot 10^9 Nm^2C^{-2} \approx (3 \cdot 10^8 m\ s^{-1})^2(5.7 \cdot 10^{-12} kg\ C^{-1})(r_c/q_c) \Rightarrow r_c/q_C \approx 1.7 \cdot 10^5 m\ C^{-1}$. Therefore, $q = (q_C/r_c c)rv \approx (1/((1.7 \cdot 10^5 m\ C^{-1})(3 \cdot 10^8 m\ s^{-1})))rv \approx (1.9 \cdot 10^{-13} C\ s\ m^{-2})rv$.

5.5. 3 dimensional balls. Countable volume, $v_c = \prod_{i=1}^n |x_i|$, Euclidean volume, $v = \prod_{i=1}^n s_i$, and all Minkowski distances, $d = (\sum_{i=1}^n s_i^n)^{1/n}$, require that a set of domain intervals/dimensions can be assigned a *total order*. A total order is defined in terms of successor and predecessor relations, where, in this case, the successor and predecessor relations are specified by the integers $i = 1$ to n that map to a set of domain intervals/dimensions.

But the commutative properties of union, multiplication, and addition allow sequencing through each interval (dimension) in every possible order. And "jumping" (indexing) over set members to another member requires calculating an offset, which is implicitly sequencing via the successor and predecessor relations.

Therefore, sequencing directly via the successor and predecessor relations from one set member to every other member requires each set member to be sequentially adjacent (either a successor or predecessor) to every other member, herein referred to as a symmetry constraint. It will now be proved that coexistence of the symmetry constraint on a sequentially ordered set defines a cyclic set that contains at most 3 members, in this case, 3 dimensions per ball and 3 3-dimensional balls.

Definition 5.1. Ordered geometry:

$$\forall\, i\ n \in \mathbb{N},\ i \in [1, n-1],\ \forall\, x_i \in \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\},$$
$$\textit{successor}\ x_i = x_{i+1}\ \wedge\ \textit{predecessor}\ x_{i+1} = x_i.$$

Definition 5.2. Symmetry Constraint (every set member is sequentially adjacent to every other member):

$$\forall\, i\ j\ n \in \mathbb{N},\ \forall\, x_i\ x_j \in \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\},\ \textit{successor}\ x_i = x_j\ \Leftrightarrow\ \textit{predecessor}\ x_j = x_i.$$

Theorem 5.3. *An ordered and symmetric set is a cyclic set.*

$$i = n\ \wedge\ j = 1\ \Rightarrow\ \textit{successor}\ x_n = x_1\ \wedge\ \textit{predecessor}\ x_1 = x_n.$$

The formal proof, "ordered_symmetric_is_cyclic," is in the Coq file, threed.v.

PROOF. A total order (5.1) defines unique successors and predecessors for all set members except for the successor of x_n and the predecessor of x_1. Therefore, the only member that can be a successor of x_n, without creating a contradiction, is x_1. And the only member that can be a predecessor of x_1, without creating a contradiction, is x_n. Applying the symmetry constraint (5.2):

$$i = n \;\wedge\; j = 1 \;\wedge\; \textit{successor}\ x_i = x_j \;\Rightarrow\; \textit{successor}\ x_n = x_1. \tag{5.15}$$

Applying the definition of the symmetry constraint (5.2) to conclusion 5.15:

$$\textit{successor}\ x_i = x_j \;\Rightarrow\; \textit{predecessor}\ x_j = x_i \;\Rightarrow\; \textit{predecessor}\ x_1 = x_n. \tag{5.16}$$ □

THEOREM 5.4. *An ordered and symmetric set is limited to at most 3 members.*

The lemmas and formal proofs in the Coq file threed.v are:

`Lemmas: adj111, adj122, adj212, adj123, adj133, adj233, adj213, adj313, adj323, and not_all_mutually_adjacent_gt_3.`

The following proof uses Horn clauses (a subset of first order logic) that uses unification and resolution. Horn clauses make it clear which facts satisfy a proof goal.

PROOF.
It was proved that an ordered and symmetric set is a cyclic set (5.3).

DEFINITION 5.5. Successor of m is n:

$$\textit{Successor}(m, n, \textit{setsize}) \leftarrow (m = \textit{setsize} \wedge n = 1) \vee (n = m + 1 \leq \textit{setsize}). \tag{5.17}$$

DEFINITION 5.6. Predecessor of m is n:

$$\textit{Predecessor}(m, n, \textit{setsize}) \leftarrow (m = 1 \wedge n = \textit{setsize}) \vee (n = m - q \geq 1). \tag{5.18}$$

DEFINITION 5.7. Adjacent: member m is sequentially adjacent to member n if the successor of m is n or the predecessor of m is n. Notionally:

(5.19)
$$\textit{Adjacent}(m, n, \textit{setsize}) \leftarrow \textit{Successor}(m, n, \textit{setsize}) \vee \textit{Predecessor}(m, n, \textit{setsize}).$$

Prove that every member is adjacent to every other member, where $\textit{setsize} \in \{1,\ 2,\ 3\}$:

$$\textit{Adjacent}(1, 1, 1) \leftarrow \textit{Successor}(1, 1, 1) \leftarrow (m = \textit{setsize} \wedge n = 1). \tag{5.20}$$

$$\textit{Adjacent}(1, 2, 2) \leftarrow \textit{Successor}(1, 2, 2) \leftarrow (n = m + 1 \leq \textit{setsize}). \tag{5.21}$$

$$\textit{Adjacent}(2, 1, 2) \leftarrow \textit{Successor}(2, 1, 2) \leftarrow (n = \textit{setsize} \wedge m = 1). \tag{5.22}$$

$$\textit{Adjacent}(1, 2, 3) \leftarrow \textit{Successor}(1, 2, 3) \leftarrow (n = m + 1 \leq \textit{setsize}). \tag{5.23}$$

$$\textit{Adjacent}(2, 1, 3) \leftarrow \textit{Predecessor}(2, 1, 3) \leftarrow (n = m - q \geq 1). \tag{5.24}$$

$$\textit{Adjacent}(3, 1, 3) \leftarrow \textit{Successor}(3, 1, 3) \leftarrow (n = \textit{setsize} \wedge m = 1). \tag{5.25}$$

$$\textit{Adjacent}(1, 3, 3) \leftarrow \textit{Predecessor}(1, 3, 3) \leftarrow (m = 1 \wedge n = \textit{setsize}). \tag{5.26}$$

$$\textit{Adjacent}(2, 3, 3) \leftarrow \textit{Successor}(2, 3, 3) \leftarrow (n = m + 1 \leq \textit{setsize}). \tag{5.27}$$

$$\textit{Adjacent}(3, 2, 3) \leftarrow \textit{Predecessor}(3, 2, 3) \leftarrow (n = m - q \geq 1). \tag{5.28}$$

Must prove that for all $setsize > 3$, there exist non-adjacent members. For example, the first and third members are not ($\neg$) adjacent:

$$(5.29)\quad \forall\, setsize > 3: \quad \neg Successor(1, 3, setsize > 3) \leftarrow Successor(1, 2, setsize > 3) \leftarrow (n = m + 1 \leq setsize).$$

That is, member 2 is the only successor of member 1 for all $setsize > 3$, which implies member 3 is not a successor of member 1 for all $setsize > 3$.

$$(5.30)\quad \forall\, setsize > 3: \quad \neg Predecessor(1, 3, setsize > 3) \leftarrow Predecessor(1, setsize, setsize > 3) \leftarrow (m = 1 \wedge n = setsize > 3).$$

That is, member $n = setsize > 3$ is the only predecessor of member 1, which implies member 3 is not a predecessor of member 1 for all $setsize > 3$.

$$(5.31)\quad \forall\, setsize > 3: \quad \neg Adjacent(1, 3, setsize > 3) \leftarrow \neg Successor(1, 3, setsize > 3) \wedge \neg Predecessor(1, 3, setsize > 3). \quad \square$$

That is, for all $setsize > 3$, some elements are not sequentially adjacent to every other element (not symmetric).

6. Insights and implications

(1) It was shown that all distances that are a function of an n-volume are Minkowski distances (4.2). And the Minkowski distances have the properties defining metric space (4.5). Therefore, the criteria of a distance measure being a function equivalent to a Minkowski distance (or all functions derived from an n-volume) would filter out functions that metric space would allow.

(2) A metric in the form $\mathrm{d}(x, y)$ is usually interpreted as the distance between two points, x and y. The derivation of the properties of metric space from the Minkowski distances indicates a more correct interpretation of $\mathrm{d}(x, y)$ is the distance spanning two domain sets (intervals) having the sizes, x and y.

(3) The Minkowski inequality proof in this article (4.5) is the first proof to not assume the triangle inequality, convexity, or Hőlder's inequality.

(4) The ratio of two related volumes (4.5), $v_x/v_y = (v_a + v_b)/(v_a^{1/n} + v_b^{1/n})^n$, generates: the Minkowski inequality, the triangle inequality, and convexity.

(5) All proofs that Euclidean distance is the smallest distance between two distinct points equate Euclidean distance to a straight line (equation), where it is assumed that the straight line is smallest distance [**Joy98**]. And proofs that a straight line (equation) is the smallest distance equate the straight line to Euclidean distance, which is circular logic. There have been no set and limit-based explanations of why Euclidean distance is the smallest distance.

 Countable distance (4.4), $d_c^n = \sum_{i=1}^{m} |x_i|^n$, generates Minkowski distance (4.2), which exposes the countable domain-to-domain set mappings that generate distance.

 Flat space is where: 1) each member of domain set, x_i, maps to itself once, and 2) each member of domain set, x_i, maps at most once to each member of domain set, x_i. Therefore, the countable distance, d_c, in flat space, ranges:

(a) from the sum of bijective mappings (the sum of 1-1 correspondences), which converges to Manhattan distance (by lemma 4.4), for example, $d = a + b + c$,

(b) to the sum of the Cartesian product mappings, which converges to Euclidean distance (by lemma 4.4): $d = (a^2 + b^2 + c^2)^{1/2}$.

$\forall\, a, b, c > 0,\ 1 \leq p < 2 :\ (a^2 + b^2 + c^2)^{1/2} < (a^p + b^p + c^p)^{1/p}$, where the largest number of domain-to-domain set mappings (the Cartesian product) makes Euclidean distance is the smallest distance in flat space.

(6) As shown in the derivations of Euclidean volume, Newton's gravity force, and Coulomb's charge force, the ruler (2.1) plus ruler convergence (2.2) is a tool to directly express some counting relations in geometry, probability, physics, etc. that is difficult to directly express with integrals.

(7) Applying the volume proof (3.3) to the Cartesian product of same-sized, infinitesimal mass forces and charge forces to derive Newton's gravity force (5.1) and Coulomb's charge force (5.2) equations provide several firsts and some insights into physics.

(a) These are the first deductive derivations of the gravity and charge forces. All other derivations have been empirical and use Newton's induction, which is not fully provable, for example, assumes the inverse square law based on empirical observation.

(b) These are the first derivations to not use the inverse square law or Gauss's divergence theorem.

(c) These are the first derivations to show that the definition of force, $F := m_0 a$, containing acceleration, $a :\ \int_0^t a\mathrm{d}t = r/t \ \Rightarrow\ \exists\ t_c, r_c \in \mathbb{R} :\ t/r = t_c/r_c \ \Rightarrow\ r = (r_c/t_c)t$, generates the inverse square law: $F := m_0 a = m_0 r/t^2 = (r_c/t_c)^2 (m_x r_c/x_x^2) x_1 x_2/r^2 = k_x x_1 x_2/r^2$.

(d) Using Occam's razor, those versions of constants like: charge, vacuum magnetic permeability, fine structure, etc. that contain the value 4π are probably incorrect because those constants are based on the less parsimonious assumption that the inverse square law is due to Gauss's flux divergence on a sphere having the surface area, $4\pi r^2$.

(e) These are the first derivations to show that time is proportionate to distance: $r = (r_c/t_c)t = ct$, which is used to derive the spacetime equations (5.3) without the notion of the speed of light.

(f) The derivations show for the first time how gravity force, charge force, spacetime, and general relativity all depend on time being proportionate to distance.

(g) Combining the constant first derivatives (ratios) into partial differential equations allows simple derivations of some general relativity equations (5.4) without the need for integrating second derivative (spacetime curvature) tensors.

(h) A state is represented by a constant value. Therefore, a state value does not vary with distance and time interval lengths. For example, the spin values of two quantum entangled electrons and the polarization of two quantum entangled photons are independent of the amount of distance and time between the entangled particles.

(8) It was proved that a totally ordered set with a symmetry constraint is a cyclic set with at most 3 members (5.3). And the definitions of distance and volume both require a total order and symmetry, which provides several insights:
   (a) Using Occam's razor, a cyclic set of at most 3 members is the most parsimonious explanation of only observing 3 dimensions of geometric distance and volume.
   (b) If there are higher dimensions of ordered and symmetric geometric space, then there is a set of at most three members (5.4), each member being an ordered and symmetric set of 3 dimensions (three balls), yielding a total of at most 9 ordered and symmetric dimensions of geometric space.
   (c) Each dimension of discrete physical states can have at most 3 ordered and symmetric discrete state values of the same type, which allows $3 \cdot 3 \cdot 3 = 27$ possible combinations of discrete values of the same type per 3-dimensional ball, for example, vector orientation values: -1, 0, 1 per orthogonal direction in the ball.
   (d) Each of the 3 possible ordered and symmetric dimensions of discrete physical states could contain an unordered collection (bag) of discrete state values. Bags are non-deterministic. For example, every time an unordered binary state is "pulled" from a bag, there is a 50 percent chance of getting one of the binary values.

References

[Bru17] P. Bruskiewich, *A very simple introduction to special relativity: Part two - four vectors, the lorentz transformation and group velocity (the new mathematics for the millions book 38)*, Pythagoras Publishing, 2017. ↑7

[CG15] W. Conradie and V. Goranko, *Logic and discrete mathematics*, Wiley, 2015. ↑

[Coq15] Coq, *Coq proof assistant*, 2015. https://coq.inria.fr/documentation. ↑2

[Gol76] R. R. Goldberg, *Methods of real analysis*, John Wiley and Sons, 1976. ↑1

[Joy98] D. E. Joyce, *Euclid's elements*, 1998. http://aleph0.clarku.edu/~djoyce/java/elements/elements.html. ↑1, 10

[Rud76] W. Rudin, *Principles of mathematical analysis*, McGraw Hill Education, 1976. ↑1

George Van Treeck, 668 Westline Dr., Alameda, CA 94501