The Attralucian Essays: Exploring the Finite

First Edition

 Typeset in LaTeX

The Attralucian Essays

A Geofinite Replacement of the Ket and Heaviside Function

Kevin R. Haylett

Chapter 1

A Geofinite Replacement of the Ket and Heaviside Function

Symbol Formation, Projection, and the Limits of Flattened Mathematical Notation

Overview

This chapter develops a Geofinite critique of two widely used mathematical-symbolic devices: the Dirac ket and the Heaviside step function. Both are treated here not merely as technical notations, but as examples of a deeper representational habit in classical mathematics and physics: the flattening of dynamic measurement processes into ideal symbolic forms. The ket compresses a measured or inferred state into an abstract vector-symbol. The

Heaviside function compresses a transition process into a dimensionless discontinuity. In both cases, the finite construction of symbols, the uncertainty of first-order measurement, and the dimensional structure of the measurement-symbol relation are omitted from the formal object.

Within Geofinitism, or Geometric Finitism, knowledge begins with finite exogenous measurement. Such measurement crosses the Generonic boundary, transforming symbolic potential into a finite symbol. At the Alphonic Limit, the symbol is not a point, line, or ideal state, but a finite three-dimensional Nexil with uncertainty and provenance. Classical symbolic systems often project this Nexil into one- or two-dimensional notation, after which the projection is treated as if it were the primary object. This chapter proposes a replacement formalism based on the *Geofinite Nexil Function*, a finite symbolic construction that preserves measurement origin, dimensional extent, uncertainty, and projection history.

The conclusion is that both the ket and the Heaviside step function should be understood as downstream projections of a more fundamental symbol-generating process. Their usefulness is not denied, but their foundational status is rejected.

Introduction

Mathematics has long relied on symbolic compression. A mark on a page, a letter in an equation, a line in a diagram, or a state-vector in a formalism allows a dynamic process to be slowed, stabilised, and manipulated. Without such symbolic compression, mathematics and science would be impossible.

Yet compression has a cost.

When a dynamic measurement process is compressed into a fixed symbol, the symbol may begin to appear more fundamental than the measurement process that produced it. The mark becomes privileged over the act of marking. The notation becomes privileged over the measurement. The formal object begins to appear as if it possesses an existence independent of the finite conditions under which it was generated.

This chapter examines two examples of this process: the *ket* of quantum mechanics and the *Heaviside step function* of mathematical physics.

The ket, usually written as

$$|\psi\rangle,$$

is a compact symbolic object used to represent a quantum state. It belongs to the formal language introduced by Paul Dirac and later absorbed into the standard mathematical presentation of quantum mechanics. It is elegant, efficient, and powerful. However, from a Geofinite perspective, it is also a highly compressed symbolic projection. It does not record its own measurement provenance, its symbolic construction pathway, or the uncertainty by which finite measurements are converted into formal state descriptions.

The Heaviside step function, usually written as

$$H(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x < 0, \\ 1, & x \geq 0, \end{cases}$$

is similarly useful. It represents a sudden transition, a switch, a threshold, or a discontinuity. It is widely used in signal processing, physics, engineering, and applied mathematics. Yet it too assumes that symbolic transition can be idealised as a dimensionless boundary. From a Geofinite standpoint, this is inadmissible as a first-order measurement object. A finite measurement does not cross from nothing to symbol across an infinitely thin line. It generates a symbol across a finite boundary of uncertainty. The central claim of this chapter is therefore:

> The ket and the Heaviside step function are flattened symbolic projections of finite measurement-symbol processes. They should not be treated as foundational objects within a Geofinite framework.

A replacement is required. That replacement must begin not with ideal state-vectors or discontinuous thresholds, but with the finite symbol as generated by measurement.

The Story of the Ket

The ket notation emerged as part of the formal consolidation of quantum mechanics. It provided a compact way of representing abstract state vectors and their relationships to dual vectors, operators, inner products, and measurement amplitudes. Its success lies in its compression. A quantum state, which might otherwise require a long coordinate representation or functional expression, can be symbolised as a single formal object:

$$|\psi\rangle.$$

The notation encourages powerful algebraic manipulation. States may be transformed, superposed, projected, normalised, and operated upon. In conventional quantum mechanics, the ket participates in a formal system in which observables are represented by operators, measurement outcomes correspond to eigenvalues, and probabilities are derived through amplitude relations.

The ket therefore belongs to an abstract mathematical language. It does not present itself as a physical mark generated by a particular finite measurement. It presents itself as a formal state-symbol.

This is precisely where the Geofinite concern begins.

The ket is not the first symbol produced by measurement. It is a downstream symbolic compression. It sits after many acts of selection, abstraction, calibration, modelling, and theoretical interpretation. Yet its notation is so compact that it can appear primary:

- the finite origin of the symbol is hidden;

- the measurement chain is hidden;

- the uncertainty of symbol formation is hidden;

- the dimensionality of the symbol is flattened into notation.

The ket is therefore not rejected as useless. Rather, its status is changed. It is no longer treated as a foundational representation of a physical state. It becomes a formal projection built from prior finite symbol-generating events.

In Geofinite terms:

$$|\psi\rangle \not\equiv \text{first-order measurement.}$$

Instead:

$$|\psi\rangle \sim \mathcal{M}\left(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n\right),$$

where $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n$ are finite symbols generated through measurement, and $\mathcal{M}$ is a model-mediated symbolic construction.

The ket is therefore a model object, not a first-order measurement object.

The Story of the Heaviside Function

The Heaviside step function entered mathematical physics as a convenient way of representing switching, activation, thresholding, and discontinuous change. Its power comes from its simplicity. A value is below threshold, or it is above threshold. The function returns zero or one. The world is divided cleanly.

In engineering and applied mathematics, this is extremely useful. It allows systems to be idealised. Circuits turn on. Signals begin. Forces are applied. Boundary conditions change. A continuous domain can be split by a symbolic threshold.

But the Heaviside function carries a strong assumption:

> The transition boundary has no finite width.

The function therefore erases the process by which a measurement becomes a symbol. It assumes that the passage from one symbolic state to another can be represented by an ideal discontinuity.

From a Geofinite perspective, this is not a first-order measurement description. A finite measurement has uncertainty. A detector has thresholds. A mark has width. A ruler line has thickness. A sensor has noise. A symbolic distinction has finite resolution. A measurement boundary is not dimensionless.

Thus the Heaviside function is not wrong as an idealisation. It is wrong only if treated as foundational.

A classical Heaviside transition says:

$$x < 0 \Rightarrow 0, \qquad x \geq 0 \Rightarrow 1.$$

A Geofinite measurement transition says:

> There is a finite region in which symbol formation occurs.

The classical step function removes this region. It replaces it with an ideal boundary.

Earlier, one might attempt to correct the function by writing a softened version:

$$H_\epsilon(x),$$

where ϵ represents a transition width. This is an improvement, but it remains incomplete. It still treats the transition as essentially one-dimensional. It still assumes the symbol can be modelled by a smoothed line.

The deeper Geofinite correction is not merely to soften the step. It is to replace the step with a finite symbol-generating structure.

Foundational Commitments of Geofinitism

Geofinitism, or Geometric Finitism, begins from a set of commitments that differ from those of classical mathematical realism.

The first commitment is that the world is known through *finite measurement*.

The second is that all measurement has *uncertainty*.

The third is that measurement produces or stabilises *finite symbols*.

The fourth is that models, equations, narratives, and theories are constructed *within the symbolic realm* after symbol generation has occurred.

The fifth is that there is no admissible appeal to a perfect correspondence between symbol and external reality. Correspondence theory, in its strong form, requires a perfect symbolic construction that exceeds the commitments of Geofinitism.

Thus the Geofinite pathway is not:

$$\text{Reality} \to \text{perfect symbol.}$$

It is:

$$\begin{array}{rl} \text{symbolic potential} & \\ \big\downarrow & \text{finite measurement} \\ \text{finite symbol} & \\ \big\downarrow & \text{symbolic relation} \\ \text{model} & \\ \big\downarrow & \text{narrative decompression} \\ \text{explanation} & \end{array}$$

The transition from symbolic potential into symbolic form occurs at the *Generonic boundary*. Before this boundary, there is no directly possessed object of knowledge. There is only symbolic potential: the possibility that measurement may generate a finite symbol.

After the boundary, the symbol enters the symbolic realm. It can be related to other symbols, compressed, decompressed, encoded, transformed, modelled, and narrated. But it never escapes its finite provenance.

This is the central discipline of Geofinitism:

> The symbol must remember its measurement origin.

The Alphonic Limit and the Nexil

At the point of first-order measurement, Geofinitism identifies the *Alphonic Limit*.

The Alphonic Limit is the current boundary of first-order symbol formation. It is not the limit of imagination, interpolation, modelling, or narrative refinement. It is the limit at which measurement first generates a finite symbolic distinction without relying on further internal reconstruction.

A first-order measurement does not produce a mathematical point. It produces a finite symbol. Within Geofnitism and FSM this finite symbol is called a *Nexil*.

The Nexil is not an abstract zero-dimensional object. It has extent, uncertainty, and provenance. Within Geometric Finitism, the symbol has a three-dimensional structure, even when later projected into a one- or two-dimensional notation.

In a simple two-dimensional observational plane, the Alphonic Limit may be understood by analogy with the finite width between ruler marks. A ruler line is not an ideal line. It has width. The observer's alignment has uncertainty. The substrate has texture. The symbol is finite. Thus, at the Alphonic Limit, the symbol is better represented not as a point but as a bounded uncertainty-bearing symbolic region.

We may write:

$$\mathcal{N}_\alpha^{(3D)} \sim (s, V_\alpha, U_\alpha, P_M).$$

Here s is the symbolic identity assigned; V_α is the finite Alphonic volume of the symbol; U_α is the uncertainty structure associated with symbol generation; and P_M is the provenance of the measurement process.

This structure is deliberately open. In particular, U_α is not assumed to be Gaussian, linear, sigmoidal, probabilistic in the classical sense, or known in advance. The uncertainty function is not imposed at first order.

This matters.

To assume a particular uncertainty function is already to enter a second-order model. It may be useful, but it must be declared as a model-mediated refinement, not smuggled into the first-order measurement.

Thus:

$$U_\alpha \neq \text{assumed Gaussian},$$

$$U_\alpha \neq \text{assumed sigmoid},$$

$$U_\alpha \neq \text{assumed classical probability density}.$$

Instead:

$$U_\alpha \sim \text{underdetermined first-order uncertainty structure}.$$

This is the formal heart of the replacement.

Flattening and Projection

Classical notation frequently flattens symbols.

A three-dimensional mark becomes a two-dimensional diagram.

A two-dimensional diagram becomes a one-dimensional expression.

A dynamic measurement process becomes a letter.

A finite transition becomes a step function.

A measurement history becomes a ket.

This flattening is not inherently wrong. It is often necessary. But Geofinitism requires that the projection be remembered.

Let the projection from the three-dimensional Nexil into a two-dimensional representation be written as:

$$\Pi_{2D}\left(\mathcal{N}_{\alpha}^{(3D)}\right) \sim n_{\alpha}^{(2D)}.$$

Similarly, the projection into a one-dimensional symbolic form may be written as:

$$\Pi_{1D}\left(\mathcal{N}_{\alpha}^{(3D)}\right) \sim n_{\alpha}^{(1D)}.$$

The crucial point is that:

$$n_\alpha^{(2D)} \not\equiv \mathcal{N}_\alpha^{(3D)},$$

and:

$$n_\alpha^{(1D)} \not\equiv \mathcal{N}_\alpha^{(3D)}.$$

The flattened symbol is not the full symbol.

It is a projection.

This is where classical mathematical notation often becomes misleading. It does not merely represent. It forgets that it represents. The flattened object then becomes treated as if it were the foundational object.

This is especially serious in quantum mechanics, where formal notation can become many layers removed from first-order measurement.

The Ket Limit

The *Ket Limit* marks the boundary beyond which a ket cannot be treated as equivalent to a first-order measurement symbol.

The ket is not a Nexil. It is not generated directly at the Alphonic Limit. It is a formal object constructed from projected symbols, modelling assumptions, and mathematical transformations.

Thus:

$$|\psi\rangle \not\equiv \mathcal{N}_{\alpha}^{(3D)}.$$

More appropriately:

$$|\psi\rangle \sim \mathcal{M}\left(\Pi(\mathcal{N}_{\alpha 1}^{(3D)}), \Pi(\mathcal{N}_{\alpha 2}^{(3D)}), \ldots, \Pi(\mathcal{N}_{\alpha n}^{(3D)})\right).$$

Here $\mathcal{M}$ denotes a model-mediated symbolic construction. The ket is therefore a projection-chain symbol, not a first-order measurement symbol.

The Ket Limit can be stated as follows:

> The Ket Limit is the boundary beyond which quantum state notation cannot claim first-order measurement status. It may operate as a formal symbolic compression, but it cannot be identified with the finite Nexil structure generated at the Alphonic Limit.

This does not abolish the ket. It reclassifies it.

Within Geofinitism, the ket is admissible only as a downstream symbolic construction. It is not foundational.

The Heaviside Limit

The Heaviside function also encounters a limit.

The classical Heaviside function treats transition as an ideal discontinuity. But in a Geofinite framework, transition is a finite symbol-generating region. Therefore:

$$H(x) \not\equiv \text{first-order threshold.}$$

Instead, the Heaviside function may be understood as a flattened projection:

$$H(x) \sim \Pi_{1D}\left(\mathcal{N}_{\alpha}^{(3D)}\right),$$

where the full Nexil structure has been compressed into a binary symbolic boundary.

This is the *Heaviside Limit*:

> The Heaviside Limit is the boundary beyond which a discontinuous one-dimensional step cannot be treated as a first-order measurement transition.

A finite measurement transition is not a dimensionless jump. It is a Nexil-forming process with extent and uncertainty.

Thus the Geofinite correction is not simply:

$$H(x) \to H_{\epsilon}(x).$$

That would still be a flattened correction.

The deeper correction is:

$$H(x) \to \Pi_{1D}\left(\mathcal{N}_\alpha^{(3D)}\right),$$

with:

$$\mathcal{N}_\alpha^{(3D)} \sim (s, V_\alpha, U_\alpha, P_M).$$

The Heaviside function is therefore preserved only as a projection of a more fundamental symbolic geometry.

The Geofinite Nexil Function

We now define a named replacement function.

Let the *Geofinite Nexil Function* be written as:

$$\mathfrak{G}_\alpha(M) = \mathcal{N}_\alpha^{(3D)} \sim (s, V_\alpha, U_\alpha, P_M).$$

Here M is a finite measurement process. The function does not return an ideal point, a binary value, or an abstract state-vector. It returns a finite symbolic unit generated at the Alphonic Limit.

Thus:

$$\mathfrak{G}_\alpha(M)$$

is the finite symbol-forming function of Geofinitism.

It may be described in words as follows:

> The Geofinite Nexil Function maps a finite

measurement process to a three-dimensional uncertainty-bearing symbolic unit with provenance.

From this function, flattened symbolic forms may be generated by projection:

$$\Pi_{2D}\left(\mathfrak{G}_\alpha(M)\right) \sim n_\alpha^{(2D)},$$

$$\Pi_{1D}\left(\mathfrak{G}_\alpha(M)\right) \sim n_\alpha^{(1D)}.$$

The ket and Heaviside function may then be reinterpreted as special downstream cases:

$$|\psi\rangle \sim \mathcal{M}\left(\Pi(\mathfrak{G}_\alpha(M_1)), \ldots, \Pi(\mathfrak{G}_\alpha(M_n))\right),$$

and:

$$H(x) \sim \Pi_{1D}\left(\mathfrak{G}_\alpha(M_x)\right),$$

where M_x is the measurement process associated with a threshold distinction.

This is not merely a notation change. It reverses the order of priority.

Classical formulation begins with the ideal object.

Geofinite formulation begins with finite symbol generation.

Results of the Enquiry

The enquiry produces several results.

- First, the ket is not a first-order measurement symbol. It is a downstream formal compression built from projected measurement-derived symbols and model assumptions.

- Second, the Heaviside function is not a first-order transition. It is a flattened idealisation of a finite symbol-generating region.

- Third, the Alphonic Limit marks the first-order boundary of symbol generation. Beyond this boundary, additional precision is model-mediated, not directly measured.

- Fourth, the Nexil is the finite symbol generated at the Alphonic Limit. It has extent, uncertainty, and provenance.

- Fifth, in Geometric Finitism the symbol has a three-dimensional structure. One- and two-dimensional notations are projections, not the full symbol.

- Sixth, the uncertainty function associated with first-order symbol generation should not be assumed. It remains open unless introduced by a declared second-order model.

- Seventh, the Geofinite Nexil Function provides a replacement frame for both ket notation and Heaviside thresholding by preserving the measurement-symbol relation.

- Eighth, classical formulations often hide the representational pipeline by flattening geometry into notation.

- Ninth, the distinction between first-order measurement and model-mediated refinement is essential. Without it, inferred precision may be mistaken for measured precision.

- Tenth, the philosophical foundation of knowledge must be measurement, not ideal correspondence.

Philosophical Discussion: Measurement as the Foundation of Knowledge

The deeper issue is not merely mathematical. It is philosophical. Classical mathematics often proceeds as though symbols can participate in a realm of ideal relations independent of measurement. The point, the line, the function, the vector, the discontinuity, and the state may be treated as if they are primary. Measurement is then seen as an imperfect attempt to access or approximate these ideal forms. Geofinitism reverses this order:

- Measurement is primary;

- Symbol is generated;

- Model is constructed;

- narrative is decompressed.

Knowledge is therefore not direct correspondence with an external object. Knowledge is a symbolic process grounded in finite measurement. This has important consequences as a measurement does not reveal a ready-made symbol. It creates a finite symbolic distinction across the Generonic boundary. That symbol is then available for manipulation within the symbolic realm. It may be compared, encoded, translated, projected, compressed, decompressed, and narrated. But all of these later operations are downstream of the first-order measurement.

The traditional correspondence view suggests that a symbol can match reality if the theory is correct enough. Geofinitism rejects this strong claim because it requires perfect symbolic construction. But finite symbols always carry uncertainty. They are generated under conditions. They have provenance. They are bounded by the Alphonic Limit. Thus the phrase "measured knowledge" must be understood carefully. Measured knowledge is not possession of the world. Measured knowledge is the disciplined construction of finite symbols from exogenous measurement, followed by accountable symbolic modelling.

This is why the ket and Heaviside function are philosophically significant. They are not merely notational tools. They exemplify a broader tendency: the conversion of finite measurement processes into flattened ideal symbols.

The ket turns a measurement-dependent symbolic history into an abstract state.

The Heaviside function turns a finite transition into an ideal jump.

- Both are useful.

- Both are elegant.

- Both are powerful.

But neither should be foundational. Within Geofinitism, the foundational object is not the ket, the step, the vector, the point, or the line. The foundational object is the finite symbol generated through measurement: the Nexil.

Summary

This chapter has proposed a Geofinite replacement for the ket and the Heaviside step function.

The ket was analysed as a downstream symbolic compression rather than a first-order measurement symbol. The Heaviside function was analysed as a flattened representation of a finite symbol-generating transition. The

Geofinite replacement begins with the Alphonic Limit, where first-order measurement produces a finite symbol. This symbol, the Nexil, is represented as:

$$\mathcal{N}_{\alpha}^{(3D)} \sim (s, V_{\alpha}, U_{\alpha}, P_{M}).$$

The corresponding named function is the *Geofinite Nexil Function*:

$$\mathfrak{G}_{\alpha}(M) = \mathcal{N}_{\alpha}^{(3D)} \sim (s, V_{\alpha}, U_{\alpha}, P_{M}).$$

This function maps finite measurement processes to finite three-dimensional uncertainty-bearing symbols with provenance.

The ket and Heaviside function may then be reinterpreted as projections or downstream symbolic constructions derived from the Geofinite Nexil Function. This preserves their operational utility while denying their foundational status.

Conclusion

The Geofinite replacement of the ket and Heaviside function is not an attempt to discard the tools of mathematical physics. It is an attempt to place them in the correct order of symbolic dependence. The classical order begins with ideal symbols and treats measurement as approximation. The Geofinite order begins with finite measurement and treats symbols as generated constructions.This reversal changes the status of foundational notation. A ket is no longer a direct state-symbol. It is a projection-chain object. A Heaviside step is no longer a first-order threshold. It is a flattened idealisation of a finite Nexil-forming process.

The result is a more disciplined account of measured knowledge.

- At the Alphonic Limit, the symbol is finite.

- At the Generonic boundary, symbolic potential becomes symbolic form.

- At the Ket Limit, abstract state notation loses first-order measurement authority.

- At the Heaviside Limit, ideal discontinuity loses first-order threshold authority.

The Geofinite Nexil Function restores the finite symbol to the centre of mathematical and physical reasoning. In doing so, it makes visible what classical notation often hides: that every model begins with a measurement, every measurement generates a symbol, and every symbol carries the finite geometry of its creation.