

## Magnification: The art of sizing

Rumani Dey

---

**Abstract:** *Since birth till death our body grows and diminishes in size. We don't know why we are on this earth breathing and growing. Anything that breathes, grows. Growth would have been insignificant without our capability to conclude or judge things. This piece is my conclusion on growth of the one that is obsessed with circles to the one that is unaware of the circle. It's a new thought. But then there are exceptions to the growth of both the circle and the line. A metallic ball would neither grow nor diminish if it is moving on a straight line on the surface of a metal. So growth is basically dependent on its flexibility to attach more components to it. Coming to research every paper needs equation and mathematical modelling with graphs which at this point is yet to be worked upon. Anyone would ask the value this paper adds to benefitting the lot. Well this is a fancy research of an idle mind. Thinking and writing is my passion. Sometimes it's just the beginning. So, I would welcome any inputs on this small discovery which definitely might not be unseen by the research fraternity.*

---

Date of Submission: 26-07-2019

Date of Acceptance: 12-08-2019

---

### I. Magnification

The art of sizing

Where did the concept of Magnification come from?

Water in the ocean magnifies by volume

Air magnifies by the container it is in. But air is something which actually magnifies.

Why would I want to magnify something?

I am a toddler and my body would grow eventually. But why is it necessary? Why is growth required?

For the ease of sight. If we begin to think about 'nothing' we find time is a moving entity. But time does not magnify. It is space that magnifies. Time span when depicted feels like a big amount is over.

We haven't seen space getting magnified either. Our eyes just see what is covered at a glance. We need to move our eyes to be able to see beyond the curvature. So it can be concluded that even space Magnification is a depiction. It's a conclusion drawn through the experience of sight that space had magnified sometime back.

What is the difference between the growing and the magnifying? Almost nullified.

But why would growth of some things be required?

Things that are moving in circles or are spherical aren't growing in size. An example is the sun, moon, earth. We haven't experienced new lands.

But living beings do grow. A ball of ice when moves in a straight line grows in volume. So if the air is moving in a non-circular direction it might grow in density. This is a depiction again.

Hence the first conclusion is - if the Behaviour of an object is repetitive it does not magnify beyond a certain limit. For example a day is repeated every 24 hrs and so the 24 hr span does not grow. It does change but almost remains same.

Earth does not grow in size. Neither does the moon, sun. They are all spherical and are assumed to be moving circular.


Growth=0 for repetitive actions

Secondly a circle can grow or diminish only when it is moving in a straight line and is in contact with a base. For example a ball of ice will grow if it is moving straight in a flat snow covered ground. It will diminish if it rolls on soil in straight line.

Growth >0 || <0 for non-circular motion objects


## II. Conclusion

1. If matter is elastic, magnification is just the increase of dimensions of the object due to flexibility.



2. If matter is metallic, magnification is again just the increase in dimension on application of force.

Heat	-1
No Force	0
Hammer	1



3. For solids like soil, ice, magnification is addition of matter on the surface
4. Matter of any kind moving in circular like the planets do not grow.
5. Space-time do not grow . They can be depicted as independent entities only after they are done with a certain span of time/certain growth of space. Question is space growing still?

### Magnification and vision:

Our eyes can see a particular curvature at a glance. If the same thing magnifies the Area the eyes can cover at a glance for the same object reduced. If the object diminishes the eyes can see the surroundings of the object too. We know this. There is nothing new about this and this is not a finding. It doesn't require proof.

Let's try to check this behaviour a bit closer. An ant follows another ant in a straight line. It cannot see me watching the line. So it doesn't flee away when I am watching. This proves exposure area of the eyes of every Living thing is fixed. Bigger the size of eyes bigger the area the eyes can cover.

So first conclusion is :

Vision is directly proportional to size of the living.

Second conclusion is:

No living thing has eyes to see backside. It's always within a certain area. You have to turn your head to see beyond the glance.

Let's think about the three areas our eyes can cover without moving our head. We turn our eyes left, we see straight, we turn our eyes right.

Let's consider we are standing at a distance 'd' from the object.

Let's think about the three areas our eyes can cover without moving our head for the same object magnified. This is same if we move closer to the object. We move straight by distance (d-1) now.

Let's think about the three areas our eyes can cover without moving our head for the same object diminished. This would give the same result if we move away from the object. We move back and are in a distance (d+1) from the object now.

Thank you all for reading this piece . Please give your valuable feedback be it negative or praiseworthy .I am still working on the Math part of Magnification and vision. So your feedback will add value to this text.

Rumani Dey. "Magnification: The art of sizing." IOSR Journal of Applied Physics (IOSR-JAP) , vol. 11, no. 4, 2019, pp. 37-39.