Modus Inversus – if (Premise is False) Then (Conclusion is False)

Ilija Barukčić[1]

[1] Internist, MD, Horandstrasse, DE-26441 Jever, Germany

Correspondence: Ilija Barukčić, Horandstrasse, DE-26441 Jever, Germany.

Tel: 49-4466-333. E-mail: Barukcic@t-online.de

Received: October 27th, 2019; Accepted October 27th, 2019; Published: October 27th, 2019

Abstract

Objective: When theorems or theories are falsified by a formal prove or by observations et cetera, authors respond many times by different and sometimes inappropriate counter-measures. Even if the pressure by which we are forced to believe in different theories although there are already predictively superior rivals to turn to may be very high, a clear scientific methodology should be able to help us to assure the demarcation between science and pseudoscience.

Methods: Karl Popper's (1902-1994) falsificationist methodology is one of the many approaches to the problem of the demarcation between scientific and non-scientific theories but relies as such too much only on *modus tollens* and is at the end more or less one-eyed.

Results: *Modus inversus* is illustrated in more detail in order to identify non-scientific claims as soon as possible and to help authors not to hide to long behind a lot of self-contradictory and sometimes highly abstract, even mathematical stuff.

Conclusions: Modus inversus prevents us from accepting seemingly contradictory theorems or rules in science.

Keywords: ***Science, non-science, modus inversus.***

1. Introduction

In view of the many and sometimes each other excluding competing scientific theories of the nature and of our world, a theoretical appreciation of scientific proof methods becomes pressing. Generally accepted scientific proof methods thereby constitutes our grounds of scientific evidence which itself might help us to refute or to confirm scientific theories. For these reasons and others, scientific proof methods are equally necessary for scientific knowledge and the demarcation line between ((justified) personal) belief and exceedingly clear and well-verified scientific knowledge and at the end between ideology and science. For these reasons and others, it is appropriate to explore the nature of **modus inversus** (Barukčić, 2019b) once again.

2. Material and methods

Today's science has become to a very great extent ideological. Rightly or wrongly, science is and has been misused since ever to support the ideologies of its practitioners or of certain ideologies as such and vice versa. Ideologies are meanwhile an unjustified part of the nature of scientific inquiry. Science is not hermetically sealed off from today's dominant, very aggressive, inhuman and leading ideology "**In making profit we believe**". Even if not all scientist seems equally susceptible to appropriation or ideological influence, there is documented (Bombardier et al., 2000) and increasing evidence that **the one who pays commands** even the result obtained by scientific investigations. In particular, **the all-encompassing dictatorship of the profit** is on the way to make science purely trivial, just one and sometimes meaningless view among many others. In order to solve real-world challenges, science taken more seriously should decrease the influence of non-science on science at a maximum. Scientific proof methods are of use to distinguish between scientific knowledge and false even if popular belief or deceptively bad arguments.

2.1. Material

2.1.1. Example 1

In New York (USA), the person M1 has been accused before the court by the public prosecutor of killing the victim V1 on October 1th, 1800. The witness W1 testifies before the court of being at the criminal site at the relevant time and having seen that and how **M1 did kill V1**. The witness W2 testifies before the court of being at the criminal site too at the relevant time and having seen that **M1 did not kill V1**. What is the truth? What does constitute a false statement and how can and must the court or sciences as such deal with false statements? Because of that distortion of the evidence and besides of the presumption of innocence and its corollary, *the in dubio pro reo principle*, the court could draw an incorrect inference i. e. fail to punish M1 (according to W2) although M1 should be punished.

2.2. Methods

A number of issues has been addressed to the concept of truth and has been with us for a long time. From the standpoint of a co-moving observer, a path can be a straight line. The same path from the standpoint of a stationary observer (Barukčić, 2019a) can be at the same period of time curved (i. e. not a straight line). To put it another way, is the truth absolute or is the truth relative or both or none? Thus far, what is truth, what does truth itself consists in, what is the nature of truth? A definite answer on this issue is not in sight, a considerable progress has still not been made in solving problems like these. More generally, we are confronted with a world in us and around us which prefers to **change without an end in sight**. We cannot avoid having to face the changes already underway before theoretical problems like these are solved. In these subjects it is necessary to be inquisitive to be able to achieve new knowledge, at the end to **try and fail and try another way**. An axiomatic approach to assure a high degree of certainty is thus far of preliminary use and can be considered.

2.2.1. Axioms

Axiom 1. (Lex identitatis)

$$+1 \quad = \quad +1 \tag{1}$$

Axiom 2. (Lex contradictionis)

$$+1 \quad = \quad +0 \tag{2}$$

Axiom 3. (Lex negationis)

$$\frac{+1}{+0} \quad = \quad \neg \tag{3}$$

where ¬ denote negation.

2.2.1. Definitions

Definition 1. (The number + 1)

Let c denote *the speed of light in vacuum* (Drude, 1894; Tombe, 2015; W. E. Weber & Kohlrausch, 1856; W. Weber & Kohlrausch, 1857), let ε_0 denote the electric constant and let μ_0 the magnetic constant. Let *i* denote the imaginary number (Bombelli, 1579). The number +1 is defined as the expression

$$+(c^2 \times \varepsilon_0 \times \mu_0) \equiv \quad +1 + 0 \equiv \quad -i^2 \quad = \quad +1 \tag{4}$$

while "=" denotes the equals sign (Recorde, 1557) or equality sign (Rolle, 1690) used to indicate equality and "-" (Pacioli, 1494; Widmann, 1489) denotes minus signs used to represent the operations of subtraction and the notions of negative as well and "+" denotes the plus (Recorde, 1557) signs used to represent the operations of addition and the notions of positive as well.

Definition 2. (The number + 0)

Let c denote the speed of light in vacuum (Drude, 1894; Tombe, 2015; W. E. Weber & Kohlrausch, 1856; W. Weber & Kohlrausch, 1857), let ε_0 denote the electric constant and let μ_0 the magnetic constant. Let *i* denote the imaginary number (Bombelli, 1579). The number +0 is defined as the expression

$$+(c^2 \times \varepsilon_0 \times \mu_0) - (c^2 \times \varepsilon_0 \times \mu_0) \equiv \quad +1 - 1 \equiv \quad -i^2 + i^2 \quad = \quad +0 \qquad (5)$$

while "=" denotes the equals sign (Recorde, 1557) or equality sign (Rolle, 1690) used to indicate equality and "-" (Pacioli, 1494; Widmann, 1489) denotes minus signs used to represent the operations of subtraction and the notions of negative as well and "+" denotes the plus (Recorde, 1557) signs used to represent the operations of addition and the notions of positive as well.

Remark 1.

One of the reasons in defining the basic numbers +1 and +0 in terms of physical "constants" is to put **classical logic and mathematics back on the right track** and finally on nature science determined feet's the way it belongs.

3. Results

THEOREM 1. MODUS PONENS BEFORE THE COURT

Premise 1:

if (W1 has been at the criminal site at the relevant time)

then (W1 could have seen that M1 did kill V1).

Premise 2:

W1 has been at the criminal site at the relevant time.

Conclusion:

W1 could have seen that M1 did kill V1.

PROOF.

Other evidence is provided before the court which testifies beyond any reasonable doubt that witness W1 has been at the criminal site at the relevant time. Thus far, premise 2 is true. The court decides finally that W1 could have seen that M1 did kill V1. **Reasons**. According to modus ponens: *if* (W1 has been at the criminal site at the relevant time) *then* (W1 could have seen that M1 did kill V1). Premise 2 is true, W1 has been at the criminal site at the relevant time, therefore the conclusion is inescapable: W1 could have seen that M1 did kill V1. In what follows, the testimony of W1 will be considered.

QUOD ERAT DEMONSTRANDUM.

THEOREM 2. MODUS INVERSUS BEFORE THE COURT

The identification of a false statement of an author, a witness or expert, even if not under oath, in a courtroom or other place where examinations of witnesses or experts or publications take place (for example, parliamentary investigation committees, review-articles et cetera) is necessary and must be possible. Today, the common view in science is that we should not rely upon *modus inversus*, in court either. However, the scientific proof methods should be able to deal with false statements too, whether orally or in writing. Otherwise, the impact of erroneous or false statements or interpretations based on the misapplication of (correct or incorrect) rules a could be very serious in the negative sense.

Premise 1:

If (W2 has *not* been at the criminal site at the relevant time)

then (W2 *cannot* have seen that *M1 did not kill V1*).

Premise 2:

W2 has *not* been at the criminal site at the relevant time.

Conclusion:

W2 *cannot* have seen that M1 did not kill V1.

PROOF.

However, with respect to witness W2, the court possesses irrefutable evidence that witness W2 has been in Paris (France) on October 1th, 1800. The court applies **modus inversus** in the following way. **Premise 1**: *If* (W2 has *not* been at the criminal site at the relevant time) *then* (W2 *cannot* have seen that M1 did not kill V1). **Premise 2**: W2 has *not* been at the criminal site at the relevant time is secured. On October 1th, 1800 witness 2 has been in Paris (France) and not in New York (USA). The court concludes (**Conclulsio**): W2 cannot have seen that M1 did not kill V1. In what follows, the testimony of W2 will not be considered.

QUOD ERAT DEMONSTRANDUM.

4. Discussion

Our historically backgrounded scientific possibilities to recognize the truth imposes the obligation to apply different scientific methods and should not be artificially and unnecessarily restricted. Otherwise, the innocent can be punished while and the guilty could be rewarded. Finally, even in science, the recognition of fallacious and erroneous theorems and statements is necessary. It is more than unsatisfactory to use only modus securus, or a direct proof in the positive (+1=+1) or in the negative (+0=+0) sense, which allow us to draw a clear conclusion by combining the axioms, definitions, and earlier theorems, because the same cannot be applied under every circumstance. The superiority of *modus securus* (Barukčić, 2019b) is by far not a reason to refuse the use of *modus inversus* (Toohey, 1948). Such an attitude could unnecessarily hamper scientific investigations and promote unnecessary and even risky and harmful scientific positions and inquiry. In contrast to religion, art, philosophy et cetera, improvements and advances in science need clear standards and other methods and criteria. Thus far, it is more than doubtful whether any delay or deny including measures of prohibitions and restrictions of the use of modus inversus is in accordance with the progressive nature of science.

5. Conclusion

Modus inversus is a very important and reliable scientific proof method and equally an instrument to tackle any obstruction science.

Acknowledgements

The open source, independent and non-profit Zotero Citation Manager was used to create and manage references and bibliographies.

Author Contributions

The author confirms being the sole contributor of this work and has approved it for publication.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest. There are no conflict of interest which exists according to the guidelines of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors.

Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

References

Barukčić, I. (2019a). Aristotle's law of contradiction and Einstein's special theory of relativity. *Journal of Drug Delivery and Therapeutics*, *9*(2), 125–143. doi: https://doi.org/10.22270/jddt.v9i2.2389

Barukčić, I. (2019b). The Interior Logic of Inequalities. *International Journal of Mathematics Trends and Technology IJMTT*, *65*(7), 146–155. doi: http://www.ijmttjournal.org/Volume-65/Issue-7/IJMTT-V65I7P524.pdf

Bombardier, C., Laine, L., Reicin, A., Shapiro, D., Burgos-Vargas, R., Davis, B., … VIGOR Study Group. (2000). Comparison of upper gastrointestinal toxicity of rofecoxib and naproxen in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. VIGOR Study Group. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, *343*(21), 1520–1528, 2 p following 1528. doi: https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM200011233432103 [PMID: 11087881]

Bombelli, R. (1579). *L' algebra : opera di Rafael Bombelli da Bologna, divisa in tre libri : con la quale ciascuno da se potrà venire in perfetta cognitione della teorica dell'Aritmetica : con una tavola copiosa delle materie, che in essa si contengono*. Bolgna (Italy): per Giovanni Rossi. Retrieved from http://www.e-rara.ch/doi/10.3931/e-rara-3918

Drude, P. (1894). Zum Studium des elektrischen Resonators. *Annalen Der Physik Und Chemie*, *53*(3), 721–768.

Pacioli, L. (1494). *Summa de arithmetica, geometria, proportioni et proportionalità*. Venice. Retrieved from http://doi.org/10.3931/e-rara-9150

Recorde, R. (1557). *The whetstone of witte, whiche is the seconde parte of Arithmetike: containyng thextraction of Rootes: The Coßike practise, with the rule of Equation: and the woorkes of Surde Nombers*. London: Jhon Kyngstone. Retrieved from http://archive.org/details/TheWhetstoneOfWitte

Rolle, M. [1652-1719]. (1690). *Traité d'algèbre ou principes généraux pour résoudre les questions...* Paris (France): chez Estienne Michallet. Retrieved from https://www.e-rara.ch/doi/10.3931/e-rara-16898

Tombe, F. (2015). The 1856 Weber-Kohlrausch Experiment (The Speed of Light).

Toohey, J. J. (1948). *An elementary handbook of logic*. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts. Retrieved from http://archive.org/details/anelementaryhan00toohgoog

Weber, W. E., & Kohlrausch, R. (1856). Ueber die Elektricitätsmenge, welche bei galvanischen Strömen durch den Querschnitt der Kette fliesst. *Annalen Der Physik Und Chemie*, *99*, 10–25. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-662-24693-1_14

Weber, W., & Kohlrausch, R. (1857). Elektrodynamische Maassbestimmungen: insbesondere Zurueckfuehrung der Stroemintensitaetsmessungen auf mechanisches Maass. *Abhandlungen Der Königlich-Sächsischen Gesellschaft Der Wissenschaften*, *5 (Leipzig: S. Hirzel)*.

Widmann, J. (1489). *Behende und hüpsche Rechenung auff allen Kauffmanschafft*. Leipzig (Holy Roman Empire): Conrad Kachelofen. Retrieved from http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.rbc/Rosenwald.0143.1

Copyrights