

Refutation of abductive reasoning

© Copyright 2018 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

Abductive reasoning is defined from C.S. Peirce as:

The universal fact p is a truthity. But if q was a tautology, then p would necessarily follow.
Therefore possibly q exists as a truthity. (1.1)

Using Meth8/VŁ4,

LET # necessity, for all; % possibility, for one or some; > Imply; \ Not And
T is the designated proof value; N is truthity as (%p>#p); C is falsity as (%p<#p).

((#p=(%p>#p))\((q=(q=q))>#p)) right_bracket (%q=(q=q)) ; CTTT CTTT CTTT CTTT (1.2)

Eq 1.2 as rendered is *not* tautologous. This means abductive reasoning is refuted.