Refutation of Heider inspired international relation theory
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We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/VŁ4 with Łautology as the designated proof value, F as contradiction, N as truthity (non-contingency), and C as falsity (contingency). The 16-valued truth table is row-major and horizontal.

From: academia.edu/27360936/A_Formal_Semantics_of_International_Relations by Fabian Schang

§1. Heider

LET:  p,  q,  r,  s:  x, y, R, z;
         ~ Not;  +  Or;  &  And;  >  Imply, greater than;  <  Not Imply, less than, ∈
         %  possibility, possibly, for one or some;  # necessity, necessarily, for every or all.

\[ R(x,z)= R(x,y) \times R(y,z) \] (3.2.1)

\[(r&(p&s))=((r&(p&q))&(r&(q&s))) ; \] TTTT TTTT TTTT TFTT (3.2.2)

Remark: Removing the "R" functor deviates further from tautology. (3.2.2.1)

\[(p&s)=((p&q)&(q&s)) ; \] TTTT TFTT TTTT TFTT (3.2.2.2)

What follows from Heider rendered in Eq. 3.2.2 as not tautologous is its further negation as irrelevant.

§2. Coherent theorem

Every political relationship \( R(x,y) \) (where \( R \in \{E,F\} \)) is coherent. (4.3.3.1.1)

\[(r=((r=r)+(r@r)))>(#r&(p&q))) ; \] TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT (4.3.3.1.2)

\[ \equiv_1 \forall x \forall y \neg (R(x,y) \land \neg R(x,y)) \] (4.3.3.2.1)

\[ (#p&#q)\&( (r&(p&q))\&(~r&(p&q))) ; \] FFFF FFFF FFFF FFFF (4.3.3.2.2)

Eqs. 4.3.3.1.1 implies 4.3.3.2.1 (4.3.3.3.1)

\[ ((r=((r=r)+(r@r)))>(#r&(p&q))) \]

\[ ((#p&#q)\&( (r&(p&q))\&(~r&(p&q))) ; \] FFFF FFFF FFFF FFFF (4.3.3.3.2)

Remark: As expected Eqs. 4.3.3.2.2 and 4.3.3.3.2 have identical table results, as not tautologous.

§3. Hegemon as demiurge in the world

LET:  r:  uc_pi Π

\[ \forall x \forall y \exists z (\Pi(x) > \Pi(y) \land (\Pi(y)+\Pi(z) > \Pi(x)) \]

\[ (#p&(q&amp&s))\&( ((r&p)>(r&q)) \& (r&q>+(r&s)>(r&p))) ; \] FFFF FFFF FFFF FFFF (5.2.Riv.1)

Therefore we deny "the hegemon acts as a demiurge in the world".