

Refutation of White's model for creation

© Copyright 2018 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

Abstract: From the introduction, we evaluate a system of four postulates (P1, P2, P3, P4). P1 implies P2; P4 implies P3; but (P1 implies P2) does not imply (P4 implies P3). Hence the system is *not* tautologous. Two subsequent postulates (P5, P6) are not examined.

We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/VL4 with Tautology 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, or repeating fragments of 128-tables, sometimes with table counts, for more variables. (See ersatz-systems.com.)

LET \sim Not, \neg ; + Or, \vee, \cup ; - Not Or; & And, \wedge, \cap, \cdot ; \ Not And; > Imply, greater than, $\rightarrow, \Rightarrow, \mapsto, \succ, \supset, \vdash, \models, \twoheadrightarrow$; < Not Imply, less than, $\in, \prec, \subset, \neq, \neq, \leftarrow, \lesssim$; = Equivalent, $\equiv, :=, \iff, \leftrightarrow, \triangleq, \approx, \simeq$; @ Not Equivalent, \neq ;
 % possibility, for one or some, \exists, \diamond, M ; # necessity, for every or all, \forall, \square, L ;
 (z=z) **T** as tautology, \top , ordinal 3; (z@z) **F** as contradiction, $\emptyset, \text{Null}, \perp$, zero;
 (%z>#z) **N** as non-contingency, Δ , ordinal 1; (%z<#z) **C** as contingency, ∇ , ordinal 2;
 $\sim(y < x)$ ($x \leq y$), ($x \subseteq y$); (A=B) (A~B).
 Note: For clarity we usually distribute quantifiers on each variable as designated.

From: White, P.B. (2019). A model for creation: part 1.
vixra.org/pdf/1903.0084v1.pdf pbwx@att.net

LET p, q, r, s: P1, P1, P3, P4.

1. For creation of the physical universe, the basic information element is a type of projection --- more specifically, a projection from a prior level. (1.1)

$$p=((q>r)>s); \quad \mathbf{TFFT \ TFTF \ FTFT \ FTFT} \quad (1.2)$$

2. The basic information structure is a sequence of such projections. With respect to the first postulate, we may refer to both projections and levels as "elements" (or basic elements) of the system, but will reserve the term "basic information element" for the projections alone. (2.1)

$$p>((q>r)>s); \quad \mathbf{TFTT \ TFTF \ TTTT \ TTTT} \quad (2.2)$$

We now add two more postulates:

3. Each such projection is a one-dimensional vector, constituting a different, but related, one-dimensional space. (The basic relations between these projections/vectors are stated in the next postulate.) (3.1)

$$(p@q)@(r@s); \quad \mathbf{FTTF \ TFFT \ TFFT \ FTTF} \quad (3.2)$$

4. Prior things (e.g., projections, levels, and constructions from them) are independent of subsequent things; and, conversely, subsequent things are dependent on prior things.

(The terms prior, subsequent, dependent, and independent denote here logical/ontological relations. See e.g. [4].) (4.1)

$$\sim((p>q)>(r>s)) = (p=p) ; \quad \mathbf{FFFF \ TFTT \ FFFF \ FFFF} \quad (4.2)$$

Using these four postulates (and two more that will be stated later), we develop a model for the basic construction of the physical universe ... (5.1, 6.1)

Remark 1.-4.: The postulates are related in pairs, then we relate the pairs.

$$P1 \text{ implies } P2: P1>P2 \quad (10.1)$$

$$(p=((q>r)>s))>(p>((q>r)>s)) ; \quad \mathbf{TTTT \ TTTT \ TTTT \ TTTT} \quad (10.2)$$

$$P4 \text{ implies } P3: P4>P3 \quad (11.1)$$

$$\sim((p>q)>(r>s))>((p@q)@(r@s)) ; \quad \mathbf{TTTT \ TFTT \ TTTT \ TTTT} \quad (11.2)$$

$$\mathbf{Remark 11.2:} \text{ For } P3 \text{ implies } P4: P3>P4 \quad (11.2.1)$$

$$((p@q)@(r@s))>\sim((p>q)>(r>s)) ; \quad \mathbf{TFFT \ TTTT \ FTTF \ TFFT} \quad (11.2.2)$$

The truth table of Eq. 11.2.2 is relatively farther from tautology than that of 11.2; hence we choose use 11.1 for P4>P3.

$$(P1 \text{ implies } P) \text{ implies } (P4 \text{ implies } P3): (P1>P2)>(P4>P3) \quad (12.1)$$

$$((p=((q>r)>s))>(p>((q>r)>s)))>(\sim((p>q)>(r>s))>((p@q)@(r@s))) ; \quad \mathbf{TTTT \ TFTT \ TTTT \ TTTT} \quad (12.2)$$

Eq. 12.2 is not tautologous. Therefore the model of creation based on four postulates so far is refuted. We did not examine the subsequent two postulates.