

Refutation of induction formulas in elementary arithmetic EA

© Copyright 2018 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

Abstract: From the introduction, we evaluate EA elementary arithmetic for induction formulas which are *not* tautologous. This further refutes the reflection property upon which subsequent assertions are based. These formulas constitute a *non* tautologous fragment of the universal logic VŁ4.

We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/VŁ4 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 ~ Not, ¬ ; + Or, ∨, ∪ ; - Not Or; & And, ∧, ∩, · ; \ Not And;
 > Imply, greater than, →, ⇒, ⇨, >, ⊃, ⊃, ⊃, ⊃ ;
 < Not Imply, less than, ∈, <, ⊂, ⊄, ≠, ←, ≲ ;
 = Equivalent, ≡, :=, ⇔, ↔, ≐, ≈, ≃ ; @ Not Equivalent, ≠, ⊄ ;
 % possibility, for one or some, ∃, ∂, M; # necessity, for every or all, ∀, □, L;
 (z=z) T as tautology, T, ordinal 3; (z@z) **F** as contradiction, ∅, Null, ⊥, zero;
 (%z>#z) N as non-contingency, Δ, ordinal 1;
 (%z<#z) C as contingency, ∇, ordinal 2;
 ~(y < x) (x ≤ y), (x ≲ y); (A=B) (A~B).
 Note for clarity, we usually distribute quantifiers onto each designated variable.

From: Pona, N.; Joosten, J.J. (2019). The reduction property revisited.
arxiv.org/pdf/1903.03331.pdf jjoosten@ub.edu

The theory EA of Elementary Arithmetic is given by the defining axioms for the arithmetical symbols together with the induction formulas

$$I_\phi := [\phi(0) \wedge \forall x \phi(x) \rightarrow \phi(x + 1)] \rightarrow \forall x \phi(x) \quad (1.1)$$

for each bounded formula ϕ .

LET p, q, r, s: ϕ , x, r, s.

$$\begin{aligned} & (((p \& (p @ p)) \& (p \# q)) > (p \& (\# q + (p = p)))) > (p \& \# q) ; \\ & \text{FFFN FFFN FFFN FFFN} \\ & \text{using T as value for 1} \end{aligned} \quad (1.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & (((p \& (p @ p)) \& (p \# q)) > (p \& (\# q + (\% p > \# p)))) > (p \& \# q) ; \\ & \text{FFFN FFFN FFFN FFFN} \\ & \text{using N as value for 1} \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

Eqs. 1.2 and 1.3 are *not* tautologous. This refutes the induction formulas of EA. This further refutes the reflection property upon which subsequent assertions are based. These formulas constitute a *non* tautologous fragment of the universal logic VŁ4.