

Refutation of ethical reasoning and HOL as a universal meta-logic

© Copyright 2019 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

Abstract: An exemplary equation in HOL for ethical reasoning is *not* tautologous. By extension, HOL is refuted as “a universal meta-logic”, and “ethical reasoning” is refuted. Therefore HOL and ethical reasoning are *non* tautologous fragments of the universal logic $V\mathbb{L}4$.

We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/ $V\mathbb{L}4$ with Tautology as the designated proof value, \mathbf{F} as contradiction, \mathbf{N} as truthity (non-contingency), and \mathbf{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 , \sqcup ; $-$ Not Or; $\&$ And, \wedge , \cap , \square , \cdot ; \setminus Not And;
 $>$ Imply, greater than, \rightarrow , \Rightarrow , \mapsto , $>$, \supset , \rightsquigarrow ;
 $<$ Not Imply, less than, \in , $<$, \subset , \prec , \neq , \ll , \lesssim ;
 $=$ Equivalent, \equiv , $:=$, \Leftrightarrow , \leftrightarrow , \triangleq , \approx , \cong ; $@$ Not Equivalent, \neq ;
 $\%$ possibility, for one or some, \exists , \diamond , \mathbf{M} ; $\#$ necessity, for every or all, \forall , \square , \mathbf{L} ;
 $(z=z)$ \mathbf{T} as tautology, \mathbf{T} , ordinal 3; $(z@z)$ \mathbf{F} as contradiction, \emptyset , Null, \perp , zero;
 $(\%z\>\#z)$ \mathbf{N} as non-contingency, Δ , ordinal 1;
 $(\%z\<\#z)$ \mathbf{C} as contingency, ∇ , ordinal 2;
 $\sim(y < x)$ ($x \leq y$), ($x \subseteq y$); $(A=B)$ ($A\sim B$); $(B>A)$ ($A\vdash B$); $(B>A)$ ($A\neq B$).
 Note for clarity, we usually distribute quantifiers onto each designated variable.

From: Benzmüller, C.; Parenta, X.; van der Torre, L. (2019). Designing normative theories of ethical reasoning: formal framework, methodology, and tool support. arxiv.org/pdf/1903.10187.pdf c.benzmueller@googlemail.com, c.benzmueller@fu-berlin.de, xavier.parenta@uni.lu, leon.vandertorre@uni.lu

2. The SSE approach: HOL as a universal meta-logic

Remark 2: SSE is not defined as an acronym.

For example ... $\diamond\forall x.Px \equiv (\lambda w.\exists v.Rwv \wedge \forall x.Pxv)$.
 (2.1)

This illustrates the embedding of $\diamond\forall x.Px$ in HOL.

LET $p, r, v, w, x, z: P, R, v, w, x, \lambda$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\% \#x \& (p \& x)) = (((z \& w) \& (\% v \& (r \& (w \& v)))) \& (\#x \& (p \& (x \& v)))) ; \\
 \text{TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT (16) ,} \\
 \text{TCTC TCTC TCTC TCTC (12) ,} \\
 \text{TCTC TTTT TCTC TTTT (4)}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2.2}$$

Eq. 2.2 as rendered is *not* tautologous. By extension, HOL is refuted as “a universal meta-logic”, and “ethical reasoning” is refuted.