Refutation of the Cabannas conjecture of objectivity

Abstract: We evaluate the 13 atomic equations, with none tautologous. This refutes the Cabannas conjecture of objectivity, forming 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, ⊤, ordinal 3; (z@z) **F** as contradiction, Ø, 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); (B>A) (A⊢B); (B>A) (A⊨B).
Note for clarity, we usually distribute quantifiers onto each designated variable.

From: Cabannas, V. (2016). Theory of objectivity. vixra.org/pdf/1904.0536v1.pdf
contact@theoryofobjectivity.com

The universe, of course, represents everything that exists. So, if there was Nothing before the universe existed, a unit could be added to Nothing (n) and it would remain Nothing (n + 1). (3.1)

LET p, ~#p:
p, Nothing [not every thing], N, n;
(%s>#s) ordinal 1; (%s<#s) ordinal 2; (s@s) zero.

p+(%s>s) ; NTNT NTNT TTTT TTTT (3.2)

A unit could also be subtracted from Nothing and it would remain Nothing (n - 1). (4.1)

p-(%s>s) ; C**F**C**F** C**F**C**F** **FFFF FFFF** (4.2)

We then have the following, considering n = 0 = Nothing: (5.1)

(p=(s@s))= p ; **FFFF FFFF FFFF FFFF** (5.2)

Remark 5.1: The author may mean to write (n=0) and (0=Nothing). (6.1) (p=(s@s))&((s@s)=p) ; T**F**T**F** T**F**T**F** T**F**T**F** T**F**T**F** (6.2)

which is a strengthening of Eq. 5.1.

N + 1 = n – 1, i.e, (3.2)=(4.2) (7.1)

(p+(%s>#s))=(p-(%s>#s)) ; **FFFF FFFF FFFF FFFF** (7.2)

N - n = -1 – 1, (8.1)

(p-p)=(~(%s>#s)-(%s>#s)) ; **F**T**F**T **F**T**F**T **F**T**F**T **F**T**F**T (8.2)

Remark 8.1: The author may mean to write N-n=((~1)+(~1)) ; (9.1)

(p-p)=(~(%s>#s)+~(%s>#s)) ; CNCN CNCN CNCN CNCN (9.2)

which is a strengthening of Eq. 8.2.

0 = -2; (10.1)

(s@s)=~(%s<#s) ; CCCC CCCC CCCC CCCC (10.2)

Or, reversing equality: N - 1 = n + 1, i.e, (8.1) (11.1)

(p-(%s>#s))=(p+(%s>#s)) ; **F**T**F**T **F**T**F**T **F**T**F**T **F**T**F**T (11.2)

N - n = 1 + 1, (12.1)

(p-p)=((%s>#s)+(%s>#s)) ; NCNC NCNC NCNC NCNC (12.2)

0 = 2. i.e, Not(10.1) (13.1)

(s@s)=(%s<#s) ; NNNN NNNN NNNN NNNN (13.2)

That is, the equation has two possible solutions: -2 and +2, i.e, (8.1) and (12.1): (14.1)

((p-p)=(~(%s>#s)-(%s>#s)))&((p-p)=((%s>#s)+(%s>#s))) ;
FC**F**C **F**C**F**C **F**C**F**C **F**C**F**C (14.2)

Remark 14.1: If the author meant to write -2 or +2, i.e, (8.1) or (12.1): (15.1)

((p-p)=(~(%s>#s)-(%s>#s)))+((p-p)=((%s>#s)+(%s>#s))) ;
NTNT NTNT NTNT NTNT (15.2)

which is a strengthening of Eq. 14.1.

We evaluated 13 equations, with none tautologous. This refutes the Cabannas conjecture of objectivity at its most atomic level.