

RE: **DEDUCIBILITY THEOREMS IN BOOLEAN LOGIC** Florentin Smarandache University of New Mexico 200 College Road Gallup, NM 87301, USA E-mail: smarand@unm.edu
<http://vixra.org/abs/1003.0171>

As presumably a basis for neutrosophic logic these mistakes were found:

Assume the Meth8 apparatus.

LET: p q r s A1 B1 An Bn

$(p > q) > ((p \& r) > (q \& s))$; TTTT T TTF TTTT TTTT ; Theorem 1
This formula is not tautologous.

$(p > q) > ((p + r) > (q + s))$; TTTT FTTT TTTT TTTT ; Theorem 2
This formula is not tautologous.

If the above are "made by complete induction", then it is an example of why induction is defective.

LET: p q r ABC

$((p \& q) + r) > (p \& (q \& r))$; TTF FFFT TTF FFFT ; Section 2(ii)
This formula is not deducible as such and is not tautologous.

$((p > p) \& (q < p)) > ((p \& q) > (p \& p))$; TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT ; 2a
[This is not a counter example of anything other than a contradiction, which Theorem 1 is not as
TTTT TTF TTTT TTTT.

For 2a to be a contradiction of Theorem 1, the 2a truth table should read:
FFFF FFFT FFFF FFFF]

$((p > p) \& (p < q)) > ((p + p) > (p + p))$; TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT ; 2b
[This is not a counter example of anything other than a contradiction, which Theorem 2 is not as
TTTT FTTT TTTT TTTT.

For 2b to be a contradiction of Theorem 2, the 2b truth table should read:
FFFF TFFF FFFF FFFF.]

Colin James III info@cec-services.com