

Refutation of the CC conjecture of Lin Fan Mao

© Copyright 2018 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

Abstract: The CC conjecture as defined by Lin Fan Mao is **not** tautologous and hence refuted.

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). Results are a 16-valued truth table in row-major and horizontal, or repeating fragments of 128-tables for more variables.

LET p, q, r, s : p, q, r , science T ; \sim Not; $+$ Or; $-$ Not Or; $\&$ And; $>$ Imply;
 $\%$ possibility, for any one or some, \exists $\#$ necessity, for every or all, \forall .
 $(p=p)$ **T** tautology; $(p@p)$ **F** contradiction; $(\%p\>\#p)$ **N** truthity; $(\%p\<\#p)$ **C** falsity;

From: Mao, L.F. (2015). Mathematics after CC conjecture: combinatorial notions and achievements. vixra.org/pdf/1508.0244v1.pdf

Remark: In the paper title, the "CC" in "CC conjecture" is not defined as a two-letter acronym within the paper.

CC Conjecture ... : Any mathematical science can be reconstructed from or made by combinatorialization. (1.0)

We rewrite Eq.1.0 as:

"The combinatorial result of elements implies making any mathematical science that is invertible from its elements." (1.1)

$((p\&q)\&r)\>\%s\>\%s\>((p\&q)\&r)$; NNNN NNNT **FFFF** **FFFT** (1.2)

Remark: In Eq. 1.1 the antecedent is "The combinatorial result of elements implies making any mathematical science" as $((p\&q)\&r)\>\%s$;
 TTTT TTTC TTTT TTTT. (1.3)

[I]t is a mathematical machinery of philosophical notion: *there always exist universal connection[s] between things T* with a disguise $G^L[T]$ on connections, which enables us converting a mathematical system with contradictions to a compatible one (2.0)

We rewrite Eq. 2.0 as:

"If [t]he combinatorial result of elements implies making any mathematical science that is invertible from its elements, then a disguise always exists to imply a contradictory mathematical science that is tautologous" (2.1)

$((((p\&q)\&r)\>\%s)\>\%s\>((p\&q)\&r))\>\#(\sim\%s\>(s\>(p=p)))$;
 TTTT TTTN TTTT TTTN (2.2)

Eqs. 1.2, 1.3, and 2.2 as rendered are *not* tautologous. This refutes the CC conjecture of Lin Fan Mao.