Refutation of reversing the counterfactual analysis of causation
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Abstract: The seminal formula of C causes E iff (~C □→ ~E) is not tautologous, that is, it is not a theorem, from which the conjecture is derived. Hence reversing the counterfactual analysis of causation is refuted. Therefore the conjecture forms a non tautologous fragment of the universal logic VL4.

We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/VŁŁ4 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.)
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Abstract: The counterfactual analysis of causation has focused on one particular counterfactual conditional, taking as its starting point the suggestion that C causes E iff (~C □→ ~E).

Remark 1.1: We interpret (~C □→ ~E) to mean □(~C → ~E). (1.1)

LET p, q: C, E.

Eq. 1.2 as rendered is not tautologous, that is not a theorem, from which the conjecture is derived. Hence reversing the counterfactual analysis of causation is refuted.