Abstract: We evaluate these topics using the Meth8/VŁ4 modal logic model checker:

Refutation of the AA aphorism "acceptance was the answer"

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 \( \sim, \not, \lor, \vee, \cup, \sqcup; - \) Not Or; \( \& \) And, \( \wedge, \cap, \sqcap, \cdot, \circ, \otimes; \not \) Not And;
\( \Rightarrow \) Imply, greater than, \( \to, \vstr, \vstr' \), \( \supset \), \( \varepsilon \), \( \prec \), \( \subseteq \); \( \not \Rightarrow \) Not Imply, less than, \( \in, \subset, \nexists, \nsubseteq \);
\( = \) Equivalent, \( \equiv, \cong, \vDash \), \( \not = \) Not Equivalent, \( \nexists \);
\( \% \) possibility, for one or some, \( \exists, \exists!, \Diamond, M \); \# necessity, for every or all, \( \forall, \Box, L \);
\( (z=z) \) T as tautology, \( T \), ordinal 3; \( (z\neq z) \) F as contradiction, \( \emptyset, \text{Null}, \bot \);
\( (\%z>\#z) \) N as non-contingency, \( \Delta \), ordinal 1; \( (\%z<\#z) \) C as contingency, \( \nabla \), ordinal 2;
\( \sim(y<x) \) ( \( x \leq y \)), ( \( x \subseteq y \)), ( \( x \subseteq y \)); ( \( A=B \)) ( \( A\sim B \)).

Note for clarity, we usually distribute quantifiers onto each designated variable.

In the AA Big Book 3rd edition, the story "Doctor, alcoholic, addict" was moved and renamed in the 4th edition to the title "Acceptance was the answer".

The title and aphorism as acceptance was the answer cannot be easily restated in the negative, by the respective antonyms of rejection and question, so as to mean rejection was the question.

Instead to capture the exact meaning with proper emphasis of terms, we rewrite the aphorism by exchanging terms, relaxing the equivalence connective by injecting implication, and defining the solution as a truthity \( N \):

The solution implies acceptance. \hspace{1cm} (1.1)

LET \( p, s : \) acceptance, solution \( N \) (%s>\#s).

\( (%s>\#s)>p \); \hspace{1cm} CTTT CTTT CTTT CTTT (1.2)

Remark 1.2: Eq. 1.2 is not tautologous, hence refuting the conjecture of the aphorism.

We recast 1.1 by replacing acceptance with the Grace of God that is always a tautology (proof) by definition, for the conjecture to read as:

The solution implies the Grace of God. \hspace{1cm} (2.1)

LET \( p, s : \) Grace \( T \) (p=p), solution \( N \) (%s>\#s).

\( (%s>\#s)>(p=p) \); \hspace{1cm} TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT (2.2)

Remark 2.2: Eq. 2.2 is tautologous to confirm the restated conjecture, "The solution implies the Grace of God".