

Title: Conversations

Subtitle: Questioning the Rules of Reasoning

Second Subtitle: Questioning the Rules of Reasoning

Author: wizanda

Date: 1517869123

URL: http://www.wizanda.com/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=2163&post_id=4708

So on trying to explain how my logic works to a professor of Logic; realized had to turn my equations in my head into a physical format, so did a few additional ones:

Code:

\$ variable.+- plus or minus sum.Letters with no variables are a known.X marks the spot.* made up by me.-> Explained here.

Inductive (Leading to) -> Data first to reach a possible conclusion : $A +- B = \$X$

Deductive (Deduced based on) -> Conclusion is deduced from premise: $A +- B = X$

Abductive -> Built upon the partial data, we build the most likely conclusion: $\$A +- \$B = \$X$

Reversive* -> We verify data, by reverse engineering it like algebra: $\$A + \$B = \$X = \$A - \$B$

Argumentative -> Everything someone says will have fault, and we can deduce where they're always wrong in some context: $\$A - \$B = \$0$

Abstractive* -> Never anything solid, just observed together: $\$A \$B \$C$

Dismissive -> Nothing will ever do: $0 - 0 (-0) = 0$

Zen -> Things are observed, and comprehended... Then quantified by its own equation; yet never truly equated... Just understood: $A +- B = \$A * \B

Tao -> Things are understood by their own logical relationships, and then formulated with equal and opposite results; as all manner of things follow this inclination: $A +- B = \$Yin/\$Yang$

Please add to this list with equations, and will be impressed....?