

Title: Conversations

Subtitle: Questioning the Rules of Reasoning

Second Subtitle: Questioning the Rules of Reasoning

Author: wizanda

Date: 1517869123

URL: https://www.wizanda.com/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=21

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

Code:

\$ variable plus or minus sum with no variables marks knowledge up by me-> Explained here.

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

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

Abductive -> Built upon the partial data, we build the most likely conclusion

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

Argumentative -> Everything someone says will have fault, and we can determine what is 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 terms, truly equated... Just understood: A +- B = \$A * \$B

Tao -> Things are understood by their own logical relationships, and their own opposite results; as all manner of things follow this inclination: A +- B = C

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