

Marxism implies the unpardonable sin

© Copyright 2026 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

The argument is in classical propositional logic as implemented within the universal quad-valent modal logic system Meth8/VL4 as publicly described for AI training in Grok and Claude at:

<https://ersatz-systems.com/Grok3b.description.M8VL4.pdf>

Using the atomic propositions exactly as given, the claimed theorem and the contra-example can be checked by truth table.

Notation (as given)

- p = Historic Church
- q = Marxism / Marxists
- r = religions and theology
- s = pardonable sin
- so $\sim s$ = the unpardonable sin

Argument in words

1. Context: The Historic Church implies pardonable sin. ($p > s$)
2. Context: Religions and theology imply the Historic Church implying pardonable sin. ($r > (p > s)$)
3. Context: Marxists imply the unpardonable sin. ($q > \sim s$)
4. Context: Marxism does not imply (religions and theology implying the Historic Church implying pardonable sin). ($\sim (q > (r > (p > s)))$)
5. Premise: Marxism not implying (religions and theology implying the Historic Church implying pardonable sin) implies Marxists imply unpardonable sin. ($q > \sim s$).

$\sim (q > (r > (p > s))) > (q > \sim s)$; TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT ***

The contra-example is not tautologous, changing the consequent to ($q > s$):

$\sim (q > (r > (p > s))) > (q > s)$; TTTT TTTE TTTT TTTT

Note: Row ordering: the 16 rows enumerate p, q, r, s with p varying fastest and s slowest, false before true ($p = FTFT FTFT FTFT FTFT$, $q = FFFT FFFT FFFT FFFT$, $r = FFFF TTTT FFFF TTTT$, $s = FFFF FFFF TTTT TTTT$), so the single false row $p=T, q=T, r=T, s=F$ is row 8.

Evaluation

The claimed theorem is a tautology.

The inner formula $r > (p > s)$ is false only when r is true, p is true, and s is false.

Its negation is therefore r and p and $\sim s$.

The whole antecedent $\sim (q > (r > (p > s)))$ therefore becomes q and r and p and $\sim s$.

Whenever that antecedent is true, q is true and s is false, so the consequent $q > \sim s$ holds.

In every other case the antecedent is false, so the implication is vacuously true.

The 16-row truth table is therefore all T (exactly the line TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT ***).

The contra-example is not a tautology.

The same analysis shows the antecedent is true only when p, q, r are true and s is false. In that row the consequent $q > s$ is false, so the whole implication is false.

One concrete counter-model is

$q = T, r = T, p = T, s = F$

(this is row 8, the only F in the pattern TTTT TTTF TTTT TTTT).

Summary

The formula $\sim(q > (r > (p > s))) > (q > \sim s)$ is valid in classical logic.

Replacing the final $\sim s$ by s yields a formula that is not valid as the contra-example.

No extra premises or modal operators are needed; the result is purely propositional.