ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)

ISRG PUBLISHERS
Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci
ISSN: 2583-7672 (Online)
Journal homepage: https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjahss
Volume – IV Issue - VI (November-December) 2026
Frequency: Bimonthly



Resurrection from Logic

Patricia Peratto

Instituto Normal de Enseñanza Lógica (INET) Consejo de Formación en Educación (CFE) Administración Nacional de Enseñanza Publica (ANEP)

| **Received:** 15.08.2026 | **Accepted:** 18.08.2026 | **Published:** 15.11.2026

*__Corresponding author:__ Patricia Peratto

Abstract

After our article (Peratto, P., 2025) we have found more proofs about resurrecting if we don´t kill, i.e. if we are true. We negate to kill, in our proof we are true ourselves and the others, is to exist both. If we kill, we prove false although we are true because we live. If we apply the semantics of classical logic we get the proposition (true and false) that is false, so we have proved false, i.e. if we kill our logic is inconsistent. In classical logic to prove false is equivalent to prove (A □□□□□□and to prove any proposition and to prove any of the three is to show the logic is inconsistent. By other side there are propositions that can not be proved: the sun falls, there is a man that is pregned, this is to show consistency (van Dalen, D., 1997).

Keywords: resurrection, logic, truth, existence, life.

1. Introduction

We found proofs of resurrection based in logic. We prove to be true. Is to live, and is a necessary and sufficient condition to resurrect.

We are based in classical propositional logic. It holds (A □ □A) for any proposition A. Then, we resurrect or we don´t resurrect, we are true or we are false. If we resurrect we are true, if we kill we prove false, we can say is to be false who kills, because is who kills the other (except if the person killed resurrects). If we are true we live, then to be true implies to resurrect because to resurrect is to be true, i.e., to live.

Has to happen to be true. There is a conjunction if we consider ourselves and the other. If one is false the conjunction is false. To be true we have not to kill and if we are true we are not killed.

To be true not killing: we are true not killing. To make proofs being true: to be true implies to have new true ideas, ideas that we didn´t have before and that are true, then to be true not only implies to resurrect, implies any way of being true. I don´t kill is true resurrection, I´m true myself and the other, is true conjunction (van Dalen, D., 1997).

We can use metaphysics besides logic (Peratto, P., 2024). By example we can repeat "mantras" as: Controls God, true different from false, reverse of false, I´m the resurrection and the life, I don´t kill, I'm am, that imply to be true. What is bad is false by definition. I call false the bad. I define as false what is bad, what makes damage to the others. Can be proved to smoke is false, because is "fire" inside ourself.

Copyright © ISRG Publishers. All rights Reserved.
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24239199

To be true is to resurrect. Can be proved by contradiction: if we don´t resurrect we are false, if we are false we are not true. The proof of resurrection is not killing, I don´t kill is to negate to be killed, myself and the other. By action and reaction if I don´t kill I´m not killed. To resurrect is to negate to be killed.

If to kill is to be false, why to continue killing? To kill to prove false is inconsistent. Besides this, we can say: to kill is to be killed, I don´t kill myself not killing the others, If I allow the others to live I don´t kill, is to prove true. If I don´t kill the other the other is not killed by me, I'm being true.

Does not kill the inocent, then the inocents are not killed and then resurrect.

I define a true planet, a planet that is true, a planet in which there are not killed. If we consider to be true and to be false, the first is 1 (true) in logic and the second is 0 (false). Then true is greater than false.

"I don´t kill" can be interpreted as "I resurrect the other" because when I say I don´t kill I negate to kill and it can be applied to me and to the other. If I don´t kill, can not kill me because can not make me kill although imply it.

2. Proofs of false and inconsistency

There are persons that say the planet is inconsistent, that apply the rule of negation elimination saying:

woman man

---------- □E

false

They does not see that woman and man are nouns, and to apply the rule we have to had propositions, by example:

Ana is woman Ana is man

---------- □E

false

In the last application of the rule "Ana is man" can not be proved then the rule can not be applied. The planet is consistent and to prove false (killing) depends of the person that kills.

I can question, if I resurrect, I can resurrect the others? I can resurrect who has killed? or I have to resurrect only the inocents? To resurrect who has killed and does not want to stop killing can be to prove false, a person can loose its proof of resurrection if resurrects non-inocents. Then to resurrect who wants to kill is to prove false instead of true.

By the other side, there are inocent persons that does not want to kill but have done it being forced, this persons will not kill if are not forced, if understand that not killing resurrect. We can have confidence and give credits to these persons. The "killers" say that kill who does not kill. Then, there are persons that kill to not be killed, what is contradictory.

We can say that happens the truth, that is true what happens, and implying this we will prove truth. Repeating this process we can find a proof of a true planet in which the persons does not kill. To prove truth we negate false. If we want a true planet we have to negate to kill. We can define transitions, from killing to not killing. We have to question, it is necessary to judge who kills? .

For this we can need telepathy, that has to be researched and studied (Peratto, 2026).

If we are true, we find in our path only useful, true persons, because we are true.

We can be other persons beside ourselves? One way of being other is not killing him, we allow the other to be. With the mantras true different from false and action and reaction we can be different from who kills. We are different from which is false if we are true.

If I don´t kill being implied to kill can not kill me (can not make me kill). By example, consider the proof:

I'm myself I'm not myself

---------- □E

false

which can also be written in the form

I'm equal to me I'm not equal to me

---------- □E

false

where the second premise of the second case is false.

If I'm myself and other person I can prove both premisses of the first case, and then false, so it is inconsistent to be other person besides myself, I have to be myself, I'm my normal form, (Gentzen, G., 1969; Prawitz, D., 1965; Girard, J. Y, 1989). We have to study if to have is to be. Are different verbs and we have to refer to the dictionary. We want a consistent planet, so we have to negate the proofs of false. Then we have to negate " I'm not myself". That the planet is consistent is an axiom.

When I say "not" (or "don´t) I refer to the logical conective with truth table:

A	□A
0	1
1	0

and I call it "negation".

To imply true is true.

The intention counts, bad intention implies false, true intention implies true.

To stop killing is not to kill, is not to be false, is to be true. Changing from false to true one can resurrect.

To be ourselves is true.

Can be said to kill is to prove false because the person killed is false after being killed. Can be said the planet is inconsistent because there are persons that kill. If we think in the rules of Natural Deduction (van Dalen, D, 1997) to prove false we have to apply □E (elimination of negation). For this we have to do a derivation like the one that follows:

George exists not (George exists)

---------- □E

false

Copyright © ISRG Publishers. All rights Reserved.
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24239199

but the premisses depend on the time, i.e. George exists and George does not exists hold at different times. Then I question if false can be proved.

If we consider the definition of negation, (not A) equal to (A □ false), it can not hold A and (A□ false) at the same time.

Since the planet is consistent, there must not be way of proving false. If we prove false we must apply □I **(**not introduction) or RAA (reduction at absurd) and prove the negation of the assumption in the case of □I or to extract the negation from the assumption in the case of RAA.

By example:

George exists George exists □ false

---------- □ E

false

---------- □ I

not (George exists □ false)

where not (George exists □ false) is equivalent to the double negation not (not (George exists)) that in classical logic is equivalent to George exists. If we apply □I (introduction of implication) we get (George exists □ George exists) that is identity. Then if we prove false, we must apply

□I or RAA, in the case above □I. The derivation becomes:

[George exists] (2) [George exists □ false] (1)

---------- □E

false

---------- □I (1)

not (George exists □ false)

----------□I(2)

George exists □ George exists

We can cancel the other assumption as shown below

George exists [George exists □ false] (1) ---------- □ E

false

----------RAA(1)

George exists

applying RAA to (George exists -> false) we get (George exists), and applying □I to the assumption (George exists) we get (George exists) □ (George exists). The derivation becomes:

[George exists] (2) [George exists □ false] (1)

----------□E

false

----------RAA (1)

George exists

---------- □ I(2)

(George exists) □ (George exists)

the proof that the planet is consistent, although there are persons killed is that spirits are inmortal and can reencarnate.

3. Proofs of Equality and Difference

We question if we can be equal to others and ourselves at the same time. The truth is that are all different. Nevertheless we can have "equalities" in parts of ourselves. An example is when two persons have the same first name and different second name. Is both equality and difference. We can say that if there is an equality are equal or that if there is a difference are different. Both definitions are possible. If I have to choose one of the two possibilities I choose the difference, because is the truth.

We are equal to ourselves. Is reflexivity. This is used in provers (Coq, 2002; Agda, 2026). To be ourselves is to be true.

We can be other and ourselves. By example a professor that teachs a theme in a class, we can say

is himself and the students. And can also be said the students have the professor ,besides being themselves always. What happens with to have is to be? The dictionary says that are different verbs., then, in the general case, to have is to be is false, although it can be cases in which have the same meaning; to know which is the case we have to refer to the dictionary. In the case of the professor and the student the professor is not the student, has them.

Consider the axiom true □ false. Consider the first name Alicia. We can define classes of equivalence where two persons are equivalent if have the same first name. In this case, the two persons are equal.

One person can want to be equal to other a propos, because the other resurrects. Resurrect(x) can be a property of the person x. We can prove: if x=y and Resurrect(x) then Resurrect(y), but this depends on the equality. If x□ y, since we are all different, each person has to prove its own resurrection.

Can be applying the same method than another, by example: "to be true in all the possible ways that we know", in this case the persons are equal because apply the same method, but each one has his proof. In (Peratto, P., 2025) we define that to resurrect we have not to kill. And we give conditions that must hold to resurrect. In this paper, we explain with more detail when we resurrect and when not.

Remains to define what happen if we define that a person "is" the words that have in their name.

If by example a person has the letters "yes" and also the letters "not" the person "is himself" and "is not himself" what gives rise to a contradiction. Then a system based in this definition is inconsistent.

References

1. Peratto, Patricia, 2025, *Resurrection is true*. INET, CFE, ANEP. , ISRG Publishers, Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, Vol III, Issue I, January-February 2025.
2. van Dalen, Dirk. 1997, *Logic and Structure*, Third, Augmented Edition, Springer-Verlag.
3. Peratto, Patricia., 2024, *Metaphysics and Logic*, INET, CFE, ANEP., ISRG Publishers, Journal of Arts,

Copyright © ISRG Publishers. All rights Reserved.
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24239199

Humanities and Social Sciences, Vol II, Issue III, May-June 2024.

4. Gentzen Gerhard, 1969, *Investigations into Logical Deduction*, The Collected Papers of Gerhard Gentzen, Edited by M.E. Szabo, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam-London.
5. Prawitz Dag, 1965, *Natural Deduction*, A Proof-Theoretical Study, Almquist & Wiksell, Stockilm, 1965.
6. Girard, Jean Yves, 1989, *Proofs and Types*, Cambridge University Press.
7. Coq, 2002, The Coq Proof Assistant: Reference Manual : Version 7.2, RT-0255, INRIA.
8. Agda 2026, Agda User Manual, Release 2.9.0, The Agda Team, Aug 06 2026.

Copyright © ISRG Publishers. All rights Reserved.
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.24239199