

A Quester © (2001,4,6) Publication, Free for personal use only.

This is updated about every six months. Always available at; DOWNLOAD LINK as a PDF File.

<http://www.forceofdestiny.co.uk/Literature/Quesor/LogicPrimer.pdf>

Extract from main pages at

[Force of Destiny](#)

2. What is logic? A quick primer..... Jump to the formal section.....

- a. First the short, then longer definition. OED 1. a. The branch of philosophy that treats of the forms of thinking in general, and more especially of inference and of scientific method.
- b. The beginnings of some of this type of reasoning was earlier than Aristotle, but he and several others are a landmark in time, over two thousand years ago. Parmenides, (b 510 BCE) first considered the distinction between opinion and truth, Truth being what IS, and Opinion being errors in the first assumption. **Aristotle** (384 BC) defined Truth as: ***"To say of what is that it is not, or of what is not that it is, is false, while to say of what is that it is, and of what is not that it is not, is true"***, but this concern with Logic picks up the topic whose essence was in the deduction. A deduction follows necessarily from several things that are supposed, namely premisses, that are considered to conform with reality. How did we get at reality in those days? Simply by taking the **blue highlighted** proposition above that is more than entirely reasonable for that time. So we are primarily concerned with deductions that follow from premisses whose truth somehow follows the notion derived above. Once this became better defined, it was clear that the truth of the premisses, while important, had no longer a central role, what was more important, was the process of reasoning, whatever the veracity of the premisses. The beginnings of a calculus of logic, much like mathematics, and algebra, where variables could be substituted by whatever propositions one wished, and the deduction that followed was necessary, but its truth or correspondence with reality was a separate and entirely new discipline, of the validity, or verifiability of percepts. This while opening a new methodology of scientific procedures also opened a new discipline of doubt, where language became a tool for treating the new found doubted percepts in a class of seeming, appearances. Lost was the former certitude of knowledge, and welcomed in was the new disciplines of persuasion, and brain washing of masses of people to fallacious conclusions, derived from perfectly sound reasoning principles. You need of course at this moment some examples. Simple two premisses and a conclusion types.
 - i. All single men are bachelors, John is a single man, conclusion – John is a bachelor. The key term here is single. Single being part of the definition of a bachelor. **NOW**.
 - ii. A sleight of hand was used here, to contribute to the certainty of the conclusion, but it wasn't needed. This was achieved by using the middle and predicate terms that was a pure definition anyway. Take away that truth identity, and you will see the conclusion remains **CERTAIN**. The reason is that the certainty is embodied in the principle of the **MIDDLE** term being transitional between 1st and 2nd premisses.
 - iii. Begin again.....All men are mortal, John is a man, conclusion – John is mortal. The key **MIDDLE** term here is men, and the predicate is mortal. When the middle term term gets carried over, it compels of necessity the conclusion. Fallacies follow when one **displaces** the middle term and predicates, as you will see from this example of everyday common fallacies:
 - iv. All men are bipeds, All men are mammals, therefore, All mammals are bipeds. **What?**
Or, all men are bipeds, some bipeds are female, therefore some men are women. **What?**
Or else All bipeds are human, Sammy over there is a biped, therefore Sammy is human. **What?** I was pointing at a penguin called Sammy.

- v. All single male blue and green tigers are bachelors, Bigtooth is a single male tiger, conclusion – Bigtooth is a bachelor. The logic is the same, but the premisses are hopefully false, since there are no blue and green tigers, at least on this planet, and we don't normally regard single male tigers as bachelors, that is where the notion bachelor includes some notion of marriage.. [Try another.](#)
- vi. All theatre tickets for last Saturday's performance of Hamlet, are no longer valid, this is a ticket for last Saturday's performance of Hamlet, therefore – conclusion, - this ticket is no longer valid. [Clear?](#) Because we normally understand the date to involve a date of expiry of validity.
- vii. All theatre tickets for **next** Saturday's performance of Hamlet, are no longer valid, this is a ticket for next Saturday's performance of Hamlet, therefore – conclusion, - this ticket is no longer valid. [Problem?.....](#) We need an additional premiss answering the question **why next weeks tickets are invalid**, or at least our money back. The premiss is suppressed in the example, but on pressurising the speaker we may get....., the lead player is ill, or we cancelled the performance, or even we have a new rule, people that buy a week in advance are payers and losers. [Truth and falsity of premiss's here depend on something different than ones own observations. Now the logic is fine, just as good as the perfect model in \(i.\) BUT the validity of the premiss's can't be so easily verified, by empirical means.](#)
- viii. NOW we move on to a similar example, where the conclusion is an outright lie, but the premisses credible, for one simple reason, **the speaker is assumed to be a person or body of authority**, their label says so, and thus credibility resides in a false background premiss before we even begin. This is a **relatively** new and widespread phenomenon that is unequivocally and irrefutably a disgraceful abuse of logic and derogation on members of the public. A simple example; The local council spokesperson for a NOW relabelled **Local Authority**, using a computer statistical and seasonal model for extrapolating data concerning the number of wheel clamps they have applied to vehicles in relationship to their target number for the year says..... “We are concerned with the disproportionate nature of penalty to offence on immobilisation of vehicles, and are doing something about it”. (premiss 1). “We are **happy to say** that the rate of clamping is now under control and slowing down”. (premiss 2). **No conclusion is provided, deliberately leaving that for the listener to instinctively use sound principles of logic, and work out the conclusion that feeds their hopes, but satisfies the councils? appetite for more.** The lie is suppressed, (suppressio veri), and relates to the time of year when the holiday season has commenced, and there is invariably a slump in clamping correlated with more people being abroad. The reasoning process leads one to feel better as the situation is going to be more humane than at present. There's only one phrase for this,
- { Hamlet. Excellent, i' faith; of the chameleon's dish. I eat the air, [promise-cramm'd.](#)
You [cannot feed capons so.](#) }
- vi. HOW on earth does one deal with this profusion of mental detritus coming at us, in the declining years of health for the planet, and peoples mental acuity. It is a major problem that is NOT solved by this kind of alarming derogation and subtraction of an electorate equally brainwashed into re-electing the same people time and again, when the ideology has little to do with the personal appetites for abuse of power. You have to look at the nature of each proposition, and its reliance on empirically verifiable reality. If the details are manufactured by the body delivering the speech act, then DOUBT it. If there is a discernible agenda like for example, the speakers wishing to aggrandise themselves, then Doubt it, and equally if there is revenue behind the whole operation, don't merely doubt it, you might as well take it that **THE OPPOSITE is more likely to be true.....**

I hope this brief introduction to the basic logical principles has been enlightening. The conclusion you can reasonably draw from the main thrusts of my arguments above is:

1. Sound logic, is absolutely required, most of us know it instinctively , but there are also many in power who don't even have the wit to use it in the manner I have shown, they don't even reason logically, and I have reliable evidence in my legal cases of exposure of authority, elsewhere on this site, to rely on to show that logic in authority is visibly and palpably on the verge of collapse, where simple contradictions are marinated against all convincing force of logic merely on the grounds that the deliverer of such ridiculous assertions has the label of authority that stamps their statements with 'credent bulk'. This adds to the decline of the planet and of mankind in general.
2. It IS essential that in deriving any form of conclusion from assertions delivered, from a rostrum, that the paper that is being generally read from, or the teleprompter, is a paper that has formulated and manufactured the speech for a purpose and with profound consideration given to the way each word, act as touchstones to the mind, and its associative complexes to drive the will of independent minds towards a conclusion they probably already wish by merely being a listener of such or such a particular speaker. Its regarded as almost axiomatic that one can be convinced of the existence of God, when one wishes to be so convinced beforehand.
3. The third consideration is an amalgam of all possible influencing factors that throw a hue, slant or nuance on plain utterances that are locutionary, as opposed to illocutionary or perlocutionary. Such factors are agendas of revenue, maintenance of a status quo, control of people's minds, achievement of objectives or goals decided behind closed doors, not stated on manifestos, and such like background factors.
4. The next area of malfeasance is that residing in the manner of advertising and persuasion. If persuasion has to be involved, then there is an agenda behind it. People don't need persuading, we can all think reasonably well for ourselves thank you. Consider when one states "to tell you the truth", and how such an assertion normally touches the mind. If one wishes to believe, then one shall. But to presage any statement with such self approving verification is to be very seriously doubted. The first sign of a lie is when someone tells you they are going to tell you the truth. Hence when a body such as the Local Government Ombudsman, advertises you can come to them for reporting maladministration, and councils also advise if you are remotely unhappy you can take your complaint to them, you need to consider to what degree that body is **accountable**, and its **composition**. When you discover it is NOT accountable, and its composition is from former Chief Executive Officers of local councils, I think a reasonable person would doubt it that's the place where maladministration can be exposed, rather than simply reported... note the distinction. Indeed their byword is they can only investigate maladministration IF injustice has occurred, which should sway it all. Forget about maladministration being investigated, its consequences are the only reason for investigation. Thus it can continue unfettered so long as the invisible injustices are side stepped.
5. At this juncture I think my own agenda is showing clearly. Plainly stated it is, I don't mind games and semantic jokes, but I dislike semantics used to cloak abuse and conferment of detriments on the weak and vulnerable.....**intensely!** For this reason, and little other, the extent and depth of this treatise on all the pages of these associated sites. The world of illusions we are increasingly surrounded with, is the worst possible tool of integrity for safeguarding our future. To perhaps think of a parallel, I suggest if any reader is familiar with the film matrix, then that portrays in modern terms such a world of illusions where the body public is farmed for its energies, to no particularly good purpose that could not otherwise be achieved by consent, co-operation, sincerity and truth. That is perhaps the legacy I should like to leave in these works.

6. The primitive notations and their linguistic equivalents very quickly explained.

Essentially we are looking for sentences whose forms include formal concepts such as: 'not', 'and', 'or', and 'if then' with the propositions referred to as 'P'. The standard notation for these functions are in red below, and shall be repeated where appropriate.

1. 'not' = '~',
2. 'and' = '•',
3. 'or' = '∨', and
4. 'if then = '⊃' if P then P, or P **implies** P, where 'P' is a proposition
5. 'P' is a propositional variable.

b. These are primitives of the relational functions between elements of as well as propositions, examples like these are simple and plentiful in everyday speech.

3. The Three laws of Thought.

- **As Aristotle wrote them, they are as follows:**
- (1) **Law of Identity:** Each existence is identical with itself;
- (2) **Law of Non-contradiction:** Each existence is not different from itself; and
- (3) **Law of Excluded Middle:** No existence can be both itself and different from itself.

These have been re-arranged in order of interest and treatment. Note: the assertions assumes that **existence IS a predicate** of things, another complex question in philosophy. Compare them with the modern formulations below, (re-ordered in sequence of treatment), and then see HOW they can be tested in truth tables for certainty. No doubts, no ambiguities, no equivocations, sophistry, can, casuistry or other forms of mis or dis informational semantical delusions.

More formally these require brief explanation of the essential primitives of formal notation.

These are primitives of the relational functions between elements of as well as propositions, examples like these are simple and plentiful in everyday speech. Their formal notations you will see frequently in these sections are the following symbols...again in blue / red.

'not' = '~', 'and' = '•', 'or' = '∨', and 'if then = '⊃' if P then P, or P **implies** P, where 'P' is a proposition.

- 1. The law of NON-contradiction. $\sim (P \bullet \sim P)$ { **NOT** the case that, P **and** not P are jointly true. }
- 2. The law of excluded middle. $P \vee \sim P$ { **Either** P is true **OR** not P is true. }
- 3. The law of identity. $P \supset P$ { P **implies** P, itself. }

In modern language I suggest to make the sentences more common to everyday thought and speech the following may be easily understood. This order is also perhaps the commonest moving from easiest to more difficult., but hardly necessary.

All the following is considered under the notion “all things being equal”, ceteris paribus, and at the same time.

Don't confuse this with what appears to be an opposing notion embodied in Heraclitus's theory of flux “ One cannot step into the same stream twice”.

- (1) **Law of Identity:** A thing is identical with itself;
- (2) **Law of Excluded Middle:** A thing IS either identical with itself or NOT identical with itself.
- (3) **Law of Non-contradiction:** It is not possible for a thing to be BOTH (identical with itself AND NOT identical with itself).

Placing these forms in a truth table matrix it's easy to see at a glance they are true propositions without any reference to reality, hence the variables P may be substituted for any proposition.

4. The Three laws of Thought. (again)

- **The modern formulations, they are as follows:**

'not' = ' \sim ', 'and' = ' \bullet ', 'or' = ' \vee ', and 'if then = ' \supset ' if P then P, or P **implies** P, where 'P' is a proposition.

- 1. The law of **NON-contradiction.** $\sim (P \bullet \sim P)$. P and not P cannot be true together.
- 2. The law of **excluded middle.** $P \vee \sim P$. Either P is true or not p is true.
- 3. The law of **identity.** $P \supset P$. P implies P, itself.

Inconsistencies: The first Law of Thought, the Law of NON-Contradiction. belongs to the class of **tautologies**, and you may recall the contradictory function shown in the preamble during the legal case.

In the calculus of logic there truth tables like the ones shown below, that provide a wonderful opportunity to prove the irrefutable nature of these laws. The laws are innate to thought, that is their essence belongs to thinking, and thinking in any manner contrary to these laws is mind bending. Take the law of non-contradiction.

The formal expression of this function of contradiction is shown in the table below. In all cases of P being either true or false, the conjunction of the two is always false and best expressed by

$\sim (P \bullet \sim P)$ which is a **tautology**. See what a tautology looks like in the truth table below, next section.

5. Truth tables.

Inconsistencies:

The first obvious Law of Thought, the Law of NON-Contradiction, belongs to the class of **tautologies**, and you may recall the contradictory function shown in the preamble during the legal case.

In the calculus of logic there truth tables like the ones shown below, that provide a wonderful opportunity to prove the irrefutable nature of these laws. The laws are innate to thought, that is their essence belongs to thinking, and thinking in any manner contrary to these laws is mind bending. Take the law of non-contradiction.

The formal expression of this function of contradiction is shown in the table below. In all cases of P being either true or false, the conjunction of the two is always false and best expressed by

$\sim (P \bullet \sim P)$ which is a **tautology**.

First the truth table for the contradiction (the left magnolia coloured two columns), that easily shows that when P is true then not P is false and vice versa.

It is **Not** the case that P **and** NOT P are true together, begins with the conjunction of P and not P; ($P \bullet \sim P$)

and concludes (the right pale blue and yellow coloured three columns), that it is not the case that P and not P are true together. $\sim(P \bullet \sim P)$.

The two columns to the right side below are actually the truth table for the contradictory function.

P	$\sim P$
T	F
F	T

It follows that the matrix below is for the negation of the contradictory function above.

\sim	(P	$\sim P$)
T	T	F
T	F	T

This shows unconditionally the proposition $\sim(P \bullet \sim P)$ TRUE for ALL the truth-possibilities of its elementary propositions and by virtue of its logical form. A statement that is necessarily true. Hence for all worlds, space and time, where there is THOUGHT, these formulations are necessarily true. Isn't that fascinating? Unlike laws of nature, that can be defeated, or at least understood so well as to utilise in a way that looks like defeat.

For example; Sir Isaac Newton's: The Universal Law of Gravitation states that: every particle in the universe attracts every other particle with a force that is directly proportional to the product of their masses and inversely proportional to the square of the distance between them. Understanding of which enables us to construct mechanisms that as it were defeat gravity so that machines can fly. The differences between the laws of thought and laws of nature are simply and essentially, that the former do NOT require empirical observation to validate, merely requiring thought itself, where the latter require empirical determinations, and consequently may be subject to manipulation as in this example of say aircraft.

To conclude then, these are special laws, not subject to manipulation, and not subject to that previously qualified term defeat. Defeat is inconceivable, to re-iterate for a thing to be both itself and its own negation at the same time IS inconceivable, despite the possibility of entertaining the notion in the mind. Such may be the ponderable nature of what I deliver to the reader, while pressing forward, having considered this already more than sufficiently. Time is of the essence in this rule, since the moment a thing has traversed a measurable instant of time, it has altered, in accordance with the Heraclitean theory of flux that states that everything in the universe is in a state of ceaseless flux, from which was derived the notion that 'one cannot step into the SAME river twice' that requires a little thought to see just how. This is worth bearing in mind when considering such necessary truths, since the temporal significance does not affect the laws, but of course in reality where thought exists, these laws are considered irrefragable. I for one have not found that person who can reconcile a contradiction, and shall not wait for such.

An important comment is required here. When looking for contradictions with any proposition that may be substituted for the variable **P1**.

Anything that is NOT **P1**, can be the rest of the entire universe in space, time and objects of any reference. So if **P1** is the proposition "This tabletop is rectangular". All other things from "This tabletop is oval" to round, hexagonal, to seats, pianos, animals, vegetables, minerals and so on to infinity, while they are ALL NOT the first proposition, **P1**, they do not fulfill the condition of being NOT **P1** in the required sense. They all are simply propositions OTHER THAN **P1**, namely p2, p3, q, q1, r, r1, r2 and tn.....

We are only focussing on propositions that are the NEGATION of the original propositions. While that is not to say that the alternatives are useless in comparison, it IS to say that alternatives are not specifically negations. Where alternatives can come close to formal contradictions in the full blown sense is the temporal element in assertions that one proposition is true or false. I shall give a fascinating example of this, in a section 9, sworn police statement for truth, that came to be shown as a contradiction because **two very different propositions** were asserted to be both true to but could not possibly stand together as true simultaneously. It was known in any case that one was falsely manufactured to commit the contravention to some category of the paperwork in issuing a penalty, but even had it not been manufactured, and had been true, the two propositions could have been true together as different propositions, because they were different in nature and time. This class of inconsistency is the class of **contrarities**, and you can take a **short digression** from here to see its application to a real life perjury case with a policeman with noting better to do on a quiet weekend than make mischief, and put me in my place.

A necessary truth, is a truth that is referred to as **A Priori**. Considered with due seriousness, it is also a truth that can be maintained at any time, in any space. Truths like this while not being very informative, are exceedingly valuable from the point of view expressed in the preamble above. Reasoning which carefully follows the rules of logic will be infallible in argument, particularly in a court of law, but also many situations where illogical persuasion (fallacies) is being attempted and refutation required.

The second Law of Thought, the Law of Excluded Middle.

This states that only one of the disjuncts, (alternatives) needs to be true, for the whole proposition to be true, as shown in the middle cell columns.

P	v	~P
T	T	F
F	T	T

The third law of Thought, the law of identity.

~	(P	~P)
T	T	F
T	F	T

This states that

where **P is true**, it is identical with itself; **P (P implies P)** and
where **Not P is True**, it is identical with itself; **Not P (Not P implies Not P)**

Glossary of terms.

Acausal..... not causal; not causally related.

Analytic..... (of a statement etc.) such that its denial is self-contradictory; true by definition

A priori..... (of concepts, knowledge, etc.) logically independent of experience; not derived from experience

Averment..... The action of positively declaring as true; assertion, affirmation. OED 3.

Balk..... To miss or omit intentionally. b. fig. To pass over, overlook, refrain from noticing (what comes in one's way); to shirk, ignore. OED II. 2. trans.

Cognitive dissonance. As presented by Leon Festinger in 1957, dissonance theory began by postulating that pairs of cognitions (elements of knowledge) can be relevant or irrelevant to one another. If two cognitions are relevant to one another, they are either consonant or dissonant. Two cognitions are consonant if one follows from the other, and they are dissonant if the obverse (opposite) of one cognition follows from the other. The existence of dissonance, being psychologically uncomfortable, motivates the person to reduce the dissonance and leads to avoidance of information likely to increase the dissonance. The greater the magnitude of the dissonance, the greater is the pressure to reduce dissonance.

Contradiction..... c. Logic. One of the four kinds of Opposition (contradiction, **contrariety**, sub-contrariety, sub-alternation): see quot. 1864. principle (or law) of contradiction: the axiom that 'a thing cannot be and not be at the same time' or 'that nothing can have at the same time and at the same place contradictory and inconsistent qualities'.

Contrariety..... 6. Logic (from sense 1). contrary propositions: those most opposed to each other as regards affirmation and negation, each denying every possible case of the other, as All A is B: No A is B; both propositions cannot be true, but both may be false. contrary terms: those which are extreme opposites within the same class, as black and white. contrary opposition: the opposition of contrary propositions and terms. OED.

Copula..... a connecting word, esp. a part of the verb be connecting a subject and predicate.

Correspondence..... agreement, similarity, or harmony. (with reality)

Denotes..... stand as a name for; signify.

Elocutionary..... The art of speaking in regard to delivery, pronunciation, tones, and gestures; manner or style of oral delivery

Empirical..... based or acting on observation or experiment, not on theory.

Epistemology..... the theory of knowledge, esp. with regard to its methods and validation.

Fact..... truth, reality

Hypostasised..... OED To make into or regard as a self-existent substance or person; to embody, impersonate.

Illocutionary..... a speech act that amounts to stating, questioning, commanding, promising, and so on. It is an act performed in saying something, as contrasted with a locutionary act, the act of saying something, the locution. (wikipedia dictionary) J. L. Austin How to do Things with Words (1962). Additional comment; this speech act can be just as effective in the sense of being perlocutionary, if used selectively in the stating sense. Stating some things while omitting to state others, IS perlocutionary.

Indicative..... (of a mood) denoting simple statement of a fact. (that is subject to proof or disproof)

Intra Vires..... "within powers." conduct by a corporation or its officers that is within the powers granted by law.

Literal..... taking words in their usual or primary sense without metaphor or allegory.

Locutionary..... Of or pertaining to an utterance by a speaker

Logic..... not contravening the laws of thought, correctly reasoned.

Logic..... The branch of philosophy that treats of the forms of thinking in general, and more especially of inference and of scientific method. (Prof. J. Cook Wilson.) Also, since the work of Gottlob Frege (1848_1925), a formal system using symbolic techniques and mathematical methods to establish truth-values in the physical sciences, in language, and in philosophical argument. The proper scope of this department of study has been and is much controverted, and books on 'logic' differ widely in the range of subjects which they include. The definition formerly most commonly accepted is 'the art of reasoning'; for various modern definitions see the later quotes. At all times the vulgar notion of 'logic' has been largely that it is a system of rules for convincing or confounding an opponent by argument. In the Middle Ages logic (or dialectic, q.v.) was one of the three sciences composing the 'trivium', the former of the two divisions of the seven 'liberal arts'. OED- 1. a.

Mens Mentis..... Mind – thoughts, of.

Mens rea..... The state of mind indicating culpability which is required by statute as an element of a crime

Noblesse oblige..... privilege entails responsibility; to honourable behaviour.

Ontology..... the branch of metaphysics dealing with the nature of being. Anselm wrote in the Proslogium that “God is something than which nothing greater can be imagined.” (A definition of God where the nature of God is 'in the understanding') The conclusion that God exists, is derived from the absurdity that “If the nature of such a being can be understood” then his non existence cannot be consistent with this understanding.”

Perlocutionary..... a speech act that amounts to persuading, convincing, scaring, enlightening, inspiring, or otherwise getting someone to do or realize something. When examining perlocutionary acts, the effect in the hearer or reader is emphasized. Unlike illocutionary acts, which stress some linguistic performance, a perlocutionary act's effect is in some sense external to the performance. (wikipedia dictionary) J. L. Austin How to do Things with Words (1962).

Predicate..... assert (something) about the subject of a proposition.

Premiss..... a previous statement from which another is inferred.

Proposition..... the literal meaning of an indicative sentence that can be tested for truth or falsity. EG: take a slightly unusual sentence, simply the exclamation ... FIRE! The meaning being, this or there is a fire. This proposition can be verified for truth or falsity, but the sentence in its first utterance is hardly even a sentence for propositional purposes.

Spectre..... a haunting presentiment or preoccupation

Speech act..... an action performed by means of language, such as describing something ("It is snowing."), asking a question ("Is it snowing?"), making a request or order ("Could you pass the salt?", "Drop your weapon or I'll shoot you!"), or making a promise ("I promise I'll give it back.") (wikipedia dictionary)

Subject..... the part of a proposition about which a statement is made

Synthetic..... (of a proposition) having truth or falsity determinable by recourse to experience

Syllogism..... a form of reasoning in which a conclusion is drawn from two given or assumed propositions (premisses): a common or middle term is present in the two premisses but not in the conclusion, which may be invalid (e.g. all trains are long; some buses are long; therefore some buses are trains: the common term is long).

Synchronicity..... the simultaneous occurrence of events which appear significantly related but have no discernible connection.

Suppressio veri..... suppressio veri, **suggestio falsi**: The suppression of the truth and / is the suggestion of a falsehood.

Tautology..... Logic. A compound proposition which is unconditionally true for all the truth-possibilities of its elementary propositions and by virtue of its logical form. A statement that is necessarily true. See the truth table matrix for tautologies and similar truth functions. (to be added shortly).

Ultra Vires..... "beyond powers."conduct by a corporation or its officers that exceeds the powers granted by law.

Author, Tony Winter, all rights reserved.

A.H. Winter B.A. Lit., B.A. Phil (Hons), Additional disciplines: **Law, Logic, Psychology, Shakespeare, Music.**

Former MD, Clothing. OEM, IT manager, Application designer, Lecturer, Programmer (Unix,Csh,Basic,C,C+),

Author of DBMS III, Menuix, Studies in Logic, and Special Fallacies of Conduct,)

M.C. Winter B.A. Lit., B.A. Phil (Hons), Additional interests: Music, Opera, Ballet, Drama, Etiquette & Fine Arts. (Contributor)

A. Winter M.Sc . St. Pauls's Cathedral, First in Organ and Piano Grades, M.Sc. Harrow, (Guild Member)

First Year five prizes winner, Piano, Organ, Art, H'master Prize, Violin, Singing. [Music Link](#)

Second Year 2 Prizes, Fourth & Fifth Year 4 prizes. Undergraduate B.Sc.