What's wrong with the following proposed inference rule?

Let P be a common subformula of goal $\mathcal{G}_1$ and goal $\mathcal{G}_2$, occurring at least once in each of these formulas. Then

> From goal $\mathcal{G}_1$ and goal $\mathcal{G}_2$
> derive goal $\mathcal{G}_1[P \mapsto False] \vee \mathcal{G}_2[P \mapsto True]$

(This is similar to, but not the same as, GG-resolution.)

Answer: Consider the tableau

g1. P	given
g2. P	given

This tableau is not valid.

If we apply the proposed inference rule, we obtain

g1. P	given
g2. P	given
g3. $\mathsf{false} \vee \mathsf{true}$	g1,g2, proposed rule

which is a valid tableau since (g3) rewrites to true.

Therefore, the proposed rule can transform an invalid tableau into a valid tableau. Such a rule therefore cannot show that the given, starting tableau, must be valid, if the resulting tableau is valid.