

Assignment 1: CS205

Joshua Ross

RUID: 185008511

Rutgers University - New Brunswick

jjr276@scarletmail.rutgers.edu

18 December 2019

1.1

32c)

Problem: Construct a truth table for $p \oplus (p \vee q)$

| p | q | $p \vee q$ | $p \oplus (p \vee q)$ |
|-----|-----|------------|-----------------------|
| T | T | T | F |
| T | F | T | F |
| F | T | T | T |
| F | F | F | F |

32f)

Problem: Construct a truth table for $(p \oplus q) \wedge (p \oplus \neg q)$

| p | q | $\neg q$ | $p \oplus q$ | $p \oplus \neg q$ | $(p \oplus q) \wedge (p \oplus \neg q)$ |
|-----|-----|----------|--------------|-------------------|---|
| T | T | F | F | T | F |
| T | F | T | F | F | F |
| F | T | F | T | F | F |
| F | F | T | T | T | F |

36c)

Problem: Construct a truth table for $(p \vee q) \vee r$

| p | q | r | $p \vee q$ | $(p \vee q) \vee r$ |
|-----|-----|-----|------------|---------------------|
| T | T | T | T | T |
| T | T | F | T | T |
| T | F | T | T | T |
| T | F | F | T | T |
| F | T | T | T | T |
| F | T | F | T | T |
| F | F | T | F | T |
| F | F | F | F | F |

36f)

Problem: Construct a truth table for $(p \wedge q) \vee r$

| p | q | r | $\neg r$ | $p \wedge q$ | $(p \wedge q) \vee r$ |
|-----|-----|-----|----------|--------------|-----------------------|
| T | T | T | F | T | T |
| T | T | F | T | T | T |
| T | F | T | F | F | F |
| T | F | F | T | F | T |
| F | T | T | F | F | F |
| F | T | F | T | F | T |
| F | F | T | F | F | F |
| F | F | F | T | F | T |

1.3

26)

Problem: Use boolean algebra to show that $\neg p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r)$ and $q \rightarrow (p \vee r)$ are logically equivalent

- $\neg p \rightarrow (q \rightarrow r) \equiv p \vee (\neg q \vee r)$ by the implication law
- $p \vee (\neg q \vee r) \equiv \neg q \vee (p \vee r)$ by the commutative and associative laws
- $\neg q \vee (p \vee r) \equiv q \rightarrow (p \vee r)$ by the implication law

30)

Problem: Use boolean algebra to show that $(p \vee q) \wedge (\neg p \vee r) \rightarrow (q \vee r)$ is a tautology

- $(p \vee q) \wedge (\neg p \vee r) \rightarrow (q \vee r) \equiv \neg((p \vee q) \wedge (\neg p \vee r)) \vee (q \vee r)$ by the implication law
- $\neg((p \vee q) \wedge (\neg p \vee r)) \vee (q \vee r) \equiv \neg(p \vee q) \vee \neg(\neg p \vee r) \vee (q \vee r)$ by De Morgan law

- $\neg(p \vee q) \vee \neg(\neg p \vee r) \vee (\neg p \vee r) \equiv \neg(p \vee q) \vee T$ by the Associative and Negation law
- $\neg(p \vee q) \vee T \equiv T$ by Domination law, proving $(p \vee q) \wedge (\neg p \vee r) \rightarrow (q \vee r)$ is a tautology

1.4

36a)

Problem: Find a counterexample (if possible) to $\forall x(x^2 \neq x)$ where the domain of x is all real numbers

For $x = 1$, $(1)^2 = (1)$, meaning $x^2 = x$, providing a counterexample to $\forall x(x^2 \neq x)$

36b)

Problem: Find a counterexample (if possible) to $\forall x(x^2 \neq 2)$ where the domain of x is all real numbers

For $x = 1$, $(\sqrt{2})^2 = 2$, meaning $x^2 = 2$, providing a counterexample to $\forall x(x^2 \neq 2)$

36c)

Problem: Find a counterexample (if possible) to $\forall x(|x| > 0)$ where the domain of x is all real numbers

For $x = 0$, $|0| = 0$, meaning $|x| = 0$, providing a counterexample to $\forall x(|x| > 0)$