Logic and Proofs

► Let *A* be a **statement**

- ▶ Let *A* be a **statement**
- ▶ A statement is sentence that can be true or false.

- ▶ Let A be a **statement**
- ▶ A statement is sentence that can be true or false.
- ▶ Let X be a set and let A be the statement " $x \in X$ "

- Let A be a statement
- ▶ A statement is sentence that can be true or false.
- ▶ Let X be a set and let A be the statement " $x \in X$ "
- A can be true or false.

- Let A be a statement
- A statement is sentence that can be true or false.
- Let X be a set and let A be the statement " $x \in X$ "
- A can be true or false.
- ▶ If x is an irrational number and X is \mathbb{Z} , then A is false.

- Let A be a statement
- A statement is sentence that can be true or false.
- ▶ Let X be a set and let A be the statement " $x \in X$ "
- A can be true or false.
- ▶ If x is an irrational number and X is \mathbb{Z} , then A is false.
- ▶ If *x* is a banana and *X* is the set of all types of fruit, then *A* is true.

Conditional Statements

▶ Sufficiency: $A \implies B$

Conditional Statements

- ▶ Sufficiency: $A \implies B$
- ▶ Necessity and Sufficiency: $A \iff B$

Conditional Statements

- ▶ Sufficiency: $A \implies B$
- ▶ Necessity and Sufficiency: A ⇔ B
- ▶ Necessity: $\neg A \implies \neg B$

Connectives

▶ New statements can be constructed from other statements by using the connectives "and" or "or."

Connectives

- ► New statements can be constructed from other statements by using the connectives "and" or "or."
- A ∨ B is read "A or B" and corresponds to the concept of union in set theory.

Connectives

- New statements can be constructed from other statements by using the connectives "and" or "or."
- A ∨ B is read "A or B" and corresponds to the concept of union in set theory.
- A ∧ B is read "A and B" and corresponds to the concept of intersection in set theory.

▶ Let *A* be the statement "the child is a boy," *B* be the statement "the child is a twin," and *C* be the statement "the child is a brother."

- ▶ Let *A* be the statement "the child is a boy," *B* be the statement "the child is a twin," and *C* be the statement "the child is a brother."
- Are the statements below true or false?

- ▶ Let *A* be the statement "the child is a boy," *B* be the statement "the child is a twin," and *C* be the statement "the child is a brother."
- Are the statements below true or false?
- $\triangleright A \Longrightarrow C$

- ▶ Let *A* be the statement "the child is a boy," *B* be the statement "the child is a twin," and *C* be the statement "the child is a brother."
- Are the statements below true or false?
- $\triangleright A \Longrightarrow C$
- \triangleright $B \implies C$

- ▶ Let *A* be the statement "the child is a boy," *B* be the statement "the child is a twin," and *C* be the statement "the child is a brother."
- Are the statements below true or false?
- \rightarrow $A \implies C$
- \triangleright $B \implies C$
- $ightharpoonup \neg A \implies \neg C$

- ▶ Let *A* be the statement "the child is a boy," *B* be the statement "the child is a twin," and *C* be the statement "the child is a brother."
- Are the statements below true or false?
- \rightarrow $A \implies C$
- \triangleright $B \implies C$
- $ightharpoonup \neg A \implies \neg C$
- $ightharpoonup \neg B \implies \neg C$

- ▶ Let *A* be the statement "the child is a boy," *B* be the statement "the child is a twin," and *C* be the statement "the child is a brother."
- Are the statements below true or false?
- \rightarrow $A \implies C$
- \triangleright $B \implies C$
- $ightharpoonup \neg A \implies \neg C$
- $ightharpoonup \neg B \implies \neg C$
- $\triangleright A \land B \implies C$

- ▶ Let *A* be the statement "the child is a boy," *B* be the statement "the child is a twin," and *C* be the statement "the child is a brother."
- Are the statements below true or false?
- $\triangleright A \Longrightarrow C$
- $\triangleright B \implies C$
- $ightharpoonup \neg A \implies \neg C$
- $ightharpoonup \neg B \implies \neg C$
- $\triangleright A \land B \implies C$
- $\triangleright A \lor B \implies C$

- ▶ Let *A* be the statement "the child is a boy," *B* be the statement "the child is a twin," and *C* be the statement "the child is a brother."
- Are the statements below true or false?
- \rightarrow $A \implies C$
- \triangleright $B \implies C$
- $ightharpoonup \neg A \implies \neg C$
- $ightharpoonup \neg B \implies \neg C$
- $\triangleright A \land B \implies C$
- $\triangleright A \lor B \implies C$
- $ightharpoonup C \implies A$

Logical Principles

▶ Contrapositive: $C \implies A \text{ iff } \neg A \implies \neg C \text{ is true.}$

Logical Principles

- ▶ **Contrapositive**: $C \implies A \text{ iff } \neg A \implies \neg C \text{ is true}.$
- ▶ **Noncontradiction**: $(A \land \neg A)$ is always false

Proofs

Mathematics has well-defined procedures for verifying that a given statement is true or false.

Proof by Deduction

Assume too that we know that there exists some C such that $C \implies B$.

Proof by Deduction

- Assume too that we know that there exists some C such that C ⇒ B.
- ▶ If we can show that $A \implies C$, then we have proven that $A \implies B$.

► Claim: $x^2 - 4x + 9$ is always positive.

- ▶ Claim: $x^2 4x + 9$ is always positive.
- ▶ Proof: We know that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $x^2 \ge 0$.

- ▶ Claim: $x^2 4x + 9$ is always positive.
- ▶ Proof: We know that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $x^2 \ge 0$.
- ▶ Therefore $x^2 + y$ for any y > 0 is always positive.

- ▶ Claim: $x^2 4x + 9$ is always positive.
- ▶ Proof: We know that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $x^2 \ge 0$.
- ▶ Therefore $x^2 + y$ for any y > 0 is always positive.
- Now note that $x^2 4x + 9$ can be rewritten as $(x 2)^2 + 5$ by completing the square.

- ► Claim: $x^2 4x + 9$ is always positive.
- ▶ Proof: We know that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $x^2 \ge 0$.
- ▶ Therefore $x^2 + y$ for any y > 0 is always positive.
- Now note that $x^2 4x + 9$ can be rewritten as $(x 2)^2 + 5$ by completing the square.
- ► Therefore $x^2 4x + 9$ is always positive. ■

▶ Claim: if f(x) is even, then it is not one-to-one.

- ▶ Claim: if f(x) is even, then it is not one-to-one.
- ▶ Proof: Recall that f(x) is even if f(-x) = f(x) for all x and is one-to-one if for all x, f(x) is unique.

- ▶ Claim: if f(x) is even, then it is not one-to-one.
- ▶ Proof: Recall that f(x) is even if f(-x) = f(x) for all x and is one-to-one if for all x, f(x) is unique.
- ▶ If f(x) is even, then f(x) = f(-x).

- ▶ Claim: if f(x) is even, then it is not one-to-one.
- ▶ Proof: Recall that f(x) is even if f(-x) = f(x) for all x and is one-to-one if for all x, f(x) is unique.
- ▶ If f(x) is even, then f(x) = f(-x).
- ▶ Thus there exists an a and a b such that f(a) = f(b).

- ▶ Claim: if f(x) is even, then it is not one-to-one.
- ▶ Proof: Recall that f(x) is even if f(-x) = f(x) for all x and is one-to-one if for all x, f(x) is unique.
- ▶ If f(x) is even, then f(x) = f(-x).
- ▶ Thus there exists an a and a b such that f(a) = f(b).
- ▶ Therefore f(x) is not one-to-one. ■

▶ A second proof strategy exploits the fact that $(\neg B \land B)$ is logically invalid.

- ▶ A second proof strategy exploits the fact that $(\neg B \land B)$ is logically invalid.
- ▶ Prove A by showing that $\neg A \implies (\neg B \land B)$.

- ▶ A second proof strategy exploits the fact that $(\neg B \land B)$ is logically invalid.
- ▶ Prove A by showing that $\neg A \implies (\neg B \land B)$.
- ▶ B can be any statement, not necessarily one that we are trying to prove or disprove.

► Claim: $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational.

- ▶ Claim: $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational.
- ▶ Proof: Suppose that $\sqrt{2}$ is rational.

- ► Claim: $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational.
- ▶ Proof: Suppose that $\sqrt{2}$ is rational.
- ▶ Then there exist two integers, a and b such that $\frac{a}{b} = \sqrt{2}$.

- ► Claim: $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational.
- ▶ Proof: Suppose that $\sqrt{2}$ is rational.
- ▶ Then there exist two integers, a and b such that $\frac{a}{b} = \sqrt{2}$.
- ▶ Let the fraction be fully reduced. This implies that *a* and *b* are not both even (why?).

- ► Claim: $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational.
- ▶ Proof: Suppose that $\sqrt{2}$ is rational.
- ▶ Then there exist two integers, a and b such that $\frac{a}{b} = \sqrt{2}$.
- ▶ Let the fraction be fully reduced. This implies that *a* and *b* are not both even (why?).
- Our assumption implies that $a^2 = 2b^2$.

- ► Claim: $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational.
- ▶ Proof: Suppose that $\sqrt{2}$ is rational.
- ▶ Then there exist two integers, a and b such that $\frac{a}{b} = \sqrt{2}$.
- ▶ Let the fraction be fully reduced. This implies that *a* and *b* are not both even (why?).
- Our assumption implies that $a^2 = 2b^2$.
- ▶ We thus know that a^2 must be even which implies that a is even.

- ► Claim: $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational.
- ▶ Proof: Suppose that $\sqrt{2}$ is rational.
- ▶ Then there exist two integers, a and b such that $\frac{a}{b} = \sqrt{2}$.
- ▶ Let the fraction be fully reduced. This implies that *a* and *b* are not both even (why?).
- Our assumption implies that $a^2 = 2b^2$.
- ▶ We thus know that a^2 must be even which implies that a is even.
- Therefore b must be odd.

- ► Claim: $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational.
- ▶ Proof: Suppose that $\sqrt{2}$ is rational.
- ▶ Then there exist two integers, a and b such that $\frac{a}{b} = \sqrt{2}$.
- ▶ Let the fraction be fully reduced. This implies that *a* and *b* are not both even (why?).
- Our assumption implies that $a^2 = 2b^2$.
- ▶ We thus know that a^2 must be even which implies that a is even.
- Therefore b must be odd.
- Since a is even, there must be some integer c such that a = 2c

- ► Claim: $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational.
- ▶ Proof: Suppose that $\sqrt{2}$ is rational.
- ▶ Then there exist two integers, a and b such that $\frac{a}{b} = \sqrt{2}$.
- ▶ Let the fraction be fully reduced. This implies that *a* and *b* are not both even (why?).
- Our assumption implies that $a^2 = 2b^2$.
- ▶ We thus know that a^2 must be even which implies that a is even.
- Therefore b must be odd.
- Since a is even, there must be some integer c such that a = 2c
- ► This yields $(2c)^2 = 2b^2$ so $4c^2 = 2b^2$ and hence $b^2 = 2c^2$

- ► Claim: $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational.
- ▶ Proof: Suppose that $\sqrt{2}$ is rational.
- ▶ Then there exist two integers, a and b such that $\frac{a}{b} = \sqrt{2}$.
- ▶ Let the fraction be fully reduced. This implies that *a* and *b* are not both even (why?).
- Our assumption implies that $a^2 = 2b^2$.
- ▶ We thus know that a^2 must be even which implies that a is even.
- Therefore b must be odd.
- Since a is even, there must be some integer c such that a = 2c
- ► This yields $(2c)^2 = 2b^2$ so $4c^2 = 2b^2$ and hence $b^2 = 2c^2$
- ▶ This implies that b^2 is even which implies that b is also even.

- ► Claim: $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational.
- ▶ Proof: Suppose that $\sqrt{2}$ is rational.
- ▶ Then there exist two integers, a and b such that $\frac{a}{b} = \sqrt{2}$.
- ▶ Let the fraction be fully reduced. This implies that *a* and *b* are not both even (why?).
- Our assumption implies that $a^2 = 2b^2$.
- ▶ We thus know that a^2 must be even which implies that a is even.
- Therefore b must be odd.
- Since a is even, there must be some integer c such that a = 2c
- ► This yields $(2c)^2 = 2b^2$ so $4c^2 = 2b^2$ and hence $b^2 = 2c^2$
- ▶ This implies that b^2 is even which implies that b is also even.
- ▶ But we just deduced that *b* is odd. Therefore we have a contradiction: *b* is both even and odd.

- ► Claim: $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational.
- ▶ Proof: Suppose that $\sqrt{2}$ is rational.
- ▶ Then there exist two integers, a and b such that $\frac{a}{b} = \sqrt{2}$.
- ▶ Let the fraction be fully reduced. This implies that *a* and *b* are not both even (why?).
- Our assumption implies that $a^2 = 2b^2$.
- ▶ We thus know that a^2 must be even which implies that a is even.
- Therefore b must be odd.
- Since a is even, there must be some integer c such that a = 2c
- ► This yields $(2c)^2 = 2b^2$ so $4c^2 = 2b^2$ and hence $b^2 = 2c^2$
- ▶ This implies that b^2 is even which implies that b is also even.
- ▶ But we just deduced that *b* is odd. Therefore we have a contradiction: *b* is both even and odd.
- ▶ Therefore our presumption that $\sqrt{2}$ is rational must be false.

► Contradiction is often a good strategy for proving statements of the form "for all x, A is true of x."

- ► Contradiction is often a good strategy for proving statements of the form "for all x, A is true of x."
- ► The setup for contradiction involves assuming that "there exists an x such that A is not true of x."

- ► Contradiction is often a good strategy for proving statements of the form "for all x, A is true of x."
- ► The setup for contradiction involves assuming that "there exists an x such that A is not true of x."
- ▶ This gives us a specific *x* for which *A* is false which is often enough to produce a contradiction.

▶ Claim: There exists an integer n > 0 such that $n^2 + n + 17$ is not a prime number.

- ▶ Claim: There exists an integer n > 0 such that $n^2 + n + 17$ is not a prime number.
- ▶ Proof: Assume that for all integers n > 0, $n^2 + n + 17$ is a prime number.

- ▶ Claim: There exists an integer n > 0 such that $n^2 + n + 17$ is not a prime number.
- ▶ Proof: Assume that for all integers n > 0, $n^2 + n + 17$ is a prime number.
- ▶ This implies that n + 1 + 17/n is not an integer for all n.

- ▶ Claim: There exists an integer n > 0 such that $n^2 + n + 17$ is not a prime number.
- ▶ Proof: Assume that for all integers n > 0, $n^2 + n + 17$ is a prime number.
- ▶ This implies that n + 1 + 17/n is not an integer for all n.
- ▶ This therefore implies that 17/n is not an integer for all n which implies that 1 is not an integer which is false. ■

We typically are interested in proving conditional statements in political science.

- We typically are interested in proving conditional statements in political science.
- ▶ To prove $A \implies B$, we assume $\neg (A \implies B)$.

- We typically are interested in proving conditional statements in political science.
- ▶ To prove $A \implies B$, we assume $\neg (A \implies B)$.
- ▶ That is, we assume *A* is true while *B* is false (why?).

- We typically are interested in proving conditional statements in political science.
- ▶ To prove $A \implies B$, we assume $\neg (A \implies B)$.
- ▶ That is, we assume *A* is true while *B* is false (why?).
- Assume $(A \land \neg B)$ and show that $(C \land \neg C)$ for some statement C.

▶ Claim: Assume $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. If a^2 is even, then a is even.

- ▶ Claim: Assume $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. If a^2 is even, then a is even.
- ▶ Proof: Assume *a* is odd and a^2 is even.

- ▶ Claim: Assume $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. If a^2 is even, then a is even.
- ▶ Proof: Assume a is odd and a^2 is even.
- ▶ Since a is odd, there exists an integer c for which a = 2c + 1.

- ▶ Claim: Assume $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. If a^2 is even, then a is even.
- ▶ Proof: Assume a is odd and a^2 is even.
- ▶ Since *a* is odd, there exists an integer *c* for which a = 2c + 1.
- ► Then $a^2 = 2(2c^2 + 2c) + 1$ which implies that a^2 is odd, a contradiction.

- ▶ Claim: Assume $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. If a^2 is even, then a is even.
- ▶ Proof: Assume *a* is odd and a^2 is even.
- ▶ Since a is odd, there exists an integer c for which a = 2c + 1.
- ► Then $a^2 = 2(2c^2 + 2c) + 1$ which implies that a^2 is odd, a contradiction.
- ▶ Therefore *a* must be even. ■

Proof by Induction

Some statements describe a property of an index number n and may be written as A(n).

Proof by Induction

- Some statements describe a property of an index number n and may be written as A(n).
- ▶ One way to prove that A(n) is true for all natural numbers n is to demonstrate that A(1) is true and that if A(n) is true then A(n+1) must be true.

► Claim:
$$1 + 2 + 3 + ... + n = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$$

- ► Claim: $1 + 2 + 3 + ... + n = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$
- ▶ Proof: First show that the equality holds for n = 1. 1 = 1(1+1)/2 = 1.

- ► Claim: $1 + 2 + 3 + ... + n = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$
- ▶ Proof: First show that the equality holds for n = 1. 1 = 1(1+1)/2 = 1.
- ▶ Now assume n = k is true (inductive hypothesis)

- ► Claim: $1 + 2 + 3 + ... + n = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$
- ▶ Proof: First show that the equality holds for n = 1. 1 = 1(1+1)/2 = 1.
- Now assume n = k is true (inductive hypothesis)
- ▶ That is, we assume $1 + 2 + ... + k = \frac{k(k+1)}{2}$

- ► Claim: $1+2+3+...+n=\frac{n(n+1)}{2}$
- ▶ Proof: First show that the equality holds for n = 1. 1 = 1(1+1)/2 = 1.
- Now assume n = k is true (inductive hypothesis)
- ► That is, we assume $1 + 2 + ... + k = \frac{k(k+1)}{2}$
- Now we just need show that n = k + 1 holds:

$$1+2+...+k+(k+1)=\frac{(k+1)((k+1)+1)}{2}$$

Example (cont.)

▶ We need to show $1 + 2 + ... + k + (k + 1) = \frac{(k+1)((k+1)+1)}{2}$

Example (cont.)

- ▶ We need to show $1 + 2 + ... + k + (k + 1) = \frac{(k+1)((k+1)+1)}{2}$
- Start with the left side of the equation. By the inductive hypothesis,

$$1+2+...+k+(k+1) = \frac{k(k+1)}{2} + (k+1)$$

$$= \frac{k(k+1)+2(k+1)}{2}$$

$$= \frac{(k+2)(k+1)}{2}$$

$$= \frac{(k+1)(k+2)}{2}$$

$$= \frac{(k+1)((k+1)+1)}{2} \blacksquare$$

► Algorithm for proof by induction is simple.

- Algorithm for proof by induction is simple.
- First prove the statement for a base case.

- Algorithm for proof by induction is simple.
- First prove the statement for a base case.
- ▶ Then assume the statement is true for some *n*.

- Algorithm for proof by induction is simple.
- First prove the statement for a base case.
- ▶ Then assume the statement is true for some *n*.
- ▶ Then show that given the inductive hypothesis (step 2), the statement holds for n + 1.

- Algorithm for proof by induction is simple.
- First prove the statement for a base case.
- ▶ Then assume the statement is true for some *n*.
- ▶ Then show that given the inductive hypothesis (step 2), the statement holds for n + 1.
- ▶ While the algorithm is simple, intuition for why inductive proofs are valid may take a while to understand.

Proof by Contraposition

▶ Recall $A \implies B$ is equivalent to $\neg B \implies \neg A$

Proof by Contraposition

- ▶ Recall $A \implies B$ is equivalent to $\neg B \implies \neg A$
- ▶ Proof by contraposition exploits this fact to prove $A \implies B$

Proof by Contraposition

- ▶ Recall $A \implies B$ is equivalent to $\neg B \implies \neg A$
- ▶ Proof by contraposition exploits this fact to prove $A \implies B$
- ▶ Often $A \implies B$ is too hard to prove by deduction, contradiction, or induction while $\neg B \implies \neg A$ is relatively simple to prove by one of these techniques.

▶ Claim: if 7m is an odd integer, then m is an odd integer.

- ▶ Claim: if 7m is an odd integer, then m is an odd integer.
- ▶ Proof: We will prove that m is even implies 7m is even.

- ▶ Claim: if 7*m* is an odd integer, then *m* is an odd integer.
- ▶ Proof: We will prove that m is even implies 7m is even.
- ▶ If m is even, then m = 2k for some integer $k \implies 7m = 7(2k) \implies 7m = 2(7k) \implies 7m = 2n$ for some integer $n \implies 7m$ is even. ■

If and Only If

▶ So far we have been focusing on proving simple statements and conditional statements of the form $A \implies B$.

If and Only If

- ▶ So far we have been focusing on proving simple statements and conditional statements of the form $A \implies B$.
- ▶ To prove a conditional statement of the form $A \iff B$, we have to prove $A \implies B$ and $B \implies A$.

If and Only If

- ▶ So far we have been focusing on proving simple statements and conditional statements of the form $A \implies B$.
- ▶ To prove a conditional statement of the form $A \iff B$, we have to prove $A \implies B$ and $B \implies A$.
- We can use different proof techniques to prove both sides of the statement.