```
Use 1 with 3, : 3x(W(x) , U(x)) - There exist an a that is both
Use -> with \forall x: \forall x (\omega(x) \rightarrow \omega(x)) \rightarrow "All western students go to university". If w(x) fail
Disproving Logical Equivalences
Ed Ar(E(K) AO(K)) = (ArE(K) A ARO(K))
Define the predicates to form a contradiction Domain = KEN
 E(K) = K is even
 O(x)= x is odd
 for all natural numbers, K is even or k is odd /
All natural numbers are odd or all natural numbers are false
lhs is true, rhs is false : not equivalent
Proving Logical Equivalence Formally
J, (¬F(K) V G(K)) = YK F(K) → J, G(K)
Using transitivity of equivalence, convert this to rhs, stating laws used
\exists_{\kappa} (\neg f(\kappa) \lor G(\kappa)) \equiv \exists_{\kappa} \neg F(\kappa) \lor \exists_{\kappa} G(\kappa) \rightarrow \text{Existential distribution over disjustion}

\exists_{\kappa} \neg F(\kappa) \lor \exists_{\kappa} G(\kappa) \equiv \neg \forall_{\kappa} F(\kappa) \lor \exists_{\kappa} G(\kappa) \rightarrow \text{Demorgan's law over existential quantifier}
\neg \forall k \ F(k) \ \lor \exists k G(k) \equiv \forall k F(k) \rightarrow \exists_k G(k) \longrightarrow \text{Expression of} \rightarrow \text{in terms of } \neg \text{ and}
More Laws
Yx(P(x) AGCK) = YxP(x) A YxG(x)
7 3 R P(K) = Yx7P(K)
Logical Proofs Using Rules of Inference
\exists_{\kappa}(\tau_{\kappa}) \vee G(\kappa)) \longrightarrow (\forall_{\kappa} F(\kappa) \rightarrow \exists_{\kappa} G(\kappa))
1. 3x (TF(x) VG(x)): Imply Assumption
2. 7F(c) VG(c)
                                 1, 7-elim with C
                                 Imply Assumption
3. (Yx F(K)]
4. F(C)
                                 3, V-elim withc
                                 Neg. assumption -> assume a F(C) to form contradiction and prove G(C)
5. [7F(c)]
                                :4,5 L-intro
:5,6 7-intro, discharge 5
6. 1
7.77F(C)
                                :2,7, V-elim \rightarrow F(C) is true so \negF(C) \lorG(C) proves G(C), Prove this for
8. G(c)
9. 3xG(x)
                                  3,9, > intro, discharges 3 > We've been working under the assumption that Yxf(x),
 10. tx F(x) -> 3xG(x)
11. 3x(7F(x) VG(x)) ->
                                : 1,10, -> intro discharges 1
    (YXF(x) -> 3KG(K))
Discharging occurs when an assumption is either proven or disprove
```

1. Logic