

# Logic Tutorial 1 Solutions

1.  $p$  : the sun shines today,  $q$  : the sun shines tomorrow,  $p \rightarrow \neg q$ .
2.  $p$  : Robert was Jealous of Yvonne,  $q$  : Robert was in a good mood,  $p \vee \neg q$ .
3.  $p$  : barometer falls.  $q$  : it will rain,  $r$  : t will snow,  $p \rightarrow (q \vee r)$ .
4.  $p$  : a request occurs,  $q$  : the request is eventually acknowledged,  $r$  : the requesting process makes progress,  $p \rightarrow (q \vee \neg r)$
5.  $p$  : the cause of cancer is determined,  $q$  : a new cancer drug is found,  $r$  : cancer is cured,  $\neg(p \wedge q) \rightarrow \neg r$ .
6.  $q$  : You can ride the roller coaster,  $r$  : You are under 4 feet tall,  $s$  : You are older than 16 years old.  $(r \wedge \neg s) \rightarrow \neg q$ .
7.  $p$  : You can access the internet from campus,  $q$  : you are a Computer Science major,  $r$  : You are a freshman.  $p \rightarrow (q \vee \neg r)$ .

*Q: When we have a logical statement of the form  $p \rightarrow q$ , where  $p$  and  $q$  are propositions corresponding to real world events, does the truth of the statement  $p \rightarrow q$  necessarily imply that the event  $p$  \*caused\* the event  $q$ ? If not, could you provide an example where the statement  $p \rightarrow q$  can be true without  $p$  necessarily causing  $q$ .*

It could simply be the case, for example that a common cause (what is called a confounder) causes both  $p$  and  $q$  to be true, so that whenever  $p$  is true  $q$  is also true, without necessarily  $p$  causing  $q$  to be true.

For example,

$p$ : This week, the weekly ice-cream sales are 3x the average.

$q$ : This week, the heat-strokes are 5x the weekly average.

Both  $p$  and  $q$  could be true during peak summer, yet without one causing the other.

<b>p</b>	<b>q</b>	<b>(p → q)</b>
F	F	<b>T</b>
F	T	<b>T</b>
T	F	<b>F</b>
T	T	<b>T</b>

<b>p</b>	<b>q</b>	<b>(¬p ∨ q)</b>
F	F	<b>T</b>
F	T	<b>T</b>
T	F	<b>F</b>
T	T	<b>T</b>

- Both the truth tables are identical in each row, and what this means is that the two propositions are *equivalent*, in that one can substitute one for the other in any larger compound proposition without altering its truth value.

<b>p</b>	<b>q</b>	<b>(p → q)</b>
F	F	<b>T</b>
F	T	<b>T</b>
T	F	<b>F</b>
T	T	<b>T</b>

<b>p</b>	<b>q</b>	<b>(¬q → ¬p)</b>
F	F	<b>T</b>
F	T	<b>T</b>
T	F	<b>F</b>
T	T	<b>T</b>

- Here again  $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$  is equivalent to  $p \rightarrow q$ .
- In fact,  $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$  is called the *contrapositive* of  $p \rightarrow q$ .