

CSE215

Foundations of Computer Science

Instructor: Zhoulai Fu

State University of New York, Korea

Today's objectives

To understand

- What is propositional logic and scope of our study
- Truth table
- Logical Equivalence

Proposition

Definition

- A **statement** or **proposition** is a sentence for which a truth value (either true or false) can be assigned

True or False?

- The atomic number of Oxygen is 8
- $1 + 1 = 3$
- (Judge asking Witness) The man chased the thief until he fell.
- My mom never made cakes, which we hate.
- There exists life in other planets.
- If earth is round, I can return to where I am by traveling toward a certain direction.
- If Luna drops to 0 won, I will go bankruptcy.
- $a \wedge b \rightarrow a$
- $(a \wedge \sim a)$

Scope of our study

- Mathematical logic, not ambiguous English
- Compound statements, not unit statements
- So, we will check if a proposition like $(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (q \rightarrow p)$ is true or false

Why logic?

Artificial Intelligence 47 (1991) 31–56
Elsevier

31

Logic and artificial intelligence

Nils J. Nilsson

Computer Science Department, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

Received February 1989

Abstract

Nilsson, N.J., Logic and artificial intelligence, *Artificial Intelligence* 47 (1990) 31–56.

The theoretical foundations of the logical approach to artificial intelligence are presented.

- Quote: “Logic provides the vocabulary and many of the techniques needed both for analyzing the processes of representation and reasoning and for synthesizing machines that represent and reason.”

Example: Software techniques used at FAANG

Question: Simplify this code

5	<code>int x = 0;</code>
6 ▾	<code>while (x < 10){</code>
7	<code> x = x + 1;</code>
8	<code>}</code>

- Answer: x must equals to 10. Following three facts
 - $x < 11$ at Line 6 (before entering the loop)
 - $x \geq 10$ after the loop
 - x is an integer

**How to check truthfulness
of propositions?**

Compound statements

Definition

- A **compound statement** is a complex sentence that is obtained by joining **propositional variables** using **logical connectives**

Logical operator	Notation	Read as
Negation	$\sim p$	not p
Conjunction	$p \wedge q$	p and q
Disjunction	$p \vee q$	p or q
Conditional	$p \rightarrow q$	p implies q if p , then q p only if q q if p q , provided that p
Biconditional	$p \leftrightarrow q$	p if and only if q
Logical equivalence	$p \equiv q$	p logically equivalent to q

Examples

- $(p \vee q) \wedge \sim (\sim p \wedge r)$
- $(\sim p \wedge q \wedge r) \vee (q \vee \sim r)$

Truthfulness of compound statements

Negation ($\sim p$)

Definition

- **Negation** of a statement p , denoted by $\sim p$, is a statement obtained by changing the truth value of p .

p	$\sim p$
T	F
F	T

Truthfulness of compound statements

Conjunction ($p \wedge q$)

Definition

- **Conjunction** of statements p and q , denoted by $p \wedge q$, is a statement such that it is true if both p and q are true and it is false, otherwise.

p	q	$p \wedge q$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	F
F	F	F

Truthfulness of compound statements

Disjunction ($p \vee q$)

Definition

- **Disjunction** of statements p and q , denoted by $p \vee q$, is a statement such that it is false if both p and q are false and it is true, otherwise.

p	q	$p \vee q$
T	T	T
T	F	T
F	T	T
F	F	F

Truthfulness of compound statements

Exclusive or $(p \oplus q)$

Definition

- **Exclusive or** of statements p and q , denoted by $p \oplus q$, is defined as p or q but not both. It is computed as $(p \vee q) \wedge \sim (p \wedge q)$

p	q	$p \vee q$	$p \wedge q$	$\sim (p \wedge q)$	$(p \vee q) \wedge \sim (p \wedge q)$
T	T	T	T	F	F
T	F	T	F	T	T
F	T	T	F	T	T
F	F	F	F	T	F

Example: Do you want Kimchi, or do you want Gimbap?

Truthfulness of compound statements

Definition

- **Conditional** or **implication** is a compound statement of the form “if p , then q ”. It is denoted by $p \rightarrow q$ and read as “ p implies q ”. It is false when p is true and q is false, and it is true, otherwise.

$p \rightarrow q$ seen as
 $\sim p \vee q$

p	q	$p \rightarrow q$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

Examples: False \rightarrow Anything is true!

- If $1+1 = 3$, then $1 = 0$
- If the earth is flat, I am walking on the moon

Truthfulness of compound statements

Biconditional statement ($p \leftrightarrow q$)

Definitions

- The **biconditional** of p and q is of the form “ p if and only if q ” and is denoted by $p \leftrightarrow q$. It is true when p and q have the same truth value, and it is false, otherwise.
- $p \leftrightarrow q \equiv (p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)$

p	q	$p \rightarrow q$	$q \rightarrow p$	$(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p)$
T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	T	F
F	T	T	F	F
F	F	T	T	T

Examples

- Assume x and y are real numbers.
“ $x^2 + y^2 = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$ and $y = 0$.”

Precedence of Logical Operators

Priority	Operator	Comments
1	\sim	Evaluate \sim first
2	\wedge \vee	Evaluate \wedge and \vee next; Use parenthesis to avoid ambiguity
3	\rightarrow \leftrightarrow	Evaluate \rightarrow and \leftrightarrow next; Use parenthesis to avoid ambiguity
4	\equiv	Evaluate \equiv last

- $p \vee q \wedge r$ reads as ...
- $\sim p \rightarrow q$ reads as ...
- $p \rightarrow q \wedge q \rightarrow p$ reads as ...

**Exercise 1: check truthfulness of
 $(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (q \rightarrow p)$ with a truth table**

Break;

Logical Equivalence

Logic equivalence

Definition

- Two statement forms p and q are **logically equivalent**, denoted by $p \equiv q$, if and only if they have the same truth values for all possible combination of truth values for the propositional variables

Checking logical equivalence

1. **Construct and compare truth tables** (most powerful)
2. Use logical equivalence laws

Logical equivalence: Example

Problem

- Show that $p \wedge (q \vee r) \not\equiv (p \wedge q) \vee r$

p	q	r	$q \vee r$	$p \wedge (q \vee r)$	$p \wedge q$	$(p \wedge q) \vee r$
T	T	T	T	T	T	T
T	T	F	T	T	T	T
T	F	T	T	T	F	T
T	F	F	F	F	F	F
F	T	T	T	F	F	T
F	T	F	T	F	F	F
F	F	T	T	F	F	T
F	F	F	F	F	F	F

**Exercise 2: check the logical equivalence
between $(p \rightarrow q)$ and $(\sim q \rightarrow \sim p)$**

Two special logical equivalence: Tautology and contradiction

Definitions

- A **tautology** is a statement form that is always true regardless of the truth values of the individual statements substituted for its statement variables.
- A **contradiction** is a statement form that is always false regardless of the truth values of the individual statements substituted for its statement variables.

Examples

- $p \vee \sim p$
- $p \wedge \sim p$

▷ **Tautology**
▷ **Contradiction**

The secret of a fortune teller

- Three students ask a fortune teller if they got an “A” in the exam
- The fortune teller says nothing but shows 1 finger
- If they all got A \rightarrow 1 is right
- If they all failed to get A \rightarrow 1 is right
- If one students get A \rightarrow 1 is right
- If two students get A (meaning one does not) \rightarrow 1 is right
- **The fortune teller will always be right, since he said a tautology.**



See how logic saved Chris Gardner



<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W2r4BUB-Rsc>

- Interviewer (giving a proposition): What would you say, if a guy walked in for an interview with such a bad T-shirt, and I hired him?
- Chris Gardner (thinking about logic): He must have really nice pants.

What would you say if a person with such a T-shirt walking into the interview, and I hired him



—> **Get Hired**

- Interviewer's **proposition**: $\text{Bad-T-shirt} \wedge \text{Get-hired}$
- **Common-sense**: $\text{Bad-T-shirt} \rightarrow \sim \text{Get-hired}$
- If Chris follows common-sense and interview's proposition, he will obtain $\sim \text{Get-hired} \wedge \text{Get-hired}$. That means **contradiction**.
- Never tell interviewers that they say a contradiction.
- So, Chris has to challenge the common-sense, to argue $\text{Bad-T-shirt} \rightarrow \sim \text{Get-hired}$ is **false**.
- Chris knows that " $\text{Bad-T-shirt} \rightarrow \sim \text{Get-hired}$ " and " $\text{Get-hired} \rightarrow \sim \text{Bad-T-shirt}$ " are **equivalent**
- So, Chris is now thinking what to imply from Get-hired?
- Since Get-hired means there must be some extraordinary quality. Chris thinks of two things:
 $\text{Get-hired} \rightarrow \text{Nice-T-shirt} \vee \text{Nice-Pants}$
- But Nice-T-shirt contradicts with Interviewer's proposition, so Christ concludes "Nice-Pants"

Let's call it a day!

- Propositional logic.
- Truth Table.
- Logical Equivalence.
- Tautology and Contradiction.

Thank you for your attention!