

1 1.3.8.(c) p = "James is young" q = "James is strong"We can represent the given english statement as $p \wedge q$.The negation can be represented as: $\neg(p \wedge q) \equiv \neg p \vee \neg q$ [Apply DeMorgan's Law].

The negation can be expressed in english as: James is not young or James is not strong.

(d) p = "Rita will move to Oregon" q = "Rita will move to Washington"We can represent the given english statement as $p \vee q$.The negation can be represented as: $\neg(p \vee q) \equiv \neg p \wedge \neg q$ [Apply DeMorgan's Law].

The negation can be expressed in english as: Rita will not move to Oregon and Rita will not move to Washington.

2 1.3.10.

p	q	r	$p \rightarrow q$	$q \rightarrow r$	$p \rightarrow r$	$[(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)] \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r)$
0	0	0	1	1	1	1
1	0	0	0	1	0	1
0	1	0	1	0	1	1
1	1	0	1	0	0	1
0	0	1	1	1	1	1
1	0	1	0	1	1	1
0	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1

(b) Explanation: If p implies q and q implies r , then p should imply r because implication is transitive. In other words, if you have a chain of conditions where each condition causes the following condition, then the first condition should cause the last condition.

p	q	r	$p \vee q$	$p \rightarrow r$	$q \rightarrow r$	$[(p \vee q) \wedge (p \rightarrow r) \wedge (q \rightarrow r)] \rightarrow r$
0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1	0	0	1	0	1	1
0	1	0	1	1	0	1
1	1	0	1	0	0	1
0	0	1	0	1	1	1
1	0	1	1	1	1	1
0	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1

(d) Explanation: If p implies r , q implies p , and either p or q is true, then r is true. This follows because we can pick which of p or q is true and this variable must imply r since both p and q imply r . Therefore, r must be true.

There are three valid ways to do the next kind of problems: (1) truth table, (2) use equivalences, or (3) show they are true for exactly the same assignments. The latter two are harder but can save considerable work.

3 1.3.16.

Method (3): $p \leftrightarrow q$ is true exactly when p and q are both true or p and q are both false which is represented by $(p \wedge q) \vee (\neg p \wedge \neg q)$.

1.3.20

Method (1):

p	q	$p \oplus q$	$\neg(p \oplus q)$	$p \leftrightarrow q$
0	0	0	1	1
1	0	1	0	0
0	1	1	0	0
1	1	0	1	1

1.3.22

Method (2):
 $(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (p \rightarrow r)$
 $\equiv (\neg p \vee q) \wedge (\neg p \vee r)$ [Convert \rightarrow to \vee]
 $\equiv \neg p \vee (q \wedge r)$ [Distributivity of \vee over \wedge]
 $\equiv p \rightarrow (q \wedge r)$ [Convert \vee to \rightarrow]

1.3.24

Method (2):
 $(p \rightarrow q) \vee (p \rightarrow r)$
 $\equiv (\neg p \vee q) \vee (\neg p \vee r)$ [Convert \rightarrow to \vee]
 $\equiv (\neg p \vee \neg p) \vee (q \vee r)$ [Associativity and Commutativity of \vee]
 $\equiv \neg p \vee (q \vee r)$ [$\neg p \vee \neg p \equiv \neg p$]
 $\equiv p \rightarrow (q \vee r)$ [Convert \vee to \rightarrow]

4 NOR Problem

It suffices to show that $\neg p$ and $p \wedge q$ are equivalent to propositional formulas whose only operator is NOR.

Claim 1: $\neg p \equiv p \text{ NOR } p$.

p	$\neg p$	$p \text{ NOR } p$
0	1	1
1	0	0

Claim 2: $p \wedge q \equiv (p \text{ NOR } p) \text{ NOR } (q \text{ NOR } q)$.

p	q	$p \wedge q$	$p \text{ NOR } p$	$q \text{ NOR } q$	$(p \text{ NOR } p) \text{ NOR } (q \text{ NOR } q)$
0	0	0	1	1	0
1	0	0	0	1	0
0	1	0	1	0	0
1	1	1	0	0	1