

How to not to be a coward

I saw the following proof today (from [Twitter](https://x.com/VinceVatter/status/1882125739111448580) (<https://x.com/VinceVatter/status/1882125739111448580>), and also from my friend):

Theorem. *If n is an integer and n^2 is even, then n is itself even.*

Proof. Contrapositives are for cowards, so assume that n is an integer and n^2 is even. Then $n^2 = 2k$ for some integer k , and thus $n^2 - 2k = 0$. Behold:

$$n = n + (n^2 - 2k) = n(n+1) - 2k.$$

Both $n(n+1)$ and $2k$ are even, so n is even too.

QED.

Contrapositives are for cowards.

Now, here's a question: consider a multiple of 3 instead. We still have $n^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{3} \Rightarrow n \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$. Can we prove this, but not being a coward? How about mod 5?

The answer is yes. Try to do it yourself before you click the triangle below.

► Proof

In this post, we will show that similar proof works for all prime and higher powers:

Theorem. For prime p , $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ has no nilpotent elements. In other words, for $k \geq 2$, $n^k \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ implies $n \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$.

First of all, we can reduce to the case when $k = 2$. For given k , take a with $2^a \geq k$. Then we have $n^{2^a} = (n^{2^{a-k}})n^k \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. From $n^{2^a} = (n^{2^{a-1}})^2$, we have $n^{2^{a-1}} \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, and repeating this gives $n \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$.

For $k = 2$, our goal is to express n as a \mathbb{Z} -linear combination of integer-valued polynomials, which are (i) divisible by n^2 , or (ii) every value is divisible by p . As above,

$$\begin{aligned} f(n) &= n(n+1)(n+2) \cdots (n+(p-1)) \\ &= n^p + a_{p-1} n^{p-1} + \cdots + a_2 n^2 + a_1 n \end{aligned}$$

is a multiple of p for any n. We have $a_1 = (p - 1)!$, and by [Wilson's theorem](#) (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wilson%27s_theorem), $a_1 + 1 = (p - 1)! + 1$ is a multiple of p. Hence

$$n = n^2(n^{p-2} + a_{p-1} n^{p-3} + \dots + a_2) + (a_1 + 1)n - f(n)$$

is divisible by p. \square

The theorem is still true if one replace p with square-free integers. In fact, the decomposition for $p = 3$ gives a proof for mod 6, too. Unfortunately, I don't know if there's a general construction of a combination for square-free modulus case.

0 Comments - powered by [utteranc.es](#)

Write Preview

Sign in to comment

 Styling with Markdown is supported

 Sign in with GitHub

Tags: [math](#)