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| Abstract: Direct proof of fermat's Last Theorem $\left(x^{\wedge} n+y^{\wedge} n=z^{\wedge} n\right)$ based on Induction on $z$ not on $n$. it <br> is short, direct and comprehensible by student in Mathematics and lovers of Mathematics. It use <br> mathematical tools of Fermat's era. |

The French mathematician Pierre de Fermat (1601-1665), conjectured that the equation $x^{\wedge} n+y^{\wedge} n=z^{\wedge} n$ has no solution in positive integers $x, y$ and $z$ if $n$ is a positive integer $>=3$. He wrote in the margin of his personal copy of Brachet's translation of Diophantus' Arithmetica:"I have discovered a truly marvellous demonstration of this proposition that this margin is too narrow to contain".
Many researchers believe that Fermat does not find a demonstration of his proposition but some others think there is a proof and Fermat's claim seems right.
The search of a solution of equation $x^{\wedge} n+y^{\wedge} n=z^{\wedge} n$ are splitted in two directions.
The first one is oriented to search a solution for a specific value of the exponent n and the second is more general, oriented to find a solution for any value of the exponent $n$.

- Babylonian (570,495 BC) studied the equation $x^{\wedge} 2+y^{\wedge} 2=z^{\wedge} 2$ and found the solution $(3,4,5)$.
- Arabic mathematician Al-Khazin studied the equation $x^{\wedge} 3+y^{\wedge} 3=z^{\wedge} 3$ in the $X$ century and his work mentioned in a philosophic book by Avicenne in the XI century.
- A defective proof of FLT was given before 972 by the Arab Alkhodjandi
- The Arab Mohamed Beha Eddin ben Alhossain (1547-1622) listed among the problems remaining unsolved from former times that to divide a cube into two cubes.(refer Image of Arabic manuscript from British Museum. Problem N4 Red color at line 8 from top).
- Fermat $(1601,1665)$, Euler $(1707,1783)$ and Dirichlet (around 1825) solved the equation for $\mathrm{n}=3,4$ and 5 .
- In 1753, Leonhard Euler presented a proof for $x^{\wedge} 3+y^{\wedge} 3=z^{\wedge} 3$
- Fermat found a proof of $x^{\wedge} 4+y^{\wedge} 4=z^{\wedge} 4$ using his famous "infinite descente". This method combines proof by contradiction and proof by backward induction.
- Dirichlet (in 1825) solved the equation $x^{\wedge} 5+y^{\wedge} 5=z^{\wedge} 5$.
- Sophie Germain (in 1823) generalized the result of Dirichlet for prime $p$ if $2 p+1$ is prime..

Let $p$ prime, $x^{\wedge} p+y^{\wedge} p=z^{\wedge} p$ has no solution in positive integers if $2 p+1$ is prime.

- In XIX century E.Kummer continued the work of Gauss and innovated by using numbers of cyclotomic field and introduced the concept of "prime factor ideal".
-Andrew Wiles, a professor at Princeton University, provided an indirect proof of Fermat's Conjecture in two articles published in the May 1995 issue of Annals of Mathematics.
Andrew Wiles solved a high level problem in modular forms about elliptic curves and the
consequence is a solution for FLT. Thanks to the results of Andrew Wiles, we know that Fermat's Last Theorem is true.
I think he opens a space for mathematicians to search proofs for FLT comprehensible by a normal student in mathematics and may be to find new concepts or ideas. This result should imply a direct proof of FLT.

In this paper, I would like to suggest a direct proof using mathematical concepts (Forward Induction and Backward Induction) and tools of the Fermat's era; valid for whatever value $n$ $>2$. This direct proof is comprehensible for a normal student and mathematical lovers.

## I- Proof by Forward Induction :

## The induction proof is on $\mathbf{z}$ not on $\mathbf{n}$.

The induction proof starts from $\mathrm{z}=2$ and $\mathrm{z}=3, \mathrm{z}=4 \ldots$ until $\mathrm{z}=\mathrm{p}$. with $\mathrm{n}>2$

Observe that for $\mathbf{z}=2$, the equation $\mathbf{x}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}+\mathbf{y}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}=\mathbf{2}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}$ has no solutions in integers x and y if $\mathrm{n}>2$.
There is no equality between the sum $\left(x^{\wedge} n+y^{\wedge} n\right)$ and $2^{\wedge} n$. if $n>2$.
The case $\mathrm{x}=\mathrm{y}$ gives $2 \mathrm{x}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}=\mathrm{z}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ which leads to $\mathrm{z}=\operatorname{sqrt}(2)^{*} \mathrm{x}$ which is not an integer.
Hence x is different from y .

## A. Basis step / anchoring

Let's assume $\mathrm{z}=3$ with $1<=\mathrm{x}<\mathrm{y}<\mathrm{z}$ and $\mathrm{x}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+\mathrm{y}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}=3 \wedge \mathrm{n}$
The cells of the table below show the different values of the sum $\left(x^{\wedge} n+y^{\wedge} n\right)$ when $x$ and $y$ varies from 1 to 3 .

The cells of the last line show the value of $\mathrm{z}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}=(\operatorname{Max}(\mathrm{x})+1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}=(2+1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}=3 \wedge \mathrm{n}$.

| $\mathrm{x}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ | 1 | $2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ | $3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{y}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |  |  |  |
| 1 | $1+1$ | $2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+1$ | $1+3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |
| $2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |  | $2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ | $2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |
| $3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |  |  | $3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{z}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ | $3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ | $3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |  |

It is obvious that $\mathrm{x}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+\mathrm{y}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ is never equal to $\mathrm{z}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}=(\operatorname{Max}(\mathrm{x})+1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}=(2+1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}=3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$.
All the sums are:
$1+1=2<3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n} ; \quad 1+2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}<3 \wedge \mathrm{n}$; and $2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}<3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$
The basis case with $\mathrm{z}=3$ does not need any proof, because you can calculate that regardless of what you choose for $x, y$, with $n>2$. The sum ( $x^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}+y^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}$ ) is either less than $z^{\wedge} n$ or greater than $z^{\wedge} n$ but never equal to $z^{\wedge} n$.

Let $\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{t})=3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}-\left(2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+\mathrm{t}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}\right)$ with $1<=\mathrm{t}<=3$. $\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{t})$ is continuous on the interval $[1,3]$
$\mathrm{f}(1)=3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}-\left(2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+1 \wedge \mathrm{n}\right)>0$
$f(2)=3^{\wedge} n-\left(2^{\wedge} n+2^{\wedge} n\right)>0$
$\mathrm{f}(3)=3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}-\left(2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}\right)<0$
So, as the value of t moves between 2 and 3 , the value $2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+\mathrm{t}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ goes from being smaller than $3^{\wedge} n$ to being greater than $3^{\wedge} n$. There is a change of sign of $f(t)$ in the interval $[2,3]$. Thus, there must be some value of $t$ in the interval [2, 3] for which $\mathbf{2}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}+\mathbf{t}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}=\mathbf{3}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}$.. The Intermediate Value Theorem (IVT) which states that « if a function is continuous on [a, b], and if L is any number between $\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{a})$ and $\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{b})$, then there must be a value, $\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{c}$, where $\mathrm{a}<\mathrm{c}<\mathrm{b}$, such that $f(c)=L »$. confirms our conclusion and we get
$\mathrm{t}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}=3 \wedge \mathrm{n}-2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ if $\mathrm{n}=3$ we get $3 \log \mathrm{t}=\log (27-8)=\log 19$ so $\mathrm{t}=2,668$
$\mathrm{t}=2,668$ in the interval $[2,3]: 2<2,668<3$
$\mathrm{n}=3 \quad 2^{\wedge} 3+(2,668)^{\wedge} 3=3 \wedge 3 \quad$ or $\quad 8+19=27$
We can repeat the same process for any value of $n$ and compute the right value of $t$ (or $y$ ) in the interval $[2,3]$ in order to get $x^{\wedge} n+y^{\wedge} n=z^{\wedge} n$ but $y$ is a real value not integer. $x$ and $z$ remain integer.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{n}=2 & 2^{\wedge} 2+(2,236)^{\wedge} 2=3^{\wedge} 2 \text { or } \\
\mathrm{n}=4 & 2^{\wedge} 4+(2,839)^{\wedge} 4=3 \wedge 4
\end{array} \text { or } 16+65=81
$$

and so on
This method will be used later in Inductive step to show that the $\operatorname{sum}\left(\mathbf{x}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}+\mathbf{y}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}\right)$ is either less than $z^{\wedge} n$ or greater than $z^{\wedge} n$ but never equal to $z^{\wedge} n$.

## B. inductive step:

Now assume the Fermat's conjecture is true until $\mathrm{z}=\mathrm{p}$.
We know that every equation $\mathrm{x}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+\mathrm{y}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}=\mathrm{z}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ from $\mathrm{z}=2$ and $\mathrm{z}=3$ until $\mathrm{z}=\mathrm{p}$ has no solutions in integers x and y if $\mathrm{n}>2$.

We want to prove that FLT is true for $\mathrm{z}=\mathrm{p}+1$.
The cells of the table below show the different values of the sum $\left(x^{\wedge} n+y^{\wedge} n\right)$ when $x$ and $y$ varies from 1 to $p$.

The last line shows the value of $\mathrm{z}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$.

| $\mathrm{x}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ | 1 | $2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ | $3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ | $4^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |  |  | $(\mathrm{p}-1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ | $\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{y}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | $1+1$ | $2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+1$ | $3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+1$ | $4^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+1$ |  |  |  | $\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+1$ |
| $2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |  | $2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ | $3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ | $4^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |  |  |  | $\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |
| $3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |  |  | $3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ | $4^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |  |  |  | $\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |
| $4^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |  |  |  | $4^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+4^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |  |  |  | $\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+4^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\ldots$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $(\mathrm{p}-2)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+(\mathrm{p}-2)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |  | $\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+(\mathrm{p}-2)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |
| $(\mathrm{p}-1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+(\mathrm{p}-1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |
| $\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{z}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ | $\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ | $\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ | $\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ | $\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ |  |  |  |  |

In the above table (first row=nth-powers of integer $x$, first column=nth-powers of integer $y$ ).
Each cell contains the sum $\left(x^{\wedge} n+y^{\wedge} n\right)$.
The last row contains the value of $z^{\wedge} n=p^{\wedge} n$.

Assume Fermat's conjecture is true until $\mathrm{z}=\mathrm{p}$.
All the sum $\left(x^{\wedge} n+y^{\wedge} n\right)$ are not equal to $p^{\wedge} n$. For all integers values of $x$ and $y$ if $n>2$ the sum ( $x^{\wedge} n+y^{\wedge} n$ ) is either less than $p^{\wedge} n$ or greater than $p^{\wedge} n$ :

If $\mathbf{x}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}+\mathbf{y}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}<\mathbf{p}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}$ then $\left(\mathbf{x}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}+\mathbf{y}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}\right)<\mathbf{p}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}<(\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{1})^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}$.

## It is OK for FLT with $\mathbf{z}=\mathbf{p}+1$

## If $\mathbf{x}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}+\mathbf{y}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}>\mathbf{p}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}$ then there are two cases:

$-\left(\mathbf{x}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}+y^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}\right)<(p+1)^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}$ or $\left(x^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}+y^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}\right)>(p+1)^{\wedge} n$.

- It is OK for FLT with $\mathrm{z}=\mathrm{p}+1$.

We have to prove that $\left(x^{\wedge} n+y^{\wedge} n\right)$ is never equal to $(p+1)^{\wedge} n$, because we already know that all the sum ( $x^{\wedge} n+y^{\wedge} n$ ) are not equal to $p^{\wedge} n$.

In the last column $\operatorname{Max}(x)=p$ all the sum $\left(p^{\wedge} n+y^{\wedge} n\right)$ with $1<y<p$ are either less than $(p+1)^{\wedge} n$ or greater than $(p+1)^{\wedge} n$. We have to show that there is no equality between the $\operatorname{sum}\left(x^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}+y^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}\right)$ and $(p+1)^{\wedge} n$.

```
\(-\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+1^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}<(\mathrm{p}+1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}\)
\(-p^{\wedge} n+2^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}<(\mathrm{p}+1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}\)
\(-\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}<(\mathrm{p}+1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}\)
- ....
\(-\mathbf{p}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}+\mathbf{t}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}<(\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{1})^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}\)
\(-\mathbf{p}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}+(\mathbf{t}+\mathbf{1})^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}>(\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{1})^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}\)
- ......
\(-\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}>(\mathrm{p}+1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}\) with the condition \(\log (1+1 / \mathrm{p})<(\log 2) / \mathrm{n}\)
- With \(n\) fixed we can compute \(p\) in order to get \(2^{*} \mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}>(\mathrm{p}+1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}\)
```

| n 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| p | $\mathrm{p}=1$ | $\mathrm{p}=3$ | $\mathrm{p}=4$ | $\mathrm{p}=5$ | $\mathrm{p}=7$ | $\mathrm{p}=9$ |
|  | $\log (1+1 / 2)<2$ | $\log (1+1 / 3)<2 / 2$ | $\log 1+1 / 4)<2 / 3$ | $\log (1+1 / 6)<2 / 6$ | $\log (1+1 / 7)<2 / 7$ | $\log (1+1 / 9)<2 / 9$ |
|  | $2^{*} 1^{\wedge} 1 \geq(1+1)^{\wedge} 1$ | $2^{*} 3^{\wedge} 2>(3+1)^{\wedge} 2$ | $2^{*} 4 \wedge 3>(4+1)^{\wedge} 3$ | $2^{*} 6^{\wedge} 4>(6+1)^{\wedge} 4$ | $2^{* 7 \wedge 5<(7+1)^{\wedge} 5}$ | $2^{*} 9^{\wedge} 6>(9+1)^{\wedge} 6$ |
|  | $2 \geq 2$ | $18>16$ | $128>125$ | $2592>2401$ | $33614>32768$ | $1062882>10^{\wedge} 6$ |

So, as the variable t moves between t and $\mathrm{t}+1$, the value $\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+\mathrm{t}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ goes from being lesser than $(p+1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ to being greater to $(\mathrm{p}+1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$. There is a change of sign. Thus, there must be some value of $t$ in the interval $[t, t+1]$ for which $\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+\mathrm{t}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}=(\mathrm{p}+1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$. This is the common sense but there is actually a mathematical theorem, known as the Intermediate Value Theorem, which confirms our conclusion.

Summary. The Intermediate Value Theorem (IVT) is a precise mathematical statement (theorem) concerning the properties of continuous functions. The IVT states that if a function
is continuous on [a, b], and if $L$ is any number between $f(a)$ and $f(b)$, then there must be a value, $\mathbf{t}=\mathbf{c}$, where $\mathrm{a}<\mathrm{c}<\mathrm{b}$, such that $\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{c})=\mathrm{L}$.

The expression $\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+\mathrm{t}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ with $1<\mathrm{t}<\mathrm{p}$ starts less than $(\mathrm{p}+1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$. It increases when t increases and becomes close to $(p+1)^{\wedge} n$. When $t$ reaches some integer value ( $p^{\wedge} n+t^{\wedge} n$ ) becomes greater than $(p+1)^{\wedge} n$. Change of value occurs between $t$ and $t+1$. The expression $\left(p^{\wedge} n+t \wedge n\right)$ may be equal to $(p+1)^{\wedge} n$ with $t$ irrational but never with $t$ integer. There is no integer value between t and $\mathrm{t}+1$.

Thus, there must be some value of $t$ in the interval [ $\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{t}+1$ ] for which
$\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+(\mathrm{T})^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}=(\mathrm{p}+1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$
and again, since $\mathrm{T}>2$, this must be an irrational value.
Thus, since there are infinitely many increasing triples ( $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{z}$ ), there are infinitely many irrational values of $T$ for which there is a solution to $x^{\wedge} n+y^{\wedge} n=z^{\wedge} n$.

Let the function $\mathrm{G}(\mathrm{t})=(\mathrm{p}+1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}-\mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}-\mathrm{t}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ with $\mathrm{l} \leq \mathrm{t} \leq \mathrm{p}, \mathrm{p}$ is fixed
The derivative is $G^{\prime}(t)=-n t^{\wedge}(n-1)$. It is always negative then $G(t)$ is decreasing from a positive value $G(1)=(p+1)^{\wedge} n-p^{\wedge} n-1$ to a negative value $G(p)=(p+1)^{\wedge} n-(p)^{\wedge} n-p^{\wedge} n$ because $2^{*} \mathrm{p}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}>(\mathrm{p}+1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ as showed above.

Change of sign of $G(t)$ occurs between $t$ and $t+1$. The expression ( $\left.p^{\wedge} n+t \wedge n\right)$ may be equal to $(\mathrm{p}+1)^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ with t irrational but never with t integer. There is no integer value between t and $\mathrm{t}+1$.

In particular, note that if $\mathrm{x}=\mathrm{y}$ then $\mathrm{x}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+\mathrm{y}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}=\mathrm{z}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ becomes $2 \mathrm{x}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}=\mathrm{z}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ or $2=(\mathrm{z} / \mathrm{x})^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$.
If we take now $\log$ to the base $(\mathrm{z} / \mathrm{x})($ written $\log (\mathrm{z} / \mathrm{x})$ of ()$)$; we get
$\log (z / x)$ of $(2)=\log (z / x)$ of $\left((z / x)^{\wedge} n\right)=n \log (z / x)$ of $(z / x)=n$. which is not integer.
Example, we see that
$\mathrm{t}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+\mathrm{t}^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}=4 \wedge \mathrm{n}$ when $\log \mathrm{t}=\log 4-1 / \mathrm{n} \log (2)$ which is real
if $n=3$ then $\log t=\log 4-1 / 3 \log 2$
$3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}+3^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}=4^{\wedge} \mathrm{n}$ when $\mathrm{n}=\log 4 / 3(2)=2,40942$ then Fermat is not true with exponent $\mathrm{n}=$ real
All the sums $\left(\mathbf{x}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}+\mathbf{y}^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}\right)$ are less than $(\mathbf{p}+1)^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}$ or greater than $(p+1)^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}$ and $\left(x^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}+y^{\wedge} n\right)$ is not equal to $(\mathbf{p}+1)^{\wedge} \mathbf{n}$ for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathrm{y}$ and $\mathrm{n}>\mathbf{2}$.

## FLT is true until $\mathrm{z}=\mathrm{p}$ implies FLT is true for $\mathrm{z}=\mathrm{p}+1$

## C. Conclusion

With the principle of strong mathematical induction, we can then conclude that the equation $x^{\wedge} n+y^{\wedge} n=p^{\wedge} n$ has no solutions in positive integers $x, y$ and $p$ if $n>2$.

This proof based on Induction on z not on n , is short, direct, comprehensible by any student in Mathematics and lovers of Mathematics.
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