

Cancellation law: we will prove by induction in  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  that

$$m + k = n + k \Rightarrow m = n \quad \forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

For  $k=1$ , note that if  $m+1 = n+1$ , then

$$s(m) = m+1 = n+1 = s(n)$$

As  $s$  is injective, then  $m=n$ .

Now, suppose it holds for  $k$  (base of induction).

Let  $m, n, k$  be such that  $m + (k+1) = n + (k+1)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Then, } s(m+k) &= m + s(k) \\ &= m + (k+1) \\ &= n + (k+1) \\ &= n + s(k) \\ &= s(n+k) \end{aligned}$$

As  $s$  is injective, we

$$\text{have } m+k = n+k$$

By induction, we have

$$m = n$$

Definition (Order) Given  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we say that  $m < n$  if there exists  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $n = m + k$ .

We say that  $m \leq n$  if  $m < n$  or  $m = n$ .

Facts about order:

- (a) If  $m < n$  and  $n < r$ , then  $m < r$ .
- (b) Given  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , exactly one of the following statements are true:
  - ①  $m < n$
  - ②  $n < m$
  - ③  $n = m$
- (c) If  $m < n$ , then  $m+p < n+p \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- (d) There are no  $m, k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $m < k < m+1$ .

All these facts can be proven using the definition of order and the properties we have for  $\mathbb{N}$ . We will prove only the last one and leave the others as an exercise.

Proof of ④: First, we show the fact for  $m=1$ :

Claim: There is no  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $1 < k < 1+1 = 2 = s(1)$

proof: Suppose for contradiction that there exists  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $1 < k < 2$ . Then,  $\exists r \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $k = s(r) = r+1$  (every number  $\neq 1$  is successor of someone).

As  $k < 2$ ,  $\exists p \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $2 = k+p$ , and hence

$$2 = k+p = (r+1)+p = r+(1+p) = r+(p+1) = s(r+p)$$

This implies  $s(1) = 2 = s(r+p)$ , and hence  $1 = r+p$ .

Now, observe that we cannot have  $1 = r+p$ . In fact, if  $p=1$ , then we have  $1 = r+p = r+1 = s(r)$ , which is a contradiction.

If  $p \neq 1$ , then  $\exists t \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $p = s(t)$ . This implies  $1 = r+p = r+s(t) = s(r+t)$ , which is a contradiction.

This finishes the proof of the claim □

Now, suppose that the statement holds for  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Suppose for contradiction that it does not hold for  $m+1$ .

Then,  $\exists k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $m+1 < k < (m+1)+1 = m+2$

$$m+1 < k \Rightarrow k = (m+1)+p \text{ for some } p \in \mathbb{N}.$$

$$k < m+2 \Rightarrow m+2 = k+r, \text{ for some } r \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}m + z &= k + r \\&= ((m+1) + p) + r \\&= (m+1) + (p+r) \\&= m + (1 + (p+r))\end{aligned}$$

By the cancelling law, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}z &= 1 + (p+r) \\&= (1+p) + r \\&= (p+1) + r \\&= s(p+r)\end{aligned}$$

As  $z = s(1)$ , we obtain  $1 = p+r$  (recall that  $s$  is injective)

This is a contradiction. As we observed before, 1 cannot be written as the sum of two natural numbers \_\_\_\_\_  $\square$

Well-ordering principle: Let  $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  be a non-empty subset.

There exists  $n_0 \in A$  such that  $\{n : n < n_0\} \cap A = \emptyset$ .

The element  $n_0$  is called the minimum element of  $A$ .

Proposition: The axiom of induction implies the well-ordering principle.

proof: For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $I_n := \{k \in \mathbb{N} : k \leq n\}$ .

Suppose for contradiction that there exists a set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  which does not have a minimum element, with  $A \neq \emptyset$ .

Let  $B = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid I_n \cap A = \emptyset\}$ .

If  $n \in B$ , then  $I_n \cap A = \emptyset$ . This implies  $n \notin A$ . Therefore,  $B \subseteq \mathbb{N} \setminus A$ .

Observe that  $1 \notin A$ , as 1 is the smallest element in  $\mathbb{N}$ .

This implies that  $1 \in B$ .

If  $n \in B$ , then  $I_n \cap A = \emptyset$ . As  $I_{n+1} = I_n \cup \{n+1\}$  (because there is no element in between  $n$  and  $n+1$ ),

we have two choices

- $n+1 \in A$ , and hence  $n+1 = \min(A)$ , contradiction.
- $n+1 \notin A$ , and hence  $I_{n+1} \cap A = \emptyset$ , where  $n+1 \in B$ .

Therefore,  $n \in B \Rightarrow n+1 \in B \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

We conclude that  $B = \mathbb{N}$ . As  $B = \mathbb{N} \setminus A$ , we have

$A = \emptyset$ , a contradiction. \_\_\_\_\_  $\square$

Proposition: the well-ordering principle implies mathematical induction.