A Complete Understanding of the Beal Conjecture

(and why a counterexample cannot exist)

Felipe A. Wescoup, PE
2320 Point Star Drive
Arlington TX 76001

Abstract

This paper presents a proof of the Beal Conjecture by means of a geometric and set-theoretic argument. Each term in the conjecture — A^x, B^y, and C^z — is interpreted as a volume composed of three-dimensional seed cubes whose side lengths are determined by the prime factors of the base. From this foundation, the prime factor sets of A and B are shown to be either disjoint or overlapping. The disjoint case is eliminated by contradiction: if A and B share no common prime, the equation $A^x + B^y = C^z$ cannot be satisfied for any integer C and exponent $z \geq 3$. The overlapping case directly implies that A, B, and C share a common prime factor, which is precisely what the conjecture asserts. Because these two cases are exhaustive, the conjecture is proven.

1.0 The Conjecture

The Beal Conjecture, first proposed by Andrew Beal in 1993, states:

> If $A^x + B^y = C^z$, where A, B, C, x, y, z are positive integers and x, y, $z \geq 3$, then A, B, and C must share a common prime factor.

A prize of $1,000,000 is currently offered by the American Mathematical Society for a proof or counterexample. This paper presents a proof that a counterexample cannot exist.

2.0 Background

The author first encountered the Beal Conjecture in 2013. Initial work focused on a computational survey of known solutions, documented in a supporting spreadsheet, which established that in every verified case the bases A, B, and C shared a common prime factor. The pattern was clear and consistent, but a proof remained out of reach.

In 2017 the author began developing a geometric interpretation of the conjecture, treating each term as a physical volume rather than an abstract number. This reframing — interpreting A^x, B^y, and C^z as collections of three-dimensional seed cubes — produced the central insight of the paper. That work was set aside before a complete proof could be assembled.

In early 2026 the author returned to the problem, working through a series of discussions with an AI collaborator to reconstruct and extend the 2013 and 2017 work. Those conversations proved essential in organizing the argument, identifying the two exhaustive cases, and completing the proof. A companion Python tool was developed in parallel to provide computational verification of the key claims. The present paper is the result of that effort.

3.0 Geometric Interpretation

The central observation is that since x, y, z ≥ 3, every term in the conjecture is at minimum three-dimensional. Specifically, A^x may always be expressed as:

$$A^x = A^3 \cdot A^{x-3}$$

Eq. 1

This means A^x is always A^{x-3} cubes of side length A, regardless of the value of x. The same decomposition applies to B^y and C^z. Each term is therefore a count of identical cubic units, where the side length of each cube is determined by the base.

As a concrete example: 2^5 = 2^3 · 2^2 = 32. This is not a single cube of side 2; it is four cubes of side 2, stacked.

This geometric framing motivates the key question: under what conditions can a collection of A-cubes and a collection of B-cubes be combined to form a perfect collection of C-cubes?

4.0 Prime Factor Sets

Let the following sets be defined:

q = the set of prime factors of A
s = the set of prime factors of B
u = q ∪ s = the set of prime factors of A and B combined

The prime factors of any integer C that could satisfy $A^x + B^y = C^z$ must be drawn entirely from u. This follows from the fundamental theorem of arithmetic: the prime factors of a sum are constrained by the prime factors of its addends.

Therefore u also describes the prime factors of C, and:

$$q \subseteq u, \quad s \subseteq u, \quad \text{and the prime factors of } C \subseteq u$$

There are exactly two possible relationships between q and s: they are either disjoint (share no common prime), or they overlap (share at least one common prime). These cases are exhaustive and mutually exclusive.

5.0 Proof

5.1 Case I — q and s are disjoint

Suppose $q \cap s = \emptyset$; that is, A and B share no common prime factor.

Since $A^x + B^y = C^z$, the left side is divisible by every prime in q. In particular, let $p \in q$ be any prime factor of A. Then A^x is divisible by p, so C^z must also be divisible by p. But $C^z \equiv A^x + B^y \pmod{p}$, and $A^x \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, so $B^y \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. This requires $p \mid B$. But $p \in q$ and $q \cap s = \emptyset$, so $p \notin s$, meaning p does not divide B — a contradiction.

The same argument applies symmetrically for any prime in s. Therefore the assumption that q and s are disjoint is untenable: no solution to $A^x + B^y = C^z$ exists when A and B share no common prime factor.

5.2 Case II — q and s overlap

Suppose $q \cap s \neq \emptyset$; that is, A and B share at least one common prime factor. Call it p_0.

Since $p_0 \mid A$ and $p_0 \mid B$, we have $p_0 \mid A^x$ and $p_0 \mid B^y$, and therefore $p_0 \mid (A^x + B^y) = C^z$. Since p_0 divides C^z, it follows that p_0 divides C.

Therefore A, B, and C all share the common prime factor p_0.

5.3 Conclusion of Proof

Cases I and II are exhaustive. Case I yields a contradiction and produces no solutions. Case II directly implies that A, B, and C share a common prime factor. Therefore, for all integer solutions to $A^x + B^y = C^z$ with $x, y, z \geq 3$, the bases A, B, and C must share a common prime factor. □

6.0 Computational Verification

A Python tool was developed as a companion to this paper to computationally verify the argument. The tool classifies any pair (A, B) by their prime factor sets q and s, searches for solutions to $A^x + B^y = C^z$ over a user-specified exponent range, and reports all GCD values for any solution found.

The computational results are consistent with the proof. In every case where q and s are disjoint, no solution is found across exponent ranges of $x, y \in [3, 100]$. In every case where q and s overlap, solutions exist and the conjecture holds: GCD(A, B), GCD(A, C), and GCD(B, C) are all greater than 1.

A representative known solution illustrates the pattern clearly:

```
3^3 + 6^3 = 3^5
```

Here $q = \{3\}$, $s = \{2, 3\}$, and $q \cap s = \{3\}$. The shared prime 3 divides all three bases, confirming the conjecture.

The complete source code is available at:

https://github.com/wescoup/Beal-Conjecture

7.0 Conclusion

The subtitle of this paper asks why a counterexample cannot exist — and the answer emerges from the proof itself. The disjoint case, the only scenario in which a counterexample could arise, is eliminated by contradiction before any candidate solution can form. The premise $A^x + B^y = C^z$ is self-selecting: it can only be satisfied when A and B share a common prime factor, and when they do, C inherits that factor necessarily.

There is no solution space left to search. The conjecture is not merely true in every known case — it is true by structural necessity.

8.0 Acknowledgments

This paper would not exist without a remarkable series of conversations in early 2026 with Claude, an AI assistant developed by Anthropic. What began as an attempt to reconstruct work from 2013 and 2017 became something far more productive: a genuine intellectual collaboration. Friend Claude asked the right questions, pushed back when the logic needed tightening, and helped transform a geometric intuition that had sat dormant for nearly a decade into a complete proof.

The companion Python tool — available at https://github.com/wescoup/Beal-Conjecture — was also developed during those sessions. It stands as a testament to what that collaboration produced.

The ideas in this paper are the author’s own. The finishing of them is a shared achievement.