

Prof. R. L. Graham
Bell Laboratories
Murray Hill
New Jersey 07979

JUL 17 1995

done #18/95

\$1000

June 10, 1995

check #3096

Dear Dr Graham,

I met with Prof. Erdős on the Hypergraphs and Symmetric Structures Conference which was held between 19 and 23 June, 1995 at Balatonlelle, Hungary.

Prof. Erdős told me that I can borrow 1000 dollars of his money if necessary. In September, 1995 I shall come to the US (Auburn, AL) to begin my graduate study.

I arrive on 14 of September at Auburn, but unfortunately I shall receive my first check a month later. For this month long period I shall need this money. I will repay it as soon as I can.

Prof. Erdős has written a letter concerning this. I enclosed his letter.



1992 #16

Dear Ron
 Another nut left the near fast sinking ship. I will be here till the end of January.

Let p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k be a sequence of primes. a_1, a_2, \dots is the sequence of integers composed of the p_i 's. Is it true that all (or all large) integers are of the form $\sum a_i, a_i + a_j$. I stupidly thought that this is difficult for 2, and 3 but Jansen and many others found the simple proof by induction. Levin and I proved more that all $n > 31$ is of this form for 2, 5, 7, but perhaps it is not easy to find a good nec + suff condition for p_1, \dots, p_k . Probably two primes suffice only for 2 and 3 but I may be completely wrong. Is it true that every $n > n_0$ can be written in the form

$n = a_{i_1} + a_{i_2} + \dots + a_{i_r}, a_{i_1} = a_{i_2} = \dots < a_{i_r} < 2a_{i_1}$
 $a_{i_1} = 2^t 3^p$. I could not decide. Is this "hard" or do I overlook a trivial point.

I have the following very nice problem with Burr (in our paper dedicated to Rankin 70-th birthday, Glasgow Math Journal about 1975) Color the squares by 2 colors is it true that every $n > n_0$ is the sum of monochromatic distinct squares.?

Merry Christmas + happy new year to you + Fam
 all yours
 E. P.

My new year of course can not be happy for obvious reasons.

Dear Ron (1978 XI 3)

In the problem version Heath Brown asked: Is it true that the number of solutions of

$$\frac{1}{m_1} + \frac{1}{m_2} - \frac{1}{m_3} - \frac{1}{m_4} < \frac{1}{x^2}, \quad 0 < m_i < x \quad (m_i \text{ integer})$$

is less than $x^{2+\varepsilon}$

Perhaps it is $< x^{2-\varepsilon}$ if one disallows $m_1 = m_3, m_2 = m_4$ but I have not yet settled it.

He also mentioned the following nice question of Huxley:

Is it true that

$$(1) \sum_{\substack{p_{m+1} - p_m > \frac{1}{3} \log x \\ p_m < x}} 1 > \pi \frac{x}{\log x}$$

(1) will of course hold with any α ($\alpha = \alpha(\alpha)$) instead of $\frac{1}{3}$ but I can not do it with $\frac{1}{3}$.

from Brun's method without too much difficulty.

$$\sum_{\substack{p_{m+1} - p_m > \log x \\ p_m < x}} (p_{m+1} - p_m) > \alpha x \text{ follows}$$

I wrote some nonsense in my last letter. Trivially for large x $\pi(x) - \pi(x-y) > (1-\varepsilon)\pi(y)$ can not hold for all y . If $x-y = x^{7/12}$ then $\pi(x) - \pi(x-y) = (1+o(1)) \frac{x^{7/12}}{\log x}$ the reasonable question is: are there inf many values of x for which for every $y = o(x^\varepsilon)$

$$\pi(x) - \pi(x-y) > (1-\epsilon) \pi(y).$$

The answer is obviously no but here I do not see the proof. I just phoned Vera - all is well - there will be a meeting at Kalamaroo in May and I am invited to preach there. It seems I have to ~~write~~ write them since they would like to have the answer by Nov 5. Please send reprints of all our papers on binomial coefficients to Prof. H. Kanold and H. Harborth both are at the university of Braunschweig.

Do you know examples of

$$\frac{u(u+1)\dots(u+t)}{v(v+1)\dots(v+t)} = \text{integer}$$

R 79, 69, 65

H. J. Kanold
79, 69A

for $\frac{u}{2} < v < u$? ($v+t < u$) i.e. $\frac{456}{345}$ is not allowed.

I seem to remember that we once proved that for every i if $m > m_0(\epsilon, i)$ then $\binom{m}{i} | \binom{m}{k}$ for all k except possible ϵm values of k , Harborth proved a somewhat weaker result namely that this holds on the average if $m = X$. But in this form we could not have proved it: if $m = 2^k$ $\binom{2^k}{2^k} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{2^k}$, thus perhaps Harborth's result is as good as can be expected. Now I remember I think we had that for every i there are integers m so that for some $k \leq \frac{m}{2}$, $\binom{m}{i} | \binom{m}{k}$.

Please send a copy of our paper on Ramsey's problems (Kienthely 1973) to: Dr Harborth
Bismroder Weg 47 3300 Braunschweig Germany
Bismroder



1992 XII 30

Dear Ben,

Are you still alive? I heard nothing from you for an infinitely long time. I am in Israel for 4 more weeks. If you can phone me on your free phone the phone number of my office is 972 4 29 4173.

Divide the plane into 4 parts. Must you have a polygon (convex polygon?) of rational area? Also can it happen that the area of the monochromatic triangles have measure 0? Perhaps all this follows easily from the construction of Kunen which you mention in your paper. Has it been published?

Can you split the squares into 2 classes such that there should be no monochromatic arithmetic progression also $x^2 + y^2 = z^2$ should have no monochromatic solution.

I hope you will write your paper on Euclidean Ramsey for Israel. I enclose a cheque for 100 dollar, also please send 25 dollar to the cashier.

Kind regards + happy new year to you + Fan au revoir
E. P.

1993 III 3
Memphis State University

901/678-2482
Mathlib@memstvx1
MSU FAX# 901/678-3299

Dear Fan + Ron,
I may be in New Jersey before I fly to England on March 17. I will probably arrive on or around March 15.

Please pay the dues for Science but it is not necessary to send it to Hungary by air mail.

Did you send the subscription for the National Geographic for Ms SZÉKELY Virginia NAGYENYED u 4 Budapest Hungary? You did do this for the last few years.

Kind regards, all reverie

E. P.

Can you color the squares with two colors so that $x^2 + y^2 = 2z^2$ should not be solvable monochromatically?

Let a_1, a_2, \dots be an infinite sequence of integers $f(m)$ is the number of solutions of $a_x + a_y = m$. An old conjecture of Turán and myself states that if $f(m) > 0$ for all $m > m_0$ then $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} f(m) = \infty$. Perhaps $\sum_{m < x} 1 = X \bar{K} O(x)$ will suffice. Ginzburg + I now thought that if a_1, a_2, \dots and b_1, b_2, \dots are two infinite sequences for which every m is of the form $a_x + b_y$ and if $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 1$ then the number of solutions of $m = a_x + b_y$ is unbounded. $a_m/b_m \rightarrow 1$ can not entirely be neglected to see this let the a 's be $\sum \epsilon_i 2^{2i}$ and the b 's $\sum \epsilon_i 2^{2i+1}$, $\epsilon_i = 0$ or 1

Dear Ron,

Today I go to Braunshweig and on the 19-th I fly to Budapest and a few days later I fly to Haifa (Technion Math Dept Haifa Israel)

A very old conjecture of mine stated that if $a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_n = m$ is such that you can not find $r+1$ a-n which are pairwise relatively prime then max is obtained by taking the multiples of the first r primes. An Armenian Mathematician Levon Khachatryan who is in Paderborn now found a counterexample. No doubt the conjecture remains true for fixed r and $m > m_0(r)$ probably $m > (r+1)p_r^2$ will suffice. Here is his counterexample. Take a p_m for which

$p_m p_{m+q} > p_{m+s}^2$ it is easy to find such primes but may be hard to prove that there are inf many such m . Let $m = p_m p_{m+q}$

My sequence is $p_1 p_2 \dots p_{m-1} p_m p_{m+1} p_{m+2} p_{m+3}$ his sequence is

$p_1 p_2 \dots p_{m-1} p_m p_{m+1} p_{m+2} p_{m+3} p_{m+4} p_{m+5} p_{m+6} p_{m+7} p_{m+8} p_{m+9}$. The number of

integers of my sequence which are not divisible by p_r , $1 \leq r \leq m-1$ and which are

$< p_{m+q}^2$ are $p_m p_{m+1} p_{m+2} p_{m+3} p_m^2 p_{m+4}^2 p_{m+5}^2 p_{m+6}^2$ and $8+7+6+5$ more multiples

($p_m p_{m+i}$, $1 \leq i \leq 8$, $p_{m+i} p_{m+i}$, $2 \leq i \leq 8$ etc) his sequence contains 36 new numbers mine only 34

i.e. $\binom{9}{2}$

Surely for every k there are integers m for which

$$p_m p_{m+k+1} > p_{m+s}^2$$

but I think this may be hard to prove

$$p_{m+i} p_{m+i+1} \quad 0 \leq i < k \leq 8$$

By the way one of our old problems stated: Let $a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_n = m$ be such that no two a-n are relatively prime. We thought that max k is either $\frac{m}{p}$ where p is the smallest prime factor of m or the numbers $2, t$, $t \leq \frac{m}{2}$, $(t, m) \neq 1$ give the maximum, he disproved this too, but here too our conjecture can be modified.

Kind regards to Fan + you, all remain

E.O.

7.



THE
UNIVERSITY
OF CALGARY

1982 IV 18

2500 University Drive N.W., Calgary, Alberta, Canada T2N 1N4

Faculty of SCIENCE
Department of MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS

Telephone (403) 284-5202

Dear Ron,

I enclose a cheque of 500 dollars.

Let $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1$. Denote by $d(G_m)$ the set of distances between two points of G_m . I asked: can one divide n -dimensional space into \aleph_0 sets $\bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} G_m$ so that all the distances in G_m are unique? i.e. for any four points of G_m determine 6 distinct distances.

Kakutani + I proved this 40 years ago for $n=1$. Davies proved it for $n=2$ and recently Kunen proved it for general n (it is not true in Hilbert space). Can one have that all the non-zero areas of the triangles in G_m should have distinct areas? Can you divide E_n into sets $G_m, m=1, 2, \dots$ so that no triangle in G_m should have area 1?

or no \mathcal{I}_m should have all triangles of all the areas.
If I remember right you proved that if the number of sets \mathcal{I}_m is finite then one of the sets contain all the areas.

* In all these problems a modification is of course needed: Either you only ask that one \mathcal{I}_m contains all the triangles of area $< \epsilon$ or you ask for all areas but assume that all the sets are unbounded.

A math in Kalamonov asked: How many integers $1 = a_1 < \dots < a_k < \frac{m}{2}$ can one give so that $a_i \neq a_j + a_k$ and $a_u + a_v + a_w \neq m$.
If m is odd you can take the odd numbers $< \frac{m}{2}$ but if m is even I can not get more than $\frac{m}{6} + O(1)$ such integers.
I really can not sign the agreement because of the extra sheet - maybe I signed it once but then I did not notice it. I enclose another cheque which I just received.

Kind regards to all, au revoir

Clear send all mail $\text{E} \text{ } \text{D}$
until about May 13 to c/o Prof. G. Szekeres 94 Warragal road
TURRA-MORRA (near Sydney) NSW Australia
WARRAGAL



Dear Ron,
Has anybody proved that the integers of the form $p^t q^p$ form a complete set i.e every $n > n_0(p, q)$ is the sum of distinct numbers of the form $p^t q^p$ also it would perhaps be of interest to try to estimate the size of $n_0(p, q)$

Please send 25 dollar to the enclosed adress. Hope you all are well

all yours
E.D.