## 2.C. An Easy Trisection Fallacy

We have already noted that any purported straightedge and compass construction for trisecting an angle will be incorrect. The following simple example illustrates how appealing such a construction might appear at first and how one can look more closely to find a mistake.

Suppose we are given an angle $\angle$ BAE as in the diagram below and we wish to trisect it. Let's assume that the lengths of the segments [BA] and [AE] are equal. It is known that segments can be divided into any number of pieces of equal length by straightedge and compass, so apply this to segment [BE] and divide it into three equal segments that we shall call [BC], [CD] and [DE]. If we look at the picture it might seem that the rays [AC and [AD trisect $\angle B A E$, but is this really true?


One can use the classical methods of Euclidean geometry to conclude that the segments [AC] and [AD] have equal length, and it is possible to analyze this figure even further using classical methods, but we shall take a shortcut using trigonometry.

Let $\boldsymbol{h}$ denote the common altitude of the isosceles triangles $\triangle B A E$ and $\triangle C A D$, and let $|\mathbf{X Y}|$ denote the length of the segment joining $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{Y}$. Then standard results in trigonometry imply the following relationships:

$$
\tan 1 / 2 \angle B A E=|B E| / 2 h \quad \tan 1 / 2 \angle C A D=|C D| / 2 h=|B E| / 6 h
$$

From these formulas we conclude that $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { t a n }} 1 / 2 \angle C A D$ is one third of $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { t a n }} 1 / 2 \angle B A E$. If this construction yielded a trisection then we would have a trigonometric identity of the form

$$
(\tan x) / 3=\tan (x / 3)
$$

and one can check directly from tables (or a scientific calculator) that the first expression is always greater than the second. Since the tangent function is strictly increasing, it follows that the middle angle is always larger than the angles on both sides.

It is also possible to disprove this trisection fallacy using classical methods from Euclidean geometry, but the argument is somewhat longer.

