William Strimling Honework 4 Question 5

Let p be a prime integer egreater than 3 Considering the formula $p = r \pmod{6}$, we know r can only possibly be 0,1,2,3,4 or r for any number r as defined by the Division Theorem where r = 60 + r and 0 = r < r .

Because there exists some integer K (K=6) where p=Kq, and int pizo (its > 3), we conconcious q|p by the definition of divides. In the case where $p\neq 6$, it follows that p is not prime by the definition primarity — there is some integer q, that divides it other than 1 and itself. Therefore it follows that p = 0 mod q is false. Similarly in case where q = 0, it would appear that q is prime however q = 0 and q to another q is not prime however q = 0 and q to another q is not prime however q = 0 and q to another q is not prime however q = 0 and q to another q is not prime by the definition of q in and we can finally conclude that q = 0 mod q is disproven.

If we take 1 to be 2, it follows that $p = Cq + 2\chi$ and therefore that p = 2(3q + 1).

By using algebra.

Based on the division theorem, we know (3q + 1) is an

Inkyer because in p = 6q + 2, $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ by the division theorem and inkyers are closed under addition and multiplication. Because we know (3q+1) is a integer, we know 2/P by the definition of divides, and therefore that p is not prince in the case of r = 2 because it is shown to be divisible by something other than I and itself.

If we take r to be 3, it follows that p=6q+3, and by Algebra that p=3 (2q+1). We know $q\in \mathbb{Z}$ and therefore that 6q+3 is an integer because integers are closed under allians and multiplication. We also know p=3 (2q+1) is an integer for the same reason. Therefore and by the definition of divides, 3|p| and it follows that in the case r=3, p is not prime as it is divided by Smalley other than 1 and itself.

If we take P to be 4, it follows that P = 69 + 4 by the division theorem. We also know P, q' E Z and therefore that (69 + 4) is E Z because integers are closed under addition and similarly that 2(39 + 2) is an integer. Therefore, but the definition of divides 2/P and thus P is not prime in the case of P = 4 because it can be devided by a number other than 0 ml itself by the divider theorem and definition of Prime.

Because I cannot be 0,2,3, or 4 as proven above in P=1 (mod 6), it follows that I most be either 1 or B and thus proves the original claim that for any integer prime that is >3, either P=1 (mod 6)