

①

a) If $\phi: R \rightarrow S$ is a ring homomorphism, then $\ker \phi \trianglelefteq R$ is an ideal. But the only ideals of a field are 0 & R , so either ϕ is injective or the zero map.

b) No, consider $\phi: \mathbb{Z}_p[x] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p$

$$f \mapsto f(1)$$

Then $f_1 = x + (p-1)x^2 \mapsto 1 + p-1 = 0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ where $f_2 \neq f_1$ but $\phi(f_1) = \phi(f_2) = 0$ so $\ker \phi \neq 0$. \blacksquare

$$f_2 = (p-1)x + x^2 \mapsto p-1+1 = 0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p$$

② If F contains a ^{nonzero} nilpotent ($x^n = 0$) then F contains a zero divisor ($x \cdot x^{n-1} = 0$) and thus F can't be a field since

$$(x^{n-1})^{-1}(x^{n-1} \cdot x) \begin{cases} \rightarrow ((x^{n-1})^{-1} \cdot x^{n-1})x = x \\ = (x^{n-1})^{-1}(x^n) = (x^{n-1})^{-1} \cdot 0 = 0 \end{cases} \Rightarrow x = 0. \#$$

But \mathbb{Z}_{p^k} contains a nilpotent iff $k > 1$, namely $[p]$ since $[p^k] = 0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^k}$.

So if $\mathbb{Z}_{p^k} \trianglelefteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ for any p and any $k > 1$, it contains a nilpotent, which would have to be in one of the terms of a direct sum decomposition, forcing that term to not be a field.

So $\mathbb{Z}_n \cong \bigoplus F_i$, each F_i a field, iff n is square-free, i.e. $n = \prod_{i=1}^m p_i^{\alpha_i}$ with $\alpha_i = 1 \forall i$.

Then take each F_i to be \mathbb{Z}_{p_i} , and $\mathbb{Z}_n \cong \bigoplus \mathbb{Z}_{p_i}$ by the Chinese Remainder Theorem. \blacksquare

③ Suppose r isn't invertible. Then $r \in I := R \setminus R^\times$. This is an ideal because if r is not invertible, tr can not be invertible for any $t \in R$. It is maximal because if $I \subseteq J$, then J contains a unit, so $J = R$.

Suppose $r \in I$ for some maximal I . If $r \in R^\times$, then $r^{-1} \in R$, so $r^{-1}r \in I \Rightarrow 1 \in I$, so $I = R$ which contradicts the maximality of I . So r can not be a unit.

④ a) G is solvable if there is a normal series with abelian quotients, i.e.

$$1 \trianglelefteq H_1 \trianglelefteq H_2 \trianglelefteq \dots \trianglelefteq H_n = G, \quad H_i/H_{i-1} \text{ abelian}$$

b) $\#G = 36 = 2^2 \cdot 3^2$, so

$$n_2 = 1 \pmod{2} \\ n_2 \mid 9$$

$$n_3 = 1 \pmod{3} \\ n_3 \mid 4$$

So $n_2 \in \{1, 3, 9\}$ & $n_3 \in \{1, 4\}$

If $n_3 = 1$, take

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & 9 & & 36 \\
 & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\
 1 & \trianglelefteq & Q_3 & \trianglelefteq & G \\
 \uparrow & & & & \uparrow \\
 9 & & & & 4
 \end{array}
 \left. \begin{array}{l} \\ \end{array} \right\} \text{size of quotients}$$

Must be abelian

Otherwise $n_3 = 4$, so define

$$\phi: G \rightarrow \text{Sym}(\text{Syl}(3, G)) \cong S_4$$

$$g \mapsto (Q_3 \mapsto gQ_3g^{-1})$$

Then $\text{im } \phi \leq S_4$, and since S_4 is solvable, so is any subgroup.

We claim $\ker \phi$ is solvable as well. It can't be the case that $\ker \phi = 0$, since this would force $|G| \leq |S_4| \Rightarrow 36 \leq 24$. If we write $\text{Syl}(3, G) = \{H_1, \dots, H_4\}$, we can identify $\ker \phi = \bigcap_{i=1}^4 N_G(H_i) \trianglelefteq G$. But it also can not be G , since this would force $n_3 = 1$. So $|\ker \phi| > 1$. By sylow 3, we know $[G : N_G(H_i)] = n_3 = 4$, so $|N_G(H_i)|$ divides 9 and thus $|\ker \phi| = 3$ or 9. In either case, $\ker \phi$ must be abelian & thus solvable.

So $\ker \phi$ is solvable & $G/\ker \phi \cong \text{im } \phi$ is solvable, which implies that G itself is also solvable. \square