





(3)

g= U1 (53-K)= (SIR) 0 -> K -> G -> Gab=2->0 O - Kab -> Gmab > 16 -> /Alexander module/ if we interpret it as a ZIZJ-modele algorithm: a,,..., an -> generators of G. aj = ai aw ai & egrange one of relations ait->1 Aj=aja,1 Aja, = (Aia,) (Awa,) (Aia,) Aja, = a, A; Awa, A; a, 1=a, Aja, Ai Awa, Aia, = = (a, 1A, 1a,)(a, 2A, 1a, 2)(a, 2, 4, a, 2)(a, 1A, a, 1) 0 = - t.A; - +2.A; + +2.4 w + +1.A; (this shows that Wirtinger gives coloning. Istill weed the other way)

RESOLUTION OF Kab 0 -> 2[Z] -> 2[Z] -> 2[Z] -> 6 -> 0 b = # generators = n-1c = # helations = n Changing to page field of fractions (2[2]) (2[2]) 6=a+c Thence but a = 1 for a lanot group G ALWAYS. COULD COMPARE RESOLUTIONS OR SMITH. Some lanots will never have a shorter resolution, when their beduced normal form of allex matrix or color checking matrix is not 1×1. But the same module X -universal cover $\Pi_1 = 1$. comes from thre infinite cyclic covering. /[G,G] We can valculate $H_1(\bar{X}, R)$ when R is any hing (commuta-X inf. eycl. II, = [G, G]
H, = Koab tive). Univeral wefficient thum but more universal than the are presented in 53-W Hatcher.

TORSION OF RESOLUTION how does it depend on the choice of R.