

SOLUTIONS SHEET 1

YANNIS BÄHNI

Exercise 1.

a. The first part can be shown for an arbitrary set X . Clearly $\emptyset, X \in \mathcal{T}$ since $X^c = \emptyset$ is countable. Let $(U_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$ be a family of sets in \mathcal{T} . If $U_\iota = \emptyset$ for all $\iota \in I$ we have that $\bigcup_{\iota \in I} U_\iota = \emptyset \in \mathcal{T}$. So assume that $U_{\iota_0} \neq \emptyset$ for some $\iota_0 \in I$. But then $U_{\iota_0}^c$ is countable, and so is $(\bigcup_{\iota \in I} U_\iota)^c = \bigcap_{\iota \in I} U_\iota^c \subseteq U_{\iota_0}^c$. Lastly, let $U_1, \dots, U_n \in \mathcal{T}$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}, n \geq 1$. If $U_\iota = \emptyset$ for some ι , then $\bigcap_{\iota=1}^n U_\iota = \emptyset$ and thus $\bigcap_{\iota=1}^n U_\iota \in \mathcal{T}$. So assume that $U_\iota \neq \emptyset$ for $\iota = 1, \dots, n$. Then $(\bigcap_{\iota=1}^n U_\iota)^c = \bigcup_{\iota=1}^n U_\iota^c$ which is a finite union of countable sets, which is countable. Hence \mathcal{T} is indeed a topology on X .

We claim that (X, \mathcal{T}) is not Hausdorff when X is uncountable. Towards a contradiction assume that (X, \mathcal{T}) is Hausdorff. Let $p, q \in X$ with $p \neq q$. Hence there exist (open) neighbourhoods U and V of p and q respectively such that $U \cap V = \emptyset$. Now $X = U \cup U^c$, where U^c is countable and clearly nonempty. But $U \cap V = \emptyset$ implies $U \subseteq V^c$ which therefore yields that U is also countable. Hence X is a union of two countable sets and thus countable. Contradiction.

b. We prove both times the contrapositive. Assume that there is a family $(A_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$ of closed subsets of X having the finite intersection property such that $\bigcap_{\iota \in I} A_\iota = \emptyset$. Then $\bigcup_{\iota \in I} A_\iota^c = (\bigcap_{\iota \in I} A_\iota)^c = X$. Since each A_ι is closed, A_ι^c is open for all $\iota \in I$ and thus $(A_\iota^c)_{\iota \in I}$ is an open cover for X . We claim that $(A_\iota^c)_{\iota \in I}$ does not admit any finite subcover. Towards a contradiction, assume that it does. Hence we find $\iota_1, \dots, \iota_n \in I, n \in \mathbb{Z}, n \geq 1$, such that $\bigcup_{k=1}^n A_{\iota_k}^c = X$. But then $\bigcap_{k=1}^n A_{\iota_k} = \emptyset$, contradicting the finite intersection property of the family $(A_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$.

Conversely, suppose that there exists an open cover $(A_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$ of X which does not admit a finite subcover. We claim that the closed family $(A_\iota^c)_{\iota \in I}$ has the finite intersection property and $\bigcap_{\iota \in I} A_\iota = \emptyset$. Let $\iota_1, \dots, \iota_n \in I, n \in \mathbb{Z}, n \geq 1$. Since $(A_{\iota_k})_{k=1}^n$ cannot cover X , otherwise it would be a finite subcover of $(A_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$, we have that $\bigcap_{k=1}^n A_{\iota_k}^c \neq \emptyset$. Thus $(A_\iota^c)_{\iota \in I}$ has the finite intersection property. Since $(A_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$ covers X we have that $\bigcap_{\iota \in I} A_\iota^c = \emptyset$.

Exercise 2.

a. Clearly, $\emptyset, X \in \mathcal{T}_d$. Let $(U_\iota)_{\iota \in I}$ be a family of elements in \mathcal{T}_d and $x \in \bigcup_{\iota \in I} U_\iota$. Then there exists $\iota \in I$ such that $x \in U_\iota$. Furthermore, we find $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $B_\varepsilon(x) \subseteq U_\iota$. Hence $B_\varepsilon(x) \subseteq \bigcup_{\iota \in I} U_\iota$. Let $U_1, \dots, U_n \in \mathcal{T}$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}, n \geq 1$, and $x \in \bigcap_{\iota=1}^n U_\iota$. Hence

there exist $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n > 0$ such that $B_{\varepsilon_l}(x) \subseteq U_l$ for $l = 1, \dots, n$ and so $B_{\tilde{\varepsilon}}(x) \subseteq \bigcap_{l=1}^n U_l$ for $\tilde{\varepsilon} := \min \{\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n\}$. Thus \mathcal{T}_d is a topology on X .

b. We will use the fact that two metrics induce the same topology if and only if they induce the same convergence. Let $\tilde{M} := (0, \infty)$. Define $f : \tilde{M} \rightarrow \tilde{M}$ by $f(x) := 1/x$. Then clearly $d_2 = \tilde{d}_2|_M$ and $d_1 = \tilde{d}_1|_M$, where

$$\tilde{d}_2 : \tilde{M} \times \tilde{M} \xrightarrow{f \times f} \tilde{M} \times \tilde{M} \xrightarrow{|\cdot, \cdot|} \mathbb{R}$$

and

$$\tilde{d}_1 : \tilde{M} \times \tilde{M} \xrightarrow{f \times f} \tilde{M} \times \tilde{M} \xrightarrow{\tilde{d}_2} \mathbb{R}.$$

It is easy to show that \tilde{d}_2 is a metric. Let $x \in M$ and $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in M . Assume that $x_n \xrightarrow{d_1} x$. Then

$$d_2(x_n, x) = \tilde{d}_1(f(x_n), f(x)) \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$d_1(x_n, x) = \tilde{d}_2(f(x_n), f(x)) \rightarrow 0$$

by the continuity of f on \tilde{M} .

(M, d_1) is complete since M is a closed subset of the complete metric space \mathbb{R} . Consider the sequence $(n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in M . Clearly, it is a Cauchy sequence in (M, d_2) since $\frac{1}{n} \xrightarrow{|\cdot|} 0$. Assume that it converges also in (M, d_2) . Since the induced topologies of d_1 and d_2 are the same, we would get that $(n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ also converges in (M, d_1) . But this is absurd. Hence (M, d_2) cannot be complete.