Discretionary Note

Anish Krishna Lakkapragada

IF YOU USE THIS FILE TO CHEAT, YOU ARE NOT ONLY STUPID BUT YOU ARE CHEATING YOURSELF OUT OF THE ABILITY TO FALL IN LOVE WITH MATH. Furthermore, I am not smarter than you and my solutions did not always get a perfect score.

CONTENT STARTS ON NEXT PAGE.

To access the general instructions for this repository head here.

MATH 255 PSET 5

February 21, 2025

1.

To prove that E is open, we WTS $\forall (a,b) \in E$, (a,b) is an interior point of E. Pick $(a,b) \in E$. Because $(a,b) \in E \implies a < b$ and so we can define $h = b - a > 0$. We now need to show that we can create a neighborhood around (a,b) that is $\subset E$. Let us define $\epsilon = \frac{h}{2} > 0$ and create the following neighborhood:

$$N_\epsilon((a,b)) = \{(x,y) : \sqrt{(a-x)^2 + (y-b)^2} < \epsilon\}$$

We now need to show that $N_\epsilon((a,b)) \subset E \implies \forall (x,y) \in N_\epsilon((a,b)), (x,y) \in E$. Pick $(x,y) \in N_\epsilon((a,b))$. This implies the following two statements: (i) $(a-x)^2 < \epsilon^2 \implies |a-x| < \epsilon$ and (ii) $(b-y)^2 < \epsilon^2 \implies |b-y| < \epsilon$. Note that $|a-x| < \epsilon \implies -\epsilon < a - x < \epsilon \implies a - \epsilon < x < a + \epsilon$ and with the same logic $b - \epsilon < y < b + \epsilon$. Substituting ϵ for $0.5h$, we know the following: $x < a + \epsilon \implies x < a + \frac{h}{2}$ and $y > b + \epsilon \implies y > b - \frac{h}{2}$. Note that $b = a + h$ and so $y > b - \frac{h}{2} \implies y > a + \frac{h}{2} > x \implies y > x \implies x < y \implies (x,y) \in E$. Thus, we have shown $N_\epsilon((a,b)) \subset E$ and so we have proven $\forall (a,b) \in E, \exists\, \epsilon > 0$ s.t. $N_\epsilon((a,b)) \subset E \implies E$ is open.

2.

Let us define $C_1, \ldots, C_k$ to be k compact sets. Let us define set $C = \bigcup_{i=1}^k C_i$. We WTS that C is compact, or that any open cover of C has a finite subcover. Let $\{S_j\} \supset C$ be an open cover of C. Because $\forall\ 1 \le i \le k, \{S_j\} \supset C \supset C_i \implies \{S_j\} \supset C_i$, $\{S_j\}$ serves as an open cover for each C_i. Because each C_i is compact, any open cover of C_i has a finite subcover. Thus, for each C_i, its open cover $\{S_j\}$ has a finite subcover $\{F_z^{(i)}\} \supset C_i$ where $\{F_z^{(i)}\} \subset \{S_j\}$.

Let us define $F = \bigcup_{i=1}^k \{F_z^{(i)}\}$ to be the union of all these finite subcovers of C_i[1]. We now WTS that F is a finite subcover of C. To do so, we need to show the following:

1. **F is an open cover of C**
   Because $\forall x \in C, x \in$ some $C_i \implies x \in$ some $\{F_z^{(i)}\} \implies x \in F$, we have $C \subset F$, meaning that F is a (finite) open cover of C.

[1] Because each finite subcover is finite, a union of these finite sets (i.e. F) will also be finite.

2. **F is a finite subcover of open cover $\{S_j\}$ of C**

   Because $\forall \{F_z^{(i)}\} \in F, \{F_z^{(i)}\} \in \{S_j\}$, F is a subcover of open cover $\{S_j\}$ of C.

Thus, we have proven any open cover of C, a union of finitely many compact sets, has a finite subcover $\implies C$ is compact.

3. An open cover of $(0,1) \subset \mathbb{R}$ can be given by $\mathbb{R} \supset \{G_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{N}\} \supset (0,1)$, where open set $G_\alpha = (\frac{1}{\alpha}, 1)$. We WTS $(0,1) \subset \mathbb{R}$ is not compact by showing that this open cover does not have a finite subcover (as this implies that not all open covers of $(0,1) \subset \mathbb{R}$ have a finite subcover $\implies (0,1) \subset \mathbb{R}$ is not compact).

   We now prove that there is no finite subcover of $\{G_\alpha\}$. We prove this by contradiction and assume that there is a finite subcover of $\{G_\alpha\}$, given by $\{G_k\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k}(\frac{1}{n_i}, 1) \subset \{G_\alpha\}$ where $n_1, \ldots, n_k \in \mathbb{N}$. Because $n_1, \ldots, n_k$ form a (finite) subset of $\mathbb{N}$, they have a minimum which we can call $n' = \min(n_1, \ldots, n_k)$. This means that the interval $\{G_k\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k}(\frac{1}{n_i}, 1)$ can be simplified to $(\frac{1}{n'}, 1)$. Because $\exists\ n'' > n'$ where $(\frac{1}{n''}, 1) \subset (0,1)$ but $\not\subset \{G_k\} = (\frac{1}{n'}, 1)$, G_k is not an open cover of $(0,1) \implies \{G_k\}$ is not a finite subcover of $\{G_\alpha\}$. Thus, we have proved by contradiction that the open cover $\{G_\alpha\}$ has no finite subcover $\implies (0,1) \subset \mathbb{R}$ is not compact.

4. (1) If A and B are disjoint sets then $A \cap B = \emptyset$. Furthermore, if A and B are closed that means $A = \bar{A}$ and $B = \bar{B}$. Thus $A \cap \bar{B} = A \cap B = \emptyset$ and $\bar{A} \cap B = A \cap B = \emptyset$, and so we know A and B are separated.

   (2) Let us define A, B as two disjoint open sets. We WTS that $A \cap \bar{B} = \emptyset$ and $\bar{A} \cap B = \emptyset$. To do so, we prove that no limit points of B are in A and no limit points of A are in B.

   WLOG, let us prove why no limit points of B are in A. We prove this by contradiction and assume that for a limit point x of B, $x \in A$. This means $\forall \epsilon > 0, N_\epsilon(x)$ contains some $b \neq x$ s.t. $b \in B$. However, because $x \in A$ and A is open $\implies x$ is an interior point $\implies \exists\ \epsilon > 0$ s.t. $N_\epsilon(x) \subset A$. Thus, this means that $N_\epsilon(x)$, which will contain some $b \neq x \in B$ by virtue of x being a limit point of B, is fully contained in $A \implies \exists\ b \in B$ and $A \implies A \cap B \neq \emptyset$, which is a contradiction of A and B being disjoint. Thus, we have proven that no limit points of B are in A and that no limit points of A are in B.

   Let us define A' and B' to be the limit points of A and B, respectively. Based on our proof above we know $B' \cap A = \emptyset$ and $A' \cap B = \emptyset$. Thus, we have:

$$A \cap \bar{B} = A \cap (B \cup B') = (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap B') = \emptyset \cup \emptyset = \emptyset$$
$$\bar{A} \cap B = (A \cup A') \cap B = (A \cap B) \cup (A' \cap B) = \emptyset \cup \emptyset = \emptyset$$

   Thus, $A \cap \bar{B} = \emptyset$ and $\bar{A} \cap B = \emptyset \implies A$ and B are separated.

   (3) $\forall x \in A, d(p,x) < \delta \implies d(p,x) \not> \delta \implies x \notin B$. The same applies in the other direction to show $\forall x \in B, x \notin A$ and so we have $A \cap B = \emptyset \implies A$ and B are disjoint.

We now prove that A and B are open. We first prove A is open. Note that A is essentially $N_\delta(p)$. As we have proved, any neighborhood of a point is open $\implies A = N_\delta(p)$ is open.

We now prove that B is open, or that all its points are interior points of B. Pick $x \in B$. To show x is an interior point, we must find some $\epsilon > 0$ s.t. $N_\epsilon(x) \subset B$. Note that because $x \in B \implies d(p,x) > \delta$. Consider $\epsilon = d(p,x) - \delta > 0$. We now aim to show that $\forall z \in N_\epsilon(x), z \in B$. Pick $z \in N_\epsilon(x)$. By Triangle Inequality we have:

$$\begin{aligned} d(p,x) &\leq d(p,z) + d(z,x) \\ d(p,z) &\geq d(p,x) - d(z,x) \end{aligned}$$

Because $z \in N_\epsilon(x), d(z,x) < \epsilon \implies d(z,x) < d(p,x) - \delta \implies -d(z,x) > \delta - d(p,x)$. Thus, we get:

$$\begin{gathered} d(p,z) \geq d(p,x) - d(z,x) \\ d(p,z) \geq d(p,x) - d(z,x) > d(p,x) + \delta - d(p,x) \\ d(p,z) > d(p,x) + \delta - d(p,x) \\ d(p,z) > \delta \end{gathered}$$

Thus, $d(p,z) > \delta \implies z \in B \implies \forall z \in N_\epsilon(x), z \in B \implies N_\epsilon(x) \subset B \implies$ all points of B are interior points $\implies B$ is open.

Thus, we have proven that A and B are disjoint open sets. By our proof in part (2), this means that A and B are separated.

(4) We prove this statement by contradiction and thus assume that this connected metric space X with at least two points is not uncountable $\implies X$ is at most countable. Let us define set $D = \{d((p,q)) : (p,q) \in X \times X\} \subset \mathbb{R}^+$. Because X is at most countable $\implies X \times X$ is at most countable $\implies D$ is at most countable[2]. We aim to find a $\delta > 0 \notin D$ where $\exists\, m \in D$ s.t. $m > \delta$. We proceed with casework on D's cardinality:

(i) **Case One: If D is finite**

Let us fix points $p, p' \in X$. D is guaranteed to contain these two elements: $d(p,p) = d(p',p') = 0$ and $d(p,p')$. Listing all elements of D in increasing order as so: $d_1, \ldots, d_n$, we can select i from 1 to $n-1$ and choose $\delta = \frac{d_i + d_{i+1}}{2}$. We are guaranteed this element does not exist in the finitely many elements of D by virtue of it existing in between two consecutive elements d_i and d_{i+1} in D. Because this element is not the maximum of D (i.e. $\delta < d_n$) $\implies \exists\, m \in D$ s.t. $m > \delta$. Furthermore, δ is an average of two non-negative numbers, where only one can be zero[3] $\implies \delta > 0$.

[2] This is because set D cannot have more elements than $X \times X$ as it is simply applying the distance function d to every element of $X \times X$.

[3] This is because D is a set and thus there are no repeat elements.

(ii) **Case Two: If D is countable**
Here, we use a familiar intervals argument to find δ. Fix $p, p' \in X$ and define $a_1 = 0$ and $b_1 = d(p, p')$. Because D is countable, we can write a sequence (q_n) that defines every element of D. Let us first define interval $I_1 = [a_1, b_1]$. Then for $q_2, q_3, \ldots,$ we can construct closed interval $I_i = [a_i, b_i]$ with nonzero length where $I_{i+1} \subset I_i$ and $q_i \notin I_i$.
Defining $\delta = \sup(\{a_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\})$, δ exists in all intervals I_i but does not exist in D. Furthermore, because $\forall i, \delta \in I_i$ we know the following two things: (i) $\delta < b_1 = d(p, q) \implies \exists\, m \in D$ s.t. $m > \delta$ and (ii) $\delta > a_i \implies \delta > 0$.

Because $\delta \notin D \implies \forall p, q \in X, d(p, q) \neq \delta \implies X = \{q \in X : d(p, q) < \delta\} \cup \{q \in X : d(p, q) > \delta\}$. Let us define set $A = \{q \in X : d(p, q) < \delta\}$ and set $B = \{q \in X : d(p, q) > \delta\}$ where, as per our previous sentence, $X = A \cup B$. Note that because $\exists\, m \in D$ s.t. $m > \delta \implies \exists\, q \in X$ s.t. $d(p, q) > \delta \implies q \in B \implies B$ is non-empty. Also note A is guaranteed to be non-empty as $d(p, p) = 0 < \delta \implies p \in A$.
Our proof in part (c) applies and so we get that A and B are separated $\implies \exists$ non-empty sets A, B s.t. $X = A \cup B$ where $\bar{A} \cap B = A \cap \bar{B} = \emptyset \implies X$ is disconnected, which is a contradiction to our given that X is connected.

5. To prove that $\mathbb{Q}$ is dense in $\mathbb{R}$, we aim to prove that $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathbb{R}$. We prove both directions of this statement below:

(a) $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \subset \mathbb{R}$
Pick $x \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$. This means that at least one of the two cases is true:

1. **Case One:** $x \in \mathbb{Q}$
If $x \in \mathbb{Q} \implies x \in \mathbb{R}$.
2. **Case Two:** x **is a limit point of** $\mathbb{Q}$
If x is a limit point of $\mathbb{Q}$, that means $\forall \epsilon > 0, N_\epsilon(x)$ contains some $q \neq x$ s.t. $q \in \mathbb{Q}$. Because $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}$, this means that $\forall \epsilon > 0, N_\epsilon(x)$ contains some $q \neq x$ s.t. $q \in \mathbb{R} \implies x$ is a limit point of $\mathbb{R}$. Because $\mathbb{R}$ is closed, this means that $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Thus we have shown in both cases that $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and so we have shown $\forall x \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}, x \in \mathbb{R} \implies \bar{\mathbb{Q}} \subset \mathbb{R}$.

(b) $\mathbb{R} \subset \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$
Pick $x \in \mathbb{R}$. We perform casework:

1. **Case One:** $x \in \mathbb{Q}$
If $x \in \mathbb{Q} \implies x \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$.
2. **Case Two:** $x \notin \mathbb{Q}$
We know that $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, x$ is a limit point of $\mathbb{R}$. Proof[4]. Thus, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$ we know that $\forall \epsilon > 0, N_\epsilon(x)$ contains some $y \neq x$ s.t. $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Because $x \neq y \implies$ either $x < y$ or $x > y$ because $\mathbb{R}$ is an ordered field $\implies \min(x, y) \neq \max(x, y) \implies \min(x, y) < \max(x, y)$.

[4] Pick $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and define $\epsilon > 0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $N_\epsilon(x) = (x - \epsilon, x + \epsilon)$, which contains $x + 0.5\epsilon$. Because x and 0.5ϵ exist in $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{R}$ is closed under addition because it is a field $\implies x + 0.5\epsilon \in \mathbb{R} \implies \forall \epsilon > 0, N_\epsilon(x)$ contains some $x' \neq x$ s.t. $x' \in \mathbb{R} \implies \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, x$ is a limit point of $\mathbb{R}$.

Let us define $\alpha = \min(x, y)$ and $\beta = \max(x, y)$. Because $x, y \in \mathbb{R} \implies \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, the density of rationals proof (Prop 3.45) applies: we know there exists some rational $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ s.t. $\alpha < r < \beta$. Thus, this means $\forall \epsilon > 0, N_\epsilon(x)$ contains some $r \neq x$ s.t. $r \in \mathbb{Q}$. This implies x is a limit point of $\mathbb{Q} \implies x \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$.

Thus, we have shown in either case, $x \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}} \implies \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, x \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}} \implies \mathbb{R} \subset \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$