

# MA571 Problem Set 5

Carlos Salinas

September 25, 2015



**PROBLEM 5.1 (MUNKRES §23, EX. 3)**

Let  $\{A_\alpha\}$  be a collection of connected subspaces of  $X$ ; let  $A$  be a connected subspace of  $X$ . Show that if  $A \cap A_\alpha \neq \emptyset$  for all  $\alpha$ , then  $A \cup (\bigcup A_\alpha)$  is connected.

*Proof.* We shall aim to prove this result by using Theorem 23.3 from Munkres. Define the collection  $\{B_\alpha\}$  by setting  $B_\alpha = A \cup A_\alpha$ . Note that by Theorem 23.3,  $B_\alpha$  is connected for all  $\alpha$ , since  $A \cap A_\alpha \neq \emptyset$  and both  $A$  and  $A_\alpha$  are connected. Next observe that the intersection  $B_\alpha \cap B_\beta \neq \emptyset$  for all  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , in particular, the subspace  $A$  is contained in the intersection since  $A \subset B_\alpha$  and  $A \subset B_\beta$  for all  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . Therefore,  $\{B_\alpha\}$  is a collection of connected subspaces of  $X$  that have a point in common. Applying Theorem 23.3 one last time, we see that the union

$$\bigcup B_\alpha = \bigcup (A \cup A_\alpha) = A \cup \left( \bigcup A_\alpha \right)$$

is connected. ■

**PROBLEM 5.2 (MUNKRES §23, EX. 6)**

Let  $A \subset X$ . Show that if  $C$  is a connected subspace of  $X$  that intersects both  $A$  and  $X \setminus A$ , then  $C$  intersects  $\partial A$ .

*Proof.* We shall proceed by contradiction. Suppose that  $C \cap \partial A = \emptyset$ , then we shall show that the pair  $C \cap A$  and  $C \cap (X \setminus A)$  forms a separation of  $C$ . Recall that by definition (see Munkres §17, p. 102) the boundary  $\partial A = \overline{A} \cap \overline{X \setminus A}$ . Then we claim that  $\overline{A} = \partial A \cup \text{int } A$ :

**Lemma 13.** *Let  $X$  be a topological space and  $A \subset X$ . Then  $\partial A$  and  $\text{int } A$  are disjoint and  $\overline{A} = \partial A \cup \text{int } A$ .*

*Proof of lemma.* The point  $x \in \partial A$  if and only if  $x \in \overline{A}$  and  $x \in \overline{X \setminus A}$ . Thus, for every neighborhood  $U$  of  $x$ , the intersection  $U \cap X \setminus A \neq \emptyset$ , in particular  $U \not\subset A$  so  $x$  is not an interior point of  $A$ . Hence, we see that  $\partial A \cap \text{int } A = \emptyset$ . To prove the last statement note that  $\partial A \subset \overline{A}$  and  $\text{int } A \subset A \subset \overline{A}$  (cf. Munkres §17, p. 95), so that  $\partial A \cup \text{int } A \subset \overline{A}$  hence, it suffices to show the reverse inclusion, namely,  $\overline{A} \subset \partial A \cup \text{int } A$ . Let  $x \in \overline{A}$ . If  $x \in \text{int } A$ , then clearly  $x \in \partial A \cup \text{int } A$ . Suppose  $x \notin \text{int } A$ . Then, by Theorem 17.5(a), for every neighborhood  $U$  of  $x$ , the intersection  $U \cap A \neq \emptyset$  and  $U \not\subset A$ . Thus,  $U \cap (X \setminus A) \neq \emptyset$  so  $x \in \overline{X \setminus A}$ . It follows that  $x \in \overline{A} \cap \overline{X \setminus A} = \partial A$ . ♣

**Lemma 14.** *Let  $X$  be a topological space and  $A \subset X$ . Then  $\partial A = \partial(X \setminus A)$ .*

*Proof of lemma.* Replace  $A$  by  $X \setminus A$  in the definition of the boundary of  $A$ . Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial(X \setminus A) &= \overline{X \setminus A} \cap \overline{X \setminus (X \setminus A)} \\ &= \overline{X \setminus A} \cap \overline{A} \\ &= \overline{A} \cap \overline{X \setminus A} \\ &= \partial A. \end{aligned}$$

♣

Now, by Theorem 17.4, we have that  $\overline{C \cap A} = C \cap \overline{A}$  and  $\overline{C \cap (X \setminus A)} = C \cap \overline{X \setminus A}$ . But by Lemma 13 and Lemma 14, the latter sets are equivalent to  $\overline{C \cap A} = C \cap (\partial A \cup \text{int } A)$  and  $\overline{C \cap (X \setminus A)} = C \cap (\partial A \cup \text{int } (X \setminus A))$ . But since  $C \cap \partial A = \emptyset$  by assumption, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{C \cap A} \cap (C \cap (X \setminus A)) &= (C \cap (\partial A \cup \text{int } A)) \cap (C \cap (X \setminus A)) \\ &= ((C \cap \partial A) \cup (C \cap \text{int } A)) \cap (C \cap (X \setminus A)) \\ &= (C \cap \text{int } A) \cap (C \cap (X \setminus A)) \\ &= \emptyset \end{aligned}$$

since  $C \cap \text{int } A \subset A$  and  $C \cap (X \setminus A) \subset X \setminus A$ . Similarly, we have that the intersection  $\overline{C \cap (X \setminus A)} \cap (C \cap A) = \emptyset$ . So by Lemma 23.1,  $C \cap A$  and  $C \cap (X \setminus A)$  form a separation of  $C$ . This contradicts the assumption that  $C$  is connected. Therefore, we conclude that  $C \cap \partial A \neq \emptyset$ . ■

**PROBLEM 5.3 (MUNKRES §23, EX. 7)**

Is the space  $\mathbf{R}_\ell$  connected? Justify your answer.

*Proof.* No. The space  $\mathbf{R}_\ell$  is not connected and we may exhibit an explicit separation. Namely, consider the basis elements  $(-\infty, 0)$  and  $[0, \infty)$ . Then  $\mathbf{R} = (-\infty, 0) \cup [0, \infty)$ , hence  $(-\infty, 0)$  and  $[0, \infty)$  form a separation of  $\mathbf{R}$  with the lower limit topology.

Alternatively, one may note that  $\mathbf{R} \setminus (-\infty, 0) = [0, \infty)$  is open in  $\mathbf{R}_\ell$  so  $(-\infty, 0)$  is both open and closed. Hence, by Munkres's alternative formulation of connectedness (cf. Munkres §23, p. 148 the italicized paragraph),  $\mathbf{R}_\ell$  is disconnected. ■

**PROBLEM 5.4 (MUNKRES §23, EX. 9)**

Let  $A$  be a proper subset of  $X$ , and let  $B$  be a proper subset of  $Y$ . If  $X$  and  $Y$  are connected, show that

$$(X \times Y) \setminus (A \times B)$$

is connected.

*Proof.* Consider the family of embeddings  $\{i_\alpha\}$  where  $i_\alpha: X \hookrightarrow X \times Y$  maps  $x \mapsto x \times y_\alpha$  for  $y_\alpha \notin B$ , for all  $\alpha$ . By Theorem 23.5,  $i_\alpha(X) = X \times y_\alpha$  is connected subspace of  $X \times Y$ . Moreover  $X \times y_\alpha \subset (X \times Y) \setminus (A \times B)$  so  $X \times y_0$ , in particular, we have that is a connected subspace of  $(X \times Y) \setminus (A \times B)$ . Similarly, consider the family of embeddings  $\{j_\beta\}$  where  $j_\beta: Y \hookrightarrow X \times Y$  maps  $y \mapsto x_\beta \times y$  for  $x_\beta \notin A$ . We similarly have that  $j_\beta(Y) = x_\beta \times Y$  is a connected subspace of  $(X \times Y) \setminus (A \times B)$ . Then we claim that

$$(X \times Y) \setminus (A \times B) = \bigcup (X \times y_\alpha) \cup (x_\beta \times Y).$$

It is clear that the union on the right is a subset of  $(X \times Y) \setminus (A \times B)$  since each  $X \times y_\alpha$  and  $x_\beta \times Y$  is a subset of  $(X \times Y) \setminus (A \times B)$ . To see the reverse containment, take  $x \times y$  in the union  $\bigcup (X \times y_\alpha) \cup (x_\beta \times Y)$ . Then  $x \times y$  is in some  $(X \times y_\alpha) \cup (x_\beta \times Y)$  so  $x \times y \in X \times y_\alpha$  or  $x \times y \in x_\beta \times Y$ . If  $x \times y \in \bigcup X \times y_\alpha$ , then  $y_\alpha \notin B$  so  $x \times y \notin A \times B$ , hence  $x \times y \in (X \times Y) \setminus (A \times B)$ . If  $x \times y \in \bigcup x_\beta \times Y$  then  $x \notin A$ , hence  $x \times y \notin A \times B$  so  $x \times y \in (X \times Y) \setminus (A \times B)$ . Thus, we have that  $(X \times Y) \setminus (A \times B) = \bigcup (X \times y_\alpha) \cup (x_\beta \times Y)$ . Then, note that by Theorem 23.3, since  $X \cap y_\alpha \cap x_\beta \cap Y \neq \emptyset$ , in particular,  $x_\beta \times y_\alpha$  is in the intersection,  $(X \times y_\alpha) \cup (x_\beta \times Y)$  is connected for all  $\alpha$  and all  $\beta$ . Thus, the subspace  $(X \times Y) \setminus (A \times B)$  is connected. ■

**PROBLEM 5.5 (MUNKRES §24, EX. 1(AC))**

- (a) Show that no two of the spaces  $(0, 1)$ ,  $(0, 1]$  and  $[0, 1]$  are homeomorphic. [*Hint*: What happens if you remove a point from each of these spaces?]  
(c) Show  $\mathbf{R}^n$  and  $\mathbf{R}$  are not homeomorphic if  $n > 1$ .

*Proof.* (a) Suppose  $\varphi: (0, 1] \rightarrow (0, 1)$  is a homeomorphism. We claim that the restriction of  $\varphi$  to  $(0, 1) \subset (0, 1]$  gives a homeomorphism to  $(0, 1) \setminus \{\varphi(1)\}$ :

**Lemma 15.** *Suppose  $\varphi: X \rightarrow Y$  is a homeomorphism. Then the restricted map  $\varphi_0: X \setminus x_0 \rightarrow Y \setminus \{\varphi(x_0)\}$  of  $\varphi$  is a homeomorphism.*

*Proof of lemma.* at



Now remove 1 from  $(0, 1]$ . Then, since  $\varphi(1)$  is bijective, there exists  $y \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\varphi(1) = y$ . Then  $(0, 1) \setminus \{y\} = (0, y) \cup (y, 1)$  is disconnected, but  $(0, 1) \setminus \{1\} = (0, 1)$  is connected. This contradicts Theorem 23.5 that the image of.

(b)



**PROBLEM 5.6 (MUNKRES §24, EX. 2)**

Let  $f: S^1 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  be a continuous map. Show there exists a point  $x$  of  $S^1$  such that  $f(x) = f(-x)$ .

*Proof.*





**PROBLEM 5.7 (MUNKRES §25, EX. 2(B))**

- (b) Consider  $\mathbf{R}^\omega$  in the uniform topology. Show that  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  lie in the same component of  $\mathbf{R}^\omega$  if and only if the sequence

$$\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} = (x_1 - y_1, x_2 - y_2, \dots)$$

is bounded. [*Hint:* It suffices to consider the case where  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}$ .]

*Proof.*

■

**PROBLEM 5.8 (MUNKRES §25, EX. 4)**

Let  $X$  be locally path connected. Show that every connected open set in  $X$  is path connected.

*Proof.*



**PROBLEM 5.9 (MUNKRES §25, EX. 6)**

A space  $X$  is said to be *weakly locally path connected at  $x$*  if for every neighborhood  $U$  of  $x$ , there is a connected subspace of  $X$  contained in  $U$  that contains a neighborhood of  $x$ . Show that if  $X$  is weakly locally connected at each of its points, then  $X$  is locally connected. [*Hint*: Show that components of open sets are open.]

*Proof.*



**PROBLEM 5.10 (A)**

Let  $X$  be a topological space. The quotient space  $(X \times [0, 1]) / (X \times 0)$  is called the *cone* of  $X$  and denoted  $CX$ .

Prove that if  $X$  is homeomorphic to  $Y$  then  $CX$  is homeomorphic to  $CY$  (*Hint:* There are maps in both directions).

*Proof.*

■