## Math 441 HW3

## Rohan Mukherjee

July 17, 2023

- 1. Notice that  $(A \times B)^c = \{(x, y) \in X \times Y \mid (x, y) \notin A \times B\} = \{(x, y) \in X \times Y \mid x \notin A \lor y \notin B\} = \{(x, y) \in X \times Y \mid x \in A^c\} \cup \{(x, y) \in X \times Y \mid y \in B^c\} = (A^c \times Y) \cup (X \times B^c)$ . Since A is closed  $A^c$  is open, and since B is closed  $B^c$  is open. Thus the above is the union of two open sets (by definition of the product topology) and hence open, and hence  $A \times B$  is closed.
- 2. (a) We recall that an arbitrary intersection of closed sets is closed. Since  $A \subset B \subset \overline{B}$ ,  $\overline{B}$  is a closed set containing A, and hence  $\overline{A} \subset \overline{B}$  by definition of intersection.
  - (b) Notice that  $A \cup B \subset \overline{A} \cup \overline{B}$ , thus  $\overline{A \cup B} \subset \overline{A} \cup \overline{B}$ . Notice also that if C is closed, then C will be one of the sets in the intersection of all closed sets containing C, and thus  $C = \overline{C}$ , hence  $\overline{\overline{A} \cup \overline{B}} = \overline{A} \cup \overline{B}$  as the finite union of closed sets is closed. For the reverse direction, notice that  $A \subset A \cup B$ , thus by part (a)  $\overline{A} \subset \overline{A} \cup \overline{B}$ . Similarly,  $\overline{B} \subset \overline{A} \cup \overline{B}$ , and  $\overline{A \cup B} = \overline{A} \cup \overline{B}$ .
  - (c) By the above, since  $A_{\alpha} \in \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Delta} A_{\alpha}$ , we have that  $\overline{A_{\alpha}} \subset \overline{\bigcup_{\alpha \in \Delta} A_{\alpha}}$ , and since this holds for all  $\alpha \in \Delta$ , we have that  $\bigcup_{\alpha \in \Delta} \overline{A_{\alpha}} \subset \overline{\bigcup_{\alpha \in \Delta} A_{\alpha}}$ . A clean counterexample is as follows: [1/n, 1] is closed in the standard topology of  $\mathbb{R}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , thus  $\overline{[1/n, 1]} = [1/n, 1]$  by the above, yet

$$\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}[1/n,1]=(0,1]$$

who's closure is [0, 1], which is strictly larger than the LHS.

- 3. Given two distinct points  $(x_1, y_1)$  and  $(x_2, y_2)$  in  $X \times Y$ , since X is Hausdorff there exist an open  $X_1 \subset X$  with  $x_1 \in X_1$  and another open  $X_2 \subset X$  with  $x_2 \in X_2$  and  $X_1 \cap X_2 = \emptyset$ . Thus  $(x_1, y_1) \in X_1 \times Y$  and also  $(x_2, y_2) \in X_2 \times Y$ . Finally,  $(X_1 \times Y) \cap (X_2 \times Y) = (X_1 \cap X_2) \times Y = \emptyset \times Y = \emptyset$ , and hence we are done, as both  $X_1 \times Y$  and  $X_2 \times Y$  are open in the product topology. We remark that we never used the condition that Y is Hausdorff.
- 4. Suppose that X is Hausdorff. Note that  $\Delta^c = \{(x, y) \in X \times X \mid x \neq y\}$ , and take any point  $(x, y) \in \Delta^c$ . By the Hausdorff condition there exists a  $U_1 \subset X$  so that  $x \in U_1$  and  $U_2 \subset X$  so that  $y \in U_2$  with  $U_1 \cap U_2 = \emptyset$ . I claim that  $U_1 \times U_2 \subset \Delta^c$ . Indeed, the condition  $U_1 \cap U_2 = \emptyset$

shows that the x and y values of this product are never equal. By the union lemma  $\Delta^c$  is open.

For the reverse direction, suppose that  $\Delta^c$  is open, and let  $x \neq y$  both in X. Since the product topology has basis

$$\mathcal{B} = \{U \times V \mid U \subset X \text{ open}, \ V \subset X \text{ open}\}\$$

we may write  $\Delta^c = \bigcup U_\alpha \times V_\alpha$ . Since  $(x, y) \in \Delta^c$ ,  $(x, y) \in U \times V$  for some U, V both open in X. Notice that  $U \cap V = \emptyset$ , since if there was some point  $x \in U \cap V$ , then  $(x, x) \in U \times V$ , which would say  $(x, x) \in \Delta^c$ , which can't be. Thus X is Hausdorff.

- 5. (a) Suppose there was an  $a \in A^{\circ} \cap \partial A$ . Since  $A^{\circ}$  is open, we have found an open neighborhood of a fully contained in A, which contradicts the fact that a is a boundary point of A. Thus  $A^{\circ} \cap \partial A = \emptyset$ . Second, we recall that  $\overline{A} = A \cup \partial A$ . I claim that  $A^{\circ} \cup \partial A = A \cup \partial A$ . The forward direction is clear. Given any  $a \in A \cup \partial A$ , either  $a \in A$ , or  $a \in \partial A$ . The second case is trivial. Now, either there is an open neighborhood U of A intersects  $A^{\circ}$ . In the first case, A is an open neighborhood contained in A, thus  $A \in A$  by definition. The second case states precisely that A is a boundary point of A (Note: any open neighborhood A of A intersects A since A is a boundary point of A (Note: any open neighborhood A of A intersects A since A is a boundary point of A (Note: any open neighborhood A of A intersects A since A is a boundary point of A (Note: any open neighborhood A intersects A since A is a boundary point of A (Note: any open neighborhood A intersects A since A is a boundary point of A intersects A since A is a boundary point of A intersects A since A is a boundary point of A intersects A since A is a boundary point of A intersects A intersects A in the first case, A is a boundary point of A intersects A in the first case, A in the first case, A is a boundary point of A in the first case, A is a boundary point of A in the first case, A in the first case, A is a boundary point of A in the first case, A is a boundary point of A in the first case, A is a boundary point of A in the first case, A is a boundary point of A in the first case, A is a boundary point of A in the first case, A is a boundary point of A in the first case, A is a boundary point of A in the first case, A is a boundary point of A in the first case, A is a boundary point of A in the first case, A is a boundary point of A in the first case, A is a boundary point of A
  - (b) I showed above  $A = \overline{A}$  iff A is closed, and similarly, if A is open, then A is an open set contained in A, thus  $A^{\circ} \supset A$ . The reverse direction is by definition, hence  $A = A^{\circ}$ . Thus  $A = A^{\circ}$  iff A is open (again, the interior is clearly open). If  $\partial A = \emptyset$ , then  $\overline{A} = A^{\circ}$  by part (a). Since  $A^{\circ} \subset A \subset \overline{A} = A^{\circ}$ , we have  $A = A^{\circ} = \overline{A}$ , which shows that A is clopen. For the reverse direction, note that if A is clopen then  $A = \overline{A} = A^{\circ}$ , and hence  $A^{\circ} = \overline{A} = A^{\circ} \cup \partial A$ . Thus,  $\emptyset = A^{\circ} \cap \partial A = (A^{\circ} \cup \partial A) \cap \partial A = (A^{\circ} \cap \partial A) \cup (\partial A \cap \partial A) = \emptyset \cup \partial A = \partial A$ .
  - (c) Since A is open, by the above  $\overline{A} = A^{\circ} \cup \partial A = A \cup \partial A$ . Since  $A^{\circ} \cap \partial A = A \cap \partial A = \emptyset$ , we have that  $\partial A \subset A^{c}$ , thus  $(A \cup \partial A) \setminus A = (A \cup \partial A) \cap A^{c} = (A \cap A^{c}) \cup (\partial A \cap A^{c}) = \partial A \cap A^{c} = \partial A$ , thus  $\overline{A} \setminus A = \partial A$ . For the reverse direction, if  $\partial A = \overline{A} \setminus A$ , let  $x \in A$ . By construction  $x \notin \partial A$ . This says that there is a neighborhood U of x so that  $V \cap A = \emptyset$  or  $U \cap A^{c} = \emptyset$ . The first condition is obviously false, since  $x \in A$ , thus  $U \cap A^{c} = \emptyset$ , or  $U \subset A$ . By the union lemma A is open, and we are done.
  - (d) This is not true. Consider  $X = \{1,2\}$  with the topology  $\mathcal{T} = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{1,2\}\}$ . It suffices to prove finite intersection on two sets. So let  $U, V \in \mathcal{T}$ . If either is empty, their intersection is empty. If neither are empty, they are either both  $\{1\}$ , both  $\{1,2\}$ , or one is  $\{1\}$  and the other is  $\{1,2\}$ . In the first and last case the intersection is  $\{1\}$ , and in the middle case the intersection is  $\{1,2\}$ . For arbitrary union, either one of the sets is  $\{1,2\}$ , or all are not  $\{1,2\}$ . In the first case the union is  $\{1,2\}$ , in the second case, if all sets are the empty set, the union is the empty set. Else, at least one is  $\{1\}$ , thus the union is  $\{1\}$ , since it can't be any bigger by the last sentence. Now, the only closed sets are  $\{\emptyset, \{2\}, \{1,2\}\}$ . The only one of those containing  $\{1\}$  is  $\{1,2\}$ , thus  $\overline{\{1\}} = \{1,2\}$ . Since  $\{1,2\}$  is open,  $\{1,2\}^\circ = \{1,2\}$ . This is strictly bigger than  $\{1\}$ , so we have disproven the claim.

- 6. The constant function 1 is never 0, thus  $V(1) = \emptyset$ . The constant function 0 is always 0, so  $V(0) = \mathbb{R}^n$ . If  $x \in V(f) \cap V(g)$ , then f(x) = 0 and f(g) = 0. Thus  $x \in V(f,g)$ . If  $x \in V(f,g)$ , then f(x) = 0 and g(x) = 0, thus  $x \in V(f)$  and  $x \in V(g)$ , hence  $x \in V(f) \cap V(g)$ . Finally, if  $x \in V(f) \cup V(g)$ , then f(x) = 0 or g(x) = 0. WLOG the first case is true, thus  $(f \cdot g)(x) = f(x)g(x) = 0 \cdot g(x) = 0$ . If  $(f \cdot g)(x) = 0$ , then since  $\mathbb{R}$  is an integral domain f(x) = 0 or g(x) = 0. Thus  $x \in V(f) \cup V(g)$ .
- 7. One recalls that nonconstant polynomials of finite degree in one variable have only finitely many roots. Thus, for any polynomial  $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ , we have three cases:  $V(f) = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $V(f) = \emptyset$ , or V(f) is a finite set. I claim that  $V(x^2 + y^2 - 1)$ , the circle, is not closed in  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ . First we shall show that  $V(x^2 + y^2 - 1) \not\subset V(f) \times V(g)$ , unless  $V(f) = V(g) = \mathbb{R}$ . WLOG  $V(f) \neq \mathbb{R}$ . If  $V(f) = \emptyset$ , we are done, since the product of the empty set with anything is empty. Else, V(f) is finite. The circle has uncountably many points at different x-values, thus will most certainly have a point with x value not in V(f). Now, suppose that  $V(x^2 + y^2 - 1) = \bigcap_{f_\alpha, g_\alpha \in \Delta} V(f_\alpha) \times V(g_\alpha)$ . If all  $V(f_\alpha) \times V(g_\alpha) = \mathbb{R}^2$ , we certainly don't have equality, so there exists one  $V(f) \times V(g) \neq \mathbb{R}^2$ . This would say that  $V(x^2 + y^2 - 1) \subset V(f) \times V(g)$ , with not both  $\mathbb{R}$ , which we proved above impossible. In the general case where we have  $V(T) \times V(G)$ , we could indeed run the same argument and say there must be one that is not all of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , which then  $V(x^2+y^2-1)\subset V(T)\times V(G)\subset V(f)\times V(g)$ for some  $f \in T$  and  $g \in G$  not both equivalently 0 but we proved that false. Notice that  $V(T) \cup V(G) = \bigcap_{f \in T} V(f) \cup \bigcap_{g \in G} V(g) = \bigcap_{f \in T, g \in G} V(f) \cup V(g) = \bigcap_{f \in T, g \in G} V(f) \cup V(g) = \bigcap_{f \in T, g \in G} V(fg)$ , and if we let  $U = \{fg \mid f \in T, g \in G\}$ , we would have this union equal to V(fg). Thus finite union may be expressed as another V(T). So if we had  $V(x^2 + y^2 - 1) =$ finite union, we would have it equal to V(T), which we showed above impossible (from the arbitrary intersection).