## Solutions to Exercises on Topological Groups, Topology 2011

- (4.3 #13) Let G<sub>1</sub> and G<sub>2</sub> be topological groups. Since they are both Hausdorff, G<sub>1</sub>×G<sub>2</sub> is a Hausdorff topological space under the product topology. Also, i : G<sub>1</sub> × G<sub>2</sub> → G<sub>1</sub> × G<sub>2</sub> is continuous because p<sub>1,2</sub> ∘ i is continuous for each projection function. Similarly, m : (G<sub>1</sub> × G<sub>2</sub>) × (G<sub>1</sub> × G<sub>2</sub>) → G<sub>1</sub> × G<sub>2</sub> because its composition with the projection functions are continuous.
- 2.  $(4.3 \ \#14)$  We must check that  $\overline{H}$  is a group under  $\cdot$ , the operation of G. First, note that  $e \in H$ so  $e \in \overline{H}$ . If  $h \in \overline{H}$ , is  $h^{-1} \in \overline{H}$ ? If  $h \in H$ , then yes, clearly. So assume  $h \in \overline{H} \setminus H$ . bwoc, assume  $h^{-1} \notin \overline{H}$ . Then  $\exists$  an open set U containing  $h^{-1}$  such that  $U \cap H = \emptyset$ . Since i, the inverse function, is continuous,  $i^{-1}(U)$  is open in G, and  $h \in i^{-1}(U)$ . Since h is a limit point of H, there is a  $g \in i^{-1}(U) \cap H$ ,  $g \neq h$ . But then  $g^{-1} \in U \cap H$ , which is a contradiction. So  $h^{-1} \in \overline{H}$ . Finally, if  $h_1, h_2 \in \overline{H}$ , we need to show that  $h_1 \cdot h_2 \in \overline{H}$ . If they're both in H, this is clear. Assume  $h_1 \in \overline{H} \setminus H$ ,  $h_2 \in H$ , and bwoc assume  $h_1 \cdot h_2 \notin \overline{H}$ . So there is an open U such that  $h_1 \cdot h_2 \in U$  and  $U \cap H = \emptyset$ . Since m is continuous,  $m^{-1}(U)$  is open in  $G \times G$ , so there is an open set of the form  $U_1 \times U_2 \subset m^{-1}(U)$ , and  $h_1 \in U_1, h_2 \in U_2$ . Thus, there is a  $g \in U_1 \cap H$ , which implies  $(g, h_2) \in U_1 \times U_2 \subset m^{-1}(U)$ . But this is a contradiction, since  $g \cdot h_2 \in U \cap H$ . The case where  $h_1, h_2 \in \overline{H} \setminus H$  is similar.

To check that  $\bar{H}$  is normal if H is, we must show that  $g\bar{H}g^{-1} \subset \bar{H}$  for all  $g \in G$ . Since  $ghg^{-1} \in H$  for all  $h \in H$ , suppose  $h \in \bar{H} \setminus H$  and  $ghg^{-1} \notin \bar{H}$ . The there is an open U containing  $ghg^{-1}$  such that  $U \cap H = \emptyset$ . Note that  $(g, hg^{-1}) \in m^{-1}(U)$ , which is open, so there is an open set  $U_1 \times V_1 \subset m^{-1}(U)$ such that  $(g, hg^{-1}) \in U_1 \times V_1$ . Similarly, we can find  $\tilde{U}_1 \times \tilde{V}_1$  such that  $(h, g^{-1}) \in \tilde{U}_1 \times \tilde{V}_1 \subset m^{-1}(V_1)$ . Since  $h \in \bar{H} \setminus H$ , there is a point  $\hat{h} \in \tilde{U}_1 \cap H$ , and so

$$m(\hat{h}, g^{-1}) \in V_1 \quad m(g, \hat{h}g^{-1}) \in U, \quad g\hat{h}g^{-1} \in U \cap H,$$

since  $h \in H$  and H is normal. This is a contradiction.

3. (4.3 #15) Suppose  $m : G \times G \to G$  is continuous. Let C be closed. We must show that  $i^{-1}(C)$  is closed. Since G is compact and Hausdorff, this will follow if we can show that  $i^{-1}(C)$  is compact. Let  $\{V_{\alpha}\}$  be an open cover of  $i^{-1}(C)$ . Note that, since G is Hausdorff, the set  $\{e\}$  is closed, and hence also compact. [It is closed because, if  $g \in G \setminus e$ , since  $g \neq e$  there exists disjoint open sets  $U_g$  and  $V_e$  containing those points. But then  $U_g \subset (G \setminus e)$ , so  $G \setminus e$  is open.] Thus,  $m^{-1}(e)$  is closed, and hence compact. Note that  $G \times C$  is closed and compact, because it is the product of compact spaces, and so

$$K := m^{-1}(e) \cap (G \times C) = \{(g^{-1}, g) : g^{-1} \in C\}$$

is the intersection of two closed sets, so it is closed, and hence compact. Note that  $\{G \times V_{\alpha}\}$  is an open cover of K, and so there is a finite subcover  $\{G \times V_{\alpha_i}\}_{i=1}^n$ . But then  $\{V_{\alpha_i}\}_{i=1}^n$  is a finite subcover of  $i^{-1}(C)$ .

4. (4.3 #16) Let  $I_{-} \in O(n)$  be any fixed matrix with determinant -1. For example,

$$I_{-} := \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Consider the function  $h: SO(n) \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \to O(n), \mathbb{Z}_2 = \{1, -1\},\$ 

$$h(M,g) = \begin{cases} M & \text{if } g = 1\\ I_-M & \text{if } g = -1 \end{cases}$$

This is onto, because if  $N \in O(n)$  with  $\det(N) = 1$ , then h(N,1) = N, and if  $N \in O(n)$  with  $\det(N) = -1$ , then  $h(I_{-}^{-1}N, -1) = N$ . A similar calculation shows it is one-to-one. We need to check it is continuous with continuous inverse. Note that the function h is piecewise linear, and O(n) consists of two connected components - in fact it can be written as the union of two disjoint, open sets (matrices with determinant plus one and minus one) - and it is exactly on these two open sets that the function h is linear. Thus, it is a homeomorphism.

To determine if it is an isomorphism, note that, if it were, either  $SO(n) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$  and O(n) would both be abelian, or neither would be. For n = 2, SO(n) is abelian, because it is just the set of all rotations:

$$SO(2) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & -\sin\theta\\ \sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{pmatrix} : \theta \in [0, 2\pi) \right\} \cong S^1.$$

However, O(2) is not abelian, because the inversion  $I_{-}$  doesn't necessarily commute with a rotation. Let R be a rotation that doesn't commute with  $I_{-}$ . If the groups were isomorphic, we would have

$$R = h(R, 1) = h(R \cdot I, -1 \cdot -1) = h(R, -1) \cdot h(I, -1) = I_{-}RI_{-},$$

which could imply that  $I_{-}R = I_{-}^{-1}R = RI_{-}$ , which is a contradiction.

- 5. (4.3 #17) Since  $m : G \times G \to G$  is continuous and  $A \times B$  is compact,  $m(A \times B) = AB$  is compact. (Continuous images of compact sets are compact.)
- 6. (4.3 #18) Since  $e \in U$  and U is a neighborhood, there is an open set  $\tilde{V}$  such that  $e \in \tilde{V} \subset U$ . This implies that  $\tilde{V}^{-1} = i^{-1}(\tilde{V})$  is open. Also,  $m^{-1}(\tilde{V})$  is open and contains (e, e), so  $m^{-1}(\tilde{V}) \cap (\tilde{V} \times \tilde{V}^{-1})$  is open and nonempty. This implies it contains a basis element  $(e, e) \in (V_1 \times V_2)$ , and so we can set  $V := i^{-1}(V_1) \cap i^{-1}(V_2) \cap V_1 \cap V_2$ , which is open.
- 7. (4.3 # 19) Since H is a discrete subgroup,  $e \in H$  and  $\{e\}$  is open in the subspace topology, and hence there must be an open set U in G such that  $U \cap H = \{e\}$ . This set U is a neighborhood of e in G. I claim the translates hU are all disjoint. Note that  $h \in hU \cap H$ , since he = h. Suppose  $\exists g \in H$  such that  $g \in hU$ ,  $g \neq h$ . This implies  $e \in g^{-1}(hU) = (g^{-1}h)U$ , which implies that  $(g^{-1}h)^{-1} = h^{-1}g \in U$ . Since  $h^{-1}g \in H$  and  $h^{-1}g \neq e$ , this is a contradiction.
- 8. (4.3 #20) BWOC, if  $C \cap H$  is not finite, then by Bolzano-Weierstrass it has a limit point  $p \in C$ . First, note that  $p \notin H$ , which follows from the following argument. Since any open set U with  $p \in U$  satisfies  $U \cap (H \setminus p) \neq \emptyset$ , there is an  $h \in H$  such that  $h \neq p$ ,  $h \in U$ . But this would contradict the fact that H is discrete – it would imply that  $\{p\} \subset H$  is not open. Using the result of problem 19, let  $U_e$  be an open set containing the identity whose translates  $U_h = hU_e$  are disjoint. Using the result of problem 18, find an open set  $V \subset U_e$  such that  $VV^{-1} \subset U_e$ . Note that  $W = VV^{-1} = \bigcup_{g \in V} \{gV^{-1}\}$  is open, because the translate  $gV^{-1}$  is open since  $V^{-1}$  is, and so  $VV^{-1}$  is a union of open sets. Also, W contains e, and  $W^{-1} = W$ . Thus, pW is an open set containing p, so there is a  $h \in H$  such that

 $h \in pW$ . So, h = pg for some  $g \in W$ . Since  $g^{-1} \in W \subset U_e$  and  $p = hg^{-1}$ ,  $p \in hU_e$ . But then  $hU_e$  is an open set that contains p and that contains only one point  $h \in H$ . This contradicts the fact that p is a limit point: since the space is Hausdorff, we can now find an open set O containing p that doesn't contain h. Then  $O \cap hU_e$  is an open set containing p that contains no element of H.