

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

CONTINUA IN THE STONE-ČECH REMAINDER OF R^2

ALICIA B. WINSLOW

CONTINUA IN THE STONE-CECH REMAINDER OF R^2

ALICIA BROWNER

In this paper it is shown that $\beta R^2 - R^2$ contains 2^c non-homeomorphic continua. This extends the result already known for dimension three and greater.

Introduction. In [5], it is shown that for $n \geq 3$, there are 2^c nonhomeomorphic continua in $\beta R^n - R^n$. The proof involves embedding solenoids in R^3 , and hence does not work for the cases $n = 1, 2$. In this paper, we prove that $\beta R^2 - R^2$ also contains 2^c nonhomeomorphic subcontinua. While this implies the result for $(n) \geq 3$, the construction in [5] also exhibits c continua in $\beta R^3 - R^3$ with non-isomorphic first Cech cohomology groups, and 2^c compacta in $\beta R^3 - R^3$, no two of which have the same shape. Also, it seems reasonable that the continua constructed in $\beta R^3 - R^3$ may be shown to have different shapes, or even nonisomorphic first Cech cohomology groups. In the case of $\beta R^2 - R^2$, it seems unlikely that any additional shape-theoretic results can be obtained with this construction. The case $n = 1$ is yet unsolved.

Preliminaries. Let βX denote the Stone-Cech compactification of a space X . For references, see Gillman and Jerison [1], or Walker [4]. The Stone-Cech remainder of X , $\beta X - X$, will be denoted by X^* . Note that the remainder of a closed subset of R^n is contained in $\beta R^n - R^n$. Also, the image under a rotation of R^2 of a set in R^2 of the form $\{(x, y): x \geq 0, \alpha \leq y \leq \gamma; \alpha, \gamma \in R\}$ will be called a thickened ray.

Main result.


THEOREM. *There are 2^c nonhomeomorphic continua in $\beta R^2 - R^2$.*

Proof. For the sake of clarity, we consider first the construction of c nonhomeomorphic continua in $\beta R^2 - R^2$. We will then apply these arguments and results in the construction of 2^c nonhomeomorphic continua in $\beta R^2 - R^2$.

Consider a collection $\{P_a: a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ where each P_a is an infinite subset of positive integers; for $a \neq b$, either $P_a - P_b \neq \emptyset$ or $P_b - P_a \neq \emptyset$; and $\text{card } \mathcal{A} = c$. For $p \in P_a$, consider the two rays $\{(x, y): x \geq 0, y = 1/p\}$ and $\{(x, y): x \geq 0, y = 1/(p+1)\}$. Between these rays, consider p disjoint thickened rays, say $T_a(p, n)$, where $n = 1, 2, \dots, p$, and labeled so that if $n_1 < n_2$, the y -coordinate of

any point in $T_a(p, n_1)$ is greater than the y -coordinate of points in $T_a(p, n_2)$.

Let $L(n) = \{(x, y): x \geq 0, y = 1/n\}$, and let $C(n) = \{(x, y): x^2 + y^2 = n, x \geq 0, 0 \leq y \leq 1\}$. Hence we have the following situation:



The continuum X will be formed as follows. Let T_a denote the union of the Stone-Cech remainders of the thickened rays $T_a(p, n)$, L the union of the remainders of the rays $L(n)$, and C the remainder of the union of the curves $C(n)$. X will be the closure in βR^2 of the union of these sets, i.e. $X = \bar{T}_a \cup \bar{L} \cup C$. One can verify that X is a continuum $\beta R^2 - R^2$. (Note that X is not the Stone-Cech remainder of the closure in R^2 of the union of the rays and curves.) For a different subset P_b of positive integers, we define T_b analogously, and let $Y = \bar{T}_b \cup \bar{L} \cup C$. Then Y is also a continuum in $\beta R^2 - R^2$.

We will show that X and Y are not homeomorphic. Suppose h is a homeomorphism from X onto Y . We begin by showing that $h(\bar{T}_a) = \bar{T}_b$.

Suppose $x \in T_a^*(p, n) = \beta(T_a(p, n)) - T_a(p, n)$ for some $p \in P_a$, $1 \leq n \leq p$, so that x is not an element of $\bar{C} - \bar{T}_a$. Then, since $T_a^*(p, n) \cap \bar{L} = \emptyset$, there is a neighborhood $N(x)$ of x in X such that $N(x) \subseteq T_a^*(p, n)$. Suppose $h(x)$ is not an element of \bar{T}_b . Then $h(x) \in \bar{L}$ or $h(x) \in C - (\bar{L} \cup \bar{T}_b)$. But $C - (\bar{L} \cup \bar{T}_b)$ is open in Y , so each point of $C - (\bar{L} \cup \bar{T}_b)$ has a neighborhood of dimension ≤ 1 , since $\dim(C) = 1$. Since any neighborhood of x has dimension 2 (by claim 2, Theorem 6 of [5]), $h(x)$ cannot be an element of $C - (\bar{L} \cup \bar{T}_b)$. Hence, $h(x) \in \bar{L}$. Then $h(N(x))$ is a neighborhood of $h(x)$, which implies there is a point $y \in L$ such that $y \in h(N(x))$. But since $y \in L$, y has neighborhoods of dimension ≤ 1 , while every neighborhood of $h^{-1}(y)$ has dimension 2, since $h^{-1}(y) \in N(x)$ and $N(x) \subseteq T_a^*(p, n)$. This is a contradiction, and so $h(x) \in \bar{T}_b$.

By an argument similar to the proof of claim 3, Theorem 6 of

[5], every point of $T_a^*(p, n)$ is a limit point of such points x , so $h(T_a^*(p, n)) \subseteq \bar{T}_b$, for every (p, n) with $p \in P_a$, $1 \leq n \leq p$. Therefore, $h(T_a) \subseteq \bar{T}_b$, which implies $h(\bar{T}_a) \subseteq \bar{T}_b$. Similarly, $h(\bar{T}_b) \subseteq \bar{T}_a$, and so $h(\bar{T}_a) = \bar{T}_b$.

Now, h must take the isolated components of \bar{T}_a to the isolated components of \bar{T}_b . These are precisely the sets $T_a^*(p, n)$ and $T_b^*(q, m)$, respectively. So, for every (p, n) with $p \in P_a$, $1 \leq n \leq p$, we have $h(T_a^*(p, n)) = T_b^*(q, m)$ for some $q \in P_b$, $1 \leq m \leq q$.

Since $a \neq b$, either $P_a - P_b \neq \emptyset$ or $P_b - P_a \neq \emptyset$, so without loss of generality assume $P_b - P_a \neq \emptyset$, and let $q \in P_b - P_a$. For some (p, n) , $p \in P_a$, $1 \leq n \leq p$, $h(T_a^*(p, n)) = T_b^*(q, 1)$. We may assume $p < q$ since $p \neq q$. Then there are integers m, m' such that $1 \leq m \leq q$, $1 \leq m' \leq q$, with $h^{-1}(T_b^*(q, m)) = T_a^*(p, i)$ for some i , and $h^{-1}(T_b^*(q, m')) = T_a^*(p', n')$ for some $p' \in P_a$, $p' \neq p$, $1 \leq n \leq p'$, and $|m - m'| = 1$. Now, $T_b^*(q, m)$ and $T_b^*(q, m')$ separate Y into two connected components and one disconnected component (since $|m - m'| = 1$). However, $h^{-1}(T_b^*(q, m)) = T_a^*(p, i)$ and $h^{-1}(T_b^*(q, m')) = T_a^*(p', n')$ separate X into three connected components, since $p \neq p'$. This is a contradiction; hence X and Y are not homeomorphic.

So far, we have constructed c continua in $\beta R^2 - R^2$ no two of which are homeomorphic. We will now modify the construction to obtain 2^c nonhomeomorphic continua in $\beta R^2 - R^2$.

Let $S \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ such that $\text{card } S = c$. There is a one-to-one correspondence between elements of S and real numbers r such that $0 \leq r < 2\pi$. So, each $a \in S$ corresponds to a unique $r_a \in [0, 2\pi)$. Let $h_{r_a}: R^2 \rightarrow R^2$ be a rotation of R^2 by r_a radians. For each element, a , of S we will construct a continuum in the manner of the first section, except along the ray $h_{r_a}(\{(x, y): x \geq 0, y = 0\})$. We will then take the union of these along with the Stone-Cech remainder of the set $\bigcup_{n \geq 1} \{(x, y): x^2 + y^2 = n\}$. More precisely, let $R_a(p, n) = h_{r_a}(T_a(p, n))$, $p \in P_a$, $1 \leq n \leq p$, and $Q_a(n) = h_{r_a}(L(n))$. Then, let R_S denote the union of the Stone-Cech remainders of the thickened rays $R_a(p, n)$, where $a \in S$, $p \in P_a$, $1 \leq n \leq p$; Q the union of the remainders of the rays $Q_a(n)$; and K the remainder of the union of the circles $\{(x, y): x^2 + y^2 = n\}$, $n \geq 1$. Let X be the closure in βR^2 of the union of the sets, i.e., $X = \bar{R}_S \cup \bar{Q} \cup K$. One can verify that X is a continuum. For another subset T of \mathcal{A} such that $T \neq S$ and $\text{card } T = c$, we define R_T analogously, and let $Y = \bar{R}_T \cup \bar{Q} \cup K$. Then Y is also a continuum in $\beta R^2 - R^2$.

We will show that X and Y are not homeomorphic. Suppose h is a homeomorphism from X onto Y , and consider $\bar{R}_S \cup \bar{Q}$. Fix $a \in S$, and let N_1, N_2 be neighborhoods of the ray $h_{r_a}(\{(x, y): x \geq 0, y = 0\})$ of radius 2, 3 respectively. Let $f: R^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a continuous

function such that $f(N_1) = 0$ and $f(R^2 - N_2) = 1$. Then f has a continuous extension, βf , to all of βR^2 . For $p \in P_a$, $1 \leq n \leq p$ and $m \geq 1$, since $R_a(p, n)$ and $Q_a(m)$ are contained in N_1 , $\beta f(R_a^*(p, n))$ and $\beta f(Q_a^*(m))$ are both 0. On the other hand, if $a \neq a' \in S$, $q \in P_{a'}$, $1 \leq n' \leq q$, and $m' \geq 1$, then outside of some compact set (that depends on a') $R_{a'}(q, n')$ and $Q_{a'}(m')$ are subset of N_2 . Therefore, $\beta f(R_{a'}^*(q, n'))$ and $\beta f(Q_{a'}^*(m'))$ are both 1. This implies that the closure of the union of all sets of the form $R_a^*(p, n)$ ($p \in P_a$, $1 \leq n \leq p$) and $Q_a^*(m)$ ($m \geq 1$) is isolated in $\bar{R}_S \cup \bar{Q}$. Hence, an argument identical to the one in the preceding section shows that $h(\bar{R}_S) = \bar{R}_T$.

Now, h must take the isolated components of \bar{R}_S to the isolated components of \bar{R}_T . These are precisely the sets $R_a^*(p, n)$, $a \in S$, and $R_b^*(q, m)$, $b \in T$, respectively. So for every $a \in S$ and (p, n) with $p \in P_a$, $1 \leq n \leq p$, we have $h(R_a^*(p, n)) = R_b^*(q, m)$, for some $b \in T$, $q \in P_b$, $1 \leq m \leq q$.

Either $S - T \neq \emptyset$ or $T - S \neq \emptyset$, so without loss of generality assume $T - S \neq \emptyset$, and let $b_0 \in T - S$. Let $q \in P_{b_0}$ and consider $R_{b_0}^*(q, 1)$. For some $a_0 \in S$, $p \in P_{a_0}$, and $1 \leq n \leq p$, $h(R_{a_0}^*(p, n)) = R_{b_0}^*(q, 1)$. Since $a_0 \neq b_0$, by an argument similar to the one used to show the continua in the first section were not homeomorphic, not every component of the form $R_{b_0}^*(q', m)$ can have as its inverse image under h a component of the form $R_{a_0}^*(p', n')$. Hence, there is an element a_1 of S , $p' \in P_{a_1}$, and $1 \leq n' \leq p'$, such that $a_1 \neq a_0$ and $h(R_{a_1}^*(p', n')) = R_{b_0}^*(q', m)$ for some $q' \in P_{b_0}$, $1 \leq m \leq q'$.

Now, $R_{a_0}^*(p, n)$ and $R_{a_1}^*(p', n')$ separate X into two connected components, each of which contains an infinite number of isolated components of \bar{R}_S . However, $h(R_{a_0}^*(p, n)) = R_{b_0}^*(q, 1)$ and $h(R_{a_1}^*(p', n')) = R_{b_0}^*(q', m)$ separate Y into either one connected and one disconnected component (in case $q = q'$, $m = 2$), or into two connected components where one contains an infinite number of isolated components of \bar{R}_T and the other contains only a finite number of isolated components of \bar{R}_T .

Since h is an onto homeomorphism that takes the isolated components of \bar{R}_S to the isolated components of \bar{R}_T , this is a contradiction. Hence, X and Y are not homeomorphic.

Since \mathcal{A} contains 2^c subsets of cardinality c , there are 2^c choices for X , no two of which are homeomorphic. Hence, since there are at most 2^c continua in $\beta R^2 - R^2$, there are exactly 2^c nonhomeomorphic continua in $\beta R^2 - R^2$.

COROLLARY. *Let X and Y be as in the proof of the above theorem. Then there does not exist a continuous map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ that is a shape equivalence. In particular, X and Y are not*

homotopic.

Proof. In [2], J. Keesling proved the following: Suppose Z is real compact and K is a continuum contained in $\beta Z - Z$. Then if $h(K) = L$ is any continuous map which is a shape equivalence, h is a homeomorphism. Hence, since X and Y are not homeomorphic, there does not exist such an f .

REMARK. In the first part of the proof of the theorem, it would have been simpler to let A be the union of the regular and thickened rays, along with the curves $C(n)$ and the positive x -axis, and let $X = \beta A - A \subseteq \beta R^2 - R^2$. However, in this case, any neighborhood of a point p in the remainder of the x -axis in X has dimension 2, yet is not in \bar{T}_a . The fact that any neighborhood of p has dimension 2 follows from the fact that if $\{B_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is a decreasing sequence of closed, n -dimensional sets in R^m , then for any point x in $B = \bigcap_{k \geq 1} B_k^*$, any neighborhood of x in B has dimension n . To see that p is not in \bar{T}_a , let $h: R^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ where $h(\{(x, y): x \geq 2, 0 \leq y \leq 1/(x^2)\}) = 1$, and $h(\{(x, y): x \geq 2, y \geq 1/x\}) = 0$. Then $h(\bar{T}_a) = 0$ implies $\beta h(\bar{T}_a) = 0$, but $\beta h(p) = 1$. Thus, if we had used the above definition for X instead of the one given in the proof of the theorem, we would not have been able to show that the sets $T_a^*(p, n)$ were sent to the sets $T_b^*(q, m)$ under the homeomorphism.

REFERENCES

1. L. Gillman and M. Jerison, *Rings of Continuous Functions*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1967.
2. J. Keesling, *Decompositions of the Stone-Cech compactification which are shape equivalences*, Pacific J. Math., **75** (1978), 455-466.
3. ———, *The Stone-Cech compactification and shape dimension*, Topology Proceedings, **2** (1977), 483-508.
4. R. C. Walker, *The Stone-Cech Compactification*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1974.
5. A. Browner Winslow, *There are 2° nonhomeomorphic continua in $\beta R^n - R^n$* , Pacific J. Math., **84** (1979), 233-239.

Received March 21, 1979.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
GAINESVILLE, FL 32611

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

DONALD BABBITT (Managing Editor)

University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

HUGO ROSSI

University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

C. C. MOORE AND ANDREW OGG

University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

J. DUGUNDJI

Department of Mathematics
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90007

R. FINN AND J. MILGRAM

Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

B. H. NEUMANN

F. WOLF

K. YOSHIDA

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Shashi Prabha Arya and M. K. Singal, <i>On the locally countable sum theorem</i>	1
John Theodore Baldwin and David William Kueker, <i>Ramsey quantifiers and the finite cover property</i>	11
Richard Body and Roy Rene Douglas, <i>Unique factorization of rational homotopy types</i>	21
Ethan Bolker and Ben G. Roth, <i>When is a bipartite graph a rigid framework?</i>	27
Alicia B. Winslow, <i>Continua in the Stone-Čech remainder of \mathbb{R}^2</i>	45
Richard D. Carmichael and Elmer Kinji Hayashi, <i>Analytic functions in tubes which are representable by Fourier-Laplace integrals</i>	51
Stephen D. Cohen, <i>The Galois group of a polynomial with two indeterminate coefficients</i>	63
Russell Allan Johnson, <i>Strong liftings commuting with minimal distal flows</i>	77
Elgin Harold Johnston, <i>The boundary modulus of continuity of harmonic functions</i>	87
Akio Kawauchi and Takao Matumoto, <i>An estimate of infinite cyclic coverings and knot theory</i>	99
Keith Milo Kendig, <i>Moiré phenomena in algebraic geometry: rational alternations in \mathbb{R}^2</i>	105
Roger T. Lewis and Lynne C. Wright, <i>Comparison and oscillation criteria for selfadjoint vector-matrix differential equations</i>	125
Teck Cheong Lim, <i>Asymptotic centers and nonexpansive mappings in conjugate Banach spaces</i>	135
David John Lutzer and Robert Allen McCoy, <i>Category in function spaces. I</i>	145
Richard A. Mollin, <i>Induced p-elements in the Schur group</i>	169
Jonathan Simon, <i>Wirtinger approximations and the knot groups of F^n in S^{n+2}</i>	177
Robert L. Snider, <i>The zero divisor conjecture for some solvable groups</i>	191
H. M. (Hari Mohan) Srivastava, <i>A note on the Konhauser sets of biorthogonal polynomials suggested by the Laguerre polynomials</i>	197
Nicholas Th. Varopoulos, <i>A probabilistic proof of the Garnett-Jones theorem on BMO</i>	201
Frank Arvey Wattenberg, <i>$[0, \infty]$-valued, translation invariant measures on N and the Dedekind completion of *R</i>	223