

1. Note on Paracompactness

By Kiiti MORITA

Department of Mathematics, Tokyo University of Education

(Comm. by K. KUNUGI, M.J.A., Jan. 12, 1961)

1. Suggested by a well-known theorem of C. H. Dowker [1] that a topological space is countably paracompact and normal if and only if the product space $X \times I$ is normal, we have established the following theorem in a previous paper [2].

Theorem 1.1. *A topological space X is m -paracompact and normal if and only if the product space $X \times I^m$ is normal, where m is an infinite cardinal number.*

Here a topological space X is called m -paracompact if any open covering of power $\leq m$ admits a locally finite open refinement, and I^m means the product space of m copies of I , where m is a cardinal number and I is the closed line interval $[0, 1]$. A topological space X is, by definition, paracompact if X is m -paracompact for any cardinal number m ; furthermore, X is paracompact if X is m -paracompact for a cardinal number m not less than the power of an open base of X . Accordingly, Theorem 1.1 gives a new characterization of paracompact spaces. Of course, " \aleph_0 -paracompact" is nothing else "countably paracompact".

The purpose of this paper is to prove the following theorem which is a generalization of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.2. *A topological space X is m -paracompact and normal if and only if the product space $X \times C^m$ is normal, where C is any compact metric space containing at least two points and C^m means the product space of m copies of C , and m is an infinite cardinal number.*

As a special case where C is a space consisting of exactly two points we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 1.3. *A topological space X is m -paracompact and normal if and only if the product space $X \times D^m$ is normal, where D is a discrete space consisting of two points and D^m means the product space of m copies of D , and m is a cardinal number ≥ 1 .*

The space D^m is called a Cantor space, and D^{\aleph_0} is the Cantor discontinuum.

It should be noted that in case $m = \aleph_0$, as far as the "if" part is concerned Theorem 1.3 gives a stronger form than Dowker's theorem while Theorem 1.1 gives a weaker form, and that for a finite cardinal number $m \geq 1$, Theorem 1.3 is true but Theorem 1.1 is not.