

Theorem (Heine-Borel) Closed bounded intervals are compact.

Proof. We argue by contradiction. Suppose  $[a, b]$  is a closed and bounded interval which is not compact. Then there exists a family of sets  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_\alpha : \alpha \in A\}$  such that

- ①  $[a, b] \subseteq \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} U_\alpha$ ;
- ② for all  $\alpha \in A$ ,  $U_\alpha$  is an open set;
- ③ for any finite subset  $B$  of  $A$ ,  $[a, b]$  is not a subset of  $\bigcup_{\alpha \in B} U_\alpha$ .

We now inductively construct a sequence of intervals  $\{I_n\}_n = \{[a_n, b_n]\}_n$  with the following properties:

- ①  $I_1 = [a, b]$ ;
- ② For each  $n$ ,  $I_{n+1}$  is either the left or the right half of  $I_n$ ;
- ③ For each  $n$ ,  $I_n$  is not a subset of  $\bigcup_{\alpha \in B} U_\alpha$  for any finite subset  $B$  of  $A$ .

Base step Choose  $I_1 = [a, b]$ . Then by assumption, property

- ③ holds for  $n=1$ .

Inductive step Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and suppose we have  $I_1, \dots, I_n$  satisfying ①, ②, and ③. Look at the left and right halves of  $I_n$ . If both of these were covered by finitely many of the sets in  $\mathcal{U}$ , then so would  $I_n$  be covered by finitely many of the sets of  $\mathcal{U}$ . But by the inductive hypothesis, this does not happen. So we define

$$I_{n+1} = \begin{cases} \text{Left half of } I_n & \text{if the left half cannot} \\ & \text{be covered by finitely} \\ & \text{many elements of } \mathcal{U} \\ \text{right half of } I_n & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This completes the proof of the induction.

By the Nested Intervals Theorem, there exists a unique  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} I_n = \{x\}.$$

In particular,  $x \in [a, b]$ , so since  $\mathcal{U}$  covers  $[a, b]$ , there exists  $\alpha_0 \in A$  such that  $x \in U_{\alpha_0}$ .

Since  $U_{x_0}$  is open, there exists  $r > 0$  such that  
$$I_r(x) \subseteq U_{x_0}.$$

Since  $b_n - a_n \rightarrow 0$ , we can choose  $n_0$  such that  $b_{n_0} - a_{n_0} < r$ .  
I claim that

$$I_{n_0} \subseteq I_r(x).$$

To see why, let  $w \in I_{n_0}$ . Since also  $x \in I_{n_0}$ , then

$$|w - x| < b_{n_0} - a_{n_0} < r,$$

so  $w \in I_r(x)$ . This proves the claim.

Thus  $I_{n_0} \subseteq I_r(x) \subseteq U_{x_0}$ , and so a single set of  $\mathcal{U}$  contains  $I_{n_0}$ . This contradicts property ③ of  $I_{n_0}$ , and so we are done.

□