

# AMENABLE ACTIONS OF THE INFINITE PERMUTATION GROUP — LECTURE II

Juris Steprāns

York University

Young Set Theorists Meeting — March 2011, Bonn



## DEFINITION

The least cardinal of a generating set for a free ultrafilter on  $\omega$  is denoted by  $u$ .

## DEFINITION

The least cardinal of a filter  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $\omega$  such that there is no infinite  $X \subseteq \omega$  such that  $X \subseteq^* A$  — in other words,  $X \setminus A$  is finite — for all  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  is denoted by  $p$ .

## THEOREM (BELL)

The least cardinal  $\kappa$  for which  $MA_\kappa(\sigma\text{-centred})$  fails is equal to  $p$ .

The **Key Hypothesis** is the following: There is a generating set  $\{G_\xi\}_{\xi \in \kappa}$  for an ultrafilter on  $\omega$  such that there exist infinite  $A_\xi \subseteq \omega$  satisfying:

- $A_\xi \subseteq^* G_\eta$  for each  $\eta \leq \xi$
- $A_\xi \cap A_\eta$  is finite if  $\xi \neq \eta$ .

### LEMMA

*If  $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{u}$  then the Key Hypothesis is satisfied.*

To see this, let  $\{G_\xi\}_{\xi \in u}$  generate an ultrafilter  $\mathcal{F}$ . Choose inductively for each  $\xi \in u$  an infinite set  $A_\xi \notin \mathcal{F}$  such that

- $A_\xi \subseteq^* G_\eta$  for each  $\eta \leq \xi$
- $A_\xi \cap A_\eta$  is finite if  $\xi > \eta$ .

This can be done because  $\{G_\xi\} \cup \{G_\eta, \omega \setminus A_\eta\}_{\eta \in \xi}$  generates a filter and  $\xi < p$ .

## COROLLARY

*If  $p = c$  or  $u = \aleph_1$  then the Key Hypothesis holds.*

It will follow from the results of Lecture III that the Key Hypothesis fails in the model obtained by adding  $\aleph_2$  Cohen reals to a model of CH.

Given the Key Hypothesis, it can be assumed that  $A_\xi \subseteq G_\xi$  rather than just  $A_\xi \subseteq^* G_\xi$  for each  $\xi \in \kappa$ . Let  $A_\xi$  be enumerated by  $\omega \times \omega$  — in other words,  $A_\xi = \{a_\xi(i, j)\}_{(i, j) \in \omega \times \omega}$ . Let  $\omega \setminus G_\xi$  be enumerated by  $\{a_\xi(-1, j)\}_{j \in \omega}$ . Now define permutations  $\theta_{\xi, i}$ , for  $i \geq -1$ , as follows:

$$\theta_{\xi, i}(x) = \begin{cases} a_\xi(i+1, j) & \text{if } x = a_\xi(i, j) \\ a_\xi(i, j) & \text{if } x = a_\xi(i+1, j) \\ x & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Note that each  $\theta_{\xi, i}$  is an involution sending  $A_{\xi, i}$  to  $A_{\xi, i+1}$  and the  $A_{\xi, i}$  are pairwise disjoint where  $A_{\xi, i} = \{a_\xi(i, j)\}_{j \in \omega}$ . Let  $\mathbb{G}$  be the subgroup of  $\mathbb{S}(\omega)$  generated by  $\{\theta_{\xi, i}\}_{\xi \in \kappa, i \geq -1}$ .

The first thing to notice is that each element of  $\mathbb{G}$  preserves the ultrafilter  $\mathcal{F}$  generated by  $\{G_\xi\}_{\xi \in \kappa}$  — in other words, if  $\mu_{\mathcal{F}}(X) = 1$  if and only if  $X \in \mathcal{F}$  then  $\mu_{\mathcal{F}}$  is an invariant mean for the natural action of  $\mathbb{G}$  on  $\omega$ .

Moreover,  $\mu_{\mathcal{F}}$  is unique. To see this, suppose that  $\nu$  is another invariant mean on  $\omega$ . There must be some  $\xi$  such that  $\nu(\omega \setminus G_\xi) > 0$  and let  $k > \nu(\omega \setminus G_\xi)$ . Recall that  $A_{\xi,-1} = \omega \setminus G_\xi$  and  $A_{\xi,i} = \{a_\xi(i,j)\}_{j \in \omega}$  for  $i \geq 0$  and, hence,  $\theta_{\xi,i}(A_{\xi,i}) = A_{\xi,i+1}$  when  $-1 \leq i < k$ . Moreover  $A_{\xi,i} \cap A_{\xi,i'} = \emptyset$  if  $i \neq i'$ .

The invariance of  $\nu$  under  $\mathbb{G}$  then implies that  $\nu(\bigcup_{i=-1}^k A_{\xi,i}) = (k+2)\nu(\omega \setminus G_\xi) > 1$  contradicting that  $\nu$  is a probability measure.

The fact that  $\mathbb{G}$  is amenable will be established by showing that it satisfies the much stronger property of being locally finite. The Key Hypothesis will be crucial for the argument.

### DEFINITION

*If  $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}(\omega)$  then the support of  $\sigma$  is defined to be  $\{n \in \omega \mid \sigma(n) \neq n\}$ . If  $H \subseteq \mathbb{S}(\omega)$  then the support of  $H$  is defined to be the union of the supports of its elements.*

### LEMMA

*A finite subset  $H \subseteq \mathbb{S}(\omega)$  generates a finite group  $H'$  if and only if there is a uniform bound for the size of the orbits  $O_{H'}(\{n\})$  of  $n$  under  $H'$ .*

To see this, note first that  $|H'| \geq |O_{H'}(\{n\})|$  for each  $n \in \omega$ .

For the other direction suppose that  $M \geq |O_{H'}(\{n\})|$  for each  $n \in \omega$  and let  $\{W_n\}_{n \in \omega}$  list all the distinct orbits of  $H'$ . Let  $D_m = \{i \in \omega \mid |W_i| = m\}$  and for each  $i \in D_m$  let  $W_i = \{w_{i,j}\}_{j \in m}$ . For  $h \in H$  let

$$\Phi_h : D_m \rightarrow \mathbb{S}(m)$$

be defined by  $\Phi_h(i)(j) = k$  if and only if  $h(w_{i,j}) = w_{i,k}$ . Note that there is a partition

$$D_m = \bigcup \left\{ D_m^\phi \mid \phi : H \rightarrow \mathbb{S}(m) \right\}$$

such that  $\Phi_h(j) = \phi(h)$  for each  $h$  and  $j \in D_m^\phi$ .



Let  $H_m^\phi$  be the subgroup of  $\mathbb{S}(m)$  generated by  $\{\phi(h) \mid h \in H\}$ . It suffices to observe that  $H'$  is isomorphic to

$$\prod_{m \leq J} \prod_{\phi: H \rightarrow \mathbb{S}(m)} H_m^\phi$$

and that this is a finite group.

## LEMMA

*Let  $\theta$  be an involution that sends  $A$  to  $B$  and  $B$  to  $A$  and fixes all else. If  $H \subseteq \mathbb{S}(\omega)$  is a subgroup whose support is almost disjoint from  $A$  then  $H \cup \{\theta\}$  generates a finite group.*

To begin note that there is no loss of generality in assuming that the support of  $H$  is actually disjoint from  $A$ . To see this let  $Z$  be the orbit under  $H$  of the intersection of  $A$  with the support of  $H$ . This is finite and  $H = H_Z \times H_{\omega \setminus Z}$  where  $H_X = \{h \upharpoonright X \mid h \in H\}$ . The support of  $H_{\omega \setminus Z}$  is actually disjoint from  $A$ . Since  $H_Z$  consists only of permutations with finite support it follows that the group generated by  $H \cup \{\theta\}$  is finite if and only if the group generated by  $H_{\omega \setminus Z} \cup \{\theta\}$  is finite.

The argument will rely on showing that there is a uniform bound for  $|O_{H \cup \{\theta\}}(\{n\})|$ . To see that this is the case, it suffices to show that for any such  $n$ , if  $f$  is in the group generated by  $H \cup \{\theta\}$  then  $f(n)$  is equal to one of:

- $\theta h \theta(n)$
- $h \theta(n)$
- $\theta h(n)$
- or  $h(n)$

where  $h \in H$ . The reason this suffices is that there is a uniform bound for  $O_H(\{n\})$  and adding  $\theta$  will, at most, increase the size by a factor of 4.

An arbitrary element  $f$  of the group generated by  $H \cup \{\theta\}$  looks like

$$f = \theta^{n_0} h_0 \theta^{n_1} h_1 \dots \theta^{n_k} h_k \theta^{n_{k+1}}$$

and, keeping in mind that  $\theta$  is an involution, one of the following alternatives holds

$$f = \theta h_0 \theta h_1 \dots \theta h_k \theta$$

$$f = \theta h_0 \theta h_1 \dots \theta h_k$$

$$f = h_0 \theta h_1 \dots \theta h_k \theta$$

$$f = h_0 \theta h_1 \dots \theta h_k$$

All that needs to be checked now is that if  $h_0$  and  $h_1$  belong to  $H$  then...

...  $h_0\theta h_1(n)$  is equal to one of the following:

- $h_0\theta(n)$
- $h_0h_1(n)$
- $\theta h_1(n)$ .

To see this, first suppose that  $h_1(n) = n$ . Then  $h_0\theta h_1(n) = h_0\theta(n)$ .

Otherwise, it must be that  $h_1(n)$  is in the support of  $H$  and there are two possibilities. The first is that  $h_1(n)$  is not in the support of  $\theta$ . In this case  $h_0\theta h_1(n) = h_0h_1(n)$ . Otherwise, because the support of  $\theta$  is  $A \cup B$  and  $A$  is disjoint from the support of  $H$  it must be that  $h_1(n) \in B$ . Since  $\theta$  sends  $B$  to  $A$  it follows that  $\theta(h_1(n)) \in A$  and hence is not in the support of  $h_0$ . Therefore  $h_0\theta h_1(n) = \theta h_1(n)$ .

To finish the proof that  $\mathbb{G}$  is locally finite it suffices to show that any finite set of generators of  $\mathbb{G}$  generates a finite group. Recall that the Key Hypothesis provided a generating set  $\{G_\xi\}_{\xi \in \kappa}$  for an ultrafilter on  $\omega$  and infinite  $A_\xi \subseteq \omega$  satisfying:

- $A_\xi \subseteq^* G_\eta$  for each  $\eta \leq \xi$
- $A_\xi \cap A_\eta$  is finite if  $\xi \neq \eta$ .

and that this yields involutions  $\theta_{\xi,-1}$  from  $\omega \setminus G_\xi$  to a subset of  $A_\xi$  and  $\theta_{\xi,i} : A_{\xi,i} \rightarrow A_{\xi,i+1}$  such that the  $A_{\xi,i}$  are pairwise disjoint. Proceed by induction on the size of  $H \subseteq \mathbb{G}$  to show that  $H$  generates a finite set. When  $|H| = 1$  use that the generators are involutions.

Supposing the result is true for  $H$  of size  $n$  let  $|H| = n + 1$  and let  $\xi$  be the largest ordinal such that there is some  $j$  such that  $\theta_{\xi,j} \in H$ . Let  $J$  be the largest integer such that  $\theta_{\xi,J} \in H$ . It follows that  $A_{\xi,J+1}$  is almost disjoint from the support of the group generated by  $H \setminus \{\theta_{\xi,J}\}$ . Since  $\theta_{\xi,J}$  is an involution the preceding lemma implies that the group generated by  $\theta_{\xi,J}$  and  $H \setminus \{\theta_{\xi,J}\}$  is finite.

## QUESTION

*Is it possible to strengthen locally finite to some other condition?*

Abelian is not possible. Rosenblatt and Talagrand showed that no nilpotent subgroup of  $\mathbb{S}(\omega)$  acts with a unique mean and this was improved by Krasa to show that there is no solvable subgroup of  $\mathbb{S}(\omega)$  acts with a unique mean.

No countable subgroup of  $\mathbb{S}(\omega)$  acts with a unique mean and assuming MA there is no such group of cardinality less than  $2^{\aleph_0}$ .