Grigorieff forcing and automorphisms of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\operatorname{Fin}$

David Chodounský Institute of Mathematics AS CR

July 8, 2012

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

Let φ be an automorphism of the Boolean algebra $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\operatorname{Fin}$

A partial 1-1 function $f: A \rightarrow A$ is an almost permutation if $Dom(f) = A^* A = Rng(f)$

Each bijection $f \colon A \to B$ induces a homeomorphism $\psi \colon \mathcal{P}(A) / \operatorname{Fin} \to \mathcal{P}(B) / \operatorname{Fin}$ by $\psi([C]) = [f[C]]$ for $C \in \mathcal{P}(A)$

Definition

An automorphism φ of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/$ Fin is trivial iff it is induced by some almost permutation of ω .

A D F A 同 F A E F A E F A Q A

An automorphism φ of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\mathsf{Fin}$ is trivial iff it is induced by some almost permutation of ω .

Question

Is every automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\mathsf{Fin}$ *trivial?*



An automorphism φ of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\mathsf{Fin}$ is trivial iff it is induced by some almost permutation of ω .

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Question

Is every automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\mathsf{Fin}$ *trivial?*

Negative answers

• W. Rudin (1956): $CH \Rightarrow NO$

An automorphism φ of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/F$ in is trivial iff it is induced by some almost permutation of ω .

Question

Is every automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ / Fin *trivial?*

Negative answers

- W. Rudin (1956): $CH \Rightarrow NO$
- ▶ Baumgartner (198?): p-ultrafilter with character $\omega_1 \Rightarrow NO$

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

An automorphism φ of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\mathsf{Fin}$ is trivial iff it is induced by some almost permutation of ω .

Question

Is every automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\mathsf{Fin}$ *trivial?*

Negative answers

- W. Rudin (1956): $CH \Rightarrow NO$
- ▶ Baumgartner (198?): p-ultrafilter with character $\omega_1 \Rightarrow NO$

・ロト ・ 同 ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・ ヨ ・ うへつ

• van Douwen (198?): $\mathfrak{u} = \omega_1 \Rightarrow NO$

Is every automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ / Fin trivial?

Negative answers

- W. Rudin (1956): $CH \Rightarrow NO$
- ► Baumgartner (198?): p-ultrafilter with character $\omega_1 \Rightarrow NO$

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

• van Douwen (198?): $\mathfrak{u} = \omega_1 \Rightarrow NO$

Is every automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ / Fin trivial?

Negative answers

- W. Rudin (1956): $CH \Rightarrow NO$
- ▶ Baumgartner (198?): p-ultrafilter with character $\omega_1 \Rightarrow NO$
- van Douwen (198?): $\mathfrak{u} = \omega_1 \Rightarrow NO$

Positive answers

 Shelah (1982): Consistently YES (iterated oracle chain condition forcing)

Is every automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\mathsf{Fin}$ *trivial?*

Negative answers

- W. Rudin (1956): $CH \Rightarrow NO$
- ▶ Baumgartner (198?): p-ultrafilter with character $\omega_1 \Rightarrow NO$
- van Douwen (198?): $\mathfrak{u} = \omega_1 \Rightarrow NO$

Positive answers

 Shelah (1982): Consistently YES (iterated oracle chain condition forcing)

・ロト ・ 同 ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・ ヨ ・ うへつ

• Shelah, Steprans (1988): $PFA \Rightarrow YES$

Is every automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ / Fin trivial?

Negative answers

- W. Rudin (1956): $CH \Rightarrow NO$
- ▶ Baumgartner (198?): p-ultrafilter with character $\omega_1 \Rightarrow NO$
- van Douwen (198?): $\mathfrak{u} = \omega_1 \Rightarrow NO$

Positive answers

- Shelah (1982): Consistently YES (iterated oracle chain condition forcing)
- Shelah, Steprans (1988): $PFA \Rightarrow YES$
- ▶ Velickovic (1993): OCA + MA_{ω_1} ⇒ YES (but MA \Rightarrow YES)

Is every automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\mathsf{Fin}$ *trivial?*

Negative answers

- W. Rudin (1956): $CH \Rightarrow NO$
- ▶ Baumgartner (198?): p-ultrafilter with character $\omega_1 \Rightarrow NO$
- van Douwen (198?): $\mathfrak{u} = \omega_1 \Rightarrow NO$

Positive answers

- Shelah (1982): Consistently YES (iterated oracle chain condition forcing)
- Shelah, Steprans (1988): $PFA \Rightarrow YES$
- ▶ Velickovic (1993): OCA + MA_{ω_1} ⇒ YES (but MA \Rightarrow YES)

Question

Does $\mathfrak{d} = \omega_1$ imply that there is a non-trivial automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\operatorname{Fin}$?

Does $\mathfrak{d} = \omega_1$ imply that there is a non-trivial automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\operatorname{Fin}$?

Shelah, Steprans (2002): "∂ = ω₁ + all automorphism are somewhere trivial" is consistent

▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶ □ のQ@

Does $\mathfrak{d} = \omega_1$ imply that there is a non-trivial automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\operatorname{Fin}$?

- Shelah, Steprans (2002): "∂ = ω₁ + all automorphism are somewhere trivial" is consistent
- ► Shelah, Steprans (Recently): "a condition close to $\vartheta = \omega_1$ " ⇒ there is a non-trivial automorphism

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Does $\mathfrak{d} = \omega_1$ imply that there is a non-trivial automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\operatorname{Fin}$?

- Shelah, Steprans (2002): "∂ = ω₁ + all automorphism are somewhere trivial" is consistent
- Shelah, Steprans (Recently): "a condition close to
 ∂ = ω₁" ⇒ there is a non-trivial automorphism

Let φ be an automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/$ Fin. The ideal Triv φ consists of sets $A \subset \omega$, such φ is induced on A by some (almost) bijection $f \colon A \to \omega$.

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

Let φ be an automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/$ Fin. The ideal Triv φ consists of sets $A \subset \omega$, such φ is induced on A by some (almost) bijection $f \colon A \to \omega$.

Definition

Let S be a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$. The automorphism φ is trivial on S if Triv $\varphi \cap S \neq \emptyset$.

Let φ be an automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/$ Fin. The ideal Triv φ consists of sets $A \subset \omega$, such φ is induced on A by some (almost) bijection $f \colon A \to \omega$.

Definition

Let S be a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$. The automorphism φ is trivial on S if Triv $\varphi \cap S \neq \emptyset$.

- trivial \Leftrightarrow trivial on $\{\omega\}$
- somewhere trivial \Leftrightarrow trivial on $[\omega]^{\omega}$

Suppose φ is a non-trivial automorphism

Suppose φ is a non-trivial automorphism

 Option 1: Curing non-triviality of φ – add an almost permutation making φ trivial.

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Suppose φ is a non-trivial automorphism

 Option 1: Curing non-triviality of φ – add an almost permutation making φ trivial.
 Generally not possible!

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Suppose φ is a non-trivial automorphism

 Option 1: Curing non-triviality of φ – add an almost permutation making φ trivial.
 Generally not possible!

Option 2: Killing φ – add new subsets of ω so that φ cannot be extended to an automorphism in the extension.

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

Definition (Grigorieff's forcing) Let \mathcal{F} be a filter on ω . Put

$$G(\mathcal{F}) = \{ p \colon I
ightarrow 2; I \in \mathcal{F}^* \}$$

and p < q iff $q \subset p$.



Definition (Grigorieff's forcing) Let \mathcal{F} be a filter on ω . Put

$$G(\mathcal{F}) = \{ p \colon I
ightarrow 2; I \in \mathcal{F}^* \}$$

and p < q iff $q \subset p$.

Fact

Let \mathcal{F} be a non-meager p-filter. The Grigorieff's forcing $G(\mathcal{F})$ is proper and $^{\omega}\omega$ bounding of size c.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Definition (Grigorieff's forcing) Let \mathcal{F} be a filter on ω . Put

Let \mathcal{F} be a filter on ω . Put

$$G(\mathcal{F}) = \{ p \colon I
ightarrow 2; I \in \mathcal{F}^* \}$$

and p < q iff $q \subset p$.

Fact

Let \mathcal{F} be a non-meager p-filter. The Grigorieff's forcing $G(\mathcal{F})$ is proper and ${}^{\omega}\omega$ bounding of size \mathfrak{c} .

Theorem (Ch., Dow)

Let φ be an automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/$ Fin and let \mathcal{F} be a non-meager p-filter such that φ is not trivial on \mathcal{F} . Let g be the $G(\mathcal{F})$ -generic real. The family

$$\langle arphi(oldsymbol{p}^{-1}(1)), arphi(oldsymbol{p}^{-1}(0)) \colon oldsymbol{p} \in oldsymbol{g}
angle$$

is an unfilled gap (in V[g]).

Theorem (Ch., Dow)

Let φ be an automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/$ Fin and let \mathcal{F} be a non-meager p-filter such that φ is not trivial on \mathcal{F} . The family

 $\langle \varphi(p^{-1}(1)), \varphi(p^{-1}(0)) \colon p \in g \rangle$

is an unfilled gap (in V[g]).

Theorem (Abraham, Todorcevic)

(GCH) For each (ω_1, ω_1) gap \mathcal{A} there exist a proper ${}^{\omega}\omega$ bounding (not adding new reals) ω_2 -p.i.c. forcing which makes \mathcal{A} indestructible in the extension.

Theorem (Ch., Dow)

Let φ be an automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/$ Fin and let \mathcal{F} be a non-meager p-filter such that φ is not trivial on \mathcal{F} . The family

 $\langle \varphi(p^{-1}(1)), \varphi(p^{-1}(0)) \colon p \in g \rangle$

is an unfilled gap (in V[g]).

Theorem (Abraham, Todorcevic)

(GCH) For each (ω_1, ω_1) gap \mathcal{A} there exist a proper ${}^{\omega}\omega$ bounding (not adding new reals) ω_2 -p.i.c. forcing which makes \mathcal{A} indestructible in the extension.

Corollary

(GCH) Let φ be an automorphism which is not trivial on a non-meager p-filter \mathcal{F} .

There is a proper ${}^{\omega}\omega$ bounding ω_2 -p.i.c. forcing \mathbb{P} such that there is no automorphism extending φ in any ω_1 preserving extension of $V[G_{\mathbb{P}}]$.

Corollary

(GCH) Let φ be an automorphism which is not trivial on a non-meager p-filter \mathcal{F} .

There is a proper ${}^{\omega}\omega$ bounding ω_2 -p.i.c. forcing \mathbb{P} such that there is no automorphism extending φ in any ω_1 preserving extension of $V[G_{\mathbb{P}}]$.

Corollary

It is consistent with ZFC that $\mathfrak{d} = \omega_1$ and every automorphisms of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ / Fin is trivial on each non-meager p-filter.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Theorem (Ch., Dow)

Let φ be an automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/$ Fin and let \mathcal{F} be a non-meager p-filter such that φ is not trivial on \mathcal{F} . The family

$$\mathcal{A} = \langle arphi(p^{-1}(1)), arphi(p^{-1}(0)) \colon p \in g
angle$$

is an unfilled gap (in V[g]).

Proof.

Let \dot{y} be a $G(\mathcal{F})$ name for a real (a candidate for filling \mathcal{A}). Fix a countable elementary submodel M containing \dot{y} . M-generic condition q forces that \dot{y} looks like a Cohen name. (Cohen for adding generic subset of $\omega \setminus \text{Dom}(q)$.)

Proof.

Let \dot{y} be a $G(\mathcal{F})$ name for a real (a candidate for filling \mathcal{A}). Fix a countable elementary submodel M containing \dot{y} . M-generic condition q forces that \dot{y} looks like a Cohen name. (Cohen for adding generic subset of $\omega \setminus \text{Dom}(q)$.)

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Proof.

Let \dot{y} be a $G(\mathcal{F})$ name for a real (a candidate for filling \mathcal{A}). Fix a countable elementary submodel M containing \dot{y} . M-generic condition q forces that \dot{y} looks like a Cohen name. (Cohen for adding generic subset of $\omega \setminus \text{Dom}(q)$.)

Lemma

Let φ be a non-trivial automorphism and \mathcal{I} be a non-meager p-ideal. Suppose $F : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ is function continuous on a dense G_{δ} set.

There are $x \subset a \in \mathcal{I}$ such that

 $\mathbf{C} \Vdash F(\mathbf{v}) \cap \varphi(\mathbf{a}) \neq^* \varphi(\mathbf{x})$ for each $\mathbf{v} =^* \mathbf{x} \cup g_{\omega \setminus \mathbf{a}}$

where **C** is Cohen forcing and $g_{\omega \setminus a}$ is Cohen generic subset of $\omega \setminus a$.