

THE KATOWICE PROBLEM AND AUTOHOMEOMORPHISMS OF ω_0^*

DAVID CHODOUNSKÝ[†], ALAN DOW[‡], KLAAS PIETER HART, AND HARM DE VRIES

The other authors dedicate this paper to Alan, who doesn't look a year over 59

ABSTRACT. We show that the existence of a homeomorphism between ω_0^* and ω_1^* entails the existence of a non-trivial autohomeomorphism of ω_0^* . This answers Problem 441 in [8].

We also discuss the joint consistency of various consequences of ω_0^* and ω_1^* being homeomorphic.

INTRODUCTION

The Katowice problem, posed by Marian Turzański, is about Čech-Stone remainders of discrete spaces. Let κ and λ be two infinite cardinals, endowed with the discrete topology. The Katowice problem asks

If the remainders κ^* and λ^* are homeomorphic must the cardinals κ and λ be equal?

Since the weight of κ^* is equal to 2^κ it is immediate that the Generalized Continuum Hypothesis implies a yes answer. In joint work Balcar and Frankiewicz established that the answer is actually positive without any additional assumptions, *except possibly for the first two infinite cardinals*. More precisely

Theorem ([1, 5]). *If $\langle \kappa, \lambda \rangle \neq \langle \aleph_0, \aleph_1 \rangle$ and $\kappa < \lambda$ then the remainders κ^* and λ^* are not homeomorphic.*

This leaves open the following problem.

Question. Is it consistent that ω_0^* and ω_1^* are homeomorphic?

Through the years various consequences of “ ω_0^* and ω_1^* are homeomorphic” were collected in the hope that their conjunction would imply $0 = 1$ and thus yield a full positive answer to the Katowice problem.

In the present paper we add another consequence, namely that there is a non-trivial autohomeomorphism of ω_0^* . Whether this is a consequence was asked by Nyikos in [7], right after he mentioned the relatively easy fact that ω_1^* has a non-trivial autohomeomorphism if ω_0^* and ω_1^* are homeomorphic, see the end of Section 1.

After some preliminaries in Section 1 we construct our non-trivial autohomeomorphism of ω_0^* in Section 2. In Section 3 we shall discuss the consequences alluded to above and formulate a structural question related to them; Section 4 contains some consistency results regarding that structural question.

Date: Friday 21-08-2015 at 14:48:13 (cest).

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 54D40. Secondary: 03E05, 03E35, 06E05, 06E15, 54A35, 54D80.

Key words and phrases. Katowice problem, homeomorphism, non-trivial autohomeomorphism, Čech-Stone remainder, ω_0^* , ω_1^* , isomorphism, non-trivial automorphism, quotient algebra, $\mathcal{P}(\omega_0)/\text{fin}$, $\mathcal{P}(\omega_1)/\text{fin}$.

[†]Research of this author was supported by the GACR project I 1921-N25 and RVO: 67985840.

[‡]Research of this author was supported by NSF grant No. NSF-DMS-0901168.

1. PRELIMINARIES

We deal with Čech-Stone compactifications of discrete spaces exclusively. Probably the most direct way of defining $\beta\kappa$, for a cardinal κ with the discrete topology, is as the space of ultrafilters of the Boolean algebra $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$, as explained in [6] for example.

The remainder $\beta\kappa \setminus \kappa$ is denoted κ^* and we extend the notation A^* to denote $\text{cl}A \cap \kappa^*$ for all subsets of κ . It is well known that $\{A^* : A \subseteq \kappa\}$ is exactly the family of clopen subsets of κ^* .

All relations between sets of the form A^* translate back to the original sets by adding the modifier “modulo finite sets”. Thus, $A^* = \emptyset$ iff A is finite, $A^* \subseteq B^*$ iff $A \setminus B$ is finite and so on.

This means that we can also look at our question as an algebraic problem:

Question. Is it consistent that the Boolean algebras $\mathcal{P}(\omega_0)/\text{fin}$ and $\mathcal{P}(\omega_1)/\text{fin}$ are isomorphic?

Here *fin* denotes the ideal of finite sets. Indeed, the algebraically inclined reader can interpret A^* as the equivalence class of A in the quotient algebra and read the proof in Section 2 below as establishing that there is a non-trivial automorphism of the Boolean algebra $\mathcal{P}(\omega_0)/\text{fin}$.

1.1. Auto(homeo)morphisms. It is straightforward to define autohomeomorphisms of spaces of the form κ^* : take a bijection $\sigma : \kappa \rightarrow \kappa$ and let it act in the obvious way on the set of ultrafilters to get an autohomeomorphism of $\beta\kappa$ that leaves κ^* invariant. In fact, if we want to induce an autohomeomorphism on κ^* then it suffices to take a bijection between cofinite subsets of κ .

We shall call an autohomeomorphism of κ^* *trivial* if it is induced in the above way, otherwise we shall call it non-trivial. For example the simple shift $s : n \mapsto n+1$ on ω_0 determines an autohomeomorphism s^* of ω_0^* .

A non-trivial autohomeomorphism for ω_1^ .* For the reader’s edification and to give the flavour of the arguments in the next section we prove that the autohomeomorphism s^* of ω_0^* , introduced above, has no non-trivial invariant clopen sets. From this we shall deduce that if ω_0^* and ω_1^* are homeomorphic then ω_1^* must have a non-trivial autohomeomorphism.

Assume $A \subseteq \omega_0$ is such that $s^*[A^*] = A^*$; translated back to ω_0 this means that the symmetric difference of $s[A]$ and A is finite. Let $K \in \omega$ be so large that this symmetric difference is contained in K .

If $k \geq K$ and $k \in A$ then $k+1 \in s[A]$ and hence $k+1 \in A$, and likewise if $k \geq K$ and $k \notin A$ then $k+1 \notin s[A]$ and hence $k+1 \notin A$. It follows that if $K \in A$ then $\omega_0 \setminus K \subseteq A$ and so $A^* = \omega_0^*$, and if $K \notin A$ then $A \cap (\omega_0 \setminus K) = \emptyset$ and so $A^* = \emptyset$.

It is an elementary fact about ω_1 that for every subset A of ω_1 and every map $f : A \rightarrow \omega_1$ there are uncountably many $\alpha \in \omega_1$ such that $f[A \cap \alpha] \subseteq \alpha$; in particular, if f is a bijection between cofinite sets A and B one has $f[A \cap \alpha] = B \cap \alpha$ for arbitrarily large α . This then implies that trivial autohomeomorphisms of ω_1^* have many non-trivial clopen invariant sets.

And so, if ω_0^* and ω_1^* are homeomorphic then ω_1^* must have a non-trivial autohomeomorphism. This result can be found as Corollary 1 to Theorem 4.1 in [7], where the latter result is credited to [4]. The present argument is probably folklore.

2. A NON-TRIVIAL AUTO(HOMEO)MORPHISM

In this section we prove our main result. We let $\gamma : \omega_0^* \rightarrow \omega_1^*$ be a homeomorphism and use it to construct a non-trivial autohomeomorphism of ω_0^* .

We consider the discrete space of cardinality \aleph_1 in the guise of $\mathbb{Z} \times \omega_1$. A natural bijection of this set to itself is the shift to the right, defined by $\sigma(n, \alpha) = \langle n+1, \alpha \rangle$. The restriction, σ^* , of its Čech-Stone extension, $\beta\sigma$, to $(\mathbb{Z} \times \omega_1)^*$ is an autohomeomorphism. We prove that $\rho = \gamma^{-1} \circ \sigma^* \circ \gamma$ is a non-trivial autohomeomorphism of ω_0^* . To this end we assume there is a bijection $g : A \rightarrow B$ between cofinite sets that induces ρ and establish a contradiction.

2.1. Properties of σ^* and $(\mathbb{Z} \times \omega_1)^*$. We define three types of sets that will be useful in the proof: vertical lines $V_n = \{n\} \times \omega_1$, horizontal lines $H_\alpha = \mathbb{Z} \times \{\alpha\}$ and end sets $E_\alpha = \mathbb{Z} \times [\alpha, \omega_1)$.

These have the following properties.

Claim 2.1.1. $\sigma^*[V_n^*] = V_{n+1}^*$ for all n . □

Claim 2.1.2. $\{H_\alpha^* : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ is a maximal disjoint family of σ^* -invariant clopen sets.

Proof. It is clear that $\sigma^*[H_\alpha^*] = H_\alpha^*$ for all α .

To establish maximality of the family let $C \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \times \omega_1$ be infinite and such that $C \cap H_\alpha = {}^*\emptyset$ for all α ; then $A = \{\alpha : C \cap H_\alpha \neq \emptyset\}$ is infinite.

For each $\alpha \in A$ let $n_\alpha = \max\{n : \langle n, \alpha \rangle \in C\}$; then $\{\langle n_\alpha + 1, \alpha \rangle : \alpha \in A\}$ is an infinite subset of $\sigma[C] \setminus C$, and hence $\sigma^*[C^*] \neq C^*$. □

Claim 2.1.3. If $C \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \times \omega_1$ is such that $H_\alpha^* \subseteq C^*$ for uncountably many α then there is a subset S of V_0 such that $S^* \cap E_\alpha^* \neq \emptyset$ for all α and $(\sigma^*)^n[S^*] \subseteq C^*$ for all but finitely many n in \mathbb{Z} .

Proof. For each α such that $H_\alpha^* \subseteq C^*$ let F_α be the finite set $\{n : \langle n, \alpha \rangle \notin C\}$. There are a fixed finite set F and an uncountable subset A of ω_1 such that $F_\alpha = F$ for all $\alpha \in A$; $S = \{0\} \times A$ is as required. □

2.2. Translation to ω_0 and ω_0^* . We choose infinite subsets v_n (for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$), and h_α and e_α (for $\alpha \in \omega_1$) such that for all n and α we have $v_n^* = \gamma^\leftarrow[V_n^*]$, $h_\alpha^* = \gamma^\leftarrow[H_\alpha^*]$, and $e_\alpha^* = \gamma^\leftarrow[E_\alpha^*]$.

Thus we obtain an almost disjoint family $\{v_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{h_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ with properties analogous to those of the family $\{V_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{H_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$, these are

Claim 2.2.1. $g[v_n] = {}^*v_{n+1}$ for all n . □

Claim 2.2.2. $\{h_\alpha^* : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ is a maximal disjoint family of g^* -invariant clopen sets. □

Claim 2.2.3. If c is such that $h_\alpha \subseteq^* c$ for uncountably many α then there is a subset s of v_0 such that $s \cap e_\alpha$ is infinite for all α and such that $g^n[s] \subseteq^* c$ for all but finitely many n in \mathbb{Z} . □

2.3. Orbits of g . By defining finitely many extra values we can assume that at least one of A and B is equal to ω and, upon replacing σ by its inverse, we may as well assume that $A = \omega$.

For $k \in \omega$ we let $I_k = \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : g^n(k) \text{ is defined}\}$ and $O_k = \{g^n(k) : n \in I_k\}$ (the orbit of k).

We shall say that a set a splits a set b if both $b \cap a$ and $b \setminus a$ are nonempty.

Claim 2.3.1. Each h_α splits only finitely many orbits.

Proof. If h_α splits O_k then there is an $n \in I_k$ such that $g^n(k) \in h_\alpha$ but (at least) one of $g^{n+1}(k)$ and $g^{n-1}(k)$ is not in h_α . So either $g^{n+1}(k) \in g[h_\alpha] \setminus h_\alpha$ or $g^n(k) \in h_\alpha \setminus g[h_\alpha]$.

It follows that each orbit split by h_α meets the symmetric difference of $g[h_\alpha]$ and h_α ; as the latter set is finite and orbits are disjoint only finitely many orbits can intersect it. \square

We divide ω into two sets: F , the union of all finite g -orbits, and G , the union of all infinite g -orbits.

Claim 2.3.2. *If O_k is infinite then there are at most two α s for which $O_k \cap h_\alpha$ is infinite.*

Proof. First we let $k \in \omega \setminus B$; in this case $I_k = \omega$. The set O_k^* is g^* -invariant, hence $O_k \cap h_\alpha$ is infinite for some α . In fact: $O_k \subseteq^* h_\alpha$ (and so α is unique); for let $J = \{n : g^n(k) \in h_\alpha \text{ and } g^{n+1}(k) \notin h_\alpha\}$, then $\{g^{n+1}(k) : n \in J\} \subseteq g[h_\alpha] \setminus h_\alpha$ so that J is finite.

It follows that the set $X = \bigcup\{O_k : k \in \omega \setminus B\}$ is, save for a finite set, covered by finitely many of the h_α .

Next let $k \in \omega \setminus X$; in this case $I_k = \mathbb{Z}$ and both sets $\{g^n(k) : n < 0\}^*$ and $\{g^n(k) : n \geq 0\}^*$ are g^* -invariant. The argument above applied to both sets yields α_1 and α_2 (possibly identical) such that $\{g^n(k) : n < 0\} \subseteq^* h_{\alpha_1}$ and $\{g^n(k) : n \geq 0\} \subseteq^* h_{\alpha_2}$. \square

The following claim is the last step towards our final contradiction.

Claim 2.3.3. *For all but countably many α we have $h_\alpha \subseteq^* F$.*

Proof. By Claim 2.3.2 the set D of those α for which h_α meets an infinite orbit in an infinite set is countable: each such orbit meets at most two h_α s and there are only countably many orbits of course.

If $\alpha \notin D$ then h_α meets every infinite orbit in a finite set and it splits only finitely many of these, which means that it intersects only finitely many infinite orbits, and hence that it meets G in a finite set. \square

2.4. The final contradiction. We now apply Claim 2.2.3 to F . It follows that there is an infinite subset s of v_0 such that $g^n[s] \subseteq^* F$ for all but finitely many n . In fact, as F is g -invariant one n_0 suffices: we can then first assume that $g^{n_0}[s] \subseteq F$ (drop finitely many points from s) and then use g -invariance of F to deduce that $g^n[s] \subseteq F$ for all n .

Let $E = \bigcup_{k \in s} O_k$; as a union of orbits this set is g -invariant. There must therefore be an α such that $E \cap h_\alpha$ is infinite. Now there are infinitely many $k \in E$ such that h_α intersects O_k ; by Claim 2.3.1 h_α must contain all but finitely many of these. This means that $O_k \subset h_\alpha$ for infinitely many $k \in s$ and hence that $h_\alpha \cap v_0$ is infinite, which is a contradiction because h_α and v_0 were assumed to be almost disjoint.

2.5. An alternative contradiction. For each α the set H_α^* splits into two minimal σ^* -invariant clopen sets, to wit $\{\langle n, \alpha \rangle : n < 0\}^*$ and $\{\langle n, \alpha \rangle : n \geq 0\}^*$ (apply the argument in subsection 1.1). Therefore the same is true for each h_α^* with respect to ρ . However, with the notation as above we find infinitely many ρ -invariant clopen subsets of h_α^* , for every infinite subset t of s we can take $(\bigcup_{k \in t} O_k)^*$. Now split s into infinitely many infinite subsets.

3. A QUESTION

Our result does not settle the Katowice problem but it may point toward a final solution. We list the known consequences of the existence of a homeomorphism between ω_0^* and ω_1^* .

$$(1) \ 2^{\aleph_0} = 2^{\aleph_1}$$

- (2) $\mathfrak{d} = \aleph_1$
- (3) there is a strong- Q -sequence
- (4) there is a strictly increasing ω_1 -sequence \mathcal{O} of clopen sets in ω_0^* such that $\bigcup \mathcal{O}$ is dense and $\omega_0^* \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{O}$ contains no P -points

The first consequence simply says that the weights of ω_0^* and ω_1^* are equal. Equality (2) was established in [1] as a major step in the proof of the theorem in the Introduction and statement (4) is [7, Theorem 3.5]

To explain (3) we need to define what a strong- Q -sequence is: a sequence $\langle A_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1 \rangle$ of infinite subsets of ω with the property that for every choice $\langle x_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1 \rangle$ of subsets ($x_\alpha \subseteq A_\alpha$) there is a single subset x of ω such that $x_\alpha =^* A_\alpha \cap x$ for all α . In [9] Steprāns showed the consistency of the existence of strong- Q -sequences with ZFC.

Not only is each of these consequences consistent with ZFC but in [2] Chodounský provides a model where these consequences hold simultaneously.

We shall now reprove the three structural consequences using the same sets that we employed in the construction of the non-trivial autohomeomorphism. We use the sets v_n to make ω resemble $\mathbb{Z} \times \omega$: first make them pairwise disjoint and then identify v_n with $\{n\} \times \omega$ via some bijection between ω and $\mathbb{Z} \times \omega$.

Our consequences are now obtained as follows:

- (2) For every $\alpha < \omega_1$ define $f_\alpha : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \omega$ by $f_\alpha(m) = \min\{n : \langle m, n \rangle \in e_\alpha\}$; the family $\{f_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ witnesses $\mathfrak{d} = \aleph_1$: for every $f : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \omega$ there is an α such that $\{n : f(n) \geq f_\alpha(n)\}$ is finite. Indeed, take A such that $A^* = \gamma[\{\langle m, n \rangle : n \leq f(m)\}^*]$ and observe that there is an α such that $E_\alpha \cap A = \emptyset$.
- (3) The family $\{h_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ is a strong- Q -sequence: assume a subset x_α of h_α is given for all α ; then there is a single subset x of ω such that $x^* \cap h_\alpha^* = x_\alpha^*$ for all α . To see this take $X_\alpha \subseteq H_\alpha$ such that $X_\alpha^* = \gamma[x_\alpha^*]$ and put $X = \bigcup_\alpha X_\alpha$ then $X \cap H_\alpha = X_\alpha$ and hence $\gamma^\leftarrow[X^*] \cap h_\alpha^* = x_\alpha^*$ for all α .
- (4) Let b_α be the complement of e_α and let B_α be the complement of E_α . Then $\langle b_\alpha^* : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ is the required sequence: in ω_1^* the complement of $\bigcup_\alpha B_\alpha^*$ consists of the uniform ultrafilters on ω_1 ; none of these is a P -point.

To this list we can now add the existence of a non-trivial auto(homeo)morphism ρ and a disjoint family $\{v_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ of infinite subsets of ω_0 such that

- (5) $\{v_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{h_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ is almost disjoint,
- (6) $\rho[v_n^*] = v_{n+1}^*$ for all n ,
- (7) $\{h_\alpha^* : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ is a maximal disjoint family of ρ -invariant sets, and
- (8) for each α the sets $(h_\alpha \cap \bigcup_{n < 0} v_n)^*$ and $(h_\alpha \cap \bigcup_{n \geq 0} v_n)^*$ are minimal clopen ρ -invariant sets.

Since the family $\{h_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ is a strong- Q -sequence one can find for any (uncountable) subset A of ω_1 an infinite set X_A such that $h_\alpha \subseteq^* X_A$ if $\alpha \in A$ and $h_\alpha \cap X_A =^* \emptyset$ if $\alpha \notin A$.

Our proof shows that ρ is in fact non-trivial on every such set X_A whenever A is uncountable.

Remark 3.1. Consequence (1) above is the equality $2^{\aleph_0} = 2^{\aleph_1}$; it does not specify the common value any further. We can actually assume, without loss of generality, that $2^{\aleph_0} = 2^{\aleph_1} = \aleph_2$. Indeed, one can collapse 2^{\aleph_1} to \aleph_2 by adding a Cohen subset of ω_2 ; this forcing adds no new subsets of ω_1 of cardinality \aleph_1 or less, so any isomorphism between $\mathcal{P}(\omega_0)/fin$ and $\mathcal{P}(\omega_1)/fin$ will survive.

Remark 3.2. It is straightforward to show that the completions of $\mathcal{P}(\omega_0)/fin$ and $\mathcal{P}(\omega_1)/fin$ are isomorphic, e.g., by taking maximal almost families of countable sets

in both $\mathcal{P}(\omega_0)$ and $\mathcal{P}(\omega_1)$ of cardinality \mathfrak{c} . These represent maximal antichains in the completions consisting of mutually isomorphic elements and a global isomorphism will be the result of combining the local isomorphisms. This argument works for all cardinals κ that satisfy $\kappa^{\aleph_0} = \mathfrak{c}$, that is, for every cardinal κ in the interval $[\aleph_0, \mathfrak{c}]$ the completion of $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)/fin$ is isomorphic to the completion of $\mathcal{P}(\omega_0)/fin$, see [2, Corollary 1.2.7].

Thus, it will most likely be the incompleteness properties of the algebras that decide the outcome of the Katowice problem.

4. SOME CONSISTENCY

To see what is possible consistency-wise we indicate how some of the features of the edifice that we erected, based on the assumption that ω_0^* and ω_1^* are homeomorphic, can occur simultaneously. For this we consider the ideal \mathcal{I} generated by the finite sets together with the sets b_α (the complements of the sets e_α). This ideal satisfies the following properties:

- (1) \mathcal{I} is non-meager,
- (2) \mathcal{I} intersects every P-point,
- (3) \mathcal{I} is generated by the increasing tower $\{b_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$, and
- (4) the differences $b_{\alpha+1} \setminus b_\alpha$ form a strong- Q -sequence.

We have already established properties (2), (3) and (4).

We are left with property (1); that \mathcal{I} must be non-meager was already known to B. Balcar and P. Simon.

We recall that a family of subsets of ω_0 is said to be *meager* if, upon identifying sets with their characteristic functions, it is meager in the product space 2^ω .

Lemma 4.1. *\mathcal{I} is not meager.*

Proof. We assume \mathcal{I} is meager and apply [10, Théorème 25] to find a sequence $\langle F_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ of pairwise disjoint finite sets with the property that $\{n : I \cap F_n \neq \emptyset\}$ is finite whenever $I \in \mathcal{I}$. By contraposition we find that whenever X is an infinite subset of ω the set $F_X = \bigcup_{n \in X} F_n$ does not belong to \mathcal{I} ; this means that if $\gamma[F_X^*] = G_X^*$ then G_X must be an uncountable subset of $\mathbb{Z} \times \omega_1$.

Fix a family $\{X_s : s \in {}^{<\omega}2\}$ of infinite subsets of ω such that $X_s \supseteq X_t$, and hence $G_{X_s} \supseteq^* G_{X_t}$, whenever $s \subseteq t$, and $X_s \cap X_t = \emptyset$, and hence $G_{X_s} \cap G_{X_t} =^* \emptyset$, whenever s and t are incompatible. Using this we can fix $\alpha \in \omega_1$ such that all exceptions in the previous sentence occur in $\mathbb{Z} \times \alpha$.

So, the family $\{G_{X_s} \cap E_\alpha : s \in {}^{<\omega}2\}$ satisfies the relations above without the modifier ‘modulo finite sets’. This implies that if $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\beta \geq \alpha$ then there is at most one branch $y_{n,\beta}$ in the binary tree ${}^{<\omega}2$ such that $\langle n, \beta \rangle \in G_{X_s}$ for all $s \in y_{n,\beta}$.

Now, since $2^{\aleph_0} = 2^{\aleph_1}$ there is a branch, y , different from all $y_{n,\beta}$. We can take an infinite set X such that $X \subseteq^* X_s$ for all $s \in y$. This means of course that G_X is uncountable and that $G_X \subseteq^* G_{X_s}$ for all $s \in y$, and hence that there is $\beta \geq \alpha$ such that $G_X \setminus G_{X_s} \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \times \beta$ for all s . However, if $\langle n, \gamma \rangle \in G_X$ and $\gamma \geq \beta$ then we should have both $\langle n, \gamma \rangle \in \bigcap_{s \in y} G_{X_s}$ by the above and $\langle n, \gamma \rangle \notin \bigcap_{s \in y} G_{X_s}$ because $y \neq y_{n,\gamma}$. \square

The methods from [2] and [3] can be used to establish the consistency of $\mathfrak{d} = \aleph_1$ with the existence of an ideal with the properties (1) through (4) of \mathcal{I} — let us call such an ideal countable-like.

Sacrificing completeness for brevity we shall only give a sketch of the proof of the following result, which is Theorem 4.5.1 from [2]. The sketch should be comprehensible to anyone familiar with the various terms employed, such as ω^ω -bounding, Grigorieff forcing etc. We refer the reader in search for definitions and more details to [2].

Theorem 4.2. *It is consistent with ZFC that $\mathfrak{d} = \aleph_1$ and there is countable-like ideal \mathcal{I} on ω .*

Proof. We start with a model of ZFC+GCH and take an increasing tower $\mathcal{T} = \{T_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ in $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ that generates a non-meager ideal and let \mathcal{A} denote the almost disjoint family of differences $\{T_{\alpha+1} \setminus T_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ — we write $A_\alpha = T_{\alpha+1} \setminus T_\alpha$. Because of the GCH we can arrange that $\{\omega \setminus T_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ generates a P-point, which more than suffices for our purposes.

We set up an iterated forcing construction, with countable supports, of proper ${}^\omega\omega$ -bounding partial orders that will produce a model in which $\mathfrak{d} = \aleph_1$ and the ideal \mathcal{I} generated by \mathcal{T} is countable-like. By the ${}^\omega\omega$ -bounding property we get $\mathfrak{d} = \aleph_1$ and the non-meagerness of \mathcal{I} for free.

To turn \mathcal{A} into a strong- Q -sequence we use guided Grigorieff forcing, as in [3]: given a choice $F = \langle F_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1 \rangle$, where each F_α is a subset of A_α , we let $\text{Gr}(\mathcal{T}, F)$ be the partial order whose elements are functions of the form $p : T_\alpha \rightarrow 2$, with the property that $p^{\leftarrow}(1) \cap A_\beta = {}^* F_\beta$ for all $\beta \leq \alpha$. The ordering is by extension: $p \leq q$ if $p \supseteq q$. This partial order is proper and ${}^\omega\omega$ -bounding and if G is generic on $\text{Gr}(\mathcal{T}, F)$ then $X = (\bigcup G)^{\leftarrow}(1)$ is such that $X \cap A_\alpha = {}^* F_\alpha$ for all α . As indicated in [3], by appropriate bookkeeping one can set up an iteration that turns \mathcal{A} into a strong- Q -sequence.

One can interleave this iteration with one that destroys all P-points; this establishes property (2) of countable-like ideals in a particularly strong way. For every ideal \mathcal{I} that is dual to a non-meager P-filter one considers the ‘normal’ Grigorieff partial order $\text{Gr}(\mathcal{I})$ associated to \mathcal{I} , which consists of functions with domain in \mathcal{I} and $\{0, 1\}$ as codomain. The power $\text{Gr}(\mathcal{I})^\omega$ is proper and ${}^\omega\omega$ -bounding and forcing with it creates countably many sets that prevent the filter dual to \mathcal{I} from being extended to a P-point, even in further extensions by proper ${}^\omega\omega$ -bounding partial orders.

All bookkeeping can be arranged so that all potential choices for \mathcal{A} and all potential non-meager P-filters can be dealt with. \square

The question arises naturally whether this argument can be adapted so as to include an automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\omega_0)/\text{fin}$ that acts in the same way as our non-trivial automorphism ρ . On the surface this seems unlikely.

The construction has the tendency of going completely in the wrong direction as regards autohomeomorphisms of ω_0^* . As explained in Chapter 5 of [2], if one has an autohomeomorphism φ that is not trivial on any element of the filter dual to \mathcal{I} then the generic filter on $\text{Gr}(\mathcal{I})$ destroys φ in the following sense: there is no possible value for $\varphi(X^*)$, where $X = (\bigcup G)^{\leftarrow}(1)$. The reason is that this value should satisfy $\varphi(p^{\leftarrow}(1)^*) \subseteq \varphi(X^*)$ and $\varphi(p^{\leftarrow}(0)^*) \cap \varphi(X^*) = \emptyset$ for all $p \in G$ and a density argument shows that no such set exists in $V[G]$.

Thus, if things go really wrong one ends up with a model in which for every non-meager P-filter \mathcal{F} and every autohomeomorphism there is a member of \mathcal{F} on which the autohomeomorphism must be trivial. This would be in contradiction with the last sentence just before Remark 3.1, which says that our ρ is non-trivial on any set that contains uncountably many h_α s.

In fact, Theorem 5.3.12 in [2] shows that by interleaving some extra partial orders in the iteration this ubiquity of triviality can actually be made to happen.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bohuslav Balcar and Ryszard Frankiewicz, *To distinguish topologically the spaces m^* . II*, Bulletin de l’Académie Polonaise des Sciences. Série des Sciences Mathématiques, Astronomiques et Physiques **26** (1978), no. 6, 521–523 (English, with Russian summary). MR511955 (80b:54026)

- [2] David Chodounský, *On the Katowice problem*, PhD thesis, Charles University, Prague, 2011, http://www.math.cas.cz/fichier/preprints/other/other_series_20150721163718_88.pdf.
- [3] ———, *Strong- Q -sequences and small \mathfrak{d}* , *Topology and its Applications* **159** (2012), no. 13, 2942–2946, DOI 10.1016/j.topol.2012.05.012. MR2944766
- [4] W. W. Comfort, *Compactifications: recent results from several countries*, *Topology Proceedings* **2** (1977), no. 1, 61–87 (1978). MR540597 (80m:54035)
- [5] Ryszard Frankiewicz, *To distinguish topologically the space m^** , *Bulletin de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences. Série des Sciences Mathématiques, Astronomiques et Physiques* **25** (1977), no. 9, 891–893 (English, with Russian summary). MR0461444 (57 #1429)
- [6] Jan van Mill, *An introduction to $\beta\omega$* , *Handbook of set-theoretic topology* (Kenneth Kunen and Jerry E. Vaughan, eds.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984, pp. 503–567. MR776630 (86f:54027)
- [7] Peter J. Nyikos, *Čech-Stone remainders of discrete spaces*, *Open problems in topology. II* (Elliott Pearl, ed.), Elsevier B.V., Amsterdam, 2007, pp. 207–216.
- [8] Elliott Pearl (ed.), *Open problems in topology. II*, Elsevier B.V., Amsterdam, 2007. MR2367385 (2008j:54001)
- [9] Juris Steprāns, *Strong- Q -sequences and variations on Martin's axiom*, *Canadian Journal of Mathematics* **37** (1985), no. 4, 730–746, DOI 10.4153/CJM-1985-039-6. MR801424 (87c:03106)
- [10] Michel Talagrand, *Compacts de fonctions mesurables et filtres non mesurables*, *Studia Mathematica* **67** (1980), no. 1, 13–43 (French). MR579439 (82e:28009)

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, AS CR, ŽITNÁ 25, 115 67 PRAHA I, CZECH REPUBLIC
E-mail address: david.chodounsky@matfyz.cz

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNC-CHARLOTTE, 9201 UNIVERSITY CITY BLVD., CHARLOTTE, NC 28223-0001
E-mail address: adow@uncc.edu
URL: <http://www.math.uncc.edu/~adow>

FACULTY OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING, MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, TU DELFT, POSTBUS 5031, 2600 GA DELFT, THE NETHERLANDS
E-mail address: k.p.hart@tudelft.nl
URL: <http://fa.its.tudelft.nl/~hart>

LEVENDAAL 143-A, 2311 JH LEIDEN, THE NETHERLANDS
E-mail address: vries101@gmail.com