Rado's conjecture and reflection principles compatible with MM

Sakaé Fuchino (渕野 昌)

Graduate School of System Informatics
Kobe University
(神戸大学大学院 システム情報学研究科)

http://kurt.scitec.kobe-u.ac.jp/~fuchino/

日本数学会 2014 年年会

(21. März 2014 (16:14 JST) version)

March 16, 2014, 於 学習院大学

This presentation is typeset by pLaTeX with beamer class.

Rado's Conjecture and the Reflection Principle RP

- A tree T is **special** if there are T_i, $i \in \omega$ s.t. all of T_i's are pairwise incomparable (antichains) and $T = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} T_i$.

- Rado's Conjecture (RC):

  RC: Any tree T is special if and only if all subtrees of T of cardinality $\aleph_1$ are special.

- (S. Todorčević) Rado's Conjecture implies the non-existence of Kurepa trees. In particular RC does not hold under $V = L$.

- (S. Todorčević) If κ is strongly compact and $\mathbb{P} = Col(\omega_1, {<}\kappa)$, then we have $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "Rado's Conjecture".

- Reflection Principle (RP):

  RP: For any regular cardinal $\kappa > \aleph_1$ and stationary $\mathcal{S} \subseteq [\kappa]^{\aleph_0}$, there is $I \in [\kappa]^{\aleph_1}$ s.t. (1) $\omega_1 \subseteq I$, (2) $\mathrm{cf}(I) = \mathrm{cf}\sup(I) = \omega_1$ and (3) $\mathcal{S} \cap [I]^{\aleph_0}$ is stationary in $[I]^{\aleph_0}$.

Rado's Conjecture and the Reflection Principle RP (2/2)

RC: Any tree T is special if and only if all subtrees of T of cardinality $\aleph_1$ are special.

RP: For any cardinal regular cardinal $\kappa > \aleph_1$ and stationary $\mathcal{S} \subseteq [\kappa]^{\aleph_0}$, there is $I \in [\kappa]^{\aleph_1}$ s.t. (1) $\omega_1 \subseteq I$, (2) $\mathrm{cf}(I) = \mathrm{cf}\,\mathrm{sup}(I) = \omega_1$ and (3) $\mathcal{S} \cap [I]^{\aleph_0}$ is stationary in $[I]^{\aleph_0}$.

- (S. Todorčević, ??) If $V = L$ we have $\neg$RC and $\neg$RP
- (S. Todorčević, Foreman-Magidor-Shelah (?))
  If κ is supercompact and $\mathbb{P} = Col(\omega_1, {<}\kappa)$, then we have

  $$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \text{“RC} \wedge \text{RP”}.$$

Common consequences of RC and RP

- RC and RP have many common consequences:
  - $2^{\aleph_0} \leq \aleph_2$;
  - $\neg\Box_\kappa$ for all κ;
  - Singular Cardinal Hypothesis;
  - Chang's Conjecture (and hence the non existence of Kurepa trees);
  - Ordinal Stationarity Reflection: For any regular $\kappa > \omega_1$ and stationary $S \subseteq S^\omega_\kappa = \{\alpha \in \kappa : \mathrm{cf}(\alpha) = \omega\}$ there is an $\xi \in S^{\omega_1}_\kappa$ s.t. $S \cap \xi$ is stationary in ξ;
  - $\cdots$ (will be discussed later)

Are RC and RP perhaps the same principle?

Are RC and RP perhaps the same principle? Or at least isn't it so that one of them can be drived from the other?

Neither!!

- (S. Todorčević) RC implies the negation of Martin's Axiom for $\aleph_1$ dense sets: RP follows from Martin's Maximum.
  - Hence (under a supercompact cardinal) $\neg$RC + RP is consistent. (MM implies the combination!)
- (酒井拓史 (H. Sakai)) (Under a supercompact cardinal) it is consistent that there is a strongly compact cardinal κ s.t., for $\mathbb{P} = Col(\omega_1, <\kappa)$, we have $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\neg$RP".
  - Hence (under a supercompact cardinal) RC + $\neg$RP is consistent.

RC implies the negation of $\mathrm{MA}_{\aleph_1}$

Theorem 1. (S. Todorčević) $\mathrm{MA}_{\aleph_1}$ implies the negation of RC.

Proof. Let $T = \{t : t$ is an increasing sequence in $\mathbb{R}$ $(\ell(t) < \omega_1)\}$ with the ordering $t <_T t' \Leftrightarrow t'$ is an endextension of t.

Then

- T is a non-special tree.
- Under $MA_{\aleph_1}$ all subtrees of cardinality $\aleph_1$ are special by a theorem of Baumgartner-Malitz-Reinhard:

  • ($\mathrm{MA}_{\aleph_1}$) all trees of cardinality $\aleph_1$ without uncountable chain are special. □

The reason of the similarity of RC and RP

Theorem 2. (1) (P. Doebler, 2013) RC implies the Semi-Stationary Reflection Principle (SSR).

(2) (S.F., H. Sakai, V. Torres and T. Usuba, ∞) RC implies the Fodor-type Reflection Principle (FRP).

Since it is already known that RP implies both SSR and FRP, we obtain the diagram:



Common consequences of SSR and FRP

SSR implies:
FRP implies:

- $2^{\aleph_0} \leq \aleph_2$
- $\neg\Box_\kappa$ for all κ
- Singular Cardinal Hypothesis
- Chang's Conjecture (and hence the non existence of Kurepa trees)
- Ordinal Stationarity Reflection: For any regular $\kappa > \omega_1$ and stationary $S \subseteq S^\omega_\kappa = \{\alpha \in \kappa : \mathrm{cf}(\alpha) = \omega\}$ there is an $\xi \in S^{\omega_1}_\kappa$ s.t. $S \cap \xi$ is stationary in ξ
- $\cdots$ (will be discussed later)

FRP is a "mathematical" reflection principle

- FRP is known to be equivalent (over ZFC) to many "mathematical" reflection theorems such as:

  - Any locally countably compact space X is metrizable if all subspaces of X of cardinality $\leq \aleph_1$ are metrizable.
  - Any T_1-space with point countable base is left separated if every subspaces of X of cardinality $\leq \aleph_1$ are left separated.
  - Any graph G is of countable coloring number if all subgraphs Y of X of cardinality $\leq \aleph_1$ are of countable coloring number.
  - ...

Variations of Strong Chang's Conjecture

- For a regular cardinal $\kappa > \aleph_1$

> $\mathrm{CC}^{\downarrow}(\kappa)$: For any sufficiently large regular θ and an well-ordering $\sqsubset$ on $\mathcal{H}(\theta)$, if $\kappa \in M \prec \langle \mathcal{H}(\theta), \in, \sqsubset \rangle$ is countable then, for any $\alpha < \kappa$, there is a countable $M \prec M^* \prec \langle \mathcal{H}(\theta), \in, \sqsubset \rangle$ s.t., letting $\alpha^* = \inf((\kappa \cap M^* \setminus \sup(\kappa \cap M))$, we have $\alpha^* > \alpha$ and $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha^*) = \omega_1$.

> $\mathrm{CC}^*(\kappa)$: (P. Doebler) For any sufficiently large regular θ and an well-ordering $\sqsubset$ on $\mathcal{H}(\theta)$, if $\kappa \in M \prec \langle \mathcal{H}(\theta), \in \sqsubseteq \rangle$ is countable then, for any $a \in [\kappa]^{\aleph_1}$, there is a countable $M \prec M^* \prec \langle \mathcal{H}(\theta), \in, \sqsubset \rangle$ s.t., $M \cap \omega_1 = M^* \cap \omega_1$ and there is a $b \in [\kappa]^{\aleph_1} \cap M^*$ s.t. $a \subseteq b$.



Possible Principle(s) unifying FRP and SSR

- $CC^{\downarrow}(\kappa)$ and $CC^{*}(\kappa)$ suggest the following natural generalization of the both of the principles:

> $CC^{\downarrow\downarrow}(\kappa)$: For any sufficiently large regular θ and a well-ordering $\sqsubset$ on $\mathcal{H}(\theta)$, if $M \prec \langle \mathcal{H}(\theta), \in, \sqsubset \rangle$ is countable with $\kappa \in M$ then, for any $a \in [\kappa]^{\aleph_1}$, there are $b \in [\kappa]^{\aleph_1}$ and countable $M \prec M^* \prec \mathcal{M}$ s.t. $a \subseteq b$, $b \in M^*$ and $b \cap M^* = b \cap M$.

- The principle $CC^{\downarrow\downarrow}(\kappa)$ for all $\kappa > \aleph_1$ clearly implies both FRP and SSR. Unfortunately, this principle is a strengthening of RP and hence RC does not imply this principle:

> Theorem 3. (S.F., 薄葉季路 (T. Usuba)) For all κ T.f.a.e:
>
> (a) $CC^{\downarrow\downarrow}(\kappa)$ for all $\kappa > \aleph_1$.
>
> (b) For all κ and any stationary $S \subseteq [\kappa]^{\aleph_0}$, for all sufficiently large regular θ and well ordering $\sqsubset$ on $\mathcal{H}(\theta)$, there is an $M \prec \langle \mathcal{H}(\theta), \in, \sqsubset \rangle$ of cardinality $\aleph_1$, s.t. $S \cap M$ is stationary in $[\kappa \cap M]^{\aleph_0}$.

Possible Principle(s) unifying FRP and SSR(2/2)



Possible Principle(s) unifying RC and RP under CH

- The model obtained by Levy collapsing (by $\mathbb{P} = Col(\omega_1, <\kappa)$) a supercompact cardinal can be seen as quite "canonical".

- Game Reflection Principle GRP^+ of B. Koenig captures many features of this model. In particular GRP^+ implies RC, RP as well as CH.



Possible Principle(s) unifying RC and RP under ¬CH

- Under ¬CH, "the canonical model $\models$ MM" does not satisfy RC.
- Mitchel's model constructed starting from a supercompact cardinal satisfies both RC and RP under $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_2$. This model is however "less canonical".
- ▷ Is there an axiom which captures a good deal of the characteristics of the Mitchel model?




終