Canonical models for fragments of the Axiom of Choice*

Paul Larson † Miami University

Jindřich Zapletal ‡ University of Florida

October 31, 2016

Abstract

We develop technology for investigation of natural forcing extensions of the model $L(\mathbb{R})$ which satisfy such statements as "there is an ultrafilter" or "there is a total selector for the Vitali equivalence relation". The technology reduces many questions about ZF implications between consequences of the Axiom of Choice to natural ZFC forcing problems.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we develop technology for obtaining a certain type of consistency results in Choice-less set theory, showing that various consequences of the Axiom of Choice are independent of each other. We will consider consequences of a certain syntactical form.

Definition 1.1. A Σ^2_1 sentence Φ is *tame* if it is of the form

$$\exists A \subseteq \omega^\omega \ ((\forall \vec{x} \in (\omega^\omega)^{<\omega} \ \exists \vec{y} \in A^{<\omega} \ \phi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})) \wedge (\forall \vec{x} \in A^{<\omega} \ \psi(\vec{x}))),$$

where ϕ, ψ are formulas which contain only numerical quantifiers and do not refer to A, but may refer to a fixed analytic subset of ω^ω as a predicate. The formula ψ is called the *resolvent* of the sentence Φ. A *resolvent* is a formula which is the resolvent of some tame sentence. A *witness* to a tame sentence of the above form is a set $A \subseteq \omega^\omega$ for which

$$(\forall \vec{x} \in (\omega^\omega)^{<\omega} \ \exists \vec{y} \in A^{<\omega} \ \phi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})) \wedge (\forall \vec{x} \in A^{<\omega} \ \psi(\vec{x}))$$

holds.

*2000 AMS subject classification 03E17, 03E40. Keywords : Axioms of Choice, ultrafilters equivalence relations.

†Partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1201494.

‡Partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1161078.

The tame Σ^2_1 sentences form a syntactical class familiar from the general treatment of cardinal invariants in [19, Section 6.1]. It is clear that many consequences of Axiom of Choice are of this form:

Example 1.2. The following statements are tame consequences of the Axiom of Choice:

1. there is a nonprincipal ultrafilter on ω. The resolvent formula is "$\bigcap \operatorname{rng}(\vec{x})$ is infinite";
2. there is an infinite maximal almost disjoint family of subsets of ω. The resolvent formula is "$x_0 \cap x_1$ is finite";
3. there is a maximal selector on a fixed analytic equivalence relation;
4. there is a Hamel basis for the space of real numbers;
5. there is an ω_1 sequence of distinct reals;
6. there is an injection from $[\omega_1]^\omega$ to $\omega_1 \times \mathcal{P}(\omega)$;
7. a fixed analytic hypergraph of finite arity has countable chromatic number.

A typical tame Σ^2_1 sentence with resolvent ψ can be associated with a natural partial order P_ψ of countable approximations. Given a resolvent ψ, a *ψ-set* is a set $a \subseteq \omega^\omega$ such that $\forall \vec{x} \in a^{<\omega} \psi(\vec{x})$ holds. We let P_ψ be the partial order of countable ψ-sets, ordered by reverse inclusion. Then P_ψ is σ-closed and adds a ψ-set $A \subseteq \omega^\omega$ as a union of the generic filter. For many naturally arising tame sentences Φ it is the case that P_ψ forces the generic set A to be a witness for Φ. We will say that $A \subseteq \omega^\omega$ is a *generic witness* for Φ if it is obtained from a filter on P_ψ which is generic over $L(\mathbb{R})$. Generic witnesses typically exhibit additional properties which can no longer be provably obtained in ZFC. For instance, a generic ultrafilter forced with countable approximations is a Ramsey ultrafilter, and a generic injection from ω_1 to 2^ω is a surjection. Note also that the poset P_ψ depends only on the resolvent of the tame Σ^2_1 sentence.

In the presence of large cardinals, it becomes natural to investigate the model $L(\mathbb{R})[A]$ to see how large a fragment of the Axiom of Choice holds in it. The present paper provides technology for doing this. We show that questions about the theory of the model $L(\mathbb{R})[A]$ frequently reduce to rather interesting ZFC forcing problems. As a result, we prove a variety of consistency results regarding non-implications between tame consequences of the Axiom of Choice, which are always verified by canonical models of the form $L(\mathbb{R})[A]$.

Throughout the paper, the letters LC denote a suitable large cardinal assumption; in all cases a proper class of Woodin cardinals is more than sufficient. In some cases - the consistency of an E_0-selector without a nonprincipal ultrafilter on ω, for instance - a single strongly inaccessible cardinal is known to suffice, but we have not pursued this systematically.

The first model we look at is the traditional canonical model with a nonprincipal ultrafilter on ω. Todorcevic has shown that in the presence of large cardinals, every Ramsey ultrafilter is generic over $L(\mathbb{R})$ for the partial order $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\mathrm{Fin}$ (see [5] and [10], for instance). The third conclusion of the following theorem is due to Simon Thomas (personal communication). The various parts of Theorem 1.3 are proved in Section 3.

Theorem 1.3. (ZFC+LC) *Let U be a Ramsey ultrafilter on ω. In the model $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$,*

1. *there are no infinite MAD families;*
2. *the quotient space $2^\omega/E_0$ is linearly orderable, but the quotients $2^\omega/E_2$ and $(2^\omega)^\omega/F_2$ are not linearly orderable;*
3. *there are no Hamel bases for $\mathbb{R}$ and no transcendence bases for $\mathbb{C}$;*
4. *there is no injection from $[\omega_1]^\omega$ to $\omega_1 \times \mathcal{P}(\omega)$.*

The model $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$ contains no total selectors for nonsmooth Borel equivalence relations. Thus, it is interesting to look at models in which such selectors, generically added by countable approximations, exist. Pinned equivalence relations are defined in Definition 4.1 below. Theorem 1.4 is proved in Section 4.

Theorem 1.4. (ZFC+LC) *Let E be a pinned Borel equivalence relation on a Polish space X, and let $S \subseteq X$ be a generic total selector for E. In the model $L(\mathbb{R})[S]$,*

1. *there are no ω_1 sequences of reals;*
2. *there are no infinite MAD families;*
3. *there are no nonatomic measures on ω;*
4. *there are no Hamel bases for $\mathbb{R}$.*

Since the models in the previous theorems do not contain any infinite MAD families, we also study a model with a MAD family. It turns out to be difficult to manage ordinary generic MAD families forced by countable approximations and we need to resort to a notion of improved MAD family as in Definition 5.1. Theorem 1.5 is proved in Section 5.

Theorem 1.5. (ZFC+LC) *Let A be a generic improved maximal almost disjoint family. In the model $L(\mathbb{R})[A]$,*

1. *there are no ω_1 sequences of reals;*
2. *there are no nonatomic measures on ω;*
3. *there are no total selectors for E_0.*

The terminology used in the paper follows the set theoretic standard of [8]. A hypergraph on a set X is a set $Z \subseteq X^n$ for some $n \leq \omega$. A coloring of a hypergraph $Z \subseteq X^n$ is a map $c\colon X \to Y$ whose fibers do not contain any members of Z. The hypergraph has countable chromatic number if there is a coloring $c\colon X \to \omega$. In the nomenclature of equivalence relations, we follow [6]. Thus, E_0 is the relation on 2^ω connecting x, y if the set $\{n \in \omega\colon x(n) \neq y(n)\}$ is finite; E_1 is the relation on $(2^\omega)^\omega$ defined by the same formula; and $=^+$ is the equivalence relation on $(2^\omega)^\omega$ connecting x, y if $\operatorname{rng}(x) = \operatorname{rng}(y)$. A selector for an equivalence relation E on X is a set which meets every equivalence class in at most one point; a selector is total if it meets every equivalence class in exactly one point. The E quotient space is the set of all E-equivalence classes. In several places we consider the set of finite binary strings $2^{<\omega}$ with coordinatewise binary addition as a group, which naturally acts on 2^ω by coordinatewise binary addition, and the action extends to an action on subsets of 2^ω as well.

2 Independence

The key to the technology is the following definition.

Definition 2.1. Let Φ_0, Φ_1 be tame Σ^2_1 sentences with respective resolvents ψ_0, ψ_1. Let A_0 and A_1 be subsets of ω^ω. We say that A_1 is (Φ_0, Φ_1)-*independent* of A_0 if there exists an infinite cardinal κ such that for every poset Q collapsing κ to $\aleph_0$, and for all Q-names τ_0, τ_1 for witnesses to Φ_0 and Φ_1 respectively extending A_0 and A_1 (that is, agreeing on $(\omega^\omega)^V$ with A_0 and A_1 respectively) there exist $n \in \omega$ and (in some generic extension) V-filters $G_i \subseteq Q$ ($i \in n$) such that

$$\forall \vec{x} \in \bigcup_i \tau_0/G_i \ \psi_0(\vec{x})$$

holds and

$$\forall \vec{x} \in \bigcup_{i \in n} \tau_1/G_i \ \psi_1(\vec{x})$$

fails.

We say that witnesses for Φ_1 are Φ_0-independent of A_0 if every witness A_1 for Φ_1 is (Φ_0, Φ_1)-independent of A_0. Similarly, we say that witnesses for Φ_1 are *independent of* witnesses for Φ_0 if every witness A_1 for Φ_1 is (Φ_0, Φ_1)-independent of every witness A_0 for Φ_0.

The definition of independence may appear awkward, but many of its instances are interesting ZFC problems which typically can be answered in ZFC. The answers can be applied to evaluate the theory of various Choice-less generic extensions of the model $L(\mathbb{R})$ via the following central theorem.

Theorem 2.2. (ZFC) *Assume that there exist proper class many Woodin cardinals. Suppose that Φ_0, Φ_1 are tame Σ^2_1 sentences with respective resolvents ψ_0, ψ_1. Let $A_0 \subseteq \omega^\omega$ be a P_{ψ_0}-generic witness to Φ_0. If, in $V[A_0]$, witnesses for Φ_1 are Φ_0-independent of A_0, then $L(\mathbb{R})[A_0] \models \neg\Phi_1$.*

Proof. Work in the model $V[A_0]$. Suppose towards a contradiction that $L(\mathbb{R})[A_0]$ does contain a witness $A_1 \subseteq \omega^\omega$ for Φ_1. In such a case, there must be a name $\eta \in L(\mathbb{R})$ such that $A_1 = \eta/A_0$. The name η is coded by a set $B_\eta \subseteq \omega^\omega$ in $L(\mathbb{R})$, and some P_{ψ_0}-condition contained in A_0 forces that η is a witness for Φ_1.

By the assumptions, A_1 is independent of A_0, as witnessed by some infinite cardinal κ. Let δ be a Woodin cardinal greater than κ and $|P|$, and let $\mathbb{Q}_{<\delta}$ be the countably based stationary tower at δ which, collapses κ to $\aleph_0$ (see [11], for instance). Let τ_0 and τ_1 be $\mathbb{Q}_{<\delta}$-names for $j(A_0)$ and $j(A_1)$ respectively, where j is the generic elementary embedding derived from forcing with $\mathbb{Q}_{<\delta}$. In some generic extension $V[A_0][G]$, there exist V-generic filters $G_i \subseteq \mathbb{Q}_{<\delta}$ $(i \in n)$ such that $\forall \vec{x} \in \bigcup_i \tau_0/G_i \ \psi_0(\vec{x})$ holds while $\forall \vec{x} \in \bigcup_i \tau_1/G_i \ \psi_1(\vec{x})$ fails.

By results (due to Woodin) in Chapter 3 of [11] (especially Exercise 3.3.18), there exists in $V[A_0]$ a tree T on $\omega \times \gamma$, for some ordinal γ, such that

- $p[T] = B_\eta$;
- $j(T) = T$ whenever j is an elementary embedding derived from forcing with $\mathbb{Q}_{<\delta}$;
- the model $\langle L(\mathbb{R}), \in p[T]\rangle$ of $V[A_0]$ is elementarily equivalent to the same structure computed in $V[A_0][G]$.

It follows that, in $V[A_0][G]$, $\bigcup_i \tau/G_i$ is a ψ_0-set forcing in P_{ψ_0} that, for each $i \in n$, τ_1/G_i is a subset of the realization of the P_{ψ_0}-name coded by $p[T]$. However, this contradicts the choice of the filters G_i $(i \in n)$. □

3 Adding a Ramsey ultrafilter

The most commonly encountered model of the form $L(\mathbb{R})[A]$ is the one obtained by forcing an ultrafilter with countably generated approximations. It is not difficult to see that the poset used is equivalent to the quotient algebra $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ modulo finite. In [7] it is shown (assuming large cardinals) that every function in $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$ from the ordinals to $L(\mathbb{R})$ is in fact in $L(\mathbb{R})$. In [4] the authors show that $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$ satisfies the perfect set theorem for all sets of reals. It is also known that a number of compact groups have the automatic continuity property there (see [17]). On the other hand, any nonprincipal ultrafilter immediately yields nonmeasurable sets and sets without the Baire property, so such sets will exist in $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$. To illustrate the extent of our ignorance about the properties of the model, we state a bold open question:

Question 3.1. Does the model $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$ collapse any cardinalities of $L(\mathbb{R})$? I.e. if $X, Y \in L(\mathbb{R})$ are sets such that there is no injection of X to Y in $L(\mathbb{R})$, does the same hold in $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$?

The question is particularly acute for the quotient spaces of countable Borel equivalence relations, as the usual techniques for discerning them in $L(\mathbb{R})$ cannot work in $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$ due to the existence of a nonmeasurable set there.

In order to apply the technology outlined above to the study of the model $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$, we first need information about how ultrafilters are preserved under multiple generic extensions.

Theorem 3.2. *Let U be a nonprincipal ultrafilter. Suppose that $n \in \omega$ and for each $i \in n$,*

1. *P_i is a poset in V, $K_i \subseteq P_i$ is a generic filter over V, and U still generates an ultrafilter in $V[K_i]$;*
2. *$Q_i \in V[K_i]$ is a poset and $\tau_i \in V[K_i]$ is a Q_i-name for an ultrafilter extending U.*

Whenever $H_i \subseteq Q$ for $i \in n$ are filters mutually generic over $V[K_i : i \in n]$, $\bigcup_i \tau/H_i$ generates a nonprincipal filter.

Proof. By a genericity argument, it will be enough for every $m \in \omega$, every tuple $\langle q_i : i \in n \rangle \in \prod_i Q_i$ and every tuple $\langle \eta_i : i \in n \rangle$ of Q-names in the respective models $V[K_i]$ such that $q_i \Vdash \eta_i \in \tau_i$, to find a number $k > m$ and conditions $q_i' \leq q_i$ so that $q_i' \Vdash \check{k} \in \eta_i$ for each $i \in n$. To do this, for each $i \in n$ let $a_i = \{k \in \omega : \exists r \leq q_i \; r \Vdash k \in \eta_i\} \subseteq \omega$. The set a_i is in the model $V[K_i]$ and must belong to the ultrafilter U, since it is forced to be a superset of η_i, $\eta_i \in \tau$ and τ is an ultrafilter extending U. Thus, the set $\bigcap_i a_i$ must contain an element k greater than m. Pick conditions $q_i' \leq q_i$ witnessing the fact that $k \in a_i$; this completes the proof. □

The crudest features of the model $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$ can now be easily derived from Theorem 2.2.

Theorem 3.3. (ZFC+LC) *Let U be a Ramsey ultrafilter. In the model $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$,*

1. *there is no infinite MAD family;*
2. *there is no ω_1 sequence of distinct reals.*

As noted above, (2) is a special case of results from [7]: $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$ and $L(\mathbb{R})$ in fact have the same functions from the ordinals to $L(\mathbb{R})$. We include a simple proof of (2) as we will use the same idea later.

Proof. To prove (1), we will show that infinite MAD families are independent of ultrafilters and then quote Theorem 2.2. The key feature of MAD families is they are not preserved by mutually generic extensions the way ultrafilters are.

Claim 3.4. *If $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ is an infinite MAD family, Q is any poset collapsing $2^{\mathfrak{c}}$, τ is a Q-name for a MAD family extending A, and $G_i \subseteq Q$ for $i \in 2$ are mutually generic filters over V, the set $\tau/G_0 \cup \tau/G_1$ is not an AD family.*

Proof. Let U be a nonprincipal ultrafilter on ω with empty intersection with A, let P be the usual c.c.c. poset adding a set $\dot{x}_{gen} \subseteq \omega$ which has finite intersection with every set not in U. The poset P regularly embeds into Q and $\dot{x}_{gen}$ becomes a Q-name under a fixed embedding. There is a Q-name $\dot{y}$ such that $Q \Vdash \dot{y} \cap \dot{x}_{gen}$ is infinite and $\dot{y} \in \tau$. Note that by the choice of the ultrafilter U, $\dot{y}$ is forced not to be in V.

Let $G_0, G_1 \subseteq Q$ be mutually generic filters. It will be enough to show that $\dot{y}/G_0 \in \tau/G_0$ has infinite intersection with $\dot{y}/G_1 \in \tau/G_1$. To show this, go back to V and suppose that $q_0, q_1 \in Q$ are conditions and $n \in \omega$ is a number. By a genericity argument, it is enough to find $q_0' \leq q_0$, $q_1' \leq q_1$ and $m > n$ such that q_0', q_1' both force $\check{m} \in \dot{y}$. For this, consider the sets

$$a_0 = \{m \in \omega \colon \exists q \leq q_0 \; q \Vdash \check{m} \in \dot{y}\}$$

and

$$a_1 = \{m \in \omega \colon \exists q \leq q_1 \; q \Vdash \check{m} \in \dot{y}\}.$$

Since $\dot{y}$ is forced to have an infinite intersection with the set $\dot{x}_{gen}$ which has a finite intersection with every set not in U, both sets a_0 and a_1 must be in U and so there is a number $m > n$ in their intersection. The proposition follows. □

(1) now follows from Theorem 2.2, and Theorem 3.2 in the case $V[K_0] = V[K_1] = V$.

The main point in (2) is that injections from ω_1 to 2^ω do not survive almost any simultaneous generic extensions at all.

Claim 3.5. *If Q_0, Q_1 are posets collapsing $2^{\mathfrak{c}}$ and τ_0, τ_1 are respectively Q_0, Q_1-names for a injections from ω_1 to 2^ω, then there are conditions $q_0 \in Q_0$ and $q_1 \in Q_1$ such that for any pair $G_0 \subseteq Q_0$, $G_1 \subseteq Q_1$ of filters separately generic over V and containing the conditions q_0, q_1 respectively, the set $\tau_0/G_0 \cup \tau_1/G_1$ is not a function.*

Proof. Note that the set of the ground model reals is forced to be countable and so it is possible to find an ordinal $\alpha \in 2^{\mathfrak{c}}$, a number $n \in \omega$, and conditions $q_0^0, q_0^1 \in Q_0$ such that $q_0^0 \Vdash \tau_0(\alpha)(n) = 0$ and $q_0^1 \Vdash \tau_0(\alpha)(n) = 1$. Let $q_1 \in Q_1$ be a condition deciding the value of $\tau_1(\alpha)(n)$; say that the value is forced to be 1. The conditions $q_0 = q_0^0 \in Q_0$ and $q_1 \in Q_1$ obviously work as desired. □

Theorem 3.2 in the case $V[K_0] = V[K_1] = V$ now implies that ω_1 sequences of distinct reals are independent of ultrafilters. (2) then follows immediately from Theorem 2.2. □

A great deal of more sophisticated information about the model $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$ can be extracted from the evaluation of chromatic numbers of Borel hypergraphs. This will be done using the following general theorem:

Theorem 3.6. (ZFC+LC) *Suppose that X is a Polish space, $n \leq \omega$, and $Z \subseteq X^n$ is a Borel hypergraph. Suppose that there exist a poset P and a P-name $\dot{x}$ for an element of X such that*

1. *P preserves Ramsey ultrafilters;*

2. *for every $p \in P$, there exist in some generic extension (separately) V-generic filters $K_i \subseteq P$ ($i \in n$) containing the condition p, such that $\langle \dot{x}/K_i \colon i \in n\rangle \in Z$ is a sequence of distinct points.*

Let U be a Ramsey ultrafilter on ω. Then in $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$, the hypergraph Z has uncountable chromatic number.

Proof. We will show that the colorings of the hypergraph Z by ω colors are independent of Ramsey ultrafilters and then use Theorem 2.2. Suppose that U is a Ramsey ultrafilter, Q is a forcing collapsing $2^{|P|}$, τ is a Q-name for an ultrafilter extending U, and σ is a Q-name for a coloring of the graph Z with colors in ω. Since P regularly embeds into Q, $\dot{x}$ becomes a Q-name via some fixed embedding of P.

Suppose that $q \in Q$ is an arbitrary condition. Strengthening q if necessary, we may assume that q decides the value $\sigma(\dot{x})$ to be some specific number $m \in \omega$. Let $p \in P$ be a condition stronger than the projection of q into P. Use (2) to find filters $K_i \subseteq P$ for $i \in n$ separately generic over V (in a generic extension $V[K_i : i \in n]$ of V) such that $p \in K_i$ and $\langle \dot{x}/K_i \colon i \in n\rangle \in Z$ is a sequence of distinct points. Let $H_i \subseteq Q/K_i$ for $i \in n$ be mutually generic filters over the model $V[K_i : i \in n]$ containing the condition q/K_i. Let $G_i = K_i * H_i \subseteq Q$. These are generic filters over V; we claim that they work as desired.

First of all, it is clear that $\bigcup_i \sigma/G_i$ is not a coloring of the hypergraph Z: its domain contains the points $\dot{x}/K_i$ for $i \in n$ which form a Z-edge, but they are still assigned the same color. Second, the set $\bigcup_i \tau/G_i$ generates a nonprincipal filter. To see this, go to the model $V[K_i : i \in n]$, note that U generates an ultrafilter in the models $V[K_i]$ ($i \in n$) by (1), and use Proposition 3.2 on $V[K_i : i \in n]$. □

The first observation about chromatic numbers in the model $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$ is that many simple graphs have uncountable chromatic number in $L(\mathbb{R})$ and countable one in $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$. The simplest example is the graph Z on 2^ω connecting binary sequences x, y if they differ in exactly one entry.

Observation 3.7. (ZF+DC) *If there is a nonprincipal ultrafilter on ω then the graph Z has chromatic number* 2.

Proof. This is well known. Let U be a nonprincipal ultrafilter on ω. For every $x \in 2^\omega$ and every $n \in \omega$ let $x[n]$ be the parity of the number

$$|\{m \in n \colon x(m) = 1\}|.$$

Let $f(x) = 0$ if the set $\{n \in \omega \colon x[n] = 0\}$ is in U, and $f(x) = 1$ otherwise. It is not difficult to see that no two elements of 2^ω connected by a graph edge have the same f-value. □

Many other Borel graphs remain uncountably chromatic in the model $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$ though. This leads to a number of interesting results. Previous proofs of the following theorem appear in [3, 12].

Theorem 3.8. (ZFC+LC) *In $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$, there is no total selector on E_0.*

Proof. Let Z be the graph on 2^ω connecting points x, y if they are E_0-related and distinct. It is easy to observe in ZF+DC that if there is an E_0 selector then the graph Z has countable chromatic number. Thus, it is enough to show that the graph Z has uncountable chromatic number in $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$, and for this it is enough to produce a suitable partial ordering P and use Theorem 3.6.

Let P be the quotient partial ordering of Borel subsets of 2^ω positive with respect to the σ-ideal I generated by Borel E_0-selectors, with the inclusion ordering. Let $\dot{x}_{gen} \in 2^\omega$ be the P-name for its canonical generic point. The poset has been studied for example in [19, Section 4.7.1], where its combinatorial form is provided and several properties isolated.

Claim 3.9. *Every Ramsey ultrafilter generates an ultrafilter in the P-extension.*

Proof. The poset P is proper and bounding by the results of [19, Section 4.7.1]. It does not add independent real by [16, Proposition 4.5]. The ideal I is $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ on $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_1$ (i.e., for every analytic set $A \subseteq 2^\omega \times 2^\omega$, the set of $y \in 2^\omega$ for which $\{x \in 2^\omega : (y, x) \in A\} \in I$ is coanalytic). The claim abstractly follows from these properties by [19, Theorem 3.4.1]. $\square$

Claim 3.10. *For every condition $p \in P$, in some forcing extension there are filters $K_0, K_1 \subseteq P$ separately generic over V, containing the condition p such that $\dot{x}_{gen}/K_0 \; Z \; \dot{x}_{gen}/K_1$.*

Proof. Let $p \in P$ be a condition. There must be a nonempty finite binary string $s \in 2^{<\omega}$ such that $(s \cdot p) \cap p \notin I$ since $p \setminus \bigcup\{s \cdot p : s \in 2^{<\omega} \setminus \{\emptyset\}\}$ is an Borel E_0-selector and therefore in the ideal I. Note that the map $q \mapsto s \cdot q$ is an automorphism of the partial ordering P. Thus, if $K_0 \subseteq P$ is a filter generic over V, containing the condition $(s \cdot p) \cap p$, then the filter $K_1 = s \cdot K_0$ is also a filter generic over V and it contains the condition p. Also, $\dot{x}_{gen}/K_0 = s \cdot \dot{x}_{gen}/K_1$ and so the two generic points obtained from the two filters are E_0-related and distinct as required. $\square$

A reference to Theorem 3.6 now concludes the proof. $\square$

As noted above, the following corollary of Theorem 3.8 is due to Simon Thomas.

Corollary 3.11. (ZFC+LC) *There is no Hamel basis for $\mathbb{R}$ or a transcendental basis for $\mathbb{C}$ in the model $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$.*

Proof. This is easiest to show using the following observations of independent interest:

Observation 3.12. (ZF+DC) *The following are equivalent:*

1. *there is a nonsmooth hyperfinite Borel equivalence relation with a total selector;*

2. every hyperfinite Borel equivalence relation has a total selector.

Proof. Only (1)→(2) requires a proof. Suppose that E is a nonsmooth hyperfinite Borel equivalence relation on a Polish space X with a total selector S. Since there is a Borel relation on X which orders each E-equivalence class in ordertype embeddable into $\mathbb{Z}$ [6, Theorem 7.2.4(iv)], one can use the selector S to produce a function $f\colon X \to \omega$ which is injective on every E-class. Now, let F be any hyperfinite equivalence relation on a Polish space Y. There is a Borel injective function $h\colon Y \to X$ which reduces F to E. Now let T be the set of $y \in Y$ for which $f(h(y))$ is the smallest number in $f \circ h''[y]_F$, and observe that T is a selector for F. □

Observation 3.13. (Simon Thomas)(ZF+DC) *If there is a Hamel basis for* $\mathbb{R}$ *or a transcendental basis for* $\mathbb{C}$*, then there is a total* E_0 *selector.*

Proof. To treat the case of Hamel basis, we will show that the existence of a Hamel basis implies existence of a total selector for the Vitali equivalence relation on $\mathbb{R}$; this will complete the proof by Observation 3.12. Let $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be such a basis; rescaling, we may assume that the number 1 belongs to B. For every nonzero $r \in \mathbb{R}$ there is a unique finite linear combination of reals in $B \setminus \{1\}$ with nonzero rational coefficients whose result belongs to the Vitali class of r. The set of results of these unique linear combinations for $r \in \mathbb{R}$ forms a total selector for the Vitali equivalence relation.

To treat the case of a transcendental basis for $\mathbb{C}$, first write K for the algebraic closure of $\mathbb{Q}$ in $\mathbb{C}$. Let E be the equivalence relation on $\mathbb{C}$ connecting x and y if $x - y \in K$. Note that this is a nonsmooth hyperfinite equivalence relation as it is an orbit equivalence of a continuous action of the abelian group $\langle K, + \rangle$ on $\mathbb{C}$. We will show that the existence of a transcendental basis implies the existence of an E-selector. Assume that $B \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is a transcendental basis. For every $r \in \mathbb{C}$ there is an inclusion smallest set $b_r \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that r belongs to the algebraic closure of b_r. In some fixed enumeration of terms for the agebraic closure, there must be a first term which, when applied to b_r, yields an element c_r of $[r_E]$. As before, the definition of c_r does not depend on r itself but only on its E-class, and therefore the set $\{c_r \colon r \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is an E-selector as desired. □

The proof is now concluded by reference to Theorem 3.8. □

Woodin (Lemma 17 of [18]) has shown that, assuming ZF + DC + AD, there is no injection from $[\omega_1]^\omega$ to $\omega_1 \times \mathcal{P}(\omega)$. His proof uses the following consequence of AD : for any function $f\colon [\omega_1]^\omega \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)$, there is a club $C \subseteq \omega_1$ such that f is constant on $[C]^\omega$. The arguments of [7] adapt to show that this partition property persists to $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$. The following theorem gives a different proof of the noninjectivity of $[\omega_1]^\omega$ into $\omega_1 \times \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ in $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$.

Theorem 3.14. *(ZF + LC) In* $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$ *there is no injection from* $[\omega_1]^\omega$ *to* $\omega_1 \times \mathcal{P}(\omega)$.

Proof. Applying Theorem 2.2, it suffices to pass to a forcing extension $V[G]$ of V satisfying CH and having the same reals as V, and showing that, in $V[G]$, injections from $[\omega_1]^\omega$ to $\omega_1 \times \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ are Φ_0-independent of U, where Φ_0 is a tame sentence corresponding to the existence of a nonpricipal ultrafilter on ω. Let Q_0 be Namba forcing, and let Q be a partial order making $2^{|Q_0|}$ countable. Let τ_0 be a Q-name for an ultrafilter extending U, and let τ_1 be a Q-name for an injection from $[\omega_1]^\omega$ to $\omega_1 \times \mathcal{P}(\omega)$. Let σ be a Q-name for the the Nambda generic element of $[(\omega_2)^{V[G]}]^\omega$, using some regular embedding π of Q_0 into Q (we identify σ with the corresponding Q_0-name in the last paragraph of the proof). Let $\dot{Q}_1$ be a Q_0-name such that $Q_0 * \dot{Q}_1$ is isomorphic to Q, via a map extending π.

Suppose first that there is a condition $q \in Q$ which forces $\tau_1(\sigma) = (\check{\alpha}, \check{r})$ for some ordinal α and some $r \subseteq \omega$ in the $V[G]$. In this case, consider mutually generic filters H_0, H_1 below q. Injectivity of $\tau_1/G_0 \cup \tau_1/G_1$ then fails at the pair (α, r) since $\sigma/G_0 \neq \sigma/G_1$, and $\tau_0/G_0 \cup \tau_0/G_1$ is a filter by mutual genericity.

Suppose now that there is no such q. Then all conditions in Q force that the value $\tau(\sigma)$ will be a pair (α, r) for some r not in $V[G]$. In such a case, let K be a Namba generic filter over $V[G]$. Since forcing with Namba forcing over a model of CH adds no reals, U is an ultrafilter in $V[G][K]$. Let H_0 and H_1 be mutually $V[G][K]$-generic filters for $\dot{Q}_1/K$. Mutual genericity gives that $\tau_0/(K, H_0) \cup \tau_0/(K, H_1)$ generates a filter, and that $\tau_1/(K, H_0) \cup \tau_1/(K, H_1)$ is not a function, since it takes two different values at σ/K. □

An interesting approach to discerning between Borel equivalence relations in the model $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$ is to discuss the linear orderability of their associated quotient spaces. In $L(\mathbb{R})$, the quotient space $2^\omega/E_0$ fails to be linearly orderable, and so the linear orderability of the quotient space fails for every Borel nonsmooth equivalence relation in $L(\mathbb{R})$. In the model $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$, the situation is more nuanced:

Observation 3.15. (ZF+DC) *If there is a nonprincipal ultrafilter on ω then the class of equivalence relations for which the quotient space is linearly orderable is closed under countable increasing unions.*

Proof. Let U be a nonprincipal ultrafilter on ω. Let $E = \bigcup_n E_n$ be an increasing union of equivalence relations on a Polish space X, and suppose that the quotient space of the relations E_n is linearly orderable for each $n \in \omega$. Let $\leq_n$ be a linear preordering on X such that the induced equivalence relation is exactly E_n. The sequence of linear orders can be found as we assume DC. Let $\leq$ be a preordering on X defined by $x \leq y$ if $\{n \in \omega \colon x \leq_n y\} \in U$. It is not difficult to verify that $\leq$ induces a linear ordering of E-classes. □

For example, for equivalence relations such as E_0 and E_1 the quotient space is linearly orderable in $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$ while no such linear orderings exist in $L(\mathbb{R})$.

To show that various quotient spaces cannot be linearly ordered in the model $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$, we will start with the summable equivalence relation E_2. Recall that this is an equivalence relation on 2^ω connecting binary sequences $x, y \in 2^\omega$ if $\sum\{\frac{1}{n+1} \colon x(n) \neq y(n)\} < \infty$.

Theorem 3.16. (ZFC+LC) *In $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$, the E_2 quotient space cannot be linearly ordered.*

Theorem 3.16 follows from the more general Theorem 3.18 below. Let Z_2 be the set of $x, y \in 2^\omega$ for which $x \; E_2 \; 1 - y$.

Observation 3.17. (ZF) *If the E_2 quotient space is linearly orderable then the graph Z_2 has chromatic number two.*

Proof. Let $\leq$ be a linear order on the E_2 quotient space. Define the coloring c on 2^ω by letting $c(x) = 0$ if for every $y \in 2^\omega$ such that $x \; Z_2 \; y$, $[y]_{E_2} < [x]_{E_2}$ holds; and $c(x) = 1$ otherwise. It is not difficult to see that c is a coloring of Z_2. $\square$

Now we will show the following.

Theorem 3.18. (ZFC+LC) *In $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$, the chromatic number of Z_2 is uncountable.*

Proof. Let $\omega = \bigcup_n I_n$ be a partition of ω into successive intervals. Write $X_n = 2^{I_n}$ for every $n \in \omega$ and let $X = \prod_n X_n$; the space X is naturally identified with 2^ω via the bijection $\pi \colon x \mapsto \bigcup x$ from X to 2^ω. Let d_n be the metric on X_n given by $d_n(u, v) = \sum\{\frac{1}{m+1} \colon u(m) \neq v(m)\}$. Let μ_n be the normalized counting measure on X_n multiplied by $(n+1)^2$. The concentration of measure computations on pages 42 and 138 of [9] show that the sequence $\langle I_n \colon n \in \omega \rangle$ can be chosen in such a way that for every $n > 0$ and every $a, b \subseteq X_n$ of μ_n-mass at least 1 there are binary strings $u \in a$ and $v \in b$ such that $d_n(u, v) \leq 2^{-n}$.

Let p_{ini} be the tree of all finite sequences t such that for all $n \in \text{dom}(t)$, $t(n) \in X_n$. Finally, let P be the poset all all trees $p \subseteq p_{\text{ini}}$ such that the numbers $\{\mu_{|s|}(\{u \in X_{|s|} \colon s^\frown u \in p\}) \colon s \in p\}$ converge to ∞ (i.e., such that, for a each real number r and each node $s_0 \in p$, there is an extesion $s_1 \in p$ of s_0 such that, for all extensions $s \in p$ of s_1, $\mu_{|s|}(\{u \in X_{|s|} \colon s^\frown u \in p\}) > r$). The ordering is that of inclusion.

The forcing P is of the fat tree kind studied for example in [1, Section 7.3.B] or [19, Section 4.4.3]. It adds a generic point $\dot{x}_{gen} \in 2^\omega$ which is the union of the trunks of the trees in the generic filter. The following two claims are key.

Claim 3.19. *The poset P preserves Ramsey ultrafilters.*

Proof. The forcing properties of posets similar to P are investigated in [19, Section 4.4.3]. [19, Theorem 4.4.8] shows that P is proper, bounding, and does not add independent reals. The associated σ-ideal is $\mathbf{\Pi}^1_1$ on $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_1$ by [19, Theorem 3.8.9]. Posets with these properties preserve Ramsey ultrafilters by [19, Theorem 3.4.1]. $\square$

Claim 3.20. *For every condition $p \in P$, in some forcing extension there are filters $K_0, K_1 \subseteq P$ which are separately generic over the ground model, with $p \in K_0 \cap K_1$ and $(\dot{x}_{gen}/K_0) \; E_2 \; (1 - \dot{x}_{gen}/K_1)$.*

Proof. Let $V[H]$ be a forcing extension in which $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\omega))^V$ is a countable set. The usual fusion arguments for the forcing P as in [1, Section 7.3.B] show that in $V[H]$, there is a condition $p' \subseteq p$ in $P^{V[H]}$ such that all its branches yield P-generic filters over the ground model. Let $s_0 \in p'$ be a node such that all nodes of p' extending s_0 have the set of immediate successors in p' of submeasure at least 1. For simplicity of notation assme that $s_0 = 0$. By induction on $n \in \omega$ build nodes $s_n, t_n \in p'$ so that

- $t_0 = s_0 = 0$, t_{n+1} is an immediate successor of t_n and s_{n+1} is an immediate successor of s_n;
- writing $u_n, v_n \in X_n$ for the binary strings such that $s_n^\frown u_n = s_{n+1}$ and $t_n^\frown v_n = t_{n+1}$, it is the case that $d_n(u_n, 1 - v_n) \leq 2^{-n}$.

Once this is done, let $K_0 \subseteq P$ be the filter associated with $\bigcup_n s_n$ and let K_1 be the filter associated with $\bigcup_n t_n$. These are branches through the tree p', so the filters K_0, K_1 are generic over the ground model. The second item immediately implies that $(\dot{x}_{gen}/K_0)\ E_2\ (1 - \dot{x}_{gen}/K_1)$ as desired.

The induction step of the construction above is obtained as follows. Suppose that $t_n, s_n \in p'$ have been found. Let

$$a = \{u \in X_n : s_n^\frown u \in p'\}$$

and

$$b = \{v \in X_n \colon t_n^\frown (1 - v) \in p'\}.$$

Then, $\mu_n(a)$, $\mu(b)$ are both numbers greater than 1, and therefore there are $u \in a$ and $v \in b$ such that $d_n(u, v) \leq 2^{-n}$. Setting $s_{n+1} = s_n^\frown u$ and $t_{n+1}^\frown (1 - v)$ completes the induction step. ☐

Now, in view of Theorem 3.6, colorings of the graph Z_2 with countably many colors are independent of Ramsey ultrafilters. In view of Theorem 2.2, the graph Z_2 has uncountable chromatic number in $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$. ☐

Remark 3.21. Theorem 3.18 shows that in $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$, every nonprincipal ultrafilter on ω intersects the summability ideal (the set of $x \subseteq \omega$ for which $\sum\{\frac{1}{n+1} \colon n \in x\}$ is finite). Blass has conjectured (for instance, in a lecture in Gainesville in February 2016) that the set of nonprincipal ultrafilters on ω in $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$ is generated from U by isomorphism (i.e., permutations of ω) and the sum operation

$$Y \oplus \langle W_i : i \in \omega \rangle = \{\pi[A] : A \subseteq \omega \times \omega \wedge \{i \in \omega \mid \{j \in \omega : (i,j) \in A\} \in W_i\} \in Y\}$$

where Y and each W_i are taken to be nonprincipal ultrafilters on ω and π is a bijection from $\omega \times \omega$ to ω. A related conjecture appears at the top of page 38 in [2].

Our next example is the equivalence relation $=^+$ on $(2^\omega)^\omega$.

Theorem 3.22. (ZFC+LC) *In $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$, the $=^+$ quotient space cannot be linearly ordered.*

Proof. Consider the graph Z on $X = (2^\omega)^\omega$ connecting x, y if

$$\{x(n) \colon n \in \omega\} = \{1 - y(n) \colon n \in \omega\}$$

and $x =^+ y$ fails.

Observation 3.23. (ZF) *If the $=^+$ quotient space is linearly orderable then the graph Z has chromatic number two.*

Proof. Let $\leq$ be a linear order on the $=^+$ quotient space. Define the coloring c on X by letting $c(x) = 0$ if for every $y \in X$ such that $x \; Z \; y$, $[y]_{=^+} < [x]_{=^+}$ holds; and $c(x) = 1$ otherwise. It is not difficult to see that c is a coloring of Z. ☐

Thus, it will be enough to use Theorem 3.6 to show that the chromatic number of the graph Z is uncountable in $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$. For this, we need to find a suitable partial order. Let P be the countable support product of ω_1 many Sacks reals, yielding an ω_1-sequence $\dot{x}_{gen}$. The following two claims are key:

Claim 3.24. *Any Ramsey ultrafilter generates an ultrafilter in the P-extension.*

Proof. The product of countably many copies Sacks forcing does not add an independent real by [13]. It is also well-known to be proper, bounding and definable, and so by [19, Theorem 3.4.1] every Ramsey ultrafilter generates a Ramsey ultrafilter in the countable product extension. Every subset of ω in the uncountable product extension comes from a countable product extension by a properness argument, proving the claim. ☐

Claim 3.25. *For every condition $p \in P$, in some generic extension there are V-generic filters $K_0, K_1 \subseteq P$ containing the condition p, such that*

$$\operatorname{rng}(\dot{x}_{gen}/K_1) = \{1 - z \colon z \in \operatorname{rng}(\dot{x}_{gen}/K_0)\}.$$

Proof. First note that the involution $z \mapsto 1 - z$ on 2^ω generates an automorphism on the Sacks poset, sending every condition s (viewed as an uncountable Borel set) to the set $1 - s$ of complements of points in s. Any involution $\pi \colon \omega_1 \to \omega_1$ generates an automorphism of the poset P, sending any condition p to a condition $\pi(p)$ whose domain is $\pi''\operatorname{dom}(p)$ and for every $\alpha \in \operatorname{dom}(p)$, $\pi(p)(\pi(\alpha)) = 1 - p(\alpha)$. Finally, note that for this automorphism, if $K \subseteq P$ is a generic filter then $\operatorname{rng}(\dot{x}_{gen}/\pi''K) = \{1 - z \colon z \in \operatorname{rng}(\dot{x}_{gen}/K)\}$.

Now, suppose $p \in P$ is a condition. Write $a = \operatorname{dom}(p) \subseteq \omega_1$; this is a countable set. Let π be any involution of ω_1 such that $a \cap \pi''a = 0$. The conditions p and $\pi(p)$ are then compatible, with a lower bound q. Let $K_0 \subseteq P$ be a filter generic over V, containing the condition q. Let $K_1 = \pi''K_0$ and check that the filters K_0, K_1 work as desired. ☐

Note that the poset P does not literally add an element of the $=^+$-quotient space but only a code for an $=^+$-class in a $\mathrm{Coll}(\omega, \omega_1)$ extension. This does not change anything in the proof of Theorem 3.6 and we can conclude that the colorings of the graph Z with countably many colors are independent of Ramsey ultrafilters. By Theorem 2.2, it follows that in the model $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$ the graph Z has uncountable chromatic number and so the quotient space cannot be linearly ordered. $\square$

We conclude this section with a natural question. [14] showed that there is a simple Borel graph which is of uncountable chromatic number in $L(\mathbb{R})$ and minimal in the sense that it can be continuously homomorphically embedded into any other uncountably chromatic graph in $L(\mathbb{R})$. Does this situation repeat in $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$?

Question 3.26. Is there a Borel graph Z_0 such that it has an uncountable chromatic number in $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$, and it can be continuously homomorphically embedded into every other Borel graph of uncountable chromatic number in $L(\mathbb{R})[U]$?

4 Adding selectors to equivalence relations

In this section, we investigate the model $L(\mathbb{R})[S]$ where $S \subseteq X$ is a total selector on a fixed equivalence relation E on a Polish space X, which is added generically by countable approximations. To prevent all of the Axiom of Choice from creeping into the model, we will restrict our attention to a class isolated by Kanovei:

Definition 4.1. An analytic equivalence relation E on a Polish space X is *pinned* if for mutually generic filters G, H, every E-equivalence class represented in both $V[G]$ and $V[H]$ is represented in V.

The restriction on the complexity of the equivalence relation E is necessary. The standard example of an unpinned equivalence relation is $=^+$ (as shown, for instance, by Claim 3.25). We make the following simple observations:

Observation 4.2. (ZF) *If there is an injection from the $=^+$ quotient space into 2^ω, then there is an injection from ω_1 into 2^ω.*

Proof. The classical Cantor diagonalization argument shows that a selector for $=^+$ induces a choice function c on cocountable subsets of 2^ω (other than 2^ω itself). Starting with a nonempty countable set of reals y, such a function c induces an ω_1-sequence of distinct elements defined by setting x_α to be

$$c(2^\omega \setminus (y \cup \{x_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}).$$

$\square$

Observation 4.3. (ZF+DC) *If $S \subseteq (2^\omega)^\omega$ is a generic total $=^+$-selector, then the model $L(\mathbb{R})[S]$ satisfies the Axiom of Choice and the Continuum Hypothesis.*

Proof. The assumption of DC gives that $L(\mathbb{R})[S] \cap 2^\omega$ is contained in $L(\mathbb{R})$. We will show that $L(\mathbb{R})[S]$ contains an ω_1-sequence $\langle x_\alpha : \alpha < \omega \rangle$ such that each element of 2^ω agrees mod-finite with some x_α. This gives the desired result.

Let P be the poset of partial countable $=^+$-selectors. Let $\langle \dot{x}_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ be a sequence of P-names for the sets x_α from the proof of Observation 4.2, defined using the generic $=^+$-selector and letting y be the set of eventually constant functions in 2^ω. Let p be a condition in P, and let z be an element of 2^ω. We want to see that p has an extension forcing the value of some $\dot{x}_\alpha$ to be equal to z mod-finite. Since $L(\mathbb{R})$ does not contain an injection from ω_1 to 2^ω, there is a least α such that the value of $\dot{x}_\alpha$ has not been decided. For each $\beta < \alpha$, let x_β be the value of $\dot{x}_\beta$ as decided by p. If z agrees mod-finite with some $\dot{x}_\beta$, then we are done. Otherwise, since p has not chosen an element of the $=^+$-class corresponding to $y \cup \{x_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$, we may extend p to a condition p' whose choice for this class is an enumeration $\langle w_n : n \in \omega \rangle$ whose diagonalization $\{(n, 1 - w_n(n)) : n \in \omega\}$ is equal to z. □

As in the previous section, the most important tool for the study of the model $L(\mathbb{R})[S]$ is a proposition showing how the selectors survive multiple forcing extensions.

Theorem 4.4. *Suppose that E is a pinned analytic equivalence relation on a Polish space X, $S \subseteq X$ is a total E-selector, Q is a poset and τ is a Q-name for an E-selector extending S. Whenever $n \leq \omega$ and $G_i \subseteq Q$ are pairwise mutually generic filters over V for each $i \in n$, then $\bigcup_i \tau/G_i$ is an E-selector.*

Proof. This is essentially immediate from the definition of a pinned equivalence relation, since there is no single E-equivalence class from which the different selectors τ/G_i could pick distinct elements. □

The crudest features of the model $L(\mathbb{R})[S]$ immediately follow:

Corollary 4.5. (ZFC+LC) *Let E be a pinned equivalence relation on a Polish space X and $S \subseteq X$ a generic total E-selector. In the model $L(\mathbb{R})[S]$,*

1. *there are no infinite MAD families;*
2. *there are no injective ω_1-sequences of reals.*

Proof. For (1), use Claim 3.4 and Theorem 2.2. For (2), use Claim 3.5 and Theorem 2.2. □

As in the previous section, the finer properties of the model $L(\mathbb{R})[S]$ follow from the investigation of the chromatic numbers of Borel hypergraphs there. This time, chromatic numbers of many graphs will be countable, and to make progress we need to reach for hypergraphs of higher finite dimension.

Theorem 4.6. (ZFC+LC) *Suppose that*

1. *E is a pinned Borel equivalence relation on a Polish space X;*

2. *$n \in \omega$ is a natural number, Y is a Polish space and $Z \subseteq Y^n$ is a Borel hypergraph;*

3. *there exist a poset P and a P-name $\dot{y}$ for an element of Y such that for every condition $p \in P$, in some generic extension there are filters $K_i \subseteq P$ for $i \in n$ containing p, pairwise mutually generic over V, and such that $\langle \dot{y}/K_i \colon i \in n\rangle \in Z$.*

Then in the model $L(\mathbb{R})[S]$, where S is the generic selector for E, the chromatic number of Z is uncountable.

Proof. We prove that colorings of Z with countably many colors are independent of total E-selectors and apply Theorem 2.2. Thus, let $S \subseteq X$ be a total E-selector, Q a poset collapsing $2^{|P|}$ to $\aleph_0$, σ a Q-name for a total E-selector extending S, and τ a Q-name for a map from Y to ω which is a coloring of the hypergraph Z. Note that P is regularly embedded into Q and therefore $\dot{y}$ becomes a Q-name via this fixed embedding. Let $q \in Q$ be a condition deciding the value of $\tau(\dot{y})$ to be some specific number $m \in \omega$. Let $p \in P$ be a condition below the projection of q into P. Use the assumptions to find, in some generic extension, filters $K_i \subseteq P$ for $i \in n$ containing p, pairwise mutually generic over V, and such that $\langle \dot{y}/K_i \colon i \in n\rangle \in Z$. Let $H_i \subseteq Q/K_i$ be filters mutually generic over the model $V[K_i \colon i \in n]$, each containing the condition q. Write $G_i = K_i * H_i \subseteq Q$ for $i \in n$, and note that these filters are pairwise generic over the ground model and contain the condition Q. We claim that they work as desired.

First of all, the map $\bigcup_{i\in n} \tau/G_i$ is not a partial coloring of the hypergraph Z, since its m-th color contains the edge $\langle \dot{y}/G_i \colon i \in n\rangle$. Second, the set $\bigcup_{i\in n} \sigma/G_i$ is a partial E-selector by Proposition 4.4. This completes the proof. $\square$

Theorem 4.7. (ZFC+LC) *There are no nonatomic finitely additive probability measures on ω in the model $L(\mathbb{R})[S]$.*

Proof. Consider the hypergraph Z on $(\mathcal{P}(\omega))^{10}$ consisting of tuples $\vec{y}$ such that every number in ω (with finitely many exceptions) belongs to at least one of the sets $\vec{y}(i)$ for $i \in 3$ and at most two of the sets $\vec{y}(i)$ for $3 \leq i < 10$.

Observation 4.8. (ZF+DC) *If there is a nonatomic probability measure on ω then the hypergraph Z has chromatic number two.*

Proof. Let μ be the measure and consider the coloring c assigning a set $a \subseteq \omega$ color 0 if $\mu(a) < 1/3$ and color 1 otherwise. No edge in the hypergraph Z can contain only points of color 0 since the first three sets on the edge have co-finite union which has to have μ-mass 1. At the same time, no edge on the hypergraph Z can contain only points of color 1 since the last seven sets on the edge would contradict the Fubini theorem between μ and the evenly distributed probability measure on the set $10 \setminus 3$. Alternately, note that in this situation we would have the contradictory equation

$$\mu(y_3 \cup \cdots \cup y_9) = \sum_{i=3}^{9} \mu(y_i) - \sum\{\mu(y_i \cap y_j) : 3 \leq i < j \leq 9\}.$$

□

Thus, it is enough to show that the hypergraph Z has uncountable chromatic number in the model $L(\mathbb{R})[S]$. To this end, consider the poset $P = 2^{<\omega}$ ordered by reverse extension and let $\dot{y}$ be the P-name for the set of all $n \in \omega$ such that for some condition p in the generic filter, $p(n) = 1$. Let $p \in P$ be an arbitrary condition. Pass to a generic extension in which $\mathfrak{c}^V$ is countable; we will produce filters $K_i \subseteq P$ for $i \in 10$ such that $\langle \dot{y}/K_i : i \in 10\rangle \in Z$ and then apply Theorem 4.6. Let $D_k\colon\ (k \in \omega)$ be an enumeration of the open dense subsets of $P \times P$ from the ground model. Let $\pi\colon \omega \to \omega^3$ be a surjection. By induction on $n \in \omega$ build numbers $m_n \in \omega$ and maps $q_n\colon 10 \times m_n \to 2$ so that

1. $m_0 = \mathrm{dom}(p)$ and $q_0(i,j) = p(j)$ for every $i \in 10$;
2. $m_0 \leq m_1 \leq m_2 \leq \ldots$ and $q_0 \subseteq q_1 \subseteq q_2 \subseteq \ldots$;
3. for every $k \in m_{n+1} \setminus m_n$, $q(i,k) = 1$ for at least on $i \in 3$ and at most two $i \in 10 \setminus 3$;
4. if $\pi(n) = \langle k, i, j\rangle$ for some $k \in \omega$ and $i \neq j \in 10$, then q_{n+1} restricted to the i-th and j-th column belongs to D_k.

The induction process is immediate. In the end, for every $i \in 10$ let $K_i \subseteq P$ be the filter generated by the maps $q_n(i, \cdot)$ for $n \in \omega$ and observe that these filters work as required. □

Theorem 4.9. (ZFC+LC) *There are no Hamel bases for* $\mathbb{R}$ *in the model* $L(\mathbb{R})[S]$.

Proof. Consider the hypergraph Z on $\mathbb{R}^3$ consisting of triples $\langle y_0, y_1, y_2\rangle$ of pairwise distinct real numbers such that $y_0 + y_1 + q = y_2$ for some rational number $q \in \mathbb{Q}$.

Observation 4.10. (ZF+DC) *If a Hamel basis for* $\mathbb{R}$ *exists then the hypergraph* Z *has countable chromatic number.*

Proof. Let B be a Hamel basis; rescaling, we may assume that it contains number 1. Each number $y \in \mathbb{R}$ is equal to unique expression of the form

$$q + \sum_{i \in n} q_i r_i,$$

where q is a rational number, each q_i is a nonzero rational number, and

$$r_0 < r_1 < \cdots < r_{n-1}$$

are irrational numbers. Let f be a function on $\mathbb{R}$ defined by setting $f(y)$ to be

$$\langle q, q_0, p_0, q_1, p_1, \dots, p_{n-2}, q_{n-1}\rangle$$

where q and each q_i are copied from the unique decomposition of y, and each p_i is the least rational number (in some fixed enumeration) between the corresponding reals r_i and r_{i+1}. The linear independence of B over $\mathbb{Q}$ gives that no edge in the graph can consist of three numbers with the same value of f. $\square$

Thus, it is enough to show that the hypergraph Z has uncountable chromatic number in the model $L(\mathbb{R})[S]$. Towards this, we will find a suitable poset P and apply Theorem 4.6. Let P be the poset of nonempty open subsets of $\mathbb{R}$, ordered by inclusion; this is the Cohen poset with its associated name for a generic point $\dot{y} \in \mathbb{R}$. The following claim is immediate:

Claim 4.11. *If $y_0, y_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ are mutually generic points for P and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ is a rational number, then the triple $y_0, y_1, y_0 + y_1 + q$ is pairwise mutually generic for P.*

Now, let $p \in P$ be an arbitrary condition. Find pairwise generic filters $K_0, K_1 \subseteq P$ containing the condition p, find a rational number $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $y_2 = \dot{y}/K_0 + \dot{y}/K_1 + q \in p$, and let $K_2 \subseteq P$ be the filter of all open subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ containing the number y_2. It is clear that the filters $K_0, K_1, K_2 \subseteq P$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 4.6 and so the application of the theorem will complete the proof. $\square$

An obvious question may be whether it is possible to discern between the existence of selectors for various equivalence relations. In general, it is not clear for which pairs E, F of Borel equivalence relations it is the case that in ZF+DC, the existence of a total selector for E implies the existence of a total selector for F. Already the case $E = E_0$ and $F = E_1$ appears to be open. We will prove one result in this direction concerning trim equivalence relations:

Definition 4.12. An analytic equivalence relation E on a Polish space X is *trim* if whenever $V[G_0], V[G_1]$ are forcing extensions of the ground model such that $V[G_0] \cap V[G_1] = V$ and $x_0 \in V[G_0] \cap X$ and $x_1 \in V[G_1] \cap X$ are E-related points, then there is a point $x \in V$ which is E-related to both.

There is a rich supply of trim equivalence relations as exhibited in [20]; one interesting example (as shown in [20]) is the equivalence relation E on $2^{\mathbb{Q}}$ connecting points x, y if $\{q \in \mathbb{Q} \colon x(q) \neq y(q)\}$ is nowhere dense. We refer the reader to [20] also for a definition of generic turbulence. For our purposes it is enough to note that that generic turbulence is characterized by being induced by a continuous action of a Polish group, with dense meager orbits, such that Claim 4.14 below holds.

Theorem 4.13. *Suppose that E is a Borel trim equivalence relation on a Polish space X and F is an orbit equivalence relation of a generically turbulent group action on a Polish space Y. The total F-selectors and independent of total E-selectors.*

Proof. The key forcing consideration is the following. Let $G \curvearrowright Y$ be the group action generating the equivalence relation E. Let P_Y be the Cohen poset of nonempty open subsets of Y ordered by inclusion, adding a generic element $\dot{y}_{gen} \in \dot{Y}$. Let P_G be the Cohen poset of nonempty open subsets of G ordered by inclusion, adding a generic element $\dot{g}_{gen} \in \dot{Y}$. The following is an alternative characterization of the turbulence of the action $G \curvearrowright Y$:

Claim 4.14. $P_G \times P_Y \Vdash V[\dot{y}_{gen}] \cap V[\dot{g}_{gen} \cdot \dot{y}_{gen}] = V$.

Let S be a total E-selector, Q a poset collapsing $2^{\mathfrak{c}}$ to $\aleph_0$, let τ be a Q-name for an E-selector extending S, and let σ be a Q-name for a total F-selector. The poset P_Y regularly embeds into the poset Q and so $\dot{y}_{gen}$ becomes a Q-name. Use Claim 4.14 to find filters $K_0, K_1 \subseteq P_Y$ such that $V[K_0] \cap V[K_1] = V$ and $\dot{y}_{gen}/K_0 \ F \ \dot{y}_{gen}/K_1$. Let $H_0 \subseteq Q/K_0$ and $H_1 \subseteq Q/K_1$ be filters mutually generic over the model $V[K_0, K_1]$ and let $G_0 = K_0 * H_0$ and $G_1 = K_1 * H_1$. It is immediate that $G_0, G_1 \subseteq Q$ are filters separately generic over V, with $V[G_0] \cap V[G_1] = V$. We claim that these filters work as required.

First of all, the set $\sigma/G_0 \cup \sigma/G_1$ is not an F-selector: σ/G_0 contains some element of the class $[\dot{y}_{gen}/G_0]_F$ and σ/G_1 contains some element of this same class as well, these two elements belong to the models $V[G_0]$ and $V[G_1]$ respectively and so they cannot be equal. If they were equal, they would have to belong to the ground model, which contradicts the fact that the class $[\dot{y}_{gen}/K_0]_F$ has no ground model elements.

On the other hand, the set $\tau/G_0 \cup \tau/G_1$ is an E-selector: all E-equivalence classes represented in both $V[G_0]$ and $V[G_1]$ are represented already in V by the trimness of the equivalence relation E, and so already the common part S of τ/G_0 and τ/G_1 selected an element from this class and the two selectors cannot disagree on it. ◻

Corollary 4.15. (ZFC+LC) *Suppose that E is a Borel trim equivalence relation on a Polish space X and F is an orbit equivalence relation of a generically turbulent group action on a Polish space Y. Let S be a generic total E-selector. Then in $L(\mathbb{R})[S]$, the equivalence relation F has no total selector.*

5 Adding MAD families

From Claim 3.4, it appears to be difficult to preserve MAD families with the multiple generic extensions. We do not know how to handle the model $L(\mathbb{R})[A]$, where $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ is a generic MAD family added with infinitely countable approximations. We have to resort to adding a more specific type of MAD family, which curiously enough has connections to the $\mathfrak{d} < \mathfrak{a}$ problem (see [15], for instance).

Definition 5.1. An *improved AD family* is a pair $\langle A, B \rangle$ such that

1. A is an infinite AD family in $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$;

2. B is a set consisting of pairs $\langle s, a\rangle$ such that s is a partition of ω into finite sets and $a \subseteq A$ is a countable set;

3. for every pair $\langle s, a\rangle \in B$ and every finite set $b \subseteq A \setminus a$, there are infinitely many sets $c \in s$ such that $\bigcup b \cap c = \emptyset$.

An improved AD family $\langle A, B\rangle$ is *maximal* if A is a MAD family and for every partition s there is a with $\langle s, a\rangle \in B$.

Improved MAD families are naturally added by a poset of countable improved AD families ordered by coordinatewise inclusion (note however that a maximal pair $\langle A, B\rangle$ in this order - allowing A and B to be uncountable - is not necessarily an improved MAD family, nor does the reverse implication hold). It is easy to verify that if G is a generic filter on the poset of countable improved AD families, then the coordinatewise union of conditions in G is an improved MAD family. Moreover, the second coordinate can be recovered from the first one by a genericity argument.

Proposition 5.2. *If the Continuum Hypothesis holds, then there is an improved MAD family. If $\mathfrak{d} < \mathfrak{a}$, then there is no improved MAD family.*

Proof. If the Continuum Hypothesis holds, it is easy to produce a filter on the poset of countable improved AD families which meets all the $\mathfrak{c} = \aleph_1$ open dense sets necessary to turn its union into an improved MAD family.

Towards the proof of the second sentence, it is enough to show that if $\langle A, B\rangle$ is an improved MAD family then $|A| \leq \mathfrak{d}$. To this end, let $\{s_\alpha \colon \alpha \in \mathfrak{d}\}$ be a collection of partitions of ω into finite sets such that for every other such partition t there is $\alpha \in \mathfrak{d}$ such that every element of s_α contains an element of t as a subset. For every ordinal $\alpha \in \mathfrak{d}$ pick a countable set $a_\alpha \subseteq A$ such that $\langle s_\alpha, a_\alpha\rangle \in B$ and use (3) in the definition of an improved MAD family to conclude that $A = \bigcup_{\alpha\in\mathfrak{d}} a_\alpha$. Thus, $|A| \leq \mathfrak{d}$ as desired. □

As in the previous sections, we must show how improved MAD families survive multiple forcing extensions. The following theorem will be sufficient for all of our purposes. An extension V' of V is *bounding* if each element of $\omega^\omega \cap V'$ is dominated by an element of $\omega^\omega \cap V$.

Theorem 5.3. *Suppose that*

- *$\langle A, B\rangle$ is an improved MAD family,*
- *$n \in \omega$,*
- *$V[G_i]$ $(i \in n)$ are bounded forcing extensions of V contained in some common extension $V[G]$,*
- *$P_i \in V[G_i]$ $(i \in n)$ are posets*
- *for each $i \in n$, $\langle \dot{A}_i, \dot{B}_i\rangle \in V[G_i]$ is a P_i-name for an improved MAD family extending $\langle A, B\rangle$.*

Then, in some forcing extension, there are filters $H_i \subseteq P_i$ $(i \in n)$, each generic over the respective $V[G_i]$, such that $\langle \bigcup_{i\in n} \dot{A}_i/H_i, \bigcup_{i\in n} \dot{B}_i/H_i\rangle$ is an improved AD family.

Proof. We will start with a key technical claim:

Claim 5.4. *For every $i \in n$, in the model $V[G_i]$ the following holds. Whenever $p \in P_i$ is a condition and σ_j $(j \in m)$ are names for elements of $\dot{A}_i$ such that $p \Vdash \sigma_j \notin V$, there exists a $k \in \omega$ such that for each $\ell \in \omega$ there exists a condition $q \leq p$ such that $q \Vdash \bigcup_{j\in m} \sigma_j \cap [k, \ell) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Suppose that the claim fails for some $i \in n$, condition $p \in P_i$ and names σ_j for $j \in m$. Then, in the model $V[G_i]$ there is a partition s of ω into finite sets such that $p \Vdash \bigcup_{j\in m} \sigma_j \cap b \neq 0$ for every $b \in s$. Since $V[G_i]$ is a bounding extension of V, there is a partition $t \in V$ of ω into finite sets, such that every $c \in t$ contains some element of s as a subset. Since $\langle A, B\rangle$ is an improved MAD family, there is a countable $a \subseteq A$ such that $\langle t, a\rangle$ is in B. Since $\langle \dot{A}_i, \dot{B}_i\rangle$ is a P_i-name for an improved MAD family extending $\langle A, B\rangle$, we now have a contradiction with condition (3) of Definition 5.1. □

Let $V[G][H]$ be a forcing extension of $V[G]$ in which each ordinal $(2^{|P_i|})^{V[G_i]}$ is countable. An inductive application of the claim makes it possible to find filters $H_i \subseteq P_i$ $(i \in m)$, each generic over the corresponding $V[G_i]$, and a partition $\omega = \bigcup_{i\in n, j\in\omega} a_{ij}$ of ω into finite sets such that

- for every $i \in \omega$ and every $x \in \dot{A}_i/H_i$, either $x \in A$ or $x \subseteq \bigcup_j a_{ij}$ up to finitely many exceptions;
- for every $i \in \omega$ and every collection $\{b_k : k \in \omega\} \in V[G_i][H_i]$ of pairwise disjoint subsets of ω, there are $j, k \in \omega$ such that $b_k \subseteq a_{ij}$.

We claim that these filters work as required. Let

$$A' = \bigcup_i \tau_i/H_i$$

and

$$B' = \bigcup_i \dot{B}_i/H_i.$$

We must argue that $\langle A', B'\rangle$ is an improved AD family.

First, prove that A' is an almost disjoint family. To this end, suppose that $x, y \in A'$ are distinct points; we must show that they have finite intersection. The critical case is when there are numbers i, j, both in n such that $x \in \dot{A}_i/G_i \setminus A$ and $y \in \dot{A}_j/G_j \setminus A$. But then, $x \subseteq \bigcup_k a_{ik}$ and $y \subseteq \bigcup_k a_{jk}$ with possibly finitely many exceptions, the sets $\bigcup_k a_{ik}$ and $\bigcup_k a_{jk}$ are disjoint, and so $x \cap y$ must be finite.

Second, suppose that $\langle s, a\rangle \in B'$ and $b \subseteq A' \setminus a$ is a finite set; we must find infinitely many sets $c \in s$ such that $\bigcup b \cap c = \emptyset$. Let $i \in n$ be an index such that

$\langle s, a\rangle \in \dot{B}_i/H_i$. There are infinitely many $c \in s$ such that $\bigcup(b \cap \dot{A}_i/H_i) \cap c = \emptyset$ since $\langle \dot{A}_i, \dot{B}_i\rangle$ is forced to be an improved MAD family. By the second item above, there must be infinitely many $c \in s$ such that $\bigcup(b \cap \dot{A}_i/H_i) \cap c = \emptyset$ and $c \subseteq a_{ij}$ for some $j \in \omega$. By the first item above, there must be infinitely many $c \in s$ such that $\bigcup(b \cap \dot{A}_i/H_i) \cap c = \emptyset$, and, for some $j \in \omega$, $c \subseteq a_{ij}$ and, for all $x \in b \setminus \dot{A}_i/H_i$, $x \cap a_{ij} = \emptyset$. This completes the proof. □

Theorem 5.5. *Injective maps from ω_1 to 2^ω are independent of improved MAD families.*

Proof. Suppose that $\langle A, B\rangle$ is an improved MAD family, Q is a poset which collapses $2^{\mathfrak{c}}$, and τ and σ are Q-names for an improved MAD family extending $\langle A, B\rangle$ and an injection from ω_1 to ω respectively. Use Claim 3.5 to find conditions $q_0, q_1 \in Q$ such that for any two filters $G_0, G_1 \subseteq Q$ generic over V and containing the respective conditions q_0, q_1 , the union $\sigma/G_0 \cup \sigma/G_1$ is not a map from ordinals to 2^ω. Use Theorem 5.3 to find generic filters $G_0, G_1 \subseteq Q$ such that $q_0 \in G_0$, $q_1 \in G_1$, and $\tau/G_0 \cup \tau/G_1$ is an improved AD family. This proves the theorem. □

Corollary 5.6. (ZFC+LC) *In the model $L(\mathbb{R})[A, B]$, where $\langle A, B\rangle$ is the generic improved MAD family, there is no injection from ω_1 to 2^ω.*

More sophisticated information about the model $L(\mathbb{R})[A, B]$ can be obtained by investigating chromatic numbers of Borel graphs.

Theorem 5.7. (ZFC+LC) *Let Z be a Borel hypergraph of finite dimension on a Polish space X. Then $L(\mathbb{R}) \models Z$ has countable chromatic number if and only if $L(\mathbb{R})[A, B] \models Z$ has countable chromatic number whenever $\langle A, B\rangle$ is a generic improved MAD family.*

Proof. The right-to-left implication is immediate as $L(\mathbb{R}) \subseteq L(\mathbb{R})[A, B]$ holds. For the left-to-right implication, fix a natural number d. There is a certain critical Borel graph Z_0 on d^ω that needs to be investigated. To obtain the graph Z_0, pick sequences $z_n \in d^n$ $(n \in \omega)$ so that $\{z_n : n \in \omega\}$ is dense in $d^{<\omega}$, and let Z_0 be the set of $\langle x_i : i \in d\rangle \in d^\omega$ for which there exists an $n \in \omega$ such that,

- for every $i \in d$, $x_i(n) = i$ and $x_i \restriction n = z_n$ hold, and
- the functions $x_i \restriction (\omega \setminus n + 1)$ for $i \in d$ are all the same.

It is known [14, Theorem 16] that in $L(\mathbb{R})$, the graph Z_0 has uncountable chromatic number and homomorphically continuously embeds into every other Borel hypergraph of dimension d and uncountable chromatic number. Thus, for the left-to-right implication it is only necessary to show that the graph Z_0 has uncountable chromatic number in the model $L(\mathbb{R})[A, B]$.

To this end, it will be enough to find a bounding proper poset P and a P-name $\dot{x}$ for an element of d^ω such that for every condition $p \in P$, in some generic extension there are filters $K_i \subseteq P$ for $i \in d$, separately generic over V, containing the condition p and such that $\langle \dot{x}/K_i : i \in d\rangle \in Z_0$. Once this is done, the proof of Theorem 3.6 (with Theorem 5.3 replacing Theorem 3.2) shows that colorings of Z_0 with countably many colors are independent of improved MAD families. A reference to Theorem 2.2 then concludes the proof.

The construction of the requisite poset P is routine. By recursion on $k \in \omega$ choose natural numbers $m_k \in \omega$ such that $0 = m_0 \in m_1 \in m_2 \in \dots$ and for every $t \in d^{m_k}$ there is $n \in m_{k+1}$ such that $t \subseteq z_n$. The poset P consists of all functions g whose domain is a coinfinite subset of ω and for each $k \in \mathrm{dom}(g)$, $g(k) \in d^{m_{k+1} \setminus m_k}$. The ordering is that of reverse inclusion. Thus, the poset P is a variation of the Silver forcing investigated in [1, Definition 7.4.11]. A routine variation of the arguments given there (on page 368) shows that the poset P is bounding and proper.

Let $\dot{x}$ be a P-name for $\bigcup \mathrm{rng}(\bigcup K)$, where K is the generic filter. Then $\dot{x}$ is a P-name for a point in d^ω. We claim that the name $\dot{x}$ has the required properties. Indeed, whenever $p \in P$ is a condition let $k = \min(\omega \setminus \mathrm{dom}(p))$, and let $n \in m_{k+1} \setminus m_k$ be a number such that $z = \bigcup_{l \in k} p(l) \subseteq z_n$. Let $u_i \in d^{m_{k+1} \setminus m_k}$ for $i \in d$ be strings such that z_n is an initial segment of $z \cup u_i$ and $u_i(n) = i$ and $u(i)(m) = 0$ for all $i \in d$ and all $n < m < m_{k+1}$. Let $K \subseteq P$ be a filter generic over V containing the condition p and get filters $K_i \subseteq P$ for $i \in d$ by adjusting the conditions in K to return the value u_i respectively at k. It is not difficult to see that the filters $K_i \subseteq P$ for $i \in d$ are as required. □

Corollary 5.8. (ZFC+LC) *If $\langle A, B\rangle$ is a generic improved MAD family, then in $L(\mathbb{R})[A, B]$*

1. *the E_0 quotient space is not linearly orderable;*
2. *there is no Hamel basis for $\mathbb{R}$;*
3. *there is no nonprincipal finitely additive measure on ω.*

Proof. For (1), consider the Borel graph Z on 2^ω connecting points x, y if $x \mathrel{E_0} 1-y$. It is clear that the Z-relation depends only on the E_0-classes of x, y, that modulo E_0 every node has degree exactly 1, and so a presence of a linear ordering on the E_0 quotient space would imply that a Z has chromatic number two. Now, the graph Z has uncountable chromatic number in $L(\mathbb{R})$ (say, by a Baire category argument), so it has uncountable chromatic number in $L(\mathbb{R})[A, B]$ by Theorem 5.7 and so the E_0 is not linearly orderable there. (2) follows from Observation 4.10. (3) follows from Observation 4.8 and Theorem 5.7. □

We conclude this section with another natural question:

Question 5.9. Is there an ω-dimensional Borel hypergraph which is uncountably chromatic in $L(\mathbb{R})$ and countably chromatic in the model $L(\mathbb{R})[A, B]$?

References

[1] Tomek Bartoszynski and Haim Judah. *Set Theory. On the structure of the real line*. A K Peters, Wellesley, MA, 1995.

[2] Andreas Blass. Kleene degrees of ultrafilters. In *Recursion theory week (Oberwolfach, 1984)*, volume 1141 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 29–48. Springer, Berlin, 1985.

[3] C. A. Di Prisco and S. Todorcevic. Souslin partitions of products of finite sets. *Adv. Math.*, 176(1):145–173, 2003.

[4] Carlos DiPrisco and Stevo Todorcevic. Perfect set properties in $L(R)[U]$. *Advances in Mathematics*, 139:240–259, 1998.

[5] Ilijas Farah. Semiselective coideals. *Mathematika*, 45(1):79–103, 1998.

[6] Su Gao. *Invariant Descriptive Set Theory*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2009.

[7] James Henle, Adrian R. D. Mathias, and W. Hugh Woodin. A barren extension. In *Methods in mathematical logic*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1130, pages 195–207. Springer Verlag, New York, 1985.

[8] Thomas Jech. *Set Theory*. Academic Press, San Diego, 1978.

[9] Vladimir Kanovei, Marcin Sabok, and Jindřich Zapletal. *Canonical Ramsey theory on Polish spaces*, volume 202 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013.

[10] Richard Ketchersid, Paul Larson, and Jindřich Zapletal. Ramsey ultrafilters and countable-to-one uniformization. *Topology and Its Applications*, 213:190–198, 2016.

[11] Paul B. Larson. *The stationary tower*. University Lecture Series 32. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004. Notes on a course by W. Hugh Woodin.

[12] Paul B. Larson. A choice function on countable sets, from determinacy. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 143(4):1763–1770, 2015.

[13] Richard Laver. Products of infinitely many perfect trees. *Journal of London Mathematical Society*, 29:385–396, 1984.

[14] Benjamin D. Miller. The graph-theoretic approach to descriptive set theory. *Bull. Symbolic Logic*, 18:554–574, 2012.

[15] Saharon Shelah. Two cardinal invariants of the continuum ($\mathfrak{d} < \mathfrak{a}$) and FS linearly ordered iterated forcing. *Acta Math.*, 192(2):187–223, 2004.

[16] Saharon Shelah and Jindřich Zapletal. Ramsey theorems for product of finite sets with submeasures. *Combinatorica*, 31:225–244, 2011.

[17] Simon Thomas and Jindřich Zapletal. On the Steinhaus and Bergman properties for infinite products of finite groups. *Confluentes Math.*, 4(2):1250002, 26, 2012.

[18] W. Hugh Woodin. The cardinals below $|[\omega_1]^{<\omega_1}|$. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 140:161–232, 2006.

[19] Jindřich Zapletal. *Forcing Idealized*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics 174. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008.

[20] Jindřich Zapletal. *Borel reducibility invariants in higher set theory.* 2015. in preparation.