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Abstract

The paper surveys some questions concerning coloring axioms which grew out of the discussions the author had with his PhD advisor Ken Kunen.

1 Introduction to coloring axioms

In studying a question of his long time colleague, M. E. Rudin, who asked whether $\text{MA}$ and the failure of $\text{CH}$ implies that every locally connected, hereditarily Lindelöf, compact space is metrizable Ken Kunen became interested in an example of Filippov [4]. Filippov had used a Luzin set to construct a locally connected, hereditarily Lindelöf, compact space that is not metrizable and Filippov’s space is also hereditarily separable. Since $\text{MA} + \neg\text{CH}$ implies that there are no Luzin sets, Kunen wondered whether $\text{MA}$ and the failure of $\text{CH}$ might refute the existence of such a space. In [9] he discovered some interesting facets of $\text{SOCA}$ and used these to show that this is not the case.

Filippov’s construction relies on the geometry of spheres and Ken was able to see in this a useful weakening of a Luzin set. For $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ let

$$T^* = \{x - y : x, y \in T \ & \ x \neq y\}$$

and Kunen defines $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ to be skinny if the closure of $\{x/\|x\| : x \in T^*\}$ is not the entire surface of the sphere in $\mathbb{R}^n$. He calls a set $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ weakly Luzin if $E$ is uncountable but every skinny subset of $E$ is countable. He then
shows that the Filippov space constructed from a set $E$ has no uncountable discrete subsets if and only if $E$ is weakly Luzin. Furthermore, he shows that weakly Luzin sets and the entangled sets that play a prominent role in the study of colouring axioms have a nice combinatorial common generalization.

With these ideas he is able to show from SOCA that if $X$ is compact and $Y$ is compact metric with $\pi : X \to Y$ continuous and if there is some uncountable $E \subseteq Y$ such that for all $y \in E$, there are three points $\{x_{i,y}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \pi^{-1}\{y\}$ with disjoint open neighbourhoods $U_{i,y}$ of $x_{i,y}$ with pairwise disjoint ranges under $\pi$ then $X$ has an uncountable discrete subset. These results stimulated my interest in modifications of colouring axioms.

Following Kunen's [1, 10, 8], given $E$ a topological space $E$ we denote by $E^\uparrow = E^2 \setminus \{(x, x) : x \in E\}$ the square of the space without the diagonal. A set $W \subseteq E^\uparrow$ is symmetric if $(x, y) \in W$ whenever $(y, x) \in W$. We may refer to a symmetric $W \subseteq E^\uparrow$ as a coloring. We shall consider various topological properties of the coloring, for example, if $W$ is open we say that it is an open coloring. If there is $T \subseteq E$ such that $T^\uparrow \subseteq W$ then we say that it is $W$-connected, $W$-homogeneous, or open homogeneous (when it is not clopen). If there is $T \subseteq W$ such that $T^\uparrow \cap W = \emptyset$ then we say that it is $W$-free, $W^c$-homogeneous or closed homogeneous (when not clopen).

The fundamental concept dealt with in the paper is the Semi Open Coloring Axiom:

**Definition 1.1.** Given a collection $\mathcal{X}$ of separable metric (or topological) spaces $\text{SOCA}(\mathcal{X})$ is the statement “Given uncountable $E \in \mathcal{X}$ and an open coloring $W \subseteq E^\uparrow$ there is an uncountable $T \subseteq E$ which is either $W$-connected or $W$-free (in other words, $T$ is homogeneous)”. $\text{SOCA}$ is $\text{SOCA}(\mathcal{X})$ when $\mathcal{X}$ is the class of all separable metric spaces.

$\text{SOCA}$ was arguably Ken’s favourite colouring axiom; In his book [10], he worked out a complete proof of the consistency of $\text{SOCA}$ and as mentioned above he put it to good use in [8] and [9].

The axiom itself was introduced by Abraham, Rubin and Shelah in [1] together with another principle called there the Open Coloring Axiom (OCA) later referred to sometimes as $\text{OCA}_{ARS}$ to distinguish it from the “other” open coloring axiom introduced by Todorčević [16] sometimes denoted by $\text{OCA}_T$ and lately called the Open Graph Axiom (OGA).

Both axioms are consequences of the Proper Forcing Axiom $\text{PFA}$. Given that consistency of $\text{PFA}$ requires large cardinals the following two somewhat vague questions seem natural:

**Question 1.2.** How much of the strength of $\text{PFA}$ can be expressed with coloring axioms?
Question 1.3. How much of PFA is equiconsistent with ZFC? Can that be expressed with a coloring axiom?

The first question has been studied extensively by Todorčević and his school. In particular, he showed [16] that Martin’s Axiom MA is equivalent to the statement that given a separable metric space \( E \) of size less than \( \mathfrak{c} \) every ccc\(^1\) coloring of \( E^\uparrow \) has an uncountable homogeneous set (see also [17]). Furthermore, Moore [12] showed that OCA\(_{\text{ARS}}\) and OGA together imply that \( \mathfrak{c} = \aleph_2 \).

In [1], the relative consistency of ZFC + OCA\(_{\text{ARS}}\) + SOCA + “There is an increasing set” is established, while an increasing set is a counterexample to OGA as shown in [16]. Hence, SOCA is weaker than OGA, and OCA\(_{\text{ARS}}\) does not imply OGA. Abraham-Rudin-Shelah also showed (in [1]) that SOCA does not imply OCA\(_{\text{ARS}}\). So the only possible implications left are:

Question 1.4. Does OCA\(_{\text{ARS}}\) imply SOCA?

Question 1.5. Does OGA imply OCA\(_{\text{ARS}}\)?

The most famous open problem about the coloring axioms is, of course:

Question 1.6 (16). Is OGA consistent with \( \mathfrak{c} > \aleph_2 \)?

A positive answer to this question provides a negative answer to the previous one by the aforementioned result of Moore [12]. Moreover, the analogous question for OCA\(_{\text{ARS}}\) has recently been solved in the affirmative by T. Gilton and I. Neeman [7].

We conclude this quick overview of coloring axioms by recalling another open problem raised by Todorčević in [16] (see also [18]):

Question 1.7 (16). Is OGA(\( \mathcal{X} \)) consistent for the class \( \mathcal{X} \) of all regular spaces without uncountable discrete subsets?

An analogous question can be also asked for SOCA:

Question 1.8. What is the largest family of topological spaces \( \mathcal{X} \) such that SOCA(\( \mathcal{X} \)) is relatively consistent with ZFC?

---

\(^1\)A coloring \( W \) is ccc if given \( p_\alpha \in [E]^{<\omega}, \alpha < \omega_1, \) such that \( (p_\alpha)^\uparrow \subseteq W \) for all \( \alpha < \omega_1, \) there exist \( \alpha, \beta < \omega_1 \) such that \( (p_\alpha \cup p_\beta)^\uparrow \subseteq W. \)
2 Weakenings of SOCA

In this section we consider two natural weaker versions of SOCA:

- **Clopen SOCA** - the same as SOCA but only for clopen colorings.
- **Dense SOCA** - the same as SOCA but only for open dense colorings.

To understand the relation between these principles it is useful to consider a concept of reduction:

**Definition 2.1.** Given a topological property $P$, an uncountable separable metric space $E$ and a coloring $W$ over $E$ we say that $W$ can be reduced to a $P$-coloring if there is an uncountable set $T \subseteq E$ such that $W \cap T^\uparrow$ is a coloring with property $P$ in the topology of $T^\uparrow$ induced from $E^\uparrow$.

Obviously, given any collection $\mathcal{X}$ of separable metric spaces, the axiom SOCA($\mathcal{X}$) is stronger than both Clopen SOCA($\mathcal{X}$) and Dense SOCA($\mathcal{X}$).

**Proposition 2.1.** Assume SOCA. Then

1. **(Clopen Reduction)** All open colorings on a separable metric space can be reduced to clopen colorings.
2. **(Dense Reduction)** Every open coloring on a separable metric space can be reduced to an open dense or empty coloring.

**Proof.** We shall prove both items simultaneously. Given a space $E$ and an open coloring $W$ over it, using SOCA there is an uncountable $T \subseteq E$ that is homogeneous. If $T$ is $W$-connected, then $T^\uparrow \cap W = T^\uparrow$ which is clopen and open dense in $T^\uparrow$. Otherwise, $T$ is $W$-free so $T^\uparrow \cap W = \emptyset$ which is clopen and empty. \qed

Recall that an uncountable set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is 2-entangled if for every uncountable collection of pairwise disjoint 2-element subsets of $A$ contains pairs $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (w_1, z_1), (w_2, z_2)$ such that $x_1 < x_2$ and $y_1 < y_2$, $w_1 < w_2$ but $z_1 > z_2$. The existence of a 2-entangled set follows e.g. from CH, while in \[
\] it is shown that SOCA implies that there are no 2-entangled sets. Interestingly, Clopen SOCA suffices and, consequently, Clopen SOCA is not a theorem of ZFC.

**Theorem 2.2.** Assuming Clopen SOCA or Dense Reduction there are no 2-entangled sets.
Proof. It suffices to show that given any uncountable linearly ordered separable metric space $X$, the increasing open coloring

$$W = \{((a, b), (c, d)) : a < c \leftrightarrow b < d\}$$

of $X^2$ can be reduced to a clopen coloring.

To see this recursively construct $T = \{x_\xi = (x_1^{\xi}, x_2^{\xi}) : \xi < \alpha\}$ as follows: Assume $x_\xi = (x_1^{\xi}, x_2^{\xi})$ for $\xi < \alpha$ have already been chosen. Since $\alpha$ is countable $X^2 \setminus \left(\bigcup_{\xi<\alpha}(X \times \{x_2^{\xi}\} \cup \{x_1^{\xi}\} \times X)\right) \neq \emptyset$. Take $x_\alpha$ to be any point in it.

Now, given two distinct $(x, y), (z, w) \in T$, we have that $x \neq y$ and $z \neq w$, hence, $((x, y), (z, w))$ is either in $W$ or in $\{((a, b), (c, d)) : a < c \leftrightarrow b > d\}$, but both are open sets. Therefore, $T \cap W$ is clopen in $T$.

We start the proof from the Dense Reduction by noting the following:

Fact 2.1. The only way to reduce a clopen coloring to an open dense one is to have an uncountable homogeneous open set.

To see this let $W$ be a clopen coloring over $E$ and assume that $T \subseteq E$ is an uncountable set that reduces $W$ to open dense. Notice that, given $(a, b) \in T^\uparrow \cap W^c$, as $T$ reduces $W$ to open dense, $T^\uparrow \cap W \cap U \neq \emptyset$ for every open set $(a, b) \in U$. On the other hand, as $W$ is clopen in $E$, there is an open set $V$ such that $(a, b) \in V \subseteq W^c$. Clearly, these two assumptions are contradicting each other. Therefore, $T^\uparrow \cap W^c = \emptyset$ making $T$ open homogeneous.

Let $W$ be increasing coloring on $A^2$ where $A$ is a 2-entangled set. We know that $W$ can be reduced to a clopen coloring, so let's assume that it is clopen. Then for any $T \subseteq A^2$, $T^\uparrow \cap W$ is clopen. So, the only way to get an open dense coloring or an empty coloring is finding an uncountable homogeneous set, which does not exist.

The increasing coloring can be used to show that there is an open coloring which is not reducible to an open dense coloring, hence the phrase ‘or empty” in the Dense Reduction is necessary. To see this take a subset of $\mathbb{R}^2$ consisting of the graph of a decreasing function and the graph of a countable partial increasing function, and consider the increasing coloring defined above.

Next we shall see that the axioms considered here imply that $b > \omega_1$ following Todorcevic [16] and Moore [11]. We shall call an $\leq^*$-increasing unbounded chain in $\omega^\omega$ of minimal length a $b$-scale.
Proposition 2.2. Each of the axioms \textit{Clopen SOCA}, \textit{Dense SOCA} and \textit{Clopen Reduction} implies $b > \aleph_1$.

\textit{Proof.} The fact that \textit{Clopen SOCA} implies $b > \aleph_1$ was proved in [11].

Now, assume that every open coloring can be reduced to a clopen coloring. Take a $b$-scale and let $W$ be an open coloring such that

$$W^c = \{(f, g) : f \geq g \text{ or } f \leq g\}$$

where $f \leq g$ means that for all $n \in \omega$, $f(n) \leq g(n)$. The above coloring has no uncountable homogeneous set when $b = \aleph_1$ (see [16]). Furthermore, using the theory of oscillation of Todorcevic [16], in any cofinal (for $b = \aleph_1$, uncountable) set of a $b$-scale there are $f$ and $h$, such that $h \leq^* f$ but $h \not\leq f$, so there is a value $m$ where $h(m) > f(m)$, so $W^c$ is closed but not clopen. Now, since every uncountable subset of a $b$-scale is also a $b$-scale (when $b = \aleph_1$), then $W$ can never be reduced to a clopen coloring.

Finally, assume \textit{Dense SOCA}. Using a $b$-scale $B$ of size $\aleph_1$, we can eliminate countably many point to have that every open set is uncountable. Using the same coloring $W$ as above, every open set in $B^\dagger$ has a subset such that

$$\{(f, h) : \exists n, m \in \omega f(n) < h(n) \text{ and } f(m) > h(m)\}$$

that is an open set. So $W^c$ is no-where-dense (nwd). Furthermore, by a theorem of Todorcevic [16], every $b$-scale has two functions, $f$ and $g$ such that $f < g$. Then, this coloring is open dense but it has no uncountable homogeneous set. \qed

In particular, none of the four axioms considered are theorems of $\textit{ZFC}$. It turns out that various combinations of these weakenings of $\textit{SOCA}$ recover the whole strength of $\textit{SOCA}$.

Theorem 2.3. The following are equivalent:

1. $\textit{SOCA}$

2. $\textit{Clopen SOCA} + \textit{Clopen Reduction}$

3. $\textit{Dense SOCA} + \textit{Dense Reduction}$

4. $\textit{Clopen Reduction} + \textit{Dense Reduction}$

5. $\textit{Dense SOCA} + \textit{Clopen SOCA}$
Proof. We already know that SOCA implies all the other statements. The equivalence of Clauses 2 and 3 with 1 have identical natural proofs: first reducing any open coloring to one of the special kind and then apply SOCA to that special coloring. The rest follows directly from the following two observations:

Fact 2.2. Dense reduction implies Clopen SOCA.

Fact 2.3. Dense SOCA implies Clopen reduction.

Fact 2.2 is a direct consequence of Fact 2.1. To show Fact 2.3, let $W$ be an open coloring over $E$. Notice that $W \cup \text{int}(W^c)$ is an open dense coloring over $E$ (its complement is $\partial W$ which is always nowhere dense). Using Dense SOCA over $W \cup \text{int}(W^c)$ we either get a close homogeneous uncountable set $T$, in which case, $T^\dagger \cap (W \cup \text{int}) = \emptyset$, so $T^\dagger \cap W$ is clopen. Or we get an uncountable set such that $T^\dagger \subseteq W \cup \text{int}(W^c)$. Because both $W$ and $W^c$ are open in $T^\dagger$ we have that $T$ reduces $W$ to clopen.

We close this section with some more natural questions:

Question 2.4. Is Dense SOCA equivalent to Clopen Reduction?

Question 2.5. Is Clopen SOCA equivalent to Dense Reduction?

Question 2.6. Is Dense SOCA weaker than SOCA?

Question 2.7. Is Clopen SOCA weaker than SOCA?

Some of these would be settled by a positive answer to the following:

Conjecture 2.8. Every open coloring can be reduced to a clopen or to an open dense coloring.

As mentioned in the previous section, it is not known if OCA$_{[ARS]}$ implies SOCA. If it turns out that the answer is negative, then the fact that OCA$_{[ARS]}$ implies Clopen SOCA (a clopen coloring is also a cover of $E^\dagger$ by open sets) settles Question 2.7 in the positive.

3 Colorings and Baire spaces

Galvin [5] (see also [8]) showed that SOCA is true for every Polish space. In particular, in uncountable Polish spaces all open colorings can be reduced to clopen ones. hence also any space that contains an uncountable Polish space has the same reduction property. These ZFC results suggest the following:
Question 3.1. What is the largest family of topological spaces $\mathcal{X}$ such that $\text{ZFC}$ implies $\text{SOCA}(\mathcal{X})$?

In a related work, Ramos-Garcia and Corona-García study the class of topological spaces for which $\text{OCA}_T$ follows from $\text{ZFC}$. Recall that a metric space $E$ is a Baire space if no non-empty open subsets of $E$ is meager, i.e. is not a union of countably many nowhere dense sets. Polish spaces are Baire by the Baire Category Theorem. Nevertheless, not all Baire spaces are polish or contain a Polish space. For example Luzin sets or Generalized Luzin sets are Baire spaces with no Polish subspace (these sets exist, for example, under $\text{CH}$ or $\text{MA} + \lnot \text{CH}$, respectively).

Furthermore, as shown in Kunen’s book, it is possible to have a Luzin set as counterexample to $\text{SOCA}$, so it is consistent that not all Baire metric spaces satisfy $\text{SOCA}$. We will show here that, if $\text{Clopen SOCA}$ is true for Baire spaces, then $\text{SOCA}$ is also true for them. In order to prove this, the following notation will be useful: Let $W$ be an open coloring over a separable metric space $E$. Given $e \in E$ let

- $W_e = \{(y : (y, e) \in W \cap (E \times \{e\})\}$,
- $(\partial W)_e = \{(y : (y, e) \in (\partial W) \cap (E \times \{e\})\}$ and
- $(\text{int}(W^c))_e = \{(y : (y, e) \in (W^c \setminus (\partial W)) \cap (E \times \{e\})\}$.

Theorem 3.2. Every open coloring over a separable metric Baire space can be reduced to a clopen one.

Proof. Let $E$ be a separable metric Baire space and let $W \subseteq E^\uparrow$ be open and symmetric. Since $E$ is separable and metric it is second countable.

Notice that $\partial W$ is meager: given an open set $U$, if $U \cap \partial W \neq \emptyset$ then $U \cap W \neq \emptyset$ and is open. Nevertheless, $(U \cap W) \cap \partial W = \emptyset$.

Let $T_0 = \{e \in E : (\partial W)_e$ is not nowhere dense$\}$.

Claim 3.3. $T_0$ is meager

Proof. We will prove the claim by contradiction. If $T_0$ is not meager then it is not nwd. Then there is $V$, a basic open, such that $V \cap T_0$ is dense in $V$. Given a basic open $U$, we can find $T_U$ the collection of points in $V \cap T_0$ such that $U \cap (\partial W)_e$ is dense in $U$. If $T_U$ is nwd for all basic open $U$, then $V \cap T_0$ would be a countable union of nwd, hence meager. This is not possible given that $V$ is an open set of a Baire space.

Hence, there is $U$ such that $T_U$ is not ndw. Now, notice that $\bigcup_{e \in T_U} (\partial W)_e \times \{e\} \subseteq \partial W$ but $\bigcup_{e \in T_U} (\partial W)_e$ is not nwd, but we also know that $(V \times U) \cap
\[ \bigcup_{e \in T_0} (\partial W)_e \text{ is not nwd in } (V \times U). \] This is a contradiction since \((\partial W)_e\) is nowhere dense.

Using the claim, we can construct, recursively, a sequence \(\langle x_\xi : \xi \in \omega_1 \rangle\) contained in \(E \setminus T_0\) such that, given \(\alpha < \beta\), \(x_\alpha \not\in (\partial W)_{x_\alpha}\). Once we construct this sequence we will be done: by symmetry of \(W\), \((e, e') \in \partial W \) if and only if \((e', e) \in \partial W\). So, the above sequence will have the property that, given \(\alpha < \beta\), \(x_\beta \not\in (\partial W)_{x_\alpha}\). Thus, \(\{x_\xi : \xi \in \omega_1\} \cap W\) will be clopen in \(\{x_\xi : \xi \in \omega_1\}\).

For the construction, assume that we already selected \(x_\xi\) for \(\xi < \alpha\), for \(\alpha < \omega_1\). Since \(\alpha\) is countable, \(E\) is a Baire space and \(x_\xi \not\in T_0\) we have that \(E \setminus \left( \bigcup_{\xi < \alpha} (\partial W)_{x_\xi} \cup T_0 \right) \neq \emptyset\). We just let \(x_\alpha\) be an element of \(E \setminus \left( \bigcup_{\xi < \alpha} (\partial W)_{x_\xi} \cup T_0 \right)\).

**Corollary 3.4.** Dense SOCA(Baire) is true in ZFC.

**Proof.** If in the proof above we assume that \(W\) is open dense, then \(W^c = \partial W\). So, the proof above generates a \(W\)-connected set.

**Corollary 3.5.** SOCA(Baire) and Clopen SOCA(Baire) are equivalent.

The following is a variation on a classical proof of Todorcevic in [16].

**Theorem 3.6.** Assuming CH there is a 2-entangled Luzin set.

**Proof.** Let \(\{f_\alpha : \alpha < \aleph_1\}\) be an enumeration of all continuous functions from \(G_\delta\) subsets of \(R\) to \(R\) and let \(R = \{x_\alpha : \alpha < \varsigma\}\) be an enumeration of the reals. Finally, let \(\{N_\alpha : \alpha < \varsigma\}\) be an enumeration of all closed nwd sets.

We will construct the set \(S \subseteq R\) by recursion. Assume that we already have \(S_\alpha = \{x_\gamma : \xi < \alpha\}\). Let

\[
\gamma_\alpha = \min \{\beta: x_\beta \not\in \bigcap_{\xi < \alpha} (N_\xi) \cup B_\alpha = \emptyset\}
\]

where

\[
B_\alpha = \{f_\chi(x_\gamma) : \xi, \chi < \alpha\}.
\]

Notice that \(B_\alpha\) is meager (it is countable) and \((\bigcup_{\xi < \alpha} N_\xi \cup B_\alpha)\) is a countable union of nwd, so they do not cover \(R\). This shows that \(R \setminus (\bigcup_{\xi < \alpha} N_\xi \cup B_\alpha)\) is non empty and \(\gamma_\alpha\) is well defined.
The set \( S = S_\xi = \{ x_\alpha : \alpha < c \} \) is the one that we are looking for. It is clear from the construction, and from the assumption that \( c = \aleph_1 \), that \( S \) is a Luzin set. To show that \( S \) is 2-entangled we follow the proof of Lemma 4.2 by Todorcevic in [16]. Let \( \{ (x_{\alpha \xi}, x_{\beta \xi}) : \xi < c \} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2 \) be a collection of size continuum of disjoint 2-tuples of \( S \).

Let
\[
K = \{ x_{\alpha \xi} : \alpha < \beta \xi < c \}.
\]
We can assume that this set is of size continuum. If not, we can run the argument interchanging the roles of \( \alpha \xi \) and \( \beta \xi \).

Now, we can define the function \( g : K \to \mathbb{R} \) such that
\[
x_{\alpha \xi} \mapsto x_{\beta \xi}.
\]
Furthermore, define the set
\[
K_0 = \{ s \in K : |\omega_g(s)| \geq 2 \},
\]
where \( \omega_g(s) = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} g(B_K^n(s)) \) is the oscillation of \( g \) at \( s \), i.e., all the accumulation points of the images (under \( g \)) of sequences that converges to \( s \).

Notice that \( |\omega_g(s)| = 1 \) if and only if \( g \) is continuous at \( s \).

Recall that any partial continuous function from \( \mathbb{R}^n \) to \( \mathbb{R} \) can be extended with a partial function whose domain is a \( G_\delta \) set. With this and our construction of \( S \) we have that the set \( K_0 \) is of size continuum.

Given \( s \in K_0 \) call \( a_s, b_s \) two elements in \( \omega_g(s) \). Without loss of generality, we can assume that \( a_s < b_s \). Let \( r \in \mathbb{Q} \) such that \( a_s < r < b_s \). Since we only have countably many options, we may shrink \( K_0 \) in such a way that for all \( s \in K_0 \) the rational number \( r \) is the same. Notice that \( K_0 \) still has size continuum.

Take \( t, s \in K_0 \) such that \( t < s \) and take disjoint intervals \( I_t, I_s \) such that \( t \in I_t \) and \( s \in I_s \). By the definition of \( a_t, a_s, b_t \) and \( b_s \) there are \( t_0, t_1 \in K \cap I_t \) and \( s_0, s_1 \in I_s \) such that \( g(t_0), g(s_0) < r < g(t_1), g(s_1) \). Then for the pairs \( (t_0, g(t_0)), (s_1, g(s_1)) \) we have \( t_0 < s_1 \) and \( g(t_0) < g(s_1) \); and for the pair \( (t_1, g(t_1)), (s_0, g(s_0)) \) we have \( t_1 < s_0 \) but \( g(t_1) > g(s_0) \).

As every Luzin set is Baire, we have the following:

**Corollary 3.7.** In a model where \( CH \) is true, \( SOCA(Baire) \) is false.

With this we can conclude that \( Dense \ SOCA(Baire) \) is weaker than \( Clopen \ SOCA(Baire) \) and \( SOCA(Baire) \).

\[ \text{Here } B_K^n(s) \text{ is the ball of radius } \frac{1}{n} \text{ with center } s \text{ in } K, \text{ a subset of } \mathbb{R}. \]
4 SOCA for larger uncountable sets

In this section we shall consider higher cardinal extensions of SOCA. This is motivated indirectly by the recent attempts to “lift” Baumgartner’s Theorem \[2\] to \(\aleph_2\), i.e. to prove that consistently every two \(\aleph_2\)-dense sets of reals are order isomorphic, (see \[13, 6\]) and directly by Shelah, Avraham and Rudin’s \[1\] where they ask if it is possible to have a version of SOCA for \(\aleph_2\). It fits in the general program to investigate the behaviour of the continuum when it is bigger than \(\aleph_2\) (as discussed in \[15\]).

A straightforward generalization of SOCA is to ask that the set \(T\) is as big as the space or bigger than certain cardinal.

**Definition 4.1.** SOCA(\(\kappa\)) is the statement: For all separable metric spaces \(E\) of size bigger or equal to \(\kappa\) and all open symmetric subsets \(W\) of \(E\)† there exist \(T \subseteq E\) such that \(|T| \geq \kappa\) and either \(T\) ⊂ \(W\) (open homogeneous) or \(T\) ∩ \(W\) = \(\emptyset\) (closed homogeneous).

For certain spaces, this axiom can be derived from SOCA and MA.

**Theorem 4.2 (SOCA and MA).** Given a separable metric space \(E\) of size \(\kappa < c\), with \(\text{cof}(\kappa) \neq \aleph_0\), and \(W \subseteq E\) open and symmetric such that all closed homogeneous sets are countable, there is an open-homogeneous set \(T \subseteq E\) of size \(\kappa\).

**Proof.** Let \(C_{E,W} = \{p \in [E]^{<\omega} : \forall x, y \in p \ (x \neq y \rightarrow (x, y) \in W)\}\). It is enough to show that this is a ccc poset. Once we have that, since it is of size \(\kappa < c\), MA will imply that it is the union of countable many filters. Notice that the union of each filter is an open-homogeneous set and, since \(\{e\} \in C_{E,W}\) for all \(e \in E\), we have that \(E\) is a countable union of open-homogeneous so, it has an open homogeneous of size \(\kappa\) (using its cofinality).

In order to show that \(C_{E,W}\) is ccc. Take \(\{p_\alpha\}_{\alpha<\omega_1} \subseteq C_{E,W}\). We will show that there exist \(\alpha \neq \beta\) such that \(p_\alpha\) is compatible with \(p_\beta\).

Since \(|p_\alpha| \in \omega\) for all \(\alpha\) we may assume that \(\{p_\alpha\}_{\alpha<\omega_1}\) is a delta system with root \(r\). Furthermore, we may assume that \(|p_\alpha \setminus r| = |p_\beta \setminus r| = m\). So, we can write \(p_\alpha \setminus r = \{x_\alpha^0, \ldots, x_\alpha^{m-1}\}\)

Let \(B\) be a countable basis of \(E\). We will refer to \(p_\alpha \setminus r\) as an \(m\)-tuple \(\overline{x}_\alpha\). For each \(\overline{x}_\alpha\) we can choose \(V_i \in B\) such that for all \(i \in m\), \(x_\alpha^i \in V_i\) and for all \(i \neq j\), \(V_i \times V_j \subseteq W\) (this is possible since \(W\) is open and for all \(i \neq j\) and all \(\gamma\) \((x_\alpha^i, x_\gamma^j) \in W\)).

We will prove by induction on \(m\) that there exists uncountable many elements that are compatible.
For $m = 1$, let $T = \{x_\alpha^0 : \alpha < \omega_1\}$. We know that $T$ do not have any uncountable closed homogeneous set, so we can use \textbf{SOCA(}$\aleph_1$\textbf{)} to choose an uncountable open-homogeneous set. Let $S \subseteq \omega_1$ be the indexes of open-homogeneous set. Notice that all the elements of $\{p_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in S}$ are compatible.

Assume we have the result for $m$, we will prove it for $m + 1$.

First, using the induction hypothesis, take $\{q_{\alpha}^m\}_{\alpha < \omega_1}$ such that $\{q_{\alpha}^m \setminus \{x_m^\alpha\}\}_{\alpha < \omega_1}$ are compatible. Now, let $T = \{x_\alpha^m : \alpha < \omega_1\}$. We now that $T$ do not have any uncountable closed homogeneous set, so we can use \textbf{SOCA(}$\aleph_1$\textbf{)} to choose an uncountable open-homogeneous set. Let $S \subseteq \omega_1$ be the indexes of the elements $x_m^\alpha$ in that uncountable open-homogeneous set. Notice that all the elements of $\{q_{\alpha}^m\}_{\alpha \in S}$ are compatible: first, all the elements of $\{q_{\alpha}^m \setminus \{x_m^\alpha\}\}_{\alpha \in S}$ are compatible; also, we have that $(x_m^\alpha, x_m^\beta) \in W$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in S$ and, finally, we have that $(x_m^\alpha, x_j^\beta) \in V_m \times V_j \subseteq W$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in \omega_1$ and all $j \in m$.

The assumption that $\kappa < c$ cannot be improved: modifying Lemma 4.2 of [16], as we did for Theorem 3.6, we can show:

\begin{theorem}
There is a set of size continuum $X$ such that for every collection of size continuum of disjoint 2-tuples of $X$ there are $(x_1, y_1)$, $(x_2, y_2)$, $(w_1, z_1)$, $(w_2, z_2)$ such that $x_1 < x_2$ and $y_1 < y_2$, $w_1 < z_1$ but $w_2 > z_2$.
\end{theorem}

Theorem 4.3 shows that the increasing coloring for $X^2$ cannot have a size continuum homogeneous set, so \textbf{SOCA(}$\kappa$\textbf{)} can only be valid for $\kappa < c$.

In order to prove \textbf{SOCA}, the authors of [1] used sequences of elementary submodels and assumed that their spaces only had countable closed homogeneous sets using a combinatorial principle (\textit{fast clubs for families of size continuum}). Following these ideas Moore and Todorčević in [13] introduced a principle (**) which we shall call \textbf{MTA}:

\begin{definition}[Moore, Todorčević [13]]
The \textit{Moore-Todorčević Axiom} for $(\omega_2, \aleph_2, \aleph_1)$ (\textbf{MTA} or \textbf{MTA(}$\omega_2, \aleph_2, \aleph_1$\textbf{)}) is the statement:

If $\mathcal{F}$ is a collection of one-to-one functions from $\omega_2$ to $\omega_2$ and $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \aleph_2$ then there is $g : \omega_2 \rightarrow \omega_2$ which is one-to-one such that

\begin{itemize}
  \item for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $\{\alpha : f(\alpha) = g(\alpha)\}$ is countable (or of size $< \aleph_1$).

  \item for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$, there is a countable (or of size $< \aleph_1$) set $D \subseteq \omega_2$ such that if $\alpha \neq \beta \in \omega_2 \setminus D$ then $f(g(\alpha)) \neq g(\beta)$.
\end{itemize}

\end{definition}

In the same paper were \textbf{MTA} is introduced, the following equivalence is proved:
Lemma 4.5. For each $\beta \in \omega_2 \setminus \omega_1$, fix $b_\beta : \beta \to \omega_1$ a bijection. MTA is equivalent to the following statement: whenever $F$ is a collection of at most $\aleph_2$ many one-to-one functions from $\omega_1$ to $\omega_1$, there is a one-to-one $g : \omega_2 \to \omega_2$ such that, whenever $\beta$ is closed under $g$ and $f \in F$, there is a countable $D \subseteq \beta$ such that:

- if $\xi \in \beta \setminus D$ then
  $$f(\min(b_\beta(\xi), b_\beta(g(\xi)))) < \max(b_\beta(\xi), b_\beta(g(\xi)))$$
- if $\eta \neq \xi \in \beta \setminus D$ then
  $$f(\min(b_\beta(g(\eta)), b_\beta(g(\xi)))) < \max(b_\beta(g(\eta)), b_\beta(g(\xi)))$$

Notice that, using axiom of choice, if the functions are countable to one, you can also construct a $g$ with the above mentioned properties. The following lemma was also discovered, independently, by Thomas Gilton.

Lemma 4.6. ($2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_2 +$ MTA) Given $E$ a separable metric space of size $\aleph_2$ and $W \subseteq E^\uparrow$ open and symmetric such that all closed homogeneous sets are countable, then there is $E_0 \subseteq E$ of size $\aleph_2$ such that the finite open-homogeneous subsets of $E_0$ ordered by reverse inclusion form a ccc forcing.

Proof. Let $E = \{e_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_2\}$ and $B = \{B_n : n \in \omega\}$ be a basis for its topology. Fix $\theta \geq \aleph_3$, and $b_\beta$ bijections between $\beta$ and $\omega_1$ for each $\beta \in \omega_2 \setminus \omega_1$.

For each closed subset of $E^n$, say $F$, and each $\beta \in \omega_2 \setminus \omega_1$ define a sequence of elementary submodels of $\langle H(\theta), E, B \rangle$ $M_0, ..., M_\alpha, ...$ with $\alpha < \omega_1$ such that each $M_\alpha$ is countable and countably closed, $F, E \in M_0$, $B \subseteq M_0$, for $\alpha < \gamma$ we have that $M_\alpha$ is an elementary submodel of $M_\gamma$ and given $\alpha < \beta$ we ensure that $e_\alpha \in M_{b_\beta(\alpha)+1}$.

Define $f_{F, \beta} : \omega_1 \to \omega_1$ with $|\beta| = |\omega_1|$ such that:

$$f_{F, \beta}(\alpha) = \min \left\{ \gamma \in \omega_1 : \forall \xi < \alpha \left( e_{\beta^{-1}(\xi)}^{\gamma} \in M_\gamma \right), \forall \delta \geq \gamma \left( e_{\beta^{-1}(\delta)}^{\gamma} \notin M_{\alpha+1} \right) \right\}.$$ 

This functions are well define since each $M_\chi$ is countable. This is a countable to one function.

Given that there are only $\aleph_2$ pairs $(F, \beta)$, using MTA we can get a one-to-one function $g : \omega_2 \to \omega_2$ satisfying the conditions of Lemma 4.5 for the set $\{f_{F, \beta} : \beta \in \omega_2 \setminus \omega_1, n \in \omega, F \subseteq E^n\}$

Let $E_0 = \{e_\beta(\alpha) : \alpha < \omega_2\}$. We claim that this set works.
To prove this, it is enough to show that given an uncountable collection of disjoint finite open-homogeneous sets, the union of two of them is open-homogeneous.

Assume that we have $\aleph_1$-many finite open-homogeneous sets, say $A = \{x_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$. We know that there is an uncountable $\beta < \omega_2$ such that for all $\alpha < \omega_1$, if $\xi \in x_\alpha$, then $\xi < \beta$. Furthermore, we can find this $\beta$ such that it is closed under $g$.

Now, without lost of generality, we can assume that all the finite sets have the same size, say $n$ and are disjoint (if they have a common root, all the elements are already compatible with the elements of the root). Notice that we can naturally associate a vector in $E^n$ to each $x_\alpha$. To do so, we see $x_\alpha = \{e_\text{g}(\xi^1_\alpha), ..., e_\text{g}(\xi^n_\alpha)\}$ in such a way that $i < j$ if and only if $b_\beta(g(\xi^1_\alpha)) < b_\beta(g(\xi^j_\alpha))$.

Shrinking $A$ if necessary, we can assume that if $\delta < \gamma$ that

$$\max(b_\beta(\xi^1_\alpha), b_\beta(g(\xi^1_\alpha))) < \min(b_\beta(\xi^1_\alpha), b_\beta(g(\xi^1_\alpha)))$$

Now, let $F$ be the closure of $\{\{e_\text{g}(\xi^1_\alpha), ..., e_\text{g}(\xi^n_\alpha)\} : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ in $E^n$.

We will work with the sequence of models associated with $F$ and $\beta$.

Given $\alpha < \beta$, we say that the height of $e_\alpha$, denoted $ht(e_\alpha)$, is the minimum $\gamma$ such that $e_\alpha \in M_{\gamma+1} \setminus M_\gamma$. Given our definition of tower of models, we have that $ht(e_\gamma) \leq b_\gamma(\gamma)$ for $\gamma \in \beta$.

Notice that, by definition, if $\alpha, \delta \in \omega_1$ and $f_{F, \beta}(\alpha) < \delta$ then $ht(e_{b_\beta^{-1}(\xi)}) < \delta$ for all $\xi < \alpha$, $ht(e_{b_\beta^{-1}(\alpha)}) < \delta$ and $\alpha < ht(e_{b_\beta^{-1}(\chi)})$ for all $\chi \geq \delta$.

Using the fact that $g$ comes from MTA, specifically, its second bullet. We have that there is a countable $D$ such that if $\eta \neq \xi \in \beta \setminus D$ and $b_\beta(g(\eta)) < b_\beta(g(\xi))$ then $f_{F, \beta}(b_\beta(g(\eta)) < b_\beta(g(\xi))$. This means that $b_\beta(g(\eta)) < ht(e_\text{g}(\xi))$. Since $ht(e_{g(\eta)}) \leq b_\beta(g(\eta))$, we have that $ht(e_{g(\eta)}) < ht(e_\text{g}(\xi))$.

Given $\alpha < \omega_1$ such that $\xi^i_\alpha \in \beta \setminus D$ for all $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$, let $\mu = ht(e_{g(\xi^n_\alpha)})$ and $F_\alpha = \{a \in E \cap M_\mu : x_\alpha \upharpoonright 1, ..., n-1 \sim a \in F\}$. Since $b_\beta(g(\xi^i_\alpha)) < b(g(\xi^i_\alpha))$ for $i < n$, we have that $ht(e_{g(\xi_i^i_\alpha)}) < ht(e_{g(\xi^n_\alpha)}) = \mu$. Then, $e_{g(\xi_i^i_\alpha)} \in M_\mu$. Given that $F, x_\alpha \upharpoonright 1, ..., n-1 \in M_\mu$, $F_\alpha \in M_\mu$. Nevertheless, $M_\mu$ is countably closed, $\xi^n_\alpha \notin M_\mu$ and $\xi^n_\alpha \in F_\alpha$. This shows that $F_\alpha$ is uncountable.

From here, it is enough to follow the exposition of the consistency of SOCA($\aleph_1$) as in [10] Lemmas V.6.14 and V.6.15. Although different in the details, the proof resembles the one exposed here for Theorem 4.2.

We see these results as steps towards the consistency of SOCA($\aleph_2$).

**Conjecture 4.7.** SOCA($\aleph_2$) is consistent.

Proving the conjecture would culminate the work that Ken and I talked so much about.

5 Once you see the stars

I was Kenneth Kunen’s last student. He accepted to be my advisor even though he was already retired.

Being Ken’s student forced me to face freedom and taught me how to find questions on my own. I learned early on that Ken was not going to tell me which path to follow, but he was also not going to let me go astray if I needed him.

In 2020, Ken fell ill but, being as responsible and caring as he was, he attended the defence of my dissertation \( [14] \) virtually. According to his family, a couple of days later he was hospitalized. He died on August 14, 2020, the same day as my birthday.

Once you see the stars is impossible to forget them. Some of the stars, constellations and galaxies of ideas that Ken had, are presented here - the one’s I was able to understand or the ones about which I got obsessed. Once we see the stars, we want to reach them and, in our minds, sometimes we can. Thank you, Ken, for opening my eyes and for allowing me to be as free as my imagination.
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