

On Strongly Equitable Social Welfare Orders Without the Axiom of Choice

Luke Serafin

June 14, 2024

Abstract

Social welfare orders seek to combine the disparate preferences of an infinite sequence of generations into a single, societal preference order in some reasonably-equitable way. In [2], Dubey and Laguzzi study a type of social welfare order which they call SEA, for strongly equitable and (finitely) anonymous. They prove that the existence of a SEA order implies the existence of a set of reals which does not have the Baire property, and observe that a nonprincipal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} can be used to construct a SEA order. Questions arising in their work include whether the existence of a SEA order implies the existence of either a set of real numbers which is not Lebesgue-measurable or of a nonprincipal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} . We answer both these questions, the solution to the second using the techniques of geometric set theory as set out by Larson and Zapletal in [11]. The outcome is that the existence of a SEA order does imply the existence of a set of reals which is not Lebesgue-measurable, and does not imply the existence of a nonprincipal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} .

1 Overview

1.1 Social Welfare Orders

Let $\langle Y, \leq \rangle$ be a totally-ordered set. In theoretical economics we may think of Y as a collection of utilities, where $x \leq y$ means that the utility of x is below that of y . Different entities (perhaps individuals or generations) may derive varying utilities from the same societal choice. For instance, consider a pair of policies P_1 and P_2 and a pair of entities x_1 and x_2 . Perhaps P_1 allows individuals to receive stock as compensation from a corporation without needing to pay tax until it is sold, while P_2 taxes stock grants at the market rate. If x_1 is a wealthy individual and x_2 a government employee, it is likely that x_1 derives high utility from P_1 and low utility from P_2 , while for x_2 the situation may be reversed due to the public projects which the extra tax revenue from P_2 enables. Or perhaps x_1 and x_2 are generations, with x_2 coming into existence after x_1 , and P_1 is a lax policy on fishing rights in a certain region while P_2 is a stricter and more conservative policy. It may be that x_1 derives considerable utility from

the fishing revenue which can be obtained under P_1 , but that x_2 derives low utility from P_1 due to depleted fish populations and would be much better off under P_2 .

Since different individuals or generations benefit variably under a given choice of policy, how can conscientious policymakers decide which of a pair of policies is preferable for the entire population? We shall make the idealization that the collection of individuals or generations is countably infinite, and represent it by \mathbb{N} . In this case the utilities derived from a given policy by all members of the population or by all generations can be represented as an element of $Y^{\mathbb{N}}$. A prelinear order on $Y^{\mathbb{N}}$, interpreted as the preference order of results from different policies, is called a *social welfare order*. Note that unlike in the case of utilities, two distinct policies can be considered equally preferred by a social welfare order. When \succsim denotes a prelinear order, we denote the corresponding relation of equal preference by \approx , which can be defined by $\approx = \succsim \cap \succsim$. The strict order notation $x \prec y$ means $x \succsim y$ and $x \not\approx y$. Of course, not all social welfare orders are equally desirable, and there are various properties which one might reasonably expect the preference order of a conscientious policymaker to possess. The properties with which we shall be concerned are finite anonymity and strong equity. The motivation for focusing on these principles is simply that Dubey and Laguzzi [2] leave open two questions about social welfare orders which satisfy finite anonymity and strong equity. For further details on social welfare orders and their properties, see [10, sec. 6], [2] and the references therein.

Definition 1 ([2]). A social welfare order is *finitely anonymous* if and only if the labels given to individuals or generations don't affect the outcome, at least if we only change finitely many labels. More precisely, an order \succsim is finitely anonymous if and only if for every finitely supported permutation π of \mathbb{N} and for every $y \in Y^{\mathbb{N}}$, $y \approx y \circ \pi$.

Finite anonymity has no relation to the utilities derived by individuals or generations, and is desirable simply so that certain distinguished individuals aren't given preference merely because they are distinguished. The next property we consider does take utilities into account. Intuitively, it favours equity by preferring scenarios where individuals have utilities which are closer together to those where they are farther apart, regardless of any quantitative differences between utilities.

Definition 2 ([1]). The relation SE on $Y^{\mathbb{N}}$ is defined by x SE y if and only if there are $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x \upharpoonright (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{i, j\}) = y \upharpoonright (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{i, j\})$ and $x(i) < y(i) < y(j) < x(j)$. A social welfare order \succsim is *strongly equitable* if and only if $\text{SE} \subseteq \prec$, or equivalently if and only if $\prec_{\text{SE} \subseteq \prec}$, where $\prec_{\text{SE} \subseteq \prec}$ is the transitive closure of SE.

Definition 3 ([2]). A social welfare order which is both strongly equitable and finitely anonymous is called a *SEA order*.

Independence results

While thinking about the possibility of actually using social welfare orders for policy decisions, at least in idealized scenarios, economists have noticed that many combinations of properties cannot be realized without assuming a portion of the axiom of choice (e.g. [17]), and in this sense are non-constructive. In particular, the authors of [2] observe that the existence of a SEA order implies the existence of a set of reals which does not have the Baire property. Since there are models¹ of $\text{ZF} + \text{DC}$ in which every set of reals has the Baire property (see, e.g. [15]), $\text{ZF} + \text{DC}$ does not imply the existence of a SEA order. The authors of [2] observe that the existence of a nonprincipal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} is enough to guarantee the existence of a SEA order, and since it is well-known that the existence of such a nonprincipal ultrafilter does not imply the full axiom of choice (see, e.g. [5]), this shows that the existence of SEA orders is weaker than the axiom of choice. But does the existence of SEA orders imply the existence of nonprincipal ultrafilters on \mathbb{N} ? Dubey and Laguzzi in [2] leave this open, and we answer this question negatively, assuming the consistency of an inaccessible cardinal. Another question left open in [2] is whether the existence of a SEA order implies the existence of a non-Lebesgue-measurable set of reals; we answer this question positively, with no large cardinal hypothesis needed. Our work leaves the question of whether large cardinals are necessary open, though note that the existence of a single inaccessible cardinal is virtually the weakest large cardinal hypothesis which is considered.

Acknowledgement This problem was suggested to me by Paul Larson, and is here solved using the techniques of geometric set theory developed by him and Jindřich Zapletal in [11]. I am grateful to my advisor, Justin Moore, for a great deal of advice and encouragement without which these results would not have come to fruition. This research was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-1854367

2 Preliminaries

The terminology and basic concepts which we use from set theory and descriptive set theory are mostly standard, and the reader is referred to the literature for more details, for example to [9] and [6] for forcing and ordinals, and to [8] and [4] for Polish spaces and Borel reducibility of equivalence relations. For large cardinals the standard source is [7]; we only need the notion of an inaccessible cardinal. Our base theory for independence results is $\text{ZF} + \text{DC}$. In the metatheory we assume full ZFC , and as a linguistic convenience we assume that ZFC is consistent (if it is not, all the results in this paper are still provable in a ZFC metatheory). For details on convergence with respect to filters and ultrafilters see [3, p. 51 ff] and [12]. The symmetric Solovay model W is a model of $\text{ZF} + \text{DC}$ in which all sets of reals have standard regularity properties;

¹Assuming that ZF is consistent; we use ZFC in the metatheory, so if it is inconsistent everything is trivial.

in particular they have the Baire property and are Lebesgue measurable. This model is discussed in [7], [6], and [11]. Following Larson and Zapletal, we take the definition of W to be $\text{HOD}(\mathbb{R} \cup V)$ as evaluated in the Lévy collapse of an inaccessible cardinal. We fix this inaccessible cardinal and denote it by κ throughout the sequel.

Terminology and notation surrounding order relations isn't entirely standard, so we give some definitions.

Definition 4. Let Y be a set and $\preceq \subseteq Y \times Y$. The pair $\langle Y, \preceq \rangle$ is called a (binary) relational structure.

1. $\langle Y, \preceq \rangle$ is a *preorder* if and only if the relation \preceq is reflexive and transitive.
2. A preorder $\langle Y, \preceq \rangle$ is a *partial order* if and only if moreover \preceq is antisymmetric.
3. A partial order $\langle Y, \preceq \rangle$ is *linear* if and only if \preceq is total.
4. A preorder $\langle Y, \preceq \rangle$ is *prelinear* if and only if \preceq is total (so prelinear orders may fail to be antisymmetric).

If $\langle Y, \preceq \rangle$ is a preorder then the relation \approx defined by $x \approx y$ if and only if $x \preceq y$ and $y \preceq x$ is an equivalence relation, and the preorder \preceq induces a partial order on Y/\approx which is linear if \preceq was prelinear. The word *poset* may refer to either a preorder or a partial order; when antisymmetry is desired one may always take the quotient by \approx in contexts where the word “poset” is used.

Definition 5. An *ordered Polish space* is a pair $\langle Y, \leq \rangle$ with the following properties:

- $\langle Y, \leq \rangle$ is a total order.
- Y is a Polish space.
- The Polish topology of Y is the order topology induced by \leq (see e.g. [14, 5.15.f]).

In the sequel we shall assume without comment that all our ordered Polish spaces have at least two elements, and so $Y^{\mathbb{N}}$ is infinite for every Y under consideration. The following proposition will allow us to reduce statements about general ordered Polish spaces to the important special case of the Cantor space $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ with its lexicographic order.

Proposition 1. *Let $\langle Y, \leq \rangle$ be an ordered Polish space. Then there is an order-preserving continuous embedding $f : Y \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ where $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ has the lexicographic order.*

Proof. Let S be the set of all elements of Y which have immediate successors or predecessors. Because Y is separable, S is countable. Hence we may choose a countable dense subset D of Y containing S . Identify $2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ with elements of $2^{\mathbb{N}}$

having finite support, and note that the lexicographic order on $2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ is dense and has no endpoints. By the universality of dense linear orders without endpoints for countable linear orders (e.g. [13, thm. 2.5]), we may fix an order-embedding $g : D \rightarrow 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$. This lifts to an order-preserving map $\hat{g} = f : \hat{Y} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ of Dedekind completions, defined by

$$\hat{g}(y) = \sup\{g(d) : d \in D \cap (-\infty, y]\},$$

which is Borel because it is order-continuous. It remains to show that \hat{g} is injective. For $x, y \in Y$, if $g(x) = g(y)$ then for every $d \in D$, $d < x$ iff $d < y$. Suppose for contradiction that $x \neq y$, say $x < y$. Because D is dense and there is no $d \in D$ with $x < d < y$, it must be that the interval (x, y) is empty. But then $x, y \in S \subseteq D$ and $g(x) = g(y)$ immediately implies that $x = y$. \square

The space $[0, 1]$ would serve as our universal ordered Polish space as well, since it is biembeddable with the Cantor space $2^{\mathbb{N}}$. But $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ fits better with standard definitions in descriptive set theory, and is in some sense a simpler space than $[0, 1]$, so we use it. We denote the group of finitely-supported permutations of \mathbb{N} by $S_{<\infty}$, and by $E_{S_{<\infty}}$ the orbit equivalence relation induced by the action of this group on $(2^{\mathbb{N}})^{\mathbb{N}}$ by permuting coordinate. Note that, taking the utility space $Y = 2^{\mathbb{N}}$, finite anonymity is precisely the condition of $E_{S_{<\infty}}$ -invariance.

2.1 SEA Orders are not Lebesgue-measurable

In [2] Dubey and Laguzzi observe that the existence of a SEA order implies the existence of a set without the Baire property. This implies that there is no SEA order in W , but what is more, the consistency of the non-existence of a SEA order with $\text{ZF} + \text{DC}$ follows because there is a model due to Shelah which can be constructed in ZF alone and in which all sets of reals have the Baire property [15]. Dubey and Laguzzi leave open whether the existence of a SEA order implies the existence of a set of reals which is not Lebesgue-measurable; we use Fubini's theorem to prove that it does, and observe that the same argument with Fubini's theorem replaced by the Kuratowski-Ulam theorem gives a simple proof that a SEA order does not have the Baire property.

Proposition 2. *Let \succsim be a SEA order on $4^{\mathbb{N}}$. Then \succsim is not Lebesgue-measurable as a subset of $4^{\mathbb{N}} \times 4^{\mathbb{N}}$.*

Proof. Let $X = 4^{\mathbb{N}}$ be the space of policies, and assume for contradiction that \succsim is Lebesgue-measurable as a subset of $X \times X$. Because \succsim is finitely-anonymous, it is closed under $E_{S_{<\infty}}$ in each coordinate. We now wish to show that $E_{S_{<\infty}}$ is ergodic, which means that an $E_{S_{<\infty}}$ -invariant set is either null or conull. It is immediate from the definition that $E_{S_{<\infty}}$ is the orbit equivalence relation of an action of $S_{<\infty}$ on $4^{\mathbb{N}}$ by homeomorphisms. The orbit of a point in $4^{\mathbb{N}}$ is dense precisely when it contains infinitely-many occurrences of each of the elements of 4, and so in particular there is a conull set of points with dense orbits. It follows that $E_{S_{<\infty}}$ is ergodic.

If \lesssim is null, then by Fubini's theorem a conull collection of vertical sections are null. Hence a conull collection of points in X each have a conull collection of points above them. This is only possible if a conull set of these points are pairwise equivalent, and so \lesssim has a conull equivalence class. But this is impossible, because there are disjoint open sets U, V with each element in U SE-below an element of V . For instance, following Laguzzi [2] we may take $U = [0, 0, 3, 3]$, $V = [0, 1, 2, 3]$. The function $f : U \rightarrow V$ defined by replacing $\langle 0, 0, 4, 4 \rangle$ by $\langle 0, 1, 2, 3 \rangle$ in the first four coordinates and leaving all other coordinates alone is a homeomorphism between disjoint open sets which satisfies x SE $f(x)$ for every $x \in U$.

Since \lesssim is not null, it is conull, and in this case Fubini's theorem gives us that a conull collection of vertical sections are conull, which means that a conull collection of points in X have a conull collection of points below them. Again this implies that \lesssim has a conull equivalence class, which yields a contradiction as before. \square

2.2 Two Constructions of SEA Orders

Dubey and Laguzzi in [2] observe that the existence of a nonprincipal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} can be used to construct a SEA order. Since they do not give a reference to an argument for this, we provide one here.

Proposition 3. *Assume there is a nonprincipal ultrafilter U on \mathbb{N} . Then there is a SEA order on $(2^{\mathbb{N}})^{\mathbb{N}}$.*

Since it will be used later, we make a definition before beginning the proof.

Definition 6. Let Y be an ordered Polish space. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the order \lesssim_n is defined by $x \lesssim_n y$ if and only if $x_{[n]} \leq y_{[n]}$ in the lexicographic order of Y^n , where for $z \in Y^{\mathbb{N}}$, $z_{[n]}$ is $z \upharpoonright n$ written in sorted order.

It is straightforward to check that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, \lesssim_n is a prelinear order on $Y^{\mathbb{N}}$.

Proof. Let $Y = 2^{\mathbb{N}}$, so the space of policies is $Y^{\mathbb{N}}$, and fix a nonprincipal ultrafilter U on \mathbb{N} . The idea is to order points of $Y^{\mathbb{N}}$ by the ultrafilter limit of their sorted initial segments. Given $x, y \in Y^{\mathbb{N}}$, define $x \lesssim y$ if and only if $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : x \lesssim_n y\} \in U$, where finite tuples are compared lexicographically. We shall show that \lesssim is SEA. It is a prelinear order because it is an ultralimit of the prelinear orders \lesssim_n .

To see that it is anonymous, suppose that $x E_{S_{<\infty}} y$. Then there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $n \geq N$, $x_{[n]} = y_{[n]}$. Thus $x \lesssim_n y \lesssim_n x$ for $n \geq N$, and $x \lesssim y \lesssim x$ follows immediately from the fact that U is nonprincipal and so contains all cofinite subsets of \mathbb{N} .

It remains to verify strong equity. Suppose that x SE y , so x and y agree on all coordinates except i and j , and that $x(i) < y(i) < y(j) < x(j)$. Then for $n \geq i, j$, $x_{[n]}$ and $y_{[n]}$ agree up to the position where $x(i)$ appears in $x_{[n]}$, and

at this position $y(i)$ appears in $y_{[n]}$. Hence $x_{[n]} < y_{[n]}$, and since $n \geq i, j$ was arbitrary and U is nonprincipal, $x < y$, as required. \square

SEA orders can also be constructed from linear orders of $4^{\mathbb{N}}/\mathbb{E}_0$ or of $(2^{\mathbb{N}})^{\mathbb{N}}/\mathbb{E}_1$, and in particular a transversal of \mathbb{E}_0 is sufficient to construct a SEA order on $4^{\mathbb{N}}$, the minimal space where the notion of SEA order is non-trivial, and a transversal of \mathbb{E}_1 is sufficient to construct SEA orders for utilities drawn from any ordered Polish space.

Proposition 4. *Suppose there is a linear order of $2^{\mathbb{N}}/\mathbb{E}_0$. Then there is a SEA order on $4^{\mathbb{N}}$ (and in fact on $n^{\mathbb{N}}$ for any $n \geq 4$, including $n = \omega$).*

Proof. A slight modification of the construction of a SEA order from a nonprincipal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} . Fix $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\mathbb{N}\}$ with $4 \leq n \leq \omega$ and a linear ordering of $2^{\mathbb{N}}/\mathbb{E}_0$. Order elements of $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ first by their \mathbb{E}_0 -classes and then by \lesssim_n for n sufficiently large (this is well-defined because x and y being ordered by \lesssim_n are \mathbb{E}_0 -equivalent). The relation so-defined is obviously finitely-anonymous, and it is easy to see that it is strongly equitable. That it is in fact a prelinear order follows from the fact that if $x <_{SE} y$, then $x \mathbb{E}_0 y$. \square

Proposition 5. *Suppose there is a linear order of $(2^{\mathbb{N}})^{\mathbb{N}}/\mathbb{E}_1$. Then for any ordered Polish space Y , there is a SEA order on $Y^{\mathbb{N}}$.*

Proof. By proposition 1 it suffices to show that there is a SEA order on $(2^{\mathbb{N}})^{\mathbb{N}}$. The argument proceeds in the same manner as that for the preceding proposition, only this time we fix an ordering of $(2^{\mathbb{N}})^{\mathbb{N}}/\mathbb{E}_1$ and order elements of $(2^{\mathbb{N}})^{\mathbb{N}}$ first by their \mathbb{E}_1 -classes and then by \lesssim_n for sufficiently-large n . \square

3 Some Geometric Set Theory

To make use of the machinery of geometric set theory, and in particular balanced forcing and its variants, it will be necessary to work with forcing conditions in generic extensions. In order for this to make sense, the forcing poset needs to be sufficiently-definable, and for our purposes that means it should be a *Suslin forcing*.

Definition 7. A poset $\langle P, \leq \rangle$ is *Suslin* if and only if there is a Polish space X over which P , \leq , and \perp are analytic.

The utility of the analyticity assumption is that Shoenfield absoluteness applies; more details and numerous examples can be found by following the references in [11].

Virtual conditions are, intuitively, objects which exist in V and describe conditions of a Suslin forcing which are guaranteed to be consistent across forcing extensions. To formalize this, we start by defining objects in V , called P -pairs, which determine P -conditions in generic extensions of V . Actually, we shall let P -pairs determine analytic sets of conditions in P , and for this we define an ordering on analytic subsets of P which is best thought of as ordering them by their suprema in a definable completion.

Definition 8 ([11, Definition 5.1.4]). For A, B analytic subsets of a Suslin forcing P , the supremum of A is below the supremum of B , denoted $\sum A \leq \sum B$, if and only if every condition below an element of A can be strengthened to a condition below an element of B . In case $\sum A \leq \sum B$ and $\sum B \leq \sum A$, we write $\sum A = \sum B$.

Definition 9 ([11, def. 5.1.6]). A P -pair for a Suslin forcing P is a pair $\langle Q, \tau \rangle$ where Q is a forcing poset and $Q \Vdash \tau$ “ τ is an analytic subset of P ”.

The analytic set named in a P -pair is not guaranteed to have stable characteristics across generic extensions, an issue which the notion of a P -pin seeks to resolve.

Definition 10 ([11, def. 5.1.6]). A P -pair $\langle Q, \tau \rangle$ for a Suslin forcing P is a P -pin if and only if $Q \times Q \Vdash \sum \tau_{\triangleleft} = \sum \tau_{\triangleright}$, where

$$\tau_{\triangleleft} = \{ \langle \sigma_{\triangleleft}, \langle p, q \rangle \rangle : \langle \sigma, p \rangle \in \tau, q \in P \}$$

is the lift of the name τ to the projection of a $Q \times Q$ -generic filter to its left factor, and similarly for τ_{\triangleright} . As in [11], one may find it useful to think of these as the left and right copies of the name τ .

Definition 11. For P -pins $\langle P, \tau \rangle, \langle Q, \sigma \rangle$, define the relation of *virtual equivalence* by $\langle P, \tau \rangle \equiv \langle Q, \sigma \rangle$ if and only if $P \times Q \Vdash \sum \tau = \sum \sigma$. Virtual conditions are equivalence classes of this relation.

That \equiv is indeed an equivalence relation is established in [11, Proposition 5.1.8]. The intuition behind virtual conditions is that they describe (suprema of analytic sets of) conditions in a way that is independent of the particular generic extension under consideration. Note that for any poset P and analytic subset $A \subseteq P$, the pair $\langle P, \dot{A} \rangle$ determines a virtual condition, so in particular P embeds naturally into its set of virtual conditions (using the obvious observation that distinct analytic subsets of P determine distinct virtual conditions).

Definition 12 ([11, Definition 9.3.1]). Let P be a Suslin forcing. A virtual condition \bar{p} of P is *placid* if and only if for all generic extensions $V[G], V[H]$ such that $V[G] \cap V[H] = V$ and all conditions $p \in V[G], q \in V[H]$, with $p, q \leq \bar{p}$, p and q are compatible. P is *placid* if and only if for every condition $p \in P$ there is a placid virtual condition $\bar{p} \leq p$. The notions of *balanced* virtual conditions and forcings are exactly analogous, with the requirement on the generic extensions $V[G], V[H]$ strengthened to mutual genericity.

As we shall see in the course of the main proofs in this paper, balanced (and placid) pairs are of great utility in showing that specific statements are forced, because if a statement is not decided by a balanced pair $\langle Q, \tau \rangle$ it is often possible to use this fact to construct incompatible pairs below $\langle Q, \tau \rangle$. In particular, a balanced pair for a forcing P decides everything about the generic object for P in the following sense:

Theorem 6 ([11, prop. 5.2.4]). *Let P be a Suslin poset and $\langle Q, \tau \rangle$ a balanced pair for P . Then for any formula ϕ and parameter $z \in V$, one of the following holds:*

- $Q \Vdash \text{Coll}(\omega, < \kappa) \Vdash \tau \Vdash_P W[\dot{G}] \models \phi(\dot{G}, \dot{z})$;
- $Q \Vdash \text{Coll}(\omega, < \kappa) \Vdash \tau \Vdash_P W[\dot{G}] \models \phi(\dot{G}, \dot{z})$,

where \dot{G} is the canonical P -name, in V^Q , for a P -generic filter.

In order to demonstrate a forcing is balanced (or placid) it is often helpful to classify balanced pairs, and for that the following equivalence relation is useful, as it provides a means of reducing balanced pairs to balanced virtual conditions.

Definition 13 ([11, Definition 5.2.5]). P -pairs $\langle Q, \tau \rangle, \langle R, \sigma \rangle$ are *balance-equivalent*, denoted $\langle Q, \tau \rangle \equiv_b \langle R, \sigma \rangle$, if and only if for all pairs $\langle Q', \tau' \rangle \leq \langle Q, \tau \rangle, \langle R', \sigma' \rangle \leq \langle R, \sigma \rangle$,

$$Q' \times R' \Vdash \exists q \in \tau' \exists r \in \sigma' \exists p. p \leq q, r.$$

That \equiv_b is indeed an equivalence relation is established in [11, Proposition 5.2.6], which also proves that if $\langle Q, \tau \rangle \leq \langle R, \sigma \rangle$, then $\langle Q, \tau \rangle \equiv_b \langle R, \sigma \rangle$.

An important property of balance equivalence is that every balance equivalence class includes a virtual condition, which is in fact unique up to equivalence of virtual conditions, so when working with P -pairs up to balance equivalence it suffices to consider virtual conditions.

Proposition 7 ([11, Theorem 5.2.8]). *For any Suslin forcing P , every balance equivalence class of P -pairs includes a virtual condition which is unique up to equivalence of virtual conditions.*

The main utility for us of the notion of placidity is that it entails that there are no nonprincipal ultrafilters on \mathbb{N} .

Proposition 8 ([11, Theorem 12.2.8,3]). *If P is a placid Suslin forcing and G is W -generic over P , then in $W[G]$ there is no nonprincipal ultrafilter over \mathbb{N} .*

4 SEA No (Nonprincipal) Ultrafilter!

We now turn to the problem of adding SEA orders to the symmetric Solovay model W without adding nonprincipal ultrafilters on \mathbb{N} or \mathbb{E}_0 -transversals. The most straightforward way to achieve this is to add a linear order of \mathbb{E}_1 (for a SEA order on $(2^{\mathbb{N}})^{\mathbb{N}}$; a linear order of \mathbb{E}_0 suffices for a SEA order on $n^{\mathbb{N}}$ for countable n). A direct, placid-forcing approach yields a more general result. Let $W_{\mathbb{E}_0}$ and $W_{\mathbb{E}_1}$ be the generic extensions of the symmetric Solovay model by the quotient space linearization posets of [11], example 8.7.5, for the equivalence relations displayed. By corollary 9.2.12 in [11], $|2^{\mathbb{N}}/\mathbb{E}_0| > 2^{\aleph_0}$ in both of these models, and by corollary 9.3.16 these are both placid extensions and so neither contains a nonprincipal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} . By lemma 4 the model $W_{\mathbb{E}_0}$ contains a SEA

order, and lemma 5 together with lemma 1 demonstrate that the model W_{E_1} contains a SEA order on $Y^{\mathbb{N}}$ for every ordered Polish space Y . This answers the question of Dubey and Laguzzi [2] about whether the existence of a SEA order implies the existence of a nonprincipal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} .

5 More General Prelinearization

In the previous section we showed how to answer the question of Dubey and Laguzzi using forcing machinery already developed by Larson and Zapletal in [11]. However, the author originally proceeded by constructing a new forcing specifically to add a SEA order, and this construction generalizes to a wider class of prelinearization problems so is worthwhile to write down.

Definition 14. Let \preceq be a preorder on a set X . A prelinear order \lesssim on X *prelinearizes* \preceq if and only if $\preceq \subseteq \lesssim$ and $\lesssim \cap \check{\lesssim} = \preceq \cap \check{\preceq}$. The order \lesssim *weakly prelinearizes* \preceq if and only if $\preceq \subseteq \lesssim$ and $\prec \subseteq <$, where \prec and $<$ are the strict versions of \preceq and \lesssim , respectively.

Consider some specific sort of object, such as a nonprincipal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} , which is frequently useful for constructing (weak) prelinearizations. The general form of the question we are interested in is when a prelinear order from W has a (weak) prelinearization in some generic extension that contains no object of the specified sort. Our result in this context is that all Borel preorders satisfying a technical condition can be prelinearized in a generic extension of W containing no nonprincipal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} .

Definition 15. A Borel preorder \preceq on a Polish space X is *tranquil* if and only if for every pair of generic extensions $V[G], V[H]$ satisfying $V[G] \cap V[H] = V$, and for every pair of elements $x \in V[G], y \in V[H]$, if $V[K]$ is such that $V[G], V[H] \subseteq V[K]$, then (as evaluated in $V[K]$) if $x \preceq y$ then there is $z \in V$ with $x \preceq z$ and $z \preceq y$.

Note that if a Borel preorder \preceq satisfies that V is *interval-dense* in any generic extension, in the sense that any nonempty interval contains an element of V , then \preceq is tranquil. Unfortunately this is not true for \leq_{SE} , but the issue is easily fixed.

Proposition 9. *The preorder \leq_{SE} on $(2^{\mathbb{N}})^{\mathbb{N}}$ is tranquil.*

Proof. It is immediate from the definition of \leq_{SE} that it is Borel. Now suppose that we have generic extensions $V[G], V[H]$ with $V[G] \cap V[H] = V$, that $V[G], V[H] \subseteq V[K]$, and that $x \in V[G], y \in V[H]$, and $x \leq_{SE} y$. Then there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a sequence $\langle x_i : i < n \rangle$ such that $x_0 = x, x_n = y$, and $x_i \text{ SE } x_{i+1}$ when both sides are defined. It follows from the definition of SE and induction that x and y differ at only a finite set of coordinates, say I . Using the fact that $2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ is dense in $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ and that $2^{<\mathbb{N}} \subseteq V$, for each $i \in I$ choose z_i with $x_i \leq z_i \leq y_i$. For $i \notin I$ we have that $x_i = y_i$ by the definition of SE, and so

$x_i = y_i \in V = V[G] \cap V[H]$. Hence the point $z = \langle z_i : i \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ is an element of V . Clearly $x \leq_{SE} z \leq_{SE} y$, which completes the proof. \square

We shall demonstrate by constructing a placid forcing that any tranquil Borel preorder has a prelinearization in a model which contains no nonprincipal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} and no \mathbb{E}_0 -transversal. But the forcing poset makes sense for arbitrary analytic preorders, so we state its definition at this level of generality.

Definition 16. Let \preceq be an analytic preorder on a subset of a Polish space. The *prelinearizing poset* $P(\preceq)$ is the poset of (enumerations of) preorders on countable subsets of X which prelinearize the corresponding restriction of \preceq , ordered by extension.

Note that this poset is σ -closed because a countable union of conditions is a condition. Hence it preserves DC.

Proposition 10. *For \preceq an analytic preorder on a subset of a Polish space, $P(\preceq)$ is Suslin.*

Proof. All the requirements to be an element of $P(\preceq)$ are clearly analytic because \preceq is. Extension is analytic also in this context, because conditions are required to be countable. Two conditions \leq_p and \leq_q in $P(\preceq)$ are incompatible precisely when there is a cycle in the relation $<_p \cup <_q \cup <$, and this is clearly an analytic requirement. \square

Proposition 11. *For \preceq a tranquil Borel preorder on a Polish space X , $P(\preceq)$ is placid, with placid virtual conditions classified by total prelinearizations of \preceq .*

Proof. First we check that if \lesssim is a prelinearization of \preceq , then $\langle \text{Coll}(\omega, X), \lesssim \rangle$ is a placid pair, where $X = \text{dom}(\preceq)$. So suppose $V[G_0], V[G_1]$ are separately generic extensions of V with $V[G_0] \cap V[G_1] = V$, and that for $i < 2$, $\lesssim_i \in V[G_i]$ is a condition in P with $\lesssim_i \leq \bar{p} = \langle \text{Coll}(\omega, X), \lesssim \rangle$ in the ordering of pairs for $i < 2$. Strengthening if needed, we may assume that \bar{p} is a condition in each $V[G_i]$. If $\lesssim_0 \perp \lesssim_1$ then there is a cycle C in $<_0 \cup <_1 \cup \preceq$. If an element x of this cycle occurs in the field of both $<_0$ and $<_1$, then because $V[G_0] \cap V[G_1] = V$, $x \in V$. For links of the form $x \prec y$ in the cycle, by tranquility there is an element $z \in V$ with $x \prec z \prec y$, and hence since \lesssim_i are prelinearizations, $x <_i z <_{1-i} y$ for some $i < 2$. Links of the form $x <_i y <_i z$ can be reduced to $x <_i z$. Hence by a simple induction we may assume without loss of generality that the links of the cycle alternate between $<_0$ and $<_1$. But because $x <_i y <_{1-i} z$ implies $y \in V$, and the \lesssim_i each extend \lesssim , this entails that there is a cycle in $<$, a contradiction.

If $\lesssim_0 \neq \lesssim_1$ are distinct prelinearizations of \preceq , then clearly no partial prelinearization can extend both simultaneously, so the balanced virtual conditions $\langle \text{Coll}(\omega, X), \lesssim_0 \rangle$ and $\langle \text{Coll}(\omega, X), \lesssim_1 \rangle$ are not balance-equivalent.

Now suppose that $\bar{p} = \langle Q, R \rangle$ is a placid virtual condition; we must find a condition of the form $\langle \text{Coll}(\omega, X), \lesssim \rangle$, with \lesssim a prelinearization of \preceq , which is balance-equivalent to \bar{p} . Strengthening if necessary, we may assume that X^V is

countable after forcing with Q . By placidity \bar{p} decides the order of any pair of elements of X^V . Let \lesssim be the relation $\{(x, y) \in X^V \times X^V : \bar{p} \Vdash \dot{x} \dot{R} \dot{y}\}$. Then $\bar{p} \leq \langle \text{Coll}(\omega, X), \lesssim \rangle$, so \bar{p} is balance-equivalent to $\langle \text{Coll}(\omega, X), \lesssim \rangle$.

Given $p \in P(\lesssim)$, by transfinite induction carried out in V there is a prelinearization \lesssim of \lesssim extending p , and so $\langle \text{Coll}(\omega, X), \lesssim \rangle \leq p$. Since we already saw that this pair is placid, we conclude that the poset $P(\lesssim)$ is placid. \square

Corollary 12. *If \lesssim is a tranquil Borel preorder then there is a model of $ZF+DC$ in which \lesssim has a prelinearization but there is no nonprincipal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} .*

Proof. Because $P(\lesssim)$ is placid and σ -closed, forcing with it over W yields the desired model. \square

The natural approach to proving that forcing with $P(\lesssim)$ does not add an \mathbb{E}_0 -transversal is the notion of compact balance as developed in [11]. Unfortunately, the poset $P(\lesssim)$ does not appear to be compactly balanced in any obvious way, but fortunately Paul Larson pointed out to me that in fact closure of placid conditions under ultralimits is sufficient. Since the following result is very general, we state it in terms of balance rather than placidity, and in fact use the notion of *cofinal balance*, which means for a Suslin poset P that for every generic extension of V by a poset of cardinality less than κ , there is a further generic extension of V by a poset of cardinality less than κ in which P is balanced.

Proposition 13. *Let $\langle P, \leq \rangle$ be a cofinally balanced Suslin forcing below the inaccessible cardinal κ with the following properties in a cofinal set of generic extensions $V[H]$ in which P is balanced:*

1. *If $V[H, H_1] \subseteq V[H, H_2]$ are generic extensions of $V[H]$ then for every balanced virtual condition $\bar{p}_0 \in V[H, H_0]$ there is a balanced virtual condition $\bar{p}_1 \leq \bar{p}_0$ in $V[H, H_1]$,*
2. *The balanced virtual conditions in $V[H]$ are closed under limits with respect to ultrafilters in $V[H]$.*

Then $W^P \models |2^{\mathbb{N}} / \mathbb{E}_0| > 2^{\aleph_0}$.

Proof. By the hypotheses of the proposition we may assume that P is balanced and that properties (1) and (2) hold in V . Suppose for contradiction that there is a P -name \dot{f} and a condition $p \in P$ such that

$$p \Vdash \text{“}\dot{f} \text{ is an injection from } 2^{\mathbb{N}} / \mathbb{E}_0 \text{ into } 2^{\mathbb{N}}\text{”}.$$

Choose $z \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that p, \dot{f} are definable from z , and let K be a filter V -generic for a poset in V of cardinality less than κ and chosen such that $z \in V[K]$.

Now let Q_R be the poset $\langle [\mathbb{N}]^{\mathbb{N}}, \subseteq \rangle$ and Q_V be Vitali forcing, which consists of Borel I -positive subsets of $2^{\mathbb{N}}$, ordered by inclusion, where I is the σ -ideal over $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ generated by Borel partial \mathbb{E}_0 -transversals. See [11, fact 9.2.3] and the references therein for details on this forcing. For $\langle U, y \rangle$ $V[K]$ -generic with respect to $Q_R \times Q_V$, note that U is a nonprincipal ultrafilter over \mathbb{N} and $y \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ in the generic

extension. Moreover, since Q_R is σ -closed, $V[K]^{Q_R}$ has the same Borel codes as $V[K]$ and thus has the same notion of Vitali forcing Q_V . Therefore y is also $V[K][U]$ -generic for Q_V . Since Vitali forcing adds no independent reals² (see [16]), the set U in $V[K][U][y]$ generates an ultrafilter over \mathbb{N} .

Working in $V[K][U]$, let \bar{p}_0 be a balanced virtual condition below p . Using (1), choose a Q_V -name \bar{p}_1 for a balanced virtual condition below \bar{p}_0 which is in P as evaluated in $V[K][U][y]$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ define $y_n(i)$ to be zero if $i \leq n$ and $y_n(i) = y(i)$ otherwise, so y_n is obtained by zeroing out the first n entries of y . It is clear that this modification does not affect the genericity of y (over $V[K]$ or $V[K][U]$), and that for every n $V[K][U][y_n] = V[K][U][y]$. Working now in $V[K][U][y]$, let \bar{p}_2 be the ultrafilter limit of $\langle \bar{p}_1/y_n : n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$. This is a balanced virtual condition of P by (2), and clearly $\bar{p}_2 \leq \bar{p}_0, \bar{p}$. It is immediate from the definition of \bar{p}_1 that the same virtual condition would be obtained from any point of $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ \mathbb{E}_0 -equivalent to y . A contradiction is now reached exactly as in the proof of [11, th. 9.2.2]. \square

Lemma 14. *An ultralimit of prelinearizations of a preorder \preceq on a set X is a preorder of \preceq .*

Proof. Let $\langle \preceq_n : n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ be a sequence of prelinearizations of \preceq , and fix a nonprincipal ultrafilter U on \mathbb{N} . Take \preceq to be the ultralimit of the sequence, so for $x, y \in X$, $x \preceq y$ if and only if $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : x \preceq_n y\} \in U$. This is a prelinear order by the standard ultralimit argument, and clearly $\preceq \subseteq \preceq$ since this holds for each \preceq_n . It remains to check that if $x \preceq y \preceq x$, then $x \preceq y \preceq x$. Suppose $x \preceq y \preceq x$, so

$$\{n \in \mathbb{N} : x \preceq_n y \preceq_n x\} \in U.$$

Since the relations \preceq_n are prelinearizations, if $x \preceq_n y \preceq_n x$ then $x \preceq y \preceq x$. Hence

$$\{n \in \mathbb{N} : x \preceq y \preceq x\} \in U,$$

which means precisely that $x \preceq y \preceq x$. \square

Corollary 15. *If \preceq is a tranquil Borel preorder then there is a model of $ZF+DC$ in which there is a prelinearization of \preceq but no \mathbb{E}_0 -transversal and no nonprincipal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} . In particular, this holds for \leq_{SE} .*

Proof. The model obtained by forcing over W with $P(\preceq)$ will witness this. We already saw that this model satisfies DC and contains no nonprincipal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} in the proof of the last corollary. Combining the classification of placid virtual conditions for $P(\preceq)$ with proposition 13 and the last lemma yields that this model also contains no \mathbb{E}_0 -transversal. \square

6 Future Work

Dubey and Laguzzi also define the notion of an ANIP social welfare order, which is finitely-anonymous and *infinite Pareto*, meaning that if $x \leq y$ coordinatewise

²Subsets of \mathbb{N} which neither contain nor are disjoint from any infinite subset of \mathbb{N} in V

and $x_i < y_i$ on infinitely-many coordinates i , then y is required to be strictly preferred to x in the social welfare order. They ask whether the existence of such an order implies the existence of a nonprincipal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} , and showing that it does not is beyond our current methods since the order defined by the infinite Pareto requirement is not tranquil. Hence the question about ANIP orders analogous to our main result about SEA orders remains open.

There is also the possibility of generalizing our results about prelinearizing tranquil Borel preorders in models with no nonprincipal ultrafilters on \mathbb{N} or \mathbb{E}_0 -transversals to broader classes of preorders, for example all Borel preorders or all analytic preorders. It would be intriguing if there is an obstruction, i.e. a Borel or at least analytic preorder such that DC suffices to prove that the existence of a prelinearization implies the existence of a nonprincipal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} , or of a \mathbb{E}_0 -transversal. The natural analogue of this question for weak prelinearization may also be of interest.

Another direction is to investigate SEA and related orders with utilities from an arbitrary definable (e.g. Borel or analytic) linear order on a Polish (or Suslin) space; what has been dropped is the requirement that the space of utilities be an ordered Polish space. In this context $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ is no longer universal in the sense of proposition 1, as witnessed by $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ with the lexicographic order, which is nonseparable and therefore does not embed into the separable space $2^{\mathbb{N}}$.

References

- [1] Claude D’Aspremont and Louis Gevers. Equity and the informational basis of collective choice. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 44(2):199–209, 1977. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2297061>.
- [2] Ram Sewak Dubey and Giorgio Laguzzi. On social welfare orders satisfying anonymity and strong equity. *Available at SSRN 3319154*, 2019.
- [3] Ryszard Engelking. *General topology*, volume 6 of *Sigma Series in Pure Mathematics*. Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1989. Translated from the Polish by the author.
- [4] Su Gao. *Invariant descriptive set theory*, volume 293 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics (Boca Raton)*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2009.
- [5] J. M. Henle, A. R. D. Mathias, and W. Hugh Woodin. A barren extension. In *Methods in mathematical logic (Caracas, 1983)*, volume 1130 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 195–207. Springer, Berlin, 1985. doi:10.1007/BFb0075312.
- [6] Thomas Jech. *Set theory*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003.
- [7] Akihiro Kanamori. *The higher infinite*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2003. Large cardinals in set theory from their beginnings.

- [8] Alexander S. Kechris. *Classical descriptive set theory*, volume 156 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. URL: <https://doi-org.proxy.library.cornell.edu/10.1007/978-1-4612-4190-4>, doi:10.1007/978-1-4612-4190-4.
- [9] Kenneth Kunen. *Set theory: An introduction to independence proofs*, volume 102 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York, 1980.
- [10] Giorgio Laguzzi. The non-democratic side of regular sets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10905*, 2020.
- [11] Paul B. Larson and Jindřich Zapletal. *Geometric set theory*, volume 248 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, [2020] ©2020.
- [12] David MacIver. Filters in analysis and topology. URL: <https://www.drmaciver.com/docs/filters.pdf>.
- [13] Joseph G. Rosenstein. *Linear orderings*, volume 98 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York-London, 1982.
- [14] Eric Schechter. *Handbook of analysis and its foundations*. Academic Press, Inc., San Diego, CA, 1997.
- [15] Saharon Shelah. Can you take Solovay’s inaccessible away? *Israel J. Math.*, 48(1):1–47, 1984. doi:10.1007/BF02760522.
- [16] Saharon Shelah and Jindřich Zapletal. Ramsey theorems for product of finite sets with submeasures. *Combinatorica*, 31(2):225–244, 2011. URL: <https://doi-org.proxy.library.cornell.edu/10.1007/s00493-011-2677-5>, doi:10.1007/s00493-011-2677-5.
- [17] William R. Zame. Can intergenerational equity be operationalized? *Theoretical Economics*, 2(2):187–202, 2007. URL: <https://econtheory.org/ojs/index.php/te/article/view/20070187/0>.