

Dissipated Compacta*

Kenneth Kunen^{†‡}

September 4, 2018

Abstract

The dissipated spaces form a class of compacta which contains both the scattered compacta and the compact LOTSes (linearly ordered topological spaces), and a number of theorems true for these latter two classes are true more generally for the dissipated spaces. For example, every regular Borel measure on a dissipated space is separable.

A product of two compact LOTSes is usually not dissipated, but it may satisfy a weakening of that property. In fact, the degree of dissipation of a space can be used to distinguish topologically a product of n LOTSes from a product of m LOTSes.

1 Introduction

All topologies discussed in this paper are assumed to be Hausdorff. As usual, a subset of a space is *perfect* iff it is closed and non-empty and has no isolated points, so X is *scattered* iff X has no perfect subsets.

There are many constructions in the literature which build a compactum X as an inverse limit of metric compacta X_α for $\alpha < \omega_1$, with the bonding maps $\pi_\alpha^\beta : X_\beta \rightarrow X_\alpha$ for $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$. In some cases, as in [7, 11, 12], the construction has the property that for each α, β , $(\pi_\alpha^\beta)^{-1}\{x\}$ is a singleton for all but countably many $x \in X_\alpha$. We shall call such π_α^β *tight maps*; these are discussed in greater detail in Section 2. The spaces X so constructed are examples of *dissipated compacta*; these are discussed in Section 3. Section 7 shows that the property of tightness is absolute for transitive models of set theory.

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 54D30, 54F05. Key Words and Phrases: scattered space, LOTS, inverse limit, irreducible map.

[†]University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706, U.S.A., kunen@math.wisc.edu

[‡]Author partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-0456653.

The precise definition of “dissipated” in Section 3 will be that there are “sufficiently many” tight maps onto metric compacta; so the definition will not mention inverse limits. Then, Section 6 will relate this definition to inverse limits.

Dissipated compacta include the scattered compacta, the metric compacta, and the compact LOTSEs (totally ordered spaces with the order topology). Section 3 also describes the more general notion of κ -dissipated, which gets weaker as κ gets bigger; “dissipated” is the same as “2-dissipated”, while “1-dissipated” is the same as “scattered”. Every regular Borel measure on a 2^{\aleph_0} -dissipated compactum is separable (see Section 5).

If X is the double arrow space of Alexandroff and Urysohn, then X is a non-scattered LOTS and hence is 2-dissipated but not 1-dissipated, while X^{n+1} is $(2^n + 1)$ -dissipated but not 2^n -dissipated. Considerations of this sort can be used to distinguish topologically a product of n LOTSEs from a product of m LOTSEs; see Section 4.

2 Tight Maps

As usual, $f : X \rightarrow Y$ means that f is a *continuous* map from X to Y , and $f : X \twoheadrightarrow Y$ means that f is a continuous map from X *onto* Y .

Definition 2.1 *Assume that X, Y are compact and $f : X \rightarrow Y$.*

- ☞ *A loose family for f is a disjoint family \mathcal{P} of closed subsets of X such that for some non-scattered $Q \subseteq Y$, $Q = f(P)$ for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$.*
- ☞ *f is κ -tight iff there are no loose families for f of size κ .*
- ☞ *f is tight iff f is 2-tight.*

This notion gets weaker as κ gets bigger. f is 1-tight iff $f(X)$ is scattered, so that “2-tight” is the first non-trivial case. f is trivially $|X|^+$ -tight. The usual projection from $[0, 1]^2$ onto $[0, 1]$ is not 2^{\aleph_0} -tight.

Some easy equivalents to “ κ -tight”:

Lemma 2.2 *Assume that X, Y are compact and $f : X \rightarrow Y$. Then (1) \leftrightarrow (2). If κ is finite, then (1) \leftrightarrow (3); if also Y is metric, then all five of the following are equivalent:*

1. *There is a loose family of size κ .*
2. *There is a disjoint family \mathcal{P} of perfect subsets of X with $|\mathcal{P}| = \kappa$ and a perfect $Q \subseteq Y$ such that $Q = f(P)$ for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$.*
3. *There are distinct $a_i \in X$ for $i < \kappa$ with all $f(a_i) = b \in Y$ such that whenever U_i is a neighborhood of a_i for $i < \kappa$, $\bigcap_{i < \kappa} f(\overline{U}_i)$ is not scattered.*

4. For some metric M and $\varphi \in C(X, M)$, $\{y \in Y : |\varphi(f^{-1}\{y\})| \geq \kappa\}$ is uncountable.
5. Statement (4), with $M = [0, 1]$.

Proof. (2) \rightarrow (1) is obvious. Now, assume (1), and let \mathcal{P} be a loose family of size κ , with $Q = f(P)$ for $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Let Q' be a perfect subset of Q , and, for $P \in \mathcal{P}$, let P' be a closed subset of $P \cap f^{-1}(Q')$ such that $f \upharpoonright P' : P' \rightarrow Q'$ is irreducible. Then $\{P' : P \in \mathcal{P}\}$ satisfies (2).

From now on assume that κ is finite.

(3) \rightarrow (1) and (5) \rightarrow (4) are obvious.

For (1) \rightarrow (3), use compactness of $\prod_i P_i$ and the fact that a finite union of scattered spaces is scattered.

For (1) \rightarrow (5): If $\mathcal{P} = \{P_i : i < \kappa\}$ is a loose family, with $Q = f(P_i)$, apply the Tietze Theorem to get $\varphi \in C(X, [0, 1])$ such that $\varphi(x) = 2^{-i}$ for all $x \in P_i$.

Now, we prove (4) \rightarrow (1) when Y is metric. Fix φ as in (4). We may assume that $M = \varphi(X)$, so that M is compact. Let \mathcal{B} be a countable base for M . Then we can find $B_i \in \mathcal{B}$ for $i < \kappa$ such that the $\overline{B_i}$ are disjoint and such that $Q := \{y \in Y : \forall i < \kappa [\varphi(f^{-1}\{y\}) \cap \overline{B_i} \neq \emptyset]\}$ is uncountable, and hence not scattered (since Y is metric). Q is also closed. Let $P_i = f^{-1}(Q) \cap \varphi^{-1}(\overline{B_i})$. Then $\{P_i : i < \kappa\}$ is a loose family. ☕

Lemma 2.3 *If X, Y are compact LOTSES and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is order-preserving ($x_1 < x_2 \rightarrow f(x_1) \leq f(x_2)$), then f is tight.*

Proof. If not, we would have $a_0 < a_1$ and b as in (3) of Lemma 2.2. Let U_0, U_1 be open intervals in X with disjoint closures such that each $a_i \in U_i$. But then $f(\overline{U_0}) \cap f(\overline{U_1}) = \{b\}$, a contradiction. ☕

In many cases, the loose family will be defined uniformly via a continuous function, and we may replace the cardinal κ in Definition 2.1 by some compact space K of size κ :

Definition 2.4 *Assume that X, Y, K are compact spaces and $f : X \rightarrow Y$. Then a K -loose function for f is a $\varphi : \text{dom}(\varphi) \rightarrow K$ such that: $\text{dom}(\varphi)$ is closed in X , and for some non-scattered $Q \subseteq Y$, $\varphi(f^{-1}\{y\}) = K$ for all $y \in Q$.*

Note that we then have a loose family $\mathcal{P} = \{P_z : z \in K\}$ of size $|K|$, where $P_z = f^{-1}(Q) \cap \varphi^{-1}\{z\}$. For finite n , we may view the ordinal n as a discrete topological space, so an n -loose function is equivalent to a loose family $\mathcal{P} = \{P_i : i < n\}$, since φ can map P_i to $i \in n$. The same phenomenon holds for \aleph_0 , but seems harder to prove:

Theorem 2.5 *If X, Y are compact and $f : X \rightarrow Y$, then there is an infinite loose family iff there is an $(\omega + 1)$ -loose function.*

This will be proved in Section 7. Beyond \aleph_0 , there is no simple equivalence between the cardinal version and the topological version of looseness. At 2^{\aleph_0} , we shall use the following terminology to avoid possible confusion between the Cantor set 2^ω and the cardinal $\mathfrak{c} = 2^{\aleph_0}$:

Definition 2.6 *Assume that X, Y are compact and $f : X \rightarrow Y$.*

- ☞ *A strongly \mathfrak{c} -loose family for f is a K -loose function $\varphi : \text{dom}(\varphi) \rightarrow K$, where K is the Cantor set 2^ω .*
- ☞ *f is weakly \mathfrak{c} -tight iff there is no strongly \mathfrak{c} -loose function for f .*

In this paper, whenever we produce a loose family of size 2^{\aleph_0} , it will usually be strongly \mathfrak{c} -loose. However, if we view $\mathfrak{c} + 1$ as a compact ordinal and let $X = Y \times (\mathfrak{c} + 1)$, then assuming that Y is not scattered, the usual projection $f : X \rightarrow Y$ has an obvious loose family of size \mathfrak{c} but no strongly \mathfrak{c} -loose family.

When X, Y are both metric, the κ -tightness of f is related to the sizes of the sets $f^{-1}\{y\}$ by:

Theorem 2.7 *If X, Y are compact metric and $f : X \rightarrow Y$, then f is κ -tight iff $\{y \in Y : |f^{-1}\{y\}| \geq \kappa\}$ is countable. f is weakly \mathfrak{c} -tight iff f is \mathfrak{c} -tight.*

In particular, if $f : X \rightarrow Y$, then f is tight iff $f^{-1}\{y\}$ is a singleton for all but countably many y , as we said in the Introduction.

For both “iff”s, the \leftarrow direction is trivial and is true for any X, Y . For $\kappa = 3$, say, the proof of the \rightarrow direction will show that if there are uncountably many $y \in Y$ such that $f^{-1}\{y\}$ contains three or more points, then for some perfect $Q \subseteq Y$, we can, on Q , choose three of these points continuously, producing disjoint perfect $P_0, P_1, P_2 \subseteq X$ which f maps homeomorphically onto Q , so $\{P_0, P_1, P_2\}$ is a loose family of size 3.

Since X is second countable, each $f^{-1}\{y\}$ is either countable or of size 2^{\aleph_0} , so it is sufficient to prove the theorem for the cases $\kappa \leq \aleph_0$ and $\kappa = 2^{\aleph_0}$. However, for $\kappa = 2^{\aleph_0}$, we can get more detailed results. For example, if there are uncountably many $y \in Y$ such that $f^{-1}\{y\}$ contains a Klein bottle, then we can choose the bottle continuously on a perfect set (see Theorem 2.9). This “continuous selector” result follows easily from standard descriptive set theory. First, observe:

Lemma 2.8 *Suppose that $g : \Phi \rightarrow Y$, where Y is a Polish space, Φ is an analytic subset of some Polish space, and $g(\Phi)$ is uncountable. Then there is a Cantor subset $C \subseteq \Phi$ such that g is 1-1 on C .*

Proof. Let $h : \omega^\omega \rightarrow \Phi$, apply the classical argument of Suslin to obtain a Cantor subset $D \subseteq \omega^\omega$ such that $g \circ h$ is 1-1 on D , and let $C = h(D)$. ☕

Theorem 2.9 *Assume that X, Y, Z are compact metric, $f : X \rightarrow Y$, and there are uncountably many $y \in Y$ such that $f^{-1}\{y\}$ contains a homeomorphic copy of Z . Then there is a perfect $Q \subseteq Y$ and a 1-1 map $i : Q \times Z \rightarrow X$ such that $f(i(q, u)) = q$ for all $(q, u) \in Q \times Z$.*

Proof. Assume that $Z \neq \emptyset$. Fix metrics d_Z, d_X on Z, X , and give $C(Z, X)$ the usual uniform metric, which makes it a Polish space. Let Φ be the set of all $\varphi \in C(Z, X)$ such that φ is 1-1 and $\varphi(Z) \subseteq f^{-1}\{y\}$ for some (unique) $y \in Y$. Observe that Φ is an $F_{\sigma\delta}$ set, since the “ φ is 1-1” can be expressed as:

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists \delta > 0 \forall u, v \in Z [d_Z(u, v) \geq \varepsilon \rightarrow d_X(\varphi(u), \varphi(v)) \geq \delta] .$$

Define $g : \Phi \rightarrow Y$ so that $g(\varphi)$ is the $y \in Y$ such that $\varphi(Z) \subseteq f^{-1}\{y\}$. Using Lemma 2.8, let $C \subseteq \Phi$ be a Cantor subset with g 1-1 on C , let $Q = g(C)$, and let $i(g(\varphi), u) = \varphi(u)$. ☕

Proof of Theorem 2.7. To prove the \rightarrow direction of the first “iff” in the three cases $\kappa < \aleph_0$, $\kappa = \aleph_0$, and $\kappa = \mathfrak{c}$, apply Theorem 2.9 respectively with Z the space κ (with the discrete topology), $\omega + 1$, and 2^ω . This also yields the \rightarrow direction of the second “iff”. ☕

Of course, we are using the fact that every uncountable metric compactum contains a copy of the Cantor set. One could also prove Theorem 2.7 using the following, plus the fact that every uncountable metric compactum maps onto $[0, 1]$:

Theorem 2.10 *Assume that X, Y, K are compact metric with $f : X \rightarrow Y$, and assume that for uncountably many $y \in Y$, there is a closed subset of $f^{-1}\{y\}$ which can be mapped onto K . Then there is a K -loose function for f .*

Proof. Let H be the Hilbert cube, $[0, 1]^\omega$. We may assume that $K \subseteq H$. Then, for uncountably many $y \in Y$, there is a $\psi \in C(X, H)$ such that $\psi(f^{-1}\{y\}) \supseteq K$. Let $\Psi = \{(y, \psi) \in Y \times C(X, H) : \psi(f^{-1}\{y\}) \supseteq K\}$, and let $g(y, \psi) = y$. Applying Lemma 2.8, let $C \subseteq \Psi$ be a Cantor set on which g is 1-1, and let $Q = g(C) \subseteq Y$. For $(y, \psi) \in C$, let $E_y = \{x \in X : \psi(x) \in K\}$. Define φ so that $\text{dom}(\varphi) = \bigcup\{E_y : y \in Q\}$, and $\varphi(x) = \psi(x)$ whenever $x \in \text{dom}(\varphi)$ and $(y, \psi) \in C$. Then φ is a K -loose function. ☕

Theorems 2.7, 2.9, and 2.10 can fail when X is not metric; counter-examples are provided by the double arrow space and some related spaces described by:

Definition 2.11 $I = [0, 1]$. If $S \subseteq (0, 1)$, then I_S is the compact LOTS which results by replacing each $x \in S$ by a pair of neighboring points, $x^- < x^+$. The double arrow space is $I_{(0,1)}$.

I_S has no isolated points because $0, 1 \notin S$. The double arrow space is obtained by splitting all points other than $0, 1$. $I_\emptyset = I$, and $I_{\mathbb{Q} \cap (0,1)}$ is homeomorphic to the Cantor set.

Lemma 2.12 For each $S \subseteq (0, 1)$, I_S is a compact separable LOTS with no isolated points. I_S is second countable iff S is countable.

Now, let $Y = [0, 1]$, let $S \subseteq (0, 1)$, let $X = I_S$ and let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be the natural map. Then f is 2-tight by Lemma 2.3, but $S = \{y \in Y : |f^{-1}\{y\}| \geq 2\}$ need not be countable, so Theorems 2.7, 2.9, and 2.10 fail here when S is uncountable (and hence X is not metric). However, one can apply these theorems in some generic extension, to get a (perhaps strange) alternate proof that f is 2-tight. Roughly, if $V[G]$ makes S countable, then X, Y will both be compact metric in $V[G]$, so Theorem 2.7 implies that f is 2-tight in $V[G]$ (because S is countable); but then by absoluteness, f is 2-tight in V . Absoluteness of tightness is discussed more precisely in Section 7.

The composition properties of tight maps are given by:

Lemma 2.13 Assume that X, Y, Z are compact, m, n are finite, $f : X \rightarrow Y$, and $g : Y \rightarrow Z$. Then:

1. If $g \circ f$ is n -tight then g is n -tight.
2. If f and g are tight, then $g \circ f$ is tight.
3. If f is $m + 1$ -tight and g is $n + 1$ -tight, then $g \circ f$ is $mn + 1$ -tight.

Proof. (1) is trivial, and (2) is a special case of (3).

For (3), assume that f is $m + 1$ -tight, g is $n + 1$ -tight, and $g \circ f$ is not $mn + 1$ -tight; we shall derive a contradiction. Fix disjoint closed $P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{mn} \subseteq X$ with $g(f(P_0)) \cap g(f(P_1)) \cap \dots \cap g(f(P_{mn}))$ not scattered. Shrinking X, Y, Z , and the P_i , we may assume WLOG that $X = P_0 \cup P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_{mn}$ and that $g(f(P_i)) = Z$ for each i . For each $s \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, mn\}$, let $Q_s = \bigcap_{i \in s} f(P_i)$. Shrinking the P_i , we may assume WLOG that each $Q_s \subseteq Y$ is either empty or not scattered; to see this, for a fixed s : If Q_s is scattered, then so is $g(Q_s)$; if R is a perfect subset of $Z \setminus g(Q_s)$, then we may replace Z by R and each P_i by $P_i \cap f^{-1}(g^{-1}(R))$.

Now, using compactness of $P_0 \times P_1 \times \dots \times P_{mn}$, as in the proof of Lemma 2.2, fix $a_i \in P_i$ for $i \leq mn$ such that $g(f(\overline{U_0})) \cap \dots \cap g(f(\overline{U_{mn}}))$ is not scattered whenever each U_i is a neighborhood of a_i . Then at least one of the following two cases holds:

Case I. Some $n + 1$ of the $f(a_0), \dots, f(a_{mn})$ are different. WLOG, these are $f(a_0), f(a_1), \dots, f(a_n)$. Choose the U_i so that the $f(\overline{U_0}), f(\overline{U_1}), \dots, f(\overline{U_n})$ are all disjoint. But then $g(f(\overline{U_0})) \cap \dots \cap g(f(\overline{U_n})) \supseteq g(f(\overline{U_0})) \cap \dots \cap g(f(\overline{U_{mn}}))$ is not scattered, contradicting the $n + 1$ -tightness of g .

Case II. Some $m + 1$ of the $f(a_0), \dots, f(a_{mn})$ are the same. WLOG, $f(a_0) = f(a_1) = \dots = f(a_m)$. Let $s = \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$. Then $Q_s \neq \emptyset$, so $Q_s = \bigcap_{i \leq m} f(P_i)$ is not scattered, contradicting the $m + 1$ -tightness of f . ☹

The “ $mn + 1$ ” in (3) cannot be reduced; for example, let $Y = Z \times n$ and $X = Y \times m$, with f, g the natural projection maps.

There is a similar result, with a similar proof, involving products:

Lemma 2.14 *Assume that for $i = 0, 1$: X_i, Y_i are compact, $f_i : X_i \rightarrow Y_i$ is $(m_i + 1)$ -tight, $m_i \leq n_i < \omega$, and $|f_i^{-1}\{y\}| \leq n_i$ for all $y \in Y_i$. Then $f_0 \times f_1 : X_0 \times X_1 \rightarrow Y_0 \times Y_1$ is $(\max(m_0 n_1, m_1 n_0) + 1)$ -tight.*

Proof. Let $L = \max(m_0 n_1, m_1 n_0)$, and let $f = f_0 \times f_1$. In view of Lemma 2.2, it is sufficient to fix any $L + 1$ distinct points $a^0, a^1, \dots, a^L \in X_0 \times X_1$ with all $f(a^\alpha) = b \in Y_0 \times Y_1$, and show that one can find neighborhoods U^α of a^α for $\alpha = 0, 1, \dots, L$ such that $\bigcap_\alpha f(\overline{U^\alpha})$ is scattered.

Let $b = (b_0, b_1)$ and $a^\alpha = (a_0^\alpha, a_1^\alpha)$.

Note that although the a^α are all distinct points, the a_0^α need not be all different and the a_1^α need not be all different. However, $|\{a_0^\alpha : 0 \leq \alpha \leq L\}| \geq m_0 + 1$: If not, then using $f(a^\alpha) = b$ and $|f_1^{-1}\{b_1\}| \leq n_1$, we would have $L + 1 \leq m_0 n_1$, a contradiction. Likewise, $|\{a_1^\alpha : 0 \leq \alpha \leq L\}| \geq m_1 + 1$.

Now, using Lemma 2.2 and the fact that each $f_i : X_i \rightarrow Y_i$ is $(m_i + 1)$ -tight, choose neighborhoods U_i^α of a_i^α such that $\bigcap_\alpha f(\overline{U_i^\alpha})$ is scattered for $i = 0, 1$. The U_i^α can depend just on the value of a_i^α (that is $a_i^\alpha = a_i^\beta \rightarrow U_i^\alpha = U_i^\beta$). Finally, let $U^\alpha = U_0^\alpha \times U_1^\alpha$ ☹

The bound on the $|f_i^{-1}\{y\}|$ cannot be removed here. For example, for each cardinal κ , one can find compact perfect LOTSES X_0, X_1, Y_0, Y_1 with order-preserving $f_i : X_i \rightarrow Y_i$ such that all point inverses have size at least κ . Then the f_i are tight by Lemma 2.3, but $f_0 \times f_1$ is not κ -tight.

A variant of the product of maps is much simpler to analyze:

Lemma 2.15 *Assume that $\ell \in \omega$ and $f_i : X \rightarrow Y_i$ is κ -tight for each $i < \ell$, where X and the Y_i are compact. Then the map $x \mapsto (f_0(x), \dots, f_{\ell-1}(x))$ from X to $\prod_{i < \ell} Y_i$ is also κ -tight.*

We now consider the opposite of tight maps:

Definition 2.16 *If X, Y are compact and $f : X \rightarrow Y$, then f is nowhere tight iff $f(X)$ is not scattered and there is no closed $P \subseteq X$ such that $f \upharpoonright P$ is tight and $f(P)$ is not scattered.*

Note also that if X, Y are metric compacta with $f : X \rightarrow Y$ and Y not scattered, then there is a Cantor set $P \subseteq X$ such that $f \upharpoonright P$ is 1-1, so

Lemma 2.17 *If X, Y are compact and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is nowhere tight, then X is not second countable.*

A further limitation on nowhere tight maps:

Lemma 2.18 *If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is nowhere tight, then f is not weakly \mathfrak{c} -tight.*

Proof. We shall get a non-scattered $Q \subseteq Y$ and disjoint non-scattered sets $P^k \subseteq X$ for $k \in 2^\omega$ so that each $f(P^k) = Q$. We shall build the P^k and Q by a tree argument. Each P^k will be non-scattered because it will be formed using a Cantor tree of closed sets, so we shall actually get a doubly indexed family. So, we build $Q_s \subseteq Y$ for $s \in 2^{<\omega}$ and $P_s^t \subseteq X$ for $s, t \in 2^{<\omega}$ with $\text{lh}(s) = \text{lh}(t)$ satisfying:

1. P_s^t is closed, $f(P_s^t) = Q_s$, and Q_s is not scattered.
2. The sets $Q_{s \smallfrown 0}, Q_{s \smallfrown 1}$ are disjoint subsets of Q_s .
3. The sets $P_{s \smallfrown 0}^{t \smallfrown 0}, P_{s \smallfrown 0}^{t \smallfrown 1}, P_{s \smallfrown 1}^{t \smallfrown 0}, P_{s \smallfrown 1}^{t \smallfrown 1}$ are disjoint subsets of P_s^t .

We construct these inductively. $P_{\mathbb{1}}^{\mathbb{1}}$ and $Q_{\mathbb{1}}$ exist (where $\mathbb{1}$ is the empty sequence) because $f(X)$ is not scattered. Now, say we have Q_s and P_s^t for all s, t with $\text{lh}(s) = \text{lh}(t) = n$. Fix s .

First, get disjoint closed non-scattered $\tilde{Q}_{s \smallfrown 0}, \tilde{Q}_{s \smallfrown 1} \subseteq Q_s$, and let $\tilde{P}_{s \smallfrown \mu}^t = P_s^t \cap f^{-1}(\tilde{Q}_{s \smallfrown \mu})$ for each t of length n and each $\mu = 0, 1$. Then, use “nowhere tight” 2^n times to get $Q_{s \smallfrown \mu} \subseteq \tilde{Q}_{s \smallfrown \mu}$ and $P_{s \smallfrown \mu}^{t \smallfrown \nu} \subseteq \tilde{P}_{s \smallfrown \mu}^t$ for each $\mu, \nu = 0, 1$ and each t of length n so that each $f(P_{s \smallfrown \mu}^{t \smallfrown \nu}) = Q_{s \smallfrown \mu}$ and each $Q_{s \smallfrown \mu}$ is non-scattered.

For $h, k \in 2^\omega$, define $Q_h = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} Q_{h \upharpoonright n}$ and $P_h^k = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} P_{h \upharpoonright n}^{k \upharpoonright n}$, let $Q = \bigcup \{Q_h : h \in 2^\omega\}$, and let $P_h = \bigcup \{P_h^k : k \in 2^\omega\}$ and $P^k = \bigcup \{P_h^k : h \in 2^\omega\}$. Then $f(P_h) = Q_h$ and $f(P^k) = Q$, and the φ of Definition 2.6 sends P^k to $k \in 2^\omega$, with $\text{dom}(\varphi) = \bigcup_k P_k$. ☕

Corollary 2.19 *If X, Y are compact, $f : X \rightarrow Y$, $w(X) < \mathfrak{c}$, Y is metric and not scattered, and f is weakly \mathfrak{c} -tight, then X has a Cantor subset.*

Proof. Since f is not nowhere tight, we may assume, shrinking X and Y , that f is tight. Let $\kappa = w(X)$, and let \mathcal{B} be a base for X with $|\mathcal{B}| = \kappa$. Whenever $B_0, B_1 \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\overline{B_0} \cap \overline{B_1} = \emptyset$, let $S(B_0, B_1) = f(\overline{B_0}) \cap f(\overline{B_1})$. Each $S(B_0, B_1)$ is scattered, and hence countable, so at most κ points of Y are in some $S(B_0, B_1)$, so there is a $K \subseteq Y$ homeomorphic to the Cantor set with K disjoint from all $S(B_0, B_1)$. $|f^{-1}\{y\}| = 1$ for all $y \in K$, so $f^{-1}(K)$ is homeomorphic to K . ☹

Note that we have not yet given any examples of nowhere tight maps. The argument of Corollary 2.19 shows that one class of examples is given by:

Example 2.20 *If X, Y are compact, $f : X \rightarrow Y$, $w(X) < \mathfrak{c}$, Y is metric and not scattered, and X has no Cantor subset, then f is nowhere tight.*

Of course, under CH, this class of examples is empty. More generally, the class is empty under MA (or just the assumption that \mathbb{R} is not the union of $< \mathfrak{c}$ meager sets), since then every non-scattered compactum of weight less than \mathfrak{c} contains a Cantor subset (see [12]). However, by Dow and Fremlin [5], it is consistent to have a non-scattered compactum X of weight $\aleph_1 < \mathfrak{c}$ with no convergent ω -sequences, and hence with no Cantor subsets; in the ground model, CH holds, and X is any compact F-space (so $w(X)$ can be \aleph_1); then, the extension adds any number of random reals.

A class of ZFC examples of nowhere tight maps with $w(X) = \mathfrak{c}$ is given by:

Example 2.21 *If X, Y are compact, $f : X \rightarrow Y$, X is a compact F-space and Y is metric and not scattered, then f is nowhere tight.*

Proof. Here, it is sufficient to prove that f is not tight, since any $f \upharpoonright P : P \rightarrow f(P)$ will have the same properties. Also, shrinking Y , we may assume that Y has no isolated points.

First, choose a perfect $Q \subseteq Y$ which is nowhere dense in Y . Then, choose a discrete set $D = \{d_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq Y \setminus Q$ with $\overline{D} = D \cup Q$ and each $f^{-1}\{d_n\}$ not a singleton. Then, choose $x_n, z_n \in f^{-1}\{d_n\}$ with $x_n \neq z_n$. Now, since X is an F-space, $\text{cl}\{x_n : n \in \omega\}$ and $\text{cl}\{z_n : n \in \omega\}$ are two disjoint copies of $\beta\mathbb{N}$ in X which map onto \overline{D} . ☹

3 Dissipated Spaces

Only a scattered compactum X has the property that *all* maps from X are tight: If X is not scattered, then X maps onto $[0, 1]^2$; if we follow that map by the usual projection onto $[0, 1]$, we get a map from X onto $[0, 1]$ which is not even weakly \mathfrak{c} -tight.

The *dissipated* compacta have the property that *unboundedly* many maps onto metric compacta are tight:

Definition 3.1 *Assume that X, Y, Z are compact, $f : X \rightarrow Y$, and $g : X \rightarrow Z$. Then $f \leq g$, or f is finer than g , iff there is a $\Gamma \in C(f(X), g(X))$ such that $g = \Gamma \circ f$.*

Lemma 3.2 *Assume that X, Y, Z are compact, $f : X \rightarrow Y$, and $g : X \rightarrow Z$. Then $f \leq g$ iff $\forall x_1, x_2 \in X [f(x_1) = f(x_2) \rightarrow g(x_1) = g(x_2)]$.*

Proof. For \leftarrow , let $\Gamma = \{(f(x), g(x)) : x \in X\} \subseteq f(X) \times g(X)$. ☕

Definition 3.3 *X is κ -dissipated iff X is compact and whenever $g : X \rightarrow Z$, with Z metric, there is a finer κ -tight $f : X \rightarrow Y$ for some metric Y . X is dissipated iff X is 2-dissipated. X is weakly \mathfrak{c} -dissipated iff X is compact and whenever $g : X \rightarrow Z$, with Z metric, there is a finer weakly \mathfrak{c} -tight $f : X \rightarrow Y$ for some metric Y .*

So, the 1-dissipated compacta are the scattered compacta. Metric compacta are trivially dissipated because we can take $Y = X$, with f the identity map. Besides the spaces from [7, 11, 12], an easy example of a dissipated space is given by:

Lemma 3.4 *If X is a compact LOTS, then X is dissipated*

Proof. Fix g, Z as in Definition 3.3. On X , use $[x_1, x_2]$ for the closed interval $[\min(x_1, x_2), \max(x_1, x_2)]$, and define $x_1 \sim x_2$ iff g is constant on $[x_1, x_2]$. Then \sim is a closed equivalence relation, so define $Y = X/\sim$ with $f : X \rightarrow Y$ the natural projection. Then Y is a LOTS and f is order-preserving, so f is tight by Lemma 2.3, and $f \leq g$ by Lemma 3.2. To see that Y is metrizable, fix a metric on Z , and then, on Y , define $d(f(x_1), f(x_2)) = \text{diam}(g([x_1, x_2]))$. ☕

By Corollary 2.19, if $w(X) < \mathfrak{c}$ and X is \mathfrak{c} -dissipated and not scattered, then X has a Cantor subset, while the double arrow space is an example of an X with $w(X) = \mathfrak{c}$ which is 2-dissipated and has no Cantor subset.

Note that just having *one* tight map g from X onto some metric compactum Z is not sufficient to prove that X is dissipated, since the tightness of g says nothing at all about the complexity of a particular $g^{-1}\{z\}$. Trivial counter-examples are obtained with $|Z| = 1$ and g a constant map. However, if all $g^{-1}\{z\}$ are scattered, then just one tight g is enough:

Lemma 3.5 *Suppose that $g : X \rightarrow Z$ is κ -tight and all $g^{-1}\{z\}$ are scattered. Fix $f : X \rightarrow Y$ with $f \leq g$. Then f is κ -tight. In particular, if Z is also metric, then X is κ -dissipated.*

Proof. Fix $\Gamma \in C(f(X), g(X))$ such that $g = \Gamma \circ f$. Suppose that \mathcal{P} were a loose family for f of size κ ; then we have $Q \subseteq f(X)$ with $Q = f(P)$ for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$, and Q is not scattered. But $\Gamma(Q)$ is scattered, since g is κ -tight and $g(P) = \Gamma(f(P)) = \Gamma(Q)$ for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$. It follows that we can fix $z \in Z$ with $Q \cap \Gamma^{-1}\{z\}$ not scattered. But then $f(g^{-1}\{z\}) = \Gamma^{-1}\{z\}$ is not scattered, which is impossible, since $g^{-1}\{z\}$ is scattered. ☹

We next consider the degree of dissipation of products:

Lemma 3.6 *Let $X = A \times B$, where A, B are compact, B is not scattered, and assume that for each $\varphi \in C(A, [0, 1]^\omega)$ there is a $z \in [0, 1]^\omega$ with $|\varphi^{-1}\{z\}| \geq \kappa$. Then X is not κ -dissipated. If for each $\varphi \in C(A, [0, 1]^\omega)$ there is a z such that $\varphi^{-1}\{z\}$ is not scattered, then X is not weakly \mathfrak{c} -dissipated.*

Proof. Since B is not scattered, fix $h : B \rightarrow [0, 1]$, and define $g : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by $g(a, b) = h(b)$. Now, fix any $f : X \rightarrow Y$ with f finer than g and Y metric. We shall show that f is not κ -tight.

Define $\hat{f} : A \rightarrow C(B, Y)$ by $(\hat{f}(a))(b) = f(a, b)$. Since the range of \hat{f} is compact and hence embeddable in the Hilbert cube, we can fix $\zeta \in C(B, Y)$ such that $E := \{a : \hat{f}(a) = \zeta\}$ has size at least κ . Let $Q = \zeta(B)$; $|Q| = \mathfrak{c}$ by $f \leq g$, so Q is not scattered. For $a \in E$, let $P_a = \{a\} \times B$. Then $\{P_a : a \in E\}$ is a loose family of size at least κ .

The second assertion is proved similarly. ☹

Note that A might be scattered; for example, A could be the ordinal $\kappa + 1$ (if κ is uncountable and regular) or the one point compactification of a discrete space of size κ (if κ is uncountable). B may be second countable; for example B can be the Cantor set.

A class of spaces A to which Lemma 3.6 applies is produced by:

Lemma 3.7 *Suppose that $f : \prod_{\alpha < \kappa} X_\alpha \rightarrow M$, where M is compact metric and, for each α , X_α is compact and not metrizable. Then there are two-element sets $E_\alpha \subseteq X_\alpha$ for each α such that f is constant on $\prod_{\alpha < \kappa} E_\alpha$.*

Proof. For $p \in \prod_{\alpha < \delta} X_\alpha$, define $\hat{f}_p : \prod_{\alpha \geq \delta} X_\alpha \rightarrow M$ by: $\hat{f}_p(q) = f(p \hat{\ } q)$. Then inductively choose E_α so that for all $\delta \leq \kappa$, the functions \hat{f}_p are the same for all $p \in \prod_{\alpha < \delta} E_\alpha$. Say $\delta < \kappa$ and we have chosen E_α for $\alpha < \delta$. Let $g = \hat{f}_p$ for some (any) $p \in \prod_{\alpha < \delta} E_\alpha$, and define $g^* \in C(X_\delta, C(\prod_{\alpha > \delta} X_\alpha, M))$ by: $(g^*(x))(q) = g(x \hat{\ } q)$. Then g^* maps X_δ into a metric space of functions, so $\text{ran}(g^*)$ is a compact metric space, so g^* cannot be 1-1, so choose E_δ of size 2 with g^* constant on E_δ . ☹

Theorem 3.8 *Assume that each X_k is compact:*

1. If X_n is not scattered and X_k , for $k < n$, is not metrizable, then $\prod_{k \leq n} X_k$ is not 2^n -dissipated.
2. If each X_k is not metrizable, then $\prod_{k < \omega} X_k$ is not weakly \mathfrak{c} -dissipated.

Proof. For (1), apply Lemma 3.6 with $A = \prod_{k < n} X_k$ and $B = X_n$. For (2), apply Lemma 3.6 with $A = \prod_{k < \omega} X_{2k}$ and $B = \prod_{k < \omega} X_{2k+1}$. ☕

In (1), if all X_k are scattered, then $\prod_{k \leq n} X_k$ is scattered and hence dissipated. As an example of (1) applied to LOTSEs, if $S \subseteq (0, 1)$ is uncountable, then $(I_S)^2$ is not dissipated (2-dissipated), $(I_S)^3$ is not 4-dissipated, and $(I_S)^4$ is not 8-dissipated. By Theorem 3.9, these three spaces are, respectively, 3-dissipated, 5-dissipated, and 9-dissipated. However, Lemma 3.6 shows that for any κ , we can find a product of two LOTSEs which is not κ -dissipated.

The following theorem will often suffice to compute the degree of dissipation of a finite product of separable LOTSEs:

Theorem 3.9 *Assume that n is finite and X_i , for $i \leq n$, is a compact separable LOTS. Then $\prod_{i \leq n} X_i$ is $(2^n + 1)$ -dissipated. Furthermore, if all the X_i are not scattered, and at most one of the X_i is second countable, then $\prod_{i \leq n} X_i$ is not (2^n) -dissipated.*

Proof. Let $D_i \subseteq X_i$ be countable and dense. Choose $f_i \in C(X_i, [0, 1])$ such that f_i is order-preserving and is 1-1 on D_i (such a function f_i exists; see the proof of Lemma 3.6 in [10]). Note that each $|f_i^{-1}\{y\}| \leq 2$, and, by Lemma 2.3, each f_i is 2-tight. Applying Lemma 2.14 and induction, $\prod_{i \leq n} f_i$ is $(2^n + 1)$ -tight. Then $\prod_{i \leq n} X_i$ is $(2^n + 1)$ -dissipated by Lemma 3.5.

The “furthermore” is by Theorem 3.8. ☕

Next, we note that “dissipated” is a local property:

Definition 3.10 *Let \mathfrak{K} be a class of compact spaces. \mathfrak{K} is closed-hereditary iff every closed subspace of a space in \mathfrak{K} is also in \mathfrak{K} . \mathfrak{K} is local iff \mathfrak{K} is closed-hereditary and for every compact X : if X is covered by open sets whose closures lie in \mathfrak{K} , then $X \in \mathfrak{K}$.*

Classes of compacta which restrict cardinal functions (first countable, second countable, countable tightness, etc.) are clearly local, whereas the class of compacta which are homeomorphic to a LOTS is closed-hereditary, but not local. To prove that “dissipated” is local, we use as a preliminary lemma:

Lemma 3.11 *Let X be an arbitrary compact space, with $K \subseteq U \subseteq X$, such that U is open, K is closed, and \bar{U} is κ -dissipated. Fix $g : \bar{U} \rightarrow Z$, with Z compact metric. Then there is an $f : X \rightarrow Y$, with Y compact metric, $f \upharpoonright K \leq g \upharpoonright K$.*

Proof. Fix $\varphi : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with $\varphi(K) = \{0\}$ and $\varphi(\partial U) = \{1\}$. First get $f_0 : \bar{U} \rightarrow Y_0$, with Y_0 compact metric, f_0 κ -tight, $f_0 \leq g$, and $f_0 \leq \varphi|_{\bar{U}}$ (just let f_0 refine $x \mapsto (g(x), \varphi(x))$). Then $f_0(K) \cap f_0(\partial U) = \emptyset$. Let $Y = Y_0/f_0(\partial U)$, obtained by collapsing $f_0(\partial U)$ to a point, p . Let $f_1 : \bar{U} \rightarrow Y$ be the natural map, and extend f_1 to $f : X \rightarrow Y$ by letting $f_1(X \setminus U) = \{p\}$. ☕

Lemma 3.12 *For any κ , the class of κ -dissipated compacta is a local class.*

Proof. For closed-hereditary: Assume that X is κ -dissipated and K is closed in X . Fix $g : K \rightarrow Z$, with Z metric. Then we may assume that $Z \subseteq I^\omega$, so that g extends to some $\tilde{g} : X \rightarrow I^\omega$. Then there is a κ -tight $\tilde{f} : X \rightarrow Y$ for some metric Y , with $\tilde{f} \leq \tilde{g}$. If $f = \tilde{f}|_K$, then f is κ -tight and $f \leq g$.

For local: Assume that $X = \bigcup_{i < \ell} U_i$, where each U_i is open and \bar{U}_i is κ -dissipated. Fix $g : X \rightarrow Z$, with Z metric. Choose closed $K_i \subseteq U_i$ such that $X = \bigcup_{i < \ell} K_i$. Then apply Lemma 3.11 and choose $f_i : X \rightarrow Y_i$, with Y_i compact metric, f_i κ -tight, and $f_i|_{K_i} \leq g|_{K_i}$. Then the map $x \mapsto (f_0(x), \dots, f_{\ell-1}(x))$ refines g , and is κ -tight by Lemma 2.15. ☕

Many classes of compacta are closed under continuous images, but this is not true in general of the class of κ -dissipated spaces:

Example 3.13 *There is a continuous image of a 3-dissipated space which is not \mathfrak{c} -dissipated.*

Proof. Let $T = (D(\mathfrak{c}) \cup \{\infty\}) \times 2^\omega$, where $D(\mathfrak{c}) \cup \{\infty\}$ is the 1-point compactification of the ordinal \mathfrak{c} with the discrete topology. Then T is not \mathfrak{c} -dissipated by Lemma 3.6. Let F_α , for $\alpha < \mathfrak{c}$, be disjoint Cantor subsets of 2^ω such that for some $g : 2^\omega \rightarrow 2^\omega$, each $g(F_\alpha) = 2^\omega$. Let $X = \{\infty\} \times 2^\omega \cup \bigcup_{\alpha < \mathfrak{c}} (\{\alpha\} \times F_\alpha) \subseteq T$. Then X is 3-dissipated by Lemma 3.5 because the natural projection onto 2^ω is 3-tight and all point inverses are scattered (of size ≤ 2). But also, T is a continuous image of X via the map $\mathbb{1} \times g$, $(u, z) \mapsto (u, g(z))$. ☕

Of course, the continuous image of a 1-dissipated (= scattered) compactum is 1-dissipated. We do not know about the dissipated (= 2-dissipated) spaces; perhaps 2 is a special case.

4 LOTS Dimension

We shall apply the results of Section 3 to products of LOTSes. Each I^n has dimension n under any standard notion of topological dimension, so that I^{n+1} is not embeddable into I^n . Now, say we wish to prove such a result replacing I by

some totally disconnected LOTS X . Then standard dimension theory gives all X^n dimension 0. Furthermore, the result is false; for example, $X^{n+1} \cong X^n$ if X is the Cantor set. However, if X is the double arrow space, then X^{n+1} is not embeddable into X^n . To study this further, we introduce a notion of LOTS dimension:

Definition 4.1 *If X is any Tychonov space, then $\text{Ldim}_0(X)$ is the least κ such that X is embeddable into a product of the form $\prod_{\alpha < \kappa} L_\alpha$, where each L_α is a LOTS. Then $\text{Ldim}(X)$, the LOTS dimension of X , is the least κ such that every point in X has a neighborhood U such that $\text{Ldim}_0(\overline{U}) \leq \kappa$.*

Lemma 4.2 *The class of compacta X such that $\text{Ldim}(X) \leq \kappa$ is a local class.*

If X is any compact n -manifold, then $\text{Ldim}(X) = n < \text{Ldim}_0(X)$. We follow the usual convention that the empty product $\prod_{\alpha < 0} L_\alpha$ is a singleton, so that $\text{Ldim}(X) = 0$ iff X is finite, although $\text{Ldim}_0(X) = 1$ if $1 < |X| < \aleph_0$.

Lemma 4.3 *If X is compact, infinite, and totally disconnected, then $\text{Ldim}(X) = \text{Ldim}_0(X)$.*

Proof. Use the fact that a disjoint sum of LOTSes is a LOTS. ☕

By Tychonov, $\text{Ldim}(X) \leq w(X)$, taking each $L_\alpha = I$. In this section, we focus mainly on spaces whose LOTS dimension is finite, although this cardinal function might be of interest for other spaces. For example, $\text{Ldim}(\beta\mathbb{N}) = 2^{\aleph_0}$; this is easily proved using the theorem of Pospíšil that there are points in $\beta\mathbb{N}$ of character 2^{\aleph_0} . We shall show (Lemma 4.5) that $\text{Ldim}((I_S)^n) = n$ whenever S is uncountable. When S is countable, this is false if S is dense in I (then $(I_S)^n \cong I_S$ is the Cantor set) and true if S is not dense in I (by standard dimension theory; not by the results of this paper). More generally, we shall prove:

Theorem 4.4 *Let Z_j , for $1 \leq j \leq s$, be a compact LOTS. Assume that $s = r + m$, where $r, m \geq 0$. For $r + 1 \leq j \leq s$, assume that Z_j has either an increasing or decreasing ω_1 -sequence. For $1 \leq j \leq r$, assume that there is a countable $D_j \subseteq Z_j$ such that $\overline{D_j}$ is not scattered, and assume that at most one of the $\overline{D_j}$ is second countable. Then $\text{Ldim}(\prod_{j=1}^s Z_j) = s$.*

The following lemma handles the case $r = s, m = 0$ if we replace each Z_j by $L_j = \overline{D_j}$.

Lemma 4.5 *Assume that n is finite and L_j , for $j < n$, is a compact separable LOTS. Also, assume that all the L_j are not scattered, and that at most one of the L_j is second countable. Then $\text{Ldim}(\prod_{j < n} L_j) = n$.*

Proof. This is trivial if $n \leq 1$, so assume that $n \geq 2$. Clearly, $\text{Ldim}(\prod_{j < n} L_j) \leq \text{Ldim}_0(\prod_{j < n} L_j) \leq n$. Also, by Theorem 3.9, $\prod_{j < n} L_j$ is not 2^{n-1} -dissipated.

To see that $\text{Ldim}_0(\prod_{j < n} L_j) \geq n$, assume that we could embed $\prod_{j < n} L_j$ into $\prod_{i < (n-1)} X_i$, where each X_i is a LOTS. Since the continuous image of a compact separable space is compact and separable, we may assume that each X_i is compact and separable, so that $\prod_{i < (n-1)} X_i$ and $\prod_{j < n} L_j$, are $(2^{n-2} + 1)$ -dissipated by Theorem 3.9, a contradiction since $2^{n-2} + 1 \leq 2^{n-1}$.

Now, assume that $\text{Ldim}(\prod_{j < n} L_j) < n$. Then we could cover $\prod_{j < n} L_j$ by finitely many open boxes, each of the form $\prod_{j < n} U_j$, with each U_j an open interval in L_j , such that each open box satisfies $\text{Ldim}_0(\prod_{j < n} \overline{U}_j) < n$. But for at least one of these open boxes, the \overline{U}_j would satisfy all the same hypotheses satisfied by the L_j , so that we would again have a contradiction. ☹️

In particular, if L is the double arrow space, then L^{n+1} is not embeddable into L^n . Similar results were obtained by Burke and Lutzer [2] and Burke and Moore [3] for the Sorgenfrey line J , which may be viewed as $\{z^+ : z \in (0, 1)\} \subseteq L$. We do not see how to derive our results directly from [2, 3], since a map $\varphi : L^{n+1} \rightarrow L^n$ need not preserve order, so it does not directly yield a map from J^{n+1} to J^n .

We now extend Lemma 4.5 to include LOTSeS which have an increasing or decreasing ω_1 -sequence. First some preliminaries:

Definition 4.6 $[A]^{n\uparrow} = \{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in A^n : \alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_n\}$, where $1 \leq n < \omega$ and $A \subseteq \omega_1$. We give $[A]^{n\uparrow}$ the topology it inherits from $(\omega_1)^n$. The club filter \mathcal{F}_n on $[\omega_1]^{n\uparrow}$ is generated by all the $[C]^{n\uparrow}$ such that C is club in ω_1 . \mathcal{I}_n is the dual ideal to \mathcal{F}_n .

Lemma 4.7 *If $B \subseteq [\omega_1]^{n\uparrow}$ is a Borel set, then $B \in \mathcal{F}_n$ or $B \in \mathcal{I}_n$.*

Proof. Since the \mathcal{I}_n and \mathcal{F}_n are countably complete, it is sufficient to prove this for closed sets K . The case $n = 1$ is obvious, so we proceed by induction. We assume the lemma for n , fix a closed $K \subseteq [\omega_1]^{(n+1)\uparrow}$, and show that $K \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1}$ or $K \in \mathcal{I}_{n+1}$. Applying the lemma for n : For each $\alpha_0 < \omega_1$, choose $\nu(\alpha_0) \in \{0, 1\}$ and a club $C_{\alpha_0} \subseteq (\alpha_0, \omega_1)$ such that for all $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in [C_{\alpha_0}]^{n\uparrow}$:

$$\nu(\alpha_0) = 0 \rightarrow (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \notin K \quad ; \quad \nu(\alpha_0) = 1 \rightarrow (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in K \quad (*)$$

Let $C = \{\delta : \delta \in \bigcap \{C_{\alpha_0} : \alpha_0 < \delta\}\}$. Then C is club and $(*)$ holds for all $(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in [C]^{(n+1)\uparrow}$. Also, $D := \{\alpha_0 \in C : \nu(\alpha_0) = 1\}$ is closed because K is closed. $[D]^{(n+1)\uparrow} \subseteq K$, so if D is club, then $K \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1}$. If D is bounded, then $C \setminus D$ contains a club, and then $K \in \mathcal{I}_{n+1}$. ☹️

Definition 4.8 *If L is a LOTS, $f \in C([\omega_1]^{m\uparrow}, L)$, and $\psi \in C([\omega_1]^{n\uparrow}, L)$, then ψ is derived from f iff $n \geq m$ and for some i_1, \dots, i_m : $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_m \leq n$ and $\psi(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) = f(\alpha_{i_1}, \dots, \alpha_{i_m})$ for all $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in [\omega_1]^{n\uparrow}$. Then a set $E \subseteq [\omega_1]^{n\uparrow}$ is derived from f iff E is of the form $\{\vec{\alpha} : \psi_1(\vec{\alpha}) < \psi_2(\vec{\alpha})\}$ or $\{\vec{\alpha} : \psi_1(\vec{\alpha}) \leq \psi_2(\vec{\alpha})\}$ or $\{\vec{\alpha} : \psi_1(\vec{\alpha}) = \psi_2(\vec{\alpha})\}$, where ψ_1, ψ_2 are derived from f .*

Lemma 4.9 *Suppose that $f \in C([\omega_1]^{m\uparrow}, L)$, where L is a compact LOTS. Then there is a club C , a continuous $g : C \rightarrow L$, and a $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, such that for all $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in [C]^{m\uparrow}$, we have $f(\vec{\alpha}) = g(\alpha_j)$, and g is either strictly increasing or strictly decreasing or constant.*

Proof. Applying Lemma 4.7, and then restricting everything to a club, we may make the following *homogeneity* assumption: for all $n \geq m$ and all $E \subseteq [\omega_1]^{n\uparrow}$ which are derived from f , either $E = \emptyset$ or $E = [\omega_1]^{n\uparrow}$. Then, our club C will be all of ω_1 . We first consider the special cases $m = 1$ and $m = 2$.

For $m = 1$, we have $f \in C(\omega_1, L)$. Applying homogeneity to the three derived sets $\{(\alpha, \beta) \in [\omega_1]^{2\uparrow} : f(\alpha) \otimes f(\beta)\}$, where \otimes is one of $<$, $>$, and $=$, we see that f is either strictly increasing or strictly decreasing or constant.

Likewise, for $m > 1$, if we succeed in getting $f(\vec{\alpha}) = g(\alpha_j)$, then g must be either strictly increasing or strictly decreasing or constant.

Next, fix $f \in C([\omega_1]^{2\uparrow}, L)$. If $\alpha < \beta < \gamma \rightarrow f(\alpha, \beta) = f(\alpha, \gamma)$, then $f(\alpha, \beta) = g(\alpha)$, and we are done, so WLOG, assume $\alpha < \beta < \gamma \rightarrow f(\alpha, \beta) < f(\alpha, \gamma)$. Let $B_\alpha = \{f(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha < \beta < \omega_1\}$, which is a subset of L of order type ω_1 . Let $h(\alpha) = \sup(B_\alpha)$. Fix $\alpha < \alpha' < \omega_1$. There are now three cases; Cases II and III will lead to contradictions:

Case I. $h(\alpha) = h(\alpha')$: By continuity of f , there is a club $C \subseteq (\alpha', \omega_1)$ such that $f(\alpha, \beta) = f(\alpha', \beta)$ for all $\beta \in C$. Applying homogeneity, we have $\alpha < \alpha' < \beta \rightarrow f(\alpha, \beta) = f(\alpha', \beta)$, so $f(\alpha, \beta) = g(\beta)$.

Case II. $h(\alpha) < h(\alpha')$: Fix β such that $\alpha < \alpha' < \beta$ and $f(\alpha', \beta) > f(\alpha, \gamma)$ for all γ . Then by homogeneity, $\alpha < \alpha' < \beta < \gamma \rightarrow f(\alpha, \gamma) < f(\alpha', \beta)$ for all $\alpha, \alpha', \beta, \gamma$. Let α' be a limit and consider $\alpha \nearrow \alpha'$: we get, by continuity, $\alpha' < \beta < \gamma \rightarrow f(\alpha', \gamma) \leq f(\alpha', \beta)$, contradicting $\alpha < \beta < \gamma \rightarrow f(\alpha, \beta) < f(\alpha, \gamma)$.

Case III. $h(\alpha) > h(\alpha')$: Fix β such that $\alpha < \alpha' < \beta$ and $f(\alpha, \beta) > f(\alpha', \gamma)$ for all γ . Then by homogeneity, $\alpha < \alpha' < \beta < \gamma \rightarrow f(\alpha', \gamma) < f(\alpha, \beta)$ for all $\alpha, \alpha', \beta, \gamma$. Letting $\alpha \nearrow \alpha'$, we get a contradiction as in Case II.

Finally, fix $m \geq 2$ and assume that the lemma holds for m . We shall prove it for $m + 1$, so fix $f \in C([\omega_1]^{(m+1)\uparrow}, L)$. Temporarily fix $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-1}) \in [\omega_1]^{(m-1)\uparrow}$, and let $\tilde{f}(\alpha_m, \alpha_{m+1}) = f(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-1}, \alpha_m, \alpha_{m+1})$; so $\tilde{f} \in C([\omega_1]^{2\uparrow}, L)$. Applying the $m = 2$ case, \tilde{f} is really just a function of one of its arguments, so that f just depends on an m -tuple (either $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-1}, \alpha_{m+1})$ or $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-1}, \alpha_m)$), so we may now apply the lemma for m . ☺

It is easy to see from this lemma that $\text{Ldim}((\omega_1 + 1)^m) = m$, but we now want to consider products of $(\omega_1 + 1)^m$ with separable LOTSes.

Lemma 4.10 *Suppose that $f \in C(X \times [\omega_1]^{m\uparrow}, L)$, where L is a compact LOTS and X is compact, nonempty, first countable, and separable. Then there is a club $C \subseteq \omega_1$, a nonempty open $U \subseteq X$, a $g \in C(\overline{U} \times C, L)$, and a $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ such that $f(x, \vec{\alpha}) = g(x, \alpha_j)$ for all $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in [C]^{m\uparrow}$ and all $x \in \overline{U}$, and such that either*

1. *for all $x \in \overline{U}$, the map $\vec{\alpha} \mapsto f(x, \vec{\alpha})$ is constant on $[C]^{m\uparrow}$ or*
2. *for all $x \in \overline{U}$, the map $\xi \mapsto g(x, \xi)$ is strictly increasing on C , or*
3. *for all $x \in \overline{U}$, the map $\xi \mapsto g(x, \xi)$ is strictly decreasing on C .*

Proof. First, let K be the set of all x such that $\vec{\alpha} \mapsto f(x, \vec{\alpha})$ is constant on some set in \mathcal{F}_m . Then K is closed, since X is first countable, so, replacing X by some \overline{U} , we may assume that $K = X$ or $K = \emptyset$. If $K = X$, then intersecting the clubs for x in a countable dense set, we get one club C such that (1) holds.

Now, assume that $K = \emptyset$. Applying Lemma 4.9, for each $x \in X$ choose a club C_x , a $g_x \in C(C_x, L)$, and $j_x \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and a $\mu_x \in \{-1, 1\}$ such that for all $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in [C_x]^{m\uparrow}$, we have $f(x, \vec{\alpha}) = g_x(\alpha_{j_x})$, and each g_x is either strictly increasing (when $\mu_x = 1$) or strictly decreasing (when $\mu_x = -1$).

For each j, μ , let $H_j^\mu = \{x : j_x = j \ \& \ \mu_x = \mu\}$. Then the H_j^μ are disjoint, and they are also closed (since $K = \emptyset$). Since $\bigcup_{j, \mu} H_j^\mu = X$, U can be any nonempty H_j^μ . ☕

In situations (2) or (3), we shall apply:

Lemma 4.11 *Suppose that $g \in C(X \times (\omega_1 + 1), L)$, where L is a compact LOTS and X is compact, and suppose that $g(x, \xi) < g(x, \eta)$ for each $x \in X$ and each $\xi < \eta < \omega_1$. Let $h(x) = g(x, \omega_1)$. Then $h(X)$ is finite.*

Proof. Assume that $h(X)$ is infinite. Then, choose $c_n \in X$ for $n \in \omega$ such that the sequence $\langle h(c_n) : n \in \omega \rangle$ is either increasing strictly or decreasing strictly. Let $c \in X$ be any limit point of $\langle c_n : n \in \omega \rangle$, and note that $h(c_n) \rightarrow h(c)$. Also note that $h(x) = \sup\{g(x, \xi) : \xi < \omega_1\}$ for every x . Consider the two cases:

Case I. $\langle h(c_n) : n \in \omega \rangle$ is increasing strictly. Then we can fix a large enough countable γ such that $g(c_n, \omega_1) < g(c_{n+1}, \gamma)$ for all n . Then we have the ω -sequence, $g(c_0, \gamma) < g(c_0, \omega_1) < g(c_1, \gamma) < g(c_1, \omega_1) < g(c_2, \gamma) < g(c_2, \omega_1) < \dots$, whose limit must be $g(c, \gamma) = g(c, \omega_1)$, contradicting $g(c, \gamma) < g(c, \omega_1)$,

Case II. $\langle h(c_n) : n \in \omega \rangle$ is decreasing strictly. Then we can fix a large enough countable γ such that $g(c_n, \gamma) > g(c_{n+1}, \omega_1)$ for all n . Then we have the ω -sequence,

$g(c_0, \omega_1) > g(c_0, \gamma) > g(c_1, \omega_1) > g(c_1, \gamma) > g(c_2, \omega_1) > g(c_2, \gamma) > \dots$, whose limit must be $g(c, \omega_1) = g(c, \gamma)$, contradicting $g(c, \omega_1) > g(c, \gamma)$, ☹️

Now if $h(X)$ is finite, we can always shrink X to a \overline{U} on which h is constant. Then note that if $h(b) = h(c)$ and $\xi \mapsto g(x, \xi)$ is always an increasing function, then there is a club on which $g(b, \xi) = g(c, \xi)$. Putting these last two lemmas together, we get:

Lemma 4.12 *Suppose that $f \in C(X \times (\omega_1 + 1)^m, L)$, where L is a compact LOTS and X is compact, nonempty, first countable, and separable. Then there is a club $C \subseteq \omega_1$ and a nonempty open $U \subseteq X$ such that either:*

1. *For some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and some continuous $g : C \rightarrow L$: $f(x, \vec{\alpha}) = g(\alpha_j)$ for all $x \in \overline{U}$ and all $\vec{\alpha} \in [C]^{m\uparrow}$ and g is either strictly increasing or strictly decreasing, or*
2. *For some $h \in C(\overline{U}, L)$: $f(x, \vec{\alpha}) = h(x)$ for all $x \in \overline{U}$ and all $\vec{\alpha} \in [C]^{m\uparrow}$.*

Lemma 4.13 *Assume that X is compact, perfect, first countable, and separable, and $\text{Ldim}(X \times (\omega_1 + 1)^m) \leq n$. Then $n > m$ and there is a nonempty open $U \subseteq X$ such that $\text{Ldim}_0(\overline{U}) \leq n - m$.*

Proof. First, restricting everything to the closure of an open box, we may assume that $\text{Ldim}_0(X \times (\omega_1 + 1)^m) \leq n$.

Fix a continuous 1-1 $f : X \times (\omega_1 + 1)^m \rightarrow \prod_{r=1}^n L_r$, where each L_r is a compact LOTS. Applying Lemma 4.12 to the projections, $f_r : X \times (\omega_1 + 1)^m \rightarrow L_r$, and permuting the L_r , we obtain a club C and a \overline{U} such that on $\overline{U} \times [C]^{m\uparrow}$:

$$f(x, \vec{\alpha}) = (g_1(\alpha_{j_1}), \dots, g_p(\alpha_{j_p}), h_1(x), \dots, h_q(x)) \quad ,$$

where $p + q = n$. Then $\{j_1, \dots, j_p\} = \{1, \dots, m\}$, since f is 1-1. Thus, $p \geq m$, so $q \leq n - m$, and for any fixed $\vec{\alpha}$, the map $x \mapsto (h_1(x), \dots, h_q(x))$ embeds \overline{U} into $\prod_{i=1}^q L_{p+i}$. ☹️

Proof of Theorem 4.4. Let $n = \text{Ldim}(\prod_{j=1}^s Z_j)$. Clearly $n \leq s$. To prove that $n \geq s$, we may replace each Z_j by a closed subset and assume that $Z_j = \omega_1 + 1$ when $r + 1 \leq j \leq s$, while $Z_j = \overline{D}_j$ when $1 \leq j \leq r$. We may also assume that whenever $Z_j = \overline{D}_j$ is not second countable, no open interval in Z_j is second countable (since there is always a closed subspace with this property). Let $X = \prod_{j=1}^r Z_j$, and apply Lemma 4.13 to obtain $U \subseteq X$ with $\text{Ldim}(\overline{U}) \leq n - m$. Since $\text{Ldim}(\overline{U}) = r$ by Lemma 4.5, we have $r \leq n - m$, so $s = r + m \leq n$. ☹️

Note that this theorem does not cover all possible products of LOTs. For example, one can show by a direct argument that $\text{Ldim}((\omega + 1) \times I_S) = 2$ whenever

S is uncountable, although $(\omega + 1) \times I_S$ is dissipated, so the methods used in the proof of Theorem 4.4 do not apply. Also, Theorem 4.4 says nothing about Aronszajn lines, which have neither an increasing or decreasing ω_1 -sequence, nor a countable subset whose closure is not second countable. In particular, it is not clear whether one can have a product of three compact Aronszajn lines which is embeddable into a product of two LOTSes.

In some sense, this “dimension theory” for products of totally disconnected LOTSes is more restrictive, not less restrictive, than the classical dimension theory for I^n , since there is also a limitation on dimension-raising maps. For example, Peano [18] shows how to map I onto I^2 , but his map has many changes of direction, so it does not define a map from I_S onto $(I_S)^2$. In fact, this is impossible:

Proposition 4.14 *If S is uncountable, then there is no compact LOTS L such that L maps continuously onto $(I_S)^2$.*

Proof. Say $f : L \rightarrow (I_S)^2$. Replacing L by a closed subset, we may assume that f is irreducible. Then, L must be separable, since $(I_S)^2$ is separable. It follows (see Lutzer and Bennett [17]) that L is hereditarily separable, which implies (by continuity of f) that $(I_S)^2$ is hereditarily separable, which is false. ☹

We do not know whether, for example, one can map L^2 onto $(I_S)^3$. Again, we may assume that L is separable, so that L^2 is 3-dissipated, while $(I_S)^3$ is not even 4-dissipated. However, as we know from Example 3.13, a continuous image of a 3-dissipated space need not be even \mathfrak{c} -dissipated.

5 Measures, L-spaces, and S-spaces

As usual, if X is compact, a *Radon measure* on X is a finite positive regular Borel measure on X , and if $f : X \rightarrow Y$ and μ is a measure on X , then μf^{-1} denotes the induced measure ν on Y , defined by $\nu(B) = \mu(f^{-1}(B))$. We shall prove some results relating μ to ν in the case that f is tight, and use this to prove that Radon measures on dissipated spaces are separable. We shall also make some remarks on compact L-spaces and S-spaces which are dissipated.

Definition 5.1 *For any space X , $\text{ro}(X)$ denotes the regular open algebra of X . If \mathcal{B} is any boolean algebra and $b \in \mathcal{B}$ with $b \neq 0$, then $b\downarrow$ denotes the algebra $\{x \in \mathcal{B} : x \leq b\}$; so $\mathbb{1}_{b\downarrow} = b$. A Suslin algebra is an atomless ccc complete boolean algebra which is (ω, ω) -distributive*

So, there is a Suslin tree iff there is a Suslin algebra. We shall prove:

Theorem 5.2 *If X is compact, ccc, not separable, and \aleph_0 -dissipated, then in $\text{ro}(X)$ there is a non-zero b such that $b\downarrow$ is a Suslin algebra.*

Of course, this is well-known in the case where X is a LOTS, and is part of the proof that a Suslin line yields a Suslin tree. Since a Suslin line is a compact L-space and is 2-dissipated (by Lemma 3.4), we have

Corollary 5.3 *There is an \aleph_0 -dissipated compact L-space iff there is a Suslin line.*

As usual, the *support* of a Radon measure μ is the smallest closed $H \subseteq X$ such that $\mu(H) = \mu(X)$. For this H , $\text{ro}(H)$ cannot be a Suslin algebra, so

Corollary 5.4 *If X is \aleph_0 -dissipated, then the support of every Radon measure on X is a separable topological space.*

In these two corollaries, the “ \aleph_0 ” cannot be replaced by “ \aleph_1 ”, since the usual compact L-space construction shows the following (see Section 6 for a proof):

Proposition 5.5 *CH implies that there is a compact L-space X which is both \mathfrak{c} -dissipated and the support of a Radon measure μ . Furthermore, μ is atomless, and, in X , the ideals of null subsets, meager subsets, and separable subsets all coincide.*

Turning to compact S-spaces, the usual CH construction [14] yields one which is scattered, and hence dissipated. Less trivially, the construction of Fedorčuk [7] shows, under \diamond , that there is a dissipated compact S-space with no isolated points and no non-trivial convergent ω -sequences; see Section 6 for further remarks on this construction.

Proof of Theorem 5.2. Since X is ccc, we may replace X by some regular closed set and assume that X is nowhere separable — that is, the closure of every countable subset is nowhere dense. Assume that in $\text{ro}(X)$ no $b\downarrow$ is Suslin, and we shall derive a contradiction.

Since X is ccc, the fact that no $b\downarrow$ is Suslin implies that there are open F_σ sets V_n^j for $n, j \in \omega$ such that for each n , the V_n^j for $j \in \omega$ are disjoint and $\bigcup_j V_n^j$ is dense, and such that for each $\varphi \in \omega^\omega$, $\bigcap_n V_n^{\varphi(n)}$ has empty interior. There is then a compact metric Y and an $f : X \rightarrow Y$ such that $V_n^j = f^{-1}(f(V_n^j))$ for each n, j . Note that this implies that each $f(V_n^j)$ is open, since $f(V_n^j) = Y \setminus f(X \setminus V_n^j)$.

Replacing f by a finer map, we may also assume that f is \aleph_0 -tight.

Observe that $f^{-1}\{y\}$ is nowhere dense for each $y \in Y$, since either $f^{-1}\{y\} \subseteq \bigcap_n V_n^{\varphi(n)}$ for some $\varphi \in \omega^\omega$, or $f^{-1}\{y\} \subseteq X \setminus \bigcup_j V_n^j$ for some n .

Now, construct open $U_s \subseteq X$ and closed $K_s \subseteq X$ for $s \in 2^{<\omega}$ as follows: $U_{\langle \rangle} = X$, and each $\overline{U_{s \smallfrown i}} \subseteq U_s \setminus K_s$, with $f(\overline{U_{s \smallfrown 0}}) \cap f(\overline{U_{s \smallfrown 1}}) = \emptyset$. Also, $K_s \subseteq \overline{U_s}$,

with $f(K_s) = f(\overline{U_s})$ and $f|_{K_s} \rightarrow f(K_s)$ irreducible. Note that K_s is separable and $\overline{U_s}$ is nowhere separable, so that the construction can continue. More specifically, to choose $U_{s \smallfrown 0}$ and $U_{s \smallfrown 1}$: First, find $p_0, p_1 \in U_s \setminus K_s$ such that $f(p_0) \neq f(p_1)$; this is possible since otherwise we would have $f(U_s \setminus K_s) \subseteq \{y\}$, contradicting the fact that $f^{-1}\{y\}$ is nowhere dense. Next, find open $W_i \subseteq Y$ with $f(p_i) \in W_i$ and $\overline{W_0} \cap \overline{W_1} = \emptyset$. Then, choose $U_{s \smallfrown i}$ with $U_{s \smallfrown i} \subseteq \overline{U_{s \smallfrown i}} \subseteq (U_s \setminus K_s) \cap f^{-1}(W_i)$.

Let $Q_n = \bigcup \{f(K_s) : s \in 2^n\}$, and let $Q = \bigcap_n Q_n$, which is a non-scattered subset of Y . Let $P_n = f^{-1}(Q) \cap \bigcup \{K_s : s \in 2^n\}$. Then the P_n are disjoint and each $f(P_n) = Q$, contradicting the \aleph_0 -tightness of f . ☹

To study measures further, we use the following standard definitions:

Definition 5.6 *If μ is any finite measure on X , then $\mathbf{ma}(\mu)$ denotes the measure algebra of μ — that is, the algebra of measurable sets modulo the null sets. If $f : X \rightarrow Y$, μ is a finite measure on X , and $\nu = \mu f^{-1}$, then $f^* : \mathbf{ma}(\nu) \rightarrow \mathbf{ma}(\mu)$ is defined by $f^*([A]) = [f^{-1}(A)]$.*

$\mathbf{ma}(\mu)$ is a complete metric space with metric $d([A], [B]) = \mu(A \Delta B)$, where $[A], [B]$ denote the equivalence classes of the sets A, B . Note that we do not require f to be onto here, although $Y \setminus f(X)$ is a ν -null set. f^* is an isometric isomorphism onto some complete subalgebra $f^*(\mathbf{ma}(\nu)) \subseteq \mathbf{ma}(\mu)$.

As usual, a measure μ on X is *separable* iff $L^p(\mu)$ is a separable metric space for some (equivalently, for all) $p \in [1, \infty)$. Also μ is separable iff $\mathbf{ma}(\mu)$ is a separable metric space iff $\mathbf{ma}(\mu)$ is countably generated as a complete boolean algebra. Separability of μ is not related in any simple way to the separability of any topology that X may have. Following [6]:

Definition 5.7 **MS** *is the class of all compact spaces X such that every Radon measure on X is separable.*

We shall prove:

Theorem 5.8 *If X is a weakly \mathfrak{c} -dissipated space then X is in MS.*

In view of Lemma 3.4, Theorem 5.8 generalizes the result from [6] that every compact LOTS is in MS. Note that a space in MS need not be \mathfrak{c} -dissipated. For example, MS is closed under countable products (see [6]), but an infinite product of non-metric compacta is never weakly \mathfrak{c} -dissipated (see Theorem 3.8).

Theorem 5.8 will be an easy corollary of some general results about measures induced by weakly \mathfrak{c} -tight $f : X \rightarrow Y$, where X, Y are compact. Say μ is a Radon measure on X , with $\nu = \mu f^{-1}$. Even if f is tight (i.e., 2-tight), the separability of ν does not imply the separability of μ ; for example, ν may be a point mass

concentrating on $\{y\}$, in which case μ can be any measure supported on $f^{-1}\{y\}$ with $\mu(f^{-1}\{y\}) = \nu\{y\}$. However, if ν is atomless, then the form of ν will restrict the form of μ . There are really two kinds of ways that ν might determine μ . We shall denote the stronger way as “ X is skinny” and the weaker way as “ X is slim”. We shall define “skinny” and “slim” also for arbitrary closed subsets of X :

Definition 5.9 *Suppose that X, Y are compact, $f : X \rightarrow Y$, μ is a Radon measure on X , and $\nu = \mu f^{-1}$. Then:*

- ☞ X is skinny with respect to f, μ iff for all closed $K \subseteq X$, $\mu(K) = \nu(f(K))$.
- ☞ X is slim with respect to f, μ iff $f^* : \mathbf{ma}(\nu) \rightarrow \mathbf{ma}(\mu)$ maps onto $\mathbf{ma}(\mu)$.

If H is a closed subset of X , then we say that H is skinny (resp., slim) with respect to f, μ iff H is skinny (resp., slim) with respect to $f \upharpoonright H, \mu \upharpoonright H$.

Note that the equation $\mu(K) = \nu(f(K))$ shows that if X is skinny, then ν determines μ ; there is no Radon measure $\mu' \neq \mu$ such that $\nu = \mu' f^{-1}$.

Lemma 5.10 *If X is skinny with respect to f, μ , then X is slim.*

Proof. If $K \subseteq X$ is closed, then $\mu(K) = \mu(f^{-1}(f(K)))$ implies that $[K] = [f^{-1}(f(K))] = f^*([f(K)])$ in $\mathbf{ma}(\mu)$. Thus, $[K] \in \text{ran}(f^*)$ for all closed $K \subseteq X$, which implies that f^* is onto. ☕

The converse is false. For example, suppose that H is a closed subset of X such that μ is supported on H and $f \upharpoonright H$ is 1-1. Then X is slim, since $\mathbf{ma}(\mu) \cong \mathbf{ma}(\mu \upharpoonright H)$, but X need not be skinny, since there may well be closed K disjoint from H with $X = f^{-1}(f(K))$; then $\mu(K) = 0$ but $\nu(f(K)) = \mu(X)$. In this example, H is skinny with respect to f, μ . Some examples of skinny sets on which the function f is not 1-1 are given by:

Lemma 5.11 *Suppose that X, Y are compact, $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is tight, μ is a Radon measure on X , and $\nu = \mu f^{-1}$ is atomless. Then X is skinny with respect to f, μ .*

Proof. If X is not skinny, fix a closed $K \subseteq X$ with $\mu(K) < \nu(f(K))$, so that $\mu(f^{-1}(f(K)) \setminus K) > 0$. Then choose a closed $L \subseteq f^{-1}(f(K)) \setminus K$ with $\mu(L) > 0$. Then K, L are disjoint in X and $\nu(f(K) \cap f(L)) = \nu(f(L)) \geq \mu(L) > 0$, so $f(K) \cap f(L)$ cannot be scattered, since ν is atomless, so f is not tight. ☕

One cannot replace “tight” by “3-tight” here. For example, say $X = Y \times \{0, 1\}$, with f the natural projection, which is 2-tight. If ν is any Radon measure on Y , and on X we let $\mu(E_0 \times \{0\} \cup E_1 \times \{1\}) = \frac{1}{2}(\nu(E_0) + \nu(E_1))$, then X is not skinny (or even slim). Here, X is the union of two skinny subsets, and this situation generalized to:

Lemma 5.12 *Suppose that X, Y are compact, $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is \aleph_0 -tight and μ is a Radon measure on X with μf^{-1} atomless. Then there is a countable family \mathcal{H} of disjoint skinny subsets of X such that $\mu(X) = \sum\{\mu(H) : H \in \mathcal{H}\}$.*

Proof. If this fails, then the usual exhaustion argument lets us shrink X and assume that $\mu(X) > 0$ and there are no closed skinny $H \subseteq X$ of positive measure. We now build an infinite loose family as follows:

Construct a tree of closed $H_s \subseteq X$ for $s \in 2^{<\omega}$; so $H_{s \smallfrown 0}, H_{s \smallfrown 1}$ will be disjoint closed subsets of H_s , and also $f(H_{s \smallfrown 0}) \cap f(H_{s \smallfrown 1}) = \emptyset$. Each H_s will have positive measure. $H_{\langle \rangle}$ can be X .

Given H_s : Since H_s is not skinny, we can choose a closed $K_s \subset H_s$ with $\mu(H_s \cap (f^{-1}(f(K_s)) \setminus K_s)) > 0$. Then, since μ is regular and μf^{-1} is atomless, we can choose closed $H_{s \smallfrown 0}, H_{s \smallfrown 1} \subseteq H_s \cap (f^{-1}(f(K_s)) \setminus K_s)$ with each $\mu(H_{s \smallfrown i}) > 0$ and $f(H_{s \smallfrown 0}) \cap f(H_{s \smallfrown 1}) = \emptyset$.

Now, let $Q_n = \bigcup\{f(H_s) : s \in 2^n\}$ and let $Q = \bigcap_n Q_n$; so, Q is non-scattered. Let $P_n = f^{-1}(Q) \cap \bigcup\{K_s : s \in 2^n\}$. Then $\{P_n : n \in \omega\}$ is a loose family. ☕

It follows that the measure algebra of μ is a countable sum of measure algebras isomorphic to algebras derived from measures on Y . Note that the K_s in this proof may be null sets, so one cannot split them also to obtain a loose family of size \mathfrak{c} , as we did in the proof of Lemma 2.18. In fact, the L-space of Proposition 5.5 shows that one cannot weaken “ \aleph_0 -tight” to “ \aleph_1 -tight” in this lemma. To see this, note that μ is a separable measure on X by Theorem 5.8, so one can get an $f : X \rightarrow Y$ such that Y is compact metric, $\nu = \mu f^{-1}$ atomless, and $f^*(\mathbf{ma}(\nu)) = \mathbf{ma}(\mu)$. Since X is \aleph_1 -dissipated, one can refine f and assume also that f is \aleph_1 -tight. Now, if H is skinny, let K be a closed subset of H such that $f(K) = f(H)$ and $f \upharpoonright K : K \rightarrow f(H)$ is irreducible. Then K is separable and hence null (by the properties of X), and $\mu(H) = \mu(K)$ (since H is skinny), so $\mu(H) = 0$. Thus, there cannot be a family \mathcal{H} as in Lemma 5.12.

However, the analogous result with “slim” (Theorem 5.14) just uses \mathfrak{c} -tightness.

Definition 5.13 *Suppose that X, Y are compact, $f : X \rightarrow Y$, and μ is a Radon measure on X . Then X is simple with respect to f, μ iff there is a countable disjoint family \mathcal{H} of slim subsets of X such that $\sum\{\mu(H) : H \in \mathcal{H}\} = \mu(X)$.*

We shall prove:

Theorem 5.14 *Suppose that X, Y are compact, $f : X \rightarrow Y$, and μ is a Radon measure on X , with $\nu = \mu f^{-1}$, and suppose that X is not simple with respect to f, μ . Then there is a $\varphi : \text{dom}(\varphi) \rightarrow 2^\omega$, where $\text{dom}(\varphi)$ is closed in X , such that for some closed $Q \subseteq Y$, $\nu(Q) > 0$ and $\varphi(f^{-1}\{y\}) = 2^\omega$ for all $y \in Q$. In particular, if ν is atomless, then f is not weakly \mathfrak{c} -tight.*

In proving this, the notion of *conditional expectation* (see [9], §48) will be useful in comparing the induced measure $(\mu|_S)f^{-1}$ to ν for various $S \subseteq X$:

Definition 5.15 *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$, with X, Y compact, μ is a measure on X and $\nu = \mu f^{-1}$. If S is a measurable subset of X , then the conditional expectation, $\mathbb{E}(S|f) = \mathbb{E}_\mu(S|f)$, is the measurable $\varphi : Y \rightarrow [0, 1]$ defined so that $\int_A \varphi(y) d\nu(y) = \mu(f^{-1}(A) \cap S)$ for all measurable $A \subseteq Y$.*

Of course, φ is only defined up to equivalence in $L^\infty(\nu)$. Conditional expectations are usually defined for probability measures, but they make sense in general for finite measures; actually, $\mathbb{E}_\mu(S|f) = \mathbb{E}_{c\mu}(S|f)$ for any non-zero c . Note that $\int_A \varphi(y) d\nu(y) = \int_{f^{-1}(A)} \varphi(f(x)) d\mu(x)$. We may also characterize $\varphi = \mathbb{E}_\mu(S|f)$ by the equation:

$$\int_S g(f(x)) d\mu(x) = \int_X \varphi(f(x)) g(f(x)) d\mu(x) = \int_Y \varphi(y) g(y) d\nu(y) .$$

for $g \in L^1(Y, \nu)$. φ is obtained either by the Radon-Nikodym Theorem, or, equivalently, by identifying $(L^1(Y, \nu))^*$ with $L^\infty(Y, \nu)$, since $\Gamma(g) := \int_S g(f(x)) dx$ defines $\Gamma \in (L^1(Y, \nu))^*$, with $\|\Gamma\| \leq 1$.

Now, given μ on X and $f : X \rightarrow Y$, we shall consider various closed subsets $H \subseteq X$ while studying the tightness properties of f . When $S \subseteq H \subseteq X$, one must be careful to distinguish $\mathbb{E}_\mu(S|f)$ (computed using μ and $f : X \rightarrow Y$) from $\mathbb{E}_{\mu|_H}(S | f|_H)$ (computed using $\mu|_H$ and $f|_H : H \rightarrow Y$). These are related by:

Lemma 5.16 *Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$, with X, Y compact, H is a closed subset of X , and μ is a Radon measure on X . Let S be a measurable subset of H . Then $\mathbb{E}_\mu(S|f) = \mathbb{E}_\mu(H|f) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mu|_H}(S | f|_H)$.*

Proof. Let $\varphi = \mathbb{E}_\mu(S|f)$, $\psi = \mathbb{E}_\mu(H|f)$, and $\gamma = \mathbb{E}_{\mu|_H}(S | f|_H)$. We may take these to be bounded Borel-measurable functions from Y to \mathbb{R} . For any bounded Borel-measurable $g : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_S g(f(x)) d\mu(x) &= \int_X \varphi(f(x)) g(f(x)) d\mu(x) \\ \int_H g(f(x)) d\mu(x) &= \int_X \psi(f(x)) g(f(x)) d\mu(x) \\ \int_S g(f(x)) d\mu(x) &= \int_H \gamma(f(x)) g(f(x)) d\mu(x) = \int_X \psi(f(x)) \gamma(f(x)) g(f(x)) d\mu(x), \end{aligned}$$

which yields $\varphi = \psi\gamma$. ☕

We now relate conditional expectations to slimness:

Lemma 5.17 *Suppose that X, Y are compact, $f : X \rightarrow Y$, and μ is a measure on X , with $\nu = \mu f^{-1}$. Let $S \subseteq X$ be measurable. Then $[S] \in \text{ran}(f^*)$ iff $[\mathbb{E}(S|f)] = [\chi_T]$ for some measurable $T \subseteq Y$, in which case $[S] = f^*([T])$.*

Proof. For \rightarrow : If $[S] = f^*([T])$ then $\mu(S \Delta f^{-1}(T)) = 0$, which implies $\mathbb{E}(S|f) = \mathbb{E}(f^{-1}(T)|f) = \chi_T$.

For \leftarrow : If $[\mathbb{E}(S|f)] = [\chi_T]$ then $\mu(f^{-1}(A) \cap S) = \nu(A \cap T)$ for all measurable $A \subseteq Y$. Setting $A = Y \setminus T$, we get $\mu(S \setminus f^{-1}(T)) = 0$, so $[S] \leq [f^{-1}(T)]$. Setting $A = T$, we get $\mu(S \cap f^{-1}(T)) = \nu(T) = \mu(f^{-1}(T))$, so $[S] \geq [f^{-1}(T)]$. ☕

In particular, X is slim with respect to f, μ iff every $\mathbb{E}(S|f)$ is the characteristic function of a set; this remark will be useful when applied also to $\mu|_H$ for various $H \subseteq X$.

Lemma 5.18 *Suppose that X, Y are compact, $f : X \rightarrow Y$, and μ is a measure on X , with $\nu = \mu f^{-1}$, and suppose that X is not slim with respect to f, μ . Then there are disjoint closed $H_0, H_1 \subseteq X$ with $f(H_0) = f(H_1) = K$, such that $\nu(K) > 0$ and, for $i = 0, 1$, $0 < \mathbb{E}(H_i|f)(y) < 1$ for a.e. $y \in K$.*

Proof. First, let $\tilde{H}_0 \subseteq X$ be closed with $[H_0] \notin \text{ran}(f^*)$. We can then, by Lemma 5.17, get a closed $\tilde{K} \subseteq f(\tilde{H}_0)$ with $\nu(\tilde{K}) > 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{H}_0|f)(y) \in (0, 1)$ for a.e. $y \in \tilde{K}$. Then, choose a closed $\tilde{H}_1 \subseteq f^{-1}(\tilde{K}) \setminus \tilde{H}_0$ with $\mu(\tilde{H}_1) > 0$. Then, choose a closed $K \subseteq \tilde{f}(\tilde{H}_1)$ with $\nu(K) > 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{H}_1|f)(y) > 0$ for a.e. $y \in K$, and let $H_i = \tilde{H}_i \cap f^{-1}(K)$. ☕

We now consider the opposite of slim:

Definition 5.19 *X is nowhere slim with respect to f, μ iff there is no closed $H \subseteq X$ with $\mu(H) > 0$ such that H is slim with respect to f, μ .*

Lemma 5.20 *Suppose that X, Y are compact, $f : X \rightarrow Y$, and μ is a measure on X , with $\nu = \mu f^{-1}$, and suppose that X is nowhere slim with respect to f, μ . Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there are disjoint closed $H_0, H_1 \subseteq X$ with $f(H_0) = f(H_1) = K$, such that $\nu(Y \setminus K) < \varepsilon$ and, for $i = 0, 1$, $0 < \mathbb{E}(H_i|f)(y) < 1$ for a.e. $y \in K$.*

Proof. Fix \mathcal{K} such that

1. \mathcal{K} is a disjoint family of non-null closed subsets of Y .
2. For $K \in \mathcal{K}$, there are disjoint closed $H_0^K, H_1^K \subseteq X$ with $f(H_0^K) = f(H_1^K) = K$, and, for $i = 0, 1$, $0 < \mathbb{E}(H_i^K|f)(y) < 1$ for a.e. $y \in K$.
3. \mathcal{K} is maximal with respect to (1)(2).

Then \mathcal{K} is countable. If $\nu(Y \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{K}) = 0$, choose a finite $\mathcal{K}' \subseteq \mathcal{K}$ such that $\nu(Y \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{K}') < \varepsilon$, set $K = \bigcup \mathcal{K}'$, and set $H_i = \bigcup \{H_i^K : K \in \mathcal{K}'\}$. If $\nu(Y \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{K}) \neq 0$, choose a closed $E \subseteq Y \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{K}$ with $\nu(E) > 0$, and use Lemma 5.18 to derive a contradiction from maximality of \mathcal{K} and the fact that $f^{-1}(E)$ is not slim. ☕

We can now use a tree argument to prove Theorem 5.14:

Proof of Theorem 5.14. Since f is not simple, there must be a closed $H \subseteq X$ such that H is nowhere slim with respect to $\mu \upharpoonright H, f \upharpoonright H$. Restricting everything to H , we may assume that X itself is nowhere slim. Also, WLOG $\mu(X) = \nu(Y) = 1$ and $f(X) = Y$. Now, get $P_s \subseteq X$ for $s \in 2^{<\omega}$ and $Q_n \subseteq Y$ for $n \in \omega$ so that:

1. $P_{\langle \rangle} = X$ and $Q_0 = Y$.
2. P_s is closed in X and Q_n is closed in Y .
3. $Q_n = \bigcap \{f(P_s) : \text{lh}(s) = n\}$.
4. $P_{s \smallfrown 0}$ and $P_{s \smallfrown 1}$ are disjoint subsets of P_s .
5. $\nu(f(P_s) \setminus f(P_{s \smallfrown i})) \leq 6^{-n-1}$ when $\text{lh}(s) = n$ and $i = 0, 1$.
6. $Q_{n+1} \subseteq Q_n$ and $\nu(Q_n \setminus Q_{n+1}) \leq 2^{n+1} \cdot 6^{-n-1} = 3^{-n-1}$.
7. $\mathbb{E}_\mu(P_s | f)(y) > 0$ for ν -a.e. $y \in f(P_s)$.

Assuming that this can be done, let $Q = \bigcap_n Q_n$. $Q \subseteq f(P_s)$ for all $s \in 2^{<\omega}$, so for $t \in 2^\omega$, let $P_t = f^{-1}(Q) \cap \bigcap_n P_{t \upharpoonright n}$. Then the P_t are disjoint and $f(P_t) = Q$ for all t . Also, $\mu(Q) \geq 1 - 1/3 - 1/9 - 1/27 - \dots = 1/2$. Let $\text{dom}(\varphi) = \bigcup_t P_t$, with $\varphi(x) = t$ for $x \in P_t$.

Now, to do the construction, note first that (6) follows from (3)(4)(5). We proceed by induction on $\text{lh}(s)$, using (7) to accomplish the splitting. For $\text{lh}(s) = 0$, (1)(2)(3)(7) are trivial, since $\mathbb{E}(X | f)(y) = 1$ for a.e. $y \in Y$. Now fix s with $\text{lh}(s) = n$. We obtain $P_{s \smallfrown 0}$ and $P_{s \smallfrown 1}$ by applying Lemma 5.20, with the X, Y there replaced by $P_s, f(P_s)$; but then we must replace ν by $\lambda := (\mu \upharpoonright P_s)(f \upharpoonright P_s)^{-1}$ on $f(P_s)$. Let $\varphi = \mathbb{E}_\mu(P_s | f)$; then, by (7) for P_s , $\varphi(y) > 0$ for ν -a.e. $y \in f(P_s)$; also $\varphi(y) = 0$ for a.e. $y \notin f(P_s)$, and $\int_A \varphi(y) d\nu(y) = \mu(f^{-1}(A) \cap P_s) = \lambda(A)$ for all measurable $A \subseteq f(P_s)$. Fix $\delta > 0$ such that $\nu(\{y \in f(P_s) : \varphi(y) < \delta\}) \leq 6^{-n-1}/2$. Now apply Lemma 5.20 to get closed $P_{s \smallfrown 0}, P_{s \smallfrown 1}$ satisfying (4) with $K_s := f(P_{s \smallfrown 0}) = f(P_{s \smallfrown 1})$ so that, for $i = 0, 1$, $\mathbb{E}_{\mu \upharpoonright P_s}(P_{s \smallfrown i} | f \upharpoonright P_s)(y) > 0$ for λ -a.e. $y \in K_s$, and $\lambda(f(P_s) \setminus K_s) < \delta \cdot 6^{-n-1}/2$. Now, by Lemma 5.16, $\mathbb{E}_\mu(P_{s \smallfrown i} | f) = \varphi \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mu \upharpoonright P_s}(P_{s \smallfrown i} | f \upharpoonright P_s)$, which yields (7) for $P_{s \smallfrown i}$. To obtain (5), let $A = f(P_s) \setminus K_s$. we need $\nu(A) \leq 6^{-n-1}$, and we have $\int_A \varphi(y) d\nu(y) = \lambda(A) < \delta \cdot 6^{-n-1}/2$. Let $A = A' \cup A''$, where $\varphi < \delta$ on A' and $\varphi \geq \delta$ on A'' . Then $\nu(A') \leq 6^{-n-1}/2$ and $\nu(A'') \leq (1/\delta) \int_{A''} \varphi(y) d\nu(y) \leq 6^{-n-1}/2$, so $\nu(A) \leq 6^{-n-1}$. ☕

Corollary 5.21 *Suppose that X, Y are compact, $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is weakly \mathfrak{c} -tight, and μ is a Radon measure on X , with $\nu = \mu f^{-1}$ atomless and separable. Then μ is separable.*

Proof. X is simple with respect to f, μ , by Theorem 5.14, which implies that $\text{ma}(\mu)$ is a countable disjoint sum of separable measure algebras. ☕

Proof of Theorem 5.8. Assume that μ is a non-separable Radon measure on X ; we shall derive a contradiction. By subtracting the point masses, we may assume that μ is atomless.

First, fix a compact metric Z and a $g : X \rightarrow Z$ such that μg^{-1} is atomless. This is easily done by an elementary submodel argument. More concretely, one can assume that $X \subseteq [0, 1]^\kappa$; then $g = \pi_d^\kappa$ for a suitably chosen countable $d \subseteq \kappa$. We construct d as $\bigcup_i d_i$, where the d_i are finite and non-empty and $d_0 \subseteq d_1 \subseteq \dots$. Given d_i , we have the space $Z_i = \pi_{d_i}^\kappa(X)$, with measure $\nu_i = \mu(\pi_{d_i}^\kappa)^{-1}$. Let $\{F_i^\ell : \ell \in \omega\}$ be a family of closed non-null subsets of Z_i which is dense in the measure algebra, and make sure that for each ℓ , there is some $j > i$ such that Z_j contains a closed set $K \subseteq (\pi_{d_i}^{d_j})^{-1}(F_i^\ell)$ with $\nu_j(K)/\nu_i(F_i^\ell) \in (1/3, 2/3)$.

Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be weakly \mathfrak{c} -tight, where Y is metric and f is finer than g . We then have $\Gamma \in C(Y, Z)$ such that $g = \Gamma \circ f$, so $\mu g^{-1} = (\mu f^{-1})\Gamma^{-1}$, so μf^{-1} is atomless. Also, μf^{-1} is separable because Y is metric, contradicting Corollary 5.21. ☕

6 Inverse Limits

Some compacta built as inverse limits in ω_1 steps are dissipated. We avoid explicit use of the inverse limit by viewing X as a subspace of some M^{ω_1} , so the bonding maps in the inverse limit will be the projection maps.

Definition 6.1 *For any space M and ordinals $\alpha \leq \beta$: $\pi_\alpha^\beta : M^\beta \rightarrow M^\alpha$ denotes the natural projection.*

Theorem 6.2 *Let M be compact metric, and suppose that X is a closed subset of M^{ω_1} . Let $X_\alpha = \pi_\alpha^{\omega_1}(X)$. Assume that for each $\alpha < \omega_1$, the map $\pi_\alpha^{\alpha+1} \upharpoonright X_{\alpha+1} : X_{\alpha+1} \rightarrow X_\alpha$ is tight. Then*

1. *For each $\alpha < \beta \leq \omega_1$, the map $\pi_\alpha^\beta \upharpoonright X_\beta : X_\beta \rightarrow X_\alpha$ is tight.*
2. *X is dissipated.*

Proof. For (1), fix α and induct on β . For successor stages, use Lemma 2.13. For limit $\beta > \alpha$, use the fact that if P_0, P_1 are disjoint closed subsets of X_β , then there is a δ with $\alpha < \delta < \beta$ and $\pi_\delta^\beta(P_0) \cap \pi_\delta^\beta(P_1) = \emptyset$.

For (2), observe that given $g : X \rightarrow Z$, with Z metric, there is an $\alpha < \omega_1$ with $\pi_\alpha^{\omega_1} \upharpoonright X$ finer than g . Now, use the fact that all $\pi_\beta^{\omega_1} \upharpoonright X$ are tight. ☹

The proof of (2) did not actually require all $\pi_\beta^{\omega_1} \upharpoonright X$ to be tight; we only needed unboundedly many. More generally, the definition of “dissipated” requires the family of tight maps to be unbounded, but it does not necessarily contain a club, although it does contain a club in the “natural” examples of dissipated spaces. We first point out an example where the tight maps do not contain a club. Then we shall formulate precisely what “contains a club” means.

Example 6.3 *There is a closed $X \subseteq 2^{\omega_1}$ such that, setting $X_\alpha = \pi_\alpha^{\omega_1}(X)$:*

- a. X is dissipated
- b. For all $\alpha < \omega_1$, $\pi_\alpha^{\omega_1} \upharpoonright X : X \rightarrow X_\alpha$ is tight iff α is not a limit ordinal.

Proof. First note that (b) \rightarrow (a) because whenever $g : X \rightarrow Z$, with Z metric, there is always an $\alpha < \omega_1$ with $\pi_\alpha^{\omega_1} \upharpoonright X \leq g$. Then $\pi_{\alpha+1}^{\omega_1} \upharpoonright X \leq \pi_\alpha^{\omega_1} \upharpoonright X \leq g$ and $\pi_{\alpha+1}^{\omega_1} \upharpoonright X$ is tight.

To prove (b), we use a standard inverse limit construction, building X_α by induction on α . We shall have:

1. X_α is a closed subset of 2^α for all $\alpha \leq \omega_1$, and $X = X_{\omega_1}$.
2. $X_\alpha = \pi_\alpha^\beta(X_\beta)$ whenever $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \omega_1$.
3. $X_\alpha = 2^\alpha$ for $\alpha \leq \omega$.
4. For $\alpha < \omega_1$: $X_{\alpha+1} = X_\alpha \times \{0\} \cup F_\alpha \times \{1\}$, where F_α is a closed subset of X_α .
5. F_γ is a perfect set for all limit $\gamma < \omega_1$.
6. $\pi_\delta^\alpha(F_\alpha)$ is finite whenever $\delta < \alpha < \omega_1$.
7. Whenever $\delta < \alpha < \omega_1$ and δ is a successor ordinal, there is an n with $0 < n < \omega$ such that $\pi_{\delta+1}^{\alpha+n}(F_{\alpha+n}) = F_\delta \times \{0, 1\}$.

Conditions (1)(2) imply that X_γ , for limit γ , is determined by the X_α for $\alpha < \gamma$; then, by (4), the whole construction is determined by the choice of the $F_\alpha \subseteq X_\alpha$; as usual, in stating (4), we are identifying $2^{\alpha+1}$ with $2^\alpha \times \{0, 1\}$. By (3), $F_\alpha = X_\alpha$ when $\alpha < \omega$. By (6), F_α is finite for successor α . Conditions (1)–(6) are sufficient to verify (b) of the theorem, but (7) was added to ensure that the construction can be carried out. Using (7), it is easy to construct F_γ for limit γ to satisfy (5)(6), and (7) itself is easy to ensure by a standard enumeration argument, since there are no further restrictions on the finite sets $F_{\alpha+n} \subseteq X_{\alpha+n}$ when $n > 0$.

To verify (b): If $\alpha < \omega_1$ is a limit ordinal, then (4)(5) guarantee that $\pi_\alpha^{\omega_1} \upharpoonright X : X \rightarrow X_\alpha$ is not tight. Now, fix a successor $\alpha < \omega$. We prove by induction that $\pi_\alpha^\beta \upharpoonright X_\beta : X_\beta \rightarrow X_\alpha$ is tight whenever $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \omega_1$. This is trivial when $\beta = \alpha$. If $\beta > \alpha$ is a limit ordinal and $\pi_\alpha^\beta \upharpoonright X_\beta$ fails to be tight, then we have disjoint closed $P_0, P_1 \subset X_\beta$ with $Q = \pi_\alpha^\beta(P_0) = \pi_\alpha^\beta(P_1)$ and Q not scattered; but then there is a δ with $\beta > \delta > \alpha$ such that $\pi_\delta^\beta(P_0) \cap \pi_\delta^\beta(P_1) = \emptyset$, and then the $\pi_\delta^\beta(P_i)$ refute the tightness of π_α^δ .

Finally, assume that $\alpha \leq \beta < \omega_1$ and that $\pi_\alpha^\beta \upharpoonright X_\beta$ is tight. We shall prove that $\pi_\alpha^{\beta+1} \upharpoonright X_{\beta+1}$ is tight. If β is a successor, we note that $\pi_\beta^{\beta+1} \upharpoonright X_{\beta+1}$ is tight because F_β is finite, so that $\pi_\alpha^{\beta+1} \upharpoonright X_{\beta+1} = \pi_\alpha^\beta \upharpoonright X_\beta \circ \pi_\beta^{\beta+1} \upharpoonright X_{\beta+1}$ is tight by Lemma 2.13. Now, assume that β is a limit (so $\alpha < \beta$) and that $\pi_\alpha^{\beta+1} \upharpoonright X_{\beta+1}$ is not tight. Fix disjoint closed $P_0, P_1 \subset X_{\beta+1}$ with $Q = \pi_\alpha^{\beta+1}(P_0) = \pi_\alpha^{\beta+1}(P_1)$ and Q not scattered. Since $\pi_\alpha^\beta(F_\beta)$ is finite, we may shrink Q and the P_i and assume that $Q \cap \pi_\alpha^\beta(F_\beta) = \emptyset$. Then $\pi_\beta^{\beta+1}(P_i) \cap F_\beta = \emptyset$, so that $\pi_\beta^{\beta+1}(P_0) \cap \pi_\beta^{\beta+1}(P_1) = \emptyset$, and the $\pi_\beta^{\beta+1}(P_i)$ contradict the tightness of $\pi_\alpha^\beta \upharpoonright X_\beta$. ☕

There are various equivalent ways to formulate “contains a club”; the following is probably the quickest to state:

Definition 6.4 *The compact X is wasted iff whenever θ is a suitably large regular cardinal and $M \prec H(\theta)$ is countable and contains X and its topology, the natural evaluation map $\pi_M : X \rightarrow [0, 1]^{C(X, [0, 1]) \cap M}$ is tight.*

For the X of Example 6.3, no π_M is tight, since π_M is equivalent to $\pi_\gamma^{\omega_1}$, where $\gamma = \omega_1 \cap M$. The X of Theorem 6.2 is wasted, as is every compact LOTS. A notion intermediate between “dissipated” and “wasted” is obtained by requiring π_M to be tight for a stationary set of $M \prec H(\theta)$.

In Theorem 6.2: since $X_{\alpha+1}$ and X_α are compact metric, the assumption that $\pi_\alpha^{\alpha+1}$ is tight is equivalent to saying that $\{y \in X_\alpha : |(\pi_\alpha^{\alpha+1})^{-1}\{y\} \cap X_{\alpha+1}| > 1\}$ is countable (see Theorem 2.7). In the constructions of [7, 11, 12], this set is actually a singleton. In some cases, the spaces are also *minimally generated* in the sense Koppelberg [15] and Dow [4]:

Definition 6.5 *Let X, Y be compact. Then $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is minimal iff $|f^{-1}\{y\}| = 1$ for all $y \in Y$ except for one y_0 , for which $|f^{-1}\{y_0\}| = 2$.*

We remark that this is the same as minimality in the sense that if $f = g \circ h$, where $h : X \rightarrow Z$ and $g : Z \rightarrow Y$, then either g or h is a bijection. Clearly, every minimal map is tight.

Definition 6.6 *X is minimally generated iff X is a closed subspace of some 2^ρ , where, setting $X_\alpha = \pi_\alpha^\rho(X)$, all the maps $\pi_\alpha^{\alpha+1} \upharpoonright X_{\alpha+1} : X_{\alpha+1} \rightarrow X_\alpha$, for $\alpha < \rho$, are minimal.*

Examples of such spaces are the Fedorčuk S-space [7], obtained under \diamond (here, $\rho = \omega_1$), and the Efimov spaces obtained by Fedorčuk [8] and Dow [4], where $\rho > \omega_1$.

Clearly, if $\rho = \omega_1$, then X must be dissipated by Theorem 6.2, but this need not be true for $\rho > \omega_1$. For example, if $A(\aleph_1)$ is the 1-point compactification of a discrete space of size \aleph_1 , and $X = A(\aleph_1) \times 2^\omega$, then X is not \aleph_1 -dissipated by Lemma 3.6, but X is minimally generated, with $\rho = \omega_1 + \omega$.

Note that if we weaken “tight” to “3-tight” in Theorem 6.2, we get nothing of any interest in general. In fact, if $M = 2 = \{0, 1\}$ and each $X_\alpha = M^\alpha$, then all $\pi_\alpha^{\alpha+1} \upharpoonright X_{\alpha+1}$ are 3-tight, but X is not weakly \mathfrak{c} -dissipated by Theorem 3.8. However, one can in some cases use an inverse limit construction build a space which is \aleph_0 -dissipated:

Proof of Proposition 5.5. We modify the standard construction of a compact L-space under CH, following specifically the details in [16]; similar constructions are in Haydon [13] and Talagrand [19]. So, X will be a closed subset of 2^{ω_1} .

We inductively define $X_\alpha \subseteq 2^\alpha$, for $\omega \leq \alpha \leq \omega_1$, along with an atomless Radon probability measure μ_α on X_α such that the support of μ_α is all of X_α . Let $X_\omega = 2^\omega$ with μ_ω the usual product measure. The measures will all cohere, in the sense that $\mu_\alpha = \mu_\beta (\pi_\alpha^\beta)^{-1}$ whenever $\alpha < \beta$. Along with the measures, we choose a countable family \mathcal{F}_α of closed μ_α -null subsets of X_α and a specific closed nowhere dense non-null $K_\alpha \subseteq X_\alpha$. When $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$, \mathcal{F}_β will contain $(\pi_\alpha^\beta)^{-1}(F)$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$, along with some additional sets. Since \mathcal{F}_α is countable, we can choose a perfect $C_\alpha \subseteq K_\alpha$ such that $\mu_\alpha(C_\alpha) > 0$, C_α is the support of $\mu_\alpha \upharpoonright C_\alpha$, and $C_\alpha \cap F = \emptyset$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$. Then we let $X_{\alpha+1} = X_\alpha \times \{0\} \cup C_\alpha \times \{1\}$. In the construction of [16], $\mu_{\alpha+1}$ can be chosen arbitrarily to satisfy $\mu_\alpha = \mu_{\alpha+1} (\pi_\alpha^{\alpha+1})^{-1}$, as long as all non-empty open subsets of $C_\alpha \times \{1\}$ have positive measure; there is some flexibility here in distributing the measure on C_α among its copies $C_\alpha \times \{0\}$ and $C_\alpha \times \{1\}$. In particular, depending on the choices made, the final measure $\mu = \mu_{\omega_1}$ on $X = X_{\omega_1}$ may be separable or non-separable. In any case, [16] shows that, assuming CH, one may choose the \mathcal{F}_α and K_α appropriately to guarantee X is an L-space and that the ideals of null subsets, meager subsets, and separable subsets all coincide.

Now, always choose $\mu_{\alpha+1}$ such that $\mu_{\alpha+1}(C_\alpha \times \{0\}) = 0$. This will guarantee that μ on X is separable, with $\mathbf{ma}(\mu)$ isomorphic to $\mathbf{ma}(\mu_\omega)$ via $(\pi_\omega^{\omega_1})^*$. Also, put the set $C_\alpha \times \{0\}$ into $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha+1}$. Then, for all $x \in X_\omega$, $(\pi_\omega^{\omega_1})^{-1}\{x\}$ is scattered (as is easy to verify), and hence countable (since X is HL). But then $\pi_\omega^{\omega_1} \upharpoonright X : X \rightarrow X_\omega$ is \aleph_1 -tight, so that X is \aleph_1 -dissipated by Lemma 3.5. ☕

We remark that by Theorem 5.8, we know that the μ of Proposition 5.5 must be separable, so it was natural to make $\mathbf{ma}(\mu)$ isomorphic to $\mathbf{ma}(\mu_\omega)$ in the construction.

7 Absoluteness

We shall prove here that tightness is absolute. This can then be applied in forcing arguments, but the absoluteness itself has nothing at all to do with forcing; it is just a fact about transitive models of ZFC, and is related to the absoluteness of Π_1^1 statements. Since we never need absoluteness of Π_2^1 (Shoenfield's Theorem), we do not need the models to contain all the ordinals. So, we consider arbitrary transitive models M, N of ZFC with $M \subseteq N$. If in M , we have compacta X, Y and $f : X \rightarrow Y$, we want to show that f is tight in M iff f is tight in N .

To make this discussion precise, we must, in N , replace X, Y by the corresponding compact spaces \tilde{X}, \tilde{Y} . This concept was described by Bandlow [1] (and later in [4, 5, 6, 12]), and is defined as follows:

Definition 7.1 *Let $M \subseteq N$ be transitive models of ZFC. In M , assume that X is compact. Then \tilde{X} denotes the compactum in N characterized by:*

1. X is dense in \tilde{X} .
2. Every $\varphi \in C(X, [0, 1]) \cap M$ extends to a $\tilde{\varphi} \in C(\tilde{X}, [0, 1])$ in N .
3. The functions $\tilde{\varphi}$ (for $\varphi \in M$) separate the points of \tilde{X} .

If, in M , X, Y are compact and $f \in C(X, Y)$, then in N , $\tilde{f} \in C(\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y})$ denotes the (unique) continuous extension of f .

In forcing, \hat{X} denotes the \tilde{X} of $V[G]$, while \check{X} denotes the X of $V[G]$.

Theorem 7.2 *Let $M \subseteq N$ be transitive models of ZFC. In M , assume that X, Y are compact, K is compact metric, and $f : X \rightarrow Y$. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. In M : There is a K -loose function for f .
2. In N : There is a \tilde{K} -loose function for \tilde{f} .

Proof. For (1) \rightarrow (2), just observe that if in M , we have φ, Q satisfying Definition 2.4 (of K -loose), then $\tilde{\varphi}, \tilde{Q}$ satisfy Definition 2.4 in N .

For $\neg(1) \rightarrow \neg(2)$, we shall define a partial order \mathbb{T} in M . We shall then prove that $\neg(1)$ implies the well-founded of \mathbb{T} in M , while the well-founded of \mathbb{T} in N implies $\neg(2)$. The result then follows by the absoluteness of well-foundedness.

As in the proof of Theorem 2.10, let $H = [0, 1]^\omega$, and assume that $K \subseteq H$. Then the existence of a K -loose function is equivalent to the existence of a $\varphi \in C(X, H)$ such that for some non-scattered $Q \subseteq Y$ we have $\psi(f^{-1}\{y\}) \supseteq K$ for all $y \in Q$.

\mathbb{T} is a tree of finite sequences, ordered by extension. \mathbb{T} contains the empty sequence and all non-empty sequences

$$\langle (\mathcal{E}_0, \psi_0), (\mathcal{E}_1, \psi_1), \dots, (\mathcal{E}_{n-1}, \psi_{n-1}) \rangle$$

satisfying:

- a. Each $\psi_i \in C(X, H)$.
- b. Each \mathcal{E}_i is a disjoint family of 2^i non-empty closed subsets of Y .
- c. Whenever $y \in E \in \mathcal{E}_i$ and $z \in K$: $d(z, \psi_i(f^{-1}\{y\})) \leq 2^{-i}$.
- d. When $i + 1 < n$: $d(\psi_i, \psi_{i+1}) \leq 2^{i-1}$, and each $E \in \mathcal{E}_i$ has exactly two subsets in \mathcal{E}_{i+1} .

In M , if \mathbb{T} is not well-founded and $\langle (\mathcal{E}_0, \psi_0), (\mathcal{E}_1, \psi_1), \dots \rangle$ is an infinite path through \mathbb{T} , then we get $\varphi = \lim_i \psi_i \in C(X, H)$ using (a)(d) and $Q = \bigcap_i \bigcup \mathcal{E}_i$, which is a non-scattered subset of Y using (b)(d), and (c)(d) implies that $\varphi(f^{-1}\{y\}) \supseteq K$ for all $y \in Q$, so (1) holds.

Now, suppose, in N , that we have Q, φ for which (2) holds; then we construct a path through \mathbb{T} . To obtain the ψ_i (all of which must be in M), use the fact that $\{\psi : \psi \in C(X, H)^M\}$ is dense in $C(\tilde{X}, \tilde{H})$. Likewise each $E \in \mathcal{E}_i$ will be a closed set in M such that $\tilde{E} \cap Q$ is not scattered. ☹

Note that Theorem 7.2 says that the existence of the φ and Q described in the proof Theorem 2.10 is absolute. The corresponding “absoluteness version” of Theorem 2.9 is false. For example, suppose that in V , we have $X = Y \times K$, where X, Y, K are compact and non-scattered, and in addition, K has no non-trivial convergent ω -sequences. Then clearly in V , there can be no perfect $Q \subseteq Y$ and 1-1 map $i : Q \times (\omega + 1) \rightarrow X$ such that $f(i(q, u)) = q$ for all $(q, y) \in Q \times (\omega + 1)$, whereas if $V[G]$ collapses enough cardinals, it will contain such a Q, i .

An application of the absoluteness result in Theorem 7.2 is:

Proof of Theorem 2.5. Assume that in the universe, V : X and Y are compact, $f : X \rightarrow Y$, and we have an infinite loose family $\{P_i : i \in \omega\}$. Let $V[G]$ be any forcing extension of V which makes the weights of X and Y countable, so that in $V[G]$, we still have $f : \tilde{X} \rightarrow \tilde{Y}$ and a loose family $\{\tilde{P}_i : i \in \omega\}$, but \tilde{X} and \tilde{Y} are now compact metric, so that Theorem 2.10 gives us an $(\omega + 1)$ -loose function in $V[G]$. Hence, by absoluteness, there is one in V . ☹

A direct proof of this can be given without forcing, but it seems quite a bit more complicated, since one must embed into the proof the method of Suslin used in proving Lemma 2.8; one cannot just quote Suslin’s theorem, since the spaces are not Polish. Theorem 2.5 is needed for the $\kappa = \omega$ part of:

Corollary 7.3 *Fix $\kappa \leq \omega$. Let M, N be transitive models of ZFC, with $M \subseteq N$. Assume that in M we have X, Y, f with X, Y compact and $f : X \rightarrow Y$. Then $M \models “f : X \rightarrow Y \text{ is } \kappa\text{-tight}”$ iff $N \models “\tilde{f} : \tilde{X} \rightarrow \tilde{Y} \text{ is } \kappa\text{-tight}”$.*

Of course, the \leftarrow direction is trivial, and holds for all κ if we rephrase Definition 2.1 appropriately so that κ is not required to be a cardinal (since “cardinal” is not

absolute). That is, if in M , we have a loose family $\{P_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$, then $\{\widetilde{P}_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is loose in N . For a version of Corollary 7.3 for $\kappa = \mathfrak{c}$, we use the notion of “weakly \mathfrak{c} -tight” from Definition 2.6.

Corollary 7.4 *Fix $\kappa \leq \omega$. Let M, N be transitive models of ZFC, with $M \subseteq N$. Assume that in M we have X, Y, f with X, Y compact and $f : X \rightarrow Y$. Then $M \models$ “ $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is weakly \mathfrak{c} -tight” iff $N \models$ “ $\widetilde{f} : \widetilde{X} \rightarrow \widetilde{Y}$ is weakly \mathfrak{c} -tight”.*

References

- [1] I. Bandlow, On the origin of new compact spaces in forcing models, *Math. Nachrichten* 139 (1988) 185-191.
- [2] D. K. Burke and D. J. Lutzer, On powers of certain lines, *Topology Appl.* 26 (1987) 251-261.
- [3] D. K. Burke and J. T. Moore, Subspaces of the Sorgenfrey line, *Topology Appl.* 90 (1998) 57-68.
- [4] A. Dow, Efimov spaces and the splitting number, *Topology Proc.* 29 (2005) 105-113.
- [5] A. Dow and D. Fremlin, Compact sets without converging sequences in the random real model, to appear.
- [6] M. Džamonja and K. Kunen, Properties of the class of measure separable compact spaces, *Fund. Math.* 147 (1995) 261-277.
- [7] V. V. Fedorčuk, The cardinality of hereditarily separable bicomacta, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 222 (1975) 302-305. English translation: *Soviet Math. Dokl.* 16 (1975) 651-655
- [8] V. V. Fedorčuk, A compact space having the cardinality of the continuum with no convergent sequences, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 81 (1977) 177-181.
- [9] P. R. Halmos, *Measure Theory*, D. Van Nostrand Company, 1950.
- [10] J. Hart and K. Kunen, Complex function algebras and removable spaces, *Topology Appl.* 153 (2006) 2241-2259.
- [11] J. Hart and K. Kunen, Inverse limits and function algebras, *Topology Proceedings*, to appear,

- [12] J. Hart and K. Kunen, First countable continua and proper forcing, to appear.
- [13] R. Haydon, On dual L^1 -spaces and injective bidual Banach spaces, *Israel J. Math.* 31 (1978) 142-152.
- [14] I. Juhász, K. Kunen, and M. E. Rudin, Two more hereditarily separable non-Lindelöf spaces, *Canad. J. Math.* 28 (1976) 998-1005.
- [15] S. Koppelberg, Minimally generated Boolean algebras, *Order* 5 (1989) 393-406.
- [16] K. Kunen, A compact L-space under CH, *Topology and Applications* 12 (1981) 283-287.
- [17] D. J. Lutzer and H. R. Bennett, Separability, the countable chain condition and the Lindelöf property in linearly orderable spaces, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 23 (1969) 664-667.
- [18] G. Peano, Sur une courbe, qui remplit toute une aire plane, *Math. Ann.* 36 (1890) 157-160.
- [19] M. Talagrand, Séparabilité vague dans l'espace des mesures sur un compact, *Israel J. Math.* 37 (1980) 171-180.