

Chris Good

Large cardinals and Dowker products

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 35 (1994), No. 3, 515--522

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/118690>

Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 1994

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

Large cardinals and Dowker products

CHRIS GOOD

Abstract. We prove that if there is a model of set-theory which contains no first countable, locally compact, scattered, countably paracompact space X , whose Tychonoff square is a Dowker space, then there is an inner model which contains a measurable cardinal.

Keywords: small Dowker space, Dowker product, normality, countable paracompactness, measurable cardinal, Covering Lemma

Classification: 03E35, 03E55, 54D15, 54D20, 54G15

In this paper we always take space to mean Hausdorff topological space. A space is normal if every pair of disjoint closed sets can be separated by disjoint open sets, and binormal if its product with the closed unit interval is normal. A space is countably paracompact (metacompact) if every countable open cover has a locally (point) finite open refinement. In [Dk], Dowker shows that a normal space is binormal iff it is countably paracompact iff it is countably metacompact. A Dowker space is a normal space that is not countably paracompact. For a survey of Dowker spaces we refer the reader to [R].

Rudin and Starbird [RS] have shown that for normal, countably paracompact X and metrizable M , $X \times M$ is normal if and only if it is countably paracompact. They asked whether a product of two normal, countably paracompact spaces could be a Dowker space. Bešlagić constructs various positive answers to this question, assuming \diamond or CH , in [B1], [B2] & [B3].

In [G] we prove that if there is a model of set theory which contains no first countable, locally compact, scattered Dowker spaces, then there is a model of set-theory which contains a measurable cardinal. Here we extend this result by proving that large cardinals are needed for a model in which there is no first countable, locally compact, countably paracompact space X with first countable, locally compact, scattered Dowker square:

1. Theorem. *If no inner model of set theory contains a measurable cardinal, then there is a first countable, locally countable, locally compact, strongly zero-dimensional, collectionwise normal, countably paracompact, scattered space whose Tychonoff square is a first countable, locally compact, collectionwise normal, scattered Dowker space.*

Notation and terminology are standard—see [E], [K] or [KV]. We regard cardinals as initial ordinals, and an ordinal as the set of its predecessors. We use

the term *club set* or *club* to denote a closed, unbounded subset of an ordinal—it will be clear from the context which particular ordinal we mean. For a function $f : A \rightarrow B$, we denote by $f^{\text{“}C}$ the set $\{f(x) : x \in C \subseteq A\}$. For a subset A of $\alpha \times \beta$, we denote the set $\{\gamma : (\exists \delta)(\gamma, \delta) \in A\}$ by $\text{dom } A$, and the set $\{\delta : (\exists \gamma)(\gamma, \delta) \in A\}$ by $\text{ran } A$. Following [B1], a subset A of $\kappa^+ \times \kappa^+$ is said to be 2-unbounded if A is not a subset of $(\kappa^+ \times \alpha) \cup (\alpha \times \kappa^+)$ for any $\alpha \in \kappa^+$. As usual we use the following characterization from [Dk]: a space is countably metacompact if and only if, for every decreasing sequence $\{D_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ of closed subsets of X , which has empty intersection, there is a sequence $\{U_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ of open sets, U_n containing D_n for each n , which also has empty intersection.

A stationary subset E of some uncountable cardinal λ is said to be *non-reflecting* if, for every $\alpha < \lambda$, $\alpha \cap E$ is non-stationary in α . If E is a non-reflecting stationary subset of κ^+ and $\alpha \in \kappa^+$, then it is easy to see that there is a club set $H = \{\gamma_\lambda : \lambda \in \theta \leq \alpha\}$ of α such that H and E are disjoint, and $(\gamma_\lambda, \gamma_{\lambda+1})$ is countable for all $\lambda \in \theta$. In what follows we shall let E denote a non-reflecting, stationary subset of κ^+ , each member of which has countable cofinality.

2. Definition. $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+}(E, 2)$ is the assertion that there is a collection $\{R_{\alpha,i} : R_{\alpha,i} \subseteq \alpha, \alpha \in E \cap \text{LIM and } i \in 2\}$ such that each $R_{\alpha,i}$ is an ω -sequence, cofinal in α , and $\{\alpha \in E : R_{\alpha,i} \subseteq X_i \text{ for both } i \in 2\}$ is stationary whenever X_0 and X_1 are unbounded subsets of κ^+ . □

In [G] we deduce, via [Dv], [DJ] and [F],

3. Lemma. *If no inner model of set-theory contains a measurable cardinal, then $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+}(E, 2)$ for some κ^+ .* □

In the construction of the space X , we use the following two consequences of $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+}(E, 2)$.

4. Definition. $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+ \times \kappa^+}(E, 2)$ is the assertion that there is a sequence $\{S_{\alpha,i} : S_{\alpha,i} \subseteq \alpha \times \alpha, \alpha \in E \cap \text{LIM and } i \in 2\}$ such that $S_{\alpha,i}$ is an ω -sequence, cofinal in $\alpha \times \alpha$, and $\{\alpha \in E : S_{\alpha,i} \subseteq X_i \text{ } i \in 2\}$ is stationary whenever X_0 and X_1 are 2-unbounded subsets of $\kappa^+ \times \kappa^+$. □

5. Definition. $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+}^\cap(E, 2)$ is the assertion that there is a sequence $\{T_{\alpha,i,n} : T_{\alpha,i,n} \subseteq \alpha, \alpha \in E \cap \text{LIM, and } i \in 2\}$ such that $\bigcup_{n \in \omega} T_{\alpha,i,n}$ and each $T_{\alpha,i,n}$ is an ω -sequence, cofinal in α , $T_{\alpha,i,n} \cap T_{\alpha,j,m}$ is empty whenever $i \neq j$ or $m \neq n$, and $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} \{\alpha \in E : T_{\alpha,i,n} \subseteq X_{i,n}, \text{ for both } i \in 2\}$ is stationary whenever $\{X_{i,n} : i \in 2, n \in \omega\}$ is a collection of unbounded subsets of κ^+ . □

6. Lemma. *If $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+}(E, 2)$, then $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+ \times \kappa^+}(E, 2)$ and $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+}^\cap(E, 2)$.*

PROOF: Let $\{R_{\alpha,i} : \alpha \in E \cap \text{LIM, } i \in 2\}$ be a $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+}(E, 2)$ -sequence. We may assume that $R_{\alpha,0}$ and $R_{\alpha,1}$ are disjoint for all $\alpha \in E \cap \text{LIM}$. Let $f : \kappa^+ \rightarrow \kappa^+ \times \kappa^+$ and $g : \kappa^+ \rightarrow \kappa^+ \times \omega$ be any bijections. $F = \{\alpha : f^{\text{“}}\alpha = \alpha \times \alpha\}$ and $G = \{\alpha : g^{\text{“}}\alpha = \alpha \times \omega\}$ are both club in κ^+ .

For α in $E \cap F \cap \text{LIM}$ such that both $f \text{``}R_{\alpha,0}$ and $f \text{``}R_{\alpha,1}$ are cofinal in $\alpha \times \alpha$, define $S_{\alpha,i}$ to be the set $f \text{``}R_{\alpha,i}$. Otherwise, for α in E , let $S_{\alpha,i}$ be an arbitrary sequence cofinal in $\alpha \times \alpha$. It is easy to see that $\{S_{\alpha,i} : S_{\alpha,i} \subseteq \alpha \times \alpha, \alpha \in E \cap \text{LIM}$ and $i \in 2\}$ is a $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+ \times \kappa^+}(E, 2)$ -sequence.

If α is in $E \cap G \cap \text{LIM}$, $i \in 2$ and $n \in \omega$, let $T_{\alpha,i,n}$ be the set $\text{dom}(g \text{``}B_{\alpha,i} \cap (\alpha \times \{n\}))$. Otherwise, for α in E , let $T_{\alpha,i,n}$ be arbitrary.

To see that $\{T_{\alpha,i,n} : T_{\alpha,i,n} \subseteq \alpha, \alpha \in E \cap \text{LIM}, \text{ and } i \in 2\}$ is a $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+}^\cap(E, 2)$ -sequence, let $\{X_{i,n}\}_{\substack{i \in 2 \\ n \in \omega}}$ be a collection of unbounded subsets of κ^+ , and let $X_i = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} X_{i,n} \times \{n\}$. $S = \{\alpha \in E : R_{\alpha,i} \subseteq g^{-1} \text{``}X_i, i \in 2\}$ is stationary. If α is in S , then $g \text{``}R_{\alpha,i}$ is a subset of X_i and hence S is a subset of $\bigcap \{\alpha \in E : T_{\alpha,i,n} \subseteq X_{i,n}, i \in 2\}$. \square

Our construction is similar to that used by Bešlagić in [B1]. We define three normal topologies, $\mathcal{T}_i, i \in 3$, on the point set $Y = \kappa^+ \times \omega$. The topologies \mathcal{T}_0 and \mathcal{T}_1 both refine \mathcal{T}_2 , which is a Hausdorff topology, hence the diagonal Δ of $(Y, \mathcal{T}_0) \times (Y, \mathcal{T}_1)$ is a closed subspace of X^2 . Our space X is the disjoint topological sum of (Y, \mathcal{T}_0) and (Y, \mathcal{T}_1) . $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+ \times \kappa^+}(E, 2)$ helps to ensure that the product X^2 is normal, and that Δ is a Dowker space. Since Δ is closed in X^2 , X^2 is also a Dowker space. We use $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+}^\cap(E, 2)$ to ensure that $(Y, \mathcal{T}_i), i \in 2$ is countably paracompact (cf §5 [B1]).

7. Example. $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+}(E, 2)$ *There is a first countable, locally countable, locally compact, strongly zero-dimensional, collectionwise normal, countably paracompact, scattered space X , whose Tychonoff square is a first countable locally compact, collectionwise normal, scattered Dowker space.*

PROOF: Let Y be the point set $\kappa^+ \times \omega$, let $\pi : Y \rightarrow \kappa^+$ be the natural projection, $\pi((\alpha, n)) = \alpha$, and let $\Pi : Y^2 \rightarrow \kappa^{+2}$ be the natural projection, $\Pi((\alpha, n), (\beta, m)) = (\alpha, \beta)$. Let $\{S_{\alpha,i} : S_{\alpha,i} \subseteq \alpha \times \alpha, \alpha \in E \cap \text{LIM}$ and $i \in 2\}$ and $\{T_{\alpha,i,n} : T_{\alpha,i,n} \subseteq \alpha, \alpha \in E \cap \text{LIM}, n \in \omega$ and $i \in 2\}$ be $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+ \times \kappa^+}(E, 2)$ - and $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+}^\cap(E, 2)$ -sequences respectively. Bearing in mind the proof of Lemma 6, it is not hard to see that we may assume that $\bigcup_{i \in 2} (\text{ran } S_{\alpha,i} \cup \text{dom } S_{\alpha,i})$ and $\bigcup_{\substack{i \in 2 \\ n \in \omega}} T_{\alpha,i,n}$ are disjoint for each α in $E \cap \text{LIM}$. We may also assume that each ω -sequence $S_{\alpha,i}$ is strictly increasing in both coordinates.

For each α in $E \cap \text{LIM}$ and each $i \in 2$, partition $S_{\alpha,i}$ into ω disjoint sequences $S_{\alpha,i,n}$, where $n \in \omega$, each cofinal in $\alpha \times \alpha$. Let $B(\alpha, i, n)$ be the sequence $\text{dom } S_{\alpha,i,n} \cup \text{ran } S_{\alpha,i,n}$. For each $n \in \omega$, $B(\alpha, i, n)$ is an ω -sequence, cofinal in α , and the collection $\{B(\alpha, i, n) : \alpha \in E \cap \text{LIM}, i \in 2\}$ is a $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+}(E, 2)$ -sequence. Since $S_{\alpha,i}$ is strictly increasing in both coordinates, $B(\alpha, i, n)$ and $B(\alpha, i, m)$ are disjoint whenever $n \neq m$. Let $B(\alpha, n) = B(\alpha, 0, n) \cup B(\alpha, 1, n)$ and let $B(\alpha) = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} B(\alpha, n)$. Enumerate the ω -sequence $B(\alpha)$ increasingly as $\{\beta(\alpha, j) : j \in \omega\}$.

For $i \in 2$ let $C(\alpha, i, n) = T_{\alpha,i,n}$ and let $C(\alpha, 2, n) = C(\alpha, 0, n) \cup C(\alpha, 1, n)$. Let $C(\alpha) = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} C(\alpha, 2, n)$. Enumerate the ω -sequence $C(\alpha)$ increasingly as $\{\gamma(\alpha, j) : j \in \omega\}$.

By assumption $B(\alpha)$ and $C(\alpha)$ are disjoint for all α in $E \cap \text{LIM}$. Let $A(\alpha) = B(\alpha) \cup C(\alpha)$ and index $A(\alpha)$ increasingly as $\{\alpha(k) : k \in \omega\}$.

We define the topologies \mathcal{T}_i by induction on the lexicographical order on $\kappa^+ \times \omega$. At each stage of the induction (α, n) , and for each $i \in 3$, we define a topology $\mathcal{T}_{i,\alpha}$ on $Y_\alpha = \alpha \times \omega$ and then a neighbourhood base $\mathcal{N}_i(\alpha, n) = \{N_i((\alpha, n), k)\}_{k \in \omega}$ at the point (α, n) . Our inductive hypotheses are, for $\gamma < \beta < \alpha$ and $i \in 3$:

- (1) $\mathcal{T}_{i,\beta}$ is a Hausdorff, conservative extension of $\mathcal{T}_{i,\gamma}$, and $Y_{\gamma+1}$ is a $\mathcal{T}_{i,\beta}$ -clopen subset of Y_β ;
- (2) $\mathcal{N}_i(\gamma, k)$ is a decreasing neighbourhood base of sets which are clopen, compact and countable under $\mathcal{T}_{i,\beta}$, and are subsets of $Y_{\gamma+1}$;
- (3) $N_i((\beta, n), k)$ and $N_i((\beta, m), k)$ are disjoint whenever $n \neq m$;
- (4) $N_0((\beta, n), k) \cup N_1((\beta, n), k)$ is a subset of $N_2((\beta, n), k)$ for all $k \in \omega$;
- (5) if $\delta(n, k) = \inf\{\pi^*N_i((\alpha, n), k)\}$, then, for all $n \in \omega$, the sequence $\{\delta(n, k) : k \in \omega\}$ is cofinal in α ;
- (6) for all $0 < r \in \omega$, the point $(\gamma, 0)$ is a $\mathcal{T}_{0,\beta}$ -limit of each sequence $C(\gamma, 0, r) \times \{r\}$, a $\mathcal{T}_{1,\beta}$ -limit of each sequence $C(\gamma, 1, r) \times \{r\}$, and a $\mathcal{T}_{2,\beta}$ -limit of both sequences;
- (7) if $N_0 \in \mathcal{N}_0(\beta, 0)$ and $N_1 \in \mathcal{N}_1(\beta, 0)$, then $N_0 \cap N_1 = \{(\beta, 0)\}$;
- (8) for all $0 \leq p \leq m$, the point $(\beta, m+1)$ is a \mathcal{T}_i -limit of the sequence $B(\alpha, m) \times \{p\}$.

If $\alpha = 0$, let $\mathcal{T}_{i,0} = \emptyset$ and let $\mathcal{N}_i(0, n) = \{\{(0, n)\}\}$ for each $i \in 3$. Suppose that we have defined $\mathcal{N}_i(\beta, k)$ for each $i \in 3$, all $\beta \in \alpha$ and all $k \in \omega$. Define $\mathcal{T}_{i,\alpha}$ to be the topology generated by $\bigcup\{\mathcal{N}_i(\beta, k) : k \in \omega, \beta < \alpha\}$.

If $\alpha = \beta + 1$ for some β , or α is not in E , then we declare the point (α, n) to be isolated and define $\mathcal{N}_i(\alpha, n)$ to be $\{\{(\alpha, n)\}\}$ for each $i \in 3$.

Now suppose that α is a limit ordinal in E .

First let us suppose that $n = 0$. The sequence $C(\alpha)$ is enumerated as $\{\gamma(\alpha, j) : j \in \omega\}$. Each $\gamma(\alpha, j)$ in $C(\alpha)$ occurs uniquely in T_{α, i_j, r_j} for some $i_j \in 2$ and some $r_j \in \omega$, and is indexed as $\alpha(k_j)$ in $A(\alpha)$. By inductive hypotheses (4) and (5), whenever $r_j > 0$, we can choose a basic open set $N_2(\gamma(\alpha, j), r_j)$ from $\mathcal{N}_2(\gamma(\alpha, j), r_j)$ such that

- (†) $\pi^*N_2(\gamma(\alpha, j), r_j)$ is a subset of the interval $(\alpha(k_j - 1), \alpha(k_j)]$ in κ^+ (by (5)).

For $i \in 3$, and each $k \in \omega$, define

$$N_i((\alpha, 0), k) = \{(\alpha, 0)\} \cup \bigcup\{N_2(\gamma(\alpha, j), r_j) : \gamma(\alpha, j) \in C(\alpha, i, r_j), r_j > 0, j > k\}.$$

Now suppose that $n = m+1$ for some $m \in \omega$. The sequence $B(\alpha)$ is enumerated as $\{\beta(\alpha, j) : j \in \omega\}$, and each $\beta(\alpha, j)$ occurs uniquely in some $B(\alpha, r_j)$, and is indexed in $A(\alpha)$ as $\alpha(k_j)$. By (4), (5) and the fact that $\mathcal{T}_{2,\alpha}$ is Hausdorff, for each $\beta(\alpha, r_j)$ such that $r_j = m$ and for each $p \leq r_j$, we can choose disjoint basic open neighbourhoods $N_i(\beta(\alpha, j), p)$ from $\mathcal{N}_i(\beta(\alpha, j), p)$, $i \in 3$ of the point $(\beta(\alpha, j), p)$ such that $N_i(\beta(\alpha, j), p)$ is a subset of $N_2(\beta(\alpha, j), p)$, for each $i \in 2$, and

- (‡) $\pi^*N_i(\beta(\alpha, j), p)$ is a subset of the interval $(\alpha(k_j - 1), \alpha(k_j)]$ in κ^+ .

For $i \in 3$, and each $k \in \omega$, define

$$N_i((\alpha, n), k) = \{(\alpha, n)\} \cup \bigcup \{N_i(\beta(\alpha, j), p) : \beta(\alpha, j) \in B(\alpha, m), p \leq m, \text{ and } j > k\}.$$

It is not hard to check that the inductive hypotheses hold.

Let \mathcal{T}_i be the topology generated by $\bigcup_{(\alpha, n) \in Y} N_i(\alpha, n)$.

Clearly both \mathcal{T}_0 and \mathcal{T}_1 refine \mathcal{T}_2 , and it is not hard to check that each (Y, \mathcal{T}_i) is Hausdorff. Moreover, in each of these topologies, a point (α, n) of Y is either isolated or has a neighbourhood homeomorphic to the ordinal space $\omega^m + 1$, for some $m \leq n$. Therefore, for each $i \in 3$, (Y, \mathcal{T}_i) is regular, first countable, locally countable, locally compact, zero-dimensional and locally metrizable.

Claim 1. *For each $i \in 3$ and all $\alpha \in \kappa^+$, the subspace $Y_\alpha = \alpha \times \omega$ of (Y, \mathcal{T}_i) is metrizable.*

PROOF OF CLAIM 1: Fix $i \in 3$. The proof is by induction, so assume that Y_β is metrizable for all $\beta \in \alpha$.

Since E is a non-reflecting stationary set, each of whose elements has countable cofinality, if α is a limit ordinal (either in E or not), or $\alpha \leq \omega_1$, then there is a sequence $\{\alpha_\gamma : \gamma \in \theta \leq \alpha\}$, which is both closed, cofinal in α , and disjoint from E . But then

$$\{(\alpha_\gamma, \alpha_{\gamma+1}) \times \omega : \gamma \in \theta\} \cup \bigcup \{ \{\alpha_\gamma\} \times \omega : \gamma \in \theta \}$$

partitions Y_α into disjoint, clopen, metrizable subsets.

Now suppose that $\alpha = \beta + 1$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that β is a limit ordinal. If β is not in E , then the two sets Y_β and $\{(\beta, n) : n \in \omega\}$ partition Y_α into disjoint, clopen, metrizable sets, and we are done. Assume that β is an element of E . By construction, $\{N_j\}_{j \in \omega}$, where $N_j = N_i((\beta, j), 1) \in \mathcal{N}_i(\beta, j)$, forms a disjoint collection of clopen, metrizable subsets of Y_α . Furthermore, by \dagger and \ddagger , if x_j is any point of N_j , then the set $\{\pi(x_j)\}_{j \in \omega}$ forms an ω -sequence, cofinal in β (though not necessarily indexed in increasing order), so the only possible limit point of the sequence $\{x_j\}_{j \in \omega}$ is (β, k) for some k in ω , which is impossible. Therefore $\{N_j\}_{j \in \omega}$ is a discrete collection of countable, clopen sets. But now $N = \bigcup_{j \in \omega} N_j$ and $Z = Y_\alpha - N$ partition Y_α into disjoint, clopen, metrizable subspaces, and again Y_α is metrizable. \square

Claim 2. *Fix $i \in 3$. If H is a subset of (Y, \mathcal{T}_i) of size κ^+ , then H has a limit point, and, if C and D are closed subsets of (Y, \mathcal{T}_i) , both of size κ^+ , then C and D are not disjoint.*

PROOF OF CLAIM 2: For any subset A of Y let $A(n) = A \cap (\kappa^+ \times \{n\})$.

Suppose that H has size κ^+ , then $H(n)$ also has size κ^+ for some $n \in \omega$. By $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+ \times \kappa^+}(E, 2)$, $B(\alpha, n) \times \{n\}$ is contained in $H(n)$, for some α in E , so H has

$(\alpha, n + 1)$ as a limit point in $\kappa^+ \times \{n + 1\}$. In fact, since κ^+ is a regular cardinal, H has κ^+ limit points in $\kappa^+ \times \{n + 1\}$.

Now let C and D be closed subsets of (Y, \mathcal{T}_i) of cardinality κ^+ . From the previous paragraph it is clear that $|C(n)| = |D(n)| = \kappa^+$, for some n . By $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+ \times \kappa^+}(E, 2)$, there is an α in E for which both $B(\alpha, 0, n) \times \{n\}$ is a subset of $C(n)$, and $B(\alpha, 1, n) \times \{n\}$ is a subset of $D(n)$, so C and D have a common limit point. \square

For each $i \in 3$, the (strong) collectionwise normality of (Y, \mathcal{T}_i) is immediate from Claims 1 and 2: Let \mathcal{D} be a discrete collection of closed sets. By Claim 2, \mathcal{D} has size less than κ^+ and there is some successor α such that Y_α contains all but at most one of the sets in \mathcal{D} . Since Y_α is clopen and metrizable we are done.

The strong zero-dimensionality of (Y, \mathcal{T}_i) also follows from Claims 1 and 2: Suppose that A and B are subsets of Y which are completely separated by the function $f : (Y, \mathcal{T}_i) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ in that $f^{\smallfrown}A = \{0\}$ and $f^{\smallfrown}B = \{1\}$. The sets $f^{-1}^{\smallfrown}[0, 1/4]$ and $f^{-1}^{\smallfrown}[3/4, 1]$ are disjoint, closed sets containing A and B respectively, so, as above, there is a successor α such that Y_α contains A , say. Y_α is a metrizable, locally compact, zero-dimensional subspace of Y and is, therefore, strongly zero-dimensional (by 6.2.10 [E]).

Claim 3. (Y, \mathcal{T}_i) is countably paracompact for each $i \in 3$.

PROOF OF CLAIM 3: Fix $i \in 3$. Since (Y, \mathcal{T}_i) is normal it suffices to show that, for every decreasing sequence of closed subsets $\{D_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ of (Y, \mathcal{T}_i) with empty intersection, there is a sequence of open subsets $\{U_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ with empty intersection such that U_n contains D_n .

Let $\{D_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ be such a sequence of closed sets. Suppose that each D_n has size κ^+ , then, with the notation used above, Claim 2 implies that $D_n(k)$ has size κ^+ for all k greater than some $k_n \in \omega$. By relabelling and adding repetitions if necessary, we may assume that $D_n(n)$ has size κ^+ for all n larger than some $n_0 > 0$. Now, by $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+}^{\cap}(E, 2)$,

$$S = \bigcap_{n \in \omega} \{\alpha \in E : T_{\alpha, i, n} \subseteq D_n(n), i \in 2\}$$

is a stationary set, and therefore non-empty. By the construction of the topology \mathcal{T}_i , if α is in S , then $(\alpha, 0)$ is in D_n for all $n \in \omega$, and so $\bigcap D_n$ is not empty—a contradiction.

Pick n_0 such that $|D_n| \leq \kappa$ for all $n \geq n_0$. By Claim 1 there is a successor α such that D_n is a subset of Y_α for $n \geq n_0$. The claim follows since Y_α is clopen and metrizable. We are done. \square

Claim 4. For $i, j \in 2$, $(Y, \mathcal{T}_i) \times (Y, \mathcal{T}_j)$ is normal.

PROOF OF CLAIM 4: Let C and D be disjoint closed subsets of $(Y, \mathcal{T}_i) \times (Y, \mathcal{T}_j)$, and recall that $\Pi : (\kappa^+ \times \omega)^2 \rightarrow \kappa^+ \times \kappa^+$ is the natural projection.

Suppose that both $\Pi^{\text{“}}C$ and $\Pi^{\text{“}}D$ are 2-unbounded in $\kappa^+ \times \kappa^+$. There are integers $m, n, j, k \in \omega$ such that $C_{n,k} = \{(\gamma, \delta) : ((\gamma, n), (\delta, k)) \in C\}$ and $D_{m,j} = \{(\gamma, \delta) : ((\gamma, m), (\delta, j)) \in D\}$ are both 2-unbounded. Let $s = n + m + j + k + 1$, so that s is strictly greater than n, m, j and k . By $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+ \times \kappa^+}(E, 2)$, there is some α in E such that $S_{\alpha,0}$ is a subset of $C_{n,k}$ and $S_{\alpha,1}$ is a subset of $D_{m,j}$. By the definition of the sequence $B(\alpha, 0, s)$

$$C_{n,k} \cap (B_{\alpha,0,s} \times B(\alpha, 0, s))$$

is infinite and cofinal in (α, α) . By the definition of the topologies \mathcal{T}_i and \mathcal{T}_j ,

$$C \cap ((B(\alpha, 0, s) \times \{n\}) \times (B_{\alpha,0,s} \times \{k\}))$$

is cofinal in $((\alpha, s), (\alpha, s))$, which is therefore a limit point of C . Similarly $((\alpha, s), (\alpha, s))$ is a limit point of D , and C and D are not disjoint.

So suppose that $\Pi^{\text{“}}C$ is not 2-unbounded. Choose γ not in E such that C is a subset of

$$K = ((\gamma \times \omega) \times (\kappa^+ \times \omega)) \cup ((\kappa^+ \times \omega) \times (\gamma \times \omega)).$$

Since γ is not in E , K is a clopen subset of $(Y, \mathcal{T}_i) \times (Y, \mathcal{T}_j)$. Since E is a non-reflecting stationary set, there is a club set H of γ , enumerated as $\{\gamma_\lambda : \lambda \in \theta \leq \gamma\}$, which misses E and such that $G_\lambda = \{\alpha : \gamma_\lambda < \alpha < \gamma_{\lambda+1}\}$ is countable. Now $\{\{\gamma_\lambda\} \times \omega\}_{\lambda \in \theta} \cup \{G_\lambda \times \omega\}_{\lambda \in \theta}$ partitions Y_γ into countable, metrizable, \mathcal{T}_i -clopen subsets of Y , for $i = 0$ or 1 . Lemma 2.8 of [B1] states that, for normal, countably paracompact space X and a countable metric space M , $X \times M$ is normal. It is easy to see, then, that K is normal. Since K is clopen, $(Y, \mathcal{T}_i) \times (Y, \mathcal{T}_j)$ is now, itself, seen to be normal—proving the claim. \square

The proof that $(Y, \mathcal{T}_i) \times (Y, \mathcal{T}_j)$ is collectionwise normal is similar.

Now, let X be the disjoint topological sum of (Y, \mathcal{T}_0) and (Y, \mathcal{T}_1) . From the above, it is clear that X satisfies the properties listed in the statement of the Theorem 1, except that it remains to show that X^2 is not countably paracompact:

Claim 5. *The closed subspace $\Delta = \{((\alpha, n), (\alpha, n)) : \alpha \in \kappa^+, n \in \omega\}$ of $(Y, \mathcal{T}_0) \times (Y, \mathcal{T}_1)$ is not countably metacompact.*

PROOF OF CLAIM 5: Let $D_n = \{((\alpha, j), (\alpha, j)) : \alpha \in \kappa^+, j \geq n\}$, and let U_n be any open subset of Δ containing D_n . $\{D_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ is a decreasing sequence of closed subsets of Δ with empty intersection, so it is enough to show that $\bigcap U_n$ is non-empty.

Notice that, since the sequences $C(\alpha, 0)$ and $C(\alpha, 1)$ are disjoint, the point $((\alpha, 0), (\alpha, 0))$ is isolated for each $\alpha \in \kappa^+$ (by hypothesis (7)). However, if α is a limit in E , then $(\alpha, n + 1)$ is both a \mathcal{T}_0 - and a \mathcal{T}_1 -limit of the sequence $B(\alpha, n) \times \{n\}$. So, as $\{B(\alpha, i, n)\}_{i \in \mathbb{2}}$ is a $\clubsuit_{\kappa^+}(E, 2)$ -sequence, the proof of Claim 2 is, almost verbatim, a proof of:

* If H is a subset of Δ of size κ^+ , then H has a limit point in Δ , and, if C and D are closed subsets of Δ , both of size κ^+ , then C and D are not disjoint.

D_n and $\Delta - U_n$ are disjoint closed subsets. D_n has cardinality κ^+ , so, by *, $|\Delta - U_n| \leq \kappa$. Hence $|\bigcap_{n \in \omega} U_n| = \kappa^+$ and in particular Δ is not countably metacompact. This completes the proof of the Theorem. \square

REFERENCES

- [B1] Bešliagić A., *A Dowker product*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **292** (1985), 519–530.
- [B2] ———, *Another Dowker product*, Top. Appl. **36** (1990), 553–264.
- [B3] ———, *Yet another Dowker product*, preprint.
- [Dv] Devlin K., *Constructability*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1984.
- [DJ] Dodd A.J., Jensen R., *The covering lemma for K* , Ann. Math. Logic **22** (1982), 1–30.
- [Dk] Dowker C.H., *On countably paracompact spaces*, Canad. J. Math. **3** (1951), 219–224.
- [E] Engelking R., *General Topology*, Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [F] Fleissner W.G., *The normal Moore space conjecture and large cardinals*, in: [KV], 733–760.
- [G] Good C., *Large cardinals and small Dowker spaces*, to appear in Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.
- [K] Kunen K., *Set Theory, An Introduction to Independence Proofs*, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.
- [KV] Kunen K., Vaughan J.E. eds., *Handbook of Set-Theoretic Topology*, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.
- [R] Rudin M.E., *Dowker spaces*, in: [KV], 761–780.
- [RS] Rudin M.E., Starbird M., *Products with a metric factor*, Gen. Top. Appl. **5**, 235–248.

WADHAM COLLEGE, OXFORD, UK

E-mail: cgood@maths.ox.ac.uk

(Received November 15, 1993)