

Foreman constructed an amenable discrete group with a unique amenable action on the integers assuming  $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{c}$ . This note will modify his construction to yield an amenable topological group with a unique amenable action on the integers without any additional set theoretic assumptions (thus answering a question of Pestov?).

Let  $\{\xi_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$  enumerate all finite one-to-one function from  $\mathbb{N}$  to  $\mathbb{N}$ . For any partial partial involution  $\sigma$  let  $\bar{\sigma}$  denote the permutation that agrees with  $\sigma$  on its domain and is the identity elsewhere, Construct by induction on  $n$  sets  $\{A_n^j\}_{j=0}^\infty$  and involutions  $\sigma_n^j : A_n^j \rightarrow A_n^{j+1}$  such that

- (1)  $\mathbb{N} \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^n \bigcup_{j=0}^J A_i^j$  is infinite for each  $J$
- (2)  $A_n^j \cap A_n^k = \emptyset$  of  $j \neq k$ .
- (3) If  $A_n = \bigcup_{j=1}^\infty A_n^j$  then  $A_n \cap A_m^j$  is finite for  $m < n$  and all  $j$ .
- (4) If there are  $\{B^j\}_{j=0}^\infty$  such that setting  $A_n^j = B^j$  yields that (1), (2) and (3) hold and if for some  $j$  there is an involution  $\theta : B^j \rightarrow B^{j+1}$  such that  $\xi_n \subseteq \bar{\theta}$  then  $\xi_n \subseteq \bar{\sigma}_n^j$ .

Let  $\mathbb{A}$  be the group generated by  $\{\bar{\sigma}_n^j\}_{n,j \in \omega}$ .

Extend the ideal generated by  $\{A_n^j\}_{n,j \in \omega}$  to a maximal ideal  $\mathcal{J}$  and for each  $X \in \mathcal{J}$  choose  $A_X$  such that  $A_X \cap X = \emptyset$  and  $A_X \cap A_n^j$  is finite for all  $n$  and  $j$ . This is possible because  $\{A_n^j \setminus X \mid n, j \in \omega\}$  generates a proper ideal on the complement of  $X$ . Let  $\{A_X^j\}_{j=1}^\infty$  partition  $A_X$  into infinite sets and choose  $\theta_X^j : A_X^j \rightarrow A_X^{j+1}$  to be involutions. Let  $\mathbb{G}$  be the group generated by  $\mathbb{A} \cup \{\bar{\theta}_X^j\}_{X \in \mathcal{J}, j \in \omega}$ . Let  $\mathbb{G}$  inherit the topology of pointwise convergence from the full symmetric group.

**Claim 1.**  $\mathbb{A}$  is dense in  $\mathbb{G}$ .

*Proof.* It suffices to show that a generating set for  $\mathbb{G}$  is contained in the closure of  $\mathbb{A}$ . It may be assumed that a given neighbourhood of  $\bar{\theta}_X^j$  is of the form  $[\xi] = \{g \in \mathbb{G} \mid \xi \subseteq g\}$ . Let  $n$  be such that  $\xi = \xi_n$ . Since  $A_X \cap A_n^0$  is finite it follows that letting  $X = B^0$  and  $B^j = A_X^j$  for  $j \geq 1$  yields  $\{B^j\}_{j=0}^\infty$  such that setting  $A_n^j = B^j$  yields that (1), (2) and (3) hold. Since  $\xi \subseteq \bar{\theta}_X^j$  it follows that  $\xi_n \subseteq \bar{\sigma}_n^j$ . In other words,  $\bar{\sigma}_n^j \in \mathbb{A}$  belongs to the given neighbourhood of  $\bar{\theta}_X^j$ .  $\square$

**Claim 2.**  $\mathbb{A}$  is amenable,

*Proof.* That  $\mathbb{A}$  is amenable is just Foreman's argument restricted to  $\mathbb{A}$ . In fact,  $\mathbb{A}$  is locally finite. To see this let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a finite subset of  $\{\bar{\sigma}_n^j\}_{n,j \in \omega}$ . Begin by observing that if the group generated by  $\mathcal{F}$  is finite if and only if there is a uniform bound for the size of the orbit  $O_{\mathcal{F}}(n)$  of  $n$  under  $\mathcal{F}$ .

Let  $K$  be the largest integer such that there is some  $j$  such that  $\bar{\sigma}_K^j \in \mathcal{F}$ . Proceed by induction on  $K$  to show that there is a uniform bound for the size of  $O_{\mathcal{F}}(n)$  under  $\mathcal{F}$ . If  $K = 0$  it is easy to see that the size of  $O_{\mathcal{F}}(n)$  is bounded by  $2|\mathcal{F}|$ . Let  $H$  be the group generated by  $\{\bar{\sigma}_K^j\}_{j=0}^\infty \cap \mathcal{F}$ . For  $K \geq 1$  let  $\mathcal{F}^*$  be the set of  $\bar{\sigma}_m^j \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $m < K$  and let  $W = A_K \cap \bigcup \{A_i^j \mid \sigma_i^j \in \mathcal{F}^*\}$ . Then  $W$  is finite and so are  $H(W)$  and  $\mathcal{F}^*(W)$  the orbits of  $W$  under  $H$  and  $\mathcal{F}^*(W)$ . As well,  $\mathcal{F}^*(H(W))$  is finite. It suffices, therefore, to consider only  $n \notin W \cup \mathcal{F}^*(H(W)) \cup \mathcal{F}^*(W)$ .

It furthermore suffices to show that for any such  $n$ , if  $f$  is in the group generated by  $\mathcal{F}$  then  $f(n) = h_0 f^* h_1(n)$  where  $f^*$  is in the group generated by  $\mathcal{F}^*$  and  $h_0$  and  $h_1$  belong to  $H$ . The reason this suffices is the fact, already noted, that the orbit of an integer under the group  $H$  has size bounded by twice the cardinality of  $H$ . All that needs to be checked now is that if  $h \in H$  and  $\sigma_0 = \bar{\sigma}_{i(0)}^j$  and  $\sigma_1 = \bar{\sigma}_{i(1)}^j$  are in  $\mathcal{F}^*$  then  $\sigma_0 h \sigma_1(n)$  is equal to one of the following:

- $\sigma_0 h(n)$
- $\sigma_0 \sigma_1(n)$
- $h \sigma_1(n)$ .

To see this, first suppose that  $\sigma_1(n) = n$ . Then  $\sigma_0 h \sigma_1(n) = \sigma_0 h(n)$ . Otherwise, it must be that  $\sigma_1(n) \in A_{i(1)}^j$ . Since  $n \notin \mathcal{F}^*(W)$  it must be that  $\sigma_1(n) \notin W$  and, hence,  $\sigma_1(n) \notin A_K$ . This implies

that either  $h(\sigma_1(n)) = \sigma_1(n)$  or  $h(\sigma_1(n)) \in A_K$ . In the first case,  $\sigma_0 h \sigma_1(n) = \sigma_0 \sigma_1(n)$ . In the second, it must be that either  $\sigma_0(h(\sigma_1(n))) = h(\sigma_1(n))$  or  $h(\sigma_1(n)) \in A_{i(0)}^{j(0)}$ . If the first alternative holds, then  $\sigma_0 h \sigma_1(n) = h \sigma_1(n)$ . However, it is not possible that  $h(\sigma_1(n)) \in A_{i(0)}^{j(0)}$  because this would imply that  $h(\sigma_1(n)) \in W$  contradicting that  $n \notin \sigma_1(H(W))$ .  $\square$

By Fremlin 449Y (ii) a topological group with a dense amenable subgroup is amenable and so, it follows from Claims 1 and 2 that  $\mathbb{G}$  is amenable.

**Claim 3.** The natural action of  $\mathbb{G}$  on  $\mathbb{N}$  is uniquely amenable.

*Proof.* Let  $\mu$  be an arbitrary  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant probability measure and suppose that the null sets of  $\mu$  do not coincide with  $\mathcal{J}$ . The maximality of  $\mathcal{J}$  implies that there must be some  $Z \in \mathcal{J}$  such that  $\mu(Z) > 0$ . The sets  $Z, \theta_Z^0, \theta_Z^1 \theta_Z^0, \dots$  are pairwise disjoint contradicting that  $\mu$  is a  $\mathbb{G}$ -invariant probability measure.  $\square$