Some Solutions to Midterm Problems

William Gasarch-U of MD

Problem 2

Prove the following and fill in the $f(k)$.

Thm For all k there exists $n = f(k)$ such that the following holds.

For all pairs of colorings:

$\mathrm{COL}_1 \colon \binom{[n]}{1} \rightarrow [2]$,

$\mathrm{COL}_2 \colon \binom{[n]}{2} \rightarrow [2]$

$(\exists H \subseteq [n])(\exists c_1, c_2 \in \{1, 2\})$ such that

Problem 2

Prove the following and fill in the $f(k)$.
Thm For all k there exists $n = f(k)$ such that the following holds.
For all pairs of colorings:
$\mathrm{COL}_1 : \binom{[n]}{1} \rightarrow [2]$,
$\mathrm{COL}_2 : \binom{[n]}{2} \rightarrow [2]$
$(\exists H \subseteq [n])(\exists c_1, c_2 \in \{1, 2\})$ such that

- H is of size k,

Problem 2

Prove the following and fill in the $f(k)$.

Thm For all k there exists $n = f(k)$ such that the following holds.

For all pairs of colorings:

$\mathrm{COL}_1\colon \binom{[n]}{1} \to [2]$,

$\mathrm{COL}_2\colon \binom{[n]}{2} \to [2]$

$(\exists H \subseteq [n])(\exists c_1, c_2 \in \{1, 2\})$ such that

- H is of size k,
- every element of H is colored c_1, and

Problem 2

Prove the following and fill in the $f(k)$.
Thm For all k there exists $n = f(k)$ such that the following holds.
For all pairs of colorings:
$\mathrm{COL}_1 \colon \binom{[n]}{1} \to [2]$,
$\mathrm{COL}_2 \colon \binom{[n]}{2} \to [2]$
$(\exists H \subseteq [n])(\exists c_1, c_2 \in \{1, 2\})$ such that

- H is of size k,
- every element of H is colored c_1, and
- every element of $\binom{H}{2}$ is colored c_2.

Problem 2 Solution

$\mathrm{COL}_1 \colon \binom{[n]}{1} \to [2]$,

$\mathrm{COL}_2 \colon \binom{[n]}{2} \to [2]$. We do the following.

Problem 2 Solution

$\mathrm{COL}_1 \colon \binom{[n]}{1} \to [2]$,

$\mathrm{COL}_2 \colon \binom{[n]}{2} \to [2]$. We do the following.

We determine n later.

Problem 2 Solution

$\mathrm{COL}_1 \colon \binom{[n]}{1} \rightarrow [2]$,

$\mathrm{COL}_2 \colon \binom{[n]}{2} \rightarrow [2]$. We do the following.

We determine n later.

By 1-ary Ramsey $(\exists H_1)[|H_1| \geq \frac{n}{2}]$, COL_1 on H_1 is color c_1.

Problem 2 Solution

$\mathrm{COL}_1 \colon \binom{[n]}{1} \rightarrow [2]$,

$\mathrm{COL}_2 \colon \binom{[n]}{2} \rightarrow [2]$. We do the following.

We determine n later.

By 1-ary Ramsey $(\exists H_1)[|H_1| \ge \frac{n}{2}]$, COL_1 on H_1 is color c_1.

We apply 2-ary Ramsey. We showed in class:

Problem 2 Solution

$\mathrm{COL}_1 \colon \binom{[n]}{1} \rightarrow [2]$,

$\mathrm{COL}_2 \colon \binom{[n]}{2} \rightarrow [2]$. We do the following.

We determine n later.

By 1-ary Ramsey $(\exists H_1)[|H_1| \ge \frac{n}{2}]$, COL_1 on H_1 is color c_1.

We apply 2-ary Ramsey. We showed in class:

$$(\forall \mathrm{COL} : \binom{2^{2k}}{2} \rightarrow [2])(\exists H)[H \text{ Homog } |H| \ge k].$$

Problem 2 Solution

$\mathrm{COL}_1 \colon \binom{[n]}{1} \rightarrow [2]$,

$\mathrm{COL}_2 \colon \binom{[n]}{2} \rightarrow [2]$. We do the following.

We determine n later.

By 1-ary Ramsey $(\exists H_1)[|H_1| \ge \frac{n}{2}]$, COL_1 on H_1 is color c_1.

We apply 2-ary Ramsey. We showed in class:

$$(\forall \mathrm{COL} : \binom{2^{2k}}{2} \rightarrow [2])(\exists H)[H \text{ Homog } |H| \ge k].$$

We turn this around:

Problem 2 Solution

$\mathrm{COL}_1\colon \binom{[n]}{1} \rightarrow [2]$,

$\mathrm{COL}_2\colon \binom{[n]}{2} \rightarrow [2]$. We do the following.

We determine n later.

By 1-ary Ramsey $(\exists H_1)[|H_1| \ge \frac{n}{2}]$, COL_1 on H_1 is color c_1.

We apply 2-ary Ramsey. We showed in class:

$$(\forall \mathrm{COL} : \binom{2^{2k}}{2} \rightarrow [2])(\exists H)[H \text{ Homog } |H| \ge k].$$

We turn this around:

$$(\forall \mathrm{COL} : \binom{m}{2} \rightarrow [2])(\exists H)[H \text{ Homog } |H| \ge 0.5 \log_2(m)].$$

Problem 2 Solution

$\mathrm{COL}_1 : \binom{[n]}{1} \to [2]$,

$\mathrm{COL}_2 : \binom{[n]}{2} \to [2]$. We do the following.

We determine n later.

By 1-ary Ramsey $(\exists H_1)[|H_1| \ge \frac{n}{2}]$, COL_1 on H_1 is color c_1.

We apply 2-ary Ramsey. We showed in class:

$$(\forall \mathrm{COL} : \binom{2^{2k}}{2} \to [2])(\exists H)[H \text{ Homog } |H| \ge k].$$

We turn this around:

$$(\forall \mathrm{COL} : \binom{m}{2} \to [2])(\exists H)[H \text{ Homog } |H| \ge 0.5 \log_2(m)].$$

Restrict COL to $\binom{H_1}{2}$. Get: $|H| \ge 0.5 \log_2(|H_1|) = 0.5 \log_2(\frac{n}{2})$.

Problem 2 Solution

$\mathrm{COL}_1 : \binom{[n]}{1} \rightarrow [2]$,

$\mathrm{COL}_2 : \binom{[n]}{2} \rightarrow [2]$. We do the following.

We determine n later.

By 1-ary Ramsey $(\exists H_1)[|H_1| \ge \frac{n}{2}]$, COL_1 on H_1 is color c_1.

We apply 2-ary Ramsey. We showed in class:

$$(\forall \mathrm{COL} : \binom{2^{2k}}{2} \rightarrow [2])(\exists H)[H \text{ Homog } |H| \ge k].$$

We turn this around:

$$(\forall \mathrm{COL} : \binom{m}{2} \rightarrow [2])(\exists H)[H \text{ Homog } |H| \ge 0.5 \log_2(m)].$$

Restrict COL to $\binom{H_1}{2}$. Get: $|H| \ge 0.5 \log_2(|H_1|) = 0.5 \log_2(\frac{n}{2})$.
Need $0.5 \log_2(\frac{n}{2}) \ge k$. Take $n = 2^{2k+1}$

Problem 2. Why Important?

In the lang of graphs $(E(x, y))$ the question:

Problem 2. Why Important?

In the lang of graphs $(E(x, y))$ the question:
Given an E^*A^* statement ϕ, find $\mathrm{spec}(\phi)$
is decidable.

Problem 2. Why Important?

In the lang of graphs ($E(x, y)$) the question:
Given an E^*A^* statement ϕ, find $\mathrm{spec}(\phi)$
is decidable.
And $\mathrm{spec}(\phi)$ is always finite or cofinite.

Problem 2. Why Important?

In the lang of graphs ($E(x, y)$) the question:
Given an E^*A^* statement ϕ, find $\mathrm{spec}(\phi)$
is decidable.
And $\mathrm{spec}(\phi)$ is always finite or cofinite.

Key Make the set Y **very homog** by making every element in Y have the same relation to every $u \in U$ and to each other.

Problem 2. Why Important?

In the lang of graphs $(E(x, y))$ the question:
Given an E^*A^* statement ϕ, find $\mathrm{spec}(\phi)$
is decidable.
And $\mathrm{spec}(\phi)$ is always finite or cofinite.

Key Make the set Y **very homog** by making every element in Y have the same relation to every $u \in U$ and to each other.

What if we added a unary predicate to the lang. So every element is colored RED or BLUE. Then we would need to **also** make every element of Y the same color.

Problem 2. Why Important?

In the lang of graphs ($E(x, y)$) the question:
Given an E^*A^* statement ϕ, find $\mathrm{spec}(\phi)$
is decidable.
And $\mathrm{spec}(\phi)$ is always finite or cofinite.

Key Make the set Y **very homog** by making every element in Y have the same relation to every $u \in U$ and to each other.

What if we added a unary predicate to the lang. So every element is colored RED or BLUE. Then we would need to **also** make every element of Y the same color.

This problem showed that YES we can do BOTH- make every element of Y the same color AND make every pair of elements of Y the same color.

Problem 2. Why Important?

We have the following:
Language is 2-col graphs ($E_1(x)$ and $E_2(x, y)$) the question:

Problem 2. Why Important?

We have the following:
Language is 2-col graphs ($E_1(x)$ and $E_2(x, y)$) the question:
Given an E^*A^* statement ϕ, find $\mathrm{spec}(\phi)$
is decidable.

Problem 2. Why Important?

We have the following:
Language is 2-col graphs ($E_1(x)$ and $E_2(x,y)$) the question:
Given an E^*A^* statement ϕ, find $\mathrm{spec}(\phi)$
is decidable.
And $\mathrm{spec}(\phi)$ is always finite or cofinite.

Problem 2. Why Important?

By iterating Ramsey to get the following theorem.

Problem 2. Why Important?

By iterating Ramsey to get the following theorem.
In the lang of any finite set of relations ($E_{11}(x)$, $E_{12}(x)$, ..., $E_{1k_1}(x)$,
$E_{21}(x_1, x_2)$, $E_{k2}(x_1, x_2)$, ..., $E_{2k_2}(x_1, x_2)$,
$\vdots$
$E_{m1}(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, $E_{m2}(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, ..., $E_{mk_m}(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$)

Problem 2. Why Important?

By iterating Ramsey to get the following theorem.
In the lang of any finite set of relations ($E_{11}(x)$, $E_{12}(x)$, ..., $E_{1k_1}(x)$,
$E_{21}(x_1, x_2)$, $E_{k2}(x_1, x_2)$, ..., $E_{2k_2}(x_1, x_2)$,
$\vdots$
$E_{m1}(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, $E_{m2}(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, ..., $E_{mk_m}(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$)
the question:
Given an E^*A^* statement ϕ, find *spec*(ϕ)
is decidable.

Problem 2. Why Important?

By iterating Ramsey to get the following theorem.
In the lang of any finite set of relations ($E_{11}(x)$, $E_{12}(x)$, …, $E_{1k_1}(x)$,
$E_{21}(x_1, x_2)$, $E_{k2}(x_1, x_2)$, …, $E_{2k_2}(x_1, x_2)$,
$\vdots$
$E_{m1}(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, $E_{m2}(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, …, $E_{mk_m}(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$)
the question:
Given an E^*A^* statement ϕ, find *spec*(ϕ)
is decidable.
And $\mathrm{spec}(\phi)$ is always finite or cofinite.

Problem 2. Why Important?

By iterating Ramsey to get the following theorem.
In the lang of any finite set of relations ($E_{11}(x)$, $E_{12}(x)$, …,
$E_{1k_1}(x)$,
$E_{21}(x_1, x_2)$, $E_{k2}(x_1, x_2)$, …, $E_{2k_2}(x_1, x_2)$,
$\vdots$
$E_{m1}(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, $E_{m2}(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, …, $E_{mk_m}(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$)
the question:
Given an E^*A^* statement ϕ, find *spec*(ϕ)
is decidable.
And $\mathrm{spec}(\phi)$ is always finite or cofinite.

This is what Ramsey proved in his paper.

Problem 3

Let T be the set of trees and $\preceq$ be the minor ordering. Show that $(T, \preceq)$ is a wqo.

Problem 3

Let T be the set of trees and $\preceq$ be the minor ordering. Show that $(T, \preceq)$ is a wqo.

You may use any theorem that was PROVEN in class or on the HW. (Note that we DID NOT prove the Graph Minor Theorem, so you can't use that.)

Problem 3. Form a Minimal Bad Sequence

Assume that there exists a bad seq.

Problem 3. Form a Minimal Bad Sequence

Assume that there exists a bad seq.

Let T_1 be the smallest tree that begins a bad seq. KILL.

Problem 3. Form a Minimal Bad Sequence

Assume that there exists a bad seq.

Let T_1 be the smallest tree that begins a bad seq. KILL.

Let T_2 be the smallest tree that begins a bad seq that begins T_1. KILL.

$\vdots$

Problem 3. Form a Minimal Bad Sequence

Assume that there exists a bad seq.

Let T_1 be the smallest tree that begins a bad seq. KILL.

Let T_2 be the smallest tree that begins a bad seq that begins T_1. KILL.

$\vdots$

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots$$

is called a minimal bad seq.

Problem 3. Form a Minimal Bad Sequence

Assume that there exists a bad seq.

Let T_1 be the smallest tree that begins a bad seq. KILL.

Let T_2 be the smallest tree that begins a bad seq that begins T_1. KILL.

⋮

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots$$

is called a minimal bad seq.

$(\forall i)$ take T_i and rm root to get **finite set** of trees $T_{i1}, \ldots, T_{ik_i}$.

Problem 3. Form a Minimal Bad Sequence

Assume that there exists a bad seq.

Let T_1 be the smallest tree that begins a bad seq. KILL.

Let T_2 be the smallest tree that begins a bad seq that begins T_1. KILL.

$\vdots$

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots$$

is called a minimal bad seq.

$(\forall i)$ take T_i and rm root to get **finite set** of trees $T_{i1}, \ldots, T_{ik_i}$.

Let

$$X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{T_{i1}, \ldots, T_{ik_i}\}$$

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{T_{i1}, \ldots, T_{ik_i}\}$$

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{T_{i1}, \ldots, T_{ik_i}\}$$

Assume not. Then $\exists$ bad seq.

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{T_{i1}, \ldots, T_{ik_i}\}$$

Assume not. Then $\exists$ bad seq. Say it begins $T_{i_1 j_1}$.

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{T_{i1}, \ldots, T_{ik_i}\}$$

Assume not. Then $\exists$ bad seq. Say it begins $T_{i_1 j_1}$.
We can assume i_1 is smallest numb that appears as a 1st index.

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{T_{i1}, \ldots, T_{ik_i}\}$$

Assume not. Then $\exists$ bad seq. Say it begins $T_{i_1 j_1}$.
We can assume i_1 is smallest numb that appears as a 1st index.

$$T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \ \text{(We have } i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{T_{i1}, \ldots, T_{ik_i}\}$$

Assume not. Then $\exists$ bad seq. Say it begins $T_{i_1 j_1}$.
We can assume i_1 is smallest numb that appears as a 1st index.

$$T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \quad \text{(We have } i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

we PREPEND $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ to the seq to get

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{T_{i1}, \ldots, T_{ik_i}\}$$

Assume not. Then $\exists$ bad seq. Say it begins $T_{i_1 j_1}$.
We can assume i_1 is smallest numb that appears as a 1st index.

$$T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \quad \text{(We have } i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

we PREPEND $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ to the seq to get

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}, T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \quad (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{T_{i1}, \ldots, T_{ik_i}\}$$

Assume not. Then $\exists$ bad seq. Say it begins $T_{i_1 j_1}$.
We can assume i_1 is smallest numb that appears as a 1st index.

$$T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \quad \text{(We have } i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

we PREPEND $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ to the seq to get

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}, T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \quad (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

For the rest goto the next slide.

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$(*) \quad T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \; (i_1 \leq i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$(*) \quad T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \ (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

we PREPEND $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ to the seq to get

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$(*) \quad T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \; (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

we PREPEND $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ to the seq to get

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_{i_1-1}, T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \; (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$(*) \quad T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \; (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

we PREPEND $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ to the seq to get

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_{i_1-1}, T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \; (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

Claim This is a **bad seq**.

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$(*) \quad T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \ (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

we PREPEND $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ to the seq to get

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}, T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \ (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

Claim This is a **bad seq**.
a) NO uptick within $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ since $T_1, T_2, \ldots$ is Bad Seq.

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$(*) \quad T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \; (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

we PREPEND $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ to the seq to get

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}, T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \; (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

Claim This is a **bad seq**.

a) NO uptick within $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ since $T_1, T_2, \ldots$ is Bad Seq.

b) NO uptick within $T_{i_1 j_1}, \ldots$ since its a bad seq.

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$(*) \quad T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \ (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

we PREPEND $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ to the seq to get

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}, T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \ (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

Claim This is a **bad seq**.

a) NO uptick within $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ since $T_1, T_2, \ldots$ is Bad Seq.

b) NO uptick within $T_{i_1 j_1}, \ldots$ since its a bad seq.

c) NO uptick $T_i \preceq T_{i_k j_k}$ since $T_i \preceq T_{i_k}$ and $i < i_k$.

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$(*) \quad T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \ (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

we PREPEND $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ to the seq to get

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}, T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \ (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

Claim This is a **bad seq**.
a) NO uptick within $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ since $T_1, T_2, \ldots$ is Bad Seq.
b) NO uptick within $T_{i_1 j_1}, \ldots$ since its a bad seq.
c) NO uptick $T_i \preceq T_{i_k j_k}$ since $T_i \preceq T_{i_k}$ and $i < i_k$.
End of Proof of Claim

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$(*) \quad T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \ (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

we PREPEND $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ to the seq to get

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}, T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \ (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

Claim This is a **bad seq**.

a) NO uptick within $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ since $T_1, T_2, \ldots$ is Bad Seq.

b) NO uptick within $T_{i_1 j_1}, \ldots$ since its a bad seq.

c) NO uptick $T_i \preceq T_{i_k j_k}$ since $T_i \preceq T_{i_k}$ and $i < i_k$.

End of Proof of Claim

$(*)$ is a bad seq that begins $T_{i_1}, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ and then has $T_{i_1 j_1}$.

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$(*) \quad T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \ (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

we PREPEND $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1-1}$ to the seq to get

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_{i_1-1}, T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \ (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

Claim This is a **bad seq**.
a) NO uptick within $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1-1}$ since $T_1, T_2, \ldots$ is Bad Seq.
b) NO uptick within $T_{i_1 j_1}, \ldots$ since its a bad seq.
c) NO uptick $T_i \preceq T_{i_k j_k}$ since $T_i \preceq T_{i_k}$ and $i < i_k$.
End of Proof of Claim
$(*)$ is a bad seq that begins $T_{i_1}, \ldots, T_{i_1-1}$ and then has $T_{i_1 j_1}$.
T_{i_1} is the smallest tree that is right after $T_1, \ldots, t_{i_1-1}$ in a bad seq.

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$(*) \quad T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \ (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

we PREPEND $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ to the seq to get

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}, T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \ (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

Claim This is a **bad seq**.

a) NO uptick within $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ since $T_1, T_2, \ldots$ is Bad Seq.

b) NO uptick within $T_{i_1 j_1}, \ldots$ since its a bad seq.

c) NO uptick $T_i \preceq T_{i_k j_k}$ since $T_i \preceq T_{i_k}$ and $i < i_k$.

End of Proof of Claim

$(*)$ is a bad seq that begins $T_{i_1}, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ and then has $T_{i_1 j_1}$.

T_{i_1} is the smallest tree that is right after $T_1, \ldots, t_{i_1 - 1}$ in a bad seq.

$T_{i_1 j_1}$ is smaller than T_{i_1}, so contradiction.

Problem 3. X is a WQO

$$(*) \quad T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \ (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

we PREPEND $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ to the seq to get

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}, T_{i_1 j_1}, T_{i_2 j_2}, \ldots \ (i_1 \le i_2, i_3, \ldots)$$

Claim This is a **bad seq**.
a) NO uptick within $T_1, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ since $T_1, T_2, \ldots$ is Bad Seq.
b) NO uptick within $T_{i_1 j_1}, \ldots$ since its a bad seq.
c) NO uptick $T_i \preceq T_{i_k j_k}$ since $T_i \preceq T_{i_k}$ and $i < i_k$.
End of Proof of Claim
$(*)$ is a bad seq that begins $T_{i_1}, \ldots, T_{i_1 - 1}$ and then has $T_{i_1 j_1}$.
T_{i_1} is the smallest tree that is right after $T_1, \ldots, t_{i_1 - 1}$ in a bad seq.
$T_{i_1 j_1}$ is smaller than T_{i_1}, so contradiction.
End of proof that X is wqo

Problem 3. X is wqo so by HW...

Recall HW04

Problem 3. X is wqo so by HW...

Recall HW04

Assume $(X, \preceq)$ is a wqo.

Problem 3. X is wqo so by HW...

Recall HW04

Assume $(X, \preceq)$ is a wqo.

Let $\mathrm{PF}(X)$ be the set of finite subsets of X.

Problem 3. X is wqo so by HW...

Recall HW04

Assume $(X, \preceq)$ is a wqo.

Let $\mathrm{PF}(X)$ be the set of finite subsets of X.

Let $\preceq'$ be the following order on $\mathrm{PF}(X)$.

Problem 3. X is wqo so by HW...

Recall HW04

Assume $(X, \preceq)$ is a wqo.

Let $\mathrm{PF}(X)$ be the set of finite subsets of X.

Let $\preceq'$ be the following order on $\mathrm{PF}(X)$.

Let $Y, Z \in \mathrm{PF}(X)$.

Problem 3. X is wqo so by HW...

Recall HW04

Assume $(X, \preceq)$ is a wqo.

Let $\mathrm{PF}(X)$ be the set of finite subsets of X.

Let $\preceq'$ be the following order on $\mathrm{PF}(X)$.

Let $Y, Z \in \mathrm{PF}(X)$.

$Y \preceq' Z$ iff $(\exists \text{ injective } f : Y \to Z)(\forall y \in Y)[y \preceq f(y)]$.

Problem 3. X is wqo so by HW...

Recall HW04

Assume $(X, \preceq)$ is a wqo.

Let $\mathrm{PF}(X)$ be the set of finite subsets of X.

Let $\preceq'$ be the following order on $\mathrm{PF}(X)$.

Let $Y, Z \in \mathrm{PF}(X)$.

$Y \preceq' Z$ iff $(\exists \text{ injective } f : Y \to Z)(\forall y \in Y)[y \preceq f(y)]$.

Then $(\mathrm{PF}(X), \preceq')$ is a wqo.

Problem 3. X is wqo so by HW...

Recall HW04

Assume $(X, \preceq)$ is a wqo.

Let $\mathrm{PF}(X)$ be the set of finite subsets of X.

Let $\preceq'$ be the following order on $\mathrm{PF}(X)$.

Let $Y, Z \in \mathrm{PF}(X)$.

$Y \preceq' Z$ iff $(\exists$ injective $f : Y \rightarrow Z)(\forall y \in Y)[y \preceq f(y)]$.

Then $(\mathrm{PF}(X), \preceq')$ is a wqo.

We will use this.

Problem 3. View the Min Bad Seq As...

The Original Min Bad Sequence is

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots.$$

Problem 3. View the Min Bad Seq As. . .

The Original Min Bad Sequence is

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots.$$

View this as a seq of finite sets of trees from wqo X.
$\{T_{11}, \ldots, T_{1k_1}\}$, $\{T_{21}, \ldots, T_{2k_2}\}$, $\cdots$

Problem 3. View the Min Bad Seq As...

The Original Min Bad Sequence is

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots.$$

View this as a seq of finite sets of trees from wqo X.
$\{T_{11}, \ldots, T_{1k_1}\}$, $\{T_{21}, \ldots, T_{2k_2}\}$, $\cdots$
By HW there is an uptick in this seq. So there is

Problem 3. View the Min Bad Seq As...

The Original Min Bad Sequence is

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots.$$

View this as a seq of finite sets of trees from wqo X.
$\{T_{11}, \ldots, T_{1k_1}\}$, $\{T_{21}, \ldots, T_{2k_2}\}$, $\cdots$
By HW there is an uptick in this seq. So there is

$$\{T_{i1}, \ldots, T_{ik_i}\} \preceq' \{T_{j1}, \ldots, T_{jk_j}\}.$$

Problem 3. View the Min Bad Seq As...

The Original Min Bad Sequence is

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots.$$

View this as a seq of finite sets of trees from wqo X.
$\{T_{11}, \ldots, T_{1k_1}\}$, $\{T_{21}, \ldots, T_{2k_2}\}$, $\cdots$
By HW there is an uptick in this seq. So there is

$$\{T_{i1}, \ldots, T_{ik_i}\} \preceq' \{T_{j1}, \ldots, T_{jk_j}\}.$$

T_{i1} is a minor of SOME elt of $\{T_{j1}, \ldots, T_{jk_j}\}$.

Problem 3. View the Min Bad Seq As...

The Original Min Bad Sequence is

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots.$$

View this as a seq of finite sets of trees from wqo X.
$\{T_{11}, \ldots, T_{1k_1}\}$, $\{T_{21}, \ldots, T_{2k_2}\}$, $\cdots$
By HW there is an uptick in this seq. So there is

$$\{T_{i1}, \ldots, T_{ik_i}\} \preceq' \{T_{j1}, \ldots, T_{jk_j}\}.$$

T_{i1} is a minor of SOME elt of $\{T_{j1}, \ldots, T_{jk_j}\}$.
T_{i2} is a minor of SOME other elt of $\{T_{j1}, \ldots, T_{jk_j}\}$.

Problem 3. View the Min Bad Seq As...

The Original Min Bad Sequence is

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots.$$

View this as a seq of finite sets of trees from wqo X.
$\{T_{11}, \ldots, T_{1k_1}\}$, $\{T_{21}, \ldots, T_{2k_2}\}$, $\cdots$
By HW there is an uptick in this seq. So there is

$$\{T_{i1}, \ldots, T_{ik_i}\} \preceq' \{T_{j1}, \ldots, T_{jk_j}\}.$$

T_{i1} is a minor of SOME elt of $\{T_{j1}, \ldots, T_{jk_j}\}$.
T_{i2} is a minor of SOME other elt of $\{T_{j1}, \ldots, T_{jk_j}\}$.
$\vdots$

Problem 3. View the Min Bad Seq As...

The Original Min Bad Sequence is

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots.$$

View this as a seq of finite sets of trees from wqo X.
$\{T_{11}, \ldots, T_{1k_1}\}$, $\{T_{21}, \ldots, T_{2k_2}\}$, $\cdots$
By HW there is an uptick in this seq. So there is

$$\{T_{i1}, \ldots, T_{ik_i}\} \preceq' \{T_{j1}, \ldots, T_{jk_j}\}.$$

T_{i1} is a minor of SOME elt of $\{T_{j1}, \ldots, T_{jk_j}\}$.
T_{i2} is a minor of SOME other elt of $\{T_{j1}, \ldots, T_{jk_j}\}$.
$\vdots$
T_{ik_i} is a minor of SOME other elt of $\{T_{j1}, \ldots, T_{jk_j}\}$.

Problem 3. View the Min Bad Seq As...

The Original Min Bad Sequence is

$$T_1, T_2, \ldots.$$

View this as a seq of finite sets of trees from wqo X.
$\{T_{11}, \ldots, T_{1k_1}\}$, $\{T_{21}, \ldots, T_{2k_2}\}$, $\cdots$
By HW there is an uptick in this seq. So there is

$$\{T_{i1}, \ldots, T_{ik_i}\} \preceq' \{T_{j1}, \ldots, T_{jk_j}\}.$$

T_{i1} is a minor of SOME elt of $\{T_{j1}, \ldots, T_{jk_j}\}$.
T_{i2} is a minor of SOME other elt of $\{T_{j1}, \ldots, T_{jk_j}\}$.
$\vdots$
T_{ik_i} is a minor of SOME other elt of $\{T_{j1}, \ldots, T_{jk_j}\}$.
You can put all this together to get T_i is a minor of T_j, which contradicts $T_1, \ldots,$ being a bad seq.

Problem 3: Afterthought

What did we use about **minor** in the proof?

Problem 3: Afterthought

What did we use about **minor** in the proof?

Would the same proof show that the subgraph-ordering for trees is a wqo?

Problem 3: Afterthought

What did we use about **minor** in the proof?

Would the same proof show that the subgraph-ordering for trees is a wqo?

I leave this for you to ponder.

Problem 4: Another Afterthought

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the set of all graphs and $\preceq$ be the subgraph ordering.

Problem 4: Another Afterthought

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the set of all graphs and $\preceq$ be the subgraph ordering.
Vote

Problem 4: Another Afterthought

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the set of all graphs and $\preceq$ be the subgraph ordering.

Vote

a) $(\mathcal{G}, \preceq)$ is a wqo and this is known.

Problem 4: Another Afterthought

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the set of all graphs and $\preceq$ be the subgraph ordering.

Vote

a) $(\mathcal{G}, \preceq)$ is a wqo and this is known.

a) $(\mathcal{G}, \preceq)$ is not a wqo and this is known.

Problem 4: Another Afterthought

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the set of all graphs and $\preceq$ be the subgraph ordering.
Vote
a) $(\mathcal{G}, \preceq)$ is a wqo and this is known.
a) $(\mathcal{G}, \preceq)$ is not a wqo and this is known.
c) The question "is $(\mathcal{G}, \preceq)$ a wqo?" is **unknown to science.**

Problem 4: Another Afterthought

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the set of all graphs and $\preceq$ be the subgraph ordering.

Vote

a) $(\mathcal{G}, \preceq)$ is a wqo and this is known.

a) $(\mathcal{G}, \preceq)$ is not a wqo and this is known.

c) The question "is $(\mathcal{G}, \preceq)$ a wqo?" is **unknown to science.**

Answer on next slide.

Graphs under Subgraph

Graphs under Subgraph

Let C_i be the cycle on i vertices.

$$C_3, C_4, C_5, \ldots$$

is an infinite seq of incomparable elements, so graphs under subgraph are NOT a wqo.

Problem 4

Prove or Disprove:
For every $\mathrm{COL}\colon \mathsf{Q} \to [100]$ *there exists an* $H \subseteq \mathsf{Q}$ *such that*

- *H has the same order type as the rationals:*

Problem 4

Prove or Disprove:
For every $\mathrm{COL}\colon \mathsf{Q} \to [100]$ *there exists an* $H \subseteq \mathsf{Q}$ *such that*

- *H has the same order type as the rationals:*
  a) H is countable

Problem 4

Prove or Disprove:
For every $\mathrm{COL}\colon \mathsf{Q} \to [100]$ *there exists an* $H \subseteq \mathsf{Q}$ *such that*

- *H has the same order type as the rationals:*
  a) H is countable
  b) H is dense: $(\forall x, y \in H)[x < y \implies (\exists z)[x < z < y]]$.

Problem 4

Prove or Disprove:
For every $\mathrm{COL}\colon \mathsf{Q} \to [100]$ *there exists an* $H \subseteq \mathsf{Q}$ *such that*

- *H has the same order type as the rationals:*
  a) H is countable
  b) H is dense: $(\forall x, y \in H)[x < y \implies (\exists z)[x < z < y]$.
  c) H has no left endpoint: $(\forall y \in H)(\exists x \in H)[x < y]$.

Problem 4

Prove or Disprove:

For every $\mathrm{COL}\colon \mathbb{Q} \to [100]$ *there exists an* $H \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ *such that*

- *H has the same order type as the rationals:*
  a) H is countable
  b) H is dense: $(\forall x, y \in H)[x < y \implies (\exists z)[x < z < y]$.
  c) H has no left endpoint: $(\forall y \in H)(\exists x \in H)[x < y]$.
  d) H has no right endpoint: $(\forall x \in H)(\exists y \in H)[x < y]$.

Problem 4

Prove or Disprove:
For every $\mathrm{COL}\colon \mathsf{Q} \to [100]$ *there exists an* $H \subseteq \mathsf{Q}$ *such that*

- *H has the same order type as the rationals:*
  a) H is countable
  b) H is dense: $(\forall x, y \in H)[x < y \implies (\exists z)[x < z < y]$.
  c) H has no left endpoint: $(\forall y \in H)(\exists x \in H)[x < y]$.
  d) H has no right endpoint: $(\forall x \in H)(\exists y \in H)[x < y]$.
- *every number in H is the same color.*

Problem 4

Prove or Disprove:

For every $\mathrm{COL}\colon \mathsf{Q} \to [100]$ *there exists an* $H \subseteq \mathsf{Q}$ *such that*

- *H has the same order type as the rationals:*
  a) H is countable
  b) H is dense: $(\forall x, y \in H)[x < y \implies (\exists z)[x < z < y]]$.
  c) H has no left endpoint: $(\forall y \in H)(\exists x \in H)[x < y]$.
  d) H has no right endpoint: $(\forall x \in H)(\exists y \in H)[x < y]$.
- *every number in H is the same color.*

TRUE. We prove it TWO ways.

Problem 4

Prove or Disprove:
For every $\mathrm{COL}\colon \mathsf{Q} \to [100]$ *there exists an* $H \subseteq \mathsf{Q}$ *such that*

- *H has the same order type as the rationals:*
  a) H is countable
  b) H is dense: $(\forall x, y \in H)[x < y \implies (\exists z)[x < z < y]$.
  c) H has no left endpoint: $(\forall y \in H)(\exists x \in H)[x < y]$.
  d) H has no right endpoint: $(\forall x \in H)(\exists y \in H)[x < y]$.
- *every number in H is the same color.*

TRUE. We prove it TWO ways.

Advice You should understand both proofs.

We Actually Prove

Def Let L be a linear ordering.
a) $L \equiv \mathsf{Q}$ means L has same order type as Q. Hence L is countable, dense, and has no endpoints.

We Actually Prove

Def Let L be a linear ordering.
a) $L \equiv \mathsf{Q}$ means L has same order type as Q. Hence L is countable, dense, and has no endpoints.

b) Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon \binom{L}{2} \to [c]$. H is **Q-homog** if H is homog & $H \equiv \mathsf{Q}$.

We Actually Prove

Def Let L be a linear ordering.
a) $L \equiv \mathbb{Q}$ means L has same order type as Q. Hence L is countable, dense, and has no endpoints.

b) Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon \binom{L}{2} \to [c]$. H is **Q-homog** if H is homog & $H \equiv \mathbb{Q}$.

We will prove the following:

We Actually Prove

Def Let L be a linear ordering.
a) $L \equiv \mathbb{Q}$ means L has same order type as Q. Hence L is countable, dense, and has no endpoints.

b) Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon \binom{L}{2} \to [c]$. H is **Q-homog** if H is homog & $H \equiv \mathbb{Q}$.

We will prove the following:

$(\forall c)(\forall L \equiv \mathbb{Q})(\forall \mathrm{COL}\colon L \to [c])(\exists H \subseteq L)[H \text{ Q-homog}]$.

We Actually Prove

Def Let L be a linear ordering.
a) $L \equiv \mathbb{Q}$ means L has same order type as Q. Hence L is countable, dense, and has no endpoints.

b) Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon \binom{L}{2} \rightarrow [c]$. H is **Q-homog** if H is homog & $H \equiv \mathbb{Q}$.

We will prove the following:

$(\forall c)(\forall L \equiv \mathbb{Q})(\forall \mathrm{COL}\colon L \rightarrow [c])(\exists H \subseteq L)[H \text{ Q-homog}]$.

We use c instead of 100 since we can then do an induction on c.

We Actually Prove

Def Let L be a linear ordering.
a) $L \equiv \mathbb{Q}$ means L has same order type as Q. Hence L is countable, dense, and has no endpoints.

b) Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon \binom{L}{2} \to [c]$. H is **Q-homog** if H is homog & $H \equiv \mathbb{Q}$.

We will prove the following:

$(\forall c)(\forall L \equiv \mathbb{Q})(\forall \mathrm{COL}\colon L \to [c])(\exists H \subseteq L)[H \text{ Q-homog}]$.

We use c instead of 100 since we can then do an induction on c.

We use L instead of Q since in the induction proof we will have a coloring of (say) (a, b) and want to use the Ind Hyp on a COL restricted to (a, b).

$(\forall c)(\forall \mathrm{COL}\colon L \rightarrow [c])(\exists H \subseteq L) H$ is Q-homog

Proof One and Proof Two Begin the Same Way

We prove this by induction on c.

$(\forall c)(\forall \mathrm{COL}\colon L \to [c])(\exists H \subseteq L) H$ is Q-homog

Proof One and Proof Two Begin the Same Way

We prove this by induction on c.

IB $c = 1$. Obviously true.

$(\forall c)(\forall \text{COL}\colon L \rightarrow [c])(\exists H \subseteq L) H$ is Q-homog

Proof One and Proof Two Begin the Same Way

We prove this by induction on c.

IB $c = 1$. Obviously true.

IH Assume true for $c - 1$.

$(\forall c)(\forall \mathrm{COL}\colon L \rightarrow [c])(\exists H \subseteq L)H$ is Q-homog

Proof One and Proof Two Begin the Same Way

We prove this by induction on c.

IB $c = 1$. Obviously true.

IH Assume true for $c - 1$.

Continued on Next Slide.

Induction Step for Proof One.

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \to [c]$.

Induction Step for Proof One.

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \to [c]$.
Let

$$H = \{x \in L\colon \mathrm{COL}(x) = c\}.$$

Induction Step for Proof One.

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \to [c]$.
Let

$$H = \{x \in L\colon \mathrm{COL}(x) = c\}.$$

Case 1 $H \equiv \mathsf{Q}$. DONE!

Induction Step for Proof One.

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \to [c]$.
Let

$$H = \{x \in L\colon \mathrm{COL}(x) = c\}.$$

Case 1 $H \equiv \mathrm{Q}$. DONE!

Case 2 $H \not\equiv \mathrm{Q}$. Three possibilities.

Induction Step for Proof One.

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \to [c]$.
Let

$$H = \{x \in L \colon \mathrm{COL}(x) = c\}.$$

Case 1 $H \equiv \mathsf{Q}$. DONE!

Case 2 $H \not\equiv \mathsf{Q}$. Three possibilities.

Case 2a H is not dense. So $(\exists x < y \in H)[(x, y) \cap H = \emptyset]$.

Induction Step for Proof One.

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \to [c]$.
Let

$$H = \{x \in L\colon \mathrm{COL}(x) = c\}.$$

Case 1 $H \equiv \mathsf{Q}$. DONE!

Case 2 $H \not\equiv \mathsf{Q}$. Three possibilities.

Case 2a H is not dense. So $(\exists x < y \in H)[(x,y) \cap H = \emptyset]$.
Nothing in (x,y) is colored c.

Induction Step for Proof One.

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \to [c]$.
Let

$$H = \{x \in L\colon \mathrm{COL}(x) = c\}.$$

Case 1 $H \equiv \mathsf{Q}$. DONE!

Case 2 $H \not\equiv \mathsf{Q}$. Three possibilities.

Case 2a H is not dense. So $(\exists x < y \in H)[(x,y) \cap H = \emptyset]$.
Nothing in (x,y) is colored c.
Let COL' be COL restricted to (x,y).

Induction Step for Proof One.

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \rightarrow [c]$.
Let

$$H = \{x \in L \colon \mathrm{COL}(x) = c\}.$$

Case 1 $H \equiv \mathsf{Q}$. DONE!

Case 2 $H \not\equiv \mathsf{Q}$. Three possibilities.

Case 2a H is not dense. So $(\exists x < y \in H)[(x, y) \cap H = \emptyset]$.
Nothing in (x, y) is colored c.
Let COL' be COL restricted to (x, y).
This is a $c - 1$ coloring on $(x, y) \equiv \mathsf{Q}$. Done by IH.

Induction Step for Proof One.

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \to [c]$.
Let

$$H = \{x \in L\colon \mathrm{COL}(x) = c\}.$$

Case 1 $H \equiv \mathsf{Q}$. DONE!

Case 2 $H \not\equiv \mathsf{Q}$. Three possibilities.

Case 2a H is not dense. So $(\exists x < y \in H)[(x, y) \cap H = \emptyset]$.
Nothing in (x, y) is colored c.
Let COL' be COL restricted to (x, y).
This is a $c - 1$ coloring on $(x, y) \equiv \mathsf{Q}$. Done by IH.

Case 2b H has a left endpoint. So $(\exists y)[-\infty, y) \cap H = \emptyset]$. Let $x \in L$ such that $x < y$. Let COL' be COL restricted to (x, y).
This is a $c - 1$ coloring on $(x, y) \equiv \mathsf{Q}$. Done by IH.

Induction Step for Proof One.

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \rightarrow [c]$.
Let

$$H = \{x \in L\colon \mathrm{COL}(x) = c\}.$$

Case 1 $H \equiv \mathsf{Q}$. DONE!

Case 2 $H \not\equiv \mathsf{Q}$. Three possibilities.

Case 2a H is not dense. So $(\exists x < y \in H)[(x, y) \cap H = \emptyset]$.
Nothing in (x, y) is colored c.
Let COL' be COL restricted to (x, y).
This is a $c - 1$ coloring on $(x, y) \equiv \mathsf{Q}$. Done by IH.

Case 2b H has a left endpoint. So $(\exists y)[-\infty, y) \cap H = \emptyset]$. Let $x \in L$ such that $x < y$. Let COL' be COL restricted to (x, y).
This is a $c - 1$ coloring on $(x, y) \equiv \mathsf{Q}$. Done by IH.

Case 2c H has a right endpoint. Similar to Case 2b.

Induction Step for Proof One.

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \rightarrow [c]$.
Let

$$H = \{x \in L \colon \mathrm{COL}(x) = c\}.$$

Case 1 $H \equiv \mathsf{Q}$. DONE!

Case 2 $H \not\equiv \mathsf{Q}$. Three possibilities.

Case 2a H is not dense. So $(\exists x < y \in H)[(x, y) \cap H = \emptyset]$.
Nothing in (x, y) is colored c.
Let COL' be COL restricted to (x, y).
This is a $c - 1$ coloring on $(x, y) \equiv \mathsf{Q}$. Done by IH.

Case 2b H has a left endpoint. So $(\exists y)[-\infty, y) \cap H = \emptyset]$. Let $x \in L$ such that $x < y$. Let COL' be COL restricted to (x, y).
This is a $c - 1$ coloring on $(x, y) \equiv \mathsf{Q}$. Done by IH.

Case 2c H has a right endpoint. Similar to Case 2b.

End of Proof One

Induction Step for Proof Two: Plan

We will try to **construct** a Q-homog set.

- We succeed! YEAH!

Induction Step for Proof Two: Plan

We will try to **construct** a Q-homog set.

- We succeed! YEAH!
- We fail! Then we will have an open interval (x, y) where COL is never color c. Use IH.

Induction Step for Proof Two: Action

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \to [c]$.

Induction Step for Proof Two: Action

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \rightarrow [c]$.
We define a seq $q_1, q_2, \ldots$ such that $\{q_1, q_2, \ldots\}$ is Q-homog OR we fail.

Induction Step for Proof Two: Action

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \rightarrow [c]$.
We define a seq $q_1, q_2, \ldots$ such that $\{q_1, q_2, \ldots\}$ is Q-homog OR we fail.
Let $q_1 \in L$ such that $\mathrm{COL}(q_1) = c$. (If no such exists, use IH.)

Induction Step for Proof Two: Action

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \rightarrow [c]$.
We define a seq $q_1, q_2, \ldots$ such that $\{q_1, q_2, \ldots\}$ is Q-homog OR we fail.
Let $q_1 \in L$ such that $\mathrm{COL}(q_1) = c$. (If no such exists, use IH.)
Assume $q_1, \ldots, q_n$ have been defined and are all color c. Order them to get $p_1 < \cdots < p_n$.

Induction Step for Proof Two: Action

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \to [c]$.
We define a seq $q_1, q_2, \ldots$ such that $\{q_1, q_2, \ldots\}$ is Q-homog OR we fail.
Let $q_1 \in L$ such that $\mathrm{COL}(q_1) = c$. (If no such exists, use IH.)
Assume $q_1, \ldots, q_n$ have been defined and are all color c. Order them to get $p_1 < \cdots < p_n$.

- If $(\exists q < p_1)[\mathrm{COL}(q) = c]$ then let q_{n+1} be q.

Induction Step for Proof Two: Action

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \to [c]$.
We define a seq $q_1, q_2, \ldots$ such that $\{q_1, q_2, \ldots\}$ is Q-homog OR we fail.
Let $q_1 \in L$ such that $\mathrm{COL}(q_1) = c$. (If no such exists, use IH.)
Assume $q_1, \ldots, q_n$ have been defined and are all color c. Order them to get $p_1 < \cdots < p_n$.

- If $(\exists q < p_1)[\mathrm{COL}(q) = c]$ then let q_{n+1} be q.
  If NOT then $\mathrm{COL}\colon (p_1 - \epsilon, p_1) \to [c-1]$. STOP. Use IH.
- For $1 \le i \le n$

Induction Step for Proof Two: Action

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \to [c]$.
We define a seq $q_1, q_2, \ldots$ such that $\{q_1, q_2, \ldots\}$ is Q-homog OR we fail.
Let $q_1 \in L$ such that $\mathrm{COL}(q_1) = c$. (If no such exists, use IH.)
Assume $q_1, \ldots, q_n$ have been defined and are all color c. Order them to get $p_1 < \cdots < p_n$.

- If $(\exists q < p_1)[\mathrm{COL}(q) = c]$ then let q_{n+1} be q.
  If NOT then $\mathrm{COL}\colon (p_1 - \epsilon, p_1) \to [c-1]$. STOP. Use IH.
- For $1 \le i \le n$
  If $(\exists p_i < q < p_{i+1})[\mathrm{COL}(q) = c]$ then let q_{n+i+1} be q.

Induction Step for Proof Two: Action

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \rightarrow [c]$.
We define a seq $q_1, q_2, \ldots$ such that $\{q_1, q_2, \ldots\}$ is Q-homog OR we fail.
Let $q_1 \in L$ such that $\mathrm{COL}(q_1) = c$. (If no such exists, use IH.)
Assume $q_1, \ldots, q_n$ have been defined and are all color c. Order them to get $p_1 < \cdots < p_n$.

- If $(\exists q < p_1)[\mathrm{COL}(q) = c]$ then let q_{n+1} be q.
  If NOT then $\mathrm{COL}\colon (p_1 - \epsilon, p_1) \rightarrow [c-1]$. STOP. Use IH.
- For $1 \le i \le n$
  If $(\exists p_i < q < p_{i+1})[\mathrm{COL}(q) = c]$ then let q_{n+i+1} be q.
  If NOT then $\mathrm{COL}\colon (p_i, p_{i+1}) \rightarrow [c-1]$. STOP. Use IH.
- If $(\exists p_1 < q)[\mathrm{COL}(q) = c]$ then let q_{2n+2} be q.

Induction Step for Proof Two: Action

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \to [c]$.
We define a seq $q_1, q_2, \ldots$ such that $\{q_1, q_2, \ldots\}$ is Q-homog OR we fail.
Let $q_1 \in L$ such that $\mathrm{COL}(q_1) = c$. (If no such exists, use IH.)
Assume $q_1, \ldots, q_n$ have been defined and are all color c. Order them to get $p_1 < \cdots < p_n$.

- If $(\exists q < p_1)[\mathrm{COL}(q) = c]$ then let q_{n+1} be q.
  If NOT then $\mathrm{COL}\colon (p_1 - \epsilon, p_1) \to [c-1]$. STOP. Use IH.
- For $1 \le i \le n$
  If $(\exists p_i < q < p_{i+1})[\mathrm{COL}(q) = c]$ then let q_{n+i+1} be q.
  If NOT then $\mathrm{COL}\colon (p_i, p_{i+1}) \to [c-1]$. STOP. Use IH.
- If $(\exists p_1 < q)[\mathrm{COL}(q) = c]$ then let q_{2n+2} be q.
  If NOT then $\mathrm{COL}\colon (p_n, p_n + \epsilon) \to [c-1]$. STOP. Use IH.

Induction Step for Proof Two: Action

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \rightarrow [c]$.

We define a seq $q_1, q_2, \ldots$ such that $\{q_1, q_2, \ldots\}$ is Q-homog OR we fail.

Let $q_1 \in L$ such that $\mathrm{COL}(q_1) = c$. (If no such exists, use IH.)

Assume $q_1, \ldots, q_n$ have been defined and are all color c. Order them to get $p_1 < \cdots < p_n$.

- If $(\exists q < p_1)[\mathrm{COL}(q) = c]$ then let q_{n+1} be q.
  If NOT then $\mathrm{COL}\colon (p_1 - \epsilon, p_1) \rightarrow [c-1]$. STOP. Use IH.
- For $1 \le i \le n$
  If $(\exists p_i < q < p_{i+1})[\mathrm{COL}(q) = c]$ then let q_{n+i+1} be q.
  If NOT then $\mathrm{COL}\colon (p_i, p_{i+1}) \rightarrow [c-1]$. STOP. Use IH.
- If $(\exists p_1 < q)[\mathrm{COL}(q) = c]$ then let q_{2n+2} be q.
  If NOT then $\mathrm{COL}\colon (p_n, p_n + \epsilon) \rightarrow [c-1]$. STOP. Use IH.

Case 1 Const never stops. $\{q_1, q_2, \ldots\} \equiv$ Q & homog. Done!

Induction Step for Proof Two: Action

Let $\mathrm{COL}\colon L \to [c]$.
We define a seq $q_1, q_2, \ldots$ such that $\{q_1, q_2, \ldots\}$ is Q-homog OR we fail.
Let $q_1 \in L$ such that $\mathrm{COL}(q_1) = c$. (If no such exists, use IH.)
Assume $q_1, \ldots, q_n$ have been defined and are all color c. Order them to get $p_1 < \cdots < p_n$.

- If $(\exists q < p_1)[\mathrm{COL}(q) = c]$ then let q_{n+1} be q.
  If NOT then $\mathrm{COL}\colon (p_1 - \epsilon, p_1) \to [c-1]$. STOP. Use IH.
- For $1 \le i \le n$
  If $(\exists p_i < q < p_{i+1})[\mathrm{COL}(q) = c]$ then let q_{n+i+1} be q.
  If NOT then $\mathrm{COL}\colon (p_i, p_{i+1}) \to [c-1]$. STOP. Use IH.
- If $(\exists p_1 < q)[\mathrm{COL}(q) = c]$ then let q_{2n+2} be q.
  If NOT then $\mathrm{COL}\colon (p_n, p_n + \epsilon) \to [c-1]$. STOP. Use IH.

Case 1 Const never stops. $\{q_1, q_2, \ldots\} \equiv$ Q & homog. Done!

Case 2 Const stops . $\exists a < b$, $\mathrm{COL}\colon (a, b) \to [c-1]$. Use IH.