SARAJEVO JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS DOI: 10.5644/SJM.17.02.01
Vol.17 (30), No.2 (2021), 129 – 142

# THE STEINHAUS-WEIL PROPERTY: III. WEIL TOPOLOGIES

NICHOLAS H. BINGHAM AND ADAM J. OSTASZEWSKI

*In memory of Harry I. Miller (1939 - 2018)*

ABSTRACT. We study Weil topologies, linking the topological-group structure with the measure-theoretic structure. This paper is a companion piece to Parts I, II, IV [BinO7,8,9] on theorems of Steinhaus-Weil type. (See [BinO6] for the fuller arXiv version combining all four.)

## 1. WEIL-LIKE TOPOLOGIES: PRELIMINARIES

We are concerned with relatives of the *Weil topology* as generators of the Steinhaus-Weil interior-point property [Ste]. For background, we refer to Weil's book [Wei, Ch. VII] and Halmos's book [Hal, Ch. XII] (see also [BinO6, §8.4]). Weil regarded his result as a *Converse Haar Theorem*, in retrieving the topological-group structure from the measure-algebra structure [Fre] as encoded by the Haar-measurable subsets – cf. [Kod]. (Here one may work either, following Weil, to within a dense embedding in a locally compact group, as in the Remark to Theorem 1M below, or, following Mackey, uniquely up to homeomorphism, granted the further assumption of an analytic Borel structure [Mac, Th. 7.1]; for further information see [BinO6, §8.16].) The alternative view below throws light on this result in that the measure structure is already encoded by the density topology $\mathcal{D}$ via the Haar density theorem, for which see [Mue], [Hal, §61(5), p. 268], cf. [BinO1, §7; Th. 6.10], [BinO3]. This view is partially implicit in [Amb]: writing $\mathcal{M}_+(\mu)$ for the $\mu$-measurable sets of positive $\mu$-measure, refinement of one invariant measure $\mu_1$ by another $\mu_2$ holds when sets in $\mathcal{M}_+(\mu_2)$ contain sets in $\mathcal{M}_+(\mu_1)$ (as in the refinement of one topology by another). This falls within the broader aim of retrieving a *topological* group structure from a given (one-sidedly) invariant topology $\tau$ on a group $G$, when $\tau$ arises from refinement of a topological group structure (i.e. starting from a *semitopological* group structure $(G,\tau)$). Also relevant here are *Converse Steinhaus-Weil* results, as in Part II Prop. 1 of [BinO6,§3], [BinO8, §2] (see also [BinO6, §8.5]). For background on group-norms see the textbook treatment in [ArhT, §3.3] (who trace this notion back to Markov) or [BinO1], but note their use

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 22A10, 43A05; Secondary 28C10.
*Key words and phrases.* Weil topology, Haar measure, Marczewski measure.

of ‘pre-norm’ for what we call (following Pettis [Pet]) a *pseudo-norm*; for quasi-interiors and regular open sets see [BinO6, §8.6]. Thus a norm $||\cdot|| : G \to [0,\infty)$ satisfies all the three conditions 1-3 below and generates a right-invariant metric $d(x,y) = ||xy^{-1}||$ and so a topology $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_d$, just as a right-invariant metric $d$ derives from a separable topology $\mathcal{T}_G$ and generates, via the Birkhoff-Kakutani Theorem ([HewR, Th. 8.3], [Gao, Th. 2.1.1]), the norm $||x|| = d(x, 1_G)$. A pseudo-norm differs in possibly lacking condition 1.i. (so generates a *pseudo*-metric).

1.i (positivity): $||g|| > 0$ for $g \neq 1_G$, and 1.ii: $||1_G|| = 0$;
2 (subadditivity): $||gh|| \leq ||g|| + ||h||$,
3 (symmetry): $||g^{-1}|| = ||g||$.

With $\mathcal{U}(G)$ the universally measurable subsets of $G$, recall from the Introduction of Part I [BinO6,7] that $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{sub}}$ if $\lambda$ is a set function $\lambda$ defined on $\mathcal{U}(G)$ and is a *submeasure*, i.e. is monotone and subadditive with $\lambda(\emptyset) = 0$ (Introduction, [Fre, Ch. 39, §392], [Tal]); by analogy with the term *finitely additive measure* (for background see [Bin], [TomW, Ch. 12]; cf. [Pat]), this is a *finitely subadditive outer measure*, similarly as in Maharam [Mah], albeit in the context of Boolean algebras, but without her positivity condition. Recall from Halmos [Hal, Ch. II §10] that a submeasure is an *outer measure* if in addition it is *countably subadditive*. The set function $\lambda$ is *left invariant* if $\lambda(gE) = \lambda(E)$ for all $g \in G$ and $E \in \mathcal{U}(G)$.

Propositions 1 and 2 below are motivated by [Hal, Ch. XII §62, cf. Ch. II §9 (2-4)], where $G$ is a locally compact group with $\lambda$ its left Haar measure, but here the context is broader, allowing in *amenable* groups $G$ (cf. [TomW, Ch. 12], [Pat]). The two results enable the introduction in §2 of Weil-like topologies generated from families of left-invariant *pseudo-metrics* derived from invariant submeasures. The latter rely on the natural *measure-metric*, also known as the *Fréchet-Nikodym metric* ([Fre, §323Ad], [Hal, §40 Th. A], [Bog, p. 53, 102-3, 418]); see [Dre1,2] (cf. [Web]) for the related literature of Fréchet-Nikodym topologies and their relation to the Vitali-Hahn-Saks Theorem. Maharam [Mah] studies sequential continuity of the order relation (of inclusion, here in the measure algebra), and requires positivity to obtain a (measure-) *metric*; see Talagrand [Tal] (cf. [Fre, §394] and the literature cited there) for a discussion of pathological submeasures (the only measures they dominate under $\ll$ being trivial), and [ChrH] for corresponding exotic abelian Polish groups.

In the setting of a locally compact group $G$, these pseudo-metrics are implicit in work of Struble: initially, in 1953 [Str1], he used a (‘sampler’) family of precompact open sets $\{E_t : t > 0\}$ to construct a mean on $G$, thereby referring to a one-parameter family of pseudo-metrics corresponding to the sets $E_t$; some twenty years later in 1974 [Str2] (cf. [DieS, Ch. 8]) identifies a left-invariant (proper) metric on $G$ by taking the supremum of pseudo-metrics, each generated from some open set in a countable open base at $1_G$. The pseudo-metric makes a very brief appearance in Yamasaki’s textbook treatment [Yam, Ch. 1] of Weil’s theorem.

**Proposition 1.1** (***Weil pseudo-norm***, cf. [Fre, § 392H], [Yam, Ch. 1, Proof of Th. 4.1]). *For $G$ a Polish group, $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{sub}}(G)$, a left-invariant submeasure on $\mathcal{U}(G)$, and $E \in \mathcal{U}(G)$ with $\lambda(E) > 0$, put*

$$||g||_E^\lambda := \lambda(gE \triangle E) \qquad (g \in G).$$

*Then $||.||_E$ defines a group pseudo-norm with associated right-invariant pseudo-metric*

$$d_E^\lambda(g,h) = ||gh^{-1}||_E^\lambda \qquad (g,h \in G).$$

*Likewise, for $\lambda$ right-invariant, a pseudo-norm is defined by*

$$||g||_E^\lambda := \lambda(E \triangle Eg) \qquad (g \in G).$$

*Proof.* Since $\lambda(\emptyset) = 0$, $||1_G||_E^\lambda = 0$. By left invariance under $a$,

$$||a^{-1}||_E^\lambda = \lambda(a^{-1}E \triangle E) = \lambda(a(a^{-1}E \triangle E)) = \lambda(E \triangle aE) = ||a||_E^\lambda.$$

Also,

$$||ab||_E^\lambda \leq ||a||_E^\lambda + ||b||_E^\lambda$$

follows from monotonicity, subadditivity and $\lambda(abE \triangle aE) = \lambda(bE \triangle E)$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda(abE \backslash E \cup E \backslash abE) &\leq \lambda(abE \backslash aE) \cup (aE \backslash E) \cup (E \backslash aE) \cup (aE \backslash abE))\\ &= \lambda(abE \backslash aE) \cup (aE \backslash abE) \cup (aE \backslash E) \cup (E \backslash aE))\\ &\leq \lambda(abE \triangle aE) + \lambda(E \triangle aE) = \lambda(bE \triangle E) + \lambda(E \triangle aE). \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

**Corollary 1.1.** ***(Kneser for Haar measure, [Kne, Hilfs. 4])***. *For $G$ a Polish group, $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_{sub}(G)$, a left-invariant submeasure on $\mathcal{U}(G)$, and $E \in \mathcal{U}(G)$ with $\lambda(E) > 0$, the set*

$$H := \{g \in G : \lambda(gE \triangle E) = 0\}$$

*is a subgroup of $G$ closed under the norm $||g||_E^\lambda$.*

*Proof.* Indeed $H = \{g \in G : ||g||_E^\lambda = 0\}$, and so $H$ is a subgroup, since for $g,h \in H$, $||gh^{-1}||_E^\lambda \leq ||g||_E^\lambda + ||h||_E^\lambda = 0$. $\square$

Recall now that a subset $A$ of a Polish group $G$ is *left Haar null* if it is contained in a universally measurable set $B$ such that for some $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(G)$

$$\mu(gB) = 0 \qquad (g \in G).$$

It is *Haar null:* $A \in \mathcal{HN}_{\text{amb}}$ [Sol1] (cf. [HofT, p. 374]), if it is contained in a universally measurable set $B$ such that for some $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(G)$

$$\mu(gBh) = 0 \qquad (g,h \in G).$$

This motivates the following application of Proposition 1.1. beyond Haar measure. Extending the notation of [BinO6,§3], Part II §1, below $\mathcal{M}_0^L(G)$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}_0(G)$) denotes the family of left-Haar-null (resp. Haar-null) sets of $G$, and we write

$$\mathcal{U}_+^L(G) := \mathcal{U}(G) \backslash \mathcal{M}_0^L(G), \qquad \mathcal{U}_+(G) := \mathcal{U}(G) \backslash \mathcal{M}_0(G).$$

Prop. 1.1. may be applied to the following measures; those constructed from $\mu$ a normalized counting measure (of finite support) are studied in [Sol1].

**Proposition 1.2.** *In a Polish group $G$, for $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(G)$ put*

$$\mu_L^*(E) := \sup\{\mu(gE) : g \in G\} \qquad (E \in \mathcal{U}(G)),$$
$$\hat{\mu}(E) := \sup\{\mu(gEh) : g,h \in G\} \qquad (E \in \mathcal{U}(G)).$$

*Then $\mu_L^*$ (resp. $\hat{\mu}$) is a left invariant (resp. bi-invariant) submeasure on $\mathcal{U}(G)$, which is positive for $E \in \mathcal{U}_+^L(G)$ (resp. for $E \in \mathcal{U}_+(G)$), i.e. for universally measurable, non-left-Haar null (resp. non-Haar-null) sets.*

*Proof.* We consider only $\hat{\mu}$, as the case $\mu_L^*$ is similar and simpler (through the omission of $h$ and $b$ below). The set function $\hat{\mu}$ is well defined, with

$$\mu(E) \leq \hat{\mu}(E) \leq 1 \qquad (E \in \mathcal{U}(G)),$$

since $\mu$ is a probability measure; it is bi-invariant, since

$$\hat{\mu}(aEb) := \sup\{\mu(gaEbh) : g,h \in G\} = \sup\{\mu(gEh) : g,h \in G\},$$

and $G$ is a group. Furthermore, for $B \in \mathcal{U}(G)$

$$\mu(gBh) \leq \hat{\mu}(B) \leq 1, \qquad (g,h \in G).$$

So, for $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(G)$

$$0 < \hat{\mu}(B) \leq 1 \qquad (B \in \mathcal{U}_+(G)),$$

since there are $g,h \in G$ with $\mu(gBh) > 0$. Countable subadditivity follows (on taking suprema of the leftmost term over $g,h$) from

$$\mu(g(\bigcup\nolimits_n A_n)h) \leq \sum\nolimits_n \mu(gA_nh) \leq \sum\nolimits_n \hat{\mu}(gA_nh) = \sum\nolimits_n \hat{\mu}(A_n),$$

for any sequence of sets $A_n \in \mathcal{U}(G)$. □

**Definition 1.1.** *For $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(G), E \in \mathcal{U}(G)$, put*

$$B_\varepsilon^E(\mu) := \{x \in G : ||x||_E^\mu < \varepsilon\}.$$

*Our next step uses Prop. 1.2. to inscribe these balls into $EE^{-1}$ for all small enough $\varepsilon > 0$.*

**Lemma 1.1.** ***(Self-intersection Lemma)**. In a Polish group $G$ for $E \in \mathcal{U}_+(G)$, and respectively for $E \in \mathcal{U}_+^L(G)$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(G)$,*

$$1_G \in B_\varepsilon^E(\hat{\mu}) \subseteq EE^{-1} \qquad (0 < \varepsilon < \hat{\mu}(E)),$$
$$1_G \in B_\varepsilon^E(\mu_L^*) \subseteq EE^{-1} \qquad (0 < \varepsilon < \mu_L^*(E)).$$

*Equivalently, for $0 < \varepsilon < \hat{\mu}(E)$, and respectively for $0 < \varepsilon < \mu_L^*(E)$,*

$$E \cap xE \neq \emptyset \quad (x \in B_\varepsilon^E(\hat{\mu})); \qquad E \cap xE \neq \emptyset \quad (x \in B_\varepsilon^E(\mu_L^*)).$$

*Proof.* We check only the $\hat{\mu}$ case; the other is similar and simpler (through the omission of $h$ below). For $E \in \mathcal{U}_+(G)$, since $\hat{\mu}(E) > 0$ by Prop. 1.2, we may pick $g,h \in G$ such that $\varepsilon_E := \mu(gEh) > 0$. Consider $x$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ with $||x||_E^{\hat{\mu}} < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_E$. If $E$ and $xE$ are disjoint, then

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon_E &= \mu(gEh) \le \mu(g(E\cup xE)h) \le \hat{\mu}(g(E\cup xE)h) = \hat{\mu}(E\cup xE)\\ &= \hat{\mu}(xE\triangle E) = ||x||_E^{\hat{\mu}} < \varepsilon \le \varepsilon_E,\end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. So $E$ and $xE$ do meet. Now first pick $t\in xE\cap E$ and next $s\in E$ so that $t=xs$; then $x=ts^{-1}\in EE^{-1}$. The argument is valid when $\varepsilon_E=\mu(gEh)$ assumes any value in $(0,\hat{\mu}(E)]$. The converse is clear. □

We need a simple analogue of a result due to Weil ([Wei, Ch. VII, §31], cf. [Hal, Ch. XII §62]). Below $\tau_1$ denotes the $\tau$-open *neighbourhoods of* $1_G$. For $G$ locally compact with $\lambda=\eta=\eta_G$ (Haar measure), the identity

$$2\eta(E)-2\eta(E\cap xE)=\eta(E\triangle xE)=1-2\int 1_E(t)1_{E^{-1}}(t^{-1}x)d\eta(t) \qquad (\dagger)$$

connects the continuity of the (pseudo-) norm to $\mathcal{T}_d$-continuity of translation in the topological group structure $(G,\mathcal{T}_d)$ of the locally compact group, and to continuity of the convolution function here (for $E$ of finite $\eta$-measure) – see [HewR, Th. 20.16]; see also [HewR, Th. 20.17] for the well-known connection between the Steinhaus-Weil Theorem and convolution. Such continuity guarantees that $B_\varepsilon^E(\eta)$ contains points other than $1_G$.

**Lemma 1.2.** *(**Fragmentation Lemma**; cf. [Hal, Ch. XII §62 Th. A]). For $\lambda\in\mathcal{M}_{sub}(G)$ a left-invariant submeasure on $\mathcal{U}(G)$ in a Polish group G equipped with a finer right-invariant topology $\tau$ with $1_G$-open-nhd family $\tau_1\subseteq\mathcal{U}_+^L(G)$: if the map*

$$x\mapsto ||x||_E^\lambda$$

*is continuous under $\tau$ at $x=1_G$ for each $E\in\mathcal{U}_+^L(G)$*
*– then, for each $\emptyset\ne E,F\in\tau$ and $\varepsilon>0$ with $\varepsilon<\lambda(E)$, there exists $H\in\tau_1$ with $HH^{-1}\subseteq FF^{-1}$ and*

$$||h'h^{-1}||_E^\lambda<\varepsilon \qquad (h,h'\in H): \qquad HH^{-1}\subseteq B_\varepsilon^E,$$

*so that $diam_E^\lambda(H)\le\varepsilon$.*

*Proof.* Pick any $f\in F$, and $D\in\tau_1$ satisfying $||x||_E^\lambda<\varepsilon/2$ for all $x\in D$. As $\tau$ is right-invariant and $1_G\in D\cap Ff^{-1}\in\tau$, pick $H\in\tau_1$ with $H\subseteq D\cap Ff^{-1}$; then

$$HH^{-1}=Hff^{-1}H^{-1}\subseteq FF^{-1}.$$

For $h,h'\in H$, as $h,h'\in D$,

$$||h'f(hf)^{-1}||_E^\lambda=||h'h^{-1}||_E^\lambda\le||h'||_E^\lambda+||h^{-1}||_E^\lambda=||h'||_E^\lambda+||h||_E^\lambda<\varepsilon. \qquad \square$$

In the presence of a refinement topology $\tau$ on the group $G$, the lemma motivates further notation: write $\mathcal{P}_{\text{cont}}(G,\tau)$, or just

$$\mathcal{P}(\tau):=\{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(G,\mathcal{T}_d): g\mapsto||g||_E^{\hat{\mu}}:=\hat{\mu}(gE\triangle E) \text{ is } \tau\text{-continuous at } 1_G\}.$$

Of necessity attention here focuses on continuity. The characterization question as to which topologies $\tau$ yield a non-empty $\mathcal{P}(\tau)$ is in part answered by Theorem 1M below. Indeed, for Haar measure $\eta$ in the locally compact case,

$$\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\tau) \qquad (\mu \ll \eta, \tau \supseteq \mathcal{T}_d),$$

by (†) in the presence of $d\mu/d\eta$ as a kernel:

$$||x||_E^\mu = 1 - 2\int 1_E(t)1_{E^{-1}}(t^{-1}x)\frac{d\mu}{d\eta}d\eta(t). \qquad (\dagger\dagger)$$

However, $\mathcal{P}(G)$ will contain measures $\mu$ singular with respect to $\eta$ : for such $\mu$, by the Simmons-Mospan Theorem [BinO6,8, Th. SM] there will be Borel subsets $B$ of positive $\mu$-measure such that $BB^{-1}$ has void $\mathcal{T}_d$-interior.

## 2. Weil-like topologies: theorems

Prop. 1.2. now yields the following result, which embraces known Hashimoto topologies [BinO3] in both the Polish abelian setting, where the left Haar null sets form a $\sigma$-ideal (Christensen [Chr]), and likewise in (the not necessarily abelian) Polish groups that are *amenable at* 1 (Solecki [Sol1,2]); this includes, as additive groups, $F$- (hence also Banach) spaces – cf. [BinO3,4], where use is made of Hashimoto topologies.

**Theorem 1**. *Let $G$ be a Polish group and $\tau$ both a left- and a right-invariant refinement topology with $1_G$-open-nhd family $\tau_1 \subseteq \mathcal{U}_+(G)$.*
*Then both the families $\{AA^{-1} : A \in \tau_1\}$ and $\{B_\varepsilon^E(\hat{\mu}) : \emptyset \neq E \in \tau, \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\tau)$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq \hat{\mu}(E)\}$ generate neighbourhoods of the identity under which $G$ is a topological group. Moreover, the pseudo-norms*

$$\{||.||_E^{\hat{\mu}} : \emptyset \neq E \in \tau, \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\tau)\}$$

*are downward directed by refinement as follows: for $\emptyset \neq E, F \in \tau_1$, $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\tau)$ and $\varepsilon < \min\{\hat{\lambda}(E), \hat{\mu}(F)\}$, there is $H \in \tau_1$ such that for $0 < \delta < \min\{\tilde{\lambda}(H), \hat{\mu}(H)\}$*

$$B_\delta^H(\lambda) \cap B_\delta^H(\mu) \subseteq B_\varepsilon^E(\lambda) \cap B_\varepsilon^F(\mu).$$

*Proof.* The proof is similar to but simpler than that of [Hal, Ch. XII §62 Th. A]. With the notation of Prop. 1.2. for $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\tau)$, given two (non-left-Haar-null) sets $E, F \in \tau_1$ and $\varepsilon < \min\{\hat{\lambda}(E), \hat{\mu}(F)\}$, by the Fragmentation Lemma (Lemma 1.2. of §1) applied separately to $\hat{\lambda}$ and to $\hat{\mu}$, there are $A, B \in \tau_1$ with

$$AA^{-1} \subseteq B_\varepsilon^E(\hat{\lambda}), \quad BB^{-1} \subseteq B_\varepsilon^F(\hat{\mu}).$$

Take any $H \in \tau_1$ with $H \subseteq A \cap B$; then

$$HH^{-1} \subseteq AA^{-1} \cap BB^{-1}.$$

Since $H \in \mathcal{U}_+(G)$ (as $\tau_1 \subseteq \mathcal{U}_+(G)$), take $\delta$ with $0 < \delta < \min\{\hat{\lambda}(H), \hat{\mu}(H)\}$; then by $(*)$ of I, Lemma 1.1,

$$B_\delta^H(\hat{\lambda}) \cap B_\delta^H(\hat{\mu}) \subseteq HH^{-1} \subseteq AA^{-1} \cap BB^{-1} \subseteq B_\varepsilon^E(\hat{\lambda}) \cap B_\varepsilon^F(\hat{\mu}).$$

(So 'mutual refinement' holds between the sets of the form $AA^{-1}$ and those of the form $B_\varepsilon^E$.) As $||\cdot||_E^{\hat{\mu}}$ is a pre-norm,

$$B^E_{\varepsilon/2}(\hat{\mu})B^E_{\varepsilon/2}(\hat{\mu})^{-1} = B^E_{\varepsilon/2}(\hat{\mu})B^E_{\varepsilon/2}(\hat{\mu}) \subseteq B^E_{\varepsilon}(\hat{\mu}).$$

By the Fragmentation Lemma again, given any $x \in G$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, choose $H \in \tau_1$ with $HH^{-1} \subseteq B^E_\varepsilon(\tilde{\mu})$. Then with $F := xH \in \tau$,

$$B^F_\varepsilon(\hat{\mu}) = \{z : ||z||^{\hat{\mu}}_F < \varepsilon\} \subseteq (xH)(xH)^{-1} = xHH^{-1}x^{-1} \subseteq xB^E_\varepsilon(\hat{\mu})x^{-1}.$$

Finally, for any $x_0$ with $||x_0||^{\hat{\mu}}_E < \varepsilon$, put $\delta := \varepsilon - ||x_0||^{\hat{\mu}}_E$. Then for $||y||^{\hat{\mu}}_E < \delta$,

$$||x_0 \cdot y||^{\hat{\mu}}_E \le ||x_0||^{\hat{\mu}}_E + ||y||^{\hat{\mu}}_E < ||x_0||^{\hat{\mu}}_E + \varepsilon - ||x_0||^{\hat{\mu}}_E < \varepsilon,$$

i.e.

$$x_0 B^E_\delta(\hat{\mu}) \subseteq B^E_\varepsilon(\hat{\mu}). \qquad \square$$

Specializing to locally compact groups yields as a corollary, on writing $B^E_\varepsilon := B^E_\varepsilon(\eta)$ :

**Theorem 1M**. *For $G$ a locally compact group with left Haar measure $\eta$, if:*

$(i)$ *$\tau$ is both a left- and a right-invariant refinement topology with $\tau_1 \subseteq \mathcal{M}_+$,*

$(ii)$ *for every non-empty $E \in \tau$, the pseudo-norm*

$$g \mapsto ||g||_E := \eta(gE \triangle E) \qquad (g \in G)$$

*is continuous under $\tau$ at $g = 1_G$*

*– then both the families $\{AA^{-1} : A \in \tau_1\}$ and $\{B^E_\varepsilon : \emptyset \neq E \in \tau$ and $0 < \varepsilon \le 2\eta(E)\}$ generate neighbourhoods of the identity under which $G$ is a topological group. Moreover, the pseudo-norms*

$$\{||.||_E : \emptyset \neq E \in \tau\}$$

*are downward directed by refinement; indeed, for $\emptyset \neq E, F \in \tau$ and $\varepsilon < 2\min\{\eta(E), \eta(F)\}$, there is $H \in \tau_1$ such that for $0 < \delta < \eta(H)$*

$$B^H_\delta \subseteq B^E_\varepsilon \cap B^F_\varepsilon.$$

*Proof.* It is enough to replace $\mathcal{P}(G)$ by $\{\eta\}$ (so that $\lambda$ and $\mu$ both refer to $\eta$), and to note that if $xE$ and $E$ are disjoint, then $\eta(xE \triangle E) = 2\eta(E)$, so that in Lemma 1.1. the bound $\eta^*(E)$ in the restriction governing inclusion may be replaced by $2\eta(E)$. $\square$

*Remark* 2.1. As in [Hal, Ch. XII §62 Th. F], but by the Fragmentation Lemma (and by the countable additivity of $\eta$), the Weil-like topology on a locally compact $G$ in Theorem 1M is locally bounded (norm-totally-bounded in some ball). Then $G$ with the Weil-like topology may be densely embedded in its completion $\hat{G}$, which is in turn locally compact, being locally complete and (totally) bounded. However, the corresponding argument in the case of the preceeding more general Theorem 1 fails, since $\hat{\mu}$ there is not necessarily countably additive.

Finally, we give a category version of Theorem 1M, as an easy corollary; indeed, our main task is merely to define what is meant by 'mutatis mutandis' in the present context. Denote by $\mathcal{B}_+(\tau)$ the non-meagre *Baire* sets (= with the Baire property, [Oxt2]) of a topology $\tau$. Given the assumption $\tau_1 \subseteq \mathcal{B}_+$ below, we are entitled to refer to the usual quasi-interior of any $E \in \mathcal{B}_+$, denoted below by $\tilde{E}$, as in Part I Cor. $2'$ [BinO6, Cor. $2'$]; we also write $\tilde{B}^E_\varepsilon$ for $B^{\tilde{E}}_\varepsilon(\eta)$.

**Theorem 1B**. *For $G$ a locally compact group with left Haar measure $\eta$, if:*

$(i)$ *$\tau$ is both a left- and a right-invariant refinement topology with $\tau_1 \subseteq \mathcal{B}_+$ and with the left Nikodym property (preservation of category under left shifts),*

$(ii)$ *for every non-empty $E \in \tau$ the pseudo-norm*

$$g \mapsto ||g||_{\tilde{E}} := \eta(g\tilde{E} \triangle \tilde{E}) \qquad (g \in G)$$

*is continuous under $\tau$ at $g = 1_G$*

*– then both the families $\{AA^{-1} : A \in \tau_1\}$ and $\{\tilde{B}^E_\varepsilon : \emptyset \neq E \in \tau$ and $0 < \varepsilon \leq 2\eta(\tilde{E})\}$ generate neighbourhoods of the identity under which $G$ is a topological group. Moreover, the pseudo-norms*

$$\{||.||_{\tilde{E}} : \emptyset \neq E \in \tau\}$$

*are downward directed by refinement; indeed, for $\emptyset \neq E, F \in \tau$ and $\varepsilon < 2\min\{\eta(\tilde{E}), \eta(\tilde{F})\}$, there is $H \in \tau_1$ such that for $0 < \delta < 2\eta(\tilde{H})$*

$$\tilde{B}^H_\delta \subseteq \tilde{B}^E_\varepsilon \cap \tilde{B}^F_\varepsilon.$$

*Proof.* In place of the inclusion of Lemma 1.1. we note a result stronger than that valid for $\tilde{E}$ (i.e. inclusion only in $\tilde{E}\tilde{E}^{-1}$): since meagreness is translation-invariant (the 'Nikodym property' of [BinO3]), $(xE)\tilde{} = x\tilde{E}$ for non-meagre Baire $E$, so $x\tilde{E} \cap \tilde{E} \neq \emptyset$ implies $xE \cap E \neq \emptyset$, and so again

$$\tilde{B}^E_\varepsilon = B^{\tilde{E}}_\varepsilon \subseteq EE^{-1};$$

here again in Lemma 1.1. the bound $\eta^*(E)$ in the restriction governing inclusion may be replaced by $2\eta(E)$. The proof of Theorem 1 may now be followed verbatim, but for the replacement of $\mathcal{P}(G)$ by $\{\eta\}$, using the stronger inclusion just observed, and of $B^{\cdot}_\varepsilon(\eta)$ by $\tilde{B}^{\cdot}_\varepsilon$. □

*Remark* 2.2. The last result follows more directly from Th. 1M in a context where there exists on $G$ a *Marczewski measure* (see [TomW, Ch. 13, cf. Ch. 11]), i.e. a finitely additive invariant measure on $\mathcal{B}$ vanishing on bounded members of $\mathcal{B}_0$; this includes $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{S}^1$, albeit under AC [TomW, Cor. 13.3]; cf. [Myc], but not $\mathbb{R}^d$ for $d \geq 3$ [DouF].

With the groundwork of Part I [BinO6,7] on translation-continuity for *compacts* completed, we close by establishing the promised dichotomy associated with the map

$$x \mapsto ||x||^\mu_E = \mu(xE \triangle E),$$

for measurable $E$ : the Fubini Null Theorem [BinO6,7, Th. FN (Part I §1)] creates a duality between the vanishing of the $F$-based pseudo-norm and a *dichotomy* for $x$-translates of $E^{-1}$ in relation to $F$ according as $x \in E$ or $x \notin E$, which are thus unable in each case to distinguish between the points of $F$. Below we write $\forall^\mu$ for the generalized quantifier "for $\mu$-a.a.' (cf. [Kec, 8.J]).

**Theorem 2 (Almost Inclusion-Exclusion).** *For $G$ a Polish group $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(G)$ and non-null $\mu$-measurable $E,F$, the vanishing $\mu$-a.e. on $F$ of the $E$-norm under $\mu$:*

$$||x||_F^\mu = \mu(xE \triangle E) = 0 \qquad (x \in F),$$

*is equivalent to the following Almost Inclusion-Exclusion for translates of $E^{-1}$:*

$(i)$ Inclusion: *$F$ is $\mu$-almost covered by $\mu$-almost every translate $xE^{-1}$for $x \in E$:*

$$\mu(F \backslash xE^{-1}) = 0 \qquad (\forall^\mu x \in E),$$

$(ii)$ Exclusion: *$F$ is $\mu$-almost disjoint from $\mu$-almost every translate $xE^{-1}$for $x \notin E$:*

$$\mu(F \cap xE^{-1}) = 0 \qquad (\forall^\mu x \notin E).$$

*Proof.* By the Fubini Null Theorem [BinO6,7, Th. FN (Part I §1)], applied to the set $H$ of Part I Prop. 3 [BinO6, Prop. 3], i.e.

$$H := \bigcup\nolimits_{x \in F} \{x\} \times (xE \triangle E),$$

$H$ has vertical sections $H_x$ almost all $\mu$-null iff $\mu$-almost all of its horizontal sections $H^y$ are $\mu$-null. But, since $y \in xE$ iff $x \in yE^{-1}$, $H^y = F \backslash yE^{-1}$ for $y \in E$ and $H^y := F \cap yE^{-1}$ for $y \in G \backslash E$. □

*Remark* 2.3. If the inclusion side of the dichotomy of Th. 8 holds for all $x \in E$, then $F \subseteq EE^{-1}$. The converse direction may fail: consider $E = (1,2) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $F = (-1,1)$, so that $E - E = F$, but no translate of $-E$ may cover $F$.

## 3. Complements

**1**. *Inclusion-Exclusion dichotomy.* Above we focus on inclusions amongst sets of the form $EE^{-1}$, for $E \in \mathcal{U}(G)$, the exception being the Inclusion-Exclusion of a set $F \in \mathcal{U}(G)$ by an $E$-, or non-$E$, $x$-translate of $E^{-1}$ in Theorem 2 (a dichotomy as between $E$ and its complement). This places most of our study on one side of a related inclusion-exclusion dichotomy – for subsets $H, B \in \mathcal{U}(G)$ in a group $G$ one has either inclusion, or 'near-disjointness':

$$HH^{-1} \subseteq BB^{-1}, \qquad \text{or} \qquad HH^{-1} \cap BB^{-1} = \{1_G\}.$$

Inclusion may be equivalently re-phrased to the meeting of distinct pairs of $H^{-1}$-translates of $B$:

$$kB \cap k'B \neq \emptyset \qquad (k,k' \in H^{-1}), \tag{$In$}$$

whereas exclusion to their disjointness:

$$kB \cap k'B = \emptyset \qquad (\text{distinct } k,k' \in H^{-1}). \tag{$Ex$}$$

The duality of the relation of $(Ex)$ to the results in Th. 2 is clarified by observing that $\mu(F \cap xE^{-1}) = 0$, for a.a. $x \in C$, is equivalent to $\mu(C \cap yE) = 0$, for a.a. $y \in F$. Indeed,

$$0 = \iint 1_C(x) 1_F(y) 1_{xE^{-1}}(y) d(\mu \times \mu) = \iint 1_F(y) 1_C(x) 1_{yE}(x) d(\mu \times \mu).$$

The condition $(Ex)$ gives rise to $I_0$, the $\sigma$-ideal introduced in Balcerzak et al. [BalRS], generated by Borel sets $B$ having perfectly many disjoint translates, as in $(Ex)$ above with $H^{-1}$ a perfect compact set (i.e. compact and dense-in-itself); continuum-many disjoint translates of a compactum also emerge in a theorem of Ulam concerning a non-locally compact Polish group: see [Oxt1, Th. 1]. Such *perfect exclusions* offer a combinatorial tool, akin to *shift-compactness* (as in Part I Th. 3 or [BinO6, Th. 3], the latter requiring a subsequence embedding under translation of any null sequence into a non-negligible set – cf. [BinO1,2] [MilO], [BanJ]), and play a key role in the context of groups with *ample generics*; see for instance the small-index property of [HodHLS].

Solecki [Sol3] proves a 'Fubini for negligibles'-type theorem (cf. Theorem FN in Part I §1 or [BinO6, §1]): the non-negligible vertical sections (relative to a uniformly Steinhaus ideal) of a planar $I_0$-negligible set form a horizontal $I_0$-negligible set. The ideal $I_0$ is of particular interest, as it violates the countable (anti)-chain condition, [BalRS].

**2**. *Regular open sets.* Recall that, in a topological space $X$, $U$ is *regular open* if $U = \mathrm{int}(\mathrm{cl}U)$, and that $\mathrm{int}(\mathrm{cl}U)$ is itself regular open; for background see e.g. [GivH, Ch. 10]. For $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}$ the Baire-density topology of a normed topological group, let $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}^{RO}$ denote the regular open sets. For $D \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}^{RO}$, put

$$N_D := \{t \in G : tD \cap D \neq \emptyset\} = DD^{-1}, \qquad \mathcal{N}_1 := \{N_D : 1_G \in D \in \mathcal{D}_{RO}\};$$

then $\mathcal{N}_1$ is a base at $1_G$ (since $1_G \in C \in \mathcal{D}_{RO}$ and $1_G \in D \in \mathcal{D}_{RO}$ yield $1_G \in C \cap D \in \mathcal{D}_{RO}$) comprising $\mathcal{T}$-neighbourhoods that are $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}$-open (since $DD^{-1} = \bigcup\{Dd^{-1} : d \in D\}$). We raise the (metrizability) question, by analogy with the Weil topology of a measurable group (see §1 and §3.1 above): with $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{B}}$ above replaced by a general density topology $\mathcal{D}$ on a group $G$, when is the topology generated by $\mathcal{N}_1$ on $G$ a norm topology? Some indications of an answer may be found in [ArhT, §3.3]. We note the following answer in the context of Theorem 1B; compare Struble's Theorem [Str2], or [DieS, Ch. 8]. If there exists a separating sequence $D_n$, i.e. such that for each $g \neq 1_G$ there is $n$ with $||g||_{D_n} = 1$, then

$$||g|| := \sum\nolimits_n 2^{-n} ||g||_{D_n}$$

is a norm, since it is separating and, by the Nikodym property, $(D \cap g^{-1}D) = g^{-1}(gD \cap D) \in \mathcal{B}_0$.

**3**. *The Effros Theorem* asserts that a transitive continuous action of a Polish group $G$ on a space $X$ of second category in itself is necessarily 'open', or more accurately is *microtransitive* (the (continuous) evaluation map $e_x : g \mapsto g(x)$ takes open neighbourhoods $E$ of $1_G$ to open neighbourhoods that are the orbit sets $E(x)$ of $x$). It emerges that this assertion is very close to the shift-compactness property: see [Ost]. The Effros Theorem reduces to the Open Mapping Theorem when $G, X$ are Banach spaces regarded as additive groups, and $G$ acts on $X$ by a linear surjection

$L : G \to X$ via $g(x) = L(g) + x$. Indeed, here $e_0(E) = L(E)$ for $e_0$ evaluation at 0. For a neat proof, choose an open neighbourhood $U$ of 0 in $G$ with $E \supseteq U - U$; then $L(U)$ is Baire (being analytic) and non-meagre (since $\{L(nU) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ covers $X$), and so $L(U) - L(U) \subseteq L(E)$ is an open neighbourhood of 0 in $X$.

**4**. *Beyond local compactness: Haar category-measure duality.* In the absence of Haar measure, the definition of left Haar null subsets of a topological group $G$ requires $\mathcal{U}(G)$, the universally measurable sets – by dint of the role of the totality of (probability) measures on $G$. The natural dual of $\mathcal{U}(G)$ is the class $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{B}}(G)$ of *universally Baire sets*, defined for $G$ with a Baire topology as those sets $B$ whose preimages $f^{-1}(B)$ are Baire in any compact Hausdorff space $K$ for any continuous $f : K \to G$. Initially considered in [FenMW] for $G = \mathbb{R}$, these have attracted continued attention for their role in the investigation of axioms of determinacy and large cardinals – see especially [Woo], cf. [MarS] – and is a key notion in [BanJ].

Analogously to the left Haar null sets, define a *left Haar meagre* set as any set $M$ coverable by a universally Baire set $B$ for which there are a compact Hausdorff space $K$ and a continuous $f : K \to G$ with $f^{-1}(gB)$ meagre in $K$ for all $g \in G$. Here, as recently noted in [BanGJS, Prop. 5.1], $K$ may be replaced by the Cantor space $2^{\mathbb{N}}$. These were introduced, in the abelian Polish group setting with $K$ metrizable, by Darji [Dar], cf. [Jab], and shown there to form a σ-ideal of meagre sets (coextensive with the meagre sets for $G$ locally compact).

**5**. *Metrizability and Christensen's Theorem.* An analytic topological group is metrizable; so if also it is a Baire space, then it is a Polish group – [HofT, Th. 2.3.6].

**6.** *Metrizability of refinements.* Underlying the Disaggregation Theorem (Part II Th. 1) which refines the topology $\mathcal{T}_d$ of $G$ there are refining metrics:

$$d_K(x,y) := d(x,y) + |\mu(Kx) - \mu(Ky)|$$

(for a family of sets $K \in \mathcal{K}_+(\mu)$ – cf. the Struble sampler of §1 above), reminiscent of Theorem 1 above.

**7.** *Quasi-invariance and the Mackey topology of analytic Borel groups.* We comment on the force of full quasi-invariance of a measure in connection with a *Steinhaus triple* $(H, G, \mu)$ [BinO5] with $H$ and $G$ completely metrizable. Both groups, being absolutely Borel, are analytic spaces. So both carry a 'standard' Borel structures with $H$ a Borel substructure of $G$. Mackey [Mac] investigates such Borel groups, defining also a (Borel) measure $\mu$ to be 'standard' if it has a Borel support. It emerges that every σ-finite Borel measure in an analytic Borel space is standard [Mac, Th. 6.1]. Of interest to us is Mackey's notion of a 'measure class' $C_\mu$, comprising all Borel measures ν with the same null sets as $\mu : \mathcal{M}_0(\nu) = \mathcal{M}_0(\mu)$. Such a measure class may be closed under translation, and may be right or left invariant; then their mutually common null sets are themselves invariant, and so may be viewed as witnessing quasi-invariance of the measure $\mu$. Mackey shows that a Borel group with a one-sided invariant measure class has a both-sidedly invariant measure class [Mac, Lemma 7.2]; furthermore, if the class is countably generated, then the class contains a left-invariant and a right-invariant measure [Mac, Lemma 7.3]. This enables Mackey to improve on Weil's theorem in showing that an analytic Borel group $G$ with a one-sidedly invariant measure class, in particular one generated by a quasi-invariant measure, has a unique locally compact topology on $G$ both yielding a topological group structure and generating the given Borel structure.

## REFERENCES


[Amb] W. Ambrose, *Measures on locally compact topological groups. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **61** (1947), 106-121.

[ArhT] A. Arhangelskii, M. Tkachenko, *Topological groups and related structures.* World Scientific, 2008.

[BalRS] M. Balcerzak, A. Rosłanowski, S. Shelah, *Ideals without ccc.* J. Symbolic Logic **63** (1998), 128-148.

[BanJ] T. Banakh, E. Jabłońska, *Null–finite sets in metric groups and their applications*, Israel J. Math. 230 (2019), 361–386.

[BanGJS] T. Banakh, S. Głąb, E. Jabłońska, J. Swaczyna, *Haar-$I$ sets: looking at small sets in Polish groups through compact glasses*, arXiv: 1803.06712.

[Bin] N. H. Bingham, *Finite additivity versus countable additivity.* Electronic J. History of Probability and Statistics, **6** (2010), 35p.

[BinO1] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, *Normed groups: Dichotomy and duality.* Dissert. Math. **472** (2010), 138p.

[BinO2] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, *Dichotomy and infinite combinatorics: the theorems of Steinhaus and Ostrowski,* Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **150** (2011), 1-22.

[BinO3] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, *Beyond Lebesgue and Baire IV: Density topologies and a converse Steinhaus-Weil theorem.* Topology and its Applications **239** (2018), 274-292 (arXiv:1607.00031).

[BinO4] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, *Additivity, subadditivity and linearity: Automatic continuity and quantifier weakening, Indag. Math.* (N.S.) **29** (2018), 687–713. (arXiv 1405.3948v3).

[BinO5] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, *Beyond Haar and Cameron-Martin: the Steinhaus support,* Topology Appl. **260** (2019), 23–56. (arXiv: 1805.02325v2).

[BinO6] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, *The Steinhaus-Weil property and its converse: subcontinuity and amenability,* arXiv:1607.00049.

[BinO7] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, *The Steinhaus-Weil property: I. Subcontinuity and amenability,* Sarajevo J. Math Vol. 16 (29), No.1 (2020), 13-32.

[BinO8] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, *The Steinhaus-Weil property: II. The Simmons-Mospan converse* Sarajevo J. Math Vol. 16 (29), No.1 (2020), 179-186.

[BinO9] N. H. Bingham and A. J. Ostaszewski, *The Steinhaus-Weil property: IV. Other interior-point properties,* Sarajevo J. Math Vol. 18 (31), No.1 (2020), to appear.

[Bog] V. I. Bogachev, *Measure theory.* Vol. I, II, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2007.

[Chr] J. P. R. Christensen, *On sets of Haar measure zero in abelian Polish groups,* Proceedings of the International Symposium on Partial Differential Equations and the Geometry of Normed Linear Spaces (Jerusalem, 1972). *Israel J. Math.* **13** (1972), 255–260 (1973).

[ChrH] J. P. R. Christensen, W. Herer, *On the existence of pathological submeasures and the construction of exotic topological groups,* Math. Ann. **213** (1975), 203–210.

[Dar] U. B. Darji, *On Haar meager sets.* Topology Appl.**160** (2013), 2396–2400.

[DieS] J. Diestel, A. Spalsbury, *The joys of Haar measure.* Grad. Studies in Math. **150**. Amer. Math. Soc., 2014.

[DouF] R. Dougherty, M. Foreman, *Banach-Tarski decompositions using sets with the property of Baire*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 7 (1994), no. 1, 75–124.

[Dre1] L. Drewnowski, *Topological rings of sets, continuous set functions, integration.* I, II, III, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Sér. Sci. Math. Astronom. Phys. **20** (1972), 269–276; **20** (1972), 277–286; **20** (1972), 439–445.

[Dre2] L. Drewnowski, *On control submeasures and measures.* Studia Math. **50** (1974), 203–224.

[FenMW] Q. Feng, M. Magidor, H. Woodin, Universally Baire sets of reals, in H. Judah, W. Just, H. Woodin (eds.), *Set theory of the continuum*, 203–242, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ. **26**, Springer, 1992.

[Fre] D. Fremlin, *Measure theory* Vol. 3: *Measure algebras*. Corrected 2nd printing of the 2002 original. Torres Fremlin, Colchester, 2004.

[Gao] Su Gao, *Invariant descriptive set theory*. Pure and Applied Mathematics **293**. CRC Press, 2009.

[GivH] S. Givant and P. Halmos, *Introduction to Boolean algebras*, Springer 2009.

[Hal] P. R. Halmos, *Measure theory*, Grad. Texts in Math. **18**, Springer 1974 (1st ed. Van Nostrand, 1950).

[HewR] E. Hewitt, K. A. Ross, *Abstract harmonic analysis*, Vol. I, Grundl. math. Wiss. **115**, Springer 1963 [Vol. II, Grundl. **152**, 1970].

[HodHLS] W. Hodges, I. Hodkinson, D. Lascar, S. Shelah, *The small index property for* ω-stable ω-categorical structures and for the random graph. *J. London Math. Soc.* **48** (1993), 204–218.

[HofT] J. Hoffmann-Jørgensen, F. Topsøe, *Analytic spaces and their application*, in [Rog, Part 3].

[Jab] E. Jabłońska, *Some analogies between Haar meager sets and Haar null sets in abelian Polish groups*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **421** (2015), 1479–1486.

[Kec] A. S. Kechris, *Classical descriptive set theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **156**, Springer, 1995.

[Kne] M. Kneser, *Summenmengen in lokalkompakten abelschen Gruppen*, Math. Z. **66** (1956), 88-110.

[Kod] K. Kodaira, *Uber die Beziehung zwischen den Massen und den Topologien in einer Gruppe*, Proc. Phys.-Math. Soc. Japan (3) **23** (1941), 67-119.

[Mac] G. W. Mackey, *Borel structure in groups and their duals.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **85** (1957), 134–165.

[Mah] D. Maharam, *An algebraic characterization of measure algebras*, Ann. of Math. (2) **48** (1947). 154–167.

[MarS] D. A. Martin, J. R. Steel, *Projective determinacy*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **85** (1988), 6582–6586.

[MilO] H. I. Miller and A. J. Ostaszewski, *Group action and shift-compactness*, J. Math. Anal. App. **392** (2012), 23-39.

[Mue] B. J. Mueller, *Three results for locally compact groups connected with the Haar measure density theorem*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **16** (6) (1965), 1414-1416.

[Myc] J. Mycielski, *Finitely additive measures*, Coll. Math., **42** (1979), 309-318.

[Ost] A. J. Ostaszewski, *Effros, Baire, Steinhaus-Weil and non-separability*, Topology and its Applications (Mary Ellen Rudin Memorial Volume) **195** (2015), 265-274.

[Oxt1] J. C. Oxtoby, *Invariant measures in groups which are not locally compact*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **60** (1946), 215–237.

[Oxt2] J. C. Oxtoby, *Measure and category*, 2nd ed. Graduate Texts in Math. 2, Springer, 1980 (1st ed. 1972).

[Pat] A. L. T. Paterson, *Amenability.* Math. Surveys and Mon. **29**, Amer. Math. Soc., 1988

[Pet] B. J. Pettis,*On continuity and openness of homomorphisms in topological groups,* Ann. of Math. (2) **52** (1950), 293–308.

[Rog] C. A. Rogers, J. Jayne, C. Dellacherie, F. Topsøe, J. Hoffmann-Jørgensen, D. A. Martin, A. S. Kechris, A. H. Stone, *Analytic sets,* Academic Press, 1980.

[Sol1] S. Solecki, *Size of subsets of groups and Haar null sets*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **15** (2005), 246–273.

[Sol2] S. Solecki, *Amenability, free subgroups, and Haar null sets in non-locally compact groups*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **93** (2006), 693–722.

[Sol3] S. Solecki, *A Fubini theorem*, Topology Appl. **154** (2007), 2462–2464.

[Ste] H. Steinhaus, *Sur les distances des points de mesure positive*, *Fund. Math.* **1** (1920), 83-104.

[Str1] R. Struble, *Almost periodic functions on locally compact groups*. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. **39** (1953). 122–126.

[Str2] R. Struble, *Metrics in locally compact groups*, Compositio Math. **28** (1974), 217–222.

[Tal] M. Talagrand, *Maharam's problem*, Ann. of Math. (2) **168** (2008), 981–1009.

[TomW] G. Tomkowicz, S. Wagon, *The Banach-Tarski paradox.* Cambridge University Press, 2016 (1st ed. 1985).

[Web] H. Weber, *FN-topologies and group-valued measures*. in E. Pap (ed) Handbook of measure theory, Vol. I, 703–743, North-Holland, 2002.

[Wei] A. Weil, *L'intégration dans les groupes topologiques*, Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles **1145**, Hermann, 1965 (1st ed. 1940).

[Woo] W. H. Woodin, *The axiom of determinacy, forcing axioms, and the nonstationary ideal*, 2nd ed., De Gruyter Series in Logic and its Applications **1**. De Gruyter, 2010.

[Yam] Y. Yamasaki, *Measures on infinite-dimensional spaces*, World Scientific, 1985.

(Received: September 17, 2019 )
(Revised: September 17, 2019 )

Nicholas H. Bingham
Mathematics Department
Imperial College
London SW7 2AZ
e-mail: *n.bingham@ic.ac.uk*
*and*
Adam J. Ostaszewski
Mathematics Department
London School of Economics
Houghton Street
London WC2A 2AE
e-mail: *a.j.ostaszewski@lse.ac.uk*