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Abstract. The principal result gives conditions which imply that a solution to the Plateau problem inherits the symmetries of its boundary. Specifically, let \( G \) be a compact connected Lie subgroup of \( SO(n) \). Assume the principal orbits have dimension \( m \), there are no exceptional orbits and the distribution of \( (n - m) \)-planes orthogonal to the principal orbits is involutive. We show that if \( B \) is a finite sum of oriented principal orbits, then every absolutely area minimizing current with boundary \( B \) is invariant.

As a consequence of the methods used, the above Plateau problems are shown to be equivalent to 1-dimensional variational problems in the orbit space. Some results concerning invariant area minimizing currents in Riemannian manifolds are also obtained.

1. Introduction. The structure of solutions to the oriented Plateau problem has been under investigation since their existence was established by Federer and Fleming in 1960 [FF]. One question that has arisen is whether solutions to the Plateau problem inherit the symmetries of their boundaries. Specifically, if \( G \subseteq O(n) \) is a compact Lie group acting on \( \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( B_0 \) is the boundary of an integral current with \( B_0 \) invariant under the action of \( G \), then must a solution to the Plateau problem with boundary \( B_0 \) also be invariant? Indeed, does there exist even one invariant solution? Federer has shown that in general there may exist no invariant solution [Fl, 5.4.17]. However, Lawson proved that if \( G \subseteq SO(n) \) and \( B_0 \) is a connected, oriented manifold of dimension \( n - 2 \) lying on the unit sphere \( S^{n-1} \), then there exist invariant solutions [L]. Here we show that if \( G \) is connected, there are no exceptional orbits, the distribution of planes orthogonal to the principal orbits is involutive, and \( B_0 \) is a finite sum of oriented principal orbits, then every solution to the oriented Plateau problem with boundary \( B_0 \) is invariant. Moreover, the Plateau problem with boundary \( B_0 \) is equivalent to a 1-dimensional variational problem in the orbit space.

Of central importance to this work is the projecting and lifting of currents in the bundle induced by the group action. If \( G \subseteq SO(n) \) is as above and \( X \) is the set of points which lie on principal orbits (orbits of highest dimension), then \( X \) is an open
dense subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and admits the structure of a fibre bundle with base space $X/G$ and fibre diffeomorphic to a principal orbit [BG, II.5.8]. However, currents of compact support in $\mathbb{R}^n$ may not have compact support when restricted to $X$. Thus we extend Brothers lifting operator [BJ1, 3.3] to currents with arbitrary support that are representable by integration and establish some of the basic properties of this extension.

In §4, we establish a useful characterization of currents in $X$ that are lifts (4.2; compare [BJ1, 3.7]) and show that the mass of a current is not increased if the current is projected to $X/G$ then lifted back up to $X$. Indeed, 4.8(2) implies that the mass of a current $T$ of finite mass is strictly decreased by projecting then lifting $T$ unless $T$ is tangent to the orbits of $G$. It is this fact together with the involutivity assumption (which implies that $\partial$ commutes with the projection operator) which implies that any locally flat current with boundary $B_0$ that minimizes mass among all locally flat currents with boundary $B_0$ is a lift and hence invariant (5.2).

In order to obtain positive results concerning integral currents, we show that the problem of minimizing mass among locally flat currents in $X$ is equivalent to a 1-dimensional variational problem (with real coefficients) in $X/G$. Restricting to compact subsets of $X/G$ we apply [F2, 5.12] from which it follows that solutions to the original problem minimize mass not only among integral currents with boundary $B_0$, but also, when restricted to $X$, among locally flat currents with boundary $B_0$. The invariance of the original solution then follows from 5.2.

Since most of the techniques are independent of Euclidean space, the following result is also obtained: Let $M$ be a compact orientable Riemannian manifold and let $G$ be a compact connected Lie group of isometries of $M$. Suppose that there is one orbit type and the distribution of planes orthogonal to the orbits is involutive. If $B_0$ is a finite union of oriented orbits, then any integral current with boundary $B_0$ which minimizes mass among all such currents is invariant.

Most of the results here are from [B]. However, 3.5, 3.6, the stronger versions of 5.2 and 5.7, 5.8, 5.10 and 5.11 are new. It should be noted that [BJ1, 3.6 and 3.7], [BJ2, 3.4] and [L, Theorems 2(c) and 4] have served as inspiration and in some cases models for 3.1, 4.2, 3.4, 5.4 and 5.5, respectively. I would also like to express my deep appreciation for the helpful suggestions and advice that I have received from John E. Brothers.

2. Notation. We adopt the notation of [Fl, pp. 669–671] except for the following additions, changes and restrictions.

The identity map on a set $A$ will be denoted by $\text{id}_A$.

We will use $T_xM$ to denote the tangent space to a manifold $M$ at the point $x \in M$, and $TM$ will be the tangent bundle of $M$.

If $M$ and $N$ are $C^\infty$ manifolds and $f: N \to M$ is $C^\infty$, then

$$f_*: TN \to TM$$

is the (intrinsic) differential of $f$. In case $f$ is 1-1 and $\xi$ is a vectorfield on $N$, we define $f_*\xi$ by
Let $M$ be an oriented $n$-dimensional Riemannian manifold with metric $b$ and unit orienting $n$-vectorfield $\tilde{M}$. For each $0 < k < n$ let $\gamma_k: \wedge_k TM \to \wedge^k TM$ be the isomorphism characterized by
\[
\langle \alpha, \gamma_k(\beta) \rangle = b(\alpha, \beta)
\]
for $\alpha, \beta \in \wedge_k T_x M$ and $x \in M$. The Hodge duality operators are the maps
\[
* : \wedge_k TM \to \wedge_{n-k} TM \quad \text{and} \quad * : \wedge^k TM \to \wedge^{n-k} TM
\]
defined by the formulae
\[
* v = \tilde{M}(x)L(\gamma_k(v)) \quad \text{and} \quad * \omega = \gamma_{n-k}(\tilde{M}(x)\omega)
\]
for $x \in M, \ v \in \wedge_k T_x M$ and $\omega \in \wedge^k T_x M$ (see [F1, 1.7.8]).

Let $\mathcal{B} = (X, \pi, Z, Y, H)$ be a smooth fibre bundle. We assume that the total space $X$, the base space $Z$, and the fibre $Y$ are Riemannian manifolds of dimensions $n$, $n - m$ and $m$, respectively; that $Y$ is compact, connected, and orientable; that the metric on $Y$ is normalized so that $\gamma^m(Y) = 1$; and that $H$ acts as a group of orientation preserving isometries of $Y$. Let $\omega_0$ be a unit orienting $m$-form for $Y$ and $\tilde{Y}$ the $C^\infty m$-vectorfield dual to $\omega_0$. Then there exists a unique $m$-form $\Omega \in \mathcal{D}^m(X)$ such that
\[
(1) \ |\Omega|^{-1}\Omega(x) \text{ is dual to } |f_\# \tilde{Y}|^{-1}f_\# \tilde{Y}(x), \text{ and}
\]
\[
(2) \ |\Omega(x)| = \left| f_\# \tilde{Y}(x) \right|^{-1}
\]
for every admissible map $f$ and $x \in \text{im} f$. One also has
\[
(3) \ f^*\Omega = \omega_0.
\]
Let $\Omega_0 = |\Omega|^{-1}\Omega$ and $\tilde{Y}_0 = \gamma_m^{-1}(\Omega_0)$ be its dual. Note that (1) implies that $\tilde{Y}_0(x)$ is simple and tangent to $\pi^{-1}(\pi(x))$.

For $z \in Z$, denote
\[
Y_z = \gamma^m|\pi^{-1}(z) \wedge \tilde{Y}_0 \in I_m(X).
\]
We will also use $Y_z$ to denote $\pi^{-1}(z) = \text{spt} Y_z$.

The set of all currents on a Riemannian manifold $U$ which are representable by integration will be denoted by $M^\text{loc}_{\ast}(U)$; following [F2] we denote
\[
M_{\ast}(U) = M^\text{loc}_{\ast}(U) \cap \mathcal{D}_{\ast}(U).
\]
Thus $T \in M^\text{loc}_{\ast}(U)$ iff $T|_{\gamma} \in M_{\ast}(U)$ for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{D}_0(U)$.

If $V$ is an open subset of the Riemannian manifold $U$ and $T \in \mathcal{D}_{\ast}(U)$, then $T|_{V}$ will denote the functional restriction of $T$ to $\mathcal{D}_{\ast}(V)$.

3. Lifting currents representable by integration.

3.1. Definition. The projection operator for the bundle $\mathcal{B}$ is the continuous linear map $P_{\mathcal{B}}: \mathcal{D}_{\ast}(X) \to \mathcal{D}_{\ast}(Z)$ of degree $-m$ defined by the formulae
\[
P_{\mathcal{B}}(T) = (-1)^{m(l-m)}\pi_\#(T|_{\Omega}), \quad \text{if } T \in \mathcal{D}_l(X) \text{ with } m < l,
\]
\[
P_{\mathcal{B}}(T) = 0, \quad \text{if } T \in \mathcal{D}_l(X) \text{ with } 0 < l < m.
\]
Note that if $T \in M^\text{loc}_{k+m}(X)$ and $\psi$ is a bounded Borel $l$-form on $Z$ with $l < k,$
then $P_{\mathfrak{g}}(T) \in M_{k}^{\text{loc}}(Z)$ and

$$P_{\mathfrak{g}}(T \cap \pi^4 \psi) = (P_{\mathfrak{g}} T) \cap \psi.$$ 

3.2. Let $L_{\mathfrak{g}}: M_{k}(Z) \to M_{k}(X)$ be the unique linear operator such that:

1. $L_{\mathfrak{g}}(R) = R \times Y$ whenever $\mathfrak{g}$ is a product bundle.
2. $L'$ is natural with respect to maps of bundles with fibre $Y$ and structure group $H$ (see [BJ1, 3.3]).

**Theorem.** There exists a unique linear map $L_{\mathfrak{g}}: M_{k}^{\text{loc}}(Z) \to M_{k}^{\text{loc}}(X)$ such that

$$L_{\mathfrak{g}} R = R \times Y$$

for every $R \in M_{k}^{\text{loc}}(Z)$ and $\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}^{0}(Z)$.

**Proof.** For $R \in M_{k}^{\text{loc}}(Z)$ and $\varphi \in \mathfrak{g}^{k+m}(X)$ define

$$L_{\mathfrak{g}} R(\varphi) = L_{\mathfrak{g}}(R \gamma \varphi)(\varphi)$$

where $\gamma_{\varphi} \in \mathfrak{g}^{0}(Z)$ is such that $\pi(\text{spt } \varphi) \subset \text{int } \gamma_{\varphi}^{-1}\{1\}$. One then uses linearity of $L_{\mathfrak{g}}$ and [BJ1, 3.5(3), 3.6(2) and 3.5(2)] to show that $L_{\mathfrak{g}} R(\varphi)$ is independent of the choice of $\gamma_{\varphi},$

$$L_{\mathfrak{g}}(R \gamma) = L_{\mathfrak{g}}(R \gamma)$$

for $\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}^{0}(Z)$, and $L_{\mathfrak{g}} R \in M_{k}^{\text{loc}}(X)$. Uniqueness is obvious.

3.3. **Corollary.** (1) If $\mathfrak{g}$ is a product bundle, then

$$L_{\mathfrak{g}} R = R \times Y \text{ for } R \in M_{k}^{\text{loc}}(Z).$$

(2) Let $\{R_{j}: j \in J\} \subset M_{k}(Z)$ be such that $\{\text{spt } R_{j}: j \in J\}$ is locally finite. Then

$$R = \sum_{j \in J} R_{j} \in M_{k}^{\text{loc}}(Z) \text{ and } L_{\mathfrak{g}} R = \sum_{j \in J} L_{\mathfrak{g}} R_{j}.$$

(3) For any constant $c \in \mathbb{R}^{+}$, $L_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is continuous on

$$\left\{ R \in M_{k}^{\text{loc}}(Z): M(R) < c \right\}.$$

(4) If $R \in M_{k}^{\text{loc}}(Z)$, then there exist a Baire $k$-vectorfield $\xi$ on $X$ and a Baire function $h > 0$ such that

$$(L_{\mathfrak{g}} R)^{n}(x) = \xi(x) \wedge \tilde{Y}_{\varphi}(x) \text{ and } \tau_{\xi}(h(x)\xi(x)) = \tilde{R}(\pi(x))$$

for $\|L_{\mathfrak{g}} R\|$ almost all $x \in X$.

(5) $P_{\mathfrak{g}} \circ L_{\mathfrak{g}} = \text{id}_{M_{k}^{\text{loc}}(Z)}$.

(6) If $R \in M_{k}^{\text{loc}}(Z)$ and $\psi$ is a bounded Borel $l$-form on $Z$ with $0 < l < k$, then

$$L_{\mathfrak{g}}(R \psi) = (L_{\mathfrak{g}} R) \psi.$$

(7) For $R \in M_{k}^{\text{loc}}(Z)$, $\text{spt } L_{\mathfrak{g}} R = \pi^{-1}(\text{spt } R)$.

(8) The operator $L_{\mathfrak{g}}$ can be uniquely extended to a linear operator on the subspace of $\mathfrak{g}^{0}(Z)$ spanned by

$$\left\{ F \in \mathfrak{g}_{\ast}(Z): F = \partial R \text{ for some } R \in M_{k}^{\text{loc}}(Z) \right\} \cup M_{k}^{\text{loc}}(Z)$$
such that \( L_\partial \circ \partial = \partial \circ L_\partial \). Moreover, (7) holds for the extended operator.

(9) If \( R \in F^\text{loc}_k(Z) \cap M^\text{loc}_k(X) \) and \( T \in F^\text{loc}_{k+m}(X) \cap M^\text{loc}_{k+m}(X) \), then

\[
L_\partial R \in F^\text{loc}_{k+m}(X) \cap M^\text{loc}_{k+m}(X) \quad \text{and} \quad P_\partial T \in F^\text{loc}_k(Z) \cap M^\text{loc}_k(Z).
\]

**Proof.** We begin by establishing

\[
(L_\partial R)(\gamma \circ \tau) = L_\partial (R \gamma) \quad (*)
\]

for \( \gamma \in \mathcal{C}^0(Z) \). For \( \varphi \in \mathcal{C}^{k+m}(X) \) and \( \gamma_\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^0(Z) \) such that \( \pi(\text{supp} \, \varphi) \subseteq \text{int} \gamma_\varphi^{-1}(1) \), one uses 3.2 and [BJ1, 3.6(2)] to see

\[
(L_\partial R)(\gamma \circ \tau)(\varphi) = L_\partial (R \gamma_\varphi)(\gamma \circ \tau)(\varphi) = L_\partial (R \gamma_\varphi)(\varphi)
\]

\[
= L_\partial (R \gamma)(\varphi).
\]

To prove (1), use (*), 3.2, [BJ1, 3.3(1)] and the equation

\[
R \gamma \times Y = (R \times Y) \pi^* \gamma
\]

for \( \gamma \in \mathcal{C}^0(Z) \).

For (2) observe that the function \( \sum_{j \in J} R_j \) is a current, since \( \{ \varphi_j \} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^k(Z) \) converging to \( \varphi_0 \in \mathcal{C}^k(Z) \) in \( \mathcal{C}^0(Z) \) implies \( \bigcup_{j=0}^\infty \text{supp} \, \varphi_j \) is contained in a compact set, and that \( R \in M^\text{loc}_k(Z) \), since \( R_j \in M_k(Z), \, j \in J \), and \( \{ \text{supp} \, R_j : j \in J \} \) is locally finite. If \( \varphi \in \mathcal{C}^{k+m}(X) \) and \( \gamma_\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^0(Z) \) with \( \pi(\text{supp} \, \varphi) \subseteq \text{int} \gamma_\varphi^{-1}(1) \), then

\[
L_\partial R (\varphi) = L_\partial (R \gamma_\varphi)(\varphi) = \sum_{j \in J} L_\partial (R_j \gamma_\varphi)(\varphi)
\]

\[
= \sum_{j \in J} L_\partial R_j(\varphi)
\]

by 3.2 and [BJ1, 3.3].

In order to verify (3) we choose a locally finite open cover \( \{ U_j \} \) of \( Z \) such that \( \text{Clos}(U_j) \) is compact and let \( \{ \gamma_j \} \) be a partition of unity subordinate to \( \{ U_j \} \). Then if

\[
\{ R_j \} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_k(Z) \cap \{ R: M(R) < c \}
\]

is a net converging to \( R_\varphi \), then

\[
L_\partial (R_\varphi \gamma_j) \rightarrow L_\partial (R_\varphi \gamma_j)
\]

by 3.2 and [BJ1, 3.5(1)]. Hence,

\[
\sum_j L_\partial (R_\varphi \gamma_j) \rightarrow \sum_j L_\partial (R_\varphi \gamma_j)
\]

and the result now follows by (2).

(4) follows easily from (*), 3.2 and [BJ1, 3.5(5)].

Application of [BJ1, 3.6(1)], (*) and 3.1 yields (5).

For (6), let \( R \in M^\text{loc}_k(Z) \) and \( \psi \) be a bounded Borel \( l \)-form with \( 0 < l < k \). Fix \( \varphi \in \mathcal{C}^{k+m-l}(X) \) and \( \gamma_\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^0(Z) \) be such that \( \pi(\text{supp} \, \varphi) \subseteq \text{int} \gamma_\varphi^{-1}(1) \). One uses [F1, 1.8.1] and [BJ1, 3.5(2)] to see that

\[
M(L_\partial (R \gamma_\varphi) \circ \varphi) < \infty.
\]
Then by applying 3.2, [BJ1, 3.6(2)] and (●), one obtains

\[ L_\mathbb{R}(R \cdot \psi)(\varphi) = \quad L_\mathbb{R}(R \cdot \gamma_\varphi \psi)(\varphi) = \quad L_\mathbb{R}(R \cdot \gamma_\varphi) \pi^k \psi(\varphi) = \quad L_\mathbb{R} R \pi^k \psi(\varphi). \]

Now (7) follows from (2), (6), [BJ1, 3.5(3)] and the observation that

\[ \text{spt } S = \bigcup_{j \in J} \text{spt } S \cdot f_j \]

whenever \( S \in \mathcal{D}_k(U) \) and \( \{ f_j : j \in J \} \) is a partition of unity subordinate to a locally finite open cover of a manifold \( U \).

To verify (8) first observe that

\[ L_\mathbb{R} \partial R = \partial L_\mathbb{R} R \]

for \( R \in \mathcal{N}_k^\text{loc}(Z) \) by [BJ1, 3.5(4)], 3.2 and (6). Suppose \( F = \partial R \) for some \( R \in \mathcal{M}_k^\text{loc}(Z) \). Define

\[ L_\mathbb{R}(F) = \partial L_\mathbb{R} R. \]

To see that \( L_\mathbb{R} F \) is well defined suppose \( R_1 \in \mathcal{M}_k^\text{loc}(Z) \) is such that \( \partial R_1 = F \). Let \( \{ U_j : j \in J \} \) be a locally finite open cover of \( Z \) such that \( \text{Clos } U_j \) is compact and there exist trivializations \( \varphi_j : U_j \times Y \to \pi^{-1}(U_j) \), and let \( \{ \gamma_j \} \) be a partition of unity subordinate to \( \{ U_j : j \in J \} \). Note that 3.2, [BJ1, 3.3], \( \partial Y = 0 \) and [F1, 4.1.8] imply

\[ \partial L_\mathbb{R} ((R - R_1) \cdot \gamma_j) = \partial \varphi_\mathbb{R} ((R - R_1) \cdot \gamma_j \times Y) = -\varphi_\mathbb{R} ((R - R_1) \cdot d\gamma_j \times Y) = -L_\mathbb{R} ((R - R_1) \cdot d\gamma_j) \]

for each \( j \). Apply (2) to obtain

\[ \partial L_\mathbb{R} (R - R_1) = \sum_{j \in J} \partial L_\mathbb{R} ((R - R_1) \cdot \gamma_j) = -\sum_{j \in J} L_\mathbb{R} ((R - R_1) \cdot d\gamma_j) = -L_\mathbb{R} \left( (R - R_1) \cdot \left( \sum_{j \in J} \gamma_j \right) \right) = 0. \]

Now \( L_\mathbb{R} \) can be extended linearly.

The second statement in (8) follows from [F1, 4.18], local triviality and the fact that

\[ L_\mathbb{R} F(\varphi) = L_\mathbb{R} (F \cdot \gamma)(\varphi) = \partial L_\mathbb{R} (R \cdot \gamma)(\varphi) \]

whenever \( R \in \mathcal{M}_k^\text{loc}(Z) \), \( F = \partial R \), \( \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(X) \), \( \gamma \in \mathcal{D}_0(Z) \) and \( \text{spt } \varphi \subset \text{int}(\gamma \circ \pi)^{-1}(1) \).

To prove (9) let \( R \in F_k^\text{loc}(Z) \cap \mathcal{M}_k^\text{loc}(Z) \), \( \gamma \in \mathcal{D}_0(Z) \) and \( C \subset Z \) be compact with \( \text{spt } \gamma \subset \text{int } C \). By [BJ1, 3.5(4)] and 3.2,

\[ L_\mathbb{R} R_1 \in \mathcal{N}_{k+m}(X) \] whenever \( R_1 \in \mathcal{N}_k(Z) \),
so that one can use \([F_1, 4.1.17] , 3.2\) and \([Bj1, 3.5(2)\) and (3)] to show
\[
L_{\beta}(R \gamma) \in F_{k+m, \pi^{-1}(C)}(X) \cap M_{k+m}(X),
\]
from which
\[
L_{\beta} R \in F_{k+m}^{\text{loc}}(X) \cap M_{k+m}(X)
\]
follows by (6). Similarly, \([F_1, 4.1.17]\) implies
\[
(T \pi^2 \gamma) \in F_{k, \pi^{-1}(C)}(X) \cap M_k(X).
\]
Since \(\pi\) is proper, \([F_1, 4.1.14]\) implies
\[
\pi^2 \gamma \in F_{k,C}(Z) \cap M_k(X),
\]
and (9) follows from 3.1.

3.4. Theorem. Let \(u(x) : T_{\pi(x)}Z \to T_xX\) be the right inverse of \(\pi_\#|T_xX\) such that \(u(x)(T_{\pi(x)}Z)\) is the orthogonal complement of \(T_xY_{\pi(x)} \subset T_xX\). Let \(R \in M_k^{\text{loc}}(Z)\) and
\[
h(x) = \|T_k(x)R(\pi(x))\|.
\]
Then
\[
\|L_{\beta} R\| (f) = \int_{Z} \int_{Y_{\pi}} f \, d\mathfrak{M}^n \, d\|R\|z
\]
for each \(\|L_{\beta} R\|\) integrable Borel function \(f\) on \(X\).

PROOF. Let \(U\) be an open subset of \(Z\) such that there exists a trivialization \(\varphi : U \times Y \to \pi^{-1}(U)\), and whenever \(u_0 \in U, y_0 \in Y\), let
\[
i_{y_0} : U \to U \times Y \quad \text{and} \quad j_{u_0} : Y \to U \times Y
\]
be the injections
\[
i_{y_0}(u) = (u, y_0) \quad \text{and} \quad j_{u_0}(y) = (u_0, y).
\]
Suppose \(R' \in M_k(U)\). By making the identification
\[
\bigwedge T_{(u_0)}(U \times Y) \cong \bigoplus_{r+s=1} \bigwedge T_{u}(U) \otimes \bigwedge T_{s}(Y)
\]
and applying \([F_1, 4.1.7\) and 4.1.8] and \([Bj1, 3.3]\), one obtains
\[
\|L_{\beta} R'\| \wedge (L_{\beta} R')^* = L_{\beta} R' = \varphi_{\#}(R' \times Y)
\]
\[
= \varphi_{\#}(\|R'\| \times \|Y\|) \wedge \varphi_{\#}(\bar{R}' \otimes 1) \wedge \varphi_{\#}(1 \otimes \bar{Y}).
\]
One uses (2) from §2 to compute
\[
\|((\varphi \circ j_{u_0})_\# \bar{Y}(y))\| = |\Omega(\varphi(u, y))|^{-1}.
\]
Also, if \(x = \varphi(u, y)\), then
\[
\pi_{\#} \circ (\varphi \circ j_{\bar{u}})_{\#} = (\pi \circ \varphi \circ j_{\bar{y}})_{\#} = \text{id}_{T_xU}
\]
implies \(\operatorname{im}((\varphi \circ j_{\bar{y}})_{\#} - u(x)) \subset \ker \pi_{\#}\) from which
\[
(\varphi \circ j_{\bar{y}})_{\#} \bar{R}'(u) \wedge \bar{Y}_0(x) = \wedge_k u(x)(\bar{R}'(u)) \wedge \bar{Y}_0(x)
\]
follows. Hence,
\[
(L_{\beta} R')^*(x) = h(x)^{-1}|\Omega(x)|(\varphi \circ j_{\bar{y}})_{\#} \bar{R}'(u) \wedge (\varphi \circ j_{\bar{y}})_{\#} \bar{Y}(y),
\]
so that
\[ \| L_{\mathfrak{B}} R' \| = \varphi_\sharp(\| R' \| \times \| Y \|) \wedge h|\Omega|^{-1}. \]

Now apply Fubini's theorem, the fact that \( \| Y \| = 3^n \), a change of variables and 2(2) to obtain
\[
\varphi_\sharp(\| R' \| \times \| Y \|)(f) = \int_U \int_Y f \circ \varphi(u, y) \, d\| Y \| \, d\| R' \|= \int_U \int_{Y_u} |\Omega| f \, d\mathcal{C}^n \, d\| R' \|u.
\]

The asserted formula for \( R' \) now follows, if we replace \( f \) by \( h|\Omega|^{-1} f \).

Suppose \( R \in M^\text{loc}_k(Z) \). Let \( \{ U_j \} \) be a locally finite open cover of \( Z \) by coordinate neighborhoods in \( \mathcal{B} \) such that \( \text{Clos } U_j \) is compact. Let \( \{ \gamma_j \} \subset \mathcal{B}^0(Z) \) be a partition of unity subordinate to \( \{ U_j \} \). Let \( \{ K_j \}_{j=1}^\infty \) be an increasing sequence of compact sets such that \( \bigcup_{j=1}^\infty K_j = X \) and let \( \chi_j \) denote the characteristic function of \( K_j \). Then for each \( \| L_{\mathfrak{B}} R \| \) summable Borel function, one has
\[
\| L_{\mathfrak{B}} R \|(f) = \sum_j \| L_{\mathfrak{B}} R \|_{\pi^2 \gamma_j}(fx_j)
= \sum_j \| L_{\mathfrak{B}} (R \gamma_j) \|(fx_j)
= \sum_j \int_Z \gamma_j(z) \int_{Y_z} fx_j h \, d\mathcal{C}^n \, d\| R \|(z)
= \int_Z \int_{Y_z} fx_j h \, d\mathcal{C}^n \, d\| R \|(z)
\]
by local finiteness, 3.3(6) and the first paragraph. Using the monotone convergence theorem we conclude that
\[
\| L_{\mathfrak{B}} R \|(f) = \int_Z \int_{Y_z} fh \, d\mathcal{C}^n \, d\| R \|z
\]
for nonnegative \( f \), hence for arbitrary \( f \) by the usual argument.

3.5. Lemma. Let \( U \) be a Riemannian manifold. If
\[
T \in F_{k+m}^\text{loc}(U \times Y) \cap M_{k+m}^\text{loc}(U \times Y)
\]
is such that
(1) for \( \| T \| \) a.e. \((u, y) \in U \times Y \) there exists
\[
\xi(u, y) \in \bigwedge_k T_{(u,y)}(U \times Y)
\]
such that \( \hat{T} = \xi \wedge \hat{Y}_0 \) and
(2) \( \partial T = 0 \), then there exists \( R \in F_{k}^\text{loc}(U) \cap M_k^\text{loc}(U) \) such that
\[
T = R \times Y.
\]

Proof. Let \( p: U \times Y \to U \) and \( q: U \times Y \to Y \) be the projections. Let \( \varphi \in \mathcal{Y}(U) \) and \( \psi \in \mathcal{Y}(Y) \) where \( i + j = k + m \). If \( j < m \), then
\[ T(p^*\varphi \wedge q^*\psi) = \int \langle \xi \wedge \widetilde{Y}_0, p^*\varphi \wedge q^*\psi \rangle \, d\|T\| = 0. \]

Assume \( j = m \) and fix \( \varphi \). Since \( \text{spt}(T \cap p^*\varphi) \) is compact, one can use [F1, 4.1.17 and 4.1.14] to show that \( q_*(T \cap p^*\varphi) \in F_m(Y) \). From the case \( j < m \) and (2), one computes

\[ \partial q_*(T \cap p^*\varphi) = 0. \]

By [F1, 4.1.31] there exists \( c_\varphi \in \mathbb{R} \) such that

\[ q_*(T \cap p^*\varphi) = c_\varphi Y. \]

But then

\[ c_\varphi = c_\varphi Y(\omega_0) = (-1)^m p_*(T \cap q^*\omega_0)(\varphi). \]

Letting \( R = (-1)^m p_*(T \cap q^*\omega_0) \), one concludes that \( R \in F^\text{loc}(U) \cap M^\text{loc}(U) \) and \( R(\varphi) = c_\varphi \), hence

\[ T(p^*\varphi \wedge q^*\psi) = \begin{cases} R(\varphi) Y(\psi), & \text{if } m = j, \\ 0, & \text{if } m < j, \end{cases} \]

from which the lemma follows by [F1, 4.1.8].

3.6. Theorem. If \( T \in F_{k+m}(X) \cap M_{k+m}^\text{loc}(X) \) is such that

(1) for \( \|T\| \) a.e. \( x \in X \) there exists \( \xi(x) \in \bigcap_k T_x(X) \) such that

\[ \widetilde{T} = \xi \wedge \widetilde{Y}_0; \]

and

(2) \( \mathcal{X}^k(m)(\pi^{-1}(\pi(\text{spt } \partial T))) = 0, \)

then \( T = L_{\Theta} \circ P_{\Theta}(T) \).

Proof. Since \( \pi \) is proper, \( \pi(\text{spt } \partial T) \) is closed. Let \( \{U_j : j \in J\} \) be a locally finite open cover of

\[ Z \sim \pi(\text{spt } \partial T) \]

such that each \( U_j \) is a coordinate neighborhood for \( \Theta \) with trivialization \( \varphi_j : U_j \times Y \to \pi^{-1}(U_j) \) and \( \text{Clos } U_j \) is compact. Let \( \{\gamma_j : j \in J\} \) be a partition of unity subordinate to \( \{U_j : j \in J\} \) and denote \( V_j = \pi^{-1}(U_j) \) and

\[ T_j = T|V_j \in F_{k+m}(V_j) \cap M_{k+m}^\text{loc}(V_j). \]

According to [F1, 4.1.14],

\[ \varphi_j^{-1} T_j \in F_{k+m}^\text{loc}(U_j \times Y) \cap M_{k+m}^\text{loc}(U_j \times Y), \]

so that an application of 3.5 gives \( R_j \in F_{k+m}^\text{loc}(U_j) \cap M_{k+m}^\text{loc}(U_j) \) such that

\[ T_j = \varphi_j(R_j \times Y). \]

Thus by [BJ1, 3.3] and 3.2,

\[ T \cap \pi^*\gamma_j = T \cap \pi^*\gamma_j = \varphi_j(R_j \times Y) \cap \pi^*\gamma_j \]

\[ = \varphi_j(R_j \times Y) = L_{\Theta}(R_j \times Y). \]
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Hence
\[ T \pi^* \gamma_j = L_{\pi^*} \circ P_{\pi^*} \left( T \pi^* \gamma_j \right) = (L_{\pi^*} \circ P_{\pi^*} T) \pi^* \gamma_j \]
now follows from 3.3(5), 3.1 and 3.3(6), and we conclude that
\[ \text{spt}(T - L_{\pi^*} \circ P_{\pi^*} T) \subset \pi^{-1}(\pi \text{spt } \partial T). \]
Finally, \( L_{\pi^*} \circ P_{\pi^*} T \in \mathcal{F}^{\text{loc}}_{k+m}(X) \) and application of [F1, 2.10.6 and 4.1.20] yields
\[ T = L_{\pi^*} \circ P_{\pi^*} T. \]

4. Projecting then lifting in the bundle induced by a group action.

4.1. Let \( G \) be a compact, connected Lie group of isometries of \( X \). Let \( \mu \) be the biinvariant Haar measure such that \( \mu(G) = 1 \). If we assume that there is only one orbit type, then \( \mathcal{B} = (X, \pi, X/G, G/G_0, \mathcal{R}(G_0)/G_0) \) is a smooth bundle where \( G_0 = \{ g \in G : gx_0 = x_0 \} \) for some fixed \( x_0 \) and \( \mathcal{R}(G_0) \) is the normalizer of \( G_0 \) in \( G \) [BG, II.5.8]. Assume that \( X \) and \( X/G \) are orientable. Then \( \mathcal{B} \) and \( G/G_0 \) are orientable, and \( \mathcal{R}(G_0)/G_0 \) can be replaced by the subgroup \( H \) consisting of those elements which preserve an orientation of \( G/G_0 \). Let \( Z = X/G, Y = G/G_0 \) and \( \omega_0, \Omega, \bar{Y}_0 \) be as before.

For such a bundle every local trivialization \( \varphi : U \times Y \rightarrow \pi^{-1}(U) \) is equivariant. To see this choose an equivariant trivialization \( \varphi_U \) as in [BG, 11.5.8] and note that for fixed \( u \in U \) there exists \( h \in \mathcal{R}(G_0)/G_0 \) such that
\[ p \circ \varphi_U^{-1} \circ \varphi \circ i_u : Y \rightarrow Y \]
is given by the action of \( h \), where \( i_u : Y \rightarrow U \times Y \) is the injection over \( u \) and \( p : U \times Y \rightarrow Y \) is the projection onto the second factor. A straightforward computation yields the equivariance of \( \varphi_U^{-1} \circ \varphi \), from which the equivariances of \( \varphi \) follows. Note that this also implies that admissible maps are equivariant (see [B, 3.2]).

The manifold \( Z \) has a natural Riemannian metric \( b_\pi \) induced by \( \pi \) as follows: For \( z \in Z \) and \( w_1, w_2 \in T_z Z \) choose \( x \in \pi^{-1}(u) \) and let \( v_1, v_2 \in T_x X \) be the unique vectors in the orthogonal complement of \( \ker \pi_\pi T_x X \) such that
\[ \pi_\pi(v_i) = w_i, \quad i = 1, 2. \]
Define
\[ b_\pi(w_1, w_2) = b(v_1, v_2) \]
where \( b : TX \times TX \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) is the metric on \( X \). Since \( G \) is a group of isometries of \( X \), \( b_\pi(w_1, w_2) \) does not depend on the choice of \( x \) and the smoothness of \( b_\pi \) follows from the existence of local cross sections.

Let \( \tilde{X} \) be a unit \( C^\infty \) \( n \)-vectorfield on \( X \) and use \( \tilde{X} \) to define a Hodge duality operator \( \ast \). Let \( \beta \in \mathcal{D}^{n-m}(Z) \) be nonvanishing. Let \( x \in X, z = \pi(x) \) and choose an admissible map \( f : Y \rightarrow X \) such that \( \pi \circ f \equiv z \). Denoting
\[ k(x) = \langle f_\ast \bar{Y}(x), \ast \pi^\pi \beta(x) \rangle, \]
one obtains from 2(2) and 2(3),
\[ \Omega(x) = k(x)^{-1} \ast \pi^\pi \beta(x). \]
Since admissible maps are equivariant and $G$ is connected, it follows from the above expression that $\Omega$ is $G$-invariant.

We now define the volume functions

$$V: X \to \mathbb{R} \quad \text{and} \quad V_\pi: Z \to \mathbb{R}$$

by the formula

$$V_\pi(z) = V(x) = |\Omega(x)|^{-1}$$

where $\pi(x) = z$. That $V_\pi$ is well defined follows from the $G$-invariance of $\Omega$. Note that $2(1)$ and $3(1)$ imply

$$\mathcal{M}(Y_z) = Y_z(\Omega_0) = Y_z(V \wedge \Omega)$$

$$= Y(V_\pi(z) \wedge \omega_0) = V_\pi(z).$$

4.2. Theorem. If $T \in \mathcal{M}_{k+m}^\text{loc}(X)$, then

$$L_\Omega \circ P_\Omega T = T$$

if and only if

1. $g_\pi T = T$ for all $g \in G$, and
2. for $\|T\|$ almost all $x \in X$ there exists $v \in \wedge_k T_x X$ such that $\tilde{T}(x) = v \wedge \tilde{\omega}_0(x)$.

Proof. If $L_\Omega \circ P_\Omega T = T$, then (2) is just 3.3(4). To prove (1) use a partition of unity, 3.3(2), 3.2 and [BJ1, 3.3] to infer that it suffices to show

$$g_\pi \varphi_{\Omega}(R \times Y) = \varphi_{\Omega}(R \times Y)$$

for $g \in G$ where $\text{spt } R$ is contained in a coordinate neighborhood $U$ of $\Omega$ and $\varphi: U \times Y \to X$ is a trivialization. But the equation follows from the equivariance of $\varphi$ and the fact that $g_\pi Y = Y$.

Now suppose $T$ satisfies (1) and (2). Let $\{U_j\}$ be a locally finite open cover of $Z$ by coordinate neighborhoods of $\Omega$ having compact closure, $\varphi_j: U_j \times Y \to \pi^{-1}(U_j)$ be trivializations, and $\{\gamma_j\} \subset \mathcal{O}_0(Z)$ be a partition of unity subordinate to $\{U_j\}$. Define

$$T_j = \varphi_{\Omega, j}^{-1}(T \mid \pi^k \gamma_j).$$

Fix $j$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{O}_k(U_j)$ and consider

$$q_{\Omega}(T_j \mid p^j \psi) \psi \omega_0$$

where $p: U_j \times Y \to U_j$ and $q: U_j \times Y \to Y$ are the projections. Since $\varphi_{\Omega, j}^{-1}$ is equivariant, $T$ is invariant, and $\omega_0$ is invariant, we have

$$(\text{id}_{U_j} \times g)_{\Omega, j} T_j = T_j$$

and

$$g_\pi(q_{\Omega}(T_j \mid p^j \psi) \psi \omega_0) = q_{\Omega}(\text{id}_{U_j} \times g_\pi(T_j \mid p^j \psi) \psi \omega_0)$$

$$= q_{\Omega}(T_j \mid p^j \psi) \psi \omega_0.$$

Thus $q_{\Omega}(T_j \mid p^j \psi) \psi \omega_0$ is a $G$-invariant Radon measure on $Y$ and there exists $c_\psi \in \mathbb{R}$.
such that
\[
q_\Psi(T \psi \wedge q^s \omega_0) = c_\Psi \mathcal{H}^m = c_\Psi Y \wedge \omega_0.
\]
We have
\[
c_\Psi = c_\Psi Y(\omega_0) = T_j(p^s \psi \wedge q^s \omega_0)
= T(\pi^s(\gamma_j \wedge \psi) \wedge (q \circ \varphi_j^{-1})^s \omega_0).
\]
By 2(2) and (1) we have
\[
\left\langle \bar{Y}_0(x), (q \circ \varphi_j^{-1})^s \omega_0(x) \right\rangle = |(\varphi_j \circ i_x)_* \bar{Y}(x)|^{-1} = \left\langle \bar{Y}_0(x), \Omega(x) \right\rangle,
\]
where \( \pi(x) = z \) and \( i_x : Y \to U_j \times Y \) is the injection \( i_x(y) = (z, y) \). Now use the simplicity of \( \bar{Y}_0 \) to obtain
\[
\left\langle v \wedge \bar{Y}_0(x), \pi^s(\gamma_j \wedge \psi) \wedge (q \circ \varphi_j^{-1})^s \omega_0(x) \right\rangle = \left\langle v \wedge \bar{Y}_0(x), \pi^s(\gamma_j \wedge \psi) \wedge \Omega(x) \right\rangle,
\]
so that
\[
c_\Psi = P_\Psi T \gamma_j(\psi).
\]
For \( \omega \in \mathcal{D}^m(Y) \) there exists \( h \in \mathcal{D}^0(Y) \) such that \( \omega = h \omega_0 \) and hence
\[
P_\Psi T \gamma_j \times Y(p^s \psi \wedge q^s \omega) = P_\Psi T \gamma_j(\psi) Y(h \wedge \omega_0) = c_\Psi Y \omega_0(h)
= q_\Psi(T_j \psi \wedge q^s \omega) = T_j(p^s \psi \wedge q^s \omega).
\]
Using (2) to infer that for \( \psi \in \mathcal{D}^{k+1}(U_j) \) and \( \omega \in \mathcal{D}^{m-l}(Y) \) with \( l > 0 \), the equation
\[
T_j(p^s \psi \wedge q^s \omega) = T(\pi^s(\gamma_j \wedge \psi) \wedge (q \circ \varphi_j^{-1})^s \omega) = 0
\]
holds, we have
\[
T_j = (P_\Psi T \gamma_j) \times Y.
\]
Thus by [BJ1, 3.3], 3.2 and 3.3(6), we conclude
\[
T = \sum_j T \pi^s \gamma_j = \sum_j \varphi_j T_j
= \sum_j \varphi_j((P_\Psi T \gamma_j) \times Y) = \sum_j L_\Psi(P_\Psi T \gamma_j)
= \sum_j (L_\Psi \circ P_\Psi T) \pi^s \gamma_j = L_\Psi \circ P_\Psi T.
\]

4.3. REMARK. It is easy to see that for locally rectifiable currents \( T \), condition (1) of 4.2 implies condition (2). However, there are simple examples of normal currents in \( X = \mathbb{R} \times S^1 \) which satisfy (1) but not (2).

4.4. THEOREM. For each \( T \in M_1^{\infty}(X) \) and \( \varphi \in \mathcal{D}(X) \), let
\[
A(T)(\varphi) = \int_G g_\Psi T(\varphi) \, d\mu_g.
\]
Then:

(1) If \( \Omega \) is the linear subspace of \( \mathcal{D}_*(X) \) spanned by 
\[
\{ Q \in \mathcal{D}_*(X) : Q = \partial T \text{ for some } T \in M^\text{loc}_{\phi}(X) \} \cup M^\text{loc}_{\phi}(X),
\]
then \( A \) can be extended to a chain map \( A : \Omega \to \mathcal{D}_*(X) \).

(2) If \( T \in M^\text{loc}_{\phi}(X) \) and \( \gamma \in \mathcal{D}_0(Z) \), then 
\[
M(A(T \pi^\# \gamma)) < M(T \pi^\# \gamma).
\]

(3) If \( T \in \mathcal{F}^\text{loc}_{\phi}(X) \cap M^\text{loc}_{\phi}(X) \), then \( A(T) \in \mathcal{F}^\text{loc}_{\phi}(X) \cap M^\text{loc}_{\phi}(X) \).

**Proof.** If \( T' \in M_\phi(X) \) and \( \varphi \in \mathcal{D}'(X) \), then 
\[
|T'(g^\# \varphi)| < M(T')M(g^\# \varphi) = M(T')M(\varphi),
\]
hence
\[
|A(T')| < \int_G |g \pi^\# T'| d\mu < M(T')M(\varphi).
\]
By replacing \( T' \) by \( T \pi^\# \gamma \) for \( T \in M^\text{loc}_{\phi}(X) \) and \( \gamma \in \mathcal{D}_0(Z) \), one obtains 
\[
A : M^\text{loc}_{\phi}(X) \to M^\text{loc}_{\phi}(X)
\]
and (2). It is easy to see that \( A \) can be extended to \( \Omega \) by use of the equation 
\[
A(\partial T) = \partial A(T).
\]

Statement (3) follows from (1), (2), \([F1, 4.1.17]\) and the fact that 
\[
A(T \pi^\# \beta) = A(T \pi^\# \beta)
\]
for \( G \)-invariant \( \beta \in \mathcal{D}_0(X) \).

4.5. **Lemma.** Let \( W \) be a finite dimensional vector space and \( v \in \wedge_{k+m} W \) and 
\( \omega \in \wedge^m W \) be nonzero and simple. Then:

(1) \( v \omega \) is simple.

(2) If \( L \) is the linear subspace associated with \( v \), \( \omega = \omega^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega^m \) where 
\( \omega^j \in \wedge^1 W \), \( j = 1, \ldots, m \), and \( v \omega \neq 0 \), then 
\[
L' = L \cap \bigcap_{j=1}^m \ker \omega^j
\]
has dimension \( k \).

(3) If \( v \omega \neq 0 \), and \( v' \in \wedge_k L' \) and \( v'' \in \wedge_m L \) are such that 
\( v' \wedge v'' = v \), then 
\[
v \omega = (-1)^{mk} \langle v'', \omega \rangle v'.
\]

**Proof.** Fix an inner product \( b \) on \( W \). Let \( w_j \in W \) be dual to \( \omega^j \), \( j = 1, \ldots, m \), 
so that \( w = w_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge w_m \) is dual to \( \omega \). Let \( W_0 \) be the subspace of \( W \) associated 
with \( w \). Denote by \( p_0 \) the orthogonal projection \( p_0 : W \to W_0 \) and \( p_1 = p_0 \| L \). Since 
\( p_0 \) is orthogonal, \( \{ w_j : j = 1, \ldots, m \} \) is a basis for \( W_0 \) and \( \omega^j \) is dual to \( w_j \), we have 
\[
v_0 \in \ker p_0 \Leftrightarrow b(v_0, w_j) = 0, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m,
\]
\[
\Leftrightarrow v_0 \in \bigcap_{j=1}^m \ker \omega^j.
\]
Hence
\[ \ker p_1 = L \cap \ker p_0 = L'. \]

Let \( l = \dim L'. \) Clearly \( l > k. \)

Choose an orthonormal basis \( \{e_1, \ldots, e_n\} \) of \( W \) such that \( \{e_1, \ldots, e_l\} \) spans \( \ker p_1 \) and \( \{e_1, \ldots, e_{k+m}\} \) spans \( L. \) For some \( c \in \mathbb{R} \) we have \( v = ce_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{m+k}. \) For each \( \lambda \in \Lambda (k+m, m) \) we associate \( \lambda' \in \Lambda (k+m, k) \) by requiring \( \im \lambda \cup \im \lambda' = \{1, \ldots, m+k\}. \) If \( \iota = \id_{\{1, \ldots, m+k\}} \) and \( \nu \in \Lambda (n, k) \), then
\[
\langle v, e^\nu \rangle = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda (k+m, m)} \delta_{\lambda, \lambda'} \langle e_{\lambda}, \omega \rangle \langle e_{\lambda'}, e^\nu \rangle = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda (k+m, m)} \delta_{\lambda, \lambda'} \delta_{\lambda'}^\nu \langle e_{\lambda}, \omega \rangle.
\]

But if \( \lambda \in \Lambda (k+m, m) \) is such that \( \lambda (1) \leq l \) then \( e_{\lambda (1)} \in \ker p_1 \subset \bigcap_{j=1}^m \ker \omega^j \) so that
\[ \langle e_{\lambda}, \omega \rangle = 0. \]

Hence \( v, w = 0 \) unless \( l < k, \) in which case we have
\[ v, w = (-1)^{mk} c \langle e_{k+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{k+m}, \omega \rangle e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_k. \]

Statement (3) now follows easily from the observation that, for \( v' \in \bigwedge_k L', \) there exists \( c' \in \mathbb{R} \) such that
\[ v' = c'e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_k. \]

4.6. Lemma. Let \( W \) be an \( n \)-dimensional vector space with basis \( \{w_1, \ldots, w_n\}. \) If \( \{w^1, \ldots, w^n\} \subset \bigwedge^1 W \) is the dual basis, \( w = w_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge w_m \) and \( \omega = w^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge w^n, \) then
\[ ((\beta \wedge \omega) \wedge w) = (-1)^{mk} \beta \wedge \omega \]
and
\[ ((\alpha \wedge w) \wedge \omega) \wedge w = (-1)^{mk} \alpha \wedge w \]
for all \( \alpha \in \bigwedge_k W \) and \( \beta \in \bigwedge_{k+m} W. \) Moreover, if \( W \) has an inner product and the spaces spanned by \( \{w_1, \ldots, w_m\} \) and \( \{w_{m+1}, \ldots, w_n\} \) are orthogonal, then
\[ |(\beta \wedge \omega) \wedge w| \leq |\beta| \]
with equality if and only if
\[ \beta = (-1)^{mk} (\beta \wedge \omega) \wedge w. \]

Proof. Let \( \lambda_0 \in \Lambda (n, m) \) be defined by
\[ \lambda_0 (i) = i \]
and for \( \nu \in \Lambda (n, k) \) denote by \( \nu ' \) the function from \( \{m+1, \ldots, m+k\} \) to \( \{1, \ldots, n\} \) defined by the formula
\[ \nu '(i) = \nu (i - m). \]
If \( \lambda \in \Lambda(n, m + k) \) and \( \nu \in \Lambda(n, k) \), then
\[
\langle w_\lambda \wedge \omega, \omega^\nu \rangle = \delta_{\lambda}^{\lambda_0 \cup \nu}.
\]
Thus if \( \lambda_0 \nsubseteq \lambda \), then
\[
w_\lambda \wedge \omega = 0 = (-1)^m((w_\lambda \wedge \omega) \wedge \omega) \wedge \omega.
\]
On the other hand if \( \lambda = \lambda_0 \cup \nu \), then
\[
w_\lambda \wedge \omega = w_\nu.
\]
Thus,
\[
((w_\lambda \wedge \omega) \wedge \omega) \wedge \omega = (w_\nu \wedge \omega) \wedge \omega = (-1)^m w_\lambda \wedge \omega.
\]
The second assertion follows similarly.

Finally, let \( B = \{ \lambda \in \Lambda(n, m + k): \lambda_0 \nsubseteq \lambda \} \). Then for \( \beta \in \Lambda_{k+m} W \),
\[
\beta = \sum_{\lambda \in B} \beta^\lambda w_\lambda + \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda(n-m,k)} \beta^\lambda \wedge w_\nu \wedge \wedge w_{r+m}.
\]
Hence,
\[
(\beta \wedge \omega) \wedge w = (-1)^m \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda(n-m,k)} \beta^\lambda \wedge \wedge w_{r+m},
\]
and since the space spanned by \( \{w_1, \ldots, w_m\} \) is orthogonal to the space spanned by \( \{w_{m+1}, \ldots, w_n\} \), we conclude
\[
|\beta| = |(\beta \wedge \omega) \wedge w| \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \beta^\lambda = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \lambda \in B.
\]

4.7. Lemma. Let \( W \) be an \( n \)-dimensional vector space with an inner product. Suppose \( w \in \Lambda_m W \) and \( \omega \in \Lambda^m W \) are simple, of norm one, and dual. If \( \xi_1 \in \Lambda_{k+m} W \) and
\[
\xi_2 = (-1)^m (\xi_1 \wedge \omega) \wedge w,
\]
then
\[
|\xi_1| = |\xi_2| \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \xi_2 = \xi_1.
\]

Proof. Assume \( |\xi_2| = |\xi_1| \neq 0 \). Use [F1, 1.8.1] to find simple \( (k + m) \)-vectors \( v_i \neq 0, i = 1, \ldots, N \), such that
\[
\xi_1 = \sum_{i=1}^N v_i \quad \text{and} \quad |\xi_1| = \sum_{i=1}^N |v_i|.
\]
Denote
\[
c_i = |v_i|/|\xi_1| \quad \text{and} \quad u_i = c_i^{-1}v_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N.
\]
From
\[
\xi_2 = (-1)^m \sum_{i=1}^N c_i (\xi_1 \wedge w) \wedge w
\]
and 4.5(1) we obtain
\[
|\xi_2| < \sum_{i=1}^N c_i |(u_i \wedge \omega) \wedge w|.
\]
Observe that \( ||\xi_i|| = |u_i| \) for each \( i \) and apply 4.6 to conclude
\[
||\xi_2|| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_i |u_i| = \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_i ||\xi_i|| = ||\xi_1|| = ||\xi_2||.
\]
Thus \( |u_i| = |(u_i \omega) \wedge w| \) and 4.6 implies
\[
u_i = (-1)^{mk} (u_i \omega) \wedge w,
\]
from which the lemma follows.

4.8. Theorem. Let \( T_0 \in M_{k+m}^{\text{loc}}(X) \). For \( ||T_0|| \) almost every \( x \in X \) denote
\[
\xi_i(x) = (-1)^{mk} (\overline{T_0}(x) \omega \Omega_0(x)) \wedge \overline{Y_0}(x)
\]
and let
\[
T_1 = ||T_0|| \wedge \xi_1 \quad \text{and} \quad T_2 = A(T_1).
\]

Then:
(1) If \( \gamma \in \mathcal{D}^0(Z) \), then
\[
M(T_2 \mathcal{G}^2 \gamma) \leq M(T_1 \mathcal{G}^2 \gamma) \leq M(T_0 \mathcal{G}^2 \gamma).
\]
(2) If \( M(T_0) < \infty \), then
\[
M(T_i) = M(T_0) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad T_1 = T_0.
\]
(3) \( L\mathcal{G}_i \circ P_{\mathcal{G}}(T_i) = T_2, \ i = 0, 1, 2. \)

Proof. Statements (1) and (2) follow from 4.4(2), the fact that
\[
M(||T_0||^\gamma \Omega) = \int |\Omega| d||T_0||,
\]
the simplicity of \( \Omega_0, 2(1) \) and 4.7.

Using the \( G \)-invariance of \( \Omega, \Omega_0 \) and \( \overline{Y}_0 \), the duality of \( \Omega_0 \) and \( \overline{Y}_0 \) and 4.6 one obtains the equalities
\[
P_{\mathcal{G}} T_0 = P_{\mathcal{G}} T_1 = P_{\mathcal{G}} T_2
\]
and
\[
T_2(\varphi) = \int_G \int \langle \overline{T}_1, g^2 \varphi \rangle d||T_0|| d\mu_g
\]
\[
= \int_G \int \langle \overline{T}_1, g^2 (\overline{Y}_0 \mathcal{G} \varphi) \wedge \Omega_0 \rangle d||T_0|| d\mu_g
\]
\[
= T_2((\overline{Y}_0 \mathcal{G} \varphi) \wedge \Omega_0)
\]
for all \( \varphi \in \mathcal{D}^{k+m}(X) \). The last equality implies that \( T_2 \) satisfies 4.2(2) and since \( T_2 \) is obviously \( G \)-invariant, an application of 4.2 establishes (3).

4.9. Corollary to 3.4. Let \( R \in M_{k+m}^{\text{loc}}(Z) \) and \( T \in M_{k+m}^{\text{loc}}(X) \) be such that
\[
L\mathcal{G}_i \circ P_{\mathcal{G}} T = T. \ Then:
(1) \( ||L\mathcal{G}_i R|| (f) = \int_Z \int_Y f \mathcal{G}^m d||R|| \mathcal{G} \)
for every \( ||L\mathcal{G}_i R|| \) integrable Borel function \( f \) on \( X \).
(2) \( \pi_\mathcal{G} = ||P_{\mathcal{G}} T|| \mathcal{G} \).
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Proof. (1) is immediate, since $Z$ has the metric induced by $\pi$. For (2), use (1) and 4.1 to compute

$$\|T\| (\gamma \circ \pi) = \int_Z \int_{Y_z} \gamma \circ \pi \, d\mathcal{C}^m \, d\|P_{\pi T}\| z$$

$$= \int_Z \gamma(z) \mathcal{C}^m(Y_z) \, d\|P_{\pi T}\| z$$

$$= \|P_{\pi T}\| (\gamma V_{\pi})$$

whenever $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}^0(Z)$.

5. Invariant solutions to the Plateau problem.

5.1. Let $b: TX \times TX \to R$ denote the metric on $X$. If $\xi$ and $\eta$ are $C^\infty$ vector-fields, then $\nabla_{\xi} \eta$ will denote the covariant derivative of $\eta$ in the direction $\xi$. Let $\{\xi_i; i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ be $C^\infty$ orthonormal vectorfields defined in an open set $W$ such that $\{\xi_i(x); i = 1, \ldots, m\}$ spans $T_x Y_z$ for $x \in W$ and $z = \pi(x)$. Let $\omega^i$ be dual to $\xi_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$,

$$h_{ij} = b(\nabla_{\xi_i} \xi_j), \quad H_j = \sum_{i=1}^m h_{ij}$$

and

$$\kappa = \sum_{j=m+1}^n H_j \omega^j.$$

$\kappa$ is the mean curvature 1-form of the fibres. Direct computations yield the equations (obtained in [L, p. 238] with opposite sign)

$$dV = V \wedge \kappa, \quad d\Omega_0 = \kappa \wedge \Omega_0 + \Omega_1,$$

where $\tilde{\Omega}_0 \wedge \Omega_1 = 0$, together with the fact that $\Omega_1 = 0$ if and only if the horizontal distribution of $\pi$ is involutive. (Details may be found in [B].) Since

$$d\Omega = V^{-1} \wedge \Omega_1,$$

we infer that

$$\partial \circ P_{\pi} = P_{\pi} \circ \partial$$

if and only if the horizontal distribution of the submersion $\pi$ is involutive. We will assume for the remainder of the paper that this distribution is involutive.

5.2. Theorem. Let $A \subset X$ be a $G$-invariant subset of $X$ and $B_0 \in F_{k+m-1}(X)$ be such that $\text{spt} B_0 \subset A$, $B_0 = \partial T$ for some $T \in F_{k+m}(X) \cap M_{k+m}(X)$, $L_{\partial} \circ P_{\pi}(B_0) = B_0$ and $\mathcal{G}^{k+m}(\text{spt} B_0) = 0$. If $T_0 \in F_{k+m}(X) \cap M_{k+m}(X)$ satisfies $\partial T_0 = B_0$, $\text{spt} T_0 \subset A$, and

$$\mathcal{M}(T_0) = \inf\{\mathcal{M}(Q); Q \in F_{k+m}(X), \text{spt} Q \subset A, \partial Q = B_0\} < \infty,$$

then $L_{\partial} \circ P_{\pi}(T_0) = T_0$.

Proof. Let $T_2 = L_{\partial} \circ P_{\pi} T_0$. From 3.3(9), (7), (8) and 5.1 we have

$$T_2 \in F_{k+m}(X), \quad \text{spt} T_2 \subset A, \quad \text{and} \quad \partial T_2 = B_0.$$
Thus 4.8(3) and (1) imply
\[ M(T_2) < M(T_0) < M(T_2), \]
from which one obtains
\[ \tilde{T}_0 = (-1)^m (\tilde{T}_0 \omega_0) \land \tilde{Y}_0 \]
by 4.8(2). The theorem now follows from 3.6.

5.3. Remark. The variational problem considered in 5.2 is somewhat more general than the relative boundary problems treated by Federer [F2], because there are no assumptions on the boundary of X (if that even makes sense). However, if M is a compact manifold with boundary and \( X = M \sim \partial M \), then the problems are the same. In fact we have the following: Let \( C \subset A \) be compact subsets of a Riemannian manifold M with boundary. Denote \( A' = A \sim C \) and \( M' = M \sim C \) and suppose \( B_0 \in F^*_i(M) \) is such that \( \text{spt } B_0 \subset A \). If either of the numbers
\[
\inf \{ M(T): T \in F^\text{loc}_{i+1}(M'), \text{spt } T \subset A', \partial T = B_0 \mid M' \} \\
\text{or} \\
\inf \{ M(Q): Q \in F^*_i(M), \text{spt } Q \subset A, \text{spt} (\partial Q - B_0) \subset C \}
\]
is finite, then they are equal.

To verify this, note that if \( Q \) is a candidate for the second infimum, then \( Q \mid M' \) is a candidate for the first with \( M(Q \mid M') < M(Q) \). Conversely, if \( T \) is a candidate for the first infimum and \( M(T) < \infty \), then for each \( \varphi \in \mathcal{E}(M) \) we define \( Q \in F_i(m) \) so that
\[ Q(\varphi) = \int_{M'} \langle \tilde{T}(x), \varphi(x) \rangle d\|T\| \]
and verify that \( Q \) is a candidate for the first infimum with
\[ M(Q) = M(T). \]

5.4. As in [L, p. 236] we introduce the metric
\[ b_k = V^{2/k} \pi^k \]
on \( Z \) for each \( k = 1, \ldots, n - m \). Each of these induces corresponding mass and comass norms which will be distinguished by the subscript \( k \). Note that for \( v, w \in \bigwedge_k T_x(Z) \),
\[ b_k(v, w) = V^{2/k} \pi^k b_v(v, w), \]
and that since the norm \( \| \|_k \) on \( \bigwedge_k T_x B \) is equivalent to \( \| \| \), \( M_k \) is equivalent to \( M \) for currents whose support is contained in a fixed compact set. Hausdorff measure in \( Z \) will always be with respect to \( b_v \).

5.5. Proposition. If \( R \in M^\text{loc}_k(Z) \), then
\[ \| R \|_k = \| R \|_V \pi = \pi \| L \|_R. \]
Consequently, if \( T \in M^\text{loc}_k(X) \) with \( L \circ \Delta(T) = T \) then
\[ M_k(P \Delta T) = M(T). \]
**Proof.** If \( R \in M_{k}^{\text{o.c.}}(Z) \) and \( f \) is nonnegative and continuous, we have
\[
\|R\|_{k}(f) = \sup\{ R(\varphi): \varphi \in D_{k}(Z), \|\varphi\|_{k} \leq f \}
\]
\[
= \sup\{ R(\varphi): \varphi \in D_{k}(Z), V_{\varphi}^{-1}\|\varphi\| \leq f \}
\]
\[
= \|R\|_{k}(f_{0}).
\]
The result now follows from 4.9(2) and 3.3(5).

5.6. **Theorem.** Let \( A \subset X \) be \( G \)-invariant and \( B_{0} \in F_{m+k-1}(X) \) be such that \( \text{spt } B_{0} \subset A \), \( B_{0} = \partial T \) for some \( T \in F_{k+m}(X) \cap M_{k+m}^{\text{loc}}(X) \) and \( L_{g} \circ P_{g} B_{0} = B_{0} \).

If
\[
\mu_{1} = \inf\{ M(T): T \in F_{k+m}^{\text{loc}}(X), \text{spt } T \subset A, \partial T = B_{0} \},
\]
\[
\mu_{2} = \inf\{ M_{k}(R): R \in F_{k}^{\text{loc}}(Z), \text{spt } R \subset \pi(A), \partial R = P_{g} B_{0} \},
\]
then \( \mu_{1} = \mu_{2} \).

**Proof.** For \( T \in F_{k+m}^{\text{loc}}(X) \) such that \( M(T) < \infty \), \( \text{spt } T \subset A \) and \( \partial T = B_{0} \), one uses 3.3(9), 3.1, [F1, 4.1.7] and 5.1 to conclude \( P_{g} T \in F_{k}^{\text{loc}}(Z) \cap M_{k}^{\text{loc}}(Z) \), \( \text{spt } P_{g} T \subset \pi(A) \) and \( \partial P_{g} T = P_{g} B_{0} \). Application of 3.3(5), 5.5 and 4.8(1), (3) yields
\[
M_{k}(P_{g} T) = M(L_{g} \circ P_{g} T) \leq M(T).
\]

Hence \( \mu_{2} \leq \mu_{1} \).

Now suppose \( R \in F_{k}^{\text{loc}}(Z) \) satisfies \( M(R) < \infty \), \( \text{spt } R \subset \pi(A) \) and \( \partial R = P_{g} B_{0} \).

By virtue of 5.5, 3.3(9), (7), (5), (8) and 5.1, one has
\[
M_{k}(R) = M(L_{g} R),
\]
\[
L_{g} R \in F_{k+m}^{\text{loc}}(X) \cap M_{k+m}^{\text{loc}}(X),
\]
\[
\text{spt } L_{g} R \subset A,
\]
and
\[
\partial L_{g} R = B_{0}
\]
and thus \( \mu_{1} \leq \mu_{2} \).

The theorem now follows if either infimum is finite and, of course, is obvious otherwise.

5.7. **Theorem.** Let \( A \) and \( C \) be compact \( G \)-invariant sets which are \( G \)-invariant Lipschitz neighborhood retracts with \( C \subset A \). Let \( B_{0} \in G_{m}(X) \) be such that \( G_{m+1}(\text{spt } B_{0}) = 0 \) and there exists \( T_{1} \in G_{m+1,A}(X) \) such that \( \text{spt}(\partial T_{1} - B_{0}) \subset C \) and \( g_{*} T_{1} = T_{1} \) for all \( g \in G \).

Then there exists \( T_{0} \in G_{m+1,A}(X) \) such that \( \text{spt}(\partial T_{0} - B_{0}) \subset C, g_{*} T_{0} = T_{0} \) for all \( g \in G \) and
\[
M(T_{0}) = \mu_{0} = \inf\{ M(Q): Q \in G_{m+1,A}(X), \text{spt}(\partial Q - B_{0}) \subset C \}.
\]

Moreover, if \( T \in G_{m+1,A}(X) \) is such that \( \text{spt}(\partial T - B_{0}) \subset C \) and \( M(T) = \mu_{0} \), then \( L_{g} \circ P_{g} T = T \) (hence \( g_{*} T = T \) for \( g \in G \)).

**Proof.** Let
\[
\mu_{1} = \inf\{ M(T): T \in F_{m+1,A}(X), \text{spt}(\partial T - B_{0}) \subset C \}
\]
and
\[ \mu_2 = \inf \{ M(T) : T \in \mathcal{R}_{m+1,A}(X), \text{spt}(\partial T - B_0) \subset C, L_{\mathfrak{a}} \circ P_{\mathfrak{a}} T = T \}. \]

Clearly \( \mu_1 \leq \mu_0 \leq \mu_2 \).

Let \( X' = X \sim C, A' = A \sim C, Z' = Z \sim \pi(C) \) and \( B'_0 = B_0|X \). Arguing as in 5.3 it is an easy matter to verify that
\[ \mu_1 = \inf \{ M(Q) : Q \in \mathcal{F}_{m+1}^{\text{loc}}(X'), \text{spt} Q \subset A', \partial Q = B'_0 \}. \]

An application of 5.6 yields the equality
\[ \mu_1 = \inf \{ M_1(F) : F \in \mathcal{F}_{m+1}^{\text{loc}}(Z'), \text{spt} F \subset \pi(A'), \partial F = P_{\mathfrak{a}} B'_0 \} \]
from which
\[ \mu_1 = \inf \{ M_1(R) : R \in \mathcal{F}_{1,\pi(A)}(Z), \text{spt} R \subset \pi(A), \text{spt}(\partial R - P_{\mathfrak{a}} B_0) \subset \pi(C) \} \]
follows using the compactness of \( \pi(A) \).

For \( G \)-invariant \( T_1 \in \mathcal{R}_{m+1,A}(X) \) one can use [F1, 4.1.28(5), 4.3, 4.2, 4.9(2), 4.1 and 3.3(4)] to show that \( P_{\mathfrak{a}} T_1 \in \mathcal{R}_{1,\pi(A)}(Z) \). Now \( b_\pi \)-isometrically embed \( Z \) as a proper submanifold of \( \mathbb{R}^N \) for some \( N \), use [F1, p. 373 and 3.1.20] in order to apply [F2, 5.12] with \( T = P_{\mathfrak{a}} T_1 \) and [F1, 4.2.16(3)], and conclude
\[ \mu_1 = \inf \{ M_1(R) : R \in \mathcal{F}_{1,\pi(A)}(Z), \text{spt}(\partial R - P_{\mathfrak{a}} B_0) \subset \pi(C) \}. \]

For \( R \in \mathcal{R}_{1,\pi(A)}(Z) \) such that \( \text{spt}(\partial R - P_{\mathfrak{a}} B_0) \subset \pi(C) \) use [BJ1, 3.5(6)], 3.2 and 3.3(7), (8), (5) to obtain
\[ L_{\mathfrak{a}} R \in \mathcal{R}_{m+1,A}(Z), \quad \text{spt}(\partial L_{\mathfrak{a}} R - B_0) \subset C \]
and
\[ L_{\mathfrak{a}} \circ P_{\mathfrak{a}} (L_{\mathfrak{a}} R) = L_{\mathfrak{a}} R. \]

Hence 5.5 implies
\[ \mu_2 \leq \mu_1. \]

Now suppose \( T_0 \in \mathcal{R}_{m+1,A}(X) \) satisfies \( \text{spt}(\partial T_0 - B_0) \subset C \) and \( M(T_0) = \mu_0 \). (Existence of such a \( T_0 \) is guaranteed by [F1, 5.1.6(1)].) Then
\[ \mu_1 \leq M(L_{\mathfrak{a}} \circ P_{\mathfrak{a}} (T_0)) \leq M(T_0) = \mu_0 = \mu_1 \]
and so by 5.2,
\[ L_{\mathfrak{a}} \circ P_{\mathfrak{a}} (T_0) = T_0. \]

Finally, invariance of \( T_0 \) follows from 4.2.

5.8. Remark. In view of [F1, 4.4.1], whenever \( P_{\mathfrak{a}} B_0 \in \mathcal{R}_0(Z) \) and \( A \) is connected one can replace the hypotheses concerning the existence of \( T_1 \) in 5.7 by \( L_{\mathfrak{a}} \circ P_{\mathfrak{a}} B_0 = B_0 \), if \( C \neq \emptyset \), or by \( L_{\mathfrak{a}} \circ P_{\mathfrak{a}} B_0 = B_0 \) and \( B_0(\Omega) = 0 \), if \( C = \emptyset \).

5.9. Suppose \( G \subset \text{SO}(n) \) is a connected closed Lie subgroup acting orthogonally on \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Assume there are no exceptional orbits. Let \( X \) be the set of points in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) which lie on principal orbits and \( S = \mathbb{R}^n \sim x \). By [BG, IV.3.1], \( X \) is an open dense subset of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) and by [BG, IV.3.1 and 4.4], \( Z = X/G \) is orientable. So if we further assume that the distribution of \( (n-m) \)-planes orthogonal to the principal orbits is involutive, then all of the previous results apply to \( X \).
5.10. Theorem. Let $B_0 \in \mathbf{I}_m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be such that $g_sB_0 = B_0$ for all $g \in G$, $\partial B_0 = 0$ and $\text{spt} B_0 \subset X$. Then for every $T_0 \in \mathbf{I}_{m+1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\partial T_0 = B_0$ and

$$M(T_0) = \inf \{M(T): T \in \mathbf{I}_{m+1}(\mathbb{R}^n), \partial T = B_0\}$$

one has

$$g_sT_0 = T_0 \quad \text{for all} \quad g \in G.$$

Proof. Find $r$ so that $\text{spt} B_0 \subset U(0, r)$ and let $K = B(0, 2r)$ and $K' = K \cap X$. Let

$$
\begin{align*}
\Gamma_1 &= \mathbf{F}_{m+1,K}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap \{T: \text{spt}(\partial T - B_0) \subset S\}, \\
\Gamma_2 &= \mathbf{F}_{m+1}^{\text{loc}}(X) \cap \{Q: \text{spt} Q \subset K', \partial Q = B_0\}, \\
\Gamma_3 &= \mathbf{F}_1^{\text{loc}}(Z) \cap \{F: \text{spt} F \subset \pi(K'), \partial F = P_{\partial}B_0\}, \\
\Gamma_4 &= \mathbf{F}_1^{\text{loc}}(Z) \cap \{R: \text{spt} R \subset \pi(K'), \partial R = P_{\partial}B_0\}, \\
\Gamma_5 &= \mathbf{F}_{m+1}^{\text{loc}}(X) \cap \{Q: \text{spt} Q \subset K', \partial Q = B_0, L_{\alpha} \circ P_{\partial}Q = Q\}, \\
\Gamma_6 &= \mathbf{F}_{m+1,K}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap \{T: \text{spt}(\partial T - B_0) \subset S, g_sT = T \text{ for all } g \in G\}, \\
\Gamma_7 &= \mathbf{G}_{m+1,K}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap \{T: \partial T = B_0, g_sT = T \text{ for all } g \in G\}, \\
\Gamma_8 &= \mathbf{F}_{m+1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap \{T: \partial T = B_0\},
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\mu_i = \inf \{\Psi(T): T \in \Gamma_i\}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, 8, \quad \text{where } \Psi = M \text{ for } i \notin \{3, 4\} \text{ and } \Psi = M_{1, i} \text{ for } i \in \{3, 4\}.
$$

The theorem will be proved by verifying the following five statements:

1. $\mu_1 \leq \mu_8 \leq \mu_7$,
2. $\mu_3 = \mu_2 \leq \mu_1$,
3. $\mu_7 \leq \mu_6 \leq \mu_5 \leq \mu_4$,
4. $\mu_4 \leq \mu_3$,
5. $g_sT_0 = T_0$ for all $g \in G$.

Part 1. The inequalities

$$\mu_1 \leq \inf \{M(T): T \in \mathbf{I}_{m+1,K}(\mathbb{R}^n), \partial T = B_0\}$$

and

$$\mu_8 \leq \mu_7$$

are obvious. The desired result now follows from [BJ3, 3.8].

Part 2. If $T \in \Gamma_1$, then $Q = T|X \in \Gamma_2$ with $M(Q) \leq M(T)$. Hence $\mu_1 \geq \mu_2$. The equality $\mu_2 = \mu_1$ is a consequence of 5.6.

Part 3. To see that $\mu_4 > \mu_5$, take $R \in \Gamma_4$ and use [BJ1, 3.5(6)], 3.3(7), (8), (5) and 5.5 to conclude $L_{\partial}R \in \Gamma_5$ with $M(L_{\partial}R) = M_1(R)$.

For $Q \in \Gamma_5$ such that $M(Q) < \infty$, define $T \in \mathbf{F}_{m+1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by

$$
T(\varphi) = \int_X \langle \tilde{Q}, \varphi \rangle d\|Q\|
$$

whenever $\varphi \in \mathbf{F}_{m+1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. It is an easy matter to check that $T \in \Gamma_6$ and $M(T) = M(Q)$. Hence $\mu_6 \leq \mu_5$.

The existence of a current $T \in \Gamma_6$ such that $M(T) = \mu_6$ can be proved as in [F1, 5.1.6]. In fact, using the notation of [F1, 5.1.6], $H(r)$ is $G$-invariant so that $Q \perp H(r)$.
is $G$-invariant for $\mathcal{L}^1$ almost every $r$. That
\[ \liminf_{i \to \infty} \mathcal{T}_K((Q_i - S) \mathcal{L} H(r)) = 0 \]
implies that a subsequence of $\{Q_i \mathcal{L} H(r)\}$ converges weakly to $S \mathcal{L} H(r)$. Hence
$S \mathcal{L} H(r)$ is $G$-invariant for arbitrarily small $r$ from which the invariance of $S$
follows. One now applies [L, 4.4] to obtain $\mu_7 < \mu_6$.

Part 4. Let $e_0 = \text{dist}(\text{supp} \, B_0, S)$. For $e \in (0, e_0)$, denote
\begin{align*}
Z_e &= \sigma(\text{int} \, K \cap \{x: \text{dist}(x, S) > e\}), \\
C_e &= \text{Clos}(Z_e) \sim Z_e,
\end{align*}
and
\[ \mu_4(e) = \inf \{M_1(R) : R \in \mathcal{R}_1(Z), \text{supp} \, R \subset \text{Clos} \, Z_e, \text{supp} \,(\partial R - P_{\mathcal{A}}B_0) \subset C_e\}. \]

We begin by showing
\[ \mu_4 < \lim_{e \to 0^+} \mu_4(e). \]

Fix $e \in (0, e_0)$ and $b_\varrho$-isometrically embed $Z$ into some Euclidean space. By
applying [F1, 3.1.20, p. 373 and 5.1.6], one finds $R_e \in \mathcal{R}_1(Z)$ such that
$\text{supp} \, R_e \subset \sigma(\text{Clos} \, Z_e)$, $\text{supp} \,(\partial R_e - P_{\mathcal{A}}B_0) \subset C_e$ and $M_1(R_e) = \mu_4(e)$.

One can apply [F1, 4.2.1 and 4.1.17] to obtain for $\mathcal{L}^1$ a.e. $\varrho \in [0, e_0 - \epsilon)$
\[ \partial(R_e \mathcal{L} Z_e + \delta) \varphi = -\langle R_e, \text{dist}(\cdot, S), \varrho + \delta > \varphi \]
whenever $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_0(Z)$ and $\text{supp} \,(\partial R_e \cap \text{supp} \, \varphi) = \emptyset$. Then
\[ R_{e, \delta} = R_e \mathcal{L} Z_{e + \delta} \in \mathcal{I}_1(Z) \]
follows from [F1, 4.3.2(2) and 4.2.16(2)] for $\mathcal{L}^1$ a.e. $\delta \in [0, e_0 - \epsilon)$. Suppose $R_{e, \delta} \in \mathcal{I}_1(Z)$. We now use [F1, 4.2.25] and the fact that
$\text{supp}(\Sigma \, T_i) = \bigcup \, \text{supp} \, T_i$ whenever $N(\Sigma \, T_i) = \Sigma \, N(T_i)$ to find indecomposable $R'_{e, \delta} \in \mathcal{I}_1(Z)$ such that
\[ R_{e, \delta} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} R_i^{e, \delta} \quad \text{and} \quad N(R_{e, \delta}) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} N(R'_{e, \delta}) \]
where $R'_{e, \delta}$ is an oriented simple rectifiable curve for each $i$. Then
\[ M_1(R_{e, \delta}) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} M_1(R'_{e, \delta}). \]

Let
\[ J_i = \{j: M(\partial R'_{e, \delta} \mathcal{L} Z_{e + \delta}) = i\}, \quad i = 0, 1, 2. \]
For each $j \in J_i$, let $q_j \in Z$ and $q_j \in \{1, -1\}$ be such that
\[ \partial R'_{e, \delta} \mathcal{L} C_{e + \delta} = q_j \delta_q. \]
Note that $\text{dist}(\pi^{-1}(q_j), S) = \epsilon + \delta$.

Choose $x_j \in \pi^{-1}(q_j)$ and find $y_j \in S$ such that
\[ |x_j - y_j| = \text{dist}(x, S) = \epsilon + \delta. \]
Let $\gamma_j: [0, 1) \to X$ be defined by the formula
\[ \gamma_j(t) = (1 - t)x_j + ty_j, \]
and let $L_j = \sigma(\pi \circ \gamma)_a(0, 1) \in \mathcal{M}_1^\text{loc}(Z)$ and $V_0 = \sup\{ V(x) : x \in K' \}$. Then
\[ \mathcal{M}_1(L_j) < V_0(\varepsilon + \delta). \]

If we let
\[ R = \sum_{j \in J_1} (R^j_{e, \delta} + L_j) + \sum_{j \in J_2} R^j_{e, \delta} \]
then we have $R \in \mathcal{R}^\text{loc}_1(Z)$, spt $R \subset \pi(K')$, and
\[
\partial R = \sum_{j \in J_1} \partial R^j_{e, \delta} - \sigma^j_{e, \delta} + \sum_{j \in J_2} \partial R^j_{e, \delta}
= \sum_{j \in J_1} \partial R^j_{e, \delta} \upharpoonright Z_{e+\delta} + \sum_{j \in J_2} \partial R^j_{e, \delta}
= (\partial R_{e, \delta}) \upharpoonright Z_{e+\delta} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}} B_0.
\]
Hence
\[
\mu_4 < \mathcal{M}_1(R) < V_0(\text{card } J_1)(\varepsilon + \delta) + \sum_{j \in J_1 \cup J_2} \mathcal{M}_1(R^j_{e, \delta})
< V_0 \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}} B_0)(\varepsilon + \delta) + \mathcal{M}_1(R_{e, \delta})
< V_0 \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}} B_0)(\varepsilon + \delta) + \mathcal{M}_1(R_e)
= V_0 \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}} B_0)(\varepsilon + \delta) + \mu_4(\varepsilon).
\]
Thus $\mu_4 < \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \mu_4(\varepsilon)$.

For $\varepsilon > 0$ we can find an open set $V \subset Z$ such that Clos $V$ is compact, $V \subset Z_{e}$ and Bdry $V$ is a $C^\infty$ submanifold of $Z$. Then by restriction and [F2, 5.12] we have
\[
\mu_4 \geq \inf\{ \mathcal{M}_1(F) : F \in \mathcal{F}_1(Z), \text{spt } F \subset \text{Clos } V, \text{spt}(\partial F - \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}} B_0) \subset \text{Bdry } V \}
= \inf\{ \mathcal{M}_1(R) : R \in \mathcal{R}_1(Z), \text{spt } R \subset \text{Clos } V, \text{spt}(\partial R - \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}} B_0) \subset \text{Bdry } V \}
> \mu_4(\varepsilon).
\]

Part 5. Assume $T_0 \in \mathcal{I}_{m+1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies $\partial T_0 = B_0$ and $\mathcal{M}(T_0) = \mu_8$. The inequalities of the first four parts show that $\mu_i = \mu_j$ for $i, j = 1, \ldots, 8$. In particular, 5.2, 4.2 and $\mu_2 = \mu_8$ imply that $T_0|X$ is $G$-invariant. Hence $T_0|X$ is $G$-invariant and we may use the equality $\mu_1 = \mu_8$ to see that $T_0 = T_0|X$.

5.11. Corollary. If $B_0 \in \mathcal{I}_m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies $g_{\mathcal{A}} B_0 = B_0$ for all $g \in G$, $\partial B_0 = 0$ and spt $B_0 \subset X$, then $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a bijection from
\[ \mathcal{I}_{m+1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap \{ T : \partial T = B_0, T \text{ is absolutely area minimizing} \} \]
to
\[ \mathcal{R}^\text{loc}_1(Z) \cap \{ R : \partial R = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}} B_0, \mathcal{M}_1(R) = \inf\{ \mathcal{M}_1(R') : R' \in \mathcal{R}^\text{loc}_1(Z), \partial R' = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}} B_0 \} \} \]
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