SECONDARY CHARACTERISTIC CLASSES OF TRANSVERSELY HOMOGENEOUS FOLIATIONS
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Abstract. Let $G$ be a simple Lie group of real rank one, and $S^\infty_q$ the ideal boundary of the corresponding hyperbolic symmetric space of noncompact type ($\mathbb{H}^n_\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{H}^n_\mathbb{C}$, $\mathbb{H}^n_\mathbb{O}$ or $\mathbb{H}^2_\mathbb{O}$). We show the finiteness of the possible values of the secondary characteristic classes of transversely homogeneous foliations on a fixed manifold whose transverse structures are modeled on $(G, S^\infty_q)$, except the case of transversely conformally flat foliations of even codimension $q$. For this exceptional case, we construct examples of foliations which break the finiteness and we show a weaker form of the finiteness. These are generalizations of a finiteness theorem of secondary classes of transversely projective foliations by Brooks-Goldman and Heitsch to other transverse structures. We also show Bott-Thurston-Heitsch type formulas to compute the Godbillon-Vey classes of certain foliated bundles, and then we obtain a rigidity result on transversely homogeneous foliations on the unit tangent sphere bundles of hyperbolic manifolds.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Secondary characteristic classes of foliations and a theorem of Brooks-Goldman-Heitsch. For a codimension $q$ smooth foliation $\mathcal{F}$ of a smooth manifold $M$, we have the characteristic homomorphism $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}} : H^\ast(WO_q) \to H^\ast(M; \mathbb{R})$ (see Section 2.1). The cohomology classes in the image of $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}}$ are called the secondary characteristic classes of $\mathcal{F}$. These are cobordism invariants of foliations, which come from the continuous cohomology of the Haefliger’s classifying space $B\Gamma^q$ [Hae79].

The relation between the dynamics or geometry of foliations and secondary characteristic classes has been one of the main themes in the study of foliations (see the review article [Hur02] by Hurder or [CC03, Chapter 7] by Candel-Conlon). Main examples of foliations with nontrivial secondary characteristic classes are quotients of homogeneous foliations on homogeneous spaces by lattices, which have been extensively studied [KT75, Yam75, Bak78, Hei78, Pit79, Pel83, Asu10]. Transversely homogeneous foliations are generalizations of these foliations, whose secondary characteristic classes can be computed in a similar way. These foliations were used in the construction of families of foliations whose characteristic classes nontrivially and continuously vary by Thurston [Thu72b, Bot78] and Rasmussen [Ras80]. Other families with this property, constructed by Heitsch [Hei78], are quotients of homogeneous foliations on homogeneous spaces by lattices. Their constructions imply that there are uncountably many foliations which are not mutually cobordant, and certain homology groups with integer coefficients of the classifying space $B\Gamma^q$ are uncountable [Hei78, Section 6].

In spite of the role played by transversely homogeneous foliations in the construction of these examples, Brooks-Goldman and Heitsch showed that transversely
projective foliations, a class of transversely homogeneous foliations, satisfy the following remarkable finiteness property of the secondary characteristic classes. Let $G$ be a Lie group and $P$ a closed subgroup of $G$. A $(G, G/P)$-foliation is a foliation whose transverse structure is modeled on the $G$-action on $G/P$ (see Definition 3.1).

When $G = \text{SL}(q + 1; \mathbb{R})$ and $G/P = S^q$, a $(G, G/P)$-foliation is called a transversely projective foliation. Fix a smooth manifold $M$ with finitely presented fundamental group. Let $\text{Fol}(G, G/P)$ be the set of $(G, G/P)$-foliations on $M$, and let

$$\Sigma(G, G/P) = \#\{ \Delta_\mathcal{F} \mid \mathcal{F} \in \text{Fol}(G, G/P) \},$$

where $q = \dim G/P$.

**Theorem 1.1** (Brooks-Goldman [BG84] in the case of $q = 1$ and Heitsch [Hei80] for $q > 1$). $\Sigma(\text{SL}(q + 1; \mathbb{R}), S^q) < \infty$.

In this article, we will generalize Theorem 1.1 for other cases of $(G, G/P)$. We also prove Bott-Thurston-Heitsch type formulas to compute secondary characteristic classes and apply such formulas to obtain certain rigidity of foliations.

### 1.2. A sufficient condition for the finiteness of secondary characteristic classes

We assume that $G$ is linear algebraic and semisimple. Let $G_C$ be a complex semisimple Lie group such that $\text{Lie}(G_C) = \text{Lie}(G) \otimes \mathbb{C}$ as a Lie algebra over $\mathbb{R}$. Our first result is the following.

**Theorem 1.2.** If $H^*(G_C/P; \mathbb{R}) \to H^*(G/P; \mathbb{R})$ is trivial on positive degrees, then $\Sigma(G, G/P) < \infty$.

When $(G, G/P) = (\text{SL}(q + 1; \mathbb{R}), S^q)$ for odd $q$, the assumption of Theorem 1.2 on $(G, P)$ is satisfied (see Section 6.2). So Theorem 1.2 implies Theorem 1.1 for odd $q$. The following cases are our examples of $(G, G/P)$:

$$(\text{SO}(n + 1, 1), S^n_{\infty}), \quad (\text{SU}(n + 1, 1), S^{2n+1}_{\infty}),$$

$$(\text{Sp}(n + 1, 1), S^{4n+3}_{\infty}), \quad (F_{4(-20)}, S^{15}_{\infty}),$$

where $S^n_{\infty}, S^{2n+1}_{\infty}, S^{4n+3}_{\infty}$ and $S^{15}_{\infty}$ are the ideal boundaries of the corresponding noncompact symmetric spaces $H_\mathbb{R}^n, H^6_\mathbb{C}, H^3_\mathbb{O}$ and $H^3_\mathbb{O}$, respectively. According to the work of manifolds, $(\text{SO}(n + 1, 1), S^n_{\infty})$-foliations are called transversely conformally flat foliations and $(\text{SU}(n + 1, 1), S^{2n+1}_{\infty})$-foliations are called transversely spherical CR foliations. The unit tangent sphere bundles of hyperbolic manifolds have typical examples of these $(G, G/P)$-foliations (see Example 2.3). The map $H^*(G_C/P; \mathbb{R}) \to H^*(G/P; \mathbb{R})$ is trivial on positive degrees except in the case of transversely conformally flat foliations of even codimension (see Section 6). Thus we get the following.

**Corollary 1.3.** If $(G, G/P)$ is $(\text{SO}(n + 1, 1), S^n_{\infty})$ for odd $n$, $(\text{SU}(n + 1, 1), S^{2n+1}_{\infty})$, $(\text{Sp}(n + 1, 1), S^{4n+3}_{\infty})$ or $(\text{F}_{4(-20)}, S^{15}_{\infty})$, then $\Sigma(G, G/P) < \infty$.

**Remark 1.4.** Since $\text{SU}(1, 1) \cong \text{SL}(2; \mathbb{R})$ and $\text{SO}_0(2, 1) \cong \text{PSL}(2; \mathbb{R})$, where $\text{SO}_0(2, 1)$ is the identity component of $\text{SO}(2, 1)$, Corollary 1.3 for $(G, G/P) = (\text{SU}(1, 1), S^n_{\infty})$ or $(\text{SO}(2, 1), S^n_{\infty})$ is essentially contained in Theorem 1.1. Hanotout [Han88] also investigated this type of finiteness results, but his result does not imply this corollary.
Theorem 1.9. Let $SO(\text{SU}(n,1))$ and $\text{Sp}(n,1)$ on spheres may not be effective, depending on $n$, because their stabilizers are equal to the centers. But, by a slight modification of the proof of Theorem 1.2, we can show the finiteness for the case where $(G, G/P)$ is $(\text{PSU}(n+1,1), S^{2n+1}_\infty)$ or $(\text{PSp}(n+1,1), S^{4n+3}_\infty)$ (see Section 6.7).

Remark 1.6. It is not difficult to see that every nontrivial secondary characteristic class of $(G, G/P)$-foliations is a multiple of the Godbillon-Vey class for these cases (see Proposition 7.4).

Theorem 1.2 will be proved in Section 5 by using the complexification of characteristic classes and an observation on certain spectral sequences.

1.3. Bott-Thurston-Heitsch type formulas. The Godbillon-Vey class $GV(F)$ of a foliation $F$ is the secondary characteristic class first discovered in [GV71], and it is specially important for transversely homogeneous foliations as suggested by results of Pittie [Pit79]. In the standard notation, $GV(F) = (2\pi)^{q+1} \Delta_F (b_1 e_1^q)$ for a codimension $q$ foliation [KT75a Theorem 7.20]. A typical example of transversely projective foliations is suspension foliations; namely, for a manifold $N$ and a homomorphism $\pi_1 N \to \text{SL}(q+1; \mathbb{R})$, we get an $S^q$-bundle $p : N \times_{\pi_1 N} S^q \to N$ foliated by a transversely projective foliation transverse to the fibers of $p$ (Example 3.4). The Bott-Thurston-Heitsch formula for the Godbillon-Vey class of transversely projective foliations computes the Godbillon-Vey class of such foliations.

Theorem 1.7 ([Thu72b] and [Bot78 Appendix by Brooks] for $q = 1$ and Heitsch [Hei78 Theorem 4.2] and [Hei83 Theorem 2.3] for $q > 1$). Let $N$ be a manifold and $\text{hol} : \pi_1 N \to \text{SL}(q+1; \mathbb{R})$ a homomorphism. Let $p_M : M \to N$ be the $S^q$-bundle over $N$ with the suspension foliation $F$ obtained from $\text{hol}$. Then, for any orientation on the fibers of $p_M$, we have

$$\left(1\right) \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{q+1}} \int_{p_M} GV(F) = e(p_M)$$

in $H^{q+1}(N; \mathbb{R})$, where $e(p_M)$ is the Euler class of the $S^q$-bundle $p_M$.

Remark 1.8. The case of $q = 1$ is special because there are different choices of $\text{SL}(2; \mathbb{R})$-actions on $S^1$. To get (1), the $\text{SL}(2; \mathbb{R})$-action on the homogeneous space $\text{SL}(2; \mathbb{R})/\text{Aff}(1; \mathbb{R}) \approx S^1$ should be used in the construction of the suspension foliation $F$, where

$$\text{Aff}(1; \mathbb{R}) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & 1/a \end{pmatrix} \mid a \in \mathbb{R}^\times, b \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$ 

This formula is important as one of few methods to calculate the Godbillon-Vey class explicitly. Heitsch obtained a similar formula for other secondary characteristic classes of transversely projective foliations ([Hei78 Theorem 4.2] and [Hei83 Theorem 2.3]).

We generalize this formula. Note that, for a manifold $N$ and a homomorphism $\pi_1 N \to G$, we have a suspension foliation of the total space of a $G/P$-bundle over $N$, which naturally admits a structure of a $(G, G/P)$-foliation (Example 3.4). Let $SO_0(n+1,1)$ be the identity component of $\text{SO}(n+1,1)$.

Theorem 1.9. Let $(G, G/P)$ denote one of $(\text{SO}_0(n+1,1), S^n_\infty)$ for odd $n > 1$, $(\text{SU}(n+1,1), S^{2n+1}_\infty)$ for $n > 0$, $(\text{Sp}(n+1,1), S^{4n+3}_\infty)$ or $(F_4(-20), S^{15}_\infty)$. Let $q =$
dim $G/P$ (the codimension of $(G, G/P)$-foliations), $N$ a manifold and $\text{hol} : \pi_1 N \to G$ a homomorphism. Let $p_M : M \to N$ be the $G/P$-bundle over $N$ with the suspension foliation $F$ obtained from $\text{hol}$. Then, for any orientation on the fibers of $p_M$, we have

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{q+1}} \int_{p_M} GV(F) = r_G e(p_M)$$

in $H^{q+1}(N; \mathbb{R})$, where $e(p_M)$ is the Euler class of the $S^q$-bundle $p_M$, and $r_G$ is the constant, depending on $(G, G/P)$, given in the following table:

| $(G, G/P)$                  | $r_G$                      |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| $(SO_0(n+1, 1), S^n_\infty)$| $n^{n+1}$                 |
| $(SU(n+1, 1), S^{2n+1}_\infty)$| $\frac{2(n+1)^{2n+2}}{n+2} \cdot \frac{(2n+1)!}{n!(n+1)!}$ |
| $(Sp(n+1, 1), S^{4n+3}_\infty)$| $\frac{2^{3/2}(2n+3)^{4n+3}}{(n+2)(n+3)^{n+1}} \cdot \frac{(4n+3)!}{(2n+1)!(2n+2)!}$ |
| $(F_4(-20), S^{15}_\infty)$| $2^{19} \cdot 3^{69/2} \cdot 7^4 \cdot 11^{16} \cdot 13$ |

Remark 1.10. Rasmussen [Ras80, Theorem 5.1] also obtained a similar formula for the case of $(SO_0(3, 1), S^2_\infty)$. The codimension one case excluded from Theorem 1.9, where $(G, G/P)$ is either of $(SO_0(2, 1), S^1_\infty)$ or $(SU(1, 1), S^1_\infty)$, corresponds to the original Bott-Thurston formula (Theorem 1.7 for $q = 1$).

We will prove Theorem 1.9 by a direct calculation on Lie algebra cohomology with the application of the Hirzebruch’s proportionality principle in Section 7. Note that it is not difficult to see that both sides of (2) are equal up to a nonzero constant factor like in the case of the original Bott-Thurston formula for codimension one case (see [BG84, Section 3]). This relation was already pointed out in the case of $(SO(n+1, 1), S^n_\infty)$ by Reznikov [Rez96, Section 5.16].

Remark 1.11. Note that, in the case of $(SO_0(n+1, 1), S^n_\infty)$ for even $n$, the Euler classes of $S^n$-bundles are trivial with real coefficients. So this type of formulas is not true in that case. But we will show a similar formula with the volume of the holonomy homomorphism (see Proposition 7.14).

Remark 1.12. Theorem 1.7 for $q = 1$ was used by Brooks-Goldman [BG84] to prove Theorem 1.1 for $q = 1$. Heitsch [Hei86] used Theorem 1.7 and its generalization to other secondary characteristic classes to prove Theorem 1.1. Based on a calculation similar to the proof of Theorem 1.9, we can give an alternative proof of Theorem 1.1 for even $q$ (see Remarks 8.5 and 8.7). This alternative proof is slightly simpler than the original proof due to Heitsch [Hei86].

1.4. The case of $G/P = S^q$ for even $q$. In this case, it is easy to see that the assumption of Theorem 1.2 on the triviality of $H^*(G_C/P; \mathbb{R}) \to H^*(G/P; \mathbb{R})$ for positive degrees is never satisfied (see Proposition 6.1). In fact, by using a Bott-Thurston-Heitsch type formula in Proposition 7.14 for the Godbillon-Vey class of
transversely conformally flat foliation of even codimension, we get the following infiniteness result.

**Theorem 1.13.** For each even \( q \), there exists a connected noncompact smooth manifold \( X \) with finitely presented fundamental group and a family \( \{ F_m \}_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \) of codimension \( q \) transversely conformally flat foliations of \( X \) such that \( \text{GV}(F_m) \neq \text{GV}(F_{m'}) \) if \( m \neq m' \).

As far as we know, this is the first example of a family of transversely conformal foliations on a connected manifold whose Godbillon-Vey classes take infinitely many different values. We do not know compact examples. Asuke [Asu10] constructed finite families of transversely holomorphic foliations on compact homogeneous spaces whose Godbillon-Vey classes take different values. (Note that complex codimension one transversely holomorphic foliations are real codimension two transversely conformal foliations.)

**Remark 1.14.** Asuke [Asu10] proved that the Godbillon-Vey class does not change nontrivially for smooth families of transversely holomorphic foliations. As pointed out by Morita [Mor79], it is not known if there exist a smooth family of transversely conformal foliations of codimension greater than two whose Godbillon-Vey classes continuously and nontrivially vary.

We will show the finiteness of secondary characteristic classes in a weaker form in this case. Let \( \chi(\nu F) \) be the Euler class of the normal bundle \( \nu F \) of \( F \). Let

\[
\Sigma(G, G/P, z) = \# \{ \Delta_F | F \in \text{Fol}(G, G/P), \chi(\nu F) = z \}
\]

for any fixed \( z \in H^q(M; \mathbb{R}) \). We get the following.

**Theorem 1.15.** If \( G/P = S^q \) for even \( q \), then \( \Sigma(G, G/P, z) < \infty \) for each \( z \in H^q(M; \mathbb{R}) \).

The proof of Theorem 1.15 is based on simple arguments with Lie algebra cohomology. Theorems 1.13 and 1.15 will be proved in Section 8.

### 1.5. Transversely conformal foliations

In this section, we assume that the fixed manifold \( M \) is compact. By a theorem of Tarquini [Tar04, Théorème 0.0.1], a transversely real analytic conformal foliation of codimension \( q > 2 \) is Riemannian or \( (\text{PSO}(q + 1, 1), S^q_{\infty}) \) on each connected component of \( M \). Let \( \text{Fol}^q_{c, \omega} \) be the set of codimension \( q \) transversely real analytic conformal foliations on \( M \). Let

\[
\Sigma^q_c = \# \{ \Delta_F | F \in \text{Fol}^q_{c, \omega} \},
\]

\[
\Sigma^q_c(z) = \# \{ \Delta_F | F \in \text{Fol}^q_{c, \omega}, z = \chi(\nu F) \}
\]

for \( z \in H^q(M; \mathbb{R}) \). Since the secondary characteristic classes of Riemannian foliations are trivial (see [KT75a, Section 4.48 and Theorem 4.52]), we get the following corollary.

**Corollary 1.16.**

(i) \( \Sigma^q_c < \infty \) for odd \( q > 1 \).

(ii) \( \Sigma^q_c(z) < \infty \) for each \( z \in H^q(M; \mathbb{R}) \) and even \( q > 2 \).
1.6. Rigidity of transversely homogeneous foliations with nontrivial secondary invariants. Let \((G, G/P)\) be \((SO_0(n + 1, 1), S^\infty_{2n})\), \((SU(n + 1, 1), S^{2n+1}_\infty)\), \((Sp(n + 1, 1), S^{4n+3}_\infty)\) or \((F_{4(-20)}, S^{15}_\infty)\). Let \(\mathcal{F}_T\) be the standard homogeneous \((G, G/P)\)-foliation on \(M = \Gamma \backslash G/K_P\), where \(\Gamma\) is a torsion-free uniform lattice of \(G\) and \(K_P\) is a maximal compact subgroup of \(P\) (Example 2.3). Here \(GV(\mathcal{F}_T)\) is nontrivial as computed in Corollary 7.12. Note that \(\dim M = \deg GV(\mathcal{F}_T)\). Fix an orientation of \(M\) so that \(\int_M GV(\mathcal{F}_T) > 0\). Then we show the following.

**Theorem 1.17.**

(i) If \((G, G/P)\) is one of \((SO_0(1, 1), S^\infty_{\infty})\) for odd \(n > 1\), \((SU(n + 1, 1), S^{2n+1}_\infty)\) for \(n \geq 1\), \((Sp(n + 1, 1), S^{4n+3}_\infty)\) or \((F_{4(-20)}, S^{15}_\infty)\), then \(\mathcal{F}\) is smoothly conjugate to \(\mathcal{F}_T\).

(ii) If \((G, G/P)\) is \((SO_0(n + 1, 1), S^\infty_{\infty})\) for even \(n\), then any \((G, G/P)\)-foliation \(\mathcal{F}\) of \(M\) satisfies \(\int_M GV(\mathcal{F}) \leq \int_M GV(\mathcal{F}_T)\). Moreover the equality holds if and only if \(\mathcal{F}\) is smoothly conjugate to \(\mathcal{F}_T\).

The essential part of the proof is to generalize the Bott-Thurston-Heitsch type formulas to foliations which may not be transverse to fibers (Lemma 9.1). It allows us to apply the rigidity theory of representations of lattices; in particular, the generalized Mostow rigidity \([\text{Cor91}, \text{Dum99}, \text{FK06}]\) for lattices of \(PSO(n + 1, 1)\) or \(PSU(n + 1, 1)\) and the superrigidity \([\text{Cor92}]\) of lattices of \(Sp(n + 1, 1)\) or \(F_{4(-20)}\).

In the codimension one case, we will show the following.

**Theorem 1.18.** If \((G, G/P)\) is one of \((SO_0(2,1), S^1_{\infty})\) or \((SU(1,1), S^1_{\infty})\), then any \((G, G/P)\)-foliation \(\mathcal{F}\) of \(M\) satisfies \(GV(\mathcal{F}) = GV(\mathcal{F}_T)\) or \(GV(\mathcal{F}) = 0\). Moreover the former case holds if and only if \(\mathcal{F}\) is smoothly conjugate to \(\mathcal{F}_T\).

To prove Theorem 1.18 we will apply a minimality theorem of Chihi-ben Ramdane \([\text{ChR08}]\) and theorems of Thurston \([\text{Tim72a}]\) and Levitt \([\text{Lev78}]\) to isotope \((G, G/P)\)-foliations with nontrivial Godbillon-Vey classes so that they are transverse to the fibers of \(\Gamma \backslash G/K_P \rightarrow \Gamma \backslash G/K_G\), where \(K_G\) is a maximal compact subgroup of \(G\). Then we can apply generalized Mostow rigidity \([\text{Go88}]\) for surface group representations.

Theorems 1.17 and 1.18 will be proved in Section 9.

**Remark 1.19.** Theorem 1.18 improves a result of Brooks-Goldman \([\text{BG84}]\). Theorem 1.18 is also related to Mitsumatsu defect formula \([\text{Mit85}]\) for the \(C^2\) stable foliations of the geodesic flows of hyperbolic surfaces, and its generalization with weaker regularity assumption by Hurder-Katok \([\text{HK90}]\) Theorem 3.11).

**Organization of the article.** Sections 2 and 3 are devoted to recall fundamental notions in this article, as indicated in the table of the contents. In Section 4, the complexification of secondary characteristic classes of transversely homogeneous foliations is explained, which will be used in Section 5 to prove Theorem 1.2. Section 6 is devoted to present the examples of the application of Theorem 1.2. In Section 7 first, the characteristic classes of homogeneous foliations on homogeneous spaces are calculated in terms of Lie algebra cohomology, and then the Bott-Thurston-Heitsch type formulas of Theorem 1.9 are deduced. Theorems 1.15 and 1.13 are proved in Section 8. (Note that the computation in Section 7 is used in Section 8 but it is not necessary for the proof of Theorems 1.15 and 1.13). In Section 9 Theorems 1.17 and 1.18 are proved by applying the modification of the Bott-Thurston-Heitsch type formulas of Theorem 1.9.
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2. Secondary characteristic classes of foliations

2.1. Fundamentals of secondary characteristic classes. Consider the Weil algebra \( W(\mathfrak{g}(q; \mathbb{R})) = \bigwedge \mathfrak{g}(q; \mathbb{R})^* \otimes S\mathfrak{g}(q; \mathbb{R})^* \) of \( \mathfrak{g}(q; \mathbb{R}) \), and its \( O(q) \)-basic subalgebra,

\[
W(\mathfrak{g}(q; \mathbb{R}))(O(q)) = \{ \beta \in W(\mathfrak{g}(q; \mathbb{R})) \mid \iota_X \beta = 0 \ \forall X \in \mathfrak{o}(q), \ \text{Ad}(g)^* \beta = \beta \ \forall g \in O(q) \} .
\]

For a principal \( GL(q; \mathbb{R}) \)-bundle \( E \) over a smooth manifold \( M \) with a \( GL(q; \mathbb{R}) \)-connection \( \nabla^E \), the Chern–Weil construction yields a homomorphism of differential graded algebras, \( \Delta_E : W(\mathfrak{g}(q; \mathbb{R}))(O(q)) \rightarrow \Omega^*(E) \). Since the image of \( W(\mathfrak{g}(q; \mathbb{R}))(O(q)) \) under \( \Delta_E \) is contained in the image of the pull-back map \( \pi^* : \Omega^*(E/O(q)) \rightarrow \Omega^*(E) \) by the \( O(q) \)-basicness, we get a differential map

\[
\Delta_E : W(\mathfrak{g}(q; \mathbb{R}))(O(q)) \rightarrow \Omega^*(E/O(q)) .
\]

By the contractibility of the fibers of \( E/O(q) \rightarrow M \), there exists a section \( s : M \rightarrow E/O(q) \). Thus we get a differential map given by the composite

\[
W(\mathfrak{g}(q; \mathbb{R}))(O(q)) \xrightarrow{\Delta_E} \Omega^*(E/O(q)) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} \Omega^*(M) .
\]

It is known that

\[
W(\mathfrak{g}(q; \mathbb{R}))(O(q)) = \bigwedge [h_1, h_3, \ldots, h_{[q]}] \otimes \mathbb{R}[c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_q]
\]

as a differential graded algebra, where \([q]\) is the maximal odd number less than \( q + 1 \). Its grading is given by \( \text{deg} h_i = 2i - 1 \) and \( \text{deg} c_i = 2i \), and its differential map is determined by \( dh_i = c_i \) and \( dc_i = 0 \). Here, \( c_i \) is the \( i \)-th Chern polynomial given by \( \det(I + \frac{1}{2} A) = \sum_{j=0}^q c_j(A) h^j \) [KT75a, p. 138 and 139]. (Note that these Chern polynomials differ from the usual one by \( \sqrt{-1} \)-factors.) This construction yields nothing for a general \( GL(q; \mathbb{R}) \)-connection because \( H^\bullet(W(\mathfrak{g}(q; \mathbb{R}))(O(q)) = 0 \). The normal bundle \( \nu F = TM/TF \) of a foliated manifold \( (M, F) \) has a special \( \mathfrak{g}(q; \mathbb{R}) \)-connection called a Bott connection [Bot72]. For a Bott connection \( \nabla \) on \( \nu F \), the frame bundle \( \mathcal{P}(\nu F) \) with the principal \( GL(q; \mathbb{R}) \)-connection associated to \( \nabla \) satisfies \( \Delta_{\mathcal{P}(\nu F)}(c_i) = 0 \) for \( i > q \) by Bott vanishing theorem. Thus, letting

\[
W_{O_q} = \bigwedge [h_1, h_3, \ldots, h_{[q]}] \otimes \mathbb{R}[c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_q]/\mathcal{I}_q ,
\]

where \( \mathcal{I}_q \) is the ideal of \( \mathbb{R}[c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_q] \) generated by the elements of degree greater than \( 2q \), we get a differential map \( \Delta_F : W_{O_q} \rightarrow \Omega^*(M) \). The map induced on cohomology,

\[
\Delta_F : H^\bullet(W_{O_q}) \rightarrow H^\bullet(M; \mathbb{R}) ,
\]

depends only on \( F \) and is denoted with the same symbol. The cohomology \( H^\bullet(W_{O_q}) \) is nontrivial, \( \Delta_F \) is called the characteristic homomorphism of \( F \), and the elements of its image are the secondary characteristic classes of \( F \). For \( I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\} \subseteq
\{1, 3, \ldots, [q]\} and \(J = \{ j_1, \ldots, j_l \}\), where \(1 \leq j_m \leq q\), let \(h_I c_J = h_{i_1} \cdots h_{i_k} c_{j_1} \cdots c_{j_l}\). Vey showed that the union of
\[
\{ c_J \mid j \text{ is even } \forall j \in J \}
\]
and
\[
\{ h_I c_J \mid i_1 + |J| \geq q + 1, \ i_1 \leq j \text{ for any odd } j \in J \}
\]
is a basis of \(H^\bullet(WO_q)\) as an \(\mathbb{R}\)-vector space, where \(i_1 = \min I\) [Hec73 Theorem 2]. The characteristic classes in (3) are the Pontryagin classes of \(\nu F\). The characteristic classes in (4) are called exotic.

**Example 2.1.** Let \(F\) be a codimension \(q\) foliation on \(M\) defined by the kernel of a \(q\)-form \(\omega\). By the Frobenius theorem, we have \(d \omega = \eta \wedge \omega\) for some 1-form \(\eta\). Then \(\eta \wedge (d \eta)^q\) is a closed \((2q + 1)\)-form on \(M\), which is equal to \((2\pi)^{q+1} |\Delta_F(h_1 c_I)|\) [KT75a Theorem 7.20]. This characteristic class \((2\pi)^{q+1} |\Delta_F(h_1 c_I)|\) is called the Godbillon-Vey class of \(F\) [GV71]. The notation \(GV(F) = (2\pi)^{q+1} |\Delta_F(h_1 c_I)|\) is standard.

2.2. **Examples of foliations with nontrivial characteristic classes.** Quotient of homogeneous foliations on homogeneous spaces by lattices are the main examples of foliations with nontrivial secondary characteristic classes.

**Example 2.2** (Roussarie’s example [GV71]). Let \(\Gamma\) be a torsion-free uniform lattice of \(SL(2; \mathbb{R})\). Let \(\pi : SL(2; \mathbb{R}) \to SL(2; \mathbb{R})/\text{Aff}(1; \mathbb{R})\) be the canonical projection, where \(\text{Aff}(1; \mathbb{R})\) is the subgroup of \(SL(2; \mathbb{R})\) given in Remark [LX]. Then the fibers of \(\pi\) induce a codimension one foliation on \(M = \Gamma \setminus SL(2; \mathbb{R})\). Let \(\{\omega, \eta, \theta\}\) be a basis of \(\mathfrak{sl}(2; \mathbb{R})^*\) so that the fibers of \(\pi\) are defined by \(\ker \omega\) and
\[
d\omega = \eta \wedge \omega, \quad d\eta = \omega \wedge \theta, \quad d\theta = -\eta \wedge \theta.
\]
By their left invariance, the 1-forms \(\omega, \eta\), and \(\theta\) on \(SL(2; \mathbb{R})\) induce 1-forms on \(M\), which are denoted with the same symbols. Let \(\mathcal{F}\) be the foliation on \(M\) defined by the kernel of \(\omega\). By the definition of \(GV(F)\), we get
\[
GV(F) = [\eta \wedge d\eta] = [\eta \wedge \omega \wedge \theta].
\]
Since \(\eta \wedge \omega \wedge \theta\) is a volume form on \(M\), it follows that \(GV(F) \neq 0\). In fact, by the Bott-Thurston formula (Theorem [LMS] for \(q = 1\)), we get
\[
\int_M GV(F) = 4\pi^2 e,
\]
where \(e\) is the Euler number of the surface \(\Gamma \setminus SL(2; \mathbb{R})/SO(2)\).

**Example 2.3.** The following example is a generalization of the last example to higher dimensions. Let \(G\) be \(SO(n + 1, 1)\), \(SU(n + 1, 1)\), \(Sp(n + 1, 1)\) or \(F_4(-20)\), and consider \(G/P\) as the ideal boundary of the corresponding hyperbolic symmetric space \(G/K_G\):
\[
\begin{align*}
H^\mathbb{R}_2 &= SO(n + 1, 1)/SO(n + 1) \times \{ \pm 1 \}, \\
H^\mathbb{C}_2 &= SU(n + 1, 1)/SU(n + 1) U(1), \\
H^\mathbb{H}_2 &= Sp(n + 1, 1)/Sp(n + 1) Sp(1), \\
H^3_G &= F_4(-20)/Spin(9).
\end{align*}
\]
Let \(K_G\) be a maximal compact subgroup of \(G\), and take a maximal compact subgroup \(K_P\) of \(P\) as \(K_P = K_G \cap P\). The ideal boundary of \(G/K_G\) is a sphere of
real dimension \( n, 2n + 1, 4n + 3 \) and 15, respectively. \( \Gamma \backslash G/K_P \) admits a foliation \( \mathcal{F}_\Gamma \) whose lift to \( G/K_P \) is defined by the fibers of \( G/K_P \rightarrow G/P \). Here, \( \Gamma \backslash G/K_P \) is a real, complex, quaternionic or octonionic hyperbolic manifold, and \( \Gamma \backslash G/K_P \rightarrow \Gamma \backslash G/K_G \) is the total space of its unit tangent sphere bundle (see Section 6), depending on the choice of \( G \). Later, we will compute \( GV(\mathcal{F}_\Gamma) \) (Proposition 7.9), and this Godbillon-Vey class is essentially the unique nontrivial secondary characteristic class for these foliations (Section 7.3). Yamato \cite{Yam75} studied the secondary characteristic classes of \( \mathcal{F}_\Gamma \) in the case where \( G = SO(n + 1, 1) \).

**Example 2.4.** The following example is a further generalization of the last example. Let \( G \) be a Lie group and \( P \) a closed subgroup of \( G \). Let \( K \) be a closed subgroup of \( P \). Let \( \Gamma \) be a torsion-free uniform lattice of \( G \). Then the fibers of the canonical projection \( G/K \rightarrow G/P \) define a foliation \( \mathcal{F}_\Gamma \) on a closed manifold \( \Gamma \backslash G/K \). The characteristic classes of this type of foliations were extensively studied and calculated by Kamber-Tondeur \cite{KT75b}, Baker \cite{Bak78}, Heitsch \cite{Hei78}, Pittie \cite{Pit79}, Pelletier \cite{Pel83} and Asuke \cite{Asu10}.

### 3. Transversely homogeneous foliations

**3.1. Definition of \((G,G/P)\)-foliations.** Let \((M, \mathcal{F})\) be a foliated manifold. Let \( G \) be a Lie group and \( P \) a closed subgroup of \( G \). When the group \( G \) is endowed with the discrete topology, it is denoted by \( G^\delta \). We denote the \( G \)-action on \( G/P \) by \((g, xP) \mapsto g \cdot xP\).

**Definition 3.1.** A (Haefliger) cocycle with values in \((G,G/P)\), defining \( \mathcal{F} \), is a triple \( (\{U_i\}, \{\pi_i\}, \{\gamma_{ij}\}) \), where:

1. \( \{U_i\} \) is an open covering of \( M \),
2. each \( \pi_i \) is a submersion \( U_i \rightarrow G/P \) such that the leaves of \( \mathcal{F}|_{U_i} \) are the fibers of \( \pi_i \), and
3. each \( \gamma_{ij} \) is a continuous map \( U_i \cap U_j \rightarrow G^\delta \) such that \( \pi_i(x) = \gamma_{ij}(x) \cdot \pi_j(x) \) for any \( x \in U_i \cap U_j \).

Two cocycles with values in \((G,G/P)\), defining \( \mathcal{F} \), are called equivalent when their union is contained in some cocycle with values in \((G,G/P)\), defining \( \mathcal{F} \). When \( \mathcal{F} \) is endowed with an equivalence class of cocycles with values in \((G,G/P)\), defining \( \mathcal{F} \), it is called a \((G,G/P)\)-foliation.

Cocycles valued in \((G,G/P)\) are examples of 1-cocycles valued in groupoids defined by Haefliger \cite{Hae58}. Transversely homogeneous foliations are natural generalizations of quotient of homogeneous foliations on homogeneous spaces in terms of 1-cocycles valued in groupoids.

**Remark 3.2.** When \( G \) preserves a metric on \( G/P \), any \((G,G/P)\)-foliation is Riemannian. In this case, the secondary characteristic classes are well known to be trivial (for example, see \cite[Section 4.48 and Theorem 4.52]{KT75a}).

**Example 3.3.** Example 2.2 is an \((SL(2; \mathbb{R}), S^1)\)-foliation, and Example 2.4 a \((G,G/P)\)-foliation. Example 2.3 is a special case of Example 2.4, where \((G,G/P)\) is \((SO(n + 1, 1), S^\infty_n)\), \((SU(n + 1, 1), S^{2n+1}_\infty)\), \((Sp(n + 1, 1), S^{4n+3}_\infty)\) or \((F_{4(-20)}, S^{15}_\infty)\), and where \( S^\infty_n, S^{2n+1}_\infty, S^{4n+3}_\infty \) or \( S^{15}_\infty \) are the ideal boundaries of the corresponding hyperbolic symmetric spaces.
Example 3.4 (Suspension foliations). Let $N$ be a smooth manifold and $h : \pi_1 N \to G$ a homomorphism. A $\pi_1 N$-action on $G/P$ is defined by $\pi_1 N \to G \to \text{Diff}(G/P)$, where the second homomorphism is the $G$-action on $G/P$. Then the quotient space $\tilde{N} \times_{\pi_1 N} G/P$ of the diagonal $\pi_1 N$-action on $\tilde{N} \times G/P$ has a foliation $\mathcal{F}$ induced by the horizontal foliation $\tilde{N} \times G/P = \bigsqcup_{x \in G/P} \tilde{N} \times \{x\}$. Here, it is easy to see that $\mathcal{F}$ naturally admits a structure of $(G,G/P)$-foliation by definition. (One can also apply Proposition 3.8 below.)

Example 3.5. Let $(M_i, \mathcal{F}_i)$ be a smooth manifold with a $(G,G/P)$-foliation for $i \in \{0, 1\}$. Assume that we have a closed transversal $S_i$ of $(M_i, \mathcal{F}_i)$ such that $S_0$ is diffeomorphic to $S_1$ as $(G,G/P)$-manifolds. Let $U_i$ be an open tubular neighborhood of $S_i$ such that the leaves of $F_i|_{U_i}$ are the fibers of a normal bundle of $S_i$. We can paste $U_0 \setminus S_0$ and $U_1 \setminus S_1$ to construct another manifold with a $(G,G/P)$-foliation. Chihi and Ben Ramdane [ChR08] used this method to construct manifolds with $(\text{SL}(2;\mathbb{R}), S^1)$-foliations with nontrivial Godbillon-Vey classes and dense holonomy groups in $\text{SL}(2;\mathbb{R})$.

Example 3.6. Let $(M, \mathcal{F})$ be a smooth manifold with a $(G,G/P)$-foliation. If we have a smooth map $f : M' \to M$ which is transverse to $\mathcal{F}$, we can pull back $\mathcal{F}$ to $M'$ as a $(G,G/P)$-foliation. This construction can be used when $f$ is a branched covering whose branch locus is transverse to $\mathcal{F}$.

Example 3.7. Thurston [Thu72a] constructed examples of codimension one foliations on Seifert fibered 3-manifolds whose Godbillon-Vey class varies nontrivially by making surgery to Example 2.2. Rasmussen [Ras80] generalized this construction to the case of codimension two. Thurston also constructed families of suspension foliations on the total spaces of $S^1$-bundles over closed surfaces of genus two whose characteristic classes vary nontrivially. These examples are constructed by pasting two transversely projective foliations of the total space of $S^1$-bundles over punctured tori [Bot78, Section 4]. Heitsch [Hei78] constructed families of $(\prod_{i=1}^k \text{SL}(n_i;\mathbb{R}), S^1(\Sigma, n_i)^{n_i})$-foliations whose characteristic classes vary by deforming $\prod_{i=1}^k \text{SL}(n_i;\mathbb{R})$-actions on $S^1(\Sigma, n_i)^{n_i}$.

3.2. Haefliger type description of transversely homogeneous foliations.

3.2.1. Flat principal $G$-bundle associated to $\mathcal{F}$ and the holonomy homomorphism. Let $(M, \mathcal{F})$ be a $(G,G/P)$-foliation defined by a cocycle $(\{U_i\}, \{\pi_i\}, \{\gamma_{ij}\})$ valued in $(G,G/P)$. The condition $\pi_i = \gamma_{ij} \cdot \pi_j$ implies the 1-cocycle condition $\gamma_{ik} = \gamma_{ij} \cdot \gamma_{jk}$. Thus $\{\gamma_{ij}\}$ is a 1-cocycle valued in $G^\delta$, which defines a flat principal $G$-bundle $\pi_G : X_G(\mathcal{F}) \to M$. Recall that

$$X_G(\mathcal{F}) = \left( \bigsqcup_i U_i \times G \right) / (x, y) \sim (x, \gamma_{ij}(x)(y)),$$

and the projection $\pi_G$ is induced by the first factor projections $U_i \times G \to U_i$. The holonomy homomorphism $\pi_1 M \to G$ of this flat $G$-bundle is called the holonomy homomorphism of $\mathcal{F}$ and denoted by $\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})$.

3.2.2. The Haefliger structure of $\mathcal{F}$. We recall the description of $(G,G/P)$-foliations in terms of a $G/P$-bundle over $M$, which is a special case of the Haefliger structures of general foliations. It was studied by Blumenthal [Bhu79] and used by Brooks-Goldman [BG84] and Heitsch [Hei86] to prove Theorem 1.1.
Proposition 3.8. A \((G,G/P)\)-foliation \(\mathcal{F}\) on \(M\) is determined by one of the following data:

(i) A flat principal \(G\)-bundle \(\mathcal{X}_G \to M\) and a section \(s\) of \(\mathcal{X}_G/P \to M\) such that \(s\) is transverse to the foliation \(\mathcal{E}\) of \(\mathcal{X}_G/P\) defined by the flat \(G\)-connection.

(ii) A homomorphism \(\text{hol}: \pi_1 M \to G\) and a submersion \(\text{dev}: \widetilde{M} \to G/P\) such that \(\text{dev}(\gamma \cdot x) = \text{hol}(\gamma) \cdot \text{dev}(x)\) for any \(x \in \widetilde{M}\) and any \(\gamma \in \pi_1 M\).

Let \(\pi_{ij}(x): G/P \to G/P\) be the diffeomorphism induced by the left product of \(\gamma_{ij}(x)\). Here, \(\{\pi_{ij}\}\) is a 1-cocycle valued in \(\text{Diff}(G/P)^\delta\), which defines a \(G/P\)-bundle \(\pi_{G/P} : \mathcal{X}_{G/P}(\mathcal{F}) \to M\) with a flat \(G\)-connection whose holonomy homomorphism is equal to \(\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})\). Recall that

\[
\mathcal{X}_{G/P}(\mathcal{F}) = \left( \bigsqcup_i U_i \times G/P \right) / (x,y) \sim (x,\pi_{ij}(x)(y)) = \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/P ,
\]

and the projection \(\pi_{G/P}\) is induced by the first factor projections \(U_i \times G/P \to U_i\). The graphs of the maps \(\pi_i\),

\[
\text{Graph}(\pi_i) = \{ (x, \pi_i(x)) \mid x \in U_i \} \subset U_i \times G/P ,
\]

define a subset of \(\mathcal{X}_{G/P}(\mathcal{F})\), which gives a global section \(s\) of \(\mathcal{X}_{G/P}(\mathcal{F}) \to M\). By construction, \(\mathcal{F}\) is obtained as the pull-back by \(\mathcal{F}\) of the foliation of \(\mathcal{X}_{G/P}(\mathcal{F})\) defined by the flat connection. Summarizing, \(\mathcal{F}\) determines a flat \(G/P\)-bundle \(\pi_{G/P} : \mathcal{X}_{G/P}(\mathcal{F}) \to M\) with a section \(s\), which in turn determines \(\mathcal{F}\).

Let \(\widetilde{M}\) be the universal cover of \(M\). The pull-back of \(\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/P \to M\) to \(\widetilde{M}\) is a trivial flat \(G/P\)-bundle. A section \(s\) of \(\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/P \to M\) yields a section \(\widetilde{s}\) of this trivial \(G/P\)-bundle over \(\widetilde{M}\) by pull-back. In an obvious way, giving \(\widetilde{s}\) is equivalent to giving a submersion \(\text{dev}: \widetilde{M} \to G/P\) that is \(\pi_1 M\)-equivariant with respect to \(\text{hol}(\mathcal{F}): \pi_1 M \to G\); i.e., \(\text{dev}(\gamma \cdot x) = \text{hol}(\mathcal{F})(\gamma) \cdot \text{dev}(x)\) for \(x \in \widetilde{M}\) and \(\gamma \in \pi_1 M\).

3.2.3. Enlargement of the Haefliger structure of \(\mathcal{F}\). We will use a bundle larger than the one described in the last section, which was used by Benson-Ellis [BE85]. Let \(K_P\) be a maximal compact subgroup of \(P\). We consider a \(G/K_P\)-bundle \(\pi_{G/K_P} : \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P \to M\) with a flat \(G\)-connection constructed by a 1-cocycle valued in \(\text{Diff}(G/K_P)^\delta\) in a way analogous to \(\pi_{G/P}\) in the last section. There is also a \(P/K_P\)-bundle \(p : \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P \to \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/P\). Since \(P/K_P\) is contractible, there is a section \(s'\) of \(p\), which is unique up to homotopy. We get a section \(\widetilde{s}\) of \(\pi_{G/K_P}\) defined by the composite

\[
M \xrightarrow{s} \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/P \xrightarrow{s'} \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P .
\]

Clearly, \(\widetilde{s}\) is transverse to the foliation \(p^* \mathcal{E}_{\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})}\) of \(\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P\), where \(\mathcal{E}_{\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})}\) is the foliation of \(\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/P\) defined by the flat \(G\)-connection. Thus we get the following.

Proposition 3.9. A \((G,G/P)\)-foliation \(\mathcal{F}\) on \(M\) is determined by one of the following data:

(i) A flat principal \(G\)-bundle \(\mathcal{X}_G \to M\) and a section \(\widetilde{s}\) of \(\mathcal{X}_G/K_P \to M\) such that \(\widetilde{s}\) is transverse to the foliation \(p^* \mathcal{E}\) of \(\mathcal{X}_G/K_P\), where \(p : \mathcal{X}_G/K_P \to \mathcal{X}_G/P\) is the canonical projection and \(\mathcal{E}\) is the foliation of \(\mathcal{X}_G/P\) defined by the flat \(G\)-connection.
(ii) A homomorphism \( \pi_1 M \to G \) and a smooth map \( \tilde{\nabla} : \tilde{M} \to G/K_P \) such that \( \tilde{\nabla} \) is transverse to the foliation defined by the fibers of \( G/K_P \to G/P \) and \( \tilde{\nabla}(\gamma \cdot x) = \pi_1(\gamma) \cdot \tilde{\nabla}(x) \) for any \( x \in \tilde{M} \) and \( \gamma \in \pi_1 M \).

4. Characteristic classes of transversely homogeneous foliations

4.1. Bott connections on the \( P/K_P \)-coset foliation of \( G/K_P \). Assume that \( G \) is semisimple and \( P \) is a closed subgroup of \( G \). Recall that \( K_P \) is a maximal compact subgroup of \( P \). In this section, we will recall the well known construction of a left invariant Bott connection on the normal bundle of the right \( P/K_P \)-coset foliation \( \mathcal{F}_P \) on \( G/K_P \), originally due to Kamber-Tondeur [KT75b, Theorem 3.7] (announced in [KT74]).

Let \( \sigma : g/p \to g \) be a splitting of the exact sequence

\[
0 \to p \to g \xrightarrow{\pi} g/p \to 0.
\]

Then consider the connection \( \tilde{\nabla} \) on the normal bundle \( \nu \mathcal{G}_P \) of the right \( P \)-coset foliation \( \mathcal{G}_P \) on \( G \) determined by

\[
\tilde{\nabla} X Y = \pi((\text{id}_g - \sigma \pi)X, \sigma(Y))
\]

for \( X \in g \) and \( Y \in g/p \). Observe that \( \tilde{\nabla} \) is left invariant. For \( X \in p \), we get \( \tilde{\nabla} X Y = \text{ad}(X)(Y) \). This fact implies that \( \tilde{\nabla} \) is a Bott connection on \( \nu \mathcal{G}_P \). If we take an \( \text{ad} K_P \)-equivariant section \( \sigma \), then \( \tilde{\nabla} \) induces a left invariant Bott connection \( \nabla \) on \( \nu \mathcal{F}_P \).

Let \( (\wedge g^*)_{K_P} \) be the \( K_P \)-basic subalgebra of \( \wedge g^* \); namely,

\[
\left( \wedge g^* \right)_{K_P} = \left\{ \beta \in \wedge g^* \mid i_X \beta = 0 \ \forall X \in \text{Lie}(K_P), \ \text{Ad}(g)^* \beta = \beta \ \forall g \in K_P \right\},
\]

which is identified to the algebra of left invariant differential forms on \( G/K_P \). By the left invariance of \( \nabla \), we get \( \Delta_{\mathcal{F}_P} : \text{WO}_q \to (\wedge g^*)_{K_P} \). Let \( g_C^* = \text{Hom}_C(g \otimes C, C) \). Let \( P_C \) be the connected Lie subgroup of \( G_C \) such that \( \text{Lie}(P_C) = \text{Lie}(P) \otimes C \). By complexifying \( \nabla \), we get a complex connection \( \nabla_C \) on the complexified normal bundle of the right \( P_C \)-coset foliation \( \mathcal{F}_{P_C} \) on \( G_C/(K_P)_C \), obtaining the characteristic homomorphism \( \Delta_{\mathcal{F}_{P_C}} : \text{WO}_q \otimes C \to (\wedge g^*_C)_{(K_P)_C} \). Thus we get that the following diagram commutes:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{WO}_q \otimes C & \xrightarrow{\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_{P_C}}} & (\wedge g^*_C)_{(K_P)_C} \\
\downarrow \Delta_{\mathcal{F}_P} & & \downarrow \\
\left( \wedge g^* \right)_{K_P} \otimes C
\end{array}
\]

where the vertical arrow is canonical.

4.2. Complexification of the enlargement of Haefliger structures. Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be a \( (G,G/P) \)-foliation of a manifold \( M \). Let \( G_C \) be the connected and simply connected complex Lie group with \( \text{Lie}(G_C) = \text{Lie}(G) \otimes C \). Let \( K_P \) be the maximal compact subgroup of \( P \). Let \( \pi_{G/K_P} : \chi_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P \to M \) be the enlargement of the Haefliger structure considered in Proposition 3.9.
We construct the fiberwise complexification of $\pi_{G/K}$ as follows. Let $\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})_C$ denote the composite
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\pi_1 M \xrightarrow{\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})} G \\
\xrightarrow{G/K} \mathbb{C}
\end{array}
\]

Let $\mathcal{X}_{G_c}(\mathcal{F})$ be the quotient of $\tilde{M} \times G_C$ by the diagonal action of $\pi_1 M$, obtaining a flat principal $G_C$-bundle $\pi_{G_c} : \mathcal{X}_{G_c}(\mathcal{F}) \to M$ whose holonomy homomorphism is $\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})_C$. Then we get a canonical map $\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P \to \mathcal{X}_{G_c}(\mathcal{F})/(K_P)_C$, which is a complexification map $G/K_P \to G_C/(K_P)_C$ on each fiber. Thus a section $s$ of $\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P \to M$ gives a section $s_C$ of $\mathcal{X}_{G_c}(\mathcal{F})/(K_P)_C \to M$.

The universal covers of $\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P$ and $\mathcal{X}_{G_c}(\mathcal{F})/(K_P)_C$ are the products $\tilde{M} \times G/K_P$ and $\tilde{M} \times G_C/(K_P)_C$, respectively. Consider the diagram
\[
\begin{array}{c}
(\bigwedge \mathfrak{g}_C^*)_{(K_P)_C} \xrightarrow{\Omega^*} \Omega^*(\tilde{M} \times G_C/(K_P)_C; \mathbb{C}) \\
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \\
(\bigwedge \mathfrak{g}^*)_K \otimes \mathbb{C} \xrightarrow{\Omega^*} \Omega^*(\tilde{M} \times G/(K_P)_C; \mathbb{C})
\end{array}
\]

where the horizontal arrows are the pull-back by the second projections and the vertical arrows are the canonical maps defined by complexification. Since $\pi_1 M$ acts on $G/K_P$ and $G_C/(K_P)_C$ by the left product of $G$, left invariant forms on $G/K_P$ and $G_C/(K_P)_C$ descend to $\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P$ and $\mathcal{X}_{G_c}(\mathcal{F})/(K_P)_C$. Thus we get the commutative diagram
\[
\begin{array}{c}
(\bigwedge \mathfrak{g}_C^*)_{(K_P)_C} \xrightarrow{\Omega^*} \Omega^*(\mathcal{X}_{G_c}(\mathcal{F})/(K_P)_C; \mathbb{C}) \\
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \\
(\bigwedge \mathfrak{g}^*)_K \otimes \mathbb{C} \xrightarrow{\Omega^*} \Omega^*(\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/(K_P)_C; \mathbb{C})
\end{array}
\]

Recall that $P_C$ is the connected Lie subgroup of $G_C$ with $\text{Lie}(P_C) = \text{Lie}(P) \otimes \mathbb{C}$. Combining the diagrams (5) and (6), we get the following.

**Proposition 4.1.** The following diagram is commutative:
\[
\begin{array}{cc}
\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_C} & \Delta_{\mathcal{F}} \\
H^*(\mathcal{X}_{G_c}(\mathcal{F})/(K_P)_C; \mathbb{C}) & H^*(\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/(K_P)_C; \mathbb{C})
\end{array}
\]

where $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}}$ is the pull-back of the $(G,G/P)$-foliation of $\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/P$ by the projection $\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P \to \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/P$, and $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_C}$ is the pull-back of the $(G_C,G_C/P_C)$-foliation of $\mathcal{X}_{G_c}(\mathcal{F})/(K_P)_C$ by the projection $\mathcal{X}_{G_c}(\mathcal{F})/(K_P)_C \to \mathcal{X}_{G_c}(\mathcal{F})/P_C$.

The following simple observation is the unique new idea in our proof of Theorem 1.2.

**Proposition 4.2.** Assume that $H^*(G_C/P; \mathbb{R}) \to H^*(G/P; \mathbb{R})$ is trivial on positive degrees. Then the image of $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}} : H^*(\text{WO}_q) \to H^*(\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/(K_P)_C; \mathbb{R})$ is contained in the image of $\pi_{G/K_P} : H^*(\tilde{M}; \mathbb{R}) \to H^*(\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/(K_P)_C; \mathbb{R})$. 
Proof. By Proposition 4.1, the image of $\Delta \xi$ is contained in the image of

$$H^\bullet(\mathcal{X}_{G_c}(\mathcal{F})/(K_P)_{c};\mathbb{R}) \to H^\bullet(\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P;\mathbb{R}).$$

Consider the Leray-Serre spectral sequences associated to the fiber bundles

$$\mathcal{X}_{G_c}(\mathcal{F})/(K_P)_{c} \to M, \quad \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P \to M.$$

Since $(K_P)_c$ and $K_P$ are homotopy equivalent to $P$, it follows that $\mathcal{X}_{G_c}(\mathcal{F})/(K_P)_c$ and $\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P$ are homotopy equivalent to $\mathcal{X}_{G_c}(\mathcal{F})/P$ and $\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/P$, respectively. Thus the restriction map between the $E_2$-terms is given by

$$r : H^\bullet(M, \mathcal{H}^\bullet(G_c/P)) \to H^\bullet(M, \mathcal{H}^\bullet(G/P)),$$

where $\mathcal{H}^\bullet(G_c/P)$ and $\mathcal{H}^\bullet(G/P)$ are the corresponding local systems associated to $\mathcal{X}_{G_c}(\mathcal{F})/P$ and $\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/P$, respectively. By the assumption of triviality of $H^\bullet(G_c/P;\mathbb{R}) \to H^\bullet(G/P;\mathbb{R})$ on positive degrees, it follows that the image of $r$ is contained in $H^\bullet(M;\mathbb{R})$. \hfill $\Box$

4.3. Two results of Benson-Ellis. Let $H^\bullet(\mathfrak{g}, K_P) = H^\bullet((\wedge \mathfrak{g})^*)_{K_P}$.

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a $(G, G/P)$-foliation of a manifold $M$. Assume that $G$ is semisimple.

**Theorem 4.3** (Benson-Ellis [BES5]). The following diagram commutes:

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
H^\bullet(\mathfrak{g}, K_P) & \xrightarrow{\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_P}} & H^\bullet(\mathcal{F};\mathbb{R}) \\
H^\bullet(WO_q) & \xrightarrow{\Delta_{\mathcal{F}}} & H^\bullet(M;\mathbb{R}),
\end{array}
$$

Note that the argument in the last section gives an alternative proof of Theorem 4.3.

Let $U$ be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^l$.

**Theorem 4.4** (Benson-Ellis [BES5], see also Haefliger [Hei86] Theorem in Section 6). For a smooth family $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in U}$ of $(G, G/P)$-foliations of $M$, the family $\{\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_t}\}_{t \in U}$ is locally constant in Hom($H^\bullet(WO_q), H^\bullet(M;\mathbb{R})$).

This rigidity comes from the vanishing results of cohomology of representations of semisimple Lie algebras.

5. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Like in the proof of Theorem 1.1 by Brooks-Goldman and Heitsch, the unique essential part of the proof of Theorem 1.2 is the following proposition.

**Proposition 5.1.** If the holonomy homomorphisms of two $(G, G/P)$-foliations, $\mathcal{F}_0$ and $\mathcal{F}_1$, on $M$ are homotopic, then $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_0} = \Delta_{\mathcal{F}_1}$.

Now, Theorem 1.2 follows from Proposition 5.1 with the arguments of Brooks-Goldman [BG84, Lemma 2].

**Proof of Theorem 1.2 by using Proposition 5.1.** Recall that we assume that $\pi_1 M$ is finitely presented. It is well known that $\pi_0(\text{Hom}(\pi_1 M, G))$ is finite (see Remark 5.3 at the end of this section). Thus there exist a finite number of $(G, G/P)$-foliations $\mathcal{F}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_m$ of $M$ such that, for any $(G, G/P)$-foliation $\mathcal{F}$ of $M$, its holonomy homomorphism is in the same connected component of $\text{Hom}(\pi_1 M, G)$ as the holonomy homomorphism of some $\mathcal{F}_i$. Thus Proposition 5.1 implies Theorem 1.2. \hfill $\Box$
Proposition 5.1 directly follows from Theorem 1.2 and Proposition 4.2.

**Proof of Proposition 5.1.** Let \( X_G(F_i)/KP \to M \) be the enlargement of the Haefliger structure of \( F_i \) considered in Proposition 5.3 for \( i \in \{0, 1\} \). Recall that a section \( s_i : M \to X_G(F_i)/KP \) is associated to \( F_i \). Consider the foliation \( \tilde{E}_i = s_i^*\mathcal{E}_{hol}(F_i) \) of \( X_G(F_i)/KP \), where \( p_i : X_G(F_i)/KP \to X_G(F_i)/P \) is the canonical projection and \( \mathcal{E}_{hol}(F_i) \) is the foliation of \( X_G(F_i)/P \) defined by the flat \( G \)-connection.

The homotopy class of \( (X_G(F_i)/KP, \tilde{E}_i) \) as a \( (G, G/P) \)-foliation is determined by the homotopy class of the holonomy homomorphism of \( F_i \). Thus, by assumption and Theorem 1.2 we get \( \Delta_{\tilde{E}_0} = \Delta_{\tilde{E}_1} \).

By Proposition 4.2, the image of \( \Delta_{\tilde{E}_0} \) is contained in the image of \( p^* : H^*(M; \mathbb{R}) \to H^*(X_G(F_0)/KP; \mathbb{R}) \). Thus \( (s^0)^*\Delta_{\tilde{E}_0} = (s^1)^*\Delta_{\tilde{E}_0} \) on \( H^*(WO_q) \), and therefore

\[
\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_0} = (s^0)^*\Delta_{\tilde{E}_0} = (s^1)^*\Delta_{\tilde{E}_0} = (s^1)^*\Delta_{\tilde{E}_1} = \Delta_{\mathcal{F}_1} .
\]

For later reference, note the following fact shown in the proof of Proposition 5.1.

**Proposition 5.2.** Let \( \sigma \in H^*(WO_q) \). If \( \Delta_{\tilde{E}_0} \) belongs to the image of \( p^* : H^*(M; \mathbb{R}) \to H^*(X_G(F_0)/KP; \mathbb{R}) \), then

\[
\#\{ \Delta_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma) \in H^*(M; \mathbb{R}) \mid \mathcal{F} \in \text{Fol}(G, G/P) \} < \infty .
\]

**Remark 5.3.** For a finitely presented group \( S \) with \( k \) generators, we can give \( \text{Hom}(S, GL(n; \mathbb{R})) \) the structure of a real algebraic variety via a tautological embedding \( j : \text{Hom}(S, GL(n; \mathbb{R})) \to GL(n; \mathbb{R})^k \) (this is an observation of Lusztig as written in [Sul76, Footnote of p. 186]). For an algebraic group \( G \) of \( GL(n; \mathbb{R}) \), we see that

\[
\text{Hom}(S, G) = j(\text{Hom}(S, GL(n; \mathbb{R}))) \cap G^k
\]

is also a real algebraic variety. Thus \( \pi_0(\text{Hom}(S, G)) \) is finite by a theorem of Whitney [Whi57].

**Remark 5.4.** We indicate an alternative way to prove the finiteness of the Godbillon-Vey class by using the complexification of the Haefliger structure of \( \mathcal{F} \) under the assumption of the triviality of \( H^*(G_{C/P}; \mathbb{R}) \to H^*(G/P; \mathbb{R}) \) on positive degrees. Note that this assumption is weaker than the assumption of the triviality of \( H^*(G_{C/P}; \mathbb{R}) \to H^*(G/P; \mathbb{R}) \) on positive degrees. Consider a \( G_{C/P} \)-bundle \( X_{G_{C/P}}(\mathcal{F})/P_{C} \to M \), which is regarded as the complexification of the Haefliger structure \( X_G(F)/P \to M \) of \( \mathcal{F} \). Assume that \( c_1(\mathcal{E}_{hol}(F)) \) is trivial if \( \dim G/P \) is even. By results of Asuke [Asu13, Corollary 1.9 and Proposition 2.2], the Godbillon-Vey class extends to \( X_{G_{C/P}}(\mathcal{F})/P_{C} \). So, if \( H^*(G_{C/P}; \mathbb{R}) \to H^*(G/P; \mathbb{R}) \) is trivial on positive degrees, then we get the finiteness of the Godbillon-Vey class like in the above proof of Theorem 1.2.

**Proposition 5.5.** We can show the triviality of \( H^*(G_{C/P}; \mathbb{R}) \to H^*(G/P; \mathbb{R}) \) on positive degrees by using the Schubert cell decomposition of \( G_{C/P} \) if \( G_{C/P} \) is a generalized Bott tower; namely, the total space of consecutive complex projective space bundles and \( G/P \) is the total space of the corresponding consecutive real projective space bundles. The Schubert cell decomposition of \( G_{C/P} \) is a cell decomposition whose cells are orbits of the action of a Borel subgroup of \( G_{C/P} \). This cell decomposition induces a cell decomposition of \( G/P \). In the case of generalized Bott towers, we can contract the inclusion \( G/P \to G_{C/P} \) cell by cell to a constant map.
6. Examples

6.1. The Euler class of the bundle $G_C/P \to G_C/G$. Let us consider the case of $G/P = S^q$. We characterize the assumption of Theorem 1.2 by the nontriviality of the Euler class of the sphere bundle

$$G/P \longrightarrow G_C/P \longrightarrow G_C/G,$$

which is homotopy equivalent to

$$K_G/K_P \longrightarrow K_{G_C}/K_P \longrightarrow K_{G_C}/K_G.$$

**Proposition 6.1.** $H^*(G_C/P; \mathbb{R}) \to H^*(G/P; \mathbb{R})$ is trivial on positive degrees if and only if the Euler class $e$ of $\varphi$ is nontrivial in $H^{q+1}(G_C/G; \mathbb{R})$.

**Proof.** From the Gysin sequence of $k(8)$ and $SO(2k)$, we get an exact sequence

$$H^q(G_C/P; \mathbb{R}) \overset{f_\varphi}{\longrightarrow} H^0(G_C/G; \mathbb{R}) \overset{\varphi}{\longrightarrow} H^{q+1}(G_C/G; \mathbb{R}).$$

Thus $e$ is nontrivial if and only if the image of $f_\varphi$ is nontrivial. In turn, the image of $f_\varphi$ is nontrivial if and only if the restriction map $H^q(G_C/P) \to H^q(G/P)$ is nontrivial.

6.2. The case of transversely projective foliations of odd codimension. In this case, $(G, G/P) = (\text{SL}(q+1; \mathbb{R}), S^q)$ for odd $q$. Let $q = 2k - 1$ and $Y_\ell = \text{SU}(\ell)/\text{SO}(\ell)$. Now, the sphere bundle (17) is

$$SO(2k)/\text{SO}(2k-1) \longrightarrow \text{SU}(2k)/\text{SU}(2k-1) \overset{p_k}{\longrightarrow} Y_{2k}. $$

We show that the nontriviality of the Euler class of (8) follows from the Borel’s computation of the Betti numbers of homogeneous spaces [Bor53].

**Lemma 6.2.** The Euler class of (8) is nontrivial in $H^{2k}(Y_{2k})$.

**Proof.** According to the computation of $H^*(Y_\ell)$ by Borel [Bor53, Proposition 31.4], we get that

$$H^*(Y_{2k}) \longrightarrow H^*(Y_{2k-1})$$

is surjective and

$$\dim H^*(Y_{2k}) = 2 \dim H^*(Y_{2k-1}).$$

Consider also the fibration

$$Y_{2k-1} \longrightarrow \text{SU}(2k)/\text{SO}(2k-1) \longrightarrow \text{SU}(2k)/\text{SU}(2k-1) \cong S^{4k-1}. $$

Assume that the Euler class of $p_k$ is trivial. Then

$$\dim H^*(\text{SU}(2k)/\text{SO}(2k-1)) = \dim H^*(S^{2k-1}) \cdot \dim H^*(Y_{2k});$$

in particular, $p_k^* : H^*(Y_{2k}) \to H^*(\text{SU}(2k)/\text{SO}(2k-1))$ is injective. By the surjectivity of (9), we get the surjectivity of $t^* : H^*(\text{SU}(2k)/\text{SO}(2k-1)) \to H^*(Y_{2k-1})$. Thus, by the Leray-Hirsch theorem, we obtain

$$\dim H^*(\text{SU}(2k)/\text{SO}(2k-1)) = \dim H^*(Y_{2k-1}) \cdot \dim H^*(S^{4k-1}).$$

But (11) and (12) contradict (10). Thus the Euler class of $p_k$ is nontrivial.

So $H^*(K_G/K_P; \mathbb{R}) \to H^*(K_G/K_P; \mathbb{R})$ is trivial on positive degrees. Thus Theorem 1.2 gives an alternative proof of Theorem 1.1 for the case of odd codimension.
6.3. The case of transversely conformally flat foliations. Now, \((G, G/P) = (\text{SO}(n+1, 1), \mathbb{S}^\infty_{\mathbb{C}})\). So \(G_C = \text{SO}(n+2; \mathbb{C})\), and

\[
K_{G_C} = \text{SO}(n+2), \quad K_G = \text{S(O}(n+1) \times \{\pm 1\}), \quad K_P = \text{S(O}(n) \times \{\pm 1\}) .
\]

Thus the sphere bundle \((7)\) is

\[
\text{S(O}(n+1) \times \{\pm 1\})/\text{S(O}(n) \times \{\pm 1\}) \longrightarrow \text{SO}(n+2)/\text{S(O}(n) \times \{\pm 1\}) \longrightarrow \zeta_{\text{SO}}.
\]

The isotropy group of the \(\text{SO}(n+2)\)-action on the unit tangent sphere bundle of \(\text{SO}(n+2)/\text{S(O}(n+1) \times \{\pm 1\})\) is \(\text{S(O}(n) \times \{\pm 1\})\). So \(\zeta_{\text{SO}}\) is the unit tangent sphere bundle of \(\text{SO}(n+2)/\text{S(O}(n+1) \times \{\pm 1\}) \cong \mathbb{R}P^{n+1}\). Hence the Euler class of \(\zeta_{\text{SO}}\) is equal to the fundamental class of \(\mathbb{R}P^{n+1}\) if \(n\) is odd. Thus, by Proposition 6.1, the assumption of Theorem 1.2 is satisfied in this case.

6.4. The case of transversely spherical CR foliations. Now, \((G, G/P) = (\text{SU}(n+1, 1), \mathbb{S}^{2n+1}_\infty)\), where the codimension \(q = 2n+1\) is odd. In this case, \(G_C = \text{SL}(n+2; \mathbb{C})\) and

\[
K_{G_C} = \text{SU}(n+2), \quad K_G = \text{S(U}(n+1) \text{U}(1)), \quad K_P = \text{S(U}(n) \text{U}(1)).
\]

Thus the sphere bundle \((7)\) is

\[
\text{S(U}(n+1) \text{U}(1))/\text{S(U}(n) \text{U}(1)) \longrightarrow \text{SU}(n+2)/\text{S(U}(n) \text{U}(1)) \longrightarrow \zeta_{\text{SU}}.
\]

The isotropy group of the \(\text{SU}(n+2)\)-action on the unit tangent sphere bundle of \(\text{SU}(n+2)/\text{S(U}(n+1) \text{U}(1))\) is \(\text{S(U}(n) \text{U}(1))\). So \(\zeta_{\text{SU}}\) is the unit tangent sphere bundle of \(\text{SU}(n+2)/\text{S(U}(n+1) \text{U}(1)) \cong \mathbb{C}P^{n+1}\). Thus the Euler class of \(\zeta_{\text{SU}}\) is equal to \(n+2\) times the fundamental class of \(\mathbb{C}P^{n+1}\). By Proposition 6.1, the assumption of Theorem 1.2 is satisfied in this case.

6.5. The case \((G, G/P) = (\text{Sp}(n+1, 1), \mathbb{S}^{4n+3}_\infty)\). Note that the codimension is always odd in this case. We get \(G_C = \text{Sp}(n+2; \mathbb{C})\) and

\[
K_{G_C} = \text{Sp}(n+2), \quad K_G = \text{Sp}(n+1) \text{Sp}(1), \quad K_P = \text{Sp}(n) \text{Sp}(1).
\]

Thus the sphere bundle \((7)\) is

\[
\text{Sp}(n+1) \text{Sp}(1)/\text{Sp}(n) \text{Sp}(1) \longrightarrow \text{Sp}(n+2)/\text{Sp}(n) \text{Sp}(1) \longrightarrow \zeta_{\text{Sp}}.
\]

The isotropy group of the \(\text{Sp}(n+2)\)-action on the unit tangent sphere bundle of \(\text{Sp}(n+2)/\text{Sp}(n+1) \text{Sp}(1)\) is \(\text{Sp}(n)\). Thus \(\zeta_{\text{Sp}}\) is the unit tangent sphere bundle of \(\text{Sp}(n+2)/\text{Sp}(n+1) \text{Sp}(1) \cong \mathbb{H}P^{n+1}\). Hence the Euler class of \(\zeta_{\text{Sp}}\) is equal to \(n+2\) times the fundamental class of \(\mathbb{H}P^{n+1}\). By Proposition 6.1, the assumption of Theorem 1.2 is satisfied in this case.
6.6. **The case** \((G, G/P) = (F_{4(-20)}, S^1)^2\). We recall the explicit presentation of \(F_{4(-20)}\). \(F_4\) and \(F_4^C\) as automorphism groups of Jordan algebras due to Freudenthal [Fre85] and Yokota [Yok75]. We follow Yokota [Yok09]. Let \(O\) be the Cayley algebra over \(\mathbb{R}\). Let \(M(3; O)\) be the \(3 \times 3\) matrix group with coefficients in \(O\). Let \(X^* = \overline{X}\), where the bar denotes conjugation in \(O\). Let \(I''_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\).

\[
J(1, 2) = \{ X \in M(3; O) \mid I''_1 X^* I''_1 = X \},
\]

\[
J = \{ X \in M(3; O) \mid X^* = X \},
\]

and \(J^C = J \otimes \mathbb{C}\). A product \(\circ\) is defined on these \(\mathbb{R}\)-vector spaces by \(X \circ Y = \frac{1}{2}(XY + YX)\). Endowed with this product, \(J(1, 2)\), \(J\) and \(J^C\) are called Jordan algebras. \(J\) can be written as follows:

\[
J = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 & x_3 & \overline{x}_2 \\ \overline{x}_3 & \xi_2 & x_1 \\ x_2 & \overline{x}_1 & \xi_3 \end{pmatrix} \in M(3; O) \mid \xi_i \in \mathbb{R}, x_i \in \mathbb{O} \right\}.
\]

Here, \(F_{4(-20)}\), \(F_4\) and \(F_4^C\) are defined as the automorphism groups of these Jordan algebras:

\[
F_{4(-20)} = \{ \sigma \in \text{Aut}_\mathbb{R}(J(1, 2)) \mid \sigma(x \circ y) = \sigma(x) \circ \sigma(y) \},
\]

\[
F_4 = \{ \sigma \in \text{Aut}_\mathbb{R}(J) \mid \sigma(x \circ y) = \sigma(x) \circ \sigma(y) \},
\]

\[
F_4^C = \{ \sigma \in \text{Aut}_\mathbb{C}(J^C) \mid \sigma(x \circ y) = \sigma(x) \circ \sigma(y) \}.
\]

It is well known that \(G_C = F_4^C\) and \(K_{G_C} = F_4\). We will get an explicit form of the parabolic subgroup \(P\).

**Lemma 6.3** (Announced by Borel [Bor50] and proved by Matsushima [Mat52]).

The isotropy group of the \(F_4\)-action on \(J\) at \(E_{11} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\) is \(\text{Spin}(9)\). Thus the orbit of \(E_{11}\) under the \(F_4\)-action is the octonionic projective plane \(\mathbb{O}P^2 = F_4/\text{Spin}(9)\).

Here, \(\mathbb{O}P^2\) is given by the following formula [Yok75]:

\[
\mathbb{O}P^2 = \{ X \in M(3; \mathbb{O}) \mid X^2 = X, \text{tr}X = 1 \}.
\]

There is a left \(G\)-action on \(\mathbb{O}P^2\) defined by \(\langle g, X \rangle \mapsto \frac{gX}{\text{tr}(gX)}\). The orbit of \(E_{11}\) under this \(G\)-action is the octonionic hyperbolic plane \(H^2_\mathbb{O} = F_{4(-20)}/\text{Spin}(9)\), and the boundary \(\partial H^2_\mathbb{O}\) of \(H^2_\mathbb{O}\) in \(\mathbb{O}P^2\) is given by

\[
\partial H^2_\mathbb{O} = \{ X \in \mathbb{O}P^2 \mid \text{tr}(X \circ I''_1 X) = 0 \}.
\]

Since \(\mathbb{O}P^2\) consists of the matrices

\[
X = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 & x_3 & \overline{x}_2 \\ \overline{x}_3 & \xi_2 & x_1 \\ x_2 & \overline{x}_1 & \xi_3 \end{pmatrix} \in J
\]

such that

\[
\xi_2 \xi_3 = |x_1|^2, \quad \xi_3 \xi_1 = |x_2|^2, \quad \xi_1 \xi_2 = |x_3|^2,
\]

\[
x_2 x_3 = \xi_1 \overline{x}_1, \quad x_3 x_1 = \xi_2 \overline{x}_2, \quad x_1 x_2 = \xi_3 \overline{x}_3,
\]

\[
\xi_1 + \xi_2 + \xi_3 = 1,
\]

and the orbit of \(E_{11}\) under the \(F_4\)-action is the octonionic projective plane \(\mathbb{O}P^2 = F_4/\text{Spin}(9)\).
a simple calculation shows that $\text{tr}(X \circ I''_1 X) = 0$ is equivalent to $\xi_1 = \frac{1}{2}$ for points $X \in \mathbb{O}P^2$ as above, obtaining a diffeomorphism

$$\partial \mathbb{H}_3 \approx \{ (x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{O}^2 \mid |x_2|^2 + |x_3|^2 = 1/4 \};$$

in particular, $\partial \mathbb{H}_3 \approx S^{15}$. Then $P$ is the isotropy group of the $G$-action on $\partial \mathbb{H}_3$ at $X_0 = \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 1/2 & 0 & 1/2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1/2 & 0 & 1/2 \end{array} \right)$.

We determine the sphere bundle $S$ in this case. Let $K_G$ denote the isotropy group of the $F_4$-action at $E_{22} = \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)$, which is a maximal compact subgroup of $G$ isomorphic to $\text{Spin}(9)$ by Lemma 6.3. A maximal compact subgroup $K_P$ of $P$ is given by $K_P = K_G \cap P$. Since the $F_4$-action on $J$ fixes the identity matrix $[\text{Yok09}, \text{Lemma 2.2.4}]$ or $[\text{Yok75}, \text{Lemma 2.3-(1)}]$, $K_P$ is equal to the isotropy group of the $\text{Spin}(9)$-action on $J$ at $\left( \begin{array}{ccc} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)$, which is isomorphic to $\text{Spin}(7)$ $[\text{Yok09}, \text{Theorem 2.7.5}]$ or $[\text{Yok76}, \text{Remark 6.3}]$. Thus the sphere bundle $S$ is

$$S^{15} \cong \text{Spin}(9)/\text{Spin}(7) \xrightarrow{\zeta_{F_4}} F_4/\text{Spin}(9) \xrightarrow{\zeta_{P_4}} F_4/\text{Spin}(9).$$

We will show the following.

**Lemma 6.4.** $\zeta_{F_4}$ is diffeomorphic to the unit tangent sphere bundle of $F_4/\text{Spin}(9)$.

The orbit $K$ of $E_{11}$ under the $F_4$-action on $J$ is $\mathbb{O}P^2 = F_4/\text{Spin}(9)$ by Lemma 6.3. Let us describe $T_{E_{11}} K$ of $K$ at $E_{11}$.

**Lemma 6.5.** We have

$$T_{E_{11}} K = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ x_3 \\ x_2 \\ x_2 \\ x_2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \mid \begin{array}{c} x_2, x_3 \in \mathbb{O} \end{array} \right\}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

**Proof.** Let $f_4 = \text{Lie}(F_4)$. Consider the infinitesimal $f_4$-action $\rho : f_4 \to T_{E_{11}} K$ at $E_{11}$. We get $\rho(f_4) = T_{E_{11}} K$ by definition. Let $\sigma = \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{array} \right)$. Since $\sigma^2 = 1$, we obtain an involution $\sigma : f_4 \to f_4$ given by $\sigma(X) = \sigma X \sigma$ Then we get a decomposition $f_4 = (f_4)_\sigma \oplus (f_4)_{-\sigma}$, where $(f_4)_\sigma$ is the $\sigma$-invariant part and $(f_4)_{-\sigma}$ is the $\sigma$-antiinvariant part. By $[\text{Yok09}, \text{Theorem 2.9.1}]$ or $[\text{Yok30}, \text{Theorem 2.4.4}]$, we get $\text{Spin}(9) = (F_4)^\sigma$. By Lemma 6.3 it follows that $\rho((f_4)^\sigma) = 0$. On the other hand, for $X \in (f_4)_{-\sigma}$, we get $\sigma(X)E_{11} = \sigma X \sigma E_{11} = -E_{11}$. Thus $\rho(f_4) = T_{E_{11}} K$ is contained in the $\sigma$-antiinvariant part $(J)_{-\sigma}$ of $J$. Since it is easy to see that $(J)_{-\sigma}$ is equal to the right hand side of (13) and $\text{dim}(J)_{-\sigma} = \text{dim} K$, we get the equality (13). $\square$

We saw that $K_P$ is the isotropy group of the adjoint $K_G$-action on

$$(J)_{-\sigma} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ x_3 \\ x_2 \\ x_2 \\ x_2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \mid \begin{array}{c} x_2, x_3 \in \mathbb{O} \end{array} \right\}$$

at $\left( \begin{array}{ccc} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)$. Thus Lemma 6.5 implies that $K_P$ is the isotropy group of the $K_G$-action on $T_{E_{11}} K$. This proves Lemma 6.4. Hence, according to $[\text{Hir49}]$ or $[\text{Yok55}]$, the Euler class of $\zeta_{E_4}$ is equal to 3 times the fundamental class of $\mathbb{O}P^2$ by the cell decomposition of $\mathbb{O}P^2$. So the assumption of Theorem 1.2 is satisfied in this case.
6.7. A remark on the center. The $G$-actions on $G/P$ are not effective for some of the pairs $(G, G/P)$ considered in Corollary 1.3. In fact, in the case where $G$ is either $(SU(n+1,1), S_{2n+1}^n)$ or $(Sp(n+1,1), S_{4n+3}^{2n+1})$ for even $n$, the stabilizers of the $G$-action on $G/P$ are given by \{ $cI_{n+2} \mid c \in \mathbb{C}^\times, c^{n+2} = 1$ \} and \{ $\pm I_{n+2}$ \}, respectively, where they are equal to the centers $Z(G)$ of $G$. In the other cases considered in Corollary 1.3, the $G$-actions on $G/P$ are effective. The quotient of $SU(n+1,1)$ and $Sp(n+1,1)$ by the centers are denoted by $PSU(n+1,1)$ and $PSp(n+1,1)$.

The finiteness of $\Sigma(PSU(n+1,1), S_{2n+1}^n)$ and $\Sigma(PSp(n+1,1), S_{4n+3}^{2n+1})$ is proved like in the cases $\Sigma(SU(n+1,1), S_{4n+3}^{2n+1})$ and $\Sigma(Sp(n+1,1), S_{8n+3}^{4n+3})$ of Theorem 1.2. We only need to notice the following two facts. By the discreteness of $Z(G)$, there is no difference when we consider their Lie algebras. Since $Z(G)$ is contained in $Z(G_C)$ and $K_P$ in both cases, the canonical embedding $G/K_P \to G_C/(K_P)_C$ is not changed by taking quotient by $Z(G)$.

7. Bott-Thurston-Heitsch type formulas

7.1. Pittie’s Bott connections. The purpose of Section 7 is to prove Bott-Thurston-Heitsch type formulas (Theorem 1.9). Section 7.1 is devoted to recall the Pittie’s construction of a Bott connection for the $P/K$-foliation $\mathcal{F}_P$ of $G/K_P$, where $G$ is semisimple and $P$ is parabolic. It will be used to calculate the Godbillon-Vey class of $\mathcal{F}_P$ in Lie algebra cohomology in Section 7.2. Since $(G, G/P)$-foliations are classified by $\mathcal{F}_P$ in the sense of Proposition 3.9(ii), this computation can be applied to $(G, G/P)$-foliations (Section 7.4). By using the computation in Section 7.2, we will also show that the Godbillon-Vey class is the essentially unique nontrivial secondary characteristic class for $(G, G/P)$-foliations in Section 7.3.

First we recall the decompositions of the semisimple $\mathfrak{g}_C$ and parabolic $\mathfrak{p}_C$. Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}_C$ contained in $\mathfrak{p}_C$. Let

$$\mathfrak{g}_C = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Upsilon} (\mathfrak{g}_C)_\alpha$$

be the root-space decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}_C$, where $\Upsilon$ is the set of roots. Fix a set $\Pi$ of simple roots which additively generate $\Upsilon$, and let $\Upsilon^+$ be the set of corresponding positive roots. Since a Borel subalgebra contained in $\mathfrak{p}_C$ is conjugate to the standard Borel subalgebra $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Upsilon^+} (\mathfrak{g}_C)_\alpha$, we can assume that $\mathfrak{p}_C$ contains $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Upsilon^+} (\mathfrak{g}_C)_\alpha$. Then there exists a subset $\Phi$ of $\Upsilon^+$ such that

$$\mathfrak{p}_C = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in -\Phi} (\mathfrak{g}_C)_\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Upsilon^+} (\mathfrak{g}_C)_\alpha .$$

Thus, with

$$r = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Phi \cup (-\Phi)} (\mathfrak{g}_C)_\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{h}, \quad u = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Upsilon^+ \setminus \Phi} (\mathfrak{g}_C)_\alpha, \quad v = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Upsilon^+ \setminus \Phi} (\mathfrak{g}_C)_{-\alpha},$$

we get a decomposition

$$\mathfrak{g}_C = \mathfrak{p}_C + v = r + u + v .$$

Here, $r$ is a reductive subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}_C$ called the Levi part of $\mathfrak{p}_C$. Note that $u$ and $v$ are ad-$r$-invariant and nilpotent.
Let $\tilde{F}_{P_i}$ the right $P_i$-coset foliation of $G_C$. Left invariant complex connections on the normal bundle $\nu \tilde{F}_{P_i}$ of $\tilde{F}_{P_i}$ are in one-to-one correspondence with $C$-linear maps $g_C \to \mathfrak{gl}(g_C/p_C; C)$. Let $\sigma : g_C \to p_C$ be the projection with respect to the decomposition (15). Consider the connection $\nabla^X$ on $\nu \tilde{F}_{P_i}$ determined by

$$\nabla^X Y = \pi((id_g - \sigma \pi)X, \sigma(Y))$$

for $X \in g_C$ and $Y \in g_C/p_C$. The connection form $\Theta$ of $\nabla^C$ is regarded as an element of $g_C^* \otimes \mathfrak{gl}(g_C/p_C; C)$. Pittie observed that, if we identify $g_C/p_C$ to $v$ via the canonical projection, then the connection form $\Theta$ of the connection given by (16) is the Maurer-Cartan form of the adjoint action of $p_C$ on $v$, which is given by

$$\theta_{ij}(X) = \eta_i([X,Y_j])$$

for $1 \leq i \leq q$, $1 \leq j \leq q$, where $\{Y_j\}$ is a basis of $v$ and $\{\eta_j\}$ is the basis of $v^*$ dual to $\{Y_j\}$. Let $p_u \otimes \Lambda^*$ denote the composite

$$\wedge^2 g_C^* \xrightarrow{d} \Lambda^2 g_C^* \otimes p_u \otimes \wedge^2 v^* \xrightarrow{\pi} p_u \otimes v^* \rightarrow v^* \otimes v^*$$

of the projections with respect to the decompositions (14) and (15). Let us denote the composite

$$\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}_C^* \xrightarrow{d} \Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}_C^* \otimes p_u \otimes \wedge^2 v^*$$

by $\dot{d}$. The curvature form $\Omega$ of $\Theta$ is the element of $\wedge^2 \mathfrak{g}_C^* \otimes \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g}_C/p_C; C)$ given by $\Omega = d\Theta - \Theta \wedge \Theta$. We will use the following observation of Pittie.

**Proposition 7.1** ([Pit79] Proposition 2.1). $d\Theta = \Omega$.

This formula is a consequence of the $(\text{ad} v)$-invariance of $u$ and $v$.

Let $Y^+ \setminus \Phi = \{\alpha_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq q}$. We will use the following observation of Pittie, which is a direct consequence of the formula (17).

**Proposition 7.2** ([Pit79] Theorem 2.3). $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_p}(h_1) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{i=1}^q \alpha_i$.

Pittie observed that $-\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_p}(c_1)$ is a Kähler form of $G_C/P_C$ under the identification of $\wedge^* u^* \otimes \wedge^* v^*$ with the left invariant de Rham complex of $G_C/P_C$ in a standard way. By using the Lefschetz decomposition of cohomology of Kähler manifolds, Pittie showed the following.

**Theorem 7.3** ([Pit79] Theorem 3.1). $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_p}(H^*(W_{O_0}))$ is linearly spanned by the Pontryagin classes and $\{ \Delta_{\mathcal{F}_p}(h_1 h_{I_1} c_I^q) \mid I \subseteq \{3, 5, \ldots, [q]\} \}$, where $[q]$ is the maximal odd number less than $q + 1$.

### 7.2. Computation in Lie algebra cohomology.

#### 7.2.1. The case $(G, G/P) = (\text{SL}(q + 1; \mathbb{R}), S^q)$. Let $q' = q + 1$. In this case, $p_C$ and $v$ are the subalgebras of $g_C = \mathfrak{sl}(q'; \mathbb{C})$ consisting of the matrices of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix}
* & * & \cdots & * \\
0 & * & \cdots & * \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & * & \cdots & * 
\end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
* & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
* & 0 & \cdots & 0 
\end{pmatrix},$$

respectively. Let $E_{ij}$ be the element of $g_C$ with 1 at the $(i,j)$-th entry and 0 at the other entries. Let $E_{ij}^*$ be the dual of $E_{ij}$. In this case, $\{E_{ij}\}_{2 \leq i,j \leq q'}$ is a basis of $v$. 
Let $\Theta = (\theta_{ij})_{2 \leq i,j \leq q}$ be the matrix presentation of $\Theta$ with respect to $\{E_{ij}\}_{2 \leq j \leq q}$. From $[E_{kh}, E_{ij}] = \delta_{hi} E_{kj} - \delta_{kj} E_{ih}$ and $E_{ij}^\vee(E_{kh}) = \delta_{jk} \delta_{ih}$, we get

$$\theta_{ij}(E_{kh}) = E_{ij}^\vee([E_{kh}, E_{ij}]) = \delta_{hi} \delta_{kj} - \delta_{jk} \delta_{ih} .$$

Then

$$\Theta = (\theta_{ij})_{2 \leq i,j \leq q'} = \begin{pmatrix} E_{11}^\vee & E_{12}^\vee & \cdots & E_{1q'}^\vee \\ E_{21}^\vee & E_{22}^\vee & \cdots & E_{2q'}^\vee \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ E_{q1}^\vee & E_{q2}^\vee & \cdots & E_{qq'}^\vee \end{pmatrix} .$$

By observing that $\sum_{i=1}^{q'} E_{ii}^\vee = 0$ on $g_i$, we get

$$\Delta_{F_p}(h_1) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \text{tr} \Theta = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{i=2}^{q'} (E_{ii}^\vee - E_{11}^\vee) = -\frac{q'}{2\pi} E_{11}^\vee ,$$

$$\Delta_{F_p}(c_1) = d\Delta_{F_p}(h_1) = \frac{q'}{2\pi} \sum_{k=2}^{q'} E_{kk}^\vee \wedge E_{k1}^\vee .$$

Note that $\Theta$ equals the Maurer-Cartan form $\Theta_{MC} = (E_{ij}^\vee)_{2 \leq i,j \leq q'}$ of $\mathfrak{sl}(q; \mathbb{C})$ modulo $\Delta_{F_p}(h_1)$. Thus

$$\Delta_{F_p}(h_1 c_1^q) = -\frac{(q')^{q+1}}{(2\pi)^{q+1}} E_{11}^\vee \wedge \bigwedge_{k=2}^{q'} E_{kk}^\vee \wedge E_{k1}^\vee ,$$

$$\Delta_{F_p}(h_1 c_1^q) = \Delta_{F_p}(h_1 c_1^q) h_1(\Theta_{MC}) .$$

We will use these formulas to give an alternative proof of Theorem [11]. Heitsch obtained more general formulas of this type for secondary characteristic classes of the form $h_1 c_1$ by the application of his residues formulas ([Hei78, Theorem 4.2] and [Hei83, Theorem 2.3]).

7.2.2. The case $(G, G/P) = (\text{SO}(n + 1, 1), S_{\mathbb{H}})$. Note that Yamato [Yam75] also made computation of characteristic classes of this case in a different way. Let $n' = n + 1$ and $n'' = n + 2$. Let

$$I_{n''} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & I_n & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{gl}(n''; \mathbb{R}) ,$$

where $I_n$ is the $n \times n$ identity matrix. We use the following description of $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}(n + 1, 1):

$$\mathfrak{g} = \{ X \in \mathfrak{gl}(n''; \mathbb{R}) \mid ^t X I_{n''} + I_{n''}^t X = 0 \}$$

$$= \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & u & 0 \\ t_v & A & t_u \\ 0 & v & -a \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{gl}(n''; \mathbb{R}) \middle| a \in \mathbb{R}, \ A \in \mathfrak{so}(n; \mathbb{R}), \ u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\} .$$

Proposition 7.1 implies

$$\mathfrak{g} = \{ X \in \mathfrak{g} \mid \exists a \in \mathbb{R} \text{ so that } X e_1 = a e_1 \}$$

$$p = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & u & 0 \\ 0 & A & t u \\ 0 & 0 & -a \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{gl}(n''; \mathbb{R}) \mid a \in \mathbb{R}, \ A \in \mathfrak{so}(n; \mathbb{R}), \ u \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\}.$$  
Then

$$\mathfrak{g}_C = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & u & 0 \\ t v & A & t u \\ 0 & v & -a \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{gl}(n''; \mathbb{C}) \mid a \in \mathbb{C}, \ A \in \mathfrak{so}(n; \mathbb{C}), \ u, v \in \mathbb{C}^n \right\},$$

$$\mathfrak{p}_C = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & u & 0 \\ 0 & A & t u \\ 0 & 0 & -a \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{gl}(n''; \mathbb{C}) \mid a \in \mathbb{C}, \ A \in \mathfrak{so}(n; \mathbb{C}), \ u \in \mathbb{C}^n \right\},$$

$$v = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ t v & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & v & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{gl}(n''; \mathbb{C}) \mid v \in \mathbb{C}^n \right\}.$$  

Let

$$a = E_{11} - E_{n''n''}, \quad v_j = E_{j1} + E_{n''j}, \quad A_{kk} = E_{kk} - E_{hh}.$$  
Then we get a basis

$$(22) \quad \{v_j\}_{2 \leq j \leq n''} \cup \{a\} \cup \{t v_j\}_{2 \leq j \leq n''} \cup \{A_{kk}\}_{2 \leq k < h \leq n'}$$

of $\mathfrak{g}_C$. Here $\{v_j\}_{2 \leq j \leq n''}$ is a basis of $v$ and $\{a\} \cup \{t v_j\}_{2 \leq j \leq n''} \cup \{A_{kk}\}_{2 \leq k < h \leq n'}$ is a basis of $\mathfrak{p}_C$. We get

$$[a, v_j] = -v_j, \quad [t v_i, v_j] = \delta_{ij} a, \quad [A_{kk}, v_j] = \delta_{jk} v_k - \delta_{kj} v_h.$$  

For $z \in \mathfrak{g}_C$, let $z^\vee \in \mathfrak{g}_C^*$ denote the dual of $z$ with respect to the basis $\{22\}$. Since $\theta_{ij}(X) = v_i^\vee ([X, v_j])$ for $X \in \mathfrak{p}_C$, it follows that

$$\theta_{ij}(a) = -\delta_{ij}, \quad \theta_{ij}(t v_i) = 0, \quad \theta_{ij}(A_{kk}) = \delta_{jk} \delta_{ik} - \delta_{jk} \delta_{ih}.$$  

Thus

$$\Theta = (\theta_{ij}) = \begin{pmatrix} -a^\vee & A^\vee_{12} & \cdots & A^\vee_{n/2} \\ A^\vee_{23} & -a^\vee & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & A^\vee_{n/2} \\ A^\vee_{2n'} & \cdots & A^\vee_{n'n} & -a^\vee \end{pmatrix}.$$  

Since $\tilde{d}(a^\vee) = -\sum_{k=2}^{n'} t v_k^\vee \wedge v_k^\vee$ and $\tilde{d} A_{kk}^\vee = 0$ (see \ref{13} for the definition of $\tilde{d}$), Proposition \ref{7.1} implies

$$\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{k=2}^{n'} t v_k^\vee \wedge v_k^\vee & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \sum_{k=2}^{n'} t v_k^\vee \wedge v_k^\vee & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \sum_{k=2}^{n'} t v_k^\vee \wedge v_k^\vee \end{pmatrix}.$$
We get

\[(23) \quad \Delta_{\mathcal{F}_F}(h_1 c_1^n) = -\frac{n^{n+1} n!}{(2\pi)^{n+1}} a^\vee \wedge \left( \sum_{k=2}^{n+1} t v_k^\vee \wedge v_k^\vee \right).\]

The Godbillon-Vey class of $\mathcal{F}_F$ is given by this formula and the well known relation $GV(\mathcal{F}_F) = (2\pi)^{n+1} \Delta_{\mathcal{F}_F}(h_1 c_1^n)$ [KLT75a, Theorem 7.20]. Later, in Proposition 7.4 we will show that any other nontrivial secondary characteristic class is a multiple of the Godbillon-Vey class by using (23). To be used later in the proof of Theorem 1.9, we state also the following equation:

\[(24) \quad \Delta_{\mathcal{F}_F}(h_1 c_1^n) = \frac{(-1)^{n(n+1)+n+1} n!}{2^{n+1} \pi^{n+1}} a^\vee \wedge \left( \sum_{k=2}^{n+1} (t v_k^\vee + v_k^\vee) \wedge \left( \sum_{k=2}^{n+1} (v_k^\vee - t v_k^\vee) \right) \right).\]

To derive (24) from (23), we note that

\[(25) \quad \text{sign} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & \cdots & m & m+1 & m+2 & \cdots & 2m-1 & 2m \\ 1 & 3 & 5 & \cdots & 2m-1 & 2 & 4 & \cdots & 2m-2 & 2m \end{pmatrix} = (-1)^{m(m-1)}. \]

7.2.3. The case $(G, G/P) = (\text{SU}(n+1, 1), S^{2n+1})$. Let $n' = n + 1$ and $n'' = n + 2$. Let $I_{n''}$ be the matrix given by (21). We use the following description of $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{su}(n', 1)$:

\[\mathfrak{g} = \{ X \in \mathfrak{su}(n'; \mathbb{C}) \mid X I_{n''} + I_{n''} X = 0 \} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & u & \sqrt{-1}c \\ t \pi & A & \sqrt{-1}g \\ \sqrt{-1}g & v & -t \pi \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{su}(n''; \mathbb{C}) \mid a \in \mathbb{C}, c, g \in \mathbb{R}, A \in \mathfrak{u}(n), u, v \in \mathbb{C}^n \right\}.\]

Since $e_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ \cdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ is a vector in the light cone, we get

\[\mathfrak{p} = \{ X \in \mathfrak{g} \mid \exists a \in \mathbb{C} \text{ so that } X e_1 = a e_1 \} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & u & \sqrt{-1}c \\ 0 & A & \sqrt{-1}g \\ 0 & 0 & -t \pi \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{su}(n''; \mathbb{C}) \mid a \in \mathbb{C}, c \in \mathbb{R}, A \in \mathfrak{u}(n), u \in \mathbb{C}^n \right\}.\]

Then $\mathfrak{g}_C = \mathfrak{su}(n''; \mathbb{C})$, and

\[\mathfrak{p}_C = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & u_1 & c \\ 0 & A & t u_2 \\ 0 & 0 & a_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{su}(n''; \mathbb{C}) \mid a_1, a_2, c, u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{C}^n, A \in \mathfrak{gl}(n; \mathbb{C}) \right\},\]

\[\mathfrak{v} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} t v_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & v_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{su}(n''; \mathbb{C}) \mid v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{C}^n \right\}.\]

We can compute $\Theta$ and $\Omega$ like in the last case. But here we compute only the Godbillon-Vey class of $\mathcal{F}_F$. By using the computation, we will see that any other nontrivial secondary characteristic classes are multiples of the Godbillon-Vey class (Proposition 7.4). We will apply Proposition 7.2 to compute $\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_F}(h_1)$. As a Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$, we take the subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}_C$ consisting of diagonal matrices. As a basis of $\mathfrak{v}$ consisting of root vectors, we can take \{ $E_{k1}$ $\}_{2 \leq k \leq n'} \cup \{ E_{n''} \} \cup \{ E_{n''} v_k \}_{2 \leq k \leq n'}$. 
For a root vector \( z \in \mathfrak{g}_c \), let \( z^\vee \in \mathfrak{g}^*_c \) be the element such that \( z^\vee(z) = 1 \) and \( z^\vee(z') = 0 \) for any \( z' \in \mathfrak{h} \) and any root vector \( z' \) which is linearly independent of \( z \).

The root of \( E_{ij} \) is given by \( E_{ij}^\vee \). Thus Proposition 7.2 implies

\[
\Delta_{F_p}(h_1) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left( E_{11}^\vee - E_{11}^\vee + \sum_{k=2}^{n'} (E_{kk}^\vee - E_{kk}^\vee) + \sum_{k=2}^{n'} (E_{n'n'}^\vee - E_{kk}^\vee) \right)
\]

\[
= -\frac{n'}{2\pi} (E_{11}^\vee - E_{n'n'}^\vee) .
\]

So

\[
\Delta_{F_p}(c_1) = d(\Delta_{F_p}(h_1)) = \frac{n'}{2\pi} \left( \sum_{k=2}^{n'} E_{1k}^\vee \wedge E_{k1}^\vee + \sum_{k=2}^{n'} E_{kn'}^\vee \wedge E_{n'k}^\vee \right) .
\]

Thus we get the following formula:

\[
(26) \quad \Delta_{F_p}(h_1 c_1^{2n+1}) = -\frac{2(n')2n+2(2n+1)!}{(2\pi)^{2n+2}} \times (E_{11}^\vee - E_{n'n'}^\vee) \wedge \sum_{k=2}^{n''} (E_{1k}^\vee \wedge E_{k1}^\vee) \wedge \sum_{k=2}^{n'} (E_{kn'}^\vee \wedge E_{n'k}^\vee) .
\]

The Godbillon-Vey class of \( F_p \) is given by this formula and the well known relation

\[
GV(F_p) = (2\pi)^{2n+2} \Delta_{F_p}(h_1 c_1^{2n+1}) \quad \text{[KT75a, Theorem 7.2].}
\]

Later, in Proposition 7.4 we will show that any other nontrivial secondary characteristic class of transversely spherical CR foliations is a multiple of the Godbillon-Vey class by using (26). To use later for the proof of Theorem 1.9 we state also the following direct consequence of (26) and (25):

\[
(27) \quad \Delta_{F_p}(h_1 c_1^{2n+1}) = (-1)^{n+1} \frac{2(n')2n+2(2n+1)!}{2n+1(2\pi)^{2n+2}} \times (E_{11}^\vee - E_{n'n'}^\vee) \wedge \sum_{k=2}^{n''} (E_{1k}^\vee \wedge E_{k1}^\vee) \wedge \sum_{k=2}^{n'} (E_{kn'}^\vee \wedge E_{n'k}^\vee)
\]

\[
\wedge \sum_{k=2}^{n''} (E_{k1}^\vee \wedge E_{1k}^\vee) \wedge \sum_{k=2}^{n'} (E_{kn'}^\vee \wedge E_{n'k}^\vee) .
\]

7.2.4. The case \((G, G/P) = (\text{Sp}(n+1, 1), S_\infty^{4n+3})\). Let \( n' = n+1 \) and \( n'' = n+2 \).

Let

\[
J' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I'_{n''} \\ -I'_{n''} & 0 \end{pmatrix},
\]

where \( I'_{n''} \) is the matrix given by (21). We use the following description of \( \mathfrak{g} = \text{sp}(n', 1) \):

\[
\mathfrak{g} = \left\{ X = \begin{pmatrix} Z_1 & Z_2 \\ Z_3 & Z_4 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{gl}(2n''; \mathbb{C}) \mid ^tX J' + J' X = 0, \quad Z_4 = \overline{Z}_1, \quad Z_2 = -\overline{Z}_3 \right\} .
\]

Here,

\[
\mathfrak{p} = \left\{ X \in \mathfrak{g} \mid \exists s, t \in \mathbb{C} \text{ so that } X e_1 = se_1 + te_{n' + 1} \right\} ,
\]
where $e_i$ is the $i$-th standard unit vector of $\mathbb{C}^{2n''}$. Thus $p$ consists of the matrices of the form:

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
  a & b & \sqrt{-1}c & d & f & g \\
  0 & A & t\mathbb{B} & 0 & B & -t f \\
  0 & 0 & -\pi & 0 & 0 & d \\
  -d & -t\mathbb{F} & -\mathbb{V} & \mathbb{V} & 0 & -\sqrt{-1}f \\
  0 & -t\mathbb{F} & t\mathbb{F} & 0 & A & t_b \\
  0 & 0 & -d & 0 & 0 & -a
\end{pmatrix},
$$

where $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $a, e \in \mathbb{C}$, $b, d \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $A \in \mathfrak{sl}(n; \mathbb{C})$ with $A = {}^tA$, and $B \in \mathfrak{u}(n)$. We get

$$
\mathfrak{g}_C = \mathfrak{sp}(n''; \mathbb{C}) = \left\{ X \in \mathfrak{gl}(2n''; \mathbb{C}) \mid {}^tXJ' + J'X = 0 \right\},
$$

which consists of the matrices of the form

$$
X = \begin{pmatrix}
  Z_1 & Z_2 \\
  Z_3 & Z_4
\end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{gl}(2n''; \mathbb{C})
$$

such that

$$
{}^tZ_1I_{n''} + I_{n''}Z_4 = -{}^tZ_3I_{n''} + I_{n''}Z_3 = -{}^tZ_2I_{n''} + I_{n''}Z_2 = 0.
$$

Then $p_C$ is the subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}_C$ consisting of the matrices

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
  a_1 & b_1 & c & d_1 & f_1 & g_1 \\
  0 & A & t_1b_2 & 0 & B_1 & -t_1f_1 \\
  0 & 0 & a_2 & 0 & 0 & d_1 \\
  d_2 & f_2 & g_2 & -a_2 & b_2 & -t c \\
  0 & B_2 & -t_2f_2 & 0 & -t_2A & t_2b_2 \\
  0 & 0 & d_2 & 0 & 0 & -a_1
\end{pmatrix},
$$

where $a_1, a_2, c, f_1, f_2, g_1, g_2 \in \mathbb{C}$, $b_1, b_2, d_1, d_2 \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $A \in \mathfrak{sl}(n; \mathbb{C})$ and $B_1, B_2 \in \mathfrak{u}(n)$. Let $\mathfrak{h}$ be a Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}_C$ with the following basis:

$$
(28) \quad \{E_{11} - E_{2n''2n''}\} \cup \{E_{kk} - E_{n''+k,n''+k}\}_{2 \leq k \leq n''} \cup \{E_{n''n''} - E_{n''+1,n''+1}\}.
$$

Thus $\mathfrak{v}$ consists of the matrices

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
  0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
  t_1u_1 & 0 & 0 & -t_1x_1 & 0 & 0 \\
  v & u_2 & 0 & y_1 & x_1 & 0 \\
  0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
  -t_2x_2 & 0 & 0 & t_2u_2 & 0 & 0 \\
  y_2 & x_2 & 0 & -v & u_1 & 0
\end{pmatrix},
$$

where $v, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ and $u_1, u_2, x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{C}^n$.

Here, we compute the Godbillon-Vey class like in the last example by using Proposition 7.2. Later, by using the computation, we will see any other nontrivial...
secondary characteristic class is a multiple of the Godbillon-Vey class (see Proposition 7.3). As a basis of \( v \) consisting of root vectors, take
\[
\begin{align*}
 u_{1,k} &= E_{k 1} + E_{2n''} n'' + k , \quad 2 \leq k \leq n', \\
 u_{2,k} &= E_{n''} k + E_{n'' + k} n'' + 1 , \quad 2 \leq k \leq n', \\
 v &= E_{n''} 1 - E_{2n''} n'' + 1 , \\
 x_{1,k} &= -E_{k n'' + 1} + E_{n''} n'' + k , \quad 2 \leq k \leq n', \\
 y_1 &= E_{n''} n'' + 1 , \\
 x_{2,k} &= -E_{n''} n'' + k + E_{2n''} k , \quad 2 \leq k \leq n', \\
 y_2 &= E_{2n''} 1 .
\end{align*}
\]

Let \( \{ \gamma_i \}_{1 \leq i \leq n''} \) be the basis of \( \mathfrak{h}^* \) dual to \( \mathfrak{h} \). The roots corresponding to these vectors are given as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
 u_{1,k} & u_{2,k} & v & x_{1,k} & y_1 & x_{2,k} \ y_2 \\
-\gamma_1 + \gamma_k & -\gamma_k + \gamma_n'' & -\gamma_1 + \gamma_n'' & \gamma_k + \gamma_n'' & 2\gamma_n'' & -\gamma_1 - \gamma_k & -2\gamma_1 \\
\end{array}
\]

Here, \( 2 \leq k \leq n' \). Thus, by Proposition 7.2
\begin{equation}
\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_P}(h_1) = -\frac{2n + 3}{2\pi} (\gamma_1 - \gamma_n'') .
\end{equation}

For a root vector \( z \in \mathfrak{g}_C \), let \( z^\vee \in \mathfrak{g}_C^* \) be determined by \( z^\vee(z) = 1 \) and \( z^\vee(z') = 0 \) for any \( z' \in \mathfrak{h} \) and any root vector \( z' \) which is linearly independent of \( z \). We have
\[
\hat{d}\gamma_1 = -\sum_{k=1}^{n'} (t^\vee u_{1,k} \land u_{1,k}) - (t^\vee v \land v) - \sum_{k=2}^{n'} (t^\vee x_{2,k} \land x_{2,k}) - (t^\vee y_2 \land y_2) ,
\]
\[
\hat{d}\gamma_n'' = (t^\vee v \land v) + \sum_{k=2}^{n'} (t^\vee u_{2,k} \land u_{2,k}) + (t^\vee y_1 \land y_1) + \sum_{k=2}^{n'} (t^\vee x_{1,k} \land x_{1,k})
\]
(see (13) for the definition of \( \hat{d} \)). Let \( \zeta \) be the standard symplectic form on \( u \oplus v \) defined by
\[
\zeta = \sum_{k=2}^{n'} (t^\vee u_{2,k} \land u_{2,k}) + 2(t^\vee v \land v) + \sum_{k=2}^{n'} (t^\vee x_{2,k} \land x_{2,k}) + (t^\vee y_2 \land y_2)
\]
\[
+ \sum_{k=2}^{n'} (t^\vee u_{2,k} \land u_{2,k}) + (t^\vee y_1 \land y_1) + \sum_{k=2}^{n'} (t^\vee x_{1,k} \land x_{1,k}) .
\]

Then
\begin{equation}
\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_P}(c_1) = d(\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_P}(h_1)) = \frac{2n + 3}{2\pi} \zeta .
\end{equation}

By (29) and (30), we obtain the following formula of the Godbillon-Vey class:
\begin{equation}
\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_P}(h_1 c_1^{4n+3}) = -\frac{(2n + 3)^{4n+4}}{2^{4n+4} \pi^{4n+4}} (\gamma_1 - \gamma_n'') \land \zeta^{4n+3} .
\end{equation}

This formula gives the Godbillon-Vey class of \( \mathcal{F}_P \) by the well known relation \( GV(\mathcal{F}_P) = (2\pi)^{4n+4} \Delta_{\mathcal{F}_P}(h_1 c_1^{4n+3}) \). Later, in Proposition 7.3, we will show that any other nontrivial secondary characteristic class of \( (\text{Sp}(n+1,1), S^{4n+3}) \)-foliations is a multiple of the Godbillon-Vey class by using (31).
To use later for the proof of Theorem 1.9 we also state the following direct consequence of (31) and (25):

\[ \Delta_{F_4} (h_1 c_4^{n+3}) = \frac{(2n + 3)4n^4(4n + 3)!}{2^{8n+6}n^{4n+4}} (\gamma_1 - \gamma_{n'}) \wedge \bigwedge_{z} (t_z z^v + z^v) \wedge \bigwedge_{z} (z^v - t_z z^v), \]

where \( z \) runs in

\[ \{w_{1,k} \}_{2 \leq k \leq n'} \cup \{w_{2,k} \}_{2 \leq k \leq n'} \cup \{x_{1,k} \}_{2 \leq k \leq n'} \cup \{x_{2,k} \}_{2 \leq k \leq n'} \cup \{y_1, y_2, v\} \]

in this order.

7.2.5. The case \((G, G/P) = (F_4(-20), S_{15}^{(5)})\). Here, we refer to [Yok09 Section 2.6] for the structure of \( f_4^C = \text{Lie}(F_4^C) \). The Dynkin diagram of the Lie algebra \( f_4^C \) is:

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & \alpha_3 \\
\end{array} \]

where the roots \( \{\alpha_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq 4} \), for a standard choice of a Cartan subalgebra \( h = \bigoplus_{i=0}^3 \mathbb{C} H_i \), are given by

\[ \begin{align*}
\alpha_1 &= \lambda_0 - \lambda_1, & \alpha_2 &= \lambda_1 - \lambda_2, & \alpha_3 &= \lambda_2, & \alpha_4 &= \frac{1}{2} (-\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_3), \\
\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 &= \alpha_1, & \lambda_0 - \lambda_2 &= \alpha_1 + \alpha_2, & \lambda_3 &= \alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 + 3\alpha_3 + 2\alpha_4, \\
-\lambda_0 + \lambda_3 &= \alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3 + 2\alpha_4, & \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 &= \alpha_2, & \lambda_0 + \lambda_3 &= \alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3 + 2\alpha_4, \\
-\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 &= \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3 + 2\alpha_4, & -\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 &= \alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3 + 2\alpha_4, \\
\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 &= \alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3, & \lambda_0 + \lambda_3 &= \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3, \\
\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 &= \alpha_1 + 3\alpha_2 + 4\alpha_3 + 2\alpha_4, & \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 &= \alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 + 4\alpha_3 + 4\alpha_4, \\
\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) &= \alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 + 3\alpha_3 + \alpha_4, & \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) &= \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 3\alpha_3 + \alpha_4, \\
\frac{1}{2}(-\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) &= \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4, & \frac{1}{2}(-\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) &= \alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3 + \alpha_4, \\
\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) &= \alpha_3 + \alpha_4, & \frac{1}{2}(-\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) &= \alpha_3 + \alpha_4, \\
\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) &= \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4, & \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + \lambda_3) &= \alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3 + \alpha_4. \\
\end{align*} \]

As mentioned in Section 6.6 the semisimple part of the Levi part of \( \mathfrak{p}_C \) is \( \mathfrak{so}(7; \mathbb{C}) \), whose Dynkin diagram is:
According to the Dynkin diagram \( \mathbf{f}_1^C \) of \( \mathbf{f}_1^C \), the unique possibility of \( \Phi \cap \Pi \) in (11) is \( \{ \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \} \). Then \( \mathbf{v} \) is spanned by the 15 negative roots that are not generated by \( \{-\alpha_1, -\alpha_2, -\alpha_3\} \), whose sum is \(-11\lambda_3\), as can be computed by using the above list of positive roots. By Proposition 7.2, we get \( \Delta_{\mathbf{F}_P}(h_1) = -\frac{11}{2\pi} \lambda_3 \). Take root vectors \( \{E_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Y}} \) so that \( B(E_\alpha, -E_\alpha) = 1 \) for the Killing form \( B \) of \( \mathbf{f}_1^C \). For \( \alpha \in \mathbb{Y} \), let \( H_\alpha \) be the element of \( \mathfrak{h} \) such that \( B(H, H_\alpha) = \alpha(H) \) for any \( H \in \mathfrak{h} \). By Proposition 7.3 and since

\[
d\lambda_3(E_\alpha, E_\alpha) = -B(E_\alpha, E_\alpha) \lambda_3(H_\alpha) = -\lambda_3(H_\alpha),
\]

we get

\[
\Delta_{\mathbf{F}_P}(c_1) = d\Delta_{\mathbf{F}_P}(h_1) = \frac{11}{2\pi} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Y} \setminus \Phi} \lambda_3(H_\alpha) E_\alpha^\vee \wedge E_{-\alpha}^\vee.
\]

By using \( B(\sum_{i=1}^4 \lambda_i H_i, \sum_{j=1}^4 \lambda_j H_j) = 18 \sum_{i=1}^4 \lambda_i \) \( \mathbb{N} \); we can compute \( \lambda_3(H_\alpha) \) in terms of the above list of positive roots of \( \mathbf{f}_1^C \). Then we get the following formula of the Godbillon-Vey class:

\[
\Delta_{\mathbf{F}_P}(h_1 c_1^{15}) = -\frac{11}{24\pi} \frac{18 \cdot 15!' \cdot \lambda_3}{224 \pi} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Y} \setminus \Phi} \left( E_\alpha^\vee \wedge E_{-\alpha}^\vee \right).
\]

This formula gives \( GV(\mathbf{F}_P) \) by the well known relation \( GV(\mathbf{F}_P) = (2\pi)^6 \Delta_{\mathbf{F}_P}(h_1 c_1^{15}) \) \([\mathrm{K}175a, \text{Theorem 7.20}]\). In Proposition 7.4, we will show that any other nontrivial secondary characteristic class of \( (F_4(-20), S_{15}^3) \)-foliations is a multiple of the Godbillon-Vey class by using (34). To be used later in the proof of Theorem 1.9 we also state the following direct consequence of (34) and (25):

\[
\Delta_{\mathbf{F}_P}(h_1 c_1^{15}) = \frac{11}{24\pi} \frac{18 \cdot 30!' \cdot \lambda_3}{224 \pi} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Y} \setminus \Phi} \left( E_\alpha^\vee + E_{-\alpha}^\vee \right) \wedge \left( E_\alpha^\vee - E_{-\alpha}^\vee \right).
\]

7.3. The Godbillon-Vey class spans the secondary characteristic classes.

We assume that \( (G, G/P) \) is equal to \( (SO(n + 1, 1), S_{\infty}^n), (SU(n + 1, 1), S_{\infty}^{2n+1}), (Sp(n + 1, 1), S_{\infty}^{4n+3}) \) or \( (F_4(-20), S_{15}^3) \). In the last section, we saw that the Godbillon-Vey class of \( \mathbf{F}_P \) is nontrivial, being given by a volume form on \( G/K_P \). By using the computation, we will prove the following result in this section.

**Proposition 7.4.** \( \Delta_{\mathbf{F}}(H^*(WO_Q)) \) is spanned by the Godbillon-Vey class \( \Delta_{\mathbf{F}}(h_1 c_1^{15}) \) for any \( (G, G/P) \)-foliation \( \mathcal{F} \) of \( \mathcal{M} \).

Recall that the secondary characteristic classes of the form \( \Delta_{\mathbf{F}_P}(h_1 c_1^j) \) with nonempty \( I \) are called exotic. First, we observe the following.

**Lemma 7.5.** Every nontrivial exotic secondary characteristic class of \( \mathbf{F}_P \) is a multiple of the Godbillon-Vey class \( \Delta_{\mathbf{F}_P}(h_1 c_1^j) \) in \( H^*(\mathfrak{g}, K_P) \).

**Proof.** Note that \( \deg h_1 c_1^j \geq 2q + 1 \) for any \( h_1 c_1^j \) in \( WO_Q \) with nonempty \( I \). Since \( (G, G/P) \) is \( (SO(n + 1, 1), S_{\infty}^n), (SU(n + 1, 1), S_{\infty}^{2n+1}), (Sp(n + 1, 1), S_{\infty}^{4n+3}) \) or \( (F_4(-20), S_{15}^3) \), we have \( G/K_P = 1 + 2 \dim G/P \). Then \( \Delta_{\mathbf{F}_P}(h_1 c_1^j) = 0 \) for any \( h_1 c_1^j \) in \( WO_Q \) with \( \deg h_1 c_1^j > 2q + 1 \), and \( \Delta_{\mathbf{F}}(h_1 c_1^j) \) is a multiple of a volume form on \( G/K_P \) for any \( h_1 c_1^j \) in \( WO_Q \) with \( \deg h_1 c_1^j = 2q + 1 \). Since the Godbillon-Vey class is represented by a volume form on \( G/K_P \) by \( 23, 24, 31 \) and \( 34 \), the proof is concluded. \( \Box \)
For the Pontryagin classes, an argument similar to Heitsch \cite{Hei86} Section 4] for transversely projective foliations implies the following.

**Lemma 7.6.** For any \((G, G/P)\)-foliation \(\mathcal{F}\) of \(M\), the Pontryagin classes of \(\nu \mathcal{F}\) are zero in \(H^*(M)\).

**Proof.** Let \(T_0(G/K_G)\) be the complement of the zero section of the total space of the tangent bundle of \(G/K_G\). Since \(G/K_P\) is \(G\)-equivariantly diffeomorphic to the total space of the unit tangent bundle of \(G/K_G\) in these cases as mentioned in Section \([\text{6}]\) we identify \(G/K_P\) as a submanifold of \(T_0(G/K_G)\). We have a \(G\)-equivariant contraction \(\gamma : T_0(G/K_G) \to G/K_P\). Let \(\rho : T_0(G/K_G) \to G/K_G\) be the projection. Consider the vector bundle \([\ker \rho_*]|_{G/K_P}\) consisting of vertical vectors. Let \(E = (\ker \rho_*)|_{G/K_P}\). We have \(\nu \mathcal{F}_P \oplus \mathbb{R}_\gamma = E\), where \(\mathbb{R}_\gamma\) is the trivial vector bundle of rank one over \(G/K_P\) spanned by vectors tangent to the fibers of \(\gamma\). Here, \(E\) has a \(G\)-invariant flat connection \(\nabla'\) induced from the vector bundle structure of \(\ker \rho_*\). Thus, the total Pontryagin form \(p(E, \nabla')\) of \((E, \nabla')\) is zero.

Let \(\tilde{M}\) be the universal cover of \(M\) and \(\text{dev} : \tilde{M} \to G/K_P\) be a \(\pi_1 M\)-equivariant map such that \(\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \text{dev} \cdot \mathcal{F}_P\), where \(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}\) is the lift of \(\mathcal{F}\) to \(\tilde{M}\) (see Proposition \([\text{3.3}]\)). By the \(\pi_1 M\)-equivariance of \(\text{dev}\), the vector bundles \(\text{dev} \cdot \mathbb{R}_\gamma\) and \(\text{dev} \cdot E\) over \(\tilde{M}\) descend to vector bundles over \(M\), which are denoted by \(\mathbb{R}_M\) and \(E_M\), respectively. Since \(E_M\) admits a flat connection by construction, the total Pontryagin class \(p(E_M)\) of \(E_M\) is 0. By \(\nu \mathcal{F} \oplus \mathbb{R}_M = E_M\) and the product formula of total Pontryagin classes, we get \(p(\nu \mathcal{F}) = p(E_M) = 0\).

Proposition \([\text{7.4}]\) is a consequence of Lemmas \([\text{7.5}]\) and \([\text{7.6}]\) and Theorem \([\text{4.3}]\).

**7.4. Proof of Bott-Thurston-Heitsch type formulas.**

**7.4.1. The volume of flat \(G/K_G\)-bundles.** Here, we recall the definition of the characteristic classes of \(G/K_G\)-bundles with flat \(G\)-connections. For a \(G/K_G\)-bundle \(p_Q : Q \to N\) with a flat \(G\)-connection whose holonomy homomorphism is \(h : \pi_1 N \to G\), we have the Chern-Weil homomorphism \(H^*(g, K_G) \to H^*(Q; \mathbb{R})\). The sections \(s\) of \(p_Q\) are unique up to isotopy because of the contractibility of \(G/K_G\). By composing the pull-back by \(s\) with the Chern-Weil homomorphism, we get a map \(H^*(g, K_G) \to H^*(N; \mathbb{R})\). Since this map depends only on \(h\), we denote it by \(\Xi_h\).

We fix an orientation on \(G/K_G\). Let \(\omega_{G/K_G}\) be the corresponding left invariant volume form on \(G/K_G\) of norm 1 with respect to the metric obtained from the Killing metric on \(g\). Let \(\text{vol}_{G/K_G} = [\omega_{G/K_G}]\) and \(\text{vol}(h) = \Xi_h(\text{vol}_{G/K_G}) \in H^m(N; \mathbb{R})\), where \(m = \dim G/K_G\). The class \(\text{vol}(h)\) is called the volume of \(Q\) or of the holonomy presentation \(h\).

**Example 7.7.** For the case where \(N = \Gamma \backslash G/K_G\) for a torsion-free uniform lattice \(\Gamma\) of \(G\), the volume of \(\Gamma \to G\) is denoted by \(\text{vol}(\Gamma)\), which is represented by the volume form on \(N\) induced from \(\omega_{G/K_G}\).

**Remark 7.8.** \(\Xi_h\) is called the Borel regulator map by algebraic geometers. For the importance of the volume in algebraic geometry, see \cite{Rez96} and the references therein.
7.4.2. Bott-Thurston-Heitsch type formulas for homogeneous foliations. We apply the computation of the last section to calculate the Godbillon-Vey classes of homogeneous foliations \( \mathcal{F}_T \) in Example 2.3. We consider the \( K_G/K_P \)-bundle \( \phi_{K_G} : \Gamma \backslash G/K_P \to \Gamma \backslash G/K_G \). In the next proposition, we will need orientations of the fibers of \( \phi_{K_G} \) and of \( G/K_G \) to define the fiber integration along \( \phi_{K_G} \) and to determine a volume form \( \omega_{G/K_G} \) on \( \Gamma \backslash G/K_G \). In the proof, we will take these orientations by using the decomposition of the volume form of \( G/K_P \) into a volume form of \( G/K_G \) and a fiberwise volume form of \( \phi_{K_G} \).

**Proposition 7.9.** Let \((G, G/P)\) be one of \((\SO_0(n+1, 1), S^0_\infty)\), \((\SU(n+1, 1), S^{2n+1}_\infty)\), \((\Sp(n+1, 1), S^{4n+3}_\infty)\) or \((F_4(-20), S^{15}_\infty)\). Let \( q = \dim G/P \) (the codimension of \( \mathcal{F}_T \)). We have

\[
\int_{\Phi_{K_G}} \Delta_{\mathcal{F}_T}(h J^q G) = c_G \omega_{G/K_G}
\]

in \( \Omega^p(\Gamma \backslash G/K_G) \) for some orientations of \( G/K_G \) and of the fibers of \( \phi_{K_G} \), where \( c_G \) is the constant depending on \((G, G/P)\) given by the following table:

| \((G, G/P)\)                      | \(c_G\)                      |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| \((\SO_0(n+1, 1), S^0_\infty)\) | \((-1)\frac{n(n-1)}{2}+\frac{n+1}{2}n! \vol(S^n)\) |
| \((\SU(n+1, 1), S^{2n+1}_\infty)\) | \((-1)^{n+1}(n+1)^{2n+2}(2n+1)! \vol(S^{2n+1})\) |
| \((\Sp(n+1, 1), S^{4n+3}_\infty)\) | \((2n+3)^{4n+4}(4n+3)! \vol(S^{4n+3})\) |
| \((F_4(-20), S^{15}_\infty)\) | \(3^{24} \pi^4 11^{16} 15! \vol(S^{15})\) |

Here, \( \vol(S^n) \) is the volume of the unit sphere in \( \mathbb{R}^{q+1} \), given by \( \vol(S^n) = (\frac{2\pi^{(q+1)/2}}{\Gamma(q+1)}})^2 \) for odd \( q \) and \( \vol(S^n) = (\frac{2(2\pi)^{q/2}}{\Gamma(q+1)}})^2 \) for even \( q \).

**Proof.** Consider the case where \((G, G/P) = (\SO_0(n+1, 1), S^0_\infty)\). We will use the notation of Sections 7.2.2. Let \( \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{m} \) be the orthogonal decomposition with respect to the Killing metric. Regarding \( \mathfrak{g} \) as a subalgebra of \( \mathfrak{gl}(n+2; \mathbb{R}) \) like in Section 7.2.2, \( \mathfrak{k} \) and \( \mathfrak{m} \) are realized as

\[
\mathfrak{g} = \{ A \in \mathfrak{g} \mid A = -A^* \},
\]

\[
\mathfrak{m} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -x & 0 \\ -x & 0 & -t_x \\ 0 & x & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{gl}(n+2; \mathbb{R}) \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\}.
\]

By (24), \( \Gamma \backslash G(K) \) is a wedge product of two components; the first component is a wedge product of Hermitian matrices and the second is a wedge product of skew-Hermitian matrices. By using (37), it is easy to see that the first part \( a^\vee \wedge \Lambda_{k=2}^{n+1} u_k^\vee + v_k^\vee \) is \( K_G \)-basic; namely, it is the pull-back of a volume form on \( G/K_G \) by the projection \( \phi_{K_G} : G/K_P \to G/K_G \). We orient \( G/K_G \) with this volume form. Since the Killing metric \( B_\theta \) of \( \mathfrak{g} \) is given by \( B_\theta(X, Y) = n \tr(XY^*) \), the norm of \( a^\vee \) and \( u_k^\vee + v_k^\vee \) are \( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}} \) and \( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \), respectively. Thus, letting \( \omega_{G/K_G} \) be the volume
form on \( G/K \) defining the same orientation and of norm 1 with respect to the Killing metric, we get

\[
a^\vee \wedge \bigwedge_{k=2}^{n+1} \left(t^i v^\vee_k + v^\vee_k\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{n+1}}} \phi^*_{K_G} \omega_{G/K}.
\]

Recall that \( K_G \cong \text{SO}(n+1) \). We consider the standard \( \text{SO}(n+1) \)-action on \( \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) so that the orbit of the first fundamental vector \( e_1 \) is \( S^n \). We can identify \( \mathfrak{m} \) with \( T_{e_1} \) by the infinitesimal action. Under this identification, the second part \( \bigwedge_{k=2}^{n+1} (t^i v^\vee_k - v^\vee_k) \) of the right hand side of (24) gives the invariant volume form on \( S^n \) of norm 2\(^{n/2} \) with respect to the standard metric on \( \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \). We orient the \( S^n \)-fibers of \( \phi_{K_G} \) with this volume form. Then, by (39), we get

\[
\int a^\vee \wedge \bigwedge_{k=2}^{n+1} \left(t^i v^\vee_k + v^\vee_k\right) \wedge \bigwedge_{k=2}^{n+1} (t^i v^\vee_k - v^\vee_k) = \frac{2^{n+1}}{n+2} \text{vol}(S^n) \phi^*_{K_G} \omega_{G/K}.
\]

Here, (39) in the case where \( (G,G/P) = (\text{SO}_0(n+1), S^n) \) follows from (24) and (40).

In the case where \( (G,G/P) = (\text{SU}(n+1), S^\infty_{2n+1}) \) or \( (\text{Sp}(n+1,1), S^4_{4n+3}) \), Equation (36) is proved in a way similar to the last case of \( (G,G/P) = (\text{SO}_0(n+1), S^n) \) by using (27) and (32). We will use the notation in Sections 7.2.3 and 7.2.4. The right hand sides of (27) and (32) are wedge products of two parts; the first one is a wedge product of Hermitian matrices and the second one is a wedge product of skew-Hermitian matrices. Regarding \( \mathfrak{g} \) as a subalgebra of \( \mathfrak{gl}(n+2,\mathbb{C}) \) (resp., \( \mathfrak{gl}(2n+4,\mathbb{C}) \)) as in Section 7.2.3 (resp., 7.2.4), (37) is true. Then, we can easily see that the first part is \( K_G \)-basic. So we orient \( G/K \) with the corresponding volume form on \( G/K \) like in the last case. The Killing metric \( B_\theta \) of \( \mathfrak{g}_\mathbb{C} \) is given by

\[
B_\theta(X,Y) = 2(n+2) \text{tr}(XY^*) \quad \text{(resp., } 4(n+3) \text{tr}(XY^*) \text{)}
\]

for the case where \( (G,G/P) = (\text{SU}(n+1), S^\infty_{2n+1}) \) (resp., \( (\text{Sp}(n+1,1), S^4_{4n+3}) \)). Thus, letting \( \omega_{G/K} \) be the volume form on \( G/K \) of compatible orientation and of norm 1 with respect to the Killing metric of \( \mathfrak{g} \), we get the equation corresponding to (39):

\[
(E^\vee_{11} - E^\vee_{n''n''}) \wedge \bigwedge_{k=2}^{n''} (E^\vee_{ik} + E^\vee_{k1}) \wedge \bigwedge_{k=2}^{n'} (E^\vee_{kn''} + E^\vee_{n'k}) = \frac{1}{(n+2)^{n+1}} \phi^*_{K_G} \omega_{G/K}.
\]

for the case where \( (G,G/P) = (\text{SU}(n+1), S^\infty_{2n+1}) \) and

\[
(\gamma_1 - \gamma_{n''}) \wedge \bigwedge_{k}^{t} (t z^\vee + z^\vee) = \frac{1}{24(n+3)^{2n+2}} \phi^*_{K_G} \omega_{G/K}
\]

for the case where \( (G,G/P) = (\text{Sp}(n+1,1), S^4_{4n+3}) \), where \( z \) runs in

\[
\{ u_{1,k} \mid 2 \leq k \leq n'' \} \cup \{ u_{2,k} \mid 2 \leq k \leq n' \} \cup \{ x_{1,k} \mid 2 \leq k \leq n' \} \cup \{ x_{2,k} \mid 2 \leq k \leq n'' \} \cup \{ y_{1}, y_{2}, v \}
\]

in this order. We embed \( K_G/K_P \) into \( \mathbb{C}^{n+1} \) (resp., \( \mathbb{H}^{n+1} \)) as the standard unit sphere. The orthogonal complement \( \mathfrak{m} \) of \( \mathfrak{t}_P \) in \( \mathfrak{t}_{G} \) is also described in a way similar to (38). Like in the case of \( (G,G/P) = (\text{SO}_0(n+1), S^n) \), the second part of the right hand side of (27) (resp., (32)) is a volume form on \( S^{2n+1} \) (resp., \( S^{4n+3} \)). So we orient the fibers of \( G/K \) with this volume form. Taking into account the structure of the Hopf fibration \( S^1 \to S^{2n+1} \to \mathbb{C}P^n \) (resp., \( S^3 \to S^{4n+3} \to \mathbb{H}P^n \),...
we see that, under the identification of \(m\) and the tangent space of \(S^{2n+1}\) (resp., \(S^{4n+3}\)), the norm of the invariant multivector fields
\[
\bigwedge_{k=2}^{n''} (E_{1k} - E_{k1}) \land \bigwedge_{k=2}^{n'} (E_{kn''} - E_{n'' k})
\]
(resp., \(\bigwedge_z (t^z z - z)\), where \(z\) runs in \(\mathbb{C}^{n+1}\)) with respect to the standard metric on the standard unit sphere in \(\mathbb{C}^{n+1}\) (resp., \(\mathbb{H}^{n+1}\)) is 2\(^n\) (resp., \(2^{2n+3}\)). By using the pairing of invariant volume forms on \(K_G/K_P\) with the above multivector fields, we see that
\[
\bigwedge_{k=2}^{n''} (E^\vee_{1k} - E^\vee_{k1}) \land \bigwedge_{k=2}^{n'} (E^\vee_{kn''} - E^\vee_{n'' k})
\]
(resp., \(\bigwedge_z (t^z z^\vee - z^\vee)\), where \(z\) runs in \(\mathbb{C}^{n+1}\)) is the invariant volume form on \(K_G/K_P\) with norm with respect to the standard metric is \(2^{3n+1}\) (resp., \(2^{2n+3}\)). Thus, by \((41)\) or \((42)\), we get the equation corresponding to \((39)\) in each case:
\[
\bigwedge_{k=2}^{n''} (E^\vee_{1k} - E^\vee_{k1}) \land \bigwedge_{k=2}^{n'} (E^\vee_{kn''} - E^\vee_{n'' k})
\]

for the case where \((G, G/P) = (\text{SU}(n+1, 1), S^{2n+1})\) and
\[
\bigwedge_{k=2}^{n''} (E^\vee_{1k} - E^\vee_{k1}) \land \bigwedge_{k=2}^{n'} (E^\vee_{kn''} - E^\vee_{n'' k}) = \frac{2^{3n+1} \text{vol}(S^{2n+1})}{(n+2)^{n+1}} \omega_{G/K_G}
\]
for the case where \((G, G/P) = (\text{Sp}(n+1, 1), S^{4n+3})\), where \(z\) runs in \(\mathbb{C}^{n+1}\) in the given order. Then \((44)\) for the case where \((G, G/P) = (\text{SU}(n+1, 1), S^{2n+1})\) (resp., \((\text{Sp}(n+1, 1), S^{4n+3})\)) follows from \((41)\) and \((27)\) (resp., \((45)\) and \((32)\)).

In the case where \((G, G/P) = (F_4(-20), S^{15})\), \(GV(F_P)\) is divided into two parts in a similar way to the other cases. We will use the notation of Section 7.2.5. We orient \(G/K_G\) and the fibers of \(\phi_{K_G}\) in a way similar to the other cases using the first and second components of \((35)\). By \(B\theta(H_3, H_3) = \sqrt{18}\) and \(B\theta(E_\alpha, E_\alpha) = 1\), letting \(\omega_{G/K_G}\) be a volume form on \(G/K_G\) of compatible orientation and of norm 1 with respect to the Killing metric, we get the equation corresponding to \((39)\):
\[
\lambda_3 \land \bigwedge_{\alpha \in T^+ \setminus \Phi} (E^\vee_\alpha + E^-_\alpha) = \frac{27}{3} \phi^*_K \omega_{G/K_G}
\]
The computation of the norm of \(\bigwedge_{\alpha \in T^+ \setminus \Phi} (E^\vee_\alpha - E^-_\alpha)\) as an invariant volume form on \(S^{15}\) is more complicated, reflecting the structure of the \(K_G\)-action on \(S^{15}\). Recall that \(K_G = \text{Spin}(9)\) and \(K_P\) is a subgroup of \(\text{Spin}(9)\) isomorphic to \(\text{Spin}(7)\) (Section 7.3). Let \(\mathfrak{so}(9)_C = \mathfrak{so}(8)_C \oplus m_1\) (resp., \(\mathfrak{so}(8)_C = (\mathfrak{t}_P)_C \oplus m_2\)) be a decompositions as an \(\mathfrak{so}(8)_C\)-module (resp., \((\mathfrak{t}_P)_C\)-module). Here \(m_1 \oplus m_2\), \(m_1\) and \(m_2\) are identified with the tangent space of \(K_G/K_P \approx S^{15}\), \(\text{Spin}(9)/\text{Spin}(8) \approx S^8\) and \(\text{Spin}(8)/K_P \approx S^7\) at a point, respectively. Here \(\mathfrak{so}(9)_C\) and \(\mathfrak{so}(8)_C\) are spanned by the root vectors \(E_\alpha\) of \(\mathfrak{t}_C\) used in Section 7.2.5 because the Cartan subalgebra
We have the homomorphism \( \phi_{K_P} : G/K_P \to G/K_G \) and the fibers of \( \phi_{K_G} : G/K_P \to G/K_G \) so \( \omega_G \) is the constant depending on \((G,G/P)\) given in Proposition 7.9.

Remark 7.11. By [Kita69] Theorem 7.83, the following diagram commutes:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
H^\bullet(\mathfrak{g},K_P) & \longrightarrow & H^\bullet(\Gamma\backslash G/K_P) \\
\downarrow f & & \downarrow f \\
H^\bullet(\mathfrak{g},K_G) & \longrightarrow & H^\bullet(\Gamma\backslash G/K_G) \\
\end{array}
\]

The homomorphism \( \kappa \) is well known to be injective. The commutativity describes the relation between Propositions 7.9 and 7.10.
By the well known relation $G(V(F)) = (2\pi)^{q+1}[\Delta_{F}(h_{1}e_{1}^{q})]$ [KT75a, Theorem 7.20], Proposition 7.9 or 7.10 implies the following.

**Corollary 7.12.** Under the assumption of Proposition 7.9, we have

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{q+1}} \int_{\Gamma \backslash G/K_{P}} G(V(F)) = c_{G} \text{vol}(\Gamma \backslash G/K_{P}),$$

where $\text{vol}(\Gamma \backslash G/K_{P})$ is the volume of $\Gamma \backslash G/K_{P}$ with the metric induced from the Killing metric of $g$.

### 7.4.3. Bott-Thurston-Heitsch type formulas for suspension foliations

The homogeneous foliations are suspension foliations over locally symmetric spaces whose holonomy homomorphisms are the canonical embeddings of lattices. We will show Bott-Thurston-Heitsch type formulas (Theorem 1.9) which can be applied to more general suspension foliations.

Suspension foliations $F$ in the statement of Theorem 1.9 are $(G,G/P)$-foliations on the total spaces of $G/P$-bundles over manifolds $N$ which are transverse to the $G/P$-fibers by construction. In the case where $\dim G/P > 1$, it is easy to see that, conversely, any $(G,G/P)$-foliation on the total space of a $G/P$-bundle over a manifold $N$ which is transverse to $G/P$-fibers is a suspension foliation in the statement of Theorem 1.9. In this section, we prove Theorem 1.9 for $(G,G/P)$-foliations on the total spaces of $G/P$-bundles over manifolds $N$ which are transverse to the $G/P$-fibers. Part of the argument will be used later in a more general situation.

Let $(G,G/P)$ be $(\text{SO}_0(n+1), S_{\infty}^{n+1})$, $(\text{SU}(n+1), S_{\infty}^{2n+1})$, $(\text{Sp}(n+1), S_{\infty}^{4n+3})$ or $(F_{4(-20)}, S_{\infty}^{15})$. Let $q = \dim G/P$ (the codimension of $(G,G/P)$-foliations). Consider the case of codimension $q > 1$; namely, all cases except $(\text{SO}_0(2), S_{\infty}^{1})$ and $(\text{SU}(1), S_{\infty}^{1})$. Let $N$ be a smooth manifold, and $p_{M}: M \to N$ an $S^{q}$-bundle over $N$. Let $F$ be a $(G,G/P)$-foliation of $M$ which is transverse to the fibers of $p_{M}$. Since $G$ preserves an orientation of $G/P$, it follows that $p_{M}$ is orientable.

We have two $G$-equivariant fibrations on $G/K_{P}$:

$$\xymatrix{ G/P \ar[r]^{\phi_{P}} & G/K_{P} \ar[d]^{\phi_{K_{G}}} \\
G/K_{G} \ar[u]^{\phi_{K_{G}}} & }$$

Now, it is easy to see that the fibers of $\phi_{P}$ and $\phi_{K_{G}}$ are of complementary dimension and transverse to each other. This observation implies the following.

**Lemma 7.13.** Let $\text{dev} : \tilde{M} \to G/P$ be the developing map of $F$. For any $\pi_{1}M$-equivariant map $s : \tilde{M} \to G/K_{G}$, there exists a unique map $\text{dev} : \tilde{M} \to G/K_{P}$ which is $\pi_{1}M$-equivariant, satisfies $\tilde{F} = \text{dev} \cdot F_{P}$ and makes the following diagram commutative:

$$\xymatrix{ G/P \ar[r]^{\phi_{P}} \ar[d]^{\text{dev}} & G/K_{P} \ar[d]^{\phi_{K_{G}}}
\tilde{M} \ar[r]^{s} & G/K_{G}. \ar[l]^{\text{dev}} }$$

Moreover, if $s$ is submersive at a point $x \in \tilde{M}$, then $\text{dev}$ is submersive at $x$. 
The equality \( \widetilde{F} = \text{dev}^*F_p \) is a trivial consequence of the construction like in Proposition 7.9. To prove the latter part of Lemma 7.13, note that \( \text{dev} \) is a submersion.

Regard \( \text{hol}(F) \) as a homomorphism \( \pi_1 N \cong \pi_1 M \to G \). Given an orientation of \( G/K_G \), the volume \( \text{vol}(\text{hol}(F)) \) of \( \text{hol}(F) \) is defined in \( H^{q+1}(N;\mathbb{R}) \) as mentioned in Section 7.4.1.

**Proposition 7.14.** We orient \( G/K_G \) and the fibers of \( \phi_{K_G} \) like in Proposition 7.9. Then we have

\[
\left(2\pi\right)^{q+1} \int\!\!\int_{pM} \text{GV}(\mathcal{F}) = c_G \text{vol(\text{hol}(F))}
\]

in \( H^{q+1}(N;\mathbb{R}) \) for an orientation of the fibers of \( p_M \), where \( c_G \) is the function of \( (G,G/P) \) mentioned in Proposition 7.9.

**Proof.** Take a \( \pi_1 N \)-equivariant map \( \overline{\sigma} : \overline{N} \to G/K_G \). We get a \( \pi_1 M \)-equivariant map \( s = \overline{\sigma} \circ p_{\overline{M}} : M \to G/K_G \), where \( p_{\overline{M}} : \overline{M} \to \overline{N} \) is the canonical projection. By Lemma 7.13 we get a \( \pi_1 M \)-equivariant map \( \text{dev} : \overline{M} \to G/K_P \) which makes the following diagram commutative:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\overline{M} & \xrightarrow{\text{dev}} & G/K_P \\
p_{\overline{M}} & & \phi_{K_G} \\
\overline{N} & \xrightarrow{\overline{\sigma}} & G/K_G
\end{array}
\]

Since \( F \) is transverse to the fibers of \( p_M \), the restriction of \( \text{dev}^* \) to each fiber of \( p_{\overline{M}} \) is a covering map onto a fiber of \( \phi_{K_G} \). Since \( p_{\overline{M}} \) and \( \phi_{K_G} \) are \( S^q \)-bundles and \( q > 1 \), the restriction of \( \text{dev} \) to each fiber of \( p_{\overline{M}} \) is a diffeomorphism. Thus the diagram (51) is the pull-back of fiber bundles. We fix an orientation of the fibers of \( p_M \) so that it is compatible with the orientation of the fibers of \( \phi_{K_G} \) under \( \text{dev}^* \). Then \( \int_{p_{\overline{M}}} \text{dev}^* \beta = \overline{\sigma}^* \int_{p_{\overline{M}}} \beta \) for any \( \beta \in \Omega^*(G/K_P) \). We have \( \int_{\phi_{K_G}} \Delta_{F_p}(h_1 e_i^1) = c_G \overline{\sigma}^* \omega_{G/K_G} \in \bigwedge^{q+1} \mathfrak{g}^* \big|_{K_P} \). Let \( \widetilde{F} \) be the lift of \( F \) to \( \overline{M} \). Since \( \widetilde{F} = \text{dev} F_p \) by Lemma 7.13 we have

\[
\int_{p_{\overline{M}}} \Delta_{\widetilde{F}}(h_1 e_i^1) = \int_{p_{\overline{M}}} \text{dev}^* \Delta_{F_p}(h_1 e_i^1) = \overline{\sigma}^* \int_{\phi_{K_G}} \Delta_{F_p}(h_1 e_i^1) = c_G \overline{\sigma}^* \omega_{G/K_G}
\]

in \( \Omega^*(\overline{N})^{\pi_1 N} \). Eq. (50) follows from this equality and the well known relation \( \text{GV}(F) = (2\pi)^{q+1} [\Delta_{\overline{F}}(h_1 e_i^1)] \) [KT75a, Theorem 7.20].

**Proof of Theorem 1.5.** Since the sign of both sides of (2) change when the orientation of the fibers of \( p_M \) changes, it suffices to prove (2) for any fixed orientation of the fibers of \( p_M \). We orient \( G/K_G \) and the fibers of \( \phi_{K_G} \) as in Proposition 7.9. Then we choose the orientation of the fibers of \( p_M \) like in the statement of Proposition 7.14.

By assumption, \( G/K_G \) is of even dimension \( q + 1 \). Since \( G/K_G \) has a \( G \)-invariant metric, the Euler form \( e \) of the oriented tangent bundle of \( G/K_G \) is a left invariant volume form on \( G/K_G \). Thus there exists a constant \( \mu \) such that \( e = \mu \text{vol}_{G/K_G} \), where \( \text{vol}_{G/K_G} \) is the left invariant form of compatible orientation and of norm 1
with respect to the Killing metric on $g$. Let $vol_{\Gamma}$ and $e_{\Gamma}$ be the volume forms on $\Gamma \backslash G/K_G$ such that $p_N^*vol_{\Gamma} = vol_{G/K_G}$ and $p_N^*e_{\Gamma} = e$, where $p_N : G/K_G \to N$ is the universal covering of $N$. By the Hirzebruch proportionality principle [CGW76, Theorem 3.3] (see also [KO90]), we can compute the constant $\mu$ by using the compact dual $K_{G_c}/K_G$ of $G/K_G$ as follows:

$$\mu = \frac{\int_{\Gamma \backslash G/K_G} e_{\Gamma}}{\int_{\Gamma \backslash G} vol_{\Gamma}} = (-1)^{(q+1)/2} \frac{e(K_{G_c}/K_G)}{vol(K_{G_c}/K_G)},$$

where $e(K_{G_c}/K_G)$ is the Euler number of $K_{G_c}/K_G$ and $vol(K_{G_c}/K_G)$ is the volume of $K_{G_c}/K_G$ with respect to the metric induced by the Killing form on $g_c$. The volume $vol(K_{G_c}/K_G)$ was computed in [AY97], obtaining:

| $K_{G_c}/K_G$ | $e$ | $\text{vol}$ |
|---------------|-----|-------------|
| $\mathbb{R}P^{n+1}$ | 1   | $2^{n-1} \pi^{n+1} \text{vol}(S^{n+1})$ |
| $\mathbb{C}P^{n+1}$ | $n + 2$ | $\frac{2^{n+1}(n + 2)^{n+1} \pi^{n+1}}{(n + 1)!}$ |
| $\mathbb{H}P^{n+1}$ | $n + 2$ | $\frac{2^{6(n+1)}(n + 3)^{n+1}6\pi^{2(n+1)}}{(2n + 3)!}$ |
| $\mathbb{O}P^2$ | 3   | $\frac{72^86\pi^8}{11!}$ |

Here, we also indicate the Euler number $e(K_{G_c}/K_G)$ of $K_{G_c}/K_G$. Thus Theorem 1.9 follows from Proposition 7.14 where the constant $r_G$ in (2) is obtained from $c_G$ in Proposition 7.14 by $r_G = (-1)^{(q+1)/2} \mu^{-1} c_G$. □

8. The case where $G/P = S^q$ for even $q$

8.1. Integration along the fibers of Haefliger structures. For transversely projective foliations, the integration of secondary invariants along the fibers of the Haefliger structures was computed by Brooks-Goldman [BG84, Lemma 2] and Heitsch [Hei86, Lemma in Section 5] to prove Proposition 5.1, which is an essential part of the proof of Theorem 1.1. In this section, we will see that such computation is reduced to a computation in Lie algebra cohomology in the case where $G/P$ is a sphere. This observation enables us to state a sufficient condition, that implies Proposition 5.1 in terms of Lie algebra cohomology. We will also see that Proposition 5.1 is not true for transversely conformally flat foliations of even codimensions. In this section, the coefficient ring of cohomology is $\mathbb{C}$.

Let $\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})$ be the principal $G$-bundle over $M$ associated to $\mathcal{F}$. Consider the diagram of bundle maps between fiber bundles over $M$,
where the horizontal maps are inclusions defined by fiberwise complexification and the vertical maps are canonical projections. Let \( H^\bullet(G_C/K_P), H^\bullet(G/K_P) \) and \( H^\bullet(G_C/K_G) \) be the local systems over \( M \) associated to the fiber bundles \( \mathcal{X}_{G_C}(\mathcal{F})/K_P, \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P \) and \( \mathcal{X}_{G_C}(\mathcal{F})/K_G \), respectively. Note that the local system associated to \( \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_G \) is trivial because the fiber \( G/K_G \) is contractible. By using integration along fibers of the vertical maps of (52), we get the commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\xymatrix{ 
H^\bullet(M; H^\bullet(G_C/K_P)) \ar[r] \ar[d]^f & H^\bullet(M; H^\bullet(G/K_P)) \ar[d]^f \\
H^\bullet(M; H^\bullet(G_C/K_G)) \ar[r] & H^\bullet(M).
}
\end{array}
\]

Observe that we have natural isomorphisms

\[
\begin{align*}
(54) & \quad H^\bullet(g, K_P) \otimes \mathbb{C} \cong H^\bullet(t_{G_C}, K_P) \otimes \mathbb{C} \cong H^\bullet(K_{G_C}/K_P) \cong H^\bullet(G_C/K_P), \\
(55) & \quad H^\bullet(g, K_G) \otimes \mathbb{C} \cong H^\bullet(t_{G_C}, K_G) \otimes \mathbb{C} \cong H^\bullet(K_{G_C}/K_G) \cong H^\bullet(G_C/K_G),
\end{align*}
\]

where the first isomorphisms in the two equations are the well known isomorphism in the Weyl’s trick [KO90] Section 3. We get the commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\xymatrix{ 
H^\bullet(g, K_P) \otimes \mathbb{C} \ar[r] \ar[d]^f & H^\bullet(G_C/K_P) \ar[r] \ar[d]^f & H^\bullet(M; H^\bullet(G_C/K_P)) \ar[d]^f \\
H^\bullet(g, K_G) \otimes \mathbb{C} \ar[r] & H^\bullet(G_C/K_G) \ar[r] & H^\bullet(M; H^\bullet(G_C/K_G)).
}
\end{array}
\]

Recall that \( \mathcal{X}_{G_C}(\mathcal{F})/K_P \) has a \((G, G/P)\)-foliation \( p^*\xi_{\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})} \), which is obtained by pulling back the foliation \( \xi_{\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})} \) on \( \mathcal{X}_{G_C}(\mathcal{F})/P \) defined by the flat \( G \)-connection by the canonical projection \( p : \mathcal{X}_{G_C}(\mathcal{F})/K_P \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{G_C}(\mathcal{F})/P \). By combining Theorem 4.3 diagrams (53) and (56), and the definition of the characteristic homomorphisms, we get the following.

**Proposition 8.1.** The following diagram is commutative:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\xymatrix{ 
H^\bullet(WO_d) \ar[r]^\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_P} \ar[d]^\Delta_{p^*\xi_{\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})}} & H^\bullet(g, K_P) \otimes \mathbb{C} \ar[r] \ar[d]^f & H^\bullet(M; H^\bullet(G_C/K_P)) \ar[r] \ar[d]^f & H^\bullet(M; H^\bullet(G/K_P)) \ar[d]^f \\
& H^\bullet(g, K_G) \otimes \mathbb{C} \ar[r] & H^\bullet(M; H^\bullet(G_C/K_G)) \ar[r] & H^\bullet(M),
}
\end{array}
\]

where \( \Delta_{p^*\xi_{\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})}} \) is the map induced by the characteristic homomorphism \( \Delta_{p^*\xi_{\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})}} \) of \( p^*\xi_{\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})} \), and \( \Xi_{\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})} : H^\bullet(g, K_G) \rightarrow H^\bullet(M) \) is the characteristic homomorphism of the flat \( G/K_G \)-bundle \( \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_G \rightarrow M \) mentioned in Section 7.4.1.

By Propositions 5.2 and 8.1 and the following fact, we will get a sufficient condition for the finiteness of secondary characteristic classes in terms of Lie algebra cohomology (Proposition 8.3).
Lemma 8.2. Let \( \sigma \) be a cohomology class of \( \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P \). Then \( \sigma \) belongs to the image of \( \pi_{G/K_P}^*: H^*(M) \to H^*(\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P) \) if and only if \( \int \sigma = 0 \).

Proof. Note that \( \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P \) is homotopy equivalent to a sphere bundle \( \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/P \) over \( M \). Since \( \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/P \) has a section, the Gysin sequence splits to give the exact sequence

\[
0 \longrightarrow H^*(M) \xrightarrow{\pi_{G/K_P}^*} H^*(\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P) \xrightarrow{\int} H^*(M) \longrightarrow 0 .
\]

The composite of the upper horizontal maps of \( \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P \) is induced on the \( E_2 \)-terms of the Leray-Hirsch spectral sequence of \( \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P \to M \) by the characteristic homomorphism \( H^*(g, K_P) \to H^*(\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P) \) of the \((G, G/P)\)-foliation \( \mathcal{F}_{hol}(\mathcal{F}) \) on \( \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P \) mentioned in Proposition 3.9. Thus, as a consequence of Propositions 5.2 and 8.1 and Lemma 8.2, we get the following.

Proposition 8.3. If \( \int \Delta_{F_P}(\sigma) = 0 \) for \( \sigma \in H^*(WO_q) \), then

\[
\# \{ \Delta_F(\sigma) \in H^*(M; \mathbb{R}) \mid F \in \text{Fol}(G, G/P) \} < \infty .
\]

This proposition reduces the latter condition to the former condition, which involves only Lie algebra cohomology. Thus the following proposition gives an alternative proof of a consequence of the residue formulas of Heitsch.

Proposition 8.4 (Heitsch [Hei78, Theorem 4.2] and [Hei83, Theorem 2.3]). In the case where \((G, G/P) = (\text{SL}(q + 1; \mathbb{R}), S^q)\) for even \( q \), we have \( \int \Delta_{F_P}(\sigma) = 0 \) for any \( \sigma \in H^*(WO_q) \).

Proof. We will use the notation of Example 7.2.1. First, we show \( \int \Delta_{F_P}(h_1 c_1^q) = 0 \). By (19) and (20), we get

\[
\Delta_{F_P}(h_1 c_1^q) = -\left( \frac{(q')^{q+1}}{(2\pi)^{q+1}} \right) E_{11}^\vee \wedge \bigwedge_{k=2}^q E_{1k}^\vee \wedge E_{k1}^\vee
\]

\[
= \left( -1 \right)^{\frac{(q-1)(q+1)}{2} + \frac{(q'+1)q+1}{2}} \frac{1}{2} E_{11}^\vee \wedge \bigwedge_{k=2}^q \left( E_{1k}^\vee + E_{k1}^\vee \right) \wedge \bigwedge_{k=2}^q \left( E_{1k}^\vee - E_{k1}^\vee \right) .
\]

Here, \( \bigwedge_{k=2}^q \left( E_{1k}^\vee - E_{k1}^\vee \right) \) is a volume form of \( \text{SO}(q')/\text{SO}(q) \approx S^q \). Thus \( \int \Delta_{F_P}(h_1 c_1^q) \) is obtained by integrating \( E_{11}^\vee \wedge \bigwedge_{k=2}^q \left( E_{1k}^\vee + E_{k1}^\vee \right) \) over \( S^q \). But, since \( q \) is even, \( E_{11}^\vee \wedge \bigwedge_{k=2}^q \left( E_{1k}^\vee + E_{k1}^\vee \right) \) is an odd function on \( S^q \); namely, we have

\[
s^* \left( E_{11}^\vee \wedge \bigwedge_{k=2}^q \left( E_{1k}^\vee + E_{k1}^\vee \right) \right) = -E_{11}^\vee \wedge \bigwedge_{k=2}^q \left( E_{1k}^\vee + E_{k1}^\vee \right) ,
\]

where \( s \) is the antipodal map on \( S^q \). So the integration of \( E_{11}^\vee \wedge \bigwedge_{k=2}^q \left( E_{1k}^\vee + E_{k1}^\vee \right) \) over \( S^q \) is zero. This implies that \( \int \Delta_{F_P}(h_1 c_1^q) = 0 \).

Note that \( h_1(\Theta_{MC}) \) is \( K_G \)-basic; namely, \( h_1(\Theta_{MC}) \) is the pull-back of a differential form on \( G_C/K_G \). Thus, by (20),

\[
\int \Delta_{F_P}(h_1 h_1 c_1^q) = h_1(\Theta_{MC}) \int \Delta_{F_P}(h_1 c_1^q) = 0 .
\]

Since other secondary characteristic classes are generated by the classes of the form \( h_1 h_1 c_1^q \) by Theorem 3.3, the result follows. \( \square \)
Remark 8.5. Heitsch [Hei86] applied consequences of his residue formulas, Theorem 1.7 and Proposition 8.3 to prove our Proposition 5.1 for the case where \((G, G/P) = (\text{SL}(q+1; \mathbb{R}), S^q)\) for any \(q\), and therefore Theorem 1.1. For even \(q\), our proof of Proposition 8.3 is slightly simpler than the original proof of Heitsch [Hei86]. It is because we directly computed the map \(H^*(g, K_P) \to H^*(g, K_G)\) in Section 7 while Heitsch applied his residue formulas ([Hei78, Theorem 4.2] and [Hei83, Theorem 2.3]). Thus we obtained a slightly simpler proof of Theorem 1.1 for even \(q\). Note that we already gave an alternative proof of Theorem 1.1 for odd \(q\) in Section 6.2 by using Theorem 1.2.

In the case where \((G, G/P) = (\text{SO}(n+1,1), S^n_{\infty})\) for odd \(n\), \((\text{SU}(n+1,1), S^n_{2\infty})\), \((\text{Sp}(n+1,1), S^{2n}_{\infty})\) or \((F_{4}(-20), S^{15}_\infty)\), our Bott-Thurston-Heitsch type formulas (Theorem 1.9) imply that the integration of \(GV(\mathcal{F}_p)\) along the fibers of the sphere bundle \(G/K_P \to G/K_G\) is nonzero, but it is a constant multiple of the Euler class of the tangent sphere bundle of \(G/K_G\). So we cannot apply Proposition 8.3 in this case to show the finiteness of the secondary characteristic classes. Nevertheless we get the following. Let \(\varphi : \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P \to \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_G\) be the canonical projection.

**Proposition 8.6.** In the case where \((G, G/P)\) is equal to one of \((\text{SO}(n+1,1), S^n_{\infty})\) for odd \(n\), \((\text{SU}(n+1,1), S^n_{2\infty})\), \((\text{Sp}(n+1,1), S^{2n}_{\infty})\) or \((F_{4}(-20), S^{15}_\infty)\), we have \(f_\varphi GV(p^*E_{\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})}) = 0\) in \(H^*(M)\) for any \((G, G/P)\)-foliation \(\mathcal{F}\) of \(M\).

**Proof.** The sphere bundle \(\mathcal{F}\) has a section because it is homotopic to the Haefliger structure \(\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/P \to M\), which has a section (see Section 3.2.2). Thus its Euler class \(e(\varphi)\) is zero. Since \(\varphi\) is a sphere bundle with a \((G, G/P)\)-foliation transverse to fibers, we get \(f_\varphi GV(p^*E_{\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})}) = r_G e(\varphi) = 0\) by the Bott-Thurston-Heitsch type formulas in Theorem 1.9.\hfill \Box

**Remark 8.7.** Note that the Godbillon-Vey class is essentially the unique nontrivial secondary class in this case by Proposition 7.4. Thus Lemma 8.2 gives us another proof of Proposition 5.1 for these \((G, G/P)\), and therefore another proof of Theorem 1.2.

On the other hand, the situation is different for transversely conformally flat foliations of even codimension. Let \((G, G/P)\) be \((\text{SO}(n+1,1), S^n_{\infty})\) for even \(n\). Consider an \(S^n\)-bundle \(M \to N\) and a \((G, G/P)\)-foliation \(\mathcal{F}\) of \(M\) transverse to the fibers with a nontrivial volume \(\text{vol}(\text{hol}(\mathcal{F}))\). For example, we can take the fiber bundle \(\Gamma \to G/K_P \to G/K_G\) foliated by the homogeneous foliation for a torsion-free uniform lattice \(\Gamma\) of \(G\). Recall that \(\varphi\) is the \(S^n\)-bundle \(\mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_P \to \mathcal{X}_G(\mathcal{F})/K_G\) associated to \(\mathcal{F}\) with the \((G, G/P)\)-foliation \(p^*E_{\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})}\) transverse to the fibers. We get the following.

**Proposition 8.8.** \(f_\varphi GV(p^*E_{\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})})\) is nonzero.

**Proof.** The volume of \(p^*E_{\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})}\) is equal to \(p^*_K \text{Vol}(\text{hol}(\mathcal{F}))\), which is nontrivial by assumption. On the other hand, \(f_\varphi GV(p^*E_{\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})})\) is a nonzero constant multiple of the volume \(p^*_K \text{vol}(\text{hol}(\mathcal{F}))\) by Proposition 7.14.\hfill \Box

8.2. **Finiteness with fixed Euler class.** Consider the case where \(G/P = S^q\) for even \(q\). In this section, we will show Theorem 1.15. In this section, the coefficient ring of cohomology is \(\mathbb{R}\). Since the Euler classes of even dimensional sphere bundles are trivial with real coefficients, the assumption of Theorem 1.2 is never satisfied.
by Proposition 6.11. Thus the Gysin sequence of the sphere bundle $\phi^G : G_C/K_P \to G_C/K_G$ splits to give the exact sequence

$$
\begin{array}{cccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & H^*(G_C/K_G) & \longrightarrow \quad H^*(G_C/K_P) & \longrightarrow & H^* -q(G_C/K_G) & \longrightarrow & 0.
\end{array}
$$

Let $\chi(\nu F_P)$ be the Euler class of the normal bundle of the $P/K_P$-coset foliation $F_P$ on $G/K_P$, which is of degree $q$.

Proposition 8.9. $\int_{\nu F_P} \chi(\nu F) = 2$.

Proof. Let $\phi_P : G/K_P \to G/P = S^3$ be the canonical projection. Consider the composite

$$
\begin{array}{c}
K_G/K_P \longrightarrow G/K_P \xrightarrow{\phi_P} G/P.
\end{array}
$$

Since $\phi_P^* TS^3 = \nu F_P$, we get

$$
\int_{K_G/K_P} \chi(\nu F) = \int_{S^3} \chi(TS^3) = 2,
$$

which implies the equality of the statement. $\square$

From (54), (55), (58) and Proposition 8.9 we get the following.

Proposition 8.10. We have

$$
H^*(g, K_P) \cong H^*(g, K_G) \otimes \mathbb{R}[\chi]/(\chi^2)
$$

as an $H^*(g, K_G)$-module, where $\chi$ is the Euler class of the normal bundle of $F$.

Consider the characteristic homomorphism $\Xi_{\text{hol}(F)} : H^*(g, K_G) \to H^*(M)$, which depends only on $\text{hol}(F) : \pi_1 M \to G$ (Section 7.4.1).

Proposition 8.11. Let $F_0$ and $F_1$ be two $(G, G/P)$-foliations of $M$ with the same holonomy homomorphism. If $\chi(\nu F_0) = \chi(\nu F_1)$, then $\Delta_{F_0}(\sigma) = \Delta_{F_1}(\sigma)$ for any $\sigma \in H^*(WO_q)$.

Proof. By Theorem 4.3 it is sufficient to prove that $\Delta_{F_0}(\sigma) = \Delta_{F_1}(\sigma)$ for any $\sigma \in H^*(g, K_P)$. For $\sigma \in H^*(g, K_G)$, we get $\Delta_{F_0}(\sigma) = \Delta_{F_1}(\sigma)$ because $\Delta_{F_i}(\sigma)$ is determined only by the holonomy homomorphism according to Proposition 8.1.

Since $H^*(g, K_P)$ is generated by $\chi$ and 1 as an $H^*(g, K_G)$-module, we get $\Delta_{F_0}(\sigma) = \Delta_{F_1}(\sigma)$ for any $\sigma \in H^*(g, K_P)$. $\square$

Since $\pi_0(\text{Hom}(\pi_1 M, G))$ is finite (see Remark 5.13, Theorem 4.4 and Proposition 8.11) imply Theorem 1.13.

8.3. Infiniteness of classes divisible by the Euler class. In this section, we will show Theorem 1.13 an infiniteness result.

Any $\sigma \in H^*(WO_q)$ is said to be divisible by the Euler class $\chi$ if there exists some $\tau \in H^*(g, K_P)$ such that $\Delta_{F_0}(\sigma) = \tau \cdot \chi$. Note that such $\tau$ belongs to $H^*(g, K_G)$ for any nontrivial divisible class $\sigma$ by Proposition 8.10. Proposition 8.10 also implies that, if $\sigma \in H^*(WO_q)$ is not divisible by the Euler class, then $\int \sigma = 0$. So, by Proposition 8.3, we get the finiteness of the possible values of $\Delta F(\sigma)$.

On the other hand, divisible classes may take infinitely different values as we will show. Let $\sigma \in H^*(WO_q)$ be a class divisible by the Euler class.
Theorem 8.12. Assume that the restriction map $H^\bullet(g) \to H^\bullet(t_G)$ is surjective. Then there exists a connected manifold $X$ with finitely presented fundamental group and an infinite family $\{F_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of $(G, G/P)$-foliations on $X$ such that $\Delta_{F_m}(\sigma) \neq \Delta_{F_m}(\sigma)$ if $m \neq m'$.

To prove Theorem 8.12 we note the following fact.

Lemma 8.13. Let $X \to Y$ be an $S^q$-bundle with a section. Then, for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exists a smooth bundle map $f_m : X \to X$ whose restriction to each $S^q$-fiber is of degree $m$.

Proof. We fix a smooth fiberwise metric on $X \to Y$ so that each $S^q$-fiber is the standard round sphere. Let $L$ be the image of a section of $X \to Y$. We can assume that $L$ is a smooth submanifold of $X$. For $x \in X$, let $F_x$ be the $S^q$-fiber of $X \to Y$ containing $x$, let $\{x_0\} = F_x \cap L$, and let $c_x$ be a great circle of $F$ through $x$ and $x_0$.

Under the identity $f : X \to X$, let $\tau$ be the lift of the identity map. Assume that the restriction map $f_m : X \to X$ is of degree $m$. Hence it has a section. Then, by Lemma 8.13, we take a smooth map $f_m : X \to X$ whose restriction to each fiber is of degree $m$. □

Proof of Theorem 8.12. Let $\Gamma$ be a torsion-free uniform lattice of $G$. Note that $\Gamma$ is finitely presented because it is the fundamental group of the closed manifold $\Gamma\backslash G/K_P$. Since $q$ is even, the Euler class of the $S^q$-bundle $\Gamma\backslash G/K_P \to \Gamma\backslash G/K_G$ is zero. Hence it has a section. Then, by Lemma 8.13 we take a smooth map $f_m : \Gamma\backslash G/K_P \to \Gamma\backslash G/K_P$ of degree $m$ for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $\bar{f}_m : G/K_P \to G/K_P$ be the lift of $f_m$ to the universal cover. Define $\Phi_m : G \times G/K_P \to G/K_P$ by $\Phi_m(g, x) = g f_m(x)$. Since $f_m$ is $\Gamma$-equivariant, we get

$$\Phi_m(g_1 g_2, x) = g_1 g_2 \bar{f}_m(x) = g_1 \bar{f}_m(g_2 x) = \Phi_m(g_1, g_2 x)$$

for $g_1 \in G$, $g_2 \in \Gamma$ and $x \in G/K_P$. Then $\Phi_m$ induces a smooth map $\Psi_m : X \to \Gamma\backslash G/K_P$, where $X$ is the quotient of $G \times G/K_P$ by the $\Gamma$-action given by $g_2 \cdot (g_1, x) = (g_2 g_1^{-1}, g_2 x)$. This $\Psi_m$ is a principal $G$-bundle over $\Gamma\backslash G/K_P$ by construction. Since $\pi_1 G$ is a finite group, $\pi_1 X$ is also finitely presented.

Let $\text{ch}_m : H^\bullet(g) \to H^\bullet(X)$ be the characteristic homomorphism of $\Psi_m$ as a flat principal $G$-bundle over $\Gamma\backslash G/K_P$. Let $F$ be a fiber of $\Psi_m$, which is homotopy equivalent to $K_G$. By the assumption, the composite of

$$H^\bullet(g) \xrightarrow{\text{ch}_m} H^\bullet(X) \xrightarrow{\Delta_{F_m}} H^\bullet(F) \cong H^\bullet(t_G)$$

is surjective, where the second arrow is the restriction map to $F$. Thus $\Psi_m^* : H^\bullet(\Gamma\backslash G/K_P) \to H^\bullet(X)$ is injective by the Leray-Hirsch theorem.

Consider the $(G, G/P)$-foliation $F_m = \Psi_m^* F_T$ on $X$, where $F_T$ is the foliation of $\Gamma\backslash G/K_P$ whose lift to the universal cover $G/K_P$ is the $P/K_P$-coset foliation $F_P$. By assumption, there exists some $\tau \in H^\bullet(g, K_G)$ such that

$$\Delta_{F_P}(\sigma) = \Xi_{\text{hol}(F_T)}(\tau) \cdot \chi(\nu F_P).$$

Since the map $\pi_1 X \to \pi_1(\Gamma\backslash G/K_P)$ induced by $\Psi_m$ is independent of $m$, we get

$$\Xi_{\text{hol}(F_m)}(\tau) = \Xi_{\text{hol}(F_T)}(\tau)$$

for any $m$. On the other hand, since $\chi(\nu F_T)$ is represented by the Poincaré dual of any $S^q$-fiber of $\Gamma\backslash G/K_P \to \Gamma\backslash G/K_G$, we get

$$\chi(\nu F_m) = \Psi^*_m \chi(\nu F_T) = m \Psi^*_1 \chi(\nu F_T) = m \chi(\nu F_T)$$

(61)
by construction. By (59), (60) and (61), we get \(\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_m}(\sigma) = m\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_1}(\sigma)\). By
the injectivity of \(\Psi^1\), \(\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_1}(\sigma)\) is nontrivial of infinite order. Hence we get \(\Delta_{\mathcal{F}_m}(\sigma) \neq \Delta_{\mathcal{F}_{m'}}(\sigma)\) for \(m \neq m'\). □

Note that the manifolds \(X\) are noncompact in our construction. We get Theorem 1.13 as a corollary of Theorem 8.12 as follows.

**Proof of Theorem 1.13.** By Propositions 7.9, 8.1 and 8.10, there is some constant \(c\) so that \(\text{GV}(\mathcal{F}) = c\chi(\nu\mathcal{F})\text{vol}(\text{hol}(\mathcal{F}))\) for transversely conformally flat foliations \(\mathcal{F}\) of even codimension. So the Godbillon-Vey class is divisible in this case. Moreover, the surjectivity of the restriction map \(H^*(\mathfrak{so}(n+1,1)) \to H^*(\mathfrak{so}(n+2);\mathbb{C})\) follows from \(H^*(\mathfrak{so}(n+1,1)) \otimes \mathbb{C} \cong H^*(\mathfrak{so}(n+2);\mathbb{C})\) and the surjectivity of \(H^*(\mathfrak{so}(n+2)) \to H^*(\mathfrak{so}(n+1))\) (see, for example, [GHV70, Theorems VI and VII in Section 6.23]). Thus the assumption of Theorem 8.12 is satisfied, which implies Theorem 1.13. □

9. Rigidity of foliations on homogeneous spaces

9.1. Generalization of Bott-Thurston-Heitsch type formulas. Let \((G, G/P)\) be \((\text{SO}_0(n+1,1), S^n)\), \((\text{SU}(n+1,1), S^n)\), \((\text{Sp}(n+1,1), S^n)\), \((\text{Sp}(n+1,1), S\mathbb{S}^{2n+3})\) or \((F_4(-20), S^{15})\). Let \(q = \dim G/P\). Consider the case of codimension \(q > 1\); namely, all cases except \((\text{SO}_0(2,1), S^2)\) and \((\text{SU}(1,1), S^2)\). Let \(M = \Gamma \backslash G/K_P\) and \(N = \Gamma \backslash G/K_G\). Let \(\mathcal{F}\) be a \((G, G/P)\)-foliation of \(\Gamma \backslash G/K_P\) whose holonomy homomorphism is \(\text{hol}(\mathcal{F}) : \pi_1 M \to G\). Since \(\pi_1 M \cong \pi_1 N\), we regard \(\text{hol}(\mathcal{F}) : \pi_1 N \to G\). We orient \(M\) and \(N\) with the orientation of \(G/K_P\) and the fibers of \(\phi_{K_G} : G/K_P \to G/K_G\) in Proposition 7.9. The volume \(\text{vol}(\text{hol}(\mathcal{F}))\) is defined in \(H^{q+1}(N;\mathbb{R})\) with the orientation of \(G/K_G\) as mentioned in Section 7.4.1.

**Lemma 9.1.** If \((G, G/P)\) is \((\text{SO}_0(n+1,1), S^n)\) for odd \(n > 1\), \((\text{SU}(n+1,1), S^n)\) for \(n > 0\), \((\text{Sp}(n+1,1), S^n)\) or \((F_4(-20), S^{15})\), then

\[
(62) \quad \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{q+1}} \int_M \text{GV}(\mathcal{F}) = c_G \int_N \text{vol}(\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})) ,
\]

\[
(63) \quad \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{q+1}} \int_M \text{GV}(\mathcal{F}) = r_G \int_N e(p_M) ,
\]

where \(e(p_M)\) is the Euler class of \(p_M : M \to N\), and \(c_G\) and \(r_G\) are the functions of \((G, G/P)\) mentioned in Theorem 1.13 and Proposition 7.9, respectively. If \((G, G/P)\) is \((\text{SO}_0(n+1,1), S^n)\) for \(n\) even, then (62) is true.

**Proof.** First, we will prove (62) for all cases of \((G, G/P)\). The first part of this proof is like the proof of Proposition 7.14. Take a \(\pi_1 N\)-equivariant map \(\overline{\pi} : \overline{N} \to G/K_G\) so that \(\overline{\pi}\) is submersive at a point \(x\). Let \(p_{\overline{M}} : \overline{M} \to \overline{N}\) denote the canonical projection \(\overline{M} \to \overline{N}\). We get a \(\pi_1 M\)-equivariant map \(s = \overline{\pi} \circ p_{\overline{M}} : \overline{M} \to G/K_G\). By Lemma 8.12 we obtain a \(\pi_1 M\)-equivariant map \(\overline{\text{dev}} : \overline{M} \to G/K_P\) which is submersive on \(p_{\overline{M}}^{-1}(x)\) and makes the following diagram commutative:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\overline{M} & \xrightarrow{\overline{\text{dev}}} & G/K_P \\
\downarrow{p_{\overline{M}}} & & \downarrow{\phi_{K_G}} \\
\overline{N} & \xrightarrow{\overline{\pi}} & G/K_G ,
\end{array}
\]
where \( \phi_{K_G} : G/K_P \to G/K_G \) is the canonical projection. Let \( p_{\tilde{Z}} : \tilde{Z} \to N \) be the pull-back of the fiber bundle \( \phi_{K_G} : G/K_P \to G/K_G \) by \( \pi \). We get the commutative diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\tilde{M} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\psi}} & \tilde{Z} \\
p_{\tilde{M}} & \downarrow & \downarrow p_{\tilde{Z}} \\
N & \xrightarrow{\pi} & G/K_G,
\end{array}
\]

where \( \xi_{\tilde{Z}} \) is the canonical map and \( \tilde{\psi} \) is the map induced by the universality of the pull-back. By taking the quotient of the left triangle of (64) by \( \Gamma \), we get the following diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
M & \xrightarrow{\psi} & Z \\
p_M & \downarrow & \downarrow p_Z \\
N & \xrightarrow{} & N,
\end{array}
\]

where \( Z \) is the quotient of \( \tilde{Z} \) by the induced \( \Gamma \)-action and \( \psi \) is the map induced by \( \tilde{\psi} \).

Let \( F_Z \) be the foliation on \( Z \) whose lift to the universal cover \( \tilde{Z} \) is \( \xi_{\tilde{Z}}^* F_P \). By applying Proposition 7.9 like in the proof of Proposition 7.14, we get

\[
\frac{1}{(2\pi)^q+1} \int_{p_Z} \text{GV}(F_Z) = c_G \text{vol}(\text{hol}(F))
\]
in \( H^{q+1}(N; \mathbb{R}) \). Since \( F = \psi^* F_Z \), we obtain \( \text{GV}(F) = \psi^* \text{GV}(F_Z) \). Hence

\[
\frac{1}{(2\pi)^q+1} \int_M \text{GV}(F) = \frac{\text{deg} \psi}{(2\pi)^q+1} \int_Z \psi^* \text{GV}(F_Z) = (c_G \text{deg} \psi) \int_N \text{vol}(\text{hol}(F)),
\]

where \( \text{deg} \psi \) is the degree of \( \psi \) as a continuous map. Since \( \psi \) is a bundle map that covers the identity map on \( N \), we get

\[
\text{deg} \psi = \text{deg} \left( \psi|_{p_M^{-1}(x)} \right).
\]

Here, \( \psi|_{p_M^{-1}(x)} : p_M^{-1}(x) \to p_Z^{-1}(x) \) is a covering map because \( \psi \) is submersive on \( p_M^{-1}(x) \). Since \( \pi_1(p_M^{-1}(x)) \cong \pi_1(p_Z^{-1}(x)) \cong \pi_1(S^q) = 1 \) because \( q > 1 \), we obtain

\[
\text{deg} \left( \psi|_{p_M^{-1}(x)} \right) = 1.
\]

By (67), (68) and (69), we get (62).

We get (63) by using Theorem 1.9 at (66) instead of Proposition 7.9. Note that \( e(p_M) = e(p_Z) \), because \( \psi \) is a bundle map of degree one on each fiber. \( \square \)

We obtain the following direct consequences.

**Corollary 9.2.**

(i) If \( (G,G/P) \) is equal to \( (\text{SO}_0(n+1,1), S^n_{0\infty}) \) for \( n \) odd, \( (\text{SU}(n+1,1), S^n_{0\infty+1}) \), \( (\text{Sp}(n+1,1), S^{4n+3}_{\infty\infty}) \) or \( (F_{4(-20)}, S^{15}_{\infty\infty}) \), then any \( (G,G/P) \)-foliation \( F \) of \( M \) satisfies \( \text{GV}(F) = \text{GV}(F_{\Gamma}) \) and \( \text{hol}(F) = \text{hol}(F_{\Gamma}) \).
(ii) If \((G, G/P) = (\text{SO}_0(n+1, 1), S^n_\infty)\) for \(n\) even, then \(\text{GV}(F) = \text{GV}(F_\Gamma)\) if and only if \(\text{vol}(\text{hol}(F)) = \text{vol}(\Gamma)\), where \(\text{vol}(\Gamma)\) is the volume of \(\Gamma \hookrightarrow G\) (see Example 7.7).

Combining Lemma 9.1 with well known properties of the volume, we get the following consequences.

**Proposition 9.3.** If \(\text{GV}(F)\) is nontrivial, then the image of the holonomy homomorphism \(\pi_1 M \to G\) is Zariski dense in \(G\).

**Proof.** If \(\text{GV}(F)\) is nontrivial, then \(\text{vol}(\text{hol}(F))\) is also nontrivial by (62). Then the image of \(\text{hol}(F)\) is Zariski dense in \(G\) by [Cor91, Proposition 2.1]. \(\square\)

**Proposition 9.4.** If \((G, G/P) = (\text{SO}_0(n+1, 1), S^n_\infty)\) for even \(n\), then \(\text{vol}(\text{hol}(F)) \leq \text{vol}(\Gamma)\).

**Proof.** This is a consequence of (62) and the following generalized version of the Milnor-Wood inequality (see [FK06, Theorem 1.1]): For any homomorphism \(h: \Gamma \to G\), we have

\[
\int_N \text{vol}(h) \leq \int_N \text{vol}(\Gamma) . \quad \square
\]

**Remark 9.5.** The inequality (70) is true also for any other simple Lie group \(G\). In fact, it is a consequence of the positivity of the simplicial volume of locally symmetric spaces due to Lafont-Schmidt [LS06] (one applies the Hahn-Banach theorem [Gro82, Corollary in page 225] with [Buc08, Corollary 7]). But here we need only the case of \((G, G/P) = (\text{SO}_0(n+1, 1), S^n_\infty)\) for even \(n\), where Corollary 9.2.i does not work.

9.2. **Rigidity of \((G, G/P)\)-foliations of \(\Gamma \backslash G / K_P\) of higher codimensions.** To prove Theorem 1.17-(i), we will apply the following generalized version of Mostow rigidity.

**Theorem 9.6** (Goldman [Gol88] for the case where \(G = \text{PSO}(2, 1)\), Dunfield [Dun99] for \(G = \text{PSO}(n+1, 1)\), and Corlette [Cor91] for \(G = \text{PSU}(n+1, 1)\)). Let \(G\) denote \(\text{PSO}(n+1, 1)\) or \(\text{PSU}(n+1, 1)\) and \(\Gamma\) a torsion-free uniform lattice of \(G\). Any homomorphism \(h: \Gamma \to G\) with \(\text{vol}(h) = \text{vol}(\Gamma)\) is conjugate to the canonical inclusion \(\Gamma \to G\) by an inner automorphism of \(G\).

**Remark 9.7.** Francaviglia-Klaff [FK06] and Bucher-Burger-Iozzi [BB12] generalized the definition of the volume of representations of uniform lattices to nonuniform lattices. (These two definitions do not coincide with each other.) It allows them to prove Theorem 9.6 in a way similar to [Dun99], including the case where \(\Gamma\) is a nonuniform lattice of \(\text{SO}(n+1, 1)\).

**Remark 9.8.** Note that the assumption of the above theorem of Goldman is the equality \(e(h) = e(\Gamma)\) for the Euler classes. But, because of the proportionality of the Euler class and the volume, it is equivalent to the equality on the volume.

**Remark 9.9.** To prove Theorem 1.17 for the case where \(G\) is \(\text{Sp}(n+1, 1)\) or \(F_4(-20)\), we will apply the superrigidity theorem of Corlette [Cor92], which asserts that any homomorphism \(\Gamma \to G\) from a uniform lattice \(\Gamma\) of \(G\) is conjugate to the canonical inclusion if its image is Zariski dense. This rigidity is stronger than the case of Theorem 9.6, so we do not need the equality on the volumes.
Proof of Theorem 9.17(i). If \((G, G/P)\) is one of \((\text{SO}_0(n+1,1), S^n_{\infty})\) for \(n\) odd or \((\text{SU}(n+1,1), S^n_{\infty})\), Corollary 9.2 (i) implies \(\text{vol}(\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})) = \text{vol}(\Gamma)\). If \((G, G/P)\) is \((\text{SO}_0(n+1,1), S^n_{\infty})\) for \(n\) even, then we get \(\text{vol}(\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})) = \text{vol}(\Gamma)\) by the assumption and Corollary 9.2 (ii). Thus Theorem 9.6 implies that \(\text{hol}(\mathcal{F}) : G \to \Gamma \hookrightarrow G\) is conjugate to \(\pi_1 N = \Gamma \hookrightarrow G\) by an inner automorphism of \(G\). Hence the standard map \(\phi_{KG} : G/K_P \to G/K_G\) is conjugate to a \(\pi_1 M\)-equivariant map \(s : G/K_P \to G/K_G\), which is a submersion. Then we get a \(\pi_1 M\)-equivariant submersion \(\text{dev} : G/K_P \to G/K_P\) by Lemma 7.13. It induces a covering map \(\text{dev} : \Gamma \backslash G/K_P \to \Gamma \backslash G/K_P\), which must be a diffeomorphism because \(\text{GV}(\mathcal{F}) = \text{GV}(\mathcal{F}_T)\).

\[\square\]

Proof of Theorem 9.17(ii). Corollary 9.2 (i) and Proposition 9.3 (i) imply that the image of \(\text{hol}(\mathcal{F}) : \pi_1 M \to G\) is Zariski dense in \(G\). Thus Corlette’s superrigidity theorem for uniform lattices in \(\text{Sp}(n+1,1)\) or \(\text{Sp}(20)\) implies that \(\text{hol}(\mathcal{F}) : \pi_1 N \to G\) is conjugate to \(\pi_1 N = \Gamma \hookrightarrow G\). The rest of the proof is the same as in the case (i).

9.3. Codimension one case. In the case where \((G, G/P)\) is \((\text{SO}_0(2,1), S^1_{\infty})\) or \((\text{SU}(1,1), S^1_{\infty})\), Lemma 9.4 is not true in general because of \(\pi_1 S^1 \cong \mathbb{Z}\). But the theory of codimension one foliations, due to Thurston and Levitt, resolves this problem. Note that, in this case, \(K_G\) is isomorphic to \(\text{SO}(2)\) or \(U(1)\), \(P\) is isomorphic to \(\text{Aff}_{+}(1; \mathbb{R})\) or \(\text{Aff}(1; \mathbb{R})\), and \(K_P\) is trivial or \(\{\pm 1\}\). Let \(\mathcal{F}\) be a \((G, G/P)\)-foliation on \(M = \Gamma \backslash G/K_P\). Here, \(N = \Gamma \backslash G/K_G\) is a closed Riemann surface and the projection \(p : \Gamma \backslash G/K_P \to \Gamma \backslash G/K_G\) is a principal \(S^1\)-bundle.

Theorem 1.18 will be deduced from the following two results:

**Theorem 9.10 (Chili-ben Ramdane [ChR08]).** If \(\text{GV}(\mathcal{F})\) is nontrivial, then the image of the holonomy homomorphism of \(\mathcal{F}\) is a uniform lattice or a dense subgroup of \(G\). In particular, \(\mathcal{F}\) is minimal.

**Theorem 9.11 (Thurston [Thu2a] and Levitt [Lev78]).** A codimension one foliation \(\mathcal{F}\) on \(M\) without compact leaves is isotopic to a foliation transverse to the fibers of \(p\).

**Proof of Theorem 1.18.** Assume that \(\text{GV}(\mathcal{F})\) is nontrivial. Then \(\mathcal{F}\) is minimal by Theorem 9.10. By Theorem 9.11, we can isotope \(\mathcal{F}\) to a foliation transverse to the fibers of \(p\). Since the Euler number of \(p\) is equal to the Euler number of \(N\) by construction and the Euler class is proportional to the volume, we get \(\text{vol}(\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})) = \text{vol}(\Gamma)\), where \(\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})\) is the holonomy homomorphism of \(\mathcal{F}\). According to Theorem 9.6, \(\text{hol}(\mathcal{F})\) is conjugate to \(\text{hol}(\mathcal{F}_T)\), which is the canonical inclusion \(\Gamma \hookrightarrow G\). Since the conjugation class of suspension foliations are determined by the conjugation class of the holonomy homomorphisms, the proof is concluded.

\[\square\]

**References**

[Asu03] T. Asuke, *Complexification of foliations and complex secondary classes*, Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. (N.S.) 34 (2003), 251–262.

[Asu10] __________, *Godbillon-Vey class of transversely holomorphic foliations*, MSJ Memoirs, vol. 24, Mathematical Society of Japan, Tokyo, 2010.

[AY97] K. Abe and I. Yokota, *Volumes of compact symmetric spaces*, Tokyo J. Math. 20 (1997), 87–105.

[Bak78] D. Baker, *On a class of foliations and the evaluation of their characteristic classes*, Comment. Math. Helv. 53 (1978), 334–363.
M. Bucher, M. Burger, and A. Iozzi, A dual interpretation of the Gromov-Thurston proof of Mostow rigidity and volume rigidity for representations of hyperbolic lattices, Trends in Harmonic Analysis, Springer INdAM Series, Springer, to appear in 2012.

C. Benson and D.B. Ellis, Characteristic classes of transversely homogeneous foliations, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 289 (1985), 849–859.

R. Brooks and W.M. Goldman, The Godbillon-Vey invariant of a transversely homogeneous foliation, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 286 (1984), 651–664.

R.A. Blumenthal, Transversely homogeneous foliations, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 29 (1979), 143–158.

A. Borel, Le plan projectif des octaves et les sphères comme espaces homogènes, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris 230 (1950), 1378–1380.

R. Bott, Lectures on characteristic classes and foliations. Notes by Lawrence Conlon, with two appendices by J. Stasheff, Lectures on Algebraic and Differential Topology (Second Latin American School in Math., Mexico City, 1971), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 279, Springer, Berlin, 1972, pp. 1–94.

M. Bucher, The proportionality constant for the simplicial volume of locally symmetric spaces, Colloq. Math. 111 (2008), 183–198.

S. Chihi and S. ben Ramdane, On the Godbillon-Vey invariant and global holonomy of\(\mathbb{RP}^1\) -foliations, Balkan J. Geom. 13 (2008), 24–34.

A. Candel and L. Conlon, Foliations. II, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 60, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.

R.S. Cahn, P.B. Gilkey, and J.A. Wolf, Heat equation, proportionality principle, and volume of fundamental domains, Differential geometry and relativity (Reidel, Dordrecht), Mathematical Phys. and Appl. Math., vol. 3, 1976, pp. 43–54.

K. Corlette, Rigid representations of Kählerian fundamental groups, J. Differential Geom. 33 (1991), 239–252.

K. Corlette, Archimedean superrigidity and hyperbolic geometry, Ann. of Math. (2) 135 (1992), 165–182.

N.M. Dunfield, Cyclic surgery, degrees of maps of character curves, and volume rigidity for hyperbolic manifolds, Invent. Math. 136 (1999), 623–657.

S. Francaviglia and B. Klaff, Maximal volume representations are Fuchsian, Geom. Dedicata 117 (2006), 111–124.

H. Freudenthal, Oktaven, Ausnahmegruppen und Oktavengeometrie, Geom. Dedicata 19 (1985), 7–63.

W. Greub, S. Halperin, and R. Vanstone, Connections, curvature, and cohomology. Volume III: Cohomology of principal bundles and homogeneous spaces., Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 47-III, Academic Press [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York-London, 1976.

W.M. Goldman, Topological components of spaces of representations, Invent. Math. 93 (1988), 557–607.

C. Godbillon and J. Vey, Un invariant des feuilletages de codimension 1, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B 273 (1971), A92–A95.

A. Haefliger, Structures feuilletées et cohomologie à valeur dans un faisceau de groupoïdes, Comment. Math. Helv. 32 (1958), 248–329.

Diagonal cohomology, Differential topology (Varenna, 1976) (Naples) (Liguori, ed.), 1979, pp. 19–70.

Y. Hantout, Classes caractéristiques de \(\Gamma(G,H)\)-structures et finitude de leur évaluation, Manuscripta Math. 62 (1988), 383–399.

N. Hanke, Differential cohomology, Differential topology (Varenna, 1976) (Naples) (Liguori, ed.), 1979, pp. 19–70.

J.L. Heitsch, Deformations of secondary characteristic classes, Topology 12 (1973), 381–388.
[Hei78] Independent variation of secondary classes, Ann. of Math. (2) 108 (1978), 421–460.

[Hei83] Flat bundles and residues for foliations, Invent. Math. 73 (1983), 271–285.

[Hei86] Secondary invariants of transversely homogeneous foliations, Michigan Math. 33 (1986), 47–54.

[Hir49] G. Hirsch, La géométrie projective et la topologie des espaces fibrés, Topologie algébrique (Paris), Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, vol. 12, Centre de la Recherche Scientifique, 1949, pp. 35–42.

[HK90] S. Hurder and A. Katok, Differentiability, rigidity and Godbillon-Vey classes for Anosov flows, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. 72 (1990), 5–61.

[Hur02] S. Hurder, Dynamics and the Godbillon-Vey class: a history and survey, Foliations: geometry and dynamics (Warsaw, 2000) (River Edge, NJ), World Sci. Publ., 2002, pp. 29–60.

[KO90] T. Kobayashi and K. Ono, Note on Hirzebruch’s proportionality principle, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math. 37 (1990), 71–87.

[KT74] F.W. Kamber and P. Tondeur, Quelques classes caractéristiques généralisées non triviales de fibrés feuilletés, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A 279 (1974), 921–924.

[KT75a] Non-trivial characteristic invariants of homogeneous foliated bundles, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 493, Springer, New York, 1975.

[KT75b] Foliated bundles and characteristic classes, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 493, Springer, New York, 1975.

[Lev78] G. Levitt, Feuilletages des variétés de dimension 3 qui sont des fibres en cercles, Comment. Math. Helv. 53 (1978), 572–594.

[LS06] J.-F. Lafont and B. Schmidt, Simplicial volume of closed locally symmetric spaces of non-compact type, Acta Math. 197 (2006), 129–143.

[Mats85] Y. Matsushima, Some remarks on the exceptional simple Lie group $F_4$, Nagoya Math. J. 4 (1952), 83–88.

[Mit85] Y. Mitsumatsu, A relation between the topological invariance of the Godbillon-Vey invariant and the differentiability of Anosov foliations, Foliations (Tokyo, 1983) (Amsterdam), Advanced Studies in Pure Math., vol. 5, North-Holland, 1985, pp. 159–167.

[Mor79] S. Morita, On characteristic classes of conformal and projective foliations, J. Math. Soc. Japan 31 (1979), 693–718.

[Pel83] W.T. Pelletier, The secondary characteristic classes of solvable foliations, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 88 (1983), 651–659.

[Pit79] H.V. Pittie, The secondary characteristic classes of parabolic foliations, Comment. Math. Helv. 54 (1979), 601–614.

[Rez96] A. Reznikov, Rationality of secondary classes, J. Differential Geom. 43 (1996), 674–692.

[Sull76] D. Sullivan, A generalization of Milnor’s inequality concerning affine foliations and affine manifolds, Comment. Math. Helv. 51 (1976), 183–189.

[Tar04] C. Tarquini, Feuilletages conormaux, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 54 (2004), 453–480.

[Thu72] W. Thurston, Foliations of 3-manifolds which are circle bundles, Master’s thesis, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, 1972.

[Thu72b] Non-cobordant foliations on $S^3$, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 78 (1972), 511–514.

[Whi57] H. Whitney, Elementary structure of real algebraic varieties, Ann. of Math. (2) 66 (1957), 454–556.

[Yam75] K. Yamato, Examples of foliations with non trivial exotic characteristic classes, Osaka J. Math. 12 (1975), 401–417.

[Yok55] I. Yokota, On the cell structure of the octanion projective plane II, J. Inst. Polytech. Osaka City Univ. Ser. A 6 (1955), 31–37.

[Yok90] I. Yokoyama, On a non compact simple Lie group $F_4$, J. Fac. Sci. Shinshu Univ. 20 (1975), 71–80.

[Yok90] I. Yokota, Realizations of involutive automorphisms $\sigma$ and $G_\sigma$ of exceptional linear Lie groups $G$, J. Fac. Sci. Shinshu Univ. 20 (1975), 71–80.

[Yok90] I. Yokota, Realizations of involutive automorphisms $\sigma$ and $G_\sigma$ of exceptional linear Lie groups $G$, Tsukuba J. Math. 14 (1990), no. 1, 185–233.

[Yok90] I. Yokota, Exceptional Lie groups, Preprint, http://arxiv.org/abs/0902.0431, 2009.
