

# 1 February, 27 2008

One more comment on the theory of bounded operators:

**Naimark Conjecture:** (1940s)

Let  $A$  be a  $C^*$ -algebra. Suppose  $A$  has the property that, up to equivalence,  $A$  has only one irreducible representation. Then  $A \cong \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{H})$  for some  $\mathcal{H}$ .

Rarely do we come across algebras that we don't know are  $\mathcal{B}_0$ , but for neatness, this would be nice to know. The answer is "Yes" if  $A$  is separable. In 2003, however, there was a surprise: Chuck Akerman and Nick Weaver (both Ph.D. students of Prof. Bade, at UC-Berkeley) showed that the answer depends on the axioms of set theory. For usual axioms **\*\*ZF definitely, and probably ZFC?\*\***, the question is undecidable. More specifically, If we assume the Diamond Principle, we can construct a counterexample to Naimark's conjecture, and Diamond is consistent with usual axioms.

**Question from the audience:** What does separable mean? **Answer:** As a Banach space, it is separable: there is a countable norm-dense subset. **Question from the audience:** If  $A$  acts on a separable Hilbert space, does that imply  $A$  is separable? **Answer:** I don't know. I'd expect that that does imply the result, but I did not try to understand the paper, since I don't know set theory.

## 1.1 Continuing from last time

We stated this Burnside theorem:

**Theorem:** If  $A$  is a  $C^*$ -subalgebra of  $\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{H})$  that acts irreducibly on  $\mathcal{H}$ , then  $A = \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{H})$ .

**Proof:**

The action must clearly be non-degenerate.  $A$  is a  $C^*$ -subalgebra, and  $\mathcal{H}$  is of non-zero dimension, so  $A$  has non-zero elements, and  $T^*T$  is non-zero if  $T$  is. So we pick out  $T \in A$  with  $T \neq 0$ ,  $T \geq 0$ . Then  $T$  is compact — spectrum is discrete, except perhaps 0 could be an accumulation point —, by the spectral theorem of compact self-adjoint operators. So  $T$  has a non-zero eigenvalue, and the projection onto the eigensubspace is in  $A$ . Thus  $A$  contains proper projections onto finite-dimensional subspace.

So we look at all projections, and find a minimal one: Let  $P \in A$  be a projection of minimal positive dimension (of range of  $P$ ). Then for any  $T \in A$  with  $T = T^*$ , we look at  $PTP$ , which is clearly self-adjoint with finite dimension. So it has spectral projections, and it's obvious that the spectral projections must be smaller than  $P$  (in the strongest sense: they are onto subspaces of range of  $P$ ). These spectral projections are certainly still in  $A$ , since they are polynomials in  $PTP$ . But  $P$  is minimal, so the only possible spectral projections for  $PTP$  are 0 and  $P$ . Thus, there exists  $\alpha(T) \in \mathbb{R}$  (self-adjoint implies real eigenvalues) such that

$PTP = \alpha(T)P$ . By splitting operators into their real and imaginary parts, we can extend this from self-adjoint  $T$  to all  $T$ : for any  $T \in A$ , we have  $\alpha(T) \in \mathbb{C}$  so that  $PTP = \alpha(T)P$ .

Let  $\xi, \eta \in \text{range of } P$ , with  $\|\xi\| = 1$  and  $\eta \perp \xi$ . We'd like to show that  $\eta = 0$ , since we're trying to show that range of  $P$  is one-dimensional. Well, for  $T \in A$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle T\xi, \eta \rangle &= \langle TP\xi, P\eta \rangle \text{ since } P\xi = \xi, \text{ etc.} \\ &= \langle PTP\xi, \eta \rangle \text{ since } P^* = P \\ &= \langle \alpha(T)\xi, \eta \rangle \\ &= 0\end{aligned}$$

But  $\overline{\{T\xi : T \in A\}}$  is  $A$ -invariant, so  $= \mathcal{H}$ , so  $\eta = 0$ .

So  $A$  contains a rank-1 projection  $P$  on  $\mathbb{C}\xi$ . Then  $\{T\xi\}$  are dense in  $\mathcal{H}$ , so  $TP$  is rank- $\leq 1$  taking  $\xi$  to  $T\xi$ . Since  $A$  is norm-closed, if we take any vector  $\eta \notin \{T\xi\}$ , we can approximate it by such, and then look at corresponding  $TP$ , which will converge to the rank-one operator on  $\eta$ . I.e., for any  $\eta \in \mathcal{H}$ , the rank-one operator  $\langle \eta, \xi \rangle_0$  is in  $A$ . But  $A$  is closed under  $*$ , so  $\langle \xi, \zeta \rangle_0$  is also in  $A$  for all  $\zeta \in \mathcal{H}$ . Multiplying gives  $\langle \eta, \zeta \rangle_0 \in A$ , so all rank-one operators in  $\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{H})$  are in  $A$ , and so all of  $\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{H})$  is in  $A$ . (All rank-one are in, so all finite-rank, and we defined  $\mathcal{B}_0$  to be the closure of finite-rank. Remember that you have to look fairly far to find a Banach algebra where the compact operators are not the closure of finite-rank ones, but there are some examples, but in  $C^*$ -land they all are.)  $\square$

**Question from the audience:** This is a converse of Schur's lemma. **Answer:** In some sense.

## 1.2 Relations between irreducible representations and two-sided ideal

We don't need the full strength of a  $C^*$ -algebra.

**Prop:** Let  $A$  be a  $*$ -normed algebra,  $I$  a two-sided ideal, and assume that  $I$  has a two-sided bounded approximate identity (for  $I$ ). Let  $(\pi, \mathcal{H})$  be a continuous irreducible representation of  $A$ . Then either

- (a)  $\pi(I) = 0$ , or
- (b)  $\pi|_I$  is irreducible.

**Proof:**

If  $\pi(I) \neq 0$ , then look at  $\overline{\{\pi(I)\mathcal{H}\}} \neq 0$  (meaning linear span), which is clearly  $A$ -invariant. So it is all of  $\mathcal{H}$ , and hence  $\overline{\{\pi(I)\mathcal{H}\}} = \mathcal{H}$ , i.e.  $\pi|_I$  is non-degenerate. Let  $\{e_j\}$  be an approximate identity for  $I$ . We showed that  $\pi(e_j)\xi \rightarrow \xi$  for all  $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ . Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a closed  $\pi|_I$ -invariant subspace. Then  $\mathcal{K}$  is  $A$ -invariant, because: given  $\xi \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $a \in A$ , and switching to module notation,  $a\xi = \lim a(e_j\xi) = \lim(ae_j)\xi$ . But  $ae_j \in I$ , so  $ae_j\xi \in \mathcal{K}$ , and since  $\mathcal{K}$  is closed,  $a\xi \in \mathcal{K}$ .  $\square$

**Prop:** Let  $A$  be a  $*$ -normed algebra,  $I$  an ideal with approximate identity. Let  $(\pi, \mathcal{H})$  and  $(\rho, \mathcal{K})$  be two irreducible representations of  $A$ . If  $\pi(I), \rho(I) \neq 0$  (so  $\pi|_I$  and  $\rho|_I$  are irreducible), and if  $\pi|_I$  is unitarily equivalent to  $\rho|_I$ , then  $\pi$  and  $\rho$  are unitarily equivalent.

**Proof:**

Let  $U : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$  be a unitary equivalence over  $I$ . I.e.  $U\pi(d) = \rho(d)U$  for  $d \in I$ , and  $U$  unitary. Then for  $a \in A$ , we have  $U\pi(a)\xi = \lim U\pi(a)\pi(e_j)\xi = \lim U\pi(ae_j)\xi = \lim \rho(ae_j)U\xi = \lim \rho(a)\rho(e_j)U\xi = \rho(a)U\xi$ .  $\square$

**Theorem:** Let  $A$  be a  $C^*$ -algebra and  $(\pi, \mathcal{H})$  an irreducible representation of  $A$ . If  $\pi(A)$  contains at least one non-zero compact operator, then  $\pi(A)$  contains all compact operators. In this case, moreover, any irreducible representation of  $A$  with the same kernel as  $\pi$  is unitarily equivalent to  $(\pi, \mathcal{H})$ .

We will give the proof next time.