

### Abstract

We discuss extremal structure in locally convex topological vector spaces, as well as a fundamental result in the theory of topological vector spaces: the Krein–Milman theorem. We also use extremal structure to prove the Stone–Weierstrass Theorem and the Banach–Stone theorem.

## Extremal Structure

We need to recall some basic ideas related to convexity and compactness in topological vector spaces.

**Theorem:** If  $A_1, \dots, A_n$  are compact convex sets in a topological vector space  $X$ , then  $\text{conv}(A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_n)$  is compact.

*Proof.* Let  $\Delta_n = \text{conv}(e_1, \dots, e_n)$  be the basic simplex in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , where elements look like

$$\Delta_n = \left\{ (s_1, \dots, s_n) \mid s_i \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^n s_i = 1 \right\}.$$

Define  $A = A_1 \times \dots \times A_n$ , and set  $f: \Delta_n \times A \rightarrow X$  to be defined by  $f(s, a) = \sum_i s_i a_i$ . We set  $K = f(S \times A)$ .

Note that since  $f$  is continuous (as addition and scalar multiplication are continuous),  $\Delta_n$  is compact, and  $A$  is compact, we have that  $K$  is compact. Furthermore,  $K \subseteq \text{conv}(A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_n)$ . We will now show that the inclusion goes in the opposite direction.

We will do this by showing that  $K$  is convex. Let  $(s, a), (t, b) \in S \times A$ , and let  $0 \leq q \leq 1$ . Then, defining

$$\begin{aligned} u &= qs + (1 - q)t \\ c_i &= \frac{qs_i a_i + (1 - q)t_i b_i}{qs_i + (1 - q)t_i}, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} qf(s, a) + (1 - q)f(t, b) &= f(u, c) \\ &\in K, \end{aligned}$$

meaning  $K$  is convex, so  $\text{conv}(A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_n) \subseteq K$ . □

**Definition.** Let  $K$  be a subset of a vector space  $X$ . A nonempty  $S \subseteq K$  is called a *face* for  $K$  if the interior of any line in  $K$  that is contained in  $S$  contains its endpoints. Analytically, this means that if  $x, y \in K$  are such that, for all  $t \in (0, 1)$ ,  $tx + (1 - t)y \in S$ , then  $x, y \in S$ .

An *extreme point* of  $K$  is an extreme set of  $K$  that consists of one point. We write  $\text{ext}(K)$  for the extreme points of  $K$ .

**Example.** Let  $\Omega$  be a LCH space. The extreme points of the regular Borel probability measures on  $\Omega$  are the Dirac measures. That is,

$$\text{ext}(\mathcal{P}_r(\Omega)) = \{\delta_x \mid x \in \Omega\}.$$

In one direction, we see that if  $x \in \Omega$ , and  $\delta_x = \frac{1}{2}(\mu + \nu)$ , then for a Borel set  $E \subseteq \Omega$  with  $x \in E$ , we have  $1 = \frac{1}{2}(\mu(E) + \nu(E))$ . Therefore,  $\mu(E) = \nu(E) = 1$ . If  $x \notin E$ , then  $0 = \frac{1}{2}(\mu(E) + \nu(E))$ , so  $\mu(E) = \nu(E) = 0$ . Thus,  $\mu = \nu = \delta_x$ , so every  $\delta_x$  is extreme.

In the opposite direction, if  $\mu \in \text{ext}(\mathcal{P}_r(\Omega))$ , we claim that there is  $x_0 \in \Omega$  with  $\text{supp}(\mu) = \{x_0\}$ . Now, since  $\mu(\Omega) = 1$ , we know that  $\text{supp}(\mu) \neq \emptyset$ .

Suppose there exist  $x, y \in \text{supp}(\mu)$  with  $x \neq y$ . Since  $\Omega$  is Hausdorff, we can separate  $x, y \in \text{supp}(\mu)$  with disjoint open sets  $U$  and  $V$ , where  $0 < \mu(U) < 1$  and  $0 < \mu(V) < 1$ . Set  $t = \mu(U)$ , and define

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_1(E) &= \frac{\mu(E \cap U)}{\mu(U)} \\ \mu_2(E) &= \frac{\mu(E^c)}{\mu(U^c)}.\end{aligned}$$

Then,  $\mu_1, \mu_2$  are regular Borel probability measures with  $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$  and  $t\mu_1 + (1-t)\mu_2 = \mu$ , which contradicts  $\mu$  being extreme. Therefore,  $\text{supp}(\mu) = \{x_0\}$ , so  $\mu = \delta_{x_0}$ .

**Example.** Let  $\Omega$  be a LCH space. Then,

$$\text{ext}(B_{M_r(\Omega)}) = \{\alpha\delta_x \mid x \in \Omega, \alpha \in \mathbb{T}\}.$$

We start by showing that  $\alpha\delta_x$  is extreme. Suppose  $\alpha\delta_x = \frac{1}{2}(\mu + \nu)$  for some  $\mu, \nu \in B_{M_r(\Omega)}$ . Then, if  $x \in E$ , we have

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2}(\mu(E) + \nu(E)).$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}|\mu(E)| &\leq |\mu|(E) \\ &\leq |\mu|(\Omega) \\ &= \|\mu\| \\ &\leq 1,\end{aligned}$$

and similarly for  $|\nu|(E)$ . Thus,  $\mu(E) = \nu(E) = \alpha$ . In particular,

$$\begin{aligned}1 &= |\alpha| \\ &= |\mu(\{x\})| \\ &\leq |\mu|(\{x\}) \\ &\leq |\mu|(\Omega) \\ &= \|\mu\| \\ &\leq 1,\end{aligned}$$

so  $|\mu|(\Omega) = 1$ , and  $|\mu|(\{x\}) = 1$ , meaning  $\mu(\{x\}^c) = 0$ . Similarly, we must have  $|\nu|(\{x\}^c) = 0$ . If  $E$  is any Borel set not containing  $x$ , we then have

$$\begin{aligned}|\mu(E)| &\leq |\mu|(E) \\ &\leq |\mu|(\{x\}^c) \\ &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

so  $\mu(E) = 0$ , and similarly  $\nu(E) = 0$ . Thus, we have  $\mu = \nu = \alpha\delta_x$ , so  $\alpha\delta_x$  is extreme.

Now, we show that if  $\mu \in \text{ext}(B_{M_r(\Omega)})$ , then  $|\mu| \in \text{ext}(\mathcal{P}_r(\Omega))$ .

Write  $\mu = f d|\mu|$  for some  $f: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ . Suppose there exist  $\nu, \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_r(\Omega)$  such that  $|\mu| = \frac{1}{2}(\nu + \lambda)$ . Then,

$$\mu = \frac{1}{2}(f d\nu + f d\lambda).$$

Since  $\nu$  and  $\lambda$  are positive measures,  $|f d\nu| = |f| d\nu = d\nu$ , and  $|f d\lambda| = |f| d\lambda = d\lambda$ . Since  $\mu$  is extreme, we have  $f d\nu = f d\lambda = \mu$ , so  $|\mu| = |f d\nu| = \nu$  and  $|\mu| = |f d\lambda| = \lambda$ .

Since  $|\mu| \in \text{ext}(\mathcal{P}_r(\Omega))$ , we have  $|\mu| = \delta_{x_0}$  for some  $x_0 \in \Omega$ . Then, for any Borel set  $E$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(E) &= \int_E f d|\mu| \\ &= \int_{\Omega} f \mathbf{1}_E d\delta_{x_0} \\ &= f(x_0) \mathbf{1}_E(x_0) \\ &= \begin{cases} f(x_0) & x_0 \in E \\ 0 & x_0 \notin E \end{cases} \\ &= f(x_0) \delta_{x_0}(E). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\mu = f(x_0) \delta_{x_0}$ . Setting  $\alpha = f(x_0)$ , we have  $|\alpha| = 1$  by definition.

**Example.** The picture of a face in a convex compact set is relatively simple. If  $u: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is an  $\mathbb{R}$ -linear continuous functional, and  $P \subseteq X$  is compact and convex, the infimum  $\inf_{x \in P} u(x) =: s$  is attained. The subset

$$P_u = \{x \in P \mid u(x) = s\}$$

is a closed face in  $P$ .

To start,  $P_u$  is nonempty because the infimum is attained. Since  $u$  is continuous,  $P_u$  is closed. Furthermore, if  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $x, y \in P_u$ , then  $(1-t)x + ty \in P_u$ , as

$$\begin{aligned} u((1-t)x + ty) &= (1-t)u(x) + tu(y) \\ &= (1-t)s + ts \\ &= s. \end{aligned}$$

Now, if  $t \in (0, 1)$  and  $x, y \in P$  with  $(1-t)x + ty \in P_u$ , then

$$s = (1-t)u(x) + tu(y).$$

Since  $u(x) \geq s$  and  $u(y) \geq s$ , we must have  $u(x) = u(y) = s$ , meaning  $x, y \in P_u$ .

## The Krein–Milman Theorem

One of the most important results in extremal structure is the fact that every compact convex set of a topological vector space (with some relatively weak conditions) has an extreme point — moreover, there are a lot of extreme points.

**Theorem (Krein–Milman):** Let  $X$  be a topological vector space where  $X^*$  separates points. If  $K$  is a nonempty compact convex set in  $X$ , then

$$K = \overline{\text{conv}}(\text{ext}(K)).$$

*Proof.* We start with a lemma.

**Lemma:** If  $F$  is a face of  $K$  and  $G$  is a face of  $F$ , then  $G$  is a face of  $K$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x, y \in K$  be such that for all  $t \in (0, 1)$ ,  $(1-t)x + ty \in G$ . Then, since  $G$  is a face of  $F$ , we have  $(1-t)x + ty \in F$ , so since  $F$  is a face,  $x, y \in F$ . However, since  $G$  is a face,  $x, y \in G$ , so  $G$  is a face of  $K$ .  $\square$

We start by showing that  $\text{ext}(K) \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $F \subseteq K$  be a closed face. The family

$$\mathcal{G} = \{G \subseteq F \mid G \text{ is a closed face in } F\}$$

is nonempty, as  $F \in \mathcal{G}$ . Ordering  $\mathcal{G}$  by containment, we will show that  $\mathcal{G}$  satisfies the conditions of Zorn's lemma. If  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$  is a chain, then we claim that

$$I = \bigcap_{G \in \mathcal{C}} G$$

is an element of  $\mathcal{G}$  that is an upper bound for  $\mathcal{C}$ . First, since  $I$  is an arbitrary intersection of convex sets,  $I$  is convex.

Furthermore, for any  $G_1, \dots, G_n \in \mathcal{C}$ , then since  $\mathcal{C}$  is a chain, there is  $j$  such that  $G_i \preceq G_j$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , meaning  $\bigcap_{i=1}^n G_i = G_j \neq \emptyset$ . Since  $K$  is compact, the finite intersection property gives  $I \neq \emptyset$ . Finally, let  $t \in (0, 1)$  with  $x, y \in F$  and  $(1-t)x + ty \in I$ . Then,  $(1-t)x + ty \in G$  for all  $G \in \mathcal{C}$ , so  $x, y \in G$  for all  $G \in \mathcal{C}$ , so  $x, y \in I$ , meaning  $I$  is a face. Notice that for all  $G \in \mathcal{C}$ , we have  $G \preceq I$ , so the conditions of Zorn's lemma are satisfied.

By Zorn's lemma, there is a maximal  $P \in \mathcal{G}$ . We claim that  $P$  is a singleton.

Note that  $P$  is compact since it is closed. Let  $\varphi \in X^*$  and set  $u = \operatorname{Re}(\varphi)$ . Since  $P$  is compact, the set

$$P_u = \left\{ p \in P \mid u(p) = \inf_{x \in P} u(x) \right\},$$

and by maximality, we must have  $P_u = P$ . Since  $\varphi(x) = u(x) - iu(ix)$ , we must have that  $\varphi$  is constant on  $P$ , so  $P = \{z\}$  as  $X^*$  separates points.

Since  $F$  is a face, and  $P \subseteq F$  is a face,  $P$  is a face, so  $z \in \operatorname{ext}(K)$ .

Now, note that  $C = \overline{\operatorname{conv}}(\operatorname{ext}(K)) \subseteq K$  as  $K$  is closed and convex. Suppose that this inclusion is strict. Let  $x_0 \in K \setminus C$ .

Then, by the Hahn–Banach separation, there is  $\varphi \in X^*$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  such that for all  $y \in C$ ,

$$u(x_0) < t \leq u(y),$$

where  $u = \operatorname{Re}(\varphi)$ . Let  $s = \inf_{k \in K} u(k)$ , so that  $K_u = \{x \in K \mid u(x) = s\}$ . This is a closed face in  $K$ , so it has an extreme point  $z \in K$ , with  $z \in C$ . Then,  $u(z) \geq t > s$ , but  $z \in K_u$ , so  $u(z) = s$ . Therefore, the inclusion is not strict.  $\square$

## Other Uses of Extremal Structure

Extremal structure can often give us a lot of information about the structure of particularly important spaces. We start by proving a particular linear-algebraic lemma.

**Lemma:** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be vector spaces,  $T: X \rightarrow Y$  a linear isomorphism. Let  $C \subseteq X$  be nonempty and convex. Then,

$$T(\operatorname{ext}(C)) = \operatorname{ext}(T(C)).$$

In particular, if  $T$  is an isometric isomorphism of normed spaces, then  $T(\operatorname{ext}(B_X)) = \operatorname{ext}(B_Y)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x \in \operatorname{ext}(C)$ . Suppose  $T(x) = \frac{1}{2}(y_1 + y_2)$  for some  $y_1, y_2 \in T(C)$ . We find  $x_i$  such that  $T(x_i) = y_i$  for each  $i$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} T(x) &= \frac{1}{2}(T(x_1) + T(x_2)) \\ &= T\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $T$  is injective,  $x = \frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2)$ , and since  $x$  is extreme,  $x = x_1 = x_2$ , and  $T(x) = y_1 = y_2$ . Thus,  $T(\text{ext}(C)) \subseteq \text{ext}(T(C))$ .

Applying the same process on  $T^{-1}$ , we have  $T^{-1}(\text{ext}(T(C))) \subseteq \text{ext}(C)$ . Therefore,  $\text{ext}(T(C)) \subseteq T(\text{ext}(C))$ , so the sets are equal.  $\square$

One of the basic consequences of the Krein–Milman theorem is that it allows us to characterize dual spaces.

**Theorem:** Let  $X$  be a normed vector space. If  $\text{ext}(B_X) = \emptyset$ , then  $X$  is not a dual space.

*Proof.* If  $Z$  is a normed space, then  $B_{Z^*}$  in the  $w^*$ -topology is a compact and convex set, meaning that  $\text{ext}(B_{Z^*}) \neq \emptyset$ . The result follows from the contrapositive.  $\square$

## The Stone–Weierstrass Theorem

**Theorem** (Stone–Weierstrass): Let  $\Omega$  be a compact Hausdorff space, and let  $A \subseteq C(\Omega)$  be a unital separating  $*$ -subalgebra. Then,

$$\overline{A}^{\|\cdot\|_u} = C(\Omega).$$

The traditional proof involves showing that if  $g \in A$ , then  $|g| \in A$ , which allows for a lattice of functions in  $A$  defined over the open cover of  $\Omega$  to admit a limit point. There is a much more slick proof involving extremal structure. First, we recall some definitions relating to the dual space.

**Definition.** Let  $X$  be a normed space, and let  $S \subseteq X$ ,  $T \subseteq X^*$ . We define

$$S^\perp = \{\varphi \in X^* \mid \varphi(x) = 0 \text{ for all } x \in S\}$$

to be the *annihilator* of  $S$ , and the *pre-annihilator* of  $T$  to be

$$T_\perp = \{x \in X \mid \varphi(x) = 0 \text{ for all } \varphi \in T\}.$$

Note that  $S^\perp \subseteq X^*$  and  $T_\perp \subseteq X$  are norm-closed subspaces.

**Corollary:** Let  $X$  be a normed space, and let  $S \subseteq X$  be a subset. Then,

$$(S^\perp)_\perp = \overline{\text{span}}(S).$$

*Proof.* Since  $S \subseteq (S^\perp)_\perp$ , we must have  $Z := \overline{\text{span}}(S) \subseteq (S^\perp)_\perp$ .

Suppose the inclusion is strict. Then, there exists  $x_0 \in (S^\perp)_\perp \setminus Z$ . By the Hahn–Banach separation for normed spaces, there is  $\varphi \in X^*$  such that  $\varphi|_Z = 0$  and  $\varphi(x_0) = \text{dist}_Z(x_0) \neq 0$ , meaning  $\varphi \in S^\perp$ , so  $\varphi(x_0) = 0$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

*Proof of the Stone–Weierstrass Theorem.* To show the Stone–Weierstrass theorem, we will show that  $A^\perp = \{0\}$ . Note that annihilators are always  $w^*$ -closed, so it is enough to show that  $B_{A^\perp} = A^\perp \cap B_{C(\Omega)^*} = \{0\}$ . Furthermore, note that  $B_{A^\perp}$  is  $w^*$ -compact, so we will show that  $\text{ext}(B_{A^\perp}) = \{0\}$ .

Suppose  $\varphi \in \text{ext}(B_{A^\perp})$  with  $\|\varphi\| \neq 0$ . Then,  $\|\varphi\| = 1$ , else we would be able to write

$$\varphi = (1 - \|\varphi\|)(0) + \|\varphi\| \frac{\varphi}{\|\varphi\|},$$

and since  $0 \neq \varphi$ , this would contradict the fact that  $\varphi$  is extreme. Thus,  $\|\varphi\| = 1$ . By the Riesz–Markov theorem, we know that  $\varphi$  is of the form

$$\varphi(f) = \int_{\Omega} f \, d\mu$$

for some regular Borel complex measure  $\mu$  with norm 1. We will show now that  $\text{supp}(|\mu|) = \{x\}$  for some  $x \in B_{A^\perp}$ .

Suppose  $x \neq y \in \text{supp}(\mu)$ . Since  $A$  separates points, we may find  $g \in A$  such that  $g(x) \neq g(y)$ . Using the Cartesian decomposition, we write  $g = h + ik$ , and since  $A$  is a  $*$ -closed subspace, we know that  $h, k \in A$ . Without loss of generality, we may take  $h(x) \neq h(y)$  (else multiply  $g$  by  $-i$  and replace  $h$  with  $k$ ).

Set  $\tilde{h} = 2\|h\|\mathbb{1}_\Omega + h$ , which yet again belongs to  $A$  since  $A$  is unital, and note that  $\tilde{h}(x) \neq \tilde{h}(y)$ . Finally, set  $f = \frac{1}{2\|\tilde{h}\|}\tilde{h}$ . We have that  $f: \Omega \rightarrow (0, 1)$  is continuous with  $f \in A$  and  $f(x) \neq f(y)$ . Furthermore,  $f \in B_{C(\Omega)}$ .

Define the complex measures  $\nu = f d\mu$  and  $\lambda = (1 - f) d\mu$ , where we define

$$\begin{aligned}\nu(E) &= \int_E f d\mu \\ \lambda(E) &= \int_E (1 - f) d\mu.\end{aligned}$$

By definition,  $\nu, \lambda \in B_{M_r(\Omega)}$ , and for all  $a \in A$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega a d\nu &= \int_\Omega af d\mu \\ &= \varphi(af) \\ &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

as we defined  $\varphi \in A^\perp$ , and  $A$  is a subalgebra. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega a d\lambda &= \int_\Omega a(1 - f) d\mu \\ &= \varphi(a(1 - f)) \\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\nu, \lambda \in A^\perp \cap B_{M_r(\Omega)} = B_{A^\perp}$ . Additionally,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nu\| + \|\lambda\| &= |\nu|(\Omega) + |\lambda|(\Omega) \\ &= \int_\Omega f d|\mu| + \int_\Omega (1 - f) d|\mu| \\ &= \int_\Omega \mathbb{1}_\Omega d|\mu| \\ &= |\mu|(\Omega) \\ &= \|\mu\| \\ &= 1,\end{aligned}$$

where we use the definition of the total variation norm,  $\|\mu\| = |\mu|(\Omega)$ .

Thus, we have the convex combination

$$\begin{aligned}\mu &= \nu + \lambda \\ &= \|\nu\| \left( \frac{\nu}{\|\nu\|} \right) + \|\lambda\| \left( \frac{\lambda}{\|\lambda\|} \right),\end{aligned}$$

and since  $\mu$  is extreme,  $\mu = \frac{\nu}{\|\nu\|}$ , meaning  $\nu = \|\nu\|\mu$ . Therefore,

$$\int_\Omega f d|\mu| = |\nu|(\Omega)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \|\nu\| |\mu|(\Omega) \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \|\nu\| d|\mu|,
\end{aligned}$$

meaning  $f = \|\nu\| |\mu|$ -a.e. Furthermore,

$$\text{supp}(|\mu|) \subseteq \{x \mid f(x) = \|\nu\|\},$$

as, taking  $E := \{x \mid f(x) = \|\nu\|\}$ , we must have  $E^c \subseteq \ker(|\mu|)$ . Since  $x, y \in \text{supp}(\mu)$ , we have  $x, y \in \text{supp}(|\mu|)$ , so  $f(x) = f(y) = \|\nu\|$ , which is a contradiction.

Therefore, we must have  $\mu = \alpha \delta_x$  for some  $|\alpha| = 1$ . Then, for all  $a \in A$ , since  $\varphi \in A^\perp$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \varphi(a) \\
&= \int_{\Omega} a d\mu \\
&= \alpha a(x).
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, this holds for  $\alpha = \alpha \mathbf{1}_{\Omega}(x)$ , so  $\mu = 0$ , which contradicts our assumption that  $\|\varphi\| \neq 0$ . Thus, we must have  $\text{ext}(B_{A^\perp}) = \{0\}$ .

Applying the Krein–Milman theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{A^\perp} &= \overline{\text{conv}}(\text{ext}(B_{A^\perp})) \\
&= \{0\},
\end{aligned}$$

or that  $(A^\perp)_\perp = \overline{A}^{\|\cdot\|_u} = C(\Omega)$ . □

## The Banach–Stone Theorem

Given two locally compact Hausdorff spaces,  $X$  and  $Y$ , and a proper<sup>I</sup> map  $\tau: X \rightarrow Y$ , there is a natural dual linear map,

$$T_\tau: C_0(Y) \rightarrow C_0(X),$$

given by  $T_\tau(f) = f \circ \tau$ .

**Theorem:** If  $\tau: X \rightarrow Y$  is a proper map, and  $T_\tau: C_0(Y) \rightarrow C_0(X)$  is a proper map, then:

- (a) if  $\tau$  is surjective, then  $T_\tau$  is injective;
- (b) if  $T_\tau$  is injective, and  $\tau(X) \subseteq Y$  is closed, then  $\tau$  is surjective;
- (c) if  $T_\tau$  is surjective, then  $\tau$  is injective;
- (d) if  $X, Y$  are compact, then if  $\tau$  is injective,  $T_\tau$  is surjective.

Furthermore,  $T_\tau$  is a contractive map; if  $\tau$  is a homeomorphism, then  $T_\tau$  is an isometric isomorphism.

*Proof.*

- (a) Let  $\tau$  be surjective. Then, if  $T_\tau(f) = 0$ , we must have  $f|_{\text{Ran}(\tau)} = 0$ ; however, since  $\text{Ran}(\tau) = Y$ , we must have  $f = 0$ .
- (b) If  $T_\tau$  is injective, and there is  $y \in Y$  such that  $y \notin \tau(X)$ , Urysohn’s lemma gives a compactly supported  $f: Y \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $f|_{\tau(X)} = 0$  and  $f(y) = 1$ . However, we would have  $T_\tau(f) = 0$ , but  $f \neq 0$ , which is a contradiction. Thus, we must have  $\tau(X) = Y$ .

---

<sup>I</sup>Preimages of compact sets are compact.

- (c) Let  $T_\tau$  be surjective, and let  $x_1 \neq x_2$  in  $X$ . By Urysohn's lemma, there is  $g \in C_0(X)$  such that  $g(x_1) \neq g(x_2)$ . We may find  $f \in C(Y)$  such that  $f \circ \tau = g$ , meaning  $f(\tau(x_1)) \neq f(\tau(x_2))$ , so  $\tau(x_1) \neq \tau(x_2)$ , and  $\tau$  is injective.
- (d) Let  $\tau$  be injective. If  $X$  is compact, then  $\tau(X)$  is compact, hence closed, and  $\tilde{\tau}: X \rightarrow \tau(X)$  is a homeomorphism. Given  $g \in C(X)$ , the continuous function  $f_0 := g \circ \tilde{\tau}^{-1}$  extends to a continuous  $f \in C(Y)$  by Tietze's Extension Theorem. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} T_\tau(f) &= f \circ \tau \\ &= f_0 \circ \tilde{\tau} \\ &= g \circ \tilde{\tau}^{-1} \circ \tilde{\tau} \\ &= g, \end{aligned}$$

so  $T_\tau$  is surjective.

Computing

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_\tau(f)\|_u &= \sup_{x \in X} |T_\tau(f)(x)| \\ &= \sup_{x \in X} |f(\tau(x))| \\ &\leq \sup_{y \in Y} |f(y)| \\ &\leq \|f\|_u, \end{aligned}$$

so  $\|T_\tau\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1$ .

Now, if  $\tau$  is a homeomorphism, then both  $T_\tau$  and  $T_{\tau^{-1}} = T_\tau^{-1}$  are contractions, meaning they must be isometries. Since  $\tau$  is a bijection,  $T_\tau$  is also a linear isomorphism, meaning  $T_\tau$  is an isometric isomorphism.  $\square$

Surprisingly, the above statement reverses — i.e., for compact Hausdorff spaces  $X, Y$ , if there is an isometric isomorphism  $T: C(Y) \rightarrow C(X)$ , there is a corresponding homeomorphism  $\tau: X \rightarrow Y$ .

**Theorem (Banach–Stone):** Suppose  $T: C(Y) \rightarrow C(X)$  is an isometric isomorphism of Banach spaces. Then, there exists a homeomorphism  $\tau: X \rightarrow Y$  and a continuous  $\alpha: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$  such that for every  $x \in \Omega$  and  $g \in C(Y)$ ,

$$T(g)(x) = \alpha(x)g(\tau(x)).$$

*Proof.* Let  $T: C(Y) \rightarrow C(X)$  be an isometric isomorphism. Then, by the properties of the transpose map,  $T^*: C(X)^* \rightarrow C(Y)^*$  is an isometric isomorphism and a  $w^*$ - $w^*$ -homeomorphism. Since  $T^*$  is an isometric isomorphism,  $T^*(\text{ext}(B_{M_r(X)}) = \text{ext}(B_{M_r(Y)}))$ .

Fix  $x \in X$ . Since  $\delta_x \in \text{ext}(B_{M_r(X)})$ , we have  $T^*(\delta_x) \in \text{ext}(B_{M_r(Y)})$ . Thus, there is a  $\tau(x) \in Y$  and  $\alpha(x) \in \mathbb{T}$  such that  $T^*(\delta_x) = \alpha(x)\delta_{\tau(x)}$ . This gives maps  $\alpha: X \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$  and  $\tau: X \rightarrow Y$ .

We claim that  $\alpha: X \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$  is continuous. If  $(x_i)_i$  is a net in  $X$  with  $(x_i)_i \rightarrow x$ , then  $(\delta_{x_i})_i \xrightarrow{w^*} \delta_x$ . Therefore,  $(T^*(\delta_{x_0}))_i \xrightarrow{w^*} T^*(\delta_x)$ . By definition, we have  $(\alpha(x_i)\delta_{\tau(x_i)})_i \xrightarrow{w^*} \alpha(x)\delta_{\tau(x)}$ . Applying to  $\mathbf{1}_Y$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha(x_i)_i) &= (\alpha(x_i)\delta_{\tau(x_i)}(\mathbf{1}_Y)) \\ &\rightarrow \alpha(x)\delta_{\tau(x)}(\mathbf{1}_Y) \\ &= \alpha(x), \end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim.



Now, we claim that  $\tau$  is a homeomorphism. Let  $(x_i)_i$  be a net converging to  $x \in X$ . Then,  $(\delta_{x_i})_i \xrightarrow{w^*} \delta_x$  and  $(\alpha(x_i))_i \rightarrow \alpha(x)$  by the previous claim.

Since scalar multiplication is continuous, we get  $(\alpha(x_i)\delta_{\tau(x_i)})_i \xrightarrow{w^*} \alpha(x)\delta_{\tau(x)}$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta_{\tau(x_i)})_i &= \left( \frac{1}{\alpha(x_i)} (\alpha(x_i)\delta_{\tau(x_i)}) \right)_i \\ &\xrightarrow{w^*} \frac{1}{\alpha(x)} \alpha(x)\delta_{\tau(x)} \\ &= \delta_{\tau(x)}. \end{aligned}$$

For each  $g \in C(Y)$ , we have  $(\delta_{\tau(x_i)}(g))_i \rightarrow \delta_{\tau(x)}(g)$ , or that  $(g(\tau(x_i)))_i \rightarrow g(\tau(x))$ . Since  $g$  is arbitrary, we have that  $(\tau(x_i))_i \rightarrow \tau(x)$ , so  $\tau$  is continuous.

To see that  $\tau$  is injective, we let  $x_1, x_2 \in X$  with  $x_1 \neq x_2$ . Then, by Urysohn's lemma, we have  $\overline{\alpha(x_1)}\delta_{x_1} \neq \overline{\alpha(x_2)}\delta_{x_2}$ , so their images under  $T^*$  are not equal as  $T^*$  is injective. Therefore, we have  $\overline{\alpha(x_1)}\alpha(x_1)\delta_{\tau(x_1)} \neq \overline{\alpha(x_2)}\alpha(x_2)\delta_{\tau(x_2)}$ . Since  $\alpha$  has modulus 1, we have  $\delta_{\tau(x_1)} \neq \delta_{\tau(x_2)}$ , so  $\tau(x_1) \neq \tau(x_2)$ .

Now, we show  $\tau$  is surjective. For any  $y \in Y$ , there exists  $\mu \in \text{ext}(B_{M_r(X)})$  such that  $T^*(\mu) = \delta_y$ . We know that  $\mu = \beta\delta_x$  for some  $x \in X$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_y &= T^*(\mu) \\ &= T^*(\beta \delta_x) \\ &= \beta T^*(\delta_x) \\ &= \beta \alpha(x) \delta_{\tau(x)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Urysohn's Lemma, we must have  $\tau(x) = y$ , so  $\tau$  is surjective.

Since  $\tau$  is a continuous bijection with  $X$  compact and  $Y$  Hausdorff,  $\tau$  is a homeomorphism.

Finally, if  $g \in C(Y)$  and  $x \in \Omega$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} T(g)(x) &= \delta_x(T(g)) \\ &= T^*(\delta_x)(g) \\ &= \alpha(x)\delta_{\tau(x)}(g) \\ &= \alpha(x)g(\tau(x)). \end{aligned}$$

□