Simplicty of Crossed Products of C^*-algebras

Masters thesis defense

Malthe Munk Karbo

Advisor: Søren Eilers

February 15, 2019

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

The main subject of this thesis is a theory describing the ideal structure of something called *crossed products* associated to a certain type of dynamical systems.

The main subject of this thesis is a theory describing the ideal structure of something called *crossed products* associated to a certain type of dynamical systems.

A natural question is: **What is the all the fuzz about?**

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

The main subject of this thesis is a theory describing the ideal structure of something called *crossed products* associated to a certain type of dynamical systems.

A natural question is: **What is the all the fuzz about?** The crossed product construction associates to a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α) a C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_\alpha G$.

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

The main subject of this thesis is a theory describing the ideal structure of something called *crossed products* associated to a certain type of dynamical systems.

A natural question is: **What is the all the fuzz about?** The crossed product construction associates to a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α) a C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_\alpha G$. This construction is important:

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

The main subject of this thesis is a theory describing the ideal structure of something called *crossed products* associated to a certain type of dynamical systems.

A natural question is: **What is the all the fuzz about?** The crossed product construction associates to a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α) a C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_\alpha G$. This construction is important:

- It provides many important and interesting examples of new C^*-algebras.

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

The main subject of this thesis is a theory describing the ideal structure of something called *crossed products* associated to a certain type of dynamical systems.

A natural question is: **What is the all the fuzz about?** The crossed product construction associates to a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α) a C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_\alpha G$. This construction is important:

- It provides many important and interesting examples of new C^*-algebras.
- It encodes quite a bit of information about both G and A and the action $G \overset{\alpha}{\curvearrowright} A$.

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

The main subject of this thesis is a theory describing the ideal structure of something called *crossed products* associated to a certain type of dynamical systems.

A natural question is: **What is the all the fuzz about?** The crossed product construction associates to a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α) a C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_\alpha G$. This construction is <u>important</u>:

- It provides many important and interesting examples of new C^*-algebras.
- It encodes quite a bit of information about both G and A and the action $G \overset{\alpha}{\curvearrowright} A$.
- The construction served as a way of answering many questions in the history of operator algebras.

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

The main subject of this thesis is a theory describing the ideal structure of something called *crossed products* associated to a certain type of dynamical systems.

A natural question is: **What is the all the fuzz about?** The crossed product construction associates to a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α) a C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_\alpha G$. This construction is <u>important</u>:

- It provides many important and interesting examples of new C^*-algebras.
- It encodes quite a bit of information about both G and A and the action $G \overset{\alpha}{\curvearrowright} A$.
- The construction served as a way of answering many questions in the history of operator algebras.
- Ties together with classic theory of dynamics.

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

The main subject of this thesis is a theory describing the ideal structure of something called *crossed products* associated to a certain type of dynamical systems.

A natural question is: **What is the all the fuzz about?** The crossed product construction associates to a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α) a C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_\alpha G$. This construction is important:

- It provides many important and interesting examples of new C^*-algebras.
- It encodes quite a bit of information about both G and A and the action $G \overset{\alpha}{\curvearrowright} A$.
- The construction served as a way of answering many questions in the history of operator algebras.
- Ties together with classic theory of dynamics.
- Ties together with many areas in C^*-theory, including the group C^*-algebra construction.

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

The main subject of this thesis is a theory describing the ideal structure of something called *crossed products* associated to a certain type of dynamical systems.

A natural question is: **What is the all the fuzz about?** The crossed product construction associates to a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α) a C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_\alpha G$. This construction is important:

- It provides many important and interesting examples of new C^*-algebras.
- It encodes quite a bit of information about both G and A and the action $G \overset{\alpha}{\curvearrowright} A$.
- The construction served as a way of answering many questions in the history of operator algebras.
- Ties together with classic theory of dynamics.
- Ties together with many areas in C^*-theory, including the group C^*-algebra construction.

Okay, but why do we care about the ideal structure of this construction?

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

The main subject of this thesis is a theory describing the ideal structure of something called *crossed products* associated to a certain type of dynamical systems.

A natural question is: **What is the all the fuzz about?** The crossed product construction associates to a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α) a C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_\alpha G$. This construction is important:

- It provides many important and interesting examples of new C^*-algebras.
- It encodes quite a bit of information about both G and A and the action $G \overset{\alpha}{\curvearrowright} A$.
- The construction served as a way of answering many questions in the history of operator algebras.
- Ties together with classic theory of dynamics.
- Ties together with many areas in C^*-theory, including the group C^*-algebra construction.

Okay, but why do we care about the ideal structure of this construction? Many answers, most notably we want to do classification.

The main subject of this thesis is a theory describing the ideal structure of something called *crossed products* associated to a certain type of dynamical systems.

A natural question is: **What is the all the fuzz about?** The crossed product construction associates to a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α) a C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_\alpha G$. This construction is important:

- It provides many important and interesting examples of new C^*-algebras.
- It encodes quite a bit of information about both G and A and the action $G \overset{\alpha}{\curvearrowright} A$.
- The construction served as a way of answering many questions in the history of operator algebras.
- Ties together with classic theory of dynamics.
- Ties together with many areas in C^*-theory, including the group C^*-algebra construction.

Okay, but why do we care about the ideal structure of this construction? Many answers, most notably we want to do classification.

And the most important question:

The main subject of this thesis is a theory describing the ideal structure of something called *crossed products* associated to a certain type of dynamical systems.

A natural question is: **What is the all the fuzz about?** The crossed product construction associates to a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α) a C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_\alpha G$. This construction is important:

- It provides many important and interesting examples of new C^*-algebras.
- It encodes quite a bit of information about both G and A and the action $G \overset{\alpha}{\curvearrowright} A$.
- The construction served as a way of answering many questions in the history of operator algebras.
- Ties together with classic theory of dynamics.
- Ties together with many areas in C^*-theory, including the group C^*-algebra construction.

Okay, but why do we care about the ideal structure of this construction? Many answers, most notably we want to do classification.

And the most important question: **Real world application?**

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

The main subject of this thesis is a theory describing the ideal structure of something called *crossed products* associated to a certain type of dynamical systems.

A natural question is: **What is the all the fuzz about?** The crossed product construction associates to a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α) a C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_\alpha G$. This construction is important:

- It provides many important and interesting examples of new C^*-algebras.
- It encodes quite a bit of information about both G and A and the action $G \overset{\alpha}{\curvearrowright} A$.
- The construction served as a way of answering many questions in the history of operator algebras.
- Ties together with classic theory of dynamics.
- Ties together with many areas in C^*-theory, including the group C^*-algebra construction.

Okay, but why do we care about the ideal structure of this construction? Many answers, most notably we want to do classification.

And the most important question: **Real world application? (money?)**

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

The main subject of this thesis is a theory describing the ideal structure of something called *crossed products* associated to a certain type of dynamical systems.

A natural question is: **What is the all the fuzz about?** The crossed product construction associates to a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α) a C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_\alpha G$. This construction is important:

- It provides many important and interesting examples of new C^*-algebras.
- It encodes quite a bit of information about both G and A and the action $G \overset{\alpha}{\curvearrowright} A$.
- The construction served as a way of answering many questions in the history of operator algebras.
- Ties together with classic theory of dynamics.
- Ties together with many areas in C^*-theory, including the group C^*-algebra construction.

Okay, but why do we care about the ideal structure of this construction? Many answers, most notably we want to do classification.

And the most important question: **Real world application? (money?)** Probably not

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

.

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

To a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α), our goal is to answer the following question:

.

To a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α), our goal is to answer the following question:

Question 1: What properties P describes the ideal structure of $A \rtimes_\alpha G$?

.

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

To a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α), our goal is to answer the following question:

Question 1: What properties P describes the ideal structure of $A \rtimes_\alpha G$?

During this talk, the hope is that we will provide some answers to this question.

.

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

To a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α), our goal is to answer the following question:

Question 1: What properties P describes the ideal structure of $A \rtimes_\alpha G$*?*

During this talk, the hope is that we will provide some answers to this question.
Answering question 1 in the above form is hard.

Instead, we break it into special cases

To a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α), our goal is to answer the following question:

Question 1: What properties P describes the ideal structure of $A \rtimes_\alpha G$?

During this talk, the hope is that we will provide some answers to this question.
Answering question 1 in the above form is hard.

Instead, we break it into special cases Some cases discussed today will be:

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

To a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α), our goal is to answer the following question:

Question 1: What properties P describes the ideal structure of $A \rtimes_\alpha G$*?*

During this talk, the hope is that we will provide some answers to this question.
Answering question 1 in the above form is <u>hard</u>.

Instead, we break it into special cases Some cases discussed today will be:

- Which properties P answers Question 1 when A is abelian?

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

To a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α), our goal is to answer the following question:

Question 1: What properties P describes the ideal structure of $A \rtimes_\alpha G$?

During this talk, the hope is that we will provide some answers to this question.
Answering question 1 in the above form is <u>hard</u>.

Instead, we break it into special cases Some cases discussed today will be:

- Which properties P answers Question 1 when A is abelian?
- Which properties P answers Question 1 when G is abelian?

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

To a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α), our goal is to answer the following question:

Question 1: What properties P describes the ideal structure of $A \rtimes_\alpha G$?

During this talk, the hope is that we will provide some answers to this question.
Answering question 1 in the above form is <u>hard</u>.

Instead, we break it into special cases Some cases discussed today will be:

- Which properties P answers Question 1 when A is abelian?
- Which properties P answers Question 1 when G is abelian?
- Which properties P answers Question 1 when $A = \mathbb{C}$?

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

To a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α), our goal is to answer the following question:

Question 1: What properties P describes the ideal structure of $A \rtimes_\alpha G$?

During this talk, the hope is that we will provide some answers to this question.
Answering question 1 in the above form is <u>hard</u>.

Instead, we break it into special cases Some cases discussed today will be:

- Which properties P answers Question 1 when A is abelian?
- Which properties P answers Question 1 when G is abelian?
- Which properties P answers Question 1 when $A = \mathbb{C}$?
- Which properties P answers Question 1 when G is discrete?

What the hell is my thesis about? Crossed products and dynamics

To a C^*-dynamical system (A, G, α), our goal is to answer the following question:

Question 1: What properties P describes the ideal structure of $A \rtimes_\alpha G$?

During this talk, the hope is that we will provide some answers to this question.
Answering question 1 in the above form is <u>hard</u>.

Instead, we break it into special cases Some cases discussed today will be:

- Which properties P answers Question 1 when A is abelian?
- Which properties P answers Question 1 when G is abelian?
- Which properties P answers Question 1 when $A = \mathbb{C}$?
- Which properties P answers Question 1 when G is discrete?

And of course, we have overlaps between the above cases.

Table of Contents

Disclaimer

Disclaimer

This will be very   for all of you.

Disclaimer

This will be very educational for all of you.

Disclaimer

This is a slide: This will be very educational for all of you. But *maybe* not that much fun for some of you.

A short primer on C^*-dynamical systems.

A short primer on C^*-dynamical systems.

Lots of prerequisite theory needed to understand todays talk.

A short primer on C^*-dynamical systems.

Lots of prerequisite theory needed to understand todays talk. **Not** possible to cover all.

Lots of prerequisite theory needed to understand todays talk. **Not** possible to cover all.

Definitin

An abstract C^*-algebra A is a Banach algebra A equipped with an involution such that

$$\|a\|^2 = \|a^* a\|,$$

for all $a \in A$.

Lots of prerequisite theory needed to understand todays talk. **Not** possible to cover all.

Definitin

An abstract C^*-algebra A is a Banach algebra A equipped with an involution such that

$$\|a\|^2 = \|a^*a\|,$$

for all $a \in A$.

Notable examples include

Lots of prerequisite theory needed to understand todays talk. **Not** possible to cover all.

Definitin

An abstract C^*-algebra A is a Banach algebra A equipped with an involution such that

$$\|a\|^2 = \|a^* a\|,$$

for all $a \in A$.

Notable examples include

- The algebra $C_0(X)$ of continuous functions vanishing at infinity on a locally compact Hausdorff space X.

A short primer on C^*-dynamical systems.

Lots of prerequisite theory needed to understand todays talk. **Not** possible to cover all.

Definitin

An abstract C^*-algebra A is a Banach algebra A equipped with an involution such that

$$\|a\|^2 = \|a^* a\|,$$

for all $a \in A$.

Notable examples include

- The algebra $C_0(X)$ of continuous functions vanishing at infinity on a locally compact Hausdorff space X.
- The algebra $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of bounded linear operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.

A short primer on C^*-dynamical systems.

Lots of prerequisite theory needed to understand todays talk. **Not** possible to cover all.

Definitin

An abstract C^*-algebra A is a Banach algebra A equipped with an involution such that

$$\|a\|^2 = \|a^*a\|,$$

for all $a \in A$.

Notable examples include

- The algebra $C_0(X)$ of continuous functions vanishing at infinity on a locally compact Hausdorff space X.
- The algebra $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of bounded linear operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.
- The group C^*-algebras $C_r^*(G)$ and $C^*(G)$ of a locally compact Hausdorff group G.

A short primer on C^*-dynamical systems.

Lots of prerequisite theory needed to understand todays talk. **Not** possible to cover all.

Definitin

An abstract C^*-algebra A is a Banach algebra A equipped with an involution such that

$$\|a\|^2 = \|a^* a\|,$$

for all $a \in A$.

Notable examples include

- The algebra $C_0(X)$ of continuous functions vanishing at infinity on a locally compact Hausdorff space X.
- The algebra $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of bounded linear operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.
- The group C^*-algebras $C_r^*(G)$ and $C^*(G)$ of a locally compact Hausdorff group G.

All of these C^*-algebras play a crucial role in the theory of crossed products.

A short primer on C^*-dynamical systems.

Definitin

An abstract C^**-algebra* A is an involutive Banach algebra A satisfying

$$\|a\|^2 = \|a^* a\|,$$

for all $a \in A$.

Definitin

An abstract C^**-algebra* A is an involutive Banach algebra A satisfying

$$\|a\|^2 = \|a^*a\|,$$

for all $a \in A$.

Definition

A *representation* of a C^*-algebra A is a pair $(\pi, \mathcal{H})$ consisting of a bounded $*$-homomorphism $\pi\colon A \to \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

A short primer on C^*-dynamical systems.

Definitin

An abstract C^**-algebra* A is an involutive Banach algebra A satisfying

$$\|a\|^2 = \|a^*a\|,$$

for all $a \in A$.

Definition

A *representation* of a C^*-algebra A is a pair $(\pi, \mathcal{H})$ consisting of a bounded $*$-homomorphism $\pi\colon A \to \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$.

The Gelfand-Neimark-Segal result

The Gelfand-Neimark-Segal result is an important result stating that all C^*-algebras A are faithfully represented on a Hilbert space.

A short primer on topological group theory

Definition

A topological group G is topological space equipped with a group structure such that the maps $G \times G \ni (s, t) \mapsto st$ and $G \ni t \mapsto t^{-1} \in G$ are continuous for all $s, t \in G$.

Definition

A topological group G is topological space equipped with a group structure such that the maps $G \times G \ni (s, t) \mapsto st$ and $G \ni t \mapsto t^{-1} \in G$ are continuous for all $s, t \in G$. By G we will **always** denote a topological group G with a locally compact Hausdorff topology.

Definition

A topological group G is topological space equipped with a group structure such that the maps $G \times G \ni (s, t) \mapsto st$ and $G \ni t \mapsto t^{-1} \in G$ are continuous for all $s, t \in G$. By G we will **always** denote a topological group G with a locally compact Hausdorff topology.

Important cases include $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{R}$ and S^1.

Definition

A topological group G is topological space equipped with a group structure such that the maps $G \times G \ni (s, t) \mapsto st$ and $G \ni t \mapsto t^{-1} \in G$ are continuous for all $s, t \in G$. By G we will **always** denote a topological group G with a locally compact Hausdorff topology.

Important cases include $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{R}$ and S^1. Topological group are important and arises naturally in many fields of mathematics.

A short primer on topological group theory

Definition

A topological group G is topological space equipped with a group structure such that the maps $G \times G \ni (s,t) \mapsto st$ and $G \ni t \mapsto t^{-1} \in G$ are continuous for all $s, t \in G$. By G we will **always** denote a topological group G with a locally compact Hausdorff topology.

Important cases include $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{R}$ and S^1. Topological group are important and arises naturally in many fields of mathematics. We will need results from the theory of **abstract harmonic analysis**, **representation theory** and **Fourier analysis**

A short primer on topological group theory

Definition

A topological group G is topological space equipped with a group structure such that the maps $G \times G \ni (s,t) \mapsto st$ and $G \ni t \mapsto t^{-1} \in G$ are continuous for all $s, t \in G$. By G we will **always** denote a topological group G with a locally compact Hausdorff topology.

Important cases include $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{R}$ and S^1. Topological group are important and arises naturally in many fields of mathematics. We will need results from the theory of **abstract harmonic analysis**, **representation theory** and **Fourier analysis**

Definition

A unitary representation of a group G is a pair $(u, \mathcal{H})$ consisting of a group homomorphism $u\colon G \to \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$ such that for all $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ the map $t \mapsto u_t\xi$ is continuous ($=$ u is strongly continuous).

A short primer on topological group theory

Definition

A topological group G is topological space equipped with a group structure such that the maps $G \times G \ni (s,t) \mapsto st$ and $G \ni t \mapsto t^{-1} \in G$ are continuous for all $s, t \in G$. By G we will **always** denote a topological group G with a locally compact Hausdorff topology.

Definition

A unitary representation of a group G is a pair $(u, \mathcal{H})$ consisting of a group homomorphism $u\colon G \to \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$ such that for all $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ the map $t \mapsto u_t \xi$ is continuous ($=$ u is strongly continuous).

Definition

A topological group G is topological space equipped with a group structure such that the maps $G \times G \ni (s,t) \mapsto st$ and $G \ni t \mapsto t^{-1} \in G$ are continuous for all $s, t \in G$. By G we will **always** denote a topological group G with a locally compact Hausdorff topology.

Definition

A unitary representation of a group G is a pair $(u, \mathcal{H})$ consisting of a group homomorphism $u \colon G \to \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$ such that for all $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ the map $t \mapsto u_t\xi$ is continuous ($=$ u is strongly continuous).

An important example is the *left-regular representation* of G:

Definition

A topological group G is topological space equipped with a group structure such that the maps $G \times G \ni (s,t) \mapsto st$ and $G \ni t \mapsto t^{-1} \in G$ are continuous for all $s,t \in G$. By G we will **always** denote a topological group G with a locally compact Hausdorff topology.

Definition

A unitary representation of a group G is a pair $(u, \mathcal{H})$ consisting of a group homomorphism $u \colon G \to \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$ such that for all $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ the map $t \mapsto u_t \xi$ is continuous ($= u$ is strongly continuous).

An important example is the *left-regular representation* of G:

Definition

The left-regular representation of G is the tuple $(\lambda, L^2(G))$, where

$$\lambda_t \xi(s) = \xi(t^{-1}s),$$

for $\xi \in L^2(G)$ and $s,t \in G$.

The perhaps shortest primer on C^*-dynamical systems

Definition

A C^**-dynamical system* is a triple (A, G, α) consisting of

Definition

A *C^*-dynamical system* is a triple (A, G, α) consisting of

- A C^*-algebra A,

The perhaps shortest primer on C^*-dynamical systems

Definition

A C^**-dynamical system* is a triple (A, G, α) consisting of

- A C^*-algebra A,
- A topological group G and

Definition

A *C^*-dynamical system* is a triple (A, G, α) consisting of

- A C^*-algebra A,
- A topological group G and
- a strongly continuous group homomorphism $\alpha\colon G \to \mathrm{Aut}(A)$
  $(\forall a \in A : G \ni t \mapsto \alpha_t(a) \in A$ is continuous$)$.

Definition

A *C^*-dynamical system* is a triple (A, G, α) consisting of

- A C^*-algebra A,
- A topological group G and
- a strongly continuous group homomorphism $\alpha\colon G \to \mathrm{Aut}(A)$ ($\forall a \in A : G \ni t \mapsto \alpha_t(a) \in A$ is continuous).

The perhaps shortest primer on C^*-dynamical systems

Definition

A *C^*-dynamical system* is a triple (A, G, α) consisting of

- A C^*-algebra A,
- A topological group G and
- a strongly continuous group homomorphism $\alpha\colon G \to \mathrm{Aut}(A)$ $(\forall a \in A : G \ni t \mapsto \alpha_t(a) \in A$ is continuous).

Definition

A covariant representation of (A, G, α) is a triple $(\pi, u, \mathcal{H})$ consisting of representations of A and G as bounded operators on a common Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ satisfying the relation

$$u_t \pi(a) u_t^* = \pi(\alpha_t(a)) \text{ for all } a \in A \text{ and } t \in G.$$

The perhaps shortest primer on C^*-dynamical systems

Definition

A *C^*-dynamical system* is a triple (A, G, α) consisting of

- A C^*-algebra A,
- A topological group G and
- a strongly continuous group homomorphism $\alpha\colon G \to \mathrm{Aut}(A)$ $(\forall a \in A : G \ni t \mapsto \alpha_t(a) \in A$ is continuous$)$.

Definition

A covariant representation of (A, G, α) is a triple $(\pi, u, \mathcal{H})$ consisting of representations of A and G as bounded operators on a common Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ satisfying the relation

$$u_t\pi(a)u_t^* = \pi(\alpha_t(a)) \text{ for all } a \in A \text{ and } t \in G.$$

When G is discrete and A is unital, it is easy to associate to such a triple a **nice** new C^*-algebra:

Discrete crossed product cookbook recipe

Discrete crossed product cookbook recipe

1. Given (A, G, α) with G discrete and A unital, consider the $*$-algebra

$$C_c(G, A) = \left\{ \sum_{t \in F} a_t \delta_t \mid F \subseteq G \text{ finite} \right\}.$$

Discrete crossed product cookbook recipe

1. Given (A, G, α) with G discrete and A unital, consider the $*$-algebra

$$C_c(G, A) = \left\{ \sum_{t \in F} a_t \delta_t \mid F \subseteq G \text{ finite} \right\}.$$

2. Pick a covariant representation $(\pi, u, \mathcal{H})$ of (A, G, α).

Discrete crossed product cookbook recipe

1. Given (A, G, α) with G discrete and A unital, consider the $*$-algebra
$$C_c(G, A) = \left\{ \sum_{t \in F} a_t \delta_t \mid F \subseteq G \text{ finite} \right\}.$$
2. Pick a covariant representation $(\pi, u, \mathcal{H})$ of (A, G, α).
3. Define a representation $\pi \rtimes u$ of $C_c(G, A)$ as operators on $\mathcal{H}$ by
$$\pi \rtimes u \left(\sum a_t \delta_t \right) := \sum \pi(a_t) u_t.$$

Cooking with C^*-algebras

Discrete crossed product cookbook recipe

1. Given (A, G, α) with G discrete and A unital, consider the $*$-algebra

$$C_c(G, A) = \left\{ \sum_{t \in F} a_t \delta_t \mid F \subseteq G \text{ finite} \right\}.$$

2. Pick a covariant representation $(\pi, u, \mathcal{H})$ of (A, G, α).
3. Define a representation $\pi \rtimes u$ of $C_c(G, A)$ as operators on $\mathcal{H}$ by

$$\pi \rtimes u \left(\sum a_t \delta_t \right) := \sum \pi(a_t) u_t.$$

4. Take the closure of $\pi \rtimes u(C_c(G, A))$ to obtain a C^*-algebra encoding some information about the dynamical system (A, G, α).

Discrete crossed product cookbook recipe

1. Given (A, G, α) with G discrete and A unital, consider the $*$-algebra
$$C_c(G, A) = \left\{ \sum_{t \in F} a_t \delta_t \mid F \subseteq G \text{ finite} \right\}.$$
2. Pick a covariant representation $(\pi, u, \mathcal{H})$ of (A, G, α).
3. Define a representation $\pi \rtimes u$ of $C_c(G, A)$ as operators on $\mathcal{H}$ by
$$\pi \rtimes u \left(\sum a_t \delta_t \right) := \sum \pi(a_t) u_t.$$
4. Take the closure of $\pi \rtimes u(C_c(G, A))$ to obtain a C^*-algebra encoding some information about the dynamical system (A, G, α).

This is the building stone for constructing crossed products.

Discrete crossed product cookbook recipe

1. Given (A, G, α) with G discrete and A unital, consider the $*$-algebra
$$C_c(G, A) = \left\{ \sum_{t \in F} a_t \delta_t \mid F \subseteq G \text{ finite} \right\}.$$
2. Pick a covariant representation $(\pi, u, \mathcal{H})$ of (A, G, α).
3. Define a representation $\pi \rtimes u$ of $C_c(G, A)$ as operators on $\mathcal{H}$ by
$$\pi \rtimes u \left(\sum a_t \delta_t \right) := \sum \pi(a_t) u_t.$$
4. Take the closure of $\pi \rtimes u(C_c(G, A))$ to obtain a C^*-algebra encoding some information about the dynamical system (A, G, α).

This is the building stone for constructing crossed products. Fails when G is non-discrete.

Table of Contents

An interlude - how do we proceed?

An interlude - how do we proceed?

As previously discussed, we have a goal:

An interlude - how do we proceed?

As previously discussed, we have a goal: To describe the ideal structure of general crossed products by means of certain properties.

An interlude - how do we proceed?

As previously discussed, we have a goal: To describe the ideal structure of general crossed products by means of certain properties.

To reach this goal today (we hope), we lay out the following plan for today:

An interlude - how do we proceed?

As previously discussed, we have a goal: To describe the ideal structure of general crossed products by means of certain properties.

To reach this goal today (we hope), we lay out the following plan for today:

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
11.
12.
13.

An interlude - how do we proceed?

As previously discussed, we have a goal: To describe the ideal structure of general crossed products by means of certain properties.

To reach this goal today (we hope), we lay out the following plan for today:

1. Cover the construction of the crossed product in the general case.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
11.
12.
13.

An interlude - how do we proceed?

As previously discussed, we have a goal: To describe the ideal structure of general crossed products by means of certain properties.

To reach this goal today (we hope), we lay out the following plan for today:

1. Cover the construction of the crossed product in the general case.
2. Proceed with describing the ideal structure.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
11.
12.
13.

An interlude - how do we proceed?

As previously discussed, we have a goal: To describe the ideal structure of general crossed products by means of certain properties.

To reach this goal today (we hope), we lay out the following plan for today:

1. Cover the construction of the crossed product in the general case.
2. Proceed with describing the ideal structure.
3. Conclusion.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
11.
12.
13.

An interlude - how do we proceed?

As previously discussed, we have a goal: To describe the ideal structure of general crossed products by means of certain properties.

To reach this goal today (we hope), we lay out the following plan for today:

1. Cover the construction of the crossed product in the general case.
2. Proceed with describing the ideal structure.
3. Conclusion.

The issue with non-discrete groups

The issue with non-discrete groups

- The goal: Given (A, G, α) and a covariant representation $(\pi, u, \mathcal{H})$, we wish to construct a represention $\pi \rtimes u$ of $C_c(G, A)$ on $\mathcal{H}$.

The issue with non-discrete groups

- The goal: Given (A, G, α) and a covariant representation $(\pi, u, \mathcal{H})$, we wish to construct a represention $\pi \rtimes u$ of $C_c(G, A)$ on $\mathcal{H}$.
- The model: given $f \in C_c(G, A)$ we want

$$\pi \rtimes u(f) = \int_G \pi(f(s) u_s \mathrm{d}s \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$$

The issue with non-discrete groups

- The goal: Given (A, G, α) and a covariant representation $(\pi, u, \mathcal{H})$, we wish to construct a represention $\pi \rtimes u$ of $C_c(G, A)$ on $\mathcal{H}$.
- The model: given $f \in C_c(G, A)$ we want

$$\pi \rtimes u(f) = \int_G \pi(f(s)u_s \mathrm{d}s \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$$

- The issue?

The issue with non-discrete groups

- The goal: Given (A, G, α) and a covariant representation $(\pi, u, \mathcal{H})$, we wish to construct a represention $\pi \rtimes u$ of $C_c(G, A)$ on $\mathcal{H}$.
- The model: given $f \in C_c(G, A)$ we want

$$\pi \rtimes u(f) = \int_G \pi(f(s) u_s \mathrm{d}s \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$$

- The issue? Is the map $s \mapsto \pi(f(s))u_s$ continuous? Is this integral well-defined?

The issue with non-discrete groups

- The goal: Given (A, G, α) and a covariant representation $(\pi, u, \mathcal{H})$, we wish to construct a represention $\pi \rtimes u$ of $C_c(G, A)$ on $\mathcal{H}$.
- The model: given $f \in C_c(G, A)$ we want

$$\pi \rtimes u(f) = \int_G \pi(f(s)u_s \mathrm{d}s \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$$

- The issue? Is the map $s \mapsto \pi(f(s))u_s$ continuous? Is this integral well-defined?

The solution? Multiplier algebra $M(A)$ of A:

The issue with non-discrete groups

The solution? The multiplier algebra $M(A)$ of A:

The issue with non-discrete groups

The solution? The multiplier algebra $M(A)$ of A: We equip it with a topology; the *strict topology* (denoted by $M_s(A)$).

The issue with non-discrete groups

The solution? The multiplier algebra $M(A)$ of A: We equip it with a topology; the *strict topology* (denoted by $M_s(A)$).

Theorem

Let A be a C^*-algebra. Then there is a unique linear map $\int \colon C_c(G, M_s(A)) \to M(A)$ such that for all non-degenerate representations $\pi \colon A \to \mathbb{B}(H)$, $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$ and $f \in C_c(G, M_s(A))$ we have

$$\langle \overline{\pi}\left(\int(f)\right)\xi, \eta\rangle = \int_G \langle \overline{\pi}(f(s))\xi, \eta\rangle \mathrm{d}s.$$

And we write $\int(f) := \int_G f(s)\mathrm{d}s$.

The issue with non-discrete groups

- The goal: Given (A, G, α) and a covariant representation $(\pi, u, \mathcal{H})$, we wish to construct a represention $\pi \rtimes u$ of $C_c(G, A)$ on $\mathcal{H}$.
- The model: given $f \in C_c(G, A)$ we want

$$\pi \rtimes u(f) = \int_G \pi(f(s) u_s \mathrm{d}s \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$$

- The issue? Is the map $s \mapsto \pi(f(s))u_s$ continuous? Is this integral well-defined?

The solution? Multiplier algebra $M(A)$ of A:

The issue with non-discrete groups

- The goal: Given (A, G, α) and a covariant representation $(\pi, u, \mathcal{H})$, we wish to construct a represention $\pi \rtimes u$ of $C_c(G, A)$ on $\mathcal{H}$.
- The model: given $f \in C_c(G, A)$ we want

$$\pi \rtimes u(f) = \int_G \pi(f(s)u_s \mathrm{d}s \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$$

- The issue? Is the map $s \mapsto \pi(f(s))u_s$ continuous? Is this integral well-defined?

The solution? Multiplier algebra $M(A)$ of A:

$$G \ni s \mapsto \pi(f(s))u_s \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$$

is strictly continuous for all $f \in C_c(G, A)$.

The issue with non-discrete groups

- The goal: Given (A, G, α) and a covariant representation $(\pi, u, \mathcal{H})$, we wish to construct a represention $\pi \rtimes u$ of $C_c(G, A)$ on $\mathcal{H}$.
- The model: given $f \in C_c(G, A)$ we want

$$\pi \rtimes u(f) = \int_G \pi(f(s) u_s \mathrm{d}s \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$$

- The issue? Is the map $s \mapsto \pi(f(s))u_s$ continuous? Is this integral well-defined?

The solution? Multiplier algebra $M(A)$ of A:

$$G \ni s \mapsto \pi(f(s))u_s \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{H})$$

is strictly continuous for all $f \in C_c(G, A)$. We set

$$\pi \rtimes u(f) := \int (\pi(f)u) = \int_G \pi(f(s))u_s \mathrm{d}s.$$

The crossed product construction

The crossed product construction

Definition

The *full crossed product* of (A, G, α) is the C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_\alpha G$ obtained by taking the closure of $C_c(G, A)$ with respect to the norm

$$\|f\|_u = \sup \{\|\pi \rtimes u(f)\| \mid (\pi, u, \mathcal{H}) \text{ is a (non-degenerate) covariant representation}\}$$

The crossed product construction

Definition

The *full crossed product* of (A, G, α) is the C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_\alpha G$ obtained by taking the closure of $C_c(G, A)$ with respect to the norm

$$\|f\|_u = \sup\{\|\pi \rtimes u(f)\| \mid (\pi, u, \mathcal{H}) \text{ is a (non-degenerate) covariant representation}\}$$

Theorem

There is a faithful homomorphism $A \hookrightarrow M(A \rtimes_\alpha G)$ and an injective strictly continuous group homomorphism $U\colon G \to \mathcal{U}(M(A \rtimes_\alpha G))$ such that for $a \in A$, $s, r \in G$ and $f \in C_c(G, A)$

$$af(s) = af(s), \quad U_r f(s) = \alpha_r(f(r^{-1}s)) \text{ and } \alpha_r(a) = U_r a U_r^*.$$

The crossed product construction

Definition

The *full crossed product* of (A, G, α) is the C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_\alpha G$ obtained by taking the closure of $C_c(G, A)$ with respect to the norm

$$\|f\|_u = \sup\{\|\pi \rtimes u(f)\| \mid (\pi, u, \mathcal{H}) \text{ is a (non-degenerate) covariant representation}\}$$

Theorem

There is a faithful homomorphism $A \hookrightarrow M(A \rtimes_\alpha G)$ and an injective strictly continuous group homomorphism $U\colon G \to \mathcal{U}(M(A \rtimes_\alpha G))$ such that for $a \in A$, $s, r \in G$ and $f \in C_c(G, A)$

$$af(s) = af(s), \quad U_r f(s) = \alpha_r(f(r^{-1}s)) \text{ and } \alpha_r(a) = U_r a U_r^*.$$

Theorem

The diagram commutes for all non-degenerate covariant representations $(\pi, u, \mathcal{H})$.

The crossed product construction

Definition

The *full crossed product* of (A, G, α) is the C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_\alpha G$ obtained by taking the closure of $C_c(G, A)$ with respect to the norm

$$\|f\|_u = \sup \{ \|\pi \rtimes u(f)\| \mid (\pi, u, \mathcal{H}) \text{ is a (non-degenerate) covariant representation} \}$$

Theorem

There is a faithful homomorphism $A \hookrightarrow M(A \rtimes_\alpha G)$ and an injective strictly continuous group homomorphism $U \colon G \to \mathcal{U}(M(A \rtimes_\alpha G))$ such that for $a \in A$, $s, r \in G$ and $f \in C_c(G, A)$

$$af(s) = af(s), \quad U_r f(s) = \alpha_r(f(r^{-1}s)) \text{ and } \alpha_r(a) = U_r a U_r^*.$$

Theorem

The diagram commutes for all non-degenerate covariant representations $(\pi, u, \mathcal{H})$.

Makes up for lack of copies inside $A \rtimes_\alpha G$.

The reduced crossed product construction

The reduced crossed product construction

The previous construction is the 'large' crossed product. We also have a small one.

The reduced crossed product construction

The previous construction is the 'large' crossed product. We also have a small one.

Definition

Let $(\pi, \mathcal{H})$ be a faithful representation of A. Then we may define a representation $(\tilde{\pi}, L^2(G, \mathcal{H})$ by $\tilde{\pi}(a)\xi(s) = \pi(\alpha_{r^{-1}}(a))\xi(r)$ for $\xi \in L^2(G, \mathcal{H})$ and $r \in G$.

The reduced crossed product construction

The previous construction is the 'large' crossed product. We also have a small one.

Definition

Let $(\pi, \mathcal{H})$ be a faithful representation of A. Then we may define a representation $(\tilde{\pi}, L^2(G, \mathcal{H})$ by $\tilde{\pi}(a)\xi(s) = \pi(\alpha_{r^{-1}}(a))\xi(r)$ for $\xi \in L^2(G, \mathcal{H})$ and $r \in G$.
Abusing notation, λ will also denote the representation of G on $L^2(G, H)$ given by

$$\lambda_s \xi(r) = \xi(s^{-1} r).$$

The reduced crossed product construction

The previous construction is the 'large' crossed product. We also have a small one.

Definition

Let $(\pi, \mathcal{H})$ be a faithful representation of A. Then we may define a representation $(\tilde{\pi}, L^2(G, \mathcal{H})$ by $\tilde{\pi}(a)\xi(s) = \pi(\alpha_{r^{-1}}(a))\xi(r)$ for $\xi \in L^2(G, \mathcal{H})$ and $r \in G$.
Abusing notation, λ will also denote the representation of G on $L^2(G, H)$ given by

$$\lambda_s \xi(r) = \xi(s^{-1}r).$$

Lemma

The triple $(\tilde{\pi}, \lambda, L^2(G, \mathcal{H}))$ is a covariant representation.

The reduced crossed product construction

The previous construction is the 'large' crossed product. We also have a small one.

Lemma

The triple $(\tilde{\pi}, \lambda, L^2(G, \mathcal{H}))$ is a covariant representation.

The reduced crossed product construction

The previous construction is the 'large' crossed product. We also have a small one.

Lemma

The triple $(\tilde{\pi}, \lambda, L^2(G, \mathcal{H}))$ is a covariant representation.

Theorem

If $\tilde{\pi}$ is faithful (non-degenerate) then $\tilde{\pi} \rtimes \lambda$ is faithful (non-degenerate).

The reduced crossed product construction

The previous construction is the 'large' crossed product. We also have a small one.

Lemma

The triple $(\tilde{\pi}, \lambda, L^2(G, \mathcal{H}))$ is a covariant representation.

Theorem

If $\tilde{\pi}$ is faithful (non-degenerate) then $\tilde{\pi} \rtimes \lambda$ is faithful (non-degenerate).

Definition

The reduced crossed product is the C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$ obtained by taking the closure of $\tilde{\pi} \rtimes \lambda(C_c(G, A))$ in $\mathbb{B}(L^2(G, \mathcal{H}))$ where π is any faithful non-degenerate representation of A on $\mathcal{H}$.

The reduced crossed product construction

The previous construction is the 'large' crossed product. We also have a small one.

Lemma

The triple $(\tilde{\pi}, \lambda, L^2(G, \mathcal{H}))$ is a covariant representation.

Theorem

If $\tilde{\pi}$ is faithful (non-degenerate) then $\tilde{\pi} \rtimes \lambda$ is faithful (non-degenerate).

Definition

The reduced crossed product is the C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$ obtained by taking the closure of $\tilde{\pi} \rtimes \lambda(C_c(G, A))$ in $\mathbb{B}(L^2(G, \mathcal{H}))$ where π is any faithful non-degenerate representation of A on $\mathcal{H}$.

$A \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$ is much more concretely defined than $A \rtimes_\alpha G$, and thus easier to work with.

The reduced crossed product construction

The previous construction is the 'large' crossed product. We also have a small one.

Lemma

The triple $(\tilde{\pi}, \lambda, L^2(G, \mathcal{H}))$ is a covariant representation.

Theorem

If $\tilde{\pi}$ is faithful (non-degenerate) then $\tilde{\pi} \rtimes \lambda$ is faithful (non-degenerate).

Definition

The reduced crossed product is the C^*-algebra $A \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$ obtained by taking the closure of $\tilde{\pi} \rtimes \lambda(C_c(G, A))$ in $\mathbb{B}(L^2(G, \mathcal{H}))$ where π is any faithful non-degenerate representation of A on $\mathcal{H}$.

$A \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$ is much more concretely defined than $A \rtimes_\alpha G$, and thus easier to work with.

Theorem

If G is amenable (=admits left-invariant mean), then $A \rtimes_\alpha G \cong A \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$

Table of Contents

Techniques for determining the ideal structure of an abstract C^*-algebra can be hard.

Techniques for determining the ideal structure of an abstract C^*-algebra can be hard.
Further assumptions can help, but might not hold generally

Techniques for determining the ideal structure of an abstract C^*-algebra can be hard. Further assumptions can help, but might not hold generally

Result for general simplicity

Suppose that A is a unital C^*-algebra equipped with a faithful tracial state τ. If to each $a \in A$ it holds that

$$\overline{\mathrm{conv}\,\{uau^* \mid u \text{ unitary}\}} \cap \mathbb{C}1 \neq \emptyset,$$

then A is simple

Techniques for determining the ideal structure of an abstract C^*-algebra can be hard. Further assumptions can help, but might not hold generally

Result for general simplicity

Suppose that A is a unital C^*-algebra equipped with a faithful tracial state τ. If to each $a \in A$ it holds that

$$\overline{\mathrm{conv}\,\{uau^* \mid u \text{ unitary}\}} \cap \mathbb{C}1 \neq \emptyset,$$

then A is simple

Works for group C^*-algebras of discrete groups, but $A \rtimes_\alpha G$ is not unital for non-discrete groups

Techniques for determining the ideal structure of an abstract C^*-algebra can be hard. Further assumptions can help, but might not hold generally

Result for general simplicity

Suppose that A is a <u>unital</u> C^*-algebra equipped with a faithful tracial state τ. If to each $a \in A$ it holds that

$$\overline{\operatorname{conv}\{uau^* \mid u \text{ unitary}\}} \cap \mathbb{C}1 \neq \emptyset,$$

then A is simple

Works for group C^*-algebras of discrete groups, but $A \rtimes_\alpha G$ is not unital for non-discrete groups

Need a less general approach to answer Question 1.

Table of Contents

The case of G abelian

The case of G abelian

The goal of today was to find properties P answering our initial question.

The case of G abelian

The goal of today was to find properties P answering our initial question.

When G is abelian, we have a rich theory drawing on the strengths of abstract harmonic analysis whenever $G \overset{\alpha}{\curvearrowright} A$:

The case of G abelian

The goal of today was to find properties P answering our initial question.

When G is abelian, we have a rich theory drawing on the strengths of abstract harmonic analysis whenever $G \overset{\alpha}{\curvearrowright} A$:

- $\rightsquigarrow \widehat{G} \overset{\widehat{\alpha}}{\curvearrowright} A \rtimes_\alpha G$, $\widehat{\alpha}_\chi(f)(s) = \chi(s) f(s)$.

The goal of today was to find properties P answering our initial question.
When G is abelian, we have a rich theory drawing on the strengths of abstract harmonic analysis whenever $G \overset{\alpha}{\curvearrowright} A$:

- $\rightsquigarrow \widehat{G} \overset{\widehat{\alpha}}{\curvearrowright} A \rtimes_\alpha G$, $\widehat{\alpha}_\chi(f)(s) = \chi(s)f(s)$.
- $\rightsquigarrow$ a duality theory called Takai duality;

$$(A \rtimes_\alpha G \rtimes_{\widehat{\alpha}} \widehat{G}, G, \widehat{\widehat{\alpha}}) \cong (A \otimes \mathbb{K}(L^2(G)), G, \alpha \otimes \mathrm{Ad}\rho)$$

The case of G abelian

The goal of today was to find properties P answering our initial question.
When G is abelian, we have a rich theory drawing on the strengths of abstract harmonic analysis whenever $G \overset{\alpha}{\curvearrowright} A$:

- $\rightsquigarrow \widehat{G} \overset{\widehat{\alpha}}{\curvearrowright} A \rtimes_\alpha G$, $\widehat{\alpha}_\chi(f)(s) = \chi(s) f(s)$.
- $\rightsquigarrow$ a duality theory called Takai duality;

$$(A \rtimes_\alpha G \rtimes_{\widehat{\alpha}} \widehat{G}, G, \widehat{\widehat{\alpha}}) \cong (A \otimes \mathbb{K}(L^2(G)), G, \alpha \otimes \mathrm{Ad}\rho)$$

Definition

The Arveson spectrum of α is the set

$$\mathrm{Sp}(\alpha) := \left\{ \chi \in \widehat{G} \;\middle|\; \alpha_f = 0 \text{ implies } \widehat{f}(\chi) = 0 \text{ for all } f \in L^1(G) \right\}$$

The case of G abelian

- $G \overset{\alpha}{\curvearrowright} A \rightsquigarrow \widehat{G} \overset{\widehat{\alpha}}{\curvearrowright} A \rtimes_\alpha G$, $\widehat{\alpha}_\chi(f)(s) = \chi(s)f(s)$.

Definition

The Arveson spectrum of α is the set

$$\mathrm{Sp}(\alpha) := \left\{\chi \in \widehat{G} \;\middle|\; \alpha_f = 0 \text{ implies } \widehat{f}(\chi) = 0 \text{ for all } f \in L^1(G)\right\}$$

The case of G abelian

- $G \overset{\alpha}{\curvearrowright} A \rightsquigarrow \widehat{G} \overset{\widehat{\alpha}}{\curvearrowright} A \rtimes_\alpha G$, $\widehat{\alpha}_\chi(f)(s) = \chi(s) f(s)$.

Definition

The Arveson spectrum of α is the set

$$\mathrm{Sp}(\alpha) := \left\{ \chi \in \widehat{G} \;\middle|\; \alpha_f = 0 \text{ implies } \widehat{f}(\chi) = 0 \text{ for all } f \in L^1(G) \right\}$$

Here α_f is the weak*-integral of f in A

The case of G abelian

- $G \overset{\alpha}{\curvearrowright} A \rightsquigarrow \widehat{G} \overset{\widehat{\alpha}}{\curvearrowright} A \rtimes_\alpha G$, $\widehat{\alpha}_\chi(f)(s) = \chi(s)f(s)$.

Definition

The Arveson spectrum of α is the set

$$\mathrm{Sp}(\alpha) := \left\{\chi \in \widehat{G} \mid \alpha_f = 0 \text{ implies } \widehat{f}(\chi) = 0 \text{ for all } f \in L^1(G)\right\}$$

Here α_f is the weak*-integral of f in A

Definition

The Connes spectrum $\widehat{G}(\alpha)$ of the action $\widehat{G}$ is the set

$$\bigcap_{D \in H^\alpha(A)} \mathrm{Sp}(\alpha|_D)$$

The case of G abelian

Definition

The Connes spectrum $\widehat{G}(\alpha)$ of the action $\widehat{G}$ is the set

$$\bigcap_{D \in H^{\alpha}(A)} \mathrm{Sp}(\alpha|_D)$$

The case of G abelian

Definition

The Connes spectrum $\widehat{G}(\alpha)$ of the action $\widehat{G}$ is the set

$$\bigcap_{D \in H^{\alpha}(A)} \mathrm{Sp}(\alpha|_D)$$

Turns out that the Connes spectrum encodes quite a bit of information about the dynamical system, the action and the crossed product.

The case of G abelian

Definition

The Connes spectrum $\widehat{G}(\alpha)$ of the action $\widehat{G}$ is the set

$$\bigcap_{D \in H^{\alpha}(A)} \mathrm{Sp}(\alpha|_D)$$

Turns out that the Connes spectrum encodes quite a bit of information about the dynamical system, the action and the crossed product.

Theorem

Suppose that G is discrete and abelian. Then the following are equivalent;

1. $A \rtimes_\alpha G$ is simple (!),
2. a. A is G-simple and b. $\widehat{G}(\alpha) = \widehat{G}$.

The case of G abelian

Definition

The Connes spectrum $\widehat{G}(\alpha)$ of the action $\widehat{G}$ is the set

$$\bigcap_{D \in H^{\alpha}(A)} \mathrm{Sp}(\alpha|_D)$$

Turns out that the Connes spectrum encodes quite a bit of information about the dynamical system, the action and the crossed product.

Theorem

Suppose that G is discrete and abelian. Then the following are equivalent;

1. $A \rtimes_\alpha G$ is simple (!),
2. a. A is G-simple and b. $\widehat{G}(\alpha) = \widehat{G}$.

Was the first result in a series of Olesen and Pedersen about ideals in $A \rtimes_\alpha G$.

Definition

The Connes spectrum $\widehat{G}(\alpha)$ of the action $\widehat{G}$ is the set

$$\bigcap_{D \in H^{\alpha}(A)} \mathrm{Sp}(\alpha|_D)$$

Turns out that the Connes spectrum encodes quite a bit of information about the dynamical system, the action and the crossed product.

Theorem

Suppose that G is discrete and abelian. Then the following are equivalent;

1. $A \rtimes_\alpha G$ is simple (!),
2. a. A is G-simple and b. $\widehat{G}(\alpha) = \widehat{G}$.

Was the first result in a series of Olesen and Pedersen about ideals in $A \rtimes_\alpha G$. The spectra helped connecting various theories and techniques together.

The case of G abelian

Turns out that the Connes spectrum encodes quite a bit of information about the dynamical system, the action and the crossed product.

Theorem

Suppose that G is discrete and abelian. Then the following are equivalent;

1. $A \rtimes_\alpha G$ is simple (!),
2. a. A is G-simple and b. $\widehat{G}(\alpha) = \widehat{G}$.

The case of G abelian

Turns out that the Connes spectrum encodes quite a bit of information about the dynamical system, the action and the crossed product.

Theorem

Suppose that G is discrete and abelian. Then the following are equivalent;

1. $A \rtimes_\alpha G$ is simple (!),
2. a. A is G-simple and b. $\widehat{G}(\alpha) = \widehat{G}$.

Theorem

The following are equivalent

1. $\widehat{G}(\alpha) = \widehat{G}$.
2. For each $\sigma \in \widehat{G}$ and each non-zero ideal $I \subseteq A \rtimes_\alpha G$ we have $I \cap \widehat{\alpha}_\sigma(I) \neq 0$.
3. For each non-zero ideal $I \subseteq A \rtimes_\alpha G$ there is a non-zero $\widehat{G}$-invariant ideal $I_0 \subseteq I$.
4. A detects ideals in $A \rtimes_\alpha G$.

Table of Contents

The case of $A = C_0(X)$ abelian and G discrete

The case of $A = C_0(X)$ abelian and G discrete

Some years after the results of Olesen and Pedersen, a new result emerged;

The case of $A = C_0(X)$ abelian and G discrete

Some years after the results of Olesen and Pedersen, a new result emerged; the Archbold-Spielberg result.

The case of $A = C_0(X)$ abelian and G discrete

Some years after the results of Olesen and Pedersen, a new result emerged; the Archbold-Spielberg result.

There is a one-to-one correspondance

$$\{\text{Topological dynamical systems}\} \leftrightarrow \{C^*\text{-dynamical abelian systems}\}$$
$$\{(X, G)\} \leftrightarrow \{(C_0(X), G, \alpha)\}$$

The case of $A = C_0(X)$ abelian and G discrete

Some years after the results of Olesen and Pedersen, a new result emerged; the Archbold-Spielberg result.

There is a one-to-one correspondance

$$\{\text{Topological dynamical systems}\} \leftrightarrow \{C^*\text{-dynamical abelian systems}\}$$
$$\{(X, G)\} \leftrightarrow \{(C_0(X), G, \alpha)\}$$

Definition

The action α is topologically free if the set

$$G_x := \{t \in G \mid t.x = x\}$$

has dense complement for each $x \in X$

The case of $A = C_0(X)$ abelian and G discrete

Definition

The action α is topologically free if the set

$$G_x := \{t \in G \mid t.x = x\}$$

has dense complement for each $x \in X$

The case of $A = C_0(X)$ abelian and G discrete

Definition

The action α is topologically free if the set

$$G_x := \{t \in G \mid t.x = x\}$$

has dense complement for each $x \in X$

Archbold-Spielberg for commutative C^*-algebra

The algebra $C_0(X) \rtimes_\alpha G$ is simple if and only if α is topologically free, minimal and $A \rtimes_\alpha G \cong A \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$ via a regular representation $\tilde{\pi} \rtimes \lambda$.

Table of Contents

A recent application (G discrete)

A recent application (G discrete)

Recently ($=$ within the last 5 years), the field studying C^*-simplicity of groups has seen tremendous development.

A recent application (G discrete)

Recently (= within the last 5 years), the field studying C^*-simplicity of groups has seen tremendous development. Why?

A recent application (G discrete)

Recently (= within the last 5 years), the field studying C^*-simplicity of groups has seen tremendous development. Why? A series of result connecting results about

A recent application (G discrete)

Recently (= within the last 5 years), the field studying C^*-simplicity of groups has seen tremendous development. Why? A series of result connecting results about

- Group C^*-algebras,

A recent application (G discrete)

Recently (= within the last 5 years), the field studying C^*-simplicity of groups has seen tremendous development. Why? A series of result connecting results about

- Group C^*-algebras,
- Crossed products,

A recent application (G discrete)

Recently (= within the last 5 years), the field studying C^*-simplicity of groups has seen tremendous development. Why? A series of result connecting results about

- Group C^*-algebras,
- Crossed products,
- Boundary actions and

A recent application (G discrete)

Recently ($=$ within the last 5 years), the field studying C^*-simplicity of groups has seen tremendous development. Why? A series of result connecting results about

- Group C^*-algebras,
- Crossed products,
- Boundary actions and
- Topological freeness.

A recent application (G discrete)

Recently (= within the last 5 years), the field studying C^*-simplicity of groups has seen tremendous development. Why? A series of result connecting results about

- Group C^*-algebras,
- Crossed products,
- Boundary actions and
- Topological freeness.

What happened?

A recent application (G discrete)

Recently ($=$ within the last 5 years), the field studying C^*-simplicity of groups has seen tremendous development. Why? A series of result connecting results about

- Group C^*-algebras,
- Crossed products,
- Boundary actions and
- Topological freeness.

What happened?

- Kennedy and Kalantar paper was released

A recent application (G discrete)

Recently ($=$ within the last 5 years), the field studying C^*-simplicity of groups has seen tremendous development. Why? A series of result connecting results about

- Group C^*-algebras,
- Crossed products,
- Boundary actions and
- Topological freeness.

What happened?

- Kennedy and Kalantar paper was released
- Gave new angle on old problem; How do we describe simplicity of $C_r^*(G)$ by algebraic properties of G?

A recent application (G discrete)

Recently ($=$ within the last 5 years), the field studying C^*-simplicity of groups has seen tremendous development. Why? A series of result connecting results about

- Group C^*-algebras,
- Crossed products,
- Boundary actions and
- Topological freeness.

What happened?

- Kennedy and Kalantar paper was released
- Gave new angle on old problem; How do we describe simplicity of $C_r^*(G)$ by algebraic properties of G?
- Answered question about implications;

$$C_r^*(G) \text{ simple} \implies C_r^*(G) \text{ unique trace} \iff \text{trivial amenable radical of } G.$$

A recent application (G discrete)

- Answered question about implications;

$$C_r^*(G) \text{ simple} \implies C_r^*(G) \text{ unique trace} \iff \text{trivial amenable radical of } G.$$

A recent application (G discrete)

- Answered question about implications;

$$C_r^*(G) \text{ simple } \implies C_r^*(G) \text{ unique trace } \iff \text{trivial amenable radical of } G.$$

Kennedy, Kalantar, Breulliard and Ozawa

The following are equivalent:

1. G is C^*-simple.
2. $C(X) \rtimes_r G$ is simple for all G-boundaries X.
3. $C(\partial_F G) \rtimes_r G$ is simple.
4. The action $G \curvearrowright \partial_F G$ is free.
5. The action $G \curvearrowright \partial_F G$ is topologically free.
6. There is some G-boundary X such that the action is topologically free.
7. Whenever X is a compact minimal G-space, amenability of G_x for some $x \in X$ implies topological freeness of the action on X.
8. If $G \overset{\alpha}{\curvearrowright} A$ with A unital, then $A \rtimes_{\alpha,r} G$ is simple whenever A is G-simple.

Thanks for listening.