

Large scale geometry of automorphism groups

Christian Rosendal,
University of Illinois at Chicago

Permutation groups and transformation semigroups,
Durham, July 2015

Third lecture: Equivariant geometry

The goal of this last lecture is to introduce a number of tools for studying and gauging the geometry of automorphism groups via embeddings into and representations on Banach spaces.

The goal of this last lecture is to introduce a number of tools for studying and gauging the geometry of automorphism groups via embeddings into and representations on Banach spaces.

One reason for studying embeddings of metric spaces into Banach spaces is that these latter have an additional linear structure which gives rise to notions of curvature (or convexity), smoothness and a host of other geometric moduli allowing us to **quantify and qualify** the geometry of the space.

The goal of this last lecture is to introduce a number of tools for studying and gauging the geometry of automorphism groups via embeddings into and representations on Banach spaces.

One reason for studying embeddings of metric spaces into Banach spaces is that these latter have an additional linear structure which gives rise to notions of curvature (or convexity), smoothness and a host of other geometric moduli allowing us to **quantify and qualify** the geometry of the space.

Similarly, linear and affine representations of our groups provides a link to study harmonic-analytic and dynamical features of these.

The goal of this last lecture is to introduce a number of tools for studying and gauging the geometry of automorphism groups via embeddings into and representations on Banach spaces.

One reason for studying embeddings of metric spaces into Banach spaces is that these latter have an additional linear structure which gives rise to notions of curvature (or convexity), smoothness and a host of other geometric moduli allowing us to **quantify and qualify** the geometry of the space.

Similarly, linear and affine representations of our groups provides a link to study harmonic-analytic and dynamical features of these.

Cf. earlier work of T. Tsankov on unitary representations of oligomorphic groups.

Linear and affine representations

Let E be a Banach space and G a topological group. A **continuous isometric linear representation** of G on E is a continuous action

$$\pi: G \curvearrowright E$$

by linear isometries on E .

Linear and affine representations

Let E be a Banach space and G a topological group. A **continuous isometric linear representation** of G on E is a continuous action

$$\pi: G \curvearrowright E$$

by linear isometries on E .

Alternatively, π may be viewed as a continuous homomorphism

$$\pi: G \rightarrow \text{Isom}(E)$$

into the group $\text{Isom}(E)$ of **linear** isometries of E , equipped with the **strong operator topology**,

Linear and affine representations

Let E be a Banach space and G a topological group. A **continuous isometric linear representation** of G on E is a continuous action

$$\pi: G \curvearrowright E$$

by linear isometries on E .

Alternatively, π may be viewed as a continuous homomorphism

$$\pi: G \rightarrow \text{Isom}(E)$$

into the group $\text{Isom}(E)$ of **linear** isometries of E , equipped with the **strong operator topology**, that is, the topology of pointwise convergence on E .

By a classical result of Mazur and Ulam, every surjective isometry $A: E \rightarrow E$ of a Banach space is **affine**, that is, of the form

$$A(\xi) = T(\xi) + \eta_0$$

for some linear isometry T and vector $\eta_0 \in E$.

By a classical result of Mazur and Ulam, every surjective isometry $A: E \rightarrow E$ of a Banach space is **affine**, that is, of the form

$$A(\xi) = T(\xi) + \eta_0$$

for some linear isometry T and vector $\eta_0 \in E$.

It follows that, if $\alpha: G \curvearrowright E$ is an action by isometries, we may decompose it into an isometric linear representation

$$\pi: G \rightarrow \text{Isom}(E)$$

By a classical result of Mazur and Ulam, every surjective isometry $A: E \rightarrow E$ of a Banach space is **affine**, that is, of the form

$$A(\xi) = T(\xi) + \eta_0$$

for some linear isometry T and vector $\eta_0 \in E$.

It follows that, if $\alpha: G \curvearrowright E$ is an action by isometries, we may decompose it into an isometric linear representation

$$\pi: G \rightarrow \text{Isom}(E)$$

and a **cocycle**

$$b: G \rightarrow E.$$

By a classical result of Mazur and Ulam, every surjective isometry $A: E \rightarrow E$ of a Banach space is **affine**, that is, of the form

$$A(\xi) = T(\xi) + \eta_0$$

for some linear isometry T and vector $\eta_0 \in E$.

It follows that, if $\alpha: G \curvearrowright E$ is an action by isometries, we may decompose it into an isometric linear representation

$$\pi: G \rightarrow \text{Isom}(E)$$

and a **cocycle**

$$b: G \rightarrow E.$$

I.e., for $g \in G$ and $\xi \in E$,

$$\alpha(g)\xi = \pi(g)\xi + b(g).$$

In general, given π , for $\alpha(g)\xi = \pi(g)\xi + b(g)$ to define an action, b must satisfy the **cocycle equation**

$$b(gf) = \pi(g)b(f) + b(g)$$

for all $g, f \in G$.

In general, given π , for $\alpha(g)\xi = \pi(g)\xi + b(g)$ to define an action, b must satisfy the **cocycle equation**

$$b(gf) = \pi(g)b(f) + b(g)$$

for all $g, f \in G$.

Also, as $b(g) = \alpha(g)0$ and α is an isometric action,

$$\|b(f) - b(g)\| = \|\alpha(f)0 - \alpha(g)0\| = \|\alpha(g^{-1}f)0 - 0\| = \|b(g^{-1}f)\|.$$

In general, given π , for $\alpha(g)\xi = \pi(g)\xi + b(g)$ to define an action, b must satisfy the **cocycle equation**

$$b(gf) = \pi(g)b(f) + b(g)$$

for all $g, f \in G$.

Also, as $b(g) = \alpha(g)0$ and α is an isometric action,

$$\|b(f) - b(g)\| = \|\alpha(f)0 - \alpha(g)0\| = \|\alpha(g^{-1}f)0 - 0\| = \|b(g^{-1}f)\|.$$

Thus, if α and thus also b are continuous, then b is both **uniformly continuous** and **bornologous**.

In general, given π , for $\alpha(g)\xi = \pi(g)\xi + b(g)$ to define an action, b must satisfy the **cocycle equation**

$$b(gf) = \pi(g)b(f) + b(g)$$

for all $g, f \in G$.

Also, as $b(g) = \alpha(g)0$ and α is an isometric action,

$$\|b(f) - b(g)\| = \|\alpha(f)0 - \alpha(g)0\| = \|\alpha(g^{-1}f)0 - 0\| = \|b(g^{-1}f)\|.$$

Thus, if α and thus also b are continuous, then b is both **uniformly continuous** and **bornologous**.

Definition

The action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright E$ is **coarsely proper** if $b: G \rightarrow E$ is a coarse embedding.

Given a topological group G and a class \mathcal{C} of Banach spaces, e.g., the class of Hilbert spaces or reflexive spaces, we have three possibilities.

Given a topological group G and a class \mathfrak{C} of Banach spaces, e.g., the class of Hilbert spaces or reflexive spaces, we have three possibilities.

- 1 G has a **coarsely proper** continuous affine isometric action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright E$ on some $E \in \mathfrak{C}$,

Given a topological group G and a class \mathfrak{C} of Banach spaces, e.g., the class of Hilbert spaces or reflexive spaces, we have three possibilities.

- 1 G has a **coarsely proper** continuous affine isometric action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright E$ on some $E \in \mathfrak{C}$,
- 2 G has a **fixed point free** continuous affine isometric action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright E$ on some $E \in \mathfrak{C}$, but no coarsely proper such action,

Given a topological group G and a class \mathfrak{C} of Banach spaces, e.g., the class of Hilbert spaces or reflexive spaces, we have three possibilities.

- 1 G has a **coarsely proper** continuous affine isometric action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright E$ on some $E \in \mathfrak{C}$,
- 2 G has a **fixed point free** continuous affine isometric action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright E$ on some $E \in \mathfrak{C}$, but no coarsely proper such action,
- 3 every continuous affine isometric action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright E$ on an $E \in \mathfrak{C}$ **has a fixed point**.

Given a topological group G and a class \mathfrak{C} of Banach spaces, e.g., the class of Hilbert spaces or reflexive spaces, we have three possibilities.

- 1 G has a **coarsely proper** continuous affine isometric action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright E$ on some $E \in \mathfrak{C}$,
- 2 G has a **fixed point free** continuous affine isometric action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright E$ on some $E \in \mathfrak{C}$, but no coarsely proper such action,
- 3 every continuous affine isometric action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright E$ on an $E \in \mathfrak{C}$ **has a fixed point**.

Since option (1) in particular implies that G coarsely embeds into some $E \in \mathfrak{C}$, it may be viewed as a strong harmonic-analytic and geometric **compatibility** between G and \mathfrak{C} , while (3) is a strong **incompatibility**.

Given a topological group G and a class \mathfrak{C} of Banach spaces, e.g., the class of Hilbert spaces or reflexive spaces, we have three possibilities.

- 1 G has a **coarsely proper** continuous affine isometric action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright E$ on some $E \in \mathfrak{C}$,
- 2 G has a **fixed point free** continuous affine isometric action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright E$ on some $E \in \mathfrak{C}$, but no coarsely proper such action,
- 3 every continuous affine isometric action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright E$ on an $E \in \mathfrak{C}$ **has a fixed point**.

Since option (1) in particular implies that G coarsely embeds into some $E \in \mathfrak{C}$, it may be viewed as a strong harmonic-analytic and geometric **compatibility** between G and \mathfrak{C} , while (3) is a strong **incompatibility**.

Question

When can we turn a coarse embedding into a cocycle?

Definition

A topological group G is **amenable** if every continuous affine action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright K$ on a compact convex subset K of a locally convex topological vector space has a fixed point.

Definition

A topological group G is **amenable** if every continuous affine action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright K$ on a compact convex subset K of a locally convex topological vector space has a fixed point.

In the specific case of interest to us here, namely automorphism groups, J. Moore has provided an equivalent reformulation of amenability in terms of **convex Ramsey theory**.

Definition

A topological group G is **amenable** if every continuous affine action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright K$ on a compact convex subset K of a locally convex topological vector space has a fixed point.

In the specific case of interest to us here, namely automorphism groups, J. Moore has provided an equivalent reformulation of amenability in terms of **convex Ramsey theory**.

However, for concrete examples, there is often some more explicit and specific reason for the groups to be amenable bypassing Moore's criterion.

Definition

A topological group G is **amenable** if every continuous affine action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright K$ on a compact convex subset K of a locally convex topological vector space has a fixed point.

In the specific case of interest to us here, namely automorphism groups, J. Moore has provided an equivalent reformulation of amenability in terms of **convex Ramsey theory**.

However, for concrete examples, there is often some more explicit and specific reason for the groups to be amenable bypassing Moore's criterion.

For example, being abelian, solvable, compact, etc.

The Haagerup property

Definition

A topological group G is said to have the *Haagerup property* if G admits a *coarsely proper* continuous affine isometric action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright \mathcal{H}$ on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} .

The Haagerup property

Definition

A topological group G is said to have the *Haagerup property* if G admits a *coarsely proper* continuous affine isometric action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright \mathcal{H}$ on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} .

Examples

- Finitely generated free groups [U. Haagerup],
- locally compact amenable groups [Bekka, Ch erix and Valette]

The Haagerup property

Definition

A topological group G is said to have the **Haagerup property** if G admits a **coarsely proper** continuous affine isometric action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright \mathcal{H}$ on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} .

Examples

- Finitely generated free groups [U. Haagerup],
- locally compact amenable groups [Bekka, Chérix and Valette]

In the context of countable or locally compact groups, the Haagerup property is often viewed as a strong **non-rigidity** property.

The Haagerup property

Definition

A topological group G is said to have the **Haagerup property** if G admits a **coarsely proper** continuous affine isometric action $\alpha: G \curvearrowright \mathcal{H}$ on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} .

Examples

- Finitely generated free groups [U. Haagerup],
- locally compact amenable groups [Bekka, Ch erix and Valette]

In the context of countable or locally compact groups, the Haagerup property is often viewed as a strong **non-rigidity** property.

For general Polish groups, we may also view it as a **regularity** property, since it allows for an efficient representation of G on the most regular Banach space \mathcal{H} .

Haagerup's construction for free groups quite easily transfers to show that also $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{T})$ has the Haagerup property.

Haagerup's construction for free groups quite easily transfers to show that also $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{T})$ has the Haagerup property.

For amenable groups, we instead have the following equivalence extending earlier work of Aharoni, Maurey and Mityagin on the uniform classification of Banach spaces.

Haagerup's construction for free groups quite easily transfers to show that also $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{T})$ has the Haagerup property.

For amenable groups, we instead have the following equivalence extending earlier work of Aharoni, Maurey and Mityagin on the uniform classification of Banach spaces.

Theorem

The following conditions are equivalent for an amenable Polish group G ,

Haagerup's construction for free groups quite easily transfers to show that also $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{T})$ has the Haagerup property.

For amenable groups, we instead have the following equivalence extending earlier work of Aharoni, Maurey and Mityagin on the uniform classification of Banach spaces.

Theorem

The following conditions are equivalent for an amenable Polish group G ,

- 1 G coarsely embeds into a Hilbert space,

Haagerup's construction for free groups quite easily transfers to show that also $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{T})$ has the Haagerup property.

For amenable groups, we instead have the following equivalence extending earlier work of Aharoni, Maurey and Mityagin on the uniform classification of Banach spaces.

Theorem

The following conditions are equivalent for an amenable Polish group G ,

- 1 G coarsely embeds into a Hilbert space,
- 2 G has the Haagerup property.

Haagerup's construction for free groups quite easily transfers to show that also $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{T})$ has the Haagerup property.

For amenable groups, we instead have the following equivalence extending earlier work of Aharoni, Maurey and Mityagin on the uniform classification of Banach spaces.

Theorem

The following conditions are equivalent for an amenable Polish group G ,

- 1 G coarsely embeds into a Hilbert space,
- 2 G has the Haagerup property.

A geometric particularity of \mathcal{H} used here is that a Polish group G coarsely embeds into \mathcal{H} if and only if it has a **uniformly continuous** coarse embedding into \mathcal{H} .

This relies on results on the extension of Hölder continuous Hilbert valued functions and was exploited earlier by B. Johnson and L. Randrianarivony.

Observe that, if $\alpha: G \curvearrowright \mathcal{H}$ is a non-trivial affine isometric action, then either the linear part

$$\pi: G \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H})$$

is a non-trivial unitary representation of G or the cocycle

$$b: G \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$$

is a non-trivial **homomorphism**.

Observe that, if $\alpha: G \curvearrowright \mathcal{H}$ is a non-trivial affine isometric action, the either the linear part

$$\pi: G \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H})$$

is a non-trivial unitary representation of G or the cocycle

$$b: G \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$$

is a non-trivial **homomorphism**.

Indeed, if $\pi \equiv \text{Id}$, then

$$b(gf) = \pi(g)b(f) + b(g) = b(g) + b(f).$$

Observe that, if $\alpha: G \curvearrowright \mathcal{H}$ is a non-trivial affine isometric action, the either the linear part

$$\pi: G \rightarrow U(\mathcal{H})$$

is a non-trivial unitary representation of G or the cocycle

$$b: G \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$$

is a non-trivial **homomorphism**.

Indeed, if $\pi \equiv \text{Id}$, then

$$b(gf) = \pi(g)b(f) + b(g) = b(g) + b(f).$$

Composing b with an appropriate linear functional on \mathcal{H} , we obtain a non-trivial homomorphism into \mathbb{C} .

Corollary

Suppose G is an amenable Polish group, not quasi-isometric to a point and coarsely embeddable into \mathcal{H} .

Corollary

Suppose G is an amenable Polish group, not quasi-isometric to a point and coarsely embeddable into \mathcal{H} .

Then G has a non-trivial unitary representation.

Corollary

*Suppose G is an amenable Polish group, not quasi-isometric to a point and coarsely embeddable into \mathcal{H} .
Then G has a non-trivial unitary representation.*

The first example of a Polish group G with no non-trivial unitary representations is due to Christensen and Herer and since then several other examples have been found, many of them amenable.

Corollary

Suppose G is an amenable Polish group, not quasi-isometric to a point and coarsely embeddable into \mathcal{H} .

Then G has a non-trivial unitary representation.

The first example of a Polish group G with no non-trivial unitary representations is due to Christensen and Herer and since then several other examples have been found, many of them amenable.

The above result then shows that provided G is amenable and has non-trivial coarse geometry, this **analytical incompatibility** with \mathcal{H} must be reflected in a **coarse geometric incompatibility** with \mathcal{H} .

Fixed points on reflexive spaces

At a recent visit to N. Monod we isolated a stronger incompatibility.

Fixed points on reflexive spaces

At a recent visit to N. Monod we isolated a stronger incompatibility.

Definition

A map $\phi: (X, d) \rightarrow (M, \partial)$ between metric spaces is said to be *solvent* if there are constants r_n so that

$$r_n \leq d(x, y) \leq r_n + n \Rightarrow \partial(\phi(x), \phi(y)) \geq n.$$

Fixed points on reflexive spaces

At a recent visit to N. Monod we isolated a stronger incompatibility.

Definition

A map $\phi: (X, d) \rightarrow (M, \partial)$ between metric spaces is said to be *solvent* if there are constants r_n so that

$$r_n \leq d(x, y) \leq r_n + n \Rightarrow \partial(\phi(x), \phi(y)) \geq n.$$

N. Kalton has shown that c_0 is not coarsely embeddable into a reflexive Banach space, but, in fact, his proof along with work of Bretagnolle, Dacunha-Castelle and Krivine reveals a stronger result.

Fixed points on reflexive spaces

At a recent visit to N. Monod we isolated a stronger incompatibility.

Definition

A map $\phi: (X, d) \rightarrow (M, \partial)$ between metric spaces is said to be *solvent* if there are constants r_n so that

$$r_n \leq d(x, y) \leq r_n + n \Rightarrow \partial(\phi(x), \phi(y)) \geq n.$$

N. Kalton has shown that c_0 is not coarsely embeddable into a reflexive Banach space, but, in fact, his proof along with work of Bretagnolle, Dacunha-Castelle and Krivine reveals a stronger result.

Theorem (Kalton)

Let E be either reflexive or $E = L^1([0, 1])$.

Then every bornologous map $\phi: c_0 \rightarrow E$ is insolvent.

Though c_0 does not isometrically embed into $\mathbb{Q}U$, it does embed with very little distortion.

Though c_0 does not isometrically embed into $\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}$, it does embed with very little distortion.

Corollary

Let E be either reflexive or $E = L^1([0, 1])$.

Then every bornologous map $\phi: \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U} \rightarrow E$ is insolvent.

Though c_0 does not isometrically embed into $\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}$, it does embed with very little distortion.

Corollary

Let E be either reflexive or $E = L^1([0, 1])$.

Then every bornologous map $\phi: \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U} \rightarrow E$ is insolvent.

Paring this with our knowledge of the geometry of $\text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U})$, we can now obtain analytical information from purely geometric data.

Though c_0 does not isometrically embed into $\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}$, it does embed with very little distortion.

Corollary

Let E be either reflexive or $E = L^1([0, 1])$.

Then every bornologous map $\phi: \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U} \rightarrow E$ is insolvent.

Paring this with our knowledge of the geometry of $\text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U})$, we can now obtain analytical information from purely geometric data.

Theorem

Every continuous affine isometric action of $\text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U})$ on a reflexive Banach space or on $L^1([0, 1])$ has a fixed point.

Sketch of Proof:

Sketch of Proof:

Consider the case when $\alpha: \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}) \curvearrowright E$ is a continuous affine isometric action on a reflexive Banach space E with linear part π and cocycle b .

Sketch of Proof:

Consider the case when $\alpha: \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}) \curvearrowright E$ is a continuous affine isometric action on a reflexive Banach space E with linear part π and cocycle b .

We will show that, if α has no fixed point, then there is a bornologous solvent map $\phi: \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U} \rightarrow E$, which is absurd.

Sketch of Proof:

Consider the case when $\alpha: \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}) \curvearrowright E$ is a continuous affine isometric action on a reflexive Banach space E with linear part π and cocycle b .

We will show that, if α has no fixed point, then there is a bornologous solvent map $\phi: \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U} \rightarrow E$, which is absurd.

Recall that, if $x_0 \in \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}$ is fixed, then the pointwise stabiliser

$$V = \{g \in \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}) \mid g(x_0) = x_0\}$$

has property (OB),

Sketch of Proof:

Consider the case when $\alpha: \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}) \curvearrowright E$ is a continuous affine isometric action on a reflexive Banach space E with linear part π and cocycle b .

We will show that, if α has no fixed point, then there is a bornologous solvent map $\phi: \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U} \rightarrow E$, which is absurd.

Recall that, if $x_0 \in \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}$ is fixed, then the pointwise stabiliser

$$V = \{g \in \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}) \mid g(x_0) = x_0\}$$

has property (OB), while the map

$$\psi: g \in \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}) \mapsto g(x_0) \in \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}$$

is a quasi-isometry.

Sketch of Proof:

Consider the case when $\alpha: \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}) \curvearrowright E$ is a continuous affine isometric action on a reflexive Banach space E with linear part π and cocycle b .

We will show that, if α has no fixed point, then there is a bornologous solvent map $\phi: \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U} \rightarrow E$, which is absurd.

Recall that, if $x_0 \in \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}$ is fixed, then the pointwise stabiliser

$$V = \{g \in \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}) \mid g(x_0) = x_0\}$$

has property (OB), while the map

$$\psi: g \in \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}) \mapsto g(x_0) \in \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}$$

is a quasi-isometry.

This means that the isometric action $\alpha: V \curvearrowright E$ has bounded orbits and thus a fixed point by a result of C. Ryll-Nardzewski.

Sketch of Proof:

Consider the case when $\alpha: \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}) \curvearrowright E$ is a continuous affine isometric action on a reflexive Banach space E with linear part π and cocycle b .

We will show that, if α has no fixed point, then there is a bornologous solvent map $\phi: \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U} \rightarrow E$, which is absurd.

Recall that, if $x_0 \in \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}$ is fixed, then the pointwise stabiliser

$$V = \{g \in \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}) \mid g(x_0) = x_0\}$$

has property (OB), while the map

$$\psi: g \in \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}) \mapsto g(x_0) \in \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}$$

is a quasi-isometry.

This means that the isometric action $\alpha: V \curvearrowright E$ has bounded orbits and thus a fixed point by a result of C. Ryll-Nardzewski.

After conjugating by a translation, we may assume that $b \equiv 0$ on V .

Observe that, if $g, f \in \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U})$ are two isometries with

$$y = g(x_0) = f(x_0),$$

Observe that, if $g, f \in \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U})$ are two isometries with

$$y = g(x_0) = f(x_0),$$

then $f \in gV$, i.e., $f = gh$ for some $h \in V$, and so

$$b(f)$$

Observe that, if $g, f \in \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U})$ are two isometries with

$$y = g(x_0) = f(x_0),$$

then $f \in gV$, i.e., $f = gh$ for some $h \in V$, and so

$$b(f) = b(gh)$$

Observe that, if $g, f \in \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U})$ are two isometries with

$$y = g(x_0) = f(x_0),$$

then $f \in gV$, i.e., $f = gh$ for some $h \in V$, and so

$$b(f) = b(gh) = \pi(g)b(h) + b(g)$$

Observe that, if $g, f \in \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U})$ are two isometries with

$$y = g(x_0) = f(x_0),$$

then $f \in gV$, i.e., $f = gh$ for some $h \in V$, and so

$$b(f) = b(gh) = \pi(g)b(h) + b(g) = b(g).$$

Observe that, if $g, f \in \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U})$ are two isometries with

$$y = g(x_0) = f(x_0),$$

then $f \in gV$, i.e., $f = gh$ for some $h \in V$, and so

$$b(f) = b(gh) = \pi(g)b(h) + b(g) = b(g).$$

It follows that we may define $\phi: \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U} \rightarrow E$ unambiguously by

$$\phi(y) = b(g) \quad \text{for some/any } g \text{ so that } \psi(g) = g(x_0) = y.$$

Observe that, if $g, f \in \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U})$ are two isometries with

$$y = g(x_0) = f(x_0),$$

then $f \in gV$, i.e., $f = gh$ for some $h \in V$, and so

$$b(f) = b(gh) = \pi(g)b(h) + b(g) = b(g).$$

It follows that we may define $\phi: \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U} \rightarrow E$ unambiguously by

$$\phi(y) = b(g) \quad \text{for some/any } g \text{ so that } \psi(g) = g(x_0) = y.$$

Since this is the composition of the bornologous maps ψ^{-1} and b , also ϕ is bornologous.

Observe that, if $g, f \in \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U})$ are two isometries with

$$y = g(x_0) = f(x_0),$$

then $f \in gV$, i.e., $f = gh$ for some $h \in V$, and so

$$b(f) = b(gh) = \pi(g)b(h) + b(g) = b(g).$$

It follows that we may define $\phi: \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U} \rightarrow E$ unambiguously by

$$\phi(y) = b(g) \quad \text{for some/any } g \text{ so that } \psi(g) = g(x_0) = y.$$

Since this is the composition of the bornologous maps ψ^{-1} and b , also ϕ is bornologous.

Similarly, if $d(y, x_0) = d(z, x_0)$ and $y = g(x_0)$, while $z = f(x_0)$, then $f \in VgV$,

Observe that, if $g, f \in \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U})$ are two isometries with

$$y = g(x_0) = f(x_0),$$

then $f \in gV$, i.e., $f = gh$ for some $h \in V$, and so

$$b(f) = b(gh) = \pi(g)b(h) + b(g) = b(g).$$

It follows that we may define $\phi: \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U} \rightarrow E$ unambiguously by

$$\phi(y) = b(g) \quad \text{for some/any } g \text{ so that } \psi(g) = g(x_0) = y.$$

Since this is the composition of the bornologous maps ψ^{-1} and b , also ϕ is bornologous.

Similarly, if $d(y, x_0) = d(z, x_0)$ and $y = g(x_0)$, while $z = f(x_0)$, then $f \in VgV$, whence

$$\|\phi(y)\| = \|b(g)\| = \|b(f)\| = \|\phi(z)\|.$$

More generally,

$$d(y, z) = d(v, w) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \|\phi(y) - \phi(z)\| = \|\phi(v) - \phi(w)\|.$$

More generally,

$$d(y, z) = d(v, w) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \|\phi(y) - \phi(z)\| = \|\phi(v) - \phi(w)\|.$$

So $\phi: \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U} \rightarrow E$ is a bornologous **metric transform** of $\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}$.

More generally,

$$d(y, z) = d(v, w) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \|\phi(y) - \phi(z)\| = \|\phi(v) - \phi(w)\|.$$

So $\phi: \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U} \rightarrow E$ is a bornologous **metric transform** of $\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}$.

And, if the cocycle b is unbounded on $\text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U})$, then ϕ is **solvent**, which is impossible.

More generally,

$$d(y, z) = d(v, w) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \|\phi(y) - \phi(z)\| = \|\phi(v) - \phi(w)\|.$$

So $\phi: \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U} \rightarrow E$ is a bornologous **metric transform** of $\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}$.

And, if the cocycle b is unbounded on $\text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U})$, then ϕ is **solvent**, which is impossible.

It follows that b is bounded and thus that $\alpha: \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}) \curvearrowright E$ has a fixed point.

Q.E.D.

More generally,

$$d(y, z) = d(v, w) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \|\phi(y) - \phi(z)\| = \|\phi(v) - \phi(w)\|.$$

So $\phi: \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U} \rightarrow E$ is a bornologous **metric transform** of $\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}$.

And, if the cocycle b is unbounded on $\text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U})$, then ϕ is **solvent**, which is impossible.

It follows that b is bounded and thus that $\alpha: \text{Isom}(\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{U}) \curvearrowright E$ has a fixed point.

Q.E.D.

In contradistinction to this, we have

Theorem (Brown–Guentner, Haagerup–Przybyrska)

Every locally compact Polish group has a coarsely proper continuous affine isometric action on a reflexive space.

Definition

A topological group G is said to be *approximately compact* if there is a countable chain $K_0 \leq K_1 \leq \dots \leq G$ of compact subgroups whose union $\bigcup_n K_n$ is dense in G .

Definition

A topological group G is said to be *approximately compact* if there is a countable chain $K_0 \leq K_1 \leq \dots \leq G$ of compact subgroups whose union $\bigcup_n K_n$ is dense in G .

E.g., the unitary subgroup $U(M)$ of an approximately finite-dimensional von Neumann algebra M is approximately compact (P. de la Harpe).

In the context of automorphism groups, approximate compactness can be usefully reformulated.

Proposition (A.S. Kechris & C.R.)

Let \mathcal{K} be a Fraïssé class of finite structures with limit \mathbf{K} .

In the context of automorphism groups, approximate compactness can be usefully reformulated.

Proposition (A.S. Kechris & C.R.)

Let \mathcal{K} be a Fraïssé class of finite structures with limit \mathbf{K} .

*Then $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{K})$ is approximately compact if and only if \mathcal{K} has the **Hrushovski property**,*

In the context of automorphism groups, approximate compactness can be usefully reformulated.

Proposition (A.S. Kechris & C.R.)

Let \mathcal{K} be a Fraïssé class of finite structures with limit \mathbf{K} .

Then $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{K})$ is approximately compact if and only if \mathcal{K} has the *Hrushovski property*, i.e., for every finite substructure $\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{M}$ and all partial automorphisms ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_n of \mathbf{A} , there is a larger finite substructure \mathbf{B} with

$$\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{B} \subseteq \mathbf{M}$$

and full automorphisms ψ_1, \dots, ψ_n of \mathbf{B} extending ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_n respectively.

Whereas a locally compact group G is amenable if and only if it admits a **Følner sequence**, that is, a sequence $F_1, F_2 \dots \subseteq G$ so that

$$\lim_n \frac{|F_n \Delta gF_n|}{|F_n|} = 0$$

for all $g \in G$, there is no similar characterisation of general amenable groups.

Whereas a locally compact group G is amenable if and only if it admits a **Følner sequence**, that is, a sequence $F_1, F_2 \dots \subseteq G$ so that

$$\lim_n \frac{|F_n \Delta gF_n|}{|F_n|} = 0$$

for all $g \in G$, there is no similar characterisation of general amenable groups.

Definition

A Polish group G is said to be **Følner amenable** if either

Whereas a locally compact group G is amenable if and only if it admits a **Følner sequence**, that is, a sequence $F_1, F_2 \dots \subseteq G$ so that

$$\lim_n \frac{|F_n \Delta gF_n|}{|F_n|} = 0$$

for all $g \in G$, there is no similar characterisation of general amenable groups.

Definition

A Polish group G is said to be **Følner amenable** if either

- 1 G is approximately compact, or

Whereas a locally compact group G is amenable if and only if it admits a **Følner sequence**, that is, a sequence $F_1, F_2 \dots \subseteq G$ so that

$$\lim_n \frac{|F_n \Delta gF_n|}{|F_n|} = 0$$

for all $g \in G$, there is no similar characterisation of general amenable groups.

Definition

A Polish group G is said to be **Følner amenable** if either

- 1 G is approximately compact, or
- 2 there is a continuous homomorphism $\phi: H \rightarrow G$ from a locally compact second countable amenable group H so that $G = \overline{\phi[H]}$.

Theorem

Let G be a Følner amenable Polish group admitting a uniformly continuous coarse embedding into a Banach space E .

Theorem

Let G be a Følner amenable Polish group admitting a uniformly continuous coarse embedding into a Banach space E .

Then G admits a coarsely proper continuous affine isometric action on a Banach space V that is finitely representable in $L^2(E)$.

Theorem

Let G be a Følner amenable Polish group admitting a uniformly continuous coarse embedding into a Banach space E .

Then G admits a coarsely proper continuous affine isometric action on a Banach space V that is finitely representable in $L^2(E)$.

Earlier results of this type due to Naor–Peres and Pestov were known for **discrete** groups.

Theorem

Let G be a Følner amenable Polish group admitting a uniformly continuous coarse embedding into a Banach space E .

Then G admits a coarsely proper continuous affine isometric action on a Banach space V that is finitely representable in $L^2(E)$.

Earlier results of this type due to Naor–Peres and Pestov were known for **discrete** groups.

The sort of properties of E preserved under the passage $E \mapsto L^2(E)$ and under finite representability are **local** in nature.

Theorem

Let G be a Følner amenable Polish group admitting a uniformly continuous coarse embedding into a Banach space E .

Then G admits a coarsely proper continuous affine isometric action on a Banach space V that is finitely representable in $L^2(E)$.

Earlier results of this type due to Naor–Peres and Pestov were known for **discrete** groups.

The sort of properties of E preserved under the passage $E \mapsto L^2(E)$ and under finite representability are **local** in nature.

E.g., the property of being **super-reflexive**, that is, having a uniformly convex renorming (Enflo).

Suppose now that

$$\sigma: G \rightarrow E$$

is a coarse embedding of a non-Archimedean Polish group G into a Banach space E .

Suppose now that

$$\sigma: G \rightarrow E$$

is a coarse embedding of a non-Archimedean Polish group G into a Banach space E .

Then the coarse structure on G is metrisable and so G is locally (OB).

Suppose now that

$$\sigma: G \rightarrow E$$

is a coarse embedding of a non-Archimedean Polish group G into a Banach space E .

Then the coarse structure on G is metrisable and so G is locally (OB).

It follows that there is a relatively (OB) open subgroup $V \leq G$.

Suppose now that

$$\sigma: G \rightarrow E$$

is a coarse embedding of a non-Archimedean Polish group G into a Banach space E .

Then the coarse structure on G is metrisable and so G is locally (OB).

It follows that there is a relatively (OB) open subgroup $V \leq G$.

Redefining σ to be constant on each left coset gV , we obtain a **uniformly continuous** coarse embedding

$$\tilde{\sigma}: G \rightarrow E.$$

Corollary

Let G be a Følner amenable non-Archimedean Polish group coarsely embeddable into a super-reflexive space.

Corollary

Let G be a Følner amenable non-Archimedean Polish group coarsely embeddable into a super-reflexive space.

Then G admits a coarsely proper continuous affine isometric action on a super-reflexive space.

Corollary

Let G be a Følner amenable non-Archimedean Polish group coarsely embeddable into a super-reflexive space.

Then G admits a coarsely proper continuous affine isometric action on a super-reflexive space.

Here is an application in a completely different direction.

Corollary

Let X be a Banach space uniformly embeddable into the unit ball B_E of a super-reflexive Banach space E . Then X contains some ℓ^p , $1 \leq p < \infty$.

Reflexive spaces

The last case to consider are reflexive spaces.

The last case to consider are reflexive spaces.

Theorem

Suppose a Polish group G carries a continuous left-invariant coarsely proper stable écart. Then G admits a coarsely proper continuous affine isometric action on a reflexive Banach space.

The last case to consider are reflexive spaces.

Theorem

Suppose a Polish group G carries a continuous left-invariant coarsely proper stable écart. Then G admits a coarsely proper continuous affine isometric action on a reflexive Banach space.

From a result mentioned yesterday, we get

Corollary

Let \mathbf{A} be a countable atomic model of a stable theory T and assume that $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{A})$ is locally (OB).

The last case to consider are reflexive spaces.

Theorem

Suppose a Polish group G carries a continuous left-invariant coarsely proper stable écart. Then G admits a coarsely proper continuous affine isometric action on a reflexive Banach space.

From a result mentioned yesterday, we get

Corollary

Let \mathbf{A} be a countable atomic model of a stable theory T and assume that $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{A})$ is locally (OB).

Then $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{A})$ admits a coarsely proper continuous affine isometric action on a reflexive Banach space.