

A non-nuclear C^* -algebra with the Weak Expectation Property and the Local Lifting Property

by

Gilles Pisier

Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843, U. S. A.

August 8, 2019

Abstract

We construct a non-exact C^* -algebra A with both the Weak Expectation Property (WEP) and the Local Lifting Property (LLP). This gives a new example of non-nuclear A for which there is a unique C^* -norm on $A \otimes A^{op}$. This example is of particular interest in connection with the Connes-Kirchberg problem, which is equivalent to the question whether $A = C^*(\mathbb{F}_2)$, which is known to have the LLP, also has the WEP. Our C^* -algebra A has the same collection of finite dimensional operator subspaces as $C^*(\mathbb{F}_2)$ or $C^*(\mathbb{F}_\infty)$.

In [5] Kirchberg gave the first example of a non-nuclear C^* -algebra A such that

$$(0.1) \quad A \otimes_{\min} A^{op} = A \otimes_{\max} A^{op}.$$

In the first lines of that paper [5], he observed that this could be viewed as the analogue for C^* -algebras of the author's result in [10] for Banach space tensor products. It was thus tempting for the author to try to adapt the Banach space approach in [10] to the C^* -algebra setting to produce new examples satisfying (0.1). In some sense the present paper is the result of this quest but it started to be more than wishful thinking only a few years ago.

Kirchberg ([6] see also [11]) proved that if A has the Weak Expectation Property (WEP) and B the Local Lifting Property (LLP) then

$$(0.2) \quad A \otimes_{\min} B = A \otimes_{\max} B.$$

Thus if a C^* -algebra A has both WEP and LLP, then (0.2) holds with $A = B$ and in fact since both LLP and WEP remain valid for A^{op} we have (0.1).

Kirchberg also proved ([6]) that $C^*(\mathbb{F}_\infty)$ has the LLP. This is in some sense the prototypical example of LLP, just like $B(H)$ is for the WEP.

The WEP, originally introduced by Lance [7] has drawn more attention recently because of Kirchberg's work [5] and in particular his proof that the Connes embedding problem is equivalent to the assertion that $A = C^*(\mathbb{F}_\infty)$ (or $A = C^*(\mathbb{F}_2)$) satisfies (0.1) or equivalently that it has the WEP.

The main result of this paper is the construction of a non-nuclear (and even non exact) separable C^* -algebra A with both WEP and LLP. This answers a question, that although it seems to have remained implicit in Kirchberg's work, was clearly in the back of his mind when he produced the A satisfying (0.1). But since at the time he conjectured the equivalence of WEP and LLP, the question did not seem so natural until the latter equivalence was disproved in [4].

While we cannot prove (0.1) for $A = C^*(\mathbb{F}_\infty)$, our algebra A has the same collection of finite dimensional operator subspaces as $C^*(\mathbb{F}_\infty)$. Thus our construction might shed some light, one way or the other, on the Connes-Kirchberg embedding problem.

Some abbreviations For short we write f.d. for finite dimensional, s.a. for self-adjoint, c.p. for completely positive, c.b. for completely bounded.

1 Nuclear pairs

We start by a few general remarks around nuclearity for pairs.

Definition 1.1. A pair of C^* algebras (A, B) will be called a nuclear pair if

$$A \otimes_{\min} B = A \otimes_{\max} B,$$

or equivalently if the min- and max-norm are equal on the algebraic tensor product $A \otimes B$.

Remark 1.2. If the min- and max-norm are equivalent on $A \otimes B$, then they automatically are equal.

Remark 1.3. Let $A_1 \subset A$ and $B_1 \subset B$ be C^* -subalgebras. In general, the nuclearity of the pair (A, B) does *not* imply that of (A_1, B_1) . This “defect” is a major feature of the notion of nuclearity. However, if (A_1, B_1) admit contractive c.p. projections (conditional expectations) $P : A \rightarrow A_1$ and $Q : B \rightarrow B_1$ then (A_1, B_1) inherits the nuclearity of (A, B) . More generally, this holds if we only have approximate versions of P and Q . For instance, if A_1 and B_1 are (closed s.a.) ideals in A and B then the nuclearity of the pair (A, B) does imply that of (A_1, B_1) .

Recall that A is called nuclear if (A, B) is nuclear for all B .

The basic examples of nuclear C^* -algebras include all commutative ones, the algebra $K(H)$ of all compact operators on an arbitrary Hilbert space H , $C^*(G)$ for all amenable discrete groups G and the Cuntz algebras.

We wish to single out two fundamental examples

$$\mathcal{B} = B(\ell_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C} = C^*(\mathbb{F}_\infty).$$

Recall that every separable unital C^* -algebra embeds in \mathcal{B} and is a quotient of \mathcal{C} . Neither \mathcal{B} nor \mathcal{C} is nuclear, nevertheless :

Theorem 1.4 (Kirchberg [6]). *The pair $(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C})$ is nuclear.*

More generally, for any free group \mathbb{F} and any $t \in B(H) \otimes C^(\mathbb{F})$ or $t \in C^*(\mathbb{F}) \otimes B(H)$ we have $\|t\|_{\min} = \|t\|_{\max}$.*

A simpler proof appears in [11] (or in [12], or now in [15]).

Since Kirchberg [5] showed that a C^* -algebra A has Lance’s WEP iff the pair (A, \mathcal{C}) is nuclear, we took the latter as our definition of the WEP. Kirchberg [5] also showed that A has a certain local lifting property (LLP) iff the pair (A, \mathcal{B}) is nuclear. We again take the latter as the definition of the LLP. With this terminology, Theorem 1.4 admits the following generalization:

Corollary 1.5. *Let B, C be C^* -algebras. If B has the WEP and C the LLP then the pair (B, C) is nuclear.*

In [4] it was shown that \mathcal{B} failed the LLP, or equivalently that the pair $(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B})$ was not nuclear, which gave a negative answer to one of Kirchberg’s questions in [5], namely whether the WEP implies the LLP. However, the following major conjecture (equivalent to the converse implication)

remains open:

Kirchberg's conjecture : The pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C})$ is nuclear, or equivalently \mathcal{C} has the WEP.

Kirchberg showed at the end of [5] that this conjecture is equivalent to the Connes embedding problem whether any finite von Neumann algebra embeds in an ultraproduct of matrix algebras.

The Kirchberg conjecture asserts that the min and max norms coincide on $\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathcal{C}$. More recently in [9, Th. 29], Ozawa proved that to prove the Kirchberg conjecture it suffices to show that they coincide on $E_n \otimes E_n$ for all $n \geq 1$, where E_n is the span of the n first free unitary generators of \mathcal{C} .

Remark 1.6. Kirchberg's example of a C^* -algebra A satisfying (0.1) is an extension of the cone algebra of $C_\lambda^*(\mathbb{F}_2)$ by the compacts. His original construction in [5] is quite difficult to follow. A much clearer presentation (unfortunately without the full details) is sketched in Remark 13.4.6 of Brown and Ozawa's remarkable book [1].

In the next two sections we gather some known facts on the WEP and the LLP, that were probably all known in some form to Kirchberg at the time of [5]. Since we use reformulations best suited for our construction, we include proofs. We refer the reader to Ozawa's concise survey [8] or to our much longer exposition in [15] for more information.

2 The WEP

We define the WEP for a C^* -algebra A by the equality $A \otimes_{\min} \mathcal{C} = A \otimes_{\max} \mathcal{C}$, where \mathcal{C} is the full (or maximal) C^* -algebra of the free group \mathbb{F}_∞ . Kirchberg showed that this property is equivalent to a weak form of extension property (a sort of weakening of injectivity), that had been considered by Lance [7].

Assume $A \subset B(H)$ as a C^* -subalgebra. Then A has the WEP iff there is a contractive projection $P : B(H)^{**} \rightarrow A^{**}$.

Equivalently, this holds iff there is a contractive linear map $T : B(H) \rightarrow A^{**}$ such that $T(a) = a$ for any $a \in A$, or in other words such that $T|_A$ coincides with the canonical inclusion $i_A : A \rightarrow A^{**}$. Note that when it exists the contractive projection P is automatically completely contractive and completely positive by Tomiyama's well known theorem. This leads to the following simple (known) criterion, which, being almost purely Banach space theoretical, will be particularly well adapted to our needs.

We denote here by ℓ_1^n the operator space dual of ℓ_∞^n . One nice realization of ℓ_1^n can be given inside \mathcal{C} : just let $E_1^n = \text{span}[1, U_1, \dots, U_{n-1}] \subset \mathcal{C}$ where (U_j) are the free unitary generators of \mathcal{C} , then $\ell_1^n \simeq E_1^n$ completely isometrically. Note (although this does not seem to play any role in the sequel) that $\|v\|_{cb} = \|v\|$ for any v defined on ℓ_1^n . This is known as the maximal operator space structure of ℓ_1^n .

Proposition 2.1. *A C^* -algebra $A \subset B(H)$ has the WEP if (and only if) for any $n \geq 1$ and any subspace $S \subset \ell_1^n$ any linear map $u : S \rightarrow A$ admits for each $\varepsilon > 0$ an extension $\tilde{u} : \ell_1^n \rightarrow A$ with*

$$\|\tilde{u}\|_{cb} \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\|u\|_{cb}.$$

Proof. This is a well known application of Hahn-Banach. Let B be another C^* -algebra. Note the isometric identity

$$(2.1) \quad B(B, A^{**}) = (B \otimes_{\wedge} A^*)^*,$$

where $B \otimes_{\wedge} A^*$ denotes the normed space $B \otimes A^*$ (algebraic) equipped with the projective norm, denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{B \otimes_{\wedge} A^*}$. Let $X = B(H) \otimes A^*$ and $Y = A \otimes A^*$ so that $Y \subset X$. Consider the assertion

that the inclusion

$$(2.2) \quad (Y, \| \cdot \|_{A \otimes \wedge A^*}) \subset (X, \| \cdot \|_{B(H) \otimes \wedge A^*})$$

is isometric. We claim that if this holds then A has the WEP. Indeed, assume that (2.2) is isometric. Consider the linear form $f : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by $f(a \otimes \xi) = \xi(a)$ (which corresponds through (2.1) with $B = A$ to $i_A : A \rightarrow A^{**}$). By Hahn-Banach, f extends to a linear form $g : (X, \| \cdot \|_{B(H) \otimes \wedge A^*}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with $\|g\| \leq 1$. Let $T : B(H) \rightarrow A^{**}$ be the map associated to g via (2.1). Then $\|T\| \leq 1$ and the fact that g extends f is equivalent to $T|_A = i_A$, so that A has the WEP. To complete the proof of the if part it suffices to show that the extension property in Proposition 2.1 implies that (2.2) is isometric. This is easy to show using the factorization of the mappings $v : A \rightarrow B(H)$ corresponding to an element x in the open unit ball of $(X, \| \cdot \|_{B(H) \otimes \wedge A^*})$. Such a v can be written as $v = UV$, where $V : A \rightarrow \ell_1^n$ has nuclear norm 1 and $\|U : \ell_1^n \rightarrow B(H)\| < 1$. If it so happens that $x \in A \otimes A^*$ then $v(A) = UV(A) \subset A$. Let $S = V(A) \subset \ell_1^n$ and $u = U|_S : S \rightarrow A$. Note $\|U\|_{cb} = \|U\|$, and hence $\|u\|_{cb} \leq \|U\|_{cb} < 1$. Let \tilde{u} be as in the extension property in Proposition (2.1), then the factorization $v = \tilde{u}V$ now shows that v corresponds to an element x in the open unit ball of $(Y, \| \cdot \|_{A \otimes \wedge A^*})$. Thus (2.2) is isometric. This proves the if part.


Conversely, if A has the WEP, by the injectivity of $B(H)$ any $u : S \rightarrow A$ extends to a map $u^1 : \ell_1^n \rightarrow A^{**}$ with $\|u^1\|_{cb} = \|u\|_{cb}$ and $u^1|_S = i_A u$. Since $\ell_\infty^n(A^{**}) = \ell_\infty^n(A)^{**}$ isometrically, there is a net of maps $u_i : \ell_1^n \rightarrow A$ with $\|u_i\|_{cb} \leq 1$ tending pointwise $\sigma(A^{**}, A^*)$ to u^1 . Then $(u_i - u)|_S$ tends pointwise $\sigma(A, A^*)$ to 0, and by Mazur's theorem passing to convex combinations we obtain a net $u'_i : \ell_1^n \rightarrow A$ with $\|u'_i\|_{cb} \leq 1$ such that $(u'_i - u)|_S$ tends pointwise to 0 in norm. Thus for i large enough u'_i is "almost" the desired extension of u . Then for each $\varepsilon > 0$ a simple perturbation argument (see e.g. [12, p. 69]) gives us a true extension \tilde{u} as in Proposition 2.1. \square

Remark 2.2. In the preceding situation, assume $A \subset B(H)$. A linear map $u : S \rightarrow A$ satisfies $\|u\|_{cb} \leq 1$ iff it admits an extension $\tilde{u} : \ell_1^n \rightarrow B(H)$ with $\|\tilde{u}\| \leq 1$. This is immediate by the injectivity of $B(H)$ and the equality $\|\tilde{u}\| = \|\tilde{u}\|_{cb}$.

This allows us to view the extension property in Proposition 2.1 as a Banach space theoretic property of the inclusion $A \subset B(H)$ like this: any u that extends to a contraction into $B(H)$ extends to a map of norm $\leq 1 + \varepsilon$ into A .

Remark 2.3. The interest of Proposition 2.1 is that the apparently weak form of extension property considered there suffices to imply the WEP. But actually, any A with WEP satisfies a stronger extension property, as follows:

Let C be a separable C^ -algebra with the LLP and let A be another one with the WEP. Then for any finite dimensional subspace $E \subset C$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$, any $u \in CB(E, A)$ admits an extension $\tilde{u} \in CB(C, A)$ such that $\|\tilde{u}\|_{cb} \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\|u\|_{cb}$. See [5] or [11, Th. 20.27] for full details.*



Remark 2.4. Recall $A^{op} \simeq \overline{A}$, where \overline{A} is the complex conjugate of A . By an unpublished result of Haagerup (see [15] for complete details) a C^* -algebra A has the WEP iff the min and max norms coincide on the set of tensors in $\overline{A} \otimes A$ of the form $\sum \overline{a_j} \otimes a_j$ (we call these positive definite tensors in [15]).

3 The LLP

We define the LLP for a C^* -algebra A by the equality $A \otimes_{\min} \mathcal{B} = A \otimes_{\max} \mathcal{B}$, where $\mathcal{B} = B(\ell_2)$. Kirchberg showed that this property is equivalent to a certain local lifting property (analogous to that of L_1 in Banach space theory), which has several equivalent forms, one of which as follows:

Proposition 3.1. *A C^* -algebra A satisfies $A \otimes_{\min} \mathcal{B} = A \otimes_{\max} \mathcal{B}$ iff for any $*$ -homomorphism $\pi : A \rightarrow C/\mathcal{I}$ into a quotient C^* -algebra, for any f.d. subspace $E \subset A$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$ the restriction $\pi|_E$ admits a lifting $v : E \rightarrow C$ with $\|v\|_{cb} \leq (1 + \varepsilon)$.*

Remark 3.2. According to Kirchberg [6] a C^* -algebra A has the lifting property (LP) if any $*$ -homomorphism $\pi : A \rightarrow C/\mathcal{I}$ as above admits a (global) contractive c.p. lifting. He proved that \mathcal{C} has the LP. By known results, it follows that $C \otimes_{\min} \mathcal{C}$ has the LP whenever C is nuclear and separable. Roughly this can be checked using the CPAP of C and the fact (due to Arveson) that the set of liftable maps on separable C^* -algebras is pointwise closed.

Note: Actually when A has the LLP the preceding local lifting even holds with $\varepsilon = 0$.

Lemma 3.3. *Assume that an isomorphism $\pi : A \rightarrow C/\mathcal{I}$ is locally liftable, meaning that it has the property considered in Proposition 3.1. Let B be any C^* -algebra.*

Then (C, B) nuclear $\Rightarrow (A, B)$ nuclear.

In particular C LLP $\Rightarrow A$ LLP.

Proof. Indeed, let $t \in E \otimes B$ with $E \subset A$ f.d. with $\|t\|_{\min} = 1$. Let $q : C \rightarrow C/\mathcal{I}$ be the quotient map. Then if (C, B) is nuclear

$$\|(v \otimes Id)(t)\|_{C \otimes_{\max} B} = \|(v \otimes Id)(t)\|_{C \otimes_{\min} B} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$$

and hence $\|(\pi \otimes Id)(t)\|_{C/\mathcal{I} \otimes_{\max} B} = \|(qv \otimes Id)(t)\|_{C/\mathcal{I} \otimes_{\max} B} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$. Since π is an isomorphism we obtain $\|t\|_{A \otimes_{\max} B} = 1$, and hence (A, B) is nuclear. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Let A be unital. Then $A = C^*(\mathbb{F})/I$ for some free group \mathbb{F} , and $C^*(\mathbb{F})$ has the LLP. In general let \tilde{A} be the unitization, let $q : C^*(\mathbb{F}) \rightarrow \tilde{A}$ be a surjective $*$ -homomorphism, and let $C = q^{-1}(A) \subset C^*(\mathbb{F})$. Since C is an ideal in $C^*(\mathbb{F})$, it still has the LLP. By Lemma 3.3 with $\pi : A \rightarrow C/\ker(q)$, the if part follows.

Conversely, if A has the LLP, so does its unitization \tilde{A} (see Remark 1.3). If $\pi : A \rightarrow C/\mathcal{I}$ is as in Proposition 3.1, then π extends to a unital $*$ -homomorphism $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{A} \rightarrow \tilde{C}/\mathcal{I}$ and it is easy to check that if $\tilde{\pi}$ is locally liftable then π also is. Thus to prove the only if part we may assume that A, C and π are all unital. Again we write $A = C/\mathcal{I}$ with $C = C^*(\mathbb{F})$. Let $E \subset A$ be a f.d. subspace. The inclusion map $E \rightarrow A$ corresponds to a tensor $t \in E^* \otimes A$ with $\|t\|_{\min} = 1$ when E^* is equipped with its dual operator space structure (see [2, 12]). We may assume $E^* \subset \mathcal{B}$ completely isometrically. Viewing $t \in \mathcal{B} \otimes A$ the LLP assumption implies $\|t\|_{\mathcal{B} \otimes_{\max} A} = 1$. Since $\mathcal{B} \otimes_{\max} A = \mathcal{B} \otimes_{\max} C/\mathcal{B} \otimes_{\max} I$. The tensor t admits a lifting $t \in E^* \otimes C$ with $\|t\|_{\mathcal{B} \otimes_{\max} C} < 1 + \varepsilon$. A fortiori, we have $\|t\|_{E^* \otimes_{\min} C} < 1 + \varepsilon$, and the linear map $\tilde{u} : E \rightarrow C$ associated to t gives us the desired local lifting. \square

Let E, F be operator spaces. Recall

$$d_{cb}(E, F) = \inf\{\|u\|_{cb}\|u^{-1}\|_{cb}\}$$

where the infimum runs over all complete isomorphisms $u : E \rightarrow F$ whenever E, F are completely isomorphic (e.g. if E, F are of the same finite dimension), and $d_{cb}(E, F) = \infty$ if they are not completely isomorphic.

Let C be a C^* -algebra. Let us denote (with the notation in [12, p. 343]) for any f.d. operator space \mathcal{E}

$$d_{SC}(\mathcal{E}) = \inf\{d_{cb}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}') \mid \mathcal{E}' \subset C\}.$$

We also set for an arbitrary C^* -algebra A

$$d_{SC}(A) = \sup\{d_{SC}(\mathcal{E}) \mid \mathcal{E} \subset A, \dim(\mathcal{E}) < \infty\}.$$

The next result is related to [4]. In the latter, it was shown that $\text{WEP} \not\Rightarrow \text{LLP}$, and at the same time that there are A 's such that $d_{S\mathcal{C}}(A) = \infty$.

Proposition 3.4. *Let A be a C^* -algebra such that $d_{S\mathcal{C}}(A) = 1$. If A has the WEP then it has the LLP.*

Proof. We will use several results from [3] (see also [15, chap. 6] for a detailed presentation). Assume $d_{S\mathcal{C}}(A) = 1$ and A has the WEP. Let $t \in A \otimes \mathcal{B}$. We will show that $\|t\|_{\max} = \|t\|_{\min}$. Let $\mathcal{E} \subset A$ be a f.d. subspace such that $t \in \mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{B}$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\mathcal{E}' \subset \mathcal{C}$ and an isomorphism $v : \mathcal{E}' \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \subset A$ with $\|v\|_{cb}\|v^{-1}\|_{cb} < 1 + \varepsilon$. Using the factorization of the canonical inclusion $i_A : A \rightarrow A^{**}$ through some $B(H)$ (which is one form of the WEP) we find an extension $\tilde{v} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow A^{**}$ of v such that $\|\tilde{v}\|_{dec} = \|v\|_{cb}$ (here we use the dec-norm of [3] and the fact due to Haagerup that the dec-norm and the cb-norm coincide for maps with range $B(H)$). Now we have $(i_A \otimes Id)t = (\tilde{v}v^{-1} \otimes Id)(t)$ and hence (again using [3])

$$\|(i_A \otimes Id)t\|_{A^{**} \otimes_{\max} \mathcal{B}} \leq \|\tilde{v}\|_{dec} \|(v^{-1} \otimes Id)(t)\|_{\mathcal{C} \otimes_{\max} \mathcal{B}} \leq \|v\|_{cb} \|(v^{-1} \otimes Id)(t)\|_{\mathcal{C} \otimes_{\max} \mathcal{B}}.$$

By Theorem 1.4, $\|(v^{-1} \otimes Id)(t)\|_{\mathcal{C} \otimes_{\max} \mathcal{B}} = \|(v^{-1} \otimes Id)(t)\|_{\mathcal{C} \otimes_{\min} \mathcal{B}}$ and hence we find

$$\|(i_A \otimes Id)t\|_{A^{**} \otimes_{\max} \mathcal{B}} \leq \|v\|_{cb} \|(v^{-1} \otimes Id)(t)\|_{\mathcal{C} \otimes_{\min} \mathcal{B}} \leq \|v\|_{cb}\|v^{-1}\|_{cb} \|t\|_{A \otimes_{\min} \mathcal{B}} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \|t\|_{A \otimes_{\min} \mathcal{B}}.$$

But by an easy and well known argument we have $\|(i_A \otimes Id)t\|_{A^{**} \otimes_{\max} \mathcal{B}} = \|t\|_{A \otimes_{\max} \mathcal{B}}$ for any $t \in A \otimes \mathcal{B}$, thus since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary we conclude $\|t\|_{\max} \leq \|t\|_{\min}$. \square

4 Outline

We follow the general strategy in [10]. We construct a sequence of operator spaces $E_n \subset E_{n+1}$ such that for any $S \subset \ell_1^n$, any $u : S \rightarrow E_n$ admits an extension (or an approximate extension) $\tilde{u} \rightarrow E_{n+1}$ but into the larger space E_{n+1} , with $\|\tilde{u}\|_{cb} \approx \|u\|_{cb}$, as in the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \ell_1^n & \xrightarrow{\tilde{u}} & E_{n+1} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ S & \xrightarrow{u} & E_n \end{array}$$

The rough plan is then to start from a space E_1 such that $d_{S\mathcal{C}}(E_1) = 1$ and find successive spaces E_n while maintaining the condition $d_{S\mathcal{C}}(E_n) = 1$ for all n . Then the idea is that the union $X = \overline{\cup E_n}$ will satisfy the extension property in Proposition 2.1 (that is equivalent to the WEP for a C^* -algebra), while the condition $d_{S\mathcal{C}}(E_n) = 1$ for all n will imply $d_{S\mathcal{C}}(X) = 1$ and hence by Proposition 3.4 the purported WEP of X would imply its LLP. Just starting from a f.d. operator space E_1 with exactness constant > 1 will ensure that X if it is a C^* -algebra is not exact, and hence not nuclear.

Since we can embed E_n into an injective object, namely $B(H)$ (and ℓ_∞ in the Banach space case) it is easy to do the first step $n = 1$ and to find some “big” space E_2 satisfying the extension but the difficulty is to find E_2 still such that $d_{S\mathcal{E}}(E_2) = 1$. The latter expresses that E_2 remains relatively “small”. In the Banach space analogue of [10] this is the main problem: there bounded cotype 2 constants are the key tool that replaces $d_{S\mathcal{E}}(E_n) = 1$; note however that the construction there is isomorphic (with uniformly bounded constants), as opposed to the present “almost” isometric one (i.e. with constants asymptotically tending to 1). However, it is actually possible to essentially proceed and maintain the condition $d_{S\mathcal{E}}(E_n) = 1$ for all n , using the operator space analogue of the construction in [10], but in the isometric setting, with all relevant constants equal to 1. This led to operator space versions of our main result, that we obtained already a few years ago (we gave a talk on this at MSRI in the Fall 2016).

But the main hurdle for us has been to arrange so that the union $\overline{\cup E_n}$ be not only an operator space but a genuine C^* -algebra. For this we need to produce embeddings $T_n : E_n \rightarrow E_{n+1}$ that are multiplicative, or at least close to multiplicative, in such a way that in the limit we obtain an algebra and multiplicative maps. This is overcome by a quite different construction of E_{n+1} given E_n based on Lemma 6.1 below.

5 Notation and preliminary setup

Let $C_0 = C((0, 1])$ and $C = C([0, 1])$. For any C^* -algebra A , we denote by $C_0(A) = C_0 \otimes_{\min} A$ the so-called cone algebra of A .

When dealing with a mapping $u : A \rightarrow B$ between C^* -algebras (or operator spaces) we will denote by $u_0 : C_0(A) \rightarrow C_0(B)$ the map extending $Id_{C_0} \otimes u$.

We reserve the notation $E \otimes F$ for the algebraic tensor product of two linear spaces.

Recall $\mathcal{C} = C^*(\mathbb{F}_\infty)$ and $\mathcal{B} = B(\ell_2)$.

It is known (see [5, Lemma 2.4]) that any separable C^* -algebra embeds in a separable one with the WEP (note: without separable this is clear since any $B(H)$ has the WEP).

Let B be a separable C^* -algebra with the WEP containing \mathcal{C} . Let $j : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow B$ be an embedding (i.e. a faithful $*$ -homomorphism).

Let $q : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow B$ be a surjective $*$ -homomorphism. We claim that we may choose q so that there is a $*$ -homomorphism $r : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ lifting j , so that we have $qr = j$. Indeed, the free product $j * q$ of j and q gives us a surjective $*$ -homomorphism $q' : \mathcal{C} * \mathcal{C} \rightarrow B$ for which the canonical embedding $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{C} * \mathcal{C}$ into the first factor is the required lifting. Thus if we replace q by q' we obtain the desired r .

The relevant diagrams are as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{C} & & \\
 \uparrow r & \searrow q & \\
 \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{j} & B
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 C_0(\mathcal{C}) & & \\
 \uparrow r_0 & \searrow q_0 & \\
 C_0(\mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow{j_0} & C_0(B)
 \end{array}$$

Let

$$\mathcal{I} = \ker(q) \text{ so that } C_0(\mathcal{I}) = \ker(q_0)$$

We denote by $\ell_\infty(A)$ the C^* -algebra formed of all bounded sequences of elements of A , and by $c_0(A) \subset \ell_\infty(A)$ the ideal formed by the sequences that tend to 0.

Our main interest will be the case when $A = C_0(\mathcal{C})$. To shorten the notation we set

$$Z = \ell_\infty(C_0(\mathcal{C}))/c_0(C_0(\mathcal{C})).$$

We denote by $Q : \ell_\infty(C_0(\mathcal{C})) \rightarrow Z$ the quotient map so that, as is well known, we have

$$\forall x = (x_n) \in \ell_\infty(C_0(\mathcal{C})) \quad \|Q((x_n))\|_Z = \limsup \|x_n\|_{C_0(\mathcal{C})}.$$

Let (σ_n) be a quasi-central approximate unit in \mathcal{I} . Our construction would be much simpler if we could find (σ_n) formed of projections. Then the mappings $x \mapsto \sigma_n x$ would be approximatively multiplicative. We will now use an idea that seems related to Kirchberg's [5, §4], but that we learnt from [1, Lemma 13.4.4], that somehow produces a way to go around that difficulty by passing to the cone algebras.

Let $\rho_n : C_0 \otimes \mathcal{C} \rightarrow C_0(\mathcal{C})$ be the linear map taking $f \otimes c$ ($f \in C_0, c \in \mathcal{C}$) to the function $(0, 1] \ni t \mapsto f((1 - \sigma_n)t)c$ (where of course $f((1 - \sigma_n)t) \in \mathcal{C}$ is obtained by spectral calculus, or just polynomial calculus if f is a polynomial in C_0).

The sequence of maps $\rho = (\rho_n)$ takes $C_0 \otimes \mathcal{C}$ to $\ell_\infty(C_0(\mathcal{C}))$. The composition $Q\rho : C_0 \otimes \mathcal{C} \rightarrow Z$ is a $*$ -homomorphism. Indeed, this is easy to check using the fact that (σ_n) is quasi-central. See [1, p.] for details. Therefore, $Q\rho$ extends to a $*$ -homomorphism $\pi : C_0 \otimes_{\max} \mathcal{C} \rightarrow Z$, or equivalently (since C_0 is nuclear) $\pi : C_0(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow Z$. Since (σ_n) is an approximate unit for \mathcal{I} we have

$$(5.1) \quad \rho(C_0 \otimes \mathcal{I}) \subset c_0(C_0(\mathcal{C})),$$

indeed this is easy to check for $f \otimes c$ with $c \in \mathcal{I}$ when f is a polynomial in C_0 .

Let $E \subset C_0(\mathcal{C})$ be a finite dimensional self-adjoint subspace (f.d.s.a. in short).

Since $C_0(\mathcal{C})$ has the LP (actually the construction can be carried out using only the LLP and a lifting of $\pi|_E$), the map $\pi : C_0(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow Z$ admits a completely contractive (in short c.c.) and completely positive (in short c.p.) lifting $\varphi = (\varphi_n) : C_0(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \ell_\infty(C_0(\mathcal{C}))$. Since φ lifts π we have

$$(5.2) \quad \forall x \in C_0 \otimes \mathcal{C} \quad \|(\varphi_n - \rho_n)(x)\| \rightarrow 0.$$

Clearly π vanishes on $C_0 \otimes \mathcal{I}$ (since $Q\rho$ does by (5.1)). By density, it follows that

$$(5.3) \quad \pi|_{C_0(\mathcal{I})} = 0.$$

Since $Q\varphi = \pi$, (5.3) implies

$$(5.4) \quad \varphi(C_0(\mathcal{I})) \subset c_0(C_0(\mathcal{C})).$$

Since φ is c.p. it is self-adjoint, and hence all the φ_n 's are self-adjoint. Moreover, since π is a $*$ -homomorphism, the lifting φ must be approximately multiplicative, namely we have

$$(5.5) \quad \forall x, y \in C_0(\mathcal{C}) \quad \|\varphi_n(xy) - \varphi_n(x)\varphi_n(y)\| \rightarrow 0.$$

Recall $q : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{I}$ and $q_0 : C_0(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow C_0(\mathcal{C}/\mathcal{I})$ are the quotient maps. Note that for any $f \in C_0$ and $c \in \mathcal{C}$ we have $q_0(\rho_n(f \otimes c)) = f \otimes q(c) = q_0(f \otimes c)$. Therefore

$$\forall x \in C_0 \otimes \mathcal{C} \quad \|\rho_n(x)\| \geq \|q_0(x)\|.$$

Similarly,

$$\forall k, \forall x \in M_k(C_0 \otimes \mathcal{C}) \quad \|Id_{M_k} \otimes \rho_n(x)\| \geq \|Id_{M_k} \otimes q_0(x)\|.$$

Let $E \subset C_0 \otimes \mathcal{C}$ be a f.d.s.a. subspace. Recall $q_0 r_0 = j_0$ and r_0, j_0 are isometric. Therefore

$$\forall x \in E \quad \|\rho_n(r_0(x))\| \geq \|x\|.$$

Therefore the map $V_n = \rho_n r_0 : E \rightarrow C_0(\mathcal{C})$ satisfies

$$(5.6) \quad \|V_n^{-1}|_{V_n(E)}\|_{cb} \leq 1.$$

Lemma 5.1. *Let $F, E \subset C_0(\mathcal{C})$ be f.d.s.a. subspaces such that $F \cdot F \subset E$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and a finite subset $D \subset C_0(\mathcal{I})$. There is a s.a. map $\psi : C_0(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow C_0(\mathcal{C})$ such that*

- (i) *For all $x \in D$ we have $\|\psi(x)\| \leq \varepsilon$*
- (ii) *$\|\psi\|_{cb} \leq 1$ and $\|\psi|_{\psi r_0(E)}^{-1}\|_{cb} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$.*
- (iii) *For all $x, y \in r_0(F)$ we have $\|\psi(xy) - \psi(x)\psi(y)\| \leq \varepsilon\|x\|\|y\|$.*

Proof. Let $\varphi = (\varphi_n)$ as before. We claim that if n is chosen large enough, then $\psi = \varphi_n$ satisfies (i), (ii) and (iii). We then already know that $\|\psi\|_{cb} = \|\varphi_n\|_{cb} \leq 1$. To obtain (i) (resp. (iii)) we invoke (5.4) (resp. (5.5)). Applying (5.5) for a δ -net in the unit ball of F with δ sufficiently small (relative to ε) one indeed obtains (iii). To prove the remaining part of (ii), we will use (5.2) and (5.6). Using these the second part of (ii) follows by a routine perturbation argument. We give the details for the reader's convenience. Let (e_j) be a basis for $r_0(E) \subset C_0(\mathcal{C})$ (recall that r_0 is an isometric *-homomorphism). We may assume that $\|e_j\| = 1$ and that there are biorthogonal functionals $f_j \in C_0(\mathcal{C})^*$ with norms $\leq c$ where $c > 0$ is some constant. Then for any $a_j \in \mathbb{C}$ we have $|a_j| \leq c\|\sum a_j e_j\|$. Let $\eta > 0$ be a constant chosen small enough so that

$$(1 - 3d\eta)^{-1} \leq 1 + \varepsilon.$$

Let $e'_j \in C_0 \otimes \mathcal{C}$ be such that $\|e_j - e'_j\| < \eta$ and $\|e'_j\| = 1$. Let $d = \dim(E)$. Then for any $a_j \in \mathbb{C}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sum a_j \varphi_n(e_j)\| &\geq \|\sum a_j \varphi_n(e'_j)\| - \|\sum a_j (\varphi_n(e_j) - \varphi_n(e'_j))\| \geq \|\sum a_j \varphi_n(e'_j)\| - \sum |a_j| \eta \\ &\geq \|\sum a_j \varphi_n(e'_j)\| - d\eta \|\sum a_j e_j\| \end{aligned}$$

and also

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sum a_j \varphi_n(e'_j)\| &\geq \|\sum a_j \rho_n(e'_j)\| - \|\sum a_j (\varphi_n(e'_j) - \rho_n(e'_j))\| \\ &\geq \|\sum a_j \rho_n(e'_j)\| - d \|\sum a_j e_j\| \sup_{j \leq d} \|\varphi_n(e'_j) - \rho_n(e'_j)\|. \end{aligned}$$

By (5.6) we have

$$\|\sum a_j \rho_n(e'_j)\| \geq \|\sum a_j e'_j\| \geq \|\sum a_j e_j\| - \|\sum a_j (e'_j - e_j)\| \geq \|\sum a_j e_j\| - d\eta \|\sum a_j e_j\|$$

By (5.2) we can choose n large enough so that

$$\sup_{j \leq d} \|\varphi_n(e'_j) - \rho_n(e'_j)\| < \eta.$$

Thus we find

$$\|\sum a_j \varphi_n(e_j)\| \geq \|\sum a_j e_j\| - 3d\eta \|\sum a_j e_j\| = (1 - 3d\eta) \|\sum a_j e_j\|.$$

Our choice of η gives us $\|\varphi_n^{-1}|_{\varphi_n(r_0(E))}\| \leq 1 + \varepsilon$. A routine modification of the preceding argument shows that

$$\|\varphi_n^{-1}|_{\varphi_n(r_0(E))}\|_{cb} \leq 1 + \varepsilon.$$

Thus the map $\psi = \varphi_n$ satisfies (ii). □

6 Main construction

Lemma 6.1. *Let $F, E \subset C_0(\mathcal{C})$ be f.d.s.a. subspaces such that $F \cdot F \subset E$. Fix n and $\varepsilon > 0$. There is a f.d.s.a. subspace $E_1 \subset C_0(\mathcal{C})$ and a s.a. map $T : E \rightarrow E_1$ such that*

(i) *For any subspace $S \subset \ell_1^n$ and any $u \in B_{CB(S,E)}$ there is $\tilde{u} : \ell_1^n \rightarrow E_1$ such that*

$$\|\tilde{u}|_S - Tu\| \leq \varepsilon \|u\|_{cb} \text{ and } \|\tilde{u}\|_{cb} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \|u\|_{cb}.$$

(ii) $\|T\|_{cb} \leq 1$ and $\|T|_{T(E)}^{-1}\|_{cb} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$.

(iii) For all $x, y \in F$ we have $\|T(xy) - T(x)T(y)\| \leq \varepsilon \|x\| \|y\|$.

Proof. We first show that to check (i) for a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, it suffices to check it with ε replaced by (say) $\varepsilon/4$ for a suitably chosen *finite* set of subspaces $S \subset \ell_1^n$ and a suitable *finite* set of u 's in the unit ball of $CB(S, E)$. Since n is fixed the set of k -dimensional subspaces $S \subset \ell_1^n$ can be viewed as being compact for the Hausdorff distance, so that it admits a finite δ -net for any $\delta > 0$. In other words, by perturbation, to obtain (i) for a given $\varepsilon > 0$, it suffices to check (i) with ε replaced by $\varepsilon/2$ for a suitably chosen *finite* set of subspaces $S \subset \ell_1^n$. Then S and $\varepsilon > 0$ being fixed, since the unit ball of $CB(S, E)$ is also compact, to show (i) with ε replaced by $\varepsilon/2$ for all u in the unit ball of $CB(S, E)$ it suffices to show (i) with ε replaced by $\varepsilon/4$ for only a suitably chosen *finite* set of u 's in it.

Now since B and hence $C_0(B)$ has the WEP the map $j_0 u : S \rightarrow C_0(B)$ admits an extension $v : \ell_1^n \rightarrow C_0(B)$ with $\|v\|_{cb} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \|j_0 u\|_{cb} = (1 + \varepsilon) \|u\|_{cb}$. We have $v|_S = j_0 u$. Clearly v admits a lifting $\hat{v} : \ell_1^n \rightarrow C_0(\mathcal{C})$ such that $\|\hat{v}\|_{cb} = \|v\|_{cb}$ (this is a classical fact, see e.g. [12, p. 45]) and $q_0 \hat{v} = v$. Then $q_0 \hat{v}|_S = j_0 u$.

Parallel to that we have $j_0 u = q_0 r_0 u$ and hence $q_0 r_0 u = q_0 \hat{v}|_S$. Thus $q_0(r_0 u - \hat{v}|_S) = 0$, and hence

$$(6.1) \quad (r_0 u - \hat{v})(S) \subset \ker(q_0) = C_0(\mathcal{I}).$$

Let D_S be a linear basis of S formed of unit vectors. Then obviously (by the triangle inequality) $\|w|_S\| \leq n \sup_{s \in D_S} \|w(s)\|$ for any $w : S \rightarrow C_0(\mathcal{C})$. Consider the map ψ in Lemma 5.1 when the finite set D is the union of all the bases D_S associated to the finite set of S 's just discussed.

We (tentatively) set

$$T = \psi r_0|_E,$$

and we define E_1 to be the a (say the smallest) f.d.s.a. subspace of $C_0(\mathcal{C})$ containing $T(E)$ and also all the subspaces $\psi \hat{v}(\ell_1^n)$ when \hat{v} runs over the finite set formed of the \hat{v} 's associated to the finite set of (S, u) 's just discussed.

Then (ii) and (iii) are given by Lemma 5.1. To check (i), let $\tilde{u} = \psi \hat{v}$. By (6.1) and (i) in Lemma 5.1 we have $\|\psi(r_0 u - \hat{v})|_S\| \leq n\varepsilon$ and hence $\|(Tu - \tilde{u})|_S\| \leq n\varepsilon$, while $\|\tilde{u}\|_{cb} = \|\psi \hat{v}\|_{cb} \leq \|\hat{v}\|_{cb} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \|u\|_{cb}$. This completes the proof since we may trivially replace ε by ε/n when applying Lemma 5.1. \square

Theorem 6.2. *Let (\mathcal{E}_n) be a sequence of finite dimensional self-adjoint (f.d.s.a.) (operator) subspaces of $C_0(\mathcal{C})$. There is a non-nuclear C^* -algebra A with both the WEP and the LLP. Moreover, for any n and any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a subspace $\mathcal{E} \subset A$ such that $d_{cb}(\mathcal{E}_n, \mathcal{E}) < 1 + \varepsilon$.*

Recall that we denote (with the notation in [12, p. 343]) for any f.d. operator space \mathcal{E}

$$d_{SA}(\mathcal{E}) = \inf\{d_{cb}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}') \mid \mathcal{E}' \subset A\}.$$

Remark 6.3. Since the set of f.d. subspaces of $C_0(\mathcal{C})$ is d_{cb} -separable if we choose for (\mathcal{E}_n) a dense sequence, then for any f.d. subspace $\mathcal{E}' \subset \mathcal{C}$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a subspace $\mathcal{E} \subset A$ such that $d_{cb}(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{E}) < 1 + \varepsilon$. In the converse direction, the LLP of A implies that for any f.d. subspace $\mathcal{E} \subset A$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a subspace $\mathcal{E}' \subset C_0(\mathcal{C})$ such that $d_{cb}(\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{E}) < 1 + \varepsilon$. Indeed, we have $d_{S\mathcal{C}}(A) = 1$ whenever A has the LLP (this follows from [4] or [12, Cor. 22.6]). Thus in some local sense, A and \mathcal{C} are somewhat “equivalent” !

Lemma 6.4. *Let (\mathcal{E}_n) be as in Theorem 6.2. Let $\varepsilon_n > 0$ be such that $\sum \varepsilon_n < \infty$. There is a sequence of f.d.s.a. subspaces $E_n \subset C_0(\mathcal{C})$ and s.a. maps $T_n : E_n \rightarrow E_{n+1}$ such that we have for any $n \geq 1$*

(i) $\forall S \subset \ell_1^n, \forall u : S \rightarrow E_n \exists \tilde{u} : \ell_1^n \rightarrow E_{n+1}$ such that

$$\|\tilde{u}|_S - T_n u\| \leq \varepsilon_n \|u\|_{cb} \text{ and } \|\tilde{u}\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon_n) \|u\|_{cb}.$$

(ii) $\|T_n\|_{cb} \leq 1$ and $\|T_n^{-1}|_{T_n(E_n)}\|_{cb} \leq 1 + \varepsilon_n$.

(iii) For any $n \geq 2$ we have $T_{n-1}(E_{n-1})T_{n-1}(E_{n-1}) \subset E_n$ and

$$(6.2) \quad \forall x, y \in T_{n-1}(E_{n-1}) \quad \|T_n(x)T_n(y) - T_n(xy)\| \leq \varepsilon_n \|x\| \|y\|.$$

(iv) For any $n \geq 2$ we have $\mathcal{E}_n \subset E_n$.

Proof. We construct E_n, T_n by induction on n starting from an arbitrary $E_1 = \mathcal{E}_1$. At the initial step $n = 1$ (i) is trivial and (iii) is void so that we simply may set $E_2 = E_1 + \mathcal{E}_2 + \text{span}[E_1.E_1]$ and let $T_1 : E_1 \rightarrow E_2$ be the natural inclusion. We have the required properties with $\varepsilon_1 = 0$.

Assume that $(E_k)_{k \leq n}$ and $(T_k)_{k < n}$ have been constructed satisfying (i) (ii) (iii) (iv). For the induction step we must produce E_{n+1} and T_n . We find $T_n : E_n \rightarrow E_{n+1}$ using Lemma 6.1 applied to $E = E_n$ with $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_n$, and taking $F = T_{n-1}(E_{n-1})$. This gives us E_{n+1} and $T_n : E_n \rightarrow E_{n+1}$ (equal to the T given by Lemma 6.1) satisfying (i) (ii) and (6.2). But since (i) (ii) remain unchanged if we enlarge E_{n+1} , we may replace our subspace by $E_{n+1} + \mathcal{E}_{n+1} + \text{span}[T_n(E_n)T_n(E_n)]$ to ensure that $T_n(E_n)T_n(E_n) \subset E_{n+1}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{n+1} \subset E_{n+1}$, so that (iv) also holds at the next step. This completes the proof by induction. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.2. Let $\varepsilon_n > 0$ be such that $\sum \varepsilon_j < \infty$. Let $\delta_n = \sum_{j > n} \varepsilon_j$. Note that the infinite product $\prod_{j \geq 1} (1 + \varepsilon_j)$ converges. We define $\eta_n > 0$ by the equality

$$(6.3) \quad 1 + \eta_n = \prod_{j \geq n} (1 + \varepsilon_j),$$

so that $\eta_n \rightarrow 0$.

Let (E_n) be as in Lemma 6.4. We will work in the ambient C^* -algebra $Z = \ell_\infty(C_0(\mathcal{C}))/c_0(C_0(\mathcal{C}))$, with quotient map $Q : \ell_\infty(C_0(\mathcal{C})) \rightarrow Z$. We denote by $L \subset \ell_\infty(C_0(\mathcal{C}))$ the subspace formed of the sequences (x_n) such that $x_n \in E_n$ for all n , so that $L \simeq \ell_\infty(\{E_n\})$.

We introduce a mapping $\theta_n : E_n \rightarrow \ell_\infty(C_0(\mathcal{C}))$, with values in L , defined by

$$\forall x \in E_n \quad \theta_n(x) = (0, \dots, 0, x, T_n(x), T_{n+1}T_n(x), T_{n+2}T_{n+1}T_n(x), \dots)$$

where x stands at the n -th place.

By (ii) in Lemma 6.4, we have

$$\forall n \geq 1 \quad \|\theta_n\|_{cb} \leq 1.$$

Then we define the subspace $Y_n \subset Z$ by setting

$$Y_n = Q\theta_n(E_n).$$

Then Y_n is a f.d.s.a. subspace of Z such that

$$Y_n \subset Y_{n+1}$$

for all $n \geq 1$. Indeed, we have

$$\forall x \in E_n \quad Q\theta_n(x) = Q\theta_{n+1}(T_n(x)),$$

because $\theta_n(x) - \theta_{n+1}(T_n(x))$ is a finitely supported element of $\ell_\infty(C_0(\mathcal{C}))$.

We define

$$A = \overline{\cup Y_n} \subset Z.$$

A priori this is a s.a. subspace. We will see below that it is actually a C^* -subalgebra.

We will first show that $d_{cb}(Y_n, E_n) \leq \prod_{j \geq n} (1 + \varepsilon_j) = 1 + \eta_n$. Note first of all that the map $w_n = Q\theta_n : E_n \rightarrow Y_n$ satisfies $\|w_n\|_{cb} \leq \|\theta_n\|_{cb} \leq 1$. Moreover we have a commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E_n & \xrightarrow{T_n} & E_{n+1} \\ \downarrow w_n & & \downarrow w_{n+1} \\ Y_n & \hookrightarrow & Y_{n+1} \end{array}$$

By definition of Y_n we know $Y_n = w_n(E_n)$. We claim that

$$(6.4) \quad \|w_n^{-1}|_{Y_n}\|_{cb} \leq \prod_{j \geq n} (1 + \varepsilon_j).$$

Indeed, for any $x \in E_n$ we have $\|w_n(x)\| = \lim_k \|T_{n+k} \cdots T_{n+1} T_n(x)\|$ and hence using (ii) in Lemma 6.4 and one more telescoping argument we find $\|w_n(x)\| \geq \prod_{n+k \geq j \geq n} (1 + \varepsilon_j)^{-1} \|x\|$. This shows $\|w_n^{-1}|_{Y_n}\| \leq \prod_{j \geq n} (1 + \varepsilon_j)$. A simple modification gives us the same for the cb-norm, whence the claim.

Now we can rewrite the preceding diagram as a factorization of the inclusion $Y_n \subset Y_{n+1}$, as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E_n & \xrightarrow{T_n} & E_{n+1} \\ \uparrow w_n^{-1} & & \downarrow w_{n+1} \\ Y_n & \hookrightarrow & Y_{n+1} \end{array}$$

Recall $\delta_n = \sum_{j > n} \varepsilon_j$. To check that A is a subalgebra of Z we will show that

$$(6.5) \quad \forall a, b \in Y_n \quad d(ab, Y_{n+1}) \leq \delta_n (1 + \eta_n)^2 \|a\| \|b\|.$$

Assume $a = w_n(x) = w_{n+1}(T_n(x))$ and $b = w_n(y) = w_{n+1}(T_n(y))$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} ab &= Q\theta_{n+1}(T_n(x))Q\theta_{n+1}(T_n(y)) = Q(\theta_{n+1}(T_n(x))\theta_{n+1}(T_n(y))) \\ &= Q((0, \dots, 0, T_n(x)T_n(y), T_{n+1}T_n(x)T_{n+1}T_n(y), T_{n+2}T_{n+1}T_n(x)T_{n+2}T_{n+1}T_n(y), \dots)), \end{aligned}$$

where $T_n(x)T_n(y) \in E_{n+1}$ stands at the $n+1$ -place. We will compare ab with $Q\theta_{n+1}(T_n(x)T_n(y))$. We have

$$\|ab - Q\theta_{n+1}(T_n(x)T_n(y))\| = \overline{\lim}_k \|T_{n+k} \cdots T_{n+1} T_n(x) T_{n+k} \cdots T_{n+1} T_n(y) - T_{n+k} \cdots T_{n+1} [T_n(x) T_n(y)]\|.$$

We claim that

$$\|T_{n+k} \cdots T_{n+1} T_n(x) T_{n+k} \cdots T_{n+1} T_n(y) - T_{n+k} \cdots T_{n+1} [T_n(x) T_n(y)]\| \leq \left(\sum_{n < j \leq n+k} \varepsilon_j \right) \|x\| \|y\|.$$

We will use (6.2) and an easy telescoping sum argument. This gives us

$$\|T_{n+1} [T_n(x) T_n(y)] - T_{n+1} T_n(x) T_{n+1} T_n(y)\| \leq \varepsilon_{n+1} \|x\| \|y\|$$

and hence since $\|T_{n+2}\| \leq 1$

$$\|T_{n+2} T_{n+1} [T_n(x) T_n(y)] - T_{n+2} [T_{n+1} T_n(x) T_{n+1} T_n(y)]\| \leq \varepsilon_{n+1} \|x\| \|y\|$$

$$\|T_{n+2} [T_{n+1} T_n(x) T_{n+1} T_n(y)] - T_{n+2} T_{n+1} T_n(x) T_{n+2} T_{n+1} T_n(y)\| \leq \varepsilon_{n+2} \|x\| \|y\|$$

and hence adding these last two inequalities we find

$$\|T_{n+2} T_{n+1} [T_n(x) T_n(y)] - T_{n+2} T_{n+1} T_n(x) T_{n+2} T_{n+1} T_n(y)\| \leq (\varepsilon_{n+1} + \varepsilon_{n+2}) \|x\| \|y\|.$$

Continuing in this way, we obtain the claim. From the claim we deduce

$$\|ab - Q\theta_{n+1}(T_n(x) T_n(y))\| \leq \delta_n \|x\| \|y\|$$

and (6.5) follows by (6.4) and (6.3). But now since $Y_n \subset Y_{n+k}$ we also have

$$\forall a, b \in Y_n \quad d(ab, Y_{n+k+1}) \leq \delta_{n+k} \rightarrow 0,$$

and hence $ab \in \overline{\cup Y_n} = A$. Clearly the same conclusion holds for any $a, b \in \cup Y_n$, so that A (which, as we already noticed, is s.a.) is a C^* -subalgebra of Z .

We will now show that A has the WEP. By Proposition 2.1, this reduces to the following:

Assertion 1. Fix n and let $u : S \rightarrow A$ with $S \subset \ell_1^n$ and $\|u\|_{cb} \leq 1$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an extension of u denoted by $\tilde{u} : \ell_1^n \rightarrow A$ such that $\|\tilde{u}|_S - u\| \leq \varepsilon$ and $\|\tilde{u}\| \leq 1 + \varepsilon$.

To check Assertion 1 we may obviously assume by density that $u(S) \subset \cup Y_m$, or equivalently that $u(S) \subset Y_m$ for some $m \geq n$ that can be chosen as large as we wish. Note that we have a natural embedding $\ell_1^n \subset \ell_1^m$, with which any $S \subset \ell_1^n$ can be viewed without loss of generality as sitting in ℓ_1^m , and for the map $v = w_m^{-1} u : S \rightarrow E_m$ we have $\|v\|_{cb} = \|w_m^{-1} u\|_{cb} \leq 1 + \eta_m$. Taking this last remark into account, by (i) in Lemma 6.4 applied to E_m , after restricting the resulting map to ℓ_1^n , we find a map $\tilde{v} : \ell_1^n \rightarrow E_{m+1}$ such that

$$\|\tilde{v}|_S - T_m v\| \leq \varepsilon_m (1 + \eta_m)$$

and

$$\|\tilde{v}\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon_m) \|v\|_{cb} \leq (1 + \varepsilon_m) \|w_m^{-1}\|_{cb} \|u\|_{cb} \leq (1 + \varepsilon_m)(1 + \eta_m).$$

Let $\tilde{u} = w_{m+1} \tilde{v} : \ell_1^n \rightarrow Y_{m+1}$. Then

$$\|\tilde{u}|_S - u\| \leq \|w_{m+1}\| \|\tilde{v} - w_{m+1}^{-1} u\|,$$

and the latter norm is $\leq \|w_{m+1}\| \|\tilde{v} - T_m v\|$ since $w_{m+1}^{-1} u = w_{m+1}^{-1} w_m (w_m^{-1} u) = w_{m+1}^{-1} w_m v$ and $w_{m+1}^{-1} w_m$ is nothing but T_m . Thus we obtain

$$\|\tilde{u}\| \leq (1 + \eta_{m+1})(1 + \varepsilon_m)(1 + \eta_m) \text{ and } \|\tilde{u}|_S - u\| \leq \varepsilon_m (1 + \eta_m).$$

Since m can be chosen arbitrarily large and both $\varepsilon_m \rightarrow 0$ and $\eta_m \rightarrow 0$, we obtain Assertion 1. By Proposition 2.1 A has the WEP.

Recall that for any f.d. subspace $E \subset C$ of a C^* -algebra C with LLP we have $d_{S\mathcal{C}}(E) = 1$. This holds in particular for $C = C_0(\mathcal{C})$.

Since $d_{cb}(Y_n, E_n) \leq 1 + \eta_n$ and $E_n \subset C_0(\mathcal{C})$ we have $d_{S\mathcal{C}}(Y_n) \leq 1 + \eta_n$ for all n . Since $A = \overline{\cup Y_n}$ with (Y_n) increasing, we have $d_{S\mathcal{C}}(Y_k) \leq d_{S\mathcal{C}}(Y_n)$ for all $k \leq n$ and hence $d_{S\mathcal{C}}(Y_k) = 1$ for all k . By perturbation this implies

$$\forall E \subset A \quad d_{S\mathcal{C}}(E) = 1.$$

Since A has the WEP, Proposition 3.4 implies that A also has the LLP.

Lastly, since we have $\mathcal{E}_n \subset E_n$ for all n there is $\mathcal{E}'_n \subset Y_n$ such that $d_{cb}(\mathcal{E}'_n, \mathcal{E}_n) \leq d_{cb}(Y_n, E_n) \leq 1 + \eta_n$. This is not quite what is stated in Theorem 6.2. But if we arrange the sequence (\mathcal{E}_n) so that each space in it is repeated infinitely many times, then for any given space \mathcal{E} in the sequence $\{\mathcal{E}_n\}$ there will be $\mathcal{E}'_n \subset Y_n$ satisfying $d_{cb}(\mathcal{E}'_n, \mathcal{E}) \leq 1 + \eta_n$ for infinitely many n 's. Choosing n large enough so that $\eta_n < \varepsilon$, we obtain the second part of Theorem 6.2. \square

7 Possible variants

1. One could work with subspaces E such that $E \subset C_0 \otimes \mathcal{C}$ and use ρ_n instead of φ_n . The only change needed is that the map $\hat{v} : \ell_1^n \rightarrow C_0(\mathcal{C})$ appearing in the proof of Lemma 5.1 should be perturbed so that it lands in $C_0 \otimes \mathcal{C}$. In this approach we have $\|\rho_n^{-1}|_{\rho_n(E)}\|_{cb} \leq 1$ but we still use φ_n in order to show that $\limsup \|\rho_n|_E\|_{cb} \leq 1$.

2. While it does not seem to make much difference, it may be more natural to work with unital algebras and operator systems instead of operator subspaces of $C_0(\mathcal{C})$. For that purpose we consider for any C^* -algebra B the unitization $C(B)$ of $C_0(B)$ in place of $C_0(B)$. This is what is usually called the cone algebra of B . Consider an operator system $E \subset C(\mathcal{C})$. We replace the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_0(\mathcal{C}) & & \\ \uparrow r_0 & \searrow q_0 & \\ C_0(\mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow{j_0} & C_0(B) \end{array}$$

by the unital analogue

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C(\mathcal{C}) & & \\ \uparrow r_1 & \searrow q_1 & \\ C(\mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow{j_1} & C(B) \end{array}$$

where q_1, r_1, j_1 are the unital extensions of q_0, r_0, j_0 . Note that

$$\ker(q_1) = \ker(q_0) = C_0(\mathcal{I}) \subset C(\mathcal{C}).$$

We extend φ_n to a unital map on $C(\mathcal{C})$.

Consider $u : S \rightarrow E$ where E is an operator system and $S \subset \ell_1^n$. We view $\ell_1^n = \text{span}[U_1, \dots, U_n]$ and $\ell_1^{n+1} = \text{span}[1, U_1, \dots, U_n]$. Let $S_1 = \mathbb{C}1 + S$. Clearly, u uniquely extends to a unital operator $u_1 : S_1 \rightarrow E$ such that $u_1|_S = u|_S$. We have $\|u_1\|_{cb} = \max\{1, \|u\|_{cb}\}$. Then if we have $\tilde{u} : \ell_1^n \rightarrow C(\mathcal{C})$ extending u , its unital extension map $\tilde{u}_1 : \ell_1^{n+1} \rightarrow C(\mathcal{C})$ satisfies

$$q_1(\tilde{u}_1|_{S_1} - \psi_1 r_1 u_1) = q_0(\tilde{u}|_S - \psi r_0 u),$$

because $(\tilde{u}_1|_{S_1} - \psi_1 r_1 u_1)(1) = 0$. Therefore we can obtain a variant of Lemma 6.4 with operator systems (E_n) and unital c.p. maps T_n .

3. In the opposite direction, we can actually work with non s.a. subspaces, and impose an additional condition that $\{T_n(x)^* \mid x \in E_n\} \subset E_{n+1}$ together with $\|T_n(x^*) - T_n(x)^*\| \leq \varepsilon_n \|x\|$ for any $x \in T_{n-1}(E_{n-1})$. We then will be able to conclude just the same that A is s.a.

4. The construction works just as well if we use all subspaces of \mathcal{C} instead of $\{\ell_1^n\}$, in the style of Remark 2.3 (with $C = \mathcal{C}$). More precisely, let $X_n \subset \mathcal{C}$ be an increasing family of f.d. subspaces with dense union. We may replace $S \subset \ell_1^n$ by $S \subset X_n$, and again study the extension problem of $u : S \rightarrow E$ by $\tilde{u} : X_n \rightarrow E_1$. This shows that, while using ℓ_1^n seems simpler, there is nothing special about it, except for the duality used in the proof of Proposition 2.1.

5. By the main result described in [14] the following property of a C^* -algebra A is sufficient (and necessary) for the WEP:

For any $n \geq 1$, any map $u : \ell_\infty^n \rightarrow A$ with $\|u\|_{cb} \leq 1$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$, there are $a_j, b_j \in A$ such that $\sup_{1 \leq j \leq n} \|u(e_j) - a_j b_j\| \leq \varepsilon$ and $\|\sum a_j a_j^\|^{1/2} \|\sum b_j^* b_j\|^{1/2} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$. Indeed, this implies that $\|u\|_{dec} \leq 1$ for any such u . One can use this criterion instead of the one in Proposition 2.1 to construct our main example.*

References

- [1] N.P. Brown and N. Ozawa, *C*-algebras and finite-dimensional approximations*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 88, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008.
- [2] E. Effros and Z.J. Ruan, *Operator Spaces*. Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2000.
- [3] U. Haagerup, Injectivity and decomposition of completely bounded maps in “Operator algebras and their connection with Topology and Ergodic Theory”. Springer Lecture Notes in Math. 1132 (1985), 170–222.
- [4] M. Junge and G. Pisier, Bilinear forms on exact operator spaces and $B(H) \otimes B(H)$, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **5** (1995), 329–363.
- [5] E. Kirchberg, On nonsemisplit extensions, tensor products and exactness of group C^* -algebras, *Invent. Math.* **112** (1993), 449–489.
- [6] E. Kirchberg, Commutants of unitaries in UHF algebras and functorial properties of exactness, *J. reine angew. Math.* **452** (1994), 39–77.
- [7] C. Lance, On nuclear C^* -algebras. *J. Funct. Anal.* **12** (1973), 157–176.
- [8] N. Ozawa, About the QWEP conjecture, *Internat. J. Math.* **15** (2004), 501–530.
- [9] N. Ozawa, About the Connes embedding conjecture: algebraic approaches, *Jpn. J. Math.* **8** (2013), no. 1, 147–183.
- [10] G. Pisier, Counterexamples to a conjecture of Grothendieck *Acta Math.* **151**, (1983), 181–209.
- [11] G. Pisier, A simple proof of a theorem of Kirchberg and related results on C^* -norms, *J. Operator Theory* **35** (1996), 317–335.
- [12] G. Pisier, *Introduction to operator space theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.

- [13] G. Pisier, Remarks on $B(H) \otimes B(H)$, *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. (Math. Sci.)* **116** (2006), 423–428.
- [14] G. Pisier, On a Characterization of the Weak Expectation Property (WEP), arxiv, July 2019.
- [15] G. Pisier, *Tensor products of C^* -algebras and operator spaces*, *The Connes-Kirchberg problem*, Cambridge University Press, to appear.
Available at: <https://www.math.tamu.edu/~pisier/TPCOS.pdf>