

The Novikov Conjecture
Oberwolfach-Seminar January 2004

Matthias Kreck and Wolfgang Lück

October 1, 2004

Contents

Introduction	9
0 A Motivating Problem (K.)	15
0.1 Dimensions ≤ 4	15
0.2 Dimension 6	16
0.3 Dimension 5	18
1 Introduction to the Novikov and the Borel Conjecture (L.)	19
1.1 The Original Formulation of the Novikov Conjecture	19
1.2 Invariance Properties of the L -Class	20
1.3 The Borel Conjecture	22
2 Normal Bordism Groups (K.)	25
2.1 Normal Bordism Groups	25
2.2 Rational Computation of Normal Bordism Groups	26
2.3 Rational Computation of Oriented Bordism Groups	28
3 The Signature (K.)	31
3.1 The Definition of the Signature	32
3.2 The Bordism Invariance of the Signature	32
3.3 Multiplicativity and other Properties of the Signature	34
3.4 Geometric Interpretation of Cohomology and the Intersection Form	35
4 The Signature Theorem and the Novikov Conjecture (K.)	39
4.1 The Signature Theorem	39
4.2 Higher Signatures	41
4.3 The Novikov Conjecture	42
4.4 The Pontrjagin classes are not homeomorphism invariants	43
5 The Projective Class Group and the Whitehead Group (L.)	47
5.1 The Projective Class Group	47
5.2 The First Algebraic K -Group	49
5.3 The Whitehead Group	53

5.4	The Bass-Heller-Swan Decomposition	54
6	Whitehead Torsion (L.)	57
6.1	Whitehead Torsion of a Chain Map	57
6.2	The Cellular Chain Complex of the Universal Covering	61
6.3	The Whitehead Torsion of a Cellular Map	63
6.4	Simple Homotopy Equivalences	66
7	The Statement and Consequences of the s-Cobordism Theorem (L.)	69
8	Sketch of the Proof of the s-Cobordism Theorem (L.)	73
8.1	Handlebody Decompositions	73
8.2	Handlebody Decompositions and CW -Structures	75
8.3	Reducing the Handlebody Decomposition	77
8.4	Handlebody Decompositions and Whitehead torsion	79
9	From the Novikov Conjecture to Surgery (K.)	83
9.1	The Structure Set	83
9.2	The Assembly Idea	84
10	Surgery Below the Middle Dimension I: An Example (K.)	91
10.1	Surgery and its Trace	91
10.2	The Effect on the Fundamental Group and Homology Groups	92
10.3	Application to Knottings	93
11	Surgery Below the Middle Dimension II: Systematically (K.)	95
11.1	The Effect of Surgery in Homology and Homotopy	95
11.2	Surgery below the Middle Dimension	97
11.3	Construction of Certain 6-Manifolds	100
12	Surgery in the Middle Dimension I (K.)	103
12.1	Motivation for the Surgery Obstruction Groups	103
12.2	Unimodular Hermitian Forms	104
12.3	The L -Groups in Dimensions $4m$	105
12.4	The L -Groups in Other Dimensions	106
13	Surgery in the Middle Dimension II (K.)	109
13.1	Equivariant Intersection Numbers	109
13.2	Stably Free Modules	110
13.3	The Quadratic Refinement	111
13.4	The Surgery Obstruction	113

14 Surgery in the Middle Dimension III (K.)	115
14.1 Stable Diffeomorphism Classification	115
14.2 The Surgery Obstruction is a Bordism Invariant	117
14.3 The Main Result	117
14.4 Proof of the Main Theorem	119
14.5 The Exact Surgery Sequence	122
14.6 Stable Classification of Certain 6-Manifolds	124
15 An Assembly Map (K.)	125
15.1 More on the Definition of the Assembly Map	125
15.2 The Surgery Version of the Novikov Conjecture	128
16 The Novikov Conjecture for \mathbb{Z}^n (K.)	129
16.1 The Idea of the Proof	129
16.2 Reduction to Mapping Tori	129
16.3 The Proof for Rank 1	131
16.4 The Generalization to Higher Rank	133
17 Poincaré Duality and Algebraic L-Groups (L. and Varisco)	135
17.1 Poincaré duality	135
17.2 Algebraic L -groups	141
18 Spectra (L.)	149
18.1 Basic Notions about Spectra	149
18.2 Homotopy Pushouts and Homotopy Pullbacks for spaces	151
18.3 Homotopy Pushouts and Homotopy Pullbacks for Spectra	154
18.4 (Co-)Homology Theories Associated to Spectra	155
18.5 K -Theory and L -Theory Spectra	157
18.6 The Chern Character for Homology Theories	159
18.7 The Bordism Group Associated to a Vector Bundle	160
18.8 The Thom Space of a Vector Bundle	161
18.9 The Pontrjagin Thom Construction	161
18.10 The Stable Version of the Pontrjagin Thom Construction	162
18.11 The Oriented Bordism Ring	164
18.12 Stable Homotopy	165
18.13 The Thom Isomorphism	166
18.14 The Rationalized Oriented Bordism Ring	166
18.15 The Integral Oriented Bordism Ring	167
19 Classifying Spaces of Families (L.)	169
19.1 Basics about G - CW -Complexes	169
19.2 The Classifying Space for a Family	172
19.3 Special Models	173
19.3.1 The Family of All Subgroups and the Trivial Family	173

19.3.2	Operator Theoretic Model	173
19.3.3	Discrete Subgroups of Almost Connected Lie Groups	173
19.3.4	Simply Connected Non-Positively Curved Manifolds	174
19.3.5	CAT(0)-Spaces	174
19.3.6	Trees with Finite Isotropy Groups	174
19.3.7	Amalgamated Products and HNN-Extensions	174
19.3.8	Arithmetic Groups	175
19.3.9	Outer Automorphism Groups of Free groups	176
19.3.10	Mapping Class groups	176
19.3.11	One-Relator Groups	176
19.3.12	Special Linear Groups of (2,2)-Matrices	177
20	Equivariant Homology Theories and the Meta-Conjecture (L.)	179
20.1	The Meta-Conjecture	179
20.2	Formulation of the Farrell-Jones and the Baum-Connes Conjecture	180
20.3	Equivariant Homology Theories	181
20.4	The Construction of Equivariant Homology Theories from Spectra	184
21	The Farrell-Jones Conjecture (L.)	189
21.1	The Bass-Heller Swan Decomposition in Arbitrary Dimensions . . .	189
21.2	Decorations in L -Theory and the Shaneson Splitting	190
21.3	Changing the Family	192
21.4	The Farrell-Jones Conjecture for Torsionfree Groups	193
21.5	The Farrell-Jones Conjecture and the Borel Conjecture	196
21.6	The Passage from \mathcal{FIN} to \mathcal{WC}	196
22	The Baum-Connes Conjecture (L.)	201
22.1	Index Theoretic Interpretation of the Baum-Connes Assembly Map	201
22.2	The Baum-Connes Conjecture for Torsionfree Groups	202
22.3	The Trace Conjecture in the Torsionfree Case	203
22.4	The Kadison Conjecture	203
22.5	The Stable Gromov-Lawson-Rosenberg Conjecture	204
22.6	The Choice of the Family \mathcal{FIN} in the Baum-Connes Conjecture . .	205
23	Relating the Novikov, the Farrell-Jones and the Baum-Connes Conjectures (L.)	207
23.1	The Farrell-Jones Conjecture and the Novikov Conjecture	207
23.2	Relating Topological K -Theory and L -Theory	211
23.3	The Baum-Connes Conjecture and the Novikov Conjecture	213
24	Miscellaneous (L.)	217
24.1	Status of the Conjectures	217
24.2	Methods of Proof	222
24.3	Computations for Finite Groups	222

24.3.1	Topological K -Theory for Finite Groups	222
24.3.2	Algebraic K -Theory for Finite Groups	223
24.3.3	Algebraic L -Theory for Finite Groups	224
24.4	Rational Computations	224
24.4.1	Rationalized Topological K -Theory for Infinite Groups . . .	225
24.4.2	Rationalized Algebraic K -Theory for Infinite Groups	226
24.4.3	Rationalized Algebraic L -Theory for Infinite Groups	227
24.5	Integral Computations	227
25	Exercises	231
26	Hints to the Solutions of the Exercises	241
	References	254
	Index	273
	Notation	280
	Schedule	282
	List of participants	289

Introduction

Manifolds are the central geometric objects in modern mathematics. An attempt to understand the nature of manifolds leads to many interesting questions. One of the most obvious questions is the following.

Let M and N be manifolds: how can we decide whether M and N are homotopy equivalent or homeomorphic or diffeomorphic (if the manifolds are smooth)?

The prototype of a beautiful answer is given by the Poincaré Conjecture. If N is S^n , the n -dimensional sphere, and M is an arbitrary closed manifold, then it is easy to decide whether M is homotopy equivalent to S^n . This is the case if and only if M is simply connected (assuming $n > 1$, the case $n = 1$ is trivial since every closed connected 1-dimensional manifold is diffeomorphic to S^1) and has the homology of S^n . The *Poincaré Conjecture* states that this is also sufficient for the existence of a homeomorphism from M to S^n . For $n = 2$ this follows from the well-known classification of surfaces. For $n > 4$ this was proved by Smale and Newman in the sixties of the last century, Freedman solved the case in $n = 4$ in 1982 and recently Perelman announced a proof for $n = 3$, but this proof has still to be checked thoroughly by the experts. In the smooth category it is not true that manifolds homotopy equivalent to S^n are diffeomorphic. The first examples were published by Milnor in 1956 and together with Kervaire he analyzed the situation systematically in the sixties.

For spheres one only needs very little information to determine the homeomorphism type: the vanishing of the fundamental group and control of the homology groups. Another natural class of manifolds is given by aspherical manifolds. A CW -complex is called *aspherical* if the homotopy groups vanish in dimension > 1 , or, equivalently, if its universal covering is contractible. The *Borel Conjecture*, which is closely related to the Novikov Conjecture, implies that the fundamental group determines the homeomorphism type of an aspherical closed manifold.

For more general manifolds with prescribed fundamental group the classification is in general unknown even if the fundamental group is trivial. In this situation it is natural to construct as many invariants as possible hoping that at least for certain particularly important classes of manifolds one can classify them in terms of these invariants. The most important invariants after homotopy and (co)homology groups are certainly characteristic classes which were defined and systematically treated in the fifties. There are two types of characteristic classes

for smooth manifolds: the *Stiefel-Whitney classes* $w_k(M)$ in $H^k(M; \mathbb{Z}/2)$ and the *Pontrjagin classes* $p_k(M) \in H^{4k}(M; \mathbb{Z})$. The nature of these classes is rather different. The Stiefel-Whitney classes of a closed manifold can be expressed in terms of cohomology operations and so are homotopy invariants, the Pontrjagin classes are diffeomorphism invariants (for smooth manifolds, and only for those they are a priori defined), but not homeomorphism or even homotopy invariants in general. Only very special linear combinations of the Pontrjagin classes are actually homotopy invariants.

For example, the first Pontrjagin class of a closed oriented 4-manifold $p_1(M)$ is a homotopy invariant. The reason is that $\langle p_1(M), [M] \rangle = 3 \cdot \text{sign}(M)$, where $\text{sign}(M)$ is the *signature* of the intersection form on $H^2(M; \mathbb{Q})$. The signature is by construction a homotopy invariant. More generally, Hirzebruch has defined a certain rational polynomial in the Pontrjagin classes (for a definition of Pontrjagin classes see [171]), the *L-class*

$$\mathcal{L}(M) = \mathcal{L}(p_1(M), p_2(M), \dots) \in \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} H^{4i}(M; \mathbb{Q}).$$

Its i -th component is denoted by

$$\mathcal{L}_i(M) = \mathcal{L}_i(p_1(M), p_2(M), \dots, p_i(M)) \in H^{4i}(M; \mathbb{Q}).$$

The famous *Signature Theorem* of Hirzebruch says that the evaluation of $\mathcal{L}_k(M)$ on the fundamental class $[M]$ gives the signature of a $4k$ -dimensional manifold M :

$$\text{sign}(M) = \langle \mathcal{L}_k(p_1(M), \dots, p_k(M)), [M] \rangle.$$

One can show that a polynomial in the Pontrjagin classes gives a homotopy invariant if and only if it is a multiple of the k -th *L-class*.

This sheds light on the homotopy properties of the polynomial $\mathcal{L}_k(M)$ of a $4k$ -dimensional manifold M . But what can one say about the other polynomials $\mathcal{L}_1(M), \mathcal{L}_2(M), \mathcal{L}_3(M), \dots$? Understanding $\mathcal{L}_i(M)$ is — by Poincaré duality — equivalent to understanding the numerical invariants

$$\langle x \cup \mathcal{L}_i(M), [M] \rangle \in \mathbb{Q} \tag{0.1}$$

for all $x \in H^{n-4i}(M)$, where $n = \dim(M)$. One may ask whether these numerical invariants are homotopy invariant in the following sense: If $g: N \rightarrow M$ is an orientation preserving homotopy equivalence, then

$$\langle x \cup \mathcal{L}_i(M), [M] \rangle = \langle g^*(x) \cup \mathcal{L}_i(N), [N] \rangle. \tag{0.2}$$

In general, these numerical invariants are not homotopy invariants. The Signature Theorem implies that the expression 0.1 is homotopy invariant for all $x \in H^0(M; \mathbb{Q})$. Novikov proved the remarkable result in the sixties that for $\dim(M) = 4k + 1$ and $x \in H^1(M)$ the expression 0.1 is homotopy invariant. This motivated Novikov to state the following conjecture.

Let G be a group. Denote by BG its *classifying space* which is up to homotopy uniquely determined by the property that it is an aspherical CW -complex with G as fundamental group. Novikov conjectured that the numerical expression

$$\langle f^*(x) \cup \mathcal{L}_i(M), [M] \rangle \in \mathbb{Q} \quad (0.3)$$

is *homotopy invariant* for every map $f: M \rightarrow BG$ from a closed oriented n -dimensional manifold M to BG and every class $x \in H^{n-4i}(M; \mathbb{Q})$. More precisely, the famous *Novikov Conjecture* says that if $f': M' \rightarrow K$ is another map and $g: M \rightarrow M'$ is an orientation preserving homotopy equivalence such that $f' \circ g$ is homotopic to f , then

$$\langle f^*(x) \cup \mathcal{L}_i(M), [M] \rangle = \langle (f')^*(x) \cup \mathcal{L}_i(M'), [M'] \rangle.$$

Notice that Novikov's result that 0.2 holds in the case $\dim(M) = 4k + 1$ and $x \in H^1(M)$ is a special case of the Novikov Conjecture above since S^1 is a model for $B\mathbb{Z}$ and a cohomology class $x \in H^1(M)$ is the same as a homotopy class of maps $f: M \rightarrow S^1$, the correspondence is given by associating to the homotopy class of $f: M \rightarrow S^1$ the pullback $f^*(x)$, where x is a generator of $H^1(S^1)$.

Looking at this conjecture in a naive way one does not see a philosophical reason why it should be true. Even in the case of the polynomial \mathcal{L}_k , where $4k$ is the dimension of a manifold, the proof cannot be understood without the signature theorem translating the L -class to a cohomological invariant, the signature. In this situation it is natural to ask for other homotopy invariants (instead of the signature) hoping that one can interpret the expressions 0.3 occurring in the Novikov Conjecture in terms of these invariants. These expressions 0.3 are called *higher signatures*. One can actually express them as signature of certain submanifolds. But this point of view does not give homotopy invariants.

It is natural to collect all higher signatures and form from them a single invariant. This can be done, namely, one considers

$$\text{sign}^G(M, f) := f_*(\mathcal{L}(M) \cap [M]) \in \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}, i \geq 0} H_{m-4i}(BG; \mathbb{Q}),$$

the image of the Poincaré dual of the L -class under the map induced from f . An approach to proving the Novikov Conjecture could be to construct a homomorphism

$$A^G: \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}, i \geq 0} H_{m-4i}(BG; \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow L(G)$$

where $L(G)$ is some Abelian group, such that $A^G(\text{sign}_G(M))$ is a homotopy invariant. Then the Novikov Conjecture would follow if the map A^G is injective. Such maps will be given by so called *assembly maps*.

The construction of such a map is rather complicated. A large part of these lecture notes treats the background needed to construct such a map. In particular, one needs the full machinery of surgery theory. We will give an introduction to

this important theory. Roughly speaking, surgery deals with the following problem. Let W be a compact m -dimensional manifold whose boundary is either empty or consists of two components M_0 and M_1 and $f: W \rightarrow X$ a map to a finite CW -complex. If the boundary of W is not empty, we assume that f restricted to M_0 and M_1 is a homotopy equivalence. Then X is a so called *Poincaré complex*, something we also require if the boundary of W is empty. The question is whether we can replace W and f by W' and f' (bordant to (W, f)) such that f' is a homotopy equivalence. If the boundary of W is not empty, then W' is an *h -cobordism* between M_0 and M_1 . In general it is not possible to replace (W, f) by (W', f') with f' a homotopy equivalence. Wall has defined abelian groups $L_m^h(\pi_1(X))$ and an obstruction $\theta(W, f) \in L_m^h(\pi_1(X))$ whose vanishing is a necessary and sufficient condition for replacing (W, f) by (W', f') with f' a homotopy equivalence, if $m > 4$. One actually needs some more control, namely a so-called normal structure on W . All this is explained in Chapters 2, 10 - 14 and Chapter 17.

Why is it so interesting to obtain an *h -cobordism*? If X is simply-connected, and the dimension of W is greater than five, the celebrated *h -cobordism theorem* of Smale says that an *h -cobordism* W is diffeomorphic to the cylinder over M_0 . In particular, M_0 and M_1 are diffeomorphic. There is a corresponding result for topological manifolds. In the situation which is relevant for the Novikov Conjecture, X is not simply-connected and then the *h -cobordism theorem* does not hold. There is an obstruction, the *Whitehead torsion*, sitting in the *Whitehead group* which is closely related to the algebraic K_1 -group. If the dimension of the *h -cobordism* W is larger than five, then the vanishing of this obstruction is necessary and sufficient for W to be diffeomorphic to the cylinder. This is called the *s -cobordism theorem*. The Whitehead group, the obstruction and the idea of the proof of the *s -cobordism theorem* are treated in Chapters 5 - 8.

In Chapters 15 - 16 we define the assembly map and apply it to prove the Novikov Conjecture for finitely-generated free Abelian Groups.

What we have presented so far summarizes and explains information which was known around 1970. To get a feeling for how useful the Novikov Conjecture is, we apply it to some classification problems in low dimensions (see Chapter 0).

In the rest of the lecture notes we present some of the most important concepts and results concerning the Novikov Conjecture and other closely related conjectures dating from after 1970. This starts with an introduction to spectra (see Chapter 18) and continues with classifying spaces of families, a generalization of aspherical spaces (see Chapter 19). With this we have prepared a frame in which not only the Novikov Conjecture but other similar and very important conjectures can be formulated: the *Farrell-Jones* and the *Baum-Connes Conjectures*. After introducing equivariant homology theories in Chapter 20, these conjectures and their relation to the Novikov Conjecture are discussed in Chapters 21 - 23. Finally, these lecture notes are finished by Chapter 24 called "Miscellaneous" in which the status of the conjectures is summarized and methods and proofs are presented.

It is interesting to speculate whether the Novikov Conjecture holds for all groups. No counterexamples are known to the authors. An interesting article ex-

pressing doubts was published by Gromov [102].

We have added a collection of exercises and hints for their solutions.

From the amount of material presented in these Lecture Notes it is obvious, that we cannot present all of the details. We have tried to explain those things which are realistic for the very young participants of the seminar to master and we have only said a few words (if anything at all) at other places. People who want to understand the details of this fascinating theory will have to consult other books and often the original literature. We hope that they will find our Lecture Notes useful, since we explain some of the central ideas and give a guide for learning the beautiful mathematics related to the Novikov Conjecture and other closely related conjectures and results.

We would like to thank the participants of this seminar for their interest and many stimulating discussions and Mathematisches Forschungsinstitut Oberwolfach for providing excellent conditions for such a seminar. We also would like to thank Andrew Ranicki for carefully reading a draft of this notes and many useful comments.