BILINEAR FORMS AND THE Ext²-PROBLEM IN BANACH SPACES
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Abstract. Let X be a Banach space and let κ(X) denote the kernel of a quotient map ℓ₁(Γ) → X. We show that Ext²(X, X*) = 0 if and only if bilinear forms on κ(X) extend to ℓ₁(Γ). From that we obtain i) If κ(X) is a L₁-space then Ext²(X, X*) = 0; ii) If X is separable, κ(X) is not an L₁ space and Ext²(X, X*) = 0 then κ(X) has an unconditional basis. This provides new insight into a question of Palamodov in the category of Banach spaces.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to establish a connection between two different areas in the theory of Banach spaces: homology and holomorphy. Let us make a brief introduction to explain the nature of our results. Given two Banach spaces X and Y let ℒ(X, Y) denote the vector space of linear continuous operators acting between them. If ℒ denotes the previous functor then its first derived functor Ext is the one that assigns to each couple X, Y the vector space Ext(X, Y) of exact sequences 0 → Y → ♦ → X → 0 modulo equivalence (see Section 2 for all unexplained terms); its second derived functor will be called Ext² and its operative description can be found in Section 3.

It turns out that several important Banach space problems and results adopt the form Ext(X, Y) = 0. For instance,

• Sobczyk’s theorem: Ext(X, c₀) = 0 for every separable Banach space X.
• Lindenstrauss’s lifting principle: Ext(L₁(μ), X*) = 0 for every dual space X*.
• The Johnson-Zippin’s theorem: Ext(H*, Lₘₐₓ) = 0 for every subspace H of c₀ and every Lₘₐₓ-space.

In general, a basic Banach space question is whether Ext(X, Y) = 0 for a given couple of Banach spaces X, Y; and one of the fundamental results is that Ext(ℓ₂, ℓ₂) ≠ 0 (see [9, 15]). Similar questions for the second derived functor Ext² have not been treated too often in the literature (see [20]). Palamodov’s Problem [18, Problem 6] states: Is Ext²(·, E) = 0 for any Fréchet space? A solution to Palamodov’s problem in the category of Fréchet space was provided by Wengenroth in [21]. In the domain of Banach spaces the answer to the question is obviously not, as can be seen in Proposition 8.3. More interesting are questions of the type: Is Ext²(X, Y) = 0 for a specific choice of X, Y ?. In particular, the problem of whether Ext²(ℓ₂, ℓ₂) = 0 is open. Partial results have been obtained in [1] and [2]. We present here the following two results. The first one establishes an unexpected connection between homology and the study of bilinear forms:
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Theorem 1.1. Let \( X \) be a Banach space and let \( Q : \ell_1(\Gamma) \to X \) be a quotient map. \( \text{Ext}^2(X, X^*) = 0 \) if and only if every bilinear form defined on \( \ker Q \) can be extended to a bilinear form on \( \ell_1(\Gamma) \).

The second result connects the \( \text{Ext}^2 \) problem with the nature of subspaces of \( \ell_1 \). Precisely,

Theorem 1.2. Let \( X \) be a separable Banach space and let \( q : \ell_1 \to X \) be a quotient map.

1. If \( \ker q \) is an \( L_1 \)-space then \( \text{Ext}^2(X, X^*) = 0 \).
2. If \( \ker q \) has an unconditional basis and is not an \( L_1 \)-space then \( \text{Ext}^2(X, X^*) \neq 0 \).

We refer the reader to [8] and [10] for basic and thorough information about tensor products, to [11, 17] for general homological tools and to [3, 4] for general results on the extension bilinear forms.

2. Ext on Banach spaces

Recall that a short exact sequence in the category of Banach spaces is a diagram \( 0 \to Y \to \phi \to X \to 0 \) formed by Banach spaces and linear continuous operators such that the kernel of each arrow coincides with the image of the preceding. The open mapping theorem guarantees that \( Y \) is a subspace of \( \phi \) such that the corresponding quotient \( \phi / Y \) is \( X \). The space \( \phi \) itself is called a twisted sum of \( Y \) and \( X \) (in that order). Two extensions \( 0 \to Y \to \phi_i \to X \to 0 \) \((i = 1, 2)\) are said to be equivalent if there exists an arrow \( T \) making commutative the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & \to & Y & \to & \phi_1 & \to & X & \to & 0 \\
\| & & T & & & & & \| \\
0 & \to & Y & \to & \phi_2 & \to & X & \to & 0
\end{array}
\]

By the 3-lemma [11], and the open mapping theorem, \( T \) must be an isomorphism. A short exact sequence is said to split if it is equivalent to the trivial sequence \( 0 \to Y \to Y \oplus X \to X \to 0 \). Given two Banach spaces \( Y \) and \( X \) we denote by \( \text{Ext}(X, Y) \) the set of all possible short exact sequences \( 0 \to Y \to \phi \to X \to 0 \) modulo equivalence.

Given operators \( \alpha : Y \to A \) and \( \beta : Y \to B \) between Banach spaces, the associated push-out diagram is

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
Y & \overset{\alpha}{\longrightarrow} & A \\
\rho \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\
B & \overset{\beta}{\longrightarrow} & \text{PO}
\end{array}
\]

(1)

The push-out space \( \text{PO} = \text{PO}(\alpha, \beta) \) is the quotient of the direct sum \( A \oplus_1 B \) by the closure of the subspace \( \Delta = \{ (\alpha y, -\beta y) : y \in Y \} \). The map \( \overline{\rho} \) is the composition of the inclusion of \( B \) into \( A \oplus_1 B \) and the natural quotient map \( A \oplus_1 B \to (A \oplus_1 B)/\Delta \), so that \( \overline{\rho}(b) = (0, b) + \Delta \) and, analogously, \( \overline{\beta}(a) = (a, 0) + \Delta \). All this make (1) a commutative diagram: \( \overline{\rho} \alpha = \overline{\beta} \beta \). Suppose moreover that we are given an exact sequence \( 0 \to Y \overset{\phi}{\longrightarrow} \phi \overset{\rho}{\longrightarrow} X \to 0 \) and an operator \( \tau : Y \to B \). Consider the push-out PO of the couple \((\phi, \tau)\).
The universal property of the push-out gives a unique operator $\bar{\rho} : \text{PO} \to X$ making a commutative diagram:

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \rightarrow & Y & \overset{j}{\rightarrow} & \diamond & \overset{\rho}{\rightarrow} & X & \rightarrow & 0 \\
\tau \downarrow & & \tau \downarrow & & \| & & \| \\
0 & \rightarrow & B & \overset{j}{\rightarrow} & \text{PO} & \overset{\bar{\rho}}{\rightarrow} & X & \rightarrow & 0 \\
\end{array}
$$

As it is well known, the lower sequence in a push-out diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \rightarrow & Y & \overset{j}{\rightarrow} & \diamond & \rightarrow & X & \rightarrow & 0 \\
\tau \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \| & & \| \\
0 & \rightarrow & B & \rightarrow & C & \rightarrow & X & \rightarrow & 0 \\
\end{array}
$$
splits if and only if there is an operator $T : \diamond \to B$ such that $T j = \tau$.

The pull-back construction is the dual of that of push-out in the sense of categories, that is, “reversing arrows”. Indeed, let $\alpha : A \to Z$ and $\beta : B \to Z$ be operators acting between Banach spaces. The associated pull-back diagram is

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
B & \overset{\beta}{\rightarrow} & Z \\
\alpha \uparrow & & \uparrow \sigma \\
\text{PB} & \overset{\bar{\beta}}{\rightarrow} & A \\
\end{array}
$$

The pull-back space is $\text{PB} = \text{PB}(\alpha, \beta) = \{(b, a) \in B \oplus_{\sigma} A : \beta(b) = \alpha(a)\}$. The underlined arrows are the restriction of the projections onto the corresponding factor. Consider an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow Y \overset{j}{\rightarrow} \diamond \overset{\rho}{\rightarrow} X \rightarrow 0$ and an operator $\tau : A \rightarrow X$. The pull-back construction yields a commutative diagram:

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \rightarrow & Y & \overset{j}{\rightarrow} & \diamond & \overset{\rho}{\rightarrow} & X & \rightarrow & 0 \\
\| & & \| & & \| & & \| \\
0 & \rightarrow & Y & \overset{j}{\rightarrow} & \text{PB} & \overset{\bar{\rho}}{\rightarrow} & A & \rightarrow & 0 \\
\end{array}
$$

Again, as it is well known, the lower sequence in a pull-back diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \rightarrow & Y & \overset{j}{\rightarrow} & \diamond & \overset{\rho}{\rightarrow} & X & \rightarrow & 0 \\
\| & & \| & & \| & & \| \\
0 & \rightarrow & Y & \overset{j}{\rightarrow} & \text{PB} & \overset{\bar{\rho}}{\rightarrow} & C & \rightarrow & 0 \\
\end{array}
$$
splits if and only if there is an operator $T : C \rightarrow \diamond$ so that $\rho T = \tau$. 
3. Projective presentations of Banach spaces

Given a Banach space $X$ there is some index set $\Gamma$ for which there is a quotient map $Q : \ell_1(\Gamma) \to X$. An exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \ker Q \longrightarrow \ell_1(\Gamma) \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow 0$$

is usually called a projective presentation of $X$. There are many non-equivalent projective presentations of a space $X$. For instance, if $X$ is a separable Banach space, two exact sequences $0 \to \ker Q \to \ell_1 \to X \to 0$ and $0 \to \ell_1(\Gamma) \oplus \ker Q \to \ell_1(\Gamma) \oplus \ell_1 \to X \to 0$ define, for uncountable $\Gamma$, non-equivalent projective presentations of $X$. However, all projective presentations are “essentially the same” in the following sense:

**Proposition 3.1.** Let $X$ be a Banach space and let $\pi : \ell_1(I) \to X$ and $Q : \ell_1(J) \to X$ be two quotient maps. Then there are isomorphisms $\alpha, \beta$ making a commutative diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \ell_1(J) \oplus \ker \pi \\
\downarrow{a} & & \downarrow{\beta} \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \ell_1(I) \oplus \ell_1(I) \\
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \ell_1(I) \oplus \ker Q \\
\downarrow{\alpha} & & \downarrow{\beta} \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \ell_1(I) \oplus \ell_1(J) \\
\end{array}
\longrightarrow
\begin{array}{ccc}
X & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow{\alpha} & & \downarrow{\beta} \\
X & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}
$$

**Proof.** Let $\{(x, y) : \pi x = Qy\}$ be the kernel of the quotient operator $\rho : \ell_1(I) \oplus \ell_1(J) \to X$ given by $\rho(x, y) = \pi x - Qy$. Since the projection onto the second coordinate $\pi_2 : \ker \rho \to \ell_1(J)$ is surjective, it admits a linear continuous selection $s : \ell_1(J) \to \ker \rho$ given by $y \to (sy, y)$. We can define an isomorphism $a : \ker \rho \to \ell_1(J) \oplus \ker \pi$ as $a(x, y) = (x - sy, y)$. It is well defined since $\pi(x - sy) = \pi x - \pi sy = \pi x - Qy = 0$. It is obviously injective since $\rho(x, y) = 0$ implies $x = sy$ and $y = 0$. And it is surjective since $(k, y)$ is the image of $(k + sy, y)$. Hence $\ker \rho = \ell_1(I) \oplus \ker \pi$ and, analogously, $\ker \rho = \ell_1(I) \oplus \ker Q$. \[\square\]

In particular

**Corollary 3.2.** Let $X$ be a separable Banach space different from $\ell_1$ and let $\pi, Q$ be two quotient maps $\ell_1 \to X$. Then there are isomorphisms $\alpha, \beta$ making a commutative diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \ker \pi \\
\downarrow{\alpha} & & \downarrow{\beta} \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \ell_1 \\
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \ker Q \\
\downarrow{\alpha} & & \downarrow{\beta} \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \ell_1 \\
\end{array}
\longrightarrow
\begin{array}{ccc}
X & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow{\alpha} & & \downarrow{\beta} \\
X & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}
$$

**Proof.** Since any infinite dimensional subspace of $\ell_1$ contains a complemented copy of $\ell_1$, one has $\ker \pi \cong \ell_1 \oplus A \cong \ell_1 \oplus \ell_1 \oplus A \cong \ell_1 \oplus \ker \pi$ and, analogously, $\ker Q \cong \ell_1 \oplus \ker Q$. It follows from the proof of Proposition 3.1 that $\ker Q \cong \ell_1 \oplus \ker Q \cong \ell_1 \oplus \ker \pi \cong \ker \pi$. \[\square\]

Thus, regarding the results in this paper there is no difference between considering two different projective presentations of $X$ and, with a slight abuse of notation, we will simply set $\ell_1$ (instead of $\ell_1(\Gamma)$) and $\kappa(X)$ to denote “the” kernel of a projective presentation. Only the results in Section 6 require separability.
4. Ext^2 on Banach spaces

Let us operatively define a few elements of the theory of the higher order derived functors of the functor \( \mathcal{U} \) in Banach spaces. Given an (equivalence class of an) exact sequence \( 0 \to A \to B \to C \to 0 \), it will be useful to give it a short name; say \( F \). We will write \( F : C \simeq A \) when it is necessary to specify the spaces \( A \) and \( C \). We will also write, when necessary, \( 0 \to A \to B \to C \to 0 \equiv F \). The second derived space \( \text{Ext}^2(X, Y) \) is the quotient of the vector space of concatenations \( FG \) in which \( G : X 
arrow B \) and \( F : B 
arrow Y \) with respect to the following equivalence relation. \( FG \equiv F'G' \) if and only if there is a finite sequence of elements \( (F_jG_j)_{j=1,...,n} \) so that

\[
FG \to F_1G_1 \leftarrow F_2G_2 \cdots \leftarrow F_nG_n \to F'G'
\]

where \( FG \to F'G' \) means the existence of a commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
0 & \to & Y & \to & A & \to & B & \to & C & \to & X & \to & 0 \\
\| & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \| \\
0 & \to & Y & \to & A' & \to & B' & \to & C' & \to & X & \to & 0
\end{array}
\]

and \( FG \leftarrow F'G' \) means the existence of a commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
0 & \to & Y & \to & A & \to & B & \to & C & \to & X & \to & 0 \\
\| & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \| \\
0 & \to & Y & \to & A' & \to & B' & \to & C' & \to & X & \to & 0
\end{array}
\]

Given \( 0 \to Y \to A \to B \to 0 \equiv F \) and \( 0 \to B \to C \to X \to 0 \equiv G \) the element \( FG \in \text{Ext}^2(X, Y) \) is said to be 0 if there is a commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
0 & & 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
Y & & Y \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
0 & \to & A & \to & \Diamond & \to & X & \to & 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \| \\
0 & \to & B & \to & C & \to & X & \to & 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
0 & & 0
\end{array}
\]

We will write \( \text{Ext}^2(X, Y) = 0 \) to mean that all elements of \( \text{Ext}^2(X, Y) \) are 0.
5. Bilinear maps on Banach spaces

Let $E$ be a Banach space. We denote by $\mathcal{B}(E, \mathbb{R})$ the Banach space of all scalar bilinear continuous forms on $E$. Classical theory yields the identification

$$\mathcal{B}(E, \mathbb{R}) = \mathcal{L}(E, E^*).$$

Let us denote $b \rightarrow \tau_b$ (or $b_T \leftarrow T$) this identification. Precisely, $<y, \tau_b(x)> = b(x, y)$. We rescue from [3, 4] the following result:

**Lemma 5.1.** A bilinear form $b$ defined on a subspace $E$ of $\ell_1$ extends to a bilinear form $B \in \mathcal{B}(\ell_1, \mathbb{R})$ if and only if $\tau_b$ admits an operator $T : \ell_1 \rightarrow \ell_\infty$ yielding a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
E & \rightarrow & \ell_1 \\
\downarrow \tau_b & & \downarrow r \\
E^* & \leftarrow & \ell_\infty
\end{array}$$

Of course: the bilinear form that extends $b$ is $b_T$.

We introduce now the natural equivalence relation on $\mathcal{B}(\kappa(X), \mathbb{R})$: $B \sim 0$ if and only if $B$ extends to a bilinear form on $\ell_1$. In general, $B \sim B' \iff B - B' \sim 0$.

6. Ext$^2(X, X^*)$ as a space of bilinear forms

**Proposition 6.1.** The vector spaces $\text{Ext}^2(X, X^*)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\kappa(X), \mathbb{R})/\sim$ are isomorphic.

**Proof.** Let us call $0 \rightarrow \kappa(X) \rightarrow \ell_1 \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0 \equiv \Lambda_1$ (resp. $0 \rightarrow X^* \rightarrow \ell_\infty \rightarrow \kappa(X)^* \rightarrow 0 \equiv \Lambda_\infty$). Every exact sequence $0 \rightarrow B \rightarrow \Diamond \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0 \equiv \Omega$ is a push-out $\Omega = \phi_\Omega \Lambda_1$ for some operator $\phi_\Omega : \kappa(X) \rightarrow B$; and every exact sequence $0 \rightarrow X^* \rightarrow \Diamond \rightarrow B \rightarrow 0 \equiv \Omega$ is a pull-back $\Omega = \Lambda_\infty \psi_\Omega$ for some operator $\phi_\Omega : B \rightarrow \ell_\infty/X^*$.

The isomorphism between $\text{Ext}^2(X, X^*)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\kappa(X), \mathbb{R})/\sim$ is as follows: given $FG \in \text{Ext}^2(X, X^*)$, with $G : X \leadsto B$ and $F : B \leadsto X^*$, write

$$FG = F\phi_G \Lambda_1 = \Lambda_\infty \psi_{F\phi_G} \Lambda_1$$

where $\psi_{F\phi_G} : \kappa(X) \rightarrow \kappa(X)^*$ is the operator associated to a bilinear form on $\kappa(X)$. Conversely, given a bilinear form $b$ on $\kappa(X)$ with associated operator $\tau_b : \kappa(X) \rightarrow \kappa(X)^*$ we form the element $\Lambda_\infty \tau_b \Lambda_1$. 

This correspondence is compatible with the equivalence relations: the commutative diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & X^* & \longrightarrow & A & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & C & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & 0 & \equiv FG \\
& & \| & & \| & & \| & & \| & & \| & & \| & & \|
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & X^* & \longrightarrow & PB & \longrightarrow & \kappa(X) & \longrightarrow & \ell_1 & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & 0 & \equiv F\psi_G\Lambda_1 \\
& & \| & & \| & & \| & & \| & & \| & & \| & & \|
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & X^* & \longrightarrow & \ell_\infty & \longrightarrow & \ell_\infty/X^* & \longrightarrow & PO & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & 0 & \equiv \Lambda_\infty\tau_b\Lambda_1 \\
& & \| & & \| & & \| & & \| & & \| & & \| & & \|
\end{array}
\]

shows that \( FG \) and \( \Lambda_\infty\tau_b\Lambda_1 \) are the same element of \( \text{Ext}^2(X, X^*) \). And, \( \Lambda_\infty\tau_b\Lambda_1 \equiv 0 \) if and only if the exact sequence \( 0 \rightarrow \ell_\infty/X^* \rightarrow PO \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0 \equiv \tau_b\Lambda_1 \) splits, which occurs if and only if \( \tau_b \) admits an extension to an operator \( \tau : \ell_1 \rightarrow \ell_\infty/X^* \). Since \( \ell_1 \) is projective, this operator can be lifted to an operator \( T : \ell_1 \rightarrow \ell_\infty \) through the quotient map \( i^* \) yielding a commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\kappa(X) & \longrightarrow & \ell_1 \\
\downarrow{\tau_b} & & \downarrow{\tau} \\
\ell_\infty/X^* & \longrightarrow & \ell_1.
\end{array}
\]

Therefore, the bilinear form \( b \) on \( \kappa(X) \) extends to the bilinear form \( b_T \) on \( \ell_1 \).

Conversely, if \( b \) extends to a bilinear form \( B \) on \( \ell_1 \) then \( T = i^*\tau_b \) is an extension of \( \tau_b \) and thus \( \tau_b\Lambda_1 \equiv 0 \) which, in particular, implies \( FG \equiv \Lambda_\infty\tau_b\Lambda_1 \equiv 0 \). \( \square \)

This proves Theorem 1. A direct consequence is that we obtain a different homology sequence to define \( \text{Ext}^2 \): given a projective presentation \( 0 \rightarrow \kappa(X) \rightarrow \ell_1 \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0 \) then one has an exact sequence

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{B}(X, \mathbb{R}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{B}(\ell_1, \mathbb{R}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{B}(\kappa(X), \mathbb{R}) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}^2(X, X^*) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & & & & & & & & & \end{array}
\]

7. Projective tensors

Let \( X\hat{\otimes}_\pi Y \) denote the tensor product endowed with the projective tensor norm, so that (see § 3.2)

\( (X\hat{\otimes}_\pi Y)^* = \mathcal{L}(X, Y^*) = \mathcal{L}(Y, X^*) \). It is plain that bilinear forms defined on \( \kappa(X) \) can be extended to bilinear forms on \( \ell_1 \) if and only if the restriction operator \( R : \mathcal{L}(\kappa(X), \kappa(X)^*) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\ell_1, \ell_1^*) \) is surjective, which happens if and only if \( i \otimes i \) is an into isomorphism. One thus has:

**Proposition 7.1.** Let \( X \) be a separable Banach space and let \( i : \kappa(X) \rightarrow \ell_1 \) be the canonical inclusion. The following are equivalent

1. \( \text{Ext}^2(X, X^*) = 0 \).
2. All bilinear forms defined on \( \kappa(X) \) can be extended to bilinear forms on \( \ell_1 \).
3. The restriction operator \( R : \mathcal{L}(\kappa(X), \kappa(X)^*) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\ell_1, \ell_1^*) \) is surjective.
4. \( i \otimes i : \kappa(X)\hat{\otimes}_\pi\kappa(X) \rightarrow \ell_1\hat{\otimes}_\pi\ell_1 \) is an into isomorphism.
Included in the proof are the quantitative facts: if all bilinear forms defined on $\kappa(X)$ can be extended to bilinear forms on $\ell_1$, then there is a constant $C$ so that all bilinear norm one forms can be extended to bilinear forms with norm at most $C$. Which means that $i \otimes i : \kappa(X) \hat{\otimes}_n \kappa(X) \to \ell_1 \hat{\otimes}_n \ell_1$ is an into $C$-isomorphism, and conversely.

Recall that $\mathcal{L}_1$-spaces preserve the projective tensor norm (see [8] 3.), therefore $\text{Ext}^2(X, X^*) = 0$ whenever $\kappa(X)$ is an $\mathcal{L}_1$-space. This proves Theorem 2 (1).

It is well known that $\ell_1$ contains uncountably many non-isomorphic $\mathcal{L}_1$ spaces [16] and that $X$ does not have to be an $\mathcal{L}_1$ space when $\kappa(X)$ is an $\mathcal{L}_1$-space. There are therefore many nontrivial examples of spaces $X$ so that $\text{Ext}(X, X^*) = 0$.

8. UNCONDITIONAL BASES AND THE EXTENSION OF MULTILINEAR FORMS

Throughout this section all Banach spaces will be separable. A beautiful classical result of Lusky [14] shows that whenever $X$ has a basis, $\kappa(X)$ has a basis. See [5] for further generalizations of this result. In general, $\kappa(X)$ need not to have an unconditional basis when $X$ has an unconditional basis, as the case of $X = c_0$ shows (as it follows from [12], Cor. 2.2); while it is not known whether $\kappa(\ell_2)$ has an unconditional basis. And this is relevant to our discussion because of the following two results:

- Lindenstrauss and Pełczyński proved in [16] that if $X$ is an $\mathcal{L}_1$-space with unconditional basis then $X$ is isomorphic to $\ell_1$.
- Defant et al. show in [7] that if $Y$ is a space with unconditional basis that is a subspace of an $\mathcal{L}_1$-space and there is a constant $C$ such that every $n$-linear form $\tau$ on $Y$ extends to an $n$-linear form $T$ on the whole space satisfying an estimate $\|T\| \leq C\|\tau\|$ then $Y = \ell_1$.

With all this we are ready to obtain our second result.

**Theorem 8.1.** Let $\kappa(X)$ be subspace of $\ell_1$ that is not an $\mathcal{L}_1$-space. If $\kappa(X)$ has an unconditional basis, then $\text{Ext}^2(X, X^*) \neq 0$.

**Proof.** As we know, if $\text{Ext}^2(X, X^*) = 0$ then $i \otimes i : \kappa(X) \hat{\otimes}_n \kappa(X) \hookrightarrow \ell_1 \hat{\otimes}_n \ell_1$ is an into isomorphism. Let $C$ be its norm. Then $\hat{\otimes}^n i : \hat{\otimes}_n \kappa(X) \to \hat{\otimes}_n \ell_1$ is an into $C^n$-isomorphism for all $n$ as it follows from the particular properties of $\ell_1$ which make it sufficient to make extensions “one variable at each time”:

$\kappa(X) \hat{\otimes}_n \kappa(X) \hookrightarrow \ell_1 \hat{\otimes}_n \kappa(X) = \ell_1 (\kappa(X)) \hookrightarrow \ell_1 (\ell_1) = \ell_1 \hat{\otimes}_n \ell_1$

and then iterate the argument

$\hat{\otimes}_n \kappa(X) \hookrightarrow \ell_1 \hat{\otimes}_n \kappa(X) \hat{\otimes}_n \cdots \hat{\otimes}_n \kappa(X) = \ell_1 (\hat{\otimes}_n^{n-1} \kappa(X)) \hookrightarrow \ell_1 (\hat{\otimes}_n^{n-1} \ell_1) = \hat{\otimes}_n \ell_1$.

Thus, $n$-linear norm one forms on $\kappa(X)$ extend to $n$-linear forms on $\ell_1$ with norm at most $C^n$. If $\kappa(X)$ has unconditional basis then the result of Defant et al. in [7] yields that $\kappa(X) = \ell_1$, which is impossible.

It is in this way that the problem of whether $\text{Ext}^2(\ell_2, \ell_2) = 0$ connects with the classical unsolved problem of whether $\kappa(\ell_2)$ has an unconditional basis:

**Corollary 8.2.** If $\text{Ext}^2(\ell_2, \ell_2) = 0$ then $\kappa(X)$ does not have an unconditional basis.
As we mentioned in the Introduction, explicit solutions to Palamodov’s question in the category of Banach spaces can be easily obtained.

**Proposition 8.3.** $\text{Ext}^2(\cdot, \ell_2) \neq 0 \neq \text{Ext}^2(\ell_2, \cdot)$.

**Proof.** Let $0 \to \ell_2 \to X \to \ell_2 \to 0$ be any nontrivial twisted sum of Hilbert spaces (see, e.g., [9, 15]). Embed $\ell_2$ into $L_1 = L_1(0, 1)$ and form the element

$$0 \longrightarrow \ell_2 \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow \ell_2 \longrightarrow L_1(0, 1) \longrightarrow L_1(0, 1)/\ell_2 \longrightarrow 0$$

It cannot be 0 because Lindenstrauss lifting principle yields $\text{Ext}(L_1(0, 1), X) = 0$ since $X$ is reflexive; thus, if the element is 0 then $\ell_2$ will be complemented in $X$, which is impossible. Also, if one writes $\ell_2$ as a quotient of $\ell_\infty$ and forms the element

$$0 \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow \ell_\infty \longrightarrow \ell_2 \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow \ell_2 \longrightarrow 0$$

this cannot be 0 simply because $\ell_\infty$ is injective and, thus, if the element is 0 then $\ell_2$ would be complemented in $X$.

We can also obtain an explicit example of $X$ so that $\text{Ext}^2(X, X^*) \neq 0$

**Proposition 8.4.** If $X = \ell_1/\ell_1(\ell_2^\prime)$ then $\text{Ext}^2(X, X^*) \neq 0$.

**Proof.** Pick a subspace $\ell_1(\ell_2^p)$ of $\ell_1(\ell_1)$ (a subspace $\ell_1(\ell_2^p)$ for any $1 < p \leq 2$ will also work [13]). This subspace clearly has an unconditional basis —it can even be chosen so that $\ell_1/\ell_1(\ell_2^p)$ fails to enjoy the Bounded Approximation Property; see the final example in [5] — and is not an $L_1$-space since its dual $\ell_\infty(\ell_2^p)$ cannot be an $L_\infty$ space because it contains $\ell_2^p$ uniformly complemented. Use now Theorem 8.1.
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