

A Short Proof of Köthe's Conjecture for Compact Rings

Scott Goodson¹, Alex Taylor²

Abstract

We provide a new proof that the upper nilradical of a compact ring coincides with the sum of its left nil ideals using the properties of orthogonal idempotents in compact rings.³

In this note all rings are assumed to be associative, but neither unital nor commutative. A topological ring is a pair (R, \mathcal{T}) , where R is a ring and \mathcal{T} is a Hausdorff topology on R , such that $(R, +, \mathcal{T})$ is a topological group and multiplication $\cdot : R \times R \rightarrow R$ is continuous. We adopt the following standard notations and definitions. The sum of all left nil ideals of R is denoted by $A(R)$. The upper nilradical of R is the sum of all two-sided nil ideals of R and is denoted by $N(R)$. The Jacobson radical is denoted by $J(R)$. A nontrivial idempotent is an idempotent which is neither 0 nor 1, and a central idempotent is an idempotent belonging to the center of the ring.

Perhaps the most persistent open problem in non-commutative ring theory is whether or not $A(R) = N(R)$ for an arbitrary ring R , the so-called *Köthe problem*. Ursul [3] proved in 1984 that they do indeed coincide for a compact topological ring R by studying nilrings of bounded index. In this note we provide a new, straightforward proof that $A(R) = N(R)$ for any compact topological ring R .

Lemma. Let R be a compact, unital ring which is not local.⁴ Then any non-local idempotent $e \in R$ can be decomposed into a sum of nontrivial orthogonal idempotents.

Proof. First suppose that R is unital. We show that $1 \in R$ can be expressed as a sum of nontrivial orthogonal idempotents. Since R is not local, it possesses a maximal set of nontrivial orthogonal idempotents $\{e_i\}_{i \in I}$. Denote their sum by $s = \sum_{i \in I} e_i$, which is a nonzero idempotent. Consider the compact subring $(1-s)R(1-s)$. If $(1-s)R(1-s)$ is not quasi-regular, then it contains a local idempotent $e' = (1-s)r(1-s)$ [4]. For each $i \in I$ we have

$$e'e_i = (1-s)r(1-s)e_i = (1-s)r(e_i - se_i) = 0$$

and similarly $e_ie' = 0$. Therefore $\{e_i\}_{i \in I}$ can be extended by adjoining e' , and this contradicts the maximality of the set. Therefore $(1-s)R(1-s)$ is quasi-regular, and so

$$(1-s)R(1-s) = J((1-s)R(1-s)) \subseteq J(R),$$

hence $(1-s) \in J(R)$ implies that $s = 1$. Thus, 1 can be decomposed as a sum of nontrivial orthogonal idempotents. Now in the case that R is not necessarily unital, let e be any non-local idempotent of R . Then e is the identity element of the compact subring eRe , hence e is a sum of nontrivial orthogonal idempotents in $eRe \subseteq R$. ■

Theorem. Let R be a compact topological ring. Then $A(R) = N(R)$.

Proof. Since $N(R) \subseteq \overline{N(R)} \subseteq \overline{A(R)} \subseteq J(R)$, it suffices to show that $S = \overline{A(R)}/\overline{N(R)} = \{0\}$. This quotient is compact as the continuous image of a compact ring, and it is Hausdorff because $\overline{N(R)}$ is closed. Suppose that S is nonzero. If S is quasi-regular then, since the Jacobson radical of a compact ring is topologically nilpotent [1], we have

$$S = J(S) = J(\overline{A(R)}/\overline{N(R)}) \subseteq J(R/J(R)) = \{0\},$$

¹The University of Texas at Dallas, Scott.Goodson@utdallas.edu

²The University of Texas at Dallas, Alex.Taylor@utdallas.edu

³This paper was written as a part of the Directed Research Program at UT Dallas. The authors thank the mathematics department for providing space for us to work and Joseph Burnett for organizing the program.

⁴A compact unital ring is not local if and only if it has nontrivial idempotents.

a contradiction. Thus, we assume that S is not quasi-regular. Suppose also that S is semisimple, otherwise we can pass to $S/J(S)$. Therefore S is unital, and S is local if and only if S is a division ring. Since the result follows trivially in the case that S is a division ring, suppose that S is not local. Then S possesses a collection of nontrivial central idempotents $\{e_i\}_{i \in I}$ [5]. Note that these central idempotents are not local: if e_i is local for some $i \in I$, then $e_i S$ is a local ring, hence a division ring. Furthermore, $e_i S(1 - e_i) = 0$ so $e_i s(1 - e_i) = 0$ for some $s \in S$, and since $e_i s \in e_i S$ is a unit it follows that $e_i = 1$ is trivial, a contradiction. Choose one central idempotent $f \in \{e_i\}_{i \in I}$. By the Lemma we can express f as a sum of nontrivial orthogonal idempotents,

$$f = \sum_{j \in J} f_j$$

which constitute a maximal set of orthogonal idempotents in the compact semisimple ring fS , and can be chosen to be central since fS is topologically isomorphic to a product of matrix rings over a finite field [1]. Furthermore, fS possesses a nonzero local idempotent $e \in fS$ [4]. Evidently $ef \in S$ is also a local idempotent because $(ef)S(ef) = e(fSf)e$ is local. Now

$$ef = \sum_{j \in J} ef_j$$

where $(ef_j)^2 = ef_j ef_j = e(f_j)^2 e = ef_j$ for each $j \in J$ and $ef_j ef_k = ef_j f_k e = 0$ for all $j \neq k$. Note also that e does not annihilate every f_j because if $ef_j = 0$ for each $j \in J$ then we can adjoin e to the collection $\{f_j\}_{j \in J}$, contradicting the fact that $\{f_j\}_{j \in J}$ is a maximal set of orthogonal idempotents in fS . We have expressed ef as a sum of orthogonal idempotents, and since they are nontrivial J must possess at least two indices. Thus, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} ef &= \sum_{j \in J} ef_j \\ &= ef_n + \sum_{j \in J \setminus n} ef_j \\ &= ef_n + ef'_n \\ &= g + g' \end{aligned}$$

where $g' = ef'_n = \sum_{j \in J \setminus n} ef_j$ is a nonzero idempotent orthogonal to $g = ef_n$. Note that $g \neq g'$ otherwise $g^2 = g = 0$. Now $ge = eg = g$, so $g \in e(fS)e$. Similarly, $g'e = eg' = g'$ so $g' \in e(fS)e$. Therefore g and g' are two different nonzero idempotents in the local ring $e(fS)e$, a contradiction. It follows that $\overline{A(R)}/\overline{N(R)} = 0$ and $A(R) = N(R)$. ■

References

- [1] I. Kaplansky, Topological Rings, *Amer. J. Math.*, 69 (1947), pp. 153-183.
- [2] T.Y. Lam, A First Course in Noncommutative Rings, (2001), pp. 294-336.
- [3] M.I. Ursul, Compact nilrings, *Matem. Zametki*, 36 (1984), pp. 839-844.
- [4] M.I. Ursul, Topological Rings Satisfying Compactness Conditions, (2002), p. 212.
- [5] S. Warner, Topological Rings, (1993), pp. 303-306.