

① First two small observations on the Killing form B .

B is invariant under $A \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$.

$$A \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}) \text{ iff } A([x, y]) = [Ax, Ay]$$

$$\Leftrightarrow A \cdot \text{ad}_x = \text{ad}_{Ax} \cdot A \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad A \cdot \text{ad}_x A^{-1} = \text{ad}_{Ax}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hence } B(Ax, Ay) &= \text{tr}(\text{ad}_{Ax} \cdot \text{ad}_{Ay}) \\ &= \text{tr}(A \text{ad}_x A^{-1} \cdot A \text{ad}_y A^{-1}) \\ &= \text{tr}(A \text{ad}_x \cdot \text{ad}_y A^{-1}) = \text{tr}(\text{ad}_x \cdot \text{ad}_y) \\ &= B(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

This implies B is invariant under $a \in \text{Der}(\mathfrak{g})$

$$(a \in \text{Der}(\mathfrak{g})) \Leftrightarrow a([x, y]) = [ax, y] + [x, ay]$$

& since $\text{Der}(\mathfrak{g}) = \text{Lie}(\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}))$.

Corollary: $B(x, y)$. the Killing form is invariant under ad_z

$$\text{Namely } B(\text{ad}_z x, y) + B(x, \text{ad}_z y) = 0$$

We used the Killing form B is invariant under ad_g in the last lecture on the structure of semi-simple Lie algebras.

② Theorem: (i) \mathfrak{g} is a compact Lie algebra, namely $\mathfrak{g} = \text{Lie}(\mathfrak{K})$

for a compact Lie group

$$\text{then } \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}) \oplus \mathfrak{g}' \quad \mathfrak{g}' = [\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$$

& \mathfrak{g}' is semi-simple.

(ii) If \mathfrak{g} is a simple Lie algebra, then \mathfrak{g} is compact
 $\Leftrightarrow B < 0$.

pf. If G is compact, $\Rightarrow \exists da$ which is bi-invariant

$\Rightarrow \forall \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_0$ on \mathfrak{g} , define

$$\langle x, y \rangle := \int_G \langle \text{Ad}_g(x), \text{Ad}_g(y) \rangle_0 da$$

$\Rightarrow \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is Ad_g invariant.

$\Rightarrow \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is also ad_g invariant in the sense

$$\langle \text{ad}_x y, z \rangle + \langle y, \text{ad}_x z \rangle = 0$$

Using the invariant inner product (which is always non-degenerate).

$\Rightarrow \text{ad}_x \in \text{so}(\mathfrak{g})$ - namely it is skew symmetric.

\Rightarrow If ad_x has matrix form (A_{ij})

$$B(x, x) = \text{tr}(\text{ad}_x \cdot \text{ad}_x) = \sum_i \sum_{j=1}^n A_{ij} A_{ji}$$

$$= - \sum_i A_{ii}^2 < 0 \quad \text{unless } A \equiv 0 \Leftrightarrow \text{ad}_x = 0$$

Here we have showed $B(x, x) < 0$ unless $\text{ad}_x = 0 \Leftrightarrow x \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g})$.

Now consider $\forall y, z \in \mathfrak{g}$.

$$\langle [x, y], z \rangle - \langle x, [y, z] \rangle = 0$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \langle [x, y], z \rangle = 0 \Leftrightarrow \langle x, [y, z] \rangle = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow x \in (\mathfrak{g}')^\perp \Leftrightarrow x \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g})$$

$$\Rightarrow \mathfrak{g}' = \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}) \oplus \mathfrak{g}'$$

Since if $x \in \mathfrak{g}' \Rightarrow, \text{ad}_x \neq 0 \Rightarrow B(x, x) < 0 \Rightarrow \mathfrak{g}'$ is semi-simple.

For (ii) One direction is easy.

If \mathfrak{g} is simple & compact $\Rightarrow \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}) \neq \mathfrak{g}$ (since \mathfrak{g} is NOT Abelian)

But $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g})$ is an ideal & $\Rightarrow \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}) = 0 \Rightarrow \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}'$ &

$B|_{\mathfrak{g}'} \leq 0$, by (i).

For the other direction. \mathfrak{g} is simple $\Rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})/\text{Int}(\mathfrak{g})$ is

discrete. But on $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$, $B < 0 \Rightarrow -B$ is an $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$ invariant, namely $B(Ax, Ay) = B(x, y)$.

$\Rightarrow A \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$ is $\in O(\mathfrak{g})$. (with respect to $-B$).

$\Rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}) \subset O(\mathfrak{g})$.

$\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$ clearly is closed since $A([x, y]) = [Ax, Ay]$ is

a closed condition $\Rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$ is compact $\Rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})/\text{Int}(\mathfrak{g})$

must be finite.

$\Rightarrow \text{Int}(\mathfrak{g})$ is compact. $\Rightarrow \text{int}(\mathfrak{g}) \cong \mathfrak{g}$ (due to $\ker \text{ad} = \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g})$)

$\Rightarrow \text{Int}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a compact Lie group with \mathfrak{g} as its Lie algebra.

Corollary: \mathfrak{g} is compact $\Rightarrow \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}) \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathfrak{g}_k$

\mathfrak{g}_i compact simple.

③ Weyl's theorem.

(i). A compact Lie group with finite center must be semi-simple.

(ii). $\forall G$, Lie group. \mathfrak{g} its Lie algebra.

If \mathfrak{g} is semi-simple & $B|_{\mathfrak{g}} < 0 \Rightarrow G$ must be compact.
 [Hence \tilde{G} is compact as well].

Defn: G is called semi-simple iff \mathfrak{g} is semi-simple
 (nilpotent solvable) (nilpotent solvable.)

Pf: (i) $Z(G)$ Center of G | proved before
 $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}) = \text{Lie}(Z(G))$

$\Rightarrow Z(G)$ discrete $\Rightarrow \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}) = 0 \Rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ is semi-simple.

(ii) \exists Algebraic proof.

We present a Riemannian geometric proof.

Bonnet-Meyer Theorem: (M, g) Riemannian mfd.

Complete. & $\text{Ric}_g \geq \lambda g$ λ constant > 0 Ric_g stands for the Ricci curvature of g

$$\Rightarrow \text{Diam}(M) \leq \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{\lambda}}$$

In particular, M is compact.

$$\text{Ric}(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^n R(e_i, x, y, e_i) \quad \{e_i\} \text{ orthonormal basis.}$$

↑
Curvature tensor.

The proof of (ii) is to use BM, by calculating the Ricci curvature of a Bi-invariant metric. [See calculation pdf for details]