



O b e r w o l f a c h S e m i n a r s

The Novikov Conjecture

Geometry and Algebra

Matthias Kreck
Wolfgang Lück

Birkhäuser

018
K92

Matthias Kreck
Wolfgang Lück

The Novikov Conjecture

Geometry and Algebra



E200600846

Birkhäuser Verlag
Basel · Boston · Berlin

Authors:

Matthias Kreck
Mathematisches Institut
Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg
Im Neuenheimer Feld 288
69120 Heidelberg
Germany
e-mail: kreck@mathi.uni-heidelberg.de

Wolfgang Lück
Mathematisches Institut
Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster
Einsteinstrasse 62
48149 Münster
Germany
e-mail: lueck@math.uni-muenster.de

2000 Mathematical Subject Classification 19J25, 19K35, 46L80, 55N20, 57R20

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from the
Library of Congress, Washington D.C., USA

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Bibliothek
Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie;
detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

ISBN 3-7643-7141-2 Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel – Boston – Berlin

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, re-use of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in other ways, and storage in data banks. For any kind of use permission of the copyright owner must be obtained.

© 2005 Birkhäuser Verlag, P.O. Box 133, CH-4010 Basel, Switzerland
Part of Springer Science+Business Media
Cover design: Micha Lotrovsky, 4106 Therwil, Switzerland
Printed on acid-free paper produced from chlorine-free pulp. TCF ∞
Printed in Germany
ISBN 3-7643-7141-2

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

www.birkhauser.ch

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 1960s, 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 1960s.

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 1950s. 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 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 1960s 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 expressing 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.

Contents

Introduction	xi
0 A Motivating Problem (K.)	1
0.1 Dimensions ≤ 4	1
0.2 Dimension 6	2
0.3 Dimension 5	4
1 Introduction to the Novikov and the Borel Conjecture (L.)	5
1.1 The Original Formulation of the Novikov Conjecture	5
1.2 Invariance Properties of the L -Class	6
1.3 The Borel Conjecture	8
2 Normal Bordism Groups (K.)	11
2.1 Normal Bordism Groups	11
2.2 Rational Computation of Normal Bordism Groups	12
2.3 Rational Computation of Oriented Bordism Groups	14
3 The Signature (K.)	17
3.1 The Definition of the Signature	18
3.2 The Bordism Invariance of the Signature	18
3.3 Multiplicativity and other Properties of the Signature	20
3.4 Geometric Interpretation of Cohomology and the Intersection Form	21
4 The Signature Theorem and the Novikov Conjecture (K.)	25
4.1 The Signature Theorem	25
4.2 Higher Signatures	27
4.3 The Novikov Conjecture	28
4.4 The Pontrjagin Classes are not Homeomorphism Invariants	29
5 The Projective Class Group and the Whitehead Group (L.)	33
5.1 The Projective Class Group	33
5.2 The First Algebraic K -Group	35

5.3	The Whitehead Group	39
5.4	The Bass–Heller–Swan Decomposition	40
6	Whitehead Torsion (L.)	43
6.1	Whitehead Torsion of a Chain Map	43
6.2	The Cellular Chain Complex of the Universal Covering	47
6.3	The Whitehead Torsion of a Cellular Map	49
6.4	Simple Homotopy Equivalences	52
7	The Statement and Consequences of the s-Cobordism Theorem (L.)	55
8	Sketch of the Proof of the s-Cobordism Theorem (L.)	59
8.1	Handlebody Decompositions	59
8.2	Handlebody Decompositions and CW -Structures	61
8.3	Reducing the Handlebody Decomposition	63
8.4	Handlebody Decompositions and Whitehead Torsion	65
9	From the Novikov Conjecture to Surgery (K.)	69
9.1	The Structure Set	69
9.2	The Assembly Idea	70
10	Surgery Below the Middle Dimension I: An Example (K.)	75
10.1	Surgery and its Trace	75
10.2	The Effect on the Fundamental Group and Homology Groups	76
10.3	Application to Knottings	77
11	Surgery Below the Middle Dimension II: Systematically (K.)	79
11.1	The Effect of Surgery in Homology and Homotopy	79
11.2	Surgery below the Middle Dimension	81
11.3	Construction of Certain 6-Manifolds	84
12	Surgery in the Middle Dimension I (K.)	87
12.1	Motivation for the Surgery Obstruction Groups	87
12.2	Unimodular Hermitian Forms	88
12.3	The L -Groups in Dimensions $4m$	89
12.4	The L -Groups in Other Dimensions	90
13	Surgery in the Middle Dimension II (K.)	93
13.1	Equivariant Intersection Numbers	93
13.2	Stably Free Modules	94
13.3	The Quadratic Refinement	95
13.4	The Surgery Obstruction	97

14 Surgery in the Middle Dimension III (K.)	99
14.1 Stable Diffeomorphism Classification	99
14.2 The Surgery Obstruction is a Bordism Invariant	101
14.3 The Main Result	101
14.4 Proof of the Main Theorem	103
14.5 The Exact Surgery Sequence	106
14.6 Stable Classification of Certain 6-Manifolds	107
15 An Assembly Map (K.)	109
15.1 More on the Definition of the Assembly Map	109
15.2 The Surgery Version of the Novikov Conjecture	112
16 The Novikov Conjecture for \mathbb{Z}^n (K.)	113
16.1 The Idea of the Proof	113
16.2 Reduction to Mapping Tori	113
16.3 The Proof for Rank 1	115
16.4 The Generalization to Higher Rank	117
17 Poincaré Duality and Algebraic L-Groups (L. and Varisco)	119
17.1 Poincaré duality	119
17.2 Algebraic L -groups	124
18 Spectra (L.)	133
18.1 Basic Notions about Spectra	133
18.2 Homotopy Pushouts and Homotopy Pullbacks for Spaces	135
18.3 Homotopy Pushouts and Homotopy Pullbacks for Spectra	138
18.4 (Co-)Homology Theories Associated to Spectra	139
18.5 K -Theory and L -Theory Spectra	141
18.6 The Chern Character for Homology Theories	143
18.7 The Bordism Group Associated to a Vector Bundle	144
18.8 The Thom Space of a Vector Bundle	145
18.9 The Pontrjagin–Thom Construction	145
18.10 The Stable Version of the Pontrjagin–Thom Construction	146
18.11 The Oriented Bordism Ring	148
18.12 Stable Homotopy	149
18.13 The Thom Isomorphism	150
18.14 The Rationalized Oriented Bordism Ring	150
18.15 The Integral Oriented Bordism Ring	151
19 Classifying Spaces of Families (L.)	153
19.1 Basics about G - CW -Complexes	153
19.2 The Classifying Space for a Family	156

19.3	Special Models	157
19.3.1	The Family of All Subgroups and the Trivial Family	157
19.3.2	Operator Theoretic Model	157
19.3.3	Discrete Subgroups of Almost Connected Lie Groups	157
19.3.4	Simply Connected Non-Positively Curved Manifolds	158
19.3.5	CAT(0)-Spaces	158
19.3.6	Trees with Finite Isotropy Groups	158
19.3.7	Amalgamated Products and HNN-Extensions	158
19.3.8	Arithmetic Groups	159
19.3.9	Outer Automorphism Groups of Free groups	160
19.3.10	Mapping Class groups	160
19.3.11	One-Relator Groups	160
19.3.12	Special Linear Groups of (2,2)-Matrices	161
20	Equivariant Homology Theories and the Meta-Conjecture (L.)	163
20.1	The Meta-Conjecture	163
20.2	Formulation of the Farrell–Jones and the Baum–Connes Conjecture	164
20.3	Equivariant Homology Theories	165
20.4	The Construction of Equivariant Homology Theories from Spectra	168
21	The Farrell–Jones Conjecture (L.)	173
21.1	The Bass–Heller–Swan Decomposition in Arbitrary Dimensions . .	173
21.2	Decorations in L -Theory and the Shaneson Splitting	174
21.3	Changing the Family	176
21.4	The Farrell–Jones Conjecture for Torsionfree Groups	177
21.5	The Farrell–Jones Conjecture and the Borel Conjecture	180
21.6	The Passage from \mathcal{FIN} to $\mathcal{K}\mathcal{C}$	181
22	The Baum–Connes Conjecture (L.)	185
22.1	Index Theoretic Interpretation of the Baum–Connes Assembly Map	185
22.2	The Baum–Connes Conjecture for Torsionfree Groups	186
22.3	The Trace Conjecture in the Torsionfree Case	187
22.4	The Kadison Conjecture	187
22.5	The Stable Gromov–Lawson–Rosenberg Conjecture	188
22.6	The Choice of the Family \mathcal{FIN} in the Baum–Connes Conjecture .	189
23	Relating the Novikov, the Farrell–Jones and the Baum–Connes Conjectures (L.)	191
23.1	The Farrell–Jones Conjecture and the Novikov Conjecture	191
23.2	Relating Topological K -Theory and L -Theory	195
23.3	The Baum–Connes Conjecture and the Novikov Conjecture	197

24	Miscellaneous (L.)	201
24.1	Status of the Conjectures	201
24.2	Methods of Proof	206
24.3	Computations for Finite Groups	206
24.3.1	Topological K -Theory for Finite Groups	206
24.3.2	Algebraic K -Theory for Finite Groups	207
24.3.3	Algebraic L -Theory for Finite Groups	208
24.4	Rational Computations	208
24.4.1	Rationalized Topological K -Theory for Infinite Groups . . .	209
24.4.2	Rationalized Algebraic K -Theory for Infinite Groups . . .	210
24.4.3	Rationalized Algebraic L -Theory for Infinite Groups . . .	211
24.5	Integral Computations	211
25	Exercises	215
26	Hints to the Solutions of the Exercises	223
	References	236
	Index	254
	Notation	261
	Schedules	263
	List of Participants	267

Chapter 0

A Motivating Problem

The classification of manifolds is one of the central problems in mathematics. Since a complete answer is (at least for manifolds of dimension ≥ 4) not possible, one firstly has to fix certain invariants in such a way that the classification is in principle possible. The reason why the classification of manifolds is impossible is reduced to the impossibility of classifying their fundamental groups. Thus as a first invariant one has to fix the fundamental group. Then the optimal answer would be to find invariants which determine the diffeomorphism (homeomorphism or homotopy) type. In recent years, low dimensional manifolds (in dimension up to 7) occurred in various mathematical and non-mathematical contexts. We motivate the Novikov Conjecture by considering the following problem:

Problem 0.1 (Classification of manifolds in low dimensions with $\pi_1(M) \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $\pi_2(M) = 0$). *Classify all connected closed orientable manifolds M in dimensions ≤ 6 with fundamental group $\pi_1(M) \cong \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$ and second homotopy group $\pi_2(M) = 0$ up to*

- (1) *homotopy equivalence;*
- (2) *homeomorphism;*
- (3) *diffeomorphism.*

Here and in the following we always mean *orientation preserving maps*.

0.1 Dimensions ≤ 4

Since all closed connected 1-manifolds are diffeomorphic to S^1 , there is no example in dimension 1.

In dimension 2 there is only one such manifold, the torus $T^2 = S^1 \times S^1$. Here the classification up to the relations i)–iii) agree.

In dimension 3 there is no manifold with fundamental group $\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$. The reason is that the classifying map of the universal covering of such a 3-manifold $f: M \rightarrow T^2$ is 3-connected. Hence it induces isomorphisms $H_p(f): H_p(M) \xrightarrow{\cong} H_p(T^2)$ and $H^p(f): H^p(T^2) \xrightarrow{\cong} H^p(M)$ for $p \leq 2$. Poincaré duality implies $H^1(M) \cong H_2(M)$. This yields a contradiction since $H_2(T^2) = \mathbb{Z}$ and $H_1(T^2) = \mathbb{Z}^2$.

There is also no such manifold M in dimension 4 by the following argument. As above for 3-manifolds we conclude that $H_2(M) \cong \mathbb{Z}$. Poincaré duality implies for the Euler characteristic $\chi(M) = 1$. Now we note that all finite coverings of M are again manifolds of the type we investigate. Namely the fundamental group is a subgroup of finite index in $\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$ and so isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$. And the higher homotopy groups of a covering do not change. Now consider a subgroup of index $k > 1$ in $\pi_1(M)$ and let N be the corresponding covering. Then $\chi(N) = k \cdot \chi(M)$. Since N is a manifold under consideration we have $\chi(N) = 1$. This leads to a contradiction.

0.2 Dimension 6

In dimension 6 one has an obvious example, namely $T^2 \times S^4$. But there are many more examples coming from the following construction.

Example 0.2 (Constructing manifolds by surgery). We start with a simply connected smooth 4-manifold M with trivial second Stiefel–Whitney class $w_2(M)$ and consider $T^2 \times M$. Then we choose disjoint embeddings $(S^2 \times D^4)_i$ into $T^2 \times M$ representing a basis of $\pi_2(M) \cong \pi_2(T^2 \times M)$. For this we first choose maps from S^2 to $T^2 \times M$ representing a basis. The Whitney Embedding Theorem implies that we can choose these maps as disjoint smooth embeddings. Finally we note that since $w_2(T^2 \times M) = 0$, the normal bundle of these embeddings is trivial and we use a tubular neighbourhood to construct the desired embeddings. Now we form a new manifold by deleting the interiors of these embeddings and gluing in $D^3 \times S^3$ to each deleted component. We denote the resulting manifold by $N(M)$. This cutting and pasting process is called *surgery*. Using standard considerations in algebraic topology one shows that $N(M)$ is an oriented manifold with $\pi_1 \cong \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$, $\pi_2 = 0$ and $w_2 = 0$ (see Exercise 0.1). We will study surgery in later chapters systematically.

Example 0.3 (A higher signature). We introduce the following invariant for the 6-manifolds N under consideration. The second cohomology is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} , and we choose a generator $x \in H^2(N)$. This generator is well defined up to sign. Let $[M]$ be the fundamental class in $H_6(M)$. Taking the cup product with the Pontrjagin class and evaluating on $[M]$ gives our invariant:

$$\pm \langle x \cup p_1(N), [N] \rangle \in \mathbb{Z} \tag{0.4}$$

which is unique up to a sign \pm . It is easy to see (see Exercise 0.2) that for the manifold $N(M)$ constructed above this invariant agrees with the first Pontrjagin

class of M evaluated at $[M]$ up to sign:

$$\pm \langle x \cup p_1(N(M)), [N(M)] \rangle = \pm \langle p_1(M), [M] \rangle. \quad (0.5)$$

The values of $\langle p_1(M), [M] \rangle$ for the different simply connected smooth 4-manifolds are known: Every integer divisible by 48 occurs [231].

We want to understand the relevance of this invariant. We firstly note that it is unchanged if we take the connected sum with $S^3 \times S^3$. Thus it is an invariant of the stable diffeomorphism type, where we call two closed manifolds M and N of dimension $2k$ *stably diffeomorphic*, if there exist integers p and q , such that $M \# p(S^k \times S^k)$ is diffeomorphic to $N \# q(S^k \times S^k)$, i.e., the manifolds M and N are diffeomorphic after taking the connected sum with p resp. q copies of $S^k \times S^k$. The relevance of the invariant $\langle x \cup p_1(N), [N] \rangle$ is demonstrated by the following result

Theorem 0.6 (Stable Classification of Certain Six-Dimensional Manifolds). *Two smooth 6-dimensional closed orientable manifolds M and N with $\pi_1(M) \cong \pi_1(N) \cong \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$ and $\pi_2(M) = \pi_2(N) = 0$ are stably diffeomorphic if and only if*

- (1) *in both cases w_2 vanishes or does not vanish;*
- (2) $\pm \langle x \cup p_1(M), [M] \rangle = \pm \langle x \cup p_1(N), [N] \rangle$.

We will give the proof of this result in Chapter 14. In our context this result leads to the following obvious questions: Is the second invariant also a stable homeomorphism or stable homotopy invariant? Here we define *stably homeomorphic* and *stably homotopy equivalent* in analogy to the definition of stably diffeomorphic by replacing in this definition diffeomorphic by homeomorphic or homotopy equivalent.

The answer is in both cases non-trivial. For homeomorphisms we pass from the Pontrjagin class $p_1(M) \in H^4(M)$ to the rational Pontrjagin class $p_1(M; \mathbb{Q}) \in H^4(N; \mathbb{Q})$. Since $H^4(N)$ is torsionfree we do not lose any information. Then we apply a deep result by Novikov (see Theorem 1.5) saying that the rational Pontrjagin classes are homeomorphism invariants and so stable homeomorphism invariants.

The rational Pontrjagin classes are in general not homotopy invariants (see Example 1.6). But Novikov conjectured that certain numerical invariants, the so-called higher signatures, built from the rational Pontrjagin classes and cohomology classes of the fundamental group are homotopy invariants. The invariant occurring in Theorem 0.6 is one of these invariants. (We will give a proof for free abelian groups in Chapter 16).

It should be noted that in contrast to the Pontrjagin classes the Stiefel-Whitney classes of a manifold are homotopy invariants. Thus the condition $w_2 = 0$ or $w_2 \neq 0$ is invariant under (stable) homotopy equivalences. Thus we conclude

Corollary 0.7. *For two smooth 6-dimensional closed orientable manifolds M and N with $\pi_1(M) \cong \pi_1(N) \cong \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$ and $\pi_2(M) = \pi_2(N) = 0$ the classifications up to stable diffeomorphism, stable homeomorphism and stable homotopy equivalence agree. In other words, the invariants from Theorem 0.6 determine also the stable homeomorphism and stable homotopy type.*

Remark 0.8 (Role of the Novikov Conjecture). The following formulation explains the surprising role of the Novikov Conjecture. In general the homotopy classification is a simpler question than the homeomorphism or diffeomorphism classification which one can attack by methods of classical homotopy theory. For the 6-manifolds under consideration the Novikov Conjecture implies that the stable homotopy type determines the stable homeomorphism and even stable diffeomorphism type of these smooth manifolds.

0.3 Dimension 5

Now we study the manifolds in dimension 5. In dimension 5 there are at least two such manifolds, namely $T^2 \times S^3$ and the sphere bundle of the non-trivial oriented 4-dimensional vector bundle over T^2 . These manifolds are not homotopy equivalent (see Exercise 0.3). Moreover, using standard techniques from homotopy theory one can show that there are precisely two homotopy types of manifolds under consideration, which are given by these two bundles. The next obvious question is the determination of the homeomorphism and diffeomorphism type of these manifolds. One can show that the diffeomorphism type is determined by the first Pontrjagin class, and since this is a homeomorphism invariant (by Novikov's result mentioned above), this also determines the homeomorphism type. But which values can the Pontrjagin class take? Here again the Novikov Conjecture comes into play. It implies in our situation that the first Pontrjagin class is a homotopy invariant. Since we know all homotopy types and in the examples above the Pontrjagin class is trivial, we conclude that the Pontrjagin class is zero for our manifolds. Thus we have again a surprising result: The homotopy type of these 5-manifolds determines the homeomorphism (and actually diffeomorphism) type! For detailed arguments and more results we refer to [136].

Remark 0.9 (Other fundamental groups). The Novikov Conjecture is also valid for all fundamental groups G of closed oriented surfaces. The proof of Theorem 0.6 also holds for these fundamental groups so that Corollary 0.7 can also be generalized to these fundamental groups. We will investigate these 6-manifolds further in [136].