PERMUTATION COMPLEXES
AND
MODULAR REPRESENTATION THEORY

Amir H. Assadi(*)

Max–Planck–Institut für Mathematik (Bonn)
and
University of Wisconsin (Madison)

Max–Planck–Institut
für Mathematik
Gottfried–Claren–Straße 26
D–5300 Bonn 3

Federal Republic of Germany MPI/90-46

(*) The research of this project and the preparation of the present manuscript was carried out during the author's visits to the Max–Planck–Institut für Mathematik (Bonn). The author is particularly grateful to Professor F. Hirzebruch for his kind invitations and MPI for financial support and hospitality during his visits.

Introduction. Let G be a finite group, and R be a commutative ring with identity. We denote by $\mathscr{M}(RG)$ the category of RG–modules. For any subgroup $H \subseteq G$, one has two basic functors $\mathscr{M}(RG) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Res}_H^G} \mathscr{M}(RH)$ and $\mathscr{M}(RH) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Ind}_H^G} \mathscr{M}(RG)$ given by restriction and induction which play an essential role in representation theory. An important and elementary class of RG–representations are permutation modules which are direct sums of modules $\mathrm{Ind}_H^G(R)$ obtained by induction from the trivial RH–moduole R for various $H \subseteq G$. In another extreme, one has RG–modules which arise by induction from RH–projective modules, leading to the concept of relative projectivity and Green's theory of vertices and sources [CR] [GR]. The value of these subcategories of modules in representation theory and related areas is well–known. in a different direction (influenced by algebraic geometry and topology), one considers not only module categories, but various categories of chain complexes of modules and their cohomologies. This culminates in the more recent approaches to representation theory through the theory of derived categories. See [SC] [CPS] and their many references.

A natural problem is to develop and study generalizations of induction–restriction theories in the set–up of derived categories. Of course, one has the various generalization of the restriction and induction functors to the categories of chain complexes. However, most of natural examples of RG–chain complexes which arise in applications are those complexes whose constituent chain modules only happen to be permutation modules. This leads to the study of complexes of permutation moduels and the representation afforded by their homologies. On the other hand such RG–complexes are far too general for the purposes of induction–restriction theory. For example an RG–free resolution C_* of an arbitrary RG–module M may be thought of as a complex of permutation modules whose only non–vanishing homology $H_0(C_*) = M$. On theother hand, natural finiteness conditions in the derived category leads to urdue restriction. For example, if we require further that C_* above be quasi–isomorphic to a bounded RG–free chain complex, then M will be very close to be RG–projective. For instance, if R is the field of characteristic p and G is a p–group, then M is necessarily RG–free. Thus the familiar conditions in the derived category leads to either severe restrictions or unmanagable generality.

A middle–ground is provided by "permutation complexes" which forma restricted and proper subcategory of the complexes of permutation modules. See SEction One for exact definitions. In particular, permutation complexes which are quadi–isomorohic to bounded permutation complexes form a distinguished nd a suitably large subcategory with a rich structure. Homology representations afforded by bounded permutation complexes demonstrate remarkable properties which make them desirable objects of study. In practice, such complexes arise naturally in the combinatorial approach to group theory, topology, and algebraic geometry (See Section One).

The theme of the present paper is a preliminary study of the deep relationship between the representation–theoretic and homological properties of permutation complexes and their homology representations from a local–to–global point of view. In particular, e prove a localization theorem (Theorem 2.1.) which is an elementary but basic tool. A projectivity criterion (Theorem 3.3) is applied to relate the present subject to more familiar constructions in group theory (Theorem 3.4.). We introduce and study a Hermitian analogue of the theory in Section Four which is applied to some well–known and classical topics in fixed point theory of topological transformation groups (Theorem 4.5 and Corollary 4.13). In Section Five we study the so–called invertible elements (called units of the stable Green ring) and endo–trivial homology representations.

SECTION ONE. PERMUTATION COMPLEXES

Let S be a G–set, i.e. a disjoint union of left cosets G/H for various $H \subseteq G$. The free R–module whose basis is given by S is denoted by $R[S]$. The trivial G–action on R and the left action of G on S gives $R[S]$ the structure of an RG–module. $R[S]$ is called the permutation module with permutation basis S. If $S = \phi$, $R[S] = 0$. A complex of permutation modules is a chain (cochain) RG–complex C_* such that each C_i is a permutation module. A special case occurs in the following:

1.1 Definition. Let $\mathscr{S} = \coprod_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} S_i$ be a disjoint union of G–sets. An RG–complex X_* is called a permutation complex with permutation basis $\mathscr{S}$ if

(1) each $X_i = R[S_i]$ is a permutation module with basis S_i;

(2) the boundary homomorphisms $\partial_i : C_i \longrightarrow C_{i-1}$ is RG–linear and satisfies $\partial_i(S_i^H) \subset R[S_{i-1}^H]$ for each $H \subseteq G$.

It follows that $\bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} R[S_i^H] \leq X_*$ is a subcomlex which we will denote by $X_*(H)$. It is clear that condition (2) of 1.1 is equivalent to the follwoing:

(2)′ For each $H \subseteq G$, the graded submodule $X_*(H)$ is a subcomplex of X_*. We call $X_*(H)$ the subcomplex of H–fixed points of X_*. The equivalent properties (2) and (2)′ tie the local and global structures of X_* together and impose non–trivial restrictions on the homology representations of bounded permutation complexes. The isotropy subgroups of $\mathscr{S}$ are caled also the isotropy subgroups of X_*. With respect to the natural action of $N_G(H)/H$ on S_i^H, $X_*(H)$ becomes an $R[N_G(H)/H]$–permutation complex, and restricting actions to $N_G(H)$, yields a pair of $N_G(H)$–permutation complexes $(X_*, X_*(H))$. Let $\mathscr{C}(RG)$ be the category of RG–complexes and RG–chain maps. There are two subcategories of $\mathscr{C}(RG)$ whose objects consist of permutation complexes. The first one is $\mathscr{P}(RG)$ where the morphisms are those chain maps $X_* \longrightarrow Y_*$ which are induced form the G–maps of the permutation bases (as G–sets) of X_* and Y_*. The second category is $\hat{\mathscr{P}}(RG)$ which is the full subcategory of $\mathscr{C}(RG)$ whose objects are the same as the objects of $\mathscr{P}(RG)$. $\mathscr{P}(RG)$ is closed under most of the familiar constructions: quotient complexes, maping cylinders, mapping cones, push–outs, etc.

<u>1.2. Definition</u>. Let X_* be a positive permutation complex, and let $\underline{R}$ be concentrated in degree zero. X_* is called <u>based</u> if there is a split augmentation in $\mathscr{P}(RG)$ $X_* \underset{\epsilon}{\overset{\longleftarrow}{\longrightarrow}} \underline{R}$, so that $X_* \cong \sigma(\underline{R}) \oplus \mathrm{Ker}(\epsilon)$ in $\mathscr{P}(RG)$. Baesd complexes and based chain homomorphisms form a subcategory $\mathscr{P}_0(RG)$.

<u>1.3. Constructions on permutation complexes</u>. Let X_* and Y_* be permutation complexes with permutation bases $A = \coprod_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} A_n$, $B = \coprod_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} B_n$, and let X'_* and Y'_* be based permutation complexes with split augmentations $X'_0 \underset{\epsilon_1}{\overset{\overset{\sigma_1}{\longleftarrow}}{\longrightarrow}} \underline{R}$ and $Y'_0 \underset{\epsilon_2}{\overset{\overset{\sigma_2}{\longleftarrow}}{\longrightarrow}} \underline{R}$. We have the following constructions in $\mathscr{P}(RG)$:

(i) Direct sum $X_* \oplus Y_*$ corresponding to the disjoint union $A \coprod B$.

(ii) Tensor product $X_* \otimes Y_*$ corresponding to the cartesian product $A \times B$.

(iii) m–fold shift for $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ by shifting the grading of the basis, or equivalently, $(X_*[m])_i = X_{i-m}$.

(iv) Wedge $X'_* \vee Y'_* = Z'_*$ in the subcategory of based complexes $\mathscr{P}_0(RG)$ is defined by $Z'_i = X_i \oplus Y_i$ for $i \geq 1$, and Z'_0 is the push–out:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
R \arrow[r, "\sigma_1"] \arrow[d, "\sigma_2"'] & X'_0 \arrow[d] \\
Y'_0 \arrow[r] & Z'_0
\end{tikzcd}$$

together with the induced split augmentation $Z'_0 \overset{\longleftarrow}{\longrightarrow} R$ from this square. One may think of $X'_* \vee Y'_*$ as "sum" in $\mathscr{P}_0(RG)$.

(v) Product in $\mathscr{P}_0(RG)$ is the smash–product $X'_* \wedge Y'_*$ defined as the pull–back:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X'_* \wedge Y'_* \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X'_* \arrow[d, "\epsilon_1"] \\
Y'_* \arrow[r, "\epsilon_2"] & \underline{R}
\end{tikzcd}$$

Equivalently, let $X'_* \vee Y'_* \equiv X'_* \otimes \sigma_2(\underline{R}) \vee \sigma_1(\underline{R}) \otimes Y'_*$ and $(X'_* \wedge Y'_*)_i = ((X'_* \otimes Y'_*)/(X'_* \vee Y'_*))_i$ for $i \geq 1$ and for $i = 0$ the pull–back diagram of RG–modules:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(X'_* \wedge Y'_*)_0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & X'_0 \arrow[d] \\
Y'_0 \arrow[r, "\epsilon_2"] & R
\end{tikzcd}$$

(vi) Reduced suspension in $\mathscr{P}_0(RG)$ of X'_* is the based complex $\Sigma X'_*$ defined by $(\Sigma X_*)_{i+1} = X_i$ for $i \geq 0$, and $(\Sigma X_*)_0 = R \oplus R$ with $(\Sigma\partial)_{i+1} = \partial_i$ and $\Sigma\partial_0 : (\Sigma X_*)_1 \longrightarrow (\Sigma X_*)$ given by $\epsilon : X_0 \longrightarrow (R)_1$ = first factor in $(\Sigma X_*)_0$. The split augmentation is provided by the projection onto the second factor of $(\Sigma X_*)_0$. The iteration of suspension for each $n \geq 1$ is denoted by $\Sigma^n X_*$. This is the analogue of the shift in (iii) for $\mathscr{P}_0(RG)$.

(vii) In addition, there are other constructions suggested by their first analogues for topological spaces, e.g. the join $X_* \circ Y_*$, the cone on X_* denoted by cX_* or unreduced suspension in $\mathscr{P}(RG)$. We leave these, and the verification of the fact that most of the other familiar constructions for chain complexes (e.g. mapping cylinders, mapping cones, etc.) can be performed in $\mathscr{P}(RG)$ or $\mathscr{P}_0(RG)$. The proof of this lemma follows from definitions and is left out.

<u>1.4. Lemma</u>. The above constructions are functorial in $\mathscr{P}(RG)$ and $\mathscr{P}_0(RG)$. In

particular, they commute with the formation of "subcomplexes of fixed points", e.g. $(X_* \wedge Y_*)(H) = X_*(H) \wedge Y_*(H)$ etc.

1.5. Important Remark. In literature, the terminology "permutation complex" occurs in various contexts with different meanings. Often, what we refer to as a complex of ermutation modules (i.e. only condition (1) of Definition 1.1 above) is called a permutation complex and condition (2) is not imposed. See, e.g. Arnold [Ar1] [Ar2], Adem [Ad1] [Ad2], and Justin Smith [Sm1]. See [A1] Chapter Eight for further references.

1.6. Examples. (1) It is obvious from the definition that a complex of permutation modules need not satisfy condition (2) of Definition 1.1. For instance, let $C_0 = \mathbb{Z}G$, $C_1 = \mathbb{Z}$ and $\partial : C_1 \longrightarrow C_0$ be the norm map $\partial(1) = \sum_{g \in G} g$.

(2) Permutation complexes arise naturally in the combinatorial approach to finite group theory, e.g. as in Ken Brown [B1] [B2], Quillen [Q2], Webb [W1] [W2], D. Smith [Sd1] and their references. One considers a partially ordered set of subgroups of G, and chooses the permutation basis in dimension n to be the chains of length n. The G–action is induced from the conjugation by elements of G.

(3) If X is a simplicial complex and elements of G act on X by simplicial maps, then the simplicial chains of the second bary centric subdivision of X yield a permutation complex. See Bredon [Bdn] Ch. Two.

(4) More generally, if X is a G–CW–complex (see Bredon [Bdn], Illmann [I] or Matsumoto [Mat] for various properties of G–CW complexes), then the complex $C_*(X)$ of cellular chains of X is a permutation complex. If $X^G \neq \phi$, then $C_*(X)$ will be a based permutation complex if we choose a base point in X^G. In (3) and (4) above, $C_*(H)$ corresponds to the simplicial and cellular chains of X^H.

(5) Smooth G–manifolds as well as complex algebraic subsets of $\mathbb{C}^n$ and $\mathbb{C}P^n$ with

algebraic G–actions also admit triangulations with simplicial G–actions. See Illmann [I] and Hironaka [Hir]. Thus, by (3) above applies. For instance, one concludes that their homology arises as the homology of a permutation complex.

(6) For more general G–spaces (e.g. paracompact ones), it is possible to use suitable Čech coverings as in Bredon [Bdn] Chapter Two to obtain a permutation complex whose cohomology computes the cohomology of the space.

(7) It is easy to see that $\mathscr{P}(RG)$ contains many permutation complexes which do not arise from topological situations of (3)–(6). Even for RG–complexes C_* whose underlying R–complex is the complex of cellular chains of a CW–complex X, it happens (more often than not) that C_* is not even RG–chain homotopy equivalent to a permutation complex of a G–CW complex as in (4) above. See Justin Snith [Sm1] and Quinn [Qf] for obstruction theories which analyze the homological obstructions for topological realization of chain complexes.

SECTION TWO. LOCALIZATION AND VARIETIES

In this section we discuss localization and its consequences in the theory of module varieties.

Let X_* be a permutation complex, and let W_* be a projective resolution of R over RG. The homology and cohomology of the total complexes associated to the double complexes $W_* \otimes_G X_*$ and $\mathrm{Hom}_G(W_*,X_*)$ are called the hypercohomology and the hypercohomology of X_*, and they are denoted by $\mathbb{H}_*(G;X_*)$ and $\mathbb{H}^*(G;X^*)$. The topological analogue of the above construction for topological transformation groups is the Borel equivariant homology $H^G_*(X;R)$ and $H^*_G(X;R)$ defined for a G–space X, using the twisted product (or the Borel construction) $E_G \times_G X \xrightarrow{\pi} BG$ associated to the universal principal bundle $E_G \longrightarrow BG$. See Bredon [Bdn], W.Y. Hsiang [Hsg], Borel

[Bor], or Quillen [Q1] for the topological theory, and Ken Brown [B3], Cartan–Eilenberg [CE], as well as Swan [Sw] for an algebraic discussion.

Let $R = \mathbb{F}_p$ or any other field of characteristic p (e.g. $\mathbb{F}_p$), and let $G = (\mathbb{Z}_p)^n$. Then for $p = 2$, $H^*(BG;\mathbb{F}_p) \equiv H^*(G;\mathbb{F}_p) = \mathbb{F}_p[t_1,\dots,t_n]$ with $t_i \in H^1(G;\mathbb{F}_p)$. For $p > 2$, let $\Lambda(u_1,\dots,u_n)$ be the exterior algebra generated by $H^1(G;\mathbb{F}_p) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}_p}((\mathbb{F}_p)^n,\mathbb{F}_p)$ and let $t_i \in H^2(G;\mathbb{F}_p)$ be the image of the Bockstein $\beta : H^1(G;\mathbb{F}_p) \longrightarrow H^2(G;\mathbb{F}_p)$. Then $H^*(G;\mathbb{F}) = \Lambda(u_1,\dots,u_n) \otimes \mathbb{F}_p[t_1,\dots,t_n]$. Similar formulas hold for R replacing $\mathbb{F}_p$. If X is a finite–dimensional paracompact G–space, and $j : X^G \longrightarrow X$ is the inclusion, then the induced homomorphism in equivariant cohomology $j_G^* : H_G^*(X;R) \longrightarrow H_G^*(X^G;R)$ is $H^*(G;R)$–linear. Let $S \subset H^*(G;R)$ be the multiplicatively closed subset generated by the non–zero $\mathbb{F}_p$–linear combinations of the polynomial generators $\{t_1,\dots,t_n\}$. The localization theorem is equivariant cohomology (originally due to Borel [Bor] and further generalized by W.Y. Hsiang [Hsg] and Quillen [Q1] states that the localized homomorphism $S^{-1}j_G^* : S^{-1}H_G^*(X;R) \longrightarrow S^{-1}H_G^*(X^G;R)$ is an isomorphism. This theorem and its ramifications have been at the heart of the developments in the cohomology theory of transformation groups since 1950's. See Borel [Bor], Bredon [Bdn], W.Y. Hsiang [Hsg], and Quillen [Q1] for examples of applications.

We have the following generalization of the above localization theorem which will be one of the main technical tools in the homological study of permutation complexes.

2.1 <u>THEOREM</u> (Localization theorem for permutation complexes). Let C_* be a bounded RG–permutation complex. Assume that $G = (\mathbb{Z}_p)^n$, ℓ is a field of characteristic p, and $S \subset H^*(G;R)$ is as in the above. Then, the inclusion $p : C_*(G) \longrightarrow C_*$ induces an isomorphism $S^{-1}\rho^* : S^{-1}\mathbb{H}^*(G;C^*) \longrightarrow S^{-1}\mathbb{H}^*(G;C^*(G))$.

Proof: Consider the exact sequence of RG–chain complexes: $0 \longrightarrow C_*(G) \xrightarrow{p} C_* \xrightarrow{q} Q_* \longrightarrow 0$. Consider the long exact sequence in hypercohomology: $\dots \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}^i(G;Q^*) \xrightarrow{q_G^*} \mathbb{H}^i(G;C^*) \xrightarrow{p^*} \mathbb{H}^i(G;C^*(G)) \xrightarrow{\delta} \dots$ in which all homomorphisms are $H^*(G;R)$–linear. Since localization is an exact functor, the theorem will follow from the statement $S^{-1}\mathbb{H}^*(G;C^*) = 0$. Note that Q_* is a permutation complex for which $Q_*(G) = 0$. Therefore, the following lemma will complete the proof of the above theorem. ■

2.2 Lemma. Let $G = (\mathbb{Z}_p)^n$ and R be a commutative ring. Suppose Q_* is a bounded complex of permutation modules with basis Σ_i such that $\Sigma_i^G = \phi$. Then $\mathbb{H}^*(G;Q^*)$ is an $H^*(G;R)$–torsion module. Therefore, if P_* is an RG–complex RG–chain homotopic to Q_* , then $\mathbb{H}^*(G;P^*)$ is also $H^*(G;R)$–torsion.

Proof: If length of Q_* is one, i.e. $Q_* = \underline{M}$ concentrated in dimension d , then $\mathbb{H}^*(G;Q^*) = \oplus H^*(G;R[G/H_i]) \cong H^*(H_i;R)$ is $H^*(G;R)$–torsion (since $H_i \neq G$ and $\rho_i : H_i \longrightarrow G$ induces a homomorphism $\rho_i^* : H^*(G;R) \longrightarrow H^*(H_i;R)$ with non–nilpotent kernel). In general, Q_* is the result of splicing a finite number of short exact sequences: $0 \longrightarrow Z_{d+1} \longrightarrow Q_{d+1} \xrightarrow{\partial} B_d \longrightarrow 0$ and $0 \longrightarrow B_d \longrightarrow Z_d \longrightarrow H_d(Q_*) \longrightarrow 0$. First suppose that there is only one integer s such that $H_s(Q_*) \neq 0$ and $H_i(Q_*) = 0$ for all $i \neq s$. In this case, all of the above short exact sequences, except possibly $0 \longrightarrow B_s \longrightarrow Z_s \longrightarrow H_s(Q_*) \longrightarrow 0$ have two terms which are permutation modules. Hence by the above case and induction all $\mathbb{H}^*(G;M_d)$ are $H^*(G;R)$–torsion, where M_d is any of the modules B_d, Z_d, Q_d or $H_s(Q_*)$. On the other hand, $\mathbb{H}^*(G;Q^*) \cong H^*(G;H^s(Q^*))$ (with a shift of dimension, possibly) since the hypercohomology spectral sequence $H^*(G;H^*(Q^*)) \Rightarrow \mathbb{H}^*(G;Q^*)$ degenerates. Next, we proceed by induction on the length of cohomology ℓ = cardinality

$\{s \mid H_s(Q_*) \neq 0\}$. Let ℓ = the length of the cohomology of Q_*, and choose d to be the smallest integer such that $H_d(Q_*) \neq 0$. Let F be a free RG–module and $\underline{F}$ the free RG–complex concentrated in dimension d. We may choose F and an RG–chain map $f : \underline{F} \longrightarrow Q_*$ such that the induced RG–homomoprhism $f_* : F \longrightarrow H_d(Q_*)$ is surjective. It is easily seen that we may arrange f to be surjective, so that the following is a short exact sequence of RG–complexes: $0 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ker}(f) \longrightarrow \underline{F} \longrightarrow Q_* \longrightarrow 0$. Now the length of cohomology of $\mathrm{Ker}(f)$ is $\ell-1$, and by induction $\mathbb{H}^*(G;\mathrm{Ker}(f)^*)$ is $H^*(G;R)$–torsion. Since $\mathbb{H}^i(G;Q^*) \xrightarrow{\delta} \mathbb{H}^{i+1}(G;\mathrm{Ker}(f)^*)$ is an isomorphism for all $i \neq d$, $d+1$, it follows that $\mathbb{H}^*(G;Q^*)$ is also $H^*(G;R)$–torsion. This proves the lemma. (Alternatively, for a shorter proof we may have argued that the second spectral sequence of the double complex $\mathrm{Hom}(W_*,Q_*)$ is convergent, and its E_2–term has a filtration by $H^*(G;R)$–torsion modules). ■

2.3. Corollary. Keep the notation and hypothese of Theorem. Let D_* is an RG–chain complex which is RG–chain homotopic to a permutation subcomplex $C'_* \subset C_*$ and assume that $C_*(G) \subseteq C'_*$. Then $S^{-1}\mathbb{H}^*(G;D^*) \cong S^{-1}\mathbb{H}^*(G;C^*)$.

Proof: The hypotheses imply that

$S^{-1}\mathbb{H}^*(G;D^*) \cong S^{-1}\mathbb{H}^*(G;C'^*) \cong S^{-1}\mathbb{H}^*(G;C^*(G)) \cong S^{-1}\mathbb{H}^*(G;C^*)$. ■

Next, we study the varieties for homology representations of permutation complexes. The localization process in cohomology is closed related to the notions of support and rank varieties for modules, introduced by J. Carlson [C1] [C2] and developed further by Avrunin–Scott [AS] and others. For simplicity, let $E = (\mathbb{Z}/p)^n$ be generated by $\langle x_1,\ldots,x_n \rangle$, and consider the reduced cohomology ring $H_E = H^*(E;k)/\mathrm{Radical} \cong k[t_1,\ldots,t_n]$. Any kE–module M gives rise to an H_E–module $H^*(E;M)$, and as such, it has a support in $\mathrm{Spec}\, H_E$. For many purposes, it suffices to consider the subspace of closed points in Spec H_E, namely Max H_E consisting of maximal ideals. Let $I(M) \subset H_E$ denote the annihilating ideal of the H_E–module $H^*(E;M)$. The cohomological support variety $V_E(M) \subset \mathrm{Max}\, H_E$ is nothing but the variety defined by $I(M) : V_E(M) = \{\mathfrak{m} \in \mathrm{Max}\, H_E : \mathfrak{m} \supseteq I(M)\}$. This definition generalizes directly to any p–group G, and with a slight modification to the case of general finite groups, see Avrunin–Scott [AS] for details, and Carlson [C1] [C2] for details of what follows. Notice that $\mathrm{Max}\, H_E \cong k^n$ = the affine k–space of dimension n. There is another n–dimensional affine space associated to $E = (\mathbb{Z}/p)^n$. Namely, let $J_E \subset kE$ be the usual augmentation ideal, and observe that $J_E/J_E^2 \cong H_1(E;k) \cong k^n$. By choosing a basis for J_E/J_E^2 and a splitting σ of the projection $\pi : J_E \overset{\sigma}{\rightleftarrows} J_E/J_E^2$, we obtain an n–dimensional k–subspace of kE, which is denoted by L. For example, for $E = <x_1,\dots,x_n>$, let a basis of L be $\{x_1-1,\dots,x_n-1\}$. To an n–tuple $(\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_n) \in k^n$, there corresponds the element $u_\alpha = 1 + \sum_{i=}^{n} \alpha_i(x_i-1) \in 1 + L$, which is a unit, and it generalites a subgroup $<u_\alpha> \cong \mathbb{Z}/p \subset kE$. $<u_\alpha>$ is called a <u>shifted cyclic subgroup</u> of kE, and it was introduced by E. Dade [D] to study endo–trivial modules. Uisng shifted cyclic subgroup, Jon Carlson defined the subset $V_E^r(M) \subset L \cong k^n$ via $V_E^r(M) = \{(\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_n) \in k^n \mid M|_{k<u_\alpha>}$ is not $k<u_\alpha>$–free$\} \cup \{0\}$ called the rank variety of M. Indeed $V_E^r(M)$ is a well–defined subset of $J_E/J_E^2 = k^n$ independent of the choice of L, and it is a homogeneous affine subvariety of k^n. There is a natural identification $J_E/J_E^2 \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathrm{Max}\, H_E$, and this results in a map $V_E^r(M) \longrightarrow V_E(M)$, which was shown to be an isomorphism of sets by Avrunin–Scott [AS], thus proving a conjecture of Carlson, see also [C2]. This isomorphism is natural and compatible with respect to the inclusion of subgroups, in particular, products of shifted cyclic subgroups $S = <u_\alpha> \times <u_\beta> \times \dots \times <u_\zeta>$ (the so–called shifted subgroups of kE which have ranks $\leq$ rank (E)).

The theory of varieties for modules have proved to be extremely valuable, not only in representation theory and finite group theory, but in the context of restricted Lie algebras (Friedlander–Parshall [FP] Jantzen [J]) and topological transformation groups and homotopy theoretic aspects of geometric topology (e.g. Adem [Ad2], Assadi [A2] [A5] and Benson–Carlson [BC] and many other references).

We will use the theory of varieties in the following sections, and for future reference, we discuss briefly how this theory generalizes to the context of permutation complexes. The motivation and much of the details may be found in Assadi [A2] and further applications in [A5].

First suppose that C_* is any kG–complex such that $\bigoplus_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} H_i(C_*)$ is a finitely generated kG–module. For simplicity of exposition, assume that G is a p–group, so that the kG–module k (with trivial G–action necessarily) is the only simple kG–module. Following [A2], the idea is to modify C_* in the category of kG–complexes so as "to simplify" its cohomological structure without changing its hyper cohomology $\mathbb{H}^*(G;C^*)$ locally. Namely, call C_* <u>freely equivalent</u> to a kG–chain complex D_* if there is a kG–chain complex K_* such that $C_* \subset K_*$ and $D_* \subset K_*$ are kG–subcomplexes and K_*/C_* and K_*/D_* are both kG–freely, and bounded with finitely generated homology. This notion was introduced in Assadi [A1] in order to study combinatorial properties of permutation complexes. As in [A2] (compare with [A1]) it is easy to see that free equivalence is an equivalence relation, and the equivalence class of C_* has a representative $\hat{C}_*$ such that $H_i(\hat{C}_*) = 0$ for $i \neq \ell$ and $H_\ell(\hat{C}_*) = M$ is a finitely generated kG–module. Call $\hat{C}_*$ a <u>resolvent</u> for C_*.

2.4. <u>Definition – Proposition</u>: Let G be a p–elementary abelian group. The rank variety and support variety of C_* is defined by $V_G^r(C_*) \equiv V_G^r(H_*(\hat{C}_*)) \equiv V_G^r(M)$ and

$V_G(C_*) = V_G(M)$, where $\hat{C}_*$ is any resolvent of C_* defined as above. $V_G(C_*)$ and $V_G^r(C_*)$ are independent of the choices of the resolvent $\hat{C}_*$.

Remark. The above definitions certainly make sense for any finite group G with the appropriately defined varieties, e.g. as in Avrunin–Scott [AS] and Assadi [A5].

When dealing with based kG–complexes, it is possible to choose the resolvent $\hat{C}_*$ also in the category of based complexes, hence $\ell \geq 0$. In this case, the sensible definition is to let $\widetilde{M} = \widetilde{H}_*(\hat{C}_*) \equiv$ the reduced homology and defined $V_G^r(C_*,\underline{k}) = V_G^r(\widetilde{M})$ and $V_G(C_*,\underline{k}) = V_G(\widetilde{M})$. Clearly $V_G^r(C_*,\underline{k}) = V_G^r(\hat{C}_*/\underline{k}) = V_G^r(C_*/k)$ and similarly for V_G .

It is useful to generalize some of the properties of module varieties to kG–complexes before specializing to the case of permutation complexes.

2.5. Proposition. Let X_*, X'_*, Y_* and Y'_* be kG–complexes with finitely generated total cohomology, and let X'_* and Y'_* be based. Then the following hold:

(a) $V_G^r(X_*)$, $V_G(X_*)$, and their based versions are unchanged under:
   (i) free equivalence,
   (ii) iterated shifts and iterated suspensions of 1.3;
   (iii) taking duals $X^* = \mathrm{Hom}(X_*,k) \equiv X_{-*}$;
   (iv) chain homotopy equivalence, or more generally kG chain maps of any degree inducing a homology isomorphism.

(b) $V_G^r(X_*) \cong V_G(X_*)$

(c) $V_G^r(X_* \otimes Y_*) = V_G^r(X_*) \cap V_G^r(Y_*)$.

(d) Similarly for the based version $V_G^r(X'_* \vee Y'_*,\underline{k}) = V_G^r(X'_*,\underline{k}) \cup V_G^r(Y'_*,\underline{k})$ and $V_G^r(X'_* \wedge Y'_*) = V_G^r(X'_*) \cap V_G^r(Y'_*)$.

(e) If X_* is bounded and kG–free then $V_G^r(X_*) = 0$.

(f) If X_* is kG–chain homotopy equivalent to a non–negative kG–complex, then $V_G(X_*)$ is the variety defined by the annihilating ideal of the H_G–module $\mathbb{H}^*(G;X^*)$.

Proof: Most of the above follow from the definitions and elementary observations. (b) is essentially the Avrunin–Scott theorem [A5] mentioned above. In (c) and (d), we may first take resolvents having their non–trivial homologies in the same dimension (reduced homology for based complexes). In (e) the resolvent $\hat{X}_*$ is seen to have a kG–free homology since X_* is bounded and kG–free. (f) From the hypercohomology exact sequence of the short exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow X_* \xrightarrow{j} \hat{X}_* \longrightarrow \hat{X}_*/X_* \longrightarrow 0$ that $j^* : \mathbb{H}^i(G;\hat{X}^*) \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}^i(G;X^*)$ is an isomorphism for all sufficiently large i (since $\hat{X}_*/X_*$ is kG–free and bounded, hence with bounded hypercohomology). Therefore, the annihilaing ideals of $\mathbb{H}^*(G;X^*)$ and $\mathbb{H}^*(G;\hat{X}^*)$ have the same radical. Similarly, $H^*(G;H^*(\hat{X}^*))$ and $\mathbb{H}^*(G;\hat{X}^*)$ define the same varieties and (f) follows. ■

Next, we specialize to the case of permutation complexes. It is convenient to think of all varieties defined for complexes or modules over kG as homogeneous affine subvarieties of $V_G^r(k) = k^n$ for $G = (\mathbb{Z}/p)^n$. In particular, for each subgroup $K \subseteq G$, $V_G^r(\mathrm{Ind}_K^G(k))$ is a linear subspace of $V_G^r(k)$ defined with $\mathbb{F}_p$–coefficients and it is isomorphic to $V_K^r(k)$. The cohomological analogue is the restriction of Spec $H_K \longrightarrow$ Spec H_G induced by the restriction homomorphism $\rho_G^G : H^*(G;k) \longrightarrow H^*(K;k)$ to the subspace of closed points. In this way, we establish a one–to–one correspondence between $\mathbb{F}_p$–rational linear subspaces of $V_G^r(k)$ (or equivalently $V_G(k)$) and subgroups of G itself. In particular, cyclic subgroups of G and $\mathbb{F}_p$–rational linea of J_G/J_G^2 correspond under the above. An important property of shifted cyclic subgroups $<u_\alpha> \subset kG$ (corresponding to $\alpha = (\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_n) \in k^n$ as above) is that kG is $k<u_\alpha>$–free. Moreover the usual apparatus of induction and restriction of representations, (e.g. Mackey's formula) and their homological consequences hold for shifted subgroups. See Carlson [C2] and Kroll [K] for justification and details. In particular, $k[G/H] = \mathrm{Ind}_H^G(k)$ is a $k<u_\alpha>$–free module if $k<u_\alpha> \cap kH = k<1> \cong k$ by Mackey's formula. Thus, if we choose α such that the line $k\{\alpha\}$ is not $\mathbb{F}_p$–rational in $J_G/J_G^2 = k^n$, then $k[G/H]$ are $k<u_\alpha>$–free for all proper subgroups $H \underset{\neq}{\subset} G$. Suppose that X_* is a permutation complex with permutation basis $\mathcal{S} = \coprod_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} S_i$. For the above choice of α, the only elements of $S_i \subset X_i$ which are left by $<u_\alpha>$ are those with isotropy group G. This suggests the slight abuse of notation $X_*(<u_\alpha>)$ indicating the fact $\mathcal{S}^{<u_\alpha>} = \mathcal{S}^G$. Since kG is $k<u_\alpha>$–free and $X_*(<u_\alpha>) = X_*(G)$, $X_*|k<u_\alpha>$ is a $k<u_\alpha>$–permutation complex and we can apply our machinary and results on $k[\mathbb{Z}/p]$–permutation complexes as before. The following summarises these observations with a slight useful generalization.

2.6. Proposition. Let X_* be a permutation kG–complex where G is any finite group, and let $H \subseteq G$, $H = (\mathbb{Z}/p)^n$. Then for a suitable choice of a shifted cyclic subgroup $<u_\alpha> \subset kH$, $X_*|k<u_\alpha>$ will have a natural structure of a $k<u_\alpha>$–permutation complex such that $X_*(k<u_\alpha>) = X_*(H)$ and $X_*/X_*(H)$ is $k<u_\alpha>$–free. ■

Remark: Clearly the set of $\alpha \in V_H^r(k)$ for which $<u_\alpha>$ has the above property form a Zariski open dense subset. A useful application of the above discussion is a simplified calculation of fixed subcomplexes.

2.7. Proposition: Suppose X_* is a bounded permutation kG–complex, and $(\mathbb{Z}/p)^n \cong H \subseteq G$ is a subgroup. (a) For any shifted subgroup $<u_\alpha> \subset kH$ as in Proposition 2.6 above,

$$H_*(X_*(H)) \cong (\mathbb{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;X^* \mid k<u_\alpha>)[\tfrac{1}{t_\alpha}] \otimes_A k \ ,$$

where $A = \hat{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;k) \cong H^*(<u_\alpha>;k)[\frac{1}{t_\alpha}]$ and $t_\alpha \in H^i(<u_\alpha>;k)$ is the polynomial generator and $i = 1$ for $p = 2$ and $i = 2$ for $p > 2$.

(b) If $\hat{X}_*$ is a resolvent for X_* and $H^*(\hat{X}^*) = M$, then $H_*(X_*(H)) \cong \hat{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;M) \otimes_A k$ (ungraded).

Proof: Consider the short exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow X_*(H) \xrightarrow{j} X_* \longrightarrow X_*/X_*(H) \longrightarrow 0$ and the corresponding long exact sequence in hypercohomology $\ldots \mathbb{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;X^*) \xrightarrow{j^*} \mathbb{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;X^*(H)) \longrightarrow \ldots$ The proof of the localization theorem 2.1 applies to this case since $\mathbb{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;\mathrm{Hom}(X_*/X_*(H),k))[\frac{1}{t_\alpha}] \cong 0$ since $X_*/X_*(H)$ is $k<u_\alpha>$–free and bounded. A standard calculation implies (a) and (b). ■

The following results shows that homology representations of bounded permutation complexes (permutable modules) have special types of rank varieties which arise for permutation modules.

2.8. Theorem. Let X_* be a bounded permutation kG–complex, where $G = (\mathbb{Z}/p)^n$. Then $V_G^r(X_*)$ consists of $\mathbb{F}_p$–rational linear subspaces of $V_G^r(k)$ corresponding to subgroups $K \subseteq G$ for which $H_*(X_*(K)) \neq 0$.

Proof: First, let $K \subseteq G$ be a subgroup such that $H_*(X_*(K)) \neq 0$. Without loss of generality and for simplicity of notation, assume that X_* is a resolvent complex, and $H_0(X_*) = M$. By Proposition 2.7. above, we may choose $<u_\alpha> \subset kK$ such that $X_*(<u_\alpha>) = X_*(K)$. Then, Proposition 2.7 (b) shows that

$\hat{H}(<u_\alpha>;M) \otimes_A k \cong H_*(X_*(K)) \neq 0$, hence $\hat{H}(<u_\alpha>;M) \neq 0$. This implies that $M/k<u_\alpha>$ is not $k<u_\alpha>$–free. The set of such $a \in V^r_K(k)$ with $X_*(<u_\alpha>) = X_*(K)$ forms a Zariski dense open subset. Thus for all $\alpha \in V^r_K(k)$, $M\,|\,k<u_\alpha>$ is not $k<u_\alpha>$–free. As discussed above, the $\mathbb{F}_p$–rational linear subspace $V^r_G(\mathrm{Ind}^G_K(k)) \cong V^r_K(k)$ corresponds to K , and hence it lies in $V^r_G(M)$. Conversely, if $M\,|\,k<u_\alpha>$ is free for such a choice of α , the localization result of 2.7 (b) shows that $H_*(X_*(<u_\alpha>)) = H_*(X_*(H)) = 0$. It remains to see that if there exists an $\alpha \in V^r_G(M)$ which does not lie in any proper $\mathbb{F}_p$–rational linear subspace of $V^r_G(k)$, then $V^r_G(M) = V^r_G(k)$ and $H_*(X_*(G)) \neq 0$. But this follows from the same argument applied abelian. ■

Let us make a few useful technical remarks which will be needed for the following proof of the analogue of Carlson's conjecture (Avrunin–Scott [AS] Theorem 1 and Carlson [C2]). First, for a kG–complex Y_* and a short exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow G \longrightarrow G/K \longrightarrow 0$ of groups, there is a Lyndon–Hochschield–Serre spectral sequence with $E_2^{i,j} \cong H^i(G/K; \mathbb{H}^j(K;Y^*)) \Rightarrow \mathbb{H}^{i+j}(G;Y^*)$ when Y_* is bounded below. There is an analogue of this spectral sequence for $G = (\mathbb{Z}/p)^n$ and shifted subgroups $K \subset kG$ and $K' \subset kG$ with the property $kK \otimes kK' \cong kG$ $H^i(K';\mathbb{H}^j(K;Y^*)) \Rightarrow \mathbb{H}^{i+j}(G;Y^*)$. This is discussed for kG–modules in Carlson [C2]. One may modify Carlson's argument and apply it to the double complex $\mathrm{Hom}_{K\times K'}(W_* \otimes W'_*, Y^*)$ (where W_* and W'_* are the free resolutions of k over kK and kK' respectively) to obtain the above spectral sequence. However, the usual spectral sequence for modules can be used for the following arguments provided that we replace Y_* by a resolvent kG–complex of Y_* .

2.9. Proposition. Suppose Y_* is a bounded permutation kG–complex for $G = (\mathbb{Z}/p)^n$, and let $<u_\alpha>$ be a shifted cyclic subgroup of kG , and $t_\alpha \in H^i(<u_\alpha>;k)$ a polynomial generator of $H_{<u_\alpha>}$. Then $\mathbb{H}^*(G;Y^*)[\frac{1}{t_\alpha}] \cong \hat{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;k) \otimes \mathbb{H}^*(K';Y^*(<u_\alpha>))$ where $kG \cong k<u_\alpha> \otimes kK'$. In particular, $\mathbb{H}^*(G;Y^*)[\frac{1}{t_\alpha}] \neq 0$ if and only if $H_*(Y_*(<u_\alpha>)) \neq 0$.

Proof: Since localization is an exact funcor, we can localize the above mentioned spectral sequence: $H^*(K';\mathbb{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;Y^*))[\frac{1}{t_\alpha}] \Rightarrow \mathbb{H}^*(G;Y^*)[\frac{1}{t_\alpha}]$. But $H^*(K';\mathbb{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;Y^*))[\frac{1}{t_\alpha}] \cong H^*(K';\mathbb{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;Y^*)[\frac{1}{t_\alpha}]) \cong H^*(K';\mathbb{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;Y^*(<u_\alpha>))[\frac{1}{t_\alpha}]) \cong H^*(K';\hat{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;k) \otimes H^*(Y^*(<u_\alpha>)))$ by the localization theorem 2.1 and since $<u_\alpha>$ acts trivially on $Y^*(<u_\alpha>)$. To verify the formula for the E_∞–term, consider performing the localization on the E_1–level:
$E_1^{**}[\frac{1}{t_\alpha}] \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{K'}(W'_*;\mathbb{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;Y^*))[\frac{1}{t_\alpha}] \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{K'}(W'_*;\mathbb{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;Y^*(<u_\alpha>))[\frac{1}{t_\alpha}])$ and since K' acts trivially on $H^*(<u_\alpha>;k)$ and $<u_\alpha>$ acts trivially on $Y^*(<u_\alpha>)$, $E_1^{**}[\frac{1}{t_\alpha}] \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{K'}(W'_*;H^*(Y^*(<u_\alpha>))) \otimes \hat{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;k)$ which clearly converges to $\mathbb{H}^*(K';Y^*(<u_\alpha>)) \otimes \hat{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;k)$ and the first assertion is proved. If $H_*(Y_*(<u_\alpha>)) \neq 0$, then $\mathbb{H}^*(K';Y^*(<u_\alpha>)) \neq 0$ and hence $\mathbb{H}^*(G;Y^*)[\frac{1}{t_\alpha}] \neq 0$. This follows from considering the second spectral sequence of the double complex $\mathrm{Hom}_{K'}(W'_*;Y^*(<u_\alpha>))$ which is convergent since $Y_*(<u_\alpha>)$ is bounded and the universal coefficients formula. If $H_*(Y_*(<u_\alpha>)) = 0$, then the LHS–spectral sequence shows that $\mathbb{H}^*(G;Y^*)[\frac{1}{t_\alpha}] = 0$. ■

We use the above to prove the analogue of Carlson's conjecture (Avrunin–Scott [AS] Theorem 1) by a different proof for bounded permutation complexes. This proof is particularly interesting from the point of view of local–to–global properties of the homology representations of permutation complexes. It also suggests an alternative proof of

Carlson's conjecture for arbitrary modules which will be presented elsewhere.

2.10 Corollary (Carlson's conjecture for permutation complexes). Let $G = (\mathbb{Z}/p)^n$ and X_* a bounded permutation kG–complex. Then $V_G^r(X_*) = V_G(X_*)$.

Proof: $V_G(X_*)$ is defined by the annihilating ideal of the $H^*(G;k)$–modules $H^*(G;H^*(\hat{X}^*))$ or equivalently $\mathbb{H}^*(G;X^*)$, where $\hat{X}^*$ is a resolvent of X^*, if $p = 2$, otherwise the annihilating ideal as H_G–modules. As in Theorem 2.8 above, assume $H_i(X_*) = 0$ for $i > 0$ and $H_0(X_*) = M$. If $K \subset G$ is any subgroup then the inclusion induces split surjections $H^*(G;k) \longrightarrow H^*(K;k)$ and $H_G \longrightarrow H_K$. The same is true for a shifted subgroup $K \subset kG$. The corresponding map on spectra yields an embedding $\rho_K^G : V_K(k) \longrightarrow V_G(k)$ whose image may be identified with $V_G(\mathrm{Ind}_K^G(k)) \cong V_K(k)$. Now let $\alpha \in k^n$ be chosen such that the line $V_G^r(\mathrm{Ind}_{<u_\alpha>}^G(k)) \cong V_{<u_\alpha>}^r(k)$ does not lie in $V_G^r(X_*)$. According to the proof of Theorem 2.8 above this condition is equivalent to $H_*(X_*(<u_\alpha>)) = 0$. By Proposition 2.9 above, the latter condition implies that $\mathbb{H}^*(G;X^*)[\frac{1}{t_\alpha}] = 0$ and consequently $V_G(\mathrm{Ind}_{<u_\alpha>}^G(k)) \cap \mathrm{Support}(\mathbb{H}^*(G;X^*)) = 0$. That is, $\rho_{<u_\alpha>}^G(V_{<u_\alpha>}(k))$ does not lie in $V_G(X_*)$. Conversely, if the line $V_G^r(\mathrm{Ind}_{<u_\alpha>}^G(k))$ lies in $V_G^r(X_*)$, then $H_*(X_*(<u_\alpha>)) \neq 0$, and by Proposition 2.9 $\mathbb{H}^*(G;X^*)[\frac{1}{t_\alpha}] \neq 0$.

Translated into a statement about supports, this is equivalent to $V_G(X_*) \cap V_G(\mathrm{Ind}_{<u_\alpha>}^G(k)) \neq 0$. Since both varieties are homogeneous, the proof is completed. ■

SECTION THREE. HOMOLOGY REPRESENTATIONS

Every RG–module M has a free RG–resolution $C_* : \ldots\ldots \longrightarrow C_1 \longrightarrow C_0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$. That is, $H_i(C_*) = 0$ for $i > 0$, and $H_0(C_*) = M$. Unless M is cohomologically trivial in the sense of Tate (see Brown [B3], Cartan–Eilenberg [CE] or Rim [R]), C_* is infinite dimensional. If we choose C_i to be permutation modules, we may arrange to have a finite dimensional classe complex C_*. This point of view has been studied by Arnold [Ar2], who has developed for instance, analogues of the familiar homological algebraic constructions using permutation modules. For instance, Arnold proves that in this context for cyclic groups G, every $\mathbb{Z}G$–module M has a "resolution" by a complex of permutation modules of length 2. However, if we require "the resolutions" to be permutation complexes, then we get non–trivial restrictions on the type of RG–modules which arise in this way. More generally we formulate the following.

3.1. Problem: Suppose X_* is a bounded permutation complex such that for some integer d, $H_i(X_*) = 0$ for $i \neq d$ and $H_d(X_*) = M$. We call X_* a "permutable resolution" of M. (1) Which RG–modules M have a permutable resolution? (2) If M is a finitely generated RG–module, when can we find a finite permutable resolution for M ?

This is an algebraic analogue of the well–known Steenrod Problem (see Lashof [L], Swan [Sw2], Arnold [Ar1], Smith [Sm1] [Sm2], Carlsson [Cg] and Assadi [A2] for a partial survey).

As we shall see below, the class of RG–modules which arise in (1) is quite restricted. Therefore, the existence of a permutable resolution may be considered as extra structure imposed on an RG–module which is a natural generalization of being a permutation module.

3.2. Definition: An RG–module which has a permutable resolution is called a permutable module.

As for part (2) of the above problem, the obstruction theory of R. Swan [Sw2] generalizes to the context of permutable resolutions. Therefore, the results of Swan [Sw2] are valid in this context and show that even among permutable modules, the existence of finite permutable resolutions imposes number–theoretic conditions on finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}G$–modules.

Using the localization theorem 2.1, we may extend many results of topological transformation groups to the context of permutation complexes. For example:

3.3. Theorem. Let X_* be RG–chain homotopic to a bounded permutation, and assume that for each maximal p–elementary abelian group $E \subseteq G$ and each $p \mid |G|$ for which $p^{-1} \notin R$, the hypercohomology spectral sequence $H^*(E;H^*(X^*)) \Rightarrow \mathbb{H}^*(E;X^*)$ degenerates. Then the RG–module $M = \bigoplus_i H_i(X_*)$ is RG–projective if and only if for each subgroup $C \subseteq G$ such that $|C| = p$ and $p^{-1} \notin R$, $M|RC$ is RC–projective.

Proof: The proof of Theorem 1.1 for G–spaces in Assadi [A2] is based on the localization theorem and arguments involving constructions which are valid in $\mathscr{P}(RG)$ as well, see Section One. We leave the minor modification to the reader. ∎

Let us mention some applications to group theory. Let G be a finite group, and let π be a poset of proper subgroups of G. Let S_n be the set of chains of subgroups $p_0 < p_1 < \dots < p_n$ of length $n+1$. Conjugation by elements of G makes S_n a G–set.

The i–th face map $\partial_i : S_n \longrightarrow S_{n-1}$ is defined by dropping the i–th subgroup in the chain, and $\partial : S_n \longrightarrow R[S_{n-1}]$ is given by $\partial = \sum_{i=0}^{n} (-1)^i \partial_i$. The resulting RG–chain complex C_* is a permutation complex for suitable choices of π. In fact, C_* is the simplicial chain complex of the simplicial complex $\Delta(\pi)$ associated to the poset π by the standard construction. See Brown [B1] [B2], Quillen [Q2], Solomon [Sol], Tits [Tt], and Webb [W2] for further discussion and applications. We use Quillen's notation [Q2] $\mathcal{A}_p(G)$ = the poset of non–trivial p–elementary abelian subgroups of G, $\mathcal{S}_p(G)$ = the poset of p–subgroups of G. If G is the finite group of $\mathbb{F}_q$–rational points of a semi–simple algebraic group $(q = p^s)$ of rank ℓ over $\mathbb{F}_q$, then we denote the Solomon–Tits building associated to G by T, see Solomon [Sol] and Tits [Tt]. The complex of permutation modules $C_*(\mathcal{A}_p(G))$ is in fact a permutation complex, and according to Quillen ([Q2] Theorem 3.1) $C_*(\mathcal{A}_p(G))$ and $C_*(T)$ are chain homotopy equivalent. Moreover, $C_*(T)$ are chain homotopy equivalent. Moreover, $C_*(T)$ is based and $H_i(C_*(T)) \neq 0$ only for $i = 0$ and $i = \ell-1$ where ℓ is the rank. The localization theorem

2.1 and the projectivity criterion together imply the following well–known results.

3.4. Theorem

(a) $H_{\ell-1}(T)$ is RG–projective, where R is a field of characteristic p or the p–adic integers.

(b) $H_{\ell-1}(C_*(\mathcal{A}_p(G-1))$ is RG–projective for an arbitrary finite group G and R as in (a).

(c) Let G be of p–rank 2, and $\tilde{C}_*$ be the reduced RG–chain complex associated to $\mathcal{A}_p(G)$ or $\mathcal{S}_p(G)$. Then $H_*(\tilde{C}_*)$ is RG–projective.

Part (c) is obtaned by Webb [W1] in a different context, and as pointed out in [Q2], and [W1], $H_1(C_*)$ is isomorphic to the Steinberg module if G is assumed to be a finite Chevalley group of p–rank 2.

Next, the projectivity criterion 3.3 above may be used as in Assadi [A2] (see also [A3]) to provide non–permutable modules. Notice that since $\mathbb{H}^*(G;X^*)$ does not necessarily admit auxiliary structures, such as an action of the Steenrod algebra, the counter examples to the Steenrod problem (e.g. as in [Cg]) which use such structures do not apply to Problem 3.1. above.

3.5. Theorem: Suppose $G \supseteq \mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}_p$ or Q_8 (= the quaternion group of order 8). Then there are finitely generated non–permutable $\mathbb{Z}G$–lattices.

Proof: The examples constructed in Assadi [A2] [A3] use the projectivity criterion [A2] Theorem 1.1. We may apply the analoguous criterion, Theorem 3.3 of above, to the examples of [A2] [A3]. ■

It is worth noticing that the analogue of Theorem 3.1 of [A2] also hold for homology representations of bounded permutation complexes:

3.6. Theorem: Let $G \supset \mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}_p$ or Q_8. Then:

(a) there are non–trivial $\mathbb{Z}G$–lattices M_1 and M_2 such that $M_1 \oplus M_2$ does not occur as the homology representation of any bounded RG–permutation complex.

(b) There are $\mathbb{Z}G$–lattices M_1 and M_2 such that neither M_1 nor M_2 occur as homology representations of bounded permutation complexes, but $M_1 \oplus M_2 \cong H_*(X_*)$ for a bounded permutation complex X_*.

Proof: The strategy of the proof is similar to Assadi [A2] with minor modifications. The details will be omitted. ■

SECTION FOUR. DUALITY

There is a "Hermitian analogue" of Problem ..... above which we will briefly discuss. Another property of permutation modules is their "self–duality": If M is a permutation RG–module, then $\mathrm{Hom}_R(M,R) \cong M$ as RG–modules. This property is not shared by most modules, and again, it can be thought of an extra structure imposed on M. In particular, one may ask for the description of permutable modules which are in addition self–dual. A special case which arises in geometric topology and topological transformation groups is the homology representations of highly–connected self–dual permutation complexes. Let C_* be a positive RG–complex, and $C^* = \mathrm{Hom}_R(C_*,R)$. If we use the usual convention $C_{-i} \equiv C^i$, then the duality condition is formulated as follows:

4.1. Condition (SD). Let C_* be a connected (augmented) RG–complex. C_* is called self–dual of formal dimension d, if there is a chain homotopy equivalence of degree d $h : C^* \longrightarrow C_*$. (We may equivalently say that C_* satisfies duality of formal dimension d).

Let X_* be a self–dual bounded permutation complex of formal dimension $2M$ such that $H_i(X_*) = 0$ for $0 < i < n$ (and by duality for $n < i < 2n$), and $H_n(X_*) = M$ finitely generated. Then we have an RG–isomorphism $H^n(X^*) \xrightarrow{\cong} H_n(X^*)$, which shows that $M \cong \mathrm{Hom}_R(M,R)$, using the universal coefficients formula. We call X_* a self–dual permutable structure (SDP–structure for short). It is not unreasonable to conjecture that a module M with an SDP–structure is permutable. We will provide some evidence for this later. Based on this, we call an RG–module M to be self–dual permutable if there is an SDP–structure for M.

4.2. Problem. Determine self–dual permutable RG–modules.

4.3. Proposition. Let $p \mid |G|$ be an odd prime. Suppose that C_* is a bounded connected RG–permutation complex such that $H_0(C_*) = H_{2n}(C_*) = R$, $H_i(C_*) = 0$ for $i > 2n$, and for $0 < i < 2n$ $H_i(C_*)$ is RG–projective. Then for each $H \in \mathcal{A}_p(G)$, $H_*(C_*(H)) \cong R \oplus R$.

Proof: It suffices to assume that $G \approx (\mathbb{Z}_p)^r$ and $R = k$. Choose $\alpha = (\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_r) \in k^r$ such that the shifted subgroup $<u_\alpha>$ satisfies $k<u_\alpha> \cap kH = k[1]$ for all proper isotropy subgroups $H \neq G$ in C_*.

Consider the hypercohomology spectral sequence $H^*(<u_\alpha>; H^*(C^*)) \Rightarrow \mathbb{H}^*(<u_\alpha>; C^*)$ in which the only possible non–trivial differential is $d_{2n+1} : E_{2n+1}^{i,2n} \longrightarrow E_{2n+1}^{i+2n+1,0}$. We note that $E_{2n+1}^{i,2n} = H^i(<u_\alpha>;k) = H^{i+2n+1}(<u_\alpha>;k) = E_{2n+1}^{i+2n+1,0} = k$ and d_{2n+1} is $H^*(<u_\alpha>;k)$–linear. Since p is odd, the cohomology period of $H^*(<u_\alpha>;k)$ is even (considering the action of the Bockstein on cohomology). Therefore $d_{2n+1} \equiv 0$ and the spectral sequence collapses. Now, the localization theorem 2.1 implies that $S^{-1}\mathbb{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;C^*<u_\alpha>) \cong S^{-1}\mathbb{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;k) \oplus H^*(<u_\alpha>;k)) \cong \hat{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;k) \otimes (k \oplus k)$. Since $S^{-1}\mathbb{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;C^*<u_\alpha>) \cong S^{-1}(H^*(<u_\alpha>;k) \otimes H^*(C^*<u_\alpha>)) \cong \hat{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;k) \otimes H^*(C^*<u_\alpha>)$. Therefore $H^*(C^*<u_\alpha>) \cong S^{-1}\mathbb{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;C^*<u_\alpha>) \otimes_{\hat{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;k)} k \cong k \oplus k$. By our choice of α, $C_*(<u_\alpha>) \cong C_*(G)$, since for all $H \neq G$, $C_*(H)|_{k<u_\alpha>}$ is $k<u_\alpha>$–free. Therefore, $H^*(C^*(G)) \cong k \oplus k$ as claimed. ■

4.4 Proposition. Let C_* be a connected bounded RG–permutation complex such that

$H_i(C_*) = 0$ for $i \notin \{0,n,2n\}$ and $H_0(C_*) = H_{2n}(C_*) = R$. For each $E \in \mathcal{A}_p(G)$ such that $C_*(E) = 0$, one has $\mathrm{rk}_A(H^*(E;H^n(C^*))) = 2$ where $A = H^*(E;R)$.

Proof: As in the above, we may assume that $R = k$, $G = (\mathbb{Z}_p)^r$ and prove the statement for $E = G$. Again choose $\alpha \in k^r$ as in 4.3 above such that $k\langle u_\alpha\rangle \cap kH = k[1]$ for all isotropy subgroups H of C_*. We remark that the set of such α forms a Zariski open (hence dense) subset of the affine k–space k^r. Since $C_*(G) = 0$, $C_*(\langle u_\alpha\rangle) = 0$ also and $C_* | k\langle u_\alpha\rangle$ is $k\langle u_\alpha\rangle$–free. It follows that $H_n(C_*)|_{k\langle u_\alpha\rangle} \cong M \oplus M \oplus F$ where F is $k\langle u_\alpha\rangle$–free and $M = k$ if $n = \text{odd}$ and $M = I =$ augmentation ideal for $n = \text{even}$. See Assadi [A4]. Thus, $\hat{H}^*(\langle u_\alpha\rangle;H^n(C)) \cong \hat{H}^*(\langle u_\alpha\rangle;k \oplus k)$. Since the set of all α for which this holds forms an open dense subset of k^r, we conclude that $H^*(G;H^n(C^*))[\frac{1}{t_\alpha}] \cong H^*(G;k \oplus k)[\frac{1}{t_\alpha}]$, and from this the claim follows. ■

4.5. Theorem. Let p be an odd prime, and $E \in \mathcal{A}_p(G)$. Let M be a self–dual permutable kG–module with an SDP–structure C_*. Suppose the rank of $H^*(E;M)$ over $H^*(E;k)$ is one. Then $\dim_k H_*(C_*(E)) = 3$.

Proof: As in the above, we may assume that $E = \mathbb{Z}_p^r = G$, and let $H^*(G;k)_{\mathrm{red}} = A$ and $K =$ quotient field of A. Recall that in the hypercohomology spectral sequence $H^*(G;H^*(C^*)) \Rightarrow \mathbb{H}^*(G;C^*)$ all E_n^{**}–terms are modules over $H^*(G;k)$ for $n \geq 2$, and the differentials are $H^*(G;k)$–linear. The first differential to consider is $d_{n+1} : E_{n+1}^{i,n+j} \longrightarrow E_{n+1}^{i+n+1,j}$ for $j = 0,n$ and all i. If $C_*(G) = 0$, then rank $H^*(G;M) = 2$ by Proposition 4.4. Therefore, we may assume that $C_*(G) \neq 0$, and choose $0 \leq \ell \leq 2n$ to be the smallest integer such that $C_\ell(G) \neq 0$. As in Proposition ..... choose $\alpha \in k^r$ such that $k\langle u_\alpha\rangle \cap k+1 = k[1]$. We will need the follwoing lemmas in order to study the above spectral sequence:

4.6. <u>Lemma</u>: In the hypercohomology spectral sequence $H^*(<u_\alpha>;H^*(C^*)) \Rightarrow \mathbb{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;C^*)$ the differential $d_{n+1} : E_{n+1}^{i,n} \longrightarrow E_{n+1}^{i+n+1,0}$ vanishes for all i.

<u>Proof of Lemma 4.6.</u>: If $\ell = 0$, then we have a split augmentation $C_0(G) \rightleftarrows k$ which gives a split augmentation $C_0 \rightleftarrows k$. Thus, the induced homomorphism $H^*(<u_\alpha>;k) \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;C^*)$ is split injective. Now suppose that $\ell > 0$. We define kG–chain complexes D_* such that $D_i = C_i$ for $0 \leq i \leq \ell-1$ and $D_i = 0$ for $i \geq \ell$, and $\hat{C}_*$ from the exact sequence of kG–comlexes: $0 \longrightarrow D_* \longrightarrow C_* \xrightarrow{q} \hat{C}_* \longrightarrow 0$. By the choice of $\ell > 0$, D_* is $k<u_\alpha>$–free, and since it is founded, $\mathbb{H}^i(<u_\alpha>;D^*) = 0$ for $i >> 0$. Therefore, for all large values of i, $q^* : \mathbb{H}^i(<u_\alpha>;\hat{C}^*) \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}^i(<u_\alpha>;C^*)$ is an isomorphism. Since $\hat{C}_*$ has a split augmentation (shifted to degree ℓ) $\sigma : \hat{C}_\ell = C_\ell \rightleftarrows k$, the differential $\hat{d}_{n-\ell+1} : E^{i,n}_{n-\ell+1}(\hat{C}^*) \longrightarrow E^{i+\ell+1,n-\ell}_{n-\ell+1}(\hat{C}_*)$ vanishes for all large values of i, as in the previous case. The periodicity of the cohomology of $<u_\alpha>$ implies that $\hat{d}_{n-\ell+1} = 0$ for all values of i. Therefore, $\sigma^* : H^*(<u_\alpha>;k) \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;\hat{C}^*)$ is injective. Since q^* is an $H^*(<u_\alpha>;k)$–linear isomorphism for $i >> 0$, $H^i(<u_\alpha>;k) \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}^i(<u_\alpha>;C^*)$ is injective. This in turn implies that the above differential $d_{n+1} = 0$ for all i. ■

Let $h : C^* \longrightarrow C_*$ be a chain homotopy equivalence given by the self–duality of C_*, and let $h_* : H^i(C^*) \longrightarrow H_{2n-1}(C^*)$ be the induced kG–isomorphism. Choose a generator $\Omega \in H^{2n}(C^*) \cong k$, and define the non–degenerate pairing $\eta : H^i(C^*) \otimes H^{2n-1}(C^*) \longrightarrow k \cong H^{2n}(C^*)$ via $\eta(f \otimes g) = g(h_*(f))\Omega$. Here we have used the universal coefficients formula $H^{2n-i}(C^*) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathrm{Hom}_k(H_{2n-i}(C_*),k)$. Since h_* is a kG–isomorphism, η becomes a kG–homomorphism with respect to the diagonal action on the left side. Besides, we have the following commutative diagram in which τ is the trace of an endomorphism:

$$(\square) \qquad \begin{tikzcd} M \otimes M \arrow[r, "\eta"] \arrow[d, "\cong"] & k \\ M \otimes \mathrm{Hom}(M, k) \arrow[r, "\cong"] & \mathrm{End}(M) \arrow[u, "\tau"'] \end{tikzcd}$$

4.7. Lemma: Keep the above notation and assume that $\hat{H}^i(<u_\alpha>;M) \cong k$ for all i. Then it follwos that:

(a) η is split surjective;

(b) $\eta_* : \hat{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;M \otimes M) \longrightarrow \hat{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;k)$ is an isomorphism;

(c) M is stably $k<u_\alpha>$–isomorphic either to k or the augmentation ideal of $k<u_\alpha>$.

Proof of Lemma 4.7.: Any indecomposable $k[\mathbb{Z}_p]$–module N, is determined by the Jordan canonical form of the generator of $\mathbb{Z}_p$ acting on the k–vector space N. This shows that if $N \not\cong 0$ and $N \not\cong k\mathbb{Z}_p$, then $1 \leq \dim_k(N) \leq p-1$, and a standard cohomology calculation and induction on $\dim_k N$ shows that $\hat{H}^i(\mathbb{Z}_p;N) \cong k$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ in this case. The assumption of Lemma 4.6 shows that $M \cong M_0 \oplus F$, where F is $k<u_\alpha>$–free and M_0 is indecomposable such that $1 \leq \dim M_0 \leq p-1$. Hence $\dim M \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$. Define a splitting $\xi : k \longrightarrow \mathrm{End}(M)$ by $\xi(1) = (1/\dim M)(\mathrm{id})$ where $\mathrm{id} \in \mathrm{End}(M)$ is the identity. The above commutative square $(\square)$ yields (a). To prove (b), observe that $M \otimes M \cong M_0 \otimes M_0 \oplus F \otimes M_0 \oplus M_0 \otimes F \oplus F \otimes F \cong M' \oplus F'$ where M' is indecomposable and M' is $k<u_\alpha>$–free. The splitting of part (a), and the Krull–Schmidt–Azumya theorem applied to the isomorphism $k \oplus \mathrm{Ker}(\eta) \cong M' \oplus F'$ implies that $M \otimes M \cong k \oplus (k <u_\alpha>)^s$ and $\mathrm{Ker}(\eta) \cong F'$ is $k<u_\alpha>$–free. Thus, η_* is an isomorphism and (b) follows. An easy calculation shows that for M_0 to satisfy $M_0 \otimes M_0 \cong k \oplus (k<u_\alpha>)^t$, the only possibilities are $\dim M_0 = 1$ or $p-1$, hence (c) follows. ■

4.8. Lemma: Keep the hypotheses of Lemma 4.7 and the above notation, and consider the internal cup product in group cohomology

$\beta : \hat{H}^r(<u_\alpha>;M) \otimes \hat{H}^s(<u_\alpha>;M) \longrightarrow \hat{H}^{r+s}(<u_\alpha>;M \otimes M)$.

(a) If M is $k<u_\alpha>$–stably isomorphic to k , then β is an isomorphism for all $r \equiv 0 \bmod 2$ and all $s \in \mathbb{Z}$.

(b) If M is $k<u_\alpha>$–stably isomorphic to the augmentation ideal of $k<u_\alpha>$, then β is an isomorphism for all $r \equiv s \equiv 1 \bmod 2$.

Proof: The proof of (a) is immediate from periodicity of the cohomology of $<u_\alpha> = \mathbb{Z}_p$. To see (b), we proceed as follows. Consider the exact sequence

$0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow F_1 \longrightarrow k \oplus F_2 \longrightarrow 0$ in which F_1 and F_2 are suitable $k<u_\alpha>$–free modules, and tesno it with M to obtain the exact sequence:

$0 \longrightarrow M \otimes M \longrightarrow F_1' \longrightarrow M \oplus F_2' \longrightarrow 0$ where F_1' and F_2' are also free. Let $\delta : \hat{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;k) \longrightarrow \hat{H}^{*+1}(<u_\alpha>;M)$ and $\delta' : \hat{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;M) \longrightarrow \hat{H}^{*+1}(<u_\alpha>;M \otimes M)$ be the connecting homomorphisms in the long exact sequences of group cohomology applied to the above short exact sequences. δ and δ' and $\hat{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;k)$–module isomorphisms and compatible with cup–products (see Brown [B3] or Cartan–Eilenberg [CE]). Therefore, we obtain the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
H^{2i}(<u_\alpha>;k) \otimes H^{2j-1}(<u_\alpha>;M) \arrow[r, "\mu"] \arrow[d, "\delta\otimes \mathrm{id}"', "\cong"] & H^{2i+2j-1}(<u_\alpha>;M) \arrow[d, "\delta'"', "\cong"] \\
H^{2i+1}(<u_\alpha>;M) \otimes H^{2j-1}(<u_\alpha>;M) \arrow[r] & H^{2i+2j}(<u_\alpha>;M \otimes M)
\end{tikzcd}$$

In the above, μ and β are given by cup–products. Since μ is an isomorphism, so is β, and (b) is proved. ∎

4.9. Lemma: If $\hat{H}^i(<u_\alpha>;M) \cong k$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, then the hypercohomology spectral sequence $H^*(<u_\alpha>;H^*(C^*)) \Rightarrow \mathbb{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;C^*)$ collapses.

Proof: From Lemma 4.6, it follows that we need to consider only $d_{n+1} : E_{n+1}^{i,2n} \longrightarrow E_{n+1}^{i+n+1,n}$. First, notice that there is a pairing in the above spectral sequence $\gamma : E_2^{i,a} \otimes E_2^{j,b} \longrightarrow E_2^{i+j,a+b}$ as follows. Let $\eta_* : H^*(<u_\alpha>;H^i(C^*) \otimes H^j(C^*)) \longrightarrow H^*(<u_\alpha>;H^{i+j}(C^*))$ be the induced homomorphism from the pairing η given above by the self–duality. Note that in this case, we need to consider $i = j = n$, and if $i = 0$ or $j = 0$, η_* is the identity. Next, we have the group cohomology cup–product β as in Lemma 4.8 above. γ is the composition $\eta_* \circ \beta$ on the E_2–level. We remark that β is constructed using a diagonal approximation in a resolution for $<u_\alpha>$; hence, β satisfies a suitable form of the Leibnitz formula with respect to the differentials in the hypercohomology spectral sequences whose E_2–terms are $H^*(<u_\alpha>;H^*(C^*))$ and $H^*(<u_\alpha>;H^*(C^* \otimes C^*)) \supseteq H^*(<u_\alpha>;H^*(C^*) \otimes H^*(C^*))$. Moreover, η_* commutes with the differentials since it is induced by coefficient homomorphisms.

Let $t \in H^2(<u_\alpha>;k) \cong k$ and $\Omega \in \hat{H}^0(<u_\alpha>;H^{2n}(C^*)) \cong k$ be generators. From Lemma 4.7 (c) we are led to consider the two cases of Lemma 4.8. First suppose M is stably isomorphic to k, and write $\Omega = \eta_*\beta(x \otimes y)$, where $x,y \in \hat{H}^0(<u_\alpha>;M)$ and we have used Lemma 4.7 (b) and Lemma 4.8 (a). Then $d_{n+1}(\Omega) = d_{n+1}(\eta_*\beta(x \otimes y)) = \eta_* d_{n+1}(\beta(x \otimes y)) = \eta_*(d_{n+1}(x) \otimes y \pm x \otimes d_{n+1}(y)) = 0$ since $d_{n+1}(x) = 0 = d_{n+1}(y)$ by Lemma 4.6. In the case M is stably isomorphic to the augmentation ideal of $k<u_\alpha>$, we have $t\Omega = \eta_*\beta(u \otimes v)$, where $v,u \in H^1(<u_\alpha>;M)$. Then $d_{n+1}(t\Omega) = \eta_* d_{n+1}(\beta(u \otimes v)) = \eta_*(d_{n+1}(u) \otimes v \pm u \otimes d_{n+1}(v)) = 0$ again by the same Lemmas. Since the E_r–terms are modules over $H^*(<u_\alpha>;k)$ and the differentials are $H^*(<u_\alpha>;k)$–linear, the periodicity of cohomology of $<u_\alpha>$ implies that $d_{n+1} \equiv 0$. For dimension reasons and using the $H^*(<u_\alpha>;k)$–module structure, it follows that $d_{2n+1} \equiv 0$ also, and the spectral sequence collapses as claimed. ■

4.10 Lemma: With the hypotheses and the notation of Lemma 4.9 above, we have $H_*(C_*(<u_\alpha>)) \cong k^3$.

Proof: This follows from Lemma 4.9 and the localization theorem 2.1 applied to the $k<u_\alpha>$–permutation complex C_* as in Proposition 4.3 above. ■

4.11 Lemma: Let p be an odd prime, and let X_* be a connected $k[\mathbb{Z}_p]$–permutation complex such that $H_i(X_*) = 0$ for $i \notin \{0,n,2n\}$ and $H_0(X_*) = H_{2n}(X_*) = k$. If $H_*(X_*(\mathbb{Z}_p)) = k$, then $H^n(X_*)$ satisfies $\hat{H}^i(\mathbb{Z}_p;H^n(X^*)) = k$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proof: As in Lemma 4.6, the differential $d_{n+1}^{*,n} : E_{n+1}^{i,n} \longrightarrow E_{n+1}^{i+n+1,0}$ vanishes. Denote by $t \in H^2(\mathbb{Z}_p;k) = k$ the generator, and localize the spectral sequence by inverting t , so that $E_{n+1}^{i,n}[\frac{1}{t}] \cong \hat{H}^i(\mathbb{Z}_p;H^n(X^*))$ and $E_{n+1}^{i,0}[\frac{1}{t}] \cong \hat{H}^i(\mathbb{Z}_p;k) \cong E_{n+1}^{i,2n}[\frac{1}{t}]$. By the localization theorem (see 2.1) $\mathbb{H}^*(\mathbb{Z}_p;X^*)[\frac{1}{t}] \cong \hat{H}^*(\mathbb{Z}_p;k)$, so that the differential $d_{n+1}^{*,2n}[\frac{1}{t}] : \hat{H}^i(\mathbb{Z}_p;H^{2n}(X^*)) \longrightarrow \hat{H}^{i+n+1}(\mathbb{Z}_p;H^n(X^*))$ is an isomorphism. ■

We complete the proof of Theorem 4.5 as follows. Suppose $\operatorname{rank}(H^*(G;M)) = 1$. In the hypercohomology spectral sequence $H^*(G;H^*(C^*)) \Rightarrow \mathbb{H}^*(G;C^*)$, the differential
$d_{n+1} : E_{n+1}^{i,n} \longrightarrow E_{n+1}^{i+n+1,0}$ induces K–homomorphisms
$d_{n+1}^{*,n} \otimes \mathrm{id} : E_{n+1}^{*,n} \otimes_A K \longrightarrow E_{n+1}^{*+n+1,0} \otimes_A K$ and
$d_{n+1}^{*,2n} \otimes \mathrm{id} : E_{n+1}^{*,2n} \otimes_A K \longrightarrow E_{n+1}^{*+n-1} \otimes_A K$. Besides,
$E_{n+1}^{*,n} \otimes_A K \cong K \cong E_{n+1}^{*,0} \otimes_A K \cong E_{n+1}^{*,2n} \otimes_A K$. The proof of Lemma 4.6 applied to the hypercohomology spectral sequence of G shows that $d_{n+1}^{*,n} \otimes \mathrm{id} = 0$. (One needs to remark only that by Lemma 2.2 $\mathbb{H}^*(G;D^*) \otimes_A K = 0$ in that proof). If $d_{n+1}^{*,2n} \otimes_A K \neq 0$,

then it must be an isomorphism. This implies that $\mathbb{H}^*(G;C^*) \otimes_A K \cong K$. From the localization theorem 2.1 it follows that $H^*(C^*(G)) = k$. For a choice of $\alpha \in k^r$ as in Lemma 4.6, $C_*(G) = C_*(<u_\alpha>)$ so that $H_*(C_*<u_\alpha>) = k$. From Lemma 4.2 above, it follows that $\hat{H}^i(<u_\alpha>;M) = k$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. But this contradicts Lemma 4.10. This contradiction shows that $d_{n+1}^{*,2n} \otimes_A K = 0$. Since $d_{2n+1}^{*,2n} \otimes_A K = 0$ again by the proof of Lemma 4.6, and $d_{2n+1}^{*,n} = 0$ for dimension reasons, the spectral sequence collapses. Hence $\mathbb{H}^*(G;C^*) \otimes_A K \cong K^3$ and the localization theorem shows that $\dim_K H_*(C_*(G)) = 3$ as desired. ■

4.12. Example: Let p be odd, $G = \mathbb{Z}_p$ and consider the linear representation of G on $\mathbb{C}^3$ with 3 non–trivial distinct weight. The induced action on the complex projective space $\mathbb{C}P^2$ has precisely 3 fixed points, and $H_2(\mathbb{C}P^2) = \mathbb{Z}$. If we choose m free orbits of points in $\mathbb{C}P^2$ and blow–up at these points, we get another algebraic action on an algebraic surface $X = \mathbb{C}P^2 \#(m\, \overline{\mathbb{C}P}^2)$ (connected sum) and $H_2(X) \cong \mathbb{Z} \oplus (\mathbb{Z}G)^m$. Similar examples can be constructed using projective actions of $G = \mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}_p$ on $\mathbb{C}P^2$ and by blowing up at an orbit G/H of points, one obtains an algebraic surface Y with $H_2(Y) \cong \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}[G/H]$. More complicated examples can be constructed by a variation of these examples. As remarked in Section One, $C_*(X)$ and $C_*(Y)$ for suitable G–simplicial structures on X and Y provide examples of SDP–structures in which $H^*(G;M)$ has rank one over $H^*(G;k)$. The geometric consequence of Theorem 4.5 is that for a Poincaré duality complex with an effective $(\mathbb{Z}_p)^r$–action, the fixed point set of any subgroup $H \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_p^r$ is never homologically acyclic. Theorem 4.5 may be considered the algebraic analogue of the theorems of Conner–Floyd [CF1] [CF2] and Atiyah–Bott [AB] and W. Browder [Bw].

4.13. Corollary: Let p be an odd prime, $G = (\mathbb{Z}_p)^r$, and C_* be an SDP–structure over kG of formal dimension 2n and $H_n(C_*) = M$. Then the following hold:

(1) If $C_*(G) \neq 0$, then $\dim H_*(C_*(G)| \geq 2$.

(2) $\dim H_*(C_*(G)) = 2$ if and only if $H^*(G;M)$ is a torsion $H^*(G;k)$–module.

(3) In any case, $H_*(C_*(G)) \neq k$.

Proof: (1) By choosing $\alpha \in k^r$ as in Theorem 4.5 above, it follows that $\dim H_*(C_*(<u_\alpha>)) \neq 1$. Since $C_*(<u_\alpha>) = C_*(G)$, $\dim H_*(C_*(G)) \geq 2$.

(2) Follows from Proposition 4.3 and the following argument. $H^*(G;M)$ is a torsion $H^*(G;k)$–module if and only if the Krull dimension of the support of $H^*(G;M)$ in Spec $H^{ev}(G;k)$ is less than dim Spec $H^{ev}(G;k) = \mathrm{rank}(G) = r$. Here, $H^{ev}(G;k) = \bigoplus_{i\geq 0} H^{2i}(G;k)$ is a commutative k–algebra whose reduced k–algebra is isomorphic to the polynomial ring $k[t_1,\dots,t_n]$. From the positive answer to the Carlson conjecture (Avrunin–Scott [AS], Carlson [C1] [C2]) it follows that there is an $\alpha \in k^r$ such that $M | k<u_\alpha>$ is $k<u_\alpha>$–free. In fact, the set of such vectors α form a Zariski open dense subset of k^r , namely, the complement of the proper closed subset (Supp $H^*(G;M)) \cap$ Max Spec($H^{ev}(G;k)$) . Thus, it is possible to arrange for such an α to satisfy $C_*(<u_\alpha>) = C_*(G)$ as well. Now Proposition 4.4 shows that $H_*(C_*<u_\alpha> = k \oplus k$, hence $\dim H_*(C_*(G)) = 2$. The converse proceeds along the same lines: For any $\alpha \in k^r$ in the complement of the $\mathbb{F}_p$–rational linear subspaces corresponding to proper subgroups of G, $C_*(<u_\alpha>) = C_*(G)$. The proof of Proposition 4.4 shows that if $\dim H_*(C_*(<u_\alpha>)) = 2$, then $\hat{H}^*(<u_\alpha>;M) = 0$, so that M is $k<u_\alpha>$–free. Therefore, the Carlson rank variety $V_G^r(M)$ (see Carlson [C1]) is a proper subset of k^r . Again, by the Avrunin–Scott theorem ([AS] Theorem 1), the cohomological support variety $V_G(M)$ is a proper subset of Max Spec($H^{ev}(G;k)$) . Hence $H^*(G;M)$ is a torsion $H^*(G;k)$–module.

(3) This follows from (1), (2).

SECTION FIVE. UNITS IN THE GREEN RING

Recall that the Green ring of RG is the Grothendieck ring associated to the set of isomorphism classes of indecomposable RG–lattices. The direct sum and tensor product (over R) of RG–modules induce the ring operations. The stable Green ring is the quotient of the Green ring by the ideal generated by RG–projective modules. WE will use the notation $\mathbb{R}(RG)$ and $\check{\mathbb{R}}(RG)$ for the Green ring and its stable version. A unit in $\check{\mathbb{R}}(RG)$ is seen to be represented by an RG–lattice M for which there exists another RG–lattice M' such that $M \otimes M' \cong R \oplus P$, where P is RG–projective. An important class of RG–lattices are the endo–trivial modules introduced by J. Alperin and E. Dade (see Dade [D] and Alperin [Alp] and they are characterized by $\mathrm{End}_R(M) \cong R \oplus P$ with $P =$ projective RG–module. The canonical RG–isomorphism $\mathrm{Hom}_R(M,R) \otimes M \cong \mathrm{End}_R(M)$ shows that endo–trivial modules represent units of $\check{\mathbb{R}}(RG)$. in the following, we will determine the units of $\check{\mathbb{R}}(RG)$ which are permutable RG–moduels arising in Steenrod's problem. It is appropriate to call an RG–module M <u>spherical</u> if there is a finite dimensional G–space X such that non–equivariantly X is homotopy equivalent to a bouquet of d–dimensionak spheres and the homology representation $H_d(X;R)$ is RG–isomorphic to M . This is inpsired by Quillen's terminology of d–spherical posets [Q2]. For example, if M is the Steinberg module of a finite Chevalley group G , or more generally the reduced homology of the simplicial complexes associated to posets $\mathcal{A}_p(G)$, $\mathcal{S}_p(G)$ or Solomon–Tits buildings (see Quillen [Q2] and Section Three above) d–spherical, where d+1 is the appropriate "rank" of G . Let us call M a spherical unit of $\check{\mathbb{R}}(G)$, if M is spherical and a unit in $\check{\mathbb{R}}(G)$ and such that its inverse in $\check{\mathbb{R}}(G)$ is also spherical.

5.1. Example. If M is a finitely generated endo–trivial and spherical, then M is a psherical unit. To see this, suppose that $H_d(X;R) \cong M$ and we have arranged for X to be a finite dimensional simplical complex with a simplicial G–action using standard approximation arguments of algebraic topology. Then we choose for G a large dimensional real or complex representation space V , and embed X G–equivariantly in V , using the Mostow–Palais embedding theorem (cf. Bredon [Brd]. Let V_∞ be the one–point compactification of V , which is a sphere with G–action. Let Y be the complement of X in V_∞ . Then by Alexander duality, Y is connected, $H_i(Y) = 0$ for $i \neq 0,\ n-d-1$, and $H_{n-d-1}(Y) \cong H^d(X)$, so that $H_{n-d-1}(Y;R) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_R(H_d(X;R),R) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_R(M,R)$. Thus, $\mathrm{Hom}_R(M,R)$ is also spherical. By endo–triviality, $\mathrm{Hom}_R(M,R) \otimes M \cong R \oplus P$ where P is RG–projective. Thus M is a spherical unit in $\mathbb{R}(RG)$ as claimed.

5.2. Theorem. Suppose M is a spherical unit in the stable Green ring $\mathbb{R}(RG)$, where G is an abelian p–group, and R is a field of characteristic p . Then M is stably isomorphic to $\Omega^n(R)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. If M is indecomposable, then $M \cong \Omega^n(R)$.

5.3. Remarks. 1) Ω is the Heller operator. See Curtis–Reiner [CR] for the definition and properties.

2) A deep and difficult theorem of E. Dade [D] characterizes endo–trivial RG–modules, for G = abelian p–group and R = field of characteristic p . In a forthcoming paper, we prove that 5.2 holds without the spherical hypothesis by a proof independent of Dade's. However, the more general results require non–elementary results from algebraic geometry. The spherical case, however, uses elementary arguments which may be helpful to get an intuitive feeling for the more general results.

3) From Section One it easily follows that spherical RG–modules are RG–permutable.

Proof: Let E be the maximal p–elementary abelian subgroup of G . By suspending, if necessary, we may assume that there is a G–space X such that $H_d(X;R) = M$ and $X^G \neq \phi$. By definition, $\dim X < \infty$ and X is homotopy equivalent to a bouquet of d–dimensional spheres. By standard arguments in algebric topology, we may assume that X is a G–CW complex, so that $C_* \overset{\text{def}}{=} C_*(X)$ is a permutation complex with permutation basis given by the cells of X. Let $\Sigma(X)$ be the singular set of the G–action on X, that is the union of fixed points X^H for all $1 \neq H \subseteq G$. Notice that in the reduced representation ring $\mathbb{C}[G]/\mathbb{C}^G$, we may choose a G–invariant inner product by averaging any given inner product. Call S the unit sphere in the reduced representation ring. S is a sphere with G–action and $S^G = \phi$. Hence the join $X \circ S$ with its natural G–action is homologically only an iterated suspension of X, so that $X \circ S$ will be still spherical. Moreover, $(X \circ S)^G = X^G \neq \phi$. This operation preserves homology up to RG–isomorphism and it has the effect of increasing the codimension of the singular set, i.e. $\dim X - \dim \Sigma(X)$ will be arbitrarily large after repreated replacement of X by $X \circ S$. There is another operation which changes $H_d(X)$ by $\Omega^r H_d(X)$, $r \geq 0$, up to stable RG–isomorphism. This is obtained by adding free orbits of (d+1)–cells to X, obtaining a G–CW complex X'. We choose a surjection $(RG) \xrightarrow{k\varphi} M$ and regard this as $H_{d+1}(X',X) \otimes R \xrightarrow{\partial} H_d(X)$, which is geometrically realized (using Hurewicz's theorem) by attaching cells $\coprod G \times D^{d+1}$ to X to obtain X'. This operation has the effect of increasing the homological codimension, i.e., since $\Sigma(X) = \Sigma(X')$, $\dim \Sigma(X)$ remains constant and the dimension d where $H_d(X;R) \neq 0$ grows arbitrarily large. Since $\Omega^r M \otimes \Omega^{-r} N$ is RG–stably isomorphic to $M \otimes N$, $\Omega^r M$ is still a spherical unit.

Now choose Y satisfying $Y^G \neq \phi$ and satisfying other hypotheses which already X satisfies, and such that $H_{d'}(Y;R) \cong M'$ is an inverse of M in $\mathbb{R}(RG)$. That is, $M \otimes M' \cong R \oplus P$ where P is RG–projective. Notice that since R is a field of characteristic p and G is a p–group, RG is local and projectives coincides with free

RG–modules. However, we will use this remark only for convenience. Consider $Z = X \wedge Y$, the smash product with the induced action, (see Section One). The Künneth formula shows that $\bar{H}_*(Z;R) \cong H_d(X;R) \otimes H_{d'}(Y;R) \cong R \oplus P$. By the localization theorem (Theorem 2.1 above for example, or Hsiang [Hsg]), $\bar{H}_*(Z^H;R) \cong R$ for each $1 \neq H \subseteq E$. Since $Z^H = X^H \wedge Y^H$ and $\bar{H}_*(Z^H;R) \cong \bar{H}_*(X^H;R) \otimes \bar{H}_*(Y^H;R)$, it follows that $\bar{H}_*(X^H;R) \cong R$. Let $\delta(H)$ be the integer such that $\bar{H}_d(X^H;R) = R$ and notice that since $X^H \supseteq X^G \neq \phi$, $\delta(H) \geq 0$.

Consider the set $\mathcal{U} = \{H \subseteq E : |E/H| = p\}$, and let W be the real linear representation of E which is the direct sum of $m(H)$ irreducible non–trivial linear representations of $E/H \cong \mathbb{Z}_p$ for each $H \in \mathcal{U}$. We choose $m(H)$, depending on $p = 2$ or $p > 2$ such that $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W^H = \delta(H) + 1$. Let $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} W = \ell + 1$. By shifting dimension or join operation as described above, we may arrange for X, and hence ℓ, to satisfy $d \geq \ell + 2 \leq \dim \Sigma(H) + 2$. While this conditon on X is not necessary for the proof, it will simplify and make the following argument more elementary. Consider the ℓ–skeleton of X, call it $X^{(\ell)}$ and its cellular chain complex $C_*(X^{(\ell)}) = D_*$. Let $F_* = C_*(X)/D_*$, which is RG–free by choice of ℓ. D_* is a permutation complex which is based and $H_\ell(D_* \otimes R) \cong H_{\ell+1}(F_* \otimes \ell)$. Since $H_i(F_* \otimes R) = 0$ unless $i = d$ or $i = \ell+1$, and F_* is RG–free and $F_i = 0$ for $i \leq \ell$ or $i > \dim X$, it follows easily that $H_d(X;R)$ is RG–stably isomorphic to $H_{\ell+1}(F_* \otimes \ell)$. Hence, up to replacing M by $\Omega^r M$ for some $r \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have reduced the problem to showing that $H_\ell(D_* \otimes R)$ is RG–stably isomorphic to $\Omega^n(R)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. (In the terminology of Assadi [A2], M and $H_\ell(D_* \_ R)$ are ω–stably isomorphic. See [A2] for related discussions).

The linear representation W satisfies The dimension equation $\dim W - \dim W^E = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{U}} (\dim W^H - \dim W^E)$, hence the restriction of the G–action on

X to the E–action satisfies the Borel formula $\ell - \delta(E) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{U}} (\delta(H) - \delta(E))$. (See Borel [Bor], Bredon [Brd] or Hsiang [Hsg] for more details). According to Dotzel [Dot], the converse to Borel's theorem holds for such a situation and $H_\ell(X^{(\ell)};R)$ is RE–isomorphic to $R \oplus P_0$, where P_0 is RE–projective. By the above discussion, we may write $M \oplus (RE)^t \cong \Omega^{d-\ell}(H_\ell(X^{(\ell)};R)) \oplus (RE)^s \cong \Omega^{d-\ell}(R) \oplus (RE)^u$ as RE–modules. Consider $\Omega^{\ell-d}(M)$ as an RG–module. By the above, $\Omega^{\ell-d}(M)|_E \cong R \oplus Q$ where Q is RE–free.

Consider the induced homomorphism $\rho^* : \hat{H}^*(G;\Omega^{\ell-d}(M)) \longrightarrow \hat{H}^*(E;\Omega^{\ell-d}(M))$ which is an F–isomorphism in the terminology of Quillen [Q1]. To see this, observe that $\Omega^{\ell-d}(M)$ is stably isomorphic to $H_\ell(X^{(\ell)};R)$, and for a choice of base point $x \in X^G$, $H^i_G(X^{(\ell)},x;R) \cong H^i(G;H^\ell(X^{(\ell)},x;R)$ for $i \geq \ell+1$, and similarly for E. This is true since the spectral sequences of equivariant cohomology (or equivalently hypercohomology) have only one row. By Quillen [Q1], one knows tat $H^*_G(X,x;R) \longrightarrow H^*_E(X,x;R)$ is an F–isomorphism since E is the unique p–elementary abelian subgroup of G. In particular, $\rho^* : \hat{H}^0(G;\Omega^{\ell-d}(M)) \longrightarrow \hat{H}^0(E;\Omega^{\ell-d}(M)) \cong R$ is non–zero, hence surjective. Let $M' = \ell^{\ell-d}(M)$. Thus, we may choose $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_{RG}(R,M')$ such that in the diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\hat{H}^0(G;R) \arrow[r, "f_*"] \arrow[d, "\cong"] & \hat{H}^0(G;M') \arrow[d, "\rho^*"] \\
\hat{H}^0(E;R) \arrow[r, "\cong f_\#"] & \hat{H}^0(E;M')
\end{tikzcd}$$

$f_* : \hat{H}^0(G;R) \longrightarrow \hat{H}^0(G;M')$ is injective. In the exact sequence of RG–modules, $0 \longrightarrow R \xrightarrow{f} M' \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ker}(f) \longrightarrow 0$ $f_\# : \hat{H}^0(E;R) \longrightarrow \hat{H}^*(E;M')$ is an isomorphism, so that $\hat{H}^*(E;\mathrm{Ker}(f)) = 0$. It follows from Rim [R] that $\mathrm{Ker}(f)|_E$ is RE–free. By Chouinard's theorem (cf. [Ch], Curtis–Reiner [CR], Ker(f) is RG–projective, hence the short exact sequence above splits over RG and M′ is stably isomorphic to R. Hence M is stably isomorphic to $\Omega^{d-\ell}(R)$, and if M is indecomposable, $M \cong \ell^{d-\ell}(R)$. ■

In the above proof we only used the fact that G has a unique p–elementary abelian group in an essential way. Other references to G being an abelian p–group may be avoided, and a modification of the above argument proves the following more general result:

Theorem: Let R be a field of characteristic p , and assume that G is a finite group with a unique conjugacy class of maximal p–elementary abelian subgroups. Suppose that M is a spherical unit in the stable Green ring $\tilde{\mathbb{R}}(RG)$. Then M is RG–stably isomorphic to $\Omega^n(R)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. ■

It is also worthwhile to point out the following whose proof follows from 5.3 and the constructions of Section One as used in the proof of Theorem 5.2.

5.4. Proposition: The spherical units of any finite group G in $\tilde{\mathbb{R}}(RG)$ form a multiplicative subgroup of the group of all units. Therefore, if M is a spherical unit, so are $\mathrm{Hom}_R(M,R)$ and $\Omega^n M$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. ■

The above results provide some evidence for the following:

5.5. Conjecture: For an arbitrary finite group G and $R = \mathbb{Z}$ or a field of characteristic p , all units of $\tilde{\mathbb{R}}(RG)$ are spherical.

References

[Ad1] Adem, A.: "Cohomological restrictions on finite group actions", (preprint).

[Ad2] ————: "Homology representations of finite transformation groups", (preprint).

[Alp] Alperin, J.: "Cohomology is representation theory", Proc. Symp. Pure Math. 47 (1986), 3–11.

[Ar1] Arnold, J.: "Steenrod's problem for cyclic p–groups", Canad. J. Math. 29 (1977) 421–428.

[Ar2] ————: "Homological algebra based on permutation modules", J. Algebra 70 (1981) 250–260.

[A1] Assadi, A.: "Finite group actions on simply–connected manifolds and CW complexes", Memoirs AMS 257 (1982).

[A2] ————: "Homotopy actions and cohomology of finite groups", Proc. Trans. Groups, Poznan 1985, Springer–Verlag LNM 1217 (1986).

[A3] ————: "Integral representations of finite transformation groups I", J. Pure Appl. Algebra (to appear).

[A4] ————: "On representations of finite transformation groups of algebraic curves and surfaces", J. Pure Appl. Algebra (to appear).

[AB] Atiyah, M.F.–Bott, R.: "Fixed point formula for elliptic complexes II: Applications", Ann. Math. 88 (1968) 450–491.

[AS] Avrunin, G.–Scott, L.: "Quillen stratification for modules", Inven. Math. 66 (1982), 277–286.

[Bor] Borel, A.: "Seminar in Transformation Groups", Ann. Math. Studies, Princeton Univ. Press 1960.

[Bdn] Bredon, G.: "Introduction to Compact TRansformation Groups", Academic Press, New York 1972.

[Bw] Browder, W.: "Pulling back fixed points", Inven. Math. 87 (1987), 331–342.

[B1] Brown, K.: "Euler characteristics of grops: The p–fractional part", Inven. Math. 29 (1975) 1–5.

[B2] ——————: "High–dimensional cohomology of discrete groups", Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA 73 (1976), 1795–1797.

[B3] ——————: "Cohomology of Groups", Grad. Texts. Math. 87 Springer–Verlag, New York 1982.

[C1] Carlson, J.: "The varieties and the cohomology ring of a module", J. Algebra 85 (1983), 104–143.

[C2] ——————: "The cohomology ring of a module", J. Pure Appl. Algebra 36 (1985), 105–121.

[Cg] Carlsson, G.: "A counterexample to a conjecture of Steenrod", Inven. Math. 64 (1981), 171–174.

[CE] Cartan, H.–Eilenberg, S.: "Homological Algebra", Princeton Univ. Press 1956.

[Ch] Chouinard, L.: "Projectivity and relative projectivity for group rings", J. Pure Appl. Algebra 7 (1976), 287–302.

[CF1] Conner, P.–Floyd, E.: "Differentiable Periodic Maps", Erg. Math. Series, Springer–Verlag Berlin 1963.

[CF2] ——————————: "Maps of odd period", Ann. Math.

[CPS] Cline, E.–Parshall, B.–Scott, L.: "Algebraic startification in representation categories", J. Algebra (to appear).

[CR] Curtis–Reiner, I.: "Methods of Representation Theory Vol. I", Prentice Hall (1981).

[D] Dade, E.: "Endo–permutation modules over p–groups II", Ann. Math. (2) 108 (1978), 317–346.

[Hel] Heller, A.: "Homological resolutions of complexes with operators", Ann. Math. 60 (1954), 283–303.

[Hit] Hironaka, H.: "Triangulations of algebraic sets", Algebraic Geometry, Arcata 1974, A.M.S. Proc. Symp. Pure Math. 29 (1975), 165–184.

[Dot] Dotzel, R.: "Converse for the Borel formula", Trans. A.M.S. 250 (1979), 275–287.

[FP] Friedlander, E.–Parshall, B.: "Support varieties for restricted Lie algebras", (to appear).

[Hsg] Hsiang, W.Y.: "Cohomology of Topological Transformation Groups", Ergeb. Math. Springer, Berlin (1975).

[I] Illmann, S.: "Smooth equivariant triangulations of G–manifolds for G a finite group", Math. Ann. 233 (1978), 199–220.

[K] Kroll, O.: "Complexity and elementary abelian p–groups", J. Algebra 88 (1984), 155–172.

[L] Lashof, R.: "Problems in topology", Seattle Topology Conference", Ann. Math. (1961).

[Mar] Matumoto, T.:

[Q1] Quillen, D.: "The spectrum of an equivariant cohomology ring, I and II", Ann. Math. 94 (1971), 549–572 and 573–602.

[Q2] ——————: "Homotopy properties of the poset of non–trivial p–subgroups of a group", Adv. Math. 28, (1978), 101–128.

[Qf] Quinn, F.: "Actions of finite abelian groups", Proc. Northwestern Univ. Homotopy Theory, Springer–Verlag LNM

[R] Rim, D.S.: "Modules over finite groups", Ann. Math. 69 (1959), 700–712.

[Sc] Scott, L.: "Stimulating algebraic geometry with algebra, I: The algebraic theory of derived categories", Proc. Symp. Pure Math. Vol. 47 (1987), 271–282.

[Sd] Smith, S.D.: Constructing representations from group geometies", Proc. Symp. Pure Math. Vol. 47 (1987), 303–314.

[Sm1] Smith, J.: "Group cohomology and equivariant Moore spaces", J. Pure Appl. Alg. 24 (1982), 73–77.

[Sm2] ――――――: "Topological realization of chian complexes, I – The general theory", Topology and Applications, 22 (1986), 301–313.

[Sm3] ――――――: "Equivariant Moore spaces", Springer–Verlag LNM 1126 (1983), 238–270.

[Sm4] ――――――: "Equivariant Moore spaces, II – The low–dimensional case", J. Pure Appl. Algebra, 36 (1985), 187–204.

[Sol] Solomon, L.: "The Steinberg character of a finite group with BN–pair", Symp. Harvard Univ. Finite GRoups 1968 Benjamin, New York (1969), 213–221.

[Sw1] Swan, R.: "A new method in fixed–point theory", Comm. Math. Helv. 34 (1960), 1–16.

[Sw2] ――――: "Invariant rational functions and a problem of Steenrod", Inven. Math. 7 (1969), 148–158.

[Tt] Tits, J.: "On buildings and their applications", Proc. Int. Cong. Math. Vancouver, 1974.

[W1] Webb, D.: "A local method in group cohomology", Comm. Math. Helv. 62 (1987) 135–167.

[W2] ――――――: "Subgroup Complexes", Proc. Symp. Pure Math. Vol. 47 (1987) 349–365.

[V] Volgel, P.: On Steenrod's problem for non–abelian finite groups", Proc. Alg. Topology Conf. Aarhus 1982, Springer–Verlag LNM 1051 (1984).