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#### Abstract

An example of a local rings system where the quasilocal algebra is a simple countably generated $C^{*}$-algebra with unit is provided by the "local observables" for the free Fermi field.


## 1. Introduction

In this note we prove that the $C^{*}$-algebra generated by the even operators in the algebra of Canonical Anticommutation Relations (CAR) on an infinite dimensional Hilbert space is simple (i.e. does not contain any two sided ideal different from 0 and the whole algebra).

This result is of interest in field theory because it shows that the algebra of all quasilocal observables for a free Fermi Dirac field is a simple separable $C^{*}$-algebra with unit. In this connection we call local observables the self adjoint (uniform limits of) even polynomials in the field operators with test functions vanishing outside a given bounded set. The local system they define satisfies evidently the usual axioms of local field theory ${ }^{1}$, and the $C^{*}$-algebra they generate (the quasilocal algebra) is the even part of the CAR algebra $\mathfrak{Z}$ on the Hilbert space $K$ which is the direct sum of the one electron and one positron Hilbert spaces; it is therefore simple (§2) in contrast with the subalgebra of all gauge invariant quantities in $\mathfrak{U}^{2}$.

This shows that the technical assumptions of $\mathfrak{A}$ being simple with unit and separable, sometimes used in the $C^{*}$-algebra formulation of field theory and statistical mechanics, do not conflict with the postulates of local theories.
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## 2. The Theorem

Let $K$ be a (complex or real) separable infinite dimensional Hilbert space and $\mathfrak{A}$ the $C^{*}$-algebra of CAR on $K^{3}$; by that we mean that there exists a linear map $\psi$ from $K$ into $\mathfrak{A}$, whose range generates $\mathfrak{A}$, such that, if $f, g \in K$,

$$
\begin{align*}
\psi(f) \psi(g)^{*}+\psi(g)^{*} \psi(f) & =\langle g, f\rangle I  \tag{1}\\
\psi(f) \psi(g)+\psi(g) \psi(f) & =0
\end{align*}
$$

(where $\langle\cdot, \cdot\rangle$ is the inner product in $K$ and $I$ the identity operator in $\mathfrak{A}$ ); it follows that $\psi$ is isometric (so that $\mathfrak{A}$ is separable) and, as $f$ spans the unit sphere $K_{1}$ of $K$, the operators $U_{f}=\psi(f)+\psi(f)^{*}$ span a family of unitary self-adjoint elements which generate $\mathfrak{A}$. Moreover $\mathfrak{A}$ is simple.

The relation

$$
\gamma(\psi(f))=-\psi(f)
$$

for all $f \in K$, defines an involuntary * automorphism $\gamma$ of $\mathfrak{A}$; we denote by $\mathfrak{U}_{+}$the set of all $A \in \mathfrak{U}$ such that $\gamma(A)=A ; \mathfrak{U}_{+}$is a $C^{*}$-subalgebra of $\mathfrak{A}$ containing $I$.

Remark. Each $A \in \mathfrak{U}_{+}$is in the norm closure of the set $\left\{U_{f} A U_{f} ; f \in K_{1}\right\}$; the even polynomials in $\psi$ and $\psi^{*}$ are in fact dense in $\mathscr{U}_{+}$, and if $P\left(\psi\left(f_{1}\right), \ldots, \psi\left(f_{n}\right)\right)$ is such a polynomial, it commutes with $U_{f}$ if $f$ is orthogonal to $f_{1}, \ldots, f_{n}$. Note that this fact is false if $K$ is finite dimensional.

Lemma. Let $\pi$ be an irreducible representation of $\mathfrak{A}$ and suppose there is a projection $E$ in $\pi\left(\mathfrak{A}_{+}\right)^{\prime}$ with $0<E<I_{\pi}$ (identity operator in the representation Hilbert space $\mathfrak{G}_{\pi}$ ), then the self adjoint unitary operator

$$
V=I_{\pi}-2 E
$$

implements $\gamma$ in the representation $\pi$ and so $\pi\left(\mathscr{H}_{+}\right)^{\prime}$ is generated by $I_{\pi}$ and $E$. Proof. It is enough to show

$$
\begin{equation*}
V \pi\left(U_{f}\right) V=-\pi\left(U_{f}\right), \quad \text { if } \quad f \in K_{1} . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The relation

$$
\pi\left(U_{f_{1}} U_{f_{2}}\right) V=V \pi\left(U_{f_{1}} U_{f_{2}}\right)
$$

if $f_{1}, f_{2} \in K_{1}$, implies
$\pi\left(U_{f_{1}}\right) V \pi\left(U_{f_{1}}\right)=\pi\left(U_{f_{2}}\right) V \pi\left(U_{f_{2}}\right)=S$, independent from $f_{1}, f_{2} \in K_{1} .(3)$ Then

$$
\pi\left(U_{f}\right)(S+V) \pi\left(U_{f}\right)=S+V, \quad \text { all } \quad f \in K_{1}
$$

it follows $S+V=\lambda I_{\pi}$ ( $\lambda$ a complex number); introducing the operators $E=\frac{1}{2}\left(I_{\pi}-V\right)$ and $F=\frac{1}{2}\left(I_{\pi}-S\right)$, it follows that $E+F=\left(1-\frac{\lambda}{2}\right) I_{\pi}$, which is only possible if $\lambda=0$, since $E, F$ are non zero self adjoint projections; then $S=-V$ and (2) follows from (3).

[^1]Theorem. $\mathfrak{U}_{+}$is simple.
Proof. Let $\pi_{1}$ be an irreducible representation of $\mathfrak{A}_{+}$; it is enough to show that $\pi_{1}$ is faithful. Let $\pi$ be an irreducible extension of $\pi_{1}$ to $\mathfrak{A}$, then

$$
\pi_{1}=E \pi \mid \mathfrak{A}_{+}
$$

with $E$ a self adjoint projection in $\pi\left(\mathfrak{U}_{+}\right)^{\prime}$. If $E=I_{\pi}, \pi_{1}=\pi \mid \mathfrak{A}_{+}$is faithful since $\pi$ is faithful. Suppose $E<I_{\pi}$ and let $A \in \mathfrak{A}_{+}$be such that

$$
\pi(A) E=0
$$

then

$$
\pi(A)\left(I_{\pi}-E\right)=0 \quad \text { is equivalent to } A=0
$$

However the Lemma above implies $\pi\left(U_{f}\right)\left(I_{\pi}-E\right) \mathfrak{G}_{\pi} \subseteq E \mathfrak{G}_{\pi}$ for all $f \in K_{1}$, so that

$$
\pi\left(U_{f} A U_{f}\right)\left(I_{\pi}-E\right)=0
$$

and by the Remark this implies

$$
\pi(A)\left(I_{\pi}-E\right)=0
$$

whence $A=0$ and $\pi_{1}$ is faithful.
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[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ For a complete account of the basic facts on CAR quoted here, see e.g. ref. [2].

