WEAKLY NULL SEQUENCES WITH UPPER ESTIMATES

DANIEL FREEMAN

Abstract. We prove that if (v_i) is a normalized basic sequence and X is a Banach space such that every normalized weakly null sequence in X has a subsequence that is dominated by (v_i), then there exists a uniform constant $C \geq 1$ such that every normalized weakly null sequence in X has a subsequence that is C-dominated by (v_i). This extends a result of Knaust and Odell, who proved this for the cases in which (v_i) is the standard basis for ℓ_p or c_0.

1. Introduction

In some circumstances, local estimates give rise to uniform global estimates. An elementary example of this is that every continuous function on a compact metric space is uniformly continuous. Uniform estimates are especially pertinent in functional analysis, as one of the cornerstones to the subject is the Uniform Boundedness Principle. Because uniform estimates are always desirable, it is important to determine when they occur. In this paper, we are concerned with uniform upper estimates of weakly null sequences in a Banach space. Before stating precisely what we mean by this, we give some historical context.

For each $1 < p < \infty$, Johnson and Odell [JO] have constructed a Banach space X such that every normalized weakly null sequence in X has a subsequence equivalent to the standard basis for ℓ_p, and yet there is no fixed $C \geq 1$ such that every normalized weakly null sequence in X has a subsequence $C-$equivalent to the standard basis for ℓ_p. A basic sequence (x_i) is equivalent to the unit vector basis for ℓ_p if it has both a lower and an upper ℓ_p estimate. That is there exist constants $C, K \geq 1$ such that:

$$\frac{1}{K}(\sum |a_i|^p)^{1/p} \leq || \sum a_i x_i || \leq C(\sum |a_i|^p)^{1/p} \quad \forall (a_i) \in c_{00}.$$

The examples of Johnson and Odell show that the upper constant C and the lower constant K cannot always both be chosen uniformly. It is somewhat surprising then that Knaust and Odell proved [KO2] that actually the upper estimate can always be chosen uniformly. Specifically, they proved that for every Banach space X if each normalized weakly null sequence in X has a subsequence with an upper ℓ_p estimate, then there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that each normalized weakly null sequence in X has a subsequence with a C-upper ℓ_p estimate. They also proved earlier the corresponding theorem for upper c_0 estimates [KO1]. The standard bases for ℓ_p, $1 < p < \infty$ and c_0 enjoy many strong properties which Knaust and Odell employ in their papers. It is natural to ask what are some necessary and sufficient properties for a basic sequence to have in order to guarantee the uniform upper estimate. In this paper we show that actually all normalized basic sequences give uniform upper estimates. We make the following definition to formalize this.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 46B20; Secondary 46B03, 46B10.

Definition 1.1. Let $V = (v_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a normalized basic sequence. A Banach space X has property (S_V) if every normalized weakly null sequence (x_n) in X has a subsequence (y_n) such that for some constant $C < \infty$

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n y_n \right\| \leq C \quad \text{for all } (\alpha_n) \in c_{00} \text{ with } \left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n v_n \right\| \leq 1. \tag{1}$$

X has property (U_V) if C may be chosen uniformly. We say that (y_n) has a C-upper V-estimate (or that V C-dominates (y_n)) if (1) holds for C, and that (y_n) has an upper V-estimate (or that V dominates (y_n)) if (1) holds for some C.

Using these definitions, we can formulate the main theorem of our paper as:

Theorem 1.2. *A Banach space has property (S_V) if and only if it has property (U_V).*

(S_V) and (U_V) are isomorphic properties of V, so it is sufficient to prove Theorem 1.2 for only normalized bimonotone basic sequences.

In section 2 we present the necessary definitions and reformulate our main results. We break up the main proof into two parts which we give in sections 3 and 4. In section 5 we give some illustrative examples which show in particular that our result is a genuine extension of [KO2] and not just a corollary.

For a Banach space X we use the notation B_X to mean the closed unit ball of X and S_X to mean the unit sphere of X. If $F \subset X$ we denote $[F]$ to be the closed linear span of F in X. If N is a sequence in $\mathbb{N}$, we denote $[N]^{\omega}$ to be the set of all infinite subsequences of N.

This paper forms a portion of the author's doctoral dissertation, which is being prepared at Texas A&M University under the direction of Thomas Schlumprecht. The author thanks Dr. Schlumprecht for his invaluable help, guidance, and patience.

2. Main Results

Here we introduce the main definitions and theorems of the paper. Many of our theorems and lemmas are direct generalizations of corresponding results in [KO2]. We specify when we are able to follow the same outline as a proof in [KO2], and also when we are able to follow a proof exactly.

Definition 2.1. Let X be a Banach space and $V = (v_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a normalized bimonotone basic sequence. With the exception of (ii), the following definitions are adapted from [KO2].

(i) A sequence (x_n) in X is called a *uV-sequence* if $\|x_n\| \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, (x_n) converges weakly to 0, and

$$\sup_{\|\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n v_n\| \leq 1} \left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n x_n \right\| < \infty.$$

(x_n) is called a *C-uV-sequence* if

$$\sup_{(\alpha_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} \in B_V} \left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n x_n \right\| < C.$$

(ii) A sequence (x_n) in X is called a *hereditary* uV*-sequence*, if every subsequence of (x_n) is a uV-sequence, and is called a *hereditary* C*-*uV*-sequence* if every subsequence of (x_n) is a C-uV-sequence.

(iii) A sequence (x_n) in X is called an M*-bad-*uV *sequence* for a constant $M < \infty$, if every subsequence of (x_n) is a uV-sequence, and no subsequence of (x_n) is an M-uV-sequence.

(iv) An array $(x_i^n)_{i,n=1}^\infty$ in X is called a *bad* uV*-array*, if each sequence $(x_i^n)_{i=1}^\infty$ is an M_n-bad uV-sequence for some constants M_n with $M_n \to \infty$.

(v) $\left(y_i^k\right)_{i,k=1}^\infty$ is called a *subarray* of $(x_i^n)_{i,n=1}^\infty$, if there is a subsequence (n_k) of $\mathbb{N}$ such that every sequence $\left(y_i^k\right)_{i=1}^\infty$ is a subsequence of $(x_i^{n_k})_{i=1}^\infty$.

(vi) A bad uV-array $(x_i^n)_{i,n=1}^\infty$ is said to satisfy the V*-array procedure*, if there exists a subarray (y_i^n) of (x_i^n) and there exists $(a_n) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+$ with $a_n \leq 2^{-n}$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that the weakly null sequence (y_i) with $y_i := \sum_{n=1}^\infty a_n y_i^n$ has no uV-subsequence.

(vii) X satisfies the V*-array procedure* if every bad uV-array in X satisfies the V-array procedure. X satisfies the V*-array procedure for normalized bad* uV*-arrays* if every normalized bad uV-array in X satisfies the V-array procedure.

Note: A subarray of a bad uV-array is a bad uV-array. Also, a bad uV-array satisfies the V-array procedure if and only if it has a subarray which satisfies the V-array procedure.

Our Theorem 1.2 is now an easy corollary of the theorem below.

Theorem 2.2. *Every Banach space satisfies the* V*-array procedure for normalized bad* uV*-arrays.*

Theorem 2.2 implies Theorem 1.2 because if a Banach space X has property S_V and not U_V then there exists a normalized bad uV-array, and the V-array procedure gives a weakly null sequence in B_X which is not uV; contradicting X being U_V.

The proof for Theorem 2.2 will be given first for the following special case.

Proposition 2.3. *Let* K *be a countable compact metric space. Then C(K) satisfies the* V*-array procedure.*

The case of a general Banach space reduces to this special case by the following proposition.

Proposition 2.4. *Let* $(x_i^n)_{i,n=1}^\infty$ *be a normalized bad* uV*-array in a Banach space X. Then there exists a subarray* (y_i^n) *of* (x_i^n) *and a countable* w^**-compact subset* K *of* B_{Y^*}*, where* $Y := [y_i^n]_{i,n=1}^\infty$*, such that* $(y_i^n|_K)$ *is a bad* uV*-array in C(K).*

Theorem 2.2 is an easy consequence of Proposition 2.3 and 2.4. Note that Proposition 2.4 is only proved for normalized bad uV-arrays. This makes the proof a little less technical.

Before we prove anything about sub-arrays though, we need to first consider just a single weakly null sequence. One of the many nice properties enjoyed by the standard basis for ℓ_p which we denote by (e_i) is that (e_i) is 1-spreading. This is the property that every subsequence of (e_i) is 1-equivalent to (e_i). Spreading is of particular importance because it implies the following two properties which are implicitly used in [KO2]:

(i) If (e_i) C-dominates a sequence (x_i) then (e_i) C-dominates every subsequence of (x_i).
(ii) If a sequence (x_i) C-dominates (e_i) then (x_i) C-dominates every subsequence of (e_i).

Throughout the paper, we will be passing to subsequences and subarrays, so properties (i) and (ii) would be very useful for us. In our paper we have to get by without property (ii). On the other hand, for a given sequence that does not have property (i), we may use the following two results, which are both easy consequences of Ramsey's theorem (c.f. [O]), and will be needed in subsequent sections.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $V = (v_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ be a normalized bimonotone basic sequence. If $(x_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ is a sequence in the unit ball of some Banach space X, such that every subsequence of $(x_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ has a further subsequence which is dominated by V then there exists a constant $1 \le C < \infty$ and a subsequence $(y_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ of $(x_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ so that every subsequence of $(y_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ is C-dominated by V.*

Proof. Let $A_n = \{(m_k)_{k=1}^\infty \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega \,|\, (x_{m_k}) \text{ is } 2^n \text{ dominated by V}\}$.

A_n is Ramsey, thus for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a sequence $(m_i^n)_{i=1}^\infty = M_n \in [M_{n-1}]^\omega$ such that $[M_n]^\omega \subseteq A_n$ or $[M_n]^\omega \subseteq A_n^c$. We claim that $[M_n]^\omega \subseteq A_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, in which case we could choose $(y_i)_{i=1}^\infty = \left(x_{m_i^n}\right)_{i=1}^\infty$. Every subsequence of $(y_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ is then 2^n-dominated by V.

If our claim where false, we let $(y_n)_{n=1}^\infty = \left(x_{m_n^n}\right)_{n=1}^\infty$ and $(y_{k_n})_{n=1}^\infty$ be a subsequence of $(y_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ for which there exists $C < \infty$ such that $(y_{k_n})_{n=1}^\infty$ is C-dominated by V. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2^N - 2N > C$ and set

$$\ell_i = \begin{cases} m_i^N & \text{if } i \le N, \\ m_{k_i}^{k_i} & \text{if } i > N. \end{cases}$$

Then $(\ell_i)_{i=1}^\infty \in [M_N]^\omega \subset A_N^c$ which implies that some $(a_i)_{i=1}^L \subset [-1,1]$ exists such that $\left\|\sum_{i=1}^L a_i v_i\right\| \le 1$ and $\left\|\sum_{i=1}^L a_i x_{\ell_i}\right\| > 2^N$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} 2^N < \left\|\sum_{i=1}^L a_i x_{l_i}\right\| &\le \sum_{i=1}^N |a_i| + \left\|\sum_{i=N+1}^L a_i x_{m_{k_i}^{k_i}}\right\| \\ &\le N + \left\|\sum_{i=N+1}^L a_i y_{k_i}\right\| \\ &\le 2N - \left\|\sum_{i=1}^N a_i y_{k_i}\right\| + \left\|\sum_{i=N+1}^L a_i y_{k_i}\right\| \\ &\le 2N + \left\|\sum_{i=1}^L a_i y_{k_i}\right\| \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$C < 2^N - 2N < \left\|\sum_{i=1}^L a_i y_{k_i}\right\|.$$

Thus $(y_{k_n})_{n=1}^\infty$ being C-dominated by V is contradicted. $\square$

The following lemma is used for a given (x_i) to find a subsequence (y_i) and a constant $C \geq 1$ such that (v_i) C-dominates every subsequence of (y_i) and that C is approximately minimal for every subsequence of (y_i).

Lemma 2.6. *Let $V = (v_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a normalized bimonotone basic sequence, $(x_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence in the unit ball of some Banach space X, and $a_n \nearrow \infty$ with $a_1 = 0$. If every subsequence of $(x_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has a further subsequence which is dominated by V then there exists a subsequence $(y_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ of $(x_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ and an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every subsequence of $(y_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is a_{N+1}-dominated by V but not a_N-dominated by V.*

Proof. By the previous lemma, we may assume by passing to a subsequence that there exists $C < \infty$ such that every subsequence of $(x_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is C-dominated by V. Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a_M < C \leq a_{M+1}$. For $1 \leq n \leq M$ let

$$A_n = \left\{ (m_k) \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega \mid \begin{array}{c} (x_{m_k})_{k=1}^\infty \text{ is } a_{n+1}\text{-dominated by V} \\ \text{and is not } a_n\text{-dominated by V.} \end{array} \right\}$$

A_n is Ramsey, and $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^M$ forms a finite partition of $[\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ which implies that there exists $N \leq M$ and $(m_k) \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ such that $[(m_k)_{k=1}^\infty]^\omega \subset A_N$. Every subsequence of $(y_n) := (x_{m_n})$ is a_{N+1}-dominated by V and not a_N-dominated by V. □

3. Proof of Proposition 2.3

Proposition 2.3 will be shown to follow easily from a characterization of countable compact metric spaces along with transfinite induction using the following result.

Lemma 3.1. *Let (X_n) be a sequence of Banach spaces each satisfying the V-array procedure. Then $(\sum_{n=1}^\infty X_n)_{c_0}$ satisfies the V-array procedure.*

To prove Lemma 3.1 we will need the following lemma which is stated in [KO2] for ℓ_p as Lemma 3.6. The proof for general V follows the outline of its proof.

Lemma 3.2. *Let (X_n) be a sequence of Banach spaces each satisfying the V-array procedure and let (x_i^n) be a bad uV-array in some Banach space X. Suppose that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a bounded linear operator $T_m : X \to X_m$ with $\|T_m\| \leq 1$ such that $(T_m x_i^m)_{i=1}^\infty$ is an m-bad uV-sequence in X_m. Then (x_i^n) satisfies the V-array procedure.*

Proof. We first consider Case 1: There exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and a subarray (y_i^n) of (x_i^n) such that $(T_m y_i^n)_{i,n=1}^\infty$ is a bad uV-array in X_m. $(T_m y_i^n)_{i,n=1}^\infty$ satisfies the V-array procedure because X_m does. Therefore, there exists a subarray $(T_m z_i^n)_{i,n=1}^\infty$ of $(T_m y_i^n)_{i,n=1}^\infty$ and $(a_n) \subset \mathbb{R}^+$with $a_n \leq 2^{-n}$ such that $(\sum_{n=1}^\infty a_n T_m z_i^n)_{i=1}^\infty$ has no uV-subsequence. $(\sum_{n=1}^\infty a_n z_i^n)_{i=1}^\infty$ has no uV-subsequence because $\|T_m\| \leq 1$. Therefore $(y_i^n)_{i,n=1}^\infty$ and hence $(x_i^n)_{i,n=1}^\infty$ satisfies the V-array procedure.

Case 2: If Case 1 is not satisfied then for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and every subarray (y_i^n) of (x_i^n), we have that $(T_m y_i^n)$ is not a bad uV-array in X_m. We may assume by passing to a subarray and using Lemma 2.5 that there exists $(N_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that

(2) $$(x_i^n)_{i=1}^\infty \text{ is a hereditary } N_n - uV - \text{sequence} \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By induction we choose for each $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ a subarray $(z_{m,i}^n)_{i,n=1}^\infty$ of $(x_i^n)_{i,n=1}^\infty$ and an $M_m \in \mathbb{N}$ so that

(3) $$(z_{m,i}^n)_{i,n=1}^\infty \text{ is a sub-array of } (z_{m-1,i}^n)_{i,n=1}^\infty \quad \text{if } m \geq 1,$$

$$z^n_{m,i} = z^n_{m-1,i} \quad \text{if } N_n \leq m \text{ and } i \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{4}$$

$$(T_m(z^n_{m,i}))_{i=1}^\infty \text{ is a hereditary } M_m\text{-u}V\text{-sequence for all } n \in \mathbb{N} \quad \text{if } m \geq 1. \tag{5}$$

For $m = 0$ let $\left(z^n_{0,i}\right)_{i,n=1}^\infty = (x^n_i)_{i,n=1}^\infty$. Now let $m \geq 1$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N_n \leq m$ let $\left(z^n_{m,i}\right)_{i=1}^\infty = \left(z^n_{m-1,i}\right)_{i=1}^\infty$ and $K_n = m$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N_n > m$, using Lemma 2.6, we let $\left(z^n_{m,i}\right)_{i=1}^\infty$ be a subsequence of $\left(z^n_{m-1,i}\right)_{i=1}^\infty$ for which there exists $K_n \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$ such that $\left(T_m z^n_{m,i}\right)_{i=1}^\infty$ is a K_n-bad-uV sequence and is also a hereditary (K_n+1)-uV-sequence. $(K_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is bounded because otherwise we are in Case 1. Let $M_m = \max_{n\in\mathbb{N}} K_n + 1$. This completes the induction.

For all $n, i \in \mathbb{N}$ we have by (4) that $\left(z^n_{m,i}\right)_{m=1}^\infty$ is eventually constant. Let $(z^n_i)_{i,n=1}^\infty = \lim_{m\to\infty} \left(z^n_{m,i}\right)_{i,n=1}^\infty$. By (5), $(z^n_i)_{i,n=1}^\infty$ satisfies

$$(T_m(z^n_i))_{i=1}^\infty \text{ is a hereditary } M_m\text{-u}V\text{-sequence for all } m, n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{6}$$

We will now inductively choose $(m_n) \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ and $(a_n) \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ so that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have:

$$(T_{m_n} z^{m_n}_i)_{i=1}^\infty \text{ is an } m_n\text{-bad uV sequence in } X_{m_n}, \tag{7}$$

$$a_n m_n > n, \tag{8}$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} a_j N_{m_j} < \frac{a_n m_n}{4}, \text{ and} \tag{9}$$

$$0 < a_n < \min_{1\leq k<n} \{2^{-n}, 2^{-n}\frac{a_k m_k}{4M_{m_k}}\}. \tag{10}$$

Property (7) has been assumed in the statement of the Lemma. For n=1 let $a_1 = \frac{1}{2}$ and $m_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a_1 m_1 > 1$, so (8) is satisfied. (9) and (10) are vacuously true for n=1, so all conditions are satisfied for $n = 1$.

Let $n > 1$ and assume $(a_j)_{j=1}^{n-1}$ and $(m_j)_{j=1}^{n-1}$ have been chosen to satisfy (8), (9) and (10). Choose $a_n > 0$ small enough such that $a_n < \min_{1\leq k<n} \left\{2^{-n}, 2^{-n}\frac{a_k m_k}{4M_k}\right\}$, thus satisfying (10). Choose $m_n > 0$ large enough to satisfy (8) and (9). This completes the induction.

By (10), we have for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$\sum_{j=n+1}^{\infty} a_j M_{m_n} < \frac{a_n m_n}{4}. \tag{11}$$

We have by (10) that $a_j < 2^{-j}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, so $y_k := \sum_{j=1}^\infty a_j x^{m_j}_k$ is a valid choice for the V-array procedure. Let $C > 0$ and (y_{k_i}) be a subsequence of (y_k). We need to show that (y_{k_i}) is not a C-uV-sequence. Using (8), choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $a_n m_n > 2C$. Using (7) choose $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(\beta_i)_{i=1}^\ell \in B_{[v_i]_{i=1}^\ell}$ such that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \beta_i T_{m_n}\left(x^{m_n}_{k_i}\right) \right\| > m_n. \tag{12}$$

We now have the following

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}\beta_i y_{k_i}\right\| &= \left\|\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\beta_i a_j x_{k_i}^{m_j}\right\| \\
&\geq \left\|\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}\sum_{j=n}^{\infty}T_{m_n}\left(\beta_i a_j x_{k_i}^{m_j}\right)\right\| - \left\|\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\beta_i a_j x_{k_i}^{m_j}\right\| \quad \text{since } \|T_{m_n}\|\leq 1 \\
&\geq a_n\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}\beta_i T_{m_n}x_{k_i}^{m_n}\right\| - \sum_{j=n+1}^{\infty}a_j\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}\beta_i T_{m_n}x_{k_i}^{m_j}\right\| - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1}a_j\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}\beta_i x_{k_i}^{m_j}\right\| \\
&> a_n m_n - \sum_{j=n+1}^{\infty}a_j M_{m_n} - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1}a_j N_{m_j} \qquad \text{by (12), (6), and (2)} \\
&\geq a_n m_n - a_n m_n/4 - a_n m_n/4 \qquad \text{by (9) and (11)} \\
&= a_n m_n/2 > C.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (y_{k_i}) is not a C-uV-sequence. $(y_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}a_j x_i^{m_j}\right)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ has no uV-subsequence, so (x_i^n) satisfies the V-array procedure which proves the lemma. $\square$

Now we are prepared to give a proof of Lemma 3.1. We follow the outline of the proof of Lemma 3.5 in [KO2].

Proof of Lemma 3.1. let (x_i^n) be a bad uV-array in $X = \left(\sum X_n\right)_{c_0}$ and $R_m : X \to X_m$ be the natural projections.

Claim: For all $M < \infty$ there exists $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and subsequence $(y_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ of $(x_i^n)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ such that $(R_m y_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is an M-bad uV-sequence.

Assuming the claim, we can find $(N_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} \in [\mathbb{N}]^{\omega}$, $(m(n))_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathbb{N}$, and subsequences $(y_i^n)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ of $\left(x_i^{N_n}\right)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ such that $\left(R_{m(n)}y_i^n\right)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is an n-bad uV sequence for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By passing to a subsequence, we may assume either that $m(n) = m$ is constant, or that $(m(n))_{n=1}^{\infty} \in [\mathbb{N}]^{\omega}$. If $m(n) = m$, then $R_m(y_i^n)_{n,i=1}^{\infty}$ is a bad uV-array in X_m. $R_m(y_i^n)_{n,i=1}^{\infty}$ satisfies the V-array procedure, and thus $(y_i^n)_{n,i=1}^{\infty}$ satisfies the V-array procedure. If $(m(n))_{n=1}^{\infty} \in [\mathbb{N}]^{\omega}$ let $T_n := R_{m(n)}|_{[y_i^r]_{i,r=1}^{\infty}}$ and apply Lemma 3.2 to the array $(y_i^n)_{i,n=1}^{\infty}$ to finish the proof.

To prove the claim, we assume it is false. There exists $M < \infty$ such that for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ every subsequence of $(x_i^n)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ contains a further subsequence $(y_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ such that $(R_m y_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is an M-uV-sequence.

By Ramsey's theorem, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ every subsequence of $(x_i^n)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ contains a further subsequence $(y_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ such that $(R_m y_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is a hereditary M-uV-sequence. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(x_i^n)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is an (M+3)-bad uV-sequence. We now construct a nested collection of subsequences $\{(y_{k,i})_{i=1}^{\infty}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ of $(x_i^n)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ (where $(y_{0,i})_{i=1}^{\infty} = (x_i^n)_{i=1}^{\infty}$) as well as $(m_i) \in [\mathbb{N}]^{\omega}$ so that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\sup_{m > m_k}\|R_m y_{k-1,k}\| \leq 2^{-k}, \tag{13}$$

$$(y_{k,i})_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{ is a subsequence of } (y_{k-1,i})_{i=2}^{\infty}, \tag{14}$$

$$(R_m y_{k,i})_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{ is a hereditary M-uV-sequence } \forall m \leq m_k. \tag{15}$$

For k=1 we choose $m_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sup_{m>m_1} \|R_m y_{0,1}\| \leq 2^{-1}$. Pass to a subsequence $(y_{1,i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ of $(y_{0,i})_{i=2}^{\infty}$ such that $(R_m y_{1,i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is a hereditary M-uV-sequence for all $m \leq m_1$.

For $k > 1$ given $m_{k-1} \in \mathbb{N}$ and a sequence $(y_{k-1,i})_{i=k}^{\infty}$. Choose $m_k > m_{k-1}$ so that $\sup_{m>m_k} \|R_m y_{k-1,k}\| \leq 2^{-k}$, thus satisfying (13). Let $(y_{k,i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be a subsequence of $(y_{k-1,i})_{i=2}^{\infty}$ so that $(R_m y_{k,i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is a hereditary M-uV-sequence for all $m \leq m_k$, thus satisfying (14) and (15). This completes the induction.

We define $y_k = y_{k-1,k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By (14), we have that $(y_{k,i})_{i=1}^{k} \cup (y_i)_{i=k+1}^{\infty}$ is a subsequence of $(y_{k,i})_{i=1}^{\infty}$. Therefore, (15) gives that

$$(v_i)_{i=k+1}^{\infty} \text{ M-dominates } (R_m y_{q_i})_{i=k+1}^{\infty} \forall m \leq m_k,\ (q_i) \in [\mathbb{N}]^{\omega},\ \text{and } k \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{16}$$

$(x_i^n)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is a $(M+3)$-bad uV sequence, so there exists $(\alpha_i) \in B_{[V]}$ such that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \alpha_i y_i \right\| > M+3. \tag{17}$$

For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \in (m_{i-1}, m_i]$ (with $m_0 = 0$) we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} R_m(\alpha_i y_i) \right\| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} |\alpha_i| \, \|R_m y_i\| + \|R_m(\alpha_k y_k)\| + \left\| \sum_{i=k+1}^{\infty} R_m(\alpha_i y_i) \right\| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} 2^{-i} + 1 + \left\| \sum_{i=k+1}^{\infty} \alpha_i R_m(y_i) \right\| \qquad \text{by (13)} \\
&\leq 1 + 1 + M \qquad \text{by (16)}
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \alpha_i y_i \right\| = \sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \| \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} R_m(\alpha_i y_i) \| \leq M+2.$$

This contradicts (17), so the claim and hence the lemma is proved. □

The proof for proposition 2.3 now follows in exactly the same way as in [KO2].

Proof of Proposition 2.3. For every countable limit ordinal α we can find a sequence of ordinals $\beta_n < \alpha$, $\beta_n \nearrow \alpha$ such that $C(\alpha)$ is isomorphic to $\left(\sum C(\beta_n)\right)_{c_0}$. Using induction and Lemma 3.1 we obtain that all $C(\alpha)$-spaces, where α is a countable limit ordinal, satisfy the V-array procedure. Thus, in view of the isomorphic classification of $C(K)$-spaces for countable compact metric spaces K (see [BP]), all $C(K)$-spaces for countable compact metric spaces K satisfy the V-array procedure. □

4. Proof of Proposition 2.4

The proof of Theorem 2.2 will be complete once we have proven proposition 2.4. To make notation easier, we now consider the triangulated version $(x_i^n)_{1\le n\le i<\infty}$ of the square array $(x_i^n)_{i,n=1}^\infty$.

Lemma 4.1. *A square array satisfies the V-array procedure if and only if it's triangulated version does.*

Proof. If $(y_i^n)_{i,n=1}^\infty$ is a subarray of $(x_i^n)_{i,n=1}^\infty$ then $(y_i^n)_{1\le n\le i<\infty}$ is a triangular subarray of $(x_i^n)_{1\le n\le i<\infty}$. Also if $(y_i^n)_{1\le n\le i<\infty}$ is a triangular subarray of $(x_i^n)_{1\le n\le i<\infty}$ then $(y_i^n)_{1\le n\le i<\infty}$ may be extended to a subarray of $(x_i^n)_{i,n=1}^\infty$ by letting $(y_i^n)_{i<n} = (x_i^n)_{i<n}$.

We now show that applying the V-array procedure to $(y_i^n)_{i,n=1}^\infty$ and $(y_i^n)_{1\le n\le i<\infty}$ yield equivalent sequences. For all $n\in\mathbb{N}$ let $0\le|\alpha_n|\le 2^{-n}$, $z_i=\sum_{n=1}^i \alpha_n y_i^n$, and $y_i=\sum_{n=1}^\infty \alpha_n y_i^n$. For all $m\in\mathbb{N}$ if $(\beta_i)_{i=1}^\infty\in B_{[V]}$ then

$$\left\|\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i z_i - \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i y_i\right\| = \left\|\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \sum_{n=i+1}^\infty \alpha_n y_i^n\right\| \le \sum_{i=1}^m |\beta_i| \sum_{n=i+1}^\infty |\alpha_n| \le \sum_{i=1}^m 2^{-i} < 1.$$

Thus we have that $\lim_{m\to\infty}\|\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i z_i\| = \infty$ if and only if $\lim_{m\to\infty}\|\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i y_i\| = \infty$, which implies the claim. $\square$

Lemma 4.2. *For all $\epsilon>0$, a triangular bad uV-array $(x_i^n)_{n\le i}$ admits a triangular subarray $(y_i^n)_{n\le i}$ which is basic in its lexicographical order(where i is the first letter and n is the second letter), and its basis constant is not greater than $2+\epsilon$ (meaning the supremum of the norm of the projections onto the span generated by intervals of the basis). In other words $y_1^1, y_2^1, y_2^2, y_3^1, y_3^2, y_3^3, y_4^1 \ldots$ is a basic sequence.*

Proof. The proof is the same as the proof that a weakly null sequence has a basic subsequence. $\square$

We now assume that the given bad uV-array (x_i^n) is labeled triangularly and that it is a bimonotone basic sequence in its lexicographical order. This assumption is valid because the properties "being a bad uV-array" and "satisfying the V-array procedure" are invariant under isomorphisms. We also assume that (x_i^n) is normalized.

The following theorem is our main tool used to construct the subarray (y_i^n) of (x_i^n) and the countable w^*-compact set $K\subset B_{[y_i^n]}$ for Proposition 2.4.

Theorem 4.3. *Assume that $(x_i^n)_{1\le n\le i}$ is a normalized triangular array in X, such that for every $n\in\mathbb{N}$ the sequence $(x_i^n)_{i=1}^\infty$ is weakly converging to 0. Let $V=(v_i)$ be a normalized basic sequence and let $(C_n)\subset[0,\infty)$ and $\epsilon>0$.*

Then (x_i^n) has a triangular sub-array (y_i^n) with the following property:

For all $n,q\in\mathbb{N}$ and all $n\le i_1<i_2\ldots<i_q$ all $(\alpha_j)_{j=1}^q\in B_V$ with $\|\sum_{j=1}^q \alpha_j y_{i_j}^n\|\ge C_n$ there is a $g\in(2+\epsilon)B_{X^*}$ and $(\beta_j)_{j=1}^q\in B_V$, so that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q} g(\beta_j y^n_{i_j}) \geq C_n, \tag{18}$$

$$g(y^m_i) = 0 \textit{ whenever } m \leq i \textit{ and } i \notin \{i_1, i_2, \dots i_q\}. \tag{19}$$

If we also assume that $(x^n_j)_{1\leq n\leq j}$ *is a bimonotone basic sequence in its lexicographical order then there exists* $(i_j) \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ *so that we may choose the sub-array* (y^n_j) *by setting* $y^n_j = x^n_{i_j}$ *for all* $n \leq j$*. In this case we have the above conclusion for some* $g \in (1+\epsilon)B_{Y^*}$*.*

Proof. After passing to a sub-array using Lemma 4.2 we can assume that (x^n_i) is a basic sequence in its lexicographical order and that it's basis constant does not exceed the value $2+\epsilon/4$. We first renorm $Z = [x^n_i]$ by a norm $|||\cdot|||$ in the standard way so that $\|z\| \leq |||z||| \leq (2+\epsilon/4)\|z\|$ and so that (x^n_i) is bimonotone in Z. We therefore can assume that (x^n_i) is a bimonotone basis and need to show the claim of Theorem 4.3 for $(1+\epsilon)B_{X^*}$ instead of $(2+\epsilon)B_{X^*}$.

Let $(\epsilon_k) \subset (0,1)$ with $\sum_{k=1}^\infty k\epsilon_k < \epsilon/4$. By induction on $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we choose $i_k \in \mathbb{N}$ and a sequence $L_k \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$, and define $y^m_j = x^m_{i_j}$ for $m \leq k$ and $m \leq j \leq k$ so that the following conditions are satisfied.

a) $i_k = \min L_{k-1} < \min L_k$ and $L_k \subset L_{k-1}$, if $k \geq 1$ ($L_0 = \mathbb{N}$).
b) For all $s, t \in \mathbb{N}_0$, all $1 \leq m \leq k$, all $m \leq m_1 < m_2 < \dots m_s \leq k$ and $\ell_0 < \ell_1 < \dots \ell_t$ in L_k, if

$$\exists f \in B_{X^*} \text{ with } \sum_{j=1}^{s} \alpha_j f(y^m_{m_j}) + \sum_{j=1}^{t} \alpha_{j+s} f(x^m_{\ell_j}) \geq C_m \text{ for some } (\alpha_j)_{j=1}^{s+t} \in B_{[V]} \tag{20}$$

then

(21)
$\exists g \in B_{X^*}$ such that

(a) $\displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{s} \beta_j g(y^m_{m_j}) + \sum_{j=1}^{t} \beta_{j+s} g(x^m_{\ell_j}) \geq C_m$ for some $(\beta_j)_{j=1}^{s+t} \in B_{[V]}$,

(b) $|g(y^{m'}_j)| < \epsilon_j$ if $m' \leq k$ and $j \in \{m', \dots k\} \setminus \{m_1, \dots m_s\}$, and

(c) $|g(x^{m'}_{\ell_0})| < \epsilon_{k+1}$ if $m' \leq k+1$.

(in the case that $s = 0$ condition (b) is defined to be vacuous, also note that in (c) we allow $m' = k+1$).

We first note for $(i_j) \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ that $(x^n_{i_j})_{n\leq j}$ is a subsequence of $(x^n_j)_{n\leq j}$ in their lexicographic orders. Thus $(x^n_{i_j})_{n\leq j}$ is a bimonotone basic sequence in its lexicographic order.

For $k = 0$, if $f \in B_{X^*}$ satisfies (20) then $g = P^*_{[x^n_{\ell_1},\infty)} f$ satisfies (21) by our assumed assumed bimonotonicity.

Assume $k \geq 1$ and we have chosen $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_{k-1}$. We let $i_k = \min L_{k-1}$.

Fix an infinite $M \subset L_{k-1} \setminus \{i_k\}$, a positive integer $m \le k$, an integer $0 \le s \le k - m + 1$, and positive integers $m \le m_1 < m_2 < \dots m_s \le k$ and define

$$A = A(m, s, (m_j)_{j=1}^s) = \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0} A_t, \text{ where}$$

$$A_t = \left\{ (\ell_j)_{j=0}^\infty \in [M]^\omega : \begin{array}{c} \text{If } (m_j)_{j=1}^s \text{ and } (\ell_j)_{j=0}^t \text{ satisfy (20)} \\ \text{then they also satisfy (21)} \end{array} \right\}.$$

For $t \in \mathbb{N}$ the set A_t is closed as a subset of $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ in the product topology, thus A is closed and, thus, Ramsey. We will show that there is an infinite $L \subset M$ so that $[L]^\omega \subset A$. Once we verified that claim we can finish our induction step by applying that argument successively to all choices of $m \le k$, an $0 \le s \le k$ and $m \le m_1 < m_2 < \dots m_s \le k$, as there are only finitely many.

Assume our claim is wrong and, using Ramsey's Theorem, we could find an $L = (\ell_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ so that $[L]^\omega \cap A = \emptyset$.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed, and let $p \in \{1, 2 \dots, n\}$. Then $L^{(p)} = \{\ell_p, \ell_{n+1}, \dots\}$ is not in A and we can choose $t_n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $(\alpha_j^n)_{j=1}^{t_n+s}$ and $f_n \in B_{X^*}$ so that (20) is satisfied (for $(\ell_{n+1}, \dots \ell_{\ell+t})$ replacing $(\ell_1, \dots \ell_t)$ and ℓ_p replacing ℓ_0) but for no $g \in B_{X^*}$ and $(\beta_j)_{j=1}^{s+t_n} \in B_{[V]}$ condition (21) holds. By choosing t_n to be minimal so that (20) is satisfied, we can have t_n, $(\alpha_j^n)_{j=1}^{t_n+s}$ and f_n be independent of p.

We now show that there is a $g_n \in B_X$ satisfying (a) and (b) of (21).

Let $k' = \max\{m - 1 \le i \le k : i \notin \{m_1, m_2, \dots m_s\}\}$. If $k' \le m$ then $\{m_1, \dots, m_s\} = \{k'+1, k'+2, \dots, k\}$ and by our assumed bimonotonicity $g_n := P^*_{[y^m_{k'+1}, \infty)} f_n \in B_X^*$ satisfies (a) and (b) of (20). If $k' > m$ let $0 \le s' \le s$, such that $m_1 < m_2 < \dots < m_{s'} < k'$, and apply the $k' - 1$ step of the induction hypothesis to f_n, $(\alpha_j^n)_{j=1}^{t_n+s}$, $m \le m_1 < \dots < m_{s'}$ (replacing $m \le m_1 < \dots < m_s$), and $k' < k' + 1 < \dots < m_s < \ell_{n+1} < \dots < \ell_{t_n}$ (replacing $\ell_p < \ell_{n+1} < \dots < \ell_{t_n}$) to obtain a functional $g_n \in B_{X^*}$ which satisfies (a) and (b) of (21).

Since g_n cannot satisfy all three conditions of (21) (for any choice of $1 \le p \le n$), we deduce that $|g_n(x^{m_p}_{\ell_p})| \ge \epsilon_{k+1}$ for some choice of $m_p \in \{1, 2, \dots k+1\}$.

Let g be a w^* cluster point of $(g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. As the set $\{1, 2, \dots k+1\}$ is finite, we have for all $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$ that $|g(x^{m_p}_{\ell_p})| \ge \epsilon_{k+1}$ for some $m_p \in \{1, 2, \dots k+1\}$. Which implies there exists $1 \le m \le k+1$ such that $|g(x^m_{\ell_p})| \ge \epsilon$ for infinitely many $p \in \mathbb{N}$. This is a contradiction with the sequence $(x^m_{\ell_i})_{i=1}^\infty$ being weakly null. Our claim is verified, and we are able to fulfill the induction hypothesis.

The conclusion of our theorem now follows by the following perturbation argument. If we have $n \le i_1 < i_2 \dots < i_q$ and $(\alpha_j)_{j=1}^q \in B_V$ with $\|\sum_{j=1}^q \alpha_j y^n_{i_j}\| \ge C_n$, then there exists $f \in B_{X^*}$ so that $\sum_{j=1}^q \alpha_j f(y^n_{i_j}) \ge C_n$. Our construction gives an $h \in B_{X^*}$ with $\sum_{j=1}^q \alpha_j h(y^n_{i_j}) \ge C_n$ and $|h(y^m_j)| < \epsilon_j$ if $m \le q$ and $j \in \{m', \dots k\} \setminus \{i_1, \dots i_q\}$. Because (y^n_i) is bimonotone, we may assume that $h(y^n_i) = 0$ for all $i \ge n$ with $i > i_q$. We perturb h by small multiples of the biorthogonal functionals of (y^n_i) to achieve $g \in X^*$ with $g(y^n_i) = h(y^n_i)$ for $i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_q\}$ and $g(y^n_i) = 0$ for $i \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_q\}$. Thus g satisfies (18) and (19). All that remains is to check that $g \in (1+\epsilon)B_{X^*}$. Because (y^n_i) is normalized and bimonotone, we can estimate $\|g\|$ as follows:

$$\|g\| \le \|h\| + \|g - h\| \le 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{i_q - 1} j\epsilon_j < 1 + \frac{\epsilon}{4}.$$

□

We are now prepared to give the proof of Proposition 2.4. We follow the same outline of the proof given in [KO2] for Proposition 3.4.

Proof of Proposition 2.4. Let (x_i^n) be a normalized bad uV-array in X and let M_n, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be chosen so that the sequence $(x_i^n)_{i=n}^\infty$ is an M_n-bad uV-sequence and $\lim_{n\to\infty} M_n = \infty$. By Lemma 4.1 we just need to consider the triangular array $(x_i^n)_{n\leq i}$. By passing to a subarray using Lemma 4.2 and then renorming, we may assume that $(x_i^n)_{n\leq i}$ is a normalized bimonotone basic sequence in its lexicographical order.

We apply Theorem 4.3 for $\epsilon = 1$ and $(C_n) = (M_n)$ to obtain a subarray $(y_i^n)_{n\leq i}$ that satisfies the properties (18) and (19). Moreover (y_i^n) in its lexicographical order is a subsequence of (x_i^n) in its lexicographical order, and thus is bimonotone. Furthermore, $(y_i^n)_{i=n}^\infty$ is a subsequence of $(x_i^n)_{i=n}^\infty$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We denote $Y = [y_i^n]_{n\leq i}$.

Let $F(n)$ be a finite $\frac{1}{2n2^n}$-net in $[-2, 2]$ which contains the points 0,-2, and 2. Whenever we have a functional $g \in 2B_{X^*}$ which satisfies conditions (18) and (19) we may perturb g by small multiples of the biorthogonal functions of $(y_i^n)_{n\leq i}$ to obtain $f \in 3B_{X^*}$ which satisfies (18), (19), and the following new condition

$$f(y_i^n) \in F(n) \qquad \text{for all } n \leq i. \tag{22}$$

We now start the construction of K. Let $Y = [y_i^n]_{n\leq i}$ and $m \in N$. We define the following,

$$L_m = \left\{ (k_1, ..., k_q) \mid \begin{array}{c} m \leq k_1 < k_2 < ... < k_q, \\ ||\sum_{i=1}^{q-1} \alpha_i y_{k_i}^m|| \leq M_m \quad \text{for all } (\alpha_i) \in B_V \\ ||\sum_{i=1}^{q} \alpha_i y_{k_i}^m|| > M_m \quad \text{for some } (\alpha_i) \in B_V \end{array} \right\}$$

It is important to note that if $(k_i) \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ and $k_1 \geq m$ then there is a unique $q \in N$ such that $(k_1, ..., k_q) \in L_m$.

Whenever $\vec{k} = (k_1, ..., k_q) \in L_m$, our application of Theorem 4.3 and then perturbation gives a functional $f \in 3B_{Y^*}$ which satisfies the properties (18),(19), and (22). In particular we have that $\sum_{i=1}^q f(\alpha_i y_{k_i}^m) > M_m$ for some $(\alpha_i) \in B_V$. We denote $f/3$ by $f_{\vec{k}}$ and let for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$K_n = \{Q_m^* f_{\vec{k}} \mid m \in \mathbb{N}\ \vec{k} \in L_n\}.$$

Here Q_m denotes the natural projection of norm 1 from Y onto $[(y_i^n)]_{1\leq n\leq i\leq m}$. Finally, we define

$$K = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty K_n \cup \{0\}.$$

We first show that $(y_i^n|_K)_{n\leq i}$ is a bad uV-array as an array in $C_b(K)$. Fix a column n_0. $(y_i^{n_0})_{i=n_0}^\infty$ is an M_{n_0}-bad uV-sequence. Consequently, given a subsequence $(y_{k_i}^{n_0})_{i=1}^\infty$ of $(y_i^{n_0})_{i=n_0}^\infty$ we have that $\vec{k} := (k_1, ..., k_q) \in L_{n_0}$ for some $q \in \mathbb{N}$. By (22), $f_{\vec{k}} = Q_{q+1}^* f_{\vec{k}}$ and thus $f_{\vec{k}} \in K_{n_0} \subset K$. $\sum_{i=1}^q f_{\vec{k}}(\alpha_i y_{k_i}^{n_0}) > \frac{M_{n_0}}{3}$ for some $(\alpha_i) \in B_V$, and so we obtain that $(y_i^{n_0}|_K)_{i=n_0}^\infty$ is an $(M_{n_0}/3)$-bad sequence in $C_b(K)$, thus proving that $(y_i^n|_K)_{n\leq i}$ is a bad uV-array.

K is obviously a countable subset of B_{Y^*}. Since Y is separable, K is w^*-metrizable. Thus we need to show that K is a w^*-closed subset of B_{Y^*} in order to finish the proof.

Let $(g_j) \subset K$ and assume that (g_j) converges w^* to some $g \in B_{Y^*}$. We have to show that $g \in K$. Every g_j is of the form $Q^*_{m_j} f_{\vec{k}_j}$ for some $m_j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\vec{k}_j \in L_{n_j}$, and some $n_j \in \mathbb{N}$.

By passing to a subsequence of (g_j), we may assume that either $n_j \to \infty$ as $j \to \infty$ or that there is an $n \in N$ such that $n_j = n$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. We will start with the first alternative. Let i_j be the first element of $\vec{k}_j$. Since $i_j \geq n_j$, we have that $i_j \to \infty$. We also have that $f_{\vec{k}_j}(y^n_i) = 0$ for all $n \leq i < i_j$. Thus $f_{\vec{k}_j} \to 0$ in the w^* topology as $j \to \infty$, so $g = 0 \in K$.

From now on we assume that there is an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\vec{k}_j \in L_n$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. L_n is relatively sequentially compact as a subspace of $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ endowed with the product topology. Thus we may assume by passing to a subsequence of (g_j) that $\vec{k}_j \to \vec{k}$ for some $\vec{k} \in \overline{L_n}$, the closure of L_n in $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

We now show that $\vec{k}$ is finite. Suppose to the contrary that $\vec{k} = (k_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$. We have that $\vec{k} \in \overline{L_n}$, so for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $N_r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\vec{k}_j = (k_1, ..., k_r, \ell_1, ..., \ell_s)$ for some $\ell_1, ..., \ell_s$ for all $j \geq N_r$. Because $\vec{k}_j \in L_n$ we have that $k_1 \geq n$, which implies that there exists $q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(k_1, ...k_q) \in L_n$. By uniqueness, L_n does not contain any sequence extending $(k_1, ..., k_q)$. Therefore, $\vec{k}_{N_{q+1}} = (k_1, ..., k_{q+1}, \ell_1, ..., \ell_s) \notin L_n$, a contradiction.

Since B_{Y^*} is w^*-sequentially compact, we may assume that $f_{\vec{k}_j}$ converges w^* to some $f \in B_{Y^*}$. We claim that $f \in K$. To prove this we first show that $Q^*_m f \in K$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. By (19) and (22) the set $\{Q^*_m f_{\vec{k}_j}(y^n_i) \mid j \in \mathbb{N}\ 1 \leq n \leq i\}$ has only finitely many elements. Since $Q^*_m f_{\vec{k}_j} \to Q^*_m f$ as $j \to \infty$ we obtain that $Q^*_m f_{\vec{k}_j} = Q^*_m f$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough. In particular $Q^*_m f \in K$. Next let $q = \max \vec{k}$. Since $\vec{k}_j \to \vec{k}$ and $\vec{k}$ is finite, we have $Q^*_q f = f$ and thus $f \in K$.

Now we show that $g \in K$. By passing again to a subsequence of (g_j) we can assume that either $m_j \geq \max \vec{k}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ or that there exists $m < \max \vec{k}$ such that $m_j = m$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. If the first case occurs, then $g_j = Q^*_{m_j} f_{\vec{k}_j}$ converges w^* to f, and hence $g = f \in K$. If the second case occurs then $g_j = Q^*_m f_{\vec{k}_j}$ converges w^* to $Q^*_m f$, and hence $g = Q^*_m f \in K$. $\square$

5. Examples

In previous sections, we introduced for any basic sequence (v_i) the property $U_{(v_i)}$, and then proved that if a Banach space X is $U_{(v_i)}$ then there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that X is $C - U_{(v_i)}$. As Knaust and Odell proved that result for the cases in which (v_i) is the standard basis for c_0 or ℓ_p with $1 \leq p < \infty$, we need to show that our result is not a corollary of theirs. For example, if (v_i) is a basis for $\ell_p \bigoplus \ell_q$ with $1 < q < p < \infty$ which consists of the union of the standard bases for ℓ_p and ℓ_q then a Banach space is $U_{(v_i)}$ or $C - U_{(v_i)}$ if and only if X is U_{ℓ_p} or $C - U_{\ell_p}$ respectively. Thus the result for this particular (v_i) follows from [KO2]. We make this idea more formal by defining the following equivalence relation:

Definition 5.1. If (v_i) and (w_i) are normalized basic sequences then we write $(v_i) \sim_U (w_i)$ (or $(v_i) \sim_{CU} (w_i)$) if each reflexive Banach space is $U_{(v_i)}$ (or $C - U_{(v_i)}$) if and only if it is $U_{(w_i)}$ (or $C - U_{(w_i)}$).

We define the equivalence relation strictly in terms of reflexive spaces to avoid the unpleasant case of ℓ_1. Because ℓ_1 does not contain any normalized weakly null sequence, ℓ_1 is trivially $U_{(v_i)}$ for every (v_i). This is counter to the spirit of what it means for a space to be $U_{(v_i)}$. By considering reflexive spaces, we avoid ℓ_1, and we also make the propositions included in this section formally stronger. Reflexive spaces are also especially nice when considering properties of weakly null sequences because the unit ball of a reflexive spaces is weakly sequentially compact. That is every sequence in the unit ball of a reflexive space has a weakly convergent subsequence.

In order to show that our result is not a corollary of the theorem of Knaust and Odell, we give an example of a basic sequence (v_i) such that $(v_i) \not\approx_U (e_i)$ where (e_i) is the standard basis for c_0 or ℓ_p with $1 \leq p < \infty$. To this end we consider a basis (v_i) for a reflexive Banach space X with the property that ℓ_p is not $U_{(v_i)}$ for any $1 < p < \infty$, but that X is $U_{(v_i)}$ and not U_{c_0}. We will be interested in particular with the dual of the following space.

Definition 5.2. Tsirelson's space, T, is the completion of c_{00} under the norm satisfying the implicit relation:

$$||x|| = ||x||_\infty \vee \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}(E_i)_1^n\subset[\mathbb{N}]^\omega n\leq E_1<\ldots<E_n} \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}||E_i(x)||.$$

(t_i) is the unit vector basis of T and (t_i^*) are the biorthogonal functionals to (t_i).

Tsirelson constructed the dual of T as the first example of a Banach space which does not contain c_0 or ℓ_p for any $1 \leq p < \infty$ [T]. Though we are more interested in T^*, we use the implicit definition of T (which was formulated by Figiel and Johnson in [FJ]) as it is nice to work with. Therefore, we need some propositions that relate sequences in a space to sequences in its dual.

Proposition 5.3. *If (v_i) is a normalized bimonotone basic sequence, (x_i) is a basic sequence, and $C > 0$ then*

(i) *(v_i) C-dominates (x_i) if and only if (v_i^*) is C-dominated by (x_i^*),*
(ii) *(v_i) C-dominates all of its normalized block bases if and only if (v_i^*) is C-dominated by all of its normalized block bases.*

Proof. We assume that (v_i) C-dominates (x_i) and let $(a_i) \in c_{00}$ and $\epsilon > 0$. There exists $(b_i) \in c_{00}$ such that $\sum a_i v_i^*(\sum b_i v_i) = ||\sum a_i v_i^*||$ and $||\sum b_i v_i|| < 1 + \epsilon$. We have that

$$||\sum a_i v_i^*|| = \sum a_i b_i = \sum a_i x_i^*(\sum b_i x_i) \leq C(1+\epsilon)||\sum a_i x_i^*||.$$

Thus (v_i^*) is $C-$dominated by (x_i^*). The converse is true by duality in the sense that we replace the roles of (v_i) and (x_i) by (x_i^*) and (v_i^*) respectively. We have $(x_i^{**}) = (x_i)$ and $(v_i^{**}) = (v_i)$ and thus the converse follows and hence (i) is proven.

We assume that (v_i) C-dominates all of its normalized block bases, and let $(\sum_{j=k_i}^{k_{i+1}-1} a_j v_j^*)_{i=1}^\infty$ be a normalized block basis of $(v_i)_{i=1}^\infty$. Because (v_i) is bimonotone, there exists a sequence $(b_j)_{j=1}^\infty \subset [-1, 1]$ such that:

$$\sum_{j=k_i}^{k_{i+1}-1} a_j v_j^*(\sum_{j=k_i}^{k_{i+1}-1} b_j v_j) = 1 = ||\sum_{j=k_i}^{k_{i+1}-1} b_j v_j|| \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Hence $(\sum_{j=k_i}^{k_{i+1}-1} b_j v_j)_{i=1}^\infty$ is the sequence of biorthogonal functions to the block basis $(\sum_{j=k_i}^{k_{i+1}-1} a_j v_j^*)_{i=1}^\infty$. We have that (v_i) C-dominates $(\sum_{j=k_i}^{k_{i+1}-1} b_j v_j)$ and thus

$(\sum_{j=k_i}^{k_{i+1}-1} a_j v_j^*)$ C-dominates (v_i^*) by (i). The converse follows by duality and hence (ii) is proved. □

Proposition 5.3 together with some well known properties of (t_i) yields the following.

Proposition 5.4. *$(t_i^*) \not\to_U (e_i)$ where (e_i) is the standard basis for c_0 or ℓ_p for $1 \leq p < \infty$.*

Proof. It easily follows from the definition that (t_i) is an unconditional normalized basic sequence and that (t_i) is dominated by each of its normalized block bases. Also, the spreading model for (t_i) is isomorphic to the standard ℓ_1 basis. By proposition 5.3, (t_i^*) is an unconditional basic sequence that dominates all of its block bases and has its spreading model isomorphic to the standard basis for basis for c_0. T^* is reflexive because (t_i^*) is unconditional and T^* does not contain an isomorphic copy of c_0 or ℓ_1. As (t_i^*) has the standard basis for c_0 as its spreading model, we have that ℓ_p is not $U_{(t_i^*)}$ for all $1 < p < \infty$. Therefore $(t_i^*) \not\to_U \ell_p$ for all $1 \leq p < \infty$. As (t_i^*) dominates all of its normalized block bases and every normalized weakly null sequence in T^* has a subsequence equivalent to a normalized block basis of (t_i^*), we have that T^* is $U_{(t_i^*)}$. T^* does not contain c_0 isomorphically thus T^* is not U_{c_0}. Therefore, $(t_i^*) \not\to_U c_0$. □

We have shown that $(t_i^*) \not\to (e_i)$ where (e_i) is the usual basis for c_0 or ℓ_p for $1 \leq p < \infty$, but we can actually say something much stronger than this. One of the main properties of ℓ_p used in [KO2] is that ℓ_p is subsymmetric. If for each basic sequence (v_i) there existed a constant $C \geq 1$ and a subsymmetric basic sequence (w_i) such that $(v_i) \sim_{CU} (w_i)$ then actually the first half of [KO2] would apply to all basic sequences without changing anything. The following example shows in particular that this can not be done.

Proposition 5.5. *If (v_i) is a normalized basic sequence such that (v_{k_i}) dominates (v_i) for all $(k_i) \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ then $(v_i) \not\to_U (t_i^*)$.*

In general, it can be fairly difficult to check if a Banach space is $U_{(v_i)}$, as every normalized weakly null sequence in the space needs to be checked. In contrast to this, it is very easy to check if T^* is $U_{(v_i)}$. This is because (t_i) is dominated by all of its block bases, and thus by Proposition 5.3 T^* is U_{v_i} if and only if (v_i) dominates a subsequence of (t_i^*). In proving Proposition 5.5 we will carry this idea further by considering a class of spaces, each of which have an unconditional subsymmetric basis (e_i) such that (e_i) is dominated by all of its normalized block bases. The additional condition of subsymmetric gives that $[e_i^*]$ is $U_{(v_i)}$ if and only if (v_i) dominates (e_i^*). Hence, we need to check only one sequence instead of all weakly null sequences in $[e_i^*]$.

The spaces we consider are generalizations of those introduced by Schlumprecht [S] as the first known arbitrarily distortable Banach spaces. We put less restriction on the function f given in the following proposition, but we also infer less about the corresponding Banach space. The techniques used in [S] are used to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 5.6. *Let $f : \mathbb{N} \to [1, \infty)$ strictly increase to ∞, $f(1) = 1$, and $\lim_{n\to\infty} n/f(n) = \infty$. If X is defined as the closure of c_{00} under the norm $|| \cdot ||$*

which satisfies the implicit relation:

$$||x|| = ||x||_\infty \vee \sup_{m\in\mathbb{N}, E_1<\ldots<E_m} \frac{1}{f(m)} \sum_{j=1}^{m} ||E_j(x)|| \quad \textit{for all } x \in c_{00},$$

then X is reflexive.

Proof. Let (e_n) denote the standard basis for c_{00}. It is straightforward to show that the norm $||\cdot||$ as given in the statement of the theorem exists, as well as that (e_n) is a normalized, 1-subsymmetric and 1-unconditional basis for X. Furthermore, (e_n) is 1-dominated by all of its normalized block bases. We will prove that X is reflexive by showing that (e_n) is boundedly complete and shrinking.

We first prove that (e_n) is boundedly complete. As (e_n) is unconditional, if (e_n) is not boundedly complete then it has some normalized block basis which is equivalent to the standard c_0 basis. However, (e_n) is 1-dominated by all its normalized block bases, so (e_n) is also equivalent to the standard c_0 basis. Hence $\sup_{N\in\mathbb{N}} ||\sum_{n=1}^N e_n|| < \infty$. This contradicts that $||\sum_{n=1}^N e_n|| \geq N/f(N) \to \infty$. Thus (e_n) is boundedly complete.

We now assume that (e_n) is not shrinking. As (e_n) is unconditional, it has a normalized block basis (x_n) which is equivalent to the standard basis for ℓ_1. We will use James' Blocking Lemma [J] to show that this leads to a contradiction. In one of its more basic forms, James' blocking lemma states that if (x_n) is equivalent to the standard basis for ℓ_1 and $\epsilon > 0$ then (x_n) has a normalized block basis which is $(1+\epsilon)$-equivalent to the standard basis for ℓ_1. Let $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{2}(f(2)-1)$. By passing to a normalized block basis using James' blocking lemma, we may assume that (x_n) is $(1+\epsilon)$-equivalent to the standard basis for ℓ_1, and thus any normalized block basis of (x_n) will also be $(1+\epsilon)$-equivalent to the standard basis for ℓ_1. Let $\epsilon_n > 0$ such that $\sum_{n=1}^\infty \epsilon_n < \epsilon$.

We denote $||\cdot||_m$ to be the norm on X which satisfies:

$$||x||_m = \sup_{E_1<\ldots<E_m} \frac{1}{f(m)} \sum_{j=1}^{m} ||E_j(x)|| \quad \text{for all } x \in c_{00}.$$

We will construct by induction on $n \in \mathbb{N}$ a normalized block basis (y_i) of (x_i) such that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have:

$$\text{If } ||y_j||_m > \epsilon_j \text{ for some } 1 \leq j < n, \text{ then } ||y_n||_m < \frac{1+\epsilon_n}{f(m)}. \tag{23}$$

For $n = 1$ we let $y_1{=}x_1$, and note that (23) is vacuously satisfied.

We now assume that we are given $n \geq 1$ and finite block sequence $(y_i)_{i=1}^n$ of (x_i) which satisfies (23). We have $\lim_{m\to\infty} ||y_i||_m \leq \lim_{m\to\infty} \#\mathrm{supp}(y_i)/f(m) = 0$ (where $\mathrm{supp}(y_i)$ denotes the support of y_i). Thus, there exists $N > \mathrm{supp}(y_n)$ such that $||y_i||_m < \epsilon_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and all $m \geq N$. Using James' blocking lemma, we block $(x_i)_{i=N}^\infty$ into $(z_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ such that $(z_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ is $(1+\epsilon_{n+1}/3)-$equivalent to the standard ℓ_1 basis. Let $M \geq 6N/\epsilon_{n+1}$ and define $y_{n+1} = \frac{1}{||\sum_{i=1}^M z_i||} \sum_{i=1}^M z_i$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $||y_j||_m > \epsilon_j$ for some $1 \leq j \leq n$. By our choice of $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that $m < N$. There exists disjoint intervals $E_1, \ldots, E_m \subset \mathbb{N}$ and integers

$1 = k_0 \leq k_1 \leq \ldots \leq k_m$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
f(m)||y_{n+1}||_m &= \frac{1}{||\sum_1^M z_i||}\sum_{i=1}^m ||P_{E_i}\sum_{j=k_{i-1}}^{k_i} z_j|| \\
&\leq \frac{1+\epsilon_{n+1}/3}{M}\sum_{j=1}^m \left(||P_{E_i} z_{k_{i-1}}|| + ||\sum_{j=k_{i-1}+1}^{k_i-1} z_j|| + ||P_{E_i} z_{k_i}||\right) \\
&\leq \frac{1+\epsilon_{n+1}/3}{M}(M+2m) \\
&< (1+\epsilon_{n+1}/3)(1+2N/M) < (1+\epsilon_{n+1}/3)(1+\epsilon_{n+1}/3) < 1+\epsilon_{n+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the induction hypothesis is satisfied.

We now show that property (23) leads to a contradiction with (y_i) being $(1+\epsilon)-$equivalent to the standard ℓ_1 basis. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We have for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ that $||\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{y_i}{n}|| = ||\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{y_i}{n}||_m$. By (23) there exists $1 \leq j \leq n+1$ such that $||y_i||_m < \epsilon_i$ for all $1 \leq i < j$ and $f(m)||y_i||_m < 1+\epsilon_i$ for all $j < i \leq n$. We have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
||\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{y_i}{n}|| = ||\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{y_i}{n}||_m &\leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{j-1}||y_i||_m + \frac{1}{n}||y_j||_m + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=j+1}^n ||y_i||_m \\
&< \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{j-1}\epsilon_i + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{nf(m)}\sum_{i=j+1}^n 1+\epsilon_i \\
&< \frac{\epsilon}{n} + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{f(2)} + \frac{\epsilon}{nf(2)} \\
&< \frac{\epsilon}{n} + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{1+2\epsilon} + \frac{\epsilon}{n(1+2\epsilon))}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} ||\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{y_i}{n}|| < \frac{1}{1+2\epsilon}$. This contradicts that (y_i) is $(1+\epsilon)$ equivalent to the standard ℓ_1 basis. Hence (e_i) is shrinking, and X is reflexive. $\square$

Using the reflexive spaces presented in Proposition 5.5, we can prove Proposition 5.5 for the case in which (v_i) in unconditional. The general case will then be reduced to this one.

Lemma 5.7. *If (v_i) is a 1-suppression unconditional normalized basic sequence such that (v_{k_i}) dominates (v_i) for all $(k_i) \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ and (v_i) is not equivalent to the unit vector basis for c_0 then there exists a reflexive Banach space X which is $U_{(v_i)}$ and not $U_{(t_i^*)}$.*

Proof. There exists $K \geq 1$ such that (v_{k_i}) K-dominates (v_i) for all $(k_i) \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$. We define $\langle\cdot\rangle$ to be the norm on (v_i) determined by:

$$\left\langle \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} a_i v_i^* \right\rangle = \sup_{(k_i)\in[\mathbb{N}]^\omega} \left\| \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} a_i v_{k_i}^* \right\| \qquad \text{for all } (a_i) \in c_{00}.$$

Where (v_i^*) is the sequence of biorthogonal functionals to (v_i). The norm $\langle\cdot\rangle$ is K-equivalent to the original norm $||\cdot||$. Furthermore, under the new norm (v_{k_i})

1-dominates (v_i) for all $(k_i)\in[\mathbb{N}]^\omega$. Thus after possibly renorming, we may assume that K=1.

Let $\epsilon>0$ and $\epsilon_i\searrow 0$ such that $\prod\frac{1}{1-\epsilon_i}<1+\epsilon$. We have that (v_i) is unconditional and is not equivalent to the unit vector basis of c_0, so for all $k\in\mathbb{N}$ there exists $N_k\geq k^2$ such that:

$$\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{N_k} v_i\right\|>\frac{k+1}{\epsilon_{k+1}}. \tag{24}$$

We define the function $f:\mathbb{N}\to[1,\infty)$ by:

$$f(n)=\begin{cases}1 & \text{if } n=1,\\ \frac{1}{1-\epsilon_1} & \text{if } 1<n\leq N_1,\\ k+1 & \text{if } N_k<n\leq N_{k+1} \text{ for } k\in\mathbb{N}.\end{cases}$$

We denote $|||\cdot|||$ to be the norm on c_{00} determined by the following implicit relation:

$$|||x|||=||x||_\infty\vee\sup_{m\in\mathbb{N},E_1<\ldots<E_m}\frac{1}{f(m)}\sum_{j=1}^{m}|||E_j(x)|||\quad\text{ for all } x\in c_{00}.$$

The completion of c_{00} under the norm $|||\cdot|||$ is denoted by X, and its standard basis is denoted by (e_i). We have that $N_k>k^2$ which implies that $\lim_{k\to\infty}k/f(k)=\infty$ and hence X is reflexive by proposition 5.5.

We now show by induction on $k\in\mathbb{N}$ that if $(a_i)_{i=1}^{N_k}\in c_{00}$ then

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^{k}\frac{1}{1-\epsilon_i}\right)|||\sum_{i=1}^{N_k}a_ie_i|||\geq||\sum_{i=1}^{N_k}a_iv_i^*||. \tag{25}$$

For k=1, we have that $\frac{1}{1-\epsilon_1}|||\sum_{i=1}^{N_1}a_ie_i|||\geq\sum_{i=1}^{N_1}|a_i|\geq||\sum_{i=1}^{N_1}a_iv_i^*||$. Thus (25) is satisfied. Now we assume that $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and that $(\prod_{i=1}^{k}\frac{1}{1-\epsilon_i})|||\sum_{i=1}^{N_k}a_ie_i|||\geq||\sum_{i=1}^{N_k}a_iv_i^*||$ for all $(a_i)\in c_{00}$.

Let $(a_i)_{i=1}^{N_{k+1}}\subset\mathbb{R}$ such that $||\sum_{i=1}^{N_{k+1}}a_iv_i^*||=1$. There exists $(\beta_i)_{1=1}^{N_{k+1}}\subset\mathbb{R}$ such that $\sum\beta_ia_i=||\sum\beta_iv_i||=1$. Let $I=\left\{j\in\mathbb{N}:\quad|\beta_j|<\frac{\epsilon_{k+1}}{k+1}\right\}$. If $\sum_{i\in I}|a_i|\geq k+1$ then $|||\sum_{i=1}^{N_{k+1}}a_ie_i|||\geq\frac{1}{k+1}\sum_{i\in I}|a_i|\geq 1=||\sum a_iv_i^*||$ and we are done. Therefore we assume that $\sum_{i\in I}|a_i|<k+1$, and thus $\sum_{i\in I}\beta_ia_i\leq\sum_{i\in I}\frac{\epsilon_{k+1}}{k+1}|a_i|<\epsilon_{k+1}$. We let $\{j_i\}_{i=1}^{\sharp I^C}=I^C$, and claim that $\sharp I^C\leq N_k$. Indeed, if we assume to the contrary that $\sharp I^C>N_k$, then

$$1\geq||\sum_{i=1}^{\sharp I^C}\beta_{j_i}v_{j_i}||\geq||\sum_{i=1}^{\sharp I^C}\beta_{j_i}v_i||\geq\frac{\epsilon_{k+1}}{k+1}||\sum_{i=1}^{N_k}v_i||>\frac{\epsilon_{k+1}}{k+1}\frac{k+1}{\epsilon_{k+1}}=1.$$

The first inequality is due to (v_i) being 1-suppression unconditional, and the second inequality is due to (v_i) being 1-dominated by (v_{j_i}). Thus we have a contradiction and our claim that $\sharp I^C \leq N_k$ is proven. We now have that

$$\begin{aligned}
1 = \sum \beta_i a_i &= \sum_I \beta_i a_i + \sum_{I^C} \beta_i a_i \\
&< \epsilon_{k+1} + ||\sum_{i=1}^{\sharp I^C} a_{j_i} v_{j_i}^*|| \\
&\leq \epsilon_{k+1} + ||\sum_{i=1}^{\sharp I^C} a_{j_i} v_i^*|| \\
&\leq \epsilon_{k+1} + (\prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{1}{1-\epsilon_i})|||\sum_{i=1}^{\sharp I^C} a_{j_i} e_i||| \quad \text{by induction hypothesis} \\
&\leq \epsilon_{k+1} + (\prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{1}{1-\epsilon_i})|||\sum_{i=1}^{N_{k+1}} a_i e_i||| \quad \text{by 1-subsymetric.}
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality gives that $1 \leq (\prod_{i=1}^{k+1} \frac{1}{1-\epsilon_i})|||\sum_{i=1}^{N_{k+1}} a_i e_i|||$. Thus the induction hypothesis is satisfied.

We have that (e_i) dominates (v_i^*), and hence (v_i) dominates (e_i^*). (e_i^*) is subsymmetric and dominates all its block bases, so $[e_i^*]$ is $U_{(v_i)}$. (e_i^*) is weakly null and is not equivalent to the unit vector basis of c_0, so $[e_i^*]$ is not $U_{(t_i^*)}$. $\square$

The proof of Proposition 5.5 will follow easily once we have established some properties of lower unconditional forms.

Definition 5.8. If (v_i) is a normalized basic sequence, then the *lower unconditional form* of (v_i) is the basic sequence (u_i) determined by:

$$||\sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} a_i u_i^*|| = \sup_{E\subset\mathbb{N}} ||\sum_{i\in E} a_i v_i^*|| \qquad \text{for all } (a_i) \in c_{00},$$

where (v_i^*) and (u_i^*) are the sequences of biorthogonal functional to (v_i) and (u_i).

The following lemma shows why the name lower unconditional form is appropriate and also that some properties of basic sequences are passed on to their lower unconditional forms.

Lemma 5.9. *If (v_i) and (x_i) are normalized bimonotone basic sequences with lower unconditional forms (u_i) and (y_i) respectively then*

- (i) *(u_i) is a 1-suppression unconditional normalized basic sequence,*
- (ii) *(v_i) $1-$dominates (u_i),*
- (iii) *if $C \geq 1$ and (v_{k_i}) $C-$dominates (v_i) for all $(k_i) \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ then (u_{k_i}) C-dominates (u_i) for all $(k_i) \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$,*
- (iv) *if (v_i) C-dominates (x_i) then (u_i) C-dominates (y_i).*

Proof. Let $(a_i) \in c_{00}$ and $J \subset \mathbb{N}$. We have that $||u_i^*|| = ||v_i^*|| = 1$ because (v_i) is normalized and bimonotone. To check unconditionality we consider:

$$||\sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} a_i u_i^*|| = \sup_{E\subset\mathbb{N}} ||\sum_{i\in E} a_i v_i^*|| \geq \sup_{E\subset J} ||\sum_{i\in E} a_i v_i^*|| = ||\sum_{i\in J} a_i u_i^*||.$$

Thus (u_i^*) is a 1-suppression unconditional normalized basic sequence, and hence (u_i) is as well. Thus (i) is proven.

(u_i^*) $1-$dominates (v_i^*), and hence (v_i) $1-$dominates (u_i) by Proposition 5.3 which proves (ii).

Let $(k_i) \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ and assume that (v_{k_i}) C-dominates (v_i). (v_i^*) $C-$dominates $(v_{k_i}^*)$ by Proposition 5.3. Thus,

$$||\sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} a_i u_i^*|| = \sup_{E\subset\mathbb{N}} ||\sum_{i\in E} a_i v_i^*|| \leq C \sup_{E\subset\mathbb{N}} ||\sum_{i\in E} a_i v_{k_i}^*|| = C||\sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} a_i u_{k_i}^*||.$$

Thus (u_i^*) $C-$dominates $(u_{k_i}^*)$, and hence (iii) follows by Proposition 5.3

Assume (x_i^*) $C-$dominates (v_i^*). Thus,

$$||\sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} a_i u_i^*|| = \sup_{E\subset\mathbb{N}} ||\sum_{i\in E} a_i v_i^*|| \leq C \sup_{E\subset\mathbb{N}} ||\sum_{i\in E} a_i x_i^*|| = ||\sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} a_i y_i^*||.$$

Hence, (y_i^*) $C-$dominates (u_i^*) and (iv) is proven. □

We now use lower unconditional forms to reduce the proof of 5.5 to the case in Lemma 5.7.

Proof of Proposition 5.5. Without loss of generality we assume that (v_i) is bimonotone. We let (u_i) be the lower unconditional form of (v_i). If T^* were not $U_{(v_i)}$ then $(v_i) \not\to_U (t_i^*)$ because T^* is $U_{(t_i^*)}$. Thus we may assume that T^* is $U_{(v_i)}$. Hence, there exists $(k_i) \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ such that (v_i) dominates $(t_{k_i}^*)$. We now have that (u_i) dominates $(t_{k_i}^*)$ by Lemma 5.9 since (t_i^*) is unconditional. Therefore (u_i) is not isomorphic to the standard basis for c_0. We have by lemma 5.9 that (u_{j_i}) $1-$dominates (u_i) for all $(j_i) \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$. By Lemma 5.7 there exists a space X which is $U_{(u_i)}$ but not $U_{(t_i^*)}$. The space X is also $U_{(v_i)}$ because (v_i) dominates (u_i), and thus our claim is proven. □

We also considered the question: "Does there exist a basic sequence (v_i) such that $(v_i) \not\to_U (w_i)$ for any unconditional (w_i)?". This is a much harder question, which is currently open. Neither the summing basis for c_0, nor the standard basis for James' space give a solution, as these are covered by the following proposition:

Proposition 5.10. *If (v_i) is a basic sequence such that $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} ||\sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i v_i|| < D$ for some $(\epsilon_i) \in \{-1,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and constant $D < \infty$ then $(v_i) \sim_U c_0$.*

Proof. Let X be a C-U_V Banach space, and let $(x_i) \in S_X$ be weakly null. By Ramsey's theorem, we may assume by passing to a subsequence that (v_i) C-dominates every subsequence of (x_i). By a theorem of John Elton [E], there exists $K < \infty$ and a subsequence (y_i) of (x_i) such that if $(a_i)_1^\infty \in [-1,1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $I \subset \{i : \quad |a_i| = 1\}$ is finite then $||\sum_I a_i y_i|| \leq K \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} ||\sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i y_i||$. Thus we have for all $A \in [\mathbb{N}]^{<\omega}$ that

$$||\sum_{i\in A} \epsilon_i y_i|| \leq K \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} ||\sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i y_i|| \leq KC \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} ||\sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i v_i|| < KCD.$$

As this is true for all $A \in [N]^{<\omega}$, (y_i) is equivalent to the unit vector basis of c_0. Every normalized weakly null sequence in X has a subsequence equivalent to c_0, so X is U_{c_0}. □

References

[BP] C. Bessaga and A. Pelczyński, *Spaces of continuous functions IV*, Studia Math., **19** (1960), 53-62.

[E] J. Elton, *Weakly null normalized sequences in Banach spaces*, Dissertation, Yale University, 1978.

[FJ] T. Figiel and W.B. Johnson, *A uniformly convex Banach space which contains no ℓ_p*, Compositio Math. **29** (1974), 179-190.

[GM] W.T. Gowers and B. Maurey, *The unconditional basic sequence problem*, Annals of Mathematics **156** (2002), 797-833.

[J] R.C. James, *Uniformly nonsquare Banach spaces*, Ann. of Math. (2)**80**(1964), 542-550.

[JO] W.B. Johnson and E. Odell, *Subspaces of L_p which embed into ℓ_p*, Compos. Math., **28** (1974), 37-49.

[KO1] H. Knaust and E. Odell, *On c_0-sequences in Banach spaces*, Isreal J. Math. **67** (1989), 153-169.

[KO2] H. Knaust and E. Odell, *Weakly null sequences with upper ℓ_p estimates*, pp.85-107, in: "Functional Analysis, Proceedings, The University of Texas at Austin, 1987-89", E. Odell, H. Rosenthal (eds.), Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1470, Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1991.

[MR] B. Maurey and H. Rosenthal *Normalized weakly null sequences with no unconditional subsequences*, Studia Math., Volume 1200, 156 pp. Berlin and New Yotk: Springer-Verlag, (1977).

[O] E. Odell, *Applications of Ramsey theorems to Banach space theory*, Notes in Banach spaces, ed. H.E. Lacey, Univ. of Texas Press, Austin, TX (1980), 379–404.

[S] Th. Schlumprecht, *An arbitrarily distortable Banach space*, Israel J. Math. **76** (1991), 81-95.

[T] B.S. Tsirelson, *Not every Banach space contains an embedding of ℓ_p or c_0*, Funct. Anal. Appl. **8** (1974), 138-141.

Department of Mathematics, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-3368

E-mail address: `freeman@math.tamu.edu`