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#### Abstract

This paper concerns fixed point theorems for nonexpansive mappings in conjugate Banach spaces. An example shows that there exist fixed-point-free affine isometries on weak* compact convex sets. Asymptotic centers of decreasing net of founded sets in $l^{1}$ are shown to be compact and a common fixed point theorem for left reversible topological semigroup of nonexpansive mappings in $l^{1}$ is given.


1. Introduction. Let $K$ be a nonempty weakly compact convex subset of a Banach space and $T: K \rightarrow K$ a nonexpansive mapping, i.e., $\|T x-T y\| \leqq\|x-y\|, x, y \in K$. A theorem of Kirk [10] (see also Browder [1], Gödhe [6]) states that if $K$ has normal structure then $T$ has a fixed point. Whether the condition of normal structure is essential remains an open problem, although Schöneberg [13] has shown that some weakenings of normal structure suffice. With a slight modification of normal structure, Kirk's proof of his theorem also yields the following theorem in conjugate Banach spaces.

Theorem 1 (Kirk). Let $K$ be a nonempty weak* compact convex subset of a conjugate Banach space and assume that $K$ possesses weak* normal structure (see Definition 1 in §3). Then every nonexpansive selfmapping of $K$ has a fixed point.

One major observation presented in this note is that the condition of weak* normal structure in Theorem 1 is essential, even for affine isometries. We also derive a sufficient condition for a conjugate Banach space to have weak* normal structure. In particular, we show that $l_{1}$ possesses weak* normal structure. Asymptotic centers of decreasing nets of bounded subsets in $l_{1}$ are shown to form a normcompact nonempty subset and an application of this result is made to obtain a common fixed point theorem for families of nonexpansive mappings in $l_{1}$.
2. A counterexample. Let $c_{0}$ be the space of null sequences, equipped with the sup norm $\left\|\left\|_{\infty},\right\| x\right\|_{\infty}=\sup _{i \geq 1}\left|x_{i}\right|$, and $l_{1}$ the space of absolutely summable sequences equipped with the norm $\left\|\left\|_{1},\right\| x\right\|_{1}=\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\left|x_{i}\right|$. For each sequence $x$, let $x^{+}$and $x^{-}$be the positive and negative part of $x$, respectively. Renorm $c_{0}$ by the
new norm defined by

$$
|x|=\left\|x^{+}\right\|_{\infty}+\|x-\|_{\infty} .
$$

$|\cdot|$ is equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ since $\|x\|_{\infty} \leqq|x| \leqq 2\|x\|_{\infty}$. This method of renorming was used by Bynum [4] to renorm $l_{p}, 1<p<\infty$.

LEMMA 1. The dual of $\left(c_{0},|\cdot|\right)$ is isometrically isomorphic to $\left(l_{1},\|\cdot\|\right)$ with the norm $\|\cdot\|$ defined by

$$
\|x\|=\max \left(\left\|x^{+}\right\|_{1},\left\|x^{-}\right\|_{1}\right)
$$

Proof. Since $|\cdot|$ is equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$, the dual of $\left(c_{0},|\cdot|\right)$ is representable by $l_{1}$. It suffices to show that

$$
\max \left(\left\|f^{+}\right\|_{1},\left\|f^{-}\right\|_{1}\right)=\sup \left\{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x_{i} f_{i}: x \in c_{0},\left\|x^{+}\right\|_{\infty}+\left\|x^{-}\right\|_{\infty} \leqq 1\right\}
$$

for each $f=\left(f_{i}\right) \in l_{1}$. Note that the supremum on the right can be taken over $x$ satisfying the further requirment that $x_{i} f_{i} \geqq 0$ for all $i$. (If $x_{i} f_{i}<0$, replace $x$ by another one with $x_{i}=0$.) It then follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x_{i} f_{i} & \leqq\left\|x^{+}\right\|_{\infty}\left\|f^{+}\right\|_{1}+\left\|x^{-}\right\|_{\infty}\left\|f^{-}\right\|_{1} \\
& \leqq \max \left(\left\|f^{+}\right\|_{1},\left\|f^{-}\right\|_{1}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

For the reverse inequality, note that one can approximate $\left\|f^{+}\right\|_{1}$ $\left(\left\|f^{-}\right\|_{1}\right)$ by $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x_{i} f_{i}$ by suitably choosing $x_{i}=1$ or $0(-1$ or 0$)$.

Example 1. Let $K=\left\{\left(x_{i}\right) \in l_{1}: x_{i} \geqq 0, \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x_{i} \leqq 1\right\} . \quad K$ is a weak* compact convex set in $\left(l_{1},\|\cdot\|\right)$ since it is the intersection of the unit ball and the weak* closed set $\left\{\left(x_{i}\right): x_{i} \geqq 0\right\}$. Let $T: K \rightarrow K$ be the mapping defined by the equation

$$
T x=\left(1-\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x_{i}, x_{1}, x_{2}, \cdots, x_{n}, \cdots\right)
$$

for $x=\left(x_{i}\right) \in K$. We show that $T$ is an isometry. Let $x, y \in K$ and let $I=\left\{i \in Z^{+}: x_{i}-y_{i} \geqq 0\right\}$ and $J=\left\{j \in \boldsymbol{Z}^{+}: x_{j}-y_{j}<0\right\}$. Assume that $\sum_{i \in I} x_{i}-y_{i} \geqq \sum_{j \in J} y_{j}-x_{j}$. Then $\|x-y\|=\sum_{i \in I} x_{i}-y_{i}$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|T x-T y\| & =\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\left(y_{i}-x_{i}\right), x_{1}-y_{1}, \cdots, x_{n}-y_{n}, \cdots\right\| \\
& =\left\|\sum_{j \in J}\left(y_{j}-x_{j}\right)-\sum_{i \in I}\left(x_{i}-y_{i}\right), x_{1}-y_{1}, \cdots, x_{n}-y_{n}, \cdots\right\| \\
& =\max \left(\sum_{i \in I} x_{i}-y_{i}, \sum_{i \in I} x_{i}-y_{i}\right) \\
& =\sum_{i \in I} x_{i}-y_{i}=\|x-y\|
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly, we also have $\|T x-T y\|=\|x-y\|$ in case $\sum_{i \in I} x_{i}-y_{i} \leqq$ $\sum_{j \in J} y_{j}-x_{j}$. Hence $T$ is an isometry. $T$ is clearly affine and fixed point free. Further properties of $K$ and $T$ are listed in the following:
(1) $\lim \left\|y-T^{n} x\right\|=\operatorname{Diam}(K)=1, y, x \in K$.
(2) $K$ does not possess weak* normal structure. This is necessarily true by Theorem 1 and the above demonstration.
(3) $T^{n} x$ converges weakly* to zero for each $x \in K$.
(4) $K$ itself is a minimal $T$-invariant weak* compact convex set. Indeed every $T$-invariant weak* comyact convex subset $C$ of $K$ must contain 0 by (3). Hence $T^{n}(0)=e_{n} \in C$ for all $n$. Therefore $K=$ $\overline{\mathrm{Co}}\left(\left\{e_{n}\right\} \cup\{0\}\right) \cong C$ and $C=K$.

The above example shows that the condition of weak* normal structure cannot be removed from Theorem 1 even if the nonexpansive mapping is an affine isometry. In contrast, every affine nonexpansive selfmapping of a weakly compact convex set always has a fixed point.
3. Conjugate Banach spaces having weak normal structure. In this section we derive a condition for a conjugate Banach space to have weak* normal structure.

Definition 1. A weak* closed convex subset $C$ of a conjugate Banach space is said to have weak* normal structure if every weak* compact convex subset $K$ of $C$ containing more than one point contains a point $x_{0}$ such that

$$
\sup \left\{\left\|x_{0}-y\right\|: y \in K\right\}<\operatorname{diam} K .
$$

In the following theorem, $\boldsymbol{R}^{+}=\{r \in \boldsymbol{R}: r \geqq 0\}$ and the notation $x_{n} \stackrel{*}{\rightharpoonup} y$ will denote the weak* convergence of $x_{n}$ to $y$.

Theorem 2. Let $X$ be a the conjugate space of a separable Banach space. Suppose that there exists a function $\delta: \boldsymbol{R}^{+} \times \boldsymbol{R}^{+} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R}^{+}$ satisfying the following conditions.
(i) For each fixed $s, \delta(r, s)$ is continuous and strictly increasing in $r$,
(ii) $\delta(s, s)>s$ for every $s>0$,
(iii) if $x_{n} \stackrel{*}{\rightharpoonup} 0$ and $\lim \left\|x_{n}\right\|=s>0$, then

$$
\lim \left\|y-x_{n}\right\|=\delta(\|y\|, s) \quad \text { for every } y \in K
$$

Then every weak* closed convex subset of $X$ has weak* normal structure.

Proof. Suppose on the contrary that $X$ contains a weak* closed convex subset $C$ which does not have weak* normal structure. Then there exists a weak* compact convex subset $K$ of $C$ with Card $K>1$ and for every $x \in K$

$$
\sup \{\|x-y\|: y \in K\}=\operatorname{diam} K=d>0 .
$$

By a method of Brodskii-Milman [3], there exists a sequence $\left\{x_{n}\right\} \subset K$ such that $\lim d\left(x_{n+1}, \operatorname{Co}\left(x_{i}\right)_{i \leq n}\right)=d$. Since subsequences of $\left\{x_{n}\right\}$ share the same property, we may assume that $x_{n} \stackrel{*}{\rightharpoonup} x_{0}$ for some $x_{0} \in K$ and $\lim \left\|x_{n}-x_{0}\right\|=s$. Clearly, $s>0$. For each fixed $m$, we have $\lim _{n}\left\|x_{m}-x_{n}\right\|=d$. Therefore, by (iii)

$$
\mathrm{d}=\lim _{n}\left\|\left(x_{n}-x_{0}\right)-\left(x_{m}-x_{0}\right)\right\|=\delta\left(\left\|x_{m}-x_{0}\right\|, s\right) .
$$

Using (i), $d=\delta(s, s)$. Using (ii), we have $s<d$. We shall show that $\sup \left\{\left\|x_{0}-y\right\|: y \in K\right\} \leqq s$. Suppose not, then there exists $z \in K$ with $\left\|z-x_{0}\right\|>s$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lim \left\|z-x_{n}\right\| & =\lim \left\|\left(z-x_{0}\right)-\left(x_{n}-x_{0}\right)\right\| \\
& =\delta\left(\left\|z-x_{0}\right\|, s\right) \\
& >\delta(s, s)=d
\end{aligned}
$$

by (iii) and (i). This is impossible. Therefore, $\sup \left\{\left\|x_{0}-y\right\|: y \in K\right\} \leqq$ $s<d$, which again contradicts our initial assumption. Hence $C$ has weak* normal structure.

The next proposition shows that the spaces $l_{p}, p \geqq 1$ satisfy the condition in Theorem 2 with $\delta(r, s)=\left(r^{p}+s^{p}\right)^{1 / p}$.

Proposition 1. In $l_{p}$, if $x_{n} \stackrel{*}{\rightharpoonup} x$, then for every $y \in l_{p}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim \sup \left\|x_{n}-y\right\|^{p}=\lim \sup \left\|x_{n}-x\right\|^{p}+\|x-y\|^{p} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, if $\lim \left\|x_{n}-x\right\|$ exists, we have

$$
\lim \left\|x_{n}-y\right\|=\left(\lim \left\|x_{n}-x\right\|^{p}+\|x-y\|^{p}\right)^{1 / p}
$$

Proof. For $p=1$, the equality is a special case of a more general equality given in Proposition 2; see Corollary 3. For $p>1$, let $J: l_{p} \rightarrow l_{q}, 1 / q+1 / p=1$, be the duality mapping defined by

$$
J x=\left(\left|x_{1}\right|^{p-1} \operatorname{sgn} x_{1}, \cdots,\left|x_{n}\right|^{p-1} \operatorname{sgn} x_{n}, \cdots\right) .
$$

$J$ is weakly continuous and $\langle J x, x\rangle=\|x\|^{p}$, see [2]. Since $J$ is the subdifferential of the convex function $f(x)=1 / p\|x\|^{p}$, we have

$$
\frac{1}{p}\left\|x_{n}-y\right\|^{p}=\frac{1}{p}\left\|x_{n}-x\right\|^{p}+\int_{0}^{1}\left\langle J\left(x_{n}-x+t(x-y), x-y\right)\right\rangle d t
$$

(Gossez-Lami-Dozo [7]). Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lim \sup \left\|x_{n}-y\right\|^{p} & =\lim \sup \left\|x_{n}-x\right\|^{p}+p \int_{0}^{1} t^{p-1}\|x-y\|^{p} d t \\
& =\lim \sup \left\|x_{n}-x\right\|^{p}+\|x-y\|^{p}
\end{aligned}
$$

Proposition 1 and Theorem 2 implies that every weak* closed convex subset of $l_{1}$ has weak* normal structure. Note that such a set may not possess normal structure. For a simple example, let $C$ be the unit ball and $K=\left\{\left(x_{i}\right): x_{i} \geqq 0, \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x_{i}=1\right\}$. Then $K$ is closed convex and $\sup \{\|x-y\|: y \in K\}=\operatorname{diam} K=2$ for every $x \in K$. Combining this result with Theorem 1 we have the following result of Karlovitz [9].

Corollary 1 [9]. Let $K$ be a weak* compact convex nonempty subset of $l_{1}$ and $T: K \rightarrow K$ be a nonexpansive mapping. Then $T$ has a fixed point.
4. Asymptotic centers in $l_{1}$.

Definition 2 [12]. Let $C$ be a nonempty subset of a Banach space $X$ and $\left\{B_{\alpha}: \alpha \in \Lambda\right\}$ a decreasing net of bounded nonempty subsets of $X$. For each $x \in C$ and $\alpha \in \Lambda$, let

$$
\begin{aligned}
r_{\alpha}(x) & =\sup \left\{\|x-y\|: y \in B_{\alpha}\right\}, \\
r(x) & =\lim _{\alpha} r_{\alpha}(x)=\inf _{\alpha} r_{\alpha}(x),
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
r=\inf \{r(x): x \in C\}
$$

The set (possibly empty) $\mathscr{A} \mathscr{C}\left(\left\{B_{\alpha}: \alpha \in \Lambda\right\}, C\right)=\{x \in C: r(x)=r\}$ and the number $r$ will be called, respectively, the asymptotic center of $\left\{B_{\alpha}: \alpha \in \Lambda\right\}$ w.r.t. $C$ and the asymptotic radius of $\left\{B_{\alpha}: \alpha \in \Lambda\right\}$ w.r.t. $C$.

Proposition 2. Let $\left\{B_{\alpha}: \alpha \in \Lambda\right\}$ be a decreasing net of bounded subsets of $l_{1}$ and $y_{n}$ a weak* convergent sequence with weak* limit $y$. Then

$$
\begin{align*}
\lim _{\alpha} \sup \left\{\|y-x\|: x \in B_{\alpha}\right\}+ & +\lim \sup \left\|y_{n}-y\right\|  \tag{2}\\
& =\lim \sup _{n} \lim _{\alpha} \sup \left\{\left\|y_{n}-x\right\|: x \in B_{\alpha}\right\} .
\end{align*}
$$

Proof. For $x \in l_{1}$, we shall denote by $x^{(i)}$ the $i$ th coordinate of $x$.

By the triangle inequality, we clearly have the inequality $\geqq$ in (2). By a simple diagonal process, we may assume that $\left\{B_{\alpha}: \alpha \in \Lambda\right\}$
is a decreasing sequence $\left\{B_{n}: n \geqq 1\right\}$ of bounded sets. Choose $x_{n} \in B_{n}$ such that $\lim \sup \left\|y-x_{n}\right\|=\lim \sup _{n}\left\{\|y-x\|: x \in B_{n}\right\}$. It follows that it suffices to prove the following inequality:
$\underset{n}{\lim \sup }\left\|y-x_{n}\right\|+\lim \sup _{m}\left\|y_{m}-y\right\| \leqq \lim _{m} \sup \lim \sup _{n}\left\|y_{m}-x_{n}\right\|$.
We may also assume, without loss of generality, that $y=0$, and that $\lim \left\|x_{n}\right\|, \lim \left\|y_{m}\right\|$, and $\lim _{m} \lim \sup _{n}\left\|y_{m}-x_{n}\right\|$ exist.

Let $r=\lim _{m} \lim \sup _{n}\left\|y_{m}-x_{n}\right\|$ and $k=\lim \left\|y_{m}\right\|$. Suppose, on the contrary that $\lim \left\|x_{n}\right\|=r-k+p$ for some $p>0$. Let $p>$ $\varepsilon>0$. Let $m_{1}, N_{1}$ and $M_{1}$ ( $N_{1}$ and $M_{1}$ depend on $m_{1}$ ) be sufficiently large integers such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\|y_{m_{1}}\right\| \geqq k-\frac{\varepsilon}{4}, \\
& \sum_{N_{1}+1}^{\infty}\left|y_{m_{1}}^{(i)}\right| \leqq \frac{\varepsilon}{8} \\
& \left\|x_{n}-y_{m_{1}}\right\| \leqq r+\frac{\varepsilon}{4},
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\left\|x_{n}\right\| \geqq r-k+p-\frac{\varepsilon}{4}, \text { for all } n \geqq M_{1}
$$

Then for $n \geqq M_{1}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
r+\frac{\varepsilon}{4} \geqq\left\|x_{n}-y_{m_{1}}\right\| & =\sum_{1}^{N_{1}}\left|x_{n}^{(i)}-y_{m_{1}}^{(i)}\right|+\sum_{N_{1}+1}^{\infty}\left|x_{n}^{(i)}-y_{m_{1}}^{(i)}\right| \\
& \geqq \sum_{1}^{N_{1}}\left|y_{m_{1}}^{(i)}\right|-\sum_{1}^{N_{1}}\left|x_{n}^{(i)}\right|+\sum_{N_{1}+1}^{\infty}\left|x_{n}^{(i)}\right|-\sum_{N_{1}+1}^{\infty}\left|y_{m_{1}}^{(i)}\right| \\
& =\left\|y_{m_{1}}\right\|-2 \sum_{N_{1}+1}^{\infty}\left|y_{m_{1}}^{(i)}\right|+\left|\left|x_{n} \|-2 \sum_{1}^{N_{1}}\right| x_{n}^{(i)}\right| \\
& \geqq k-\frac{\varepsilon}{4}-\frac{\varepsilon}{4}+r-k+p-\frac{\varepsilon}{4}-2 \sum_{1}^{N_{1}}\left|x_{n}^{(i)}\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence

$$
\sum_{1}^{N_{1}}\left|x_{n}^{(i)}\right| \geqq \frac{1}{2}(p-\varepsilon), \quad n \geqq M_{1} .
$$

Since $y_{m} \stackrel{*}{\sim} 0$ there exist $m_{2}, N_{2}>N_{1}$ and $M_{2}>M_{1}\left(N_{2}\right.$ and $M_{2}$ depend on $m_{2}$ ) such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{1}^{N_{1}}\left|y_{m_{2}}^{(i)}\right| \leqq \frac{\varepsilon}{10}, \\
& \left\|y_{m_{2}}\right\| \geqq k-\frac{\varepsilon}{5},
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{N_{2}+1}^{\infty}\left|y_{m_{2}}^{(i)}\right| \leqq \frac{\varepsilon}{10} \\
& \left\|x_{n}-y_{m_{2}}\right\| \leqq r+\frac{\varepsilon}{5}
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\left\|x_{n}\right\| \geqq r-k+p-\frac{\varepsilon}{5}, \quad \text { for } \quad n \geqq M_{2}
$$

Then for $n \geqq M_{2}$, we have

Hence

$$
\sum_{N_{1}+1}^{N_{2}}\left|x_{n}^{(i)}\right| \geqq \frac{1}{2}(p-\varepsilon) \quad \text { for } \quad n \geqq M_{2}
$$

Continuing in this way, we obtain two sequences $M_{1}<M_{2}<\ldots$ and $N_{1}<N_{2}<\cdots$ such that for $n \geqq M_{k}$,

$$
\sum_{N_{k-1}+1}^{N_{k}}\left|x_{n}^{(i)}\right| \geqq \frac{1}{2}(p-\varepsilon), \quad N_{0}=0
$$

Thus for $n \geqq M_{k},\left\|x_{n}\right\| \geqq \sum_{1}^{N_{k}}\left|x_{n}^{(i)}\right| \geqq k \cdot 1 / 2(p-\varepsilon)$. This contradicts the boundedness of the sequence $x_{n}$.

Corollary 2. Let $x_{n}$ be a bounded sequence in $l_{1}$ and $y_{n} \stackrel{*}{\longrightarrow} y$. Then $\lim \sup \left\|x_{n}-y\right\|+\lim _{m} \sup \left\|y_{m}-y\right\|=\lim \sup \lim \sup \left\|x_{n}-y_{m}\right\|$.

Corollary 3. Proposition 1 for $p=1$.

THEOREM 3. Let $C$ be a weak* closed convex nonempty subset of $l_{1}$ and $\left\{B_{\alpha}: \alpha \in \Lambda\right\}$ a decreasing net of bounded nonempty subsets
of $C$. Let the function $r(x)$ be defined as in Definition 2. Then for each $s \geqq 0,\{x \in C: r(x) \leqq s\}$ is weak* compact convex and the asymptotic center of $\left\{B_{\alpha}: \alpha \in \Lambda\right\}$ w.r.t. $C$ is a nonempty (norm) compact convex subset of $C$.

Proof. Let $K_{s}=\{x \in C: r(x) \leqq s\}$ and let $K$ be the asymptotic center. Clearly, diam $\left(K_{s}\right) \leqq 2 s$. Since $r(\cdot)$ is a convex function, $K_{s}$ is also convex. To show that $K$ is weak* compact, it suffices to sohw that $K_{s}$ is weak* closed. Let $y_{n} \in K_{s}$ and $y_{n} \xrightarrow{*} y$. By Proposition 2.

$$
\begin{equation*}
r(y)=\lim \sup r\left(y_{n}\right)-\lim \sup \left\|y_{n}-y\right\| \leqq s \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence $y \in K_{s}$ and $K_{s}$ is weak* closed. Suppose now that $s=r$, where $r$ is the asymptotic radius of $\left\{B_{\alpha}: \alpha \in \Lambda\right\}$ w.r.t. $C$. If $r\left(y_{n}\right)=r$, then we must have $\lim \sup \left\|y_{n}-y\right\|=0$ for otherwise $r(y)<r$, a contradiction to the definition of $r$. Therefore, for a sequence in $K$, weak* convergence implies norm convergence. Hence $K$ is compact. Since $K=\bigcap\left\{K_{s}: K_{s} \neq \varnothing\right\}$ and each $K_{s}$ is nonempty weak* compact, we have $K \neq \varnothing$.

Corollary 4. Let $C$ be a weak* closed convex subset of $l_{1}$ and $D$ a nonempty bounded subset of $C$. Then the Chebyshev center of $D$ w.r.t. $C$ is nonempty compact convex. In particular, for any two points $x$ and $y$, the set $\left\{z \in l_{1}:\|z-x\|=\|z-y\|=1 / 2\|x-y\|\right\}$ is compact.

Proof. If we let $B_{\alpha}=D$ for every $\alpha \in \Lambda$, the asymptotic center of $\left\{B_{\alpha}: \alpha \in A\right\}$ is the same as the Chebyshev center of $D$.

We conclude this section by giving an application of Theorem 3. Let $K$ be a set and $S$ a semigroup of selfmaps of $K . S$ is said to be a topological semigroup if $S$ is equipped with a Hausdorff topology such that for each $a \in S$, the two mappings from $S$ into $S$ defined by $s \rightarrow a s$ and $s \rightarrow s a$ for all $s \in S$, are continuous. $S$ is said to be left reversible if any two nonempty closed right ideals of $S$ have nonempty intersection (cf. [5, p.34]). If $K$ is a topological space and $S$ a left reversible topological semigroup of selfmappings of $K$ suce that the mapping $(s, x) \rightarrow s(x)$ is separately continuous, then $S$ becomes a directed set if we define $a \geqq b$ if and only if $a S \subseteq \operatorname{cl}(b S)$. Moreover, if for a fixed element $u \in K$, we define $W_{s}=$ $\operatorname{cl}(s S(u))$ ) for all $s \in S$, then the family $\left\{W_{s}: s \in S\right\}$ is a decreasing net of subsets of $K$ (see [8]).

Theorem 4. Let $C$ be a weak* closed convex nonempty subset of $l_{1}$ and $S$ a left reversible topological semigroup of nonexpansive selfmappings of $C$ such that the mapping $(s, x) \rightarrow s(x)$ is separately continuous. If for some $x \in C, s \in S, s S(x)$ is bounded, then $S$ has a common fixed point in $C$.

Proof. Let $W_{s}$ be defined as in the last paragraph. By Theorem 2 in [12], the asymptotic center $K$ of $\left\{W_{s}: s \in S\right\}$ is a $S$-invariant subset of $C$. By Theorem 4, $K$ is a nonempty compact convev set. Since a compact convex set has normal structure, by Theorem 3 in [12] or Corollary 1 in [8], $S$ has a common fixed point in $K$.
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