

A topological proof of Terao's generalized Arrow's Impossibility Theorem

Takuma Okura

August 27, 2024

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Original Arrow's Impossibility Theorem	3
3	Formulation by Terao	4
4	Nerve Theorem	7
5	Simplicial complex based on Manabe	8
6	Simplidial complex based on Baryshnikov	9
7	Relation between $M_m(\mathcal{A})$ and $B_m(\mathcal{A})$	11
8	Topological proof of Terao's extended Arrow's impossibility theorem	11
8.1	A commutative diagram	11
8.2	the (★) part in Figure 1, 2 (the first nerve theorem)	15
8.3	the (♠) part of Figure 1, 2 (the second nerve theorem)	15
8.4	the (♣) part of Figure 1, 2	16
9	Appendix	19

Abstract

In Terao [24], Hiroaki Terao defined and studied “admissible map”, which is a generalization of “social welfare function” in the context of hyperplane arrangements. Using this, he proved a generalized Arrow's

Impossibility Theorem using combinatorial arguments. This paper provides another proof of this generalized Arrow's Impossibility Theorem, using the idea of algebraic topology.

1 Introduction

In the mid-20th century, Kenneth Joseph Arrow defined “social welfare function” to discuss the mechanism for determining the preference of an entire society based on individual preferences. He proved that there is no social welfare function satisfying certain conditions. This theorem is known as Arrow's impossibility theorem.¹ (Arrow [1], [2]) While his approach was combinatorial, Graciela Chichilnisky introduced a topological point of view to social choice theory. (Chichilnisky [6]~[11]) Her approach was topological in the formulation of the problem, making it distinct from the traditional formulation of Arrow. In (Baryshnikov [3]), Yuliy Baryshnikov opened up a new possibility of using geometry solely in the method of proof, while keeping the content of the traditional Arrow's impossibility theorem unchanged. Following this, some topological proofs of Arrow's Impossibility theorem are considered. (Manabe [16], Rajsbaum, Raventós [18], Tanaka [20], [21], [23])

On the other hand, in Terao [24], Terao Hiroaki presented a new theorem (hereafter referred to as the “main theorem” in this paper) which properly contains the original Arrow's impossibility theorem. He achieved this by using tools of hyperplane arrangements.² However, his proof method was combinatorial. The question of this paper is whether the topological method can be applied to prove Terao's generalized Arrow impossibility theorem. In this paper, we show the answer is “Yes” by giving a new topological proof of Terao's theorem (chapter 8).

The geometric proof consists of two parts. First, I constructed simplicial complexes and simplicial maps from combinatorial objects and focused on their homological properties, based on Manabe [16] and Baryshnikov [3]. Following Baryshnikov [3], I used nerve and nerve theorem to this end. Second, following Manabe [16], I showed the existence of a dictator using metric. In Manabe [16], he used a combinatorial argument to reduce Arrow's impossibility theorem to the case of three alternatives. However, this paper does

¹Until now, there have been many works related to Arrow's impossibility theorem. Among them, Eliaz's one (Eliaz [12]) and works by Gibbert and Satterthwaite (Gibbert [14], Satterthwaite [19]) are also approached by topological method (Baryshnikov, Root [4], Fujimoto [13], Tanaka [22])

²As another generalization of Arrow's impossibility theorem, the following preprint was recently published. (Lara, Rajsbaum, Raventós [15]) It provides a generalization in the context of domain restriction.

not employ such a reduction. I give a proof that is valid in the general case. In Baryshnikov [3], he overcame the second step by handling concrete cycles in the homology group. While it may be possible to extend this method to Terao's framework, that is not attempted in this study.

2 Original Arrow's Impossibility Theorem

Arrow's impossibility theorem is a theorem that states no voting system satisfies certain conditions. In this context, the voting system is formulated as a *social welfare function* defined as follows. Let us think of a society that consists of m people. Suppose each individual has *preferences*, that is linear ordering, over the elements of a certain finite set A . When we denote the set of all total orders on A as L_A , the *social welfare function* is defined as a map from L_A^m to L_A . However, when considering all possible functions, democracy is not reflected at all. Therefore, it is meaningful to impose some constraints. He imposed the following three conditions for social welfare function to be reasonable.

The first one is the following.

Definition 2.1 (Independence of Irrelevant Alternatives(IIA)). Let A be an arbitrary finite set and m, l be natural numbers. We denote the set of all total orders on A as L_A . We say a map $f: L_A^m \rightarrow L_A^l$ satisfies *Independence of Irrelevant Alternatives (IIA)* when for all distinct two elements a, b in A , there exists a map $\phi_{\{a,b\}}: L_{\{a,b\}}^m \rightarrow L_{\{a,b\}}^l$ which makes the following diagram commutative. Here, $\epsilon_{\{a,b\}}: L_A \rightarrow L_{\{a,b\}}$ denotes a map that restricts relations on A to that on subset $\{a, b\}$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 L_A^n & \xrightarrow{f} & L_A^n \\
 \epsilon_{\{a,b\}}^m \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \epsilon_{\{a,b\}}^l \\
 L_{\{a,b\}}^m & \xrightarrow{\phi_{\{a,b\}}} & L_{\{a,b\}}^l
 \end{array}$$

This condition states that the ranking of a and b in the preferences of the entire society is determined only by the information on the ranking of a and b in the preferences of each individual.

The second condition is the *Pareto Property (PAR)*.

Definition 2.2 (Pareto Property (PAR)). Let A be an arbitrary finite set and m be a natural number. We denote the set of all total orders on A as L_A . We say a map $f: L_A^m \rightarrow L_A$ satisfies *Pareto Property (PAR)* when $f \circ \Delta = id$. Here, $\Delta: L_A \rightarrow L_A^m$ is the diagonal map.

This condition states that when all members of the society have the same preference p_0 , the preference of the society should also be p_0 .

The last condition is *Nondictatorship (ND)*

Definition 2.3 (Dictator, Nondictatorship (ND)). Let A be an arbitrary finite set and m be a natural number. We denote the set of all total orders on A as L_A . For a map $f: L_A^n \rightarrow L_A$, i ($1 \leq i \leq n$) is said to be a *dictator* when f coincides with the projection onto the i -th component. We say a map $f: L_A^n \rightarrow L_A$ satisfies *Nondictatorship (ND)* if there is no dictator for f .

This condition excludes social welfare functions that always follow the opinion of a particular individual.

Surprisingly, Arrow's impossibility theorem states that there is no social welfare function that satisfies these three conditions.

Proposition 2.1 (Arrow's impossibility theorem). *Let A be a finite set which satisfies $|A| \geq 3$. Let m be natural numbers. We denote the set of all total orders on A as L_A . A map $f: L_A^n \rightarrow L_A$ which satisfies IIA and PAR is a projection onto a certain component.*

3 Formulation by Terao

In this section, we state Terao's extended Arrow's impossibility theorem based on Terao [24].

First, we review basic concepts that concern *hyperplane arrangement*.

Definition 3.1 (hyperplane arrangement). Let V be a vector space. Finite set of affine subspace of V is said to be *hyperplane arrangement* in V .

Example (Boolean Arrangement). Let n be a natural number.

$\mathcal{A} = \{\ker x_1, \ker x_2, \dots, \ker x_n\}$ defines a hyperplane arrangement in \mathbb{R}^n . This is called *Boolean Arrangement*.

Example (Braid Arrangement). Let n be a natural number. $\mathcal{A} = \{\ker(x_i - x_j) \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n, i, j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ defines a hyperplane arrangement in \mathbb{R}^n . This is called *Braid Arrangement*.

Definition 3.2 (subarrangement). Let \mathcal{A} be a hyperplane arrangement in a vector space V . A subset \mathcal{B} of \mathcal{A} is also a hyperplane arrangement in V . So, we say \mathcal{B} is a *subarrangement* of \mathcal{A} .

Definition 3.3 (central). A hyperplane arrangement \mathcal{A} is said to be *central* if all of its element contains origin.

Definition 3.4 (chamber, $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$). Let \mathcal{A} be a hyperplane arrangement in V . A connected component of $V - \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{A}} H$ is said to be a *chamber* of \mathcal{A} . A set of all chambers of \mathcal{A} is denoted by $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$.

Definition 3.5 (rank, $r(\mathcal{A})$). Let \mathcal{A} be a central hyperplane arrangement in V . $\dim V - \dim(\bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{A}} H)$ is said to be *rank* of \mathcal{A} and denoted by $r(\mathcal{A})$.

Definition 3.6 (decomposable, indecomposable). Let \mathcal{A} be a central hyperplane arrangement in V . \mathcal{A} is said to be *decomposable* when there are nonempty subarrangements $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ ($n \geq 2$) such that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{A}_2 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \mathcal{A}_n$ and $r(\mathcal{A}) = r(\mathcal{A}_1) + r(\mathcal{A}_2) + \dots + r(\mathcal{A}_n)$. We denote this as $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \uplus \mathcal{A}_2 \uplus \dots \uplus \mathcal{A}_n$. We say \mathcal{A} is *indecomposable* if \mathcal{A} is not decomposable.

Fact 3.1 (Terao [24], Lemma 2.1. and Proposition 2.3.). *Let \mathcal{A} be a central hyperplane arrangement in V . Up to order, there is a unique decomposition $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \uplus \mathcal{A}_2 \uplus \dots \uplus \mathcal{A}_n$ such that each $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ is indecomposable. This decomposition coincides with the decomposition of the graph $\Gamma(\mathcal{A})$ (definition 3.9) into connected components.*

Example (Boolean Arrangement is decomposable). Let n be a natural number such that $n \geq 2$. Let \mathcal{A} be Boolean Arrangement in \mathbb{R}^n . If we set $\mathcal{A}_1 = \{\ker x_1\}$ and $\mathcal{A}_2 = \{\ker x_2, \dots, \ker x_n\}$, then $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \uplus \mathcal{A}_2$. Therefore \mathcal{A} is decomposable.

Definition 3.7 (dependent, independent). Let \mathcal{A} be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V . We say subarrangement \mathcal{B} is *dependent* when $r(\mathcal{B}) < |\mathcal{B}|$. We say \mathcal{B} is *independent* when it is not dependent.

Definition 3.8 (circuit). Let \mathcal{A} be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V . We say subarrangement \mathcal{B} is a *circuit* if it is minimal in the set of dependent subarrangements.

Definition 3.9 (graph $\Gamma(\mathcal{A})$). Let \mathcal{A} be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V . We can construct a graph $\Gamma(\mathcal{A})$ in the following way. The vertex set is $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$. We connect H_i and H_j with an edge if and only if there is a circuit that contains H_i and H_j .

Proposition 3.1 (criterion for decomposability, Terao [24] Lemma 2.1.). *Let \mathcal{A} be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V . \mathcal{A} is indecomposable if and only if $\Gamma(\mathcal{A})$ is connected.*

Proof. Terao [24] Lemma 2.1. □

Example (Braid Arrangement is indecomposable). Let n be a natural number such that $n \geq 3$. Let \mathcal{A} be Braid Arrangement in \mathbb{R}^n . $\Gamma(\mathcal{A})$ is connected because each subarrangement \mathcal{B} such that $|\mathcal{B}| = 3$ is a circuit. Therefore, Braid Arrangement is indecomposable.

remark. From now on, unless otherwise stated, the coefficient field of vector space is real, and hyperplane arrangement is always central.

Terao [24] successfully formulated Arrow's impossibility theorem by introducing the concept of *admissible map*. In this paper, we divide the definition into two parts (IIA and PAR) to make it easier to understand the correspondence with Arrow's classical impossibility theorem.

First, we define a notation for certain maps in order to state the definition of IIA.

Definition 3.10 (map ϵ_H). Let \mathcal{A} be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V . Let n be a natural number. For arbitrary element H in \mathcal{A} , we define a map $\epsilon_H: \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Ch}(\{H\})$ as follows. For an element c in $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$, $\epsilon_H(c)$ is an element of $\mathbf{Ch}(\{H\})$ which contains c .

Definition 3.11 (IIA (in hyperplane arrangement setting)). Let \mathcal{A} be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V . Let m, l be natural numbers. A map $\Phi: \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^m \rightarrow \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^l$ is said to satisfy *IIA* when for each H there exists a map ϕ_H which makes the following diagram commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^m & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^l \\ (\epsilon_H)^m \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow (\epsilon_H)^l \\ \mathbf{Ch}(\{H\})^m & \xrightarrow{\phi_H} & \mathbf{Ch}(\{H\})^l \end{array}$$

Definition 3.12 (PAR (in hyperplane arrangement setting)). Let \mathcal{A} be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V . Let m be natural numbers. We say a map $\Phi: \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^m \rightarrow \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ satisfies *PAR* when for every chamber c of \mathcal{A} , $\Phi(c, c, \dots, c) = c$ holds.

Definition 3.13 (admissible map, Terao [24] Definition 1.1.). Let \mathcal{A} be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V . Let m be natural numbers. A map $\Phi: \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^m \rightarrow \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ is said to be *admissible* if Φ satisfies IIA and PAR(in in hyperplane arrangement setting)

Based on the above definitions, Terao's extended Arrow's impossibility theorem can be stated as follows. The original Arrow's impossibility theorem corresponds to the case where \mathcal{A} is a Braid Arrangement. ³

Theorem 3.1 (Terao's extended Arrow's impossibility theorem, Terao [24] Theorem 1.5. (2)). *Let \mathcal{A} be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V . Let m be natural numbers. if $|\mathcal{A}| \geq 3$, then every admissible map $\Phi : \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^m \rightarrow \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ is a projection onto a component.*

The purpose of this paper is to give a topological proof of this theorem.

4 Nerve Theorem

In this section, we introduce a theorem (Proposition 4.1) from Bauer, Kerber, Roll, and Rolle [5]. This theorem will be used in the proof in section 8 of this paper.

Definition 4.1 (category \mathbf{ClConv}^*). We define a category \mathbf{ClConv}^* as follows.

Object : $(X, \{C_i\}_{i=1}^k, \{b_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_r}\})$

Here, X is a subset of Euclidean space of arbitrary dimension n , and k is a natural number. $\{C_i\}_{i=1}^k$ is a closed convex finite covering of $\{C_i\}_{i=1}^k$ in \mathbb{R}^n (so we have $\bigcup_{i=1}^k C_i = X$ in \mathbb{R}^n). Furthermore $\{b_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_r}\}$ denotes a point in $\bigcap_{j=1}^r C_{i_j}$ chosen for each subset $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_r\} \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ such that $\bigcap_{j=1}^r C_{i_j} \neq \emptyset$.

Morphism : Morphism from $(X, \{C_i\}_{i=1}^k, \{b_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_r}\})$ to $(Y, \{D_j\}_{j=1}^l, \{c_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_s}\})$ is a pair (f, ϕ) . Here, f is a continuous map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ which is affine on each $\{C_i\}$, and ϕ is a index map $\phi: \{1, 2, \dots, k\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, l\}$ which satisfies $f(C_i) \subset D_{\phi(i)}$, $f(b_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_r}) = c_{\phi(i_1) \phi(i_2) \dots \phi(i_r)}$.

The composition of morphisms and other structures are naturally defined, forming a category.

Definition 4.2 (Forgetful Functor \mathbf{Forget}). We can define a functor $\mathbf{Forget} : \mathbf{ClConv}^* \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$ as follows.

$\mathbf{Forget}((X, \{C_i\}_{i=1}^k, \{b_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_r}\})) = X$.

$\mathbf{Forget}((f, \phi)) = f$.

Definition 4.3 (Functor \mathbf{SdNrv}). We can define a functor $\mathbf{SdNrv} : \mathbf{ClConv}^* \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$ as follows.

³More precisely, Terao has classified admissible arrangements, including this theorem as a result. For specific details, please refer to reference Terao [24].

$$\mathbf{SdNrv}((X, \{C_i\}_{i=1}^k, \{b_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_r}\})) = |\mathbf{SdNrv}(\{C_i\}_{i=1}^k)|.$$

$$\mathbf{SdNrv}((f, \phi)) = |\mathbf{Sd}(\phi_*)|.$$

Here, $\phi_*: \mathbf{Nrv}(\{C_i\}_{i=1}^k) \rightarrow \mathbf{Nrv}(\{D_j\}_{j=1}^l)$ is a map which is induced from ϕ , and $\mathbf{Sd}(\phi_*)$ is a map induced from ϕ_* between barycentric subdivisions. And, $|\mathbf{Sd}(\phi_*)|$ is a map induced from $\mathbf{Sd}(\phi_*)$ between geometric realizations.

Definition 4.4 (Natural transformation Γ). We can define a natural transformation Γ from \mathbf{SdNrv} to \mathbf{Forget} as follows. For an object $(X, \{C_i\}_{i=1}^k, \{b_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_r}\})$ in \mathbf{ClConv}^* , we associate a map from $|\mathbf{SdNrv}(\{C_i\}_{i=1}^k)|$ to X by mapping vertex $\{C_{i_1}, C_{i_2}, \dots, C_{i_r}\}$ in $|\mathbf{SdNrv}(\{C_i\}_{i=1}^k)|$ to $\{b_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_r}\}$ and extending affinely.

Proposition 4.1 (Γ is object-wise homotopy equivalence, Bauer, Kerber, Roll, Rolle [5] Theorem 3.1.). *Every morphism in \mathbf{Top} induced from the natural transformation defined above is homotopy equivalence.*

Proof. Bauer, Kerber, Roll, Rolle [5] Theorem 3.1. □

5 Simplicial complex based on Manabe

In this section, we construct a simplicial complex $M_m(\mathcal{A})$ from a given hyperplane arrangement \mathcal{A} and a natural number m (Definition 5.2). This is inspired by the simplicial complex K described in Manabe [16].

Definition 5.1 (separate). Let \mathcal{A} be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V .

Let m be a natural number.

For an element H in \mathcal{A} and a subset $T \subseteq \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^m$, we say $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ *separate* T when $|(\epsilon_H)^m(T)| \geq 2$.

Definition 5.2 ($M_m(\mathcal{A})$). Let \mathcal{A} be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V .

Let m be a natural number.

We construct a simplicial complex $M_m(\mathcal{A})$ as follows.

Vertex set : $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^m$

The condition for a simplex : Subset $T \subseteq M_m(\mathcal{A})$ is an element of $M_m(\mathcal{A})$ if and only if there is at least one element of \mathcal{A} which does not separate T . Since this condition is preserved by the operation of taking subsets, a face of a simplex is still a simplex. Therefore this satisfies the axioms of an abstract simplicial complex.

Proposition 5.1 (IIA map induces a map between simplicial complex). *Let \mathcal{A} be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V .*

Let m, l be a natural number.

If $f: \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^m \rightarrow \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^l$ satisfies IIA, f induces a simplicial map $\tilde{f}^M: M_m(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_l(\mathcal{A})$.

Proof. This is clear from definition. □

6 Simplicial complex based on Baryshnikov

In this section we construct a simplicial complex $B_m(\mathcal{A})$ from a given hyperplane arrangement \mathcal{A} and a natural number m (Definition 6.3). This is a complete generalization of simplicial complexes N_W and N_P in Baryshnikov [3].

Definition 6.1 ($\mathfrak{U}_{\mathcal{A},m}, U_{\mathcal{A},m}$). Let \mathcal{A} be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V .

Let m be a natural number.

We define $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathcal{A},m}$ as $\{c_1 \times c_2 \times \cdots \times c_m \subset V^m \mid c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m \in \mathbf{Ch}(\{H\}), H \in \mathcal{A}\}$ and define U_m as the union of all elements of $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathcal{A},m}$. U_m is an open subset of V^m .

Definition 6.2 ($\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},m}, A_{\mathcal{A},m}$).⁴ Let \mathcal{A} be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V .

For each element H of \mathcal{A} , we fix an element α_H of V^* which satisfies $\ker(\alpha_H) = H$. Let m be a natural number.

We define $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},m}$ as $\{a_1 \times a_2 \times \cdots \times a_m \subset V^m \mid a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m \in \mathbf{A}(\{H\}), H \in \mathcal{A}\}$ and define A_m as the union of all elements of $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},m}$. Here, $\mathbf{A}(\{H\}) = \{c_0 \cap \{\vec{x} \in V \mid |\alpha_H(\vec{x})| \geq 1\}, c_1 \cap \{\vec{x} \in V \mid |\alpha_H(\vec{x})| \geq 1\}\}$ (c_0 and c_1 are two chambers of $\{H\}$) A_m is a closed subset of V^m .

Definition 6.3 ($B_m(\mathcal{A})$). Let \mathcal{A} be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V .

Let m be a natural number.

Since $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathcal{A},m}$ is a covering of U_m , we can construct a simplicial complex $B_m(\mathcal{A})$ as a nerve of this covering $\text{Nrv}(\mathfrak{U}_{\mathcal{A},m}) (= \text{Nrv}(\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},m})^5)$.

⁴We introduce this concept for just a technical reason. In the proof of our main theorem, we want to use functorial Nerve theorem. We use this definition and use a ‘‘closed’’ covering to ensure the functoriality. There might be a simpler method, but considering that the technical difficulties here are not essential to the purpose of this paper, we have not explored that possibility.

⁵By definition, we can use $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},m}$ as a covering of A_m instead of $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathcal{A},m}$ in order to get $B_m(\mathcal{A})$.

Proposition 6.1 (structure of $U_{\mathcal{A},m}$). *Let \mathcal{A} be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V .*

Let m be a natural number.

We have the following.

- (1) $U_m = V^m - \bigcup_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n) \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}^n} (\pi_{i_1}^{-1}(H_1) \cap \pi_{i_2}^{-1}(H_2) \cap \dots \cap \pi_{i_n}^{-1}(H_n))$
- (2) $\text{codim}(\pi_{i_1}^{-1}(H_1) \cap \pi_{i_2}^{-1}(H_2) \cap \dots \cap \pi_{i_n}^{-1}(H_n)) \geq r(\mathcal{A})$
- (3) *The equation holds in (2) $\iff s: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ ($s(H_k) = i_k$) is constant on each connected component of $\Gamma(\mathcal{A})$.*

Proof. (1)

$$\begin{aligned}
U_m &= \bigcup_{U \in \mathfrak{U}_{\mathcal{A},m}} U \\
&= \{(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2, \dots, \vec{x}_m) \in V^m \mid \exists H \in \mathcal{A}, \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}, \vec{x}_i \notin H\} \\
&= V^m - \{(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2, \dots, \vec{x}_m) \in V^m \mid \forall H \in \mathcal{A}, \exists i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}, \vec{x}_i \in H\} \\
&= V^m - \bigcup_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n) \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}^n} (\pi_{i_1}^{-1}(H_1) \cap \pi_{i_2}^{-1}(H_2) \cap \dots \cap \pi_{i_n}^{-1}(H_n))
\end{aligned}$$

Here, $\mathcal{A} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_n\}$.

(2)(3)

We have

$$\pi_{i_1}^{-1}(H_1) \cap \pi_{i_2}^{-1}(H_2) \cap \dots \cap \pi_{i_n}^{-1}(H_n) = \bigcap_{j=1}^m \pi_j^{-1} \left(\bigcap_{H \in s^{-1}(j)} H \right)$$

(If $s^{-1}(j) = \emptyset$, we assume $\bigcap_{H \in s^{-1}(j)} H = V$)

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{codim}_{V^m} \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^m \pi_j^{-1} \left(\bigcap_{H \in s^{-1}(j)} H \right) \right) &= \sum_{j=1}^m \text{codim}_V \left(\bigcap_{H \in s^{-1}(j)} H \right) \\
&\geq \text{codim}_V \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^m \bigcap_{H \in s^{-1}(j)} H \right) \\
&= r(\mathcal{A})
\end{aligned}$$

This equality holds if and only if $\mathcal{A} = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^m s^{-1}(j)$. This is equivalent to the condition that $s: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ ($s(H_k) = i_k$) is constant on each connected component of $\Gamma(\mathcal{A})$. □

7 Relation between $M_m(\mathcal{A})$ and $B_m(\mathcal{A})$

Definition 7.1 (dual of simplicial complex). Let K be a simplicial complex such that the union of all simplices with maximum dimension is K . In other words, the set of all simplices with maximum dimension becomes a covering of K . In this case, we define the *dual* of K , K^* as the nerve of this covering.

Proposition 7.1 ($M_m(\mathcal{A})$ can be identified with the dual of $B_m(\mathcal{A})$). *Let \mathcal{A} be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V . Let m be a natural number. $B_m(\mathcal{A})$ is a simplicial complex such that the set of all simplices with maximum dimension becomes its covering. We have a natural one-to-one correspondence of elements between $B_m(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^m$, and we can think of $M_m(\mathcal{A})$ as the dual of $B_m(\mathcal{A})$.*

Proof. This is clear from definition. □

8 Topological proof of Terao's extended Arrow's impossibility theorem

Let $\mathcal{A} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_n\}$ be a central hyperplane arrangement in a real vector space V , and let $n = |\mathcal{A}| \geq 3$. Since we use $A_{\mathcal{A}, m}$ in the following discussion, we fix an element of V^* for each element H in \mathcal{A} . Let m be a natural number, and $\Phi: \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^m \rightarrow \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ be an admissible map. We want to show that Φ is a projection map onto a certain component.

First, we relate $M_m(\mathcal{A})$ and $B_m(\mathcal{A})$ to the sphere in a topological point of view. We use the nerve theorem for that purpose. The first key step is to prove Proposition 8.1. This part is heavily informed by Baryshnikov [3].

8.1 A commutative diagram

We can construct the following two commutative diagrams (Figure 1, 2) for $\vec{c} = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{m-1}) \in \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^{m-1}$. These commutative diagrams are largely the same, except for the mappings indicated by the dotted lines.

These diagrams relate simplicial complexes $M_\bullet(\mathcal{A})$ and $B_\bullet(\mathcal{A})$ which are constructed from combinatorial information of Arrow's impossibility theorem

to spheres functorially in a topological point of view. In this sense, this diagram plays the role of a bridge between combinatorics and topology.




Figure 1: a commutative diagram




Figure 2: a commutative diagram

We explain some notations in Figure 1, 2.

- $\rho_{i,\bar{c}}$ and Δ are maps defined as follows.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \rho_{i,\bar{c}}: \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^m \\
 \cup & & \cup \\
 c & \longmapsto & (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{i-1}, c, c_i, \dots, c_{m-1}) \\
 \\
 \Delta: \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^m \\
 \cup & & \cup \\
 c & \longmapsto & (c, c, \dots, c)
 \end{array}$$

Since it is clear from definition that $\rho_{i,\vec{c}}$ and Δ satisfy IIA, each of them is uniquely extended to a simplicial map from $|M_1(\mathcal{A})|$ to $|M_m(\mathcal{A})|$. We denote them as $\widetilde{\rho}_{i,\vec{c}}^M$ and $\widetilde{\Delta}^M$.

Similarly Φ can be uniquely extended to a simplicial map from $|M_1(\mathcal{A})|$ to $|M_m(\mathcal{A})|$. We denote it as $\widetilde{\Phi}^M$.

- $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathcal{A},k}$ is the set of maximum dimensional simplicies of $B_k(\mathcal{A})$.
- We define simplicial maps $\widetilde{\rho}_{i,\vec{c}}^M$ and $\widetilde{\Delta}^M$ as follows.
As defined earlier, $B_1(\mathcal{A})$ is the nerve of $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},1}$ (a covering of A_1), and $B_m(\mathcal{A})$ is the nerve of $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},m}$ (a covering of A_m).
Let a be an element of $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},1}$. We denote a map which sends a to $a_1 \times a_2 \times \cdots \times a_{i-1} \times a \times a_i \times \cdots \times a_{m-1}$ as $\rho''_{i,\vec{c}}: \mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},1} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},m}$. Here, each $a_k (1 \leq k)$ is a unique element of $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},1}$ which is contained in $\epsilon_H(c_k)$. Here, $c_k (1 \leq k)$ are chambers of \mathcal{A} fixed above in order to create this diagram. Furthermore, $\Delta'': \mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},1} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},m}$ is a map which sends c to $c \times c \times \cdots \times c$.
Since for some elements of $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},1}$, d_1, \dots, d_k , both $\rho''_{i,\vec{c}}$ and Δ'' satisfy $\bigcap_{i=1}^k d_i \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \bigcap_{i=1}^k \rho''_{i,\vec{c}}(d_i) \neq \emptyset$, $\bigcap_{i=1}^k d_i \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \bigcap_{i=1}^k \Delta''(d_i) \neq \emptyset$, each of them can be uniquely extended to a simplicial map from $|B_1(\mathcal{A})|$ to $|B_m(\mathcal{A})|$. We denote them as $\widetilde{\rho}_{i,\vec{c}}^B$ and $\widetilde{\Delta}^B$.
- $\rho'_{i,\vec{c}}$ and Δ' are maps from $\{|\sigma|\}_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathcal{A},1}}$ to $\{|\sigma|\}_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathcal{A},m}}$ induced from $\widetilde{\rho}_{i,\vec{c}}^B$ and $\widetilde{\Delta}^B$.
- $|\cdot|$ represents geometric realization of abstract simplicial complex.
- Let \mathfrak{U} be some covering. $\text{Nrv}(\mathfrak{U})$ is the nerve of \mathfrak{U} . This is an abstract simplicial complex whose vertex set is \mathfrak{U} . $\text{SdNrv}(\mathfrak{U})$ is the barycentric subdivision of $\text{Nrv}(\mathfrak{U})$. This is an abstract simplicial complex whose vertex is simplex of $\text{Nrv}(\mathfrak{U})$ and whose simplex is ascending chain of simplexes of $\text{Nrv}(\mathfrak{U})$. When we have a map between covering $f: \mathfrak{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{V}$. $\text{Nrv}(f): |\text{Nrv}(\mathfrak{U})| \rightarrow |\text{Nrv}(\mathfrak{V})|$ is the affine expansion of f . We can also induce $\text{SdNrv}(f): |\text{SdNrv}(\mathfrak{U})| \rightarrow |\text{SdNrv}(\mathfrak{V})|$ from f .
- \vec{b} is introduced in subsection 8.3
- $\pi: \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow (\bigcap_{i=1}^n H_i)^\perp$ is the orthogonal projection, and r is a deformation retract $r(x) = x/|x|$.
- Each Γ in the diagram above denotes a map that is induced from the natural transformation Γ (Proposition 4.1)

8.2 the (★) part in Figure 1, 2 (the first nerve theorem)

Let us consider $(|B_1(\mathcal{A})|, \mathfrak{B}_{\mathcal{A},1}, \{b_\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathcal{A},1}})$ and $(|B_m(\mathcal{A})|, \mathfrak{B}_{\mathcal{A},m}, \{b_\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathcal{A},m}})$, objects in category \mathbf{CIConv}^* , and morphisms $(\widetilde{\rho}_{i,\vec{c}}, \rho'_{i,\vec{c}})$ and $(\widetilde{\Delta}, \Delta')$

between them. Here, b_σ denotes the barycenter of σ .

It is clear that $(|B_1(\mathcal{A})|, \mathfrak{B}_{\mathcal{A},1}, \{b_\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathcal{A},1}})$ and $(|B_m(\mathcal{A})|, \mathfrak{B}_{\mathcal{A},m}, \{b_\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathcal{A},m}})$ are actually determine objects in category \mathbf{CIConv}^* , and that $(\widetilde{\rho}_{i,\vec{c}}, \rho'_{i,\vec{c}})$ and $(\widetilde{\Delta}, \Delta')$ are actually morphisms between them.

The commutativity of the diagram is evident for the middle and right squares and similarly follows easily for the leftmost square from the definition of the mappings and the manner of identification. The mappings induced by the two Γ s in the (★) part are both homotopy equivalent maps by the nerve theorem (Proposition 4.1).

8.3 the (♠) part of Figure 1, 2 (the second nerve theorem)

First, we fix a set of base points of $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},1}$. We denote this as B . Next, for $c \in \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$, a set of base points B_c for $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},1}$ is defined as follows. If $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},1} (\bigcap_{i=1}^k A_i \neq \emptyset)$ satisfies $c \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^k A_i \neq \emptyset$, then the base point for $\{A_1, \dots, A_k\}$ is defined as \vec{b}_c , where \vec{b}_c is the base point of $A_{H,c}$ in B . Here, $A_{H,c} = \{A \in \mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},1} | A \cap c \neq \emptyset\}$. For $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},1} (\bigcap_{i=1}^k A_i \neq \emptyset)$ which do not satisfy the above condition, the base point of $\{A_1, \dots, A_k\}$ in B_c is defined to be the same as that in B .

Generally, it should be noted that from the sets of base points B_1, \dots, B_m for the covering $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},1}$ of $A_{\mathcal{A},1}$, a set of base point $B_1 \times \dots \times B_m$ for the covering $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},m}$ of $A_{\mathcal{A},m}$ is induced naturally.

Let us consider objects $(A_{\mathcal{A},1}, \mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},1}, B_c)$, $(A_{\mathcal{A},m}, \mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},m}, B_{c_1} \times B_{c_2} \times \dots \times B_{c_{m-1}} \times B_c \times B_{c_i} \times \dots \times B_{c_{m-1}})$, and a morphism $(\rho_{i,\vec{b}}, \rho''_{i,\vec{c}})$ between them in category \mathbf{CIConv}^* . Furthermore, let us also consider objects $(A_{\mathcal{A},1}, \mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},1}, B_c)$, $(A_{\mathcal{A},m}, \mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{A},m}, B_c \times \dots \times B_c)$, and a morphism (Δ, Δ'') between them in the same category \mathbf{CIConv}^* .

Here, we define \vec{b} as $\vec{b} = (b_{c_1}, b_{c_2}, \dots, b_{c_{m-1}}) \in \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^{m-1}$, and $\rho_{i,\vec{b}}$ as $\rho_{i,\vec{b}}(\vec{x}) = (b_{c_1}, b_{c_2}, \dots, b_{c_{i-1}}, \vec{x}, b_{c_i}, \dots, b_{c_{m-1}})$. Δ is the diagonal map. The choice of base points ensures that these objects and morphisms are actually objects and morphisms of \mathbf{CIConv}^* . The commutativity of the diagram is directly follows from definitions and naturality. By the nerve theorem (Proposition 4.1), the maps induced by the four Γ s in the (★) part are all

homotopy equivalence. (Note that the Γ s defined in Definition 4.4 are homotopic to each other even when the base points are changed. This property plays a significant role when deducing Proposition 8.1)

8.4 the (\clubsuit) part of Figure 1, 2

Lemma 8.1 (the leftmost two inclusions are homotopy equivalences). *In (\clubsuit) part of the Figure 1 and 2, the leftmost two inclusions are homotopy equivalences*

Proof. see section 9. □

Lemma 8.2 (two inclusion maps (\heartsuit) induce isomorphisms on the homology groups of degree $r(\mathcal{A}) - 1$ or lower.).

Proof. This follows from Proposition 6.1. □

This follows purely from algebraic topology.

Fact 8.1 (a proposition concerning sphere). *Let n, m be natural numbers such that $n, m \geq 2$. Let i be a natural number such that $1 \leq i \leq m$. Let $\vec{x} = (\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2, \dots, \vec{x}_{m-1})$ be arbitrary points of $(S^n)^{m-1}$. We define $\rho_{i, \vec{x}} : S^n \rightarrow (S^n)^m$ as follows.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \rho_{i, \vec{x}}: S^n & \longrightarrow & (S^n)^m \\ \cup & & \cup \\ p & \longmapsto & ((\vec{x}_i)_1, (\vec{x}_i)_2, \dots, (\vec{x}_i)_{i-1}, p, (\vec{x}_i)_{i+1}, \dots, (\vec{x}_i)_{m-1}) \end{array}$$

Let $\Delta : S^n \rightarrow (S^n)^m$ be a diagonal map. In this case, we have the following relationship between maps induced on n dimensional homology groups.

$$\sum_{i=1}^m (\rho_{i, \vec{x}})_* = \Delta_*$$

From now on, we fix an element of $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$, c_0 . We set $\vec{c}_0 = (c_0, c_0, \dots, c_0)$.

From the Fact 8.1 and the Figure 1 and 2, we have the following.

Proposition 8.1. *Let $\mathcal{A} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_n\}$ be a real central indecomposable hyperplane arrangement in V such that $n = |\mathcal{A}| \geq 3$. Let m be a natural number. Let $\Phi : \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^m \rightarrow \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ be an admissible map. In this case, we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \left(\widetilde{\Phi \circ \rho_{i, \vec{c}_0}}^M \right)_* = \text{id}$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^m \left(\widetilde{\Phi \circ \rho_{i, \vec{c}_0}}^M \right)_* &= \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\widetilde{\tilde{\Phi}^M \circ \rho_{i, \vec{c}_0}}^M \right)_* \\
&= \left(\widetilde{\tilde{\Phi}^M} \right)_* \circ \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\widetilde{\rho_{i, \vec{c}_0}}^M \right)_* \\
&= \left(\widetilde{\tilde{\Phi}^M} \right)_* \circ \left(\widetilde{\tilde{\Delta}^M} \right)_* \\
&= \left(\widetilde{\tilde{\Phi}^M \circ \tilde{\Delta}^M} \right)_* \\
&= \left(\widetilde{\Phi \circ \Delta}^M \right)_* \\
&= \left(\widetilde{\text{id}}^M \right)_* \\
&= \text{id}
\end{aligned}$$

□

In the following discussion, we show that i_0 of Proposition 8.1 is actually a dictator. This discussion is greatly inspired by Manabe [16].

The following lemma is an important property of IIA.

Lemma 8.3 (an important property of IIA). *Let \mathcal{A} be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V . When a map $f: \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ satisfies IIA, the following five properties are equivalent.*

- (i) f is one-to-one.
- (ii) For each element H of \mathcal{A} , ϕ_H is id or $\bar{\text{id}}$.
(Here, ϕ_H is defined in definition 3.11, and $\bar{\text{id}}$ is the map which exchanges the two elements of $\mathbf{Ch}(\{H\})$.)
- (iii) \widetilde{f}^M is not null-homotopic.
- (iv) the degree of \widetilde{f}^M is 1 or -1 .
- (v) \widetilde{f}^M is a homeomorphism.

Proof. (v) \Rightarrow (iv) \Rightarrow (iii) \Rightarrow (ii) is clear. (i) \Rightarrow (v) is also obvious. To show (ii) \Rightarrow (i), it is enough to derive the injectivity of f from (ii), and this is easy. □

Corollary 8.1. *Let us assume $g: \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ is one-to-one, satisfies IIA, and has a fixed point. In this case, g is id.*

Proof. From the above proposition, for each H , ϕ_H must be either id or $\bar{\text{id}}$. However, the condition that it has a fixed point implies that they must all be identity. \square

From Proposition 8.1, Lemma 8.3, and Corollary 8.1, the following hold.

Proposition 8.2. *Let $\mathcal{A} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_n\}$ be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V such that $n = |\mathcal{A}| \geq 3$. Let m be a natural number. Let $\Phi: \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^m \rightarrow \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ be an admissible map. In this case, there exists some $i_0 (1 \leq i_0 \leq m)$, such that $\Phi \circ \rho_{i_0, \vec{c}_0}$ is id.*

Proof. From Proposition 8.1, there exists some $i_0 (1 \leq i_0 \leq m)$ such that $\Phi \circ \rho_{i_0, \vec{c}_0}$ is not null-homotopic. In this case, from Proposition 8.1, $\Phi \circ \rho_{i_0, \vec{c}_0}$ is one-to-one. Φ and ρ_{i_0, \vec{c}_0} satisfy IIA, therefore $\Phi \circ \rho_{i_0, \vec{c}_0}$ also satisfies IIA. Furthermore, Φ satisfies PAR, and $\vec{c}_0 = (c_0, c_0, \dots, c_0)$, $\Phi \circ \rho_{i_0, \vec{c}_0}$ has c_0 as a fixed point. Therefore, from Corollary 8.1, $\Phi \circ \rho_{i_0, \vec{c}_0}$ is id. \square

Up to this point, it has been shown that for $\vec{c} \in \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^m$ where all components except the i_0 component are the same, Φ coincides with the projection onto the i_0 -th component. If this is also true for all $\vec{c} = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{m-1}) \in \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^{m-1}$, then the proof is complete.

Let us $\text{IIA}_{\text{bij}}(\mathcal{A})$ be the set of all bijections from $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ to $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ that satisfy IIA. For f in $\text{IIA}_{\text{bij}}(\mathcal{A})$, we can think of a sequence of maps $(\phi_{H_1}, \phi_{H_2}, \dots, \phi_{H_n})$. (Here, $\mathcal{A} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_n\}$). From Proposition 8.1, this sequence consists of id or $\bar{\text{id}}$. We can make $\text{IIA}_{\text{bij}}(\mathcal{A})$ into a metric space by introducing Hamming distance of the sequences above. Furthermore, for any natural number k , we can define a metric can be defined for any two elements \vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2 in $\mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^k$ by setting the metric to be the number of $H \in \mathcal{A}$ that separates $\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2\}$.

We now define the following map.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \phi: \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^{m-1} & \longrightarrow & \text{IIA}_{\text{surj}}(\mathcal{A}) \\ \cup & & \cup \\ \vec{c} & \longmapsto & \Phi \circ \rho_{i_0, \vec{c}} \end{array}$$

By the preceding discussion, the domain and codomain of this map are metric spaces, and it is easy to see that ϕ satisfies $d(\phi(\vec{c}_1), \phi(\vec{c}_2)) \leq d(\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2)$ (In other words, ϕ is a non-expanding map.)

By the basic discussion of hyperplane arrangements, the following holds.

Fact 8.2. *Let $\mathcal{A} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_n\}$ be a real central hyperplane arrangement in V such that $n = |\mathcal{A}| \geq 3$. Suppose there is no $\{H\} \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A} - \{H\}) \uplus \{H\}$ (particularly in the case that \mathcal{A} is indecomposable). In this case, for any element in $\text{IIA}_{\text{surj}}(\mathcal{A})$ except for id , the distance from id is at least 2.*

By Proposition 8.2, for any $\vec{c} = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{m-1}) \in \mathbf{Ch}(\mathcal{A})^{m-1}$, it follows that $\Phi \circ \rho_{i_0, \vec{c}}$ is id . Therefore, the main theorem (Theorem 3.1) is proven.

9 Appendix

Proposition 9.1. *Let k be a natural number. For the inclusion map, $A_{\mathcal{A}, k} \hookrightarrow U_{\mathcal{A}, k}$ there is a deformation retract $r: U_{\mathcal{A}, k} \rightarrow A_{\mathcal{A}, k}$. Especially, $A_{\mathcal{A}, k} \hookrightarrow U_{\mathcal{A}, k}$ is homotopy equivalence.*

Proof. We define a function $\rho: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows.

$$\rho(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & 1 < x \\ x & 0 < x \leq 1 \\ -x & -1 \leq x < 0 \\ 1 & x < -1 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Using this, we define a map $H: U_{\mathcal{A}, k} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow U_{\mathcal{A}, k}$ as follows.

$$H(\vec{y} = (\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2, \dots, \vec{x}_m), t) = (1 - t)\vec{y} + t \frac{1}{\left(\max_{H \in \mathcal{A}} \left(\min_{1 \leq i \leq m} (\rho(\alpha_H(\vec{x}_i)))\right)\right)} \vec{y} \quad (2)$$

This is the desired deformation retraction. □

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Mikio Furuta for his constant encouragement and advice. I also express my gratitude to the senior students in the graduate office for their helpful discussions and encouragement.

References

- [1] Kenneth J Arrow. A difficulty in the concept of social welfare. *Journal of political economy*, 58(4):328–346, 1950.

- [2] Kenneth J. Arrow. *Social Choice and Individual Values*. Yale University Press, 2012.
- [3] Y.M. Baryshnikov. Unifying impossibility theorems: A topological approach. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 14(4):404–415, 1993.
- [4] Yuliy Baryshnikov and Joseph Root. A topological proof of the gibbard–satterthwaite theorem. *Economics Letters*, 234:111447, 2024.
- [5] Ulrich Bauer, Michael Kerber, Fabian Roll, and Alexander Rolle. A unified view on the functorial nerve theorem and its variations. *Expositiones Mathematicae*, 41(4):125503, 2023.
- [6] Graciela Chichilnisky. *Manifolds of preferences and equilibria*. University of California, Berkeley, 1976.
- [7] Graciela Chichilnisky. On fixed point theorems and social choice paradoxes. *Econom. Lett.*, 3(4):347–351, 1979.
- [8] Graciela Chichilnisky. Social choice and the topology of spaces of preferences. *Adv. in Math.*, 37(2):165–176, 1980.
- [9] Graciela Chichilnisky. Social aggregation rules and continuity. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 97(2):337–352, 1982.
- [10] Graciela Chichilnisky. The topological equivalence of the Pareto condition and the existence of a dictator. *J. Math. Econom.*, 9(3):223–233, 1982.
- [11] Graciela Chichilnisky and Geoffrey Heal. Necessary and sufficient conditions for a resolution of the social choice paradox. *J. Econom. Theory*, 31(1):68–87, 1983.
- [12] Kfir Eliaz. Social aggregators. *Soc. Choice Welf.*, 22(2):317–330, 2004.
- [13] Akira Fujimoto. A topological proof of eliaz’s theorem. Master’s thesis, The University of Tokyo, 2017.
- [14] Allan Gibbard. Manipulation of voting schemes: a general result. *Econometrica*, 41:587–601, 1973.
- [15] Isaac Lara, Sergio Rajsbaum, and Armajac Raventós-Pujol. A generalization of arrow’s impossibility theorem through combinatorial topology. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06024*, 2024.

- [16] Naohiro Manabe. A topological proof of arrow's impossibility theorem—a proof using metric and degree—. Master's thesis, The University of Tokyo, 2013.
- [17] P. Orlik and H. Terao. *Arrangements of Hyperplanes*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften : a series of comprehensive studies in mathematics. Springer-Verlag, 1992.
- [18] Sergio Rajsbaum and Armajac Raventós-Pujol. A combinatorial topology approach to arrow's impossibility theorem. 2022.
- [19] Mark Allen Satterthwaite. Strategy-proofness and Arrow's conditions: Existence and correspondence theorems for voting procedures and social welfare functions. *J. Econom. Theory*, 10(2):187–217, 1975.
- [20] Yasuhito Tanaka. On the equivalence of the Arrow impossibility theorem and the Brouwer fixed point theorem. *Appl. Math. Comput.*, 172(2):1303–1314, 2006.
- [21] Yasuhito Tanaka. A topological approach to the Arrow impossibility theorem when individual preferences are weak orders. *Appl. Math. Comput.*, 174(2):961–981, 2006.
- [22] Yasuhito Tanaka. A topological proof of Eliaz's unified theorem of social choice theory. *Appl. Math. Comput.*, 176(1):83–90, 2006.
- [23] Yasuhito Tanaka. On the equivalence of the Arrow impossibility theorem and the Brouwer fixed point theorem when individual preferences are weak orders. *J. Math. Econom.*, 45(3-4):241–249, 2009.
- [24] Hiroaki Terao. Chambers of arrangements of hyperplanes and arrow's impossibility theorem. *Advances in Mathematics*, 214:366–378, 2006.