

# MICHELL TRUSS AND FROM 1-BEAM TO K-BEAM

CHENGCHENG YANG

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In classic mechanics, suppose there are forces  $\mathbf{F}_i$  applied at single points  $M_i$  denoted as

$$\mathbf{F} = \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i \delta_{M_i},$$

where  $\delta_{M_i}$  is the dirac measure at  $M_i$ . If  $\mathbf{F}$  is a system in equilibrium, namely the net force and the net torque are both equal to zero:

$$\sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i = 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i \wedge M_i = 0,$$

one can connect the system with finitely many **1-dimensional beams** as shown by Gangbo [5]:

$$\mathbf{F} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{l'} \lambda_{ij} \text{Beam}(a_i, a_j),$$

where

$$\text{Beam}(a_i, a_j) = (\delta_{a_j} - \delta_{a_i}) \frac{a_j - a_i}{|a_j - a_i|},$$

and  $(\lambda_{i,j})$  is a symmetric matrix. Here  $\lambda_{i,j}$  is the stress coefficient associated with the 1- beam  $[a_i, a_j]$ .

Now we generalize that to consider external forces which are uniformly distributed over  $(k-1)$ -simplices  $[a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]$  denoted as

$$(1) \quad \mathbf{F} = \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i \mathcal{H}_{[a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]}^{k-1},$$

---

*Date:* March 26, 2024.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 49Q20, 74B05.

*Key words and phrases.* Michell Truss, optimal design, area-minimizing currents, flat chain complex, current.

My phd advisor Dr. Robert Hardt has given me many valuable advices. I appreciate the discussion with him.

where  $\mathcal{H}_{|[a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]}^{k-1}$  is the  $(k-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  restricted to the simplex  $[a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]$ ; and  $\mathbf{F}_i$  is the (constant) force exerted on  $[a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]$ . If  $n \geq k+1$  and the same equilibrium conditions are satisfied, then we can show that  $\mathbf{F}$  can be connected with finitely many  **$k$ -dimensional beams**, which are elastic  $k$ -simplices whose elastic behaviors can be described by Cauchy stress tensors. [1] Here we generalized the techniques in Gangbo's notes using differential forms, Hodge star operator, and left interior multiplication. [5]

Furthermore, we can consider the minimization problem in higher dimensions as in the one-dimensional Michell problem [6]: Given an elastic surface  $\mathbf{S}$  made of  $(k-1)$ -beams under an equilibrated system  $\mathbf{F}$  of external forces, then we ask the following two questions:

- (i) What are the necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of an elastic body made of  $k$ -beams whose forces on the surface balance  $\mathbf{F}$  and whose surfaces consist of  $\mathbf{S}$ .
- (ii) What is an optimal design so that the total cost is a minimum?

We've solved the existence question completely; and research is still in progress for the minimal question. In particular when  $k=1$ , it involves a system of beams joining a given finite collection of pointed forces. It was first introduced by A. Michell in 1904, then used in mechanical engineering, and recently popularized in many pure mathematics works by W. Gangbo and others. [6] [5] [7] Here we are going to generalize them to higher dimensional cases. We have already found the minimal solutions in terms of the flat chain complex and vector-valued currents. Right now we want to use the Calibration theory for future directions.

## 2. RANK 1 DIAGONAL MATRICES

Let  $D$  be an  $n \times n$  diagonal matrix, then  $D$  has rank 1 if and only if  $D = \lambda e_i \otimes e_i$  for some nonzero real number  $\lambda$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Here we use the notation that given any vector  $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$ ,  $v \otimes v$  denotes the  $n \times n$  matrix whose  $(i, j)$ -entry is equal to  $v_i v_j$ .

In general, let  $A$  be an  $n \times n$  symmetric matrix, then  $A$  has rank 1 if and only if  $A = \lambda v \otimes v$  for some unit vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and some nonzero real number  $\lambda$ . We may choose an orthogonal matrix  $O$  such that  $D = O^T A O$  is diagonal. Then  $\text{rank}(A) = \text{rank}(D) = 1$ .

## 3. POLYHEDRAL $k$ -CHAINS IN $\mathbb{R}^n$

For integers  $0 \leq k \leq n$  and geometrically independent points  $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k$ , the  $k$ -simplex spanned by  $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k$  is the set (convex hull) of all

points  $x$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  such that

$$x = \sum_{i=0}^k t_i a_i, \text{ where } \sum_{i=0}^k t_i = 1, \text{ and } t_i \geq 0.$$

Since there are two orientations, we use  $[a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k]$  to denote the oriented  $k$ -simplex consisting of the simplex  $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k$  and the equivalence class of the particular ordering  $(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k)$ .

Let  $A_k$  denote the collection of all oriented  $k$ -simplices in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Then we define  $C_k$  to be the real vector space generated by  $A_k$ , mod out the subspace that is generated by elements of the form

$$\sigma + \hat{\sigma}, \text{ and } \sigma_1 + \sigma_2 - \sigma_1 \cup \sigma_2,$$

where  $\hat{\sigma}$  has the opposite orientation of  $\sigma$ . And  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  share a common  $(k-1)$ -dimensional face and their union is another  $k$ -simplex.

For  $k \geq 1$ , the boundary operator  $\partial$  is defined as usual:

$$\partial[a_0, \dots, a_k] = \sum_{i=0}^k (-1)^i [a_0, \dots, \hat{a}_i, \dots, a_k],$$

where  $\hat{a}_i$  means omitting  $a_i$ . One needs to check the well-definedness on  $C_k$ . When  $k = 1$ , suppose an oriented 1-simplex  $[a, b]$  is being subdivided by an interior point  $c$ , we orient the two new 1-simplices as  $[a, c]$  and  $[c, b]$  so that

$$\partial([a, c] + [c, b] - [a, b]) = 0.$$

In general, suppose we've have done so for  $C_{k-1}$  such that  $\partial$  is well-defined. Then given a  $k$ -simplex  $\sigma$  being subdivided into two simplices  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2$  of dimension  $k$ , there is a vertex  $w$  and a face  $s$  such that  $\sigma$  is the cone  $[w, s]$  of  $w$  over  $s$ , together with  $s$  being subdivided into two simplices of dimension  $k-1$ , calling them  $s_1, s_2$ . It follows that  $\sigma_i$  is the cone  $[w, s_i]$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Note that if  $s = [a_0, \dots, a_{k-1}]$  is an oriented simplex in  $C_{k-1}$ , the bracket  $[w, s]$  denotes the oriented simplex  $[w, a_0, \dots, a_{k-1}]$ . Then one may check

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial\sigma_1 + \partial\sigma_2 - \partial\sigma \\ &= \partial([w, s_1] + [w, s_2] - [w, s]) \\ &= (s_1 - [w, \partial s_1]) + (s_2 - [w, \partial s_2]) - (s - [w, \partial s]) \\ &= (s_1 + s_2 - s) - [w, \partial(s_1 + s_2 - s)] \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The last step is by the inductive definition. Therefore a **polyhedral  $k$ -chain** in  $C_k$  is a finite real linear combination of (possibly overlapping) oriented  $k$ -simplices. It is equivalent to a finite real linear combination

of disjoint (except on their boundaries) oriented  $k$ -simplices. Moreover, applying the boundary operator  $\partial$  to both yields the same result. Given that  $\partial^2 = 0$ , we obtain a chain of real vector spaces:

$$\{C_k, \partial\} = C_n \xrightarrow{\partial} \cdots \xrightarrow{\partial} C_0 \rightarrow 0,$$

when the ambient space is  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

Imitating the de Rham theorem, one can easily define the integral

$$\int_{\sigma} \omega = \int_{\Delta_k} \sigma^* \omega, \text{ where } \sigma : \Delta_k = [e_0, \dots, e_k] \rightarrow [a_0, \dots, a_k],$$

for any smooth differential  $k$ -form  $\omega$  and any oriented  $k$ -simplex  $\sigma = [a_0, \dots, a_k]$ . Extending by linearity, for any  $k$ -chain  $c$  one can define

$$\int_c \omega = \sum_{i=1}^m c_i \int_{\sigma_i} \omega, \text{ if } c = \sum_{i=1}^m c_i \sigma_i.$$

#### 4. STRESSED $k$ -CHAINS IN $\mathbb{R}^n$

In Solid Mechanics, the *Cauchy Stress Tensor* is a  $3 \times 3$  symmetric matrix  $A$  that tells you the force of one part of the body acting on the other. [1] More precisely, each point  $a$  of an elastic body in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  is associated with an  $A$  such that if a plane passing through  $a$  with a unit normal  $v$ , the force of the half space  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : (x - a) \cdot v < 0\}$  acting on the plane per unit area is given by  $Av$ . Here we are going to use the same definition with  $\mathbb{R}^3$  replaced by  $\mathbb{R}^n$  for any integer  $n \geq 1$ .

A (constantly) *stressed polyhedral  $k$ -simplex* is a tensor product  $A \otimes \sigma$  where  $\sigma$  is an oriented  $k$ -simplex and  $A$  is a symmetric  $n \times n$  real matrix. In the case when the nontrivial eigenspaces of  $A$  lie in the tangent space of  $\sigma$ ,  $A$  is a Cauchy stress tensor for  $\sigma$  and so we can also call  $A \otimes \sigma$  a **k-beam**. Therefore a 1-beam is a stressed spring and a  $k$ -beam is a stressed  $k$ -simplex. Furthermore a *stressed polyhedral  $k$ -chain* is a finite real linear combination of stressed polyhedral  $k$ -simplices.

**One Dimensional Example: Stressed Springs.** Suppose  $n = 2$ ,  $k = 1$ , and  $a = (0, 0)$ ,  $b = (1, 0)$  are two points on the horizontal axis. Let  $\sigma$  be the oriented 1-simplex  $[a, b]$  and  $A = D_{\mu e_1} = \mu(e_1 \otimes e_1)$ .

For  $\mu > 0$ ,  $A \otimes \sigma$  acts like a *compressed spring* because the internal force in the positive  $e_1$  direction is a positive multiple of  $e_1$ . A compressed spring means that it pushes outwardly its endpoints.

Similarly, for  $\mu < 0$ ,  $A \otimes \sigma$  acts like a *stretched spring* because the internal force in the positive  $e_1$  direction is a negative multiple of  $e_1$ . A stretched spring means that it pulls inwardly its endpoints.

A general *structurally stressed spring* between two arbitrary points  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is described by a *structurally stressed 1-simplex* or a *1-beam*

in the form of  $D_{\mu(b-a)} \otimes [a, b]$ . Here positive  $\mu$  gives a compressed spring while negative  $\mu$  gives a stretched spring. Michel strusses are finite linear combinations of structurally stressed springs that efficiently balance a given system of pointed vector forces.

Note that a simple *nonstructurally stressed* 1-simplex is  $D_{e_2} \otimes [a, b]$  with  $a = (0, 0), b = (1, 0)$ .

**Higher Dimensional Definitions.** We will define a stressed  $k$ -simplex  $A \otimes \sigma$  to be *structurally stressed* if all the nontrivial eigenvectors of  $A$  lie in the tangent space of  $\sigma$ . Then  $A \otimes \sigma$  is called a structurally stressed  $k$ -simplex or a *k-beam*.

A *stressed polyhedral k-chain* is a finite sum  $\sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i A_i \otimes \sigma_i$  of stressed  $k$ -simplices. The collection of these gives a real vector space

$$\mathcal{P}_k(\mathbb{R}^n; \text{Sym}_n) = \text{Sym}_n \otimes C_k.$$

For  $k \geq 1$ , the usual formula for the boundary  $\partial\sigma$  of an oriented simplex  $\sigma$  leads to a well-defined *boundary operator*

$$\partial : \mathcal{P}_k(\mathbb{R}^n; \text{Sym}_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{k-1}(\mathbb{R}^n; \text{Sym}_n), \quad \partial\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i A_i \otimes \sigma_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i A_i \otimes \partial\sigma_i$$

A polyhedral chain is *structurally stressed* if all its simplices are structurally stressed. In other words, a structurally stressed polyhedral  $k$ -chain is a finite combination of  $k$ -beams.

The boundary of a structurally stressed polyhedral  $k$ -simplex is usually *not* entirely structurally stressed. The situation is trivial when  $k = 1$  because a nonzero coefficient  $A$  would contain an eigenspace of dimension  $\geq 1$  which doesn't exist in the tangent space of a point. A more interesting and instructive elementary example is as follows.

**A Uni-directional Stretch of a Rectangle.** Suppose  $n = 2, k = 2$ , and  $S$  is a counterwise-oriented coordinate rectangle  $[a, b] \times [c, d] \in \mathbb{R}^2$  for some real numbers  $a < b, c < d$ . Let  $A$  be the simple horizontal stretching  $D_{-e_1} = -(e_1 \otimes e_1)$ . One can imagine  $S$  is a horizontally stretched piece of elastic cloth. Then  $\partial S$  is the sum of four terms corresponding to the four oriented edges of  $S$ :

$$\partial S = A \otimes [(a, c), (b, c)] + A \otimes [(b, c), (b, d)] + A \otimes [(b, d), (a, d)] + A \otimes [(a, d), (a, c)].$$

The first and third are top and bottom edges, being stretched horizontally. So they are structurally stressed. But the second and forth are right and left edges, being neither compressed nor stretched, but instead pulled apart horizontally. So they are nonstructurally stressed.

Therefore in general the boundary of a structurally stressed simplex has two parts: the stress in the boundary and the external force coming from the original stressed simplex. Let's look at another example.

**A Uni-directional Stretch of a Triangle** Next let's cut the rectangle  $S$  along a diagonal. Then for either of the resulting two right triangles, the diagonal boundary edge would be both stretched internally and pulled externally. First we abbreviate the three oriented edges of the lower stressed right triangle  $T$  as the oriented 1-simplices:

$$I = [(a, c), (b, c)], J = [(b, c), (b, d)], K = [(b, d), (a, c)],$$

As before  $A$  stretches  $I$  and pulls  $J$  to the right.

To describe the effect of the horizontal stretch  $A$  on the diagonal edge  $K$ , we simply orthogonally decompose  $e_1$  in terms of its components:

$$e_1 = \kappa \vec{K} + \lambda \vec{K}^\perp,$$

where  $\vec{K}$  is the unit vector of  $K$ , and  $\vec{K}^\perp$  is outward pointing unit vector perpendicular to  $\vec{K}$ .

Then

$$\begin{aligned} -e_1 \otimes e_1 &= -(\kappa \vec{K} + \lambda \vec{K}^\perp) \otimes (\kappa \vec{K} + \lambda \vec{K}^\perp) \\ &= \left[ -\lambda^2 (\vec{K}^\perp \otimes \vec{K}^\perp) - \kappa \lambda (\vec{K} \otimes \vec{K}^\perp) \right] + \left[ -\kappa^2 \vec{K} \otimes \vec{K} - \kappa \lambda \vec{K}^\perp \otimes \vec{K} \right] \\ &= -\lambda e_1 \otimes \vec{K}^\perp - \kappa e_1 \otimes \vec{K} \end{aligned}$$

Coming from the lower triangle, the diagonal edge  $K$  is being stretched to the left horizontally. In other words, the lower triangle is pulling it to the right horizontally. This external force has two components: one is orthogonal to  $K$  and the other is parallel to  $K$ . And they can be expressed as

$$-\lambda e_1 \otimes \vec{K}^\perp = -\lambda^2 (\vec{K}^\perp \otimes \vec{K}^\perp) - \kappa \lambda (\vec{K} \otimes \vec{K}^\perp).$$

On the other hand, at each interior point of the diagonal edge  $K$ , there is a pair of horizontal force acting in the opposite direction, which contributes to the stress. This stress also has two components: one is the normal stress parallel to  $K$  and the other is the shear stress perpendicular to  $K$ . So we can write them as

$$-\kappa e_1 \otimes \vec{K} = -\kappa^2 \vec{K} \otimes \vec{K} - \kappa \lambda \vec{K}^\perp \otimes \vec{K}.$$

Notice that when we decompose the stressed boundary edge  $K$  into two parts, neither the two matrices are symmetric. Therefore one needs the general vector space  $M_n$  of all  $n \times n$  real matrices. Before stating a theorem for stress chains of general dimensions, let's consider

**Multi-directional Stretches of a Rectangle.** By the spectral theorem one can similarly understand the higher rank case by writing any

symmetric matrix  $A$  as

$$A = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i v_i \otimes v_i = \sum_{i=1}^n D_{\mu_i v_i},$$

where  $\{v_i\}$  is an orthonormal basis consisting of eigenvectors of  $A$ , and the  $\mu_i$  are their corresponding eigenvalues.

As a specific example of this, suppose one works with the same rectangle  $S$  as above but replaces  $D_{-e_1}$  by  $A = D_{-e_1} + D_{-e_2}$ . Intuitively imagine that an elastic cloth is made of both horizontal and vertical threads with possibly different elasticity. Then the resulting  $A$  stressed rectangle is now being *simultaneously* stretched both horizontally and vertically. The top and bottom edges are simultaneously stretched horizontally and pulled apart vertically, while the right and left edges are simultaneously stretched vertically and pulled apart horizontally.

Turning now to  $(k-1)$ -dimensional stressed simplex  $A \otimes \tau$  occurring in the boundary expansion of a general structurally stressed  $k$ -simplex  $A \otimes \sigma$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . It suffices to work on the rank 1 case, say  $A = \mu e_1 \otimes e_1$ . In the  $k$ -dimensional tangent space of  $\sigma$ , let  $\vec{\tau}^\perp$  be the outward normal unit vector to the tangent space of  $\tau$ . As before, we find the orthogonal decomposition of  $e_1$  in terms of  $\vec{\tau}^\perp$  and its projection onto the tangent space of  $\tau$ . We can now conclude the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.** *For any structurally stressed polyhedral  $k$ -chain  $P$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , the  $(k-1)$ -stressed chain  $\partial P$  admits a unique decomposition:*

$$(2) \quad \partial P = S + F,$$

where  $S$  consists of simplices in  $M_n \otimes C_{k-1}$  under normal and shear stresses and  $F$  consists of simplices in  $M_n \otimes C_{k-1}$  that are under externally forces

*Proof.* Given any structurally stressed polyhedral  $k$ -chain  $P$ , it is a finite sum of structurally stressed polyhedral  $k$ -simplex  $A \otimes \sigma$ , where  $\sigma$  is an oriented  $k$ -simplex and  $A \in \text{Sym}_n$ . The spectral theorem assures that  $A$  is diagonalizable and so

$$A = D_{\mu_1 v_1} + \cdots + D_{\mu_n v_n} = \mu_1 (v_1 \otimes v_1) + \cdots + \mu_n (v_n \otimes v_n).$$

By hypothesis one may assume, without loss of generality, that  $v_l$  lies in the tangent space of  $\sigma$  for  $l \leq k$  and  $\mu_l = 0$  for  $l > k$ .

Suppose  $\sigma = [a_0, \dots, a_k]$ , then  $\text{span}(a_1 - a_0, \dots, a_k - a_0)$  is the tangent space of  $\sigma$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Given

$$\partial \sigma = \sum_{i=0}^k (-1)^i [a_0, \dots, \hat{a}_i, \dots, a_k],$$

let  $s = [a_0, \dots, \widehat{a_i}, \dots, a_k]$  be the face opposite to the vertex  $a_i$ , then the set  $\{a_1 - a_0, \dots, \widehat{a_i - a_0}, \dots, a_k - a_0\}$  forms a basis for the tangent space of  $s$ ; moreover, there is a unit normal vector  $\hat{n}$  to the space such that the basis  $\{a_1 - a_0, \dots, \widehat{a_i - a_0}, \dots, a_k - a_0, \hat{n}\}$  spans the same space as  $\{a_1 - a_0, \dots, a_k - a_0\}$ . We may choose  $\hat{n}$  to point outwardly so that the two bases are consistently oriented. In other words, if the transition matrix  $B$  is defined by

$$(-1)^i(a_1 - a_0, \dots, \widehat{a_i - a_0}, \dots, a_k - a_0, \hat{n}) = B(a_1 - a_0, \dots, a_k - a_0),$$

then  $B$  has a positive determinant.

Next following the Gram-Schmidt algorithm there is an orthonormal basis  $\{\vec{E}_1, \dots, \vec{E}_{k-1}\}$  for the tangent space of  $s$  which satisfy the following relations:

$$\vec{E}_j = \begin{cases} \frac{(a_j - a_0) - \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} \langle a_j - a_0, \vec{E}_l \rangle \vec{E}_l}{|(a_j - a_0) - \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} \langle a_j - a_0, \vec{E}_l \rangle \vec{E}_l|} & \text{for } j \leq i-1, \\ \frac{(a_{j+1} - a_0) - \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} \langle a_{j+1} - a_0, \vec{E}_l \rangle \vec{E}_l}{|(a_{j+1} - a_0) - \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} \langle a_{j+1} - a_0, \vec{E}_l \rangle \vec{E}_l|} & \text{for } j \geq i, \end{cases}$$

where  $\vec{E}_1 = (a_1 - a_0)/|a_1 - a_0|$ . Note the orientation of the orthonormal basis  $\{\vec{E}_1, \dots, \vec{E}_{k-1}, \hat{n}\}$  is still consistent with the orientation before, because the Gram-Schmidt algorithm was performed under a sequence of elementary matrices with positive determinants.

Therefore we may define an orthogonal matrix  $O$  as the change of coordinates matrix whose first  $k$  columns are  $O = (\vec{E}_1, \dots, \vec{E}_{k-1}, \hat{n}, \dots)$ . For each  $l \leq k$ , write  $v_l$  as follows:

$$v_l = \kappa_1^l \vec{E}_1 + \dots + \kappa_{k-1}^l \vec{E}_{k-1} + \kappa_k^l \hat{n}.$$

Then the matrix  $OD_{\mu_l v_l} O^T$  is zero everywhere except the upper left block matrix

$$\mu_l \begin{bmatrix} (\kappa_1^l)^2 & \dots & \kappa_1^l \kappa_k^l \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \kappa_k^l \kappa_1^l & \dots & (\kappa_k^l)^2 \end{bmatrix} = \mu_l (\kappa_p^l \kappa_q^l).$$

Combining everything together, we have

$$A = O \left[ \sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{p,q=1}^k \mu_l (\kappa_p^l \kappa_q^l) \right] O^T.$$



Let's look at the matrix in the brackets in details. Denote it as  $\tilde{A}$ , then it can be separated into four matrices as follows:

$$(3) \quad \tilde{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{a}_{1,1} & \cdots & \tilde{a}_{1,k-1} & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \tilde{a}_{k-1,1} & \cdots & \tilde{a}_{k-1,k-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \tilde{a}_{k,1} & \cdots & \tilde{a}_{k,k-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \tilde{a}_{k,k} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & \tilde{a}_{1,k} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \tilde{a}_{k-1,k} \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The interpretations of the four matrices are analogous to the preceding examples.

- (1) The first matrix is symmetric and is the usual Cauchy stress tensor inside the boundary face  $s$ . That is to say, we may view  $s$  as an elastic material region of dimension  $k-1$  in the tangent space spanned by  $s$ , calling it  $\mathbb{R}^{k-1}$ . Then at each interior point  $a$ , for a unit vector  $\vec{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{k-1}$ , multiplication of  $\vec{u}$  with the first matrix gives the stress (force per unit area) at  $a$  on the orthogonal plane  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{k-1} : (x-a) \cdot \vec{u} = 0\}$  exerted by the half space  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{k-1} : (x-a) \cdot \vec{u} < 0\}$ . For instance  $\vec{u} = \vec{E}_1$ , then the stress is equal to

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{a}_{1,1} & \cdots & \tilde{a}_{1,k-1} & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \tilde{a}_{k-1,1} & \cdots & \tilde{a}_{k-1,k-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \vec{u} = \tilde{a}_{1,1} \vec{E}_1 + \cdots + \tilde{a}_{k-1,1} \vec{E}_{k-1}.$$

Since the stress is contained inside the tangent space, we will use the same definition as in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  or  $\mathbb{R}^3$  to call this the *normal stress*.

- (2) The second matrix can be thought of the shear stress for the face  $s$ . With the same setup as above, if we multiply  $\vec{u}$  with the second matrix, the result is a perpendicular vector to the face. Hence if we view  $s$  as an elastic body, then the *shear stress* at  $a$  on the orthogonal plane  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{k-1} : (x-a) \cdot \vec{u} = 0\}$  due to  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{k-1} : (x-a) \cdot \vec{u} < 0\}$  is equal to the product. For example if  $\vec{u} = u_1 \vec{E}_1 + \cdots + u_{k-1} \vec{E}_{k-1}$ , the shear stress is equal

to

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \tilde{a}_{k,1} & \cdots & \tilde{a}_{k,k-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \vec{u} = (\tilde{a}_{k,1}u_1 + \cdots + \tilde{a}_{k,k-1}u_{k-1})\hat{n}.$$

- (3) The third matrix tells us that the original  $k$ -simplex  $\sigma$  is pushing or pulling its face  $s$  in the orthogonal direction. This external *orthogonal force*  $\vec{F}_1$  can be calculated using

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{F}_1 &= -\tilde{a}_{k,k}(\text{area of } s)\hat{n} \\ &= -\tilde{a}_{k,k}\sqrt{\text{Gram}(a_1 - a_0, \dots, \widehat{a_i - a_0}, \dots, a_k - a_0)} \hat{n}. \end{aligned}$$

- (4) The fourth matrix indicates that the  $k$ -simplex  $\sigma$  is exerting an external force on the face  $s$  parallel to the tangent space of  $s$ . And this external *parallel force*  $\vec{F}_2$  is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{F}_2 &= -(\tilde{a}_{1,k}\vec{E}_1 + \cdots + \tilde{a}_{k-1,k}\vec{E}_{k-1})(\text{area of } s) \\ &= -(\tilde{a}_{1,k}\vec{E}_1 + \cdots + \tilde{a}_{k-1,k}\vec{E}_{k-1})\sqrt{\text{Gram}(a_1 - a_0, \dots, \widehat{a_i - a_0}, \dots, a_k - a_0)}. \end{aligned}$$

Let's finish the proof of the theorem. Denote the four matrices in  $\tilde{A}$  as  $\tilde{A}_1, \tilde{A}_2, \tilde{A}_3, \tilde{A}_4$ , respectively. Then we may write  $A \otimes s$  as

$$\begin{aligned} A \otimes s &= O\tilde{A}_1O^T \otimes s + O\tilde{A}_2O^T \otimes s + O\tilde{A}_3O^T \otimes s + O\tilde{A}_4O^T \otimes s \\ &= O(\tilde{A}_1 + \tilde{A}_2)O^T + O(\tilde{A}_3 + \tilde{A}_4)O^T, \end{aligned}$$

where the first term gives the total internal stress within the face  $s$  and the second term gives the total external force on the face  $s$  from the  $k$ -simplex  $\sigma$ . And each of these corresponds to the  $S$  and  $F$  in (2), respectively.

For uniqueness, suppose  $\{\vec{E}'_1, \dots, \vec{E}'_{k-1}, \hat{n}\}$  is another orthonormal basis whose orientation is consistent with the basis  $\{\vec{E}_1, \dots, \vec{E}_{k-1}, \hat{n}\}$ ; furthermore, the vectors  $\vec{E}'_1, \dots, \vec{E}'_{k-1}$  span the tangent space of  $s$ . Note that we choose the same unit normal vector  $\hat{n}$ , because it doesn't depend on the basis but rather the orientation of  $s$  itself. Then there exist another four matrices  $\tilde{A}'_i$ , respectively, and  $\tilde{A}'$  satisfying the following:

$$A = O'\tilde{A}'O'^T = O'\tilde{A}'_1O'^T + O'\tilde{A}'_2O'^T + O'\tilde{A}'_3O'^T + O'\tilde{A}'_4O'^T.$$

We want to show that  $O'\tilde{A}'_iO'^T = O\tilde{A}_iO^T$  for each  $i$ . This is an exercise of linear algebra. There is a  $(k-1) \times (k-1)$  matrix  $C$  such that

$$(\vec{E}_1 \cdots \vec{E}_{k-1}|\hat{n}) \left( \begin{array}{c|c} C & \\ \hline & 1 \end{array} \right) = (\vec{E}'_1 \cdots \vec{E}'_{k-1}|\hat{n})$$

Thus

$$O \left( \begin{array}{c|c} C & \\ \hline & 1 \end{array} \right) = O'.$$

Since  $O\tilde{A}O^T = O'\tilde{A}'O'^T$ ,

$$\tilde{A} = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} C & \\ \hline & 1 \end{array} \right) \tilde{A}' \left( \begin{array}{c|c} C^T & \\ \hline & 1 \end{array} \right),$$

from which the equality  $O'\tilde{A}'_iO'^T = O\tilde{A}_iO^T$  follows for each  $i$ . □

Remark: our use of the  $n \times n$  symmetric matrix as a coefficient matrix for lower dimensional chains where  $k < n$  (such as Michel trusses) now carries information about not only internal responses (compression, stretching, shearing) of the chain but also external responses (being pulled or pushed). So it extends the usual meaning of the Cauchy Stress tensor. The theorem leads to the following formal definition of a generalized Cauchy stress tensor.

Let a stressed polyhedral  $(k-1)$ -simplex  $A \otimes \tau$  be given where  $A$  is an  $n \times n$  real symmetric matrix and  $\tau$  is an oriented  $(k-1)$ -simplex. Suppose the eigenvectors  $\vec{v}_i$  and their corresponding eigenvalues  $\mu_i$  of  $A$  satisfy the two conditions:

- (i) One can reorder the  $\mu_i$  so that  $\mu_i = 0$  for  $i > k$ ;
- (ii) Moreover, the first  $k-1$  eigenvectors  $\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_{k-1}$  lie inside the tangent space of  $\tau$ .

Then we say that  $A$  is a *generalized Cauchy stress tensor* for  $\tau$ . It follows that  $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} D_{\mu_i v_i} \otimes \tau$  consists of stresses inside  $\tau$  and  $D_{\mu_k v_k}$  consists of external forces acting on  $\tau$ .

## 5. THE EXISTENCE PART OF THE PLATEAU PROBLEM

The next natural question is whether the converse of the theorem also holds. In other words, suppose  $Q$  is a stressed polyhedral  $(k-1)$ -chain, we look for necessary and sufficient conditions for which there exists a structurally stressed polyhedral  $k$ -chain  $P$  such that  $\partial P = Q$ .

The physical interpretation of this question can be stated as: Given a finite number of  $(k-1)$ -dimensional polyhedra  $Q$  made of elastic bodies with possibly different elastic constants in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Suppose each polyhedron in  $Q$  is feeling not only an external force, but also an internal stress, then we ask: “Does there exist finitely many  $k$ -dimensional polyhedra  $P$  also made of elastic bodies such that

- (i) The nonzero boundary of  $P$  is  $Q$ ;

- (ii) The pushing or pulling of  $P$  on its boundary balances the external forces on  $Q$ ;
- (iii) The compressing, stretching, and shearing stresses inheriting from  $P$  in its boundary also match with those in  $Q$ ?"

The answer is yes! In the next two subsections, we will prove this result.

**5.1. Matching External Forces.** Given a system  $\mathbf{F}$  of forces in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  whose support consists of finitely many  $(k-1)$ -simplices. If  $n \geq k+1$ , we are going to show that if the system  $\mathbf{F}$  is in equilibrium, then there exist a  $k$ -dimensional stressed simplicial complex whose external forces on the boundary exactly match the system  $\mathbf{F}$ .

Here we want to generalize the notation of normalized beams in Gangbo's paper. Instead of forces  $\mathbf{F}_i$  applied at single points  $M_i$  denoted as

$$\mathbf{F} = \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i \delta_{M_i},$$

where  $\delta_{M_i}$  is the dirac mass at  $M_i$ , we consider external forces that are uniformly distributed over  $(k-1)$ -simplices  $[a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]$  denoted as

$$(4) \quad \mathbf{F} = \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i d\mathcal{H}_{|[a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]}^{k-1},$$

where  $\mathcal{H}_{|[a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]}^{k-1}$  is the  $(k-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  restricted to the simplex  $[a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]$ ; and  $\mathbf{F}_i$  is the (constant) force exerted on  $[a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]$ .

Furthermore, Given a system  $\mathbf{F}$  of forces in equilibrium, namely the net force and the net torque are both equal to zero:

$$\sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i = 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i \wedge M_i = 0,$$

one can decompose the system into finitely many 1-dimensional beams as follows:

$$\mathbf{F} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{l'} \lambda_{ij} \text{Beam}([a_i, a_j]),$$

where

$$\text{Beam}([a_i, a_j]) = (\delta_{a_j} - \delta_{a_i}) \frac{a_j - a_i}{|a_j - a_i|},$$

and  $(\lambda_{i,j})$  is a symmetric matrix. Here  $\lambda_{i,j}$  is the stress coefficient associated with the Beam $[a_i, a_j]$ .

Here we can first generalize the 1-dimensional beams to  $k$ -dimensional ones. Given a  $k$ -simplex  $[a_0, \dots, a_k]$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , suppose its Cauchy stress tensor  $A$  is an  $n \times n$  matrix whose nonzero eigenvalues are  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k$  corresponding to orthonormal eigenvectors  $v_1, \dots, v_k$ . Moreover, assume that these eigenvectors lie in the tangent space spanned by the  $k$ -simplex, namely  $\text{span}(a_1 - a_0, \dots, a_k - a_0)$ . Then we can express the  $k$ -dimensional Beam on  $\sigma = [a_0, \dots, a_k]$  with stress tensor  $A = D_{\mu_1 v_1} + \dots + D_{\mu_k v_k}$  as

$$(5) = \frac{1}{(\text{volume of } \sigma)} \sum_{i=0}^k (-1)^i \sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j v_j [(\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i) \bullet v_j] d\mathcal{H}_{|[a_0, \dots, \hat{a}_i, \dots, a_k]}^{k-1}.$$

Here  $\lrcorner: \bigwedge_k \mathbb{R}^n \times \bigwedge^{k-1} \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \bigwedge_1 \mathbb{R}^n$  is the left interior multiplication with  $\zeta$  and  $d\eta_i$  defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta &= (a_1 - a_0) \wedge \dots \wedge (a_k - a_0), \\ d\eta_i &= d(a_1 - a_0) \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{d(a_i - a_0)} \wedge \dots \wedge d(a_k - a_0) \text{ for } i > 0, \\ d\eta_0 &= d(a_2 - a_1) \wedge \dots \wedge d(a_k - a_1), \end{aligned}$$

where  $d(w)$  represents the dual vector to  $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$  in the dual space  $(\mathbb{R}^n)^*$ . Note that when  $n = k$ , the left interior multiplication  $\lrcorner$  is the same as the Hodge star  $*$ . [3]

**Claim 1.** *Given the above notations, first  $(-1)^i(\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i)$  gives the correct normal vector to the  $i$ th face  $s_i = [a_0, \dots, \hat{a}_i, \dots, a_k]$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Second*

$$\frac{\mu_j v_j [(-1)^i(\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i)] \bullet v_j}{\text{volume of } \sigma}$$

*is equal to the force exerting on  $s_i$  due to the stress in the direction of the  $j$ th eigenvector  $v_j$  with eigenvalue  $\mu_j$ , i.e., the matrix  $D_{\mu_j v_j} = \mu_j(v_j \otimes v_j)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\sigma = [a_0, \dots, a_k]$  and assume that  $a_0$  is at the origin. First let's show that  $\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i$  lies in the tangent space of  $\sigma$ . Let  $V$  be the span of  $a_1, \dots, a_k$ . For any  $\beta \in V^\perp$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} d\beta(\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i) &= (d\eta_i \wedge d\beta)(\zeta) \\ &= \det \begin{bmatrix} (a_1 - a_0) \cdot (a_1 - a_0) & \dots & (a_1 - a_0) \cdot (a_k - a_0) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \beta \cdot (a_1 - a_0) & \dots & \beta \cdot (a_k - a_0) \end{bmatrix} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

So  $\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i \in V$ , as desired.

Next we want to show that  $\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i$  is perpendicular to the  $i$ th face  $s_i = [a_0, \dots, \hat{a}_i, \dots, a_k]$ . If  $i > 0$ , for any  $a_j - a_0$  with  $j \neq i$ , one has

$$d\eta_i \wedge d(a_j - a_0) = 0 \Rightarrow d(a_j - a_0)(\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i) = 0.$$

For  $i = 0$ , the proof is similar.

Lastly we look for the norm of  $\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & |\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i|^2 \\ &= d(\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i)(\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i) = d\eta_i \wedge d(\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i)(\zeta) \\ &= (-1)^{k-i} \det \begin{bmatrix} (a_1 - a_0) \cdot (a_1 - a_0) & \cdots & (a_1 - a_0) \cdot (a_i - a_0) & \cdots & (a_1 - a_0) \cdot (a_k - a_0) \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ (\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i) \cdot (a_1 - a_0) & \cdots & (\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i) \cdot (a_i - a_0) & \cdots & (\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i) \cdot (a_k - a_0) \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ (a_k - a_0) \cdot (a_1 - a_0) & \cdots & (a_k - a_0) \cdot (a_i - a_0) & \cdots & (a_k - a_0) \cdot (a_k - a_0) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= (-1)^{k-i} (\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i) \cdot (a_i - a_0) (\text{area of } s_i)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$(\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i) \cdot (a_i - a_0) = \frac{(-1)^{k-i} |\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i|^2}{(\text{area of } s_i)^2}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i) \cdot (a_i - a_0) \\ &= d(a_i - a_0)(\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i) = d\eta_i \wedge d(a_i - a_0)(\zeta) \\ &= (-1)^{k-i} \det \begin{bmatrix} (a_1 - a_0) \cdot (a_1 - a_0) & \cdots & (a_1 - a_0) \cdot (a_k - a_0) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ (a_k - a_0) \cdot (a_1 - a_0) & \cdots & (a_k - a_0) \cdot (a_k - a_0) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= (\text{volume of } \sigma)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\sigma = [a_0, \dots, a_k]$ . Thus

$$|\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i| = (\text{area of } s_i)(\text{volume of } \sigma).$$

It follows that the force on  $s_i$  coming from the  $j$ th Cauchy stress tensor  $D_{\mu_j v_j}$  is

$$\left[ (-1)^i \frac{\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i}{|\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i|} \bullet v_j \right] \mu_j v_j (\text{area of } s_i) = \frac{1}{\text{volume of } \sigma} (-1)^i \mu_j v_j [(\zeta \lrcorner d\eta_i) \bullet v_j].$$

□

In general the equilibrium conditions for a system of forces in the form of (4) can be written as:

$$(6) \quad \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i = 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i \wedge \hat{s}_i = 0,$$

where  $\hat{s}_i = (a_0^i + \dots + a_{k-1}^i)/k$  is the barycenter of the simplex  $s_i = [a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]$ . The natural question to ask is that given a system of forces in equilibrium, is it possible to decompose it into finitely many  $k$ -beams? The answer is yes for  $k = 1$ . Now we want to prove for all  $k \geq 2$ .

The crux is a sequence of lemmas as follows:

**Lemma 1.** *Suppose  $k = 2$ . Assume that*

$$(7) \quad \mathbf{F} = \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i d\mathcal{H}_{[O, a_i]}^1,$$

where each 1-simplex  $[O, a_i]$  emanates from the origin  $O$  to some  $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Given that  $\mathbf{F}$  satisfies the equilibrium condition in (6), then  $\mathbf{F}$  is a linear combination of finitely many 2-beams.

*Proof.* For each  $[O, a_i]$ , denote its barycenter by  $\hat{a}_i$  which is equal to  $a_i/2$ . Then using these centers together with the forces, one can decompose them into a linear combination of 1-beams. More precisely, let  $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}$  be defined as:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{F}} = \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i \delta_{\hat{a}_i},$$

which is also in equilibrium by (6). Therefore there exist  $\tilde{l} \geq l$  points of application  $\hat{a}_1, \dots, \hat{a}_{\tilde{l}}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and an  $\tilde{l} \times \tilde{l}$  symmetric matrix  $\{\lambda_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^{\tilde{l}}$  of null diagonal such that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{F}} = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq \tilde{l}} \lambda_{ij} \text{Beam}([\hat{a}_i, \hat{a}_j]).$$

Note that the centers  $\{\hat{a}_1, \dots, \hat{a}_{\tilde{l}}\}$  are included in the set  $\{\hat{a}_1, \dots, \hat{a}_{\tilde{l}}\}$ . Moreover, one may change the point of reference in the proof of Gangbo to ensure that the origin  $O$  is not any point of application. So we can connect the origin  $O$  with each  $\hat{a}_i$  and extend the ray to a new point  $a_i$ , so that  $\hat{a}_i$  is the center of the 1-simplex  $[O, a_i]$ . It follows that the  $[\hat{a}_i, \hat{a}_j]$  is not only parallel to  $[a_i, a_j]$  but also lies in the tangent space of  $[O, a_i, a_j]$ . So there is a Cauchy stress tensor  $A_{ij} = D_{\mu_{ij} v_{ij}}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & A_{ij} \otimes \text{Beam}([O, a_i, a_j]) \\ &= \lambda_{ij} \frac{a_j - a_i}{|a_j - a_i|} d\mathcal{H}_{[O, a_j]}^1 - \lambda_{ij} \frac{a_j - a_i}{|a_j - a_i|} d\mathcal{H}_{[O, a_i]}^1 + 0 d\mathcal{H}_{[a_i, a_j]}^1, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$v_{ij} = \frac{a_j - a_i}{|a_j - a_i|}, \quad \mu_{ij} = -\lambda_{ij} \cdot \frac{|a_j - a_i|}{\text{area of } [O, a_i, a_j]}.$$

Finally let's verify that

$$\mathbf{F} = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq \tilde{l}} A_{ij} \otimes \text{Beam}([O, a_i, a_j]).$$

For each  $[O, a_i]$ , the total force due to the 2-beams is equal to the coefficient of  $\hat{a}_i$  in  $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}$ , which is  $\mathbf{F}_i$  when  $i \leq l$  and zero when  $i > l$ . For each  $[a_i, a_j]$ , there is no force on it and its coefficient in  $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}$  is also zero because there is no term for  $\delta_{\frac{a_i+a_j}{2}}$ .

**Secretly hidden here, we are assuming that no things overlap.**

Thus we obtain (7) as desired.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.** *Suppose  $k = 3$ . Assume that for any system of 1-simplices and forces in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with  $n \geq 3$ , it can be decomposed into a finite combination of 2-beams. Given that*

$$(8) \quad \mathbf{F} = \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i d\mathcal{H}_{[O, a_i, b_i]}^2,$$

where each 2-simplex  $[O, a_i, b_i]$  emanates from the origin  $O$  to some interval  $[a_i, b_i]$ . Given that  $\mathbf{F}$  satisfies the equilibrium condition in (6), then  $\mathbf{F}$  is a linear combination of finitely many 3-beams.

*Proof.* Let  $\hat{a}_i$  be  $2a_i/3$  and  $\hat{b}_i = 2b_i/3$  for each  $i$ . Define  $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}$  as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{F}} = \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i d\mathcal{H}_{[\hat{a}_i, \hat{b}_i]}^1,$$

then it is a system of forces in equilibrium because the center of  $[\hat{a}_i, \hat{b}_i]$  is the same as that of  $[O, a_i, b_i]$ .

By the hypothesis, there exist  $\tilde{l} \geq l$  intervals of application  $[\hat{a}_1, \hat{b}_1], \dots, [\hat{a}_{\tilde{l}}, \hat{b}_{\tilde{l}}]$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and real symmetric matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_{\tilde{l}}$  such that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{F}} = \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{l}} A_i \otimes \text{Beam}([\hat{a}_i, \hat{b}_i, \hat{c}_i]),$$

where  $\hat{c}_i$  can be either  $\hat{a}_j$  or  $\hat{b}_j$  for some  $j \neq i$  as long as  $[\hat{a}_i, \hat{b}_i], [\hat{b}_i, \hat{c}_i], [\hat{c}_i, \hat{a}_i]$  are contained in the set  $\{[\hat{a}_i, \hat{b}_i]\}_{i=1}^{\tilde{l}}$ . Note that the original intervals  $\{[\hat{a}_i, \hat{b}_i]\}_{i=1}^l$  are also contained in this set. For convenience one may use the notation:

$$A_i \otimes \text{Beam}([\hat{a}_i, \hat{b}_i, \hat{c}_i]) = \mathbf{F}_{i, [\hat{a}_i, \hat{b}_i]} d\mathcal{H}_{[\hat{a}_i, \hat{b}_i]}^1 + \mathbf{F}_{i, [\hat{b}_i, \hat{c}_i]} d\mathcal{H}_{[\hat{b}_i, \hat{c}_i]}^1 + \mathbf{F}_{i, [\hat{c}_i, \hat{a}_i]} d\mathcal{H}_{[\hat{c}_i, \hat{a}_i]}^1,$$



where each  $\mathbf{F}_i$  can be calculated using the formula in (5). For example, suppose  $A_i = D_{\mu_{i,1}v_{i,1}} + D_{\mu_{i,2}v_{i,2}}$ , then

$$\mathbf{F}_{i, [\hat{a}_i, \hat{b}_i]} = \frac{1}{\text{area of } [\hat{a}_i, \hat{b}_i, \hat{c}_i]} \sum_{j=1}^2 \mu_{i,j} v_{i,j} [(\zeta_i \lrcorner d(\hat{b}_i - \hat{a}_i)) \bullet v_{i,j}],$$

where  $\zeta_i = (\hat{b}_i - \hat{a}_i) \wedge (\hat{c}_i - \hat{a}_i)$ .

Moreover we may ensure that the origin  $O$  does not lie in any of the 2-simplices by choosing new points of reference in the proof for the case  $k = 2$ , together with  $n \geq 3$ .

So connect the origin  $O$  with each of the  $\hat{a}_i, \hat{b}_i, \hat{c}_i$  and extend the ray to a new point  $a_i, b_i, c_i$ , respectively, such that  $\hat{a}_i, \hat{b}_i, \hat{c}_i$  are equal to  $2/3$  of  $a_i, b_i, c_i$  correspondingly. It follows that not only  $[\hat{a}_i, \hat{b}_i, \hat{c}_i]$  is parallel to  $[a_i, b_i, c_i]$  but also lies in the tangent space of  $[O, a_i, b_i, c_i]$ .

Therefore one can find a Cauchy stress tensor  $B_i$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & B_i \otimes \text{Beam}([O, a_i, b_i, c_i]) \\ &= \mathbf{F}_{i, [\hat{a}_i, \hat{b}_i]} d\mathcal{H}_{[O, a_i, b_i]}^2 + \mathbf{F}_{i, [\hat{b}_i, \hat{c}_i]} d\mathcal{H}_{[O, b_i, c_i]}^2 + \mathbf{F}_{i, [\hat{c}_i, \hat{a}_i]} d\mathcal{H}_{[O, c_i, a_i]}^2 + 0 d\mathcal{H}_{[a_i, b_i, c_i]}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $B_i = D_{\lambda_{i,1}v_{i,1}} + D_{\lambda_{i,2}v_{i,2}}$ , where the  $v_{i,j}$  are eigenvectors in  $A_i$ , and

$$\lambda_{i,j} = -\frac{2}{3} \mu_{i,j} \cdot \frac{\text{area of } [a_i, b_i, c_i]}{\text{volume of } [O, a_i, b_i, c_i]}.$$

Finally one can verify that

$$\mathbf{F} = \sum_{i=1}^7 B_i \otimes \text{Beam}([O, a_i, b_i, c_i]).$$

□

Now let's generalize the proof of the previous lemma to any  $k \geq 3$ .

**Lemma 3.** *Suppose  $k \geq 3$ . Assume that for any system (4) of  $(k-2)$ -simplices and forces in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with  $n \geq k$  and satisfying (6), it can be decomposed into a finite combination of  $(k-1)$ -beams. Then given that*

$$(9) \quad \mathbf{F} = \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i d\mathcal{H}_{[O, a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-2}^i]}^{k-1},$$

where each  $(k-1)$ -simplex  $[O, a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-2}^i]$  emanates from the origin  $O$  to some  $(k-2)$ -simplex  $[a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-2}^i]$ . Given that  $\mathbf{F}$  satisfies the equilibrium condition in (6), then  $\mathbf{F}$  is a linear combination of finitely many  $k$ -beams.

*Proof.* For each  $1 \leq i \leq l$  and  $0 \leq j \leq k-2$ , let

$$\hat{a}_j^i = \frac{k-1}{k} a_j^i,$$

so that the center of  $[\hat{a}_0^i, \dots, \widehat{a_{k-2}^i}]$  equals that of  $[O, a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-2}^i]$ . Define  $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}$  as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{F}} = \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i d\mathcal{H}^{k-2}_{|[\hat{a}_0^i, \dots, \widehat{a_{k-2}^i}]},$$

and it is an equilibrium system of forces.

By the hypothesis, there exist  $\tilde{l}$ , with  $\tilde{l} \geq l$ ,  $(k-2)$ -simplices of application  $\{[\hat{a}_0^i, \dots, \widehat{a_{k-2}^i}]\}_{i=1}^{\tilde{l}}$  and real symmetric matrices  $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^{\tilde{l}}$  such that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{F}} = \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{l}} A_i \otimes \text{Beam}([\hat{a}_0^i, \dots, \widehat{a_{k-2}^i}, \widehat{a_{k-1}^i}]),$$

where  $\widehat{a_{k-1}^i}$  can be any of the vertices of  $[a_0^m, \dots, a_{k-2}^m]$  for some  $m \neq i$  so that the following  $(k-2)$ -simplices

$$[\hat{a}_0^i, \dots, \widehat{a_{k-2}^i}], [\hat{a}_1^i, \dots, \widehat{a_{k-1}^i}], \dots, [\hat{a}_0^i, \dots, \widehat{a_{k-3}^i}, \widehat{a_{k-1}^i}]$$

are contained in the set  $\{[\hat{a}_0^i, \dots, \widehat{a_{k-2}^i}]\}_{i=1}^{\tilde{l}}$ . Note that the original  $(k-2)$ -simplices  $\{[\hat{a}_0^i, \dots, \widehat{a_{k-2}^i}]\}_{i=1}^l$  are contained in this set as well. For convenience we write:

$$\begin{aligned} & A_i \otimes \text{Beam}([\hat{a}_0^i, \dots, \widehat{a_{k-2}^i}, \widehat{a_{k-1}^i}]) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathbf{F}_{i,j} d\mathcal{H}^{k-2}_{|[\hat{a}_0^i, \dots, \widehat{a_{j-1}^i}, \widehat{a_{j+1}^i}, \dots, \widehat{a_{k-1}^i}]}, \end{aligned}$$

where each  $\mathbf{F}_{i,j}$  can be calculated using the formula in (5). For example, suppose that  $A_i = \sum_{m=0}^{k-2} D_{\mu_{i,m} v_{i,m}}$ , then

$$\mathbf{F}_{i,j} = \frac{1}{\text{volume of } [\hat{a}_0^i, \dots, \widehat{a_{k-1}^i}]} \sum_{m=0}^{k-2} \mu_{i,m} v_{i,m} [(\zeta_i \lrcorner d\eta_{i,j}) \bullet v_{i,m}],$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_i &= (\hat{a}_1^i - \hat{a}_0^i) \wedge \dots \wedge (\hat{a}_{k-1}^i - \hat{a}_0^i), \\ d\eta_{i,j} &= d(\hat{a}_1^i - \hat{a}_0^i) \wedge \dots \wedge d(\hat{a}_{j-1}^i - \hat{a}_0^i) \wedge d(\hat{a}_{j+1}^i - \hat{a}_0^i) \wedge \dots \wedge d(\hat{a}_{k-1}^i - \hat{a}_0^i). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover we may ensure that the origin  $O$  does not lie any of the  $(k-1)$ -simplices by choosing a new point of reference in the proof for the  $k-1$  case under the assumption that  $n \geq k$ .

Next connect the origin  $O$  with each  $\hat{a}_j^i$  and extend the ray to a new point  $a_j^i$  such that

$$a_j^i = \frac{k}{k-1} \hat{a}_j^i.$$

It follows that not only  $[\hat{a}_0^i, \dots, \hat{a}_{k-1}^i]$  is parallel to  $[a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]$  but also lies in the tangent space of  $[O, a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]$ . Therefore one can find a Cauchy stress tensor  $B_i$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & B_i \otimes \text{Beam}([O, a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathbf{F}_{i,j} d\mathcal{H}^{k-1}_{|[O, a_0^i, \dots, a_{j-1}^i, a_{j+1}^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]}. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $B_i = \sum_{m=0}^{k-2} D_{\lambda_{i,m} v_{i,m}}$  with the  $v_{i,m}$  being the eigenvectors of  $A_i$  and

$$\lambda_{i,m} = - \left( \frac{k-1}{k} \right)^{k-2} \mu_{i,m} \cdot \frac{\text{area of } [a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]}{\text{volume of } [O, a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]}.$$

Finally let's verify that

$$\mathbf{F} = \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{l}} B_i \otimes \text{Beam}([O, a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]).$$

For each  $[O, a_0^i, \dots, a_{j-1}^i, a_{j+1}^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]$ , the total force on it due to the  $k$ -beams is equal to the coefficient of  $[\hat{a}_0^i, \dots, \widehat{a_{j-1}^i}, \widehat{a_{j+1}^i}, \dots, \hat{a}_{k-1}^i]$  in  $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}$  which is equal to  $\mathbf{F}_i$  when  $i \leq l$  and zero when  $i > l$ . For each  $[a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]$  there is no force on it and its coefficient in  $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}$  is also zero because there is no  $d\mathcal{H}^{k-1}$  term for it. Thus we obtain (9) as desired.  $\square$

Next we are going to work through a sequence of three propositions following the ideas from Gangbo's notes.

**Proposition 1.** *Suppose  $n \geq k + 2$ . Assume that  $\mathbf{F}$  is given by (4) and that*

- (i)  $[a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i] \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, l$ ;
- (ii)  $\mathbf{F}_i$  is perpendicular to the hyperplane  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ .

*Then one may decompose  $\mathbf{F}$  into a sum of two equilibrium systems of forces*

$$\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{F}^h,$$

*where  $\mathbf{B}$  is a finite combination of  $k$ -beams, and  $\mathbf{F}^h$  is an equilibrium system of  $(k-1)$ -simplices and forces in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $\bar{O} = e_n$ . For each  $s_i = [a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]$ , denote its center by  $\hat{s}_i$  which is contained in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  by hypothesis. If  $\mathbf{F}_i = f_i e_n$ , then we can write  $\mathbf{F}_i$  as

$$\mathbf{F}_i = \mathbf{F}_i^{\bar{O}} + \mathbf{F}_i^h,$$

where

$$\mathbf{F}_i^h = f_i \hat{s}_i, \quad \mathbf{F}_i^{\bar{O}} = \mathbf{F}_i - \mathbf{F}_i^h.$$

Since  $\mathbf{F}_i$  is parallel to  $e_n$ , the  $n$ th column of  $\hat{s}_i \wedge \mathbf{F}_i$  is equal to  $f_i \hat{s}_i$ , therefore

$$\sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i^h = 0.$$

Moreover since  $\hat{s}_i \wedge \hat{s}_i = 0$ ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i^h \wedge \hat{s}_i = 0.$$

So

$$\mathbf{F}^h = \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i^h d\mathcal{H}_{|s_i}^{k-1}$$

is a system in equilibrium whose simplices and forces are all contained in  $\mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ . Being the difference between two equilibrium systems,

$$\mathbf{F}^{\bar{O}} = \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i^{\bar{O}} d\mathcal{H}_{|s_i}^{k-1}$$

is also in equilibrium.

Next we want to show that  $\mathbf{F}_i^{\bar{O}}$  comes from finitely many  $k$ -beams. First notice that  $\mathbf{F}_i^{\bar{O}} \in \text{Span}(a_0^i - \bar{O}, \dots, a_{k-1}^i - \bar{O})$  because

$$\mathbf{F}_i^{\bar{O}} = f_i(e_n - \hat{s}_i) = -\frac{f_i}{k}((a_0^i - e_n) + \dots + (a_{k-1}^i - e_n)).$$

We are going to translate  $s_i = [a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]$  in the direction of  $\mathbf{F}_i^{\bar{O}}$  to arrive at a new  $(k-1)$ -simplex  $\tilde{s}_i = [\tilde{a}_0^i, \dots, \tilde{a}_{k-1}^i]$  so that

$$\bar{O} = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} t_j \tilde{a}_j^i.$$

Indeed, one can compute that

$$\bar{O} = \frac{1}{k}((a_0^i + \frac{\mathbf{F}_i^{\bar{O}}}{f_i}) + \dots + (a_{k-1}^i + \frac{\mathbf{F}_i^{\bar{O}}}{f_i})),$$

so that

$$\tilde{a}_j^i = a_j^i + \frac{\mathbf{F}_i^{\bar{O}}}{f_i}, \quad t_j = \frac{1}{k}.$$

Construct the parallelepiped  $P_i$  formed by using the base  $s_i$  and the side  $\frac{\mathbf{F}_i^{\bar{O}}}{f_i}$ : that is, the  $P_i$  is spanned by  $a_1^i - a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i - a_0^i, \frac{\mathbf{F}_i^{\bar{O}}}{f_i}$ , and is based at  $a_0^i$ . Furthermore, let  $A_i$  be the symmetric matrix  $D_{\mu_i v_i}$ , where

$$v_i = \frac{\mathbf{F}_i^{\bar{O}}}{|\mathbf{F}_i^{\bar{O}}|}, \quad \mu_i = \frac{|\mathbf{F}_i^{\bar{O}}|^2}{f_i \text{area of } s_i}.$$

Since  $A_i$  contributes to zero forces on all  $(k-1)$ -faces of  $P_i$  except  $s_i$  and  $\tilde{s}_i$ ,

$$\mathbf{F}_i^{\bar{O}} d\mathcal{H}_{|s_i}^{k-1} - \mathbf{F}_i^{\bar{O}} d\mathcal{H}_{|\tilde{s}_i}^{k-1} = A_i \otimes \text{Beam}(P_i),$$

where  $P_i$  can be decomposed into finitely many  $k$ -simplices. Furthermore, since  $\bar{O}$  is the barycenter of  $\tilde{s}_i$ , one may rewrite  $\tilde{s}_i$  as a sum of subsimplices as follows:

$$\tilde{s}_i = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} [\tilde{a}_0^i, \dots, \bar{O}, \dots, \tilde{a}_{k-1}^i],$$

where  $\bar{O}$  is in the  $j$ th spot.

Hence  $\mathbf{F}^{\bar{O}}$  can be decomposed into another two systems: one consists of  $k$ -beams and the other all connecting with  $\bar{O}$ . That is

$$(10) \quad \mathbf{F}^{\bar{O}} = \sum_{i=1}^l A_i \otimes \text{Beam}(P_i) + \mathbf{F}^{\bar{O}'}$$

where

$$\mathbf{F}^{\bar{O}'} = \sum_{i=1}^l \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathbf{F}_i^{\bar{O}} d\mathcal{H}_{|[\tilde{a}_0^i, \dots, \bar{O}, \dots, \tilde{a}_{k-1}^i]}^{k-1}.$$

According to the lemma 3, there are symmetric matrices  $B_i$  such that

$$(11) \quad \mathbf{F}^{\bar{O}'} = \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{l}} B_i \otimes \text{Beam}([\bar{O}, a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i]).$$

Let  $\mathbf{B}$  be the sum (10) + (11). Then  $\mathbf{B}$  is a finite combination of  $k$ -beams and

$$\mathbf{F}^{\bar{O}} = \mathbf{B},$$

as desired.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.** Suppose  $n \geq k + 2$ . Assume that  $\mathbf{F}$  is given by (4) and that

- (i)  $[a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i] \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, l$ ;
- (ii)  $\mathbf{F}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

Then one may decompose  $\mathbf{F}$  into a sum of two equilibrium systems of forces

$$\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{F}^h,$$

where  $\mathbf{B}$  is a finite combination of  $k$ -beams, and  $\mathbf{F}^h$  is a equilibrium system of  $(k-1)$ -simplices and forces in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ .

*Proof.* Decompose each  $\mathbf{F}_i$  into  $\mathbf{F}_i^h$ , that is parallel to  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ , and  $\mathbf{F}_i^v = f_i e_n$ , for some real number  $f_i$ . So we obtain two systems as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}^h &= \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{F}_i^h d\mathcal{H}_{|s_i}^{k-1}; \\ \mathbf{F}^v &= \sum_{i=1}^l f_i e_n d\mathcal{H}_{|s_i}^{k-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}^h + \mathbf{F}^v.$$

Since the  $n$ th column of  $\mathbf{F}_i^h \wedge \hat{s}_i$  is equal to zero for each  $i$ ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^l f_i e_n \wedge \hat{s}_i.$$

Furthermore  $\sum_{i=1}^l f_i = 0$  so that  $\mathbf{F}_i^v$  is a system in equilibrium, which implies that  $\mathbf{F}_i^h$  is also a system in equilibrium. Applying Proposition 1 to  $\mathbf{F}_i^v$  gives us the desired result.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.** Suppose  $n \geq k + 2$ . Assume that  $\mathbf{F}$  is given by (4) and that

- (i)  $[a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i] \in \mathbb{R}^n$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, l$ ;
- (ii)  $\mathbf{F}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

Then one may decompose  $\mathbf{F}$  into a sum of two equilibrium systems of forces

$$\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{F}^h,$$

where  $\mathbf{B}$  is a finite combination of  $k$ -beams, and  $\mathbf{F}^h$  is a equilibrium system of  $(k-1)$ -simplices and forces in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ .

*Proof.* To bring each simplex down to  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ , we use the following two steps.

Step 1: Suppose  $s_i$  is parallel to the hyperplane  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ , let's decompose  $\mathbf{F}_i$  into its vertical and horizontal components:

$$\mathbf{F}_i = \mathbf{F}_i^h + \mathbf{F}_i^v.$$

First for the vertical component  $\mathbf{F}_i^v$ , one can translate  $s_i$  vertically so that it lies in the hyperplane. More precisely, let  $d$  be such that  $a_0^i - de_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . Denote  $a_j^i - ed_n$  by  $\tilde{a}_j^i$  for each  $j$  between 0 and  $k-1$ , and  $[\tilde{a}_0^i, \dots, \tilde{a}_{k-1}^i]$  by  $\tilde{s}_i$ . Let  $I = [0, d]$ . Then  $s_i \times I$  can be subdivided into  $k$ -simplices and so we may “push”  $s_i$  to  $\tilde{s}_i$ . More precisely, there exists a symmetric matrix  $A_i$  such that

$$A_i = D_{\mu_i v_i}, \text{ where } \mu_i = \frac{|\mathbf{F}_i^v|}{\text{area of } s_i}, v_i = \frac{\mathbf{F}_i^v}{|\mathbf{F}_i^v|},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{F}_i^v d\mathcal{H}_{|s_i}^{k-1} - \mathbf{F}_i^v d\mathcal{H}_{|\tilde{s}_i}^{k-1} \\ &= A_i \otimes \text{Beam}(s_i \times I) \\ &= A_i \otimes \text{Beam}[\tilde{a}_0^i, a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i] - A_i \otimes \text{Beam}[\tilde{a}_0^i, \tilde{a}_1^i, a_1^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i] \\ & \quad + \dots + (-1)^{k-1} A_i \otimes \text{Beam}[\tilde{a}_0^i, \tilde{a}_1^i, \dots, \tilde{a}_{k-1}^i, a_{k-1}^i]. \end{aligned}$$

Next for the horizontal component  $\mathbf{F}_i^h$ , we break it into another two forces:

$$\mathbf{F}_i^{h,1} = \mathbf{F}_i^h + e_n, \quad \mathbf{F}_i^{h,2} = \mathbf{F}_i^h - e_n.$$

Then one may “push”  $s_i$  to another  $\tilde{s}_i^j \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  in the direction of  $\mathbf{F}_i^{h,j}$  for  $j = 1, 2$ . This is analogous to the previous case. Let  $P_i^j$  be the parallelepiped spanned by pushing  $s_i$  to  $\tilde{s}_i^j \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  in the direction of  $\mathbf{F}_i^{h,j}$  for  $j = 1, 2$ ; moreover, let  $A_i^{h,j} = D_{\mu_i^{h,j} v_i^{h,j}}$  be defined as

$$\mu_i^{h,j} = \frac{|\mathbf{F}_i^{h,j}|^2}{(e_n \cdot \mathbf{F}_i^{h,j}) \text{ area of } s_i}, \quad v_i^{h,j} = \frac{\mathbf{F}_i^{h,j}}{|\mathbf{F}_i^{h,j}|}.$$

It follows that for each  $j$ ,

$$\mathbf{F}_i^{h,j} d\mathcal{H}_{|s_i}^{k-1} - \mathbf{F}_i^{h,j} d\mathcal{H}_{|\tilde{s}_i^j}^{k-1} = A_i^{h,j} \otimes \text{Beam}(P_i^j),$$

where  $P_i^j$  is a finite union of  $k$ -simplices.

Step 2: Now let us assume that  $s_i$  is not parallel to the hyperplane  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . Without loss of generality, one may also assume that  $\mathbf{F}_i$  is not in the tangent space of  $s_i$  and the hyperplane  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{F}_i \notin \text{span}(a_1^i - a_0^i, \dots, a_{k-1}^i - a_0^i), \quad \mathbf{F}_i \notin \mathbb{R}^{n-1}.$$

Otherwise we may decompose  $\mathbf{F}_i$  into a sum of two forces which don't. Then consider the parallelepiped with base  $s_i$  and side parallel to  $\mathbf{F}_i$ . It intersects  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  at some  $(k-1)$ -simplex  $\tilde{s}_i$ :

$$\tilde{s}_i = [\dots, a_j^i - \frac{a_j^i \cdot e_n}{\mathbf{F}_i \cdot e_n} \mathbf{F}_i, \dots].$$

Let  $P_i$  be the polyhedron with top  $s_i$ , bottom  $\tilde{s}_i$ , and sides parallel to  $\mathbf{F}_i$ , then  $P_i$  is a finite union of  $k$ -simplices. Moreover, we can find a symmetric matrix  $B_i$  such that

$$B_i \otimes \text{Beam}(P_i) = \mathbf{F}_i d\mathcal{H}_{|s_i}^{k-1} - \mathbf{F}_i d\mathcal{H}_{|\tilde{s}_i}^{k-1}.$$

Indeed  $B_i = D_{\mu_i v_i}$ :

$$\mu_i = \frac{|\mathbf{F}_i|^2}{(e_n \cdot \mathbf{F}_i) \text{area of } \tilde{s}_i}, \quad v_i = \frac{\mathbf{F}_i}{|\mathbf{F}_i|}.$$

Applying Proposition 2 finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.** *Suppose  $k \geq 1$  and  $n \geq k + 1$ . Assume that  $\mathbf{F}$  is given by (4) and  $\mathbf{F}$  satisfies the equilibrium condition in (6), then  $\mathbf{F}$  can be decomposed into finitely many  $k$ -beams.*

*Proof.* We prove by induction on  $k$ . First when  $k = 1$ , this is done in Gangbo's notes. Let  $k \geq 2$  and assume that for any system of  $(k - 2)$ -simplices and forces in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with  $n \geq k$ , it can be decomposed into a finite combination of  $(k - 1)$ -beams.

Now let's prove for the case when there are  $(k - 1)$ -simplices with forces acting on them in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , where  $n \geq k + 1$ . To prove this case, we are going to induct on the dimension  $n$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

If  $n = k + 1$ , there exists  $\bar{O}$  that doesn't lie in the tangent space of any  $(k - 1)$ -simplices, then we may push  $s_i$  to another  $\tilde{s}_i$  following the exact same proof in Proposition 1. Therefore  $\mathbf{F}$  may be decomposed into a sequence of  $k$ -beams and another system  $\mathbf{F}^{\bar{O}'}$  of  $(k - 1)$ -simplices that all connect to  $\bar{O}$ . By the inductive hypothesis and Lemma 3,  $\mathbf{F}^{\bar{O}'}$  is also a sequence of  $k$ -beams.

If  $n \geq k + 2$ , Proposition 1, 2, and 3 imply that  $\mathbf{F}$  is a sequence  $\mathbf{B}$  of  $k$ -beams and an equilibrium  $\mathbf{F}^h$  system of  $(k - 1)$ -simplices and forces in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . Applying the inductive hypothesis on  $n - 1$  yields the desired result.  $\square$

**5.2. Matching Stresses.** Finally, we can solve the existence question in two steps. First, suppose  $Q$  is a stressed polyhedral  $(k - 1)$ -chain whose coefficients are generalized Cauchy Stress tensor. Then  $Q$  can be decomposed into:

$$Q = S + F,$$

with  $S$  being the stresses and  $F$  being the external forces.

If we assume that the net force and torque in  $F$  are both equal to zero, then according to Theorem 2, there exists a structurally stressed



polyhedral  $k$ -chain  $P_1$  such that

$$\partial P_1 = S_1 + F,$$

where the external forces of  $P_1$  on its boundary can balance out these of  $Q$ . Therefore  $\partial P_1 - Q = S_1 - S$  has only internal stresses and no external forces, since the external forces in  $F$  are equal. Furthermore, since the coefficients are symmetric matrices in  $Q$  and  $P_1$ , if there is no external parallel force, then there is no shear stress. This can be observed from the matrix decomposition in (3). It follows that the coefficients of  $S_1 - S$  are only symmetric matrices. Therefore it remains to show that there exists a structurally stressed  $k$ -chain  $P_2$  such that

$$\partial P_2 = S_1 - S.$$

In fact, one can prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.** *Suppose  $R$  is a structurally stressed  $(k-1)$ -chain in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $\partial R = 0$  if and only if there exists a structurally stressed  $k$ -chain  $P$  such that  $\partial P = R$ .*

*Proof.* The if part is trivial, so let us prove the only if part. The idea is to construct cones. First, one can express  $R$  as

$$R = \sum_{i=1}^m A_i \otimes \sigma_i.$$

Since  $k \leq n$ , there exists a point  $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $w$  does not lie in the tangent spaces of  $\sigma_i$ 's. So one may construct the cone  $w * \sigma_i$  of  $w$  over each  $\sigma_i$ . Define

$$P = \sum_{i=1}^m A_i \otimes (w * \sigma_i).$$

Since  $R$  is structurally stressed, the eigenspaces of  $A_i$  corresponding to nonzero eigenvalues lie inside the  $\text{span}(\sigma_i)$ . Therefore they also lie in the  $\text{span}(w * \sigma_i)$ . So  $P$  is also structurally stressed.

Next, since  $\partial(w * \sigma) = \sigma - w * \partial\sigma$  and  $\partial R = 0$ , one can check that

$$\partial P = \sum_{i=1}^m A_i \otimes \partial(w * \sigma_i) = \sum_{i=1}^m A_i \otimes \sigma_i = R.$$

□

**Theorem 3.** *Suppose  $Q$  is a stressed polyhedral  $(k-1)$ -chain such that*

$$Q = \sum_{i=1}^m A_i \otimes \sigma_i = S + F$$

where the  $A_i$  are generalized Cauchy stress tensor for each  $\sigma_i$ ,  $S$  consists of the stresses, and  $F$  consists of the forces. Then there exists a structurally stressed polyhedral  $k$ -chain  $P$  such that

$$\partial P = Q$$

if and only if  $\partial Q = 0$  and the net force and the net torque of  $F$  are both equal to zero.

*Proof.* The if direction is trivial, so let us focus on the only if direction. Since  $A_i$  is a generalized Cauchy stress tensor for each  $\sigma_i$ , there exists an eigenvector  $v_i$  of  $A_i$  whose eigenvalue is not zero and  $v_i$  does not lie in the tangent space of  $\sigma_i$ . It contributes to the external force  $\mathbf{F}_i$  on  $\sigma_i$

$$\mathbf{F}_i = A_i v_i \cdot (\text{area of } \sigma_i).$$

Let

$$\mathbf{F} = \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{F}_i \mathcal{H}_{|\sigma_i}^{k-1}.$$

By hypothesis, the system  $\mathbf{F}$  satisfies the equilibrium conditions that

$$\sum \mathbf{F}_i = 0, \quad \sum \mathbf{F}_i \wedge \hat{\sigma}_i = 0,$$

where  $\hat{\sigma}_i$  is the barycenter of  $\sigma_i$ . According to Theorem 2, there exists a structurally stressed  $k$ -chain  $P_1$  such that  $R = \partial P_1 - Q$  is a structurally stressed  $(k-1)$ -chain. Moreover,

$$\partial R = \partial^2 P_1 - \partial Q = 0.$$

So by Lemma 4, there exists a structurally stressed  $k$ -chain  $P_2$  such that  $\partial P_2 = R$ . Combining  $P_1$  with  $P_2$ , one yields

$$\partial(P_1 - P_2) = R + Q - R = Q.$$

So  $P = P_1 - P_2$  is the desired structurally stressed  $k$ -chain.  $\square$

## 6. THE MINIMIZER PART OF THE PLATEAU'S PROBLEM

Given the existence property, the next natural question to ask is: "What does a minimizer look like?" There are two different ways to approach this question: flat chain complex and current.

**6.1. Minimizer in Flat Chain Complex.** To discuss flat chains, we need to first put a norm  $|\cdot|$  on  $Sym_n$  so that it satisfies the three properties:  $|A| \geq 0$  with equality if and only if  $A = 0$ ,  $|A + B| \leq |A| + |B|$ , and  $|-A| = |A|$ . The abelian group  $(Sym_n, |\cdot|)$  is known as a *normed abelian group*. Then one may define the *mass* norm on the stressed polyhedral chain complex as follows.

For each stressed polyhedral  $k$ -chain  $P$ , there is a representative in its equivalence class such that

$$(12) \quad P = \sum_{i=1}^m A_i \otimes \sigma_i,$$

where the  $A_i \in Sym_n$  and the  $\sigma_i$  are distinct oriented  $k$ -simplices that do not overlap with each other except on their boundaries. Then the *mass* of  $P$  is defined as

$$\mathbb{M}(P) = \sum_{i=1}^m |A_i| \mathcal{H}^k(\sigma_i),$$

where  $\mathcal{H}^k(\sigma_i)$  is the  $k$ -dimensional volume of  $\sigma_i$ . It is easily checked that  $M$  is well-defined. Different choices of  $|\cdot|$  on  $Sym_n$  gives different meanings to the mass. For example,

**The Cost of Constructing  $P$ .** When  $|A| = \sum_{j=1}^n |\lambda_j|$  with  $\lambda_j$  being the eigenvalues of  $A$ . Each eigenvalue can be interpreted as an elastic constant, therefore the product of  $|A|$  with the volume of  $\sigma$  estimates the cost of building such an elastic material whose shape is  $\sigma$  and whose internal stretching/compressing are summarized by  $|A|$ .

Next we define the *flat norm* using Whitney's notation: Suppose  $P$  is a stressed  $k$ -chain,

$$\mathcal{F}(P) = \inf \{ \mathbb{M}(R) + \mathbb{M}(Q) \mid P = R + \partial Q, \text{ where } Q \text{ is a stressed } (k+1)\text{-chain} \}.$$

Now for each compact subset  $K$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , let  $\mathcal{P}_k(K) \subset \mathcal{P}_k(\mathbb{R}^n)$  be the  $k$ -dimensional stressed chains supported in  $K$ . Then one complete this metric space with respect to the flat norm  $\mathcal{F}$ , calling it  $\mathcal{F}_k(K)$ . The union of these gives the normed abelian group of *flat chains*

$$\mathcal{F}_k(\mathbb{R}^n) = \bigcup_{K \text{ compact}} \mathcal{F}_k(K).$$

Then one can apply the compactness theorem for flat chains to the following theorem. [9]

**Theorem 4.** *Suppose that  $Q$  is a stressed  $(k-1)$ -chain satisfying the conditions in Theorem 3. Let  $K$  be a sufficiently large compact set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  containing the support of  $Q$ . Then there exists a flat  $k$ -chain  $P_0$  in  $\mathcal{F}_k(K; Sym_n)$  such that  $\partial P_0 = Q$  and its mass  $M(P_0)$  is less than or equal to*

$$\inf \{ \mathbb{M}(P) : P \in \mathcal{P}_k(K; Sym_n), \partial P = Q, P \text{ is structurally stressed.} \}$$

*Proof.* Given that  $K$  is sufficiently large, the set is not empty and so the infimum exists. Denote the infimum by  $\alpha$ . Let  $\{P_i\}$  be a minimizing sequence in the set such that  $\mathbb{M}(P_i) \rightarrow \alpha$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ .

Since closed balls are compact in  $(Sym_n, |\cdot|)$ , the compactness theorem for flat chains says that for any  $\lambda > 0$ , the following set

$$\{P \in \mathcal{F}_k(K; Sym_n) : \mathbb{M}(P) + \mathbb{M}(\partial P) < \lambda\}$$

is compact in the flat norm. Since  $M(P_i)$  is bounded above and  $M(\partial P_i) = M(Q)$  is finite, it follows that there is a convergent subsequence  $\{P_{i_j}\} \rightarrow P_0$  for some flat chain  $P_0$  supported in  $K$  with respect to the flat norm. Since mass is lower semicontinuous,

$$M(P_0) \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} M(P_{i_j}) = \alpha.$$

Moreover,

$$\mathcal{F}(\partial P_{i_j} - \partial P_0) \leq \mathcal{F}(P_{i_j} - P_0) \rightarrow 0$$

implies that

$$\partial P_0 = Q.$$

□

Remark 1:  $P_0$  is not hard to visualize according to the approximation theorem for flat chains. That is, there is a sequence of polyhedral chains  $P_i \rightarrow P_0$  in the flat norm such that

$$M(P_i) \rightarrow M(P_0), \quad M(\partial P_i) \rightarrow M(\partial P_0).$$

However, we don't know whether the  $P_i$  are supported in  $K$  and their boundaries might not be  $Q$ . In fact, the flat chain  $P_0$  might be "smeared out."

Remark 2: In our hypothesis, we fixed a compact set  $K$  and so the minimal solutions were restricted to be supported in  $K$ . But in general, we are interested in looking for

$$\inf \{ \mathbb{M}(P) : P \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mathbb{R}^n; Sym_n), \partial P = Q, P \text{ is structurally stressed.} \}$$

This is still an open question and we wonder: “Do we need to make  $K$  larger and larger in order to obtain the infimum of all such structurally stressed  $P$  whose boundary is  $Q$ ?”

## 6.2. Current.

6.2.1. *Vector-Valued Currents.* Given an oriented  $k$ -simplex, it defines a bounded linear operator on the space  $\mathcal{D}^k(\mathbb{R}^n)$  of smooth compactly supported differential  $k$ -forms:

$$\omega \rightarrow \int_{\sigma} \omega,$$

so  $\sigma$  can be viewed as a *current*. We use this idea to treat  $A \otimes \sigma$  as a *vector-valued current*.

Consider the vector space of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ -valued  $k$ -covectors:

$$\mathbb{R}^n \otimes \wedge^k \mathbb{R}^n \cong [\wedge^k \mathbb{R}^n]^n.$$

It is generated by elements of the form  $v \otimes \omega$  where  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\omega \in \wedge^k \mathbb{R}^n$ . In fact, every element of  $[\wedge^k \mathbb{R}^n]^n$  can be expressed in the form of

$$(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n),$$

where  $\omega_j \in \wedge^k \mathbb{R}^n$ . For example,

$$v \otimes \omega = (v^1 \omega, \dots, v^n \omega), \text{ if } v = (v^1, \dots, v^n).$$

Since  $[\wedge^k \mathbb{R}^n]^n$  is a finite dimensional real vector space, it is a Hilbert space with an inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  and an Euclidean norm  $|\cdot|$ .

Consider now the vector space of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ -valued, smooth, compactly supported, differential  $k$ -forms on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ :

$$\mathbb{R}^n \otimes \mathcal{D}^k(\mathbb{R}^n) \cong [\mathcal{D}^k(\mathbb{R}^n)]^n = C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n \otimes \wedge^k \mathbb{R}^n).$$

For each stressed  $k$ -chain  $A \otimes \sigma$ , one may view it as a bounded linear map on  $\mathbb{R}^n \otimes \mathcal{D}^k(\mathbb{R}^n)$  by

$$A \otimes \sigma(v \otimes \omega) = A(v) \int_{\sigma} \omega.$$

Extending by linearity, every stressed  $k$ -chain becomes a bounded linear map on  $\mathbb{R}^n \otimes \mathcal{D}^k(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . We can think of it as a vector-valued current acting upon vector-valued differential forms.

6.2.2. *Comass and Currents.* We need to use a special norm on  $\wedge^k \mathbb{R}^n$  other than the Euclidean norm in order to have:

$$\|A \otimes \sigma\| = \sup\{|A \otimes \sigma(\Omega)| : \|\Omega\| \leq 1\} = \mathbb{M}(A \otimes \sigma).$$

For every  $k$ -covector  $\phi \in \wedge^k \mathbb{R}^n$ , recall the *comass* norm on  $\phi$  is defined as:

$$\|\phi\| = \sup\{|\phi(X_1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_k)| : X_1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_k \in \wedge^k \mathbb{R}^n, |X_1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_k| \leq 1\}.$$

[3] It satisfies the following relationship:

$$|\phi| \leq \|\phi\| \leq \binom{n}{k}^{\frac{1}{2}} |\phi|,$$

where  $|\phi|$  is the Euclidean norm on  $\phi$ . The corresponding *comass* norm on a smooth, compactly supported, differential  $k$ -form can be defined as follows:

$$\|\omega\| = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|\omega_j(x)\|.$$

One can check that for any oriented  $k$ -simplex  $\sigma$ :

$$\text{vol}(\sigma) = \sup\{|\int_{\sigma} \omega| : \|\omega\| \leq 1\}.$$

Furthermore, for every  $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^n \otimes \mathcal{D}^k(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , its *comass* norm can be defined as follows:

$$\|\Omega\| = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n \|\omega_j\|^2}, \text{ if } \Omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n).$$

Before verifying the equality, we need to modify one last thing. Previously, in the definition of the mass, we mentioned one norm on  $A$  by adding the absolute values of its eigenvalues. Here we are going to use another norm on  $A$  by picking the largest absolute values of its eigenvalues, namely,

$$|A| = \max_i |\lambda_i| = \sup\{|Ax| : |x| \leq 1\}.$$

**Lemma 5.** *For every stressed  $k$ -chain  $T = \sum_{i=1}^m A_i \otimes \sigma_i$  with  $A_i$  being symmetric matrices and  $\sigma_i$  being oriented  $k$ -simplices,*

$$\|T\| = \sup\{|T(\Omega)| : \|\Omega\| \leq 1\} \leq \mathbb{M}(T).$$

*In particular when  $T = A \otimes \sigma$ ,*

$$\|T\| = \mathbb{M}(T).$$

*Proof.* Assume  $\Omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n) = \sum_{j=1}^n e_j \otimes \omega_j$  with  $\omega_j \in \mathcal{D}^k(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $\|\Omega\| \leq 1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} |T(\Omega)| &\leq \left| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n A_i(e_j) \int_{\sigma_i} \omega_j \right| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^m A_i \left( \sum_{j=1}^n e_j \int_{\sigma_i} \omega_j \right) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m |A_i| \text{vol}(\sigma_i) \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n \|\omega_j\|^2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^m |A_i| \text{vol}(\sigma_i) \\ &= \mathbb{M}(T) \end{aligned}$$

In the case when  $T = A \otimes \sigma$ , we may select a differential form  $\omega$  supported in  $\sigma$  such that

$$\int_{\sigma} \omega \rightarrow \text{vol}(\sigma), \quad \|\omega\| \leq 1.$$

Moreover, let  $v$  be a unit eigenvector corresponding to the largest absolute value of the eigenvalues of  $A$ . So  $\|v \otimes \omega\| \leq 1$ , and

$$|A \otimes \sigma(v \otimes \omega)| = |A(v) \int_{\sigma} \omega| \rightarrow |A| \text{vol}(\sigma).$$

□

**Theorem 5.** *Suppose that  $Q$  is a stressed polyhedral  $(k-1)$ -chain*

$$Q = \sum_{i=1}^m A_i \otimes \sigma_i = S + T,$$

*satisfying the following conditions:*

- (i) *the coefficient matrices  $A_i$  are generalized Cauchy stress tensor,*
- (ii) *the system  $F$  of forces is in equilibrium: the net force and torque are zero,*
- (iii)  $\partial Q = 0$ .

*Then there exists a vector-valued current  $T$  such that  $\partial T = Q$  and its norm  $\|T\|$  satisfies*

$$\|T\| \leq \inf \{ \mathbb{M}(P) : P \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mathbb{R}^n; \text{Sym}_n), \partial P = Q. \}$$

*Proof.* Given a sequence of stressed polyhedral  $k$ -chains  $\{P^j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$  converging to the infimum. Their  $i$ th component functions  $P_i^j$  are bounded linear operators over  $\mathbb{R}^n \otimes \mathcal{D}^k(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . The Alaoglu Theorem says that if  $X = \mathbb{R}^n \otimes \mathcal{D}^k(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is a normed vector space, the closed unit ball in  $X^*$  is compact with respect to the weak\* topology. [4] It follows that there is a  $T_i \in (\mathbb{R}^n \otimes \mathcal{D}^k(\mathbb{R}^n))^*$  such that

$$P_i^j(v \otimes \omega) \rightarrow T_i(v \otimes \omega),$$

for all  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\omega \in \mathcal{D}^k(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Let  $T = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ , then  $P^j$  converges to  $T$  weakly

$$P^j(v \otimes \omega) \rightarrow T(v \otimes \omega),$$

for all  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\omega \in \mathcal{D}^k(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . It follows that

$$\|T\| = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|P^j\| \leq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{M}(P^j) = \inf.$$

Moreover, one can define  $\partial T$  as

$$\partial T(v \otimes \omega) = T(v \otimes d\omega),$$



and then extend by linearity. One can show that our previous definition  $\partial(A \otimes \sigma) = A \otimes \partial\sigma$  still makes sense by Stokes' Theorem on manifolds with corners:

$$(A \otimes \sigma)(v \otimes d\omega) = A(v) \int_{\sigma} d\omega = A(v) \int_{\partial\sigma} \omega = (A \otimes \partial\sigma)(v \otimes \omega).$$

Therefore  $\partial P^j = Q$  implies that

$$\partial T(v \otimes \omega) = T(v \otimes d\omega) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} P^j(v \otimes d\omega) = Q(v \otimes \omega).$$

So

$$\partial T = Q.$$

□

**6.2.3. Riesz Representation Theorem.** To interpret the vector-valued current  $T$  in the previous theorem, one may adapt the vector-valued version of the Riesz representation theorem to our stressed  $k$ -chains as follows. [8]

**Theorem 6.** *Suppose  $T = \sum_{i=1}^m A_i \otimes \sigma_i$  is a stressed  $k$ -chain with  $A_i$  being symmetric matrices and  $\sigma_i$  being oriented  $k$ -simplices, then*

$$T : \mathbb{R}^n \otimes \mathcal{D}^k(\mathbb{R}^n) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$$

*is linear and for all compact subsets  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ,*

$$\sup\{|T(\Omega)| : |\Omega| \leq 1, \text{ spt } \Omega \subset K\} < \infty.$$

*The Riesz Representation Theorem implies that there are positive Radon measures  $\nu_i$  and  $\nu_i$ -measurable functions*

$$\vec{T}_i : \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \otimes \wedge^k \mathbb{R}^n, \text{ with } |\vec{T}_i(x)| = 1 \text{ for } \nu_i \text{ almost all } x \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n,$$

*such that the  $i$ th entry of  $T(v \otimes \omega)$  is equal to*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \langle v \otimes \omega(x), \vec{T}_i(x) \rangle d\nu_i,$$

*for all  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\omega \in \mathcal{D}^k(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .*

*Proof.* In the statement of the Riesz Representation Theorem, let  $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ , which is a locally compact Hausdorff space, and let  $H = \mathbb{R}^n \otimes \wedge^k \mathbb{R}^n$ , which is a finite dimensional real Hilbert space with inner product norm  $|\cdot|$ . For every  $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^n \otimes \mathcal{D}^k(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , it can be viewed as a smooth function from  $\mathbb{R}^n$  to  $\mathbb{R}^n \otimes \wedge^k \mathbb{R}^n$  with compact support. So  $\Omega \in C_c^\infty(X, H)$  and

$$T : C_c^\infty(X, H) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Moreover, since every element of  $C_c(X, H)$  can be approximated by some  $\Omega \in C_c^\infty(X, H)$ ,  $T$  can be extended linearly to

$$T : C_c(X, H) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n.$$

By the previous theorem, each coordinate function  $T_i$  of  $T$  is linear and bounded. That is for every compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$\sup\{T_i(f) : f \in C_c(X, H), \|f\| \leq 1, \text{spt } f \subset K\} \leq \mathbb{M}(T) < \infty.$$

Therefore there is a positive Radon measure  $\nu_i$  on  $X$  and  $\nu_i$ -measurable function  $\vec{T}_i : X \rightarrow H$  with  $|\vec{T}_i| = 1$  for  $\nu_i$  almost all  $x$  on  $X$  such that

$$T_i(f) = \int_X \langle f, \vec{T}_i(x) \rangle d\nu_i(x) \quad \text{for any } f \in C_c(X, H).$$

In particular, for all  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\omega \in \mathcal{D}^k(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , the  $i$ th entry of  $T(v \otimes \omega)$  is equal to

$$\int_X \langle v \otimes \omega(x), \vec{T}_i(x) \rangle d\nu_i(x),$$

as desired.  $\square$

**Corollary 1.** *One may view the vector-valued current  $T$  as a vector-valued measure on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ :*

$$\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_n).$$

For each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , the total variation of  $\nu_i$  satisfies:

$$|\nu_i| = |T_i| = \sup\{T_i(\Omega) : |\Omega| \leq 1\},$$

where  $|\Omega|$  is the Euclidean analogue of the comass norm  $\|\Omega\|$ .

Moreover, the total variation of  $\nu$  defined as

$$|\nu| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n |\nu_i|^2},$$

satisfies

$$|T| = \sup\{|T(\Omega)| : |\Omega| \leq 1\} \leq |\nu|.$$

*Proof.* On the one hand, for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and for  $\nu_i$  almost all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$|\langle \Omega(x), \vec{T}_i(x) \rangle| \leq \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^n |\omega_k(x)|^2} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^n |\vec{T}_i^k(x)|^2} = |\Omega(x)| |\vec{T}_i(x)| \leq |\Omega(x)|,$$

since  $|\vec{T}_i(x)| = 1$  for  $\nu_i$  almost all  $x$ . It follows that when  $|\Omega| \leq 1$ ,

$$|T_i(\Omega)| = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \langle \Omega(x), \vec{T}_i(x) \rangle d\nu_i \right| \leq \|\nu_i\|.$$

On the other hand, one can approximate each  $\vec{T}_i(x)$  with some  $\Omega(x)$  such that  $|\Omega| \leq 1$  and  $\langle \Omega(x), \vec{T}_i(x) \rangle$  converges to  $|\vec{T}_i(x)|^2 = 1$  for  $\nu_i$  almost all  $x$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Therefore  $T_i(\Omega)$  converges to  $|\nu_i|$ .

Furthermore, for  $|\Omega| \leq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 |T(\Omega)| &= |(T_1(\Omega), \dots, T_n(\Omega))| \\
 &= \left| \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \langle \Omega(x), \vec{T}_1(x) \rangle d\nu_1, \dots, \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \langle \Omega(x), \vec{T}_n(x) \rangle d\nu_n \right) \right| \\
 &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \langle \Omega(x), \vec{T}_i(x) \rangle d\nu_i \right|^2} \leq |\nu|.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

## 7. CONCLUSION

In this paper we proved the necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of an elastic body made of  $k$ -beams whose boundary is given by an elastic surface made of  $(k-1)$ -beams under an equilibrium system of forces. This generalizes the 1-dimensional problem of finding the springs connecting an equilibrium system of pointed forces in mechanical engineering.

Furthermore we tried to solve the Plateau problem of finding the optimal design using the techniques in geometric measure theory. Historically Michell and Gangbo approached the one-dimensional question by introducing their own dual problems. So the original question is still open. In this paper we approached this question in two different directions. One direction employed the flat chain complex to obtain the optimal design. The other direction treated the  $k$ -beams as vector-valued currents, which can be further interpreted as vector-valued measures using the Riesz representation theorem.

The regularity question is still leading us to new potential research questions. For example, Jerez Chen talked about how to use varifolds to solve the  $k=1$  case. [2] We are interested in studying the higher dimensional cases as well. Moreover, we are interested in find specific minimizers using the calibration theory. In the end, questions such as putting  $L^2$ -norm for the potential energy and studying in rectifiable finite chain also interest us.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Irgens, F. (2008), *Continuum Mechanics*, Springer. ISBN 3-540-74297-2.
- [2] Chen, J. (2022), *Mathematical Results for Michell Trusses*, Ph.D Thesis.
- [3] Federer, H. (1969), *Geometric Measure Theory*, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Berlin–Heidelberg–New York: Springer-Verlag, Vol. 153.
- [4] Folland, G. B. (1999), *Real Analysis: Modern Techniques and Their Applications*. - 2nd ed., A Wiley-Interscience publication, ISBN 0-471-31716-0.
- [5] Bouchitté G., Gangbo, W., Seppecher, P. (2004) *Michell Trusses and Existence of Lines of Principal Actions*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., Vol. 18 (9), p. 1571-1603.
- [6] Michell, A. G. M. (1904) *The Limits of Economy of Material in Frame-Structures*, Philosophical Magazine, Vol. 8(47), p. 589-597.
- [7] Prager, W. (1974), *A Note on Discretized Michell Structures*, *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, Vol. 3, p. 349-355.
- [8] Simon, L. (2014), *Introduction to Geometric Measure Theory*, <https://web.stanford.edu/class/math285/ts-gmt.pdf>.
- [9] (2014), *Brian White-Topics in GMT (Math 258) Lecture Notes By Otis Chodosh*, <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:85510849>.

FRENCH HALL 5311, UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI, 2815 COMMONS WAY,  
CINCINNATI, OH 45221

*Email address:* `yang2ch@ucmail.uc.edu`