

Zero-Sum Games and Linear Programming Duality

Bernhard von Stengel

Department of Mathematics, London School of Economics, b.von-stengel@lse.ac.uk

May 23, 2022

Abstract

The minimax theorem for zero-sum games is easily proved from the strong duality theorem of linear programming. For the converse direction, the standard proof by Dantzig (1951) is massively incomplete, as we argue in this article. We explain and combine classical theorems about solving linear equations with nonnegative variables to give a correct alternative proof.

1 Introduction and summary

LP duality (the strong duality theorem of linear programming) is a central result in optimization. It helps proving many results with ease, such as the minimax theorem for zero-sum games, first proved by von Neumann in 1928 [25]. As reported in [9, p. xxvi], George Dantzig explained on 3 October 1947 his nascent ideas on linear programming to John von Neumann. In response, he got an “eye-popping” lecture on LP duality, which von Neumann conjectured to be equivalent to his minimax theorem. This “equivalence” is commonly assumed (for example, Schrijver [20, p. 218]), but on closer inspection does not hold at all.

“Equivalence” is actually not a good term – all theorems, as logical statements without free variables, are equivalent, to “true”. We therefore say that theorem A *proves* (rather than “implies”) theorem B, typically by a suitable but different use of the variables in theorem A, and state straightforward proof relations of this kind as propositions (see Proposition 1 for an example).

The classic proof by Dantzig [7] of LP duality from the minimax theorem needs an additional assumption about the game solution (acknowledged by Dantzig), namely strict complementarity in the last column of the game matrix that corresponds to the right-hand side of the LPs. However, as we argue in this paper, this amounts to the Lemma of Tucker [23], which in turn is essentially the well-known

Lemma of Farkas [10]. But the Lemma of Farkas proves LP duality directly, so that the minimax theorem is not of much use.

This paper has several aims. First, to provide a proper proof of LP duality from the minimax theorem that does not implicitly use the Lemma of Farkas. Second, to explain this connection via theorems about the solution of linear equations in nonnegative variables. Third, to give a fairly complete exposition of these theorems rather than appealing to “well-known facts”, and to present several less-known elegant proofs from the literature in this context.

We give a self-contained introduction to linear programming duality and to the minimax theorem in Section 2. Section 3 recalls how LP duality is proved from the Lemma of Farkas, which characterizes when the inhomogeneous linear equations $Ax = b$ have no solution vector x such that $x \geq \mathbf{0}$. In Section 4 we consider the Theorem of Gordan [13], which characterizes when the homogeneous equations $Ax = \mathbf{0}$ have no solution $x \geq \mathbf{0}$ other than the trivial one $x = \mathbf{0}$. Gordan’s Theorem and its “inequality version” due to Ville [24] prove the minimax theorem and vice versa.

Stiemke [21] gave a two-page proof of the Theorem of Gordan [13] (without referencing it, even though published in the same journal, presumably with no editor around to remember it). The proof uses implicitly that the null space and row space of a matrix are orthogonal complements. But there are no matrices in these papers – people manipulated linear equations with their unknowns instead. Out of historical interest, we reproduce Stiemke’s proof in Section 5. We also present a most elegant half-page proof of the minimax theorem due to Loomis [16] that deserves to be better known.

Section 6 presents the classic derivation of LP duality from the minimax theorem due to Dantzig [7]. Even though its additional assumption looks minor, we show that it amounts to the Lemma of Tucker [23]. This, as noted by Tucker [23, p. 7], proves the Lemma of Farkas, which shows that the assumption is way too strong to make Dantzig’s derivation useful.

However, Tucker did not consider the converse that in nearly the same way the Lemma of Farkas proves his Lemma (see Proposition 7). This suggests that Tucker thought he had proved a more general statement. Tucker’s proof of his Lemma is indeed short and novel, but in this light must be viewed as another proof of the Lemma of Farkas. The *Theorem* of Tucker [23] is an easy but powerful generalization of his Lemma. Like Broyden [3] we think that it deserves more recognition.

Our main result, Theorem 6 in Section 7, is a proper proof of LP duality from the minimax theorem. Tucker’s Theorem shows that any system of homogeneous equations $Ax = \mathbf{0}$ such that $x \geq \mathbf{0}$ has a natural partition of its solution vector x into a set of variables that can take positive values and the others that are zero in any nonnegative solution. It is easy to see that one can drop the nonnegativity

requirement for the variables that can be positive. By *eliminating* these unconstrained variables from the system $Ax = \mathbf{0}$ with a bit of linear algebra, applying Gordan’s Theorem to the variables that are always zero in any nonnegative solution then gives Tucker’s Theorem. Our proof based on this variable elimination is inspired by Adler [1, section 4]. Tucker’s theorem proves LP duality in a stronger version, namely the existence of a “strictly complementary” solution, in a good use of Dantzig’s game (see the end of Section 7).

In Section 8, we present an alternative approach to salvaging the proof by Dantzig [7] by adding an additional row to Dantzig’s game for a given linear program. This destroys the nice symmetry of this game but enforces the crucial assumption in a minimax solution to the game. However, the fact that this works also needs proof, which amounts to Carathéodory’s Theorem on basic feasible and optimal solutions, which goes some way towards concepts used in the simplex algorithm [8]. Section 9 gives a detailed comparison of our work with the closely related paper by Adler [1].

In the final Section 10 we present a little-known gem of a proof of the Lemma of Farkas due to Conforti, Di Summa, and Zambelli [6]. Their theorem states that a system of inequalities $Ax \leq b$ is *minimally* infeasible if and only if the corresponding *equalities* $Ax = b$ are minimally infeasible. Because the linear equations are infeasible, a suitable linear combination of them states $0 = -1$, which proves the Lemma of Farkas in this context.

2 LP duality and the minimax theorem

Throughout, m and n are positive integers, and $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. All vectors are column vectors. The j th component of a vector x is written x_j . All matrices have real entries. The transpose of a matrix A is written A^\top . Vectors and scalars are treated as matrices of appropriate dimension, so that a vector x times a scalar α is written as $x\alpha$, and a row vector x^\top times a scalar α as αx^\top . Where possible, we transpose vectors rather than the matrix, to emphasize that Ax is a linear combination of the columns of A and $y^\top A$ is a linear combination of the rows of A . The all-zero and the all-one vector are written as $\mathbf{0} = (0, \dots, 0)^\top$ and $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)^\top$, their dimension depending on the context, and the all-zero matrix just as 0. Inequalities between vectors or matrices such as $x \geq \mathbf{0}$ hold between all components.

A linear program (LP) in *inequality form* is given by an $m \times n$ matrix A and vectors $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and states, with a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of variables:

$$\underset{x}{\text{maximize}} \quad c^\top x \quad \text{subject to} \quad Ax \leq b, \quad x \geq \mathbf{0}. \quad (1)$$

This LP is called *feasible* if there is some $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that fulfills the constraints $Ax \leq b$ and $x \geq \mathbf{0}$, otherwise *infeasible*. If there are arbitrarily large values of $c^\top x$ with $Ax \leq b$ and $x \geq \mathbf{0}$, then the LP is called *unbounded*.

With (1) considered as the *primal* LP, its *dual* LP states, with a vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ of variables:

$$\underset{y}{\text{minimize}} \quad y^\top b \quad \text{subject to} \quad y^\top A \geq c^\top, \quad y \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad (2)$$

with feasibility and unboundedness defined accordingly.

The *weak duality* theorem states that if both primal and dual LP have feasible solutions x and y , respectively, then their objective function values are mutual bounds, that is,

$$c^\top x \leq y^\top b, \quad (3)$$

which holds because feasibility implies $c^\top x \leq y^\top Ax \leq y^\top b$. Hence, if there are feasible solutions x and y so that the two objective functions are *equal*, $c^\top x = y^\top b$, then both are optimal. The (strong) *LP duality* theorem states that this is always the case if the two LPs are feasible:

Theorem 1 (LP duality). *If the primal LP (1) and the dual LP (2) are feasible, then there exist feasible x and y with $c^\top x = y^\top b$, which are therefore optimal solutions.*

A *zero-sum game* is given by an $m \times n$ matrix A and is played between a *row player*, who chooses a row i of the matrix, simultaneously with the *column player*, who chooses a column j of the matrix, after which the row player receives the matrix entry a_{ij} from the column player as a *payoff* (which is a *cost* to the column player). That is, the row player is the maximizer and the column player the minimizer. The rows and columns are called the players' *pure strategies*.

The players can *randomize* their actions by choosing them according to a probability distribution, called a *mixed strategy*. The other player may know the probability distribution but not the chosen pure strategy. The row player is then assumed to maximize his *expected payoff* and the column player to minimize her *expected cost*. We denote the set of mixed strategies of the row player by

$$Y = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid y \geq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}^\top y = 1\}, \quad (4)$$

and of the column player by

$$X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x \geq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}^\top x = 1\}, \quad (5)$$

in order to stay close to the LP notation (normally row and column player are considered as first and second player, respectively, so that the letters for their mixed strategies should be in alphabetical order, but this is already violated with the very common naming of the LP variables $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$).

With mixed strategies y and x of row and column player, the expected payoff to the maximizing row player and expected cost to the minimizing column player is $y^\top Ax$.

The minimizing column player who chooses a mixed strategy x should expect that the row player responds with a mixed strategy y (called a *best response*) that maximizes her payoff $y^\top Ax$. That best-response payoff $\max_{y \in Y} y^\top Ax$ is the weighted sum $\sum_{i \in [m]} y_i (Ax)_i$ of the expected payoffs $(Ax)_i$ for the rows i and therefore equal to their maximum, which in turn is the least upper bound v of these row payoffs. That is,

$$\max_{y \in Y} y^\top Ax = \max_{i \in [m]} (Ax)_i = \min \{v \in \mathbb{R} \mid Ax \leq \mathbf{1}v\}. \quad (6)$$

A *min-max* strategy x of the column player minimizes this worst-case cost v that he has to pay, that is, it is an optimal solution to

$$\underset{x, v}{\text{minimize}} \quad v \quad \text{subject to} \quad Ax \leq \mathbf{1}v, \quad x \in X \quad (7)$$

and then v is called the *min-max value* of the game.

Similarly, a *max-min* strategy y and the *max-min value* u is an optimal solution to

$$\underset{y, u}{\text{maximize}} \quad u \quad \text{subject to} \quad y^\top A \geq u\mathbf{1}^\top, \quad y \in Y. \quad (8)$$

The minimax theorem of von Neumann [25] states

$$\max_{y \in Y} \min_{x \in X} y^\top Ax = v = \min_{x \in X} \max_{y \in Y} y^\top Ax \quad (9)$$

where the unique real number v is called the *value* of the game. Via (6) and the corresponding expression for $\min_{x \in X} y^\top Ax$ (the best-response cost to $y \in Y$), we state this as follows.

Theorem 2 (The minimax theorem). *Consider optimal x, v for (7) and y, u for (8). Then $u = v$ (the value of the game), x is a min-max strategy, and y is a max-min strategy.*

The LP (7) is in *general form* with an equation $\mathbf{1}^\top x = 1$ and an unconstrained variable v (with $-v$ to be maximized), and so is (8), which is the dual LP to (7) with u as the unconstrained variable (with $-u$ to be minimized) that corresponds to the equation for X written as $-\mathbf{1}^\top x = -1$. Since both LPs are feasible, the strong duality theorem (which also holds for LPs in general form) implies that their optimal values are equal ($-v = -u$), which proves Theorem 2.

One can avoid stating LPs in general form by ensuring that the min-max value is positive, by adding a constant α to the payoffs a_{ij} , which defines a new payoff matrix $A + \mathbf{1}\alpha\mathbf{1}^\top$. Then for $y \in Y$ and $x \in X$

$$y^\top (A + \mathbf{1}\alpha\mathbf{1}^\top) x = y^\top Ax + y^\top \mathbf{1}\alpha\mathbf{1}^\top x = y^\top Ax + \alpha, \quad (10)$$

which shows that best responses and min-max and max-min strategies are unaffected and the corresponding values just shifted by α . If all entries of A are

positive, then $v > 0$ for any feasible v in (7). Division of each row in (7) by v (where we now maximize $1/v$) then gives the LP

$$\underset{x}{\text{maximize}} \mathbf{1}^\top x \quad \text{subject to} \quad Ax \leq \mathbf{1}, \quad x \geq \mathbf{0} \quad (11)$$

with its dual

$$\underset{y}{\text{minimize}} y^\top \mathbf{1} \quad \text{subject to} \quad y^\top A \geq \mathbf{1}^\top, \quad y \geq \mathbf{0}. \quad (12)$$

Both LPs are feasible with nonzero optimal solutions x and y , which give the min-max and max-min strategies xv and yv with $v = 1/\mathbf{1}^\top x = 1/\mathbf{1}^\top y$ and game value v .

These are the standard ways to derive the minimax theorem from LP duality [8, section 13-2]. Section 6 describes the classical converse approach, which we show to be incomplete.

3 The Lemma of Farkas and LP duality

The standard way to prove the LP duality theorem uses the Lemma of Farkas [10], stated in (13) below, which characterizes when an inhomogeneous system $Ax = b$ of linear equations has no solution $x \geq \mathbf{0}$ in nonnegative variables. Two related theorems are (14) and (15). The following proposition asserts how close they are, by using the respective matrix in different ways (we say “proves” rather than “implies” because it is not the same matrix).

Proposition 1. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then each of the following three assertions proves the others: The Lemma of Farkas with equalities and nonnegative variables*

$$\nexists x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax = b, \quad x \geq \mathbf{0} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \exists y \in \mathbb{R}^m : y^\top A \geq \mathbf{0}^\top, \quad y^\top b < 0, \quad (13)$$

the Lemma of Farkas with inequalities and nonnegative variables

$$\nexists x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax \leq b, \quad x \geq \mathbf{0} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \exists y \in \mathbb{R}^m : y^\top A \geq \mathbf{0}^\top, \quad y \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad y^\top b < 0, \quad (14)$$

and the Lemma of Farkas with inequalities and unconstrained variables

$$\nexists x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax \leq b \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \exists y \in \mathbb{R}^m : y^\top A = \mathbf{0}^\top, \quad y \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad y^\top b < 0. \quad (15)$$

Proof. In each of (13), (14), (15) the direction “ \Leftarrow ” is immediate, for example in (13) because $y^\top A \geq \mathbf{0}^\top$ and $Ax = b, x \geq \mathbf{0}$ imply $y^\top b = y^\top Ax \geq 0$ which contradicts $y^\top b < 0$. We therefore only consider “ \Rightarrow ”. Condition (13) proves (14) by writing $Ax \leq b$ as $Ax + s = b, s \geq \mathbf{0}$ for a vector of *slack variables* $s \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and then applying (13) to the matrix $[A \ I]$ instead of A , where I is the $m \times m$ identity matrix.

Conversely, if there is no solution $x \geq \mathbf{0}$ to $Ax = b$, that is, to $Ax \leq b$ and $-Ax \leq -b$, then by (14) there are nonnegative $y^+, y^- \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $(y^+)^\top A - (y^-)^\top A \geq \mathbf{0}^\top$ and $(y^+)^\top b - (y^-)^\top b < 0$. This shows (13) with $y = y^+ - y^-$.

Condition (15) follows from (14) by writing $Ax \leq b$ in (15) as $Ax^+ - Ax^- \leq b$ with nonnegative x^+ and x^- . The converse holds by writing $Ax \leq b, x \geq \mathbf{0}$ in (14) as $Ax \leq b, -x \leq \mathbf{0}$ in (15). \square

These versions of the Lemma of Farkas are “theorems of the alternative” in that exactly one of two conditions is true, as in (13): Either there is a solution x to $Ax = b, x \geq \mathbf{0}$, or a solution y to $y^\top A \geq \mathbf{0}^\top, y^\top b < 0$, but not to both. We always state such theorems so that “ \Rightarrow ” is the nontrivial direction.

The following is standard (e.g., Gale [11, p. 79]).

Proposition 2. *The inequality version (14) of the Lemma of Farkas proves LP duality.*

Proof. Suppose that the primal LP (1) has a feasible solution \bar{x} and the dual LP (2) has a feasible solution \bar{y} and that, contrary to the claim of the LP duality theorem, there are no feasible x and y so that $c^\top x = y^\top b$. That is, the system of inequalities

$$\begin{array}{rcl} Ax & \leq & b \\ -A^\top y & \leq & -c \\ b^\top y - c^\top x & \leq & 0 \end{array} \quad (16)$$

has no solution $(y, x) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with $y \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $x \geq \mathbf{0}$. Hence, by (14), there are nonnegative $(\hat{y}, \hat{x}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ so that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} -\hat{x}^\top A^\top + tb^\top & \geq & \mathbf{0}^\top \\ \hat{y}^\top A & - & tc^\top \geq \mathbf{0}^\top \\ \hat{y}^\top b - \hat{x}^\top c & & < 0. \end{array} \quad (17)$$

If $t > 0$ then $\hat{x} \frac{1}{t}$ and $\hat{y} \frac{1}{t}$ are feasible solutions to the primal (1) and dual (2) with $\frac{1}{t} \hat{y}^\top b < c^\top \hat{x} \frac{1}{t}$ in violation of weak duality (3). If $t = 0$ then $A\hat{x} \leq \mathbf{0}$ and $\hat{y}^\top A \geq \mathbf{0}^\top$. The last inequality in (17) implies that at least one of the inequalities $\hat{y}^\top b < 0$ or $0 < c^\top \hat{x}$ holds. Suppose the latter. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $A(\bar{x} + \hat{x}\alpha) \leq b$ and $\bar{x} + \hat{x}\alpha \geq \mathbf{0}$, but $c^\top(\bar{x} + \hat{x}\alpha) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, that is, the objective function of the primal LP is unbounded, contradicting its upper bound $\bar{y}^\top b$ from the dual LP. Similarly, $\hat{y}^\top b < 0$ implies that the dual LP is unbounded and thus the primal LP infeasible, again a contradiction. This shows that (16) has a nonnegative solution (y, x) with $y^\top b \leq c^\top x$ and thus $y^\top b = c^\top x$ by weak duality, as claimed. \square

The converse also holds, as well as a useful extension of LP duality.

Proposition 3. *The LP duality Theorem 2 proves (14). Moreover, if the primal LP (1) is infeasible and the dual LP (2) is feasible, then the dual LP is unbounded.*

Proof. Suppose there is no $x \geq \mathbf{0}$ with $Ax \leq b$. Then the LP

$$\underset{x,t}{\text{maximize}} \quad -t \quad \text{subject to} \quad Ax - \mathbf{1}t \leq b, \quad x \geq \mathbf{0}, t \geq 0 \quad (18)$$

(which is feasible by choosing $t \geq -b_i$ for all $i \in [m]$ and $x = \mathbf{0}$) has an optimum solution with $t > 0$. The dual LP to (18) states

$$\underset{y}{\text{minimize}} \quad y^\top b \quad \text{subject to} \quad y^\top A \geq \mathbf{0}^\top, \quad -y^\top \mathbf{1} \geq -1, \quad y \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad (19)$$

is feasible with $y = \mathbf{0}$, and therefore has an optimal solution $y \geq \mathbf{0}$ with equal objective function value to the primal, that is, $y^\top b = -t < 0$. This shows (14).

To prove the second part, suppose $\bar{y}^\top A^\top \geq c^\top$ for some $\bar{y} \geq \mathbf{0}$. Then with the preceding $y \geq \mathbf{0}$ such that $y^\top b < 0$ we have $(\bar{y}^\top + \alpha y^\top)A \geq c^\top$ and $\bar{y} + y\alpha \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $(\bar{y}^\top + \alpha y^\top)b \rightarrow -\infty$ as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$. \square

4 The theorems of Gordan and Ville

The Lemma of Farkas with equalities (13) states when the inhomogeneous linear equations $Ax = b$ have no solution $x \geq \mathbf{0}$ in nonnegative variables. The following Theorem (20) of Gordan [13] for homogeneous equations states when the system $Ax = \mathbf{0}$ has no nontrivial solution $x \geq \mathbf{0}$. Its “inequality version” (21) is known as the Theorem of Ville [24]. Ville’s Theorem essentially states the minimax theorem for a game with positive value. To prove the minimax theorem from Ville’s Theorem, the game should have its value normalized to zero. A common way to achieve this is to symmetrize the game [12]. Instead, we shift the payoffs as in (10) so that the max-min value is zero. Note that the min-max and max-min values in (7) and (8) exist without having to assume LP duality.

Proposition 4. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Then the following Theorem (20) of Gordan proves the Theorem (21) of Ville and vice versa, and (21) proves the minimax theorem and vice versa:*

$$\nexists x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax = \mathbf{0}, \quad x \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad x \neq \mathbf{0} \Leftrightarrow \exists y \in \mathbb{R}^m : y^\top A > \mathbf{0}^\top, \quad (20)$$

$$\nexists x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax \leq \mathbf{0}, \quad x \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad x \neq \mathbf{0} \Leftrightarrow \exists y \in \mathbb{R}^m : y^\top A > \mathbf{0}^\top, \quad y \geq \mathbf{0}. \quad (21)$$

Proof. Assume (20) holds. We prove (21). Suppose there is no $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $Ax \leq \mathbf{0}$, $x \geq \mathbf{0}$, $x \neq \mathbf{0}$. Then there is no $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $Ax + s = \mathbf{0}$ and $x \geq \mathbf{0}$, $s \geq \mathbf{0}$, and $(x, s) \neq (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})$ (this clearly holds if $x \neq \mathbf{0}$, and if $x = \mathbf{0}$ then $s = \mathbf{0}$). Hence, by (20), there is some $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $y^\top A > \mathbf{0}^\top$ and $y > \mathbf{0}$ and thus $y \geq \mathbf{0}$. This shows the nontrivial direction “ \Rightarrow ” in (21).

Conversely, suppose there is no $x \geq \mathbf{0}$, $x \neq \mathbf{0}$ with $Ax = \mathbf{0}$ and hence no $x \geq \mathbf{0}$, $x \neq \mathbf{0}$ with $Ax \leq \mathbf{0}$ and $-Ax \leq \mathbf{0}$. Then by (21) there exist $y^+ \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $y^- \geq \mathbf{0}$ with $(y^+)^\top A + (y^-)^\top (-A) > \mathbf{0}^\top$, that is, $(y^+ - y^-)^\top A > \mathbf{0}^\top$, which shows (20) with $y = y^+ - y^-$.

Assume the minimax Theorem 2 holds for the game matrix A . The left-hand side of (21) states that the value v of the game is positive, because otherwise there would be a mixed strategy $x \in X$ with nonpositive min-max value v in (7). With the optimal $y \in Y$ and $u > 0$ in (8) we have $y^\top A \geq u\mathbf{1}^\top > \mathbf{0}^\top$ as asserted in (21).

Conversely, assume (21) and consider a game matrix A . Let u be its max-min value and $y \in Y$ be a max-min strategy as in (8). Let $A' = A - \mathbf{1}u\mathbf{1}^\top$. Then $y^\top A' = y^\top A - u\mathbf{1}^\top \geq \mathbf{0}^\top$. We claim that $A'x \leq \mathbf{0}$ for some $x \in X$. If not then there is no $x \geq \mathbf{0}$, $x \neq \mathbf{0}$ with $A'x \leq \mathbf{0}$ (otherwise scale x so that $x \in X$), and therefore by (21) we have $y^\top A' > \mathbf{0}^\top$ for some $y \geq \mathbf{0}$. Because $y \neq \mathbf{0}$, we can scale y such that $y \in Y$ and choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $y^\top A' \geq \varepsilon\mathbf{1}^\top$ and hence $y^\top A \geq (u + \varepsilon)\mathbf{1}^\top$, which contradicts the maximality of u in (8). Hence, there is $x \in X$ with $A'x \leq \mathbf{0}$, so A' has min-max value zero and therefore A has min-max value u , which proves the minimax theorem. \square

5 The theorems of Stiemke and Loomis

This section is about two proofs of the minimax theorem. For historical interest, we first reproduce a short proof of Gordan's Theorem (20) by Stiemke [21]. In modern language, it uses the property that the null space and row space of a matrix are orthogonal complements, as stated in (25) below. We state this property as the following "theorem of the alternative" about the solvability of linear equations without nonnegativity constraints, which is well known (e.g., [14]). We also use this lemma in Section 10 for a short proof of the Lemma of Farkas.

Lemma 1. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then*

$$\nexists x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax = b \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \exists y \in \mathbb{R}^m : y^\top A = \mathbf{0}^\top, \quad y^\top b \neq 0. \quad (22)$$

Proof. We show the nontrivial direction " \Rightarrow ". Assume that b is not a linear combination of the columns A_1, \dots, A_n of A . Let k be the column rank of A and $\{A_j\}_{j \in K}$ be a basis of the column space of A , with $|K| = k \geq 0$, and let A_K be the matrix of these columns. By assumption, the $m \times (k+1)$ matrix $[A_K \ b]$ has rank $k+1$, which is also its row rank. Its rows span therefore all of $\mathbb{R}^{1 \times (k+1)}$, in particular the vector $(\mathbf{0}^\top, 1)$, that is, $y^\top A_K = \mathbf{0}^\top$ and $y^\top b = 1$ for some $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Any other column A_j of A for $j \notin K$ is a linear combination of the basis columns, $A_j = A_K z^{(j)}$ for some $z^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}^k$, which implies $y^\top A_j = y^\top A_K z^{(j)} = 0$. This shows that overall $y^\top A = \mathbf{0}^\top$ and $y^\top b \neq 0$, as required. \square

Theorem 3 (Stiemke [21]). *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Then*

$$\nexists y \in \mathbb{R}^m : y^\top A \geq \mathbf{0}^\top, \quad y^\top A \neq \mathbf{0} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \exists x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax = \mathbf{0}, \quad x > \mathbf{0}. \quad (23)$$

Proof. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rowspace}(A) &= \{y^\top A \mid y \in \mathbb{R}^m\}, \\ \text{nullspace}(A) &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid Ax = \mathbf{0}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

We have for $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$c^\top \in \text{rowspace}(A) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall x \in \text{nullspace}(A) : c^\top x = 0 \quad (25)$$

because this is equivalent to

$$\exists y : y^\top A = c^\top \Leftrightarrow \nexists x : Ax = \mathbf{0}, c^\top x \neq 0, \quad (26)$$

which (with both sides negated) is the transposed version of (22).

The nontrivial direction in (23) is “ \Rightarrow ”. It states: Suppose $\mathbf{0}^\top$ is the only nonnegative vector in $\text{rowspace}(A)$. Then there is some $x \in \text{nullspace}(A)$ with $x > \mathbf{0}$. We show this by induction on n . If $n = 1$ then the single column of A is $\mathbf{0}$, and we can choose $x = 1$. Let $n > 1$ and suppose the claim is true for $n - 1$.

Case 1. There is some $a \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, $a \geq \mathbf{0}$, $a \neq \mathbf{0}$ so that $(1, -a^\top) \in \text{rowspace}(A)$. Consider a set of row vectors $(1, -a^\top), (0, a_2^\top), \dots, (0, a_m^\top)$ that span $\text{rowspace}(A)$ (easily obtained from the rows of A). There is no $w \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$ such that $c^\top = \sum_{i=2}^m w_{i-1} a_i^\top$ is nonnegative and nonzero, because otherwise $(0, c^\top)$ is in $\text{rowspace}(A)$ and nonnegative and nonzero. Hence, by inductive hypothesis, there is some $z \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$, $z > \mathbf{0}$, such that $a_i^\top z = 0$ for $2 \leq i \leq m$. Then $x_1 = a^\top z > 0$, and $x = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ z \end{pmatrix} \in \text{nullspace}(A)$ by (25) because $(1, -a^\top)x = 0$ and $(0, a_i^\top)x = 0$ for $2 \leq i \leq m$, and $x > \mathbf{0}$.

Case 2. Otherwise, consider any $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and let $(c_1, c^\top) = y^\top A$ with $c \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$. Then $c \geq \mathbf{0}$ implies $c = \mathbf{0}$, which holds by assumption if $c_1 \geq 0$, and if $c_1 < 0$ and $c \geq \mathbf{0}$, $c \neq \mathbf{0}$ then $(1, \frac{1}{c_1}c^\top) \in \text{rowspace}(A)$ and Case 1 applies. By inductive hypothesis, there is some $z \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$, $z > \mathbf{0}$, such that $A \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ z \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{0}$. If $x_1 = 0$ for all $x \in \text{nullspace}(A)$ then by (25) we have $(1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \text{rowspace}(A)$ contrary to assumption. So there is some $x' \in \text{nullspace}(A)$ with $x'_1 > 0$, and therefore $x = x'\varepsilon + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ z \end{pmatrix} > \mathbf{0}$ for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, where $Ax = \mathbf{0}$. This completes the induction. \square

The preceding theorem is statement I of Stiemke [21], and Gordan’s Theorem (20) is statement II.

Proposition 5. *Stiemke’s Theorem 3 proves Gordan’s Theorem (20).*

Proof. Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Let $\{b_1, \dots, b_k\}$ with $k \geq 1$ be a spanning set of $\text{nullspace}(A)$ and $B = [b_1 \cdots b_k]$. Then for b and c in \mathbb{R}^n

$$b \in \text{nullspace}(A) \Leftrightarrow b^\top \in \text{rowspace}(B^\top) \quad (27)$$

and, using (25),

$$\begin{aligned} & c^\top \in \text{rowspace}(A) \\ \Leftrightarrow & \forall x \in \text{nullspace}(A) : c^\top x = 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow & c^\top b_i = 0 \quad (1 \leq i \leq k) \\ \Leftrightarrow & c^\top B = \mathbf{0}^\top \\ \Leftrightarrow & c \in \text{nullspace}(B^\top). \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Stiemke's Theorem (23) applied to B^\top instead of A states

$$\nexists b^\top \in \text{rowspace}(B^\top), \quad b \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad b \neq \mathbf{0} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \exists c \in \text{nullspace}(B^\top) : c > \mathbf{0} \quad (29)$$

which by (27) and (28) is equivalent to

$$\nexists b \in \text{nullspace}(A), \quad b \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad b \neq \mathbf{0} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \exists c^\top \in \text{rowspace}(A) : c > \mathbf{0} \quad (30)$$

which is Gordan's Theorem (20). \square

Via Propositions 4 and 5, Stiemke's Theorem 3 therefore proves the minimax theorem. Using symmetric games, this was also shown by Gale, Kuhn, and Tucker [12].

Our favorite proof of the minimax theorem is based on the following theorem.

Theorem 4 (Loomis [16]). *Let A and B be two $m \times n$ matrices with $B > 0$. Then there exist $x \in X$, $y \in Y$, and $v \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $Ax \leq Bxv$ and $y^\top A \geq vy^\top B$.*

The case $B = \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top$ gives the minimax theorem. Conversely, the minimax theorem proves Theorem 4 [15, p. 19]: Let αB for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ be the matrix B scaled by α . Because $B > 0$, the value of the game $A - \alpha B$ is negative for sufficiently large α , positive for sufficiently negative α , is a continuous function of α , and therefore zero for some α , which then gives Theorem 4 with $v = \alpha$.

The following is the proof by Loomis [16] of Theorem 4 specialized to the minimax theorem. It is an induction proof about the min-max value v and max-min value u (which exist, irrespective of LP duality). It is easy to remember: If the players have optimal strategies that equalize v and u for all rows and columns, then $u = v$. Otherwise (if needed by exchanging the players), there is at least one row with lower payoff than v , which will *anyhow* not be chosen by the row player. By omitting this row from the game, the minimax theorem holds (using a bit of convexity and continuity) by the inductive hypothesis.

Proof of Theorem 2. Consider optimal solutions v, x to (7) and u, y to (8), where

$$u = u\mathbf{1}^\top x \leq y^\top Ax \leq y^\top \mathbf{1}v = v. \quad (31)$$

We prove $u = v$ by induction on $m + n$. It holds trivially for $m + n = 2$. If all inequalities in (31) hold as equalities, then $u = v$. Hence, assume that at least one inequality is strict, say $(Ax)_k < v$ for some row $k \in [m]$ (the case for a column is similar). Let \bar{A} be the matrix A with the k th row deleted. By induction hypothesis, \bar{A} has game value \bar{v} with $\bar{A}\bar{x} \leq \mathbf{1}\bar{v}$ for some $\bar{x} \in X$, where it is easy to see that

$$\bar{v} \leq v, \quad \bar{v} \leq u \quad (32)$$

because compared to A the game \bar{A} strengthens the minimizing column player.

We claim that $\bar{v} = v$. Namely, if $\bar{v} < v$, let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and consider the strategy $x(\varepsilon) = x(1 - \varepsilon) + \bar{x}\varepsilon$ where $x \in X$ because X is convex. Then

$$\bar{A}x(\varepsilon) = \bar{A}(x(1 - \varepsilon) + \bar{x}\varepsilon) \leq \mathbf{1}v(1 - \varepsilon) + \mathbf{1}\bar{v}\varepsilon = \mathbf{1}(v - \varepsilon(v - \bar{v})) < \mathbf{1}v. \quad (33)$$

For the missing row k of A where $(Ax)_k < v$ we have for sufficiently small ε

$$(Ax(\varepsilon))_k = (Ax)_k(1 - \varepsilon) + (A\bar{x})_k\varepsilon < v. \quad (34)$$

Hence, $Ax(\varepsilon) < \mathbf{1}v$ for some $x(\varepsilon) \in X$, in contradiction to the minimality of v in (7). This shows $v = \bar{v}$, and, by (32), $\bar{v} \leq u \leq v = \bar{v}$ and therefore $u = v$. This completes the induction. \square

The proof by Loomis [16] has been noted (in particular by von Neumann and Morgenstern [26], p. vi) but is not widely known, and should be a standard textbook proof (as in von Stengel [27], p. 216). (A better title of Loomis's paper would have been "An elementary proof of the minimax theorem", given that Theorem 4 is not substantially more general.) It was, in essence, re-discovered by Owen [18]. However, Owen needlessly manipulates the max-min strategy y ; the proof by Loomis is more transparent. Owen's proof is discussed further by Binmore [2].

6 The minimax theorem and LP duality

The following theorem assumes the minimax theorem.

Theorem 5 (Dantzig [7]). *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Consider the zero-sum game with the payoff matrix B (with $k = m + n + 1$ rows and columns) defined by*

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A & -b \\ -A^\top & 0 & c \\ b^\top & -c^\top & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (35)$$

Then B has value zero, with a min-max strategy $z = (y, x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$ that is also a max-min strategy, with $Bz \leq \mathbf{0}$. If $z_k = t > 0$ then $x \frac{1}{t}$ is an optimal solution to the primal LP (1) and $y \frac{1}{t}$ is an optimal solution to dual LP (2). If $(Bz)_k < 0$ then $t = 0$ and at least one of the LPs (1) or (2) is infeasible.

Proof. Because $B = -B^\top$, this game is symmetric and its game value v is zero. Let $z = (y, x, t)$. Then $Bz \leq \mathbf{0}$ states $Ax - bt \leq \mathbf{0}$, $-A^\top y + ct \leq \mathbf{0}$, and $b^\top y - c^\top x \leq 0$. If $t > 0$ then $x \frac{1}{t}$ and $y \frac{1}{t}$ are primal and dual feasible with $b^\top y \frac{1}{t} \leq c^\top x \frac{1}{t}$ and therefore optimal.

If $(Bz)_k < 0$, that is, $b^\top y - c^\top x < 0$, then $t > 0$ would violate weak duality, so $t = 0$. Moreover, $Ax \leq \mathbf{0}$ and $y^\top A \geq \mathbf{0}^\top$, and $y^\top b < 0$ or $0 < c^\top x$. As shown following (17), this implies infeasibility of at least one of the LPs (1) or (2). \square

Hence, Theorem 5 seems to show that the minimax theorem proves LP duality. The known "hole" in this argument is that it does not cover the case of a min-max strategy z where $z_k = 0$ and $(Bz)_k = 0$. Luce and Raiffa [17, p. 421] even claim without proof that if $(Bz)_k = 0$ for all min-max strategies z , then $\bar{z}_k > 0$ for

some max-min strategy \bar{z} . Because B is skew-symmetric ($B = -B^\top$), this would solve the problem with \bar{z} as a min-max strategy. We show that this assumption is essentially the Lemma of Tucker [23, p. 5] for the case of a skew-symmetric matrix, and that this defeats the purpose of proving LP duality from the minimax theorem.

Proposition 6. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Then the following Lemma of Tucker*

$$\exists y \in \mathbb{R}^m, x \in \mathbb{R}^n : y^\top A \geq \mathbf{0}^\top, \quad x \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad Ax = \mathbf{0}, \quad x_n + (y^\top A)_n > 0 \quad (36)$$

proves the following inequality version and vice versa:

$$\exists y \in \mathbb{R}^m, x \in \mathbb{R}^n : y \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad y^\top A \geq \mathbf{0}^\top, \quad x \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad Ax \leq \mathbf{0}, \quad x_n + (y^\top A)_n > 0, \quad (37)$$

and similarly its version for a skew-symmetric matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$, that is, $B = -B^\top$:

$$\exists z \in \mathbb{R}^k : z \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad Bz \leq \mathbf{0}, \quad z_k - (Bz)_k > 0. \quad (38)$$

Proof. Applying (36) to the matrix $[I \ A]$ with the identity matrix I gives (37). For the converse, write $Ax = \mathbf{0}$ as $Ax \leq \mathbf{0}$, $-Ax \leq \mathbf{0}$.

Condition (38) follows from (37) with $A = B$ and $z = x + y$ because $-Bz = z^\top B$ and $y_n \geq 0$ and $(x^\top B)_n \geq 0$. For the converse, use $B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A \\ -A^\top & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $z = \begin{pmatrix} y \\ x \end{pmatrix}$. \square

As already noted by Tucker [23, p. 7], his Lemma (36) proves immediately the Lemma of Farkas (13). Less known, but similarly easy, is that the converse holds as well.

Proposition 7. *Tucker's Lemma (36) proves the Lemma of Farkas (13) and vice versa.*

Proof. Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and consider the matrix $[A \ -b]$. By (36), there exist $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $x \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $t \geq 0$ such that $y^\top [A \ -b] \geq \mathbf{0}^\top$, $Ax - bt = \mathbf{0}$, and $t - y^\top b > 0$. If $t = 0$ then we have $y^\top A \geq \mathbf{0}^\top$ and $y^\top b < 0$. If $t > 0$ then $Ax \frac{1}{t} = b$ with $x \frac{1}{t} \geq \mathbf{0}$. This shows (13).

Conversely, let $A = [A_1 \ \cdots \ A_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. By (13), either $\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} A_j z_j = -A_n$ for some $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ with $z \geq \mathbf{0}$, in which case let $x = \begin{pmatrix} z \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $y = \mathbf{0}$, or otherwise $y^\top A_j \geq 0$ for $1 \leq j < n$ and $y^\top (-A_n) < 0$ for some $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$, in which case let $x = \mathbf{0}$. In both cases we have $Ax = \mathbf{0}$ and $x_n + y^\top A_n > 0$, and (36) holds. \square

Condition (38) is the assumption of Theorem 5 that allows proving LP duality from the minimax theorem. However, by Propositions 6 and 7 this means assuming the Lemma of Farkas, which implies LP duality directly.

In the next section, we show a proper way of proving LP duality from the minimax theorem.

7 Proving Tucker's Theorem from Gordan's Theorem

In Tucker's Lemma (36), the last (n th) column of the matrix A plays a special role, which can be taken by any other column. This proves the following stronger version (39) known as the *Theorem of Tucker* [23, p. 8].

Proposition 8. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Tucker's Lemma (36) proves Tucker's Theorem*

$$\exists y \in \mathbb{R}^m, x \in \mathbb{R}^n : y^\top A \geq \mathbf{0}^\top, \quad x \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad Ax = \mathbf{0}, \quad x^\top + y^\top A > \mathbf{0}^\top. \quad (39)$$

Proof. Let $j \in [n]$. By applying (36) to the j th column of A with j instead of n , choose $y^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $x^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$(y^{(j)})^\top A \geq \mathbf{0}^\top, \quad x^{(j)} \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad Ax^{(j)} = \mathbf{0}, \quad x_j^{(j)} + ((y^{(j)})^\top A)_j > 0. \quad (40)$$

Then $y = \sum_{j \in [n]} y^{(j)}$ and $x = \sum_{j \in [n]} x^{(j)}$ fulfill (39). \square

Tucker's Theorem (39) is a very versatile theorem that proves a number of theorems of the alternative (see [23]), for example immediately Gordan's Theorem (20) or Stiemke's Theorem 3.

The main Theorem 6 of this section shows that Gordan's Theorem (20) proves Tucker's Theorem (39). It is based on the following observation. If $Ax = \mathbf{0}$ and $x \geq \mathbf{0}$, then any y with $y^\top A \geq \mathbf{0}^\top$ has the property that if $x_j > 0$ then $(y^\top A)_j = 0$ because otherwise $0 = y^\top Ax = \sum_{j \in [n]} (y^\top A)_j x_j > 0$. Hence, (39) implies that the *support*

$$S = \text{supp}(x) = \{j \in [n] \mid x_j > 0\} \quad (41)$$

of x is unique. The main idea is that the nonnegativity constraints for the variables x_j for $j \in S$ can be dropped and these variables therefore be eliminated, which allows applying Gordan's Theorem to the remaining variables. The following proof is distilled from the more complicated computational approach of Adler [1, section 4].

Theorem 6. *Gordan's Theorem (20) proves Tucker's Theorem (39).*

Proof. Let $A = [A_1 \cdots A_n]$. For any $S \subseteq [n]$ and $J = [n] - S$ write $A = [A_J \ A_S]$ and $x = (x_J, x_S)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. If $Ax = \mathbf{0}$, $x \geq \mathbf{0}$, $Ax' = \mathbf{0}$, $x' \geq \mathbf{0}$, then $A(x + x') = \mathbf{0}$, $x + x' \geq \mathbf{0}$, and $\text{supp}(x + x') = \text{supp}(x) \cup \text{supp}(x')$. Choose S as the inclusion-maximal support of any $x \geq \mathbf{0}$ such that $Ax = \mathbf{0}$. Then any y with $y^\top A \geq \mathbf{0}^\top$ fulfills $y^\top A_S = \mathbf{0}^\top$ (because otherwise $y^\top Ax = y^\top A_S x_S > 0$).

On the other hand, (39) states $x_j + y^\top A_j > 0$ for all $j \in [n]$, which requires $y^\top A_j > 0$ for $j \in J = [n] - S$. We now show that there indeed exist $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $x = (\mathbf{0}, x_S)$ such that

$$y^\top A_J > \mathbf{0}^\top, \quad y^\top A_S = \mathbf{0}^\top, \quad Ax = A_S x_S = \mathbf{0}, \quad x_S > \mathbf{0}, \quad (42)$$

which implies (39). Consider some $\tilde{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$ with maximum support $S = \text{supp}(\tilde{x})$ such that $A\tilde{x} = \mathbf{0}$, that is, $\tilde{x}_S > \mathbf{0}$. If $S = [n]$ we are done. Let k be the rank of A_S . Suppose $k = m$. We claim that then $S = [n]$, which implies (39) with $y = \mathbf{0}$. Namely, if $j \in [n] - S$, then $A_j = A_S \hat{x}_S$ for some \hat{x}_S because A_S has full rank, and therefore $A_j + A_S(\tilde{x}_S \alpha - \hat{x}_S) = \mathbf{0}$ where $\tilde{x}_S \alpha - \hat{x}_S > \mathbf{0}$ for sufficiently large α , which gives a solution $x \geq \mathbf{0}$ to $Ax = \mathbf{0}$ with $\text{supp}(x) = \{j\} \cup S$ in contradiction to the maximality of S .

Hence, let $k < m$. In order to apply Gordan's Theorem (20), we eliminate the variables x_S from the system $Ax = A_J x_J + A_S x_S = \mathbf{0}$ by replacing it with an equivalent system $BAx = \mathbf{0}$ with a suitable invertible $m \times m$ matrix B . Let a_{iS} be the i th row of A_S for $i \in [m]$. Suppose for simplicity that the last k rows of A_S are linearly independent and define the matrix E , and that for $i = 1, \dots, m - k$ we have $a_{iS} = z^{(i)}E$ for some row vector $z^{(i)}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{1 \times k}$. Then the $m \times m$ matrix

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 0 & -z^{(1)} \\ & \ddots & & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 1 & -z^{(m-k)} \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ & \vdots & & & \ddots & \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (43)$$

is clearly invertible, and any solution (x_J, x_S) to $A_J x_J + A_S x_S = \mathbf{0}$ is a solution to

$$BA_J x_J + BA_S x_S = \mathbf{0} \quad (44)$$

and vice versa, with

$$BA_J = \begin{bmatrix} C \\ D \end{bmatrix}, \quad BA_S = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ E \end{bmatrix} \quad (45)$$

where $C \in \mathbb{R}^{(m-k) \times |J|}$, $D \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times |J|}$, and $E \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times |S|}$.

Suppose there is some $x_J \in \mathbb{R}^{|J|}$ with

$$Cx_J = \mathbf{0}, \quad x_J \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad x_J \neq \mathbf{0}. \quad (46)$$

Because E has rank k there exists x_S so that $Ex_S = -Dx_J$. Then $Dx_J + Ex_S = \mathbf{0}$ and hence $BA_J x_J + BA_S x_S = \mathbf{0}$ and thus $A_J x_J + A_S x_S = \mathbf{0}$. With $x(\alpha) = (x_J, x_S + \tilde{x}_S \alpha)$ we have $Ax(\alpha) = \mathbf{0}$ (because $A_S \tilde{x}_S = \mathbf{0}$) and $x(\alpha) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, where $x(\alpha)$ has larger support than S , but S was maximal. Hence, there is no x_J so that (46) holds. By Gordan's Theorem (20), there is some $w \in \mathbb{R}^{m-k}$ with $w^\top C > \mathbf{0}^\top$, that is,

$$(w^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top) \begin{bmatrix} C \\ D \end{bmatrix} > \mathbf{0}^\top, \quad (w^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ E \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{0}^\top.$$

With $y^\top = (w^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)B$ and (45), this implies (42) with $x = \tilde{x}$, as claimed. \square

Because the minimax theorem proves Gordan's Theorem (see Proposition 4), it proves Tucker's Theorem (39) and Tucker's Lemma (36) and the Lemma of Farkas and therefore LP duality.

Instead of the minimax theorem we can by Proposition 5 use Stiemke's Theorem 3 to prove Gordan's Theorem (20). The short proof by Tucker [23] of his Lemma (36) has some structural similarities to Stiemke's proof but uses more explicit computations.

We explain how Tucker's Theorem proves, as one of its main applications [23, theorem 6], the condition of *strict complementarity* in linear programming. For the LP (1) and its dual LP (2), a feasible pair x, y of solutions is optimal if and only if we have equality in (3), that is, $c^\top x = y^\top Ax = y^\top b$, which means

$$y^\top(b - Ax) = 0, \quad (y^\top A - c^\top)x = 0. \quad (47)$$

This orthogonality of the nonnegative vectors y and $b - Ax$, and of $y^\top A - c^\top$ and x , means that they are complementary in the sense that in each component *at least one* of them is zero:

$$y_i(b - Ax)_i = 0 \quad (i \in [m]), \quad (y^\top A - c^\top)_j x_j = 0 \quad (j \in [n]), \quad (48)$$

the "complementary slackness" condition. *Strict complementarity* states that there are feasible solutions x and y to (1) and (2), respectively, where *exactly one* of each component in (48) is zero, that is, in addition to (47),

$$y + (b - Ax) > \mathbf{0}, \quad x^\top + (y^\top A - c^\top) > \mathbf{0}^\top. \quad (49)$$

Geometrically, the LP solutions x and y are then in the relative interior of the set of optimal solutions. Unless this set is a singleton, x and y are not unique, but their supports $\text{supp}(x)$ and $\text{supp}(y)$ are. Similar to (38), Tucker's Theorem (39) proves that for a skew-symmetric matrix B there is some z such that

$$z \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad Bz \leq \mathbf{0}, \quad z - Bz > \mathbf{0}. \quad (50)$$

Applied to Dantzig's game matrix B in (35) this gives (49), so this game is very useful here.

8 Extending Dantzig's game

The following is another approach to proving LP duality from the minimax theorem, by "enforcing" the last column of the game B in (35) to be played with positive probability t by adding an extra row to B .

Theorem 7. *Suppose that if both the primal LP (1) and its dual (2) are feasible, there is some real number M so that the added constraint $\mathbf{1}^\top x \leq \frac{M}{2}$ does not affect the maximum*

in (1) and the added constraint $\mathbf{1}^\top y \leq \frac{M}{2}$ does not affect the minimum in (2). Then the zero-sum game

$$B_M = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A & -b \\ -A^\top & 0 & c \\ b^\top & -c^\top & 0 \\ \mathbf{1}^\top & \mathbf{1}^\top & -M \end{bmatrix} \quad (51)$$

has value zero with min-max strategy (y', x', t) and max-min strategy $(y', x', t, 0)$ if and only if (1) and (2) are indeed feasible, in which case $x' \frac{1}{t}$ is optimal for (1) and $y' \frac{1}{t}$ is optimal for (2). At least one LP is infeasible if and only if the value of B_M is positive.

Proof. Suppose the two LPs have optimal solutions x and y with $Ax \leq b$ and $y^\top A \geq c^\top$, that is, $-A^\top y \leq -c$, and $b^\top y = c^\top x$, and assume that $\mathbf{1}^\top x \leq \frac{M}{2}$ and $\mathbf{1}^\top y \leq \frac{M}{2}$. Let $t = 1/(\mathbf{1}^\top y + \mathbf{1}^\top x + 1)$ and $y' = yt$ and $x' = xt$. Then (y', x', t) is a min-max strategy for B_M : Namely, $t \geq 1/(M + 1)$, which implies $1 - t - Mt \leq 0$, which is the cost in the last row of B_M . Clearly, the strategy (y', x', t) for the column player has nonpositive cost for all other rows of B_M , and the strategy $(y', x', t, 0)$ for the row player nonnegative payoff in each column. That is, the value of B_M is zero.

Conversely, if B_M has value zero, then any min-max strategy (y', x', t) requires $t > 0$ to have a nonpositive cost in the last row, which then defines optimal solutions to the two LPs as described.

Compared to the symmetric game B in (35), the maximizing row player has an extra strategy, so the game value of B_M is nonnegative, and therefore positive if it is not zero. \square

The assumed boundedness of the objective functions of the LPs (1) and (2) in Theorem 7 holds if and only if the respective optimum is indeed attained. Unlike for the LPs (7) and (8) for finding optimal strategies in a zero-sum game, which are defined on the compact strategy sets X and Y , the domain of a more general LP is not necessarily bounded. For example, maximizing x_2 subject to $x_2 \leq 0$, $x \geq \mathbf{0}$ has an unbounded set of feasible and optimal solutions x . Attainment of the maximum in (1) has to use the linearity of the objective function (for example, $-e^x$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ has an upper bound but no maximum). An unbounded LP has an unbounded ray (see Proposition 3), but that proof uses already the Lemma of Farkas. Using the supremum instead of the maximum is of no use when applied to the game B_M .

The maximum in (1) is attained because of the following well-known observation [5, theorem 3.4]. A *basic* solution x to $Ax = b$ is given by a solution x where the columns A_j of A so that $x_j \neq 0$ are linearly independent. These columns are then easily extended to a basis of the column space of A . We can assume that A has full row rank m , so that a basis has size m .

Theorem 8. *If the system $Ax = b$, $x \geq \mathbf{0}$ has a feasible solution x , then it also has a basic feasible solution. If the LP: maximize $c^\top x$ subject to $Ax = b$, $x \geq \mathbf{0}$ has an optimal solution x , then it also has a basic optimal solution.*

Proof. Suppose that $Ax = b$ for some $x \geq \mathbf{0}$. Choose x with minimal support, and omit in $Ax = b$ all columns outside the support of x . Then if $Az = \mathbf{0}$ for some $z \neq \mathbf{0}$, let $P = \{j \mid z_j > 0\}$ where $P \neq \emptyset$ (otherwise replace z by $-z$). Then with $\alpha = \min\{\frac{x_j}{z_j} \mid j \in P\}$ and $x' = x - z\alpha$ we have $Ax' = b$, $x' \geq \mathbf{0}$ and x' of smaller support than x . Hence, no such z exists, which proves the claimed linear independence.

For our second claim, we consider basic solutions both to $Ax = b$ and to a system with an additional row. For a basis $\{A_j \mid j \in K\}$ of the column space of A , let A_K be the invertible matrix of these columns. If $Ax = b$, $x \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $\text{supp}(x) \subseteq K$ then K is called a feasible basis, and we write $Ax = A_K x_K$ where $x_K = (x_j)_{j \in K}$ (note that some components x_j for $j \in K$ are allowed to be zero). Let $\alpha = \max\{c_K^\top x_K \mid K \text{ is a feasible basis of } Ax = b\}$. Suppose, contrary to the claim, that $\beta = c^\top x > \alpha$ for some $x \geq \mathbf{0}$, $Ax = b$. Let L be a feasible basis with solution x for the system $Ax = b$, $c^\top x = \beta$. Then $|L| = m + 1$, clearly $\text{supp}(x) = L$, and $L = K \cup \{j\}$, where K is a feasible basis for $Ax = b$. Then $A_K x_K + A_j x_j = b$, which we rewrite so that x_K depends on x_j as

$$x_K = A_K^{-1}b - A_K^{-1}A_j x_j \quad (52)$$

and therefore

$$c_K^\top x_K + c_j x_j = \beta = \underbrace{c_K^\top A_K^{-1}b}_{\leq \alpha} + \underbrace{(c_j - c_K^\top A_K^{-1}A_j)}_{> 0} x_j. \quad (53)$$

However, this implies $A_K^{-1}A_j \leq \mathbf{0}$, because if the vector $A_K^{-1}A_j$ had a positive entry, then we could increase in (52) the variable x_j even further so that one component of x_K becomes zero (reducing the support of x to at most m), and thus obtain a basic feasible solution to $Ax = b$ with $c^\top x \geq \beta$, a contradiction. But then (52) and (53) describe an unbounded ray and the LP is unbounded with no optimum. \square

With the added equation $\mathbf{1}^\top x = x$, the first claim in Theorem 8 is *Carathéodory's theorem*: Any convex combination b of points in \mathbb{R}^m is already the convex combination of a suitable set of at most $m + 1$ of these points [4, p. 200]. Our proof of the second claim is a standard argument about the simplex algorithm [8], where our assumption $\beta > \alpha$ in (53) avoids dealing with degenerate bases where some basic variables are zero.

Theorem 8 is applied to the LP (1) by writing $Ax \leq b$ with slack variables as $Ax + s = b$, $s \geq \mathbf{0}$. Because the number of bases of the column space of A is finite, the LP (1) attains its maximum for some basic solution x , so that we can choose M so that $\mathbf{1}^\top x \leq M/2$. If the dual LP (2) is feasible, we can also assume that the additional constraint $\mathbf{1}^\top y \leq M/2$ does not affect its optimum. Then the

assumptions of Theorem 7 are met, which proves LP duality from the minimax theorem.

This proof via Theorem 8 goes already halfway into the simplex algorithm, which is why we consider our Theorem 6 via the theorems of Gordan and Tucker more natural. Both proofs require some linear algebra in addition to the proof by Loomis of the minimax theorem.

9 Comparison with Adler (2013)

The closest related work to ours is Adler [1]. One of its goals is to close the hole in Dantzig’s proof. A second goal is to reduce the computational problem of solving an LP (in the sense of finding an optimal solution or proving there is none) to the problem of solving a zero-sum game by means of a polynomial-time reduction.

Adler also considers the more basic *feasibility* problem of determining if $\{x \mid Ax = b, x \geq \mathbf{0}\}$ is empty (via a witness y by (13)) or not. Rather than writing $Ax = b$ as $Ax \leq b$ and $-Ax \leq -b$ (see Proposition 1), Adler uses $Ax \leq b$ and $(\mathbf{1}^\top A)x \geq \mathbf{1}^\top b$, which adds only one inequality to $Ax \leq b$ but is less symmetrical.

The polynomial-time reductions considered by Adler are Karp-type and Cook-type reductions. The Karp reduction [1, section 3.1] takes an LP and generates a suitable game, to which one then applies an algorithm to find a pair of max-min and min-max strategies. This is similar to our Theorem 7, which we have applied directly to Dantzig’s game. Our game B_M in (51) to enforce $t > 0$ if the LPs are feasible is simpler than [1, proposition 7]. Either approach requires a bound on the possible optimal LP solutions. Mathematically, we can provide such a bound via Carathéodory’s theorem (see Theorem 8) by looking only at basic feasible solutions. For feasibility of $Ax = b, x \geq \mathbf{0}$, as Adler does, this is enough. For finding optimal basic solutions, our proof of Theorem 8 needs additional arguments in (53) related to the simplex algorithm. An explicit bound on optimal LP solutions can be obtained if the entries of A, b , and c are integers [19, lemma 2.1] or even algebraic numbers [1, p. 172], but not for general real numbers.

The Cook reduction [1, section 3.2] invokes an algorithm to find a minimax solution, in general several times, to eventually produce an LP solution or prove infeasibility of at least one LP. It does not assume special inputs. Adler’s main insight is that variables that can take positive values can be converted to unconstrained variables and then be eliminated algebraically. Our proof of Theorem 6 uses this insight, but with much simpler algebra.

In summary, part of our contribution is a streamlining of Adler’s arguments to prove LP duality from the minimax theorem. In addition, we have clarified the central role of Tucker’s Lemma and its close connection to the Lemma of Farkas in this context, which shows how incomplete Dantzig’s proof indeed is. Our – partly

expository – article also shows that it is worth understanding and “refactoring” the details of important proofs.

10 Minimally infeasible sets of inequalities

We conclude this article with a short elementary proof of the Lemma of Farkas in its inequality-only version (15) due to Conforti, Di Summa, and Zambelli [6]. The main trick is to state the *minimal* infeasibility of these inequalities in terms of infeasibility of the corresponding equalities, which is canonically proved by induction. The second step is to apply the linear algebra Lemma 1 to the infeasible equalities to obtain the required vector y in (15).

A set of linear equations and inequalities is called infeasible if it has no solution, and *minimally* infeasible if omitting any one equation or inequality makes it feasible. The following proofs of theorem 2.1 and lemma 2.1 of [6], in simplified notation, show (15) based on minimally infeasible sets of inequalities.

Theorem 9 (Conforti, Di Summa, and Zambelli [6]). *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and let a_1, \dots, a_m be the rows of A . Suppose the system $Ax \leq b$ is minimally infeasible.*

(i) *Then the system $Ax = b$ is minimally infeasible.*

(ii) *Reversing any inequality $a_i x \leq b_i$ in $Ax \leq b$ creates a feasible system:*

$$\forall i \in [m] \exists x^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^n : a_i x^{(i)} > b_i, \quad \forall k \in [m] - \{i\} : a_k x^{(i)} = b_k. \quad (54)$$

Proof. We prove that for any $R \subseteq [m]$ the constraints

$$a_i x = b_i \quad (i \in R), \quad a_i x \leq b_i \quad (i \in [m] - R) \quad (55)$$

are minimally infeasible. The proof is by induction on $|R|$. For $|R| = 0$ condition (55) holds by assumption. Suppose it holds for all R up to a certain size $|R|$. If $R = [m]$ then the proof of (i) is complete, so let $h \notin R$, where we want to show that

$$a_i x = b_i \quad (i \in R), \quad a_h x = b_h, \quad a_i x \leq b_i \quad (i \in [m] - R - \{h\}) \quad (56)$$

is minimally infeasible. The system (56) is infeasible (because $Ax \leq b$ is infeasible), so we have to prove that omitting any constraint $a_j x = b_j$ or $a_j x \leq b_j$ for $j \in [m]$ produces a feasible system. This is clearly the case if $j = h$, or if $j \in R$ by applying the inductive hypothesis to $R \cup \{h\} - \{j\}$, so let $j \notin R$. The constraints (55) for $i \neq h$ and $i \neq j$ have solutions $x^{(h)}$ and $x^{(j)}$, respectively, with

$$\begin{aligned} a_i x^{(h)} &= b_i \quad (i \in R), & a_i x^{(h)} &\leq b_i \quad (i \in [m] - R - \{h\}), & a_h x^{(h)} &> b_h \\ a_i x^{(j)} &= b_i \quad (i \in R), & a_i x^{(j)} &\leq b_i \quad (i \in [m] - R - \{j\}). \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

If $a_h x^{(j)} = b_h$ then $x^{(j)}$ is a feasible solution to (56) with row $a_j x \leq b_j$ omitted. Otherwise $a_h x^{(j)} < b_h$, and a suitable convex combination of $x^{(j)}$ and $x^{(h)}$ is such a solution because $a_h x^{(h)} > b_h$. This completes the induction.

Condition (ii) is an immediate consequence of (i): Let $i \in [m]$. Because $Ax = b$ is minimally infeasible, there is some $x^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $a_k x^{(i)} = b_k$ for all $k \neq i$ and $a_i x^{(i)} \neq b_i$, where $a_i x^{(i)} < b_i$ would imply that $Ax \leq b$ is feasible, hence $a_i x^{(i)} > b_i$. \square

Proof of (15) using Theorem 9. The direction “ \Leftarrow ” in (15) is immediate (and will be used below). To prove “ \Rightarrow ”, assume that $Ax \leq b$ is infeasible, and by dropping sufficiently many rows from these inequalities (whose components of y will be set to zero) that $Ax \leq b$ is minimally infeasible. Denote the number of rows of this minimally infeasible system again by m . By Theorem 9, $Ax = b$ is minimally infeasible. By Lemma 1, there is some $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ so that $y^\top A = \mathbf{0}^\top$ and $y^\top b = -1$. It remains to show that $y \geq \mathbf{0}$. If not, suppose that $I = \{i \in [m] \mid y_i < 0\} \neq \emptyset$. Define the system $A'x \leq b'$ as $Ax \leq b$ with the rows in I reversed, that is, each of its rows $a'_i x \leq b'_i$ means $-a_i x \leq -b_i$ if $i \in I$ and $a_i x \leq b_i$ otherwise. Take some $i \in I$, and $x^{(i)}$ as in (54) in Theorem 9(ii). Then $A'x^{(i)} \leq b'$. On the other hand, define $w \in \mathbb{R}^m$ by $w_k = |y_k|$ for $k \in [m]$. Then $w \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $w^\top A' = y^\top A = \mathbf{0}^\top$ and $w^\top b' = y^\top b = -1$. But this contradicts $0 = w^\top A'x^{(i)} \leq w^\top b'$. Hence, $I = \emptyset$ and therefore $y \geq \mathbf{0}$ as required. \square

Finally, even though Theorem 9 has a canonical proof, one still has to come up with the theorem. Perhaps the most natural and elementary proof of the same version (15) of the Lemma of Farkas is “projection” or Fourier-Motzkin elimination (see Schrijver [20, p. 155f] and references). It expresses the constraints in $Ax \leq b$ in terms of x_1 by dividing each row by the coefficient of x_1 when it is nonzero, which reverses the inequality when the coefficient is negative. This induces mutual bounds among the other linear terms in x_2, \dots, x_n and eliminates x_1 . This elimination is then iterated (and may lead to an exponential increase in the number of constraints). See Kuhn [14] and Tao [22, p. 180] for deriving (15) in this way.

References

- [1] Adler, I. (2013). The equivalence of linear programs and zero-sum games. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 42(1), 165–177.
- [2] Binmore, K. (2004). Guillermo Owen’s proof of the minimax theorem. In: G. Gambarelli (ed.), *Essays in Cooperative Games*, 19–23. Kluwer, Boston.
- [3] Broyden, C. G. (2001). On theorems of the alternative. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 16(1-4), 101–111.
- [4] Carathéodory, C. (1911). Über den Variabilitätsbereich der Fourier’schen Konstanten von positiven harmonischen Funktionen. *Rendiconti del Circolo Matematico di Palermo (1884–1940)*, 32(1), 193–217.
- [5] Chvátal, V. (1983). *Linear Programming*. W. H. Freeman, New York.
- [6] Conforti, M., Di Summa, M., and Zambelli, G. (2007). Minimally infeasible set-partitioning problems with balanced constraints. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 32(3), 497–507.

- [7] Dantzig, G. B. (1951). A proof of the equivalence of the programming problem and the game problem. In: T. C. Koopmans (ed.), *Activity Analysis of Production and Allocation* (Cowles Commission Monograph No. 13), 330–335. Wiley, New York.
- [8] Dantzig, G. B. (1963). *Linear Programming and Extensions*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- [9] Dantzig, G. B. and Thapa, M. N. (1997). *Linear Programming 1: Introduction*. Springer, New York.
- [10] Farkas, J. (1902). Theorie der einfachen Ungleichungen. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 124(1), 1–27.
- [11] Gale, D. (1960). *The Theory of Linear Economic Models*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- [12] Gale, D., Kuhn, H. W., and Tucker, A. W. (1950). On symmetric games. In: H. W. Kuhn and A. W. Tucker (eds.), *Contributions to the Theory of Games, Vol. I*, volume 24 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*, 81–87. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- [13] Gordan, P. (1873). Ueber die Auflösung linearer Gleichungen mit reellen Coefficienten. *Mathematische Annalen*, 6(1), 23–28.
- [14] Kuhn, H. W. (1956). Solvability and consistency for linear equations and inequalities. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 63(4), 217–232.
- [15] Laraki, R., Renault, J., and Sorin, S. (2019). *Mathematical Foundations of Game Theory*. Springer.
- [16] Loomis, L. H. (1946). On a theorem of von Neumann. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 32(8), 213–215.
- [17] Luce, R. D. and Raiffa, H. (1957). *Games and Decisions: Introduction and Critical Survey*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- [18] Owen, G. (1967). Communications to the editor: An elementary proof of the minimax theorem. *Management Science*, 13(9), 765–765.
- [19] Papadimitriou, C. H. and Steiglitz, K. (1982). *Combinatorial Optimization: Algorithms and Complexity*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- [20] Schrijver, A. (1986). *Theory of Linear and Integer Programming*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK.
- [21] Stiemke, E. (1915). Über positive Lösungen homogener linearer Gleichungen. *Mathematische Annalen*, 76(2), 340–342.
- [22] Tao, T. (2008). *Structure and Randomness: Pages from Year One of a Mathematical Blog*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI.
- [23] Tucker, A. W. (1956). Dual systems of homogeneous linear relations. In: H. W. Kuhn and A. W. Tucker (eds.), *Linear Inequalities and Related Systems*, volume 38 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*, 1–18. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- [24] Ville, J. (1938). Sur la théorie générale des jeux où intervient l’habileté des joueurs. In: E. Borel et al. (ed.), *Traité du Calcul des Probabilités et de ses Applications, Tome IV*, 105–113. Gauthier-Villars, Paris.
- [25] von Neumann, J. (1928). Zur Theorie der Gesellschaftsspiele. *Mathematische Annalen*, 100(1), 295–320.
- [26] von Neumann, J. and Morgenstern, O. (1947). *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior, 2nd ed.* Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- [27] von Stengel, B. (2022). *Game Theory Basics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.