

In Step 8 of the second welfare theorem proof, we argued that if $x'_i \succ_i x_i^*$, that $\alpha x'_i \succ_i x_i^*$ for an $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently close to 1.

Proof: We define the sets:

$$\mathcal{A}^+ = \{\gamma \in [0, 1] : \gamma x'_i \geq_i x_i^*\}$$

$$\mathcal{A}^- = \{\gamma \in [0, 1] : x_i^* \geq_i \gamma x'_i\}$$

We break the proof up into 6 steps.

1. **Step 1:** The sets \mathcal{A}^+ and \mathcal{A}^- are nonempty.

- Because $x'_i \succ_i x_i^*$, we have $\gamma x'_i \succ_i x_i^*$ for $\gamma = 1$. Hence \mathcal{A}^+ is nonempty.
- Because $x_i^* \gg \mathbf{0}$ and because x_i^* is Pareto optimal, we have that $x_i^* \geq_i \mathbf{0}$. This is because $\mathbf{0}$ was always feasible to give to i and not make anyone worse off so it cannot make them strictly better off compared to x_i^* . Therefore $x_i^* \geq_i \gamma x'_i$ for $\gamma = 0$. Hence \mathcal{A}^- is nonempty.

2. **Step 2:** The sets \mathcal{A}^+ and \mathcal{A}^- are closed.

- We will show this for \mathcal{A}^+ and a similar argument holds for \mathcal{A}^- . Consider a sequence $\gamma_n \rightarrow \gamma$ with each $\gamma_n \in \mathcal{A}^+$, implying $\gamma_n \in [0, 1]$ and $\gamma_n x'_i \geq_i x_i^*$ for all n . By the continuity of preferences, the preference relation is preserved under limits: if $\gamma_n x'_i \geq_i x_i^*$ for all n , then $\gamma x'_i \geq_i x_i^*$. Because the unit interval is closed, we also know that $\gamma \in [0, 1]$. Hence \mathcal{A}^+ is closed.

3. **Step 3:** $\mathcal{A}^+ \cup \mathcal{A}^- = [0, 1]$.

- This follows from the completeness of preferences \geq_i . For any γ , either $\gamma x'_i \geq_i x_i^*$ or $x_i^* \geq_i \gamma x'_i$ (or both).

4. **Step 4:** $\mathcal{A}^+ \cap \mathcal{A}^- \neq \emptyset$.

- From step 3, $\mathcal{A}^+ \cup \mathcal{A}^- = [0, 1]$, a *connected set*.¹
- Suppose toward a contradiction that $\mathcal{A}^+ \cap \mathcal{A}^- = \emptyset$. Because \mathcal{A}^+ and \mathcal{A}^- are both closed and disjoint, they are separated. From step 3, this means we can write $[0, 1]$ as the union of two non-empty separated sets. But this contradicts that $[0, 1]$ is connected.

5. **Step 5:** $\exists \beta \in [0, 1)$ such that $\beta x'_i \sim_i x_i^*$.

- That such a $\beta \in [0, 1]$ exists comes from the non-empty intersection of $\mathcal{A}^+ \cap \mathcal{A}^-$. We just need to rule out the possibility $\beta = 1$. But $x'_i \succ_i x_i^*$ so we cannot have $\beta = 1$.

6. **Step 6:** $\exists \alpha$ satisfying $\alpha x'_i \succ_i x_i^*$.

- We know that $x'_i \succ_i x_i^*$ and $\beta x'_i \sim_i x_i^*$.
- By convexity, we have $\lambda x'_i + (1 - \lambda) \beta x'_i \succ_i x_i^*$ for all $\lambda \in (0, 1)$.
- Because $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta \in [0, 1)$, we have $0 < \lambda + (1 - \lambda) \beta < 1$ and $[\lambda + (1 - \lambda) \beta] x'_i \succ_i x_i^*$.
- Thus $\alpha = \lambda + (1 - \lambda) \beta$ satisfies $\alpha x'_i \succ_i x_i^*$

¹A connected set is a set which cannot be written as the union of two non-empty separated sets (sets where each set is disjoint from the other's closure). That is, the set X is connected if it cannot be written as the union of 2 non-empty sets A and B , where both $A \cap \bar{B} = \emptyset$ and $\bar{A} \cap B = \emptyset$.