

Inevitability of Polarization in Geometric Opinion Exchange

Abdou Majeed Alidou* Júlia Baligács† Max Hahn-Klimroth ‡
 Jan Hązła§ Lukas Hintze ¶ Olga Scheftelowitsch ||

Abstract

Polarization and unexpected correlations between opinions on diverse topics are an object of sustained attention. However, numerous theoretical models do not seem to convincingly explain these phenomena.

This paper is motivated by a recent line of work, studying models where polarization can be explained in terms of biased assimilation and geometric interplay between opinions on various topics. The agent opinions are represented as unit vectors on a multidimensional sphere and updated according to geometric rules. In contrast to previous work, we focus on the classical opinion exchange setting, where the agents update their opinions in discrete time steps, with a pair of agents interacting randomly at every step.

Our findings are twofold. First, polarization appears to be ubiquitous in the class of models we study, requiring only relatively modest assumptions on the update functions, reflecting biased assimilation. Second, there is a qualitative difference between two-dimensional dynamics on the one hand, and three or more dimensions on the other. Accordingly, we prove almost sure polarization for a large class of update rules in two dimensions. Then, we prove polarization in three and more dimensions in more limited cases and try to shed light on central difficulties absent in two dimensions.

1 Introduction

It is of great interest in politics and economy to understand how individuals in groups and societies exchange and update their opinions based on influences by new events and mutual interactions. A salient aspect of opinion evolution is the tendency towards *polarization*. Numerous dynamics are at play, and the exact definition of polarization is not always apparent. For

*AIMS Rwanda. Email:abdou@aims.edu.gh.

†University of Oxford. Email:jbaligacs@gmail.com

‡Goethe University Frankfurt, Email:hahnklm@mathematik.uni-frankfurt.de. Partly supported by DFG FOR 2975.

§AIMS Rwanda. Email:jan.hazla@aims.ac.rw. A.M.A. and J.H. were supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation German research chair funding and the associated DAAD projects No. 57610033 and No. 57761435.

¶Universität Hamburg, Email:lukas.rasmus.hintze@uni-hamburg.de.

||TU Dortmund, Email:olga.scheftelowitsch@udo.edu. Supported by DFG CO 646/5.

example, *issue alignment* refers to the correlation between opinions of different topics, i.e., if two individuals agree on one topic, they are typically more likely to also agree on some other topic. Another aspect is *issue radicalization* where individuals build strong opinions on a specific topic, sharply different from other individuals. In this paper, by *polarization*, we refer to the extreme case of issue alignment where a society splits into two groups where the individuals in the same group mostly agree but mostly disagree with individuals from the other group. Several authors from a variety of backgrounds are increasingly observing polarization and warning about this phenomenon, e.g., in the context of the United States [BG08; Mas18; Fre20; Kle20].

More broadly, the desire to understand the evolution of opinions in societies has led to extensive theoretical research on modelling and analyzing the relevant dynamics (see, for instance, surveys [MT17; GR20]). While many of the suggested models, especially those that do not allow for interactions between multiple topics, do not seem to account well for polarization, a recent line of work postulated models where polarization emerges more naturally [HJMR23; GKT21]. Those models are *geometric* in the sense that opinions of individuals (also referred to as *agents*) are represented as points in the Euclidean space evolving according to geometric rules, in particular based on the scalar products between interacting opinions.

In particular, Hażła, Jin, Mossel and Ramnarayan [HJMR23] introduced a model where the agent opinions are represented as vectors on a multidimensional unit sphere. Therein, each dimension may represent a topic or idea (e.g., climate change, gun laws), and the coordinate value reflects the individual’s stance on the topic. The assumption that opinions belong to the unit sphere reflects a fixed “budget of attention” of agents, i.e., if an individual is very interested in one specific topic, then they have less time to form a strong and confident opinion about some other topic. An “interaction” updates opinions in a way that reflects *biased assimilation*: Agents become “attracted” closer to opinions that align well with their existing beliefs and “repulsed” by opposite opinions. [HJMR23] then showed some scenarios leading to polarization, where over time agent opinions converged to two antipodal groups.

Gaitonde, Kleinberg and Tardos [GKT21] studied this and related models further. Pursuing the question of how ubiquitous the kind of polarization from [HJMR23] is, they established a more general framework and showed polarization results (including “weak polarization” in some cases) in several other scenarios.

However, we believe that the question of ubiquity of polarization in geometric opinion models is still far from explored. In this work, we analyze a general class of models and show polarization in a wide class of scenarios of “pure” opinion exchange.

First, both [HJMR23] and [GKT21] focus on models where opinions evolve due to “external” influences, in the sense that every individual experiences the same impacts, independent of their initial opinion (representing, e.g., influences by the media). In contrast, we study the classical opinion exchange setting, where opinions evolve due to pairwise interactions between agents, representing, e.g., one-on-one political discussions.

Second, we aim to work with more general update rules in order to understand what properties and assumptions drive polarization. In [HJMR23], the updates were proportional to the scalar product between two opinions. In particular, in their model, opinion \mathbf{u} “attracts” in exactly the same measure as the opposite opinion $-\mathbf{u}$ “repulses”. Therefore, the effect of inter-

vening with opinions \mathbf{u} and $-\mathbf{u}$ is exactly the same. Similarly, most of the examples studied in [GKT21] have this property, which they call “sign-invariance”. We consider more general update rules not relying on this exact property. We think this captures some more realistic, asymmetric scenarios. For example, it seems natural to consider scenarios where opinions which are similar to an agent’s opinion are likely to have a large attraction, while opposing opinions elicit only mild dislike.

Our main finding is that issue alignment and polarization are ubiquitous in the settings that we study. We prove almost sure convergence to antipodal pairs of opinions for a robust class of natural update functions. It appears that the geometric interplay between multiple topics and a modest version of biased assimilation are sufficient to inevitably cause a strong version of issue alignment.

On the technical side, our results point towards a qualitative difference in the dynamics when the model is considered in dimensions ≥ 3 opposed to dimension 2, i.e., when the model represents more topics. More precisely, let d denote the dimension of the model in the sense that opinions are vectors on the $(d - 1)$ -dimensional sphere $\mathbb{S}^{d-1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. For $d = 2$, we show polarization for a natural class of *stable* (see Definition 2.2) update functions unless there is a trivial obstacle preventing it (Theorem 2.7). However, in Section 8, we show that an important property that we rely on in the proof of the two dimensional case does not hold for a larger number of dimensions.

For $d \geq 3$, we show almost sure polarization in case of three agents (Theorem 2.6). We also show almost sure polarization for another natural class of *active* update functions (Theorem 2.4), for which the polarization is somewhat easier to establish. Finally, we attempt to isolate the challenge in the case of more than three opinions and stable functions. We define a notion of (d, n) -*stable* update functions, which captures the crucial needed property of escaping “almost orthogonal” configurations. We prove that such functions induce almost sure polarization. However, we leave for future work to show that any specific function actually has this property.

Related work As mentioned, the two works which are most relevant to this one are [HJMR23] and [GKT21]. We refer an interested reader to these papers for additional literature discussion.

These two works mostly study settings where the opinions evolve due to external influences. One could surmise that the polarization arises due to those external “interventions”. Here, we argue that it is inevitable also when such influences are absent and agents only interact with each other. Therefore, the polarization is more likely to be a general feature of the geometric structure utilized in this class of models. Furthermore, we believe that there is value in rigorously showing that polarization arises generally rather than as a special property of specific update functions.

On a technical level, it might appear intuitive that polarization occurs in our setting of pure opinion exchange. However, we face challenges not present in models discussed above due to lack of additional “mixing” introduced by external influences. In particular, as discussed throughout the paper, for many natural update functions it seems challenging to deal with configurations where the agents are almost, but not entirely, partitioned into two orthogonal

groups. Furthermore, in some of the proofs we rely on potential functions to a smaller extent. Therefore, our proofs use some novel arguments compared to [HJMR23] and [GKT21].

The “party model” from [GKT21] (see equation (4) therein) is arguably the most similar to our setting. In short, it is a mixture of external influences and (averaged) pairwise interactions. We think the closest comparison is to our model with the sign update function. In contrast, we study a different setting with only pairwise interactions and more general class of update functions. In particular, we believe the “stable” functions from our paper are technically more challenging. (The “party model” is more general in that it only requires a connected graph of interactions while our results are for fully supported distributions.)

Many classical opinion exchange models have been studied that tend to induce consensus rather than disagreement. One of the most striking examples is Aumann’s agreement theorem for Bayesian models [Aum76], see also [GK03; MT17] for Bayesian models more generally. Further well-known examples include models introduced by DeGroot [DeG74], and Friedkin and Johnsen [FJ90]. On the other hand, there is vast literature addressing various aspects of polarization. In contrast to our work, much of this literature is focused on one-dimensional opinions (e.g., [MKFB03; DGL13; DSCS+17; YYF22; CWT22]), opinions or actions with discrete rather than continuous values (e.g., [Axe97; PY22]) or update rules quite different from our geometric framework (e.g., [BB07; MGM23]).

2 Model and dynamics

In our model, we have a total of n agents, each having an opinion represented as a vector on the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . We denote the opinion of the i -th agent by \mathbf{u}_i . As explained above, each dimension may represent a topic, and each coordinate of \mathbf{u}_i reflects the individual’s stance on a given topic.

We then consider the dynamics with discrete time $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, where at each step t , a pair (i, j) is chosen i.i.d. from $[n] \times [n]$ according to a fixed distribution \mathcal{D} with full support, referred to as an *interaction distribution*. We then say that, at time t , agent j *influences* agent i , or more generally that i and j *interacted* at time t . Then agent i updates its opinion, where we define its new opinion \mathbf{u}'_i to be given by

$$\mathbf{u}'_i = \frac{\mathbf{w}}{\|\mathbf{w}\|}, \text{ where } \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{u}_i + f(\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j \rangle) \cdot \mathbf{u}_j \quad (2.1)$$

where $f : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a fixed *update function* (we prove in Claim 3.4 that, in the update functions we consider, we never have $\mathbf{w} = 0$. Therefore, the new opinion is well defined.).

We refer to a tuple of all agents’ opinions $\mathcal{U} = (\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n) \in (\mathbb{S}^{d-1})^n$ as a *configuration* and let $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ denote the configuration at time t . The most extreme version of issue alignment is captured by the following definition.

Definition 2.1. *A configuration \mathcal{U} is polarized if for every i, j either $\mathbf{u}_i = \mathbf{u}_j$ or $\mathbf{u}_i = -\mathbf{u}_j$.*

We say that a sequence of configurations $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ polarizes if $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ exists and is a polarized configuration (where convergence is in the standard topology in \mathbb{R}^d).

Note that, according to this definition, a consensus configuration is also considered polarized. While this might initially seem undesirable, it is unavoidable if we want to prove polarization for arbitrary initial configurations: Indeed, if all opinions are sufficiently close in the starting configuration, they will converge to consensus. However, we show in Lemma 3.10 that, when the initial configuration is drawn from a distribution satisfying certain symmetry conditions, the agents with high probability form two antipodal groups of roughly equal size. In other words, “true” polarization occurs with high probability.

In the following, we study the conditions under which a sequence of configurations $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ polarizes almost surely.

2.1 Update functions

The update function signifies how much agent i will change their opinion based on the preexisting alignment $\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j \rangle$. The biased assimilation assumption should reflect that if the opinions are similar (e.g., $\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j \rangle \approx 1$), \mathbf{u}_i will be “attracted” towards \mathbf{u}_j , and if they are dissimilar (e.g., $\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j \rangle \approx -1$), then \mathbf{u}_i is “repelled” away from \mathbf{u}_j . Some natural examples of update functions are $f(A) = \eta \cdot A$ suggested in [HJMR23] and $f(A) = \eta \cdot \text{sign}(A)$ studied in [GKT21] (in both cases there is a hyperparameter $\eta > 0$).

However, there are many other natural possibilities. For example, we can assume different strengths of “positive” and “negative” interactions i.e., for some $\eta_+, \eta_- > 0$,

$$f(A) = \begin{cases} \eta_+ \cdot A & \text{if } A \geq 0, \\ \eta_- \cdot A & \text{if } A < 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

Another alternative is the asymmetric sign function $f(A) = \eta_+ \cdot \mathbb{1}[A \geq 0] - \eta_- \cdot \mathbb{1}[A < 0]$ (or even $f(A) = \eta_+ \cdot \mathbb{1}[A \geq t] - \eta_- \cdot \mathbb{1}[A < t]$ for some $-1 < t < 1$).

Moving directly on the sphere Our framework also captures update rules that can be expressed differently, arguably in a more natural way. For example, consider the following scheme that avoids explicit normalization from (2.1):

Let $0 < \eta < 1$ and $\alpha = \cos^{-1}(\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j \rangle)$ be the angle between \mathbf{u}_i and \mathbf{u}_j (i.e., the distance on the sphere between i and j ’s opinions). Let $\phi = \frac{\eta}{2} \sin(2\alpha)$ be the distance by which i will move its opinion towards/away from j (positive sign: towards; negative sign: away from; other choices are possible but a nice property of this one is $\phi \geq 0$ iff $\alpha \leq \pi/2$ iff $\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j \rangle \geq 0$).

Then, set

$$\mathbf{u}'_i = (\sin(\alpha - \phi)\mathbf{u}_i + \sin(\phi)\mathbf{u}_j) / \sin(\alpha). \quad (2.3)$$

The formula (2.3) is known as “spherical linear interpolation” [Sho85] and the new opinion \mathbf{u}'_i is guaranteed to be on the sphere. It can be easily checked that the procedure we just described gives the same updates as (2.1) with the update function $f_{\text{slerp},\eta}(A) = \sin \phi / \sin(\alpha - \phi)$.

Stable and active functions Our aim is to cover a broad class of update functions while keeping the mathematical discussion tractable. To that end, let us settle on two definitions:

Definition 2.2 (Stable function). *A function $f : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is stable if it is continuous and if $\text{sign}(f(A)) = \text{sign}(A)$ for all $A \in [-1, 1]$.*

Note that every stable function f fulfills $f(0) = 0$ and $f(A)$ is positive (respectively negative) if and only if A is positive (respectively negative). The scaled identity $f(A) = \eta A$, as well as its asymmetrical version from (2.2) and $f_{\text{slerp}, \eta}$ are all stable.

Definition 2.3 (Active function). *An update function f is active if*

1. *There exists $-1 < A_0 < 1$ such that $f(A) \leq 0$ for $A < A_0$ and $f(A) \geq 0$ for $A > A_0$.*
2. *There is a universal lower bound $m > 0$ such that $\inf_{-1 \leq A \leq 1} |f(A)| \geq m$.*

The sign function $f(A) = \eta \cdot (\mathbb{1}[A \geq 0] - \mathbb{1}[A < 0])$ (as well as its asymmetrical variants discussed above) is an example of an active function.

Our definitions include a requirement of at most one sign change of f (located exactly at $f(0) = 0$ in case of a stable function). This does not seem to be fundamental, but we impose these conditions for the sake of simplicity (among others, in order to keep the concept of “active configurations” simpler). Nevertheless, we believe they capture the most natural and mathematically interesting cases.

2.2 Examples

While Definition 2.1 reflects complete issue alignment, it does not necessarily capture the division into two sizable groups with opposing opinions. In particular, it includes consensus configurations where all opinions are equal.

If the update function is odd $f(-A) = -f(A)$, then there is a symmetry argument (observed previously both in [HJMR23] and [GKT21]) to establish the division into two opposing camps. More precisely, if n opinions are sampled i.i.d. from a distribution which gives the same weight/s/density to \mathbf{u} and $-\mathbf{u}$, then with high probability the agents converge to a polarized configuration with $n/2 \pm O(\sqrt{n})$ agents in each group. For completeness we give a concentration bound argument in Lemma 3.10.

For asymmetric update functions, we do not address this issue theoretically. However, empirically it appears that even if the update function is asymmetric, randomly placed agents tend to congregate into two groups, each of significant size.

For example, Figure 1 illustrates simulation for the update function given by (2.2) with $\eta_+ = 0.9$, and $\eta_- = 0.1$. Opinions of 100 agents were initially placed uniformly at random on the sphere for $d = 4$. An example of such random configuration is shown in Figure 1a. For four different random starting configurations, the configurations after 2800 time steps are shown in the image. The histogram on Figure 1d displays the distribution of the size of the polarized groups, over 1000 runs of the experiment. We can see that despite the asymmetry of the update rule, the group size is around half of the number of opinions.

The most challenging aspect of the theoretical analysis we employ is to determine if the random process can get stuck in an “almost orthogonal” configuration. That could correspond to a situation where the agents sort into communities interested in disjoint topics. However,

Figure 1: Issue radicalization with an asymmetric update rule: $n = 100$, $d = 4$, $\eta_+ = 0.9$, $\eta_- = 0.1$. The initial configuration is obtained by choosing n opinions uniformly at random on the unit hyper-sphere. The update rule used is the one in (2.2). The first image shows what such initial configuration looks like. Each of Figures 1b, 1c, 1e and 1f shows the configuration at time $t = 2800$, for four independent runs of the experiments (i.e., four different initial configurations). Furthermore, over 1000 independent runs of the experiments, the histogram of the size of the polarized groups is plotted. As $d = 4$, three coordinates are plotted spatially, and color represents the fourth coordinate.





Figure 2: Almost orthogonal configurations polarize: $n = 100, d = 4$ and the update rule is $f(A) = 0.1A$. Initially, for every pair of opinions, their dot product A satisfies $|A| \leq 0.001$ or $|A| \geq 0.999$. The process escapes the “almost orthogonal” configuration and polarizes.



such almost orthogonal configurations are inherently unstable and ultimately evolve into polarization. Figure 2 illustrates simulations with the update rule $f(A) = \eta A$ with $\eta = 0.1$. We took 100 agents in 4 dimensions, and the starting configuration is chosen such that, for every two opinions $\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j$, either $|\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j \rangle| \leq 0.001$ (i.e. “almost orthogonal”) or $|\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j \rangle| \geq 0.999$. The configurations at different time steps show that the process escapes the almost orthogonal configuration, and eventually polarizes.

2.3 Results

Our results address the following question: In which settings does a given starting configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ polarize almost surely?

First, we show polarization in the case of active update functions.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $d, n \geq 2$ and f be an active update function, \mathcal{D} a fully supported interaction distribution and $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ a configuration of n opinions. Then, $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ polarizes almost surely.*

It turns out that the case of stable update functions is significantly more challenging. In their case, we first need to identify special cases that do not polarize for trivial reasons.

Definition 2.5 (Separable configuration). *A configuration \mathcal{U} is separable when it can be partitioned into two nonempty sets S and T such that, for every opinion $\mathbf{u} \in S$ and $\mathbf{v} \in T$, we have $\mathbf{u} \perp \mathbf{v}$.*

Since stable update rules satisfy $f(0) = 0$, a separable configuration remains separable with the same partition after any interaction. In particular, such a configuration cannot polarize. For this reason, when considering stable update functions, we always assume that the initial configuration is non-separable. Conversely, in Lemma 6.2 we show that non-separability is preserved under any interaction. Accordingly, we ask the question: Under which conditions does the process $\mathcal{W}^{(t)}$ polarize almost surely for all non-separable initial configurations? In particular, does it polarize almost surely for all stable update functions?

We provide partial positive answers to this question by showing polarization for stable update functions in two special cases. First, we obtain polarization in the case of three agents.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $d \geq 2$, f be a stable update function, the interaction distribution \mathcal{D} have full support and $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ be a configuration of three opinions which is not separable. Then, $\mathcal{W}^{(t)}$ polarizes almost surely.*

Second, we show polarization in the two-dimensional setting for an arbitrary number of opinions.

Theorem 2.7. *Let $d = 2$, $n \geq 2$, the interaction distribution \mathcal{D} have full support, f be a stable update function, and $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ be any initial configuration which is not separable. Then, almost surely, $\mathcal{W}^{(t)}$ polarizes.*

Remark 2.8. *The only aspect of the distribution \mathcal{D} that plays a role in the proofs is the minimum probability $p_{\min} = \min_{i,j} \mathcal{D}(i, j)$. Our theorems assume that \mathcal{D} is fully supported, equivalently $p_{\min} > 0$. It seems natural and interesting future direction to extend our study to more general distributions.*

For convenience, we assume throughout that \mathcal{D} is fully supported on the set $[n] \times [n]$. In fact, since an interaction (i, i) does not change the configuration, for the theorems above \mathcal{D} needs to be fully supported only on the set $\{(i, j) \in [n] \times [n] : i \neq j\}$.

2.4 Outline of proofs

Let us briefly discuss the main ideas used to prove our results.

Strictly convex configurations For all three theorems stated above, we found it useful to consider a class of configurations that we call *strictly convex*:

Definition 2.9 (Strictly convex configuration). *Let $0 \leq c < 1$. A configuration \mathcal{U} is called c -strictly convex if there exist $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \{\pm 1\}$ such that $\langle b_i \mathbf{u}_i, b_j \mathbf{u}_j \rangle > c$ for every $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. When $c = 0$, we simply say that \mathcal{U} is strictly convex.*

Equivalently, a configuration is strictly convex if there exists a choice of b_1, \dots, b_n and a convex cone with apex angle less than $\pi/4$ that contains every $b_i \mathbf{u}_i$. The apex angle of a cone is the angle between its axis and any of its generating vectors. If an update function satisfies $\text{sign}(f(A)) = \text{sign}(A)$, it is not hard to see that for any interaction of agents, the updated configuration remains strictly convex with the same b_1, \dots, b_n . And, since a new opinion of an agent is a linear combination of two existing opinions, the “width” of the cone of the updated configuration cannot increase. More precisely, if we let

$$\mathcal{P}(t) = 1 - \min_{i,j \in [n]} \langle b_i \mathbf{u}_i^{(t)}, b_j \mathbf{u}_j^{(t)} \rangle,$$

then $\mathcal{P}(t+1) \leq \mathcal{P}(t)$ always holds. Furthermore, it can be shown that with probability uniformly bounded away from zero, $\mathcal{P}(t)$ decreases by a constant factor in a constant number of steps, hence $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{P}(t) = 0$ happens almost surely. As a result, the configuration polarizes, where the opinions of agents with $b_i = 1$ converge to some vector \mathbf{u}^* , and the opinions of agents with $b_i = -1$ to the antipodal vector $-\mathbf{u}^*$. Ultimately, we show:

Lemma 2.10. *Let $d, n \geq 2$ and \mathcal{D} be a fully supported distribution.*

If the update function is stable and $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ strictly convex, then $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ polarizes almost surely.

If the update function is active, recall A_0 from Definition 2.3. If $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ is $|A_0|$ -strictly convex, then $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ polarizes almost surely.

Lemma 2.10 is proved in Section 4. The difference in the case of active update functions stems from the fact that they do not satisfy $\text{sign}(f(A)) = \text{sign}(A)$ in general, but only for $|A| > |A_0|$.

Proof outlines of Theorem 2.4 and Theorem 2.7 The proofs of both theorems follow a common strategy. In both settings, active update functions for $d \geq 2$ and stable update functions for $d = 2$, we establish that a strictly convex configuration can be reached in a constant number of steps from any allowed initial configuration.

Lemma 2.11. *Let $d, n \geq 2$, and f an active update function. There exists K such that, for every configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$, there is a sequence of K interactions after which $\mathcal{U}^{(K)}$ is $|A_0|$ -strictly convex.*

Lemma 2.12. *Let $d = 2$, $n \geq 2$, and f a stable update function. There exists K such that, for every configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ which is not separable, there exists a sequence of K interactions such that $\mathcal{U}^{(K)}$ is strictly convex.*

Note that the constant K in the lemmas above can depend on d, n , and f . This is true also for other similar statements in the rest of the paper.

Since any sequence of interactions of constant length occurs with some positive constant probability, at every time there is a constant probability that a strictly convex configuration will be reached in $O(1)$ steps. It follows that a strictly convex configuration will be reached almost surely. Then, polarization follows from Lemma 2.10.

Lemma 2.11 is easier to handle, since for active update functions the uniform lower bound $|f(A)| \geq m$ ensures that any pair of opinions will have their absolute correlation exceed $|A_0|$ (or

any other fixed value) after $O(1)$ interactions between them. Therefore, the required sequence of interactions is constructed by agent 1 influencing each other agent a fixed number of times. The details are given in Section 5.

Lemma 2.12 seems more surprising, and its proof is more involved. Furthermore, as discussed shortly, its statement is false for $d \geq 3$. To understand this, it is useful to distinguish configurations which we call ϵ -inactive.

Definition 2.13 (ϵ -activity). *Let $\epsilon \geq 0$. A configuration \mathcal{U} is called ϵ -inactive if for every i, j it holds $|\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j \rangle| \leq \epsilon$ or $|\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j \rangle| \geq 1 - \epsilon$. Otherwise, we say that the configuration is ϵ -active. When $\epsilon = 0$, we simply say active and inactive instead of 0-active (respectively 0-inactive).*

For a stable update function, if $A_{ij} = \langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j \rangle \approx 0$, then also $f(A_{ij}) \approx 0$. In that case, it can be easily seen from (2.1) that an interaction where j influences i will not move the opinion of agent i by much. On the other hand, if $|A_{ij}| \approx 1$, then, since \mathbf{u}_i and \mathbf{u}_j (or \mathbf{u}_i and $-\mathbf{u}_j$ if their correlation is negative) are already close to each other, and since the updated opinion lies on the great circle between them, the updated opinion will not move far away from the original one. Therefore, every interaction in an ϵ -inactive configuration effects only a slight change.

Turning back to Lemma 2.12, if a non-separable initial configuration is also ϵ -inactive, it seems less obvious to construct the required sequence of interactions of bounded length. In Section 7 we give a geometric argument to achieve that.

Polarization of three opinions Finally, Theorem 2.6 proved in Section 6 gives almost sure polarization for stable functions and three agents. Here, we introduce another approach. We define a suitable potential function and show that it decreases almost surely to some constant value. Importantly, the speed of decrease depends on the starting configuration. Then we prove that, once this constant value is reached, there exists a constant-length sequence making the configuration strictly convex, so that Lemma 2.10 can be applied.

2.5 Partial progress for stable functions

A natural follow-up question is: Which stable update functions elicit almost sure polarization for $d \geq 3$? Unfortunately, the proof strategy for $d = 2$ cannot be employed directly. In particular, in general the statement of Lemma 2.12 does not hold.

Theorem 2.14. *Let $d \geq 3$ and consider the update function $f(\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle) := \eta \cdot \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ for some $\eta > 0$. For every $T \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, there exists a configuration of three opinions $\mathcal{U}^{(0)} = (\mathbf{u}_1^{(0)}, \mathbf{u}_2^{(0)}, \mathbf{u}_3^{(0)})$ such that $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ is not separable and, for every choice of T interactions, the resulting configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(T)}$ is not strictly convex.*

Theorem 2.14 is proved in Section 8. An important point for our purposes is that the configurations constructed in the proof of Theorem 2.14 satisfy $A_{12} = A_{13} = -A_{23} = \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon = \epsilon(T) \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, such configurations are ϵ -inactive. Clearly, in order to prove almost sure polarization for $d \geq 3$, one at least needs to show that such configurations are almost surely “escaped”. This leads us to the following more general considerations.

For small enough ϵ , there is a natural structure to ϵ -inactive configurations. We can uniquely divide the opinions into “clusters” such that all absolute correlations inside a given cluster are close to 1, and all opinions in different clusters are almost orthogonal:

Definition 2.15 (Cluster). *Let \mathcal{U} be a configuration. A non empty set $C \subset [n]$ is a cluster of \mathcal{U} if, for every $i, j \in C$, $|A_{ij}| > 1/2$, and for every $i \in C$, $j \notin C$, $|A_{ij}| < 1/2$.*

Of course, in an ϵ -inactive configuration for $\epsilon < 1/2$, the correlations inside a cluster satisfy $|A_{ij}| \geq 1 - \epsilon$, and correlations between clusters satisfy $|A_{ij}| \leq \epsilon$. Furthermore, as suggested above, the clusters of an ϵ -inactive configuration form a partition of agents.

Lemma 2.16. *Let $0 \leq \epsilon < 1/8$ and \mathcal{U} a configuration that is ϵ -inactive. Then, the clusters of \mathcal{U} form a partition of the agents. Furthermore, if $\epsilon < 1/d$, then there are at most d clusters.*

Lemma 2.17. *Let f be a stable update function. There exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that:*

- *If configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ is ϵ_0 -inactive, then $\mathcal{U}^{(t+1)}$ is $1/256$ -inactive.*
- *Configurations $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ and $\mathcal{U}^{(t+1)}$ have the same clusters.*

Lemma 2.16 is proved in Section 3 and Lemma 2.17 in Section 9.

Clearly, if a sequence of configurations polarizes, then for large enough t it holds $|A_{ij}^{(t)}| > 1/2$ for every i, j , in particular the configuration consists of one cluster containing all agents. On the other hand, in light of Lemma 2.17, for small $\epsilon > 0$, the number of clusters of an ϵ -inactive configuration does not change over time as long as the configuration remains ϵ -inactive. Therefore, in order to prove almost sure polarization for all non-separable initial configurations, it is necessary to prove in particular that any non-separable ϵ -inactive configuration with at least two clusters almost surely eventually becomes ϵ -active.

In Section 9, we make partial progress towards analyzing polarization for stable functions and $d \geq 3$. We prove that (with one additional caveat), the property described above is not only necessary, but also sufficient for almost sure polarization. In order to state this result, we introduce a concept of (d, n, \mathcal{D}) -stable update functions that captures the property required for polarization:

Definition 2.18. *Let $d, n \geq 2$, \mathcal{D} a fully supported distribution, and f a stable update function. Let ϵ_0 be given by Lemma 2.17. f is called (d, n, \mathcal{D}) -stable if there exists some $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ and $p > 0$ such that:*

Let $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ be a configuration of n opinions in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} which is ϵ -inactive and not separable, with $k \geq 2$ clusters. Then, the following two properties hold. First, almost surely, there exists t such that $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ is ϵ -active. Second, for the earliest such time t_1 , with probability at least p , there exist two agents i, j such that at time 0 they are in different clusters, and $|A_{ij}^{(t_1)}| > \epsilon$.

Theorem 2.19. *Let $d, n \geq 2$, \mathcal{D} a distribution with full support, and f a (d, n, \mathcal{D}) -stable update function. Let $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ be a configuration which is not separable. Then, $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ almost surely polarizes.*

Note the above-mentioned caveat: The definition has an additional condition of $|A_{ij}^{(t_1)}| > \epsilon$, for i, j from different clusters with probability at least p . We refer to Section 9 for the discussion of this condition and the proof of Theorem 2.19.

Since the notion of (d, n, \mathcal{D}) -stability is given in terms of behavior of the random process over a potentially long time, it is not clear how to show that any given stable update function satisfies the definition. Indeed, in this paper we do not prove that any specific function is (d, n, \mathcal{D}) -stable for all $d, n \geq 3$, and leave this problem for future work.

Subsequent work A follow-up paper [ABH25] shows (with some effort) that $f(x) = \eta \cdot x$ is (d, n, \mathcal{U}) -stable for $\eta > 0$, $d, n \geq 2$ and the uniform interaction distribution. In particular, this implies almost sure polarization for all non-separable configurations in that case.

Outline In the rest of the paper, we proceed as follows. In Section 3, we introduce some notation and discuss several preliminaries. Then, we proceed sequentially, proving the results discussed above. In Section 4, we show Lemma 2.10 for strictly convex configurations. In Section 5, we prove polarization for active functions, i.e., Theorem 2.4. Section 6 contains some general properties of the dynamics of stable functions, as well as the proof of Theorem 2.6 for three opinions. In Section 7, we then prove polarization in two dimensions (Theorem 2.7). Finally, moving to the case of stable functions and $d, n \geq 3$, Section 8 contains the proof for Theorem 2.14 and Section 9 for Theorem 2.19.

3 Preliminaries

3.1 Setting and dynamics

Let $d, n \geq 2$ denote the number of dimensions and the number of agents, respectively. We let $[n]$ denote the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and refer to agents by indices from this set. As mentioned, a *configuration* \mathcal{U} is a tuple of n opinions in d dimensions, i.e., $\mathcal{U} = (\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n)$ where for every i , $\mathbf{u}_i \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. We denote the correlation $A(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ between two vectors \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} as $A(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) := \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle$. Similarly, the (primary) angle between two opinions \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} is denoted as $\alpha(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) := \arccos(\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle)$. In the context of n opinions $(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n)$, we will write $A_{ij} := A(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j)$ and $\alpha_{ij} := \alpha(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j)$. Note that $0 \leq \alpha(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq \pi$ for all opinions \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} . We will also need a related notion that we call *effective angle*:

Definition 3.1. *The effective angle of two opinions \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} is given as $\gamma(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) := \min(\alpha(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}), \pi - \alpha(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}))$. As with the correlations and angles, we write for short $\gamma_{ij} := \gamma(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j)$.*

Note that $\alpha(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \alpha(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})$ and $\gamma(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \gamma(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})$. Also, the effective angle does not change when an opinion is flipped, but the angle may change; that is $\gamma(-\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \gamma(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ while $\alpha(-\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \pi - \alpha(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$. Since the angle function $\alpha(\cdot, \cdot)$ is just the distance along the sphere, it satisfies the triangle inequality $\alpha(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_k) \leq \alpha(\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j) + \alpha(\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{u}_k)$. One can show that also the effective angle satisfies the triangle inequality, since it is the induced metric on the projective space $\mathbb{R}\mathbb{P}^{d-1}$.

Let us formally restate the dynamics of a single instance of our model and derive a formula for how much a correlation changes due to one interaction.

Definition 3.2. We call an element $(i, j) \in [n] \times [n]$ an interaction and say that j influences i . Let $f : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an update function and \mathcal{D} a probability distribution on $[n] \times [n]$.

We consider discrete timesteps $t \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$, and an infinite sequence of i.i.d. random variables $I^{(1)}, I^{(2)}, \dots$ drawn from \mathcal{D} . For a given initial configuration of opinions $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$, we define the configurations $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ for $t = 1, 2, \dots$ as follows.

If $I^{(t)} = (i, j)$, then for every agent k

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}_k^{(t+1)} &= \mathbf{u}_k^{(t)} \text{ if } k \neq i, \\ \mathbf{u}_i^{(t+1)} &= \frac{\mathbf{w}}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} \text{ where } \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{u}_i^{(t)} + f(A_{ij}^{(t)}) \cdot \mathbf{u}_j^{(t)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{u}_k^{(t)}$ is the opinion of agent k at time t and $A_{ij}^{(t)}$ is the correlation between $\mathbf{u}_i^{(t)}$ and $\mathbf{u}_j^{(t)}$.

Remark 3.3. From the definition of the model, we can notice the following facts. If $I^{(t)} = (i, j)$, then

- $\mathbf{u}_i^{(t+1)}$ is a linear combination of $\mathbf{u}_i^{(t)}$ and $\mathbf{u}_j^{(t)}$,
- for every $k, l \in [n]$ such that $k \neq i$ and $l \neq i$, we have $A_{kl}^{(t+1)} = A_{kl}^{(t)}$.

While it is in general possible that $\mathbf{w} = 0$ and therefore $\mathbf{u}_i^{(t+1)}$ is ill-defined, Claim 3.4 below implies that for active and stable update rules $\mathbf{w} = 0$ is not possible.

Claim 3.4 (New correlation). Consider an update function f and two opinions $\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j$ with correlation A . Let A' denote the new correlation after j influences i . Then, we have $\|\mathbf{w}\|^2 = 1 + 2Af(A) + f(A)^2$ and consequently A' is given by

$$A' = \frac{A + f(A)}{\sqrt{1 + 2Af(A) + f(A)^2}}. \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. Indeed, we have $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{u}_i + f(A)\mathbf{u}_j$ and, by bilinearity, $\|\mathbf{w}\|^2 = \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w} \rangle = 1 + 2Af(A) + f(A)^2$. Finally, indeed

$$A' = \left\langle \frac{\mathbf{w}}{\|\mathbf{w}\|}, \mathbf{u}_j \right\rangle = \frac{A + f(A)}{\sqrt{1 + 2Af(A) + f(A)^2}}. \quad \square$$

Since $\|\mathbf{w}\|^2 = 1 + 2Af(A) + f(A)^2 = (A + f(A))^2 + (1 - A^2)$, the only way for $\mathbf{w} = 0$ to occur is $A \in \{-1, 1\}$ and $A = -f(A)$. However, our definitions of stable and active functions ensure $f(1) > 0$ and $f(-1) < 0$ and therefore $f(1) \neq -1$ and $f(-1) \neq 1$.

3.2 Transitivity properties

We now move to basic transitivity properties that follow from triangle inequality for the Euclidean norm. These properties are used throughout later proofs.

Lemma 3.5 (Transitivity of closeness). *Let $d \geq 2$, $0 < \epsilon < 1/4$, and consider three opinions $\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{u}_k$. If $|A_{ij}| \geq 1 - \epsilon$ and $|A_{ik}| \geq 1 - \epsilon$, then*

$$|A_{jk}| \geq 1 - 4\epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \text{sign}(A_{jk}) = \text{sign}(A_{ij}) \text{sign}(A_{ik}).$$

Proof. First, assume $\text{sign}(A_{ij}) = \text{sign}(A_{ik}) = 1$. In that case, we need to show $A_{jk} \geq 1 - 4\epsilon$. Indeed, by assumption $\|\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_j\|^2 = \langle \mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_j \rangle = 2(1 - A_{ij}) \leq 2\epsilon$. Similarly, $\|\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_k\|^2 \leq 2\epsilon$. By the triangle inequality, $\|\mathbf{u}_j - \mathbf{u}_k\| \leq \|\mathbf{u}_j - \mathbf{u}_i\| + \|\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_k\| \leq \sqrt{8\epsilon}$. Hence, $A_{jk} = 1 - \|\mathbf{u}_j - \mathbf{u}_k\|^2/2 \geq 1 - 4\epsilon$.

The other cases are reduced to the first case. For example, let $\text{sign}(A_{ij}) = -1$ and $\text{sign}(A_{ik}) = 1$. We need to show $A_{jk} \leq -(1 - 4\epsilon)$. Then, $A(\mathbf{u}_i, -\mathbf{u}_j) = -A_{ij} \geq 1 - \epsilon$. Applying the first case to $\mathbf{u}_i, -\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{u}_k$, we have $A(-\mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{u}_k) \geq 1 - 4\epsilon$, hence $A_{jk} \leq -(1 - 4\epsilon)$. The remaining cases proceed similarly. \square

As a consequence, we obtain a simple criterion for strict convexity.

Claim 3.6. *Let $0 < \epsilon < 1/4$. If \mathcal{U} is such that for every opinions $\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j$ we have $|A_{ij}| \geq 1 - \epsilon$, then \mathcal{U} is strictly convex.*

Proof. Let $b_1 = 1$ and $b_i = \text{sign}(A_{1i})$ for $i > 1$. That ensures $\langle b_1 \mathbf{u}_1, b_i \mathbf{u}_i \rangle \geq 1 - \epsilon$ for every i . For general i, j , we have $\langle b_i \mathbf{u}_i, b_j \mathbf{u}_j \rangle \geq 1 - 4\epsilon > 0$ by Lemma 3.5. \square

Lemma 3.7 (Inactivity relations). *Let $d \geq 2$, $\epsilon \geq 0$, and consider three opinions $\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{u}_k$. If $|A_{ij}| \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}$ and $|A_{ik}| \geq 1 - \epsilon$, then $|A_{jk}| \leq 8\sqrt{\epsilon}$.*

Furthermore, in the special case $d = 2$, if $|A_{ij}| \leq \epsilon$ and $|A_{ik}| \leq \epsilon$, then $|A_{jk}| \geq 1 - 2\epsilon^2$.

Lemma 3.8 (Transitivity of activity). *Let $d \geq 2$, $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \geq 0$, and consider three opinions $\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{u}_k$. If $|A_{ij}| \geq \sqrt{\epsilon_1}$ and $|A_{ik}| \geq 1 - \epsilon_2$, then $|A_{jk}| \geq \sqrt{\epsilon_1} - 3\sqrt{\epsilon_2}$. In particular, if $\epsilon_1 \geq 16\epsilon_2$, then $|A_{jk}| \geq \sqrt{\epsilon_2}$.*

Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8 are proved in Appendix A. Let us also prove Lemma 2.16 about the clusters of ϵ -inactive configurations.

Proof of Lemma 2.16. Consider the relation between agents in \mathcal{U} which is defined to hold if and only if the condition $|A_{ij}| > 1/2$ holds. We first observe that it is an equivalence relation. The only nontrivial part to check is transitivity. Consider three agents i, j, k such that $|A_{ij}|, |A_{ik}| > 1/2$, therefore by ϵ -inactivity $|A_{ij}|, |A_{ik}| \geq 1 - \epsilon$. Applying Lemma 3.5, indeed we have $|A_{jk}| \geq 1 - 4\epsilon > 1/2$, where we used that $\epsilon < 1/8$.

Since \mathcal{U} is ϵ -inactive, $|A_{ij}| = 1/2$ is impossible. Therefore, each equivalence class of this relation is a cluster and each cluster must be an equivalence class. Hence, we obtain the desired partition.

It only remains to prove that there are at most d clusters. Assume otherwise and choose arbitrarily opinions $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{d+1}$, each from a different cluster. By the Welch bounds [Wel74], there exist $i \neq j$ with $|A_{ij}| \geq 1/d$. Therefore, the configuration cannot be ϵ -inactive for any $\epsilon < 1/d$. \square

3.3 Polarization into balanced groups

In this subsection, we establish that, although consensus is a polarized configuration according to Definition 2.1, it occurs with vanishing probability if the update function is odd and the initial configuration is chosen according to a distribution fulfilling a symmetry condition. This argument was already pointed out in [HJMR23, Remark 3.1] in the setting of their model with external influences. Here, we adapt it to our setting and state an explicit concentration bound.

Definition 3.9 (Symmetric Distribution). *A distribution Γ on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} is symmetric if for every subset $A \subset \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, we have $\Gamma(A) = \Gamma(-A)$.*

Lemma 3.10. *Let f be an odd update function, \mathcal{D} the interaction distribution, Γ a symmetric distribution on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . Draw n opinions $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n$ i.i.d. from the distribution Γ and let $\mathcal{U}^{(0)} = (\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n)$. Let $\mathcal{U}^{(\infty)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ when the limit exists. Then, for every $c > 0$,*

$$\mathbf{P}_{\Gamma, \mathcal{D}} \left[\left| \left| \left\{ i : \mathbf{u}_i^{(\infty)} = \mathbf{u}_1^{(\infty)} \right\} \right| - \frac{n+1}{2} \right| \geq c\sqrt{n-1} \mid \mathcal{U}^{(t)} \text{ polarizes} \right] \leq 2 \exp(-2c^2).$$

The bound in Lemma 3.10 implies that under an odd update function, when opinions that are chosen from a symmetric distribution on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} polarize, then with high probability they form two antipodal groups of similar sizes. Note that the expectation $(n+1)/2$ is slightly larger than $n/2$ since the first opinion is always equal to itself.

Proof. Consider n independent random variables $U_i \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ with distribution Γ , and n independent Rademacher random variables $B_i \in \{-1, +1\}$ with uniform distribution. First, note that the random variables $B_i U_i$ are also independent and distributed according to Γ , because Γ is symmetric.

Also, given that the function f is odd, for any particular initial configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(0)} = (\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_i, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n)$ and any sequence of interactions $I^{(1)}, I^{(2)}, \dots$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ exists and is polarized, it holds that for $\mathcal{U}^{(0)} = (\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, -\mathbf{u}_i, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n)$ and the same sequence of interactions the limit also exists and is a polarized configuration. The only difference is that if in the first case $\mathbf{u}_i^{(\infty)} = \mathbf{v}$, then in the second case $\mathbf{u}_i^{(\infty)} = -\mathbf{v}$. So, with $\mathcal{V}^{(0)} = (B_1 \mathbf{u}_1, \dots, B_n \mathbf{u}_n)$, if the random processes are coupled using the same interactions $I^{(1)}, I^{(2)}, \dots$, then $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ polarizes if and only if $\mathcal{V}^{(t)}$ polarizes. In particular, whether $\mathcal{V}^{(t)}$ polarizes does not depend on the Rademacher variables B_i .

Accordingly, condition on some choice of $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ and interactions $I^{(t)}$ such that $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{(t)}$ polarize, so that the only remaining randomness is over (B_i) . Let $S = \left\{ i : \mathbf{u}_i^{(\infty)} = \mathbf{u}_1^{(\infty)} \right\}$ and $S' = \left\{ i : B_i \mathbf{u}_i^{(\infty)} = B_1 \mathbf{u}_1^{(\infty)} \right\}$. We will now show

$$\Pr \left[|S'| - \frac{n+1}{2} \geq c\sqrt{n-1} \right] \leq 2 \exp(-2c^2).$$

The statement of the lemma then immediately follows by averaging over $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ and $I^{(t)}$. As we have

$$|S'| = \sum_{i \in S} \mathbb{1}_{[B_i = B_1]} + \sum_{i \notin S} \mathbb{1}_{[B_i = -B_1]}.$$

and as always $1 \in S, 1 \in S'$, the random variable $|S'| - 1$ is a binomial with parameters $(n-1, 1/2)$, therefore we obtain the desired inequality from Hoeffding's inequality,

$$\mathbf{P}_{\Gamma, \mathcal{D}} \left[\left| |S'| - 1 - \frac{n-1}{2} \right| \geq c\sqrt{n-1} \right] \leq 2 \exp(-2c^2). \quad \square$$

4 Strictly convex polarization: Proof of Lemma 2.10

In this section, we prove Lemma 2.10, that is, we show that strictly convex configurations polarize almost surely. In order for our proof to be applicable for both active and stable update functions, we introduce a definition:

Definition 4.1. *Let $c \geq 0, 0 \leq \beta < 1$. An update function f is (c, β) -contractive if, for every A with $|A| > c$:*

1. $\text{sign}(f(A)) = \text{sign}(A)$.
2. $1 - |A'| \leq \beta \cdot (1 - |A|)$, where $A' = (A + f(A)) / \sqrt{1 + 2Af(A) + f(A)^2}$ is the new correlation (see Claim 3.4).

We will now establish the following sequence of results:

Lemma 4.2 (Strictly convex polarization). *Let $c \geq 0, 0 \leq \beta < 1$ and $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ be c -strictly convex. If the update function is (c, β) -contractive, then $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ polarizes almost surely.*

Claim 4.3 (Contraction for active functions). *Let f be an active update function. Recall that there exists some A_0 with $|A_0| < 1$ such that $f(A) > 0$ for $A > A_0$ and $f(A) < 0$ for $A < A_0$. There exists $0 < \beta < 1$ such that the following holds. Let A be a correlation between two vectors and let A' be the updated correlation after one interaction between them. If $A > A_0$, then $1 - A' \leq \beta(1 - A)$. Similarly, if $A < A_0$, then $A' - (-1) \leq \beta(A - (-1))$.*

In particular, f is $(|A_0|, \beta)$ -contractive.

Claim 4.4 (Contraction for stable functions). *Let f be a stable update function. For every $\delta > 0$, there exists $\beta = \beta(\delta) \in (0, 1)$ such that f is $(\delta, \beta(\delta))$ -contractive.*

It is easy to see that Lemma 2.10 follows from Lemma 4.2, Claim 4.3, and Claim 4.4. (In the stable case, note that if $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ is strictly convex, then it is δ -strictly convex for some $\delta > 0$.) We prove Lemma 4.2 in Section 4.1, Claim 4.3 in Appendix A, and Claim 4.4 in Section 4.2.

4.1 Proof of Lemma 4.2

Recall the outline from Section 2.4. As mentioned there, we will utilize a potential function $\mathcal{P}(t) = 1 - \min_{i,j \in [n]} |A_{ij}^{(t)}|$. Lemma 4.2 follows from the following intermediate results.

Lemma 4.5. Assume $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ is c -strictly convex, f is (c, β) -contractive and that, at time step t , agent i is influenced by agent j . Then, for every $k \neq i$,

$$\min_{1 \leq l \leq n} |A_{kl}^{(t+1)}| \geq \min_{1 \leq l \leq n} |A_{kl}^{(t)}|. \quad (4.1)$$

Furthermore, $\mathcal{P}(t+1) \leq \mathcal{P}(t)$ and the configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(t+1)}$ is also c -strictly convex with the same values of b_1, \dots, b_n .

Lemma 4.6. Let $d, n \geq 2$, \mathcal{D} be a fully supported distribution and f a (c, β) -contractive update function. There exists $p > 0$, such that, for any c -strictly convex configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ and $t = \binom{n}{2}$,

$$\Pr[\mathcal{P}(t) \leq \beta \cdot \mathcal{P}(0)] \geq p. \quad (4.2)$$

Lemma 4.7. Let $(\mathcal{U}^{(t)})_t$ be a sequence of configurations such that:

1. $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ is c -strictly convex.
2. The update function f is (c, β) -contractive for some $\beta < 1$.
3. $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{P}(t) = 0$.

Then, $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ polarizes.

Let us show Lemma 4.2 assuming that Lemmas 4.5 to 4.7 hold. Then, we will prove those lemmas in turn.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Consider a sequence of Bernoulli random variables X_0, \dots, X_k, \dots , where X_k is the indicator of event $\mathcal{P}((k+1)\binom{n}{2}) \leq \beta \cdot \mathcal{P}(k\binom{n}{2})$. By Lemma 4.5, the configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ remains c -strictly convex at all times. Lemma 4.6 implies that $\Pr[X_k = 1] \geq p$ for some constant $p > 0$ and for every k , even conditioned on $(X_i)_{i < k}$. Applying, e.g., the second Borel–Cantelli lemma, almost surely $X_k = 1$ happens for infinitely many values of k . Since, by Lemma 4.5, $\mathcal{P}(t+1) \leq \mathcal{P}(t)$ holds in every case, if $X_k = 1$ for infinitely many k , then $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{P}(t) = 0$. But that in turn implies the polarization of $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ by Lemma 4.7. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.5. Let b_1, \dots, b_n be the values from the definition of strict convexity for configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$. Assume that, at time step t , agent i is influenced by agent j and let $k \neq i$. Observe that due to the definition of (c, β) -contractivity for every i, j we have the property $\text{sign}(A_{ij}^{(t)}) = \text{sign}(f(A_{ij}^{(t)}))$.

When $l \neq i$, we have $A_{kl}^{(t+1)} = A_{kl}^{(t)}$. Otherwise, observe that

$$\text{sign}\left(f(A_{ij}^{(t)})A_{jk}^{(t)}\right) = \text{sign}\left(A_{ij}^{(t)}\right)\text{sign}\left(A_{jk}^{(t)}\right) = (b_i b_j) \cdot (b_j b_k) = b_i b_k = \text{sign}\left(A_{ik}^{(t)}\right). \quad (4.3)$$

Since

$$A_{ik}^{(t+1)} = \left\langle \frac{\mathbf{u}_i^{(t)} + f(A_{ij}^{(t)})\mathbf{u}_j^{(t)}}{\|\mathbf{u}_i^{(t)} + f(A_{ij}^{(t)})\mathbf{u}_j^{(t)}\|}, \mathbf{u}_k^{(t)} \right\rangle = \frac{A_{ik}^{(t)} + f(A_{ij}^{(t)})A_{jk}^{(t)}}{\sqrt{1 + 2A_{ij}^{(t)}f(A_{ij}^{(t)}) + f^2(A_{ij}^{(t)})}},$$

it follows from (4.3) that $\text{sign}(A_{ik}^{(t+1)}) = \text{sign}(A_{ik}^{(t)})$ and furthermore

$$\begin{aligned} |A_{ik}^{(t+1)}| &\geq \frac{|A_{ik}^{(t)}| + |f(A_{ij}^{(t)})| \cdot |A_{jk}^{(t)}|}{\sqrt{1 + 2A_{ij}^{(t)}f(A_{ij}^{(t)}) + f^2(A_{ij}^{(t)})}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{1 + |f(A_{ij}^{(t)})|} \left(|A_{ik}^{(t)}| + |f(A_{ij}^{(t)})| \cdot |A_{jk}^{(t)}| \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{1 + |f(A_{ij}^{(t)})|} \left(\min_{1 \leq l \leq n} |A_{kl}^{(t)}| + |f(A_{ij}^{(t)})| \min_{1 \leq l \leq n} |A_{kl}^{(t)}| \right) = \min_{1 \leq l \leq n} |A_{kl}^{(t)}|, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of (4.1). In particular,

$$\min_{k, l \in [n]} |A_{kl}^{(t+1)}| = \min_{k \neq i} \min_{l \in [n]} |A_{kl}^{(t+1)}| \stackrel{(4.1)}{\geq} \min_{k \neq i} \min_{l \in [n]} |A_{kl}^{(t)}| = \min_{k, l \in [n]} |A_{kl}^{(t)}| \quad (4.4)$$

and $\mathcal{P}(t+1) \leq \mathcal{P}(t)$ follows.

Finally, the calculations above imply $\text{sign}(A_{ij}^{(t+1)}) = \text{sign}(A_{ij}^{(t)})$ and $|A_{ij}^{(t+1)}| \geq 1 - \mathcal{P}(t+1) \geq 1 - \mathcal{P}(t) > c$ for every i, j , therefore also $\langle b_i \mathbf{u}_i^{(t+1)}, b_j \mathbf{u}_j^{(t+1)} \rangle > c$, and the configuration remains c -strictly convex with the same b_1, \dots, b_n . \square

Proof of Lemma 4.6. Since the interaction distribution \mathcal{D} has full support, it suffices to give a sequence of interactions of length $\binom{n}{2}$ such that $\mathcal{P}(\binom{n}{2}) \leq \beta \cdot \mathcal{P}(0)$. Since by Lemma 4.5 the configuration remains c -strictly convex, and by (c, β) -contractivity, if agent i is influenced by agent j at time t , then

$$1 - |A_{ij}^{(t+1)}| \leq \beta \left(1 - |A_{ij}^{(t)}| \right). \quad (4.5)$$

We claim that the following sequence of interactions is as desired: For all $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ in increasing order, let agent i influence all agents j with $j > i$. Say that, in the procedure above, agent i influences other agents from time t_1 to $t_2 := t_1 + n - i$. Since (4.5) applies to every agent $j > i$, we have

$$1 - \min_{j:j>i} |A_{ij}^{(t_2)}| \leq \beta \left(1 - \min_{j:j>i} |A_{ij}^{(t_1)}| \right) \leq \beta \left(1 - \min_{j,k} |A_{jk}^{(0)}| \right).$$

By Lemma 4.5 applied to agents $\{i, \dots, n\}$, the value $\min_{j:j>i} |A_{ij}^{(t)}| = \min_{j:j \geq i} |A_{ij}^{(t)}|$ does not decrease for $t \geq t_2$ because agent i is not influenced again. Therefore,

$$1 - \min_{i,j} |A_{ij}^{(\binom{n}{2})}| = 1 - \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \min_{j:j>i} |A_{ij}^{(\binom{n}{2})}| \leq \beta \left(1 - \min_{i,j} |A_{ij}^{(0)}| \right),$$

which as explained before proves the claim. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.7. Let b_1, \dots, b_n be signs from the definition of strict convexity and let $1 \leq i \leq n$. We will first show that sequence $(\mathbf{u}_i^{(t)})_t$ is Cauchy, and therefore converges. By way of contradiction, assume that the sequence is not Cauchy. That is, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for

all T there exist $t_1, t_2 > T$ with $\|\mathbf{u}_i^{(t_1)} - \mathbf{u}_i^{(t_2)}\| > \epsilon$. Since the norm is a continuous function of the angle, there exists $\epsilon' > 0$ such that it also holds $\alpha(\mathbf{u}_i^{(t_1)}, \mathbf{u}_i^{(t_2)}) > \epsilon'$.

However, by assumption on convergence of $\mathcal{P}(t)$, for t_1 large enough we have $\alpha(b_j \mathbf{u}_j^{(t_1)}, b_{j'} \mathbf{u}_{j'}^{(t_1)}) < \epsilon'/2$ for every $1 \leq j, j' \leq n$. Due to $\text{sign}(f(A)) = \text{sign}(A)$ for $|A| > c$, at any future time $t_2 > t_1$, vector $b_i \mathbf{u}_i^{(t_2)}$ lies in the projection onto the sphere of the convex hull of $(b_1 \mathbf{u}_1^{(t_1)}, \dots, b_n \mathbf{u}_n^{(t_1)})$. It follows $\alpha(\mathbf{u}_i^{(t_2)}, \mathbf{u}_i^{(t_1)}) < \epsilon'/2$, which is a contradiction. Accordingly, sequence $(\mathbf{u}_i^{(t)})_t$ is Cauchy and converges.

Furthermore, since $\mathcal{P}(t)$ converges to zero, and using Lemma 4.5, for every $i < j$ it holds $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} A(b_i \mathbf{u}_i^{(t)}, b_j \mathbf{u}_j^{(t)}) = 1$. Therefore the limits of sequences $b_i \mathbf{u}_i^{(t)}$ are all equal and $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ polarizes. \square

4.2 Proof of Claim 4.4

Consider two opinions with correlation A and effective angle γ . In this section let us use the notation A' and γ' for the new correlation and effective angle after an interaction between them. First, recall from Claim 3.4 that the new correlation is given by

$$A' = \frac{A + f(A)}{\sqrt{1 + 2Af(A) + f(A)^2}}. \quad (4.6a)$$

Claim 4.8. *If f is stable, then $\text{sign}(A') = \text{sign}(A)$. Furthermore,*

$$A \in \{-1, 0, 1\} \implies A' = A, \quad (4.6b)$$

$$A \notin \{-1, 0, 1\} \implies 1 > |A'| > \frac{|A + f(A)|}{1 + |f(A)|} > |A| > 0. \quad (4.6c)$$

Proof. f is stable, so by definition $\text{sign}(A) = \text{sign}(f(A))$, which implies with (4.6a) that $\text{sign}(A') = \text{sign}(A)$. Let's then show (4.6b) and (4.6c). The case $A \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ is easy to check directly. Otherwise, we know that $-1 < A < 1$, and $Af(A) < |f(A)|$. Therefore $1 + 2Af(A) + f(A)^2 < (1 + |f(A)|)^2$. Hence,

$$|A'| > \frac{|A + f(A)|}{1 + |f(A)|} = \frac{|A| + |f(A)|}{1 + |f(A)|} > \frac{|A|(1 + |f(A)|)}{1 + |f(A)|} = |A|.$$

Furthermore, from the definition of the model an interaction between two non co-linear opinions cannot make them co-linear, so $|A'| < 1$. \square

Proof of Claim 4.4. We define $\beta := \max\{1/(1 + |f(x)|) : x \in [-1, -\delta] \cup [\delta, 1]\}$. Observe that the maximum exists because f is continuous and $[-1, -\delta] \cup [\delta, 1]$ is compact. Moreover, observe that $\beta < 1$ because, since f is stable, we have $f(x) \neq 0$ for $x \neq 0$. We obtain

$$|A'| \stackrel{\text{Cl. 4.8}}{\geq} \frac{|A + f(A)|}{1 + |f(A)|} \stackrel{\text{sign}(A) = \text{sign}(f(A))}{=} \frac{|A| + |f(A)|}{1 + |f(A)|} = 1 - \frac{1 - |A|}{1 + |f(A)|} \geq 1 - \beta(1 - |A|).$$

This implies that f is (δ, β) -contractive. \square

For future use, we give a similar contraction result for the effective angle. The proof is included in Appendix A.

Claim 4.9 (Contraction of the effective angle). *Let f be a stable update function. For every $\delta > 0$, there exists $0 < c_0 < 1$ such that, if $\gamma \leq \frac{\pi}{2} - \delta$, then $\gamma' \leq c_0\gamma$.*

5 Active update functions: Proof of Theorem 2.4

In this section we prove Lemma 2.11 and Theorem 2.4.

Proof of Lemma 2.11. The strategy of the proof is to make agent 1 influence every other agent until all opinions are so close to each other that the configuration is c -strictly convex, for $c = |A_0|$ where A_0 is taken from Definition 2.3. To that end, choose some $\epsilon < \min(1 - c, 1/256)$, and let $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon/4$. If for an opinion \mathbf{u}_i it holds $A_{1i} = A_0$, then after one interaction where 1 influences i it holds $A_{1i} \neq A_0$ and the proof reduces to one of the other cases. If $A_{1i} > A_0$, then from Claim 4.3, in at most $T = \lceil \log_{\beta}(\epsilon_0/2) \rceil$ steps of agent 1 influencing i we will have $A_{1i} \geq 1 - \epsilon_0$. Similarly, if $A_{1i} < A_0$, then in at most T steps of agent 1 influencing i we will have $A_{1i} \leq -1 + \epsilon_0$.

This implies that if we make agent 1 influence every other agent $T + 1$ times each, then after $K = (n - 1)(T + 1)$ interactions we will have $|A_{1i}^{(K)}| \geq 1 - \epsilon_0$ for every $i \in [n]$. From Lemma 3.5, for every $i, j \in [n]$, $|A_{ij}^{(K)}| \geq 1 - 4\epsilon_0 \geq 1 - \epsilon$. Therefore, by Claim 3.6, $\mathcal{U}^{(K)}$ is strictly convex. Furthermore, for every i, j , $|A_{ij}^{(K)}| \geq 1 - \epsilon > c$. Therefore, $\mathcal{U}^{(K)}$ is c -strictly convex. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.4. From Lemma 2.11, at any time t , independently of the past, if configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ is not $|A_0|$ -strictly convex, then

$$\Pr[\mathcal{U}^{(t+K)} \text{ is } |A_0|\text{-strictly convex} \mid \mathcal{U}^{(t)}] \geq p_{\min}^K,$$

where $p_{\min} > 0$ is the minimum probability in \mathcal{D} . That implies that almost surely, eventually $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ becomes $|A_0|$ -strictly convex. Then, by Lemma 2.10, $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ polarizes. \square

6 Stable update functions and proof of Theorem 2.6

From now on, we study polarization under stable update functions. We begin the discussion in Section 6.1 with observing that interactions under stable functions preserve active, separable, and strictly convex properties. In Section 6.2, we show that three opinions polarize almost surely (Theorem 2.6). Finally, in Section 6.3 we show that every ϵ -active configuration eventually becomes ϵ -inactive. This result is used in Section 7 and Section 9.

6.1 Properties of stable update functions

In this section we give a few properties of various types of configurations. Recall active, separable and strictly convex configurations from Definitions 2.5, 2.9 and 2.13. We show that those properties are preserved over time. The first claim follows immediately from Claim 4.8.

Claim 6.1. *Let f be a stable update function. $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ is active if and only if $\mathcal{U}^{(t+1)}$ is active.*

Lemma 6.2. *Let f be a stable update function. A configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(t+1)}$ is separable if and only if $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ is separable.*

Proof. Let us prove the first implication. Assume that $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ is separable. From Definition 2.5, there exists a subspace $V \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for every opinion \mathbf{u}_i , either $\mathbf{u}_i \in V$ or $\mathbf{u}_i \in V^T$, where V^T is the orthogonal complement of V .

Let the configuration at time $t+1$ be obtained by j influencing i . Given that $\mathbf{u}_i^{(t+1)}$ is a linear combination of $\mathbf{u}_i^{(t)}$ and $\mathbf{u}_j^{(t)}$, we have that

- if $\mathbf{u}_i^{(t)}, \mathbf{u}_j^{(t)} \in V$ (respectively $\mathbf{u}_i^{(t)}, \mathbf{u}_j^{(t)} \in V^T$), then $\mathbf{u}_i^{(t+1)} \in V$ (respectively $\mathbf{u}_i^{(t+1)} \in V^T$),
- if $\mathbf{u}_i^{(t)} \in V$ and $\mathbf{u}_j^{(t)} \in V^T$ (or vice versa), then $A_{ij}^{(t)} = 0$, so the interaction has no effect and $\mathcal{U}^{(t+1)} = \mathcal{U}^{(t)}$.

We conclude that $\mathcal{U}^{(t+1)}$ is also separable.

Conversely, let's show that if $\mathcal{U}^{(t+1)}$ is separable, then so is $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $\mathcal{U}^{(t+1)}$ is separable and $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ is not. So there exists V such that for every $i \in [n]$, either $\mathbf{u}_i^{(t+1)} \in V$ or $\mathbf{u}_i^{(t+1)} \in V^T$. Given that $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ is not separable, if at time t , j influenced i , it means $\mathbf{u}_i^{(t)} \notin V$ and $\mathbf{u}_i^{(t)} \notin V^T$, while $\mathbf{u}_j^{(t)} \in V$ or $\mathbf{u}_j^{(t)} \in V^T$. Furthermore, the opinion of i must have moved, so $A_{ij}^{(t)} \neq 0$.

Assume $\mathbf{u}_j^{(t)} \in V$. An interaction between i and j cannot make their opinions orthogonal (Claim 4.8) so $\mathbf{u}_i^{(t+1)} \notin V^T$. But $\mathbf{u}_i^{(t+1)}$ is a non-trivial linear combination of $\mathbf{u}_i^{(t)} \notin V$ and $\mathbf{u}_j^{(t)} \in V$, so it cannot lie in V either, a contradiction. A similar argument works for the case $\mathbf{u}_j^{(t)} \in V^T$. \square

Claim 6.3. *Let f be stable and $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ strictly convex for some b_1, \dots, b_n . Then, $\mathcal{U}^{(t+1)}$ is strictly convex for the same b_1, \dots, b_n .*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ is strictly convex, it is δ -strictly convex for some $\delta > 0$. The result follows by Claim 4.4 and Lemma 4.5. \square

6.2 Polarization of three opinions: Proof of Theorem 2.6

Let f be a fixed stable update function. Let $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ be a starting configuration of three opinions for some $d \geq 2$ which is not separable (since opinions always stay in the span of initial opinions, in fact we could assume w.l.o.g. that $d = 3$, however, we do not use this assumption in the proof). Recall the effective angle from Definition 3.1. Given configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ of three opinions at time t , let

$$P^{(t)} := \gamma_{12}^{(t)} + \gamma_{13}^{(t)} + \gamma_{23}^{(t)}.$$

Suppose $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ is not separable. The first step in the proof will be showing that $P^{(t)}$ never increases with t :

Lemma 6.4. *Almost surely, $P^{(t+1)} \leq P^{(t)}$.*

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that agent 2 influences agent 1. Since only opinion 1 moves, we have to show $\gamma_{12}^{(t+1)} + \gamma_{13}^{(t+1)} \leq \gamma_{12}^{(t)} + \gamma_{13}^{(t)}$. First, let us show two inequalities

$$\gamma_{12}^{(t+1)} + \alpha_{13}^{(t+1)} \leq \gamma_{12}^{(t)} + \alpha_{13}^{(t)}, \quad (6.1a)$$

$$\gamma_{12}^{(t+1)} + \alpha_{13}^{(t)} \leq \gamma_{12}^{(t)} + \alpha_{13}^{(t+1)}. \quad (6.1b)$$

To establish them, recall that the angular distance $\alpha(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a metric on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} , in particular it obeys the triangle inequality. Now, observe that indeed

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{13}^{(t+1)} &= \alpha(\mathbf{u}_1^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{u}_3^{(t)}) \leq \alpha(\mathbf{u}_1^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{u}_1^{(t)}) + \alpha(\mathbf{u}_1^{(t)}, \mathbf{u}_3^{(t)}) = \gamma_{12}^{(t)} - \gamma_{12}^{(t+1)} + \alpha_{13}^{(t)}, \\ \alpha_{13}^{(t)} &= \alpha(\mathbf{u}_1^{(t)}, \mathbf{u}_3^{(t)}) \leq \alpha(\mathbf{u}_1^{(t)}, \mathbf{u}_1^{(t+1)}) + \alpha(\mathbf{u}_1^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{u}_3^{(t)}) = \gamma_{12}^{(t)} - \gamma_{12}^{(t+1)} + \alpha_{13}^{(t+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Inequalities (6.1a) and (6.1b) follow by rearranging. Finally, if $\alpha_{13}^{(t)} \leq \pi/2$, then $\gamma_{12}^{(t+1)} + \gamma_{13}^{(t+1)} \leq \gamma_{12}^{(t+1)} + \alpha_{13}^{(t+1)} \leq \gamma_{12}^{(t)} + \alpha_{13}^{(t)} = \gamma_{12}^{(t)} + \gamma_{13}^{(t)}$. On the other hand, if $\alpha_{13}^{(t)} > \pi/2$, then $\gamma_{12}^{(t+1)} + \gamma_{13}^{(t+1)} \leq \gamma_{12}^{(t+1)} + \pi - \alpha_{13}^{(t+1)} \leq \gamma_{12}^{(t)} + \pi - \alpha_{13}^{(t)} = \gamma_{12}^{(t)} + \gamma_{13}^{(t)}$. \square

Since $P^{(t)}$ is bounded and nonincreasing with t , the limiting random variable P^∞ is well defined. One could think that we are almost done, but this is not quite the case. The state space is uncountable and therefore it is possible that the potential decreases “too slowly” to converge to zero. In particular, Lemma 6.4 applies to a separable configuration with $\mathbf{u}_1 \perp \{\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{u}_3\}$, but for that configuration it will obtain $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P^{(t)} = \pi$. We also need to handle configurations that do polarize, but where every interaction makes only small progress. To achieve that, we will need an additional step.

First, let us show that for large enough angles we do make constant progress:

Claim 6.5. *For every $\delta > 0$, there exists k such that the following holds. If $1.2\pi \leq P^{(t)} \leq 3\pi/2 - \delta$, then there exists a sequence of k interactions such that $P^{(t+k)} \leq P^{(t)} - 0.05\pi$.*

Proof. Let us rename the opinions if necessary so that $\gamma_{12}^{(t)} \leq \gamma_{13}^{(t)} \leq \gamma_{23}^{(t)}$. Since $1.2\pi \leq P^{(t)} \leq 3\pi/2 - \delta$, it follows $0.2\pi \leq \gamma_{12} \leq \pi/2 - \delta/3$ and $\gamma_{23} \geq 0.4\pi$. In particular, γ_{12} is strictly bounded away from $\pi/2$ and zero. Take c_0 from Claim 4.9 invoked for $\delta/3$. This means we can let agent 1 influence agent 2 a bounded number of steps $k_a = \log(1 - 0.15\pi/\gamma_{12})/\log(c_0)$ until γ_{12} decreases by 0.15π . Since γ_{23} is at least 0.4π it can only increase by 0.1π so that the potential decreases by at least 0.05π . \square

Second, we show that any other configuration can become strictly convex after a constant number of interactions:

Claim 6.6. *There exists k such that, for every configuration that is not separable and with $P^{(t)} \leq 1.2\pi$, there is a sequence of k interactions that make $\mathcal{U}^{(t+k)}$ strictly convex.*




Figure 3: Illustration of the situation considered in Claim 6.6.

Proof. In the following for clarity let us drop the superscript for values at times t , so that $\gamma_{12} = \gamma_{12}^{(t)}$, etc. Without loss of generality, assume that $\gamma_{12} \leq \gamma_{13} \leq \gamma_{23}$. Since $\mathcal{W}^{(t)}$ is not separable, it holds $\gamma_{13} < \pi/2$, or in other words $|A_{13}| > 0$, since otherwise opinion 3 would be orthogonal to both 1 and 2. Furthermore, observe that $P^{(t)} \leq 1.2\pi$ implies $\gamma_{12} \leq 0.4\pi$. By Claim 4.9, influencing agents 1 and 2 a bounded number of times if necessary, let us also assume from now on that $\gamma_{12} \leq 0.01\pi$.

We will now show that the configuration becomes strictly convex if, K times in a row, agent 1 influences agent 2 (for large enough K). To that end, let $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ be the projection of \mathbf{u}_3 onto the span of \mathbf{u}_1 and \mathbf{u}_2 and let $\mathbf{v} = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}/\|\tilde{\mathbf{v}}\|$. For any opinion \mathbf{u} in the span of \mathbf{u}_1 and \mathbf{u}_2 , clearly it holds $A(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}_3) = A(\mathbf{u}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}})$. In particular, we have $\text{sign}(A(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}_3)) = \text{sign}(A(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}))$.

Let us consider an easier special case first. Assume that $\gamma(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}) \leq 0.05\pi$. Let us show that in that case the configuration is already strictly convex. Let $b_2 = \text{sign}(A_{12})$ and $b_3 = \text{sign}(A_{13})$. We need to check that the three angles $\alpha(\mathbf{u}_1, b_2\mathbf{u}_2)$, $\alpha(\mathbf{u}_1, b_3\mathbf{u}_3)$ and $\alpha(b_2\mathbf{u}_2, b_3\mathbf{u}_3)$ are strictly less than $\pi/2$.

First, $\alpha(\mathbf{u}_1, b_2\mathbf{u}_2) = \gamma_{12} \leq 0.01\pi$. Furthermore, by what we said above we have $A(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}) \neq 0$, which implies $A_{13} \neq 0$ and $\alpha(\mathbf{u}_1, b_3\mathbf{u}_3) = \gamma_{13} < \pi/2$. Finally, $\alpha(b_2\mathbf{u}_2, b_3\mathbf{u}_3) \leq \alpha(b_2\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{u}_1) + \alpha(\mathbf{u}_1, b_3\mathbf{u}_3) = \gamma_{12} + \gamma(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}) \leq 0.06\pi$. Again, that implies $\alpha(b_2\mathbf{u}_2, b_3\mathbf{u}_3) < \pi/2$ and the configuration is strictly convex.

Accordingly, from now on assume $\gamma(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}) > 0.05\pi$. Since $\gamma_{13} \leq \gamma_{23}$, and again using $A_{i3} = A(\mathbf{u}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{v}})$ for $i = 1, 2$, it holds that $\gamma(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}) \leq \gamma(\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v})$. Let us use the fact that the three vectors $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}$ lie on the same plane. Accordingly, there are two possibilities for their “orientations” (as usual up to flipping signs). Figure 3 can be consulted for illustration.

The two possible cases are $\gamma_{12} = \gamma(\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}) - \gamma(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v})$ and $\gamma_{12} = \pi - \gamma(\mathbf{u}_2, \mathbf{v}) - \gamma(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v})$. In both of them it is easy to check the crucial property

$$\gamma_{12} \leq 2\left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \gamma(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v})\right). \quad (6.2)$$

Applying Claim 4.9 to (6.2) a sufficient number of times (recall that $\gamma(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}) \geq 0.05\pi$), there exists K such that after agent 1 influences agent 2 for K times, it holds $\gamma(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2^{(K)}) \leq (\pi/2 - \gamma(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}))/10$.

Finally, we show that $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2^{(K)}, \mathbf{u}_3$ form a strictly convex configuration. For that, take $b_i = \text{sign}(A_{1i})$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Since $\gamma_{12}, \gamma_{13} < \pi/2$, and since by Claim 4.8 it holds that $\text{sign}(A_{12}^{(K)}) = \text{sign}(A_{12})$, it follows $\langle \mathbf{u}_1, b_2 \mathbf{u}_2^{(K)} \rangle, \langle \mathbf{u}_1, b_3 \mathbf{u}_3 \rangle > 0$. It remains to show $\langle b_2 \mathbf{u}_2^{(K)}, b_3 \mathbf{u}_3 \rangle > 0$. As discussed above, this is equivalent to $\langle b_2 \mathbf{u}_2^{(K)}, b_3 \mathbf{v} \rangle > 0$ or in other words $\alpha(b_2 \mathbf{u}_2^{(K)}, b_3 \mathbf{v}) < \pi/2$.

Since $\langle \mathbf{u}_1, b_2 \mathbf{u}_2^{(K)} \rangle, \langle \mathbf{u}_1, b_3 \mathbf{u}_3 \rangle > 0$, it follows $\alpha(\mathbf{u}_1, b_2 \mathbf{u}_2^{(K)}) = \gamma(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2^{(K)})$ and $\alpha(\mathbf{u}_1, b_3 \mathbf{u}_3) = \gamma(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_3)$. As before, the second of those equalities implies $\alpha(\mathbf{u}_1, b_3 \mathbf{v}) = \gamma(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v})$. Finally, we can conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(b_2 \mathbf{u}_2^{(K)}, b_3 \mathbf{v}) &\leq \alpha(b_2 \mathbf{u}_2^{(K)}, \mathbf{u}_1) + \alpha(\mathbf{u}_1, b_3 \mathbf{v}) = \gamma(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2^{(K)}) + \gamma(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{10} \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \gamma(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}) \right) + \gamma(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{v}) < \frac{\pi}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Let us conclude the proof of Theorem 2.6.

Proof of Theorem 2.6. Since the initial configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ is not separable, it holds $P^{(0)} < 3\pi/2$. Applying Claim 6.5 for $\delta = 3\pi/2 - P^{(0)}$, we get k such that, as long as $P^{(t)} > 1.2\pi$, then there is a sequence of k interactions such that $P^{(t+k)} \leq P^{(t)} - 0.05\pi$. Iterating for at most 6 times, we get a sequence of K interactions such that $P^{(t+K)} \leq 1.2\pi$. So, at every time t , independently of the past, with probability at least p_{\min}^K it will happen that $P^{(t+K)} \leq 1.2\pi$. That implies that almost surely $P^{(t)} \leq 1.2\pi$ at some time t . Furthermore, by Lemma 6.2, the configuration remains not separable at all times.

Finally, once $P^{(t)} \leq 1.2\pi$, by Claim 6.6 at every time step the configuration can become strictly convex in constant time and constant probability. Again, this implies that $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ eventually becomes strictly convex. And a strictly convex configuration polarizes by Lemma 2.10. \square

6.3 Opinions cannot remain ϵ -active forever

When dealing with more than three opinions, parts of our proof strategy remain the same. We will show that almost surely the configuration becomes strictly convex, and deduce from Lemma 2.10 that the opinions polarize. As a first step towards showing that strict convexity is inevitable, we prove that for every ϵ , the opinions become ϵ -inactive almost surely, as implied by Lemma 6.7 below. This section is dedicated to proving that lemma.

Lemma 6.7 (Almost sure inactivity). *Let f be stable and $n, d \geq 2$. For every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists K_0 such that for every configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$, there exists a sequence of K_0 interactions such that $\mathcal{U}^{(K_0)}$ is ϵ -inactive.*

Proof. We proceed by a natural greedy strategy where agents influence each other until all opinions are either very correlated or almost orthogonal. First, note the following claim.

Claim 6.8. *For every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists T such that for every opinions $\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j$, if $|A_{ij}^{(0)}| \geq \epsilon$ and if the first T interactions are between agents i and j , then $|A_{ij}^{(T)}| \geq 1 - \epsilon$.*

Proof. The proof follows by applying Claim 4.4 a sufficient number of times. \square

Let $\epsilon > 0$ and set $\epsilon_0 := \min(1/8, \epsilon/64)^2$ so that $\epsilon \geq 64\sqrt{\epsilon_0}$. We want to find K and a sequence of K interactions after which for every pair of opinions, it holds either $|A_{ij}^{(K)}| \leq \epsilon$ or $|A_{ij}^{(K)}| \geq 1 - \epsilon$.

Choose (and rename) greedily a maximal set of opinions $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_k$ such that $|A_{ij}^{(0)}| \leq \epsilon_0$ for every $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. For every opinion \mathbf{u}_j for $j > k$, by construction there exists at least one $1 \leq i \leq k$ such that $|A_{ij}^{(0)}| > \epsilon_0$. For every $j > k$, choose one such i arbitrarily and let agent j be influenced at least T times in a row by agent i , where T is taken from Claim 6.8 applied for ϵ_0 . Perform this for every agent in sequence so that there are $K_0 = nT$ interactions in total. Note that K_0 indeed depends only on f, n , and ϵ .

We now show that the resulting configuration is ϵ -inactive. Over the K interactions, the opinions $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_k$ are not moved, so $\mathbf{u}_i^{(0)} = \mathbf{u}_i^{(K)}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Furthermore, for every $j > k$, the opinion \mathbf{u}_j is influenced by a unique \mathbf{u}_i where $1 \leq i \leq k$. Therefore, from Claim 6.8, for every $j > k$ there exists $1 \leq i \leq k$ such that $|A_{ij}^{(K)}| \geq 1 - \epsilon_0$. It can be observed that:

- By the choice of $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_k$, for every $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, $|A_{ij}^{(K)}| \leq \epsilon_0 < \epsilon$.
- For every $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $j > k$, there exists $1 \leq l \leq k$ such that $|A_{jl}^{(K)}| \geq 1 - \epsilon_0$. So, either $i = l$ and $|A_{ij}^{(K)}| \geq 1 - \epsilon_0 > 1 - \epsilon$; or $i \neq l$ and with $|A_{il}^{(K)}| \leq \epsilon_0 \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_0}$ and $|A_{jl}^{(K)}| \geq 1 - \epsilon_0$ we apply Lemma 3.7 and obtain $|A_{ij}^{(K)}| \leq 8\sqrt{\epsilon_0} < \epsilon$.
- For every $i, j > k$, there exists $1 \leq l, m \leq k$ such that $|A_{il}^{(K)}| \geq 1 - \epsilon_0$ and $|A_{jm}^{(K)}| \geq 1 - \epsilon_0$. If $l = m$, then from Lemma 3.5, $|A_{ij}^{(K)}| \geq 1 - 4\epsilon_0 > 1 - \epsilon$. If $l \neq m$, then note that $|A_{lm}^{(K)}| \leq \epsilon_0$ and consider Claim 6.9 below which is proved by applying Lemma 3.7 twice.

Claim 6.9. *Let $d \geq 2$, $\epsilon \geq 0$, and consider four opinions $\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j, \mathbf{u}_k, \mathbf{u}_l$. If $|A_{ij}| \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}$, $|A_{ik}| \geq 1 - \epsilon$, and $|A_{jl}| \geq 1 - \epsilon$, then $|A_{kl}| \leq 64\sqrt{\epsilon}$.*

Applying Claim 6.9 gives $|A_{ij}^{(K)}| \leq 64\sqrt{\epsilon_0} \leq \epsilon$.

We conclude that for every $i, j \in [n]$, $|A_{ij}^{(K)}| \leq \epsilon$ or $|A_{ij}^{(K)}| \geq 1 - \epsilon$. Therefore the configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(K)}$ is ϵ -inactive. \square


7 Polarization in two dimensions: Proof of Theorem 2.7

The objective of this section is to prove Theorem 2.7. Let $d = 2$, f be a stable function, \mathcal{D} a distribution with full support, and $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ a configuration that is not separable. Let us first point out that Theorem 2.7 follows from Lemma 2.12:


Proof of Theorem 2.7. From Lemma 6.2, since $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ is not separable, $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ remains not separable for every $t \geq 0$. By Lemma 2.12, there exists fixed K such that for every t , independently of

Figure 4: The cases from the proof of Lemma 2.12. For Case 2, applying \mathbf{u}_1 and \mathbf{u}_2 to all other opinions in their respective clusters will make the configuration strictly convex.

(a) Case 1: $\forall i, j, |A_{ij}| \geq 1 - \epsilon_0$. Up to negation all opinions are close to each other.



(b) Case 2: $\exists i, j : |A_{ij}| \leq \epsilon_0$. So, every $b_k u_k$ is within the two blue areas.



the past, $\mathcal{U}^{(t+K)}$ is strictly convex with probability at least $p_{\min}^K > 0$, where p_{\min} is the minimum probability in the interaction distribution \mathcal{D} . It follows that almost surely there exists t such that $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ is strictly convex. And, from Lemma 2.10, we conclude that almost surely the sequence $(\mathcal{U}^{(t)})_t$ polarizes. \square

It remains to prove Lemma 2.12. Let $\epsilon_0 = 1/256$. By Lemma 6.7, for some $K_0 = K_0(n, d, f)$, there is sequence of K_0 interactions such that $\mathcal{U}^{(K_0)}$ is ϵ_0 -inactive. Therefore, it is sufficient to show Lemma 2.12 only for ϵ_0 -inactive, separable configurations. (Since for a general configuration we can concatenate K_0 interactions that make it ϵ_0 -inactive and further K interactions that make it strictly convex.)

For a high level idea of the proof in this case, let $\epsilon > 0$ and consider a configuration $\mathbf{u}_1 = (\cos(\pi/2 - \epsilon), \sin(\pi/2 - \epsilon))$, $\mathbf{u}_2 = (\cos(\pi/2 + \epsilon), \sin(\pi/2 + \epsilon))$, $\mathbf{u}_3 = (1, 0)$, as illustrated in Figure 3 (where \mathbf{v} is \mathbf{u}_3 in our case). That is, \mathbf{u}_1 and \mathbf{u}_2 are both almost orthogonal to \mathbf{u}_3 and on the opposite sides of the y -axis. Such a configuration is not strictly convex. As ϵ decreases, any time agent 1 influences agent 2, opinion \mathbf{u}_2 will move only by a small amount. However, it requires only a constant number of interactions to bring \mathbf{u}_2 onto the other side of the y -axis, regardless of the value of ϵ . Once this is achieved, the configuration is strictly convex. While care is needed to get the details right in every case, at heart the proof of Lemma 2.12 implements this idea.

Proof of Lemma 2.12. For readability, let us drop superscripts at time 0. That is, we will write $\mathcal{U}, \mathbf{u}_i, A_{ij}, \gamma_{ij}$, etc. instead of $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}, \mathbf{u}_i^{(0)}, A_{ij}^{(0)}, \gamma_{ij}^{(0)}$. We prove this lemma by cases depending on how the initial configuration \mathcal{U} looks like. As discussed above, we can assume w.l.o.g. that \mathcal{U} is ϵ_0 -inactive for $\epsilon_0 = \frac{1}{256}$. Accordingly, for every i, j either $|A_{ij}| \leq \epsilon_0$ or $|A_{ij}| \geq 1 - \epsilon_0$. If $|A_{ij}| \geq 1 - \epsilon_0$ for every i, j , configuration \mathcal{U} is already strictly convex by Claim 3.6.

Therefore, let us turn to the more challenging case where there exist i, j such that $|A_{ij}| \leq \epsilon_0$. Recall the notation $\alpha_{ij} = \arccos(\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j \rangle)$ and the effective angle $\gamma_{ij} = \min(\alpha_{ij}, \pi - \alpha_{ij})$. Without

loss of generality, assume that \mathbf{u}_1 and \mathbf{u}_2 satisfy

$$|A_{12}| = \max_{i,j: |A_{ij}| \leq \epsilon_0} |A_{ij}|.$$

Note that this is equivalent to

$$\gamma_{12} = \min_{i,j: |A_{ij}| \leq \epsilon_0} \gamma_{ij}. \quad (7.1)$$

By Lemma 2.16, the opinions are partitioned into two clusters \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 with

$$\mathcal{C}_1 = \{i \in [n] : |A_{1i}| \geq 1 - \epsilon_0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C}_2 = \{i \in [n] : |A_{2i}| \geq 1 - \epsilon_0\},$$

and \mathbf{u}_1 and \mathbf{u}_2 are (up to negation) a closest pair of opinions which are not in the same cluster.

Let us specify a sequence of interactions that will make the configuration strictly convex. By Claim 4.9, there exists some fixed T such that if $\gamma_{ij} \leq \pi/4$ and i influences j for T times, then $\gamma_{ij}^{(T)} \leq \gamma_{ij}/8$. Take a sequence of $K = (n-2)T$ interactions where for every $i > 2$: if $i \in \mathcal{C}_w$, then the sequence contains T interactions where w influences i . It remains to show that after this sequence the configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(K)}$ is strictly convex.

For every $i \in [n]$, define

$$b_i := \begin{cases} \text{sign } A_{1i}, & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{C}_1 \\ \text{sign}(A_{12}) \text{sign}(A_{2i}), & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{C}_2 \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v}_i^{(t)} := b_i \mathbf{u}_i^{(t)}.$$

To show strict convexity at time K , it is sufficient that for every i, j it holds $\langle \mathbf{v}_i^{(K)}, \mathbf{v}_j^{(K)} \rangle > 0$. For that, we consider the angles

$$\beta_{ij}^{(t)} = \arccos \left(\langle \mathbf{v}_i^{(t)}, \mathbf{v}_j^{(t)} \rangle \right)$$

for $0 \leq t \leq K$. Note that either $\beta_{ij}^{(t)} = \gamma_{ij}^{(t)}$ or $\beta_{ij}^{(t)} = \pi - \gamma_{ij}^{(t)}$. The result will follow from the sequence of claims below.

Claim 7.1. For every $0 \leq t \leq K$, $\beta_{12}^{(t)} = \beta_{12} = \gamma_{12}$.

This is clear, because no agent influences 1 or 2 among the K interactions, so for every $0 \leq t \leq K$, $\mathbf{u}_1^{(t)} = \mathbf{u}_1$ and $\mathbf{u}_2^{(t)} = \mathbf{u}_2$. Furthermore, by construction we have:

Claim 7.2. Let $w \in \{1, 2\}$. For every $i \in \mathcal{C}_w$, $\gamma_{wi}^{(K)} \leq \gamma_{wi}/8$.

Claim 7.3. For every t , if $i \in \mathcal{C}_1$, then $b_i = \text{sign}(A_{1i}^{(t)})$; and if $i \in \mathcal{C}_2$, then $b_i = \text{sign}(A_{12}^{(t)}) \text{sign}(A_{2i}^{(t)})$.

The statement of Claim 7.3 is true at $t = 0$ by definition. It remains true at subsequent times, because $A_{12}^{(t)}$ remains the same, and, for every $i \in \mathcal{C}_w$, i is influenced only by w . Therefore, for every $0 \leq t < K$, $\text{sign}(A_{wi}^{(t+1)}) = \text{sign}(A_{wi}^{(t)})$.

Claim 7.4. For every $0 \leq t \leq K$ and $i \in \mathcal{C}_w$, $\beta_{wi}^{(t)} = \gamma_{wi}^{(t)}$.

Proof. In short, this follows from the previous claim. If $i \in \mathcal{C}_1$, then

$$\langle \mathbf{v}_1^{(t)}, \mathbf{v}_i^{(t)} \rangle = b_1 b_i A_{1i}^{(t)} = \text{sign}(A_{1i}^{(t)}) \cdot A_{1i}^{(t)} \geq 0.$$

Thus, $\beta_{1i}^{(t)} \leq \pi/2$ and $\beta_{1i}^{(t)} = \gamma_{1i}^{(t)}$. Similarly, if $j \in \mathcal{C}_2$, then

$$\langle \mathbf{v}_2^{(t)}, \mathbf{v}_j^{(t)} \rangle = b_2 b_j A_{2j}^{(t)} = b_2 \text{sign}(A_{12}) \text{sign}(A_{2j}^{(t)}) \cdot A_{2j}^{(t)} \geq 0.$$

Thus, $\beta_{2j}^{(t)} \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\beta_{2j}^{(t)} = \gamma_{2j}^{(t)}$. □

Claim 7.5. For every $i, j \in [n]$, $\beta_{ij}^{(K)} < \pi/2$.

Proof. If $i, j \in \mathcal{C}_w$ for $w = 1, 2$, then, by Claim 7.4 and Claim 7.2,

$$\beta_{ij}^{(K)} \leq \beta_{wi}^{(K)} + \beta_{wj}^{(K)} = \gamma_{wi}^{(K)} + \gamma_{wj}^{(K)} \leq \frac{\gamma_{wi}}{8} + \frac{\gamma_{wj}}{8} \leq \frac{\pi}{8} < \frac{\pi}{2}.$$

Now suppose $i \in \mathcal{C}_1$ and $j \in \mathcal{C}_2$. Similarly, and also using Claim 7.1, we have

$$\beta_{ij}^{(K)} \leq \beta_{1i}^{(K)} + \beta_{12}^{(K)} + \beta_{2j}^{(K)} = \gamma_{1i}^{(K)} + \gamma_{12}^{(K)} + \gamma_{2j}^{(K)} \leq \beta_{12} + \frac{\beta_{1i} + \beta_{2j}}{8}.$$

Let's show that $\beta_{2j}/4 < \pi/2 - \beta_{12}$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $\beta_{2j}/4 \geq \pi/2 - \beta_{12}$. See Figure 4b for an illustration of the situation.

First, note that we have $\gamma_{2j} = \beta_{2j} \leq \arccos(1 - \epsilon_0) < \arccos(\epsilon_0) \leq \beta_{12} = \gamma_{12} \leq \pi/2$. In particular, given that $d = 2$, it holds that

$$\beta_{1j} = (\beta_{12} + \beta_{2j}) \quad \text{or} \quad \beta_{1j} = (\beta_{12} - \beta_{2j})$$

(since $\beta_{12} + \beta_{2j} < \pi$ and $\beta_{12} - \beta_{2j} > 0$ there is no need for taking modulo).

- $\beta_{1j} = \beta_{12} - \beta_{2j}$ for $\beta_{2j} > 0$ is impossible, since then $\gamma_{1j} \leq \beta_{1j} < \beta_{12} = \gamma_{12}$, which contradicts (7.1).
- If $\beta_{1j} = \beta_{12} + \beta_{2j}$, then it follows by our assumption by contradiction that $\beta_{1j} \geq 2\pi - 3\beta_{12}$ and consequently $\gamma_{1j} \leq \pi - \beta_{1j} \leq 3\beta_{12} - \pi = 3\gamma_{12} - \pi < \gamma_{12}$, again contradicting (7.1). The last inequality is strict as $\gamma_{12} = \pi/2$ implies that clusters \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 are orthogonal and therefore \mathcal{U} is separable.

We conclude that $\beta_{2j}/4 < \pi/2 - \beta_{12}$, and with a similar argument, $\beta_{1i}/4 < \pi/2 - \beta_{12}$. These imply that $\beta_{ij}^{(K)} \leq \beta_{12} + (\beta_{1i} + \beta_{2j})/8 < \pi/2$. This ends the proof of the claim. □

We conclude that for every i and j , $\beta_{ij}^{(K)} < \frac{\pi}{2}$ which means $\langle \mathbf{v}_i^{(K)}, \mathbf{v}_j^{(K)} \rangle > 0$. Hence, the configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(K)}$ is strictly convex. □

8 Counterexample in higher dimensions: Proof of Theorem 2.14

In this section, we prove that the statement of Lemma 2.12 is false for $d \geq 3$, indicating that a generalized proof of polarization requires further ideas.

Proof of Theorem 2.14. As before, recall that $A_{ij}^{(t)} := \langle \mathbf{u}_i^{(t)}, \mathbf{u}_j^{(t)} \rangle$. First, observe that, if three opinions given by $\mathbf{u}_1^{(t)}, \mathbf{u}_2^{(t)}, \mathbf{u}_3^{(t)}$ are in a strictly convex configuration, then the following holds: If $A_{12}^{(t)} > 0$, then we have $\text{sign}(A_{13}^{(t)}) = \text{sign}(A_{23}^{(t)})$ (because $A_{12} > 0$ implies $b_1 = b_2$ in the strictly convex definition).

Let us define the configuration satisfying the required conditions. Pick $\epsilon > 0$ small enough such that it satisfies the condition $\epsilon/2 \geq \epsilon^2 \cdot (\eta + (2\eta + \eta^2)/2) T(1 + \eta)^{2T}$. Pick three vectors $\mathbf{u}_1^{(0)}, \mathbf{u}_2^{(0)}, \mathbf{u}_3^{(0)}$ in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} such that $A_{12}^{(0)} = A_{13}^{(0)} = \epsilon$, $A_{23}^{(0)} = -\epsilon$ (note that this is possible for small ϵ whenever $d \geq 3$).

Since $A_{12}^{(0)} > 0$ but $A_{13}^{(0)}, A_{23}^{(0)}$ do not have the same sign, this configuration is not strictly convex (and clearly it is not separable). Furthermore, it will not be strictly convex until one of the signs of the A_{ij} flips. Therefore, it is sufficient to show that none of the signs of the A_{ij} flips in the first T steps. It turns out that any possible interaction can change each correlation by at most $O(\epsilon^2)$. Hence, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, more and more interactions are required to flip one of the signs. In the rest of the proof, we develop this argument rigorously.

To that end, we investigate the changes in correlations for every possible interaction. For this, let (i, j, k) be some permutation of $(1, 2, 3)$ and assume that, at time t , agent i is influenced by agent j . We have the following upper bounds on the changes in correlations:

$$\left| A_{ij}^{(t+1)} \right| \stackrel{(3.1)}{=} \frac{(1 + \eta) \cdot \left| A_{ij}^{(t)} \right|}{\sqrt{1 + (2\eta + \eta^2) \left(A_{ij}^{(t)} \right)^2}} \leq (1 + \eta) \cdot \left| A_{ij}^{(t)} \right| \leq (1 + \eta) \cdot \max \left\{ \left| A_{ij}^{(t)} \right|, \left| A_{ik}^{(t)} \right|, \left| A_{jk}^{(t)} \right| \right\},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left| A_{ik}^{(t+1)} \right| &= \frac{\left| A_{ik}^{(t)} + \eta A_{ij}^{(t)} A_{jk}^{(t)} \right|}{\sqrt{1 + (2\eta + \eta^2) \left(A_{ij}^{(t)} \right)^2}} \leq \left| A_{ik}^{(t)} \right| + \eta \left| A_{ij}^{(t)} \right| \cdot \left| A_{jk}^{(t)} \right|, \\ &\leq (1 + \eta) \cdot \max \left\{ \left| A_{ij}^{(t)} \right|, \left| A_{ik}^{(t)} \right|, \left| A_{jk}^{(t)} \right| \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Together, this gives for every $t \geq 0$

$$\max \left\{ \left| A_{ij}^{(t)} \right|, \left| A_{ik}^{(t)} \right|, \left| A_{jk}^{(t)} \right| \right\} \leq (1 + \eta)^t \cdot \epsilon. \quad (8.1)$$

To derive lower bounds on the changes in correlations, the following inequality will turn out to be useful. For every $x \geq 0$, Taylor's theorem implies that there is some $\xi \in [0, x]$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{1+x}} = 1 - \frac{x}{2} + \frac{3}{4}(1+\xi)^{-5/2} \geq 1 - \frac{x}{2}. \quad (8.2)$$

We obtain the following bounds on the changes in correlation. By Claim 4.8, $A_{ij}^{(t+1)}$ has the same sign as $A_{ij}^{(t)}$ and $|A_{ij}^{(t+1)}| \geq |A_{ij}^{(t)}|$. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{ik}^{(t+1)} \cdot \text{sign}\left(A_{ik}^{(t)}\right) &= \frac{A_{ik}^{(t)} + \eta A_{ij}^{(t)} A_{jk}^{(t)}}{\sqrt{1 + (2\eta + \eta^2) \left(A_{ij}^{(t)}\right)^2}} \cdot \text{sign}\left(A_{ik}^{(t)}\right) \geq \frac{\left|A_{ik}^{(t)}\right| - \eta \left|A_{ij}^{(t)} A_{jk}^{(t)}\right|}{\sqrt{1 + (2\eta + \eta^2) \left(A_{ij}^{(t)}\right)^2}} \\
&\stackrel{(8.2)}{\geq} \left(\left|A_{ik}^{(t)}\right| - \eta \cdot \left|A_{ij}^{(t)}\right| \cdot \left|A_{jk}^{(t)}\right|\right) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{2\eta + \eta^2}{2} \left(A_{ij}^{(t)}\right)^2\right) \\
&\geq \left|A_{ik}^{(t)}\right| - \eta \cdot \left|A_{ij}^{(t)}\right| \cdot \left|A_{jk}^{(t)}\right| - \frac{2\eta + \eta^2}{2} \left(A_{ij}^{(t)}\right)^2 \\
&\stackrel{(8.1)}{\geq} \left|A_{ik}^{(t)}\right| - \left(\eta + \frac{2\eta + \eta^2}{2}\right) (1 + \eta)^{2t} \cdot \epsilon^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Considering two cases $A_{ik}^{(t)} > 0$ and $A_{ik}^{(t)} < 0$, the calculation above implies that $A_{ik}^{(t+1)}$ has the same sign as $A_{ik}^{(t)}$ as long as the right hand side is strictly positive. Moreover, the absolute value of the correlation decreases by at most $(\eta + (2\eta + \eta^2)/2) (1 + \eta)^{2t} \cdot \epsilon^2$. Together, we obtain that, for every $i \neq j$ in $\{1, 2, 3\}$ and every $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$, we have

$$\left|A_{ij}^{(t)} - A_{ij}^{(0)}\right| \leq \epsilon^2 \cdot \left(\eta + \frac{2\eta + \eta^2}{2}\right) \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} (1 + \eta)^{2k} \leq \epsilon^2 \cdot \left(\eta + \frac{2\eta + \eta^2}{2}\right) \cdot T \cdot (1 + \eta)^{2T} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Since $|A_{ij}^{(0)}| = \epsilon$, this implies that the sign of A_{ij} does not flip for the first T steps. In particular, the configuration does not become strictly convex for any sequence of T interactions. \square

9 Polarization for (d, n, \mathcal{D}) -stable functions:

Proof of Theorem 2.19

Our strategy to prove Theorem 2.19 is as follows: As a first step, we prove Lemma 2.17, which implies that the partition into clusters does not change while a configuration is ϵ -inactive. Recall from the definition of (d, n, \mathcal{D}) -stable functions that an ϵ -inactive configuration with at least two clusters almost surely becomes ϵ -active again. Accordingly, in the second step, we prove that, once a configuration becomes ϵ -active, there exists a constant length sequence of interactions that makes the configuration ϵ -inactive again, but with a strictly smaller number of clusters. In particular, the number of clusters decreases with some constant probability.

More precisely, we only give such a constant length sequence if the configuration became active due to $|A_{ij}^{(t)}| > \epsilon$ for i, j from different clusters (as opposed to $|A_{ij}^{(t)}| < 1 - \epsilon$ for i, j from the same cluster). Since this indeed occurs with constant probability by the definition of (d, n, \mathcal{D}) -stability, it can also be concluded that the number of clusters decreases with constant probability.

Putting these facts together, if a configuration is ϵ -inactive with $k > 1$ clusters, with constant probability it will become ϵ -active and then ϵ -inactive again with a strictly smaller number of

clusters. As the number of clusters is bounded by $\max(d, n)$, almost surely the configuration ends up with only one cluster. But a configuration with one cluster must be strictly convex, and therefore polarizes by Lemma 2.10.

Let us proceed with this plan, starting with the proof of Lemma 2.17. As a preliminary, we give a technical bound which formalizes that, for stable functions, interactions between nearly orthogonal opinions result in only small changes to the opinions.

Claim 9.1. *Let f be a stable update function and $M, c > 0$ such that $|f(A)| \leq M$ if $|A| \leq c$. Then, whenever agent j influences agent i and $|A_{ij}| \leq c$, it holds for the new opinion \mathbf{u}'_i that $A(\mathbf{u}'_i, \mathbf{u}_i) \geq 1 - M$.*

Proof. From $\text{sign}(f(A)) = \text{sign}(A)$, we have $Af(A) \geq 0$. Suppose $A = A_{ij}$ satisfies $|A| \leq c$. Then,

$$A(\mathbf{u}'_i, \mathbf{u}_i) = \frac{1 + Af(A)}{\sqrt{1 + 2Af(A) + f(A)^2}} \geq \frac{1}{1 + |f(A)|} \geq \frac{1}{1 + M} = 1 - \frac{M}{1 + M} \geq 1 - M. \quad \square$$

Proof of Lemma 2.17. Let $\epsilon_1 = 1/256$. Given that f is continuous on $[-1, 1]$ and $f(0) = 0$, it follows that for every $M > 0$ there exists $c(M) > 0$ such that $|f(A)| \leq M$ whenever $|A| \leq c(M)$. Take $M = (\epsilon_1/8)^2$ and choose $\epsilon_0 = \min(c(M), M)$. Suppose $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ is ϵ_0 -inactive. Assume that agent j influences agent i , so only \mathbf{u}_i moves from time t to $t+1$. We want to show that $\mathcal{U}^{(t+1)}$ is ϵ_1 -inactive and is formed by the same clusters as those that compose $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$. We proceed by analysing two cases, depending on if i and j were in the same cluster or not.

Assume that i and j were in the same cluster at time t . Their interaction does not decrease their absolute correlation, that is $|A_{ij}^{(t+1)}| \geq |A_{ij}^{(t)}| \geq 1 - \epsilon_0$. So, for any k in the same cluster, and from the transitivity of closeness stated in Lemma 3.5, we have $|A_{ik}^{(t+1)}| \geq 1 - 4\epsilon_0 \geq 1 - \epsilon_1 > 1/2$ because $|A_{jk}^{(t+1)}| = |A_{jk}^{(t)}| \geq 1 - \epsilon_0$. Also, for every k from another cluster, we have $|A_{jk}^{(t+1)}| \leq \epsilon_0$. Therefore, $|A_{ik}^{(t+1)}| \leq 8\sqrt{\epsilon_0} \leq \epsilon_1 < 1/2$ from Lemma 3.7. Therefore, $\mathcal{U}^{(t+1)}$ is ϵ_1 -inactive with the same clusters as $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$.

Now suppose $i \in C_1$ and $j \in C_2$ where C_1 and C_2 are different clusters of $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$. As $\epsilon_0 \leq c(M)$, from Claim 9.1, this implies $|A(\mathbf{u}_i^{(t)}, \mathbf{u}_i^{(t+1)})| \geq 1 - M$. For every $k \in C_1$, $|A_{ik}^{(t)}| \geq 1 - \epsilon_0 \geq 1 - M$. Therefore $|A_{ik}^{(t+1)}| \geq 1 - 4M \geq 1 - \epsilon_1 > 1/2$ by Lemma 3.5. For every $k \notin C_1$, $|A_{ik}^{(t)}| \leq \epsilon_0 \leq \sqrt{M}$. Therefore $|A_{ik}^{(t+1)}| \leq 8\sqrt{M} = \epsilon_1 < 1/2$ by Lemma 3.7. Again, we conclude that $\mathcal{U}^{(t+1)}$ is ϵ_1 -inactive with unchanged clusters. \square

For an ϵ -inactive configuration, let $\text{NC}(\mathcal{U})$ denote the number of clusters in \mathcal{U} . In the following lemma, we argue that if a configuration becomes active, then there exists a bounded number of interactions that strictly decreases the number of clusters.

Lemma 9.2. *Let $d, n \geq 2$, f be a stable update function and take ϵ_0 from Lemma 2.17. For every $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ there exists $K_0 = K_0(n, f, \epsilon)$ such that:*

If $\mathcal{U}^{(t-1)}$ is ϵ -inactive and there exist two agents i, j that were in different clusters at time $t-1$ and such that $|A_{ij}^{(t)}| > \epsilon$, then, there exists a sequence of $K \leq K_0$ interactions such that $\mathcal{U}^{(t+K)}$ is ϵ -inactive and $\text{NC}(\mathcal{U}^{(t+K)}) \leq \text{NC}(\mathcal{U}^{(t-1)}) - 1$.

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{U}^{(t-1)}$ is ϵ -inactive for $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$. From Lemma 2.17, $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ is $1/256$ -inactive, and the clusters are preserved from $t-1$ to t . Now suppose w.l.o.g. there are two clusters C_1 and C_2 and two agents $1 \in C_1$, $2 \in C_2$ such that $\epsilon < \left| A_{12}^{(t)} \right| \leq 1/256$. Let's find a sequence of $K > 0$ interactions such that $\mathcal{U}^{(t+K)}$ is ϵ -inactive and $\text{NC}(\mathcal{U}^{(t+K)}) \leq \text{NC}(\mathcal{U}^{(t-1)}) - 1$.

Let $\epsilon' = \epsilon^2/16$. From Claim 6.8, there exists $T = T(\epsilon')$ such that for any pair of agents with $\left| A_{ij}^{(t)} \right| \geq \epsilon'$, after T interactions between them it holds $\left| A_{ij}^{(t+T)} \right| \geq 1 - \epsilon'$.

In particular, for every $i \in C_1$, it holds $\left| A_{1i}^{(t)} \right| \geq 1 - 1/256 > \epsilon'$. If agent 1 influences agent i for T successive steps, we will obtain $\left| A_{1i}^{(t+T)} \right| \geq 1 - \epsilon'$. We can repeat this for every $i \in C_1$. Therefore, there exists $T_1 > 0$ and a sequence of T_1 interactions such that at time $t + T_1$ we have $|A_{1i}| \geq 1 - \epsilon'$ for every $i \in C_1$.

On the other hand, let $j \in C_2$, in particular $\left| A_{2j}^{(t)} \right| \geq 1 - 1/256$. Similarly as before, let agent 2 influence agent j for $T(\epsilon')$ times, after which we will have $|A_{2j}| \geq 1 - \epsilon'$. At that time, from the transitivity of activity stated in Lemma 3.8 (and by noting that $\epsilon^2 = 16\epsilon'$), we also have $|A_{1j}| \geq \sqrt{\epsilon'} > \epsilon'$. Accordingly, we now let agent 1 influence agent j further $T(\epsilon')$ times, which makes agents 1 and j close, in particular $|A_{1j}| \geq 1 - \epsilon'$.

Repeating this procedure for every $j \in C_2$, there exists $T_2 > 0$ and a sequence of T_2 interactions such that at time $t + T_1 + T_2$ we have $|A_{1i}| \geq 1 - \epsilon'$ for every $i \in C_1 \cup C_2$. Let $K_1 = T_1 + T_2$. We conclude that for every $i \in C_1 \cup C_2$, we have $\left| A_{1i}^{(t+K_1)} \right| \geq 1 - \epsilon'$. From Lemma 3.5, we have $\left| A_{ij}^{(t+K_1)} \right| \geq 1 - 4\epsilon' = 1 - \epsilon^2/4 \geq 1 - \epsilon$, for every $i, j \in C_1 \cup C_2$.

If the configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(t+K_1)}$ is ϵ -inactive, we are done. Indeed, all opinions from $C_1 \cup C_2$ are now in one cluster, and opinions in other clusters did not move, so we must have reduced the number of clusters by (at least) one.

On the other hand, if $\mathcal{U}^{(t+K_1)}$ is ϵ -active, recall that $\mathcal{U}^{(t-1)}$ was ϵ -inactive. Since then, all interactions moved only opinions belonging to C_1 or C_2 . Therefore, if $\mathcal{U}^{(t+K_1)}$ is ϵ -active, it must be because there is $i_1 \in C_1 \cup C_2$, $i_\ell \in C_\ell$ such that $|A_{i_1 i_\ell}^{(t+K_1)}| > \epsilon$ and $\ell \geq 3$.

But now we can repeat the same argument with respect to clusters $C_1 \cup C_2$ and C_ℓ . (In particular, note that at time $t + K_1$ we have $|A_{i_1 i}| \geq 1 - \epsilon$ for every $i \in C_1 \cup C_2$ and $|A_{i_\ell i}| \geq 1 - \epsilon$ for every i in C_ℓ .) Therefore, there exists K_2 and a sequence of interactions (all of them moving opinions only in C_1, C_2 and C_ℓ) such that at time $t + K_1 + K_2$ we have $|A_{ij}^{(t+K_1+K_2)}| \geq 1 - \epsilon$ for every $i, j \in C_1 \cup C_2 \cup C_\ell$.

Repeating this procedure at most n times if necessary, we finally arrive at a sequence of K interactions such that $\mathcal{U}^{(t+K)}$ is ϵ -inactive. By construction, it is clear that this configuration has a strictly smaller number of clusters than $\mathcal{U}^{(t-1)}$. In particular, at least two clusters of $\mathcal{U}^{(t-1)}$ have been merged into one. By noting that for every i , $K_i \leq 3nT(\epsilon')$, and $i \leq n$, we can choose $K_0 = 3n^2T(\epsilon')$, and the claim is verified. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.19. Note that the preceding results required only that f is stable. Only this proof uses the stronger assumption that f is (d, n, \mathcal{D}) -stable.

Proof of Theorem 2.19. Recall ϵ from the definition of (d, n, \mathcal{D}) -stability. Let $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ be an initial configuration which is not separable (and hence remains not separable for the rest of time). If

it is ϵ -active, then from Lemma 6.7, a.s. there exists t_1 such that $\mathcal{U}^{(t_1)}$ is ϵ -inactive. Therefore, let us assume w.l.o.g. that $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$ is also ϵ -inactive.

Let $t(0) = 0$ and NC_0 be the number of clusters of configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(0)}$. If $\text{NC}_0 = 1$, then by Claim 3.6 the configuration is strictly convex and from Lemma 2.10 $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ polarizes almost surely.

Suppose $\text{NC}_0 > 1$. The function f is (d, n, \mathcal{D}) -stable. Therefore, almost surely there exists the earliest t such that $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ is ϵ -active. From Lemma 6.7, almost surely there exists $t(1) > t$ such that the configuration $\mathcal{U}^{(t(1))}$ first returns to being ϵ -inactive.

Repeating this argument, we let $t(k)$ as the first $t > t(k-1)$ such that $\mathcal{U}^{(t-1)}$ is ϵ -active and $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ is ϵ -inactive. Then, we let NC_k to be the number of clusters of the configuration at time $t(k)$. The sequence $t(k)$ is either infinite or terminates at the first k such that $\text{NC}_k = 1$. In the latter case, we extend the sequence (NC_k) so that $\text{NC}_s = 1$ for every $s > k$.

As mentioned, if k is the first index such that $\text{NC}_k = 1$, then the configuration at time $t(k)$ is strictly convex and $\mathcal{U}^{(t)}$ polarizes. Accordingly, we will be done if we prove that almost surely $\text{NC}_k = 1$ for some k .

To that end, condition on some history of configurations up to time $t(k)$ such that $\text{NC}_k > 1$. Let $t' > t(k)$ be the first later time such that the configuration becomes ϵ -active. By Lemma 2.17, the configurations at times $t' - 1$ and t' have the same clusters as at time $t(k)$. Furthermore, by the definition of (d, n, \mathcal{D}) -stability, with probability at least $p > 0$, at time t' there exist two agents from different clusters with correlation exceeding ϵ . By Lemma 9.2, in that case there exists a sequence of at most K_0 interactions such that afterwards the configuration becomes ϵ -inactive with a strictly smaller number of clusters. In other words, after those interactions it will hold $\text{NC}_{k+1} < \text{NC}_k$.

Let $w > 1$. Averaging over all histories such that $\text{NC}_k = w$, we conclude that $\Pr[\text{NC}_{k+1} \leq w - 1 \mid \text{NC}_k = w] \geq p \cdot p_{\min}^{K_0}$, where $p_{\min} > 0$ is the smallest probability in the interaction distribution \mathcal{D} .

To show that almost surely there exists k such that $\text{NC}_k = 1$, we couple the random process NC_k with the following Markov chain. Let $X_k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $q = p \cdot p_{\min}^{K_0}$. We define

$$\begin{aligned} X_0 &= n, \\ \mathbb{P}[X_{k+1} = 1 \mid X_k = 1] &= 1, \\ \forall m > 1, &\begin{cases} \mathbb{P}[X_{k+1} = m - 1 \mid X_k = m] = q \\ \mathbb{P}[X_{k+1} = n \mid X_k = m] = 1 - q \end{cases}. \end{aligned}$$

Let's show that there exists a joint distribution (NC_k, X_k) such that almost surely $X_k \geq \text{NC}_k$ for every k . We proceed by induction on k . For $k = 0$ indeed it holds with certainty $\text{NC}_0 \leq n = X_0$.

Now suppose inductively that the joint distribution $(\text{NC}_s, X_s)_{s \leq k}$ is already defined up to some k . Condition on some $\text{NC}_k = w$ and $X_k = m$. By induction, $X_k \geq \text{NC}_k$ almost surely, in particular $w \leq m$.

If $w = m = 1$, by definition we have almost surely $X_{k+1} = 1 = \text{NC}_{k+1}$.

Conversely, let $m > 1$. By the definition of X_k , conditioned on $X_k = m$, we need $X_{k+1} = m - 1$ with probability q and $X_{k+1} = n$ with probability $1 - q$. But as stated above, $\Pr[\text{NC}_{k+1} \leq w - 1 \mid \text{NC}_k = w] \geq q$, so indeed there exists a joint distribution such that if $X_{k+1} = m - 1$, then

$\text{NC}_{k+1} \leq w - 1 \leq m - 1$ almost surely. Otherwise, it holds $\text{NC}_{k+1} \leq n = X_{k+1}$. We conclude that almost surely for every k , $\text{NC}_k \leq X_k$.

Since 1 is the only recurrent state in the Markov chain (X_k) , almost surely there exists k such that $X_k = 1$. (This is because the Markov chain has just one “sink” state where it will a.s. get stuck, see, e.g., (1.5.6) in [Ros19].) By the coupling property $X_k \geq \text{NC}_k$, that implies $\text{NC}_k = 1$ almost surely, which, as explained above, is sufficient for polarization. \square

10 Conclusion

In this paper we studied the phenomenon of polarization in a geometric opinion exchange framework. We have shown that when we consider opinions as vectors and an interaction between opinions according to a geometric update rule depending on their overall correlation, then certain update rules obeying biased assimilation will cause polarization (issue radicalization and issue alignment) in a fully connected network. There remain several interesting avenues for further research.

For example, do there exist interesting update rules for $d \geq 3$ which do not always converge to a polarized configuration? Similarly, are there natural modifications to the model that could exhibit a more varied behavior?

Another natural research direction is the analysis of non fully connected networks. This seems especially interesting as it could connect the interaction of the geometry of interacting opinions (as studied in this paper) with the geometry of connections between agents.

Finally, we also leave unaddressed the subjects of the speed of convergence to polarization and which properties affect it, and the sizes of the two polarized groups for update functions which are not odd.

A Deferred proofs

Proof of Lemma 3.7. For the first statement, assume that $\epsilon < 1$ (otherwise the statement is trivial) and that $A_{ik} \geq 1 - \epsilon$. The other case $A_{ik} \leq -(1 - \epsilon)$ follows by an easy reduction as in the proof of Lemma 3.5.

By the triangle inequality,

$$\left| \|\mathbf{u}_j - \mathbf{u}_k\| - \|\mathbf{u}_j - \mathbf{u}_i\| \right| \leq \|\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_k\| = \sqrt{2(1 - A_{ik})} \leq \sqrt{2\epsilon}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left| \|\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_j\| - \sqrt{2} \right| = \left| \sqrt{1 - A_{ij}} - 1 \right| \leq \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - |A_{ij}|} \right) \leq |A_{ij}| \leq \sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

Putting the two bounds together, $\sqrt{2} - 2\sqrt{2\epsilon} \leq \|\mathbf{u}_j - \mathbf{u}_k\| \leq \sqrt{2} + 2\sqrt{2\epsilon}$, which implies $2 - 16\sqrt{\epsilon} \leq \|\mathbf{u}_j - \mathbf{u}_k\|^2 \leq 2 + 16\sqrt{\epsilon}$ and $|A_{jk}| \leq 8\sqrt{\epsilon}$. The first statement is thus proved.

For the second statement, consider an orthonormal coordinate system where \mathbf{u}_i has coordinates $(1, 0)$. Let $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that \mathbf{u}_j has coordinates (x_1, y_1) , and \mathbf{u}_k has coordinates (x_2, y_2) .

Now, suppose $|A_{ij}| \leq \epsilon$ and $|A_{ik}| \leq \epsilon$. Let's show that $|A_{jk}| \geq 1 - 2\epsilon^2$. We want to show that for every $\epsilon \geq 0$, if $|x_1| \leq \epsilon$ and $|x_2| \leq \epsilon$, then $|x_1 x_2 + y_1 y_2| \geq 1 - 2\epsilon^2$. Note that $y_1^2 = 1 - x_1^2 \geq 1 - \epsilon^2$ and similarly $y_2^2 \geq 1 - \epsilon^2$. In particular, $|y_1 y_2| \geq 1 - \epsilon^2$ and $|x_1 x_2| \leq \epsilon^2$. That gives

$$|A_{jk}| \geq |y_1 y_2| - |x_1 x_2| \geq 1 - \epsilon^2 - \epsilon^2 = 1 - 2\epsilon^2. \quad \square$$

Proof of Lemma 3.8. As before, suppose $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \leq 1$, otherwise the conclusion is trivial. Suppose also $A_{ij} \geq \sqrt{\epsilon_1}$ and $A_{ik} \geq 1 - \epsilon_2$ (otherwise we can flip \mathbf{u}_j and/or \mathbf{u}_k as necessary, which does not change the absolute values $|A_{ij}|, |A_{ik}|, |A_{jk}|$). So, $1 - A_{ij} \leq 1 - \sqrt{\epsilon_1} \leq 1$ and $1 - A_{ik} \leq \epsilon_2$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} A_{jk} &= 1 - \frac{\|\mathbf{u}_j - \mathbf{u}_k\|^2}{2}, \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{(\|\mathbf{u}_j - \mathbf{u}_i\| + \|\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{u}_k\|)^2}{2}, \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{2(1 - A_{ij})} + \sqrt{2(1 - A_{ik})} \right)^2, \\ &\geq 1 - \left(1 - \sqrt{\epsilon_1} + \epsilon_2 + 2\sqrt{(1 - \sqrt{\epsilon_1})\epsilon_2} \right), \\ &\geq \sqrt{\epsilon_1} - \epsilon_2 - 2\sqrt{\epsilon_2}, \\ &\geq \sqrt{\epsilon_1} - 3\sqrt{\epsilon_2}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Claim 4.3. f is an active function, so we let $m > 0$ denote the infimum of $|f(A)|$ over $[-1, 1]$. Recall from Claim 3.4 that the new correlation is given by

$$A' = \frac{A + f(A)}{\sqrt{1 + 2Af(A) + f(A)^2}}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Let's consider the cases $|A| > |A_0|$ and $|A| \leq |A_0|$ separately.

Case $|A| > |A_0|$: We know that $-1 \leq A \leq 1$ and $Af(A) \leq |f(A)|$. Therefore $1 + 2Af(A) + f(A)^2 \leq (1 + |f(A)|)^2$. Furthermore, given that $|A| > |A_0|$, it follows from the definition of an active function that $\text{sign}(A) = \text{sign}(f(A))$. Hence,

$$|A'| \geq \frac{|A + f(A)|}{1 + |f(A)|} = \frac{|A| + |f(A)|}{1 + |f(A)|} = 1 - \frac{1 - |A|}{1 + |f(A)|}.$$

From (A.1), $\text{sign}(A) = \text{sign}(f(A))$ implies $\text{sign}(A') = \text{sign}(A)$. Thus, proving the claim in this case is equivalent to proving that $1 - |A'| \leq \beta(1 - |A|)$. Finally, given that for every A , $|f(A)| \geq m$, we obtain

$$|A'| \geq 1 - \frac{1 - |A|}{1 + |f(A)|} \geq 1 - \frac{1 - |A|}{1 + m}.$$

By letting $\beta := 1/(1 + m) < 1$, it follows that $1 - |A'| \leq \beta(1 - |A|)$. This also implies that f is (c, β) -contractive for $c = |A_0|$.

Case $|A| \leq |A_0|$: Without loss of generality suppose $A_0 \geq 0$ (the case $A_0 < 0$ is symmetric). So, $|A| \leq |A_0|$ implies $-A_0 \leq A \leq A_0$. But we need not consider the case $A = A_0$ as it is not covered by the claim. The argument in this case proceeds as follows. We let $M := (A - m)/\sqrt{1 - 2Am + m^2}$ and we show that $A' \leq M$. Then we will show that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for every $A \in [-A_0, A_0]$, $A - \delta \geq M$. Indeed that would imply that $A' \leq A - \delta$ when $-A_0 \leq A < A_0$. By taking $\beta = (A_0 + 1 - \delta)/(A_0 + 1)$, it would follow that $A' + 1 \leq A + 1 - \delta < \beta(A + 1)$ because

$$\beta(A + 1) = \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{A_0 + 1}\right)(A + 1) = A + 1 - \delta \frac{A + 1}{A_0 + 1} > A + 1 - \delta,$$

which concludes the proof.

Let's then show that $A' \leq M$. To that end, fix $-1 < A < 1$ and let us show that A' is an increasing function of $f(A)$. Define $S := S(x) := 1 + 2Ax + x^2$. We want to show that $g(x) = (A + x)/\sqrt{S}$ is increasing for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that $S > (A + x)^2 \geq 0$. The result follows directly by considering the derivative of g :

$$g'(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{S}} - \frac{(A + x)^2}{S\sqrt{S}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{S}} \left(1 - \frac{(A + x)^2}{S}\right) > 0.$$

We know that when $-A_0 \leq A < A_0$, $f(A) < 0$, so $f(A) \leq -m$. Given that A' increases with $f(A)$ we get

$$A' \leq \frac{A - m}{\sqrt{1 - 2Am + m^2}} = M.$$

We will now show that $M = (A - m)/\sqrt{1 - 2Am + m^2} < A$ for $-A_0 \leq A \leq A_0$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $(A - m)\sqrt{1 - 2Am + m^2} \geq A$. This implies

$$A - m \geq A\sqrt{1 - 2Am + m^2}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

If $-A_0 \leq A \leq 0$, then $(A - m)^2 \leq A^2(1 - 2Am + m^2)$ and so $m^2 - 2Am \leq A^2(m^2 - 2Am)$. Given that $m^2 - 2Am > 0$, we obtain the contradiction $A^2 \geq 1$. Similarly, if $0 < A \leq A_0$, then $(A - m)^2 \geq A^2(1 - 2Am + m^2)$ and so $m^2 - 2Am \geq A^2(m^2 - 2Am)$. In this case $m^2 - 2Am < 0$ because $A - m > 0$ from (A.2). The contradiction $A^2 \geq 1$ follows again. We conclude that $A - (A - m)/\sqrt{1 - 2Am + m^2}$ is a positive continuous function of A on the closed interval $[-A_0, A_0]$. Therefore, it has a minimum $\delta > 0$ on that interval. We conclude that $M \leq A - \delta$ when $-A_0 \leq A < A_0$. The claim follows. \square

Proof of Claim 4.9. For further use, we note that

$$\forall x, 1 - \cos x \leq \frac{1}{2}x^2. \quad (\text{A.3a})$$

$$\exists c > 0 : \forall 0 \leq x \leq c, 1 - \cos x \geq \frac{x^2}{2} - x^4. \quad (\text{A.3b})$$

First let us prove the bound on γ' for $\gamma \leq \gamma_0$, where we choose $\gamma_0 > 0$ small enough. Let $\epsilon := 1 - |A|$, $\epsilon' := 1 - |A'|$. By Claim 4.4, there exists $0 < c < 1$ such that $\epsilon' \leq c\epsilon$. Note that $\gamma = \arccos(|A|)$ and $\gamma' = \arccos(|A'|)$.

From the bounds on cosine (Eq. A.3a, A.3b), we have

$$\epsilon = 1 - \cos \gamma \leq \frac{1}{2} \gamma^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon' = 1 - \cos \gamma' \geq \frac{1}{2} (\gamma')^2 - (\gamma')^4.$$

Furthermore, for every $\delta > 0$, there exists x_0 such that if $x < x_0$, then $x^4 < \delta \frac{1}{2} x^2$. Therefore, if $\gamma' \leq \gamma \leq x_0$, then

$$\epsilon' \geq \frac{(1-\delta)}{2} (\gamma')^2.$$

We then have

$$\frac{(1-\delta)}{2} (\gamma')^2 \leq \epsilon' \leq c\epsilon \leq \frac{c}{2} \gamma^2,$$

and so $\gamma' < \sqrt{c/(1-\delta)} \gamma$. By choosing $\delta < 1 - c$, and setting $c_0 = \sqrt{c/(1-\delta)} < 1$, we conclude the case $\gamma \leq \gamma_0$.

Finally, we also need to obtain the bound for $\gamma \in [\gamma_0, \frac{\pi}{2} - \delta]$. First, assume $\gamma = \alpha$. Note that Claim 4.8 implies that $\gamma' < \gamma$ when $\gamma \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$. Furthermore, given that A' is a continuous function of A , we have that $\gamma'/\gamma < 1$ is a continuous function of $\gamma \in [\gamma_0, \pi/2 - \delta]$. So, there exists $0 < M < 1$ such that if $\gamma \in [\gamma_0, \frac{\pi}{2} - \delta]$, then $\gamma'/\gamma \leq M$. If $\gamma = \pi - \alpha$, the argument is entirely symmetric.

We conclude that over the whole interval $[0, \frac{\pi}{2} - \delta]$ it holds $\gamma' \leq \max(c_0, M)\gamma$. \square

Acknowledgements This research project was initiated as a part of the DAAD activity in Dortmund organized by Amin-Coja Oghlan and Nicola Kistler and their research groups. We are grateful to the referees for their extensive and helpful comments.

References

- [ABH25] Abdou Majeed Alidou, Júlia Baligács, and Jan Hązła. “Geometric opinion exchange polarizes in every dimension”. arXiv:2510.08190. 2025.
- [Aum76] Robert J. Aumann. “Agreeing to Disagree”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 4.6 (1976), pp. 1236–1239.
- [Axe97] Robert Axelrod. “The dissemination of culture: A model with local convergence and global polarization”. In: *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41.2 (1997), pp. 203–226.
- [BB07] Delia Baldassarri and Peter Bearman. “Dynamics of political polarization”. In: *American Sociological Review* 72.5 (2007), pp. 784–811.
- [BG08] Delia Baldassarri and Andrew Gelman. “Partisans without Constraint: Political Polarization and Trends in American Public Opinion”. In: *American Journal of Sociology* 114.2 (2008), pp. 408–446.
- [CWT22] Tianyi Chen, Xu Wang, and Charalampos E Tsourakakis. “Polarizing Opinion Dynamics with Confirmation Bias”. In: *International Conference on Social Informatics*. 2022, pp. 144–158.

- [DeG74] Morris H. DeGroot. “Reaching a Consensus”. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 69.345 (1974), pp. 118–121.
- [DGL13] Pranav Dandekar, Ashish Goel, and David T. Lee. “Biased assimilation, homophily, and the dynamics of polarization”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110.15 (2013), pp. 5791–5796.
- [DSCS+17] Michela Del Vicario, Antonio Scala, Guido Caldarelli, H. Eugene Stanley, and Walter Quattrociocchi. “Modeling confirmation bias and polarization”. In: *Scientific Reports* 7 (2017), p. 40391.
- [FJ90] Noah E Friedkin and Eugene C Johnsen. “Social influence and opinions”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Sociology* 15.3-4 (1990), pp. 193–206.
- [Fre20] David French. *Divided we fall: America’s secession threat and how to restore our nation*. St. Martin’s Press, 2020.
- [GK03] Douglas Gale and Shachar Kariv. “Bayesian learning in social networks”. In: *Games and Economic Behavior* 45.2 (2003). Special Issue in Honor of Robert W. Rosenthal, pp. 329–346.
- [GKT21] Jason Gaitonde, Jon Kleinberg, and Éva Tardos. “Polarization in geometric opinion dynamics”. In: *Conference on Economics and Computation (EC)*. 2021, pp. 499–519.
- [GR20] Michel Grabisch and Agnieszka Rusinowska. “A survey on nonstrategic models of opinion dynamics”. In: *Games* 11.4 (2020), p. 65.
- [HJMR23] Jan Hązła, Yan Jin, Elchanan Mossel, and Govind Ramnarayan. “A Geometric Model of Opinion Polarization”. In: *Mathematics of Operations Research* (2023).
- [Kle20] Ezra Klein. *Why we’re polarized*. Simon and Schuster, 2020.
- [Mas18] Lilliana Mason. *Uncivil agreement: How politics became our identity*. University of Chicago Press, 2018.
- [MGM23] La Mi, Jorge Gonçalves, and Johan Markdahl. “Polarization of Multi-Agent Gradient Flows Over Manifolds With Application to Opinion Dynamics”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* (2023).
- [MKFB03] Michael W. Macy, James A. Kitts, Andreas Flache, and Steve Benard. “Polarization in dynamic networks: A Hopfield model of emergent structure”. In: *Dynamic Social Network Modeling and Analysis* (2003), pp. 162–173.
- [MT17] Elchanan Mossel and Omer Tamuz. “Opinion exchange dynamics”. In: *Probability Surveys* 14 (2017), pp. 155–204.
- [PY22] Jacopo Perego and Sevgi Yuksel. “Media competition and social disagreement”. In: *Econometrica* 90.1 (2022), pp. 223–265.
- [Ros19] Jeffrey S Rosenthal. *A first look at stochastic processes*. World Scientific, 2019.
- [Sho85] Ken Shoemake. “Animating rotation with quaternion curves”. In: *Conference on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques (SIGGRAPH)*. 1985, pp. 245–254.

- [Wel74] Lloyd R. Welch. “Lower bounds on the maximum cross correlation of signals”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 20.3 (1974), pp. 397–399.
- [YYF22] Baizhong Yang, Quan Yu, and Yi Fan. “A Hybrid Opinion Formation and Polarization Model”. In: *Entropy* 24.11 (2022), p. 1692.