How Do You Cut a Cake So Nobody Lies? 1. The Problem With Cake

Suppose you and a friend are sharing a birthday cake. Half is plain sponge; the other half is covered in glacé cherries, which you love and your friend detests. How should you divide it? The obvious answer, cutting it in half, gives your friend a pile of cherries they don't want, and leaves you with less sponge than you'd like. You've both ended up worse off than you needed to be. This is not just a dessert inconvenience. It is, in disguise, one of the oldest problems in mathematics.

The mathematical theory of fair division asks: given a resource that different people value differently, how do we share it so that everyone feels they have received a fair share? The question turns out to be surprisingly deep. It connects combinatorics, game theory, and even topology with some of it remaining unsolved today.

We will start with the simplest case - two people, one cake and build up to something genuinely remarkable.

2. I Cut, You Choose

The classical solution for two people is known as the cut and choose protocol, and it is so old that it appears in the Book of Genesis. One person (the cutter) divides the cake into two pieces. The other (the chooser) picks whichever piece they prefer. The cutter then receives whatever is left.

Why is this fair? We need to be precise. Mathematicians define two properties a division should satisfy:

Proportionality. Each of the n players receives a piece they value as at least 1/n of the whole cake.

Envy-freeness. No player prefers another player's piece to their own.

For two players, these are equivalent. And cut and choose satisfies both, provided both players act rationally. The chooser simply picks whichever half they value more — by definition, they cannot envy the other piece. The cutter, knowing they will get the leftover, should divide the cake into two halves of equal value to them. If the cutter genuinely values both halves equally, they cannot envy the chooser either.

This is elegant. But it has one serious flaw: the two roles are not symmetric. The chooser has an advantage - they see both pieces before committing. The cutter must commit first, blind to what the chooser actually values. If the cutter knows the chooser prefers cherries, they might be tempted to put all the cherries in one half and keep the plain sponge half for themselves. Rational? Yes. Fair in spirit? Debatable.

More importantly, cutting and choosing fails completely for three or more people. With three players, it is not obvious how to proceed. Do two people cut while the third chooses? Do they cut sequentially? Whatever protocol you devise, someone can end up envying someone else's piece. To solve the three-person case, we need considerably heavier machinery.

3. Triangles to the Rescue: Sperner's Lemma

Before returning to cake, we need a detour into combinatorics. In 1928, a German mathematician named Emanuel Sperner proved a beautiful lemma about triangles. It looks, at first glance, like a puzzle about colouring.

Take a triangle and subdivide it into smaller triangles - a triangulation. Now colour every vertex of the triangulation using one of three colours : say, red, green, and blue - subject to one rule:

Sperner's Colouring Rule

Label the three corners of the big triangle Red, Green, and Blue. Any vertex on an edge of the big triangle may only use the two colours of the endpoints of that edge. Interior vertices may be any colour.

A small triangle in the triangulation is called fully labelled if its three vertices carry all three different colours. Sperner's Lemma then states:

Sperner's Lemma

Any triangulation of a triangle satisfying Sperner's Colouring Rule contains an odd number of fully labelled triangles. In particular, there is always at least one.

The proof is a lovely induction argument. Draw a 'door' on every edge of every small triangle that is coloured Red–Green. Now count how many rooms in the triangulation have an odd number of doors. The big triangle has exactly one external Red–Green edge, so there is one external door. Each time you pass through a door you enter a new room. Rooms with two doors contribute nothing to the parity count; only rooms with one door matter. With one external door, the number of rooms with exactly one internal door must be odd ; and the only such room is a fully labelled triangle.

Why should a cake-cutter care about coloured triangles? Because Sperner's Lemma, it turns out, is secretly a theorem about fair division.

4. Turning Triangles Into Cake: The Simmons–Su Protocol

In 1999, mathematician Francis Su used Sperner's Lemma to prove that an envy-free division always exists - for any number of players, any number of pieces, and any valuation of the cake. We'll build the argument for three players, which already captures all the key ideas.

Imagine the cake lying along a line from 0 to 1. A division into three pieces is described by two cut-points, say x and y, with $0 \le x \le y \le 1$. The set of all possible divisions is therefore a triangle: every point (x, y) with $x \le y$ represents one valid way to cut the cake.

Now triangulate this triangle into smaller and smaller sub-triangles, and ask each of the three players (Alice, Bob, and Carol) which piece they prefer at every vertex of the triangulation. Colour each vertex with the label of the player who prefers the leftmost piece at that cut-point, or the middle piece, or the rightmost piece, according to a careful rule that mirrors Sperner's colouring conditions.

By Sperner's Lemma, there must be a fully labelled triangle - a tiny sub-triangle at whose three vertices Alice, Bob, and Carol each prefer a different piece. As we refine the triangulation, making the sub-triangles smaller and smaller, the fully labelled triangles converge to a single point: a cut that is, in the limit, envy-free. Every player receives the piece they most prefer, or at worst, a piece they consider tied for first place.

The Envy-Freeness Guarantee

For any number of players n, an envy-free division into n pieces always exists. No matter how differently the players value different parts of the cake, however many cherries are involved, there is always a way to cut it so that nobody wishes they had someone else's slice.

This is a remarkable result. It does not give us an algorithm to find the fair division quickly, the protocol above requires infinitely many steps to converge, but it guarantees one is out there.

5. But Can You Do It in Finite Time?

The existence guarantee raises an uncomfortable follow-up question: if finding an envy-free division requires an infinite process, is it any use in practice? Alice and Bob will have eaten their cake long before the algorithm converges.

For two players, the answer is easy: cut and choose finishes in two steps. For three players, a procedure called the Selfridge–Conway protocol solves it in a bounded number of steps - though it requires some players to trim pieces and others to choose among the trimmings, in a careful choreography that reads like a very polite argument at a children's party.

For four or more players, the situation becomes considerably harder. For many years it was an open question whether a finite envy-free protocol even existed for $n \geq 4$. The answer came only in 2016, when Haris Aziz and Simon Mackenzie published a protocol that always terminates, but with a number of steps that can grow astronomically with n. How astronomically? For five players, the worst-case number of steps is bounded by a tower of exponentials so large it is difficult to write down without running out of pages. It is, in a technical sense, finite. In a practical sense, you would need a very patient cake.

Whether there exists a protocol that is both envy-free and efficient, finishing in a reasonable number of steps , remains one of the genuinely open problems in the area. The cake is still being divided.

6. Why Cake Is More Than Cake

It would be easy to dismiss this as charming recreational mathematics ; a civilised excuse to think about pudding. But fair division problems appear everywhere that resources must be shared between parties with different preferences.

When two countries negotiate a maritime border, each values different stretches of water for fishing, oil, or shipping lanes. When divorcing partners divide assets, each may place high sentimental value on items the other barely cares about. When the NHS allocates organs, or a government distributes broadcast spectrum to telecommunications companies, or a university assigns office space to departments - these are all, structurally, cake-cutting problems. The mathematical insight that an envy-free solution always exists is not just reassuring for birthday parties: it underpins the entire theory of mechanism design, the field that asks how to build systems where honesty and fairness are built into the rules themselves.

The Gale-Shapley algorithm for stable matching, used by the NHS to assign junior doctors to hospitals every year, is a close cousin of these ideas. So is the theory of auction design, which determines how governments raise billions of pounds selling mobile phone licences. The maths of sharing cake is, quietly, the maths of how societies distribute things fairly.

7. Conclusion: Have Your Cake and Prove It Too

We started with a cake, a knife, and a disagreement about cherries. We ended up in the middle of a triangle, counting coloured vertices and invoking a lemma from 1928 to guarantee that fairness is always achievable - in principle, at least, if not always before the cake goes stale.

What I find most beautiful about this corner of mathematics is that the result is both obvious and surprising at the same time. Of course there should always be a fair way to share something that feels intuitively right. But that the proof runs through Sperner's Lemma, through triangulations of a triangle, through a parity argument about doors and rooms, is not obvious at all. The path from 'cutting cake' to 'fixed-point topology' is not one you would predict. That unexpected connection - the sudden appearance of deep structure in a familiar problem - is precisely what makes mathematics worth doing.

The open problems remain. A fast, practical, envy-free protocol for many players is still out there to be found. And if you do find it, I suggest you celebrate with cake - divided, of course, by a method of your choosing.

References

Su, F. E. (1999). Rental harmony: Sperner's lemma in fair division. American Mathematical Monthly, 106(10), 930–942.

Sperner, E. (1928). Neuer Beweis für die Invarianz der Dimensionszahl. Abhandlungen aus dem Mathematischen Seminar der Universität Hamburg, 6,

265–272.
Aziz, H. & Mackenzie, S. (2016). A discrete and bounded envy-free cake cutting protocol for any number of agents. Proceedings of the 57th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science.

Brams, S. J. & Taylor, A. D. (1996). Fair Division: From Cake-Cutting to Dispute Resolution. Cambridge University Press.

Robertson, J. & Webb, W. (1998). Cake-Cutting Algorithms: Be Fair If You Can. A K Peters.