Lecture Notes, March 12 & 14

Sen's REVISED proof of the Group Contraction Lemma (this is the version in his notes "Arrow and the Impossibility Theorem")

 $\begin{array}{l} \underline{Definition} \ (Decisive \ Set): \ Let \ x,y \in X, \ G \subseteq H. \ G \ is \ decisive \ on \ (x, \ y) \\ denoted \ D_G(x,y) \ if \ [\ x \ P_i \ y \ for \ all \ i \in G \] \ implies \ [\ x \ P \ y \] \ independent \ of \\ P_{j,}, \ j \ \in H, \ j \ \notin G. \end{array}$

Note that under the Pareto Principle, there is always at least one decisive set, H. Further, the Field Expansion Lemma, says that a decisive set on one pair of possibilities is decisive on all.

<u>Group Contraction Lemma:</u> Let $G \subseteq H$, #G > 1, G decisive. Then there are G_1, G_2 , disjoint, nonempty, so that $G_1 \cup G_2 = G$, so that one of G_1, G_2 is decisive.

Proof: By Unrestricted Domain, we get to choose our example. Let

 $\begin{array}{l} G_1:\ x>y,\,x>z,\,y ? z\\ G_2:x>y,\,z>y,\,x ? z\\ H\setminus G:\ unspecified\\ G \mbox{ is decisive so } D_G(x,\,y)\ \mbox{ so } x\ P\ y\ .\\ Case \ 1:\ z\ P\ x \end{array}$

By transitivity of P, z P y, but then G_2 is decisive (only G_2 's preferences on z/y were specified; G_2 is getting his way, independent of others' preferences). By the Field Expansion Lemma G_2 is decisive on everything.

Case 2: x P z

 G_1 is getting his way. Only G_1 's preferences on x/z were specified. So G_1 is decisive.

QED