Demystifying the 'Metric Approach to Social Compromise with the Unanimity Criterion'

by

Shmuel Nitzan[1]

Abstract

In a recent book and earlier studies, Donald Saari well clarifies the source of three classical impossibility theorems in social choice and proposes possible escape out of these negative results. The objective of this note is to illustrate the relevance of these explanations in justifying the metric approach to the social compromise with the unanimity criterion.

Keywords: social choice, impossibility theorems, metric approach to compromise with the unanimity criterion

JEL Codes: **D71, D72.**

.

[1] Department of Economics, Bar Ilan University, Ramat Gan, 52900 Israel,

1. Introduction

Saari (2008) well clarifies the source of three classical impossibility theorems in social choice and proposes possible escape out of these negative results. The objective of this note is to illustrate the relevance of these explanations in justifying the metric approach to the social compromise with the unanimity criterion.

.

The three negative results discussed in Chapter 2 of his recent book and in Saari (1998), (2001), Saari and Petron (2006) and Li and Saari (2008) are Arrow's impossibility theorem (1951), Sen's Paretian-Liberal Paradox (1970) and Chichilinsky's topological dictatorship result (1982a). Saari shows that the common thread that relates these results is that they are based on conditions that force the associated aggregation rule to ignore crucial information about individual preferences. In Arrow's case, the Independence of Irrelevant Alternatives (IIA) condition forces the aggregation rule to concentrate solely on binary rankings, disregarding the consistency (transitivity) of individual preferences. In Sen's case, the Minimal Liberalism (ML) condition, again, prohibits the rule from using information about transitivity of individual preferences. In Chichilinsky's case, the Continuity (C) property emphasizes local behavior, ignoring the global structure of preferences.

The change of these results to positive ones requires modification of the (implausible) conditions that prohibit the aggregation rule from using valuable information, such that it does use the vital missing information.

Saari demonstrates the application of this approach in all three cases. He replaces IIA with condition IIIA, which ensures that the social preference relation is based on how individuals rank the alternatives as well as on the intensity of the ranking. This enables escape from Arrow's theorem and leads to the the Borda rule. The question 'how to evade Sen's result is not completely resolved', but Saari proposes ways and some guidelines to sidestep the difficulty. One suggestion is to allow an agent to be decisive only if his decision does not impose strong negative externalities on others. Finally, to escape from Chichilinsky's negative result, Saari proposes to secure global instead of local information on individual preferences. In his example, such information involves both the individuals' preferred points in the different regions of alternatives and the ranking of the regions.

It seems to me that the metric approach to social compromise with the unanimity criterion is based on recognition of Saari's plausible suggestion as to how to obtain positive results in the above three cases. In other words, the metric approach can be rationalized applying Saari's insightful diagnosis of the reason for the trouble in the above three well known impossibility results. Let me briefly present the metric approach (Farkas and Nitzan (1979), Lehrer and Nitzan (1985), Cambell and Nitzan (1986)) and then illustrate its effectiveness in obtaining positive conclusions.

2. The metric approach

The metric approach to compromise with the unanimity criterion, henceforth *the metric approach*, utilizes information on individual preferences taking into account the intensity of rankings. The unanimity criterion is defined as follows. Suppose that the individual preference relations are strict orderings on the set of alternatives X. Denote by $U(x,S)$ the set of profiles where alternative x is most preferred in the set S, which is a subset of X, from the point of view of every individual. A social choice function C(**P**,S) satisfies the unanimity criterion if

$$\mathbf{P} \in U(x,S) \Rightarrow \mathrm{C}(\mathbf{P},\mathrm{S}) = \{\mathrm{x}\}$$

Since in most profiles unanimity regarding the most preferred alternative does not exist, the unanimity criterion does not lead to a unique social choice function. The multiplicity of social choice functions that satisfy the unanimity criterion raises the question whether there exists one that compromises with the criterion in the sense that it is "closer" (in terms of a metric δ between profiles) than all the other functions to implementing the criterion. A social choice rule C(**P**,S) compromises with the unanimity criterion according to the metric δ if, for every subset S and for every preference profile **P** defined on X,

$$\mathrm{C}(\mathbf{P},\mathrm{S}) = \{x \in S : \forall y \in S,\ \mathrm{d}(\mathbf{P}|_S, \mathrm{U(x,S)}) \le \mathrm{d}(\mathbf{P}|_S, \mathrm{U(y,S)})\}$$

where $\mathrm{d}(\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q}) = \min_{Q \in V} \delta(\mathbf{P},\mathbf{Q})$ is the distance between a profile **P** and a set of profiles V and $\mathbf{P}|_S$ is the restriction of the profile **P** to the set S. Notice that the metric δ enables measurement of preference intensity (as well as intra-personal and inter-personal comparisons of preference intensities). The use of δ and of the profile sets

U(.,.) in the above definition of the compromising rule C (**P**,S) ensures that the global structure of individual preferences and their intensity are taken into account in determining the social choice.

3. Applications of the metric approach

3.1 The possibility of positional rules

A rule has a reasonable quasi-metric rationalization if it has a symmetric additively decomposable quasi-metric rationalization δ ($\delta = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_i$, $\delta_i = \delta_j = \delta'$) and δ' is neutral and monotonic. Lehrer and Nitzan (1985) have proved that a rule has a reasonable quasi-metric rationalization, if and only if it is a positional rule. By replacing the IIA condition of Arrow's theorem with 'the reasonable metric approach', the admissible rules are the positional rules. In the special case where δ' is the inversion metric, Farkas and Nitzan (1979) have shown that the rule compromising with the unanimity criterion is the Borda positional rule. This positive result is closely related to Theorem 2.5 in Saari (2008).

3.2 The libertarian resolution of the Paretian-liberal paradox

Applying the metric approach to extend the individual preferences on alternatives to preferences on an individual's assigned rights (these second-order rankings are based on the intensity of the ordinal preferences), Harel and Nitzan (1987) demonstrate that the Paretian-liberal paradox can be resolved by allowing voluntary exchange of rights. As shown by Saari and Petron (2004), for any decision rule that satisfies Sen's (ML) condition, in each cycle, each and every agent suffers a strong negative externality that is caused by the choices made by some decisive agent. The libertarian approach of Harel and Nitzan is based, first, on the use of preference intensity to define preferences on rights and then on Coase's observation, the Coase theorem, that the externalities problem can be resolved by voluntary exchange; in our case, the exchange of rights.

3.3 Consistency between unanimity, anonymity and modified continuity

In a topological setting, the metric approach, which applies information of preference intensity, can again be used to establish a possibility result. Using a finite framework, Baigent (1986), following Chichilinsky's (1982b) topological approach, has

considered a proximity preservation property for a social choice rule. This property requires that the "smaller" the change in individual preferences, the "smaller" the change in the social choice. It has been shown that this property is inconsistent with the plausible unanimity property and the anonymity property (a weaker form of dictatorship). The problem of this 'continuity' property is that it does not allow the rule to recognize the structure of the decision problem. A resolution of this problem by taking into account the missing information can be based on the use of an alternative property of proximity preservation, namely the metric respect for the unanimity criterion. A social choice rule has this property, if the "closer" a profile is to an ideal situation where some alternative is a unanimously preferred outcome, the "closer" the social choice to this alternative. This modified 'continuity' property succeeds in eliminating inconsistency with the unanimity and anonymity properties because it does not ignore the explicit global structure of preferences. This is illustrated in Nitzan (1989).

4. Conclusion

In his recent book, Saari (2008) accomplishes his objective of disposing dictators and demystifying voting paradoxes. I have tried to prove that he also demystifies the metric approach to social compromise with the unanimity criterion.

References

Arrow, K.J., 1951, (2nd edition 1963), *Social Choice and Individual Values*, Wiley, New York.

Baigent, N., 1986, "Preference Proximity and Anonymous Social Choice", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 102(1), 161-169.

Campbell, D. and Nitzan, S., 1986, "Social Compromise and Social Metrics," *Social Choice and Welfare*, 3, 1-16.

Chichilinsky, G., 1982a, "The Topological Equivalence of the Pareto Condition and the Existence of a Dictator", *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 9, 223-233.

Chichilinsky, G., 1982b, "Social Aggregation Rules and Continuity", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 97(2), 337-352.

Farkas, D. and Nitzan, S., 1979, "The Borda Rule and Pareto Stability: A Comment," *Econometrica*, 47, 1305-06.

Harel, A. and Nitzan, S., 1987, "The Libertarian Resolution of the Paretian Liberal Paradox," *Journal of Economics*, 47, 337-352.

Lehrer, E. and Nitzan, S., 1985, "Some General Results on the Metric Rationalization for Social Decision Rules," *Journal of Economic Theory*, 37(1), 191-201.

Li, L and Saari, D.G., 2008, Sen's Theorem: Geometric Proof and New Interpretations, *Social Choice and Welfare*, 31(3), 393-413.

Nitzan, S., 2009, *Collective Preference and Choice*, Cambridge University Press, forthcoming.

Nitzan, S., 1989, "More on the Preservation of Preference Proximity and Anonymous Social Choice," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 104(1), 187-90.

Saari, D.G., 2008, *Disposing Dictators, Demystifying Voting Paradoxes,* Cambridge University Press.

Saari, D.G., 2001, *Elections and Decisions: Explaining the Unexpected*, Cambridge University Press.

Saari, D.G., 1998, ""Connecting and Resolving Sen's and Arrow's Theorems", *Social Choice and Welfare*, 15, 239-261.

Saari, D.G. and Petron, A., 2006, "Negative Externalities and Sen's Liberalism Theorem", *Economic Theory*, 28, 265-281.

Sen, A.K., *Collective Choice and Social Welfare*, Holden Day, San Francisco.

Bar-Ilan University
Department of Economics
WORKING PAPERS

1-01 **The Optimal Size for a Minority**

Hillel Rapoport and Avi Weiss, January 2001.

2-01 **An Application of a Switching Regimes Regression to the Study of Urban Structure**

Gershon Alperovich and Joseph Deutsch, January 2001.

3-01 **The Kuznets Curve and the Impact of Various Income Sources on the Link Between Inequality and Development**

Joseph Deutsch and Jacques Silber, February 2001.

4-01 **International Asset Allocation: A New Perspective**

Abraham Lioui and Patrice Poncet**,** February 2001.

5-01 **מודל המועדון והקהילה החרדית**

יעקב רוזנברג, פברואר 2001.

6-01 **Multi-Generation Model of Immigrant Earnings: Theory and Application**

Gil S. Epstein and Tikva Lecker, February 2001.

7-01 **Shattered Rails, Ruined Credit: Financial Fragility and Railroad Operations in the Great Depression**

Daniel A. Schiffman, February 2001.

8-01 **Cooperation and Competition in a Duopoly R&D Market**

Damiano Bruno Silipo and Avi Weiss, March 2001.

9-01 **A Theory of Immigration Amnesties**

Gil S. Epstein and Avi Weiss, April 2001.

10-01 **Dynamic Asset Pricing With Non-Redundant Forwards**

Abraham Lioui and Patrice Poncet, May 2001.

11-01 **Macroeconomic and Labor Market Impact of Russian Immigration in Israel**

Sarit Cohen and Chang-Tai Hsieh, May 2001.

Electronic versions of the papers are available at
http://www.biu.ac.il/soc/ec/wp/working_papers.html

12-01 **Network Topology and the Efficiency of Equilibrium**

Igal Milchtaich, June 2001.

13-01 **General Equilibrium Pricing of Trading Strategy Risk**

Abraham Lioui and Patrice Poncet, July 2001.

14-01 **Social Conformity and Child Labor**

Shirit Katav-Herz, July 2001.

15-01 **Determinants of Railroad Capital Structure, 1830–1885**

Daniel A. Schiffman, July 2001.

16-01 **Political-Legal Institutions and the Railroad Financing Mix, 1885–1929**

Daniel A. Schiffman, September 2001.

17-01 **Macroeconomic Instability, Migration, and the Option Value of Education**

Eliakim Katz and Hillel Rapoport, October 2001.

18-01 **Property Rights, Theft, and Efficiency: The Biblical Waiver of Fines in the Case of Confessed Theft**

Eliakim Katz and Jacob Rosenberg, November 2001.

19-01 **Ethnic Discrimination and the Migration of Skilled Labor**

Frédéric Docquier and Hillel Rapoport, December 2001.

1-02 **Can Vocational Education Improve the Wages of Minorities and Disadvantaged Groups? The Case of Israel**

Shoshana Neuman and Adrian Ziderman, February 2002.

2-02 **What Can the Price Gap between Branded and Private Label Products Tell Us about Markups?**

Robert Barsky, Mark Bergen, Shantanu Dutta, and Daniel Levy, March 2002.

3-02 **Holiday Price Rigidity and Cost of Price Adjustment**

Daniel Levy, Georg Müller, Shantanu Dutta, and Mark Bergen, March 2002.

4-02 **Computation of Completely Mixed Equilibrium Payoffs**

Igal Milchtaich, March 2002.

5-02 **Coordination and Critical Mass in a Network Market – An Experimental Evaluation**

Amir Etziony and Avi Weiss, March 2002.

6-02 **Inviting Competition to Achieve Critical Mass**

Amir Etziony and Avi Weiss, April 2002.

7-02 **Credibility, Pre-Production and Inviting Competition in a Network Market**

Amir Etziony and Avi Weiss, April 2002.

8-02 **Brain Drain and LDCs' Growth: Winners and Losers**

Michel Beine, Fréderic Docquier, and Hillel Rapoport, April 2002.

9-02 **Heterogeneity in Price Rigidity: Evidence from a Case Study Using Micro-Level Data**

Daniel Levy, Shantanu Dutta, and Mark Bergen, April 2002.

10-02 **Price Flexibility in Channels of Distribution: Evidence from Scanner Data**

Shantanu Dutta, Mark Bergen, and Daniel Levy, April 2002.

11-02 **Acquired Cooperation in Finite-Horizon Dynamic Games**

Igal Milchtaich and Avi Weiss, April 2002.

12-02 **Cointegration in Frequency Domain**

Daniel Levy, May 2002.

13-02 **Which Voting Rules Elicit Informative Voting?**

Ruth Ben-Yashar and Igal Milchtaich, May 2002.

14-02 **Fertility, Non-Altruism and Economic Growth: Industrialization in the Nineteenth Century**

Elise S. Brezis, October 2002.

15-02 **Changes in the Recruitment and Education of the Power Elitesin Twentieth Century Western Democracies**

Elise S. Brezis and François Crouzet, November 2002.

16-02 **On the Typical Spectral Shape of an Economic Variable**

Daniel Levy and Hashem Dezhbakhsh, December 2002.

17-02 **International Evidence on Output Fluctuation and Shock Persistence**

Daniel Levy and Hashem Dezhbakhsh, December 2002.

1-03 **Topological Conditions for Uniqueness of Equilibrium in Networks**

Igal Milchtaich, March 2003.

2-03 **Is the Feldstein-Horioka Puzzle Really a Puzzle?**

Daniel Levy, June 2003.

3-03 **Growth and Convergence across the US: Evidence from County-Level Data**

Matthew Higgins, Daniel Levy, and Andrew Young, June 2003.

4-03 **Economic Growth and Endogenous Intergenerational Altruism**

Hillel Rapoport and Jean-Pierre Vidal, June 2003.

5-03 **Remittances and Inequality: A Dynamic Migration Model**

Frédéric Docquier and Hillel Rapoport, June 2003.

6-03 **Sigma Convergence Versus Beta Convergence: Evidence from U.S. County-Level Data**

Andrew T. Young, Matthew J. Higgins, and Daniel Levy, September 2003.

7-03 **Managerial and Customer Costs of Price Adjustment: Direct Evidence from Industrial Markets**

Mark J. Zbaracki, Mark Ritson, Daniel Levy, Shantanu Dutta, and Mark Bergen, September 2003.

8-03 **First and Second Best Voting Rules in Committees**

Ruth Ben-Yashar and Igal Milchtaich, October 2003.

9-03 **Shattering the Myth of Costless Price Changes: Emerging Perspectives on Dynamic Pricing**

Mark Bergen, Shantanu Dutta, Daniel Levy, Mark Ritson, and Mark J. Zbaracki, November 2003.

1-04 **Heterogeneity in Convergence Rates and Income Determination across U.S. States: Evidence from County-Level Data**

Andrew T. Young, Matthew J. Higgins, and Daniel Levy, January 2004.

2-04 **"The Real Thing:" Nominal Price Rigidity of the Nickel Coke, 1886-1959**

Daniel Levy and Andrew T. Young, February 2004.

3-04 **Network Effects and the Dynamics of Migration and Inequality: Theory and Evidence from Mexico**

David Mckenzie and Hillel Rapoport, March 2004.

4-04 **Migration Selectivity and the Evolution of Spatial Inequality**

Ravi Kanbur and Hillel Rapoport, March 2004.

5-04 **Many Types of Human Capital and Many Roles in U.S. Growth: Evidence from County-Level Educational Attainment Data**

Andrew T. Young, Daniel Levy and Matthew J. Higgins, March 2004.

6-04 **When Little Things Mean a Lot: On the Inefficiency of Item Pricing Laws**

Mark Bergen, Daniel Levy, Sourav Ray, Paul H. Rubin and Benjamin Zeliger, May 2004.

7-04 **Comparative Statics of Altruism and Spite**

Igal Milchtaich, June 2004.

8-04 **Asymmetric Price Adjustment in the Small: An Implication of Rational Inattention**

Daniel Levy, Haipeng (Allan) Chen, Sourav Ray and Mark Bergen, July 2004.

1-05 **Private Label Price Rigidity during Holiday Periods**

Georg Müller, Mark Bergen, Shantanu Dutta and Daniel Levy, March 2005.

2-05 **Asymmetric Wholesale Pricing: Theory and Evidence**

Sourav Ray, Haipeng (Allan) Chen, Mark Bergen and Daniel Levy, March 2005.

3-05 **Beyond the Cost of Price Adjustment: Investments in Pricing Capital**

Mark Zbaracki, Mark Bergen, Shantanu Dutta, Daniel Levy and Mark Ritson, May 2005.

4-05 **Explicit Evidence on an Implicit Contract**

Andrew T. Young and Daniel Levy, June 2005.

5-05 **Popular Perceptions and Political Economy in the Contrived World of Harry Potter**

Avichai Snir and Daniel Levy, September 2005.

6-05 **Growth and Convergence across the US: Evidence from County-Level Data (revised version)**

Matthew J. Higgins, Daniel Levy, and Andrew T. Young , September 2005.

1-06 **Sigma Convergence Versus Beta Convergence: Evidence from U.S. County-Level Data (revised version)**

Andrew T. Young, Matthew J. Higgins, and Daniel Levy, June 2006.

2-06 **Price Rigidity and Flexibility: Recent Theoretical Developments**

Daniel Levy, September 2006.

3-06 **The Anatomy of a Price Cut: Discovering Organizational Sources of the Costs of Price Adjustment**

Mark J. Zbaracki, Mark Bergen, and Daniel Levy, September 2006.

4-06 **Holiday Non-Price Rigidity and Cost of Adjustment**

Georg Müller, Mark Bergen, Shantanu Dutta, and Daniel Levy. September 2006.

2008-01 **Weighted Congestion Games With Separable Preferences**

Igal Milchtaich, October 2008.

2008-02 **Federal, State, and Local Governments: Evaluating their Separate Roles in US Growth**

Andrew T. Young, Daniel Levy, and Matthew J. Higgins, December 2008.

2008-03 **Political Profit and the Invention of Modern Currency**

Dror Goldberg, December 2008.

2008-04 **Static Stability in Games**

Igal Milchtaich, December 2008.

2008-05 **Comparative Statics of Altruism and Spite**

Igal Milchtaich, December 2008.

2008-06 **Abortion and Human Capital Accumulation: A Contribution to the Understanding of the Gender Gap in Education**

Leonid V. Azarnert, December 2008.

2008-07 **Involuntary Integration in Public Education, Fertility and Human Capital**

Leonid V. Azarnert, December 2008.

2009-01 **Inter-Ethnic Redistribution and Human Capital Investments**

Leonid V. Azarnert, January 2009.

2009-02 **Group Specific Public Goods, Orchestration of Interest Groups and Free Riding**

Gil S. Epstein and Yosef Mealem, January 2009.

2009-03 **Holiday Price Rigidity and Cost of Price Adjustment**

Daniel Levy, Haipeng Chen, Georg Müller, Shantanu Dutta, and Mark Bergen, February 2009.

2009-04 **Legal Tender**

Dror Goldberg, April 2009.

2009-05 **The Tax-Foundation Theory of Fiat Money**

Dror Goldberg, April 2009.

2009-06 **The Inventions and Diffusion of Hyperinflatable Currency**

Dror Goldberg, April 2009.

2009-07 **The Rise and Fall of America's First Bank**

Dror Goldberg, April 2009.

2009-08 **Judicial Independence and the Validity of Controverted Elections**

Raphaël Franck, April 2009.

2009-09 **A General Index of Inherent Risk**

Adi Schnytzer and Sara Westreich, April 2009.

2009-10 **Measuring the Extent of Inside Trading in Horse Betting Markets**

Adi Schnytzer, Martien Lamers and Vasiliki Makropoulou, April 2009.

2009-11 **The Impact of Insider Trading on Forecasting in a Bookmakers' Horse Betting Market**

Adi Schnytzer, Martien Lamers and Vasiliki Makropoulou, April 2009.

2009-12 **Foreign Aid, Fertility and Population Growth: Evidence from Africa**

Leonid V. Azarnert, April 2009.

2009-13 **A Reevaluation of the Role of Family in Immigrants' Labor Market Activity: Evidence from a Comparison of Single and Married Immigrants**

Sarit Cohen-Goldner, Chemi Gotlibovski and Nava Kahana, May 2009.

2009-14 **The Efficient and Fair Approval of "Multiple-Cost–Single-Benefit" Projects Under Unilateral Information**

Nava Kahanaa, Yosef Mealem and Shmuel Nitzan, May 2009.

2009-15 **Après nous le Déluge: Fertility and the Intensity of Struggle against Immigration**

Leonid V. Azarnert, June 2009.

2009-16 **Is Specialization Desirable in Committee Decision Making?**

Ruth Ben-Yashar, Winston T.H. Koh and Shmuel Nitzan, June 2009.

2009-17 **Framing-Based Choice: A Model of Decision-Making Under Risk**

Kobi Kriesler and Shmuel Nitzan, June 2009.

2009-18 **Demystifying the 'Metric Approach to Social Compromise with the Unanimity Criterion'**

Shmuel Nitzan, June 2009.