

INTEGRAL REPRESENTATION WITHOUT ADDITIVITY

BY

DAVID SCHMEIDLER

IMA Preprint Series # 77

June 1984

INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS AND ITS APPLICATIONS

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

514 Vincent Hall

206 Church Street S.E.

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

#	Author(s)	Title	#	Author(s)	Title
1		Workshop Summaries from the September 1982 workshop on Statistical Mechanics, Dynamical Systems and Turbulence	20	George R. Sell	Linearization and Global Dynamics
2	Raphael De laLlave	A Simple Proof of C. Siegel's Center Theorem	21	P. Constantin C. Foias	Global Lyapunov Exponents, Kaplan-Yorke Formulas and the Dimension of the Attractors for 2D Navier-Stokes Equations
3	H. Simpson, S. Spector	On Copositive Matrices and Strong Ellipticity for Isotropic Elastic Materials	22	Milan Mikiavcic	Stability for Semilinear Parabolic Equations with Noninvertible Linear Operator
4	George R. Sell	Vector Fields in the Vicinity of a Compact Invariant Manifold	23	P. Collet, H. Epstein	Perturbations of Geodesic Flows on Surfaces of Constant Negative Curvature and their Mixing Properties
5	Milan Mikiavcic	Non-linear Stability of Asymptotic Suction	24	J.E. Dunn, J. Serrin	On the Thermomechanics of Interstitial working
6	Hans Weinberger	A Simple System with a Continuum of Stable Inhomogeneous Steady States	25	Scott J. Spector	On the Absence of Bifurcation for Elastic Bars in Uniaxial Tension
7	Bau-Sen Du	Period 3 Bifurcation for the Logistic Mapping	26	W.A. Coppel	Maps on an Interval
8	Hans Weinberger	Optimal Numerical Approximation of a Linear Operator	27	James Kirkwood	Phase Transitions in the Ising Model with Traverse Field
9	L.R. Angel, D.F. Evans, B. Ninham	Three Component Ionic Microemulsions	28	Luis Magalhães	The Asymptotics of Solutions of Singularly Perturbed Functional Differential Equations: and Concentrated Delays are Different
10	D.F. Evans, D. Mitchell, S. Mukherjee, B. Ninham	Surfactant Diffusion; New Results and Interpretations	29	Charles Tresser	Homoclinic Orbits for Flow in R^3
11	Leif Arkenyrd	A Remark about the Final Aperiodic Regime for Maps on the Interval	30	Charles Tresser	About some Theorems by L.P. Sil'nikov
12	Luis Magalhães	Manifolds of Global Solutions of Functional Differential Equations	31	Michael Aizenmann	On the renormalized Coupling Constant and the Susceptibility in ϕ_4^2 Field theory and the Ising Model in Four Dimensions
13	Kenneth Meyer	Tori in Resonance	32	Gene Wayne	The KAM Theory of Systems with Short Range Interactions I
14	C. Eugene Wayne	Surface Models with Nonlocal Potentials: Upper Bounds	33	M. Slemrod J.E. Marsden	Temporal and Spatial Chaos in a Van der Waals Fluid due to Periodic Thermal Fluctuations
15	Kathy Perlick-Spector	On Stability and Uniqueness of Fluid Flow Through a Rigid Porous Medium	34	J. Kirkwood, C.E. Wayne	Percolation in Continuous Systems
16	George R. Sell	Smooth Linearization Near a Fixed Point	35	Luis Magalhães	Invariant Manifolds for Functional Differential Equations Close to Ordinary Differential Equations
17	David Wolking	A Nonlinear Stability Analysis of a Model Equation for Alloy Solidification	36	C. Eugene Wayne	The KAM Theory of Systems with Short Range Interactions II
18	Pierre Collet	Local C^∞ Conjugacy on the Julia Set for some Holomorphic Perturbations of $z \rightarrow z^2$	37	Jean De Canniere	Passive Quasi-Free States of the Noninteracting Fermi Gas
19	Henry C. Simpson Scott J. Spector	On the Modified Bessel Functions of the First Kind On Barrelling for a Material in Finite Elasticity	38	Elias C. Alfantis	Maxwell and van der Waals Revisited
			39	Elias C. Alfantis	On the Mechanics of Modulated Structures

INTEGRAL REPRESENTATION WITHOUT ADDITIVITY*

by David Schmeidler**

February 1984

Tel-Aviv University and IMA University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT

Let I be a norm-continuous functional on the space, B , of bounded Σ -measurable real valued functions on a set S , where Σ is an algebra of subsets of S . Define a set function v on Σ by: $v(E)$ equals the value of I at the indicator function of E . For each a in B let $J(a) = \int_{-\infty}^0 (v(a \geq \alpha) - v(S))d\alpha + \int_0^{\infty} v(a \geq \alpha)d\alpha$. Then $I = J$ on B if and only if $I(b + c) = I(b) + I(c)$ whenever $(b(s) - b(t))(c(s) - c(t)) \geq 0$ for all s and t in S .

* This paper together with "Subjective Probability and Expected Utility without Additivity" preempts my previous paper entitled "Subjective Probability without Additivity" (Temporary Title) (1982), The Foerder Institute for Economic Research, Tel-Aviv University.

** I am thankful to Jean-Francois Mertens for the reference to Choquet and to Dellacherie. Partial financial support from the Foerder Institute and NSF Grant No. SES-8026086, is gratefully acknowledged.

INTEGRAL REPRESENTATION WITHOUT ADDITIVITY

by David Schmeidler

1. INTRODUCTION

Let Σ denote a nonempty algebra of subsets of a set S , let $B(S, \Sigma)$, or B for short, denote the set of bounded, real valued, Σ -measurable functions on S , and let v denote a monotonic real valued function on Σ with $v(\emptyset) = 0$. Monotonicity means here that for any E and F in Σ , $E \subset F$ implies $v(E) \leq v(F)$. Since S is in Σ , it is assumed without loss of generality that $v(S) = 1$.

Choquet (1955), defined an integration operation with respect to the non-necessarily additive set function v . Given a nonnegative valued function a in B let,

$$I(a) = \int_S a dv = \int_0^{\infty} v(\{s \in S \mid a(s) \geq \alpha\}) d\alpha \quad (1)$$

where the integral on the right side is the extended Riemann integral.

Choquet was interested in capacities and he imposed several additional restrictions on Σ and on v . He dealt with a sigma algebra generated by the compact subsets of a metrisable compact topological space S , and with a strongly subadditive, and continuous at countable monotonic unions and intersections, set function v . These additional conditions are omitted here.

If every subset E of S is identified with its indicator function E^* , then the functional I extends v from Σ to B_+ the nonnegative functions in B . This extension is monotonic and positively homogeneous of degree one (i.e., $a \geq b$ on S implies $I(a) \geq I(b)$ and $I(\lambda a) = \lambda I(a)$ for $\lambda > 0$). Two functions a and b in B are said to be comonotonic if $(a(s) - a(t))(b(s) - b(t)) \geq 0$ for all s and t in S . Dellacherie (1970)

proved that $I(a + b) = I(a) + I(b)$ for comonotonic a and b in B_+ .
(There is a correctable mistake in his proof).

In this paper we investigate the opposite direction, i.e., when a monotonic functional, say I , which is additive on comonotonic functions, can be represented through an integration operation as in (1) with respect to a monotonic set function ν , defined by $\nu(E) = I(E^*)$ on Σ . Our motivation stems from the foundations of Bayesian decision theory and subjective probability. Within this framework an element a in B is interpreted as an uncertain payoff; $a(s)$ is the payoff or utility to the decision maker if the "state of nature" s in S occurs. The primitive concept is a binary relation over B , the decision maker's preferences between uncertain payoffs. Such a preference relation can be represented by a functional, say I , on B : i.e., a stand in the binary relation to b iff $I(a) \geq I(b)$. Formula (1) is interpreted as an expectation operation with respect to not necessarily additive probabilities.

The main result is stated and proved in the next section. Section 3 presents a variant of the main result useful for applications and a generalization to nonmonotonic set functions.

2. THE MAIN RESULT

THEOREM: Let $I : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $I(S^*) = 1$ be given.

Suppose also that the functional I satisfies:

- (i) Comonotonic additivity a and b comonotonic imply $I(a + b) = I(a) + I(b)$. (Hence $I(0) = 0$).
- (ii) Monotonicity. $a \geq b$ on S implies $I(a) \geq I(b)$.

Then, defining $\nu(E) = I(E^*)$ on Σ we have for all a in B :

$$I(a) = \int_0^{\infty} \nu(a \geq \alpha) d\alpha + \int_{-\infty}^0 (\nu(a \geq \alpha) - 1) d\alpha \quad (2)$$

Remark 1: A functional on B satisfying comonotonic additivity and monotonicity also satisfies homogeneity (of degree 1). For a positive rational number α , $I(\alpha a) = \alpha I(a)$ is implied by comonotonic additivity. The monotonicity assumption which is also a continuity assumption implies, in turn, the above equality for an arbitrary nonnegative number α .

Remark 2: The number 1 appearing in formula (2) stands for $v(S) = I(S^*)$. It is 1 only because of our normalization, which can be done w.l.o.g. because of homogeneity of I .

Remark 3: The integrand in (2) can be referred to as the distribution of a w.r.t. to v . Formally we define for a in b its distribution $a^* : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by,

$$a^*(\alpha) = \begin{cases} v(a \geq \alpha) & \alpha \geq 0 \\ v(a \geq a) - v(S) & \alpha < 0 \end{cases}$$

If a is nonnegative then $a^*(\alpha) = 0$ for all negative α , and formulas (1) and (2) coincide. If θ is a negative lower bound of a then $a^*(\alpha) = 0$ for $\alpha \leq \theta$. If μ is an upper bound of a then formula (2) is equivalent to; $I(a) = \int_{\theta}^{\mu} a^*(\alpha) d\alpha$. We show now that (2) is implied by (1).

Since a and any constant function are comonotonic we have

$$I(a - \theta S^*) = I(a) + I(-\theta S)$$

On the other hand we claim that

$$\int_{\theta}^{\mu - \theta} (a - \theta S^*)^*(\alpha) d\alpha = \int_{\theta}^{\mu} a^*(\beta) d\beta - \theta$$

because $(a - \theta S^*)(\alpha) = v(a - \theta \geq \alpha) = v(a \geq \alpha + \theta)$, and denoting $\alpha + \theta = \beta$, $v(a \geq \beta) = a^*(\beta)$ for $\beta \geq 0$ and $v(a \geq \beta) - 1 = a^*(\beta)$ for $\beta < 0$. So, formula (2) is implied by formula (1).

Proof of the Theorem: As a conclusion of the remarks above it suffices to prove formula (1) for nonnegative functions. Suppose that (1) holds for all finite step functions and we prove it for an arbitrary nonnegative Σ -measurable function a bounded by, say λ . For $n = 1, 2, \dots$ and $1 \leq k \leq 2^n$ define $E_n^k = \{s \in S \mid \lambda(k-1)/2^n < a(s) \leq \lambda k/2^n\}$, and define $a_n(s) = \lambda(k-1)/2^n$ and $b_n(s) = \lambda k/2^n$ for s in E_n^k . So

$$a_n(s) \leq a_{n+1}(s) \leq a(s) \leq b_{n+1}(s) \leq b_n(s)$$

for all s and n . By monotonicity assumption $I(a_n) \leq I(a) \leq I(b_n)$ and by comonotonic additivity, $0 \leq I(b_n) - I(a_n) = \lambda/2^n \rightarrow 0$ with $n \rightarrow \infty$.

By our assumption about set functions $I(a_n) = \int_0^\lambda v(a_n \geq \alpha) d\alpha$ and

$I(b_n) = \int_0^\lambda v(b_n \geq \alpha) d\alpha$ for all n . Hence in order to prove that

$I(a) = \int_0^\lambda v(a \geq \alpha) d\alpha$ it is enough to show the inequality below for all n :

$$\int_0^\lambda v(a_n \geq \alpha) d\alpha \leq \int_0^\lambda v(a \geq \alpha) d\alpha \leq \int_0^\lambda v(b_n \geq \alpha) d\alpha$$

However this inequality follows from:

$$v(a_n \geq \alpha) \leq v(a \geq \alpha) \leq v(b_n \geq \alpha)$$

which in turn follows from the monotonicity of v and the definitions of a_n and b_n for $n = 1, 2, \dots$.

Proof for Step Functions. The proof is carried out by induction on the number of steps different from zero. Every nonnegative function a in B , which is not identically zero, has a unique representation $a = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i E_i^*$ for some k where $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2 > \dots > \alpha_k > 0$ and the sets $E_i, i = 1, \dots, k$ are pairwise disjoint and nonempty. For such a step function a we have, defining $\alpha_{k+1} = 0$:

$$\int_0^{\alpha_1} v(a \geq \alpha) d\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^k (\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}) v\left(\sum_{j=1}^i E_j\right) \quad (3)$$

The induction hypothesis is that for $k < n$

$$I(a) = \sum_{i=1}^k (\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}) v\left(\sum_{j=1}^i E_j\right) \quad (4)$$

and we prove it for $k = n$. Note that for $k = 1$ it says $I(\alpha E^*) = \alpha v(E)$ which holds because of the homogeneity of I and the definition of the set function v .

Given $a = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i E_i^*$ as above, $a = b + c$ where $b = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (\alpha_i - \alpha_k) E_i^*$ and $c = \alpha_k \left(\sum_{i=1}^k E_i\right)^*$. By the induction hypothesis, ($k - 1 < n$),

$$I(b) = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} ((\alpha_i - \alpha_k) - (\alpha_{i+1} - \alpha_1)) v\left(\sum_{j=1}^i E_j\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}) v\left(\sum_{j=1}^i E_j\right) \quad \text{and}$$

$$I(c) = \alpha_k v\left(\sum_{j=1}^k E_j\right).$$

So, $I(b) + I(c) = \sum_{i=1}^k (\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}) v\left(\sum_{j=1}^i E_j\right)$. On the other hand, since b and c are comonotonic, $I(a) = I(b) + I(c)$ and formula (4) for $k = n$ has been proved.

Q.E.D.

Remark 4: The opposite direction to the Theorem asserts that if a functional I is defined by formula (2) with respect to some monotonic set function, then it satisfies conditions (i) and (ii) of the Theorem. The proof of this direction is quite easily obtained by reversing the proof of the Theorem.

More specifically: if a functional I on $B(S, \Sigma)$ is defined by (2) for some monotonic ν one has to prove that it is comonotonically additive and monotonic. Monotonicity of I is obvious since, $a \geq b$ on S implies $a^* \geq b^*$ on R .

Comonotonic additivity is first shown for finite step functions in B . To see this and for future reference two immediate claims are stated without proofs.

CLAIM 1: Two finite step functions b and c in $B(S, \Sigma)$ are comonotonic iff there are: an integer k , a partition of S into k pairwise disjoint elements of Σ , $(E_i)_{i=1}^k$ and two k -lists of numbers $\beta_1 \geq \beta_2 \geq \dots \geq \beta_k$ and $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2 \geq \dots \geq \gamma_k$ such that $b = \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i E_i^*$ and $c = \sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i E_i^*$.

CLAIM 2: Let $(E_i)_{i=1}^k$ be a Σ -measurable finite partition of S ($i \neq j$ then $E_i E_j = \phi$), and let $a = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i E_i^*$ with $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_k$. Then for any set function $\nu : \Sigma \rightarrow R$ with $\nu(\phi) = 0$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} a_V^*(\alpha) d\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^k (\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}) \nu\left(\sum_{j=1}^i E_j\right) \quad (5)$$

(The distribution of a w.r. to ν , a^* , is defined in Remark 3 above and $\alpha_{k+1} = 0$).

Clearly if $I(a)$ is defined by left side of (5) for finite step functions, then (5) and Claim 1 imply additivity for comonotonic finite step functions. The extension to any comonotonic functions in B is done as usually by computing appropriate limits.

Remark 5: It is obvious that the Theorem and its converse hold if B is substituted with B_0 , the set of all finite step functions in B .

Remark 6: If $I : B_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies comonotonic additivity and monotonicity it has a unique extension to all of B which satisfies comonotonic additivity and monotonicity on B .

The proof is immediate since B is the (sup) norm closure of B_0 in \mathbb{R}^S (see Dunford Schwartz, 1957, p. 240), and monotonicity implies norm continuity.

3. EXTENSIONS

Let $B(S, \Sigma, K)$, $B(K)$ for short, denote the set of functions in B with values in $K \subset \mathbb{R}$, and suppose that $[-1, 1] \subset K$ and K convex. A corollary to the Theorem is now stated. It is applicable to the neo-Bayesian model (Schmeidler 1984).

COROLLARY: Let $I : B(K) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given such that:

(i) For all λ in $K : I(\lambda S^*) = \lambda$

(ii) If a, b and c are pairwise comonotonic, $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $I(a) > I(b)$, then $I(\alpha a + (1-\alpha)c) > I(\alpha b + (1-\alpha)c)$

(iii) If $a \geq b$ on S then $I(a) \geq I(b)$

Then, defining $v(E) = I(E^*)$ on Σ , we have for all a in $B(K)$, as in (2):

$$I(a) = \int_{-\infty}^0 (v(a > \alpha) - 1) d\alpha + \int_0^{\infty} v(a > \alpha) d\alpha$$

Proof: The idea of the proof is to extend I to all of B and to show that the conditions of the Theorem are satisfied.

Because of (i) I is homogeneous on $B(K)$ and, by homogeneity, it can be uniquely extended to a homogeneous functional on B . The extension is also denoted by I . Once again by homogeneity (and by (iii)) the extended functional I satisfies (iii), i.e. monotonicity on all of B . Comonotonic

additivity of I on B is implied by the following Lemma and, it goes without saying, by homogeneity.

LEMMA: Given the conditions of the Corollary, let a and b in $B(k)$ be comonotonic with values in $[-1 + \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon]$ for some $\epsilon > 0$ and let $0 < \lambda < 1$.

Then $I(\lambda a + (1-\lambda)b) = \lambda I(a) + (1-\lambda)I(b)$.

Proof: Denote $I(a) = \alpha$ and $I(b) = \beta$. By a condition of the Lemma, and by (i) and (iii) (of the Corollary), αS^* and βS^* are in $B(k)$, $I(\alpha S^*) = \alpha$ and $I(\beta S^*) = \beta$.

We have to prove that $I(\lambda a + (1-\lambda)b) = \lambda \alpha + (1-\lambda)\beta$. Suppose, per absurdum, that $I(\lambda a + (1-\lambda)b) > \lambda \alpha + (1-\lambda)\beta$. (The case of the other inequality is treated similarly).

Let $0 < \delta < \epsilon$; then by (i), $I(a) < I((\alpha+\delta)S^*)$ and $I(b) < I((\beta+\delta)S^*)$.

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \alpha + (1-\lambda)\beta + \delta &= I(\lambda(\alpha+\delta)S^* + (1-\lambda)(\beta+\delta)S^*) > \\ I(\lambda a + (1-\lambda)(\beta+\delta)S^*) &> I(\lambda a + (1-\lambda)b). \end{aligned}$$

The equality holds by (i) and each of the two inequalities is implied by (ii). Since the inequality above holds for any δ , ($0 < \delta < \epsilon$), we get the required contradiction.

Q.E.D.

Remark 1: The Corollary holds if $B(K)$ is substituted with $B_0(K)$, the set of bounded, Σ -measurable finite step functions on S with values in K . Same is true for the Lemma.

PROPOSITION 1: Suppose that $I : B_0 \rightarrow R$ satisfies comonotonic additivity and positive homogeneity of degree 1. Then, defining $v(E) = I(E^*)$ on Σ , we have for all a in B_0

$$I(a) = \int_{-\infty}^0 (v(a \geq \alpha) - v(S))d\alpha + \int_0^{\infty} v(a \geq \alpha)d\alpha \quad (6)$$

PROPOSITION 2: Suppose that $I : B \rightarrow R$ satisfies comonotonic additivity and norm continuity. Then (6) above holds for all a in B .

Proofs: Remark 3 in Section 2 and the proof for (finite) Step Functions do not use monotonicity of I or v , except to obtain homogeneity of I , which is assumed in Proposition 1 and implied by the continuity assumed in Proposition 2. Hence Proposition 1 holds and in order to prove Proposition 2 we have to extend it from finite step functions to bounded functions in B . We can not use directly the Proof of the Theorem because it heavily relies on monotonicity. However, because of Remark 3 we can restrict the proof to nonnegative functions.

So, let a in B be given with values in the interval $[0, \lambda]$.

First it is proved that the Riemann integral $\int_0^{\lambda} a^*(\alpha)d\alpha$ exists.

Otherwise there is an $\bar{\epsilon} > 0$ such that for every n there is a partition of $[0, \lambda]$ to k_n intervals $\lambda = \lambda_0 > \lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \dots > \lambda_{k_n} = 0$ with

$\lambda_{i-1} - \lambda_i < 1/2^n$, $\bar{\lambda}_i$ and $\underline{\lambda}_i$ in $]\lambda_{i-1}, \lambda_i]$ and $a^*(\bar{\lambda}_i) \geq a^*(\underline{\lambda}_i)$ for all i such that $\sum_i a^*(\bar{\lambda}_i)(\lambda_{i-1} - \lambda_i) - \sum_i a^*(\underline{\lambda}_i)(\lambda_{i-1} - \lambda_i) > \bar{\epsilon}$.

For every n two step functions are defined on S : $a_n(s) = \underline{\lambda}_i$ for s in $]\bar{\lambda}_{i-1}, \bar{\lambda}_i]$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k_n$. Hence $a_n(s) - a(s) \leq 1/2^n$ and $b_n(s) - a(s) < 1/2^n$ on S . Continuity of I implies then:

$I(a_n) \rightarrow I(a)$ and $I(b_n) \rightarrow I(a)$ that is $I(a_n) - I(b_n) \rightarrow 0$.

On the other hand by Proposition 1 and by definition of a_n

$$I(a_n) = \int_0^\lambda v(a_n \geq \alpha) d\alpha = \sum_i a^*(\lambda_i)(\lambda_{i-1} - \lambda_i) \quad \text{and similarly} \quad I(b_n) = \int_0^\lambda v(b_n \geq \alpha) d\alpha = \sum_i a^*(\lambda_i)(\lambda_{i-1} - \lambda_i).$$

Thus $|I(a_n) - I(b_n)| > \bar{\epsilon}$ for all n , a contradiction.

As a conclusion we get that $\int_0^\lambda a^*(\alpha) d\alpha$ exists. Furthermore, for every $\epsilon > 0$ there is n_ϵ such that for all $n > n_\epsilon$: $|\sum_i a^*(\lambda_i)(\lambda_{i-1} - \lambda_i) - \int_0^\lambda a^*(\alpha) d\alpha| < \epsilon$ i.e. $|I(a_n) - \int_0^\lambda a^*(\alpha) d\alpha| < \epsilon$. Since continuity of I implies $I(a_n) \rightarrow I(a)$, $I(a) = \int_0^\lambda a^*(\alpha) d\alpha$.

Q.E.D.

REFERENCES

- Choquet G. (1955), "Theory of Capacities", Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble, 5, 131-295.
- Dellacherie C. (1970), "Quelques Commentaires sur les Prolongements de Capacites", Seminaire de Probabilites V Strasbourg, Springer Verlag (Lecture Notes in Math. 191).
- Dunford N. and J.T. Schwartz (1957), Linear Operators Part I, Interscience, New York.
- Schmeidler, D. (1984), "Subjective Probability and Expected Utility Without Additivity".

Recent IMA Preprints (continued)

#	Author(s)	Title	#	Author(s)	Title
40	William Ruckle	The Strong ϕ Topology on Symmetric Sequence Spaces	60	Rafael Rob	The Coase Theorem an Informational Perspective
41	Charles R. Johnson	A Characterization of Borda's Rule Via Optimization	61	Joseph Jerome	Approximate Newton Methods and Homotopy for Stationary Operator Equations
42	Hans Weinberger Kazuo Kishimoto	The Spatial Homogeneity of Stable Equilibria of Some Systems on Convex Domains	62	Rafael Rob	A Note on Competitive Bidding with Asymmetric Information
43	K.A. Pericak-Spector W.O. Williams	On Work and Constraints in Mixtures	63	Rafael Rob	Equilibrium Price Distributions
44	H. Rosenberg, E. Toubiana	Some Remarks on Deformations of Minimal Surfaces	64	William Ruckle	The Linearization Projection, Global Theories
45	Stephan Pelikan	The Duration of Transients	65	Russell Johnson Kenneth Palmer George R. Sell	Ergodic Properties of Linear Dynamical Systems
46	V. Capasso, K.L. Cooke, M. Witten	Random Fluctuations of the Duration of Harvest	66	Stanley Reiter	How a Network of Processors can Schedule Its Work
47	E. Fabes D. Stroock	The LP-intergrability of Green's functions and fundamental solutions for elliptic and parabolic equations	67	R.N. Goldman D.C. Heath	Linear Subdivision is Strictly a Polynomial Phenomenon
48	H. Brezis	Semilinear Equations in R^N without conditions at infinity	68	R. Giachetti R. Johnson	The Floquet Exponent for Two-dimensional Linear Systems with Bounded Coefficients
49	M. Slemrod	Lax-Friedrichs and the Viscosity-Capillarity Criterion	69	S. Williams	Realization and Nash Implementation: Two Aspects of Mechanism Design
50	C. Johnson, W. Barrett	Spanning Tree Extensions of the Hadamard-Fischer Inequalities	70	S. Williams	Sufficient Conditions for Nash Implementation
51	Andrew Postlewaite, David Schmeidler	Revelation and Implementation under Differential Information	71	William Zame	Equilibria in Banach Lattices Without Ordered Preferences
52	Paul Blanchard	Complex Analytic Dynamics on the Riemann Sphere	72	W. Harris Y. Sibuya	The Reciprocals of Solutions of Linear Ordinary Differential Equations
53	G. Levitt, H. Rosenberg	Topology and Differentiability of Labyrinths in the Disc and Annulus	73	S. Pelikan	A Dynamical Meaning of Fractal Dimension
54	G. Levitt, H. Rosenberg	Symmetry of Constant Mean Curvature Hypersurfaces in Hyperbolic Space	74	D. Heath W. Sudderth	Continuous-Time Portfolio Management: Minimizing the Expected time to Reach A G
55	Ennio Stacchetti	Analysis of a Dynamic, Decentralized Exchange Economy	75	J.S. Jordan	Information Flows Intrinsic to the Stability of Economic Equilibrium
56	Henry Simpson Scott Spector	On Failure of the Complementing Condition and Nonuniqueness in Linear Elastostatics	76	J. Jerome	An Adaptive Newton Algorithm Based on Numerical Inversion: Regularization Post Condition
57	Craig Tracy	Complete Integrability in Statistical Mechanics and the Yang-Baxter Equations			
58	Tongren Ding	Boundedness of Solutions of Duffing's Equation			
59		Abstracts for the Workshop on Price Adjustment, Quantity Adjustment, and Business Cycles			