Generalized Oligarchies

by Melvin F. Janowitz

DIMACS, Rutgers University
Piscataway, NJ 08854

American Mathematical Society Meeting #1092
at University of Louisville
October 5-6, 2013
Internet version:
http: // home.dimacs.rutgers.edu/∼melj/amstalktr.pdf

Background

L is a finite lattice.

Partially ordered set.

All a, b have a join ($a \vee b$) and meet ($a \wedge b$).

L represents possible actions or decisions.

$$L^n = L \times L \times \cdots \times L \ (n \text{ factors})$$

Defn: A profile $\pi = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$.

Idea: You are getting advice from n experts.

Entry x_i is advice from expert i.

Defn: A consensus function is a mapping $F\colon L^n \to L$.

$F(\pi)$ yields the summary advice.

Can think of L as representing partitions of a set, or weak orders, or at least three atoms representing choices with added 0 and 1.

These are all atomistic simple finite lattices.

atom: An element that covers 0.

atomistic: Every element is join of atoms.

simple: Only trivial congruences.

Conditions to Consider

$F\colon L^n \to L$ where L is a finite atomistic lattice.
$J =$ set of atoms.
Terminology:
For profile π and $a \in L$, define $N_a(\pi) = \{i\colon a \le \pi(i)\}$.
For $x \in L$, $\pi_x = (x, x, \ldots, x)$.
Define F^0 by $F^0(\pi) = 0$ for all profiles π.
Paretian: $N_a(\pi) = N \Rightarrow a \le F(\pi)$.
Decisive: If $N_a(\pi) = N_a(\pi')$, then $a \le F(\pi) \Leftrightarrow a \le F(\pi')$.
Neutral monotone: For $a, a' \in L$, if $N_a(\pi) \subseteq N_{a'}(\pi')$,
then $a \le F(\pi) \Rightarrow a' \le F(\pi')$.
Oligarchy: $\exists M \subseteq N$ such that $F(\pi) = \bigwedge\{\pi(j)\colon j \in M\}$.
Think of appointing a committee M that jointly acts as a dictator.
Residual map $F(\pi_1) = 1$ and F is a meet homomorphism.

Fundamental Theorem

Theorem: (Leclerc and Monjardet) L is a finite simple atomistic lattice with cardinality > 2. $F\colon L^n \to L$. Following are equivalent:

1. F is decisive and Paretian.
2. F is neutral monotone but not F^0.
3. F is a meet homomorphism and $F(\pi) \geq \bigwedge_j \{\pi(j)\}\ \forall \pi$.
4. F is a residual map and $F(\pi_a) \geq a$ for all atoms a.
5. F is an oligarchy.

From *Aggregation and Residuation*, Order **30**, 2013, 261–268.
Wish to extend this to direct products of simple lattices.
Inspiration: Boston Marathon bombing, or weather events like Hurricane Sandy or the World Trade Center attack.

Finite Atomistic Lattice L

Motivation: Want to apply Oligarchies to several problems at the same time. They may or may not independently reach their decisions.

External idea: Take $L_1, L_2, \ldots, L_k$ to be finite nondistributive atomistic simple lattices, with $L = L_1 \times L_2 \times \cdots \times L_k$.

Define consensus functions F_i on L_i each with the same value of n.

Let π_i be profile on $(L_i)^n$ for each i with $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_k)$.

Define $F\colon L^n \to L$ by $F(\pi) = (F_1(\pi_1), F_2(\pi_2), \ldots, F_k(\pi_k))$.

More Terminology:

Defn: For $a, b \in L$, write $a \nabla b$ if $(a \vee x) \wedge b = x \wedge b \; \forall x$.

Defn: For a, b atoms write $a \delta b$ if $a \neq b$ and for some $x \in L$, $a < b \vee x$ and $a, b \not\leq x$.

∇ and δ:

Fact: For a, b distinct atoms, $a \nabla b$ fails $\Leftrightarrow$ $b \delta a$.

Proof: $(a \vee x) \wedge b > x \wedge b$ means $b \leq a \vee x$ and $b \not\leq x$.

Let δ^t denote transitive closure of δ.

Fact: L is simple iff every pair of atoms is connected by δ^t.

Defn: s in a lattice is standard if $\forall x, y$,
$(s \vee x) \wedge y = (s \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge y)$. s induces a congruence Θ_s by $x \Theta_s y$ if $x \vee y = (x \wedge y) \vee s_1$ for some $s_1 \leq s$.

Fact: Every congruence on a finite atomistic lattice is generated by a standard element.

Fact: If ∇ is symmetric, then every congruence is generated by a central element z.

Defn: z is central iff it has a complement z' and L is isomorphic to $[0, z] \times [0, z']$ under the mapping $x \mapsto (x \wedge z, x \wedge z')$.

Theorem: If ∇ is symmetric, then L is the direct product of simple atomistic lattices.

Generalized oligarchies

$F \colon L^n \to L$ where L is a finite atomistic lattice that is a direct product of k simple lattice each with cardinalty ≥ 3.

Let $z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_k$ be the atoms of the center of L, so each $[0, z_i]$ is simple.

Defn:For each profile π, let $\pi_i = \pi \wedge \pi_{z_i}$.

Defn:For each z_i, define F_i on $[0, z_i]$ by $F_i(\pi_i) = F(\pi) \wedge z_i$.

If $\pi_i = \pi'_i \, \forall i$, then $\pi = \pi'$, and there is no issue. For this to make sense for a single index i, need F summand compatible in that $\pi_i = \pi'_i$ implies $F(\pi) \wedge z_i = F(\pi') \wedge z_i$.

Lemma: If $F(\pi \wedge \pi_{z_i}) = F(\pi) \wedge F(\pi_{z_i})$ and $F(\pi_{z_i}) \geq z_i$,
or if F is neutral monotone and not F^0,
or if $F(\pi_{z_i}) = z_i \, \forall i$,
then F is summand compatible.

Distributive simple atomistic lattices have cardinality ≤ 2, so L is the direct product of a Boolean lattice and some simple lattices each having cardinality > 2.

Theorem: (Improved result) L is a finite atomistic lattice that is the direct product of simple lattices each having cardinality > 2. $F\colon L^n \to L$. Following are equivalent:

1. F is decisive, Paretian and summand compatible.
2. F is neutral monotone but not F^0.
3. F is a meet homomorphism and $F(\pi) \geq \bigwedge_j \{\pi(j)\}\ \forall \pi$.
4. F is a residual map and $F(\pi_a) \geq a$ for all atoms a.
5. F is a *generalized oligarchy* in the sense that for every atom z_i of the center of L, each induced consensus function F_i defined on $[0, z_i]$ by $F_i(\pi \wedge \pi_{z_i}) = F(\pi) \wedge z_i$ is an oligarchy.

Future Projects

- Suppose there is a meet homomorphism from a finite atomistic lattice L onto a direct product of simple lattices each having cardinality > 2. What then?
- Does any of this extend to finite subdirect products of simple lattices, each having cardinality > 2.
- What about finite lattices that are not atomistic or atomistic but not ∇-symmetric?
- Does a lattice theoretic approach yield any insight into other consensus functions?

That's all Folks!