

(3) $(\mathcal{B}, C(\cdot))$.

with $\mathcal{B} = \{\{x, y\}, \{x, y, z\}\}$

and $C(\{x, y\}) = \{x\}$.

Prove that if $(\mathcal{B}, C(\cdot))$ satisfies WARP, then it must hold.

$$C(\{x, y, z\}) = \{x\} \text{ or } = \{z\} \text{ or } = \{x, z\}.$$

Reminder: WARP. Weak Axiom of Revealed Preference.

$(\mathcal{B}, C(\cdot))$ satisfies the WARP. iff:

if for some $B \in \mathcal{B}$.

$x, y \in B$ and $x \in C(B)$.

then for any $B' \in \mathcal{B}$ with $x, y \in B'$,
we must also have $x \in C(B')$

⊕. remember that $C(\cdot)$, the "choice rule" assigns a non-empty set.

(108)

Reminder. The choice structure $(D(A))$.
 "reveals" a pref. rel. \succeq^x defined by.

$$x \succeq^x y \iff \exists B \in \mathcal{D} \text{ with } xy \in B \text{ and } x \in C(B).$$

x is "revealed preferred to" y .
 (at least).

Call it
 violate

the WARP.

x is "revealed strictly preferred to" y .
 if $\exists B \in \mathcal{D}$ with $xy \in B$, $x \in C(B)$
 and $y \notin C(B)$!

WARP = " If $x \succeq^x y$ (ie x is revealed. (at least.) preferred to y)
 then $y \not\succeq^x x$. (ie y cannot be revealed. strictly preferred to x).

$$\text{WARP} \equiv x \succeq^x y \implies y \not\succeq^x x.$$

So assume $\mathcal{D} = \{E_{x,y}, E_{x,y,z}\}$.

and $C(E_{x,y}) = \{x\}$.

\Downarrow
This means $\forall B \in \mathcal{D}$ (in this case $E_{x,y}$)
with $x, y \in B$, $x \in C(B)$ and
 $y \notin C(B)$.

$\implies x \succ^* y$. (x revealed strictly preferred to y.)

\Updownarrow
($x \succeq^* y$ and $x \not\prec^* y$). (*)

For the WARP to be satisfied by the choice structure $(\mathcal{D}, C(\cdot))$, we must not "reveal" inconsistencies, i.e. there cannot be:

~~$y \in C(E_{x,y,z})$~~ . (otherwise, we would have $y \succeq^* x$ which would contradict (*).)

But $C(E_{x,y,z})$ cannot be empty,

so we must have:

either $x \in C(E_{x,y,z})$ or $y \in C(E_{x,y,z})$
or both \square

(14) Let $x(p, w)$ = demand of the consumer.

s.t. $x_i(p, w) = \frac{w}{p_1 + p_2} \quad i = 1, 2.$

- a) prove that this demand is homogeneous of deg 0.
- b) prove that it satisfies Walras' law.
- c) Sketch the Weak axiom of revealed pref. (WARP) in the framework of the demand.
- d) Prove that this demand satisfies WARP.

Proof: (a) Let $d > 0 \quad \forall i = 1, 2.$

$$x_i(d p, d w) = \frac{d w}{d p_1 + d p_2} = \frac{w}{p_1 + p_2} = x_i(p, w) \cdot \underbrace{d^0}_{=1}.$$

\implies so $x(p, w)$ is homogeneous of deg 0. □

d)
$$p \cdot x(p, w) = p_1 x_1(p, w) + p_2 x_2(p, w).$$

$$= \frac{p_1 w}{p_1 + p_2} + \frac{p_2 w}{p_1 + p_2} = w.$$

\implies so $x(p, w)$ satisfies Walras' law. □ Prop.

c) Show that the Walrasian demand function $x(p, w)$ satisfies WARP iff $\forall (p, w)$ and (p', w') :

$$p \cdot x(p', w') \leq w \text{ and } x(p', w') \neq x(p, w)$$

$$\implies p' \cdot x(p, w) > w'$$

Proof: $x(p, w)$ specifies the choice.

$$C(B_{p, w}) = x(p, w) = \text{set of } x \text{ in } B_{p, w} \text{ which are preferred to all others.}$$

= affordable bundles given $p \gg 0$ and $w > 0$.

Assume. $p \cdot x(p', w') \leq w$,
it means that. $x(p', w') \in B_{p, w}$.

Assume. $x(p', w') \neq x(p, w)$

\implies thus we have $x(p, w) \succ^* x(p', w')$

$x(p', w')$ and $x(p, w) \in B_{p, w}$ and \nearrow revealed strictly preferred to ...

because.
($x \succ^* x'$
and $x' \not\succeq^* x$.)

Thus, by WARP, we cannot have.

$$x(p', w') \text{ and } x(p, w) \in B_{p', w'}$$

$$\text{and } x(p', w') = C(B_{p', w'})$$

But. $x(p', w') \in B_{p', w'}$ and $x(p', w') = C(B_{p', w'})$
are both TRUE.

so. $x(p, w) \in B_{p', w'}$ must be FALSE.

□.

ie | we must have. $p' \cdot x(p, w) > w'$ |

--- c). So the WARP in the framework of the demand is.

$$\boxed{p \cdot x(p', w') \leq w \text{ and } x(p', w') \neq x(p, w) \implies p' \cdot x(p, w) > w'}$$

d). $x_i(p', w') = \frac{w'}{p_1' + p_2'}$. $i = 1, 2$.

So. $p \cdot x(p', w') \leq w$

$$\iff p_1 \frac{w'}{p_1' + p_2'} + p_2 \frac{w'}{p_1' + p_2'} \leq w.$$

$$\iff \boxed{(p_1 + p_2) w' \leq w \cdot (p_1' + p_2')} \quad (*)$$

And. $x(p, w) \neq x(p', w') \iff \frac{w'}{p_1' + p_2'} \neq \frac{w}{p_1 + p_2}$.

\implies . (*) is strict!

ie. $(p_1 + p_2) w' < w (p_1' + p_2')$.

$$\iff w' < (p_1' + p_2') \frac{w}{p_1 + p_2} = p' \cdot x(p, w).$$

$$\text{ie. } \boxed{p' \cdot x(p, w) > w'}$$

□.