

PUZZLES IN COMPETITIVE EQUILIBRIUM ANALYSIS

- So far we have focused on competitive equilibrium analysis.
 - + But why?
 - + Why concentrate on equilibrium?
 - + Why assume competitive behaviour?
- Here we re-examine the basics of market interaction by agents.
- Let's start by having another look at the exchange economy.
- Ke'll redraw the Edgeworth box.













THE NATURE OF CE

- Given competitive behaviour, the CE is the only "consistent" allocation.
- Clearly the location of the CE depends upon the initial resource endowment [R].
- But why assume competitive behaviour?
- Why should Alf and Bill behave as price-takers?



HOW TO MAKE PROGRESS

- × It would be convenient to assume there is a big hand....
 - + ...given the prices the system almost solves itself
 + But we have to manage without the artificial construct.
 + How?
- × We need a more general solution concept.
- Base this on a broader concept of trading behaviour.
- We will describe the type of equilibrium associated with this concept.
- Then we examine how price-taking equilibrium relates to this.







THE IDEA OF BLOCKING: A STORY

- × One day you take your bundle to the "swap shop."
- Some bossy person there proposes (insists on?) a particular feasible allocation.
- × You and some others don't like the bundle you all get under this allocation.
- Your group finds that, just by using its own resources, you could all get as much or more utility as that offered under the proposed allocation.
- You guys therefore refuse to accept the proposal.
- × Your coalition has *blocked* the proposed allocation

A FORMAL APPROACH

- × Consider a proposed allocation for the economy $\hat{[\mathbf{x}]}$
- × A coalition
- $K \subseteq \{1, 2, ..., n_h\}$
- ★ An allocation [**x**] preferred by the coalition K: $\forall h \in K$: $U^h(\mathbf{x}^h) \ge U^h(\mathbf{x}^h)$, for some $h \in K$: $U^h(\mathbf{x}^h) > U^h(\mathbf{x}^h)$
- The allocation [x] of bundles is feasible for Kif:
- $\Sigma_{h \in K} \mathbf{X}^h \le \Sigma_{h \in K} \mathbf{R}^h$
- \star If there is a feasible, preferred bundle for K then
 - ... $[\mathbf{x}]$ is blocked by K
- An allocation is blocked by a coalition if the
- coalition members can do better for themselves

EQUILIBRIUM CONCEPT

- Solution Solution
- Surely no blocked allocation could be a solution to the trading game?
- So we use the following definition of a solution:
- The Core is the set of unblocked, feasible allocations.
- × Let's apply it in the two-trader case.

COALITIONS * In a 2-person world there are few coalitions: {AIf } {Bill} {AIf & Bill}

























A POWERFUL RESULT: THE SHRINKING CORE

- × As you clone the economy the core becomes smaller.
- × If you make *N* large enough you will find some coalition that blocks any non-CE allocation.
- × So in the limit the core contains only CE allocations.
- In a suitably large economy the core exactly equals the set of competitive equilibria.

THE SHRINKING CORE: DISCUSSION

- * The result rules out non-price-taking behaviour as a solution. But:
- There are some weasel words: "suitably large".
 + In principle N should be infinite
- Process requires balanced replication of the Alf and Bill tribes.
- + Problems arise if there is one large *b*-trader and many *a*-traders All possible coalitions are assumed relevant to
- negotiations about blocking. + Only valid if communication and other coalition costs are negligible. The Internet?
- We have argued only using an exchange economy. + Can be extended to production economies with CRTS and (with some difficulty) others too.

REVIEW Basic components of trading equilibrium: Coalitions Booking Booking Core as an equilibrium concept Core as an equilibrium concept Core as an equilibrium concept Station to CE Every CE must lie in the core How In the limit of a replication economy the core consists only in the limit of a replication economy the core consists only of CE Formation of CE Formati