

Ordered Conflict Resolution*

By

**D. Randall Jenkins, Ph.D.
5672 East Circulo Terra
Tucson, Arizona 85750
(520) 544-0472
Randall@PBWModel.Com
www.pbwmodel.com**

Copyright © 2006, by David Randall Jenkins, Ph.D. All rights reserved.

***This paper has been adapted from its academic journal submission form and has been interdisciplinary accounting and economics supplanted for presentation at the Eleventh Annual Ethics Research Symposium.**

Dedication: For the Precious Moments.

Abstract

The ancient philosophers who wrote scripture accomplished a feat in social choice theory Contemporary Economists have found to be generally impossible. The Scripture Writers' social choice theory model is defined by impossibility-resolved social welfare function formulation and social state definition interrelationships. Meanwhile, the Contemporary Economists' social choice theory models are defined by impossibility-plagued (tastes or values)-based social welfare functions.

Since social choice theory involves passing from individual well-being to societal well-being, and visa versa, it is reasonably foreseeable social choice theory model methodologies must pass from the (microeconomic: macroeconomic) perspective to the (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective, and visa versa. The Scripture Writers' ordered conflict resolution methodology demonstrates such perspectives must be equilibratorily aligned to effect (individual: societal) or (societal: individual) transitions. Therefore, equilibratory alignment is a social welfare function formulation and social state definition impossibility resolution necessary condition. This paper demonstrates the Scripture Writers' ordered conflict resolution methodology for achieving the essential equilibratory alignment condition.

The ordered conflict resolution methodology explained in this paper fundamentally underscores SW social choice theory model SWFF and SSD impossibility resolution. Accordingly, accounting research ought to revisit [(individual accounting information usefulness): (accounting policy formulation)] transitivity in the ordered conflict resolution methodology context.

Table of Contents

<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
Abstract	ii
I. Introduction	1
A. CE and SW Social Choice Theory Model Distinction	1
B. Accounting Research Implications	3
C. Paper Organization	4
II. Relations, the Confounding Principle, References and Generalization	4
A. Unordered Relations	4
B. Ordered Relations	5
C. The Confounding Principle	6
D. References	6
E. Generalization	7
1. Principle Ordered Relation Generalization	7
2. Principle Unordered Relation Generalization	7
III. Order Magnitude	8
A. The Quaternary Order	8
B. The Quaternary Order Relation Context	10
IV. Ordered Subjective References	12
A. The HP Unordered Subjective Reference	12
B. The HS Ordered Subjective Reference	13
C. The HT Ordered Subjective Reference	14
D. The HQ Ordered Subjective Reference	16
V. Ordered Objective References	18
A. The HP Unordered Objective Reference	18
B. The HS Ordered Objective Reference	19
C. The HT Ordered Objective Reference	20
D. The HQ Ordered Objective Reference	22
VI. Ordered (Subjective: Objective) Reference Transition	25
A. APPGIT	27
B. The APPGIT Constraint	28
C. APPGIT-Compliant Progression	31
D. Generalized APPGIT Principles	32
VI. Conclusion	34
<u>References</u>	35

Table of Contents

<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
<u>Figures & Tables</u>	
Figures	
Figure II.1 - The Unordered (X, Y) Relation	5
Figure II.2 - The [Z: (X, Y)] Ordered Relation	6
Figure II.3 - The Function Z	6
Figure II.4 - The Progression (X and Y)	7
Figure II.5 - The Position (X or Y)	8
Figure III.1 - The Quaternary Lower and Higher Orders	11
Figure III.2 - Actual Nation, Region, Village and Camp (VOW _n : VOW _{n+1}) Ordered Conflict Resolution Theatre	13
Figure IV.1 - The HP Camp PPPP Subjective Reference	14
Figure IV.2 - The Village PPP-ICV	16
Figure IV.3 - The Region PP-ICV	17
Figure IV.4 - The Nation P-ICV	19
Figure V.1 - The HP Camp PPPP Objective Reference	20
Figure V.2 - The Village PPP-EA	22
Figure V.3 - The Region PP-EA	23
Figure V.4 - The Nation P-EA	26
Figure VI.1 - The Within-Region PP ICVs.....	29
Figure VI.2 - The PPPP Camp Visitation Order	34
Tables	
Table III.1 - (VOW _n : VOW _{n+1}) _i Quaternary Order Exclusionary Prejudice Consequences	12

I INTRODUCTION

Social choice theory is generally viewed as embracing a sizable society's decision-making function. (Sen 1998). The haunting investigative question is whether cogent aggregative societal judgments can be derived through diverse individual preferences, concerns and judgments. (*Id*). Contemporary Economists (CE) claim social choice theory investigations are eighteenth century French mathematician pioneered [(Sen 1998); *citing*, (Borda 1781) and (Condorcet 1785)]. However, the philosophers who wrote scripture (Scripture Writers or SW) addressed the same social choice theory issues the CE face today; and did so thousands of years before Borda's and Condorcet's pioneering studies.¹

A. CE and SW Social Choice Theory Model Distinction

Both the CE and SW social choice theory models are predicated upon the interrelationship between social state definition (SSD) and social welfare function formulation (SWFF). The SW social choice theory model involves an impossibility-resolved SWFF and SSD interrelationship. Meanwhile, the CE tastes or values-based social welfare functions remain impossibility-plagued. (Sen, *supra*; *citing*, Arrow 1951, 1963). The model construct difference is that the SW recognize ordered conflict and ordered conflict resolution consequences; the CE do not.

The SW would contend root values-based SWFF impossibility is caused by the CE employment of unordered conflict resolution tactics (*i.e.*, ordered subjective references) in an ordered conflict environment. CE analyses characteristically involve two individuals and the

¹ Although the instant paper lacks the formal proof or reasoning that the scripture writers developed the ordered conflict resolution methodology herein described, the author represents the precepts set forth in this paper were adduced from studying scripture and credit for any perceived theoretical ingenuity this paper engenders belongs to the scripture writers.

conflict between their respective preference rankings of three social states. (Arrow 1951, 1963). Since the social states are interrelated in a social state definition hierarchical structure, the conflict is ordered. By relaxing the nondictatorship condition and imposing the independence of irrelevant alternatives condition, Arrow's possibility theorem is characterized as substantively employing unordered conflict resolution tactics in an ordered conflict environment.

The SW rationale for countenancing ordered conflict resolution in constructing a social choice theory model is straightforward. Since social choice theory involves passing from individual well-being to societal well-being, and visa versa, it is reasonably foreseeable social choice theory model methodologies must pass from the (microeconomic: macroeconomic) perspective to the (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective, and visa versa.

In the Scripture Writers' ordered conflict resolution methodology: (i) the (microeconomic: microeconomic) perspective is subjective characterized, (ii) the (microeconomic: macroeconomic) perspective is quasi-objective characterized, and (iii) the (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective is objective characterized. The (microeconomic: microeconomic) perspective is a higher order, ordered subjective reference consequence; the (microeconomic: macroeconomic) perspective is a higher order, ordered objective reference consequence; and, the (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective is a lower order, Equilibratory Alignment, consequence.

The Scripture Writers' ordered conflict resolution methodology demonstrates the (microeconomic: macroeconomic) and (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspectives must be equilibratorily aligned to effect (individual: societal) or (societal: individual) transitions. Therefore, equilibratory alignment is a social welfare function formulation and social state definition impossibility resolution necessary condition. This paper demonstrates the Scripture

Writers ordered conflict resolution methodology for achieving the essential equilibratory alignment condition. Future papers further address the SW social choice theory model and compare it to the CE taste and values-based social welfare function models.

B. Accounting Research Implications

Accounting research has broadly examined financial accounting public choice issues based on the social choice theory models of Arrow and the other CE. (Walker 1984: 278). Specifically, Beaver and Demski applied Arrow's impossibility theorem to the issue of whether the free market economy could realize a Pareto optimal financial reporting system. (*Id; citing*, Beaver and Demski 1974). Arrow's impossibility theorem has constrained accounting research inasmuch as anyone exploring the literature would be forced to conclude that social choice theory, in itself, offers no hope that there is a solution to the issue of public choice among financial reporting alternatives. (*Id; citing*, Cushing 1977).

Arrow's impossibility theorem has been applied in more specific accounting research contexts as well. Demski examined the consequence of Arrow's impossibility theorem on the formulation of normative accounting standards. (Demski 1973: 721; "There is no way of moving from complete and transitive preferences at the individual level to a group level complete and transitive notion of preferences that satisfies Arrow's conditions;" *citing*, Arrow, 1963). Beaver adopted Arrow's (SSD: SWFF) social state preference ranking structure and examined Arrow's conditions of reasonableness in considering security price research for accounting. (Beaver 1974).

The ordered conflict resolution methodology explained in this paper fundamentally underscores SW social choice theory model SWFF and SSD impossibility resolution. Accordingly, accounting research ought to revisit [(individual accounting information

usefulness): (accounting policy formulation)] transitivity in the ordered conflict resolution methodology context.

C. Paper Organization

This paper's organization is structured to help the reader grasp the Scripture Writers' ordered conflict resolution methodology. Thesis organization includes ordered relations and the Confounding Principle, order magnitude rationale, ordered subjective references, ordered objective references, and ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition.

II

ORDERED AND UNORDERED MODELS, RELATIONS, THE CONFOUNDING PRINCIPLE, REFERENCES AND CONFOUNDING PRINCIPLE GENERALIZATION

By recognizing models are inherently (Function: Progression: Position) defined, the SW came to recognize the distinction between unordered and ordered relations. Moreover, this recognition also transparently led the SW to recognize ordered and unordered models as they characterized the (SWFF, SSD) social choice theory interrelationship. While this paper's principle ordered conflict resolution methodology focus is the unordered model, the relationship between ordered and unordered models is briefly explained.

A. Ordered and Unordered Models

The difference between ordered and unordered characterization is tantamount to the (Any, Given) difference. An ordered characterization is "Any" state of the world analogous while an unordered characterization is "Given" state of the world analogous. For example, a condition that is individual intrinsic is characterized as unordered; whereas when the same condition is individual extrinsic it is characterized as ordered. Thus, (unordered: ordered) transitivity is (individual: societal) transitivity analogous.

1. Ordered Models

In the setting of the SW social choice theory model, an ordered model is (Function: Progression: Position) characterized; subject to the ordered objective reference constraint. That is, subjective references are ordered model irrelevant as only ordered objective references characterize the ordered model. The issue in question in the SW ordered model setting is equilibratory alignment. Equilibratory alignment involves the alignment of the descending (Macroeconomic: Microeconomic)-Perspective with the ascending (Microeconomic: Macroeconomic)-Perspective. As will be learnt herein, access to the (Macroeconomic: Microeconomic)-Perspective enables adducing the economic complement's actual consequences.

The economic complement is equilibratory alignment antithetical. The economic complement's actual consequences are the only empirically discernible consequences inasmuch as equilibratory alignment consequences are inherently subjective and cannot be characterized as empirically discernible. The empirically discernible economic complement's actual consequences define what the equilibratory alignment consequences are not; which allows objective deduction of what the equilibratory alignment consequences are.

In the SW social choice theory model, ordered equilibratory alignment ultimately leads to achieving SSD_n . The achieved SSD_n becomes instantly SWFF impounded and SSD_{n+1} becomes the new social welfare ideal. Ergo, the SW ordered model is Equilibratory Alignment space resident, is perennially an SWFF component and is (Function: Progression: Position) schematically depicted as:




Figure 2.1
The Ordered Model Schematic

2. Unordered Models

The (Ordered: Unordered) Model transition is [(Ordered Model, Unorder_n, Position): (Unordered Model: Function)] effected. That is, in the unordered model setting, the Function process is hierarchical structure truncated and exists only in the sense of a collective force equated to achieving (Ordered Model, Unorder_n, Position). An [(Unordered Objective Reference)-Position, (Ordered Objective Reference)-Perspective] reference is a necessary condition for returning to the Ordered Model Equilibratory Alignment theatre. That is, the issue at hand in the unordered model theatre is the classic struggle between subjective and objective reference declaration. The balance of this paper explains this struggle and its resolution.

B. Unordered Relations

By the term relation, here, it is meant the reciprocal force between elements in a two element set. For example, the (X, Y) set is a relation because it is reciprocal force imbued. The terms primary and antithetical are used to describe such a relation. In the (X, Y) set, X is labeled the primary element and Y is labeled the antithetical element. The unordered relation (X or Y) is depicted as:




Figure 2.2
The Unordered (X or Y) Relation

SW recognized unordered relations do not exist in a vacuum. Rather, the (X or Y) elements respectively represent model positions while the (X and Y) statement represents model progression. In recognizing [(X or Y): (X and Y)] transitivity, the SW recognized model functions; say function Z, and the unordered and ordered relations distinction.

C. Ordered Relations

In the (Unordered Model, Ordered Relation) setting, the (X, Y) set is said to devolve from the function, Z, where $Z = f(X, Y)$; S.T. (Z_k, X_k) . Ordered relations necessarily involve the distinction between lower and higher orders in an interrelated hierarchical structure. The lower order aspect of the structure is characterized as {[Resolved: Unresolved], [(Primary and Antithetical): (Primary or Antithetical)]} space. The higher order aspect of the structure is characterized as {[Unresolved: Resolved], [(Primary or Antithetical): (Primary and Antithetical)]} space. Lower and higher orders are depicted as:




Figure 2.3
The Unordered Model Ordered Relation

In the foregoing schematic, (Unordered Model, Function, Z) defines (Ordered Model, Position, Unordered_n) if and only if (X and Y) is [(Unordered Objective Reference)-Position, (Ordered Objective Reference)-Perspective] reference defined. The Confounding Principle explains the reference declaration necessity.

D. The Confounding Principle

A simple exercise demonstrates ordered relation confounding. Let the real integer Z represent the unordered model function, let the real integer X represent the higher order primary set element and let the real integer Y represent the higher order antithetical set element.

The function Z is implicit constraint endowed. Since the inclusion of the primary element as an implicit constraint is (function: progression: position) transition sufficient, an antithetical Y constraint statement is unnecessary, to wit:




Figure 2.4
The Unordered Model

Given that {[Unordered Model, Function, Z], [Z = f(X, Y); S.T. (Z_k, X_k)]}, it can be said for any Z, the (X, Y) set is infinite. That is, the (Any, k) Z statement is infinite and the (Any, k) X statement is infinite. Therefore, the function Z is defined by ordered infinite statements. The concomitant condition of the ordered relation function and set as infinite defines the function and set as confounded.

Unconfusing the ordered relation involves transforming the infinite (X, Y) set into a finite (X, Y) set. The (infinite: finite) set transition is (i) a (function: progression: position) transition function, and (ii) a model position reference declaration function. By declaring a model position reference the ordered relation is unconfused. The model position reference is defined in (position, perspective) terms.

The [Function Z: Progression (X and Y)] transition is (Any: Given) Z achieved: $(Z_k: Z_i)$. The X constraint remains unchanged as (Any X, X_k). Z's given constraint value realization is [(Ordered Model, Position, Unorder_n): (Unordered Model, Function, Z)] transition defined. The (Unordered Model, Function, Z) is resolved ethical conflict characterized where the resolved ethical conflict is [(Unordered Objective Reference)-Position, (Ordered Objective Reference)-Perspective] reference defined. In the unordered model setting, [Progression, (X and Y)] is {[Lower Order], [(Unordered Objective Reference)-Position, (Unordered Subjective Reference or Ordered Objective Reference)-Perspective]} defined. Moreover, in the unordered model setting, [Position, (X or Y)] is {[Higher Order], [(Unordered Subjective or Objective Reference)-Position, (Unordered Subjective or Ordered Objective Reference)-Perspective]} defined. Lower order progressions are threshold resolved ethical conflict characterized, while higher order positions are unresolved ethical conflict characterized.

In the unordered model progression setting, although the function Z is (infinite: finite) transformed, the Progression (X and Y) is still an infinite statement because the function $Z = f(X, Y)$; S.T. (Z_i, X_k) yet results in an infinite (X, Y) set. However, it is important to recognize ordered infinite statements [*i.e.*, the function Z and the progression (X and Y)] have been transformed into an unordered infinite statement [*i.e.*, the progression (X and Y)]. The unordered infinite statement is still confounded.

The $(X_k: X_i)$ transition transforms the unordered infinite progression (X and Y) statement into the unordered finite (X or Y) statement. Since the Z function is given Z defined as Z_i and the any (X

and Y) progression is now given X defined as X_i , Y is necessarily [(Any: Given), (Y_k , Y_i)] transformed. The resulting position statement is articulated as $Z = f(X, Y)$; S.T. (Z_i , X_i) and the confounded unordered infinite statement has been finite statement transformed and unconfused.

The position (X or Y) constraint value declaration by X or Y raises the ethical conflict question, "Who gets to declare the position (X or Y) constraint value to effect [(Confounded: Unconfused), (Unordered Infinite: Finite)] statement transition, X or Y?" The answer to this question introduces the reference declaration concept and the distinction between subjective and objective references.

E. References

The confounded progression (X and Y) is unconfused by either subjective or objective reference declaration. The reference resolves the confounded progression (X and Y) by initially determining the value of either X or Y and then determining the remaining element's value by taking the difference between the given Z value and the declared value.

The subjective reference is position (X or Y) defined as either the X-perspective adduced from the X-position or the Y-perspective adduced from the Y-position. The objective reference is position (X or Y) defined as either the Y-perspective adduced from the X-position or the X-perspective adduced from the Y-position.

Subjective reference declaration leaves the position (X or Y) conflict unresolved such that it matters who declares the reference first, X or Y, because the declaration is effected through the endogenous perspective. On the other hand, objective reference declaration makes it indifferent who declares the reference first, X or Y, because the declaration is effected through the exogenous perspective.

F. Generalization

There are two types of principle generalization applicable to ordered relations:

1. Principle Ordered Relation Generalization

Principle Ordered Relation Generalization is the (objective: subjective) process of imposing an ordered relation principle onto its unordered aspects.

2. Principle Unordered Relation Generalization

Principle Unordered Relation Generalization is the (subjective: objective) process of imposing an unordered relation principle onto its equilibratorily aligned ordered aspects.

Confounding Principle Generalization represents the notion that the Confounding Principle's holding that (ordered infinite: unordered infinite: finite) statement transformation is required to unconfuse the ordered relation, is applied to the ordered relation's unordered aspects by constraint excluding inherently infinite elements from feasible statement inclusion. Ergo, for example, irrational numbers or other inherently infinite elements are position (X or Y) excluded by the rule of Principle Unordered Relation Generalization.

There are fundamental social choice theory model ordered subjective or objective reference declaration consequences. Section III rationalizes order magnitude. Section IV illustrates ordered subjective reference consequences. Section V illustrates ordered objective reference consequences. Section VI explains ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition requirements.

III Order Magnitude

The first question begging involves a model's ordered relations magnitude. That is, whether a model should be comprised of two, three, four, or more orders must be rationalized.


This matter is addressed first. The second matter sets forth the SW model's quaternary order relation context.

A. The Quaternary Order

The SW argument for a quaternary order model is straightforward. Essentially, the SW social choice theory model involves [(macroeconomic: microeconomic)-Perspective]: [(microeconomic: macroeconomic)-Perspective] transition, and visa versa, where unordered Equilibratory Alignment_i is a [Given Subjective, (Any Subjective, Given Objective), Any Objective]_i function. Since the quaternary order is the threshold order magnitude where Equilibratory Alignment_i is satisfied, the SW recognized the quaternary order as the efficient order magnitude.

Equilibratory alignment is an important SW social choice theory notion inasmuch as the higher order (microeconomic: macroeconomic) perspective must have access to the lower order (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective. Such equilibratorily aligned access is a necessary condition for adducing ordered actual consequences. Actual consequences are significant economically efficient [Maximum Expected Value of Outcome ("MAXEVO"), Minimum Expected Outcome Variability ("MINEOV")] defined. That is, equilibratory alignment is an ordered conflict resolution necessary condition.

The quaternary order is (Lower Order, Higher Order) defined where each lower order level is function-like in relation to the succeeding level's (Primary, Antithetical) progression. That is, the function LP is defined by the progression (HQ-Primary, HQ-Antithetical); the function LS is defined by the progression (HT-Primary, HT-Antithetical); the function LT is defined by the progression (HS-Primary, HS-Antithetical); and, the function LQ is defined by the progression (HP-Primary, HP-Antithetical), to wit:



B. The Quaternary Ordered Relation Context

The SW social choice theory model ordered conflict threshold involves primary and antithetical exclusionary prejudice conflict. This conflict is a function of ordered subjective reference declaration. The exclusionary prejudice quaternary order is relatively and inversely defined. It is defined by the relationship of the segment of the population excluded to the degree of exclusionary prejudice evisceration difficulty, to wit:

Exogenous Prejudice	Population Excluded	Evisceration Difficulty
Primary	Most	Least
Secondary	Next Most	Next Least
Tertiary	Next Least	Next Most
Quaternary	Least	Most

Table III.1
 $(VOW_n: VOW_{n+1})_i$ Quaternary Order Exclusionary Prejudice Consequences

The SW SSD is incrementally $(VOW_n: VOW_{n+1})_i$ defined; where each $(VOW_n: VOW_{n+1})_i$ term fulfills an SW SWFF aspect. Objectively discerned, the ordered conflict resolution theatre's actual Nation, Region, Village and Camp schematic is defined as a five-level (LP, LS-HQ, LT-HT, LQ-HS, HP) tree structure, to wit:

IV
Ordered Subjective References

The SW recognized ordered conflict resolution is necessarily (subjective: objective) reference defined inasmuch as progression is inherently defined as a (subjective: objective) transition. As a result, understanding ordered conflict resolution involves understanding ordered subjective reference consequences, ordered objective reference consequences and the (subjective: objective) reference transition. This section demonstrates quaternary order subjective reference consequences. The demonstration assumes the initial subjective reference position is Figure III.2's Camp PPPP.

A. The HP Unordered Subjective Reference

The Camp PPPP (HO, Primary, Unordered) subjective reference is defined as (Camp PPPP-Position, Camp-PPPP-Perspective), to wit:




Figure IV.1
The HP Camp PPPP Subjective Reference

Since the reference is unordered, (i) it involves only a higher order reference, (ii) there is no Equilibratory Alignment; function, (iii) there is no lower order (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective to access, and (ii) Camp PPPP's subjective perception of Camp PPPA from a Camp PPPP perspective is not illusionary; rather it involves the Camp PPPA actual consequence variable ("ACV"), PPPA.

B. The HS Ordered Subjective Reference

The HS ordered subjective reference involves the threshold illusionary consequence variable ("ICV"), the Village PPP-ICV. An ICV represents a subjective perception of (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access and is inappositely defined relative to actual (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access. That is, the ICV renders the actual (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective inaccessible.

The Village PPP-ICV enlases the antithetical [Village PPA: (Camp PPAP, Camp PPAA)] reference. The purported equilibratory alignment access is inappositely placed, resulting in an illusionary subjective perception of actual consequences. Practically, the ordered subjective reference involves a (microeconomic: microeconomic) perspective and not a (microeconomic: macroeconomic) perspective. And, the ordered subjective reference (microeconomic: microeconomic) perspective defines actual-(Village PPA-ACV, Camp PPAP-ACV and Camp PPAA-ACV) in Village PPP-ICV terms.

As demonstrated, *infra*, the ICV makes adducing the Village PPA-ACV, Camp PPAP-ACV and Camp PPAA-ACV generally impossible. Moreover, such threshold general impossibility ensures concomitant SWFF and SSD general impossibility.

The Village PPP [(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered)] ordered subjective reference subsumes the (Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered) subjective reference. The HS ordered subjective reference is defined as {[(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered)]-Position, [(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered)]-Perspective}}, to wit:




Figure IV.2
The Village PPP-ICV

Since the subjective reference is ordered, the Camp PPPP subjective perception of Camp PPPA is Camp PPPA-ACV defined, but the Camp PPPP subjective perception of Village PPA, Camp PPAP and Camp PPAA is ICV defined and not ACV defined. Illusionary consequences are significant economically inefficient not-(MAXEVO, MINEOV) defined. That is, Camp PPPP defines Village PPA, Camp PPAP and Camp PPAA in terms of the significant economically inefficient Village PPP-ICV illusion and not the significant economically efficient Village PPA-ACV, Camp PPAP-ACV and Camp PPAA-ACV.

C. The HT Ordered Subjective Reference

The HT ordered subjective reference involves the Region PP-ICV. The Region PP [(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Region PP, HT, Ordered)] ordered subjective reference subsumes the [(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered)] subjective reference. The HT ordered subjective reference is defined as {[(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Region PP, HT, Ordered)]-Position, [(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Region PP, HT, Ordered)]-Perspective}, to wit:





Figure IV.3
The Region PP-ICV

Since the HT subjective reference is ordered, the Camp PPPP subjective perception includes Camp PPPA-ACV, Village PPP-ICV and Region PP-ICV. Camp PPPP's incremental subjective perception of Village PAP, Village PAA, Camp PAPP, Camp PAPA, Camp PAAP and Camp PAAA is illusionary and not actual. That is, Camp PPPP defines Village PAP, Village PAA, Camp PAPP, Camp PAPA, Camp PAAP and Camp PAAA in terms of the significant economically inefficient Region PP-ICV illusion and not the significant economically efficient Village PAP-ACV, Village PAA-ACV, Camp PAPP-ACV, Camp PAPA-ACV, Camp PAAP-ACV and Camp PAAA-ACV.

D. The HQ Ordered Subjective Reference

The HQ ordered subjective reference involves the Nation P-ICV. The Nation P [(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Region PP, HT, Ordered), (Nation P, HQ, Ordered)] subjective reference subsumes the [(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Region PP, HT, Ordered)] subjective reference. The HQ subjective reference is defined as {(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Region PP, HT, Ordered), (Nation P, HQ, Ordered)]-Position, [(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Region PP, HT, Ordered), (Nation P, HQ, Ordered)]-Perspective}, to wit:



VOW_n
Figure IV.4
The Nation P-ICV


Since the HQ subjective reference is ordered, the Camp PPPP subjective perception includes Camp PPPA-ACV, Village PPP-ICV, Region PP-ICV and Nation P-ICV. Camp PPPP's incremental subjective perception of Nation A, Region AP, Region AA, Village APP, Village APA, Village AAP, Village AAA, Camp APPP, Camp APPA, Camp APAP, Camp APAA, Camp AAPP, Camp AAPA, Camp AAAP and Camp AAAA is illusionary and not actual. That is, Camp PPPP defines Nation A, Region AP, Region AA, Village APP, Village APA, Village AAP, Village AAA, Camp APPP, Camp APPA, Camp APAP, Camp APAA, Camp AAPP, Camp AAPA, Camp AAAP and Camp AAAA in terms of the significant economically inefficient Nation P-ICV illusion and not the significant economically efficient Nation A-ACV, Region AP-ACV, Region AA-ACV, Village APP-ACV, Village APA-ACV, Village AAP-ACV, Village AAA-ACV, Camp APPP-ACV, Camp APPA-ACV, Camp APAP-ACV, Camp APAA-ACV, Camp AAPP-ACV, Camp AAPA-ACV, Camp AAAP-ACV and Camp AAAA-ACV.

**V.
Ordered Objective References**

This section's purpose is to demonstrate quaternary order objective reference declaration consequences. The demonstration assumes the initial objective reference position is Figure III.2's Camp PPPP.

A. The HP Unordered Objective Reference

The Camp PPPP (HO, Primary, Unordered) objective reference is defined as (Camp PPPP-Position, Camp-PPPA-Perspective), to wit:



**Figure V.1
The HP Camp PPPP Objective Reference**

Since the reference is unordered, Camp PPPP adduces Camp PPPA's ACV from Camp PPPA's perspective of Camp PPPP. The unordered reference involves the actual Camp PPPA-ACV, PPPA. These analyses demonstrate, at the unordered HP reference level, there is no substantive difference between subjective or objective reference declarations. Both references result in PPPA-ACV deduction. However, the distinction is whether the unordered conflict resolution is undertaken with an eye toward ordered subjective or objective references. As will be seen, only ordered objective references can result in ordered conflict resolution and (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access.

B. The HS Ordered Objective Reference

The HS ordered objective reference involves threshold Equilibratory Alignment_t (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access. Such access is important because its objective perspective is the only economic perspective that enables adducing relevant ordered ACV(s). The Figure V.2, Village PPP-EA blue box is the LQ (Given Subjective) Equilibratory Alignment_t (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access granted by the Village PPP objective reference declaration. Since the Village PPP objective reference involves the (Camp PPPP: Village PPP) ordered objective references, LQ (Given Subjective) Equilibratory Alignment_t is achieved, relative (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access is granted and the ordered [(Village PPA-ACV): (Camp PPAP-ACV, Camp PPAA-ACV)] is adduced.

The Village PPP [(Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered)] objective reference subsumes the (Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered) objective reference. The HS objective reference is defined as {[(Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered)]-Position, [(Village PPA, HS, Ordered), (Camp PPAP, HP, Unordered), (Camp PPAA, HP, Unordered)]-Perspective]}, to wit:




Figure V.2
The Village PPP-EA

Since the Village PPP objective reference is ordered: (i) the Camp PPPP objective discernment of Camp PPPA is Camp PPPA-ACV adduced, (ii) the resulting Village PPP-ACV is adduced, and (iii) the Village PPP objective discernment of [(Village PPA): (Camp PPAP or Camp PPAA)] is Village PPA-ACV, Camp PPAP-ACV and Camp PPAA-ACV adduced as a result of the Village PPP-EA LQ (Given Subjective) Equilibratory Alignment_i (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access.

C. The HT Ordered Objective Reference

The HT ordered objective reference involves the Region PP objective reference. The Region PP objective reference enables (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access through the LT (Any Subjective, Given Objective) Equilibratory Alignment_i Region PP-EA.

The ordered Region PP objective reference subsumes the ordered [(Village PPP): (Camp PPPP)] objective references and is defined as the [(Region PP, HT, Ordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered)] objective reference. The HT objective reference is defined as {[(Region PP, HT, Ordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered)]-Position, [(Region PA, HT, Ordered), (Village PAP, HS, Ordered), (Village PAA, HS, Ordered), (Camp PAPP, HP, Unordered), (Camp PAPA, HP, Unordered), (Camp PAAP, HP, Unordered), (Camp PAAA, HP, Unordered)]-Perspective}], to wit:




Figure V.3
The Region PP-EA


Since the Region PP objective reference is ordered: (i) the Camp PPPP objective discernment of Camp PPPA is Camp PPPA-ACV adduced, (ii) the resulting Village PPP ACV is adduced, (iii) the Village PPP objective discernment of [(Village PPA): (Camp PPAP or Camp PPAA)] is Village PPA-ACV, Camp PPAP-ACV and Camp PPAA-ACV adduced as a result of the Village PPP-EA LQ (Given Subjective) Equilibratory Alignment_i (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access, and (iv) the Region PP objective discernment of {[Region PA]: [Village PAP: (Camp PAPP or Camp PAPA)] and [Village PAA: (Camp PAAP or Camp PAAA)]} is Region PA-ACV, Village PAP-ACV, Village PAA-ACV, Camp PAPP-ACV, Camp PAPA-ACV, Camp PAAP-ACV and Camp PAAA-ACV adduced as a result of the Region PP-EA LT (Any Subjective, Given Objective) Equilibratory Alignment_i (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access.

D. The HQ Ordered Objective Reference

The HQ ordered objective reference involves the Nation P objective reference. The Nation P objective reference enables (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access through the LS (Any Objective) Equilibratory Alignment_i Nation P-EA.

The ordered Nation P objective reference subsumes the ordered [(Region PP): (Village PPP): (Camp PPPP)] objective references and is defined as the [(Nation P, HQ, Ordered), (Region PP, HT, Ordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered)] objective reference. The HQ objective reference is defined as {[(Nation P, HQ, Ordered), (Region PP, HT, Ordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered)]-Position, [(Nation A, HQ, Ordered), (Region AP, HT, Ordered), (Region AA, HT, Ordered), (Village APP, HS, Ordered), (Village APA, HS, Ordered), (Village AAP, HS, Ordered), (Village AAA, HS, Ordered), (Camp APPP, HP, Unordered), (Camp APPA, HP, Unordered), (Camp APAP, HP, Unordered), (Camp

APAA, HP, Unordered), (Camp AAPP, HP, Unordered), (Camp AAPA, HP, Unordered), (Camp
AAAP, HP, Unordered), (Camp AAAA, HP, Unordered)]-Perspective]}, to wit:



VOW_n
Figure V.4
The Nation P-EA

Since the Nation P objective reference is ordered: (i) the Camp PPPP objective discernment of Camp PPPA is Camp PPPA-ACV adduced, (ii) the resulting Village PPP ACV is adduced, (iii) the Village PPP objective discernment of [(Village PPA): (Camp PPAP or Camp PPAA)] is Village PPA-ACV, Camp PPAP-ACV and Camp PPAA-ACV adduced as a result of the Village PPP-EA LQ (Given Subjective) Equilibratory Alignment_i (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access, (iv) the Region PP objective discernment of {[Region PA]: [Village PAP: (Camp PAPP or Camp PAPA)] and [Village PAA: (Camp PAAP or Camp PAAA)]} is Region PA-ACV, Village PAP-ACV, Village PAA-ACV, Camp PAPP-ACV, Camp PAPA-ACV, Camp PAAP-ACV and Camp PAAA-ACV adduced as a result of the Region PP-EA LT (Any Subjective, Given Objective) Equilibratory Alignment_i (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access, and (vi) the Nation P objective discernment of ({Nation A}: {[Region AP]: [Village APP: (Camp APPP or Camp APPA)] and [Village APA: (Camp APAP or Camp APAA)]} and {[Region AA]: [Village AAP: (Camp AAPP or Camp AAPA)] and [Village AAA: (Camp AAAP or Camp AAAA)]} is Region AP-ACV, Region AA-ACV, Village APP-ACV, Village APA-ACV, Village AAP-ACV, Village AAA-ACV, Camp APPP-ACV, Camp APPA-ACV, Camp APAP-ACV, Camp APAA-ACV, Camp AAPP-ACV, Camp AAPA-ACV, Camp AAAP-ACV and Camp AAAA-ACV adduced as a result of the Nation P-EA LS (Any Objective) Equilibratory Alignment_i (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access.

VI.
Ordered (Subjective: Objective) Reference Transition

Since the (Ordered Objective Reference, Equilibratory Alignment_i) interface enables (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access and ACV discernment, ordered

(subjective: objective) transition is important. That is, $(VOW_n: VOW_{n+1})_i$ transition is a $[(Camp_n: Camp_{n+1}), (subjective: objective)]$ reference transition function.

The SW recognized such transition is a product of the Antithetical-Primary Population General Impossibility Theorem (APPGIT), the APPGIT Constraint and APPGIT-Compliant Progression (collectively, the APPGIT Factors). Moreover, the SW recognized that generalization of the APPGIT Factors has social choice theory model implications beyond higher order reference progression.

The APPGIT Factors serve several purposes. First, APPGIT stands for the proposition ordered subjective reference ICVs make ordered objective reference ACV discernment generally impossible; and also result in SWFF and SSD general impossibility. The SW deduced that the ability to effect ordered ACV discernment is an ordered objective reference function. Accordingly, they recognized ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition also enables SSD and SWFF impossibility resolution. The APPGIT Factors define ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition methodology (*i.e.*, ordered conflict resolution) and, as a result, fundamentally underpin the social choice theory impossibility resolution.

This section first demonstrates the Antithetical-Primary Population General Impossibility Theorem. The theorem educates the reason ordered subjective references lead to both ordered ACV discernment general impossibility and SWFF and SSD general impossibility.

Second, this section explains the APPGIT Constraint where unordered (subjective: objective) reference transition is unordered voice change constrained. A voice change is effect through a reference's perspective element. APPGIT Constraint violations result in APPGIT's illusionary consequences.

Third, this section defines APPGIT-Compliant Progression as ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition. APPGIT-Compliant Progression allows unordered and ordered reference position element transition in conjunction with the APPGIT Constraint's unordered voice change.

Finally, this section generalizes APPGIT principles applicable elsewhere in the PBW Model. Generalizing APPGIT principles, *inter alia*, explains why ranking social state preferences is an inappropriate social choice theory activity.

A. APPGIT

The Antithetical-Primary General Impossibility Theorem holds that ordered subjective references it generally impossible to adduce ICV-enlaced ACVs. The significant economically efficient ACVs are deemed to materially dominate, in all respects, the significant economically inefficient ICV. Ergo, (ICV: ACV) transition is economically rational and vested with appropriately significant economic pay-offs. The Antithetical-Primary General Impossibility Theorem follows:




Figure VI.1
The Within-Region PP ICVs

Theorem: The Village PPP ordered subjective reference Village PPP-ICV is a {[Village PPP]: [(Village PPA-ACV): (Camp PPAP-ACV, Camp PPAA-ACV)]} assessment general impossibility.

Proof.

- i. [Village PPP: (Camp PPAP-ACV, Camp PPAA-ACV)] assessment is a [Village PPP: Village PPA-ACV] assessment $f(x)$;
- ii. [Village PPP: Village PPA-ACV] assessment is a Village PPP-ICV evisceration $f(x)$;
- iii. Village PPP-ICV evisceration is a [(Camp PPPP, Camp PPPA), (HO, P)]: [(Village PPP), (LO, Q)] ordered objective reference $f(x)$; ergo,
- iv. The Village PPP ordered subjective reference Village PPP-ICV is a {[Village PPP]: [(Village PPA-ACV): (Camp PPAP-ACV, Camp PPAA-ACV)]} assessment general impossibility.

Q.E.D.

APPGIT thereby teaches the ordered subjective reference Village PPP-ICV is a Village PPA-ACV, Camp PPAP-ACV and Camp PPAA-ACV general impossibility.

B. The APPGIT Constraint

The APPGIT Constraint defines the parameters for effecting unordered (subjective: objective) reference transition. Effecting unordered (subjective: objective) reference transition

concomitantly effects unordered (ICV: ACV) and significant economically (inefficient: efficient) transitions.

Effecting unordered (subjective: objective) reference transition is a necessary condition for effecting ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition. Effecting ordered (subjective: objective) transition is a necessary condition for effecting unordered (VOW_n : VOW_{n+1})_i transition. Effecting unordered (VOW_n : VOW_{n+1})_i transition is a necessary condition for effecting ordered (VOW_n : VOW_{n+1})_k transition. And, finally, effecting ordered (VOW_n : VOW_{n+1})_k transition is a necessary condition for resolving SWFF and SSD general impossibility.

Pragmatically, the unordered voice to be changed is determined by referencing whichever voice, in the (subjective: objective) progression order, enables the next camp visit. Camps are the actual socioeconomic entities of residence. All other entities are defined in terms of various collections of camps. That is, camps are the unordered socioeconomic entity; all other socioeconomic entities are ordered camp entities.

Unordered (subjective: objective) reference transitions involve unordered reference perspective transition. Since camps are the unordered socioeconomic entity, the reference perspective is always stated in (Primary, Secondary, Tertiary and Quaternary) voice ("PSTQ") terms.

The (subjective: objective) perspective transition is an unordered APPGIT voice change function. The voice change question involves which voice to change: Primary, Secondary, Tertiary or Quaternary. Since the progression is a (subjective: objective) function, the unordered voice change scheme is lower order perspective defined as (Quaternary: Tertiary: Secondary: Primary).

The tertiary voice cannot be changed until and unless all camps within that voice have been visited by and through a quaternary voice change. The secondary voice cannot be changed until and unless all camps within that voice have been visited by and through tertiary and quaternary voice changes. And, the primary voice cannot be changed until and unless all camps within that voice have been visited by and through secondary, tertiary and quaternary voices changes.

For example, if $(VOW_n: VOW_{n+1})_i$ progression is assumed to be Camp PPPP commenced, the (subjective: objective) reference transition question is which voice must Camp PPPP change to satisfy the APPGIT Constraint. Recognizing the APPGIT Constraint's (Quaternary: Tertiary: Secondary: Primary) progression requirement, Camp PPPP first investigates whether changing its quaternary voice enables it to visit another camp. Camp PPPP effects an unordered (subjective: objective) reference transition by changing the reference's perspective. So Camp PPPP changes its quaternary voice from 'P' to 'A.' Ergo, the objective reference is defined as (Camp PPPP-Position, Camp PPPA-Perspective). Since the quaternary voice change enables Camp PPPP "to visit" Camp PPPA, the (subjective: objective) reference transition is complete.

Based on the foregoing, the APPGIT Constraint is unordered (subjective: objective) reference transition applicable where such transitions are effected by changing the reference's PSTQ perspective. It holds APPGIT voice changes are unordered voice change constrained; else APPGIT's general impossibility is incurred. Ergo, unordered voice changes are (Quaternary: Tertiary: Secondary: Primary) progression defined and constrained.

C. APPGIT-Compliant Progression

APPGIT-Compliant Progression defines the parameters for effecting ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition. Effecting ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition enables Equilibratory Alignment_{*i*} (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access. Ordered (subjective: objective) reference transitions involve either unordered or ordered reference position transition. Position transition is always camp commenced and camp concluded because all progression is a (camp_{*n*}: camp_{*n+1*}) function.

Pursuant to the APPGIT Constraint, reference perspective transition must remain unordered. Ordered reference position transitions are stated in P, PS, PST or PSTQ terms. There can be more than one position change in a (camp_{*n*}: camp_{*n+1*}) progression.

The (camp_{*n*}: camp_{*n+1*}) progression scheme means reference position statements begin and end in PSTQ terms. The PSTQ position statement is constrained by the PSTQ perspective statement. Moreover, the (Primary, P), (Secondary, PS) and (Tertiary, PST) position statements are PSTQ perspective constrained. That is, APPGIT-Compliant Progression must comply with the APPGIT Constraint. The APPGIT Constraint holds there can be only one reference perspective voice change in any (camp_{*n*}: camp_{*n+1*}) progression.

The (Tertiary, PST) position cannot be changed until and unless all subsidiary (Quaternary, PSTQ) positions have been visited. The (Secondary, PS) position cannot be changed until and unless all subsidiary (Tertiary, PST) positions have been visited. And, the (Primary, P) position cannot be changed until and unless all subsidiary (Secondary, PS) positions have been visited.

Each (VOW_{*n*}: VOW_{*n+1*})_{*i*} Ordered Conflict Resolution Theatre's five level structure includes 1-World, 2-Nations, 4-Regions, 8-Villages and 16-Camps. Therefore, [(VOW_{*n*}:

$VOW_{n+1})_i$, transition involves fifteen (15) Camp-to-Camp transitions. Notwithstanding which of the sixteen Camps commences ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition, the (Quaternary: Tertiary: Secondary: Primary) transition order is the same, to wit:

$$Q_1, T_2, Q_3, S_4, Q_5, T_6, Q_7, P_8, Q_9, T_{10}, Q_{11}, S_{12}, Q_{13}, T_{14}, Q_{15}.$$

For example, assuming $(VOW_n: VOW_{n+1})_i$ transition is Camp PPPP commenced, the $(VOW_n: VOW_{n+1})_i$ Ordered Conflict Resolution Theatre 1-World, 2-Nations, 4-Regions, 8-Villages and 16-Camps would be APPGIT-Compliant Progression Path numbered as follows:




Figure VI.2
The PPPP Camp Visitation Order

In other words, the left-to-right Camp visitation order would not be a serial (1, 2, 3, 4 . . . 16) visitation order. APPGIT and the APPGIT Constraint combine to establish the (1, 2, 4, 3, 8, 7, 5, 6, 16, 15, 13, 14, 9, 10, 12, 11) left-to-right Camp visitation order. This order is referred to as the "APPGIT Language."

Once all sixteen camps have been "visited," (i) ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition is complete, (ii) Village PPP-ICV, Region PP-ICV and Nation P-ICV are eviscerated, (iii) Equilibratory Alignment_i (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective Village PPP-EA,

Region PP-EA and Nation P-EA access is granted, and (iv) all Nation P and A ACVs are adduced. $(VOW_i: VOW_{n+1})_k$ transition issues are future paper reserved.

D. Generalized APPGIT Principles

APPGIT, the APPGIT Constraint and APPGIT-Compliant Progression, taken together, offer a generalized teaching involving ordered conflict resolution tactics and ordered conflict environments. These include:

- i. Ordered subjective references breed illusionary consequences and SSD and SWFF general impossibility,
- ii. Ordered objective references breed actual consequences and enable SSD and SWFF impossibility resolution,
- iii. Ordered conflict resolution tactics (*i.e.*, ordered objective references) must be employed in an ordered conflict environment,
- iv. When unordered conflict resolution tactics (*i.e.*, ordered subjective references) are employed in an ordered conflict environment, the consequences are illusionary,
- v. Progressions behind the extant $(SWFF_n: SSD_n)$ progression involve SSD that are SWFF impounded and such SSD no longer exist, and
- vi. Progressions ahead of the extant $(SWFF_n: SSD_n)$ progression (SSD_n involves unordered SSD progression) involve ordered SSD_{n+1} , *et seq.*, where such ordered social states are inherently illusionary consequence defined.

VIII. ***Conclusion***

The employment of unordered conflict resolution tactics in an ordered conflict environment results in illusionary consequences and forecloses Equibratory Alignment_i (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access. The (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access foreclosure implicates SWFF and SSD general impossibility. The employment of ordered conflict resolution tactics in an ordered conflict environment results in actual consequences and enables Equibratory Alignment_i (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access. In turn, ordered (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access defines SWFF and SSD impossibility resolution. The ordered (subjective: objective) transition lessons learned in this paper underpin ordered conflict resolution implications for impossibility-resolved social choice theory models.

References

Texts

Arrow, K. J. *Social Choice and Individual Values*. Monograph No. 12. Cowles Commission for Research in Economics. New York: Wiley (1951, 1963).

Condorcet, Marquis de. *Essai sur l'application de l'analyse à la probabilité des décisions rendues à la pluralité des voix*. Paris: L'Imprimerie Royale, 1785.

Journal Articles

Beaver, W. H. "Implications of Security Price Research for Accounting: A Reply to Bierman." *The Accounting Review*, 49(3), July 1974, pp. 563-571.

Beaver, W. H. and J. S. Demski. "The Nature of Financial Accounting Objectives: A Summary and Synthesis." Supplement to *Journal of Accounting Research* Vol. 12, Studies on Financial Accounting Objectives: 1974, 1974, pp. 170-187.

Borda, J. C. "Mémoire sur les Élections au Scrutin." *Histoire de l'Académie Royale des Sciences* (Paris), 1781. [Translated by Alfred de Grazia, "Mathematical Derivation of an Election System." *Isis*, June 1953, 44(1-2), pp. 42-51].

Cushing, B. E. "On the Possibility of Optimal Accounting Principles." *The Accounting Review*, 52(2), April 1977, pp. 308-321.

Demski, J. S. "The General Impossibility of Normative Accounting Standards." *The Accounting Review*, 48(4), October 1973, pp. 718-723.

Sen, A. K. "The Possibility of Social Choice." *The American Economic Review*, 89(3), June 1999, pp. 349-378.

Walker, M. "Risk Attitudes, Value-Restricted Preferences, and Public Choice Over Lotteries and Information Systems." *The Accounting Review*, 59(2), April 1984, pp. 278-286.