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- Athletes using performance-enhancing drugs
- Two competing companies deciding advertising budgets
- Nation-states deciding to restrict CO2 emissions
- Two people meet and exchange closed bags, with the understanding that one of them contains money, and the other contains a purchase. Either player can choose to honor the deal by putting into his or her bag what he or she agreed, or he or she can defect by handing over an empty bag.
- http://www.radiolab.org/story/golden-rule/
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What should Ann (Bob) do? Dominance reasoning is not Pareto!
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What should Ann (Bob) do? Change the game...
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## Nozick: Symbolic Utility

"Yet the symbolic value of an act is not determined solely by that act. The act's meaning can depend upon what other acts are available with what payoffs and what acts also are available to the other party or parties. What the act symbolizes is something it symbolizes when done in that particular situation, in preference to those particular alternatives. If an act symbolizes "being a cooperative person," it will have that meaning not simply because it has the two possible payoffs it does but also because it occupies a particular position within the two-person matrix - that is, being a dominated action that (when joined with the other person's dominated action) yield a higher payoff to each than does the combination of dominated actions. " (pg. 55)
R. Nozick. The Nature of Rationality. Princeton University Press, 1993.
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What should / will Ann (Bob) do? Change the game (eg., Symbolic Utilities)
"Game theorists think it just plain wrong to claim that the Prisoners' Dilemma embodies the essence of the problem of human cooperation.
"Game theorists think it just plain wrong to claim that the Prisoners' Dilemma embodies the essence of the problem of human cooperation. On the contrary, it represents a situation in which the dice are as loaded against the emergence of cooperation as they could possibly be. If the great game of life played by the human species were the Prisoner's Dilemma, we wouldn't have evolved as social animals!
"Game theorists think it just plain wrong to claim that the Prisoners' Dilemma embodies the essence of the problem of human cooperation. On the contrary, it represents a situation in which the dice are as loaded against the emergence of cooperation as they could possibly be. If the great game of life played by the human species were the Prisoner's Dilemma, we wouldn't have evolved as social animals! .... No paradox of rationality exists. Rational players don't cooperate in the Prisoners' Dilemma, because the conditions necessary for rational cooperation are absent in this game."
K. Binmore. Natural Justice. Oxford University Press, 2005.
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## Strategies
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- Periodic: All-C, All-D, CD, CCD, CDD, CCDD, ...
- Random
- Memory: Tit-for-Tat, Two-Tit-for-Tat, ...


## Additional Reading

 wass semen weme Nash condion Choice Theory ParetoHarsanyi Arrow Social ChoiceRationality

- S. Kuhn, Prisoner's Dilemma, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, plato.stanford.edu/entries/prisoner-dilemma/
- W. Poundstone, Prisoner's Dilemma, Anchor, 1993
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Suppose the players meet only once. It would seem that the Proposer should propose $99 \%$ for herself and $1 \%$ for the Disposer. And if the Disposer is instrumentally rational, then she should accept the offer.
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## Ultimatum Game

But this is not what happens in experiments: if the Disposer is offered $1 \%$, $10 \%$ or even $20 \%$, the Disposer very often rejects. Furthermore, the proposer tends demand only around $60 \%$.

A typical explanation is that the players' utility functions are not simply about getting funds to best advance their goals, but about acting according to some norms of fair play. But acting according to norms of fair play does not seem to be a goal: it is a principle to which a person wishes to conform.
"Rationality has a clear interpretation in individual decision making, but it does not transfer comfortably to interactive decisions, because interactive decision makers cannot maximize expected utility without strong assumptions about how the other participant(s) will behave. In game theory, common knowledge and rationality assumptions have therefore been introduced, but under these assumptions, rationality does not appear to be characteristic of social interaction in general."
(pg. 152, Colman)
A. Colman. Cooperation, psychological game theory, and limitations of rationality in social interaction. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 26, pgs. 139-198, 2003.
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