Impatience for Weakly Paretian Orders: Existence and Genericity

Kuntal Banerjee[*]and Ram Sewak Dubey[‡]

July 2012

Abstract

We study order theoretic and topological implications for impatience of weakly Paretian, representable orders on infinite utility streams. As a departure from the traditional literature, we do not make any continuity assumptions in proving the existence of impatient points. Impatience is robust in the sense that there are uncountably many impatient points. A general statement about genericity of impatience cannot be made for representable, weakly Paretian orders. This is shown by means of an example. If we assume a stronger sensitivity condition, then genericity obtains.

Journal of Economic Literature Classification numbers: D70, D90.

Keywords: Impatience Condition, Weak Pareto, Sensitivity Conditions, Genericity, Order Types, Uncountable Sets.

[*]Corresponding author: Department of Economics, College of Business, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton FL 33431. Email: kbanerje@fau.edu.

[†]Department of Economics and Finance, Montclair State University, Montclair, NJ, 07042; Email: dubeyr@mail.montclair.edu.

[‡]We thank an Editor of this Journal for helpful suggestions. The paper has benefitted from substantive and thorough comments from an anonymous referee. We remain solely responsible for the contents of the paper.

1 Introduction

It is widely observed in economic data that in the context of intertemporal decision making almost all economic agents exhibit a preference towards the advancement of timing of future satisfaction. This aspect of human behavior is aptly called impatience. This paper is concerned with the impatience implications of representable, weakly Paretian[1] intertemporal preferences. With regards to impatience, the focus of the literature (Koopmans (1960), Koopmans et.al. (1964)), has been to address two questions:

> *Existence:* For what minimal conditions on a preference order on infinite streams of utility is there some implication of impatience?
>
> *Robustness:* How "many" impatience points are there in the program space?

Time preferences in general, and impatience in particular was discussed by social scientists at least as early as Rae (1834), Bohm-Bawerk (1891) and Fisher (1930). In contrast to the descriptive, albeit compelling discussions along the long history of the topic, a formal analysis on the issue of impatience was first made by Koopmans (1960) and extended by Koopmans et.al. (1964)[2]. Following the important early contributions by Koopmans and his coauthors, subsequent analysis developed precise impatience conditions and obtained clear answers to the question of existence and robustness of impatience. In the words of Brown and Lewis (1981), the basic premise of each study was to

> "....impose as few restrictions as possible .... such that every complete continuous preference relation is (in some precise sense) impatient"[3].

Much of the classical literature on impatience conforms to this line of study. For instance, focusing on the case of continuous (in the sup-metric) preference orders aggregating infinite

[1] The weak Pareto condition states that on ranking infinite utility streams we should prefer a stream $\mathbf{x}$ to $\mathbf{y}$ whenever $\mathbf{x}$ is strictly better than $\mathbf{y}$ in every period. A formal definition is given in section 2.3.

[2] An excellent summary of the classical literature can be found in Koopmans (1972). For a more recent survey of the literature, incorporating impatience as observed in experiments, see Frederick et.al. (2002).

[3] In the interest of full disclosure, the part of the quotation omitted here indicates the exact nature of the topological restriction that Brown and Lewis is after.

utility streams, Diamond (1965) imposed the strong Pareto[4] condition as a fundamental postulate, and showed that if a strongly Paretian preference order is continuous (in the sup metric), then, with an additional non-complementarity axiom, it must exhibit, what he called "eventual impatience". Burness (1973) avoided imposing non-complementarity axioms in getting his "eventual impatience"result, but he assumed continuously differentiable representation[5]. Banerjee and Mitra (2007) obtained impatience implications for representable orders satisfying strong Pareto. We seek to strengthen the results from the Banerjee-Mitra paper in keeping with the Brown and Lewis (1981) doctrine stated above.

To place our results in the context of the recent literature on intertemporal preferences, it will be convenient to consider the case where infinite utility streams belong to $[0,1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ (call this set X). A strongly Paretian order on the set X of infinite utility streams need not exhibit any impatience in any part of the program space (Svensson (1980) provides an example of such an order). On the other hand, a strongly Paretian representable order on X must have (i) an uncountable number of impatient points, and (ii) the set of impatient points must be dense in the metric space (X, d), where d is the sup metric. (Banerjee and Mitra (2007), Theorems 1 and 2). This paper examines the role of strong Pareto in obtaining the impatience results in Banerjee and Mitra (2007). Specifically, we show (using methods introduced into the literature by Dubey and Mitra (2011)) that result (i) above continues to be valid if strong Pareto is replaced by weak Pareto [Theorem 1]. Furthermore, (ii) is not valid when strong Pareto is replaced by weak Pareto [Example 2]. However, result (ii) continues to hold when strong Pareto is replaced by infinite Pareto. [Theorem 2].

The paper is organized as follows. Preliminaries, sensitivity and impatience conditions are introduced in section 2. Existence and robustness results are presented in section 3. Section 4 explores the representability requirement and its conenction with impatience. Proofs of results not presented in the body of the paper are relegated to a separate appendix. We summarize our contributions and relate our findings to existing results after each theorem. This makes a separate concluding section redundant.

[4]The strong Pareto condition states that society should prefer a stream $\mathbf{x}$ to $\mathbf{y}$ whenever period utilities in $\mathbf{x}$ are as good as they are in $\mathbf{y}$, and for some period $\mathbf{x}$ gives a strictly higher utility than $\mathbf{y}$. A formal definition is given in section 2.3.

[5]Burness (1976) studied impatience for separable functions. As will be clear from our motivation and analysis, these conditions are somewhat extraneous to addressing the issue of existence and robustness of impatience.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notation and Order Theoretic Definitions

We will say that a set A is *strictly ordered* by a binary relation R if R is *connected* (if $a, a' \in A$ and $a \neq a'$, then either aRa' or $a'Ra$ holds), *transitive* (if $a, a', a'' \in A$ and aRa' and $a'Ra''$ hold, then aRa'' holds) and *irreflexive* (aRa holds for no $a \in A$). In this case, the strictly ordered set will be denoted by $A(R)$. For example, the set $\mathbb{N}$ is strictly ordered by the binary relation $<$ (where $<$ denotes the usual "less than" relation on the real numbers).

We will say that a strictly ordered set $A'(R')$ is *similar* to the strictly ordered set $A(R)$ if there is a one-to-one function f mapping A onto A', such that:

$$a_1, a_2 \in A \text{ and } a_1 R a_2 \Rightarrow f(a_1) R' f(a_2). \tag{OP}$$

We now specialize to strictly ordered subsets of real numbers. The set of natural numbers will be denoted by $\mathbb{N}$, the set of positive and negative integers by $\mathbb{I}$. We will say that the strictly ordered set $Y(<)$ is of *order type* μ if Y contains a non-empty subset Y' with the property that the strictly ordered set $Y'(<)$ is similar to $\mathbb{I}(<)$[6].

Example 1: Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a < b$. The intervals (denoted by the letter L) (a, b), $[a, b]$, $(a, b]$ and $[a, b)$ are of order type μ. To see this, pick the minimum positive integer N such that $a+(1/N) < b-(1/N)$ and observe that the set $A = \{a+(1/n) : n \geq N \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{b-(1/n) : n \geq N \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is similar to $\mathbb{I}(<)$ and is contained in L.

As a matter of notation the completion of a proof is denoted by $\blacksquare$, and the completion of a claim is denoted by $\square$. Proofs that are not presented in the body of the paper appear in the appendix.

Instantaneous utilities (also called generational utilities or period utilities) will be assumed to lie in some non-empty subset Y of $\mathbb{R}$. Consequently, infinite utility streams belong to the set X, where $X = Y^{\mathbb{N}}$, the set of all sequences with each term of the sequence being interpreted as one-period utility[7]. If the set of period utilities, Y is specified, the definition of X uniquely

[6]For more details and an excellent exposition of these ideas, see Sierpinski (1965). The terminology of order type μ is from Dubey and Mitra (2011).

[7]Given infinite utility streams $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$ in X we write $\mathbf{x} >> \mathbf{y}$ if $x_n > y_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and denote by $\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{y}$ if $\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$.

determines the space of infinite utility streams. So we will find it convenient to just describe the set Y, since there should be no confusion about the context of reference.

The set of infinite utility streams $X = Y^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $Y = [0, 1]$ will be of particular interest. We will call this the *classical domain*. It is well known that period utilities in the neoclassical bounded growth model lies in some bounded interval of the real line, see Roy and Kamihigashi (2007) for the one-sector growth model. More generally the reduced form of several dynamic economic models also have the above feature, see Mitra (2000) for a rich set of examples. This case has also been the focus of analysis in the classical papers of Koopmans (1960) and Diamond (1965). Apart from the applicability of this case, it also allows us to compare our existence and robustness results across the spectrum of sensitivity conditions introduced in section 2.3.

An *intertemporal order* (interchangeably called a preference order on X) is a binary relation $\succsim$ on X which is complete (if for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X$ either $\mathbf{x} \succsim \mathbf{y}$ or $\mathbf{y} \succsim \mathbf{x}$ holds) and transitive. Given a preference order $\succsim$ on X, we indicate it's asymmetric and symmetric parts by $\succ$ and $\sim$. Recall, for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X$, $\mathbf{x} \succ \mathbf{y}$ implies $\mathbf{x} \succsim \mathbf{y}$ and *not* $\mathbf{y} \succsim \mathbf{x}$, and the symmetric relation $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbf{y}$ is defined as $\mathbf{x} \succsim \mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{y} \succsim \mathbf{x}$.

An intertemporal order is *representable* if there is some $U : X \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X$, we have $\mathbf{x} \succsim \mathbf{y}$ iff $U(\mathbf{x}) \geq U(\mathbf{y})$.

2.2 Topological Preliminaries

For any preference order $\succsim$ on X and any $\mathbf{x} \in X$, denote by $UC(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{y} \in X : \mathbf{y} \succsim \mathbf{x}\}$ and $LC(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{z} \in X : \mathbf{x} \succsim \mathbf{z}\}$ the *upper* and *lower contour sets of* $\succsim$ *at* $\mathbf{x}$. An intertemporal order $\succsim$ is *continuous* in a topology Υ of X if $UC(\mathbf{x})$ and $LC(\mathbf{x})$ are closed subsets in (X, Υ) for every $\mathbf{x} \in X$.

The analysis of topological results will be with regard to the classical domain, that is for $Y = [0, 1]$. On $X = Y^{\mathbb{N}}$, we define the concept of distance between two points by the sup-metric; that is for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X$ the metric topology generated by the function $d : X^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ given by $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sup\{|x_n - y_n| : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. We will denote the metric space by the tuple (X, d). For any $\epsilon > 0$, denote the open ball around some $\mathbf{x} \in X$ with radius ϵ by $B(\mathbf{x}, \epsilon)$.

Given (X, d), a subset A of X is said to be *generic* if it is dense and open in X.

2.3 Sensitivity Conditions

The fundamental behavioral restriction we impose on intertemporal preferences is that of sensitivity to generational utilities. We present three sensitivity conditions. Let $\succsim$ be a preference order on X, it is said to satisfy

Weak Pareto: if $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X$ and $\mathbf{x} >> \mathbf{y}$, then $\mathbf{x} \succ \mathbf{y}$,

Infinite Pareto: if $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X$ and $x_n \geq y_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for some subsequence $\{N_k\}$ of $\mathbb{N}$ the inequality is strict, then $\mathbf{x} \succ \mathbf{y}$,

Strong Pareto: if $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X$ and $\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{y}$, then $\mathbf{x} \succ \mathbf{y}$.

Note that in each of these conditions an inference is made about the relative ranking of two streams from information on generational utilities. Such an aggregation reflects the sensitivity of the ordering to period utilities; hence the name sensitivity condition. It is easy to verify that the sensitivity conditions, starting with weak Pareto, become more demanding as we move down the list; in the sense that a preference order satisfying Strong Pareto, must satisfy weak Pareto and infinite Pareto. In addition to the above sensitivity conditions, it is useful to note a particularly intuitive monotonicity criterion, we call it condition (M):

$$\text{if } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X \text{ and } \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{y}, \text{ then } \mathbf{x} \succsim \mathbf{y}. \tag{M}$$

The weak Pareto condition along with the basic monotonicity condition (M) (which states that we do not reverse the natural weak dominance of vector comparability when we compare two streams) is S1 in Diamond (1965, p. 172) and the strong Pareto condition is condition S2 in Diamond (1965, p.173). The use of the word Pareto is in reference to the social choice literature; in particular in finite population social choice the weak Pareto condition has been used extensively, see Arrow (1963) and Sen (1977) for instance. The strong Pareto condition is also called strictly increasing in the context of economic agents exhibiting delay aversion, see for example, Benoit and Ok (2007). The infinite Pareto condition is introduced and analyzed in Crespo, Nuñez and Zapatero (2009).

We will be exclusively dealing with representable preference orders on X satisfying sensitivity conditions. For representable preference orders there are natural analogues of each of the sensitivity conditions expressed in terms of the function that represents the order.

2.4 Impatience Condition

We provide here a precise definition of what we mean for a preference order on X to exhibit impatience at some $\mathbf{x} \in X$. Some auxiliary definitions are needed to formalize our impatience condition. Given $\mathbf{x} \in X$, and $M, N \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $\mathbf{x}(M, N)$ the sequence $\mathbf{x}' \in X$ defined by,

$$x'_M = x_N,\ x'_N = x_M \text{ and } x'_n = x_n,\ \forall n \neq N, M. \tag{1}$$

An intertemporal order $\succsim$ is said to *exhibit impatience at* $\mathbf{x} \in X$, if there exist $M, N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $M > N$ such that, either

$$\text{(i) } x_M > x_N \text{ and } \mathbf{x}(M, N) \succ \mathbf{x}; \text{ or (ii) } x_M < x_N \text{ and } \mathbf{x} \succ \mathbf{x}(M, N). \tag{2}$$

Observe that the definition of a new sequence $\mathbf{x}(M, N)$ in (1) from some $\mathbf{x} \in X$ involves swapping one-period utilities corresponding to periods M and N, ceteris paribus. The impatience condition captures the intuition that the preference order $\succsim$ exhibits a preference towards "immediate gratification".

For representable preference orders on X, the information from the impatience condition (2) can be translated to the real-valued function that represents it. If $\succsim$ is a representable (by a real valued function W) preference order on X and exhibits impatience at $\mathbf{x} \in X$, then there exist $M, N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $M > N$ such that, either

$$\text{(i) } x_M > x_N \text{ and } W(\mathbf{x}(M, N)) > W(\mathbf{x}); \text{ or (ii) } x_M < x_N \text{ and } W(\mathbf{x}) > W(\mathbf{x}(M, N)).$$

Alternatively, if $W : X \to \mathbb{R}$ represents $\succsim$ and exhibits impatience at $\mathbf{x} \in X$, then there exists $M, N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $M > N$ such that,

$$(x_N - x_M)(W(\mathbf{x}(M, N)) - W(\mathbf{x})) < 0. \tag{3}$$

3 Impatience Implications for Weakly Paretian Orders

We present the main results of the paper in this section. The first result (Theorem 1) uses only order theoretic methods to characterize domains of utility streams on which representable, weakly Paretian orders exhibit some impatience and show that under the identified domain restrictions there are uncountably many points at which such orders exhibit impatience. The second set of results are topological in nature and obtain when the space of utility streams is endowed with a specific metric.

3.1 Order Theoretic Implications

The main characterization result is stated in Theorem 1.

Theorem 1 *Suppose Y is a non-empty subset of $\mathbb{R}$ and let $X = Y^{\mathbb{N}}$.*
(i) A representable, weakly Paretian preference order $\succsim$ on X has a point $\mathbf{x} \in X$ at which $\succsim$ exhibits impatience iff Y is of order type μ.
(ii) If Y is of order type μ and $\succsim$ be a representable, weakly Paretian preference order on X, then the set of points of X at which $\succsim$ exhibits impatience, that is

$$I = \{\mathbf{x} \in X : \ \succsim \text{ exhibits impatience at } \mathbf{x}\}$$

is uncountable.

Remarks:

Relation to Literature: (i) The impatience condition in our paper is the same as in Banerjee and Mitra (2007). In the classical domain, our result is a generalization of Banerjee and Mitra (2007) by virtue of a weaker sensitivity requirement. In contrast, Diamond (1965) proved the existence of eventual impatience, which captures impatience in utility streams where the tail of the stream is uniformly bounded away from the first period utility. He used the strong Pareto and non-complementarity conditions to obtain his result. Our results are not comparable to his results on two dimensions; firstly, impatience in our case can obtain in utility streams that are convergent which is not the case in Diamond (1965), secondly, we do not need any non-complementarity, continuity or strong Pareto conditions to obtain our impatience implication. However, it is worth noting that Diamond (1965) achieves a stronger form of impatience implication; he demonstrates that every stream for which first period utilities are bounded away from the tail of the stream must exhibit impatience.

(ii) In a recent paper Benoit and Ok (2007) study "delay aversion". This can be viewed as comparative impatience, in the sense that impatience content of two representable preference orders are compared in their paper. They also address the very interesting and intuitive possibility where a preference towards improving current consumption at the cost of diminished future consumption need not necessarily imply impatience. In an intertemporal setting with endowments, a preference towards the advancement of timing of consumption could be a consequence of a lower endowment today. This issue is not addressed in this paper. It would be interesting to study the questions of this paper in a general equilibrium model incorporating this feature.

Method of Proof: The proof of Theorem 1 bears a resemblance to Dubey and Mitra (2011). They showed the impossibility of anonymous representable preference orders[8] satisfying weak Pareto. The existence of an impatient point for weakly Paretian, representable order is a consequence of their proof technique and is not a direct corollary of their results. We exploit a crucial feature that drive their result; that is, we explore sequences for which positive terms appear along some subsequence in increasing order and along the complementary subsequence negative terms appear in decreasing order. This feature along with the inductive nature of order type μ subsets to which period utilities belong, is sufficient to guarantee the existence of impatience. Our method (again exploiting this feature of sequences) does more than existence; we have shown, using order theoretic methods (without invoking any topological properties) alone, that impatient points are in fact, uncountable.

3.2 Topological Implications

The set of impatience points (I) being of the order of the continuum shows that impatience is robust in a weak sense. In this section we pursue a stronger result.

We show that for every weakly Paretian, representable intertemporal order $\succsim$, the set of impatient points is *not* necessarily generic. Precisely, we show (by means of an example) that a representable and weakly Paretian preference order on X exists, for which, the set of impatient points is not dense, and consequently cannot be generic in (X, d). However, if we strengthen the sensitivity requirement to infinite Pareto, genericity of the set of impatient points follow.

3.2.1 Impatience is not Generic for Weakly Paretian Orders

In this section we provide an example of a weakly Paretian, representable preference order on X that exhibits no impatience on some open set of (X, d). In particular this implies that the set of impatient points pertaining to this order cannot be a dense, open subset of X.

Example 2: Let $Y = [0, 1]$ and $X = Y^{\mathbb{N}}$. Consider the following class of subsets of X:

[8] Anonymity means that ranking of streams is indifferent to the finite permutation of generational utilities as defined in (1).

$$\mathcal{V} = \{V \subset X : V = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} V_i \text{ and there exists some } \textit{minimally} \text{ chosen } N \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } V_i = [0, 1/2) \text{ for all } i > N\}.$$

In the definition of the class $\mathcal{V}$, we choose $N(V)$ to correspond to the *smallest* natural number such that for all integers $i > N(V)$ we have $V_i = [0, 1/2)$. It is in this sense that we use the word "minimally chosen" in the definition. It is important to note that for any $V \in \mathcal{V}$, and any $\mathbf{x} \in V$, for $t = N(V) - 1$ we must have $x_t \in [1/2, 1]$. Note that the infinite Cartesian product of $[0, 1/2)$ does *not* belong to this set.

This class of subsets is non-empty. We will first define a sequence of subsets $\{U_i\}$ of X which is crucial to the demonstration and also establishes non-emptiness of $\mathcal{V}$. Let

$$U_i = [0, 1/2) \times [0, 1/2) \times \cdots \times [0, 1/2) \times \underbrace{(1/2, 1]}_{i^{th}\text{place}} \times [0, 1/2)^{\mathbb{N}} \tag{4}$$

be the Cartesian product of the intervals $[0, 1/2)$ and $(1/2, 1]$ with the latter interval appearing in the i^{th} position. Observe that $U_i \cap U_j = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$. From (4), it is clear that $U_i \in \mathcal{V}$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. It is also easy to see that U_i is an open set in (X, d) for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. To see this, denote by $\mathbf{x}^i = (0, 0, .., 0, 1, 0, ..)$, the vector in X with 1 at the i^{th} position and 0 elsewhere and note that $U_i = B(\mathbf{x}^i, 1/2)$. This implies that U_i is open in X. We will write $U = \cup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} U_i$. Clearly, U is open in X.

Define the function $W : X \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$W(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \max\{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in V \in \mathcal{V} \\ x_1 & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in [0, 1/2)^{\mathbb{N}} \\ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (1/2)^{n-1}(2 + x_n) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

Now define $\succsim$ as:

$$\mathbf{x} \succsim \mathbf{y} \text{ iff } W(\mathbf{x}) \geq W(\mathbf{y}).$$

Note that the max in line one of (5) is well defined, since for any $\mathbf{x} \in V \in \mathcal{V}$, the quantity $\arg\max\{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ must be attained for some index $j \leq N(V) - 1$.

Claim 1: $\succsim$ *satisfies weak Pareto.*

Proof: Let $\mathbf{x}' >> \mathbf{x}$ for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in X$. Consider the following cases: (A) $\mathbf{x}' \in V' \in \mathcal{V}$ (B) $\mathbf{x}' \notin V$ for any $V \in \mathcal{V}$.

In case (A), we must have either (a) $\mathbf{x} \in V \in \mathcal{V}$ or (b) $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1/2)^{\mathbb{N}}$. In (a), $\mathbf{x}' >> \mathbf{x}$ implies $N(V) \leq N(V')$. Let $j = \arg\max\{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $k = \arg\max\{x'_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Using the appropriate range in (5), we have $W(\mathbf{x}') = x'_k$ and $W(\mathbf{x}) = x_j$. Note that $\mathbf{x}' >> \mathbf{x}$ and $N(V) \leq N(V')$ implies $W(\mathbf{x}) = x_j < x'_j \leq x'_k = W(\mathbf{x}')$. In (b), $\mathbf{x}' >> \mathbf{x}$ and (5) implies $W(\mathbf{x}) = x_1 < (1/2) \leq W(\mathbf{x}')$.

In case (B), two sub-cases are possible: (i) $\mathbf{x}' \in [0, 1/2)^{\mathbb{N}}$ or (ii) $\mathbf{x}' \notin [0, 1/2)^{\mathbb{N}}$. Observe that in (i), $\mathbf{x}' >> \mathbf{x}$ implies $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1/2)^{\mathbb{N}}$. Using (5) we get $W(\mathbf{x}) = x_1 < x'_1 = W(\mathbf{x}')$. In sub-case (ii),

$$W(\mathbf{x}) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (1/2)^{n-1}(2 + x_n) < W(\mathbf{x}')$$

holds, as was needed. □

Claim 2: *Every point of U (an open set in X) is a patient point of $\succsim$.*

Proof: For any $\mathbf{x} \in U$, there is some (unique) U_i such that $\mathbf{x} \in U_i \in \mathcal{V}$. This implies that $\max\{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} = x_i$. For any $M, N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $M > N$ we must have $\mathbf{x}(M, N) \in U_i$ if $M \neq i$ and $N \neq i$; $\mathbf{x}(M, N) \in U_N$ if $M = i$ or $\mathbf{x}(M, N) \in U_M$ if $N = i$. In each of these cases, $W(\mathbf{x}(M, N)) = W(\mathbf{x})$ holds. □

Thus, we have demonstrated the existence representable intertemporal order satisfying weak Pareto that exhibits pure patience on some open set of the program space (X, d). This shows that we cannot claim a general result on the genericity of the set of impatient points when we weaken the sensitivity requirement to weak Pareto for representable orders.

We note two other properties of W: (i) W is *not* continuous in the sup-metric[9] and (ii) W satisfies the monotonicity condition (M). In view of (i), we have not been able to construct an example of a weakly Paretian, sup-metric continuous order on X with at least one patient point. This remains an open question and is formally stated for emphasis.

Open Question: Is there a (sup-metric) continuous preference order satisfying weak Pareto and monotonicity (M) with at least one purely patient point?

If the answer to the above open question is in the negative, then it would imply that for continuous preference orders satisfying weak Pareto and monotonicity, every non-constant stream

[9] Consider the sequence $\{\mathbf{x}^n\}$ in X with $x^n_k = (1/2) - (1/2)^n$ for all k. It is easy to check the following: (a) $\mathbf{x}^n \to \bar{\mathbf{x}} = (1/2, 1/2, 1/2, ...)$ in the sup-metric and (b) $\lim_{n\to\infty} W(\mathbf{x}^n) = (1/2) < W(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$. This shows that W is *not* continuous in the sup-metric.

exhibits some impatience. In particular, this would make the analysis in section 3.2.2 redundant. We hope that our construction above provides some direction in search of an answer to the open question.

3.2.2 Sufficient Condition for Genericity

In this section, we prove that for representable preference orders satisfying infinite Pareto, impatience is indeed generic. On the one hand, Example 2 demonstrates that genericity is not implied by a weakly Paretian, representable preference order and the analysis in Banerjee and Mitra (2007) guarantees that if we strengthen sensitivity all the way to strong Pareto, then impatience is indeed generic. We are able to establish genericity for representable orders which satisfy a sensitivity requirement between weak and strong Pareto, generalizing the Banerjee-Mitra genericity result.

We first show that the set of impatient points of a representable intertemporal order satisfying infinite Pareto must be dense in (X, d).

Theorem 2 *Suppose* $Y = [0, 1]$ *and* $X = Y^{\mathbb{N}}$. *Let* $\succsim$ *be a representable intertemporal order satisfying infinite Pareto. Then the set of points of* X *at which* $\succsim$ *exhibits impatience*

$$I = \{x \in X \ : \ \succsim \ \textit{exhibits impatience at } x\}$$

is a dense subset in (X, d).

Remark:

Impatience is Generic: To show that set I is generic in (X, d), in addition to Theorem 2 we need to show that the set I is an open set in (X, d). If we make the additional assumption that $\succsim$ is continuous in (X, d), (that is for each $\mathbf{x} \in X$, the upper and lower contour sets $UC(\mathbf{x})$ and $LC(\mathbf{x})$ are both closed in (X, d)), then the set I can be easily shown to be an open subset in (X, d). The proof of this fact is identical to Theorem 3 in Banerjee and Mitra (2007) and is omitted.

3.3 Representation and Impatience

Our analysis so far has demonstrated impatience implications of representable weakly Paretian orders. We have not discussed as to why representability was assumed to obtain "zones of impatience" in the program space. This is addressed in this section[10].

For this section, let us restrict attention to intertemporal orders satisfying strong Pareto defined on the classical domain. Banerjee and Mitra (2007) show that representability is sufficient to guarantee the existence of impatient points (in fact, a dense subset of impatient points in (X, d)). It is natural to ask whether representability is also necessary to obtain impatience implications for Strongly Paretian intertemporal orders. This question is answered in the negative by means of example 3.

Example 3: Consider the infinite dimensional lexicographic order, $\succsim_L$ defined as follows. Give $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in X = [0,1]^{\mathbb{N}}$, let $\delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : x_n \neq x'_n\}$ and define $\succsim_L$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x} &\sim {}_L\mathbf{x}' \text{ iff } \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}' \\ \mathbf{x} &\succ {}_L\mathbf{x}' \text{ iff } \mathbf{x}_{\delta(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{x}')} > \mathbf{x}'_{\delta(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{x}')}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that $\succsim_L$ is a transitive and complete binary relation that satisfies strong Pareto. Moreover, it is not representable. $\succsim_L$ exhibits impatience at any non-constant utility stream, and such streams are dense in (X, d). This example shows that representability is not necessary to derive impatience implications for sensitive orders.

We know from Svensson (1980) that an anonymous intertemporal order (which by implication does not exhibit any impatience) satisfying strong Pareto exists. From Basu and Mitra (2003) we can conclude that such an order is not representable. Notably Svensson's definition of the order involves the use of the Axiom of Choice, which raises the suspicion that such an order (one that satisfies Strong Pareto and exhibits no impatience) cannot be *constructed*. This leaves open the possibility of whether every explicitly constructed (in some precise sense, see Lauwers (2010)) strongly Paretian intertemporal order on X exhibits some impatience. We leave this question for future research.

[10] The line of enquiry in this section was initiated by a referee. The same referee also suggested example 3.

4 Appendix

This section is dedicated to the proofs of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2. Following the method in Dubey and Mitra (2011), the proof of Theorem 1(i) is in two steps. We first establish the existence of an impatient point for weakly Paretian, representable intertemporal orders on $X = Y^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $Y = \mathbb{I}$. The next step extends this result to domains of infinite utility streams where the period utilities belong to non-empty subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ of order type μ. The characterization result in Theorem 1(i), follows from noting the existence of purely patient preference orders when period utilities belong to a subset of $\mathbb{R}$ that is *not* of order type μ.

To facilitate the proof of the robustness results, we find it convenient to establish existence of an impatient point in a particular subset of $X = \mathbb{I}^{\mathbb{N}}$. We introduce some auxiliary notation to present this result.

Let us denote $(0, 1)$ by Z and fix some enumeration of the rationals in Z as

$$Q = \{q_1, q_2, q_3, \cdots .\}. \tag{6}$$

For any real $r \in (0, 1)$ define the sequence $\langle a_n(r)\rangle$ by

$$a_n(r) = \begin{cases} n \text{ if } q_n \in (0, r) \\ -n \text{ if } q_n \in [r, 1). \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

and denote the set $\{a_1(r), a_2(r), ...\}$ by $\mathbb{I}(r)$. Note that $\mathbb{I}(r)$ contains infinitely many positive integers and infinitely many negative integers. We can decompose $\mathbb{I}(r)$ into pairwise disjoint sets $\mathbb{I}^+(r) = \{n \in \mathbb{I}(r) : n > 0\}$ and $\mathbb{I}^-(r) = \{n \in \mathbb{I}(r) : n < 0\}$. Moreover, since $\mathbb{I}^+(r)$ is a subset of positive integers, we can define a unique sequence of integers $\langle m_s(r)\rangle$ such that $\mathbb{I}^+(r) = \{m_1(r), m_2(r), ...\}$ and $m_1(r) < m_2(r) < \cdots$[11]. Similarly, since $\mathbb{I}^-(r)$ is a subset of negative integers (implying $\mathbb{I}^-(r)$ and every subset of $\mathbb{I}^-(r)$ has a maximum element), we can define a unique sequence of integers $\langle p_s(r)\rangle$ such that $\mathbb{I}^-(r) = \{p_1(s), p_2(s), ...\}$ and $p_1(s) > p_2(s) > \cdots$.

Proposition 1 *Suppose $Y = \mathbb{I}$ and $X = Y^{\mathbb{N}}$. Let $\succsim$ be a representable, weakly Paretian preference order on X. Then the set of points of X at which $\succsim$ exhibits impatience*

$$I = \{\mathbf{x} \in X : \ \succsim \text{ exhibits impatience at } \mathbf{x}\}$$

[11] Set $m_1(r) = \min\{n : n \in \mathbb{I}^+(r)\}$ and define recursively for $s > 1$, $m_s(r) = \min\{n : n \in \mathbb{I}^+(r)/\{m_1(r), ..., m_{s-1}(r)\}\}$. Note that at every stage we are taking the minimum over a set of positive integers which exists.

is non-empty.

Proof. Denote by $W : X \to \mathbb{R}$ the function that represents $\succsim$ and $\mathbb{I}(r)^{\mathbb{N}}$ by $X(r)$ for $r \in Z$. We will prove a stronger result than stated in the statement of the proposition. Suppose by way of contradiction, that the weakly Paretian $\succsim$ (represented by W) exhibits no impatience in $X(r)$.

Recall that Q is a fixed enumeration of the rationals in Z given by (6). For any real number $t \in Z$, there are infinitely many rational numbers from Q in $(0, t)$ and in $[t, 1)$. For each real number $t \in Z$, we can then define the set $L(t) = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : q_n \in (0, t)\}$ and the sequence $\langle n_s(t) \rangle$ such that $n_1(t) < n_2(t) < n_3(t) < \cdots$ and $L(t) = \{n_1(t), n_2(t), \cdots\}$ [as in footnote 11].

Similarly, for each real number $t \in Z$, we can define the set $U(t) = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : q_n \in [t, 1)\}$ and the sequence $\langle v_s(t) \rangle$ such that $v_1(t) < v_2(t) < v_3(t) \cdots$ and $U(t) = \{v_1(t), v_2(t), \cdots\}$.

For each real number $t \in (0, 1)$, we note that $L(t) \cap U(t) = \emptyset$, and $L(t) \cup U(t) = \mathbb{N}$. Then, for each $r \in Z$ define the sequence $\langle x_n^r(t) \rangle_{n=1}^{\infty} = \mathbf{x}^r(t)$ as follows:

$$x_n^r(t) = \begin{cases} m_{2s-1}(r) & \text{if } n = n_s(t) \text{ for some } s \in \mathbb{N} \\ p_{2s'+1}(r) & \text{if } n = v_{s'}(t) \text{ for some } s' \in \mathbb{N}. \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

Fix $r \in Z$ for the rest of the analysis. For any $t \in Z$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we must have $x_n^r(t) \in \mathbb{I}(r)$. So $\mathbf{x}^r(t) \in X(r)$ for any $t \in Z$. By way of contradiction we have assumed that W does not exhibit impatience at $\mathbf{x}^r(t)$ for any t. The proof of Proposition 4 in Dubey and Mitra (2011) shows that there is an impatient point[12] in the set

$$\hat{X}(r) = \{\mathbf{x} \in X(r) : \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^r(t) \text{ as in (8) for some } t \in Z\}. \tag{9}$$

In conclusion, there is some $\mathbf{x} \in \hat{X}(r) \subset X$ at which the representable, weakly Paretian preference order $\succsim$ must exhibits impatience. ■

We can show that when period utilities belong to an order type μ subset of $\mathbb{R}$, the conclusion of Proposition 1 continues to hold.

[12] For a fixed $r \in Z$ and any $t \in Z$, note that in the sequence $\mathbf{x}^r(t)$ defined in (8) positive terms appear along some subsequence of $\mathbb{N}$ in increasing order of magnitude, and along the complementary sequence negative terms appear in decreasing order of magnitude. It is this feature of $\mathbf{x}^r(t)$ that is crucial in generalizing the proof of Proposition 4 in Dubey and Mitra (2011). The equality (26) in the proof of Proposition 4 in Dubey and Mitra (2011), holds with a weak inequality here. However, this modification leaves the final contradiction unaffected. For the sake of brevity, we omit the details here.

Proposition 2 *Suppose Y is a non-empty subset of $\mathbb{R}$ and is of order type μ and let $X = Y^{\mathbb{N}}$. Let $\succsim$ be a representable, weakly Paretian preference order on X. Then the set of points of X at which $\succsim$ exhibits impatience*

$$I = \{\mathbf{x} \in X : \ \succsim \ \textit{exhibits impatience at } \mathbf{x}\}$$

is non-empty.

Proof. Denote by $W : X \to \mathbb{R}$ the function that represents $\succsim$. Since Y is of order type μ, it contains a non-empty ordered subset $Y'(<)$ which is similar to $\mathbb{I}(<)$. This implies that there is a one-to-one and onto function $f : \mathbb{I} \to Y'$ that is order-preserving in the sense of condition (OP). Let $J = \mathbb{I}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and define $V : J \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$V(z_1, z_2, ...) = W(f(z_1), f(z_2), ...) \tag{10}$$

It is easy to show that V satisfies weak Pareto. Proposition 1 implies that there is some $\mathbf{z} \in J$ at which V exhibits impatience. We will show that W exhibits impatience at $(f(z_1), f(z_2), ...)$. With some abuse of notation we will denote the sequence $(f(z_1), f(z_2), ...)$ in X by $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z})$. Since V exhibits impatience at $\mathbf{z} \in J$, w.l.o.g, there is some $M, N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $M > N$ such that $z_M > z_N$ and $V(\mathbf{z}(M, N)) > V(\mathbf{z})$. This information on $\mathbf{z}$ directly translates to $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z})$ as the function f is an order preserving map from $\mathbb{I}$ onto Y'. Hence, $f(z_M) > f(z_N)$ and $W(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z})(M, N)) = V(\mathbf{z}(M, N)) > V(\mathbf{z}) = W(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z}))$, showing that W exhibits impatience at $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z}) \in X$. ■

We will now state a result that combines the conclusions of Proposition 1 and 2 in Dubey and Mitra (2011).

Proposition 3 *Suppose Y is a non-empty subset of $\mathbb{R}$ and is* ***not*** *of order type μ and let $X = Y^{\mathbb{N}}$. Then the representable, preference order $\succsim$ defined by*

$$\mathbf{x} \succsim \mathbf{y} \ \textit{iff} \ W(\mathbf{x}) \geq W(\mathbf{y})$$

where $W : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$W(\mathbf{x}) = \alpha \inf\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} + (1 - \alpha) \sup\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$$

with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ as a parameter, does not exhibit impatience at any $\mathbf{x} \in X$ and satisfies weak Pareto.

The results in Proposition 2 and 3 imply the characterization result in Theorem 1(i).

To demonstrate the result in Theorem 1(ii) we will need some additional notation. For two sets A, B if there is an injective map with domain A and range B, then we will write $A \leq_c B$. If there is a bijection (a one-to-one and onto map) with domain A and range B, then we say the sets are of the same cardinality and denote it by $A =_c B$. The Cantor-Bernstein Theorem states that $A \leq_c B$ and $B \leq_c A$ implies $A =_c B$.

Proposition 4 *Suppose $Y = \mathbb{I}$ and $X = Y^{\mathbb{N}}$. Let $\succsim$ be a representable, weakly Paretian preference order on X. Then the set of points of X at which $\succsim$ exhibits impatience*

$$I = \{\mathbf{x} \in X : \ \succsim \ \textit{exhibits impatience at } \mathbf{x}\}$$

is uncountable.

Proof. Let $I(\hat{X}(r))$ be the set of impatient points of $\succsim$ in the set $\hat{X}(r)$, where $\hat{X}(r)$ is given by (9). From Proposition 2, for each $r \in Z$ the set $I(\hat{X}(r))$ is non-empty. We will first show that for $r, r' \in Z$ and $r \neq r'$, we must have $I(\hat{X}(r)) \cap I(\hat{X}(r')) = \emptyset$.

Suppose $\mathbf{x}(r) = \mathbf{x}^r(\alpha) \in I(\hat{X}(r))$ and $\mathbf{x}(r') = \mathbf{x}^{r'}(\beta) \in I(\hat{X}(r'))$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in Z$. There are two possible cases: (A) $\alpha \neq \beta$ and (B) $\alpha = \beta$. We need to show that in both cases $\mathbf{x}(r) \neq \mathbf{x}(r')$.

In case (A), assume w.l.o.g $\beta > \alpha$. Since there are infinitely many rationals in the interval (α, β) from (8) it follows that there are infinitely many natural numbers n for which

$$x_n^{r'}(\beta) > 0 > x_n^r(\alpha).$$

In particular, we must have $\mathbf{x}(r) \neq \mathbf{x}(r')$.

In case (B), assume w.l.o.g $r < r'$. Let

$$N = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : q_n \in [r, r')\}.$$

There are two possibilities: (i) $N = 1$ and (ii) $N > 1$. Consider $N = 1$. In this case, $m_1(r') = 1 < m_1(r)$. Since by assumption $r < r'$, if $q_n < r$ for some n, then $q_n < r'$. Hence the dominance of $m_1(r')$ over $m_1(r)$ carries over to every term, that is $m_t(r') < m_t(r)$ for all t. Since some $n = n_s(\alpha)$ exists, we must have $x_n^{r'}(\alpha) = m_{2s-1}(r') \neq m_{2s-1}(r) = x_n^r(\alpha)$. So $\mathbf{x}(r) \neq \mathbf{x}(r')$ is established when $N = 1$.

Suppose $N > 1$. Then for $i = 1, ..., N-1$ it must be that either $q_i \in (0, r)$ or $q_i \in [r', 1)$. Let there be exactly $J \geq 0$ non-negative integers such that $q_{J_i} \in (0, r)$ for $i = 1, ..., J$ and $K \geq 0$ non-negative integers for which $q_{K_i} \in [r', 1)$ for $i = 1, ..., K$. Of course, $J + K = N - 1$. This immediately implies that $m_j(r') = m_j(r)$ for $j = 1, ..., J$ and $p_k(r') = p_k(r)$ for $k = 1, ..., K$. However, $m_{J+1}(r') = N < m_{J+1}(r)$, and the inequality registers for all $m_j(r')$ and $m_j(r)$ for $j > J$. So, $m_j(r') < m_j(r)$ for all $j \geq J + 1$. This implies that $\mathbf{x}(r) \neq \mathbf{x}(r')$ when $N > 1$.

Since $I(\hat{X}(r)) \cap I(\hat{X}(r')) = \emptyset$, we can use the axiom of choice to define a choice function $g : Z \to X$ such that

$$g(r) \in I(\hat{X}(r)) \text{ for each } r \in Z. \tag{11}$$

So g is an injective function from Z onto $g(Z) \subset I$. This shows that $Z \leq_c I$. It is well known that $Z =_c \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{R} =_c \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$. These last two equivalences are well known (see Kolmogorov and Fomin 1970, p. 15 and p. 20). These equivalences imply, $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} \leq_c I$. Also, $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ has a subset I which (trivially) has the same cardinality as I, Hence, $I \leq_c \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Thus by the Cantor-Bernstein theorem, $I =_c \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$, that is I is of the power of the continuum. ■

Proof of Theorem 1(ii). Denote by $W : X \to \mathbb{R}$ the function that represents $\succsim$. Let $J = \mathbb{I}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and define $V : J \to \mathbb{R}$ by (10), and note that V satisfies weak Pareto. Denote the set of impatient points of V by I_V. For any $\mathbf{x} \in I_V$, we have (using Proposition 2) $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \in I$ (recall, from the proof of Proposition 2 that for any $\mathbf{x} \in J$ we have $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = (f(x_1), f(x_2), ...) \in X$) and by (OP) the function $F : I_V \to I$ defined by $F(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ is one-to-one and onto on its image set, $F(I_V)$, and $F(I_V) \subset I$. So I has a subset, $F(I_V)$, that has the same cardinality as I_V, so $I_V \leq_c I$. By Proposition 4, $I_V =_c \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ holds, so $I_V \leq_c I$ implies $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} \leq_c I$. Also, $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ has a subset I which (trivially) has the same cardinality as I, so $I \leq_c \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$. By the Cantor-Bernstein theorem, $I =_c \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$, that is I is of the power of the continuum. ■

Proof of Thorem 2. We have to show that for any $\mathbf{x} \in X$ and $\epsilon > 0$ the open ball of radius ϵ and center $\mathbf{x}$ (denoted $B(\mathbf{x}, \epsilon)$) has non-empty intersection with I. Let $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in X$ and $\epsilon > 0$ we need to show $B(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \epsilon) \cap I \neq \emptyset$. Let $a \equiv \liminf_{n \to \infty} \{\bar{x}_n\}$.

Given a fixed $\epsilon > 0$ assume w.l.o.g, $(a - \epsilon/2, a + \epsilon/2) \subset Y$ and denote the interval $(a - \epsilon/2, a + \epsilon/2)$ by Y'. From the definition of a it follows that there is some N such that for all $k > N$ we must have

$$a - (\epsilon/2) < \bar{x}_k. \tag{12}$$

Choose N to be the smallest such natural number for which (12) holds and fix it. We will now recursively define a particular subsequence of the natural numbers $\{N_1, N_2, ...\}$ such that

$\bar{x}_{N_k} < a + (\epsilon/2)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. As step 1, set $N_1 = N$ and find the smallest natural number $N_2 > N$ such that $\bar{x}_{N_2} < a + (\epsilon/2)$. In step 2, start with N_2 and find the smallest natural number $N_3 > N_2$ such that $\bar{x}_{N_3} < a + (\epsilon/2)$. Proceed recursively to obtain the sequence $\{N_1, N_2, ...\}$ such that

$$\bar{x}_{N_k} < a + (\epsilon/2) \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{13}$$

Claim 3. *If $b \in Y'$, then $\bar{x}_{N_k} - \epsilon < b < \bar{x}_{N_k} + \epsilon$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$*: Observe that by subtracting ϵ from both sides of (13) and comparing with b, we get $\bar{x}_{N_k} - \epsilon < a - (\epsilon/2) < b$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, by adding ϵ to both sides of (12) and comparing with b we get $b < a + (\epsilon/2) < \bar{x}_k + \epsilon$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ as was needed. □

Denote X' by $(Y')^{\mathbb{N}}$ and let $g : X' \to X$ be defined as $g(\mathbf{y}) = (g_k(\mathbf{y}))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ where,

$$g_k(\mathbf{y}) = \begin{cases} y_i & \text{if } k = N_i \text{ for some } i \\ \bar{x}_k & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

Define the function $U : X' \to \mathbb{R}$ as $U(\mathbf{y}) = W(g(\mathbf{y}))$ for $\mathbf{y} \in X'$.

We show first that U satisfies weak Pareto on X'. To verify weak Pareto, take $\mathbf{y}' >> \mathbf{y}$ for $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}' \in X'$ and note that (14) implies $g_k(\mathbf{y}') > g_k(\mathbf{y})$ for $k = N_i$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Since W satisfies infinite Pareto, the following must be true

$$U(\mathbf{y}') = W(g(\mathbf{y}')) > W(g(\mathbf{y})) = U(\mathbf{y}),$$

establishing that U satisfies weak Pareto on X'. As Y' is a set of order type μ, Theorem 1 implies that there exists some $\mathbf{y}' \in X'$ at which U exhibits impatience. So, there is some $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m > n$ such that

$$(y'_n - y'_m)(U(\mathbf{y}'(m, n)) - U(\mathbf{y}')) < 0. \tag{15}$$

The information in (15) can be translated to obtain an impatient point in $B(\bar{x}, \epsilon)$. From the definition of g we must have $N_n < N_m$, $g_{N_n}(\mathbf{y}') = y'_n$ and $g_{N_m}(\mathbf{y}') = y'_m$. Using (15) we get

$$(g_{N_n}(\mathbf{y}') - g_{N_m}(\mathbf{y}'))[W(g(\mathbf{y}')(N_m, N_n)) - W(g(\mathbf{y}'))] < 0.$$

Hence, W must exhibit impatience at $g(\mathbf{y}') \in B(\bar{x}, \epsilon)$ (by Claim 3, and (14) we must have $g(\mathbf{y}) \in B(\bar{x}, \epsilon)$ for all $\mathbf{y} \in X'$) as was required. ■

References

[1] Arrow K J (1963) Social choice and individual values. John Wiley, New York.

[2] Banerjee K, Mitra T (2007) On the impatience implications of Paretian social welfare functions, Journal of Math Econ 43: 236-248.

[3] Basu K, Mitra T (2003) Aggregating infinite utility streams with intergenerational equity: the impossibility of being paretian. Econometrica 71: 1557-1563.

[4] Benoit J-P, Ok E (2007) Delay aversion. Theoretical Econ 2: 71-113.

[5] Böhm-Bawerk, E V (1891) The positive theory of capital. Stechert, New York (translated by William Smart, 1923).

[6] Brown D J, Lewis L (1981) Myopic economic agents. Econometrica 49: 359-368

[7] Burness H S (1973) Impatience and the preference for advancement in the timing of satisfactions. Journal Econ Theory 6: 495–507.

[8] Burness H S (1976) On the role of separability assumptions in determining impatience implications. Econometrica 44: 67–78.

[9] Crespo J, Nuñez C, Zapatero J R (2009) On the impossibility of representing infinite utility streams. Econ Theory 40: 47-56.

[10] Diamond P A (1965) The evaluation of infinite utility streams. Econometrica 33: 170–177.

[11] Dubey R S, Mitra T (2011) On equitable social welfare functions satisfying the weak Pareto axiom: a complete characterization. Intl. Journal of Econ Theory 7: 231-250

[12] Fisher I (1930) The theory of interest as determined by impatience to spend income and opportunity to invest it. Macmillan, New York.

[13] Frederick S, Loewenstein G, O'Donoghue T (2002) Time discounting and time preference: a critical review. Journal of Econ Lit 40: 351–401.

[14] Kolmogorov A N, Fomin S V (1970) Introductory Real Analysis. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.

[15] Koopmans T C (1960) Stationary ordinal utility and impatience. Econometrica 28: 287–309.

[16] Koopmans T C (1972) Representation of preference orderings over time. In: McGuire C B, Radner R (eds.), Decision and Organization. North Holland, Amsterdam.

[17] Koopmans T C, Diamond P A, Williamson R E (1964) Stationary utility and time perspective. Econometrica 32: 82-100.

[18] Lauwers L (2010) Ordering infinite utility streams comes at the cost of a non-Ramsey set. Journal of Math Econ 46: 32-37.

[19] Mitra T. (2000) Introduction to Dynamic Optimization Theory. In: Majumdar M, Mitra T, Nishimura K (eds.), Optimization and Chaos. Springer-Verlag.

[20] Rae J (1834) The Sociological Theory of Capital. Macmillan, London, 1905.

[21] Roy S, Kamihigashi, T (2007) A non-smooth, non-convex model of economic growth. Journal Econ Theory 132: 435-560.

[22] Sen A K (1977) On weights and measures: informational constraints in social welfare analysis. Econometrica 45:1539–1572.

[23] Sierpinski W (1965) Cardinal and ordinal numbers. Polish Scientific, Warsaw.

[24] Svensson L G (1980) Equity among generations. Econometrica 48: 1251–1256.