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Thank you for this opportunity ...

... to re-engage with a topic after 20 years,

... to meet a community.
• **The Art of Causal Conjecture** MIT Press 1996.

• **The situation of causality.** *Foundations of Science* **1** 543-563. 1996.


• **Causality and responsibility.** *Cardozo Law Review* **22** 101-123. 2001.

• **Game-Theoretic Foundations for Probability and Finance** Wiley 2019.
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Event trees
What will Rick do after school?

Nodes are instantaneous events or situations, without duration.

Edges are actions, with duration.
The word “event” has too many meanings.

1. Usual meaning in probability: set of root-to-leaf paths, “Moivrean event”.


3. Step from one node to another: change, action, “Humean event”.

An instantaneous event is not necessarily labeled with a single clock time.

Rick intends to pump up his bicycle time when he gets home, but he will eat a cookie first, and at some point he may get distracted and start watching television.
How should we think about cause and effect in an event tree?

In my 2001 *Cardozo Law Review* paper, I suggested that

- cause = step in the tree (Humean event);
- effect = node in the tree (situation).

![Event tree diagram](image)
Axioms for finite event trees

A finite event tree is a finite set with a partial ordering \textit{precedes} such that:

- There is an element that precedes all the others.
- If \( S \) and \( T \) both precede \( U \), then either \( S \) precedes \( T \) or \( T \) precedes \( S \).
2

Refinement
So $E_1$, $E_2$, and $E_3$ can be thought of as a single situation.
Refine further
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Relations between instantaneous events (a.k.a. situations)
Consider *all* the situations in our story. This includes I, G, F, R, E, and E₁, E₂, and E₃.

Also the situation obtained by merging F and E₂, the situation obtained by merging F and E₃, etc.

What are the (binary) relations among these situations, and how can we axiomatize them?

Are *precedes* and *refines* enough? No.
F = instantaneous event that Bob goes to college

E = instantaneous event that Bob goes to Princeton

G = instantaneous event that Bob joins the navy

H = instantaneous event that Bob drops out or graduates

I = instantaneous event that Bob drops out or graduates

Go to Princeton -> Go to Rutgers -> Join Navy

Drop Out -> Graduate -> Drop Out -> Graduate

Go on ship -> Office job
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$E$ allows $H$.</td>
<td>No matter how $E$ happens, $H$ can happen later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H$ requires $F$.</td>
<td>No matter how $H$ happens, $F$ has already happened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ precedes $H$.</td>
<td>$F$ allows $H$ and $H$ requires $F$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E$ foretells $I$.</td>
<td>When $E$ happens, $I$'s later happening is inevitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ always foretells $I$.</td>
<td>$F$ foretells $I$ and $I$ requires $F$.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4

Axioms for situation spaces
In my 1998 “Mathematical foundations for probability and causality”, I considered how the notion of an “instantaneous event space” or “situation space” can be axiomatized.

I found that I needed 4 or 5 binary relations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY MANDATORY RELATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S refines T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever S happens, T happens at the same time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S str.requires T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever S happens, T has already happened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S str.foretells T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever S happens, T must happen later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S forbears T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever S happens, T remains only possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S divergent T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever S happens, T cannot happen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My axioms were complex, and I don’t think anyone followed up with them.

Perhaps I was misguided to insist on binary relations.

Perhaps an adequate axiomatization can be based on these four relations:
• situation $S$ precedes situation $T$,
• situation $S$ implies situation $T$,
• situation $S$ diverges from situation $T$,
• set of situations $\mathcal{C}$ composes situation $T$. 
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Chain event graphs
Only some of the situations in the situation space are shown.
Predictive causality
According to this philosophy, causal structure is the structure of predictions by a superior intelligence, who witnesses everything that could conceivably be witnessed by a human-like witness and predicts everything that could conceivably be predicted by a human-like scientist.

I call this superior intelligence "Nature."

Like us and unlike God, Nature moves through time.

Her knowledge increases as she sees what happens.

Like us, Nature can predict some events in advance but cannot predict everything.
Our knowledge can be empirically valid but still not causal.

Nature's superior knowledge may allow her to rule out some things we regard as possible but will not, if our knowledge is valid, allow her to rule in things we know to be impossible.
Glenn knows less than Nature.
Doob’s fundamental idea in martingale theory: Use notion of filtration to express that you are not a prophet.

You have a filtration. Prophet has a larger filtration, because he has more knowledge at every moment.

**Theorem:** Martingales in small filtration become semimartingales in large filtration, where they decompose into “signal plus noise”.

Probability in situation spaces should be richer than measure theory with multiple filtrations.

- No filtration-like time scale.

- Allow decision causes (steps).

- Allow causes with upper and lower probabilities.
NO PROBABILITIES

Try to refine
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Supermartingales in situation spaces
Generalizes probability theory to upper and lower probability in event trees.

*Forecasting strategy*: offers gambles in each situation.

*Gambling strategy*: chooses a gamble in each situation.

*Supermartingale*: resulting capital process (assigns $ amount to each situation)

*Upper probability of E*: amount gambler must risk to win one unit if E happens.
A payoff $g$ is an extended real-valued function on the children.

An offer is a set $\mathbf{G}$ of payoffs.

**Axiom G1.** If $g_1, g_2 \in \mathbf{G}$, then $g_1 + g_2 \in \mathbf{G}$.

**Axiom G2.** If $c \in [0, \infty)$ and $g \in \mathbf{G}$, then $cg \in \mathbf{G}$.

**Axiom G3.** If $g_1 \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^Y}$, $g_2 \in \mathbf{G}$, and $g_1 \leq g_2$, then $g_1 \in \mathbf{G}$.

**Axiom G4.** If $g \in \mathbf{G}$, then $\inf g \leq 0$. 
How do we generalize further to situation spaces?

*Forecasting strategy*: offers gambles in each situation. Payoffs of an offer can be in arbitrary descendants, not just in children.

*Gambling strategy*: chooses a gamble in each situation.

*Supermartingale*: resulting capital process (assigns $ amount to each situation)

*Upper probability of E*: amount gambler must risk to win one unit if $E$ happens.