M. V. JOHNS JR.

## REPRESENTING FINITELY ADDITIVE INVARIANT PROBABILITIES

Ву

Richard A. Olshen

## TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 21

March 15, 1968

## PREPARED UNDER GRANT DA-ARO(D)-31-124-G726

FOR

U. S. ARMY RESEARCH OFFICE

Reproduction in Whole or in Part is Permitted for any Purpose of the United States Government

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

## REPRESENTING FINITELY ADDITIVE INVARIANT PROBABILITIES

By

### Richard A. Olshen Stanford University

## 1. Introduction.

Hewitt and Savage [6] have shown that finitely additive exchangeable probabilities on a product space are integral averages of power product probabilities. They prove this result as a corollary to their theorems on the countably additive case. This note adapts their technique to the study of more general invariant probabilities. From results of Farrell [4] and Choquet and Feldman ([7], Section 10) it is concluded that finitely additive invariant probabilities are averages of finitely additive ergodic probabilities.

In a countably additive context it seems necessary to impose restrictions on the Borel field being studied and on the maps used to define invariance and ergodicity. Relaxing the assumptions of one type must be balanced by strengthening those of the other (in addition to [4] and [7], see [1] and [12]). Here, however, the field of sets can be arbitrary, and the maps are assumed only to be measurable. Rather than state a host of theorems which can be proved, one particular case is proved in detail. Later on it is explained how the techniques can be applied to other problems. Several definitions of ergodicity are proposed and related to the one used. The final section contains a subjective probability interpretation of invariance and ergodicity.

Prepared with partial support of U.S. Army Research Office Grant DA-ARO(D)-31-124-G726.

#### 2. A Representation Theorem

A homomorphism from one field of sets to another is a map which preserves finite unions, finite intersections, and complements. The notions of isomorphism and automorphism are defined in the obvious ways. A  $\sigma$ -homomorphism (isomorphism, automorphism) in addition preserves countable unions and intersections.

Assume  $\Omega$  is a set,  $\mathcal{F}$  a field of subsets of  $\Omega$ , and T a 1-1 bi- $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable map of  $\Omega$  onto  $\Omega$ . T and its powers can be viewed as automorphisms of  $\mathcal{F}$ . A finitely additive probability  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  is said to be invariant if  $\mu(A) = \mu(T^{-1}A) [= \mu(T^{n}A), n = \pm 1, \pm 2...]$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ ;  $\mu$  is ergodic if there do not exist  $\delta > 0$  and  $A_1, A_2, \ldots \in \mathcal{F}$  for which  $\delta < \mu(A_n) < 1 - \delta$ ,  $\lim_{m,n \to \infty} \mu(A_n \Delta A_m) = 0$ , and  $\mu(A_n \Delta T^{-1} A_n) \to 0$ ( $\Delta$  denotes symmetric difference). Let  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})[\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})]$  be the set of finitely additive invariant [ergodic] probabilities on  $\mathcal{F}$  and let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the smallest  $\sigma$ -field of subsets of  $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})$  containing all sets of the form  $\{\nu | \nu \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F}), \nu(A) \leq \alpha\}$ , where  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ , and A is a fixed set in  $\mathcal{F}$ . (1) THEOREM.  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})$  is not empty. For each  $\mu \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})$  there is a unique countably additive probability  $\lambda$  on  $\mathcal{C}$  satisfying

(2) 
$$\mu(A) = \int_{\mathcal{E}}^{h} \nu(A) d\lambda(\nu)$$

for all  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ . (It is clear that, conversely, if for a finitely additive probability  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  there exists a  $\lambda$  on  $\mathscr{C}$  satisfying (2) for all  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ , then  $\mu \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{F})$ .)

PROOF. By Stone's representation theorem for Boolean algebras ([11], Section 8) there is an isomorphism  $\varphi$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  onto the field of compact open subsets of some compact, totally disconnected Hausdorff

space S. Call S "the" Stone space of  $\mathcal{F}$ ; any two such are homeomorphic. For B  $\in \mathcal{O}$  define UB =  $\varphi(\mathbf{T}^{-1}(\varphi^{-1}\mathbf{B}))$ . Of course U and its powers are automorphisms of  $\mathcal{O}$ . Moreover, there exists a homeomorphism  $\psi$  of S with itself for which  $\psi^{-1}\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{B}$  for all B  $\in \mathcal{O}$  ([11], Section 11). Let  $\sigma(\mathcal{O})$  be the  $\sigma$ -field generated by  $\mathcal{O}$ ; it is essential to notice that  $\sigma(\mathcal{O})$  is the Baire  $\sigma$ -field of S ([5], p. 221). Because  $\psi$  and  $\psi^{-1}$  take Baire sets to Baire sets, U can be extended uniquely to a  $\sigma$ -automorphism of  $\sigma(\mathcal{O})$ .  $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{F})$  and  $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})$  are in obvious 1-1 correspondence with  $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{O})$  and  $\sigma(\mathcal{O})$  respectively. Each finitely additive probability  $\eta$  on  $\mathcal{O}$  is in fact countably additive, and so admits unique extension to a countably additive probability on  $\sigma(\mathcal{O})$ . To see this, it is enough to demonstrate that  $\mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{B}_2, \ldots$  in  $\mathcal{O}$  and  $\mathbf{B}_1 \supset \mathbf{B}_2 \supset \ldots, \ \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{B}_i = \phi$  imply  $\eta(\mathbf{B}_i) \to 0$  ([5], pp. 39 and 54). But this condition is trivially satisfied, for since the B's are compact and have void intersection, some  $\mathbf{B}_i$  is already void.

Recall that if  $\eta$  is any countably additive probability on  $\sigma(\mathcal{O})$ and for A,B  $\in \sigma(\mathcal{O})$ , the distance from A to B is defined to be  $\eta(A \triangle B)$ , then  $\sigma(\mathcal{O})$  is a complete semi-metric space, and moreover that every member of the space is the limit of a Cauchy sequence of elements of  $\mathcal{O}$ . Easy consequences of these facts are as follows: (a)  $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{J}(\sigma(\mathcal{O}))$ ; (b) if  $\nu \in \mathcal{J}(\sigma(\mathcal{O}))$  then  $\nu \in \varepsilon(\mathcal{O})$  iff there does not exist  $B \in \sigma(\mathcal{O})$  for which  $\nu(B \triangle UB) = 0$ ,  $0 < \nu(B) < 1$ . The existence of such a B implies that of a C satisfying UC = C,  $0 < \nu(C) < 1$  -- for example, take C = limsup U<sup>n</sup>B.

An argument given by Choquet (see [7], pp. 81-2) and (a) imply  $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{F})$ is nonempty. Briefly, the set of all finite, signed, countably additive Baire measures on S can be viewed as the dual space of the Banach space

of continuous, real-valued functions on S. With those measures given the weak\* topology, the maps  $U^n$ ,  $n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots$  induce continuous linear transformations of the (compact, convex) set of countably additive probabilities,  $\mathcal{P}$ , onto itself. And  $\mathcal{J}(\sigma(\mathcal{O}))$  is the subset of  $\mathcal{P}$ consisting of fixed points for the maps  $U^n$ . The Markov-Kakutani fixed point theorem ([3], p. 456) implies  $\mathcal{J}(\sigma(\mathcal{O}))$  is not empty, and hence that  $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{A})$  is not empty.

In view of the existence of  $\psi$ , (a), the remark following (b), and a theorem of Farrell ([4], p. 460), for each  $\mu \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{O})$  there exists a unique (countably additive) probability  $\tilde{\lambda}$  on the  $\sigma$ -field of subsets of  $\varepsilon(\mathcal{O})$  generated by sets of the form  $\{\eta \mid \eta \in \varepsilon(\mathcal{O}), \eta(\mathcal{C}) \leq \alpha; 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, C \in \sigma(\mathcal{O})\}$  satisfying

(3) 
$$\mu(B) = \int_{\mathcal{C}} \eta(B) \, d\tilde{\lambda}(\eta)$$

for each  $B \in \sigma(\mathcal{O})$ . In particular (3) holds for each  $B \in \mathcal{O}$ . Yet for such B,  $\eta(B)$  viewed as a function of  $\eta \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{O})$  is measurable with respect to the  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathfrak{F}$  generated by sets of the form  $\{\eta \mid \eta \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{O}), \eta(C) \leq \alpha; 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, C \in \mathfrak{O}\}$ . Thus for  $B \in \mathcal{O}, \lambda$  can be cut down to  $\mathfrak{F}$ , and (3) still holds. But now (1) follows in view of the correspondence between  $\mathfrak{F}$  and  $\mathfrak{F}, \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{O})$  and  $\mathcal{J}(\mathfrak{F})$ , and  $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{O})$  and  $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})$ .

Of course the definition of  $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})$  is contrived so that  $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})$ corresponds to countably additive probabilities on  $\sigma(\mathcal{O})$  which are ergodic in the usual way. And it is implicit in (2) that  $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})$  is the set of extreme points of  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})$ . Yet it may be of interest to see what

becomes of other definitions of ergodicity when applied to  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ . For example,  $\mu \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{F})$  might be called ergodic if there does not exist  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  for which  $A = T^{-1}A$ ,  $0 < \mu(A) < 1$ . That this would have been ridiculous is clear from the following example. Let  $\Omega$  be the set of bilateral sequences of 0's and 1's,  $\mathcal{F}$  be the smallest field containing the cylinders, and T be the shift. It is easy to verify that  $\Omega$ and  $\emptyset$  are the only members of  $\mathcal{F}$  in variant under  $T^{-1}$ , and so every member of  $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{F})$  would be ergodic by this definition. (With  $\Omega$  given the ordinary product topology,  $\mathcal{F}$  is a base of compact open sets, and so  $\Omega$  is its own Stone space.)

It may seem reasonable to call  $\mu \in \mathcal{J}(\mathscr{F})$  ergodic if there does not exist  $B \in \mathscr{F}$  for which  $\mu(B \triangle T^{-1}B) = 0$ ,  $0 < \mu(B) < 1$ . Unlike the case with  $\sigma(\mathcal{O})$  and U, this definition is not identical to the one just discussed, and it is true that a  $\mu$  not ergodic in this sense is not ergodic according to the definition adopted. Probabilities ergodic in this sense need not be extreme in  $\mathscr{I}(\mathscr{F})$ , however, as is illustrated by an example. Let  $(\Omega,\mathscr{F})$  be as in the previous paragraph. Suppose  $\mu$ is a measure on  $\mathscr{F}$  induced by any sequence of exchangeable random variables which are neither independent nor with probability one either identically 0 or identically 1. Then it follows from deFinetti's theorem ([2], Chapter 4; [6], p. 486) that the only sets  $B \in \mathscr{F}$  satisfying  $\mu(B \triangle T^{-1}B) = 0$  are  $\Omega$  and  $\emptyset$ , and that  $\mu$  is not extreme in the power product probabilities on  $\Omega$ , let alone in  $\mathscr{I}(\mathscr{F})$ .

### 3. Generalizations.

Apparently several times in Section 2  $T^{-1}$  or  $\psi^{-1}$  was considered when reference to the inverse was unnecessary. The reason for this was

to keep notation consistent with that of more general problems than the one being studied. What follows is an outline of several results similar to (1), some generalizations and some not comparable. The interested reader will have no trouble filling in the details himself.

Suppose  $\Omega$  is a set,  $\mathcal{F}$  a field of subsets, and  $\mathcal{F}$  a family of  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable maps of  $\Omega$  into itself. Then  $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{J}$  implies  $\mathbf{T}^{-1}$  can be viewed as a homomorphism of  $\mathcal{F}$  (though the same is not necessarily true of  $\mathbf{T}$ ). A finitely additive probability  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  is in  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})$  if  $\mu(\mathbf{A}) = \mu(\mathbf{T}^{-1}\mathbf{A})$  for each  $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{J}$  and  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{F}$ ; it is in  $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})$  if there do not exist  $\delta > 0$  and  $A_1, A_2, \ldots \in \mathcal{F}$  for which  $\delta < \mu(A_n) < 1-\delta$ ,  $\lim_{m,n \to \infty} \mu(A_n \bigtriangleup A_m) = 0$ , and  $\mu(A_n \bigtriangleup \mathbf{T}^{-1}A_n) \to 0$  for each  $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{J}$ .

Again the Stone space argument can be employed. If U on  $\mathcal{O}$  corresponds to  $T^{-1}, T \in \mathcal{J}$ , there may not be a homeomorphism of the Stone space corresponding to U, but at least there is a unique continuous map  $\xi$  of S into S satisfying UB =  $\xi^{-1}$ B for each B  $\in \mathcal{O}$  ([11], p. 32). Hence the results of Farrell ([4], p. 460) and Choquet and Feldman ([7], pp. 82-3) apply to yield a number of theorems similar to (1). Of course, that  $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{F})$  is not empty does not follow from the Markov-Kakutani fixed point theorem unless the maps in  $\mathcal{J}$  commute under composition. Yet other fixed point theorems can be employed in specific situations (see [8], Section 5; [3] p. 457).

With the definition of ergodicity given in this section, every member of  $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})$  is an extreme point of  $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{F})$ . And the present definition is analogous to that of Phelps ([7], p. 81). Farrell's definition would have  $\mu \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{F})$  ergodic if there does not exist  $B \in \sigma(\mathcal{O})$  satisfying both B = UB for each U on  $\sigma(\mathcal{O})$  (corresponding to a  $\mathbb{T}^{-1}$ ) and

0 < v(B) < 1, where v on  $\sigma(\mathcal{O})$  corresponds to  $\mu \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{F})$ . For conditions that a  $\mu$  ergodic in Farrell's sense be in  $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{J})$  see ([4], p. 452; [12], pp. 196-7). In general his definition is not equivalent to either definition mentioned in the last section.

It seems pointless to present a catalogue of representation theorems including results on the nonemptiness of  $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{F})$  and the uniqueness of the representation. But perhaps one striking fact deserves mention. Namely, the <u>existence</u> of a representation of the form (2) requires not only no assumptions on  $\Omega$  and  $\mathcal{F}$ , but also no assumptions on the maps  $\mathcal{J}$  other than their measurability. The only qualification is this. If  $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{O})$  is not weak\* closed in  $\mathcal{J}(\sigma(\mathcal{O}))$ , the  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{B}$  in (1) must be enlarged in a manner similar to that described by Bishop and deLeeuw (see [7], pp. 31 and 83; [6], p. 481).

## 4. An Interpretation.

One reason for being interested in finitely additive probabilities is a sympathy with the notion of subjective probability ([2]; [10]). Thus it may seem interesting that the definitions of invariance and ergodicity used here have subjective interpretations. For purposes of illustration, assume again that  $\Omega$ ,  $\mathcal{F}$ , and T are as in the examples of Section 2. Each  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  determines a law for the coordinate process  $X_n(\omega) = \omega(n)$ , the n-th coordinate of  $\omega$ . If  $\mu$  represents your beliefs about  $X_n$ , then  $\mu$  is invariant <u>for you</u> if the probability  $X_n(\omega) = 0$  (and hence the probability  $X_n(\omega) = 1$ ) does not depend on n.  $\mu$  is ergodic for you if there is an  $\varepsilon > 0$  for which no pattern of 0's and 1's of finite length j (j = 1,2,...) has the following property. Your probability that  $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_d)$  exhibits the pattern is strictly

between 0 and 1. But you are sure to within probability  $\varepsilon$  that  $(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_j)$  will exhibit the pattern iff  $(X_2, X_3, \ldots, X_{j+1})$  will also. By contrast, the frequentistic notion of ergodicity ([9], pp. 104-5) involving averages figuring in the ergodic theorem does not fit comfortably into the framework of subjective probability (cf. [2], Chapter VI; [10], Chapter 3).

#### REFERENCES

- Cater, S. (1964). Some representation theorems for invariant probability measures. Illinois J. Math. 8, 408-418.
- [2] deFinetti, B. (1937). La prevision: ses lois logiques, ses source subjectives. <u>Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré 7</u> 1-68. Translated by H. Kyburg and reprinted with annotations by deFinetti in <u>Studies</u> <u>in Subjective Probability</u>, H. Kyburg, Jr. and H. Smokler (editors), Wiley, 1964.
- [3] Dunford, N. and Schwartz, J. T. (1958). <u>Linear Operators</u>, <u>Part I</u>. Interscience, New York.
- [4] Farrell, R. H. (1962). Representation of invariant measures.Illinois J. Math. 6, 447-467.
- [5] Halmos, P. R. (1950). Measure Theory. Van Nostrand, Princeton.
- [6] Hewitt, E. and Savage, L. J. (1955). Symmetric measures on cartesian products. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 80, 470-501.
- [7] Phelps, R. R. (1966). <u>Lectures on Choquet's Theorem</u>. Van Nostrand, Princeton.
- [8] Rickert, N. W. (1967). Amenable groups and groups with the fixed point property. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 127, 221-232.
- [9] Rosenblatt, M. (1962). <u>Random Processes</u>. Oxford Univ. Press, New York.
- [10] Savage, L. J. (1954). <u>The Foundations of Statistics</u>. Wiley, New York.
- [11] Sikorski, R. (1960). Boolean Algebras. Springer, Berlin.
- [12] Varadarajan, V. S. (1963). Groups of automorphisms of Borel spaces. <u>Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 109</u>, 191-220.

Unclassified				· ·	··· ·	
Security Classification		a D				
DOCUMENT C	CONTROL DATA - R	&D entered when	the overell r	eport is clas	eilied)	
1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)	•	2. REPO	RT SECURI	TY CLASSI	ICATION	
Stanford University		1000	Unclass:	ified		
Department of Statistics		26. GROU	IP .	() ()		
Stanford, California						
3. REPORT TITLE						
REPRESENTING FINITELY ADDITIVE INV.	ARIANT PROBABII	ITIES				
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report end inclusive datas)						
Technical Report, March, 1968		t sector				
5. AUTHOR(S) (Last name, first name, initial)					· .	
Olshen, Richard A.					• **	
6. REPORT DATE	74. TOTAL NO. OF	PAGES	76. NO. 0	FREFS		
March 15, 1968	8		2 A	12		
S. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.	9. ORIGINATOR'S	REPORT NU	MBER(S)			
DA-ARO(D)-31-124-G726	·					
5. PROJECT NO.	Technics	1 Report	: No. 21		· · ·	
a second a second s					88	
<b>c.</b>	Sb. OTHER REPOR	T NO(S) (Any	y other numbe	re that may	be assigned	
<i>d</i> .	<u> </u>		-			
0. A VAIL ABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES						
Distribution of this decompation	مىلىغىنىغاتىر					
DISTRIBUTION OF UNIS COCUMENT IS U	urrur red•					
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	12. SPONSORING MI	LITARY ACT	IVITY			
	Army Research Office					
	Durham.	Durham, North Carolina				
The second se			8			
13. ABSTRACT				11		
Hewitt and Savage have shown that	finitely addit	ive exch	angeable	e probab	ilities	
on a product space are integral average	es of power pro	duct pro	babilit:	ies. Th	ey prov	
this result as a corollary to their the	eorems on the c	ountably	additi	ve case.	This	
note adapts their technique to the stud	dy of more gene	ral inva	riant p	robabili	ties.	
From results of Farrell and Choquet and	d Feldman it is	conclud	led that	finite	y addi-	
tive invariant probabilities are avera	ges of finitely	additiv	ve ergod:	ic probe	bilitie	
In a countably additive context i	t seems necessa	ry to in	nose rea	strictio	ons on t	
Borel field being studied and on the m	aps used to def	'ine inva	riance a	and ergo	dicity.	
Relaxing the assumptions of one type m	ust be balanced	by stre	engtheni	ng those	of the	
other. Here, however, the field of se	ts can be arbit	rary, an	nd the ma	aps are	assumed	
only to be measurable. Rather than sta	ate a host of t	heorems	which ca	an be pr	oved,	
one particular case is proved in detai	1. Later on it	is expl	ained ho	ow the t	echniqu	
can be applied to other problems. Seve	eral definition	s of erg	odicity	are pro	posed	
and related to the one used. The fina	1 section conta	ins a su	bjective	e probab	ility	
interpretation of invariance and ergod:	icity.					
	•					
nattir ingi k Shintea aktabi kupati kupati kupati Kutata aktabi kupati kupati kupati						
nattir izi z z z z z z z z Terrez aztel z z z z z z z z z z z z z						
DD 1508 1473		IJγ	oclassif.	ied		

# Unclassified

ized.

covered.

14. KEY WORDS		LINK A		LINK B		LINK C			
			ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	
o o activitados	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	an ang an tarag							
nvariant Prob rgodic Probab ubjective Pro	ability bility bability		ο 1			. * <u>.</u>		in 1 an 1 1 an 1	
	13 3								
	ст. Ст.н. Ко Ст.			•	1250 	a			e a <sup>l</sup> x
			97 (F) 14	8					
ATING ACTIVITY: actor, subcontractor ity or other organize T SECURITY CLA classification of the Data" is included propriate security 2: Automatic downg bio and Armed For	Enter the name a r, grantee, Depart ation (corporate a SSIFICATION: E he report. Indicat . Marking is to b regulations. grading is specific cas Industrial Mar	INSTRU and address ment of De- uthor) issuing inter the over- e whether e in accord- ed in DoD Di-	CTIONS imposed by such as: (1) " (2) " (3) " th	y security Qualified port from Foreign a port by D U. S. Gov U. S. Gov is report sers shall	classific requeste DDC." DDC is no ernment directly request	cation, us rs may ob nent and t authoriz agencies from DDC through	sing stand otain copi dissemina red." may obta . Other o	dard state ies of this ation of the in copies qualified	ements a his Of DDC
	ATING ACTIVITY: actor, subcontracto ity or other organiz Classification of ti 1 Data" is included popopriate security 2: Automatic down 10 10 and Armed For	KEY WORDS Invariant Probability Subjective Probability Subjective Probability ATING ACTIVITY: Enter the name a factor, subcontractor, grantee, Depart ity or other organization (corporate a RT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION: E classification of the report. Indicat d Data" is included. Marking is to b ippropriate security regulations.	KEY WORDS Invariant Probability Subjective Probability Subjective Probability Number of the probability INSTRU ATING ACTIVITY: Enter the name and address factor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of De- ity or other organization (corporate author) issuing RT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION: Enter the over- classification of the report. Indicate whether i Data" is included. Marking is to be in accord- uppropriate security regulations. P: Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Di-	KEY WORDS Invariant Probability Subjective Probability Subjective Probability Mathematical Structure Structure Structure ATING ACTIVITY: Enter the name and address factor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of De- ity or other organization (corporate author) issuing RT SECUNITY CLASSIFICATION: Enter the over- classification of the report. Indicate whether i Data" is included. Marking is to be in accord- popropriate security regulations. P: Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Di-	KEY WORDS   LIN     RoLE   RoLE     Invariant Probability   Invariant Probability     Subjective Probability   Invariant Probability     Atting ACTIVITY: Enter the name and address actor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Derity or other organization (corporate author) issuing   Imposed by security such as:     RT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION: Enter the over- report from   (1) "Qualified report from     C1 Security regulations.   (2) "Foreign a report by D     P: Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Di- Uppropriate security regulations.   (3) "U. S. Gov this report users shall	KEY WORDS LINK A   ROLE WT   Role WT   Role WT   Invariant Probability Subjective Probability   Subjective Probability Subjective Probability   Subjective Probability Subjective Probability   Role WT   Subjective Probability Subjective Probability   Role Subjective Probability   Subjective Probability Subjective Probability   Subjective Probability Subjective Probability   Subjective Probability Subjective Probabi	KEY WORDS LINK A LINK A   ROLE WT ROLE   Invariant Probability Bubjective Probability   Subjective Pr	KEY WORDS ROLE WT ROLE WT   Rouged in the second secon	KEY WORDS ROLE WT ROLE WT ROLE   Invariant Probability Invariant Probability Invariant Probability Invariant Probability   Invariant Probability Invariant

(4) "U. S. military agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified users shall request through

(5) "All distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified DDC users shall request through

If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indicate this fact and enter the price, if known.

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES: Use for additional explanatory notes.

12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY: Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring (paying for) the research and development. Include address.

13. ABSTRACT: Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual summary of the document indicative of the report, even though it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.

It is highly desirable that the sbstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as (TS), (S), (C), or (U).

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 150 to 225 words.

14. KEY WORDS: Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical context. The assignment of links, roles, and weights is optional.

DD . 508M. 1473 (BACK)

or by the sponsor), also enter this number(s).

3. REPORT TITLE: Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classifica-

tion, show title classification in all capitals in parenthesis

4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES: If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is

5. AUTHOR(S): Enter the name(s) of author(s) as abown on

or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of aervice. The name of

the principal author is an absolute minimum requirement.

6. REPORT DATE: Enter the date of the report as day,

7a. TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES: The total page count

should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the

7b. NUMBER OF REFERENCES: Enter the total number of

8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER: If appropriate, enter

the applicable number of the contract or grant under which

8b, 8c, & 8d. PROJECT NUMBER: Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number,

98. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S): Enter the offi-

cial report number by which the document will be identified and controlled by the originating activity. This number must

95. OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S): If the report has been sssigned any other report numbers (either by the originator

10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES: Enter any limitations on further dissemination of the report, other than those

subproject number, system numbers, task number, etc.

month, year; or month, year. If more than one date appears

immediately following the title.

on the report, use date of publication.

number of pages containing information.

references cited in the report.

the report was written.

be unique to this report.

Unclassified Security Classification