TALKING ECONOMICS

For Non-Economists
(and Economists Too)

VOLUME I
Microeconomics

ALBERTO ADES

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Economics has a reputation problem. Most people see it as a field of impenetrable charts, arcane formulas, and jargon-heavy debates best left to professors and policy wonks. It's easy to understand why. Walk into any economics classroom or pick up a standard textbook, and you'll find yourself drowning in mathematical models that seem to have little connection to the real world. Yet this perception misses something fundamental: economics is simply the study of how we make choices when we can't have everything we want—and those choices shape everything from the price of coffee to the fate of nations.

Talking Economics grew out of frustration with this disconnect. Too many people who could benefit from economic thinking feel shut out by the field's academic gatekeepers. This book isn't another textbook for economics majors. Instead, it's designed for everyone else—the curious citizen who wants to understand why gas prices spike, the journalist covering a Federal Reserve meeting, the student wondering how trade wars actually work.

The approach here breaks with convention. Rather than marching through theories and models, *Talking Economics* unfolds as a series of conversations. Picture sitting in on discussions with history's great economic thinkers—Adam Smith puzzling over market forces, John Maynard Keynes debating government intervention, Milton Friedman defending free markets. These aren't dry biographical sketches but living debates that illuminate how ideas emerge, evolve, and clash with one another.

This conversational method serves a purpose beyond accessibility. It mirrors how economic understanding actually develops—through argument, questioning, and the gradual refinement of ideas. When you follow Socrates as he leads someone to discover a truth through careful questioning, you learn not just the conclusion but the reasoning behind it. The same principle applies here: by witnessing these intellectual exchanges, readers develop their own capacity for economic reasoning.

The book's three volumes map onto economics' traditional divisions, but without the usual academic stuffiness. Volume One explores how individuals and business-

es make decisions—why some products succeed while others fail, how markets set prices, what drives innovation. Volume Two zooms out to examine entire economies—what causes recessions, how governments can respond, why some countries prosper while others stagnate. Volume Three ventures into the global arena—how trade shapes prosperity, what happens when currencies clash, why financial crises spread across borders.

Throughout, the focus remains practical. Abstract theories matter only insofar as they help explain the world we actually inhabit. The goal isn't to provide ready-made answers to every economic question, but to equip readers with the conceptual tools to think through issues themselves. Once you understand how supply and demand interact, you can analyze why housing prices soared during the pandemic. Grasp the mechanics of monetary policy, and you'll see how interest rate changes ripple through to affect your mortgage. Master the basics of government finance, and you can evaluate what might happen if the U.S. defaulted on its debt. These aren't questions the book answers directly—they're the kinds of real-world puzzles that economic thinking helps you solve.

This democratizing impulse feels especially urgent today. We live in an era when economic forces shape daily life in unprecedented ways. A central bank decision ripples across continents, affecting everyone from factory workers to software developers. Trade disputes touch farmers and manufacturers worldwide. A financial crisis that begins in one country can topple governments on the other side of the globe. When a pandemic disrupts supply chains, consumers everywhere feel the effects at grocery stores and gas stations. In such an interconnected world, economic literacy isn't a luxury—it's essential equipment for navigating modern life.

Writing this book, I drew on artificial intelligence to sharpen the dialogues and refine the explanations. The irony isn't lost on me: using twenty-first-century technology to revive the ancient Socratic method. But innovation has always served understanding, and if AI can help make economic ideas more accessible, then it's simply the latest tool in humanity's long effort to democratize knowledge.

Talking Economics is written for anyone who's ever felt excluded from economic discussions but knows they shouldn't be. For the history major who needs to understand markets, the English teacher whose students ask about inflation, the journalist covering economic policy, the engaged citizen trying to make sense of competing claims about trade and taxes. Most of all, it's for anyone who believes

that in a democracy, important ideas should be accessible to everyone—not just the credentialed few.

I

Socrates and Glaucon explore the foundations of economic thinking, starting with scarcity—an unavoidable reality that compels us to make tough choices amid limited resources and boundless needs. They consider how this fundamental condition shapes our decisions and establishes priorities for individuals and communities alike, creating a solid framework for grasping economic behavior.

The dialogue further examines incentives—the powerful drivers that guide our choices—and budget constraints, which define the boundaries of what we can achieve when handling finite resources. Socrates and Glaucon explore how these personal decisions interconnect to form broader economic patterns that affect everyone from ordinary people to society at large. This chapter lays the groundwork for appreciating how core economic principles play out in everyday life.

What is economics?

> In the gardens of the Academy, just outside Athens, the morning air is still cool. Socrates, the philosopher famed for his questions, and Glaucon, Plato's curious brother, walk slowly beneath the olive trees, their sandals crunching the gravel paths. Around them, students rehearse arguments, scribes read aloud from scrolls, and the hum of the city drifts in from beyond the walls. The setting, alive with voices and ideas, frames their own exchange.

Socrates: Ah, Glaucon, you wear the face of a man wrestling with a mystery. What question troubles you so early in the day?

Glaucon: It is the merchants, Socrates—their bargaining and selling. I cannot help but ask myself: what is economics? The term is everywhere, but its true nature remains hidden from me.

Socrates: That's a profound question. To begin, what ideas come to mind when you think of economics?

Glaucon: Money, markets, wealth, trade, the production of goods, taxes, and the choices governments make.

Socrates: You've touched on key elements, but does economics revolve solely around money and governance, or might it encompass more?

Glaucon: I suppose it also involves how people manage resources like time, money, or even deciding what to purchase and what to forgo.

Socrates: Exactly. Economics concerns the management of resources. Now, what do you make of those resources? Are they boundless?

Glaucon: No, of course not. There are always constraints: land, food, money, and even time itself.

Socrates: Quite right. If resources are finite while our desires know no bounds, what does that compel us to do?

Glaucon: To make choices. We must decide how to allocate those resources, since we can't fulfill every desire at once.

Socrates: Precisely. Economics examines those very choices. And who faces this necessity of choosing?

Glaucon: Everyone: individuals, families, businesses, and governments.

Socrates: Indeed. Economics explores how these various actors make decisions to employ limited resources in meeting needs and desires. Would you say this captures the essence of our discussion?

Glaucon: Yes, economics is about how we handle resources to achieve what we want, recognizing that we can't have it all.

Socrates: Well said. Yet to make these decisions and oversee the use of scarce resources, we need a way to gauge their scarcity. This is where prices and markets come into play.

Glaucon: What role do prices serve?

Socrates: Prices function as a mechanism for allocating resources. In a market, they reflect the relative value of resources based on their availability and demand. For instance, if water becomes scarce in a region, its price rises, encouraging people to use it more judiciously or seek substitutes. Thus, prices not only signal scarcity but also coordinate how resources are employed.

Glaucon: So the market employs prices to guide people in responding to shortages.

Socrates: Precisely. It's a decentralized system that harmonizes countless individual decisions without direct oversight. Prices act as signals, directing consumers and producers toward the most efficient allocation of resources.

Glaucon: That accounts for why prices fluctuate with changing conditions, such as after a poor harvest or the advent of a new invention.

Socrates: Correct. Returning to our main topic, what aspects do you believe economics investigates to understand these decisions?

Glaucon: I'd say it examines markets, the exchange of goods and services, consumer choices, and how governments regulate these activities.

Socrates: Absolutely. It also encompasses the labor market and governmental policies on spending and revenue. Given this breadth, economics is divided into two primary branches: microeconomics and macroeconomics. Are you familiar with them?

Glaucon: Yes, though some examples would help clarify.

Socrates: When we study how the price of wheat influences bakers, that's microeconomics. But if we consider how a war affects the overall prosperity of Athens, that's macroeconomics.

Glaucon: Are these branches linked?

Socrates: Entirely. Individual decisions at the micro level shape the broader economy at the macro level, and macroeconomic policies in turn influence those individual choices.

Glaucon: Could we define each branch more precisely?

Socrates: Microeconomics explores how individuals and firms make decisions and interact in specific markets, such as what to produce and at what price to sell. Macroeconomics, on the other hand, looks at the economy as a whole, including growth, inflation, and unemployment.

Glaucon: What does economic growth entail?

Socrates: It's the sustained increase in the production of goods and services over time, such as building more homes, manufacturing additional products, and providing greater education or healthcare.

Glaucon: And inflation?

Socrates: That's the persistent rise in prices, which erodes the purchasing power of money.

Glaucon: And unemployment?

Socrates: It refers to the absence of jobs for those who want and seek work, impacting both people and the economy at large.

Glaucon: We'll delve into all this in greater detail.

Socrates: As we proceed, we'll explore these concepts and their connections more thoroughly.

Glaucon: So, economics is the study of how we use limited resources to satisfy our needs?

Socrates: Precisely, Glaucon. It's a science of choices and well-being. Has this clarified things for you?

Glaucon: Much clearer now. I see that economics extends beyond mere money—it's about our decisions in a world of constraints.

Socrates: I'm glad to have assisted. May this insight encourage you to reflect and enhance our lives and communities.

Microeconomics

> In the tranquil gardens of Plato's Academy, Socrates and Glaucon sit beneath the shade of an olive tree, engaged in conversation. Around them, attentive students gather, eager to follow the dialogue and deepen their understanding of microeconomics and its many subfields.

Socrates: Tell me, Glaucon, which subject shall we examine today?

Glaucon: You spoke recently of microeconomics, and the term has stayed with me. I know it is a branch of economics, but I'd like a clearer sense of what it means, why it matters, and the questions it seeks to answer. Could you explain?

Socrates: I'd be delighted. Microeconomics focuses on the behavior of individuals, households, and firms in the marketplace. But let me ask you: why do you think it's important?

Glaucon: I suppose it's because it explains how markets work and how prices are set.

Socrates: That's a solid starting point. Let me encourage you to consider it more broadly. If microeconomics examines individual decisions, what effect does that have on the economy as a whole?

Glaucon: If each person decides what to buy or sell, that influences prices, since they depend on how much people are willing to pay or accept for a good. It also shapes how resources are allocated: goods and services go to those who value them most or are prepared to pay more. So overall, these choices affect how the market operates and, ultimately, the broader economy.

Socrates: Precisely. Microeconomics provides the tools to understand how consumers and producers make decisions and how those decisions impact the market. Now, how do you think prices for goods are determined in an economy?

Glaucon: I imagine prices are set based on what consumers are willing to pay and what producers are willing to accept for a good.

Socrates: That's right. Prices adjust according to the behavior and interactions between buyers and sellers. What drives consumers and producers in those choices?

Glaucon: Consumers aim to maximize their satisfaction, and producers seek to maximize their profits.

Socrates: Indeed. When we say consumers seek to "maximize their satisfaction," we mean they try to make the best of their circumstances: they spend their money in ways that yield the greatest value, choosing products they prefer, that best meet their needs, or that offer the optimal balance of quality and price. Would you like to learn more about the areas of microeconomics?

Glaucon: Yes, I'd like a clear understanding of its different branches.

Socrates: Let's consider how consumers decide what to purchase. This falls under consumer theory, which examines how people maximize their satisfaction with limited income. What constraints do they face?

Glaucon: Clearly, their income, as we've seen. They can't buy everything they want.

Socrates: That's correct. Income is the primary constraint, but savings and wealth also play a role, as they can generate returns and provide additional income.

Moving on to other branches of microeconomics, there's producer theory: it studies how firms decide how much to produce. What factors influence those decisions?

Glaucon: I suppose the costs of essential inputs and the available technology.

Socrates: Exactly. Firms aim to maximize profits by considering these costs and the technology they use—that is, the methods, techniques, and processes that allow them to transform inputs into final products as efficiently as possible.

Glaucon: I see; the distinction between those two branches is quite clear.

Socrates: Then let's think about how prices are determined in different markets. Imagine a scenario with many buyers and sellers, all offering a very similar product, like wheat. How are prices set in such a case?

Glaucon: I'd say the price adjusts based on what buyers are willing to pay and what sellers are willing to accept, and no single producer can influence the price on their own.

Socrates: Precisely. In a market like that, we say the participants are "price takers." With so many sellers offering an identical product, like wheat, no individual producer has the power to alter the price through their actions alone. If one tried to sell at a higher price, buyers would simply turn to another seller at the market rate.

Glaucon: So each producer has only two choices: accept that price or not sell at all.

Socrates: Well said. But what happens in a situation where a single producer controls the market?

Glaucon: In that case, the producer has more power to set prices, since there's no direct competition.

Socrates: Just so. When one firm dominates the market, it has greater control over pricing. What does this mean for consumer welfare?

Glaucon: I expect prices would be higher, which would harm consumers.

Socrates: Yes. And this brings us to welfare economics, which examines how economic decisions affect social well-being. It also helps us understand market failures. Do you grasp what that means?

Glaucon: Not entirely. Is it when the market doesn't function properly?

Socrates: Indeed. We speak of a market failure when the market alone doesn't allocate resources efficiently, leading to outcomes that harm societal well-being. One common type is an externality, though it's not the only one. There are others, like public goods and imperfect competition. But before we proceed, what do you understand by an externality?

Glaucon: I think it's when an economic activity affects people who aren't directly involved, like a factory polluting a nearby village's river and harming the residents—who aren't owners of the company.

Socrates: Very well put; that's an example of a negative externality. It's a situation where one party's activity causes harm to others without compensation. Pollution is a classic case because it impacts those not participating in the activity. But there are also positive externalities. Can you think of an example?

Glaucon: Perhaps something beneficial, like someone maintaining a beautiful garden that neighbors enjoy viewing.

Socrates: Exactly. A positive externality occurs when an activity generates benefits for others who don't pay for them. In the garden example, neighbors appreciate the view without contributing to its upkeep. Both positive and negative externalities are significant: they influence overall societal well-being and represent a market failure. Without intervention, the market doesn't correct these effects on its own. Is everything clear so far?

Glaucon: Yes. But how does all this apply to everyday life?

Socrates: Imagine a dye works on a riverbank that dumps dyes, polluting the water flowing to downstream villages. Microeconomics suggests that to address this, the town could impose a tax on the amount of waste discharged into the river. This tax, known as a Pigouvian tax—named after the English economist Arthur Pigou—forces the dye works to account for the environmental damage and the costs to those using the river water. Such taxes apply to any activity that harms others. For instance, if the village levies a fee per container of waste dumped, the dye works might reduce pollution to avoid higher payments.

Glaucon: I see. But what does "social cost" mean? I've heard the term.

Socrates: An excellent question. Social cost refers to the total costs an economic activity imposes on society, including the private costs borne by the firm and the external costs affecting others. In the pollution example, while the dye works might only consider its production expenses, the contamination could harm public health, the environment, or people's quality of life. By taxing the pollution, the government aims to internalize these external costs: making the firm treat them as part of its own expenses. Thus, the firm doesn't just weigh production costs but also its broader societal impact, encouraging it to cut pollution and minimize those added expenses.

Glaucon: Ah, that's fascinating. So microeconomics doesn't just study how markets function; it also explores ways to correct their shortcomings.

Socrates: That's right. And it helps us understand how economic decisions influence the distribution of wealth and income within society.

Consumer theory

> Socrates engages in a dialogue with Glaucon about consumer behavior, exploring how preferences and constraints influence purchasing decisions.

Socrates: Tell me, Glaucon, what inquiry shall we pursue today?

Glaucon: I'd like to make sense of consumer theory. You said it deals with how people decide what to purchase, but I still don't see the whole picture. Could you walk me through it?

Socrates: Certainly. But first, what do consumers seek when making purchasing decisions?

possible responses, and staying adaptable are essential for navigating complex scenarios effectively.

Interview with John Nash on game theory

> In a Princeton University auditorium, the air is thick with anticipation. The interviewer, a professor of economics, is poised to engage in an imaginary dialogue with the renowned mathematician John Nash, whose contributions to game theory revolutionized strategic analysis in economics and beyond.

Interviewer: Good afternoon, Dr. Nash. It's an honor to have you with us. Your work in game theory has profoundly transformed economics and many other fields. To start, could you explain to our audience, from your perspective, what game theory is and why it is so profoundly important?

John Nash: Thank you—it's a pleasure to be here. Game theory is, at its core, the study of how individuals or groups make decisions when each one's outcome depends on the choices of others. It focuses on strategic interactions and how interdependent decisions shape outcomes for everyone involved. Its importance lies in providing a framework to analyze and understand decision-making in contexts of conflict and cooperation, across domains from economics to international relations.

Interviewer: Fascinating. You're renowned for developing a foundational concept in economics that predicts outcomes when economic agents interact strategically: the Nash equilibrium. Could you give us an example of how it applies in the real world of business or economics?

John Nash: A classic example is two competing firms in a duopoly, such as Coca-Cola and Pepsi. Each must decide how much to invest in advertising. If both invest heavily, they might gain market share but incur steep costs. If neither invests,

they save money but miss out on a competitive edge. A Nash equilibrium here might involve both choosing a moderate level of advertising, where neither can improve its position by unilaterally changing strategy. This kind of analysis helps companies anticipate competitors' responses and make more informed choices.

Interviewer: That's very illuminating. And how does game theory, particularly the Nash equilibrium, apply to international relations?

John Nash: Game theory is highly useful in analyzing international relations, especially in situations of conflict and cooperation. Consider the arms race during the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union. Both nations had incentives to stockpile nuclear weapons to secure their power, but this came at enormous economic, political, and social costs. Each had reasons to keep investing in arms, fearing disadvantage if the other did.

However, such competition can lead to a Nash equilibrium that is far from ideal: both continue massive spending on weapons, yet the costs outweigh the benefits for everyone. To avoid this, arms limitation treaties like the START agreements offered an alternative equilibrium. In these pacts, neither side has incentives to deviate unilaterally, as breaking the treaty would bring higher costs and mutual distrust.

Interviewer: That's truly intriguing, Dr. Nash. But how does the concept of nuclear deterrence fit into this analysis? Could it be seen as another equilibrium?

John Nash: Absolutely. Another notable equilibrium is Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD). Here, both countries maintain arsenals large enough to deter any nuclear attack, since a first strike would guarantee mutual annihilation. It is an equilibrium rooted in deterrence: no country initiates a conflict because the consequences would be catastrophic for all. Though grim, this setup ensured a degree of strategic stability during the Cold War, as both sides recognized that any offensive move would lead to devastating outcomes.

Interviewer: That makes a great deal of sense. Would you say that game theory can help diplomats and governments craft more effective policies?

John Nash: Certainly. Game theory offers an analytical framework for understanding how nations interact in areas like trade negotiations, military alliances, and environmental agreements. By identifying potential Nash equilibria, diplomats and governments can design policies and accords that foster cooperation and reduce conflict. For example, in climate change talks, countries must coordinate to cut greenhouse gas emissions, but each has incentives to let others shoulder most of the

effort. Game theory can help design enforcement and verification mechanisms to ensure compliance with commitments.

Interviewer: Intriguing. What role do incentives and information play in game theory and in seeking Nash equilibria?

John Nash: Incentives and information are central to game theory. Incentives shape players' motivations for choosing one strategy over another. For instance, in a game involving collaboration or competition, incentives determine whether players lean toward cooperation or rivalry. Information is equally vital: in many games, players lack complete knowledge. In such cases, the Nash equilibrium can shift based on the information available. Games with imperfect information often yield very different outcomes from those with full information.

Interviewer: Could you provide an example of how imperfect information might affect decisions in an economic or political context?

John Nash: In politics, consider nuclear disarmament negotiations, where one country might not have full details on another's arsenal or intentions. This asymmetry can breed distrust and hinder cooperation. These are known as games of asymmetric information.

Interviewer: How does the equilibrium change in a game with asymmetric information?

John Nash: Asymmetric information fundamentally alters the analysis, as players make decisions without equal access to facts. This introduces uncertainty about the opponent's actions and intentions, forcing one or both to speculate about behavior. The result can be more conservative or riskier choices.

To illustrate, let's extend the example of two countries negotiating nuclear arms reductions. If one lacks knowledge of the other's true arsenal size or capabilities, it might hesitate to cut its own weapons, fearing vulnerability. This uncertainty fosters distrust and leads to less cooperative actions. The same holds in financial markets: opaque information can distort prices and spark speculative bubbles.

Interviewer: Is asymmetric information alone enough to cause breakdowns in cooperation?

John Nash: Not necessarily. Asymmetric information is a key factor, but for cooperation to falter, there must also be incentives for players to exploit that asymmetry strategically—meaning reasons to lie or distort the truth.

This brings to mind James Fearon's seminal article, "Rationalist Explanations for War." Fearon argues that asymmetric information alone doesn't explain why conflicts escalate to war. The crux is that there must be incentives for actors not to disclose information accurately. In other words, countries might exaggerate their military capabilities or downplay aggressive intentions to gain leverage in negotiations. This manipulation of information, per Fearon, leads to cooperation failures and, in some cases, escalation to armed conflict.

Interviewer: So, it's the combination of asymmetric information and incentives to deceive that generates conflicts?

John Nash: Precisely. Asymmetric information might create uncertainty on its own, but if both sides were honest or transparent, many conflicts could be averted. It is the presence of incentives to hide or manipulate information that causes breakdowns in cooperation. This occurs across domains, from international diplomacy to trade, where one party benefits from keeping the other in the dark.

In political or economic spheres, those with privileged information have incentives to leverage it. Without mechanisms to align incentives or build trust, the system is prone to failure—that's the real peril. And there's another critical element: miscalculations. Wars, for instance, don't just arise from distrust or misaligned incentives; they often occur because someone errs in assessing the situation, overestimating their own strength or underestimating the other's.

Interviewer: Dr. Nash, how can distrust be overcome in situations of asymmetric information?

John Nash: A key approach is through costly and credible signals that players can send to convey private information about their intentions or capabilities. For example, consider a new company spending lavishly on advertising. Though it may seem excessive, this outlay signals confidence in the product's quality, as only a strong product could justify the expense with expectations of repeat sales.

Interviewer: And what about in other contexts, like the labor market?

John Nash: A similar dynamic plays out in the labor market with university education. A degree isn't just about gaining knowledge; it serves as a signal to employers of a worker's ability and dedication. What makes this signal credible is that earning a degree is more costly—in time, effort, and money—for those with lesser skills or discipline. Thus, only those with genuine capability and resolve are likely to complete it.

This creates a mechanism for differentiation: employers view the investment in education as evidence of a candidate's competence, thereby reducing uncertainty about potential productivity. In this way, signals are effective because their cost correlates directly with the trait being communicated, making them reliable for bridging asymmetric information in the job market.

Interviewer: Remarkable insights, Dr. Nash! Your work hasn't just shaped economic theory—it has influenced numerous other disciplines. What do you see as the future of game theory in economics and international relations?

John Nash: I believe game theory will remain a vital field for understanding strategic interactions in all their forms. With technological advances and the rise of the digital economy, new interactions—like electronic markets and cryptocurrencies—pose challenges and opportunities for game theory. In international relations, global issues such as cyberattacks and terrorism likewise demand fresh applications to devise more effective deterrence and cooperation strategies. Game theory will evolve to encompass more complex, realistic models that better capture the intricacies of human behavior.

Interviewer: Dr. Nash, you mentioned that game theory will evolve to include more complex models. Could you give us a concrete example of how this might work in a real-world scenario?

John Nash: Of course. Imagine two major tech companies, A and B, vying for dominance in the artificial intelligence market. Each faces a strategic choice: invest heavily in research and development to launch a groundbreaking product, or stick with incremental improvements to their existing offerings.

Interviewer: How would traditional game theory apply in this case?

John Nash: This scenario fits neatly into a prisoner's dilemma. If both companies opt for heavy innovation investment, they might advance technologically but incur substantial costs that erode net profits. If only one invests, it captures greater market share and superior gains, leaving the other at a disadvantage. Yet if both choose not to invest aggressively and instead pursue gradual enhancements, they avoid high costs and maintain a more stable, mutually beneficial equilibrium.

The dilemma arises because, while cooperation through restrained investment would be ideal, individual incentives drive them to invest aggressively to avoid being outpaced. This results in a Nash equilibrium where both invest, bear high costs, and achieve a suboptimal outcome compared to cooperating on incremental

progress. It highlights how self-interest can thwart cooperation even when it is collectively more profitable.

Interviewer: So, what would change in this scenario?

John Nash: This is where game theory needs to advance. It's not enough to consider only financial costs and benefits; we must incorporate human factors like risk, trust, and emotions. For instance, suppose Company A has endured past failures from risky innovations, making its executives more conservative and hesitant to invest. Meanwhile, Company B's CEO is known for bold vision and calculated risk-taking. These psychological and cultural elements influence strategic decisions and are far more challenging to model in traditional game theory frameworks.

Interviewer: So, how does game theory capture these human influences?

John Nash: More advanced models integrate behavioral elements and individual preferences, often through reputation games. To illustrate with our companies: Company A might recognize that its risk aversion—preferring to avoid scenarios with potential for major losses, even if they offer major gains—hinders long-term competition. Thus, while it invests, it does so more cautiously. Conversely, Company B, with its reputation for innovation and risk, can attract investors and partners drawn to high-potential ventures. These choices, shaped by perception and prior experience, more accurately reflect how firms operate and adapt in reality.

Interviewer: Fascinating. So, could we say that modern game theory accounts for both rational decisions and more subjective aspects?

John Nash: Exactly. In the past, we assumed players simply maximized utility without nuance. But human behavior is rich with subtleties: fears, ambitions, past experiences, reputations. Incorporating these makes game theory more robust and more applicable to real-world situations, from business competition to global politics to everyday social interactions.

Interviewer: Thank you so much, Dr. Nash. This perspective opens up exciting possibilities for the future of game theory.

John Nash: Thank you for the invitation. I'm eager to see how this field develops in the years ahead.

Bonus: **Interview with Yuval Noah Harari on the dangers of AI**

> This imaginary interview takes place in a sleek university lecture hall. The atmosphere is understated, attracting a modest crowd of students and professors who listen intently as Yuval Noah Harari converses with the host. Behind them, a projector displays visuals related to artificial intelligence, framing their discussion of emerging technologies and the profound changes they may bring.

Interviewer: Welcome to this special conversation. Joining us is Yuval Noah Harari, the historian and author of acclaimed books such as *Sapiens* and *Homo Deus,* who has been outspoken about the existential risks that AI poses to humanity. Yuval, thank you for being here.

Yuval Noah Harari: It's a pleasure—thank you for the invitation.

Interviewer: In your recent comments, you've described AI as a danger to humanity. Could you explain how you reached that conclusion?

Yuval Noah Harari: AI is the first technology in history capable of making decisions autonomously, and that fundamentally changes the equation. In the past, technologies were tools controlled by humans; AI has the potential to make decisions that directly affect our daily lives, from the content we consume to more profound matters such as our health and political interactions. My concern is that we're advancing technologically without the necessary regulations to ensure these decisions are ethical and safe.

Interviewer: You mentioned that this power might pose a threat to democracies. How do you see AI affecting that sphere?

Yuval Noah Harari: Democracy relies on free and honest public discourse. If AI systems can manipulate those conversations or even generate political narratives, there's a risk that citizens will lose the ability to distinguish what's real from what's not. In authoritarian regimes, controlling information has always been a key tool. With AI, democracies could become even more vulnerable to mass manipulation. Imagine engaging on social media, convinced you're debating with a fellow human, when it's actually an AI designed to shape your political views. That, without question, signals the end of democracy as we know it.

Interviewer: Beyond the political risks, you've also warned about how AI could impact jobs and the global economy.

Yuval Noah Harari: Exactly. One of the gravest risks I highlight is that many people could be left without jobs, not temporarily but structurally. AI can replace millions of workers without the skills to adapt to a new labor market. That would create not only an economic crisis but also psychological and social crises: people might feel utterly useless within the system.

Interviewer: In one of your articles in *The New York Times,* you warned that AI could do more than just replace jobs. You mentioned it might manipulate our emotions and political decisions. What would that scenario look like?

Yuval Noah Harari: A disturbing scenario is that AI could come to dominate narrative creation, which is an extraordinarily powerful capability. Human history is built on the stories we share and how they shape our collective decisions. Imagine a world where most of the stories, news, and even personal conversations we encounter are generated by AI without our knowledge. The capacity to influence elections, opinions, and even cultural identity would be immense. We wouldn't know whether we're speaking to a real person or a machine engineered to sway us.

Interviewer: That sounds like a genuine threat to the integrity of our societies. What solutions do you propose to mitigate these kinds of risks?

Yuval Noah Harari: The key is regulation. We can't simply trust tech companies to do the right thing. As I've explained elsewhere, we need a regulatory framework similar to that of the pharmaceutical industry, in which no technology is released without rigorous testing and ethical review. We must also ensure that AI systems are aligned with human values and not used to exploit our psychological vulnerabilities. That includes safeguarding democracy from manipulation and ensuring people retain control over their everyday lives.

Interviewer: In another article you published in *The Economist,* you discuss the potential independence of AI. Is that really a possibility?

Yuval Noah Harari: We're already seeing AI make autonomous decisions in certain fields, and that's a major challenge. It's not science fiction. For instance, in medicine, we have AI systems that diagnose diseases and decide on treatments, often better than many doctors. But if we allow AI to make decisions without human oversight, we risk losing control over essential aspects of our lives. That's why it's imperative to develop mechanisms that oversee and limit its capabilities before it's too late.

Interviewer: Fascinating, Yuval. Let me turn now to some questions from the audience.

Audience Member: Professor Harari, you mentioned that AI could manipulate our emotions and political decisions. How can we, as individuals, protect ourselves from that kind of manipulation in our daily lives?

Yuval Noah Harari: Excellent question. The first step is to build a higher level of digital literacy: learn to question what we consume online, verify sources, and understand that not everything on our social feeds is real. We also need to demand transparency from tech platforms, ensuring they clearly indicate when content was generated by AI. Finally, it's essential to advocate for laws that regulate these technologies to shield citizens from mass manipulation.

Audience Member: My question is a bit theoretical: Could AI enable planned economic systems, like communism, to function in the future?

Yuval Noah Harari: A compelling question. In theory, AI has the potential to solve a longstanding problem of planned economies: the lack of accurate and timely information. In the past, attempts at central planning failed because governments couldn't process the vast amounts of data needed for efficient decisions about production, distribution, and consumption.

With AI, we could envision a system where highly advanced algorithms analyze the population's needs in real time and optimize available resources. However, fundamental issues remain. One is the concentration of power: Who controls the AI making these decisions? Another is the inflexibility of centralized systems in adapting to individual preferences. While AI could make planning technically more efficient, it wouldn't resolve the ethical and political problems inherent to communism.

In summary, it's conceivable that AI could make economic planning more viable from a technical standpoint in the future, but questions of rights, equity, and control would still pose major challenges.

Audience Member: Professor Harari, you've spoken about regulation, but in a globalized world, how can we coordinate among countries, especially if some prioritize innovation over ethics?

Yuval Noah Harari: This is one of the biggest challenges. AI knows no borders, but governments do. If we don't achieve global cooperation, we'll see a technological arms race, with countries competing to develop more advanced AI without regard for ethical implications. It could be catastrophic.

We need something akin to international agreements on nuclear weapons. A framework like that would set minimum standards for AI development and use. The United Nations could play a key role, along with international organizations focused on technology. It won't be easy, but history shows that, faced with global challenges, international cooperation is possible if everyone grasps what's at stake.

Interviewer: Thank you all for your questions. Professor Harari, it was a pleasure having you here and hearing your insights on the future of AI and its impact on humanity.

Yuval Noah Harari: Thank you. These discussions are crucial for anticipating the challenges ahead.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Alberto Ades (@adesalb on X) is an economist with more than thirty years of experience in global financial markets. He is currently Director of Research and Strategy at NWI Management.

Over the course of his career, he has held senior positions at BofA Merrill Lynch, Citigroup, and Goldman Sachs, where he led research teams and developed pioneering economic and financial models.

He earned a PhD in Economics from Harvard University and a law degree from the University of Buenos Aires. His research has been published in leading academic journals, including the *American Economic Review* and the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, and he frequently contributes commentary to both local and international media.

Originally from Argentina, he now resides in New York.