

## Conclusion

Classical game theory involves problems of two types: descriptive and prescriptive. The former is related to choice prediction, and the latter indicate the choices the player must make. The principle of max-min is used in both cases to minimize losses. By using game theory we agree implicitly that the max-min principle describes the process of players' decision making and we also base our own decisions on this principle. If we believe that other players are inclined to irrational risk and we also are willing to risk, we must not use classical game theory to make decisions.

The theory of reflexive game theory is based on the model of mental mechanisms realizing the anti-selfishness principle. This theory is also capable of solving descriptive and prescriptive problems. In the former case, we can predict subjects' choices, assuming that they obey the anti-selfishness principle. In the latter case, knowing the relations between the subjects and the influences on them, we can find if there is a choice satisfying the anti-selfishness principle and what it is.

The absence of a choice signals to us that we have to change our view of the problem. Consider an example. I have two friends living in a town far from me. They have in bad terms. I may go to their town and stay with one of them. Each friend wants me to visit but does not invite me, because he is afraid that I would stay with the other. No hotel or motel exists in that town. A formal analysis of this situation shows that I am in a state of frustration, i.e., I cannot decide either to go or not to go.

The impossibility of making choice that satisfies the anti-selfishness principle generates the following question: is it worth making this particular choice? Perhaps, I'd better consider another alternative, like inviting my friends to visit me.

Therefore, the theory of reflexive games is capable of guiding our choices and of indicating situations a fresh recasting of the alternatives is needed.