

ON THE THEORY OF HUMAN DECISIONS IN THE AGE OF “BENEFICIAL GLOBALIZATION”

Katalin Martinás^{1,*} and Ádám Kerényi²

¹Loránd Eötvös University
Budapest, Hungary

²Institute of Finances and International Economic Relations,
Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, University of Szeged
Szeged, Hungary

Regular article

Received: 15. June 2010. Accepted: 3. October 2010.

ABSTRACT

The globalisation is a complex phenomenon with many advantageous and disadvantageous consequences. In this paper we investigate the linkage between globalised market economy and the happiness through the ethical implications of the greatest happiness principle in a system approach. We also investigate the terms of the beneficial globalisation. Our proposition is that: the main condition of the good globalisation should be Bentham's principle: the greatest happiness for the greatest number and the United States Declaration of Independence's famous phrase *pursuit of happiness*.

We face the following problem: the globalization assures – due to its Nature – the growth of Z , which is the marketed part of the globalization, but not the total happiness.

The main question in political philosophy is: What do we need to do in order to live together well? In complex approach, based on the wealth increase law we take into account the parameters, which will be changed by the human decisions (i) as well as the long-term expectations, which are motivating the decisions themselves (ii). Factors (i) are the followings: material goods, money, parameters of human physiology (e.g. health), psychology (knowledge), sociology (e.g. friends, power). These quantities are measurable in principle, i.e. they can be mapped into the set of real numbers. The changes are exchanges between two agents or with the nature, and there is production/consumption inside the agent.

KEY WORDS

globalisation, decision theory, greatest happiness principle

CLASSIFICATION

JEL: B59, C65

PACS: 89.65.Gh, 89.75.-k

*Corresponding author, η: martinas@ludens.elte.hu; +36 1 2090 555 Ext 6360;
Loránd Eötvös University, Pázmány Péter sétány 1/A, H-1117 Budapest, Hungary

INTRODUCTION, THE ECONOMY OF HAPPINESS

For strategic investigations the understanding of the nature of human decisions is a central problem. The focus of the present paper is the ethical side of human decisions.

Most of decision theory is normative or prescriptive, i.e., it is concerned with identifying the best decision to take. Modern decision theory is intimately related to optimization theory. In the present scientific world picture the theory of rational decisions is the mainstream approach. It is based on the utility maximization principle, which refers to the simple system approach, and there is no place for ethical considerations. Edmund Opitz has observed that utilitarianism with its greatest happiness principle “asserts that men are bound together in societies solely on the basis of a rational calculation of the private advantage to be gained by social cooperation under the division of labor” [1].

Human decisions are significantly influenced by ethical rules. For the purpose of this paper, “ethics” means the rules of behaviour that are applied to a person by a system or institution they participate in. Ethics, then, refers to situational codes of behaviour [2]. Ethics refers to well-based standards of right and wrong that prescribe what humans ought to do, usually in terms of rights, obligations, benefits to society, fairness, or specific virtues. Yet, the origin of ethics is an open question.

To help determine the origin of ethics, we first need to understand if morality is a human invention or – at least partially – it is due to Nature.

Hutcheson [3], Helvetius and Bentham [4] claimed that ethical rules are to ensure the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people. The greatest happiness principle is well known, and it is a standard subject in most introductions to moral philosophy. The principle needs a great deal of interpretation, since as it stands it does not speak of the ways locating and comparing happiness of individuals, nor of issues of distribution and conflicting claims. Yet although the interpretation of the greatest happiness principle allows a wide variety, happiness can be measured unambiguously. The empirical tests falsify all the theoretical objections against the greatest happiness principle. The criterion appears practically feasible and morally sound. Hence the greatest happiness principle deserves a more prominent place in policy making. Happiness is a useful goal criterion, both in public policy and in individual therapy [5].

Based on the greatest happiness principle Martínás [6] outlined a non-equilibrium economic framework, which contains as a special case the neoclassical economic approach. Our preliminary results underline the critics that the results of GE economics come from the unnatural meta-axioms but not from the economic nature. It was shown that for the exchange of material goods a force law similar to physics could be derived. The force is proportional to the differences of the values of the trading partners. That driving force of individuals in the trade process can be visualized also as market force. So the market forces act and (if there are no other processes – consumption, production) then these forces push the economic system to the direction of economic equilibrium. In the present lecture we investigate the case of non-material resources too. Our results show that culture, knowledge and social relations are different from the material goods, and there is no real market force for them.

On the other hand the GHP (Greatest Happiness Principle) for the society gives rules and ethical demands for such transfers [7]. In this paper we attempt to show that for different types of decisions different rules follow from the Greatest Happiness Principle. Bentham’s moral philosophy tells that

GHP for the society = Greatest Happiness for the greatest number of people.

Traditional utilitarianism contradicts the traditional moral philosophies. “Both the older natural law philosophies as well as those founded upon religious traditions take issue with the use of force so as to gain one’s material wherewithal. If it can be shown that utilitarianism suffers logically from several fatal flaws, then the rational thing that one ought to do is to reject it as a basis for making ethical judgments in policy debates in favor of a more substantive moral philosophy of life” [8].

We will investigate the constraints for the exchanges, which follows from the maximum societal happiness rule. It will be shown that the rules of exchanges are different for the different kinds of resources, so the ethical rules, being the subject of ethics must be different for the handling of resources.

In the first chapter we summarize the description of human decisions in a complex system approach, where we deal with the decisions concerning the different resources. The governing principle of human decisions is the greatest happiness principle.

In the second chapter an interesting result of the in CSA (Complex Systems Approach) will be discussed. The resource exchanges on societal level show different characteristics for the material goods, relational goods and for the knowledge. For the well being of the society the governing rule (ethics) must be different for the different resource types. Market forces can govern the exchanges only in case of material goods and services.

Everybody has all type of resources. Nevertheless there is a certain type of resource corresponding to main activity of the human being. We can classify the members of a society by the type of resource representing the main activity. Modern sociology does not use this classification, but these groups are in correspondence with the social categories of ethics as formulated by Plato and Aristotle. Jacobs [9] further defined two moralities (trader and guardian), and with a historical survey she proved that it is applicable to quite different groups of people, referring to the Platonian classification. In this paper we reconstruct the groups referring to the Platonian classification, Compared to the Jacobian grouping three further groups will be identified, namely the scientists, the investors and the employees. The rules of interactions are different for the different groups, leading to different ethical rules.

GLOBALISATION’S DEFINITION

The globalization process mediates the effects of inequality and poverty on well-being. But globalization also introduces or exacerbates other factors that affect people’s well-being as much if not more than income growth. This insecurity contributes to negative perceptions of the globalization process, particularly in countries where there are very weak social insurance systems or where existing systems are eroding. Our main question is: is complex happiness can fulfill the gap between economists’ assessments of the aggregate benefits of the globalization process and the more pessimistic assessments that are typical of the general public [15].

The widely acknowledged elements of economic globalization comprise the liberalization of international trade, the expansion of foreign direct investment (FDI), the global organization of production, and the emergence of massive cross-border financial flows. This resulted in the increased integration of markets and intensified international competition. Globalization came about through the combined effect of two underlying forces: policy decisions to reduce national economic barriers (tariffs and non-tariff barriers), and the impact of new information, communication and transport technology (ITC). Standard economic wisdom tells us that economic globalization will boost economic growth and employment, and enrich every participating country. Net gains accrue from economic integration, even though within

a country there may be winners and losers. With liberalized foreign trade and investment, funds will flow to the poor countries where capital is scarce, and hence, the return on investment will be higher than in the developed industrialized countries. Capital inflows may come in the form of loans or portfolio investment, supplementing domestic savings and loosening the financial constraint on national public budgets and on additional investment by local companies. Or they may take the form of foreign direct investment (FDI), which is expected to bring about greater efficiency as a result of more intense competition, trade specialization in accordance with local comparative advantages and the transfer of technology and superior management techniques. If a developed country that produces skill intensive products trades with a less developed country producing commodities with low skill content, both countries are said to benefit. According to the standard economic theory on trade – first developed by David Ricardo, and more recently elaborated in the Heckscher-Ohlin and the Stolper-Samuelson theorems – trade will entail factor cost equalization that will diminish the economic disparities between nations and eventually let them converge at the same level of income [13].

Globalization is a major engine of growth and therefore plays a major role in reducing poverty. Karl Marx despises capitalism since capitalism involves labor exploitation and therefore cannot bring happiness [16]: “The fact that labor is external to the worker, i.e., it does not belong to his intrinsic nature; that in his work, therefore he does not affirm himself but denies himself, does not feel content but unhappy, does not develop freely his physical and mental energy but mortifies his body and his mind. The worker therefore only feels himself outside his work, and in his work feels outside himself.”

GREATEST HAPPINESS PRINCIPLE

In the present scientific world picture the theory of rational decisions is the utility maximization principle, which refers to the simple system approach.

The utility principle of economics is rooted in the principle of greatest happiness. In “thermodynamic” complex system approach - the principle of greatest happiness leads to the wealth increase principle [10]. The wealth increase principle – as a substitute of utility maximization was investigated in the book of Ayres and Martínás [11], where actions are not defined as simple optimizations. but they depend also on the motivations reflecting the expectations on the future changes of the environment (natural and social), as well as on anticipated emotions they might experience as a result of the outcomes of their choices, as it was shown by Mellers and McGraw [12].

In the complex system approach of decisions we characterize an agent by her resources. For our purposes resource is anything, which can be produced or consumed or traded. The resources are measurable, at least in principle, i.e. they can be mapped into the set of real numbers.

In the complex system approach, based on the wealth increase law we take into account both the parameters, which will be changed by human decisions (i) and the long-term expectations, which are motivating the decisions themselves (ii). Among factors (i) are measurable parameters. An important part of human decisions concerns the exchange/production/consumption of resources (material and immaterial ones).

They are the followings:

- material goods,
- money,
- parameters of human physiology (e.g. health),
- knowledge,

- relational goods (e.g. friends, power),
- time.

These quantities are measurable in principle, i.e. they can be mapped into the set of real numbers. Differences in the behaviour of resources induce a grouping in the society. The individuals are grouped by the activity, namely which type of resource is handled by them.

- Producers-traders – Material goods
- Politicians – Relational goods
- Scientists – Teachers’ – Knowledge
- Investor (profiteer) – Money

Employees Consumers – spend their time and effort (work) only in order to buy goods. They sell their time to get the salary; nevertheless they have no possibility for the decisions concerning the production, trade of the resources. The workers here are not producers or traders, as they do not make decisions concerning the production. It will be shown that the listed group structure corresponds to the Platonian classification of citizens.

All resource changes can be formally written in the form of balance equation. The changes can be exchanges between two agents or with the nature, J , or there is production/consumption inside the agent, S .

$$dX/dt = J + S + D, \quad (1)$$

where X is the symbol for the resource. dt stands for the time of the action, and dX is the change of the resource during time dt . J is the flow, S is the source, which can be production or consumption and D , is for the dissipation. That equation is valid for every actor and every resource, so it is better to put indices to identify the agents and the resources

$$dX_{AB,i}/dt = J_{AB,i} + S_{A,i} + D_{A,i}, \quad (2)$$

where X_{Ai} is the quantity of resource i owned by the agent A , capital letters identify the agents, while i is for the type of the resource, $J_{AB,i}$ is the flow of the i -th resource between agents A and B , S_{Ai} is the source/sink, describing the effect of production, consumption and D_{Ai} is dissipation.

For the exchanges agent A selects $J_{AB,i}$, and agent B selects $J_{BA,i}$, and the laws of nature define the relation of $J_{AB,i}$ and $J_{BA,i}$. The source term S_{Ai} arises by his decision, the production and consumption decisions define it. Formally the dissipation D is also a source (sink) term. Nevertheless generally we do not select D_{Ai} as the dissipation is defined by the laws of nature, and it is always present, and correspondingly it always means a decrease, so D is negative. The appearance of the dissipation is crucial to the understanding of economics. It gives an explanation for the fact, which we have to work to maintain our happiness, to compensate dissipation effects.

In modern economics the applied selection rule corresponds to an optimization process. The best is selected, so the mathematical model is the optimization method. Nevertheless it is justifiable only in the case of a complete model. When all the constrained for the optimization are reconciled in the mathematical model. It is not the case for economic decisions. Physics shows an alternative approach. In thermodynamics the law of nature is the entropy maximum principle, nevertheless the dynamics of the thermodynamic systems is not described by the entropy maximum principle, but a force law is introduced. The changes are the flows, and the flows are defined by a force law, in first approximation the flow is proportional to the force.

The GHP for individuals in the complex system approach characterizes the actors by the wealth function; Z . Wealth function is similar to the utility function with some important

differences. Utility is usually defined as a function expressing the preferences over the possibilities for choice. Wealth characterizes the state of the agent, which is it assigns the valuation to the stock of resources. The utility is the change of the wealth. The wealth function is the function of the stock of resources

$$Z = Z(X_1, \dots, M), \quad (3)$$

where X is for the different resources and M is the money. If the quantity of the resources changes, then the wealth change is

$$\delta Z = \sum_i (\partial Z / \partial X_i) \delta X_i + (\partial Z / \partial M) \delta M = \sum_i w_i \delta X_i + w_M \delta M, \quad (4)$$

where w_i is the value of the i -th good, as it is the wealth increase due to the quantity change. Expected wealth change is the driving force. Force law connects the driving force and the decision. The driving force is not the Newtonian force, describing the interaction between to bodies, but it is similar to the thermodynamic force. The driving force for exchange is the expected wealth increase of the trading partners. It is an important difference of economics and physics. Here the force is not between the agents so it is not a spatial difference but a temporal difference of the existing and the expected values. We summarize the similarities and differences with thermodynamics.

In thermodynamics the force law is formulated in the form of transport equations:

$$J = L \cdot F, \quad (5)$$

where, as in the example of heat transfer, J is the heat flow then F is the temperature difference and L is the heat conductivity. So the heat flow between bodies A and B is defined by the temperature difference of the bodies. The thermodynamic force originates in the difference of the systems.

In case of decisions the driving force is the difference of the wealth of the actual state and the expected state, but not the difference of the agents. In case of exchange between agents there is a difference from thermodynamics, while here are two force laws, one for each of the agents, and in thermodynamics exists only one. The driving force for agent A is his expected wealth gain, while for agent B it is her expected wealth gain. The driving force of agents A and B can be different. It will be shown that for the exchange of material goods with a mathematical transformation a market force can be introduced, which will be similar to the thermodynamic force (it is proportional to the value differences of the agents).

Further difference is that in thermodynamics the exchanged quantities are the energy, mol numbers, and volume – and there is a conservation law for them. In case of human decisions the resources are only similar to the physical quantities (energy) – but they are different: The conservation law can be stated only for the material goods, but not for the others.

The total quantity of the material goods of the society does not change with the transfer. Trading material goods is a zero-sum game. For material goods the conservation law holds, it expresses the basic fact that if we give a certain material good to somebody, she will have more and we will have less, and there is a law of conservation to such material goods

$$d(X_{Ai} + X_{Bi}) = 0. \quad (6)$$

In the exchange of material goods the total quantity remains constant, but the wealth of the society increases. We can exchange material goods only by spatiotemporal movement of material goods from one place to another. For example, if from our pocket we give a certain amount of money to somebody, we will have less money in our pocket. That property has an important consequence. We can introduce a new force, which will be similar to the market force. The driving force for an individual agent is the expected increase of wealth of the

individuals, but the conservation law, which is valid for material goods, gives a transformation possibility and the will be the value difference of the individuals.

In case of knowledge transfer the total knowledge in the society is increasing with the transfer

$$d(X_{Ai} + X_{Bi}) > 0. \quad (7)$$

For social exchanges it is difficult to guess, we can find examples, when there can be a total decrease, but in other cases total increase is also possible. It is our plan to investigate them in the future. For the present it is sufficient to state that they are not the same as the material goods, that there is no conservation law for the social exchanges.

A fundamental difference between material and mental commodities is that while there is a conservation law for the former one, there is no such law for the latter one. Individuals can be grouped by their activity, namely which type of resource group is concerned in the professional activity. Since the trade of resources in separate groups is done in different fashion, the individuals also main a they form groups on different grounds. These groups, formed by interaction among individuals, adhere to governing ethics – which serve the purpose of defining the rules of exchange where these have not been explicitly stated.

The conservation law for material goods allows the introduction of market forces for the material good exchanges, but there is no way to introduce them for the other types of goods. There is no real market force for the knowledge. For a beneficial globalization the knowledge transfer must not be based on market mechanisms.

MARKET FORCES

From human point of view exchange of material goods is a win-win game. Each agent has a wealth increase after the exchange – at least an expected gain. The welfare of the society is the highest when the highest is the possibility for exchanges. We will show that the market forces define the exchanges, so the optimal approach is the free market. The introduction of the market forces follows.

For material good exchanges, the wealth function change is

$$dZ = \sum_i w_i dX_i, \quad (6)$$

when the quantity of goods changes.

The law of exchange is that both actors have an expected wealth increase that is $dZ_A > 0$, and $dZ_B > 0$.

For the sake of simplicity we assume now that the exchange is for the quantities dx_1 and dx_2 . After the exchange the new stocks of resources will be

$$\begin{aligned} X_{A1}' &= X_{AA} + dx_1, \\ X_{A2}' &= X_{A2} + dx_2, \\ X_{B1}' &= X_{B1} - dx_1, \\ X_{B2}' &= X_{B2} - dx_2. \end{aligned}$$

The first agent accepts the offered exchange if it leads to the expected wealth increase, that is

$$dZ_A = w_{A1}dx_1 + w_{A2}dx_2 > 0. \quad (7)$$

The exchange is possible if there is a partner for whom

$$dZ_B = w_{B1}dx_1 + w_{B2}dx_2 < 0. \quad (8)$$

The driving force for exchange is dZ_A and dZ_B , respectively. Here the force is not between the agents so it is not a spatial difference but a temporal difference of the existing and the expected values of the agents.

Now, let us look for the case when agent A sells a good to agent B for the price p . We introduce the monetary value, v . It is just the ratio of the value and the value of the money.

$$v_i = w_i/w_M, \quad (9)$$

is the value in monetary units. With that notation the wealth change of the agent A is as follows

$$\Delta Z_A = w_M(v_{Ai} - p)J_{BA,i} \quad (10)$$

that is, for the agent A the difference of the value and price times the traded quantity and the whole is multiplied with the value of the money.

A similar expression holds for the agent B , the minus sign comes from the fact that there is a transfer:

$$\Delta Z_B = -w_M(v_{Bi} - p)J_{BA,i}. \quad (11)$$

Driving force is defined as the wealth increase for a unit process. We selected the unit process, when 1 unit of good is transferred, that is agent A gets 1 unit of good, and gives money to agent B , and the quantity of the money is the price. Driving force for the exchange is:

$$F_{Ai} = (v_{Ai} - p) \quad (12)$$

$$F_{Bi} = -(v_{Bi} - p) \quad (13)$$

The driving force is positive for both agents, when the price is smaller then the value given by agent A and larger than the value given by agent B . The force law makes the connection between the force and the traded quantity. Force law states that the traded quantity is a function of the driving force.

$$J_{Ai} = X_{Ai}(F_{Ai}) \quad (14)$$

$$J_{Bi} = X_{Bi}(F_{Bi}) \quad (15)$$

Price is defined by the condition, that there is a transfer. As the exchange implies that the traded quantities by the agents equal (with negative sign). It gives a constraint, which defines the price. In linear approximation we assume that the rate of the process is proportional to the force, the coupling factor is the motivation, L .

$$dX_{Ai} = L_{Ai} (v_{Ai} - p) \quad (16)$$

$$dX_{Bi} = L_{Bi} (v_{Bi} - p), \quad (17)$$

and the conservation law of goods gives the constraint:

$$dX_{Ai} + dX_{Bi} = 0. \quad (18)$$

Expressions (16-18) give the price equation

$$p = (L_{Ai}v_{Ai} + L_{Bi}v_{Bi})/(L_{Ai} + L_{Bi}). \quad (19)$$

To simplify the formula, now we assume that the motivations are equal, that is $L_1 = L_2 = L$, then the transferred quantity will be given by a formula similar to thermodynamic force law, where the heat flow is proportional to the temperature difference:

$$J_{BA,i} = L/2 (v_{Ai} - v_{Bi}). \quad (20)$$

The effective driving force for the exchange of the good, i , is just the difference of the values assigned by the agents to the good i . The value difference has a similar role as the temperature difference in thermodynamics. We can introduce now the “market force”

$$F = v_{Ai} - v_{Bi}. \quad (21)$$

Nevertheless that market force appears is only because of the mathematical manipulations. The economic driving force acts on the agents. Similarly, the effective willingness $L/2$ is again a derived formula; it is the result of the individual willingness parameters, which characterize the transfer between the agents. We can see that for more complicated cases too the final expression depends on the values and the differences. That is the trade of material goods has an efficient description with the market forces.

A trade event increases the total wealth of the society, so the best for the society is the highest rate of trade that is the free market. Jacobs summarized the ethical rules for the producers/traders, she called them commercial morality. The commercial morality involves a different and contrasting set of behavioral rules, namely:

- negotiate; avoid force and violence wherever possible
- seek voluntary agreements
- be honest ('honesty is the best policy')
- collaborate willingly with strangers and aliens for commercial purposes
- compete vigorously, but fairly
- respect contracts (including informal ones) and the rule of law
- be enterprising; be open to new ideas; be innovative
- value comfort and convenience rather than ostentation
- allow — even encourage — collegial dissent for the sake of the objective
- be thrifty. Save and invest for productive purposes
- be industrious and work hard. Be efficient
- be optimistic (your future is in your own hands)

CONCLUSION

By the 'happiness paradox' is meant a global phenomenon that has become apparent during recent decades. Well-being, as measured by a self-reported rating of one's happiness, or by other objective indices of mental health, does not improve, or it even deteriorates, whilst income per head, which is the main proxy for material well-being, displays a distinct rising trend. The paradox is reinforced by the fact that people still strive to earn more income by working harder and for longer hours. These facts are paradoxical because economists would expect higher income to mean greater well being, and that more wealth would enable people to exploit technical progress in order to reduce their working time [15].

The globalization due to its promises encourages the growth of Z , but not the achieving of the global happiness. The main criteria of the happiness is that the possible choices should contain that action, which the actor may increase its happiness. Simple system (rational) approach: the globalization increases the number of choices so it also increases the happiness. But according to the complex system approach the globalization also abolishes some possibilities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work was sponsored by the Hungarian Research Fund, OTKA K 61586.

REFERENCES

- [1] Opitz, E.A.: *Religion and Capitalism: Allies, Not Enemies*. Irvington-on-Hudson, NY: The Foundation for Economic Education, 131, 1992,
- [2] Phoenix, C.: *Three Systems of Ethics for Diverse Applications*. <http://www.nanotech-now.com/Chris-Phoenix/diverse-ethics.html>, 2002,
- [3] Hutcheson, F.: *Second treatise of An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*. 1725. Reprinted by Garland Pub., New York, 1971,
- [4] Bentham, J.: *Principles of Morals and Legislation*. <http://www.econlib.org/library/Bentham/bnthPMLCover.html>,

- [5] Veenhoven, R.: *Measures of Gross National Happiness*.
In OECD: Statistics, Knowledge and Policy. Measuring and Fostering the Progress of Societies. OECD, Paris, 231-253, 2007,
- [6] Martinás, K.: *From Simple to Complex*.
In preparation.
- [7] Martinás, K.; Margitay-Becht, A. and Herrera, D.R.: *Wealth, Groups, Ethics*.
Interdisciplinary Description of Complex Systems **6**(1), 1-9, 2008,
<http://indecs.eu/index.php?s=x&y=2008&p=1-9>,
- [8] Cleveland, P.A.: *The Failure of Utilitarian Ethics in Political Economy*.
The Journal of Private Enterprise **18**, 2002,
- [9] Jacobs, J.: *Systems of survival*.
New York, Random House, 1992,
- [10] Graham, C.: *The Economics of Happiness Insights on globalization from a novel approach*.
World Economics **6**(3), 41-55. 2005,
- [11] Sengerberger, W.: *Globalization and Social Progress: The Role and Impact of International Labour Standards*. 2nd revised & extended ed.
Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Bonn, 2005,
- [12] Marx, K.: *Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*.
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1844/manuscripts/preface.htm>,
- [13] Martinás, K.: On the principle of maximum happiness.
International Conference *Astronomy and Civilization*, Budapest, August 10-13, 2009. In press,
- [14] Ayres, R.U. and Martinás, K.: *On The Reappraisal Of Microeconomics: Economic Growth And Change In A Material World*.
Elgar, 2006,
- [15] Mellers, B.A. and McGraw, A.P.: *Anticipated Emotions as Guides to Choice*.
Current Directions in Psychological Science **10**(6), 210-214, 2001.

O TEORIJI LJUDSKOG ODLUČIVANJA U DOBA "GLOBALIZACIJE DOBROBITI"

K. Martinás¹, Á. Kerényi²

¹Sveučilište Loránd Eötvös
Budimpešta, Mađarska

²Institut za financije i međunarodnu ekonomiju, Fakultet ekonomije i menadžmenta,
Sveučilište u Szegedu
Szeged, Mađarska

SAŽETAK

Globalizacija je kompleksna pojava mnogobrojnih poželjnih i nepoželjnih posljedica. U članku istražujemo vezu između ekonomije globaliziranog tržišta i sreće temeljem posljedica principa najveće sreće u okviru znanosti o sustavima. Također istražujemo pojam globalizacije dobrobiti. Polazna nam je pretpostavka kako u temelju dobre globalizacije trebaju biti Benthamov princip (najveća sreća najvećeg broja ljudi) te pojam *traženje sreće* iz Deklaracije neovisnosti Sjedinjenih Država.

Pritom se suočavamo sa sljedećim problemom: u skladu sa svojom prirodom globalizacija osigurava rast svog tržišnog dijela, ali ne i ukupne sreće.

Glavno pitanje političke filozofije jest *Što trebamo učiniti kako bismo zajedno živjeli dobro?* U pristupu kompleksnih sustava, na temelju zakona porasta bogatstva uzimamo u obzir parametre koji će se mijenjati zbog (i) ljudskih odluka te zbog (ii) dugoročnih očekivanja, koje povratno motiviraju odluke. Čimbenici u grupi

ljudskih odluka su: materijalna dobra, novac, parametri ljudske fiziologije (npr. zdravlje), psihologije (znanje) i sociologije (prijateljstva, moć). U principu te su veličine mjerljive, tj. mogu se preslikati na skup realnih brojeva. Promjene su izmjene između dva agenta ili između agneta i prirode, a za svakog agenta uključene su interna proizvodnja i potrošnja.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI

globalizacija, teorija odlučivanja, princip najveće sreće