

2-2004

Integrity, shame and self-rationalization

Elias L. Khalil

Vassar College, elias.khalil@verizon.net

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalwindow.vassar.edu/faculty_research_reports

Citation Information

Khalil, Elias L., "Integrity, shame and self-rationalization" (2004). *Faculty Research and Reports*. 80.
https://digitalwindow.vassar.edu/faculty_research_reports/80

This Working Paper is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Window @ Vassar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Research and Reports by an authorized administrator of Digital Window @ Vassar. For more information, please contact library_thesis@vassar.edu.

Integrity, Shame and Self-Rationalization

Elias L. Khalil*

Vassar College Economics Working Paper # 55

ABSTRACT

Integrity is a non-ordinary commodity. The “sale” of integrity gives rise to the anomaly of shame. If integrity has a price, why do agents experience a disutility (shame) that they try to hide or, by resorting to self-rationalization, try to deny? The proposed view, called “quantum,” explains shame easily. It also avoids another set of anomalies that face heterodox models based on the multiple-self framework.

Key words: Cretan Liar Paradox, identity, identity switch, heroism, imprinting and the transactional view (pragmatism), self-cheating (procrastination), fairness, unitary-self view, multiple-self view, quantum view

JEL classification: D0

Department of Economics, Vassar College. Email: elias.khalil@verizon.net.

URL (author): <http://irving.vassar.edu/faculty/ek/ek.htm>

URL (paper): <http://irving.vassar.edu/faculty/VCEWP/VCEWP55.pdf>

- The paper was supported in part by research fellowships from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (Germany) and the Earhart Foundation (USA). Early drafts greatly benefited from the comments of Timur Kuran, Gary Becker, Cass Sunstein, Richard Posner, J. Barkley Rosser, and participants of seminars at Vassar College, Queens College, and the University of Connecticut. However, none of them should be held responsible for any remaining failing.

Is Public Exposure Necessary?

		YES	NO
<p><i>Is Action the Object Of Evaluation?</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">YES</p>	<p>Shame of Ridicule: Indecent exposure that hinders “reflexive utility” related to decorum</p>	<p>Shame of Opportunism: Free-riding that buttresses “substantive utility” related to promises</p>	
<p style="text-align: right;">NO</p>	<p>Humiliation</p>	<p>Ignominy</p>	

Figure 1: *Disapproval in Backward-Looking Evaluations
(Integrity Utility)*

Introduction

Economic theorists are generally pressed hard to account for the emotional and physiological state known as “shame”—despite its ubiquity. Sex offenders, embezzlers, collaborators with the enemy, shop lifters, and so on, try to cover their faces from a curious public. As Michael Lewis puts it, the person who feels shameful usually wants to hide, disappear, or even die:

Shame results when an individual judges his or her actions as a failure in regard to his or her standards, rules and goals ... The person experiencing shame wishes to hide, disappear or die. It is highly negative and painful state that also disrupts ongoing behavior and causes confusion in thought and an inability to speak. The body of the shamed person seems to shrink, as if to disappear from the eye of the self or others. Because of the intensity of this emotional state, and the global attack on the self-system, all that individuals can do when presented with such a state is to attempt to rid themselves of it [Lewis, 1995a, p. 71; see also Lewis, 1995b, p. 75].

Shame usually arises from the violation, as Lewis puts it, of one’s own standards of moral behavior—standards aimed to buttress one’s own sense of integrity:

Definition: Shame is a disutility *of a particular kind* that arises from most, but not all violations of integrity.¹

In turn, we need to define integrity:

¹ Meanwhile, guilt can be defined as a milder form of shame [Lewis, 1995b, p. 75-77; Tangey, 1990, p. 103].

Definition: Integrity is a utility of a particular kind that usually arises from backward-looking, intertemporal action that maintains the unity of the self. Integrity of the self is affirmed when the “present self” honors, when it has a choice to dishonor, a commitment made by a “past self.” The present act of honoring has no meaning without referring to the *context*, viz., the commitment or promise made by the past self when the present self can defect. As such, the context cannot be divided at the margin if intertemporal unity of the self, i.e., integrity, to be maintained.

The most salient point of this essay is that integrity is a non-ordinary commodity because the “sale” of integrity generates a non-ordinary disutility called shame. If shame is an ordinary disutility, why we do not celebrate the “sale” of integrity as we celebrate the sale of ordinary commodities such as labor service, furniture, and so on?

To be sure, integrity can be “sold” only if cost of law enforcement is sufficiently high. If transaction cost of law enforcement is zero, integrity would have a zero “price.” So, is integrity a non-ordinary commodity because the gained wealth (bribe) is fictitious—i.e., it amounts to a zero-sum game where the gain of one agent is at the expense of another?

This is not the case. Another kind of transaction cost, afforded by search cost [Coase, 1937], also allows for fictitious gain when market competition leads to expenditures on advertisements that act as positional goods. Also, public goods and regulations allow for fictitious gain arising from political competition (rent-seeking). Neither kind of waste-generating competition or fictitious gain gives rise to shame.

The distinctive characteristic of transaction cost related to opportunism [Williamson, 1975] or shame is that there is a violation of binding commitment or intertemporal consistency, i.e., integrity. So, still, why is integrity a non-ordinary commodity? Integrity expresses the context of decisions. One cannot reduce the context to the content—otherwise it would invite the Cretan Liar Paradox, as discussed below.

So, the pain associated with the selling of integrity cannot be an ordinary disutility. Given that integrity is about the consistency of past and present selves, it is about the preservation of identity, which can be considered a capital stock. George Akerlof and Rachel Kranton [2000] model identity as a taste. However, identity *qua* integrity is a capital stock, called below “identity capital,” which is necessary for the constitution of the constraint function irrespective of the historical or cultural setting. Such a setting only defines the exact details of integrity *qua* identity capital.² Although the essay focuses mainly on integrity *qua* utility (of a special kind), the simple model offered here treats integrity as a constraint.

² What defines honesty, integrity, honor, and shame vary across individuals and across cultures [Cohen & Nisbett, 1994, 1997; Mosquera *et al.*, 2002]. An act committed against a clan member might be considered dishonest, but if committed against outsiders, it might be considered “clever.” This difference is probably one aspect of ethnic and clan solidarity. This paper is not concerned with historical and cultural peculiarities. In fact, to come to grip with these peculiarities, we need a simple model that captures the relation of integrity and interest in an ahistorical sense.

The preservation of identity, and the avoidance of shame, is so central to human and physical mental health that the failure may lead to multiple personality disorders as discussed by Lewis [1995a,b]. The preservation of identity is central enough that agents regularly resort to strategies of denial in order to suppress paradoxically from their own consciousness any hint of shame. One common strategy is self-rationalization [see Broucek, 1991; Schneider, 1992; Miller, 1996], which can be defined in the following way:

Definition: Self-rationalization amounts to the over-stretching of a narrative to convince mainly the self that the self did not sacrifice integrity for a higher income or greater comfort.

As the story of Adam and Eve illustrates, the agent usually tries to rationalize actions already taken in order to convince mainly himself that he is a man of integrity. The agent even may resort to “projection,” i.e., thinking that others are dishonest and even evil, as Hanah Arendt [1976] has argued with regard to the indictment of Nazi war criminals.

Social psychologists have amassed enormous empirical findings about shame and the pathologies that it can generate [e.g., Buss, 1980; Nathanson, 1992; Morrison, 1996; Lansky & Morrison, 1997; Gilbert & Andrews, 1998; Lewis & Haviland-Jones, 2000; Seidler, 2000; Tangney & Dearing, 2002]. Sociologists have studied the phenomenon of shame in relation to violence and social deviance [Scheff 1990; Retzinger, 1991; Scheff & Retzinger, 1991]. On the other hand, anthropologists have identified shame as an important cement of communal solidarity [e.g., Gilmore, 1987; Hans, 1991]. Some political scientists have also highlighted how shame gives origin to hubris and the quest after political power [Fisher, 1992]. Economists have started to pay attention to shame, usually under terms such as “honesty,” “trust,” “fairness,”

“retaliation,” and so on, as exhibited in the ultimatum, trust, and dictator games [Fehr & Gächter in Ben-Ner & Putterman, 1998; Levine, 1998; *passim* Khalil, 2003a].

While the approaches of the economists are more analytical than the discussions found in other disciplines, the analytical rigor comes at the expense of richness of understanding the psychological and cultural meaning of shame. This paper attempts to preserve the deep understanding of shame gained from the other disciplines—but without sacrificing the analytical rigor that typifies the economic approach.

In fact, this paper finds the theoretical treatment of honesty in economics to be less than satisfactory for a number of reasons. This paper shows that the mainstream approach, called here the “unitary-self” view, faces different anomalies. Mainly, the unitary-self view, with its diverse flavors, can neither explain shame nor self-rationalization at first approximation. The heterodox critics of the mainstream approach, grouped here under the “multiple-self” view, are capable of explaining shame and self-rationalization. However, once the promoters of the multiple-self view split the agent into multiple selves, they encounter difficulty in putting the selves back together.

The paper proposes an alternative view, called “quantum,” which promises to supersede the failings of the unitary- and multiple-self approaches. The quantum view proposes that while self-integrity is a taste, it cannot, contrary to the unitary-self theories, be part of ordinary tastes that make up the usual utility function, what is called here “substantive utility.” Rather, integrity is the meaning that defines the context of acting according to one’s identity, i.e., affirming the continuity between present self and past self. As a meaning, integrity cannot be divided at the

margin as ordinary tastes á la unitary-self theory. Of more importance, as a context, integrity cannot be an element of the ordinary utility *set* that affords context.

To elaborate, integrity as an element in the ordinary utility set would invite a logical contradiction: Integrity *qua* context has a zero cost of production. The only cost integrity has is the foregone gain from acting opportunistically. But such a cost is an opportunity cost of the non-ordinary kind. Namely, integrity is a *by-product* of a choice over alternatives taken within a context and, hence, integrity cannot be reduced and made into one of the alternatives. Such a reduction would make the *set* of alternatives a member of itself, which invokes the Cretan Liar Paradox [Russell, 1956].

On the other hand, the quantum view proposes that while self-integrity is non-ordinary, it cannot, contrary to the multiple-self theories, be totally separate from ordinary tastes that make up substantive utility. That is, integrity *qua* context entails that it cannot be totally divorced from its substrate—as much as the meaning of a sentence cannot exist independently of the words that make up the sentence. The term “quantum” is chosen exactly to distance the taste for integrity from these two kinds of modeling.

Section one reviews and criticizes standard (i.e., unitary-self) theories and heterodox (i.e., multiple-self) theories. Section two provides conceptual clarifications of the scope of shame. Section three lays out the quantum model of shame. Section four reviews some ramifications of the quantum approach with regard to identity switch, imprinting and the transactional view of action (pragmatism), heroism, procrastination (self-cheating), the penal code, taboos, and etiquettes. The last section draws highlights the main point.

1. Theories of Integrity

1.1 Unitary-Self Approach

1.1.1 The integrity-as-strategy view

The standard, unitary-self view comes in three varieties [Khalil, 2003a]. The first one models integrity as a cost-effective constraint that the agent adopts to win the trust of others in repeated games [e.g., Tullock, 1985; Axelrod & Dion, 1988]. The games do not have to be infinite, but long enough to confirm that the present cost of defection outweighs the present cost of cooperation [Kreps *et al.*, 1982]. In this, what one may call, “integrity-as-strategy” view, agents act with integrity because they are enlightened egoists.

The integrity-as-strategy view definitely explains why many firms forego myopic profits in order to buttress “goodwill.” But this view cannot explain at first approximation one anomaly: the persistence of integrity in one-shot games. At a second approximation, though, the anomaly can be explained. To decipher whether the game is one-shot or repeated involves sufficiently high transaction cost. So, the agent opts for a heuristic of acting with integrity in all cases because, on average, the foregone opportunistic gain is lower than the transaction cost needed in order to differentiate among games case-by-case.

This secondary approximation, i.e., the transaction cost qualification, may succeed in explaining why excessive calculation may convince one to behave always with integrity. Still, however, there are games, such as leaving tips in far-from-home restaurants or experimental games such as the ultimatum game, that clearly involve zero transaction cost. The agent obviously should defect and leave no tip in a far-from-home restaurant—which is generally not the case [Azar, 2004]. The agent obviously should take any proposed amount of money on the

table in the ultimatum game—which is generally not the case [Güth *et al.*, 1982; Güth *et al.*, 1990; Bolle, 1995, 1996; Roth *et al.*, 1991; Roth, 1995, pp. 258-260; Camerer & Thaler, 1995].

In particular, in the ultimatum game, the Proposor expects the Respondent to be despondent, i.e., act vengefully and refuse the proposed division of the money if the division is deemed “unfair.” The Proposor acts fairly probably because the Respondent is ready to hurt his substantive utility, i.e., is ready to act with vengeance [Posner, 2002].³ In either case, whether the Proposor wants to be fair or the Respondent wants to level punishment, the agent should not behave as such, given zero transaction costs, according to the integrity-as-strategy view.

1.1.2 The integrity-as-taste view

³ Gary Bolton [1991] disputes the vengeance motive in the ultimatum game. He argues that the Responder's utility in the ultimatum game consists of absolute income as well as relative income, where low income relative to others engenders envy. He argues that a Responder rejects a low offer when the disutility of inequality outweighs the utility of the absolute amount offered. Such an explanation, however, is appropriate if the inequality is generated by a random device, not by a Proposor. To wit, experiments show that Responders tend to accept low offers when, first, generated by a computer [Rabin, 1993] and, second, generated as a result of competition among Responders [Roth *et al.*, 1991]. Thus, Responders resort to punishment when they attribute the low offer to unfairness on the part of Proposors; they do not merely punish in order to avoid the disutility of envy.

So, how to explain the phenomenon of integrity in single-shot games (with close to zero transaction cost)? To solve the anomaly, other theorists have placed integrity in the objective function, i.e., as an ordinary taste [e.g., Andreoni, 1988; Rabin, 1993; Levine, 1998]. According to what one may call the “integrity-as-taste” view, integrity can be sacrificed at the margin as the intensity of temptations rises. The integrity-as-taste view is epitomized in the cliché “every man has a price”—which, curiously, connotes a disdainful or a repugnant judgment of dishonesty.

This view solves the anomaly facing the taste-as-strategy view; i.e., it can explain integrity in single-shot games. In fact, integrity-as-taste view can be modified to explain the discontinuous character of integrity as accomplished by Dowell, Goldfarb, and Griffith [1998].⁴

⁴ Despite the conscious effort of Dowell, Goldfarb, and Griffith [1998] to distance themselves from the unitary-self approach, they advance the integrity-as-taste view. Dowell *et al.*, make one single advance. Namely, they model honesty as a discrete choice: either one chooses to take a bribe or not. This modeling resembles the state-dependent utility function [Hirshleifer & Riley, 1992, pp. 60-66] and Robert Moffit’s [1983] model of welfare stigma. However, Dowell *et al.*, place the moral choice in the standard, substantive utility function, and focus on accounting for integrity as a lumpy, discontinuous choice. The point, however, about integrity is not mainly that moral choices are discontinuous and, consequently, that the traditional unitary-self views are faulted for missing this fact. There are a host of other phenomena that are discontinuous, but unrelated to honesty, such as choices taken at the extensive margin—as whether to dress warm, take a vacation, or file for divorce. Although Dowell *et al.*, see their model as intermediate between the unitary- and multiple-self views, they miss the point of contention that divides these

In general, though, the integrity-as-taste view creates a host of other anomalies.

The main failing of the integrity-as-taste view is *not* that it violates the desired, standard assumption of stable preferences [Stigler & Becker, 1977]. The theorist can always claim that he has “forgotten” to include the taste for integrity in the original formulation of the utility function. The main failing rather consists of two anomalies, *shame* and *viability*.

Concerning shame, it may seem odd to call shame an anomaly. It is obviously a disutility that arises when one sells a particular commodity, integrity. Thus, as the integrity-as taste view maintains, shame is not different from any other disutility that arises when one sells, e.g., a table or a labor service, where one would be giving up the pleasure of the table or the pleasure of leisure. However, shame is a *non-ordinary* disutility—as much as integrity is a non-ordinary commodity. The “sale” of integrity is bizarre because it amounts to collapsing the *context* of buying and selling of ordinary goods with the *buying* and selling of ordinary goods. The “sale” of integrity does not increase social output. But also rent seeking and positional goods do not increase social output. What really matters is whether the agent has committed to the internalization of the costs of others. If there are no property rights, there is no theft even if

two approaches. Namely, the contention is not about the continuity *versus* discontinuity of *behavior*, but rather is about the continuity *versus* discontinuity of the *self*. Dowell *et al.*, chose the unitary-self conception and, hence, their model suffers from the same fate: Why does one usually experience shame when one sells his integrity?

one's action does not increase social output. So, there is nothing innate about integrity. It amounts to what one has agreed implicitly or explicitly.

When there is integrity, the agent is committed to observe the rights of others as specified by the law. This commitment amounts to stating that the income of others are part of the agent's income. So, the agent cannot expand his income at the expense of others because, once the law is enforced, the agent has to pay back the aggrieved party.

This explains why the "sale" of integrity, although painful, is not celebrated even when the bribe is very high—while the sale of other goods are usually celebrated when the fetched price is high enough. One may argue that the celebration of dishonesty is not suppressed because of fear of retaliation. But, to remind ourselves, we are discussing here the single-shot game where retaliation is not an issue.

In any case, if the reason why one does not celebrate the hard work of shame, as one does the hard work of labor, is the fear of retaliation, we have a prediction: The dishonest agent should at least confide to himself how proud he is for being a rational liar, i.e., for lying when expected opportunistic gain is greater than expected cost in terms of retaliation and disutility of shame. But stylized facts generally do not support this prediction: The dishonest agent may even resort to what psychologists call "projection" when he expresses the cliché "every man has a price" when he judges the motive of others. In projection, the agent subconsciously attributes his own dishonesty onto others in order, paradoxically, to hide from himself such a judgment [see Grant & Crawley, 2002]. So, why is the agent trying to hide from himself the fact that he is a rational liar? He should, at least in private, be proud of his efficiency.

So, the question persists, if every man has a price, why do people try to hide from others in single-shot game—where the fear of retaliation or the protection of reputation is not of concern? A more puzzling anomaly, why do people try to hide their opportunistic act from their own selves when they stretch the facts of a narrative, i.e., what is known as self-rationalization? Even thieves and hardened criminals resort to self-rationalization—such as the victim “had it coming”—as they attempt to avoid cognitive dissonance [Akerlof & Dickens, 1982].⁵

Concerning the second anomaly facing the unitary-self approach, i.e., viability, people with a taste for integrity are similar to people with a taste for pain or a taste for kerosene. Such tastes make the agent a non-viable entity, prone to sickness and, hence, cannot survive in market competition. In market competition where single-shot games are paramount, the sincere may inherit the heavens, but he cannot inherit the earth according to Darwinian natural selection theory.

1.1.3 The integrity-as-trait view

A Darwinian selection argument interestingly can come to the rescue and remedy the viability anomaly facing the integrity-as-taste view [e.g., Witt, 1986; Hirshleifer, 1987; Frank, 1987; Güth & Yaari, 1992; Gintis, 2000]. The argument employs what one may call “social selection” as

⁵ Another strategy of self-rationalization is that all others others seem to be cheating as well.

This strategy, though, may not be self-rationalization if the charge is true. One is not obligated to be exploited as in the case of paying for a public good while all others free-ride [Margolis, 1991].

opposed to familiar natural selection. In social selection, the selectors are conspecifics—i.e., part of the same population as in the case of sexual selection—who favor agents with the trait for honesty over agents with the trait for deception. According to this argument, if honest agents in the population exceed a critical threshold, they would reproduce faster than conniving agents for the simple reason that traders, especially in single-shot games, prefer them over deceivers. One hurdle in the integrity-as-trait view, which is not serious, is that the signal for honesty, such as sweating and voice trembling, should be expensive to mimic.

So, the integrity-as-trait view explains viability. Further, the integrity-as-trait view sheds light on shame: Shame can be seen as the emotional/physiological cost of inhibiting one's trait to be honest. That is, it can be seen as a “hard-wired” apparatus residing in the organism to back-up the honesty trait.

However, the integrity-as-trait view invokes its own enigma. How can the integrity-as-trait explain self-rationalization? If the agent does not have the integrity trait, why is he pretending *to himself* that he has it? On the other hand, if the agent does have the integrity trait, the integrity-as-trait view may explain self-rationalization as the attempt of the agent to avoid the hard-wired pain of shame. This would be an illustration of having the cake and eat it too: Here, the organism is capable of authentically sending the cues of trust, but only to trick others while (thanks to self-rationalization) feeling the pain of shame.

However, if nature abhors inefficiency, why would nature undertake such a circuitous route? Such a route is, in the final analysis, no different from mimicking the physiological cues of having the trait of integrity, when the agent does not. If this is the case, it would be cheaper

and, hence, more efficient for nature to produce agents who mimic the trait of integrity than, first, to produce agents with the trait of integrity but only, second, to undermine it with the trait of self-rationalization.

In addition, the idea of shame as a “hard-wired” apparatus is doubtful to start with. It does not explain why agents, in many instances, can suspend the shame apparatus *without resorting to self-rationalization*. As the model below shows, agents find it suitable to negate integrity, without arousing shame, under particular circumstances. For instance, if agents become convinced that the only way to survive is through cheating, they do not have to worry about commitments to the past self—and they would cheat without arousing any shame. So, shame is not an automatic, “hard-wired” response. Shame, as shown in the model, can be turned on or suspended—depending on the current circumstances.

Another anomaly faces the integrity-as-trait view: The diffusion of the honesty trait can take place only if the population has already reached a critical ratio of honest agents. But what is the origin of such initial ration? So, the integrity-as-trait cannot, in the final analysis explain the origin of honesty.

So, the puzzle persists. The three flavors of the unitary-self approach cannot easily explain integrity, shame, or self-rationalization.

1.2 Multiple-Self Approach

The multiple-self approach seems to account for integrity, shame and, correspondingly, for self-rationalization. The multiple-self approach comes in different varieties, some concerned with intertemporal choice and choice under uncertainty [e.g., *passim* Elster, 1986]. What concern us

here are the multiple-self theories related to moral behavior, at least with regard to the explanation of shame. For these theories, Immanuel Kant's [1969] notion of the "categorical imperative" serves as the basis of the idea that a moral self stands independently from substantive utility. For Kant, the categorical imperative amounts to acting according to duty as dictated by the maxim that one acts according to rules that he wishes them to be universal laws. There are other formulations of the categorical imperatives that need not concern us here.

But basically, the categorical imperative is about obligation that does not hinge on one's preferences, inclinations, feelings, or particular goals. For Kant, the categorical imperative or maxim has the power of "moral law" in the sense of "duty," i.e., doing something for its own sake. This should not be interpreted that Kant was advocating strict particular rules. Rather, whatever is determined to be the particular rule or duty, it acts as a moral law.

If one's duty is to fulfill a promise, it is a categorical imperative in the sense that it is not, what he calls, a "hypothetical imperative." A hypothetical imperative is what economists call efficiency, i.e., the choice of the best means to achieve a given end. Thus, hypothetical imperative dictates actions in light of the expected consequence.

To caution, though, for Kant, hypothetical imperatives and categorical imperatives do not exhaust the sphere of action. Kant allows for actions that stem from sentiments or the pursuit of happiness, what he calls "permitted" goals [Kant, 1969]. Such goals are permitted in the sense that they are morally indifferent (*adiaphora*), i.e., not forbidden by the moral law. For instance, to use Kant's examples, whether one nourishes himself with meat or fish, or with beer or wine, is morally indifferent action. In fact, the pursuit of happiness does not fall within the categorical imperative. So, one can speak of two independent goals, one is "permitted" (*licitum*) insofar as it

falls outside the categorical imperative and the other is “obligatory” insofar as it falls within the categorical imperative. Given either goal, Kant’s notion of the “hypothetical imperative” amounts to optimization calculus, i.e., finding the correct mean to achieve the given goal.

So, for Kant, while one can use the optimization calculus to achieve either the permitted end or the obligatory end, the permitted and obligatory ends belong to different, unrelated spheres. In contrast, for the unitary-self view or for consequentialist ethics, the two ends are actually part of the same utility function, where the permitted ends and obligatory ends are fungible or commensurable. That is, Kant does not consider obligatory ends, such as honesty, to be tradable at the margin.

Similar to Kant, Amitai Etzioni [1986] argues that one should distinguish substantive ends, which generate “pleasure utility,” from ideal ends, which engender “moral ‘utility’.” Etzioni’s “pleasure utility” seems to correspond to Kant’s permitted ends, while Etzioni’s “moral ‘utility’” corresponds to Kant’s obligatory ends. The two kinds of ends or utilities are supposedly incommensurable—a position also advocated by a number of economists critical of the unitary-self approach [e.g., Harsanyi, 1955; Sen, 1977, 1995; Hirschman, 1985].

For instance, Amartya Sen [1977, 1995] regards duty, or what he calls commitment, to be “counter preferential” in the sense that it has a higher moral source that is bound to reduce welfare or what is called here substantive utility. Sen welcomes John Harsanyi’s [1955] distinction between “ethical” and “subjective” preferences. While the former expresses what the person prefers “on the basis of impersonal social considerations alone,” the latter denotes what the person actually prefers “on the basis of his personal interests or on any other basis” [*Ibid.*, p. 315]. This Kantian dichotomy draws a wide and unbridgeable distinction, as if the social “good”

is metaphysically separate from individual welfare. Sen [1977] enriches this dichotomy by proposing the notion of meta-preferences [see also Frankfurt, 1971]. For Sen, the structure of the self is more complex, where the social good can be stratified into multiple levels, ranked by a higher principle of morality.⁶

One can state in general that the multiple-self approaches are successful in explaining shame: The sentiment of shame cannot be offset irrespective of the magnitude of the bribe or payoff because the abrogated duty or obligation is, to start with, incommensurable with substantive utility. However, the multiple-self explanation gives rise to another set of anomalies:

1. How does the person decide whether an action falls within or outside the categorical imperative? For instance, how does one determine whether eating meat as opposed to eating exclusively vegetables a permitted end as opposed to an obligatory end? The same applies to the question of abortion.
2. How does the moral self decide hard cases, i.e., adjudicate among competing moral duties? This task could become impossible given that the moral law is independent of consequences or of the cost of pursuing one duty as opposed to another duty.

⁶ Commenting on Sen, Jane Mansbridge [1998] regards such Kantian approach too restrictive because it treats altruism (sympathy), or what she and Elster [1990] call “love,” as part of substantive utility (welfare or interest). For Mansbridge, Kantian duty and love should be seen as independent springs, and in turn neither can be reduced to substantive utility.

3. Even in the absence of hard cases of competing moral duties, how does the moral self decide what is the moral duty in the first place—especially given the fact that both ends share the same resources? Even Kant admits that the particular circumstances should determine the particular moral law. If this is the case, there is a connection between the supposed two selves—the moral and the substantive. So far, though, the Kantian or multiple-self approach has failed to identify the connection for an obvious reason—it may very well undermine the thesis that the two selves are unrelated.
4. As pointed out by many others, if the two selves are unrelated, the moral self can become “out-of-control,” i.e., totally detached from the particular circumstances. As a result, the moral self can become a dictator in the sense of prescribing a way of life that could become painful, harmful to survival, and extremely inhumane.
5. If agents have multiple selves, how do we differentiate them from non-viable agents suffering from the multiple personality disorder? How can one bridge among the multiple selves if the agent is not at the extreme state of disorder? This bridging is almost impossible given that the spring of the moral self is thought to be independent from substantive utility.
6. If moral duty is unrelated to interest, it would give rise to sentimental foolishness, i.e., when people act according to duty when they should not.

The proposed quantum view promises to provide an account of integrity that supersedes the shortcomings facing both the unitary-self view as well as the multiple-self view. But first we need to define the scope of the investigation.

2. Conceptual Issues

2.1 Utility: Symbolic vs. Substantive

It is proposed here that there are two kind of utility, “symbolic utility” and “substantive utility.”

They are defined in the following way:

Definition: Substantive utility (welfare) arises from the consumption of ordinary goods such as shelter, food, objects of art, and so on.

Definition: Symbolic utility (self-esteem) arises from the consumption of non-ordinary goods such as pride, respect, morale, integrity, and so on.

The proposed distinction is not a dichotomy as in the case of the multiple-self approach. The connection between the two kinds of utility can be expressed in three ways:

1. Text/Context: Substantive utility relates to symbolic utility in the same way that a word relates to the meaning or context afforded by the whole sentence. For example: Examine the word “heirloom” in the following two sentences:

1) “This is an heirloom pin for sale”

2) “This is an heirloom tomato on sale”

2. Subset/Set: Substantive utility relates to symbolic utility in the same way that a subset relates to the set. The set cannot be a subset of itself.

Otherwise, one commits **The Cretan Liar Paradox**

3. **Ordinary/Quantum:** Substantive utility is ordinary while symbolic utility is non-ordinary or, what is called here, “quantum.” The term “quantum” is used in two related senses:

- 1) Symbolic utility expresses a unity of satisfaction that cannot be divided;
- 2) Symbolic utility expresses a quality of satisfaction that is neither totally separable from substantive utility, nor is an element in the substantive utility set. So, as quantum, integrity cannot be pursued as totally divorced from substantive utility. But it also cannot be traded as a substantive good.

2.2 Symbolic Utility: Integrity vs. Respect

Shame differs from embarrassment. Shame is the emotion that may arise from violating the symbolic utility of integrity (as when one acts with dishonesty). Embarrassment is the emotion that may arise from failing to be forward-looking sufficiently, more tenacious, or more alert in pursuing one’s goals. Such failure negates another kind of symbolic utility called here “respect utility” [see Khalil, 2003b]. While shame is close to “foolishness” in the sense that one did not *ex ante* choose the optimum choice, embarrassment differs from “foolishness.” As Arnold Buss notes:

Unlike embarrassment, in shame there is usually a stricken look, often one of sadness. People verbalize feelings of regret, chagrin, and humiliation, for they are mortified at their own behavior and have a strong desire to escape from the eyes of onlookers or a desperate wish to sink into the earth. There is none of the feeling of *foolishness* present in

embarrassment. Rather, shame involves sorrow, even self-disgust. Consider these quoted reactions to a shameful event reported by college students: Wanted to crawl under a rock and die; felt dumb and humiliated because everyone knew; felt hurt, confused, regretting; wanted to cry and try to hide it from others; felt less of a person than others; depressed, mad at myself; felt failure, humiliation, regret; and felt ashamed, stupid, and mad at myself [Buss, 2001, pp. 177-178] (emphasis added).

To note, social psychologists have yet to offer a theoretical account of the difference between shame and embarrassment. At best, Buss [2001, p. 178] asserts, without elaborating, that “[u]nlike embarrassment, shame is often the consequence of immorality.” But studies after studies merely focus on the minute and behavioral differences between the two [Miller & Tangney, 1994; Babcock & Samini, 1990]. They focus on scenarios of shame and embarrassment to record which is more serious, involve intentionality, reactions such as blushing, duration of feelings, reaction of others, and so on.

But if we take the observation of Buss seriously, we should ask why shame involves morality, while embarrassment arises from failing to act with attentiveness or apply one’s best effort. As Buss [2001, p. 184] states, in “embarrassment, one feel foolish; in shame, humiliated.”

Embarrassment arises from either social gaffes, when observers are necessary, or from failure to apply one’s best effort, when observers are not necessary [Khalil, 2003b]. In either case, the act is *not* censured as immoral. In contrast, shame arises from violation of trust or what one takes dear to self-identity. Shame involves immorality. In this regard, it is helpful to distinguish two kinds of commitment, “non-binding commitment” and “binding commitment” [Khalil, 1999].

The term “binding commitment” denotes the promise to pay one’s debt or to honor contract—a promise whose violation justifies punishment or ostracism. Such a promise is non-

negotiable, unless the agent is experiencing an emergency situation. Such a promise differs from “non-binding commitment” such as the aspiration to become a singer or the ideal to eliminate poverty [see Khalil, 1999]. Aspirations and ideals are negotiable commitments if their pursuit turned out to be more difficult than expected. The abandonment of the aspiration or ideal does not call for punishment or ostracism. The negation of non-binding commitments at the first sight of difficulty, though, undermines self-respect and invites embarrassment because it indicates that the agent lacks tenacity [see Khalil, 2003b].

The object of study here is binding commitment.⁷ Binding commitment invokes a particular context, viz., the commitment to the past self. Such a context is called “category” in order to distinguish it from another kind of context, called “frame,” invoked by the non-binding commitment of aspiration, which is forward-looking.

2.3 Object of Evaluation (Integrity Utility): Action vs. Self

While the focus here is on shame, we need to distinguish between two kinds of evaluations that give rise to shame. Shame can arise from the evaluation of the self *in toto*, but also it can arise from the evaluation of an action. The evaluation of the total self involves, if negative, humiliation or ignominy [Miller, 1993]. The focus of this essay is on the evaluation of a specific action. This should not mean that evaluation of total self is insignificant.

As Figure 1 shows along the vertical axis, these two kinds of disapproval appear if we

⁷ In either kind of commitment, the phenomenon under study, viz., integrity, has nothing to do with altruism [Khalil, 2004]. Many authors [e.g., Posner, 2002] offer altruism as an explanatory of honesty. Altruism is primarily a substantive taste towards others, while commitment is primarily motivated by the satisfaction of one’s self-image.

specify the object of evaluation. If the object is the total self, i.e., there is no specific action which is under evaluation, the disapproval is either humiliation (when public exposure is necessary) or ignominy (when public exposure is unnecessary). Given the focus on binding action (not embarrassment), this paper ignores humiliation and ignominy.

2.4 Shame (Integrity Utility): Opportunism vs. Ridicule

While the focus here is on shame (not embarrassment) in relation to the evaluation of a specific action (not total self), we still have two kinds of shame that are occasioned by the issue of whether public exposure plays the *central* role. As Figure 1 shows along the horizontal axis, if public exposure is necessary, it gives rise to “shame of ridicule.” But if public exposure is not necessary, but definitely would make disapproval worse, it gives origin to what is coined here “shame of opportunism.”

The choice of terms may seem idiosyncratic, but hopefully they correspond to some extent to everyday usage. An alternative terminology [Tangney *et al.*, 1994], not followed here, is “private shame” vs. “public shame.” Private shame arises from an opportunistic act. It does not depend on whether others are aware of the act—although such awareness intensifies the emotion. In contrast, public shame, when it would be absent when no one is watching, arises from that which necessarily entails the presence of onlookers, as explained shortly.

Shame of opportunism, the main focus of this paper, arises from weakness of will that hinders one from completing (binding) commitments—commitments that would detract from what is named here “substantive utility.” Shame of opportunism emerges when one behaves as a

free-rider such as when one acts opportunistically and reneges on a promise made to others or to the self. The term “substantive” is used to denote material interest or welfare-enhancing tastes such as shelter, food, and aesthetic pleasure. To make sense of substantive utility, it stands juxtaposed to self-regarding emotions, what was called above “symbolic utility,” that encompasses self-integrity and other quantum effects ranging from self-respect to the expression of admiration [Khalil, 2000]. Given that substantive utility is about direct, non-mediated welfare, shame of opportunism, or self-rationalization, does not need the presence of others—although such presence heightens the shame.

On the other hand, shame of ridicule stems from failing to adopt another kind of (binding) actions, viz., what enhances what is explained below as “reflexive utility.” Shame of ridicule consists of committing indecent exposure or acts that violate identity roles that can be deliberate or out of sloth. They consist of obvious violation of rules that respect the “property rights” of others—where such rights are not in the substantive sense but rather in terms of sensitivities. For instance, shame of ridicule arises when the agent exposes in public, oblivious to the feelings of others, certain body parts, when he violates dinner table manners, and when he gives a gift that would ridicule the recipient in public. Of course, the particularities of indecent exposures vary culturally; they could be belly buttons or sexual organs.

The term “reflexive” is chosen because the indecency concerns utility (either of the substantive or symbolic kind) that is invoked by association or in an indirect manner. It tarnishes the original utility indirectly. The original utility under focus can be substantive, as in the case of indecent exposure, or symbolic, as in the case of the gift. While original utility can be substantive or symbolic, reflexive utility is whatever extra pain gained as a result of the pain of

others. For instance, the exposure of body part may make others repulsed, which affects the disposition of everyone. Or, in the case of the gift, the mortification of the recipient of ridiculous gift increases the giver's taste for revenge. As these examples indicate, the presence of others is, unlike shame of opportunism, necessary.

As shown in Figure 1, what is common to shame of ridicule and humiliation is the presence of others—a common characteristic that may explain why some authors confuse the two. We should not lose sight that what distinguishes them is the object of evaluation. In ridicule, a particular act is ridiculed. But in humiliation, the core identity of the person is judged, such as when one makes fun of someone's ethnicity, religion, accent, parents, posture, weight, nationality, physical appearance, and physical or mental disability. Given the focus here on shame, the object of evaluation is (binding) action rather than the total self.

3. A Simple Model of Integrity

3.1 Three Scenarios of Trespassing

Violation of the law by itself is not a cause of shame. Cheating on income tax or ignoring minimum wage laws usually does not cause one, at least in most occasions, to feel self-disgust. On the other hand, a diverse number of moral codes which are at the origin of stigma, such as divorce or cohabitation in some cultures, have no correspondence in law. But in other cases, law and morality do overlap, as in the violation of property rights as in the cases embezzlement, espionage, and theft. What concerns us here is the moral code rather than the law *per se*. I want to use a simple example of the violation of the moral code with regard to trespassing inspired by Ronald Coase's [1960] efficiency theory of property rights, which in some respect is similar to

the Kaldor-Hicks efficiency criterion and Richard Posner's [1983, chs. 3-4] wealth maximization criterion. I want to use three scenarios of trespassing in order to anchor the proposed modeling of integrity *qua* quantum utility:

Example: The perpetrator, P, without permission, lets his cattle march through the property of the aggrieved party, A. The property is posted throughout with "no trespassing" signs. While A's wealth decreases by ΔW_a , P's wealth increases by ΔW_p .

There are three possible scenarios:

Scenario 1: $\Delta W_a > \Delta W_p$

So, the trespassing is inefficient according to Coase Theorem or the Kaldor-Hicks criterion.

Scenario 2: $\Delta W_a < \Delta W_p$ — whereas no emergency involved.

So, while the trespassing is efficient according to Coase Theorem or the Kaldor-Hicks criterion, it does not qualify under the principle of imminent domain.

Scenario 3: $\Delta W_a < \Delta W_p$ — whereas an emergency involved.

So, while the trespassing is efficient according to Coase Theorem and Kaldor-Hicks criterion, it falls within the principle of imminent domain.

3.2 The Quantum Model

The proposed model promises to sharpen the issues involved in the three scenarios. Let us assume that the perpetrator (P) maximizes his substantive utility function (U^s),

$$\mathbf{Max} U^s = U^s (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) \dots (1)$$

where X_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$) denotes substantive good such as food, shelter, or museum visit. The usual assumptions concerning the U function ($U' \geq 0$ and $U'' \leq 0$) apply. The agent P maximizes his consumption subject to two constraints: "the efficiency constraint" and the "ethical constraint." Concerning the efficiency constraint,

$$W_p(I) + \Delta W_a(I) = P_1 X_1 + P_2 X_2 + \dots + P_n X_n \dots (2)$$

where I denotes the perpetrator's integrity, $W_p(I)$ perpetrator's wealth, ΔW_a the change of wealth of the aggrieved party, and P_i the price of X_i . The usual assumptions ($W_p(I) \geq 0$ and $X_i \geq 0$) apply. Also, it is assumed that the discrete value of I is common knowledge with zero transaction cost. While $\Delta W_a \leq 0$ is the usual case when $I=1$ (cheating), the conclusions of this model do not change in the unusual case of $\Delta W_a > 0$.

This construction of the efficiency constraint involves the internalization of all externalities. The reason for the internalization has nothing to do with altruism. Otherwise, the utility function should reflect the taste for altruism. The internalization is justified in the case of a fully functioning judicial system where perpetrators are held accountable at zero transaction cost. That is, whatever the agent imposes on others because of cheating, he would have to compensate the aggrieved party, following Coase Theorem, while the cost of enforcing the law is zero.

The efficiency constraint (2) involves two further assumptions. First, integrity (I) is a *category*, i.e., a discrete variable that shifts the constraint function. While the quantity of a bribe is continuous, the act of taking or rejecting the bribe is categorical, i.e., discontinuous.⁸ Integrity

⁸ It is true that one may try to be ambiguous when he takes a bribe, such as camouflage it as a series of small and inconsequential gifts, or when he commits a series of small lies. However, such acts of camouflage amount to self-rationalization and, hence, begs the question: Why does not the agent commit the dishonest act in one strike—which should be cheaper from the standpoint of transaction cost. The attempt to be ambiguous (i.e., self-rationalization) when one acts dishonestly only confirms that integrity is a quantum act. The agent who takes small “gifts,” rather than a one-time bribe, is not consuming dishonesty at the margin—but rather is trying to hide (from himself) the dishonesty altogether.

can take only two values: $I = 0$ if the agent acts with decency, and $I = 1$ if the agent violates his own standard of decency. Second, this model assumes that the perpetrator does not resort to dishonesty for purposes such as retaliation, revenge, or malice. The only purpose is to increase wealth, in the sense of substantive utility, of the perpetrator. So, by definition, the change of wealth is, at least *ex ante*, positive,

$$\Delta W_p(1) = W_p(1) - W_p(0) \geq 0 \dots (3)$$

The change of wealth of the aggrieved party (ΔW_a) may not equal the change of wealth of the perpetrator ($\Delta W_p(1)$):

$$\Delta W_a = r \Delta W_p(1) \dots (4)$$

where r is the rate of transformation of the perpetrator's benefit, arising from dishonesty or trespassing. It is usually the case that $r < 0$. (But even if $r \geq 0$, it should not change the results of this model.) In the trespasser example, in Scenario 1, $r < -1$; i.e., the trespassing is inefficient from the standpoint of Coase Theorem. In Scenarios 2 & 3, $0 > r > -1$; the trespassing is efficient from the standpoint of Coase Theorem.

The rate of transformation r is not a given,

$$r = r(TC_a [w_a, w_p, R_a], W_p/W_a) \dots (5)$$

where TC_a represents total cost of the aggrieved party and W_p/W_a the respective wealth levels. TC_a is a function of w_a and w_p , the respective wage rates, and R_a , the lost resources of the aggrieved party. The rate of transformation function (5) captures Pareto optimality and, what is called here, Bentham optimality. For Pareto optimality, $r(\cdot)$ is a function of the total cost (TC_a), which, in turn, is a function of opportunity cost measured by the wage rates (w_a, w_p) and actual

lost resources of the aggrieved party (R_a). In addition, for Bentham optimality, $r(\cdot)$ is a function of relative wealth (W_p/W_a), which assumes that interpersonal utility comparison is non-problematic.⁹ If so, it would be efficient for the poor perpetrator, as Robin Hood had reasoned, to steal from the rich aggrieved party if the marginal dollar generates greater pleasure for the poor than it does for the rich.

Concerning the other constraint, the ethical constraint, it arises when the binding commitment to be honest is part of the perpetrator's integrity utility (U^i):

$$\Delta U^i = \Delta U^i (d_j I(S) \mid W(0)_p > W_p^c) \dots (6)$$

where d_j ($j = 1, 2, \dots, m$) is the *discrete* severity of the offense as assessed by the perpetrator where, e.g., $d_3 > d_2$, S the number of spectators including the perpetrator, and W_p^c represents the critical wealth of the perpetrator below which places the perpetrator in a state of emergency. The ΔU^i function is decreasing, in a quantum manner, in d_j when $I=1$ (dishonesty), i.e., shame arises, *given that* the wealth of the perpetrator acting honestly ($W(0)_p$) exceeds his critical wealth (W_p^c). That is, in emergency situations, if the agent was to act honestly and, consequently, would place his wealth below the critical level, integrity utility would not be affected when $I=1$:

$$\Delta U^i = \Delta U^i (d_j I(1)(S) \mid W(0)_p < W_p^c) = 0 \dots (7)$$

The conditional ethical constraint (7) highlights the difference between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3 in the trespassing example. Although both scenarios enhance efficiency from the

⁹ Actually, Adam Smith's [1776, Khalil 1990] notion of "impartial spectator" allows for an agent, who occupies a station equally distanced from altruist and beneficiary, to compare their welfare. Even Gary Becker's [1981] theory of altruism, based on including the welfare of beneficiary to be part of the utility of the altruist, assumes that interpersonal utility comparison is non-problematic.

standpoint of Coase Theorem, only Scenario 3 meets the ethical criterion because the perpetrator's wealth would be below critical wealth if he acts with integrity.

The exception to the rule of justice in the emergency zone, where there is imminent danger to livelihood, is long recognized in Roman law as well as in the common law of England and the United States. According to this legal tradition, a contract made under necessity, such as imminent danger to life, is not upheld by the legal authorities [Epstein, 1995, ch. 6]. Timur Kuran [1990, 1995] discussed at length what he calls "preference falsification." Agents had to resort to dishonest behavior in order to survive in oppressive environments such as the "Grand Inquisitions" in Spain and modern dictatorships. Agents had to lie about their true identity and beliefs. Such lies, when honest wealth would be under critical wealth, usually did not cause the agent to incur a sense of shame.

We need to specify critical wealth,¹⁰

$$W_p^c = W_p^c(d_j(W_p/W_a)) \dots (8)$$

W_p^c is a function of the contemplated severity of the offense. Murder can be justified if enacted in self-defense, but not if enacted to stave off hunger. While shoplifting of food can be justified if enacted to stave off severe hunger, but not if enacted to save money for a theatre ticket.¹¹ So, W_p^c decreases with d_j . But d_j is not a given. It is influenced by the wealth of the potential

¹⁰ Criticality of wealth is not an absolute level of poverty or an ironclad state of emergency. It rather includes what the agent regards, with the support of conventions, what is needed to sustain "capability" as defined by Amartya Sen [1985].

¹¹ Likewise, the eating of the flesh of already dead people, as abhorrent as it could be, was sanctioned by the Catholic church, and was not considered a sin, in the case of the survivors of an air crash in the desolate Andes mountains [Read, 1974].

perpetrator relative of the wealth of the aggrieved party. It makes no sense in terms of criticality of wealth for a starving person to steal from another, equally starving person.

To elaborate, the higher j means greater severity of offence, which is relevant only if $I=1$ (dishonesty). The j degree is subjective in the sense that different agents might assign different degrees of offense to the same act of opportunism. However, usually and across the board, murder is a higher degree of offence than taking a bribe, and taking a bribe is a higher degree of offense than shoplifting or failing to declare a defect in one's used car [Akerlof, 1970]. Furthermore, for ΔU^i to be non-zero, $S \geq 1$, i.e., the self has to be aware of its own action for integrity utility to change. Obviously, $d_j I$ increases in S , where the pain of shame is amplified by the number of people who are aware of the dishonest act of the perpetrator.

To maximize substantive utility (U^s), the necessary condition for cheating, but not the sufficient condition, is if net social wealth increases:

$$\Delta W_p(1) + \Delta W_a \geq 0 \dots (9)^{12}$$

If we use equation (4), the necessary condition (8) becomes,

$$\Delta W_p(1) + r\Delta W_p(1) \geq 0 \dots (10)$$

or what one may name the “optimum efficiency condition”:

$$\mathbf{optimum\ efficiency\ condition: } r \geq -1 \dots (11)$$

¹² Libertarians criticize Coase Theorem for focusing exclusively on this condition.

If one cheats when $r < -1$, the act would be foolish, i.e., non-optimum in the efficiency sense. This flows from the model's assumption of full transparency and accountability—so the person would have to compensate fully the aggrieved party's substantive damages.

However, there is a sufficient condition, what one may name “optimum ethical condition”:

$$\text{optimum ethical condition: } \Delta U^i (I=1) \geq 0 \dots (12)$$

There are three immediate implications of the optimum ethical condition:

- 1) The optimum ethical condition amounts to a corner solution--similar to the optimum efficiency condition. As much as agents in many occasions act foolishly and violate the optimum efficiency condition, they can also act unethically and violate the optimum ethical condition.
- 2) If one cheats ($I=1$), the ethical condition can be satisfied only in cases of emergency. This means that integrity utility is not the same as the act of integrity.
- 3) The ethical condition differs from lexicographic ordering. While the discontinuous zone or no-cheating rule is absolutely non-tradable beyond critical wealth, lexicographic ordering allows for a continuous trading of bundles after a minimal consumption of one commodity (such as basic food) is satisfied.

3.3 Discussion

The proposed model of integrity embodies the quantum approach that distinguishes it from the unitary- and multiple-self approaches. Contrary to the unitary-self approach, it upholds the idea of integrity as a symbolic utility that is separate from substantive utility by setting up integrity

utility as a distinct function that acts as a constraint. On the other hand, contrary to the multiple-self approach, it upholds the idea of integrity as a symbolic utility that is somewhat dependent on substantive utility by making the function related to substantive interest. First, it expresses the idea that integrity is nothing but the result of keeping a promise which was undertaken in the past to further one's interest. Second, integrity can be violated without giving rise to shame when wealth is below critical wealth.

3.3.1 The Unitary-Self Approach Revisited

In the view of integrity-as-strategy, there is no ethical constraint (6). There would be only the efficiency constraint (2a),

$$W_p(I) + \Delta W_a + R = P_1X_1 + P_2X_2 + \dots + P_nX_n \dots (2a)$$

Whereas R ($R < 0$) represents rent paid by the “perpetrator” to the “aggrieved” party. Given that the “perpetrator” will not violate the rights of others because of concern over reputation, the “perpetrator” must obtain a permission to use the resource of the “aggrieved” party, besides paying the aggrieved party the full cost of such use (ΔW_a). So, when $I=1$, it means that the “perpetrator” decided to ask for a permission to use the resource of the aggrieved party. In this case, the owner of the resource may charge rent (R) determined by the market or, in the case of bilateral monopoly, by negotiation. The only condition that holds is,

$$\Delta W_p(1) + \Delta W_a + R \geq 0 \dots (9a)$$

After substituting, using equation (4),

$$\Delta W_p(1) + r\Delta W_p(1) + R \geq 0 \dots (10a)$$

$$\text{optimum efficiency condition with rent: } r \geq - (1 + R / \Delta W_p(1)) \dots (11a)$$

However, as stated above, while this case can account for integrity in iterative game under particular conditions, it cannot account for integrity in single-shot game with zero transaction costs.

The integrity-as-taste view can account for integrity in single-shot game with zero transaction costs. In the integrity-as-taste view, there is no ethical constraint (6) as well. The efficiency constraint (2), and also the optimum efficiency condition (11), would hold as in the quantum model. The only difference is the utility function of the perpetrator,

$$\mathbf{Max} U^s = U^s (I, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) \dots (1)$$

where $I=0$ for decency and $I=1$ for dishonesty. Since integrity is a categorical choice, the additional constraint for committing dishonesty, beside the optimum efficiency condition (11) is the following egocentric ethical condition:

$$\mathbf{optimum\ egocentric\ ethical\ condition:} U(\Delta W_p(1) - \Delta W_a) \geq U(I = 0) \dots (12a)$$

It is called “egocentric” because the perpetrator is placing a price tag on his integrity [Khalil, 2001]. For such an egocentric, he is justified in betraying his partner if the utility of the net income arising from cheating exceeds, or at least equals, the utility arising from acting with integrity.

However, as stated above, this view cannot account for shame or why the agent does not pride by abiding by the above constraint (12a). Also, such a taste for integrity makes the organism non-viable in competitive markets.

The integrity-as-trait view attempts to take care of the issue of viability and persistence of shame. In the integrity-as-trait view, there is no ethical constraint (6) as well. The agent here acts with integrity because he is built that way—and hence shame persists because it is hard-

wired. The agent is built that way because, according to the Darwinian social selection story, other agents prefer to deal with a person who has the integrity trait. Agents with the integrity trait, under particular conditions, would be richer on average than deceitful agents:

$$\sum_t \delta^t W_p^t(0) \geq \sum_t \delta^t W_p^t(1) \quad (2b)$$

where $\delta < 1$ is the discount factor, $t = 0, \dots, \infty$, assuming that the agent also counts the benefits of the integrity trait for potential progenitors.

However, for the integrity-as-trait story to work, there has to be a critical mass of agents with the integrity trait. This defeats the purpose of explaining the existence of the trait. Further, as mentioned earlier, if integrity is a trait, why do people violate it and then try to rationalize that they did not? The phenomenon of self-rationalization is enigmatic in the house of the integrity-as-trait view. The agent who does not have the trait need not pretend *to himself* that he has it. The agent who has the trait, but undertake self-rationalization when he violates his trait, would be a strange, inefficient organism. First, the organism is loaded with the integrity trait, then he is loaded with self-rationalization in order to avoid the sense of shame. It would be more efficient for nature to build, instead, an organism with the dishonest trait accompanied with the ability to mimic the honesty trait in order to free-ride.

3.3.2 The Multiple-Self Approach Revisited

To avoid all the anomalies facing the unitary-self views, one is prompted to start afresh, as many of the advocates of the multiple-self approach do. Unlike the three flavors of the unitary-self view, the multiple-self approach recognizes the ethical constraint,

$$\Delta U^i = \Delta U^i (d_j I(S) \forall W(0)_p) \dots (6a)$$

Here, the multiple-self view identifies integrity utility with the act of integrity itself. It does not allow for a zone of emergency where, if honest wealth is below the critical level, one would be allowed to cheat or to abrogate an earlier commitment without incurring shame.

Furthermore, the quantum approach concurs with the multiple-self approach that integrity is a non-ordinary commodity. However, it differs from the multiple-self approach by avoiding the modeling of integrity as a fetish—i.e., making integrity into something potent or part of some categorical imperative that obfuscates its earthly origin. For the quantum approach, integrity is a non-ordinary commodity because it expresses the context of exchange.

Of more importance, the advocates of the multiple-self approach do not seem to realize the origin of ethical constraint: Namely, the ethical constraint is a binding commitment that the agent adopts or contracts because production depends on identity or intertemporal consistency. The moral commitment has no lofty or metaphysical origin. In fact, agents or groups may take pride in being skillful in exploiting others when there is neither explicit nor implicit binding commitment to do otherwise. The binding commitment does not have a universal content. The content depends on historical circumstances. The binding commitment is simply a contracted obligation and, as discussed below, acts as part of “identity capital.” Identity capital expresses the sense of bonding that one usually needs to organize one’s skills in light of an identified goal.

In short, by radically separating integrity utility from substantive utility, the advocates of the multiple-self view cannot connect the supposedly different selves.

4. Ramifications

4.1 Identity Switch

Short of emergency, it is hard to satisfy the optimal ethical condition. Short of emergency, as examined above, agents usually resort to self-rationalization, i.e., the over-stretching of a narrative in order to justify a dishonest action. In this manner, with self-rationalization, the agent attempts to capture integrity while dishonestly.

However, one may still revoke binding commitments, even when one is outside the emergency zone, and still avoid the sense of shame *without resorting to self-rationalization*. This is possible if one undergoes “identity switch.” Unlike the case of justified dishonesty in the case of emergency, in identity switch the agent no longer recognizes the old rules of integrity, morality, or identity. In identity switch the agent preserves integrity while disowning one’s binding commitments.

The switch from one core identity to another, from a conservative to a liberal or from a Catholic to a Jew, is usually undertaken as a result of an identity crisis. The agent might be seeking a greater coherence or comprehensibility—as probably the case with St. Paul’s spiritual rebirth in the New Testament. This is probably the same reason for identity switch in revolutionary times, when states change directions. Further, agents may not openly undergo identity switch but rather slowly slip into self-hate and even group self-hate [Gilman, 1986]. Still, another reason for the identity switch is expected wealth. It is often the case that agents switch their religion in light of the religion of the ruling class or the religion of the hegemonic state.

4.2 Imprinting and the Transactional View

The idea of imprinting originated from the work of Konrad Lorenz [1965] and other ethologists. They observed that organisms have a great partiality towards whoever is their first care provider or their first physical surrounding. They exhibit what behavioral economists call the “endowment effect” [Thaler, 1980], which is marshaled to explain an observed difference between the "willingness to pay" and "willingness to accept" [Camerer, 1995, pp. 665-670; Eisenberger & Weber, 1995]. The agent has a bias towards the inherited endowment or default state because the first provider or first physical surrounding acts as the solid rock that the agent needs in order to produce,

$$Q = Q(K, L, T, U^i) \dots (13)$$

where Q is output, K capital, L labor, and T land. In this production function, integrity utility acts as “identity capital” that affords the agent “attention.” Attention includes memory and focus that are needed to coordinate human capital with other physical resources over time. The fund U^i is simply the aggregation of all previous additions of integrity arising from previous, discrete choices,

$$U^i = \sum_t \Delta U_t^i \dots (14)$$

where $t = 0, \dots, T$, T the present, and ΔU_t^i is the ethical constraint (6). In this manner, the agent’s productive ability, the ability to undertake forward-looking action, depends not only on the traditional inputs but also on amassed fund of integrity utility.

Imprinting in human affairs amounts to attachments to the binding commitments made by past selves. The agent invests in honesty or authenticity to augment identity capital as he invests in other resources such as human capital. In the case of integrity, the agent is relating to the first

self as the solid rock, the first care provider, upon whom he undertakes further explorations and production activity.

So, past commitments act as the default states which are not initially questioned. Norms of justice and binding commitments play analytical roles similar to the role of the first care provider in imprinting. One should not, and usually does not, start from scratch or from some an idealized world [Levi, 2004]. Rather, and this is the core of the idea of action according to the philosophy of pragmatism, or what John Dewey and Arthur Bentley [1999] call the “transactional view,” experience precedes reason: The agent takes what is given without reflection; there is a bias towards the *status quo*. The basic idea of the transactional view is that the agent questions current commitments, understanding, identity, and so on, only in light of a crisis or disturbance that needs to be settled [Ryan, 2002].

4.3 Heroism

Heroism is usually confused with integrity [e.g., Urmson, 1958; Heyd, 1982; Montague, 1992]. While they overlap, they are not identical. Heroism can be defined as acting honestly or according to identity when the consequent wealth is below critical wealth:

$$W(0)_p < W_p^c$$

That is, heroism amounts to the preservation of identity or integrity when the agent, given that he is in a state of emergency, should abandon his integrity. So, in the act of heroism or supererogation, the agent is acting foolishly, not observing the optimum ethical constraint.

Nonetheless, we still admire the thousands of members of Jehovah's Witnesses who chose to perish in Nazi death camps rather than gain freedom by signing the declaration card

which renounces their faith and pledges allegiance to the Third Reich [Engardio, 1996]. It is curious how the choice of death or loss of career over the renouncement of one's identity or belief—as also evident by the sacrifices of early Christians, liberation rebels, revolutionaries under repressive regimes, or Samurai warriors¹³--is usually admired.¹⁴ In fact, every state, ideology, and religion has its legends of heroes and saints.

If heroism is not foolishness, how should we model heroism? Evidently, the hero's critical wealth is much lower than the normal critical wealth of spectators. In fact, the hero seems to be most interested in preserving or solidifying the identity of such spectators. There can be no heroes without spectators.

Early Christians withstood torture and met death, rather than abandon their faith, in order to influence the faith of spectators. There is no hero without admirers or potential admirers.

What would happen to the Catholic Church if all Catholics become celibate priests and nuns?

¹³ Saikaku Ihara's [1981] account of *giri* (the code of honor among the Samurai) makes an interesting and pertinent reading. Writing in 1688, Ihara's tales are permeated with social satire of the absurdities generated by extreme and unintelligent pursuit of honor. While some tales portray honor as optimum and hence admirable, the majority of tales show how *giri* engenders suboptimum ridiculous results when the actor pursues *giri* while he is in the critical zone.

¹⁴ One cannot but admire Vaclav Havel when he explained later why he risked so much by sending an open letter critical of the Communist government of Czechoslovakia in 1975:

The letter, on the primary level, was a kind of autotherapy: I had no idea what would happen next, but it was worth the risk. I regained my balance and my self-confidence. I felt I could stand up straight again, and that no one could accuse me any longer of not doing anything, of just looking on in silence at the miserable state of affairs. I could breathe more easily because I had not tried to stifle the truth inside me. I had stopped waiting for the world to improve and exercised my right to intervene in that world, or at least to express my opinion about it [quoted in Kuran, 1995, p. 287].

So, heroism is not an optimal or rational strategy for *all* the members of the group. Rather, the hero does want everyone in the group to follow his steps to martyrdom. He rather wants others to remember him posthumously. The hero wants to influence the identity of the admirers, taking into consideration the expected utility of the adhered faith or identity.

The prerequisite of spectators may allow us to distinguish heroes from hermits and followers of mystic orders who deny themselves the pleasures of everyday life. Such ascetics are not heroes. They are actually maximizing a different utility function and, hence, they do not need spectators. So, people who seem to lead a life of pain may not be acting heroically, but rather pursuing their own pleasures.

4.4 Procrastination as Self-Cheating

In all acts of cheating, the present self does not honor the commitment made by a past self. While in cheating proper the aggrieved party is another person, in self-cheating the aggrieved party is a future self.

The best example of self-cheating is procrastination. For instance, the self at time $t=0$ promises to cut the grass later, let us say $t=1$, but at $t=1$ the self cheats and does not carry out the commitment, imposing a cost on the future self, the self at $t=2$. This imposes an extra cost because the self at $t=2$, as understood at $t=1$, is already crowded with other responsibilities. Procrastination is usually not seen as dishonesty because the aggrieved party is still the same person. Another example of self-cheating is anorexia [Bell, 1985; Condit, 1990], where the present self undermines the well-being of the future self.

Self-cheating has given rise to pre-commitment contracts, where the present self limits its choice to preserve the interest of the future self. Similar to the *inter-person* exchange of hostages to prevent defection, pre-commitment is *intra-person* exchange of hostages to prevent self-cheating. The best example of pre-commitment is the fable of Ulysses and the Sirens [Elster, 1984]. As Posner [1995] suggests, the role of law in molding personal choices can be seen as pre-commitment. For instance, the social security system can be seen as a freely appointed guardian against undersaving, similar to the helmet law in some states.¹⁵

4.5 *The Penal Code*

While the debate in economics on how to model integrity is recent, the debate in legal and political philosophy extends at least to Socrates. It has taken a new form in modern positions as best exemplified in the Kantian orientation of Ronald Dworkin [1977, 1978] and the utilitarian orientation of Gary Becker [1968] and Richard Posner [1983]. Dworkin maintains an independent source for rights and justice as espoused by the multiple-self approach. Becker and Posner reduce these notions to substantive utility as entailed by the unitary-self approach.

¹⁵ To caution, however, not all pre-commitments are about the prevention of self-cheating. In many cases, the pre-commitment is undertaken because one admits that he lacks the resolve or tenacity to execute a task. In other cases, the precommitment is undertaken to galvanize resolve as the case of an invading army burning its own ships. Such kinds of precommitment are about forward-looking action, which is outside the focus here.

The proposed quantum view of integrity suggests that a penal code that exclusively relies on depriving the criminal of substantive utility—a code advocated by Jeremy Bentham on the bases of deterrence—is inadequate. Some legal scholars, such as Dan Kahan [1996], want to revive the expressive theory of punishment which prevailed before Bentham. The expressive theory entails the appropriateness of the use of shame—inflicted on convicted criminals through corporal punishment ranging from public display of the offense to chain gangs--as a method of punishment.

To wit, as Kahan argues, the penal code of the U.S. is totally detached from the use of shame—as evident by the public's endorsement of imprisonment over cheaper and probably more effective methods of sanctions such as fines and community service. The overwhelming public endorsement of imprisonment as the prime method of punishment does not arise, as Kahan maintains, from misinformation, lack of knowledge, or belief in the greater effectiveness of imprisonment. The public rather regards these alternatives as falling short of expressing the condemnation of acts which violate public trust--a condemnation which goes beyond the demand of substantive retribution.

4.6 Etiquette

People who are committed to the rights of others usually follow, even in single-shot games, the rules of fairness in order to reach equitable distribution of public goods, such as access to parks or roads. When an equitable access is not clear, people act with courtesy or what is called generally “etiquette.” Etiquette include the rule of “first-come-first-served” when people compete for the services of a clerk at a post office. They also include courtesy and yielding

when a person asks if others are interested in the last serving of a dish at dinner table before the person helps himself to it.

So, etiquettes are methods to distribute nonexclusive, public goods which may experience congestion. Etiquettes express binding commitments to fairness; they generally do not express sympathy with the substantive interest of the other. Amartya Sen expresses the difference between commitment and sympathy in the following famous parable:

The contrast between sympathy and commitment may be illustrated with the story of two boys who find two apples, one large, one small. Boy *A* tells boy *B*, 'You choose'. *B* immediately picks the larger apple. *A* is upset and permits himself the remark that this was grossly unfair. 'Why?' asks *B*. 'Which one would *you* have chosen, if you were to choose rather than me?' 'The smaller one, of course', *A* replies. *B* is now triumphant: 'Then what are you complaining about? That's the one you've got!' *B* certainly wins this round of argument, but in fact *A* would have lost nothing from *B*'s choice had his own hypothetical choice of the smaller apple been based on sympathy as opposed to commitment. *A*'s anger indicates that this was probably not the case [Sen, 1982, p. 93; Anand, 1993, p. 67].

We also need to distinguish etiquettes from *manners* such as refraining from telling gross jokes or burping at dinner table. Manners are related to what was called earlier "reflexive utility," where one's utility depends exclusively on the utility of others. Manners in this regard give rise to propriety of behavior or the "virtue of self-command," according to Adam Smith [1976; Khalil, 1990]. Self-command amounts to restraining the burst of joy or anger beyond what is deemed proportionate to the stimulus. The determination of what is proportionate depends on how other spectators react to the same stimulus.

4.7 Taboos

The proposed theory can open new vistas concerning the modeling of self-identity and taboo markets such as the sale of children, the secrets of one's country, ethnic identity, masculine identity, and so on. The proposed quantum view may answer why adding material incentives does not usually increase, and even may decrease, the supply of taboo items such as cadaveric organs [see Bowden & Hull, 1993]. The shame arising from the trade of taboo items is similar to the shame associated with cheating.

5. Conclusion

The proposed quantum approach attempts to deal with the strange case of integrity or, its sister, shame. Integrity is a strange commodity because it expresses the context of the exchange. The quantum approach neither conceives integrity as an element of substantive utility (unitary-self approach) nor as totally independent of substantive utility (multiple-self approach). The advanced quantum view promises to solve the anomalies of shame and self-rationalization that face the unitary-self approach. It also promises to explain why *justified* dishonesty and identity switch do not give rise to shame, contrary to what is expected by the multiple-self approach.

The paper attempts to solve the puzzles of shame, self-rationalization, justified dishonesty, and identity switch. The key idea is that integrity, which expresses a commitment to a past self, is a quantum taste. To be a quantum taste, the utility is symbolic rather than substantive. To be a symbolic utility, it expresses the sense of selfhood rather than simply pleasure in the sense of substantive utility. As such, symbolic or quantum utility is neither,

under particular conditions, fungible with substantive utility nor it is totally separable from substantive utility.

However, should economists drop the unitary-self approach altogether? For a great range of issues, where the empirical observation does not involve shame, the unitary-self approach is useful as a first approximation. It is useful if one is interested in explaining how the increase of incentives may tempt people, at the extensive and intensive margin, to commit crime. However, it is possible that the increase of an incentive may lead to the switch of context and, therefore, would prompt people to decrease rather than to increase the supply of the desired activity. For instance, if monetary reward is offered for first time for some public duty, such as blood donation or volunteer work in a local hospital, the introduction of a monetary incentive would change the context where the activity would not be seen any longer as part of civic duty and identity.

Thus, we need the quantum approach when context of action matters. So, the unitary-self approach should be applied with caution, while realizing that maximization operates within a context that is invisible if one only focuses on monetary incentives.

References

- Akerlof, George A. "The Market for 'Lemons': Quality Uncertainty and the Market Mechanism." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, August 1970, 84:3, pp. 488-500.
- _____ and William T. Dickens. "The Economic Consequences of Cognitive Dissonance." *American Economic Review*, June 1982, 72:3, pp. 307-319.
- _____ and Rachel Kranton. "Economics and Identity." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, August 2000.
- Anand, Paul. *Foundations of Rational Choice Under Risk*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Andreoni, James. "Why Free Ride? Strategies and Learning in Public Goods Experiments." *Journal of Public Economics*, December 1988, 37, pp. 291-304.
- Arendt, Hannah. *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*, revised edition. New York: Penguin Books, 1976.
- Axelrod, Robert and Douglas Dion. "The Further Evolution of Cooperation." *Science*, 9 December 1988, 242:4884, pp. 1385-1390.
- Azar, Ofer H. "What Sustains Social Norms and How They Evolve? The Case of Tipping." *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 2004, forthcoming.
- Becker, Gary S. "Crime and Punishment: An Economic Approach." *Journal of Political Economy*, 1968, 76, pp. 169-217
- _____. "Altruism in the Family and Selfishness in the Market Place." *Economica*, February 1981, 48, pp. 1-15.
- Bell, Rudolph M. *Holy Anorexia*, epilogue by William N. Davis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Ben-Ner, Avner and Louis Putterman (eds.) *Economics, Values, and Organization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Bolle, Friedel. "Does Trust Pay?" Discussion paper, Europa-Universität Viadrina, Frankfurt (Oder), 1995.
- _____. "Rewarding Trust: An Experimental Study." Discussion paper, Europa-Universität Viadrina, Frankfurt (Oder), 1996.

Bolton, Gary E. "A Comparative Model of Bargaining: Theory and Evidence." *American Economic Review*, December 1991, 81:5, pp. 1096-1136.

Bowden, A.B. and A. Hull. *Controversies in Organ Donation: A Summary Report*. New York: National Kidney Foundation, 1993.

Broucek, Francis J. *Shame and the Self*. New York: Guilford Press, 1991.

Buss, Arnold H. *Self-Consciousness and Social Anxiety*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman, 1980.

_____. *Psychological Dimensions of the Self*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2002.

Camerer, Colin. "Individual Decision Making." In John H. Kagel and Alvin E. Roth (eds.) *Handbook of Experimental Economics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995, pp. 587-703.

_____ and Richard H. Thaler. "Anomalies: Ultimatums, Dictators and Manners." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Spring 1995, 9:2, pp. 209-219.

Coase, Ronald H. "The Nature of the Firm." *Economica*, November 1937, 4, pp. 386-405.

_____. "The Problem of Social Cost." *Journal of Law and Economics*, October 1960, 3, pp. 1-44.

Cohen, D., and R.E. Nisbett. "Self-protection and the Culture of Honor: Explaining Southern Violence." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 1994, 20, 551-567.

_____. "Field Experiments Examining the Culture of Honor: The Role of Institutions in Perpetuating Norms about Violence." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 1997, 23, 1188-1199.

Condit, Vicki K. "Anorexia Nervosa: Levels of Causation." *Human Nature: An Interdisciplinary Biosocial Perspective*, 1990, 1:4, pp. 391-413.

Dewey, John and Arthur F. Bentley. *Knowing and the Known*. In Rollo Handy and E.C. Harwood (eds.), *Useful Procedures of Inquiry*. Great Barrington, MA: Behavioral Research Council, (1949) 1973.

Dowell, Richard and Keith McLaren. "An Intertemporal Analysis of the Interdependence Between Risk Preference, Retirement, and Work Rate Decisions." *Journal of Political Economy*, June 1986, 94, pp. 667-82.

Dowell, Richard S., Robert S. Goldfarb, and William B. Griffith. "Economic Man as Moral Individual." *Economic Inquiry*, October 1998, 36:4, pp. 645-653.

Dworkin, Ronald M. "Is law a System of Rules?" In R.M. Dworkin (ed.) *The Philosophy of Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

_____. *Taking Rights Seriously*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Eisenberger, Roselies and Martin Weber. "Willingness-to-Pay and Willingness-to-Accept for Risky and Ambiguous Lotteries." *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, May 1995, 10:3, pp. 223-233.

Elster, Jon. *Ulysses and the Sirens: Studies in Rationality and Irrationality*, revised edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

_____. (ed.). *The Multiple Self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

_____. "Selfishness and Altruism." In Jane Mansbridge (ed.) *Beyond Self-Interest*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Engardio, Joel P. "Jehovah's Witnesses' Untold Story of Resistance to Nazis." *The Christian Science Monitor*, 6 November 1996, 88:240, pp. 1-13.

Epstein, Richard A. *Simple Rules for a Complex World*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Etzioni, Amitai. "The Case for a Multiple-Preference Conception." *Economics and Philosophy*, October 1986, 2:2, pp. 159-183.

Fisher, N.R.E. *Hybris: A Study in the Values of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greece*. Warminster, England: Aris & Phillips, 1992.

Frank, Robert H. "If *Homo Economicus* Could Choose His Own Utility Function, Would He Want One With a Conscience?" *American Economic Review*, September 1987, 77:4, pp. 593-604.

Frankfurt, Harry M. "Freedom of the Will and the Concept of a Person." *Philosophical Review*, January 14, 1971, 68:1, pp. 5-20.

Gilbert, Paul and Bernice Andrews (eds.). *Shame: Interpersonal Behavior, Psychopathology, and Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

- Gilman, Sander L. 1986. *Jewish Self-Hatred: Anti-Semitism and the Hidden Language of the Jews*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gilmore, David D. (ed.) *Honor and Shame and the Unity of the Mediterranean*. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, 1987.
- Gintis, Herbert. "Strong Reciprocity and Human Sociality." *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 2000, 206, pp. 169-199.
- Grant, Jan and Jim Crawley. *Transference and Projection: Mirrors to the Self*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press, 2002.
- Güth, Werner, Rolf Schmittberger, and Bernd Schwarze. "An Experimental Analysis of Ultimatum Bargaining." *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, December 1982, 3:4, pp. 367-388.
- Güth, Werner and R. Tietz. "Ultimatum Bargaining Behavior - A Survey and Comparison of Experimental Results." *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 1990, 11, pp. 417-449.
- Güth, Werner and Menahem Yaari. "Explaining Reciprocal Behavior in Simple Strategic Games: An Evolutionary Approach." In Ulrich Witt (ed.) *Explaining Process and Change: Approaches to Evolutionary Economics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992, ch. 2., pp. 23-34.
- Hans, James S. *The Origins of the Gods*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.
- Harsanyi, John C. "Cardinal Welfare, Individualistic Ethics, and International Comparisons of Preference." *Journal of Political Economy*, 1955, 63, pp. 309-321.
- Heyd, David. *Supererogation: Its Status in Ethical Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Hirschman, Albert O. "Against Parsimony: Three Easy Ways of Complicating some Categories of Economic Discourse." *Economics and Philosophy*, April 1985, 1:1, pp. 7-21.
- Hirshleifer, Jack. "On the Emotions as Guarantors of Threats and Promises." In John Depré (ed.) *The Latest on the Best: Essays on Evolution and Optimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1987, ch. 14, pp. 307-326.
- _____ and John Riley. *The Analytics of Uncertainty and Information*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

- Ihara, Saikaku. *Tales of Samurai Honor: Buke Giri Monogatari*, trans. Caryl Ann Callahan. Tokyo: Monumenta Nipponica, Sophia University, (1688) 1981.
- Kahan, Dan M. "What Do Alternative Sanctions Mean?" *University of Chicago Law Review*, Spring 1996, 63.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals*, translated by Lewis White Beck, with critical essays edited by Robert Paul Wolff. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, [1785] 1969.
- Khalil, Elias L. "Beyond Self-Interest and Altruism: A Reconstruction of Adam Smith's Theory of Human Conduct." *Economics and Philosophy*, October 1990, 6:2, pp. 255-273.
- _____. "Sentimental Fools: A Critique of Amartya Sen's Notion of Commitment." *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, December 1999, 40:4, pp. 373-386. (URL: www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/01672681)
- _____. "Symbolic Products: Prestige, Pride and Identity Goods." *Theory and Decision*, August 2000, 49:1, pp. 53-77.
- _____. "Adam Smith and Three Theories of Altruism." *Recherches Économiques de Louvain – Louvain Economic Review*, 2001, 67:4, pp. 421-435.
- _____. "Why does Trustworthiness Pay? Three Explanations: An Introduction." In E.L. Khalil (ed.) *Trust*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2003a.
- _____. "Respect, Embarrassment and Self-Deception." A working paper, 2003b
- _____. "What is Altruism?" *Journal of Economic Psychology*, February 2004, 25:1, pp. 97-123. www.elsevier.com/jump/?http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/01674870
- Kuran, Timur. "Private and Public Preferences." *Economics and Philosophy*, April 1990, 6:1, pp. 1-26.
- _____. *Private Truths, Public Lies: The Social Consequences of Preferences*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Lansky, Melvin R. and Andrew P. Morrison (eds.). *The Widening Scope of Shame*. Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press, 1997.
- Levi, Isaac. "Corrigibilism Without Solidarity." In E.L. Khalil (ed.) *Dewey, Pragmatism and Economic Methodology*. London: Routledge, 2004, pp. 240-252..

Levine, David. "Modeling Altruism and Spitefulness in Experiments." *Review of Economic Dynamics*, July 1998, 1:3, pp. 593-622.

Lewis, Michael. "Self-Conscious Emotions." *American Scientist*, January-February 1995a, 83:1, pp. 68-78.

_____. *Shame: The Exposed Self*. New York: Free Press, 1995b.

_____ and J. Haviland-Jones (eds.) *Handbook of Emotions*, second edition. New York: Guilford Press, 2000.

Lorenz, Konrad. *Evolution and Modification of Behavior*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Mansbridge, Jane. "Starting with Nothing: On the Impossibility of Grounding Norms Solely in Self-Interest." In Avner Ben-Ner and Louis Putterman (eds.) *Economics, Values, and Organization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998, ch. 5, pp. 151-168.

Margolis, Howard. "Free Riding versus Cooperation." In Richard J. Zeckhauser (ed.) *Strategy and Choice*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991, pp. 83-105.

Miller, Susan B. *Shame in Context*. Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press, 1996.

Miller, William Ian. *Humiliation: And Other Essays on Honor, Social Discomfort, and Violence*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Moffit, Robert. "An Economic Model of Welfare Stigma." *American Economic Review*, December 1983, 73:5, pp. 1023-1035.

Montague, Phillip. *In the Interests of Others: An Essay in Moral Philosophy*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer, 1992, ch. 2.

Morrison, Andrew P. *The Culture of Shame*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1996.

Mosquera, Patricia M. Rodriguez, Antony S.R. Manstead, Agneta H. Fischer. "The role of honour concerns in emotional reactions to offences." *Emotion & Cognition*, January 2002, 16:1, pp. 143-163.

Nathanson, Donald L. *Shame and Pride: Affect, Sex, and the Birth of the Self*. New York: Norton, 1992.

Posner, Richard A. *The Economics of Justice*, second edition. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983.

_____. *Aging and Old Age*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

_____. "Behavioral Law and Economics: A Critique." *Economic Education Bulletin*, American Institute for Economic Research, Great Barrington, MA, August 2002.

Retzinger, Suzanne M. *Violent Emotions: Shame and Rage in Marital Quarrels*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1991.

Rabin, Matthew. "Incorporating Fairness into Game Theory." *American Economic Review*, December 1993, 83:5, pp. 1281-1302.

Read, Piers Paul. *Alive: The Story of the Andes Survivors*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1974

Roth, Alvin E. "Bargaining Experiments." In John H. Kagel and A.E. Roth (eds.) *Handbook of Experimental Economics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995, pp. 253-348.

_____, Vesna Prasnikar, Shmuel Zamir, and Masahiro Okuno-Fujiwara. "Bargaining and Market Behavior in Jerusalem, Ljubljana, Pittsburgh, and Tokyo: An Experimental Study." *American Economic Review*, December 1991, 81:5, pp. 1068-1095.

Russell, Bertrand. "Mathematical Logic as Based on the Theory of Types." In *Logic and Knowledge: Essays 1901-1950*, ed. by Robert Charles Marsh. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1956, pp. 59-102. (Originally published in the *American Journal of Mathematics*, 1908.)

Ryan, Frank X. "Dewey's Reconstruction of Modern Philosophy," *Transactional Viewpoints*, Spring 2002, 1:2, pp. 1-4. (www.brc-aier.org)

Scheff, Thomas J. *Microsociology: Discourse, Emotion, and Social Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

_____ and Suzanne M. Retzinger. *Emotions and Violence: Shame and Rage in Destructive Conflicts*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1991.

Schneider, Carl D. *Shame, Exposure, and Privacy*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1992.

Seidler, Günter Harry. *In Others' Eyes: An Analysis of Shame*, trans. from the German by Andrew Jenkins. Madison, CT: International Universities Press, 2000.

Sen, Amartya K. "Rational Fools: A Critique of the Behavioral Foundations of Economic Theory." *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 1977, 6:4, pp. 317-344. (Reprinted in Sen, 1982, ch. 4.)

_____. *Choice, Welfare and Measurement*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1982.

_____. *Commodities and Capabilities*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1985.

_____. "Rationality and Social Choice." *American Economic Review*, March 1995, 85:1, pp. 1-24.

Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, edited by D.D. Raphael and A.L. Macfie. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

Stigler, George J. and Gary S. Becker. "DE Gustibus Non Est Disputandum." *American Economic Review*, March 1977, 67:1, pp. 76-90.

Tangney, June Price. "Assessing Individual Differences in Proneness to Shame and Guilt: Development of the Self-Conscious Affect and Attribution Inventory." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1990, 59, pp. 102-111.

_____ and Ronda L. Dearing. *Shame and Guilt*. New York: Guilford Press, 2002.

Thaler, Richard H. "Toward a Positive Theory of Consumer Choice." *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, March 1980, 1:1, pp. 39-60.

Tullock, Gordon. "Adam Smith and the Prisoners' Dilemma." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1985, 100, no. 402, Supplement, pp. 1073-1081.

Urmson, J. O. "Saints and Heroes." In A.I. Melden (ed.) *Essays in Moral Philosophy*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1958, pp. 198-216.

Williamson, Oliver E. *Markets and Hierarchies: Analysis and Antitrust Implications*. New York: The Free Press, 1975.

Witt, Ulrich. "Evolution and Stability of Cooperation without Enforceable Contracts." *Kyklos*, 1986, 39:2, pp. 245-266.